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Balaam's Prophecy (Numbers XXIV. 17-24) and the God Sheth.

By Prof. A. H. Sayce, M. A.,

Oxford University, England.

I must begin by apologizing for adding another commentary to the many which have already appeared on the Prophecy of Balaam in Num. XXIV. 17-24; but I believe I have some new conjectures and facts to bring forward which may possibly prove of interest. That the prophecy is a cento has long since been recognized. It does not present an unbroken thread of connection, and the interruptions in verses 20, 21 and 23 suggest either that successive prophecies have been attached one by one to the original prophecy in verses 17-19, or else that the passages they introduce have been taken from other documents of various age and ancestry. An examination of the original prophecy makes the latter view the more probable.

In the first place the prophecy begins with a pronoun which has no antecedent, "I shall see him," "I shall behold him," says Balaam (verse 16), but we have no indication as to who it is that is meant by the him. It cannot be Israel, since Balaam was seeing Israel ranged close below him at the time; it cannot refer to "the star," since the latter is mentioned subsequently. The passage has obviously been taken from elsewhere, with the omission of its commencement (like Isa. ii. 2). That the latter part of the verse also has been borrowed from another source is clear from a comparison with Num. xxii. 28; Jer. xlviii. 45, and Amos ii. 2, on which I shall have more to say presently. Verse 19 must also be derived from some other context. Though united by the conjunction with the preceding verse, the nominative cannot be "Israel," as this would make no sense, and we must therefore construe the verb with the impersonal "one." But the expression, "And let one rule out of Jacob" has no apparent connection with the statement immediately preceding, "Israel is doing valiantly;" while the prep-
osition יֵבָל leads us to believe that the punctuation ought to be דֶּל "one shall descend from Jacob" rather than דֶּל from הָרָד. This at all events was the reading of the Septuagint translators. The רֵע at the end of the verse cannot be right. No "city" has been referred to, only the land of Edom and Seir,—an additional proof that the verse did not originally belong to the place which it now occupies. A comparison with Num. xxii. 28 seems to indicate that the reading ought to be רֵע, and that the verse primarily followed immediately upon verse 17, verse 18 being an interpolation. Possibly the cause of the change of רֵע into רֵע is to be found in Ps. lx. 9.

When we turn to the concluding verses of the prophecy (20–24), the first point which strikes us is that, whereas the original prophecy appears to refer to the conquest of Moab and Edom by David, the "parable" upon Amalek finds its fulfillment in the destruction of the Amalekites by Saul (cf. 1 Chron. iv. 43), while verses 22 and 24 transport us to the period of the Assyrian campaigns. The second point is the interpolation of verse 23, which not only interrupts the context, but is introduced by the imperfect formula "he took up his parable and said," instead of the complete, "he looked on אָסָר," etc. The paronomasia in verses 20, 21, will also be noted, inasmuch as no trace of it appears in the preceding verses.

Geiger has ingeniously suggested that in verse 22 we should disregard the Massoretic punctuation, and simply render "Who shall survive Samuel?" In this case, the words would be out of their true place which would be immediately after verse 20. Against this is the fact that the prophecy in verse 24 terminates with the same words as does verse 20.

The imperfect condition of the introductory formula in verse 23 is shown by the Septuagint to be due to a corruption of the text. The Septuagint has Kal ḫεαν ῥβν ὁμ, a reading which naturally suggests the name of Agag. It cannot have originated in the יִנ below (which is translated וֹ א), but is the best evidence yet adduced in support of Geiger’s conjecture. It must be remembered that Agag is mentioned in the Massoretic text of xxiv. 7.

We should then have the following as the original text of verses 20–23:—
"And when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable and said: Amalek was the first of the nations; but his latter end shall be that he perish forever. And when he looked on Agag, he took up his parable and said: Alas, who shall survive Samuel? And he looked on the Kenites, and took up his parable and said: Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in Sela. Nevertheless the Kenite shall be wasted until אסăr shall carry thee away captive."

There would now remain only the enigmatic verse 24. That the Massoretic text is corrupt is obvious from the impossibility of construing it, and the reading

---
1 So also the Samaritan and Syriac versions and Onkelos. Gaab, Vater, Knobel, etc., endeavor to escape from the grammatical difficulty by proposing to read יֵבָל יַרְד or וּרְד.
of the Septuagint καὶ ἐξελήφθηκα indicates that we should read דִּבְרֵי or דִּבְרֵי instead of דִּבְרֵי. But what is the antecedent of those who "come forth"? If we could accept the third person singular of the Septuagint (Δυς) the reference would be to "Aššūr" in verse 22; indeed the plural participle might also be understood in the same sense, דָּבְרֵי being construed as a collective. But דָּבְרֵי cannot signify the "sea-coast;" it is used only of the "bank" of a river, not of the shore of the sea. I am, therefore, tempted to believe that the passage is corrupt, and that instead of דִּבְרֵי we ought, perhaps, to read דִּבְרֵי. However this may be, the name of Chittim can be defended only on the supposition that the verse was interpolated in the prophecy in the Persian or Ptolemaic age, and that the name of Aššūr which occurs in it denotes Syria. But against this supposition several weighty reasons may be urged. The obvious corruption of the first words of the verse and the various readings to which they have given rise can but be explained on the hypothesis that the verse was of much greater antiquity than such a supposition would imply; moreover, it is Eber and not Aššūr which is "also to perish forever;" and lastly the words דָּבְרֵי אֶצֶל אֲשֶׁר are manifestly an interpolation. They destroy the parallelism of the verse; they interrupt the context, which states that Eber and not Aššūr is to perish; and the repetition of the word דָּבְרֵי indicates a scribe's error. Furthermore, unless Aššūr is taken to mean Syria, it could hardly be attacked, and as a matter of history, we know never was attacked, by an expedition coming from Cyprus; while it is difficult to make Aššūr synonymous with Eber, as the present reading of the verse would imply. It seems to me, therefore, that "Aššūr" must originally have been a marginal gloss upon דָּבְרֵי, which subsequently made its way into the text, and once there was necessarily provided with a second דָּבְרֵי. The whole verse would thus run: "And they come out of ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...", and they (i. e., the Assyrians) afflict Eber." It must be left to future research to decide what tribe or nationality can be meant by "Eber." It may be noted, however, that Abram after coming out of Syria is called "the Hebrew" in Gen. xiv. 13, and that Damascene tradition made him a king of Damascus.

It is now time to return to the latter part of the verse 17, with which the prophecy of Balaam begins. I have already noticed that the passage is found in varying forms in other parts of the Old Testament, where it is provided with a context which is wanting here. Its oldest form seems to be preserved in Num. xxii. 28. Here a māshāl or "old poem" is quoted, like the māshāl which Balaam is said to have "taken up," and which, though subsequently adapted to the conquest of Moab by the Israelites, is really an Amorite

1 This is also the reading of the Samaritan codex and version (דִּבְרֵי) and דִּבְרֵי. The Targum of Jonathan has יְדֵי "armies," which, however, cannot be construed any more than the Massoretic דִּבְרֵי.

2 In Assyrian masšāl denotes "an extract" from an old book (W. A. I., iv. 15, 23).
song of triumph—the single specimen of Amorite literature that has been preserved to us. Its adaptation to the successes of Israel caused one portion of it to become popular among Hebrew writers; hence we find Jeremiah quoting it in XLVIII. 45, 46, and Amos slightly varying its words in II. 2. Balaam treats the original with the same freedom as Amos.

The original ran as follows (Num. xxxi. 28): “For there is a fire gone out of Heshbon, a flame from the city of Sihon; it hath consumed Ar of Moab, the lords of the high places of the Arnon.” In Balaam’s adaptation this becomes, “There has trodden a star out of Jacob and a sceptre has arisen out of Israel; and it has shattered the temples of Moab and the head of all the sons of Sheth.” Here I have corrected the Massoretic reading וָרַּחְפֶּּל into the וָרַּחְפֶּל of the text of Jeremiah; וָרַּחְפֶּל, the Pipel of וָרַּחְפֶּל “to dig up,” is not used of living persons, and would moreover destroy the parallelism of the verse. It is on account of the parallelism, moreover, that I have followed Ewald in rendering רַחֲמָא by “the temples” of the head, in accordance with Lev. xix. 27, though the Septuagint, Vulgate and Syriac, like the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, must have read בָּרַחָמֵה “governors”—a reading certainly more conformable with the original than רַחֲמָא.

For Heshbon and the city of Sihon Balaam substitutes Jacob and Israel; for the ideas of “fire” and “flame” he substitutes those of “star” and “sceptre.” But the two latter ideas are not in parallelism with one another, while the verb חַבֶּל, with which they are construed, is applicable only to the “sceptre,” and not to “the star.” Moreover the verb לְדוֹרָה to which חַבֶּל serves as nominative cannot be used of a star; the natural verb to employ with חַבֶּל would be לְדוֹרָה which is, however, appropriated to חַבֶּל. Either חַבֶּל or חַבֶּל must be a false reading, and since the verbs apply to חַבֶּל and not to חַבֶּל, it is clear that it must be the latter word which is in fault. I cannot, however, propose a satisfactory emendation. The analogy of Gen. xl. 10, would suggest a word like מַדֶּחָה; but לְדוֹרָה is also a strange expression, and the analogy of Num. xxxi. 28, and Jer. xlvi. 45, would lead us to expect only one verb.

The change made in the second part of the passage in Balaam’s prophecy is followed by Jeremiah, except that Jeremiah necessarily retains the לְדוֹרָה of the original in place of Balaam’s מַדֶּחָה. The only differences between Jeremiah and Balaam are that Jeremiah has the singular מַדֶּחָה instead of the dual מַדֶּחָה and מַדֶּחָה instead of מַדֶּחָה. Amos also (II. 2), who has transformed the of the original into the like-sounding מַדֶּחָה, evidently read מַדֶּחָה which he explains by מַדֶּחָה and מַדֶּחָה, an addition which spoils the rhythm of

1 For מַדֶּחָה Jer. xlvi. 5 gives us the ungrammatical מַדֶּחָה—נָבוּךְ, where it is obvious that we should read הַבָּרוֹן “the house of Sihon,” like the Assyrian Bit-Humuri for Samaria.

2 I have already discussed מַדֶּחָה instead of מַדֶּחָה.
Balaam’s Prophecy and the God Sheth.

his verse. The reading יָנָשׁ must therefore be early. On the other hand, while the more difficult יָנָשׁ might be explained by the more intelligible יָנָשׁ, it is impossible to suppose that יָנָשׁ could have been corrupted into a word which was such a puzzle to later generations as יָנָשׁ. Here as elsewhere the rule holds good that the harder reading is the best.

Regarding יָנָשׁ, then, as the word of which יָנָשׁ was a later attempt at explanation, what meaning can we assign to it? The expression “all the sons of Sheth” replaces the words of the original, “the lords of the high place of Arnon.” The latter were the Moabites, who worshiped on the high places of Arnon; the inference therefore is obvious that “the sons of Sheth” were the Moabites who worshiped in the same locality. The expression will thus be parallel to Ben-Ammi, “an Ammonite” (Gen. xix. 38); and since we now know that Ammi was the name of the god of Ammon, we may conclude that Sheth also was the name of the Moabite god who was worshiped on the very high-places from which Balaam surveyed the children of Israel.

The conclusion is verified by archaeological evidence. At the foot of the south-eastern angle of the Harem at Jerusalem Sir C. Warren found among other fragments of early pottery two handles ornamented with a representation of the winged solar disk and inscriptions in Phoenician letters of the pre-exilic period. One of these reads לֶלֶךְ-תִּשְׁפָּה “belonging to Melech-Tsiph,” the other לֶלֶךְ-שְׁתִּי “belonging to Melech-Sheth.” The latter name can only be explained as signifying “Moloch is Sheth,” like Malchiel, Malchiyah or Melchizedek, thus bearing witness to the fact that not only was Sheth a deity, but that he was worshiped by persons who left their pottery within the precincts of Jerusalem in the valley of the sons of Hinnom. It is therefore possible that Dr. Neubauer may be right in identifying him with the antediluvian patriarch Seth, the father of Enos or “Man,” as well as in seeing his name in the Bosheth of Me-phi-bosheth and Ish-bosheth (2 Sam. ii. 8; 1 Chron. viii. 33) where Bosheth has first been contracted from הַשְׁתִּי (as in Bedad for Ben-Dad) and then assimilated to הַשְׁתִּי “shame.” What makes the latter conjecture the more probable is that יָנָשׁ must mean “the phallus” (see 2 Sam. x. 4; Isa. xx. 4), and stand for יָנָשׁ, the Assyrian sinatu “urine.” Possibly Sheth was the native name of the Moabite god Baal-peor.

I am inclined to believe that the name of the god Sheth occurs in Gen. iv. 7, in a very disguised form. We here have an old proverb quoted: “If thou doest well, it is יָנָשׁ; and if thou doest not well, יָנָשׁ lieth at the door.” Now the second part of the phrase is found in the Assyrian legend of the plague-god Nerra (M. 55, col. i. 4) where we read D. P. Ner-ra ra-bi-su abulli-šu “the god

1 It is possible that the יָנָשׁ of Amos was suggested by the like-sounding יָנָשׁ, the poetical synonym of יָנָשׁ.
Nerra lieth at its gate." Consequently נֶּשֶׁב will be the Hebrew equivalent of the Assyrian Nerra, and will mean, not "sin"—which makes no sense—but rather the punishment that follows upon sin. It has taken the place of the earlier angel of pestilence. As the latter portion of the proverb thus once contained the name of a deity, the first portion of it must have done so too, and since the termination of נֶּשֶׁב has obviously been assimilated to that of נֶּשֶׁךְ, it is reasonable to suppose that this divine name was נֶשֶׁךְ. When the proverb passed into Hebrew mouths, the god Sheth became an abstract noun, and with the assistance of the interpolated נ and the change of ש into ש was identified with נֶּשֶׁכָּע "exaltation." The latter word, however, agrees but badly with the context of the proverb, and can only be forced into harmony with it by the gratuitous supposition that מלאי is "understood."

2 We should notice the difference of form assumed by the proverb in the mouths of the settled Babylonians and the nomad Hebrews. The "city-gate" of the one is replaced by the "tent-door" of the other.
THE GREEK WORDS IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.¹

BY PROF. HARTWIG DERENBOURG.

[Translated from the French by Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph. D.]

The ethnographical table in the Book of Genesis names יָיוָן (Yāwān) among the sons of Japheth (גֹּרֶנָה).² Throughout the Orient the term Ionians (Ἰωνές, Ἰωνίς) has become a synonym for Greeks. Both in the Semitic and the Aryan cosmography it appears to have been applied to the two sea-costs which face each other, separated—and reunited by the numerous islands of the Αἰγαίoν Sea—from the province of that name on the western borders of Asia Minor running out into a sharp-pointed, irregularly shaped cape in the direction of Hellas.³ The Greeks themselves knew of the deep-seated confusion which led the barbarians to identify them with the “long-robed Ionians.”⁴ “The Athenians,” says Herodotus,⁵ “were not unaware of this fact, but refused to recognize any such term; and even to this day the greater part resent the appellation as an insult.”

The compiler of these old biblical genealogies, in which each people is personified by an individual, continues in these words: “And the sons of Yāwān were Elishāh (יוֹלִישָה), Tarshish (תַּרְשִׁיש), the Kittites (כִּיְטִים) and the Rhōdānites (רְודָאנים).”⁶ The identifications which have been proposed for these terms occurring several times in the Old Testament, are innumerable; and the literature on the subject furnishes in itself material for an entire bibliography. Our own preference is Ἀεolis (ἡ Ἀεολίς),⁷ the Iberian colony of Tartessos (Ταρτέσσας), the Cyprians, inhabitants of Cithium (ὁ Κιτταῖος),⁸ and the Rhodians (ὁ Ρόδος).

¹ See Melanges Grouz (pp. 235-244) Paris, 1884. [The Translator retains, where practicable, Professor Dernbourg’s transcription of Hebrew and Greek proper names.]
² x. 2 (cf. the parallel I Chr. i. 5). The other biblical examples of the word יָיוָן are Gen. x. 4 (cf. 1 Chr. i. 7); Isa. lxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 13; Joel iv. 6 (יוֹנָם) “the sons of the Ionians”; Zech. xi. 19; Dan. viii. 21, where Alexander the great is designated as יָיוָן, יָיוָן “the king of the Greeks;” x. 20, where he is called יָיוָן יָיוָן “the chief of the Greeks,” who rules יָיוָן יָיוָן “the kingdom of Greece” (xi. 2). All the epigraphical and literary material bearing on this ancient term has been carefully collected and discussed by Prof. B. Stade, in his essay De populo Javan parergon patriæ sermones conscriptum (Gissae, 1880).
⁴ Ὸανεις ἔλαχερτυνες, Iliad, XIII, 685.
⁵ Book I., 168. See also the very interesting passages on this subject collected by Gesenius in his Thesaurus, p. 587b.
⁶ The text in 1 Chr. i. 7, reads יִבְּרוֹמִים in order to perfect a rhyme among the four names, divided into two pairs.
⁷ So the reading in Chronicles, according to which Genesis, where we have דָּרְדַּנֵים, is to be corrected. The Septuagint and the Samaritan translations have already in Genesis the reading which we, following the example of Reuss and Stade, regard as the preferable one. Reuss, however, adds that, for the “Dardanites,” some have suggested the Dardanians, others, Trojans or Dodones and even Illyrians (“L’histoire sainte et la loi,” I., p. 889). Note also Ezek. xxxvii. 19, 20, where Yāwān and Dedān follow close upon one another.
⁸ This, according to Stade (op. cit., p. 8, 9), was the ancient name of Carthage.
⁹ At present the village of Larname, which figures in the first part of the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum (pp. 85-100) with seventy-eight inscriptions. Esdræl speaks of the “isle of the Cithians.”
The conquests of Alexander, in the year 332 B. C., gave the Greek language a prepondering influence in Palestine. Hebrew grammar, indeed, firmly resisted the Macedonian sway, as it formerly presented an inflexible front against Persian rule; but the vocabulary was enriched by the addition of a number of foreign words, imported with new conceptions for which there existed no equivalents in the national tongue. It is of the Greek elements in the Book of Daniel that I propose to treat.

The date and composition of the Book of Daniel have been fixed with an absolute certainty. It is a Palestinian work\(^1\) of the year 169 or 168 before the Christian era. Hebrew and an Aramaic dialect, known as biblical Aramaic, are used alternately, as in the Book of Ezra. But our author goes even further, and does not hesitate to give his work a still stronger polyglottic character by the introduction of Persian and Greek words. M. Haug, in a learned monograph, has traced the etymologies of the former,\(^2\) and I shall endeavor to do the same for the latter.

King Nebukadnezzar (נְבֵעָדָן נֶצֶּזֶּזֶּר), we are told, had erected a statue which was to be dedicated in the presence of all the dignitaries of the kingdom. The herald charged to “proclaim with might” the orders of the king, is called נֶפֶרָא, which is the ordinary Aramaean transcription of the Greek κεφάς. The herald speaks as follows to the noble assembly: “Peoples, nations and languages! At the moment when ye hear the sound of the cornet, the flute, guitar, harp, psaltery, bag-pipe, in a word, of all instruments, ye shall fall down and prostrate yourselves before the statue of gold which king Nebukadnezzar has set up.”\(^3\)

The unfashionable sounds of the Kinnor and Ugbah, the invention of which, according to the Bible, reaches back to the earliest days of humanity,\(^4\) are here replaced by the grander tones of a foreign orchestra.

1st. The cornet, נֶפֶרָא. The proper meaning of the word is “horn” of an animal; it is used in this sense in the very same Book of Daniel (vii, 7, 8, 20, 21, 24.) But wherever the word has penetrated, it has been applied to designate a wind-instrument of one kind or another. The analogy of the Greek κέρας (κέρατος) might be invoked; but it is fully counterbalanced by the constant usage in pure

---

\(^1\) Apart from the linguistic point of view, which in itself is decisive, the contents of ch. IX., referring to Jerusalem, removes all further doubts.

\(^2\) In Ewald's Jahrbiicher d. Bibl. Wissenschaft (1863), V., pp. 151-164.

\(^3\) A denominative verbal form is found in v. 29, נֶפֶרִים, which has the sense of κεφάσω “proclaim by voice of herald.” Dan. iii. 4. The “wāw” (ונ ל) which I have rendered by “in a word,” is frequently used in this way by the author of the Book of Daniel when, at the end of a detailed enumeration, he resumes the thread of his discourse. So ch. iii. 3, נְפָרִים לְשׁוֹלֵם לֶב נְפָרִים means “in a word all the dignitaries of the kingdom;” iii. 21, נְפָרִים לְשׁוֹלֵם לְתֵלאֵם לֶב נְפָרִים “in a word, all their garments;” iii. 27, נְפָרִים לְשׁוֹלֵם לְתֵלאֵם לָמְפָרִים “in a word all the intimate advisors of the king,” etc. A similar use of the copula “wāw” is not without example in Hebrew, as II. Exod. xx 9.

\(^4\) Gen. iv. 21. Professor Grätz, whose indefatigable activity leads him to all subjects, has devoted an extensive article to the part which music played in the temple of Jerusalem. See Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenthums, 1881, No. 6; and also his commentary to the Psalms (Breslau, 1882), I., 64 seq.
Hebrew of מַחֲרַת in the proper sense of "horn." Nor is it likely that the Latin form cornu should have contributed to this transformed meaning of σκιργ, for it is only a century later that Rome appears on the scene, to play the rôle of conqueror of the present and destroyer of the past, in the Orient.

2d. The flute, σακύρα. Like καρνα, this word is the result of a compromise between the Hebrew-Aramaic stem פֶּנַי “whistle” and the Greek σφαγ. The prefix and termination are Semitic; but the body of the word, σχύξι, bears a resemblance to σφαγ which is rendered all the more striking by the fact that, in proper names, a Shin is always the equivalent of the Greek Sigma. Both the Septuagint and the version of Theodotion have σφαγ. It ought to be added, however, that, according to a Greek tradition preserved in the Onomasticon of Pollux (IV., 9, § 15), this species of pipe is claimed to be an invention of two Medes.

3. The guitar, סְיָרָן, with the variant סְיָרָה. While the foreign origin of the two preceding words may be disputed, and in fact has been often contested, there is a general consensus in regarding κιθάρις (a poetic form of κιθάρα), as the source of καθρος.

4. The sambuca, σαμβοκ. The Greek forms for this species of harp are σαμβοκ, σαμβοχ, σαμβοκ, σαμβοκ, ἱαμβοκ, perhaps also ἱαμβοκ. From what region the word came to the Greeks it is difficult to determine. Neither Athenæus Deipnosophistæ (IV., 23), nor Strabo, Geography (X., § 17), consider it to be of Greek origin. The instrument acquired great favor at Rome, in the hands of the fascinating sambucinae et sambucistriae. In speaking of the latter, Scipio the younger says, in Macrobi. Saturnales (III., xiv., 6), “Docentur praestigias inhonestas cum cincedulis et sambuca psalteriique eunt in ludum histrionum.” As in Daniel, the sambuca is there joined to psaltery.

5. The psaltery, פֶּנַי. The termination “in,” which might suggest the Aramaean plural, corresponds generally to the Greek ὰν in Neo-Hebraic and Aramaean transcriptions of Greek words. Thus we have, besides our word, שַעֲרֵיהִים, שַעֲרֵיהִים, וַעֲרֵיהִים, וַעֲרֵיהִים etc.

---

1 In one passage, indeed (Jos. vi. 5), מַחֲרַת is used by the side of the ordinary term Shôfâr, to designate a trumpet. The enumeration of the musical instruments in the third chapter of Daniel occurs again in vs. 7, 10 and 15, with slight variations, which will be treated in their proper place. My quotations are according to the critical edition of Baer & Delitzsch (Leipzig, 1882).
2 So the Κ'θι in the four examples of this word, while according to the Κ'ρι the vocalization is "Katros," with the suppression of the ροδ.
3 Gesenius, Thesaurus, p. 1318a, has collected a number of instances where the termination "os" has in Aramaean been substituted for a Greek formation in "is."
4 The "u" has also left its trace in the variant מַעְרֵיהִים (v. 7).
5 The French "sasnedrin" has been adopted directly from the Aramaean form, which is overlooked in Littré's French Dictionary.
6 Quite a number of such examples have been collected by Gesenius, Thesaurus, p. 1116b. M. Dozy has shown that the Arabic authors and copyists likewise adopt a termination "in" in the transcription of Latin words in place of "us." So "Romanus" becomes with them "Romālin," and "Alvitus" is changed to "Alvitn." Dozy, Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen âge, 2d ed. (1881), I, p. 104.
6. The bag-pipe, *τάρκα*.

   1 This is the Greek *συμφωνία*, which, moreover, all the ancient versions have reproduced with rare unanimity; the Septuagint as well as Theodotion, the *Veneta* as also the Vulgate. According to a fragment of Polybius, preserved in Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* (X., 52), Antiochus Epiphanes showed a marked fondness for this instrument at the very epoch when the Book of Daniel was written. The bag-pipe, it is supposed, was thus called, because the sound obtained by the aid of two tubes produces for the ear a "symphony" of harmonious tones.  

   Besides *καρόκα* and the six musical instruments, the "Chaldean" portion of Daniel (ii. 4b—vii.) contains a number of words which appear to come of Greek stock. They are as follows:

   (a) *σύνε* "word," which is found only in Ezra and the more modern literature of Israel, is perhaps a derivation of the ancient Persian (Pehlevi) "patgam," in modern Persian, "paigam," but possibly also the equivalent of the Greek *φθήγμα*.

   (b) *σύνε*.

   (c) *κάλυμμα*, with the variant *κάλυψις*?, "necklace," is clearly the Greek *μανίξις*, with a prosthetic aspiration which might mislead, had we not, on the other hand, the form *καλύπτα* in the Targum and in the Talmud (Levy's *Chald. Dict.* s. v.).

   (d) *καρόκα*, plural of an unused singular *καρό* "prefect," "magistrate," probably an assemblage of officials, sitting as the members of a tribunal, or of a grand council, which recalls the archons (*δραχων*', or rather, if one wishes to account for the initial syllable, *συνδραχων*.

   (e) *καράττ*, an *αποκε ειρημένον*, which the Vulgate translates "cibi;" the Septu-
agint with ἐδέσματα, and the Arabic version also as food, and which I propose to
connect with τὸ ἦν “to eat,” in conformity with the ancient tradition, all the more
reliable, in this instance, for bordering so close upon the period of the composition
of the work.

With all possible reserve, I add to this list,

(f) The comparison which has been ventured between the enigmatical ḫār
occurring twice (Π. 6; v. 17), and in both passages in connection with
“gifts,” and the Greek νόμισμα “money,” by a quite plausible exchange of “m”
and “b.” The common translation both of ancient and modern versions and
commentators is “rewards.”

In the Hebrew portion of Daniel (I. 2, 4a, 8–11) there are also some words
which may be traced to Greek prototypes, although in some of these instances it
is possible to prove a Greek origin with absolute certainty:

1. In מָגְלֵים (I. 3) “nobles” I believe we may recognize, with Gesenius,1 the
προτίμοι, if the word is not, following Ewald, to be referred to a Persian word of
the same stem and formation.2

2. שְׂמֵרוּת (x. 8) “flaming torches” is given in the Septuagint as λαμπτάς.
The reduplication of the “pe” (ב) in the Hebrew word strengthens the probability
of an identification between יִירְשָׁר and λαμπτάς (λαμπτάς). But, on the other hand,
the force of the objection that the word “lappid” is found at all periods of Hebrew
literature cannot be denied. Possibly it is really the Greek λαμπτόω “shine,” with
all its derivatives, which is of Semitic origin.

3. It is customary to render מִלְתָּי (xi. 43) as “treasures.” So the Vul-
gate and the Syriac, while the Septuagint and the Arabic, translating “hidden
stores,” seem to refer the word to a Semitic stem “kaman” (hide, conceal). As
for the modern commentators, they are as unanimous in their translation “treasures”
as in their silence with regard to the derivation. I imagine that they take
the word in the sense of “preserved,” “stored away,” as מַלְתָּי, which differs
from our word only in the first letter of the stem, and as the Arabic مَلْتَي
(dhakhâ’irou). But for my part, I am strongly inclined to suspect that we have
here a phenomenon similar to that pointed out above in the case of מִלְתָּי, namely, a Semitic formation grafted on an Indo-European word. Just as in

that, apart from the importance to be attached to almost contemporaneous translations, the
comparison with the Hebrew passage (Dan. x. 8), “neither meat nor wine entered my mouth,”
induces me to translate also here “food he permitted not to be brought before him.” The ob-
jection that this interpretation would involve a useless repetition, in view of the preceding
mentions of his fasting, is fully offset by the prolix style of the Book of Daniel. Besides, con-
cubines are called by an entirely different name, נַעֲרִי (v. 2, 3, 23).

1 Geschichte d. hebr. Sprache und Schrift (Leipzig, 1815), p. 64. In his Thesaurus, Gesenius
speaks in less positive terms. The word is found again in Esther 1. 8; vi. 9. Halévy also favors
the etymology προτίμοι (op. cit. p. 62).

2 Die Propheten, etc., III, p. 470.

3 Gen. xv. 17; Exod. xx. 18; Jud. viii. 16, 20; xv. 4, 5; Isa. lxii. 1, etc.
σῶρες, so here we have the prefix, preceding a Greek word which appears to me to be κεφελα. An intentional or unconscious association with ἑκέννα "hide" may have brought about the substitution of a Hebrew כ for the Greek λ in the final syllable.¹

4. When the ancient translators of Daniel came across a word with which they were not familiar, they supposed it to be a proper name and contented themselves with transcribing the word. In this way Ἐφραῖος, in the phrase Ἐφραῖος Ἐφραίμ (xi. 45), became in the Septuagint Ἐφραῖος, and Ἀραμές in the Vulgate. The Syriac and Arabic translate "in the plain," without accounting for the suffix. The general opinion of scholars to-day is to compare the Arabic ٥نَّ (fadanun), and render the expression by "tents of his palace." However, the old word כ which in Genesis² designates the "plain" (of Aram), seems, having emigrated to Greece, where it is found in the form of πέλεον and πέλον, to re-appear in the Book of Daniel, with a prosthetic כ. I do not hesitate to refer the suffix to the whole phrase, and translate "and he will pitch his tents of the plain."

5. Hitzig, in his commentary to the Book of Daniel,³ has compared the subordinate official charged to superintend the education of Daniel and of his companions, and called רָאִיל (i. 11) or, without the article, "melgar," with Μολοσσῆς, Laconian Μολοσσῆρ. Then he connects Μολοσσῆρ with κολοσσῆς, which contains the idea of grandeur, just as, in Hebrew, we have כ, originally "great," and then used for "master" (rabbi). All this scaffolding is ingeniously put together rather than solidly, and it is useless to point out the untenableness of such a conjecture.⁴

The field of these detailed investigations might perhaps be extended by showing the resemblances from Daniel, the youngest of all the books which have been admitted into the canon, to the most ancient documents, as the song of Deborah, some fragments of Genesis, and some few Psalms. The list of Greek words would grow smaller, until they would gradually disappear altogether, the nearer we would approach the purest and most archaic Hebrew. The conclusions to which such researches, carried on in "cold blood," without fear of the conclusions and with a serene and implacable impartiality, would lead, might be astonishing to some. The supposed antiquity of the "Song of Songs"⁵ would

¹ The resemblance between לְנָשׁ (Isa. xxviii. 25, 27) and κύμανον "cumin," is of course not accidental. The word belongs to that numerous class of terms expressing natural objects common to the Semitic and Indo-European families. Gesenius, in his Geschichte (pp. 65–68), has treated with great exactness the words common to the two groups. Ernest Renan has taken up the same subject in his Histoire des Langues Semitiques (4th ed.) pp. 204–210; and it is needless to add that his remarks bear, as usual, the stamp of his marvelous tact and encyclopedic knowledge.

² xxv. 30; xxviii. 2, 5, 8, 7; xxxi. 15; xxxviii. 18; xxxv. 9; xlvi. 16.

³ In the series Kurzgefasstes exeget. Handbuch z. Alt. Test., p. 11 seq.

⁴ Halévy (op. cit. 262) compares the Greek μυκοφόρος μιλλέρ. He has also proposed a Greek etymology for Μυκόν (Dan i. 5, 8, 10, 15; xi. 26), which he connects with ποταφάγον, a Dorian form of ποταφάμον. Ḳb., p. 240, note 2.

⁵ Even those that deny the authenticity of the Song of Songs, and refuse to regard it as a
have to be tested anew by such a study, undertaken by scholars, free from all apologetic prejudices. But what if if the composition of the book be moved down some centuries, would the song for that be any less the poem par excellence of vernal love? Would the "dark spikenard" Sulamith exhale a perfume less sweet? Would not all the lovers of the beautiful and of the ideal continue to ask, with the royal lover, "Who is this that shineth like the morning dawn; beautiful as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as a battalion of warriors?"

work of King Solomon, ordinarily place its composition about the tenth century before our era. According to our conclusions the date cannot be earlier than the Macedonian conquest, which took place in 332. The beauty and richness of the style recalls that of the Psalms of this epoch; and the book seems to have been written in the first years of the Macedonian sway, at the close of the fourth century before the Christian era. Without entering into details, I would recall יִרְמָה (Cant. iii. 9), which the Septuagint translates φορεῖον "couch," and בְּרִיָּה (iv. 13) "garden," which reproduces exactly the consonants and vowels of παράδεισος. Incidental to the former word, which occurs in the Targum under the form בְּרִיָּה, without the prosthetic alef (Levy, "Chald. Wörterbuch," II., p. 290a), and in the Talmud under the form בְּרִיָּה, Dr. M. Sachs speaks of "the modern Hebrew of the Song of Songs." Beiträge z. Sprach- u. Alterthumsforschung aus neuesten Quellen (Berlin, 1865-64), II., p. 69.

Grätz has undertaken such an investigation with an inexorable logical force, in his book Das Hehelled uebersetet u. kritisch erlautert (Leipzig, 1871). In his Kohelet (Leipzig, 1871) he has collected, in an appendix, the "Grecisms in Kohelet."

Song i. 12. On γάρδον "spikenard" (ναρδος) see Löw, Aramaeische Pflanzennamen (Leipzig, 1883), p. 98a.
AN ARABIC VERSION OF THE "REVELATION OF EZRA."

BY RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, New York.

In the Zeitschrift f. d. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, vi., 1886, p. 199, Prof. Baethgen, of Kiel, has given the Syriac text of an Ezra Apocalypse from a Berlin MS. (Sachau 181). Prof. Isaac H. Hall had before this given a translation of the same text from a MS. belonging to the Union Theological Seminary in New York. Dr. Baethgen has overlooked what Steinschneider has said (ZDMG. XXVIII., p. 647) in reference to this Apocalypse. In addition to the London and Roman copies, there is a MS. of this text in Paris. Dr. Steinschneider suggests that the Arabic Paris MS. 107 contains the same text. The following extracts from that MS. which Prof. Hartwig Deroënbourg has very kindly made at my request, show that Dr. Steinschneider was, in the main, right in his supposition. The substance of both is the same, though the Arabic represents a different and, at times, a fuller version. I give the text just as Prof. Deroënbourg sent it. Of the MS. he says: "Le nouveau catalogue, rédigé en français a pour base des bulletins rédigés par le célèbre orientaliste italien Amari, contient ce qui suit à la page 34: '2° (fol. 14) Explication de la vision que le prophète Daniel raconta à son disciple Esdras, et indication de ce qui doit arriver aux enfants d'Ismael e d'Agar la Copte. Le texte auguel il est fait allusion commence au fol. 14 r° au haut de la page après une page blanche et finit à la ligne 2 du fol. 20 r°.'

In the same article Dr. Baethgen treats of the Syriac text of Epiphanius' "Lives of the Prophets" contained in Sachau 131. The opening sections in the Syriac on the authorship of the different biblical books and on the life of Job, seem to be wanting in the Greek recensions. It might be interesting to follow up some of these notes to their source. There is no doubt that some of them go back to Talmudic traditions, e.g., that Moses wrote the Book of Job, or that Pinḥas was concerned in the composition of Joshua.

The notices about Job are also given in the lexicons of Bar 'Alî and Bar Bahlul; see Payne Smith, col. 140, s. v. פִּנְחָס; 1637, s. v. פִּנְחָס. Rabben Tam was also of opinion that 'Alîḵā is the name of a wise man.}

---

1 See also Journal of the Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exeg., Dec. 1886, p. 192; The Independent, Jan. 13, 1887.
2 Presbyterian Review, 1886, p. 537.
4 Fürat, Der Kanon des Alten Testaments, p. 80; Marx, Traditio Rabbinorum Veterrima, p. 14; Baer and Strack, Dödulke Hateamim, p. 78; cf. also B. O., 1, 488.
5 Delitzsch, Das Salomonische Spruchbuch, p. 498.
بسم الاب والابن والروح القدس.
الله الواحد له المجد امين.

نبدى بعون الله تعالى وحسن ترقيقه بشرح ربي دانيال النبي الذي اخبر به عزرا تلبیذه بما يكون من خبر بنى اسعيل بن هاجر القبطية.

بسلام الربي امين. امين. امين.

قال دانيال النبي لعزرا تلبیذه اسع رويات يا ابنى واعجب من اعمال الله البر وعدلة وقيد (sic) امره وثبات قولة في جميع الخلاف والامم وعلم انى رايت ملأتي نزل من السماء يسبح ويمجد وعلية لباس أبيض وجهه كابرق منير يهرع ويداه وساعده وذراعاه كالنعاس وعيناه مثل شعاع الشمس وبيده اليمنى محلة (مجلة) مملوءة كتابة. فقال لي ان الله قد سمع صلاتك ورسلني اليك اعرف ما يكون في آخر الزمان وهذه المجلة لك فاقنع رائراً ما فيها واخذت المجلة من يده بخشية ورعدة فنشرتها وتراتها فذا فيها بلديا شتى ومصرة بالغة شديدة الضحك (sic) وحمدت الله الذي يرفع من يشا ويبن من يشاء لده الملك والقدرة وقتلت يا رب احفظ وخلص شعبة من النفي الضرارية التي تلبىها مسلمًا سامًا وليس الخلاص منها بل منك انت ايه الله القوى الجبار ثم نظرت الى المجلة فذا فيها حية على رأسها اثنى عشر قرنا وعلى ذنبها تسعة قصبان تجب من البرية ورايتها تقابل جميع الشعوب والامم وسلطانها شديد على كل البشر وهي محبوسة تتجرع السم وتندمغ
The Apocalypse ends as follows:

وينتظرون ويجمعهم ويتبعه عامّة الناس إلا الاصفياء الصادرون في الجهاد ثم يبكي ايليا واصبح فوبكيانه مواجهة ومداهات ماجعدة وتكون ارقاء دماءهم على يديه ثم ينزل الرّب من السماء مع ملاكتك التقتين فهلك البرذوق ويسمع من في القبرة القرن العظيم ويسجرون لله ويرون العلامة المقدسة التي كفروا بها ويتعجبون منها ويفرح الابرار ويكذرون المسلمون وتميى الابرار إمام الاحتم في العمام (الغم . 1) إلى المللوت (الملكوت sic, 1) وتذهب الاشرار إلى العم (الغم . 1) والعذاب الشديد ولمّا رأيت (20 رك) إنا دانيال هذه الرواية وكتبتها وتركتها تذكرة للاخرين وابدأ سمرة السعيد لله دائما أمين. أمين. أمين.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the one God, to whom glory [is ascribed], Amen.

With the aid of God, the exalted, and his beautiful guidance, we will commence the explanation of the story of the Prophet Daniel, which he told to Ezra, his pupil, in reference to that which was to happen in the history of the children of Ishmael, the son of Hagar, the Egyptian. With the peace of God! Amen! Amen! Amen!

Daniel, the prophet, said to Ezra, his pupil: Listen to my story, O my son! and wonder at the works of God, the faithful one, and at his justice, and at . . . of his utterance, and the stability of his word with all living and existing beings. Know then that I saw an angel, clad in a white garment, his face shining like
bright lightning, his hands and fore-arms and his arms [being] like copper, his eyes as the rays of the sun, come from heaven praising and glorifying [God]. And in his right hand there was a scroll full of writing. Then he said to me: God has already heard thy prayers and has sent me to you to tell you what will happen at the end of time. This scroll is for thee: open it, therefore, and read what is in it. Then I took the scroll from his hand with fear and trembling. And I opened it and read it; and behold in it were [mentioned] sundry afflictions and evils which were to come, terrible in...... Then I praised God, who exalts whom he wishes, and brings down whom he wishes; and to him belong the kingdom and the power.

Then I said, O Lord! preserve and keep thy people from the bloody serpent, whose mouth is full of poison. There is no escape from it but in thee. Thou art God, the strong, the mighty one. And I looked into the scroll, and behold there was a serpent [mentioned?] upon whose head were twelve horns and upon whose tail nine [protruding] bones, which was to come from without; and I saw that it would make war upon all mankind, and [upon all] peoples. Its leader was cruel to all flesh; and it [itself] was fearful, ejecting poison as water and casting [it] upon whomsoever lighted upon it.¹ Then I saw an angel come down from heaven, and kill it and break its horns.

(fol. 19 v°). And the Jews will be rejoiced because they will say: He is the Messiah for whom they have waited, and [that] he would collect them, and [that] the most men would follow him, except such hard-hearted ones who remain in contention [with him]. Then Elijah will come and Enoch, and the two will drive him to the utmost extremity, and he will make a strong fight. And the shedding of their blood shall be upon his hands. Then will the Lord come down from heaven with his angels who surround him and destroy the wicked one.

And they in the grave will hear the mighty horn. Then they will stand up, and fall down before God, and they will see the holy sign which they had [formerly] denied. Then they will be astonished at it, and the good will rejoice and the damned ones be sad. And the good will come into the presence of their God in the clouds to [inherit] the kingdom, and the wicked will go into trouble and frightful punishment.

And when I, Daniel, had seen this vision, I wrote it down and left it for those that come after me. Praise be to God, the everlasting, the eternal, the perpetual one. Amen! Amen! Amen!

¹ Prof. Derenbourg is not at all certain of the reading of this word. Mr. A. B. Ehrlich, suggests šādaphahā, and I have translated accordingly.
SOME UNPUBLISHED ESARHADDON INSCRIPTIONS.
(CYLINDER C; 80, 7-19, 15; PS. AND K. 1679.)

BY ROBERT F. HARPER, PH. D.,
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The three historical cylinders of Esarhaddon, now found in the British Museum, I have numbered A, B and C. A is published in I R. 45-47; B in III. R. 15-16; C has not as yet been published. The cylinder published in III R. 15-16 has usually been called the "Broken Cylinder" or C, but I have preferred to designate it as B, because it is larger, better preserved and, perhaps, more important than the unpublished and unnumbered cylinder which I have called C.

During the summer of 1885, while working in the Assyrian Room of the British Museum, I had occasion to collate cylinders A and B and to copy cylinder C, together with several other fragments of the Esarhaddon inscriptions. The results of my collations of A and B I have already given in the April number of Hebrew, on pages 177-185, under the title: "Some Corrections to the Texts of Cylinders A and B of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions as published in I R. 45-47 and III R. 15-16." My copy of the hitherto unpublished cylinder C will be found on the following plates.

Cylinder C, as can be seen from these plates, is very badly broken in some places. None of its columns are complete. This cylinder is, however, notwithstanding its very imperfect condition, of the greatest importance for the restoration and establishment of the text of A. The editors of I Rawlinson evidently made much use of C in restoring A. A as published in I R. is quite different from the A found on the original clay cylinder in the British Museum. The editors of I R. have quietly restored (from cylinder C) many lines without comment. Many signs also on A are so badly broken as to be quite unintelligible without the help of C. The two cylinders seem to go hand in hand. The one is necessary to the other. Where A is badly preserved, C is generally well preserved, and the contrary is also true. As a result of this, it is possible to restore the text of A, with the help of C, in all but a very few places. Notice the frequent reference to cylinder C in my "Corrections to A, etc.," in the April Hebrew.

Great pains were taken in copying cylinder C, as well as 80, 7-19, 15; PS. and K. 1679, and the following plates will be found to be almost exact reproductions of these fragmentary inscriptions. No attempt, however, was made to reproduce the Assyrian signs as they are on the originals. For the convenience
of any who may care to make use of these fragments for comparative work, I add the following scheme:

Cylinder C I. is wanting.

" C III. = " A III. 10–53.
" C V. = " A V. 22–VI. 16.

Lines 56–71 published in I R. as belonging to cylinder A VI. are added from C (latter half of col. VI.) and B VI. 12–24. The editors of I R. should have made mention of this fact, as in their present position, there is no reason to believe that they are not to be found on the original of cylinder A. Mr. Ernest A. Budge, in his edition of the texts of cylinders A and B of the Esarhaddon inscriptions must have made little or no use of cylinder C in his restoration of the text of A. Mr. Budge claims that he made continual reference to all the Esarhaddon texts found in the British Museum; but the condition in which he left the texts of A and B would hardly bear out this statement.

80, 7–19, 15; PS. is a fragment of a cylinder containing now only two badly broken pieces of columns. I have reproduced only the first of these two columns. This column is of great importance in the study of the text of A IV. 8–18 and A III. 25–37.

K. 1679, cf. with this small fragment cylinder A I. 40–49.

I am under many obligations to my friend, Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, both for the very great kindness he showed me during my stay in the British Museum, and for the collations of several texts he has sent me since my return to America. I am also indebted to my highly-honored teacher, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, for his careful examination of these texts and for several important suggestions.
JEWISH GRAMMARIANS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,


IV.

MENAHEM BEN SARUK.

When, in the early part of the fourth century, a Babylonian scholar—in the person of R. Zeira—was for the first time chosen to preside over one of the Talmudical schools of Palestine, that at Zepphoris, it was an indication that the center of rabbinical learning had begun to shift its position. No longer dependent upon the mother-country for their leaders, the academies of Pumbaditha and Sura from being the protegés became the rivals of Jabneh and Tiberias, and when the sceptre passed entirely out of the hands of Judea, it was held for successive centuries by Babylon. A change, even more momentous in its character, was foreshadowed by the election, referred to in the last article, of Saadia ben Joseph of Fayyum (in upper Egypt) in the early half of the ninth century, to the charge of the academy at Sura. The light which, for want of fuel, languished in the East and finally died out, shot up into a mighty flame in the West.

Menahem ben Saruk was born in Tortosa about the year 910. At the instance of his patron, Hasdai Ibn Shaprut, the powerful minister of Caliph Abdullah-rahman III., he removed to Cordova, where he must have established a school in which he expounded his theories of Hebrew grammar. In Cordova he seems to have spent the greater part of his life, and it was there that he wrote his chef-d’œuvre, the "Maḥberet"1 or Hebrew Dictionary. In contradistinction to Saadia, whose literary efforts embraced so many fields, Menahem, so far as we know, concentrated his energies on classical Hebrew. Although versed in Talmudic lore, as evidenced by the frequent allusions to the "language of the Mishna" in his dictionary, he probably laid no claims to being an authority in this field. His method of reasoning and his manner of writing bear none of those marks which distinguish writers like the famous Rashi, who are strongly under the influence of what we may call the Talmudic spirit, and it is perhaps not going too far to say that, had he been, in those days, a great Talmudist, he would not have been a great grammarian. It is more than likely that he was the author of other works besides his dictionary. We know of some Hebrew poems that he wrote; but with the exception of a Hebrew letter which is of importance for the light it throws

1 Filipowski, "Maḥberet Menahem" (London, 1854).
upon a sad incident in his life, the Maḥberet is the only production of his pen that has been preserved. Without doubt, however, it was his most important production; for in it he has deposited the rich stores of his knowledge, and takes occasion to amplify and illustrate his favorite theories of Hebrew grammar. Apart from the intrinsic merits of the work, there are two features connected with it which enhance the interest of the book for us. In the first place, it represents the earliest attempt at a complete vocabulary of biblical Hebrew under a systematic arrangement. Partial lexicographical collections had been made previous to Menaḥem, as for example, by Jehuda Ibn Koreish, who discussed the words that Hebrew possesses in common with Syriac and Arabic, and also such as occur in the Talmudical literature, and by Saadia, who made a list of the διπλα λεγόμενοι of the Old Testament; but no one had as yet attempted a dictionary—in the full and real sense. Secondly, it is worthy of note that while the predecessors of Menaḥem wrote, as a general thing, in Arabic, the Maḥberet is in Hebrew. This fact is in itself an indication of the revival in the study of Hebrew which had taken place, and becomes all the more significant in view of the other writers of this period who followed Menaḥem’s example. Menaḥem’s style has been called “hard.” There is no doubt that it has this defect at times, but the difficulty he encountered in adapting a language that does not lend itself readily to technical and didactical writing to his purposes, fully accounts for this and other deficiencies that may be detected, and if we bear in mind that he is a pioneer opening up a quite untrodden path, the ingenuity with which he coins new words for the numerous technical terms required in a grammatical treatise, must call forth our unqualified admiration. So, to choose a few out of a large number of examples that might be given, from the word רות which he employs for “root-letter” he forms a verb “to be regarded as a root-letter,” or “to enter into a word as a root-letter.” In the same way רות is used to express that a letter is to be looked upon as an attachment to the root. Again, to distinguish between Dageš-lene and Dageš-forte, he says that the former is נלענול, involves simply a distinction in pronunciation, while the other (רלענול) affects the interpretation of the word. Of terms already in existence as רט, רט, רט—so is his way of spelling—he invariably forms denominative verbs and verbal derivatives. He speaks of the many אָּלִיל uses of the letter Beth. Such formations as כָּלָיָם “composed of three letters,” and אָּלָיָה for “to add an Aleph,” are very frequent. It is also true that Menaḥem’s style is sometimes involved; he occasionally has a very roundabout way of saying things; but for all that, his Hebrew is, as a general thing, fluent and at times elegant. His introduction is a beautiful specimen of what may well be called pure Hebrew, built as it is on the best models in the Old Testament.

Before proceeding to the dictionary proper, Menaḥem elucidates the principles which have guided him in his work. He begins with a division, which is,
however, not original with him, of the letters of the alphabet into *litterae radicales*
and *serviles*. He combines the former into a mnemonic phrase מָזְמַר נַעֲלוֹת בַּעֲרֶךְ which might be rendered "sealed is the book of the righteous sprout," meaning, of course, the Old Testament; and the latter he forms into שַׁמַּלְמַרְבָּא רִיבּוֹר "whose work is understanding." He then gives illustrations of the way in which the *serviles* combine with the *radicales*, and here at once the peculiarity as well as the great defect of his grammatical system, becomes apparent. Menahem, of course, recognizes the distinction between the root-letters and the *radicales*. The *serviles* can be root-letters as well as *radicales*, and the only advantage which the latter possess over the former is that they are used exclusively as root-letters (בַּעֲרֶךְ) whereas the *serviles* may serve either לִימְרוּם or לִשְׁמַר. Now, as a means of distinguishing in any given case whether a servile letter forms part of the root or not, Menahem sets up the fundamental principle that no portion of the root of a word can ever *disappear* in the course of inflection. Hence all that is required to detect the root of any word is to pick out those letters which are constant through all the changes incident to declension, conjugation, the attachment of prefixes and suffixes, and the like, while any letter which, though it be only in a single form of the verb, falls away, is thereby at once shown to be non-essential to the root of the word. The consequences of such a radical principle will occur to every one. The three classes of verbs הָפַּכְתָּ, לִימְרָה, לִשְׁמַר the י נ fall away entirely. A Hebrew root may consequently consist of three, two or even one letter, and the same root may embrace an endless variety of forms and cover the most incongruous significations. The testimony must be awarded to Menahem of being consistent in carrying out this principle. Thus, since the י of לִשְׁמַר falls away in the infinitive מִשָּׁמַר, the י cannot be a root-letter in this case and the root therefore consists simply of מִשָּׁמַר. For a similar reason the root of מִשָּׁבִית, since the י falls away in מִשָּׁבִית, is מִשָּׁבִית; of מִלְבַּד, the root is מִלְבַּד. The root of מִלְבַּד consists of three letters, because the י never falls away, but the root of מִשָּׁבִית according to Menahem is מִשָּׁבִית, for the י does not appear in such forms as מִשָּׁבִית. But the root of מִלְבַּד is likewise מִלְבַּד and the same root also underlies מִלְבַּד and of course also מִלְבַּד. Upon turning to this root in the Maḥberet we actually find no less than four distinct stems united under one head. So under מִלְבַּד we have מִלְבַּד, מִלְבַּד, מִלְבַּד; under מִלְבַּד there are confused together מִלְבַּד, מִלְבַּד, מִלְבַּד; and many more might be cited. As already stated, the occurrence of a single form in which, for any reason, an נ is dropped, is sufficient to exclude the possibility of regarding the נ as one of the root-letters. While,

---

1 Donash Ibn Labrat, the subject of our next sketch, has the following combinations of מִלְבַּד: "Donash the Levite," "truth like goodness," and מִלְבַּד. The sense of which—if indeed any was intended—is very obscure. Such mnemonic combinations were quite the fashion among the writers of this period, each author generally forming his own.

2 The distinction between stem and root is unknown to the grammarians of the middle ages; the only word they have is מִלְבַּד.
therefore, in the case of רח, רפ, וְדַּרְנָה, and many others, the נ belongs to the root for the reason that in none of the derived forms does it fall away, the root of יִנַּבָּה (Isa. ix. 17) is ה because in בִּנְבוּל (Exod. xiv. 3)—where the י is not radical, since it does not appear in the former word—the נ has dropped out. Menahem, however, draws a distinction between the pure loss of an נ in the course of inflection and such instances where the נ is merely elided. Thus he regards יִשְׁחֵל (Prov. xvii. 4), יִשָּׁח (Isa. xiii. 20), יֵבְרִית (Lev. xxvi. 16), יִנָּהוֹד (1 Sam. xxv. 24) as contracted forms. But in all such cases the נ must be counted with the root, because the loss is only an apparent, and not a real one, accidental, and not incidental. The root, therefore, of הָלְחָל is הָלָל, and so of the other examples הָלְדוּ, הָרְא, while that of הָרְפֵּר, הָרְפֵּר, is הָרְפֵּר, and not הָרְפֵּר, alone, as one might suppose, from the fact that the נ of הָלְחָל does not appear in the form. With regard to the ה of הָלְחָל, there can, of course, be no doubt, since it regularly falls away in such forms as הָלְחָל, הָלְחָל, and the like. The same distinction applies where the נ is contracted in the middle of the word, e. g., הָלְדוּ, הָלְדוּ (4, 8, 8) the root of which is, notwithstanding the disappearance of the נ, לֵדוּ. The ה and ה, finally, follow the analogy of the נ. So Menahem enumerates הָלְדָה (Job. xxix. 25) not under הָדָה but assigns it to a root הָדָה. If, however, an נ, occupying, according to our ideas, the third place in a triliteral stem, disappears, the loss is regarded by Menahem in every case as a real one, and hence the נ is by that fact debarred from being included in the root. The form נְדֶנֶּה, accordingly, is referred to a root מְדַנ, because in מְדַנְו (Num. xi. 23) the נ is wanting, and for a similar reason the root of נְלֶנֶּה—since we have a form, מְלַנְלִין (Job xxxii. 18)—is מְלַנ. Here the distinction between accidental and incidental disappearance of a letter is entirely lost sight of, and even the circumstances that the forms מְדַנְנִין and מְלַנְלִין are met with, the former indeed very frequently, did not apparently rouse Menahem to a recognition of the arbitrariness of a method which entailed, as a consequence, the removal of by far the greater number of stems נְלִין from the language. Indeed an actual count gives only eighteen such stems in the whole Mahberet. But Menahem does not even shrink from drawing the last conclusion to which his theories perforce led him—a conclusion which already to the following generation appeared in so preposterous a light, namely, that the stem (or root) of a word might consist of one single letter. By a strict application of the principle laid down in his preface, he is led through a comparison of the forms מְלַנְלִין and מְדַנְנִין to fix upon the letter ה as the root. What else can the root be, since ה is the only letter which these forms have in common. By a similar process ה is made to fig-

1 It may be noted in this connection that the few stems—in all about twenty-five—with Waw or Yodh as second radical which Menahem admits are all such where these letters לְלַנ, לְלַנ, לְלַנ ה, לְלַנ ה, "do not in any given case fall away" (except by way of contraction) as בְּרִית.
ure as the root of ר"ם (Lev. xiv. 27); ר"מ (Num. xix. 21); ר"מ (Lev. viii. 11); the ו for ו"ש (Lam. iii. 35) ו"ש (Exod. viii. 12), and so on through eighteen of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. In the case of some letters it even happens that several distinct stems are thrown together under one head. The above-referred-to נ, besides doing service for what according to our ideas is a stem נ"ר, also embraces נו and נו; the ב for ב (daughter) and ב (Jud. v. 25); the י for ינ and י; and more the like.

The arrangement of the dictionary proper is a very simple one. Each root is discussed in sub-divisions—מָהֵלָּבָן—according to the various significations met with in the forms derived from the root. So the very first root בָּּא has six maḥlākot as follows: (a) father, (b) desire, (c) fresh fruit, (d) bags, (e) sorerer, (f) sorrow—a motley array, but if we bear in mind Menahem’s principle whereby בָּּא includes נִבְּאָה, בָּּא and בָּּא, perfectly intelligible. The confusion brought about by Menahem’s unfortunate principle, though sufficiently great, is not as great as we might be led to expect, and this for the reason that very frequently the various significations assigned to a root, correspond to distinct stems. Thus in the above-cited example, all the forms of מָהֵלָּבָן “desire” are covered by the second division, those of בָּּא by the fourth and fifth division. On the other hand, in the case of the first division, בָּּא “father” and בָּּא which Menahem renders as “first, beginning,” two different stems are confused together. Again, under the root מַלְל, which has six divisions, the stems מַלְל מַלּוּ מַלְל, owing to the distinct signification of each, are very easily kept apart, and found to correspond to the first, second, fourth and sixth division respectively, while the third division gives a second meaning of מַלְל “giant” and the fifth a derivative of מַלְל viz. מַלְל “prayer.” At first sight one might be led to suppose from the neatness of such an arrangement that Menahem was well aware of the fact that he was grouping together stems totally distinct from one another, and that when he speaks of biliteral and uniliteral roots, it is merely for the sake of greater convenience that he admits their existence, but upon closer examination of the Mahberet, it becomes very clear that Menahem, sharing herein the views generally held at that period, not only knows of no distinction, as already intimated, between stem and root, but that for him the second כ of מַלֲל, the כ of מַלְל, the כ of מַלֲל and the כ of מַלֲל or the כ in מַלֲל, serving, in fact, a similar purpose as the latter—and ה מַלֲל—affixed and not root-letters.

If, however, we leave the field of theory and turn to the practical interpretation of the many words, phrases and sentences quoted by Menahem in his diction-

---

1 A list of the uniliteral roots is given on pp. 40-41 of Filipowski’s edition.
2 Menahem’s Interpretation מָהֵלָּבָן (Job. xxxii. 19).
ary, we shall find a great deal to admire and much that may still be of service in these days of advanced scholarship. His knowledge of Hebrew is as exact as it is comprehensive; he seems to have the entire Old Testament at his finger’s ends, as evidenced by the copious examples he puts forth. His explanations are frequently ingenious without overstepping the bounds of sober conjecture; he has a keen perception for the niceties of Hebrew diction, which betrays itself in the minute discussions into which he at times enters, as well as in the briefer remarks profusely scattered throughout the work. He has above all that feeling for language, equivalent almost to a linguistic instinct, which is as essential to the philologist as a good ear to a musician. A few quotations from the dictionary, in further illustration of his methods and his characteristics, may fittingly conclude this sketch.

After giving it as his opinion that יִנְשָׁא (Isa. xxxiii. 7), יִנְשָׁא (Isa. xxix. 1, 2) and יִנְשָׁא לִי (Ezek. xlxi. 15) are one and the same word, he continues as follows:

"Ari’el is the name of the altar; and the sense of יִנְשָׁא לִי (Isa. xxxiii. 7) is that, at the destruction of the altar called Ari’el, they cry and they weep for it; they bewail their sanctuary, they lament their Ari’el, they mourn for their altar. The objection which might be raised against this interpretation, that the verbs יַעֲקֹב and יָכַב cannot take a direct object, but require the intervention of the preposition לְעַל, is groundless; for Gen. xxxvii. 35, we have יַעֲקֹב לְאָרָר (Deut. xxxiv. 8), יַעֲקֹב לְאָרָר (Num. xx. 29); and the further objection that these verbs require at least an רֹאִים before their object also falls away in view of such passages as יָכַב לִשְׁלֹשׁ (Gen. xxiii. 2), and יָכַב לְשָׁמְשָׁר (Neh. ix. 28).

"Some scholars, however, are of the opinion that יִנְשָׁא לְאָרָר is a contraction for יִנְשָׁא לִי ('I appeared unto them'). Now I am well aware that there are quite a number of such instances of two words being contracted into one to be met with in Hebrew; as יִנְשָׁא לְאָרָר (Isa. xv. 19) which stands for יַעֲקֹב ('thou hast given to me'), יְנִשָּׁא (Jer. x. 20) for יָכַב (Job xv. 17) for יָכַב (Job xxxi. 37) for יָכַב (Ps. cv. 77), and many more the like. But יִנְשָׁא לְאָרָר is certainly not of their number; for apart from the fact that in this case we would naturally expect a vocalization like יִנְשָׁא לְאָרָר, an examination of יִנְשָׁא לְאָרָר and יִנְשָׁא being synonyms.

1 The passive of יֶכַּב, and not יִכַּב, which can, at the most, be an abbreviation of יַכַּב, the active of the verb.
the other passages where the passive of this verb is used with reference to the 'appearance' of the Eternal (Exod. iii. 2; Lev. ix. 28; Mal. iii. 2), proves that a construction like this is inadmissible.” Menahem then enters upon a refutation of a third opinion, according to which לברא is itself compounded of two words and compared with הלימה (Job xxvi. 7), which some explain as though composed of יל and מ" without anything;" לופלופים (Cant. iv. 4) equal to יל and מ" mounds of edges" (?); and ירש (Isa. lxvi. 24), decomposed similarly into יַר and מ" habitation of sorrow.” Menahem regards such explanations as a mere idle play on words, and denies absolutely the possibility of compounding words in this way in Hebrew. By a reference to לבו (Exod. xxxii. 9) he shows that הרֵא is a single word from a stem בָּל, and הרֵא is also one word, synonymous with מ" ruins,” while הרֵא is a contraction from רַלְפָּל, as מִלְפָּל מִלְפָּל (Job xxxv. 11) from מֵלֶפֶן, going back to a stem מ" and here used in the sense of "instruction” or "guidance.” The tower of David to which the poet compares the neck of his beloved, was, it is natural to suppose, very high, so that it could be seen afar off and serve as a guide for travelers and wayfarers. Hence it is appropriately described as בֵּנוּי מִלְפָּל "built for teaching,” i. e., for directing "the dwellers of the land, the villagers and the wanderers.”

Consistent with himself, Menahem, rejecting the Talmudical explanation of the puzzling בְּגָן (Gen. xlii. 43), which makes the word a compound of בָּג and ב" "merciful father,” takes it as an imperative form of בָּג in the sense of "bend the knee.” With "abarakkhu,” in Assyrian, the attempt to trace the word to Egyptian origin, as is still done in the eighth edition of Gesenius, must of course be abandoned; and it may yet be that scholars, especially those who, like Delitzsch, declare "abarakkhu” to be a good Semitic word, will go back to the explanation given by Menahem and, following him, by other writers of this and succeeding periods.

Incidental to a discussion of the above-referred-to סבון מִלָּפֶן מִלָּפֶן (Job xxxix. 19), Menahem calls attention to the parallelismus membrorum peculiar to Hebrew poetry and its value in interpreting words that might otherwise be obscure. "The half of the verse,” he says, "explains the other half, since the latter but repeats the sense of the former.” He quotes the following as examples: Deut. xxxii. 2; Job xxxix. 15; Cant. iv. 12; Isa. viii. 13; xxvi. 6; xxxviii. 28; xxxi. 5; xxxii. 21; xlix. 16; Hos. viii. 18; Hab. i. 15. By application of the same principle he concludes that סבון in the above passage must mean "bags of wine.”

