UNIV.OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/americanjournalo01univuoft

P
1208
A
S
American Journal of Semitic Languages & Literatures

HEBRAICA

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL IN THE INTERESTS OF HEBREW STUDY

MANAGING EDITOR:

WILLIAM R. HARPER, PH. D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND THE COGNATE LANGUAGES IN THE CHICAGO BAPTIST UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AND PRINCIPAL OF SCHOOLS, INSTITUTE OF HEBREW.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

PAUL HAUPT, PH. D.,

PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GOETTINGEN, AND PROFESSOR OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HERMANN L. STRACK, PH. D., D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN.

387058
27. 11. 40

VOLUME I.

MARCH 1884–APRIL 1885.

CHICAGO:

The American Publication Society of Hebrew,

P. O. Address, MORGAN PARK, ILL.

PJ
3001
A6
v.1

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NO. I.—MARCH, APRIL, MAY, 1884.

[NOTE.—"HEBRAICA" was commenced as a Monthly, and three numbers were issued, for March, April and May. It was then determined to publish it as a Quarterly, and count the three monthly numbers as No. I.]

MARCH.

I. THE PURPOSE OF HEBRAICA. By *William R. Harper*..... 1-5
II. THE HIGHER CRITICISM, A WITNESS TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVE. By *Hermann L. Strack, Ph.D*..... 5-10
III. THE INTERMEDIATE SYLLABLE. By *Prof. T. J. Dodd*..... 10-13
IV. CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW SYNONYMY, I. כשׁפט—דין. By *Rev. P. A. Nordell*..... 13-14
V. BOOKS FOR THE STUDY OF ASSYRIAN. By *Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D*..... 14-15
VI. GENERAL NOTES:—The Ethical Dative.—The Word יאר.—Davidson on Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament.—Rules of Life..... 15-17
VII. EDITORIAL NOTES..... 18-20
VIII. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS..... 20-21
IX. BOOK NOTICES:—Delitzsch's Hebrew and Assyrian.—Lehrbuch der Neuhebraeischen Sprache.—Ballin's Hebrew Grammar..... 21-23
X. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 23-24

APRIL.

I. A PHŒNICIAN INSCRIPTION IN NEW YORK. By *Isaac H. Hall, Ph.D*..... 25-26
II. THE PSALMS WITH THEIR SUPERSCRIPTIONS. By *Barnard C. Taylor*..... 26-31
III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW AND ASSYRIAN PHILOLOGY. By *K. Kohler, Ph.D*..... 31-33
IV. CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW SYNONOMY, II. By *Rev. P. A. Nordell*..... 33-36
V. PIRKE ABOTH. *Translated by B. Pick, Ph.D*..... 36-40
VI. HEBREW CHIROGRAPHY. By *Archibald C. Wheaton*..... 40-41
VII. GENERAL NOTES:—The Accentuation of the Poetical Books.—Michaelis on Hebrew Study.—צרקה in Later Hebrew.—Two Epigrams of Aben Ezra..... 41-43
VIII. EDITORIAL NOTES:—Intermediate Syllables.—Hebrew Study at Vanderbilt University.—A Pastor's Testimony.—Hebrew Study in the Junior Vacation..... 43-46
IX. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS..... 46
X. BOOK NOTICES:—Turpie's Chaldee Manual..... 47-48
XI. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 48

MAY.

I. BOOKS FOR THE STUDY OF THE NEO-HEBRAIC LANGUAGE. By *Hermann L. Strack, Ph.D*..... 49-51
II. THE VARIETIES OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET. By *Prof. John C. C. Clarke*..... 52-59
III. ON "INTERMEDIATE SYLLABLES." By *B. Felsenthal, Ph.D*..... 60-65
IV. CONTRIBUTED NOTES:—ל"ה Verbs: First Person Sing. Impf. Qal..... 66-67
V. EDITORIAL NOTES..... 67-70
VI. BOOK NOTICES..... 70-71
VII. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 72

NO. 2. OCTOBER, 1884.

I. THE SYLLABLES IN THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. By *Prof. Hermann L. Strack, Ph. D* ... 73-75
II. METHODS IN HEBREW GRAMMARS. By *Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D* ... 75-79
III. ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300. By *Cyrus Adler* ... 80-95
IV. מִשְׁרֹתִים-מִלְכִים. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF HEBREW GRAMMAR. By *Prof. Wilhelm Bacher, D. D.* ... 96-97
V. THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE. By *Prof. E. Kautzsch, D. D* ... 98-115
VI. MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. By *Prof. John P. Peters, Ph. D* ... 115-119
VII. PIRKE ABOTH; OR SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS. By *Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D* ... 119-123
VIII. CONTRIBUTED NOTES:—Remarks on the Ethiopic.—Kautzsch's Aramaic Grammar.—The Study of Arabic in the University of Cincinnati.—חרקר—גן־בגרן. 123-130
IX. EDITORIAL NOTES:—The Study of Assyrian.—Unaccented Open Syllables with a Short Vowel ... 130-132
X. BOOK NOTICES ... 133-134
XI. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY ... 135-136

NO. 3.—JANUARY, 1885.

I. THE MASSORETIC VOWEL-SYSTEM.—By *Prof. Crawford H. Toy* ... 137-144
II. THE DAGHESH IN INITIAL LETTERS. *A translation by Rev. O. O. Fletcher* ... 145-152
III. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TIME OF THE TALMUD. By *Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D* ... 153-174
IV. ASSYRIAN PHONOLOGY, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HEBREW. By *Prof. Paul Haupt, Ph. D* ... 175-185
V. ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES. By *Francis Brown, Ph. D* ... 182-183
VI. MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. By *John P. Peters, Ph. D* ... 184-186
VII. GENERAL NOTES:—A Question in Hebrew Grammar.—Additional Aramaic Words in the New Testament.—The Religion of the Kassites.—A Chaldee Hymn. By Israel Nagara ... 187-191
VIII. EDITORIAL NOTES:—The Institute of Hebrew.—The present Number of HEBRAICA.—Professor Haupt's Series of Articles ... 192-193
IX. BOOK NOTICES:—Mitchell's Hebrew Lessons.—Koenig's Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebaeude der hebraeischen Sprache ... 194-198
X. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY ... 199-200

NO. 4.—APRIL, 1885.

I. THE CYLINDER OF NEBUKADNEZZAR AT NEW YORK. By *J. F. X. O'Connor, S. J.* ... 201-208
II. THE SCRIBE. By *Prof. H. L. Strack, Ph.D., D.D.* ... 209-211
III. PIRKE ABOTH; OR, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS. By *Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D.* ... 212-216
IV. WATEH-BEN-HAZAEL. By *Prof. Paul Haupt, Ph.D.* ... 217-231
V. SYRIAC VERSION OF EPISTLE OF KING ABGARUS TO JESUS. By *Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph.D.* ... 232-235
VI. PLEIADES, ORION AND MAZZAROTH. By *Prof. John G. Lansing, M. A.* ... 236-241
VII. MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. By *Prof. John P. Peters, Ph.D.* ... 242-243
VIII. GRAMMATICAL QUESTIONS. By *Prof. F. B. Denio* ... 244-246
IX. CONTRIBUTED NOTES:—On the Semitic Languages in General.—The Relatives שׁ and אֲשֶׁר.—Genesis xx., 16.—Note on כְּנֵן (Dan. ii., 23; Ezra v., 16), כְּנָנָה (Ezra iv., 10, 11; vii., 12), כְּנָה (Ezra iv., 17).—צַלְמָוֶת or צַלְמָוֶת?—Moriah.—"Conscience" for כִּלְיָה.—Errata in the Baer-Delitzsch Edition of Proverbs.—Purpose without a Connective.—On the Source of the Name יהוה ... 247-257
X. BOOK NOTICES:—Some Recent German Books ... 258-262
XI. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY ... 263-264
XII. GENERAL INDEX TO VOL. I ... 265-267

HEBRAICA.

VOL. I. MARCH, 1884. NO. 1.

THE PURPOSE OF HEBRAICA.

BY WILLIAM R. HARPER.

I.

The study of the Hebrew language, except for distinctly theological uses, and the study of the other Semitic languages, except for the assistance derived from them for the Hebrew, receive but slight attention at the hands of American scholars. These studies are carried on almost exclusively in the divinity hall, where they are necessarily secondary. Nor even here are they emphasized as they deserve. The time of both instructor and student is occupied largely in the discussion of questions strictly theological. Discussions of a philological nature are neither required, nor expected. The professor is crowded with work of one kind or another; he cannot engage in original investigations. The time at his disposal is short. It must be given to the Old Testament, and not to Hebrew. He cannot afford to be a professor of language merely. He studies the language, only so far as he is obliged to do so, to fit himself for a tolerable performance of his duties as a theological instructor. He teaches the rudiments of the language a few hours a week during a portion of the Junior year. The remainder of the course, so far as concerns Hebrew, is given to exegesis, an exercise in which, because of the lack of preparation for it on the part of the pupil, the professor works, while the student rests.

Is there no work to be done in Semitic philology? When we remember that America has yet to produce a Hebrew lexicon, that almost nothing is accessible on the subject of Hebrew synonyms, that the meaning of a large number of Hebrew words is as yet not satisfactorily determined, that for our grammars and for our texts we must go to England and Germany, that no comparative Semitic grammar has yet appeared, that practical text-books for the study of Chaldee, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic and Assyrian are yet to be written, that we have no texts of separate books edited with notes, that no genuine work in textual criticism has yet been done, that the texts of the ancient versions are in a deplorable state, that great and important questions in Semitic ethnology are yet unsettled, that biblical chronology is a matter of the greatest uncertainty, that a critical Introduction in English to the Old Testament, is demanded by the times,—when we recall these facts, we realize certainly that there is work to be done. And that it is a great and growing work, will not be questioned by those who, for a moment, reflect. Who will do this work, if not the Professors of Hebrew? Is it not demanded of

the men who occupy the Old Testament chairs of our theological seminaries that they throw themselves with energy into these literary and philological fields, and not devote all their strength to "discussions as to technical minutiae of the Jewish schoolmen?" Shall not American scholars take hold of this work, in larger numbers and with greater zeal than ever before?

HEBRAICA will endeavor to furnish a medium for the publication of some of the results of this study. It will aim to serve as a means of inter-communication between scholars engaged in the various departments of Semitic work. It will particularly encourage original investigation. Its pages will be open to the discussion of all topics relating to the Semitic languages, literature, or history. It will urge those whose profession calls them to undertake the investigation of such topics to do their duty in this matter by using the opportunities afforded them, to render a valuable and a lasting service to the cause of higher education and learning.

II.

That Christian ministers ought to know Hebrew, is a generally accepted truth. It is necessary now in but few cases to enlarge upon the reasons for this study. In the case of those clergymen who do not have at least some knowledge of the language, it may be supposed that they earnestly desire it, and, indeed, would have it, but for unfavorable circumstances in the past or present. One will not go far wrong in saying that at least *eighty* out of every hundred ministers are alive to the importance of this subject. Of these eighty, however, not more than *ten*, probably, endeavor to do any systematic or consecutive work. Of the remaining *seventy*, there are *ten*, not more, who may reasonably satisfy themselves that they ought not to do such work. These are men who are physically or mentally unable. After deducting from every hundred cases, *twenty* who are not sufficiently interested in their work to make that preparation for it which may justly be regarded as indispensable, *ten* who may be supposed to be carrying on such study, and *ten* who may reasonably be excused from it, there remain *sixty*, who will confess that such study is desirable, and, indeed, necessary, yet do not undertake it. These sixty men have either commenced the study and dropped it, or they have never taken it up. In the former case, they may have had an instructor, who was a scholar, and an exegete, but not a teacher; or, a sufficient amount of time may not have been given in the curriculum of study to this department, and hence they did not attain that degree of knowledge which would have enabled them to carry on the study without further assistance; or, they may have regarded the study as of no importance, and consequently have shirked it at every possible opportunity. In the latter case, they may have entered the ministry without the ordinary preparation, laboring under the delusion, that without their immediate help the Kingdom of God must perish; or, they may have studied in the seminary, everything but the Bible.

Whatever be the reason assigned, the fact remains that sixty ministers out of every hundred, although they ought to have a living acquaintance with this language, and acknowledge this to be so, and desire the same, yet do not have it, and take no steps toward obtaining it. And why? Because they have formed a distaste for the study and cannot overcome it; or, because they are pressed with other claims of a more immediate nature, and have not the will-power needed to push them to one side; or, because they find it difficult to carry on such study alone and cannot, in the nature of the case, withdraw from their work to attend

a school where instruction may be obtained; or, because they have not had that encouragement which was needed to bring them to decide to undertake the study.

HEBRAICA will endeavor to interest these ministers, sixty out of every hundred, more deeply in the study of Hebrew; to stimulate them, if possible, to engage in such study, and to aid them, if possible, in its prosecution. These things it will aim to do by publishing words of incitement and encouragement from men who are in the midst of the work, and by means of actual help, afforded in the pages of the Journal, toward a better understanding of the principles and structure of that language in which is written three-fourths of God's revelation to man.

III.

Hebrew being a professional study, and being taught, consequently, only in the theological seminary, it might be supposed that a reasonable amount of time would be given that department in connection with which it is studied, that the best methods would be adopted by those who give this instruction, and that at least a fair knowledge of the language be gained by those who undertake the study. What are the facts?

(1) The time spent in the entire Old Testament department, in the majority of our seminaries, is not quite equivalent to that which is spent in the study of Latin *or* Greek during two years of a preparatory course. Classes average one recitation a day, for four days in the week. In the course, about two hundred and ninety hours of recitation are included. If the same amount of time were spent consecutively it would amount to about four and a half or five months of work. During this time, the student must master the Hebrew language, of which at the beginning of his course he is wholly ignorant; he must also learn the Aramaic, and must read as large a portion as possible of the Hebrew Bible. He must, likewise, become acquainted with the geography and archaeology of Palestine. The ancient versions of the Old Testament must receive some attention. A thorough grounding must be received in the three great sub-departments, Old Testament Hermeneutics, Old Testament Introduction, Old Testament Theology. To the department of the New Testament, the same amount of time is given, although the student is, from the beginning, thoroughly versed in the language which forms the basis of work. It is true, also, that the matter to be studied, although in some respects confessedly more important, covers but one-third as much ground, and is of a nature far less difficult. (2) Of the time spent in the Old Testament department, short as it is, probably not one-third is usually given to work of a linguistic character. The teaching of the principles of the language is regarded as drudgery. Few instructors take much interest in it. The work assigned from day to day is a task, burdensome alike to pupil and teacher. These tasks are prepared, but in many cases, only because they are required. The class is hurried into exegesis. Three chapters of Genesis, in some cases, have been painfully gone through with, when the Psalms, or Job, or one of the minor Prophets is taken up. From this time, the work is of a theological character and no longer linguistic. Is it supposed that the study of exegesis can be carried on with no adequate knowledge of the original language? (3) When we consider then the small amount of time given to the study of Hebrew and the injudicious method followed by many teachers in the study, we may be prepared for the statement that only a very small proportion of our seminary graduates take away with them a respectable knowledge of the language. This will pass undisputed. Theological students

not seldom sell their Hebrew books. Few ministers, as stated above, give any time to this study. We have a comparatively small number of Semitic scholars in our country. The Semitic work is being done in Germany. Is this as it should be?

That the present constitution of our seminaries is perfect is not to be supposed. Within a decade, great changes have been made in regard to these very matters. Instead of one man performing the labor of both Old and New Testaments, two men now perform that service; and in the more wealthy seminaries, an associate professor also is appointed. There is still room for advance. Much can be gained by the judicious use of better methods. At all events, either more instruction must be given the student, and greater acquisitions made by him, or the study of the Old Testament in the original tongues must be given up. In eight cases out of ten, the time spent by theological students in the study of Hebrew is time lost.

HEBRAICA will endeavor to increase the interest in Hebrew study among theological students: and it will work to advance the interests of that department in the theological seminary which has too often been regarded as the least important, and which has suffered greatly from indifference and neglect.

IV.

Universities and many colleges aim to teach everything. Almost no department of study is unrepresented in the curriculum. It is true, however, that with two or three notable exceptions, Semitic languages have no place. The literature, which of all literatures, has most influenced human thought and action, the history of the people to whom the world is indebted for its religion, that family of languages which is second in importance only to the family of which our own tongue is a member,—the Bible, Jewish history, and the Semitic languages pass unnoticed. This is a condition of things which should not long continue. It is not the place here to assign reasons why these subjects should be recognized in the University and College curriculum, at least as electives. Nor is there space to show why the theological seminary should not be left alone to do a work, which can no longer be regarded as strictly professional. It is sufficient to say, that if America is to perform her share in the great and important departments now, for the first, opening up in the remote districts of the East, if American scholars are to be prepared to take their part in deciding the vital questions that have arisen concerning the integrity of the Old Testament, if American scholarship is to take an active part in that rapidly developing science, the Science of Comparative Religion, surely Oriental studies, and particularly Semitic studies, must be introduced into the curriculum of non-professional schools. These studies must be encouraged in a more active manner than they have ever been. Instruction must be provided for those who desire it. Investigation must be encouraged on the part of those who have the ability and the taste for it.

What HEBRAICA can accomplish in this direction, it will do. Such changes in the established order of things are always slow. But if this is a thing to be done, it will in time be accomplished. If those who believe that Hebrew should be taught in colleges would but unite in an effort to introduce the study, they would soon succeed, for the number would be large and influential. It is possible that such a union of effort may be obtained. This, it will be understood, is one of the purposes for which HEBRAICA has been instituted.

V.

Within three years there has been organized and carried into successful operation a School for the study of Hebrew by Correspondence. This School, at this writing, includes over six hundred clergymen and students. The members of the School are of every evangelical denomination. They reside in almost every State in the Union, in Canada, in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, in Turkey, in China, in Japan, in India. Their sole aim in this work is to attain a thorough acquaintance with the Hebrew language. They are interested in all that pertains to this department of study. They desire aid which is not to be found in dictionaries and grammars. They will appreciate and obtain profit from the discussion of topics, as it comes fresh from the hands of instructors and students. They feel bound together by a common tie. For this class of men, as well as for those clergymen and students who are to-day carrying on regular and systematic study by themselves, HEBRAICA is intended. If rightly conducted, it cannot but prove to them invaluable.

To furnish a medium for the discussion of Semitic topics by Semitic scholars, to encourage and aid those who are in the ministry to engage in Semitic study, to advance, if possible, the interests, and to increase the efficiency of the Old Testament department in our various seminaries, to advocate the introduction of Semitic studies into our Universities and Colleges, and to form a bond of connection between the widely scattered members of the Hebrew Correspondence School, HEBRAICA is sent forth. May it not receive the sympathy and cooperation of all who have at heart the cause of higher learning?

THE HIGHER CRITICISM, A WITNESS TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVE.

BY HERMANN L. STRACK, PH. D., TH. LIC.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

Not a few orthodox theologians in Europe, very many in England and America, see in the application of the so-called Higher Criticism to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, a danger to the faith, and consequently by principle stand aloof from all such work.

Now, it is indeed noteworthy, that the Higher Criticism has had its origin and first accomplishment mostly through suggestions which have come from those who were heterodox. It were easy to enumerate many examples. In this periodical devoted to the study of the Old Testament and the Hebrew Language, I give only three of the many names well known in the history of the Pentateuch criticism: *Thomas Hobbes*, whom Thorschmid* has called the "grand-father of all free-thinkers in England," the author of the "Leviathan, or the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth," etc. (London, 1651, Part III., chap. 33); the inventor of the strange Pre-Adamite hypothesis, *Isaac la Peyrere* (Systema theologicum ex Praeadamitarum hypothesi, 1655 [*sine loco*], IV., cap. 1); and the Jewish

* "Versuch einer vollstaendigen Engellaendischen Freydenkerbibliothek, 1765-67."

pantheist, *Baruch Spinoza* (Tractatus theologico-politicus, 1670, in particular cap. 9). But we are not warranted in concluding from this that the Higher Criticism is necessarily opposed to a positive, orthodox view; and least of all may we Protestants be, from principle, opponents of the Higher Criticism. On the contrary, criticism is inquiry, and it is a holy duty of Protestantism to inquire after truth; we should not believe what has been once handed down simply upon authority, but we should always still *test it for ourselves*. He to whom the truth of the Christian religion is a fact of experience, independent of external evidences, will be able to devote himself to the struggle for knowledge without anxiety respecting the issue. One is not to despair if it many times seems that the results of science work injury to the positive Christian faith. For the fact suggests itself: either what is now regarded as the result is not true and then will come the time of correction or refutation; or the result is true and then it will be made plain that the traditional view was in reality deficient, it may be in the dogmatic premises or in the exegesis or in some other relation.

It has, therefore, given me much joy, that, just as I was about to write this short contribution for this new periodical, I should find essentially the preceding thoughts expressed in a book just received by me from New York. *Charles Augustus Briggs*, Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, closes the preface of his latest, and very recommendable book* with these words: "With an implicit faith in the God of the Bible and the power of grace contained in the holy Word; and with an unwavering recognition of the supreme excellence of the written word as the mirror of the eternal Logos: and with an entire submission to its authority as supreme over all doctrines of men and ecclesiastical decisions, this biblical study is submitted to the judgment of the intelligent reader." He who speaks thus is sheltered from the reproach of rationalism, of unbelief. And the same eminent scholar writes, p. 246, "There is also a prejudice in some quarters against these studies and an apprehension as to the results. This prejudice is unreasonable. This apprehension is to be deprecated. It is impossible to prevent discussion. The church is challenged to meet the issue. It is a call of Providence to conflict and to the triumph of evangelical truth. The Divine Word will vindicate itself in all parts. These are not the times for negligent Elis or timorous and presumptuous Uzzahs. Brave Samuels and ardent Davids who fear not to employ new methods and engage in new enterprises and adapt themselves to altered situations, will overcome the Philistines with their own weapons."

In the following lines, which others, it may be, will follow with more and better, I would now seek to show that the results of the Higher Criticism can be used in many ways in favor of the credibility of the biblical accounts.

The historian rightly considers a fact to be better proved, and therefore to be more credible, when testified to by several independent authors, than when only one isolated account is at hand. The reports of a single unbiased and intelligent eye-witness are, to be sure, worth more than the accounts of several later witnesses. But so soon as we concede that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, the very dissimilarity of the original documents incorporated into the Pentateuch is serviceable for the re-establishment of its credibility.

---

* Biblical Study, its Principles, Methods and History, together with a Catalogue of Books of Reference. *New York:* Scribner's Sons, 1883. XV., 506 pp. 8vo.

A redactor who welds together what is entirely contradictory is an irrational, injudicious man. Now, those who admit the Pentateuch to have been constructed out of three or four great codes, extol, almost in a body and on numerous occasions, the circumspection, the care, the tact of the redactor. They come, therefore, into evident conflict with themselves when they, in many other places, affirm that between the individual original documents there are discrepancies and even fundamental contrarieties which are irreconcilable. They do not notice what follows. A redactor or author (which name may also be preferred) who compiles from three or four codes a greater work, will take from each of his sources that related in it, which is most evident, most complete, and most suitable to the purpose of the new work; he will partly shorten, partly omit the parallel accounts of the other sources, in order that there may not be too many, and too long, repetitions. Out of that document, naturally, which was most detailed in its treatment of the priests and ceremonial law, was that exclusively or particularly taken which has reference to the priest and the ceremonial law; and what alluded to the prophetic spiritual contemplation of history, peculiar to the Jehovistic document, will have been mostly omitted, because this last document, was in this respect, more detailed and clearer.

If, now, we have analyzed the Pentateuch, according to determined criteria, into its original elements, there will *appear* to be a greater difference than originally existed, between the Priest-codex and the Jehovistic, to speak only of the two sources already named; for of each of these two sources there is wanting to us, according to all probability, the most of that wherein it was closely at one with the other source. The circumstance that an intelligent man has wrought together these diverse documents, is proof that he did not believe in the existence of essential differences. Further, we will be able to perceive, in spite of the incomplete state in which the original documents are preserved to us, that, as regards many an important matter of fact, it was related in more than one of the sources (the calling of Moses, the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, &c.); and that is to us weighty testimony in behalf of the historical reality of the leading facts, inasmuch as the diverse sources of the Pentateuch are, if not altogether, still partly, independent of one another. Weighty testimony, we say; for, in modern times, many inquirers have gone so far as to combat the historical reality of the unique legislative and prophetic labors of Moses.

In relation to the Pentateuch analysis, that is, in relation to the question, which parts of the Pentateuch belong to the individual original writings, there has been lately much progress effected. But even, at the present, unproved statements are very frequently made; and the analysis has not come to that degree of trustiness and certitude which is necessary, if far-reaching conclusions are to be built upon it.

The results with reference to Genesis are best assured. We may, in particular, consider it as beyond doubt, that the beginning of this book, the so-called first creation-record (I., 1–II., 4*a*) comes from the Priest-codex, and is only continued in chap. v.; on the contrary the section, II., 4*b*, *sqq.*, has its origin in the Jehovist. We will not here, at this time, canvass the oft discussed question, as to whether and how far differences between these two records of the creation are to be acknowledged; but would rather call attention to something else.

According to the assertion of most of the representatives of the critical tendency, the Priest-codex knows nothing of a Fall, and stands in this respect in

opposition to the Jehovist account. We believe, on the contrary, it may be affirmed that the Priest-codex originally contained an account of the entrance of sin into the creation and that this was only omitted by the redactor in favor of the account of the Jehovist in Gen. III., an account alike detailed and instructive. This assertion we will now seek to prove.

Six times does it say in the first creation-record, speaking of the separate works of God, "It was good" (I., 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25); of the entire creation, in consideration of its completeness, on account of the harmony in which the individual parts exist,* and because of the character of the whole which arises from the fact that the parts belong together, there occurs the predicate "very good" טוב מאד, (I., 31). This "good," occurring seven times, contains a protest against the view that God is the author of evil.† This word therefore points to the time following, points to the fact that the creation has not remained very good, or even good. Now, it is, according to my conviction, altogether impossible to accept that in the Priest-codex the fifth chapter of Genesis followed directly upon this "good" seven times asserted. At the beginning of this chapter it is said: This is the book of the Toldoth [generations] of Adam. When God created Adam, he made him in the likeness of God (בדמות אלהים).....; and when Adam was 130 years old, he begat in his own likeness, according to his own image (בדמותו כצלמו) and called his name (the name of the begotten) Seth." Seth's likeness to Adam is not, to be sure, expressly set in antithesis to Adam's likeness to God; nevertheless the acceptance of a distinction [between them] agrees very well with the wording [of the account]. And that in reality a distinction must be made, that between this chapter and the first creation-record there comes the loss of the predicate "good," of this, וַיָּמָת repeating itself throughout the entire fifth chapter with shuddering monotony, furnishes proof. The constant repetition of this word in each succeeding section‡ [*Glied*] is certainly intentional. It reminds that death and together with it evil and sorrows have pressed into the world and that death ruled (ἐβασίλευσεν, Rom. V., 14), even over him who should govern the earth (Gen. I., 26–28), over man. A genealogical register with this refrain *cannot* have formed the immediate continuation of the first creation-record. The origin of evil and sorrow, hence the origin of sin, must also have been originally related in the Priest-codex, between the account of the creation and Adam's genealogical register.

Attentive consideration of the fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis likewise furnishes us with proof of this. It is acknowledged by all who concede an authority to the critical analysis, that II., 5, *sqq.*, is drawn from the Jehovist, and that I., 1–II., 3, belongs to the Priest-codex. But how is it with II., 4? Does this verse belong wholly to the Priest-codex or wholly to the Jehovist; or is it to be so divided that the first half of it may belong to the Priest-codex, the second to the Jehovist?

In order to arrive at a correct judgment, we must take into consideration the following points:

1. The word Toldoth is *constantly* a superscription not a subscription. This is

* Compare the Greek κόσμος, the Latin *mundus*.

† The passage, Is. XLV., 7, is not inconsistent with the above. The interpretation of this verse would lead too far here.

‡ Only with Enoch does there occur a necessary exception.

also true as to Num. III., 1, and Ruth IV., 18, in which two places alone, outside of Genesis, does Toldoth occur with a following genitive.* According to this, V. 4 would belong wholly to the following.

2. Toldoth is found otherwise only in Elohistic sections, but the following is undeniably Jehovistic; therefore the word Toldoth could not have belonged, at least originally, to the following.

3. Toldoth signifies "begettings", the following genitive designates the begetter; for example XI., 27, ואלה תולדת תרח "*et hæc sunt ea quæ generata sunt* (*orta sunt, originem ducunt*) *a Tarah*" [and these are those who were begotten by (arise from, derive origin from) Terah]. In what follows upon תולדת פלני [so and so] the begetting of the פלני is *never* treated of; but what comes after declares: whom פלני begat, and mostly indeed through several sections [*Glieder*]; what may have become of the begotten or the most important of them; and beside this, how it may have issued with פלני after the mentioned begetting or begettings. According to this constant usage of the language, תולדות השמים והארץ cannot denote "the origin of the heavens and the earth," cannot therefore be the subscription of the section (which latter has been assumed in order to avert the conclusion which follows from the fact remarked above *sub.* 1). Rather must these words allude to what has its origin from them (the heaven and the earth).

But does that which follows, *as to its contents*, answer to this requirement? I believe: Yes. Plants and animals, as we know from chap. I., originated conformably to God's will by the co-participation of the earth. Man also is created out of earth (according to chap. II.). But it might be objected, that of *heaven* nothing whatever is further said in what follows. Against this, it is to be noted that the transposition ארץ ושמים in v. 4*b* intimates beforehand that the chief consideration in the mind of the redactor rests upon the *earth*. And further, we have with the very word Toldoth another instance indicating that in the following genitive something superscriptive is mentioned, of which no further notice will be taken in the text: I mean the entirely analogous passage Num. III., 1, *sqq.*, which, so far as I know, has never yet been put to this service by any one. The chapter begins ואלה תולדת אהרן ומשה. There Moses is mentioned along with Aaron in the superscription, because both together were at that time the heads of the tribe of Levi, of whose muster record is made in Num. III. But only the sons of Aaron are named; because these only, as forefathers [*Stammvater*] of the priests were of significance for the future of the tribe of Levi, while the sons of Moses stand back because they belong to the Levite division of the tribe: they are not even called by name among the Kohathites (v. 27).

If we now ask how these three points, which, in the present state of the case, stand in opposition to one another, can be equally right, I see no other possibility than the supposition that, in the Priest-codex, V., 1 did not follow immediately upon the account of the creation (I., 1–II., 3), but that a section, which ואלה תולדות began, stood between them and related, in other words, what after creation first of all befell the thing created, related the Fall of man, an epoch-making incident for all the creation. This section has yielded to the Jehovistic account; the redactor has left only the superscription and indeed so that he used it as the superscription of the Jehovistic narrative, taken up by him and made to follow

* Elsewhere it invariably has a suffix.

immediately after. Why the account of the Priest-codex concerning the fall of man, has been omitted, we naturally cannot now specify; it can only be presumed that it occurred because the Jehovistic account was more detailed and clearer.

In any case the fact that *two* written statements of the fall of man, &c., lay before the redactor of Genesis, serves to enhance the credibility of the account respecting the history of these primitive ages.

THE INTERMEDIATE SYLLABLE.

BY PROFESSOR T. J. DODD,

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Questions about the *Intermediate Syllable* arise in the minds of all beginners whose attention has once been called to the subject. There are numbers who have no difficulty here because they have never learned the existence of such a syllable. Many of the grammars in common use make no mention of it;—others merely signify that the syllable exists, but do not give sufficient information even to arouse curiosity or to stir up difficulty. It is not surprising that the older Manuals such as those of Buxtorf, Reineccius, Opitius, and the like, should have nothing to say about the subject,—nor need we expect to find a treatment of it in such brief compends as those of Jones, Wolfe, Tregelles, Arnold, Merowitz, Mannheimer and Deutsch; but that such authors as Lee, Nordheimer and Kalisch should have passed the matter by in absolute silence or have given it so little recognition that one is at a loss to seek it in their books, may well excite astonishment. Of those writers, such as Ewald, Gesenius, Bickell, and Green, who have mentioned this syllable, Green alone seems to have recognized its importance, and he fails to give a complete, satisfactory account of it. Ewald has only a few lines devoted to it, telling us in general terms that "*half shut* syllables always arise at the resolution of a vowel by flexion.... or with very loosely attached and separate *præ-* and *postfix* syllables." Gesenius, improved by Roediger and translated by Davies, barely alludes to the syllable in saying,—after having mentioned a few words in which it occurs,—that "the Sh'vâ sound is especially slight in consequence of the very short syllable preceding it,"—and, in a foot note, "that this faintest sort of vocal Sh'vâ may well be indicated by a mere apostrophe." In Mitchell's Gesenius we have a few more words, but nothing that amounts to a real consideration of the subject. Here we find two kinds of vocal Sh'vâ distinguished, "the Sh'vâ *mobile*, and the Sh'vâ *medium* placed under such consonants as stand at the end of a syllable with a short vowel, and thus effecting at least a slight close of the same, while at the same time they serve as appoggiatura to the following syllable." A line or so upon the pronunciation of this Sh'vâ *medium*, and we have no more either of it or of the syllable preceding. Even in the few words given, we must note an unguarded expression: "*at the end of a syllable with a short vowel*" is too loose a definition either for Gesenius, or for his representative. According to this, the Sh'vâ may be *medium* in any one of the words קְטָלוּ, קְטָלוּ, בְּרִיעַ, תַּדְשֵׁא, - and, waving all criticism of mere looseness or inaccuracy of definition of the

Sh'vâ, we must call attention to the fact that the *intermediate syllable* itself is not so much as named. *Bickell*, in his "*outlines*," called by Dr. Curtiss, the translator, "the most scientific discussion of the Hebrew language which has yet been produced," shows very plainly in the Reading Exercises at the close of his treatise, that he recognizes the syllable as belonging to the language,—shows this in his pronunciation of the Imv. sing. 2 fem. קְטְלִי, yet he makes no mention of it in his discussion of syllables. *Vibbert's Guide*, though treating especially and only of the Hebrew pronunciation, seems to know nothing at all about the matter. We have said that Dr. Green alone, so far as we know, has given real attention to this subject, yet he has not considered it of sufficient importance to give it a place in his classification of syllables. He brings it up under the heads of Vocal Sh'vâ and Dāghēsh-lene, and nearly all that he says of it is placed among his *fine-print observations*. What he *there* says is, however, very full and satisfactory, with the exception of his omission of the article הַ or הָ as forming, with the following letter, an intermediate syllable, and perhaps a few other omissions. Having collected, in a single paragraph, the different classes of this syllable, and given rules for determining, so far as practicable, in each given case, when the syllable occurs, he dismisses the subject, as if it had nothing to do with the general subject of Hebrew grammar,—and that, too, immediately after an observation to the effect that "these rules are sometimes of importance in etymology."

In etymology and in the pronunciation of the language is to be found the sole importance of these rules, and from certain standpoints of view, we might be content to pass it by with a mere recognition. But if the pronunciation be a matter of any consequence at all, we should certainly see to it that our pronunciation be correct. Thus considered the intermediate syllable appears to be on a perfect level with the *open* and the *closed*,—or the *pure* and the *mixed*. The Massorites evidently so regarded it, for they were careful to keep it distinctly in view, at least in all cases where the B'ghădh-k'phăth letters were concerned, and this portion of their work they carried to such minuteness as to indicate its presence even in the most exceptional cases, as in בְּגָדְוֹ instead of בִּגְדוֹ.

The fact that in all construct plurals where the vowel has been dropped,—in all Infinitives and Imperatives of the Qăl when additions are made that draw the tone,—in all cases where בְּ and כְּ, the inseparable prepositions, are prefixed,—and in many others that need not be named,—the Dāghēsh-lene is with but few exceptions carefully excluded from the B'ghădh-k'phăth letters following the Sh'vâ, shows most clearly that the punctators of the text considered this syllable as of equal importance with any other part of their work. That the sound which *we* give to the intermediate syllable is hardly to be discerned from that of the open or the closed is no reason why we should either ignore it or give it inadequate consideration, especially if we undertake to represent the pronunciation of the language in its other characteristics. We can give no sound whatever to the letter 'Ălĕph, and no man certainly knows what was the power of 'Ayĭn, and yet in all attempts to present these letters to the English eye, we either carefully employ some written symbols, or we write the Hebrew form itself. A little practice, however, will enable us to give about as accurate sound to this syllable as to any other in the language. For instance, in such a word as דִּבַּרְכֶם we may touch, as it were, the ר but lightly, dividing it into two partial sounds, using the one in

closing the first syllable of the word, the other in beginning the next syllable. We can thus make a sound *intermediate* between what would be דִּבַּרְכֶּם on the one hand, and דִּבַּרְכֶם on the other.

As regards the inseparable prepositions prefixed to the Inf., it would seem that the rule is to make an intermediate syllable when בְּ and כְּ are used, but that לְ makes the syllable *mixed* or *closed*. Besides the remarks and the examples given by Dr. Green, p. 27, see intermediate syllables in בְּכָתוֹב Ps. LXXXVII., 6; בְּנָפֵל Job XXXIII., 15; כְּנָבֵל Isa. XXXIV., 4; כְּנָפוֹל 2 Sam. III., 34, with many others that might be given,—with בְּ and כְּ. Yet here, it must be remarked, exceptions will be found. For *mixed* syllables made by לְ, take *Fuerst's Concordance*, and look for the Inf. const. of any verb whose second radical is one of the B'ghădh-k'phăth:—then find לִנְדֹּר Num. VI., 2; לְמֵכוֹר Neh. X., 32.

There seems to be a very good reason for this difference between לְ and the other prepositions. As observed by the Editor in the SUPPLEMENT of the April No. of the STUDENT, "it forms a closer union"—and "is treated as part of the grammatical form." This is because in signification it is more closely allied to the Infinitive than are the other prefixes in question. Like the English *to* it fits into the uses of the Infinitive so nicely that in all probability it became to the Hebrew mind a part of the verb, just as many consider *to* a part of the Infinitive mood in English.

Inasmuch as we have allowed that Dr. Green has given us, in his treatment of the Sh'vâ and of Dāghēsh-lene, a satisfactory view of the intermediate syllable, as it *there* appears, and yet assert that he has not given to the subject the consideration which it demands, we must beg space for one or two remarks additional. Unless we are greatly mistaken we find in this author's work no further mention of the intermediate syllable after he passes on from Dāghēsh-lene. And yet this syllable runs all along through the Hebrew language. There are many *turns* or *angles* in our course through the study at which our way may become somewhat darkened or perplexed, unless we keep it continually in view. Thus we read, not only in Green's, but in the other grammars likewise, that the suffixes כֶן, כֶם, כְּ must always be preceded by vocal Sh'vâ (Green, p. 249), but soon the student finds such forms as דִּבְּרֵךְ and דִּבַּרְכֶם, and he is at a loss to know how it comes that if the Sh'vâ be vocal, there is no Mĕthĕgh in the latter word, making it דִּבְּרְכֶם. If the Sh'vâ be vocal, the ר must begin the second syllable, leaving the first as דַּבְ, which being *open* and *toneless* must take the Mĕthĕgh. But there is no Mĕthĕgh, and the student's perplexity is never removed unless by his own insight into the matter, he discovers the error of the grammars at this point, and sees that the Sh'vâ is *not* a vocal Sh'vâ, but what Gesenius, before alluded to, calls the Sh'vâ *medium*. Before we had observed this nomenclature of Gesenius, we had made for ourself a threefold division of the Sh'vâ as *silent*, *vocal*, and *intermediate*, corresponding to the closed, open, and intermediate syllables. By such a threefold division, quite a number of the minor points of Hebrew grammar may be more clearly presented, as well as a more accurate and consistent pronunciation of the language. With such divisions we see that the rule just given for the suffixes כֶן, כֶם, כְּ needs to be modified. These are preceded by *vocal* Sh'vâ when the preceding vowel is long, as in דִּבְּרֵךְ, שִׁלַּחְתִּיךְ, צִוָּנְכֶם, etc., but *intermediate* when

said vowel is short, as in אֹהֳבֵךְ, נֹאכְלֵם, מַקְלֵכֶם, יִשְׁלְמֵךְ, שִׁמְרֵךְ, דִּבְרֵכֶם, and, from the examples given, it will be seen that the rule is applicable both to nouns and verbs, when receiving these suffixes.

Since writing the above our attention has been kindly called by Prof. Harper to the treatment of the intermediate syllable by Dr. Davidson. On turning to the grammar of the latter, we find that we had indicated, by pencil marks upon the margin, our appreciation of his comparatively full exposition of the subject. Yet here there are the same defects as those just considered, when we come to view many of the etymological processes of the language. And besides, the Doctor's definition of the intermediate or, as he calls it, the *half-open* syllable is very defective. He tells us—p. 10—that "another kind of syllable, not uncommon, is the *half-open*. It has a short unaccented vowel, but the consonant that would naturally close it is pronounced with a slight vowel sound after it, and thus hangs loosely between this syllable and the one following—e. g., בִּקְטֹל which is not bĭq-ṭōl nor bĭ-q'ṭōl." This definition does very well for all such examples as that given,—those in which the closing consonant has Sh'vâ under it, but will not answer for those in which such consonant has a vowel, as in אַחֵר, אַחִים, and the like, together with many which are formed by some of the prefixed particles, הַהוּא etc. Green's definition—p. 27—is equally at fault because it likewise proceeds upon the idea of a Sh'vâ being always under the closing consonant of the syllable. Had these authors taken into consideration the *acute* or *sharpened* syllables as a separate class, they had doubtless discovered their defective definitions,—the *acute* syllable terminating with the same letter that the next syllable begins with,—in other words, a *double* letter, as in קַטֵּל. On a little consideration it will be seen that the intermediate syllable partakes of the nature both of the *open* and *closed*, as in דִּבְרֵכֶם, and of the *open* and acute or *sharpened*, as in אַחִים.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW SYNONYMY.

By Rev. P. A. Nordell,
New London, Ct.

I.

מִשְׁפָּט — דִּין

The Septuagint translates both דִּין and מִשְׁפָּט by *κρίμα*, *κρίσις*, and even by *δίκη*, and the Vulgate by *causa* and *judicium*. In Hebrew the words are by no means used indiscriminately. דִּין, a common Semitic word, has the primary meaning to rule, to govern. In the East executive and judicial authority are often vested in the same official, and hence executive administration is intimately blended with the function of a lawgiver or a judge, as when Darius says, di-na-a-tav at-tu-u-a kul-lu', "my laws (or decrees) they fulfilled" (Nashi Rustam Inscr. 11). The word soon passed from its primary meaning into that of judging or deciding suits affecting property or civil rights. This general reference to matters affecting individuals it retains in post-biblical Hebrew, where the Great Sanhedrin is called the בֵּית דִּין, a judicial sentence גְּזַר דִּין, a fine דִּין קְנָסָא, and a capital sentence דִּין נְפָשׁ.

שָׁפַט, with the fundamental thought of erecting, setting upright, gives the verbal substantive מִשְׁפָּט, which designates the establishment of truth or justice in a cause on trial. It differs from דִּין by having an implied reference to an objective standard of right. A מִשְׁפָּט is a judgment in harmony with justice and truth; a דִּין should be just and equitable, but it has no inherent moral reference. The former is a judicial embodiment of absolute rectitude, the latter of legal justice which may be far from being equitable; the one is an infallible righteous judgment, the other a fallible judicial utterance. These distinctive meanings are exhibited in Ps. IX., 4. כִּי־עָשִׂיתָ מִשְׁפָּטִי וְדִינִי, "For thou hast maintained my right and my cause," i e., assisted him in securing a righteous judgment and a favorable decision. See also Ps. CXL., 13; Is. X., 2. The moral element of מִשְׁפָּט appears conspicuously in passages like Job XXVII., 2, where the Almighty is charged with taking away, not the patriarch's דִּין but his *just judgment;* and Is. LIII., 8 where the Messiah is said to be snatched away, not from a legal, but from a righteous sentence. While, then, דִּין is used in biblical Hebrew almost exclusively to designate judgments in respect to disputes or grievances arising between man and man, מִשְׁפָּט, by virtue of its moral reference, is used almost as exclusively to designate the judgments of God, these being understood to embrace not only the exhibitions of his compensative justice, but the entire *corpus juris divini* of laws, statutes, regulations, precepts, etc.

BOOKS FOR THE STUDY OF ASSYRIAN.

BY PROFESSOR D. G. LYON, PH. D.,
Harvard University, Cambridge.

1. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH.—Assyrische Lesestuecke Ed. 2. Leipzig: *J. C. Hinrichs*, 1878. Price 24 marks (= $6).
2. WILHELM LOTZ.—Die Inschriften Tiglathpileser's I. Leipzig: *J. C. Hinrichs*, 1880. Price 20 marks. (Contains a long text transcribed, with translation, commentary and glossary.)
3. EBERHARD SCHRADER.—Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Ed. 2. Giessen: *J. J. Richer*, 1883. Price about 15 marks. (Contains numerous translations and a long and valuable glossary.)
4. "A selection from the Miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria." Edited by H. C. Rawlinson and T. G. Pinches. London, 1880. Price 10 shillings (= $2.50). (This is the first half of Vol. V. of "The Cuneiform Inscriptions Western of Asia," and contains the finest Assyrian inscription yet published.)
5. D. G. LYON.—Keilschrifttexte Sargons Koenig's von Assyrien (722-705, v. Chr.). Leipzig: *J. C. Hinrichs*, 1883. Price 24 marks. (Contains the origin-

al texts in cuneiform character, together with transliteration, translation, commentary and glossary.)

FOR FURTHER INDEPENDENT STUDY OF THE LANGUAGE.

6. "The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia." Edited by H. C. Rawlinson and others. London, 1861–1875. Vols. I.–IV. Price 20 shillings a volume. Vol. IV. is said to be out of print.

7. HENRI POGNON.—L'Inscription de Bavian. Paris: *F. Viewey*, 67 rue Richelieu, 1879. Price about 15 francs (= $3).

8. PAUL HAUPT.—Sumerische Familien Gesetze. Leipzig: *J.C.Hinrichs*, 1879. Price 12 marks.

9. CARL BEZOLD.—Die Achaemenideninschriften. Leipzig: *J. C. Hinrichs*. Price 24 marks.

10. PAUL HAUPT.—Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte (in five parts, of which four have appeared). Leipzig: *J. C. Hinrichs*, 1881. Price 36 marks (for the four parts).

There are several Assyrian grammars, but these are necessarily quite imperfect. The best are:

11. A. H. SAYCE.—"An Elementary Grammar; with full syllabary and progressive reading book, of the Assyrian language." London: *Sam. Bagster & Sons*. Has had two or three editions. Get the latest. Price about 10 shillings.

12. J. MENANT.—Manuel de la Langue Assyrienne. Paris: *L'Impremerie Nationale*. Price about 15 francs. Well worth having.

GENERAL NOTES.

The Ethical Dative.—An unemphatic pronoun in the dative, joined to the verb in the same person with it, may very palpably express the way in which the action returns upon itself, is terminated and completed; as הָלַךְ לוֹ *he is gone* [Ger. *er ist sich gegangen*], *i. e.*, he has taken himself off, made off with himself, is quite vanished, as it were, Cant. II., 11; Gen. XII., 1; nay, such a pronoun may even accompany a reflexive verb as הִתְהַלֵּךְ לוֹ Ps. LVIII., 8; a similar expression is נָס לוֹ *he fled for himself*, *i. e.*, betook himself to flight, Isa. XXXI., 8; Cant. VIII., 14; Amos VII., 12, though, in prose, נָס and בָּרַח alone [*i. e.*, without the reflexive pronoun] are always used in the same meaning. In most cases, however, this mode of expression rather indicates a special participation in the action by the agent or speaker, a certain earnestness or zeal with which he acts; but it occurs, as an expression of heartiness, more in the diffuse and easy-going popular style, both in poetry and in unimpassioned prose; thus, קִנְּוּ לָמוֹ *they hoped for themselves* (*i. e.*,

almost your *earnestly*), Job VI., 19; with an intransitive participle, which is at the same time applied to an inanimate object, as, *the cart* הַמְלֵאָה לָהּ *which is full for itself* (*i. e.*, which has quite filled itself) *with sheaves*, Amos II., 13; and especially in sentences in which advice is tendered or a question asked, such a dative is apt to intrude itself, Isa. II., 22, XXIII., 7. The strong liking on the part of certain later poets for the use of the particle, in the Aramaic fashion, is clearly evidenced by Ps. CXX., 6, CXXII., 3, CXXIII., 4. On the other hand, the extensive accumulation of pronouns having a reflex reference produces a degree of pleasantry, such as is found in the Lat. *ipsissimi*, Ger. *hoechstselbst:* הִמָּה . . . הֵמָּה לִבָּם. Eccles. III., 18.—*Ewald's Hebrew Syntax.*

The word יאר.—This word, meaning "river" or "channel," commonly regarded as an Egyptian word and explained by the Egyptian aur "Nile," is undoubtedly a genuine Hebrew word. This opinion is supported by the passage Job XXVIII., 10, where יְאֹרִים means "fountains in the rocks" or, according to some commentators, "subterraneous passages hewn out in the rocks." See also my remarks in *Paradies*, p. 312. The Assyrian form of the word, ya'ûrê "streams," occurs in an inscription of Ramannirari I. (c. 1320 B. C.). Another derivative of the same root יאר or ואר, which I believe means "to send," may be seen in the large inscription of Nebuchadnezzar (col. VI., 46), where the vast ocean ti'âmtu gallatu, is called ya-ar-ri. i. e., yâri marti "the bitter stream" on account of its salt-water. The Hebrew name of the Nile, יְאֹר (Assyr. Yaru-'u-u) is probably an adaptation of the Egyptian word to the good Semitic name for "stream," ya'ûru, yâru, יאר.—*Frederic Delitzsch, in Hebrew and Assyrian.*

Davidson on Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament.—In the fifth edition of the Hebrew New Testament, edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Prof. Delitzsch of Leipzig—a work carefully executed—there are several things still which need alteration and correction. We have dipped into the volume in several places and have found words incorrect or unsuitable. Thus for ἄγγελοι θεοῦ in Hebrews I., 6, Elohim is put; a plural which never signifies *angels*. In Galatians VI., 18, אֲחַי "my brethren," with a pause accent, is not the proper representative of ἀδελφοί alone. In Matthew XXII., 37, and Luke X., 27, מַדָּע is given for διάνοια, which is not the best word. The Septuagint has for it συνείδησις in Ecclesiastes X., 20. In John VIII., 44. הַכָּזָב is introduced after אָבִי at the end of the verse, giving an interpretation more than doubtful. The uncertainty of the original Greek should have been retained.

In Acts III., 16, הָאֲרוּכָה is not the best equivalent for ὁλοκληρία; the proper word is מִתֹּם. In Romans II., 4, for μακροθυμία there should be אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם not אֹרֶךְ רוּחוֹ. In Philippians II., 6, the difficult word ἁρπαγμός is rendered שָׁלָל, which fails to give the true sense. In Jude 19, the rendering הַפְּרוֹשִׁים מִן־הַצִּבּוּר "who separate from the congregation," is too free, being an interpretation rather than a translation. And the interpretation is an incorrect one, for, according to the true reading, the meaning of the Greek is, "who create schisms." In He-

brews XI., 10, the word "foundations" is rendered by a singular noun יְסוֹדָתָהּ "its foundation," whereas the plural of יְסֹד should be used.

In Revelation XIII., 2, גְּדוּפִים stands for *βλασφημια*, which is too mild a word, since it means "reproaches;" נְאָצָה is a better substitute. In Revelation XIII., 4 a better verb than שָׂמִים would be תָּמָה. The Hithpa'el of שָׂמִים does not occur in the Bible with אַחֲרֵי after it. In Revelation XXI., 11 אוֹר is the wrong word for the Greek *φωστήρ*; it should be כְּיָאוֹר. The text, taken as the basis, is the Elzevir of 1624; but several various and better readings are indicated in different parts. A critical text should have been adopted, such as Tischendorf's last, to which Delitzsch himself is favorable. But the Bible Society seems to stand in the way of such an innovation, however desirable at the present day.—*From Modern Review.*

Rules of Life.*

כִּי זֶה הָאִישׁ שִׂחַר שָׁלוֹם וְעָרַג וְקִבֵּר
לְשֶׁבֶת בְּטַח כָּל־יָמָיו מִסַּעַר,
פֶּה בִּדְרָכַי תֵּלֵךְ אַל תֵּט אֶל עֶבֶד,
כִּי זֶה הֵיכַל כָּל־טוּב, אַף זֶה הִשְׁעַר:

עַל הוֹן תָּשִׁישׁ, רַק לֹא תַחַת עַל שֶׁבֶר,
אִתָּה תֶּחְכָּם, רַק לֹא תָבוּז אִישׁ בַּעַר,
בַּנַּעַם תִּתְרָאֶה לְקִרְאַת כָּל־גֶּבֶר,
אֶת־הַיָּשִׁישׁ תַּהֲדַר, תָּחוֹן הַנַּעַר:

אַל נָא תֶּהֱגֶה אִם לֹא תִשְׁפֹּט כָּל־אֹמֶר,
אַל נָא תִּשְׁפֹּט אִם לֹא תַחְקֹר כָּל־טַעַם,
אַל נָא תַּחְקֹר אֶת־הַנִּשְׁגָּב מֵחֹמֶר:

אִם יֵשׁ עוֹלָתָה בָּךְ, אַחַר אַל תֹּכַח,
אִם זָר שִׂכְךָ נֹאזֶן אַל תֵּט בְּזָעַם,
שִׁיתָה תָמִיד יִרְאַת שַׁדַּי אֶל נֹכַח:

* From אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי הַנְּעוּרִים, by *Ephraim Luzzato*. This work is very scarce, and is deservedly esteemed for its elegant diction and poetic beauties.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The publication of HEBRAICA has been undertaken, because it is believed that such a journal may be the means of aiding study in the department to which it is devoted. The responsibility involved in the undertaking is very great, and the factors which must be utilized to insure success are numerous. But such a journal *seemed* to be called for, and in the absence of any other effort, this one is made. Whatever may be the result, those interested are to be assured that every reasonable exertion will be put forth to accomplish the end proposed.

The Associate-editors, Drs. Strack and Haupt have most kindly consented to share the burden of the editorial responsibility. It is but justice to them, however, to say that since they reside at so great a distance from the place of publication, they cannot be regarded as responsible for minute details, such as those of typography, etc. Each will do certain specified work in connection with the journal, the nature of which will be announced in another place. Their interest in the undertaking is very great, and their hearty co-operation is assured.

It is understood that the name of each editor will be signed to the matter of which he is the author, and that the editors are personally responsible only for their own publications. All matter published will be such as has been prepared expressly for HEBRAICA, except the selections printed under the head "General Notes." Contributions written in German will be translated. In this work the Managing-editor desires to acknowledge his indebtedness both for what has been done and for what shall yet be done to Rev. O. O. Fletcher, of Ottawa, and to Mr. Ira M. Price, of Morgan Park.

The general purpose of the journal has already been indicated. To make it what it ought to be in point of character, will be difficult. If profitable to one class, viz., Old Testament Professors and Hebrew scholars, it will be beyond the reach of those who are mere students. Will not both classes bear with us patiently until once the journal is fairly started? The consideration, aid and encouragement of all who are in any way interested in Semitic studies, is requested.

The field which the journal is intended to occupy is a large one. Many departments, and these quite distinct, are included. Articles on topics in all of these departments cannot be furnished at one time; even if it were possible to obtain them, there is not sufficient space. Care will be taken to introduce as great a variety as possible. Short articles or "Notes" touching upon interesting and important points will be a prominent feature.

The number of pages will be increased from twenty-four to thirty-two, and even to a greater number, as soon as the size of the subscription-list will seem to justify such an enlargement.

The present will never be fully understood until the Orient be made to yield up her stores of ancient treasures. This is equally true of the moral and religious, as well as of the secular history of man. This explains the present activity of oriental scholars, in turning and overturning, unravelling and deciphering the records of the past. In the interests of this work, three new Journals for oriental study have come into existence within six months. In October, 1883, appeared the first number of *Literatur-Blatt fuer Orientalische Philologie*, edited by Prof. Dr. Ernst Kuhn of Munich, aided by Johannes Klatt of Berlin. This Journal takes

up discussions of Oriental Languages in the broadest sense. In January, we received the first number of *Zeitschrift fuer Keilschriftforschung und Verwandte Gebiete*, edited by Drs. Bezold and Hommel, Privat-docenten in Munich, with the co-operation of Amiaud and Babelon of Paris, Lyon of Cambridge, and Pinches of London. This number contains articles by Schrader, Sayce, Guyard, Oppert and others. The intimate relationship between Assyrian and the other Semitic tongues and a strong corps of editors, bespeak a useful and profitable future for this Journal. Articles in both of these Journals are printed either in English, German, French, or Italian.

In March, HEBRAICA ventures to claim recognition as a periodical with a definite end in view, with a distinct and important work to accomplish. It shrinks from a comparison with the others just mentioned, or with those older Journals of which Germany is rightly so proud. It would be judged by what it desires and hopes to be, rather than by what it is. But what department of study can show the institution of three such Journals within six months?

The question of the *Intermediate Syllable* probably never before formed the subject of an article. It may be inquired, why consider a matter of comparatively so small importance? It may be answered that no question, however insignificant, is a matter of small importance, when accuracy is desired. No student of Hebrew has, in any sense, mastered that language who is unable to pronounce it correctly and without hesitation. But this is something no student can do, without a clear and intelligent understanding of the *intermediate syllable*.

He who pronounces קִטְלוּ qĭṭ-lû, and בִּדְגַת bĭdh-găth has evidently made an incorrect pronunciation. Why is it not better to pronounce such words correctly, qĭ-ṭ'lû, bĭ-dh'ghăth? It is true, some deny the existence of this syllable. We confess that the term *intermediate* is liable to be misunderstood, especially by beginners. Dr. Green defines the term clearly and is consistent in his use of it, but many who study his grammar misinterpret his meaning. In § 20. 2. *a* the syllable is called *intermediate*, as "being in strictness neither simple nor mixed, but partaking of the nature of both." Everything in § 22. *a* is in accordance with this. The term is used, therefore, not, as many suppose, to indicate the *position* of a certain syllable, but to indicate the nature. In many respects, the term *half-open* is preferable. The question has been asked us, what do the old Jewish grammarians say about the so-called *intermediate* syllable? We have referred this question for answer in our next number to two learned Hebraists of Chicago, Rabbi B. Felsenthal, and B. Douglass, Esq.

It seems certain that we are on the eve of a new era in Semitic studies. This is due, we believe, more to the prominence now being assumed by the Assyrian than to all other causes combined. Assyrian is to do for Semitic what the Sanskrit has done, and is doing for Indo-Germanic. The work done by Bopp, Mueller, Williams, Whitney and many others, in the one family, is being done in the other family by Delitzsch, Haupt, Schrader, Sayce, Lyon, Pinches and others. But the field is a very broad one. There is a loud call for men to come forward and devote themselves to this study. Could a more attractive work present itself to the mind of one who really desired to accomplish something? Why is it that so many students are entirely satisfied to do over what has already been done many times

before? It is said, that the difficulties which one must overcome who would learn Assyrian are so many and so great that such work is entirely out of the question. This may have been true five years ago, but it is not to-day. With Prof. Haupt at Baltimore, Prof. Brown at New York, and Prof. Lyon at Cambridge, what better advantages could be desired? We are assured, moreover, by an eminent Assyriologist, that the language is not so difficult as it is popularly supposed to be. To a man well-acquainted with Hebrew, Assyrian is no more difficult than is the Hebrew to one, who, for the first time, takes up Hebrew. At our request Professor Lyon has kindly furnished a list of books for those who desire to begin the study of Assyrian. Not all of these books need be purchased at once. The list includes the most valuable books yet published in this department. Why should not every well furnished public library, whether of college or city, purchase a set of these books, and thereby render it possible for some one to take hold of this study, who for lack of means would otherwise be prevented?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. How is the vowel û in the Hŏph'ăl of ע"ע verbs to be explained? G.

The form הוּסַב is for הֻסְבַּב. With this is to be compared הוּשַׁב for הֻוְשַׁב, from יֻשַׁב (וָשַׁב) and הוּקַם for הֻקְמַם from קוּם. In הוּשַׁב, the origin of וּ (= ŭ+v) is evident. In the case of הוּקַם, it has been suggested that הֻקְמַם, by the transposition of ו, becomes הֻוְקַם, and this הוּקַם. It may be, however, that both verbs ע"ע and ע"ע merely follow the analogy of verbs פ"י. The difficulty lies in the fact that while ă of the Qăl, Nĭph., and Hĭph. is heightened to ā, and ĭ of the Hĭph. to ē, the ŭ is *lengthened* to an unchangeable û, rather than heightened to a changeable ō. Unless some such explanation as the one given, which, indeed, is only an expedient, is adopted, the û must be regarded as irregular, and may be compared with the î of the Hĭph., where in accordance with the laws of the language, we should have expected ē.

2. On what principle is the Article prefixed to the construct Infinitive הַדַּעַת, as in Gen. II., 9, עֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע, and Jer. XXII., 16, הֲלֹא־הִיא הַדַּעַת אֹתִי?

It being understood that neither an Infinitive construct nor a noun in the construct state may receive the article, it may be said:

1) That four times out of seven (1 Kgs. VII., 14; Hos. IV., 6 (twice); Dan. XII., 4) דַּעַת treated as an abstract verbal noun, and not as an Infinitive construct, receives the article according to Ges., 109. 3. *c*). Here may be compared

(*a*) the nominal form דֵּעָה which is also sometimes used as an Inf. (Ex. II., 4); and

(*b*) the two cases of הַיִּשְׁבַת (1 Kgs. X., 19 and 2 Chron. IX., 18); the former case showing that while דַּעַת, the Inf., may be used as a noun, דֵּעָה the noun (cf. also רֵדָה, Gen. XLVI., 3) may be used as an Inf.; the latter showing the possibility of the פ"י Infinitive being used substantively.

2) In Gen. II., 9. 17, where דַּעַת is found not only with the article but also

with a following noun in some manner dependent on it, it is insufficient to say either (*a*) that, contrary to the rule, דַּעַת has the article simply to make עֵין definite (*Green's Chrestomathy*), or (*b*) that this is one of twenty-five cases in which a noun in the construct state has the article (*Kalisch*), or (*c*) that דַּעַת, an Infinitive, has the article because דַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע is regarded as one word (*Keil*). The true explanation is that דַּעַת, a verbal substantive, receives the article as expressing an abstract idea, and governs an object in the accusative just as the verb from which it is derived would do. Although the verbal nouns, having the form of an Inf., are found both with the article and with the accusative, but never with both at the same time, דַּעַת, inasmuch as it is used as a substantive more than the other Infinitives, and receives in these texts (Gen. II., 9 and Jer. XXII., 16) a special emphasis, not only as a noun has the article, but also as a verbal noun takes an accusative.

3. Is the use of אֵת as the sign of the definite object constant or somewhat variable? McC.

In answer to this question it may be said: 1) אֵת is *necessary* only with pronominal suffixes where they must be separate from the verb; (2) its use with nouns, is variable, being used more commonly before names of persons than of things; 3) it is used much more rarely in poetry than in prose, and in the earlier literature than in the later. The fullest treatment of the particle will be found in Ewald's Hebrew Syntax, pp. 36–39.

4. What is the force of the construct state in עַל־יַד יְמִינֶךָ, Ps. CXXI., 5? C. C. H.

Compare the same phrase in Judg. XX., 16; 2 Sam. XX., 9. The exact force of this case is expressed in English by a noun and an adjective, *thy right hand*; e. g. שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין *the right leg*; כָּל־עֵין יָמִין *all the right eyes*, 1 Sam. XI., 2. The relation is the explicative or appositional, *Ges.* 114. 3, 116. 5; *Mueller*, 79; *Ewald*, p. 88.

BOOK NOTICES.

DELITZSCH'S HEBREW AND ASSYRIAN.*

This book is a reprint of seven articles printed in the *Athenæum*, May-August, 1883. The purpose of the book is a definite one, viz., to show that not from Arabic, as hitherto, but from Assyrian, must be obtained the assistance needed in explaining (1) many Old Testament passages which have not yet been settled; (2) many single words, such as the names of certain animals referred to in the Levitical law, the names of plants, nouns and verbs of rare occurrence, and even verbs of common use, some of which have several derivatives; (3) some grammatical questions. It is claimed that the value of Arabic, for Hebrew lexicography, has been greatly exaggerated, and that Assyriology is actually inaugurating a new era in this depart-

* *The Hebrew Language*, viewed in the light of Assyrian Research. By Dr. FRIEDRIC DELITZSCH, Professor of Assyriology in the University of Leipzig. London: Williams & Norgate. 7½x5. Pp. XII., 71. Price, $1.25.

ment. The reasons urged why Assyrian ought to be, and indeed is, more valuable, are (1) the fact that the Babylonian and Hebrew peoples at one time dwelt together in long continued and close intercourse, and (2) the fact that the Assyrian and Hebrew literature were co-existent, while Arabic literature dates only from the seventh century of our era. Without entering into any criticism of the book we cite, for the information of those students whose attention has not been called to this subject, a few of the many examples presented: (1) נָהַל (Pi. נִהֵל) is usually explained by the Arabic نهل *to drink*, hence *to give to drink, lead to water, lead, guide*. Assyriology shows that it is a synonym of רָבַץ *lie down*, and נוּחַ *rest*. Cf., in view of this, Ps. XXIII., 2, and 2 Chron. XXXII., 22 with 1 Chron. XXII., 18. (2) רְאֵם or רִים (Job XXXIX., 9–10) is neither (*a*) *unicorn* (cf. Ps. XXII., 21), nor (*b*) a kind of antelope (last two editions of Gesenius), nor (*c*) *buffalo* (Ges.), but is (*d*) the Assyrian rimu, "a strong-horned, fierce-looking wild bull, skilled in climbing mountains, and whose colossal and formidable likeness was placed by the Assyrian kings, before the entrance of their palaces to ward off and terrify the approaching enemy." (3) נִיסָן is not the *budding-month* (cf. נִין *bud, flower*), but = the Assyrian nisanu, *the starting month*, cf. נָסַע *depart*. (4) חָתָן, whence חוֹתֵן *father-in-law*, is not from the Arabic meaning *to cut, cut into* (Ges. 8th ed.), the father-in-law gaining entrance to another family, but from Assyrian hatânu, *to surround, protect, help, support:* the parents-in-law, according to this, being those who support the young family. Cf. חָם *father-in-law*. חֲמוֹת *mother-in-law*, from חָמָה *surround, protect*, whence also חוֹמָה *wall*. (5) צֹאן *flock*, is not from an Arabic root meaning to be *small, sick* (Ges. 8th ed.), but is the same as the Assyrian sênu, from a root which is synonymous with טוֹב, *to be good, kind*, the flock being so called because of the tameness and gentleness of the animals composing it. (6) אָדָם is from a root = בָּנָה *build, beget*, and is the same as בֵּן *son* from בָּנָה, while אַדְמָה is the *cultivated* ground. (7) אֵם *mother*, אַמָּה *cubit*, and אֻמָּה *nation*, are from an Assyrian root meaning *be wide*, whence *ummu* (= אֵם), *the womb*, a roomy receptacle for the child, *mother; ammatu* (= אַמָּה), *width, length, cubit; ummu* (= אֻמָּה), *nation*, a vast or numerous body of men. Space forbids the insertion of other examples. Professor Delitzsch has completed a Hebrew dictionary along with his Assyrian dictionary, but is uncertain whether he shall publish it at once.

LEHRBUCH DER NEUHEBRAEISCHEN SPRACHE.*

We have before us only the Prospectus of this volume from which we gather the following facts. To do thorough work in the study of post-biblical literature is rendered possible only by having a knowledge of the variations of the modern from the post-biblical Hebrew. No good assistance in this department of study has been furnished. Nor has there existed any bibliography of the subject such as would be of service to a Christian student. For a long time, Dr. Strack has been intending to supply the demand by furnishing a text-book which should serve both as a grammar and as a reading-book. The prominence which the study of Rabbinica has

* *Lehrbuch der Neuhebraeischen Sprache und Literatur*, von HERMANN L. STRACK und CARL SIEGFRIED. I. Grammatik der Neuhebraeischen Sprache, CARL SIEGFRIED; II. Abriss der Neuhebraeischen Literatur, HERMANN L. STRACK. Karlsruhe und Leipzig: *H. Reuther*.

recently assumed in the German Universities has compelled a more speedy completion of the book than was originally proposed. At the request of Dr. Strack, therefore, Carl Siegfried has prepared in accordance with a general outline furnished, the grammatical portion of this volume. Dr. Strack's work in the literature of the department is intended to give a general survey of the most important writings and to furnish the student a motive and basis for still further study. Only a few articles that appear in Journals have been included in the list. If the undertaking meets with favor Dr. Strack promises to enlarge this second part into a small volume. A third part which is yet to follow will contain a Chrestomathy, Vocabulary, and a list of the most important abbreviations. The preface closes with the expression of a hope that by means of this volume the study of Jewish literature, in many respects so important, which in Buxtorf's time was zealously pursued, and has produced rich fruits, may bloom into a rich and vigorous life.

BALLIN'S HEBREW GRAMMAR.*

The noteworthy feature of this grammar is the fact that the "Exercises," English into Hebrew as well as Hebrew into English, consist almost entirely of phrases and sentences taken from the Bible. This is certainly a better plan than that of manufacturing short meaningless clauses, adopted in many grammars; but it is in many respects impracticable. We do not believe that the ordinary student will be able to do satisfactory work with this grammar. The principles are stated in a confusing and disconnected manner. There is no uniformity of statement, and no continual reference, as there should be, to the great underlying laws of the language, which govern the inflection throughout. Numerous instances might be selected of faulty, misleading and even incorrect statements. One will suffice: "§ 123. In verbs having one of the letters ב. ג. ד. כ. פ or ת in the root, those letters take *dagesh lene* when preceded by a silent shĕva, excepting:—(*a*) In the construct infinitive *Kal* with the prefixes ב. כ. as בִּכְתֹּב. כִּכְתֹּב; (*b*) verbs with the aspirate as the third radical never take a *dagesh lene* in it, as כָּתְבִי. כָּתְבוּ." Here (1) the Sh'vâ is not silent but vocal, and (2) such a statement as (*b*), the only reference to this peculiarity of the Imperative, is manifestly inaccurate and insufficient.

With every sentence in the Exercises, there is given the book, chapter and verse of the Bible in which this is found. This, it seems, would be sufficient to render the Exercises, valuable though they are, of little service to the learner. It is better to place the "key" to grammatical exercises only in the hands of teachers. The typography is accurate, and the book itself is a model of beauty so far as execution and arrangement go. It is an interesting fact that it is prepared by a sister and a brother.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BEZOLD, CARL, Ueber Keilinschriften: Sammlung gemeinverstaendlicher Vortraege, herausgeg. von Rud. Virchow und Fr. von Holtzendorff. XVIII. Serie, Heft 425. Berlin: *Habel*, 1883. 8vo.

* *A Hebrew Grammar*, with Exercises selected from the Bible. By ADA S. BALLIN and F. L. BALLIN. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1 Paternoster Square. 7¼x5. Pp. XIV., and 509.

BUDGE, E., The Fourth Tablet of the Creation Series, relating to the fight between Marduk and Tiamat. *Proceed. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* 1883–84, pp. 5–11.

COSQUIN, EMMANUEL, Le livre de Judith et les documents assyriens. *Precis hist.*, T. 32, No. 6, Juin, 1883, pp. 328–333.

DELATTRE, A., Salomon, Assurbanipal, Balthasar. *Precis hist.*, T. 32, No. 7, Juillet, 1883, pp. 361–367.

DELITZSCH, FRDR., The Hebrew Language viewed in the light of Assyrian research. London: *Williams & Norgate*, 1883.

DELITZSCH, FRDR., Die Artikel Accad, Adrammelech, Anammelech, Asarhaddon, Askenas, Asnaphar, Assur, Babel, Babylonien, Bel, Belsazar, Benhadad, Buz und Chaldaea im "Calwer Bibellexicon, Bibl. Handwoerterbuch illustrirt, ... redig. von P. Zeller und herausgeg. von dem Calwer Verlagsverein. Calw und Stuttg. 1884, gr. 8., Lief 1."

EVANS, GEORGE, An essay on Assyriology. Published by the Hibbert Trustees. London: *Williams & Norgate*, 1883. 75 pp. together with five tables. 8vo.

FLEMMING, JOHANNES, Die grosse Steinplatteninschrift Nebukadnezars II. in transcribirtem babylonischen Grundtext nebst Uebersetzung und Commentar. *Inaug. Diss.* Goettingen, 1883. VIII. 61 S. 8vo.

HALEVY, J., Mélanges de critique et d'histoire relatifs aux Peuples Sémitiques. Paris: *Maisonneuve & Co.*, 1883. 8vo.

HARKNESS, M. E., Assyrian Life and History. With Introduction by Reg. Stuart Poole. London: *Relig. Tract. Soc.*, 1883. 107 pp. 8vo. 1 table. (By-Paths of Bible Knowledge. Vol. II.)

HAUPT, PAUL, Beitraege zur assyrischen Lautlehre (vorgelegt von P. de Lagarde). *Nachr. v. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wiss.* zu Goettingen, 1883. 25 April No. 4. (Sitz. v. 3. Maerz) S. 85–115.

HIMPEL, Der geschichtliche Abschnitt Jes. c. 36–39. Erlaeuterungen desselben durch assyrische Keilinschriften. *Theol. Quartalschr.* Jahrg. 65, H. 4, 1883. S. 582–653.

HOMMEL, FRITZ, Die semitische Voelker und Sprachen als ersten Versuch einer Encyclopaedie der semitischen Sprach—und Altersthumwissenschaft. Erstes Band (Allg. Einleiting: Erstes Buch: die vorsemitischen Kulturen in Aegypten und Babylonien). XII., VIII. 541 S. in 8vo. Leipzig: *Otto Schulze*, 1883.

KAMPHAUSEN, ADOLF, Die Chronologie der hebraeischen Koenige. Eine geschl. Untersuchung. Bonn. 1883. 104 S. 8vo.

SAYCE, A. H., Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments. London: *Rel. Tract Soc.*, 1883, 199 pp. 8vo. (By-paths of Bible Knowledge, Vol. III.)

HEBRAICA.

VOL. I. APRIL, 1884. NO. 2.

A PHŒNICIAN INSCRIPTION IN NEW YORK.

BY ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

The most important of the Phœnician inscriptions in the di Cesnola collection, in New York, like most of the others on marble in the same collection, came from a temple on a tongue of land between the salines and the sea, south-west of the modern Marina or Scala of Larnaca. The temple was dedicated, as appears from the inscriptions, to a deity named Eshmun-Melqarth, or Esculapius-Hercules; probably identical with the Greek Palæmon or the Roman Portumnus or Portumus. Not far away was a temple to Artemis Paralia, or Diana of the seashore, which may call to mind the story of Iphigenia as priestess of Artemis among the Taurians. The date of this inscription, like that of most of the rest, is in the fourth century B. C. This inscription has been published before, but always imperfectly or incorrectly, by Rödiger in *Monatsbericht der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, for May, 1870; by Schröder in same for May, 1872; and by Renan in *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. It originally consisted of eight lines; and almost all the *lacunæ* may easily be filled. The following is its transliteration in Hebrew letters, putting letters supplied in brackets:

[בשנת....למלך פמייתן]
מלך כתי ואדיל בן
[מל]כיתן מלך כתי ו
[אדי]ל מנחת ו אז איש
[ית ן ו]יטנא עבד אלן[?]
עבדמלקרת בן [עבד?]
[ר]שף לאדני ל[ארן]
[אשמנמ]לקר[ת]

In English: "In the year .... of king Pumiathon king of Citium and Idalium, son of Melekyathon king of Citium and Idalium, these [are] two offerings which the god's (?) servant 'Ebedmelqarth son of ['Ebed-] Resheph gave and dedicated to his Lord, to the Lord Eshmun-Melqarth."

The first line is supplied from the matter of other inscriptions and the neces-

sity of the case: and the supplied matter is justified by the few strokes which remain of the letters of that line. The other matter to be supplied is obvious, till we come to the end of line five. At first the א appeared to be the last letter of the line, and the natural supply suggested was דני, making the word mean "of his (or, my) Lord." But a ל is there, plainly; which requires, apparently, אלן or אלנם or אלה: either of which is good in Phœnician; but the middle one of the three would be plural. In the last line there was room for the common close of such inscriptions; and it may have been there. It would be יברך "May he bless." The word supplied at the end of line six may be said to be uncertain; but it was some word of composition with the following שך[ר]. This last word, alone, is an epithet of Apollo. Several different words enter into composition with it to form proper names. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to add here that י_ is a suffix of the third person in Phœnician, as well as of the first. The tenor of this inscription, standing by itself, may make it doubtful whether it is to be considered first person or third; but test cases of the sort show it generally to be of the third: and as such it gives the better sense here.

Concerning the first line, I have observed that the day and month are not uniformly given, in addition to the year of the sovereign's reign, when the inscription (as here) records the offering of a private person. There was evidently no room for the day and the month in the line; while as above supplied, the number of letters tallies well with that of the other lines severally.

THE PSALMS WITH THEIR SUPERSCRIPTIONS,

Including Kind of Poem, Author, and Musical Directions, with some remarks on these.

BY BARNARD C. TAYLOR.

Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa.

BOOK I.

No. of Ps.	Kind.	Author.	Musical Directions.	
Pss. 1. and 2. No notes.				
Ps. 3.	מזמור	לדוד	סלה*	(9—3, 5, 9.)
" 4.	"	"	למנצח "	(9—3, 5.)
" 5.	"	"	" אל־הנחילות	
" 6.	"	"	" בנגינת על־השמינית	
" 7.	שגיון	"	" סלה	(18—6.)
" 8.	מזמור	"	" על־הגתית	
" 9.	"	"	" על־מות לבן "	(21–17, 21.)
" 10.	No notes.			
" 11.		"	"	
" 12.	מזמור	"	" על־השמינית	
" 13.	"	"	"	
" 14.		"	"	
" 15.	"	"		

* The figures give No. of verses in Ps. and verses that end with סלה.

No. of Ps.	Kind.	Author.	Musical Directions.		
Ps. 16.	מכתם	לדוד			
" 17.	תפלה	"			
" 18.		"	למנצח		
" 19.	מזמור	"	"		
" 20.	"	"	"	סלה	(10–4.)
" 21.	"	"	"	"	(14–3.)
" 22.	"	"	" על-אילת השחר		
" 23.	"	"	"		
" 24.	"	"		"	(10–6, 10.)
" 25.		"			
" 26.		"			
" 27.		"			
" 28.		"			
" 29.	"	"			
" 30.	"	"	(שיר חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת)		
" 31.	"	"	"		
" 32.	משכיל	"		"	(11–4, 5, 7.)
" 33.					
" 34.		"			
" 35.		"			
" 36.		"	"		
" 37.		"			
" 38.	מזמור	"	להזכיר		
" 39.	"	"	" לידיתון		
" 40.	"	"	"		
" 41.	"	"	"		
			BOOK II.		
Ps. 42. }	משכיל	לבני-קרח	למנצח		
" 43. }					
" 44.	"	"	"	סלה	(27–9.)
" 45.	"	"	" על-ששנים		
" 46.		"	" על-עלמות שיר	"	(12–4, 8, 12.)
" 47.	מזמור	"	"	"	(10–4.)
" 48.	" שיר	"		"	(15–9.)
" 49.	"	"	"	"	(21–14, 16.)
" 50.	"	לאסף		"	(23–6.)
" 51.	"	לדוד	"		
" 52.	משכיל	"	"	"	(11–5, 7.)
" 53.	"	"	"		
" 54.	"	"	" על-מחלת		
" 55.	"	"	" בנגינת	"	(9–5.)
" 56.	מכתם	"	" בנגינת	"	(24–8, 20.)
" 57.	"	"	" על-יונת אלם רחקים		
" 58.	"	"	" אל-תשחת	סלה	(12–4, 7.)
" 59.	"	"	" אל-תשחת		
" 60.	" ללמד	"	" אל-תשחת	"	(18–6, 14.)
" 61.		"	" על-שושן עדות	"	(14–6.)
			" על-נגינת	"	(9–5.)

No. of Ps.	Kind.	Author.	Musical Directions.		
Ps. 62.	מזמור	לדוד	למנצח	על־ידותון סלה	(13–5, 9.)
" 63.	"	"	"		
" 64.	"	"	"		
" 65.	"	שיר "	"		
" 66.	"	"	"		" (20–4, 7, 15.)
" 67.	"	"	"	בנגינת	" (8–2, 6.)
" 68.	"	" "	"		" (36–8, 20, 33.)
" 69.		"	"	על־שושנים	
" 70.		"	"	להזכיר	
" 71.					
" 72.		לשלמה			

BOOK III.

Ps. 73.	מזמור	לאסף			
" 74.	משכיל	"			
" 75.	" שיר מזמור	"	למנצח	אל־תשחת סלה	(11–4.)
" 76.	" "	"	"	בנגינת "	(13–4, 10.)
" 77.	"	"	"	על־ידותון "	(21–4, 10, 16.)
" 78.	משכיל	"			
" 79.	מזמור	"			
" 80.	"	"	"	אל־ששנים עדות	
" 81.		"	"	על־הגתית "	(17–8.)
" 82.	"	"			" (8–2.)
" 83.	" שיר	"			" (19–9.)
" 84.	"	לבני־קרח	"	על־הגתית "	(13–5, 9.)
" 85.	"	"	"	"	" (14–3.)
" 86.	תפלה	לדוד			
" 87.	שיר מזמור	לבני־קרח			" (7–3, 6.)
" 88.	" "	"	"	על־מחלת לענות	" (19–8, 11.)
" 89.	משכיל	להימן			
	משכיל	לאיתן		סלה	(53–5, 38, 46, 49.)

BOOK IV.

Ps. 90.	תפלה	למשה	
" 91.	No notes.		
" 92.	מזמור שיר		ליום השבת
" 93—97.	No notes.		
" 98.	מזמור		
" 99.	No notes.		
" 100.	מזמור	לתודה	
" 101.	מזמור	לדוד	
" 102.	תפלה		
" 103.		לדוד	
" 104—106.	No notes.		

BOOK V.

Ps. 107.	No notes.		
" 108.	מזמור שיר	לדוד	
" 109.	מזמור	"	למנצח

No. of Ps.	Kind.	Author.	Musical Directions.
Ps. 110.	מזמור	לדוד	
" 111—119.	No notes.		
" 120.	שיר המעלות		
" 121.	שיר למעלות		
" 122—134.	שיר המעלות		
" (122, 124, 131, 133.		לדוד)	
" (127.		לשלמה)	
" 135—137.	No notes.		
" 138.		לדוד	
" 139.	מזמור	"	למנצח
" 140.	"	"	" סלה (14-4, 6, 9.)
" 141.	"	"	
" 142.	משכיל	"	
" 143.	מזמור	"	סלה (12-6.)
" 144.		"	
" 145.	תהלה	"	
" 146—150.	No notes.		

Let me call attention to some of the facts presented in this table. And first it will be noticed that in Book I., containing forty-one psalms, the term משכיל occurs but once, תפלה once, מכתם once, שגיון once, (the only time in the whole collection) while מזמור occurs twenty-two times. But four of these psalms are without any notes, and these only are anonymous, the other thirty-seven being ascribed to David. למנצח is prefixed to nineteen. Other notes are prefixed to nine, indicating the time, instrument, kind of voices or occasion to which the psalm was adapted. The term סלה occurs in eight.

In the 2nd Book, containing thirty psalms (counting the 42nd and 43rd as one) the first three are termed משכיל, the next not named (except the term שיר), the next five termed מזמור, the next four משכיל, then five מכתם, one not named, then seven מזמור or מזמור שיר, the last four not named.

The first seven are ascribed to the sons of Korah, the next to Asaph, and the rest to David except the last to Solomon (?) and three anonymous.

למנצח is prefixed to all but five. Fifteen have other notes prefixed indicating the tune, &c.

The term סלה occurs in seventeen of the thirty.

In the 3rd Book, containing seventeen psalms, the term מזמור occurs twelve times, תפלה once, משכיל three times and once in the double title of the 88th psalm. The first eleven are ascribed to Asaph, then two to the sons of Korah, one to David, two more to the sons of Korah, and the last to Ethan. None are anonymous. למנצח is prefixed to eight. Seven have other notes indicating tune, &c. The term סלה occurs in eleven.

In the 4th Book, containing seventeen psalms, the term תפלה is given to two, מזמור to four, while eleven are not named. One is ascribed to Moses, two to David and the rest are anonymous. No other musical directions occur.

In the 5th Book, containing forty-four psalms, the term מזמור is given to seven, משכיל to one, תהלה to one שיר המעלות to fifteen, the remaining twenty not named. Fifteen are ascribed to David, (three of these occurring together in one group, and eight in another), and one to Solomon. The other twenty-eight are

anonymous. לְמנצח is only prefixed to three, and סלה occurs in but two, no other musical notes appear.

Now it will be observed that in the 4th and 5th Books, containing fifty-one psalms, there are no directions for the choir whatever except with four psalms, and these are Davidic. While of the first eighty-nine psalms sixty-five have such directions. If, as is claimed by some, the collection of psalms was especially arranged for the Second Temple, why do we not find the most choice notes with the later psalms?

The way in which they occur clearly indicates a more elaborate service of song with the former Temple. And this corroborates the statements found in Chronicles.

It seems certain that these "notes" were not added by some late editor, but have been retained as they were found with the various psalms when they were put in their present form.

The occurrence of "notes" with only the four psalms in the 4th and 5th Books, tends to confirm the genuineness of their ascription to David. And the fact that there are some of David's writing in the later Books renders it probable that all ascribed to him were written by him. Of course internal proof may contradict this probability.

The question then arises: How is it that we find Davidic psalms in the last Book? And this suggests the future question: When were the psalms arranged in the five Books as we have them? There are different answers to this question. One view is that the 1st Book was collected about the time of David, the second in the days of Hezekiah, when the collector thought he had all the Davidic psalms, the 3rd probably in the days of Josiah, and the 4th and 5th after the Exile. But the question arises: How were Davidic psalms preserved (especially if unknown), during nearly 600 years, apart from the book or books of Psalms? The reply by some is that these are not David's writings. This reply, however, is only necessitated by the theory of gradual collection. Others say there was no attempt to produce a collection for the Temple service till after the Exile, and then the collection was made from earlier smaller collections. The musical notes, however, point clearly to the service of the first Temple.

Taking into consideration all the facts, is there no more in favor of the view that the psalms were put in their present form and divisions, near the close of the period of the production of the Psalms, and that the collector rearranged collections used in the first Temple and added psalms not before collected! In favor of this view could be urged the classification according to author, kind of psalm, use of the Divine name, and chronology. Whatever view is taken, it is evident that no one principle of classification has been followed.

Without entering into a discussion of the manner of collecting and arranging, I would especially urge the proof furnished by the "choir notes" that the use of the psalms prevailed in the first Temple. And this fact may further help us in determining to what extent the Hebrew writings generally were collected, and in what esteem they were held before the Exile.

I would call attention to the figures in the table with the word סלה, which show the number of verses in the psalm and the verses which end with סלה. It will be observed that in four psalms the term appears at the end of the psalm. Will its position help us to determine whether it means "to rest" or "repeat" or "let the instruments strike up," "let the song rise higher," or disprove all of

these meanings? In no psalm does it occur more than three times except in the eighty-ninth, where it occurs four times. One certain thing about it is that it is so ancient that nothing certain can be determined as to its significance.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW AND ASSYRIAN PHILOLOGY.

BY DR. K. KOHLER.
New York City.

1. שֵׂכְוִי = *the cock*. This is the Rabbinical explanation of Job XXXVIII., 36, which Delitzsch in his excellent commentary on Job, p. 468, adopts in preference to any other. He derives the name from סכה = discern, see, hence "the morning-seer." The Arabic word תכי thukhai = cock connects, says Delitzsch, rather with the root שאך = שכא to be strong, reminding of גבר = man, another Rabbinical (and Syrian) name for cock. As to the latter, I do not venture to bring in the Hindoo name תכי 1 Kgs. X., 22 = peacock for comparison. But it is remarkable that the word *sikkim* שכים occurs in the *Izdubar legends*. In Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis p. 184, the 12th and 13th line of the first fragment is given thus: "The spirits of Erech Suburi turned to *Sikkim* and went out in companies." This corresponds to the preceding verse: "The gods turned to flies and flew away in droves." In Sayce's second edition of Smith's Genesis, however, I find on p. 193 the word *sikkim* (which Fr. Delitzsch has also in his German edition) translated with *cocks*.

That the שוים "the spirits" stood in close relation to cocks in Oriental and Occidental mythology, is known to all those versed in the subject. The Rabbis, see Talmud Berachoth 6ᵃ and 7ᵃ, believe the spirits had cock's legs and their presence could be ascertained through cocks.

2. זִיז שָׁדַי Ps. L., 11, corresponding to the preceding וְעִוֹף הָרִים, is translated all that moves about, roams on the fields. A Rabbinical tradition in Midrash Rabba Leviticus Par. XXII. takes זיז as a *gigantic bird*, large enough to obscure the sun by its wings, which occupies the same position among the birds as the *Leviathan* among the fishes and the *Behemoth* among the wild beasts. That the לויתן and בהמות are mythical animals, and *not* the common Crocodile and the Walrus, would have been admitted long ago but for the theological bias prevailing in Biblical philology. A striking parallel to the *Leviathan* of Job and the Psalmist is offered in the Crocodile *Maco* son of Set of the Egyptian Ritual of the Dead XXXI. and XXXII. (quoted in Lenormant's Chaldean Magic p. 97) and in the Dragon *Tihamat*, the *scaly* monster רהב with which Bel Marduk fights at the time of the creation. The Egyption derivation of *Behemoth* was exploded long ago, but our conservative professors of Hebrew still adhere to it as to any other dogma. Let one read the description of the *Leviathan* in Job and that of *Midgard's worm* in Norse Mythology (Anderson p. 99) and he will perhaps find the poetry to come nearer the truth than reality does. But to return to our mythical giant-bird *Ziz*—זיז, I think it is the same mentioned in Assyrian Mythology as the divine bird *Zu* (cf. Sayce ed. of Smith's Chaldean Genesis p. 122 f. where this storm-bird Zu is identified with the Arabian Roc and the Chinese storm-bird "which in flying obscures the sun"). About this divine bird Zu we are told that

"he went out as the god Ungal Turda to a remote mountain far away from all habitation to become a storm-bird (see Lenormant's Magic, Germ. ed. p. 128), and the story reminds one vividly of the Persian *Simurgh* [and the bird *Kamek*, probably Simurgh the correct reading Spiegel Eran. Alterthumsk. III. p. 561), which also "obscures the sun with its wings"]. The Simurgh or "giant-bird" is, like Zu, endowed with the miraculous powers of restoring life and health, and many of the Oriental and Occidental legends about life-restoring powers possessed by great magicians like Virgil, Faust, *Maimonides*, *Theophrastus* can be traced back to the Zu-Simurgh legend. I refer here to H. Petermann's "Reisen im Orient II. 106–109, Legends of the Mandeans," which collection of folk tales seems to have escaped the notice of C. R. Conder in his recent most instructive work on *Heth and Moab* in his treatment of the Zir (Sal) legends on pp. 356–362. There can be little doubt, also, that the Rabbinical legend of the big egg of Bar Yochni ביצת בר יוכני which in breaking inundated sixty cities and felled three hundred cedar trees (Bechoroth 57b) belongs to the same class. Compare Hygrin's Fables 197 "The Egg of Venus" (Davkina = יוכני ?).

In what connection this bird Zu stands to the *nest of precious stones* "in the forest of the Gods," mentioned in table IX. of the Izdubar legend, I do not venture to express any opinion, but that the *Cherub* in Ezekiel XXVIII. "the bird on the mountain of the gods who walks in the midst of stones of fire and all kinds of precious stones" must also be reckoned among this class of mythical storm-birds is certain (see Cheyne Isa. I., 36–37 and II., 272 f.). The son and the kindred spirits of the god Ungal Turda or Zu, and of Marduk were, indeed, the guardians of the precious stones in the bowels of the earth.

The relation of the Prometheus legend to the Zu bird and his wife "the goddess of perfumes," Sayce has hinted at in his Babylonian Literature p. 40.

3. הֵאָח and הֵידָד are generally explained as simple interjections for which a derivation is deemed unnecessary. A deeper examination into such words has, however, disclosed the fact that these, too, were originally regularly articulated words, and this rule applies to our two words as well. They were originally used as exclamations of woe at the mourning over *Tammuz* (= Adonis) and the full words were: הוי אָח and הוי דוד "Woe oh brother! Woe oh friend!" Thus the passage in Jer. XXII., 18 has been happily explained by the weeping of Isthar and Kharimat over the dead Tammuz their husband and brother (Chaldean Genesis p. 246 f.), and these lively airs gradually became popular exclamations. Compare the exact parallel offered by the Egyptian Maneros and the Phœnician Ailinos (אוי לנו) song derived from the lamentations of Isis and Nephthys over Osiris and from the Adonis festivals in Greece.

4. Many *Cabbalistic* ideas can now be directly traced back to Chaldea, as e. g. the קְלִפּוֹת, the evil incrustations of impure and malign spirits which can be dispelled by magic spells of holy names (see Delitzsch's Chaldean Genesis p. 295 and Lenormant's Chaldean Magic, Germ. ed. p. 75); the warding off of evil by holy things (idols) placed at the entrance of houses, the exact parallel to *Bible texts* put at the Jewish *door posts* מְזוּזָה, and magic texts with knots fastened to the body or garments like the *phylacteries* (תפלין וקמיעות) and the knots of the fringes of ציצית (compare Lenormant's Magic and Sorcery p. 45 f). Even the *sacred name* with its magical powers is already a *secret* of the *god* Hea or Maruduk whose weapon of *fifty* heads, the murderous weapon of Anu, the god of heaven,

"the *bow of lightning*" with which Anu, or he, dispels the evil spirits, the sun of "*fifty faces*" annihilates all hostile powers, (Chaldean Genesis p. 86 f). He communicated the names of the *fifty gods* to men in order to exorcise the demoniacal powers (eodem p. 79).

5. The word אָמֵן used in oaths, appears from the Assyrian to have been a real incantation or invocation, and not merely an assertion like "yes" or "true." And this throws a certain light on the *Amen, Amen* which the woman tried for jealousy had to speak at the ordeal (Num. v., 22). To the custom of drinking charmed water as a trial compare the modern practice of the Arabs in Conder's *Heth and Moab*, p. 343, and the old Chaldean or Accadian practice, Lenormant's Magic, p. 72.

6. A parallel to the angels which pull the sun along the heavens in his going in and out mentioned in Midrash Yalkut to Ps. XIX. is found in Lenormant's *Chaldäische Magie* p. 187.

7. The name Zikkurat זִכּוּרַת for pyramidal towers in Assyria and Babylonia offers, I think, the explanation of the Biblical אַזְכָּרָה the pyramidal form of the smoke of the incense on the altar. It is perhaps not going too far to derive the word זֵכֶר = record, like שֵׁם = name from שְׂמָא = high place, and זֵכֶר = prominence, in which sense the word זִכְרוֹנָא "head of Jordan," "head of Euphrates," occurs in the Talmud, and not from progeny which preserves the "memory" זֵכֶר or זָכוּר, the male.

8. I close with the question whether the Assyrian word *Surubat* = might, in Smith's History of Sennacherib, offers a clue to the curious name *Sarbath Sarbani El*, under which title the Maccabean history has come down to us according to the words of Origen?

CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEBREW SYNONOMY.

By Rev. P. A. Nordell,
New London, Conn.

II.

חֹזֶק, חָזָק, חַיִל, עֹז, כֹּחַ, גְּבוּרָה, אוֹן.

We encounter here a group of synonymes expressing the general notion of power. To discriminate them sharply from one another is not easy. The Hebrew writers themselves did not always mark the distinctions accurately, for we often find them using one or another with no apparent reason for the choice. Nor in general have these distinctions been noted in ancient translations. With the exception of כֹּחַ, which the Septuagint almost invariably renders ἰσχύς, no fixed rules seem to have been observed in translating these words into either Greek or Latin. Perhaps it would be unreasonable to expect accurate discriminations in an ancient tongue, since even in modern languages the corresponding terms are continually blending in signification and interchanging in usage.

אוֹן, from the unused radical און which means primarily to breathe, derives its meaning of power from the hard breathing, the panting, occasioned by the expenditure of power, by that which is done *anhelatus ictibus*. This meaning

appears clearly in אָוֶן, the working one's self weary, hence fatigue, trouble, sorrow. From the supposed analogy of newly broken land yielding its richest strength to the first crop, אוֹן became a poetical designation of procreative force and its first fruits, Gen. XLIX., 3. The signification of power develops in אוֹן, as in אָוֶן, the further signification of substance, riches,—that which is obtained by the exertion of power; in the same manner the German "Vermögen" designates both ability and property.

In גְּבוּרָה the conception of power springs from the primary reference of its root גָּבַר to the act of binding, making fast, compressing, which is also the sense of the Arab. جبر. Like אוֹן it points to the outward manifestation of power rather than to its inward possession. גְּבוּרָה differs from אוֹן, however, in that while the latter looks more to the exercise of physical or personal strength (Job XL., 16, Isa. XL., 29), the former looks to the putting forth of power in its largest sense. But גְּבוּרָה, like *κράτος*, while referring originally to bodily strength, soon abandons this restricted notion, and passes into the broader conception of self-asserting might, rule, or lordship,—from power to might, from *δύναμις* to *δυναστεία*. This last, accordingly, is its most frequent rendering in the Septuagint. Hence גְּבוּרָה becomes pre-eminently the designation of divine, or royal autocratic power, which is able to execute its purposes, and to vindicate itself against opposition. In post-biblical Hebrew God himself is called simply הַגְּבוּרָה, the Almighty, whose creative and sustaining power is manifested throughout the universe (cf. Levy's Neu-hebr. u. chald. Wörterb.). Traces of this usage are found even in the New Testament, as in Matt. XXVI., 24. The use of the plural גְּבוּרוֹת, like the Syr. ܓܒܘܪܬܐ to designate the mighty works of God, or miracles in their positive aspect, follows naturally from preceding usages.

Unlike גְּבוּרָה, which in every signification points to the manifestation of power, כֹּחַ represents power as quiescent, latent. The former is dynamic and extensive, the latter static and intensive. This conception springs doubtless from the primary meaning *juicy, marrowy* (Fürst), hence full of life, and of the robust strength which accompanies fullness and freshness of life. Thus the Psalmist (XXII., 16) exclaims, "My strength, כֹּחִי, is dried up like a potsherd;" and Job (XXI., 24), enumerating evidences of strength, speaks of the breasts being full of milk, and the bones moistened with marrow. The proper equivalent of כֹּחַ, therefore, is strength, *ἰσχύς, robur*, inherent capacity of power, whether of body (Jud. XVI., 5, and so in most instances), or of mind (Prov. XXIV., 5, Dan. I., 5). Hence also the Rabbins designated the five senses of man כֹּחוֹת שֶׁבָּאָדָם, and vegetative power as כֹּחַ צְמִיחָה (Nork's Hebr., chald. u. rabbin. Wörterb.). These inward and outward aspects of power are clearly discriminated in 1 Chron. XXIX., 12. בְּיָדְךָ כֹּחַ וּגְבוּרָה (and also in Septuagint *ἰσχὺς κ. δυναστεία* and in the Vulg. *virtus et potentia*), where כֹּחַ covers merely the idea of passive, indwelling power, and גְּבוּרָה conveys the notion of sovereign power actively manifested in authority and dominion. Both terms are equally appropriate in denoting the almighty power of God, considered from different points of view. Even in such a passage as Jer. X., 12, where the creation of the earth is ascribed to the כֹּחַ of God, the reference is chiefly to that inherent omnipotence of which creation is the external evidence.

עֹז, another term for power, is from עָזַז, of which the root עזז, Arab. عز has the primary meaning to make fast or secure. From this arises the kindred notion of strength; more especially strength divine (1 Chron. XVI., 11), human (Ezek. XXX., 6), or brute (Job XLI. 22 [14]), employed for *offensive or defensive purposes*. As a fitting and frequent designation of divine power, it not only embraces כח and גבורה in their inward and outward aspects of power, but adds to these its own peculiar shade of significance. עז is not simply גבורה, God's sovereign might, but this might actively enlisted in behalf of the poor and oppressed who cry unto him for help (Ps. LXVI., 3); it is not simply כח, God's inherent strength, but this strenght viewed as a secure refuge, an impregnable bulwark against every foe who threatens the welfare of God's people (Ps. XXVIII., 7): Even in Ps. VIII., 2 (3) עז has the signification of bulwark, defense, which God has created out of the mouth of babes.

There is a number of words which, like גבורה, derive their signification of power from the sense of tying fast, binding together, girding tightly. This meaning always proceeds from the primary idea of turning, encircling, winding. Hence these words, חַיִל, חָזָק, חֲזָקָה are to be distinguished from each other only as in actual usage they pass into various significations wherein the conception of power still remains central and controlling. Thus חַיִל, from חול, develops its conception of power along the line of personal valor, considered of as something with which a man is tightly encircled, "Thou hast girded me with חַיִל," 2 Sam. XXII., 40. As womanly virtue corresponds to manly valour, each being considered a distinguishing characteristic, חיל becomes, moreover, the designation of virtue in woman, as it does of bravery in man. Like און it signifies also wealth, riches, viewing these not simply as material equivalents for energy expended, but, poetically, as acquisitions won by valorous enterprise, whether legitimate or illegitimate. It does not exclude the notion of forcible acquisition, as suggested by Delitzsch (Job XX., 15), for the word has no reference to the moral quality of the act by which the riches are obtained. That it points to acquisition by bold, successful ventures, rather than by the slow process of natural accumulation is indicated by the use of the phrase עָשָׂה חַיִל both in the sense of doing valiantly (Ps. LX., 14), and of getting wealth, (Deut. VIII., 17, 18); cf. the English phrase "making money." Hence also the frequently recurring phrase גבור חיל.

חָזַק with its derivatives means properly to wind around tightly, as e. g. by throwing the arms about anything, whether for the purpose of holding it fast, or of holding it up; hence the exertion of power in seizing, or in supporting. It is used in Gen. XLI., 51, to indicate the tight grip with which the famine held the land. In connection with a house or city it expresses the idea of holding up, repairing, fortifying that which is about to fall. It is also used figuratively to denote the act of holding up the weak hands, that is, making anyone courageous in the pursuit of any desired end. "Hence, in this way, its frequent connection with the heart, the physical heart of flesh and blood, the seat of animal and sentient vigor, or, if it is predicated of the heart in a more spiritual sense, it is as the supposed seat of emotions and desires, having ing no reference to the moral state of that heart, but only to its spiritual firmness in carrying out its purposes or impulses, good or bad. Nothing can be farther from the real meaning of this phrase [ויחזק יהוה את־לב פרעה],

as thus applied, than any idea of rendering hard or cruel what in itself, and without this, was mild and compassionate.....It means the giving strength, firmness, tightness, to a cowardly heart whether that heart be morally good or bad. Here in the case of Pharaoh it was a base evil heart that God tightened, strengthened, hardened. It was the only way in which it could be made to reveal itself.....It was as though there had been given to his base, cowardly spirit an invigorating *cordial;* that is an *heart-strengthener*." (Taylor Lewis in *Princeton Review*, March, 1883, pp. 187–188; an admirable exegesis of the above troublesome and often misunderstood passage.)

PIRKE ABOTH; or, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,
Allegheny, Pa.

Translated from the Hebrew Edition of Prof. H. L. Strack, of Berlin, Germany.*
[What is included in brackets is by the translator].

CHAPTER I.

1. Moses[1] received the Law[2] on Mount Sinai[3] and delivered[4] it to Joshua[5], and Joshua to the elders[6], and the elders to the prophets[7], and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue[8]. They said three things: be deliberate in judgment, and raise up many disciples, and make a fence about the law[9].

* Dr. Pick has not translated all the "notes" published in Professor Strack's edition. Many of the "notes" in this edition are intended only as an aid in the study of the text. These and some others have been omitted for lack of space.—[*Editor.*]

[1] Lev. xxvi., 46.

[2] I. e., Both the written and unwritten law.

[3] I. e., From God. In the Talmud we often meet with the phrase הלכה למשה מסיני [i. e., a rule according to Moses from Sinai.] Eduyoth viii., 7; Jadayim iv., 3.

[4] From מָסַר tradere, transmit, comp. v., 8; from this is derived מַסֹּרֶת tradition, especially the tradition respecting the explanation of the Bible, the oral law, iii., 13. Comp. Matth. xv., 2, παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. The word came also to denote the tradition concerning the text of the Bible, Massora.

[5] Josh. i., 7. Numb. xxvii., 18-21.

[6] Josh. xxiv., 31 [Judg. ii., 7].

[7] Jer. vii., 25.

[8] According to tradition an assembly which convened after the return from Babylonia, which for a long time decided over all legal (religious) matters. See Neh., ix., 10. Comp. Joh. Eberh. Rau, *Diatribe de Synagoga Magna*, Utrecht 1727; C. Aurivillus, *Dissertationes* (ed. J. D. Michaelis), Goett. and Leip. 1790, p. 130-160; A. Th. Hartmann, *Die Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen*, Hamburg, 1831, p. 120-166: Abr. Kuenen, *Over de mannen der groote Synagoge*, Amst. 1876; [D. Hoffman, *Ueber die Maenner der grossen Versammlung* in Magazin fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Berlin, 1883, p. 45 sq]. The legal traditions, it is true, were preserved by the scribes, but also further developed.