Three times1 Menahem quotes opinions of Jehuda Ibn Koreish only to refute them. Of these, the most interesting is the one in reference to the phrase בֵּנוּי יָבֵל לְשֹׁב (Jer. xi. 19). Menahem renders it “and I am

1 תבונא, מ"א and מ".
like a great lamb brought to the slaughter.” “But,” he continues, “Jehuda ben Koreish explains בֵּכֵשׁ וַאֲלֹהָ as though it were בֵּכֵשׁ וַאֲלֹהָ and translates ‘like a lamb and ox.’ This necessitates the addition of a ה before the second word, and since it is identical, according to Koreish’s opinion, with שֵּׁנָה אֲלֹפִּיָּ (Deut. vii. 13), we would also have to insert a ה in the latter word between the ה and the ל. Now we have no right whatever to do this, and must content ourselves with explaining words as they stand. Nor can it be claimed that the ה is here omitted, as is the case in רָאוֹן (Exod. xxviii. 17), אַרְבָּא מֵשָׁרָה וְלֹא כְּלָלִימוֹת (Exod. 1. 2), and the like; for in all these instances—Menaḥem quotes also Exod. xxvii. 19; xxxix. 13; Deut. xxvii. 19—there is always one ה at the end of the series, and, besides, even this is only permissible where there are at least three objects in juxtaposition, but never where there are only two. Hence the only possible translation of בֵּכֵשׁ וַאֲלֹהָ is “great lamb.” When treating of Menaḥem’s great opponent, Donash ben Labrat,* we shall have occasion to refer to the reply which the latter makes in defense of Koreish.

---

1 In the next number of HEBRAICA.
SOME OBSERVATIONS UPON TIKKUN SOPHERIM.

BY PROF. HENRY M. HARLAN, D. D., LL. D.,

Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

The July (1887) number of Hebraica contains an important article on 

\textit{correction} or \textit{emendation of the scribes}, by Rev. Mr. Crane, of Princeton, N. J. The number of passages in the Hebrew Bible said to have been corrected by the scribes is eighteen, running from Genesis to Malachi.

The author gives both what is stated to have been the original text of these passages, and also the present Massorethic reading, upon which he comments, and reaches the following conclusion: "If it be proven that the scribes have, in truth, made one single correction in the original writings in the places designated as \textit{Tikkun Sopherim}, then their whole line of defense must fall to the ground; for it is no longer entitled to the least credence, and the value of each \textit{Tikkun} must be determined solely by the weight of evidence in its favor, in each individual case, totally irrespective of any statements or explanations handed down by personally interested scribes. \textit{Falsus in uno falsus in omnibus} is a well-established principle of legal evidence for determining the credibility of witnesses, and it is equally applicable to the case in hand."

This bears hard on the fidelity of the scribes, and if accepted in all its breadth, it will throw great doubt on the correctness of the Massorethic text, and, indeed, on the Old Testament text in general, as nobody, in that case, can tell how many passages the scribes have altered. We shall give the facts of the case as far as we know them, and then what seem to be the inferences to be drawn from them.

The oldest reference made to passages of the Old Testament as corrected by the scribes, occurs in the \textit{Mechilla}, a commentary embracing a number of chapters of the Book of Exodus, written down in Hebrew in the \textit{first half of the third century}.\footnote{This is the date assigned by Dr. Weber ("System der Altsyn. Paläst. Theol.," Leipzig, 1880), and about the date assigned to it by Dr. Zunz ("Gottesdienst Vorträge der Juden," pp. 46, 7).} The passages are found on Exod. xv. 7, and are only eleven in number, in the following order: (1) Zech, ii. 12 (A. V. 8); (2) Mal. i. 18; (3) 1 Sam. iii. 13; (4) Job vii. 20; (5) Hab. i. 12; (6) Jer. ii. 11; (7) Ps. cvi. 20; (8) Num. xi. 15; (9) 2 Sam. xx. 1; (10) Ezek. viii. 17; (11) Num. xii. 12.\footnote{The passages are given by Rabbi Dr. Abraham Geiger ("Urschrift und Ubersetzung der Bibel," Breslau, 1857, p. 300). This is the date assigned by Dr. Weber ("Altsyn. Paläst. Theol.," Leipzig, 1880, p. 21). In Abraham Geiger, p. 809.} Another Jewish work, the \textit{Jalkut}, belonging to the \textit{thirteenth century}, gives the same emended passages except number 4 (Job. vii. 20). The \textit{Sifre}, a Jewish commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, written in the \textit{third century}, gives only seven passages as corrected
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by the scribes, viz., numbers 1, 4, 10, 5, 7 and 11 of the Mechilta, without stating what the original reading was. In the Tanchuma, a Jewish commentary on the Pentateuch, written in the ninth century, the number of the passages stated to have been corrected by the scribes is considerably enlarged. In Geiger's list we find five emended passages more than we have in the Mechilta, making sixteen. These five passages are: Hosea iv. 7; Job xxxii. 3; Gen. xviii. 22; Lam. iii. 20; 2 Sam. xvi. 12. The Talmudists, according to Dr. Geiger, say but little respecting these emended passages. The reason he assigns is, that the corrected text had not yet obtained authority. In the Tractat Sopherim there is no mention of these passages. "On the contrary, the oldest Massora known to us, found in the manuscript of Odessa of the year 916, contains them. Here the expression Tikkun Sopherim 'correction of the scribes' has become fixed, and the number of passages is definitely given as eighteen. These eighteen passages, which are indicated merely through single words and with which the original reading is not given, correspond for the most part with those of Tanchuma, only three of them being wanting, namely, Hosea iv. 7; Lam. iii. 20 and 2 Sam. xvi. 12. On the other hand, one number which contains the passage, 1 Kgs. xii. 16, with its parallel passage, 2 Chron. x. 16, is reckoned as four, as each of them contains two corrections, and two are added, namely, Mal. i. 12, indicated by הַמֶּלַלְתִּים, and iii. 8 or 9 by הַלַּעֲמָנִים. Finally, the Massora as we read it in our editions, both at the beginning of Numbers and on Ps. cvi. 20, gives also the number of eighteen words which have been corrected by the scribes."3

Here the question arises, Who were the scribes that corrected the passages? The Tanchuma states that it was done by the men of the Great Synagogue, that is, a council of scribes in Jerusalem, consisting of one hundred and twenty members, the period of whose activity extended from Ezra to the death of the high priest Simon (B.C. 196), a period of about two hundred and fifty years.4 But it will be remembered that the Tanchuma, named from its author, was written in the ninth century after Christ, more than a thousand years after the close of the Great Synagogue that is said to have made the changes in the original readings of certain texts. Such a late statement does not appear to us to be worth much. The statement of a Christian writer of the eleventh or twelfth century respecting original readings of passages in the gospels or changes that were made in the second century would have but little weight with us. Gutbier inserted in his edition of the Peshitto Syriac New Testament (Hamburg, 1664) the passage containing the three heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7), and remarks in his critical notes: "Since it is known [sic!] that the Arians spared in this place neither the Greek text itself, nor the oriental versions, we have inserted this verse, wanting in other

1 The date given by Dr. Zunz ("Gottesdienst Vorträge der Juden," p. 237).
2 Written about the ninth century it would seem. Dr. Zunz, p. 377.
3 "Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel," by Rabbi Abraham Geiger, pp. 311, 312.
editions, from the notes of Tremellius." Does any biblical scholar now believe
that the original epistle of John contained that verse? We at least hope not.
Assertions of this kind are to be received with great caution. Now in regard to
the number of the passages of the Old Testament said to have been corrected,
there is no uniformity of statement, as we have already seen. Nor in the passage
from the Mechilta quoted by Geiger, is there any mention made of corrections by
the Great Synagogue.

Let us now look at the passages said by Tanchuma to have been corrected by
the Great Synagogue, in the light of the history of the text in those passages, to
ascertain, if possible, whether the original text was in fact changed. We begin
with Gen. xviii. 22, "And Abraham was still standing before Yahweh." The
original reading is stated to have been, "Yahweh was still standing before Abra-
ham."  But we have proof that our present reading goes back to B. C. 330. For
the Samaritan Pentateuch has the same order as the Massoretic text, ... לֵבָנָה
לָדָו... The LXX. has the same, Ἀβραάμ δὲ ἦν ἐν τητησίν Κυρίων Κυρίων.
The Targum of Onkelos has the same arrangement, ... לֵבָנָה לָדָו...; also
the Peshitto Syriac contains the same position,  In the Bereshith Rabba, a commentary on Genesis written in the sixh
century, we have the following respecting this passage: "And they went towards Sodom; but
Abraham still stood before the Eternal. The latter is, according to R. Simon, a
correction of the scribes; (for it cannot be well supposed) that the Shekinah
waited for Abraham." This is the first reference to a correction of this text, and
it rests on the statement of R. Simon, who, according to Dr. Zunz, lived about
A. D. 166, that is about three hundred and fifty years after the close of the Great
Synagogue; so that, if the text in Genesis was corrected by these men, it must
have been done before B. C. 330, the latest date to which we can assign the Sa-
maritan Pentateuch. The Hebrew manuscripts exhibit no variation of text in
the passage.

The next passage in order is Num. xi. 15, "And let me not see my wretchedness?"
(כְּרֵעָה, emended, it is said, for כְּרֵעָה they evil). But our present reading is
supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch, which has כְּרֵעָה; the LXX., which
has τὴν κακωσθεὶν μου; the Peshitto Syriac, which reads כְּרֵעָה my wretchedness;
and Onkelos, who renders it כְּרֵעָה my misery. No Hebrew MS. gives a differ-
ent reading of the word. In Num. xii. 12, we have, "Let her not be as one dead,
of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb." In
this passage it is alleged that כְּרֵעָה his mother has been substituted

1 This is the date assigned to it by Dr. Weber, "Altsy. Palæst. Theol.," p. xxiii.
3 Gottesdienst Vorträge," p. 46.
4 This is the date assigned to it by De Wette, who is skeptical enough on all these points.
5 This is manifest from Doederlein's edition of the Hebrew Bible, accompanied with a large
collection of readings from the collations of Kennicott and De Rossi, Leipzig, 1793.
6 So far at least as noticed in Doederlein's edition.
for our mother; and his flesh, for our flesh. But here again our Massoretic text is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch, and substantially by the LXX., which has "her flesh," and "womb of mother," where "her" must be supplied from the context. The Peshitto Syriac has "his mother" and "his flesh." Here one of Kennicott's MSS. has זַמֵּיהֶה, and another, אֲמוֹת; and two have בְּשֵׁרָתָן, showing that there were different readings of the text in early times. The number of alleged corrections in the Pentateuch—by counting Num. xii. 12, as two—is four; and we see no good reason to believe that our Massoretic text does not give us the original reading.

The next alleged correction in order in the Hebrew Bible, is 1 Sam. iii. 18, the substitution of יִלּוּ for יִלּוּ, making the passage read that the sons of Eli "cursed themselves" (i.e., "brought a curse upon themselves"), instead of "cursing me" (that is, God). Here the LXX. reads κακολογοῦντες ἑδὸν reviling God. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel agrees very well with the Hebrew text, while the Peshitto Syriac has, "His sons were treating with contempt the people" (הָלֹא). One of Kennicott's MSS. reads יֵלָה me, instead of לָהּ them. The original reading here seems to be very doubtful. In the account of the wicked deeds of the sons of Eli, no mention is made of direct blasphemy. We see no good reason to think that the scribes would have changed יִלָה to לָהּ in order to mitigate the crime of Eli's sons.

"It may be that Yahweh will look upon my affliction" (עַל חוֹנִי, K'ri), 2 Sam. xvi. 12. Buxtorf remarks that "the Massorah in both places quotes this passage; it is also reviewed in the book Tanchuma......but in what word the correction consists they do not explain. The commentators also here make no mention of a correction," etc. Now if the original reading was, "It may be that Yahweh will look with his eye (עַל חוֹנִי) and requite" etc., it is strange that there is in the whole Hebrew Bible no other similar construction as seeing with (one) eye; but we find the phrase, "With thine eyes (עַל חוֹנִי) shalt thou behold" (Ps. xci. 8). And the reading K'thithb יַפְלַה רָמאָה after בְּשֵׁר is similar to what we find in Gen. xxix. 32, and also in other places, in which בְּ is prefixed to a noun after this verb. If we take the Massoretic reading יַפְלַה בְּשֵׁר (K'thithb) and render it "upon my misery," giving to יַפְלַה the same sense which Gesenius gives the word in Ps. xxxi. 11, which the context absolutely requires, we shall have no difficulty. The LXX. and the Peshitto Syriac agree well with this rendering, the former having εν τῷ ταρανόρβοσει, and the latter, סַמֵּה upon my humiliation. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel has "tears of my eye." In this passage the Hebrew MSS. give a variety of readings both as K'thithb and K'ri.

"To your tents, O Israel; now see to thine own house, David. So Israel departed unto their tents" (1 Kgs. xii. 16). Here the Massoretic text has לָהּ أنאולית

1 That is where the lists of the words are given.
and וּלְגֵּשָׁנִים, to thy tents and to his (their) tents, said to have been corrected for וּלְגֵּשָׁנִים, to thy gods and to his (their) gods. In respect to these two words, the Hebrew MSS. present no variation from the Masoretic text. The LXX. reads, “To thy tents,” and “to his tents.” The Peshitto Syriac has, “To thy tents......and every one went away to his own town or village (מָקוֹם). The Targum, “To thy village......and to his village.” The parallel passage to this is found in 2 Chron. x. 16, in which the reading is the same. It seems to me in the highest degree probable that our Masoretic text gives the original reading; for what sense would there be in the children of Israel exhorting each other to abandon Rehoboam and return to their gods? Abandoning Rehoboam did not necessarily imply a revolt from the true God. But to what gods were they to return? Jeroboam had not yet set up the calf (Apis) worship in Bethel and in Dan. Or was the author of Kings guilty of an anachronism which the scribes kindly corrected through an especial affection for the idolatrous ten tribes and apostates from the temple worship in Jerusalem? Not very likely.

“And, lo, they put the branch to their nose” (Ezek. viii. 17). On this passage Gesenius remarks, under the word מַעֲנֵי, “In allusion to the custom of the Persians (Parsees), who adore the rising sun, holding in their left hand a bundle of twigs called ‘Barsom.’ The context explains the matter. Ezekiel had seen in vision, in the Lord’s house, twenty-five men with their backs turned towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshiped the sun towards the east. Then the Lord commented on the doings of these men, and said, “And, lo, they put the branch to their nose.” As these worshipers of the sun had turned their backs upon the temple of Yahweh, and were adoring the heavenly luminary, how could they be thrusting their myrtle twigs under the nose of Yahweh? In this passage the LXX. expresses the sense in a general way: Ἰδοὺ ἄνω τοὺς μυρούς. In the Peshitto Syriac the פְּנֵי of the Hebrew text is represented by “their nostrils;” and in the Targum, by “their nose.” Two of Kennicott’s MSS. read פְּנֵי.

“My people have changed their glory (רֹאשׁ) for that which doth not profit” (Jer. ii. 11). Here it is alleged the original was רֹאשׁ my glory. But the context does not suit this latter reading. The statement of the Masoretic text that God’s people had exchanged their glory, i. e., God, honor and prosperity, for that which profiteth not—the idolatrous worship, with its bad consequences—makes good sense. The LXX. has ἔχουσιν ἄνω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. The Peshitto Syriac, “My people have changed their honor for that which is without profit.” The Targum has, “My people have left my service in which I was bringing them honor,” etc. One of Kennicott’s MSS. has רֹאשׁ.

“As they were increased, so they sinned against me; therefore will I change their glory into shame” (Hosea iv. 7). Here the original רֹאשׁ my glory is said to have been altered to the present reading רֹאשׁ their glory. But the context
shows that our present reading is correct; and it is very unlikely that God would say, "I will change my glory into shame." The LXX. agrees with the Massoretic text, and the Peshitto Syriac has, "They have turned their honor into shame," which is also the reading of the Targum.

"Art thou not from everlasting, O LORD, my God, mine Holy One? We shall not die?" (Hab. i. 12). According to Tanchuma, as given both by Rabbi Levy1 and Dr. Geiger,2 the original reading of נָהֳלָה נִל "we shall not die" was נֶל נָהֳל "he will not die." The LXX. reads, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνεινεν. The Peshitto reads, "That we may not die thou art the Lord;" that is, "thou art the Lord, so that we shall not die." "No codex has the reading נָהֳל נֶל "(thou shalt die), that is, נָהֳל נֶל. The Massoretic reading makes good sense, "Because thou art the eternal and holy God, we shall be saved." Quite in the same line is the language of Christ, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

"For thus saith the Lord of hosts, After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you; for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye," (Zech. ii. 8), said to have been corrected from יִצָּלֵית my eye. But in both readings the reference is to the divine eye, so that the anthropomorphism is not avoided. The LXX. and the Peshitto Syriac have "his eye." Two of Kennicott's MSS. read יִצָּלֵית my eye.

"Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness is it! and ye have snuffed at (contemned) it, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. i. 18). In this passage it is said that נָהֳל me has been changed into נָהֳל it, after "ye have snuffed at." We, however, see nothing incongruous in our Massoretic text. In the previous verse the Israelites are charged with profaning the name of the LORD by saying that the table (the altar) of Yahweh is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even his meat, is contemptible, and ye have contemned it, (that is, the altar). The LXX. has "I have blown them away," and the Peshitto Syriac, "thou hast blown upon it."5

"Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee so that I am a burden to myself" (יִצָּלֵית), said to have been changed from יִצָּלֵית to thee, i. e., a burden to thee (Job. vii. 20). But the Massoretic reading also in this passage, makes good sense and fits the context. The last part may be rendered, "Why hast thou (God) made me a mark (subject of attack) for thyself so that I am a burden to myself?" The LXX. and the Syriac read, "I am a burden to myself."

"They found no answer, and yet had condemned Job" (Job xxxii. 3). In this passage it is alleged that the original was דְּרָא הָלֵית which was changed to

1 "Chaldäisches Wörterbuch," vol. II., p. 554.
3 The Peshitto has נָהֲל蹿 evidently a typographical error for נָל蹿 "n'muth."
5 The unpointed text דְּרָא הָלֵית seems to have led astray both the LXX. and the Syriac translators. The first takes it as first person singular, and the latter as second singular, with a pronominal affix.
and that the text read, "They condemned God." But the context certainly requires the Masoretic reading: "They had condemned Job," and this is the sense both of the LXX. and the Syriac, and the Hebrew MSS. show no deviation from the Masoretic text.

"Thus they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass," (Ps. cv. 20). In this passage, it is alleged that the original his glory has been changed into their glory. It is true that the worshipers of the golden calf did—so far as men could—change the glory of God into the likeness of an ox, and the Psalmist might have so expressed it, just as Paul says respecting the heathen that they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man," etc. (Rom. i. 23). But the Psalmist may have preferred a less direct statement and have written "their glory (i. e. the glorious object of their worship) they turned into the likeness of an ox." In Gen. xxxii. 58 we have an instance of this indirect method of statement: "And Jacob swore by the fear of his father Isaac," that is the Almighty whom Isaac feared. But why should we suppose that the scribes changed the text? If they had scruples about the statement that the glory of God had been turned into the likeness of an ox, why might not the Psalmist have had similar scruples? Both the LXX. and the Syriac have "their glory," from which there is no deviation in the Hebrew MSS.

"My soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humbled in me" (Lam. iii. 20). The change said to have been made in this passage is the substitution of ים instead of himself. This presupposes that the passage originally had an entirely different meaning from that given in the English Version. "Remember (me) and bow thyself down to me," would be the rendering. The LXX. reads: ὃς ἀλλ' ἡ ψυχή πον, which favors the Masoretic text. The Peshitto Syriac translates it: "Renew (ךָף) my soul in me," which presupposes the Masoretic reading in the word under discussion. The Hebrew MSS. give no variation of reading respecting the word. It is not likely that the verb רֵפֵּשׁ in the Hiph'ill form, with a transitive meaning, was used by Jeremiah to express God's bowing himself down. Besides, in the present passage, the word occurs but twice in the Hebrew Bible, viz., in "her house sinks down into death" (Prov. ii. 18); and in "our soul is bowed down in the dust" (Ps. xliii. 25). When God is called upon to hearken to men's wants, the language is, "Incline thine ear to me," Pas. xvii. 6; xxxi. 3, etc., or "bow the heavens," etc. The Hiph'ill of רֵפֵּשׁ is used in these passages. No good reason can be assigned for the rejection of the Masoretic reading.

We conclude with the following reflections upon the whole subject:

1. The statement that the scribes, that is, the men of the Great Synagogue (B. C. 444–196), made changes in the original text to remove anthropomorphisms or anthropopathisms, or any unseemly expressions, is not found until three hun-
dred and fifty years after the Great Synagogue. The list is not uniform, and the entire number, eighteen, is not given until about eleven hundred years after the close of this famous council of Jewish scholars. Besides this, the statement is too indefinite. No unprejudiced Christian scholar would consider statements of a similar character in reference to changes in the New Testament, of any value.

Can any one believe that the men of the Great Council—said to be one hundred and twenty in number—deliberately voted to change what they believed Moses wrote? Their reverence for the Torah would have prevented them from altering any well-established reading. Their motto was "Put a hedge about the Law and make disciples." They were traditionists. Nor do we think they would have changed the language of the prophets in whose inspiration they believed. Various readings, no doubt, existed in different MSS. of the Hebrew Bible long before the time of Christ, and the School of Ezra may have labored in settling the Old Testament text. But were they less scrupulous than their later disciples, the Massorites, who would not correct manifest errors in the text, but simply indicated the corrections by marginal notes? The men of the Great Synagogue and their followers in the subsequent ages, may have made some mistakes, it is true, in their textual criticism.

Is there any good reason to believe that the Christians of antiquity changed any part of what they believed to be the original text of the New Testament? Have the Mohammedans altered their Quran?

These remarks will have but little weight with those critics who believe that Ezra wrote a part of the Pentateuch, and that Deuteronomy was forged in the name of Moses, seven or eight centuries after that lawgiver; and that various documents entering into the Pentateuch were worked over in the time of Ezra, or at an earlier period. In that case, why did they not throw out the passage in the Pentateuch which represents Aaron, their first great highpriest, as making a golden calf for idolatrous worship? This fact in Aaron's history, gave the old masters in Israel the greatest amount of trouble.¹ Neither have the scribes expunged from the text the blunder of Moses, nor the crimes of David and Solomon, nor the crimes and idolatries of the Israelitish people in general. Is there any other history in the world that can be compared in point of fidelity to that in the Bible, in which the vices and crimes of the people are so faithfully described by the pen of their own historians and so carefully preserved in their archives to their own infamy? Well did Sir Isaac Newton remark that he found more sure marks of truth in the Bible than in any profane book whatever.

2. Passages of an anthropomorphic and of an anthropopathic character in the Hebrew Bible have certainly been allowed by the scribes to stand. Thus we have, "They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden" (Gen. iii. 8); "He (God) kept him as the apple of his (God's) eye" (Deut. xxxii. 10); "He

runneth upon him, even on his neck, upon the thick bosses of (the Almighty's) buckler” (Job xv. 26); “And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart” (Gen vi. 6). If such expressions as these, and others that might be named, the scribes have allowed to stand, it is not likely that they would have modified others that were not more offensive.

3. The principle, false in one, false in all, cannot be safely applied, either in regard to human testimony or written documents. A witness may be unreliable in matters in which the truth militates against his own interests, while in other cases in which his self-interest is not affected, his testimony may be believed. A man may be insane on one subject and perfectly sane on all others. So far as pertains to the Old Testament scribes, it seems clear that they were too conscientious to make changes that would diminish Israel's disgrace or augment his honor. In matters pertaining to the Deity, a zeal for his glory might be supposed to lead them to suppress what they thought derogatory to his character in the representations of his actions given in Hebrew history. But we see no proof that anything of the kind was ever done. Pious fraud had no place among the ancient Hebrews.
EGYPTIAN NOTES.

BY PROF. J. G. LANSING, D. D.,

New Brunswick, N. J.

I. BASHMURIC.

The three different dialects of the Coptic language are called the Saidic, the Memphitic and the Bashmuric. The Saidic, as the name indicates, was the dialect of Upper or Southern Egypt. The Memphitic, as the name also indicates, was the dialect of the district of Memphis. The Bashmuric dialect was the dialect of the Delta, especially the Eastern Delta. But the origin of the term Bashmuric is not so evident as the names in the other two cases. There is no place in the Delta by the name of Bashmur, or anything like it, to account for the origin of Bashmuric as applied to this dialect of the Coptic. This has been investigated and tested. The following is proposed, however, as furnishing perhaps a more satisfactory derivation and explanation of the term Bashmuric.

Pass along the Delta in early spring, or when vegetation has nicely started. The owners of flocks and herds are going forth with them. Inquire of them where they are taking their flocks and herds. They reply *نَبَاشُمْرَحْمُمْ* = "Nabashmurahum;" that is, to pasture them. The *نا* = "na," is the Arabic prefix for the first person plural. The *حُم* = "hum," is the Arabic suffix for the third person plural. This leaves the word *بَشْمُر* = "Bashmur." The *بَا* = "ba," is the Bashmuric or Coptic definite article II or III. We have left, then, the noun *شَمَر* = "shamar," which means pasture, shepherding place. The word is still applied to the pasturing fields and plains of the Eastern Delta to-day. This throws light upon the origin of the shepherds and inhabitants of the Eastern Delta. They were descendants of the Hyksos, the Arabian shepherd kings. Confirmatory of this we find far more Semitic words in the Bashmuric than in the other Coptic dialects. Does not the Coptic and Arabic *شَمَر* = "shamar," to pasture, shepherd, give also some added light and force to the corresponding Hebrew *שָׁמַר*?
II. THE EGYPTIAN NAME OF JOSEPH.

The Egyptian name given to Joseph by Pharaoh, as recorded in Gen. xli. 45, has received the following transliterations and interpretations:

**Hebrew:** יֵשָׁנָתָה פָּאָה = "Safnath Paanaah."

**Septuagint:** Γονεομοφανὴς = "Psonthomphanek."

**Vulgate:** "Salvator Mundi Savior of the World." So others.

**Coptic:** Ἄσπονθομφανὲς = "Psonthom Phanek."

**Targum, Syriac, and Others:** "A Revealer of Secrets."

**Gesenius:** "The Supporter or Preserver of the Age."

**Others:** "The Food of Life," or "of the Living."

**Renouf and Budge:** "tEastent-pa-anX" = "Store-house of the House of Life."

**Brugsch:** "Governor of the District of the Place of Life."

For convenience sake we may begin at the end of the name, going backwards.

1st. "PaanX." As the Hieroglyphic and Coptic show, and as nearly all are agreed, the last or second part of Joseph's name, נַעֲנָ א , was, in the old Egyptian, "pa anX." "Pa," as shown by the Coptic, is here the masculine definite article "the," the Coptic Π ι or Π. "AnX" is "life" or "living one."

Brugsch, in this connection, in his Egypt under the Pharaohs, vol. II., p. 265, makes it "life." But in Records of the Past, Brugsch translates, in a Delta inscription of the time of the Hebrews, the same expression "pa anX," as "the Living One," and refers it to God. And so, with good reason, we would render it here. We have the corresponding Hebrew expression יִתְנַעֲנָ א and מָנַעֲנָ א נ תֶּ.

2d. ננ = "nath" in Safnath. The old Egyptian was "ent." So Renouf, Budge, and others. The Coptic has preserved for us the force and significance of this old Egyptian word or particle "ent." The Coptic is ΔΤΕ = "ente," and signifies the particle "of," or "of" the sign of the Genitive case or construct state. So it is used not only in Coptic but in old Egyptian inscriptions. In the Hieroglyphic this particle was used between a noun and a verb. In the Coptic it is used between two nouns. This old Egyptian "ent" throws light upon, or perhaps indicates something as to, the origin of the Hebrew נִנָּ ; e.g., Gen. iv. 1, "I have gotten me a man" ננ = "of," not נ = "from" (A. V.), or נ = "with" (R. V.).
3d. ד׳ = "Saf," not "Zaph," as in the A. V. There has been more discussion in regard to the meaning of this part of the name. But upon examining the Hieroglyphic Lexicon or Vocabulary of Pierret, it is strange to see how there can be any doubt as to the word and its meaning. Pierret gives as follows:—

"child," "son," etc.

"2 fils," "2 sons," and "sif-sen."

"šeb," corresponds, in the Rhind papyrus, to ḳ = "sa" = "filius," "son."

The precise correspondence between the old Egyptian "Sef," "Sefi," "Sif," and this Hebrew ד׳, as the first part of the old Egyptian name of Joseph, is evident. "Saf," therefore, means "son;" and the old Egyptian name of Joseph means, therefore, "Son of the Living One," i. e., God.
OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED
BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

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

V.
ISAIAH.

LIII. 4. See under Gen. xlix. 10.

— 5. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." See under lii. 18.

"But he was wounded," etc. Rav Huna said, in the name of Rabbi Acha: The sufferings are divided into three parts,—one for David and the Patriarchs; one for the generation of the destruction (i. e., for Israel in the exile); and one for the Messiah, of whom it is said, "Yet have I set my king" (Ps. ii. 6).—Fallut in loco.

— 6. "And the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

The congregation of Israel said to the Holy One, blessed be he! Lord of the universe! for the sake of the Law, which thou hast given to me, and which is called a source of life, shall I ever enjoy thy light? What is the meaning of "in thy light shall we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 9)? It denotes the light of the Messiah; as it is said, "And God saw the light, that it was good" (Gen. i. 4). This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be he! had already respect to the generation of the Messiah and to his works, before the creation of the world, and that he preserved that first light under the throne of his glory for the Messiah and his age. Satan pleaded before the Holy One, blessed be he! and said: Lord of the universe, for whom is the light preserved under the throne of glory? The Holy One answered: For him who is to overthrow and to shame thee. Satan said: Let me see him! The Holy One said: Come and see him! When he saw him he trembled and fell upon his face and said: Yes, truly, that is surely the Messiah who will throw me and all idolatrous nations into hell; for it is said, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces" (Isa. xxv. 6). In that hour the nations gathered together and said before the Holy One, blessed be he! Lord of the universe, who is he in whose hands we are to fall? What is his name? What is his nature? The Holy One replied: Ephraim, Messiah, my righteousness—is his name; he exalts his light and that of his generation,
and gives light to the eyes of Israel, and redeemeth his people. No nation or
tongue can stand before him; for it is said, "The enemy shall not exact upon
him, nor the son of wickedness afflict him" (Ps. lxxxix. 22). All his ene-
mies and adversaries shall fear him and go back before him; as it is said,
"And I will beat down his foes before his face" (v. 23). Even the streams
will run before him into the sea; as it is said, "I will set his hand also in the
sea, and his right hand in the rivers" (v. 25). When they flew, the Holy
One, blessed be he! began to stipulate with him (the Messiah). He said to
him: The sins of those who are treasured up beside thee will bring thee
under a yoke of iron, and make thee like this calf, whose eyes are dim, and
will torment thy spirit with unrighteousness; and because of transgression
thy tongue will cleave to the roof of thy mouth. Dost thou accede to this? Messiah rejoined before the Holy One, blessed be he?—Lord of the universe,
perhaps this trouble is for many years? The Holy One, blessed be he! re-
plied: By thy life and the life of thy head, a week have I decreed upon thee
(Dan. ix. 27). If it grieve thy soul, I will expel or afflict thee now. He
replied before him: Lord of the universe, with heartfelt gladness and with
heartfelt joy I take this upon myself, on condition that not one of Israel
shall perish; and that not only those that are alive shall be saved in my days,
but also those that are hid in the dust; and not only the dead shall be saved
in my days, but also those dead who died from the time of the first Adam
until now; and not these only, but also those who have been prematurely
born; and not only these, but also all that are in thy mind to create and have
not yet been created. Thus I consent, and on these terms I take this office
upon myself.—Yalkut on Isaiah lx. 1.

LIV. 5. "For thy Maker is thine husband."

"This month shall be unto you" (Exod. xii. 2); this is like unto a king who,
at his betrothal, consigns to his bride only a few gifts. But when he married
her he consigned to her so many gifts as is becoming a husband. In the same
manner, this world is a bride, as it is said, "And I will betroth thee unto me
for ever" (Hos. ii. 19); but he only gave to them the moon, as it is said,
"This month shall be unto you." But in the days of the Messiah they will
be married, as it is said, "For thy Maker is thine husband;" and then he
will give them everything, as it is said, "And they that be wise shall shine as
the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as
stars for ever and ever" (Dan. xii. 3).—Midrash on Exodus xii. 22, sect. 15.

11. "Behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations
with sapphires."

On the words, "This month shall be unto you" (Exod. xii. 2), the Midrash
remarks that, in the future, God will make ten new things. The fifth is that
Jerusalem will be built with sapphires, as it is said, "Behold, I will lay," etc.,
and "I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones" (Isa. LIV. 12). And these stones will shine like the sun, and the nations of the world will come and rejoice in the glory of Israel, as it is said, "And the gentiles shall come to thy light" (ibid., LX. 3).

—Mi'rdash on Exodus xii. 2, sect. 15.

LVII. 16. "For the spirit should fall before me, and the souls which I have made."

Rabbi Hiya, the son of Tanchum, or as others say, in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, interpreted our passage thus: King Messiah shall not come till all the souls are brought into existence which were included in the divine plan at the creation. And these are the souls which are indicated in the book of the first man; for it is said, "This is the book of the generation of Adam" (Gen. v. 1).—Mi'rdash on Koheleth or Ecclesiastes i. 6; on Genesis v. 1, sect. 24; Talm. Ye'bbamoth, fol. 62, col. a; fol. 68, col. 2.1

LIX. 15. "Yea, truth falleth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

We have the teaching, Rabbi Judah said, in the generation in which the Son of David shall come, the house of assembly will be for fornication, and Galilee shall be in ruins, and Gaban laid waste; and the men of Gabul shall go from city to city, and shall find no favor. And the wisdom of the scribes shall stink, and they that fear sin shall be despised, and the face of that generation shall (shamelessly) be as that of a dog; truth shall fail, as it is said, "Yea, truth falleth." What is the meaning of "Yea, truth falleth"? Those of the house of Rav say that she shall be made into droves (i.e., divided among opposing schools or parties), and thus go away. What is the meaning of "He that turns from evil will be regarded as a fool"? Those of the house of Rabbi Shilah say, Everyone that departeth from evil shall be counted a fool by the world.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 1; cf. also Mi'rdash on Song of Solomon, 2:13.

16. "And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor."

Rabbi Yochanan said, "The Son of David will come only in a generation which is either wholly guiltless or wholly guilty; for concerning the former it is written, "Thy people shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land forever" (Isa. LX. 21), and concerning the latter it is written, "And he saw that there was no man," etc., and it is added, "For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it" (Isa. XLVIII. 11).—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1; Yalkut in loco.

17. "For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation

1 In the latter passages it reads "Son of David."
upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak."

"He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation" (Isa. LXI. 10). There are seven garments which the Holy One, blessed be his name! has put on since the world began, or will put on before the hour when he will visit with his wrath the godless Edom. When he created the world he clothed himself in honor and glory; for it is said, "Thou art clothed with honor and glory" (Ps. CIV. 1). When he showed himself at the Red Sea he clothed himself in majesty; for it is said, "The Lord reigneth; he is clothed with majesty" (Ps. XCIII. 1). When he gave the law he clothed himself with might; for it is said, "Jehovah is clothed with might, wherewith he hath girded himself" (Ps. XCIII. 1). As often as he forgave Israel its sins he clothed himself in white; for it is said, "His garment was white as snow" (Dan. VII. 9). When he punishes the nations of the world he puts on the garments of vengeance, as it is said, "He put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak" (Isa. LIX. 17). He will put on the sixth robe when the Messiah is revealed. Then will he clothe himself in righteousness; for it is said, "For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation on his head" (ibid.). He will put on the seventh robe when he punishes Edom. Then will he clothe himself in red; for it is said, "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel?" (Isa. LXIII. 2). But the robes with which he will clothe the Messiah will shine from one end of the world to the other; for it is said, "As a bridegroom who is crowned with his turban, like a priest" (Isa. LXI. 10). And the sons of Israel will rejoice in his light, and will say, Blessed be the hour when the Messiah was born; blessed the womb which bore him; blessed the eyes that were counted worthy to see him. For the opening of his lips is blessing and peace; his speech is rest to the soul; the thoughts of his heart confidence and joy; the speech of his lips pardon and forgiveness; his prayer like the sweet-smelling savor of a sacrifice; his supplications holiness and purity. O, how blessed is Israel for whom such a lot is reserved; for it is said, "How great is thy goodness which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee" (Ps. XXXI. 19).—Pesikta (ed. Buber), p. 149, col. 1.

19, 20. "So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun. When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him. And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord."

Rabbi Jochanan said: If thou seest a generation whose prosperity is gradually diminishing, look out for him (i. e., the Messiah); for it is said, "And the afflicted people thou wilt save" (2 Sam. XXII. 28). If thou seest a generation
overwhelmed with great calamities as with a flood, look out for him; for it is said, "When the enemy," etc.—_Talmud Sanhedrin_, fol. 97, col. 2.

LX. 1. "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."

_Targum_: Arise, shine, O Jerusalem, for the time of thy redemption is come, and the glory of the Lord is revealed upon thee.

If you are careful in observing the lighting the lamps, I will let shine for you a great light in the future, as it is said, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come."

—_Midrash on Numbers_ VIII. 2, sect. 15.

2. "For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord," etc.

A Sadducee once asked Rabbi Abuhu, When will Messiah come? He replied, When darkness will cover your people. Why dost thou curse me? asked the other. The Rabbi answered, The Scripture says, "For behold, the darkness shall cover," etc.—_Talmud Sanhedrin_, fol. 99, col. 1.

God will bring darkness over the nations; but to the Israelites he will give light; as it is said, "For behold, the darkness," etc.—_Midrash on Exodus_ X. 23, sect. 14.

3. See under LIV. 11.

21. See under LIX. 16.

LXI. 5. "And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks; and the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen," etc.

A teacher of Elijah's school said: Once I went from place to place, and I found an old man who said to me, What will become of the nations of the world in the days of the Messiah? I said to him, My son, every nation and every kingdom that had persecuted and mocked Israel shall see the blessing of Israel, and shall return to their dust and have no share in life; for it is said, "The wicked shall see it and be grieved" (Ps. CXLII. 10). But every nation and every kingdom that did not persecute and mock Israel will come in the days of the Messiah; for it is said, "And strangers shall stand," etc.; but "ye shall be named the priests of the Lord" (Isa. LXI. 6).—_Yalkut on Exod._ XII. 48.

10. See under LIX. 17.

LXIII. 2. See under LIX. 17.

4. "The day of vengeance is in my heart," etc.

Rabbi said: [The days of the Messiah will be] 365 years, according to the number of the days of the sun; for it is said, "The day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come."—_Talmud Sanhedrin_, fol. 99, col. 1.

See also under Ps. XC. 15.

Rabbi Saul, of Nava, said, in the name of Rabbi Simeon: If someone asks
thee, when the time of redemption comes, reply, "The day of vengeance is in my heart." Thus it is written.—Midrash on Ecclesiastes XII. 10.

16. "For thou art our father; for Abraham has not known us, and Israel acknowledges us not; thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer of old is thy name."

Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachmani, said, in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: What is the meaning of, "For thou art our father," etc.? In the Messianic future, the Holy One, blessed be he! will say to Abraham, Thy children have sinned. He will reply: Let them be blotted out, by reason of the holiness of thy name. The Lord will then say: I will address myself to Jacob, who, having experienced trouble in rearing his children, will perhaps intercede for them. He said to them, Thy children have sinned. He replied, Let them be blotted out, by reason of the holiness of thy name. He will say, There is no rationality in old people, and no counsel in young ones. He will then say to Isaac, Thy children have sinned. He will then reply, What! My children and not thine? When, in their eagerness, they said, "We will do and hear," thou didst call them, "Israel is my first-born son." (Exod. rv. 22); and now they are my children and not thine! What is the extent of their transgression? How many are the years of man? Seventy, take off twenty, during which no punishment is inflicted, and there remain fifty. Take off twenty-five more that are spent in sleep, and there remain twenty-five. Take off half of these for the time spent in prayer, eating and relieving nature, and there remain twelve and a half. These few years of sin, if thou wilt bear them alone, well; if not, let half be borne by me, and half by thee. Or shouldest thou say that I am to bear them all alone, behold, I have offered myself sacrificially unto thee. At this they will say (to Isaac), "Thou art our father." But Isaac will say, Instead of praising me, praise the Holy One, blessed be he! They will then raise their eyes on high, and say, "Thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer of old is thy name."—Talm. Shabbath, fol. 89, col. 2.

LXIV. 4. "Neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee."

Rabbi Yochanan said: All the prophets prophesied only with reference to the days of the Messiah; but as regards the world to come, "Eye hath not seen, O God, beside thee," etc.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 99, col 1.

1 Only those who were above that age died in the wilderness (Num. xiv. 29).
THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTION IN THE TUNNEL OF NEGUB.

BY HUGO WINCKLER, PH. D.,
Berlin, Germany.

In a tunnel in the neighborhood of Negub, on the Zab river, Layard (*Nineveh and its Remains*, I. 81, *Nineveh and Babylom*, p. 616) found a slab upon which an inscription was engraved. The text has been published by him in his *Inscriptions*, plate 35, but in a very mutilated condition. It would be impossible to make anything out of the inscription if a recent find did not give the necessary material.

Brit. Mus. 81—6—7. 219 (seal of Esarhaddom) contains the following (only concocted) genealogy of Esarhaddom:

8. Aššûr-âḫī-iddin-na, etc.
27. apal Sin-âḫī-ir-ša, etc.
apal Šam-ukin, etc.
29. li-ip-li-pi da-ru-u ša Bīl-ib-ni apal
A-da-si šaš mātu Aššûr ki
u-tu ki-ši-ti ša-a-ti.

K. 2801 Aššûr-âḫī-iddina
apal Sin-âḫī-irba apal Šam-ukin, etc.
lib-lib-bi šarrû-ti ša Bīl-BA (ibni or šbuš
or bani) šaš
KI. (Aššûr).

A. H. 82: 7—14 no number (cylinder of Saosduchinos).
Šamaš-šum-ukin . . apal Aššûr-âḫī-iddina . . . . . . TUR. TUR (liplipi) Sin-
âḫī-irbâ, etc. . . . . . . lip-pal-pal Šarru-ukin etc. . . . . . . šarru-u-ti da-ru-u ša Bīl-bani (sic!) apal A-da-si pir’u Pal. Bī. KI. (Aššûr).

This genealogy was concocted only during the reign of Esarhaddom.¹ It was to give the Sargon dynasty, which had simply usurped the throne, the necessary line of ancestors: for Bīl-bani and Adasi must be looked upon as the ancestors of a dynasty which ruled in primeval times.² A similar statement is never found

---

¹ See the introduction to my edition of the Sargon inscriptions, which will soon leave the press.
² I hope to speak more fully of this upon another occasion.
before the time of Esarhaddon. This gives us a clew as to who the builder of the tunnel of Negub was, for on the fifth line of the inscription the name A-da-si can be clearly made out. Before that we must read Bīl-BA (= ibni, bani). According to the above it becomes probable that the inscription is the work of Esarhaddon. His name, it is true, is now lost: but at the end we must certainly read apal Sin-āḫī [īrbā], so that there can be no doubt as to the author of the inscription.

I shall now give the transcription and translation of what I have reconstructed from the publication of Layard.

L. 3. ................. apal Sin-āḫī [īrbā]
4. Ṣarru rabū šarru] dan-nu šar kiššati
   šar mātu Aššūr apal Šarru-ukin šar
   mātu Aššūr šakkanak Ka-dingir-KI.
   (Babili) šar I’mī. [Ku. (Sumfrī) u Akkadi
5. ................. ? li-îp-î-[pi] Bīl-BA
   (ibni) apal A-da-si šar mātu Aššūr
   Ki-šitti [ša-a-ti].............
6. ........ḥirītu bu-tuk(?)-ti ša Aššūr
   našir-apli rubū a-liq pa-[na...........
7. ........iš-[tu] ki-rib nāru Zaban šli
   ta-mir-ti šlu Kal-ḥi- uṣaḥru-u ? ...........

Translation: Esarhaddon...son of Sennacherib, the great, the powerful king, king of the hosts, king of Assur, son of Sargon, king of Assur, suzerain of Babylon, king of Sumir and Accad..... (of the) descendents of Bil-ibni, son of Adasi, king of Assur...? 

6. A canal and tunnel which Asur-našir-pal, a prince who lived before my time, had caused to be dug from the bed of the Zab to the reservoir of Kalḥi.....

The remark of Layard (loc. cit.) that the whole intention of the builder was to lead the water of the Zab to Nimrud (Kalḥi) or to the surrounding plain, agrees exactly with the contents of the inscription.
Mr. Crane on Tikkun Sopherim.—Mr. Crane, in writing on the Tikkun Sopherim, should have known that in my "Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum," pp. 87, 88, I have gathered together all the literature upon that subject. He must know at least of Geiger's "Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel." From the great work of Ch. D. Ginsburg, "The Massora compiled from Manuscripts," vol. II. (London, 1883), p. 710, he could have learned that among the Massorites themselves differences about the דין תקוע שום existed.

Hermann L. Strack,
Berlin.

Pronunciation of יְהֹוָי.—Concerning the original pronunciation of the divine name יְהֹוָי, the writer has been accustomed to instruct his classes as follows: Though the original vowels belonging to יְהֹוָי are nowhere given in the Old Testament, a contracted form of the name, which has vowels, exists, at the close of certain proper names, יְהֹוָי, יְהֹוָא, יְהֹוָשׁוֹע, etc. In the case of other words, a similar contracted ending represents an uncontracted original form, having vowels as well as consonants, as:—יְהֹוָשָׁע, Exod. xxxiv. 8; Josh. v. 14, et. al., יְהֹוָשָׁע, Gen. xviii. 2, et. al., for יְהֹוָשָׁע, 2 Sam. xv. 32, et. al. Assuming that similar contracted forms proceed from corresponding uncontracted forms, יְהֹוָי must represent an original יְהֹוָי; or, allowing יְ to close the first syllable יְהֹוָי. Cf. the form יְיָי found in Ps. lxviii. 5, and elsewhere. To recapitulate—יְהֹוָי contracts to יְיָי in יְיָי, etc. יְהֹוָשׁוֹע contracts to יְויוֹשׁוֹע; hence יְיָי or יְיָי is the voweled original.

Charles Rufus Brown,
Newton Centre, Mass.

The de Sarzec Inscriptions.—The following interesting summary is taken from a dissertation (for the doctorate) prepared by Ira M. Price, Ph. D., Morgan Park, Ill., and presented to the Philosophical faculty, University of Leipsic:

"M. Ernest de Sarzec entered upon official duty as consul of the French government at Bosrah in January, 1877. He had had the advantage of experience in desert life—several years in Egypt and in Abyssinia. In Egypt, especially, he had acquired a fondness for the study of antiquities. His new position in the midst of the empires of the past, in the midst of the ruins of the almost fabulous civilizations of 3000 years ago, fanned this flame into action, and pushed him out into the fields of treasures. His zeal and true devotion to the interests of science, and most of all his indomitable energy in pushing to realization his cherished hopes, set a most worthy example before the consuls of all civilized, all enlightened and educated peoples. The beginning of the discoveries was
almost contemporaneous with his arrival in the country. Within two months, he began his expedition into lower Chaldea. From March 5th to June 11th, 1877, he conducted his first campaign. February 18th to June 9th, 1878, marked his second tour. Upon his return to Paris in July, 1878, the exhibition of his discoveries aroused great enthusiasm and he was again sent to Bosrah. A third trip was made in January, 1880, and continued three months, during which time some of his most important discoveries were made. He undertook a fourth campaign November 12th, 1880, to March 15th, 1881. On his return to France in May, 1882, he was made ‘Correspondent de l’Institute de France,’ and the fruits of his discoveries were deposited in the Louvre. It was also, at once, decided to publish the results of these excavations for the benefit of scholars at large.

"The point of M. de Sarzec’s excavations lay in Chaldea, at Tello, about three or four days from Bosrah, about sixty miles north of Mugheir, forty-five miles east of Warka, and five east of Hātt-e-l-Hāi, a canal connecting the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. The ruins, or hills, of Tello are about four miles long, located in the midst of a morass which owes its origin to the numerous branches of this canal. In this hill, Tello, which Rassam once visited, near the north-west end, de Sarzec made his most important discovery. He lay bare a temple, whose outer wall presents the form of a parallelogram about 175 feet long, by 100 broad. The angles point toward the four points of the compass, contrary to the position of the pyramids of Egypt, whose sides occupy this position. This temple, as those of Chaldea and Babylonia in general, was found to stand on a mound sixteen to twenty feet high. The outer wall is five feet thick, built of bricks one foot in length and breadth, cemented together with bitumen, and bearing the inscription or name, Gu-de-a. After exposing the walls, de Sarzec pushed his way through the doors and windows into this structure. The first room into which he entered has a basal measure of 55×65 feet. In this room he found nine headless statues of diorite, a large number of fragments of vases, and remnants of various other kinds of Chaldean art. In the entire palace he found thirty-six rooms of different forms and sizes. In most of them something of real interest was discovered. Especially noteworthy was a discovery, made here in 1877, of two terra-cotta cylinders, each twenty-four inches in length by twelve inches in diameter. Each of these remarkable cylinders contains about 2000 lines of inscriptions.

"The inscriptions included in the discoveries of de Sarzec are of several kinds. They evidently belong to quite different periods of history. Of those published in ‘Découvertes en Chaldée,’ Livraison I, plate 2, Nos. 1 and 2 exhibit a very rude specimen of writing, rather hieroglyphic than cuneiform. Plates 3 and 4 give us a better style, not so rude, but still preserving the general outline of the same signs that can be seen on plate 2. On plate 7, No. 2, enlarged on plate 8, is found a very bold linear form of writing, exhibiting some very ancient forms, e.g. $\langle$ in an original $\bigcirc$. In the so-called Gudea-inscription, plates 16–19, the style of writing has reached an artistic nicety. The lines which characterize the other inscriptions just mentioned, are beginning in a few cases to give way to a narrow wedge. In the small inscriptions of plate 29, the wedge is distinctly seen, especially in No. 1. Further, all these forms of writing, from the rudest down to the most artistic, let us into the secret of the origin of a large
number of signs, whose original form and meaning hitherto has been enveloped in uncertainty.

"From a disregard of the question of the direction of writing and reading, the question of the origin of the signs has in the past been forced to carry double difficulties. From the discoveries of de Sarzec the original direction of writing and reading may be considered as settled beyond a question. The attempt to explain the origin of the signs, by taking them in the positions in which we find them in the later Babylonian and Assyrian, as read from left to right, meets with failure in almost every case. On this ground Houghton set forth his explanations, rather guesses, of a large number of signs. In several of his solutions he resorted to a method which should have set him on the right track, viz.: that of setting the signs upright. To a close observer there had been abundant evidence of this primitive direction of writing and reading long before de Sarzec's discoveries. In the works of Dorow and Ker Porter are found figures of seals with inscriptions in these early characters. The lines of writing read, as in de Sarzec, downwards. This is distinctly shown by the position of the mythical figures at their sides. The perpendicular lines also progress from right to left, as do the Semitic languages in general (except Ethiopic). The language of the inscriptions is the so-called Sumerian or Akkadian, in its very earliest forms. It is further, as distinguished from later productions, unilingual. It is written in what seems to be purely ideographic characters, with no trace whatever of what are called dialectical differences. A large number of very small inscriptions in the same language are found in I R. 1-5; also, the unilingual inscriptions of Hammurabi, the language on many of the seals in the magnificent catalogue of the collection of de Clercq, several published seals of the British Museum, and many of the tablets published by Strassmaier, belong to about the same class.

The contents surpass in amount and extent those of all other similar inscriptions. They seem to be principally dedicatory memoirs to the building of temples. The pantheon is taken up, and each god assigned his place, with his peculiar relations to men. The sources of the materials, the methods of transportation, and the purposes for which these materials were used in the building of the temples, are all recorded with a nice accuracy. Of the great theme of late Assyrian history, such as wars, subjugations, very little is said. Together with Magan and Meluḫḫa are mentioned a large number of geographical points, throwing much light upon the geography of these old countries. The work already done [July, 1886] on these inscriptions embraces a few scattered translations of the smaller and less difficult ones, principally by French Assyriologists. These have been published, for the most part, in their own journals. Although these have been very fragmentary, they have been, by no means, devoid of results. They have merely intimated what a mine of information is yet to be derived from an exhaustive study of these inscriptions."

The author gives about twenty pages, text, translation and glossary, of "The Gudea Inscription" (plates 16-19). A complete work, including the Transcription, Transliteration, and, as far as possible, the Translation, Glossary and Sign-list, of the published inscriptions of de Sarzec, is promised at an early date.
BOOK NOTICES.

WICKES’ TREATISE ON HEBREW ACCENTUATION.

This is really a continuation of a work published by the same author in 1881, on the accentuation of the three so-called poetical books of the Old Testament. The writer began with the poetical books, partly because the ground to be covered would be less, and partly also because these books stood in greater need of treatment. In the work before us Mr. Wickes has employed a truly scientific method. No pains have been spared to make the treatment full and accurate. It is not too much to say that no work of an equally conscientious or valuable character, has ever before been done on this subject. The MSS. in all the principal libraries have been collated, a work in itself of great magnitude.

His presentation of the purposes of the accents is excellent. The distinction made and carried out so rigidly between logical and syntactical pauses makes very simple what, at least to beginners, has always been obscure. No one can now doubt either (1) that the purpose was to draw out the sense and impress it on the minds of readers and hearers; or (2) that the meaning thus drawn out is only the traditional meaning, and consequently to be disregarded when satisfactory arguments may be presented.

Perhaps most interesting will be found the author’s arguments for the later date of the Babylonian system of punctuation as compared with the Palestinian. His conclusion that the Babylonian is but an attempt to simplify and introduce regularity into the older system is well-founded and will be generally accepted.

What he gives us in reference to the original musical force of the accents, though meagre, is more definite than anything which has been before published. The highest melodies were represented by Pāzêr, T’līšā, Gērēs; the medium, by Zārqā (S’gholtā), R’bhīḥāš’, L’gharmē, T’bhīr; the lowest, by Paštā, Zāqūph, Tīph-hā, ’Attnāḥ and Šīlūq. The distinction of Emperors, Kings, Counta, etc., is justly claimed to be fanciful and misleading. It is a distinction originated by early Christian writers, and is not found in Jewish grammars. Chapter III. takes up the general question of the dichotomy, which lies at the basis of the whole system. Its origin is explained to have arisen in connection with the poetical parts of the Pentateuch, e.g., Exod. xv.; Deut. xxxii. First applied to these according to the principles of Hebrew poetry, it afterwards spread to the prose portions. Adopting as a law, that the main dichotomy should always be found where the main logical pause would require it, he proceeds to classify under seven heads the variations to this law. Variations may be satisfactorily explained as due, e.g., to an effort to secure rhetorical effect, to mark special emphasis, or to present a peculiar interpretation. The cases cited are generally well-chosen. Occasionally,
however, a text will be found which does not seem to support the author’s view. Chapter IV. treats of syntactical dichotomy. The laws for the accentuation of the subject, the object, adverbs, prepositional phrases, the vocative, the verb, the predicate in nominal sentences, and conjunctions, under different circumstances, are given with their deviations. In Chapter V., the treatment of Siilluq, the presentation is something like this: The main dichotomy may come on the first word before Siilluq and be marked by Tiphhā or 'Atnāḥ, the former being most common (Gen. ii. 1; Isa. xxxvi. 1); on the second word, marked by 'Atnāḥ or Tiphhā (for the latter, Gen. i. 13; Exod. xv. 18); on the third or fourth word, marked by 'Atnāḥ or Zaqēph; on the fifth word, always marked by 'Atnāḥ. The succeeding chapters take up the consecution of 'Atnāḥ, Zaqēph, and the remaining accents.

An interesting feature of the work is the list of texts, corrected by the rules laid down, in connection with each section. Nor are these corrections the work of conjecture. Not only do they, as thus amended, accord with the laws deduced, but in nearly every case MS. authority is found to corroborate the emendation. The arguments by which S'gholū is shown to be subordinate to 'Atnāḥ, and the proof that it is but a substitute under certain definite circumstances for Zaqēph are, taken together, convincing and conclusive.

It has been attempted to give a notice of the contents and spirit of this book. Further details cannot be added. Criticism, while on some points possible, is hardly gracious, in view of the great flood of light which our author, by his pains-taking labors, has shed upon the subject of the accents. It is sufficient to say of this volume what Professor Driver has said of the first: “A more lucid or masterly exposition of a complicated subject could scarcely be imagined.”

W. R. HARPER.

DELITZSCH’S ASSYRISCHES WORTERBUCH.*

The first Lieferung of Delitzsch’s Assyrisches Woerterbuch has at last made its appearance to the great delight of all Assyrian, as well as general Semitic, students. It consists of 168 large quarto pages, written in Delitzsch’s characteristically plain hand. These pages carry us from N to ῬῊ. In his preface, the author states that he hopes to finish this work in ten such Lieferungen of 160 pp. each, i. e. in all, 1600 pp.

The author has compiled his lexicon in strict concordance with the rules laid down in his Prolegomena. These are in brief, 1) the explanation of the Assyrian by means of the Assyrian, references to be made to the other Semitic languages only when necessary to bring out the meaning more clearly, or for the sake of comparison; 2) the arrangement of the stems alphabetically and the placing of all derivatives under their respective stems; 3) the separation of the Proper Nouns from the lexicon proper; 4) the separation of the most important notes from those of less importance and from mere theories. The former are in

* ASSYRISCHES WORTERBUCH ZUR GESAMMTEN BISHER VERÖFFENTLICHEN KEILSCHRIFT-LITERATUR UNTER BEHERZIGUNG ZAHLREICHER UNVERÖFFENTLICHER TEXTE VON DR. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, PROF. ORD. HON. FÜR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND SEMITISCHE SPRACHEN AN DER UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG. ERSTE LIEFERUNG. LEIPZIG: J. C. HINRICH’SCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, 1887. 4TO. 188 PP. M.30
large type, the latter in smaller type, or classified as foot-notes. Naturally a
great many things have been inserted which would not find place in a Hebrew or
Arabic lexicon; for example, the publication in extenso of many unpublished
texts. This was found necessary, because a great many texts had been published
very imperfectly, and others of great importance had not been published at all.
This method adds greatly to the bulk of the lexicon; and yet it is far preferable
to that suggested by Prof. Lyon, viz.: that the texts should rather be published in
different numbers of one of the journals devoted to Assyriology. It is, to say the
least, the simpler and more convenient method of the two.

Although this lexicon appeared only last April, it has already received much
criticism, both favorable and unfavorable, fair and unfair.¹

A book should, in so far as possible, be judged from the standpoint of the
author, and not from that of the critic, or, to be more explicit, Delitzsch’s Assyrisches Woerterbuch should be judged from what it professes to be, and not from what
other people think it should be. The author announces that his book is to be a
complete lexicon to all the inscriptions heretofore published, and to some—not
all—unpublished inscriptions. One reviewer ² is unreasonable enough to say in
one column that the book should have been made a pocket-dictionary instead of
what it is, and, a few lines below this statement, that the book is of no value
because it does not contain all the words in all the unpublished and as yet
unnumbered and even unwashed tablets in the British Museum. How long
would we be compelled to wait if Delitzsch had not published his lexicon until
all the tablets in the British Museum were classified and read? Mr. Pinches, with the
assistance of others, has worked indefatigably during the last nine years to bring
about this classification. And yet how many thousands of tablets remain un-
touched? Again, Mr. Smith should have criticized the fundamental principle laid
down by the author in his Prolegomena, viz.: that the Assyrian should, in so far as
possible, be explained by and through the Assyrian, instead of denouncing him
because he has not filled his book with numerous comparisons from the Arabic, a
language which is, relatively speaking, remotely related to the Assyrian.

Prof. Delitzsch has endeavored to arrange each word under its root in alphabetical order. No one can appreciate the difficulty of this work who has not
made a similar attempt. The arrangement according to stems in the other Semitic
languages must be considered as mere child’s play when compared to the
Assyrian. Our author has, in all probability, made many mistakes in this arrange-
ment, and he himself is the last one to claim perfection for his work. Where he
was in doubt as to the stem of a word, he has frankly admitted his doubt. His
theories, in such cases, have been added in smaller type and in many cases with
the greatest reluctance.

The author, so far as we have seen, has made no direct statements as to his
present position on the Sumero-Akkadian question. As far back as the third
edition of his Assyrische Lesestuecke (July, 1885), he has carefully avoided the terms
Sumerian and Akkadian, preferring the more general and non-committal term
“Non-Semitic.” In Dr. Zimmern’s Busspsalmen, he admits that more scientific
methods and more convincing arguments must be used against the Anti-Akkadists

¹ Cf. Prof. D. G. Lyon’s most fair and appreciative review in the Proceedings of the American
Oriental Society, at Boston, May 1886; A. S. Smith, in the Academy, July 23, 1887; E. in the Exposi-
tor, Sept., 1887.

² A. S. Smith, in the Academy, July 23, 1887.
than have heretofore been used, if the Akkadists wish to win their points. From several indirect statements, however, one is led to believe that Delitzsch is gradually drawing nearer and nearer to the Anti-Akkadist school of Halévy. His remarks are still very guarded and only serve to make one inquisitive in respect to the real views of the author. All Assyrologists would be pleased to have a plain and concise statement of his present views on this question.

Another point, going hand in hand with the preceding, may be noticed, viz.: that the author explains as good Semitic many words hitherto regarded as loan-words. Nothing else could be expected, after the remarks made above. A b a is placed under the stem יבשות, and translated "Secretär," with the additional remark that there is no doubt that it is "gutsemitisch." A b k a l l u, with less emphasis, however, is also regarded as a good Semitic word—contrary to Haupt, who takes it as a loan-word—composed of a b  k a l l u, cf. pp. 32, 33. The author's treatment of a b a r a k k u, a b r a k k u (pp. 69, 70) is new and interesting. On p. 72, the expressions b i t i a b t u, T i g. v i. 99 = "mein zerstörtes Haus" and a b  t a  t i, Neb. B o r s. i i. 10, = "die zu Grunde gegangen," are explained by placing a b t u and a b t á t i under the root יבשות. Mr. Smith in "The Bor-sippa Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar," along with a multitude of other false derivations, says: "This certainly means 'stories.' I think the root is יבשות." He had evidently paid but little attention to Delitzsch's Assyrisches Woerterbuch before writing this article (it appeared in July, about two weeks before the review in the Academy) or he would have noticed the derivation given by Delitzsch. Cf. also Assyr. Woertebuch, p 109. A g u r r u from a stem יבשות: "to surround." Delitzsch distinguishes two a g u r r u's (as he had already done in his "Vorlesungen"), viz: a g u r r u, i. = "Umschliessung," "Einfassung," "Umkleidung," and a g u r r u, ii. = "baked clay," "bricks," always used collectively.

On pp. 119, 120, new light is thrown on the difficult word a d a g u r r u which occurs in Nimrod Epos x i. 149. Cf. also è l d u from the stem יבשות, instead of è l d u, pp. 150, sqq.

Many more interesting words and references could be cited, but lack of space forbids. In conclusion, it may be said that the first Lieferung contains even more material than could have been expected. The typographical execution is splendid. It is a monumental work and deserves the kind attention of all Semitic students. Many will not be able to agree with the author in all that he says, but all will recognize the hand of a master in this book. That the author's life may be prolonged until he brings this—his life's work—to completion should be the earnest wish of every Semitic student.

ROBERT F. HARPER,
Yale University.

TABLEAU COMPARE DES ECRITURES BABYLONIENNE ET ASSYRIENNE.*

The body of the very useful and much needed work before us consists of a syllabary giving the archaic and the various modern forms of two hundred and ninety-six characters, to which, in a supplement, eleven are added, making a total

---

1 In the Babylonian and Oriental Record, July, 1887.
of three hundred and seven numbers. The archaic forms occurring on the monuments discovered in the plains of Chaldaea by de Sarzec are taken as a basis, and for the first time appear classified according to a certain system. Underneath the archaic form or forms of each character are ranged, in two parallel columns, the various equivalents in the more modern styles down to the current forms, all the Babylonian styles being to the left of the dividing line and the Assyrian to the right, the distinct forms in each column being further subdivided according to their derivation from the assumed prototype. This plan of arrangement, for obvious reasons, is an exceedingly convenient one. In this way the confusion to the eye is avoided which would result from a single array of signs, and the detection of a desired character is greatly facilitated, while, at the same time, the comparison between the Babylonian and Assyrian forms being at command, a survey of the entire field can be more readily obtained. Reference to cuneiform inscriptions are given for every single form, with the exception of the current Assyrian and Babylonian ones (which close the list under each number), where, of course, no references are required. In fifty-five instances (out of the three hundred and seven numbers) the archaic forms have not yet been found on the monuments, and have therefore been conjecturally constructed; but only when it has been possible to decompose the modern form into its parts, and when, for these parts, archaic equivalents exist, have the conscientious authors ventured to supply missing links in the chain. On the other hand, in twenty-five cases, our authors have not succeeded in assimilating the archaic form to a modern equivalent; and in six cases the assimilation is marked as uncertain. Following the syllabary comes a table of the numerals in the Gudea inscriptions, also with the Babylonian and Assyrian forms, and upon these, two lists, in modern Assyrian characters, arranged in the usual order, the first of which contains such signs as are referred to in the syllabary, together with the number under which they are to be found, and the second, those that are not, the two together forming, as the preface assures us, a complete index of the cuneiform signs at present known.

We should have liked to have seen a third list added, giving the old Babylonian forms with their equivalents in the current Assyrian style, for the benefit of those who are passing from the latter to the study of the former, and perhaps even a fourth list giving a similar arrangement of the characters in the modern Babylonian style might not have been superfluous.

An important and curious fact results from a study of the development of the cuneiform system such as is now, thanks to Messrs. Amiaud and Méchineau, placed within easy range of every student.

There was nothing which, in the early days of the decipherment, puzzled scholars so much and served to cast such suspicion in "lay" circles upon the results reached by the decipherers, as the polyphonic character of the signs. How was it possible, it was asked, that a single character should have the values "uğ" and "nit," or "kal," "dan," "rib" and "lab"? We have long since ceased to wonder at this. It is rather the poly-ideographic character of the signs that may now more justly call forth our surprise. The association due to synonymity, or similarity of ideas, is of course the most important factor in accounting for the various significations which a character has acquired. In this way the sign which means strong is also used for the synonyms of strong; that for mouth may designate face, countenance, hence form, as well as to speak, command and word or order. A second factor is the association due to similarity of sound, to which the reviewer
recently called attention in a paper read before the American Oriental Association.¹ According to this principle identity or similarity in sound leads to the employment of a sign to express objects not otherwise related. Thus the character which, as an ideogram, has the value “ilibittu” brick, is extended to “ilipittu” fence; and in the same way, merely through closeness of sound, “tukultu” help and “takiltu” apparition, are brought together; and many more like.

A third factor which is now, by the “Tableau Comparé,” placed beyond doubt, is the fusion of two, and in some cases of three, signs, originally distinct, into one. Messrs. Amiaud and Méchineau call attention to eight cases where this process has taken place. The sign, for instance, which has the phonetic values “uš” and “nit” (No. 187 of Delitzsch’s “Schrifttafel”) has two entirely distinct archaic prototypes. Now we know that “uš” is the “Sumero-Akkadian” for Assyrian “zikaru” male, and “nit,” an abbreviation of “nita” or “nitā,” is the equivalent of “ridu” stream, effusion. There seems to be no connection whatever between these two terms; but on the assumption that the one of the archaic prototypes represents “uš” and the second “nit,” and that it is merely by the flowing together of the two forms in the modern styles that the two terms have been thrown together, the difficulty is cleared away. The same applies to “bar” and “maš” (No. 47 of the “Schrifttafel”), for which again there exist two archaic forms. The sign “šar,” “ḥir,” etc. (No. 111), presents an interesting feature. While in the modern Babylonian there has taken place a fusion of only two forms, in the current Assyrian the process has gone still further and a third form, for which as yet a separate character is to be found in the former, has in the latter been thrown together with the other two. But the most interesting of the instances cited is that of “ku,” etc. (No. 288), which reverts to no less than four archaic forms.

On the other hand, and as a kind of compensation, we find at least one instance where the contrary seems to have taken place, and signs are differentiated in modern styles which in older types are not distinguished. In the case of Nos. 215 and 219 (according to the “Schrifttafel”) the further back we go, the less differences do they show, and in some of the Nebuchadnezzar texts there is practically none at all; so that, although the archaic form for the latter has not yet been found, it is very probable, as our authors say, that the two descend from “a single and common primitive form.” But even if this be not admitted, the forms must have been so alike as to have been mistaken for one another. In no better way can we account for the fact that the latter has so many phonetic values, “bir,” “pir,” “laḥ” and “liḥ,” in common with the former, and is furthermore used to express such ideas as “namaru” to be bright and “nuru” light. The sign, as is known, also designates “šabu” warrior and “ummānu” army, with a corresponding phonetic value “ṣab” (whence “ṣap” and “zab”); and if we may be permitted to venture a further conjecture, it is that, in the latter sense, the sign is an abbreviation of “SAB” and “ZUN.” A parallel instance would be No. 288, which in the sense of “subatu,” “nalbašu” dress, seems to be an abbreviation of No. 291.²

Morris Jastrow, Jr.,
University of Pennsylvania.

¹ Proceedings for May, 1887, pp. 18-22. See also Zimmern, “Busspsalmen,” p. 6.
² In the “clothing” list, V R. 14, 15, Nos. 288 and 291 are used interchangeably as determinatives.
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THE HEBREW TETRAMETER.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

In the HEBRAICA, April, 1886, I gave an account of the Hebrew trimeter, and in April, 1887, specimens of the strophical organization of the trimeters. I now propose to give some examples of the tetrameter, and in the articles soon to follow, to consider the pentameters, hexameters, and the poems of mixed rhythm.

The tetrameters are measured by four beats of the accent, and are often divided by a caesura into two halves, with two beats of the accent in each part. I shall first give a poem of equal strophes, and then specimens of strophes of different number of lines.

1. Psalm XLVI. has three strophes with refrains. The refrain is missing in the Hebrew text at the close of the first strophe, but I take the liberty of restoring it.

Strophe I.

אלים לענו | מחמה וני
עורב הצור | נצאם מצא
עליך לאנייה | בחריכי ארין
נ빼תם היו | בך יימ
ידמי חמריו prophets
ירשו חורב בנהא
ירוה צמאו עמד
משב ינהו | אלהי ענק

{Refrain.

The strophe is composed of three synonymous distichs. Four lines are tetrameters having a caesura in their midst. The last two lines are trimeters, where there is no such caesura. It is not uncommon for tetrameters to have occasional
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trimeter lines to make the movement more rapid, especially at the beginning and at the end of strophes. The refrain is a trimeter in the first line and a tetramer in the second line.

Strophe II.

נהר פלוני | שמחוה עיר-אלוהים
קרש משכון עליון
אלוהי בך בך | בל תמת
יעורא אלוהים | לפנית בך
חמ ג Vimeo | ממדבר ה
ננו בך בך | תמנ אפר
(Refrain.

This strophe is also composed of three synonymous distichs. The second line is a trimeter. The last four lines are fine examples of the use of the caesura.

It seems to me quite possible that נזר originally belonged to the second line. This would make both lines tetrameters, and the parallelism would be complete. A prosaic copyist would be likely to make such a mistake.

Strophe III.

לבט חוח | מסעלא היוה
אשר שים | שמה בך
משכון מלהמר | ערב-כמה חאר
כשק יטבר | קצין תחת
הרפ ורע | בני-אלוים
ארוח כנרט | ארון בצאר
(Refrain.

This strophe is also composed of three synonymous distichs, all tetrameters. The traditional text inserts after the fourth line ע nfl | שחר באש . This is not only a trimeter, but it destroys the uniformity of the poem by making the strophe of seven lines instead of six, and by making a tristich in a Psalm composed elsewhere of only distichs. This line has probably crept in from the margin as a kindred idea.

2. Psalm xiii. gives an example of gradual decrease in the lines of strophes, the first strophe being a complaint, the second a petition, and the third concluding with confidence in Jahveh.
The traditional text omits יָרָאָב at the beginning of the fourth line, but gives it in every other line. This omission reduces the line to a trimeter and destroys the symmetry of the strophe. It should be restored.

Strophe II.

הָבוֹשָׁה עָנִי | יְהוָה אֲלֵיהִי
חָזְיוֹר עָנִי | פָּרָשֶׁת הָמָה
מִזְאַמֵּר יָזִּי יְכָלָּרוּי
עֲרֵי יִלְדָּה כְּאָמָם

Strophe III.

אָנָי חָסֶרָה נַסְחַתָּה
נָל גֶּלֶב בְּשָׂרוֹתָה
אָשְׂרֶה לִירָוָה בְּיִנְמָל עַלְּוַי

The first and second lines of the third strophe are trimeters in order to make a more rapid movement. The caesura is evident in the last tetrameter line.

3. The Dirge of David over Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 19–27, is a fine example of a tetrameter with refrains. There is great difference of opinion as to its strophical organization, due to the place of the three refrains. I am of the opinion that we have three diminishing strophes, the first and second beginning with the refrain, the latter made up entirely of the refrain itself. The refrain varies slightly. Its basis is אָלֹנִי נְפֹלֵל נָבוֹרִים, which appears in the first and last refrain in this trimeter form; but, in the second refrain, it is lengthened into a tetrameter by the addition of הבִּיר-מַלְיָה. The refrain is still further modified in the first example by being preceded byезְנֵי יְשָׂרָאֵל על-כְּמוֹתֵינוּ חֲלָל; in the second instance by being followed byיוֹתָן עִלְּכְּמוֹתֵינוּ חֲלָל, and in the last example by being followed byיִאְכָּר בָּלֶב, מַלְיָה.

Strophe I.

זִעְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל | עִלִּכְמֹותֵינוּ חֲלָל
[Refrain.

אֲלֹנִי נְפֹלֵל נָבוֹרִים]
(a)
אל תגור בנה
אל תבשך או חיות אשלך
פניך תגלהו או בני פלשתים
פניך תגלהו או בני הערלים

(b)
דרי בניබך אל－סאל
אל－מפרעם עילך חרי הפרעה
כימים נגלה מגן נבויים
מנך שאולו חל－מישר בשם

(c)
מרז הלילים או מחלב בניים
קשת חיות או לא－נושך אתו
חרוב שאול או לא－תשקם ריק

(d)
שאול חיות או י 의원 הזהים
בחיים הם מבוים או לא פרו
מנשרים כל או יתארים נבר

(e)
בנה ישראלו או שאול البنינה
משלbucks של או עונם
המענה או רחיים או לברשבן

Strophe II.
{Refrain.

(f)
צר－לי עליּו נוחי חיות
נעמת לי מצר נפלאתה
אhtarך לי מאהבת שיש

Strophe III.
{Refrain.

{Refrain.
{Refrain.
{Refrain.
If the refrains were absent or were not in their present position, it would be
easier to divide the dirge into two tetrastichs and four tristichs, each of these
being complete in itself. We have marked these by letters attached to the
text. The first lines of the tetrastichs (a) and (b) are trimeters; but the other lines
are tetrameters, some of them with the caesura evident. The Massoretic text
reduces the tetrameter lines of the first tetrastich to trimeters and the trimeter to
a dimeter by the use of the מַקְקֶפֶם, and in the second tetrastich makes the two
closing tetrameters into pentameters by omitting the מַקְקֶפֶם, but this is with-
out regard to the rhythm.

In the first tristich (c) the tetrameters are evident with caesuras. In the
second tristich (d), it is usual to attach בַּהֹרִים to יהיわれים; this breaks up
the two tetrameters into three lines, a trimeter, dimer and trimeter, which is
hardly likely. Moreover, by arranging as we have done, the caesura appears in
each line and the thought is stronger and better. In the third tristich (e), the
caesuras are noticeable. In the fourth tristich (f), we disregard the Massoretic
accents and restore the lines to their tetrameter form, and thus greatly improve
the rendering.

I am distressed for thee, my brother, Jonathan;
Thou art sweet to me, thou art very wonderful;
Thy love to me, is more than the love of women.

4. One of the finest odes in the Old Testament is given in Exod. x.v. It has
a refrain which does not appear at the close of the strophes, but is given apart
from them. It should be placed at the close of the strophes. The strophes
increase, the second strophe being twice the length of the first, and the third
strophe three times its length. The refrain is

ألم רוכב | רמה בים
| ריאייה ליהוה | כי ננאה נא
{Refrain.

The movement is clearly tetrameter, with the caesura in the midst of each line.

Strophe I.

venge the righteous | righteous, my life

and the groaning | those who call upon me in mercy

for the mercy of the Lord | Lord, the Lord

in mercy and truth | in mercy and truth

and in mercy and truth | in mercy and truth

and in mercy and truth | in mercy and truth

and in mercy and truth | in mercy and truth

Amen.

{Refrain.
The caesura is striking in each of these lines. The arrangement agrees with the usual division of the lines, except in the second line, which is divided in the Massoretic text into two lines, spoiling the movement. Line 6 is a pentameter. We find that occasionally at the end of the strophe tetrameters are lengthened to pentameters, just as we have seen that they are sometimes shortened to trimeters.

Strophe II.

יִמְנִךְ לִי הָוָה | נָאִיר הָבָה
יִמְנִךְ לִי הָוָה | תֵּרֵעָן אֵאֵי
בַּרְכֵּךְ נָאִיר | תַּהֲרֵךְ קָמִךְ
תָּשְׁלֶה הָוָה | אֱכֲלָמָךְ בּוּקָשָׁא
וּזְרוּ הָאָפָא | נָעַפְּרֶנְו מִי
נֶגֶפַּם כֶּכֶּם נְלִיוּם
קְפֵּא הַמָּחָה | בַּלְמַי
אֶמְרְךָ אֲוֹב | אָאָרְךָ אֲשִׁי
אָהֲלֵךְ נֶלֶט | הַמְּלוֹמַם נַפְּשִׁי
אֵרְיֵךְ חוֹרֵבָא | הַרִּיחְמֵם יִדוֹ
נֶשֶׁף בְּרֲחָרָךְ | כַּסְפִי יָו
עֲלֵלָה צַעְפוּן הַכָּמִים כָּרִירֵךְ
(אי שִׁירֵה לִי הָוָה | כִּינְאֲאָה נָאָה
(לָעָמִים וּרְכָּבָא | רֵם הָאָמֵם

There is no departure from the tetrameter movement in this long strophe. In most of the lines the caesura is plain. In the Massoretic text, lines 5, 6, 7 are changed into trimeters by the misuse of the מָקַקְּפַּה.

Strophe III.

מִי כָּמְכָה בָּאֲלָמִים הָוָה
מִי כָּמְכָה נָאִיר בַּקְּרֵשָׁא
נָאִיר הָוָה | עַשֵּׁה פַלֶּא
נָמְתָה יִמְנִךְ | מְבַלְמַם אָרְיִן
נָהֲתוּ הָבָּחָרָךְ | טֹמֶר נָלָה
נָלָה בָּעָרָךְ | אלֵנִיהָ קָרָשָׁא
שֶׁמַּעַּו עַמְּמַי יִרֵוָה
חַלְּלָה | יִנָּבְּתָא פְּלַשָּׁא
אֶנֶּחֶל לָא | אַלְּפֵי אָרְרִים
אָלֵי מַמְאָא | אֶזְאַמְהוּ רָעָר
In this strophe of eighteen lines there is a single departure from the tetrameter movement. In line 7 the Massoretic text reduces a few of the lines to trimeters by an improper use of the Maqāqēph. In the last line נָהוֹ is to be preferred to נָהוֹ.

We now have a supplementary line which seems not to have belonged to the original poem. It is just such a supplement as we often find in the Psalter.


5. The difference between the tetrameters and trimeters may be seen in Psalm LXXXIX., where there is a paraphrase of the covenant with David in seven strophes of eight trimeter lines each, enclosed in five strophes of twelve tetrameter lines. We shall give the tetrameter strophes and the opening and closing trimeter strophes.

Strophe I.

חֵן, יְהוָה | לֹעֵל עֹבר
לְרֹאשׁוֹ וְאָדוֹנֵךְ אֲמוֹנַתּ בֶּן
כִּי אֲמַרְתֶּנָּה | לֹעֵל הָסֵר יִנֶּה
שֶם תַּנְךָ אֲמוֹנַתּ בֶּן
כִּי אֲמַרְתֶּנָּה | לֹעֵל הָסֵר יִנֶּה
נָשֵׁבְתָּ יְרֵךְ | זֶרֶק
עֹר-עֲלוֹת אֲכֵנִי רְאֶה
בְּנֵיהֶנָּל לְרֹאשׁוֹ וְאָדוֹנֵךְ
יוֹדֶה שֶם | פָּלָקְדֶּנָּה
אֶנָּמָרְתֶּנָּה | בֶּנֶקֶל כְּרִישֵׁם
כִּי מֵכַשָּׁךְ | יִנְשָׁף לְרֹאשׁוֹ
יְרֵךְ לְרֹאשׁוֹ | בּוּנֶקֶל אֲלֵימֶנָּה
There are two things to be noticed in this strophe: (1) The caesura is not very evident in any of the lines and is not present in the most of them; and (2) the four lines referring to the covenant with David assume the trimeter movement as a preparation for the long paraphrase of the covenant itself.

Strophe II.

In this strophe most of the lines disclose the caesura. There is no departure from the tetrameter movement except in the second line of the traditional text. This becomes tetrameter by taking מַעְרָה from the following line, so that each line will have a divine name in the order אָלָלְיִי זְבָאוֹת , יְרוֹד , אָל , זְבָאוֹת.

Strophe III.
This strophe has tetrameter lines mostly with caesuras, until we come to the ninth line, which is a half line. This is followed by trimeters, preparing the way for the paraphrase.

Strophe IV.

א רכבת בקיא
לפשרין והאמר
שיהיו יוצר עין-dbContext
דרומתי בוחר מעשים
מצלתי יזר עבורי
בשם קרפי משהתיי
אשרי-י הבח עמו
אף שונים האמצע

The change of movement here is quite evident. It is obscured by the traditional text at the beginning, which reads

א רכבת בקיא לפשיר
והאמר ישיחי יוצר עין-dbContext

This is quite possible. But a study of the strophe as a whole as compared with the following strophes urges to the division of lines that I have made. We now omit strophes 6–9 which are all trimeters and give

Strophe X.

דרומה ימי צורי
הלשחת כל-אחיבי
אף-השיש זור-חרבה
ולא-הקפה-מלحما
הרשעה-מתחרה
ocene על-אלם-מנחרה
הכרצה ימי עלימו
העימה על-י-ברשה

This strophe has all trimeter lines except the single dimeter in line five.

Strophe XI.

עדמה יוהו ומקרא-לדומה
הברך כמי-איש-מקרא
וכם-ארני-מה-חלך
עלמה שא-בראת כל-בני-ארם
This concluding strophe agrees with the three opening ones in being a tetrameter. Many of the lines disclose the caesuras. There is a textual change in line three, by inserting אָנַי instead of אָנִי, in accordance with line nine. The eighth line is the only trimeter. This would become a tetrameter if we inserted אָשֶר, the relative, as we must, indeed, in the translation. The אָשֶר is used in lines eleven and twelve. One would expect it here rather than that the poet should neglect the regularity of his rhythm.

There are not so many tetrameters as trimeters and pentameters in Hebrew poetry. One of the finest specimens of the tetrameter is the Song of Deborah, which is divided into three parts, with three strophes and thirty lines in each part. These examples will be sufficient to indicate the various forms of the tetrameter. In the next number, I propose to give specimens of the pentameter.
THE TEXT OF MICAH.*

By Prof. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

This is the first half of a new commentary on the book of Micah. The author, already favorably known for his work in Syriac, "found it advisable to separate from the commentary proper, all that should precede as preparatory work, especially the inquiry concerning the state of the text." He had in mind to present the text-critical material in its completeness, in order to base upon it a judgment of its value and some conclusions as to the method of Old Testament text-criticism in general. After a brief introduction and a sketch of the work already done in this regard, he therefore takes up the critical material, verse by verse, judging its value in each particular case. He then sketches at length "the results of the text-critical inquiry." This text-critical part occupies more than two-thirds of the book. The remainder is devoted to questions of literary criticism, with special reference to recent attacks upon the unity of the book.

As attention is directed, just now, to Old Testament text-criticism, this book is one of real importance; for it gathers and presents a considerable part at least of the material by which the text of the Book of Micah must be settled. "Two opinions," are the author's opening words, "belong to the axioms of recent Old Testament exegesis: that the text of Micah's prophecies is a corrupt text, and that in the ancient versions we have the means of correcting it." Without discussing the use of the word axiom, these two propositions are certainly very widely held; and the present reviewer at least is fully convinced of their truth. Let any one who is fairly familiar with Hebrew try to read the book—say especially chs. i. and ii.—and he will be driven to the conclusion that the text has suffered materially in transmission. The alternative is to suppose that the prophet could not express his thoughts grammatically in his own language. The text being admitted to be corrupt, it follows, of course, that the ancient versions give us the material for correction so far as correction is possible. Conjecture, to be sure, remains; but conjecture can offer no evidence except intrinsic probability as it presents itself to a single mind.

Professor Ryssel now thinks the former proposition exaggerated, and the latter erroneous. In regard to the former we will not dispute with him—corruption may be more or less. He actually concedes some amount of it himself. But

---

it is nothing less than a misfortune that such a scholar should take out a brief against the assertion that we have in the versions a help to the correction of the text. If he proves his point, he leaves the corruption (which he admits, in small measure at least) incurable. In fact he does himself concede some instances where the versions have preserved a better reading, and these concessions alone invalidate his argument. It would have been better had he not set out to do so much. The greater part of his book is not really an argument against any use of the versions, but an argument against a vicious use of them. In this respect it has real value. If the criticism of the Old Testament text is ever to be a science, it must be conducted on fixed principles, and these principles must be settled by thorough discussion. Professor Ryssel’s discussion is thorough and candid; and although I think him biased in favor of the Massoretic text, I think his arguments must be carefully weighed. It seems to me the argument would have been put in better shape had it been in the form of a critical text with an *apparatus*. It doubtless labors under a disadvantage also in appearing without the expository part of the commentary.

The author’s general remarks on the method of using a version as a source for its text, contain much that is good. It is no doubt true that a version may be too mechanically translated back into the language from which it was made, and so may be made to render variants that never existed. It is true also that “each language has its own characteristic modes of expression,” for which allowance must be made. That the LXX., for example, renders a singular by a plural does not necessarily show that they had a plural form before them. When they supply the object or subject so often omitted by the Hebrew, it does not always prove that they had a different text from ours. But while allowance should be made for these things, too much must not be made. The question in each case is one of probability. In Mic. iv. 2, for example, we have in the M. T. לָלֵּל הָעָלָמָא, the LXX. reads *δείδε* ἀναβαίνειν. Ryssel says that the omission of the conjunction is intentional, because the translators took לָלֵּל as an interjection. But is it not more simple to suppose that a \ has been omitted or inserted in one of the two Hebrew texts, especially in immediate proximity to another \ as here? The question, as I say, is one of probabilities; and I suspect that one who knows the many chances of error which beset a scribe, will find it generally more probable that one of these chances has influenced the text, than that the translators made more or less intentional changes in what they were trying to render.

It is necessary to keep two things apart: first, the collection of variants; second, the selection of the true reading. Every one will agree with our author when he says that to ascertain the existence of a different reading from the one current with the Massoretes, is not to show that that reading is the true one. Of course not; but to make the comparison we need all the variants fairly before us. Prof. Ryssel minimizes the quantity of these to his utmost ability.
He seems to go on the principle that, if by any ingenuity or refinement (perverse or otherwise), the translators could possibly have twisted the text into the meaning they give, we must not assume that their text was different from ours. For example, he ascribes to the versions frequent alterations on account of the parallelism. But when we reflect that the parallelism of members is by no means one of the prominent features of Micah's style, and that, even in the Hebrew poetry, attention has been directed to it, so far as we know, only within the last hundred years, we must feel that he is ascribing to the translators more knowledge than they actually possessed. The simple alternative here also is to suppose that the original parallelism has often been obscured by the carelessness of scribes.

In order to admit as few variants as possible, the author makes many assertions in regard to the versions which are not susceptible of proof, and where the possibility at least always remains that a variation in text existed. It would have been better to err the other way, and to have counted the possible variant. At the risk of becoming tedious, I wish to consider some of these assertions. At the very beginning we find: "The LXX. changed the opening words רָאָה יֵום הָעֶשֶׁר, choosing the more historical phrase which is very common in the Old Testament (יתן יֵому לְרָאָה)." He adds: "The LXX. certainly had the ordinary text before them." The evidence is certainly the other way; and if an intentional change has been made, it is more probably one that conformed the opening words to the ordinary title, than the reverse. In 1. 2 we have הבלי, for which the LXX. gives λόγον—"It is most probable that the translator inserted λόγον, which he thought to be necessary . . . . . and then neglected הבלי, especially as he translates the following המלך loosely by καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αἰρή."

But the difference between the two cases is world-wide; the second case is a fairly exact translation, the former is no translation at all. Even if the author's ingenious hypothesis could be proved true, it would still leave us a variant; for the testimony of the LXX. would be against the existence of הבלי at all.

In 1. 5 the common text has: "For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. Who is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? and who is the high places of Judah? is it not Jerusalem?" The word בֵּית כֹּל (high places) is, to say the least, surprising. The LXX. has ἡμῶν ἐκατ. Ryssel remarks (p. 16): "Although the LXX. and Peshitto translate as though they read בֵּית כֹּל, yet this hypothesis is not absolutely necessary, because this translation may be explained on the theory that perfect parallelism was aimed at. . . . . From the translation of the Targumist who paraphrases (Where have sinned—those of the house of Judah?), on the other hand, we may conclude that the reading בְּיַמָּה was found in MSS. along with the reading of the text. . . . . That two [Hebrew] MSS. have בְּיַמָּה on the margin is of no importance whatever." As will be seen, the author will decide against the M. T. only in case of absolute necessity, ignoring again the fact that textual criticism is a
matter of probabilities. On the side of הַעֲשָׂרִים, we have LXX., Peshitto and the Targum; for as between the two readings in question, the Targum certainly favors this one. While now we may suppose Peshitto influenced by LXX., the Targum is entirely independent of it. We have the concurrence of two witnesses against one, and even that one has traces of the original reading in the marginal notes cited by Prof. Ryssel. Prof. Ryssel argues against the probability of כְּמוּנָה being a corruption of תַּעֲשָׂרִים. But it is probably not a case of derivation of one of these from the other, but of תַּעֲשָׂרִים from חֵי, which is testified by the two principal witnesses, LXX. and Targum.

In 1. 10 we read בַּעֲשָׂרִים, for which LXX. has οἱ ἐν Ἡρῴδει μὴ μεγαλώσαθε, which, of course, points to מַלְבָּרוֹל. The Peshitto reads rejoice not (רַב לֵב). Yet Prof. Ryssel says “it can scarcely be supposed that the translators found these readings in their text.” How can we suppose anything else is difficult to see; מַלְבָּרוֹל is a very common word, with which, therefore, the translators were perfectly familiar. Considered by itself, the phrase in which it occurs is perfectly intelligible, the translators had no need to improve it by conjecture. In fact, we can think of no reason why they should translate as they did, except that they read in their text the words they respectively rendered. Dr. Ryssel suggests that it is a case of indistinct or faded writing, in which they were obliged to guess at the word. But if this is so, it does not authorize the conclusion that מַלְבָּרוֹל is certainly the only correct reading.” The existence of three variants makes the supposition of indistinct writing very plausible; but if this be assumed, why should the latest reading of all (as to its testimony) be assumed to be original? The author asserts that the words are borrowed from 2 Sam. 1. 20; but how does he know that? Would not a scribe be influenced by that passage to change this one into conformity with that, rather than the other way? These questions show, I think, that Prof. Ryssel has not clearly thought out the process of manuscript transmission.

The very difficult passage, beginning with this verse, gives occasion for discussion in almost every word, and the text is evidently corrupt—perhaps hopelessly so. Ryssel discusses the variant readings (or variant translations) at considerable length, and gives on every page evidence of his learning and industry. But his results as to the correction of the text are the same as above. He gets no real help from the versions. We shall be curious to see what he will make of these verses in the positive and constructive part of the commentary. In contrast with his conservatism as regards the use of the versions is the freedom with which he occasionally uses conjectural emendation. In regard to the words last discussed (verse 10a) he says (p. 22) “all these facts lead to the conjecture that the words were originally written on the margin to point out that the paronomasiae of the following verse were constructed on the scheme” of 2 Sam. 1. 20. In like manner the following three words “are to be erased as spurious.” Two
thirds of a verse then are erased on supposed internal evidence alone, against the testimony (to their existence at least) of all the versions; while the testimony of the versions, however strong, is not admitted. 1

The author's method is, perhaps, sufficiently characterized by the examples already given. It is, at any rate, fairly represented by them. Everywhere he finds that a different reading (from the M. T.) "can scarcely be thought of" (p. 43); he finds that the difference in the versions "only shows that they tried, with more or less success, to understand and render the text" (p. 53); "the LXX. changed the plural masculine into the feminine singular, because they had in mind the people of Israel" (p. 55); "the translation of the LXX. of course [natürlich] does not go back to a different reading" (p. 58); "it is easily seen that the LXX. thought necessary to read נ(fc) instead of (H), while the converse is not supposable" [undenkbar] (p. 62); in v. 3 the LXX. perversely "inserted an and (in one place) because they began a new sentence, and omitted the v before because they joined this to the preceding words; here, then, the LXX. seem to have the M. T. before them" (p. 85). This example is instructive enough to dwell upon a moment. The pivotal point is in the words נ(fc)י וונלככמ, where LXX. omit v. As will be seen, the preceding word ends in the same letter. In such a case the insertion by error is more probable than the omission. Add to this that the structure of the verse is more regular without this and:

"And he shall stand and pasture in the strength of Jehovah,
In the glory of the name of his God they shall dwell;
For now he shall be great unto the ends of the earth."

Certainly one would say, if the admission of the versions is ever allowable, it is allowable here, not only as testifying to the existence of a variant, but as having preserved the original reading and construction.

Without giving a number of similar assertions which I have marked, allow me to notice what I suppose to be the root of the difficulty—a lack of clearness as to the origin and value of the Massoretic text. Of course I do not desire to undervalue that text, and have always guarded myself against extravagant statements of its faults. That it has faults is now generally admitted. Prof. Ryssel's statements lead logically to the conclusion that it has no faults; or if it has any, that we are powerless to correct them. In one place he uses the following language:

"The text [of the LXX.] is more corrupt than the Massoretic, and this is explained by the fact that, at the time when the Greek translation was prepared (third century B. C.), as yet no care had been given the Bible text, and no firm tradition had arisen concerning the text and the exposition—such tradition as by then existing

---

1 Prof. Ryssel rejects the current translation of נ(fc)י (in Akko), on the ground that Micah has a distinct geographical situation in eye, naming only Judaite localities. He does not recognize (or does not state) that a reading found in some MSS. of the LXX.—בַּגְּנֵי נְיָיָה would point to a Judaite locality—Bochim.
means was able to collect valuable material which benefited the later versions. Besides, the numerous variations of the LXX. are explained, not properly by a different type of text, but by imperfect comprehension of it. This was the immediate consequence of the fact that the text was less exactly fixed, in that, besides the vocalization (which indeed was later than the other versions, but was partially replaced by the Jewish tradition), the vowel letters were frequently lacking; and further, the familiarity with the contents of the biblical books, and even the knowledge of Hebrew, since it was no longer a spoken language, certainly did not stand as high as later, in the time of the Jewish academies in Palestine, and again in Babylonia, which [academies] assisted the fixation of the text by vocalization, probably also the targumic and Syriac translators, certainly [nachweisbar] also Jerome" (p. 185).

I think I have rendered this sentence with tolerable correctness, though I confess it does not seem perfectly clear. The question it raises is this—Has the author any clear idea of the origin of the M. T.? He speaks of that text as fixed by tradition at the time of the vocalization by the Massoretes. He knows that at an earlier period the text was not yet fixed in this way, and was less furnished with vowel letters. Now it would seem to be obvious that the later fixation cannot claim any advantages over the earliest unfixed text, except as a commentary is an advantage. The commentary tells us what are its author's views of his text—the punctuation tells us what its authors supposed to be the meaning of the text. In neither case can we be excused from ourselves going back to the (consonantal) original, and consulting every other commentator (such are the early versions also), giving preference to the one which on internal grounds best interprets his author. Prof. Ryssel says that the Old Testament books went through a time when the text was less carefully treated than later. In that period it suffered corruption. Later the Jewish scribes treated it with greater care and fixed it in its present form. But what was it that they so carefully fixed and preserved for us? Evidently a text which had been previously corrupted. But where it was corrupt had they any certain means of restoring its earlier state? Evidently not. For it is one of the axioms of the text-criticism that the original reading can be restored when preserved in one of the various readings in our possession. Text-criticism as a science must work with variants, and these notoriously the Massoretic editors had not. The most these editors could do was to hand down the text as it came to them, without further change. Their fixation of the text embodied a tradition also which had confessed grown up after the time of careless transmission. Such a tradition has doubtless great value, but its value is secondary to the earlier tradition embodied in the LXX. The earlier in point of time must be better. According to Prof. Ryssel the later MSS. of the New Testament must be the most valuable. In them, too, we have a text fixed by tradition. But it has long
been recognized that the tradition must be disregarded, and that the earliest documents have the greatest weight.

It seems then that our author labors under a false impression in the weight he gives to the M. T. This is perhaps indicated also by his respect for Jewish "authorities." In one case we have a verb now pointed as Piel, which three of the versions give as Pual. The reading as Pual is found also in Hebrew MSS. (nine in number) and editions. In favor of the Piel as original and correct reading (says Prof. R.) we have the best authorities (cf. Norzi), Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Ibn Ganach and others. How these authorities knew the original reading is the question. That their reading is correct, according to the decision of the punctuators, is a very different matter.

One other point may be briefly mentioned. Prof. Ryssel gives rules for the criticism of the Old Testament text. The third of these rules lays emphasis upon the commonplace that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. It is greatly to be regretted that the author did not more carefully analyze some cases, in order to show us what he understands by the more difficult reading. The reading which gives us nonsense is really more difficult than another which makes sense; the ungrammatical reading is more difficult than the grammatical. The fact is, the rule has only a qualified value. It applies to one class of cases—where a less common word has been replaced by one more familiar. Here it is intrinsically probable that the more familiar word has taken the place of the other. But these cases are not a majority by any means. The corruptions of the text which arise from a scribe's carelessness (interchange of similar letters, homeoteleuton, repetition of letters, omission of words), from the influence upon his mind of parallel or similar passages, and from the illegibility of MSS.—these make up a considerable majority, and in regard to these the canon is of no use. If we are to have a general rule, it ought to be stated in the form given it by Westcott and Hort—"That reading is original which will account for the existence of the others."

The space already occupied will not allow me to consider Prof. Ryssel's essay on the genuineness of the Book of Micah. The length of this notice will testify to my interest in the subject of text-criticism and his discussion.
THE NESTORIAN RITUAL OF THE WASHING OF THE DEAD.

By Isaac H. Hall,

New York City.

One of the manuscripts recently acquired by the Union Theological Seminary in New York, consists of "The Service of Obsequies;" or, as stated in the colophon, "The Order of the Obsequies of Every Class, Men, Women, Youths, and All Ages and All Conditions." It treats of each class separately, giving rituals and rubrics, sometimes merely referring to other books for the words of a Scripture passage, a dirge, a response, etc., and sometimes giving them at length. The manuscript is on paper, 148 leaves (296 pages), in quiniones, bound in heavy boards covered with leather, but now somewhat dilapidated. Size of book, 9 x 7 x 2½ inches; of written page, 6 x 4½ inches; about 19 lines to the page, running clear across, or in only one column. It is written in a beautiful Nestorian script, pretty fully pointed, with abundant rubrication, and somewhat ornamented here and there. The book was finished, as the colophon says, in the year of the Greeks 2046, on the 5th day of the month of Ab, on the 4th Tuesday of Summer; which corresponds to Tuesday, August 5th, A. D. 1735. It was written in Targawar, in the village of Darband, by Priest Warda, son of the late Lazarus, one of the sons of Mar John, bishop of Adorbigan.

At the beginning of the book is the "Ritual (or Custom) of the Washing of the Departed," which has proved so interesting to those who have heard it translated, that it seems proper to send a copy of the text and a translation to Hebrewica. In copying the text, most of the points are omitted, since the matter is clear enough without them. The following is the text. It occupies a few lines over three pages of the manuscript.
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...
In the name of the Living One who dieth not, we write the Ritual of the Washing of the Departed.

1st. They set towards the East the face of the departed, and when they require to wash him, they sign him between the eyes [idiomatic for on the forehead] with the sign of the cross. Next they wash his head and his face and his whole neck as far as his back [i.e., the back of the neck at its base], according to the Redemptive Word [referring to another part of the Ritual]. And then they wash his right hand as far as its elbow, also his left hand in like manner. Next they make him sit, and dash water upon his right shoulder, and they wash his whole side as far as to his knees; in like manner also his left side. Next they lay him upon the spine of his back, and wash his bed [unless is a mistake for his "belly"], and all his members. And then they lay him upon his face, and wash his feet from the knees downward. And then they make him sit, and take water in a platter, and dash it upon his head three times, and they clothe him in white garments, as in the days of his wedding.

But if he be a monk, they do not in that manner, but they wash first from his head as far as his back [see above]. Then they wash his right hand as far as its elbow, and his left hand likewise. But they do not strip off his [monk's] garment from his body, but they dash water upon the garment outside, and the one
who is washing him rubs his garment upon his body on all sides, until the water [runs off] very clear. Next they wash his feet downward from his knees. Then those who are present go out, and a familiar friend [lit., and he who has boldness toward him] remains with him in his place, and, after his fellows have gone out, strips him of his clothing, and dresses him in other clothing. But it is not right for him to bring in a cross with him, not at all, by any means; that he may not follow the fashion of those who covered up our Lord's cross [i.e., the worldly hypocrites].

"And know this, too, that in the rank in which he used to go to the altar while living, in that [rank] they shall let him enter the grave. If he were a monk, without grade to go in to the altar, according to the rank of his monkhood let them thus bring him in. But if he be one out of many, a light, according as he used to stand in the service of the church, let them thus bring him to the grave.

"And while they are washing the departed, whoever he may be, they say over him the maúthbhē (i.e., kathisma) of the washing, performing it in the house of the departed, or upon the roofs, or if they have no place, in the church; according as it is written in the Order of the Departed.

"And when they carry him out, they begin the qaľē of the way, and let his head be foremost, as it were leaving peace to the household. And when they go out from the village, they put the bier in a pure place, and they perform fully three 'únīn. Then they take him up and bear him, with qaľē and shūch-lāphē, and the priests and the people preceding him, until they come beside the grave.

"And when they begin the qaľā of the approach, Maranathā, they make the bier pass first, and the priests and people after the bier, until they come to the grave. And they lay the departed on the right hand side of the grave, the priests remaining at his feet with their faces toward the grave.

"And when they have finished from the pašdqā three 'únīn, they lower the departed into the grave. And when the pašdqā is ended, the priest throws a little dust in the grave, but not in the form of a cross, as foolish people do; and they bury completely the dead. And pray [ye] for the sinner."

Respecting the technical terms which I have not translated above, the maúthbhē, "sessions," "seats," is equivalent to the Greek kathisma, meaning originally that part of the service during which the people sat. The qaľa, "voice," and the shūchlāpha, "variation," are respectively the prayer or hymn, generally the latter, and the sentiment used in connection or in alternation with it; or, perhaps "chant" is a better rendering for both. The "qaľā of the way" is, in effect, a processional chant. The 'únai (plural in this MS., 'únain) is an anthem with responses, or antiphonal. The pašdqā appears to be the "conclusion;" varying greatly for different classes of people, and comprehending several divisions which bear some of the names above given,
along with others. These technical terms would be better understood if there were space enough to introduce a few samples.

The text above given is repeated piecemeal, in the shape of rubrics, at the appropriate places in the manuscript, except that which relates strictly to the washing, which occurs nowhere else in the book.

The ritual for the burial of priests was translated into English, and published by the Rev. George Percy Badger, in his "The Nestorians and their Rituals." In another connection he mentions the fact that directions for the washing are given; but does not translate them.
ON THE SEPARATION WHICH MAY TAKE PLACE BETWEEN THE SO-CALLED DEFINED AND DEFINING NOUN IN ARABIC.¹

Philippi defines the grammatical nature of the construct state in Semitic languages as follows:

"It is connecting, in the closest possible manner, one word with another, and shows itself in the one following the other immediately and inseparably, in the shortening of the first noun, and in the fact that, when the second noun is defined, the first is also defined by it."

The shortening of the first noun is shown in Arabic by the loss of the Tenwin; in Hebrew, by vowel shortening. To show the effect of the defining force of the second noun upon the first, the following example may be adduced. If I want to say, in Semitic languages, "a daughter of the king," defining king, but leaving daughter undefined, I cannot use the construct state; e. g., يـَـُـنَـتُ الـِلُـلُـك can only mean "the king's only daughter," or "the king's daughter to whom we have referred." "A daughter of the king" must be rendered فيـَـُـنَـت لـِلـِلُـلُـك "a daughter to the king." With respect to the point upon which Philippi justly lays stress—"inseparable and immediate sequence"—there are some remarkable exceptions in Arabic. Such exceptions come under the category of the تَـُـضْـل "separation" which takes place between the مُـضـَـاف "attached word," "first word," and the مُـضـَـاف إِلَـيـهِ "word to which it is attached," "second word." Reference is made to these cases of separation in Wright's Arabic Grammar, vol. II., § 90. It may, however, be interesting to the readers of Hebraica to see how the matter is treated by a native grammarian. The following is a translation from the celebrated "Watch-fire" of the late Nasif Al-Yazigi:

I.

"And generally the separation by the مُـضـَـاف or by its طـُـرف 'nouns of time or place' may be used freely."

¹ The name of the author of this article has been lost. It will be announced in a later number.
That is to say, that in the Arabic language cases occur of the separation of the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ from the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ by means of the object of the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ or its accompanying noun of time and place. And this is the real annexation.¹

The annexation occurs when the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ is a مصدر and the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ is its قَالِب. With respect to separation by the مصدر or object we find the following line of the Ragiz:

يَفْرِقُ حَبُّ الْسَّنَبِيلِ الْكَتَانِيمِ بِالْقَطَعِ قَرْنِ الْقَطْنِ الْبَحَالِ

"He cuts down the grains of the full ears in the fields as the Mihlags cut down the cotton." That is to say,

قَرْنِ الْبَكَالِي الْقَطْنِ

As an example of separation by means of the طَرْفُ we have the words of the poet:

لَمَّا رَأَيْتُ شَاهِدًا أَعْتَبَرْتُ لِلَّهِ دَرُّ الْقَيوْمِ مَنْ لَمْ يَهْمَ

"After she had seen him who hated thee she burst into tears. What a man is he who to-day rebuked her!" That is to say,

لِلَّهِ دَرُّ مَنْ لَمْ يُهْمَ

And in the merely verbal annexation the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ when a nomen agentis is separated from one of its objects (the مُصَافُ إِلَيْهِ) by another of its objects, as in the saying,

مَا زَالَ يُوقّنُ مَنْ يَأْمُرُ بِالْفَقْطَى وَسَرَالَ مَانِعُ فَضْلُهُ الْمُكْتَاج

"And he who approaches thee is certain of riches, while others than thou withhold their benefits from the needy." That is to say,

مَانِعُ الْمُكْتَاجِ فَضْلُهُ

Or the طُرُفُ in such an annexation can take place by means of the طُرُفُ, as in the saying of another,

أَشْنَى بِنَيْكَرِ لا أَكُونِ وَمُدْخَتِي كَنَاجِبِ يُومًا صَحِيرًا بَعْسَيْدِ

"Satisfy me with good, that I may not become with my eulogy like him who one day chiselled a stone with a broom." That is to say,

¹ Wright's Arabic Grammar.
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And you already know that an attracted word \( \text{مُؤَجَّرَر} \), with the particle which attracts it, is in every respect like the \( \text{تَسَارَفُن} \), and through this we have the saying of the poet,

\[
\text{هَمَا أَخَوَا في الْحَرَّةِ مِنْ لَا أَخَا لَهُ، إِذَا خَافَ يَوْمًا ذَبَّةً فَدَعَا مَعِيَّا.}
\]

"These too are the brothers in battle of him who has no brother; when he fears on any day a blow from the sword he calls upon them." And the saying of another,

\[
\text{لَا أَدْلُتُ مَعْتَمًا فِي الْهَيْيَانِ مُصَبَّرًا تَصْلِي يَهَا كُلُّ مَنْ عَادَكَ دِيرًا.}
\]

"Behold, thou art accustomed to patience in the battle; thou burnest with it whoever opposes fires to thee."

And all this may be used freely, in opposition to him who says that it can only be employed \( \text{بَالْضُرْوَرَة} \) to satisfy poetical requirements. (Here Al-Yazigi agrees with Th. Malic in his Alfiyya.) Moreover, it occurs in prose \( \text{ُتُّنَتَ} \). We have the reading of some,

\[
\text{وَزِينَ لَكِنْذِرَ سِنَّ الْمُشْرِكِينَ فَتُلَّ أَوْلَادُهُمْ شَرَكَانِهِمْ}
\]

"And the killing of their children by their companions was made to seem good to many idolaters."

\[
\text{فَلاَ تَخَسَّبِينَ اللَّهَ مُخْتَفِي وَغَدَةٌ رُسلِهِ}
\]

"And do not think that God changes his promise to his apostles."

And the saying of some of the Arabs,

\[
\text{تَرُكُّ يَوْمًا نَفْسِكَ وَعَرَاهَا سَعِيًّا لِهَا في رَكَانًا}
\]

"Leaving the soul alone one day with its desires is an advance towards its destruction."

And they allow a separation to take place by means of an oath, as Alkisae relates, according to one reading,

\[
\text{هَذَا عَلَامُ وَآللَّهُ رَيِّدُ}
\]

"This, by God, is the slave of Zaid."

An oath \( \text{ضَمْم} \) is of the essence of a \( \text{تَسَارَفُن} \), since it is an attracting word \( \text{جَارِ} \) with its attracted word, and separation is easy by means of it when the \( \text{مُدَافُن} \) has no \( \text{ضَمْم} \). And know that this separation is restricted to
those cases where the mudač 'ilaihi is not a pronoun; for then of necessity the two must be joined together, and faslun is impossible. Separation has also taken place when the mudačun is a مَصَدَّرَ, and the mudačun 'ilaihi its object by means of the agent of the مَصَدَّرَ, according to the saying of the poet,

ما إِرْدُ رَأِيَتْنَا لِهَوْيِّ مِن طِبْرِ وَلا عَدَمَتْا قَهْرُ وَجُدُّ صَبِّ

"We have not seen a medicine for love, nor have we lost a lover who has been conquered by passion."31

منَعَ آلَّاَّاتٍ كَأْثِرَةٍ مِن مَّكَافَاطِيِّهِ أَحَدٌ بِسَيِّدِي‌نَا.

This, however, is peculiar to poets, the opposite of the separation between the masdar and its agent, examples of which we have already had. For the failun virtually precedes; and if verbally it follows, it is still as if the mudačun were inserted with its failun.

II.

وَفَيْلَ‍َٰلُ بِكَنْعَتٍ أَضْطُرَارًا وَأَلَامًا. قَذَّبَهُ وَأَلْقَ‍َٰلُ قَلِيلًا وَرَدَا

"And the separation by an adjective may be employed when poetical necessity demands it, and a vocative also occurs for a like purpose; but both are seldom used."

As an illustration of faslun by means of an epithet, we have,

نَجَبَتْ تَقَدِّمُ الْمَرْدَايِ سَبِيقَةٌ مِنِّ أَبِي عُبَيْدَ شَيْخٍ الْأَبَاطِيعَ طَالِبِ

"I escaped, but Al-Maradi had already welted his sword from the son of Abu Talib, the chief of the valleys."

That is to say,

مِنِّ أَبِي عُبَيْدَ شَيْخُ الْأَبَاطِيعَ

And by means of a vocative, as in the saying of another one,

وَقَانُ كَعْبُ بُجَيْرٍ مُنَقِّدٍ لَّهُ مِنْ تَعْجِيبِ تَهْلِكَةِ بِالْخَلَدِ فِي سَقَرِ

"The agreement by Caab with Bujeir saves thee from the hastening of destruction and from remaining forever in hell."

That is to say,

وَقَانُ بُجَيْرٍ يَاكَعْبُ

Both of these are said to be ُكَعْبُ شَيْخٍ الْأَبَاطِيعَ; for neither the phrase ُكَعْبُ مَعْمُولٌ to the mudačun.

---

1 Irrespective of the faslun the construction in this sentence is not easy. See for illustration of it Wright, II., § 27b, 3, p. 60:—
The faslun can also take place by means of a condition, as in the saying of some,

"This, if it please God, is the slave of thy brother."

And also by means of an extraneous maf'al or tscarf, as in the words of the poet,

"She waters generously her toothbrush with the moisture of her saliva, just as the Rasaf holds back the water of the mountain."

Or the saying of another,

"Just as a book was written one day by the hand of a Jew, writing the lines nearer or farther from one another."

In the first instance the general order would be,

In the second instance the order would be,

The faslun, however, is little in use, and its imitation is to be avoided, for the mudafun 'ilaihi is really part and parcel of the mudafun; and therefore faslun between them is strange, except that the faslun by means of ma'mulun is easier owing to the connection between it and its agent. Therefore they have permitted this extensively.
TWO CRUCES INTERPRETUM, PS. XLV. 7 and DEUT. XXXIII. 21, REMOVED.

BY PROFESSOR GIESEBRECHT,
Greifswald.

I. PSALM XLV. 7.

The following exposition has, perhaps, a general interest because the passage belongs, on account of the use made of it in Heb. i. 8, 9, to the more familiar ones of the Old Testament. Now, in reference to the following verse, the view is already somewhat prevalent that it is altogether false to translate by addressing the (messianic?) king, "Therefore hath anointed thee, O God! thy God," etc. For, in this and the remaining so-called Elohim Psalms, the original יָהּ has been corrected by a reviser to יֹהָנָי, and the original text accordingly read, "Therefore hath anointed thee Jahve, thy God," etc.

This consideration has led me to an easy and, as I believe, also correct emendation of the previous verse, which the Epistle to the Hebrews translates, according to the LXX., "Thy throne, O God, endureth from everlasting to everlasting." It seems to me that there is no doubt that (as also Olshausen asserts) grammatically the translation of the LXX. is the only correct one, and would have to be unconditionally accepted if there did not arise against it the weightiest material difficulties. When Hupfeld, over against this, takes יֹהָנָי as a genitive to כָּלַם, and regards this construction as entirely unobjectionable, it appears to me that, in this case, this philologist, at other times so skillful, showed some human weakness. Aug. Müller, on the contrary, expresses himself in his Hebr. Schulgrammatik, p. 225, rightly with caution on the construction here accepted by Hupfeld, according to which a suffix can enter between the construct state and its genitive. The proofs cited for this by Ewald and others, all succumb to well-grounded objections; cf. the LXX. to Ps. lxxi. 7 and Lev. xxvi. 42; the text of Cornill to Ez. xvi. 27; the parallel verse, Ps. xviii. 38, to 2 Sam. xxii. 38, for Lev. vi. 3; the old versions, etc. The forced conjectures which Olshausen has made for the correction of this difficult passage, have no real positive value, but only the negative import of pointing out the seat of the evil. Olshausen rightly misses a verb.

Starting from these facts, I venture the following conjecture:

1. As often in the Elohim Psalms, so here also יֹהָנָי has been written by a reviser to take the place of a יָהּ.

1 Translated from Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Hft. 2, 1887, pp. 290-293.
2. Yet he erred in his zeal to remove the unpronounceable name of God, and corrected אֱלֹהֵי instead of אֱלֹהִים into אֱלֹהִים.

3. If, accordingly, the text originally read, בּהָקָרָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים וָנֵר, there is here not only the removal of אֱלֹהִים, but also the addition of a verb.

4. This reading is supported by a parallel passage, 2 Sam. vii. 16, כָּמַ֩י אֵלֵו יְהוָ֖ה נָבָֽעַר-עֲלֵ֗ם; cf. Lam. v. 19. For the use of אֵלֵו as simple accusative there may be compared Ps. xlviii. 15; lxi. 10; lxvi. 7; lxxxix. 2, 3, 38; civ. 5.

II. Deut. xxxiii. 21.

The following conjecture, which I had already made several years ago, I publish chiefly because I learn from Dillmann’s latest commentary on Deuteronomy that this investigator, unfavorable as he is to conjectural criticism, is himself here induced to make an emendation, and indeed exactly at the same word where I also regard an emendation necessary, but where I, on the ground of the LXX., dare to go yet further. Of course I do not mean that I have herewith placed the passage beyond dispute; but I regard as right the way which I have taken to correct it. The difficulty of the M. T. is, on the one hand, in מִגְּדַל, and on the other, in the succeeding words בָּהֵן אֵלֵו בָּרֵא שִׁית. The difficulties of these need, among the friends of the Old Testament, no detailed statement.

If now there is anything clear, it seems to me this, that the LXX. did not know our text. If at least ἀρχαίως, as is generally accepted, is to be a translation of מִגְּדַל, then the following συναγείνων ομα is evidently not אֵלֵו מִגְּדַל, and Dillmann is certainly right in his conclusion. Now it seems possible to me to get the LXX. text with the greatest ease by transposition of מִגְּדַל; quoting it with its vowel signs it reads, בָּהֵן אֵלֵו בָּרֵא שִׁית = and the heads of the people assembled themselves.

The advantages of this are evident. The senseless מִגְּדַל disappears; we gain at once the simplest explanation for the anomalous מִגְּדַל and at the same time the most beautiful agreement in number between מִגְּדַל and its verb. Of course the words now form a direct allusion to Num. xxxii., to the solemn assembly of the heads of the people in which the possession of the Jordan was allotted to Gad.

In the preceding part of the sentence, the LXX. restored, indeed, the subject according to the sense, by means of ὡς ἐκεῖ ἔκπροσθην γὰρ. Yet, out of their text, we can get with certainty a הָלְכָּא for הָלְכֵים. Referring מֵחָצָא to Moses, we then get either מִגְּדַל, where the direct object of מֵחָצָא, following of itself from the context, would be omitted:

“And he chose for himself the first part [viz., the land east of the Jordan]; For this the leader appointed for his inheritance When the heads of the people assembled themselves.”
Or we might read ℓקנש, changing פִּיהָקַנְשׁ:

"And he chose for himself the first part [the land east of the Jordan];
For there his portion was assigned him
When the heads of the people assembled themselves."

Of course the sentence רַעַשׁ רוֹאֵשׁ עָבֹד, still follows up somewhat disconnectedly on that which precedes. I therefore leave open, as a further possibility, the assumption of erasing it altogether as a gloss, pointing to Num. xxxiii., and resting on verse 5, בָּטָלָה רוֹאֵשׁ עָבֹד. Then the following:

"He executed the justice of Jahve with Israel,"—would fitly unite with the first half of the verse, which reports that a prominent portion was allotted to him.

At all events, it seems to me that, by following this conjecture, the fearful groping and essaying with ℹ and ἵνα, which one meets with in all expositions, will cease.
THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE WORDS IN THE HEBREW
NOMINAL SENTENCE.¹

BY C. ALBRECHT.

All languages distinguish between verbal and nominal sentences, according to
the different parts of speech which can form a predicate. The former is a sen-
tence in which the subject is (virtually) a noun and the predicate a finite verb;
the latter is a sentence in which the subject, as well as the predicate, are (virtually) nouns. When such virtual nouns, in the position of subject or predi-
cate, are represented by independent sentences, we have a compound sentence.
Accordingly, the difference in the kinds of sentences rests on the different parts
of speech in the predicate. As nouns can indicate only rest, continuance, fixed-
ness, etc.; and verbs, motion, action, development; so the nominal sentence
describes, or gives to the subject, an abiding attribute or condition; and the
verbal sentence expresses a movement or the development of an action, or say a
condition (in case of neuter verbs).² In reference to the arrangement of the
words in the simple nominal sentence, which has not been accurately indicated in
any grammar of the Hebrew language, but, on the contrary, often even falsely
stated, I have, in comparison with the Arabic and Aramaic, arranged tables
which embrace the entire Old Testament.

The result of it is as follows:—In the nominal sentence the chief emphasis
rests on the subject, and the chief interest attaches to it as the object which is
thought of as being in a position or condition or as provided with an attribute.
The regular arrangement of the words in the nominal sentence of all Semitic
languages is, therefore, subject-predicate; not regarding, of course, the arrange-
ment of words in poetry, which here, as in most languages, takes more license.
In Arabic this rule is more easily recognized, and has therefore, generally
speaking, been always rightly understood; but in Hebrew and Aramaic it is

¹ Translated from Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Hft. 2, 1887, pp. 218-224.
² In this definition of the Semitic nominal sentence, account has not been taken of the exact
but unscientific statements of Arabic grammarians, which correspond only in part to the above.
1859; and on this, “Beiträge zur Erklärung des Mufaṣṣal” von Trump, München, 1878, 1884, § 24
These are followed by Caspari-Müller and Gesenius-Kautzsch, while others still treat nominal
and verbal sentences together; so Ewald, Uhleman, Winer, Nägelsbach, Müller, “Hebr. Schul-
grammatik,” §§ 497-504, Eng. translation, § 125 seq., Hollenberg, § 45b. The correct definition
Nöldeke gives in his “Syrische Grammatik,” § 309 seq.; so also Stade, “Hebr. Gram.,” § 381 (cf.
§ 180a), bases upon it the explanation of formation of the Hebr. verb. In regard to others,
everyone who lectures on Hebr. grammar and syntax, gives it, no doubt, as I, for example,
heard it from Philippi-Rostock.
more difficult. We will consider in particular the arrangement of words in the
Hebrew according to the different parts of speech in the predicate:

A. The predicate is a substantive.
Rule: The arrangement is subject-predicate; e. g., Gen. xiii. 10.
Exceptions:
1. The substantive as predicate must precede when there is a special empha-
sis on it, so as to make it prominent to the eye and to the ear; e. g., Jud. xviii. 29.
2. The substantive as predicate may precede.
   a) If the subject is a pronoun. This latter rule, of which we find as yet no
trace in Arabic, goes through all other Semitic languages, and that quite natu-
really, for the person, here assumed as generally known, excites less interest than
that which is said of him; e. g., 1 Sam. xv. 29.
   b) So as to avoid the harshness (nachklappen) of its following a subject
which consists of several words; e. g., Exod. vi. 14, 15.
   c) In the case of a question; e. g., 1 Sam. xvi. 4.
The arrangement is freer in poetry, where, on account of chiasm, with spe-
cial frequency, the predicate precedes in one member and follows in the second
or the reverse; e. g., Ps. xlvi. 8, 12.
B. The predicate is an adjective:
Rule: The arrangement is subject-predicate; e. g., Gen. ii. 12.1
Exceptions:
1. The adjective as predicate must precede when there is a special emphasis
on it. This is especially often the case when the adjective is a comparative; e. g.,
Gen. iii. 6; iv. 13.
2. The adjective as predicate may precede:
   a) When the subject is a pronoun, cf. A. 2. a.; e. g., Exod. ii. 2.
   b) So as to avoid harshness (nachklappen) when it would follow a subject
consisting of several words; e. g., 2 Kgs. xx. 19.
   c) In case of a question; e. g., Num. xiv. 3.

1 While elsewhere in Arabic the rule for the arrangement of the words (viz., subject-predi-
cate) is strictly carried out in the nominal sentence and exceptions occur only singly in inter-
rogative sentences, when the predicate is to be made especially prominent, when the subject is
limited by سل or دل. Cf. Sura x. 54, 78; ix. 150; v. 66; in this case the arrangement of words
in Arabic is exceedingly free and in all probability not original.
The regular arrangement must take place: 1) when the subject is a pronoun, e. g., Sura ii. 4;
or 2) when the predicate is limited by سل or دل, e. g., Sura lxvii. 9, 20.
Inverted arrangement must take place: 1) when there is united with the subject a pronoun
which refers to something in the predicate, e. g., Sura cix. 6; 2) when the subject is limited by
سل or دل, e. g., Sura xiii. 19; xv. 21.
Otherwise the arrangement is without rule, in spite of all the statements of Arabic gramma-
rians (cf., for example, Trumpf, "Mufassal," § 28, "Ueber den arab. Satzbau," ii. 5). The pre-
positional expression as predicate, is sometimes put after, if no ambiguity is to be feared.
To the arrangement of words in poetry what was said under A. applies; e. g., Ps. xxxiii. 4. There is only to be noted that in the poetic sections of the Old Testament the adjective occurs very often as a comparative in the predicate, and to this circumstance is due the fact that it more frequently precedes. Thus, of the cases in Koheleth, about twenty in all, only ii. 17 and xi. 7 are not comparatives.

C. The predicate is a participle. Here also the rules under A. apply; e. g., Gen. i. 2; 2 Sam. xvii. 10; Gen. iii. 14; Deut. xxviii. 4; 2 Sam. x. 3; Ps. cxi. 7.

In Aramaic, on account of the frequent use of the participle instead of the finite verb, the arrangement is practically without rules, cf. Nöldeke, § 309, 324.

D. The predicate is an adverb or adverbial expression.

Rule: The arrangement is subject-predicate; Num. xiv. 43.

Exceptions:
1. The adverb as predicate must precede:
   a) When there is a special emphasis on it; e. g., Gen. xlvi. 6, 11; 1 Sam. xx. 18.
   b) As interrogative adverb; e. g., Gen. iv. 9, xviii. 9.

2. The adverb as predicate may precede:
   a) When the subject is a pronoun; e. g., Gen. xlvi. 10.
   b) To avoid harshness (nachklappen) when it would follow a subject consisting of several words; e. g., Num. xiii. 22.
   c) In a relative sentence, where it appears closely joined by Maqqeph to the nota relationis; e. g., Gen. ii. 11.

For the arrangement in poetry, what was said under A. is applicable; e. g., Koh. xii. 11.

E. The predicate is a prepositional expression.

Rule: The arrangement is subject-predicate.

Exceptions:
1. The prepositional expression as predicate must precede, when there is a special emphasis on it. This is especially frequent when, by means of a nominal sentence the verb to have, to possess, is paraphrased (there is to him = he has), the prepositional expression being virtually the subject; e. g., Gen. xviii. 14; xxvi. 20.

2. The prepositional expression as predicate may precede:
   a) When the subject is a pronoun; Gen. xxvi. 24.
   b) To avoid harshness (nachklappen) when it would follow a subject consisting of several words; e. g., Num. xxxiii. 9; 1 Sam. xxv. 2.
   c) In case of a question, Gen. xxxi. 14; xxxviii. 25; but cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 29, 32.
d) In a relative sentence, when it generally appears joined to the *nota relationis* by means of *Miqqêph*; Gen. i. 29, 30; vi. 17; xxxiv. 14; Lev. xiv. 40.

For the arrangement in poetry, compare what was said under A., and Ps. xi. 4.

F. The predicate is an infinitive.

*Rule:* The arrangement is subject-predicate; e. g., Isa. xxx. 7; Jer. xxi. 16.

*Exceptions* are not found in the Bible.

More frequent than the use of the simple infinitive as predicate in the nominal sentence is the use of the infinitive with † where we then generally translate: there is; in order to; can; must. Cf. Ewald, § 237c.

G. The predicate is a numeral.

*Rule:* The arrangement is subject-predicate; e. g., Exod. xvi. 36; xxvi. 2.