[9] [Mr. Westcott, in quoting this sentence, remarks: "The difficulty of social and national life, the conflicting interests of ruler and subject, the anxious effort to realize in practice the integrity of state and citizen, when both were imperilled by foreign supremacy, are attested by the *first command*, which could never have occupied such a space in the land of a settled government and certain independence. The *second command* points to the true source of strength in an age of transition and conflict. The evils of doubt and dissension are best removed by the extended knowledge of the principles embodied in the state. In proportion as the different classes of the Jewish people were instructed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, priestly usurpation on the one hand, and popular defection on the other, became impossible. The *third command* alone

2. Simeon the Just was the one of the last men of the Great Synagogue. He used to say: The world exists by virtue of three things—the law,[1] the service,[2] and the acts of benevolence.[3]

3. Antigonus of Sacho[4] received the tradition from Simeon the Just. He used to say: Be not like servants who serve the master for the sake of receiving reward, but be ye like servants who serve the master not for the sake of receiving reward, and let the fear of Heaven[5] be upon you.

4. José, the son of Joëzer of Zereda, and José, the son of Jochanan of Jerusa-

---

contains the warning of the coming end. The fence was necessary, because the law was not only fixed, but dying. Religion already seemed capable of being defined by rule, duty had ceased to be infinite. Stern uprightness, devotion to the law, scrupulous ritualism,—all springing from a heroic faith and tending to a lifeless superstition,—such were the characteristics of the city which, on the frontier of the East, awaited with undaunted courage the approach of the conquering hosts of Alexander." (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, Boston, p. 81). More interesting, however, is the remark of the late Dean Stanley on this sentence: "But there is one traditional saying ascribed to the great Synagogue which must surely have come from an early stage in the history of the scribes, and which well illustrates the disease, to which as to a parasitical plant, the order itself, and all the branches into which it has grown, has been subject. It resembles in form the famous mediæval motto for the guidance of conventual ambition, although it is more serious in spirit. 'Be circumspect in judging—make many disciples—make a hedge around the law.' Nothing could be less like the impetuosity, the simplicity, or the openness of Ezra than any of these three precepts. But the one which in each succeeding generation predominated more and more was the last: 'Make a hedge about the law.' To build up elaborate explanations, thorny obstructions, subtle evasions, enormous developments, was the labor of the later Jewish scribes, till the Pentateuch was buried beneath the Mishna, and the Mishna beneath the Gemara. To make hedges round the the Koran has been, though not perhaps, in equally disproportioned manner, the aim of the schools of El-Azas and Cordova, and of the successive Fetuahs of the Sheyks-el-Islam. To erect hedges round the Gospel has been the effort, happily not continuous or uniform, of large and dominant sections of the scribes of Christianity, and the words of its Founder have well-nigh disappeared behind the successive intrenchments, and fences, and outposts, and counterworks of councils, and synods, and popes, and anti-popes, and sums of Theology and of Saving Doctrine, of Confessions of Faith and Schemes of Salvation,—and the world has again and again sighed for one who would once more speak with the authority of self-condemning Truth and 'not as the scribes' (Matt. vii., 29). A distinguished Jewish Rabbi of this century, in a striking and pathetic passage on this crisis in the history of the nation, contrasts the prospect of the course which Ezekiel and Isaiah had indicated with that which was adopted by Ezra, and sums up his reflections with the remark that: "Had the spirit been preserved instead of the letter, the substance instead of the form, then Judaism might have been spared the necessity of Christianity." (Herzfeld ii., 32-36). But we in like manner say that, had the scribes of the Christian Church retained more of the genius of the Hebrew prophets, Christianity in its turn would have been spared what has too often been a return to Judaism, and it was in the perception of the superiority of the Prophet to the Scribe that its original force and unique excellence have consisted." (*Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, iii., p. 165 sq., New York, 1877.)]

[1] *Treatise Nedarim* fol. 32, col. 2: Great is the Thora; for if it were not given, heaven and earth would not exist; comp. Jer. xxxiii.; 25.

[2] *Abhodha*, i. e., sacrificial service. After the destruction of the Temple עֲבוֹדָה is also used to denote "prayer."

[3] Comp. *Succa* fol. 49, col. 2: In the three particulars is benevolence (גמילות חסדים) superior to alms giving (צדקה): the latter is only the bestowal of money, but benevolence can be exercised by personal service as well. Alms can only be given to the poor, but benevolence can be shown to the rich equally as well. Alms are confined to the living, but benevolence may be extended to the dead as well as to the living.

[4] A name of two cities in Judea.

[5] Meton. = God. Comp. iv., 12: שֵׁם שָׁמַיִם the name of God, i., 11, iv., 4b, לְשֵׁם שׁ for God's sake without selfish motive, ii., 2.12; iv., 11, v., 17.—Dan. iv., 23: Matt. xxi., 25, Comp., also Lev. xxiv., 11.

lem,[1] received the tradition from them. José, the son of Joëzer of Zereda,[2] said[3]: let my house be a meeting-place[4] for the sages, and dust thyself[5] with the dust of their feet and drink in their words thirstingly.[6]

5. José, the son of Jochanan of Jerusalem, said: Let thy house be wide open,[7] and let the poor be the sons of thy household and indulge not much in conversation[8] with a woman.[9] (They said[10] this with reference to one's own wife, how much more[11] with the neighbor's wife). (Hence the sages said[12]: Whoever indulges much in conversation with a woman, causes evil to himself,[13] and neglects the study of the law, and his end[14] is that he becomes an heir of gehenna).[15]

6. Joshua the son of Perachiah and Nithai of Arbela, received from them (by tradition). Joshua, the son of Perachiah, said: Get for thyself a teacher[16]; win for thyself a companion and judge every one charitably.

7. Nithai[17] of Arbela[18] said: Keep aloof from a wicked neighbor,[19] and attach

---

[1] With these two sages the so-called pairs (זוגות) commence, (cf. beside our passage 6, 8, 10, 12), of whom, according to tradition, the first was president, the second the vice-president of the Great Synagogue. Against the correctness of this tradition see Abr. Kuenen, *Verslagen en mededeelingen der Koningl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Decl.* x., 1866, p. 141–147, and E. Schuerer, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 410–413; for it D. Hoffmann, *Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heiligthums* (Jahresbericht des Rabbiner-Seminars fuer das orthodoxe Judenthum pro 5638 (1877–78, Berlin). The first pair probably flourished towards the middle of the second pre-Christian century, the last a few decades before the commencement of the Christian era.

[2] Zereda, comp. 1 Kings, xi., 26; 2 Chron. iv., 17.

[3] The first pair received the tradition not from Antigonus, but from them, i. e., the disciples of Antigonus. Between Antigonus and the first pair there is a gap.

[4] A house of meeting, more especially the house of study, where the sages met.

[5] "Dust thyself" (denominative of אָבָק dust), i. e., sit down at their feet. Comp. v., 15; also Aboth R. Nathan vi.: When a sage enters a city, think not that you will not need him, but sit before him on the ground and receive every word of his with fervor and reverence. Mark x., 39, cf. Acts. xxii., 3, *ἐγώ εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος . . . παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος.*

[6] Other reading בְּצַמְאָה (Jer. ii., 25). A comparison of the bathing with water as i., 11, *Jer. Hagiga* i., 1, two rabbis say to Rabbi Joshua: we are all thy disciples and drink of thy water.

[7] Wide open, comp. רֶוַח room, Gen. xxxii., 17,—Aboth Rabbi Nathan vii., we read of Job that his house had a door on each side, so that the traveller could enter everywhere.

[8] שִׂיחָה (biblical), thought, pious meditation; in later Hebrew; talk, gossip, comp. iii., 10 b, vi., 5.

[9] In the Beraitha *Nedarim* 20a it is added as a reason: because you commit at last adultery. This closes Jose's maxim. Of the two following glosses, the second is the older one.

[10] אמרו, the plural with reference to the following חכמים.

[11] Lit. light and heavy; comp. also vi., 3, a talmudic formula to express the inferences 'a minori ad majus and vice versa. Biblical אַף כִּי.

[12] With this phrase here (as in Thanna de-be Elijahu, init.) the book Ecclus. ix., 9 sq. is quoted. [The disciples of Christ marvelled that he talked with a woman, John iv., 27].

[13] עַצְמוֹ later Hebrew to denote the refl. pronoun: ii., 3, 4, 7, 13 and often (Bbl. בעצם היום הזה).

[14] סוֹף and יָתֵד (see iii., 1;) express not simply the future, but denote the full certainty that something takes place. סוף is generally followed by ל with the infin.: ii., 4 (he will at last be heard).

[15] Josh. xv., 8. In the Targumins and Talmuds it denotes the abode of the damned, *γεέννα*, also 5, 19. The opposite is גַּן עֵדֶן, *παράδεισος*, see v., 20.

[16] רַב teacher (cf. i., 16). [It was regarded as a great honor to call oneself a scholar of a celebrated rabbi: comp. Acts xxii., 3.]

[17] Besides here also mentioned *Hagiga* ii., 2. Cod. Cambr. reads in both passages Matthai, so also the Jerusalem Talmud and a Frankfurt Siddur [i. e. prayer-book] of the year 1306. Nithai is abbreviated from Nethanja.

[18] Macc. ix., 2, now Irbid.

[19] Comp ii., 9 [comp. 1 Cor. xv., 33].

not thyself to a wicked man, and do not think thyself exempt[1] from punishment[2].

8. Judah the son of Tabbai and Simeon the son of Shebach received from them (by tradition). Judah, the son of Tabbai said: Consider not thyself as the arranger[3] of the law; and when litigants[4] stand before thee, let them be in thine eyes as if they be guilty; but when they have been dismissed[5] from thy presence let them be in thine eyes as innocent[6] when they have accepted the sentence.

9. Simon, the son of Shetach, said: Be a most[7] searching examiner of witnesses, and be cautious[8] in thy words, lest[9] from them they might learn to falsify.

10. Shemayah and Abtalion received by tradition from them. Shemayah said: Love work,[10] hate rabbiship[11], and make not thyself known to the government.[12]

11. Abtalion said: Ye sages be on your guard with respect to your words, lest you become amenable to captivity, and be exiled to a place of evil watert, and the disciples who come after you may drink of the same and die, whereby the name of God may would be blasphemed.

12. Hillel and Shammai received by tradition from them. Hillel said: Be of the disciples of Aaron, he loved peace, and pursued peace, he loved mankind,[13] and brought them into proximity with the law.

13. He used to say: Whoever strives for a name of eminence, loses his name[14]; he who increases not, decreases,[15] and he who learns not, is worthy of death[16];

---

[1] יאש, Bbl. נואש despair, later Hebr. Hithp. 1, despair Sanhedrin 97 *a*; 2, to relinquish the thought in something; here and Seder Olam Rabba 28: Whosoever enjoys prosperity, let him not relinquish the thought in misfortune (אל יתיאש), and whosoever is in misfortune, let him not relinquish the thought in prosperity.

[2] פרע Bbl. redeem, postbibl. to pay. נפרע to make oneself paid, iii., 16, here punish כן iv., 4*b* v., 1; פורען he that pays, punishes, chastises; פורענות especially of divine punishment, here iv., 11. Plur. v., 8.

[3] ערך מלים verba struere, ערך משפט Job xiii., 18, here with personal object: let the law take its own course. Comp. also iv., 5.

[4] Litigants. בעל דין iv., 22, plaintiff.

[5] נפטר to depart, e. g. also Toma i., 5. פְּטִירָה departure, demise, vi., 9*b*.

[6] זַכַּי innocent; opposite is חַיָּב. The plural is formed like רַשָּׁאִין iv., 8.

[7] כַּרְבָּה conjug. periphrastic to denote, what should always be done.

[8] Careful, ii., 1, 3, 10, 13. iv., 13*a*; comp. Bibl. הזהיר, נזהר and Ezra iv., 22 והיר.

[9] Lest = *μήποτε*, ne forte i., 11.

[10] [The most excellent rabbis worked at a trade], comp. Acts xviii., 3; xx., 34; 1 Thess. ii., 9; 2 Thess. iii., 8. 1 Cor. iv., 12. Interesting is the agreement of Eph. iv. 28: *ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, μᾶλλον δέ κοπιάτω* with *Kiddushin* fol. 29, col. 1: he that teaches not his son a trade is like bringing him up to stealing.—Franz Delitzsch, *Jud. Handwerkeriehen zur Zeit Jesu*, 3 ed. Erlangen 1879 [Engl. transl. by B. Pick, New York 1883 under the title: Jewish Artisan Life]. S. Meyer, *Arbeit und Handwerk im Talmud*, Berlin 1878.

[11] Rather dominion.—Pesakim 87 *b*: "Woe to dominion, for it kills those who have it."

[12] רְשׁוּת government (as ii., 3). related with ראש; רְשׁוּת, permission, iii., 15.—Com. Prov. xxv., 6.

[13] בְּרִיָּה creature, usually in plur., comp. ii., 11; iii., 10 *a*: iv., 1.6; vi., 1; mostly men in relation to God, men also without reference to this relationship. Mark xvi., 15 *κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει.*

[14] [Comp. Matt. xxiii., 12].

[15] [Comp. Matt. xiii., 12].

[16] חַיָּב guilty. הִתְחַיֵּב to become guilty, iii., 4,8. [Comp. Eccles. xxx.,13. A German proverb says:

and he who makes use of the crown (of the law for his own end) shall perish.[1]

14. He said moreover: If I am not for myself, who will be for me? And when I am not for myself, what am I? and if not at present, when then?

15. Shammas[2] said: Make thy study of the law fixed; speak little but do much,[3] and receive everyone with a pleasant face.

16. [4]Rabban[5] Gamaliel said: Obtain for thyself a teacher and be quit of doubt,[6] and do not indulge too much in tithing by conjecture.[7]

17. Simeon his son said: All my days have I been brought up among wise men, and never found anything better for man[8] than silence; and the study[9] is not the principal thing[10] but the practice[11]; and whoever indulges in much talking causes sin.[12]

19. Rabban Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, said: The direction of the world depends upon three things, viz.: on truth and on justice and on peace, for it is said[13]: "Truth and judgment of peace judge ye in your gates.

HEBREW CHIROGRAPHY.

By Arch. C. Wheaton.

Morrisonville, N. Y.

We speak of the modern practice of the art. Accuracy and speed are two valued qualities for which every writer of Hebrew naturally strives. It is not out of place to add beauty also if it can be had without too great expense of time. The nice distinctions to be observed in the formation of certain letters have perplexed many and perhaps disheartened some. Let all such be of good cheer, there is a right way to do even this, and, as usually, the right way is the easier. The He-

---

Idleness is the root of all evil, and an idle brain is the devil's workshop. Seneca says Epist. 82, 3: *otium sine litteris mors est et hominis vivi sepultura*].

1 It was prohibited to receive any payment for instruction in the law. Comp. *Nedarim* fol 62, col. 1; *Baba Bathra* fol. 8, col. 1.

2 This name already occurs. 1 Chron. ii., 28, 44.

3 This is illustrated *Baba Mezia* fol. 87 col. 1 by an example of Abraham, who offered the three men a morsel of bread (Gen. xviii., 5) but afterwards brought the best that he had.

4 §§ i., 16—ii., 7 are later additions. ii., 8 immediately follows i., 15

5 The preceding sages without any title. No title was the highest degree. Rabban (here for the first time) is more than Rabbi and Rab.

6 [Comp. Jas. i., 6].

7 אומד conjecture. The heave-offering, theruma, was given באומד, Menachoth fol. 54 col. 2, i.e., it was not necessary to measure off exactly the 50th part. Leusden remarks correctly: Ne dato saepius decimas ex conjectura, vel minus dando vel plus. Si minus dederis, avarus judicaberis et peccabis: plus dando vel prodigus habeberis vel hypocrita.

8 גוף (α) body, (β) person, iv., 6; similar here where it is best to translate "man;" (γ) essence main thing, thus, iii., 18 גופי הלכות main halachoth, essential doctrines, v., 8 שבעה גופי עברה seven main sins.

9 Study, investigation (2 Chron. xiii., 22; xxiv., 27 signification doubtful). ביתה כדרש, v., 12 house of study [college].

10 עקר (α), root = שֹׁרֶשׁ, (β) basis, the essential thing.

11 [Comp. Rom. ii., 13; 1 Cor., iv., 20; Jas. i., 23.]

12 Comp. Prov. x., 19.

13 Zech. viii., 16. According to the best witnesses this quotation is a later edition.—שנאמר is used in quotations ii., 9; iii., 2 and often. Other forms see under iii., 7*a*.

brew letters are written from left to right, and shaded horizontally instead of perpendicularly as in English. The Hebrew stylus was a square cornered instrument, most easily imitated in our hands by a "stub" or engrossing pen. (Spencerian, Gothic, No. 22 is excellent.) This pen should be held between the first and second fingers at an angle of 45 degrees with the hand, so as to present its widest surface to the horizontal stroke. As a general rule each letter requires two strokes for its completion, except those obviously made with one stroke, and ה, ח, מ and פ, which require three.

As a general rule also, all the letters are made by beginning with the upper stroke, but it is important to note certain exceptions. If it is impossible to shade Hebrew letters correctly and rapidly in the usual manner of holding a pen, it is equally impossible to construct these exceptional letters readily and well unless we make the lower stroke first. These letters are similar to others which precede them alphabetically, and were probably constructed by a reversed mode of formation to produce distinctive features. They are כ, מ, נ, ס and פ.

The cleavage of stone, the yielding of wax or clay and the flow of ink naturally produce bold lines and sharp angles when two lines are brought together at right angles, as in the cases where the upper stroke is made first. When the lower stroke is made first the termination of the line is in the direction from which the complementary line is expected and accordingly weak and uncertain. This law is clearly illustrated in the letters ב and כ which are otherwise precisely alike. In the case of נ and ן it is to be observed that in addition to this tendency, the downward stroke when made first glides past the point of junction, an accident which would be avoided in the reversed mode of construction. The distinction between ד and ר is of a similar nature, the former being composed of two strokes and the latter of but one.

ט can not be perfectly formed in less than two strokes, and ם is swiftly and accurately formed only by producing a character like the right hand portion of ט and afterward adding as a third stroke a ׳ on the left shoulder. ת is distinguished from ח as much by its being composed of two strokes instead of three, as by its foot at the base of the left line.

ף is exactly like כ with the addition of the distinctive mark, and the practised eye distinguishes it from כ quite as much by its reversed formation as by its distinctive sign.

GENERAL NOTES.

The Accentuation of the Three Poetical Books.—The questions have often been asked, Why the three (so-called) Poetical Books—Psalms, Proverbs, and Job—have a different accentuation from the twenty-one Prose Books; and again, why—if there was to be a distinction—the poetical accentuation should have been *confined* to the three books above-named, when there are other books which, if their poetical character be regarded, seem equally to claim it. There was clearly no *necessity* for any distinction at all, for we find the same portions Pss. XVIII. and CV. 1-15, at one time marked with the poetical, and at another (see 2 Sam. XXII., and 1 Chron. XVI. 8-22) with the prose

accents; and in the Babylonian system of punctuation, Psalms, Proverbs, and Job were accented in the same way as the other books. We have then to do with a refinement peculiar to the Palestinian synagogues and schools,—a refinement (as it would seem) of a purely *musical* character. At least, we find the melody much more frequently interfering with the rules of the accentuation, as fixed by the logical or grammatical construction of the verse, than in the other books. The idea seems to have been to compensate for *the shortness of the verses* (which is a marked characteristic of the greater part of these books) by a finer and fuller, more artificial and impressive, melody. For the Psalms a peculiar melody was suitable enough, and it may not have been inappropriate when applied to the brief and pregnant verses of Job and Proverbs.

When and by whom this improvement in the cantillation of the synagogue was introduced, we are unable to say. By the help of the Talmud we can trace the accents to the first centuries of the Christian era; but the Talmud (Palestinian as well as Babylonian) gives no hint as to any variation in the accentuation of the several books. The *argumentum e silentio* may perhaps be allowed its weight here, particularly as Jerome also does not allude to having heard from his Jewish teacher a particular mode of reading for the three books, although he draws special attention to their other peculiarities,—metre (as it seemed to him) and stichical division in the writing. Moreover, if this accentuation had been due to an *early* tradition, we should expect to find it represented in the Babylonian system of punctuation. I venture therefore to think that it had its origin in a comparatively recent period, the *terminus a quo* being the early part of the fifth century, at which time the Palestinian Talmud had been closed, and Jerome was dead; and that *ad quem*, the close of the seventh century, when, in all probability written signs were first employed for the accents. It would not, on account of this its later origin, lose its interest for us, because it would still represent the traditional division and interpretation of the text.—*Wickes, in a Treatise on the Accentuation of the Poetical Books.*

Michaelis on Oriental Study.—"Divines, therefore, who confine their studies to the Greek Testament, and, without learning the Oriental languages, aspire to the title of Theologians, lead not only themselves into error, but those to whom they undertake to communicate instruction; and I may venture to affirm that no man is capable of understanding the New Testament, unless to an acquaintance with the Greek, he joins a knowledge of at least Hebrew, Syriac, and Rabbinic."

"Those who have neither opportunity nor abilities to acquire sufficient knowledge to investigate for themselves, must at least be in possession of so much as is requisite to profit from the learned labors of others, and to apply those treasures of Grecian and Oriental Literature, which their predecessors have presented to their hands. But a man unacquainted with the Septuagint, and the classic authors, can form no judgment of the critical remarks which have been made on the language of the Old Testament,.....

In short, he can see only with foreign eyes, and believe on the authority of others; but he can have no conviction himself, a conviction, without which no man should presume to preach the Gospel, even to a country congregation."—*Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. I. Sec. XIII.*

The above which I came upon accidentally ought to be impressed upon every student who desires a dispensation from Hebrew. G. C. TANNER.

צְדָקָה in later Hebrew.—The word which has obtained currency among the Jews for "charity" or rather "alms," is the Hebrew word צדרה. Throughout the Old Testament this word signifies "justice" or "righteousness," its Greek equivalent being *δικαιοσύνη*; but in several instances—eight in all—the version of the Septuagint has rendered the word by *ἐλεημοσύνη*, "mercy" or "benevolence," thus showing that among the Hellenistic or Alexandrian Jews the popular acception of צדרה had already gained ground. In Rabbinical writings the term צְדָקָה is only used in the signification of "benevolence" or "charitable gifts." The transition from the meaning of righteousness to that of "benevolence," and from the abstract noun to the concrete signification of "alms" is curious, and it deserves to be noted that our own word "alms" is a descendant of *ἐλεημοσύνη*, the first signification of which is the abstract idea of "pity" or "mercy."—*Dr. Sigmund Louis, in Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology, Vol. VIII.*

Two Epigrams by Aben Ezra.—

I.

(The poet complains about the the unhappy course of his life.)

גלגל ומזלות במעמדם — נטו במהלכי למולדתי
אם יהיו נרות סחורותי — לא יאסוף שמש עדי מותי
אינע להצליח ולא אוכל — כי עותוני כוכבי שמי
לו אהיה סותר בתכריכין — לא יגועון אישים כל ימי

II.

Whatever happens to man—be it joyful or sad—is of a fleeting character. Let us therefore keep the even tenor of our mind.)

מילדי יום אל תבהל — כי ילדי יום לא ירגעו
אל תשמח בם אם ייטיבו — גם אל תחת אם ירעו
כי הטובות גם הרעות — כאשר יחנו כן יסעו

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Intermediate Syllable.—In reply to a question concerning the *Intermediate Syllable* referred to Dr. B. Felsenthal, and Mr. Benjamin Douglass, these gentlemen have kindly sent scholarly and valuable papers. There have been received also two other papers called forth by the article on this subject in the last issue. Because these papers are all quite long, and because so large a portion of the space of the preceding number was given to this topic, it has been deemed wise to delay somewhat the publication of additional matter in this line. It is believed that the subject is one of real importance, that to overlook or disregard it is to neglect a principle recognized by the Massoretic punctators in every verse, that the differences of opinion concerning it are due chiefly to the lack of clear and definite expression in its discussion. Now would it not be well for those engaged in teaching Hebrew to know the opinions and practice of each other in reference to this point? Will not professors and instructors kindly answer the following questions, and allow the publication of the same in the next HEBRAICA?

(1) Is the so-called *Intermediate* syllable to be recognized? If so, on what grounds?

(2) Is it worth while to attempt an explanation of its character and occurrence, to those who have been studying the language but for a short time? If so, in what manner?

(3) Of the names *intermediate*, *half-open*, *slight*, which is to be preferred? If none of these are acceptable, what may be suggested?

Let us have a *Symposium*, on the subject of the "Intermediate Syllable."

Hebrew Studies in Vanderbilt University.—From a statement prepared, at our request, by Prof. T. J. Dodd, we learn the following facts in reference to the study of Hebrew at Vanderbilt University.

(1) The course of study covers a period of three years, all of which time is occupied with the study of Hebrew, in the same sense in which these words would be used of the Greek or Latin. (2) Regarding the method which teaches inflections, meanings and written forms all at the same time, as contrary to nature, and as tending to confuse, Prof. Dodd teaches, largely by the *viva voce* process, the pronunciation, meanings and inflections of words of various parts of speech, and the leading peculiarities of syntax, *before any use is made of the printed text*. (3) When a large amount of this preparatory work has been performed, the alphabet, together with all the signs needed in pronunciation, is learned, and then a book containing lists of verbs and nouns is placed in the student's hand, from which he is drilled in the *written forms* of words whose pronunciation, meaning and inflection he has already learned. At the same time the more important sections of Green's grammar are marked out, to be learned by private study. (4) Students are encouraged to ask, and are themselves asked, all manner of questions, and in the elucidations of the text given day by day, the student is taken through quite a comprehensive course of Biblical Archæology and Hermeneutics, though no text-book is employed and no time is *nominally* devoted to these subjects. Believing this entire subject of Hermeneutics to be involved in a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, the professor teaches his students that the word of God in the language in which it is written is its own best interpreter, and that all formal principles of Hermeneutics, aside from the laws and usages of the Sacred Tongue are to be regarded with suspicion. (5) The students of Hebrew, with a few exceptions, take their meals at a common table, and so far as practicable put into use the Hebrew learned in the class-room. This the professor encourages them to do, believing, as he does, that notwithstanding the blunders made, there will be advance, and that the mere repetition of such words as they know, will contribute largely to a mastery of the language.

The work, as thus pursued, is said to arouse great interest. And while a large portion of the class-room work is thus given to exercises of a purely practical character, the study of the grammar of the language is kept up assiduously during the three years.

We invite the attention of students and instructors of Hebrew to these points, believing that by the study of each other's methods, we may be profited. Lack of space forbids a fuller statement. But sufficient has been mentioned to indicate the main characteristics of the work as carried on in this flourishing University of the South.

A Pastor's Testimony.—From a most devoted and hard working pastor in West Virginia come these words: "I have not abandoned the study of Hebrew, but for some time past I have been obliged to take it in homœopathic doses. Let me add my name to the list of those who advocate the introduction of Hebrew into the College curriculum. Nor would I have it optional with those who have the ministry in view. If our Theological Seminaries would make some knowledge of Hebrew a requirement for entrance to the best advantage, I believe they would do their students and the cause of the Gospel a favor."

The matter stands thus: If men are to be expected to continue the study of the Old Testament in the original, after entering upon the active work of the ministry, they must, beforehand, have received such a knowledge of the original as will enable them to do this with some ease. The time allotted to the study of Hebrew is not, in most cases, sufficient to accomplish this thing. Either the study should not be taken up, or, it must receive more time in the Seminary, or men must have some knowledge of Hebrew when they enter the Seminary. There is no option. One of these courses must be followed. While we believe thoroughly, that there are some men, called to preach the Gospel, whom God never intended should study Hebrew, and that for these men opportunity for the careful study of the Scriptures in English must be afforded, we would regret to see the course pursued by one our *Eastern* seminaries generally adopted. To place men who do not study Hebrew, on equal footing with men who do study it, to say virtually, it is a matter of small moment whether or not this language is studied, means a lowering of the standard of scholarship in any seminary in which such action is taken. There may, of course, be special reasons why this should be done, but unless they are made public, they cannot be considered. Such a step is a most serious blow to the interests of the highest and best Biblical study. Let men begin this study in College, and let them enter the Seminary with a knowledge of Hebrew, as well as with a knowledge of Greek. This is the opinion of thousands of clergymen who, to-day, realize, as those just entering the ministry do not realize, the value of such knowledge as an aid in the intelligent study of God's word.

The introduction of Hebrew into Colleges will come. It is only a question of time and work. Shall not those who favor such a step unite in an effort to bring it about?

Hebrew Study in the Junior Vacation.—"To begin a second year of the study of Hebrew with nothing lost of what was gained in the first; especially, to begin it with an enlarged vocabulary and greater facility in resolving grammatical forms, may make all the difference between success and failure in acquiring the language."

These are the introductory words of the preface to a volume containing the Hebrew text of 1 Samuel, together with a complete vocabulary of the book, prepared by Rev. A. S. Carrier, under the auspices of Dr. E. C. Bissell, of the Hartford Theological Seminay, and Professor C. R. Brown, of Newton Theological Institution. The volume is intended merely for private circulation Is not the suggestion here made a most forcible one? Has it not been said, and with truth, that theological students know less *Hebrew* at the end of the Middle than at the end of the Junior year, and still less at the end of the Senior year? But how can this be explained? Because grammatical drill and the direct application of

grammatical principles stop short at the end of the junior year. But if a student who has just finished the work of the Junior year, during the interval between the first and second years of his seminary course, will set himself to read carefully and critically one of the Books of Samuel, or of Kings, and will in this study make out with exactness the place of each verbal form, at the same time making his own, so far as possible, the vocabulary of the book, in how much better condition he will be to do satisfactorily the higher and more important work of the Middle year. Is this not a thing to be done by every man who desires to make the most of himself in this department of study? Is it not a course to be urged by professors of Hebrew upon their students?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. At what (approximate) date did the use of *final* forms of letters, viz., Kăph, Mêm, Nûn, etc. begin to obtain with writers of Hebrew?

The final letters ך, ם, ן, ף, ץ seem to have been in use among the Jews ever since they changed their old original alphabet for כתב אשורי, "the Assyrian alphabet." The oldest Hebrew MSS. have these final letters; so have the oldest inscriptions upon gravestones,—and gravestones have been found in the Crimea whose inscriptions, if they are genuine, date back to the first Christian century. The Talmud also knows the peculiar final letters, and says that they were originated by the prophets. See Sabbath fol. 104*a* מנצפ"ך צפים אמרו.

2. When were the final letters first used to express numeral signs above four hundred?

As numeral signs the final letters appear mostly, if not exclusively, in the Massorah. I do not call to memory any instance from Talmudic, Midrashic, or late Rabbinic literature, in which the final letters are used to indicate numbers above four hundred. As an example of the Massoretic use of the final letters there may be cited the note at the end of Genesis, where it is stated that the the book of Genesis contains 1534 verses, א"ך ל"ד סימן; as also the note at the end of Leviticus, where the number of verses is given as 849, נט"ף.

3. Would their numerical value be regarded as the same as that of the usual form in "Gematria," or the Rabbinical method of giving the "number" of a word?

In almost all statements, Massoretic statements excepted, the final letters have the same numerical values as the usual corresponding forms, e. g., in chronograms, on the title pages of Hebrew books, etc., in Gematriyaoth, and similar methods by which the "number" of a word is given. It is possible that a few exceptions from this rule may be found, but they will be few.

[For the answers to these questions we are indebted to Dr. B. Felsenthal, Chicago].

BOOK NOTICES.

TURPIE'S CHALDEE MANUAL.*

This is the second of a proposed series of *twelve* manuals for Oriental languages by the *same author*. It is, as the author says in the preface, a collection of material "suitable for his purpose," taken from various grammars, and does not claim to be an original work. The neatness and beauty of the typography strike the eye, as, indeed, do all the works of the publishers. The make-up consists of Preface, Contents and Introduction, 23 pp., Elements and Parts of Speech, 91 pp., Syntax 53 pp., and *Errata* 2 pp., and Chrestomathy with vocabulary 52 pp. Of the body of the work, 22 sections (41 pp.) were carefully compared with the grammars of Winer, Riggs and Petermann, and the sources of each section noted. The author's plan, as revealed by this process, may be shown by illustration; e. g., Introduction p. XIX, Note 2 (½ p.) is taken bodily from Winer; pp. XXI and XXII, Note 1 (1½ pp.) is taken bodily from the introduction to Riggs' Chrestomathy. Again §6, p. 5, (8) is throughout from Riggs, p. 6, (9) is from Riggs, where an apparent attempt at improvement, simply confuses Transposition and Assimilation; (10) is a literal translation from the Latin of Petermann; (11) is a compound of Riggs and Petermann; p. 7, (12) and (13) are translations bodily from Petermann. Thus might be assigned the sources of almost every sentence in the remaining 21 sections. The statements of different authors follow each other, not always connected. In fact, they seem to lack the continuity, the living connection of thought characteristic of one who has digested and assimilated the matter into his own system of thought. "The verb has two tenses, Preter or Perfect, and Future or Aorist, but more rightly the Impf." Whatever this latter may mean, the term Fut. occurs throughout the treatment, as, indeed, it does in its sources.

The Syntax is a redeeming feature of the work, and worthy of some careful study, as being an exceptionally full treatment of the subject. The Chrestomathy, wisely, too, is made up of selections from *several* Targums, thus affording an excellent exercise for the student. The table of errata is certainly a reflection on the work of proof-reading, especially, when by actual counting, it is found that it does not contain one-half of the *avoidable* mistakes; this cannot fail to retard the usefulness of the book, since, if there is any grammar that should be as near as possible to perfect, that should be the Chaldee, so various, irregular, and confusing are its forms to a beginner.

The work then may be useful for its Syntax and Chrestomathy, and as a *compilation* (not a grammar) of three or four grammars. *A grammar cannot be a compilation;* it must have personality and continuity, order and scientific classification, concise statement of facts and principles, and an arrangement of these in a philosophical, pedagogical style for ready comprehension. The principles *must not be embodied* in a prose style, making prominent neither facts nor illustra-

* A Manual of Chaldee Language: containing a grammar of Biblical Chaldee and of the Targums, and a Chrestomathy, consisting of selections from the Targums with a vocabulary, by David McCalman Turpie, M. A., D. D., London: *Williams and Norgate.*

tions, tending rather to confusion than order. The *grammarian's* work is not to *compile* but to *classify* facts, and any other method is unworthy the efforts of a true scholar of to-day. It is to be hoped that a somewhat different plan will be followed in the remainder of the series, and thus render to linguistic science a real contribution.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BERLINER, A., Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens im Talmud und Midrash. 71 S. gr. 8. Berlin: *Gorzelauczyk & Co.* 1884.

BERTIN, G., Suggestions on the voice-formation of the Semitic Verb. A comparative and critical study, *Journ. of the Royal Asiatic Society* Oct. p. 387–418, 1883.

BICKELL, G., Principes généraux de grammaire hébraïque. Traduit par E. Philipe. Paris: *V. Lecoffre.* 1884.

BRUGSCH, H. Thesaurus inscriptionum Ægyptiacarum. Altägyptische Inschriften, gesammelt, verglichen, übertragen, erklärt und autographirt. 3. Abth., Geographische Inschriften altägyptischer Denkmäler. 1884. (VII. und 5. 531–618, 4) baar n. n. M.22.— (1–3: M.156.—) Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C., Sceaux et cachets israelites, phœnicians et syriens. Note complentaire. *Journ. as.:* Sér. 8. T. II. 1883. p. 304, 305 et planche.

DELITZSCH, FRDR., und PAUL HAUPT. Bibliothek Assyriologische. 3. Bd. 1. Abth. gr. 8. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*

DELITZSCH, FRDR., Die Sprache der Kassaer. Linguistisch histor. Funde und Fragen. gr. 8. (VI. 756.) Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*

DERENBOURG, J. et H., Étude sur l'épigraphie du Yemen [suite] *Journ. Asiatique* Aug.-Sept., p. 229–277, 1883.

EUTING, JUL., Sammlung der carthagischen Inschriften, hrsg. m. Unterstützg. der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 1. Bd. Taf. 1–202 u. Anh., Tafel 1–6. gr. 4 (1 Bl. Text). Strassburg: *Truebner.* 1883.

GUYARD, S., Nouvelles notes de lexicographie assyrienne (§ 1–19): *Journ. Asiatique* Aug.–Sept. 1883, p. 184–198.

HALEVY, G., Dan. i., 3 Ashpenas, *Journ. as.* 1883, Aug.-Sept., p. 282–284. Miscellanises sémitololgiques, *Journ. as.* Oct.-Dec. 1883, p. 432–467.

———— Observations sur les inscriptions sabéennes. *Journ. as.* jan. 1884, p. 99–105.

KRALL, JAK., Studien zur Geschichte des alten Aegypten. II. Aus demot. Urkunden. Lex.-8, 100 S. n. 1. 60 (I. u. II.: n. 2. 80). Wien: *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.*

NOELDEKE, T., Untersuchungen zur Semitischen Grammatik, *ZDMG*, 37. 4. 1883. S. 524–540.

STASSMAIER, J. N., Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen und akkadischen Wörter im zweite Bande der "Cuneiform inscriptions of W. A." sowie mehrerer anderer meist unveröffentlichter Inschriften mit zahlreichen Ergänzungen und Verbesserungen der Texte nach den Thontafeln des Britischen Museums. 2.–4. Lief. (S. 103–768) in 4°. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.* (Band IV.-Lief. 2–4 der Assyr. Bibl.)

VOGUE, DE, Inscriptions palmyriennes [suite]. *Journ. as.*, Aug.-Sept. 1883, p. 149 183.

HEBRAICA.

VOL. I. MAY, 1884. NO. 3.

BOOKS FOR THE STUDY OF THE NEO-HEBRAIC LANGUAGE.

BY HERMANN L. STRACK, PH.D.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

The Neo-Hebraic has never been properly a living language; neither is it an entirely dead language. All teachers of the law have discussed legal questions in this language. During the entire middle ages, the Jewish scholars of countries differing most widely, announced and interchanged views in this language. Even now, numerous periodicals in this language appear: the Hammaggid, המגיד, published in Lyck (East Prussia) is, for example, the organ from which thousands of Jews in Eastern Germany, in Poland and in Russia, obtain their information concerning the events of the day. At the present time the Neo-Hebraic is, for all not wholly unlearned Jews, the means by which they, when in foreign lands, make themselves understood by their co-religionists. I, myself, a few weeks ago, conversed in this way with many Jews in Cairo, in Jerusalem and in Tiberias.

The Neo-Hebraic is, consequently, acquired by the Jews not so much through instruction as through practice. This, therefore, explains why we have only few and insufficient printed aids for the learning of the Neo-Hebraic. Two other circumstances, also, increase the difficulty of the acquirement of this language by Christians. First: the oldest Neo-Hebraic literary productions have an age of eighteen centuries (many prayers, many portions of the Mishna); from that time until now, the language has naturally passed through many changes. Second: this language has been used for very diverse purposes (Jurisprudence, Religion, Philosophy, Philology, etc.), and has been subjected to the influence of very diverse peoples and languages.

The beginner will, therefore, do well to apply himself at first simply to *one* rubric, it may be to the Mishna, or the Exegetes, or some other department.

An indispensable exercise in preparation is the reading of unpointed texts. I recommend for this, the edition of the Pentateuch edited by S. Baer under the title תקון הסופר והקורא [Tiqqun ha-sopher veha-qore] (Roedelheim, J. Lehrberger & Co., 1866 and other times). This little book is very correctly printed and cheap, about 270 pages for one Mark. One may begin with a part which he has already read in pointed text.

He would be able then most easily to read historical pieces. The book by

Joseph Zedner: Auswahl historische Stücke aus hebräischen Schriftstellern vom Zweiten Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart. Mit vokalisirten Texte, deutscher Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen. Berlin 1840. x, 293 pp.

is to be recommended. To be sure, it contains no glossary; but this want is tolerably supplied by the German translation standing opposite.

C. J. Corve: Chrestomathia rabbinica. Pars prima. Berlin 1844. 208 pp.

Corve is a pseudonym. The author's name is J. H. R. Biesenthal, the same who had a notable commentary on the Epistle to Hebrews published in 1878 Leipzig). The first part of the chrestomathy contains matter historical, geographical, philological and philosophical. Over against the Hebrew text a Latin translation is placed. Latin notes and the vocalization of the more difficult words facilitate the understanding. The second part which was to offer extracts from the Talmud, has, we are sorry to say, not appeared.

A book very rich in its contents but, unfortunately, seldom found, is that of

Johannes Theodor Beelen: אבני חפץ. Chrestomathia rabbinica et chaldaica cum notis grammaticis, historicis, theologicis, glossario et lexico abbreviaturarum. Löwen 1841–43, 3 vols. in 6 parts. 322, 170; 326, 201; 112, 343 pp.

I would call the attention of those who interest themselves specially in the modern Neo-Hebraic literature to

Adam Martinet: תפארת ישראל Hebräische Chrestomathie der biblischen und neuern Literatur. Bamberg 1837. xvi, 404 pp.

Only the first 24 pages contain biblical pieces. Aside from this the entire book is devoted to the modern literature. Poetry has had particular consideration (pp. 144-323); nevertheless we find also fables, letters, essays, prayers. With the exception of three small pieces all the texts are vocalized. The notes (336–352) have a historico-literary content. The conclusion is a lexicon (pp. 353–404).

With the aid of these works, the beginner will be able to accomplish the first exercises in the reading of Neo-Hebraic texts. After he has completed these he will, as a rule, apply himself to a specific class of writings. As to these further steps we would also offer advice.

Having conquered the elements, many begin with the *Mishna.* This is not unsuitable; because for the study of the Mishna there are already many aids at hand.

Leop. Dukes: Die Sprache der Mischna lexicographisch und grammatisch betrachtet. Esslingen 1846. 127 pp.

Abr. Geiger: Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah. Breslau 1845. Erste Abtheilung: Lesebuch x, 135 pp.

The first part contains a short grammar of the language of the Mishna; the second well chosen selections for reading, in part vocalized, with copious notes and a glossary.

Hermann L. Strack: פרקי אבות. Die Sprüche der Väter. Ein ethischer Mischna-Tractat mit Kurzer Einleitung, Anmerkungen und einem Wortregister. Karlsruhe und Leipzig 1882. H. Reuther; 48 pp. (New York: B. Westermann & Co.). 1 Mark, 20 pf.

This treatise, very attractive as to its contents, is particularly suitable for the beginner because of its almost pure biblical language. In this edition all deviations from the biblical usage, as well as the factual difficulties are explained. The text is vocalized.

L. A. Wolff: Mischna-Lese oder Talmud-Texte religiös-moralischen Inhalts. Grösstentheils in vokalisirtem Urtext mit deutscher Uebersetzung und erläuternden Anmerkungen. Leipzig 1866, 1868. 2 Hefte. 158 pp.

An acquaintance with the Neo-Hebraic epistolary style may be obtained from

J. Buxtorf: Institutio epistolaris hebraica. Basil 1629.

For the introduction to the study of the *exegetical works*, I recommend

Johannes Leusden: Jonas illustratus. Utrecht 1656.
In this book are given the commentaries of Raschi, Abraham ibn Ezra, David Kimchi, in pointed text with a Latin translation.

Aug. Wuensche: Der Prophet Hosea übersetzt und erklärt. Leipzig 1868. Wünsche has quoted many interpretations from Raschi, Abraham ibn Ezra and David Kimchi in the original and in a German translation.

The grammatical terminology is collected and explained in Latin in

Jo. H. R. Biesenthal et *F. Lebrecht:* Rabbi Davidis Kimchi Radicum Liber. Berlin 1847. Col. LIII.–LX.

In further study, one must especially consult the lexicons:

Johannis Buxtorfii: P. Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum... editum a J. Buxtorfio Filio. Basel 1640.

Moses Schulbaum: הכללי אוצר המלים. Allgemeines, vollständiges, neuhebräisch-deutsches Wörterbuch mit Inbegriff aller in den Talmudischen Schriften und in der neuen Literatur überhaupt vorkommenden Fremdwörter.

This is by no means complete, nevertheless useful at times, because of the consideration paid to the later Neo-Hebraic. Buxtorf's work is not easily found, and is dear. Even B. Fischer's careful reprint (1866–1874) of Buxtorf's lexicon is dear (63 Marks): it contains many useful, but also not a few useless, additions by the editor.

Jacob Levy: Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. Nebst Beiträgen von H. L. Fleischer. Leipzig 1876 sqq.

Only three volumes (567, 542, and 736 pp.) have as yet appeared; in these the letters א to ע are treated. A very painstaking work; but it contains only the Talmudim and Midraschim, not the remaining Neo-Hebraic literature, hence e. g., neither philology nor philosophy.

Many Neo-Hebraic writings have been translated into Latin, English, German, or French. These translations will assist those who have no teacher, and are, in consequence, included in the books about to be enumerated.

Hermann L. Strack und *Carl Siegfried:* Lehrbuch der neu-hebräischen Sprache und Literatur. Karlsruhe und Leipzig 1884. H. Reuther: xii, 132 pp. 3 Mark. New York: B. Westermann & Co.

The first part (pp. 1–92) gives an epitome of the Neo-Hebraic grammar with respect especially to the Mishna (by Prof. Siegfried); the second part contains a bibliographic synopsis of the entire Neo-Hebraic literature, so far as it may be of interest for Christians, according to the divisions: Mishna, Talmud, Tosephta, Midrashim, later Halacha, Exegesis and Philology, History, Poetry, Philosophy, and Theology. Appended thereto, something is given concerning the Jewish-German [Judaico-German] literature. A detailed catalogue of aids to the understanding of the Neo-Hebraic forms the conclusion. To this catalogue, I may refer those who wish to know of still more books than those named in the present article.

THE VARIETIES OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET.

BY PROF. JOHN C. C. CLARKE,

Shurtleff College, Upper Alton, Ill.

The alphabets of the Semitic peoples are not merely objects of curiosity. They restore many pages of nearly or wholly forgotten history. The map of Arabia platted with its ancient letters is a picture of its tribal and religious divisions, overlaid with the lines of commercial travel and the track of war, and showing the points where literature and civilization entered, the dates of their entrances, with the courses, the helps and the hindrances of their progress. The present generation, however, still sees the subject as a new study, and by the discovery or collation of formerly unknown or neglected inscriptions has thrown upon the field of view an hitherto unimaginable illumination.

Although some confusion exists from the imperfectness and great differences of professed *facsimiles* of inscriptions, as published by different explorers and scholars, the history of the letters of the peoples north of Sinai may be supposed to be well illustrated as far back as the tenth ante-christian century. And yet, for full assurance as to the origin of the old Semitic alphabet, and its primitive forms, we must refer as much as we are able to the Southern Arabic and North African alphabets.

The southern part of Arabia is and has been almost closed to Europeans by an unfriendly climate and the ill will of the natives. The people are Arabic, speaking various dialects. Those of the extreme south were anciently called Himyarin, either from a king of Yemen, or, as some suppose, from their dusky hue. Some scholars are of opinion that in Kahtan, an ancient prince, and in Hadramaut, the name of the region, are to be recognized the biblical Joktan and Hazarmaveth, descendants of Arphaxad. That the southern Arabs had a peculiar alphabet has been known from the preservation of most of its characteristics in the letters of Abyssinia. Over these peculiarities the imagination of scholars exhausted itself in conjecturing Greek, Roman, Syriac and Numidian influences as the modifying forms. The Ethiopic literature is Christian, and its words are written from left to right, both of which facts suggest Greek or Roman influence. But these are delusive conjectures; for the Ethiopic letters bear little resemblance to Greek or Roman, while yet the Ethiopians use Greek letters for numerals, and thus emphasize the distinction. In writing from left to right the Ethiopians have only yielded to the constant suggestion and pressure of nature. The Egyptian hieroglyphics were written indifferently to right or left, and pointed or faced against the advance of the reader, as a weathercock against the moving wind. In painted or drawn figures having many parts it was equally natural to move the brush to right or left, but it is most natural for a painter or writer to place himself squarely before his tablet, and begin at the right hand. Hence the Egyptians in hieratic and demotic writing always moved from right to left, but made the several letters usually with the chief strokes as we now write, as is often shown by their unfinished ends. Most of the Semitic tribes, by linking letters, and by making connecting lines constituent elements, were constrained to preserve the same direction in writing, but it was always awkward. The Ethiopians, retaining the isolated forms of their letters, and rather erecting and

Table XVI. **Hebrew.**

	Oldest Known.		Of Roman Period.						
	Siloam Ins.	Stones	Coins.			Coins.	Stone.	Stone.	Stone.
a									
b									
g									
d									
h									
v.u									
z									
hh									
t									
i.y									
k									
l									
m									
n									
s									
'									
p									
ts									
q									
r									
sh									
t									

Y and ת are joined letters.

From a cast and the lithograph of the Am. Pal. Expl. Fund.

An inscription. Supposed to be oldest by De Vogüé. 1868.

Stones of Cent's VIII & IX. B.C.

De Vogüé. Revue Archéologique. 1865.

Old Shekels.

Coins of the Maccabees. B.C. 160 & 140.

Coins of the Revolt. A.D. 66.

Gesenius. Mon. Phœn.

Found in the "Tomb of the Kings" in 1864. Supposed to be about Christ Era. Renan.

Inscriptions in Jerusalem. De Vogüé. Rev. Arch. '64.

Gravestones in Crimea. of A.D. 50 and 5?. Neubauer. Bul. S.E. Pop. Acad. 1864. Chwolson. Mem. " " 1865.

J.C.C. Clarke.

Table XVIII.

Hebrew.

	Coins.			Inscriptions.		Layard's Bowls.		
a								
b								
g								
d								
h								
v. u								
z								
h								
t								
i. y								
k								
l								
m								
n								
s								
ʿ								
p								
ṣ								
q								
r								
sh								
ṯ								

Copper. B.C. 165-135. Smith's Bible Dictionary.

Silver. B.C. 140-131.

Rawlinson's Herodotus.

Jerusalem. Cent. I. A.D. De Vogüé Rev. Arch. 1865.

Hefr Berein. Cent. III.

Dr. Levy in Z.D.M.G. 1855.

Of about the Christian era. Layard's Nineveh and Babylon. Am. ed.

Cent IV & VII.

J.C.C. Clarke.

Table XIX.

Hebrew.

	Layard's Bowls.			M. S.	Modern Print.			
a								
b								
g								
d								
h								
v. u								
z								
hh								
t								
i. y								
k								
l								
m								
n								
s								
'								
p								
ts								
q								
r								
sh								
t								
	No. 1 Page 513. Abt Chr Era.	No. 3 P. 511. Cents IV & VIII.	No. 5. P. 520.	Roll from Malabar, at Cambridge. Eng. From Horne's "Introduction."		Final Letters.	Letters preserving line connecting forward.	Letter preserving line connecting backward.

Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon." Eng. Ed.

J.C.C. Clarke.

Table XX

Hebrew.

Rabbinical and Current Script.

	Used in Poland, Germany, and Moravia.	Polish and Moravian.	"Raschii." German, Lusitanian and Spanish.	Spanish and Lusitanian.	Used in Africa and Syria.	Raschii, or Common Rabbinical.	German Rabbinical.	Masculine, or Polish Current Script.	Feminine or German Current Script.	Spanish and Levantine, Napheyi.
a	א	א	א	א	א	א	א	א	א	א
b	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב	ב
g	ג ג	ג	ג	ג	ג	ג	ג	ג	ג	ג
d	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד
h	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה	ה
v. u	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו	ו
z	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז
hh	ח	ח	ח	ח	ח	ח .	ח	ח	ח	ח
t	ט ט	ט	ט	ט	ט	ט	ט	ט	ט	ט
i. y	י	י	י	י	י	י	י	י	י	י
k	כ ך כ	כ ך	כ ך	כ ך	כ ך	כ ך	כ ך	כ ק	כ ק	כ ך
l	ל ל	ל ל	ל	ל ל	ל ל	ל	ל	ל	ל &	ל
m	מ ם ם	מ ם	ם ם	ם	ם	מ ם	מ ם	מ ם ם	מ ם ם	מ ם
n	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן	נ ן
s	ס ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס
'	ע	ע	ע	ע	ע	ע	ע	ע ע	ע ע	ע
ph	פפ פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף	פ ף ף	פ ף
tz	צ צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ	צ ץ ץ	צ ץ
q	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק	ק
r	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר	ר
sh	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש	ש
t	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת	ת

"Tentamen de Variis Codicum Hebraicorum." O.G. Tuck.

Bullhorn etc.

J.C.C. Clarke.

squaring them, were free to feel the full force of the constant suggestion of nature to move the hand wholly toward the right, and eventually they yielded to it.

The old Himyaritic alphabet represented simple sounds, being all consonants, but the later Ethiopic, retaining the old twenty-two letters, and adding four others for *kh*, *z*, *f* and *p*, has also adjusted a system of modifications for adding seven vowels to each of the consonants, and five diphthongs to some of them, (of most of these, however, Lepsius says that they are not diphthongal, but deep gutturalizings, developing an elaborate system of elegant syllabic characters). To these the Amharic system of Abyssinia has added seven more sets by modifying seven dental consonants to represent its newer palatal sounds.

The immediate source of the Himyaritic letters, the date of their adoption, and the influences which have modified them, are not to be hastily affirmed. The superficial appearances of Greek, Roman, Syriac, Numidian and Egyptian influences are trivial and contradictory. Studied in the inscriptions brought from the Syrian Hauran and from Yemen and Ethiopia, and in the manuscripts preserved in European libraries, the Himyaritic alphabet with its products, [the Ethiopic Geez syllabarium and the still newer Amharic], appears to have originated in the old Semitic alphabet as now known, or in more archaic hieratic forms of the same, and to have been isolated at a very early day, and modified in its own peculiar and indigenous line of development[1] It joins the other alphabets of the world in telling the old story of the universal independence of our race on the accidental or providential development of writing in Egypt, while it adds to this a story of southern Arab isolation, alike social, religious, literary and commercial.

It is necessary to study in connection with the Himyaritic letters a set of alphabets found in old Libya in northern Africa. Some curious inscriptions in Algeria and Tunis, of which some are accompanied by Punic translations, have long been known. One of them found at Dugga (ancient Tucca) has been published by Gesenius and many others, but so variously that the copies are of uncertain value. Still the alphabet was in the main discovered, although scholars differed in opinion as to certain letters, as was natural, because no one heeded any but superficial signs, or thought of the changes which have taken place in the aspiration of consonants. About 1846 M. Borsonnet, in Algiers, stumbled upon tokens of a secret writing among the Berbers. He skillfully followed his clew, and obtained a confession of the existence of the alphabet and a copy of

---

[1] In the oldest Himyaritic and Ethiopic relics the *g*, *d*, *z*, *n*, *ayin*, *koph*, *sin*, *two ts*, and a second *z* from *teth* show distinctly their origin in the old common Semitic alphabet. The other liquids, *l*, *m* and *r*, are unmistakably of the same origin, but are modified. The *k* and *kh* seem to be made from old *k* after extending out its bifurcation on an arm, as in some other antique relics. Of the labials, the modern *ph* is probably from the old lozenge-shaped *p* which is nearly hieroglyphic, although from appearances only it might be thought to be derived either from old Semitic *h* or *r*, or from demotic *b*. The original *p* is probably retained in *psa*, now made like Roman T, while the other *p* (*pait*) is a variant of the lozenge-shaped *p*. The breathings א, ה, ו and ע are most unlike their modern prototypes; but the old א and ה are much like each other inverted, and seem to have come in correlated developments from old common א and ה, which also are much like each other inverted. So also Himyaritic *h* and *s* which inverted are alike, may be made in the same general line of modification from old Semitic *h* and *s* which are like each other inverted; or *s* and *ts*, which in old relics are much alike, may be similarly made from old Semitic ס and צ, which are much like each other reversed, the difference disappearing when their respective minor or wing-like lines are made of equal length with the main lines.

it, which, with many differences, bore some resemblance to the inscriptions of Tunis. Other discoveries soon revealed the use of other varieties of quite similar alphabets among the Tuariks, some of which preserve many elements of the inscription of Dugga. The Berbers, among whom these alphabets are found, are the light-colored tribes who are generally regarded as of Semitic race, but Lepsius classifies their language as Hamitic.

[1]Between the Himyaritic and the Berber letters there are many resemblances, as if the latter had been derived from the former. Since some of the Berber relics were co-eval with Carthage they confirm the supposed antiquity of the Himyaritic letters. Some of the Berber letters, however, while of a Himyaritic cast yet approach nearer to the Egyptian prototypes of the Semitic. Such are *b*, *g*, *d*, *z*, *l*, *m* and *r*. If we could have any doubts of the derivation of the Semitic alphabet from the Egyptian, a comparison of the Semitic, Himyaritic and Berber letters assures the common origin of all in the Egyptian. We have again, in these secret Berber alphabets, the same story of dependence on Egypt, and of ethnical seclusion. Both the Himyaritic and the Berber alphabets testify of a persistent preservation of an ancient literary culture, never sufficiently extended socially, religiously or commercially to produce such a current script as was developed in Syrian letters before the Christian era.

We may now turn to the northern Semitic letters and their illustrations of history. Of Hittite, Amalekite and Philistine letters we cannot speak. If Syrian relics older than about 1000 B. C., exist, they are probably buried under the *debris* of Syrian cities. Of larger specimens of Old Semitic letters we have the Hebrew inscription in the conduit of Siloam, of uncertain date, the Moabite stone of Mesha, of about 900 B. C., the Sidonian inscription to Baal Lebanon, the epitaph of Ashmunazzar, a king of Sidon of 600 or 500 B. C., and a Phœnician tablet from a temple at Marseilles, of about 400 B. C. All of these are of recent discovery. Of small inscriptions on Assyrian and Phœnician stones, bronzes, seals, medals, vases, etc., there are some which date from 600 to 200 B. C. Persian seals of the fifth and fourth centuries also give us the old Semitic letters with a Chaldaic cast. There is also preserved a number of Numidian, Phœnician, Punic and insular relics of various dates near the Christian era, showing modifications of the old alphabet.

Scraps from a Phœnician book of history by Sanchoniathon are preserved, but do not seem to indicate much literary culture among that people. The old common tradition of the Phœnician invention of the alphabet is shown to be unfounded. Even Phœnician commerce now appears to have been of trifling extent, both absolutely, and relatively, to that of Europeans and of the people of Asia Minor. Phœnicia, of insignificant territorial extent, having only three cities, if ever Hamitic, must at a very early date have so largely recruited its population from the Semites who were flooding Syria as to have attained a complete Semitic character. Neither science, philosophy, poetry, nor commerce left permanent memorials either at home or abroad. Even the tradition that the

---

[1] In these remarks the reference is only to the letters of the oldest Libyan inscriptions. Libyan *ps* show how Himyaritic *p* (Pait) may be made from old Semitic *p*. Libyan *b*, Himyaritic *w*, and Hieroglyphic *p* are nearly identical in form, but need not be so in origin. Barth says the Berbers have no *z*, but other authorities give *z* and *zh*. From appearances, old Libyan *z* seems to have been a *t*, and the modern one is old Semitic *z* or Egyptian *s*, while the Tuarik *s* and *ts* seem to be made from old Semitic *teth* as in most of the Asiatic languages that adopt the Arabic alphabet.

alphabet was carried to Europe by Phœnicians has now to contend with a probability that letters were carried from Syria through Asia Minor to Europe.

Whoever named the letters had lost the knowledge of their origin and was ignorant that originally the letters faced towards the right.

The letters of all Syrian relics show that the old Semitic letters remained for fifteen centuries or more without much change. They had assumed at the first the characteristics of a writing with a reed-pen on papyrus, and no changes seem to have been introduced which indicate either such ornamentation as is developed by devotion to literature as a fine art, or such modification as results from the hurry of business or of much writing. A tendency to change, aggravated by unskillful penmanship, haste, the nature of writing-materials and increased use, appears as early as the captivity of Israel, although in carefully made inscriptions the old forms were long afterwards preserved. Letters on Assyrian bronzes, Israelite and Persian seals and Punic and insular inscriptions, show tendencies toward rounding triangular loops, opening loops and circles, dropping small parts and joining letters together. These changes progressed so that before the Christian era four distinct styles of letters were added to the older ones.

The first appeared in Algiers, Tunis, etc., and is called Numidian. It maintained the separateness of the letters, but abbreviated them, and formed them rudely. Its changes are such as indicate isolation from primitive sources and recklessness of them, with a considerable amount of use. It corrupted *aleph* and *mem* to mere crosses, dropped *samekh*, often reduced *b*, *d*, *z* and *n* to mere short lines, as also did the Syriac and Arabic, and in other respects it resembled Arabic and Syriac without their ligatures. It was a dying alphabet of an effete people, and passed out of use soon after the Christian era.

The second style is found in the heart of Syria or northern Arabia. This modified its letters into a flowing type adapted to rapid writing. It dropped considerable parts of letters, and added extended lines and limbs to connect letters. Eventually, it established these ligatures as essential parts of letters. This style bears the general name of Aramaic or Syriac. It includes a considerable number of varieties, covering a development period of several centuries before and after the Christian era. When half developed it bore the name of Estranghelo, was common in Syria, and preserved to the Syrians the Hebrew and Christian scriptures and a considerable literature. Its various forms bear testimony to much use alike in a busy mercantile life, and in facilitating an extended literature and in ministering to a luxurious civilization. Some of the characteristics of the cursive Syriac style appear in all the Chaldaic, Aramaic and Arabic writing, after the Macedonian period, giving tokens of much commercial, literary and political intercourse, while the stoppage of crystallization of certain sets of forms at various stages of development indicates sharply drawn lines of ethnical and religious separateness.

Of partially developed Syriac letters, one of the oldest specimens was found inscribed on lead as a burial tablet at Abushadr in Babylonia, and published by Bunsen. Another remains in relics of a semi-Gnostic sect of Babylonia of the first or second century, of whom some thousands still remain near Bassorah, who are variously called Sabæans, Zabians, Mendæans, Mendaites, Nazareans, Nasoreans, Syro-Galileans, Mendai, Jahia, Disciples of John Baptist, and Pretended Christians. This alphabet is a syllabary, the letters being much simplified,

and each vowel being joined to its preceding consonant. Four manuscripts in this character are preserved in the British Museum. Of the Estranghelo letters there are many varieties, in different relics. formed with various degrees of skill and taste. Since the Christian era the Estranghelo has been much used. The Adlerian MS. of the New Testament is written in a modified Estranghelo. While the Estranghelo letters show cursive forms and ligaments, they are yet usually written separately. This style of the alphabet shades away into another of more simplified and more connected letters, which are usually called Peshito, and associated with the Peshito scriptures. It is a style adapted to free writing in the common business of a cultivated people, and was often quite elegant. Other varieties of the Estranghelo were and are used for title pages, initials and ornamental writings. The Estranghelo and Peshito styles must have existed together at an early date about the Christian era, and they are the parents of the modern Syrian letters somewhat used by the Syriac Christians on the Malabar coast of Hindustan, and by the Nestorians and other Jacobite Christians. They were also somewhat influential in the formation of the Arabic style, of which we have next to speak.

The third of those of which we have spoken as four new general styles seems to have had its *habitat* in Petra, and the region from the Hauran to Sinai. Its older forms are found in numerous inscriptions in the Nabathean region east of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, and in those once puzzling inscriptions in and near Wady Mukatteb near Sinai. Its characteristics are a greater slurring and simplification of forms, and an increased use of connecting lines. The Nabathean letters generally retain considerable resemblance to the old Semitic and the Syriac, but the Sinaitic letters carried the process of simplification so far as to make *a*, *b*, *z*, *l*, *n* and *r* often simple short lines undistinguishable from each other. The inscriptions are so numerous as fully to illustrate the course of modification. Those of the Hauran bear testimony to intelligence and culture in the once strong Nabathean kingdom. Those of the Sinaitic region were long supposed to be relics of the migration of the Israelites, but they are found to be simple memorials of Aramaic and Arabic visitors, probably to a heathen shrine. Some are in letters essentially Syriac or Palmyrene, and sôme have Greek accompaniments. Most of them begin with the word ישלם. They evidence a general diffusion of the use of letters among the Nabatheans. They probably date from two centuries before the Christian era to three after it. The alphabet was first deciphered by Prof. E. E. F. Beer, in 1839. It is a very rude writing, most of the Sinaitic inscriptions being only shallow scratches. Yet this rude writing, very little changed, is the elegant Cufic and the useful Arabic. Of these, the former is an artistic, tasteful style, usually heavily written or painted, used in showy inscriptions and manuscripts in early Mohammedan times, and deriving its name from the city of Cufa near Bagdad. The other, the common Arabic, called Neshki and Hat, holds about the same relation to the Cufic that the Peshito does to Estranghelo. In the Cufic, by the assimilation of *b* and *t*, *z* and *r*, *g* and *ch*, *s* and *sh*, and *p* and *q*, the alphabet was reduced to seventeen forms, and of these *aleph* and *lamedh* much resembled each other, as did also *gimel* and *ayin*. The Neshki so modified its style as to make the same seventeen forms very simple, while by the use of dots it makes these letters represent nine additional sounds, viz., the remaining five of the old alphabet, three peculiar linguodentals, aspirated *cheth* and *ghain*, and the division of *tsadhe* into an *s* and a *d*.

The Neshki characters have now remained essentially unchanged for twelve or fifteen centuries, protected by Mohammedan reverence, and serving the purposes of an immense literature and of the commerce of a vast region. They are adopted for the literary purposes of the Persians, Tartars and Mohammedans generally, with some additions by diacritic points and with some changes of the sounds to suit the softer tones of these languages. The Arabic letters are adjusted to the reed-pen and flowing ink on smooth surfaces, but have been adapted to very ornate and fantastic designs with much involution for monograms and inscriptions. Of other old varieties, those found at Persepolis are interesting as relics of the early Arabic culture, as is also the Mauritanian, which in style is between the Cufic and the Neshki, and is an interesting testimony to North African culture. Also a curious Saracenic alphabet, called Hagarene, has been preserved. It is made from the Neshki, but by diacritic points increases its characters to forty-one. Instead of using the ordinary ligamental parts of the letters it writes on one continuous base line the fundamental forms of all the letters in a very stiff and angular way.

The Arabic, above all the other Semitic alphabets, carries in itself the tokens of its extensive use. A student examining it may say at once, Here is an alphabet with a history, an alphabet that has done something.

The fourth and last general class of modified letters which was formed from the old type by process of modification is one which preserves the letters each as unconnected majuscules or uncials, but has adopted more or less of the variations introduced by the cursive Syriac styles. All such alphabets carry their own evidence that they had been used only to a limited extent, were confined in narrow geographical limits, and were crystallized or buried by events which destroyed the political life of the people who used them. In this class belong the Palmyrene, the Samaritan and the Hebrew letters.

The Palmyrene letters, relics of the city of Palmyra or Tadmor, are known in[1] few inscriptions, some of which are now in England and Rome. The extraordinary differences between the published *facsimiles* of these few inscriptions well illustrate the difficulties which hinder the readers of old inscriptions. As published by Cornelis de Bruyns and the "Philosophical Transactions" they are more curious than legible, many of them having letters looking like our common Arabic[2] numerals. Rhenferd and others blundered grievously in interpreting them, but by the aid of the bilingual tablets they are intelligible. There is much difference in the care and skill with which they have been carved. In essentials of outline

---

[1] Only fifteen were known to Gesenius, ten of which are bilingual. Wood, "The ruins of Palmyra," London, 1753, and Swinton in the "Philosophical Transactions," Vol. 48, have given well the four that are at Oxford. One of those at Rome was published inverted in the "Philosophical Transactions," Vol. 19, it being in 1696 in a wall in a vineyard near Rome. A much improved representation of it was given by Gesenius in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopedia. The stone bears a Latin version which explains the Syriac. The two that are at Rome have been quite well published by Lanci. Those at Oxford have been well given by M. A. Levy in the "Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft" for 1864. One may see further Barthelemy, Spon's "Miscellanea," Irby and Mangles, Rosenmueller's "Bibliotheca Geographica," vols. I. and II. etc.

[2] In one inscription they give such a figure five times, which closely resembles an Estranghelo ɣ but is not recognized by Gesenius, Bunsen or Hoffmann as Palmyrene. *d*, *k*, *p*, and *r* are sometimes much like 3, and and *v* sometimes resembles 2, while *teth* is like 6. So also in some Sinaitic inscriptions as published in Gage's "Studies in the Bible Lands" there are combinations much like 2967, and 955, and 19759, and 956765.

they have the characteristics of the Estranghelo Syriac, and of Chaldaic Hebrew, but are produced in a chirography that makes them very peculiar. Their dates all fall between A. D. 84 and 257. They are of little importance except as curious illustrations of the oddities of Semitic isolations, being trifles in comparison with the Greek characteristics of Palmyra.

The Samaritan alphabet is the name commonly given to the letters of a remnant of people about Nablus, at Mt. Gerizim, a mixed race equally pretentious and uncertain alike in letters and religion. They have long claimed great antiquity for some manuscripts of the Pentateuch, one of which professes to have been made by Abisha, a grandson of Aaron, and to have been saved from the burning of Zerubabel's temple.[1] The whole story of the Samaritans is a tissue of fiction. The Pentateuch of the Samaritans is strongly marked with late Chaldaic and Syriac features of language and text. The Aramaic character of the language is known to all Semitic scholars. The divergencies of the text from the Hebrew have been very fully described in many issues of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, by Rev. B. Pick, of Allegheny, Penn., an erudite and skillful Hebraist. The Samaritan letters are as different from the primitive Semitic as the German are from the old Latin. [2]Not a single letter retains its pristine form. There are many differences of style in the MSS., and in an old inscription reciting the Decalogue at Nablus[3] which some ascribe to A. D. 546, and in the letters as given from MSS. by Gesenius. The Samaritans and their alphabet are but a little drift in one of the eddies of the waves that have so long surged in Syria. The *detritus* is much mixed and abraded, but the people have not been destitute of taste and painstaking in using and preserving what the wrecking has left to them. Their pretensions are now but a phase of the loss of national memory. The vaunted MSS. cannot probably be older than the eleventh Christian century.

Lastly. In the fourth class stand the modern Hebrew letters. Of ancient Hebrew relics there are the recently discovered inscription in the conduit of Siloam, which is evidently quite primitive, and some small carvings on stone which de Vogue ascribes to centuries VII. and VI. B. C. Of assured Israelite relics older than the Maccabean period we have in fact scarcely anything. Of coins of the second and first centuries B. C. there are many. Of small inscriptions of the Christian era there is a trifling number. Of inscribed bowls from Babylonia there are several dating between the third and seventh Christian centuries. There are scattered in the world many medals professing to be ancient Hebrew coins, on which the letters are of modern Hebrew style, and of course they are worthless. Indeed they are now repeatedly multiplied by galvanic processes, sometimes in copper from silver and back from copper to silver. Perhaps, because it has been so much an object of interest, the Hebrew alphabet has been much the subject of misconception and unsustained pretension. Fry's "Pantographia," along with much palæographical matter publishes seventeen styles of the Hebrew

---

[1] Dr. Rosenmueller in the Zeitschrift d. D. M. G. for 1864 gives the alphabet of this MS. which is almost identical with that of a MS. of the eleventh Christian century which is in the Royal Library at Paris, and of which a *facsimile* is published in Sylvester's Palæographie Universelle.

[2] The *k*, *m*, *n* and *p* have plainly the connecting lower line which originated in the Syriac. The *k* is in all respects Aramaic. The *zain* and *samek* are scarcely recognizable as Semitic of any style. The *l* has the late peculiarity of standing above the line. The *qoph* is thoroughly Hebraic of the modern type. The *teth* is decidedly Syriac as on the late potteries of Babylonia.

[3] This inscription is given in Zeitschrift d. D. M. G. for 1859, p. 279, and again in 1860, p. 622, with extraordinary difference.

alphabet under the names of "Alphabet of Adam, Noah, etc." They are merely slight alterations of the modern Hebrew alphabet, and of no historical value. Joseph Hammer published in London in 1806 a small volume which professes to give an Arabic work of Ahmed Ben Abubekr Ben Wakshih, of A. D. 855, but in this volume only the Cufic is correct, and all the rest is imposture.

The oldest Hebrew differs from other primitive Semitic alphabets only in its *vav* and *tsade*, which, however, are evidently derived from the old sources of all. The few specimens which we have of the old Hebrew do not give us its *gimel*, *teth*, *samekh*, and *pe*. While on the coins of the Jews (B. C. 106 to A. D. 135), the letters are in the antique style, but with some tendency towards those forms which afterwards became distinctive in the Samaritan, there appear in all other Hebrew relics after the Christian era the peculiarities of modern Hebrew letters. The same modifications which constitute the distinctiveness of the Estranghelo Syriac, and also to some extent of the Nabathean, were made very considerably in the Hebrew. Indeed Hebrew and Estranghelo, in their essential outlines, can be written so as to differ very little. The Hebrew like the Syriac and Arabic has opened and flattened the loops and angles of ב, ד, ז, כ, נ, ע, פ, and ר. It has adopted as characteristics the heavy top and base lines, but if these are made thin, and only their outlines are retained, nearly all its letters are essentially Syriac forms. It has in its letters adopted as essential elements the Syriac ligamental lines of ב, כ, נ, פ and צ and owes its use of two forms of ךכ, ם מ, ן נ, ף פ and ץ צ to their development in the Syriac and Nabathean, from which it adopted them in the development period when connected and separated forms were both in use, and when the use of ligaments was governed by taste, convenience or skill.

In more modern times, writers of Hebrew have adopted styles which are called Script and Rabbinical letters. These, although somewhat abbreviated, and usually written small, are still separated or majuscule letters. One style of these is made familiar by Hebrew grammars, but many other varieties are used in Europe, and probably others elsewhere.[1]

The Hebrew alphabet, like all others, is a reflection of the national history. It indicates, as the characteristic of national history during the period of its development, limited area, Syriac surroundings, a strong Chaldaic impress, a literary revival under influences of Greek and Roman taste before the development of European minuscule writing, then a loss of ethnical concentration and theological vigor, after which the old things became embalmed in veneration.

---

[1] Balhorn's "Alphabete" gives four varieties. Prof. Tuch in 1772, in his book "Tentamen de Variis Codicum Hebraicorum," gave fourteen varieties, but nine of these are nearly identical.

ON "INTERMEDIATE SYLLABLES."

BY B. FELSENTHAL, PH. D.,
Chicago.

1. "Questions about the *Intermediate Syllable* arise in the minds of all beginners whose attention has once been called to the subject."—Thus *Prof. Dodd* commences his learned paper in the first number of this Monthly. But right here it may be questioned whether the special attention of beginners ought to be called to such phonological niceties which affect neither Hebrew orthography nor Hebrew grammar proper, and which do not at all affect the sense and meaning of words and sentences. Of course, where the etymological composition of a word is to be exhibited, the word must be divided accordingly. In Hebrew, however, this can never be the purpose of syllabication. If with reference to Hebrew we raise such questions, it can only be for the purpose of showing the pronunciation, which is supposed to be correct, or, in some cases, for the purpose of deciding whether a Dāghēsh-lene should be employed, or should be omitted, in a following aspirate (בגרכפת). But whose ear is so fine that he can distinguish, whether a reader or speaker enounces *form-al* or *for-mal?* Who makes, in reading Hebrew, an audible or otherwise perceptible distinction between Mĭz-môr and Mĭ-zʿmôr? In reality, it makes, in the majority of cases, no difference whether we read the syllables, so happily designated by *Dr. Dodd* as *intermediate*, in the manner indicated by the learned Professor, or whether we do not so. We perceive no difference in fluent reading between qĭṭ-lû and qĭ-ṭʿlû (Imp. Qăl). As to the orthography and meaning, there is, as said above, no difference and no difficulty whatever.

2. But if we wish to be perfectly accurate, what *is* the proper syllabication, qĭṭ-lû, or qĭ-ṭʿlû? The surest and easiest way to reach an answer is, to go by analogy. Let us take a verb whose third radical letter is an aspirate, and see how the corresponding form sounds. We find then: שְׁכָבוּ, the ב being rāphé, i. e. being without a Dāghēsh-lene, the word is to be read thus: shĭ-khʿbhû; similarly: rĭ-dhʿphû, &c. Consequently we must likewise syllabify: qĭ-ṭʿlû; though the first syllable has a short vowel and is unaccented.

3. In the foregoing lines we had as examples verbs in the Imperative Qăl. Let us select now words of another class,—Infinitives with one of the inseparable prepositions (כ"ל) prefixed. How have we to syllabify:—bĭq-ṭōl, kĭq-ṭōl, lĭq-ṭōl? or: bĭ-qʿṭōl, kĭ-qʿṭōl, lĭ-qʿṭōl? We apply the same process. We look for a verb whose second radical is one of the aspirates. We find בִּנְפֹּל, כִּנְפֹּל, with the פ rāphé; but לִנְפֹּל, with the פ Dāghēsh-lene. We find similarly בִּכְתֹּב, כִּשְׁכַּב, and likewise לִסְפֹּר, לִשְׁכַּב, &c. We would therefore also syllabify: bĭ-qʿṭōl, kĭ-qʿṭōl, and—lĭq-ṭōl. And thus, in order to be very accurate we would syllabify: bĭ-shʿnăth, &c., in accordance with the readings: bĭ-dhʿbhăr, bĭ-sʿphăth, &c.

4. Let us proceed yet a little further in collecting examples before we venture upon laying down general rules; for thereby we follow the true Baconian inductive method. In the words קִבְרֵי, כַּרְמֵי (the construct of קִבְרִים, כְּרָמִים), are the first syllables closed ones, or "intermediate" ones? As we find כַּנְפֵי, דַּרְכֵי, בִּגְדֵי, רִכְבֵי, יִקְבֵי, מַלְכֵי with no Dāghēsh in the third letter, we must conclude

that in all these words the first syllables are the so-called intermediate syllables (therefore: kă-rᶜmê, &c.).

5. For similar considerations we must read YĬts-ḥāq, and not YĬ-tsᶜḥāq, since in the name יִפְתַּח (which is of the same grammatical construction, and which we take as our model) the third letter (ת) has a Dāghēsh, and the preceding letter closes a syllable. We syllabify: MĬbh-ṭāḥ, in analogy with mĬdh-bār; ʾăl-mān, qĬn-yān, &c., in analogy with qŏr-bān, &c.

6. Have we now, after all these examples, sufficient material upon which to base general rules, according to which we may say, In this case the unaccented syllable with a short vowel is closed, and in that case it is *intermediate?* Upon first thought it may seem so. If we are satisfied with the knowledge of the *facts*, and if we do not desire to rack our minds to find the deeper *reasons* for them, we might say, Let us open our Hebrew Bible, and let us compare analogous word-forms containing one of the letters בגדכפ"ת; let us, in doubtful cases, see whether a Měthĕgh will indicate to us how to divide the word properly. But when once we become engaged in such research, we shall soon find that we stand upon slippery ground, and that even our Massoretic text, which, as such, is in general almost beyond any doubt and dispute, leaves us quite at a loss as to Měthĕghs, Dāghēsh-lenes, Măqqēphs, and other such points of minor importance. The most careful editors of the Bible, scholars who have thoroughly studied the whole field of the Massorah, have had to admit this. At the end of the so-called Rabbinical Bibles there are to be found several folio pages full of "Different Readings by Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali," and also several pages full of "Different readings by the Madinaḥë (an Eastern, or Babylonian, school of Massorites) and Ma'arbaë (a Western, or Palestinian school of Massorites)." The differences of the last named schools concern then and now the consonant-text. The Madinaḥë and Ma'arbaë disagree among other points also in a considerable number of cases in regard to full or defective spelling of the words, and the like. But Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali differ mostly in regard to Měthĕghs, Măqqēphs, accent-signs, Dāghēshes, &c. We select at random some of such different readings, in which the one demands an intermediate, and the other a closed syllable. In Gen. XXXII., 18, Ben-Asher reads יִפְנֶשׁךָ (yĬ-phᶜghă-shᶜkhā) and Ben-Naphtali reads יִפְגֹּשׁךָ (yĬph-gă-shᶜkhā); in Gen. XLII., 30, Ben-Asher reads כִּמְרַגְלִים, and Ben-Naphtali כְּמַרְגְּלִים (with a Měthĕgh at the side of the Kăph); in Ex. VI., 27, Ben-Asher reads הַמְדַבְּרִים, and Ben-Naphtali הַמַּדְבְּרִים (in both these readings the מ has not the Dāghēsh-forte which would be required by a well known general grammatical rule, and this is also one of the many Massoretic curiosities); in Num. XXI., 4, Ben-Asher reads לְסַבֵּב, and Ben-Naphtali לִסְבֹּב; in 1 Sam. XXII., 19, Ben-Asher לְפַנַּע, and Ben-Naphtali לִפְנַע; in Ps. XLIX., 15, Ben-Asher reads לִשְׁאוֹל, and Ben-Naphtali לִשְׁאֹל; *Ibid.* LXXX., 11, Ben-Asher אַרְזֵי, Ben-Naphtali אַרְזֵי; *Ibid.*, XCVI., 11, Ben-Asher יִרְעַם, Ben-Naphtali יִרְעַם. It would be easy to multiply largely these selections.

7. Besides these different readings of Ben-Asher and Ben Naphtali we shall find records of such and similar disagreements in other places. Any one who examines either the marginal or the larger Massorah; or who opens such more or less minute Massoretical commentaries and annotations as the 'Ên Haqqorê by

Jequthiel Hakkohen ben Jehuda (יהב"י), or the Or Tora by Menaḥem de Lonzano, or the Minḥath Shay by Solomon Norzi, or the Tiqqun Soph'rim by Solomon Dubno, and numerous other works; or who peruses some of the very large number of works, or parts of works, on Niqqudh by the Jewish grammarians since the days of Juda Hayyug down to W. Heidenheim and S. D. Luzzatto; or who takes cognizance of the hundreds of different readings in the manuscripts collected by Kennicott, De Rossi, Firkovitsch, and others,—will soon conclude that we shall hardly be able to lay down general rules for these nice points of Hebrew phonology, covering all cases. It is true that in the Infinitive Qăl with a prefixed Lāmĕdh the first syllable is *mostly* a closed one, as Prof. *Dodd* has already noticed. But he himself remarks also that "exceptions will be found:" and how many! Thus the Infinitive לְצָבָא is found three times in the Bible, viz., in Num. IV., 23; VIII., 24; and in Isa. XXXI., 4. On the last named place the marginal Massorah remarks: לית כוותיה דגש וישארי רפין. There is no other לְצָבָא extant like this, in which the letter ב has a Dāghēsh, in the other two passages the ב is rāphé.

So we find that the second radical letter is also rāphé in the words לְנָתוּשׁ ולְנָתוּן (Jer. I., 10), and so it is in some other instances of words of this class.

As some other examples of irregularities we note: בְּשִׁכְּן (Gen. XXXV., 22), כְּזִכֹּר (Jer. XVII., 2), where we should have expected to find בְּשִׁכֵּן and כְּזִכֵּר. We note furthermore: חַסְדֵּי in the editions of the Psalms by the painstaking Massoretical scholars *W. Heidenheim*, *S. Baer*, and others, while the same editors have constantly and uniformly עַבְדֵּי. Hă-ṣ'dhê, or Hăṣ-dê? It deserves to be noticed that even W. Heidenheim, accurate as he was in such matters of punctuation, seems not to have been certain which was correct. In his several editions of the Pentateuch to which the Haphṭaroth (the pericopes from the prophetical books read in the Synagogues) are added, chap. LXI. of Isaiah appears as Haphṭarah to Section Nitzzabhim, and there the learned editor has the following footnote:

חַסְדֵּי, thus the word is found in ancient manuscripts, the Hêth with a Mĕthĕgh and the Dālĕth rāphé; and so it is in all other places where this word occurs. —And yet in his editions of the Psalms Heidenheim has constantly חַסְדֵּי!

We may in this connection further mention that, according to the Massorah, in the words מִקְצָה, מִקְצַת, wherever they are found in the Bible, the ק is without the Dāghēsh. The Dāghēsh is also omitted after the article in such words as לַיְלִים, לַשְּׁפָנִים, לַמְּיַלְדוֹת, הַיְשׁוּעָה, הַצְּפַרְדְּעִים, הַמְּטַהֵר, הַמְּדַבֵּר &c., &c. Have we now in the first syllable of these words in place of acute syllables "intermediate syllables"?

A noteworthy difference in punctuation we find in the word רַעַמְסֵס. In Ex. I., 11 the word reads רַעַמְסֵס (Ră-'ăm-ṣēṣ), and in Gen. XLVII., 11; Ex. XII., 37; Num. XXXIII., 35 it reads רַעְמְסֵס (Ră'-m'ṣēṣ). Aben Ezra, and others, have in consideration of these discrepancies expressed the opinion that there must have been two רעמסס in Egypt.

8. We are totally at a loss concerning the proper reading when we meet certain proper nouns, for which we cannot easily find parallel forms, and in which no aspirate is contained, which might give us a clue as to the correct

reading. We know well enough how to syllabify עָרְפָּה (Ruth i.. 4) = Or-pāh; דַּלְפוֹן (Est. ix., 7) = Dă-l'phôn. But how is it with צָפְנַת and אָסְנַת (Gen. xli., 45)? Shall we read Tsā-ph'năth, 'A-s'năth? Or Tsŏph-năth, 'Oṣ-năth? According to Norzi, the Mĕthĕgh appearing under these words in most of the editions is not undisputed. And now who shall decide?

9. We have thus far spoken of uncertainties in our Massoretic text, and have referred to the records of different readings, to discrepancies in the manuscripts, &c. But this is not all. Within the last forty years old Bible manuscripts have been discovered in the Crimea and elsewhere in the Orient which have a system of punctuation quite at variance in form, position, &c., from the system we possess. We have the Palestinian or the Tiberias punctuation. The newly discovered system is, in distinction from ours, called the Babylonian or Assyrian punctuation. In 1844 a fac-simile of a part of an Odessa MS., containing the book of Habakkuk, was published by Pinner. And by this publication knowledge of that strange ancient punctuation reached for the first time the Semitic scholars of Western Europe and America. Since then *Prof. Strack* and others have published in fac-simile larger parts of these ancient MSS. with the "Assyrian" pointing. If we now compare the readings preserved in these MSS. with our Massoretic readings, we shall also be forced to the conclusion that in a number of less important points our text is an uncertain one.

10. After this digression we return to the subject of "Intermediate Syllables." The books lay it down as a rule that an unaccented open syllable can never have a short vowel. But in reality we meet quite a number of words which do not accord with this rule, and we are embarrassed. How is this? we ask. Do we not read mă-l'khê, dĭ-bh'rê, lĭ-q'ṭû? Are here not unaccented open syllables with short vowels? Grammarians answer in various ways. Some say, the first syllables in these words must not be taken as open syllables; they are half-open, or, as others call them, half-closed, or, as *Prof. Dodd* calls them, intermediate syllables. *Gesenius* evades the difficulty in another way; he says, the Sh'vâ on the boundary line of the two syllables is neither a silent nor a vocal Sh'vâ; it is a Sh'vâ *medium*. The Jewish grammarian *Solomon Hanau*, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century, and who was a very prolific author of meritorious grammatical works, explained the difficulty by another theory. He said that the Păttăḥs, the Sĕghôls, the Hîrĕqs, the Qāmĕts-ḥāṭûphs, &c., in the syllables under consideration are in reality not short vowels; they stand where strictly Sh'vâ should stand; and he gave them a special name, he called them תנועות קלות, *light vowels*. So, e. g., he said, מַלְכֵי, a derivative of מְלָכִים, should properly be מִלְכֵי, but this being a phonetic impossibility the first Sh'vâ becomes a T'nû'ā qăllāh, and in this case a Păttăḥ is inserted; לְקַטּוֹ is derived from לְקֹט, and should really be לִקְטוֹ, but in this case too the first Sh'vâ had to be eliminated, and a T'nû'ā qăllāh, here a Hîrĕq, took its place. *Ben-Zeeb*, the author of the *Talmudh L'shon Ibhri*, accepted the theory of *S. Hanau*. Others, equally eminent or more eminent as grammarians, would not adopt this theory.

11. But rather than subscribe to any of these and similar explanations it would probably be better to go back to those theories of Hebrew vowels and Hebrew syllabication prevailing among the Sephardic grammarians in ante-Qimḥi times, say before the year 1200. *They* did not speak of long vowels and short vowels; *they* did not teach that any Sh'vâ occurring after a Qāmĕts, or af-

ter a Hōlĕm, or a Shûrĕq, or a Tsērê, or a Hîrĕq with a Yôdh, *must* be a vocal Sh'vâ, &c. In accordance with the actual facts of that Semitic language, they taught that the Hebrew possesses three fundamental vowels (Abu'l-Walid, in his Risâlat et-Taqrîb—recently published in the *Opycules d'Abou'l-Walid*, by J. & H. Derenbourg, Paris, 1880—calls these principal vowels Shureq, Hiriq, Pathaḥ; Juda Hallevi, in his book *Cuzari*, calls them Qamotz, P'thiḥa, Shebher; Aben Ezra, in his book Tzaḥoth, has for these fundamental vowels the names: Holem, Hiriq, Pathaḥ-gadhol; others have other names for them). By a process of subdivision the ancient grammarians came then to enumerate seven vowels. They called them the seven kings (מלכים), and the Sh'vâ they called the servant (משרת). In regard to vocal Sh'vâ and silent Sh'vâ they differed also from more modern grammarians. Aben Ezra did not divide the word תֵּשְׁבִי into the two syllables tê-sh'bhî, as we do, but he said that the word had to be read, tēsh-bhî; and in the above-mentioned book Tzaḥoth he called the great Hebrew poet Solomon ben Gabirol to account for his dissolving, in one of his hymns, the word תֵּשְׁבִי into a T'nû'ă and a Yāthēdh (i. e. into a syllable without, and one with a vocal Sh'vâ). With the three Qimḥi's (Joseph and his two sons: Moses and David) a new period commenced in the history of the science of Hebrew Grammar. The Qimḥi's lived in the Provence, among Christians, who spoke a Romance dialect, and whose better classes cultivated the study of the Latin. Arabic the Qimḥi's did not understand, as their Jewish brethren on the other side of the Pyrenees did, who lived among Arabic-speaking Moors. Influenced by the Latin and the Provencale, and partly guided by the pattern of Latin Grammar, Joseph Qimḥi, and after him his sons, reconstructed the Hebrew grammar upon a new basis. While the Sephardic Jews had formed their grammatical system after the Arabic grammar (and they were right in this, for the central Semitic Hebrew is certainly more closely connected with the Southern Semitic Arabian Language than it is with the Latin), the Qimḥi's began a new departure in Hebrew grammar. In doing so they imitated, consciously or unconsciously, the system of Latin Grammar in as far as it was feasible. They knew that Latin had five vowels which were either long or short, and also long and short syllables, &c., and so they carried corresponding theories over into the Hebrew. Was a real progress in Hebrew philology effected thereby? There are many now who doubt this. But be this as it may, so much is certain, that Qimḥic influences were soon widely felt, and Qimḥic grammatical doctrines were soon generally taught and are still taught and still adhered to in our present age.

12. Concerning the uncertainties and doubtful readings of the Massoretic text we would advance yet some additional remarks, before we conclude. These uncertainties, numerous as they are, are after all but the exceptions, and concern mostly such unimportant matters as Măqqēph, or Mĕthĕgh, or Dāghēshlene, and the like. In the main, the Massoretic text is, as such, above dispute, and is, critically considered, a good text. But how must we explain its many puzzling peculiarities? Why is there here the spelling of a word "full" and in another place "defective"? Why is there here a Mĕthĕgh, and there, none? Why is there here a Mûnăḥ, and in another verse of the same grammatical construction, instead thereof a Mĕrkā? Such questions can be asked almost without number. It seems to me that the most correct answer to these questions lies in the statement that the Massorites and Naqdanim came to their

final conclusions *firstly*, by retaining the text which they found in the majority of the manuscripts before them, and which they copied most scrupulously and faithfully. There is an old historical tradition, that the Massorites, when they had three manuscripts before them, of which two agreed and one disagreed, accepted the reading of the two. (Jerus. Ta'anith IV., 2; Soph'rim VI., 4; &c.). *Secondly*, when the manuscripts left them in doubt, or when those of them who acted as Naqdanim were about to add their diacritical points, vowel-signs, accent-signs, and it was found that traditions in this regard had become beclouded, then they made their conclusions according to their own rational considerations and best judgment. Here and there they may have been led by deeper considerations; here and there they may have punctuated the text so as to harmonize it with the halachic or hagadic teachings of their times. But as to Măqqēph, Měthĕgh, and Dāghēsh-lene, accident may have guided the pens of the earlier punctators almost everywhere. It was with them, as it is with us. We often write a comma, where we just as well make a semicolon; we often put an exclamation point, were we just as well might omit it. And yet in a few instances the punctators may have had their well-weighed reasons for their seeming abnormities. They may, in some places, have put in a Măqqēph, or omitted a Dāghēsh-lene, for reasons which to them may have appeared as exceedingly important. We give here one or two examples. In Ps. II., 12 the words נשקו־בר are brought into a closer connection by a Măqqēph. *Jellinek* (in his Beth Hammidhrash Vol. V. p. XIII) suggests that this little Măqqēph was a protest of the Massorites against the messianic conception of the verse by the Christian "Fathers," who translated בר by "son"; in order now to have it distinctly understood that בר is but an adverbial addition to נשקו, and that it should be translated by "purely," a Naqdan put between the two words that small dash, Măqqēph. In Ex. XV., 11 the first Kăph in the first מי־כמכה is rāphé, and the first Kăph in the second מי כמכה has a Dāghēsh-lene. This insignificant Dāghēsh was considered already hundreds of years ago as being "*tendenziös*," i. e. as having a well considered purpose. Some Rabbis of the later Middle Ages were of the opinion that the Dāghēsh was inserted with the following intention. If the Kăph would be rāphé, a reader or listener would be reminded, by the very sound of the words, of that idol-worshiper Micah, who is spoken of in Judges XVII., and this had to be prevented. *Geiger* (Urschrift p. 293) gives another and a more plausible reason for this Dāghēsh. But as this article has become longer than the writer intended it should be, we merely refer those interested to Geiger's work which is easily enough accessible.

Other points might have been noticed, but the lack of space forbids.

CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

פ״א Verbs: First Person, Sing., Impf. Qal.—Davidson in his explanation of this form says that the א *of the preformative* is dropped.[1] This is surely incorrect and to show how plainly he is in error, we suggest the following considerations:

1. That which causes these verbs to take on their leading peculiarity is the weakness of א as a consonant, and its tendency to quiesce in a preceding vowel-sound. The weakness of א when it is the first radical may be quite fully illustrated.

a. In a verb *prim. rad.* א, which is not constantly of this class, but whose א at times retains its consonantal character. אחז, in the impf. Qăl, is sometimes יאחֹז, oftener, however, יֹאחֵז; in which latter form the א quiesces in the preceding ŏ. To this might be added אתה, which shows in one place תֵּאתֶה.[2]

b. There are not a few instances in which a first radical א has been dropped from the written form of the impf. Qăl, 2nd and 3rd persons. The verbs fully פ״א furnish the following: תִּמְרוּ,[3] יִמְרוּךָ,[4] from אמר; תֹּבֵא[5] (for תֹּאבֶה) from אבה: וַתֹּפְהוּ[6] from אפה. Other verbs give us תֹּסֵף[7] תֹּסֶף[8] from אסף; תֵּזֵלִי[9] וַתֹּחֶז,[10] and וַיֵּתֵא[11] from אזל, אחז and אתה.

c. The derived conjugations show at least two instances in verbs פ״א, in which the radical א has ceased to be written. הָכִיל for הַאֲכִיל[12] and, אוֹכִיל.[13] According to Gesenius we might here add יוֹכְלוּ[14]; but this Fuerst denies. Of verbs not regularly פ״א, but having א as the first radical, we have a number of instances in which the א has been elided in the derived conjugations.[15]

These instances suffice to prove the weakness of א as a first radical after a preformative. א preformative shows no such weakness; indeed its very character and office as preformative give it firmness. Davidson's explanation is against the characteristic firmness of preformatives and the characteristic weakness of א as a first radical preceded by a preformative.

2. If his explanation were the true one we should experience not a little difficulty in accounting for the vocalization of the remaining א. We can hardly say that the vowel preceding it, that of the preformative, has been given it; for this would seem to be without analogy.

3. The testimony of the cognate languages is in favor of our view, that the radical א has been elided. Not to mention the Chaldee, it is notably true that the Samaritan verbs of the corresponding class *very frequently* reject this consonant.[16] The Syriac, as in ܐܫܬ, gives a form which is to be similarly explained.[17] In Arabic, for a syllable whose typical form is orthographically analogous to that of the syllable under discussion, there is found, in old MSS., an intermediate orthography which shows quite plainly how the contracted form was developed. Thus conj. IV. of أَسَرَ *to surpass;* for أَسَّرَ there is to be seen أَاسَّرَ (in old MSS.) but regularly آسَرَ.[18]

---

[1] Heb. Gram. 5th ed., § 35, 1, Rem. *d.* [2] Mic. iv., 8. [3] 2 Sam. xix., 14. [4] Ps. cxxxix., 20. [5] Prov. i., 10 [6] 1 Sam. xxviii., 24. [7] 2 Sam. vi., 1. [8] Ps. civ., 29. [9] Jer. ii., 36. [10] 2 Sam. xx., 9. [11] Deut. xxxiii., 21. [12] Ezek. xxi., 23. [13] Hos. xi., 4. [14] Ezek. xlii., 5. [15] See Kautzsch's Ges. Gram. (Mitchell) § 68, 2, Rem. 1, 2. [16] Petermann, Porta Lingg. Orient., Tom. III., p. 37. [17] Noeldeke, Kurzgefasste Syrische Gram. § 33. [18] Wright, Arabic Gram. 2d ed. Vol. I., § 135.

In view of the above considerations, there is surely no sufficient reason for assuming that the preformative א is dropped in the 1st pers., sing., impf., Qăl of the פ"א verbs. On the contrary, we should hold with most authorities,[1] that the radical א is elided.

The fuller explanation of this form requires more than the above. The first person is to be carefully distinguished from the second and third; for the steps in its development are not the same as those in the forms of the other persons. Quite another law obtains here, that of the dissimilation of the initial and final sounds of the syllable.[2] By reason of this the א as the closing sound was dropped, and the preformative, being in an open syllable, was lengthened to â, and this latter obscured to ô. These changes must have taken place very early,—anterior, it would seem, to the development of the Sh'vâ mobile[3] and of the tendency to the deflection of ă to ĕ under א, both of which characterize the Hebrew and Aramaic branches. Indeed it is probable that in this form of the verbs פ"א, the radical א was never heard in the Hebrew and, consequently, was not written.

O. O. FLETCHER.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Professor Strack's article on "Books for the study of the Neo-Hebraic Language" comes in quite opportunely. Many requests have been received by the American editor for just such information. These requests betoken an interest in this department of Hebrew study. Attention is invited to the care with which the edition, the number of pages, and the character of each book are given. May not American scholars learn much from the painstaking accuracy in matters of detail, which characterizes German scholars? For the translation of Dr. Strack's MS. we are indebted to Rev. O. O. Fletcher, Ottawa, Ill.

The study of alphabets is a distinct department of study, and one full of interest and importance. Not many Americans have gone into it very deeply. Among others may be mentioned the names of Dr. W. H. Ward, editor of *The Independent*, and Dr. J. P. Peters, of New York. Prof. Clarke, the author of the article on this subject in the present issue, has made it a life-long study. Only a few are in a position to criticize his results. Certainly all will enjoy this most readable article. The tables which accompany it have been prepared at great expense. This article, together with one published in *The Old Testament Student*, Vol. II., No. 10, will be reprinted in pamphlet form.

The article of Dr. Felsenthal on "Intermediate Syllables," is possibly more interesting and valuable for the information which it contains on Textual Criticism, than for what is said on the subject proper. After the careful handling of the theme here given, one must recognize that there is, to a great extent, lack of uniformity in the occurrence of such syllables. But with the following words from

[1] See, for instance, Bickell's Outlines of Hebrew Gram. (Curtiss) §§ 36, 124; and Gesenius' Gram. 23d ed., and Strack, Hebraeische Gram. (Petermann series) *in loc.* [2] For an ingenious application of this law to another and quite difficult question in Hebrew, see OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. II., p. 25. [3] Against this view, see Bickell's Outlines of Hebrew Gram. (Curtiss) § 36.

a letter written by Dr. F. we cannot entirely agree: "What progress would be made by a German or a Frenchman beginning to learn English, if this beginner were to waste his time by thoroughly studying such questions as whether we should syllabify *ri-sing* or *ris-ing? La-bra-dor* or *Lab-ra-dor?* Life is short, and Hebrew philology is long. Other more important matters claim our time and attention, and therefore our time must not be taken up too much by such fruitless discussions."

There is some force in this; but would not the same objection hold against all matters of detail which were not of immediate practical importance? Now, whatever may be said of the undesirableness of instructing beginners in the minute details and exceptions of etymology and syntax, the questions of orthography sustain a different relation to his progress. It is absolutely essential to any respectable knowledge of the language that a person should be able to pronounce it with care and accuracy. That student who pronounces Hebrew without an intelligent understanding of the use of Dāghēsh-lene, pronounces neither easily nor accurately. And an intelligent understanding of Dāghēsh-lene cannot exist without a knowledge of the so-called intermediate or half-open syllable. Again, how much scientific interest is a student to be supposed to have who, when he has been taught that simple (or open) syllables, when unaccented, must have long vowels, and that a vocal Sh'vâ cannot be found under the final consonant of a syllable, will pass such words as וַיְהִי, בְּרֵנַת, etc., without a question? That the same word is written differently by different authors, or copied differently in different texts, is only a greater reason why the matter should be explained to the beginner, as soon as a sufficient number of instances have occurred to call his attention closely to it. So frequent is the occurrence of words containing this syllable, and so peculiar is it in view of the rules ordinarily laid down by grammarians, that very soon, in our opinion, should the student be taught its use. An average student, who has studied Hebrew two weeks, ought to be able to master the subject in an hour's study.

In a notice of HEBRAICA, published in *The Nation* (April 10th), there occur several statements to which it seems desirable to refer. Certainly the first number of the journal contains nothing to cause any careful reader to suppose that it was "mainly intended for the benefit of a school for the study of Hebrew by correspondence." Nothing has been published to this effect, nor does the material contained in the journal go to show this. It is true that the members of this school are required to subscribe for it, and it is equally true that without their support the journal could not be published. That, however, the above statement is incorrect will be seen 1) from the fact that for the members of this school a special Supplement is issued each month, which is not sent to other subscribers, and 2) from the wide scope of the journal, and the aims sought to be accomplished by its publication, as announced in the first number.

The statement that the number under review "embraces some original matter of merit beside some notices copied from books and periodicals," seems a little unfair in view of the fact that of twenty-four pages, *two* contained selections, and the remaining twenty-two, original matter.

If it is supposed that in America a journal of this nature can, at once, rank with similar German periodicals, there will be a measure of disappointment. As

a matter of fact, the public sentiment in reference to this kind of literature is yet to be formed. Can this be done in a month, or in a year?

The editors of HEBRAICA understand that it cannot immediately be made all that they desire. Time is needed to develop an interest, and to incite men to investigation in this department of study. Much has already been done. The "much" is, however, little, when compared with what yet remains. HEBRAICA needs the encouragement and support of all men interested in the higher lines of study. It is an undertaking beset with almost insuperable difficulties. Is it worthy of help? Does it deserve aid? If so, let this help be given. And, it may be added, the time for rendering aid is the present. A good word, a subscription-fee is of far more value now than at any future time. If the journal succeeds, help given later, though desirable, will not be so necessary. If the journal fails, such assistance will be valueless.

A uniform method of transliterating Hebrew words is desirable. No two grammarians agree exactly in the signs adopted. The following has been the system of the managing editor. For this system special type has been cast. That it might be improved in some respects is probable. צ might better be transliterated by c with cedilla. Other minor changes might easily be suggested. The system will be accepted, however, as upon the whole satisfactory. Contributors, unless they distinctly express a desire to the contrary, will understand that this system will be employed in HEBRAICA. They are requested to conform, as far as possible, to this system in preparing articles.

CONSONANTS.

א	ʾ	ו	v	ל	l	צ ץ	ts
ב	bh	ז	z	מ ם	m	ק	q
ב	b	ח	ḥ	נ ן	n	ר	r
ג	gh	ט	ṭ	ס	s	שׂ	s
ג	g	י	y	ע	ʿ	שׁ	sh
ד	dh	כ ך	kh	פ ף	ph	ת	th
ד	d	כ	k	פ	p	ת	t
ה	h						

VOWELS.

Originally long.		Tone-long.		Short.		Half.	
ָ	â	ָ	ā	ַ	ă	ֲ	ᵃ
ִי	î			ִ	ĭ	ֱ	ᵉ
וּ	û			ֻ	ŭ	ֳ	ᵒ
ֵי	ê	ֵ	ē	ֶ	ĕ	ֶ	ᵉ
וֹ	ô	ֹ	ō	ָ	ŏ		

Diphthongal ֵי, as in נַעֲשֶׂה, é.

The originally long vowels are always marked with (ˆ) and the tone-long with (¯) whether the writing in Hebrew be full or defective.

The following forms are enclosed in parenthesis.

(1) Quiescent א and ה. [Quiescent ו and י are regarded as expressed in the vowel.]

(2) Păttăḥ-furtive and the helping păttăḥ in the Perf. 2 f. s. of verbs ל guttural.
(3) Letters retained simply for orthographical reasons, as ' in פָּנָיו.