*Exceptions:* The numeral as predicate must precede when there is a special emphasis on it; e. g., Num. xi. 21.

H. The predicate is a pronoun.

*Rule:* The arrangement is subject-predicate; e. g., Gen. xxvii. 21, 24; Isa. xiii. 4. (It was I).

*Exceptions:* The interrogative pronoun as predicate always precedes; e. g., Gen. xxxiv. 65; only two exceptions are found in the Bible, Exod. xvi. 7, 8.

When a sentence has several subjects or several predicates, regularly and commonly, those parts of the sentence which belong together stand also together; e. g., Gen. x. 2, 3; xiii. 18. There are, however, cases where several subjects enclose the predicate or several predicates enclose the subject; especially is this so in poetry; e. g., Amos v. 20; Prov. viii. 18; Ps. cxlvii. 5, 6.

In one case there is no exception to the general rule for the arrangement of words in the nominal sentence, viz., in the so-called circumstantial or conditional clause, even not in poetry; e. g., Gen. xix. 1; Judges iv. 5; Koh. ii. 3.

BY ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH. D.,

Instructor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

A transliteration and translation of Cylinder A, together with parts of B and a few other texts, was published in 1880 by Ernest A. Budge in his History of Esarhaddon. This book, however, is unsatisfactory from a textual as well as from a lexicographical stand-point.\(^1\) His edition of the text of Cylinder A is, on the whole, no better than Rawlinson's copy in The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, vol. i. In some places he has corrected the text; but, in others, he has changed the text where it had already been published correctly. His methods of textual criticism are unscientific, since he does not seem to have made sufficient use of the helps at his disposal. Cylinder C,\(^2\) which is of the greatest importance for the reconstruction of the text of A, has received little or no attention.

On account of these defects in Budge's treatment of the text, I was led, by the suggestion of Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, to take up the study of the Esarhaddon inscriptions. In the summer of 1885, while studying in the British Museum, I collated A and B, and copied C, together with several other unpublished texts. This collation forms the basis of the corrections\(^3\) which I have offered to the texts as published by Rawlinson, Smith, and Budge. Although the text of Esarhaddon is generally regarded as an easy one, there are, nevertheless, many difficult words and expressions to be found in it. For some of these I have offered new transliterations and translations. In one of the following numbers of Hebraica I shall publish some notes in defense of these readings.

To my friend and teacher, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, I am greatly indebted for suggestions and help in my study of the Esarhaddon texts.

\(^1\) Cf. Fried. Delitzsch in the Literarisches Centralblatt, May 21, 1881.

\(^2\) Cf. my article in Hebraica, Oct., 1887, "Some Unpublished Esarhaddon Inscriptions (Cylinder C; 80, 7-19, 15, PS. and K. 1679)."

\(^3\) Cf. my article in Hebraica, April, 1887, "Some Corrections to the Texts of Cylinders A and B of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions as published in I R., 45-47, and III R., 15, 16."

5. Nabû Marduk Istar ša Ninâ Istar ša Arbaʾîl ilâni rabûti bêlēšu ultu şet šamši adî erēb šamši ittallakuma māhira là ḫû

Kâsid Šidâni ša ina ḫabal tāmtim

10. sāpinu gimir dadmēšu dûršu u šubatsu assuḫma kirib tāmtim addîma ašar maškanišu uḫallīḫ Abdîmilkūti šarrašu

15. ša lapân kakkeʾa ina ḫabal tāmtim innabtu kîma nûni ultu kirib tāmtim abâršuma akkisa ḫakkûsu nakmu bušâšu ḫurâši kaspi abnē akartu

20. mašak pîri šin pîri uṣa urkarîna lubultî bîrmē u kitē mimma šumšu niṣirti ëkallîšu ana muʾde ašlula nišēšu rapâštî ša nîba là ḫû

25. alpē u šenî imērē ābuka ana kirib Aššûr upa(ḫ)bîrma šarrâni Ḥattî u aḫi tāmtim kâlîšunu ina ašri šanîmma ḫala uṣēpišma

30. [Kar-Ašûr]laḫiddina attabi nibîtsu niṣē ḫubut kaštiʾa ša šadî u tāmtim şet šamšî ina libbi uṣēšib šudśâšiʾa pîḥâti elîšunu aškûn

35. u Sandûarri šar Kundi Sîzû nakru aḳṣu là pâliḥ bêlûtiʾa
Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions.

Translation.

Cylinder A.

1. [Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, king of Šumer] and Akkad
   [son of Sennacherib], king of Assyria;
   [son of Sargun], king of Assyria;
   who, under the protection of Ašûr, Sin, Šamaš,

5. Nabû, Marduk, Ištar of Nineveh,
   Ištar of Arbela, the great gods, his lords,
   from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun
   marched without a rival.

The conqueror of Sidon, which lies in the middle of the sea,

10. the overthrower of all its dwellings;
   its wall and its dwelling (houses) I tore down
   and threw them into the sea,
   and destroyed its site.
   Abdimilkûti, its king,

15. who, before my weapons,
    into the midst of the sea had fled,
    like a fish, from the midst of the sea,
    I drew him out and cut off his head.
    His accumulated property, gold, silver, precious stones,

20. elephant skin, elephant ivory, ušû and urkarēnu wood,
    variegated and linen clothing, of every description,
    the treasure of his palace,
    in great quantities, I carried away.
    His numerous men, who were without number,

25. oxen, sheep and asses
    I brought to Assyria.
    I assembled the kings of Hatti
    and of the sea-coast—all of them.
    In another place, I caused the city to be built

30. and [Kar-Ašûr]ahiddin I called its name.
    The men, the booty of my bow, from the mountains
    and the sea of the rising of the sun,
    I caused to dwell there;
    my officer and governor I placed over them.

35. And Sandùarri,
    king of the cities of Kundi and Sizû,
    a powerful enemy, who did not respect my lordship,
ša ilâni umašširuma
ana šadê maršûtāti ittakil
40. u Abdimilkûtî šar Šîdûni
ana rêsûtûšu ışkunuma
šum ilâni rabûti ana aşmēš izkurûma
ana emûkēšun ittaklû
anâku ana Ašûr bêlî’a attakilma
45. kıma įşṣûrî ульт kirib šadê
abûrṣuma akkîsa kağkâsu
aşîn dànân Ašûr bêlî’a
niše kullumimma
kağkâdê Sandûdarri
50. u Abdimilkûtî
ina kišâdi rabûtišun ālulma
ittî zammêrê(?) u ...
inà rêbit Ninû etêtîk

Šâlîl Arzâni(?)

55. [ša itê(??)] nahâl Muṣri

II. 1. . . . . . . . idkêšu
ana Aššûr ūrâ
ina teği abûlî ša şêt ša Ninû
ittî asi kalbi u šâhê
5. uşêşibšunûtî kamêš

u Te’ušpâ Gîmirrâ
umman-manda ša aşaršu rûku
ina irṣîtim Hûbuṣnâ
adî gîmir ummânišu ura(s)sîba ina kakki

10. Kâbis kišâdi niše Hilakki
Du’ua ăsîbût ğu̇ršâni
ša teği Tabâl
ša elî šadêšunu (dannûtî) ittaklûma
ultu îmê pâni lâ iknušû ana nîrî
15. XXI ālanišunu dannûtî
adî ālâni şîhrûtî ša limêtišunu
almê akşud aślula şallatsun
abûl âkkur ina ışāti âkmu
sitûtêšunu ša ḥiṭṭu
20. u kullultu lâ ışû
kabtu nîr bêlûtî’a ūmîdunûtî.
who had forsaken the gods,
to the impassable mountains he trusted,

40. and Ἄδημλικύτι, king of Sidon
came to his help.
The name of the great gods they both despised (?)
and trusted to their own forces.
I trusted in Ἀσύρ, my lord,

45. and, like a bird, from the midst of the mountains,
I drew him forth and cut off his head.
In order to show the men the power
of Ἀσύρ, my lord,
the heads of Sandûarrî

50. and Ἄδημλικύτι
upon the necks of their great men I hung.
With male and female singers(?),
into the streets of Nineveh I marched.

The despoiler of Arzani,

55. which is on the banks of the river of the land of Egypt.

II. 1 . . . . .
to Assyria brought.
In the vicinity of the eastern gate of Nineveh,
with wild boars, dogs and wild beasts

5. I caused them to sit in chains.

And Τῆ'υσπα of Gimir
an 𒌷 mmap an manda, whose residence was afar off,
in the Ḩubušna territory,
together with the whole of his army, I ran through with the sword.

10. The trampler upon the necks of the men of Hilakki
Du'ua, the inhabitants of the mountain-ridges,
which lie in the vicinity of Tabal;
who trusted to their [mighty] mountains,
and from days of old had not been subject to any yoke;

15. XXI powerful cities,
together with the smaller cities of their territory,
I besieged, captured, carried away their spoil,
I destroyed, tore down and burned with fire.
Upon the rest, who had not committed sin

20. and crimes,
I placed the heavy yoke of my lordship.
Dâ'îš Barnaki nakru aḫṣu
ašihûte Tilašûrî
ša ina pi nišê

25. Mêhrânu Pitânû
inambû zikiršûn.

Musappîh nišê Mannâ
kûtû lâ sanka
ša ummânâtî Išpâkâ
Ašgûzâ kidru lâ mušêzihišû
inâru ina kakki.

Târid Nabû-zêr-napišti-uştêšir apal Marduk-apal-iddîna
ša ana šar Elamti ittaklûma
lâ ušêzûbu napâtsu

35. Na'id-Marduk aḫûšu
ašu epêš ardûti'a
ultu kirib Elamti innabtamma
ana Ninâ āl bêlûti'a
illikamma unaššîk šêpê'a

40. mât tâmtim ana sihirtîša
ridût aḫišû ušadgil pânûšû.

Nâbi' Bît-Dakkûrî
ša kirib Kaldî aiab Bâbîli
kâmû Samaš-ibni šarrîšû

45. isâhpu ḥabbîlu lâ pâlihu zikri bêl bêlê
ša eklê aplê Bâbîli
u Barsap ina parîktê itbaluma
ašû anâku puluhtî Bêl u Nabû īdû
eklê šinâtî utûrma

50. pûn aplê Bâbîli u Barsap
ušadgil
Nabû-šallim apal Balasu
ina kussêšu ušêšibma
išâṭa abšâni.

55. Adumû āl daunûte Aribî
[ša] Sinaḫêrîba šar Aššûr
[abû] bânû'al ikkuduma

58. . . . . . . . . ilânišu
The treader upon the land of Barnaki, a powerful enemy,
the inhabitants of Tilašûri
who in the language of the people

25. Miḥrānu Piṭānu
    they call their name.

The scatterer of the inhabitants of Minni,
the ḫuṭû, the unsubmissive;
who subdued the armies of Ɨṣpaka

30. of Ašguza—an alliance that did not save him—
    with (his) sword.

The driver away of Nabû-żêr-napištî-uitēšir, son of Mardukbaliddin,
who trusted to Elam,
but did not save his life.

35. Naʿid-Marduk, his brother,
in order to subject himself to me
fled from Elam, and
came to Nineveh, my lordship’s city,
and kissed my feet.

40. The sea-land, in its extent,
    the dominion of his brother, I entrusted to him.

Who tore away Bit-Dakkûri
which is in Kaldi, an enemy of Babylon.
The binder of Šamaš-ibni, its king,

45. a foolish (?), bad person, who did not fear the renown of the lord of lords,
    who had taken away the fields of the Babylonians
    and Borsippans by force.
    Because I knew the fear of Bêl and Nabû
    these fields I returned, and

50. to the Babylonians and Borsippans
    I entrusted.
    Nabû-šallim, son of Balasu,
    I placed on his throne
    and he was tribute to me.

55. Adumû, the powerful city of Aribi
    [which] Sennacherib, king of Assyria,
    [the father], my begetter, had captured and

58. . . . . . . . . . . his gods

*5
III. 1. [šulula] ana Aššûr
ūrà
[Hasû]šu šar Aribi
iti tamartiušu kabitte
5. ana Ninâ ál bêlûti'a
illikamma unaašík sépê'a
aššu nadân ilânîšu wassallâmina
rému aršíšuma
ilânî šâtunu anḫûsuno uddišma
10. danân Ašûr béli'a
u šîtir šumi'a elîšunu ušaštirma
utêrma addinšu
Tabû'a tarbit ēkallî'a
ana šarrûti elîšunu aškunma
15. itti ilânîša ana mâtiša utêrêši
LXV gammalê elî màdâti
abê'a maḫriti uraddima
ukîn šîrûšu.
Arka Hasûšu šîmtu ūbilšuma
20. Ḡa'šu apalšu
ina kussëšu ušabîbma
X mana ěrúsî M abnê bërûti
L gammalê M guṇzi (?) rîkê
elî màdâte abêšu uraddima ēmidsu

25. Bâzu nagû ša ašaršu rûku
mi-sîd(?) nabâli kaṅkṣar dábtu ašar šumâme
OXL kasbu kaṅkṣar bâšē
pûkuttu u aban pi-sabîti
XX kasbu kaṅkṣar şiri u akârabî
30. ša kîma zirbâbê malû ugaru
XX kasbu Hasû šaddî sâg-gîl-mud
ana arki'a umaṣširma ētiḵ
ša ultu ūmê ullûti
lâ illiku šarru pâni maḫri'a
35. ina kîbît Ašûr bêli'a
ina kirbišu šalṭâniš attallak.
VIII šarrâni ša kirib nagê šâ'atu
adûk ilânîšunu namkûrišunu busâšunu
u nišëšunu ašlula ana kirib Aššûr
40. Lâlé šar Iâdi'
ša ultu lapân kaṅkê'a ipparsidu
III. 1. had carried away, to Assyria
   had brought;
   [Hazā'īlu, king of Aribi,
   with his heavy present,
5. to Nineveh, my lordship’s city,
   came and kissed my feet.
   For the return of his gods he besought me, and
   I showed him compassion.
   The injuries of these gods I repaired, and
10. the power of Ašûr, my lord,
   and the writing of my name upon them I caused to be written,
   and gave them back.
   Tabû’a, who was reared in my palace,
   I appointed to sovereignty over them, and
15. with her gods to her land I returned her.
   LXV camels in addition to the former tribute
   of my fathers, I added and
   set on him.
   Afterwards, fate carried Hazā'īlu away, and
20. Ia’ilû, his son,
   I placed on his throne.
   X maneh of gold, M brilliant (?) stones,
   L camels, M ġursû of sweet smelling herbs,
   in addition to the tribute of his father, I added and placed on him,

25. Bāzu, a district, whose situation is afar off,
   a . . . of land, a wearisome(?) country, a barren place,
   CXL kasbu of swampy land,
   pākūt‫ת‬u and gazelle-mouth stone;
   XX kasbu of snakes and scorpions,
30. which, like grasshoppers, filled the country;
   XX kasbu of Hazû, a mountain of sāg-gīl-mud stone
   I left behind me and I marched.
   Where, from days of old,
   no king before me had gone,
35. by the command of Ašûr, my lord,
   into its midst I marched victorious.
   VIII kings of that district I killed,
   their gods, property, possessions,
   and men I carried away into Assyria.
40. Lâlâ, king of Iadî’,
   [who] before my weapons had fled,
šallat ʾilānīšu ʾismēma
ana Ninā ʾāl bēlūtīʾa
adī maḥrīʾa ʾillikamma

45. unaššīk šēpēʾa
rēmu aršīšuma ʾakṭabišu aḥu[lap]
ilānīšu ša ʾaslula ḏanān ʾAšūr bēlīʾa
elīšunu aṣṭurma utērma addinšu
nagē Bāzi šūʾatu

50. uṣadgīl pānuššu
bīltu mandātu bēlūtīʾa
ukīn širuššu

Bēliḵša apal Bunāni Gambulā
ša ina XII kasbu Ḹaḵḵar ina mē u apparaṭi

55. kīma nūnī šītkunu šubtu
ina źibīt ʾAšūr bēlīʾa ḥattu ʾimḵutsuma
kt źem rāmānīšu
bīltu u mandātu
g̠ūmāh̠h̠ē šukul šamna

60. . . . . . . . . . . .

IV. 1. ūbilamma unaššīk šēpēʾa
rēmu aršīšuma ʾuṣarḫissu libbu
šāpīt-Bēl ʿāl ḏanūtīšu
dannassu udanninma

5. šāšu adī šābē ḳaṣṭišu ina libbi
ušēlišuma
kīma dalti Elamti ʾédiššu

Patušarra nagū ša itē bit MUN
ša kirib Madā ṛukūṭi

10. ša pāṭī Bikni šaddē uknē
ša ina šarrāni ābēʾa mamma lâ ikbusu
irṣītim māṭišun
Šidirparna Eparna
ḥazanāti dannūṭi

15. ša lâ kitnušša ana nīrī
šāšunu adī niṣšēšunu ʾisē rukūbēšunu
alpē šēnī imērē udurē
šallatsun kābītu ʾaslula ana ʾAšūr

Uppiz ḥazan ša Partakka

20. Zanasana ḥazan ša Partukka
heard of the carrying away of his gods, and
to Nineveh, my lordship's city,
into my presence he came, and
45. kissed my feet.
I showed him compassion and spoke to him of peace(?).
Upon his gods, which I had carried away, I wrote
the power of Ašûr, my lord, and gave them back.
The district of Bāzi
50. I entrusted to him,
the taxes and tribute of my lordship
I imposed upon him.

Bēlikiša, son of Bunāni, of Gambul,
who, at the distance of XII kasbu of land in the water and marshes,
55. like a fish had fixed (his) dwelling;
by the command of Ašûr, my lord, terror struck him.
Of his own accord,
taxes and tribute,
large oxen, completely fattened
60.       

IV. 1. he brought and kissed my feet.
I showed him compassion and I made his heart confident.
Šapî-Bêl, the city of his strength,
its strength I strengthened, and
5. he himself, together with his bow-men,
I caused to go up into it, and
like a door of Elam, I shut it up.

Patušarra, a district on the borders of . . . ,
which is in the midst of the far-off Medes,
10. on the borders of Bikni, a mountain of alabaster stone,
the territory of whose land no one
among the kings, my fathers, had trodden,
Šidirparna Šparna,
the powerful city-officers,
15. who were not under subjection to any yoke,
they themselves with their men, horses, chariots,
oxen, sheep, asses, dromedaries,
their heavy spoil I carried away to Assyria.

Upplz, city-officer of Partakka,
20. Zanasana, city-officer of Partukka,
Ramatê'a ḥazan ša Uракazabarna
Madâ ša ašarrunu rûku
ša ina tarsi šarrâni abê'a irîtim Aššûr
lâ ibballitûnimma là ikbusû kâkêkarša

25. puluḫtu rašûbat Aššûr bèli'a ışhupšunûtîma
murniskî rabûti uknû ṱib mâtišu
ana Ninâ āl bèlûti'a
iššûnimma unaššûkâ šêpê'a
aššu ḥazanâti šakâtu idkûšunûti

30. bèlûti ušallûma
êrišû'inni kidru
šudšâkê'a piḫâti
ša pâtî mâtišun
ittîšunu uma'irma

35. nišê âšibût âlânî šâtunu
ikbusûma ušaknîšû šêpûšun
biltu mandâtû bèlûti'a šattîšamma uknî šîrûşun

Ultu Aššûr Šamaš Bêl u Nabû
Ištar ša Ninâ Ištar ša Arba'il

40. ëlî nakirê'a ina lêti
ušaxizûnimma amsû mala libbi'a
ina kîsîtti nakirê šadlûti
ša ina tukulti îlânî rabûti bèlê'a
ikšudâ kâtê'a

45. ešeṭ maḥâzê ša Aššûr
u Akkadî ušepîšma
kaspî ḥûrâṣî uṣa'înma
unammera kîma ūme

Ina ūmêsûma ākal maḥîrte

50. ša kirib Ninâ
ša šarrâni ālik maḥri abê'a
ušepîšû ana šutêşur karâši
paḵâdi murniskê parê
narkabâtî bèlê unût(e) taḥâzi

55. u šallat nakirê gimir mimma šûmsû
ša Aššûr šar îlânî
ana eški šarrûti'a išruḵa
ana šîtmur sîšê
şitamduḫ narkabâtî

60. [ašru šû'atu īmîšannîma]
Ramatê’a, city-officer of Urakazabarna, Medes, whose situation is afar off, who, under the reign of the kings, my fathers, the territory of Assyria had not crossed over and had not trodden its ground, 25. the fear of the might of Ašûr, my lord, overwhelmed them. Large horses, alabaster-stone, the choice of his land, to Nineveh, my lordship’s city, they brought and kissed my feet. As for the city-officers, faint-heartedness (?) struck them; 30. they besought my lordship, and they asked of me a treaty. My over-officers, the prefects of the border of their land, I sent with them. 35. The men, the inhabitants of these cities, they trampled upon and subdued. The tribute and taxes of my lordship I imposed upon them forever.

From the time that Ašûr, Šamaš, Bêl and Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela, 40. had set me in power over my enemies and I had found the fulness of my heart, with the booty of my numerous enemies, which, under the protection of the great gods, my lords, my hands had captured, 45. the temples of the cities of Assyria and Akkad I caused to be built, and with silver and gold I adorned them, and I made them as bright as the day. 

In those days, the former palace, 50. which is in Nineveh, which the kings, my forefathers, had caused to be built, for the stowing away of the camp, for the sheltering of the horses and bulls, chariots, weapons, utensils of war, 55. and the spoil of the enemies, everything of every description, which Ašûr, the king of the gods, for the strengthening of my kingdom had presented, for the stalling of the horses, and the hitching-up of the chariots, 60. [that place had become too small for me, and]
V. 1. נישׁ מתְּתי חָבָעְתָּ קאָשִתְיַא
      עלו עָמְישׁיקֶעַ עֵשׁאָסֵשׁעְנֵעֲתוֹתָא
      אִלְבִּינְׁו לְיבָּנָתִי
      עָמְאָלִי שִׁ֣רְּ֣ה שׁוּֽאָתּוּ
5. אָנה סִּיבְּרְיִ סְאָקָרְנָא
      קָּבָּקָרְוַּע מַדְוַו קִמְּא אֶֽחָצְתִּינָאָה
      גֵּלְתִּי לִיבְּבִי כֵּלֻיַּבְּקַמָּא
      אֵלִישׁא וּרְאִדְדִי
      יָנִי פִּלְי אָבָן שָֽדִי דָנְנִי
10. טָמְלָא וּשְמַלְלִי

     אַדּוֹּֽסְמָא XIX שַֽארְרָנְי הַטְּיַא
     שָּלִי טָמְטִימַע וּקַֽגְּבָלְטִימַע קַֽלְּיִשְׁנַעְנָא
     עָמְאָיִּירְשׁוֹנֵעְנַעְנַעְנָא
     גֻּשְׁרֵי רָבְבְּתִי דִּמְמִי סִירְעַתי
15. אֲבִימִיִי קְרִיִי סִירְמִיַנְי
      גֵּלְתִי קִרְיֵב סִֽירְּאָרָא לָֽבָּנָאָה
      לָֽמִאְסָסְי לַֽטִּו זָאָסָאָתּוּ
      אָסקַפֶּפִּאָט אַגְרַֽרְּי
      שָלִי גִּסְּ-סִירְ-גַּאָל אָשְּםָאָן
20. טוּרְ-מִי-נָא טוּרְ-מִי-נָא-טָֽו-דָו
      אָנְגִי-דָמְקֶעַ עַל-לִֽו-דָו
      גִיָּנְא הַֽיִּי-לִי-בָּא גֵּלְתִי חַרְשָּנְי
      אָסָר נַבְנַטִּיַשְׁנַעְנָא
      אָנה הַֽיָּשָּחְטיַא וּקַלְּלִיַא
25. מָרְשִׁיַא פַּאָקִיַא
      אָנה נינְאֹא עוּשְּלָדְלִיַּדְנִי

     יָנִי אָרְחִי שֶמְּיַא úמִי מַטְגָּרִי
     אַלְיָ תָּמְלִי שׁוּ֥אָתּוּ
     טַקְלְלַטִי רַבְבָּטִי
30. אָנה מְעַסָּב בֵּלַעֲטיַא
      אַבְּטַאָנִי שִֽׁרְּעַשְׁעַ
      בִּיטְאָנִי שָל XCV ina I ammati rabītim ina arkat
      XXXXI ina I ammati rabītim rāpšat
      שָלִי שַאָרְרָנְי אָלְיָ מַחְרִי אַבְּאָה
35. מָמָmercial 3ָּאָ בְּעַעְסָא בְּעַעְשּׁ עָפָעְשׁ
      גֻּשְׁרֵי קְרִיַיָא שִׁרְעַתי
      עָשְּאָטִאָלִי אֵלִישׁא
      דַּלְטִי שֵׁרְמִיַא שָא אָרְסִינא תַּבְּע
      מְשִׁיר קַסְפִי עַסְיָרְרִיַא уuрακκיסמַא
V. 1. the men of the countries, the booty of my bow,
I caused them to carry allu umšikku
and they made bricks.
That small palace
5. I tore down entirely.
A large quantity of ground, in accordance with my means,
from the midst of the fields I cut off, and
added to it.
With freestone, a stone of the mighty mountains,
10. I filled out its terrace.

I assembled XXII kings of the land of Ḫatti,
of the sea-coast and the middle of the sea; to
all of these I gave my commands, and
large beams, mighty posts
15. of abîme, cedar and cypress
from the midst of Sirara and Labnana,
brilliant colossi and bull-colossi(?)
Einfassungsschwellen of
gis-sir-gal and ašnan stone, of
20. turminat turminat urdu
èn-gi-damku aladu
gi-na ħi-li-ba, from the mountain-ridges,
the place of their production,
for the requirements of my palace,
25. with labor and with difficulty,
they caused to be drawn to Nineveh.

In a fortunate month, on a favorable day,
upon that terrace,
great palaces
30. for the dwelling of my lordship,
I built upon it.
A palace, whose length was XCV great cubits,
whose breadth was XXXI great cubits,
which, among the kings who went before me, my fathers,
35. no one had built, I built.
Mighty beams of cedar
I laid in rows upon it.
Doors of cypress-wood, whose odor was good,
with a covering of silver and copper, I bound

*6
40. urattâ bâbēša
   lamassê u šêdê ša abnê
   ša ki pî šiknišunu
   irti limni utârû
   nâsîru kibsi mušallîmu
45. tallakťi šarri bânišunu
   imnu u šumêlu ušašbita
   Âigarsîn
   ĕkal pilî u erinî
   .. (See corrections to text) ..
50. ana multaʿtî bêlûtiʿa
   nakliš ušêpiš
   lamassê érê maššê[te]
   ša aḥênuţ pâna u arka
   inâta[lâ] kilâtan kiribša ulzi[z]

VI. 1. dimme erini šîrûti
   abîme kulûl bâbêšîn émid
   sihiirtî ĕkalli šatu
   nîbhû pâšku ša KA uknî
5. ušêpišma usalmâ kîlîliš
   si-ēl-lu mat gi-gu kîma. ??
   ušasḫira gimir bâbê
   sikkat kaspi ebbî u siparri namri
   urattâ kirib[ṣîn]
10. dânan Ašûr bêliʿa
   ša ina matâtî nakrûte
   ēteppušu
   ina šîpir ḥarrakûte ēṣîka kiribša
   kirû maḥḥu tamšîl Hamânîm
15. ša kâla riḳkê u eṣê
   ḥurrûšu itâša émid
   kisâlaša rabêš(?) urabbîma
   tallaktaša maʾdiš urappîš
   ana maškît sîsê kiribša
20. šuktu ušêšeramma
   uṣâḥbîba atappîš
   ĕkallu šûʿatu ultu ušēša
   adî taḥlubiša
   arșip uṣakilîma lulê umalli
25. eš-gal kišib-kak-kak-a
   ĕkallu pâkidat kâlâmû azkura nibitaa
40. and I hung as its gates.
   Bull-divinities and colossi of stone
   which, according to their position,
   turn the breast of the enemy,
   which protect the path, render inviolable
45. the way of the king, their builder,
   to the right and left I caused them to take
   their positions.
   A palace of freestone and cedar
   šu-tē-mu-du-ti(?)
50. for the renown of my lordship,
    artistically I caused to be built.
    Glittering female colossi of bronze
    which looked sidewards, forewards and backwards
54. I placed in it on both sides.

VI. 1. Mighty beams of cedar,
    of a bimē, as the fastening of their gates I placed.
    The surrounding-wall of that palace
    nibiḫu pašku of pi-stone and alabaster
    I caused to be made and to surround like a wreath(?).
5. . . . . . . like . . . . .
    I caused to surround the whole of the gates.
    Doors of pure silver and shining copper
    I hung in their midst.
10. The power of Ašûr, my lord,
    which I had exhibited
    in hostile countries,
    by the work of the engravers, I carved in it.
    A large park like those of Ḫamân,
15. in which every sort of spices and trees
    was planted, I placed on its sides.
    Its ground-floor I greatly enlarged, and
    its path I made much wider.
    For a drinking-place for the horses, within it
20. I had a watering-trough constructed and
    arranged after the manner of a canal.
    This palace, from its foundation
    to its roof,
    I erected, caused to be completed and fitted out with fulness.
25. Ekalū pākidat kālāma
    i. e., the palace guarding everything, I called its name.
Ašûr Ištar ša Ninâ ilâni Ašûr kâlišunu ina kirbiša akrima
nikê taṣrihte ebbûti

30. maḥaršun akkîma
uṣamḫira kadra’a
ilâni šâtunu ina kûn libbišunu
iktarrabû šarrûti
rabûti u nišê mâtî’a kâlišunu

35. ina ta-zîr-te u kirêti
ina passûrî taṣilâti
kiribša ušêşibma
ušâliša nuparšun
karânê kurunnu amkira şurrašun

40. šamnu rêštû šamnu gu-la amuḫaššunu uṣaški
ina kîbît Ašûr šar ilâni u ilâni Ašûr
kâlišunu ina tûb şerê ḫud libbi
nummur kabitti şêbê littûte
kiribša dârêš lumêma

45. lušbâ lalâsa
ina zâk-mukki arḫî rêštî kullat murnîskê
pare imerce gammalê
bêlê unût taḥâzi
gimir ummâni šallat nakirê

50. šattisamma lâ naparkû
lupkida kiribša
ina kirib êkalli šâtu
şêdu damku lamassu damku
nâsîr kîbsî šarrûti’a

55. muḫaddû kabitti’a

B. VI. 13. dârêš lištablû ai ḫiparkû idâša
ana arkat ūmê ina šarrâni aplê’a ša Ašûr u Ištar

15. ana bêlât mâtî u niše inambû zikiršû
enuma êkallu šâtu ilabirûma in(n)ahu anḫûssa luddîš
kî ša anâku mušarû šiṭîr šum šarrî abê bâni’a
itti mušarê šiṭîr šumi’a aškunuma
atta kîma iṭîma mušarû šiṭîr šumi’a

20. amurma šamna puṣuḫ niḵû iḵî
itti mušarê šiṭîr šumika šukun
Ašûr u Ištar ikribika išemmu.
Ašûr, Ištar of Nineveh, the gods of Assyria,
all of them, I invited into it.
Large and clean sacrifices

30. I sacrificed before them,
and I presented my presents.
These gods, in the steadfastness of their hearts,
looked with favor on my kingdom.
The great men and inhabitants of my country—all of them—

35. with eating (?) and feasting,
with the dedicatory vessels,
in its midst, I caused to sit,
and I caused their hearts (spirits) to rejoice.
With wines and cider I bribed (?) their hearts,

40. the best oil I offered (??) them, I caused them to drink.
By the command of Ašûr, king of the gods, and the gods of Assyria,
all of them, in health of body, joy of heart,
cheerfulness of spirit, abundance of offspring,
within it, may I continually dwell, and

45. may its fulness be sufficient.
On the beginning of the year, in the first month, all of the horses,
bulls, asses, camels,
weapons, utensils of war,
all the soldiers, the spoil of my enemies,

50. yearly, without fail,
within it may I store away.
Within this palace, may the
gracious bull-divinities and gracious colossi,
protecting the footsteps of my majesty,

55. causing my spirit to rejoice,

B. VI. 18. forever show themselves, may they not separate from its side.
For the future, among the kings, my sons, whomsoever Ašûr and Ištar

15. call to be ruler of land and people,

at the time when this palace becomes old and weak, may he repair its

damage.
Accordingly as I placed the inscription of the king, my begetter,
with the inscriptions of my name,
so do thou as I did, and look after my inscription,

20. and cleanse it with oil, sacrifice sacrifices,
with thy own inscriptions place it.
Ašûr and Ištar will hear thy prayers.
JEWISH GRAMMARIANS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.
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V.

Dônâsh ben Labrat.

It occasionally happens that a man attains fame not for any pronounced merits of his own, but because he chances to be thrown in contact with some eminent personage, either as a friend or as an opponent. Boswell is remembered solely because he followed Johnson about like a shadow. Lessing replies to the attacks made upon him by Goethe, and in this way ensures for the latter a lasting celebrity, though not of the most enviable kind. Dônâsh b. Labrat enjoys the distinction—if distinction it be—of being the opponent of Saadia Gaon and of Menâhêm b. Sarûk. Whether he had other claims for being remembered or not, he is known to us only as the author of two sharp polemical treatises; the one containing a pointed criticism of Saadia's Arabic translation of the Bible; the other, an attempt to discountenance Menâhêm's standing as a grammarian, under the guise of a would-be friendly review of the latter's dictionary.

Concerning the life and career of Dônâsh we know nothing but that he was born in Fez, and was a contemporary of Menâhêm b. Sarûk. It would seem as though Dônâsh never completed the criticism of Saadia's translation, or—which is perhaps more probable—the single manuscript which exists of the work contains only an abstract of the whole. Dônâsh picks out the flaws in the translation, shows that in many places Saadia misunderstood the sense, in others was misled by external resemblances to confuse stems together which had nothing to do with one another. There is no doubt that in many, if not in most, of the criticisms which Dônâsh makes, he is fully in the right. So in the very first paragraph of his "Replies" he points out that Saadia reads the word הַמְלִית (Exod. ii. 5) for מְלִית, and renders "and she stretched out her fore-arm," though the Targum also adopts this interpretation. Again, misled perhaps by the following word, Saadia takes כָּלָרָכָל נְבֶל (Num. xxiv. 6) in the sense "as tents, the Lord planted." Dônâsh shows the objections to such a rendering. In this

1 See HEBSBAQ, vol. iii., No. 8.
2 Published by Robert Schrôter (Breslau, 1866), under the title ספר תשובות ויוסף הולך ב' לברך על רבי צדיק חמא.
3 In accordance with an opinion in Lotah, 12a, and Exodus Rabbah, s. 1.
4 v. B'rabkoth, 16a.
way he passes on from word to word through the 192 paragraphs comprising the part of the treatise that is known to us. Assuming that he is always justified in his objections, he is still not warranted in speaking with such severity and at times contempt of Saadia's work as characterize the critique. Allowance may of course be made for the customs of the time. Dónash lived in an age when a spade was called a spade, and when, in their warfare with one another, scholars vied with each other in the use of opprobrious epithets and slanderous insinuations—remnants of which period may still be found in our own days. But Dónash, it is fair to suppose, outstepped the bounds of what was even then considered legitimate criticism; and especially in his treatment of Menahem, he is generally bitter, and at times extremely coarse. The consequence is that, even when we are forced to admit the correctness of Dónash's censures, our sympathies are still with the nobler Menahem, whose unselfish labors were received in so unworthy a manner. The opposition on the part of Dónash did not cease with the publication of his T¿áubhôth, but was extended to charges of a more serious character. Exactly of what nature these charges were, we do not know; but we do know that they cost Menahem his happiness and for a time his liberty. His house, for some reason or other, was ransacked and he himself thrown into prison. There are good reasons for believing that Dónash was implicated in these indignities offered to a man who seems to have been the embodiment of the quiet and unassuming scholar.

In the introduction to the critique Dónash, it is true, claims to hold Menahem in high esteem. He calls him "my brother," prays that God may shower blessings upon him, confesses the reluctance with which he undertakes his task. "I reprove thee," he says, "only in the hope that thou mayest love me still more;" and adds, "How much better, besides, is open reproof than concealed love." But these and other complimentary phrases are scarcely in keeping with the bitter words with which almost every paragraph closes. Dónash's purpose to throw ridicule on Menahem is only too clear. Now, Menahem is a "fool," then, a "deceiver," and again, an "ignoramus." He misguides the young; he does not know what he is talking about; he is lacking in the first rudiments of Hebrew,—in such terms does Dónash constantly speak of his rival. All this, however, must not blind us to the merits which the T¿áubhôth possesses. While Dónash cannot be said to have advanced the study of Hebrew grammar, still the testimony must be awarded him that he was successful in picking out the great defects in the theories and views of Menahem. Dónash has a keener sense for the niceties of grammar than Menahem; he enters deeper into the spirit of the language; and even where his reasoning is unsatisfactory, his instinct frequently leads him on the right path. He also seems to have had a far better acquaintance with some of the cognate Semitic languages, especially Arabic and Aramaic, than his con-

1 Ed. by Filipowski (Criticae Vocab Recensiones Donash ben Librat Levitae), London, 1855.
temporaries in general; and this no doubt was of great advantage to him in opening his eyes to the lack of method in the theories of the Jewish grammarians of the day.

His criticism is twofold. He attacks the interpretations which Menahem gives of biblical passages and of the meanings he assigns to words, and on the other hand points out errors in tracing words to their stems, in throwing verbal forms together which have nothing in common, in mistaking nouns for verbs, suffixes for parts of the stem and the reverse; and more the like. He embodies his objections in the form of a poem—if a conglomeration of rhyming stanzas may be called a poem—which but for a kind of a commentary which he has fortunately attached, explaining at length on what grounds his differences are based, would be perfectly unintelligible. Even as it is, despite the prosaical supplement, there are many passages which are absolute enigmas, though for our consolation be it added, that we probably lose very little by our inability to fathom them. For the understanding of Dônavlah’s position it suffices to confine ourselves to his prose, which, in contradistinction to his heavy verse, is graceful, fluent, and extremely pleasant to read.

As a specimen of his method, his reply to Menahem’s argument against Jehuda Ibn Koreish’s explanation of חֵבֶשׁ אַלֹהַ (Jer. xi. 19) as “lamb and ox,” may be selected. Menahem, it will be remembered,1 asserts that the וָאָב conjunctive can only be omitted in a continuous series of at least three words, and even then there is a וָאָב just before the last of the words thus placed in juxtaposition. Furthermore, the singular of the verb (יָתַּל) which follows shows that the subject also must be a singular. Dônavlah disputes both assertions, and justly so. Examples such as שִׁמְשָׁנָה יִרְאֶה עָבוֹד (Hab. iii. 11) prove that the וָאָב may be omitted in the case of two words; and in the second place, there are many instances where a singular verb is attached to a plural subject, or has for its subject two nouns; e.g., שֶׁמֶּנִי וַקָּמָה יִשְׁמַח לְ (Prov. xxvii. 9), וַיִּתְקַלְלֶנָּה (Esth. iv. 14). Dônavlah accepts, accordingly, the interpretation given by Koreish. In his opinion there is an intentional contrast between the small and great. The prophet wishes to say that both lamb as well as ox shall be carried to the slaughter. The arguments of Dônavlah are sound enough to set aside Menahem’s objections; but, for all that, Menahem is right and Koreish wrong. The context clearly demands such a translation as “I am like a tame lamb led to the slaughter.”

In general, Dônâsh may be said to be a closer or rather a sharper reasoner than Menahem. He pays greater attention to minute details, and there is little that escapes his critical eye. Menahem rather carelessly mistakes the word עֵלֶּם in בָּאָבְלֵי הָהֵלֶּם אֵשׁ עָבְרָה (ψ 39, 7) for “image,” for which Dônâsh takes him severely to task. He shows that the stem is the same as that of הָלֶם, and

---

1 See HEbraICA, VOL. IV., p. 32.
hence the phrase is to be rendered "in darkness man wanders about." It is important to note that Dônåsh is not led astray by the Massoretic vocalization of יִּפְלָמַה to explain it (as has so often been done) as a combination of two words. For him the word is an abstract noun, formed just as יִּפְלָמַה (Isa. L. 3), and he also attempts to give a reason for the curious vocalization, in which, however, he is less successful. The fact is that the Massoretes believed the word to be composed of לֶ֑ע and מֹ֑ה, and vocalized it accordingly. But rejecting the "punning" etymology, we are justified in setting aside the traditional vocalization, and read instead "šalmūt."

Menaḥem again exhibits a neglect of detail in throwing יִּפְלָמַה (Hos. x. 14) under the same category as בֹּרֶא "to ensnare," and also similarly deriving נִּפְלָא as (Hos. ii. 24) from נָר, regarding the two final letters as added, though without any apparent reason and without affecting the sense in any way. To Dônåsh, such a notion seems preposterous. Both words, he says, can of course only be nothing else than proper names. He pounces unmercifully on this unfortunate error of Menaḥem's. "I should like to know," he says, "how you propose to translate נִּפְלָא (Hos. i. 4), if יִּפְלָא is a common (and not a proper) noun? Perhaps, 'I shall visit the sowers of the ground in the house of Jēhu?""

In this way Dônåsh proceeds to expose the weaknesses and defects of Menaḥem; but while, as already intimated, he succeeds in doing this—and in so far, his critique is of considerable value to us—he cannot be said to stand on a higher plane than the unhappy Menaḥem. Like so many critics, he fails to improve upon the production he endeavors to overthrow. So while rejecting most of the attempts on the part of Menaḥem to trace verbal forms to uniliteral stems, he yet admits the existence of such stems. The stem of וָנַּט is not a mere ט, as Menaḥem thinks; but this, he says, is the case with יִּבְרֵא and כִּֽנְּה (Lam. iii. 58). Again חכּ "thus" belongs to the class of indeclinable particles like יִּפְלָא , בּ, נַּגּ, הָיִּ֨ר, and the like. The stem is not a ט, but consists of two letters; however, חכו (Exod. xvii. 6) and חָּכַּמ (Judges xv. 8) do go back to such a uniliteral stem. The main difference between him and Menaḥem is that, while the latter consistently carries out his principle that no letter which at any time may disappear from the word can belong to the stem, Dônåsh sets up no theory whatever, but is, in great part, led by his instinct to reject the etymologies of Menaḥem. On the other hand, Dônåsh is unquestionably superior as an exegetical critic. Here he is generally extremely happy and ingenious. His interpretation of verse 18 of the very difficult Psalm lv. merits quoting. According to Dônåsh, the poet says, speaking of his distress, that, were it simply an enemy against whom he were obliged to contend, he might bear his fate quietly. He could seek refuge from one who hates him, but it is "thou a man of my rank, an associate, an intimate friend." Dônåsh adds, "It is a well-known fact that it is much harder to bear the
reproaches of a friend than those of an enemy, and one can escape an enemy, but it is impossible to avoid a friend, to whom one has poured out one’s whole heart.”

Again, as already intimated, the use he makes of his thorough acquaintance with Arabic, gives him an advantage over Menahem. He frequently compares Hebrew words with their Arabic equivalents. In one instance he enumerates about 260 words common to Hebrew and Arabic, and defends himself against the objection that was no doubt raised against this comparative method, by pointing out the closeness of the relation existing between the two languages. He also has at least an inkling of a Lautverschiebungsgezetze; for he says that there is an interchange of letters among the words as they pass from one language to the other. An י in one becomes frequently א in the other; א ד here is a ש there; a ש in Hebrew is represented by a מ in Arabic; א ג, by a ד; א ח, by a ב. We also find in his grammar for the first time a systematic division of the parts of speech into nouns, verbs and particles; or, as he calls them, שמות וה menoim, וחתולים ואתונילן. We may be permitted to conclude from this that Dönâsh made a study of Arabic grammarians; for the terms used by Dönâsh represent the Hebrew equivalents of those used by Sibawaihi in his grammar.1

In this way, by directing attention to the Arabic as a help towards a better understanding of Hebrew, he paves the way for Abu Zakariyyâ Jaâjâ ben Dawûd Hajjuq, who, by a more systematic and more extended application of Dönâsh’s comparative method, inaugurates a new era in the study of Hebrew grammar.

---

On Job III. 14, נִבְעָנָה מֵרָבְרוֹת לָמוֹ נַעֲלֵי מִי, Matthes (Het Boek Job, 1878, p. 67) and Kuenen (Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1878, p. 518) both suspect the reading of this passage, the latter remarking, “Corruptions of this kind can easily be pointed out, but will seldom if ever be cured.” Bickell, however, who is not in general slow to correct, adheres to the Massoretic text, explaining רָבְרוֹת, with Schlottmann and Delitzsch, of palaces or monuments destined to become, or (if mausolea) to remain desolate and uninhabited (see his article in Zeitschrift fuer katholische Theologie, 1886, Heft 3). Dillmann and Davidson both see that this puts too great a strain upon the expression (cf. Job xv. 28), besides being opposed to Hebrew usage. Both, too, agree with the Dutch critics in suspecting corruption, but neither of them has proposed this very simple correction, viz., for לָמוֹ נַעֲלֵי מִי; Isa. lii. 9; lxii. 4; Jer. xlix. 18. These three passages, however, need not of course control our exegesis of the corrected phrase. That נַעֲלֵי מִי may have the sense of “the primeval world” (πάλαιος κόσμος, 2 Pet. ii. 5) is clear from Job xxii. 15; cf. Ps. cxxiiii. 4 (Lam. iii. 6); Isa. xliv. 7; Ezek. xxvi. 20. The last-mentioned passage is specially helpful, because it says (if I am not mistaken) that not only, as in Job xxii. 15, 16, the primeval men themselves, but also their cities, had been thrust down by the Divine Judge into She'ol (cf. Matt. xi. 23). It is of this nether world that the impassioned patriarch Job is speaking. That the wise men whom he and his friends represent meditated on the fate of the antediluvians, is apparent from the passages already referred to. How natural it seems that Job should speak of himself, imaginatively, as meeting in She'ol the mighty kings and counsellors who had built those spacious ruins which challenged the attention of newly admitted “shades” (Refaim)! I am well aware of the ingenious explanations of the received text which Matthes and others have collected. To each of them there is some cogent objection. Perhaps it may be objected to my own exegesis that בני הָרְבָּרוֹת means, in usage, to “build up ruined places;” so it does in Isa., lxii. 4; but must it mean this in a widely different context? We must remember that, according to the popular Semitic belief, the judgment of God was limited to the “land of the living;” tyrant-kings and oppressed subjects were alike “cut away from this hand” in the under-world. Hence, in spite of Job xxii. 15, 16, an innocent child (of rich people) might, in She'ol, become the neighbor of great though sinful kings (as yet there was no division in Hades according to the character of the previous life). Notice, in conclusion, that Job iii. 14, interpreted as above, casts a fresh light on verse 15; the speaker is on the verge of the complaint which embitters the subsequent outpourings of his much-tried soul. I mean that we need not explain the gold and silver there mentioned of treasures buried in mausolea, but interpret it in accordance with Isa. v. 14. All the glory of these mighty kings has gone down with them and with their old-world ruined cities into the under-world.

T. K. CHHEYNE,
Oxford University, England.
EINLEITUNG IN DEN THALMUD.*

This excellent treatise of seventy pages is an off-print of the article "Thal- 
mud" in the second edition of Herzog’s Real-Encyclopädie. In the preface the 
author states that it is his purpose to give from an objective and purely scientific 
stand-point, a bird’s eye view, of the field covered by the "Thalmud;" and the 
testimony must be awarded him that he has fulfilled not only his promise, but 
also the high expectations warranted by the acknowledged eminence of Strack’s 
scholarship. It is by far the best treatment the subject has ever received in an 
encyclopedic work. The arrangement is an admirable one, and leaves nothing to 
be desired. In eight chapters he passes in review briefly and yet, through the 
copious references which are given, exhaustively the divisions of the work, the 
arrangement of parts, the contents of the sixty-three treatises of the Talmud. 
Besides this, he gives a history of the compilation, chronological lists of authori-
ties quoted in the Talmud, and closes with a practically complete bibliographical 
index. A feature of the monograph which is worthy of note is the consistency 
with which the method of transcription adopted by Strack is adhered to. In this 
respect it is a safe guide, although there are some objectionable points in Strack’s 
system, notably the use of two and three letters to indicate one sound. But in 
almost every respect, the monograph is exactly what an introduction should be. 
Clear and concise, it is not overcharged with ballast unnecessary for the specialist 
and only confusing to the general student, and by confining itself strictly to the 
subject, equally free from private conjectures as well as from any bias, whether 
favorable or unfavorable.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.
University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS.†

As is stated in the preface, this "volume of notes was undertaken at the 
suggestion of Professor Driver, and is mainly intended for students beginning 
the Hebrew language. The notes are taken chiefly from the best German com-
mentaries, and do not aim at originality." Including two brief appendices,—one 
on the structure of Genesis, and the other on the names of God,—there are 380 
pages (7½ in. x 5 in.). The book contains notes, textual, grammatical and exeget-
ical, given as briefly as was consistent with the author’s aim, very seldom so 
briefly as to be unintelligible at the first reading. It is a summary of the 
opinions of the best writers; among commentators, the names of Dillmann and 
Delitzsch occurring most frequently; and among grammarians, those of Gesenius, 
Davidson, Stade, Ewald, for the etymology; and Driver and Aug. Müller, for 
syntax. The readings of the versions are given whenever likely to be of value in 
evidence. In commenting on difficult verses, the author frequently reserves his

* EINLEITUNG IN DEN THALMUD. By H. L. Strack. Leipzig, 1887. Price, M.1.50
† NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS. With two appendices. By G. J. 
own opinion; and when the best interpreters are at variance, he does not often attempt to decide among them. There are exceptions to this; e. g., on page 68, where, in interpreting vi. 3, last clause, he decides against Dillmann.

On this side of the water, this book would not be likely to prove as useful for the mere beginner as for the purpose of a rapid and thorough review, for which it has very great excellencies.

There are some points in which the book is open to criticism. At least one statement is out of date,—the remark that "habal" is a common word for son in Assyrian (p. 48). There are a few infelicities of statement: as that (p. 39) in יַרִיבוּ the tone is drawn back and the vowel lengthened (the vowel is restored, rather, when naturally it takes the tone); also the remark that masculine nouns prefer the numeral in the feminine form, and vice versa, is not quite proper (pp. 71-77); יַרִיבוּ is said to be "pausal form of יַרִיבוּ" (p. 37), and again it is distinguished from יַרִיבוּ said to be "the pausal form of the 1st person" (p. 39), no hint being given that = is here exceptional. Once in a while a translation adopted by our author is ambiguous; as, e. g., that of Gen. ii. 19, "whatever he called them" (p. 32). It is hardly credible that he could have misunderstood Driver ("Heb. Tenses," 2d ed., § 38a), or overlooked Dillmann's interpretation of the verse; but we should know his translation of the final clause, in order to be certain of this; בָּרִיבוּ, Gen. xiii. 12, does not mean "towards Sodom," but "as far as Sodom." It is not usual to speak of חֲרִיבוּ as an apoc. form (p. 10).

Some exceptions may be taken in which the theory of vowel changes here presented. Many distinguished grammarians will object to calling = a short vowel in יַרִיבוּ, יַרִיבוּ (p. 10). On page 5, the author explains יַרִיבוּ as "imperf. apoc. form יַרִיבוּ, for יַרִיבוּ, weakened from יַרִיבוּ (like יַרִיבוּ from יַרִיבוּ, weakened from יַרִיבוּ)." He seems to mean that the = before = is the attenuated = which came from = of the stem. If this is his meaning, he has misunderstood his reference to Gesenius, where it is correctly stated that the final = is a helping vowel, and that the stem vowel = has been reduced to שַׁוָּא in יַרִיבוּ. Cf. the pausal forms יַרִיבוּ, יַרִיבוּ, which not only have the =, but restore and heighten the original = to =. Cf. also יַרִיבוּ and יַרִיבוּ on our author's opposite page (4). Can the author mean (p. 181) that יַרִיבוּ of the 3 fem. perf. omits שַׁוָּא in order to distinguish that pers. from the 2 fem. ? With his explanation of יַרִיבוּ here given cf. a note in HEBRAICA for April, 1885, p. 250. The author is to be commended for general consistency in transliterations; as, e. g., Onqelos, p. vi, 4, etc.; Onq., p. 18, 37, etc.; Peshiṭṭo, p. xii; but why transliterate "Kain," pp. 47, 48, etc., and "Kri," pp. 81, 204, etc.? Presumably, he followed Driver in the first instances ("Tenses," p. 161, though "Onk." occurs on p. 308, probably by oversight), and he has the same authority for going farther ("Qri," "Tenses," p. 161, 204). Only one error in reference has been discovered by the present writer, that on p. 13, where the note on ii. 3 is probably intended for the reference i. 7.

These are of minor importance, and in no wise affect the general accuracy of the book. It is recommended to all who may wish to refresh themselves in Hebrew grammar and to make a rapid survey of the best opinions on the Book of Genesis. As a summary of these, it is in every way admirable.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN,
Newton Theol. Institution.
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THE HEBREW PENTAMETER.
BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Hebrew pentamer is measured by five beats of the rhythmical accent. The caesura usually comes after the third beat; but not infrequently after the second, so as to give a variation to the movement. The greater portion of Hebrew poetry is in the trimeter movement, the greater portion of the remainder is pentamer. The tetrameters and hexameters are less numerous.

The pentameter line is often treated as if it was composed of two lines in parallelism. But the second half of the pentameter line is not in such marked parallelism with the first as the second line of a trimeter poem. It is rather supplementary to the first half, even when parallelism appears.

1) The first specimen of the pentameter that we shall give is the alphabetical dirge contained in Lamentations iii. This dirge has twenty-two strophes in which the initial letter of the strophe begins with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet in the order from נ to ז. But the alphabetical structure is not confined to the initial letters of the strophes. Each strophe contains three lines and each line begins with the characteristic letter of the strophe. We shall give four of these strophes as specimens of the twenty-two. Bickell makes these lines of twelve syllables in accordance with his theory of the structure of Hebrew verse. In general, his lines of twelve syllables correspond with our pentamer.

ña
אַחַי וּבְשֵׁם עַבְרָהָא
אוֹתָי וּנְהַוָא יִלְךָ֥ הַשֵּׁלַחְלָא
אַרְבָּאָא יִשְׁבֶּי הָפָא יִתְוָא קָלְרֵהוֹמ

*2
The only changes in the Massoretic text are insertions of Maqpephs between הָאוֹר (line 1); נֵבְּרָי (line 3); לֶאָרֶצַּנּא (line 7); עֶרֶב (line 8); (line 10), all of which changes are in accordance with good usage. The lines have the caesura after the third beat of the accent, except in lines 2 and 6; the latter being the only tetrameter line among the twelve. We have seen that there are occasional dimeter lines among the trimeters, and trimeter lines among the tetrameters; so we are not surprised to find a tetrameter among these pentameters.

It will be seen that the parallelism is between the pentameter lines rather than between the two parts of the pentameters; the second half of the pentameter gives a supplementary statement. In some cases this is akin to parallelism, as in lines 4 and 9; but it is noteworthy that in the latter the verb is omitted, showing its dependence upon the first half of the line, and in the former it is really complementary, in that the treatment of the bones is added to the flesh and skin.

2) The second specimen that we shall give is two strophes of the great alphabetical poem in praise of the Divine Word, Psalm cxix. We have here twenty-two strophes, and each strophe is composed of 8 lines, and each line of the strophe begins with the characteristic letter of the strophe. The pentameter movement is clear, and the lines are distinctly marked off by the letters of the alphabet. Bickell also regards the lines of this poem as composed of twelve syllables.
The Hebrew Pentameter.

We remove the Maqeph in א, line 6, between אל and מצותא, which has made it a very long word of six syllables; between ב and העונין in א, line 8; between א and הרשון in ב, line 2, and between פך and ימשפים in ב, line 5. We insert Maqeph between ימשפים בישהר-לבב in א, line 7, and ב in ב, line 3, in both cases having no more than five syllables. There is but a single tetrameter line in the sixteen, namely, in ב, line 7.

3) We shall now give a pentameter prayer with a refrain. This prayer is given in Jonah II. It has two strophes of six lines each; closing with עליהו, קריש, and a broken strophe of three lines without a refrain. It seems that the author of Jonah used an older poem, or so much of it as suited his purpose, leaving the third strophe unfinished.

I.

קרישה, מצרה-ל, אל הזוה עיונית,
מכסה שואל, שוררתו, שמשת קהל,
ורשלונים, מוצלחת כבל-חיים, תודה י скачבי
כל משבך, מבוא נלך עליה עבורה,
וזן-אמוה; נמנים鉄 אצתי
אצל אוסמי לדורים, אל-יתלב קריש

II.

אפגאני, ימים יציבנים | זוהי י скачבי,
מק חוכמה לארץ | לקצוץ הורמים
ירחי, זארא | ברוחה, בעיナイ, עלילה
There are three pentameter distichs, the first distich has synonymous parallelisms, the second progressive parallelisms, and the third antithetical parallelism. The caesura is usually after the third beat, but in the fifth line it is after the second beat.

In the second strophe the Massorites made an unfortunate separation of verses 6 and 7. לֵכֶּרֶם הָרִים goes with the previous line as its complement, making the first distich of this strophe synonymous. The second distich then begins with יִרְדָּם and is antithetical, the second line begins with לוֹעַל. The closing distich is synonymous.

With this change we have again a symmetrical strophe of six pentameter lines exactly like its mate with the refrain. We have found no occasion to change the Massoretic Maqqephns thus far in this piece. But in the fragment of the third strophe we remove the Maqqephns between לְבַלָּל and אַשָּׁר (line 1) and between לְבַל and לֵך. The latter must be removed on account of the caesura, which is immediately before the verb; the former might remain and give us a tetrameter line.

4) The Pilgrim Psalms cxx.—cxxxiv. are all pentameters, with the single exception of the long cxxxii., which is a trimeter that in other respects seems out of place in this little collection. They are fine specimens of pentameters, and the study of the poetical structure aids in the interpretation.

We have seen that Bickell’s lines of twelve syllables correspond in general with our pentameters. It is interesting to note that he makes all these Pilgrim Psalms, except cxxxii., of the measure of seven and five, that is, seven syllables in the first line, five in the second, seven in the third and five in the fourth, and so on. The only difference from his metre of twelve syllables is in breaking the line in two; there is no difference in the sum total of syllables. In this Bickell is mistaken, the poems are really the same in their structure as those already considered.

Psalm CXX.

אלּיְדוֹה בַּעוֹרָה יְלָוָתְיָהּ וְקָרָאתָיוּיָהּ
יִרוֹחַ הָעֲלוֹת נְפַשְׁיָהּ מְשַׁמִּירֵךְ מְלַשְׁמָרוֹתָהּ
מִשְׁתַּאֲרוֹתָהּ וְעָשְׁתוּתָהּ מְלַשְׁמָרוֹתָהּ
This Psalm gives eight pentameter lines. We notice one of the features of the Pilgrim Psalm, the repetition of certain catch-words, e. g., רמיה, מַלְשָׁן, and שלום making a sort of marching rhythm.

Psalm CXXI.

The first line reappears in the second, making this synonymous distich complete in itself. The יי of line 3 is taken up in line 4, and the יי of line 4 appears in line 5 and becomes the catch-word of the rest of the poem, in lines 7 and 8. It is possible that יי of the last line arose by the copyist’s eye catching the first word of the upper line. But the Masorites insert a Maqeph between יי and there is no reason, from the rhythm, why it should be omitted.

Psalm CXXII.
This poem of ten lines is composed throughout of pentameter lines. Only one emendation is necessary. We agree with Bickell in removing נאב from line 6 before כָּפַר. It has come in from the margin, or the mind of the scribe. The line is sufficiently clear without it, and it disturbs the rhythm. We notice the catch-words יִרְשָׁלֶם and שָׁלוֹם.

Psalm CXXIII.

The first and second lines are evidently pentameters. The third line is a tetrameter as it stands. It is probable that דָּנָה has been rubbed off at the beginning. The fourth line is a pentameter. כֹּל should be combined with עִינוּיָה by a Maqqeph. This gives us a synonymous tetrameter. In the fifth line the Massoretic יִוְרָה has slipped in, as often elsewhere in Hebrew literature; we strike it out therefore. The last verse is difficult. The כֹּל very properly reads לֵלֶכֶת יִוְרָה which gives us a pentameter for the last line, but leaves us with a trimeter in the previous line. לֵלֶכֶת is not good grammar before רְשָׁאָנִים. It seems likely that a second לֵלֶכֶת, a proper construct without the article was originally there, and that it was omitted by a copyist's mistake. The omission of repeated words is as common in copying as the repetition of words by mistake. If we restore it, we remove the fault of grammar, give the verb an object in the same line; make it a pentameter line like all the others in the poem, and give another example of the repetition of a catch-word. The marching rhythm then comes complete and is carried on from the beginning to the end, in לֵלֶכֶת and עִינוּיָה. The closing tristich is a fine example of progressive parallelism, in which the first half of the second line is synonymous with the last half of the first, and the second half is progressive thereto. The first half of the third line is synonymous with the second half of the second line, and the second half of the third line is synonymous with the second half of the first line. We have not space for all of the Pilgrim Psalms, and accordingly will select a few others.

Psalm CXXV.
The Massorites have divided verses 1 and 2 unfortunately. יעהמ כותב, and thus we have a fine specimen of introverted parallelism with the third line, in which the first half of the second line is synonymous with the second half of the third, as the second half of the first line with the first half of the third, and the three lines make a tristich. We next have a progressive distich, which is followed by an antithetical distich and a trimeter refrain.

Psalm CXXVI.

The divine name יי, by scribal error, appears in the Massoretic text of lines 3 and 4 with יי, where it was unnecessary, as the subject of the verb is clear from the context. We have stricken it out. We also follow the קי in line 5, reading ישיבת. We correct the scribal blunder of line 1, and read ישיבת for the ישיבת which has arisen by transposition of the letters קי. The changes of the Maqquphs can hardly be objected to with propriety. They are made to accord with good usage. The removal of a Massoretic Maqquph between ה and ה in the last line makes it more harmonious with הילע of the previous line. This Psalm is composed of two tetrastichs; they are both of great beauty. The first is an example of introverted parallelism. The first and fourth lines are synonymous throughout. The second line is synonymous with the last half of the first and fourth lines; and the third line is synonymous with the first half of these lines. The second tetrastich is entirely different in structure. The second line is progressive to the first; and is of the tetramer movement in order to bring out a strong antithesis between its two equal members.
This antithesis then expands in the antithetical lines that follow, where the third line is synonymous with the first half of the second, and the fourth line with its second half.

Psalm CXXX.

The Massoretic text obscures the movement in several places. נַחֲרָי slipped into the first line and was the occasion of an incorrect division of the verses. We agree with Bickell and strike it out. Then we have a distich of pentameters in which there is introverted parallelism between the halves of the lines. The second distich is antithetical. In the three lines that follow, the Massoretic accentuation and verse divisions destroy the poetry altogether. We therefore discard them and follow the LXX., and thereby gain not only the pentameter but also a better parallelism. As the first line begins with כִּכְלֵה, the sixth line begins with its synonymous כִּכְלֵה. The transition from the first person of the verb to נִמְשָׁם is in accordance with the change from אִּנַּהְקָא to אִנַּהְקָא in Psalm III. 5. We have, moreover, another parallelism between מַלְאָנִי לֵבִכָּר and making the first half of the sixth line synonymous with the second half of the fifth line. The seventh line begins with שֵׁמָרְיָמְלָבָכָר, which is another example of the marching movement so common in these Psalms, and it results in another case of introverted parallelism between these two lines. These three lines are accordingly bound together in synonymous parallelism. The eighth line is now synonymous with the fourth, and the ninth line is in strong antithesis with the third; so that our Psalm is really composed of an opening distich of prayer for redemption; and a concluding heptastich of great beauty setting forth the assurance of the redemption of Israel.

5) We shall now give the dirge of Babylon (Isa. xlvii), which is one of the finest pieces in the Old Testament.

I.