The syllable-divider is not represented.
Măqqēph is represented by +.
The transliteration of Zeph. III., 8 furnishes an example of nearly every form.

lā-khēn ḥăk-kû+lî n'ûm+y'hô-vā(h)
l'yôm qû-mî l'ădh
ki mĭsh-pā-ṭî lĕ-'ṣōph gô-yîm
l'qŏ-bh'tsî măm-lā-khôth
lĭsh-pōkh 'ălê-hĕm zā'-mî
kōl ḥ'rôn 'ăp-pî
kî b'ēsh qĭn-'ā-thî
tē-'ā-khēl kŏl+hā-'ā-rĕts.

BOOK NOTICES.

GESENIUS' LEXICON.*

The last two editions of this standard work have been prepared by the Dorpat Professors Mühlau and Volck. The changes introduced in the first of their editions (the eighth in the whole series) were characterized by Prof. Robertson Smith as "not all of them improvements." Dissatisfaction has been more pronounced since the appearance of the last—ninth—edition. First Professor Siegfried devotes over nine columns of the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* to the subject and then Lagarde occupies a whole number of the *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* with it. A comical turn is given to the procedure by the protest of the editors in reply to Siegfried, which protest amounts only to the assurance that they must express their indignation at his strictures. A dignified silence would have been better for them.

The influence of party feeling is probably to be taken into account in judging such a controversy. The Dorpat theologians are conservative Lutherans of the school of *von Hoffmann*. Their critics are pronounced liberals. Gesenius himself was a rationalist, and Messrs. Siegfried and Lagarde feel that his great work ought not to receive a color which its author would not have given it. In this they are to some extent correct. Gesenius' own work, which has been acceptable to two generations of scholars of all shades of opinions, shows how little one's theological standpoint need interfere with his critical and linguistic study. Until we come to a *biblico-theological* lexicon of the Old Testament, there should be no reason to inquire into the theological views of our lexicographers. If then Mühlau and Volck have been one-sided it is a mistake. A biblico-theological lexicon seems far away in the future.

More serious is the charge made by Prof. Siegfried that the Massoretic text is not used by the authors in its most correct form, especially that Baer's edition of Genesis, Psalms, etc., has not been consulted often enough. A lexicon of the Massoretic text should certainly be based on the Massora. If this text were faith-

* Gesenius' (Wilhelm) Hebraeisches und Chaldaeisches Handwoerterbuch ueber das Alte Testament. Neunte vielfach umgearbeitete Auflage von Prof. F. Muehlau und W. Volck. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel.* 1883. xlvi, 978 pp. Large 8vo.

fully used we should find less fault than the critics are disposed to do when they complain that Mühlau and Volck neglected proposed *emendations* of the text. Doubtless many such emendations are needed and many that have been suggested (especially when based on the versions) will be found acceptable. But the space to which a hand-lexicon is restricted offers a bar to a full statement of such conjectures. Still in the case of obscure words a brief reference to them would not be out of place.

That lack of space can hardly be pleaded for the partial consideration of these proposed changes in the text is evident from the amount given up to doubtful etymologies. The effort of the etymologist is here to trace all triliteral roots back to biliterals. These biliterals are supposed first to expand in the ע"ע form as in the example quoted by Lagarde, כרר from a supposed כר. So far so good. There would be no objection if that were all. But when this same כר is made also the father of מרא, מרה, מרח, מרד, מרט, מרן, מרק, מור, מאר, מהר, ימר, מחר—then we begin to shake our heads, all the harder when we find twenty-four triliteral stems (some identical with those already given) written in Arabic letters. In the first place, if we assume a monosyllabic stage for the Semitic language, it is hardly to be supposed that its single root כר could have been so productive—rather it can hardly be supposed that there was such a paucity of monosyllables that each one had to expand into so many triliterals. In the second place, the reduction of meanings so varied to one primitive notion is a matter of conjecture, and often violent conjecture at that. Thirdly, the method is uncertain. Why should not מרח come from רח and מרן from רן—especially in view of the fact that מ is a servile letter in the stage of the language which we actually know? But what is so largely a matter of conjecture might as well be omitted. Fourthly, what is scientifically certain ought not all to be included in a hand-lexicon when its tendency is rather to bewilder than to help the student.

The object of this article is not to reproduce individual criticisms or to defend them. Probably not all of them could be defended, and Lagarde shows himself as usual over-sensitive about neglect of his own publications. One or two interesting remarks may be quoted.

מאכלת cannot be the instrument with which one eats—the Semites have always eaten with their fingers.

אגן is derived from יגן to trample. But a wash-basin would break (Lagarde says very rightly) if trampled upon, and it has never been oriental manners to put either hands or feet into the basin.

אֵל is derived from אול. Lagarde's Orientalia might at least have been mentioned. His hypothesis is that it comes from the root אלה = to aspire. God then is the one to whom we aspire—the goal of life.

בָּשָׂר is originally the skin, the complexion. בשר therefore is to say something which makes a man change color, i. e., to bring him good or bad news.

The two notices from which this is drawn will repay perusal. They are found: Theologische Literaturzeitung 1883, Nov. 17 (No. 23), and Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen 1884, Apr. 1 (No. 1).

H. P. SMITH.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

STRASCHUN, D. O., *Der Tractat Taanat* des babylonischen Talmud zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übertragen mit steter Rücksicht—nahme auf Talmud Jeruschalmi. Midrasch Rabbot, Tanchuma, Pesikta de Rab Kahana, Midrasch, Tillim, Abot de R. Nathan, Pirke de R. Elieser, Scheiltot de Rab Achai Gaon, Sifra, Sifri und Mechilta. Mit einem Vorwort von Lic. Dr. Aug. Wünsche. Halle 1883. XX, 185 pp. 6 Mark.

RAWICZ, M., *Der Tractat Megilla* nebst Tosafat [sic] vollständig ins Deutsche übertragen. Frankfurt a. M. [1884]. J. Kauffmann. iv, 117 pp.

WUENSCHE, AUG., *Der Midrasch Wajikra Rabba* das ist die haggadische Auslegung des Buches Mose. Zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übertragen. Mit Noten und Verbesserungen von Rabbiner, Dr. J. Füerst. Leipzig, 1884. x., 298 pp.

FISCHER, B., *Talmudische Chrestomathie* mit Anmerkungen, Scholien und Glossar unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der talmudischen Discussion als Lesebuch zu der von ihm edirten Winer'schen Grammatik bearbitet. Leipzig, 1884. vii, 268 pp.

[The author has paid more regard to the Halacha than the authors of other chrestomathies and his work deserves notice on this account. The notes representing matter of fact are mostly suitable; but, on the other hand, the author lacks a systematic, philological training, as his work upon the Winer grammar also showed. The beginner will not be able to read this chrestomathy without a teacher.]

BERLINER, A., *Targum Onkelos.* Herausgegeben und erläutert. Berlin 1884. (London: D. Nutt). Erster Theil: Text nach editio Sabioneta v. J. 1557. 242 pp. Zweiter Theil: Noten, Einleitung und Register. xii, 266 pp. 10 Mark.

[The above furnished by Prof. H. L. Strack, partly by Prof A. Strack.]

B., J., First Lessons in Hebrew, without points, on the old English Plan. For the use of children and the unlearned. Part I. 8vo pp. 16. London: *Castle & Lamb.*

BEECHER, W. J., Drill Lessons in Hebrew. Auburn, N. Y.: *Knapp, Peck & Thompson.*

BISSELL, E. C., 1 Samuel with a Vocabulary. Chicago, Morgan Park: *The American Publication Society of Hebrew.*

FRIEDERICI, CHAS., Bibliotheca Orientalis, or a complete list of Books, Papers, Serials and Essays published in 1883, in England and the Colonies, Germany and France, on the History, Languages and Religion, Antiquities and Literature of the East. Leipzig: *Otto Schulze.*

HAUG, MARTIN, Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis. Edited and enlarged by E. W. West. 3d ed., 8vo pp. 462. London: *Truebner.*

HEISS, J. B., Uebungsstoff zur arabischen Formenlehre begründet auf eine hebräisch-arabisch-lateinische Wörtersammlung. Leipzig: *Otto Schulze.*

LAGARDE, P. de, Persische Studien, [aus: 'Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen'] 8vo pp. 76–140. Göttingen: *Dieterich.*

HEBRAICA.

VOLUME I. OCTOBER, 1884. NUMBER 2.

THE SYLLABLES IN THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY HERMANN L. STRACK, PH.D.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

It is not my purpose, at this place, to take part in the discussion on "Intermediate Syllables," commenced by Professor Dodd and Rabbi Felsenthal, but, rather, merely to show how the whole subject of syllables in Hebrew can be clearly put forth for the beginner, so that he may be sufficiently prepared for a real understanding of the various forms of the language. I hope that, through such a discussion of the various points that come into play in the matter of syllables in Hebrew, some light may also be thrown on what are called "Intermediate Syllables." It will be clear, from what follows, why I make use of the technical term "loosely-closed syllable" (*lose geschlossene Silbe*). Right here may I be permitted to call the attention of the reader to the term "opened syllables," which, so far as I know, is a new term. For the purpose of getting a better general view of the subject, I have almost entirely omitted all mention of exceptions. The majority of exceptions are to be explained on the basis of euphony (לְתִפְאֶרֶת הַקְּרִיאָה, as the Jewish grammarians say); because the sacred writings of the Old Testament were, and still are, chanted in solemn rythm in the synagogues. I wish to add, further, that the following explanation is not contained in my Hebrew grammar,[1] and is, thus, an important addition to it.

§A. BEGINNING OF SYLLABLES.—Every syllable, and hence, also, every word, *must begin with a consonant*, that is,

(a) Neither with a vowel (an exception is found only in ו conjunctive, *e. g.*, וּדְבַר . . וּבַיִת . . וּמֶלֶךְ);

NOTE.—Before labials, the Babylonian system of punctuation has וֹ, *i. e.*, ו.

§B. Nor with two consonants. When the first letter of a syllable (or of a word) has no vowel of its own, then it receives sh'wâ mobile (cf. my grammar, §5, *b*), and, in the case of א ה ח ע, Hāṭĕph (§5, *c*; §10, *a*, 3).

§C. CLOSE OF SYLLABLES.—Here we distinguish

I. *Open Syllables*, i. e., syllables closing with a vowel, *e. g.*, אִישִׁי . . קוּמִי שָׁנָה . . אִתּוֹ (on ה cf. §2, *b*). These syllables always have long vowels.

[1] Hebraeische Grammatik; mit Uebungsstuecken, Literatur und Vokabular. Zum Selbststudium und fuer den Unterricht. Von Hermann L. Strack. Karlsruhe und Leipzig: H. Reuter. New York: B. Westermann & Co. Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew. xvi., 163 pp. 2 Mark 70 pf.

Exceptions are found in the verbal suffixes (§ 76, *c*) נִי־ (ănî), in which the liquid can be regarded as virtually doubled.

NOTE.—Syllables closing with א are considered open, *e. g.*, קָטַל, but מָצָא (cf. § 10, *c*, 1).

§ D. Unaccented syllables, with long vowels, are open; the sh'wâ following them is the sh'wâ mobile, *e. g.*, שִׁמְרִים shô-m'rîm.

§ E. II. *Closed Syllables*, i. e., those ending in a consonant, *e. g.*, קָן־טַל (second syllable). They are called doubly closed, when the consonant closing the syllable is followed by another consonant in the same word, *e. g.*, מִצְ־וָה (first syllable), קְטֹרֶת (second syllable). When the two consonants are the same, *i. e.*, when the vowel is followed by a consonant with a dāghēsh, this syllable is also called sharpened, *e. g.*, הַשִּׁשִּׁי (first and second syllables).

§ F. Unaccented closed syllables always have short vowels, *e. g.*, מַבְ־דִּיל (first syllable), יֶלֶד (first), וַיָּקָם wăyyāqŏm (first, third), וַיָּמָת (first, third).

§ G. Unaccented syllables with short vowels are closed, *e. g.*, קָטַלְ־תֶּם (first).

§ H. In closed Penultima with tone, we find only the following vowels: (1) the tone-long vowels ā, ē, ō; hence neither î nor û, nor the vowels naturally long, or long by contraction, namely, â, ê, ô; (2) the short vowels ă, ĕ, *e. g.*, מִמֶּנּוּ . . קְטֹרֶת.

§ I. In closed Ultima with tone, any long vowel may occur; of the short vowels, sometimes the ĭ, *e. g.*, the two particles אִם (if), עִם (with), which, however, often (as is always done in the case of מִן־) becomes toneless when măqqēph is used, and the form וַיִּשְׁבְּ (§ 72, *n*, *a*).

Especially worthy of note are

§ K. III. *The Opened Syllables*, i. e., syllables which really close doubly, but in which this is avoided by means of a helping-vowel.

(1) *At the end of words.* An ordinary helping-vowel (exceptions, § 11, *i*), generally S'ghôl, but also (especially if the last, or next to the last syllable, is a guttural) Păttăḥ. Then the vowel of the open syllable, if with tone, generally is lengthened, namely, ŏ to ō, as, *e. g.*, קָדֹשׁ . . רָחַב . . אֹרַח, for qŏdhsh, rŏḥb, ŏrḥ; ĭ to ē, *e. g.*, סֵפֶר . . שֵׁמַע, for ṣĭphr, shĭm'; ă to ĕ, *e. g.*, מֶלֶךְ . . זֶרַע, for mălk, zăr' (cf. § 27, *c*, *d*).

§ L. If the next to the last letter is a guttural, then ă remains unchanged in the open syllable, *e. g.*, נַעַר (§ 27, *e*), תּוֹכַחַת . . דַּעַת (§ 35, *a*), וַיַּעַל (§ 72, *n*. *ε*), hence short vowel.

§ M. In the apocopated imperfect of the verbs ל״ה, the lengthening of ĭ to ē frequently does not take place, *e. g.*, יִגֶל for yĭgl, וַיִּבֶן (cf. § 72, *n*. *γ*).

§ N. If the next to the last letter is י, then Hîrĕq is used as a helping-vowel, Păttăḥ is retained in open syllables, as, *e. g.*, עַיִן (§ 28, *a*); thus also in the suffix form יךָ־, *e. g.*, אֱלֹהַיִךְ, "your (fem.) God;" as also in the dual ending יִם־.

§ O. (2) *In the middle of words.* The first closing consonant, if it is a guttural, frequently, in order to ease the pronunciation, receives the ḥāṭĕph corresponding to the preceding vowel; and, in this case, this vowel is not lengthened. Examples (in § 10, *a*, 4); נַעֲרוֹ, to be divided נַעַ־רוֹ, nă'ă-rô.

§ P. The vowel is also not lengthened, when, instead of the ḥāṭĕph,

on account of a sh'wâ following it, the corresponding short vowel is employed (cf. §5, *e*), *e. g.*, יִחְזַק, first plural יִחְזְקוּ, to be divided יִחְזְ־קוּ, yĕḥĕz-qû; יִחְלֹם, first plural יִחְלְמוּ, to be divided יִחְלְ־מוּ.

§Q. IV. *Loosely-closed Syllables* we call those which were originally followed by a vowel, which, however, in accordance with the laws of etymology, (§§11, *c*, 2, and 11, *d*) fell away. The "loose close" can be seen, from the fact that the letters בגדכפ"ת remain aspirated. The sh'wâ cannot be heard, and is *not* sh'wâ mobile. Examples (in §11, *c*, 2), כָּנָף, dual, with suffix, כַּנְפֵיהֶם, kăn-phê-hĕm (§24, *d*), מְלָכִים for mălăkhîm, suffix מַלְכֵיהֶם (§27, *g*); חָרְבָתֵיךְ, ḥŏr-bhō-thăyīkh (§34, *a*). In §11, *d*, e. g., יַעֲמִד, plural יַעַמְדוּ, to be divided yă'ăm-dhû (§63, *e*); נֶאֱסַף, plural נֶאֶסְפוּ (§63, *g*); יֶחֱרַד, plural יֶחֶרְדוּ (§63, *f*).

§R. Loosely closed are also those syllables which originated from the union of the prefixes ל . כ . ב with words whose first consonant had a sh'wâ under it, *e. g.*, לְדָבָר (§11, *g*, 2), from דָּבָר+lă. Exceptions are found with לְ before the Inf. Qăl. (cf. §53, *c*, where לְקִבֹּר, from קִבֹּר+lă (לְ) is mentioned).

§S. Very rarely is a loosely closed syllable found where no vowel has been omitted (cf. §27, *m*), cf. also הַבִּיתָה (*accus. loci*), for which word, according to §19, *b*, *a*, the ground-form, băyt, is to be presupposed. A fixed closed syllable is found, contrary to the rule, in בִּרְכַת (*stat. const.*), of בְּרָכָה (§33, *d*), and in חֶרְפוֹת (*stat. const.*), of חֶרָפוֹת (§34, *c*), cf. also בְּשָׁפְכָךְ (§53, *d*).

METHODS IN HEBREW GRAMMARS.

By Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.,
Columbus, Ohio.

To understand and master a language implies more than the mere mechanical acquisition of its facts. It means the study of a language from a philological standpoint, an examination of its grammar and lexicon for the purpose of learning its inner character and being, and in order to be able to understand rationally and philosophically the phenomena of the speech. Whitney[1] says of the linguistic student: "He deals with language as the instrument of thought, its means of expression, not its record; he deals with simple words and phrases, not with sentences and texts. He aims to trace out the inner life of language, to discover its origin, to follow its successive steps of growth, and to deduce the laws that govern its mutations, the recognition of which shall account to him for both the unity and variety of its present manifested phases; and, along with this, to apprehend the nature of language as a human endowment, its relation to thought, its influence upon the development of intellect and the growth of knowledge, and the history of mind and of knowledge as reflected in it." Necessary as it is to acquire thoroughly and well the data of a language, and to learn these for practical purposes, it will be readily seen that the most interesting and, in many respects, most profitable problems of linguistic study reach out above and beyond these

[1] *Language and the study of Language*, p. 6.

individual facts. Especially has this been recognized in the past few decades, since the comparative method of study, which has been so abundantly fruitful in all departments of learning, has been applied to languages also, and comparative philology has been found so great a power in historical, ethnographical, mythological, and other researches. The soul and life of language has never been so much studied, or so well understood, as at present.

And what is true of language in general is true also of the Semitic tongues in particular; they, too, and here again the Hebrew in particular, have been reaping the benefit of the revolution in method and manner introduced into philology in general. As new problems and aims assumed prominence, new methods in research were adopted, and the departure from the old mechanical systems in grammar and lexicon became more and more radical. *In statu quo* is, at best, a relative phrase, and scarcely anywhere is this more the case than in the department of Semitic studies; here advance and improvement have been decided and marked, and scarcely any feature of this study has made it more attractive than the fact that it (and especially is this true of Hebrew grammar) has, in our leading works on the structure of the language, left the more practical stage, and entered upon that of philosophical and theoretical discussion, in which the philological principles as such, the Hebrew as a special language, as one member of a group or family of tongues, is studied objectively, and for strictly grammatical purposes. While all grammars of the present day, as was the case in the old works, still have the practical aim of making the language of the Old Testament intelligible to the student of God's Word, yet they no longer are written for the sole and only purpose of rendering hand-maid services to exegesis and other theological disciplines. Hebrew is studied now also for its own sake, and its bearings on philology in general and Semitic philology in particular; and has thus assumed an independence and new dignity.[1]

This change in the basis and aim of Hebrew grammars is contemporaneous with the introduction of more rational methods into philological discussion in general, and is no more than five or six decades old. It was introduced by a German; and the work of building upon the foundation thus laid has been done almost exclusively by Germans: to the present day there is not in the English language, not even as a translation, a work which can fairly be called a philosophical grammar of the Hebrew language. The nearest approach to it is probably Kalisch. As yet, about all our grammars are rudimentary and elementary, confining themselves strictly to the facts of the language, and only sporadically endeavoring to explain these facts.[2]

The father of higher Hebrew grammar is Wilhelm Gesenius, who was born in 1786, and, in 1843, died as professor of theology, at Halle. Theodore Benfey[3] calls him "the original founder of an independent Semitic philological science, and among the most important representatives of a critical and unprejudiced

[1] It must not be forgotten that such methods and problems have not a mere abstract or philosophical value; in fact, some are productive of many important practical and exegetical results, e. g., the discussion as to whether the interchange of הוּא and הִיא in the so-called Priest Codex is a sign of antiquity or of a later date, and similar points.

[2] We shall not, however, forget to mention that a number of excellent monographs on special points of grammar have appeared in English, based upon a most thorough study of the language in its whole length and breadth, and *facile princeps* among these is Driver's *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. 2nd Edition. Oxford, 1881.

[3] In his *Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*, 1869, p. 685.

Semitic philology." It is with Gesenius, both as a lexicographer and a grammarian, that English students of Hebrew are better acquainted than with any other of the leading authorities in this department; and this is, at least partly, due to the fact that some of his works have been translated into our language, and his empirical system finds more acceptance among us than do the more abstract systems of others. And yet English scholars apparently make but little use of his two greatest works, namely, his grammatical *Lehrgebäude* and his large lexicon, the *Thesaurus*, which, according to the opinion expressed lately by so good an authority as Professor Strack, of Berlin, is still the best at our command.[1] Gesenius began with the publication of a Hebrew lexicon, in 1810; and out of this grew both his smaller dictionary, in 1815, of which the ninth edition, by Mühlau and Volck, recently appeared, and of which Robinson has made an English translation, as also the *Thesaurus*, a large Hebrew-Latin dictionary of 1522+166 folio pages, completed by Rödiger, in which is collected all that the languages, literature, geography, history, etc., of the Orient could contribute to the explanation of the Old Testament idiom. Both in method and results he was apparently more successful, at least found less opposition, in his lexicographical work than in his grammars. Of these, the first edition of the smaller and best known appeared in 1813; and, at the author's death, thirteen editions had made their appearance. A number of further editions were published by Rödiger, and now the editorship has been entrusted to the capable hands of Kautzsch, who has brought down the work to our own days, in scientific character, and has also added an exercise book. Out of this smaller grammar grew, in 1817, his *Ausfuehrliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, an elaborate and exhaustive treatise on Hebrew grammar, comprising 908 closely printed octavo pages; and it is in this work that we find his system and method both explained and carried out. It is the empiric method, the collection of all the data that the language as such offered, and the deduction of the principles from these data. True, his *Lehrgebäude* makes it a special point to compare, wherever possible, what the cognate tongues have to offer in explanation of Hebrew forms and words, but to these is nowhere given a decisive, but only an illustrative voice. He confines himself to the analysis of the language as found in the Old Testament literature, and has very little sympathy for any abstract, philosophical theorizing. In the introduction to his larger grammar (p. III), he says that it was his object to make a complete and critical collection of the grammatical forms, and, on the basis of these, to give a rational explanation. His *Lehrgebäude* is a faithful expression of this aim, and is a work worthy of much more attention than it receives.

Allied in spirit, though later in date, are the massive two volumes of Böttcher (died in 1863) edited by Mühlau, in 1866–68. There is in no language a more complete collection of the data of Hebrew as given in the Old Testament than in this work. While independent in his treatment of the subject, especially in the use of a new nomenclature in the place of the traditional grammatical *termini technici*, Böttcher too insists upon explaining the Hebrew on the basis of Hebrew alone, and differs from and advances upon Gesenius, chiefly in his protest against the authority of Arabic grammar in the arrangement and explanation of the Hebrew.

A linguistic genius, such as appears but once in a generation, was Georg Hein-

[1] *Theol. Literaturblatt*, June 20, 1884.

rich Aug. Ewald, whose career, as remarkable for its excentricities as for its brilliancy, reads almost like a fable. He was born in Göttingen, in 1803, and died there in 1875. His grammar appeared in 1827, as *Kritische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache;* but from the fifth to the present eighth edition it bears the title *Ausfuehrliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes*, 935 pp. Of all the Hebrew grammars that have appeared this is certainly the most philosophical; his method is synthetic and speculative. Not only are the results of Semitic study, but also the principles of philology in general, here allowed to show their influence, and the factors and agencies that combine in the growth and development of the language put into requisition for the explanation of the etymology and word formation in Hebrew. He does not take the facts of the language and then by the process of analysis show how these facts became such, as is the method of Gesenius, but rather, on the other hand, he assumes philological data, and shows how, from the basis of the roots and stems of the language, the gender, cases, tenses and moods grew into what they are now. With Gesenius he endeavors to explain Hebrew from Hebrew alone, at least treats it chiefly as self-explanatory, but, in doing so, follows a course exactly the opposite from the one pursued by his great co-laborer. His views can best be learned in his Introductory, from p. 17—39. His standpoint is further illustrated by the position he takes over against the claims made for the Arabic, in reference to antiquity of form, and utility in the explanation of Hebrew. He says, p. 19:

"Over against the Aramaic languages, which are known to us only in the form they appeared in the last few centuries before Christ, the Hebrew, as it appears in the powerful and mighty language of the prophets and the great poets, is distinguished by a greater fulness and more developed structure, over aginst the Arabic, which is, indeed, more developed in some points, but in its structure of words and sentences has become as peculiar and inflexible (*starr*) as the Arabic desert, and which appears on the stage of history only 400 years after Christ, it is distinguished by greater antiquity and by its mobile and youthful character. . . . Many features, which in the younger languages have been divided, and in this or that dialect have undergone a peculiar development, the Hebrew still retains in an undivided state. Therefore, the study of the Semitic as a family of languages, must begin especially with the Hebrew, because this language exhibits to us the oldest form of the Semitic in its connection and originality."

The system of Justus Olshausen (died 1884) is like and unlike that of Ewald. In its general features his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, the first and only volume of which appeared in 1861, is similar to Ewald's in its synthetic character, in building up the grammar from philological and philosophical premises, and endeavoring to follow its gradual growth; but it differs from Ewald in its endeavors to show this procession in its historical unfolding from the original Semitic language, and in finding the materials for this historical basis in the Arabic. His antithesis to Ewald finds expression already on p. 2, where he says, "In reference to the primitive character of the whole linguistic structure, both as to sounds and words, the Hebrew is surpassed by the Arabic." This he proceeds to prove from historical and linguistic arguments; and concludes with the remark, "that it is evident from what precedes, that the comparison of no cognate language throws so much light upon the Hebrew as does the Arabic." Proceeding from this standpoint, he gives in his grammar from page 8 to page 30, a complete grammatical scheme, based upon the Arabic, of what he would consider original Semitic forms,

and, in his grammar proper, starts out from these philosophicallycons trued forms to explain the character, origin and meaning of the forms as found in the Old Testament. This principle gives form and character to his whole grammatical work. His system can be called the linguistic-comparative, combined with the historical method. Quite a successful attempt to popularize the method and results of Olshausen, we find in Bickell's *Grundriss der hebräischen Grammatik*, 1869, translated by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr., as "Outlines of Hebrew Grammar," 1877.

A synthesis of Ewald and Olshausen we have in the *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, published 1879, by Professor B. Stade, in Giessen, who thus endeavors to do for Hebrew what Nöldeke has done for the Aramaic languages. He seeks to work only with the acknowledged correct principles of philology, but at the same time takes into consideration only the materials that are really at hand in the Old Testament, and has quite successfully combined the principles as advocated by these two great grammarians. His object, in doing so, was to give a correct picture of the Hebrew language as really existing. (*Vorwort*, p. v.)

The last on the list is the *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, by Dr. Friedrich Eduard König, of Leipzig, of which the first volume, treating of the script, the pronunciation, the pronoun and the verb, appeared in 1881. His method is partly new and partly old. He virtually returns to the analytic manner of Gesenius and Böttcher, but with many improvements, and is more scientific; he is, further, historical, inasmuch as he endeavors to trace the development of existing forms out of the older, which he, too, finds, for the most part, in the Arabic; he follows out the principles of the physiology of sound (*Lautphysiologie*), which seeks to explain on a rational basis the nature of the letter-sounds, their influence on each other, their changes, etc. A distinguishing feature of the work is the fact that it is a commentary on all other grammars, by presenting the *status controversiae* on all the disputed points of grammar, and by the discussion of the *pros* and *cons* offered by the various grammarians. There is no other grammar that gives so clear an insight into the real questions of Hebrew grammar, its interrogation points and problems, and in general such a complete survey of the whole field of inquiry, as does the work of König.

It may not be out of place here to remark that the studies of Assyriologists have as yet produced but few, if any, tangible or important results for Hebrew grammar; their treasuries have yielded good gold for Hebrew lexicography chiefly, and not for Hebrew grammar. The discussion now going on between the "Arabic" and the "anti-Arabic," or Assyrian schools, is almost entirely in the department of the dictionary. The protest raised by the younger Delitzsch and others against the methods of the editors of Gesenius' Dictionary is exclusively against the use, or abuse, of Arabic for the explanation of the meaning of Hebrew words, and the antithesis of the protestants is that rather the Assyrian should utter the decisive voice in this regard, whenever comparisons with the dialects are made. But in no perceptible manner have the recent Assyrian researchers influenced the methods of Hebrew grammarians.

ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

BY CYRUS ADLER.

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Manuscript copies of the Hebrew Bible are comparatively rare, and, considering the antiquity of the books which compose it, extremely modern. Writers vaguely allude to a manuscript of the 9th century, but its existence cannot be verified.[1] The oldest MS. in the Erfurt Library, and, according to Lagarde, the oldest extant copy of the Massora, has been assigned the date of 1100 (Symmicta, p. 137). The oldest Hebrew MS. Bible in the *Bibliotheque Imperiale* (Derenbourg's *Catalogues des Manuscrits Hebreux et Samaritains de la B. I.*) is 1286. Moreover, many of the early MSS., and even some of the early prints, are unpunctuated. The most complete MS. of the Pentateuch and commentaries in the *Bibliotheque Imperiale* is in this condition.[2] Such also is the case with the large number of MS. copies of the Pentateuch now extant, and they labor under the additional disadvantage of all being multiplications of one original. This unfortunate state of affairs leaves us no facts on which to study the history of the vowel points, and makes textual criticism a hazardous undertaking.

With this preface, a MS. of considerable interest may now be introduced. It is at present the property of Mayer Sulzberger, Esq., of Philadelphia, and was purchased by him from the late Dr. Wickersham, who had himself bought it from Professor Vincenzo Gustale, now living at Florence, Italy. It was sold as a MS. of the year 1300, and was pronounced, from an examination of the handwriting (by Rabbi Iesi, of Ferrara), to be of that date. Our first purpose is to ascertain whether there be any internal evidence to corroborate these statements.

The MS. contains סליחות, or rather תחנונים, that is, supplicatory prayers recited by Jews between New Years day and the day of Atonement. Its first part agrees exactly, even to the arrangement, with a collection made by the great Italian scholar, Samuel David Luzzato, except that, where his edition reads "here the reader says any prayer which he pleases," our MS. has always inserted one—a confirmation of both the correctness of the editor and the antiquity of the MS. That it was the custom to insert poetical invocations at these places is proved by a MS. (No. 630 of the Catalogue) preserved in the *Bibliotheque Imperiale*. Its title is סדר התחנונים; and, of the six poetical invocations inserted, five correspond with those in our MS., viz:—

מצירי ערי . . . יעירוני רעיוני . . . אעירה . . . שחר קמתי . . . אלהי

Our MS. possesses three such poems which can be recognized (two from their acrostics, and the third from its having lived even to our own time) and which may furnish some evidence in regard to its date. The first, the acrostic of which is דניאל, is a poem of no merit. It was probably written by an Italian of the twelfth century, though the single name of Daniel is so common, that nothing positive can be asserted concerning him. The next is the famous ברכי נפשי of

[1] Such a MS. was reported to exist in the Parma Library. An inquiry concerning it has not elicited a reply from the Librarian, Abbe Perreau.

[2] In the celebrated collection of MSS. of Rabbi David Oppenheimer, now a part of the Bodleian Library, the oldest MS. is an unpunctuated one of the Pentateuch, of the year 1288. No. 107 of the catalogue is the oldest punctuated text in his collection. It is a copy of the Psalms, no older than the fourteenth, and possibly as late as the sixteenth century.

Baḥya ibn Bakoda, who flourished about the year 1100. The third, and for us most important, connects itself, in three ways, with the name of Menaḥem Reganati. The acrostic is מנחם הקטן ב' רבי בנימין חזק ואמץ אמן ואמן "Menaḥem, the little one" being the humble way in which people ordinarily describe themselves. The poem has a superscription,

תחנה שחברה מרנא ורבנא הרב ר' מנחם ז"צל איש ריקאנאטי

and lastly we have the subscription, or signature, of the author, giving his name as it occurs in the acrostic.

Before attempting to draw any conclusions from these statements, it will be fitting to describe, in detail, the arrangements of the MS. It consists of thirty-four leaves, of mingled parchment and vellum, and is written by a hand which can unhesitatingly be pronounced as that of a professional scribe. The leaf is 8¼ inches long, and 12⅛ inches broad; and, from the ageing of the edges, this would seem to have been their original size. The formation of the letters is, to some extent, peculiar. The *aliph* is formed thus, א; the *pe* thus, כ—so that *pe* and *fe* are not distinguished except by the *raphe* mark; the *he* thus, ה—*he* with *mapiq* not being differentiated; there is no distinction between ד and ר; ן and ן are distinguished only by the shading of the latter, which makes it identical with the printed ן; נ is followed very closely by ן or ו, especially the latter, the two almost appearing to form a compound letter. On the top of the first page there are two lines and a half written in a style of Hebrew known as Cursive Italian. They are much blurred and obscured, and were not written by the person who wrote the MS. As far as the inscription could be deciphered, it reads as follows:

לזכרון טוב יהוה אמן

....כה"ר יצחק מריקאנטי....מכר לי זה התחנונים וקבל מידי....משה רפאיל בן כמוה"רר הרופא יוסף נ"ע....נר ותשב(?)

The top line is merely an invocation, "May this be for a good memorial. Amen:" then a break; then, "Rabbi Isaac, of Reganati;" another break; then, "sold me this book of supplications, and received from me;" another break—probably the price; then comes the name, "Moses Raphael, son of Rabbi Doctor Joseph, son of——(?)"

The above inscription warrants us in concluding that Isaac Reganati either wrote the MS. himself, or, if he was not a scribe, hired one to do it for him. That Isaac Reganati was a contemporary and immediate successor of Menaḥem, we may infer from the fact of his having preserved the poem; for nothing short of filial affection could have induced him to that step. Menaḥem Reganati died in 1290, and is known to the modern world only as a great Kabbalist. From these facts, as well as from the inscription, from the poem of Bakoda and that of Daniel, joined with the tradition and the opinion of the expert referred to, I think it safe to assume that the MS. before us is one of the latter part of the thirteenth, or of the earlier part of the fourteenth century.

And now the question arises, Does any more interest attach to this than to any other antiquarian curiosity? In view of the statements made above, concerning the rarity of early MSS. of the Bible, even unpunctuated, the discovery, in so old a MS. as this, of some part of the Scriptures punctuated, however small that part of it may be, must be of some value.

Scattered among these supplicatory prayers are thirteen Psalms; and a

comparison has yielded some points which are of considerable importance from a historical, as well as grammatical, point of view.

The variations in the text, while not very numerous, are striking. In Ps. CXXXVIII., 7, it reads והאחזני, for והושיעני; though the latter is given in the margin. In Ps. XXVIII., 7, we read עזי וכינני, for עזי וכיעזי; and the former is certainly the more poetical expression. In Ps. CXLI., 8, the *quadralitarum*, יְהוָה, is written אלהים. In Ps. CVIII., 9, for לי, we have ולי, in the passage לי גלעד לי מנשה. In Ps. XLVI., 7, הארץ occurs in place of ארץ. In XLVI., 9, אלהים is inserted after יהוה. Ps. LXXXVI., 6, לקול for בקול; and with הקשיבה this is an allowable construction (cf. Ps. V., 3, and Is. XLVIII., 18). Ps. XXVIII., 3, the whole passage—ועם פעלי און דברי שלום עם רעהם—is omitted in the text, and is added above in a different handwriting. אדני is frequently abbreviated to double *yod*. We have fifty-six *scriptiones plenæ*, and eight *defectivæ*, which do not occur in the ordinary text.

If we but remember the extreme strictness of the rules which bound the scribes, the Massorah,[1] which counted the letters, the notions about the mystical value of writing the name of God in a certain way, we cannot but conclude that the writer of this little work had before him a text of the Bible differing materially from the *textus receptus*.

An examination of the vowel points proved even more interesting. The appended notes show over five hundred variations; and the table will give some idea as to where they lie. Three hundred are taken up in a confusion of *qames*, *pathah*, and *hatef-pathah*. The pre-tonic *qames*, as in ערב וָבקר . . דור וָדור, is unknown; the article frequently does not take a *qames* before the gutturals; אישר is written with *qames*, instead of *hatef pathah;* on the other hand, על followed by *maqaf*, is pointed with *hatef-pathah*.

It may be suggested that all this results from pure ignorance; but the fact that all the בגדכפת, without the *dagesh*, have the *raphe* marked, is itself sufficient evidence that the MS. has been carefully written. Of course, it would be ludicrous to suppose that one MS. of this kind could overthrow a well established system; nor do I attempt to draw any definite conclusions from the facts gathered. Yet it would seem that we have here an absolutely phonetic system of representation, without a knowledge of some of the rules of Hebrew Grammar which, at best, seem arbitrary.

A study of the consonantal characters, and a comparison with a MS. of the twelfth century, have suggested another point. It seems rather unusual that the Hebrew characters should, with the exception of five terminals, consist entirely of initials; but these two MSS. seem to show that the MS. style, at least, possessed medials as well. The present square characters correspond exactly to the initials, and have only been in exclusive use since the invention of printing.

The peculiarities of punctuation seem to show that Qamḥi's[2] grammatical system was not without opponents. Aben Ezra asserts that there were but seven

---

[1] In Ps. CXIII., 7, there is a punctuation which shows an absence of Massoretic tradition. The word מֵרִמְדָּפִי, with the note פתח באתנח, is punctuated מֵרִמְדָּפִי. Cf. also note to Ps. CXXXVIII., 2.

[2] I write the name Qamḥi, because there are three MSS. of his מכלול in the *Bibliotheque Impériale*, in which it is pointed in that way. See the interesting discussion in the *Athenæum*, March 22, 1884.

vowels; and Judah ha Levi confirms this statement.[1] Luzzato's studies resulted in the same conclusion.[2] Comparative grammar will also militate against this system. Even such a complex language as Ethiopic has but seven vowels.

As was remarked before, one MS. is not enough to warrant any positive inferences. Yet I think that these facts are important enough to deserve the attention of editors of future critical editions.

NOTE. In the following presentation, the English spelling of Hebrew words is that of the author of the article; an exception was made in the case of this article for reasons apparent to all. Tsadhe, however, is represented by *s*, and not by *c* with Cedilla, as the author would have had it.—[ED.]

PSALM LXV. סה

1. לַמְנַצֵּחַ — Dagesh wanting in צ.
2. דְּמִיָּה — Ḥatef-qameṣ (ֲ) under ד for qibbus (ֻ).
   יְשֻׁלַּם — Qames (ָ) under ל for pathaḥ (ַ).
3. תְּפִלָּה — Dagesh wanting in ת.
   עָדֶיךָ — Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under ע for qames (ָ). Sere (ֵ) under ד for seghol (ֶ).
   יָבֹאוּ — Scriptio plena.
4. עֲוֹנֹת — Scriptio plena.
   מְנִי — Sere (ֵ) under מ for seghol (ֶ).
5. תִּבְחַר — Qames (ָ) under ח for pathaḥ (ַ). Delitzsch points ב with ḥatef-pathaḥ; our MS. follows the ordinary shewa simplex.
   בֵּיתֶךָ — Sere (ֵ) under ת for seghol (ֶ). Daghesh wanting in ב.
   קָדְשׁ — Scriptio plena.
6. בְּצֶדֶק — Dagesh wanting in ב.
   תַּעֲנֵנוּ — Qames (ָ) under ת for pathaḥ (ַ).
7. בְּכֹחוֹ — Dagesh wanting in ב.
   נֶאְזָר — Ḥatef-seghol (ֱ) under א for shewa simplex (ְ). Dagesh wanting in ז.
8. יַמִּים — Qames (ָ) under י for pathaḥ (ַ).
   גַּלֵּיהֶם — Qames (ָ) under ג for pathaḥ. Sere (ֵ) under ה for seghol (ֶ).
   וַהֲמוֹן — Pathaḥ (ַ) under ה for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ).
9. קְצָוֹת — Scriptio plena.
   מֵאוֹתֹתֶיךָ — Scriptio plena.
   מוֹצָאֵי — Shewa simplex (ְ) under צ for qames (ָ).
   וְעֶרֶב — Shewa simplex (ְ) under ו for qames (ָ).
   תַּרְנִין — Dagesh wanting in ת.

---

[1] See the scholarly article of Dr. Felsenthal, in the HEBRAICA for May, p. 64. A discussion of the pre-Qamhi school is beyond the scope of the present paper. May we not hope for a fuller discussion of the subject from Dr. Felsenthal?

[2] Cf. his "Vehoah 'al hagabala," against the antiquity and authenticity of the *Zohar*.

10. פְּקֻדָתָ Pathaḥ (ַ) under פ for qames. Dagesh wanting in פ and in ת.

הָאָרֶץ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ); ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under א for qames (ָ).

וַתִּשְׁקְקָהּ Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in ת; shewa simplex (ְ) under ק for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ); sere (ֵ) under ק for seghol (ֶ).

רַבַּת Qames (ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (ַ); qames (ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (ַ).

מָלֵא Seghol (ֶ) under ל for sere (ֵ).

תְּכִין Dagesh wanting in ת.

תְּכִינָהּ Dagesh wanting in ת.

11. נַחֵת Qames (ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (ַ).

גְּדוּדֶיהָ Scriptio plena; sere (ֵ) under ד for seghol (ֶ).

בְּרִבִּיבִם Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in ב.

תְּמוֹגַגְנָה Shewa simplex (ְ) under ג for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) (given as a variant). Sere (ֵ) under ג for seghol (ֶ). Scriptio plena.

12. שְׁנַת Qames (ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (ַ).

טוֹבָתֶךָ Scriptio plena; sere (ֵ) under ת for seghol (ֶ).

וּמַיְעָנְלֶיךָ Sere (ֵ) under ל for seghol (ֶ).

דָּשֵׁן Pathaḥ (ַ) under ד for qames (ָ).

13. תַּחֲנֻרָנָה Scriptio plena.

14. לָבְשׁוּ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ל for qames (ָ); ḥolem (וֹ) with שׁ for shureq (וּ).

כָּרִים Pathaḥ (ַ) under כ for qames (ָ).

בָּר Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ).

PSALM LXXXVI. פו

1. אָזְנְךָ Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under א for qames (ָ); seghol (ֶ) under ז for shewa simplex (ְ).

עָנִי Pathaḥ (ַ) under ע for qames (ָ).

2. שָׁמְרָה Ḥatef-qames (ֳ) under ש for qames; pathaḥ (ַ) under ר for qames (ָ).

נַפְשִׁי Qames (ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (ַ).

חָסִיד Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under ח for qames (ָ).

אָנִי Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under א for qames (ָ).

עַבְדֶךָ Seghol (ֶ) under ד for shewa simplex (ְ).

אֵלֶיךָ Seghol (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

3. הַיּוֹם Dagesh wanting in י.

חָנֵנִי Ḥatef-qames (ֲ) under ח for qames. Segholֶ (ֶ) under נ for sere (ֵ).

אֲדֹנָי Written ''

אֵלֶיךָ Segholֶ (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

4. אֵלֶיךָ Segholֶ (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

אֲדֹנָי Written ''.

נַפְשִׁי Qames (ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (ַ).

5. אֲדֹנָי Written ''

וְסַלָּח Qames (ָ) under ס for pathaḥ (ַ).

וְרַב Qames (ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (ַ).

6. בְּקוֹל Our MS. reads לְקוֹל.

תַּחֲנוּנוֹתָי Qames (ָ) under ת for pathaḥ (ַ).

7. צָרָתִי Pathaḥ (ַ) under ר for qames (ָ).

אֶקְרָאֶךָּ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ר for qames (ָ).

8. אֵין Segholֶ (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

בָּאֱלֹהִים Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ). Segholֶ (ֶ) under א for ḥatef-segholֱ (ֱ).

אֲדֹנָי Written ''.

וְאֵין Segholֶ (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

כְּמַעֲשֶׂיךָ Qames (ָ) under מ for pathaḥ (ַ). Pathaḥ (ַ) under ע for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ).

9. אֲשֶׁר Qames (ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ).

יָבוֹאוּ Pathaḥ (ַ) under י for qames (ָ).

וְיִשְׁתַּחֲווּ Qames (ָ) under ת for pathaḥ (ַ).

אֲדֹנָי Written ''.

וִיכַבְּדוּ Shewa simplex (ְ) under י.

10. וְעֹשֶׂה Scriptio plena. Segholֶ (ֶ) under שׂ for sere.

לִבַּדֶּךָ Qames (ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (ַ).

11. דַּרְכֶּךָ Qames (ָ) under ד for pathaḥ (ַ). Pathaḥ under ך for qames (ָ).

אַהֲלֵךְ Pathaḥ (ַ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ). Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under ה for pathaḥ. Dagesh wanting in ל.

בַּאֲמִתֶּךָ Qames (ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ).

שִׁכְמְךָ Segholate (־ֶ) under שׁ for ḥireq. Segholate (־ֶ) under מ for shewa simplex (־ְ).

12. אֲדֹנָי Written יְ֫.

אֱלֹהַי Qames (־ָ) under ה for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וְאַכְבְּדָה Pathaḥ (־ַ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (־ֲ). Qames (־ָ) under כ for pathaḥ (־ַ).

13. עָלַי Pathaḥ (־ַ) under ע for qames (־ָ).

נַפְשִׁי Qames (־ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (־ַ).

14. קָמוּ Pathaḥ (־ַ) under ק for qames (־ָ).

עָלַי Ḥatef-pathaḥ (־ֲ) under ע for qames (־ָ). Qames (־ָ) under ל for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וַעֲרַת Qames (־ָ) under ד for pathaḥ (־ַ).

בִּקְשׁוּ Punctuated thus Delitzsch בְּקְשׁוּ.

נַפְשִׁי Qames (־ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (־ַ).

שָׁמוּךְ Pathaḥ (־ַ) under שׁ for qames (־ָ).

15. וְאַתָּה Qames (־ָ) under א for pathaḥ (־ַ).

אֲדֹנָי Written יְ֫.

רַחוּם Qames (־ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וְחַנּוּן Qames (־ָ) under ח for pathaḥ (־ַ).

אַפַּיִם Qames (־ָ) under פ for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וְרַב Qames (־ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וְאֱמֶת Shewa simplex (־ְ) under ו for seghol. Segholate (־ֶ) under א for ḥatef-seghol (־ֱ).

16. אֵלַי Segholate (־ֶ) under א for sere (־ֵ). Qames (־ָ) under ל for pathaḥ (־ַ).

וְחָנֵנִי Ḥatef-qames (־ֳ) under ח for qames (־ָ).

עֻזֶּךָ Segholate (־ֶ) under ז for shewa simplex. Dagesh omitted in ז.

לַעֲבֶדֶךָ Ḥatef-pathaḥ (־ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (־ַ).

לְבֶן Sere (־ֵ) under ב for seghol (־ֶ).

אֲמָתֶךָ Qames (־ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (־ֲ).

17. שְׂנָאַי Qames (־ָ) under א for pathaḥ (־ַ); scriptio plena.

עֲזַרְתָּנִי Qames (־ָ) under ת for pathaḥ (־ַ).

PSALM CXXXII. The MS. gives it קלא.

1. הַמַּעֲלוֹת Qames (־ָ) under מ for pathaḥ (־ַ).

אֵת Seghol (◌ֶ) under א for sere (◌ֵ).

2. אֲשֶׁר Qames (◌ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ).

נִשְׁבַּע Qames (◌ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

3. אָבָא Pathaḥ (◌ַ) under א for qames (◌ָ).

אֶעֱלֶה Seghol (◌ֶ) under ע for ḥatef-seghol (◌ֱ).

עַל Ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

יְצוּעָי Pathaḥ (◌ַ) under ע for qames (◌ָ).

4. אֶתֵּן Sere (◌ֵ) under א for seghol (◌ֶ). Seghol (◌ֶ) under ת for sere (◌ֵ).

לְעַפְעַפַּי There is a ו before ל which was afterwards stricken out. Qames (◌ָ) under פ for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

5. עַד Ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

לַאֲבִיר Qames (◌ָ) under ל for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

6. הִנֵּה Seghol (◌ִ) under נ for sere (◌ֵ).

שְׁמַעֲנוּהָ Qames (◌ָ) unker מ for pathaḥ (◌ַ). Shewa simplex (◌ְ) under ע for ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ). Pataḥ (◌ַ) under ה for qames (◌ָ).

בְּאֶפְרָתָה Pathaḥ (◌ַ) under ר for qames (◌ָ).

יָעַר Ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

7. נָבוֹאָה Pathaḥ (◌ַ) under נ for qames (◌ָ).

נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Qames (◌ָ) under ת for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

לַהֲדֹם Scriptio plena.

רַגְלָיו Qames (◌ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

8. לִמְנוּחָתֶךָ Ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ) under ח for qames (◌ָ). Scriptio plena.

9. כַּהֲנֶיךָ Shewa simplex (◌ְ) under ך for qames (◌ָ).

10. עַבְדְּךָ Ḥatef-pathaḥ (◌ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

אַל Qames (◌ָ) under א for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

11. נִשְׁבַּע Qames (◌ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (◌ַ).

אֱמֶת Seghol (◌ֶ) under א for ḥatef-seghol (◌ֱ).

יָשׁוּב Pathaḥ (◌ַ) under י for Qames (◌ָ).

בִּטְנְךָ Seghol (◌ִ) under נ for shewa simplex (◌ְ).

לְכִסְאֲךָ Seghol (◌ִ) under ס for sere (◌ֵ).

12. וְעֵדֹתַי Scriptio plena.

אֲלַמְּדֵם Qames (◌ָ) under ל for pathaḥ (◌ַ). Seghol (◌ֶ) under ד for sere (◌ֵ).

גַּם Qames (ָ) under ג for pathah (ַ).

בְּנֵיהֶם Sere (ֵ) under ב for shewa simplex (ְ). Seghol (ֶ) under נ for sere (ֵ).

עֲדֵי Pathah (ַ) under ע for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

עַד Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for pathah (ַ).

14. מְנוּחָתִי Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ח for qames (ָ).

עֲדֵי Pathah (ַ) under ע for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

עַד Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for pathah (ַ).

אֲשֶׁב Seghol (ֶ) under שׁ for sere (ֵ).

15. צִיָּה Scriptio defectiva.

אַבָּרֵךְ Qames (ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ). Pathah (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ).

וַחֲסִידֶיהָ Pathah (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ).

יְרַנְנוּ Qames (ָ) under ר for pathah (ַ).

אַצְמִיחַ Qames (ָ) under ח for pathah (ַ).

PSALM XLVI. מו

1. לַמְנַצֵּחַ Qames (ָ) under נ for pathah (ַ). Dagesh wanting in צ.

קֹרַח Qames (ָ) under ר for pathah (ַ).

עַל Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for pathah (ַ).

2. אֱלֹהִים Seghol (ֶ) under א for ḥatef-seghol (ֱ).

מַחֲסֶה Qames (ָ) under מ for pathah (ַ). Shewa simplex (ְ) under ח for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

וְעֻזּ Scriptio plena.

3. עַל Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for pathah (ַ).

4. יֶחְמְרוּ Pathah (ַ) under י for seghol (ֶ).

בְּגַאֲוָתוֹ Qames (ָ) under ג for pathah (ַ). Pathah (ַ) under א for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

5. נָהָר Pathah (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ).

פַּלְגָיו Pathah (ַ) under ג for qames (ָ).

יְשַׂמְּחוּ Qames (ָ) under שׂ for pathah (ַ).

קְדֹשׁ Qames (ָ) under ק for shewa simplex (ְ). Scriptio plena.

6. בַּל Qames (ָ) under ב for pathah (ַ).

יַעֲזְרֶהָ Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for shewa simplex (ְ). Pathah (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ).

אֱלֹהִים Seghol under א for ḥatef-seghol (ֱ).

7. מַמְלָכוֹת Qames (ָ) under מ for pathah (ַ).

תָּכוּג Pathah (ַ) under ת for (ָ).

ארין Our MS. reads הארין.

8. מִשְׁגָּב Qames (ָ) under ג for pathah (ַ).

9. The word אלהים has been added after יהוה.

אֲשֶׁר Qames (ָ) under א for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

10. מִלְחָמוֹת Ḥatef-pathah under ח for qames (ָ).

עַד Ḥatef-pathah (ֲ) under ע for pathaḥ (ַ).

קְצֵה Seghol (ְ) under צ for sere (ֵ).

הָאָרֶץ Pathah (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ).

יְשַׁבֵּר Qames (ָ) under ש for pathah (ַ).

יְקַצֵּץ Seghol (ְ) under צ for sere (ֵ).

חֲנִית Qames (ָ) under ח for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

עֲגָלוֹת Qames (ָ) under ע for ḥatef-pathah (ֲ).

בָּאֵשׁ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ). Seghol (ְ) under א for sere (ֵ).

11. אָנֹכִי Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under א for qames (ָ).

בָּאָרֶץ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ).

12. מִשְׁגָּב Qames (ָ) under ג for pathaḥ (ַ).

יַעֲקֹב Qames (ָ) under י for pathaḥ (ַ).

PSALM LI. נא

1. לַמְנַצֵּחַ Qames (ָ) under נ for pathaḥ (ַ).

2. בְּבוֹא Scriptio defectiva.

אֵלָיו Seghol (ְ) under א for sere (ֵ).

בָּא Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for qames (ָ).

בַּת Qames (ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (ַ).

שָׁבַע Qames (ָ) under ב for pathaḥ (ַ).

3. חָנֵּנִי Ḥatef-qames (ֳ) under ח for qames (ָ). Seghol (ְ) under נ for sere (ֵ).

אֱלֹהִים Seghol (ְ) under א for ḥatef-seghol (ֱ).

כְּחַסְדֶּךָ Shewa simplex (ְ) under ד for seghol (ֶ).

כְּרֹב Scriptio plena.

פְּשָׁעָי Pathaḥ (ַ) under ע for qames (ָ).

4. הֶרֵבָה The ה יתיר is not found in the MS.

טָהֳרִנִי Qames (ָ) under ט for pathaḥ (ַ). Pathaḥ (ַ) under ה for ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ).

6. לְבַדֶּךָ Seghol (ֶ) under ד for shewa simplex (ְ).

חָטָאתִי Pathaḥ (ַ) under ט for qames (ָ).

וְהָרַע Pathaḥ (ַ) under ה for qames (ָ). Qames (ָ) under ר for pathaḥ (ַ).

בְּעֵינֶיךָ Sere (ֵ) under נ for seghol (ֶ).

עָשִׂיתִי Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under שׂ for ḥireq.

לְמַעַן Qames (ָ) under both מ and ע for pathaḥ (ַ).

הַצַּדִּק Qames (ָ) under ד for pathaḥ (ַ).

בְּדָבְרֶךָ Ḥatef-qames (ֳ) under ד for qames (ָ).

בְּשָׁפְטֶךָ Ḥatef-qames (ֳ) under שׁ for qames (ָ).

7. בְּעָוֹן Pathaḥ (ַ) under ב for shewa simplex (ְ). Ḥatef-pathaḥ (ֲ) under ע for qames (ָ). Scriptio defective.

יְחַמַּתְנִי Seghol (ֶ) under ח for ḥatef-seghol (ֱ). Qames (ָ) under מ for pathaḥ (ַ).

8. אֱמֶת Seghol (ֶ) under א for ḥatef-seghol (ֱ).

בַּטְּחוּת Scriptio defectiva.

וּבָסָתֶם Shureq (וּ) with ת for qibbus (ֻ).

חָכְמָה Ḥatef-qames (ֳ) under ח for qames (ָ).

9. תְּחַטְּאֵנִי Seghol (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

בְּאֵזוֹב Seghol (ֶ) under א for sere (ֵ).

תְּכַבְּסֵנִי Qames (ָ) under כ for pathaḥ (ַ).

אַלְבִּין Qames (ָ) under א for pathaḥ (ַ).

10. תַּשְׁמִיעֵנִי Seghol (ֶ) under ע for sere (ֵ).

תָּגֵלְנָה Pathaḥ (ַ) under ת for qames (ָ).

דָּכִיתָ Pathaḥ (ַ) under ת for qames (ָ).

[In order to save space, the remaining variations of the MS. under consideration, are placed in tabular form.—*Ed.*]

11.	כִּחֲטָאַי	מִחֲטָאַי	תִּקַּח	תִּקָּח
	עֲוֹנֹתַי	עֲוֹנֹתָי	14. הָשִׁיבָה	הֲשִׁיבָה
	מִחֵה	מְחֵה	15. אַלְמְדָה	אֲלַמְּדָה
12.	חַדֵּשׁ	חֲדֵשׁ	פּוֹשְׁעִים	פּוֹשְׁעִים
13.	אַל	אֲל	דְּרָכֶיךָ	דְּרָכֶךָ
	קָדְשֶׁךָ	קָדְשֶׁךָ	אֵלֶיךָ	אֵלֶיךָ
	אַל	אֲל	יָשׁוּבוּ	יָשׁוּבוּ

	וְאֶתְנָה		16.	אֱלֹהִים	
	אֱלֹהִים	19.		אֱלֹהִי	
	תַּחְפּוֹן	21.		תְּשׁוּעָתִי	
	אֲז		17.	יי	
	עַל			שְׁפָתַי	
	מִזְבָּחֶךָ		18.	תַּחְפּוֹן	
				זֶבַח	

PSALM LXXXV. פה

	תִּתֵּן		1.	לַמְנַצֵּחַ	
	לָנוּ		2.	אַרְצֶךָ	
	אֶשְׁמְעָה	9.		שָׁבְתָּ	
	מָה			שְׁבִית (keri)	
	הָאֵל		3.	עַמְּךָ	
	חֲסִידָיו		4.	אָסַפְתָּ	
	יָשׁוּבוּ			הֲשִׁיבוֹתָ	
	לִירֵאָיו	10.	5.	וְהָפֵר	
	לִשְׁכֹּן		6.	הַלְעוֹלָם	
	וֶאֱמֶת			תֶּאֱנַף	
	וְשָׁלוֹם			תִּמְשׁךְ	
	נָשָׁקוּ			אַפֶּךָ	
	אֱמֶת			לְדוֹר	
	נִשְׁקָף			וָדוֹר	
	וְאַרְצֵנוּ	13.	7.	הֲלֹא	
	וְיָשֶׂם	14.		תָּשׁוּב	
	לַדֶּרֶךְ			תְּחַיֵּינוּ	
	פְּעָמָיו		8.	וְיִשְׁעֲךָ	

PSALM CVIII. קח

	בָּעַמִּים	4.	2.	אָשִׁירָה	
	כִּיעַל	5.		אַף	
	שָׁמַיִם		3.	עוּרָה	
	חַסְדְּךָ			הַנֵּבֶל	
	וְעַד			אָעִירָה	
	שְׁחָקִים			שָׁחַר	

וְאֶפְרַיִם	וְאֶפְרַיִם	אֲמִתֶּךָ	אֲמִתֶּךָ
מְחֹקְקִי	מְחֹקְקִי	עָל	עָל 6.
רָחְצִי	10. רָחְצִי	שָׁמַיִם	שָׁמַיִם
עָל	עַל	וְעַל	וְעַל
אֱדוֹם	אֱדוֹם	הָאָרֶץ	הָאָרֶץ
אֶתְרוֹעָע	אֶתְרוֹעָע	לְמַעַן	לְמַעַן 7.
יוֹבִלֵנִי	11. יוֹבִילֵנִי	יֶחֱלְצוּן	יֶחֱלְצוּן
עַד	עַד	וַעֲנֵנִי	וַעֲנֵנִי
אֱדוֹם	אֱדוֹם	דִּבֶּר	דִּבֶּר 8.
הַלֹא	12. הֲלֹא	בְּקָדְשׁוֹ	בְּקָדְשׁוֹ
תֵּצֵא	תֵּצֵא	אֶעֱלֹזָה	אֶעֱלֹזָה
בְּצִבְאוֹתֵינוּ	בְּצִבְאוֹתֵינוּ	אֲחַלְּקָה	אֲחַלְּקָה
הַבָּה	13. הָבָה	וְאֶמֹךְ	וְאֶמֹךְ
וְשָׁוְא	וְשָׁוְא	סֻכּוֹת	סֻכּוֹת
בֵּאלֹהִים	בֵּאלֹהִים	אֲמַדֵּד	אֲמַדֵּד
חַיִל	חָיִל	וְלִי	לִי 9.
יָבוּס	יָבוּס	מְנַשֶּׁה	מְנַשֶּׁה

PSALM XIII. יג

אוֹיְבִי	אֹיְבִי	עָד	עַד 2.
יְכָלְתִּיו	יְכָלְתִּיו	פָּנֶיךָ	פָּנֶיךָ
צָרָי	צָרַי	מִמֶּנִּי	מִמֶּנִּי
וְאָנִי	6. וַאֲנִי	עֵינִי	עֵינַי 4.
יָגֵל	יָגֶל	אִישָׁן	אִישַׁן
גָּמַל	גָּמַל	יֹאמַר	יֹאמַר 5.

PSALM CXLII. קמב.

עָלַי	עָלַי	בְּמַעֲרָה	בְּמִעָרָה 1.
בְּאוֹרַח	בְּאֹרַח		
אַהֲלֵךְ	אַהֲלֵךְ		
הָבִּט	5. הַבֵּיט	אִשְׁפּוֹךְ	אֶשְׁפּוֹךְ 3.
וּרְאֵה	וּרְאֵה	צָרָתִי	צָרָתִי
מָכִיר	מַכִּיר	לְפָנָיו	לְפָנָיו
דוֹרֵשׁ	דוֹרֵשׁ	אָנִיד	אַגִּיד
אֵלֶיךָ	6. אֵלֶיךָ	בְּחִתְעַטֵּף	בְּחִתְעַטֵּף 4.

(Some late erasure has been made in the punctuation of ב and מ, with what object does not appear.)

אַמְצוּ	אָמְצוּ	הַחַיִּים
מִמֶּנִּי	מִמֶּנִּי	הַקְשִׁיבָה
יַכְתִּירוּ	יַכְתִּרוּ	דַּלּוֹתִי
תִּגְמוֹל	תִּגְמֹל	מֵרֹדְפַי

Here is a note פתח באתנח

PSALM CXXXVIII. In the MS. it is numbered קלז.

מִמַּרְחַק	מִמֶּרְחַק	לְדָוִד
יֵידֵע The MS. contains		אָזְמָרְךָ
יֵרֵע and above ' probably for ' as a correction.		אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
		קָדְשְׁךָ
תְּחַיֵּנִי	תְּחַיֵּנִי	אַמִּתֶּךָ
אֹיְבִי	אֹיְבִי	כל The Massoret. note
יָדְךָ	יָדֶךָ	is כ׳ בחולם yet we have it

pointed with qames.

וְתוֹשִׁיעֵנִי In place of this word the MS. contains וְתאחֲזֵנִי, the other word being given as a variant.

וְתַעֲנֵנִי	וְתַעֲנֵנִי	
תַּרְחִיבֵנִי	תַּרְחִיבֵנִי	
עוֹז	עוֹז	
וְיָשִׁרוּ	וְיָשִׁרוּ	
וְשָׁפַל	וְשָׁפַל	
וְגָבוֹהַּ	וְגָבוֹהַּ	
יְמִינְךָ	יְמִינְךָ	
יִגְמֹר	יִגְמֹר	
מַעֲשֵׂה Writ. inst.	מַעֲשֵׂי	

PSALM CXLI. The number קמא is written by another hand.

Written וּבַל	וּבַל	מְשֹׂאַת
אֶלְחֲמָה	אֶלְחַם	כַּפַּי
בְּמַעֲנִיהֶם	בְּמַעֲנֵיהֶם	מִנְחַת
צָדִיק	צַדִּיק	עָרֵב
Written נִיא	נָיִי	נִצְרָה
סְלָע	סֶלַע	עַל
שׁוֹפְטֵיהֶם	שׁפְטֵיהֶם	דַּל
אִמְרַי	אִמְרָי	שְׁפָתַי
פּוּלַח	פַּלַּח	אַל
וּבוּקַע	וּבְקַע	רַע
בָּאָרֶץ	בָּאָרֶץ	בְּרִשְׁעָה
עַצְמֵינוּ	עַצְמֵינוּ	פֹּעֲלֵי

פּוֹעֲלֵי	פֹּעֲלֵי	אֵלֶיךָ	8. אֵלֶיךָ
בְּמָכְמָרָיו	10. בְּמַכְמָרָיו	אֱלֹהִים	writ. in MS. יְהוָה
יָחָד	יַחַד	עֵינֵי	עֵינָי
אֲנֹכִי	אָנֹכִי	נָפְשִׁי	נַפְשִׁי
Omitted in text	עַד	שָׁמְרֵנִי	9. שָׁמְרֵנִי
and added above the line.		פָּח	פַּח
אֶעֱבוֹר	אֶעֱבוֹר	וּמוֹקְשׁוֹת	וּמִקְשׁוֹת

PSALM XXVIII. כח

הַשֵּׁב	הָשֵׁב	אֵלֶיךָ	1. אֵלֶיךָ
לַהֶם	לָהֶם	תֶּחֱרַשׁ	תֶּחֱרַשׁ
יַבִּינוּ	5. יָבִינוּ	תֶּחְשֶׁה	תֶּחְשֶׁה
פְּעֻלּוֹת	פְּעֻלֹּת	וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי	וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי
מָעֲשֵׂה	מַעֲשֵׂה	תַּחֲנוּנָי	2. תַּחֲנוּנַי
יָדָיו	יָדָיו	אֵלֶיךָ	אֵלֶיךָ
יְהֶרְסֵם	יְהֶרְסֵם	בְּנוֹשְׂאִי	בְּנָשְׂאִי
תָּחֲנוּנָי	6. תַּחֲנוּנָי	יָדַי	יָדַי
עַזִּי	7. עֻזִּי	קָדְשֶׁךָ	קָדְשֶׁךָ
וּמָעֻזִּי	In our MS. וּמָגִנִּי	אַל	3. אַל
וְנֶעְזַרְתִּי	וְנֶעֱזַרְתִּי	וְעִם פְּעֲלֵי אָוֶן דִּבְרֵי שָׁלוֹם עִם	
וַיַּעֲלוֹ	וַיַּעֲלֵז	רֵעֵהֶם. This sentence is not in	
עֻזּוֹ	8. עֹז	the text but is added in the mar-	
לָנוּ	In our MS. לָמוֹ	gin in Rabbinical characters.	
הוֹשִׁיעָה	9. הוֹשִׁיעָה	וְרָעָה	וְרָעֵה
וּבָרֵךְ	וּבָרֵךְ	בִּלְבָבָם	בִּלְבָבָם
נַחֲלָתֶךָ	נַחֲלָתֶךָ	תֵּן	4. תֵּן
וְנַשְּׂאֵם	וְנַשְּׂאֵם	וּכְרוֹעַ	וּכְרֹעַ
עַד	עַד	מַעֲלָלֵהֶם	מַעַלְלֵהֶם
הָעוֹלָם	הָעוֹלָם	כְּמַעֲשֵׂה	כְּמַעֲשֵׂה
		לָהֶם	לָהֶם

PSALM XXXII. לב

בְּשַׁאֲנָתִי	3. בְּשַׁאֲנָתִי	פֶּשַׁע	1. פֶּשַׁע
יוֹמָם	4. יוֹמָם	חַטָּאָה	חַטָּאָה
וַלַּיְלָה	וָלַיְלָה	יַחְשֹׁב	2. יַחְשֹׁב

	עָלַי	עַלִי	לִיעַת	לִיעַת	
	יָדֶךָ	יַדֶךָ	מִצוא	מִצוא	
	קַיָן	קָיָן	לִישטָךְ	לִישטָךְ	
5.	וַעֲוֹנִי	וְעָוֹנִי	מַיִם	מָיִם	
	עֲלֵי	עָלִי	רַבִּים	רָבִים	
	פִּשָׁעַי	פִּשָׁעָי	יַגִיעוּ	יָגִיעוּ	
	חַטַאתִי	חָטָאתִי	אַתָה	אָתָה	7.
6.	יִתְפַּלֵל	יִתְפָּלֵל	סַתֵר	סָתֵר	
	אֵלֶיךָ	אֵלִיךָ	מִצַר	מִיצָר	

The last page of the MS. is so blurred that it was impossible to continue the notes to this Psalm.

TABULAR VIEW.

for ֵ 141 ֶ 13 ִ 2

for ֶ 13 ֵ 2

for ַ 90 ָ 24

for ֵ 13 ֶ 36

for ֶ 26

for ִ 47 ֵ 23 ֶ 9

for ִ 3 ֵ 6 ֶ 3

There are eighteen differences occurring once each.

Scriptiones plenæ, 56

Scriptiones defectivæ, 8

מלכים–משרתים.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF HEBREW GRAMMAR.

BY PROFESSOR DR. WILHELM BACHER,
Budapest, Hungaria.

In the May number of HEBRAICA (p. 64) Dr. Felsenthal says of the oldest ante-Qimḥi grammarians: "They called them the seven kings (מלכים), and the sh'wâ they called the servant (משרת)." This remark is based upon the common view that the appellation "kings" for vowels was used by the ancient Hebrew grammarians to mark the contrast with the "serving" sh'wâ. That this view is erroneous I have already shown in my work *Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, (Strassburg i. E., 1882) p. 61, Anm. 1. What I have stated there I will briefly repeat here and supplement this with some further considerations.

Already Ben Asher calls the vowels מלכים, cf. Digdugê ha-ṭ'amim, ed. Baer and Strack, § 10: והם שבעה מלכים בכ"ב מומלכים, "they (the vowels) are the seven kings, appointed as rulers over the twenty-two consonants." They are accordingly called "kings," because they are the lords of the consonants and the sounds giving them motion. M'naḥem b. Sarug, in the same sense, though not using the expression מלכים, says: ותכון המלה תחת ממשלתם והמה מושליה ואוחזיה, "the word is confirmed under their government, and they are its rulers and possessors." (Maḥbereth ed. Filipowski, p. 4a). According to M'naḥem then, the vowels are the rulers of the word; they determine its pronunciation and meaning; but at another place (l. c. p. 7b) he calls them "those set over the letters and their rulers: אלה האותיות . . . . . יש שוטרים עליהם ומושלים אותם." The same thing, although from another point of view, we find also in Dunash ben Labrât the opponent of M'naḥem, who in his anti-critique of the latter calls the vowels "the seven fathers of speech"—אבות המבטא שבעה (criticae vocum recensiones, p. 5). In Jehuda Hayyug, the founder of the new science of Hebrew grammar, there appears in the midst of the Arabic text the traditional Hebrew term שבעה מלכים (cf. my work über die grammatische Terminologie des...Hajjug [Wien, 1882], p. 18; also Derenbourg, Opuscules et Traités d'Aboul Walid, p. 274). But neither in him nor in Ibn Ġanâḥ is there the least indication that sh'wâ is considered as "serving" and the vowels, over against the sh'wâ, as "rulers." The contrast between מלכים and משרתים is known to the old grammarians in reference to the root-letters and function-letters. The former are called מלכים, the latter משרתים by Dunash ben Labrât, l. c. p. 5b, as also by his pupil Jehudî ben Shesheth, in his criticism of M'naḥem's pupils (Liber Responsiorum, ed. Stern, p. 28, l. 22) cf. Die grammatische Terminologie etc., p. 25, Anm. 2.

Joseph Qimḥi with whom a new theory of Hebrew vowels begins to assert itself, namely the division into five long and five short vowels, cannot emancipate himself entirely from the old terminology. His definition of sh'wâ begins with the following words: "Know that the sh'wâ is not a vowel by itself, and that it has not been made a ruler among the seven kings, for the glory of kingship was not bestowed upon it (דע כי השבא אינה תנועה בפני עצמה ולא המליכוה בשבעה מלכים כי לא נתן עליה הוד מלכות). I quote this passage from

the ספר הזכרון, from the manuscript copy kindly put at my disposal by Mr. S. J. Halberstam.

The sh'wâ then is for him also not yet a "servant" of the vowels; it is only not a king like them, simply because it is not a vowel. In Moses Qimḥi's short handbook מהלך שבילי הדעת no definition of the sh'wâ is found. David Qimḥi, however, says in his מכלול, in the beginning of the section on the sh'wâ (ed. Lyck, fol. 138 b; ed. Fürth, fol. 154 b), but without any reference to the term מלכים, "The sh'wâ is not a vowel, but serves the vowels." (השוא איננה תנועה אך היא משרתת התנועות). With this the term "servant" came to be used for the sh'wâ in the same degree as Qimḥi exerted an influence on the later grammarians. Benjamin ben Jehudâ, of Rome, who lived at the close of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries, says concerning the sh'wâ in his little work, which is often printed as an introduction to Moses Qimḥi's grammar (cf. the collection of דקדוקים, edited by Elia Levita, in Bomberg's printing officin, Venice, 1546): ואינה בעצמה תנועה רק היא משרת את התנועות" (probably משרת is to be read as feminine, as in 1 Kgs. i., 15, or to be emended into משרתת). Two hundred years later, Elia Levita, next to the Qimḥis the most influential grammarian, transferred the name of "kings," which formerly was the designation of the seven vowels in the old system, to the ten vowels of the new system, and he says in his grammar (which is partly metrical) פרקי אליה (in the collection of דקדוקים mentioned above) p. 55. b.

אלה מלכים העשרה המולכים בהברה
חמיש משרתות לחמיש קטון לגדול כשורה
אחד משרת לכלם וישמו שוא ולכך נברא

That is, of the ten kings, the five short ones serve the five long ones; but all are served by the sh'wâ set apart for this purpose. P. 58 a, of the same book we read of the sh'wâ: אשר נקרא משרת למלכים.

We will refer here only to Abraham Balmes, who in מקנה אברהם (Venice, 1523) introduces section three (שיער הנקודות), with a long explanation of the division of the vowels into מלכים and עבדים. Also Prophiat Duran (Efodi) may be referred to, who ascribes the use of the word מלכים for the seven vowels to Ibn Ezra (Ma'sé Efod, ed. Friedländer and Kohn, (Wien, 1865) p. 34, וכבר הניחו אותם מפני זה קצת החכמים שבעה וקרא אותם האבן עזרא מלכים להתנהג תנועת הסימנים על פיהם), but he still has the correct idea that the vowels are called kings "because the letters (סימנים = אותיות, as signs of the sounds, קולות) are governed by their command," i. e., just as Ben Asher expressed it, because the vowels govern the consonant signs.

I will improve this opportunity to refer also to an appellation of the seven vowels which is found in the Arabic commentary of Saadya on the book Jetsira, quoted in Derenbourg's *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 207. אלסבע נגמאת, the seven sounds. נגמה = Heb. נעימה has in other connections a musical meaning.

THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE.

BY PROF. E. KAUTZSCH, D. D.,
Tuebingen, Germany.

TRANSLATED FROM KAUTZSCH'S GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCH-ARAMÄISCHEN.
By Professor Charles R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.

§ 1. THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL ARAMAIC TO THE REMAINING SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

The Aramaic dialect occurring in a few sections of the Old Testament (Dan. II., 4b—VII., 28; Ezra IV., 8—VI., 18; VII., 12–26; Jer. X., 11, as well as in two words of Gen. XXXI., 47) is a member of the West-Aramaic group of dialects. The latter, together with the closely related East-Aramaic group, forms the Aramaic branch of the Shemitic, or more narrowly, of the North-Shemitic family of languages.

Concerning the ramification of the Shemitic family generally, cf.: *E. Renan*, histoire générale des langues sémitiques. 4. ed. Paris 1864; *Gesenius-Kautzsch*, hebr. Grammatik §§ 1, 2, and the literature there under § 1. No. 6; *B. Stade*, Lehrbuch der hebr. Gramm., Leipzig 1879, §§ 2–11 (with searching consideration of the later literature); *E. König*, histor.-krit. Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache, Leipzig 1881, § 3. Concerning the Aramaic in particular: *Th. Nöldeke*, "Aram" in *Schenkel's* Bibellexicon I, 229 sq., as well as in the "Ausland," for 1867, p. 778 sq. ("Namen und Wohnsitze der Aramäer") and in Ztschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft, Vol. XXV. (1871), p. 113 sq. ("Die Namen der aram. Nation und Sprache"); *Schrader*, "Aram" in *Riehm's* Hdwörterb. des Bibl. Alterthums, p. 79 sq.; *Volck*, "Aram" in *Herzog-Plitt's* Protestant. Realencyklopädie, 2. ed., I, 601 sq. (with copious references to the literature); *H. Strack*, Einleitung ins A. Test., in *Zöckler's* Handb. der theolog. Wissenschaften I, 191 sq. (Add to these: *David*, grammaire de la langue araméenne [in the Syriac language], Paris 1880; *R. Duval*, traité de grammaire syriaque. Paris 1881).

The above definition presupposes a division of the Shemitic dialects into (1) the Arabic-Ethiopic branch, as the South-Shemitic, as distinguished from (2) the North-Shemitic, including the other three chief-branches of the Shemitic family (the Canaanitic, the Aramaic and the Assyrian-Babylonian).

§ 2. GRADUAL EXTENSION OF THE WEST-ARAMAIC DIALECT.

The home of the West-Aramaic dialect was the territory between the upper Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea (with the exception of course of the Phœnician coast-line). This territory includes the regions South and South-West of Damascus, extending, therefore, as far as the boundaries of the kingdom of Israel (cf. 1 Sam. X., 6, concerning the conflict of David with the Aramæans of Beth-rehob, who, according to Judg. XVIII., 28, lived in the immediate neighborhood of Dan). In early times, however, the Aramaic began to advance further South and to dispossess the Canaanitic dialects (including Hebrew) until finally—about the middle of the second century B. C.—it became the common language of the country in Syria, Palestine and the adjacent countries on the East.

Detached points of contact with the Aramaic, not all borrowed directly therefrom, however, can be established even in pre-exilic books of the Old Testament composed on the soil of the Northern kingdom, certainly, e. g., in the Song of Solomon and in certain parts of Judges. A direct influence of Aramaic was doubtless opened by the deportations of Israelites spoken of in 2 Kgs. XV., 29 and XVII., 6 (734 and 722 B. C.); for after that, according to 2 Kgs., XVII., 24, (cf. also Ezra IV., 2, 10) the thoroughly depopulated land was occupied by colonists who had come in part from territory where Aramaic was spoken (e. g. Hamath).

In Judah, as far as we can judge, the written language was maintained, almost without Aramaic influence, until the close of the seventh century. It is shown by 2 Kgs. XVIII., 26, however (cf. Isa. XXXVI., 11), that toward the end of the eighth century (the occurrence relating thereto falls in the year 701) Aramaic was understood, at least by the principal men in Judah, and, consequently, already was a language of international trade, or, at any rate, of diplomacy. This fact is confirmed in the Aramaic legends which have been preserved (beside an Assyrian text) on tablets of clay, as well as on fragments from the ruins of Assyrian and Babylonian palaces (afterwards, also, on old Persian coins); cf. *Schrader*, ZDMG, 1872, p. 167, and the literature there; further, *Levy*, Gesch. der jüd. Münzen, Lpz., 1862, p. 147, sq.; *de Vogué*, Mélanges d'archéologie orientale. Paris, 1868, p. 193, sq.[1] The first direct influence of Aramaic on the Hebrew is to be found in Jeremiah[2] (cf. *Zimmer*, Aramaisme Jeremiani I, Halle, 1880), more certainly, and already of a grammatical sort, in Ezekiel; while the writers of the last part of the Exile (Isa. XIII., sq., XXXIV., XXXV., XL.—LXVI.) and shortly after the same (Haggai, Zechariah, and even Malachi and the memoirs of Nehemiah worked into the book of Nehemiah) are distinguished by a comparatively pure Hebrew. In the exilic and post-exilic parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, which formerly were designated as the Original Writing, or Elder Elohist (now as the Priests' Codex, or Q) the influence of Aramaic is shown more in the domain of lexicon than of grammar (cf. concerning this especially *Riehm*, in the Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken, 1872, p. 283, sq., and *V. Ryssel*, de Elohistæ Pentateuchici Sermone, Lpz., 1878, both holding fast to the pre-exilic composition of the Priest's Codex, though *Ryssel* especially, by his careful and profound investigations, has produced much evidence for the opposite view); *Giesebrecht* opposes *Ryssel* ("Zur Hexateuchkritik," in the Ztschr. f. die Alttest. Wissensch., 1881, p. 177, sq.) and his conclusions are modified again, in some particulars, by *Driver*, "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist" (in the Journal of Philology, Oct., 1882, p. 201, sq.). Still stronger is the Aramaic coloring in several post-exilic books; in particular, Chronicles, Esther and, to the most marked degree, in Koheleth and certain Psalms (cf. for Koheleth the commentaries of *Franz Delitzsch*, Lpz., 1875, p. 197, sq. and *C. H. Wright*, The Book of Koheleth, London, 1883, p. 488, sq.; concerning Books II.—V. of the Psalms, cf. *Giesebrecht*, "Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen," in Ztschr. f. die Alttest. Wissensch., 1881, p. 276, sq.).

§ 3. CONTEMPORANEOUS USE OF ARAMAIC AND HEBREW.

It is presupposed by documents in Ezra (IV., 8–22; V., 6–17; VI., 6–12; VII., 11–26) that, under the Persian supremacy, Aramaic was used in diplomatic intercourse with Western Asia. The fact, however, that the author of the present book of Ezra (toward the end of the fourth century B. C.), after giving the Aramaic documents (IV., 8, sq.), carries on his own narrative in Aramaic, and that the author of Daniel (about 167 B. C.), after the conversation between Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans (II., 4–11), continues, up to the end of chapter

---

[1] Of course we must not conclude from these Assy. Baby. parallels, with v. *Gutschmid* (Neue Beitraege zur Gesch. des alten Orients, Leipzig, 1876, p. 18, sq.) that the business world in Nineveh then spoke Aramaic and no longer understood the official [Assyrian] language. (As it is said to follow also, according to v. *Gutschmid*, from 2 Kgs. XVIII., 26, that a dialect of the Aramaic was the popular language in the territory of the Euphrates and the Tigris already in the eighth century). For the contrary cf. *Schrader*, Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung (Giessen, 1878), p. 62 sq.—Least of all may we conclude from the above facts that the Aramaic idiom naturalized in Palestine in the last centuries B. C. could only have been imported from Babylonia; cf. concerning that below § 6, 2.

[2] In this statement, we designedly leave out of consideration the Book of Job, as linguistically peculiar: besides unquestionable Aramaisms (such as the frequent כְּלִין and כֻּלְּהוֹן instead of the Hebrew דְּבָרִים) the book contains no less frequent points of contact with the Arabic store of words.

VII., in Aramaic, satisfactorily show that, at that time, both writers and readers must have been equally familiar with both dialects.

The above conclusion would still remain valid, if we had presupposed, with *Strack* (Einleitung ins A. T., p. 165), that, at least after Alexander the Great, there was an Aramaic book of the narratives of Daniel, which, at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was interwoven with the recently written book of visions. Similarly affirms v. *Orelli*, die Alttest. Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches (Wien, 1882), p. 515, sq. On the contrary, *Merx* ("Cur in libro Danielis juxta Hebræam Aramæa adhibita sit dialectus?" Hal., 1865) explains the occurrence of two languages in the book on the assumption that the Aramaic text was for the people, and the Hebrew for the learned men. In that case, however, the same would have to be affirmed of Ezra, which, in regard to the Hebrew chapters in that book, is impossible.—We here mention, further, the ingenious fancy which the so-called Græcus Venetus (ed. by *O. Gebhardt*, Lpz., 1875) realized in his translation of Daniel, by rendering the Hebrew parts into Attic, and the Aramaic into the Doric dialect.

§ 4. HEBREW SUPPLANTED, AS A LANGUAGE OF INTERCOURSE, BY ARAMAIC.

The actual dispossession of Hebrew, as the language of conversation, by Aramaic, must be dated from the end of the third century B. C.; previous to that an influence had been exerted, through the government of the Ptolemies and of the first Seleucidæ, in favor of Greek rather than Aramaic. For a time, two languages may have had sway, even in ordinary intercourse, as they do to-day upon the border of territories where different languages are spoken, until finally Hebrew was preserved only as the language of the schools, and, at last—perhaps after the last pre-Christian century—only as the language of worship. As late as the first century A. D., however, Hebrew as such was understood, even by the people, at least in Palestine. This can be proved by such passages as Luke IV., 17 sq.

That acquaintance with Aramaic on the part of the post-exilic colony at Jerusalem must take place, as it were, of itself is shown by a glance at the configuration of its territory. On the North, a population speaking Aramaic extended tolerably near to the gates of Jerusalem; in some places, the new Jewish settlers were evidently entirely surrounded by neighbors speaking Aramaic. Add to this the fact that, for the satisfaction of most their wants, the Jews were dependent upon foreign traders, with whom business could be transacted hardly otherwise than in the common language of the rest of Palestine; cf. Neh. XIII., 16, 20, according to which even Tyrians were then settled in Jerusalem, and other traders from abroad were accustomed to come to the city. That a common familiarity on the part of all the inhabitants of a district where two languages are spoken (even though they be quite different from each other) is possible, may be observed to-day in certain regions of Switzerland, Belgium (especially in Brussels) and elsewhere.

That Hebrew was understood for a long time after the decided victory of the Aramaic as the language of conversation, was due, on the one hand, to the zeal of the learned men and, on the other, to the significance of Hebrew as the sacred language of the entire people. The first is attested by the fact that much which is undeniably old in the language has been handed over to the post-biblical Hebrew. The exclusive use of Hebrew in the reading of the Old Testament is attested by the uniform Jewish tradition that, in the public use of Scripture, the most that was allowed, for a long time, was the oral interpretation of the same into Aramaic. From the latter fact, it might be explained how the hearers gradually became familiar with the Aramaic form of certain parts of the divine Word, as appears to follow from Matt. XXVII., 46 and Mark XV., 34 (cf. also *Reuss* Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. T., p. 723); but the demonstrative force of such passages as Luke IV., 17 sq., where there is not the least intimation of an interpretation after

the reading is not thereby annulled.[1] It is true that in the Mishna, the habitual interpretation of what is read appears presupposed, when, in Megilla IV., 4 the reader of the Law is directed to read no more than one verse to the translator, while three are permitted in the prophetical reading (cf. also IV., 6 regarding the reading and interpretation of the Law by minors, and IV., 10 concerning the parts which may be read indeed, but not translated). But it is another question whether this mode of procedure had arisen at the time of Jesus. We might decide certainly, only if we were accurately informed as to the nature of the "verses" (פְּסוּקִים) here intended and the date of their introduction. Just as little may we conclude with *Zunz* (gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 61 sq.) from the existence of a written Targum of Job about the middle of the first century and still older Targums of Esther and the Psalms, all of which are affirmed in the Talmud, that there was already a Targum of the Law on record. Cf. on this subject *Bleek-Wellh.* Einleitung ins A. Test., p. 606 and the citation there from the Jerusalem Talmud, in which it is forbidden to read the interpretation from a book. Concerning the (infrequent) prayers in the Aramaic language, as e. g. the so-called Qaddîš, originally "Concluding prayer after haggadic discourses in houses of mourning," cf. *Delitzsch*, Gesch. der jüd. Poesie, p. 136, Note.

§ 5. THE REMAINS OF THE WEST-ARAMAIC DIALECT.

Whether a pagan and profane literature ever existed in the West-Aramaic (or indeed in any Aramaic) language,[2] must remain undecided. The remains of West-Aramaic yet existing belong chiefly to the domain of Jewish (including Samaritan) religious writings. Here belong:

1. The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (cf. above § 1 and below § 7).

Whether any one of the so-called Apocryphal books of the Old Testament was composed originally in West-Aramaic, it is entirely impossible to show. Jerome

---

[1] Compare the very noteworthy treatment of this question by *Franz Delitzsch* in "The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society" (Leipzig, 1883), extracts from which (in Translation [German T.]) might be of interest in regard to other questions. It is said there on pp. 30, 31: "A friend of mine does not cease to entreat me to translate the New Testament into the Aramaic idiom which was spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles; that is, into the language of the Palestinian Talmud and the Palestinian Targums. But his desire rests on an illusion. The Hebrew remained even after the Exile the language of Jewish literature. The Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach was written in Hebrew, as its fragments in the Talmud show. The original of the first book of Maccabees and of the so-called Psalter of Solomon was Hebrew. The inscriptions on coins, the epitaphs, the liturgic prayers were Hebrew. The form of the laws was Hebrew, as appears from their codification in the Mishna, also the book, in which, as Papias says, Matthew had collected the sermons of the Lord, was written ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ. It is true, that in that time ἑβραϊστί and χαλδαϊστί [? cf. concerning this below § 6, 1, Rem.] were not accurately distinguished. Nevertheless it is quite unlikely that Matthew wrote in Aramaic; for the Aramaic dialect of Palestine—which in the Talmud is called כורסי....—was the language of daily life, the vulgar language, in which the people and also the learned were wont to converse and to hold controversies, but ἡ ἑβραὶς διάλεκτος, in which St. Paul was accosted by the exalted Savior, Acts xxvi., 14, and in which he himself addressed the people of Jerusalem, Acts xxi., 40; xxii., 2, [cf. below § 6, 3] was the holy language, the language of the temple worship, of synagogical and domestic prayer; of all formulas of benediction, of the traditional law; further, the parables, the animal fables, the lamentations for the dead in the Talmuds and Midrashim are mostly Hebrew; the holy language continued to be the language of the higher form of speech, even the popular proverbs were only partly Aramaic. Josephus stating in the preface of his work on the Jewish war, that his narrative was originally drawn up for his compatriots of inner Asia in the common mother-tongue, certainly means the Hebrew, not the Aramaic language. Knowledge of Hebrew was then, as now, universal among the educated of the nation. Aramaic, on the contrary, was understood only by a small portion of the Diaspora [Dispersion T.] Therefore it would be a useless attempt to translate the New Testament into the Palestinian Sursi. The Shemitic woof of the New Testament Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic. Our Lord and his apostles thought and spoke [?] for the most part in Hebrew."

[2] Renan (Histoire generale, p. 259) regards this as at least probable.

(see the proof passages in *E. Schuerer's* article, "Apokryphen des A. Test." in *Herzog's* protest. Real-Encykl. I², p. 491 sq.) names the books of Tobit and Judith as composed Chaldaico sermone (i. e. West Aramaic) and translated them from this idiom into Latin, but that by no means shuts out the conclusion (which in the case of Judith is almost indubitable, cf. *Schuerer* p. 505 and in other places), that the actual original of both texts was Hebrew, the Aramaic text consequently itself a translation. (For the more recent discussions of this controversy, occasioned by *Ad. Neubauer's* issue of an Aramaic text of the book of Tobit from a Bodleian MS., Oxford 1878, see in my report of O. T. studies of 1878 in the "Wissenschaftlichen Jahresbericht der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch." [Leipzig 1881], p. 23; *Graetz* declares himself in favor of a modern Hebrew original of Tobit. See his essays on "The Book of Tobit" etc. in "Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wissensch. des Judenth." 1879, p. 145 sq.). Likewise the Aramaic proverbs of Sirach, which have been handed down to us, partly in Talmudic citations and partly as a compilation by themselves (as the so-called "small Sirach" or "Alphabet of the son of Sirach" in connection with an alphabet of the Hebrew proverbs of Sirach) prove nothing against a Hebrew original of the Greek book of Sirach. These proverbs are, rather, in part translations of Hebrew matter, in part independent additions of a later compiler; cf. *Delitzsch*, zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie (Leipzig 1836, p. 20 sq.), *L. Dukes*, Rabbinische Blumenlese (Leipzig, 1844), p. 31 sq., and especially p. 67 sq. (where may be found more details concerning the literature of these proverbs); according to the text of *Paul Fagius* (Isny, 1542) *Dukes* gives here twenty-three Aramaic proverbs of Sirach (besides forty-two Hebrew ones).

2. Detached Words and Clauses in the New Testament and in the writings of Josephus.

The samples of the language of intercourse in Palestine at the time of Jesus and the apostles, which appear occasionally in the N. T., would of themselves be sufficient to contradict any fables which have arisen concerning the idiom spoken by them. Cf. with regard to this *Reiske*, de lingua vernacula Jesu Christi, Jen. 1670, and particularly *de Rossi*, dissertazioni della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da tempi Maccabei in disamina del sentimento di un recente scrittore Italiano, Parma, 1772.'4. By the latter is meant the Neapolitan *Domin. Diodati* and his book de Christo Graece loquente (Neap. 1767). Further: *H. F. Pfannkuche* "Ueber die palästinische Landessprache in dem Zeitalter Christi und der Apostel, ein Versuch, zum Theil nach *de Rossi* entworfen" in *Eichhorn's* Allgem. Bibliothek der bibl. Litter. Vol. VIII. (1798) 3, p. 365 sq. *H. E. G. Paulus*, verosimilia de Judaeis Palaestinensibus, Jesu etiam atque apostolis, non aramaica dialecto sola, sed graeca quoque aramaisante locutis. Jena 1803. *Winer*, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms § 3 (Hebrew-Aramaic coloring of the N. T. diction; with many references to the older literature). *Franz Delitzsch* "Ueber die palästinische Volkssprache, welche Jesus und seine Jünger geredet haben" in the year 1874, No. 27 of the "Daheim" (also in the Zeitschrift "Saat auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 195 sq.); *the same*, "Traces of the vernacular tongue in the gospels" in the "Hebrew Student" (Chicago), Nov., 1882, p. 81 sq.; Dec., p. 104 sq.; Sept., 1883, p. 1, sq. Concerning the bad pronunciation of the Galileans indicated in Matt. XXVI., 73, Mark XIV., 70 (Acts II., 7), which appeared especially in the complete ignoring of gutturals, cf. the Talmudic proofs in *Wetstein*, Nov. Test., on Matt. XXVI., 73; *Meuschen*, Nov. Test. ex Talmude etc. illustratum (Lipz. 1736) p. 119. The reproach was raised in particular with reference to the Galilean pronunciation of Hebrew.

Below we give an alphabetical list[1] of the samples of Palestinian Aramaic found in the N. T. with the addition of the most important witnesses, namely, the Codex Sinaiticus [S], Alexandrinus [A], Vaticanus [B], Ephraeme Syri [C], Cantabrig. [D]; WH signifies the readings which are adopted in the critical edition of *Westcott* and *Hort* (London 1881), Tisch. the readings of the editio octava critica major of *Tischendorf*.

[1] This list, sifted critically, seemed so much the more necessary, as, up to to-day, not only in the New Testament commentaries, but also in the excellent Clavis novi test. of *W. Grimm*, many errors and inaccuracies in reference to these words have been dragged along.

A. Single Appellatives and Proper Names.

Ἀββᾶ (Tisch., on the contrary WH *ἀββά*; the same fluctuation regarding the accentuation of final *α* of the so-called Emphatic state is seen elswhere—cf. below *γαββαθᾶ*, *γολγοθᾶ*, *μαμωνᾶ*—although properly speaking, only the circumflex is justifiable[2] = אַבָּא *ὁ πατήρ*, Mark XIV., 36 and elsewhere.

Ἀκελδαμάχ (so WH with B; on the contrary Tisch. *ἀχελδαμάχ* with S A. In favor of *ακ*, against *αχ* however is also *ακελδαιμαχ* of codex D and *ακελδαμα* of codex E, i. e. Laudianus Oxoniensis; cf. the same difference, in the transcription of ק, below in *σαβαχθανεί* = שְׁבַקְתָּנִי and in *ῥακα*) = חַקַל דְּמָא *χωρίον αἵματος* Acts I., 19.—*ακελ* (for *ακαλ*) is probably due simply to the influence of *λ* upon the preceding vowel, *δαμα* for *δεμα* to the inclination elsewhere shown to conform the sound of the Sh'wâ mobile to that of the following vowel; cf. *Gesenius-Kautzsch*, hebr. Gramm. § 10, 1, 2), Rem. and the literature in Note 3).—*Δαμάχ* instead of *δαμά* (so cod. E) reminds us of *Σειράχ* = סִירָא. If the Greeks here actually heard such a sharp sound, why not in similar cases? or must we conclude that there was a misunderstanding of the writing דמה, סירה, if not even that דמח occurred as an error of the copyist? Concerning the addition of *κ* (e. g. *Σαραδακ*, Num. XXXIV., 8 = צְרָדָה), elsewhere of *δ*, *θ*, *μ*, *ν*, *σ* to final vowels in the Septuagint cf. *Frankel*, Vorstudien zu den LXX. (Leipzig 1841), p. 97 sq.

Βαραββᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος, Βαριησοῦς, Βαριωνᾶ, Βαρνάβας, Βαρσαββᾶς, Βαρτιμαῖος, all proper names compounded with בַּר *son*.

Βεεζεβούλ (so WH Matt. X., 25; XII., 24; Mark III., 22; Luke XI., 15, 18 sq. with S B while A C D [also S in Mark III., 22] present Βεελζεβούλ, the reading adopted by Tisch.; the suppression of the *λ* in the popular pronunciation, however, would be scarcely striking) = בְּעַל זְבוּל (not בַּעַל as even Grimm has it). Now זְבוּל is certainly not equal to the modern Hebrew זֶבֶל *dung*, but only the signification *dwelling* can be supported. In spite of this, the meaning of Βεελζ. as "*Master of the dwelling*, or *of the kingdom*" (so e. g. *Meyer* on Matt. X. 25, who finds a confirmation of this empty appellation in the preceding *οἰκοδεσπότης*) is to be rejected. Zebûl is rather a modification of zebûb (cf. בְּעַל זְבוּב 2 Kgs. I., 2 and elsewhere), although in this modification may have co-operated not merely convenience of pronunciation (so *Baudissin*, art. "Beelzebub" in Herzog's PRE[1]), but also the thought of זֶבֶל *dung*, זְבוּל *dunging* (and also the *offering of idolatrous sacrifices!*).

Βηθεσδά (more correctly, according to what was remarked under *ἀββᾶ—δᾶ*) = בֵּית חִסְדָּא, *House of Grace*, is the reading of A C in John V., 2; for חִסְדָּא (instead of the elsewhere usual חַסְדָּא) one need not appeal to the Syriac chesdā: reference to the Biblical-Aramaic חֶלְמָא *dream* is sufficient. On the contrary Tisch. and WH according to cod. Sin. have adopted *βηθζαθά* (WH place *βηθσαιδα* in the margin, as the reading of B). In the appendix p. 76, WH express the opinion that both readings (of S and B) are perhaps only bad

---

[1] Cf. *de Lagarde*, gesammelte Abhandlungen (Leipzig, 1866), p. 39, Note: "I always change the accents of foreign words according to my judgment; in 1 Cor., XVI., 22, one must write *μαράν ἀθά*, or renounce the reputation of being an intelligent man." This accentuation for אֲבָא, and similar words restored without doubt the actual tone as it existed in the living language, but it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that, when the penult is closed (not merely sharpened) the accent is carried over as paroxytone, cf. *πάσχα*, *Μάρθα*; properly speaking *σίκερα* also is clearly for *σίκρα* (שִׁכְרָא). Do these examples rest upon an accommodation to the Greeks and Romans, or may we derive from them a law (the accentuation of a closed penult before an open ultima), which afterwards had been entirely ignored by Jewish tradition? It is to be remarked, moreover, that, contrary to the above, in Jos. Antiq., 3, 7, 1 *χαναίας* (כְּנַנְיָא) and 3, 10, 16 *ἀσαρθά* (עֲצַרְתָּא), appear to be transferred.

modifications of the same name, whose correct form is probably *βηθζαιθά* [בית זיתא *House of Olives*]; nevertheless *βηθσαιδά* equalling בֵּית צַיְדָא (cf. the local name in John I., 45) *place of fishery* is not impossible.

Βοανηργές (so Tisch. and WH with S A B C) is explained in Mark III., 17 by *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*. The word offers, however, manifold difficulty. That *βοανη* is impure pronunciation for בְּנֵי, which the uncultivated Galileans spoke for בְּנֵי (so e. g. *Bretschneider* in his Lexicon novi testamenti), is a monstrous assumption; not much better is the assertion, which *Lightfoot*, appealing to *Broughton*, has made current (Horae hebr. on Mark III., 17), that the Jews had always pronounced sh'wâ as *oa*, e. g. *noabhyim* for נְבִיאִים and that hence *Strabo* writes *Μοασαδα* for Masada [מְצָדָא ?]. As little does רְגֵשׁ mean *thunder*, but *a noisy crowd of people* and the Aram. רְגוּשׁ and רְגוּשׁ is *rustling*, *noise*, not *thunder*. *Jerome* is right in demanding for the meaning "son of thunder" *Benereem* (בְּנֵי רְעֵם, commonly, to be sure, רַעַם). It is another question, however, whether *Jerome* (on Dan. I., 8) on this account has a right to affirm: "Non ut plerique putant Boanerges, sed emendatius legitur Benereem," especially as he himself on Matt. X., 4 explains the name boanerges "ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei."[1] It appears to me in every way most probable that רְגַז (רְגִיז) *anger*, *angry impetuosity*, rather than רְגֵשׁ, is contained in the word, and it is conceivable that this might be expressed by *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*. Or are we to assume with *Delitzsch* (Saat auf Hoffnung 1874, p. 208) a peculiar provincialism?

Γαββαθᾶ (Tisch.; WH *γαββαθά*, cf. above on *ἀββᾶ*) John XIX., 13 = גַּבְּתָא (emph. state of גַּבָּא *hill*, which is fem. of גַּב). Concerning the transcription of sh'wâ by *a* cf. above *ἀκελδαμάχ*.

Γολγοθᾶ (so Tisch.; WH *γολγοθά*) with S A B D in Matt. XXVII., 33; for the elision of the ל cf. above under *βεελζεβούλ*; according to *Levy*, neuhebr. und chald. Wörterbuch, the pronunciation גֻּלְגַּלְתָּא as emph. state of גֻּלְגֻּלְתָּא had been usual. In the Syriac gāgultā, the first *l* is elided and compensated by lengthening the vowel.

Ἐφφαθά (WH and Tisch.) Mark VII., 34 with the best witnesses (S[3] D *ἐφφεθα*, which would point to אֶתְפֶּתַח) = אֶתְפַּתַּח *open thyself!* It is true that the Pattaḥ under פ could be for the purpose of conforming sh'wâ to the full vowel (see above on *ἀκελδαμαχ*) and the form consequently could be Ethp'el; but in favor of Ethpa'al is the fact, that this form anyway is in use as passive to פְּתַח, and not less, that the Targum on Is. XLII., 7 expresses the opening of the eyes by Pa'il. With regard to *θ* for ת (with Dag.) cf. *γολγοθα*. Since moreover this Imperative, properly speaking, can refer only to the eyes, we must ask whether originally אֶתְפַּתַּחוּ (with a suppression of the unaccented final vowel in Syr. fashion; cf. below *κουμ* in Mark V., 41) was not intended.

Κῆφας John I., 43 and elsewhere כֵּיפָא, emph. state of כֵּיף *rock*.

Λεγιών Mark V., 9 with S B C D, the Latin *legio*, but probably first by accommodation of the Aramaic לְגִיוֹן.

Μαμωνᾶ (so Tisch.; WH *μαμωνά*, see above on *ἀββᾶ*) = מָמוֹנָא emph. state of מָמוֹן. The etymology is uncertain; for the writing מָאמוֹנָא (so Grimm) rests upon the very doubtful derivation from אמן (= object of confidence). The root מון, assumed by *Levy*, (= מני, מנה *to allot*) does not exist.

---

[1] Did *Jerome* have *ἐνεργής* in mind? We can suppose a great deal in his case!

De Lagarde, Gött. gel. Anz., 1884, p. 278, refers *μαμωνας* to מיעמון, whose stem יעמן corresponds to the Arabic ضمن; מיעמון weakens to מיאמון, which is authenticated in one instance, became מימון or ממון, in a way similar to the change of יאמר finally to יאמר.

Μάρθα (cf. for the accentuation the Note under *ἀβββᾶ*) Luke X., 38 and elsewhere = מָרְתָא *the mistress*, emph. state from מָרְא, the fem. of מָר *lord*.

Μεσσιάς John I., 42 and elsewhere = מְשִׁיחָא emph. state from מְשִׁיחַ *anointed* (Hebr. מָשִׁיחַ); for the transcription, *Nöldeke* reminds us of Ιεσσαί for יִשַׁי.

Πάσχα (cf. for the accentuation the Note under *ἀβββᾶ*) Matt. XXVI., 2, elsewhere = פַּסְחָא emph. state of פַּסַח, which would correspond to the Hebrew פֶּסַח; Jewish tradition, on the contrary, demands פִּסְחָא to which the Syr. peschā also corresponds.

Ῥαββουνί (so Tisch. Mark X., 51 and John XX., 16 with S A C; on the contrary WH *ῥαββουνεί* with B; far more badly attested is the reading *ῥαββονί*, although in John XX., 16, D also presents *ῥαββωνεί*) *my Lord*. The vocalization is surprising, for all other tradition knows only the forms רַבָּן and רִבּוֹן. Is *ῥαββουνί* also a Galilean provincialism?

Ῥακά (so WH Matt. v. 22 with S^2 B, on the contrary Tisch. *ῥαχά* with S^1 D; cf. for this vacillation in the transcription of ק what was said above on *ακελδαμαχ*. according to what was remarked on *ἀββᾶ*, the word must be accented *ῥακᾶ*); The word is not emph. state from רֵיק, but abbreviation from רֵיקָן *empty*, as יוֹחָנָא (proper name) from יוֹחָנָן. The vocalization is again surprising.

Σατανᾶς Matt. IV., 10 and elsewhere, emph. state of סָטָן; the form *σατᾶν* adopted by *Grimm*, with the Textus Receptus, 2 Cor. XII., 7, is only attested by S^3 A^2 D^2 and 3.

Σίκερα (cf. for the tone under *ἀββᾶ*) Luke I., 15 = שִׁכְרָא, emph. state of a presupposed שִׁכַר (not however directly for the Hebrew שֵׁכָר as *Grimm* states).

Ταβειθά (more correct would be again *—θᾶ*) so WH Acts IX., 36 with B C, on the contrary Tisch. Ταβιθά with S A (cf. concerning the vacillation between *ι* and *ει* above in *ῥαββουνι*) = טַבְיְתָא emph. state of טַבְיָא *δορκάς* (cf. Hebrew צְבִי). That instead of ṭabhy'tha people spoke ṭabhitha with a resolution of the consonant Yodh, or to the Greek ear appeared so to speak, is not improbable; on the contrary, the form טַבִיתָא, with which *Grimm* identifies *ταβιθά*, is rather Syriac (cf. below at *ταλιθα*).[1]

I am reminded by *Siegfried's* Miscellanea II., 10 (in *Hilgenfeld's* Ztschr. f. wissensch. Theol. XXVII., 3, p. 358 sq.) that, after *ταβειθα*, *ωσαννα* (in Matt. XXI., 9 and other passages) should have been established. Cf. *Siegfried* in the passage cited: "In the New Test. Commentaries, as far as we have observed, Ὡσαννά is reduced to the הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא of Ps. CXVIII., 25 (cf. also Grimm, Lex. N. T. 1879, p. 473ᵃ). No doubt this was the passage intended, but the form *ὡσαννά* can not be identified with נָא ה". As follows from Elias Levita's exposition in his Sefer Tisbi, the word is the Greek rendering of an abbreviated pronunciation of that petition, הוֹשַׁע-נָא, with which may be compared أَعْشُنَا in Payne Smith, Thes. Syr. T. I., 1879, p. 1639." In a Note *Siegfried* says: "Since writing the above, my attention having been called to *Hilgenfeld*, Nov. test. extra canon. receptum, fasc. IV., p. 26, I see that others also have taken exception to the derivation of *ὡσαννά* from the form in Biblical Hebrew, and that *Anger* with *Hilgenfeld's* approval has referred to the Aramaic

[1] Levy in the neuheb. W B writes טַבִּירָא and explains this from the Arabic *Sabbîjjat* maid, girl (!), citing in addition to his own opinion *Fleischer*, who set the matter right already in a remark to *Levy's* Chald. WB ueber die Targumim (I., 439), with the formula "according to F. &c."!

אוישענא. There appears to be no doubt, therefore, as to the correctness of such an explanation." Cf. with this also *Hilgenfeld* (Evangeliorum secundum Hebraeos, etc. quae supersunt, Lips. 1884, p. 25), who gives the meaning *serva nos*, and appeals to *A. Merx* for the same.

As a characteristic of the popular language of that time, we may mention the striking abbreviations of many names, such as *Jose* for Joseph, *Lazaros* (לַיְעָזַר) for אֶלְעָזָר, מַתַּי (from which Matthaios, Matthäus) for מַתִּתְיָה, *Salome* for שְׁלֹמִית and others; cf. *Delitzsch*, in the place mentioned, p. 206 sq.

B. Aramaic Sentences.

In Matt. XXVII., 46, Jesus cites from Psalm XXII., 2, according to WH, Ἐλωί, ἐλωι (so S, B on the contrary ἐλωει, A ηλι, D ηλει, hence Tisch. ἡλεί) λεμὰ (S B; more correct would be, moreover, again λεμᾶ) σαβαχθανεί (S A; B has σαβακτανει, cf. above on ακελδ. and βακα); the same in Tisch. leaving ἡλεί out of account. This would be accordingly אֱלָהִי א לְמָא שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, in which of course the Hebrew, אֱלָהִי (instead of the Aramaic, אֱלָהִי) before the Aramaic, ל' ש is very striking, since elsewhere, the pronunciation of ā like ō can not be established; on σαβ, for שְׁבַ cf. above under ακελδαμαχ. Of the oldest Uncials, only D gives the citation in Hebrew: ηλει, ηλει, λαμα ζαφθανει (= עֲזַבְתָּנִי). This reading is adopted by WH in the margin and, in the Appendix p. 21, is designated as "Western" (Gr. Lat.); probably it is an attempt to reproduce the Hebrew as distinguished from the Aramaic forms. In the parallel passage

Mark XV., 34, S A B C give ελωι (hence WH ἐλωί, Tisch. ἐλωΐ), next S C λεμὰ (so also Tisch., on the contrary WH with B D give λαμὰ, although this in Aramaic would be לְמָא *nothing*); finally, σαβαχθανεί (so WH and Tisch.) with S^3 C; S^1 σαβακτανει, as in Matthew, on the contrary D again ζαφθανει, which also has got into the twisted reading of B (ζαβαφθανει).

According to this condition of things, the oldest tradition appears to be that the verse was cited by Jesus in Aramaic, and indeed with אֱלָהִי at the beginning; for ελωι, testifies moreover the circumstance that it agrees far less with the play upon Elias which was united with it than ηλι or ηλει. *De Lagarde* GGA, 1882, p. 329, finds in all this a proof of early and systematic corrections in the N. T. text.

Mark V., 41: ταλιθὰ (more correct would be once more —θᾶ, as well as κοῦμ afterwards) Tisch. with S A C (WH ταλειθά with B) κούμ (so WH and Tisch. with S B C; on the contrary A D κουμι). Ταλιθά is nevertheless again (cf. above in ταβιθα) not equal to טְלִיתָא (so *Grimm*), which would be Syriac, still less to טְלִיתָא (*Meyer*), but, properly speaking, to טַלְיְתָא, fem. of טַלְיָא *juvenis*. The best attested reading κούμ points to the suppression of the toneless final vowel in pronunciation, as in Syriac.

1 Cor. XVI., 22: μαρὰν ἀθά (better ἀθᾶ, cf. above on ἀββᾶ) WH and Tisch. according to all old witnesses: *our Lord is coming*, (or *has come*, see Appendix. T.) i. e. not מָרָנָא אֲתָה (*Grimm*), with the confluence of the *a* of both words when these words were combined (μαρανα θα), [but probably מָרָן אָ, as the form also sounds in Syriac; it is not in consistent with that, that in fact מרנא was written (cf. Bib. Aram. נָא; perhaps more correctly נָא), the toneless final vowel being suppressed in pronunciation.

Concerning the traces of the West-Aramaic dialect in Josephus, cf. *B. de Rossi* in the work already mentioned p. 55 sq.; *Pfannkuche* p. 459 sq. (both needing sifting); *Bleek*, Einl. ins A. Test., 3. ed., p. 54 sq. Concerning the influence which West-Aramaic exercised upon Josephus in his use of the Old Testament, an essay in *Joh. David Michaelis'* oriental. und exeget. Bibliothek V. (1773), p. 221 sq. contains something.

3. The so-called Targums or Translations of the Old Testament. The most important are: The Targum on the Pentateuch ascribed to *Onkelos* and the Targum to the prophets named after *Jonathan ben Uzziel*. There exist still, in addition to these, two Targums to the Pentateuch, called Jerusalem I., or Targum of Pseudo-*Jonathan* and Jerusalem II.; the latter is preserved only in fragments, or originally, was only a collection of Glosses belonging to an older Targum, a remodeled form of which lies before us in *Pseudo-Jonathan* (so *Geiger*, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, Breslau, 1857, p. 455). On the Hagiographa also (except Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel) there are Targums by different, some of them by very late, hands. The foundation may have been laid for the older Targums (*Onkelos*, *Jonathan*) as early as in the first century B. C., since, at the reading of the Scriptures in the Synagogues, single words and expressions which were no longer understood (see above, § 4) were to be orally interpreted by so-called מְתֻרְגְּמָנִים, or Translators. Nevertheless, the process of fixing these interpretations in writing, and the gradual extension of them unto whole books continued for centuries, and was first brought to a comparative conclusion in the Babylonian Schools of the fourth century A. D. On the other hand, the final compilation of Pseudo-Jonathan was not earlier than the seventh century, and other Targums were still later. Even to-day we are far from having a critically-sifted consonant-text of the Targums, to say nothing of a unified and in a measure plausible vocalization.

Concerning the Targums generally, cf. the introductions to the O. T., especially *Bleek-Wellhausen*, p. 287 sq., and *Strack*, in *Zöckler's* Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften I., 172 sq. (with abundant and careful references to the literature); further *Volck*, Art. "Thargumim" in *Herzog's* PRE,[1] 1862, Vol. XV.; *Th. Nöldeke*, die alttestam. Literatur (Leipzig, 1868), p. 255 sq.; *Schuerer*, neutestam. Zeitgeschichte (Leipzig, 1874), p. 475 sq., likewise with abundant specifications of the literature; *Weber*, System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie (Leipzig, 1880), p. xi.–xix. A survey of the editions of the Targums is given by *Petermann*, porta chaldaica, ed. II. (Berlin, 1872), p. 82 sq. Noteworthy "Bemerkungen über die Vocalization der Targume" are given by Merx in the Abhandlungen des Berliner Orientalistencongresses, I., 142 sq.

4. Single sentences of the Mishna, the Gemaras of the so-called Jerusalem Talmud and detached traces in the Babylonian Talmud and the Midraschim.

For finding one's way in regard to the Mishna and the Talmuds in general, we refer here only to the excellent survey in *Schuerer's* Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte, p. 37 sq. In the Bab. Talmud, the Tractat *Nedarim* approaches the West-Aramaic idiom, and, in certain peculiarities, the Tractat *Nazir* also; cf. *Luzzatto*, Gramm. der bibl.-chald. Sprache und des Idioms des Thalmud Babyli (German by Krüger, Bresl., 1873), p. 54. There belongs here, from the Midrash-literature, the *Megillath Ta'anith*, or book of fasts cited already in the Mishna: cf. *Schuerer*, p. 54; *Strack*, art. "Midrasch" in Herzog's PRE[2], Vol. IX., 759; *Braun*, "Entstehung und Werth der Meg. Taanit" " in the Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth., 1876, p. 375 sq., 410 sq., 445 sq.

5. The Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch. This was probably composed in the first century A. D., though the final compilation, as far as we can speak of such a thing, may have been delayed until the fifth or sixth century. Besides this, there have been preserved only scanty remains of the Samaritan-Aramaic, in liturgies and songs.

This Aramaic *Translation* of the Pentateuch must not be confounded with the Samaritan Recension of the *Hebrew* Pentateuch. For the literature on the Samaritan Targum and the linguistic character of the same, cf. *Kautzsch*, art.

"Samaritaner" in Herzog's PRE.² Vol. XIII. (1884), especially p. 349 sq. In this place, also, it may be permitted to remind the reader emphatically, that every judgment of the Samaritan-Aramaic dialect based upon the editions of the Targum which have hitherto appeared, must fall necessarily into the gravest errors. This is true, alas, of the expensive Pentateuchus Samaritanus of *H. Petermann* (Fasc. I. Genesis, Berol. 1872; II. Exodus, 1882; III. Leviticus, 1883, the last edited by *C. Vollers*), after that, *Kohn* ("Zur Sprache, Litteratur und Dogmatik der Samaritaner," p. 103 sq. and 206 sq.) had proved conclusively that the usual assumption of peculiar (so-called Caucasian) roots and words in Samaritan-Aramaic, rests solely upon such a corruption of the MSS. of the Targum, as is incredible: according to *Kohn*, we possess, of the original Targum, perhaps only a few fragments (a relatively pure text is given only in the Petersburg fragments edited by Kohn, p. 215 sq., in the fragments of a Samaritan Targum, which *Nutt*, London, 1874, issued from a codex of the Bodleian Library and one of the Cambridge City Library, and, finally, in the "Pessach-Haggadah" edited by Kohn, on p. 1 sq., from a codex belonging to *Franz Delitzsch*). The original Samaritan—leaving out of account, perhaps, a somewhat large admixture of Hebraisms, as well as of Greek and Latin words—is as good as identical with the Palestine-Aramaic otherwise known to us.

6. The Written Remains of Aramaic on Stone and Papyrus, which originated (at least in the majority of cases) with Jews in Egypt.

Cf. *Gesenius*, scripturæ linguæque Phœniciæ monumenta, I. 226 sq.; III. tab. 4 (Alphabet) and tab. 29–33. Concerning the written characters cf. *Euting*, in the large table of characters in *Chwolson's* Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum (Petersb., 1882), col. 10–16, according to inscriptions dating from 482 to about 100 B. C.—The most important monuments of this kind were lately published by the Palæographical Society, Oriental Series, and they are; Part II. Table XXV. and XXVI., Papyrus CVI. of the British Museum (from the collection belonging formerly to the Duke of *Blacas*), with a description by *Wright* and *Nöldeke*, and the literature down to 1877. According to these men, this document dates from the last part of the Ptolemaic, or the earlier Roman period, composed either by a pagan Aramæan, or (more probably) by an Egyptian Jew, as a sort of Haggada to Exod. I. The Aramaic is strongly alloyed with Phœnician and Hebrew.—Further, Part V., Table LXIII., the column found in 1877, at Sakkara, now in the Royal Museum at Berlin, which represents a libation before Osiris, and bears a parallel Egyptian-Aramaic inscription, dating from the fourth year of Xerxes (482 B. C.); cf. *Lepsius*, concerning eine ägyptisch-aram. Stele, Ztschr. für ägypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, XV. (1877), p. 127 sq.; *Lauth*, ägypt.-aram. Inschriften, Report of the Session of the Munich Academy, 1878, I., philosophical-histor., class II., p. 97 sq. and 148; *Prætorius*, ZDMG XXXV., 442 sq.—Table LXIV: the celebrated stone with a four-line inscription, which is now kept in the Museum at Carpentras, in Southern France, and represents, above the inscription, a female mummy, and over this an adoration before Osiris. According to *Lepsius* and others, the stone belongs to the time of the Ptolemies; according to *Clermont-Ganneau* (see below) these Egypt.-Aram. monuments belong to the time of the Persian dominion over Egypt, i. e., 527–405, or 340–332, when Aramaic was the official language in Egypt; and the person named Taba upon the stone was daughter of a Persian officer and native Aramæan who had married an Egyptian woman. [If so, it is true that Hebraisms such as אִישׁ and קָחִי await an explanation]. Discussion over the stone has lately become animated again, since *Schlottmann* (ZDMG XXXII., 187 sq. and 767 sq.; XXXIII., 252 sq.) supposed that metre and rhyme are to be found upon the same; cf. *Halevy*, ibid., XXXII., 206 sq.; *de Lagarde*, Nachrichten der Gött. gel. Ges., 1878, p. 357 sq. (also Symmicta, II., 56 sq. and 79 sq.) Of further documents, we mention the inscription upon a vase of the temple of Serapis, now in the Louvre (cf. *Levy*, ZDMG XI., 65 sq.; *Merx*, ibid., XXII., 693 sq.; *Prætorius*, ZDMG, XXXV., 442; *Clermont-Ganneau*, Rev. Crit., 1883, No. 21, p. 415 sq.); for the Egyptian-Aramaic inscriptions generally, cf. *Clermont-Ganneau*, origine perse des monuments araméens d'Egypte, Rev. archéolog., vol. 36, p. 93 sq. and 37, p. 21 sq. (also separately, Paris, 1880).

Of extra-Jewish origin are:

7. The Palmyrene Inscriptions found in the ruins of Tadmor (Palmyra) and for the most part bi-lingual (Aram.-Greek).

Facsimiles of these inscriptions were given first by *R. Wood*, The Ruins of Palmyra (London 1753; see the older literature in *de Wette-Schrader*, Einl. ins A. T., p. 79); in later times: *Levy* ZDMG XV., 615 sq. and XVIII., 65 sq., where nineteen inscriptions are given, dating from 396-578 of the Seleucidan era (85–267 A. D.); an addition thereto ibid. Vol. XIX., 314 and XXIII., 282 sq.; further in Count *de Vogue's* Syrie centrale (Paris 1868 sq.), as well as in extract 5 of the Journal asiat. 1883; more than all however by *Euting* in the Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum II., Table 17–28 (Inscriptions from 9 B. C. to 270 A. D.). *Blau* ZDMG XXVIII., 73 sq. (über ein palmyr. Relief mit Inschrift); *Mordtmann*, Neue Beiträge zur Kunde Palmyras in the Report of the Munich Academy 1875, Vol. II., Suppl.-Number III., 1–88; *Ed. Sachau*, palmyr. Inschriften, ZDMG XXXV., 728 sq., Remarks thereupon by *Nöldeke* XXXVI., 664 sq. For other matter see *Euting* in the report of the DMG for 1878, p. 63 and in *Baethgen's* Report for 1880, ibid. p. 154. Concerning the linguistic character of this inscription, cf. *Merx* ZDMG XXII., 674 sq. and especially *Nöldeke* ibid. XXIV., 85 sq.; *Sachau* ibid. XXXVII., 562 (without any notice of *Nöldeke's* previous work). In content, they are partly pagan dedicatory inscriptions, partly inscriptions in honor of deserving persons and partly epitaphs.

8. The Numerous Inscriptions and Coins of the Nabateans on the Sinai-Peninsula, in Idumea, the Hauran and elsewhere, from the last century B. C. and the first A. D.

Misled by the numerous Arabic names, which occur in these inscriptions, they were regarded by scholars, for a long time, as Arabic. So particularly *Tuch*, ZDMG II., 395 sq.; III., 129 sq. and so yet *Böttcher*. Ausführl. Lehrb. der heb. Sprache 1, p. 6, where these inscriptions are explained as North-Western Arabic (set right by *Muehlau* in the Supplement p. 644, where also is the older literature). A more correct judgment on this question was established by *Levy*, ZDMG XIV., 363 sq.; XVII., 82 sq.; XVIII., 630; XXII., 261 sq.; XXIII., 435 sq. and 652 sq.; XXV., 429 sq. and 508; XXVII., 133; further *Blau* ibid. XVI., 331 sq., *Meier* ibid. XVII., 575 sq.; and in particular *Nöldeke* ibid. XVII., 703 sq. and XIX., 637 sq., as well as *de Vogue* in the Revue archéol. 1864, p. 284 sq. (Inscriptions from the Hauran); *the same* in the Mélanges d'archéol. orient., p. 149 sq. and Appendice p. 21 sq. (Coins of the Nabatean kings from 95 B. C. to 104 A. D.; concerning two such from Petra, cf. also *de Saulcy* in the Mél. de Numism. 1878, 193 sq.) and in Syrie centrale (1868) p. 89 sq., finally *Euting* in the Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum II. (Paris 1883), tab. 29–35; and Table LXV., Part V. of the Oriental Series issued by the Palaeograph. Society.

9. More voluminous remnants of the West-Aramaic dialect and likewise of extra-Jewish origin lie before us in a translation of the Bible, preserved in a Vatican MS. of the Gospels, which was completed 1030 A. D., as well as in London and Petersburg MSS. (These last contain it in union with other fragments of religious matter).

The text of the Vatican MS., which embraces about two-thirds of the Gospels, was edited by *F. Miniscalchi Erizzo*, 2 tomi, Verona 1861 and '64. For the "Christian-Palestinian" dialect of this version, cf. *Nöldeke*, ZDMG XXII., 443 sq.; according to him, the translation originated between the third and the sixth centuries A. D. and probably upon Judaean soil (*Blau*, ibid. XXIII., 266 sq., seeks to refer the localities mentioned in the annotations of the Vat. Codex to the ancient Decapolis). Further fragments of this version (for the most part Palimpsests) are to be found in London and St. Petersburg; the latter were collected by *Tischendorf* upon his second and third journeys (59 and 70 leaves). All these fragments (except the Vat. Codex), with fragments of Biographies of Saints, Hymns etc., were edited by *Land* as "fragmenta syropalaestina" in Tom. IV. of his Anecdota syriaca (Lugd. Bat. 1875), including fragments from the Psalms (which are trans-

lations from the Septuagint, as the arithmetical figures [Bezifferung] show), from the London and Petersburg Gospels (of which the London exhibits, according to Land, a Melk—[a celebrated Benedictine Abbey founded in 1089. T.] Ritual older than the Roman Codex, while, in the Petersburg Bible, an older and quite peculiar and a younger Codex are to be distinguished), finally London fragments from Deuter., Isaiah, Proverbs, with Petersburg fragments from the Gospels, Deuter., Isaiah and Job. According to Land, the Roman Codex is later than almost all the other fragments. (The London ones are placed by *Wright* between the eighth and the thirteenth centuries.) At the time of its origin, accordingly, at the beginning of the eleventh century, Aramaic was no longer the language of intercourse in the circles concerned with it, as the Arabic inscriptions show. The writing, according to *Land*, is a variety of the capitals used for books at Edessa, which withal the Greek capitals have imitated in the rude and angular character of the letters.

10. Living remains of this dialect, once so widely diffused, are found at present only in Ma'lula and two neighboring villages upon the Eastern declivity of Anti-Lebanon, of course in a bad state of decay and, as the entire population speaks Arabic as well, near its end.

This fact was made clear long ago by *Brown* and *Volney* (cf. *Renan*, histoire générale p. 268). Closer information with reference to the language itself was first given by the missionary *Jules Ferrette* in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society XX., 431 sq.; *Nöldeke* discusses the same ("über den noch lebenden syrischen Dialekt im Antilibanon") ZDMG XXI., p. 183 sq.; cf. the remarks of *Merx* thereupon ibid. XXII., 271 sq. A farther list of words of the Ma'lula-dialect was published by *Cl. Huart*, who visited Ma'lula in the autumn of 1877, in the Journal asiatique, Ser. VII., Vol. XII., 478 sq. (Oct.–Dec. 1878; cf. the notice of *R. Duval* ibid. XIII., 465 sq. and L'universe Israélite, 1879, No. 16). Accurate and comprehensive disclosures are still to be expected from *Socin* and *Prym*, who passed several weeks in Ma'lula in the latter part of the summer of 1869, and carefully transcribed, from the mouth of a Christian woman[1] of the Greek confession, a series of narratives with Arabic translation. The following sample, for which I am indebted to Prof. *Socin*, may give an idea of the condition of this Aramaic: vōṭ áhād ishme froz lalō īle ḥōna, i. e לה (ת)אי(א) (ה)ות אחד אשמה פרג לאלה(א) חונא(א) = there was a man whose name was Faragh 'allah, he has (had) a little brother etc.

§ 6. CONCERNING THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE ARAMAIC DIALECT FOUND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. In the designation of the Aramaic dialects generally, and of the Biblical-Aramaic in particular, such confusion prevails even yet in many ways, that it is necessary to supplement what has been said with a confirmation of the terminology employed (§ 1). The view derived from Dan. II., 4, that the Aramaic dialect in Daniel and Ezra was the language of the Chaldean people, has, as its first consequence, the misconception that, not only this dialect, but also the nearest related dialect, that of the Targums, etc., were designated as "Chaldaic;" secondly, however, there flowed out of it the inverted distinction of this pretended Chaldaic, as the East-Aramaic, from Syriac, as "West-Aramaic," while the reverse is correct. The distinction proposed by Fürst[2] of the (so-called) Chaldaic and of the Syriac as "Jewish and Christian Aramaic," is

[1] One of these villages has gone over to Islam, but speaks its Aramaic dialect. Moreover, the tradition of the language is maintained chiefly by women; the language of the men is already greatly corrupted by the influence of the Arabic.

[2] Lehrgebaeude der Aram. Idiome, Chald. Gramm. (Leipzig, 1835) p. 5; there again, however, Fuerst distinguishes Jewish East-Aramaic (the language of the Bab. Talmud) as "Bab.-Aram.-Heb." from the "Palest.-Aram.-Hebrew," as well as from the Syriac.

not altogether suitable, according to what is laid down in § 5: for to the East-Aramaic dialects belongs, not only the dialect of Edessa used by the Christian Syrians, but also the language of the Babylonian Talmud; it follows no less from § 5, No. 7–10, that extra-Jewish monuments have been preserved, which belong to the West-Aramaic group. More suitable is the designation of the West-Aramaic as *Palestinian Aramaic*,[1] inasmuch as the remnants of this dialect yet existing arose for the most part (except the Palmyrene, the Egyptian and almost all the Nabatean inscriptions) upon the soil of Palestine. In the list of these (South) West-Aramaic or Palestinian Aramaic dialects belongs now the dialect lying before us in Daniel and Ezra, which we most fitly designate as "Biblical Aramaic."

In Daniel II., 4[a], we are informed that the Kasdîm, or Chaldeans, summoned by Nebuchadnezzar, addressed him in Aramaic (אֲרָמִית), and, in fact, their dialogue with the king (v. 4b sq.) is reported in the Aramaic language. Accordingly, it was plainly the opinion of the author of the book of Daniel (or of ch. I.–VII.) that this Aramaic dialect was the language of conversation at the court of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, instead of the East-Semitic dialect whose Babylonian form lies before us in numerous inscriptions—among others, those of Nebuchadnezzar himself. This *real* "Chaldaic," which is mentioned in Jer. V., 15, as a language unintelligible to the Jews (cf. the similar verdict of Isa. XXVIII., 11 and XXXIII., 19, with regard to Assyrian), the author of Daniel conceives as the secret or learned language of the Magians, since he (I., 4) lets the Jewish boys be instructed in the language and literature of the Chaldeans: כַּשְׂדִּים is here used surely in no other sense than everywhere else in Daniel (except V., 30, in the connection מֶלֶךְ כ' and IX., 1, מַלְכוּת כ'); and the dialect designated correctly in Dan. II., 4 (also Ez. IV., 7) אֲרָמִית has been termed, since Jerome (on Dan. II., 4), the "Chaldaic," just on account of a misunderstanding of the word כַּשְׂדִּים.[2] The author of Daniel uses the word as a title for the members of the Babylonian guild of priests, as already Herodotus regards *οἱ Χαλδαῖοι* as a designation of the priests of Baal, and the name was subsequently the customary one for the Magians, Astrologers, Soothsayers, etc., of the East. Jerome, however, and those who followed him, confused therewith the use of כַּשְׂדִּים as name of the people; and since, in Dan. II., 4, the "Chaldeans" speak Aramaic, so "Chaldaic" and "Aramaic" were held to be identical. And the matter has stood thus in the "Chaldee grammars" and the "Hebrew and Chaldee lexicons," in spite of all protests,[3] up to this day.

2. In possession of the correct terminology there falls to the ground the fable (still stated up to the latest date), that the Jews in the Babylonian exile forgot their Hebrew and, instead of it, brought the "Chaldaic," the language of conversation, with them to Palestine (cf. e. g. *Zunz*, die gottesdienstl. Vorträge

---

[1] This terminology has already been proposed by *Pfannkuche* in *Eichhorn's* Allg. Bibl., VIII., 3, p. 469.

[2] It is, to be sure, questionable, whether this misunderstanding comes upon Jerome himself or upon his Jewish teachers. For the latter, might be cited the fact that, in the Massora to the Targum of Onkelos (cf. *Berliner's* Edition of the same, p. XVIII. sq.), the Targum-Aramaic (as distinguished from the Biblical) is designated repeatedly as לישנא דכסדאי *language of the Chaldeans*. Without doubt, the composition of this Massora belongs, according to *Berliner* (ibid., p. IX.), as late as about 900 A. D., though *Berliner* at this point reminds us of the passage Chullin 24 *a*, according to which לשון כשרים in Dan. I., 4, means the Aramaic language.

[3] Cf. already *Schloezer* in *Eichhorn's* Repertorium, VIII. (1781), p. 118 sq.; the correct distinction of East-Aramaic (Syriac) and West-Aramaic (Biblical Aramaic and the language of the Targums) was expressly drawn again by *Geiger* ZDMG, XVIII., 654, and *Noeldeke*, ibid. XXI., 183 sq., and particularly XXV., 113 sq. (die Namen der aram. Nation und Sprache.)

der Juden, Berl. 1832, p. 7 sq.; *Herzfeld*, Gesch. des Volkes Israel III., 44 sq.; *Böttcher*, ausführliches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache I., 18). Leaving out of account that it was the normal practice in Jerusalem about 430 B. C., according to Neh. XIII., 24, to speak יְהוּדִית,[1] and that the slow overthrow of Hebrew by Aramaic may be shown upon valid grounds (cf. above p. 4 sq.), the Jews could not take a dialect from Babylon which was not spoken there.

3. With regard to the designations of the West-Aramaic dialect used in antiquity, the following is yet to be brought forward:—In the New Testament, this dialect is designated as *ἑβραϊστί Hebrew* (so certainly in John V., 2; XIX., 13, 17, perhaps also in XIX., 20 and with the obscure *αρμαγεδων* Rev. XVI., 16), although the same word is elsewhere applied (so surely in Rev. IX., 11, perhaps also in John XIX., 20 and Rev. XVI., 16; certainly, moreover, already in the Prologue of Jesus Sirach) to designate the old Hebrew language. The meaning of the expression *ἡ ἑβραὶς διάλεκτος*, Acts XXI., 40 and XXII., 2, as well as XXVI., 14, (as already the *ἑβραὶς φωνή* 4 Mac. XII., 7 and XVI., 15) is doubtful. In the first two passages, the deep silence of the people reported in XXII., 2 favors the old Hebrew, for this silence is less easily explained, if the Apostle used the vernacular familiar, for the most part, to all hearers in the neighborhood; on the contrary, he could place on record his Pharisaic education and his *future* zeal for the Law (cf. v. 3) no better than in the use of the sacred tongue. In Acts XXVI., 14 also, it corresponds more to the importance and solemnity of what is recorded, to think of the old Hebrew and not of the Aramaic vernacular.[2] With the New Testament, Josephus also uses *Hebrew* (*γλῶττα τῶν Ἑβραίων*), as well of old Hebrew, as of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

4. Further on, within the Christian era, *Syrian* and *Syriac*, which, for a long time, had been used for the purpose almost invariably by the Greeks, were fixed as designations of the whole department of Aramaic just as, already, the LXX. had everywhere rendered אֲרַמִּית by *συριστί*. According to *Nöldeke* (ZDMG XXV., 116), this name was adopted by the Christian Aramæans and for the reason that, to a Jew, "Aramean" had become identical with "Heathen" and, in the same sense, had passed over to the Syriac translation of the New Testament (e. g., Acts XVI. 1 and XIX., 10, for Ἕλλην; Gal. II., 14, ארמאית for *ἐθνικῶς*). Just so, the Palestinian Jews called all Aramaic סוּרְסִי, while the designation ארמי was preserved (at least for the language [לישון ארמי]) by the Babylonian Jews; see the evidence in *Nöldeke*, 116 sq. as well as the proof, *the same* p. 117 sq., that the form 'armâjê is to be regarded as the original designation of the nation: "as however the idea of 'Heathen' was united with this form, 'arâmâjê was artificially set apart from it as name of the people" —a distinction which can be proved from the Jewish sources (cf. *Levy*, neuhebr. u. chald. W.-B. under אֲרַמִּי and אֲרַמַּאי). The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (including Jer. X., 11 and the two words in Gen. XXXI., 47)

[1] Quite mistaken is the appeal of the Talmud to Neh. VIII., 8 as proof that the people then needed an "interpretation" of the Law; מְפֹרָשׁ does not mean in that passage any more than in Ezra IV., 18, "interpreted," but simply "clearly, distinctly" (Vulg. manifeste).

[2] So also *Delitzsch*, the Hebrew New Testament, p. 30 (cf. above § 4, Note); in "Saat auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 210 *Delitzsch* still supposed that: "with a call in this (Palestinian Aramaic) language *Schaul, Schaul, lema redaft jathi*, the ascended Lord brought Saul of Damascus to his senses."

are curtly called תרגום in the Mishna and Talmud (see the proofs in *Nöldeke* p. 128), because written in the language which is elsewhere employed for the interpretation (targŭm) of Scripture, as contrasted with מִקְרָא, the Scripture composed in the sacred language.[1]* The designation of the vernacular of Palestine at the time of Jesus as the "Syro-Chaldaic," which was for a long time customary (though of course very unfortunate), might likewise be traced to *Jerome;* cf. *Jerome* adv. Pelag. III., 1: The Gospel of the Hebrews is "chaldaico syroque sermone, sed hebraico literis scriptum."

§ 7. CONCERNING THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC TEXTS IN GENERAL.

Of the remnants of the West-Aramaic idiom in the Old Testament enumerated in § 1, the two words transmitted in Gen. XXXI., 47 might reach back to sometime in the ninth century B. C., in case the verse containing them belonged to one of the old sources of the Pentateuch. Even if this verse can be shown to be an addition by the last (post-exilic) redactor of the Pentateuch however—and, in fact, an activity in the direction of redaction is very prominent in the welding of the sources of vv. 45 sq.—we should have in it probably the oldest sample of the Biblical-Aramaic dialect, since there can be no doubt that Jer. X., 11 is a gloss, introduced at some time or other into the text of the prophet, and the redaction of the present text of Ezra can not be placed earlier than the last quarter of the fourth century B. C.

1. If Gen. XXXI., 47 originated from one of the ancient sources of the Pentateuch (J or E) it could not be shown, from the form of the two words in question, that their use as words of Laban the "Aramæan," (cf. vv. 20 and 24) from Haran in Mesopotamia, prove them to be *East-Aramaic;* for the Massoretic writing שָׂהֲדוּתָא with Qāměts in the first syllable might be vowelled correctly for West-Aramaic (as for Syriac); from initial שׂ (instead of ס in the Targums and in Syriac, cf. § 9, Rem. 2), no conclusion can be drawn; moreover the same corresponds in this root regularly to the Arabic šîn. The noun יְגַר may be verified as well from the Syriac as from the Targums.

2. That Jer. X., 11, in spite of the LXX., who seem to have had the verse before them, is a gloss introduced wrongfully into the text, follows directly from the troublesome interruption of the original connection between vv. 10 and 12; indirectly, however, from the fact that no reasonable ground for the sudden insertion of an *Aramaic* verse can be discovered; for that this verse was meant to indicate to the Jews how they must answer the Chaldeans, to whom they could have spoken only in "Chaldaic," is too trifling an argument to deserve serious refutation. It is striking that, in this gloss, together with the usual אַרְעָא *the Earth* is found the form אַרְקָא, which seems to have belonged to the East-Aramaic and perhaps was intruded into the verse at some time in Babylonia.[2] The remaining forms, such as דִּי (almost invariably דְ in East-Aramaic), תֵּאמַרוּן (Syr. תְּאמֵר, in Babylonian also תֵּימַר), לָהֵם (cf. Ezra V., 3 and elsewhere) correspond to the

[1] In the Midrasch Beresith rabba to Gen. xxxi., 47, is ascribed to Samuel bar Nachman the verdict that the "Persian" language should not be lightly esteemed, since God has honored it in the Law (here, at Gen. xxxi., 47), the Prophets (Jer. x., 11) and the Kethubhim (Dan. ii., 4 sq., Ezra iv., 8 sq.). Here לשון פרסי can be only an ancient error of the text for לשון סורסי.

* This Talmudic terminology might be cited as evidence for the opinion of *Lenormant*, followed by *Dr. W. H. Ward*, that Daniel and Ezra were originally written entirely in Hebrew, and that portions of them being lost, their place was supplied by the corresponding Aramaic Translation (Targum). See *Old Testament Student* for Nov., 1883, pp. 90, 91. [T.]

[2] ארקא is not protected, indeed, from the suspicion of an ancient copyist-error, a suspicion which lies near at hand, by the fact that it is enumerated by the Jews (naturally according to

West-Aramaic idiom. The clearly Hebrew word אֱלָהּ added at the close, if it belongs to the gloss at all, must have been added by a Hebrew copyist.

The Aramaic sections in Daniel and Ezra are distinguished more by lexical, than grammatical peculiarities. At all events, the few differences, which we will mention in their proper places, do not justify the verdict, that in the book of Daniel, the decomposition of the Aramaic has already advanced much further (Renan, hist. générale, p. 219).

§ 8. THE TEXTUAL TRADITION AND GRAMMATICAL TREATMENT OF THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

The Aramaic texts, of a religious content, proceeding from Jews and Samaritans, are all, in the nature of things, originally more or less strongly influenced by the Hebrew;[1] and, in this sense, the distinction mentioned above (§ 6, 1), of Jewish and Christian Aramaic (the latter largely influenced by the Greek) is justified. Similarly, the Biblical Aramaic also bears strong traces of the Hebrew influence; only, a great part of the Hebraisms might be placed to the account of later copyists, of whom some were ignorant of Aramaic, and some designedly adjusted it to the Hebrew. The text has suffered no less corruption in the printed editions, however; until such a multitude of asserted variations has arisen as, e. g., the stereotype edition of *Hahn* finds it necessary to present. The prevailing confusion was very recently checked, for the first time, by the superior text which *S. Baer* fixed in his edition of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah (Lpz., Tauchnitz, 1882) on the basis of the best manuscript and other witnesses. Hence, we have everywhere based our assertions upon it. In so doing, it must never be forgotten that even this text is only the relatively oldest and most certain form of the *Massoretic tradition*, and in no wise offers security that we have before us, in all particulars of writing and pronunciation, the texts intended by the authors of Daniel and Ezra. This assumption is impossible; because the Massoretes, in certain cases, have, without reason, substituted another pronunciation for the one demanded by the consonant text; in other places, have conspicuously wavered in the vocalization of the same form, and sometimes have made mistakes which may be demonstrated. Not rarely, also, reference to the form of West-Aramaic, acquired from the Targums, may have influenced the pointing (cf. Renan, in the work mentioned, p. 220). Although, therefore, the grammatical exposition must everywhere proceed from the critically fixed Massoretic tradition, it must, nevertheless, at least not withdraw from a criticism of this tradition, when the text, by its deviation from analogous phenomena of the Biblical Aramaic, or of West-Aramaic in general, is suspicious.

The literature of grammars for Biblical Aramaic is considered in *Steinschneider's* "bibliograph. Handbuch über die theoret. und prakt. Liter. für hebr. Sprachkunde" (up to 1850), Lpz. 1859. Cf., further, the survey in *Petermann's* Porta Chaldaica, ed. II., p. 80 sq.; by *Volck*, in *Herzog's* PRE²I, 604 sq.; *Reuss*, Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. Test., p. 511; *Strack*, Einleitung ins A. Test., p. 191 sq.—

Jer. x., 11), among the four, seven, or ten names of the earth, but is so by its unquestionable occurrence upon the large fragments brought from ths Assyrian Royal-palaces to the British Museum (cf. *Levy*, Gesch. der jued. Muenzen, Leipzig, 1862, p. 149). For ארקא in Mandaic, cf. Noeldeke, Mand. Gramm., p. 73. The change of sound appears sufficiently guaranteed by the Aramaic עֲטַר, *to smoke*, beside the Hebrew קָטַר, *to burn incense*.

[1] For the Hebraisms in the Targum of Onkelos, which is commonly regarded as the most genuine monument of the South-Western Idiom, cf. *Geiger* in ZDMG, xviii., 653 sq.

There have been added, since these were published: the Paradigms placed at the beginning of the edition of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah by *Baer* (see above); tolerable caution is necessary in using these, since, for the sake of completeness, many forms are adopted which cannot be made good, and which even contradict the remaining analogy; further, the third edition of *Winer's* "chaldäische Grammatik für Bibel und Targummim," enlarged by directions for the study of the Midrasch and Talmud, edited by Rabbi *B. Fischer*, Lpz., 1882. Fortunately, the editor has distinguished his own additions by cursive type, and, in that way, has facilitated the omission of them, which, for the beginner, is, in the highest degree, necessary.

CORRECTION.—P. 102, l. 5. For "cf. *Schuerer* p. 505 and in other places," read "cf. *Schuerer* in the place mentioned p. 505."

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

BY PROF. JOHN P. PETERS, PH.D.

Philadelphia, Pa.

In the 9th edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, in the article "Amalekites," occurs what seems to be a curious case of the propagation of error. We read: "It has been generally supposed that the Haman of the Book of Esther, called "the Agagite," belonged to the royal line of the Amalekites; but it is now found, from Assyrian records, that Agagi was the name of a country east of Assyria, from which it may be assumed that the title was derived. See Lenormant, *Lettres Ass.* I., 45." M. Lenormant mentions as eighth among the minor cantons of Media "Agazi...., called Agagi.... in the inscriptions of the *Fastes*. It is the Agagi of the Book of Esther." In the *Fastes* M. Oppert gives the cuneiform characters for *Agazi*, but transliterates falsely *Agagi*. M. Lenormant has copied his error, and on that error the article in Enc. Brit. has based a new theory regarding Haman. It is curious to observe that at Esther III., 1, the Septuagint reads for **האגגי**, *βουγαῖον*, while in III., 10; VIII., 3, 5, the Gentile name is omitted, and in IX., 24, *ὁ Μακεδών* is used. Josephus *Ant. Jud.*, XI., 6, 5, translates Agagite by *Ἀμαληκίτης*. M. Lenormant cites from *Ptolemaeus* the name *Ἄζαγα* or *Ἄζαξα* as probably the Median canton called *Agazi* by the Assyrians.

Prof. Noeldeke, in the *Sitzungsberichte der koeniglich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, gives a provisional account of an Aramæan inscription discovered bp Prof. Euting at Teima (تيما, **תימא**), in an oasis of Northern Arabia, on the borders of the Syrian desert. In Gen. XXV., 15; 1 Chron. I., 30, **תימא** appears as a son of Ishmael. It is mentioned in Is. XXI., 14, in the **כֵּישֵׂא בְּעֶרֶב**. In Jer. XXV., 23 and Job VI., 19 (**תמא**) it appears as a commercial place or people. The Septuagint writes it *Θαιμάν*, confusing it with the famous Edomite canton of that name. Ritter and Wetzstein identify **תימא** with Taimâ in the Haurân, whom Cheyne has followed in his commentary on Isaiah. A somewhat similar confusion will be found to exist regarding **דדן**, which is connected in Isaiah and Jeremiah with **תֵּימָא**. The inscription, which is confidently assumed to antedate the Persian conquest, belonging to a period between 500 and 800 B. C., has been, so far as preserved, transliterated into Hebrew characters, as follows:

(Lines 1—9 are gone almost entirely.)

10. הגם להן אלהי
11. תימא (י)חצן לצלם שזב בר פטסרי
12. ולזרעה בבית צלם זי הגם וגבר
13. זי יחבל סותא זן אלהי תימא
14. ינסחוהי וזרעה ושמה מן אנפי
15. תימא והא [ז]א צדקתא זי . . .
16. צלם זי מחר . ושנגלא . . אשז . א
17. אלהי תימא לצלם [זי] הגם א .
18. מן חקלא דקלן . . . ומן שימת א
19. זי מלכא דקלן ווו ווו כל דקלן
20. זי . . . [ש]נה בשנה ואלהן ואנש
21. לא יהני בצלם שזב בר פטסרי
22. מן ב . תא זן . ול[זר]עה ושמה
23. כמן . . . . לא . . .

For this is suggested the translation:

10. הגם. But may the gods
11. of Teimâ protect (?) the image of שזב, son of Petosiri,
12. and his seed in the house of the image of הגם. And a man
13. who injures this? . . . . . may the gods of Teimâ
14. remove him and his seed and his name from the surface
15. of Teimâ! And this is the duty which . . . .
16. the image of . . . .
17. the gods of Teimâ to the image of הגם:
18. from the field ten date-palms and from the treasure
19. of the king ten date-palms, altogether of date-palms
20. twenty-one . . . . year by year. And gods and men
21. shall derive no profit from the image of שזב, son of Petosiri.
22. . . . . and to his seed and his name . . . . .

To the left hand, above, is a sceptre-bearing image, which Euting describes as "the portrait of king in pure Assyrian costume." Below this is a priest offering at an altar, underneath which is written צלם שזב כמרא, "Image of שזב, the priest."

The language of the whole is Aramæan, and the characters are said to belong to the oldest type, resembling those on the Babylonian contract tables and the lion of Abydos. For the wide-spread use of the Aramæan language, in the time of the Assyrian supremacy, Noeldeke and Landauer compare 2 Kgs. XVIII., 26, and Is. XXXVI., 11. The name Petosiri is explained as the Egyptian Pet-Osiri. The stone itself is now on the way to Germany.

In the possession of a gentleman in New York is a fragment of a synagogue roll which claims a romantic history. In the last Kurdo-Persian war the little town Meyandop was sacked by the Kurds, and among the other plunder was a synagogue roll. This was purchased by a shoemaker, who used the greater part of it in his trade. Before it was entirely destroyed, however, a missionary from Oroomiah saw and bought it. From him part passed into the hands of an Armen-

ian student, who brought it to this country, but the larger part is said to have gone to the St. Petersburg Museum. The part in this country contains Ex. XXIX., 32, to end of book. The length of the roll is twenty inches, about six inches of which are margin. There are fifteen columns of manuscript. It does not seem to be old.

In his *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, Dr. Lyon adds one word to our knowledge of the Hittite language. In the *Stier-Inschrift*, 67–69, we read: "bît appâtê tamšil êkal Ḫattê ša ina lisân mât aḫarrê bît ḫilâni išassûšu ušêpiša mêḫrit bâbêšin." (A portico after the manner of a Hittite temple, which in the language of the Westland bît-ḫilâni they call, I caused to be built before their doors.) For this particular form of architecture compare also 1 Kgs. VI., 3.

In his latest work, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, note on p. 61, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch practically announces his acceptance of the view of Schrader and Hommel, that the כּוּשׁ in Gen. II., 13, X., 8, is a mistake for כִּישׁ. Such a mistake would be a natural and easy one to make, both being originally written כיש. In Assyrian inscriptions we find Ku-u-šu or Ku-su, Ethiopian, the כּוּשׁ of Gen. X., 7, and Kaššu, which is the כּוּשׁ (or כִּישׁ) of X., 8. In *Wo lag das Paradies*, Delitzsch maintained a different view, supposing כּוּשׁ of Gen. X., 7 to be identical with כּוּשׁ of Gen. X., 8, and similarly connecting the Kûšu and the Kaššu. The Kaššu were the "Elamite-Sumerian" stratum of peoples to the north and west of the Persian gulf. He was also inclined to connect them with the Kašda or Kaldu (כַּשְׂדִּים). In the present work, on the other hand, he attempts to prove, from an examination of the forty or more Kossæan words now known, that no linguistic connection existed between the Kaššu and either the Sumerian-Accadians or the Elamites. Mr. Theo G. Pinches writes, in opposition to this view, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XVI., Part 2, maintaining the linguistic connection of Kossæan and Sumerian-Accadian. Prof. Haupt, writing in the *Andover Review* (July), also seems to think that the little we know points in the direction of such a connection. Prof. Delitzsch holds that the Kaššu came from the mountains of the north-east, and gained control of Babylonia about 1500, B. C. Karduniaš (his גַּן עֵדֶן) was the special seat of their settlement. The nine kings of an Arabian dynasty, mentioned by Berosus, he regards as Kossæan, and, like Karduniaš, they have names ending in aš. He still inclines to connect the Kašda, or Chaldees, with the Kaššu. Mr. Pinches, on the other hand, seeks the origin of the Kaššu in the north-west. "The cuneiform style of writing was in use in early times in Cappadocia, and the country around seems to have borne the name of Cush." Thence, in his opinion, the Accadian race, including the Kaššu, emigrated to Babylonia. On the ground of some newly discovered texts, Prof. Delitzsch also deals considerably with the difficult subject of early Babylonian chronology. In the May number of the *Proceedings of Biblical Archæology*, Mr. Pinches also deals with the same subject, on the ground of still more recent discoveries. The two together leave the matter in a very unsatisfactory condition.

By the liberality of Miss C. L. Wolfe, of New York, an American expedition to Babylonia has at last been rendered possible. The main object of the expedition is exploration. One of the members is the Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D., of the *Independent*.

In his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, p. 118, Prof. Wellhausen says: "As a lunar festival, undoubtedly the Sabbath also reached back to a great antiquity. Among the Israelites, however, this day acquired a quite peculiar significance,

by which it was distinguished from all other festivals; it became the day of rest κατ' ἐξοχήν. Originally the rest was only a consequence of the festival, etc." With this compare the following from the summing up in Dr. Lotz's *Quaestionum de Historia Sabbati:* "11) Sabbata [apud Babylonios] non erant dies atri sed otii severe quidem imperati, verum minime tristis. 12) Non ad Lunae cultum sabbata principio pertinuerunt. 13) Sunt fortasse ex eo orta, quod numerus senarius Babyloniis numerus principalis (*Grundzahl*) mensurarum erat, quare senum dierum laboris quasi plenus videbatur esse laboris modus, quem subsequi diem quietis consentaneum esset. 14) Israelitae Sabbata a Babyloniis acceperunt, etc."

Dr. Carl Abel, of Dresden, the well-known Coptic scholar, has in the press a book on the relations between the Japhetic, Semitic and Hamitic families of languages.

W. A. I., vol. V., 2nd part, has appeared. Among its plates is an edition of the "Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I.," published last year by Dr. H. Hilprecht as "Inaugural-Dissertation" under the title "Freibrief Nebuchadnezzar's I." It is in archaic characters; and, in addition to the original, the editors have, therefore, given us a transcription into the common later Babylonian characters. A similar transcription of this inscription, together with transliteration and translation, the latter differing in some particulars from those of Dr. Hilprecht, were published by Messrs. Pinches and Budge, in the April number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.* Messrs. Pinches and Budge, as well as Dr. Hilprecht, have assigned Nebuchadnezzar I. to the middle of the 12th century B. C. Prof. Friedr. Delitzsch did the same in his *Sprache der Kossäer*, on the ground of the so-called synchronous history in II. R, 65, where a Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon seems to be the cotemporary of Aššurešiši, father of Tiglathpileser I., king of Assyria. In the list of Babylonian kings, published by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings* for May, we find the 12th century filled up from 1175 onward. From 1154 to 1146 ruled a king whose name Mr. Pinches has failed to transliterate. Unless this should turn out to be Nebuchadnezzar, it would seem as though the synchronous history, the list of Babylonian kings, or the Assyriologists had made a mistake. In the July number of the *Andover Review*, Prof. Haupt ascribes to the monarch in question the date 1300 B. C., but does not give his reasons. The above mentioned list also seems to show that the name which Prof. Delitzsch (p. 15) conjectured to be Nabûkudûrusur was Ninipkudûruṣur, who reigned in the 10th century B. C. This is important, on account of the ingenious use Prof. Delitzsch made of this conjecture in the work above referred to. Besides Nebuchadnezzar, the most important king affected by the change is Simmas-sigu, whom Delitzsch placed about 1175 B. C., now dated 1003—985.

Among the texts published in the new part of V. R., which have been already described or discussed, in the *Transactions* or *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, we notice especially Plates LX. and LXI., a "stone tablet from the temple of the Sun-god at Sippara, containing an inscription of Nabû-bal-iddina." Of this stone there appeared a photo-lithograph, with description and general summary of contents, in *Transactions*, Vol. VIII., Part 2, and in the *Proceedings* for May will be found a further notice of the same.

Plate XLIV. contains the "list of names of ancient Sumerian and Accadian kings," of which Prof. Delitzsch has made such large use in the *Sprache der Kossäer* (cf. pp. 20, 21), and which was discussed by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings* for January, 1881.

The famous Nabonidus cylinder from Sippara, which carried us back to the date 3800, B. C. (Sargon of Akkad), a portion of which was published and discussed in the *Proceedings* for November, 1882, appears as Plate LXIV.

The texts of this latest publication are almost, if not quite, all from the discoveries of Mr. Rassam, and are chiefly Babylonian, in distinction from Assyrian. A new edition of IV. R is now in press.

In the *Independent* of September 4th, Dr. I. H. Hall gives some account of a valuable Syriac MS., belonging to Mr. R. S. Williams, of Utica, N. Y. Its chief value lies in the fact that it contains 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. The date of writing is 1471, A. D. The text is in substantial agreement with the "Bodleian manuscript, as reported by Pococke. It is also a little closer to the Greek text of the critical editions than is the text of Pococke." It comes from Further Asia, where it was probably written by a trinitarian Christian; but it is written "in a rather western Syrian hand." It attempts to be critical, and has a number of Syriac and Arabic marginal notes about points, vowels, and the like, "which give the manuscript a high value in linguistic science."

PIRKE ABOTH; or, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny, Pa.

Translated from the Hebrew Edition of Prof H. L. Strack, of Berlin, Germany.

[What is included in brackets is by the translator.]

CHAPTER II.

1. Rabbi[1] saith, Which is the right way that a man should choose for himself? All such as is honorable to him who treads therein, and gets him honor from man.[2] Moreover, be as careful about the performance of a light precept as of a weighty one, because thou canst not estimate the award due to the respective precepts. Compute always the temporal damage sustained by the performance of a duty by its eternal reward, and the temporary gain acquired by transgression by the damage in eternity. Contemplate three things, and thou wilt avoid the occasions for transgressions. Consider what is above thee: an All-seeing eye, and an hearing ear,[3] and all thy deeds are written in a book.[4]

2. Rabban Gamaliel,[5] the son of Rabbi Judah, the prince, said: The study[6] of the law accords well with worldly pursuits; the twofold occupation causes sin

[1] Rabbi plainly is Rabbi Jehuda ha-nasi, also Rabbenu ha-gadosh, son of Simeon, mentioned I., 18, editor of our Mishna, flourished in the last quarter of the second century, A. D. On him comp. Abr. Krochmal, *Hechaluz* ii., 63-94; A. Bodek, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus als Zeitgenosse und Freund des Rabbi Jehuda ha-nasi*, Leipz. 1868; S. Gelbhaus, *Rabbi Jehuda Hanasi und die Redaction der Mishna*, Vienna, 1876 (in fact 1880, only to be used with precaution). [Comp. Strack's review in Schuerer's *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, No. 3.]

[2] Phil. iv., 8: *καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος ταῦτα λογίζεσθε.*

[3] Ps. xxxiv., 16, 17; 1 Peter iii., 12.

[4] Dan. vii., 10. [Comp. Rev. iii., 5; xiii., 8; xx., 12; xxi., 27. Comp. also the word in the *dies Irae*: Liber scriptus proferetur, In quo totum continetur, Unde mundus judicetur].

[5] [About 210-225 A. D., He was named *Bathraa*, i. e., the "Last," because he terminated the long dynasty of the house of Hillel.]

[6] Study; so also iv., 13a; vi., 5, 6; different v., 21.

to be forgotten. And all the study of the law, that is not supported by business, will become of none effect, and will be the cause of sin. And whoever is engaged in the service of the congregation ought to act for God's sake; then will the merit[1] of their ancestors support them, and their righteousness endure forever. As for you, I entitle you to great reward as if ye had performed them.

3. Beware of the powers that be, for they do not patronize except for selfish purposes; they appear as friends while men are useful[2] to them, but they do not stand by a man when he is in distress.

4*a*. He used to say: Make His (God's) will[3] as if it were thine own, that He may make thy will as if it were His will.[4] Nullify thy will on account of His will,[5] so that He may nullify the will of others on account of thy will.

4*b*. Hillel[6] said: Separate[7] not thyself from the community; and have no confidence in thyself until the day of thy death; and judge not thy fellow-man until thou art placed in his position;[8] and utter not a word that is incomprehensible, (under the impression) that it will eventually be comprehensible; and say not, When I shall be at leisure, I shall study; mayhap thou wilt not have leisure.

5. He also said: A boor cannot be fearful of sin, nor can a rustic[9] be a saint;[10] the bashful[11] will not become learned, nor the passionate man a teacher; nor will the engrossed[12] merchant be a sage; and where there are no men, strive[13] thou to be a man.

6. He having also seen a skull floating on the water, said: "Because thou hast caused others to float, thou hast been floated; and the end of those who floated thee will be that they will be floated."[14]

---

[1] Merit זכות; on the זכות comp. F. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palaestinischen Theologie*. Leipz. 1880, chap. 10; on זכות דאבות [i. e., merit of the fathers] especially pp. 280–285.

[2] הֲנָאָה *use, profit;* נֶהֱנָה (Niphal of הנה) iv., 5*b*, vi., 1, *to profit by.*

[3] [Comp. Matt. vii., 21.]

[4] [Comp. Matt. xxi., 22.]

[5] [Comp. 1 John ii., 15, 17. In Xenoph. *Memor.* ii., 1, 28 we read: "Wilt thou have the favor of the gods, serve the gods."]

[6] With Hillel's maxims § 4*b*–7 (others, see above i., 12–14), the traditional chain is again taken up, which was interrupted by the inserted sentences of men from the house of Hillel (i., 16–2, 4*a*).

[7] פָּרַשׁ to separate. Heb. x., 25 *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες κτλ.* [Dean Stanley quotes Ewald as saying on this maxim: "Separate not....death." "This," Ewald remarks, "is a strange truth for a Pharisee to have uttered; one which, had the Pharisees followed, no Pharisee would have ever arisen. Yet," he adds, with true appreciation of the elevation of the best spirits above their party, "it is not the only example of a distinguished teacher protesting against the fundamental error of his own peculiar tendencies."]

[8] [Comp. Ecclus. xi., 7: Blame not before thou hast examined; think over first, and then rebuke.]

[9] עַם הארץ (an expression already occurring Ezek. vii., 27, though not in that same signification) denotes the great mass devoid of the knowledge of the law, John vii., 49: *ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον.* Here, as in other passages, e. g. v., 10, an individual is meant [comp. גוי = gentile], then plur. עַמֵּי הארץ iii., 10*b*. Observe the special prominence which is attached to the intellectual above the ethical.

[10] Only a seeming contradiction with *Shabbath*, fol. 63, col. 1, towards the end: [when the rustic is a saint] live not in his neighborhood.

[11] Bashful, here: he that is ashamed of putting a question.

[12] סְחוֹרָה also vi., 5 *traffic*) cf. Ezek. xxvii., 15), comp. *Eruvin* fol. 55, col. 1, where it is said on Deut. xxx., 13: Rabbi Jochanan said: לֹא בשמים [not in heaven], the law is not found among the high-minded; [neither is it beyond the sea], neither is it found among the merchants. [Comp. also *Ecclus.* xxvi., 29: "A merchant will hardly keep himself free from doing wrong, and a huckster will not be declared free from sin."]

[13] The same maxim is given in the Aramaic *Berathoth*, fol. 63, col. 1.

[14] Comp. *Sota* i., 7: "With the measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you," and Hillel's dictum *Shabbath*, fol. 31, col. 1: "What is hateful to you, do not unto thy neighbor."

7. He also said: He who increases flesh increases worms; he who increases riches, increases cares; he who increases wives, increases witchcraft; he who increases maid-servants, increases lewdness; he who increases men-servants, increases robbery; he who increases his knowledge of the law, increases life; he who increases his study in college, increases wisdom; he who increases counsel, increases prudence; he who increases justice, increases peace; if a man has gained a good name, he has gained it for himself; if he has gained the words of the law, he has gained for himself eternal life.

8*a*.[1] Rabban Jochanan,[2] the son of Zaccai, received the tradition from Hillel and Shammai. He used to say: If thou hast studied the law much, do not consider it as a good deed on thy part, since thou wast created for that very purpose.[3]

8*b*. Rabban Jochanan, the son of Zaccai, had five disciples, and these are they; Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos,[4] Rabbi Joshua, the son of Hananya, Rabbi José, the priest, Rabbi Simeon, the son of Nathanael, and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach. He thus estimated their worth: Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos, is as a well-plastered cistern, which loses not a drop; Joshua, son of Hananya, happy are his parents; R. José, the priest, is a saint; R. Simeon, the son of Nathanael, fears sin; and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach, is an ever-flowing spring. He used to say: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale of the balance, and R. Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, in the other, he would outweigh them all. Abba Saul[5] said, in his name: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale, and Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, with them, and Eleazar, the son of Arach, in the other, he would outweigh them all.

9. He said to them: Go forth and consider which is the good path to which a man should cleave. Rabbi Eliezer said; A good eye;[6] Rabbi Joshua said, A good comrade; Rabbi José said, A good neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, One who perceives the future; Rabbi Eleazar said, A good heart.[7] He said to them: I prefer the words of Eleazer, the son of Arach, to your words; as his words include yours. He also said to them: Go forth and consider which is the bad way[8] that man should shun. Rabbi Eliezer said: a bad eye[9]; Rabbi Joshua said: A bad comrade; Rabbi José said, A bad neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, The borrower who does not repay, for when one borrows from man, it is as if he borrows from God,[10] for it is said: "The wicked borroweth and payeth not again; but the

---

[1] Continuation to i., 15.

[2] A disciple of Hillel; according to *Rosh ha-shana*, fol. 31 col. 2, he became 120 years old, the same age—the Mosaic—which was ascribed to Hillel and R. Agiba.

[3] Comp. Luke xvii., 10; 1 Cor. ix., 16.

[4] Ὑρκανός. The meaning of this name, which already occurs in the second century B. C. (John Hyrcanus, 135-105) is not yet ascertained.

[5] In the first half of the second century A. D.

[6] According to v., 19, the disciples of Abraham have "a good eye," those of Balaam "a bad eye." Comp. also Prov. xxii., 9 [and Matt. vi., 22].

[7] [I. e., susceptible of every good, comp. Matt. v., 8; Luke vi., 45.]

[8] [I. e. the way which leads to destruction. In the Scriptures רַעָה means often "darkness," for the evil one likes the darkness. Thus Prov. ii., 13: "who leave the paths of uprightness to walk in the way of darkness;" comp. also 2 Peter ii., 15.]

[9] [the eye is the mirror of the soul, comp. Matt. vi., 23.] עַיִן רָעָ means to be envious, malicious.

[10] [Literally, "place," which is often used in Jewish writings for God, because there is no place which is not pervaded by His presence. Philo *de somn.* says: ὁ θεὸς καλεῖται τόπος τῷ περιεργεῖν, κτλ.]

righteous showeth mercy and giveth."[1] Rabbi Eleazar said: a bad heart.[2] He said to them: I prefer the words of Eleazer, the son of Arach, to your words, as his words include yours.

10. They[3] also said three things: Rabbi Eliezer[4] said: Let the honor of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own; and be not easily provoked, and repent one day[5] before thy death, and[6] warm thyself by the fire of the sages, and be careful that their coal does not burn thee, for their bite is as the bite of a jackal, and their sting like the sting of a scorpion, and their burn is the burn of a fiery serpent, and all their words are as fiery coals.

11. Rabbi Joshua said: The bad eye, the bad thought[7] and misanthropy draw man out of the world.[8]

12. Rabbi José said: Let the property of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own, and prepare thyself to study the law, for it will not be bequeathed to thee by inheritance;[9] and let all thy deeds be to promote the name of God.[10]

13. Rabbi Simeon said: Be careful of reading the Shema[11] and the Prayer;[12] and when thou prayest consider not thy prayer as fixed,[13] but pray for mercy and supplicate for grace in the presence of God, "for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil,"[14] and be not impious in thine own sight.

14. Rabbi Eleazer said: Be diligent to study the law, and consider what thou mayest rejoin to an epicurean,[15] and consider also for whom thou workest, and who is thy employer,[16] who is to pay the wages for thy labor.

15. Rabbi Tarphon[17] said: The day is short,[18] and the labor vast,[19] but the

---

[1] Ps. xxxvii., 21.

[2] Mark vii., 21, 22.

[3] Each of them.

[4] Comp. C. A. R. Toetterman, *R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos sive de vi qua doctrina Christiana primis seculis illustrissimos quosdam Iudaeorum attraxit.* Leipzig, 1877 (comp. *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1877, col. 687—689).

[5] One day, i. e. to-day, since you may die to-morrow, *Shabbath*, fol. 153, col. 1. Comp. Hillel's words, I. 14 and II. 4*b* toward the end.

[6] The words "and....fiery coals" probably a later addition, comp. Aboth Rabbi Nathan.

[7] There are two inclinations in man, a good and an evil one. The good is to conquer the evil, and can do so, according to Jewish teaching. Comp. Weber, *Altsyn. Theol.* esp. p. 208 sq., 221 sq. The evil inclination is also called יֵצֶר without addition, see *Aboth*, IV., 1.

[8] "Draw out of the world," refers here, III., 10*b* and IV., 21, to the physical life. Comp. Prov. xiv., 30.

[9] Comp. Deut. xxxiii., 4.

[10] [Comp. 1 Cor. x., 31.]

[11] The prayer, which every grown-up male Israelite (excepting women, children and slaves) has to recite twice every day (in the morning and in the evening). It contains the three sections of the law, Deut. vi., 4–9, xi., 13–21; Num. xv., 37–41, and bears its name from the first word שְׁמַע. [Comp. also Pick, art. *Shema* in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop.]

[12] [It is the eighteen benedictions or *Shemoneh Esreh*. Comp. Pick, art. *Shemoneh Esreh* in McClintock and Strong, l. c.]

[13] Comp. *Berachoth* IV., 4, where we read as R. Eliezer's word: "If one makes his prayer fixed, his prayer is not supplications."

[14] Joel ii., 13.

[15] Freethinker, i. e., the non-Israelitish freethinker, according to *Sanhedrin*, fol. 39, col. 2.

[16] God, see § 16.

[17] Τρύφων, a contemporary of the five disciples of Jochanan, often mentioned as the opponent of Agiba. [Some maintained that he is the same Trypho, who is the interlocutor in Justin Martyr's Dialogue. Comp. Pick, art. *Tarphon* in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop.]

[18] [Comp. John ix., 4.]

[19] [Comp. ibid. iv., 35.]

laborers are indolent,[1] though the wages be large and the master of the house[2] is pressing.

16. He used to say: It is not incumbent upon thee to finish the work,[3] and yet thou art not at liberty to be idle about it.[4] If thou hast studied the law much, great reward will be given thee; for faithful is thy employer, who will award to thee the hire of thy labor;[5] but know that the reward of the righteous is in the future.

CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

Remarks on the Ethiopic.—That a magazine which is devoted to the interests of Hebrew study, which looks at the language of the Old Testament rather from a philological standpoint than as the medium of pre-Christian revelation, should not pass by unnoticed the claims of the cognate tongues, will probably be accepted without debate. Indeed it is one of the objects of HEBRAICA to encourage such discussions. Accordingly the language and literature of Ethiopia, "the Switzerland of Africa," have a right to a hearing in its columns from time to time. And this they richly merit. Both the character of the Ethiopic language, in that it has worked out the common Semitic genius in its own peculiar way, and thus contributes its portion to the solution of the problems of this group of languages, as also the large literature which is treasured up in this language, are well worthy of study. Ethiopic is not a mere twig from some larger limb, not a mere dialect of which only fragmentary remains or a few enigmatical inscriptions have been preserved; but possessing an extensive literature, it has a complete grammar and a full lexicon, and thus offers ample material for wide research.

It is not a matter of difficulty to assign to this language its position in the Semitic group. Geographical reasons point to a closer affinity between the Ethiopic and the Arabic, an affinity which would appear all the closer from the historical reason that both languages about the same time became the vehicles of an extensive literature, and that they thus would have reached about the same stage of development. Of course this latter feature, in consideration of the well known conservatism of the Semitic languages, as this is apparent, e. g., in the virtually uniform character of Biblical Hebrew and in the primitive character of the Arabic, would seem of little moment, yet for the purpose of comparing the two languages it has its importance. An examination of the language shows that what history and geography suggest is correct. The Ethiopic language belongs to the Southern Semitic group, of which the Arabic is the representative and most important member. This connection is evident e. g. in the partition of ט and צ into two letters of different intensity (like the Arabic ح and خ for ח, and ص and ض for צ although it no longer splits the ת, ד, מ and ע into two each, as is the

[1] [Comp. Matt. ix., 37, 38.]
[2] God [οἰκοδεσπότης, Matt. xx. 1].
[3] [Comp. Rom. xii., 4, 5.]
[4] [Comp. Matt. xx., 6.]
[5] [Comp. ibid. xx., 8, 9.]

case in Arabic, but in the room thereof has developed an emphatic *p* sound and a number of *u*-containing gutturals and palatals); further, in the frequency of the short vowels at the end of words, in the wealth of verbal forms, making use of every possibility offered in this connection, and thus producing twelve regular and full conjugations of the triliteral verb; in the large number of verb roots of four and more letters; in the inner, or broken and collective plural and formatonis; in the regular accusative; in the separating of the subjunctive and voluntative from the imperfect; in the possibility of suffixing two personal pronouns to a single verb, and in a number of other less important grammatical peculiarities. In the lexicon the relation is equally close and apparent. The *copia verborum* indeed contains quite a number of what are probably African vocables, or at least can as yet not be explained from a Semitic basis, but yet the great mass of words and meanings are the same as in Arabic; and in many cases where the latter has developed roots and significations of its own, not found in the North Semitic branch, the Ethiopic has the same peculiarities as its southern neighbor. One very marked feature of the Ethiopic language is its syntax. The Arabic has surpassed exceedingly the stiff and stereotyped character of Hebrew and Syriac syntax, but the pliability of the Arabic is nothing compared with the elegance and variety of the grammatical structure of the Ethiopic. The latter language, probably because its literature was nourished under Greek example and Greek incitement, has a fineness of syntax unequalled by any other of its sister Semitic languages, and yet it cannot be said that any of its syntactical features are unnatural or un-Semitic. While the Greek may have furnished the models and idea, the syntax of the Ethiopic grammar exhibits only the development of what is contained in germ in the structure of the other languages, partly in the Arabic and partly in the North Semitic.

And yet the Ethiopic is by no means merely a dialect of the Arabic. Already the fact that many of the words for the most common objects in existence and for the most frequently occurring acts are in Ethiopic not the same as those used in Arabic, shows that at a comparatively early period the Ethiopic language entered upon a development of its own. Its vowels are not so abundant, ă and ĕ being its only short vowels; its nominal and adjective formations are not as varied and numerous; its prepositions and conjunctions are nearly all peculiar; it has no diminutive or elative forms, and no genitive; its alphabet is syllabic and reads from left to right, although this is a later development, the older inscriptions still showing the *βουστροφηδόν* style, and thus pointing to an original method from right to left. And while a number of facts seem to show that the language of Ethiopia occupied an independent position over against the Arabic, which was the classical tongue at least of Northern and Middle Arabia, whatever its nearer relation may have been to the comparatively unknown but nearer languages of Southern Arabia; a number of other facts, both in grammar and lexicon, point to a closer connection with the North Semitic languages, or, rather, indicate that the Ethiopic retained and developed some features of the one original and undivided Semitic tongue which the northern branch also developed, but which the Arabic did not develop, or at any rate dropped. Still another class of peculiarities show that in the Ethiopic the process of decay had already commenced when it became a literary language. All these features combined will aid in giving the language its proper position as a branch, but one marked by individuality in character and development, of the Semitic family.

The Ethiopians call their tongue "lezâna Geĕz," the language of the free. Originally it was the language spoken in Tigre, a district in the northern part of Ethiopia; but when a powerful government was established at Uxum, the capital of Tigre, and spread over the rest of the country, the language of the district became the language of the country. This is a phenomenon often observed in history. The Arabic of the Koran and of literature was originally the dialect of the tribe Kinânâ, to which the Kuraisch family, of which Mohammed was a member, belonged. With the conquests of the new religion it spread also. In the Germany of the reformation period a similar transformation took place through Luther's Bible and other writings. Although the alphabet and beginnings of Ethiopic literature cannot be ascribed to Christian influences, as is proved from the fact that these old inscriptions date back to pre-Christian days and convey sentiments decidedly heathenish, yet the literature of the language as such is entirely of a Christian and ecclesiastical sort. And to the present day, although the Amharic and other dialects have supplanted it in the mouths of the people, and even the priests and educated people understand but little of it, it continues to be used in the services of the Church as the *lingua sacra*.

At the head of Ethiopic literature stands the version or versions of the Bible; and with these words the two chief characteristics of this literature have been expressed—it is κατ' ἐξοχήν churchly, and a literature of translations partly from the Greek and partly from the Arabic. The position here assigned to the Ethiopic translation of the Bible is based not only or chiefly on chronological grounds, but rather on the fact that this translation gave character and form to all the literature that followed. Dillmann, the greatest of Ethiopic scholars, in the Prolegomena to his Lexicon, says, "Inter ea (i. e. Ethiopic literature) primum locum obtinent Biblia Æthiopica, quæ omnium literarum Abyssiniarum fundamentum sunt et norma, et quam reliqui scriptores suum dicendi scribendique genus conformaverunt." These words in nowise overestimate the importance or influence of this version for the literary life of Ethiopia. This translation made from the Septuagint soon after the Christianization of Ethiopia, is a fair and reliable one, and should be heard in settling one of the vexed questions of old Testament Science, viz., the text of the LXX. As yet the whole Old Testament has not been published. In 1701 Job Ludolph published the Psalms, and in 1853 Dillmann issued a critical edition of the Octateuchus (i. e. the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and Ruth) and of 1 and 2 Kings, and lately also of the prophet Joel. The New Testament was published in Rome as early as 1548 by the Abyssinian Tesfa-Zion, which version was received into the great London Polyglot Bible, and in 1830 Th. P. Platt issued an edition for the British Bible Society; but neither of these can be called critical. About the same time with the Bible, or soon after, a number of other books were translated, which, owing to the vague ideas of Biblical canon among the Ethiopians are sometimes found among the canonically received books. Fortunately a large number of these translations are of works of which the originals have been lost, and in this case the translations have a greater than the mere literary value of aiding in determining or understanding the original texts. A number of Pseudepographi of the Old Testament have thus been preserved to the church. Without doubt the chief of these is the enigmatical Book of Enoch, of which a new translation, with extensive introduction and notes, by the writer appeared at Andover in 1882. Dillmann has published the Ethiopic text and a German translation. Allied in spirit to Enoch is the haggadistic production

called the Kufale, or the Book of Jubilees, or also the Smaller Genesis, CH λεπτὴ γένεσις, in which the contents of Genesis are reproduced under the scheme of Jubilee periods, and filled out with all kinds of rabbinical stories. Dillmann published the Ethiopic texts in 1859 and a German translation in the *Goettinger Gelehrter Anzeiger*, but no English translation has as yet been made. Other works of this kind, well known through the patristic citations, are the *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Apocalypse of Ezra. The Ethiopic text of the former was published by Dillmann in 1876, and of the latter by Platt in 1820. A most peculiar work is the *Physiologus*, the representative of a strange class of Christian literature in the early middle ages, in which the objects of nature are used to teach and illustrate Christian doctrine and morality, and of this Hommel edited the Ethiopic text and made a German translation in 1877. The latest work of this kind issued is the contest of Adam, edited in Ethiopic by Trumpp, and translated into English by Malan. The literature is also rich in liturgical work, of which, however, but little has been translated. Trumpp in 1878 published the Ethiopic Baptismal Book of which the present writer soon after made a translation in the Luthern Quarterly, Gettysburg, Pa.; and Rodwell, in 1864 and 1867, published in London, chiefly from MSS., a large collection of Ethiopic Prayers and Liturgies. Some few works are extant on other subjects, such as exegesis, mostly translations from Chrysostom; a collection of Monastic commands called the Rules of Pachominy; confessions of faith, both of the Church as a whole and of prominent individuals; and one or two works on philosophy, law and medicine. The ascetic literature, as can be expected, is very large, the lives of the saints being described *in extenso*. The Ethiopic almanac has a saint for every day, and a biography of every saint. Wüstenfeld recently published a German translation of this saints' biographical calendar, called the Synaxarium. Poetry also is to be found, but it has stood in the service of the Church, consisting chiefly of antiphones, prayers and laudations of Mary and the saints. A kind of a Specilegium Æthiopice in English translation was given by the writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January 1882. Of course we have not given here anything like a complete list of Ethiopic works, not even of all that have been published, but have endeavored to furnish only enough material for readers to form a judgment as to the character and scope of this literature.

The facilities for studying Ethiopic are very good for any one who understands German, but very poor for a person who does not. And this is nearly all the work of a single man, Professor A. Dillmann, of Berlin, a pupil of Ewald. It is true that before his day we had the grammar and lexicon of that enthusiastic scholar Job Ludolf, the author of the very valuable *Historie Æthiopica* and the accompanying *Commentarius in Hist. Æthiop.*; but Dillmann's work threw all this into the shade. His *Grammatik*, *Lexicon Æthiopic Latinum* and *Chrestomathia Æthiopica* offer not only the beginner, but also the advanced student vast material for work. They are all the fruit of ripe scholarship, written upon the solid basis of comparative Semitic philology, and will repay study. Other aids also are at hand. Schrader, the well known Assyrian scholar, has written a well digested and careful treatise on the relation of the Ethiopic to the other Semitic tongues, entitled "*De Linguae Æthiopicae Cum Conatis Linguis Comparatae Indole Universae*;" Stade, now Professor in Giessen and the author of a new and excellent Hebrew Grammar, wrote a dissertation on the pluraliteral stems in Ethiopic; Hommel has made some contributions to the Ethiopic lexicon in his *Physiologus* and his

Namen der Längethieres beiden Suedsemit. Völkern; Trumpp has also done something in this direction in his various contributions to Ethiopic; König, the author of the new Hebrew grammar based on Qimḥi, has published two series of studies on the alphabet, pronunciation and forms of the Ethiopic language, and others have done similar work. From this last, which of course is by no means exhaustive, it is apparent that there is plenty of material at the disposal of scholars for both the critical and the literary study of the Ethiopic language. It is only to be regretted that so few find inclination and time to devote more attention to this interesting subject.

G. H. S.

Kautzsch's Aramaic Grammar.—This work deserves special commendation from the fact that the author has restricted himself to the Aramaic as presented in the Old Testament, and that he did neither intend, nor pretend, as some others before him have done, to write a grammar of the Aramaic in general. The Aramaic dialects, as we have them preserved in Daniel and Ezra, in the various Targums, in the two Talmuds, in the Midrashic and in some other branches of the ancient Jewish literature, differ very considerably, grammatically as well as lexically. In time and in place the remains of the Aramaic literature lie almost as widely asunder as the writings of Chaucer and of Macaulay, as the Scotch dialect and that of Wales. Could we now reasonably expect that one grammar of the English language should give us at the same time the rules governing modern English and old English, the English of Northumberland and the English of Sussex County? Any attempt to do so, would result in our confounding one dialect with another, and would be misleading.

So we find in some of the Aramaic dialects the verb חֲמָא (*to see*), while in others only חֲזָא is used. In some, *water* is designated by the noun מַוִי, in others by מַיִן, or מַיָא. In some the plural of masculine nouns ends in ־ִי, in others the ending is ־ִין, com. גַּבְרִי and גּוּבְרִין (*men*). In some the 1 p. Sing. Perf. of the verb ends in ־ִית, in others in ־ִי, comp. אֲמָרִית and אֲמָרִי (*I have said*), חֲזִית and חֲזָאִי (*I have seen*). And thus there are hundreds of differences to be found.

Facts enough are recorded proving that even in Judea the dialect of the neighboring Galilee was understood with difficulty in the Talmudic age, and *vice versa*. In Talmud Babyl. Erubhin 53b, for instance, we find several anecdotes showing this. For example: A Galilean had come to Judea, and there he asked, Who has an אמר? Who has an אמר? And they answered him, Thou foolish Galilean, what dost thou desire with thy אמר? Dost thou mean a חֲמוֹר (*donkey*) to ride upon, or חֲמַר (*wine*) to drink, or עֲמַר (*wool*) to clothe thyself with, or אִמַּר (*a lamb*) to kill it? In Genesis Rabba, chap. XXIV., Rabbi Eliezer is quoted as having made the remark that in Galilee they say עִיוְיָא instead of חִיוְיָא (*serpent*). If such grammatical and lexical differences were prevailing in the speech of the inhabitants of Southern and of Northern Palestine, how still more marked must have been the difference between the Eastern Aramaic spoken in the Euphrates valley and the Western Aramaic spoken on the shores of the lake of Genesareth?

On page 16 of his grammar, Prof. Kautzsch gives a specimen of the Aramaic as still spoken in three villages on the eastern slope of the Anti-Lebanon mount-

ain. If from this short specimen we would be justified in determining the characteristics of the Aramaic as still living in the mouths of a few hundred Syrians of the present day, we might say that in that dialect even radical letters are often dropped. For אחונא (*brother*) they say חונא, for הות (*it was*) they say וֹת. The same peculiarity we find in the old Aramaic literature, especially in the Jerusalem Talmud, where for אנן (*we*) the form נן appears, for אמר (*to speak*) the form כֵּר, for the proper noun אלעזר the shortened form לעזר, and so forth.

In § 5, No. 3 of his book, Prof. Kautzsch says that we are still lacking a good critical edition of the Targum, both in regard to the consonant-text and to the vocalization thereof. This complaint has now happily become groundless, at least in part. For within a few months, A. Berliner's excellent edition of the Onkelos Targum has left the press (Berlin, 1884), accompanied by notes, introduction, and indexes,—an edition which will satisfy the demands of every student.

B. FELSENTHAL.

The Study of Arabic in the University of Cincinnati.—The study of Arabic has been carried on in the University of Cincinnati for more than five years. The whole number of students that have taken it as a part of their curriculum, amounts to twelve or thirteen. The course, as laid down in the catalogue, is one of two years, but in many instances students have given four or five years to Arabic, making it a main or a secondary branch in a post-graduate course. The authorities of the Hebrew Union College strongly urge those under their charge to engage in the study thereof as long as possible.

At first the students were supplied by the instructor with different books in Arabic, by which aids they were taught to read the text. By means of dictation, paradigms and a vocabulary were acquired, and this was followed by the translation of simple sentences from Arabic into English and vice versa. A knowledge of the most common rules of Syntax was imparted in the same way. The students then took up Wright's Arabic Grammar and Arnold's Chrestomathy, omitting much in the former as being unnecessary. At least two thirds of the Chrestomathy were read, and it was succeeded by the Muallakat, with commentary (Arnold's edition). There was some doubt about the expediency of laying before young students a text so difficult. It was very hard, for a while; but in a short time, there were very few passages that they could not translate. There were four of the Muallakat read.

The last book that is given to the students is the Koran, with Beidhawis' Commentary (Fleischer's edition). The most important Suras with commentary are selected, translated, and the commentary pointed. It is best to accustom students very early to unpointed text. They will not find it, by any means, so difficult as they would think.

Every other year a course of lectures is given on the Semitic languages. These are more of an encyclopedic than philological nature.

Hebrew is not taught in the University of Cincinnati, on account of the advantages offered by the Hebrew Union College. Nearly all of the students that take Arabic have already received instruction in Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac. The University of Cincinnati has not yet any professor that devotes his time exclusively to teaching the Semitic languages. It will, without doubt, not be very long before such a chair has been established.

One great hindrance to the study of Arabic is the cost of books, and, it might even be added, the lack of the right kind of books at any cost. There is not one grammar that gives, in a succinct and clear form, such an insight into Arabic as is furnished by fifty Latin, or Greek grammars to those wishing to pursue either of these languages. W. SPROULL.

גַּן־בְּעֵדֶן.—"Eden" (Heb. עֵדֶן) had originally nothing to do with עֵדֶן, pl. עֲדָנִים. The Hebrews received the word (meaning "field," "plain") from the Babylonians. The usual Assyrian ideograph for "field," "Steppe," "plain," is explained in the syllabaries (vid. *Haupt*, ASK, 18, No. 312) by i-di-n u, *i. e.*, עֵדֶן, and as this word appears, at the same time, in the left column of the syllabary (as i-di-i n), it may be supposed that it was an old (*uraltes*), non-Semitic word, which later passed over into the Semitic (Del.). Eden, as used by the Hebrew writer, is, of course, a *proper name*, which the Hebrews, as often happens in such cases, interpreted after their own etymology, and which they probably connected with עֵדֶן in the meaning "joy," "pleasure."—In this "field" Jahveh planted a "garden," in which he placed the man. The ideograph in Assyrian for the conception "garden," read k a r and g a n, is explained, as regards its meaning in the syllabaries (vid. III., R, 70, 96; ASK, 15, 217) by Assyr. g i n û (g i-nu-u), Accad. g a-n a, and, aside from this, it is, for the Assyrian, made clear through i k-l u, *i. e.*, חקל, "field." It must remain undecided whether this word which is found in *all* the Semitic languages, also in the Ethiopic, is to be regarded as non-Semitic, but Sumero-Accadian (*Sayce*, *Haupt*, *Del.*), *i. e.*, as a foreign word in these languages, as "Park" in ours. The possibility that this word passed from the Semitic into the Accadian is, in our opinion, equally as probable, because (vid. F. Del. PD. 135) the proper and, at all events, older word for "garden," in the Accadian, seems to have been k a r; g u n, g i n replaced k a r, as far as we now see, for the first in the time of Asurbanipal (Assurb. *Smith*, 183). The etymology of the word is also, to say the least, made no less satisfactory by the acceptance of its Semitic origin than by the acceptance of its coming out of the Accadian.—*Schrader's KAT.*[2] R. F.

חִדֶּקֶל (Gen. II., 14), the Hebrew name of the Tigris, occurring also in Dan. X., 4. Noteworthy, as is known, is the pronunciation with prefixed ḥ i, which we meet neither in the Aramaic, nor in the Arabic, nor, finally, in the Persian form of the name. It is, however, not specifically Hebraic. It is found also in the Assyrian, but not, however, in the usual texts; these also present only the form "Diglat," *e. g.*, the Behistun (*l. c.*) inscription, Babyl. text l. 35 (D i-i g-l a t). We meet it, however, in the more complete syllabaries. One of these (II. Rawl. 50, 7) explains the ideograph in Beh. 34, and known to represent the Tigris (BAR.TIK.KAR) by I-d i-i g-l a t, *i. e.*, as the syllables a, i, u, in the Assyrian represent also h a, h i, h u,=H i d i g l a t, a form which, as proposed, corresponds very nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation, and joins itself with the Samaritan הדקל. The hardening of h(i) to ḥ(i), in transfer from one language to another, is, in general, not infrequent. As the Persian A h u r a m a z d â, in the inscription of N a ḳ s c h-i-R u s t a m, certainly became the Babylonian A ḥ u r m a z d a' (together with U r i m i z d a or U r a m a z d a, also U r i m i z d a' of the Behistun inscription), and as the same probably holds good in the Assyrian

itself in the case of the foreign names Hamattu and Amattu "Hamâth," Ha-midi and Amidi "Amid," so it is also probable that this Assyrian and Aramaic דרקל(ח) is only hardened in pronunciation from an original דרגל(ה)— and that the pronunciation with ק goes back to a still earlier form with ג. Probably the matter stands thus, that Idiglat, especially Diglat (the latter in the Behistun inscription) was the weaker *Babylonian* pronunciation, as reflected in the Persian Tigrâ, and as retained to the present day in the Arabic دِجْلَة, while, in the Hebrew and (cf. חִדֶּקֶל) Aramaic, the specifically *Assyrian* pronunciation received precedence. In other cases it is also known that, in Assyrian, a hard, emphatic ק corresponds to a weak ג in the Babylonian, and that, in still other respects, differences exist between the Assyrian and Babylonian pronunciations, is no less well known. Worthy of notice is the rejection of the fem. ending (a,t) in the Hebrew and Aramaic; while the Assyrian and the other languages mentioned above, including the Neo-Persian, have constantly retained it. Cf. the reverse in the Assyrian-Himjaritic-Aramaic עשתר, عثتر, عثر, in contrast with the Hebrew-Canaanitic עשתרת.—*Schrader's KAT.*[2]

R. F.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Study of Assyrian.—The impression prevails that, unless one has a life-time to devote to it, little can be accomplished in the study of Assyrian. This impression is a mistaken one. It is true, of course, that one's entire life might profitably be devoted to the study; that, to become recognized as an authority in Assyrian, one must give himself up exclusively to this and kindred subjects. But are we to take it for granted that, unless a man is to become a *specialist* in a given department, there is nothing in connection with that department which he may profitably study? Shall no man study Latin except the prospective professor of Latin?

It is probable that the difficulties of Assyrian study have been exaggerated. Or, perhaps the statement may better be made thus: The difficulties which originally existed,—and, it must be conceded, they seemed almost insuperable,—thanks to the arduous labors of such men as Delitzsch, Schrader, Oppert, Sayce, are now largely removed. Difficulties, to be sure, still remain; but, compared with those which have been overcome, they are of a minor character. The greatest difficulty for the student is the mastery of the syllabary, now that it has been quite definitely determined. But we think that an important and helpful step in advance was made during the past summer, when it was decided by an eminent Assyriologist—a practical instructor—that it was expedient, first to get some knowledge of the language through transliterated texts, and then, gradually to master the signs. This method has two advantages: it will encourage the student; and it will enable him to acquire the syllabary all the more rapidly and thoroughly, because he will know the meaning and signification of the roots and formative elements for which the signs stand.

The adoption of this method will induce five men to take up Assyrian where, otherwise, one would have hesitated. Nor need we fear that men will not learn the syllabary, after having gained some knowledge of the language. Surely that

which he would earlier have been compelled to do, will now be done all the more willingly; for not only will the student find it more easy, but he will be more fully persuaded of its importance.

The question arises: For whom is a study of Assyrian important? Whom will it pay? We answer:

1) *The professors of Hebrew.* We cannot understand how any one whose business it is to instruct in Hebrew, or to teach the Old Testament, can well afford to be without some knowledge, at least, of that language and literature which has already affected so largely the very questions which he is called upon daily to discuss in the class-room, viz., the forms of Hebrew words, the meaning of Hebrew words, the history of a nation so closely connected with that of Israel. The example of a learned professor of Hebrew, nearly sixty years of age, in a Southern seminary, who has spent his vacation, just closing, in the class-room study of Assyrian, because, indeed, he felt that a knowledge of this language was necessary to fit him for the better performance of his duties as a professor of Hebrew,—the example of this man deserves to be imitated by younger men. There is much time spent in these days by our theological professors in the discussion of questions which are of no possible moment, however they may be settled. Why not devote a portion of this time to the study of Assyrian? We profess to follow the historico-grammatical method in our interpretation of Scripture. Are there any questions then so fundamental as questions of grammar, of lexicography, of history? Is there any one source from which so much aid may be gained as from Assyrian?

2) *Ministers who know Hebrew.* There are some clergymen, let us thank God, who are familiar with Hebrew, who read the Hebrew of the Old Testament, as they read the Greek of the New. These, as compared in number with those who do not possess this knowledge, are, it must be confessed, few. But they are growing more numerous. Ten years ago they might be counted by tens. To-day they may be counted perhaps by hundreds. For this class of men, we can think of no more profitable linguistic study. Even a slight knowledge of Assyrian will enliven their Hebrew, and make it again as fresh as when first learned. Besides, who ought to be more fully equipped for the study of the Divine Word than the minister? Not even the specialist. If the Assyrian language and history will assist one in understanding the Hebrew language and history, shall it not be studied?

3) *Students of Ancient History and of Comparative Religions.* The discoveries in Assyria have opened a new field in Ancient History. What student in this department or in that of Comparative Religions,—now a science in itself,—can well afford to be ignorant of a language, of a literature, and of a history which promise so much to the investigator. Nor need one suppose that he can understand the history or religion of a people, any more than its literature, without an acquaintance with its language. The greatest of all Hebrew historians, Ewald, was likewise the greatest of all Hebrew scholars.

It is objected, *first*, that the books for the study of Assyrian are very expensive. This is true; but what library is worthy of the name that has not an Assyrian apparatus? and, besides, what are a few dollars in a matter of this kind. It may not be long, perhaps, until we shall have Assyrian text-books prepared by American professors, and then the objection of expense will no longer exist.

It is objected, *secondly*, that it is impossible to obtain instruction. This was

true three years ago, but is no longer true. At Cambridge, Professor D. G. Lyon has classes in Assyrian; in New York City, Professor Francis R. Brown; in Philadelphia, Professor John P. Peters; in Baltimore, Professor Paul Haupt. There was, during the past summer, and there will also be, the coming summer, an opportunity for gaining this instruction. Shall all this kind of work be done in Germany? Shall not American scholars show that they have a deep interest in whatever concerns the Word of God, or the language in which that Word is written?

Unaccented Open Syllables with a Short Vowel.—With Professor Strack's admirable treatment of "Syllables in Hebrew" the discussion in HEBRAICA of the so-called "Intermediate" Syllable will close. We regret that we cannot take space for the publication of other articles on this subject which have been received.

In closing the discussion, a few words may be regarded as in place:—

From the lack of a clear treatment of this subject by grammarians, and from the opinions of eminent teachers expressed orally and by letter to the writer, it is inferred that the subject is one not deemed worthy of attention. But what are the facts?

1) The Hebrew vowel-system, "while not authentic, and by no means to be regarded as an intrinsic part of the text," is not merely valuable, but indeed *necessary*, as an aid in learning the language. No accurate knowledge of the Hebrew can be obtained aside from an absolute mastery of the principles of the Massoretic system of punctuation, whether these be regarded as natural or artificial, real or imaginary. And the regularity of the system is all the more a reason why seeming departures from it should be closely examined.

2) There are in the first chapter of Genesis 454 syllables ending with a vowel, including those ending with a quiescent letter. Of these, 181 are accented, 273 unaccented (the Měthĕgh not being regarded as an accent). In all grammars the law is laid down that unaccented simple (or open) syllables must have a long vowel; but of the 273 unaccented syllables, 39, i. e., one in seven, has a short vowel. There is, of course, a clear reason in every case for this seeming violation of the rule. But why, when so large a number of such cases occurs, should no mention be made of them?

3) That student who fails to notice this deviation, and to classify the instances of it, cannot be called a critical student. That teacher who will not take into account a fact which, in violation of a most fundamental principle, occurs at least twenty times on every page of the Hebrew Bible, is not a critical teacher.

4) In our study of the Hebrew upon the basis of the Massoretic punctuation, we find, as a matter of fact, repeated instances of unaccented syllables ending in a short vowel. Why not, for the sake of convenience, designate these syllables by some definite and appropriate term? Professor Green has used the expression "intermediate;" Gesenius (Kautzsch) "half-open;" Strack suggests for some "loosely closed," for others, "opened." For our own part, any one of these terms would be satisfactory.

[In the article on "The Aramaic Language," § 1, the spelling "Shemitic" was allowed to stand, by an oversight, instead of "Semitic." Hereafter ו will be transliterated by w, and שׁ by š.—*Ed.*]

BOOK NOTICES.

KAUTZSCH'S GRAMMAR OF THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC.*

This is a complete *Reference*-grammar for *Biblical*-Aramaic, and will make a convenient companion volume to the edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar by the *same author*. It is about half as large as that work, and follows, in the main, the arrangement pursued there. The Introduction (a translation of which is given in this number) contains twenty-three pages; Orthography comprises seventeen pages; Etymology, ninety-one; and Syntax, forty-one. The real excellence of the book consists in the thoroughness with which the comparison with Hebrew is maintained, and differences noted, and in the free communication of the author's opinion on difficult questions. In dealing with the latter, everything which may shed light upon the matter in hand seems to have been consulted. The Index to Scripture passages shows that all but forty-seven Aramaic verses have been cited in the body of the work, and one passage has eleven such references.

For details, it may be sufficient to refer to what our author has done for the noun. This subject, so difficult of treatment and, hitherto, so loosely treated, is here handled with scientific accuracy and with a fullness never attempted. Forty pages, more than half of them in minion type, are given to the Etymology alone. In this division of the grammar, the Biblical citations are very numerous, at least one passage being referred to in the case of every form, and all forms occurring in Biblical Aramaic are said by the author to be enumerated in the classification which he gives. The general method of classification is like that in Gesenius, except that feminine nouns of a particular class are discussed with the masculines of the same class. Many interesting facts are here brought into prominence, as, e. g., in the statement, on p. 84, that ה_ of the fem. and emph. masc. is not used by Hebraism for א_, but is to be regarded as just as good Aramaic and at least as old as the latter; and in the one on page 91, that forms like צִלֵּם are really Segholates of the A-Class, while forms like עֵשֵׂב are I-Class Segholates. The remarks on *foreign* words, though brief, are, for the most part, satisfactory. In the discussion of the noun, as everywhere else in the book, forms not actually occurring in the Bible are distinguished by a special sort of type.

The Syntax of the Noun may be so estimated by the following list of sections printed in the contents. They are:—The Genders; The Numbers; The Emphatic State; The representation of the Genitive relation by the so-called Const. State; The Genitive by circumlocution with דִּי; The Noun in exclamation; The Noun in apposition; The Noun governed by Verbs; The Adjective as attributive and the expression of it by circumlocution; The Numerals.

For purposes of *reference* the volume before us renders all other books of the sort well nigh useless, so far as concerns *Biblical* Aramaic; and the author deserves the thanks of all friends of Semitic study. C. R. B.

* GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCH-ARAMAEISCHEN, MIT EINER KRITISCHEN EROERTERUNG DER ARAMAEISCHEN WOERTER IM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Von E. Kautzsch, Ord. Professor der Theologie in Tuebingen. VIII and 182 pp. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel*, 1884.

BROWN'S ARAMAIC METHOD.*

In the title to his work, Professor Brown seems to have been obliged to choose between unscientific inaccuracy and a correctness that is slightly indefinite. For he has rejected the old, but really inaccurate, name of Chaldee, and substituted for it the more correct, but also more indefinite name Aramaic. Yet his book is only designed to be an introduction to the more thorough study of the so-called Chaldee of the Bible and the Targums. It is not easy to see, however, how one possessed of the scholarly spirit of which Professor Brown's book gives evidence, could have done otherwise.

It is certainly to be regretted that we cannot have some name more true to the philological facts of the case than the old name of Chaldee, by which to distinguish the language of the Targums from that other offshoot from the old common stock, i. e. the language, or dialect, known as the Syriac.

Professor Brown's excellent book consists substantially of three parts; (1) Selections from the Targums, (2) scholarly and helpful Notes on these selections, and also on the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (for the text of these the student is referred to the Hebrew Bible), and (3) a carefully prepared Vocabulary. Thus the book is essentially, as is stated in the Preface, a Reading Book, or Chrestomathy. The Preface also informs us that it is only the First Part of a work yet to be completed by the issue of Part II, which will consist of a Grammar. The Chrestomathy is published before the Grammar, because the design of Professor Brown is that his completed work shall be used in the "acquisition of the elements of Aramaic by the so-called *Inductive* Method." In this method, the student is first led to see the facts in the language itself, and learns the principles and laws underlying these facts afterwards.

To aid in the accomplishment of his purpose, Professor Brown has printed in his book the text of the first ten chapters of the Targum of Onkelos, with the corresponding portions of the Hebrew text on the opposite pages. By this means, the student will be able, with the help of a skilful instructor, to discover for himself all the important resemblances and differences between the Hebrew and the Chaldee, and thus become prepared for a systematic study of the Chaldee Grammar. As a partial compensation for the yet unpublished Part II, Professor Brown has inserted in this Part I, before the title page, a complete set of Chaldee paradigms, so that the book, as it now stands, will form, in the hands of a competent teacher, a complete apparatus for giving the student command of the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament, and such a knowledge of the language of the Targums, as will fit him to enter upon the more thorough study of them.

The print, both English and square character (Hebrew and Chaldee) is good and clear, and the appearance of the pages is very pleasing to the eye. To those who know anything of the difficulty of securing good work of this sort in our country, the press-work reflects no small credit upon the publishers.

Professor Brown has made a real and valuable contribution to the study of the so-called Chaldee; and one proof of the excellence of his work is, that his book already, so soon after its publication, has been adopted as a text-book in at least five important Theological Seminaries. S. B.

* AN ARAMAIC METHOD, a Class-Book for the study of the Elements of Aramaic from Bible and Targums, by Charles R. Brown. Part I. Text, Notes, and Vocabulary. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*, Morgan Park, 1884.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

AMAND, A. Quelques observations sur les inscriptions des statues de Tell-Lah. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, April '84.

BACHER, W. Die Hebräisch-Arabische Sprachvergleichung d. Abulwalîd Mer-Wân ibn Ganâh. Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*.....M.1.20

BADGER, G. P. An English-Arabic Lexicon. London: *Paul Trench & Co.* .80s.

BASSETT, J. Grammatical note on the Simnúní dialect of the Persian Language. *Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, Jan., '84.

BERGAIGNE, A. Manuel pour étudier la Langue Sanscrite. Chrestomathie, lexique, principes de grammaire. *Vieweg*.....12fr.

BERGK, T. Zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabete in Pamphylien. *Ztschr. f. Numismatik*, XI. 4.

BERLINER, A. Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens im Talmud und Midrash. (By Kroner.) *Juedisches Litteratur-Blatt*, July 31, '84.

BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos. Herausgegeben und erläutert. I. Thl. Text, nach Editio Sabioneta d. J. 1557. II. Thl. Noten, Einleitung und Register. Mit Unterstützung der k. Academie der Wissenschaften in Berlin. Berlin: *Gorzelauczyk & Co.*, 1884.....M.10.—

BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos. (By G. F. Moore.) *Andover Review*, Oct., '84.

BLOCH, J. S. Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Talmudische Literatur. Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der Talmudischen Literatur. Wien, *D. Löwy*. Gr. 8vo, pp. X, 139.

BROWN, C. R. An Aramaic Method. A Class-Book for the study of the Elements of Aramaic from Bible and Targums. Part I. Text, Notes and Vocabulary. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*, 1884.....$1.75

DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. Hebrew Language viewed in light of Assyrian Research. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 25.

DUVAL, R. Sur la contrée araméenne, appellée pays supérior, par les lexicographes syriaques. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar. '84.

DVORAK, RUD. Ueber "tinûru" des Assyrisch-Babylonischen and die entsprechenden Formen der übrigen semitischen Sprachen. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung*, April, '84.

FISCHER, B. Talmudische Chrestomathie. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litblt.*, 24.

GAINET. Le déluge de Noé et les terrains quaternaires des geologues. Besançon: *Jacquin*. 8vo, pp. XLII, 194.

GENZ, H. Die Lokalkenntniss der Bibel. Anklam: 1884. 8vo, pp. IV, 39. M.—.50

GESENIUS, W. Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 9. Aufl. v. F. Mühlau u. W. Volck. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litblt.* 22; (By P. de Lagarde.) *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 7; (By C. Siegfried.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Sept. 6.

GUYARD, ST. Une nouvelle racine assyrienne; barû. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar., '84.

GUYARD, ST. Questions suméro-accadiennes. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.* Apr. '84.

HALEVY, J. Coup d'oeil retrospectif sur l'alphabet libyque. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar., '84.

HARING, I. Die עֲנִיִּים und עֲנָיִים im Alten Testament. *Theol. Studien aus Wuerttemberg*, 1884, 2.

HARTMANN, M. Presserzeugnisse Syriens in den Jahren 1882–83. *Literatur-Bl. f. Orient. Philol.*, March, '84.

HEIDENHEIM, M. Bibliotheca Samaritana. Herausgegeben und mit Einleitung, textkritischen Noten, Scholien und Beilagen versehen. I. Leipzig: *O. Schulze*.....M.3.50

HIRSCH, S. R. Ueber die Beziehung des Talmuds zum Judenthum und zu der sozialen Stellung seiner Bekenner. Frankfurt: *Kauffmann*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 38.

HOMMEL, FRITZ. Die sumero-akkadische Sprache und ihre Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, April, July, '84.

KAUTZSCH, E. Uebungsbuch zu Gesenius-Kautzsch' Hebräischer Grammatik. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel*, 1884, pp. 162.

KAUTZSCH, E. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen mit einer kritischen Erörterung der aramäischen Wörter im Neuen Testament. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel*. Gr. 8., pp. VIII, 181.....M.4

KREMER, A. FRHR. v. Beiträge zur arabischen Lexicographie. II. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. der k. Akad. der Wissensch."] Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*.....78s.

KREMP, F. Hebräische Studien. Gymasialprogramm. Rastatt, 1883.

LANMAN, C. R. A Sanskrit Reader, with Vocabulary and Notes. Parts I. and II. Texts and Vocabulary. Boston: *Ginn & Heath*, 1884.

LEVY, J. Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudin und Midraschim. (By S. Fraenkel.) *Lit.-Bl. f. Orient. Philol.*, Aug., '84.

LYON, D. G. Keilinschrifttexte Sargon's, Königs von Assyrien. (By J. P. Taylor.) *Andover Review*, June, '84.

MITCHELL, E. C. Elementary Hebrew Grammar and Reading Book. Andover: *W. F. Draper*, 1884, pp. 120.....$1.25

MITCHELL, H. G. Hebrew Lessons: a book for beginners. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. Pp. 232.....$1.80

PREISWERK, D. S. Grammaire hébraïque. 4 éd., refondue par Past. S. Preiswerk. Avec un tableau comparatif des alphabets. Basel: *Georg*. Gr. 8., pp. LXVI, 402.

RAMMELT, G. Ueber die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebräischen. (Hallenser Dissertation, 1883.) Leipzig: *Fock*. 8vo, pp. 32.....M.1.—

REDHOUSE, J. W. A simplified Grammar of the Ottoman-Turkish Language. London: *Truebner & Co.*, Post 8vo, pp. 216.

SAYCE, A. H. The literary works of Ancient Babylonia. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftf.*, July, '84.

SCHRADER, E. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprunge der altbabylonischen Cultur. Berlin: *Duemmler*, 1884. Gr. 4to, pp. 49.

SCHRADER, E. Kineladan und Asurbanipal. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, July, '84

STRACK, H. L. Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache und Literatur. *Modern Review*, July, '84.

STRACK, H. L. Hebräische Grammatik. (By H. Vuilleumier.) *Revue de Theol. et de Phil.*, July, '84; (By E. Nestle.) *Lit. Centralbl.*, 25.

STRASSMAIER, S. J. Fünf babylonische Verträge aus der Zeit von Nebukadnezar. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung*, April, '84.