רֵדֵו רַעְשָׁא עֲלֵי-עֶפֶר | בֶּרֶכְהָה בּ-כַּ-בֹּכֶל
שְׁאי לַצְּרְיָא | תְּאָכְסָא | בּ תֶּשְׁרָמ
This strophe is composed of a tristich of two synonymous lines with third progressive thereto; and a tetrastich of three synonymous lines with the fourth progressive to it. Lines 3 and 4 might be taken as three tetrastichs, but they are better as we have given them, the first of them referring to bondage, the second to exile.

II.

כל醛 התוספת יקרויכר | רבח Nugn nu.
קרוי רחמים ומוחין-כתה | גלץ צמרך.
השפר שלל נל-שישק | עבורי נרהוור.
נחל עוזריך | נג חראת ותפרך.
נכם אאת | לא א芬兰 אדות

I agree with Eichhorn and Cheyne that the line נאלם ייזרה צבאות שם | קרום ישראל has come in from the margin as a scribal exclamation of praise. It disturbs the thought of the piece as well as the structure of the strophe. I also agree with Cheyne in separating from לא שמה | עיר, where it gives no good sense, and in attaching it to ברה in line 6.

This strophe begins with an imperative, and its first and second lines resemble the second and third lines of the previous strophe, so that we have a progressive distich. A progressive tristich takes up the middle of the strophe, and it concludes with a synonymous distich.

III.

ntaxת שמעייאתא ערזיה | דישכת נבטה.
אמרה רבך | אגי אמש עז.
לא תשאש אלתנה | לא אראש שבל.
תבואנה על שטח-אלה | ונצם בימים אחור.
שכל אלמל | חמש טאל עילך.
ברב שמש | מעצה המר.
תבמות תרעך | אמהי טל ראני.
This strophe also begins with an imperative, and corresponds with לְכָּל of the previous strophes, לְכָּל of the first line reappears in of the last line. The strophe is a heptastich in which there is a sort of introverted parallelism about the fourth line as a centre.

IV.

וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
והָאָרֶץ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה
וְאֵלֶּה בֵּיתֶךָ בַּכָּל | הַיְוָרֵעָה

We insert מֵעָלִי at the beginning in accordance with the LXX. and the usage of the poet to begin each strophe with an imperative or jussive. We follow the LXX. and Arabic Versions, and omit the Massoretic אָלֶּה from the last line. The sixth line is quite long. It is possible that הַיְוָרֵעָה is a marginal insertion from line 6 of the previous strophe, with which it is parallel. The opening distich of this strophe corresponds with that of the previous strophe, the second line being the same with the exception of the substitution of י with Imperfect for the Participle with the article, and the first lines are synonymous. We next have a synonymous tristich which corresponds with lines 4 and 5 of the previous strophe. The strophe ends with a synonymous distich which also corresponds with the last distich of the previous strophe. The entire strophe is accordingly synonymous with the previous strophe.

V.

זֵכֵרְנֵנִי וֹיָרֵעָה | וֹיָרֵעָה הָעָרִים דְּבָרֵי בַּכָּל
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ
זָמְרוּ לַהֲרוּשִׁים | מַעַּרַשׁ יִהְיוּ עֲלֵיךְ

This strophe begins with a jussive on account of its reference to the magicians. The מֵעָלִי of the first line is the catch-word of the strophe that reappears in מֵעָלִי of the last line. The strophe as a whole is progress-
ive to the previous pair of strophes. The opening distich has synonymous parallelism between the second member of the first line and the first member of the second, but the second member of the second line is progressive to the first member of the first line. The middle of the strophe is a synonymous tristich. The strophe comes to an end with a progressive distich.

We have selected the above specimens of the pentameter, not only to show the pentameter movement where it is evident in the alphabetical poems, but also in order to show the help the study of poetry gives to the criticism of the text, and so an understanding of the parallelism upon which the interpretation depends.

Our next paper will treat of the Hebrew Hexameter.
THE TARGUM TO JEREMIAH.

BY PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

It may be taken as generally conceded that the Targums, although based substantially on the Massoretic text, yet occasionally show traces of variation. The amount and value of such variation has not yet been definitely settled however, and, in investigating the text of Jeremiah, I have been led to look into the Targum. The results are embodied in this paper.

I have used for comparison the Hebrew text of Jablonsky (Berlin, 1889), mainly, because my copy has a wide margin, convenient for notes. Wherever this paper speaks of M.T. (=Massoretic text) this edition is meant. As this edition has a good reputation for correctness, it may be taken as fairly representative of the accepted Hebrew.

The text of the Targum is notoriously in a bad condition, and the means of correcting it are inaccessible in this country. The printed copies may be arranged in three classes—that of Bomberg repeated in Buxtorf,1 (b) that of the Antwerp and Paris polyglotts (a), and that of Lagarde,2 Codex Reuchlinianus, (r), the oldest known manuscript, at least the oldest that can be dated with certainty. These three have been collated by Cornill in the Zeitschrift fuer die Altertumsverrichtliche Wissenschaft, 1887, pp. 178 sqq. I have relied upon this collation in comparing the Targum with the Hebrew.

The Targum to Jeremiah presents the characteristics of the other Targums. A considerable portion of it may be called a close translation. In many cases, however, it expands by the insertion of words or phrases. In others, it paraphrases or interprets. Instead of figurative expressions, it sometimes gives their direct meaning as understood by the translator. Especially where the Hebrew is obscure it is apt to give a paraphrase, and in these passages it is sometimes difficult to make out the text which the translator had before him. An example or two will illustrate these features. The very first verse of the book will serve. The Hebrew has “The words of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah, of the priests who were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin.” The Targum renders “The words of prophecy of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah, of the chief of the priests of the prefects that were in Jerusalem, the man who had received his inheritance in the land of Anathoth, in the land of the tribe of Benjamin.” I have italicized the additions which

1 According to Cornill (Ezechiel p. 118) Walton’s polyglott has Buxtorf’s text with the Antwerp translation, “adapted” in places.

2 Prophetae Chaldaeae. Paulus Lagarde e fide codicis reuchliniani edidit. Lipsiae, 1872.
are here quite extensive. It would seem at first sight that a translator who allows himself such liberties could not be relied upon at all. After a little, we see however, that the additions are generally limited to certain cases that can be easily distinguished. The names Judah, Benjamin, etc., are generally preceded by the word tribe, as though it were the translator's habit to speak of them in this way. The desire to avoid anthropomorphisms will account for a large number of cases. The Word of Jehovah is expanded into the Word of prophecy from before the Lord. Where God himself speaks in the first person the Targum substitutes My Word (ד"ר). In i. 8, Jeremiah says "Jehovah put forth his hand and touched my mouth," the Targum renders "The Lord sent forth the words of his prophecy and arranged [them] in my mouth." Jeremiah's strong expression (addressed to God) "thou hast surely deceived this people" (tv. 10) is softened into "false prophets are deceiving this people." So where the prophet (under the influence of strong emotion, no doubt) says (xiv. 8, 9), "Why shouldst thou be like a stranger in the land, and like a traveler who turns aside to lodge? why shouldst thou be like a man taken by surprise, like a strong man not able to save?" the Targum gives us "Why should thy wrath descend upon us and we be like sojourners in the land and like a traveler that turneth aside to lodge? why should thy wrath descend upon us and we be driven about and forsaken when thou art a strong man able to save?" As an example of interpretation in translating, we may notice i. 11. The prophet sees an almond rod according to Hebrew. In the Targum he sees a king watching to do evil. For a boiling pot with its face to the North is put a king raging like a pot and his army marshalled and coming from the face of the North. In ii. 1, thy coming after me in the wilderness is rendered or paraphrased—that they believed in my word and came after my two messengers after Moses and Aaron in the wilderness for forty years. The priests are not allowed to say (ii. 7) "where is Jehovah," but—let us fear before the Lord. The lions of the Hebrew (ii. 15) become kings in the translation. One curious case is where Ebed-Melech, the Cushite, is translated "a servant of King Zedekiah," as though Zedekiah were called the Cushite in derision. These examples, which might be multiplied tenfold without difficulty, will suffice to show the method of the translator. The immediate question is, whether, in spite of the difficulties arising from the method, the Targum is of any real help to us in throwing light upon the Hebrew. In order to answer this question, we must leave out of view all these eccentricities of interpretation and consider only those cases which seem to indicate a various reading. Strictly speaking a variant exists only where the consonantal text is affected. We suppose the Targumist not to have been acquainted with the Masoretic vowel points. In a few cases he pronounced a word differently from what the punctuators indicate. These variants (in a minor sense) may at least be mentioned. We read in tv. 2 "I have destroyed the daughter of Zion." The Targum renders דַיְמָעָה, apparently taking it as a second person feminine דַיְמִי.
The fuller form (with yodh) is found elsewhere in Jeremiah. In ii. 13, יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי is translated as though it were יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי (so LXX.); xvi. 17 for יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי Targum and LXX. read יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי; xxxiii. 26 יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי is translated יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי (== יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי). This is to be sure a variation in the consonants, but the omission or insertion of a vowel letter is extremely common. In xxx. 13 the noun יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי is translated as though it were יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי; xxxvi. 15, יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי of the Hebrew becomes יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֵנֵי; li. 17 "for a lie is his image," the Targum has "for a lie have they cast"—טְנָבִים for יִנְבִּים.

The real variants may be divided into two classes: those in which the Targum agrees with the LXX, and those in which the Targum has not this support. Readings of the former class have a strong probability in their favor owing to the independent nature of their testimony. If I have correctly observed the facts, the Targum and the LXX agree together as against the M.T. in the following instances: iii. 18, "which I made your fathers inherit": their fathers.1 IV. 8, "for thus saith Jehovah to the men of Judah and to Jerusalem": to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. IV. 8, "heat of the wrath of Jehovah": omit of the wrath. IV. 26, "from before his wrath": and from before. VII. 27, "all these words": omit all. IX. 6, "for what shall I do on account of the daughter of my people": on account of the evil of the daughter of my people. XI. 19, "let us destroy the tree": saying come and let us destroy.72 XVII. 13, "and ye shall serve there other gods day and night because I will not show you mercy": הַלֹּחַ הָיוּ לֹא לָכֵי, the Targum לֹא לָכֵי הַלֹּחַ. The LXX. has αὐτῷ ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ἔλεος, the Targum לָכֵי הַלֹּחַ הלָכֵי הַלֹּחַ. The former points to יִנְבִּים; of the latter I am not quite certain, though it certainly is not the natural translation of the M.T. We can account for the change from יִנְבִּים on dogmatic reasons (it seemed to recognize the real existence of other gods),3 and perhaps the same reasons would lead the Targum to make its rendering indefinite. [I, Jehovah] "try the reins and to give" (xvii. 15): omit and. "Jehovah hath saved thy people" (xxxiii.): his people. "And they turned to me back and not face and to teach [לְוֹמִים] them rising early and teaching (xxxii. 38) (לְוֹמִים): LXX. has καὶ ἔδησάν (== and I taught them). Targum לְוֹמִים רַחְמֵיהֶם יַךְ עָבַרְנָה נַפְסֵיהָ אֲשֶׁר יְהֹוָה is the original of both and is exactly the form needed. It may have been corrupted by the following לְוֹמִים. XXXIV. 5, "and ' alas Lord! shall they mourn for him?": omit and. XXXV. 17, "Jehovah God of Hosts": Jehovah of Hosts. As I pointed out recently, interpolations of this kind are very frequent.4 "All the former words which were upon

1 I put the Massoretic reading first, then, after a colon, that in which the two versions agree.
2 In this case the insertion of the word saying is almost necessary to the sense of a translation. It is possible, therefore, that both versions put it in without authority from their text.
3 I owe this observation to Professor Stade.
4 Even here the testimony of the Targums is not homogeneous, nor is that of the LXX. But on the principle that the versions are more likely to be corrected into conformity with the M.T. than to be changed away from it we may assume the discrepant MSS. to preserve the original especially when two (one from each version) agree.
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the former roll (xxxvii. 28): omit the italicized word. To Jeremiah, the prophet (xxxvii. 6): omit the prophet. This again is a case of frequent occurrence, and although only one edition of the Targum has the shorter text, its concurrence with the LXX. is significant. In xl. 5, the translators seem not to have had our present text before them, and agree in substituting שָׁלוֹם for שָׁלוֹם (LXX. εἰ καὶ ὑστ., Tar. יִשָׂכְלֹם). "And Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah" (xl. 8): and Johanan, son of Kareah. XLI. 10, "the daughters of the king": insert and. XLII. 22, "with famine": and with famine. L. 11 insert י before the second י in L. 29, both versions agree with the Qərî in inserting וָלָא.

If any reader will look at these passages in his Hebrew Bible I am sure he will find the internal evidence in their favor in every case unless it be the one already noted, xi. 19. To be sure the list is not very large and the corrections are of no great importance. Textual criticism, however, deals with minutiae. The list of passages in which the Targum alone indicates a various reading is larger. It is as follows:

II. 6, "from the land of Egypt": from Egypt. II. 9, "therefore I will yet strive with you": omit yet. II. 16, omit יָיָמַר קָרַבּ but insert it after אֵלָי. III. 20, "surely a woman rebels from her companion, so have ye rebelled against me": surely like as [כָּל מֹרֶם] a woman. III. 21, "the weeping of the supplications [כִּבֵּץ תְּהֵבָנָה] of the children of Israel": the children of Israel weep and sigh [כִּבֵּץ וַנְאָה רָבָּה מַהְמַתֶּנָה]. IV. 28, omit י before חָנָם. IV. 29 makes a difficulty because בָּהָי חָנָם in the next clause refers back to this: בָּהָי חָנָם is the reading of the Targum; the LXX strikes out the article reading בָּהָי חָנָם, showing that both felt difficulty. The latter is more likely to be the original text, and possibly the Targum gives a free translation of this. IV. 50, "lovers have rejected thee": thy lovers— for גָּוָלִים גָּוָלִים: all their princes are rebels = כל שׁרָתָם מִורֶם. X. 4, "with silver and with gold he decorates it" [הָפָרָה]: he covers it (reading apparently הָפָרָה). X. 8, "the instruction of vanities [מִשְׂפָּר הָבֵלָם], wood is it": and because they served vanities—for of what value are they? [וְעָלָיוֹת לַמֵּשָּׁה הַכִּנָּה אֵין לְאָתָן]. I suspect the Targumist had a different reading for מִשְׂפָּר, though what it was I am not able to say. The latter part of the sentence may be simply a free rendering. X. 21, for read יְשָׁנֵל השכָלִים. XI. 14, "in the time of their crying to me on account of their evil": in the time when thou prayest for them in the time of their evil— בֵּעָר עִלָּיָה for בֵּעָר עִלָּיָה, קָרָא for קָרָא, נַעֲלוֹת for נַעֲלוֹת אָלִי, and נַעֲלוֹת for נַעֲלוֹת אָלִי. The Targum is the more natural reading, as the prophet has just been commanded himself not to pray for the people. XV. 18, "and in all thy borders": omit and. XVII. 1, "your altars": their altars. XVII. 8, "thy high places with sin" [בָּמֶשָּׁה הַכִּנָּה]: for sins because ye were worshiping vanity. This is a paraphrase, but it seems to point to כֹּחְם הַכִּנָּה, simply reversing the order of the two words. This would
make the form נשתם regular also. XVIII. 4, חתמה נשתם pointing to ב instead of כ. XX. 5, "all the treasure of this city"': of this land. XX. 6, "and to Babylon thou shalt come" [חמה: shalt be led [URLConnection probably reading נבות]]. XXI. 14, "and I will kindle a fire in her forest": in her city ["וּלָּו for כָּל]. XXII. 8, insert י before נלע-דה. The preceding word ends in י and the conjunction has probably dropped out under this influence. XXIII. 4, "and shall not be missing" (טֶלַךְ פֶּקֶרֶךְ?): and shall not tremble (evidently reading נֵרוּפָה בֵּרוּפ). XXIII. 8, "and from all the lands": omit all. XXV. 22, "and to your dreams": and to your dreamers of dreams; so also xxix. 8 and xxxiv. 3, and this renders it possible that it is simply a case of free translation. XXVII. 20, omit יְלָה. XXIX. 16, "that inhabits this city": this land. XXX. 21, omit יְלָה. XXX. 23, insert י before פֶּרֶךְ. XXXII. 21, "and with great fear" [נמרוד]: with a great vision [נמרוד]. The Targum seems to have read or understood נShield מקרא. XXXII. 23, insert י before נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ. XXXII. 32, one recension (b) omits נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ. XXXIV. 4, for נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ, which would seem to point to נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ. XXXIV. 9, "to lay service upon them, upon a Jew his brother each man" [נShield בֵּיוֹד הָאָדָם אֵלִי]. The Targum has נShield בֵּיוֹד הָאָדָם אֵלִי and this is the natural order in Hebrew also. נShield בֵּיוֹד הָאָדָם אֵלִי, when used distributively as in this verse, generally comes at the beginning of the clause, as in this same chapter elsewhere, v. 10 נShield אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי כָּבָּד, v. 14 נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי נShield הָאָדָם אֵלִי. XXXIV. 12, (a) omits the first נShield לֹא יִשְׁתָּמְרוֹ, which is certainly redundant in our present text. XXXV. 4, for נShield כְּלָנַן נShield בֵּינֵי נShield כְּלָנַן נShield בֵּינֵי נShield כְּלָנַן נShield בֵּינֵי נShield כְּלָנַן נShield בֵּינֵי. In XXXVIII. 16, Zedekiah swears by Jehovah who made for us this soul; Targum (א) the soul, which is more accurate. XLII. 10, "if returning ye will dwell" [נShield שְׁבֵּה נShield בֵּיהוֹוָה], but it is generally the same verb which is found in the infinitive joined with a finite form. The Targum at least feels the difficulty, for it reads נShield בֵּיהוֹוָה for the second word. The LXX., however, is probably correct in reversing the process and reading נShield בֵּי (καθαίρετες). In XLIV. 3, omit נShield בֵּי (b); LXX. omits the last three words of the verse. In XLIV. 6 (ar) insert י before נShield לָפַת. XLVI. 10 נShield לָפַת.
must be decided in each instance separately. But the indications already given will show that in a considerable proportion of the passages cited (more than half, I judge) the Targum has preserved for us the better text. At least in settling our text it will not be safe to ignore this version.

As I have already indicated it is not always easy to determine when the Targum had our text. I have carefully excluded a number of cases in which nevertheless a different reading may have existed. Some one else may be able to find clear testimony among these uncertain sounds and I will therefore give a list of possible variations.

V. 10, “go up against [or upon] her walls” — הב שחורות, Targum possibly reading בֵּיתךְ הַשָּׁר יִשָּׁר or even בֵּיתךְ הַשָּׁר יִשָּׁר. But as in the same verse we have “her branches” rendered “her citadels” this may be only an instance of interpretation by the translator. XIII. 17, “my soul shall weep because of pride” [ךֵל הַגָּדִים]: because your treasure passes from you—ךֵל בְּּזָרִים. The only way in which I can account for this translation is to suppose the Targum to have read הָלְא or הָלְא. XVI. 7, “and they shall not make them drink the cup of consolation for his father and his mother”: each one for his father (inserting מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו for the עַל מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו of M. T.). If מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו dropped out might be changed to עַל מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו. “We shall take our revenge upon him” (xx. 10): we shall be revenged our revenge upon him. For מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו the Targum may have read מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו. “Rock of the plain” (xxi. 18) [זֵעֲרֵר הָדוֹמֶר]: fortified cities does not seem a natural translation or even interpretation of these words; it seems to imply זֵעֲרֵר הָדוֹמֶר עַעָל בְּזָרִים. In Ps. xxxi. 22 we find עַעָל מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו, עַעָל מִשָּׁר כְּלָיו. XXVI. 10, “the new gate” is in the Targum the eastern gate (so also xxxvi. 10), “And ye shall call me and shall go [בָּרָכְתֶּן] and shall pray to me” (xxxix. 12). For the words in italics the Targum has “and I will hear your prayer” [בָּרָכְתֶּן]. In xxxviii. 22 [בָּרָכְתֶּן]: omit ¶ (b). This is a case where a translator might leave out the conjunction as not necessary to the sense. L. 15, for יִבְדֶל we find מְדֵל. LI. 55, “and will destroy from her a great voice” [כֹּל נֹרֲאָל]: great armies [מְשָׁר מַזְיָא] which would, barring the plural, stand for מְדֵל נֹרֲאָל. LII. 29, the Targum inserts מְדֵל [מְדֵל נֹרֲאָל] before necessary to the sense.

I have not kept a list of the passages where the discrepancy of M. T., LXX. and Targum is so great as to show that no one of the translators was able to make out what his text meant. We should be justified in concluding from such discrepancy that the text has been corrupted beyond present possibility of emendation. This would be only a negative result however. The data which have been presented seem to me to have some positive value.
CYLINDER B OF THE ESARHADDON INSCRIPTIONS (1144 B.C.
BRITISH MUSEUM; III R. 15-16) TRANSLITERATED
AND TRANSLATED.

BY ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH. D.,
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

This cylinder has usually been called the "Broken Cylinder" or C, but I
have preferred to designate it as B, because it is larger, better preserved and,
perhaps, more important than the unnumbered cylinder, which I have called C.¹
B was first published in Layard's Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from
Assyrian Monuments (London, 1851), pp. 54-58, under the title "On lower half
of an Hexagonal object of Baked Clay." It appeared again in III R. 15, 16,
edited by George Smith. This edition is very much better than that of Layard,
but, on account of the extremely bad condition of the original of B, many errors
are to be found in it. Columns I., II. and V. 12-25 were published by Budge in
History of Esarhaddon (London, 1880). Budge's edition is little, if any, better
than George Smith's. Cf. Delitzsch's review in the Literarisches Centralblatt,
May 21, 1881. Column I. 2-25 has been published by Delitzsch in his Assyrische
Lesestuecke, 3d edition, p. 117, No. 7, and by Bruto Teloni in his Chrestomazia
Assira (Firenze, 1887), pp. 60-62; and, finally, Column V., 12-27 by Schrader in
his Zur Kritik der Inschriften Tiglathpileser's II, des Asarhaddon und des Assurbanipal
(Berlin, 1880).

Transliterations of Cylinder B have been published by Menant, Annales des Rois
d'Assyrie (Paris, 1874); by Fox Talbot, Records of the Past, vol. III. and in the
North British Review, 1870, [Column I.]; by Budge, History of Esarhaddon, [Col-
umns I., II. and V. 12-25]; by Delitzsch, in Mürdter's Kurzgefasste Geschichte
Babyloniens und Assyriens (Stuttgart, 1882), p. 207, [Column I. 2-25]; by Teloni,
Chrestomazia Assira, pp. 60-62, [Column I. 2-25]. Cf. also Delitzsch in Wo lag
das Paradies and Schrader in KGF. and KAT.

During the summer of 1885, while working in the Assyrian Room of the
British Museum, I collated Cylinders A and B and copied C. The results of this
collation have been published in the April (1887) number of HEBRAICA and later
in my Leipzig Inaugural-dissertation. Many important and hitherto unnoticed
corrections and readings will be found in these "Textual Notes."

¹ Published for the first time in the October (1887) HEBRAICA. Cf. also my Leipzig Inau-
gural-dissertation, Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions, etc.
There are many difficult words and idioms in Cylinder B and I have offered several new transliterations and translations. In a future number of *Hebraica*, I will discuss, among others, the following words and combinations: ašûr, kuššu, nîtu, kutû, pariktû, nabâlu, mi-šid(?), dâbtu, bâšu, puṭuttu, the names of the eight kings in column IV. 19-22, my combination of the lines 1-10, column V. (hitherto incorrectly understood), V. 7, ešku, aḥaztu (=property, Eigenthum), amuḥbašunu, zak-mukku (=שניד), izkurû (A, r. 42), kullumu, asi, ummân-manda, târid, nâbi', šatu (=šadâdu), aktabišu ahu[lap]?, šaḵatû, askuppât agurrê, bîtanni (=נִבָּי), sikkatu, A, vi. 1-10, A, vi. 18, amkira šurrašun, etc., etc.

In the transliteration, I have practically followed the method of the Delitzsch school. In the October (1887) *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, Paul Haupt proposes another "new system of transliteration for the Semitic sounds." It remains to be seen whether this attempt will survive any longer than his previous one set forth with so much confidence in his *Beiträge zur assyr. Lautlehre*.

To my friend, Mr. Theo. G. Pinches of the British Museum, I am indebted for many readings to be found in the "Textual Notes," which were published in April *Hebraica*, 1887. I am also under obligations to my teacher, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, for many suggestions and renderings.
I. 1. ušarrid ušaḥbit (?) ........
labbiš annadirmâ issâriḥ qabittî
âšșu epêš šarrûti bit abê'a nîpîr (?) šangûti'a
ana Ašûr Sin šamaš Bêl Nabû u Nêrgal

5. Ištar ša Ninâ Ištar ša Arba'il
kâṭî aššaša imturû qibîti
ina anîššu kēni ... takiltu (?)
ištaparûnimâ alîk lâ kalâta
idâka nittallakma ninâra garêka

10. istên úmê šinâ úmê ûl u'kkî pân ummâni'a ûl adgul
arkâ ûl âmur pîkîtî sîsê šîmîtî nîri
ûl unût taḥâzi'a ûl ašûr
ṣîdêṭ girî'â ûl ašpûk
raggu kuşşu Šabâṭu dannat kuşṣi ûl âdur

15. kîma issâri si-si-in-ni mupparšî
ana sakâp za'ēri'a aptâ idâ'a
ḫarrân Ninâ paškiš urruṭiš ardîma
ellamû'a ina iršiti Šanigalbat (?) gîmir kûrâdēšun
šîrûti pân girî'â šâbtûma ušâlû kakkēšun

20. pulûḥti ilânî rabûti bêlê'a isḫupšunâtîma
tîb taḥâzî'a danni êmurûma êmû maḫûtîš (?)
Ištar bêlît ḳabli taḥâzi râ'îmat šangûti'a
idâ'a tâzizma kašatsunu tašbir
taḥâzišûnu raksû tapṭūrma

25. ina puḫrûšunî iḳbü umma annû šarani
ina qibîti šîrtî idâ'a ittanasḫarû iḳbü

Col. II. 1. ...........................................
..... karassu idkêma ana Nin-gal-mu (?)
šalaṭ Ūru ardu dâgil pânî'a
nîtu ilmešuma išbatu mûşâšû

5. ultu Ašûr šamaš Bêl u Nabû Ištar ša Ninâ
Ištar ša Arba'il 网讯 Ašûraḫiddin
ina kussê abê'a tâbüš ušêšibûnîma
Col. I. 1. . . . . . . . . . .
I was fierce like a lion and my heart (Gemüt) was enraged.
To exercise the sovereignty of my father's house and to clothe my
priestly office,
to Ašûr, Sin, Šamaš, Bel, Nabû and Nergal,
5. Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela,
I raised my hand and they looked with favor on my petition.
In their eternal mercy, an oracle
they sent me, viz.: "Go, do not delay;
we will march at thy side and will subjugate thy enemies."
10. One day, two days I did not wait, the front of my army I did not
look upon,
the rear I did not see, the appointments of my yoked horses,
the weapons for my battle I did not inspect,
provisions for my campaign I did not issue.
The furious cold of the month Šabātu, the fierceness of the cold, I
did not fear.
15. Like a flying si-si-in-ni bird
for the overthrow of my enemies, I opened out my forces.
The road to Nineveh, with difficulty and haste, I descended.
Before me in Hanigalbat, all of their lofty warriors
seized the front of my expedition and forced a battle.
20. The fear of the great gods, my lords, overwhelmed them,
the approach of my mighty battle they saw and they became
like . . .
Ištar, the mistress of onslaught and battle, the lover of my priestly
office,
stood at my side and broke their bows.
Their compact line of battle she broke up
25. and in their assembly they cried: "This is our king."

Col. II. 1. . . . . . . . . . .
. . . his camp-baggage he gathered together and against
Nin-gal-mu,
governor of Uru, a servant dependent on me,
with a force he surrounded him and seized his exits.
5. From the time that Ašûr, Šamas, Bēl and Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh,
Ištar of Arbela, me Esarhaddon
on the throne of my fathers, had firmly seated
bēlūt māti ušadgīlū pāni'a šû ûl iplaḫ
nade aḫē ûl iršima arđi ûl umaššir
10. u rakbušu adī maḫri'a
ûl īšpurama šulmu šarrūti'a ûl iš'al
epšētēšu limnētē ina kirib Ninā ašmēma
libbi īgugmā iššariḫ kabittā šudšākē'a
piḫāti ša pāṭi mātišu uma'ir širuššu
15. u šû Nabû-zēr-napišti-uštēšir barānū nabalkattānu
alāk ummānī'a išmēma ana Elamti kī šēlabis innabit
aṣṣu māmit ilāni rabūti ša ēparku1 (?) Ašûr Sin Šamaš
Bēl u Nabû annu kabtu emēdāšuma
kirib Elamti inārūšu ina kakki
20. Naʾid-Marduk aḫūšu epšēt Elamti
ša ana aḫēšu ēteppušū ēmurma
ultu Elamti innabtamma ana epēš ardu'ti'a
ana Aššûr illikamma ušallā bēlūtā
Tāmtim ana siḫirtīša ridūt aḥēšu usadgīl pānuššu
25. šattīšamma lā naparkā itti tamartešu kabitte
ana Ninā illikamma umaššaḫa šēpē'a
Abdimilkūtu šar Šiddīni
lā pāliḫ bēlūti'a lā šēmu zikir šapti'a
ša ellā tāmtim gallati ittakluma islū nīri'a
30. Šiddīni āl tuklatišu ša kirib tāmti nadū
(Cf. Cylinder A, I. 9, sqqu.)

Col. III. . . . (Cf. Cylinder A, II. 6, sqqu.) . . .

1. ina iršit Hûbuš[na(?)] adī gimir ummānišu]
urassiba [ina kakki].

__________________

Akbūs kišādi nišē [Ḫilakki]
Du'u'a šibūt [ḫuršāni]

5. ša tēḫ Tabala . . . .
ša ell šadēšunu dannoṭi [ittakluma]
ultu ūme pāni lā kitnu[ša anna nīri]
XXI ālānišunu dannoṭi adī [ālāni šihrūti]
ša limētišunu alme' ak[šud ašulu šallatsun]

1 This reading is doubtful. The text is badly broken. One can read ő-tē-ku as well as ő-par-ku.
and the dominion of the land had trusted to me, he did not fear, he did not turn aside, and did not cease to be my servant,

10. but his messenger, into my presence,
he did not send, concerning the prosperity of my kingdom he did not ask.

Concerning his evil deeds in the midst of Nineveh I heard and my heart was angry and my liver (or heart) was enraged.
My superior-officers, the prefects of the border of his land, I sent against him

15. and he, Nabu-zêr-napišti-uššir, a robber and rebel, of the march of my army heard, and, like a fox, he fled to Elam.
As the oath of the great gods . . . . . . Ašûr, Sin, Šamaš, Bêl and Nabû, a heavy punishment they placed on him, and in the midst of Elam they subjugated him with the sword.

20. Na'id-Marduk, his brother, the affairs of Elam, which I had done to his brother, saw and from Elam he fled and to become my servant to Assyria came and besought my lordship.
The land of Tamtim, in its whole extent, the dominion of his brother, I entrusted to him.

25. Yearly, without fail, with his heavy present, to Nineveh he came and kissed my feet.
Abdimilkutu, King of Sidon, who did not fear my lordship, who did not listen to the command of my lip,
who trusted to the vast sea and threw off my yoke,
Sidon, his principal city, which is situated in the midst of the sea. [And Tē'uspa of Gimîr, an ummān-manda, whose residence was afar off] in the Ḥuβušna territory, [together with the whole of his army],
I ran through [with the sword].

Col. III.

I trampled on the necks of the men of [Hilakki], Du'u'a, the inhabitants of [the mountain-ridges],
5. which lie in the vicinity of Tabala . . . . ;
who, to their mighty mountains [trusted, and]
from days of old had not been subject [to any yoke];
XXI of their powerful cities, together with [the small cities] of their territory, I besieged, captured, [carried away their spoil],
10. abbul akkur ina isâ[ti akmu] sitûtesunu sa hîtû [u kullultu] là iêâ kabtu nir bêlû'î'a émidunûti.

Adîsh Barnakâ . . . . . . .
âsibûti Tilâshûri sa ina pî [nisê]
15. Mihrûnu Pitânû inambû zikirshûn

Usappîh niše Mannâ kutû là sankan u ummânišu Ispakâ Åguszê kidru là mušezibisho anar ina kakkì.

Ašlul Bit-Dakkûri sa kirib Kaldi aiab Bâbili
20. akmu šamas-ibni šarrišu ishapppu řahbîlû là pâliju zikri bêl bêlê
sa ekłê aplê Bâbili u Barsap ina parîktî itbaluma utêrû ramânûš
ašû anâku puluhtu Bêl u Nabû idû
25. ekłê šâtina utêrma pân aplê Bâbili u Barsap uşadgîl
Nabû-shallim apal Balasu
[ina kus]esèsu ušèsibma išât abšâni.

Col. IV. 1. . . . . . . . . . nišû šèpèšun
. . . . . . . . . ukin ēlisun

[Patušarra na]gû sa itê bit MUN
[sa kirib Mâdâ râkûtîi] sa pâtî Bikni šadu uknê
5. [sa ina šarrâni ab'e'a] mamma là ikbusu iršîtim mâtišun
[Šidirparna Epa]rma ḡazanâti dannûte
[sa là kitnušû ana nî]ri šâšunu aďi nišešunû
[sîsê rukâbëšunu] alpè şeni uduri
[šallatsun kabîttu] ašlûla ana kirib Aššûr.

10. [Bâzu] nagû sa ašaršu râku
[mi-ašîd?] nabâli kaḵkar dâbtu ašar šumâme
[CXL] kasbu kaḵkar bāsi puḵuttu u aban pi-šabîti
ašar širi u âkрабî kîma zirbâbê malû ugaru
XX kasbu Ḥazû šaddî sag-gil-mud
15. ana arki'i'a umašîrma šîtk
10. I destroyed, tore down and with fire [I burned].
Upon the rest of them, who sin [and crimes]
had not committed, I placed the heavy yoke of my lordship.

I trampled upon Barnaki . . . . , . . . 
the inhabitants of Tilašûri who, in the language of [the people]

15. Mihrânu Pitamu they call [their] name.

I scattered the men of Minni, the kûtû, the un submissive
and his army. Ispaka of Azguza—
an alliance that did not save him—I subdued with the sword.

I despoiled Bit-Dakkû, which is in Kaldi, an enemy of Babylon,

20. I bound Šamaš-ibni, its king, a foolish (?), bad person,
who did not fear the renown of the lord of lords,
who had taken away the fields of the Babylonians and Borsippans
by force and had turned them to his own use.
Because I knew the fear of Bêl and Nabû,

25. these fields I returned, to the Babylonians
and Borsippans I entrusted.
Nabû-šallim, son of Balasu,
[on his] throne I placed and he was tribute to me.

Col IV. 1. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
[Patušarra], a district on the borders of . . . . . .
[which is in the midst of the far-off Medes], on the borders of
Bilki, a mountain of alabaster stone,

5. the territory of whose land no one [among the kings, my fathers,
had trodden];
[Šidirparna, Eparna], the powerful city-officers,
[who were not subject to any yoke], they themselves with their men,
[horses, chariots], oxen, sheep, dromedaries,
[their heavy spoil], I carried away into the midst of Assyria.

10. [Bàzû], a district, whose situation is afar off,
[a mi-šid (?)] of land, a wearisome country, a barren place,
[CLX] kasbu of swampy ground, thorny undergrowth, and gazelle-
mouth stone,
where snakes and scorpions, like grasshoppers, fill the country;
XX kasbu of Hâazu, a mountain of sag-gil-mud stone,

15. I left behind me and I marched.
नगु सु'atu शा उत्ते उमे उलुति
ला लिल्कु शारु पानि मह्रि'ा
ина किभि अशुर बेलि'ा इना किर्बितु शल्तानिश अत्तलक
किसु शर हल(?)'दिली अकबरु शर इलि'ाते

20. मानसकु शर मागलानि इपाते शर्रत दिख्रानि
हबिसु शर कादाबा' निजारु शर गापानि
बाइलु शर्रत इलिलु हबाजिरु शर बुदाते
VIII शर् रानि शा किरिब नगे सु'तु आदुक
किमा* . . . अस्ताली पाॅर खरार्डेशुन

25. इलाशिसुनु मानकु रिशुनु बुशासुनु उ निशेशुनु आस्लुला शा किरिब
अशुर
लाले शर इलाइ' शा लापान काक्केता इपपरसिदु]
(Cf. Cylinder A, IV, 41, sqq.)

Col. V. [इना उमेशुमा एकल माहिर्ते शा किरिब निनात]
शा [शर्रानि अःः ल्क माह्रि अबे' आझुः उःपिषुः]
आना सु[तेशुर कराकि पाकादी मुर्निक्के]
पारे नर्कबाती [बेले उनात ताजाती]
उ शलल्त नकिरे गी[मिर मिममा शुम्शु]

5. शा अशुर शर इलानि शा एकि शर्रुति'ा लिरुका
आना जितमुर बीसे जितमुडु नर्कबाती
असुः सु'तु आजिषानिमा निसे मातै तुबुत काट्ति'ा
अलु उमात्कु उसाशिसुनुतिम आलिनु लिबनाती
एकालु शिह्रा सु'तु आना सिहिर्तीशा अःक[कुरमा]

10. खाक्कारु माँ'दु किमा आजातिमा उल्टै लिब्बी एक्लेब [अब्तुक्मा]
एशु उधर्दी इना पिली अबन जादी . . . .
तमले उःमलली एड्के मा शर्रानि हात्ति उ एबिर तांम्ति
* * * * * * *
* * * * * * *

25. उ शर्रानि शा इतानाना कबाल तांम्तिम
नापहर(?), XXII शर्रानि हात्ति आहि तांम्तिम कबाल तांम्तिम कालिशुनु
उमा'रिशुनुतिमा गुशुरे रबुती
(Cf. Cylinder A, V, 15, sqq.)

Col. VI. . . . . (Cf. Cylinder A, VI, 39, sqq.)
शाम्नु रेज्त्तु शाम्नु गु-ला अमुह्मा'शुनु उःश्की
िना किभि अशुर शर इलानि अशुर कालिशुनु
*Cf. Textual Notes, in loco (April Hebrewica, 1887).*
That district, where, from days of old,
no king before me had marched,
by the command of Ašûr, my lord, into its midst I marched victoriously.
Kīsu, king of Haldili; Akbaru, king of Iłpi'ate;
20. Mansaku, king of Magalani; Iapa', queen of Diḫrāni;
 Ḥabisu, king of Kadaba'; Niḥaru, king of Ga'pani;
 Ba'ilu, queen of Ḫilu; Habaziru, king of Buda',
VIII kings of that district I killed.
Like . . . . I cast the corpses of their warriors.
25. Their gods, property, possessions, and men I carried away to Assyria.
Lālē, king of Iadi', who before my weapons [had fled], etc.

Col. V. [At that time, the former palace, which is in Nineveh],
which [the kings, my forefathers had caused to be built];
for the [stowing away of the camp, for the sheltering of the horses]
and bulls, chariots, [weapons, utensils of war],
and the spoil of the enemies, [everything of every description],
5. which Ašûr, the king of the gods, for the strengthening of my kingdom had presented,
for the stalling of the horses, hitching up of the chariots,
that place had become too small for me, and the men of the countries, the booty of my bow,
allu umākku I caused them to carry and they made bricks.
That small palace I tore down entirely, and
10. a large quantity of ground, in accordance with my means, from the midst of the fields I cut off, and added to it. With freestone, a stone of the mountain . . . . I filled out its terrace. I assembled the kings of Ḫatti and beyond the sea, * * * * *
* * * * * * * *
25. and the kings of Iatnana in the midst of the sea—in all XXII kings of Ḫatti, of the sea-coast, of the midst of the sea, all of them;
to all of these I gave my commands, and large beams, etc., etc.

Col. VI. The best oil I offered (??) them, I caused them to drink.
By the command of Ašûr, king of the gods, and the gods of Assyria, all of them,
ina ṭūb šērē ḫud libbi nummur kabitti
5. šēbē littûte kiribša dāriš
lurmēma lušbâ lalâša
ina za-k-m u-k-ki arḫi rēšî kullat murniskê
parê bēlê gammalê unût taḥâzi
gimîr ummâni šallat nakirê
10. šattîšamma lá naparkâ lupkîda kiribša
kirib ēkallî šātu sēdu damku lamassu damku
nāṣir kibsi šarrûti‘a muḫadū kabitti‘a
etc., etc., etc.

[Cf. HEbraICA, Jan., 1888, and my “Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions, etc.,” where B, VI. 13-23, is transliterated and translated.]
in health of body, joy of heart, cheerfulness of spirit,

5. abundance of offspring, in its midst continually
may I dwell and may its fullness be sufficient.
On the beginning of the year, in the first month, all of the horses,
bulls, camels, weapons, utensils of war,
all the soldiers, the spoil of my enemies,

10. yearly, without fall, may I store away within it.
Within this palace, may gracious bull-divinities and gracious
colossi,
protecting the footsteps of my majesty, causing my spirits to
rejoice, etc., etc.
Notes on the Psalms.

By Samuel Davidson, D. D., LL. D.,


II. 12. The correct translation is that given by Jerome, "adorate pure" worship purely. See my "On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament," p. 57.

IV. 8. See the "Fresh Revision," p. 72.

VI. 11. The Imperfects in this verse should be rendered "they shall be," etc.; not "let them be."

VIII. 2.גְּלָי. This is a difficult form. It is an Imperative, not an Infinitive, and is differently explained by critics. If the reading be genuine, the translation is "which glory of thine set thou above the heavens (also)." Verse 5. See "Fresh Revision," p. 78.

XII. 7. הַיִלְדוֹת crucible, of earth? Ewald's translation is improbable. Hupfeld's "in the earth" gives a doubtful meaning to ה prefixed.

XVI. 3. Perhaps the best way to take this difficult verse is to render "as to the saints who are in the land and the nobles, all my pleasure is in them." Ewald's exposition of this Psalm is not good; Hupfeld's is somewhat better. In the tenth verse the singular reading "thy pious one" is not original, and the plural, "thy pious ones," is right. Verse 5.׳יָעַל, cf. Gesenius and Ewald on the word. The latter not so good as the former. It is the Particle of Qal (Lehrgebäude, p. 308). Internal evidence fails to find a suitable occasion for this Psalm in the life of David. It does not agree well with his position when he was in the wilderness of Ziph (see 1 Sam. xxvi. 19). A much later time than David's must be assigned to it. Verse 4.׳יָהַד. This verb means here as elsewhere to buy; "who buy another (god)." The rendering adopted by many, exchange, is not exactly suitable; for it requires a peculiar supplementing, exchange (Jehovah) (for) another; or the improbable, take in exchange another. Other observations on this Psalm may be found in my "Revision of the English Old Testament," pp. 67, 68.

XVIII. Hupfeld unnecessarily and with weak reasons denies the Davidic authorship. The last two verses proceed from a later hand than the preceding part.

XIX. This Psalm is made up of two separate pieces. Ewald is wrongly blamed by Jennings and Lowe for holding this opinion. The first part is badly translated in the authorized version. The latter part of verse 4 is incorrect in Kamphausen. Verse 5. יָד not sound, as Gesenius and Ewald suppose,
but *measure, expanse, region*, what a measuring-line stretches over. Here Hupfeld is right. The fourth verse does not agree well with 3 and 5, and it has therefore been interpreted in various ways.

**XXII. 17.** The best way to interpret the verse is, "they enclose me, my hands and feet, like the lion;" i.e. they enclose my whole person, enclose me altogether so that I cannot escape. Hupfeld's note on the verse is excellent; and Gesenius has also a good one upon it (Thesaurus, p. 671). Ewald's is disappointing. The versions generally take the word *as the lion* for a verb, ὑπερχως, ἡθχιωσαν, vinxerant, foderunt; but a verb is not easily got out of the Masoretic reading, which must be altered for the purpose. It is utterly improbable that it is a participle, instead of a noun, in the plural construct; and to render it as "piercing" is an unlucky guess. To say with Ewald that the present reading is owing to Christian-Jewish polemics, is mere conjecture. It is superfluous to state that the 22d Psalm is not Messianic. How could the Messiah speak as in the 7th verse? If some parts be applied to Christ in the New Testament that is no sound reason for thinking that the original writer meant it so. A pious sufferer in the time of the exile is the speaker; and his enemies are heathen persecutors. I do not believe that he personifies the Jewish people. Rather does he speak in his own name and of himself.

**XXV. 11.** The verb יָנָחַלְנָה is difficult of explanation; and the grammars do not present a satisfactory solution of it. See Ewald's Lehrbuch, § 344 b. Nordheimer's Grammar, vol. II. § 985. 1. Gesenius's by Roediger, English translation, § 126 d. The entire subject of the Hebrew tenses is not yet cleared up; and I know that Hupfeld, despairing of getting a satisfactory solution of the problem, abandoned the publication of his Hebrew grammar after its commencement. Too many divisions and distinctions have been introduced. In the present case it is probable that the writer neglected to write a verb just before that which perplexed the reader. As the passage stands, the י conversive prefixed to the Perfect, or as some prefer to call it Waw consecutive, gives it the sense of an Imperfect or Future which, expressing strong hope or assurance, is allied to the Imperative of supplication, "pardon mine iniquity." I am fully aware that this is an imperfect explanation; but it is better than those offered in the grammars.

**XXIX. 2.** In holy or festal adornment, angels being conceived as clothed in festal dress before God's throne. Hupfeld's explanation is incorrect here; but De Wette, following Gesenius, has rightly interpreted the phrase.

**XXXII. 9.** The last clause of this verse is extremely difficult. I translate it, "With bit and bridle their youth must be bound; they do not come near thee otherwise." As the noun יָנָחַלְנָה occurs in Psalm cxx. 5, meaning time of life, it probably means the same here; especially youth, implying vigor, strength. Many understand it in the sense of ornament or trappings. Hupfeld's inter-
pretation seems far-fetched; and Kamphausen gives no clear solution. One is tempted to suppose the text corrupt. Ewald gives a meaning to 'יְשָׁן which cannot be accepted, viz.: cheek; so that his interpretation turns aside from the true one.

XXXVI. 3. This is a most perplexing verse. I should render it, "For it (the oracle of transgression within his heart) has made it smooth to him in his eyes so as to find his iniquity [and] to hate;" in other words, the secret utterances of the wicked man's heart make the way of finding out his iniquity and cherishing hatred an easy thing to him. It gives him satisfaction both to seek out his misdeeds, and gratify his hatred. The long, elaborate and ingenious note of Hupfeld is not convincing. Nor can I adopt altogether the interpretation given by Ewald. Kamphausen wavers. The true sense turns in a great degree on the subject of יְשָׁן whether it be God or the oracle.

XXXVII. 38. It is almost unnecessary to remark that the latter clause of this verse is wrongly translated in the received version. The correct rendering spoils the text for funeral sermons. It is, "that there is a posterity to the man of peace;" posterity being a blessing under the Old Testament. Gesenius has properly recorded this signification, but the present passage is not given in his examples of it. None but Hengstenberg would deny that the Hebrew word has the sense in question.

XXXIX. 8. The first half of this verse can only mean "I was dumb in silence, I held my peace without gladness," etc., or, "far from joyfulness I was silent." The difficult word is rightly explained by Hupfeld and Kamphausen; wrongly by Ewald, who has "I was silent of the good" (I missed). Delitzsch renders most improbably "without prosperity," that is, without taking note of it; while Jennings and Lowe resort to the far-fetched sense: without [gaining] any good [therefrom]. DeWette's note and translation are unsatisfactory, "I was silent from everything," good as well as evil.

XLII. 5. This verse, upon which many interpretations and comments have been spent, may be best translated, "These things will I call to mind, and pour out my soul in me, that I passed in the multitude, walked in solemn procession to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, a festival-keeping throng." The psalmist expresses his remembrance of the past, rather than his longing and hope in relation to the future. Hupfeld accumulates a variety of opinions about the different words of the verse, amid which the reader may easily lose a clear apprehension of the critic's own interpretation. Inclining to an opposite extreme of Ewald's method, he balances too much.

XLV. There is little doubt about this Psalm being an epithalamium composed on the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of a Tyrian king. Being a secular poem, like the 72d, the Jews interpreted it allegorically; and this method of exegesis passed over to the early Christians, leading them to apply
it to Messiah. But the Messianic interpretation is foreign to the original sense, and can only be carried through the Psalm by thrusting forced meanings upon the words. I see no good reason for referring the Psalm to Jero-boam II., as Ewald does; a conjecture which was probably prompted by the more frequent intercourse of the northern kingdom with the Tyrians; much less for referring it with Hitzig to the marriage of Ahab with Jezebel. Nor is Delitzsch's conjecture probable that the poem was meant to celebrate Joram's marriage with Athallah. The Psalm has its difficulties. In the 7th verse occurs "thy God's throne," i.e. thy divine throne, etc.; and the version "thy throne, O God," is incorrect; for the plural אֶלְדוֹת cannot be applied to one king. It may perhaps be used of kings, as in the 82d Psalm; but even there Hupfeld denies it that sense. In verse 9, לְכַל must either be a plural meaning strings, music of stringed instruments, or, of Armenia, Armenian. The former interpretation is usually adopted; but the use of the word for לָכְל is without analogy. Gesenius makes as good an attempt as there can be to explain the form of the word (Lehrgebäude, pp. 525-6); and Ewald is still less satisfactory. It is better on the whole to take it as it occurs in Jer. Li. 27, where a province of Armenia is meant. Notwithstanding the authority of Jerome and of Hupfeld, as well as Hitzig, "the daughter of Tyre" in the 18th verse must mean, the Tyrians, the inhabitants of the city, especially the males. The translation "O daughter of Tyre" comes awkwardly with and before it, after the preceding words. See "Fresh Revision," p. 77.

XLVIII. 3. This verse is difficult. I translate it, "beautiful in elevation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion; in the remotest north is the city of the great King." The explanation of "the remotest north" given by Ewald and Hitzig must be rejected. Gesenius and DeWette come very near the true sense; but Hupfeld's interpretation is the best, which supposes the contrast to be with Sinai in the south. The sense "sides" is wrong in this place; and to take the clause "remotest north" in close connection with Mount Zion is erroneous, because Zion was in the south of the city. The word לָכַל does not mean "angle," as some render it. The meaning would be greatly simplified if we could suppose with Olshausen that the two words, "extremities of the north," were a marginal gloss that was taken into the text; and Kamp-hausen is inclined to adopt the suggestion.

LI. This Psalm is not David's, but is of the exile date as shown by the 20th verse. The conception of sin as committed against God alone, the offering of a broken spirit being more acceptable to him than material sacrifices, and the character of the diction are all alien to the time of David. But the suitableness of the 16th verse to the title has led many to suppose that it is David's penitential utterances. Yet it is difficult to reconcile the 6th verse with Davidic authorship. How could adultery and murder be sins against
God alone? The last two verses create a great difficulty, as they appear inconsistent with what is said immediately before about the particular sacrifices with which God is well pleased. Hence many have thought them a late addition, not a part of the original composition. This, however, is a bold assumption. Taking them as properly belonging to the Psalm, we suppose the meaning to be, that the restored people would offer sacrifices in the divinely appointed place with hearts purified by adversity; sacrifices presented thus being the only acceptable ones. The 14th verse (second clause) should be rendered "and with a willing spirit support me." The spirit is the Psalmist's, but given by God. The word יִשְׁפַּל in the 5th verse means as usual "in order that," and is always telic, implying purpose; though cause and effect were not logically separated by the Jews. It may appear strange to us to interpret an author so as to make him say "I have done evil in order that thou mightest be justified in thy sentence;" but the Jews referred all things to the immediate influence and action of God, not hesitating to say he hardened Pharaoh's heart that he should refuse to let the Israelites go free; that he creates evil (Isa. xlv. 7); and that he inclined the Egyptians' minds to give jewels and ornaments to the Israelites, who borrowed without the idea of repaying; "he hath blinded their eyes," etc. (John xii. 40). The idea in the 7th verse approaches nearer to that of original sin than in any other passage in the Old Testament; but it does not state that which theologians mean by the phrase. We should remember that the language is that of poetry, not prose; and that poetry exaggerates. All that is meant is that the writer speaks of himself as inheriting a nature with the seeds of sin in it—a nature corrupt and inclined to sin from the earliest years. The language does not imply that man sins in Adam; or that the sin of Adam is imputed to him. Neither does it imply that he is wholly corrupt, without freedom of will to think and do good; and it is entirely incorrect to say that "in iniquity" and "in sin" are predicated of his parent, not of himself.

LIII. The greater part of this Psalm is a repetition of the xivth; and critics have puzzled over the question how the sameness is to be accounted for. Neither seems to be exactly in its original state; but the LIVth is nearer it than the xivth. David himself was not the author of them, for they belong to the time of the captivity. The alterations in the one or the other are not systematically or deliberately made. A few may have arisen from subsequent reflection; but most took place in the course of transcription or traditional transmission. Intentional adaptation of the first Psalm in the second to some particular occasion is unlikely. The change of Jehovah into Elohim proceeds from the collector of the second book, of which the Psalm is a part.

LV. This Psalm is obviously later than David, so that Ahithophel is not the treacherous friend described. Verses 7-9 show that the poet lived among
enemies in the same city, that is, Jerusalem. The assertion made by Lowe and Jennings that the Psalm "teems with Davidic idioms" is wholly incorrect. Hitzig's opinion that Jeremiah was the author is favored by various expressions; but the tone is hardly that of the prophet. The writer lived at the time when the city was besieged by the Babylonians, and society was in a state of confusion. He was in a very excited state of mind, prays against his enemies, and especially against a friend who had proved faithless. The sequence of the verses is so loose and disconnected, that Hupfeld believes in displacement of certain portions, 18-15, 20b, 21, 22, 24. But this is an unnecessary assumption. The writer's feelings and perilous situation account for his broken statements. The latter part of the 20th verse, which is introduced abruptly, is very difficult. "They who have no changes, and they fear not God." The word מַעֲלָה cannot apply to a moral change, though Gesenius gives that meaning to it, so that the sense is not "they do not change for the better;" neither is it "they do not change from prosperity to adversity." Looking to the use of the word in Job xiv. 14, I would venture to propose the interpretation "they do not change their post," as soldiers do who keep watch in turn and are relieved. They adhere to their post, that is, they remain continually and obstinately in the same sinful position. They are always at their sinful post. The attempts of Ewald and Hupfeld to find a different sense for the word are unsuccessful.

LV. The received version of the 5th verse is unintelligible. It should be, "by God's help I will praise his word," i.e. this promise fulfilled to me. In the 11th verse, where the clause is repeated, the suffix to מַעֲלָה cannot be dispensed with. There can be little doubt that מַעֲלָה in verse 8 should be מַעֲלָה, as Ewald conjectures. He is followed by Olshausen and Hupfeld.

LVII. Probably from the same author as that of LV., and so not David. The 4th verse should be rendered, "he that pants for me (my persecutor) has reproached." The clause is abruptly and awkwardly introduced. The verb נַעֲבָד in the 5th verse creates great difficulty. If it be a genuine reading, it should be rendered, "I must lie with the fiery ones, the sons of men," etc.; though one would expect the prefix ב' before מַעֲלָה; cf. Isa. L 11. The various conjectures respecting the passage may be seen in Hupfeld, who takes refuge in a corruption of the text, which he does too often.

LVIII. Verse 2 should probably be rendered, "Is the righteousness which you should speak really dumb? do you judge uprightly the sons of men?" Many point מַעֲלָה differently, and propose מַעֲלָה for מַעֲלָה, i.e., "ye gods." Verse 10. Translate, "whether fresh or burning, He (God) will sweep them away." The words are variously interpreted. Verse 9. מַעֲלָה is a noun, not an apecopated future Hiph. of מַעֲלָה, as Gesenius, followed by Hengstemberg, supposes.
LX. Verse 6. Translate "thou gavest to them who fear thee a banner to flee to from before the bow." Verse 6 is ironical. "Shout in triumph over me, O Philistia." But this does not suit the context, and the reading should probably be, as in Psalm cviii. 10, "Over Philistia I will shout in triumph." In verse 5, thou hast given us to drink wine of reeling, the נ should be pointed as construct. Here it is absolute by mistake. The Psalm is often referred, along with the lxiv., to Maccabean times. But this does not clearly follow from internal evidence. It belongs to a time when the nation was in a downcast and disastrous state, perhaps in exile.

LXIV. 7th verse. ינפב. This verb in the first person plural gives no good sense. It should be ימיב, they "have completed." The 8th verse reads properly, "and God shoots them; an arrow (flies) suddenly; their wounds are (there)." The accent is against the union of ימיב with the preceding context. Verse 9. It is better with Hupfeld to alter a single point in the verb and so translate, "and He will cause it to fall upon (or destroy) them, their tongue." The rendering of DeWette is not bad, "their tongues will cause them to fall upon one another." Ewald, whom Hengstenberg follows, is less happy in his exegesis of the words.

LXV. 6th verse. Render "of all the ends of the earth and of the sea, distant (as they are)." This is contrary to the accents, but required by the sense. The translation, "of the distant parts of the sea," is inconsistent.

LXVI. Ewald appears to be right in dividing this Psalm into two parts. The first is national, descriptive of national calamities, and perhaps referring to the invasion of the land by Sennacherib. The second, verses 13-20, is personal, expressing the feelings of a pious Israelite; and its date is earlier than the first.

LXVIII. This Psalm is the most difficult of interpretation among all that form the collection, and has given rise to a greater number of separate dissertations or treatises than any other. To do it full justice would require from me both a new translation and a comment on each verse—a thing inconsistent with the plan of these brief and occasional remarks on the book of Psalms. I can only offer a few remarks. It is of late origin, referring to the return of the Jews from Babylon and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of God on Mount Zion. Hence its analogy with the Deutero-Isaiah. The hope of the people is expressed in a lyric hymn which takes a highly poetical flight, full of bold imagery, and animated with a fiery inspiration. Verse 11. Translate "thy beasts settled down in it; thou prepardest them in thy goodness for the afflicted, O God," with a reference to the quails. The triumphal song of the women announcing victory begins with the 18th verse and ends with the 15th. Verses 14, 15. Translate,
"Will ye lie at ease between the pales?  
Wings of a dove covered with silver  
And her feathers with the shimmering yellow of gold,  
When the Almighty scattered kings therein,  
It became clear as snow in the darkness."

The sense of these words can only be guessed. The first line is addressed to the victorious Israelites by way of rebuke. They take their ease instead of pursuing the enemy. The bold figure in the second and third lines may allude to the still, unwarlike, pastoral life of the two and a half tribes on the east of Jordan who, instead of following up their conquest, rest in contented inactivity, admiring the bright colors of the doves in the fields where the cattle are being herded. The reproof is still continued that the tribes are satisfied with pastoral life when they should be continuing their warlike conduct; and the severe admonition is enforced by the fact that they were thus idly reclining amid the pastures of their flocks, though the Almighty scattered kings for their sake. It is impossible to say what בִּי in the 15th verse refers to. 81. "Rebuke the beast of the reeds, the multitude of bulls with the calves of the peoples; subdue those who are greedy for money," etc. "The beast of the reeds" means Egypt. Bulls are the strong; calves the weak. The last part requires a slight change of the original text to bring out the sense I have given.

LXIX. This Psalm dates in the exile and proceeds from a prophet, as appears from verses 30–37; but whether Jeremiah can be fixed upon as the writer, which is Hitzig's opinion, cannot be settled by any probable evidence. The various passages in it which are applied to Christ in the New Testament do not show that the writer had such in his mind; especially as the bitter spirit and curses of enemies (verses 23, etc.) are directly opposed to the genius of the New Testament. The 11th verse. "And I wept; my soul was in fasting" (i.e. I fasted) hardly requires the emendation of Olshausen and Hupfeld, which turns רַבְּנֵי into דַּכַּנְי, "I humbled my soul by fasting."

LXX. This poem is a repetition of the second part of Psalm XL. The variations of the two texts show on the whole the superiority of the present one.

LXXII. The title ascribes the authorship to Solomon; but he is neither the writer nor the subject of it. The language and contents are much later. It expresses the hopes, wishes, and aspirations of a pious Israelite for the everlasting continuance of the Davidic kingdom, which was regarded as identical with the Kingdom of God; and describes in the ideal language of poetry a king reigning over the whole earth. Such hopes point to a Messianic time. The collector of the second book of the Psalms, thinking that the Davidic ones were ended, added the doxological epilogue contained in the last three verses. Lowe and Jennings render the prefix ב in דַּכַּנְי unto, incorrectly (verse 16). It is extremely doubtful whether the preposition has ever that
meaning; though Gesenius and Fürst give it. The passages quoted in its favor are not relevant, such as Genesis xi. 4, Psalm xix. 5. The signification of "motion to" should be dropped.

LXXIII. The 4th verse should be rendered, "their iniquity has gone forth from an unfeeling heart; the imaginations of the heart have overflowed." This requires a change of punctuation in one word. See Fürst's Lexicon. The second clause of the 24th verse is wrongly translated in the received version, though Hupfeld agrees with it. Such belief in a future state of happiness is foreign to the Old Testament. It should be translated, "and after honor thou wilt take me," i.e. thou wilt take me to honor. יִנַּל is a preposition governing נַלְכְּפִ, not an adverb. See "Fresh Revision," pp. 72,73.

LXXIV. If the text of the 19th verse be right, we must render, "give not over to the greedy troop thy turtle dove" (dear people). By transposing two words Hupfeld gets, "give not over to rage the life of thy dove."

LXXVI. 5. This verse is difficult. Though Ewald, DeWette and others render it, "thou art full of splendor, more excellent than the mountains of prey," I cannot think that the poet would have compared Jehovah to the mountains of prey. It is better to translate "from mountains of prey;" but Hupfeld, who identifies these mountains with Zion, can hardly be correct. A sacred place could not be so designated except by a strange figure. I take "mountains of prey" to be a general expression referring to no specific place. Jehovah is represented as a lion descending from mountains to spoil and subdue. The Psalm refers to Sennacherib's overthrow. Verse 11. "Thou girdest thyself with the remnant of fury," i.e. God's fury. When should not be supplied before "thou girdest," as DeWette supposes.

LXXVII. 11th verse. This very obscure verse I translate thus: "Then I said, this is my suffering; but the right hand of the Most High changes." The Psalmist's consolation derived from the mighty works which God wrought for his people in past times, follows in the next verse. Among the many interpretations offered, that of Delitzsch is the most far-fetched and improbable. The theophany in verses 17-20 appears to be the insertion of a later hand than the author's. It is borrowed in part from Hab. iii. 10, etc. Delitzsch, however, thinks that it is the original which Habakkuk had before him.

[To be continued.]
A TRACT ON THE SYRIAC CONJUNCTIONS.

By Richard J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D.,
Columbia College, New York City.

The native Syriac grammarians usually speak of seven parts of speech. Thus Yañan bar Zu'bî says distinctly (MS. Or. Berlin Sachau, 306, fol. 67a):

Severus bar Šakku, his pupil, makes the same division in the beginning of his diálogoi. The same may be said of Elia of Tirhân, and of Bar 'Ebhrâyâ. But there was another division current among the Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew grammarians. This was the threefold division into noun, verb, and conjunction. This division is Aristotelian, and probably owes its existence to the philosophical studies of Syriac and Arabic scholars. The συνδεονοι comprised “all elements of speech which possess no logical worth.” Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, too, though he mentions the other division, makes use of this more common one both in his larger and smaller grammars.

The following little tract on the conjunctions is not uninteresting, and may be useful in tracing back the statements of the native grammarians to their source. The Grecian grammarians had already separated the conjunctions into different classes; the later ones, such as Apollonios, giving to each conjunction its own peculiar power. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ has a very instructive chapter on this point in his
K‘thabhah dh’semhe (p. 156ff). The following tract has the same end in view. Though I suspect very much that it is fashioned after some Greek model, I have been unable to find that model. The author is unknown; but as it occurs in a MS. of the British Museum, according to Wright’s excellent judgment, of the 9th or 10th century, and together with Massoretic works and tracts of Ya‘kubh ‘Urhâyâ, I have little hesitation in referring its composition to the Syrian Massoretic schools which flourished from the 8th to the 13th centuries. Some of the statements here made have found their way to the later grammarians and to the lexicographers such as Bar ‘Alî, Bar Bahlûl, Baswadh, etc. (see Notes).

My text is taken from MS. Or. Berlin Sachau No. 70, entitled (Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau’schen Sammlung, Berlin, 1885, p. 7) “Jacobit. Sammelband,” which contains some Apocryphal writings; notices about the Prophets; “On Asnath the wife of Joseph,” and some grammatical extracts. On fol. 83 is part of the tract of Ya‘kubh ‘Urhâyâ on accents.* The MS. was written in the year 1827, and is a careful copy of a much older original. The characters are Jacobite, both the Eastern and Western systems of vocalization being used. Rukkakhâ and kušâya are regularly marked in red. The tract is preceded by a list of the Greek accents said to be by Epiphanius. I have been unable to find anything in the Greek works of that author to substantiate this claim, and can only surmise that the mistake arose from its close proximity in the original MS. to the treatise “de ponderibus et mensuris.”

Our tract exists also in the Vatican, the National Library at Paris, and the British Museum. The Vatican copy (Sir. clxx. fol. 192 a., the MS. being dated 980 A. D.) which Prof. Ignazio Guidi has with his usual kindness transcribed for me, is exactly similar to the Sachau MS. My friend, Dr. Hugo Winckler, has collated my copy once more with the original.

The names of the accents in use among the Greeks, by Epiphanius: ὄξεια, βαρεία, περισσωμένη, which is called βραχεία, ψυλή, ὑφή, ἀπόστροφος, ἐνωδιαστική.

The conjunction of verbal nouns—treating of what power and meaning there is to each one of them; and that some of them are significant either directly

---

* MS. Sachau
† MS. Vatic.
‡ I. e., ἄνωμα ῥήματος of Appolonios (Steinthal "Gesch. der Sprachwissen., p. 642). Otherwise the plural is Ἔματα Σχῆμα (Bar 'Elkh. 1., p. 15, 15). Among Syriac grammarians the "verbal
or impliedly, and others are nouns which in themselves designate actions. Gē r, dē (i)n, kīth, lām. Some unite the discourse, some the thought. Some introduce the person, and some are disjunctive. And there are some which stand alone.

Gē (i)r brings that which is below (protasis) to that which is above (apodosis). Gē (i)r, further, is a conjunction of a phrase; and, at times, causes that which is above (apodosis) to follow, and joins it to that which is below (protasis). De (i)n, also, has the same power as gē (i)r, and joins that which is above to that which is below, and that which is below to that which is above. B'ram introduces the person, and keeps it far from doubt in very truth. Kīth connects that which has previously been said with the discourse, and binds the discourse, so that what has been mentioned be not strange to that which has preceded. Lām, as is evident to every one, distinguishes the person, and shows that that which has been said does not belong to it. Hākhil and Bahghun are not conjunctions, but are compounded of conjunctions. Bahghun joins the verb with a noun expressing cause, when it connects the discourse. That one and hākhil refer to some narrative. Ellā and b'ram are confirmative. Kadh is preparatory; Mādhē(i)n is causative. Kē'math is affirmative. Åphen [shows] equality of action. Aikanā teaches something. Aukīth is explanatory. Hādhē and hānā affirm that which has been preaced beforehand. Hākhanā [shows] equality and completion. În is a word which shows joy. Lā is a word showing contradiction. Tābh [shows] an addition to that which has preceded. 'Emath(i) indicates time. Aikā indicates place. K'mā expresses number, and length, and width, and weight, and measure. Āpa forms an optative sentence and Kāi is like it. Kaddā, up to this; μālov especially; ara kai; and bahghun thence, or therefore. Ėtā afterwards. B'ram is placed sometimes instead of hāsā, sometimes instead of ellā; tākh (rāx) perhaps.

NOTES.

1 cf. Mufassal, ed. Broch, p. 146. which corresponds to the definition in the Poetics of Aristotle (1457a) συνδέομεν δέ τοι φωνῆς δομος. Cf. also Ignazio Guidi “Bolletino Italiano degli studii orientali,” Nuova Serie.—Num. 6, p. 108. There was, however, another definition current among the Syrian grammarians. On fol. 60a. Bar Zu’bi says:

noun” had a very wide signification, any form of the verb with either the prefix Dāllath or Lāmāth being classed under that head. Bar Zu’bi (fol. 53a), has a statement to this effect which is too long to cite here. Cf. Elia of Tirhan, p. 39, 10. Bar ‘Ehhrādī, L., p. 81, 16 (= Karmseddin Ap. Payne Smith, Col. 2113). Cf. also the τοῦ ἀναγγέλοντος and ἀναγγελτον of Priscian (Steinthal, p. 646). An expression similar to the one in our text occurs in Bar ‘Ehhrādī L., p. 81, 22, though we would expect here the words dhəməllā wədəhashəmahē (Bar ‘Ebh. i., p. 156, 6; H., ed., Bertheau, p. 65; Elia of Tirhan, p. 39, 17).
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Severus bar Šakku gives almost the same definition (MS. Petermann 1, 15, fol. 51b).

Bar ʻEbrâyā in his Ḵṯhābhā dẖšemēh, p. 156, l. 5, has the Aristotelian definition given above; but he also mentions (l. 10) that Yākubh ʻUrḥāyā says that the conjunction is a ʻādān. I have no doubt that the source of this is to be found in the definition of Dionysius Thrax, which Severus has taken up bodily. We must remember that Dionysius defined ʻādān to be μέρος ἐπιχιετοῦ κατὰ σύνταξιν λόγου (Συνταξιοῦσα. (ed. Uhlig. p. 86.)

Σύνταξιοῦσα ἐστὶ ʻādān συνθένως διάνοιαν μετὰ τάξεως καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰρμηνείας κεχρηστικῶν πληροφορίαν. (ed. Uhlig. p. 86.)

3 Ḵṯhābhā dẖšemēh, p. 2, line 3, Metrical Grammar, ed. Martin, p. 4, l. 14. The same division occurs in his Ḥewath Ḥekhm̱thā, although his original (Aristotle, Poetics, chap. xxi.) counts eight. In the last cited place Bar ʻEbrâyā tells us that the conjunctions are called ʻādān šērā which reminds one of the Arabic šērā.


† See my "A Treatise on Syriac Grammar by Mār[i] Eliē of Ṣōbhāh," Notes, p. 2.
4 cf. Guidi loc. cit.
6 Steinhals, p. 290. In his K’tthabhă dh’semhê, Bar ’Ebhrâyâ even counts such words as [word] in certain connections among the conjunctions. On p. 159 he has a long discussion on ἐτῶς and ὠν which I have found again in Bar Zu’bi and which can be traced back to Aristotle.* cf. Payne Smith, col. 1029, s. v., 299, s. v., [word]
9 B. O. Ibid. Anc. fonds. 142 (Zotenberg, Catalogue, p. 30) MSS. Add. 7183, fol. 126b, 12,178, fol. 124a (Wright, Catalogue, p. 110b.)
10 I am not clear as to the real meaning of these words. Perhaps they contain an attempted translation of the Greek σημαίνω and σημαίνομαι. It is worthy of note that the four conjunctions mentioned here all belong to those called by Bar ’Ebhrâyâ [word] as opposed to the [word] [word]
10a πράγμα σημαίνον? Steinhals, p. 569.
12 Διαζευγτικόν of Dionysius; in Syriac [word] . Cf. the accents [word] and [word].
13 Cf. the accents [word] and [word].
14 Bazwâdh, the author of a dictionary of philosophical terms, has the same definition. See Hoffmann, De Hermeneutics, p. 197. Bar ’Ebhrâyâ (I, p. 161, 3) has a similar definition. Dionysius calls these συλλογιστικοί (συλλογιστικόν) διοι πρὸς τὰς καταφορὰς τε καὶ συλλογές τῶν ἀποδείξεων εἰ διάκεινται.
15 Bar ’Ali (Payne Smith, col. 886) has exactly the same words, cf. Bar ’Ebhrâyâ, ibid, l. 4.
16 Cf. such expressions as [word] (Bar ’Ebhrâyâ, I, 168, 23) though I am not certain of the exact meaning of πρὸς άιεα here, cf. ZDMG. xxx., p. 528. With [word], however, (B. E. Metrical Gram., l. 657) the expression is intelligible.
17 Bar ’Ali and Bar Bahlûl (Payne Smith col. 1727) have the same explanation. Bar Ebhrâyâ remarks that neither this conjunction nor [word], [word], [word], [word] are found in the P’šiṭtab (I, p. 160, l. 2). Bar Zu’bi says the same (fol. 66a) [word] [word]. [word] [word]. [word] [word]. [word] [word]. [word] [word].
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19 cf. Bar 'Ebhrayā, I, p. 167, 5ff., Payne Smith, cols. 682 and 449 s. v. ʾṣm. Bar Zu′bī has this notice word for word (fol. 67a).

I read ʾṣm. cf. Bar Zu′bī in the previous note. This will explain the expression of Bar Bahlul (Payne Smith, col. 1066) ʾṣm. ʾṣm.

22 παρασκευάστικός? Hoffmann, loc. cit., p. 198.
23 A derivative of κενέω.
26 Payne Smith, col. 1201.
27 Cf. ἐναρκτέρα, Steinthal, p. 675.
28 Cf. the same expression in Bar 'Alī and Bar Bahlul (Payne Smith, col. 1721).
NEBUCHADNEZZAR’S ARTIFICIAL RESERVOIR.

BY HUGO WINCKLER, PH. D.,

Berlin, Germany.

In a previous number of Hebrewica¹ I called attention to an old structure, the tunnel of Negub, by means of a partial restoration of an inscription, which had been previously given up as hopelessly mutilated. This time I should like to call attention to a similar undertaking, one of which we now have many proofs. The first decipherer (Oppert) of the great Nebuchadnezzar inscription in the East India House, London, has already pointed out that one passage agrees exactly with a notice of Berossus. I R. 58, viii. 52—ix. 1 we read:

\[ \text{In between (i.e., the walls) I erected} \]
\[ \text{a mole of brick. On its top I built a} \]
\[ \text{large building for my royal residence} \]
\[ \text{and joined it to the palace of my father²} \]
\[ \text{In a lucky month, on an auspicious day,} \]
\[ \text{“I joined its breast to the breast of the} \]
\[ \text{nether world,”³ and elevated its top} \]
\[ \text{like a mountain forest. In 15 days I} \]
\[ \text{finished its building.} \]

The corresponding passage in Berossus (Abydenus ap. Eusebius Chron. ed. Schoene, p. 38) reads as follows: "When Nebuchadnezzar had received the royal power, he surrounded Babylon with a triple wall in 15 days. He drew off the Nahr-malka, an arm of the Euphrates. Above the city Sippara he built a reservoir, 40 parasangs in circumference, and 20 fathoms deep, and built gates which could be opened so as to irrigate the plain. It was called ἑξεργάζομαι.""

We pass over the rapidity with which the building is said to have been constructed. It is sufficient to call attention to the wonderful way in which the words of Nebuchadnezzar agree with those of Berossus.

The cuneiform inscriptions give us also information about the triple walls. The two principal walls, Imgur-Bil and Nimitti-Bil, are frequently mentioned; and I myself have published a text in the Zeitschrift f. d. Assyriologie, i., p. 337, sqq. (cf. also ibid. ii., p. 124, sqq.) relating to the building of the third outer wall. It has not been possible, up to the present time, to identify the works on the Nahr-

¹ October, 1887, p. 52.
² I layed the foundation.
³ Or i-kal-at (?): to the (before mentioned) temples?
malka and the building of the reservoir. But it is evident that these works are likewise mentioned in the inscription of Nabopolassar published by me in the Ztschrift. f. d. Assyriologie, II., p. 69, sqq. In my notes to this inscription (ibid. p. 75) I have already made the conjecture that, by the mûnûhûši nikkûti there mentioned, the reservoirs mentioned by Rassam, Babylonian Cities, Victoria Institute, p. 5, London, are meant. This conjecture is verified by the passage in Berossus mentioned above. The works were used for collecting the water for the irrigation of the land, for which the Babylonian expression mûnûhûši "water of fruitfulness" very well fits. The fact that in one place the buildings are ascribed to Nabopolassar, in the other to his son Nebuchadnezzar presents no difficulties. Either a mistake has been made by one of the many editors of Berossus (Abydenus), or this work, like so many others, was begun by Nabopolassar, and only finished by his son. Whether we have, as I conjectured (loc. cit. p. 70) any information in this same inscription about buildings erected on the Nahr-Malka, and mentioned also by Berossus, cannot yet with certainty be decided. In both cases the expression is not quite clear.

As I think I can further the understanding of that inscription a little, I allow the passage I have mentioned to follow (Nabop. I. 4—II. 8).

14. nâru Purattu is-si-šu-ma  
15. a-na ku-ud (?)—dulû bi-lu-ti-šu-nu  
16. mi-i ri-š-ku a-na sa-a-bu  
II. 1. Na-bi-um-abîl-u-šu-ur  
   2. a-aš-ru ša-aḫ-šim  
   3. pa-li-ḫī līl a-a-ti  
   4. nûr Sippara  
   5. lu-u-ša-aḫ-ra-am-ma  
   6. mi-š nu-uḫ-ši nik-lu-tim  
   7. a-na šamû ḫśli-ia  
   8. lu-u-ki-in

The Euphrates had left it (Sippara). The waters had departed to (from?) Nabopolassar, the humble, the submissive, caused the canal of Sippara to be dug.

It is worthy of note how exactly the name given to the reservoir, mûnûhûši, "waters of abundance, of fruitfulness," agrees with the statement made by Berossus-Abydenus that its purpose was "to irrigate the plain."

---

1"Remains of prodigious basins are seen, in which a surplus supply must have been kept for any emergency when the water in the Euphrates falls low."
2 Not ku !
3 cf. ZA. II. 145.
OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED
BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D.,
Allegheny City, Pa.

VI.

JEREMIAH.

V. 9. "And it shall come to pass, when ye shall say, Wherefore doeth the Lord our God all these things?" etc.

Rabbi Jose, the son of Halaphta, said: Whoever knows how many years the Israelites served idols, will know when the Son of David comes. And these three passages are in support of this dictum, viz.: "And I will visit upon her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them" (Hos. ii. 13); "That as he cried, and they would not hear; so they cried, and I would not hear" (Zech. vii. 18); and "It shall come to pass, when," etc.—Introduction to Midrash on Lamentations.

XVI. 13. See under Gen. xl. 10.

XXIII. 5. "I will raise unto David a righteous branch."

Targum: I will raise unto David the Messiah the righteous.

— 6. "And this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness."

Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said, in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: Three are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be he! viz.: the righteous, Messiah, and Jerusalem. Of the righteous it is said, "Everyone that is called by my name" (Isa. xlili. 7). Of Messiah it is said, "This is his name," etc.; and of Jerusalem it is written, "And the name of the city from that day shall be, the Lord is there" (Ezek. xlviii. 35). Read not "there" (šāmāh), but "her name" (š*māh).—Talmud Baba Bathra, fol. 75, col. 2; Yalkut in loco.

What is the name of the King Messiah? Rabbi Abba, son of Kahana, said: Jehovah; for it is written, "This is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness." Rabbi Levi said: Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king, and the name of its king like the name of his God. Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king; because it is written, "And the name of the city from that day shall be, Jehovah is there" (Ezek. xlviii. 35); and the name of its king like the name of its God; for it is written, "And this is his name whereby," etc. Rabbi Joshua, son of
Levi, said: "Branch" (γεμαθ) is the Messiah's name; for it is written, "Behold, the man whose name is Branch, and he shall grow out of his place." Rabbi Judan said, in the name of Rabbi Ibo: "Comforter" (מ'נָהֵהמ) is his name; for it is written, "The Comforter is far from me" (Lam. 1:16). Rabbi Hanina replied: There is no contradiction in the assertions of both; for γεμαθ and מ'נָהֵהמ are equal in number.—Midrash on Lamentations I. 16.

7, 8. "The days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led," etc.

Ben-Zoma asked the wise men: Will mention be made of the Egyptian exodus in the days of the Messiah? Is it not said, "The days come, saith the Lord," etc.? They replied: The Egyptian exodus will not lose its place altogether, but will only become secondary, in view of the liberation from the subjection to the other Gentile kingdoms.—Talmud Berachoth, fol. 12, col. 2.

XXX. 9. "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them."

Targum: And they shall worship before the Lord their God, and they shall hearken to Messiah the Son of David, their king, whom I will raise up to them.

Rav said: In the future God will raise up for them another David; as it is said, "They shall serve the Lord their God," etc.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 2.

21. "And their governor shall proceed from the midst of them."

Targum: And their kings shall be magnified from them, and their Messiah shall appear out of their midst.

XXXI. 20. See under Ps. XXII. 7.

XXXIII. 18. "The flocks shall pass again under the hands of him that telleth them."

Targum: The people shall be again numbered by the hand of the Messiah.

15. "I will cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David."

Targum: I will raise up unto David the Messiah of righteousness.

Lamentations.

I. 16. "For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water, because the comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me," etc.

See under Gen. XLIX. 10. The Midrash in loco gives a curious story about the birth of the Messiah, which is the same as quoted from the Jerusalem Talmud under Ps. XVIII. 50.

II. 22. "Thou hast called as in a solemn day my terrors round about."

Targum: Thou shalt proclaim freedom to thy people of the house of Israel, by the hand of the Messiah.
IV. 22. "The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion."

Targum: And afterwards the iniquity shall be finished, O congregation of Zion, and thou shalt be delivered by the hands of the Messiah and Elijah the high priest.

EZEKIEL.

XVI. 55. "When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate."

There are ten things which will be renewed in the future. The fourth is, All devastated cities will be rebuilt, and there shall be no more any desolate place; even Sodom and Gomorrah will once be rebuilt, as it is said, "When thy sisters, Sodom," etc.—Midrash on Exodus XII. 12, sect. 15.

XXV. 14. "And I will lay my vengeance upon Edom by the hand of my people Israel."

In this life, it is true, the Israelites are compared to the dust of the earth; but in the Messianic age they will be like the sand of the sea; for as the sand makes the teeth dull, so also will the heathen be destroyed in the time of the Messiah, as it is said, "There shall come a star out of Israel" (Num. xxiv. 17), and "I will lay my vengeance," etc.—Midrash on Numbers II. 32, sect. 2.

XXXI. 21. "In that day will I cause the horn of the house of Israel to bud forth."

Rav Hanina said: The Son of David will not come till fish will not be found even when required for a sick man; for it is said, "Then will I cause their waters to sink, and their rivers to run like oil" (Ezek. xxxii. 14), and it is also written, "In that day will I cause the horn of the house," etc.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1.

XLVII. 9. "And it shall come to pass, that everything that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live."

Of the ten new things which will be in the future the second is, the Holy One will bring forth living water from Jerusalem, and will cure with it all diseases, as it is said, "And it shall come to pass," etc.—Midrash on Exodus XII. 12, sect. 15.

— 12. "And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed; it shall bring forth new fruit according to his month, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary."

The third of the ten new things which will be in future is that the Holy One makes the trees bring forth fruits every month, as it is said, "And by the river upon," etc.—Midrash, 1. c.

XLVIII. 19. "And they that serve the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel."

Mar says: The Land of Israel is in the future to be divided among thirteen tribes. To whom (belongs the thirteenth part)? To the Prince (i. e., the
King Messiah, as Rashi explains); for it is written, "And they that serve," etc.—Talmud Baba Bathra, fol. 122, col. 1.

**Daniel.**

II. 22. "And the light dwelleth with him."
Abba Serunga refers these words to the Messiah; for it is said, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee" (Isa. LX. 1).—Midrash on Genesis i. 1, sect. 1.
Rabbi Bibi Sanguria said: Light is his (Messiah's) name; for it is said, "The light dwelleth with him."—Midrash on Lamentations i. 16.

VII. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were placed (not 'cast down,' as in A. V.), and the Ancient of days did sit."
What will this say? One (throne) for himself and one for David. For we have the teaching: One for himself and for David,—these are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Said to him Rabbi Jose: Akiva! how long wilt thou render the Shechinah profane!—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 38, col. 2; Hagigah, fol. 14, col. 1.

— 18. "Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven."
Rabbi Joshua ben Levi asked: In one place it is written, "Behold, one like the Son of Man," etc., and in another, "Lowly and riding upon an ass!" (Zech. ix. 9). (He answered), If they be worthy, He (the Messiah) will come with the clouds of heaven; if not, He will come lowly and riding upon an ass.1—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1.

— 27. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven," etc.
Because the Israelites observed the law among them (the Edomites), the Holy One will make them inherit in the future the throne of glory; as it is said, "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness," etc.—Midrash on Numbers vi. 22, sect. 11.

IX. 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city," etc.

1 Very interesting is the following interpretation given by Saadia (flourished in the ninth century) on the passage: "This (one like the Son of Man) is Messiah our righteousness; for it is not written with reference to Messiah, 'lowly, and riding upon an ass'? (Zech. ix. 9); surely he comes in humility, for he does not come upon a horse in glory. But since it is written, 'with the clouds of heaven,' it signifies the angels of the heavenly hosts, which is the great glory which the Creator will give to the Messiah, as it is written, 'with the clouds of heaven;' then he shall be great in government. When it is said (v. 9), 'the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool,' he speaks after the manner of men. They brought him to the Ancient of days; for it is written (Ps. cx. 1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand,' etc. 'And there was given him dominion,' i.e., He gave to him a government and a kingdom, as it is written (Ps. ii. 6), 'Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion;' and as it is written (1 Sam. ii. 10), 'He shall exalt the horn of his anointed; his kingdom shall not depart, and shall not be destroyed for ever and ever.'"
True, it was known that the temple will be destroyed; but the time could not be fixed. Abai said, This cannot be determined; but against this is the passage, "Seventy weeks," etc.—*Talmud Nazir*, fol. 32, col. 2.

Rabbi Jose said: Seventy weeks intervened between the destruction of the first temple and the second.—*Yalkut on Amos* VII. 17.

XII. 3. See Isaiah LIV. 5.

**Hosea.**

II. 13. See Jer. v. 19.
— 18. "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground."

To the ten new things which will be in the future belongs, 7) that the Holy One will bring together all beasts, all fowls and creeping things, and will make a covenant with them and with all Israel; as it is said, "And in that day will I make a covenant," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* XII. 12, sect. 15.

III. 5. "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king."

Targum: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the service of the Lord their God, and be obedient to Messiah the Son of David, their king.

XIV. 7. "They that dwell under his shadow shall return."

Targum: They shall dwell under the shadow of their Messiah.

**Joel.**

II. 28. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," etc.

God said: In this world only a few prophesy; but in the future all Israelites will be prophets, as it is said, "And it shall come to pass afterward," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* XI. 16, sect. 15.

IV. 18. "And a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim."

As the first redeemer (i. e., Moses) caused a spring to come up, so also will the last do; as it is said, "And a fountain shall come forth," etc.—*Midrash on Ecclesiastes* I. 9.

**Amos.**

IV. 7. "And I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city."

The rabbis have taught: In the cycle of seven years in which the Son of David shall come, in the first year this scripture will be fulfilled, "And I will
cause it to rain upon one city, and cause it not to rain upon another city;" in the second the arrows of famine shall be sent; in the third there shall be a great famine, and men and women, pious people and men of deed, shall die, and the law shall be forgotten by those who have studied it; in the fourth shall be satiety, but it shall not be satiety; in the fifth shall be great satiety, and they shall eat and drink, and rejoice, and the law shall return to those who had learned; in the sixth, uproar; in the seventh, wars; in the end of the seventh the Son of David will come. Behold, exclaimed Rav Joseph, there have been many septennial cycles of this kind, and Messiah has not come. Abaye replied: Were there voices in the sixth year, and wars in the seventh? or did the events occur in the same order?—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 1.

V. 18. "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light." Rabbi Sintär lectured: What is the meaning of what is written, "Woe unto you that desire the day," etc. It is to be compared to a cock and a bat which were once waiting for the light, when the cock said to the bat, "I wait for the light, because the light is intended for me, but thou, what is the light to thee?" And this is similar to what Rabbi AbuHu answered a certain Sadducee, who had asked when Messiah will come: "When darkness will overwhelm your people," was the reply.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 2.

VIII. 11. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, or a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of the Lord." Ten famines came into the world; the first was in the days of the first man, for it is said: "cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. iii. 14); the second in the days of Lamech, for it is said "because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed" (Gen. v. 29); the third in the days of Abraham (Gen. xii. 10); the fourth in the days of Isaac (xxvi. 1); the fifth in Jacob's time (xlv. 6); the sixth in the time of the Judges (Ruth i. 1); the seventh in the days of David (2 Sam. xxi. 1); the eighth in the days of Elisha (2 Kgs. vi. 28); the tenth will be in the future, as it is said, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine," etc.—Midrash on Genesis, v. 29, sect. 25.

IX. 11. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen."

Rav Nachman said to Rav Isaac: Hast thou heard when the son of the fallen come? Who is the Son of the Fallen? [Reply.] Messiah. Is the Messiah called the Son of the Fallen? Yes. For it is written, "In that day will I raise," etc. Well, replied Rav Isaac, thus said Rabbi Jochanan: In the generation when the son of David will come, the disciples of the wise will

1 The same we also find in Midrash on Song of Solomon, ii. 13.
be diminished, the eyes of those that shall be left shall be consumed with grief and anguish, and many calamities and oppressive edicts will be repeatedly decreed, so that before one visitation ceases a second will come on speedily.—\emph{Talmud Sanhedrin}, fol. 96, col. 2; 97 col. 1; \emph{Yalkut on Amos} XI. 11.

After enumerating the unexpected deliverance of Joseph, Moses, Ruth, David, of Israel in the days of Haman, the Midrash continues: Who could have expected that the Holy One, blessed be He! would raise up the fallen tabernacle of David, as it is said, "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen," (and who should have expected) that the whole world should become one congregation? Yet it is said, "for thee will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent" (Zeph. III. 9).—\emph{Midrash on Genesis}, XL. 23; sect. 88.

\textbf{Obadiah.}

18. "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them."

The Israelites said before God: Lord of the Universe! how long shall we be in bondage? He replied: Till the day comes of which it is said, There shall come a star of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel" (Num. XXIV. 12).

As soon as the star comes of Jacob, the stubble of Esau will burn. How is this proved? From "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame," etc. God said: In that hour my kingdom will be glorious and I will rule over you, as it is said, "And saviors shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's" (Obad. 21).—\emph{Midrash on Deuteronomy}, II. 4, sect. 1.

\textbf{Micah.}

IV. 3. "Nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Rabbi Elieser said: In the time of the Messiah, will not be found any arms, because they will not be needed, for it is said "Nation shall not lift up a sword," etc.—\emph{Talmud Shabbath}, fol. 68, col. 1.

— 8. "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come."

\textit{Targum}: And thou, O Messiah of Israel, who art hidden by reason of the sins of the congregation of Zion, to thee hereafter is the kingdom to come.

V. 2. "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be a ruler in Israel."

\textit{Targum}: But thou, Bethlehem-Ephratah, thou hast been little to be counted among the thousands of the house of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth
before me Messiah, to exercise dominion over Israel, whose name is spoken
of from old, from the days of eternity.

— 3. "Therefore will He give them up, until the time that she which travailleth
hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the
children of Israel."

Rav said: The Son of David will not come until the ungodly kingdom has
spread itself for a period of nine months over Israel, for it is said, "Therefore
will He give them up," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 2.

— 5. "And this man shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our
land; and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him
shepherds, and eight principal men."

Rabbi Simeon, the son of Yochai, has taught: When you see a Persian horse
tied to the graves of the land of Israel, expect the footsteps of the Messiah.
What is the reason? "And this man shall be the peace," etc. And who are
the seven shepherds? In the midst is David, Adam, Seth, Methuselah to his
right, and Abraham, Jacob and Moses to his left. And where went Isaac?
He went and sat down at the gate of hell, to save his children from the judg-
ment of hell, and the eight principal men are: Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos,
Zephaniah, Hezekiah, Elijah and the King Messiah.—*Midrash on Song of
Solomon*, VIII. 10.

VII, 6. "For the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against
her mother, the daughter in law against her mother in law; a man's enemies
are the men of his own house."

Rabbi Nehorai said: In the generation in which the Son of David will come,
boys will confuse the faces of old men. Old men will rise up before the young.
The son will treat the father shamefully, and the daughter will rise up against
her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. The face of
that generation will be as the face of a dog; the son will have no shame before
his father.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 97, col. 1.

In the footprints of the Messiah impudence will increase, and there will be
scarcity. The vine will produce its fruit, but wine will be dear, and the gov-
ernment will turn itself to heresy, and there will be no reproof. And the house
of assembly will be for fornication. Galilee will be destroyed, and Gablas
laid waste; and the men of Gabul will go from city to city and find no favor.
And the wisdom of scribes will stink, and those that fear sin will be de-
spised, and truth will fail. Boys will confuse the faces of old men. Old men
will rise up before the young. The son will treat the father shamefully, the
daughter will rise up against her mother; the daughter-in-law against her
mother-in-law, and a man's foes will be those of his own household. The

1 *Talmud Yoma*, fol. 10, col. 1, read for "over Israel," over the whole world.
2 The same we find in *Midrash on Song of Solomon*, 2, 13.
face of that generation will be as the face of a dog; the son will have no shame before his father. Upon whom, then, are we to rely? Upon our Father who is in heaven.—Talmud Sotah, fol. 49, col. 2.

Nahum.

I. 15. "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts," etc.
When the evangelist will come once, Judah will be the first to hear the good tidings, as it is said, "Behold upon the mountains," etc.—Midrash on Numbers, ii. 9; sect. 2.

Habakkuk.


III. 18. "Yet I will rejoice in the Lord."
Targum: Then on account of the miracles and deliverance that thou shalt perform for thy Messiah.

Zephaniah.

III. 9. "For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent."
Rabbi Eleazar said: In the future, all Gentiles will be converts, which, as Rabbi Joseph said, is proved, "for then will I turn to the people a pure language," etc.—Talmud Aboda Zarah, fol. 24, col. 1.

—11. "For then I will take away out of the midst of thee them that rejoice in thy pride, and thou shalt no more be haughty because of my holy mountain." Seiri said, in the name of Rabbi Hanina: The Son of David will not come till all pride has ceased in Israel, for it is said, "For then I will take away," etc. And it is also written, "I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord" (v. 12).—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1.

Haggai.

II. 6. "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land."
"Behold I have begun." This refers, said Rabbi Azarya, to the help which is once to come. How so? As the prophet said to Israel, "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens," etc.—Midrash on Deuteronomy, ii. 31; sect. 1.

Zechariah.

I. 20. "And the Lord showed me four carpenters."
Who are these four carpenters? Rav Chana the son of Bisma said, in the name of Rabbi Simon the Pious: They were Messiah the son of David, Messiah
the son of Joseph, Elijah, and the Angel of Righteousness.—*Talmud Sbaha*, fol. 52, col. 2; *Yalkut* in Exod.

II. 10. See below under ix. 9.

III. 8. "I will bring forth my servant, the Branch."

*Targum*: Behold! I bring my servant the Messiah, who shall be revealed.

IV. 7. "The head-stone thereof."

*Targum*: And he shall reveal his Messiah, whose name was spoken from eternity. "Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain." This is the king Messiah. And why is he called the great mountain? Because he is greater than the patriarchs.—*Tunkuma in Yalkut* in loco.

VI. 12. "And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, and he shall grow up out of his place," etc.

*Targum*: And thou shalt speak to him, saying, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man, Messiah is his name, who shall hereafter be revealed and anointed.

—See above Jer. xxiii. 6.

VII. 18. See above Jer. v. 19.

IX. 1. "The burden of the word of the Lord in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus shall be the rest thereof."

What is the meaning of the word Hadrach? According to Rabbi Judah it is the name of a place. According to Rabbi Nehemiah, Hadrach is the name of the king, Messiah, because he is sharp (*kad*) and gentle (*rach*); sharp to the Gentiles and soft to the Israelites.—Midrash on the *Song of Solomon* vii. 5; *Yalkut* in loco.
The Native Language of Abraham.—It would be reasonable to infer that the native language of Abraham was Aramaic, since he emigrated from Ur of the Chaldees to the land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 31). Moreover, in Deut. xxvi. 5, where directions are given for the offering of the first-fruits, reference is made to Abraham as the Syrian. Also the word Hebrew, which is applied first to Abraham (Abram), Gen. xiv. 13, points in the same direction. Hebrew means the one from beyond, i. e., beyond the Euphrates. It is a patronymic from בְּנֵי the country beyond, בַּיָּם the country beyond the river. The apppellative would then mean the one who comes from beyond (the river). It is so translated in the Septuagint ἐκ περάτων. The conclusive argument, however, is to be taken from Gen. xxxi., according to which Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones, commemorative of their covenant. Jacob gave it a Hebrew name, Galeed, גַּלָּא, heap of witness, but Laban called it Jegarshahadutha גֶּגֶרְשַׁהֲדוּתָה, which has the same meaning as Galeed. This compound Jegarshahadutha is Aramaic. The only reason why Laban would use Aramaic, would be because it was his own language and that of the country in which he lived.

The grandfather of Laban was Nahor, and of Jacob, Abraham. Nahor and Abraham were brothers, the sons of Terah, Gen. xi. 27. When Terah went out from Ur, he took with him Abram and his grandson Lot, whose father, Haran, had died. He left behind Nahor, his second son, the father of Bethuel and grandfather of Laban. Those that remained in their own country would not change their language, and since Laban spoke Aramaic that must have been originally the language of Terah and his family. It is probable that Abraham knew Hebrew before he came into the land of Canaan, for there is no indication that he had any difficulty in conversing with its inhabitants.

W. O. SPROWL,
University of Cincinnati.

Two Corrections.—I have to make two corrections in my article in the July number of Hebraica, to which Professor Nödeke has kindly called my attention. On page 250, line 4, מָסֶר is the Greek ἔθος he was of opinion. For מָסֶר = ἔθος, see Hoffmann “De Hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis,” p. 211, 24. We have the same use of the word מָסֶר = ἔθος in מָסֶר. Wright, “Catalogue of Syriac MSS.,” p. 494a, 599, i. 5.; Frothingham, “Stephen bar Sudaili,” p. 59. Bar ‘Ali, No. 1546. Knös “Chrestomathia,” p. 7, 8, etc.

Professor Nödeke also thinks it probable that Bar ‘Ebhrayâ has made Thales to be his own countryman, as אלקט (“Hist. Dynast.”, p. 50) can also be the Nisba of אלקט. In this way the two texts would agree.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, N. Y.
TELONI'S CHRESTOMAZIA ASSIRA.*

This chrestomathy is modeled after Lyon's Assyrian Manual. After a short introduction of 11 pp., the author gives in pp. 14-19 the most common Assyrian signs with their most usual values. In this Sillibario, the order followed is that of Lyon rather than that of Friedrich Delitzsch. The author has also, after Lyon, separated the phonetic from the ideographic values, the latter appearing on pp. 113-121. Much can be said in favor of this, but, on the whole, the old method seems to be preferable. It enables the student to have before him in one table both values, and, as only the most common ideograms appear in an elementary book of this kind, there is no danger of confusion. The grammar proper extends over pp. 20-50. It is very elementary—in fact, rather too brief and elementary even for a beginner's manual. In the paradigms of the verb, the author follows neither Delitzsch's nor Lyon's nomenclature, e.g., i kāṣād is Pres., i kāṣād, Impf., etc. Pages 50-76 contain Assyrian texts, the most of which are accompanied by a transliteration. The texts used are rather stale, as they have appeared in every elementary Assyrian book which has ever been published. The author's method of transliteration is that of Schrader. With few exceptions the texts are published correctly and very little fault can be found with the transliterations. Pages 77-112 form a commentary to the preceding texts and transliterations, and on pp. 121-144 is given a list of all the words occurring in those texts. The commentary is the chief feature of the book. The method pursued is to be commended highly. The author introduces the pupil at once into Assyrian bibliography, and gives him an insight into the only true method of studying Assyrian. After a careful study of these notes, the student must be well versed in the literature, as constant reference has been made to everything of importance which has ever been published.

The book is printed from photo-engraved plates and is very legible, although the author's writing is not as clear as that of Delitzsch or Pinches.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
Yale University.

DELITZSCH'S GENESIS.†

The venerable author of this excellent work has for decades occupied a position among Old Testament specialists as unique as it has been prominent. In him are found harmoniously united two characteristics that on the surface some-


† NEUER COMMENTAR ÜBER DIE GENESIS, VON FRANZ DELITZSCH. Leipzig: Dorfling und Franke, 1887.
times appear inconsistent with each other. And herein the man and his work exhibit their individuality and independence. There are none, among modern commentators, who more profoundly than Delitzsch accept the revealed character of the sacred records, admit and hold fast to that which is supernatural in both the contents of these records and also their inspiration, as over against the naturalistic tendencies of the philosophic thought of the day, which have gained such controlling power in the revolutionary hypothesis of the advanced Old Testament critics; and, on the other hand, there are none who admit more readily than he that, from the human side, these records, as literary compositions that were developed under historical circumstances, that "have had their fates" like other productions of the pen, are the legitimate subjects of historical criticism. It is his stand-point that the application of the current canons of literary criticism to the books of the Bible not only do not injure their character as a revelation and the records of a revelation, but rather enhance these, by exhibiting the origin and growth of these books in their entire historical surroundings and thus enabling the student to draw from them all the better the wealth of truth that was originally deposited in them. The commentaries of Delitzsch, and especially his exposition of Genesis, are exhibitions of these principles put into practice. While it is not always clear to the reader how the writer can adhere to the tenets of the one without violating the rights of the other principle, certain it is, that Delitzsch nearly always succeeds in drawing from the biblical books the pure and wholesome truths of divine revelation.

These facts also explain the fundamental thoughts underlying the method and spirit of the new commentary on Genesis. Naturally Old Testament students will be most interested in the author's position on the problems of Higher Criticism. The book before us is really the fifth edition of the commentary which in 1872 appeared for the fourth time. The changes and improvements are, however, so many and so great, that the author is justified in calling it not the fifth edition of a former work, but "a new commentary." These last fifteen years have witnessed a revolution in the literary criticism of the Old Testament. The old theory of the "supplement," which the Jehovist was thought to have been for the Elohist, is entirely abandoned, thanks to the searching investigations of Hupfeld. A sure basis for critical analysis of the Pentateuch has been made by the theory that the documents of the present Pentateuch were originally separate and independent productions, prepared at different stages in the history of Israel's religious development, which stages they too reflect directly and indirectly, and that these documents were later united into one work. From this stand-point the literary researches of the Pentateuch have been progressing with marked agreement up to the stage which the historical questions of the order of the documents and the historico-theological question of the restatement of the religious factors and forces that entered into and directed Israel's religion in origin and development, have reached.

The older editions of this work were prepared under the spell of the supplementary theory. That Delitzsch, too, had abandoned this, was known from various essays in theological periodicals. Now he has formulated them and given a summary of his views of the origin of the Pentateuch as these have crystallized in his mind after fully a half-century's patient and pious study. He, of course, accepts the ordinary analysis of the Pentateuch, and this is declared by the Germans to be the outcome and fruit of a century's close, critical scrutiny. In the
minor details of the analysis, where not all are yet agreed, he generally sides with Dillmann, in the analysis given in Knobel’s Commentary on the Hexateuch. Delitzsch, too, regards the Priest-Codex as the latest and no longer as the earliest document in the Pentateuch, but differs widely from the radical school in claiming for it a pre-exilic origin. In general he looks with horror upon the naturalistic reconstruction schemes of the Wellhausen-Kuenen school. He tersely says that he does not believe in “the religion of the era of Darwin;” i.e., he is not willing to analyze God out of his word and out of the history of Israel and substitute the idea of natural development. It would be a serious misconception of Delitzsch’s position to think that he does not accept as historical the contents of the Pentateuch because he places at a later date their literary composition. While he makes concessions in this regard that conservative scholars, particularly in America, are not willing to make, he yet regards as divinely conducted and inspired the history and the records of these books. Nothing is more fixed in his mind than that the book whose thoughts he is unfolding is the word of God. He may have peculiar ideas as to the manner in which these thoughts received the literary shape in which they are now found, but for him this does not affect the revealed character of the thoughts.

Concerning the details of the comments probably little needs to be said. Delitzsch’s methods in this regard are well known. With the ardor of youth the aged nestor has collected from the rich storehouses of special research whatever is of any aid in interpreting the words of the book of Genesis. With the experienced scholarship of one who has taught for years, he has sifted the material carefully and retained only that which is of positive value. Whatever historical, philological, archaeological, and other investigation, especially Assyriology, has offered has been carefully weighed, although in Assyriology he is willing to accept as reliable what many others regard as at best problematic. A specially valuable feature of the work is that its materials are collected chiefly from primary sources of information and not from secondary, thus opening a field of study to which even Dillmann is an insufficient introduction; and, further, that this material is offered in such a shape as to urge on the student to further study. Of course the commentary in this way contains much that, strictly speaking, might have been excluded as having but little direct bearing on the interpretation proper of the text, but the student can well afford to take this superabundance of good things.

In short, the new commentary is the fruit of long and ripe scholarship. It is the fruit of a life’s work. Its merits entitle it to the warmest welcome, and its careful study cannot but be exceedingly profitable.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Capital University.

A TARGUM CHRESTOMATHY.*

The critical study of the Bible, and especially of the Massoretic text, has of late brought the old versions into great prominence. It has been found that only by means of a careful and critical use of these versions, as Cornill has

done for Ezekiel, can we control the Hebrew text which has come down to us. One of the most important of these, representing as it does one stage in the history of the biblical text, is the Targüm. Many difficulties, however, have stood in the way of a proper use of this ancient witness. Chief among these has been the unscientific state of these texts in our common editions. Teachers who have attempted to make their study a part of a college or seminar course, know the many difficulties which impede their way. The oldest editions, based, it is true, upon some MS. authority, though not always the best, have become as scarce as the MSS. themselves. The same holds good of the Polyglotts, which, in addition, are too unwieldy for general use. Until recently we have had to rely upon the texts printed in many of the Hebrew Bibles, which are either carelessly edited, or corrected according to some peculiar system.*

The German Oriental Society, at its meeting at Breslau, in the year 1857, resolved itself to undertake the publication of good Targüm texts based upon MSS. But nothing definite came of this decision.† Within the last few years, however, a beginning has been made by individual scholars to meet this difficulty. Lagarde has given us a faithful copy of the consonant text of the celebrated Reuchlin codex of the year 1105, and has made the Bomberg text of the Haggadah accessible to students. Berliner has made us acquainted with the Massorah to the Targüm Onkelos, and has given us a handy edition of the very rare Sabbioneta text of the Pentateuch. But this has reference only to the consonant text, which turns out to be more fixed than has generally been supposed. The greatest divergence in the MSS. and editions, however, lies in the vocalization. Here disorder and uncertainty reign supreme. Dr. Berliner, an authority on the subject, says (‘‘Massorah,’’ p. 124), ‘‘I am now quite certain that there is hardly a single line in the texts of our editions which is free from mistakes.’’ A grammar of the Jewish Aramaic is as yet an impossibility; our Targüm lexicon is full of false forms. A scientific study of the Targümim can be made only upon the basis of a comparison of the best and oldest MSS. If we had only Tiberian MSS. at our disposal, it would be impossible to arrive at any certainty whatever. But the discovery of old Targüm MSS., punctuated according to the Babylonian system, has made such an attempt possible. These Babylonian texts do not differ so much among themselves. They are vocalized according to a uniform system. They represent the pronunciation as it was fixed by a school; the Tiberian, on the other hand, that of the common people. It will be seen from this that the Babylonian texts must form the basis of any future edition of the Targümim. This does not mean that the Babylonian is a priori to be given the prominence over the Tiberian. They are two distinct systems of punctuation, but it is only by means of the Babylonian that we can properly determine the Tiberian system.

But a good deal of preliminary work has to be done before we can think of re-editing any of the Targümim. The different MSS. (of which there are quite a number) must be examined, collated, and arranged in classes. The best must be selected, and the necessary variants noted.

---

* Mercier, in his ‘‘Decalogus Præceptorum Divinorum, etc.,’’ says expressly, ‘‘Item Targhum Onkell in Decalogum…….recens punctis juxta analogiam grammaticam notatam per eundem.’’ Buxtorf, in his edition of 1613, 16, says that he has edited the chaldaic text ‘‘ad antiquam veram et perpetuam prisciæ linguae Chaldaicæ analogiam libris Israæ et Daniæs pulpere cruæ præmonstratum.’’

† See the history of different attempts in Berliner, ‘‘Targum Onkelos,’’ II., p. 193 seq.; Lagarde, ‘‘Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,’’ 1887, No. 22, p. 851, seq. (Mithfeld, II, p. 103).
The general plan of such a work has been sketched in the excellent little
work of Professor Merx, of Heidelberg, "Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der
Targume" (Proceedings of Berlin Oriental Congress, Berlin, 1882, I., 142). With
this end in view the same scholar has compiled the work before us, which forms
part of the Porta Linguarum Orientalium. This little book deserves a hearty
welcome from all interested in these studies. The Babylonian texts are here
taken as the basis; the Tiberian variants from MSS. and old prints are given in
notes at the bottom of the page. Professor Merx has confined himself, in these
notes, to the most necessary references, though he has occasionally given us a
grammatical or lexicographical excursus. The Babylonian superior punctuation
is almost exclusively used, thus giving students a chance of becoming acquainted
with this system. The book will have a double use. For the first time scholars
will have the MS. evidence systematically presented; they will be able to deter-
mine the comparative worth of the two systems of vocalization. But the chrestom-
athy will also be of use to teachers who can safely put these texts into the hands
of students. A small lexicon will make it possible for a beginner to find his way
with very little help. It is safe to suppose that this new chrestomathy will give
a fresh impetus to the study of these ancient texts which are so interesting to
philologists as well as to students of the Biblical Word.

It is impossible in this brief notice to go into any detail. The lexicon is a
very welcome addition, though a more extended use might have been made of
some of the dialects—the Palmyrene for instance. As Professor Merx has occa-
sionally gone out of his way to cite Ethiopic and Arabic, the Assyrian might have
been brought in in several places to advantage. The science of Assyrian philology
has surely advanced far enough to make its claims to recognition heard even by
compilers of rabbinical grammars and lexicons.

It may be well to mention here that the library of Temple Emanu-El, in New
York, possesses a MS. Maḥzôr, of the thirteenth century, which contains a num-
ber of the Haphtarôth in the Aramaic translation. The text is not that of our
usual editions, but similar to the one found by Lagarde in an Erfurt Maḥzôr.*
Upon some other occasion I hope to speak more fully about this Maḥzôr.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, N. Y.

---

* Symmiota I., 139. Cf. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, p. 130.
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SPECIMENS FROM THE NESTORIAN BURIAL SERVICE.

BY ISAAC H. HALL,
New York City.

The Nestorian Burial Service, from which the Ritual of the Washing was published in HEBRAICA of January,¹ well repays reading throughout. There are, to be sure, many repetitions, which become tedious after a while; but there are so many striking anthems and other poetic portions, along with many Scripture passages which appear in a new light, or, owing to the Syriac phraseology, in peculiar fitness for their special application in the service, that the several parts are extremely interesting by themselves, and the whole most beautiful. Many of these occur in the special parts of the service employed over particular classes of the dead. Were it not that a mere synopsis would be tediously long, it would be given here. It will do for the present to say that, besides the separate services for persons of every ecclesiastical grade, and for the men, the women, the youth, and the children, there are others even for the bridegroom, the bride, the rich, the strangers, the murdered, the drowned,—and still more.

It is proposed here to present a few specimens from the paṣāqā, applicable to a few of these classes. In every case, however, there are alternations that may be sung or chanted either in addition to or in place of those here given.

The first specimen is a couple of anthems that conclude the paṣāqā for women. The Syriac text runs as follows, most of the points being omitted, as not necessary for the reader:

¹ In that article, by a double error, the leaves and pages of the MS. were said to be 148 and 296. They should be 138 and 274; two pages being blank.

*2
"Another. In [the tune of] The Lord opened to her. *Anthem:*

"On one of the days [i.e. one day], when I was passing through [lit. over] Bethany,
I also saw there Martha and Mary, as they were weeping.

*Versicles:*

"For they were weeping bitterly a groaning weeping,
Like sirens in the midst of the seas and the rivers.
For they were cooing after the manner of a dove over her young,
Like the man from whom the son of [his] old age is taken away.

*In the same of Women:*

"O King Messiah, Renower of all, vouchsafe to thy handmaid
That with the Wise Virgins she may enter into light.

*Versicles:*

"The dove, the young woman, that was brooding over her young,
Death pounced upon her like a hawk, and destroyed her life;
The blessed vine that was planted in the blessed vineyard [giver.
By the pruning-hook of death, lo! she was gathered in (reaped) from her life-
The chosen stone, that was set in the head of the corner,
By the ax of death, lo! she was torn off from the mountain of her house."
Respecting the fitness of the tune specified in the first rubric, "Another," etc., it may be noted that this anthem follows a series of poetical prayers (anthems and versicles) which, with many beautiful similes, entreat the Lord to receive her, along with the blessed companies, especially the wise virgins (who furnish an abundance of beautiful similes), into the heavenly marriage feast—though that is not the only simile of the sort used. One set of versicles, for instance, contains the following: "El God, merciful Lord of created beings, mingle the soul of thy handmaid with those of the Virgins, that she may sing praise and utter voices [i.e. such as living creatures use as peculiar to their tribe], and multiply thanksgivings and voices of praise to thy great and holy name with all of her [being] joyfulness; that she may be a companion to the Virgins of the Parable." The rubric then takes on the dramatic, the "anthem" representing the Lord as speaking, while the versicles are the antiphonal song of priests and deacons; or, in case of a sufficiently enlightened people, of priests and congregation. The Scripture allusions in both anthem and versicle are generally plain enough. The "sirens," however, join a Scripture idea with one of the literary and folk-lore ideas. For the whole subject, see R. Payne Smith's *Thesaurus*, 2620, 2621. The Septuagint uses the word in a like signification.

With regard to the second anthem and versicles, the "Renewer of all," or "Maker anew of all things," has its origin in a number of Scripture expressions, such as Ps. civ. 30; but cannot possibly, in Syriac, come from Apocalypse xxi. 5. The phrase occurs elsewhere in the Burial Service; e.g. in the anthem at the "complete burying," or filling up the grave: "*Anthem*: O King Messiah, Renewer of all in the day of thy [lit. his] coming, Vouchsafe to thy servant that he may sing praises at thy right hand. *Versicle*: In the day that thou comest, Messiah our King, for the proving of all, Grant to thy servant openness of face with thy holy ones." The other allusions are so manifest that I forbear to give particular references. They would likewise, if all were cited, unduly swell this article. In the Syriac, the fourth word from the end, the scribe has accidentally transposed § with the §.

Another specimen will doubtless be welcome in translation:

"*Another*. Of Brides. *In [the tune of] Blessed be our Work.*

"The Bride, whose soul is departed
From beside the earthly bridegroom,
Is about to become to-day
The bride of the heavenly bridegroom.

*Versicles*:

Instead of gold and of pearls
And the bridal veil of transitory ornament,
In glorious light she takes delight,
In joy which has no comparison.
For the bridechamber which death has dissolved,
That was closed about her on earth,
Lo! Christ has inclosed her on high
In the bridechamber that is full of joys.

In this specimen the last quatrains of the versicles is a little peculiar in idiom, and worth giving in the original:

\[
\text{In the special service for children are some most affecting passages; and the whole would be desirable in translation if it could be presented in a reasonable space. The passage 2 Sam. xii. 16-23, is introduced with wonderful effect. Of course the "suffer little children," or allusion thereto, is introduced over and over again, together with references to Jesus' childhood; but many Scripture thoughts are adapted which it will be hard to find gathered on the same theme in our language. Many other sources, strange to us, are likewise drawn upon. In one chant and versicle the child is dramatically represented as speaking:}

"Let it not grieve you, O [my] parents, that I am separated from you;
For great good things are reserved in heaven for every one that believes.

"Versicles:
Although death has taken me from you in the filling of time [i.e. early],
Little time remains before [you] until I return.
For I know that the love of a father is very compassionate,
And to that of a mother there is no comparison—and Job testifies [thereto].

In several places such consolation is involved for the parents as that which consoled Abraham and Sarah when Isaac was saved from being offered up; but there occurs one remarkable anthem with this allusion that deserves transcription and translation entire:
"Another. In [the tune of] 'The Voice that Calleth.' Anthem:

'Blessed be Christ our Redeemer, who invited the children,
And made them heirs in the dwelling of heaven.

Versicles:

"Said Sarah to Abraham, 'Whither takest thou him—
This our only son whom the Lord gave us?
To the mountain thou art going up, with him [thither] go up I.
Thou seest thou to kill him—in his stead I will die.
And if it be that his Lord require him, with tears let us persuade him
That he will leave to his parents an heir, who is the last one they have.'

"Abraham took the knife, and the fire, with the wood,
And took Isaac, his only son, and went up to the mountain.
His mother gazed upon him, and fell on his breast,
And kissed him and kissed him, and spake thus:
'My son, whom at ninety-nine years old the Lord gave us!
Yet now that the Lord demands thee, get thee away in peace!'

"Kissed him and kissed him" seems to me the only fit rendering of מָלַקְא. "Go thou in peace" is perhaps as good a rendering of ... יָלַק as the one given above, which retains the accusative and keeps a reflexive color.

One more specimen will do for the children. The Syriac of the anthem reads as follows:

From Syriac:

In English the anthem and the following versicles read thus; the versicles rhyming, however, in Syriac:

"Go thou, [bit of] splendor, lighted taper,
Beautiful abundance, sweet and bitter!

"Versicles:

"And as for this consuetude,
The fruit of the tree
Whose ingatherer was death,
Also its spiritual transmitter,
Let the parents know
That precious to his God
Is the laborer that strays not,
The child without sin.

This young boy,
Who found rest in the harbor of the grave,
Is a companion with them
[Who are] in the kingdom of the Son.

The word here rendered "in the harbor" is the rather singular (construct ?) form אֶלֶּחָא, where the ordinary form יִלֹּחַ or יִלֹּחַ (without dropping the final l) might have been expected, since it is a foreign word. It may, however, have been intended for the exact Greek form, nominative or accusative, λυθη. In most cases where the word commonly occurs, it would seem that the dative form had been transferred into the language.

The preceding specimens come from that part of the pası̂qı̂a called the qurba_n, or offering (qurba_n in the plural), which some may think a separate division of the service. The canon for the qurba_n is given, with certain other canons, near the end of the MS., as follows; the places here omitted, or in brackets, being the four or five words that are torn away at the corner of a leaf, where some, at least letters, must be conjecturally supplied:

"Concerning the Qurbané of the Departed. Concerning the qurba_n (i.e. offerings) and commemorations and restings (requiems) which believers perform for their departed, they are not known as a canon which the apostles doubted. For if the qurba_n and [commemorations] are not profitable, how do we believe that the Lord Jesus (is adorable in?), or, magnified(?) his honor? For he offered himself as an offering (qurba_n) to his Father, and paid the debt of our father Adam, and expiated his sin which was the cause of death. For he that doubts in this respect is no Christian, but denies the resurrection of the dead, according to the testimony of the blessed Paul, ‘For if the dead rise not, neither is Christ risen; for all of it, that he descended to Sheol, and that he will revive the dead from [their] graves, and in deed will establish the general resurrection—if Christ rose not, that preaching is vain, and our belief is a thing of nought. But that Christ rose from the dead is very truth, the signs and wonders establish, that were done at the hands of the apostles, who testified concerning the resurrection; for God did not show his powers and mighty deeds by the hands of lying witnesses; and the wise men of Greece and the philosophers of Athens would not have received the preaching that the Man Crucified rose from the dead...[world], unless they had seen signs of mighty working that was above nature,[done] by the preachers of the resurrection. Therefore the dead are more abundantly helped by.
qūrbanē and restings (requiems) and righteousnesses (alms) which are done in their behalf, and they attain rest of their souls and expiation of their sins, without doubt."

In the preceding parts of the pāsēqā occur many anthems and versicles of which the curious might desire a specimen. The betrothed maiden, the bridegroom cut off just before his wedding, the only son of a mother, and so on, have affecting dirges sung over them; but the similes are mostly too familiar to be cited. Over strangers, besides the lamentation that he died away from his friends, and had no mother or other relations to weep over him, no familiar ones rightly to perform his obsequies, the comparison of his burial with that of Moses, whose sepulchre no man knoweth, though the angels gathered him in, is used in several ways, with extreme beauty. But to say nothing of lack of space, a translation would scarcely exhibit their excellence without the full Syriac text. The murdered have a choice of seven different anthems (with the versicles); the drowned, four, in which Peter's experience in walking on the water—saved by Jesus' hand, and the flood, serve as some of the effective comparisons. In many of them the metrical structure of the anthem adds to the force, though the variation consists in little more than the number of syllables in a verse (line). In some, as the versicles for the betrothed maiden, rhyme decidedly adds to the force. For the rich there are four anthems, which readers will doubtless be gratified to see in translation, though it would be better to see the shading from the original text:

"Another. Of the Rich. In the tune 'To Him that is Compassionate.' Anthem.

"O world, how bitter art thou!  
And thy gains are not fast held.

As for me, woe is me! What shall I do?  
For the day of judgment draws nigh, is at hand!

"Versicles:

"Thou didst move me, also thou didst entice (or, flatter) me  
By thy refreshments, and by thy wealth,  
And like a bird of prey thou didst bind me fast,  
And didst loose me that I may seek forgiveness.

"For thy refreshments are transitory [lit., of the filling of time],  
And their diligent quests are distress,  
And their joys not to be relied upon;  
They have sunk me in perdition.

"Anthem:

"Flee from the world, flee from its riches, also from its evil;  
And look and examine into the way of death, how bitter [it is]."
"Versicles:

"Look upon me, brethren, how I wrought and how I toiled; But nothing of my possessions cleaves to me, except my deeds.

"The riches of the world do not deliver the race of man, Nor does his substance enter with him into the kingdom.

"Of the Rich. In the same [tune].

"Flee from the world and from men, O man! And prove and see that thou certainly diest, O man!

"Versicles:

"The grave is thy house; and the darkness, thy light, O man! And worms and the moth eat thy flesh, O man!

"Those [treasures] that thou gatheredst, for whom shall they be, O man! And thy debts alone go with thee, O man!

"Cursed is the world, and cursed is its riches, O man! And cursed is every one whosoever that loves it, O man!

"Of the Rich. In the tune 'Come, let us Repent.' Anthem.

"O inhabitant of time [i.e. temporary dweller], Whom his acquisitions will not deliver, Rest thee in the peace That lodgeth beside thee.

"Versicles:

"By thy favors I was increased, Yet I was despised with thee [i.e. in thy estimation]; And to-day I go down To the grave of humiliation.

"Look on me, beloved ones, And remember my despising, And love it no more— The riches of this world."
THE HEBREW HEXAMETER.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Hebrew Hexameter is a double trimeter. The caesura ordinarily divides the line in the middle. Hence it is not always easy to decide whether the line is a hexameter or two trimeters. But there are several helps to the decision of this question. (a) The hexameter lines occasionally divide by the caesura into $4 + 2$ or $2 + 2 + 2$. (b) There will also be examples of two caesuras dividing the line into $2 + 2 + 2$. (c) Pentameter lines will be found to vary the movement. As we have found that the poet will shorten his trimeter into a dimeter, his tetrameter into a trimeter and his pentameter into a tetrameter, so there are occasional pentameter lines in hexameter poems. (d) The second half of the line will be complement to the first half, and the parallelism will be between the hexameter lines.

I. THE CAPABLE WIFE.

אשא-זוול 미 ינאו | וחרק תמניים מברך
בשח-כח בל בלה | וישל ליה והר
נמלוחהwordpress אל-Pri | בל ימי חי
דרשה צרפ פחתות | ותעש בפח כפיה
יהוה כל ינויים חותר | מחמוד ימי окי ליום
מקים בור-יליה | וחתן תור-להיה | וחוק לערתיה
המות שירוד תודרה | ימי הקみました בחר
טור南部 מתקני | והאמן ותודרה
שעמה כיJAVA שחרה | לא-כבב בליל נרה
ידיה שחלדה ביבש | ו_Positive מחמת פלך
כפה פרשתيط נון | וייח שחלדה לַאִיבָּן
לא-תאיר אליהם שליח | כי-כל ידהLouis שים שינה
מרביה עשתה-יל | שיש וראפת לברשה
נורא בשעותיו בלא | ובשובה על-קידן אורן
סוס עשתה והמר | וחזור נבנה לבעני
ען יחר lavoro | והשקת ליום אחרון
פי פרה נבנה | וחזור חור עлер-שבעה
עמשי הילדה חייה | קדים עצלא לא-יושבה
This beautiful alphabetical poem might be taken as composed of alphabetical trimeter distichs, so far as most of the poem is concerned; for the caesura is in the middle of the line in all cases except four lines. But lines 1 and 6 have two caesuras and the lines with מ and נ are pentameters.

**Psalm CXXXVII.**

I.

עִלְּגָּרְדָו בֵּלָּלֶנָּה | בַּמְּלֹאכָּה | בַּהֲקָם | בַּעְּלוֹבָּה
בְּאוֹרָהֲתָא זָרָה | יָכַל-עֶרֶבֶּשָּׁם | בְּהַלְוֵרָהֲתָא | בְּקֹשִׁים
כְּשָׁמְאָלָהּ שָׁבָּרָה | רַבָּרָה שָׁבָּרָה
וּהָטַּלָּנָהּ שְׁמָהָה | שִׁירוֹ לְבָכִר זָאִין

II.

אוֹשַׁר נַעַר הָאָרְמָתָא | עַל-אָרְמָתָא נַכְּרָה
אַמְסִךְ שָׁבָּרָה | שָׁבָּרָה יְסָרִיה | חָרָבָּה יְסָרִיה | יְסָרִיה
הָרָבָּה לֵשָׁנָא | לֵשָׁנָא לִבָּא | לַאֲבַרְכֵּךְ
לָא לְאַעֲלוֹת אֲדַר-רִישָּׁלָה | עִלְּרָאָשָׁמ שְׁמָהָה

III.

זָהָהֲרָה לְבָנִי אֻרְוָב | אֲדוֹתָמ | יִשְׁמָר
הָאָמָרֶם עַרִי עַרִי | עַרִי הָעֵלֶם הָה
בָּטַּלָּנָהּ שָׁבָּרָה | בָּטַּלָּנָהּ שָׁבָּרָה | בָּטַּלָּנָהּ שָׁבָּרָה
אַשָּׁר שָׁיָאָה | נֵפִּים אֲדַר-עֲלָלִים | אוֹלָהֲלוּ

This song is composed of three strophes of four lines each. The hexameters are more varied than in the previous piece. The Massorites make an unfortunate division of verses one and two that destroys the rhythm. We have really two hexameter lines with each two caesuras, and the parallelism is essentially synonymous. The second distich is also synonymous in the relations of its lines; but the distich is progressive to the first distich, giving the reason of it. The third hexameter has its caesura after the fourth beat, the fourth hexameter after the second beat.

In the second strophe the first line has the caesura after the fourth beat. This is followed by a synonymous tristich. The second line of the strophe is a pentameter as it stands; but the verb lacks an object which must be supplied, and
it is not clear from the context what that should be. It seems likely that the object has been omitted by an early copist, and the line has thus become defective. We might supply הָרְפֵא or some such noun. The third line has the caesura in the middle, and the fourth line gives the caesura after the fourth beat.

The third strophe is composed of two distichs. The first distich is synthetic; the second is synonymous. The first expresses the vindictive feelings toward Edom; the second, towards Babylon. The first line has the caesura after the fourth beat; the second line, in the middle; the third line has two caesuras and is rather long; the fourth line gives the caesura after the second beat. It is possible that הבִּילְכֵּל is a later addition, and that the whole of the last strophe originally referred to Edom.

(8) Isaiah lx. is a fine example of the hexameter. It agrees with the first piece that we have given in placing the caesura in the middle of the line so frequently that in many places the production seems like a trimeter poem. But taking the poem as a whole, there seems to be little doubt that it is a hexamer.