VOSEN, C. H. Rudimenta linguae hebraicae publicis et domesticae disciplinae brevissime accommodata. Retractavit, auxit, sextum emendatissima ed. Dr. Fr. Kaulen. Freiberg: *Herder*. Gr. 8vo, pp. IV, 131.

ZOECKLER, O. Luther als Ausleger des Alten Testaments, gewürdigt auf Grund seines grösseren Genesis-Commentars. Greifswald: *Abel*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 77. M.1

HEBRAICA.

VOLUME I. JANUARY, 1885. NUMBER 3.

THE MASSORETIC VOWEL-SYSTEM.

BY CRAWFORD H. TOY,

Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

There is little or no doubt as to the actual use of the Massoretic vowel-signs; this is fixed by the readings of our Hebrew Bibles. The only question is as to its proper statement and explanation, about which there are considerable differences of opinion; and, as a contribution to the subject, and in the hope of eliciting further discussion, I give the substance of what I have been in the habit of teaching on this point. I shall refer to the historical genesis of the sounds only where it seems to throw light on the Massoretic system. As to the explanations of the old Jewish grammarians, they are to be taken as testimony, but not as final authority.

THE SOUNDS.

I transliterate as follows: Kāmeṣ, ā; Pattaḥ, a; Seḡōl, e; Ṣērē, ē; the two sounds of Hīrek, i and ī; Kāmeṣ Hāṭūf, o; Hōlem, ō; the two sounds of Šūrek-Kibbūṣ, u and ū; Šᵉwā simple, ᵉ suspended, composite, ă, ĕ, ŏ.

The vowel-sounds are usually described as "long" or "short;" but these terms seem to me to be objectionable. They are likely to be misleading: they may convey the impression that one sound differs from another only in the length of time given to its utterance—and there is no reason to suppose that this is true in Hebrew. But if they be understood to indicate merely a natural difference of length in sounds of different articulate quality, it is still an objection to them that they define the vowels by a secondary and uncertain characteristic—secondary, because it is merely a consequence of the essential articulate quality—uncertain, because it belongs largely to elocution, and is apt to be fixed by the speaker's feeling at the moment, which may lead him to make an i longer than an ā. For these reasons I shall avoid these terms, and use those mentioned below.

As there is no recognizable phonetic difference between mutable and immutable Kāmeṣ, Hōlem, and the rest, I shall not distinguish them in transliteration, but write k ā m as d ā b ā r, and k ŏ ṭ ē l as y i k ṭ ō l. This is an etymological and not a phonetic difference, and need be mentioned only in explanation of vowel-movements; though certainly it may be useful to mark it for beginners.

The vowel-sounds may be described as follows:

Kāmeṣ, ā, in its original form, is the sound produced when the vocal cavity is opened very wide, the tongue depressed and drawn back as far as possible, and the column of air issues unchecked and unmodified by the articulating organs—the ā in fāther. At some time, however, which it would be hard to fix with certainty, the sound seems to have been modified into that of English a w; we may probably infer this from the fact that, in both the Massoretic and the Babylonian systems, the o is regarded as a modification of Kāmeṣ. But, as its phonetic relations, long before established, were unaffected by this change of pronunciation, we may continue to mark it ā.

Pattaḥ, a, differs from Kāmeṣ in that, in making it, the vocal cavity is not so wide open, the tongue is slightly raised, and the ictus is further forward; it is not English a in pat, but more nearly German a in mann.

Ṣegōl, e, begins the series of linguo-palatal sounds; to form it the lips are kept moderately open and parallel, the tip of the tongue is about as high as the top of the bottom row of teeth, and the ictus of the column of air is made well back against the hard palate—about as e in met.

Ṣērē, ē, in the same series, keeps the lips a little farther apart, and the middle of the tongue raised toward the roof of the mouth, with the ictus farther forward, as a in mate, perhaps a diphthongal sound.

Hīrek, i, ī, seems to represent two sounds, both made with lips farther apart and teeth nearer than in Ṣegōl and Ṣērē, the tongue also being nearer the roof of the mouth, and the ictus further forward: the second of these, the outermost of the linguo-palatals, found usually in open syllables, is i in pique; the first, occurring usually in closed syllables, is midway between this and i in pit. About this latter i I am not sure; its syllabic relations give ground for supposing that it differs from e only, or principally, in having the ictus further forward, the elevation of the tongue being less than in ē.

Kāmeṣ Ḥāṭūf, o, begins the series of labials, in which the lips are arched or rounded, and the tongue depressed; its ictus is farther back than that of e. It is not the o in blot, that is, nearly a, but midway between this and a w. The next sound in the series, proceeding forward, is this a w, made with lips rounded, yet well apart, and tongue drawn far back—apparently the later sound of Kāmeṣ, more closed than a, from which it does not stand very far.

Ḥōlem, ō, the next member of the labial series, diminishes the rounded aperture of the lips, and draws the tongue farther back; it is o in note.

Šūrek-Kibbūṣ, u, ū, represents two sounds, one lying just behind, the other just in front of ō; the former has the lips more open, and the tongue further forward, the latter the lips more closed, and the tongue more arched, than ō; the first is nearly u in full, the second, u in rule. But about the second there is the same sort of doubt as in the case of o and i, though the doubt will not affect the syllabic movements.

Šᵉwā simple, ᵉ, is a very slight i, e or u; the composites are slight forms of a, e, o.

The vowels may be arranged in several different ways:

1. According to the place of the ictus on the line from throat to lips:

ā a o e ē i ī u ō ū

This list indicates the relation of the vowels to the consonants Ālef, Hē, Yōd, Wāw.

2. According to the position of the organs of speech:

ā, a.....vocal cavity open;
e, ē, i, ī.....tongue raised, lips parallel;
o, u, ō, ū.....tongue depressed, lips rounded.

This table shows, further, the interchanges of the vowels, both the pre-historic (ā, ō; u, ō) and the historic, living movements (a, e, i; o, ō, etc.)

3. According to the ease with which the sound may be sustained:

ā ē ī ō ū.....heavy
a e i.....medial
o u.....light

Šᵉwā, as the lightest sound, belongs in a category by itself.

The facility of prolongation seems to be in proportion to the friction of air against the walls of the cavity, which again depends on the extent of closure of the cavity, except in case of the a-sounds, so that the names "closed" and "open" might be used. I prefer those given above, because they suggest the difference in friction and volume that may be felt by trying the vowels. It is possible that there is some other difference here besides friction, but I have not been able to discover any other. This table gives the ground for the preference for certain vowels in open syllables, and for others in closed syllables; its correctness must be tested by the facts of the Massoretic pointing.

EMPLOYMENT OF VOWELS IN SYLLABLES.

When we come to examine the functions of the vowels in syllables, their statics and dynamics, we must bear in mind that these are not governed by absolutely inflexible rules. The sounds themselves were probably not absolutely fixed; for each one of our actual sounds represents a certain area in the vocal cavity within whose limits it is susceptible of changes. The laws of euphony and convenience also, which so largely determine the use of the vowels, are by no means unbending, but may vary with circumstances, or may yield to other considerations.

Whether or not Šᵉwā shall be regarded as forming a separate syllable is a good deal a matter of expression or convenience. The Jewish grammarians did not so regard it, but attached it to the succeeding syllable, and their example has been generally followed in modern works. The other view seems to me the better one. That the Šᵉwā was a real vowel-sound there can be no doubt, and it is almost as certain that the language treated it as forming a syllable. The indisposition of the Semitic languages to begin a syllable with two consonants is well known: Syriac writes 'eṣṭadon for *στάδια*, and Arabic 'ismit for Smith. The Massoretic pointing itself recognizes the vocalic character of Šᵉwā in never dageshing a mute after it, and its syllabic character in those cases, as the interrogative he, the article, and the conjunction wa, where it writes a metheg in the syllable before the pretonic Šᵉwā. Etymologically Šᵉwā always represents the lowest point of a full vowel, and the recognition of its syllabic character helps to make plain inflectional vowel-changes, and also, as it appears to me, helps to simplify the presentation of the whole vowel-system. Undoubtedly this mode of looking at it is more in keeping with our phonetic ideas, and for that reason alone would be preferable, provided it does not go counter to some phonetic principle of the language—and this, I think, is not the case.[1]

[1] Pattah furtive also is a true vowel; but, as it does not in any way affect tone or vocalization or other pointing, it may be dismissed with a remark to that effect.

I shall, therefore, consider only two sorts of syllable: open, consisting of consonant+vowel; and closed, consisting of consonant+vowel+one or two consonants. I do not see that there is any need of making a third class of "half-open" or "intermediate" syllables, a syllable that is neither open nor closed, but ends in a consonant to which is attached a vowel that belongs neither to the preceding nor to the succeeding syllable, but remains unpleasantly suspended between them. It seems decidedly simpler to treat the consonant with Šᵉwā as a simple syllable. Whether this is so will best be tested by applying the theory to the explanation of the facts.

The primary physiological division of syllables is into open and closed, under each of which heads we have the secondary, in Hebrew partly artificial, division into toned and untoned.

A. OPEN SYLLABLES.

In general, it may be said that open syllables prefer the heavier or more easily extensible vowels, for an obvious physiological reason. But heavy and light, closed and open, are only relative terms as applied to vowels, and the difference in ease of pronunciation is not so great but that it may be made subordinate to other considerations. We may examine the various sorts of open syllable separately.

1. *With the tone.*

The general rule here needs no illustrations. The favorite vowels are ā, ē, ī, ō, ū. The toned open syllable is perhaps oftenest final, but is found abundantly in penult in suffixes to nouns and verbs, in verb-forms, and in pause.

Other vowels, however, especially e and a, occur in these syllables. Thus, in the demonstratives z e "this," ē l l e "these," out of z a, and ē l l a, or z a y a and ē l l a y a; in g e "valley" (also written g ē); in nouns of the form g ō l e, from verbs third radical Yod or Waw. These last come from i-forms, as g ō l i, out of g ō l i y a, and the presence of the e is to be referred to a feeling of euphony in the language. The construct shows the fuller vowel, as g ō l ē.

Further, in the a-class of Segolates, as m é - l e k, out of the monosyllabic m a l k, where the old accentuation of the word was retained when the a became e. It was only in the special stress of pause that it was felt to be necessary to strengthen the a into ā. If the second radical is a guttural, the first vowel is a.

So in the feminine with segolate or toneless e t ending, as k ō ṭ é l e t, out of k ō ṭ ē l e t for k ō ṭ ē l a t. The Hebrew impatience of the ending a t in the absolute form of the noun has led to two modes of treating the participle: the a t has gone into toned ā, before which the ē of the stem has sunk into Šᵉwā, k ō ṭ.ᵉl ā; or the tone has receded from a t, which then becomes e t, and the toned ē has been assimilated to the following e. The large number of Segolate forms shows a fondness for e in a toned open syllable.

A stem-e is retained before the atonic petrified Accus. termination ā, as k a r m é . l ā, where the e is felt to be an essential part of the stem. So in the pause-form of the noun with suffix k ā, as ḏᵉ b ā r é . k ā, the retraction of the tone to the penult necessitates a full vowel, and the old case-ending a is retained in the form of e. The e in s u . s e . k ā, s u . s e . h ā, the plural noun with suffixes k ā and h ā, probably represents the old diphthong e i, out of a i = a y, from the full plural s u s a y, out of s u s a y a.

An example of toned a in an open syllable is found in the 3 sing. masc. Perf. with 1 pers. sing. suffix, as k ʿ ṭ ā l á . n ī: in obedience to a law of euphony the tone

is retracted, and the primitive third vowel of the verb-stem is retained, but, perhaps by reason of the phonetic weight of the ending nī, is not advanced to ā.

Also, in the plural noun with 2 sing. fem. suffix, as susá.yik, which seems to be a phonetic degradation of original susa.ya.k, susa being the accus. stem, ya the plural sign and k the pronoun; the tone is drawn back, in accordance with a general euphonic principle in Hebrew. The same explanation would apply to the dual ending áyīm: k'nāfáyīm is for kanafa.ya.m, where m is the mimation.

2. *In pretone.*

The two considerations, besides the preference for a-sounds, that determine the pretonic vowel, are the syntactical position of the word as not needing or needing definition (absolute and construct); and the phonetic weight given to a final added syllable. In a word regarded as needing definition by a succeeding word or suffix the tendency is to depress the pretonic to its slightest form — in the contrary case it will retain its vowel. If the final added syllable be heavy, so as to take the tone, the pretone will be light, otherwise not. The pretonic vowel is always either very heavy, ā, ē, ī, ō, ū, or the lightest, Š'wā, never a, e, o, u.

In the following cases, then, a full vowel is found:

In the absolute noun, as dābār, zākēn, kāṭōl;

The Kal Perf. 3 sing. masc., Nifal Impf. 3 sing. masc., and certain Hifil forms;

A sing. noun whose final syllable has ā, or ē with mutable pretone, when it takes a suffix which forms one syllable with the old third vowel of the noun-stem, or which is not heavy enough to attract the tone to itself, that is, any suffix except ka, kem, ken, as d'bārī for d'bāraya, z'kēnō for z'kēna.hū, d'bārēnū;

Kal Perf. 3 sing. masc. with any suffix except ka, kem, ken, as k'ṭālánī, k'ṭālām;

Kal Perf. 3 sing. fem. with any suffix except kem, ken, as: k'ṭālátnū, k'ṭālát'kā. In the last example the ordinary rule, that the tone cannot go farther back than the penult, is abandoned, for the sake of maintaining the very slight vowel-sound before the kā. The importance of the fem. ending at here prevents the tone from going over to the ultima, and preserves a trace of the old Semitic antepenultimate tone;

An inseparable preposition, as bā.hem, lā.hēn, lā.máyim, out of ba and la, whence come b' and l'.

On the other hand, the result of rapid pronunciation is to put Š'wā in pretone in the following cases, in all of which the Š'wā represents an original full vowel which it is desired to preserve:

The construct sing. and plur. of Nouns, including the abstract noun of action (Infin.) and the noun of command (Imperative), as d'bar, di.b'.rē, k'ṭōl;

The sing. noun with the suffixes ka, kem, ken, the Inf. with all suffixes, the Imperat. with all endings and suffixes, as d'.bār'.ká, for dabara.kā; koṭ'lī, ki.ṭ'.lū. The Inf. shows recollection of its ancient form kuṭul, which likewise belonged to the Imperative, these both being merely rapidly pronounced nouns. The suffix kā carries so great weight that it retains before it the old accus. ending, only degraded to Š'wā;

The Perf. 3 sing. masc. with the suffixes ka, kem, ken, as k'ṭāl'kā; kiṭ.ṭe.l'.kém, k'ṭa.l'.kem, precisely as the noun:

The Perf. 3 sing. fem., with suffixes k e m, k e n, as k ᵉ ṭ ā . l a . t ᵉ . k e m. The identity of action of noun and verb in this case is noteworthy—the form d ᵉ b ā r ᵉ k ā might be either of the two. The reason is that the suffix k ā, attracting the tone, produces the same changes in the primitive noun-verb stem d a b a r a;

Verb-forms, except Hifīl, whose final syllable contains any vowel but a, when suffixes are added at the end, as y i k . ṭ ᵉ . l ā . n ī;

Verbs Pē guttural with open-syllable preformative, as y e . ḥ ĕ . z a ḳ;

All verb-forms, except Hifīl, in which the afformative consists of a vowel, as k ā . ṭ ᵉ . l ā, n i ḳ . ṭ ᵉ . l ū, t ᵉ . k u ṭ . ṭ ᵉ . l ī. The verb here differs from the noun; the former is d ā . b ᵉ . r ā, the latter d ᵉ . b ā . r ī. But the verb-form with accus. suffixes agrees with that of the noun; both are, for example, d ᵉ . b ā . r ō. The real difference, therefore, is between the verb with subject-suffix and the verb with object-suffix: the former degrades its pretonic syllable, the latter maintains it. The explanation of this fact is connected, perhaps, with the more complete sense-transformation that the original noun-verb stem underwent with the assumption of subject-suffixes, a construction that was probably later than the form with object-suffixes. But this belongs to general Semitic grammar.

3. *In antepretone, or farther back.*

Wherever the pretone has a full vowel, the antepretonic vowel, if mutable, becomes Šᵉwā, as d ᵉ b ā r ī m; the cases are so numerous, and the reason so obvious, that no further remark is necessary.

When the pretone has Šᵉwā, there are two classes of cases, in the first of which a light vowel, and in the second a heavy vowel, is found in antepretone.

First, a light vowel in antepretone.

a. From additions at the beginning of the word.

Monosyllabic words with slender vowels are often prefixed to words having Šᵉwā in pretone. If, now, this Šᵉwā is held to be essential to the word, it must be retained, and the light vowel will then stand in the antepretonic syllable. For example, an inseparable preposition with a construct form, as b i, out of b a (before a syllable with full vowel, b ᵉ), with d ᵉ b a r or k ᵉ ṭ ō l, makes b i . d ᵉ b a r or b i . k ᵉ ṭ ō l; w a with y ᵉ h ī, the usual dagesh forte being omitted, makes w a . y ᵉ h ī. Here b i k ᵉ is not a half-open syllable, but is composed of two syllables, the second of which is very light; or, if one prefers to consider k ᵉ ṭ ō l as a single syllable, it must be defined as compound, consisting of a full syllable preceded by a consonant with a slight vowel-accompaniment. The case is different with l i (out of l a) and the const. Inf.: the fusion of the two words, so far as the sense is concerned, is so complete (as in the similar English form "to kill") that the Infin. gives up its first syllable, and the combination is pronounced l i ḳ . ṭ ō l.

b. From additions at the end of the word.

When inflectional endings or suffixes are attached to the Inf. Const. and Imperative Kal, as ḳ o ṭ ᵉ l ī, ḳ i ṭ ᵉ l ū, k i b ᵉ d ī; ḳ o ṭ ᵉ l ī is out of original k u ṭ u l . ī or ḳ o ṭ o l . ī, k i b ᵉ d ī from k a b a d ī, and ḳ i ṭ ᵉ l ū follows the analogy of k i b ᵉ d ū. The original second vowel maintains itself in the form of Šᵉwā, and the first vowel keeps its original form. The peculiarity here is the retention of the second vowel, a contrivance of the language, apparently, to difference the abstract noun of action from the ordinary concrete noun. In one case, b e g e d, which makes b i . g ᵉ d ī, the same procedure has been adopted in a concrete noun; and this last example may lead us to suspect that this pronunciation was more frequent in early times than appears in the Massoretic pointing.

When the suffix kem is added to nouns, as dᵉ.ba.rᵉ.kem, di.bᵉ.rē.kem, where the antepretonic ba and the preantepretonic di have slender vowels. Before kem the primitive sing. dabara becomes dᵉbarᵉ, just as before ka; but while, in the latter case, the comparative lightness of the final syllable leads to the lightening of a into ā, dᵉ.bā.rᵉ.kā, here the greater weight of kem retains the ā, so as to avoid the accumulation of heavy syllables. The earlier plu. construct dabarē, out of dabara.ya, sinks its ba, which becomes antepretonic on the addition of the toned kem, into bᵉ, and must then retain a full vowel in the preceding syllable, only diminishing the da to di.

This procedure of the noun with kem is in striking contrast with that of the verb in the addition of tem: the verb drops the third vowel of the old stem, and then dabar.tem becomes dᵉbar.tem. Why the noun keeps the third vowel, and the verb drops it, is not clear.

In the const. plu. of nouns also the light antepretonic vowel is found, as di.bᵉ.rē, ma.lᵉ.kē. The sense of the second vowel in the primitive dabara is so strong, as to cause its retention in the diminished form of Šᵉwā, and the antepretone then naturally has its own full vowel, which is sometimes a, sometimes i, sometimes o, as in the segolate forms malᵉkē, sifᵉrē, kodᵉšē; the full plural form malakīm (ordinarily now existing in the form mᵉlākīm) becomes malakē, and then malᵉkē.

With this we may connect the pronunciation of certain feminines in ūt, as malᵉkūt, yalᵉdūt. The explanation of these forms may be the same as that of bigᵉdi, above mentioned; we may have here another survival of an ancient pronunciation, which retained the second vowel in the sing. stem. Or, with Bickell (Outlines of Hebrew Grammar, Eng. translation by S. I. Curtiss, p. 61), we may suppose that the ground-form of such feminines is the plu. malakū, to which t is added, and the pretonic vowel diminished. But not all feminines in ūt retain the second vowel; we find, for example, mar.dūt and 'aš.tūt. It may, therefore, be better to refer the cases in question to the more general fact above stated.

Finally, we have to mention the case of a heavy vowel in open antepretone. This occurs in both noun and verb: in the former, when suffix kā is added to a sing., not segolate, having an a-vowel in the last syllable, or an ē-vowel preceded by a mutable, as dᵉbārᵉkā, zᵉkēnᵉkā; in the latter, in those Kal Perfect forms in which the subject-suffix consists of, or is preceded by, a vowel, as qāṭᵉlā, qāṭᵉlū, qāṭᵉlūn. The noun-form has already been referred to; the third vowel being retained before kā, in the shape of Šᵉwā, the second vowel remains full, and, because of the lightness of the two following syllables with Šᵉwā and ā, its vowel is increased to ā. The verb acts in the same way; out of dabarat, dabarū come dābᵉrā, dābᵉrū, in contrast with the noun-form dᵉbārō.

B. CLOSED SYLLABLES.

1. *In tone.*

The absolute noun, with one or two exceptions, takes a heavy vowel in a toned closed syllable, as dābār, miškāṭ, zākēn, niqṭāl, moqṭāl, mᵉqaṭṭēl. This full pronunciation is, perhaps, due to the sense of completeness in the meaning of the noun. The exceptions are: a few monosyllabic words, like bat and 'am, contracted from fuller forms; and particles, such as 'al, 'ad, lᵉbad, similarly contracted.

In lām.mā the heavy ā is retained, in spite of the euphonic doubling of the m.

The noun in construct state lightens an a-vowel, if possible, as dᵉbar, mišpat, zᵉkan, yam—a consequence of the rapid pronunciation resulting from the dependence of such a noun on a following word. In this category we may probably include the relative pronoun ăšer, as the construct form of a noun āšār, "place." Perhaps, also, the prepositions come under the same head of construct nouns.

The verb also frequently shows a in closed syllables with the tone, as in Perf. of Kal, Nifal, Pual, Hofal, Hithpaal, and Imperf. of Pual, Hofal and Hithpaal. Whether this is due to a feeling that the verb stands in a sort of construct relation with the following word, I shall not undertake to decide. In Piel and Hifil, on the other hand, the heavier vowels are found, though even here the a is retained in Perf. before a subject-ending beginning with a consonant, and in several Piel Perfects, 3 sing. mas. The Piel form with e, as dibber, instead of dibbēr, is found in several verbs, and shows that e was not far from a or ē.

Further, e is found in the pronouns 'at. tem, kem, ken, hem, hen, having come from original u; and in such forms as 'ē. nén. ni, "I am not," where 'ēnen is for 'ēnan, accusative with added demonstrative n, for primitive na.

It is to the dependent sense of the preposition and conjunction that we owe the i of the almost proclitic min and 'im.

2. *Without the tone.*

The vowel here is, without exception, light. The plural of bayit, "house," is to be pointed either bottim or bā. tīm, better the latter, = bᵉyā. tīm.

This is what has seemed to me the best statement of the Hebrew vowel-system. The general method and results remain the same, if we prefer to treat the Šᵉwā as not forming an independent syllable; and any one who takes this view may make for himself the necessary changes in the wording.

[The writer's own method of transliteration has, for obvious reasons, been employed in this article.—ED.]

THE DĀGHĒSH IN INITIAL LETTERS.[1]

[Translated from Dissertation in the Baer and Delitzsch edition of Proverbs, by Rev. O. O Fletcher, Ottawa, Ill.]

Respecting the pronunciation of the בגדכפת "כפת the earlier grammarians submit this rule: כל בגדכפ"ת דסמיך ליה"ו רפי, בר מן מפיק מפסיק דחיק ואתי מרחיק;[2] that is, if any one of the בגדכפת "בגד letters immediately follows a word which ends in one of the quiescents יה"ן, it is to be pronounced without aspiration (rāphé); but it is not so pronounced:

1. If the letter יה"ן with which the preceding word terminates is not quiescent, but retains its consonantal sound (מפיק);

2. If the two words under consideration are not closely joined but are, on the contrary, separated (מפסיק);

3. If the first word is a Mĭlră' and the second a Mĭl'êl or, so to speak, two *ictus* or ἄρσεις come in contact (דחיק);

4. If the first word, to be pronounced with the accent on the penultima, joins to itself, as if "*e longinquo*" [from afar] (אתי מרחיק), the second word, and the latter is either a monosyllable or a Mĭl'êl.

Of these four exceptions, the first two are made sufficiently clear in the grammars;[3] but whatever is there found concerning the last two, דחיק and אתי מרחיק, deals with these only partially and with insufficient accuracy, and hence is not without an admixture of errors. Wherefore it will not be superfluous to set forth in one conspectus the laws, newly examined and more accurately stated, by which the dagessation of the initial letters of words is regulated, especially since, in assigning the reasons for the accepted methods of writing in this edition of Proverbs, we will here and there appeal to these same laws by a mere token.

§ 1.

Whenever those two words, of which the latter begins with one of the mutes, that is, with one of the בגדכפת "בגד which are pronounced either hard [unaspirated] or soft [aspirated],[4] are interpunctuated with a distinctive accent, the בגדכפת "כפת

[1] I have taken the liberty of correcting errors in biblical references to be found in the original, without making special note where I have so done. Of these there were about thirty. It is, of course, known that the references here given are to the best Massoretic text, which will be found to be, in not a few instances, quite different from that contained in the commoner editions of the Hebrew Bible. Just here, it may be well to call the attention of readers who have the Baer-Delitzsch text of Isaiah, to two needed corrections in that most carefully edited work.

xii., 18, for אִשִּׁים מִדְבָּר write אִשִּׁים מִדְבָּר liv., 17, for וְכָל-לָשׁוֹן write [וְכָל-לָשׁוֹן]

[2] So Moses Kimchi in מהלך chap. 3, and David Kimchi in *Michlol*, 89. Solomon Hanau, in צהר התבה 25, and others adduce this rule as by the authority of the Massora; and this is in a measure correct, since Ben-Asher already makes mention of it in דקדוקי הטעמים § 29. But in the Massora which we are accustomed to call by this name (i. e. the printed), the rule does not appear reduced to this form. The same is true with respect to the related rule: כל זעיר דכפיק דגש בר מן אז או אי אי.

[3] Delitzsch has discussed the second quite fully in a dissertation in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1878, pp. 585—590, under the title *Die Dagessirung der Tenues*.

[4] Because of this peculiarity, the book *Jezira* calls these six letters, to which it adds ר (כפולים, ובגדכ"פ פרת. See Delitzsch's *Physiologie und Musik in ihrer Beleutung fuer die Grammatik, besonders die hebraeische* (1868). p. 11 ss.

always, without a single exception, receives the Dāghēsh, i. e., loses the aspiration, as בצלמנו כדמותנו (Gen. I., 26); ורדו בדגת (I., 28); הישני גיחון (II., 13); ואתה תישופנו (III., 15); ויפלו פניו (IV., 5).

§ 2.

But when a word beginning with one of the בגד"כפת, coheres more closely with the preceding word and is annexed to it, either by Măqqēph or by a conjunctive accent, the mute does not receive Dāghēsh, unless the word preceding terminates in a consonant and thus in a closed syllable; e. g., עֵין פְּרִי (Gen. I., 11); ויפח באפיו (II., 7); ארץ כוש (II., 13); ותהן גם (III., 6); תוסף תת (IV., 12); כאשר דבר (XII., 4); שרי גברתי (XVI., 8); קלוי באש (Lev. II., 14); יְדֵי תביאנה (VII., 30); ויתאו דויד (1 Chron. XI., 17).[1]

On the contrary, when the word preceding ends in one of the quiescents and this letter quiesces, that is, when it ends in an open syllable, the mute which follows is aspirated and does not have Dāghēsh: e. g., הָיְתָה תֹהוּ (Gen. I., 2); וירדוּ בַּדגת (I., 26); בְּנוֹ פָּרִי (I., 29); וצלה גם (IV., 22); ויהי כְּנען (IX., 26); היה דבר (XV., 1).[2]

If these two words under consideration are logically united by an accent, but it is indicated by the interjected line Pˢsiq that, in the reading they are to be somewhat disjoined, this little separation also causes the mute with which the second word begins to have Dāghēsh (§ 1). The following are examples: עשו ו בלה (Gen. XVIII., 21); אתו ו באש (Deut. IX., 21); אפוא ו בני (Prov. VI., 2). עמו ו כהם (1 Chron. XXI., 3); ביהודה ו דרכים (Neh. XIII., 15).

§ 3.

There are, however, other conditions which may abrogate this general law, that is, by which it is effected that, even after an open syllable, a mute is not aspirated but is hardened by Dāghēsh. The first of these conditions is the concurrence of similar letters (אותיות דומות); the second, the concussion of tones (דחיק); the third, the attraction of a following word by a preceding, the latter having a remote tone (אתי מרחיק). Under the second and third of these conditions, not only the בגד"כפת but all letters, אה"וחע excepted, receive Dāghēsh.

§ 4.

If a word begins with two ב's or with two כ's, or even with ב and כ or ב and מ[3] [or ב and פ],[4] and the first of these letters has Šᵉwâ, the letter which

[1] The Massorites called such a termination מפיק, that is, having the force of a consonant. By the very name of He Mappiq, we can see that it belongs here; hence, בצדה תשים (Gen. vi., 16); נהה בהם (Ezek. vii., 11); ולה נפין (Dan. vii., 6). Only three times does it occur that, though the first word ends in a consonant, the mute following retains the aspiration: קו־תֹהו (Is. xxxiv., 11); שלו בה (Ezek. xxiii., 42); ארני בם (Ps. lxviii., 18). See Massora to Ps. lxviii., 18, *Diqduqe Hateamim* § 29.

[2] By reason of this, either לא כי (1 Kgs. iii., 22, 23; 2 Kgs. xx., 10) or לֹא כִי (Gen. xviii., 15; xix., 2 and often) is written, according as לא has a conjunctive or disjunctive accent. See Delitzsch in *Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1878, pp. 589 sq.

[3] Ben-Naphtali adds כ and נ (כנ), Ben-Asher on the contrary opposing; the *textus receptus* follows the latter. See argument on Ps. xxiii., 3. *Diqduqe Hateamim*, p. 30.

[4] [The author has omitted the combination ב and פ; probably through oversight, since he gives examples of it. See references to Lev. xxv., 53; 2 Sam. xviii., 25; Isa. lix., 21; Zeph. iii., 13; Ps. xxxiv., 2; Job xxiv., 5; 2 Chr. xxix., 36.]

has Šʿwâ takes Dāghēsh, in order that the pronunciation may not be too much suppressed by the concurrence of two aspirates. This pointing obtains even though the first word has a conjunctive accent and terminates in an open syllable. Examples: וּתְתַפְּשָׂהוּ בְּבִגְדוֹ (Gen. XXXIX., 12); בְּשָׁבְתְּךָ בְּבֵיתֶךָ (Deut. VI., 7); וַיְהִי כְּכֹלוֹת (Josh. VIII., 24); וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָה (Judg. I., 14); וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָם (1 Sam. XVI., 6); קְטַנָּה כָּכָה (1 Kgs. XVIII., 44); הִלְא כְּכַרְכְּמִישׁ (Is. X., 9); נִשְׁכְּבָה בְּבִשְׁתֵּנוּ (Jer. III., 25); הָיְתָה בְּבֵיתוֹ (1 Chron. VII., 23); כִּי בְמִקְלִי (Gen. XXXII., 11);[1] אֹתָנוּ בְּמִשְׁמָר (XL., 7); לוֹ בְּמִצְרַיִם (XLVI., 27); יְרַדְנוּ בְּפֶרֶךְ (Lev. XXV., 53); בְּעַבְדִּי בְּמֹשֶׁה (Num. XII., 8); וַיְחַנוּ בְּמִדְבַּר (XXXIII., 36); בִּשְׁדֵה בְּפִיו (2 Sam. XVIII., 25); שָׂמְתִּי בְּפִיךְ (Is. LIX., 21); יִכְּצֵא בְּפִיהֶם (Zeph. III., 13); עָמְדָה בְּמִישׁוֹר (Ps. XXVI., 12); תְּהִלָּתוֹ בְּפִי (XXXIV., 2); יָגִילוּ בְּמַלְכָּם (CXLIX., 2); שִׂמְחוּ בְּמָחוֹל (CXLIX., 3) יִצְאוּ בְּפֶעָלָם (Job XXIV., 5); כִּי בְּפִתְאֹם (2 Chron. XXIX., 36).

But if the first of these two letters beginning the [second] word has a full vowel, Dāghēsh is withheld: e. g., אִשָּׁה בְּבְתוּלֶיהָ (Lev. XXI., 13); וַיִּשְׁחִיתוּ בְּנֵי (Judg. XX., 25); כֹּהֲנֵי בָּמוֹת (1 Kgs. XIII., 33); הָיְתָה בָּבֶל (Is. XIII., 19); יְרֵא בְּפַלְגוֹת (Job XX., 17); אַרְכֻּבֵי בְּבֶלְיָא (Ezra IV., 9); אֲזַלוּ בְּבֶהֱלָה (IV., 23).

§ 5.

The rule דְּחִיק[2] pertains to words taken two at a time whose accents meet, in consequence of which they are joined by Măqqēph; in particular as follows:

a) If the first of two cohering words ends in ה ֵ and the second is either a monosyllable or has the accent on the first syllable, the mute with which the second begins has Dāghēsh. Examples: וּמִשְׁנֵה־כֶסֶף (Gen. XLIII., 15); תַּעֲשֶׂה־ בּוֹ (Exod. IV., 17); נַכֶּה־בּוֹ (Num. XXII., 6); תִּכְסֶה־בָּהּ (Deut. XXII., 12); אֹכְלֵה־בָּם (XXXII., 24); יִבְנֶה־בַּיִת (2 Sam. VII., 13); יִכְסֶה־בָּגֶד (Ezek. XVIII., 17); יְחַוֶּה־דָּעַת (Ps. XIX., 3); מִכְסֶה־פָּשַׁע (Prov. XVII., 9); הֵינָאֶה־גֹמֶא (Job. VIII., 11); יִפְצֶה־פִּיהוּ (XXXV., 16); נִבְנֶה־לָנוּ (Gen. XI., 4); וְנַעֲשֶׂה־לָנוּ (*ib.*); יִרְאֶה־לּוֹ (XXII., 8); וְאֶעֱשֶׂה־שָּׁם (XXXV., 3); יִהְיֶה־לְעָם (XLVIII., 19); יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ (Exod. XXVIII., 32); תִּשְׁתֶּה־מַיִם (Deut. XI., 11); נִשְׁתֶּה־יַיִן (Jer. XXXV., 6); יִשְׁוֶה־לּוֹ (Hos. X., 1); יִצְוֶה־לָךְ (Ps. XCI., 11); יִכְבֶּה־נֵעֹר (CXIX., 9); תִּרְבֶּה־ שִׁחַד (Prov. VI., 35); מְגַלֶּה־סוֹד (XI., 13); מְעַנֶּה־רָשׁ (XV., 1); תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ XXIV., 6); תִּשְׁוֶה־לּוֹ (XXVI., 4).[3]

---

[1] According to the opinion of some punctuators ב in בְּכֻיָּלוֹת (Exod. XX., 20) is not to have Daghesh, since Ga'ya [Methegh] gives it sufficient weight.

[2] [For the letters affected by this rule, see § 3, last sentence.]

[3] In [some] grammars the vowel Pattah is brought under this rule, כֶּה־זֹאת, כֶּה־זֶה, כֶּה־בְּצִין, כֶּה־בְּרִי being adduced as examples, but without cause; for after כֶּה־ just as after זֶה־ with Maqqeph, Daghesh always follows, even if the subsequent word is not accented on the first syllable; e. g. כֶּה־נוֹרָא (Gen. XXVIII., 17); כֶּה־פָּשַׁע (XXXI., 36); כֶּה־פָּרְצַת (XXXVIII., 29); כֶּה־נִרְבָּר וְכֶה־נֵצְטָדֵק, כֶּה־נֶאְסַר, (XLIV., 16); כֶּה־יְרָאֵנִי (Num. XXIII., 3); כֶּה־תֹאמַר (1 Sam. XX., 4); כֶּה־דּוֹדִךְ (Cant. V., 9); זֶה־פְּרִיָּה (Num. XIII., 27); זֶה־כִּיּוֹנַח (1 Chron. XXII., 1). Hence כֶּה and זֶה are somewhat peculiar. And aside from כֶּה there is no word which, when followed by Maqqeph ends in ה ֵ.

b) Moreover if the first of two words closely attached ends in ה_ and the second is either a monosyllable or a Mîl'ēl, the first letter of the latter receives Dāghēsh, but only under this condition, that the final syllable of the former begins with Šʿwâ *mobile*. Examples: לְקָחָה־זֹאת (Gen. II., 23); גְּשָׁה־לִּי (XXVII., 26); לְךְ־נָא (Num. XXIII., 13); תְּנָה־לָנוּ (XXVII., 4); וְאִדְרְשָׁה־בָּהּ (1 Sam. XXVIII., 7); נִתְּנָה־לּוֹ (XXV., 30); וְנִדְמָה־שָּׁם (Jer. VIII., 14); סְאָה־סֹלֶת (2 Kgs. VII., 1); וְאִשְׁקְלָה־לּוֹ (XXXII., 9); לְרָאוֹת־בָּךְ (Ezek. XXVIII., 17); שִׁעְטָה־לּוֹ (Cant. III., 11); אִלְקְטָה־נָּא (Ruth II., 7); שִׁבָּה־פֹּה (IV., 1); נִשְׁמְחָה־בּוֹ (Ps. LXVI., 6); אִזְמְרָה־לָּךְ (LXXI., 23;) מְחֻלָּה־לֵב (Prov. XIII., 12); וְאֶהְיֶה־שָּׁם (XV., 17;) אִשְׁלְמָה־רֵעַ (XX., 22); נִבְחֲרָה־לָּנוּ (Job XXXIV., 4).

But if the final syllable of the first word does not begin with Šʿwâ *mobile*, the rule דחיק is not applied, hence a mute at the beginning of the second word is aspirated, [and a letter other than mute is written without Dāghēsh]: e. g. לִטְמֹאָה־בָּהּ (Lev. XVIII., 23); וְלִדְבָקָה־בּוֹ (Deut. XI., 22); צִוָּה־לָנוּ (XXXIII., 4); דִּמָּה־לָנוּ (2 Sam. XXI., 5); נִגְלָה־לָמוֹ (Isa. XXIII., 1); שִׁלְחָה־לּוֹ (Ezek. XVII., 7); כִּסָּה־בָגֶד (XVIII., 16); גִּלָּה־בָךְ (XXII., 10); עֲרָיָה־בֹּשֶׁת (Mic. I., 11); הִכָּה־צוֹר (LXXVIII., 20); שִׁמְעָה־לִי (Job XXXII., 10); וְעָנוֹ־צֶדֶק (Ps. XLV., 5); וְשִׁנְאָה־בֹּהּ (Prov. XV., 17); וְשִׁלְוָה־בָּהּ (XVII., 1); וְנִרְאָה־דֹּשֶׁא (XXVII., 25).

§ 6.

If the first of two words closely attached is Mîl'ēl and has an open final syllable ending in Qāmĕṣ or Sĕghôl, and the second word is accented on the first syllable, the mute[1] with which the latter commences has Dāghēsh. This rule is called אתי מרחיק, that is "*veniens e longinquo*" [coming from afar], because the accent of the first word is remote from that of the second and attracts it powerfully from a distance. Dagessation on account of אתי מרחיק takes place under these conditions:

a) If the accented syllable of the first word is the one on which, according to the law of its formation, the tone would fall: e. g., עָשִׂיתָ זֹּאת (Gen. III., 14); הִגַּדְתָּ לִּי (XII., 18); הֵרָה נָסוֹ (XIV., 10); הֲבָה נָּא (XXXVIII., 16); עָלֶיךָ פָּרִץ (XXXVIII., 29); בְּאֵרָה שָׁבַע (XLVI., 1); וְעָבְדֶיךָ בָּאוּ (XLII., 10); וְעָשִׂיתָ צִיץ (Exod. XXVIII., 36); הִנָּחָה לִּי (XXXII., 10); וְעָשִׂיתָ פֶּסַח (Deut. XVI. 1); וְזָבַחְתָּ פֶּסַח (XVI., 2); וְיָצָאתָ שָׁמָּה (XXIII., 13); חִפַּצְתָּ בָּהּ (XXI., 14); וְאַעֲיָדָה בָּם (XXXI., 28); וְהָגִיתָ בּוֹ (Jos. I., 8); הִתַּלְתָּ בִּי (Judg. XVI., 10); תִּנָּנָה לִּי (1 Sam. XXI., 10); לָמָּה בָּאתִי (2 Sam. XIV., 32); אֲצִיתָנָה יָחַד (Is. XXVII., 4); תִּרְאֶינָה בָּהּ (Mic. VII., 10); דִּמִּיתָ בָּכֹה (Ezek. XXXI., 18); פִּקַּדְתָּ לַיְלָה (Ps. XVII., 3); עֲלָתָה בּוֹ (XCII., 16); עֲדוּתֶיךָ שָׁשַׁעְתִּי (CXIX., 14); וְהַחֲזִיקָה בּוֹ (Prov. VII., 13); עָלֶיהָ קָם (Job XXXVIII., 5); לֻכְנָה שָׁבְנָה (Ruth I., 8); מְאוֹמָה רָע (Jer. XXXIX., 12); מְחַצְתָּ רֹאשׁ (Hab. III., 13); לְמַעְלָה רֹאשׁ (Ezra IX., 6); אֵלֶה פָּה (Gen. XXXIII., 5); אֵלֶה לָךְ (Deut. V., 3).

[1] [See § 3 last sentence, for the letters affected by this rule.]

b) If the tone of the first word recedes to the penultima (נסג אחור), and this syllable is lengthened and its accent takes the place of the firm Měthĕgh,[1] then a mute commencing the second word receives Dāghēsh. Examples: יֶלֶד בֵּן (Gen. XIX., 38, whereas without the recession of the tone, יֶלֶד); הִשְׁבִּיעָה לִי (XXI., 23); וְרִבִּיצָה בּוֹ (Deut. XXIX., 19); מָלְאָה דָּם (Isa. XXXIV., 6); נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ (XL., 7); מִשְׁלָה לוֹ (XL., 10); נִסְּכָה בּוֹ (LXIX., 19); הָיְתָה לָנוּ (Ezek. XXXVI., 2); מָלְאָה גַּת (Joel IV., 13); דִּבְקָה בָהּ (Ruth I., 14); יָרְדָה מַיִם (Lam. I., 16); עָמְדָה לִי (Eccl. II., 9); נִירְשָׁה לָנוּ (Ps. LXXXIII., 13); מָצְאָה בַיִת (LXXXIV., 4); הָיְתָה זֹאת (CXVIII., 23); עָרְבָה לִי (Jer. XXXI., 26); וְנִשְׁקָה לּוֹ (Prov. VII., 13); שִׁבְּעָה מַיִם (XXX., 16); נִטְּעָה כֶרֶם (XXXI., 16).

If, on the contrary, the receding accent occupies a syllable which is incapable of receiving Měthĕgh, the dagessation of the mute is not admitted: e. g. חָרְבָה לָךְ (Gen. IV., 6); וְעָשָׂה שָׁם (XIII., 4); וְיָעֲשָׂה פֶּסַח (Num. IX., 10); וְקָרָא בּוֹ (Deut. XVII., 19); מָצָא בָהּ (XXIV., 1); מָצְאָה כֶּסֶף (XXII., 19); שְׁדֵה טוֹב (Ezek. XVII., 8); בְּנוֹה טוֹב (XXXIV., 14); מִצְרָה לִי (Jonah II., 3); עָנָה בִי (Ruth I., 21); נָטָה קָו (Lam. II., 8); עָשָׂה פֶּלֶא (Ps. LXXVIII., 12); לְנִסְכָה לֵהּ (Dan. II., 46); טוֹבָה לָךְ (Ruth IV., 15); מִתְקוֹמְמָה לּוֹ (Job XX., 27).

Imperfects and participles of ל"ה verbs are, however, excepted; after these the mute of the subsequent word has Dāghēsh, even though the receding accent may occupy a syllable in which Měthĕgh does not belong: as עֹשָׂה לָךְ (Gen. XXXI., 12); יֵעָשֶׂה לּוֹ (Exod. XXI., 31); אֹקְרֵה כֹה (Num. XXIII., 15); עֹשֵׂה כֹל (Isa. XLIV., 24); יְבֻנֶה בָּהּ (Zech. I., 16); וּמוֹרֵה שָׁקֶר (Hab. II., 18); יְנֻקָּה רָע (Prov. XI., 21); קֹנֵה לֵב (XIX., 8); גֹּלֶה סוֹד (XX., 19); כֹּרֶה שַׁחַת (XXVI., 27); הֹאֲבֵה רִים (Job XXXIX., 9).

c) Likewise, if Měthĕgh occupies the place of the accent in the first word, the mute at the beginning of the second word has Dāghēsh, according to the rule נסג אחור; e. g. יֶלֶד־לּוֹ (Gen. XXI., 3, where Měthĕgh fills the place of the accent; cf. יֶלֶד בֶּן XIX., 38); נָתְנָה־לִּי (III., 12); אֹרְדָה־נָּא (XVIII., 21); הָבָה־לִּי (XXX., 1); וְעָנְתָה־בִי (XXX., 33); הַגִּידָה־נָּא (XXXVII., 16); אֶלְכָה־נָּא (Exod. IV., 18); אֹרָה־לִי (Num. XXII., 6); קָבָה־לִי (XXII., 11); הָמִיה־לִי (Jer. IV., 19); בּוֹנָה בַּיִת (2 Chr. II., 3); שְׁכָנָה־לָהּ (Ps. CXX., 6); עָשְׂתָה־לָהּ (Prov. XXXI., 22).

d) Also, if the first syllable of the second word does not have the primary tone, but only Měthĕgh indicating the secondary tone, nevertheless the letter by which it begins has Dāghēsh from the analogy of the law נסג אחור, the בגד כפת being, however, excepted, since they reject this looser condition of dagessation. Examples: שְׁמָה קָבְרוּ (Gen. XLIX., 31); אָשִׁירָה לַיי (Exod. XV., 1); וְיִרְאַת מֵאֱלֹהֶיךָ (XIX., 14); וְעָשִׂיתָ סִירֹתָיו (XXVII., 3); אֵינֶנָּה מַעֲלָה (Lev. XI., 26); בְּאָה נַחֲלָתֵנוּ (XXXII., 14); כְּכָה יֵעָשֶׂה (Num. XV., 11); עַבְדֶיךָ נָשְׂאוּ (XXXI., 49);

[1] Concerning the firm and indispensable Methegh (מתג תכין), see *Methegsetzung* § 10; *Merx, Archiv* I. 1869) [and Kautzsch's Gesenius Heb. Gram. § 16, 2. b].

19); עבדיך יעשו (xxxii., 25); ועבדיך יעברו (xxxii., 27); לאחיך לעניך (Deut. xv., 11); וכעסתה אשבירה מאנוש (xxxii., 26); ועשית כיעקה (xxii., 8); צרתה (1 Sam. i., 6); ולמה לא־שמיעת (xv., 19); אלה יעקב (Is. xliv., 21); צפנת ליראיך (Ps. xxxi., 20); עליה מחנות (Ezek. iv., 2); כבה יאכלו (iv., 13); הבה יירשו (xxxvii., 9); נתתה ליראיך (lx., 6); שמת מועקה (lxvi., 11); כונגת מישרים (xcix., 4); אמרת לאבותיהם (Neh. ix., 23); לאבתינו (ix., 36).

That dagessation does not take place in those cases in which the letter having Měthĕgh is one of the six mutes, is readily discerned from the following examples: תחתיה תעמד (Lev. xiii., 28); אלה תולדות (Gen. ii., 4); למה תעמד (xxiv., 31); הורעת בעמים (xliv., 2); פעלת בימיהם (Ps. ix., 11); עזבת דרשיך (lxxvii., 15); דכאת כחלל (lxxxix., 11). The cause is easy to perceive. Dāghēsh in these six letters not only sharpens, but changes, the pronunciation; but where the tone of the first syllable of the second is only secondary, which Měthĕgh indicates, the dagessation does not have sufficient force to harden an aspirate. There are, however, two places where, nevertheless, a mute assumes Dāghēsh: כמכה באלם (Exod. xv., 11) and וישימה תל-עולם (Jos. viii., 28).

e) If the second word, either a monosyllable or Mĭl'ēl, begins with a letter having Šʿwâ, this letter itself receives Dāghēsh, the four serviles בו"כל being excepted: e. g. עשה פרי, עשה פרי (Gen. i., 11, 12); ארצה כנען (xii., 5); הרחיבה שאול (Isa. v., 14); ואציעה שאול (Ps. cxxxix., 8); גדלת מאד (civ., 1); שמת טעם (Dan. iii., 10); כלא מטא (iv., 25); ושמתו שמו (Neh. ix., 7); and even ועשית קערתיו (Exod. xxv., 29).[1] That the letters בו"כל do not take Dāghēsh [under these conditions], will appear from these examples: ידעתיך בשם (Exod. xxxiii., 12); תהיין לאיש (Deut. xxi., 15); נהייתי לעם (xxvii., 9); צריה קראתיך בצדק (Isa. xlii., 6); תמקנה בחוריהן (Zech. xiv., 12); לראש (Lam. i., 5). The particle לך which constantly receives Dāghēsh is excepted: חלילה לך (Gen. xviii., 25); ועשית לך (Deut. x., 1); אלהיך לך (xxiii., 6); ואסכה לך (2 Sam. xii., 8); לקחתי לך (xii., 9); שאלת לך (1 Kgs. iii., 11); ונתתיה לך (xi., 35).—ולילה לילה (Ps. xix., 3) follows this analogy.

§ 7.

From this mere statement of the rules, we gather that the second of two words taken together does not receive Dāghēsh by reason of דחיק or מרחיק, unless

[1] So in the Spanish codices, says Hayyug, according to Jequshiel the punctator, whose critical commentary Heidenheim has added to his edition of the Pentateuch entitled מאור עינים. Delitzsch says this is the Daghesh orthophonic, inasmuch as it preserves the distinct pronunciation of the initial letter. Some codices as Erfurt. 3 (see Delitzsch's *Complutensische Varianten*, 1878 p. 12) use this Daghesh orthophonic too much. But really the Daghesh orthophonic is more extended in its use than has been hitherto acknowledged. Indeed it is doubtful whether the Daghesh דחיק and especially the Daghesh אתי מרחיק is rightly classified by the grammarians under the species Daghesh *forte conjunctive*.

1. This word has the primary tone, or at least the secondary tone, on the first syllable; and

2. The first word which joins the second to itself by Dāghēsh, ends either in Qāmĕç or Sĕghôl. Hence the following remain rāphé: בָּרְכָה בָּרָךְ (Num. XXIII., 11); מְבָרְכֶיךָ בָּרוּךְ (XXIV., 9); אַבְנֵיהָ בַּרְזֶל (Deut. VIII., 9); עֲשִׂיתָ בַּסָּתֶר (2 Sam. XII., 12); וַיִּפְלוּ־שָׁמָּה (Gen. XIV., 10); עֹשֵׂה פֶּלֶא (Exod. XV., 11); שִׁירוּ לַיְיָ (XV., 21); יוֹרְדֵי בּוֹר (Ezek. XXXI., 14); נַעֲוֵה־לֵב (Prov. XII., 8); עֲשִׂיתִי כֵן (Neh. V., 15); and of this sort elsewhere. It has, however, come to be usage that, if any Mĭl'ēl ends in the vowel û, a sibilant or liquid beginning the following word may have Dāghēsh. Examples: קוּמוּ צְאוּ (Gen. XIX., 14, Exod. XII., 31); תְּשִׁבֵּיתוּ שְׁאֹר (Exod. XII., 15); קוּמוּ סְעוּ (Deut. II., 24); סְרוּ רְדוּ (1 Sam. XV., 6); נָסוּ נָדוּ (Jer. XLIX., 30); וַיֶּחֱלוּ מְעַט (Hos. VIII., 10). Also the particles לֹא and לוֹ receive Dāghēsh after וַיֹּאמְרוּ, in four places: Gen. XIX., 2;[1] Judg. XVIII., 19; 1 Sam. VIII., 19; Est. VI., 13.

The following are anomalous, inasmuch as they cannot be arranged under the laws expounded above, but are confirmed by the authority of the Massora: כִּי־נְאֵה נָאָה (Exod. XV., 1, 21); מִי כָמֹכָה (XV., 11); עִם־זוּ גָאָלְתָּ (XV., 13); יִרְמוּ וְשַׁמְתִּי כְּאֶבֶן (XV., 16); אֲבִיךָ קָנָךְ (Deut. XXXII., 6); עֲבִית כָּשִׁית (XXXII., 15); כָּדְכוֹד (Is. LIV., 12); וְנֹאלַאתִי כְּלְכֵל (Jer. XX., 9); גְּאֻלַּת בְּזֵרוֹעַ (Ps. LXXVII., 16); תִּסְרֵנוּ יָהּ (XCIV., 12); קְרָאתִי יָהּ (CXVIII., 5); יִסְרַנִּי יָהּ (CXVIII., 18); חִקְרֵנוֹהָ כִּן־הִיא (Job V., 27); גְּדַבְרִיָּא דְּתַבְרִיָּא (Dan. III., 2, 3); וְחָכְמָה כְּחָכְמַת־ (V., 11).[2]

§ 8

It remains for us to add something concerning that Dāghēsh which, according to the teaching of the ancients, is written, not only in the בגד"כפת but also in other letters, after words terminating in a consonant. For, if the first of two words taken together ends with the same consonant with which the second commences, the consonant which begins the second word takes Dāghēsh lest it be confounded with the preceding in the more hasty reading.[3] Examples: אִם־מָחוֹט (Gen. XIV., 23); לֶאֱכֹל־לֶחֶם (XXXI., 54); עַל־לֵב (XXXIV., 3); גַּם־מִשְׁלִשִׁים, גַּם־ (Exod. IV., 10); בֶּן־נוּן (XXXIII., 11); וְנֶעְלַם מִמֶּנּוּ (Lev. V., 2); וְאִם־תָּךְ תִּתְמֹל (XXVII., 8); עִם־מֹשֶׁה (Josh. III., 7); בֶּן־נֵר (1 Sam. XIV., 50); בֶּן־נְתַנְיָה (2 Kgs. XXV., 23); מְבַקְשִׁים מַיִם (Isa. XLI., 17); אִשִׁים מִדְבָּר, לְאַגַּם־מַיִם (XLI., 18);

[1] Cf. Delitzsch's commentary on this passage and XIX., 14 (4th Germ. ed. pp. 337, 339).

[2] Cf. the Massora on Dan., v., 11, *Diqduqe hateamim* § 29. The Daghesh in the Yodhs, Ps. CXVIII., 5, 18, can be explained by a rule proposed above (see Delitzsch's commentary on these passages). But since Daghesh is omitted elsewhere, as in בְּהוֹכֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם, וְלֹי יְהוֹשִׁיעַ (Ps. CXVI., 6, 19], it is more satisfactory to account these two instances of יָהּ as exceptions. For the rest, see what Parchon (p. 4) and Norzi (on Ex. XV.) say.

[3] The use of this Daghesh, to which Delitzsch has given the name *orthophonic*, has been omitted by editors of the text of the Bible, through ignorance rather than through negligence. We show, in our Psalter (Brockhaus 1874, p. IX) that the employment of this Daghesh has the force of law even with the older Massorites.

לִמחוֹל לִי (Ps. xxvi., 4); עִם־מֵתַי וגם־מֵהם (lxvi., 21); וכל־לְשׁוֹן (liv., 17); עִם מַרעִיתוֹ (xcv., 7); עַל־לוּחַ (Prov. iii., 3); עַל־לְחָיהּ (Lam. i., 2); קֶדֶם מַלכָּא (Dan. ii., 10); אֲתוֹן־נוּרָא (iii., 6); וְהֵיכַל לִבבֵל (Ezra vi., 5); וּלכֻם מְהוֹדעִין (vii., 24); גַּם מְגֻבָּה (Eccl. xii., 5).[1]

Wherever the particles לֹא and לוֹ come together thus לֹא לוֹ, inasmuch as these are similar in sound but different in signification, לֹא has Dāghēsh, and by it the reader is admonished to enunciate the negative with emphasis and to distinguish it carefully from the pronoun; as in Gen. xxxviii., 9; Hab. i., 6; Prov. xxvi., 17. With the same intent לוֹ לֹא is written in Deut. xxxii., 5. And the Lāmĕdh of the word לֵאמֹר has Dāghēsh whenever the noun מֹשֶׁה precedes it; e. g. Exod. vi., 10, 29; xiii., 1; xiv., 1.[2]

---

[1] Very often the little line Pʿsiq, placed between two such words, is substituted for the Daghesh; as רִבִּים ׀ כְּפָנֶיךָ (Deut. vii., 1); אחיכם ׀ כְּכל הגוים ׀ מְנחה (Is. lxvi., 20); בבל ׀ לְגלִים ׀ כִּיעָן (Jer. li., 37); וברזל ׀ לְרֶכֶב (1 Chron. xxii., 3); ואנשים ׀ כְּיעֵט (Neh. ii., 12); חצור ׀ רכה (xi., 33); now and then, where it can be done, Methegh *remorans* [retarding] (הַעֲמָדָה) is added, e. g., וְיִצָּן צִיָּן (Num. xvii., 23); וְאוֹזֵל לוֹ (Prov. xx., 14).

[2] Cf. Lonzano in *Or thora*, on Exod. vi., 10.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TIME OF THE TALMUD.

By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D.

Allegheny, Pa.

§ 1. THE CANON.

The word *canon* (*κανών*) occurs first in the third century of our era. A corresponding word for canon, now used, is nowhere found in Jewish writings. The different expressions for Bible are ספר or הספר, "the Book" *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (*Sabim* v., 12; *Sabbath*, fol. 13, col. 2; *Pesachim*, fol. 19, col. 2), כתבי הקדיש, "Holy Writings" (*Yadaim* iii., 5; *Sabbath* xvi., 1), מקרא, i. e., reading (*Taanith*, fol. 27, col. 2), אורייתא נביאים וכתובים, i. e., the Law, Prophets and Hagiographa (*Kiddushin*, fol. 49, col. 1).

The Talmud also does not profess to impart information respecting the manner in which the Old Testament canon was formed. It does, however, contain a list of all the books regarded as canonical, as the following passage, which may be regarded as the *locus classicus*, shows: "*Our rabbis have taught*"[1] (thus we read in *Baba Bathra*, fol. 14, col. 2, and fol. 15, col. 1) "*that the order of the prophets is Joshua and Judges, Samuel and Kings, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve.*

"(Question) Hosea is the first; because it is written, 'The beginning of the word of the Lord to Hosea' (Hos. i., 2). But how did he speak in the beginning with Hosea? Have there not been many prophets between him and Moses? Rabbi Jochanan explains this as meaning that Hosea was the first of the four prophets who prophesied at that time—Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Amos. Why, then, was he not put first [i. e., before Jeremiah]? (Reply) Because his prophecy stands next to that of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi; and, as these are the last prophets, he is, therefore, counted with them. (Objection) But, then, should it [Hosea] have been written by itself, and placed [before Jeremiah]? (Reply) No; because it is so small, and could have easily been lost. (Question) Since Isaiah lived before Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Isaiah ought to have been placed before them? (Reply) Because the book of Kings closes with desolation, and Jeremiah is entirely full of desolation, Ezekiel commences with desolation, and closes with desolation, whereas Isaiah is all consolation, we combine desolation with desolation, and consolation with consolation.

"*The order of the Kethubim* [i. e., Hagiographa] *is Ruth and Psalms, and Job and Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Lamentations, Daniel and Esther, Ezra and Chronicles.*[2] According to him who says that Job lived in the time of

---

[1] With this phrase (תנו רבנן or abbreviated ת"ר) is introduced what is called Beraitha, a kind of supplement to the Mishna, and which we have put in Italics, in order to distinguish it from the observations made thereon by the late Talmudists. As the Beraitha was only the private opinion of some individual teacher, its directions were not regarded as binding.

[2] This paragraph on the Hagiographa is entirely omitted in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia s. v. *Canon of the Old Testament*. Indeed this whole Talmudical passage is there reproduced in such a mutilated form as to convey no idea of what Prof. Strack intended by quoting this passage in his article *Kanon* in Herzog's *Real Encyklopædia*. I can only account for this by supposing that the translator was not familiar enough with the Hebrew, and thought it best to omit it entirely.

Moses, ought Job to be put first? (Reply) We never commence with misfortune. (Objection) But Ruth, too, contains misfortune. (Reply) But misfortune with a happy end, as Rabbi Jochanan said [cf. *Berachoth*, fol. 7, col. 2]. Why was she called Ruth? Because she was the ancestress of David, who refreshed the Holy One, blessed be he! with hymns and psalms.

"(Question) And who wrote them [viz., all the holy writings]? Moses wrote his book and the section of Balaam[1] and Job; Joshua wrote his book and the eight verses of the Law [Deut. XXXIV., 5–12]. Samuel wrote his book and Judges and Ruth. David wrote the book of Psalms, with the assistance of [or in the place of][2] the ten elders, with the aid of Adam, the first man, of Melchizedek, of Abraham, of Moses, of Heman, of Jeduthun, of Asaph and of the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah wrote his book and the books of Kings and Lamentations. Hezekiah and his assistants wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, the symbol of which is יְמִישָׁה.[3] The men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel and the Twelve [Minor Prophets], Daniel and the roll of Esther, the symbol of which is קְנַדְנַ.[4] Ezra wrote his book and the genealogies of the book of Chronicles down to himself.[5] This is a support for the saying of Rab; for Rab Jehuda said, in the name of Rab, 'Ezra did not leave Babylon [for the Holy Land], till he had written his own genealogy, and then he went up.' Who finished it [the book of Ezra]? Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah."

This is the famous passage in the Babylonian Talmud, which has no parallel in the much older Jerusalem Talmud; and its understanding depends entirely upon the signification assigned to the word כָּתַב, *to write*, which, in one form or other, occurs so frequently within its compass. Herzfeld has strangely endeavored to show that it is used here in five distinct significations; but his views on this point have rightly been rejected by scholars. "It is also putting violence on the word to regard it, without some qualifying statement in the context, as signifying *to write in*, or *to introduce* into the canon." Strack rightly maintains that Rashi, in his commentary on the passage, in *Baba Bathra*, has given the correct

---

[1] That Moses wrote this section is expressly stated, although its parts [are not necessary elements of Moses and his Law, and the series of his doings.

[2] ע"י abbreviated for על ידי "with the help of," which signification this phrase often has. But it also occurs in the sense of "in the room of" (cf. *Shekalim* i., 6, 7, "he who pays the temple shekel on behalf of a woman" על יד אשה etc.; *Megilla*, fol. 24, col. 1: "and if he is young, his father or his teacher shall do it in his stead" על ידו). Hence Bloch explains the passage above to mean that David wrote the Psalms in question for the ten elders whose names are found mentioned in their titles (i. e., Adam, Ps. cxxxix.; Melchizedek, cx.; Abraham, Ps. lxxxix.; Moses, Ps. xc.; Heman, Ps. lxxxviii.; Jeduthun, Pss. xxxix., xlii., lxxvii.; Asaph, Pss. l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii.; sons of Korah, Pss. xlii.-xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii.) i. e., he put these Psalms in their mouths, and wrote, as it were, from their several standpoints. "If this be the meaning of the passage, it shows that the Talmud recognized such literary devices as perfectly lawful and in no way inconsistent with divine inspiration."

[3] ימשך the mnemonic sign for the following books: י = Isaiah ישעיה; מ = Proverbs משלי; ש = Song of Songs שיר השירים; and ק = Ecclesiastes קהלת.

[4] קנדנ. ק = יחזקאל Ezekiel; נ = שנים עשר The Twelve Minor Prophets; ד = דניאל Daniel; נ = מגלת אסתר Esther.

[5] עד לו. Rashi explains the clause to mean "as far as his (Ezra's) own genealogy. But Rabbi Chananel says that לו here stands for ולו, the first word of 2 Chron. xxi., 2, which verse Ezra had prefixed to his own genealogy. See Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. W. B.*, s. v. כתב.

interpretation of the word: "The college of Hezekiah wrote the book of Isaiah; for Isaiah was put to death by Manasseh; but the prophets wrote their books first before [i. e., not until immediately before] their death.... The men of the Great Synagogue, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Zerubbabel, Mordecai, and their associates, wrote the book of Ezekiel. I know not any other reason why Ezekiel himself did not do it [write his book], except that his prophecy was not designed to be written outside [of Palestine]. They wrote, therefore, his prophecies after they went to the [Holy] Land. And so with the book of Daniel, who lived in exile, and with the roll of Esther. The Twelve Prophets, because their prophecies were short, did not write them, [that is] each prophet [did not write] his own book. When Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi arose and saw that the Holy Spirit was departed [from Israel], and that they were the last prophets, they wrote their prophecies [i. e., those of the Minor Prophets], and they united together the short prophecies, and they made a large book, that they [the books of the lesser prophets] might not perish because of their small size."

As has already been remarked, the Talmudic passage says nothing about the close of the canon, but speaks only of the composition of holy writings.

§ 2. ORDER OF THE BOOKS.

The order of the books, according to the Talmud, is: 1) Genesis; 2) Exodus; 3) Leviticus; 4) Numbers; 5) Deuteronomy; 6) Joshua; 7) Judges; 8) Samuel; 9) Kings; 10) Jeremiah; 11) Ezekiel; 12) Isaiah; 13) the Twelve Minor Prophets; 14) Ruth; 15) Psalms; 16) Job; 17) Proverbs; 18) Ecclesiastes; 19) Song of Songs; 20) Lamentations; 21) Daniel; 22) Esther; 23) Ezra and Nehemiah; 24) Chronicles. A comparison of this list with that of our present Hebrew Bibles shows a difference in the position of some books. Thus, our Hebrew Bibles, which have the massoretic order, put Isaiah before Jeremiah, Esther before Daniel, etc. Their order is as follows: 1)–9) Genesis to Kings; 10) Isaiah; 11) Jeremiah; 12) Ezekiel; 13) Twelve Minor Prophets; 14) Psalms; 15) Proverbs; 16) Job; 17) Song of Songs; 18) Ruth; 19) Lamentations; 20) Ecclesiastes; 21) Esther; 22) Daniel; 23), 24) Ezra, Chronicles.

§ 3. NUMBER OF THE BOOKS.

The number of books constituting the Old Testament is, according to the Talmud, twenty-four. Thus we read in *Taanith*, fol. 8, col. 1: "Rab Ada bar Ahaba, before he came before Raba, repeated his lesson twenty-four times, corresponding to the number of the biblical books." *Exod. Rabba*, sect. 41: "Rabbi Levi said, in the name of Rabbi Simeon ben Lakesh: As the bride is adorned with twenty-four kinds of ornaments, so also must the scholar be acquainted with the twenty-four books." *Numb. Rabb.* sect. 14: "Rabbi Berachja, the priest, said, in the name of Rabbi: We read מסמרות [i. e. nails], but it is not written so, but משמרות [watches of the temple]. As there were twenty-four watches of priests and Levites, so there are also twenty-four books [of Scripture]," and on Eccl. XII., 12, we read there also: 'God said, Twenty-four books have I written for thee, be careful not to add to them, for of making many books there is no end, and whoever reads one verse which is not contained in the twenty-four books is like one who reads in extraneous books.'" In *Midrash Koheleth*, on XII., 11, we read with reference to the nails fastened, "Rabbi Chiya puts eleven [nails] upon the one

and thirteen upon the other, together twenty-four, corresponding to the twenty-four books and the twenty-four watches of the priests," and on XII., 12 we read there, "He that brings more than twenty-four books into his house [i. e., the canon] causes confusion."

The quotations made in the Talmud are, of course, from the twenty-four books, but we also find citations from Ben Sira, commonly known as Ecclesiasticus, which are introduced by "as it is written" (דכתיב, *Berachoth*, fol. 48, col. 1), "for it is said" (שנאמר, *Erubin*, fol. 65, col.1), or "this matter is written in the Law, repeated in the Prophets, reiterated a third time in the Hagiographa" (*Baba Kama*, fol. 92, col. 2, where a passage is quoted from Ben Sira as hagiographic).[1] For the benefit of the reader, we subjoin a list of passages which occur in the Talmud and Midrash:

Ecclus.	III., 21, 22	cf. Chagiga, fol. 13, col. 1; Jerus. Chagiga II., 1.
"	VI., 6	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2; Yebamoth, fol. 63, col. 2,
"	VI., 32 (Syriac)	" Jerus. Berachoth VII. towards the end; Jerus. Nazir, V., 3; Berachoth, fol. 48, col. 1; Bereshith Rabba, sect. 91.
"	VII., 10	" Eruvin, fol. 65, col. 1.
"	VIII., 10 (Syriac)	" Succa, fol. 21, col. 2; Aboda Sarah, fol. 19, col. 1.
"	IX., 8–13	" Yebamoth, fol. 63, col. 2; Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2.
"	IX., 12 (Syriac)	" Aboth I., 5.
"	XI., 1	" Jer. Berachoth, fol. 29, col. 1; Nazir, fol. 18, col. 1.
"	XI., 27	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2.
"	XIII., 15; XXVII., 9	" Baba Kamma, fol. 92, col. 2.
"	XIII., 25, 31	" Bereshith Rabba, fol. 82, col. 3.
"	XIV., 11–19	" Eruvin, fol. 54, col. 1.
"	XVIII., 23	" Midrash Tanchuma, fol. 13, col. 1.
"	XXV., 3, 4	" Pesachim, fol. 113, col. 2.
"	XXV., 17	" Sabbath, fol. 11, col. 1.
"	XXVI., 1	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2; Yebamoth, fol. 63, col. 2.
"	XXVII., 9	see under XIII., 15.
"	XXVIII., 14	cf. Wayyikra Rabba, sect. 30.
"	XXVIII., 22	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2; Yebamoth, fol. 63, col. 2.
"	XXX., 22, 23	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2.
"	XXXVIII., 1	" Jer. Sanhedrin, 44; Jer. Taanith, fol. 9, col. 1.
"	XXXVIII., 4, 8	" Bereshith Rabba, fol. 12, col. 1; Yalkut, in Job, 148.
"	XLI., 30	" Betza, fol. 32, col. 2; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch. 24.
"	XLII., 9, 10	" Sanhedrin, fol. 100, col. 2.

From these frequent quotations, it must not be inferred that the Talmud regarded the book of Ben Sira as belonging to the collection of sacred books, as

[1] The passage runs thus: "Rabba said to Rabban bar-Mare: Where have the people that saying 'a bad palm-tree wanders about and goes along with lazy, or barren, trees?' He replied: This matter is written in the Law, repeated in the Prophets, and reiterated a third time in the Kethubim (or Hagiographa) and handed down in the traditions, and again in the Beraitha. Written in the Law, as it is written (Gen. xxix., 9), 'and Esau went unto Ishmael;' repeated in the Prophets, as it is written, (Judg. xi., 3), 'and there were gathered to Jephthah vain men, and they were with him;' and reiterated a third time in the Kethubim, as it is written, 'every bird dwells by its kind, and the son of man by one who is akin to him.'" The last passage is found in Eccius. xiii., 15; xxvii., 9.

the following statements will show:—thus we read—"All Israel has a portion in the world to come. But these persons have no portion in the world to come, namely, he who says, there is no resurrection of the dead in the Torah, or that the Torah is not from heaven, or [he who is] an Epicurean. Rabbi Akiva says, He also who reads in the extraneous books" (*Sanhedrin* X., 1), which latter clause the Jerusalem Talmud (chap. X., 28ᵃ) explains to mean "the books of Ben Sira and the books of Ben Laanah," etc. The Midrash on Koheleth, XII., 12, says: "Every one who brings into the middle of his house more than the twenty-four books [of the canon] brings confusion into his house, as, for example, the book of Ben Sira and the book of Ben Tiglah," etc. And in the Tosefta Yadaim (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 683) we read: "The gospels and the books of heretics do not defile the hands, the book of Ben Sira, and all the books which were written from that time onwards do not defile the hands."[1] Accordingly Ecclesiasticus is not included in the canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Hilary, Rufinus, etc., and though St. Augustine, like the Talmud and the Midrashim, often quotes this book, yet he also, like the ancient Jewish authorities, distinctly says, that it is not the Hebrew Canon (*De civitate Dei* XVII., 20). St. Jerome (*Prol. in Lib. Sol.*) says, that Ecclesiasticus should be read "for the instruction of the people (*plebis*), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines," and Epiphanius (*De mensuris et pond.*, p 534) states that "Siracidem in arco foederis non fuisse asservatum, nec proinde canonicis adscriptum."

§ 4. DIVISION OF THE BOOKS.

The twenty-four books of the Old Testament are divided into the *Law*, *Prophets* and *Hagiographa*. The Law, or Torah, consists of five books, viz.:—

1. *Bereshith*, so called from the first word of the book,[2] also called *Sepher Yezira* (ספר יצירה) i. e., book of creation (*Sanhedrin*, fol. 62, col. 2; *Jerus. Megilla*, ch. 7), or the book of the Patriarchs (ספר האבות), also "the book of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (ספר אברהם יצחק ויעקב—*Aboda Sarah*, fol. 25, col. 1).

2. *Shemoth* (ואלה שמות or שמות), so called from the commencement of the book,[3] also called the second fifth [of the five books] (חומיש שני—*Halachoth Gedoloth*, fol. 36). A certain part of the book, treating of the laws of damages, had the special name "book of damages" (ספר נזיקין or ס' דינין), and another "a book of redemption" (ספר גאולה).

---

[1] As this phrase is often used in the Talmud concerning the books of the Old Testament, it may be well to speak of it here. In the Talmud, *Sabbath*, fol. 14, col. 1, the question is asked, Why Holy Writ is reckoned among the eighteen subjects which are decreed as defiling the hands? The answer there given is, because the Theruma food and the Torah, both being regarded as holy, used to be placed near each other. When it was afterwards discovered that the sacred books were thereby exposed to danger (damage by mice), the Rabbis decreed that they should henceforth be regarded as *unclean*, in order to prohibit them from coming in contact with those sacred eatables. Hence the decree "All holy Scripture pollutes the hands," which exclusively applies to holy, i. e., inspired books. Wherever, therefore, it is said that a book is כיטמא את הידים *defiling the hands*, it means that the book is canonical; and when it is said אין כיטמא את הידים, *does not defile the hands*, it means that the book is not canonical.

[2] Origen, in his catalogue (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* VI., 25) says that the book which the Christians call γένεσις, is called by the Hebrews ἀρχαί, from the first word of the book.

[3] Origen l. c. ονιλιαμοθ.

3. *Wayyikra* (ויקרא), from the first word of the book;[1] more common, however, is the name *Torath Kohanim*, i. e., the law-book for the priests (*Menachoth* III., 4; *Sifra*, col. 99), or sometimes "book of the priests" (ספר כהנים—*Halachoth Gedoloth*, fol. 36).

4. *Bammidbar* (במדבר), from the most conspicuous word of the first verse; also, after the first word, *Wayedabber* (וידבר—*Mishna Yoma*, ch. VII.);[2] more usual was the name *Chumash Happekudim* (חמשה הפקודים—*Menachoth* IV., 3),[3] i. e., one fifth of the five books about the numbering, corresponding to ἀριθμοί and *numeri*.

5. *Elleh Haddebarim* (אלה הדברים), after the first word of the book;[4] often, however, *Mishneh Hattorah* (*Aboda Sarah*, fol. 25, col. 1), corresponding to δευτερονόμιον. A large part of the book is also called *Sepher Tokachoth* (ספר תוכחות) (Sifré in Deut. initio), i. e., the book of admonitions.[5] These five books together, since each book was named *Chumash* (*Sofrim* 3, 4), were called the five *Chumshin* or merely *Chumshin* (חמשה חומשין—*Jerus. Megilla* I., 8; חומשין—*Menachoth*, fol. 30, col. 1; or also חומשין של תורה—*Menachoth*, l. c.).

Besides the division of the Law into five books, there also existed a division into seven books. Thus we read *Midrash Bereshith Rabba*, sec. 64 (Gen. XXVI., 17, 18): "How many wells did our father Isaac make in Beer-sheba? Rabbi Judah said, four wells. Wherefore his children became four cohorts in the wilderness. The rabbis said five, corresponding to the five books of the Law. The first well he called Esek, corresponding to the first book, Bereshith.... The second he called Sitnah, corresponding to the second book, Shemoth.... 'They found there a well of living water,' corresponding to the third book, Wayyikra.... The [fourth well] he called Shebah, corresponding to the fourth book, Wayedabber, because it completes the seven books of the Torah. But there are only five? (Yes) but Bar Kapra divided the book Wayedabber into three books, viz., Num. I., 1—X., 35; X., 35, 36; XI. sq."

In *Midrash Wayyikra Rabba*, sect. 11 (Lev. IX., 1) we read (concerning Prov. IX., 1): "Bar Kapra referred this to the Torah. 'Wisdom hath builded her house;' this is the Torah, as it is said, 'For the Lord giveth wisdom' (Prov. II., 6) and 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way' (ibid. VIII., 22). 'She has hewn out her seven pillars;' these are the seven books of the Torah. But are there not five only? (Yes) but Bar Kapra divided the book [i. e., Numbers] into I., 1—X., 35 etc." [as above]. Cf. also Talmud, *Sabbath*, fol. 115, col. 2; 116, col. 1, further on.

The second part of the twenty-four books comprised the *Prophets*, which were subdivided into Earlier Prophets (נביאים ראשונים) and Later Prophets (נ' אחרונים). The former comprised Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; the latter, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve Minor Prophets.

The third part, the *Hagiographa*, the Talmud also knows in a more definite

---

[1] Ibid. ονικρα.

[2] Jerome in *Prol. Galeat.*: "Primus apud eos (Judaeos) liber vocatur *Beresith*, quem nos Genesin dicimus. Secundus *Veele Semoth*, tertius *Vaicra*, id est *Leviticus*. Quartus *Vajedabber*, quem *Numeros* vocamus, etc.

[3] Origen αμμεσφεκωδειμ, which he could not interpret.

[4] Ibid. ελλε αδδεβαριμ.

[5] It is interesting to know that Philo too quotes Deuteronomy by the name of "hortatory admonitions," thus *De Agricult.* § 39: ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς; *De Mutat. Nom.* § 41; *De Profug.* § 25.

rubrication of smaller and larger Kethubim (קטנים and כתובים גדולים—*Berachoth*, fol. 57, col. 2): the former, as Psalms, Proverbs, Job—called אמ״ת by a mnemotechnic sign; the latter, as Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and the five Megilloth, i. e., Esther, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Ruth, Song of Solomon (cf. *Abboth de Rabbi Nathan*, ch. XL.; *Sotah*, fol. 7, col. 1).

It is noteworthy that we are told, in the Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, fol. 13, col. 2, (towards the end) that between each book of the Pentateuch and of the Prophets four lines must be left blank, but three lines between each book of the Minor Prophets.

§ 5. THE SMALLER SECTIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

In our Hebrew Bibles, which follow the Massoretic text, the Pentateuch is divided into 669 Parashahs or sections, of which 290 are open; and 379 are closed. Of these Parashahs mention is already made in the Mishna, viz.:

1. *Taanith*, ch. IV., § 3, the history of creation is divided into seven sections, viz., Gen. I., 1–5; 6–8; 9–13; 14–19; 20–23; 24–31; II., 1–3.

2. *Berachoth*, ch. II., § 2; *Taamid*, ch. V., § 1; *Menachoth*, ch. III., § 7—the sections of Prayer and Phylacteries are mentioned, viz., Exod. XIII., 1–13; Deut. VI., 4–9; XI., 13–21; Num. XV., 37–41.

3. *Megillah*, ch. III., 4–6 (cf. also Yoma VII., 1; Sota VII., 7) the following sections for the Sabbath and Festivals are given, viz., Exod. XXX., 11–16; Deut. XXV., 17–19; Num. XIX., 1–22; Exod. XII., 1–12; Lev. XXII., 26–33 (for the first day of the Passover); Deut. XVI., 9–12 (for Pentecost); Lev. XXIII., 23–25 (for the New Year); Lev. XVI., 1–34; XXIII., 26–35 (for the day of Atonement); Num. VI., 22—VII., 18 (for the day of Dedication of the Temple); Exod. XVII., 8–13 (for Purim); Num. XXVIII., 11–15 (for the New Moon); Lev. XXVI., 3 sq.; Deut. XXVIII. sq. (for Fast Days).

4. *Taamid* V., 1; *Sota* VII., 2–6:—Num. VI., 22–27.

5. *Yadaim* III., 4:—Num. X., 35, 36.

6. *Sota* VII., 1:—Deut. XVII., 14–20; Num. V., 11–31; XIX., 1–22; Deut. XXI., 1–9; XXVI., 1–11; XIV., 22–27; XXVI., 12–15; XXV., 5–10., etc.

7. *Berachoth*, fol. 12B, we read that the Parashahs were invented by Moses himself: "Said R. Abuhu, the son of Sotarti, in the name of R. Jehuda, son of Sebida, they intended to add the Parashah of Balak [i. e., Num. XXII., 2—XXV., 9] to the reading of the Shema. But why did they not add it? Because they did not wish to trouble the congregation. But what was the reason [i. e., for such an addition]? Perhaps, because it is written there, 'God brought them out of Egypt?' But then, why not say the Parashah treating of usury [i. e., Lev. XXV., 35–38] and that of weight [i. e., Lev. XIX., 33–37], in which it is written of the Exodus. But, said R. Josi, son of Abin, [The reason why the Rabbins intended to add this section is] that the verse is written there 'He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion: who will stir him up?' [Num. XXIV., 9] But why not say this verse, then, alone? Because it is a rule among us that any Parashah which Moses, our teacher, divided, we also divide; and anyone which Moses did not divide, neither do we. But why have they added the Parashah of the fringes? [ציצית, Num. XV., 37–41]. R. Jehuda, the son of Chabilu, said, Because it contains five things; the law concerning fringes, the exodus, the yoke of the commandments [i. e., the execution of the same], the opinion of heretics [i. e., the warning against the opinion of those who reject all teachings of the Talmud, and

do not recognize the Deity], the lust of sin, and lust of idolatry" etc., etc.

8. *Ibid.*, fol. 63a, we read the following: "We have the tradition, Rabbi says. Why is the Parashah of the Nasir [Num. VI., 1–21] so near to that of the adulterous wife? [Num. V., 11–31.] To teach you that every one who sees the woman suspected of adultery in her degeneration, should abstain from wine. R. Hiskiah, son of Rabbi Parnach, said, in the name of R. Jochanan, Why is the Parashah of the woman suspected of adultery so near to that of the offering? [Num. V., 9, 10.] To teach you," etc., etc.

9. *Baba Bathra*, 14B: "Moses wrote his book and the Parashah of Balaam" [which is the same as that of Balak].

10. *Gittin*, 60A: The eight sections are mentioned, which were publicly read at the erection of the tabernacle; "R. Levi said eight sections were said on the day when the tabernacle was erected, viz.: פרשת כהנים [Lev. XXI., 1–24]; ופרשת לוים [Num. VIII., 5–22]; ופרשת טמאים [Num. IX., 6 sq. But these verses form no section to-day.]; ופרשת שילוח טמאים [Num. V., 1–4]; ופרשת אחרי מות [Lev. XVI., concerning the High Priest]; ופרשת שתויי יין [Lev. X., 8–11]; ופרשת נרות [Num. VIII., 1–4]; ופרשת פרה אדומה [Num. XIX.].

That some of these Parashahs were open פתוחות, some closed סתומות, we already read in Tr. Sabbath, fol. 103B, An open section should not be made closed, and a closed one not open; cf. also Jerus. Megilla, fol. 71 B. In Tr. Soferim I., 13, we also read that an *open* section is an empty space, the width of *three letters*, at the beginning of a line; and the *closed* is as much in the middle of a line.

In *Midrash Bereshith Rabba* (ad Gen. XLVII., 28) sect. XCVI., fol. 107, 3, we read the following: "'And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt' (ויחי יעקב בארץ מצרים). Why is this section closed before all the sections of the law? Because, when our father Jacob died, the bondage of Egypt commenced for Israel. Again, why is it closed? Because our father Jacob intended to reveal the end, and it was kept secret to him. Again, why is it closed? Because all troubles in the world were kept secret to him."

In the Talmudic period, the Parashahs were not separated by the letters פ and ס, but by a small space, which seems to have been called פֶּרֶק, and of which mention is made in *Berachoth* II., 2; *Cholin* X., 4; *Taamid* VII., 3, 4.

§ 6. THE LARGER SECTIONS.

Different from the *smaller Parashahs*, or sections, which were formed by open spaces, and are of later origin, are the so-called *larger Sections or Parashahs* of the Pentateuch (marked in our Bibles by פ פ פ and ס ס ס), now read on successive Sabbaths, which are not mentioned in the Talmud, and are, consequently, ignored in the synagogue rolls. They were introduced solely for the purpose of securing the public weekly reading of the whole Pentateuch within a certain period of time. The practice of publicly reading sections of the Law in the synagogues is very ancient, as may be seen from Acts XV., 21, Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρίσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος, and *Josephus contra Apion* II., 17 fin., Οὐκ εἰς ἅπαξ ἀκροασάμενους οὐδὲ δὶς ἢ πολλάκις ἀλλ' ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφεμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἐκέλευσε συλλέγεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν. But the arrangement of these readings, and the division of the portions read, being of later origin, were not always and every-

where alike; for, in Palestine, the whole Pentateuch was read in three years, or three years and a half, being divided into a hundred and fifty-five sections; whereas, in Babylonia, this was done in a single year, the whole Pentateuch being divided into fifty-four sections.[1]

§ 7. HAPHTARAHS.

After the reading of the Law in the synagogue, it was also the custom, from an early period, to read a passage from the Prophets (of which custom we already read in Acts XIII., 27, *τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας*· and Luke IV., 16, *εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι*· and 17, *καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφητοῦ*), and with that to dissolve the meeting (*λύειν τὴν συναγωγήν*, Acts XIII., 43; Hebr. הפטיר). Hence, the reader who made this conclusion was called מַפְטִיר, and the prophetic passage read הַפְטָרָה. The Mishna repeatedly speaks of the Haphtaroth, and even mentions several of them; yet, in general, they cannot then have been fixed determinately; and, even now, different usages prevail among the Jews of different countries, as may be seen from the לוח הפטרות, or table of Haphtaroth appended to our Hebrew Bibles, where the sections adopted by the אשכנזים, or German Jews, and the ספרדים, or Spanish Jews, are marked.

§ 8. VARIOUS READINGS.

The various readings so frequently found in the margins and foot notes of the Hebrew Bible, known as *Q'ri* and *K'thibh* (קרי וכתיב, plur. קריין וכתיבן), are very ancient. The Talmud traces the source of these variations to Moses himself; for, as we are distinctly told in Tr. *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2, "that the pronunciation of certain words according to the scribes (מקרא סופרים), the emendations of the scribes (עטור סופרים), the not reading of words which are in the text (כתיב ולא קרי), and the reading of words which are not in the text (קרי ולא כתיב), etc., are a law of Moses, from Sinai (הלכה למשה מסיני)." According to the Massorah, as printed in the first Rabbinic Bible, the sum total of *Q'ris* and *K'thibhs*, occurring in the Bible, is 1359, viz.:

Genesis.....25	2 Kings..... 80	Habakkuk..... 2	Lamentations.. 28
Exodus.....17	Isaiah..... 55	Zephaniah..... 1	Ecclesiastes.... 11
Leviticus..... 6	Jeremiah.....148	Haggai..... 1	Esther..... 14
Numbers.....11	Ezekiel.....143	Zechariah..... 7	Daniel..... 129
Deuteronomy....23	Hosea..... 6	Malachi..... 1	Ezra..... 33
Joshua.....38	Joel..... 1	Psalms.....74	Nehemiah..... 28
Judges.....22	Amos..... 3	Proverbs.....70	1 Chronicles... 41
1 Samuel.....73	Obadiah..... 1	Job.....54	2 Chronicles.... 39
2 Samuel.....99	Micah..... 4	Song of Songs.. 5	——
1 Kings.....49	Nahum..... 4	Ruth.....13	Total.....1359

But the number is larger, as may be seen from Table VIII, appended to the several parts of the Hebrew Bible edited by Baer and Delitzsch. We will only mention some instances, where they occur in the Talmud.

---

[1] Cf. Fuerst, *Kultur-u. Literatur-Gesch. d. Juden in Asien*, pp. 61, 62; Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr.* pp. 4, 329 sq.

Gen. VIII., 17:—הוצא, Midr. *Bereshith Rabba*, in loco, sec. XXXIV (Wünsche's German ed., p. 151); א"ר יודן הוצא כתיב היצא קרי, i. e., Rabbi Judan says, It is written הוצא, but read היצא. Rashi remarks on this passage, The Q'rî is הוצא, the K'thîbh היצא, because he was first to tell them to go out; but, if they should refuse to go, he was to make them go.

Lev. XXI., 5:—The K'thîbh is יקרחה, but the Q'rî is יקרחו: cf. *Maccoth*, fol. 20, col. 1; *Kiddushin*, fol. 36, col. 1.[1]

Lev. XXIII., 13:—The K'thîbh is ונסכה, but the Q'rî ונסכו: *Menachoth*, fol. 89, col. 2.

1 Sam. XVII., 23:—The K'thîbh is ממערות, but the Q'rî ממערכות: *Sotah*, fol. 42, col. 2, and is followed by Sept. and Vulg.

Esth. IX., 27:—The K'thîbh is וקבל, but the Q'rî וקבלו:[2] *Jerus. Berachoth*, fol. 14, col. 3; *Bab. Sabbath*, fol. 88, col. 1.

Job XIII., 15:—The K'thîbh is לא, but the Q'rî לן: *Sotah* V., § 5.

Prov. XXXI., 18:—The K'thîbh is בליל, but the Q'rî is בלילה:[3] *Pesikta* (ed. Buber, Lyck, 1868), fol. 65, col. 1.

Eccl. IX., 4:—The K'thîbh is יבחר, but the Q'rî יחבר:[4] *Talm. Jerus. Berachoth*, fol. 13, col. 2; so also in the Sept., Symmachus, Syriac, Chaldee, and in ten of Kennicott's and thirteen of DeRossi's MSS.

Hag. I., 8:—The K'thîbh is אכבד, but the Q'rî אכבדה: *Yoma*, fol. 21, col. 2, where we read the following: Rabbi Samuel ben Enia saith, Why has the K'thîbh ואכבד, and the Q'rî ואכבדה? What is meant by the absence of ה? It is because of the five things which made the difference between the first and the second temple, viz., the *ark* with the lid and the cherubim upon it, the *fire*, the *Shechinah*, the *Holy Ghost* and the *Urim and Thummim*.

To these variations belong also the substitution of euphonisms (לשבח) for *cacophonisms* (לגנאי). Thus we read in the Talmud (*Megilla*, fol. 25, col. 2), "Our sages allow all the verses wherein are written indecent expressions to have decent expressions read in their stead, as ישכבנה instead of ישגלנה (Deut. XXVIII., 30; Isa. XIII., 16; Jer. III., 2; Zech. XIV., 2), טהורים for עפלים (Deut. XXVIII., 27; 1 Sam. V., 6, 9, 12; VI., 4, 5, 17), דביונים for חריונים (2 Kgs. VI., 25), צואתם for חוריהם (2 Kgs. XVIII., 27; Isa. XXXVI., 12), רגליהם for מימי שיניהם (2 Kgs. XVIII., 27; Isa. XXXVI., 12), למוצאות for למחראות (2 Kgs. X., 28). Cf. also *Talmud Jerus. Megilla* IV.; Tr. *Soferim* IX., 8.

These passages, the number of which could be greatly increased, prove that the reading, קרי, owes not its origin to various manuscript readings, but is of great antiquity.[5]

---

[1] On this word the Massorah remarks, "Fourteen words have a ה at the end, which is read and considered as ו, viz.: Lev. XXI., 5; Deut. XXI., 7; 1 Kgs. XXII., 49; 2 Kgs. XXIV., 10; Jer. II., 15; XXII., 6; I., 6; Ezek. XXIII., 43; XXXV., 12; XXXVII., 22; Ps. LXXIII., 2; Job XVI., 16; Lam. IV., 17; Dan. III., 29."

[2] This word, according to the Massorah, belongs to a class of eighteen words which want the suffix ו in the text. These words are found in Gen. XXVII., 29; XLIII., 28; Judg. XXI., 20; 1 Sam. VII., 9; XII., 10; XIII., 19; 1 Kgs. IX., 9; XII., 7; 2 Kgs. XX., 18; XXII., 5; Isa. XXXVII., 30; Jer. XLVIII., 7; Ezek. VII., 21; Dan. V., 21; Ez. III., 3; Neh. III., 30, 31; Esth. IX., 27. These instances are also enumerated in Tr. *Sopherim* VII., 1, with the exception of Gen. XLIII., 28; Judg. XXI., 20; Neh. III., 30.

[3] This word, according to the Massorah, belongs to a class of twenty-nine words which have no ה in the textual reading, but have it in the marginal reading.

[4] This word belongs to a class of sixty-two words in which two letters following each other are transposed.

[5] Danzius, *Sinceritas Scripturae Vet. Test. praevalente Keri vacillans*, Jenae, 1713.

For the most part, the Rabbis follow the reading of the קרי, often that of the כתיב, especially when they can elicit a new interpretation from the reading of the כתיב. Thus, at Ruth III., 3, the Midrash (*Ruth Rabba*, sect. V., fol. 47, 3, Cracow, 1588, fol.) reads וירדתי, whereas the קרי reads וירדת.

In the treatise *Soferim*, instances of different readings are given, which we put in the following order:

a) *Written and Read.*

Under this head, in chapt. VI., 5, instances are enumerated where it is written לא, but read לן. Such words are fifteen, and are found in Exod. XXI., 18 (cf. also *Bechoroth* I., 7); Lev. XI., 31 (cf. *Cholin*, fol. 65, col. 1); XXV., 30 (cf. *Megilla*, fol. 10, col. 2; *Erachin*, fol 32, col. 1); 1 Sam. II., 3; 2 Sam. XVI., 18; Isa. IX., 2; XLIX., 5; LXIII., 9; Ps. C., 3 (cf. also *Midrash Tillim*, sect. 100); CXXXIX., 16; Job XIII., 15 (cf. *Sotah* V., 5); XLI., 4; Prov. XXVI., 2 (cf. *Maccoth*, fol. 11, col. 1); XIX., 7; Ez. IV., 2.

Ch. VI., 6, we read of two instances where the reverse takes place, i. e., where לן is written, but לא is read, viz., 1 Sam. II. 16; XX., 2.

b) *Read and Written.*

Ch. VI., 7, we read that the word יעואל, which, in four instances, is written יעואל, is read יעיאל, viz., 1 Chron. IX., 35; XI., 44; 2 Chron. XXVI., 11; XXIX., 13.

c) *Read and not Written.*

This class, comprising ten instances (cf. also *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2), is enumerated in chapt. VI., 8. The passages are, Judg. XX., 13; 2 Sam. VIII., 3; XVI., 21; XVIII., 20; 2 Kgs. XIX., 37; Isa. XXXVII., 32; Jer. XXXI., 38; L., 29; Ruth III., 5, 17.

To this class also belong those instances in which the ו is not written, but read. The instances are given in chap. VII., 1. See also note 2 to Esth. IX., 27, given above.

In chap. VII., 2, we read of twenty-nine words which have no ה in the textual reading, but have it in the marginal reading, viz., Josh. XXIV., 3; 1 Sam., IX., 26; XXIV., 19; 2 Sam. XXI., 9; 1 Kgs. I., 37; 2 Kgs. IX., 37; Isa. XLI., 23; LIV., 16; Jer. XVII., 8; XL., 16; Ezek. XXIII., 16, 43; XLV., 3; Hag. I., 8; Ruth I., 12; IV., 4; Ps. VI., 4; LXXIV., 6; XC., 8; Prov. XXX., 18; XXXI., 16, 18; Job I., 10; XLII., 16; Lam. II., 19; V., 1, 21; Eccl. VII., 22; Neh. IX., 6.

d) *Written, but not Read.*

Eight such words are given in chap. VI., 8 (cf. *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2), viz., 2 Sam. XIII., 33; XXV., 21; 2 Kgs. V., 18; Jer. XXXVIII., 16; XXXIX., 12; LI., 3; Ezek. III., 12; Ruth III., 12.

To this class also belong eleven words in which the ו is written, but not read (chap. VII., 1), viz., Josh. VI., 7; IX., 7; 1 Sam. XV., 16; 2 Sam. XXII., 34; 1 Kgs. XII., 3, 21; 2 Kgs. IX., 33; XIV., 13; XVI., 15; Ezek. XLVI., 9; Neh. III., 15.

We also read, chap. VII., 2, of twenty words which have a ה written, but not read, viz., Josh. VII., 21; XXIV., 8; 2 Sam. XXIII., 20; 1 Kgs. VII., 23; Jer. III., 7; XV., 9; XVIII., 10; XXVI., 6; XXXI., 39; XLIII., 11; XLVIII., 27; Mic. III., 2; Zech. I., 16; Ruth I., 3; Ps. LI., 4; Prov. VIII., 17; XXVII., 10; Dan. IX., 18; Lam. III., 10; Ezra V., 15.

e) *Written as one word, but read as two.*

The fifteen words belonging to this class are mentioned in chap. VII., 3, viz., Gen. XXX., 11; Exod. IV., 2; Deut. XXXIII., 2; Jer. VI., 29; XVIII., 3; Ezek. VIII., 6; Isa. III., 15; Ps. X., 10; LV., 16; CXXIII., 4; Job XXXVIII., 1; XL., 6; Neh. II., 13; 1 Chron. IX., 4; XXVII., 12.

The reverse is the case in eight instances, where words are written as two, but read as one.

f) *Written as two, and read as one.*

Judg. XVI., 25; 1 Sam. IX., 1; XXIV., 9; Isa. IX., 6; XLIV., 24; Lam. I., 6; IV., 3; 2 Chron. XXXIV., 6.

Another class of words is also mentioned, chap. VII., 4, which have

g) *A ו written in the middle of the word, where ן is read.*

This list not being given very correctly in *Soferim*, we give according to the book *Ochloh w'Ochlah*.[1] Gen. XXXIX., 20; 1 Sam. XXV., 18; 2 Sam. XV., 20; Isa. XLV., 2; 2 Kgs. XXIV., 15; Jer. L., 44; 2 Sam. XVI., 12; Jer. VI., 7; Nah. II., 6; 1 Chron. VII., 31; Prov. XXIII., 24; Ez. IV., 9; Gen. VIII., 17; Jer. XIX., 2; XLVIII., 5; Zech. XI., 2; Ezek. XLII., 9; 2 Chron. XXXV., 3; Ps. V., 9; Prov. XXIII., 5; Ez. VIII., 17; Jer. XXV., 7; 2 Chron. XXVI., 21; Num. XIV., 36; Josh. XIX., 22; Isa. LXII., 3; Jer. XIV., 14 (twice); VIII., 7; Ezek. XLI., 15; 1 Chron. IV., 20; XII., 3; 2 Chron. XXXV., 4; Ps. LXXIV., 11; 1 Kgs. VI., 5; Ezek. XLVIII., 14; 1 Chron. XX., 5; 2 Chron. XXIX., 14; Ps. LIX., 16; CXL., 10; Prov. IV., 16; 2 Sam. III., 15; Jer. XVI., 16; Judg. XXI., 22; 1 Sam. XVIII., 6; Ezek. XXII., 18; Isa. XLII., 24; Ps. CXXIX., 3; 1 Sam. XX., 1; Jer. XLVIII., 21; Isa. LVII., 19; Neh. X., 20; Isa. III., 16; Neh. VII., 52; 2 Sam. XIV., 7; 1 Sam. XXV., 18; Jer. XL., 8; Amos VIII., 4; 2 Chron. XIII., 19; Esth. VIII., 13; Jer. XIV., 3; XLVIII., Ezek. IV., 15; Num. XXVI., 9; 1 Kgs. XIV., 25; Jer. XVIII., 16; XV., 11; XLIII., 10; 1 Chron. XXIV., 24; Zeph. II., 7; Ps. LXXXV., 2; Prov. XXII., 20; Num. XXXII., 7; Prov. III., 30; Job. XXX., 22.

In connection with these variations, we will only mention that, in the Mishna, Megilla IV., 10, we read of some passages which may publicly be read, but not interpreted. Thus, "the occurrence of Reuben [with Bilhah, Gen. XXXV., 20] may be read without being interpreted; that of Tamar [*ibid.* chap. XXXVIII.,] is to be read and interpreted; the [first part of the] occurrence with the golden calf is to be read and interpreted, but the second part [commencing Exod., XXXIV., 21] is to be read without being interpreted. The blessing of the priests [Num. VI., 22 ff.], and the occurrence of David and Amnon [2 Sam. XI., XII., XIII.] are neither to be read nor interpreted."

§ 9. ABLATIO SCRIBARUM, OR עִטּוּר סוֹפְרִים

The *ablatio scribarum*, or removal of the Scribes, consists in the removal of a superfluous ן which has crept into the text, and which has been erroneously prefixed to אַחַר, viz., Gen. XVIII., 5; XXIV., 55; Num. XXXI., 2; Ps. LXVIII., 26. They note, also, that it has been erroneously prefixed to the word מִשְׁפָּטִיךָ, in Ps. XXXVI., 7. Cf. Tr. *Nedarim*, 37B.

[1] Cf. a description of this work in my art. *Ochlah w'Ochlah*, in McClintock & Strong's Cyc., s. v.

§ 10. CORRECTIO SCRIBARUM, OR תִּקּוּן סוֹפְרִים

In the Talmud, nothing is said of these so called "Tiqqûn Sôph'rîm," or "emendations of the Scribes;" and yet these corrections must be very old, since reference is made to them in the *Mechilta*, a commentary on Exodus (chap. XV., 7), the first compilation of which was probably made about 90 A. D.; in the *Siphri*, a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy (Num. X., 35), compiled by Rab (A. D. 219–247); in the *Tanchuma*, fol. 26, 1, compiled by Tanchuma ben-Abba (fl. cir. A. D. 440); in the *Bereshith Rabba* (in Gen. XVIII., 22), sec. XLI, fol. 54, 4 fin.; and *Shemoth Rabba*, sec. XIII., fol. 128, 4; XXX., fol. 146, 4 in medio; XLI., fol. 156, 1 initio; both ascribed to Oshajá b. Nachmani (fl. A. D. 278).

As these corrections are, in general, only alluded to in our books called "Introductions to the Old Testament," but not given, we will give them here. The Massorites mention eighteen "Tiqqûn Sôph'rîm," or emendations of the Scribes, and refer to eighteen alterations which the Scribes decreed should be introduced into the text, in order to remove anthropomorphisms and other infelicities of expression. These eighteen emendations (or י"ח מלין) are as follows, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:

1. Gen. XVIII., 22, where, for the original reading ויהוה עודנו עמד לפני אברהם *and Jehovah still stood before Abraham*, is now substituted ואברהם עודני עמד לפני יהוה *and Abraham still stood before Jehovah*, because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before Abraham.
2. Num. XI., 15, for ברעתך *thy evil*, is substituted ברעתי *my evil*.
3, 4. " XII., 12, " אמנו *our mother*, " אמו *its mother*.
" " בשרנו *our flesh*, " בשרו *its flesh*.
5. 1 Sam. III., 13, " אלהים *God* (Sept. θεόν), " להם *themselves*.
6. 2 " XVI., 12, " בעינו *with his eye*, " בעוני *at my affliction*.
7. 1 Kgs. XII., 16, " לאלהיו *to their God*, " לאהליו *to their seats*.
8. 2 Chron. X., 16, " " " " " "
9. Jer. II., 11, " כבודי *my glory*, " כבודו *their glory*.
10. Ezek. VIII., 17, " אפי *my nose*, " אפם *their nose*.
11. Hos. IV., 7, " כבודי *my glory*, " כבודם *their glory*.
12. Hab. I., 12, " תמות *thou diest not*, " נמות *we shall not die*.
13. Zech. II., 12, " עיני *mine eye*, " עינו *his eye*.
14. Mal. I., 13, " אותי *ye make me expire*, " אותו *ye weary it*.
15. Ps. CVI., 20, " כבודי *my glory*, " כבודם *their glory* (cf. Jer. II., 11; Hos. IV., 7)
16. Job VII., 20, " עליך *to thee*, " אלי *to myself*.
17. " XXXII., 3, " את אלהים or את הדין *God* or *the divine justice*, is substituted איוב *Job*.
18. Lam. III., 19, וְתָשִׁיחַ עָלַי נַפְשֶׁךָ *thy soul will mourn over me*, is substituted וְתָשׁוֹחַ עָלַי נַפְשִׁי *and my soul is humbled within me*.

On these emendations of the Scribes, Bleek, in his *Introduction* (pp. 803, 4), says: "These remarks [of the Rabbins], as I believe, have been, in general, too little thought of, and, as a whole, have not been judged correctly. It is usually assumed that what are named Tiqqûn Sôph'rim are only alterations of the false readings of many manuscripts, in conformity with other manuscripts which were more correct; and it is at once taken for granted that the readings preferred by

the Scribes, which are just those of our present manuscripts and editions, have been the genuine original readings..... Much rather, we are moved, partly by the statements of the Massorites, partly by the nature of several of the readings set aside by the Tîqqûn Ṣôph'rîm, compared with the readings introduced by them, and at present found in the text, to look upon the matter thus: that, in these passages, other readings were actually accepted universally at an earlier time, or, at all events, were to be found in most of the common manuscripts, which the Scribes considered themselves justified in altering, because they presented what created scruples or gave offense in certain respects. Hence, this earlier reading, which is noted as having been altered, is always to be held in high estimation, critically considered; and we may actually assume, with great probability, in several cases at least, that it is the original reading."[1]

§ 11. PUNCTA EXTRAORDINARIA.

Over single letters, partly over entire words, we find dots or points, generally called "puncta extraordinaria." The first instance is mentioned in the Mishna Tr. Pesachim IX., 2, over the ה of the word רחקה, Num. IX., 10. Ten such words, which have these extraordinary points, are enumerated in Midrash *Bemidbar Rabba* on Num. III., 39, sec. III., fol. 215, 4, cf. *Pirke de Rabbi Nathan* c. 33, *Sifri* ad Num. IX., 10; Tr. *Soferim* VI., 3; *Massora Magna* on Num. III., 39; *Ochlah w'Ochlah*, sec: 96; Trägard *De literis textus S. Hebraei insolitae quantitatis formae situs et punctationis*, Gryph., 1764.

1. Gen. XVI., 5 יהוה ביני וביניך. The Massorites note on this word: There is a point on the last י, and it is one of the ten pointed words, which occur in the Law, four in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa. It is worthy to be noticed, that in the whole Pentateuch the word in question is nowhere written *plene*, i. e., with *two yodhs*, except in our passage.
2. Gen. XVIII., 9 אַלָיו. On this passage the *Midrash Bereshith Rabba* (sec. XLVIII., Wünsche's Germ. tranl. p. 227 sq.) remarks: אין are pointed, but not the ל. R. Simeon ben Eliezer saith, Wherever you find more letters than points, you must explain the letters, i. e., what is written; but where you find more points than letters, you must explain the letters. In this case, where there are more points than the written text, you must explain the points, viz., אַיֵּה "Where is Abraham?" The meaning is, that the points over these three letters intend to indicate that the three angels did not ask, "Where is Sarai?" איה שרה, but "Where is Abraham?" איו אברהם Cf. Tr. *Baba Meziah*, fol. 87*a*.

[1] Geiger, in *Urschrift*, p. 331, remarks on the first case: "The subordinate, it was thought, stands before the superior, not the superior before the subordinate. For this cause, the original reading, 'and Jehovah stood, etc.,' was changed into 'and Abraham stood.' Not only the whole connection, but also the Talmud and Midrashim, indicate that the first reading is the more correct one. For, in explanation of Lev. XIX., 32, 'before the hoary head thou shalt rise,' we read, in *Jerus. Bikkurim* III., 13, 'I, the Lord, have exercised the rising before the hoary head first,' probably with reference to Gen. XVIII., 22. As for the literature, cf. Hackspan, *De usu librorum*, etc., appended to his Nizzachon, Altorf, 1644; Bornitz *De Tiqqun Sopherim*, Viteb., 1644; Walton, *Proleg.* VII., 10; Hottinger, *Thes. Philol.*, pp. 434 sq.; Wachner, *Antiq. Ebr.* I., pp. 110, 111; Delitzsch, *Habakkuk*, Lips., 1842, pp. 206-208; Wedell, *De emendationibus a Soferim*, etc., Vratisl., 1869; Raym. Martin, *Pugio fidei;* Frankel, *Vorstudien*, pp. 172, 219.

3. Gen. XIX., 33 ובקומה. In the Talmud, Tr. *Nazir*, fol. 23 *a*, we read: Why is there a point over the ו in the word ובקומה? To indicate that when she lay down, he (Lot) did not perceive it, but when she arose, he perceived it. Cf. also Tr. *Horayoth*, fol. 10A. St. Jerome, *Quaest. in Genesin:* "Appungunt desuper quasi incredibile et quod rerum natura non capiat, coire quempiam nescientem."

4. Gen. XXXIII., 4 וישקהו. There are different interpretations on these points. The *Midrash Bemidbar* in loco explains it by שלא נשקו מכל לבו "that he (Esau) did not kiss him sincerely;" the *Bereshith Rabba* sec. LXXVIII., (Wünsche l. c. p. 382) thinks "That Esau's kiss was sincere;" a third authority says, that these points are meant to indicate, that Esau did not intend לנשקו i. e., to kiss him, but לנשכו i. e., "to bite him."

5. Gen. XXXVII., 12 את, *Beresh. Rabba* in loco, sec. LXXXIV. (Wünsche l. c. p. 412): The points over את indicate that "they only went away to feed themselves," or as *Bemidbar Rabb.* in loco says: "They went away not to feed the flock, but to eat and drink," etc.

6. Num. III., 39. ואהרן. *Bemidbar Rabb.* in loco, says the *Waw* of ואהרן is not pointed, because he did not belong to that number (or census of the Levites). In the Talmud, Tr. *Bechoroth*, the question is why the word אהרן is pointed? and the same answer is given.[1]

7. Num. IX., 10. רחקה. This instance is already mentioned in the *Mishna Pesachim* IX., § 2, where we read thus: "What is a distant journey? R. Akiba says from Modaim and beyond, and from all places around Jerusalem, located in the same distance. R. Eleazar says, from the threshold of the court of the Temple and outward. R. José says, the reason for the point on the ה [in our word] was to denote that it is not necessary to be actually on a distant road, but only beyond the threshold of the Temple." This idea the Sept. probably intended to express by *ἐν ὁδῷ μακρὰν* i. e., distant on the way, while *ἐν ὁδῷ μακρᾷ* would be "on a distant way."

8. Num. XXI., 30. אישר. The *Baal Hatturim* on this passage, says that by the point on the ר in the word אישר only אש is left, which means "fire," and which destroyed the place. In the Talmud *Baba Bathra* 79*a* we read אש and not אשר.[2]

9. Num. XXIX., 15. ועשרון. *Bemidbar rabba* in loco: "It is to teach us that there was only one tenth." Cf. Tr. *Menachoth*, fol. 87*β* where the one עשרון is not read. The Sept. cod. Vatic. omits the first word.

10. Deut. XXIX., 28. לנו ולבנינו עד-עולם. *Bemidbar rabba* in loco answers the question concerning these points by: "You have made manifest, hence I will also manifest unto you hidden things," cf. also Talmud Tr. *Sanhedrin*, fol. 43*β* in fine, and Norzi in Jos. VII., 21.

---

[1] If this interpretation is correct, then the word Aaron is superfluous, and thus it is wanting in some codd., also in the Syr. and Sam. Cf. our *Horae Samaritanae* in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1878 (Andover).

[2] The Copt. Vulg. read *esh*, and so also the Sept. and Sam. Cf. *Horae Samaritana* ibid. in loco.

11–14. 2 Sam. XIX., 20 יצא; Isa. XLIV., 9 המה; Ezech. XLI., 20 ההיכל; ibid. XLVI., 22 מהקצעות. On these words nothing is to be found in Rabbinic writings. Cf. Surenhusius *βίβλος καταλλαγῆς*, p. 73.

15. Ps. XXVII., 13. לולא. On this the Talmud Tr. *Berachoth*, fol. 41*a* says: "But how could David call himself holy? and it is written: Unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living." And we have a teaching in the name of R. Josi: Why are there points on לולא? David said before the Holy One (blessed be he): Lord of the universe, I am aware that thou greatly reward the just in future ages, but I know not if I shall have a part of it with them, or not. Perhaps that he had offended Him by any sin." Buxtorf remarks on this passage, that is טעם בלא טעם i. e., "a sense without a sense." The meaning probably is that לולא without the points means *if not*, like the Latin *nisi*, but with the points it signifies a "doubt."[1]

As to the origin and signification of these points nothing certain can be said. According to the Rabbins, Ezra is said to have been the author of these points. In *Bemidbar Rabba* ad Num. III., 39, sec. III., fol. 215, 4,we read that "when Elias will come and ask Ezra, Why hast thou written thus? he will answer, I have long ago pointed these letters; but when Elias will say to him, Thou hast written well, then he will remove these letters." The same we also read in *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan*, ch. 33. This much may be taken for granted that these points were known long before the time of the Talmud. Cf. also Hüpeden, *neue wahrscheinliche Muthmassung von der wahren Ursache der ausserordentlichen Punkte*, Hannov. 1751, § 4 sq.; Hiller, *De arcano keri et kethib*, Tubing. 1692, p. 156; Geiger, *Lehrbuch der Mischnah*, Vratislav. 1846, II. p. 87, 88; the same, *Urschrift* pp. 257–258.

§ 12. INVERTED NUN ׆.

Before Num. X., 35 and after X., 36, we find in our Hebrew Bibles the letter *Nun* נ inverted ׆. In the Talmud, Tr. *Sabbath* fol. 115*β*; 116*a*, we are told "that the section commencing ויהי בנסע הארן (Num. X., 35) was made by God with signs below and above, to indicate that it is not in its proper place. But Rabbi said, This is not so, but this book was counted by itself. How do you know it? Rabbi Samuel bar Nachman said, R. Jonathan said, [It is written] "She hath hewn out her seven pillars (Prov. IX., 1), this means the seven books of the law." It may be that the statement "that this section is not in its place," was still known in the time of the Sept., for the Codex Alex. and the Vatican read this part before the 34th verse.

Besides the *inverted nun* mentioned in Sabbath, we also read in Rosh hashana, fol. 117*β*, of *inverted Nuns* found in Ps. 107. But on examining some thirty-eight editions of the Psalms, which we found on our shelves, only seven have the inverted *Nun*, viz., Hahn's *Hebr. Bible* of 1839 and 1867; Rosenfeld's *Hebr. Bible* 1836; Letteris' Bible ed. by Abrahamson, Berlin 1866, and the Psalm editions of Baer and Delitzsch, Leipzig 1861, 1874, 1881.

---

[1] In the most recent edition of the Psalms, ed. by Baer and Delitzsch, Lipsiae, 1874, this word is marked with three points above and four below. The reason why the *Waw* is unpointed is stated (p. 13a) "Vav caret puncto, quod metuendum foret ne cum *Cholem* commutaretur." The same remark we also find in edition of 1880, p. 93. We may also add that the word in question is wanting in the Sept., Syriac, Arab., Vulg., Symm., and in some Hebr. MSS.

§ 13. THE WAW Q'TI'A' IN NUM. XXV., 12.

Of this ויו קטיעא or *Waw cut off*, which is written in our Hebrew Bibles ו, the Talmud Tr. *Kiddushin* fol. 66*β* states the following: Whence do we have it, that a person having some defect is unfit for the sacred ministry? R. Jehudah said, that R. Samuel taught that it is because the Scripture says, "Wherefore say, Behold I give unto him my covenant of peace," a perfect peace and not an imperfect one. But said one, it is written שלום, i. e., "peace," but answered R. Nachman, the *Waw* in שלום is cut off (ויו קטיעה היא).

§ 14. THE CLOSED OR FINAL MEM (ם) IN THE MIDDLE OF THE WORD.

ISA. IX., 6 לסרבה.

In the Talmud, Tr. *Sanhedrin*, fol. 94*β* we find the following: "Why is it that all the *Mems* in the middle of a word are open [i. e., מ], and this one is closed [i. e., ם]? The Holy One (blessed be he!) wanted to make Hezekiah the Messiah, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog; whereupon Justice pleaded before the presence of the Holy One (blessed be he!), Lord of the Universe, 'What! David, the king of Israel, who sang so many hymns and praises before thee, wilt thou not make him the Messiah; but Hezekiah, for whom thou hast performed all these miracles, and who has not uttered any song before thee, wilt thou make him the Messiah?' Therefore has the *mem* been closed."

§ 15. SUSPENDED LETTERS.

The suspended *Nun* we find in מְנַשֶּׁה, Judg. XVIII., 30. The Talmud *Baba Bathra*, fol. 109*β*, states the following: "Was he (i. e., Gershom) the son of Manasseh? whereas the Scripture says, 'the sons of Moses were Eleazer and Gershom.' But because he did the deeds of Manasseh [2 Kgs. XXI.], the Scripture appended him to the [family] of Manasseh." The meaning is that the prophet did not like to call Gershom, the son of Moses, because it would be ignominious that Moses should have had an impious son, hence he calls him the son of Manasseh, with the suspended letter, which may mean either the son of Manasseh or that of Moses.

The suspended *Ayin* we find in רִשׁעִים, Job XXXVIII., 15. In the Talmud, Tr. *Sanhedrin* fol. 103*β*, we read: Why is the ע in רשעים suspended? [It is to teach] that when a man is רִישׁ "poor" in this world, he will also be רֵשׁ in the world to come, or lit. "poor below, he will also be poor above."

Of the suspended *Ayin* in מֵיעַר Ps. LXXX., 14 we read, Tr. *Kiddushin*, fol. 30*β*, that this letter is the middle letter in the Psalms.

§ 16. MAJUSCULAR AND MINUSCULAR LETTERS.

Of the words written with large and small letters in our Hebrew Bible, we find nothing in the Talmud itself, but some instances are mentioned in the Tr. *Sopherim* chap. IX., which prove that this mode of writing must have been very ancient and served a certain purpose.

The instances mentioned in *Soferim* IX. are as follows:

ו majuscular in נחלן Lev. XI., 42 because it is the middle of all the letters in the Pentateuch (ישהיא הציי אותיות של תורה, Kiddushin 30*a*); י majuscular in ויגדל Num. XIV., 17; ל majuscular וישלכם—ישראל Deut. XXXIV., 12 Deut. XXIX., 27.

י minuscular in תישׁ Deut. XXXII., 18, the *Yodh* in תישׁי must be smaller than any in the Pentateuch, cf. also *Midrash Vajikra Rabba* sec. XXIII. fin. fol. 192, 3.

As to the letter ן in ויזתא (Esther IX., 9) whether it should be written majuscular or minuscular, is a matter of dispute, cf. Talmud, Tr. *Megillah*, fol. 16*β*.

Besides these letters mentioned above, we find nothing more in the Talmud, although there is no doubt, that the writing of the other letters was known in the time of the Talmud. Thus, e. g., the word והתגלח (Lev. XIII., 33) which is now written with a majuscular ג is mentioned as the middle of the verses of the Pentateuch (*Kiddushin* fol. 30*β*).

For the benefit of the student we give here according to the alphabet, all passages where, according to the Massorah, words with *majuscular* letters are found:

1 Chron. I., 1; Gen. I., 1; Lev. XIII., 33; Deut. VI., 4; Deut. XXXII., 6; Esth. IX., 9; Mal. III., 22; Esth. I., 6; Job IX., 34; Num. XIV., 17; Ps. LXXX., 16; Deut. XXIX., 27; Prov. I., 1; Exod. XXXIV., 7; Ruth III., 13; Num. XXVII., 5; Eccl. XII., 13; Deut. VI., 4; Dan. VI., 20; Gen. XXX., 42; Isa. LVI., 10; Ps. LXXXIV., 4; Exod. XXXIV., 14; Song of Song I., 1; Esth. IX., 29.

This is the list as given in the *Massorah marginalis* on Gen. I., 1; in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Chron. I., 1, however, where this list is repeated, the following alterations are made; for Esth. IX., 9 is substituted Lev. XI., 42; for Job IX., 34 is substituted Eccl. VII., 1; Num. XXVII., 5 and Gen. XXX., 42 are omitted; for Esth. IX., 29 is substituted Deut. XVIII., 13. In the *Ochlah w'Ochlah* again, where the list is also given, sec. 83, p. 88, Lev. XI., 42 is substituted for Esth. IX., 9; Dan. VII., 10, representing final *mem*, is added; Ps. LXXX., 16 is given instead of Exod. XXXIV., 7, and Gen. XXX., 42 is omitted. The same book, moreover, sec. 82, p. 88, gives another alphabetical list of majuscular letters contained in the Pentateuch alone, which is as follows:—

Deut. XXXIII., 29; Gen. I., 1; Lev. XIII., 33; Deut. VI., 4; Deut. XXXII., 6; Lev. XI., 42; Gen. XXXIV., 31; Gen. XLIX., 12; Exod. II., 2; Num. XIV., 17; Deut. XXVIII., 68; Deut. II., 33; Deut. XXIX., 27; Num. XXIV., 5; Gen. L., 23; Exod. XXXIV., 7; Num. XXVII., 5; Num. XIII., 30; Deut. VI., 4; Deut. XXXII., 5; Gen. XXX., 42; Exod. XI., 8; Exod. XXVIII., 36; Deut. XXII., 6; Exod. XXXIV., 14; Deut. III., 11; Deut. XVIII., 13.

The alphabetical list of the minuscular letters, as given in the Massorah finalis under the letter *Aleph.* and in the Massorah marginalis on Lev. I., 1 is in the following passages:

Lev. I., 2; Prov. XXX., 15; Job VII., 5; Prov. XXVIII., 17; Gen. II., 4; Ps. XXII., 30; Num. XXV., 12; Ps. XXIV., 4; Esth. IX., 9; Job XXXIII., 9; Lam. II., 9; Num. XXXI., 24; Deut. XXXII., 18; Gen. XXIII., 2; Lam. I., 12; Deut. IX., 24; Lev. VI., 2; Neh. XIII., 30; Nahum I., 3; Prov. XVI., 28; Jer. XXXIX., 13; Isa. XLIV., 14; Nahum I., 3; Ps. XXVII., 5; Lam. III., 36; Dan. VI., 20; Jer. XIV., 2; Job XVI., 14; Exod. XXXII., 25; Gen. XXVII., 46; Exod. XXXIV., 26; Esth. IX., 7; Esth. IX., 9.[1]

§ 17. THE PASEK OR SPACE BETWEEN SINGLE WORDS.[2]

When proper names occur twice in an address, they are separated by a small space, as in Gen. XXII., 11: אברהם ׀ אברהם; XLVI., 2: יעקב ׀ יעקב; 1 Sam.

[1] Cf. Engestroem, *De litteris Massoreth. majusculis.* Lond., Goth. 1738; Geiger in *Ozar Nechmad* II., pp. 87–89 (Vindob. ed. Blumenfeld).

[2] A list of all the passages where this Pasek occurs is given by Baer and Delitzsch in the parts.

III., 10: שמואל ו שמואל, called by the Massorites פָּסֵק *Pasek* (and not פְּסִיק *P'sik*, as it is generally written and pronounced). No such space or pasek, however, is found in Exod. III., 4 between מִי מִי שה מִי שה, vide *Midrash Shemoth Rabba*, sec. II. fol. 120, 3: "You will find a space between Abraham Abraham, Jacob Jacob, Samuel Samuel, but none between Moses Moses. Why this? it is like a man who bears a great burden and calls to N. N. who is near him, Take off from me this burden," etc. Norzi, who also quotes this passage, remarks that some say, "that with the other prophets he ceased sometimes to speak, but with Moses he never ceased, while he was alive."

§ 18. THE ALPHABET.

At what time the square character of the Hebrew alphabet was perfected, it is now difficult to determine with precision. Origen (died 254 A. D.), and Jerome (died 420), who probably followed Jewish tradition ascribe it to Ezra, and thus also José ben Halafta, who flourished between 138 and 164 A. D. But there can be no doubt that our present Hebrew alphabet was already known before the time of the Talmud, since the descriptions and allusions to the form of the Hebrew letters, which we find in the Talmud precisely suit the present square characters. In the treatise *Sabbath*, fol 103, col. 2 we are told very distinctly not to interchange א with ע, ב with כ, ג with צ, ד with ר, ה with ח, ו with י, ז with ן, ט with פ, ם with ם. That such a pre-caution was necessary, may be seen from what Origen mentions, that in his time the Tetragrammaton יהוה was rendered ΠΗΗΙ,[1] the ה being interchanged with ח, and ו with י, and in the Mishna (*Sabbath* XII., 5), the case is mentioned of two *zayins* (זז) being written for *cheth* (ח). More striking are the mistakes which have crept into the Alexandrian version, on account of mistaking one letter for a similar one, thus, e. g., א for ע, as 1 Sam. XVIII., 22, Sept. *καὶ σὺ* ואתה, Hebr. ועתה *and now*; XXXI., 1 אל־נגב, Sept. עַל־נֶגֶב *ἐπὶ τὸν νότον*; 2 Sam. XII., 19 וירא, Sept. וידע *καὶ ἐνόησε*; ב for כ, as Nahum II., 14 רכבה, Sept. רבבה *πλῆθος σου*; 1 Sam. X., 2 בלכתך, Sept. כלכתך *ὡς ἂν ἀπέλθῃς*; XI., 6 בשמעו, Sept. כשמעו *ὡς ἤκουσε* etc., etc.

The Talmud already knows the five final letters ם ן ץ ף ך (l. c. fol. 104, col. 1) which were probably used to render reading more easy by distinguishing one word from another (thus e. g., אלהים את—the third and fourth word of the first chapter of Genesis—might be read אלהי מאת).

---

of the Hebrew Bible hitherto published, viz., Genesis p. 91; Job p. 63; Psalms (ed. 1880) p. 153; Proverbs p. 62; Isaiah p. 84; Twelve Minor Prophets p. 97; Libri Danielis, Ezrae et Nehemiae p. 129.

[1] Jerome in his 136th letter to Marcellus, where he treats of the ten names of God, says: "nonum (sc. nomen Dei) est tetragrammum, quod *ἀνεκφώνητον* i. e., ineffabile, putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur *Jod, E, Vau, E*. Quod quidam non intelligentes propter elementorum similitudinem, quum in Graecis libris repererint Pi Pi legere consueverunt" (Opp. ed. Vallarsi I. 131; III. 720). Similar is the statement found in a fragment of Evagrius treating of the ten Jewish names of God, that the ineffable Tetragram, which *καταχρηστικῶς* is pronounced by the Jews *ἀδωναῖ*, by the Greeks *κύριος*, according to Exod. XXVII., 36 was written on the plate of the high-priest *ἁγίασμα κυρίῳ* ΠΗΗΙ (in some codd. *πι πι*). . . *τούτους χρησιμεύειν τοὺς ἀποχρίους ὡσθ' ἅπαξ ὀναν ιηπ* ΠΗΗΙ, *ἁ γῆς* (cf. Cotelerius *Monum. Eccles. Graecae* III., 216, by Vallarsi III., 726; Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* p. 205 sq.) For more on this subject, cf. my art. *Shem Hammephorash* in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop.

The Talmud also not only mentions the so-called *taggin* (תגין, כתרים),[1] or calligraphic ornaments on the letters ש ע ט נ ז ג ן (*Menachoth*, fol. 29, col. 1, 2; *Sabbath*, fol. 89, col. 1; 105, col. 2), but also mentions different combinations of the alphabet, as *Athbash*, *Achas*, *Albam* (אל בם—אחס—את בש).

This system is the more remarkable on account of Jerome having so confidently applied it to the word *Sheshak* ששך, in Jer. XXV., 26 (which according to the *Athbash* אתבש, as the first combination from its two initial words is called), it being the same as בבל Babel. According to the same rule לב קמי stands for כשדים, as Sept. translates Χαλδαίους (ibid. LI., 1),

§ 19. THE VOWEL POINTS.

It is now generally acknowledged that the vowel points which are found in our Hebrew Bibles, did not originally belong to the text, but are of later origin, and were added by the Massorites. The very fact that there existed two kinds of vowel-systems, the Babylonian or Assyrian and the Palestinian or Western, proves that the vowel-points could not have originated at one and the same time, otherwise the Babylonians would not place the vowels above the letters, as the *Prophetorum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (from the year 916 A. D. and ed. by Strack, Petropoli, 1876) shows, and the Palestinians would not place the vowels under the letters, as we now have it in our Hebrew Bibles. That during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some should have defended the divinity of the vowel-points, and even went so far as in Switzerland to make it a confessional article of belief in the *Formula Consensus*, art. IV. can. II. according to which in 1678 a law was enacted that no person should be licensed to preach the Gospel in their churches unless he publicly declared that he believed in the integrity of the Hebrew text and in the divinity of the vowel-points and accents ("codicem Hebr. Vet. Test. tum quoad consonas tum quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa sive punctorum saltem potestatem θεόπνευστον esse") may surprise us at present like a good many other things of past ages.

The letters of the Hebrew, like those of the Arabic, Syriac, Chaldee and Samaritan, were only consonants, and as the letters א for ā, ו for ū, י for ī, were sometimes used as vowels, it is evident that a word without these vowel-letters, and when simply written with consonants, with different vowels attached to it, would yield different meanings. Thus דבר when vowelled can be דָּבָר *word*, דִּבֶּר *speaking*, דָּבַר *he has spoken*, דַּבֵּר *to speak*, דֶּבֶר *pest*, דְּבִיר *sanctuary*, etc.

A comparison of the Alexandrian version with our present voweled text shows that the Seventy or rather seventy-two translators had an unvoweled text from which they translated. Even in the first centuries of our era, the Hebrew text had no vowel points, as can be seen from the Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, as well as from the Peshito and Jerome's Latin translation. Thus the latter says: "Idem sermo et iisdem litteris scriptus diversus apud eos et voces et intelligentias habet, e. c. *pastores* et *amatores* iisdem litteris scribuntur *res*, *'ain*, *yod*, *mem* (רעים): sed pastores *ro-im* (רֹעִים) leguntur, *amatores* re-im (רֵעִים)." *In Epist.* 126, *ad Evagrium:* "Non refert, utrum Salem an Salim nominetur, cum vocalibus in medio litteris perraro utantur

[1] Cf. *Sepher Taghin*, *Liber coronularum* ed. J. I. L. Barges, Paris 1866, and Derenbourg *Notes epigraphiques* (ibid. 1877) p. 134.

Hebraei, et pro voluntate lectorum atque varietate regionum eadem verba diversis sonis et accentibus proferantur." In *comment. ad Hab.* III., 5: "Pro eo, quod nos transtulimus *mortem* in Hebraeo tres litterae sunt positae, Daleth, Beth, Resh, absque ulla vocali, quae si legantur *dabar* (דָּבָר) "verbum," significant; si *deber* (דֶּבֶר) "pestem;" Hab. III., 4: verbum שׁם pro qualitate loci et posuit (שָׁם) intelligitur, et ibi (שָׁם). Cf. also ad *Gen.* XLVII., 31; S. *Epist.* 125 *and Damasum.*"

Some have supposed that a certain vowel-system must have existed in the time of the Talmud, and based their argument upon the phrases אלתקרי כך אלא כך "read not so, but so" (e. g., do not read בָּנַיִךְ "thy sons" but בְּנַיִךְ "thy builders"; do not read וְיָשֵׂם "and prepare" but וְיָשָׁם "and there" (Ps. L., 23), and ישאם למקרא וישאם למסורת "there is a solid root for the reading of the text, and there is a solid root for the traditional pronunciation," which occur so often in the Talmud. But these phrases prove the contrary. The Jews were in the habit of reading without points, and this they could do, since according to the statement of the Talmud (*Pirke Aboth* V., 24 "a boy five years old should commence with the reading of the law"). Josephus and Philo, from the very childhood the Jewish youth was made acquainted with Holy Writ, and therefore they said, "do not read so, but so" which they would not have said, had the words in question been pointed in a certain manner.

§ 20. DIVISION OF WORDS.

Hebrew was originally written, like most ancient languages, without any division between the words, in a *scriptio continua*, which fact accounts for the various readings in the Septuagint. But there is no doubt that a division of words already existed in the time of the Talmud, at least the final letters which were already mentioned (§ 18), may have served such a purpose, and in *Menachoth*, fol. 30, col. 1, the space between the words in the sacred manuscripts is fixed with precision. Whether or not this division of words by points—as used in the Samaritan Pentateuch—was applied, must be left undecided.

§ 21. DIVISION ACCORDING TO THE MEANING—VERSES.

There is no doubt that at a very early period a division according to verses (פסוקים) existed. "Every verse divided by Moses may not otherwise be divided" (*Megilla*, fol. 22, col. 1) is an old axiom. The reason for such a division was probably twofold:

1. *The reading of the Scriptures*, especially in the synagogue, led to such a division. Already the *Mishna Megilla* IV., § 4 mentions the פסוקים in relation to this, for we read, "not less than three verses of the Law may be read in the synagogue to any person [called to read]. One verse only of the Law may be read at one time to the meturgeman or interpreter; but it is lawful to read three consecutive verses to him from the Prophets; but if each verse should form a separate section, one verse only may be read [to the interpreter] at a time." The Gemara forbids the leaving of the synagogue before the ending of such a section (Berachoth 8*a*), introduces the injunction of Ezra (Neh. VIII., 8; Megilla 3*a*; Nedarim 37*β*) and prescribes in reference to the Prophets, how many sections are to be read on the week-days (Baba Kama 82*a*).

2. *The study of the Law, the instruction and teaching of the same in the school* produced such sense-divisions. These were distinguished from the former, which were merely called פסוקים. by the names טעמים "clauses," "sententiae," or also פסוקי טעמים clause-sections. To instruct in the dividing of clauses (פיסוק טעמים) was a special part of Rabbinical teaching (Tr. *Nedarim* 37*a*); in *Berachoth* fol. 62*a* the teacher is said to point it out to his scholars with the right hand, and disputed points of the law were settled accordingly (Chagigah 6*β*).

As to the sign of this division, which is now found in the Hebrew Bible [׃], it is not found in the Synagogue-rolls, nor is it mentioned in the Talmud, and is of later origin, and we must conclude it as highly probable that these divisions into verses and periods were not first externally designated, but were merely transmitted by oral tradition, as may be seen from the following quotation (*Kiddushin*, fol. 30*a*): "Therefore are the ancient called Soferim, because they counted all letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the *Vaw* in ונחון [Lev. xi., 42] is the half of all the letters in the Pentateuch; דרש דרש [ibid. x., 16] is the middle word; והתנלח [ibid. xiii., 33] the middle verse; that *Ain* in מיער [Ps. lxxx., 14] is the middle letter in the Psalms, and Ps. lxxvii., 38 the middle verse." In the same passage we also read that the Pentateuch contains 5888 verses, the Psalms 8 more and Chronicles 8 less. Now, if we compare this with the number as given by the Massorites, we will find that the Talmud counts 43 verses more than the Massorites in the Pentateuch, a difference which can only be explained from the statement made in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 14*β*) "That Joshua wrote his book and 8 verses of the law (viz., Deut. xxxiv., 5–12 (יהושע כתב כספרו ושמונה פסוקים שבתורה), and that the Occidentals, as we read (*Kiddushin* l. c.) divided the verse in Exod. xix., 9 into 3 verses. This much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud, there was a division according to verses, but whatever this mark of division was, if there was any at all—at least Tr. *Sopherim* chap. 3, 5 is against it—is difficult to point out.

§ 22. ΣΤΙΧΟΙ.

The poetical passages in Exod. xv.; Deut. xxxii.; Judg. v.; 2 Sam. xxii. were in the time of the Talmud already written *στιχηρῶς* (i. e., in broken lines, cf. Tr. *Sabbath* fol. 103, col. 2 in fine; *Sopherim* xii.; the same may be said of the poetical books אמת, i. e., Job, Proverbs, Psalms. Also the decalogue was originally written in ten series שיטים, *στίχοι*, as is intimated in the Targum on the Song of Songs v., 13: "The two tables of stone which he gave to his people were written in ten rows (shittin) resembling the rows or beds (shittin) in the garden of balsam." In the Synagogue scrolls this rule is carried out up to this day, thus Exod. xv. is found written in this way:

לאמר אשירה ליהוה כי גאה גאה סוס
ורכבו רמה בים עזי וזמרת יה ויהי לי
לישועה זה אלי ואנוהו אלהי
אבי וארממנהו יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה

To complete our subject we ought to speak about the quotations of the Old Testament in the Talmud. This we reserve for a future article.

ASSYRIAN PHONOLOGY, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HEBREW.

By Professor Paul Haupt, Ph. D.

§1. THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE HAS THE FOLLOWING SOUNDS:

I. Vowels:..... a i u; â î û; e.

II. Consonants:..... ' b g d z ḫ ṭ k l m n s p ṣ q r š t; in Hebrew transcription: א ב ג ד ז ח ט כ ל מ נ ס פ צ ק ר ש ת.

Examples:

a) abnu (construct aban) *stone;* appu, *face;* kalbu (construct kalab) *dog*, feminine kalbatu, *bitch;* šarru (construct šar, plural šarre or šarrâni) *king*, feminine šarratu (construct šarrat, plural šarrâti) *queen;* šallatu (from šalâlu, imperfect išlul, *to plunder*) *spoil;* qaštu (construct qašat, plural qašâti) *bow;* daltu (construct dalat, plural dalâti) *door;* ammatu, *cubit;* la'abu, *flame;* ma'adu (feminine ma'adtu, ma'attu) *much* (plural ma'adûti, feminine, ma'adâti); arratu (from arâru, imperfect erur, present irrar, imperative arur) *curse;* rapšu (feminine rapaštu or rapaltu) *expanded, wide;* aššatu, *wife;* zikaru (or zikru) *male;* šikaru (or šikru) *strong drink;* ilmad (imperative lámad) *he learnt;* narkabtu (plural narkabâti) *chariot*, from irkab, *he rode;* imḫaṣ, *he wounded* (imperative maḫaṣ); imraṣ, *he was ill;* iš'al, *he asked.*

Cf. Hebrew, אֶבֶן (Aramaic אַבְנָא); אַפַּיִם (Aramaic אנפין); כֶּלֶב (Aramaic כַּלְבָּא); שַׂר (feminine שָׂרָה, for שַׂרְרָה*, LXX. Σάρρα); שָׁלָל; קֶשֶׁת (Aramaic קַשְׁתָּא, Syriac קשׁתא); דֶּלֶת; אֲמָה; לַהַב; מְאֹד; מְאֵרָה, for מְיֵארָה*, from אָרַר; פָּרַשׁ; אִשָּׁה (Syriac אַנתתָא, attâ); זָכָר (cf. Aramaic דְּכַרָא, *ram*); שָׂכָר; יָלְמִד; מִרְכָּבָה (plural מַרְכָּבוֹת, Aramaic מרכבתא); יִרְכַּב; יִמְחַץ (מַחַץ, Isa. xxx., 26); Aramaic יִמְרַע (Arabic yamrad); Hebrew יִשְׁאַל.

i) libbu, *heart;* šinnu, *tooth;* šibbu, *girdle* (cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Studien*, 132); bintu, *daughter;* milku (construct milik) *counsel* (from malâku, imperfect imlik); libittu (construct libnat) *brick;* ṣindu (for ṣimdu,[1] construct ṣimid) and ṣimittu (for ṣimidtu, construct ṣindat) *yoke, span;* nimru, *leopard;* riḫṣu (construct riḫiṣ) and riḫiṣtu or riḫiltu (construct riḫṣat) *inundation*, from raḫâṣu (imperfect irḫiṣ); sidru (construct sidir) and sidirtu (construct sidrat) *array;* ṣiḫru (construct ṣiḫir, feminine ṣiḫirtu) *small;* siḫirtu, *totality;* sikiptu (from sakâpu, imperfect iskip, present isâkip, *to cast down*) *defeat;* gimru (construct gimir) and gimirtu, *totality;*

[In the foot-notes an italicized *a*, *i*, or *u* represents â, î, û: an italicized *t*, *h* or *s* represent ṭ, ḫ, or ṣ. It has been impossible to secure in time the Nonpareil type for these letters.—W. R. H.]

[1] Cf. Arabic 'indî = Hebrew עִמָּדִי *with me.*

niklu (nikil) and nikiltu (V. R. 3, 85) *deceit;* ilu (plural ilâni) *god;* iṣu, *wood;* tilu (not tillu!) (plural tilâni) *hill* (= Akkadian dul, du); iddin (= yandin = yantin) *he gave* (present inádin, imperative idin, for nidin); irbiṣ, *he couched;* itkil (present itákil) *he trusted;* illik (present illak, imperative alik) *he went*, from alâku, *to go;* iḫliq (present iḫáliq) *he fled;* iššiq and unaššiq, *he kissed;* ikkir, *he was hostile;* išlim, *it was completed;* ikkis and unakkis, *he cut off.*

Cf. Hebrew לֵב (Aramaic לִבָּא); שֵׁן (Aramaic שִׁנָּא); ....; בַּת (בִּתִּי, *my daughter;* Arabic bint, plural banât); נִמְלַךְ (וַיִּמָּלֵךְ לִבִּי, Neh. v., 7; Aramaic מִלְכָא,[1] *consilium*); לְבֵנָה (Aramaic לִבְנְתָּא, לִבִּינְתָּא); צֶמֶר; נָמֵר (Aramaic נִמְרָא); רַחַיִם; שְׁדֵרוֹת (2 Kgs. xi., 8, 15; 2 Chron. xxiii., 14; cf. also 1 Kgs. vi., 9) and סְדָרִים, Job x., 22 (Aramaic סִדְרָא); צָעִיר; ....; ....; נָמַר, בָּנְכְלֵיכֶם) יִגְמֹר (Ps. vii., 10; xii., 2; lvii., 3; lxxvii., 9; cxxxviii., 8); נָכַל אֲשֶׁר נָכְלוּ, Num. xxv., 18; Aramaic נִכְלָא); אֵל; עֵץ; תֵּל; (Arabic tall, plural tilâl and tulûl); יִתֵּן (Aramaic יִנְתֵּן); יִרְבֵּץ; Aramaic תְּכַל; יֵלֵךְ; Ethiopic yěḫlěq; Hebrew יִשַּׁק, יְנַשֵּׁק; נָכְרִי; יִשְׁלַם.

u) ummu, *mother;* šumu, *name;* kupru (construct kupur) *asphalt;* urḫu (construct uruḫ) *road;* quṭru (construct quṭur, Sanh. iv., 68) *smoke;* lubšu (construct lubuš) and lubuštu or lubultu (construct lubšat) *garment;* uznu (construct uzun) *ear;* zumbu (for zubbu) *fly;* ṣumbu (for ṣubbu, ṣub'u) *finger;* uzzu, *might;* pulḫu and puluḫtu, *fear;* uduntu (II. R. 48, 35 f.) for udumtu (construct udmat) *blood;* buṭnu (construct buṭun) *pistacia;* uklu (construct ukul) and ukultu (construct uklat) *food;* gullatu, *district;* kullatu, *totality* (from kalâlu, shaphel šuklulu, imperfect ušaklil, imperative šuklil, *to complete*, cf. Chaldee שַׁכְלֵל, Pass. אִשְׁתַּכְלַל = Assyrian Ištaphal imperfect uštaklil); uggatu,[2] *anger;* mutu,[3] *husband;*

[1] Also מֶלֶךְ in the biblical proper names אֲבִימֶלֶךְ and אֲחִימֶלֶךְ seems to have the same meaning. The Assyrian transcription of these names is Abi-milki, Aḫi-milki, not Abi-malki and Aḫi-malki!

[2] Cf. II. R. 20, 37 d; IV. R. 10, 2 and 49 a; 12, 38 etc. Uggatu comes from the stem agagu *to burn, to glow* (used only of anger, as the Hebr. חָרָה) II. R. 36, 31 g; IV. R. 28, 16 b; impf. egug (2 p. tagug. tagugi ASKT. 123, Obv. 21, agug; plur. egugu IV. R. 55, 17 b, fem. eguga, 2 p. tagugu, taguga, 1 p. nigug; infinitive Niphal nangugu — na'gugu II. R. 36, 32 g (cf. ASKT. 76, 2 and 10); adjectivum verbale aggu (adverbium aggis) *angry.* Cf. Guyard § 48; ASKT. 177, No. 43. Delitzsch (*Assyr. Lesestuecke*, p. 31) considers aggu a Sumerian loan-word, Schrader, KAT. 373 combines the stem with Hebr. הנג, הגה. Agagu, however, is evidently the Arabic ajja (or agga) *to burn, to flame*, impf. ya'ujju, infinitive ajîj. Cf. libbatu *anger* in libbati imtalî *he was filled with fury* (= הִתְמַלִּי חֵמָא Dan. iii., 19) Deluge IV. 8 (see my commentary, KAT. 78, and my glossary to the Deluge, KAT. 507, s. v. לאב), prop. *he was filled with flames* (libbatu = lihbatu; cf. לַהֲבָה = לַבָּה Exod. iii., 2). Also חֵמָא, חֶמָא *anger* (Hebr. חֲמָה, construct חֲמַת) comes from the stem יחם (cf. Arabic wahima) *to get warm, to become inflamed, excited*, then espec. *to rut.* The construct of Syriac חְמָתָא *anger* (whence the denominative Ithpael אִתְחַמַּת *to get angry*) חֲמַת is based on the analogy of the stems שְׁנַת ע"ע like שְׁנָא (absolute שְׁנָא) *sleep* from יָשַׁן (Arabic wasina). Cf. Noeldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 105.

[3] Cf. Ethiopic met (plur. amtat) *maritus, vir*, Hebr. מְתִים. The word is like sumu *name*,

išpuk, *he poured out;* išrup, *he burned;* ekul (= yekul, imperative akul) *he ate;* išqul, *he weighed;* irḫuṣ, *he trusted;* iṣṣur (from naṣâru, imperative uṣur, for nuṣur) *he protected;* iššuk, *he bit;* imdud, *he measured.*

Cf. Hebrew אֵם (Aramaic אִמָּא, Arabic umm); שֵׁם (Aramaic שֻׁם);[1] כֹּפֶר (Aramaic כֻּפְרָא); אֹרַח (Aramaic אֻרְחָא); קִיטוֹר, Gen. XIX., 28; Ps. CXIX., 83 (Aramaic קְטָרָא); לְבוּשׁ; אֹזֶן (Aramaic אֻדְנָא, Syriac אדנא); זְבוּב (Aramaic דְּבָבָא); אַצְבַּע (Aramaic צִבְעָא); עֹז (with suffix עָזִּי, Aramaic עָזָא); דָּם, akin to אָדֹם, *to be red* (Aramaic אַדְמָא, Punic אדם, *blood*); בָּטְנִים, Gen. XLIII., 11 (Aramaic, with partial assimilation of the final ן to the initial ב,[2] בִּטְמָא, Arabic buṭm); אֹכֶל, feminine אֹכְלָה; גָּלִיל, feminine גְּלִילָה; כֹּל (for kull); יִשְׁפֹּךְ; יִשְׂרֹף; יֹאכַל (dissimilation for יֹאכֹל, Aramaic יֵיכֹל); יִשְׁקֹל; Aramaic יְרַחֵן (cf. דִּי הִתְרַחֲצוּ עֲלוֹהִי, Dan. III., 28); יִצֹּר and יִנְצֹר; יִשַּׁךְ and יִשֵּׁךְ (Aramaic, with transposition, יְנַכֵּת and יְכַת); יָמִיד.

â) dâmu, *blood;* ṭâbu (feminine ṭâbtu, construct ṭâbat, plural ṭâbûti, feminine ṭâbâti) *good;* mâru, *child* (plural mâre, feminine mârtu, construct mârat, plural mârâti, *daughter;* kâlu, *totality;* bâbu, *gate;* râšu, *head;* lâ, *not;* mâtu (plural mâtâti) *country* (= Akkadian mada); dâdu, *beloved;* nâru (= *nahru, plural nârâti) *river;* šâru (= *ša'aru, plural šâre) *wind;* qâtu (plural qâtâ or qâte) *hand;* pâdu *side;* pânu, *face;* ḫarrânu (plural ḫarrânâti, *road;* lidânu (from alâdu = יָלַד) *child;* ummânu (plural ummânâti) *people, army;* lišânu (plural lišânâti) *tongue;* kišâdu (plural kišâdâti) *neck;* timâli, *yesterday;* ti'âmtu (with partial assimilation of the feminine ת to the preceding מ, ti'âmdu) or tâmtu, tâmdu (plural tâmâti) *sea;* išâtu, *fire;* burâšu, *cypress;* qurâdu, *warrior;* bu'ânu, *ulcer;* buḫâlu, *male;* ḫušâḫu, *famine;* turâḫu, *steinbock;* ṣubâtu, *garment;* maḫâzu (plural maḫâzânî) *city;* manâḫtu, *resting place;* âšipu, *enchanter;* ṣâ'idu, *hunter;* dânu, *judge;* šarrâni, *kings;* šarrâti, *queens;* bâbâni or bâbâti, *gates;* bâ'u, *to enter;* nâḫu, *to rest;* târtu (construct târat, from târu, imperfect itûr, present itâr) *return;* Namtâru, *a demon.*

Cf. Hebrew דָּם; טוֹב (Aramaic טָב); ....; כֹּל;[3] Aramaic בָּבָא[4] (Arabic

---

a bi-consonantal noun of the shortest formation: the stem is not כִּתָּה, nor, in spite of the Ethiopic plural amtat, כִּתּוֹת (cf. Noeldeke, *Mandaitische Grammatik*, p. 95).

[1] Ethiopic sem (= sum or sim) plur. asmat, which is evidently based on the analogy of amtat, plur. to met *husband.*

[2] Cf. Arabic ibham (plural abahim and abahîm) *thumb.* – Hebrew בֹּהֶן. Assyrian, with transposition, ubanu = hubanu.

[3] From the stem כלל; Jer. xxxiii., 8, כִּתִּיבוּ: כּוֹל. Cf. also the Western Syriac bye-form of כָּל: כֻּלָּ, Noeldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, p. 32. The stem of Assyrian kalu, *totality*, cannot be כלל (Schrader, KAT. 558 s. v.) nor כלה (Lyon, *Sargon* 87). Kalu, *totality*, is = *kawalu just as Aramaic קָל *voice* (also Ethiopic qal, plur. qalat) = *qawalu and ṭabu, *good* = *ṭayabu. Cf. also Noeldeke, *Syr. Gram.* § 98, B; Stade, *Hebr. Gram.* § 201, c.

[4] For בָּבָא in בָּבָא עַיִן Zach. II., 12 see Fleischer's remarks in Levy's *Chald. Woerterbuch ueber die Targumim*, vol. I. p. 419, col. b. Bab, *entrance, gate*, is of course akin to בוא (Assyrian ba'u, Ethiopic bawi, Perf. bo'a *to enter.*

bâb, plural abwâb); רֹאשׁ, plural רָאשִׁים for רְאָשִׁים* (Aramaic רֵאשָׁא,[1] modern Arabic râs); לֵא (Aramaic לָא, also Arabic lâ); Aramaic כְּרָא,[2] *city, village;* דּוֹד; נָהָר[3] (plur. נְהָרוֹת); שַׂעַר, Isa. XXVIII., 2; שְׂעָרָה, Job IX., 17; Nah. I., 3, and סַעַר, סְעָרָה; ....; ....; פָּנִים; חָרָן for חַרָן,* *Κάρραι* (which does not mean *parched*); לְדָה, לֵדָה; עָם; לָשׁוֹן (plural לְשׁוֹנוֹת, Aramaic לִשָׁן[4]); Ethiopic kĕsâd (plur. kĕsâdât); תְּמוֹל (Aram. תְּמָלִי); תְּהוֹם (plur. תְּהֹמוֹת); אֵשׁ (Aramaic אֶשָׁא, Dan. VII., 11, or אֶשְׁתָּא, feminine אֶשְׁתָּא, Syriac אֶשְׁתָּא, *fever;* Ethiopic ĕsât or perhaps ĕssât, *fire*); בְּרוֹשׁ (Aramaic בְּרָתָא, בְּרוֹתָא); ....; מָחוֹז, Ps. CVII., 30 (Aramaic מָחוֹזָא, cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 70, g), מָנוֹחַ, feminine מְנוּחָה; אַשְׁפִּים (Aramaic אָשְׁפִין, Syriac אֶשׁוּפָא); צַיִד, Jer. XVI., 16; בּוֹא; דַּיָּן; נוּחַ; תּוֹר.

î) šî, *she;* kî or (with the emphatic ma) kî-ma, *like;* pî (genitive and construct state of pû) *mouth,* pî'a, *my mouth;* ittî'a or ittî,[5] *with me;* attî, *thou* (feminine); nîru (from nâru = narâru,[6] *to bind*) *yoke* (cf. *ζυγόν* from *ζεύγνυμι*; jugum and jungo); dînu, *judgment,* from dânu (=*dayânu, imperative dîn, imperfect idînu, present idânu = *yadáyanu) *he judged;* pîru, *elephant* (plural pîrâti); mîtu (= *mawîtu) *dead;* šîbu (feminine šîbtu) *gray-haired old man, elder* (abstract noun šîbûtu, *old age, eldership*); bîšu (= bi'išu) *evil;* nîḫu (feminine nîḫtu, construct nîḫat) *quiet* (=*nawîḫu from nâḫu, imperfect inûḫ = Hebrew נוּחַ, *to rest*); dîku (feminine dîktu[7]) *killed* (from dâku, imperfect idûk); šîmu, *price,* feminine šîmtu (construct šîmat, plural šîmâti) *fate* (from šâmu =*šayâmu, imperfect išîmu, *to establish, to determine, to fix,*

[1] Also in Assyrian the usual form is resu, not rasu. The latter is to be met with e. g. Sennacherib V. 56: apira rasu'a *I covered my head* instead of epira resu'a. The Assyrian eperu *to cover* corresponds to the Arabic ghafara; cf Guyard, *Notes de Lexicographie Assyrienne,* Paris, 1883, § 7. The Impf. Piel of eperu is uppir = u'appir = yughappir; the Ifte'al, itepra or itepira = etepir, etapir, yetapir, yatapir, ya'tapir. Cf. Haupt, *Nimrodepos,* 42, 5.

[2] Cf. Noeldeke, *Neusyr. Gram.* p. 92, n. 1; *Mandaeische Gram.* p. 99; *Syr. Gram.* p. 50, 2.

[3] For the Assyr. naru, *river;* saru, *wind* = nahru, sa'aru; cf. the modern Syriac nara, *river* and sara (כְּיָרָא) *hair,* Noeldeke *Neusyr. Gram.* p. 86. Observe naru, *river;* niru, *yoke;* nuru, *light;* neru, *νῆρος;* saru, *wind;* siru, *flesh;* suru, *bull;* seru, *morning* = Hebrew נָהָר, Aram. נְהָרָא. נִירָא; Hebr. שַׂעַר, שְׂאֹר, שׁוֹר, שָׂחַר.

[4] The stem of לְשׁוֹן is not לְשָׁה, but לוּשׁ; the stem of the Aramæan לִשָׁן is לְשַׁשׁ. Both are akin to לָחַשׁ, Assyrian la su (ASKT. 11, 75 and 214, 75), Arabic la*h*isa *to lick.* For the meaning of the Hebrew לָחַשׁ cf. H. R. 32, 59 a. b.; V. R. 12, No. 4, 41. For לָחַשׁ = לָשַׁשׁ cf. Lagarde, *Materialien zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs,* Leipzig, 1867, II., p. 4, 19, where the Hebrew וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם is rendered by Arabic wa-ru*h*(u) ullah(i) turiff(u) 'ala wajh(i) al-ma'(i); also *Voyages d' Ibn Batoutah,* ed. Defremery & Sanguinetti, Tome IV. (Paris, 1858), p. 16, 8: wa-kana fuquha *ta*'irun yurafrifu bi-jana*h*aihi, cf. also Aramaic רְהַט *to run* = Hebrew רוּץ; בָּהַת *to be ashamed* = בּוֹשׁ; נָהֲרָא *light* = נֵר (from נוּר); כָּהַל *to be able* = כּוֹל, יָכֹל; Syriac צְהְיוֹן *Zion* (also Arabic صهيون) = צִיּוֹן (from צוּן *to protect,* Delitzsch, *Genesis,* p. 578, 2); etc., etc. See Gesenius' *Hebrew Lexicon,* ed. Muehlau & Volck, Leipzig, 1883, p. 199, and Stade's *Hebrew Grammar,* § 146.

[5] Ittu *side* is = idtu, fem. of idu (Ethiopic ed) *hand, side,* Heb. יָד, Aram. אִידָא.

[6] Hence niraru *ally,* nirarutu *alliance, succor.*

[7] Diktu means also *military forces, army,* e. g., diktasu ma'atta aduk, *I killed many of his soldiers.*

to stipulate, etc.); ḫîrtu (construct ḫîrat, plur. ḫîrâti) *wife*, fem. of *ḫîru (= *ḫayîru) *selected*, from ḫâru (= *ḫayâru)[1] *to select* (nomen agentis ḫâ'iru[2] =*ḫâyiru, *husband*), qîštu (plural qîšâti) *present*, *gift*, from qâšu (imperfect iqîš, Piel uqâ'iš) *to present*; zîqu, *blowing*, *wind*, from zâqu, imperfect izîq, present izáq (= *yazáyaq) *to blow*; itîbu, *he was good* (= Arabic yaṭîbu, Hebrew יֵיטַב); izîru, *he was hostile* (participle zâ'iru,[3] *enemy*, *adversary*, cf. זָרִים, Ps. LIV., 5, etc.; idîšu, *he crushed* (nomen agentis dâ'išu[4] = *dâyišu); igîru (V. R. 4, 50) *he revolted* (participle gâru,[4] *enemy*, cf. Hebrew גָּר and גֵּר, *stranger*, from גּוּר); iḫîšu (imperative ḫîš) *he hastened*; išînu (Deluge III., 49; cf. *Assyr. Lesestuecke*, 80, 90; Haupt, ASKT. 89. 25) *he smelled*; zaqîpu, *pole*, from zaqâpu, *to erect* (imperfect izkup); maḫîru, *price*, from maḫâru *to receive* (imperfect imḫur); bikîtu, *weeping*, from bakû (= *bakâyu) *to weep*, imperfect ibkî, *he wept*, present ibâkî, imperative bikî; maštîtu or maltîtu, *drink*, from šatû *to drink* (imperf. ištî or iltî, impv. šitî, present išâtî); mašqîtu, *watering place*, from šaqû *to water* (imperfect išqî, present išâqî, impv. šiqî); ṣabîtu, *gazelle*, ASKT. 71, 13; tamšîlu (= *tamšîlu) *likeness*, *like*; tarbîtu, *produce*, *product*, *offspring*, from *rubbû (=*rubbuyu) imperfect urabbî, *to make to grow*, *to bring up*; Tašrîtu or (with assimilation of the *a* to the following î) Tišrîtu, *Tishri*, *the seventh month*, *or the first month of the second half of the year*,[5] infinitive of šurrû (= šurruyu) *to begin*; tiṣlîtu (= *taṣliyatu) *prayer*, infinitive to ṣullû (imperfect uṣallî, present uṣallâ) *to pray*; šîru (= *ši'ru) *flesh*; 'rîmu (= ri'mu) *wild bull* (plural rîmâni); zîbu, *wolf*, (= zi'bu); ḫîṭu (= ḫiṭṭu, ḫiṭ'u) *sin*, from ḫaṭû (= ḫaṭâ'u) *to sin*, imperfect iḫṭî; ṣîlu (plural ṣîlâni) *rib* (= ṣillu, ṣil'u).

---

[1] Cf. Ethiopic *haraya* or *harya*, *selegit*, part. pass. *heruy*, fem. *herît* (=*hereyt*, *heruyt*, *heruyt*) *selectus*, akin to *her*, fem. *hert* *egregius*, *praestans*, *bonus* (plur. *herau*, fem. *herat*)= Arabic *ḥair* and *ḥaiyir* (= *ḥayir*) *bonus*, from *ḥara*, impf. *yaḥîru* *elegit*, *selegit*. Cf. also Hebr. בּוֹחַר, which seems to go back to a bi-consonantal root חר.

[2] Besides *ha'iru*, we find also *hamiru* or *haviru* (not *hawiru*!) e.g., Haupt, *Nimrodepos* xlii., 7–9: *alka-ma Izdubar lu ha'ir atta, inbika asi qasu qisa-ma* (Gesenius § 131, 3, a) *atta lu mutî-ma anaku lu assatka*—*Come, Izdubar, be my husband, give me thy love* (*inbu* = *ibbu* = *hibbu*), *thou shalt be my husband and I thy wife*. Here Fragment No. 14 of my edition (p. 30) has, instead of *ha'ir*, the form *ha-me-ir* (as in IV. R. 27, 2 a) i. e., *hamir* (Delitzsch in Lotz's *Tiglathpileser*, p. 141) or (with *e*, on account of the following *r*, as in *umdassera*, *they were deserted*, *ustesera*, *I directed*, *uma'era*, *I sent*, etc.) *hamer*, *haver*. Cf. also *ha-mer*, *Descent of Ishtar*, 42, b, and my remarks in Schrader's KAT. 66, note 3.

[3] The stems of *za'iru* and *da'išu* are זיר, דיש, not זאר, דאש (Lotz). Cf. Schrader, KAT. 550, note.

[4] *Garu* and *gîru*, H. R. 48, 41 and 42 b (Lotz, 108, 45) are = *garayu, *girayu. Cf. *mahru* (fem. *mahrîtu*) *first* = *mahrayu* (from *mahru*, *front*, like קַדְמִי, from קֶדֶם). *daru*, *eternal* (fem. *darîtu*) (= *dahrayu) from *daru* (plur. *darâti*) *eternity*, *restu* (Lotz, 92; Schrader, KAT. 607) *chief*, *principal*, etc. (= *restayu) from *restu*, fem. of *resu*, *head* (*Ištar resti ilani* is *Istar the princess of the gods*) *sulumu* *treaty of peace*, V. R. 1, 124 = *sulumayu, from שָׁלוֹם, שָׁלֵם *peace*, etc., etc.

[5] Cf. Dillmann, *Ueber das Kalenderwesen der Israeliten vor dem babylonischen Exil*, Monatsberichte of the Berlin Academy, Oct. 27, 1881.

Cf. Hebrew הִיא; כְּמוֹ, כ; פֶּה, construct פִּי; אִתִּי; אַתְּ, אַתִּי; Aramaic נִירָא, Arabic nîr (cf. Hebrew נִירוּ לָכֶם נִיר, Jer. IV., 3, Hos. X., 12; also מָנוֹר אֲרָנִים *jugum textoris, liciatorium*, Aramaic נַוְלָא, Arabic naul and minwâl); דִּין; Aramaic פִּילָא, Arabic fîl (sinnu-'l-fîli, sinn-el-fîl, *ivory*, Chaldee שֶׁנְהַבְּפִין = שֵׁן דְּפִיל. Assyrian šinni pîri or šin pîri, Akkadian ka-amsi, cf. also Hebrew שְׁנְהַבִּים); Aramaic מִיתָא (Hebrew מֵת); שֵׂיב, feminine שֵׂיבָה (Aramaic סָבָא, feminine סָבְתָא *senex*, Arabic šaib *senectus*); Aramaic בִּישָׁא (feminine בְּאִישְׁתָּא c. א' נְעָלָם. Ez. IV., 12); Aramaic נִיחָא; Hebrew דָּכַךְ, דָּכָא, דַּכָּה, דֻּכָּא, *to crush*, etc.; Aramaic סִימָא *positus, constitutus*, feminine סִימְתָא (Hebrew שׂוֹם); ....; ....; Aramaic זְקָא; ....; ....; יָדוּשׁ (but Deut. XXV., 4.. לֹא־תַחְסֹם שׁוֹר בְּדִישׁוֹ); ....; חֵישׁ, Ps. XC., 10; Ethiopic ṣênâwa *odorem exhalavit*, aṣênâwa *odoratus est*, ṣênâ *odor* (Prætorius); Aramaic זְקִיפָא *crux*, passive participle from זָקַף *to raise up* (זְקִיף, Ez. VI., 11); Hebrew מְחִיר; בְּכִית, Gen. L., 4; מִשְׁתֶּה (Aram. מִשְׁתְּיָא); מַשְׁקֶה; צְבִיָּה, Cant. IV., 5; VII., 4 (Aramaic טְבִיתָא. Acts IX., 36, Ταβιθά, i. e., Δορκάς); Arabic tamthîl, infinitive Piel from mathala = Hebrew מָשָׁל; מַרְבִּית = תַּרְבִּית (cf. כָּל־מַרְבִּית בֵּיתָךְ 1 Sam. II., 33) τόκος, *fenus*; תִּשְׁרִי = תִּשְׁרִית infinitive of שָׁרָה *initium fecit* (שָׁרִיו, Ez. V., 2); Aramaic צְלוֹתָא, Arabic ṣalât (infinitive of ṣallâ—wa-lâ yuqâlu ṣallâ taṣliyatan); שְׁאֵר; רְאֵם, Job XXXIX., 9 רֵים, plural Ps. XXII., 22 רְמִים (Aramaic רֵימָא); זְאֵב (Aramaic דְּאֵבָא), חִטָּא (= ḥiṭṭ), צֵלָע (Chaldee plural עִלְעִין, Dan. VII., 5; Syriac אִלְעָא, Arabic ḍila'un, ḍil'un.

û) šû, *he;* mû (plural me or mâmi) *water;* šamû, *heaven* (plural šame or šamâmi); pû (genitive pî, accusative pâ) *mouth* (plural pânu, pâni, *face*, plur. plur. pânâti or pânâtu); nûru, *light;* nûnu, *fish;* ṭûbu,[1] *goodness;* sûqu, *street;* šûmu, *garlic;* dûru (plural dûrâni) *circle, wall, castle;* Kûšu, *Ethiopia;* Kûtu, *Kutha;* Ulûlu, *Elul, the sixth month;* atûdu, *he-goat;* šarûru, *splendor;* abûbu,[2] *deluge* (plural abûbâni); ṭûdu (plural ṭûde or ṭûdâti) *road;* bûru (= bu'ru, also feminine bûrtu[3]) *pit;* mûru (= muhru) *foal, cub*, etc.; rûqu (= ruḫûqu, Ethiopic rĕḫûq, Amharic rûq) *remote* (feminine rûqtu,

[1] *Tubu* is also infin. Piel of טִיב, =**tuyyubu*, cf. *turu to bring back* (= tuwwuru), *nuhu to calm* (=**nuwwuhu*), *kunu to fasten* (=**kuwwunu*) etc. See Delitzsch in Lotz's *Tiglathpileser*, p. 98.

[2] KAT. 66, note 3 I have combined abubu with the Hebrew nomen proprium of the Deluge מַבּוּל, cf. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, Giessen, 1883, p. 259, 1. For the initial מ in מַבּוּל instead of the Assyrian א cf. כִּרְחֶשְׁוָן = Assyr. Arahsamna *eighth month* (יֶרַח+שְׁמִינִי). It might be well to note that according to Wetzstein the Syriac Bedouins say mahidh, makil, mamir, instead of *ahidh, akil, amir*, part. of ahadh(a) *to take*, akal(a) *to eat*, amar(a) *to command* = Hebr. אחז, אכל, אמר. In the Arabic dialect of Egypt we find instead of *ahidh, akil* the forms wahid, wakil (Spitta, p. 16); cf. Hebr. יחר = אחר etc., etc. For the name מַרְחֶשְׁוָן cf. also Halevy, *Melanges de critique et d'histoire relatifs aux peuples semitiques*. Paris, 1883, p. 3, note 4.

[3] ASKT. 127, 35, cf. II. R. 9, 32 h. The well-known stem baru (impf. ibaru) *to hunt, to catch* (inf. Piel bu'uru) may be a denominative verb from this buru *pit* and mean originally *to catch in pits*. Ṣadu ša lame (Akkadian nigin) ASKT. 32, 761, on the other hand, is *battue*, cf. Lenormant, ESC. 216. In the texts, however, baru is used especially of fowling and fishing.

plural rûqâti, masculine rûqûti); kussû, *throne* (= Akkadian guza); sîsû, *horse;* šadû (plural šade) *mountain*,[1] also *east;*[2] qanû (= Akkadian gin, gi) *reed;* kirû (plural kirâni) *park* (= Akkadian kar); ginû *garden* (= Akkadian gan[3]); šânû (fem. šânîtu = *šâniyatu) *second* (plural šânûti, fem. šânâti); rabû (feminine rabîtu) *great* (plural rabûti, feminine rabâti); Elamû (= *Elamayu) *Elamite* (feminine Elamîtu); ilûtu, *divinity;* aḫûtu or aḫḫutu (cf. Hebrew אַחִם, with Dāghēsh-forte implicitum) *brotherhood;* šarrûtu, *kingdom;* belûtu, *lordship;* abûtu, *paternity;* mârûtu, *filiation;* ardûtu, *servitude;* dannûtu, *power*, from dannu, feminine dannatu (plural dannûti, feminine dannâti) *powerful;* inûḫu (imperative nûḫ) *he rested;* idûku (imperative dûk) *he killed;* imûtu (imperative mût) *he died;* illikûni, *they came;* ûbilûni, *they brought;* ûṣûni, *they came out;* erubûni, *they entered*, etc., etc.

Cf. Hebrew הוּא; מַיִם; שָׁמַיִם; פֶּה; נֵר (Arabic nûr, *light*, plural nîrân and anwâr); Aramaic נוּנָא (Arabic nûn, plural nînân and anwân; cf. also the name of Joshua's father נוּן); טוֹב; שׁוּק (Arabic sûq); שׁוּם (Aramaic תּוּמָא, Arabic thûm, dialect. fûm); דּוּר, *circle*, Isa. xxix., 3; כּוּשׁ; כּוּת, 2 Kgs. xvii., 30; אֱלוּל, Neh. vi., 15; עָתוּד (Arabic 'atûd); ....; ....; ....; בּוֹר (= בְּאֵר, בִּאֵר, Assyrian bîru); ....; רָחוֹק; כַּסָּא (Aramaic כָּרְסְיָא); סוּס (Aramaic סוּסְיָא); ....; קָנֶה (Aramaic קַנְיָא; Arabic qanât); כַּר; גַּן; שֵׁנִי, feminine שֵׁנִית (Arabic thânin = *thâniyun, feminine thâniyatun).

Of the vowel *e* I shall treat in a following article.

---

[1] *Sadu mountain* might be identical with Hebrew שָׂדֶה *field*. Cf. Ethiopic dabr (plur. adbar plur. plur. adbarat) *mons, regio montana* and Aram. דַּבְרָא *campus* (Hebr. דְּבִר, דִּבֶּר). Cf. Halevy, *Melanges*, etc. p. 43.

[2] In the Talmud (Gittin 31 b): שַׁרְיָא *east-wind*. South-wind is *sutu* = שׁוּתָא (Yebamoth 72 a; Shabbath 116 b; Erubin 65 a; north-wind iltanu (for istanu) = אִיכְתְּנָא; west-wind aharrru = אוּרְיָא. Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, Leipzig, 1874, p. 140.

[3] For ginu = gan and kiru = kar cf. kitu = kat, gad *linen* II. R. 44, 7 g. h. Also Arabic kattan *linen* (Aram. כְּתָּנָא, cf. Hebr. כְּתֹנֶת *χιτών*) as well as qutun *cotton* may come from this Akkadian gad, kat. The *d* in Ethiopic kedan (plur. kedanat) *tunica* is owing to a partial assimilation to the following *n;* cf. Assyr. nadanu *to give* = נָתַן. Ethiopic kadana *to cover* is = Assyrian katamu, cf. Mandaic שׁלנרא (Syriac שְׁלָרָא) = Assyrian salamtu *corpse*.

ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES.

By Francis Brown, Ph. D.,

Professor in Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

Bezold and Hommel's *Zeitschrift fuer Keilschriftforschung*, contains, in the number for April, 1884, an article by R. Dvorák, which is of great importance for Semitic lexicography. It is entitled "Ueber tinûru des Assyrisch-babylonischen und die entsprechenden Formen der übrigen semitischen Sprachen." No more brilliant philological article has recently appeared; and if the new periodical which contains it can assure us of many such contributions, it will become indispensable to every student of ancient language. The author of this article begins by showing the occurrence of the word (Hebrew תַּנּוּר, *oven*, *furnace*, Aramaic תַּנּוּרָא, Syriac ܬܢܘܪܐ, Arabic tannûr, Assyrian tinûru) in the Semitic languages. He then gives a summary of the attempts to explain its form, e. g., some Arab grammarians making it a taf'ûl form from nûr, others—and the larger number—a derivative from tnr, and, in the absence of that root in Arabic, a foreign word, Gavâlîkî specifying the Persian language as its source. The derivation from נוּר has been advocated by modern Semitists, as well as the composition of תַּנּוּר (תַּן+נוּר, etc.). The latter theory hardly needs discussion; the former is opposed by the author, on the ground that the taf'ûl formation gives abstracts, and that these are, accordingly, feminine, or plural,—neither of which suits tannûr. The presence of the word, in the form tinûru, on a cuneiform tablet of Ašurbanipal's time, does not indicate, according to Dvorák, that it belongs to the older elements of Semitic language, since Ašurbanipal lived in the seventh century B. C., and we are not at liberty to infer that the word is older than the document in which we actually find it. Hence the Hebrew תַּנּוּר, occurring in Isaiah and the Jahvist narrator of Genesis, must be considered older than tinûru, and cannot be, according to the theory of Assyriologists, borrowed from the Assyrians. After examining the shades of meaning of the word in the Semitic languages, the author calls attention to the tanûra of the Zend, the tanûr of the Pehlevi, the ṭonir of the Armenian, etc., (having the same meaning with תַּנּוּר), and endeavors to show that the Zend form is the original, whence the word passed to the Semitic peoples (the Aramaic exhibiting the earliest Semitic form), and thence back again to the modern Persian, where it is also found. He would assign it to the root tan, = *extend*, *expand*, and explain "oven," "furnace" from that root, by the hollow, extended (distended) form of the fire-pot.

It will be seen that this discussion is of far-reaching significance. The theory brings back, in a new and striking form, that dependence of the Semitic on the Indo-Germanic—more specifically, on the Persian—language and people, which the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions has been thought to disprove. The author has certainly exposed, with great clearness, the difficulties attending the current explanations of the form תַּנּוּר, and produced a model of suggestive,

well grounded philological discussion. We pass over some detailed questions, which need still more elucidation, to notice one or two general features of the subject that seem to have been inadequately considered by the writer. (a) It is wrong to claim that tinûru, found in Ašurbanipal's time, may not be considered older than that date. Words do not suddenly appear in a literary language, developing according to natural laws, without previous existence in the spoken language. Least of all is it so in a written language where the changes are as slow as in the literary Assyrian. It is one thing to argue that a document is late, because it contains words not found in old documents, and another thing to argue that words are new, because they occur only in a late document. (b) The author does not hold to his own principle; for he can maintain his argument for the priority of the Zend tanûra only by saying that this word "mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit älter ist als seine schriftliche Fixirung im Avesta" (p. 150). (c) As to the time and mode of the borrowing, the author ventures no hypothesis, though holding that the Aramaic is the earliest Semitic form. Now, we indeed know very little of the movements of the Aramæans, and it is *possible*, of course, that they, somewhere and sometime, came into contact with Persians, and got from them the name of the fire-pot. But, from all we now know of the ancient Persians, and their position in Asia before the sixth century B. C., such a contact is not likely. The likelihood is diminished, when we remember that the borrowing of the name would strongly hint at the borrowing of the article also, and all the indications are opposed to the theory that the Assyrians were indebted either to the Persians or to the Aramæans for the arts and appliances of their civilization.

While, then, Dvorák is to be heartily thanked for his most suggestive examination, it must not be forgotten that these general considerations have their part to play in the final settlement of the questions as to tinûru, and as to early Indo-Germanic influence on Semitic language.

In the new *Calwer Bibellexicon*, just completed, there are many contributions from Friedrich Delitzsch. His articles contain a number of new etymologies of Assyrian and Babylonian proper names. There is a decided tendency to regard the verbal element in these names as Imperative, wherever this is possible. In the case of Sargon, indeed, Delitzsch gives the choice between "He (God) has established the king," and "The king is true" (*righteous* or *just*), with "Righteous king" as a third possibility. But Sennacherib (Sin-aḫi-êrbâ) he renders "O Sin (the Moon-god) multiply brothers;" Sanballat (Sin-balliṭ) "Sin, bestow (or support) life;" Shalmaneser (Šalmânu-ušširi), "Shalman, guide aright" (or "let it succeed")—this is not wholly new,—etc. Nebuchadnezzar (Nabû-kudûrî-uzur, so Del.) is translated "Nebo, protect my territory" ("Nebo, schirme mein Gebiet!" cf. Hilprecht, *Freibrief Nebukad. I.*). This translation has never been publicly explained and justified, so far as we are aware.

It may be added, in this connection, that the difficulty which Delitzsch, in an earlier part of the same lexicon (art. "Asnaphar"), feels in identifying Ašurbanipal with the Kineladanos of Ptolemy is obviated by Schrader's present theory, that Kineladan was a specifically Babylonian name for Ašurbanipal, and not at all a corruption or modification of the latter. (E. Schrader, *Kineladan und Asurbanipal*, Zeitschr. f. Keilschriftforschung, July, 1884.)

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

By John P. Peters, Ph. D.,

Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia.

On page 25 of *Babylonian Life and History* Mr. Budge says: "It has been recently shown that the correct reading of the cuneiform sign for Akkad is Uru, and I think that there is no doubt that this is the Ur from which Abraham came." This situation of Ur of the Chaldees would agree better with Prof. Delitzsch's theory of the origin of the Chaldees than the received location at Mugheir.

In the last number of Hebraica I pointed out certain difficulties concerning the date of Nebuchadnezzar I. There are some peculiarities in the large inscription of that monarch which I do not remember to have seen mentioned. Col. i., 10, he is spoken of as ka-šid mat A-ḫar-ri-i "subduer of the West-land," i. e. Phœnicia. Did the Babylonians in the twelfth century actually penetrate to the Mediterranean? Again, in this inscription he is nowhere called by the proper title of a king of Babylon. In Col. i., 2, Hilprecht reads, it is true, malku Bâbili (the regular title, on the other hand, should be šar Bâbili) but Pinches and Budge agree in reading the same ṣi-it Tin-tir-ki (Bâbili), i. e., "offspring of Babylon." Neither does Babylon play otherwise an important part in the inscription. Col. ii., 3, it is mentioned along with Nipur as free from conscription, and Col. ii., 18, the governor of Babylon appears in the list of witnesses. Col. i., 3, Nebuchadnezzar is called sakkanakku Eridi, "governor of Eridu," and Col. ii., 24, among the witnesses, we find Nabû-ku-dur-ri-uṣur amêlu êzzu mat Namar, "Nebuchadnezzar prince of the land of Namar." This inscription seems to have settled, as Hilprecht points out, that the name which some Assyriologists were inclined to read Zimri, with reference to זִמְרִי in Jer. xxv., 25, is in fact Namar. This country or district lies in the north-eastern part of Babylonia.

Among the archives which Mr. Hormuzd Rassam discovered in Ešarra, the temple of the Sun at Sepharvaim, a document of Nebuchadnezzar II. was missing. In his account of the very thorough search after ancient archives which he caused to be made by his army, as also a restoration of the temple, Nabonidus mentions Nebuchadnezzar II. as having been active in a similar manner. Now while Mr. Rassam found an inscription of Nabû-bal-iddina, and also documents of Nabopolassar, no inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II. seems to have come to hand. Within a short time the Metropolitan Museum of New York has obtained possession of what appears to be the missing document. It is a clay barrel-cylinder, eight or ten inches in length, perforated, about four inches in diameter at its middle point, and tapering to a diameter of approximately one and a half inches at the extremities (unfortunately I have mislaid my note of the exact measurement of the cylinder and have no cast by me). This was found at Aboo-Habbah (Sippara, Sepharvaim), and is an account of the restoration of Ešarra, the temple of the Sun, in Sippara. The script is archaic, the characters being strikingly similar to

those in the inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I. as copied by Hilprecht. There are three columns, of which the first contains twenty-seven, the second forty-two, and the third thirty lines. As one line in the second column is double, the actual number of lines is a hundred. Almost, if not quite, every line in the inscription can be read entire or supplied satisfactorily from parallel lines in other places. The first sixteen lines contain the titles, beginning (1) Nabû-ku-dur-ru-u-ṣu-ur (2) šar mi-ša-ri-im (king of righteousness) and ending

(12) za-ni-in E-sagili.....(restorer of Esagili)
(13) u E-zi-da.....(and Ezida)
(14) mâru ki-i-num.....(true son)
(15) ša Nabû-pal-u-ṣu-ur.....(of Nabopolassar)
(16) šar Ka-dingir-ra-ki a-na-ku (king of Babylon am I).

It then proceeds to state how, by the orders of "Marduk, the great lord who has raised me to rule over them," Nebuchadnezzar restored the temple of Šamaš Ešarra which is in the midst of Sippara, which had fallen into decay. This section of the inscription ends at line 67 with the statement: E-šar-ra ša ki-ri-ib Sippara i-na ḫi-ṭa-a-ti u ri-ša-a-ti lu e-pu-uš "Ešarra, which is in the midst of Sippara, on account of sin and transgression had made." The remainder is an invocation and prayer to Šamaš, who is, of course, besought to accept favorably this work, to bless the king's deeds, prolong his life, and give him victory over his enemies. To the best of my knowledge this is the most important cuneiform inscription which has yet reached this country.

In the *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft I. of the year 1884, the editor, Prof. B. Stade of Giessen, makes an acute suggestion for the emendation of the text of the fourth chapter of Isaiah which certainly deserves careful consideration, if not unqualified adoption. Presumably every student appreciates certain difficulties in that chapter in its present form. There is no proper connection between the Messianic conclusion, IV., 2-6, and the section II., 1—IV., 1, which it closes. The Messianic בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא seems to refer to the period described in IV., 1, rather than to the Messianic epoch. Then, too, verses 5 and 6 appear to form an anticlimax. Moreover, the construction of verses 4, 5 and 6 is unintelligible, no proper conclusion existing for the condition expressed in the אִם of verse 4. Prof. Stade also notices certain doctrinal difficulties of the last two verses. He suggests this arrangement: 4, 2, 3a, omitting 3b, 5 and 6. The passage would then read: (4) "When the Lord hath purged the filth of the daughters of Zion, and cleansed the blood spots of Jerusalem from her midst, with a breath of judgment, and with a breath of destruction; (2) In that day the growth of Jehovah shall be a beauty and a glory, and the fruit of the land a pride and an adornment for the escaped of Israel; (3) And it shall be, the remnant in Zion, and the remainder in Jerusalem, Holy shall it be called." This makes, probably, a far more forcible and logical Messianic conclusion than that offered by the present text. It brings the passage into immediate connection with verse 1: assigns to בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא its proper Messianic reference without the intervention of an ellipsis; and affords an intelligent conclusion to the condition contained in אִם. Even if we can follow Prof. Stade merely in the transposition of verse 4 to a position immediately after verse 1, without subscribing to his proposed omissions, much will have been done towards the elucidation of the difficulties of this important chapter.

I suppose the curious stanza formed by the names of the female luxuries mentioned in Isa. III., 18–23 must have been observed by commentators, but I have not been able to find any notice of it:

(1) העכסים והישביסים והישהרנים
(2) הנטפות והשרות והרעלות
(3) הפארים והצעדות
(4) [ו]הקשרים ובתי נפש והלחשים
(5) הטבעות ונזמי האף (?)
(6) המחלצות והמעטפות והמטפחות
(7) [ו]החריטים [ו]הגלינים והסדינים
(8) [ו]הצניפות והרדינים

Verses 1, 2, 3 and 6, 7, 8 correspond, with an exact reversal of the order of masculines and feminines. The strophe and epistrophe, if they may be so called, are separated by two verses; 4, containing two masculines separated by a broken phrase, and 5, containing a feminine followed by a broken phrase. These two verses do not, therefore, correspond to one another after the manner of the remainder of the stanza, and I suppose that a feminine plural has been lost from the text at the end of verse 5 (v. 21). At the beginning of verse 4, והקשרים should read הקשרים, and similarly in verse 7, והחריטים should read החריטים, and in verse 8 הצניפות should be put for והצניפות, and, on the other hand, in the seventh verse הגלינים must be read והגלינים. The analogy of all the other words in the last two verses shows that we must point this latter word וְהַגְּלִינִים and not הַגְּלִינִים, as in the Massoretic text. This involves its translation, as in the LXX. apparently, as thin silken tissues, rather than, as in the Targum of Jonathan, by mirrors. The former translation also harmonizes better with the context. The peculiar character of this stanza raises the question whether it was an original composition of Isaiah, or a popular song existing ready to his hand.

This last question forces itself still more strongly upon us, as it seems to me, in reference to the lyrical snatch contained in the fifth chapter of Isaiah. I believe commentators are reasonably well agreed that Cant. II., 15 is a fragment of a popular vintage song. Is not the same the case with Isa. V., 1, 2? Has not the prophet used a snatch of some popular vintage song as the text of a scathing sermon, in the form of a poetic parable, delivered or published probably at the vintage season? This would also account for the apparent play on words in the phrase שירת דודי, a play which becomes still more apparent when we compare לידידי with the name ידידיה given to Solomon, 2 Kgs. XII., 25. It may be said, in passing, that if we point, instead of דודי, דּוֹדִי, the assonance with לִידִידִי, required by the verse, is all the more striking. If my suggestion be correct, and we have a fragment of a vintage song with a punning allusion to David and his psalms, perhaps also to Solomon, the difficulties of commentators regarding the interchange of דודי and ידידי, as also concerning the exact sense of the verse, would vanish. (Or is it possible that we have here no vintage song with a punning allusion to the great Psalmist, but rather a reference to Ps. LXXX., which is admittedly prior to Isaiah's time?)

GENERAL NOTES.

A Question in Hebrew Grammar.—In Müller's Hebrew Syntax section 68 reads thus: "In Hebrew a peculiar kind of determination is customary, when individuals of a class-conception, which of themselves are indeterminate, or even a class-conception as a whole, are to be represented as determined by the contents." The illustrations are וַיָּבֹא הַפָּלִיט Gen. XIV., 12. 13; וּבָא הָאֲרִי 1 Sam. XVII., 34; בַּמִּקְנֶה בַּכֶּסֶף וּבַזָּהָב Gen. XIII., 2; and עֵין הַמַּיִם Gen. XVI., 7. Apparently Gen. XIV., 12, 13 and 1 Sam. XVII., 34 denote individuals of a class-conception, and in Gen. XIII., 2 and XVI., 7 the class-conception as a whole is to be regarded as determined by the context. Is this the best mode of explaining these passages? In Green's Grammar, third edition, and in Nordheimer's Grammar, וְאַבְרָם כָּבֵד מְאֹד בַּמִּקְנֶה בַּכֶּסֶף וּבַזָּהָב, Gen. XIII., 2, is explained otherwise, also 1 Sam. VII., 34 in Green. In Gesenius' (Mitchell's) Hebrew Grammar § 108, Rem. 1b, where Gen. XIII., 2 is mentioned, the ordinary use of the generic article seems implied. In Nordheimer, § 720, II. 2, we find the following:

"The article is also prefixed, by way of emphasis, to nouns not used to denote individual objects, but as general terms. It is thus prefixed:

"a. To common appellatives, not designating individuals, but employed simply as generic terms as applicable to any individual or individuals of the class mentioned; in which case it serves to render prominent the nature and properties of the class of objects denoted rather than the objects themselves.....

"b. To material nouns used emphatically in a general sense."

Under this last head Nordheimer places the passage before us. Gen. XIII., 2. In Green § 245, 5d, "It is said, Gen. XIII., 2, that Abram was very rich..... since these are viewed as definite and well-known species of property." The citation from Nordheimer gives a good definition of the generic use of the article. The statement in Green elucidates the application of Nordheimer. It is a more natural explanation of the passage than that mentioned in Müller's Grammar. Perhaps Müller means the same thing; if he does, his language is infelicitous. The article in הַמַּיִם, Gen. XVI., 7, can be explained by reference to Nordheimer. 720, II. 2b, just as well as in the preceding passage. The use of the article after כְּ in comparisons is put by many grammarians under the head of generic article. The note in Riehm's edition of Hupfeld on Ps. XVII., 12, translated also at the foot of page 33 of Ewald's Hebrew Syntax, shows that we must regard this use of the article as in a strict sense the generic use. The last edition of Gesenius' Grammar acquiesces. It remains to be proved that the instances just discussed need any different explanation from the generic article as used after כְּ comparationis.

1 Sam. XVII., 34 is thus explained in Green 245, 5d: "In speaking of the invasion of his father's flocks, David says הָאֲרִי, the lion, and הַדֹּב, the bear, came, 1 Sam. XVII., 34, because he thinks of these as the enemies to be expected under the circumstances." This is in accord with § 245, 3, the article is used to particularize an object spoken of "when it is obviously suggested by the circumstances." Nordheimer, § 720, II. 1, states the same usage as follows: "In Hebrew an article is frequently prefixed to a noun which, although not otherwise directly

specified, is definite in the writer's mind, and which, owing to the context, or to a general knowledge of existing usages and circumstances, is also rendered definite by the use of the article to the mind of the reader." This use of the article is not generic, but restrictive. To the writer it seems a more adequate explanation for both Gen. XIV., 13 and 1 Sam. XVII., 34.

It is but just to add that Ewald § 277a refers to these two passages in such a way that we are probably to regard his explanation as that of the generic article. Also Nordheimer, in a foot-note under the section quoted above on the generic article (720. II. 2a), gives the same explanation of 1 Sam. XVII., 34 that is found in Müller. This is, indeed, a peculiar use of the generic article, if there be such a use, and may perhaps throw a side-light on the הָעַלְמָה of Isa. VII., 14. The use of the article to restrict or determine the noun as especially connected with the circumstances of the subjet of discourse, particularly as *natural*, *usual*, *proper*, *necessary*, *expected*, and similar, is a use of the article which is only imperfectly recognized. The use is as much rhetorical as syntactical. The syntax of Green, and the yet more complete discussion in Nordheimer give a satisfactory statement of this use of the article. In Gesenius, Ewald and Müller this use is overlooked. Indeed it is a matter of serious regret (to teachers, at least) that a manual, otherwise so full and symmetrical as Müller's Hebrew Syntax, should be almost totally silent on the use of the article.

F. B. DENIO,
Bangor.

Additional Aramaic Words in the New Testament.—In his *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaeischen*, Professor Kautzsch gives an excellent list of Aramaic words and sentences found in the New Testament (see also HEBRAICA, pp. 103 sq.). But it seems that the learned author has overlooked a few words. We may be permitted to complement his list by the following:

SAPPHIRA.—Σαπφείρη (Acts V., 1) = שַׁפִּירָא *the beautiful.* The corresponding masculine name שַׁפִּיר was also in use. One שפיר is mentioned in Talm. Moêd qaton, fol. 11, a.

BETHPHAGE.—Βηθφαγή (Matt. XXI., 17, and elsewhere) = בֵּית פַּגֵּי *house of figs.* So Winer, Kitto, Delitzsch, and others. Bethphage, a place very near to Jerusalem, is also often mentioned in the Jewish literature of the first centuries of the common era. The name, however, is as often spelled בית פאגי as בית פגי. See P'saḥim 63, b; Babha M'tzi'a 90, a; Sifré Num. sec. 191; Toṣiphta P'saḥim chap. VIII., and many other passages. But why shall we translate *Bethphage* by *house of figs?* פגי means *unripe* figs or *unripe* grapes. If we adopt פאגי as the correct spelling, we must give up that translation altogether, and another one must be looked for. Was perhaps Benjamin Muṣaphia on the right track when he (in his Additamenta to the *'Arukh* s. v. בת פאגי) explained פאגי to be derived from the Greek φαγεῖν *to eat?*

BETHANY.—Βηθανία (Matt. XXI., 17, and elsewhere). Was perhaps the Palestinian Aramaic original of this name = בֵּית עַנְיָא, *house of poverty?* A place by that name, it is true, is nowhere mentioned in the literature of the Jews; but this may be accidental. And the rendering of the name in the Greek gospels makes it plausible that the original Aramaic name was that given above. It was a fanciful guess of Lightfoot to identify the Bethany of the New Testament with בית היני, a place mentioned several times in the Jewish literature of the first Christian

centuries, as, for instance, in P'sahim 53, a; Hullin 53, a; Babha Metzia 88, a (in which latter place the name is spelled בית הינו), etc., and to translate that name by *house of dates*. Winer (in his *Bibl. Realwörterbuch* s. v.), Kitto (*Cyclop. of Bibl. Knowl.* s. v.), Neubauer (*La Geographie du Talmud* p. 150), and others, have adopted the guess of Lightfoot as correct. So also did Delitzsch; for, in his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, he constantly renders Bethany by בית היני. But one must hesitate to consider the talmudical Beth-hiné as equivalent to Bethany. In the first place, the exact location of Beth-hiné, though in close neighborhood to Jerusalem, is not so very certain. Secondly, בית היני would have been transliterated differently, and would not appear as "Bethania." As to the meaning of בית היני *house of dates*, it must be remarked that the talmudical היני, a shortened form of אהיני, means not *dates* in general, but only *unripe* dates.

B. FELSENTHAL.

Chicago.

The Religion of the Kassites.—This chapter (III.), closely related to that on the Language of the Kassites, will discuss somewhat more fully than it does the first sixteen lines of Rassam's Kassite-Semitic glossary, which are as follows:

1.	wanting		
2. [	]	[ilu] [	
3. ši-		ilu Sîn	"Moon-god"
4. sa-	aḫ	ilu Šamaš	"Sun-god"
5. šú-ri-ia-	aš	ilu Šamaš	"Sun-god"
6. ub-ri-ia-	aš	ilu Râmân	"Air-god"
7. ḫu-ud-	ḫa	ilu Râmân	"Air-god"
8. ma-rad-	daš	ilu Adar	"God Adar"
9. gi-	dar	ilu Adar	"God Adar"
10. 'ga-	la	ilu Gu-la	"Goddess Gula"
11. ka-mul-	la	ilu Ê-a	"Water-god"
12. šú-ga-	ab	ilu Nêrgal	"Lion-god"
13. šú-ga-mu-	na	ilu Nêrgal ilu Nusku	"Lion-god as god of the noon-day sun"
14.	dur	ilu Nêsgal	"Lion-god"
15. šú-gur	ra	ilu ? ? ?	"God Merodach..."
16. mi-ri-zi-	ir	ilu Bêlet	"Goddess Beltis"

The glossary begins with the names of twelve Kassite divinities, of which the first two are yet wanting. That the national god of the Kassites stood in the first line is to be accepted as certain, and that this god probably bore the name Kaššu was already shown on page 29.[1] If these were the twelve highest divinities of the Kassites, the goddess Šûmalî'a, Šîmalî'a, the goddess of the snow-peaks, may have followed in the second line, as she is expressly mentioned as a chief divinity of the land Namar, and, further, also appears in very close connection with the great god of the Kassites, Šukamuna. Generally speaking, this Kassite divinity-list is not exhaustive. Šiḫu, as one of the names of Merodach, is wanting; also Hardaš and Bugaš, if these, as is most natural, represent names of gods; and, finally, Harbê, the name of Bel, as well as Duniâš, if the last is not only a sort of by-name of one of the twelve great gods.

The order of succession, Moon-god, Sun-god, Air-god (lines 3–7), is the usual one in the Assyrian texts. Vid. Tig. I., 5–10, etc.

[1] A god Kassu is attested by the name of a king of the Semitic-Kassite period mentioned on p. 15, Rem., viz. in ilu Kas-su-u-nadin-ahu. If Kassu was the national-god of the people of Kassu, we have a similar concurrence of the name of a people and god as in the case of Assur, Asur, and, perhaps, Susan, Susinak.

By the Kassites the god Adar was called Maraddaš (line 8) or Gidar (line 9). As regards the nature of the Bab.-Assyr. god Adar, there is still great obscurity, although the cuneiform literature has long since given us the right clue. The god Adar, which, with its two oft-occurring ideographs Bar and Nin-ib, is preferably designated as the "Decider" (*Entscheider*) or "Lord of decision" is the god of the all-consuming and scortching South- or Noonday-sun; in reality, the same divinity as the Sun-god, however, only when viewed from its exclusively destructive side, as the destroying, devastating Sun-flames. Also the Fire-god Nusku, who is preferably named mâlik milki ilâni rabûtē, "the one who has the power of decision among the great gods" and is also expressly attested as the god of the South- or Noonday-sun, is in reality one with the god Adar.[1] That Saturn, Bab. Kaivânu, is directly dedicated to the god Adar, is easily intelligible. Adar, Gibil (the Fire-god), Nusku, Malik-Moloch are, in reality, the same divinity; and the fact that the inhabitants of the Sun-city, Sippar-Sepharwaim, burned their children with fire, in honor of Adrammelech, i. e. Adarmalik, "Adar, the decider," needs no further commentary (2 Kgs. XVII., 31). Finally, it is of special interest that our Kassite-Semitic glossary (line 13) proves also the god Nêrgal as identical with Nusku. This also is easy to be explained. The lion, under whose likeness the god Nêrgal is worshiped, is the symbol of the destructive Sun-flame, and as the fourth month, the hot month Tammûz, is dedicated to the god Adar, so the lion is that sign of the zodiac in which the sun is found in the fifth month, which last, through its Sumerian ideograph, is placed in closest connection with the fire. Adar (Nusku) and Nêrgal otherwise show a number of traits which still reveal their original identity. As the Assyrians worshiped their Nêrgal,[2] so the Kassites their Šugamuna, chiefly as the god of War and of the Chase.

After Adar follows, as frequently in the Bab.-Assyr. texts his wife, the goddess Gula, Kassite Hala (line 10). She bears, in the Bab.-Assyr. cuneiform texts, the by-names "the great mistress," "the wife of the god of the Noonday-sun," "the mother," "the bearer of the black-headed creatures" (i. e. men), "the mistress who awakens the dead," etc.

The two signs dir-ia in line 15, which follow the frequently-used ideograph for the god Merodach, I do not understand.

The Babylonian goddess designated in line 16 by the ideograph for bêltu, "mistress," who is placed to correspond with the Kassite goddess Mirizir, is at once to be understood as the goddess Beltis, i. e. Ištar, the evening star. But as Beltis (as well as Anunit, the goddess of the morning star) is, in reality, one with Ištar, the Venus-star, and Ištar, on the other hand, is often confounded with Nanâ (Nanai), who originally only personified a special quality of the goddess Ištar—perhaps, as a bow-armed huntress—so may the Kassite goddess Mirizir confidently be set over against the Babylonian Ištar-Nanâ. It would well correspond to this that the records of the gifts of Nebuchadnezzar I., on the one hand, make mention of the Moon-god Sin and bêlit álu Ak-ka-di, "the mistress Akkad," i. e. perhaps Ištar-Anunit of Agadê, as divinities of the house

[1] The identity of the Fire-god Gibil and the god Nusku is made clear by the Hymn IV. R. 26, No. 3, and is emphatically confirmed by the Table published in my "Assyrische Lesestuecke," 1st ed. p. 39, under the title "Goetter und Goetterzahlen."

[2] For Nergal as the god of war, see Salm. Ob. 11, where he is called sar tamhari, "King of the Contest or War" and chiefly III. R. 38, No. 1, Obv. 1 sq.: for Nergal as also Adar, as god of the chase, see, e. g., Tig. VI., 58.

Habban; on the other side, of Sûmalî'a, Râmân, Nêrgal and ilu Na-na-a, i. e. Ǩanâ, as divinities of the land Namar.

The religion of the Kassites, as represented according to our glossary, has, perhaps, not remained free from the influence of that of their new home, Babylonia. However, that the Kassites worshiped the Moon, Sun, Storm, Thunder and Lightning, Fire and Water as gods, and that they, in the goddess of the snow-covered mountain tops, have originated a goddess peculiar to themselves, is, at all events, certain. But whether this worship of a goddess corresponding to the Babylonian Gula, or of a god Merodach, is older than their removal into Babylonia is doubtful. Proper names, at least, as Harbišiḫu, i. e. "Lord (Bel) is Merodach," appear to me to be Kassite only in their outer shell, and, as far as their meaning is concerned, to have clearly arisen on Babylonian soil.—*Friedrich Delitzsch in "Die Sprache der Kossäer."*

A Chaldee Hymn by Israel Nagara.

(The poet, who lived in the latter part of the sixteenth century, was a native of Damascus and died as Rabbi in Gaza. He was very prolific in his productions. Some of them have considerable merit.. It will be noticed that the hymn here following has the poet's name ישראל as an acrostic.)

י ה רִבּוֹן עָלַם וְעָלְמַיָּא
אַנְתְּ הוּא מַלְכָּא מֶלֶךְ מַלְכַיָּא
עוֹבַד גְּבוּרְתֶּךְ וְתֻכְּהַיָּא
שְׁפַר קֳדָמָךְ לְהַחֲוָיָא

ש בְּחִין אֶסְדַּר צַפְרָא וְרַמְשָׁא
לָךְ אֱלָהָא קַדִּישָׁא בָּרָא כָּל נַפְשָׁא
עִירִין קַדִּישִׁין וּבְנֵי אֱנָשָׁא
חֵיוַת בָּרָא וְעוֹפֵי שְׁמַיָּא

ר בְּרִבִּין עוֹבָדָךְ וְתַקִּיפִין
כְּכָךְ רָמַיָּא זְקֵף כְּפִיפִין
לוּ יְחִי גְּבַר שְׁנִין אַלְפִין
לָא יֵיעוֹל גְּבוּרְתֶּךְ בְּחוּשְׁבְּנַיָּא

א לָהָא דִּילֵהּ יְקַר וּרְבוּתָא
פְּרוֹק יַת עָנְךְ כִּפּוּם אַרְיוּתָא
וְאַפֵּק יַת עַמִּיךְ כְּגוֹ גָּלוּתָא
עַמָּא דִּי בְחַרְתְּ מִכָּל אֻמַּיָּא

ל מִקְדְּשָׁךְ תּוּב וּלְקַדֵּשׁ קוּדְשִׁין
אַתַּר דִּי בֵהּ יְחֵדוּן רוּחִין וְנַפְשִׁין
וְיַזְמְרוּן שִׁירִין וְרַחֲשִׁין
בִּירוּשְׁלֶם קַרְתָּא דִּשְׁפַרְיָא

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Institute of Hebrew.—The organization known heretofore as "The American Institute of Hebrew," will hereafter be called "The Institute of Hebrew." This "Institute," as will appear from the statement made in the Supplement to this number, includes, as members, thirty-seven professors of Hebrew and of related departments. The Schools of the "Institute" will be The Correspondence School of Hebrew, and the Summer Schools held at Philadelphia, Chicago, at some point in New England, and at Chautauqua.

It is but reasonable to inquire, What will this organization accomplish?

It will eventually raise the standard of scholarship in the Old Testament department of the theological seminaries. If only a small proportion of the men about to enter the seminary have acquired beforehand a knowledge of Hebrew, a great thing will have been accomplished,—provided, of course, this preparation is thorough. As the course of study is arranged, it will soon be seen that only those who come thus prepared are able to do what they themselves desire to do in this department.

It will not be a long time until, through the influence of this organization, instruction in Hebrew will be furnished by our better class of colleges. There can only be offered two objections to this: the difficulty of securing and defraying the expenses of a suitable instructor, and the fact that already the college course includes too much. But such objections are by no means insuperable. If there is demand for this instruction, the colleges will be compelled to furnish it. It will be the work of "The Institute of Hebrew," and of those connected with it, to demonstrate that the demand exists, and indeed to assist in creating it. Through the influence of this organization, there will be aroused a greater interest among clergymen in the study of Hebrew and the Old Testament. This interest has already been excited in some measure; but what has been done in this direction will appear insignificant in the light of what shall be done within five years.

It can fairly be said, that there are but few organizations in existence which have before them a work, so definite, so important, and so assured of success.

The present number of Hebraica.—A single number of a journal devoted to the interests of Semitic study, with articles, notes and reviews by C. H. Toy, Franz Delitzsch, B. Pick, Paul Haupt, Francis Brown, J. P. Peters, B. Felsenthal, F. Denio, H. P. Smith, and G. H. Schodde, may certainly be regarded as a most valuable number. We believe that in America there is room for such a journal. Whether those who ought to stand by the undertaking will do so, remains, in part, to be seen. The April number will be the fourth and last number of the first volume. If encouragement, from the right sources, of the proper kind, and in a reasonable measure, is received, the Managing Editor will undertake the issue of Volume II. If he does not receive this encouragement, he will regard the issue of Volume I. as an experiment, and will not repeat it.

Professor Haupt's Series of Articles.—This number contains the first of a series of articles by Professor Haupt on Assyrian grammar. In the April number he will treat of the *e*-vowel in Assyrian. In later numbers he will take up in order (1) *the Changes in the Consonants*, (2) *the Noun*, (3) *the Verb*. When these articles are completed, he will likewise furnish an epitome of Ethiopic grammar. All this is written with special reference to the Hebrew, and is designed chiefly for those who have a knowledge of Hebrew only. Its purpose will be to interest students of Hebrew in the Assyrian and Ethiopic. There is no scholar in this country, or indeed in Europe, who is better able to carry out this plan. It is one in which, we are assured, all readers of HEBRAICA will be greatly interested.

Hebrew Texts with Notes.—There is no lack of grammars for the study of Hebrew. With each passing year one or more new treatises appear in this line. It is quite rare to find a teacher of Hebrew who has not written, or planned to write, a grammar. Each generation furnishes its score or more. But why has not something been done in the way of editing the text of the various books of the Hebrew Bible with grammatical notes, and references to a standard grammar? After a few weeks of elementary drill, the student is plunged into Deuteronomy, or Isaiah, or the Psalms, with no helps, but those of the most injurious character, viz., the King James translation and a commentary. He is, in this way, educated to rely upon the former, and is seldom able to make an independent translation; while so much of his time is taken up in reading what for his purpose is worse than trash, that he fails wholly to obtain any considerable familiarity with the Hebrew text. The time which should have been used in the close and critical study of the text of a Psalm, for example, is given to the perusal of the compilation on that Psalm found in Spurgeon's "Treasury of David."

Ought we not to have editions of the more important books of the Bible with such notes as are furnished in connection with an edition of Homer, or Horace, and perhaps with a vocabulary? How much better work, how much more work, a class would do in the study of Isaiah, if there existed such a text.

At a recent gathering of Hebrew professors, this question came up, and much interest was manifested in it. It was learned that some such work had been thought of, and indeed planned by several. May we not hope that some of our energy may be expended in this direction, and that for a time, at least, we may be spared the appearance of another Hebrew grammar?

BOOK NOTICES.

PROFESSOR MITCHELL'S HEBREW LESSONS.*

In noticing a book of this kind, a larger allowance than usual must be made for the *personal equation*. Teachers differ in their capacity and in their methods. A book which suits one would be no help at all to another. It is moreover difficult to test a text-book thoroughly without use in the class-room, in fact even a year's trial might be insufficient to bring out all its merits. Especially is this the case where a new book displaces one long familiar to the teacher. It is possible that the book before us would stand this test and so reverse some of the judgments expressed below. It need hardly be said, therefore, that the present reviewer expresses only an opinion formed by careful reading of the book—and it will give him great pleasure to be convinced that his opinion is wrong—wherever it is unfavorable to the book.

It is not uniformly unfavorable, however, and such an impression would be a mistake. There are features of conspicuous excellence which ought to receive due mention. One of these is the handsome dress in which it appears. We have rarely seen a Hebrew book, or a school book of any kind, so well printed. The binding is tasteful also, and the whole make-up calculated to enhance the reputation of the publishers. The printing seems to be correct; we have not read all the exercises to be sure, or the vocabulary. In what we have read we have noticed but a single instance of error, and that was only the loss of a Hōlĕm (p. 57, line 13)—a kind of accident (the breaking off of a point) almost unavoidable.

A question ought to be raised just here, however. Ought a lesson book to be so handsomely printed? We think not, if (that is to say) the cost of the book is increased. The student needs many books. To the large proportion of our theological students the cost of text-books is something of a burden. The difference between two dollars and one dollar as the price of a grammar would enable the student to buy another book, and this other book might well be one extremely useful to him. Gesenius' grammar in the last edition (by Kautzsch) is put at the list price of four Marks (a dollar, or rather a little less) and the usual discount can be had from this. The "Uebungsbuch" which goes with it costs 55 cents; Strack's grammar, with exercises, costs 62 cents. I know it will be said there are various reasons for this. But surely the discrepancy is too great. One way of reducing the size of such a book would be to leave out the Chrestomathy, i. e., the Scripture selections and their vocabulary. There is no reason why a class that has gone through an elementary grammar should not be put at once into the Bible with the lexicon in hand.

In the plan of the "Lessons" we notice with approval the giving of a distinct chapter to the subject of *new syllables*. This is one of the points obscure to the

* HEBREW LESSONS: a Book for Beginners. By H. G. Mitchell, Ph. D., Professor in the School of Theology of Boston University. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. vi and 164 and 68 pages.

beginner, and the teacher cannot bring it up too often. No more effective way of enforcing it could be found than that taken by Dr. Mitchell—giving a separate chapter to it with illustrative examples. The same is true of the lesson on the *orthotone prepositions*, and of the one on the so-called verbal particles. In both these cases the learner is apt to be confused, and he needs special instruction as we find it here given.

We are also favorably impressed with the plan of giving some unvocalized passages—Dr. Mitchell prints the book of Ruth without points. For the more advanced student reading without points is a valuable exercise. The unpointed sentences in the lessons (beginning on page 140) seem well calculated to lead up to the continuous text.

And now we have some questions to raise on points which strike us less favorably. Hebrew teachers may not agree about them—perhaps it would be well if they could be discussed by others than ourselves in order to mutual edification. First, in regard to the vowel letters. Would it not be well to make the statement about 'Alĕph a little different in form from the others? The statement is

"The Hebrews originally had no signs to represent vowels; when, therefore, they wished in certain cases to express such sounds, they used some of the consonants for the purpose. The ambiguity of these letters led to the invention of distinct characters.

"1. The consonants thus used were, *etc.*

"א stood for *a* when this vowel (rarely) needed a representative, especially in the middle of a word; sometimes also for other vowels" (p. 3).