**Isaiah lx.—Strophe I.**

כְּרֵמָא וְכִּבְּרַי אָצְרִי | בּוֹבָרְרַי הָוהָה עֵלֶךְ וְרָּחִי כֵּרֵמָא חָוָה יִכְּסַה אָצְרִי | עֲמֵרַי לַאֲמָם
עֲלֵךְ יִרְחָה יִיָּה | בּוֹבָרְרַי עֵלֶךְ יִרְחָה
והָלָךְ נִכְּסַה לַאֲמָם | מִלָּכָה לַנָּה וְרָּחִי
שָׁאָלָךְ עַנְּיֵךְ יִרְחָה | כֵּלָם נִכְּסַה קרַלַכְּל
בִּנְּיָךְ מִרְחָה יִכְּסֲה | בּוֹבָרְרַי עֵלֶךְ הָוהָה
אֶזְרָךְ הָוהָה | פַּחֲרַר הָוהָה לַכְּלָבָק
כְּרֵמָא עַלְּפָה הָוניִים | הָלוֹלִים יִכְּסַּה קרַל
שֶׁפַּעֲקַנְּוּ见过ֶם הָכָּפָרָה | בּוֹרְרַי מִרְחַת עֵלֶךְ עֵלֶךְ
מְשָׁבָה יִכְּסַּה | דֶּבְּרַלְכָּה שֶׁפַּעֲקַנְּוּ见过ֶם הָוהָה
כַּלָּנָא קָרָר יִכְּבְּרַיֵּךְ | אֵלַי נִכְּסַּה יִשְׁרָאֵלַךְ
יִעָלַל עַלְּפָהֵיהֶם | בּוֹטָה הָפָרָאָה אֵפָאְרִי

These lines all have the caesura in the middle with the exception of two. The second line has the measure 4+2; the tenth line has two caesuras. The Massorites wrongly attach בּולָ to the tenth line. We have given it at the close of the ninth, where it is necessary to complete the hexameter movement. If this were the only strophe of the poem, it might be taken as a trimeter.

**Strophe II.**

מִיָּאֵיִלּוֹ עַעֲפָתִינוֹ | כַּוָּיִמּוֹ אַל אָרְבְּאוֹתֵה
כִּלּּלִי אָם יִכְּוַי | אָנוֹיָה הָרְשִׁי בְּרַשָּׁהָ
לָתְלִיהָ בֶּן מַרְאֹן | בְּסִפְּרִים וּרְבּוֹת אֱלֹהִים
לְשֹׁמַיָּהוּ אָלָאִים | וְאָכְרָשַׁת שִׁירֹת לְבָשָׂרָן
בֵּנוֹנֶנֶגֶר חֶסֶרֶךְ | צְלָלֵיכָם יִשְׁרְוֹן
כִּכְּפֶּסֶף הָכָיתִים | הֻנֵּרֵנָיָה רַחְמֵנִיָּה
אָרוֹם שִׁעַרְךָ חֶמְרוֹ | יִשְׂמַחְוַל לְלַעֲשָׂר
לָהְבוּא אָלָאִים חֶלְּבָּה | וְאָכְרָשַׁת חֶרְדָּר הַרְאוֹר יִוָרְךָ
לָפֵאָר מֶכֶסֶם מְכֶסֶם | מְכֶסֶם רְגָלִי אַכֶּבֶר

In this strophe there are four lines in which there is a departure from the usage of this piece to place the caesura in the middle of the line. There are two pentameters in lines 5 and 6. Line 8 has the measure 4+2. Line 10 is a broken line such as we have found at times in tetrameters and pentameters.

**Strophe III.**

וְהלָלֵךְ אֶלֶּיךָ שְׁזוּחֵךְ | בָּנִי מְעַנֶּךָ
וְחָשְׁרֵתֵךְ עַל חָפְתּ רֶנֶךְ | בַּל מְעָנָךְ
וּהָרָאָרָא צוּרֵךְ | צֶּעַרְךָ בַּיְּאָרָא
חֵטָאת חֵזְקֵךְ עָוֹנָךְ | שִׁמֶגֶתָךְ אֶמְשָׁך
שְׁמֵמָרֵי לֶמֶצְוָנִי עֲלִימ | מַשְׁחֵךְ הָרָא הָדוּר
יִנְקֶק חָלוֹב נֶציָא | וּשְׁרֵמָלָא חָנֶק
וֹרְעָה בִּי-אָנוּי יִהוָה מָעָשְׂךָ | נַגֵּל אַבְרָאִיק
חָטָאת נוֹהַשְּׁתָא אֵיבָא יוֹב | יוֹהָה-כָּבָרָא אֹלֵא קָסָח
וְהָה-עַעַצְמוּ (אֲבָאָא) נוֹהַשְּׁת | יוֹהָה-כָּבָרָא (אֲבָאָא) בָּרָא
רְשָׁמְהֶי פְּקרָרֵךְ שִׁלָּם | נַנְשָׂךְ זָרָקָה
לא-ישְׁמַעְוַל עַזָּה הָדָא-כָּרָא | שְׁרֵי-שֶׁבֶר בַּפּוֹכַלִּק
וּקְרְאָא יִשְׁחֵת הָמֵתָח | יֵשֵׁר הָתוֹלָה

This strophe differs from the other two already considered in having a much greater variety of measure. Lines 1, 2, 10 and 12 are pentameters. Lines 7 and 11 have the measure 4+2. Line 9 seems to be defective in the Massorethic text. It is necessary to insert the verb אֲנִי twice here, as in the previous line; then the hexameter has the caesura in the middle.

**Strophe IV.**

לָא-יוֹיְתֵל-לָעֲרֵךְ שִׁמֶנָּשְׁךָ לְאָוְרֲו לִימוֹ | וּלָגְנָה הַיִּוָרְךָ לְאִי אַיָּלְךָ
וּיְוַיְלֵךְ לוֹוה לְאָוְרֲעַלְךָ | אֲלָדָיִלְךָ לְמַכְּרָאָרָא

...
The three previous strophes are of twelve lines. This fourth strophe has but eight lines. The lines have the caesura in the middle with the exception of lines 2 and 6, which are pentameters, and the last line, which is a broken line and a trimeter.

(4) Jeremiah is very fond of the hexameter movement. We shall give a specimen from his lamentation in chapters viii.--ix.

The lines as usual are divided by the caesura into two equal parts; but there are exceptions. Line 2 has the measure 4 + 2, lines 4 and 8 are pentameters, and lines 5, 11 and 12 have two caesuras each.

The prophet Jeremiah uses the hexameter movement in his little book of comfort (xxx.--xxxii.). Another fine example of the hexameter is the Apocalypse Isaiah, xxiv.--xxvii., which is composed of twelve strophes of ten lines each (see Briggs’ “Messianic Prophecy,” 295–308; 246–257). Examples might be multiplied; but we have given a sufficient number to illustrate the rhythm.
A SYRIAC FRAGMENT.

BY PROF. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, N. Y.

In the year 1888, whilst busied in Berlin and London with the Syriac translations of the Canon of Aristotle and of the Isagoge of Porphyry,¹ I had occasion to examine closely MS. Sachau 116. It is described in the Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau'schen Sammlung, p. 11, as containing "Sticke logischer Schriften von Aristoteles und Porphyrius (bes. tabellarische Darstellungen)."

The MS. consists wholly of individual leaves and parts of different Kurrâs. I have not noted how many there are; but some of my extracts were taken from Kurrâs twenty-four and twenty-five. The MS. must, therefore, have been quite voluminous. These "tabellarische Darstellungen" are nothing more than the well-known Tubels of Porphyry.² These tables commence at the end of Kurrâs 24 where we read

As a specimen, I give the first table:

¹ There are at least two translations of the Isagoge into Syriac (MS. or. Berlin Petermann, 1, 9, fols. 8b-36a, and MS. Brit. Mus. add. 14, 658, fols. 61-73). There is also an Arabic translation in the Petermann MS. I have made copies of all three. For other MSS. see Wenrich De Auctorum Graecorum versionibus, etc., Lipsiae, 1842, p. 280. The Arabic translation mentioned by Wenrich, l. c., p. 283, Zenker, Aristotelis Categorice, p. 13, as having been made by Bar 'Ebhrayâ, is probably only a compendium. Such a compendium exists also in the Sâwâdh Sûphîa, Hêwâth Hêkâmîthâ, and Münarâth Kudhâ. See A List of Plants, etc., p. 9.

² Of the Syriac translation of the Categories there are even four different versions known to me. 1. MS. Brit. Mus., 14659 fol. 3a-22b, perhaps by George, Bishop of Arabs, in a MS. of the 8th or 9th century. 2. MS. Brit. Mus. add. 14658, fol. 73a-91b, probably by Sargis of Râs 'Ain, in a MS. of the 7th century. 3. MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Ancient Fonds 161, fol. 11b-27b (according to a collation of Dr. Winckler) = MS. Vatican 158, fol. 27b (collation of Prof. Gudl), by the celebrated Ya'kîb 'Urbâyâ (cf. Hoffmann, De Hermeneutica, p. 17). 4. Berlin MS. Sachau 226 fol. 10a-42b, a very recent copy (see A Treatise on Syriac Grammar, p. 23). I have made faithful copies of the London and Berlin MSS.

The MS., however, contains no work of Aristotle. The text which still remains in addition to the tables, consists of a rhymed metrical description (I cannot call a poem) of the human body. The description is interrupted (verses 87–162) by a comparison of the human body with the vegetable and animal world. Verses 162–165 read "we will also enumerate briefly | each one of the parts (of the body) | what power it has | in the human body. |

As the description now stands (completing the first strophe), it contains 267 verses. The beginning is wanting. How many verses there were originally it is now impossible to say. I think the end is complete. Whether the leaves which contain the following text follow each other correctly is questionable. They were disconnected and bore neither mark or catch-word. The Kurrása number did not
suffice. I have simply arranged the leaves in the way the text would give the best sense.

We have here the heptasyllabic metre of Mār(i) 'Aprēm (חַּלְּעֵּנֵי אֵשֶׁר), each strophe consisting of four verses. I was for some time doubtful whether fol. 3a was in its proper place. The strophe has five verses; but in two other places the same thing occurs (lines 234 seq. and 259 seq.), which seems to show that the addition is intentional.

The title and the author of the composition are unknown. From line 37, (כְּפָּרַם, הַנּוֹמָה), l. 165 (וְּאֵיָּרַנְדָּה), and from the fact that the personal pronoun which refers to the subject of which the author is speaking is always masculine, I infer that the title was | לַעֲמֻדַּא | כְּפָּרַם. Karmseddināyā, ap. Payne Smith, col. 2354, s. v. | עָמַגְּדַּה, cites two verses (255, 256) as from a | עָמַגְּדוּת “metrical homily or description.” The same is the case with verses 31 and 32; see Payne Smith, col. 978, s. v. פֶּנָה. In his article on the word | עָמַגְּדוּת col. 2238, Payne Smith says that where Karmseddināyā uses the word as an authority, he does so “spec. de Bar-Heb. carminibus.” I am unable to decide whether this is so in our case. The full title no doubt is | לַעֲמֻדַּת | כְּפָּרַם.

The MS. is written in a good bold Nestorian hand of about the seventeenth century.1 Vowels and diacritical points have been abundantly added. I have not thought it necessary, except in a very few instances, to reproduce these. Professor Nöildeke, of Strassburg, has very kindly offered me some textual suggestions which I have acknowledged at the foot of the page.

---


2 Nöildeke MS.
A Syriac Fragment.

209

صُصَمَّ يُنفِّقُ مَكْرُهُ.

صُمَّمَ فَعَنُبٌ سَمَّحَهُ.

صُصَمَّ مَكْرُهُ.

صُصَمَّ مَكْرُهُ.

1 Nöld.; MS. 53
2 Fol. 1b.
53. מחמה ב Câmara אולם.
71. מבנה סלע למחנה.
77. עמדה סלע המסבך.
81. מחנה בר עמנואל רוחב.
85. מחנה מסנים חפץ.
50. מחנהophobic אולם.
57. סלע מקרא חצובה.
61. חפץ במחנה.
65. מחנה מסים מוכיים.
69. מחנה מסים מוכיים.
73. מסים מחנה מסים.
78. מסים מחנה מסים.
80. מסים מסים מסים.
83. מסים מסים מסים.
88. המסים מסים המסים.

1 Read א"ללקיא
2 Fol. 2a
3 Nöld.; my copy has א looking! Mas.
A Syriac Fragment.
A Syriac Fragment.

166

168

170

174

178

182

186

190

194

198

1 Fol. 8b. 2 Nöld.; MS. [not legible]
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لا يَتَعَبِّرُ عَلَى مَعَارِضَةٍ

1. لا يَسَّرُّ بِمَعَارِضَةٍ

202

هَذِهُ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. هَذَا مَعَارِضَةٌ

214

سَكَّةٌ قَبَّةٌ

1. سَكَّةٌ قَبَّةٌ

210

مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. مَعَارِضَةٌ

223

عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

220

مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

1. مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

226

عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

228

مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

1. مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

228

عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

218

مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

1. مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

220

مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

1. مَعَارِضَةٌ عَرْبَةٌ

225

عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

214

فَحْشَا عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. فَحْشَا عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

214

فَحْشَا عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1. فَحْشَا عَرْبَةٌ مَعَارِضَةٌ

1 Fol. 4a. 2 Nöld.; MS.
PENTATEUCHAL ANALYSIS.

BY BENJAMIN WISNER BACON,

Lyme, Conn.

A few words touching the field of controversy are needed in order to a correct idea of the theories and the stand-point of the authorities cited.

The prevailing theory is the Grafiian. Graf's followers, pre-eminent among whom are Kuenen and Wellhausen, consider the "prophetic," so-called (JE), to be the older of the two main sources of the Hexateuch. JE itself is composite, a close amalgamation of two kindred narratives of Hebrew history. J (circ. 800) and E (circ. 750) circulated for a time independently, and were more or less modified. After the destruction of Ephralm and the discovery of Deuteronomy (621) whose origin also must be placed at about this period (650—621), J and E were united into a closely welded whole, and soon after, Deuteronomy, which had, meantime, received an introduction and an appendix, was incorporated.

These two processes necessitated further interpolation and modification, and for a considerable period \( \frac{(J + E) + D}{R_{je} \cdot R_{d}} = JED \) circulated as a well-rounded "prophetic" compilation. But with the interruption of the cultus by the exile began the process of codification of the Levitical, ritual law. Heretofore it had been consuetudinary, tradition and the living praxis having sufficed for its transmission. Ezekiel (40-48)\(^3\) inaugurated the new system of a written Torah, which progressed during the exile with the formation of the code known as the Heiligkeitsgesetz, P\(^1\) (Lev. 17—26), an antique body of laws midway in tone between Deuteronomy and the priestly legislation. It culminated in the priestly code, P\(^2\). This great work drew from JE a sketch of the history, made from its own stand-point; it incorporated and added to P\(^1\), and was itself subsequently expanded by P\(^3\). Ezra introduced it as the constitution of the post-exilic hierarchical state. A final redactor, R, combined P with JED at some time between

---

1 A Tabular Presentation according to Representatives of the Principal Schools of Higher Criticism, Including Fragments and Portions Assigned to Editors, Interpolators, Compilers and Glossators.

The writer has in preparation a volume embodying the subjoined analysis and presenting J, E, and P conjecturally restored.

In order that the discussion of the Pentateuchal question, announced by Professors Harper and Green, might be followed to the best advantage, it was decided to insert as a preliminary paper a "tabulated presentation" of the Analysis itself. Everyone will see, at a glance, that with such a presentation as a basis the discussion can be conducted much more easily and satisfactorily. The second paper upon the subject will appear in the October HERBALICA, and will treat of the first twelve chapters of Genesis.—Editor.

2 Wellhausen holds that the amalgamation of J and E preceded the origin of D.

3 Throughout the article, chapters are distinguished from verses by means of bold-faced type.
Ezra’s promulgation thereof (444 B.C.) and the appearance of the LXX. version (circa 250 B.C.). We might express the process by the formula: \[ \frac{\text{Hexateuch} = (J + E) + D + (P_1 + P_2 + P_3)}{\text{Rje} \quad \text{Rd} \quad \text{R}} \]

Against the Grafilians a minority of critics under the able leadership of Dillmann still maintain the older theory, in a modified form. This school nearly coincides with the Grafilian in the date and origin assigned to the prophetic narrative JE, and to Deuteronomy; but insists upon an earlier origin for P. Dillmann describes the development of the priestly element (P) somewhat as follows:¹

The most ancient portions of P are more properly to be considered a cluster of fragments, most densely aggregated together in Lev. 17-26, but scattered also throughout the middle portion of the Hexateuch from Ex. 31 to Num. 15. In a certain sense they may be considered as having a common “source,” since attempts at codification were made probably as early as the period of Jehoshaphat, the material itself being consuetudinary law transmitted in certain cases from a period as remote as the first centuries after the conquest. But this source P¹ (Dill. S) shows no such unity of design as to enable us to treat it as a specific document. On the contrary certain portions were incorporated by P² and worked over by him, certain others were taken up by R after complete recasting at his hand, still others adopted in an unassimilated form.⁴

But the differences still remaining between these various fragments of P¹, after allowance has been made for the double redaction of P² and R in the one case and of R alone in the other, is too great to admit of their having existed together in a single code. Two codes of P¹ at least were current, beside individual toroth, and the process of redaction of P¹ extended demonstrably into the Exile. A considerable group of fragments from one of these (including its hortatory conclusion, Lev. 26:3-46) still exhibiting its characteristic point of view of “holiness,” is preserved to us in Leviticus 17—26, worked over, however, by P².

P², for whom the date 800 B.C. is approximately determined by Dillmann, is held to be dependent for his historical material largely upon E (900–850 B.C.), also upon the sources of J, which are frequently very ancient. Here and there he has ancient historical material of his own, but his richest sources are of course the priestly toroth. In the first half of the eighth century appeared J, dependent largely upon E, but also using P², though writing from a totally different standpoint. As a popular writer he has access to popular sources. R’s work consisted simply in the simultaneous combination of E, P², J, and parts of P¹. Very rarely does he use the pen; but in the transposition, clipping, and piecing of his material he shows the utmost freedom. Deuteronomy, the latest document of the

¹The Hypothesis broached in Dill. II. of a version of S (P¹) worked over and incorporated by C (P¹J) is withdrawn in Dill. III., p. 463; hence the only remaining versions of P¹ recognized by him are P¹P² and P¹R. From these are to be distinguished perhaps unadulterated fragments P¹ (III., pp. 583-570).
Hexateuch, was added by a later redactor, R^4, who used the pen more freely. Thus Dillmann, followed in general by Ed. Riehm ("Handwörterbuch der bibl. Alterthum," Halle).

The most recent period of Hexateuch criticism shows the development of a third school of more conservative character. W. Robertson Smith ("Old Test. in the Jewish Church," Appleton & Co., 1881; and "Prophets of Israel," 1882) made an attempt to show the compatibility of the Graffian theory with evangelical theology; but for a time the only safe course for orthodox scholars who recognized the scientific character of critical methods, was supposed to be to follow Dillmann. Two professors of the Leipzig faculty, however, F. E. König ("Offenbarungs begriff des Alt. Test.," 2 vols.; Leipzig, 1882), and the veteran commentator of world-wide fame, Franz Delitzsch ("Ztschr. f. k. W. und k. Leben," 1880; and "Genesis," Leipzig, 1887) have boldly adopted the Graffian theory in its main outlines as not only in their opinion preferable in itself, but as affording a better basis for the defence of orthodoxy than Dillmann’s. W. Graf von Bandissin also ("Heutige Stand der a. t. Wissenschaft," Giessen, 1885) seeks a middle ground between Dillmann and Wellhausen. But in the special department of Hexateuch analysis a still more recent writer has the best claim to be considered the representative of that modern school which seeks both to avail itself of all the resources of criticism from an evangelical stand-point and to take an independent position while doing full justice to Dillmann on the one hand and to Kuenen and Wellhausen on the other. This most recent authority is R. Kittel ("Geschichte der Hebräer," Gotha, 1888).

The following is a list of authorities from which our data are derived:

**Dillmann, August.**

Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Hand-buch zum Alten Testament.

Vol.

**Delitzsch, Franz.**


**Kittel, R.**

Geschichte der Hebräer.

2. Theologische Studien aus Württemberg VII. 1886.

**Kuenen, A.**

2. Theologisch Tijdschrift XI., XII., XIII., XV., XVIII. 1877-1884.
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Wellhausen, Julius.

Bußde, K.
II. Gen. XLVIII. 7 und die benachbarten Abschnitte: Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, III. 1883.
III. Richter und Josua. Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, VIII. 1887.

Jülicher, A.

The above cited works furnish the data for the summary of Hexateuch analysis, and are selected for completeness and for their representative character. The divergence between the analysis of Dillmann and Wellhausen measures, probably, the extent of difference on this score among the recognized critical authorities of to-day.

These authorities are referred to under the following abbreviations: Dill. I., II., III.; Del. I. and II. 1, 2, 3, etc.; Kitt. I., II.; Kuen. I. and XI., XII., etc.; Well. I., II., III.; Bud. I., II., III.; Jül. I., II., III. For a bibliography of critical works, the reader is referred to Dill. I., II., III. and Kuen. I.

A. THE PRIESTLY LAW BOOK P3.

I. Genesis.

In the following pages the analysis of Dillmann is given as the basis, and that of the other critics in the foot-notes. Every divergence, even if no more than a portion of a verse, is noted. Where more or less is attributed by different critics to the source in question, this also is indicated. Where there is complete agreement id. (idem) is used. I have not thought it necessary in giving the analysis of Kuenen and Wellhausen in all cases to distinguish between JE, the redactor of J and E (whose work was performed about the period of D, and whose style is admitted to be almost indistinguishable from the deuteronomio), and R3, the redactor of JE and D. The distinction is not always made by the critics themselves. In general it amounts to this, that JE is a harmonist, R3 an interpolator and embellisher. P3, in our nomenclature, stands for all additions not of a merely editorial nature, appended by second, third or fourth hand to the great law-book whose framework is the priestly history. Similarly J3, E3, D3, include all elements not of an editorial character which have been appended to the original "prophetic" documents. Notes intended according to the critics for harmonizing JE and E, or for the union of JE to D, and glosses and Interpolations in general of a minor character, supposed to have preceded the union of JED to P, are included under R3. R occupies toward JEDP the same relation that R3 does to JED. Dillmann's theory, of course, makes the activity of R precede that of R3 whose work consisted in uniting D to JEP.

1. The Toledoth of the Heavens and the Earth: an account of creation and of the institution of the Sabbath.
1:2-2:4a (2:4a, the original title, was removed from before 1:2 by R, who supplied instead v. 1).\(^1\)

2. *The Book of the Toledoth of Adam*: a genealogy of ten generations, the tenth link branching into three, showing the descent of Noah from Adam in the line of the eldest son.

5:1-32 (exc. v. 29 [= J]).\(^2\)

2. *The Toledoth of Noah*: an account of the flood, lasting for two periods of five months and one of two months (365 days), and of the institution of God’s covenant with Noah; the Noachic legislation.

6:9-22; 7:6, 11, 13-16a, 18-21, 23b, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b, -5, 13a, 14-19; 9:1-17, 23f (7:7-9 = R)\(^8\).

4. *The Toledoth of the sons of Noah*: an ethnological table deriving the peoples of the world by descent from the three sons of Noah, beginning with the youngest.

10:1-7, 20, 22f, 31f.\(^4\)


11:10-26.\(^5\)


11:27, 31*, 32 (usalemה יזנא v. 31 = R) 12:4b, 5; 13:6, 11b (from מלחומ יאליהו) 12a (to רוכבל).\(^6\)

(b) Further items in the history of the Terachites: Lot delivered from the overthrow of Sodom; Abram begets Ishmael; theophany to Abram and institution of the law of circumcision; promise of Isaac; Isaac’s birth; Sarah dies; Abraham buys the field of Ephron and buries Sarah in the cave of Machpelah; death and burial of Abraham.

19:29; 21:1, 13, 15f; ch. 17 (in v. 1 read לארשי, changed by R to לוהיט) 21: 1b*, 2b-5 (in v. 1b read לארשי) ch. 23; 25:7-11a.\(^7\)


---

\(^1\) Well, Kuen., Bud., Del., Kitt., 1:1-2:4a (2:4a before 1:1; Well. finds traces of an older source employed by P. Bud. and Kuen. (?) identify this older writer as J, the author of the deluge story, whom P follows elsewhere.)

\(^2\) Id. (Bud. finds also traces of enrichment by R from J in vs. 22-24. In v. 22 he reads ‘וַיֵּלֵךְ יִרְמָיו’ and from v. 24 only ‘וַיָּלָךְ יָרָם וְיָרָם נָאְרָו’ (לארשי)).

\(^3\) Id. (exc. 7:23b, given to J by Bud., Kuen. and Del.; 7:1a, assigned to P2 [exc. בְּנֵי נְעָר יִשְׂרָאֵל = R] by Bud. and Kuen. (?); and 7:6 and 8:13b given by Well., the former to R, the latter to J).

\(^4\) Id. Kittel’s analysis begins at this point. He finds P2 in the same verses.

\(^5\) Id.

\(^6\) Id. (exc. Well. 11:23 and 30 also = P2 and last clause of 12:5 = J. Del. and Kitt. consider דברי כְּפָרָע original. Bud. assigns it to J).

\(^7\) Id. (exc. as to 16:1 and 21:1f; Kitt. 16:1a; Well., Del., 16:1 = J; Well., Kuen. and Del. deny 21:1b to P2. Kitt. and Del. assign also v. 2a to P2. Bud. as above. see I., p. 224 note).
25:12-17. 8

8. The Toledoth of Isaac: his marriage and the birth of his sons; Esau's marriage displeasing to his parents; Jacob blessed and sent to Paddan-aram for a wife; his family there; he returns [and is involved in war with the Shechemites]; God meets him at Bethel and there renews the covenant with him; arrived at Hebron his father dies and is buried by Esau and Jacob; Esau removes to Mt. Seir.

25:19,20...26b; 26:34f; 27:46; 28:1-9; (29:24,29; 30:4a, 9b(?)); 31:18; 33:18; 34:1a,2a,4,6,8-10,15-17,20-24... (vs. 13f,18,25,27-29 and מֶלְאָכָה in v. 5 = R); 35:6a, 9-15 (exc. דּוּי in v. 9 [= R]) 16 in part, 19 in part; 22b (from יְלִיוֹת) -29; 36:2a,5b,6-8; 37:1; (36:1,2b-5a = R with a basis of J(?) and P²). 9

9. The Toledoth of Esau: an ethnogico-genealogical table deriving the twelve tribes of the Edomites from Esau; the sons of Esau; [the seven alaphim of the Horites; the royal succession of Edom]; the alaphim of the Edomites.

36:9a,*10a,11,18,16-18*,19a,29f,31-35a,36-43; (vs. 9b,12 and 14, יְלִיוֹת in v. 16, and רְאִיתו בְּרָאִית in vs. 19 and 35b = R. The names of Esau's wives also in vs. 10,13f,16-18 were altered by R to bring them into correspondence with his source in vs. 1-5). 10

10. The Toledoth of Jacob: Joseph's greatness in Egypt; the sons of Jacob migrate thither [a table of Jacob's descendants]; Pharaoh gives them audience and offers them the land of Ramses; Jacob brings his life to a close in Egypt; adopts the sons of Joseph; gives final directions to his sons; dies, and is buried in the cave of Machpelah.

37:2a (to יְלִיוֹת or to יַעֲקֹב or to יְלִיוֹת) 41:46,(47(?),36(?),50(?)); 46:6f,8-27, (vs. 8,12b, 15,20, 26f worked over by R); 47:5b, supplying it from LXX. יִבְרָא מַזְיַרֵה אֲלֵיה יִשְׂרָאֵל יַעֲקֹב בְּנוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל פֶּרֶעָה מָרָא פָּרֵעָה לֹויִבָא

Then 5b,6a,7-11, 27 in part, 28; 48:3-6; 49:1a, 28b-32 (exc. either 30b or v. 32 = R); 48:7 (exc. הָיָה יְהוָה = R); 49:33 in part (חָדֶשׁ יְהוָה = J) 50:12f. 12

---

8 The only considerable disagreement affects ch. 34. Well. and Kuen. find positively no trace of P² though they make approximately the same division as Dill. Well.: 34:1a,2,4-5,7,8-10, 12-15,19-24, 27-29 = X. Del. same verses = P², Kuen: 34:1 and 2 in part, 4-5, 8-10, 12 and 14 in part, 15-17,20-24,25 in part, 27-29 = R. Kitt. agrees with Dill. There are also the following divergences: Kuen. and Del. assign 27:46 to R. Del. gives P² also 33:15. All the critics except Dill. deny to P² the parts of 36:6,15,18, above mentioned. Kuen., Well. and Del. find traces of an older source underlying P² in 38:9 seq., Kuen. holds it to be a lost passage of J referred to by Hosea, ch. 12: 5b, and assigns v. 14 to R. Finally 38:1-5 is thus variously analyzed: Bud. 1-5 = R on a basis of P². Well. 1-5 another source. Kuen. P² was perhaps superseded by 1-5, 9-19. Del. v. 1 = P², 2- 5 = R. On vs. 8-10 and 37:1, id.

9 Well. Bud., Kuen., Kitt., only vs. 40-43 = P²; vs. 9-19 = R following the same source as in vs. 1-5. Kitt. thinks P² may lie at the basis of 15-39. Del., 28:10-15,20-43 (in v. 16 dele הֲרָקִים as in Sum.).

10 Well. and Kuen. reject from P² 46:8-27, assigning it to R, otherwise there is practical agreement. Well., 37:2a; 41:48; 46:6f; 47:(LXX,5b,6a,7-11,27,28; 48:3-7; 49:29-33; 50:12f. Bud. (considering only ch. 48f; 48:8-6 (v. 7 = R); 49:1a,2b-5b (exc. 'נִוֹ יְהוָה' = J), and 30b = R); add
II. Exodus-Deuteronomy.

Instead of Del. and Bud., Jül. is referred to for the analysis of Ex. 1-24. Delitzsch's Pentateuch-critische Studien relate to historical criticism and only give an occasional indirect indication of his analysis, sufficient, however, to show a general agreement with the other critics. The series of titles with which P* marked the headings of his chapters also cease with Genesis, marking the close of the first division of his work, the patriarchal period. P* opens the new division of his book with a table of

1. "The sons of Israel which came into Egypt;" the cry of their bondage comes up before God.

1:1–5,7 (exc. v. ab) 18 (exc. רֹּאָיָה . . . בֵּיתְךָ [ = J or E] and יִתְנָה [ = R]) 2:23 (from מְאֹדְנֵהוּ (ם) on) —25.11

2. Theophany to Moses; revelation of the name Yahweh as a pledge of deliverance; Moses commissioned to deliver Israel; [a genealogy of Reuben, Simeon and Levi showing the descent of Moses and Aaron;] Aaron appointed Moses' spokesman.

6:2–5, 6*, 7, 10f, 18, 14–27 (vs. 8f, 12, 28f, 30a = R. Much misplacing is also due to R.) 6:30b—7:7.12

3. The five wonders in Egypt. Aaron's contest with the magicians.

(a) The first wonder: Aaron's rod changed to a serpent; the magicians do likewise.

7:8–13.13

(b) The second wonder: Aaron's rod turns all the water of Egypt to blood; the magicians do likewise.

7:19–22 (exc. 20, from מְאֹדְנֵהוּ on, and 21a).14

(c) The third wonder: Aaron's rod brings frogs; the magicians do likewise.

8:1–3, 11 (from מְאֹדְנֵהוּ on. Supply מְאֹדְנֵהוּ לְרֶמֶשׁ מֶרֶעֶז.15

(d) The fourth wonder: Aaron's rod brings lice; the magicians fail and acknowledge "the finger of God."

8:12–15.16

(e) The fifth wonder: Moses and Aaron sprinkle ashes before Pharaoh; it becomes a boil on man and beast; the magicians being stricken flee. Pharaoh still obdurare.

9:8–12.17

---

11 Id. (exc. that Jül. and Kuen. include also 1:9 and make no note of traces of J or E in v. 13f."
13 Id.
15 So Kuen. and Well., Jül. and Kitt. include also 11a.
16 Id.
17 So Well., Jül., Kitt., Kuen. (exc. מְאֹדְנֵהוּ (ם) v. 12 = R).
(f) Conclusion of the section. Pharaoh's obduracy provokes the direct intervention of Yahweh.
11:9,10 (9b perhaps = R).
4. Passover: the deliverance from Egypt.
(a) Moses and Aaron receive directions from Yahweh for Israel; regulations concerning the calendar and the killing and eating of the passover lamb.
(b) Egypt smitten: Israel delivered; the law of Mazzoth. In 12:37 the word מִּצְּוֹת
(c) The first-born shall be Yahweh's.
13:1,2.
5. Passage of the Red Sea.
13:20; 14:1-4,8,9 in part (exc. רַבִּי יִרְאֶה אֵלֶּהוּ [JE] and דָּשַׁנְוּת [R]) 15-18 (exc. לְתֹֽאָלָה יֵֽשׁ מָה מָעַ עִמּוֹ in v. 15, and מְלֹא in v. 16 [E]) 21a,c,22,23,26; the first 6 words of 27,28a,29 (בַּרְובֵּךְ וּפָרְשֶׁנָּו in 17,18,23,26,28 and כִּי מָוֵת רְבָּעָה in v. 9 = R).
6. The march to Sinai: [Elim]; Manna given; Rephidim; Sinai; Moses goes up into the mount.
(15:27?); 16:1-8,6*,8-14,15b,16-18,22-24,31-34,36*; 17:1a; 19:2a,1; 24:15-18a (to מָלֹא) (15:27 perhaps E(?). Ch. 16 entirely worked over by R and removed from its proper position [to this all the critics agree]. The P2 elements are given as above in Dill., iii., p. 634, but in ii., p. 165, somewhat differently, e. g. v. 6f is attributed to P2 and v. 8 to R. Vs. 8 in part, 4f,15a, 19f in part, 21,25-30,35a = J, the rest = R).
7. The law and the testimony: the pattern shown in the mount; the institution and regulation of the Levitical ritual.

From Ex. 25 to Num. 10 the entire mass is admitted by all the critics to belong to P in its various stratifications P1, P2, P3. Only Ex. 32-34:28, and a trace of E in 31:18 belongs to the "prophetic" element, and in these three chapters Dillmann alone finds a single trace of P2 (in 32:15a). The extrication of P1,

---

20 So Well., Kuen. (40*) and Kitt., admitting the order to have been altered by R, but not adopting Dillmann's reconstruction. Jüll. gives vs. 14-20 to P4. Del. (viii) P3 = 14-20,42-51.
P², P³ in Ex. 25–Num. 10 and the legal chapters of Numbers, with the analysis of the great code of the "prophetic" Hexateuch, Deuteronomy, are reserved for another article. The historical thread of P² is traced by all the critics in Ex. 26ff., (the construction of the tabernacle), Lev. 9,10 in part; (the inauguration of the ritual, and death of Nadab and Abihu), Num. 10:11–28; (the departure from Sinai). We proceed from the point where P² is again combined with JE, viz., in the story of

8. The sending of the spies, murmuring of the people at their report and the punishment.

Num. 13:1–17a,21,25,26a,32 (to N\(\text{N}\)'\(\text{N}\)); 14:1 in part, 2 in part, 5–7,10,26,27–29, 34–38.\(^{24}\)

9. The revolt of Korah and the Levites; punishment of the people's murmuring; the plague assured by Aaron's atonement.

16:1a,2f in part, 4 in part, 5–7 for the most part, 18–24a,35; 17:8–15,16–28 (16:8 in part, 8–11,16f,24b,37a,32b = R; 17:1–5 = P³).\(^{25}\)

10. Water from the rock at Meribah; the sin of Moses and Aaron; Aaron's death; fragments of the itinerary.

20:1a (to H\(\text{N}'\)\(\text{N}\)'\(\text{N}\)), 2,3b,6f,8a,10a,12*,13*,22–29; 21:10f; 22:1 (many traces of R).\(^{26}\)

11. Israel misled by the Midianites after the counsel of Balaam; Phinehas' prompt action stays the plague.

25:6–9,14–16,19 (10–13 = P³. 17f = R. Ch. 31 is connected with this account, but in its present form = P³).\(^{27}\)

12. The census of the nation, preparatory to the occupation of Canaan; regulation of inheritances where the heirs are females; the daughters of Zelophehad.

Ch. 26 (exc. vs. 8–11 and 58–61 [= P³]); 27:1–11.\(^{28}\)

18. Moses receives directions to prepare for his death; Joshua commissioned; Reuben and Gad receive an inheritance east of Jordan.

Deut. 28:48–52 (exc. glosses in vs. 49 and 52. The passage is a repetition of Num. 27:12–14 [P³ or R], this latter according to Dill. being the copy; Num.
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14. [An itinerarium of the wilderness stations].
33:1-49 (exc. 6f*,14f*,16f*,40,49 [= R]).30
15. Moses’ death.
Deut. 1:8; 34:1a (to יִנָּה), 5*,7a,8f.31

III. Joshua.

1. Crossing the Jordan; passover at Gilgal [Achan’s trespass]; the league with Gibeon.
3:4(?), 4:13,*15-17,19; 5:10-12; 7:1,18b,25ba; 9:15b,17-21,27 in part.32
2. The inheritance of Reuben and Gad.
13:15-19,23-27*28,29b,32 (vs.30-22,29a,30f,33 = R).33
3. The distribution of the inheritances by lot; Judah’s inheritance; a description of the territory of the tribe, giving boundaries, and enumerating the cities and villages.
4. The inheritance of Manasseh-Ephraim, of Benjamin, and of the other seven tribes; similar tables of boundaries and cities, ending with a colophon.

29 Well. and Kuen. seem to consider Deut. 32:48-52 a repetition by R or by P himself of Num. 27:12-14. At this point Num. 27:12-23. As to ch. 32, Well. gives to P vs. 16-19 (for substance, but worked over), 34 (= 16) 28-32. Kuen. P* underlies 1-5,16-32 (vs. 6-15 = P*). R has here so thoroughly digested his material that more cannot be said. Kitt. 27:12-33; 32:2,4,18-22,28-32,40, (7)1.....(7)12 in v. 33 = R), Deut. 32:48-53.
31 Well. and Kuen. Deut. 34:1a,7a(?),8f (1:9 = R). Kitt. Deut. 34:1aa,7a,8f (v. 5 = J).
34 Well., 18:11; 14:1-5; 15:1-12 (exc. traces of JE in v. 4a and 12b,20-44 (45-47 = JE(?)),46-62 (v. 68 = JE). Kuen., 18:1; 14:1-5; 15:1,20 (merely the headings of the lists of cities are given by Kuen. as belonging to P because these can be identified as his, while from the nature of the case the mere names of cities afford no clue, and would doubtless be transferred intact from one source to another. The contents of the list as well as the headings must belong in part at least to P*. But all criteria are lacking to determine what part he borrowed and what was added to him).
35 Well., 16:4-8; 17:1ab,4,7,9 in part, 10a; 18:11-35; ch. 19 (exc. 49f and 15,24b,25a,33,36-38 [ = JE]) and v. 47 (= J(?)); 17:5,8,9,10b,11-18; 18:2-10 (exc. of v. 7 = D*) and traces in 19:1,17,23. Kuen., 16:4-8; 17:1a,8-6,11a,30b,38b; 19:1 in part, 5b,16,23,24,31,32 in part, 39,40,45,51 (see note 34).
5. The cities of refuge and the cities of the priests and Levites appointed. 20:1(?);2f,6*,7-9; 21:1-40 (41-48 = D^2); the portions of ch. 20 omitted are wanting in LXX. Well. and Kuen. consider LXX. more correct here and regard vs. 4f, etc., as late interpolations in a style imitating D. Dill. prefers the Massoretic text and assigns the additions to R^4. The LXX. found them superfluous and so omitted them. 36

6. The altar built by the transjordanic tribes. Its intention is misunderstood by the rest of Israel and they march against Reuben, Gad and Manasseh; explanation of the Gileadites and peaceful separation of the tribes.

22:9f,18-15,19-21,30f,32a....(vs.1-6 = D; vs. 7f = R^4 including a trace of E in v. 8; vs. 11,*12,24-27,32*33f = E; vs. 16-20 and 22-29 in their present form = R; the whole chapter thoroughly worked over by R and afterward a second time by R^4). 37

B. THE EPHRAIMITE NARRATIVE E.


I. Genesis.

1. [Abram recaptures Lot from Chedorlaomer and is blessed by Melchizedek.]

Ch. 14: = R (on a basis of E (?) exc. vs. 17-20 = R). 38

2. The promise of Isaac.

15:2* (traces in vs. 1,3,5,6 worked over by J and R). 39

3. Sarah and Abimelech.

Ch. 20 (exc. vs. 18, and יִבְרְלוֹן בַּשָּׁלֹשׁ in v. 14 = R). 40

4. Birth of Isaac and expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael.

21:6,8-21 41

5. Abraham's covenant with Abimelech at Beer-sheba.

21:22-32a. 42

6. The sacrifice of Isaac.

22:1,2*,3-10,11*,12f,14*19 (vs. 15-18 = R). 43

7. [Abraham's marriage with Keturah.]

---

37. Well., 22:9-34 (vs. 1-6 = R^4; v. 8 in part from E; v. 7 = R). Kuen. 22:1-6 = R^4; vs. 7f = R; vs. 9-34 = P^4.
38. Well., Kuen. = R entire. Del. = J.* Kitt. vs. 1-16,21-24 (exc. glosses [e. g. vs. 12] and touches of R), and the basis of 17-20 = E. Also, possibly, traces of E in 12:6a,8a (v. 9 = E or R).
39. Well., 1-6 = E worked over by R^4. Bud., 1 in part, 3a,2b,5 = E. Kuen., no certain trace of E before Gen. 20. Ch. 15 is composite, but does not necessarily include E. Del., v. 2 = E, 1,3-6 = J. Kitt. in part (common to E and J except המל and יִ֣ים ...תַּנֵּךְ = J) 25,6 (v. 6 common to J and E) and some words in 9,12, and 18 (9,12,18 common to J and E).
40. Id.
42. Id. (exc. Well. adds v. 33).
43. Kitt. assigns vs. 14-18 to R from J and fails to mention v. 19). Well. vs. 22-24 also = E. Otherwise id.

25:1-4 (v. 5 = J; v. 6 = R4).
8. Birth of Jacob and Esau.
25:25*,27* (fragments)45.
9. Isaac in Gerar.
26:1*,4*,6,46
10. The blessing of Isaac; Jacob defrauds Esau of the inheritance.
27:1-45 in part. (Vs. 15,24-27,30a (to הָעִיפְּךָ מֵאָרָּה) 35-38 = J. Vs. 21-28, 30b,38f = E. 44b = 45aa, one J, the other E. Impossible to carry the analysis further).47
11. Flight to Haran; Bethel; Jacob’s dream and vow.
28:11f,17-22 (v. 19a(?) J and E; 19b,21b = R).48
12. Jacob in Haran; marriage with Leah and Rachel.
29:1,15b-30 (exc. vs. 24,29 = 12 and v. 26 = J).49
30:1-3a,6,8,17-24 (exc. 20b,22c,24b [= J],22a [= P2] and 21 [= R or J]).50
14. Jacob’s service with Laban; he returns from Aram; pursuit of Laban and covenant on Mt. Gilead.
30:26,28 (32-34 “hardly” E’s); 31:2,4-17,19f,21a,22-24,26,28-45*,47*,51-54*; 32:1; (31:10,12, יָעַרְבָּק בְּהֵקִים in v. 45, v. 47 in part, H רַב הַלָּבֶד וְלֹא הָלַּבֶד in vs. 51f, לֹא הַלָּבֶד וְאָלָּלִים in v. 52, and לֹא הַלָּבֶד וְאָלָּלִים in v. 53 = R).51
15. The story of Mahanaim and Peniel; encounter with Esau.
32:2,4* (in part) 14b-22,24,25-32; 33:4*,5,11a (32:33 = R).52

---

45 Well(?), Bud., Kuen., Del. and Kitt. agree that 25:1-6 = J.
46 Well., vs. 24,25 perhaps. Bud., Kuen., no trace of E. Del., J or E. Kitt., v. 27f = E and J in common, vs. 25a = E.
47 Well., Kuen., Kitt. no trace of E. Del., traces of E in ch. 26, e.g. in v. 26 and 32a.
48 Well. points out the presence of J and E throughout 27:1-45. E appears in vs. 1,18,21-24,28, 30b,35-38. J in vs. 7 and 20,24-27,30a,38f. So Kuen. and Del. (a trace of J also in 27:46(?)). Kitt. E = 27:1b,4,11,13,15 in part, 18,21-23,28,30b,35b,34,42.
50 Well., 29:1-30 (exc. vs. 24,32b,32 = P(?)) and v. 26 = J). Kuen. declines to analyze. Del., v. 1 = J; 16b-30 (exc. 24 and 29 = P4) = E. Kitt. as above.
51 Well., 30:1-8 (exc. 3b and לְכָּל יָעַרְבָּק בְּהֵקִים in v. 7 = R) 17-24 (exc. 20b,34b = J and v. 21 = R). Kuen. and Del. decline to analyze, but state that E is indicated by the divine name in vs. 6, 8,17,18,20,22,23. Kitt., 30:1-3a,6,8,17-20a,30c-34a. (Owing to a misprint in Kittel’s note the dash between 20c and 24a is missing, see p. 123, note 7; and cf. the text above.)
52 Well., fragments of E in 30:25-30, then vs. 32-34; 31:2,4-17 (exc. vs. 10 and 13 interpolated by R1), 19-24,35b, 26,38-37, 41-45 נַפְּעָל in v. 45 = R) 51-54 (exc. the interpolations of R4 noted above by Dill.). 32:1. Kuen. 30:25-43 for substance ch. 31 (exc. v. 18[=P]1,3,22b[= J], and the portions of 45-54 indicated by Well.). Del., 30:25-43 = J, “comprising fragments of E,” (v. 46b = R 31:1-3 = J), vs. 4-17, 19-34 = E; vs. 35-45 = E with parts of J; 47,50-53, (54 = J) 32:1. Kitt., E = 30:36,38; 31:2,4,9,11,13-17 (10 and 12 = R), 19-21,23-44 (exc. 25 and 27) 45 (exc. 2)46,48-50 (exc. 48b,49) 55; 32:1.
53 Del., 33:2f = J (see f). (It is not clear from the commentary, p. 401 seq., whether Del. assigns 33:2f and 8f to the same author or not, but so apparently.) E = 14b-22, 34-33. Well., Kuen., 32:2f,14b-33; 33:4*,5,8,11. Kitt., 33:2f,4, 14b-22,24, 35a; 33:4b,5b,11.
16. Jacob’s land purchase at Shechem; fulfills his vow at Bethel; death of Deborah and Rachel.

33:19f.; 35:1–4,6b–8, 16–19a, 20 (v. 6a = P2, אָבָב יַעֲכֹב אֱלֹהִים in v. 6 and אָבָב in 19b, also vs. 21,22a = R).63

17. Joseph’s prophetic dreams and the envy of his brethren; Reuben seeks to save him from their conspiracy and restore him to his father; he persuades the brethren to cast Joseph into a pit; Midianites pass by, find Joseph, and kidnap him; Reuben returning is in despair at not finding the child; the brethren report his death.

37:5–18a (exc. 5b,8c, יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמָל לֵאמָל in vs. 9,10a [lxx.] = R; vs. 12–14*; מִלְכָּת מִרְבֵּר in v. 14 = R or J) 19,20,22,23f*,24,28*,29f,31f*,34f*,36; also in v. 21 (vs. 28c,35b = J; 31f part E, part J).54

18. Joseph is brought to Egypt and sold to Potipher, Pharaoh’s head sheriff, who entrusts him with the care of the prison; the dreams of Pharaoh’s officers interpreted.

39:4 in part, 8,21 in part; 40:2,3a,4,5a,6–15a,16–23 (39:1 יְסִימוּר... וְלַעֲבָרִים = R).55

19. Joseph interprets Pharaoh’s dream, and is made ruler of Egypt.

Ch. 41 (exc. a few traces of J. in vs. 14,18–22(?),34, and one part of the following doublets: 30b = 31; 35b = 35a; 41,43b,44 = 40; 49 = 48; 55,56a = 54b.66

20. The sons of Jacob go to Egypt to buy food; Joseph meets them roughly and imprisons Simeon on pretence of their being spies; he demands that Benjamin be brought down; Reuben pledges himself for Benjamin’s safety.

Ch. 42 (exc. 2a,4b,6, parts of 7, יִלּוּם in 10,27,28a*, and 38 [= J] 28b belongs after v. 35).67
21. Joseph reveals himself; his brethren return to fetch Jacob. 48:14*,23c; 45:1–27 (exc. 1a,2,4b,5a, 10 in part, 18f = J; vs. 19–21*). 58
22. Jacob migrates to Egypt. 46:1 in part, 3f, 5 in part (1a,5b = J or R); 47:12, parts of 18–26* (18–26 = J on a basis of E, removed by R from after 41:55 and worked over). 59
23. Jacob blesses Joseph and dies; death of Joseph. 48:1,2a,9a,10b,11f,15f, 20 in part, 21f; 50:1–3(?),15–26 (exc. v. 18 and parts of 21,24 [= J]) (in ch. 48 E is expanded by R through the addition of 2b,9b,10a,13f, 17–19,20b from J). 60

II. Exodus.

1. Oppression in Egypt; birth and youth of Moses. 1:6,8–12,16–2:14 (exc. traces of J in 1:10,12,20; 2:14; also 1:21 and parts of 2:6f = J). 61
2. Moses called at Horeb and commissioned to deliver Israel; revelation of the name Yahweh. 3:1–5*,4b–6,9–16*,18–22*,62
3. Moses returns to Egypt with the rod of God; the demand made of Pharaoh. 4:17,18,20b,21,28b,31a; 5:2f,6–8,10,11a, 12–19,20f in part (4:22f = J, removed by R from before 10:23; 6:1 = R). 63

---

58 Well. 48:14,23c; 45:1–27 (exc. a trace in v. 1a, יְהֹוָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל הַקָּדָם in v. 4f, v. 10, and 18f [= J]). Kuen. agrees with Well. and Dill. Del. 48:13,23b and parts of ch. 45, especially 17–23,7, (see p. 586). Kitto. 48:14,23c, traces of E in 44:12 (27,59,26,7), then 45:1b,3ab,5ab,8b,9,11f,15–27.
59 Well. 46:1b,2–5* (ia, יְהֹוָּה in v. 2, parts of 3f [e.g. יְהֹוָּה = J]; 47:12(7,12–26)? (perhaps derived from an account in J, parallel to ch. 41). Kuen. 46:1b–5* (ia = R); 47:12(7) (reasons for assigning 47:12–20 to E are not conclusive). Del. 46:1–5; 47:12–26(7) (J and E inseparable). Kitto. 46:1b–5; (exc. יְהֹוָּה v. 2); 47:12,13–20(7) (J and E inseparable).
60 Well. 48 entire (exc. הָעַד = P); 50:1–3(?),15–25. Bud. (II.) E in ch. 48 = vs. 10–12,15f,20ab(7) 21f. Kuen. E = v. 1,2,5,13,16,18–22 (vs. 13,14,17–19 = E*; in v. 22 read יְהֹוָּה לָוַי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Del. 48:10–12,15f,20–22 (the rest, exc. vs. 3–7, = J; Kuenen’s conjecture for v. 22 “very tempting”); 50:15–26 (traces of J, and on the other hand traces of E in vs. 1–10). Kitto. 48:1,2a,3a,9a,10b,11f,20f,21f (8,11,31, in common with J); 50:1–8 (in common with J), 15–26 (exc. parts of v. in 18,21f,24,24.4)
62 Well. 3: traces in 1–9 (e.g. v. 4 after the first clause and 8 and 9,10–15,21f. Kuen. 3:1–15 (exc. v. 4a,7a,9a or b = J), 19f,21f (apparently, but see J in loco. and Kuen., i., pp. 254–255 and 149). Juml. 3:1–6* (רְאוֹסָה) v. 8 and 4 for = R4, 9–14 (exc. רְאוֹסָה) in v. 9 (= J) which belongs before v. 16 and traces in 21f (v. 15, and 20–22 for = R4). Kitten. 3:1–3 (for the most part), 4b–8,6–16a, and from v. 15, at least the first words after the 26mark.
64 Well. 7:15d,17b,30 (from יְהֹוָּה on) 21a,24; 9:22 (+ the words יְהֹוָּה לָוַי יִשְׂרָאֵל from v. 24,
5. The destruction of the first-born of Egypt and the exodus.
11:1–3; 12:31–33,37b,38; 13:17–19 (21f[?]).

6. The passage through the Red Sea; Miriam’s song.

7. Marah; water from the rock at Horeb; battle with Amalek; Jethro’s visit.
15:22–26 (27 = P2); 17:3–6,8–16; 18:1–27 (exc. 2b (= R) and traces of J in 1, (5),9,10; the story last named is probably misplaced).

8. The ten words [and the covenant] at Horeb.
19:2b,3–8*,10–15, 16 in part, 17–19*; 20:1–20* (vs. 9–11 = P2); then 21–26 and chs. 21–23, viz., the book of the covenant, an ancient code incorporated by E. R removed it from after 24:14, its original position. The following glosses and interpolations by R should be eliminated: 22:20–23,24b,30; 23:13,15,23–25,51b,33; 24:3,4 (from התה on), 5f,8a,11,12 (in part), 13f.

before אבל�לך23a,31f,55; 10:13,15a (to תִּכְנָרָם) 14a, (to תַּכְיָד) 15ab (from יִכְרָק) 20,21–23,27. Jül., 7:17 (from...תַּכְיָד on) and v. 18 (15d and 되ודא...יללכנ) in v. 17 = R4 = 20 (from תִּכְנָרָם on) 21a,24,25a; 8: 21b–23* 9:22,23a,24a, (דָּרֹשׁ ...שָּׁמ) 25ab,55ab; 10:7–13a (to תִּכְנָרָם), 14a (to תַּכְיָד), 15a (from תִּכְרָק, exc. יכָּרִית = R4) 20,21–23 (9:35c = R). Kuen. (p. 151) refers to the agreement between Dill. and Jül., and rests upon it: 8:18b = R4(?); 9:14b,16b,29b; 10:1b,2 = R4 but see J in loco). Kitt., 7:17f,20ab,21a,24(?); 9:22,23a,24–25 (referring to Well.) 31f,35a; 10:12,13a,14a,21–27,28f; 11:8. 11f.


as Well. 14:3,4 (exc. ...כֶּלֶם יִדָּרֶשׁ, 7,8a,11 תַּכְיָד) in v. 9, and the beginning of v. 10; יִנָּרְאָה בִּנְתָּלָה הָדֶק in v. 15, v. 16–18, v. 19a, and perhaps the last clause of v. 20, v. 21 (first and last clauses), 22f,26,27aa,28f; (16:1–21 incorporated by R4). Jül. 14:7,10bb (from יַכְרִית רָס), 16 in part, 19a, 21aab,25,26a(2),27aa (to תַּכְיָד), 35a; (15:2–18 = R4, but see J in loco). Kuen. similarly, but making 14:19 = B. Kitt. 14:7,8b,16,19a,22a; 15:20f,1–18 and 19 (or the song may have been given by J).

as Well. perhaps 15:22–25,27 (v. 26 = R4); then 17:1–7 (v. 1a and traces in vs. 2–3 are drawn from another source), 8–19 (?)(15f:??); 18:1–27 (exc. 5b = R; 18 is expanded from another source).

Kitt. 15:22–25a,27 = J (25b,26 = R4); 17:1b,2,5, 8:15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22–25 (exc. 2b = R4 and a recasting by him of the verses following). Kitt. 15:22–26 (v. 25 = R4); 17:3–6 (exc. parts of 5f [= J]; in v. 6 read רָזָר בִּרְבּוּ (for בִּרְבּוּ; the latter a gloss according to Jül.), 8–16; 18:1a,2a (2b = R4), 3–7,8–10* (traces of J), 11–27 (ch. 18 is misplaced).

as Well. 18:2b,10–19* in part; 20:1–19* (18:3–8 and 20:6, also 'הָרְאָה בִּרְבּוּ יִנָּרְאָה בִּנְתָּלָה הָדֶק in 2 = R4; v. 11 = R); 24:13,14, 15 מִי הַמַּרְאִים in v. 15, and v. 18 from רָזָר שׁוֹלֵץ...רָזָר in v. 15a (from יֶכֶרֵה...רָזָר). The book of the covenant incorporated by J with interpolations and glosses as follows: 20:22; 22:20–23, last clause of v. 24 and v. 30; 23:2b,22b,25a,31b,32–34 = R4; v. 13 = R; 23:17–19 is borrowed from ch. 34; 23:4,5 and 8b were early interpolations). Jül. 19: 2b,3a,10,14,18b,19; 20:18,19,20*; 21:1,2a,5a,7a,8,12a,17–17a (19:3b [fr. נִקְנֵי],5,8b,12?); 18a(7),28f = R4; 20:2b,5b–7b,9,10,12b,17b = expansions of the 10 words previous, and subsequent, to incorporation in R; 20:11 = R. Then the book of the covenant: 20:24 (22f = R4) — 23:38 (exc. 22:19–23, 27b(7); 23:4(?),14–19 [7b as in LXX]). Exc. further, 23:5b,9b,10–12, and all of 20–33 but 30f and a few traces in 22f, the exceptions principally = R4). Then 24:3–8 (1f,9–11 = P4); here Jülicher’s treatise ends. Kuen. (xv.); 19:10–19* (65b–8, v. 13? = R4); 20:15–21,21–17* (v. 11 = P3 or R. The other expansions = R4). The book of the covenant (20:33a,34–25, chs. 21–23) belongs where Deuteronomy now stands and was displaced by R4 who provided it with the introduction, v. 22b, and the following interpolations: 21:16; 22:20–23,24–26, 23:1–5,6,8,9,10–12,23f,30–33,52b(?),55a(?), and perhaps others; 23:13 = R. Ch. 24:3–8 (exc. יִכָּרֵה...רָזוּ in v. 4 (= R4)) belongs with the book of
9. The golden calf; departure from Horeb; the tent of meeting.
31:18b; 32:15 in part, 16–19aa, 25–29; 33:1–5 in part (in v. 5 the beginning, to יָרְאַה, then רֳוֵרַי) 6–7–11.66

III. Numbers.

1. The departure from Horeb, Taberah; the manna and the quails in Qibroth Taavah.
10:33a; 11:1–3, 7–9, 10ba, 30–35.70

2. Miriam and Aaron rebel; arrival in Kadesh and sending of the spies.

3. Rebellion of Datharn and Abiram; the earth swallows them up.
Traces in 16:1–4 (e.g., 1b, and parts of 2, 3f) in 12–15, (e.g., 14ab, 15b = E, 14aa, 15a = J) and in 25–34 (28f, 32a = E 30f, 33a = J).72

4. Death of Miriam; water from the rock in Kadesh; embassy to Edom.
20:1b, 3a, 4f, 7, 8 (first two words and ba) 9*, 10b*, 11 (v. 9 = R) 14–19, 21.73
5. The brazen serpent; Israel in the border of Moab; conquest of the territory of Sihon.

21:4–9 (exc. נַעֲרָתָן נָעֲרָתָן in v. 4 = R) 12–18a, 21–24 (LXX.) (18b–20 and 25–32* = R, from another source [J(?)]; 33–35 has been imported by R4 from Dt. 3:1–4).74

6. Balak and Balaam; the involuntary blessing of the prophet hired to curse.

22:2–21 (exc. 3a, 4, 5a, 7a, 17f and perhaps יִנְגָּר לָאָם שְׁיֹבִי in v. 21 [= J]) 36–41; 23:1–28, 27f in part(?); 24:25(?) (23:26[27]–30; 24:20–24 = R).75

7. The people sin at Baal-peor; Gad and Reuben receive their lot; the cities of Jair.

25:1a, 3, 5; 32:2a, 3, 16f (20f in part(?)), 24, 34–38 (39, 41f(?)).76

IV. Deuteronomy.

8. Directions for a sacrificial feast on Ebal; charge to Joshua; [the blessing of Moses].

27:5–7a (vs. 1–8, 9f = D1, 4, 7b, 8 = R4, 11–26 = R4 and R); 31:14f (vs. 16–23; 32:1–44 = J) and ch. 33 (incorporated by E(?)).77

V. Joshua.

In this book the problem of critical analysis is greatly complicated by the introduction of a new element. P* has been extricated with comparative facility and unanimity. JE is still the main residuum, but according to all the critics, greatly expanded and worked over by R4. Dillmann supposes the author of Deuteronomy to have supplied to his code a historical appendix, which constitutes, therefore, an independent source, taken up by R4 and combined with P* and account has since been altered, obliterating the "sin" of Moses and Aaron, (cf. 30:24; 27:14 [Dt. 32:50]). Well. and Dill. concur, but Kuen. declines on this account a more detailed analysis. 20:24–25 = E. Kitt. 20:3–5, 7–11, 18 (many touches of P*’s language) 14–21.


76 Well., 25:1–5 = JE (E or J), 22:1:5, traces in 16–19 (דָּשְׁנָה in v. 17), and 29–27 = X; 34–43 (exc. v. 40 = R) = JE (E, or J). Kuen., 25:1–5 = E (see XVII); there are traces of E underlying the work of R4 in 22:1–5, 32–33; E = further, vs. 33–42 (exc. v. 33 and the references to Manasseh in 39–45 [- R4]). Kitt., 25:3, 5; 22 parts of v. 1f, v. 16f, 24, 34–38, 39, 41f; ("a bit of information given here by E by way of anticipation. From it arose later in P(?) and R, the idea that half Manasseh had already in Moses' time possessed a lot east of Jordan").

77 Well., 31:14–50 and ch. 34 (exc. J = P* in 1a and 7a, [and J in 7b(?)]) = JE (E(?). worked over by R4); Dt. 38 is an independent fragment. Kuen., (XIII and r. p. 125f) E = 25:5–7a (vs. 1–4, 7b, 8 = R4, v. 9f = D, 11–15, 14–36 = P*); 31:14f, 23 (and traces in v. 1–8 worked over by R4), (vs. 16–23 and 33:1–44 = R4 or more properly = JE, distinguished by Kuen. from R4, among other reasons because the song and introduction, the latter written for the purpose of uniting the song to JE, from their matter and language must have preceded the amalgamation of JE and D: vs. 24–30 = R4; ch. 33 stands out of all connection and was perhaps taken up by R4); 34:1–12 (exc. P* in 1a, 8,9 and R4 whose redaction extends throughout, as in the case of 31:1–5, 14–23). Kitt., Dt. 31:14–23(?); 32:44; 33:1–20 (2–29 an older source incorporated by E: ch. 32:1–38 is not E’s Song of Moses, but a more recent production substituted for it by R4); 34:10.
JHE. The four documents, three of them already united by R, were amalgamated and worked over by him. Kuen., Well., Bud., Kltt. attribute these Deuteronomistic additions to D* or R*, the writer who incorporated Deuteronomy with JHE and provided it with a historical introduction and appendix. The result is, in the opinion of all, such an obliteration of the characteristics of J and E by R, so thorough an incorporation of them into D*, that they are only traceable with difficulty and in a few passages.

Dillmann assigns the following passage to JHE in Josh. 1:12: Chs. 2-3:26 (27-30,31b(?)); ch. 9 for the most part (9:8-9a,11-15a,13,22f(?)); 10:1-11,18-27; 11:1,5-9. From this must be subtracted a verse or two for Ps (see Ps below) and some minor contributions of D and R4.


To this was added by D* or R4 ch. 1 almost entire (merely a basis of JHE); 2:10f; 3:3,7; 4:14, 21-24; 5:2 (exc. לָו and רַע = R); 4-7; 8:1b,27,39(?)b,30-35; 9:24f,27b; 10:3,25,37(?),40-42; 11:10-20, 22b; ch. 12 largely. Ps has only a verse or two in ch. 4f.