In the first place, the sentence relating to distinct characters (points) ought to be removed to a later paragraph. It is only confusing where it now stands.

Secondly, it must be very puzzling to the student to read that the same letter was used occasionally for one vowel and occasionally for another. Lastly, it conveys a mistaken impression to say that the Hebrews ever *chose*[1] this letter to express these vowel sounds. The cases in which א is used (apparently) as a vowel are all cases in which it was at one stage of the language a consonant and survived in spelling (as in our own silent letters) after it became quiescent. In בָּאתָם, for example, we can hardly doubt that we have a form at one time pronounced בַּאְתָם; so רָאשִׁים was רָאְשִׁים, רֹאשׁ was רֹאְשׁ. In these and nearly all such instances the א was not used as a vowel, but the pronunciation changed after the form of the words was fixed. The words are very rare (like ראמות) in which, by a false analogy, this letter has been introduced as a vowel letter. Opinions will differ of course as to how much of this should be stated to the beginner. Our own observation is that students will have clearer ideas of the whole subject if the historic process is laid before them somewhat fully.

An elementary grammar should be clear. On the whole Professor Mitchell's statements are easy to understand. Exceptions are the following:

"In such a case the word represented by the consonants is called k'thibh ('written') while that represented by the vowels, and *usually found in the margin*, is called k'rî ('read')".

The words we have italicised should surely be "whose consonants are usually found in the margin," for just above the word is spoken of as *represented* by con-

[1] Dr. Mitchell does not say that they chose the vowel letters for this purpose, but this impression will almost inevitably be made upon a student who is accustomed to think of the vowels as letters like the consonants.

sonants. Even with this change the sentence needs to be expanded, in order to give a good idea of the phenomena under discussion.

"The *daghesh* is often omitted from other letters when they are followed by a vocal sh'wa, yet not from בּ. גּ. דּ. כּ. פּ. תּ, since their value would thus be affected."

Some other word than *value* would be better here.

"It [a syllable] may have two [consonants at the beginning], but no more, *without an intervening vowel*. In the latter case, however, the pronunciation of these consonants is assisted by the introduction of a sh'wa."

The words in italics ought to be omitted altogether. The statement concerning the Š'wâ is misleading. The student having learned here that this sign is introduced to assist in the pronunciation of the consonants (to do which it has a sound of its own) is soon informed that there is such a thing as a *silent* Š'wâ. It would be better to make a general statement that the Š'wâ was invented to denote the absence of a full vowel, and then to show when it is vocal and when it is silent.

Prof. Mitchell describes syllables as *simple* and *mixed*, dividing the latter into closed and intermediate. We prefer the terms *open*, *half-open* and *closed*, because they are descriptive.

A radical innovation is made in the treatment of the verb. The stems are reduced to five by putting the two passive forms with their respective actives. The usual names Qăl, Nĭph'ăl, etc., are discarded, and the five species are numbered, as in the usual Arabic grammars, I., II., etc. Now we are not convinced of the desirability of this innovation. Conformity to the Arabic grammar would be well enough if the cases were alike. But the cases are not alike. Arabic regularly makes a passive to all the active species, and indeed on occasion it can make a passive to the reflexive species. It is not so in Hebrew. The passive of the simple stem has disappeared, and the reflexives have themselves become passive in meaning in a large proportion of cases. It seems to us better, therefore, either to reduce the stems to three, each having (theoretically) a passive and a middle voice, or else to range all seven forms side by side, as is the traditional method. This being done, we should not be strenuous as to the technical names. The only point to be considered is that the names are already established. The student can read no other Hebrew grammar with profit without knowing them, he will find them in his lexicon on every page and they will meet his eye whenever he takes up a critical commentary. For these reasons it would be better to introduce them, at least in a subordinate way, in every grammar.

The exercises in reading Hebrew and translating English into Hebrew are copious—possibly too copious, but that is a fault easily remedied. It seems to us that longer sentences might be introduced earlier in the book. A large part of the exercises consist of single words. This is more wearisome to the student than if he had something more connected. Then the real unit with which we have to deal in learning a language is the sentence. Some of Prof. Mitchell's sentences seem to us not happily chosen—as illustrations, that is, of normal Hebrew syntax.

And now, in closing, a few general questions. Ought we to make a difference in the sound of Sĕghôl, as is done by our author, who makes it correspond to *e* in *pet* or (when written *plene*) in *there?* Is it correct to say that a helping-vowel (p. 9) "does not always cause the removal of Dāghēsh-lene and the silent Š'wâ? In other words, does not the fact that the point in שָׁלַחְתְּ does not cause the

removal of the daghesh prove that it should be classed rather as a Păthăḥ-furtive than as a helping vowel? Is it not too broad to say (p. 14) that the Relative Pronoun (? Particle) is "*usually* supplemented by a personal pronoun representing the antecedent?" This statement is not very clear without illustrative examples, which are not given either in direct connection with it or in the exercise which follows. Is it true that (p. 47) "a construct followed by a definite genitive may be either definite or indefinite?" We have on the other hand the impression that a construct followed even by an undefined genitive is to some extent definite. בן־מלך is *the* son of a king as distinguished from בן לְמֶלֶךְ a son of a king. In the verb with suffixes shall we say (p. 54) that כתבתְ loses its last vowel? Is it not rather true that the suffix is attached directly to that vowel, as in כתבוני? In the notes (p. 35) the point in א in the word ויבִיאוּ is called a *dagesh*. Is it not really a Măppîq?

The Syntax would be made clearer by a few examples. There is no hint that the verbs with a double medial are found uncontracted as well as contracted in the simple species. H. P. SMITH.

HISTORISCH-KRITISCHES LEHRGEBÆUDE DER HEBRÆISCHEN SPRACHE.*

The author of this grammar is one of the most active among the younger generation of Semitic scholars in Germany. A number of philological and theological works have shown him to be a man of rare erudition in this department, and of indefatigable industry. His best-known writings are probably his "De criticae Sacrae argumento e linguae legibus repetito," published in 1879, and his "*Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testamentes*," published in 1882, while his "*Studien*" both in Hebrew and Ethiopic, have proved him well acquainted with the minutiæ of the dialects. Naturally we expect that a grammar from such a source would have rare merits, and in this we are not disappointed. It is true that no grammarian of the Hebrew language can hope, at this date, to enlarge the materials of which a grammatical system is to be constructed; nor are the modifications of the traditional text, made by a closer critical study of the Massorah and other aids, of such a character and extent as to offer the grammarian new matter of any importance, as is shown by the texts issued by Baer and Delitzsch. Our Hebrew grammars can, accordingly, differ only in manner and method, but not in matter. A new candidate in this field can hope to receive recognition and favor only by a new and better arrangement and more rational explanation of the data and facts of the language. And in this regard König's work has some features that entitle its author to the thanks of Semitic and Old Testament students everywhere. Especially is there one important characteristic in which his book is distinguished from all the rest and in which he supplies something that scholars have been in need of for a long time. To read only this or that grammar of Hebrew, one gets the impression that there are no points of doubt or debate in the whole field, and that none of the phenomena of the language admit of more than one explanation, the

* HISTORISCH-KRITISCHES LEHRGEBÆUDE DER HEBRÆISCHEN SPRACHE. Mit steter Beziehung auf Qimhi und die anderen Autoritaeten ausgearbeitet v. Dr. Friedrich Eduard Koenig, Licentiat und Privatdocent der Theologie an der Universitaet Leipzig. Erste Haelfte: Lehre von der Schrift, der Aussprache, dem Pronomen und dem Verbum. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1881. 710 pp. 8vo.

one offered by the author we happen to be reading. That such is not the true state of affairs is known to all who have gone a little beyond surface investigation; and that the different grammarians do not explain the facts of the language in the same way, but that each has his theory here and his hypothesis there, is known to all who have taken the trouble to compare two or more of the larger Hebrew grammars. Yet in all of these grammars, from the days of Gesenius on, the method has been in vogue of simply giving the explanation that best suited the author, taking no consideration or making no mention of what other authors have thought on these points. This rather one-sided method we find in all our larger grammatical systems. König, in this regard, supplements all of his predecessors by stating fully and clearly, on all points, the *status controversiæ*, giving the reasons pro and con wherever different views have been given by grammarians. He thus gives a vast amount of valuable information; and this is of such a character as to stimulate the student to further study and to independent investigation. On debatable ground he cites the authorities from Qimḥi on, and then gives the reasons for his own conclusion in the matter. This principal peculiarity of the work has brought with it a lengthy discussion of points that are elsewhere not brought out so prominently, as, for instance, the use of the Hōlĕm, the discussion of which reaches from p. 44 to 49: the pronunciation of the Qāmĕç-Hāṭûph, from 90 to 111. As the book grew out of the author's work in the school-room, he has elaborated especially those points which cause the student the greatest trouble. In this manner he has endeavored to combine practical utility with a philosophically correct method of investigation, namely, the historical and analytical. It is to be hoped that König's work will be completed in the near future. Olshausen did not live to write a Syntax; Stade has promised to do so, but has not done it; we have nothing exhaustive and thorough in the Syntax of the language since Ewald's work. Certain it is that the researches in the Indo-European languages and the comparative method will offer a fine field for the student of Hebrew Syntax. From the industry of König in the past we have reason to hope that he will not disappoint us as did the others.

G. H. SCHODDE.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ANDREAE, H. V. Die Psalmen. aus dem Grundtexte übersetzt u. durch e. fortlauf. Besprechg. erläutert. Frankfurt a. M.: *Schriften-Niederlage d. Evangel. Vereins.* Pp. viii., 580.

BACHER, W. Die hebräisch-arabische Sprachvergleichung des Abulwâlîd. (By Dr. Locoy.) *Jued. Litter.-Blatt*, No. 46, 1884.

BRANDT. Die Entdeckung der babylonischen Alterthümer. *Deutsch-evang. Blätter*, Bd. 9, Heft 2.

BRANDT. Die assyrisch-babylonische Keilschrift-Literatur und das Alte Testament. *Ibid.*, 3.

BROWN, FRANCIS. The Needs of Hebrew Lexicography. *Presbyterian Review.* Jan., '85.

BRUGSCH, H. Thesarus inscription um Aegptiacarum. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*

BRUGSCH, H. Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter. Nach den Denkmälern bearb. 1. Hälfte. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.* Pp. vii, 280.

DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. Studien über indo-germanisch-semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft. Neue Lichtdr.-Ausg. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.* Pp. 119.

Die Kabbala. Ihre Hauptlehren und ihr Verhältniss zum Christenthum. Innsbruck: *Vereinsbuchhandlung.* Pp. 58.

DILLMANN, A. Ueber die Regierung, insbesondere die Kirchenordnung des Königs Zar'a Jacob. Berlin, 1884.

DUNCKER, M. Geschichte der Alterthums. Neue Folge. 1 Bd. Leipzig, 1884.

EBERS, G. Der geschnitzte Holzsarg d. Haṭbastra im ägyptologischen Apparat der Universität zu Leipzig. Leipzig: *Hirzel.*

FRANKE, A. H. Das alte Testament bei Johannes. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärg. u. Beurtheilg. der johanneischen Schriften. Göttingen: *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* Pp. iv, 316.

GEBHARDT. Beiträge zur Erklärung der griechischen Wörter in den Talmuden und Midrashim. Zweite Serie. *Jued. Littblt.*, Nos. 40-41, '84.

GINSBURG, C. D. The Massorah: Compiled from Manuscripts; Alphabetically and Lexically arranged. 2 vols. London, 1883. Pp. 758, 830.

GUYARD, STANISL. Note sur quelques passages des inscriptions de Van. *Journ. assyr.*, Sér. 8, T., II.

HALEVY, J. Notes de lexicographie assyrienne. *Zeitschrift f. Keilschriftforschung.* Vol. I., No. 3.

HAUPT, PAUL. Das babylonische Nimrodepos. Keilschrifttext der Bruchstücke der sogenannten Isdubarlegenden mit dem keilschriftlichen Sintfluthberichte nach den Originalen im Britischen Museum copirt und herausgeg. Abt. I., den Keilschrifttext der ersten 10 Tafeln enth. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*, 1884.

HILPRECHT, HERM. Freibrief Nebukadnezar's I., Königs von Babylonien, c. 1130 v. Chr. Zum ersten Male veröffentlicht, umschrieben und übersetzt. Inaug.-Diss. Leipzig, 1883.

HOFFMANN, G. Nachtrag zu H. KIEPERT's "Karte der Ruinenfelder von Babylon." *Ztschr. d. Ges. f. Erdkunde*, Vol. 18, No. 6.

HOLTZMANN, A. Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata. Ein Anhang zu W. D. Whitney's Jüdischer Grammatik. Leipzig, 1884.

HOROVITZ, M. Der Talmud. Drei Reden. Frankfurt a. M., 1883.

JAPHET, J. M. Hebräische Lesefibel. 9., verb. u. verm. Aufl. Frankfurt a. M.: *Grobel*. Pp. 32.

JENSEN, P. De incantamentorum sumerico-assyriorum serici quae dicitur "surbu" tabula VI. I. *Ztschr. f Keilschriftforschung*, Vol. I., No. 4.

KAUTZSCH, E. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. *Jued. Litter.-Blatt*, No. 45, 1884; *Lit. Centralblt.*, No. 44, '84; *Theol. Litblt.*, No. 46, '84.

KOENIG, F. E. Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte gegenüber den Entwickelungstheoretikern beleuchtet. Leipzig, 1884.

LEDRAIN, E. Archéologie assyrienne. Collection Sarzec. Une petite ville d'architectures et de sculptures en l'an 4500 avant J.-C. *Rev. pol. et lit.*, No. 2, Jan. 12, 1884, T. 33.

Liber Ezechielis. Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus masorae varie illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit S. Baer. Cum praefatione Franc Delitzsch et glossario Ezechielico-babylonico Friedr. Delitzsch. Leipzig: *Tauchnitz*. Pp. XVIII, 134.

LIPPERT, JUL. Allgemeine Geschichte des Priesterthums. Vol. 2. Berlin: *Th. Hoffmann*, 1884. Pp. XXIV, 734.

MARX, G. H. Traditio rabbinorum veterrima de librorum veteris testamenti ordine atque origine illustrata. Leipzig. Pp. 60.

MATTERSDORF, W. Die Methode des ersten hebräischen Unterrichts in der jüdischen Religionsschule. *Jued. Littblt.*, Nos. 36–37, '84.

MUEHLAU, F., and VOLCK, W. W. Gesenius' Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch. (By J. F. McCurdy.) *Amer. Jour. of Philology*, Vol. IV., 3.

MUELLER, DAV. HEINR. Vorläufige Mittheilungen über eine von Professor Joseph Wünsche in der Nähe von Van entdeckte Keilschrift. *Anzeiger der philos.-hist. Classe der k. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien*, Jy. '84, No. XVI.

PERLES, J. Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien. München: *Th. Ackermann*. Pp. VI, 247.

POGNON. Inscription de Mérou-nérar I., roi d'Assyrie. *Journ. assyr.*, Sér. 8, T. II., 1883.

PREISWERK, S. Grammaire hébraïque. (By A. Loisy.) *Bulletin critique*, No. 15, '84; (By R. Duval.) *Revue critique*, No. 33, '84.

RABBINOVICZ, R. Variae lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud babylonicum &c. Pars XIV. Tract. Sebachum. München: *Rosenthal*. Gr. 8vo, pp. VIII, 256.

RAWLINSON, H. C., and PINCHES, T. G. A selection from the miscellaneous inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia. V., 2. *The Athenæum*, Sept. 6, '84.

SAYCE, A. H. The literary works of Ancient Babylonia. *Zeitschrift f. Keilschriftforschung*, Vol. I., No. 3.

SCHIFFER, S. Das Buch Koheleth im Talmud u. Midrasch. Leipzig: *Schulze*. Pp. 140.

SINNETT, A. P. Die esoterische Lehre oder Geheimbuddhismus. Uebersetzung aus dem Englischen. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. Pp. XX, 260.

WOLFF, PH. Arabischer Dragoman. Grammatik, Wörterbuch, Redestücke der neuarabischen Sprache. Leipzig: *Brockhaus*. Pp. VI, 370.

HEBRAICA.

VOLUME I. APRIL, 1885. NUMBER 4.

THE CYLINDER OF NEBUKADNEZZAR AT NEW YORK.*

BY J. F. X. O'CONNOR, S. J.,

Professor in Woodstock College, Maryland.

Having learned that a collection of cuneiform inscriptions had arrived at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, I visited the Museum during the month of August, 1884, to examine the new collection and to practice copying the cuneiform contract tablets at the east end of the building.

Among the valuable pieces of the new collection was a cuneiform Babylonian Cylinder. Upon expressing a wish to copy it, I was informed it could be done only on two conditions. The first was the permission of General L. P. di Cesnola, Director of the Museum; the second was the permission of the owner of the collection, as it was not yet Museum property. With kindly courtesy, facility for study and the privilege of copying the Cylinder was granted by the Director of the Museum. Mr. Bernard Maimon, the actual owner and original collector, also consented with the restriction that no publication should be made until the purchase of the Cylinder by the Museum.

I began my work of copying the inscription in the Museum on August 27th, and completed it during the first week of September.

On October 7th, a communication was sent to me, by the Director's orders, that the Cylinder was now Museum property and the publication open to me, but no restrictions would be placed on any one, and a cast would be forwarded as soon as possible. Towards the end of October I received a cast of the Cylinder, with

* The following is an explanation of the abbreviated references in the article:

I R., II R., III R., IV R., V R. = WAI. = *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia.* Sir Henry Rawlinson. The numerals before R., indicate the volume; after, the page. (London, 1861-70-75-80.) Del., *Assyr. Lesest.* = Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestuecke.* (Leipzig, 1878.) Del., *Assyr. Stud.* = Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien.* (Leipzig, 1874.) Del., *Wo lag das Paradies?* = Friedrich Delitzsch. (Leipzig, 1881.) ASKT. = Paul Haupt, *Assyrische Sumerische Keilschrifttexte.* (Leipzig, 1881-82.) SFG. = Paul Haupt, *Sumerische Familiengesetze.* (Leipzig, 1879.) BAL. = Paul Haupt, *Beitraege zur Assyrischen Lautlehre.* (1883.) KAT. = Eberhard Schrader, *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament.* (Giessen, 1883.) Neb. = *Inscription Nebuchadnezzar,* I R., 53-58. Neb. Bab. = *Cylinder-inscription from Babylon,* I R., 51, No. 2. Neb. Senk. = *Cylinder-inscription Senkereh.,* I R., 51, No. 2. Tig. I. Lotz = *Tiglathpileser,* I. Wm. Lotz. (Leipzig, 1880.) Sarg. Cyl. = David G. Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's.* (Leipzig, 1883.) Menant. = *Manuel de la langue Assyrienne.* (Paris, 1880.) AVAAW. = J. N. Strassmaier, S. J., *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der Assyrischen und Akkadischen Woerter.* (Leipzig, 1882-83-84-85.) ABVW. = J. N. Strassmaier, S. J., *Altbabylonischen Vertraege aus Warka.* (Berlin, 1882.) Cont. Tab. 17 Nab. = J. N. Strassmaier, S. J., *Contract Tablet, 17th year of Nabonidus.* (London, 1882.)

a note stating that the first one made was forwarded to me according to promise. After taking precautions to be assured that the text was as perfect as could be under the circumstances, the translation was announced on November 17th. With the full text in hand, I began the work of translation and collation with other Babylonian texts, and towards the end of December the work was completed.

The writing, in the peculiar Babylonian archaic character, is divided into three sections. On the terra-cotta cylinder, a smooth band, unmarked by characters, running from end to end, indicates the beginning of each column. Unlike the Semitic languages, Ethiopic excepted, the Babylonian, as well as the Assyrian cuneiform, is read, like our English, from left to right.

This particular Cylinder is of interest, less from any new historical fact that it reveals than from its being, as far as known, the first unpublished original that has found its way from that ancient empire of Babylon to the city of New York, there to tell its story of the work of the mighty king, and confirm anew the facts made known by the other inscriptions of this same monarch.

Every new document, whatever its value, is an additional link in the chain that binds us to the history of past nations. The question is often asked, "Of what practical use are these inscriptions?" For the Semitic student no answer is required, but it may be worth while for those not professionally interested in these new and important researches to glance at the significance which these discoveries and interpretations bear in the eyes of leading Assyriologists. We have but to look at the works of Delitzsch, Haupt, Schrader, to see how this language, hidden for centuries, now comes forth to help us reconstruct the history of forgotten nations. The results of cuneiform studies have given rise to a literature full of the deepest interest to men of all opinions and pursuits. These studies may be looked upon from a two-fold point of view, that of philology and history; but both have the same end—the practical use of the results of interpretation.

"The excavations of Mesopotamia, during the last few years," says a paper, read before the Philosophical Society of Great Britain, "have been productive of especially good results. Not only has Assyrian grammar and lexicography been enriched by magnificent 'finds' of bilingual and grammatical tablets, but a considerable quantity of history has been made known to us through the discovery of Cylinders which were inscribed during the latter years of the Babylonian empire. They are peculiarly valuable, because they are the productions of those who lived at the time when the events happened which they record." The contract tablets, and the Egibi tablets give an insight into the commercial affairs of Babylon, and reveal their great loan and banking system. Some of these contract tablets, or notes of legal transfer, are now in the New York Museum. (Cf. E. A. Budge, *On Recent Inscrip. of Neb.*)

As to the discovery of this Cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar, the writer learned the facts from Mr. Maimon personally, who gave him the following details: Amid the ruins at Aboo Habba, (the site of Sippara, Sepharvaim of the Hebrews, situated between the Euphrates and the Tigris, north of Babylon and southwest of Bagdad), while searching in the ruins and thrusting into them a spear he held in his hand, Mr. Maimon found considerable resistance in the loose rubbish. Working the spear around the object, he found it to be of considerable size, and, upon digging it out, discovered this Cylinder, bearing an inscription in cuneiform characters.

The name Nebuchadnezzar has been variously explained. It is found in the cuneiform writings as Nabu-kudurri-usur, written also Na-bi-uv-ku-du-ur-ri-u-ṣu-ur, (V R. 34, Col. II., 67). In Hebrew it becomes Nebû-khodr-eṣṣôr, and by successive modifications and corruptions is written and spoken Nebu-chad-neṣṣor. Nebuchadnessor. The transition is easy to the German Nebukadnezzar, and the English Nebuchadnezzar. In the *Ναβουχοδονόσορ* of the Septuagint, we find the origin of Nabuchadonosor. (Ant. Jud. x., 6.) The name has three elements—Nabû "Nebo," kudurru "crown," uṣur "protect." "Nebo, protect my crown." Others give to the word kudur, the meaning "landmark." (I R. 52, 5 and 6.) (Cf. Schrader, KAT. 362.) (Fleming, *East India Inscription*, p. 22,—Budge, *Recently Discovered Inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar*, p. 3.)

The word Nebo, nabû = "to speak," "prophesy," "prophet," appears as a usual element in the names of Babylonian Kings, Nabopolassar, Nabu-pal-uṣur, "Nebo, protect my son." From them it passed to members of the royal household, as the general Nebu zardan, and even to persons whom the Babylonians held in honor, as the Jewish captive youth Abednego, signifying "servant of Nebo," so named by the feast-master of Nebuchadnezzar, from the Hebrew "Abed," "servant," and "Nebo," which the Jews, either not understanding or rejecting through contempt, changed to Nego. (KAT. p. 429.) This use of the name of the deity in the names of individuals, appears, as is well known, in the Hebrew names of the Angels, Mi-chael—who is like God.

This would hardly be the place to give the history of Nebuchadnezzar and his works. (Cf. G. Rawlinson, *Seven Monarchies*, Fourth Mon., c. VIII., c. VII., notes 12, 13.) Suffice it to say here, that unlike the Assyrian Kings, Assurbanipal and Sennacherib, who glory in their battles and conquests, and in the recital thereof, Nebuchadnezzar's chief glory, if we judge from his inscriptions, seems to be the building and restoring of the temples of his gods.

The temple referred to in the inscription with which we are concerned, is the temple of E Parra, the temple of the Sun at Sippara. Sippara or Aboo Habba, is situated on the left bank of the Euphrates, and being one of the earlier cities, the river Euphrates itself is called the "river of Sippar." The name appears with varied spelling, Si-par, Si-ip-par, Sip-par, (II R. 13, 26, d.—V R. 23, 29.—II R. 48, 55, a, b), and with and without determinative.

The god of Sippara was Samas, the Sun god. His temple was called E Parra, the temple of the Sun. Another city sacred to Samas was Larsa, called in the non-semitic text, *babbar-unu-ki*, "dwelling of the sun" (I R. 2, No. 111, IV., 4, 3). In Semitic phonetic spelling it is found La-ar-sa-am-ki. The temple there was E-babbara. (*Neb. Grot.*, II., 42.) (Cf. Del., *Paradies*, P. 223. *Assyr. Stud.*, *Akkad. Glos.*, p. 174. Haupt, ASKT., p. 37, No. 41.)

The other temples mentioned in this inscription, E-Saggil and E-Zida, were erected, the one to Merodach at Babylon, the other to Nebo at Borsippa, the sister city of Babylon. Both were subsequently restored by Nebuchadnezzar. E-Sagila was the "temple of the lofty head," and was also named "the palace of heaven and earth, the dwelling of Bel, El, and Merodach." (*Neb. Borsip.*, I., 15 *ff.*) E-Zida, in Assyrian, bîtu kenu, means the "everlasting dwelling."

The name Babylon occurs in many different forms in the Babylonian inscriptions. Commonly it is written KA-dingir-RA = "the gate of god," Bab-ili, Bâbîlu; ka, being the Akkadian for "gate," and dingir, the ideogram for "god." (IV R. 12, 13.) The oldest non-semitic form appears as Tintir. (IV R. 20, 3.)

We find the name of the city as a pure ideogram: (*a*) Ka-dingir-(-ra)(ki), (Khors, 2, 6. I R. 48, No. 5, 3); (*b*) as a phonogram: Ba-bi-lu(ki), (I R. 52, No. 5); (*c*) as combined ideogram and phonogram: Ba-bi-dingir, *i. e.* Ba-bi-ilu. (*Neb.*, IV., 28). (Cf. Del., *Paradies*, p. 212. Schrader, KAT. p. 121.) Babylon is the Greek form of Babel or Bab-ili, and Ba-bel is the Semitic translation of the Akkadian KA-dingir-RA.

Instead of the Assyrian *ilu*, in Babylonian we read dingir; thus ilu-šu, his god, becomes dingir-na; abu-šu, his father, adda-na. The syllable *ra* suffixed takes the meaning, "to," "for," as adda-na-ra = to his father. Ka-dingir-ra = the gate to god. (Cf. Haupt, SFG. p. 3.) The passages where this name occurs are endless, thus: ina ka-dingir-ra epuš. (I R. *Neb.*, Col. IV., l. 17; VI., ll. 26, 29; Col. VII., ll. 1. 4, 34, 40.) Again: ina Babili epuš. (I R. *Neb.*, IV., 28, 31.) Bab-ilu and Si-par are both found in the Syllabary. (II R. 13, 25.)

Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar, reigned in Babylon from about B. C. 604 to B. C. 560. The first king of Babylon was Nobonassar, B. C. 747; the last, Nabonidus, B. C. 555, who reigned 17 years until the time of Cyrus. According to the Babylonian canon of Ptolemy, the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign is placed at 604 B. C., his father Nabopolassar's at 625, and that of Evil-Merodach, 561. (Cf. Schrader, KAT. p. 490.)

These observations are deemed sufficient for the understanding of the meaning of the inscription.

The substance of the inscription is as follows:

I am Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, lawful son of Nabopolassar. I, the King of righteousness, the interpreter, the spoiler, filled with the fear of the gods and loving justice, have placed in the hearts of my people the spirit of reverence towards the gods, and as a devout worshipper, have rebuilt their temples E Saggil and E Zida.

This proclamation we issue:

My great Lord Merodach singled me out as the restorer of the city and the rebuilder of its temples, and made my name illustrious.

This proclamation we make:

The temple of E Parra, the temple of Samas, which is at Sippara, and which long before my reign had fallen to ruins, I rebuilt.

The great god Samas hearkened to no king before me, and gave no command to do this work. But I, his servant, filled with awe of his divinity, in piety and wisdom built his temples, at his inspiration.

I lifted up my hands in constant prayer, for the building of his temple E Parra. The god Samas accepted the lifting up of my hands, he heard my prayer for the building of his temple. Samas, Ramanu and Merodach heard me. My prayer was heard by Samas my Lord, the judge of heaven and earth, the warlike, the great hero, the supreme, the glorious Lord, who governs the decisions of justice. The temple of my great Lord, the temple of Parra, at Sippara, in joy and jubiliant exaltation I built.

O great god Samas, when thou dost enter in joy into the work made by my hands, grant that it may be lasting; look with favor upon me, and may I receive a blessing from thy lips.

Let me sate myself with glory, and grant me a long life and the establishment of my kingdom forever. Let me be an everlasting ruler, with a righteous sceptre, true power, governing my people in peace and prosperity forever.

By the power of my arms, give success to my warriors in battle; send me, O Samas, prosperous omens—peace and prosperity, and let my armies disperse the power of mine enemies.

In the cuneiform text as here given, the lines marked with the numerals are the copy of the Archaic Babylonian, the original text of the Cylinder. The lines marked *b.* are the transcription, character for character, of the old Babylonian into the later Babylonian of the sixth century B. C. The lines marked *a.* are the Assyrian characters of the seventh century B. C., as we find them in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings.

Thus, the triple text may serve as a useful reference for the study and comparison of the Babylonian and Assyrian characters.

In the transcription, the method has been to keep as closely as possible to the syllabication of the original. The marked letters in the transcription have the usual values of the corresponding letters in Hebrew:

š = sh, ṣ = ts, ḫ = ch hard, ṭ = teth, ḳ = koph.

The work upon the Inscription has been done in the intervals of other serious study, and if it be allowed "*parva componere magnis*," the writer would conclude in the words of Friedrich Delitzsch in his introduction to the *Paradies:* "It was a difficult work, difficult in itself, and much more difficult from external circumstances; and now that I have reached the end, and look back, there arise before me many defects....which are pardonable, indeed, but still remain imperfections. Nevertheless, in the rough ore brought with patience from the depth of the mine, some pure metal may be found. May the science of Archæology, and especially Biblical science, sift this out; may they make subservient to their advancement that wide field and promising perspective of language, culture and religion which has been opened to them by the researches of Assyriology."

TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION.

COL. I.

1.	Nabû-ku-dur-ru-u-ṣu-ur	1. Nebuchadnezzar,
	šar mi-ša-ri-im	King of righteousness,
	pa-aš-ru, ša-aḫ-tu	master of life and death,
	ša pa-la-aḫ ilâni mu-du-u	who knoweth the fear of the gods,
5.	ra-'-im ki-it-ti	5. loving justice
	u mi-ša-ri-im,	and righteousness;
	mu-uš-te-'-u ba-la-ṭam	seeking life,
	mu-ša-aš-ki-in	establishing
	ina bi-i ni-ši-im	in the mouth of the people
10.	pu-lu-uḫ-ti ilâni rabûti	10. the fear of the great gods;
	mu-uš-te-ši-ir eš-ri-it ilâni	seeker of the temple of the god;
	za-ni-in E-Sag-gil	restorer of the temple Saggil,
	u E-Zida	and the temple Zida;
	aplu ki-i-nim	true Son

15.	ša Nabû-pal-u-ṣu-ur	15. of Nabopolassar
	Šar Bâbili a-na-ku	King of Babylon am I.
	Ni-nu: il Marduk	We (proclaim): the god Merodach
	belu ra-bi-u	my great lord
	ana be-lu-ut ma-da	to rule the country
20.	iš-ša-an-ni-ma	20. raised me up;
	a-na za-nin-nu-ti ma-ha-za	for the restoration of the city,
	u ud-du-uš eš-ri-e-ti-šu	and the renewing of its temples
	šu-ma ṣi-ra-am	my lofty name
	ib-bi-u	he gave forth.
25.	ni-nu-mi-šu E-Parra bît il Šamas	25. We (proclaim) this: The temple of Parra, the temple of the Sun
	ša ki-ri-ib Sippar	which is in Sippara,
	ša u-ul-la-nu-a.....?	which long before me (had fallen to ruins?)
	e-mu-u.....?	and decay.....(I built?).
COL. II.	il Šamaš en-ni ra-bi-u	The god Šamaš my great lord
30.	a-na ma-na-ma šarri ma-aḫ-ri-im	30. not to any former King
	la im-gu-ur-ma	had he hearkened and
	la ik-bi-u e-bi-šu	had not commanded to do (this)
	â-ši.....?	I.....(his servant?)
	e-im-ku mu-ut-nin-nu-u	wise and pious,
35.	pa-li-iḫ i-lu-ti-šu	35. (was in) fear (of) his divinity.
	a-na e-bi-eš eš-ri-e-ti	to build the temples
	li-ib-ba (uštallit):	he (directed) my heart:
	u-ga-ru am-ša-as-si (?)	I cleared the grounds (?)
	aš-ši ga-ti	I lifted up my hands,
40.	u-sa-ap-pa-ša aš-ši (?)	40. and I made supplication (?)
	a-na e-bi-eš bîti E-Parra	for the building of the temple Parra,
	u-mi-šu um-ma	day by day (to)
	Šamaš en-ni ra-bi-u	the god Šamaš, my great lord.
	ni-iš ga-ti-ia im-ḫu-ur-ma	the lifting up of my hands he accepted;
45.	iš-ša-a su-pi-e-a	45. he received my prayers
	a-na e-bi-eš bîti šu-a-ti	for the building of that temple,
	e-bi-eš bîti ša il Šamaš	the building of the temple of Šamaš.
	il Šamaš il Ramânu u il Marduk	Šamaš, Ramanu and Merodach
	ip-ru-us-ma.....(?)	turned (?) and (hearkened).

50.	il Šamaš il Ramanu u il Marduk	50. Šamaš, Ramanu and Merodach
	ša e-bi-eš bîti E-Parra	for building the temple Parra
	an-num (?) ki-i-num	true mercy
	u-ša-aš-ki-nu-um	established
	i-na te-ir-ti-ia	during my reign.
55.	a-na il Šamaš en-ni	55. Unto Šamaš, my lord,
	da-a-a-nu si-i-ru-um	the supreme judge
	ša ša-me-e u ir-ṣi-ti	of heaven and earth,
	ḳar-ra-du ra-bi-u	the warlike, the great hero,
	it-lu ka-ab-tu.....	the supreme, the glorious lord,
60.	be-lu mu-uš-te-ši-ir	60. the lord who directs
	pu-ru-us-si-e ki-it-ti	the decision of righteousness,
	beli ra-bu-u beli-ia	to the great lord, my lord,
	bit-su E-Parra	his temple E Parra,
	ša kirib Sipar	which is in Sippara,
65.	ina ḫi-da-a-ti	65. in joy
	u ri-ša-a-ti	and jubilant exaltation
	lu e-pu-uš	I built.
	ilu Šamaš beli rabu-u	The god Šamaš, my great lord
	a-na E-Parra biti-ka nam-ru	into the temple E Parra, thy glorious temple,
70.	ḫa-di-iš i-na e-ri-bi-ka	70. upon thy joyful entering therein
COL. III.	li-bi-it ga-ti-ia šu-ul-bi-ir	the brickwork of my hands let it endure.
	ki-ni-iš na-ap-li-is-ma	look with grace (upon me) and
	dam-ga-tu-a li-iš-šak-na	mercy, may it (be) established (by)
	ša-ap-tu-uk-ka	thy word (lip).
75.	i-na ki-bi-ti-ka ki-it-ti	75. by thy righteous command,
	lu-uš-ba-' li-it-tu-ti	let me sate myself with glory;
	ba-la-ṭam ana û-um ru-ku-u-ti	life unto days remote,
	ku-un kussî lu-si-ri-iḳ-tu-um-ma	stability of my throne mayest thou grant.
	li-ri-ku li-iš-ša-libu	may they be long (the days of my reign)
80.	ri-'-u-u a-na dâra-a-ti	80. lordship for eternity,
	ḫaṭṭu i-ša-ar-ti	a righteous sceptre,
	ri-e-u-ti ṭa-ab-ti	just sway,
	ši-bi-ir-ri ki-i-num	true insignia of sovereignty,
	mu-ša-li-im ni-ši	prosperity to my people

85. lu-i-ba (?) ḫaṭṭu šar-ru-ti-ia	85. giving peace (?) to the sceptre of my royalty
a-na dâra-a-ti	unto eternity.
i-na kakkê ez-zuti	with mighty weapons,
te-bu-ti ta-ḫa-za	with a successful battle
lu-zu-lu-ul um-ma-ni-(ia?)	let me adorn my troops.
90. il Šamaš atta-ma	90. The god Šamaš thou,
ina di-i-nim u bi-i-ri	in judgment and oracles,
i-ša-ri-is a-pa-la-an-ni	in righteousness, bind me
ina a-ma-ti-ka	in thy word.
ša-li-mu	grant success,
95. ša-la-ma bi-e-ri	95. a lasting prosperity.
lu-ti-bu-u lu-za-aḳ-tu	May they draw near, may they sting,
kakku kakkua	the weapon; my weapon,
kakke	the weapons
na-ki-ri-im	of the enemy
li-mi-e-si	let it disperse.

THE SCRIBE.

By H. L. Strack, Ph. D., D. D.,

Translated from advance sheets of *Realencykl. f. Prot. Theol. u. Kirche.* 2d Edition. Vol. XIII. Leipzig, 1884, by O. O. Fletcher.

The order of the Scribes, i. e., of the doctors of the law, first appears[1] among the Jews, after the Babylonish exile. At that time the authority of the law had taken the place of the authority of the king; the law, and indeed principially the Pentateuchal law, had become the absolute norm of the common life.

Ezra, whose work it was to give the law this position, bears the title סֹפֵר. (See, especially, Ez. VII., 6—ספר מהיר בתורת משה; 12, 21—סֵפֶר דָּתָא. Cf. also Neh. VIII., 1, 4, 13; XII., 36; VIII., 9; XII., 26.) We may conclude, partly from the former use of the word סֹפֵר, partly from the additional expressions in the places cited (particularly מָהִיר), that this title was accorded him because of his care for the restoration and dissemination of manuscripts of the law. (Cf. likewise Neh. XIII., 13—Shelemiah, the kôhēn, and Zadoq, the sôphēr; and 1 Chron. II., 55—מִשְׁפְּחוֹת סופרים who dwelt in Yă'bēç.)

The translation of the Old Testament word סוֹפֵר is the frequent *γραμματεύς* of the New Testament. Matt. II., 4; V., 20; IX., 3; XV., 1; XVII., 10; XXI., 15; XXIII., 2 sqq.; XXIII., 34, etc.

Two other features of the Scribe's employment, which in course of time became most prominent, gave occasion for the synonymical Greek designations *νομικός* (Matt. XXII., 35; Lk. VII., 30; X., 25; XI., 45 sq., 52; XIV., 3; Tit. III., 13) and *νομοδιδάσκαλος* (Lk. V., 17; Acts V., 34—*πατρίων ἐξηγῆται νόμων* Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII., 6, 2).

So far as we can judge from the Pentateuch, the Mosaic law was never a *corpus juris ecclesiastici*, answering to our conceptions of system; still less was it a *corpus juris*. And yet when this law had received its unique position, old customs, which had up to this become no more than unwritten law [Gewohnheitsrecht], could be advanced to the rank of official, statutory law; but new law, properly so called, might be no longer produced.

Then it became the main purpose to search out and interpret the letter of the written law; so to interpret it that it could find application to the present, and indeed to as many of the relations of the present as possible. Even of Ezra himself we read (Ez. VII., 10): "He had prepared his heart to seek (לִדְרֹשׁ) the law of Yahveh, and to do and teach (וְלַלַּמֵּד) in Israel statutes and judgments [מִשְׁפָּט, Recht]." If we take into consideration the condition of the Torah as just mentioned, if we recall further that, from the time of Malachi, the prophetic spirit had departed from Israel, that, with the death of the generations which returned from the exile, the impulse to an independent religious life, which lay in the specific experience of divine help, was extinct, that the feeling of peculiar weakness drifted toward a slavish, literal service of God, and that the slow, but constant, change in the social and other relations made the formation of new legal axioms

[1] From an earlier age. Cf. Jer. VIII., 8—יַעַט שֶׁקֶר כִּפְרִים.

requisite, we cannot be surprised that many of the interpretations of the law given by the Scribes, and more particularly by those of the later time, remind us of the Lord's denunciation of those who "strain out gnats and swallow camels" (Matt. XXIII., 24). One example in lieu of many. Let us compare the proof of the resurrection of the dead which Christ rests upon Exod. III., 6 (Matt. XXII., 23 sqq.) with the way in which Deut. XXXI., 16 is applied in the Babylonian Talmud (Sanhedrin, fol. 90, col. 2): "The Sadducees asked Rabban Gamaliel how he would prove that God would raise the dead. He answered them: Out of the Torah; for there we find, וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל-מֹשֶׁה הִנְּךָ שֹׁכֵב עִם אֲבוֹתֶיךָ וְקָם. They replied: But perhaps we are to join וְקָם with הָעָם הַזֶּה וְזָנָה. And immediately after we read that the celebrated authorities Jehoshua' ben Hananya and Shim'on ben Yoḥay explained the cited verse just as Rabban Gamaliel did! The Middoth, the hermeneutical rules, contributed some method, at least in appearance, to these interpretations (see my article "Hillel," PRE.,[1] VI., p. 115, col. 1; further, J. Hamburger, *Realencyklopædie fuer Bibel u. Talmud*, Part II., pp. 206–208; still later in PRE.,[1] article "Thalmud").

In the almost infinite variety of cases arising in the daily life within the civil, criminal and ritual law, new questions were constantly calling for answer. Therefore a cessation of the work of interpretation was impossible. After Jehuda hanasi had codified, in the Mishna, the interpretations which had found recognition up to the end of the second century after Christ (the oral law), the discussions of the Amoraim[1] were only the more zealously carried on.

To this activity of the Scribes, looking to the ascertainment of the law, an addendum forms, the purpose of which is to secure the observance of the law. In order to prevent transgression of its prohibitions, they make supplementary prohibitions, in observing which there was not left to the Israelite any possibility, much less any enticement, to become disobedient to a single statement of the written or oral law. Pirqe Aboth (Sayings of the Fathers) I., 1: The men of the Great Synagogue said.....Make a hedge about the law, עֲשׂוּ סְיָג לַתּוֹרָה. In the Talmud, Mo'ed qaton, fol. 5, col. 1, and Y'bamoth, fol. 21, col. 1, Lev. XVIII., 30 is explained עֲשׂוּ מִשְׁמֶרֶת לְמִשְׁמַרְתִּי, i. e., "Add a guard to my law."

The Scribes were, therefore, not so much theologians as jurists. Consequently we are to assume that the members of the Synedria, at least the more prominent ones, were chosen, as far as possible, from their number; compare for Jerusalem, among others, the following common expressions: "The high-priests and scribes and elders" (Mk. XI., 27, *et cet.*), "the high-priests and scribes" (Matt. XX., 18, *et cet.*).

If the Jews were to remain the people of the law, the knowledge of the law once acquired must be preserved in all coming time, and care for true tradition must be had among the succeeding generations. The pedagogic activity requisite for this purpose (especially in the earlier age when there was as yet no written Mishna) was a further essential task of the Scribes. The instruction was oral; only in particular cases was a codex of the Bible consulted. The exercise was constant repetition; hence שָׁנָה (repeat) signifies freely *learn*, *study* (Pirqe Aboth, II., 4*b*; III., 7*b*) and *teach* (*ib.*, VI., 1). The formal statement of propositions and the holding of discussions thereupon occurred mostly in certain "houses of learn-

[1] [The Amoraim were the expositors of the Mishna, the oral law reduced to writing.]

ing" (יְשִׁיבָה, בֵּית מִדְרָשׁ); in Jerusalem, halls and rooms of the outer temple court were used for this purpose (cf. Matt. XXI., 23; XXVI., 55; Mk. XIV., 49; Lk. II., 46; XX., 1; XXI., 37; John XVIII., 20). Teachers (Matt. XXVI., 55) and pupils (Lk. II., 46; Pirqe Aboth, V., 15) sat; the teacher upon a somewhat elevated place (Acts XXII., 3; cf. Pirqe Aboth, I., 4; Aboth de R. Nathan, 6).

The religious addresses on the sabbaths and at other times were, in no small part, by Scribes (cf. Hamburger as cited above, pp. 921 sqq., especially 924, 926). Many Scribes busied themselves likewise with the Haggada (cf. Hamburger, pp. 19–27; W. Bacher, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, Strassburg i. E., 1878; the same author, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, in the *Monatsschrift f. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1882 ff.) The Halacha was, however, the peculiar field of their professional labors.

Most of the Scribes belonged to the party of the Pharisees (cf. Mk. II., 16, *γραμματεῖς τῶν φ.*· Lk. V., 30, *οἱ φ. καὶ οἱ γρ. αὐτῶν*· Acts XXIII., 9, *τινὲς τῶν γρ. τοῦ μέρους τῶν φ.*), as was quite natural, from the essential character of Phariseeism; consequently they lived mostly in Judea, and especially in Jerusalem (Scribes of Galilee, e. g., Lk. V., 17). But since the high-priests were Sadducees, there must also have been Sadducæan Scribes.

The Scribes did not receive either salary or fee for their judicial or pedagogic labors. Many maintained themselves by the work of their hands (cf. Franz Delitzsch, *Juedisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu*, 3d edition, Erlangen, 1879; S. Meyer, *Arbeit u. Handwerk im Talmud*, Berlin, 1878); many were so wealthy that they could live upon the income from their fortune; not seldom did it occur that some one entertained a Scribe, either through pity, or as a guest for a time. It was considered wrong for any one to make any profit whatever out of his acquaintance with the law: cf. Pirqe Aboth, I., 13: "He who uses the crown of the study of the law for his own profit, shall perish;" Baba Bathra, fol. 8, col. 1: "In the time of a famine, Rabbi [Jehuda ha-nasi] declared that one should desire to feed those learned in the law, but not the ignorant. Then said Jonathan ben Amram, refusing to name his share in the knowledge [of the law], Feed me as thou wouldest feed a dog, a raven." But there must have been many exceptions to this commendable principle; for Jesus says (Mk. XII., 40; Lk. XX., 47) of the Scribes, "You devour widows' houses, and in pretence make long prayers;" and (Lk. XVI., 14) the Pharisees are characterized as *φιλάργυροι*. The fact also that the Scribes lay claim to an altogether unbecoming amount of esteem, goes to prove the supposition that the disinterestedness of the Scribes was not so universal as it seems to have been, according to Jewish sources.

LITERATURE.—A. Th. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen*, Hamburg, 1831, p. 384 sqq.; Gfroerer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, I (1838), p. 109 sqq.; Winer, *Realwörterbuch* [in this also the older literature, as: Th. Ch. Lilienthal, *De νομικοῖς juris utriusque apud Hebræos doctoribus privatis*, Halle, 1740, 4vo]; A. Hausrath, *Neutestamentlich. Zeitgeschichte*[2] I, Heidelberg, 1873, p. 76 sqq.; E. Shuerer, *Lehrbuch der neutest. Zeitgesch.*, Leipzig, 1874, § 25; Ferd. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theologie*, Leipzig, 1880, cap. VIII.—X.; also the historical works of L. Herzfeld, J. M. Jost, H. Graetz (vol. III.), and H. Ewald.

PIRKE ABOTH; or, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS.

By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D.

Allegheny, Pa.

Translated from the Hebrew Edition of Prof. H. L. Strack, of Berlin, Germany.

[What is included in brackets is by the translator.]

CHAPTER III.

1. Akabya,[1] the son of Mahalalel, said: Consider three things and thou wilt not be led into transgression; bear in mind whence thou hast come, and whither thou art going, and before whom thou must be ready[2] to render[3] judgment and account. Whence hast thou come? from a polluting substance; and whither art thou going? to a place of dust, vermin and worms;[4] and before whom hast thou to render judgment and account?[5] before the King of kings, the Holy One, blessed be he!

2*a*. Rabbi Chanina,[6] suffragan[7] of the priests, said: Pray for the peace of the government;[8] for, were it not for the fear of it, man would devour his fellow man alive.

2*b*. Rabbi Chanina,[9] the son of Teradyon, said: Two persons sitting together and are holding no conversation about the law, such is an assembly of scorners; for it is said,[10] "Nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful;" but when two persons are sitting together, and are holding converse about the law, the divine presence[11] rests in their midst; for it is said,[12] "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon his name." This refers to two; but suppose only one is sitting engaged in the study of the law, will the Holy One (blessed be he!) appoint him a reward? (certainly), for it is said, "He sitteth alone and keepeth silence, because he hath borne it upon him."[13]

---

[1] He belongs to the oldest authorities whose names are given, probably contemporaneous with Gamaliel I.

[2] עָתִיד Bibl. *ready*; in later Hebrew, to denote what shall certainly come to pass in the future.

[3] לָתֵת, also iv., 10-22; v., 1. The verbs פ״נ and פ״י form, in the Mishna, the infinitive with ל, without ת, as לִטֵּל, לִשָּׂא, לִקַּח.

[4] [*Vermin and worms*, a ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, worms of all kinds.]

[5] [Cf. Matt. xii., 36; xviii., 23; Heb. ix., 27.]

[6] Another reading is Hananya.

[7] In the Bible only the plural סְגָנִים, "suffragans of the priests." He must have lived before the destruction of the temple. From the fact that Chanina is always mentioned with that title, we may infer, with certainty, that he was the last incumbent of that office.

[8] 1 Tim. ii., 1, 2; Jer. xxix., 7.

[9] Another reading is Hananya. His daughter was the famous Berurya, wife of Rabbi Meir. [The Talmud contains many stories concerning her. Her end was tragic. She had ridiculed the saying of the Rabbis, that women were light minded. "By thy life," said her husband, "thou wilt one day admit the truth of their assertion." By his order, one of his disciples laid a snare for her, into which she fell at last; and the consequence was, that she strangled herself.]

[10] It is to be observed that the Talmud, in quoting Scripture, mostly cites only a few words, and not the whole verse (section), and leaves it to the hearer (reader) to supplement the words necessary for the argument. Thus, here, the first two verses of the First Psalm are used as an argument.

[11] שְׁכִינָה, cf. Weber, *Altsynagog. Theologie*, p. 179 sq. [12] Mal. iii., 16. [13] Lam. iii., 28.

3. Rabbi Simon[1] said: Three who have eaten at the same table and have not discoursed on the words of the law thereat, are to be considered as if they had eaten of the sacrifices to the dead;[2] for it is said,[3] "All tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean." But three who have eaten at the same table and have discoursed on the words of the law thereat, are to be considered as if they had eaten of the table of the Lord; for it is said,[4] "And he said unto me, this is the table that is before the Lord."

4. Rabbi Chanina,[5] the son of Hachinai, said: He who is wakeful in the night, and walketh on the highway by himself, and giveth his heart to vanity, such an one is guilty against his soul.

5. Rabbi Nehunjah,[6] the son of Ha-kanah, said: Everyone who takes upon himself the yoke of the law, the yoke of the powers that be is removed from him, as well as the yoke of conventional manners. But he who casts off from himself the yoke of the law, then the yoke of the powers that be, as well as that of conventional manners, is laid upon him.

6. Rabbi Halaphta,[7] the son of Dosa, of Cephar Hananyah,[8] said: Ten who sit and are engaged in discoursing on the law, the divine presence rests in their midst; for it is said,[9] "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty." Suppose only five are assembled, (is it the same as with ten? Yes); for it is said,[10] "He hath founded his troop in the earth." And suppose only three (are assembled, it is the same); for it is said,[11] "He judgeth among the gods." Is it so with two? (Yes), for it is said,[12] "They that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened and heard." And is this the case with one? (Yes), for it is said,[13] "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and bless thee."

7*a*. Rabbi Eleazar, of Bartotha,[14] said: Give to him[15] of his own; for thou and what thou hast are his, and thus it is said[16] by David,[17] "For all things are from thee, and of thine own have we given thee."

---

[1] Simon ben Yochai (cf. also iv., 13b; vi., 7), famous pupil of R. Aqiba. For a long time he was regarded as the author of the Sohar, which was, however, composed in the second half of the thirteenth century, by Moses ben Shemtobde Leon. [Cf. Pick arts. *Simon ben Yochai*, in McClintock & Strong's Cyclop., ix., p. 757; also the art. *Moses de Leon*, ibid., vi., p. 689.]

[2] See Ps. cvi., 28. [Cf. Num. xxv., 2.]

[3] Isa. xxviii., 8. The word "place," מקום, means here "God."

[4] Ezek. xli., 22.

[5] A pupil of Rabbi Aqiba.

[6] Teacher of Ismael, a cotemporary with Aqiba. [Cf. Pick, art. *Nechunjah ben Ha-Kanah*, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop. s. v.]

[7] A cotemporary with Hanina ben Teradyon. § 2*b*.

[8] A place in Galilee. Cf. Ad. Neubauer, *La geographie du Talmud*, Paris, 1868, p. 178, 22b.

[9] Ps. lxxxii., 1. That ten are necessary to form a congregation (עֲדָה) is inferred from Num. xiv., 27 [where the ten spies are called עדה]. Cf. also *Megilla*, fol. 23, col. 2.

[10] Amos vi., 9.

[11] Ps. lxxxii., 1, אלהים are judges. Three belong at least to a court.

[12] Mal. iii., 16.

[13] Exod. xx., 24.

[14] According to I. Schwarz, *Das heilige Land* (Frankfort a. M. 1852), p. 161, in Upper Galilee.

[15] i. e., God.

[16] Supply "in the scripture." On the mode of Talmudic quotation cf. W. Surenhusius *Βίβλος καταλλαγής*. Amst., 1713. [Also Pick, art. *Quotations of the Old Testament in the Talmud*, McClintock and Strong's Cyclop. s. v.] The passage referred to here is from 1 Chron. xxix., 14.

[17] In a similar way Jonah iii., 10 is quoted in *Thaaniyoth*, II., 1, by נאמר באנשי נינוה ["concerning the men of Nineveh it is said"]. Cf. Rom. xi., 2, ἐν Ἠλείᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;

7*b*. Rabbi Jacob[1] said: He who is walking on the way musing (on the law), and pauses in his musing, and says, How beautiful is this tree! how beautiful is this farm!—is, according to the Scripture, worthy of death.

8. Rabbi Dosetai,[2] the son of Janai,[3] said, in the name of Rabbi Meïr:[4] He who forgets a single subject of his studies is considered by Scripture as having incurred guilt against his soul; for it is said,[5] "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen." Possibly his study may have overmatched his strength, (what then?); but it is said,[5] "And lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life." Hence he is not worthy of death, except he deliberately lets it depart from his heart.

9. Rabbi Haninah,[6] the son of Dosa,[7] said: Whosoever's fear of sin takes precedence of his wisdom, his wisdom abides; but whosoever's wisdom takes precedence of his fear of sin, his wisdom does not abide. He also said: Whosoever's works exceed his wisdom, his wisdom abides; but whosoever's wisdom exceeds his works, his wisdom will not abide.

10*a*. He also said: With whomsoever the spirit of mankind is pleased, the Spirit of God is also pleased; but with whomsover the spirit of mankind is not pleased, the Spirit of God is also not pleased.

10*b*. Rabbi Dosa,[8] the son of Harchinas, said: Sleep in the morning,[9] wine at noon,[10] and puerile conversation and spending time at places where the ignorant sit, draw a man out of the world.

11. Rabbi Eleazar[11] Hammudai[12] said: He who profanes holy things, and observes not the holy days,[13] and offends his neighbor in public, and sets at naught the covenant of our father Abraham,[14] and gives explanations not in conformity with tradition, though he has in his favor a knowledge of the law and[15] good works, he has no share in the world to come.[16]

12. Rabbi Ishmael[17] said: Be humble before thy superior, gentle towards youth, and receive all men with joy.

13. Rabbi Aqiba said: Jest and frivolity train men for immorality. Tradition

---

[1] Generally regarded as father of Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob. Another reading is Simeon.

[2] Dositheus.

[3] Abbreviated from Jonathan.

[4] Rabbi Meïr was a famous disciple of R. Aqiba. [Cf. Pick, art. *Meir*, in McClintock & Strong.]

[5] Deut. iv., 9.

[6] Legend ascribes to him the power of miracles. Cf. *Berakhoth*, fol. 33, col. 1; *Thaanith*, fol. 24, col. 2. He lived at the time of Jochanan, the son of Saccai.

[7] Abbreviated from Dositheus.

[8] Cotemporary of Jochanan, the son of Saccai.

[9] When the Shema is to be recited.

[10] Not the use of wine itself is forbidden; but the fact that one sits at the wine, instead of working while it is day.

[11] He lived at the time of the Adrianic war.

[12] Of Modiim, a place situated two hours east of Lydda, often mentioned in the first book of the Maccabees.

[13] כויצרות already occurs in 2 Chron. viii., 13.

[14] Jerus. *Pea*, i., 1, זה שהוא מושך לו ערלה. 1 Macc. i., 15, *καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἁγίας*. [Reference is to those who, belonging to the Grecian party, were ashamed of circumcision.]

[15] The words תורה ו, "a knowledge of the Law and," are not in the Cambridge codex.

[16] Cf. Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, ch. x, where those are enumerated who have no share in the world to come.

[17] Ishmael, a cotemporary of R. Aqiba and R. Tarphon.

is a fence for the law; giving tithes forms a fence for riches;[1] vows form a fence for abstinence; the fence for wisdom is silence.

14. He also said: Man is beloved, because he was created in the image (of God); a greater love was made known unto him, because he was created in the image;[2] for it is said,[3] "That in the image of God made he man." Israel are beloved, because they are called children; the love was enhanced by it being made known to them that they were called the children of God; for it is said,[4] "Ye are the children of the Lord your God." Israel are beloved, for to them was given a precious instrument;[5] the love was enhanced by it being made known to them that a precious instrument was given to them, by which the world was created; for it is said,[6] "For I give you good doctrine, forsake not my law."

15. Everything is foreseen,[7] and free will is accorded, and the world is judged beneficently, and all according to the majority of works.

16. He used to say, Everything is given on pledge,[8] and a net is spread over every living creature.[9] The mart is open, and the merchant credits, and the ledger is open, and the hand writes down, and whoever desires to borrow, let him come and borrow, but the stewards[10] make constantly[11] their daily rounds, and make man refund, whether he consents to or does not consent, and they have that on which they may support (their claim), and the verdict is a veracious verdict, and everything is prepared for the banquet.[12]

17. Rabbi Eleazar,[13] the son of Azariah, said: Where there is no learning, there can be no proper behavior; where there is no behavior, there can be no learning; where there is no wisdom, there is no reverence; where there is no reverence, there is no wisdom. Where there is no prudence, there is no discretion; where there is no discretion, there is no prudence. Where there is no meal, there is no learning; where there is no learning, there is no meal. He used to say: To what is every one to be compared whose wisdom is in advance of his actions? To a tree whose branches are many, but whose roots are few,[14] and the wind comes and uproots it and overturns it;[15] for it is said,[16] "And he shall be like the destitute one in a desert plain, and shall not see when good cometh; and he shall sit amongst the things parched up in the wilderness, a salt land and not inhabited." But to what may he be compared whose actions are in advance of his wisdom? To a tree whose branches are few, but its roots many; and though all the winds in the world come and blow at it, they cannot make it stir from its place; for it is

---

[1] Cf. *Sabbath*, fol. 119, col. 2, towards the midst: עַשֵּׂר בְּשֶׁבִיל שֶׁתִּתְעַשֵּׁר [i. e., give tithes that thou mayest become rich.]

[2] The words "a greater love.....image" are wanting in ancient MSS. and editions, and are probably spurious.

[3] Gen. ix., 6. [4] Deut. xiv., 1.

[5] Here is meant "the Law."

[6] Prov. iv., 2.

[7] צפה used of the eyes of God, Prov. xv., 3. [Cf. Matt. x., 30; Heb. iv., 13.]

[8] [Cf. Matt. xii., 36.] [9] [Cf. Heb. ix., 27.]

[10] [πράκτωρ, Lk. xii., 58; ὑπηρέτης, Matt. v., 25.]

[11] תָּדִיר constantly like the biblical תָּמִיד. Cf. Dan. vi., 17, 21, בְּתָדִירָא.

[12] Cf. Rev. xix., 9, *μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι.*

[13] President of the Sanhedrim at Jabneh, after the deposition of Gamaliel II.

[14] [Cf. Matt. vii., 26.]

[15] [Cf. Matt. vii., 27.]

[16] Jer. xvii., 6.

said,[1] "For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green; and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit."

18. Rabbi Eleazar Hisma said: Nesting[2] and the observance of the menses[3] are important constitutions; astronomy and geometry are ornaments of wisdom.

---

[1] Jer. xvii., 8.

[2] קִנִּין "nesting," a Talmudic treatise in the 5. order of the Mishna, treats of birds for sacrifices in accordance with Lev. v., 1-10.

[3] נִדָּה, a treatise of the 6. order of the Mishna. [It treats the subject of the menstruating woman, and occupies 145 pages of the Babylonian Talmud.]

WÂTEH-BEN-HAZAEL,

Prince of the Kedarenes about 650 B. C.

By Professor Paul Haupt, Ph. D.

In the account of his expedition against the country of Arabia, king Sardanapalus[1] relates the severe punishment which he inflicted on Wâteh, the son of Hazael, the shelkh of the Kedarenes.[2] After his cousin and namesake, Wâteh, the son of Birdadda, had fled before the victorious Assyrian army unto the Nabatheans, Wâteh-ben-Hazael had come to Nineveh ana kullum tanitti ili Aššûr. Thereupon, the account goes on to say, Sardanapalus placed him in a cage, and bound him with the asi of dogs. Thus, like a watch dog, Wâteh had to keep watch at the great gate of the rising sun[3], that is, at the east side of the wall of Nineveh, which bears the name Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti.

The cuneiform text of the annals which give us the account of this humiliation of Wâteh, is contained in Vol. III. of Sir Henry Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, London, 1870, pl. 24, ll. 7–20; in George Smith's *History of Assurbanipal*, London, 1871, p. 260, ll. 7–18; and finally in Vol. V. of Rawlinson's work, pl. 7, ll. 123/4, and pl. 8, ll. 1–14. The last named text is taken from the new decagon cylinder[4] Rm. 1, which was found by Hormuzd Rassam in the northern palace at Kouyunjik. In transcription, this text reads as follows:

col. VII. 123. DIŠ[5]-U-a-a-te-' ma-ru-uš-tu im-ḫur-šu-u-ma
e-diš-ši-šu in-na-bit a-na KUR Na-ba-a-a-ti

col. VIII. 1. DIŠ-U-a-a-te-' TUR-DIŠ-Ḫa-za-DINGIR
TUR-ŠEŠ-AD ša DIŠ-U-a-a-te-' TUR-DIŠ-Bir-DINGIR-IM
ša ra-man-šu iš-ku-nu

[1] Sardanapalus (Greek Σαρδανάπαλλος) reigned at Nineveh from B. C. 668–626. The Assyrian form of the name is Aššûr-bânî-abla or Aššûr-bân-abla, i. e., "the God Assur (is) the begetter of the son." In Ezra iv., 10, the name appears in the corrupt form אָסְנַפַּר (with Aleph qamezatum et metheghatum) Asnappar (not Osnappar). אסנפר stands for אס[רב]נפר = אסר־בן־פל. See Bosanquet, in Smith's *Assurbanipal*, p. 337; Schrader KAT. 376; Delitzsch in *Libri Danielis, Ezræ et Nehemiæ*, ed. Baer, Lipsiæ, 1882, pp. vii-ix. Sardanapalus was (cf. V R. 1, 8; 62, 4) the son of Esarhaddon (681—668), the grandson (V R. 1, 25; 4, 126; 62, 7) of Sennacherib (705—681), the great-grandson of Sargon II. (722—705). Esarhaddon (Hebr. אַסַרְחַדּוֹן, 2 Kgs. xix., 37; Isa. xxxvii., 38; Ezra iv., 2) is = Assyr. Aššûraḫaddina, Aššûr-aḫa-iddina, i. e., "the God Assur gave a brother;" Sennacherib (Greek Σενναχήριβος, Herod. ii., 141 Σαναχάριβος, Hebr. סַנְחֵרִיב) = Assyr. Sinaḫeriba, Sin-aḫe-erib (or erba), i. e., "the Moon-god Sin increased the brothers;" Sargon (Hebr. סַרְגֹן, Isa. xx., 1) = Assyr. Šarru-kenu "the legitimate king," in Akkadian Šar-gena.

[2] Hebr. בְּנֵי־קֵדָר, Isa. xxi., 17; Pliny, V., 12: *Cedrei*; Greek Κέδραιοι or Κέδαρηνοί.

[3] Cf. *abulli Shamash*, Lyon, *Sargonstexte*, pp. 38, 67 and 44, 84.

[4] Cf. American Oriental Society: Proceedings at New York, October, 1882, p. ix, No. 5.

[5] The words printed in capitals are Akkadian ideographs. Dish means in Akkadian "man," kur "country" and "mountain," tur "child," dingir "god," shesh "brother," ad "father," im "wind," lugal "king," shar "totality," mesh "multitude," gal "great," sha "and," en "lord," gish "wood," urku "dog," ka "gate," murub "waist" or "zone," uru "city," ki "place." Cf. my *Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, Leipzig, 1881/2, p. 164, § 8, and my *Akkadian Glossary*, ib., pp. 148—156.

a-na LUGAL-u-ti KUR A-ri-bi
DINGIR-ŠAR LUGAL DINGIR-MEŠ KUR-u GAL-u
ṭe-en-šu u-ša-an-ni-ma
il-li-ka a-di maḫ-ri-ia
a-na kul-lum ta-nit-ti DINGIR-ŠAR
ŠA DINGIR-MEŠ GAL-MEŠ EN-MEŠ-ia
an-nu kab-tu e-mid-su-ma
GIŠ ši-ga-ru aš-kun-šu-ma
it-ti A-SI-UR-KU ar-ku-us-šu-ma
u-ša-an-ṣir-šu KA-GAL MURUB URU-NINÂ-KI
ni-rib mas-naq-ti ad-na-a-ti.

In Assyrian this is to be read:—

COL. VII.

123. U'âte'a maruštu imḫuršû-ma
ediššišu innabit ana mât Naba'âti.

COL. VIII.

1. U'âte'a mâr Ḫazâ'ili,
mâr aḫi abi ša U'âte'a mâr Bir-Dadda,
ša râmânšu iškunu
ana šarrûti mât Aribi,
5. il Ašûr, šar ilâni, šadû rabû,
ṭenšu ušannî-ma
illika adî maḫrî'a
ana kullum tanitti il Ašûr
u ilâni rabûti belê'a.
10. annu kabtu emidsû-ma
šigâru aškunšû-ma
itti ASI kalbi arkussû-ma
ušanṣiršu abulli qabal al Ninu'a
Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti.

George Smith, in his *History of Assurbanipal*, p. 260, translates as follows: "Vaiteh, misfortune happened to him, and alone he fled to Nabatea. Vaiteh, son of Hazail, brother[1] of the father of Vaiteh son of Birvul,[2] who himself appointed[2] to the kingdom of Arabia; Assur, king of the Gods,[3] the strong and mighty,[3] a decree repeated, and he came to my presence. To satisfy the law of Assur and the great Gods my lords, a heavy judgment took him, and in chains I placed him, and with ASI and dogs I bound him, and caused him to be kept in the great gate in the midst of Nineveh Nirib-barnagti-adnati."

[1] *was* brother.
[2-2] Bir-daddi, whom the people of his country appointed.
[3-3] The strong mountain.

This translation is repeated in George Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, seventh edition, London, 1883, p. 136, ll. 7–18. The unessential corrections which are made there I have indicated in the foot-notes.

M. Joachim Ménant, in his *Annales des rois d' Assyrie*. Paris. 1874, p. 271, renders this passage: "Shamaïti, atteint par les revers, s'enfuit vers le pays de Nabaïti (les Nabathéens). Shamaïti, fils de Haza-ilu, frère du père de Samaïti, fils de Bir-bin, s'étant mis de lui-même à la tête du royaume d'Aribi, Assur le puissant, le terrible, le roi des Dieux, lui donna un ordre et il vint en ma présence. Pour satisfaire aux décrets d'Assur et des Grand-Dieux, mes Seigneurs, il subit un jugement sévère. Je l'ai chargé de chaînes, je l'ai lié avec des ASI et des chiens et je l'ai fait conduire devant les grands portiques de Ninua."—

From these translations, it is not clear why Sardanapalus should have inflicted such a cruel punishment upon Wâteh. For, apparently, the Arabian sheikh was guilty only of having come to Nineveh. At other times, Sardanapalus, like his royal ancestors, showed mercy even to obstinate rebels, when they voluntarily presented themselves at the Assyrian capital.

The king says that he imposed upon Wâteh a heavy annu. Annu is punishment for *sin*. It corresponds to the Hebrew אָוֹן[1] (Num. XXIII., 21; Job XXXVI., 21; Isa. I., 13), and means primarily "worthlessness, iniquity, sinfulness," then also the punishment for this; even as in Hebrew עָוֹן (from עָוָה) Isa. V., 18; עֲוֹלָה Hos. X., 13; and חַטָּאת Zech. XIV., 19 and Prov. XXI., 4 also mean "punishment for sin."

What sin had Wâteh committed? The mention thereof must be contained in the words kullum tanitti il Ašûr. Wâteh came to Nineveh, to kullum the majesty of Assur. It is clear that kullum in this connection cannot mean "satisfy," but "insult, slight." Kullum is the construct state of the Infinitive Pā"ēl of כלם.[2] Cf. Hebr. נִכְלָמִים 2 Sam. X., 5 and 1 Chron. XIX., 5 (LXX. ἠτιμωμένοι).

But what induced Wâteh to go to Nineveh and insult the national deity of Assyria in the presence of the Assyrian king? The royal annals say, il Ašûr ṭenšu ušannî. This does not mean, "Assur a decree he repeated" (?!) or "Assur lui donna un ordre," but "The god Assur had smitten him with insanity."

It is true that ušannî may mean "he repeated," corresponding to the Hebr.

---

[1] Assyrian annu, of course, does not come from a stem און, mediæ ו, but from a stem mediæ geminatæ, אנן. Instead of annu we also find (with resolution of the doubling by the insertion of a ר) arnu, construct state aran (e.g. Sennach. Sm. 60, 6). Cf. Hebr. אַרְנֶבֶת *hare*, Lev. XI., 6; Deut. XIV., 7 (Arabic arnab) = annabtu, feminine to Assyr. annabu, an intensive form of the stem אנב *to spring* (Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, London, 1883, p. 65); Aramæan כּוּרְסְיָא *throne* (Arabic kursiyy) for כִּסֵּא, Hebr. כִּסֵּא, Assyr. kussû (= Akkadian guza); דַּרְמָשֶׁק in the book of Chronicles for דַּמֶּשֶׂק, Assyrian Dimashqu or Dimmashqu (genitive, *i* or *a*), Arabic Dimashqu and Dimishqu. The construct state of arnu = annu, aran, is *Analogiebildung*. Cf. my remarks in Schrader's *KAT.* pp. 498 and 582/3.

[2] On another stem כלם see Lyon, *Sargonstexte*, p. 73, and Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, p. 51.

שָׁנָה, e. g., II R. 39, 9 f. šunnî-šû-ma *repeat it, say it a second time*, Akkadian ša-munni-gu-tab;[1] or *he reported*, corresponding to the Aramæan תַּנִּי, e. g. allâku ḫanṭu illiká-ma ušannâ âti (cf. Hebr. אֹתִי) *a courier came and reported to me;* ušanni, however, like the Hebrew שָׁנָה, means also "to change, to alter." In *ASKT.* 51, 58/9, therefore, ušannî appears as the synonym of unâkir, from the stem נכר. According to the notations which I have introduced in my *Sumerische Familiengesetze*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 20, n. 3, šunnû *to repeat, to report*, has a שׁ[1] (= Arabic ث), while šunnû *to change, to alter*, has a שׁ[3] (= Syriac ܫ). With š$_1$unnû is connected šinâ *two*, šânû (= šâniyu) *second* (feminine šânîtu); with š$_3$unnû *to change*, šattu (construct šanat, plural šanâti) *year* (Aram. שַׁתָּא, constr. שְׁנַת).

Ṭenšu[2] stands for ṭemšu; מ before ד, ט, ת, ם and ש was pronounced like נ in Assyrian. Hence we find ṣindu *team, span*, for ṣimdu (צמד);[3] mundaḫṣe *warriors*, for mumdaḫṣe, plural of mundaḫṣu = mundaḫiṣu = mumdaḫiṣu, Participle to amdáḫiṣ = amtáḫiṣ[4] *I fought*, from מחץ, Aramaic מיחא;[5] innindu *he was placed*, for innimdu, yan'amidu, Hebr. יַעֲמֹד; mandûdu *length*, for mamdûdu, from madâdu *to be extended*;[6] nindágara *let us listen to each other*, V R. 1, 125, for nimdágara; undînâ, *Nimrod Epic*, 45, 85, for umdînâ, yumtanni'a; perhaps also sându *shoham stone*, for sâmdu, sâmtu, sahmatu (Hebrew שֹׁהַם);[7] uduntu *blood*, for udumtu (אדם). burrûntu *dark-colored* (feminine of burrûmu); ḫanṭu *swift*, for ḫamṭu, from חמט, ḫamâṭu (Imperfect *u*, see Haupt's *Nimrod Epic*, 78, arkišunu ardud aḫmuṭ urriḫ, cf. urriḫa kakkešu, V R. 4, 8, a denominal Pā"ēl from urḫu *road, march*) *to flare, to tremble, to hasten;* ušantil *I extended*, Imperfect to šumṭulu (*ASKT.* 175) *to extend*, Shaphel of

[1] Var. tagh. See *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* of June 6, 1882, p. 112, and my *Akkadische Sprache*, Berlin, 1883, p. xxxiii.

[2] Cf. ṭenšunu, Assurbanipal Sm. 249, j; išbat ṭenšu, Haupt, *Nimrod Epic*, 60, 12.

[3] Cf. Arabic عندي = Hebrew יַעֲמִדִי; HEBRAICA, p. 175, n. 1.

[4] Cf. amdáḫar *I received*, for amtáḫar, Ifte'al of מחר; umdallû *they filled*, for yumtalli'û; umdaššer (Assurb. Sm. 198 undiššer) *I was deserted* for umtaššer, umtaššir (*r* on account of the following ר), reflexive-passive stem of the Pa"el muššuru (see my BAL. 91, 2); tâmdu *sea* = tâmtu, tâmatu, tahmatu, a by-form of ti'âmdu = ti'âmtu, tihâmatu, feminine to the Hebrew תְּהוֹם. Ti'âmdu may be the same word as the Arabic تِهَامَة Tihâme, the name of the sandy stretch of coast along the Red Sea. Cf. the Assyrian name mât Tâmdim or mât Marratim (Hebr. מרתים, Jer. l., 21) for the southernmost part of Lower Babylonia (Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 182), and the Greek Πόντος, Latin *Pontus*, for the district in the north-east of Asia Minor, on the coast of the Pontus Euxinus.—For the *e* in umdaššer instead of umdaššir, cf. umaššera, V R. 1, 45 and 112; uštešera V R. 1, 68; 2, 127; 3, 28; 4, 113; 5, 65; Haupt, *Nimrod Epic*, 10, 46; ugammeru, *Tig.*, vi., 37; namerišu, *Tig.*, vii., 100; unammera *I made brilliant*, Esarhaddon (Budge), 74, 48; za'erî'a, *Tig.*, viii., 32; za'erût, *Tig.*, viii., 41, etc., etc.

[5] See my "Beitraege zur assyrischen Lautlehre" in the Goettingen *Nachrichten* of March 3, 1883, p. 97. I cite this essay as *BAL.*

[6] מדד *to measure* (Imperfect imdud, ASKT. 65, 27) is a denominal verb, and means properly "to determine the extension, the length, of a thing."

[7] See Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 131, 27.

מטל; šanšu *sun*, for šamšu;[1] tanšîlu *likeness*, for tamšîlu, Infinitive Pā"ēl of משל; ḫanšâ *fifty*, for ḫamšâ (Ethiopic ḫamsâ) and ḫanšu *fifth*, for ḫâm(i)šu, kansaku for kamsaku[2] *I bow* from kamâsu, (Impf. ikmis), etc.

Ṭemu is the form qatl of the stem טעם, and stands for ṭa'mu, like belu *lord* (fem. beltu, construct belit, plural beleti = belâti) for ba'lu, Hebr. בַּעַל; remu *mercy*, for raḥmu, Hebr. רַחֲמִים; šeru *morning*, for šaḥru, Hebr. שַׁחַר; ṣeru *wilderness*, *field*, for ṣaḥru, Arabic صحراء ṣaḥrâ', plural صحارى Sahara; rešu *head*, for ra'šu, Hebr. רֹאשׁ, Aram. רֵאשָׁא; ṣenu *flock*, for ṣa'nu, Hebr. צֹאן. Cf. my *Familiengesetze*, p. 66, and my *BAL.* p. 94, n. 2.

Ordinarily the Assyrian ṭemu means "report, message, order," e. g. ṭemu utîrûni *they brought the message*, cf. Hebrew טַעַם, Jonah III., 7.[3] In the combination ṭemu ušannî, however, ṭemu, like the Hebr. טַעַם, means "understanding, intellect."[4] Ṭenšu ušannî[5] accordingly means "he altered his intellect," or "alienated his reason," "deprived him of reason." The expression answers exactly to the Hebr. וַיְשַׁנּוֹ אֶת-טַעְמוֹ, 1 Sam. XXI., 14; cf. לְדָוִד בְּשַׁנּוֹתוֹ אֶת-טַעְמוֹ[6] in the superscription of Ps. XXXIV. So also in Syriac we have the expression שַׁנִּי טַעֲמֵהּ *mutavit saporem suum*, for "he pretended to be insane," and the Participle Qal שָׁנֵיא means *insipidus*, *delirus*, *insanus*, whence שָׁנְיוּתָא *amentia*, *insania*.

---

[1] Cf. Hebrew נשׁה *to forget* = Assyrian mašû, Imperfect imšî *he forgot*; דֶּשֶׁן *fat* = Arabic dasim, etc. The נ in these stems is due to a partial assimilation of the מ to the dental sibilant.

[2] See my remarks in Dr. Flemming's *Nebukadnezar*, p. 38, 62.

[3] Cf. also IV R. 67, 58a (*SFG.* 64, 7) and *ib.* 54, 8–12a = Smith *Assurbanipal*, 297: ana elî ša šarru beli'a ṭe-e-me iškunannî umma: ṭem ša Arabi mala tašimmû šuprâ alakti-šî (in Hebrew transcription אן עלי ששר ביעל טעכא ישכנני אם טעם שערב כל תשמע שפרה הלכת שיא) *on account of the fact that the king my lord gave orders to me, saying: "News of the Arabians, which thou hearest, send here* (properly *this way*)." Compare moreover Assurb. Sm. 38, 13: urruḫiš ṭemu aškunšunûti; ib. 124: išákanka ṭemu; 134 uqâ'û pân šikin ṭemî'a; 154 idágalû pân šakân ṭemî'a; 172 iškunšunûti ṭemu; 180 ušannušu šikin ṭemî'a; 198 and 248 ṭe-e-mu ša Elamti; Haupt's *Nimrod Epic* 1, 6 ub-la ṭe-e-ma.

[4] Cf. ša lâ îšû ṭemu u milki, Sennacherib Sm. 116, 23; lâ râš ṭemi u milki, ib. 111, 3; ṭemi u milki Assurb. Sm. 9, 2 (V R. 17, 4 and 5 c), etc., etc.

[5] Cf. also ṭenšu tušannû III R. 35, No. 6, l. 60 = Smith, *Assurbanipal*, 292 x.; ušannî ṭenša Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestuecke*, Leipzig, 1878, p. 83, 5; III R. 38, 12 and 13:—Kudurnanḫundi Elamû ša nîš ilâni rabûti lâ [iṣṣurû] ša ina ša-ni-e ṭe-e-me ana emûq râmânišu [ittaklu] *Kudurnanhundi, the Elamite, who did not* [*keep*] *the oath of the great gods, who, in the distortion of his mind,* [*trusted*] *in his own power.* Assurbanipal Sm. 135: nikis qaqqadi Te'umman belišunu qirib ali Ninua emurû-ma ša-ni-e ṭe-e-mi iṣbatsunûti. Umbadarâ ibquma ziqnâšu (cf. ibáqam ziknâšu ib. 142 and qaqqaru ušešir ina ziqnîšu ib. 161 and V R. 4, 29; for the form ziqnâšu with long â before the suffix cf. arnâšu V R. 3, 17, and ḫîṭâšu Deluge IV, 15) Nabû-damiq ina paṭri parzilli šibbišu išḫula karassu *When they saw the cutting off of the head of Te'umman, their lord, in the city of Nineveh, fury overcame them: Umbadara tore his beard, Nebodamiq with the iron sword of his girdle pierced through his own body.* Cf. also Sennacherib Sm. 119, 23: ušannû milik ṭemîšu.

[6] מ with Dagesh orthophonicum; cf. Stade, *Hebr. Grammatik*, § 40.

Accordingly I translate the whole passage as follows: When misfortune overtook Wâteh (the son of Birdadda) he fled alone to the land of the Nabatheans. Wâteh, the son of Hazael, however—the cousin of Wâteh-mâr-Birdadda, who had made himself king of Arabia—the god Assur, the king of the gods, the great mountain, alienated his reason, so that he came into my presence to slight the majesty of the god Assur and the great gods, my lords. A heavy penalty I imposed upon him, placing him in a cage and binding him fast together with young (?) dogs. Thus I made him watch at the great gate of the wall of Ninua (which bears the name) Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti.

I add a few words for the explanation of the text.

Col. VII., l. 123.—The name Wâteh is written in Assyrian U-a-a-te-'. It is evidently the nomen agentis of an Arabic verb primæ و and tertiæ gutturalis (ا, ء, ح, ع, or غ) perhaps = واتع or واتح. The *e* in Uâte'u represents the pronunciation of the *i* before a guttural. Instead of U-a-a-te-'u we find in other passages I-a-u-ta-'u, e. g. III R. 34, 23 and 28a, 34 and 37b (Assurbanipal Sm., 283, 87; 287, 22 and 27). Iauta'u seems to correspond to an Arabic form يَوْتَع,[1] a name like يَتْحَق,[2] يَقْطَن, يَعْقُب, يَدْلَه, يَدْبَش, يَبْشَم, يَاْئِر (afterwards מֵאִיר,[3] i. e. the frequent name of German Jews, *Meyer*), also יַהְוֶה. Cf. also the name of the Arabian tribe I-sa-am-me[4]-'u (this was read Ishâme'u, with שׁ, at the time of Sardanapalus, see my *BAL.*) V R. 8, l. 110, i. e. يَسْمَع,[5] with an accented *a*-vowel after the first stem-consonant, a formation like the Assyrian išâbir *he breaks*, inâdin *he gives*, irâbiṣ *he couches*, etc. (*BAL.* 98), or the Ethiopic isâmĕ', isâbĕr, etc. Accordingly this oldest Semitic verbal form[6] of which I have treated in my article in vol. x. of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1878, p. 244 seq., was still in existence, at least in proper names, at the time of Sardanapalus not only in Assyrian and Ethiopic, but also in Arabic dialects. The name Isâme'u is a positive proof for this fact.

U-a-a-te-'u is the form qâtil or Participle, and I-a-u-ta-'u the form yaqtalu or Imperfect, of the stem ותא; the relation is the same as between יָאִיר and מֵאִיר. But that I-a-'i-lu-u, Ia'ilû on the Esarhaddon Cylinder (I R. 46, 20a), as is generally assumed,[7] is only a modification of the same name,

[1] Cf. the Arabic imperfect forms يورع yaura'u, يوجل yaujalu, يوجع yauja'u, يوجى yaujâ, يوحم yauḥamu, etc.

[2] Cf. F. Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur hebraeischen Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 140; Stade, *Hebraeische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, § 259a.

[3] Cf. Lagarde, *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi*, Lipsiæ, 1874, p. 154.

[4] *E* instead of *i* again, on account of the following guttural.

[5] Delitzsch, *Paradies*, 298, reminds us of the biblical name מִשְׁמַע Gen. xxv., 14; 1 Chron. i., 30; cf. also 1 Chron. iv., 25.

[6] Cf. also Koenig, *Aethiopische Studien*, Leipzig 1877, pp. 82/3.

[7] See, e. g., Smith, *Assurbanipal*, 298; Budge, *Esarhaddon*, 52; Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. I., Stuttgart, 1884, p. 550. Cf., on the other hand, Schrader, *KGF.* 54.

I regard as impossible. U-a-a-te-'u[1] mâr Ḫa-za-ili was evidently a brother of Ia'ilû. The latter name is combined by Schrader (*KAT.* 25, n.) with the Hebr. יוֹאֵל; ilû, however, cannot be = אֵל, but represents, as appears from the long û at the end, אֱלָהּ, Arabic ilâhun; so that Ia'ilû is = יְהוֹ+אֱלָהּ, i. e. "Yah is God."

maruštu corresponds to the Akkadian nin-giga (Sumerian am-giga); see *ASKT.* 43, 38, and compare Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, p. 186, 76. It is a form like šamuktum, II R. 32, 32c, or anuntu, V R. 9, 82.

imḫuršû-ma means literally "it was over against him, it faced him." On the stem מָחַר see Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 124/5. The length of the *u* in the suffix šû is owing to the influence of the enclitic ma *and*. That the suffix šu also in other cases has a long vowel cannot be proved.

Line 124.—edišši-šu *he alone* is a denominative derivative from edu *one* (= âdu, a'adu, aḫadu) Hebr. אֶחָד (= aḫḫad).

innabit is the Imperfect Niphal from abâtu *to perish* = Hebr. אבד, where the ד is due to a partial assimilation of the ת to the ב, as in כָּבֵד *heavy* = Assyr. kab(i)tu. See my article in the *Andover Review* of July, 1884, "The Language of Nimrod, the Kashite," p. 98, n. 1. innabit stands for ינאבת in'abit, see my *Familiengesetze*, p. 10, 1. This regressive assimilation of the first stem-consonant takes place only with stems פ"א; cf. innamir *he was seen*, from אמר, innitqa (= ינאתק) *he was carried away*, from עתק = אתק (Delitzsch, *Paradies*, 304), innirišu *it is planted* = ينغرش (yan'arašu, yan'erašu, yan'erišu, innerišu, innirišu) IV R. 7, 53a, inmimmedu *it is placed* = Hebr. יְעֻמַּד IV R. 7, 54a.[2] In other cases the prefix נ is assimilated to the first stem-consonant, even in the case of stems פ"י, e. g. i'aldû *they were born* (IV R. 15, 22a and 2b) for iwwaldû (Hebr. יִוָּלְדוּ) = inwalidû.[3] We find also the same formation from אבת, with a somewhat different signification, however: ekallâti i'abtâ *the palaces were ruined* (*Tig.* VI. 99, sing. 'i-a-bit, VIII. 4). i'abtâ is = יאבתא, with tešdîded א, and this = ינאבתא, with assimilation of the vowelless נ to the following א. Cf. also Haupt, *ASKT.* 76, 2 and 10.

Na-ba-a-a-ti is to be read neither Nabâti nor Nabaiti, but Naba'âti;[4] so also ta-a-a-ar-ti-ia *my return* ta'ârtî'a, da-a-a-nu *judge* da'ânu, ḫa-a-a-al-tu *army* (*KAT.* 74) ḫa'âltu, da-a-a-aš-tu *treading* da'âštu, not târtî'a, dânu, ḫâltu, dâštu. a-a, after a syllable ending in *a*, is not the sign of prolongation only, but â with preceding hiatus.[5] Naba'âti stands for Nabayâti,

[1] Schrader, in the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy of March 4, 1880, p. 276, reads Uaiti' and considers it a diminutive form.

[2] Cf. *Zeitschrift fuer Keilschriftforschung*, vol. I., Munich, 1884, p. 286, ll. 53 and 54.

[3] Cf. V R. 1, 27: ashar Assurahaddin abu banî'a qiribshu i'aldu, *where Esarhaddon the father my begetter had been born;* Haupt, *Nimrod Epic*, p. 5, l. 23.

[4] Cf. the form Ni-ba-'-a-ti, Niba'âti, IV R. 54, 13a (Smith, *Assurbanipal*, 297, 13).

[5] Cf., however, sa-a-a-i-du (with ص) *ASKT.* 32, 702; *SFG.* 64, 6.

Hebr. נְבִיוֹת. In Assyrian, intervocalic ' becomes א; cf. â'u *who* (*SFG.* 64, 7) = ayyu, zâ'iru *enemy*, ḫâ'iru *husband*, dâ'išu *crushing*, = zâyiru, ḫâyiru, dâyišu;[1] uqâ'iš *I presented* = uqâyiš, uqayyiš; qâtâ'a *my hands*, înâ'a *my eyes*, šepâ'a *my feet*, birkâ'a *my knees*, dîmâ'a *my tears*, idâ'a *my arms*, = qâtâya, înâya, etc.; pânû'a *my face*, abû'a *my father*, râšû'a *my head*, (*Sennacherib*, V. 56) = pânúya, abúya, ra'šúya; Kaldâ'a *Chaldean* = Kašdáya;[2] re'u *shepherd* = reyu, ra'yu;[3] išâ'u (V R. 8, 88) or iše'u[4] *he seeks* = išâyu (iša'yu, iša'ayu) etc., etc.

Col. VIII., l. 1.—On mâru *child* (fem. mârtu *daughter*) see my remarks in Schrader's *KAT.* 508, s. v. מאר.

Ḫazâ'ilu is = חֲזָאֵל, also written חֲזָהאֵל. See Schrader, *KAT.* 551, s. v. חזאל. The writing Ḫa-za-a-ilu (Delitzsch, *Paradies*, 304) III R. 24, 9a, is a mistake for Ḫa-za-ilu-a; and *a* in this case is the Akkadian ideogram for ablu, construct abil, bil, bal (= Aram. בַּר!) *son* (Akkadian ibila).

Line 2.—Whether the Akkadian ideogram tur-šeš-ad or a-šeš-ad *child* (or *son*) *of the brother of the father*, was read in Assyrian mâr aḫi abi, or whether it was reproduced by a single word for "cousin," cannot be decided.

Birdadda is the Old Testament name בֶּן הֲדַד. The name signifies "son of Dadda," the Syrian god of the atmosphere, Adad in Macrobius, sat. 1, 23 (Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 750). Cf. Schrader, *KGF.* 539; *KAT.* 454; Theo. G. Pinches "Upon the name Ben-hadad," in the *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archæology of Feb. 6, 1883, p. 71. Delitzsch (*Paradies*, p. 298) combines the name Birdadda with the name of one of the three friends of Job, בִּלְדַּד הַשּׁוּחִי. Bil in Bildad represents the intermediate steps between the Assyrian ablu, (a)bil, and the Aramæan בַּר.[5] In the latter the vowel *a* is due to the influence of the ר; cf. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, § 17; *Syrische Grammatik*, § 54. The Aramæan בַּר, therefore, is not a dialectical modification of בֶּן,[6] but an Akkadian loan-word. That Assyrian ablu *son*, is of Akkadian origin[7] I

[1] Cf. HEBRAICA, p. 179.

[2] Cf. the Biblical Aramæan קְרִי: כַּשְׂדָּאֵה, plural כַּשְׂדָּאֵי, for the כתיב: כַּשְׂדָּיָא, כַּשְׂדָּיֵא, etc. See Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaeischen*, Leipzig, 1884, § 11, 1b.

[3] See my article in the *Andover Review*, l. c., p. 97, n. 2.

[4] The א in išhe'u stands for ', but the א in the imperfect tash'u-m *Deluge*, I., 7 (*ASKT.* 55, 4), is an א = ע. The א in the Infinitive Ifta"'al shite'u or shute'u and in the Participle mushte'u or multe'u, again is = ', multe'u is = multeyu, multa'(i)yu. multene'u is = multane'u multaneyu, multana'yu, mushtana'iyu.

[5] Cf. the Syriac forms: בְּרִי *my son*, בְּרכוֹן *your son*, בְּרהוֹן *their son* (not בַּרכוֹן, בַּרהוֹן with *a*); the ĭ here is the original vowel, Noeldeke's *Syrische Grammatik*, §§ 146 and 54.

[6] Cf. Fleischer, in Levy's *Neuhebraeisches Woerterbuch*, vol. I., Leipzig, 1876, p. 287.

[7] Friedrich Delitzsch in his review of Dr. Hommel's essay *Die sumero-akkadische Sprache und ihre Verwandtschaftsverhaeltnisse* (Separatabdruck aus der *Zeitschrift f. Keilschriftforschung*) in a recent number of the Leipzig *Literarisches Centralblatt* thinks ablu a genuine Semitic word, as well as gushuru *beam*, labiru *old*, turahu *steinbock*, qanu *read;* etlu and etelu *lord*, etc. I, however, still maintain that ablu is of Akkadian origin.

have already maintained in *SFG.* 9; cf. also Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, p. 2; Haupt, *ASKT.* 184. The word ibira, which in Akkadian means "field-laborer," seems also to be related to this Akkadian ibila *son*; cf. *ASKT.* 214, No. 70.

Lines 3 and 4.—ša râmânšu iškunu ana šarrûti mât Aribi *who had made himself king of Arabia* (ana šarrûti literally *to the kingdom*) refers not to Wâteh the son of Hazael, but to Wâteh the son of Birdadda, who had fled to the Nabatheans. The successor of Hazael had been, first, his son Ia'ilû. After the death of the latter, as it seems, his brother Wâteh-ben-Hazael had the next claim to the throne; but the cousin of Ia'ilû and Wâteh-ben-Hazael, Wâteh-ben-Birdadda, usurped the dominion.

râmânu means literally "highness" (stem רום) and then like nafs *soul*, in Arabic, or rees *head*, in Ethiopic, it is used as a reflexive pronoun. Cf., e. g., Arabic القيت نفسى في دجلة alqaitu nafsî (or bi-nafsî) fî Dijlata *I threw myself into the Tigris;* Ethiopic rassáya reesô káma za-idáwî *he gave himself out to be ill, pretended illness* (German, *er stellte sich an wie einer, der krank ist*), Dillmann, *Ethiopic Chrestomathy*, p. 24, l. 4. See also Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache*, Karlsruhe, 1884, §§ 31 and 90d.

šadû rabû (Akkadian kur-gal, IV R. 27, 15a) *the great mountain* or *rock*, is a common epithet of Assur and Bêl in Assyrian, e. g., Sennach. Sm. 2, 4; 4, 2; 6, 10, etc. Cf. Ps. XVIII., 3:—יְהוָה סַלְעִי ... אֵלִי צוּרִי אֶחֱסֶה־בּוֹ, *Yahveh is my rock.... my God, my mountain*[1] *wherein I find refuge.* צור is = Aram. טור *mountain.*[2] Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, London, 1883, p. 48, calls attention to the Assyrian proper name Ilušadû'a *God is my rock* or *mountain.* He also regards the Hebrew שַׁדַּי as only an intensive form of this Assyrian šadû. But this I still consider doubtful.

Line. 7.—illika *he came*, does not stand, as is commonly assumed, for i'lika, with assimilation of the aspirate, but it is an analogical formation after the stems פ"ן. The Hebrew יֵלֵךְ, on the other hand, is an analogical formation after the stems פ"ן.

Line 8.—tanittu *majesty*, stands for tanidtu, taniddatu, tanihdatu, stem נהד, from which we have na'idu *lofty.* Cf. *SFG.* 29, 4; Assurb. Sm. 7, 36; 248; 318; V R, 1, 36; *KGF.* 165, 27, etc., etc. Alongside of tanittu there also occurs tanâtu. This stands for tanâttu = tanâdtu = tanâdatu = tanahdatu. The plural is tanâdâti.

Line 10.—kabtu is syncopated from kabitu (intransitive participle of kabâtu) whence its construct state is kabit, and the feminine kabittu. Cf. namru (construct namir, feminine namirtu) *bright, clear* = Arabic نمر

---

[1] Cf. the use of רוֹמֵם in בְּצוּר יְרוֹמְמֵנִי Psalm xxvii. 5; כִּן־קַנְאִי תְּרוֹמְמֵנִי Psalm xviii., 49.

[2] Cf. the name Ταῦρος, Taurus, Kiepert, *Manual of Ancient Geography*, London, 1881, p. 20. See also Olshausen, in the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy of July 10, 1879, p. 559.

namir, damqu, feminine damiqtu *propitious*, gamru, feminine gamirtu *complete*, qardu, feminine qarittu *valiant;* baṭlu, feminine baṭiltu *ceasing*, šadlu, feminine šadiltu *wide*, etc., etc.

Line 11.—In ši-ga-ru the *a* is long, as appears from the orthography ši-gar-ru, col. VIII. 111 (Smith, *Assurbanipal*, 281, 93, si-gar-ru with סְ (?)), hence šigâru. The word is not of Semitic origin, as is supposed by Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, p. 46, but is an Akkadian loan-word. The Akkadian form is sigar = Sumerian simar. Cf. *ASKT.* 43, 40; II R. 23, 32c; IV R. 17, 5a; 18, 28b; 20, No. 2, 3. In Ezek. XIX., 9 this Akkadian sigar *cage*, appears in the form סוגַר — וַיִּתְּנֻהוּ בַּסּוגַר בַּחַחִים וַיְבִיאֻהוּ אֶל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל: *posueruntque eum in caveâ cum uncinis (per nares transfixis) et duxerunt eum ad regem Babyloniæ.* Cf. *Liber Ezechielis*, ed. Baer, Lipsiæ, 1884, p. xv. בן אשר punctuates this ἅπαξ λεγόμενον as בַּסּוגַרֹ ו מלרע; בן נפתלי, on the other hand, as בְּסוֹגַרֹ ו מִלְעֵיל. Instead of סוגר, however, we should read סיגר.

Line 12.—itti asi kalbi arkussu *I bound him with the asi of dogs.* itti can only mean "along with," "at the side of," not "with the aid of." For the latter we should have ina, not itti. Accordingly asi cannot mean "chain" or "collar," but must be a particular kind of dog, perhaps the young of dogs, pups, puppies.[1] The Assyrian word for "pup" seems to be mîrânu (for مهران) a derivative of mâru, mîru, mûru *young, child;* cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, p. 36; Schrader, *KAT.* 346, 8. mâru and mîrânu are connected with the verb umâ'eru. Participle mumâ'er, etc. Whether asi be an Akkadian ideogram, or an Assyrian word phonetically written, cannot be decided.

ittu (Hebr. אֵת) is, as I pointed out in the last number of the HEBRAICA, p. 178, n. 5, the feminine to idu *hand, side*, and therefore stands for idtu; cf. šimidtu *team*, for šimittu, ilittu *birth*, for ilidtu, kišittu *property*, for kišidtu, abuttu *field-labor*, for abudtu (Hebr. עֲבֹדָה), ma'attu for ma'adtu, fem. of ma'adu *much* (cf. Hebr. מְאֹד), Hebr. אַחֹת aḥḥât (Geez, aḥattî) for aḥḥádt, fem. of אֶחָד *one*, Ethiopic walatt *daughter* = waladt, ולדת, Arab. 'abattu *I have served* for عبدت 'abadtu. idtu is a form like bintu *daughter*, V R. 2, 70. The plural itâti alongside of idâti (cf. Delitzsch, in Lotz's *Tiglathpileser*, 116) is an analogical form. Cf. above our remarks on aran, construct state of arnu = annu, p. 219, n. 1. That the Hebrew אֵת cannot be the feminine of the Assyrian ina (Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, Göttingen, 1884, p. 226) I have already remarked, *ASKT.* 194.

arkus-šu *I bound him.* Generally s+š, just like š+š, s+š, z+š, becomes *ss*; e. g. ulabbissu *I clothed him* for ulabbiš-šu, murussu (IV R. 29, 50c; *SFG.* 26, 7) *his sickness* for muruṣ-šu (murṣu, = Arabic مرض marad, Aram. מַרְעָא), izûssu *he allotted to him* for izûz-šu, iqîssu *I presented to him* for

[1] Cf. on the other hand Budge, *The History of Esarhaddon*, London, 1880, p. 133, s. v. ASI, and Delitzsch's *Assyrische Studien*, p. 35; Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, p. 198, n. 3.

iqîš-šu (*ASKT.* 46, 35 and 36), rupussa *her width* for rupuš-ša (*Deluge*, I. 26; *Sennacherib Sm.* 163, 23) etc., etc. The verb רכס *to bind together, to bind to*, which is quite common in Assyrian, occurs in the Old Testament in only two places, namely, Exod. XXVIII., 28; XXXIX., 21:—וְיִרְכְּסוּ אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן מִטַּבְּעֹתָיו אֶל־טַבָּעֹת הָאֵפוֹד בִּפְתִיל תְּכֵלֶת, *and they shall bind the Hoshen* (i. e. the breast-plate of the high-priest) *from its rings to the rings of the ephod with threads of violet-purple.*

Line 13. -ušanṣir is the Shaphel of naṣâru, Imperfect iṣṣur, Imperative uṣur. As a rule, vowelless נ, as in Hebrew, is assimilated to the following consonant; e. g. appu *face*, šattu *year*, šuttu *sleep, dream*, aššatu *wife*, nappašu *air-hole*, maṣṣartu *watch*, maddattu *tribute* (= mandantu), zibbatu *tail*, libittu *brick*, imittu *right side* (feminine to imnu = yaminu), kettu *righteousness*, akkis *I cut off*, aqqur *I destroyed*, assuḫ *I carried away*, abbî *I called*, taššuka *she bit*, iššiq *he kissed*, iddin *he gave*, aššî *I lifted up*, ikkir *he was hostile*, izziz *he established himself*, etc., etc. Cf. Hebrew אַפַּיִם (Aram. אַנְפִּין), שָׁנָה (Aram. שַׁתָּא), שֵׁנָה (Aram. שְׁנָתָא), אִשָּׁה (Aram. אַנְתְּתָא), Arabic منفس manfas, Aram. מַטַּרְתָּא, Hebr. מִדָּה Neh. v., 4 (Aram. Ezra IV., 13; VII., 24 מִנְדָּה, Syriac מַדַּ[א]תָּא *SFG.* 16, 4), Hebr. לְבֵנָה, זָנָב (Aram. לִבְנְתָּא, יָמִין (לִבְתָּא, בֵּן (Aram. כְּאנָא, כֵּינָא), Aram. נְכַס, Hebr. קִרְקַר, נָסַח, נָבָא, נָשַׁךְ (Aram. נְכַת), נָתַן, נָשָׁא, נָכַר, Ethiopic nâzáza (*KAT.* 511, s. v. נזז).

Instances in which the נ is retained as in enzu *goat* (Hebr. עֵז, Arabic عنز) bintu *daughter*, enšu *feeble*, mandattu *tribute*, manzazu *resting place*, sinûntu or (with partial regressive assimilation of the feminine ת) sinûndu *swallow* (Aram. סְנוּנִיתָא), etc., are relatively rare. In the stem נצר we find also in Hebrew, as is well known, alongside of יָצַר (with assimilation of the נ) the uncontracted form יִנְצֹר.

ka-gal means in Akkadian "large gate." In the vocabulary Sm. 12 (V R. 13) which treats of the different kinds of watches, this word is rendered in Assyrian by abullu. We find, in line 19, Akkadian ennun-kagal = Assyr. mâṣarti abulli. mâṣartu is = maṣṣartu, manṣartu, like mâdattu *tribute* = maddattu, mandantu, from nadânu *to give*. abullu is the Aram. אַבּוּלָא *city-gate, entrance in the city-wall*, which has usually been wrongly connected with the Greek *ἐμβολή*. Cf. Delitzsch, in the Additions to the German edition of George Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, Leipzig, 1876, p. 298; *Hebrew and Assyrian*, p. 24, n. 1.

qablu (Akkadian murub, synon. ib) is usually translated "midst," being probably regarded as a metathesis of the Arabic qalb *heart*. But how can an אַבּוּלָא be in the midst of a city? In the bilingual fragment IV R. 29, No. 2, qablu is found along with qaqqadu *head* (cf. Hebr. קָדְקֹד), napištu (plural

napšâti) *soul* (Hebr. נֶפֶשׁ, plur. נְפָשׁוֹת; Aram. נַפְשָׁא,[1] plur. נַפְשָׁתָא), kišâdu (plur. kišâdâti = Ethiopic kĕsâdât) *neck*, irtu[2] *breast*, and qâtu *hand*. In the legend of the descent of the goddess Istar into Hades (IV R. 31, 54a) we read that, after having passed through the fifth gate, the keeper of the Under-world took from the goddess šibbu ša qabliša. šibbu is, as we have already mentioned in the HEBRAICA, p. 175, the "girdle;" qablu must therefore mean, as a part of the body, "waist." The qablu of a city, however, is the *enceinte* or surrounding wall. In Assurbânipal, Smith, 317a, (cf. III R. 34, col. b, 50), therefore, qablu has the determinative BAD *wall*, Assyr. dûru: dûr qabal ali ša Ninua. qabal tâmdi, likewise, does not mean the midst of the ocean, but the zone of the sea immediately surrounding the continent, the sea near the shore. This is important for geographical statements in the cuneiform inscriptions. The Phœnician city Arados (Hebr. אַרְוָד) for example, is called al Armada ša qabal tâmdim,[3] i. e. it was situated on an island near the continent. Also the island of Cyprus to be sure is frequently called mât Atnâna ša qabal tâmdim; see Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 291.