The portions assigned to D by Dill. in Josh. 1-12 are as follows: In general chs. 1:3f; 5:1- 8:33,34f; 10:12-14,28-43; 11:10-20. From Ps come only 8.4 in part(?); 4:10 in part, 15-17,19; 5:9-10; 7:1,15b,25 in part; 9:15b,17-21,37 in part.

In chs. 15-24 Ps predominates. Dill. assigns to it 18:15-19,23-37a,28,39b,39; 14:1-5; 15:1-2,20- 44,48-62; 16:4 in part, 5-9; 17:1a,3f,7 in part, 9 in part, 10 in part, 18:11a,12-28; ch. 19 for the most part; 20:27,5 in part, 7-9; 21:1-40; 22:7,15,16,19-21,30f,29a. This portion removed, the parts assignable to D according to Dill. are 15:1-19,17; 18:15b; 21:42-91h,9 and ch. 23. This element also being removed there remains for JHE 14:8-15 in part; 15:13-19,16:1-6,10, 17:18 in part; 18: 3:10,11b; traces in ch. 19 (specifically 19:40f); much of ch. 22 and ch. 24 for the most part.

Of elements recognizable as derived from J or E Kuenen finds in the second part of Joshua but two passages, 17:14-18 = J and ch. 24* = E. Beside these 18:3-6,8-10 and 18:1-7; 15:13-19 may be reckoned to JHE in the broader sense. D or R4 added 13:8-12,14; 14:6-15; 15:7; 21:41-48; 22:3, 4(7),5 (or 21:9,6); ch. 23; 24:1b,13,31, and parts of 24:7,18,17b,24.

Well. has traced a primary and a secondary element in the historical chapters of Josh. 1-12, but does not connect them with J or E except in a few verses of ch. 9 [= J]. The Deuteronomistic elements of Joshua are, according to him, as follows: Ch. 1: 2:9-11; 3:2-4,6-8,9,15(?)f in part; 4:6,7(?), 12-14,20-24; 5:1-4,7; 6:17,27 (ch. 7 = JHE [R4]); 8:1,29 in part, 30-35; 9:1f,34f; 10:1 in part, 8:27,28-43; 11:2f,15,16,20 (21-25 still later); ch. 12; 13:1-14 (exc. perhaps only vs. 1 and 7); vs. 15-22 = P*; 14:6-15; 15:7; 21:41-48; ch. 23; 24:1 in part, 13,31. These removed, we have still to eliminate JHE's own handiwork (of which ch. 7 and 10:16-26 are examples) from the "prophetic" nucleus, to reach the sources themselves. The analysis of Joshua, therefore, after the removal of Ps, resolves itself into a search for stray fragments of J and E in the mass JHE D*

In this search Budde, r., is invaluable, though his investigation is confined to passages which can be connected with Judg. 1 [= J] and hence can only be cited in a few instances. On the evidence of ch. 24 [= E] Bud. (Kuen.) reaches the conclusion that E's story of the conquest must have been quite different from that of either of the sources discovered by Well. in chs. 1-12, but finds evidence in Judg. 1 for identifying the primary element with J1 and the secondary with J3.

In the notes on Joshua this characteristic of the investigation must be borne in mind and reference made to the lists already given for passages outside of the sources themselves.

1. Crossing the Jordan; the people circumcised by Joshua at Gilgal; the "rolling away" of the reproach of Egypt.

8:12; 4:1a,4f,7b,9; 5:2f (exc. לָו and רַע in v. 2 [= R4]), 8f (vs. 4-7 = R4, cf. LXX.). 78

2. The capture of Jericho.

(5:13-15 = E or J) 6:1 (E or J), 4 in part*, 5f,7b,8f,18*,19*,16a (17-19 = E or

78 Well., ch. 1 = D1; ch. 2 = JHE (R4 on a basis of J or E); "secondary element" in ch. 3 = vs. 12, 15a,16a; 4:4-7,9-11a,15-18; 5:2f (exc. לָו and רַע), 8f (4:11b,14,20-24; 5:4-7 = R4; 4:19 = P1); Kuen. distinguishes the same verses as the "secondary element." Bud. considers this secondary element J4, not B. Kltt., 8:1ac,9:12; 4:5,7b; 8:15a (misplaced by R4: read יִכְלָל דּוֹרֵי לַיְלִי); 5:9 (4:3a; 5:4-7 = R4; 3:2-4,6-8 and 4:10-15 for the most part = D4; 4:9,15,17,19 = P3).

5*
J), 20b (21–25 = E or J) (touches in 8f, 11, 14f = R; vs. 2, 17b, 18 and 27 and the continued blowing of trumpets, 4f, 13 = Rd).\(^79\)

3. The capture of Ai and covenant with the Gibeonites.

8:10–12, 14 in part, 16 in part, 17 in part, 18, 20b, 26, 30, 31b; 9:3–27 (exc. 6b, 7, 9 in part, 10, 14f, 16 in part, 17–21, 24f, 27). (Ch. 7 for the most part = J. 8:1f, 7b, 8a, 22b, 27–29 and traces in 8, 11, 15, 21, 24; also 9:1f, 9 in part, 10, 24f, 27 in part = Rd; 8:13 and בָּמַסרי in v. 19 = R).\(^80\)

4. The battle of Gibeon.

10:1–11, 16–27 (vs. 12–14, 15, 28–43 = D; vs. 8 and 25 and 1, 2, 6, 7, 19, 24, 26f in part = Rd).\(^81\)

5. Settlement in the land, and inheritances of the tribes; Caleb receives Hebron; the house of Joseph obtain a double portion; they invade Gilead.

14:6–15*; 15:13(?) 16:1–3(?) one of the two stories in 17:14–18 (14f = 16:14 in part 17f); 19:49f; 22:8* \(^82\)

6. Conclusion of E’s history; Joshua’s charge to the people at Shechem; the history briefly reviewed and Israel pledged to the service of Yahweh; Joshua’s death and burial.

Ch. 24 (exc. 1f in part, 6–8 in part, 17–19 in part, 10f in part, 13 in part, 26a, 31 = R and Rd).\(^83\)

\(^79\) Well., 8:13–15, “like JE”; 6:3–5 in part, 6–9* (8xa, 9 in part = R), 12, 15, יִדּוּס וּכָל in v. 15 (15b = gloss), 16a and 30 (from יִדּוּס וּכָל on) = No. 2 (E) (6:1, 2, 22, 25, 27 = R). Kuen., the story characterized by priests and ark, perhaps E’s, but see L., p. 168f, and above, p. 233, also note on J in loco. Kitt., 5:13–15 = E; 6:4a, 5ab, 6a, 7–12b, 16a, 20a (13ab and the last three words of the verse = R).

\(^80\) Well., ch. 7 = R; ch. 8 (exc. 8a, 12f, 14b, 18, 30), last clause, 26 (= No. 1); v. 1, 29 in part (= R); and vs. 30–35 (= Ds) belongs to the “secondary element”; No. 2 includes in ch. 9 vs. 3, 8–11, 15a, 16, 22f, 23, 27*. An affinity is pointed out between No. 1 in this story and E, but the two are not identified; much less is No. 1 identified with J, though the identity is not formally denied (vs. 15c, 17–21 = P; vs. 1, 24f = D). Kuen. finds the same “fundamental lines” in ch. 8 as Well., but they think they may very well have been J’s; for ch. 9 see J, note in loco. Bud., similarly, to Well. exc. 8:1a (= D). Kitt., 8:10–12a (12b = gloss); v. 13 = R, 14ab, 16b, 17a, …24ab, 18, 36, possibly more; then traces of E underlying v. 30, 31b (the sacrificial feast on Ebal; the “prophetic” element in ch. 9 = J).


\(^82\) Well., in the latter part of Joshua, ch. 24 and 22:8 excepted, no further attempt is made to separate the threads of JE, the “prophetic” element = 11:1–9 (exc. v. 2f = R2); 15:1c, 12b, 13–19; 16:1–8, 9f; 17:5f, 10b, 11–15; 18:2–10 (v. 7*); 19:15b, 24a, 25a, 28, 30, 35–38, 49f; 21:45–46; 22:3 – J or E (vs. 1–6 = D); v. 7a = gloss, 7b = R2; chap. 28 = Ds. Kuen. finds in chs. 18–23 only 17:14–18 and 18:2–6, 8, 10 remaining of the “prophetic” account of the partition of the land. The former passage of these, however, stands upon the same footing as the more antique fragments in chs. 1–12, and may therefore be assigned to J; 18:2–6, 8–10 on the other hand was written by JE himself, v. 7 = R4; to this nucleus was added before the time of P, hence by R4, 18:1b, 8, 12–14, 53; 14:6–15; 18:7; 21:41–43; 22:4–5; 28 entire; 24:1, 13, 31. Kitt., 11:1–9 = R4 working over a section of J or E. From v. 10 to the end of ch. 12 = Ds. E reappears only with 15:13–19 with any degree of probability. Then 16:1–5; 17:14 (read הָרֹק רֵי), 15 (exc. לֹא תִּנְסָא מִלְקָה, הָרֹק = gloss, see LXX. Insert after לְרֶוַה), יַרְבָּה; 18:2–6, 8–10.

\(^83\) So all the critics, with slight divergence as to the portions due to R. Well. (exc. מַעַרְיָה, מִשְׁפָּךְ borrowed from 23:2 in v. 1; the list of tribes in v. 11 = R4; מִתּוֹרִים and מִלְקָה in v. 12 and read שָׂרָא and הַרְבָּה מִלְקָה, cf. LXX.; v. 13 = R4; לֹא תִּנְסָא מִלְקָה in v. 18, and vs. 19b, 26a, 31). Kuen. (exc. 10, 13, 31 = R4). Kitt., “stark überarbeitet.”
C. THE JUDEAN (?) NARRATIVE J.

I. Genesis.

1. The beginning of the world; paradise; the woman’s transgression and the curse.

2:4b-3:24 (exc. נִבְלָתָה after נבְלָתָה passim; 3:20 and perhaps 2:10-15 = R).\(^{84}\)

2. Adam’s descendants [Cain and Abel(?)]; a seven-linked genealogy, the last link branching into three; the song of Lamech; [a fragmentary ten-linked genealogy ending with Noah and his three sons(?)].\(^{85}\)

4:1-16 (misplaced(?); נῦ in v. 1 = R), 17-24,25f; 5:29 (J follows in 17-24 an older source, possibly E).\(^{86}\)

3. The sons of God and the daughters of men; corruption of the earth.

6:1-8 (exc. נִבְלָתָה and וּכְרַת in v. 4, וּכְרַת נבְלָתָה יִבְרָא לָו in v. 7 = R); J rests in 6:1-4, as also in 4:17-24, upon an older source, possibly E.\(^{87}\)

---


\(^{85}\) Well., Bud., Kuen. and Kitt. (p. 84) come to practically the same conclusion with regard to J in Gen. 1-11. All agree that the original writer, J, had no flood story. His narrative consisted of a) the paradise story; 2:4b-3:24; b) a seven-linked genealogy dividing with Lamech, the seventh, into three branches, Japheth, Tubal and Tubal; these are ancestors of the present race, divided according to the mode of life, and corresponding to Shem, Ham and Japheth in the other story; 4:1-25b,16b-24; c) the story of the origin of the Nephilim (see Num. 13:33); 6:1-4 (Well.(?), Bud., exc. vs. 3 misplaced, and + 10-9; Kuen. + 10:9(?)); d) (Bud. e) the story of Noah, the husbandman, whose discovery of the vine relieves the “curse of the ground;” his experience of the effects of wine, and his prophetic song foreshadowing the relations of the three peoples of Syria, Shem, Japheth and Canaan (6:20) 9:20-27 (exc. נִבְלָתָה in v. 22 = R); then e) (Bud. d) the dispersion from Babel; 11:1-9; and f) a second seven-linked, tripartite genealogy, beginning with Shem and ending with Terah, father of Abram, Nahor and Haran (the genealogy underlying 10:21 (exc. נבְלָתָה כָּרָא = R), 25, and 11:10-26); then g) 11:23-30; 12:1ff. This original “Urgeschichte” was interpolated by J (Bud. makes J\(^{3}\) the author of an independent “Urgeschichte,” the beginning of which underlies ch. 1 and is traceable in 2:9bc,10-15; 3:22,24, and which was united by J\(^{3}\), author of 4:1-16, to J\(^{3}\); J\(^{3}\) adopted the Mesopotamian story of Hassidara and the flood (see Geo. Smith’s Chald. Acc. of Genesis), borrowed the name Noah (5:29) from J\(^{3}\), and, inserting Seth and Enoch after Adam in J\(^{3}\)’s genealogy of Lamech, made, with slight alteration of the other names (cf. 4:17-24 with ch. 5), a new genealogy corresponding in number (10) with that of Hassidara, and connected it by means of 4:23f with J\(^{3}\). The line thus ran from Adam through Seth to Noah; for 4:23bc,3-16a had already been added to J\(^{3}\) before J\(^{3}\)’s work began, and the line of Cain might be regarded as set aside. At the end of the flood-story J\(^{3}\) added in the place of J\(^{3}\)’s story of the dispersion, 9:18 (exc. last clause), 19: 10:3-19,21a,25-30, a table of the (70(?)) nations of the world, deriving them by genealogies from Shem, Ham (Egyptian Kem, substituted for “Canaan” in J\(^{3}\) to transform the originally Semitic tribe-fathers into world-ancestors) and Japheth. Finally, adopting J\(^{3}\)’s genealogy of Abram, he allowed the original story to flow on uninterrupted. The interpolation, however, so far exceeds the original in extent that in chs. 4-11 the primitive portions are mere fragments on the stream. With this necessary explanation the following analytical notes will be better understood.

\(^{86}\) Del., 4:1-26; 5:29 (the incompatibilities of 4:1-16 and 17-24 are due to the use of a special source—oral(?)—in 4:17-24; 6:1-4, [l., pp. 132, note, and 148]). Well., Bud., Kuen., 4:1 (exc. מֶרִי), 2b,16b-24 (5:29 = J); 4:2ab,3-16a,26f; 5:29 = J\(^{3}\). (Bud., 4:2ab,3-16a, and parts of 4:25 = J). In 4:17b read מִכְרָא אָדָם קַבֵּשׁ חַבִּרָה בִּיתוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים (מִכְרָא אָדָם קַבֵּשׁ בִּיתוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים). In v. 22 read מִכְרָא אָדָם קַבֵּשׁ בִּיתוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים (מִכְרָא אָדָם קַבֵּשׁ בִּיתוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים). Del., ed. (J on the basis of an older source). Well., 6:1-4 (exc. יְזִירָה) = J\(^{3}\); vs. 5-8 = J\(^{3}\). Kuen., 6:1-4; 10:9(?) = J\(^{3}\); vs. 5-8 = J\(^{3}\). Bud., 6:1f,4f; 10:9 = J\(^{3}\); 6:1f,5-8 = J\(^{3}\). (In v. 3 translate, “And
4. The deluge of forty days; rescue of Noah and his family in the ark; sacrifice of Noah and promise of Yahweh.

7:1f,3 in part, 4f,7*,10,12,16b,17,22*,23*; 8:2b,3a,6–12,18b,20–22 (R = 7:3a,7 in part, 8f, 22f in part). 68

5. The peopling of the earth from the sons of Noah; [Noah’s vine culture and prophetic song concerning Shem, Japheth and Canaan].

9:20–27,18f; 10:8,10–12,18–19,21,25–30 (9:20–27 is from a special source. 10:9,24 and perhaps 14 in part and הַרְוָם הֵּ֖לֵבַֽלִּים in v. 19 = R). 69

6. The tower of Babel and the dispersion; Abram and his kindred.

11:1–9,28b–30 (exc. כלְּ רֹאֵ֖י נַעֲרֵ֣י = R). 60

7. Abram called from his home; his journey with Lot, halting at Shechem and Bethel; separation from Lot and settlement at Mamre.

12:1–4a,6–9; 13:2,5–11a,12, exc. last clause, 13–18 (13:3f and הִלָּ֔שׁ עַ֖מִּים in v. 1 = R). 91

8. Yahweh’s covenant with Abram.

Traces in ch. 15 worked over by R; specifically, v. 4,9–18* (exc. 12–16 = R); R = v. 7f; R4(?) = vs. (16) 19–21. 62


16:2,4–14; 25:18b. 63

10. Visit of three heavenly ones to Abram at Mamre; promise of Isaac; punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah; origin of Moab and Ammon.

18:1–19:38 (exc. 19:29 = P2). 64

---

Yahweh said, 'My spirit [breath] shall not prevail in man forever. In their going astray he is flesh; therefore shall his days be an hundred and twenty years.' Insert after 9:26. In v. 4 hundred word: בַּיָּמִ֤ים נַעֲרֵ֖י 'וֹדֵ֥דר הַיָּמִֽים מִשָּׁלְךָ' וְיִנַּ֖שְׁבֵּ֑ךְ. In v. 7f word: בָּאֹרֵ֣י נַעֲרֵ֖י 'וְלֵ֥בָנִֽים בְּעָדוֹתֵֽךְ הָֽאָדָּמֶֽים'.

60 Well, Bud., Kuen., ad. = J4 (exc. Well. 7:6 = R, but 8a,22f = J; Bud., Kuen., 7:17a = R). Del. 6d.


64 Well., vs. 5:13,17f; R = vs. 7f,12–16: R4 = vs. 19–21. Kuen, two accounts, one of doubtful origin, the other J’s; the whole account traceable in vs. 2–4* (5,6 = R4), b) another story in v. 11f,6–13,17f (18–19,21 = R4 and B(?)). Bud., 1,2a,3b,4,6–11,17,18; R = 12–16,19,21. Del., ch. 15 = J, exc. vs. 2 and 16 = E; vs. 8–21 have been taken by J from E and worked over. Kitt., J1 = 16:1,3f,6 (vs. 1 and 6 common to E and J); J3 = vs. 7–18 (exc. parts of B in vs. 9,12 (14 P(?)) and perhaps 16).


66 Del., Kitt., ad. Well., Kuen., ad. (exc. also 18:17–19,22b–28a = R4, and [Well.], the alteration, by R4, of כָּלִֽי; 18:2,16,22a; and בַּיָּמִ֖ים in 19:1,10,12, etc., to plurals, with the corresponding changes elsewhere). Well. reads in 18:1 'כְּ רֹאֵ֖י', cf. v. 4.
11. Birth of Isaac; [Abram’s sojourn with the Philistines(?)]; news of the descendants of Nahor; Abram sets his house in order; the steward sent to the Nahorites to bring a wife for Isaac.

21:1a,2a,7,32b-84; 22:20-24; 25:3,11b,18a; ch. 24 (exc. v. 62 and in v. 67a, and v. 67b = R).65

12. Isaac in Gerar; [Abimelech takes Rebekah]; the wells of the Negeb; controversy with the Philistines and covenant at Beersheba; birth and youth of Esau and Jacob.

26:1b, first three words of v. 2, 3a,7-14,16f,19-33; (the first three words of v. 1, v. 2 from מִלְכָּר אֲלָתָה on, v. 6 = E; 3b-5 = R4; מִלְכָּר אֲלָתָה in 1a, and vs. 15 and 18 = harmonic interpolations of R); 25:21-34 (exc. 26c = P2 and traces of E in vs. 25 and 27).66

18. The blessing of Isaac; Jacob supplants Esau.

27:1-45 = JE and is composite, but only partially separable into J and E; J = vs. (7),15,(20),24-27,30a (to בָּלַע יָמִים),35-38 and 44b or 45aa and other portions not extricable, cf. E supra.67

14. Jacob’s flight to Haran; [the theophany at Bethel:] his marriages and service with Laban.

28:10,12-16,19a,(21b),19b,21b = R; 29:2-15a,26,31-35; 30:3b,4f,7f (4a and 9b R(?)),9-16,20b,22c,24b (v. 21 = R or J; 22aa = P2(?)),25-48 (exc. 26,28 = E).68

15. Jacob’s return from Aram-Naharahaim; pursuit of Laban; covenant on Mt. Gilead.

31:1,8,21 in part, 25,27,46,48-50 (46b,48a = R, from J elsewhere; v. 47 gloss, or perhaps from E elsewhere).69

---


67 Well., J apparent in vs. 7,20, and 24-27,30a,33f. Del., td. (+ a trace in 27:45(?)). Kuen., composite, but the elements of J and E cannot be determined with certainty. Kitt., J traceable in 7,15 in parts, 20,24,27,30a,33,36,45.


16. The story of Mahanaim and Peniel; [Jacob wrestles with a divine being and receives a blessing and a new name:] crosses the Jabok at Peniel and meets Esau in peace.

32:4-14a,28; 33:1-16 (exc. 4a,5,11a = E; 32:33 = R). 100

17. Succoth; Shechem and the rape of Dinah; [Israel's departure; immorality of Reuben; the descendants of Esau].

38:17,18b; 34:2b,3,5,7,11-13,19,25*26,50f; 35:21(?); 36:2f,10,13,16-18,20-28(?) (these parts of ch. 36 removed by R from before 32:4. 33:18a; 34:1a,2a,4,6,8-10,15 (14)-17,20-24 = P²; v. 26b; 35:21(?),22a; 36:1,2a(? and other portions of ch. 36 = R). 101

18. Joseph Israel's favorite; his brethren hate him and conspire to kill him; Judah interposes and, as a caravan of Ishmaelites passes by, suggests that they sell him; the Ishmaelites bring Joseph to Egypt.


19. The origin of Judah's families; his Canaanite affinities and wicked sons.

Ch. 38. 103

20. Joseph is bought of the Ishmaelites by "an Egyptian;" he is slandered by his master's wife and imprisoned.

39:1 (exc. the portion identical with 37:36 [= R from E]), 2f, 4 in part, 5f,7-20,21 in part, 22f. 104

21. Joseph made lord of Egypt; the famine.

40:1,3b,5b,16b; and traces in 41:14,18-22(?), v. 34,30b or 31,35b or 35a,41,43b, 44 or v. 40,49 or 48, 55,56a or 54b. 105

---

100 Well., 32:4-9,14a (10-13 = R²), 23-33; 33:1-16 (exc. 4a,5,8,11 = E). Kuen. 32:4-9,14a (10-13 = R²), 25-33; 33:1-16 (exc. some details including vs. 5,10,11 = E). Del., 32:2 (etc.) — 14a,39; 33:1-16. Kitt., 32:2-14a,23,33-33 (v. 30f perhaps = R). 101 Well., 33:17,19*; 34:3,7 in part, 11f,19,26f,50f (the rest of ch. 34 is of doubtful origin, but "auf keinen Fall" P²); 35:31-39 = J or E, the rest of ch. 35 (exc. 35*, 6,8,46-53 drawn by R from other sources (35:21f = R(?)). Kuen., 33:17; 34, traces including vs. 3,7 in part, 11f,19,26,33,31 (vs. 1 in part, 2 in part, 4,6,9-10,13 and 14 in part, 15-17,30-34,55 in part, 37-39 = R, [see xiv.]); 35:22a(? (preferably 35,21f = E; the greater part of ch. 36 is of doubtful origin). Del., 33:17; 34:3,5,7,11f (13 = E), 19,26f,50f (vs. 27-39 = E; rest of chapter = P²); 35:16-20 (35:21f; 36:2-5 = R). Kitt., 33:17 (parts of 19f(?)); 34:1b,2b,3,5,7,11-13,14,19,25f,50f, 35:21f (possibly the basis of 36:1f). 102 Well., 37: traces of J in 2b(?)(but בְּכֵן... בֵּית הָנֵר v. 2, and בֵּית הָנֵר v. 10, more like R), vs. 12-24 (exc. בֵּית הָנֵר v. 12b and v. 13a to בֵּית... v. 18,22 and parts of 33f, 35 (exc. first clause = E)), 29f, בֵּית... בֵּית הָנֵר in v. 28,31-33 (exc. parts of 32,34,35 = E). Kuen., in practical agreement with the above, but without 2b (= R) and without 12-18. Del., 37:2f,12-18,23 in part, 35-37,28 in part, 38-35 (exc. traces of E in 31-35). Kitt., 37:2b,3,4a,11a,12,13a,14-18,21 (read יָדֵי הָנֵר), 23b,33a-37,38b,38f (for the most part) exc. (last clause). 103 R².


22. Joseph’s brethren come to buy food; returning, at the lodging place, they find their money in their sacks; the food consumed, they make a second visit; Judah becomes surety for Benjamin.

42:2a, 4b, 6, parts of 7, 52 in v. 10, 27, 28a; 43:1–3; 48:28; 48:4–13, 15–23ab, 24–34.

23. Joseph’s hospitality; the cup hidden in Benjamin’s sack; the brethren brought back; Judah offers himself for Benjamin.

Ch. 44.

24. Joseph reveals himself and sends for his father; Israel goes down to Egypt; is met by Joseph in Goshen; Joseph and five of his brethren petition Pharaoh for leave to occupy Goshen.

45:1a, 2, 4b, 5a, 10 in part, 13f, 28; 46:28–47:5a, 6b.

25. [Joseph’s administration in Egypt during the famine; Israel fed.]

47:12–26, 27 in part.

26. Jacob’s charge to Joseph; [blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh]; blessing of all the sons; death and burial in Canaan; [Joseph’s continued kindness].

47:29–31; 48:2b, 9b, 10a, 13f, 17–19, 20b; 49:1b–27 (incorporated), 83 in part; 50:1–3(?), 4–11, 14, 18b, 21 in part, 24 in part(?).

II. Exodus.

1. Israel in Egypt; birth and youth of Moses; his flight to Midian and marriage there; the theophany at Sinai; Moses commissioned to deliver Israel and equipped with signs for the people and for Pharaoh.

Traces in 1:10, 12, 20 v. 21; 2:5f in part, and a trace in v. 14; vs. 15–22; 3:3 in part, 4a, 7b, 16 in part, 17; 4:1–16 (in 2:18 insert בֹּקֶב before בַּעֲרֵי).


107 Ed. (Kitt. suggests a possible background of E in vs. 2, 12, 23, 31.)

108 Wells, 45:1, 5a בָּרָק בְּרָקָי in v. 4f, vs. 10, 13f, 28; 46:1f, 5f in part; 46:28–47:4, 6b. Kuen., ch. 45 = E, exc. parts of vs. 4, 5, etc. (28 not mentioned); 46:28–47:5a, 6b. Del., ch. 45 (exc. 17–23 = E) with interpolations from E; 46:1, 28–47:4, 6b. Kitt. 45:1a, 2, 4c, 5a, 10, 13f, 28; 46:1a, (12b, 7f, 10f, 12f, 24f) 28–47:5a, 6b.


111 Wells, traces in 1:14; v. 20b, 22; 2:6ab, 10b, 11–22 (exc. v. 15a = E(?)); 3:1–9 (exc. traces of E in 4, vs. 6f, 10–16 (19f = R4); 4:1–9, 10–12 (13–16 = B6). JAll. no sure trace of J before 3:1f (jamin) in vs. 2 and 4 = R4 for הִרָאֶד, הִרָאֶד in v. 9, vs. 10–18 (vs. 15, 19f = R4, 21f = R4 or E enriched by R4); 4:1–12, (13–16 = R4). Kuen., "in Ex. 1–11, the prophetic narrative, in its present form, is due to JE, who did not simply interweave his documents in this case, but made their statements the groundwork of a narrative of his own, especially in chs. 4–11." Still J is traceable in distinction from R in 3:4a, 7f, and 9a or 9b; 4:14–16 = R4 (see r. p. 150). Kitt., 1:20b, 22, and perhaps traces in v. 14; 2:3, 11, 14, 16–23ab (23ab by the other critics is placed with LXX. before 4:19); 3:2 in part (specifically 2aa) 3:4a, 7f (exc. 8bb), 16b–22 (exc. parts of this passage, especially in v. 18); 4:1–12 (18–19(?)).
2. Moses returns to Egypt; struggle with Yahweh at the lodging place and circumcision of Moses' son; he [meets Aaron and] reports to the elders of Israel; Moses and the elders go to petition Pharaoh.

2:23ab; 4:19,20a,22-26,27-29a,30,31 in part; 5:1f,5,9,11b,21-23 in part (6:1 = R; 4:22f misplaced).\textsuperscript{112}

3. The seven plagues of Egypt: the water turned to blood; frogs; flies; murrain of cattle; hail; locusts; death of the first-born.

7:14,16,25,26-29; 8:4-11a,16-28 (except 16a,21-24a = E); 9:1-7,18,(14-16 = R), 17-21,23b,24b,25a,26-30,34b; 10:1a,(1b,2,3a = R), 3b-7,13b,14b,15a,16-19,28f; 11:4-8; 12:29f,54-36,38f.\textsuperscript{113}

4. The exodus; [laws of 

5 [Manna given]; water from the rock at Massa-Meribah.

16:3 in part, 4f,15a,19f in part, 21,25-30,35a (all, however, removed from before Num. 11 and worked over by R or R1); 17:2,7.\textsuperscript{115}

6. The theophany to the people at Sinai; [the covenant before the mount; Moses goes up and remains forty days in the mount; idolatry of the people; Moses'] intercession; renewal [celebration] of the covenant.

\textsuperscript{112} Well, 2:23ab; 4:18,20a,24-26,29-31 (5ff and וֹרָה or וֹרַה in 29f; 5:1,4,30 = R); 5:1-6:1 (5:4,5 show traces of expansion). Kuen, 4:21-23 = R\textsuperscript{4} (see r. 155,259 and notes supra). Jol, 2:23ab; 4:19,20a,24-26 (21-23,27f,30a = R); 5:3,4 (נָדֶּשׁ מָרָה וַדָּבָר מָרָה בְּלִי נָדֶּשׁ מָרָה בְּלִי דָּבָר). 22f (rest of 5 = E; 6:1 = R). Kittal, (2:23ab) 4:19 and a statement corresponding to 20a,24-26; 5:1b,2,4.

\textsuperscript{113} Well, 7:14-17a (exc. 15d = R), 17b from מַעֲרִיק הָעָלִים, 18,25-29; 8:4-11a (apparently, see II, pp. 553 and 556, but without וֹרַה vs. 4 and 5), 18-28; 9:1-7,19 (14 = R\textsuperscript{4}), 15-21,30,34 (exc. מַעֲרִיק הָעָלִים), 56a,56-50,33f; 10:1a,3b-11 (1b-3a = R); 13 (exc. first clause = E), 14 (exc. first clause = E), 15 (exc. first clause = E), 16a,15b-18,25f; 11:4-8: 18:20f (41-50 = R). Jol, 7:14-17a (exc. last clause of v. 15 = R\textsuperscript{4}), 23,26-29 (26a = B, 28a = R); 8:4-10,11ab (exc. מַעֲרִיק = R, 11ab = P\textsuperscript{4}), 16-28 (exc. 16b = R and 21-23 = E worked over by R\textsuperscript{4}); 9:1-7 (exc. לְכֹל בְּרָאשֵׁהוּ), 13,17,18,20,34,24 (exc. מַעֲרִיק הָעָלִים), 25b-27 (exc. מַעֲרִיק הָעָלִים), 25a,30a and הַיְּשֵׁרָה יִדְרָאֵב in 26b,51-53a, הָרֵיאֶה בְּרָאֵב in 25b,54 (14-16,19-21,30 = R, 50c = B); 16:1a,8ab,30-66ab,13 (from מַעֲרִיק), 16ab,15a (to the second מַעֲרִיק), 15b-29 (1b,5a to מַעֲרִיק, 6ab = R\textsuperscript{4}); 11:4-8; 12:20-31,39f,39 (38 and 38-38 = B). Kuen, in practical agreement with Dill and Jol. (see r. 155,259).

\textsuperscript{115} Kittel, 7:14-17bs,26,28-50; 8:4-11a,16-23; 9:1-7,18,21-23,27-30,33f; 10:1-11,13b, 14b-20; 11:7f,4-7; 12:29,30ab,31-36 (mostly), 29.
19:3-6 in part, 9,11 in part, (18b(?)) 16 in part, 18 in part, 20-22,25 (20:18 in part, 20 in part(?)); 24:1f,6f,11 in part, 12 in part, 18b; 32:1-14,19-24,30-34*(35 = R); 33:1-5*,12-23*; 34:1-28; (19:28f = R; 34:10-27 was removed by R from after 24:2. After 34:9 followed originally 33:14-17, then 34:28. Vs. 11-26 are a mere extract from the Book of the Covenant). The traces (of J(?)) in ch. 18 are neglected in III. p. 624.116

III. Numbers.

1. Departure from Sinai; Hobab goes with Israel as guide; the Mosaic formula at the moving or resting of the ark; Kibroth-hattaawah; Israel lusts for flesh; seventy elders appointed.

10:29-32...33b,35f; 11:4-6,10* (exc. הָרֹאשׁ דְּרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ וּרְאֵה = E), 11-29 (the two stories of the murmuring for flesh and the elders, not originally together, united by R).117

2. [Rebellion of Miriam and Aaron; Kadesh; spies sent out; the people's murmuring and attack on Amalek.]

Traces in ch. 12 (vs. 2,4f,9 in part); 13:17-20 in part (cf. E), 22,27f; 14:1b,2 in part, 3f(?),6f,28(?),30,39-45 (exc. 39 in part, 41 in part, 44 in part = E).118

---

116 Well. 19:9a(?) (parts of 10f(?)20-25 (exc. 23f = R4); 20:23-35; chs. 21-23 (exc. 20:23; 22:20-23, last clause of v. 24 and v. 30; 23:9b,22b,25a,31b-33 = R4; 19:9b and 23:12 = R; 23:17-19 is borrowed from ch. 34:25ff; chs. 5,8 = early interpolations); 24:3-8; 33:1f,8a,13,14 (33:1-6,15-31,35 = R). The rest of ch. 32 = R4 and R4; 33:13,15-23 = R4; 34:1-35 is an ancient version of the Ten Words incorporated by R4 and interpolated by him as follows: v. 1 from בַּעֲשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ on בַּעֲשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ in v. 4, vs. 5-9 and a great part of 10-13, v. 24. The other interpolations in 10-27 by which the original Ten Words, L. v. 14a, II, 17, XIII, 18a, IV, 19a, v. 21a, v. 58, VII, 25a, VIII, 25b, IX, 26a, x. 26b have been added, are a part of the code as it was when incorporated). Jdt. 19:9a,11,(12,13a = J or R4) 15,16a,15,20-22,25 (9b,8,12(?))8a,13(?),23f = R4; 9b = R. No further traces of J to the end of ch. 24, where Jdt. 19a's treaty closes. The Book of the Covenant, 20:23-23:38 interpolations, especially in 23:20ff, excepted, is assigned by all the critics except Well. to E (see note in loco). Kuen. "It is doubtful whether J has contributed anything to the accounts of the Sinai legislation and the apostasy of the people, Ex. 19-24 and 32-34. Perhaps traces of J in 19:13b,20,22,25; 33:1a,8a,15,6, (see xv.). The original account in these chapters was E's and consisted of 19:10-19; 20:18-21,1-17; 24:12-14 (v. 12b as in Dt. 5:27)18b; 31:18 in part; 32:1-5,15f in part, 17-20,(21-24(?))...33:7-11...34:1-4 (in 34:1-4 read רֶאָשׁ אֶלְעָשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ רֶאָשׁ אֶלְעָשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ then the rest of v. 1 and רֶאָשׁ אֶלְעָשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ then the carrying out of these instructions and v. 2b). The rest, so far as it belongs to E, i. e. chs. 31-33, 24:3-8 originally occupied the position of Deuteronomy. R4 removed it hither, expanding and interpolating it, and inserted it by means of alterations in ch. 19f and of 34:6-9; 34:10-27 was originally an independent version of the Sinal covenant, with an introduction of its own in vs. 1-5. For B4 etc., see note to E in loco. Kitt., J = 19:9a(?),11,12,13,20f. Then one of the three הָרֹאשִׁים הָרֹאשִׁים הָרֹאשִׁים in 24:13-18,15a(?)) then 34:28; 32:1-3 (9-14 = R4), 19,20(?),21,24-30,34,35 = R or R4. Traces in 33:5b(?) and 12-23, especially vs. 19-23; (33:1-5 = E worked over by R4; 12-23 = R4 [on a basis of J(?)]) 34:1-5,10-27 (9-9 = R4). Kitt. thinks not impossible that Well may be right in seeing in 34:1-5 (exc. בַּעֲשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ in vs. 1,4 and 1b from בַּעֲשֵׁי נִשָּׁיָהוֹ), 10-27 the original covenant according to J. In that case it would follow immediately after Jdt. 19 and afterward the Decalogue, 24:15a, etc.).

117 Well. 10:29-32,33b-36; 11:1-5(7),4-6,10a,b,11-13,23,10b,30-35. Kuen. 10:29-32; 11:4-13,15,31-33* in part, 34,35* (11:18-24a,31-33 mostly = R4 [JE]). Kitt., 10:29-32 (then Ex. 16 in part); 11:4-6, 10-29* (or 24-29 = R4).

118 Well. no trace of J in ch. 12; in ch. 13 J = 19 or 20, 23 or 25, 37-39; 14:1 in part, 4,8f (11-34 = R4 on a meagre basis of J). Kuen. no trace of J in chs. 12-14. Kitt. no traces of J in ch. 12; J in ch. 13f = vs. 17b-19,20,27,28f; 14:1b,5f,8f,10-33.
3. [Rebellion of Dathan and Abiram; Edom’s opposition(?)].
16:1b,2-4 in part, 12-15 in part, 25-34 in part (see E in loco.); 20:20(?). 119
4. Attack of the king of Arad (misplaced); [perhaps a fragment of a list of encampments; conquest of territory in Moab].
21:1-8,18b-20(?),25-32(?). 120
5. Balak and Balaam; Israel blessed by the prophet of Yahweh.
22:3a,4,5a,7a,17f, וְןָשָׁבֶּהְיוֹן in v. 21(?),22-34,35a; 24:1-18 (19); (22: 85b [= 21b]; 23:28[27]-30; 24:20[19]-24 = R). 121
6. Trespass of Israel with the Moabite women; Gad and Reuben’s settlement in the trans-Jordanic district (inheritance of the sons of Machir and Jair misplaced); warning to extirpate Canaanite idols.

IV. Deuteronomy.

1. [Warning to Israel by Moses before his death and song of Moses]; Moses’ death.
31:14f (traces), 16-23; 32:1-44; 34:1b,4. 123

V. Joshua. 124

1. [Israel crosses the Jordan]; the monument in Gilgal of stones from Jordan; [appearance of the captain of Yahweh’s host to Joshua].
4:3bc,6,7a,8,10f,11*,20*; 5:18-15. 125

122 Well., 25:1-5 = J or E; 33:52f,55f = P incorp. by P1; no further trace of J until Deut. 34. Kuen., 25:1-5 = E; no trace of J anywhere in these chapters (see xviii. and E, note in loco.). Kitt., 25:1,2,4 (22:1b,2a,3,5-13,25-27)*.
123 Well., no trace of J exc. perhaps 34:7b; the rest, 31:14-23; 32:1-44 and ch. 34 = D3 and E worked over by R4. Kuen., no trace of J (see E note in loco.). Kitt., no trace of J, exc. 34:1abb, 5 (v. 4 = R4).
124 For the general analysis of Joshua in Dill. and of the “prophetic element” in Kuen. and Well. see under E, p. 236.
125 Well., ch. 1 = D4; “primary element” J(?) = ch. 2 worked over by R4 (exc. Rahab’s speech, vs. 9-11 = R4 entire); then 8:1,5,9(?)=10,11a (read הַלַּיְלָה instead of הַלַּיְלָה), 13f (exc. one-half of v. 16); 4:1,3,8 (v. 2 and the first three words of v. 3 = R4 [JE]). Kuenen distinguishes “the story wherein the stones are piled up at Gilgal” from that of E concerning the “raising a heap of stones in the bed of the Jordan”; for the latter he specifies the constituent verses; the portions of the former (J) the reader may infer by subtracting E from JE, see L., p. 159 and above, notes to p. 238f. Kitt., ch. 1f = D4; fragments of his source in 1:1, 2,10,11; J is traceable in ch. 8f as follows: 1ab,8,10a (10b = D3), 11 (read הַלַּיְלָה instead of הַלַּיְלָה), 13f (dile מִלְּעַרְתָּן), 15b,16f; 4:1,3 (from מִשְׁמַר וֹאָנַי), 6a,8,20(?); 3:2,4,6-8, and 4:10-5:1 mostly = D4; 4:9 15-17,19 = P4). Bud. makes the same analysis as Well. and brings evidence to identify Well.’s “primary element” with J1.
2. The capture of Jericho [and trespass and punishment of Achan].
6:8,7a,10,11,14,15a,16b,20aa, (8f,11,14f = R, 2,17b,18,27 and parts of 4,8f,13 =R4) ch. 7* (exc. vs. 24f[= R4] and traces of R). 126
3. The capture of Ai.
8:3–9,14 in part, 15f,17 in part, 19–22a,23–25; (8:1f,7b,8a,22b,27–29 and traces in vs. 3,11,15,21,24 = R4; v. 13, and כנפ顯示 in v. 19 = R). 127
4. The covenant with the Gibeonites; Israel deceived; the Gibeonites enslaved.
9:6b,7,14,15aa, 16 in part (vs. 1f,9 in part, 10,24f,27 in part =R4). 128
5. The occupation of the land; settlement of Caleb and Otniel; the Jebusites; Gezer; the cities which held out against Manasseh; the Danites capture Laish; traces of a description of the inheritances.
18:2–10,11b (?) (or = E; v. 7 = R4); 15:13–18,14–19; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12f; 19: 47; the portions of chs. 16f and 19 excluded from P2. 129
6. [Dismissal of Reuben and Gad]; a summary of the conquest of their several portions of territory by the tribes independently.
Irrecoverable traces of J - ch. 22. Jud. 1 for the most part. 130

---

126 Well., 6:3f,4 in part, 7 in part(?), 10f* (read לְדִיקֵי י), 14,15a,16b,17a,19,20aa,21,24, (vs. 1f,5a,9aa and bb, 17b,18,22f,25–27 = R4) ch. 7 = R4 (JE). Kuenen sanctions the analysis but gives no personal division. "The story in which the priests and the ark are not mentioned, but the people raise the war-cry and blow the trumpet, whereupon the walls fall, may very well be J's"; ch. 6f = JE. Kitt. 6:3,4ab,5b,10f (read יִקְוֹד הַנַּבִּיתִים) 14,15a,16b,30a,20b, (from יָרֵא) on 20(?); ch. 7 = R4 on a basis of J. Bud. adds to Well. J, v. 28.

127 Well. "primary element" = 8:3a,15, 13,14b,18,20 in part, 28. Points of resemblance with E are noted by Well. This "primary element" Dill. assigns to E. Hence Well.'s and Bud.'s analysis corresponds with that of Dill, and Kitt. under the same heading in E. Kuen. thinks the "primary element" is not E's and may very well have been J's. Bud., 8:3a,12,13a perhaps traces in 14 and 20 and probably vs. 18 and 26 (exc. נִלְיָה הַלָּאֲשֹּׁנָה = R). Kitt., 8:3–9,14a,b,15a,16a,17b, 19f and from v. 22 the words לְדִיקֵי י (rest of the verse = R4); 23,24a,b,25 (vs. 13,21,22a = R4).

128 Well., 8:30–35 = R4; 9:8 (exc. יִקְוֹד הַנַּבִּים וּנְעָמָה), 7,12–14 = J (9:1f,24f = R4). Kuenen recognizes the "remains of a narrative in which the negotiations with the Gibeonites were conducted by the 'men of Israel' and not Joshua." Kitt., 8:30–35 = R4; 9:1f = D; J = 9:3–7 (exc. the words rejected by Well. in v. 8 and read the clause before תַּנָּחַ ו ה = in v. 11), 9 (vs. 3 and 10 = D4), 11–14,15ab,22f,28, 30 (15aa,24f and 27 = R4). Bud., 9:3–8 (exc. דּוּ לִי and וּנְעָמָה and in place of אָלֶמְאִים אֵלֶּה יִשָּׁרִי, 7 (Qeri), 9:11–13 (in v. 12 תַּנָּחַ ו = without), 14 (Insert after יִשָּׁרִי יִקְוֹד תִּרְצוּ נִלְיָה לְדִיקֵי י from v. 16a), 16,22f,25f (exc. first word of v. 22) (vs. 8,10,15a,24 = R4).

129 Well. and Kuen., 18:2–10 (exc. v. 7 = R4) and 15:12–19 = JEB. Well. also, 15:63; 16:1–3f, 17–

130 Dill. alone finds any evidence of J in ch. 22. Bud. and Kitt. find Jud. 1:1–25 to be a mass of fragments from J worked over and incorporated by the redactor of Judges. Well. and Kuen. also recognize the relationship. Bud. and Kitt. restore the narrative of J in Judg. 1 as follows: vs. 1b,3,5–7,19,21,23, last clause of v. 10,11–17,30 (in v. 16 read instead of דְּלִיקֵי י, מִלֵּנֵי י; in v. 36 read instead of בְּעָלָה, בְּעַלָּה, בְּעָלָה; correct v. 21 according to Josh. 15:33,32–35 (in v. 22 for יִשָּׁרִי יִקְוֹד יֵבֵד and בְּעָלָה read לִיקָד and לְדוּ לִי read לְדִיקֵי י and supplement the passage with Josh. 18:13,27f (v. 27 as in Josh. 17:12), 29 (supplement from Josh. 16:10,20–33,34 + Josh. 19:47a [LXX.], 35; 2:1a,5b. (Judg. 1:1a,4,8f,10ab,18; 2:1b–5a = R.)

[To be continued in October Number (1889).]
SOME NOTES ON "THE MONOLITH INSCRIPTION OF SALMANESER II."

BY PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,
University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Craig\(^1\) has earned the gratitude of Assyriologists by furnishing them with a good text and an excellent translation of this highly important inscription. Thanks to the very careful study he has made of the original stone, he has succeeded in finding satisfactory readings for a considerable number of words hitherto regarded as illegible or obscure, and besides the numerous corrections he has to offer to the text as given in III Rawlinson, the conjectures which he proposes for the broken-off portions are valuable and in most cases entirely acceptable. Nor should mention of the commentary added by Dr. Craig be omitted, though one might have wished this part to have been more copious than it is.

The following miscellaneous notes, suggested by a study of Dr. Craig's work, may, perhaps, throw further light on some passages and otherwise be found of some value.

Col. I, 3. In view of the reading \(\text{tu-ku-um-tu}\) Col. II, 71, there seems to be no good reason why we should not read \(\text{tu-\underline{\kappa}um-tu}\) here instead of \(\text{tu-\underline{k}um-tu}\), as Dr. Craig proposes; all the more so as the reading with \(\underline{n}\) is not found, as far as I am aware, in historical texts (at all events very rarely), but only in syllabaries. See Delitzsch to Lotz Tigl. Pil., p. 94.

Line 6. There are several examples of erasures in this inscription made by the scribe himself\(^2\), and I am therefore inclined to believe that the difficulty at the end of this line is to be explained on such grounds.

A comparison with I R. 86,1, where we have \(\text{ni-\sha\dot{e}n\dot{a}}\) A-num "darling of Anu," suggests that in this instance, too, the scribe, forgetting that he had already written \(\text{e-ni}\), wrote or started to write \(\text{\si}\) with dual sign and then erased it. The faint traces, still to be seen, fit in with this supposition, while not positively confirming it. Furthermore, it appears that, in consequence of this erasure, the scribe forgot—if Dr. Craig's copy may be trusted—to add the determinative before the god Bél.

The expression \(\text{ni-\sha\dot{e}t}\) of this or that god, used quite synonymously with \(\text{nara\dot{m}}\) "beloved" (e. g. Sar. I, 10) is best explained as a briefer form that arose from \(\text{ni-\sha\dot{e}t\,\dot{e}ni}\) or \(\text{ni-\sha\dot{e}t\,\dot{e}n\dot{a}}\).

---

\(^1\) HEBRAICA, VOL. III., No. 4, PP. 201-222.

\(^2\) For example, Col. I, 7, where the scribe after erroneously reduplicating \(\text{\si}\) erased the first.
35. Supply biltu u before madatu. The measurement warrants this, and the parallel passages, such as I., 23, render it quite certain.

47. A comparison with lines 15 and 19 favors the addition of SAB.SUN.-MEŠ. = ummanatê, after narkabatê. The traces seem to be in accord. So also Col. II., 3, the reading ummanatê is certainly to be preferred to ma'adu. Instead of dikta-su supplied by Dr. Craig at the end of the line, I should prefer tidukišunu, as more in accord with the style of the inscription (cf. Col. I., 39 and II., 98). The readings in I, 24, II, 11 and 64 would then have to be similarly altered. The point appears to be a trifling one and yet it is well to preserve the uniformity of style in an inscription, where we are not warranted in assuming any variation.

II., 5-6. Read "ma-ha-ze rabûte ša ahu Pa-ti-na-a ak-te-rib. Alani ša tamdi e-li-ni-ti ša mat A-har-ri," etc. The great towns of the Patiniants I approached. The cities of the upper sea of Aharru. I destroyed. For the expression tamdu elintu instead of the more usual tamdu elitu see San. Tayl. I., 13 and III R, 12, 3. With this reading there is no longer any reason to doubt that DUP is here the ideogram for erib.

53, 54. It is not easy to say exactly how the text originally read, though the general sense of the passage is clear, but something like the following seems to be demanded by the context, and is, moreover, justified on other grounds:

After argiš supply ["sihrute rabûte ina lib-bi [batule šunu] šal ba-tu-[la-te-šu-nu ana] a-si-ta-a-ti," etc. The small and great within (sc. the city) their youths and maidens at the asitâta on stakes I impaled. To see the justice of this restoration, it is necessary to compare Col. I., 17. Cf. also Ašurn. II. 19. The only change that my conjecture demands is the substitution of the fem. dem. for the signs TE.AŠ, which resemble ŠAL sufficiently to warrant the belief that another inspection of the stone would show the latter to be the actual character. The rendering "columns" for asitatu does not appear satisfactory. The word has long been recognized as a difficult one.1 It is clearly the equivalent of the Talmudic נלעיךֵו which is of frequent occurrence, and is throughout used in the sense of "wall." In Arabic, on the other hand, under the form ﺪﻴــاء, the meaning is apparently "column, pillar," but Fraenkel2 very properly classes it among the loans-words from the Aramaean, so that the Arabic meaning in no case counts for much and we are thrown back to the Talmudic as coming nearer to the original sense. In the Mandaic dialect,3 also, the word is found with the meaning "wall." That in Assyrian, similarly, it was something connected with a wall, is clearly shown by the passage in the Tigrath-pileser inscription, Col. 5, 27, where it occurs by the side of dûru: "dura-šu raba-a u a-sa-ia-šu ša agurri ana

1 Cf. Lotz T. F., p. 155.
2 See the passages in Jastrow's Talm. Dict., s. v.
3 Aramäische Fremdw., p. 11.
nabali akbaši." From Ašurn. II., 89, it also follows that an asitu was something erected at the entrance to a city and therefore near the city wall. An asitu must have been rather broad—and for this reason a "column" seems out of the question—for Ašurnaširpal in the same passage speaks of having spread the skins of his captives over it. The addition of ša ḳakkadešu in the two passages of our inscription, Col. I., 16, and II., 58, to the word, leaves scarcely a doubt of its being an architectural term and the last appeal, therefore, as in the case of all termini technici of Babylonian and Assyrian architecture must be made to archaeology.

Dr. Craig recognizes this in his note to the word and therefore his rendering "a column of heads" is all the more surprising. While we are, therefore, justified in referring both the Arabic, Talmudical and Mandaean equivalent back to the Assyrian as the original source—as will be found to be the case with other architectural terms, etc.—the special meanings which the term may have acquired in traveling from one people to another can at best serve as a guide, but not as a positive indication of what the term was applied to in Assyrian. It may be said with safety that an asitu was a structure built at the city wall—perhaps a frame-work—and that asitu ša kakkašešu is a place where executions took place. The two forms for the plural asitu (or a-sa-ia-tu) and asitatu are rather curious, and it is interesting to note that the former of these corresponds letter for letter with the plural in the Mandaean נְהָנְשָׁנָא. In a future article I shall discuss this word and the expression asitu ša ḳakkadešu at greater length.

60. In an article published in Bezold's Zeitschrift (vol. II., p. 358 seq.), I have shown that epšitu here and in some other passages is to be translated "story," "narrative," and forms a parallel to Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל which in post-biblical literature is used in precisely the same way.

72. Instead of ru puš read gibis, as in I., 32 and in II., 15, where we have gi-biš ummanatešu. That the sign here used has among others this value, is proved by II R. 26, No. 1, col. 10 c. d., where after gab we must evidently supply šu.\(^1\)

75. Is KI-LAL, perhaps, to be read šukultu, according to V R. 41, No. 2, 58?\(^2\) For another meaning of this compound ideogram see V R. 16, Rev. 44.

I close with a list of some interesting parallel passages in this inscription:

| Col. I., 19 | II., 42. |
| Col. I., 21 | II., 21 and 32. |
| Col. II., 7 | II., 39. |
| Col. I., 27 | I., 49 = II., 44. |
| Col. I., 46 | II., 50. |
| Col. II., 44 | II., 54. |

---

\(^1\) Cf. Zimmerm, BP., p. 76; Brünnnow's List, No. 5450.

\(^2\) See also II R. 8, 11e,f (Strassmaier, A.V. 8138); Brünnnow's List, No. 9317.
OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED
BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D.,
Allegheny City, Pa.

ZACHARIAH.

IX. 9. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly, riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."—See above, Dan. vii. 18. "We will be glad and rejoice in thee" (Song of Solomon i. 4). It is like a queen whose husband and sons and sons-in-law have undertaken a sea voyage. Your sons have returned; the news is brought to her. What do I care? let my daughters-in-law rejoice with them, is her reply. Again the news is brought that her sons-in-law have returned. What do I care? is her reply; this is a cause for my daughters to rejoice. But when the news reached her of the return of the king, her husband, she said: Now is my joy complete. Thus also the prophets will once come and say to Jerusalem: "Thy sons shall come from far" (Isa. lx. 4); but she will say: What do I care? "And thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side" (ibid). What do I care? will be the reply. But when she hears, "Behold thy king cometh unto thee," she says: Now is my joy complete, as it is said: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion." In that hour she says: "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God" (Isa. lxi. 10).—Midrash on Song of Solomon, i. 4.

Rabbi Hillel said: There will be no Messiah, because they have enjoyed him already in the days of Hezekiah. Rav Joseph said: May the Lord forgive Rav Hillel. For when was Hezekiah? In the first house (i.e. during the first temple), and did not Zechariah prophesy during the second temple, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; behold thy king," etc.—Talmud Sanhedrin, fol. 99, col. 1.

X. 4. "Out of him came forth the corner, out of him the nail, out of him the battle-bow, out of him every oppressor together."

Targum: Out of him shall come forth his king, out of him his Messiah, out of him the strength of his war, out of him all his goodness shall be exalted together.

XII. 10. "And I will pour upon the house of Israel, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon
me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn: for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born."

What is the cause of his mourning? In this Rabbi Dosa and the other Rabbis differ. The one said it was for Messiah, the son of Joseph, who is to be slain; and the other said it was for the evil desire which is to be slain. If the cause will be the violent death of Messiah, the son of Joseph, one can understand that which is written, "And they shall look to him whom they have pierced."—Talmud Succaḥ, fol. 52, col. 1.

XIV. 5. "And the Lord, my God, shall come, and all the saints with thee." How many prophets were in Israel, whose names are not known, but in the future God will bring them with him, as it is said, "And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee."—Midrash on Ecclesiastes i. 11.

— 7. "But it shall be one day, which shall be known to the Lord."

Another interpretation of "There was none of them" (Ps. cxxxix. 16) is that it means the seventh day, for this world is to last 6,000 years; 2,000 years

---

1 The words to which reference is made and which precede our passage are these: "And the land shall mourn," etc. (Zechar. xii. 10). Have we not here a lesson a fortiori? If in the future, on an occasion of mourning, and when the evil has no more dominion, the Law says: "Men apart and women apart, how much more should men and women be apart now, when the evil imagination has dominion; and on occasions of mirth."

2 The fiction about two Messiahs—Messiah the son of Joseph, and Messiah the son of David—was originally derived from Zechar. xii. 10, and belongs to a later period. The Messiah the son of Joseph, or Messiah the son of Ephraim, was looked upon as one destined to be born in poverty, and acquainted with the ill, and was to be killed in war. The Messiah the son of David, on the other hand, was regarded as the great Messiah, who was to be the final conqueror, and to erect a kingdom over which he was to reign forever. The doctrine of the two Messiahs seems to have sprung up after the Christian era. When hardly pressed by Christian argument about the Old Testament prophecies of the sufferings of the Messiah, the fiction about two Messiahs would offer a welcome means of escape. In both Talmud and the late Targums, this fiction is already found (comp. Glaesener, De gemino Indcorum Messia, Heilinstädt, 1798, p. 145 seq.; Schöttgen, Horae Hebrotace, i. p. 556). That Zechar. xii. 10 was the origin of the fiction of Messiah, the son of Joseph, may be assumed with certainty, since Jewish writers always speak of him in connection with this passage, and a comparison of two passages from Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmud confirms our assumption. The former remarks with reference to Zechar. xii. 10: Here are two opinions concurring on this passage; the one says that which they (the people) mourn is the Messiah; and the other, that which they mourn is evil desire (original sin). The latter we have quoted above to the passage. The Jerusalem Talmud, as may be seen, brings our passage in connection with the Messiah, although it also gives room for the evil desire. The Babylonian Talmud cuts the knot asunder by fabricating all at once a second Messiah. This passage (Succaḥ, fol. 52, col. 1) is indeed the earliest which contains the strange fiction of the Messiah the son of Joseph. On the same page we also read: "The Rabbis have taught: the Holy One, blessed be He! will say to Messiah the son of David, may he be speedily revealed in our own days!" "Ask of me, and I will give thee!" as it is said, "I will declare the decree... This day have I begotten thee; ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance" (Ps. ii. 7, 8). But knowing that Messiah the son of Joseph was slain, he will say: I desire nothing of thee but life. That will sound the reply, Thy father David prophesied concerning thee long ago; as it is said: "He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it to him" (Ps. xxi. 4).—Castelli, in his Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei (Firenze, 1874) devoted a whole section to the Messia figlio di Giuseppe (pp. 224-238) and Hamburger in his Real. Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud, II. p. 783, has a separate article on the Messiah the son of Joseph, who is thus called in the mystic Messianic expectations and Messianic tales.

2 See also Yalkut in loco.
it was waste and desolate; 2,000 years under the Law; 2,000 years under the Messiah. And because our sins are increased, they are prolonged. As they are prolonged, and as we make one day a Sabbath year, so will God in the latter days make one day a Sabbathic year, which is 1,000 years, and it is said, "But it shall be one day, which shall be known to the Lord," this is the seventh day.—Yalkut on Psalm cxxxix. 16.

— "At evening time it shall be light."

This refers to the world to come.—Yalkut, l. c.

XIV. 9. "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one."

"The time of the singing is come" (Song of Sol. ii. 12), i. e., the time has come to redeem Israel; the time has come to cut off the foreskin; the time has come to destroy the power of the Cuthaean; the time has come that the kingdom of heaven should be revealed, for it is said, "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth."—Midrash on Song of Solomon ii. 18.

Rabbi Joshua of Sichnin said, in the name of Rabbi Levi: God used the manner of speech of the patriarchs and made it the introduction to the promise of redeeming the children. God said to Jacob: Thou hast said: "Then shall the Lord be my God." As thou livest, all good things, blessings and consolations, which I will impart upon thy children, shall begin with these words, for it is said, "And it shall come to pass in that day," etc. (Isa. xi. 11), "And it shall come to pass in that day," etc. (Joel iv. 18), "And it shall come to pass in that day," etc. (Isa. xxvii. 18), "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth," etc. (the introductory phrase being י": ל solicitud).—Midrash on Genesis xxviii. 21; sect. 70. Yalkut is loco.

MALACHI.

IV. 1. "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven."

The globe of the sun is incased, as it is said, "He maketh a tabernacle for the sun" (Ps. 19). A pool of water is before it. In the hour, when the sun comes out, God cools its heat in the water lest it should burn up the whole world. But in the future the Holy One, blessed be He! will free it from its sheath and will burn up with it the wicked, as it is said, "For, behold, the day cometh," etc.—Midrash on Genesis i. 17; sect. 6.

— 2. "But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness," etc. Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He! Shall the raiment be always taken to pledge (op. Exod. xxii. 26)? God replied: No, only till the sun goeth down, that is, till the Messiah comes, for it is said, "But unto you that fear my name," etc.—Midrash on Exodus xxii. 26; sect. 31.
CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

"On the Separation which may take place between the so-called Defined and Defining Noun in Arabic."—On this subject HEBRAICA of last January contained an interesting anonymous article the name of whose author had been lost. It is a pleasure to us to be able now to make the name known. We regret the numerous errata. The printer affirms that they are not "printer's errors," as there were but two marks in the proofs from which he made his corrections. At all events, we gladly insert the following communication from the author of the article in question:

To the Editor of HEBRAICA:

Dear Sir:

The article I sent you some time ago "on the Separation which may take place between the so-called Defined and Defining Noun in Arabic," has just been brought to my notice. Will you allow me to correct the following printer's errors? The article was published anonymously in the January number of 1888:

Page 87:

First Arabic line, three lines from bottom, dele final ي of مطلقائ

Page 88:

Three lines from top, for "And this is the real annexation," read "And this in the real annexation:" and then leave out full stop, and join with beginning of the اضافة المعنويت

Line 7, for البناج البناجي read البناج البناجي

Line 13, for استعبرت استعبرت read استعبرت استعبرت

Page 89:

Line 5, for فدعاهم فدعاهم read فدعاهم فدعاهم

Line 9, for معتاد معتان read معتاد معتان

Line 11, for وزن وزن read وزن وزن. For شركاتهم read شركاتهم
CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

Line 14, for "Th. Malic," read "Ibn Malic."

Line 14, for نثر نثر prose, read نثر نثر prose.

Line 19, for وعلاء وعَدَة read وعَدَة.

PAGE 90:

Line 5, for إن ارن read إن

Line 8, beginning منع should be removed from text, and placed beneath the note at the bottom of the page.

Line 7 from bottom, for وقافي وقافي read وقافي

Line 3 from bottom, for " " "

PAGE 91:

Line 8 from bottom, for اليساوي اليساوي read اليساوي

Line 4 from bottom, for القياس القياس read القياس

Faithfully Yours,

LAWRENCE M. SIMMONS.

The Owens College, Manchester, England.

Kalilg W·damnag in Syriac Literature.—On page 127 of his edition of this Syriac text, Professor Bickell mentions a gloss of the lexicographer Bar Bahlúl (10th cent.) in which he thought he had found a reference to Kalilg W·damnag. Nöldeke, however, showed (ZDMG. xxx., 754) that this supposition was wrong. Cf. also Löw ZDMG., xxxi., 535.

Bar Bahlúl, however, does mention this work in another place, see Payne Smith, col. 1850 s. v. """"ام خط قصب من تليلج ودممی"" where we read س‌ا بُدَّمُ خَط قصب من تليلج ودممی. This quotation is indeed found in the Syriac text, p. 40, l. 14. Karm-seddínâyâ has also taken up the gloss bodily. Payne Smith's translation is wrong; خط قصب means "a dividing line made of cane." The published text, however, reads حائط (، تلیمیس‌ا، س‌ا، حائط، تلیمیس‌ا).

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, N. Y.
The Orientalische Bibliographie.—The Orientalische Bibliographie, edited by Professor August Müller (Königsberg, Germany), seeks to include within its scope the Oriental literature of every country where Oriental studies have found a home. It recognizes the growing importance of the American school. It is very desirable that the Bibliography shall be complete in every respect. For this purpose I have been appointed co-laborator for America. I shall be very thankful for the receipt, wherever possible, of reviews, magazine and shorter newspaper articles, etc., bearing upon any of the subjects of which the Bibliography treats. Where this is impossible, the exact title of the article, name of the writer and of newspaper, and date of issue will suffice. The extent of our country is so great, its papers so numerous, that it is well-nigh impossible for one man to control the whole. In the interest of science it is to be hoped that this help will be readily and speedily given.

Richard Gottheil,
Columbia College, N. Y.
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