---

[1] נַפְשָׁא is not = נַפָּשׁ, and this = nafsh, but stands for nafish, the regular construct state of napishu, whence נַפְשָׁא *soul* is syncopated, just as kabitu *heavy*, gamiru *complete*, namiru *clear*, etc. (fem. kabittu, gamirtu, namirtu; constr. state masc. kabit, gamir, namir) become in Assyrian kabtu, gamru, namru, etc. Similarly מַלְכָּא *king* is not = מַלַךְ = malk, but = malik and מַלְכָּא *the king* is syncopated from malika (= Assyr. ma-li-ki, Lyon, 13, 17); cf. also Stade, *Hebr. Grammatik*, § 191a, n. 1. Both נַפְשָׁא and מַלְכָּא are formations like כתף, כתפָּא (originally כתפָּא) *shoulder*. מלכָּא (originally מַלְכָּא) appears in Arabic, as is well known, as malikun, and for נַפְשָׁא we have still in Assyrian the intransitive feminine form napishtu, plural napshati for napishati.

Noeldeke, in his *Syrische Grammatik*, § 93, says: "Die einsylbige Grundform qatl, &c., wirft, wo keine Endung antritt, bei starken Wurzeln den Vocal hinter den 2. Radical (!), z. B. מַלְךְ fuer malk; קֹדֶשׁ qedosh fuer qudsh." This is not correct. The *i* in melik, as we have seen, is not the attenuation of the characteristic vowel of the first syllable, but rather the characteristic intransitive vowel of the form qatilu; and qedosh stands not for qodsh, qudsh, but for qudush. As I have remarked in my BAL. p. 90, the Assyrian Segholate forms qatlu, qitlu, qutlu have in the construct state qatal, qitil, qutul, e. g. abnu *stone*, aban; pagru *corpse*, pagar (e. g. V R. 2, 116 and 118; 3, 9); karshu *stomach*, karash; qarnu *horn*, qaran; zikru *name*, zikir; ziqpu *point*, ziqip; niklu *art*, nikil; riksu *band*, rikis; kibsu *step*, kibis; uznu *ear*, uzun; mursu (with ض) *sickness*, murus; lubshu *garment*, lubush; puhru *totality* (with خ) puhur, etc., etc. Syriac forms like תַּרְעָא, תְּרֵיעָא *door*, פַּגְרָא, פִּגְרָא *corpse*, צַפְרָא, צִפְרָא *morning*, etc., correspond exactly to such Assyrian formations as pagru, pagar, etc.; similarly רַגְלָא, רִגְלָא *foot*, and פַּלְגָא, פִּלְגָא *half*, to Assyrian zikru, zikir; riksu, rikis, etc., etc. Formations like בַּעְלָא, בְּעִילָא *lord*, כַּרְסָא, כִּרְסָא *stomach*, צַלְמָא, צִלְמָא *image*, טַעְמָא, טְעֵמָא *taste, reason*, on the other hand, are based on the analogy of נַפְשָׁא, כַּתְפָּא, כִּתְפָּא, מַלְכָּא, מִלְכָּא, etc., etc. Kautzsch's statement (*Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaeischen*, § 54) "Die Hauptform des Singular pflegt den charakteristischen Vocal hinter den zweiten Stammconsonanten zu werfen" is, therefore, not accurate. I shall treat of this question shortly in a special article.

[2] Irtu (construct irat) could be a formation like biltu (construct bilat, cf. בָּלוֹן Ezra iv., 13, 20; vii., 24) *tribute* (*KAT.* 377) from יבל, or rather ובל. Cf. יְהִיר (Prov. xxi., 24; Hab. ii., 5) = Germ. *sich bruestend, sich in die Brust werfend*. Cf. also Flemming, *Nebukadzenar II.*, Goettingen, 1883, p. 33, 36.

[3] Cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 281, and for the כ in the Assyrian form Armad, my *BAL.* 88, 2.

[While correcting the proofs, I have noticed that Mr. Ernest A. Budge, in his *History of Esarhaddon*, London, 1880, p. 41, l. 3, has already translated, "In front of the great gate at the *border* of the city of Nineveh;" Assyrian (according to his transcription): ina di-khi ABULLI GABAL AL-sa NINUA, D. A.; and in the foot-note on the same page he adds, "Compare ina BAB tsi-it, D. P., Sam-si GABAL, D. P., NINUA, D. A. u-sa-an-tsir-su, D. P., si-ga-ru. "In the gate of the rising sun, at the border of Nineveh, I caused him to be guarded in wooden bonds." Similarly, p. 33, l. 9: Ca-sid D. P., Tsi-du-un-ni sa ina GABAL tam-tiv "the conqueror of Tsidon, which (is) upon the border of the sea." In the glossary, p. 139, Mr. Budge combines this GABAL with the Hebrew גְּבוּל or גְּבוּלָה. P. 35, ll. 15 and 16, on the other hand, he translates sa la-pa-an D. P., CACCI-ya ina KABAL tam-tiv in-nab-tu "who from before my weapons into the *midst* of the sea had fled;" similarly, p. 79, l. 12, sa a-khi tam-tiv u GABAL tam-tiv "of the sea-coast and the *middle* of the sea;" and p. 159, s. v. Yātnana, ina kabal tamti erib Samsi "in the *middle* of the sea of the setting sun" (i. e. Mediterranean). He seems to assume two different words; one gablu, with ג (cf. V R. 28, 84h), and the other qablu, with ק. Since Mr. Budge's laborious work has been censured beyond measure, I take pleasure in being able to state that I consider *The History of Esarhaddon* fully as good as George Smith's *History of Assurbanipal* and the *History of Sennacherib* by the same scholar. I could not, I am sorry to say, study Mr. Budge's book before the beginning of April of this year. Of his remarks which seem to me worthy of note, I should like to point out among others, the combining of citu or kitû with Chaldee כִּתּוּנָא, Greek *χιτών* (p. 137),[1] ummânu *army* with Hebrew הָמוֹן (p. 158),[2] šadû *mountain* with Arabic سَدٌّ or سُدٌّ (p. 152),[3] dadme *dwelling places* with אֲדָם (p. 137), and lalû[4] with Akkadian lal *to fill* (p. 145), etc.]

Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti was the name of the eastern gate of the wall of Nineveh. Col. IX. 108, king Sardanapalus relates of Wâteh-ben-Hazael's cousin, Wâteh-ben-Birdadda, who at last had fallen into the hands of the Assyrians: ulli kalbi addîšû-ma ina abulli ṣît šanši ša qabal ali Ninua ša Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti nabû zikirša ušanṣiršu šigâru *I placed on him a dog-collar, and at the gate of the rising of the sun of the wall of the city of Nineveh, (the gate) whose name they call* Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti *I left him to keep guard in a cage.*

---

[1] Compare my remarks on p. 181 of the HEBRAICA, n. 3.

[2] Cf. Lyon, *Sargonstexte*, Leipzig, 1883, p. 77, 71: "Das Wort ummanu *Heer*, welches seinen Plural ummanati bildet, wird getrost dem hebr. הָמוֹן, das ja auch von Kriegsheeren gebraucht wird, gleichzusetzen sein!"

[3] Cf. my remarks, HEBRAICA, p. 181, n. 1.

[4] Cf. Flemming's *Nebukadnezar II.*, p. 44.

ullu is the Hebrew עֹל, Arabic غُلّ ghull, which means not only "yoke," but also "iron collar." Cf. Deut. XXVIII., 48: וְנָתַן עֹל בַּרְזֶל עַל-צַוָּארֶךָ *and he will place a chain of iron on thy neck.*" Alongside of ullu there also occurs allu with the same meaning, just as we have urḫu (Hebr. אֹרַח, Aram. אָרְחָא) and arḫu alongside of one another with the meaning "road." That the first stem-consonant of this allu is not א[1] (Lyon, *Sargonstexte*, pp. 72/3) but א[5] = ġ, has been already remarked by Dr. Jensen, p. 299 of the first volume of the Munich *Zeitschrift fuer Keilschriftforschung*. With the frequent imperfect âlul, allu has nothing to do; âlul does not mean "I bound," but "I hung;" for example, pagrešunu (Hebr. פִּגְרִים) ina gašîše âlul *I hung their corpses on boat-hooks.* For âlul see my essay on the Sumerian dialect in the Göttingen *Nachrichten* of Nov. 3, 1880, p. 514, n. 3. gašîšu is a boat-hook, that is, a pole with an iron hook at one end (German *Staken*), Talmudic נָשׁוּשׁ. Cf. Fleischer in Levy's *Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I., Leipzig, 1876, p. 438, additions to p. 386, Col. I. line 17.

addî is Imperfect from nadû; see my glossary to the cuneiform account of the Deluge in Schrader's *KAT.* p. 510, s. v. נדי, and my *Akkadische Sprache*, pp. 33 and XXXVIII.

ṣît in ṣît šanši is exactly the Hebrew צֵאת, Infinitive construct of יצא (Gen. XIX., 23; Ps. XIX., 6; Neh. VI., 15); ṣît stands for ṣi't with quiescing of the א as rîmu *wild bull* (Hebr. רֵים, רְאֵם)[1] for ri'mu, šîru *flesh* (Hebr. שְׁאֵר) for ši'ru, etc., etc.

zikru (construct zikir) *name*, is a synonym of šumu (Chald. שֻׁם), and corresponds to the Hebrew זֵכֶר. Cf. Exod. III., 15: זֶה-שְׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְזֶה זִכְרִי לְדֹר דֹּר *this is my name for eternity and this my title for all generations;* so also Hos. XII., 6: יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת יְהוָה זִכְרוֹ *Yahweh is the god of hosts, Yahweh is his name.*

nabû (= nabâ'u, stem נבא, cf. Ethiopic nabába *to speak*) has in Assyrian the meaning of the Hebrew קרא. nabû zikra is = קָרָא שֵׁם. With the same meaning we find also qebû (stem קבע) šuma or zikra, also zakâru šuma.

neribu (plural neribeti for neribâti) means "entrance," from the stem erêbu *to enter*, cf. erêb šanši *entrance of the sun*, i. e. *evening*, Hebr. עֶרֶב. neribu stands for nerabu, naghrabu. In Syriac the word appears as נַארְבָּא, see my *BAL.* 97.

masnaqti (not barnagtu!) comes from the stem sanâqu, Imperfect isniq *to be narrow*, and means therefore "strait, passage." In Syriac the stem סנק has the meaning of *indigere*, cf. אִסְתְּנַק *indiguit*, סָנִיק *indigens*, סְנִיקוּתָא

[1] Cf. Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, pp. 6 and 7.

and סְנָקְנָא *indigentia* (Assyrian sunqu).[1] In Hebrew we have the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον צִינָק *prison*, Jer. XXIX., 26: וְנָתַתָּה אֹתוֹ אֶל־הַמַּהְפֶּכֶת וְאֶל־הַצִּינָק *thou shalt put him in the stocks and in prison*. Others combine צִינָק with the Arabic زِنَاق zinâq, and translate "collar." צִינָק means properly "straits." The צ from ס arises from a partial assimilation to the final ק. Cf. צָחַק in Genesis and Exodus (as well as in Judg. XVI., 25 and Ezek. XXIII., 32) for שָׂחַק *to laugh*. In Arabic we have for this ضحك dahika, and similarly instead of סָנַק *to be narrow*, we find ضنك danuka. סנק and צנק, סחק and צחק have, in the mouths of the Orientals, almost the same pronunciation.[2] The stem סנק or צנק is, moreover, only a modification of the stem צוק, Arabic ضاق dâqa, cf. הֵצִיק. In Aramæan this צ[3] appears as an ע, cf. Syriac עָקְתָא *angustia*. Accordingly, מֵעִיק (= Hebr. מֵצִיק) Amos II., 13, עָקַת רָשָׁע Ps. LV., 4, מוּעָקָה (Hebr. מוּצָק) Ps. LXVIII., 11, are Aramaisms.

adnâti[3] stands for admâti, as Hebrew דֶּשֶׁן *fat*, for דֶּשֶׁם. Arabic dasim, and means "dwelling-places," as it seems, especially "dwelling-places of the gods, temples." It is a synonym of the well known word admânu.[4] Nerib-masnaqti-adnâti is, therefore, "the entrance to the passage to the temples," a Ninevite "Cathedral Street Gate."

---

[1] In Ethiopic the Assyrian sunqu (construct sunuq) appears in the form senq (written شنق or سنق). Ethiopic senq, however, does not mean *indigentia, fames*, but rather κατ' ἀντίφρασιν *commeatus, viaticum*, just as Assyrian bubu'tu means not only *hunger* but also *food*. For bubu'tu see Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, 186, 85; my essay on the Sumerian dialect, p. 517, n. 2; Schrader, *Berliner Sargonsstele*, p. 35, 70. Cf. also sunqu bubuti V R. 3, 135; 4, 59.

[2] Cf. the transposition of the aspiration in Neoionic κιθών *tunica* = Attic χιτών, ἐνθεῦτεν *thence* = ἐντεῦθεν, etc.

[3] Compare for this word: Pognon, *L'inscription de Bavian*, Paris, 1880, p. 26 and p. 217. Pognon says: adnati est un pluriel. Ce mot m'est inconnu et je le traduis d'apres le sens de la phrase par *lieux, endroits*. On le trouve encore a la ligne 20 (de l'inscription de Bavian). See also II R. 67, 86 and Strassmaier, *Woerterverzeichniss*, p. 36, No. 191.

[4] Cf. e. g. Neb. VII, 39; VIII, 23; Tig. VII, 74 and 90; VIII, 17; Sennacherib Sm. 150, 77; Lyon, *Sargonstexte* 36, 49. Akin to admanu from the stem אדם (√דמם) is the frequent plural dadme *dwelling places, countries*, from the stem דרם (= דמדם) an incomplete reduplication of the biconsonantal root דם. For dadme see e. g. Neb. VIII, 22; IX, 55; Sennacherib Sm. 6, 17; 52, 16; 86, 23; 90, 54; Assurb. Sm. 95, 76; Esarh. Budge 34; Lotz, Tig. 194, No. 1, 9. Cf. also Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, p. 59.

SYRIAC VERSION OF EPISTLE OF KING ABGAR TO JESUS.

By Professor Isaac H. Hall, Ph. D.,
New York City.

The following Syriac Version of the Apocryphal Epistle of King Abgar to Jesus, and Jesus' reply, is from a parchment leaf lately sent to the writer by the Rev. William Hayes Ward, D. D., who obtained it, with a number of other fragments, from a monastery in the Tûr in Mesopotamia. The leaf is 9¼x6¼ inches in dimension, is written in very old Estrangela in two columns to the page, each column 7 to 7¼ inches high and 2 to 2¾ inches wide. One corner of the leaf is mutilated, causing a few small gaps in the writing. As to age, it seems to belong to the eighth century, but it may be older by a century more. The other matter on the leaf is the end of a homily on the love of poverty, or, as the matter itself seems to interpret the title, love to the poor and wretched.

The copy here given corresponds with the manuscript, line for line, letter for letter, and point for point; except that some of the points may be faded out, and those I do not venture to supply. In line 59, however, the scribe added above the line, as a correction to the last word of the line, a *waw* between the *olaf* and *pi*. This, as at least unnecessary, I have not copied.

Lines 1–4 are at the end of the second column on the first page of the leaf; lines 5–35 occupy the first column of the second page, and lines 36 to 66 occupy the last column.

Lines 1–5, with an undecipherable word in line 6, as well as the last two words of line 39, with lines 40–42, are in red.

In line 5, the parchment is wholly gone as far as the word that appears in the copy below; in line 6, the mutilated undecipherable word in red at the beginning is followed by a place torn away, so that the body of the Epistle here begins in the middle of a word. But it probably began ܡ̣ ܗܘܟܡܐ, with only three more Syriac letters to be supplied. The gap in lines 7 and 8 I do not venture to supply.

All that has hitherto appeared in print of these Epistles, in the Syriac version, is to be found in Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, Williams & Norgate, 1864), and Phillips' *Doctrine of Addai* (London, Trübner, 1876); but I have not access to those works, and cannot tell how they agree with this text. But they mention Addai (i. e. Thaddeus) as the disciple sent, or to be sent, by Jesus to Abgar; while this fragment clearly names Judas instead.

1. ܠܥܡ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܒܓܪ

ܡܠܟܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܬܥܢܐ

ܠܝܫܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܚܝܐ

ܕܐܬܪܐ ܒܟ ܐܠ

ܗܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܒܟ ܐܠ ܝ

5. ܐܘܬܘܕܟ . . .

. . . . ܥܒܕ ܠܟ

. . . ܡܢܟ ܐܫܬܐܠ

. . . ܡܐ ܕܐܬܝܬ

ܘܠܐ ܫܩܦܬ ܡܢܝ:

ܐܘ ܒܥܕܐܝ ܕܐ 10.

ܢܛܘ ܐܢܐ ܠܫܩܦܬܐ

ܘܠܫܘܥ: ܡܫܝܚܐ

ܘܠܡܚܝܐ: ܕܐܬܐ

ܩܛܘ ܐܢܐ. ܕܟܬܒ

ܒܩܕܐ ܡܐ ܕܟܬܒ 15.

ܐܢܐ. ܠܐܠܡܝ ܘܠܡܕܡܝܢ

ܕܐܬܝ ܠܝ ܐܬܪܐ

ܡܐܬܐ ܐܢܐ. ܫܩܠܬ

ܡܢ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ

ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟ ܡܢ 20.

ܠܡܝ. ܐܠܐ ܕܟܠ

ܐܢܐ ܠܟ ܐܫܠܚ ܐܢ

ܐܢܐ ܠܟ ܐܫܠܚ

ܘܠܫܠܚ ܠܟ ܠܡܢ

ܡܢܟ ܐܢ ܠܝ. 25.

ܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܢ ܐܫܠ

ܠܡܝ ܡܢ ܐܢ.

ܠܡܝ ܡܢ ܐܢ

ܐܢܐ ܐܢ ܠܟ

ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܐܠ 30.

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ. ܠܡܝ

ואת בנו את.
את אחיו את
ויקח אליפז בן
35. עשו את אשת
בן אדמה בן
הנחת אחות .
את שם אשת
בשמת ויהי בן
40. ראעואל את שבו
אחרי מלכו בעלחנן
בן עכבור ויהי
בעלחנן בנו מת
את הדר ויהי
45. שמו מהיטבאל
בת מטרד בת
מי זהב. ותמת
את הדר ויהי
50. שמו אלוף
הגמל אלוף
תימן אלוף
אהליבמה אלוף
55. אלה אלופי
בני עשו ראש
לבני אליפז
בכור בני

The same day that I received them I sent a translation of these Epistles to *The Independent;* but in my haste I missed some letters, so that that translation has here a few corrections.

One word in the title of the Letter of Abgar, rendered "blessed" below, is evidently the common abbreviation for that word, though not specially marked as such in the manuscript. If not an abbreviation, it is to be rendered "good."

The following is a translation; italicizing the words that are written in red in the manuscript:

"*Begins the Letter of King Abgar; Abgar, the black, Prince of the region, to Jesus the blessed Redeemer who appeared....of Jerusalem....* [Whereas it has been h]eard by me....and of the healings [wrought (?)] by thy hands, and not with perfumes and medicaments! For as it was said thou makest the blind to see, and the lame to walk, and cleansest the lepers, and castest out the unclean spirits and devils, and healest them that are led captive in lingering diseases, and thou raisest the dead; and since all these things are rumored of thee, I thought that thou wert one of the crowned (?) that thou had descended from God from heaven, and [therefore] thou doest these things; or that certainly thou wert of God and [therefore] thou doest these things. For this reason, therefore, I wrote, entreating from thee that thou wouldst be persuaded and come to me, and heal this sorrow (or, disease) which I have. For also I have heard that the Jews murmur against thee, and desire to vex thee. But I have a city, small and beautiful, that is enough for two.

"*Copy of the matters that were written from Jesus by the hand of Hanania, tabellarius, to Abgar, prince of the region.* Blessed is he that believeth in me, though he hath not seen me; for it is written concerning me that they who see me will not believe in me, and they who have not seen me shall believe and live. But as to that which thou didst write me, that I should come to thee; it is fitting that I should fulfill here everything for which I was sent; and after that I shall have fulfilled [it], then I shall be taken up to him who sent me. And when I shall have been taken up, I will send to thee one of my disciples to heal thy sorrow (or, disease), and also to give life to thee.—But after these letters, also, those follow them [that are written] in the Syriac tongue, [to the purport] that after Jesus had ascended he sent to him Judas...."

PLEIADES, ORION AND MAZZAROTH.

Job XXXVIII., 31, 32.

By John G. Lansing, M. A.

Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.

The first word to be considered is מַעֲדַנּוֹת. It is translated in the E. V. "sweet influences," as derived from עָדַן. Lexicons and commentaries generally make מַעֲדַנּוֹת, by transposition, equivalent to מַעֲנַדּוֹת. This transposition word is derived from עָנַד *to bind*, Arabic عند = Aanad *vicinage, nearness, a thing at one's side*. This word is used twice as a verb (Job XXXI., 36 and Prov. VI., 21), and nowhere as a substantive, save in this place according to the transposers. According to this transposition, the word in the passage is variously rendered "bands," "bindings," "twistings," "clusterings," etc., of the Pleiades. But the transposition is demonstrably wrong. The feminine plural noun מַעֲדַנּוֹת occurs only in this passage. But the masculine form מַעֲדָן occurs in four places. To translate the masculine form in these places as derived from עָנַד, shows the absurdity of translating the feminine form in this passage as derived from that root. Without transposition, מַעֲדַנּוֹת is manifestly derived from עָדַן as the root. Gesenius says of עָדַן "a root not used in Kal, which appears to have had the signification of softness, laxity; Arab. غدن = *Ghadan* to be flexible, to vacillate, غُدَنٌ softness, laxity, languor, غُدَانٌ a cane, or reed, a tall rod (pr. vacillating, vibrating in the air)." But غدن = Ghadan is not the Arabic word that corresponds to the Hebrew עָדַן, but an entirely different word, having a different spelling and a different meaning. The Arabic word that corresponds to the Hebrew עָדַן exists under precisely corresponding letters: Hebrew עָדַן, Arabic عدن = Aadan. So much is unmistakably shown by the usages of the words in Hebrew and Arabic. Now the Arabic word عدن = Aadan means to remain, to stay, to keep a thing to a certain place without allowing it to quit that place, and to do so by some gentle, sweet, harmonious influence or power; as when camels tied to a certain stake in a certain spot move around it in a comparatively large circle, contentedly feeding upon the luxuriant grass that abounds. The strict accuracy and unquestionable force of this meaning as the true meaning of both the Hebrew and Arabic words עָדַן and عدن appear from the usages of the words, and will further appear when we come to apply it in the interpretation of this passage, after we have considered the lexical meaning of כִּימָה.

כִּימָה is a noun fem. sing. from the root כּוּם. Of this root Gesenius says,—"An unused root. Arabic كام *Kam* to heap up, كُومَةٌ = *Komatun, a heap*, like the Hebrew כִּימָה, which see." Turning then to כִּימָה, Gesenius defines,—"A heap,

cluster (from the root כוּם, which see): specially of stars, hence the Pleiades, or the seven stars, consisting of seven larger stars, and other lesser ones closely grouped; Arab. ثُرَيَّا = *Thuraya* (plenty, multitude), more fully عقدالثريا = *Ookd-eth-Thuraya* the bundle of the Pleiades." But Gesenius does not give us the full meaning of the Arabic كام = Kam, and his other Arabic references to the Pleiades are incomplete. The Arabic has a number of names for the Pleiades, indicating their appearance in the heavens, their significance in the economy of nature, etc. Among these names we have the one mentioned by Gesenius, viz., الثريا = Eth-Thuraya, which means the Pleiades as comprising, in appearance, many stars in a small space; for it is said that, amid its conspicuous stars, are many obscure stars, the number altogether being said to be twenty-four, according to an assertion of Muhammad. ثريا also means a cluster of lamps, resting in holes in the bottom of a lantern. The lamps are so called as being likened to the Pleiades in the heavens. The Pleiades are also called by the Arabs النَّجْم = En-Nagmoo, that is, *The Asterism*, because it was regarded as being the most beneficial and excellent of all star-groups in its influences on the weather. And because the setting of one star and the simultaneous rising of another, that is the Pleiades, indicated approaching rain, and took place just before the rains began to fall in Arabia; therefore the Pleiades were also called نوء = No-un. Alluding to the copiousness of the tears he had shed because of the absence of his divine friend, the matchless Ibn-Il-Fared says

جاد ان ضنّ نوء الطرف اذ يسقط خيّ

"Still in a parched land would torrents flow,
Though on earth's rim the Pleiades had failed to glow."

But the word used by the Almighty in calling Job's attention to the Pleiades was כִּימָה, root כוּם, Arabic كام = Kam, and كومة = Komat corresponding to כִּימָה. But Gesenius does not give us the radical and full meaning of the Arabic. The Arabic كام = Kam means something more than "to heap up," and كومة = Komat more than "a heap," as see Butris Bustani's Arabic Lexicon, *et al.* The word كام = Kam is used with reference to many particles of sand being gathered together and heaped up so that they stand upright, like a pillar, upon a certain place, socket, or pivot. The word is also used with reference to a thing or person standing upon and turning around upon a certain point or pivot, as when a person stands or turns round upon the tip of his foot. This is the meaning of the word God employs. God employs it to indicate a certain group of stars. That group of stars is none other than the Pleiades, because precisely this is the truth about the Pleiades, and about them alone. By a series of calculations independent, and indeed ignorant of the truth contained in this passage in Job, the science of Astronomy has recently discovered that the heap or

cluster of stars called the Pleiades constitute the standig-place, the point, socket, pivot about which the whole solar system revolves. They have discovered that Alcyone, the brightest star of the Pleiades, is *the* center of gravity of our vast solar system, the starry pivotal point on which and about which worlds and systems of worlds go moving through space. There is a plain intimation of this fact when we consider the number of stars there grouped together in comparatively so small a space. Now it becomes apparent what is the true meaning and peculiar force of the word מַעֲדַנּוֹת as derived from עָדַן, Arabic عدن Aadan, to keep or hold a thing to a certain place without allowing it to quit that place, and to do so by some gentle, sweet, or harmoniously working influence or power, as when camels tied to a certain stake in a certain spot move around it in a comparatively large circle, contentedly feeding upon the luxuriant grass that abounds. So the Pleiades keep and hold in their places the worlds and systems of worlds as they go moving in their circling orbits around that starry stake, that pivot of power. In their revolutions around the Pleiades these worlds and systems of worlds move most harmoniously. There is not a deviation, not a disturbance. So the holding and keeping influences or powers of the Pleiades are gentle, sweet, harmoniously working. It is the harmonious operation of God's great laws reigning throughout the universe. Did not such harmony prevail, were the Pleiades to let go or loosen for a moment their constant and harmonious holdings and keepings of the worlds of the solar system, destruction and disturbance would come to those worlds, and cosmos be turned to chaos. And so the wisdom, power and goodness of God are mightily and magnificently manifest. The force of the challenge to Job and the glorious truth contained in the same are apparent. Canst thou bind together, stop, bring to naught these constant and powerful and harmonious holdings of the Pleiades? And so understand, moreover, that God reigns in and over human affairs, wisely, beneficently, omnipotently,—making every thing to work together for good.

The bands of Orion are his מוֹשְׁכוֹת, from מָשַׁךְ, Arabic مسك = Masak, that is, *the drawings, the takings hold, the drawn bandings, the girdlings* of כְּסִיל. According to the Hebrew and Arabic usages of the word כְּסִיל, it refers to the constellation of Orion. The three stars about midway in the constellation, and arranged somewhat obliquely as to the rest of the constellation, constitute the bands or girdlings of Orion. From these girdlings three other stars are ranged downward, constituting Orion's pendent sword. The interpretation which represents Orion as a giant chained to the skies, etc., is a comparatively modern myth which is utterly without foundation in the language, and utterly unworthy being thought of in this connection. God is speaking; and God is speaking about past and present and eternal facts, and not about the possible and passing and puerile fancies of men. כְּסִיל is derived from כָּסַל whose primary meaning appears to be "to be fleshy, to be fat," whence כֶּסֶל *loin, flank*. The word is applied in a

good and bad sense. In a good sense, as meaning "strength, firmness, boldness." In a bad sense, as meaning "languor, inertness, folly." The corresponding Arabic word كسل = Kasal comprises both of these meanings, and not simply the meaning of "languor and inertness," according to Gesenius. According to the first meaning, and the root of the word, we have the signification of giant, and hence Orion, a constellation or set of stars representing in full outline a giant figure. But we must go to the Arabic, and to the ideas of the old Arabian Astronomers, to be confirmed and further informed in the interpretation of כְּסִיל by Orion. As in the case of the Pleiades, so the Arabs have a number of names for the constellation Orion. It will suffice to mention two or three of these as illustrative of the passage. Orion was and is called الجَبَّارُ = Al-gabbaro, that is, "the great, mighty, gigantic one." This is the word used in the Arabic versions. Orion was so called because the relative position of the stars constituting that constellation represented the form of a kingly and gigantic personage enthroned in the heavens and marching through the skies. The constellation of Orion was also called الجَوْزَاءُ = Al-Goza, from جوز = Goz, meaning "to pass in or along, to traverse or cross the middle, and pass through it." The constellation of Orion was so called because of the three very bright stars disposed obliquely in the midst thereof, constituting the bands or girdlings of the starry giant Orion, as passing along and about his middle or waist or loins, and so called by the Arabs النَّظْمُ = En-Nazm, and نِطَاقُ الجَوْزَاءِ = Nitak-ul-Goza, and فَقَارُ الجَوْزَاءِ = Fakar-ul-Goza. The word God employs is כְּסִיל. It is derived from כָּסַל *to be fleshy, large, strong, firm, bold; hence giant; hence Orion.* The precisely corresponding Arabic word is كسل = Kasal, which has the same meanings and additional meanings: as, for example, a person strongly taking and firmly holding a certain position; and again, the strong cord or band of a bow as wound around one end and strongly pulled across the middle, and firmly wound around the other end. These definitions refer plainly and can refer only to the constellation Orion. How so? What is the fact about that constellation? Just this: that those three brilliant stars which constitute the bands or girdlings of Orion never change their form. They preserve the same relative position to each other and to the rest of the constellation from night to night, and year to year, and age to age; so that they present precisely the same appearance to us now that they did to Job in the land of Uz milleniums ago. In the vast firmament of starry hosts, where constant and stupendous changes are going on, these stars constituting the bands of Orion do ceaselessly, changelessly maintain their relative positions. And so as to the force of the challenge,—Canst thou loosen, open, disband these firm bands?—Canst thou bring change, disturbance, disorder as to the relative positions uniformly and uniquely occupied by these stars in all time? Alter these unvarying positions, annul the law which binds them together in these

eternal relations, burst open those blazing bands—if thou canst. And so as to the truth set forth,—Understand, O Job, understand, O man, that the All-wise, All-mighty, All-good God is uniformly, unchangeably, unendingly so.

Job's scientific knowledge, as well as spiritual appreciation of these astronomical allusions, can scarcely be a matter of doubt. If any one doubt it, let me remind him that he is making God to darken counsel by using words without knowledge in thus addressing Job with language of which Job had no true or adequate comprehension. Let me remind him that Job's spiritual appreciation of such language as this was such as to overwhelm him with penitence, humility and awe; and the production of such an effect is conceivable only on the ground that Job's scientific knowledge was very accurate and very profound. Let me remind him of the preeminent position occupied by the Arabians from the very earliest times as to the science of Astronomy. Let me remind him of the meanings of those three ancient Arabic expressions before mentioned as used to designate Orion and his girdlings or bands, نظام الجوزاء and نطاق الجوزاء and فقار الجوزاء, that is, the regularly ordered, the eternally ordered, the eloquently and magnificently ordered bands of Orion. Let me remind him that there are numerous passages in the poetry of the old Arabians that display a remarkable knowledge of Astronomy, similar to that revealed and displayed in these passages of Scripture, which were, I doubt not, thoroughly understood by the great Arabian patriarch Job. I quote a couplet from an old Arabian poem at hand,—a poem celebrating the matchless and immemorial hospitality of the Arabians:—

"I looked to the sky's azure tent, where Orion already
Stood watching by night, *and his sword in its belt glittered steady.*"

Beha Ed Deen Zoheir, an Arab poet of Egypt who flourished in the thirteenth century, says,—

وَتفرَّعَتْ لِلْمَجْدِ مِنْكَ ثَلَاثَةٌ كَثَلَاثَةِ ٱلْجَوْزَاءِ فِي جَنَبَاتِهِ
مِن كُلِّ مَهْدِيٍّ غَدَا فِي مَهْدِهِ يَسْمُو الَى اَسْلَافِهِ بِسِمَاتِهِ

"Well mayest thou rest! three sons are thine,
Who shall perpetuate thy line,—
Like those three brilliant stars that shine
On old Orion's breast.
Who in their very cradle bore
Marks of God's guiding hand, and wore
Signs of that worth, with which of yore
Thy ancestors were blest."

"Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season?" The word is מַזָּרוֹת. We are advised to change the מ into נ and derive the word from נָזַר *to separate*

oneself, *abstain*, *consecrate*. We are advised to change the ר into ל and convert מַזָּרוֹת into מַזָּלוֹת. According to this latter change we are to render the word by "lodging places," from the Arabic منزل = Manzal, and refer it to the signs of the Zodiac. But all this is so arbitrary and unnecessary, so utterly without any reasonable foundation, that it becomes irreverent and preposterous to think of God, who is here speaking,—to think of God as thus changing, accommodating, corrupting language in its usage,—God, who all through this chapter has been using words that corresponded with the utmost truth and accuracy to the actual, scientific, creative facts about those phenomena concerning which he was speaking. מָזַר is an unused root in the Hebrew, but it is not an unused root in the Arabic. The root exists under precisely the same letters in Arabic, viz., مزر = Mazar. One of the principal definitions of this root in Arabic refers to the perforated piece of wood at the top of the tent into which the upper extremity of the tent pole is thrust as a button into its loop, and also to the pulling of the ropes that join this piece of wood at the top of the tent to the stakes all around the tent about which the several ropes are looped or buttoned. Now it is utterly impossible to give this language any other interpretation than that which refers it to the satellites as they move about their planets, held to the planets by the law of gravitation; to the planets and their satellites as they move about the sun, held by it and to it according to the same law of gravitation; to the sun and the planets and the satellites and the whole solar system moving about Alcyone of the Pleiades, held by it and to it according to the same wonderful law. And so as to the force of the challenge,—What does man know about the movements of these bodies, about the law of gravitation? How much less can he effect as to the sending forth of these planets, each in its appointed time, each to its appointed sphere, each with its appointed velocity, and thus maintain them? Here is a complexity of bodies, a complexity of relations, a complexity of movements. And yet in the midst of all this manifold and marvelous complexity, there is a marvelous harmony. In all this complexity and harmony the infinite wisdom, power, and goodness of God are transcendently manifest. And the teaching,—the same is certainly and gloriously true as to man in the complexity of human affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

By John P. Peters, Ph. D.

Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia.

The prophet Isaiah (x., 8) makes the Assyrian king say, הֲלֹא שָׂרַי יַחְדָּו מְלָכִים. I do not know that attention has been called to the reference which is here made to the difference of usage of the related Hebrew and Assyrian, in the words for "king" and "prince." The Hebrew מֶלֶךְ has the signification of the Assyrian s a r, and, *vice versa*, Assyrian m a l a k u corresponds in sense to Hebrew שַׂר. The prophet plays upon this difference of use.

Amos i., 6—Gaza is to be punished עַל־הַגְלוֹתָם גָּלוּת שְׁלֵמָה. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 9th edition, would render this "because they took captive," *die gefangenen in voller Zahl*. The LXX. explain גָּלוּת שְׁלֵמָה by *αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ Σαλωμών*. The translation of the LXX. makes no sense, but suggests a change of pointing for the Hebrew which makes an unintelligible passage intelligible, viz., גָּלוּת שְׁלֻמָה. What the prophet seems to mean is, that Gaza is to be punished for its breach of a professedly friendly relation, in kidnapping Hebrews to be sold as slaves. It means "because they carried captive them who were at peace." The same meaning belongs to the phrase in the 9th verse, where Tyre is guilty of the same crime. Perhaps it is not necessary to change the pointing of שְׁלֵמָה in order to justify such a rendering. A glance at שָׁלוֹם and שָׁלֵם in a Hebrew lexicon will show any one that, at least according to our Massoretic pointing, the two words have been somewhat confused in use. So, in our English Bibles, at Gen. xxxiii., 18, we read, "And Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shechem," where the real sense is, "And Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem." At Mic. ii., 8, it has been suggested that we should read שְׁלֵמָה for שַׁלְמָה (cf. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 427).

Isa. xi., 15.—The sense of this verse seems to be, "As Jehovah laid under the ban the tongue of the Egyptian sea; so will he wave his hand against the Euphrates with a blast of his breath, and smite it into seven rivulets, and make a way for sandaled feet." The comparison throughout the passage is one of the past and the future. The rescue from Egypt is made the text of a promise of rescue from Assyrian bondage. This comparison is carried so far that, in imitation of the Song of the Sea, (Exod. xv.) we have here (Isa. xii.) a similar song to be sung after the new deliverance, Isa. xii., 2 even being quoted partly from Exod. xv., 2.

Amos v., 25–27.—The use of tenses and conjunctions, as also the connection of thought, in this passage, seems to me to be the same as in the passage from Isaiah just quoted. "Sacrifices and meat offerings ye offered unto me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel; so shall ye take up Sikkuth, your king, and Kiun, your star-god, your images which ye made for yourselves, and I will carry you captive beyond Damascus." The wandering out of captivity in the past is compared with the wandering into it in the future; the worship of the true God

in the past, with that of idols in the future. In the translation of the passage I have transposed צַלְמֵיכֶם, as suggested by Professor Schrader (KAT. 442) to a position after אֱלֹהֵיכֶם. He would point סַכּוּת and כִּיּוּן, explaining the former as Sak-kut, a Sumerian-Akkadian name of Adar, and the latter as the Assyrian Ka-ai-va-nu, or Saturn, making them thus nearly identical. The former name reminds us involuntarily of סְכוֹת בְּנוֹת of 2 Kgs. XVIII., 30, which latter Mr. Budge says is the god Zarpanituv.

Isa. VII., 14.—The best commentary to this passage is, it seems to me, Mic. IV., 10. In the latter passage, the Daughter of Zion is in travail with the birth of a purified remnant. The capture of Jerusalem itself is represented as part of the throes of labor. "Writhe and twist, Daughter of Zion, like one that giveth birth; for now shalt thou go out of the city and dwell in the field." In Isa. VIII., 8, 11, עִמָּנוּ אֵל seems to be used to indicate the purified remnant which shall still remain after the Assyrian river has overflowed the land, against which no counsel or might of the foe shall prevail, because it is a god-with-us. In Isa. VII., 14, in spite of the very unusual word used, הָעַלְמָה, I believe that the בַּת־צִיּוֹן is spoken of. She is pregnant with the עִמָּנוּ אֵל, the purified remnant, and in the distress that is at hand the prophet sees the pangs of birth. It is quite possible that we owe the unusual word here used, הָעַלְמָה, to the unoriginal form in which the prophecy has been preserved to us, as a mere abstract put into shape apparently by some one other than the prophet, at some period posterior to the events recorded. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the LXX., ἡ παρθένος, may represent the original reading; so that we should substitute, in the Hebrew, הַבְּתוּלָה for הָעַלְמָה. This would be the natural word to use with reference to the Daughter of Zion (cf. Jer. XVIII., 13; XXXI., 4, 21; Amos V., 2). Is it possible that we have in the Hebrew a doctrinally modified text, the LXX. testifying to the true original? The Targum of Jonathan, usually so free in its use of מְשִׁיחָא, even in Isa. LIII., gives no hint, of a Messianic character, of the prophecy in Isa. VII., 14, nor, where עִמָּנוּ אֵל is again used, in Isa. VIII., 8, 11.

GRAMMATICAL QUESTIONS.

By Professor F. B. Denio,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

THE REPETITION OF THE CONSTRUCT STATE BEFORE A SECOND GENITIVE.

The language of the grammars on this subject is pretty harmonious. Gesenius (§ 114 : 1): "The language avoids, also, letting a noun in the *construct state* be followed by several genitives connected by *and* (וְ), and prefers in that case to repeat the *nomen regens; e. g.*, Gen. XXIV., 3 אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וֵאלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ *the God of the heavens and the God of the earth.*" Ewald (339: *b*): "If a noun in the construct state or a preposition refers to several nouns, it is always to be repeated (see § 289), unless those which follow attach themselves readily, in accordance with the meaning, to the first; as זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ *flowing with milk and honey*, Exod. III., 8, and other examples in Judg. I., 6, 7; 1 Chron. XXIX., 2; Prov. I., 3. [Judg. I., 6, 7, and 1 Chron. XXIX., 2, give four instances of a pair of genitives after a single construct noun. Prov. I., 3, is more noteworthy: לָקַחַת מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל צֶדֶק וּמִשְׁפָּט וּמֵישָׁרִים : *to receive the instruction of wisdom, justice, and judgment and equity.* Four genitives, the last two of which are joined by וְ]. When there are several nouns the construct state is often repeated with every one, or with every two, Jer. VIII., 1., Isa. II., 2." Jer. VIII., 1, gives five genitives, each preceded by its own construct state, which is עַצְמוֹת *bones* in every instance. Again, Isa. II., 2, gives three pairs of genitives after the thrice repeated רוּחַ *spirit*. An examination of this passage will show that the two genitives attached to the same construct are closely united to form a single idea. Ewald (§ 289 : *c*) seems to furnish an explanation for the non-repetition of the construct in the instances where it is not repeated with each genitive. "Similarly, a poetic writer may only mentally resume the construct state in the case of a subsequent member of the sentence, whether this be in the beginning of the following part, Prov. I., 3, or after some other words in the middle of it, Job. XXVI., 10." That is, in Prov. I., 3, cited above, מוּסַר is to be repeated after the ăthnāḥ, because there is no וְ before צֶדֶק [?]. In Job XXVI., 10, the explanation is good for the somewhat peculiar translation of Ewald, which, however, seems both unnecessary and harsh. In any case this seeming explanation in Ewald (§ 289 : *c*) is applied only to poetic constructions, and therefore will have no value for a frequent occurrence of the construction in prose. There are several instances where this explanation has no value, and another may be suggested which is to the mind of the writer much better; it is an explanation which is in accord with the citation from Ewald (§ 339 : *b*). The translator of Ewald's Hebrew Syntax (after § 289 : *c*) inserts a passage as follows: "Nor does the Hebrew even like to have two or more nouns co-ordinated after one construct noun; the governing word is rather repeated before the second subordinated noun; thus, *the God of heaven and the God of earth*, Gen. XXIV., 3: *the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, Exod. III., 6, 15: but the shorter mode of expression is also

used, see verse 16." In Müller's Hebrew Syntax (§ 75 : *c*) the same statement is made as in Gesenius. A remark is added, however. (§ 75 : *c*. Rem. *a*): "Rarely as in Gen. XIV., 19, קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ 'Possessor of heaven and earth,' where, however, both genitives are still of the same kind, viz., possessive."

The liking of the Hebrews to repeat the construct noun is doubtless caused by the tendency to circumstantiality in narrative. This tendency has powerfully colored the New Testament diction (Winer's New Testament Grammar, § 65 : 4). The exceptions to the rule cited from the grammars, however, are far too numerous to be called rare. They are so numerous as not to prove the rule, but to break it down. It is not said that the exceptions are more numerous than the instances of conformity, though the general impression of the writer would lead him to say so. The following references show something of the frequency of the violation of the rule: Deut. XII., 6; XXVIII., 4, 51; XXXII., 19; Isa. I., 28; X., 28; XLV., 14; LX., 6—give illustrations of genitives in pairs. Deut. VIII., 7; Isa. I., 11; XXXVII., 3—give illustrations of genitives in groups of three. Isa. XXXVI., 17 gives two pairs. Deut. VIII., 8 gives five genitives after one construct. This list is not exhaustive, and is purposely confined to these two books. The writer doubts whether as many instances of accordance with the rule will be found as he has noted exceptions. Of course these two books cannot prove universal usage. Their usage, or lack of usage, is enough to raise the question how extensive an usage the rule records.

A more important question is, What is the difference in thought between the phrase in which the construct is repeated and the phrase in which it is omitted? One suggestion has been noted above, viz., that the construct was repeated in thought with the second genitive. This was suggested only for the usage in poetry. Without doubt, this is a correct explanation of some cases, but not of most. Another suggestion is to be found in the quotation above from Ewald (§ 339 : *b*), in the words "unless they attach themselves readily, in accordance with the meaning, with the first." The citation from Müeller (§ 75 : *c*, *Rem. a*) is in harmony with this. To put it in another form, it is like the mode of conception in the New Testament Greek, when a preposition is expressed with only the first of several nouns governed by it. Cf. Winer's New Testament Grammar (50 : 7). "When two or more substantives dependent on the same preposition immediately follow one another, joined together by a copula, the preposition, if the substantives in question denote things which are to be conceived as distinct and independent, ...but not repeated, if the subtantives fall under a single category, or (if proper names) under one common class." To the same effect Buttmann's New Testament Grammar (§ 147 : 30), "By omitting to repeat the preposition, the writer gives an intimation that he regards the members rather as homogeneous, belonging together, or united into one whole; by repeating it, that he wants to have them taken as independent, of a dissimilar or even contrary nature." Similar are the explanations given of the repetition or non-repetition of the article after the first of two or more nouns of the same number, gender and case and connected by *καί*. Buttmann, § 125 : 15, 16 and 17; and Winer, § 19 : 3, 4 and 5.

The principle involved is rather a necessity in the nature of thought than a mere usage. It is likely, therefore, that the same phenomena and the same mode of expression might occur in languages so widely dissimilar as the Greek and the Hebrew. Therefore, it would seem that, where the Hebrew *wished to portray with*

circumstantiality the individual relations or properties of that which was expressed by the construct noun, he repeated it with each genitive, or sometimes with each pair of genitives. If he wished to unite these relations in a group and to ignore the individual relations, he did not repeat the genitive. To illustrate the point take an example which has been mentioned above: אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב Exod. III., 6, 15; IV., 5. In Exod. III., 16, we find only one construct: אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב. This same form is found in 1 Kgs. XVIII., 36; 1 Chron. XXIX., 18, and 2 Chron. XXX., 6. In these last references וְיִשְׂרָאֵל is used in the place of the וְיַעֲקֹב of the earlier expression. Where אֱלֹהֵי is not repeated it shows more clearly the idea of the one God in his relations with the race-ancestors. Where אֱלֹהֵי is repeated it brings out the idea of God in relation to each of the great ancestors of the race. This may account for the fact that the later expressions all group the three names together. In the earlier conception, because, perhaps, the writer had the three individuals more distinctly in mind, Abraham, Isaac and Jabob are individualized by the repetition of אֱלֹהֵי. In the later writings the three ancestors were conceived in their common relation to the race rather than in their individual relation. Some confirmation of this conception is found in the phrases in Exod. II., 24, בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־אַבְרָהָם אֶת־יִצְחָק וְאֶת־יַעֲקֹב, and 2 Kgs. XIII., 23, where the preposition אֵת is used with אַבְרָהָם and omitted with the following genitives. It is worthy of note that this group of names occurs with אֶל after וָאֵרָא in Exod. VI., 3; with לְ after נִשְׁבַּע or נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי in Gen. L., 24; Exod. XXXIII., 1; Num. XXII., 11; Deut. XXXIV., 4; after זָכַר in Deut. IX., 27; as appositives after a preceding noun in Deut. I., 8; VI., 10; IX., 5, 27; XXIX., 12; XXX., 20. In all these cases the preposition אֶל or לְ is repeated with each of three names. This group of words occurs but one other time—in Lev. XXVI., 42, and this passage seems more than almost any other to verify the opinion that the repetition is for the sake of circumstantiality. וְזָכַרְתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקוֹב וְאַף אֶת־בְּרִיתִי יִצְחָק וְאַף אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אַבְרָהָם אֶזְכֹּר וְהָאָרֶץ אֶזְכֹּר *Then will I remember my covenant with Jacob; and also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember, and the land will I remember.*

CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

On the Semitic Languages In General.—All the Semitic languages constitute a strictly peculiar and individual family, which is most sharply distinguished from all other human tongues by definite laws and peculiarities. Among these peculiarities the following may be mentioned as the most important:

1) So far as inflection is concerned, all inflectional roots are at least triliteral, or are so considered. The triliteral character is the rule. The indicative roots (Deutewurzel), which are capable of inflection only in a very imperfect manner, are an exception to this rule. They constitute a very ancient portion of the language. These and a number of concept roots (Begriffswurzel) which yield to the ordinary inflection only with great difficulty, and very clearly show the marks of having originated from biliteral roots, point to an older period of the language, when the law of triliterality did not yet exist. This is not to be understood to mean that then no triliteral roots existed at all. In the case of many triliteral roots, every attempt to reduce them to a biliteral character ends in a failure. In that period of the language, the triliteral roots probably occupied the same position with reference to the biliteral that the pluriliteral now hold by the side of the triliteral. Gradually their number increased, as by augmentation of sound the biliteral roots were raised to the position of triliterals, until finally the latter constituted the majority, and caused the biliterals that remained to take their inflection. The present system of both nominal and verbal formation can in its fundamental types—but only in these—easily be older than the law of triliterality.

From this law of triliterality, it follows that the union of a consonant with a vowel does not suffice for the formation of a complete and inflectional root, as, e. g., is the case in the Indo-European and the Tartaric languages. For instance, *as* = to be; *do* = to give; Turkest. *ko-mak* = to place, etc.

2) The position of a vowel within the root does not contribute to the meaning of the root.

3) The variations of the vowels within the three-root consonants does not effect a difference in the meaning of the roots. Roots with the difference in meaning which the German language has in *haben, heben; laben, leben, lieben loben; Last, List, Lust*, could not exist side by side in any Semitic language.

4) Since then the meaning of the root clings to the group of consonants, the changes in consonants is accordingly restricted to very narrow limits. The different derivatives from the roots can therefore, in the various Semitic languages, not be so unlike each other, as, e. g., is the case in the Indo-European language; for instance, *εἰμί* for *ἐσμί*, Sanskrit *asmi*, Lat. *sum* for *es-um*, Gothic *im* for *is-m*. On the other hand, the Semitic makes a most extensive use of vowel changes, in order to bring out the finer shades of meaning which the word conveys over against its root as also over against other words. In this manner the vowel *a* characterizes, in the perfect, the active transitive meaning; *a* in conjunction with *i* and *u*, the intransitive; *u* with *i*, or *a*, the passive. In the same manner the imperfect is distinguished by a peculiar vowel from the perfect. From this it is also plain that the possibility of the mechanical change of vowels is a very lim-

ited one, and is found more in connection with prefixes and suffixes than with roots. In consequence of this, the Semitic languages differ from each other in grammatical features scarcely more than do the Germanic or the Slavonic.

5) The Semitic languages have a number of peculiar sounds that are wanting in other languages. These are the emphatic sounds צ, ט, ק and ע. Beside צ there seems at one time also to have existed a ץ da, beside ע a ע̇ Rain.

6) The Semitic languages have indeed passed beyond the agglutinative stage, and have become inflected languages; however they lack the ability of distinguishing in the verb the time in which the action takes place. In the place of this, the distinction between completed and non-completed action is a substitute of less value, and the distinction between the genders that is carried almost throughout the verb, is, strictly speaking, a luxury. The inflection of nouns, however, especially when compared with the Indo-Germanic, the Tartaric, and the Finnish languages, is very meagre. The richest of the Semitic languages knows only three cases, and cannot everywhere keep even these apart in form.

7) A further want is the inability to form new verbs by the union of a preposition and a verb, or of a noun and a verb. From this is explained the varied and often abrupt transfers of meanings in the Semitic roots. Every outward sign of a transfer of a general meaning upon something special is wanting, or *vice versa*, how one special meaning is applied to another special, or a general to another general. To a small extent this lack is made good by the possibility of deriving new verbs in the form of various verbal stems from nouns (*verba denominata*), whose meanings then contain the special ideas of the noun.

The Semitic languages, on account of their peculiarities as just explained, could most aptly be called the Triliteral languages. The name Semitic, by which they are now known, is a very recent designation. It is first found printed in an article of August Ludwig Schlözer on the Chaldees, printed in the *Repertorium fuer Bibl. und Morgenländ. Literatur* in 1781. The honor of having given the name wide acceptation belongs to Johann Gottfr. Eichhorn, who also claims to have invented the name. Before that these languages were called simply oriental. The name Semitic is based upon the fact that, as far as was known then, those nations that, according to Gen. x., 21 seq., descended from Shem, spoke languages related to the Hebrew. That the Phœnicians, who according to verse 6 were a Hamitic tribe, spoke such a tongue was explained by their having adopted a new language. However, this latter view is in the highest degree improbable. And then Genesis x. gives us only geographical notices in a genealogical garb. Therefore the designation Semitic is inappropriate and misleading. However, since Eichhorn's day it has been generally in vogue, and in scientific discussion it has gradually received a definitely fixed idea. For this reason it is best to retain the name, although not what a correct exegesis of Gen. xi. 10 would suggest as to the linguistic relationship of the children of Shem.

The Semitic languages, by the marks that have been noticed above, are sharply distinguished from all other classes of languages. Especially is it a fixed fact that between the Semitic and the Indo-European groups no genealogical relationship exists. To such a relationship the agreement not only in roots is necessary, but also in the grammatical structure. The latter is in the two families essentially different, and just as little can the former be found. The attempt has often been made to show the connection as far as roots are concerned. But

no other roots except the onomata poetica agree. And if the variety of meanings did not exist in the Semitic roots, probably no attempt at an agreement would have been made. All attempts to show such an agreement do not stand the test of criticism. For the present a comparison of Semitic and Indo-European roots is not possible, because in both groups important preliminary questions are still unsolved. Comparisons between Semitic and Indo-European words is a mark of dilettantic misdemeanor (Unfug). Whenever the same words are found in both the one has borrowed from the other.

According to the opinion of other scholars a certain original relationship exists between the Semitic and the neighboring languages in North Africa, or the Berber languages together with the Egyptian. In reality there is found here not only a similarity in the roots, but also likenesses in grammatical points, as, e. g., the formation of the feminine by a *t*, of the causative by sibilant sounds (Zischlaute), the repetition of the root in order to form the intensive, etc. However, we are too little acquainted with these North African languages to pass a sure judgment. Above all, it must not be overlooked in the discussion of the question as to the relationship of the Semitic with the Indo-European or the African languages, that the same causes have the same results, i. e., that similarly disposed people spontaneously produce similar characteristics in their languages.—*Translated from Stade's Hebr. Grammatik, by G. H. Schodde.*

The Relatives ·שֶׁ and אֲשֶׁר.—There are three views as to the relation of these to each other; viz., (1) The view of F. Hommel,[1] that the two are of independent origin, אֲשֶׁר being the construct of an original אָשַׁר (Assyr. ašru), and ·שֶׁ (deflected to ·שֶׁי) being an original sign of relation; (2) What may be called the old view, represented by Ewald and the grammarians generally, which reckons אֲשֶׁר as the original relative, and derives ·שֶׁ or ·שֶׁי by aphæresis of א and assimilation of ר; (3) That of Sperling,[2] who makes ·שֶׁי the original relative, and derives אֲשֶׁר from it by prefixing an independent pronominal stem *a*, and affixing lă (which appears also in the Arabic relative alladi), ל being then hardened to ר.

The second view has been sufficiently refuted by Sperling. Of the first and third, the third seems to the present writer to contain the essence of the truth, in deriving אֲשֶׁר from ·שֶׁי. Hommel's objections may be reduced to three;—1st. There is an ašar in Assyrian, the construct of the noun ašru, and this word is used relatively. In reply, it may be stated that ašar is frequently used relatively where place is referred to (and this may be explained as a loose mode of expression with the relative omitted [cf. Isa. XXIX., 1; perhaps also Job XVIII., 21], or as a natural extension of the idea of place to place *where*); but no well attested instance has been cited to prove an extension of its meaning to other relations.[3] Hommel indeed quotes I R. 59, II., 14 seq.:—(14) Šaḍi*m* nisûti (15) ištu tamti iliti (16) adi tamti šapliti, (17) urḫu*m* ašṭûti*m*, (18) padani*m* piḫûti, (19) ašar kibsišu arrusu (20) Šipila

[1] In ZDMG., 1878, pp. 708–715.

[2] *Die Nota Relationis im Hebraeischen*, Jena, 1876.

[3] This point seemed so important, and the writer's knowledge of Assyrian so meagre, that he has consulted his friend Dr. Lyon on the subject, who informs him that he has found no passage where ašar is used relatively save in respect to place.

ibâšu, (21) ḫarânam namraṣam, (22) uruḫ zumami (23) irtidi—as an example of a wider use; but ašar in this case may be regarded as having its primary meaning, with the relative understood before it, and used just as it is in Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, p. 28, l. 38. The fact that kibsi ends in *i*, though not demonstrative evidence of it, has its bearing in this direction; for the termination *i* is very rarely found in the nominative of nouns.[1] The similarity between ašar and אֲשֶׁר may be explained, then, as a mere coincidence.

The further objections of Hommel, namely, that *l* and *r* in Semitic are never exchanged for each other, and that *r* is never found as a pronominal stem—if true, are not vital to the essence of Sperling's claim. It would seem, however, that אֲשֶׁר might be more naturally derived from the shorter relative than is attempted by him. Hommel is right in maintaining that שֵׁ is original, and שְׁ derived; but having שְׁ, the transition to שֶׁר is not difficult, whether we suppose the Dāghēš to have arisen simply to make prominent the previous sound (as Sperling claims), or as compensation for the ל of שֶׁל; for the use of ר to avoid Dāghēš-forte is not unknown in Semitic, but is found, not only in Aramaic and Hebrew Quadriliterals, but also in other words, as, e. g., כָּרְסָא for כִּסֵּא, דַּרְמְשָׁק beside דַּמֶּשֶׂק. After the addition of ר, the word might easily take on the character of a separable, and then prosthetic א would be appropriate. Cf. the Samaritan de, but with suffixes ed. For the change of an inseparable into a separable cf. בְּמוֹ, כְּמוֹ. לְמוֹ.

According to this explanation, then, the original שֵׁ was supported by Dāghēš-forte and deflected to שְׁ. For the Dāghēš, ר was afterwards substituted, and the word thereby formed received prosthetic א, an increase familiar in the Semitic tongues.

C. R. BROWN,
Newton Centre, Mass.

Genesis xx., 16.—It is shown by Dillmann, in his *Kommentar*, that וְנֹכָחַת is found in the Niph'al Perf. 2d sing. f., with wāw consecutive, and his translation may be rendered into English as follows: *And with all* (that are with thee)—*thus thou art proved* one to whom a wrong has been done or.....*thus thou art justified.* ו is consecutive, and introduces the conclusion from the preceding statement. A Participle is out of place in such a connection, and a feminine noun no less so. We might suppose the word to be Perf. 3d fem. in ת_, *and concerning the whole matter thus it is settled;* but this idea would be expressed with the masculine, not the feminine. Hence our author feels himself shut up to the second person fem., and he corrects the text to וְנֹכַחַתְּ. So far Dillmann. In the occurrence of such a form, however, is there not a key to the solution of the problem of the helping - of Lāmĕdh Guttural verbs in the 2d person feminine? Some writers regard it as *furtive*, while others regard it as a full vowel; but this reading (if correct) in ת seems to be nearly decisive for the second hypothesis, for it gives us a form which is just what we should expect the verb to assume under the influence of a helping vowel, and similar to יְרֵב, זְרַע, מְלֵךְ. In such cases as these, a final aspirate, if preceded by the helping vowel, loses its hard sound, though it is quite

[1] Cf. C. H. Toy, in *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. V., No. 4.

usual to retain the hard sound and go without the helping vowel, and we have such forms as וַיִּשְׁתְּ and even a noun נֶרְדְּ. It is a singular fact, however, that, in very rare instances, the hard sound is retained after the helping vowel has been inserted, e. g. in יַחַדְּ, Job III., 6; יִרְדְּךָ, Ps. VII., 6. Now יַחַדְּ being a form precisely analogous to יֶרֶב and especially to וַתַּעַד, Hos. II., 15, it is idle to say that the vowel in the first instance is *furtive*, and in the second a *full* vowel (see, however, Stade, *Grammatik*, p. 85). The possibility is thrown open, then, of retaining a hard sound after a vowel. If so, the same is true of the vowel in the 2d person f. of Lāmĕdh Guttural verbs. The hard sound of this person might very well be retained, usually, in order to conform to the analogy of the other persons, while a word such as we have considered in this note gives the more accurate form of the same.

IBID.

Note on כְּעַן (Dan. II., 23; Ezra V., 16) כְּעֶנֶת (Ezra IV., 10, 11; VII., 12) כְּעֵת (Ezra IV., 17).—It may not seem out of place to repeat, substantially, that which has already appeared in print, but which may not have been seen by many readers of HEBRAICA. There can be little doubt that these three words have a common origin in עֵת and כְּ, that the root of עֵת is עָנָה (akin to אָנָה), that עֵת, therefore, means "time" as that which is "approaching," "coming to meet one," "happening," and that the word may have a local as well as a temporal signification.[1] According to this, כְּעַן may very well mean "now," as derived from the idea "according to time," while, in another connection, כְּעֶנֶת or כְּעֵת may have a local meaning "according to that which immediately follows this place." No other explanation seems appropriate in Daniel and Ezra, and so the meaning "thus," "as follows" (not, however, "and so forth," as given in Gesenius's Lexicon; for "and so forth" refers rather to what is omitted than to what is expressed, while here there is probably no question of anything in mind which might be said in a formula, or the like, but was not) seems the only one admissible.

IBID.

צַלְמָוֶת or צַלְמוּת?—In *The Prophecies of Isaiah* (ed. 3, vol. II., pp. 142–3) I have ventured to combine both views as to the right pronunciation, suggesting "that the original pronunciation was צַלְמוּת, and the original meaning 'blackness' or 'darkness'; but that, as no other offshoot of the same stem had survived in Hebrew, the word passed into disuse, till Amos (V., 8) and Isaiah (IX., 1) revived it." I suppose these prophets to have needed a fresh word to express "deep gloom," and to have assumed a didactic derivation from צֵל and מָוֶת. I will not repeat my arguments, but quote some remarks of Prof. Nöldeke, who supports Hitzig in his opposition to the now popular theory that צַלְמָוֶת, i. e., darkness, is the true form. "We have no right, for the sake of a root unproved elsewhere, to give up the ancient traditional and very appropriate pronunciation. Observe, too, that the word occurs seventeen times in the Old Testament, but never in the construct state; this is much more easily explicable if the word is a compound than if it is simple. The only passage (Job XII., 22) in which the gender and number of the word can be recognized, speaks (though not with absolute deci-

[1] See the opinion of Fleischer in appendix to Levy's *Woerterbuch ueber die Targumim*, p. 572.

siveness) for the masculine singular, i. e., for the old view." (Review of A. v. Kremer's *Altarab. Gedichte* in *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1867, Bd. I., p. 456).

To an inquiry made in my behalf by a friend of mine, Prof. Nöldeke thus replies. "The tradition is unanimous....and this view gives an excellent sense. It is not important that, by the frequent use of the word, the signification became somewhat weakened." He points out that צֶלֶם is always a plastic image, never a painted one, much less a "shade" (as Mühlau and Volck). He does not, however, take account of the fact that צלם *to be dark* occurs in Assyrian, and is, therefore, an old Semitic root. This fact, and the use of צַלְמָוֶת in Job XXXVIII., 17, and probably elsewhere, for Hades (either by direct reference or allusively) compel me to recognize an element of truth in the theory which Prof. Nöldeke rejects. See my note as above. T. K. CHEYNE.

Moriah.—The Chronicles (2 Chron. III., 1) seems to have explained the word "shown by Jehovah" (מֹרִיָּה־יְהוָה), but the writer of Gen. XXII., 14 (whether a glossator or not) seems to me to distinguish *the mountain called* "Jehovah jireh" from the region of "the Moriah" specified in verse 1. In other words, it is not provable that he interpreted "Moriah" like the Chronicles. Is not "Moriah" probably a lengthened form of מוֹרֶה (XII., 6), as Gesenius (*Thesaurus, s. v.*), Ewald (*Gesch.* III., 313), and Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, 1872, p. 537) have more or less positively held? There were Morehs in several districts of Palestine (see Gen. XII., 6; Judg. VII., 1, where, however, the Peshito reads הרמה).—N. B. The versions take no account of the final יה. Josephus calls the mountain of the sacrifice τὸ Μώριον ὄρος (*Ant.* I., 13, 1). The historical exposition of Gen. XXII., 1–14 must be reserved for another place. IBID.

At page 387 of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, June, 1884, Mr. Hansen refers to the unique sense of "conscience" for מַדָּע in Eccles. X., 20. He may be inclined to accept Klostermann's proposed correction of בְּמַדָּעֲךָ into בְּמֻדָּעֲךָ *among thine acquaintance* (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, Heft 1). How strange the parallel between the conscience and a sleeping-chamber presupposed by the traditional text! IBID.

Errata in the Baer-Delitzsch Edition of Proverbs.—For the convenience of those who have the Baer-Delitzsch edition of Proverbs, it may be well to note certain needed errata in the dissertation *De primam vocabulorum litterarum dagessatione*.

p. viii,	§ 1, last line,	for	12	read	13
"	§ 2, line 7,	"	4	"	14
"	foot-note 1, line 1,	"	quinque	"	sex
"	" 2, last line,	"	6	"	18 (*bis*)
p. ix,	§ 4, line 2, after *Mem* insert the words "vel *Beth* et *Pe*."				
"	" " 9,	for	8	read	18
"	" " 9,	"	9, 10	"	10, 9
"	" " 11,	"	10	"	11
"	" " 12,	"	26	"	25
"	" " 15,	"	12	"	2

p. ix, § 4,	l. 16,	for 24, 6	read 24, 5
" "	" "	" 29. 6	" 29, 36
" "	" 19,	" 11	" 21
"	foot-note 2, line 1,	"	" 20, 26
p. x, § 5,	line 8,	" 5	" 12
" "	" 8,	" 23	" 24
" "	" 8,	" 6	" 7
" "	" 3 from bot.	" 25	" 15
" foot-n.	" 5,	" 28, 16	" 28, 17
" "	" 5,	" 31, 16	" 31, 36
" "	" 7,	" 17	" 27
p. xi, text,	" 3 from top,	" 17, 6	" 17, 7
" "	last line,	" 5, 5	" 4, 13
p. xii, "	line 1,	" 10	" 9
" "	" 15,	" 21, 3	" 21, 31
" "	" 8 from bot.	" 29	" 49
p. xiii, "	lines 4 and 8	" quinque	" sex
" "	line 13,	" 29	" 28
" "	" 19,	" 24	" 25
p. xiv, "	" 6,	" Ez.	" Ex.
" "	" 6,	" 4	" 14
p. xv, "	" 4 from bot.	" 25	" 26
" ft.-n. 1.	" 4	" 22, 2	" 22, 3
" "	" 4	" 3, 15	" 2, 12

O. O. FLETCHER.

Purpose without a Connective.—The simplest imaginable construction of two verbs, one of which is dependent upon the other, is that in which they are placed side by side without a connective. Such a construction is characteristic of infancy. It was doubtless very frequent in the early history of the Hebrew, as of other languages. It is still found, especially in poetry, where it is employed to give to a composition a vivacity not often sought in prose. The dependent verb is oftenest in the Imperfect, the tense suited to expressing the potentiality of an action (Driver, § 24). When this tense appears in its simplest form, there is sometimes difficulty in determining just what is the nature of the dependence expressed. In certain cases either of two or three interpretations may be adopted with little variation of the sense; *e. g.* Deut. XXXII., 39; Isa. L., 2; Prov. XIX., 25. In other cases the context favors a translation by one of the forms by which, in English, a purpose is expressed. When the Imperfect appears in a voluntative (jussive or cohortative) form, there is seldom any doubt with reference to its signification (Driver, § 46). It is then usually best translated by a dependent clause with a particle denoting a purpose.

I need only call attention to the fact that the voluntative is not always distinguishable, when used, and that the sacred writers are not consistent in the use of the moods. The Imperative is a few times employed after an Imperative without a connective.

The following are among the more striking examples under this head, arranged according to the use of the moods and tenses:

PERFECT—IMPERFECT.

Isa. XLI., 2. The jussive יִרְדְּ in this passage can hardly be equivalent to the simple Imperfect (Driver, § 64, Obs. Cf. the commentaries of Ewald and Delitzsch).—Job XXX., 28. The usual construction with the Infinitive is abandoned, probably because a repetition of the act is to be indicated.—Neh. XIII., 19. The command to the guard is the apodosis.

IMPERFECT CONSECUTIVE—IMPERFECT.

Isa. XLI., 7. The confident assertion of the workmen, לֹא יִמּוֹט, forms the apodosis.—Job XVI., 8. In this, as in the passage XXX., 28, just cited, the leading verb is קוּם, after which the usual construction is that with the Infinitive.—2 Chron. IV., 6. The Infinitive is followed by an emphatic explanatory clause (Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, § 337 *b*).

IMPERFECT—IMPERFECT.

Ex. XXVIII., 32: repeated, XXXIX., 23, without the verb of the protasis.—Lev. XVI., 30; an emphatic explanatory clause.—Ps. LI., 10: *that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.*—LV., 7: *that I may fly;* after a question implying a wish.—LXXVIII., 11; really two successive questions (see Delitzsch *i. l.*).—CII., 14; like the last example, instead of the more usual Infinitive.—CXL., 9; similar to the construction with פֶּן, but more striking.—Job XXIV., 14 (cf. XVI., 8).

IMPERATIVE—IMPERFECT.

Exod. VII., 9; with the jussive.—XVIII., 19; a colloquial expression.—Ps. IX., 21: *that the nations may know.*—XXXIV., 12 (cf. Exod. XVIII., 19).—XXXIX., 5; with the cohortative.—LI., 16.—LXI., 8 (cf. Jonah II., 1).—LXXXVI., 11.—CXVIII., 19: *that I may enter them,—may praise Yah.*—CXIX., 17 (cf. verses 77 and 144).—CXIX., 145.

When the purpose is negative the apodosis regularly takes אַל. Exod. X., 28. Ps. XIX., 14 (cf. Job XXXIII., 18). Job XXXVI., 21.

INFINITIVE—IMPERFECT.

Hab. III., 16: *to invade it;* another construction with the Infinitive.

PARTICIPLE—IMPERFECT.

Isa. V., 11 (cf. 1 Sam. XXIX., 11, where a single act is denoted).—XIII., 9; where the construction with the Infinitive is once used, but abandoned for that with the finite verb (cf. Lev. XVI., 30).

IMPERATIVE—IMPERATIVE.

Deut. I., 21. 1 Sam. XX., 36. Jer. XLVIII., 6 There are several idiomatic expressions containing two Imperatives which might, perhaps, be shown originally to have implied a purpose; *e. g.* those in which the first Imperative is, לֵךְ, קוּם, etc.

The foregoing examples may, in comparison with other expressions of purpose, be called indefinite. A particle may be supplied without changing the quality, but not without modifying the intensity of the idea. It is, therefore, plain that this construction cannot be said to denote a peculiar kind of purpose, but only to give to it a lively reality, whatever may be its peculiarity.

[In Syriac the omission of the connective is even more frequent than in

Hebrew (see Uhlemann, §§ 85. 4 : *d*, *β*, and 62, 2). In this language the latter of two perfects without a connective may denote the purpose of the former (Uhlemann, § 60. 5, *b*; Bernstein's *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, p. 56, ll. 3 and 12, and p. 78, l. 3).]

H. G. MITCHELL.

Boston.

On the Source of the Name יהוה.—Since the theory that the idea in the tetragrammaton as already used by Moses had undergone the change of a development, might find some support in the claim that the name Yahweh has been taken from other religious systems, it will be necessary briefly to explain the opinions of scholars, those of our day especially, on this subject, as also what seems to be the correct view concerning it. Since Israel could have borrowed the name in question only through the presupposed or real, direct or indirect, connection with other nations, it will be best to consider in order the different nations who are claimed to have made use of the name Yahweh.

That the Indo-Europeans have this Old Testament appellation for God in the word Jovis, is considered by v. Bohlen (*Gen.* p. ciii), Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 672), and J. G. Müller (*Die Semiten, etc.*, p. 163) as "a view not easily to be refuted." But so little direct connection between the Indo-European and the Semitic languages can be pointed out, that it is out of question to find a derivative of the Indo-European div (*to shine*) transferred into the Semitic; but rather must the name of Yahweh, used by one of the Semitic nations (Israel), be derived from a Semitic verb. Hitzig endeavored to prove for יהוה, not an etymological and linguistic, but rather an ideal and historico-religious connection with the Indo-European, by saying: "From all appearances, the word Yahweh has come from Astuads, i. e., astuat = the Existing-one, as in the Armenian language God is called. Moses modeled his name of God after this, but only because his mind was prepared to grasp the idea, and by reflection he was able to understand the truth and depth of the thought in 'astuads.'" But how is it possible, even if the story concerning the flood shows acquaintance with the Ararat of Armenia (Gen. VIII., 4), and even if the oldest traditions of the Hebrews point rather to a direct north-easterly than a south-easterly source, to believe that Moses, while in Egypt, took an Armenian name of God as his model?

If then an Aryan or Japhetic origin of the tetragrammaton is apparently an impossibility, it seems, on the other hand, quite natural, on account of the actual connection between the Hebrews and the Hamitic (Gen. X., 8-12) original inhabitants of Babylon, to look for a proto-Chaldaic origin for the (commonly so considered) original form of Yahweh, namely Yau. This has been done last by Frederick Delitzsch (*Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 158 sq.). But I must on this point express my agreement with the criticism of Friedrich Philippi (*Ztschrift fuer Völkerpsychologie*, 1883, pp. 175-190). The latter has shown, on the one hand, that Delitzsch is unsuccessful in his attack on the generally accepted view, which takes יהוה to be a Qal form of הוה, and Yahu, Yah, Yeho, Yo to be abbreviations of this form, and, on the other hand, that there is no proof for Delitzsch's assertions, that an original Yau had been transformed into a Yahu: that there had been an Assyrio-Babylonian god named Yau; and that there had ever been a Sumerico-Akkadian name *i* for the divinity. According to Schrader (*Keilinschriften u. d. V. T.*, 1883, p. 25) a Hebrew or Assyrian origin of the name יהוה seems not even a possibility. But did not the Hamitic Canaanites, who had em-

igrated from the neighborhood of Babylon and the Erythrian Sea into the Semitic districts, possess the name Yahweh in some form? Even if we do find scattered reminiscences of the name, if not in Κολπία, yet, e. g., in the name of a Hamitic king (2 Sam. VIII., 10, and in cuneiform inscriptions), historically, it is more probable that these latter added the name Yahweh to their mythological list. This is also the view of Baudissin (*Studien*, I., p. 223).—Again, another party of the Hamitic nation, namely the Egyptians, are considered as furnishing the model for the word Yahweh, both for the word and the idea. The former view is that of Röth, who considers the name Yahweh an imitation of Yoh, the god of the moon. But as there is no reason why the Hebrews should select from the Egyptian gods just this Yoh, and as Yahweh stands in no special relation to the moon, this identification must be considered as forced and without ground. The latter view, i. e., a connection between the idea of Yahweh and an Egyptian idea, has in a two-fold manner been made the actual source of the tetragrammaton. In the first place, the Old Testament definition of the tetragrammaton, the sentence "I am that I am" (Ex. III., 14) is considered a translation of an inscription on the Isis temple at Sais reported by Plutarch. It is this (*De Iside*, ch. 9). *Τὸ ἐν Σάει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγος ἐπιγραφὴν εἶχε τοιαύτην: Ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδείς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν.* But this inscription "describes the goddess Neith as the one that eternally reproduces herself, over against which the idea lying in Yahweh is most radically contradictory" (Tholuck). In the second place, the idea expressed in the name Yahweh is regarded as a reproduction of the Egyptian nuk pu nuk. However, Le Page Renouf (*Vorlesungen*, p. 227) says: "The words nuk pu nuk are indeed found in several passages in the Book of the Dead, and it is also true that the word nuk is the personal pronoun *I*, and that the demonstrative word pu is frequently employed to connect the subject and the predicate of a sentence. But the connection in which the word stands must be looked at, before we can be sure of having a complete sentence before us, especially as pu generally stands at the end of a sentence. A careful study of the passages in the Book of the Dead where these words occur, shows us immediately that they contain no mysterious teachings concerning the being of God. In one of these passages (78: 21) the dead person says: 'I am he that knows the way of Nu;' at another (31 : 4), 'I am the ancient in the land.' 'I am he who is Osiris, the ancient, who looked on his father Seb and his mother Nut on the day of the great slaughter.' In another account in this book (contained in ch. 96) the words nuk pu nuk, disappear, because the report is in the third person. There we read: 'He is the bull of the field, he is Osiris, who,'" etc.

Or is the name Yahweh an original possession of the Semitic family, but belonging to another member than the Israelites? However the opinion of v. d. Alm. Tiele and Stade, that Yahwe was originally the name of the god of the Kenites, a member of the Midianites, has no proof whatever for itself. For even though we learn in 1 Chron. II., 55, that the Kenites are joined with the Rechabites, it is expressly stated in 1 Chron. IV., 10, that the Kenite Jabez, who had settled in Judea, had called upon the name of Yahweh. And it must also be accepted in the case of the Rechabite Jonadab (2 Kgs. X., 15 sq.) who had settled in the Northern Kingdom, that he, since a separate motive for his action is nowhere mentioned, maintained his fidelity to the worship of Yahweh, which had been adopted by his forefathers, for the same reason that the 7000 Israelites

(1 Kgs. XIX., 18) did. The descendants of Jonadab also thus maintain their fidelity only to the God who had been accepted by them (Jer. XXXV.). But in itself it is improbable that the Kenites, who in a political and social view were strangers and metics, and only an element whose presence was permitted, should, from a religious point of view, have been the ruling element from whom the Israelites should have adopted their most precious possession. Is it not, even from the outstart, probable that they were the g e r i m who had adopted the Y a h w e h cultus, and not proselytes, because, by their own voluntary act, they have accepted what others have received from their fathers, and "must first secure in order to possess"—generally the most zealous advocates of the possession?

Over against the favor with which an extra-Israelitish source for the Y a h w e h idea is received by a number of modern scholars, and over against the view that in doing so the true spirit of critical prudence and historical impartiality is evinced, I believe the historical consciousness of the Israelites ought to be thrown into the scales, according to which they regarded the divine appellation in question as their own peculiar property, while they have handed down other religious phenomena as foreign in character. The manner in which this historical consciousness finds its expression is well expounded by Tuch (*Genesis*, 1838, p. xl sq.) in these words: "The non-Israelite cannot know of Y a h w e h, but can have only a corruption of the deity in general. In his mouth the word יהוה would not signify the true God, the Creator of the world and Lord of the nations, but in a one-sided manner, only the God of the Hebrews. Y a h w e h would thus become one of the gods (cf. 1 Kgs. XX., 23, with verse 28). With a clear conception of the difference, the Hebrew avoids the use of the word יהוה both when he speaks to non-Israelites and also when he introduces non-Israelites as speakers, and employs principally the word אלהים. This we find in Judg. I., 7; VII., 14; 1 Sam. IV., 7, 8; Jonah III., 3; cf. with 5, 8, 9, 10; 1 Sam. XXX., 15; XXII., 3. It is characteristic that just in these cases the construction of אלהים with the plural (cf. 1 Sam. IV., 8) is generally used, whereby the Israelite narrator entirely places himself on the standpoint of the heathen conception of the divinity. From this standpoint also must be explained the fact that the word יהוה is not used by those animals that are introduced as speaking (cf. Judg IX., 9, with Gen. III., 1, sq.)."—*Translated from König's "Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1884, pp. 29–33."

BOOK NOTICES.

SOME RECENT GERMAN BOOKS.

By Professor H. P. Smith, D. D.

Cincinnati, O.

We shall first mention a work* which is not very recent, and which does not belong distinctively in the field of Old Testament science, it bears so directly, however, on all ancient literature, that it ought to interest every one who studies the intellectual development of the race. The author undertakes to give us as complete an account as possible of ancient book-making. He notes first the various classical words for the book and its parts. The second chapter discusses pergament as a book material and fixes the differences between the book and the codex. In the next division we are informed as to the usual size of ancient books. Stichometry is the subject of a separate chapter, while another describes the papyrus manufacture, and this is closely followed by another on the difference in form between books of poetry and prose books. A clear picture of the work of the ancient publisher is given in the seventh chapter. The eighth traces for us the change which took place as the *codex* took the place of the *volumen*, a change with which Christianity had (strange to say) considerable to do. The present writer is not competent to criticize the data of the work, still less to pronounce upon its proposed emendations in various classic texts. He can say, however, without reserve, that it is a very interesting book, and one from which much may be learned.

A reminder of the recent Luther-anniversary is the union in one volume of the reformers prefaces to the different editions of the Bible,† in his translation published during his lifetime. From the preface by Prof. Kleinert we learn that, besides separate issues of the New Testament and parts of the Old, the whole Bible was printed in eleven editions under Luther's own eye. In each of these he made changes and improvements. The prefaces now before us are characteristic of Luther, and many a sentence will stick in the memory of the reader, as this: "Here [in the Old Testament] thou wilt find the swaddling-clothes and the manger in which Christ lies, whither also the angel directed the shepherds. Poor and meager clothing, but precious the treasure, Christ, that lies therein." Of his occasional difficulty in translation we hear in the preface to Job: "I have taken pains to give clear and good German. It often happened that we were a fortnight or three or four weeks seeking for a single word, and even then we did not always find it. In Job Master Phillip, Aurogallus and I wrought so that sometimes in four days we could scarcely accomplish three lines. Friend, now that it is in German and finished, one can run his eye over three or four pages without

* Das Antike Buecherwesen in seinem Verhaeltniss zur Literatur; von *Theodor Birt*. Berlin, 1882. 8vo, viii and 517 pp.

† Dr. Martin Luther's Vorreden zur Heiligen Schrift.....neu herausgegeben auf Veranstaltung der Preussischen *Hauptbibelgesellschaft*. Berlin, 1883. 8vo, xviii and 185 pp., with portrait of Luther.

stumbling; but he will not discover what stones and stumps once lay where he now glides along as over a planed board. We had to sweat and fret before we could get the stones and stumps out of the way and make so fine a walk." The preface to the Psalter contains the well-known passage in which that book is called a *little Bible* "in which all that is in the whole Bible is contained in miniature, so that it becomes a beautiful encheiridion or handbook." A little further on we read "In fine, wilt thou see the holy Christian church painted in miniature with vivid color and form, take up the Psalter—there thou hast a fine, clear, clean glass that shall show thee what Christianity is." We are tempted to further quotation, but we forbear.

Dr. Mandelkern has ready for the press a Hebrew concordance more extensive than any at present in use, and more correct, as he hopes. It is difficult to find a publisher for such a work, and he has therefore published a brief prospectus,* accompanied by recommendations from those who have examined the manuscript. These recommendations come from Professors Delitzsch, Fleischer, Schlottmann, and others almost equally well known. The prospectus itself exhibits the shortcomings of Buxtorf and Fürst, and explains the advantages of Dr. Mandelkern's own work. The latter includes proper names and the most important particles, corrects the errors and omissions of earlier efforts, and makes its citations in such a way as to give the sense, instead of taking three or four words as they come." We cannot doubt that such a work is greatly needed, and in the present state of Hebrew study in this country, we do not see why the author might not count on the sale of a hundred copies here.

The Jewish question is represented by three recent pamphlets. The first is by Dr. Joel, well known as an author. It is "against Gildemeister."† But we have not been able to procure the article to which this is a response. We learn, however, from Dr. Joel' statements, that Prof. Gildemeister was called as witness in a criminal suit, which involved the character of the compendium of Jewish usage known as the *Shulchan Aruch*. Gildemeister declared this work still to be binding on the Jews, and gave what he supposed to be fair examples of the legislation found in it and in the Talmud. Dr. Joel replies to both counts; and it is evident that, for the more advanced Jews, it cannot be said that any of the ancient codes are binding in their entirety. We might blame them (though on the whole we shall probably find them excusable) for not breaking more decidedly with the traditions of the past.

Dr. Blumenstein makes a contribution to Jewish science in his discussion of the various kinds of oath, with especial reference to the Talmud.‡ The work consists of three parts, which take up in succession the Biblical oath, the Mishnic oath and the Rabbinical oath. It has been commended by Prof. Strack as on the whole a reliable statement. In reading it we have not discovered anything remarkable, except the Rabbinical thoroughness of classification, which provides for every possible emergency. No reference is made to *Kol Nidre*, which indeed does not come under the legal aspect of the subject.

---

* DIE NEUBEARBEITETE HEBRAEISCH-CHALDAEISCHE BIBEL-CONCORDANZ von Dr. S. Mandelkern in Leipzig. Leipzig, 1884.

† GEGEN GILDEMEISTER. Breslau, 1884. Small 8vo, 34 pp.

‡ DIE VERSCHIEDENEN EIDESARTEN NACH MOSAISCH-TALMUDISCHEM RECHTE UND DIE FAELLE IHRER ANWENDUNG; von Dr. J. Blumenstein. Frankfurt a. M., 1883. 8vo, 32 pp.

In the next number* we find more that stirs our blood, though we desire to be cautious in regard to every new movement. It comes, however, with the introduction of Prof. Franz Delitzsch, known as a warm friend of the Jews and a clear-headed man, as well as a profound scholar. The documents are in fact the confession of a new Judeo-Christian sect which has started in Russia. They declare a firm belief in "Jesus our brother," with a desire to maintain Jewish customs and usages so far as not inconsistent with such a belief. For an extended statement we must refer to the work itself. A supplement has appeared which we have not seen. The leader of the new movement has recently been assassinated, as we are informed by the daily papers; and between the intolerant government of Russia and the intolerance of Russian Jews, there is reason to fear that the little community may be crushed at its birth. Jewish papers in this country are rather inclined to sneer at it; but it can hardly be further from Talmudic Judaism than are some of the reform Jews, and one would think any movement that looks like progress would be welcome to the latter.

The Jewish Bible Dictionary of Dr. Hamburger appears in a second edition —partly at least; we gather that the revision is to extend over only the first two parts.† The work differs from others of its class, in that it is all written by one man. This fact being taken into consideration, it is certainly a very creditable performance; but it is almost unnecessary to add that it can show little originality. In the majority of articles that we have examined, nothing especially remarkable is found. In some cases, however, we have information on Talmudic practice or interpretation which is very welcome. So in the articles *Arbeit*, *Armuth*, *Babel*, *Ehre*, not to mention others. The account of Babylonia is extended so as to include post-biblical Judaism there. We have noticed some instances in which improbable assertions of the Talmud are given as historical facts.

The *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*‡ reaches its conclusion with the thirty-third and thirty-fourth part (*lieferung*). The present volume contains the Midrash to Proverbs. This is said to be of comparatively late origin; but it shows the likeness of the whole family. The completed work, containing over three thousand pages, is a monument to the industry of the author, and would seem to be sufficiently extensive to give a good idea of what is meant by Haggada. A single example may be introduced here. On Prov. XIII., 20 ("He who associates with the wise becomes wise, but the companion of fools is himself foolish,") we have the comment—"Like one who goes into the perfumer's, even though he buys or sells nothing, his clothes will carry a fragrance the whole day. This is the companion of the wise. Or, on the other hand, if one goes into the tanner's, even though he buys or sells nothing, his clothes will carry the smell the whole day. Like him is the one who consorts with fools."

* DOCUMENTE DER NATIONAL-JUEDISCHEN CHRISTGLAEUBIGEN BEWEGUNG IM SUEDRUSSLAND. In Original und deutscher Uebersetzung mitgetheilt von Franz Delitzsch. Erlangen, 1884. vi and 44 pp. in German with xxiv pp. Hebrew text.

† REAL-ENCYCLOPÆDIE FUER BIBEL UND TALMUD. Woerterbuch zum Handgebrauch fuer Bibelfreunde, etc. Ausgearbeitet von Dr. J. Hamburger. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Abtheilung I., Heft 1, 2. Leipzig, 1884. 178 pp. 8vo. The whole of this first or Biblical division fills 1102 pp.

‡ BIBLIOTHECA RABBINICA. Eine Sammlung alter Midrashim zum ersten male ins Deutsche uebertragen von Lic. Dr. Aug. Wuensche. Leipzig, 1885.

Prof. Schrader's essay* deals with the vexed question of the Akkadian or Sumerian or Akkado-Sumerian origin of Babylonian civilization. As is well known, the debate has now lasted a considerable time. The minority, headed by Halevy, decline still to be convinced of the Akkado-Sumerian existence at all, and of the existence of the "Turanian" dialects in some of the inscriptions. Prof. Schrader presents the arguments for both these points with his usual learning and perspicuity; and, to the layman at least, there would seem to be little left to say in reply.

The problems of Old Testament study† are the subject of a small book, by Dr. Koenig, already well known as a scholar in this department. His aim is to discover the exact point of inquiry in each case where difference of opinion exists in the different schools. In his study he found certain things asserted by the "development theorists," under the influence (as he supposes) of a development bias. The chief of these theorists is Kuenen, whose standpoint is notoriously the parity of all religions. "The religion of Israel is to us *one* of the religions, nothing less, but also nothing more." In contrast with this, Dr. Koenig formulates his own view, when starting on the inquiry, thus: "My judgment as to the parity of all religions is not decided at the start. Rather will I draw my assertions concerning the relative worth of all religions from the contemplation of the facts of history." In consequence of this determination he puts an interrogation point at each of several assertions of the modern school. These assertions generally concern "Yahweh" as the tribal god of Israel; his identity with Moloch; the position of Moses as a religious teacher; the worship of Yahweh under an image; the originality of the prophets; the age of the idea of the covenant; and the relations of the priests to the Torah. Each of these is discussed at some length, and the conclusion of the whole argument is stated as follows: "According to what precedes, I hold that there is reason for the assertion that the main elements of the Old Testament religion are not changed by the written prophets, and that the historical phases of the Mosaic religion were not alterations of its substance." As Dr. Koenig avowed himself some time since to be a Wellhausenian in critical questions, this study is especially interesting; because it shows that Wellhausen's theories may be held along with distinct supernaturalism.

The new edition of Herzog‡ has reached the middle of the fifteenth volume—more exactly, three-fifths of this volume are now in our hands. In this part there is much that is of especial interest to the Old Testament student. Prof. Strack contributes an article on the "Great Synagogue," and one on "Synagogues," both characterized by his accustomed learning. Considerably longer is the description of "Syria," by Dr. Ryssel. It discusses the name, the geography, the history and the literature of the country. Immediately following it is an article on the "Syriac Versions of the Bible" by Nestle. Dr. Nestle confines himself to the Peshito, as the other Syriac versions are treated in an earlier volume. He apparently finds no reason to depart from the common view that the transla-

* ZUR FRAGE NACH DEM URSPRUNGE DER ALTBABYLONISCHEN CULTUR, von Eb. Schrader. Berlin, 1884. 4to., 49 pp.

† DIE HAUPTPROBLEME DER ALT-ISRAELITISCHEN RELIGIONSGESCHICHTE GEGENUEBER DEN ENTWICKELUNGSTHEORETIKERN. Beleuchtet von Lic. Dr. Eduard Koenig. Leipzig, 1884. 8vo., iv and 108 pp.

‡ REAL-ENCYCLOPÆDIE FUER PROTESTANTISCHE THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. Heft 142-146. Leipzig, 1884, 1885.

tion was made as early as the second century. Prof. Volck has a good article on the Targums: but it is rather disappointing, on looking for "Talmud," to be referred to the supplement.

Lagarde has collected a number of his shorter writings in a single volume.* The most of them have appeared in the Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen. First in order is an essay on Lord Ashburnham's library, celebrated for the number of rare manuscripts it contains. Secondly, the preface to the author's "Anmerkungen zur Griechische Uebersetzung der Proverbien" (now out of print) is repeated, with additional notes. Of the rest, a number announce other publications. Some discuss Semitic words. Of these the longest is concerning צרה in the essay entitled, (as separately published) "Is marriage with a deceased wife's sister prohibited in the Pentateuch?" and written in English. The discussion turns upon the meaning of the word צרה in Lev. XVIII., 18. By elaborate comparison of the dialects, Lagarde establishes the meaning to be *a fellow-wife—co-wife* we might say.

The latter part of the volume (pp. 242–379), contains Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus according to the Codex Amiatinus. It is generally known that Tischendorf held this to be one of the most ancient MSS. of the Latin Bible (Old Latin, of course, in these two books) that have come down to us--probably the most ancient of all. Lagarde does not date it so early, placing it in the ninth instead of the sixth century. In any case, an accurate collation of it is desirable, as that which goes under Tischendorf's name is now generally recognized to be sufficient.

---

* MITTHEILUNGEN von Paul de Lagarde. Goettingen, 1884. Large 8vo, 384 pp.

SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BACHER, W. Hebräisches ב und arabisches ب. *Ztschr. d. Deutsch. Morg. Ges.*, No. 3, 1883.

BACHER, W. Die hebräisch-arabische Sprachvergleichung des Abulwalîd Merwân ibn Ganâh. (By C. F. Seybold.) *Literatur-Blatt f. Orientalische Philologie*, Nov., '84.

BALLHORN, F. Alphabete orientalischer und occidentalischer Sprachen. Nürnberg: *H. Ballhorn*, 1880.

BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litblt.*, No. 43, 1884.

BERTIN, G. On the character and influence of the accent in the Akkadian and Assyrian words. *Proc. Soc. of Bib. Archæol.*, Nov., '82.

BOEHTLINGK, O. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerter Fassung. 5. Thl. 2. Lfg. Leipzig: *Voss' Sort.*

CASSEL, DAV. Hebräisch-deutsches Wörterbuch nebst Paradigmen der Substantiva und Verba. 2. Aufl. Ober-Glogau: *Kukutsch.* Pp. IV, 377.

DELITZSCH, FRIEDRICH. Die Sprache der Kossäer. (By E. Mayer.) *Literatur-Blatt f. Oriental. Philologie*, Nov., '84. (By J. Halevy.) *Revue crit.*, June 16, '84.

HARKAVY, A. Neuaufgefundene hebräische Bibelhandschriften. Bericht an die kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg. Leipzig: *Voss' Sort.* Pp. 48.....M.3.70

HEIDENHEIM, M. Die samaritanische Pentateuch-Version. (By H. L. Strack.) *Lit. Centralblt.*, No. 50, 1884.

HILPRECHT, HERM. Freibrief Nebukadnezar's I., Königs von Babylon. (By C. Bezold.) *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung.*

HOMMEL, FR. Die semitischen Völker und Sprachen. (By E. König.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 23, 1884.

HOWELL, M. S. Grammar of the classical Arabic Language. (By G. P. Badger.) *Academy*, Dec. 27, '84.

KAULEN, FR. Assyrien und Babylonien. (By Himpel.) *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1884.

KAUTZSCH, E. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. (By J. J. P. Valeton. *Theol. Studien*, II., No. 5; (By K. Budde.) *Theol. Literaturztg.*, No. 26, 1884; (By C. Siegfried.) *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, No. 28, 1885.

KEANE, A. H. Semitico-oceanic linguistic affinitres. *Nature*, Dec., '83.

KOENIG, FR. Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte. (By E. Kautzsch.) *Theol. Literaturztg.*, No. 22, 1884.

KONIG, J. Das Alter und die Entstehungsweise des Pentateuchs. Freiburg: *Mohr*.....M.1.50

LANMAN, C. R. A Sanskrit Reader. (By L. v. Schroeder.) *Literatur-Blatt f. Orientalische Philologie*, Nov. '84.

LEFORT, F. Sur la période chaldaique. *Journ. des Sav.*, Nov., '83.

LIEBLEIN, J. Egyptian religion. Leipzig: *Hinrich.* Pp. 46.....M.1.50

MITCHELL, E. C. An Elementary Hebrew Grammar and Reading Book. (By G. F. Moore.) *Andover Review*, Jan., '85.

MITCHELL, H. G. Hebrew Lessons. (By G. F. Moore.) *Ibid.*

MITRA, R. The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepāl. (By T. W. Rhys-Davids.) *The Academy*, Aug. 30, '84.

NOELDEKE, TH. Untersuchungen zur Semitischen Grammatik. *Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges.*, No. 4, 1883.

PETERS, J. P. On the Egyptian and Old Babylonian Theories of the origin of the Phœnician Alphabet compared. *Proc. Amer. Orient. Soc.*, Oct. '83.

PINCHES, F. G. Papers upon Assyrian Grammar.—Introductory. *Proc. Soc. of Bibl. Archæol.*, Nov., '82.

RIEHM, ED. C. AUG. Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Altertums f. gebildete Bibelleser. Bielefeld: *Velhagen & Klasing*.....M.2.20

SARZEK, E. DE. Découvertes en Chaldée. Première Livre. Paris: *E. Leroux*. 30fr.

SAYCE, A. H. Origin of the Persian Cuneiform Alphabet. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung*, Jan., '84.

SCHAEFER, B. Das Diluvium in der Tradition der Völker. Frankfurt a. M.: *Foesser*. Pp. 22.....M.0.50

SCHRADER, EBERH. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprunge der alt-babylonischen Cultur. (By J. Halevy.) *Revue crit.*, July 14, 21, '84.

STEINGASS, F. The Student's Arabic-English Dictionary. *Athenæum*, Mar. 28, '85.

STRACHUN, D. O. Der Tractat Taanit des babyl. Talmud. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Lit.*, No. 40, '84; *Lit. Centralbl.*, No. 37, '84.

TOY, H. Semitic Notes. *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. V., 4.

Vocabulaire arabe-français à l'usage des étudiants. Beyrouth, 1883. Pp. x, 1007.....M.12

WIEDEMANN, A. Aegyptische Geschichte. (By R. Pietschmann.) *Literatur-Blatt f. Oriental. Philologie*, Nov., '84.

WUENSCHE, A. Bibliotheca rabbinica. Die Pesikta des Rab Kahana. (By Kroner.) *Jued. Liter.-Blatt*, No. 45, 1884.

General Index.

Adler, Dr. C., On a Hebrew Manuscript of the Year 1300 80
Alphabet, The Varieties of the Semitic 52
Answers, Questions and 20, 46
Aramaic Language, The 98
Assyrian, Books for the Study of 14
Assyrian Philology, Contributions to Hebrew and 31
Assyrian Phonology, with special reference to Hebrew 175
Assyriological Notes 182
Bacher, Prof. Wm., מישרתים-מלכים. A contribution to the History of the terminology of the Hebrew Grammar 96
Bibliography, Semitic 23, 48, 71, 135, 199, 263
Book Notices: Ballin, Hebrew Grammar, 23; Brown, Aramaic Method, 134; Delitzsch, Hebrew and Assyrian, 21; Gesenius, Lexicon, 70; Kautzsch, Grammar of the Biblical-Aramaic, 133; König, Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude Sprache, 197; Mitchell, Hebrew Lessons, 194; Some Recent German Books, 258; Strack, Lehrbuch der Neuhebräischen Sprache, 22; Turpie, Chaldee Manual, 47.
Brown, Prof. Francis, Assyriological Notes 182
Chirography, Hebrew 40
Clarke, Prof. J. C. C., The Varieties of the Semitic Alphabet 52
Contributed Notes: *C. R. Brown*, The Relatives יֶשׁ and אֲשֶׁר, 249; Genesis xx., 16, 250; Note on כֶּסֶת, 251; — *T. K. Cheyne*, צַלְמָוֶת or צַלְמוּת?, 251; Moriah, 252; — *R. F.*, גַּן-בְּעֵדֶן, 129; חַדְקֵל, 129; — *B. Pelsenthal*, Kautzsch's Aramaic Grammar, 127; — *O. O. Fletcher*, פ"א Verbs: First Person Sing. Impf. Qal., 66; Errata in the Baer-Delitzsch Edition of Proverbs, 252; — *H. G. Mitchell*, Purpose without a Connective, 253; — *G. H. Schodde*, Remarks on the Ethiopic, 123; — *W. Sproull*, Study of Arabic in the University of Cincinnati, 128; — On the Semitic Languages in General, 247; On the Source of the Name יְהוָה, 255.
Contribution to the History of the Terminology of the Hebrew Grammar 96
Contributions to Hebrew and Assyrian Philology 31
Contributions to Hebrew Synonomy 13, 33
Cylinder of Nebukadnezzar at New York, The 201
Daghēsh in Initial Letters, The 145
Denio, Prof. F. B., Grammatical Questions 214
Dodd, Prof. T. J., The Intermediate Syllable 10

Editorial Notes: Miscellaneous, 18, 67; Hebrew Studies in Vanderbilt University, 44; Hebrew Study in the Junior Vacation, 45; Hebrew Texts with Notes, 193; The Institute of Hebrew, 192; The Intermediate Syllable, 43; A Pastor's Testimony, 45; The Present Number of HEBRAICA, 192; Prof. Haupt's Series of Articles, 193; The Study of Assyrian, 130; Unaccented Open Syllables with a Short Vowel, 132.

Epistle of King Abgar to Jesus, Syriac Version of ... 232

Felsenthal, Dr. B., On "Intermediate Syllables" ... 60

General Notes: A Question in Hebrew Grammar, *F. B. Denio*, 187; The Accentuation of the Three Poetical Books, 41; Additional Aramaic Words in the New Testament, *B. Felsenthal*, 188; Chaldee Hymn by Israel Nagara, 191; Davidson on Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, 16; The Ethical Dative, 15; Michaelis on Oriental Study, 42; צְדָקָה in Later Hebrew, 43; The Religion of the Kassites, 189; Rules of Life, 17; Two Epigrams by Aben Ezra, 43; The Word יֵאֹר, 16.

Grammatical Questions ... 244

Hall, Dr. I. H., A Phœnician Inscription in New York ... 25

Syriac Version of Epistle of King Abgar to Jesus ... 232

Harper, Prof. W. R., Purpose of HEBRAICA, The ... 1

Haupt, Prof. P., Assyrian Phonology, with Special Reference to Hebrew ... 175

Wâteh-Ben-Hazael ... 217

HEBRAICA, The Purpose of ... 1

Hebrew and Assyrian Philology, Contributions to ... 31

Hebrew Chirography ... 40

Hebrew Grammars, Methods in ... 75

Hebrew Language, The Syllables in the ... 73

Hebrew Manuscript of the year 1300, On a ... 80

Hebrew Synonomy, Contributions to ... 13, 33

Higher Criticism, A Witness to the Credibility of the Biblical Narrative ... 5

Initial Letters, The Dāghēsh in ... 145

Inscription in New York, A Phœnician ... 25

Intermediate Syllable, The ... 10

"Intermediate Syllables," On ... 60

Kautzsch, Prof. E., The Aramaic Language ... 98

Kohler, Dr. K., Contributions to Hebrew and Assyrian Philology ... 31

Language, The Aramaic ... 98

Lansing, Prof. J. G., Pleiades, Orion and Mazzaroth ... 236

Lyon, Prof. D. G., Books for the Study of Assyrian ... 14

Massoretic Vowel System, The ... 137

Mazzaroth, Pleiades, Orion and ... 236

Methods in Hebrew Grammars ... 75

Miscellaneous Notes ... 115, 184, 242

Nebukadnezzar at New York, The Cylinder of ... 201

Neo-Hebraic Language, Books for the Study of ... 49

Nordell, Rev. P. A., Contributions to Hebrew Synonomy ... 13, 33

Notes, Assyriological ... 182

Notes, Miscellaneous ... 115, 184, 242

O'Connor, Rev. J. F. X., The Cylinder of Nebukadnezzar at New York ... 201

Old Testament in the Time of the Talmud, The 153
Orion and Mazzaroth, Pleiades 236
Peters, Prof. J. P., Miscellaneous Notes 115, 184, 242
Pick, Rev. B., Pirke Aboth; or, Sayings of the Fathers 36, 119, 212
The Old Testament in the Time of the Talmud 153
Pirke Aboth; or, Sayings of the Fathers 36, 119, 212
Phœnician Inscription in New York, A 25
Phonology, Assyrian, with special reference to Hebrew 175
Psalms with their Superscriptions 26
Purpose of HEBRAICA, The 1
Questions and Answers 20, 46
Questions, Grammatical 244
Sayings of the Fathers. Pirke Aboth; or 36, 119, 212
Schodde, Prof. G. H., Methods in Hebrew Grammars 75
Scribe, The 209
Semitic Alphabet, The Varieties of the 52
Semitic Bibliography 23, 48, 71, 135, 199, 263
Strack, Prof. H. L., The Higher Criticism, A Witness to the Credibility of the Biblical Narrative 5
Books for the Study of the Neo-Hebraic Language 49
The Syllables in the Hebrew Language 73
The Scribe 209
Study of Assyrian, Books for The 14
Superscriptions, The Psalms with their 26
Syllable, The Intermediate 10
Syllables, On "Intermediate" 60
Syllables in the Hebrew Language 73
Syriac Version of Epistle of King Abgar to Jesus 232
Taylor, Prof. B. C., The Psalms with their Superscriptions 26
The Scribe 209
Toy, Prof. C. H., The Massoretic Vowel System 137
Time of the Talmud, The Old Testament in the 153
Varieties of the Semitic Alphabet, The 52
Vowel-System, The Massoretic 137
Wâtch-Ben-Hazael 217
Wheaton, A. C., Hebrew Chirography 40

BINDING LIST JAN 15 1943

PJ
3001
A6
v. 1

The American journal of
Semitic languages and
literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY