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

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

(a) Neither with a vowel (an exception is found only in a conjunctive, e. g., בַּעַר...);  

Note.—Before labials, the Babylonian system of punctuation has ֪, t. e., ֪.  

§ B. Nor with two consonants. When the first letter of a syllable (or of a word) has no vowel of its own, then it receives sh'wā mobile (cf. my grammar, §5, b), and, in the case of י"" י י נ, Hātēph (§5, c; §10, a, 3).  

§ C. CLOSE OF SYLLABLES.—Here we distinguish

I. Open Syllables, i. e., syllables closing with a vowel, e. g., אַשְׁנָה... (on י cf. §2, b). These syllables always have long vowels.

Exceptions are found in the verbal suffixes (§ 76, e) ́nī (āni), in which the liquid can be regarded as virtually doubled.

Note.---Syllables closing with  are considered open, e. g., ́tōqān, but  ṣāqān (cf. § 10, c, 1).

D. Unaccented syllables, with long vowels, are open; the shēwawaw following them is the shēwawaw mobile, e. g., ́tōqān, šō·m·rīm.

E. II. Closed Syllables, i. e., those ending in a consonant, e. g., ́tōqān (second syllable). They are called doubly closed, when the consonant closing the syllable is followed by another consonant in the same word, e. g., ́tōqān, ́bīn (first syllable), ́tāqān (second syllable). When the two consonants are the same, i. e., when the vowel is followed by a consonant with a dāghēsh, this syllable is also called sharpened, e. g., ́ṣāqān (first and second syllables).

F. Unaccented closed syllables always have short vowels, e. g., ́ṣēwāl (first syllable), ́ṣēwāl (first), ́wēyāqām (first, third), ́tēwāl (third).

G. Unaccented syllables with short vowels are closed, e. g., ́wēyāqām (first).

II. In closed Penultima with tone, we find only the following vowels:
1. the tone-long vowels ā, ē, ū; hence neither Ī nor Ū, nor the vowels naturally long, or long by contraction, namely, ā, ē, Ū; 2. the short vowels ā, Ė, e. g., ́ṣēwāl . .

I. In closed Ultima with tone, any long vowel may occur; of the short vowels, sometimes the Ū, e. g., the two particles ́nā (if), ṣē (with), which, however, often (as is always done in the case of ́tāqān) becomes toneless when ́qāfēph is used, and the form ́ṣēwāl (§ 72, n, a).

Especially worthy of note are

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

1. At the end of words. An ordinary helping-vowel (exceptions, § 11, i), generally ́ṣēwāl, but also (especially if the last, or next to the last syllable, is a guttural) ́tāqān. Then the vowel of the open syllable, if with tone, generally is lengthened, namely, ū to Ū, as, e. g., ́wēyāqām. . . ́rākāh, for ́qāfēsh, ṣēhb, ṣōrb; Ū to Ū, e. g., ́wēyāqām . . . ṣēhān, for ́shphr, ́shām; ˚ to ˚, e. g., ́ṣēwāl . . . ́bēyān, for ́mālkh, ̀zār (cf. § 27, c, d).

L. If the next to the last letter is a guttural, then ˚ remains unchanged in the open syllable, e. g., ́ṣēwāl (§ 27, e), ́wēyāqām (§ 35, a), ́ṣēwāl (§ 72, n, i), hence short vowel.

M. In the apocopated imperfect of the verbs ́nāl, the lengthening of Ū to Ū frequently does not take place, e. g., ́nāl for ́yaghāl (cf. § 72, n, i).

N. If the next to the last letter is ˚, then Hirēq is used as a helping-vowel, ́tāqān is retained in open syllables, as, e. g., ́tāqān (§ 28, a); thus also in the suffix form ́tāqān, e. g., ́tāqān, ́tāqān, “your (fem.) God,” as also in the dual ending ́qāfēph.

O. (2) In the middle of words. The first closing consonant, if it is a guttural, frequently, in order to ease the pronunciation, receives the hātēph corresponding to the preceding vowel; and, in this case, this vowel is not lengthened. Examples (in § 10, a, 4); ́ṣēwāl to be divided ́ṣēwāl, nāʿīn-roş.

P. The vowel is also not lengthened, when, instead of the hātēph,
on account of a sh'wā following it, the corresponding short vowel is employed 
(cf. § 5, e), e. g., אַלֶּה, first plural אֶלֶּהּ, yēhēz-qā‘; שָׁלֵּחַ, first plural שָׁלְחָן, to be divided בּוֹרֵז. 

§ Q. IV. Loosely-closed Syllables we call those which were originally followed 
by a vowel, which, however, in accordance with the laws of etymology, (§§ 11, c, 2., 
and 11, d) fell away. The “loose close” can be seen, from the fact that the 
letters ב ‘ר remain aspirated. The sh’wā cannot be heard, and is not sh’wā 
mobile. Examples (in § 11, c, 2), נֵבָה, dual, with suffix, בֵּן הַבָּלָם, kān-phē-hēm 
(§ 24, d), בֵּית לֶךְ for mālākhām, suffix בֵּית לֶקָה בֵּית הַלְּךָ (§ 27, g); וּבְרָה תֹּהֵב, plural תֹּהֶבֶת, to be divided יָאָמ-דְּהַוְו 
(§ 63, e); לָמַן, plural לָמַנְטְנִים (§ 65, g); וּבְרָה, plural וּבְרָה (§ 65, f).

§ R. Loosely closed are also those syllables which originated from the union of 
the prefixes ב . ל with words whose first consonant had a sh’wā under it, e. g., 
לְבָרָה (§ 11, g, 2), from רֲבִּיח++לָא. Exceptions are found with ל before the Inf. Qāl. 
(cf. § 53, c, where רֲבִּיח++לָא (ל 7) is mentioned).

§ S. Very rarely is a loosely closed syllable found where no vowel has been 
omitted (cf. § 27, m), cf. also מַלְבָּה (accus. loci), for which word, according to 
§ 19, b, a, the ground-form, bây’t, is to be presupposed. A fixed closed syllable is 
found, contrary to the rule, in בּוֹרֵז (stat. const.), of בּוֹר (§ 33, d), and in 
ינְרָה (stat. const.), of יָנָר רְשֵׁם (§ 34, c), cf. also מַלְבָּה (§ 53, d).

METHODS IN HEBREW GRAMMARS.

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

To understand and master a language implies more than the mere mechanical 
acquisition of its facts. It means the study of a language from a philological 
standpoint, an examination of its grammar and lexicon for the purpose of learning 
its inner character and being, and in order to be able to understand rationally and 
philosophically the phenomena of the speech. Whitney¹ says of the linguistic 
student: “He deals with language as the instrument of thought, its means of 
expression, not its record; he deals with simple words and phrases, not with sen-
tences and texts. He aims to trace out the inner life of language, to discover its 
origin, to follow its successive steps of growth, and to deduce the laws that govern 
its mutations, the recognition of which shall account to him for both the unity 
and variety of its present manifested phases; and, along with this, to apprehend 
the nature of language as a human endowment, its relation to thought, its influence 
upon the development of intellect and the growth of knowledge, and the 
history of mind and of knowledge as reflected in it.” Necessary as it is to acquire 
thoroughly and well the data of a language, and to learn these for practical 
purposes, it will be readily seen that the most interesting and, in many respects, 
most profitable problems of linguistic study reach out above and beyond these

¹ Language and the study of Language, p. 6.
individual facts. Especially has this been recognized in the past few decades, since the comparative method of study, which has been so abundantly fruitful in all departments of learning, has been applied to languages also, and comparative philology has been found so great a power in historical, ethnographical, mythological, and other researches. The soul and life of language has never been so much studied, or so well understood, as at present.

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

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

The father of higher Hebrew grammar is Wilhelm Gesenius, who was born in 1786, and, in 1843, died as professor of theology, at Halle. Theodore Benfey3 calls him "the original founder of an independent Semitic philological science, and among the most important representatives of a critical and unprejudiced

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

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

3 In his *Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*, 1889, p. 865.
Semitic philology." It is with Gesenius, both as a lexicographer and a grammarian, that English students of Hebrew are better acquainted than with any other of the leading authorities in this department; and this is, at least partly, due to the fact that some of his works have been translated into our language, and his empirical system finds more acceptance among us than do the more abstract systems of others. And yet English scholars apparently make but little use of his two greatest works, namely, his grammatical Lehrgebäude and his large lexicon, the Thesaurus, which, according to the opinion expressed lately by so good an authority as Professor Strack, of Berlin, is still the best at our command. Gesenius began with the publication of a Hebrew lexicon, in 1810; and out of this grew both his smaller dictionary, in 1815, of which the ninth edition, by Mühlau and Volck, recently appeared, and of which Robinson has made an English translation, as also the Thesaurus, a large Hebrew-Latin dictionary of 1522+166 folio pages, completed by Rödiger, in which is collected all that the languages, literature, geography, history, etc., of the Orient could contribute to the explanation of the Old Testament idiom. Both in method and results he was apparently more successful, at least found less opposition, in his lexicographical work than in his grammars. Of these, the first edition of the smaller and best known appeared in 1813; and, at the author's death, thirteen editions had made their appearance. A number of further editions were published by Rödiger, and now the editorship has been entrusted to the capable hands of Kautzsch, who has brought down the work to our own days, in scientific character, and has also added an exercise book. Out of this smaller grammar grew, in 1817, his Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache, an elaborate and exhaustive treatise on Hebrew grammar, comprising 908 closely printed octavo pages; and it is in this work that we find his system and method both explained and carried out. It is the empiric method, the collection of all the data that the language as such offered, and the deduction of the principles from these data. True, his Lehrgebäude makes it a special point to compare, wherever possible, what the cognate tongues have to offer in explanation of Hebrew forms and words, but to these is nowhere given a decisive, but only an illustrative voice. He confines himself to the analysis of the language as found in the Old Testament literature, and has very little sympathy for any abstract, philosophical theorizing. In the introduction to his larger grammar (p. 111), he says that it was his object to make a complete and critical collection of the grammatical forms, and, on the basis of these, to give a rational explanation. His Lehrgebäude is a faithful expression of this aim, and is a work worthy of much more attention than it receives.

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

A linguistic genius, such as appears but once in a generation, was Georg Hein-
rich Aug. Ewald, whose career, as remarkable for its eccentricities as for its brilli-

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

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

The system of Justus Olshausen (died 1884) is like and unlike that of Ewald.
In its general features his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, the first and only
volume of which appeared in 1861, is similar to Ewald's in its synthetic character,
in building up the grammar from philological and philosophical premises, and en-
deavoring to follow its gradual growth: but it differs from Ewald in its endeavors
to show this procession in its historical unfolding from the original Semitic lan-
guage, and in finding the materials for this historical basis in the Arabic. His
antithesis to Ewald finds expression already on p. 2, where he says, "In reference
to the primitive character of the whole linguistic structure, both as to sounds and
words, the Hebrew is surpassed by the Arabic." This he proceeds to prove from
historical and linguistic arguments; and concludes with the remark, "that it is
evident from what precedes, that the comparison of no cognate language throws
so much light upon the Hebrew as does the Arabic." Proceeding from this stand-
point, he gives in his grammar from page 8 to page 30, a complete grammatical
scheme, based upon the Arabic, of what he would consider original Semitic forms,
and, in his grammar proper, starts out from these philosophically construed forms to explain the character, origin and meaning of the forms as found in the Old Testament. This principle gives form and character to his whole grammatical work. His system can be called the linguistic-comparative, combined with the historical method. Quite a successful attempt to popularize the method and results of Olshausen, we find in Bickell’s *Grundriss der hebräischen Grammatik*, 1869, translated by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr., as “Outlines of Hebrew Grammar,” 1877.

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

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

It may not be out of place here to remark that the studies of Assyriologists have as yet produced but few, if any, tangible or important results for Hebrew grammar; their treasures have yielded good gold for Hebrew lexicography chiefly, and not for Hebrew grammar. The discussion now going on between the “Arabic” and the “anti-Arabic,” or Assyrian schools, is almost entirely in the department of the dictionary. The protest raised by the younger Delitzsch and others against the methods of the editors of Gesenius’ Dictionary is exclusively against the use, or abuse, of Arabic for the explanation of the meaning of Hebrew words, and the antithesis of the protestants is that rather the Assyrian should utter the decisive voice in this regard, whenever comparisons with the dialects are made. But in no perceptible manner have the recent Assyrian researchers influenced the methods of Hebrew grammarians.
ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

BY CYRUS ADLER.

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

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

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

מלעיה דעיי ... ענייה דניי ... משלר קפתי ... אלי... ננייה עניי וпотי... ישאר קפתי...

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

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

2 In the celebrated collection of MSS. of Rabbi David Oppenheimer, now a part of the Bodleian Library, the oldest MS. is an unpunctuated one of the Pentateuch, of the year 1286. No. 107 of the catalogue is the oldest punctuated text in his collection. It is a copy of the Psalms, no older than the fourteenth, and possibly as late as the sixteenth century.
Baḥya ibn Bakoda, who flourished about the year 1100. The third, and for us most important, connects itself, in three ways, with the name of Menahêm Reganati. The acrostic is "Menahêm, the little one" being the humble way in which people ordinarily describe themselves. The poem has a superscription, and lastly we have the subscription, or signature, of the author, giving his name as it occurs in the acrostic.

Before attempting to draw any conclusions from these statements, it will be fitting to describe, in detail, the arrangements of the MS. It consists of thirty-four leaves, of mingled parchment and vellum, and is written by a hand which can unhesitatingly be pronounced as that of a professional scribe. The leaf is 8½ inches long, and 12½ inches broad; and, from the ageing of the edges, this would seem to have been their original size. The formation of the letters is, to some extent, peculiar. The aliph is formed thus, נ; the pe thus, ב—so that pe and fe are not distinguished except by the raphe mark; the he thus, ה—he with mapiq not being differentiated; there is no distinction between ה and ה; י and י are distinguished only by the shading of the latter, which makes it identical with the printed י; י is followed very closely by י or י, especially the latter, the two almost appearing to form a compound letter. On the top of the first page there are two lines and a half written in a style of Hebrew known as Cursive Italian. They are much blurred and obscured, and were not written by the person who wrote the MS. As far as the inscription could be deciphered, it reads as follows:

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

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

Scattered among these supplicatory prayers are thirteen Psalms; and a
comparison has yielded some points which are of considerable importance from a historical, as well as grammatical, point of view.

The variations in the text, while not very numerous, are striking. In Ps. cxxxviii., 7, it reads נִמְשָׁכִי, for though the latter is given in the margin. In Ps. xxviii., 7, we read יְנָע, for and the former is certainly the more poetical expression. In Ps. cxli., 8, the quadrailiterum, ד"נ, is written לָדוֹת. In Ps. cvii., 9, for we have נְלָעֵרְי in the passage לְלֹא לְמִשְׁתַּפִּס. In Ps. xlvi., 7, ד"נ occurs in place of לְלֹא לְמִשְׁתַּפִּס. In xlvi., 9, is inserted after ד"נ. Ps. lxvi., 6, לֵיה for and with this is an allowable construction (cf. Ps. v., 3, and Is. xlvi., 18). Ps. xxviii., 3, the whole passage—ד"נ ד"נ ד"נ—is omitted in the text, and is added above in a different handwriting. ד"נ is frequently abbreviated to double yod. We have fifty-six scriptiones plener, and eight defectivae, which do not occur in the ordinary text.

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

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

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

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

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

---

1 In Ps. cxlii., 7, there is a punctuation which shows an absence of Massoretic tradition. The word נְלָעֵרְי, with the note נְלָעֵרְי, is punctuated לָדוֹת. Cf. also note to Ps. cxxxviii., 2.

2 I write the name Qamhi, because there are three MSS. of his לְבָנִי יְהוָה in the Bibliothèque Imperiale, in which it is pointed in that way. See the interesting discussion in the Athenæum, March 22, 1884.
vowels; and Judah ha Levi confirms this statement. Luzzato’s studies resulted in the same conclusion. Comparative grammar will also militate against this system. Even such a complex language as Ethiopic has but seven vowels.

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

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

**PSALM LXV. וּד**

1. דגשה WANTING IN [Dagesh wanting in ג].
2. מתף-קמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קיבוס (📸).
3. דגשה WANTING IN [Dagesh wanting in ג].
4. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸).
5. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸). DAGESH WANTING IN [Dagesh wanting in ג].
6. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸).
7. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸).
8. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸).
9. מתף-פקמאס (📸) UNDER נ FOR קמאס (📸). SEGHOl (📸) UNDER א FOR SEGHOl (📸).

---

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

2 Cf. his “Vehoah’al hagabala,” against the antiquity and authenticity of the _Zohar_.

---
10. Pathāh (−) under ב for qames. Dagesh wanting in ב and in מ.
Pathāh (−) under מ for qames (τ); ḥāṭef-pathāh (−) under נ for qames (−).
Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in מ; shewa simplex (−) under מ for ḥāṭef-pathāh (−); sere (−) under מ for seghol (−).

Qames (−) under מ for pathāh (−); qames (−) under ב for pathāh (−).
Seghōl (−) under ל for sere (−).
Dagesh wanting in מ.
Dagesh wanting in מ.

11. Qames (−) under י for pathāh (−).
Scriptio plena; sere (−) under מ for seghol (−).
Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in מ.
Shewa simplex (−) under י for ḥāṭef-pathāh (−) (given as a variant). Sere (−) under י for seghol (−). Scriptio plena.

12. Qames (−) under י for pathāh (−).
Scriptio plena; sere (−) under מ for seghol (−).
Sere (−) under ל for seghol (−).
Pathāh (−) under מ for qames (−).


14. Pathāh (−) under ל for qames (−); ḥōlem (י) with ש for shureq (י).
Pathāh (−) under ב for qames (−).
Pathāh (−) under ב for qames (−).

PSALM LXXXVI.

1. Ḥāṭef-pathāh (−) under נ for qames (𝜏); seghol (−) under י for shewa simplex (−).
Pathāh (−) under י for qames (−).

2. Ḥāṭef-qames (−) under ש for qames; pathāh (−) under מ for qames (−).
Qames (−) under י for pathāh (−).
Ḥāṭef-pathāh (−) under מ for qames (−).
Ḥāṭef-pathāh (−) under נ for qames (−).
Seghol (−) under מ for shewa simplex (−).
Seghol (−) under נ for sere (−).
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3. Dagesh wanting in ד. 
Hatef-qames (מ) under נ for qames. Seghol (נ) under ט for sere (נ). 
Written "" 
Seghol (נ) under נ for sere (נ). 
4. Seghol (נ) under נ for sere (נ). 
Written "" 
Qames (נ) under י for pathah (נ). 
5. Written "" 
Qames (נ) under ר for pathah (נ). 
Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). 
6. Our MS. reads ל. 
Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). 
Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). 
7. Pathah (נ) under נ for qames (נ). 
Pathah (נ) under נ for qames (נ). 
8. Seghol (נ) under נ for sere (נ). 
Pathah (נ) under ב for qames (נ). Seghol (נ) under נ for hatef-seghol (נ). 
Written "" 
Seghol (נ) under נ for sere (נ). 
Qames (נ) under ב for pathah (נ). Pathah (נ) under י for hatef-pathah (נ). 
9. Qames (נ) under נ for hatef-pathah (נ). 
Pathah (נ) under נ for qames (נ). 
Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). 
Written "" 
Shewa simplex (נ) under נ. 
10. Scriptio plena. Seghol (נ) under כד for sere. 
Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). 
11. Qames (נ) under נ for pathah (נ). Pathah under נ for qames (נ). 
Pathah (נ) under נ for hatef-pathah (נ). Hatef-pathah (נ) under נ for pathah. Dagesh wanting in ל. 
Qames (נ) under נ for hatef-pathah (נ).
Seghol (ateway) under ו for hireq. Seghol (ateway) under ב for shewa simplex (ateway).

12. Written מ"ת.
Pathah (ateway) under נ for pathah (ateway). Qames (ateway) under כ for pathah (awayt).

13. Pathah (ateway) under י for qames (ateway).
Qames (-awayt) under י for pathah (ateway).

14. Pathah (ateway) under ב for qames (ateway).
Hatet-pathah (ateway) under י for qames (ateway). Qames (ateway) under ב for pathah (awayt).

Qames (ateway) under כ for pathah (awayt).
Punctuated thus Delitzsch ב'כש.
Qames (ateway) under י for pathah (awayt).
Pathah (ateway) under י for qames (ateway).

15. Qames (ateway) under נ for pathah (awayt).
Written מ"ת.
Qames (ateway) under כ for pathah (awayt).
Qames (ateway) under נ for pathah (awayt).
Qames (ateway) under ב for pathah (awayt).
Qames (ateway) under י for pathah (awayt).

Sheva simplex (awayt) under י for seghol. Seghol (ateway) under נ for hatet-seghol (awayt).

16. Seghol (ateway) under נ for sere (awayt). Qames (ateway) under ב for pathah (awayt).
Hatet-qames (ateway) under כ for qames (awayt).
Seghol (ateway) under ב for shewa simplex. Dagesh omitted in ב.
Hatet-pathah (ateway) under י for pathah (awayt).
She (awayt) under ב for seghol (awayt).
Qames (ateway) under נ for hatet-pathah (awayt).

17. Qames (ateway) under נ for pathah (awayt); scriptio plena.
Qames (ateway) under ב for pathah (awayt).

PSALM CXXXII. The MS. gives it נלפ.

Qames (ateway) under ב for pathah (awayt).
Seghol (–) under נ for sere (—).

2. Qames (––) under נ for ħatef-pathah (=).
   Qames (––) under נ for ħatef-pathah (=).

3. Pathah (––) under נ for qames (––).
   Seghol (––) under ג for ħatef-seghol (−).
   ħatef-pathah (––) under ג for pathah (––).
   Pathah (––) under ג for qames (––).

4. Sere (––) under נ for seghol (––). Seghol (––) under מ for sere (––).
   There is a מ before מ which was afterwards stricken out. Qames (––) under נ for pathah (––).

5. ħatef-pathah (––) under ג for pathah (––).
   Qames (––) under ג for pathah (––).

6. Pathah (––) under נ for sere (––).
   Seghol (––) under ג for sere (––).
   Qames (––) under ג for pathah (––). Shewa simplex (––) under ג for ħatef-pathah (––). Pathah (––) under מ for qames (––).

7. Pathah (––) under נ for qames (––).
   Qames (––) under מ for pathah (––).
   ħatef-pathah (––) under נ for qames (––).
   Pathah (––) under מ for qames (––).
   Shewa simplex (––) under מ for pathah (––).

8. ħatef-pathah (––) under מ for qames (––). Scriptio plena.

9. Shewa simplex (––) under מ for qames (––).

10. ħatef-pathah (––) under מ for qames (––).
    Qames (––) under נ for pathah (––).

11. Qames (––) under נ for pathah (––).
    Seghol (––) under נ for ħatef-seghol (–).
    Pathah (––) under ג for Qames (––).
    Seghol (––) under ג for shewa simplex (––).

12. Scriptio plena.

Qames (––) under מ for pathah (––). Seghol (––) under מ for sere (––).
HEBRAICA.

1. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

2. Sere (ι) under ι for shewa simplex (ι). Seghol (ι) under ι for sere (ι).

3. Pathah (ι) under ι for ḫatef-pathah (ι).

4. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

5. Pathah (ι) under ι for ḫatef-pathah (ι).

6. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

14. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for qames (ι).

15. Pathah (ι) under ι for Ḫatef-pathah (ι).

PSALM XLVI. מ

1. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι). Dagesh wanting in ι.

2. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

3. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

4. Seghol (ι) under ι for Ḫatef-seghol (ι).

5. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι). Shewa simplex (ι) under ι for Ḫatef-pathah (ι).

Scriptio plena.

6. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

7. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

8. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

9. Pathah (ι) under ι for qames (ι).

10. Pathah (ι) under ι for qames (ι).

11. Qames (ι) under ι for Ḫatef-pathah (ι).

12. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for shewa simplex (ι). Scriptio plena.

13. Qames (ι) under ι for pathah (ι).

14. Ḫatef-pathah (ι) under ι for shewa simplex (ι). Pathah (ι) under ι for qames (ι).
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Seghol under נ for ħatef-seghol (ְּ).  
Qames (ש) under ב for pathah (ש).  
Pathah (ש) under ה for (ש).  
Our MS. reads רִאָשָׁנָה.

Qames (ש) under בי for pathah (ש).  
The word שִׁלְשֹׁם has been added after רָהִים.

Qames (ש) under י for ħatef-pathah (ש).  
Hatef-pathah under ב for qames (ש).  
Hatef-pathah (ש) under י for pathah (ש).  
Seghol (ש) under י for sere (ש).  
Pathah (ש) under ב for qames (ש).  
Qames (ש) under י for pathah (ש).  
Seghol (ש) under י for sere (ש).  
Qames (ש) under ב for ħatef-pathah (ש).  
Qames (ש) under י for ħatef-pathah (ש).  
Pathah (ש) under ב for qames (ש).  
Seghol (ש) under נ for sere (ש).  

PSALM LI. נ

Qames (ש) under בי for pathah (ש).  
Scriptio defectiva.

Seghol (ש) under נ for sere (ש).  
Pathah (ש) under ב for qames (ש).  
Qames (ש) under ב for pathah (ש).  
Qames (ש) under ב for pathah (ש).

Hatef-qames (ש) under ב for qames (ש).  
Seghol (ש) under י for sere (ש).

Seghol (ש) under נ for ħatef-seghol (ש).  
Shewa simplex (ש) under י for seghol (ש).  
Scriptio plena.

Pathah (ש) under י for qames (ש).

The יניער י has not been found in the MS.
Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\))\). Pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for hatef-pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

6. Seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for shewa simplex (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

Sere (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Hatef-pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for hireq. Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for both \(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\) and \(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Hatef-qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

7. Pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for shewa simplex (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Hatef-pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) under \(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\) for seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

8. Seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for hatef-seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Scriptio defectiva.

Shureq (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) with \(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\) for qibbus (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

9. Seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for sere (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for sere (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

10. Seghol (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for sere (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)). Pathah (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)) for qames (\(\text{תנ\(\text{מ}\)\(\text{ג}\)).

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

11. 

12. 

13. 

14. 

15.
ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

16. אלוהים אלוהים
    אלוהים אלוהים
    והנותן והנותן
    הנעתי הנעתי
    אַה הָעָטָנָה
    אַה הָעָטָנָה
    פִּנְס פִּנְס

17. אַה אַה
    סְפִּיט סְפִּיט
    יִשְׁמְוּ יִשְׁמְוּ
    צַל צַל

18. מְבָזֶה מְבָזֶה
    מְבָזֶה מְבָזֶה
    "ב"ה "ב"ה
    נַבָּא נַבָּא
    נַבָּא נַבָּא
    לְכָּל לְכָּל

PSALM LXXXV. הָּפֶךְ

1. הלכָּה הלכָּה
2. אֵאָה אֵאָה
    אֵאָה אֵאָה
    שַׁבָּה שַׁבָּה (keri)
3. עֵמְכּ עֵמְכּ
4. אִּסְפַּה אִּסְפַּה
    אִּסְפַּה אִּסְפַּה
    אֶשָּׁרָה אֶשָּׁרָה
5. מַחְרֵם מַחְרֵם
6. תַּעֲלֵמָה תַּעֲלֵמָה
    תַּעֲלֵמָה תַּעֲלֵמָה
    וַתְּחַמְּגֶה וַתְּחַמְּגֶה
    לְפָרָה לְפָרָה
    לְפָרָה לְפָרָה
7. הָלֵא הָלֵא
8. הָנָּוּ הָנָּוּ
9. אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר
    אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר
    יִשְׁמַעְוִ יִשְׁמַעְוִ
    "נָנָה" "נָנָה"
    נָנָה נָנָה
10. לִפְנֵי לִפְנֵי
11. נַשְׁקָה נַשְׁקָה
12. נַשְׁקָה נַשְׁקָה
13. נַשְׁקָה נַשְׁקָה
14. נַשְׁקָה נַשְׁקָה

PSALM CVIII. מַהְיָא

1. אָשְׁרָה אָשְׁרָה
2. נַעְלֵם נַעְלֵם
3. נַעְלֵם נַעְלֵם
4. בִּעְמֵם בִּעְמֵם
5. מֵעָלִים מֵעָלִים
6. נִשְׁפִּים נִשְׁפִּים
7. חָסֵיקָה חָסֵיקָה
| 6. | אָמַת | אֲפַרְי | זָכַר | מִתְחַנְּקָי | נוֹס | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 10. | נוֹס | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 7. | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 11. | וּכְלִי | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 8. | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 12. | לָו | שֵׁם | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |

**PSALM XIII. נ**

| 2. | עַד | אָבֵי | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |
| 4. | עַד | אָבֵי | נוֹס | רַחְזָה | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח | בֶּן | פֶּתַח |

**PSALM CXLII. קָמָב**

| 1. | בָּעָרָה | בָּעָרָה | בָּעָרָה | בָּעָרָה | בָּעָרָה | בָּעָרָה |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | אָשֶׁר | אָשֶׁר | אָשֶׁר | אָשֶׁר | אָשֶׁר |
| 5. | מִכְּפַד | מִכְּפַד | מִכְּפַד | מִכְּפַד | מִכְּפַד |
| 4. | בְּהַרְגָּם | בְּהַרְגָּם | בְּהַרְגָּם | בְּהַרְגָּם | בְּהַרְגָּם |

(Some late erasure has been made in the punctuation of 2 and 5, with what object does not appear.)
ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

Here is a note  פתח בכרתנית

PSALM CXXXVIII. In the MS. it is numbered \( \text{ילך} \).

1. לדר
2. אשת которую
The Massoret. note is yet we have it pointed with qames.
3. ההנה
The MS. contains \( \text{תאנה} \), the other word being given as a variant.
4. מרשכין
5. ינשרא
6. ישאר
7. ינור
8. ינור
Writ. inst. מאוניברס

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

9. מרשך
10. הלע
Written נלך
11. הנס
12. הלע
13. הלע
14. הלע
written נלע
15. הלע
16. הלע
17. הלע
written נלע
18. הלע
19. הלע
20. הלע
written נלע
21. הלע
22. הלע
23. הלע
written נלע
24. הלע
25. הלע
26. הלע
written נלע
27. הלע
28. הלע
29. הלע
written נלע
30. הלע
31. הלע
32. הלע
written נלע
33. הלע
34. הלע
35. הלע
written נלע
36. הלע
37. הלע
38. הלע
written נלע
39. הלע
40. הלע
41. הלע
written נלע
42. הלע
43. הלע
44. הלע
written נלע
45. הלע
46. הלע
47. הלע
written נלע
48. הלע
49. הלע
50. הלע
written נלע
51. הלע
52. הלע
53. הלע
written נלע
54. הלע
55. הלע
56. הלע
written נלע
57. הלע
58. הלע
59. הלע
written נלע
60. הלע
61. הלע
62. הלע
written נלע
63. הלע
64. הלע
65. הלע
written נלע
66. הלע
67. הלע
68. הלע
written נלע
69. הלע
70. הלע
71. הלע
written נלע
72. הלע
73. הלע
74. הלע
written נלע
75. הלע
76. הלע
77. הלע
written נלע
78. הלע
79. הלע
80. הלע
written נלע
81. הלע
82. הלע
83. הלע
written נלע
84. הלע
85. הלע
86. הלע
written נלע
87. הלע
88. הלע
89. הלע
written נלע
90. הלע
91. הלע
92. הלע
written נלע
93. הלע
94. הלע
95. הלע
written נלע
96. הלע
97. הלע
98. הלע
written נלע
99. הלע
100. הלע
written נלע
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8. אלך פעל פעל
     וַחֲכֹךְ פֶּעַל אָלֶךְ וַחֲכֹךְ
     וּלְעֹלֶךְ פָּעַל עַד
     וּלְעֹלֶךְ פָּעַל עַד
     וּלְעֹלֶךְ פָּעַל עַד
     וּלְעֹלֶךְ פָּעַל עַד

10. בכוכביי יחר יחר
     ובַּכּוֹכְבוֹי יַחֲר יַחֲר
     ובַּכּוֹכְבוֹי יַחֲר יַחֲר
     ובַּכּוֹכְבוֹי יַחֲר יַחֲר
     ובַּכּוֹכְבוֹי יַחֲר יַחֲר

9. שָׁמָרְיָה שָׁמָרְיָה
     שָׁמָרְיָה שָׁמָרְיָה
     שָׁמָרְיָה שָׁמָרְיָה
     שָׁמָרְיָה שָׁמָרְיָה
     שָׁמָרְיָה שָׁמָרְיָה

Omitted in text and added above the line.

PSALM XXVIII. חכ.

1. אלך אלך
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה

2. תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה
     תְּחָרָה תְּחָרָה

3. אלך אלך
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ

In our MS. תְּחָרָה
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן

This sentence is not in the text but is added in the margin in Rabbinical characters.

4. נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ
     נַגְּרוּ נַגְּרוּ

In our MS. לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן

8. הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה

In our MS. לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן
     לָנוּן לָנוּן

9. הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה
     הַשָּׁמָרְיָה הַשָּׁמָרְיָה

PSALM XXXII. לב

1. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

2. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

3. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

4. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

5. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

6. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

7. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

8. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

9. ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

In our MS. ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א

In our MS. ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
     ד"א ד"א
ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

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

TABULAR VIEW.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are eighteen differences occurring once each.

Scriptiones plenæ, 56
Scriptiones defectivæ, 8
A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF HEBREW GRAMMAR

BY PROFESSOR DR. WILHELM BACHER,
Budapest, Hungaria.

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

the manuscript copy kindly put at my disposal by Mr. S. J. Halberstam.

The shawā then is for him also not yet a "servant" of the vowels; it is only not a king like them, simply because it is not a vowel. In Moses Qimhi's short handbook מַלֵּךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל הַרְעֹת, no definition of the shawā is found. David Qimhi, however, says in his מַלֵּךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל, in the beginning of the section on the shawā (ed. Lyck, fol. 188 b; ed. Fürth, fol. 154 b), but without any reference to the term מַלֵּךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל, "The shawā is not a vowel, but serves the vowels." (Here the הַרְעֹת אֲרֵי אִי מַשָּׁרָה הַרְוָּעָה. With this the term "servant" came to be used for the shawā in the same degree as Qimhi exerted an influence on the later grammarians. Benjamin ben Jehuda, of Rome, who lived at the close of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries, says concerning the shawā in his little work, which is often printed as an introduction to Moses Qimhi's grammar (cf. the collection of יִסְרָאֵל, edited by Elia Levita, in Bomberg's printing officin, Venice, 1546): "The shawā is not a vowel, but serves the vowels."

This (probably נְמֵשָׁוָה is to be read as feminine, as in 1 Kgs. 1., 15, or to be emended into נְמֵשָׁוָה). Two hundred years later, Elia Levita, next to the Qimhis the most influential grammarian, transferred the name of "kings," which formerly was the designation of the seven vowels in the old system, to the ten vowels of the new system, and he says in his grammar (which is partly metrical) (in the collection of יִסְרָאֵל above) p. 55, b.

That is, of the ten kings, the five short ones serve the five long ones; but all are served by the shawā set apart for this purpose. P. 58 a, of the same book we read of the shawā: נְמֵשָׁוָה מַשָּׁרָה לִילִים.

We will refer here only to Abraham Balmes, who in מַסִּכָּה אֲבָרִיח (Venice, 1523) introduces section three (שער הנוכחות), with a long explanation of the division of the vowels into שָׁוָה and עֶבֶר. Also Prophiat Duran (Efodi) may be referred to, who ascribes the use of the word מַלֵּךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל for the seven vowels to Ibn Ezra (Ma'sé Efod, ed. Friedländer and Kohn, (Wien, 1885) p. 34, לְכַלְלָא גָּדוֹלָא אֲלָמָא כְּשֶׁה הַלַּכָּא שֶׁבַּעַה, כְּרָאָה אֲלָמָא הַלַּכָּא, but he still has the correct idea that the vowels are called kings "because the letters (משים, אורות, עַמָּיִם, מַשָּׁוָה) are governed by their command," i. e., just as Ben Asher expressed it, because the vowels govern the consonant signs.

I will improve this opportunity to refer also to an appellation of the seven vowels which is found in the Arabic commentary of Saadya on the book Jetsira, quoted in Derenbourg's Manuel du Lecteur, p. 207. נְמֵשָׁוָה נְמֵשָׁוָה נְמֵשָׁוָה: the seven sounds. נְמֵשָׁוָה נְמֵשָׁוָה נְמֵשָׁוָה: has in other connections a musical meaning.
THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE.

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

In Judah, as far as we can judge, the written language was maintained, almost without Aramaic influence, until the close of the seventh century. It is shown by 2 Kgs. xviii., 26, however (cf. Isa. xxxvi., 11), that toward the end of the eighth century (the occurrence relating thereto falls in the year 701) Aramaic was understood, at least by the principal men in Judah, and, consequently, already was a language of international trade, or, at any rate, of diplomacy. This fact is confirmed in the Aramaic legends which have been preserved (beside an Assyrian text) on tablets of clay, as well as on fragments from the ruins of Assyrian and Babylonian palaces (afterwards, also, on old Persian coins); cf. Schrader, ZDMG, 1872, p. 167, and the literature there; further, Levy, Gesch. der jüb. Münzen, Lpz., 1862, p. 147, sq.; de Voguè, Mélanges d'archéologie orientale, Paris, 1868, p. 168. The first direct influence of Aramaic on the Hebrew is to be found in Jeremiah2 (cf. Zimmer, Aramaisme Jeremiani I, Halle, 1880), more certainly, and already of a grammatical sort, in Ezekiel; while the writers of the last part of the Exile (Isa. xiii., sq., xxxiv., xxxv., xl.—lxvi.) and shortly after the same (Haggai, Zechariah, and even Malachi and the memoirs of Nehemiah worked into the book of Nehemiah) are distinguished by a comparatively pure Hebrew. In the exilic and post-exilic parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, which formerly were designated as the Original Writing, or Elder Elohist (now as the Priests’ Codex, or Q) the influence of Aramaic is shown more in the domain of lexicon than of grammar (cf. concerning this especially Riehm, in the Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken, 1872, p. 288, sq., and V. Ryssel, de Elohistae Pentateuchici Sermones, Lpz., 1878, both holding fast to the pre-exilic composition of the Priest’s Codex, though Ryssel especially, by his careful and profound investigations, has produced much evidence for the opposite view); Giesebrecht opposes Ryssel (“Zur Hexateuchkritik,” in the Ztschr. f. die Altert. Wissensch., 1881, p. 177, sq.) and his conclusions are modified again, in some particulars, by Driver, “On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist” (in the Journal of Philology, Oct., 1882, p. 201, sq.). Still stronger is the Aramaic coloring in several post-exilic books; in particular, Chronicles, Esther and, to the most marked degree, in Koheleth and certain Psalms (cf. for Koheleth, the commentaries of Franz Delitzsch, Lpz., 1875, p. 197, sq. and C. H. Wright, The Book of Koheleth, London, 1883, p. 488, sq.; concerning Books II.—V. of the Psalms, cf. Giesebrecht, “Über die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen,” in Ztschr. f. die Altert. Wissensch., 1881, p. 278, sq.).

§ 3. CONTEMPORANEOUS USE OF ARAMAIC AND HEBREW.

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

1 Of course we must not conclude from these Assy. Baby. parallels, with v. Gutschmidt (Neue Beiträge zur Gesch. des alten Orients, Leipzig, 1876, p. 15, sq.) that the business world in Nineveh then spoke Aramaic and no longer understood the official [Assyrian] language. (As it is said to follow also, according to v. Gutschmidt, from 2 Kgs. xviii., 26, that a dialect of the Aramaic was the popular language in the territory of the Buphrates and the Tigris already in the eighth century.) For the contrary cf. Schrader, Kollenschriften und Geschichtsforschung (Giesen, 1878), p. 68 sq.—Least of all may we conclude from the above facts that the Aramaic idiom naturalized in Palestine in the last centuries B. C. could only have been imported from Babylonia; cf. concerning that below § 6, 2.

2 In this statement, we designately leave out of consideration the Book of Job, as linguistically peculiar: besides unquestionable Aramaisms (such as the frequent וָתַה and יָתִים instead of the Hebrew דָּתִים) the book contains no less frequent points of contact with the Arabic store of words.
vii., in Aramaic, satisfactorily show that, at that time, both writers and readers must have been equally familiar with both dialects.

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

§ 4. Hebrew Supplanted, as a Language of Intercourse, by Aramaic.

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

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

That Hebrew was understood for a long time after the decided victory of the Aramaic as the language of conversation, was due, on the one hand, to the zeal of the learned men and, on the other, to the significance of Hebrew as the sacred language of the entire people. The first is attested by the fact that much which is undeniably old in the language has been handed over to the post-biblical Hebrew. The exclusive use of Hebrew in the reading of the Old Testament is attested by the uniform Jewish tradition that, in the public use of Scripture, the most that was allowed, for a long time, was the oral interpretation of the same into Aramaic. From the latter fact, it might be explained how the hearers gradually became familiar with the Aramaic form of certain parts of the divine Word, as appears to follow from Matt. xxvii., 46 and Mark xv., 34 (cf. also Reuss Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. T., p. 723); but the demonstrative force of such passages as Luke iv., 17 sq., where there is not the least intimation of an interpretation after
the reading is not thereby annulled. It is true that in the Mishna, the habitual interpretation of what is read appears presupposed, when, in Megilla IV., the reader of the Law is directed to read no more than one verse to the translator, while three are permitted in the prophetic reading (cf. also IV., regarding the reading and interpretation of the Law by minors, and IV., 10 concerning the parts which may be read indeed, but not translated). But it is another question whether this mode of procedure had arisen at the time of Jesus. We might decide certainly, only if we were accurately informed as to the nature of the "verses" intended and the date of their introduction. Just as little may we conclude with Zunz (gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 61 sq.) from the existence of a written Targum of Job about the middle of the first century and still older Targums of Esther and the Psalms, all of which are affirmed in the Talmud, that there was already a Targum of the Law on record. Cf. on this subject Bleek-Wellh. Einleitung ins A. Test., p. 606 and the citation therefrom the Jerusalem Talmud, in which it is forbidden to read the interpretation from a book. Concerning the (infrequent) prayers in the Aramaic language, as e.g. the so-called Qaddis, originally "Concluding prayer after haggadic discourses in houses of mourning," cf. Delitzsch, Gesch. der Jud. Poesie, p. 186, Note.

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

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

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

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

1 Compare the very noteworthy treatment of this question by Franz Delitzsch in "The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society" (Leipzig, 1888), extracts from which (in Translation [German T.]) might be of interest in regard to other questions. It is said there on pp. 30, 31: "A friend of mine does not cease to entreat me to translate the New Testament into the Aramaic idiom which was spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles; that is, into the language of the Palestinian Talmud and the Palestinian Targums. But his desire rests on an illusion. The Hebrew remained even after the Exile the language of Jewish literature. The Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach was written in Hebrew, as its fragments in the Talmud show. The original of the first book of Maccabees and of the so-called Psalter of Solomon was Hebrew. The inscriptions on coins, the epitaphs, the liturgic prayers were Hebrew. The form of the laws was Hebrew, as appears from their codification in the Mishna, also the book. In which, as Papis says, Matthew had collected the sermons of the Lord, was written אֶלֶף הַרְאוֹתָו. It is true, that in that time אֵלֶּף הַרְאוֹתָו and בַּהֲזַלְבַּיְתָה [cf. concerning this below § 6, 1, Rem.] were not accurately distinguished. Nevertheless it is quite unlikely that Matthew wrote in Aramaic; for the Aramaic dialect of Palestine—which in the Talmud is called מִרְמָכָה—was the language of daily life, the vulgar language, in which the people and also the learned were wont to converse and to hold controversies, but רֵעֶם אֲדָסֶר, in which St. Paul was accosted by the exalted Savior, Acts xxvi., 14, and in which he himself addressed the people of Jerusalem, Acts xxii., 40; xxvi., 2, [cf. below § 6, 3] was the holy language, the language of the temple worship, of synagogue and domestic prayer; of all formulas of benediction, of the traditional law; further, the parables, the animal fables, the lamentations for the dead in the Talmuds and Midrashim are mostly Hebrew; the holy language continued to be the language of the higher form of speech, even the popular proverbs were only partly Aramaic. Josephus stating in the preface of his work on the Jewish war, that his narrative was originally drawn up for his compatriots of Inner Asia in the common mother-tongue, certainly means the Hebrew, not the Aramaic language. Knowledge of Hebrew was then, as now, universal among the educated of the nation. Aramaic, on the contrary, was understood only by a small portion of the Diaspora [Dispersion T.]. Therefore it would be a useless attempt to translate the New Testament into the Palestinian Sursi. The Semitic woof of the New Testament Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic. Our Lord and his apostles thought and spoke [?] for the most part in Hebrew.

2 Renan (Histoire generale, p. 250) regards this as at least probable.
(see the proof passages in E. Schuerer's article, "Apokryphen des A. Test." in Herzog's protest. Real-Encyk. I2, p. 491 sq.) names the books of Tobit and Judith as composed Chaldaico sermone (i.e. West Aramaic) and translated them from this idiom into Latin, but that by no means shuts out the conclusion (which in the case of Judith is almost indubitable, cf. Schuerer p. 505 and in other places), that the actual original of both texts was Hebrew, the Aramaic text consequently itself a translation. (For the more recent discussions of this controversy, occasioned by Ad. Neubauer's issue of an Aramaic text of the book of Tobit from a Bodleian MS., Oxford 1878, see in my report of O. T. studies of 1878 in the "Wissenschaftlichen Jahresbericht der deutschen Morgenland. Gesellsch." [Leipzig 1881], p. 28; Graetz declares himself in favor of a modern Hebrew original of Tobit. See his essays on "The Book of Tobit" etc. in "Monatschr. für Gesch. u. Wissenschaft des Judenth." 1878, p. 145 sq.). Likewise the Aramaic proverbs of Sirach, which have been handed down to us, partly in Talmudic citations and partly as a compilation by themselves (as the so-called "small Sirach" or "Alphabet of the son of Sirach" in connection with an alphabet of the Hebrew proverbs of Sirach) prove nothing against a Hebrew original of the Greek book of Sirach. These proverbs are, rather, in part translations of Hebrew matter, in part independent additions of a later compiler; cf. Delitzsch, zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie (Leipzig 1836, p. 20 sq.), L. Dukes, Rabbinische Blumenlese (Leipzig, 1844), p. 51 sq., and especially p. 67 sq. (where may be found more details concerning the literature of these proverbs); according to the text of Paul Fagius (Isny, 1542) Dukes gives here twenty-three Aramaic proverbs of Sirach (besides forty-two Hebrew ones).


The samples of the language of intercourse in Palestine at the time of Jesus and the apostles, which appear occasionally in the N. T., would of themselves be sufficient to contradict any fables which have arisen concerning the idiom spoken by them. Cf. with regard to this Reiske, de lingua vernacula Jesu Christi, Jen. 1670, and particularly de Rossi, dissertazioni della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da tempi Maccabei in disamina del sentimento di un recente scrittore Italiano, Parma, 1772-74. By the latter is meant the Neapolitan Domin Diodati and his book de Christo Graece loquente (Neap. 1697). Further: H. F. Pfannkuche "Ueber die palästinische Landessprache in dem Zeitalter Christi und der Apostel, ein Versuch, zum Theil nach de Rossientworfen" in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek der bibl. Litter. Vol. viii. (1798) 3, p. 385 sq. H. E. G. Paulus, verosimilia de Judaesi Palaestinensibus, Jesu etiam atque apostolis, non aramaica dialecto sola, sed graeca quoque aramaissante locutis. Jena 1808. Winer, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms § 3 (Hebrew-Aramaic coloring of the N. T. diction; with many references to the older literature). Franz Delitzsch "Ueber die palästinische Volkssprache, welche Jesus und seine Jünger geredet haben" in the year 1874, No. 27 of the "Daheim" (also in the Zeitschrift "Saat auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 195 sq.); the same, "Traces of the vernacular tongue in the gospels" in the "Hebrew Student" (Chicago), Nov., 1882, p. 81 sq.; Dec., p. 104 sq.; Sept., 1883, p. 1 sq. Concerning the bad pronunciation of the Galileans indicated in Matt. xxxvi., 78, Mark xiv., 70 (Acts ii., 7), which appeared especially in the complete ignoring of gutturals, cf. the Talmudic proofs in Wetstein, Nov. Test., on Matt. xxvi., 78; Meuschen, Nov. Test. ex Talmude etc. illustratum (Lipz. 1736) p. 119. The reproach was raised in particular with reference to the Galilean pronunciation of Hebrew.

Below we give an alphabetical list1 of the samples of Palestinian Aramaic found in the N. T. with the addition of the most important witnesses, namely, the Codex Sinaiticus [S], Alexandrinus [A], Vaticanus [B], Ephraem Syri [C], Cantabrig. [D]; WÌ signifies the readings which are adopted in the critical edition of Westcott and Hort (London 1881), Tisch. the readings of the edition octava critica major of Tischendorf.

---

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

'אָזְזָא (Tisch., on the contrary WH 'אָזְזָא; the same fluctuation regarding the accentuation of final a of the so-called Emphatic state is seen elsewhere—cf. below γα,ζα,γδα, γδοδα, μαμνα—although properly speaking, only the circumflex is justifiable2 = נִלְזָא o πατηρ, Mark xiv., 36 and elsewhere.

"אָסְלָמָךְ (so WH with B; on the contrary Tisch. "אָסְלָמָךְ with S A. In favor of αθ however is also "אָסְלָמָךְ of codex D and "אָסְלָמָךְ of codex E, i.e. Laudianus Oxoniensis; cf. the same difference, in the transcription of פ, below in אָסְלָמָךְ פֵּאָי = וֹלִדי and in בָּסָא = נִלְזָא זֶרֶא o יֵאְמָא.

Acts i., 19.—αστ (for αστ) is probably due simply to the influence of λ upon the preceding vowel, δαմα for δεμα to the inclination elsewhere shown to conform the sound of the Shvâ mobile to that of the following vowel; cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, hebr. Gramm. § 10, 1, 2, Rem. and the literature in Note 3).—Δαμά instead of δαμά (so cod. E) reminds us of Σαμά= נִלְזָא. If the Greeks here actually heard such a sharp sound, why not in similar cases? or must we conclude that there was a misunderstanding of the writing רֶכֶב, רֶכֶב, if not even that רכֶב occurred as an error of the copyist? Concerning the addition of κ (e.g. Σαμάς, Num. xxxiv., 8 = דגניר) elsewhere of δ, ζ, μ, ν, σ to final vowels in the Septuagint cf. Frankel, Vorstudien zu den LXX. (Leipzig 1841), p. 97 sq.

בַּרְאָבָא, בַּרְדַּלְוָלַאִיוֹאִו, בַּרְדַּוָו, בַּרְדַּוָו, בַּרְדַּוָו, all proper names compounded with בַּר son.

בֵּטֵל (so WH Matt. x., 25; xi., 24; Mark iii., 22; Luke xi., 15, 18 sq. with S B while A C D [also S in Mark iii., 22] present בֵּטֵל, the reading adopted by Tisch.; the suppression of the λ in the popular pronunciation, however, would be scarcely striking) = נִלְזָא גֵּלֵל (not as even Grimm has it). Now נִלְזָא is certainly not equal to the modern Hebrew נִלְזָא dungen, but only the signification dweiling can be supported. In spite of this, the meaning of בֵּטֵל as "Master of the dwelling, or of the kingdom" (so e.g. Meyer on Matt. x. 25, who finds a confirmation of this empty appellation in the preceding οικότατης) is to be rejected. Zebál is rather a modification of zebâ (cf. נִלְזָא גֵּלֵל), although in this modification may have co-operated not merely convenience of pronunciation (so Baudissin, art. "Beelzebub" in Herzog's PREI), but also the thought of נִלְזָא dungen, גֵּלֵל dungen (and also the offering of idolatrous sacrifices?).

בֵּרְדַּוָו (more correctly, according to what was remarked under 'אָזְזָא—דד) = נִלְזָא גֵּלֵל, House of Grace, is the reading of A C in John v., 2; for נִלְזָא (instead of the elsewhere usual נִלְזָא) one need not appeal to the Syriac chesdâ: reference to the Biblical-Aramaic נִלְזָא dream is sufficient. On the contrary Tisch. and WH according to cod. Sin. have adopted בֵּרְדַּוָו (WH place בֵּרְדַּוָו in the margin, as the reading of B). In the appendix p. 76, WH express the opinion that both readings (of S and B) are perhaps only bad

1. Cf. de Lagarde, gesammelte Abhandlungen (Leipzig, 1886), p. 30, Note: "I always change the accents of foreign words according to my judgment; in 1 Cor., xvi., 23, one must write μαραν άθα, or renounce the reputation of being an intelligent man." This accentuation for הָנָא and similar words restored without doubt the actual tone as it existed in the living language, but it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that, when the penult is closed (not merely sharpened) the accent is carried over as paroxytone, cf. πάσχα, Μάρθα; properly speaking śīkra also is clearly for śīkra (אֱלֹהִים). Do these examples rest upon an accommodation to the Greeks and Romans, or may we derive from them a law (the accentuation of a closed penult before an open ultima), which afterwards had been entirely ignored by Jewish tradition? It is to be remarked, moreover, that, contrary to the above, in Jos. Antiq., 3, 7, 1 χαναίας (אֱלֹהִים) and 3, 10, 16 עָסָרְבָא (אֱלֹהִים), appear to be transferred.
modifications of the same name, whose correct form is probably βοανέργης [βοανέργης] House of Olives; nevertheless βοανέργης equaling ἄρνητιν [ἀρνητιν] (cf. the local name in John 1., 45) place of fishery is not impossible.

Βοανέργης (so Tisch. and WH with S A B C) is explained in Mark III., 17 by νεφρήνος. The word offers, however, manifold difficulty. That βοανέργης is impure pronunciation for θηνή (so e. g. Bretschneider in his Lexicon novi testamenti), is a monstrous assumption; not much better is the assertion, which Lightfoot, appealing to Broughton, has made current (Horae hebr. on Mark III., 17), that the Jews had always pronounced sh'wā as θη, e. g. noabhyim for ἁβύι and that hence Strabo writes Μοᾶδα for Μάσαδα. As little does θη mean thunder, but a noisy crowd of people and θη is rustling, noise, not thunder. Jerome is right in demanding for the meaning “son of thunder” Benereem (βενερεης, commonly, to be sure, βενερεης). It is another question, however, whether Jerome (on Dan. I., 8) on this account has a right to affirm: “Non ut plerique putant Boanerges, sed emendatius legitur Benereem,” especially as he himself on Matt. X., 4 explains the name Boanerges “ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei.” It appears to me in every way most probable that θη (θη) anger, angry impetuosity, rather than θη, is contained in the word, and it is conceivable that this might be expressed by νεφρήνος. Or are we to assume with Delitzsch (Saat auf Hoffnung 1874, p. 206) a peculiar provincialism?

Ταβάνατα (Tisch.; WH γαβάνατα, cf. above on δαβά) John XIX., 13 = Ναβαν (emph. state of Ναβαν hill, which is fem. of Ναβαν). Concerning the transcription of sh'wā by a cf. above ἀκελλαμαχ. Γολγοθά (so Tisch.; WH γολγοθά) with S A B D in Matt. XXVIII., 33; for the elision of the η cf. above under βεκεζεβίκ; according to Levy, neunebr. und chald. Wörterbuch, the pronunciation Ναβαν as emph. state of Ναβάν had been usual. In the Syriac γαγκτά, the first ι is elided and compensated by lengthening the vowel.

'Ερράδα (WH and Tisch.) Mark VIII., 34 with the best witnesses (S3D ἑρράδα, which would point to τον ἱλιον) = ορράδιον open thyself! It is true that the Pattah under η could be for the purpose of conforming sh'wā to the full vowel (see above on ἀκελλαμαχ) and the form consequently could be Εθρα'α; but in favor of Εθρα'α is the fact, that this form anyway is in use as passive to Εθρα', and not less, that the Targum on Is. XLII., 7 expresses the opening of the eyes by Πα'il. With regard to θ for η (with Dag.) cf. γολγοθά. Since moreover this Imperative, properly speaking, can refer only to the eyes, we must ask whether originally γάγκτα (with a suppression of the unaccented final vowel in Syr. fashion; cf. below κούμ in Mark v., 41) was not intended.

Κόφας John I., 43 and elsewhere Κόφας, emph. state of Κόφα rock.

Δεγνόν Mark v., 9 with S B C D, the Latin legio, but probably first by accommodation of the Aramaic גנה. Μαμώνα (so Tisch.; WH μαμώνα, see above on δαβά) = Μαμώνας emph. state of μαμών as object of confidence. The root μαμών (so Grimm) rests upon the very doubtful derivation from μαμών (= object of confidence). The root assumed by Levy, (= μαμών) to allot does not exist.

1 Did Jerome have ἑρράδα in mind? We can suppose a great deal in his case!
De Lagarde, Gött. gel. Anz., 1884, p. 278, refers μαμωνά to μαμώνα, whose stem corresponds to the Arabic √مز, which is authenticated in one instance, became מז or מזמ, in a way similar to the change of רמנות finally to רמונ. מַדַּא (cf. for the accentuation the Note under α,β) Luke x., 38 and elsewhere = מזרין the mistress, emph. state from מֶרֶן, the fem. of מֵר lord.

Μεσσίας John i., 42 and elsewhere = מֶשֶׁל emph. state from מֵשֶל anointed (Hebr. מְשֶל); for the transcription, Nöldeke reminds us of יֵשֶׁל for מְשֶל.

Πάσχα (cf. for the accentuation the Note under α,β) Matt. xxvi., 2, elsewhere = מֶסֶכֶד emph. state of מָכֶד, which would correspond to the Hebrew תָּכֶד; Jewish tradition, on the contrary, demands מֶסֶכֶד to which the Syr. peschā also corresponds.

Ῥάν (so WH Matt. v. 22 with B S, on the contrary Tisch. ῥάν with S D; cf. for this vacillation in the transcription of ῥ what was said above on ἄκαν, according to what was remarked on α,β, the word must be accented ῥάν; the word is not emph. state from ῥά, but abbreviation from ἄκαν empty, as מֶסֶכֶד (proper name) from מֶסֶכֶד. The vocalization is again surprising.

Σαράνας Matt. iv., 10 and elsewhere, emph. state of מֶסֶכֶד; the form σαράνα adopted by Grimm, with the Textus Receptus, 2 Cor. xii., 7, is only attested by S2 A2 D2 and 3.

Στεφάνα (cf. for the tone under α,β) Luke i., 15 = מֶסֶכֶד, emph. state of a presupposed מֶסֶכֶד (not however directly for the Hebrew תָּכֶד as Grimm states).

Ταβίθα (more correct would be again —θά) so WH Acts ix., 36 with B C, on the contrary Tisch. ταβίθα with S A (cf. concerning the vacillation between θα and θε above in pa,β,ονοί = מֶסֶכֶד emph. state of מֶסֶכֶד dopaθ (cf. Hebrew תָּכֶד). That instead of tabhitha people spoke tabhitha with a resolution of the consonant Yodh, or to the Greek ear appeared so to speak, is not improbable; on the contrary, the form מֶסֶכֶד, with which may be compared Syriac (cf. below at ταβίθα),1

1. I am reminded by Siegfried's Miscellanea ii., 10 (in Hilgenfeld's Ztschr. f. wissensch. Theol. xxvii., 3, p. 358 sq.) that, after ταβίθα, ὡσανα (in Matt. xxix., 9 and other passages) should have been established. Cf. SIEG Fried in the passage cited: "In the New Test. Commentaries, as far as we have observed, ὡσανα is reduced to the תָּכֶד of Ps. cxviii., 25 (cf. also Grimm, Lex. N. T. 1879, p. 473)." No doubt this was the passage intended, but the form ὡσανα cannot be identified with מֶסֶכֶד. As follows from Elias Leviata's exposition in his Hefer Tisbi, the word is the Greek rendering of an abbreviated pronunciation of that petition, מֶסֶכֶד, with which may be compared מֶסֶכֶד in Payne Smith, Thes. Syr. T. I., 1879, p. 1839." In a Note SIEG Fried says: "Since writing the above, my attention having been called to Hilgenfeld, Nov. test. extra canon. receptum, fasc. iv., p. 26, I see that others also have taken exception to the derivation of ὡσανα from the form in Biblical Hebrew, and that Anger with Hilgenfeld's approval has referred to the Aramaic

1 Levy in the neube.w B writes מֶסֶכֶד and explains this from the Arabic Sabbathat maid, girl (!), citing in addition to his own opinion Flitacker, who set the matter right already in a remark to Levy's Chald. WB ueber die Targumim (L. 426), with the formula "according to F. &c."
HEBRAICA.

There appears to be no doubt, therefore, as to the correctness of such an explanation.19 Cf. with this also Hilgenfeld (Evangeliorum secundum Hebraeos, etc. quae supersunt, Lips. 1884, p. 25), who gives the meaning serva mos, and appeals to A. Merx for the same.
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THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE.

3. The so-called Targums or Translations of the Old Testament. The most important are: The Targum on the Pentateuch ascribed to Onkelos and the Targum to the prophets named after Jonathan ben Uzziel. There exist still, in addition to these, two Targums to the Pentateuch, called Jerusalem I., or Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalem II.; the latter is preserved only in fragments, or originally, was only a collection of Glosses belonging to an older Targum, a remodeled form of which lies before us in Pseudo-Jonathan (so Geiger, Uebersetzungen der Bibel, Breslau, 1857, p. 455). On the Hagiographa also (except Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel) there are Targums by different, some of them by very late, hands. The foundation may have been laid for the older Targums (Onkelos, Jonathan) as early as in the first century B. C., since, at the reading of the Scriptures in the Synagogues, single words and expressions which were no longer understood (see above, § 4) were to be orally interpreted by so-called ד'יונס or Translators. Nevertheless, the process of fixing these interpretations in writing, and the gradual extension of them unto whole books continued for centuries, and was first brought to a comparative conclusion in the Babylonian Schools of the fourth century A. D. On the other hand, the final compilation of Pseudo-Jonathan was not earlier than the seventh century, and other Targums were still later. Even to-day we are far from having a critically-sifted consonant text of the Targums, to say nothing of a unified and in a measure plausible vocalization.


4. Single sentences of the Mishna, the Gemaras of the so-called Jerusalem Talmud and detached traces in the Babylonian Talmud and the Midraschim.

For finding one's way in regard to the Mishna and the Talmuds in general, we refer here only to the excellent survey in Schuerer's Neutestament. Zeitgeschichte, p. 37 sq. In the Bab. Talmud, the Tractat Nedarim approaches the West-Aramaic idiom, and, in certain peculiarities, the Tractat Nazir also; cf. Luzatto, Gramm. der bibl.-chald. Sprache und des Idioms des Thalmud Babyli (German translation by Krüger, Bresl., 1873), p. 54. There belongs here, from the Midrash-literature, the Megillath Tu'anith, or book of fasts cited already in the Mishna; cf. Schuerer, p. 54; Strack, art. “Midrasch” in Herzog's PRE, Vol. IX., 759; Braun, “Entstehung und Werth der Meg. Taanit” in the Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth., 1876, p. 375 sq., 410 sq., 445 sq.

5. The Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch. This was probably composed in the first century A. D., though the final compilation, as far as we can speak of such a thing, may have been delayed until the fifth or sixth century. Besides this, there have been preserved only scanty remains of the Samaritan-Aramaic, in liturgies and songs.

This Aramaic Translation of the Pentateuch must not be confounded with the Samaritan Recension of the Hebrew Pentateuch. For the literature on the Samaritan Targum and the linguistic character of the same, cf. Kautzsch, art.
"Samaritaner" in Herzog's PRE,² Vol. XIII. (1884), especially p. 349 sq. In this place, also, it may be permitted to remind the reader emphatically, that every judgment of the Samaritan-Aramaic dialect based upon the editions of the Targum which have hitherto appeared, must fall necessarily into the gravest errors. This is true, alas, of the expensive Pentateuchus Samaritanus of H. Petermann (Fasc. I. Genesis, Berol. 1872; II. Exodus, 1882; III. Leviticus, 1883, the last edited by C. Volkers), after that, Kohn ("Zur Sprache, Litteratur und Dogmatik der Samaritaner," p. 108 sq. and 206 sq.) had proved conclusively that the usual assumption of peculiar (so-called Caucasian) roots and words in Samaritan-Aramaic, rests solely upon such a corruption of the MSS. of the Targum, as is incredible; according to Kohn, we possess, of the original Targum, perhaps only a few fragments (a relatively pure text is given only in the Petersburg fragments edited by Kohn, p. 215 sq.), in the fragments of a Samaritan Targum, which Natt, London, 1874, issued from a codex of the Bodleian Library and one of the Cambridge City Library, and, finally, in the "Pessach-Haggadah," edited by Kohn, on p. 1 sq., from a codex belonging to Franz Delitzsch. The original Samaritan—leaving out of account, perhaps, a somewhat large admixture of Hebraisms, as well as of Greek and Latin words—is as good as identical with the Palestine-Aramaic otherwise known to us.

6. The Written Remains of Aramaic on Stone and Papyrus, which originated (at least in the majority of cases) with Jews in Egypt.

Cf. Gesenius, scripture lingueque Phoenicie monumenta, I. 226 sq.; III. tab. 4 (Alphabet) and tab. 29–33. Concerning the written characters cf. Euting, in the large table of characters in Chwolson's Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum (Petersb., 1882), col. 10–16, according to inscriptions dating from 482 to about 100 B.C.—The most important monuments of this kind were lately published by the Paleographical Society, Oriental Series, and they are; Part II. Table xxv. and xxvi., Papyrus cvi. of the British Museum (from the collection belonging formerly to the Duke of Blacas), with a description by Wright and Nödeke, and the literature down to 1877. According to these men, this document dates from the last part of the Ptolemaic, or the earlier Roman period, composed either by a pagan Aramean, or (more probably) by an Egyptian Jew, as a sort of Haggada to Exod. 1. The Aramaic is strongly alloyed with Phoenician and Hebrew.—Further, Part V., Table lxiii., the column found in 1877, at Sakkara, now in the Royal Museum at Berlin, which represents a libation before Osiris, and bears a parallel Egyptian-Aramaic inscription, dating from the fourth year of Xerxes (482 B. C.).—cf. Lepsius, concerning eine ägyptisch-aram. Stele, Ztschr. für ägypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, xv. (1857), p. 127 sq.; Laub, ägypt.-aram. Inschriften, Report of the Session of the Munich Academy, 1878, I., philosophico-histor., class II., p. 97 sq. and 148; Pretorius, ZDMG xxxv., 442 sq.—Table lxiv: the celebrated stone with a four-line inscription, which is now kept in the Museum at Carpentras, in Southern France, and represents, above the inscription, a female mummy, and over this an adoration before Osiris. According to Lepsius and others, the stone belongs to the time of the Ptolemies; according to Clermont-Ganneau (see below) these Egyptian-Aramaic monuments belong to the time of the Persian dominion over Egypt, i. e., 527–405, or 340–332, when Aramaic was the official language in Egypt; and the person named Taba upon the stone was daughter of a Persian officer and native Aramean who had married an Egyptian woman. [If so, it is true that Hebraisms such as בּמָן and תַבָּא awaited an explanation]. Discussion over the stone has lately become animated again, since Schloemann (ZDMG xxxvii., 187 sq. and 767 sq.; xxxviii., 252 sq.) supposed that metre and rhyme are to be found upon the same; cf. Hlelery, ibid., xxxvii., 206 sq.; de Lagarde, Nachrichten der Gott. gel. Ges., 1878, p. 357 sq. (also Symmica, II., 56 sq. and 79 sq.) Of further documents, we mention the inscription upon a vase of the temple of Serapis, now in the Louvre (cf. Lery, ZDMG xi., 65 sq.; Merz, ibid., xxi., 693 sq.; Pretorius, ZDMG, xxxv., 442; Clermont-Ganneau, Rev. Crit., 1883, No. 21, p. 415 sq.); for the Egyptian-Aramaic inscriptions generally, cf. Clermont-Ganneau, origine perse des monuments araméens d'Egypte, Rev. archéolog., vol. 36, p. 93 sq. and 37, p. 21 sq. (also separately, Paris, 1880).
Of extra-Jewish origin are:

7. The Palmyrene Inscriptions found in the ruins of Tadmor (Palmyra) and for the most part bi-lingual (Aram.-Greek).

Facsimiles of these inscriptions were given first by R. Wood, The Ruins of Palmyra (London 1758; see the older literature in de Wette-Schrader, Einl. ins A. T., p. 79); in later times: Levy ZDMG xv., 615 sq. and xviii., 65 sq., where nineteen inscriptions are given, dating from 396–578 of the Seleucid era (85–267 A.D.); an addition thereto ibid. Vol. xix., 314 and xxiii., 282 sq.; further in Count de Vogue’s Syrie centrale (Paris 1868 sq.), as well as in extract 5 of the Journal asiat. 1883; more than all however by Euting in the Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum ii., Table 17–28 (Inscriptions from 9 B.C. to 270 A.D.). Blau ZDMG xxviii., 78 sq. (über ein palmyr. Relief mit Inschrift); Mordtmann, Neue Beiträge zur Kunde Palmyras in the Report of the Munich Academy 1875, Vol. ii., Suppl.-Number iii., 1–88; Ed. Sachau, palmyr. Inschriften, ZDMG xxxv., 728 sq., Remarks thereupon by Nöldeke xxxvi., 684 sq. For other matter see Euting in the report of the DMG for 1878, p. 63 and in Baethgen’s Report for 1880, ibid. p. 164. Concerning the linguistic character of this inscription, cf. Merz ZDMG xxi., 674 sq. and especially Nöldeke ibid. xxiv., 85 sq.; Sachau ibid. xxxvii., 562 (without any notice of Nöldeke’s previous work). In content, they are partly pagan dedicatory inscriptions, partly inscriptions in honor of deserving persons and partly epitaphs.

8. The Numerous Inscriptions and Coins of the Nabateans on the Sinai Peninsula, in Idumea, the Hauran and elsewhere, from the last century B.C. and the first A. D.

Misled by the numerous Arabic names, which occur in these inscriptions, they were regarded by scholars, for a long time, as Arabic. So particularly Tuch, ZDMG iii., 395 sq.; iii., 129 sq. and so yet Böttcher, Ausführl. Lehrb. der heb. Sprache 1, p. 6, where these inscriptions are explained as North-Western Arabic (set right by Muehlau in the Supplement p. 644, where also is the older literature). A more correct judgment on this question was established by Levy, ZDMG xiv., 368 sq.; xvii., 82 sq.; xviii., 680; xxii., 261 sq.; xxiii., 485 sq. and 652 sq.; xxv., 429 sq. and 508; xxvii., 133; further Blau ibid. xvi., 381 sq., Meier ibid. xvii., 575 sq.; and in particular Nöldeke ibid. xvii., 703 sq. and xix., 637 sq., as well as de Vogue in the Revue archéol. 1894, p. 284 sq. (Inscriptions from the Hauran; the same in the Mélanges d’archéol. orient., p. 149 sq. and Appendice p. 21 sq. (Coins of the Nabatean kings from 95 B. C. to 104 A. D.; concerning two such from Petra, cf. also de Saulcy in the Mdl. de Numism. 1878, 198 sq.) and in Syrie centrale (1868) p. 89 sq., finally Euting in the Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum ii. (Paris 1883), tab. 29–35; and Table lxv., Part v. of the Oriental Series issued by the Palaeograph. Society.

9. More voluminous remnants of the West-Aramaic dialect and likewise of extra-Jewish origin lie before us in a translation of the Bible, preserved in a Vatican MS. of the Gospels, which was completed 1030 A.D., as well as in London and Petersburg MSS. (These last contain it in union with other fragments of religious matter).

The text of the Vatican MS., which embraces about two-thirds of the Gospels, was edited by F. Miniscachi Erizzo, 2 tomi, Verona 1861 and 64. For the “Christian-Palestinian” dialect of this version, cf. Nöldeke, ZDMG xxii., 443 sq.; according to him, the translation originated between the third and the sixth centuries A. D. and probably upon Judaean soil (Blau, ibid. xxiii., 286 sq., seeks to refer the localities mentioned in the annotations of the Vat. Codex to the ancient Decapolis). Further fragments of this version (for the most part Palimpsests) are to be found in London and St. Petersburg; the latter were collected by Tischendorf upon his second and third journeys (59 and 70 leaves). All these fragments (except the Vat. Codex), with fragments of Biographies of Saints, Hymns etc., were edited by Land as “fragmenta syropalaestina” in Tom. iv. of his Aeneoda syriaca (Lugd. Bat. 1875), including fragments from the Psalms (which are trans-
lations from the Septuagint, as the arithmetical figures [Bezifferung] show), from the London and Petersburg Gospels (of which the London exhibits, according to Land, a Melk—[a celebrated Benedictine Abbey founded in 1089. T.] Ritual older than the Roman Codex, while, in the Petersburg Bible, an older and quite peculiar and a younger Codex are to be distinguished), finally London fragments from Deuter., Isaiah, Proverbs, with Petersburg fragments from the Gospels, Deuter., Isaiah and Job. According to Land, the Roman Codex is later than almost all the other fragments. (The London ones are placed by Wright between the eighth and the thirteenth centuries.) At the time of its origin, accordingly, at the beginning of the eleventh century, Aramaic was no longer the language of intercourse in the circles concerned with it, as the Arabic inscriptions show. The writing, according to Land, is a variety of the capitals used for books at Edessa, which withal the Greek capitals have imitated in the rude and angular character of the letters.

10. Living remains of this dialect, once so widely diffused, are found at present only in Ma'lula and two neighboring villages upon the Eastern declivity of Anti-Lebanon, of course in a bad state of decay and, as the entire population speaks Arabic as well, near its end.

This fact was made clear long ago by Brown and Volney (cf. Renan, histoire générale p. 268). Closer information with reference to the language itself was first given by the missionary Jules Ferrette in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society xx., 431 sq.: Nöldeke discusses the same ("über den noch lebenden syrischen Dialekt im Antilibanon") ZDMG xxí., p. 183 sq.; cf. the remarks of Merz thereupon ibid. xxí., 271 sq. A farther list of words of the Ma'lula-dialect was published by Cl. Huart, who visited Ma'lula in the autumn of 1877, in the Journal asiatique, Ser. vii., Vol. xii., 478 sq. (Oct.–Dec. 1878; cf. the notice of R. Duval ibid. xiii., 466 sq. and L'Univers Israelite, 1879, No. 16). Accurate and comprehensive disclosures are still to be expected from Socin and Prym, who passed several weeks in Ma'lula in the latter part of the summer of 1869, and carefully transcribed, from the mouth of a Christian woman1 of the Greek confession, a series of narratives with Arabic translation. The following sample, for which I am indebted to Prof. Socin, may give an idea of the condition of this Aramaic:

\[wēt \text{áhādish} \text{froz} \text{laló} \text{ileh} \text{öna}, \text{i.e.} \text{("n')N(N")N" }\text{tºt'N Tº TITNn(n) NYFT(N) = therewas a man whose name was Faragh 'allah, he has (had) a little brother etc.}\]

§ 6. CONCERNING THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE ARAMAIC DIALECT FOUND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. In the designation of the Aramaic dialects generally, and of the Biblical-Aramaic in particular, such confusion prevails even yet in many ways, that it is necessary to supplement what has been said with a confirmation of the terminology employed (§ 1). The view derived from Dan. II., 4, that the Aramaic dialect in Daniel and Ezra was the language of the Chaldean people, has, as its first consequence, the misconception that, not only this dialect, but also the nearest related dialect, that of the Targums, etc., were designated as "Chaldaic;" secondly, however, there flowed out of it the inverted distinction of this pretended Chaldaic, as the East-Aramaic, from Syriac, as "West-Aramaic," while the reverse is correct. The distinction proposed by Fürst2 of the (so-called) Chaldaic and of the Syriac as "Jewish and Christian Aramaic," is

---

1 One of these villages has gone over to Islam, but speaks its Aramaic dialect. Moreover, the tradition of the language is maintained chiefly by women; the language of the men is already greatly corrupted by the influence of the Arabic.

The Aramaic Language.

not altogether suitable, according to what is laid down in § 5; for to the East-
Aramaic dialects belongs, not only the dialect of Edessa used by the Christian
Syrians, but also the language of the Babylonian Talmud; it follows no less
from § 5, No. 7–10, that extra-Jewish monuments have been preserved, which
belong to the West-Aramaic group. More suitable is the designation of the
West-Aramaic as Palestinian Aramaic,\(^1\) inasmuch as the remnants of this dialect
yet existing arose for the most part (except the Palmyrene, the Egyptian and
almost all the Nabatean inscriptions) upon the soil of Palestine. In the list
of these (South) West-Aramaic or Palestinian Aramaic dialects belongs now
the dialect lying before us in Daniel and Ezra, which we most fitly designate
as “Biblical Aramaic.”

In Daniel II., 4*, we are informed that the Kasdim, or Chaldeans, summoned
by Nebuchadnezzar, addressed him in Aramaic (עָרָמְיָה), and, in fact, their
dialogue with the king (v. 4b sq.) is reported in the Aramaic language. Accord-
ingly, it was plainly the opinion of the author of the book of Daniel (or of ch.
I.–VII.) that this Aramaic dialect was the language of conversation at the court
of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, instead of the East-Semitic dialect
whose Babylonian form lies before us in numerous inscriptions—among others,
those of Nebuchadnezzar himself. This real “Chaldaic,” which is mentioned in
Jer. v., 15, as a language unintelligible to the Jews (cf. the similar verdict of Isa.
xxviii., 11 and xxxiii., 19, with regard to Assyrian), the author of Daniel
conceives as the secret or learned language of the Magians, since he (I., 4) lets
the Jewish boys be instructed in the language and literature of the Chaldeans;
ישועית is here used surely in no other sense than everywhere else in Daniel
(except v., 30, in the connection יָעַרְמֵי and ix., 1, יָעַרְמֵי); and the dialect
designated correctly in Dan. ii., 4 (also Ez. iv., 7) has been termed, since
Jerome (on Dan. ii., 4), the “Chaldaic,” just on account of a misunderstanding
of the word ישועית.\(^2\) The author of Daniel uses the word as a title for the
members of the Babylonian guild of priests, as already Herodotus regards
אֵל יָעַרְמֵי as a designation of the priests of Baal, and the name was subsequently
the customary one for the Magians, Astrologers, Soothsayers, etc., of the East.
Jerome, however, and those who followed him, confused therewith the use of
ישועית as name of the people; and since, in Dan. ii., 4, the “Chaldeans” speak
Aramaic, so “Chaldaic” and “Aramaic” were held to be identical. And the
matter has stood thus in the “Chaldee grammars” and the “Hebrew and Chaldee
lexicons,” in spite of all protests,\(^3\) up to this day.

2. In possession of the correct terminology there falls to the ground the fable
(still stated up to the latest date), that the Jews in the Babylonian exile forgot
their Hebrew and, instead of it, brought the “Chaldaic,” the language of conversa-
tion, with them to Palestine (cf. e. g. Zunz, die gottesdienstl. Vorträge

\(^1\) This terminology has already been proposed by Pfannkuche in Eichhorn’s Allg. Bible., viii.,
3, p. 490.

\(^2\) It is, to be sure, questionable, whether this misunderstanding comes upon Jerome him-
self or upon his Jewish teachers. For the latter, might be cited the fact that, in the Massora to
the Targum of Onkelos (cf. Berliner’s Edition of the same, p. xviii. sq.), the Targum-Aramaic
(as distinguished from the Biblical) is designated repeatedly as קְנָתוֳהִי יָעַרְמֵי \(\text{language of the}
Chaldeans. Without doubt, the composition of this Massora belongs, according to Berliner (ibid.,
p. ix.), as late as about 900 A. D., though Berliner at this point reminds us of the passage Chullin
24 a, according to which יָעַרְמֵי in Dan. I., 4, means the Aramaic language.

\(^3\) Cf. already Schloezer in Eichhorn’s Repertorium, viii. (1781), p. 118 sq.; the correct distinction
of East-Aramaic (Syriac) and West-Aramaic (Biblical Aramaic and the language of the Targums)
was expressly drawn again by Geiger ZDMG, xviii., 654, and Noicdite, ibid. xxi., 183 sq., and par-

cularly xxv., 113 sq. (die Namen der aram. Nation und Sprache.)
der Juden, Berl. 1832, p. 7 sq.; Herfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Israel iii., 44 sq.; Bottcher, ausführliches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache i., 18). Leaving out of account that it was the normal practice in Jerusalem about 430 B.C., according to Neh. xiii., 24, to speak יִשְׂרָאֵל;¹ and that the slow overthrow of Hebrew by Aramaic may be shown upon valid grounds (cf. above p. 4 sq.), the Jews could not take a dialect from Babylon which was not spoken there.

3. With regard to the designations of the West-Aramaic dialect used in antiquity, the following is yet to be brought forward:—In the New Testament, this dialect is designated as יִבְרָאִי Hebrew (so certainly in John v., 2; xix., 13, 17, perhaps also in xix., 20 and with the obscure אֶֽהָֽנָא Rev. xvi., 16), although the same word is elsewhere applied (so surely in Rev. ix., 11, perhaps also in John xix., 20 and Rev. xvi., 18; certainly, moreover, already in the Prologue of Jesus Sirach) to designate the old Hebrew language. The meaning of the expression יִבְרָאִי שְּׁתֵּר Acts xxii., 40 and xxiii., 2, as well as xxvi., 14, (as already the יִבְרָאִי שְּׁתֵּר 4 Mac. xii., 7 and xvi., 15) is doubtful. In the first two passages, the deep silence of the people reported in xxii., 2 favors the old Hebrew, for this silence is less easily explained, if the Apostle used the vernacular familiar, for the most part, to all hearers in the neighborhood; on the contrary, he could place on record his Pharisaic education and his future zeal for the Law (cf. v. 3) no better than in the use of the sacred tongue. In Acts xxvi., 14 also, it corresponds more to the importance and solemnity of what is recorded, to think of the old Hebrew and not of the Aramaic vernacular.² With the New Testament, Josephus also uses Hebrew יִבְרָאִי, as well of old Hebrew, as of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

4. Further on, within the Christian era, Syrian and Syriac, which, for a long time, had been used for the purpose almost invariably by the Greeks, were fixed as designations of the whole department of Aramaic just as, already, the LXX. had everywhere rendered רְאֵמָא by σεβρί. According to Nöldeke (ZDMG xxv., 116), this name was adopted by the Christian Arameans and for the reason that, to a Jew, "Aramean" had become identical with "Heathen" and, in the same sense, had passed over to the Syriac translation of the New Testament (e.g., Acts xvi. 1 and xix., 10, for Ἑλλην; Gal. ii., 14, רְאֵמָא for יִבְרָאִי). Just so, the Palestinian Jews called all Aramaic יִבְרָאִי, while the designation רְאֵמָא was preserved (at least for the language יִבְרָאִי) by the Babylonian Jews; see the evidence in Nöldeke, 116 sq. as well as the proof, the same p. 117 sq., that the form 'arāmājē is to be regarded as the original designation of the nation: "as however the idea of 'Heathen' was united with this form, 'arāmājē was artificially set apart from it as name of the people" —a distinction which can be proved from the Jewish sources (cf. Levy, neu-hebr. u. chald. W.-B. under רְאֵמָא and יִבְרָאִי). The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (including Jer. x., 11 and the two words in Gen. xxxxi., 47)

¹ Quite mistaken is the appeal of the Talmud to Neh. viii., 8 as proof that the people then needed an "interpretation" of the Law: מְבַסֵּס does not mean in that passage any more than in Ezra iv., 18, "interpreted," but simply "clearly, distinctly" (Vulg. manifeste).
² So also Delitzsch, the Hebrew New Testament, p. 30 (cf. above $4, Note); in "Saat auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 210 Delitzsch still supposed that: "with a call in this (Palestinian Aramaic) language Schaul, Schaul, lema redaft jathi, the ascended Lord brought Saul of Damascus to his senses."
are curtly called דָּנַיָּא in the Mishna and Talmud (see the proofs in Nöldeke p. 128), because written in the language which is elsewhere employed for the interpretation (targüm) of Scripture, as contrasted with נָלָא, the Scripture composed in the sacred language. The designation of the vernacular of Palestine at the time of Jesus as the "Syro-Chaldaic," which was for a long time customary (though of course very unfortunate), might likewise be traced to Jerome; cf. Jerome adv. Pelag. iii., 1: The Gospel of the Hebrews is "chaldaico syroque sermonae, sed hebraico litteris scriptum."

§ 7. CONCERNING THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC TEXTS IN GENERAL.

Of the remnants of the West-Aramaic idiom in the Old Testament enumerated in § 1, the two words transmitted in Gen. xxxi., 47 might reach back to sometime in the ninth century B. C., in case the verse containing them belonged to one of the old sources of the Pentateuch. Even if this verse can be shown to be an addition by the last (post-exilic) redactor of the Pentateuch however—and, in fact, an activity in the direction of redaction is very prominent in the welding of the sources of vv. 45 sq.—we should have in it probably the oldest sample of the Biblical-Aramaic dialect, since there can be no doubt that Jer. x., 11 is a gloss, introduced at some time or other into the text of the prophet, and the redaction of the present text of Ezra can not be placed earlier than the last quarter of the fourth century B. C.

1. If Gen. XXXI., 47 originated from one of the ancient sources of the Pentateuch (J or E) it could not be shown, from the form of the two words in question, that their use as words of Laban the "Aramaean," (cf. vv. 20 and 24) from Haran in Mesopotamia, prove them to be East-Aramaic; for the Massoretic writing נָלָא with Qāméts in the first syllable might be vowelled correctly for West-Aramaic (as for Syriac); from initial נ (instead of מ in the Targums and in Syriac, cf. § 9, Rem. 2), no conclusion can be drawn; moreover the same corresponds in this root regularly to the Arabic سن. The noun לָא may be verified as well from the Syriac as from the Targums.

2. That Jer. x., 11, in spite of the LXX., who seem to have had the verse before them, is a gloss introduced wrongfully into the text, follows directly from the troublesome interruption of the original connection between vv. 10 and 12; indirectly, however, from the fact that no reasonable ground for the sudden insertion of an Aramaic verse can be discovered; for that this verse was meant to indicate to the Jews how they must answer the Chaldeans, to whom they could have spoken only in "Chaldaic," is too trifling an argument to deserve serious refutation. It is striking that, in this gloss, together with the usual נָלָא, the Earth is found the form נָלָא, which seems to have belonged to the East-Aramaic and perhaps was intruded into the verse at some time in Babylonia. The remaining forms, such as לָא (almost invariably ל in East-Aramaic), לָא (Syr. 'בֶּן), in Babylonian also לָו, דָּלָא (cf. Ezra iv., 3 and elsewhere) correspond to the

1 In the Midrasch Beresith rabba to Gen. xxxi., 47, is ascribed to Samuel bar Nachman the verdict that the "Persian" language should not be lightly esteemed, since God has honored it in the Law (here, at Gen. xxxi., 47, the Prophets (Jer. x., 11) and the Kethubbim (Dan. ii., 4 sq., Ezra iv., 8 sq.). Here דָּלָא can be only an ancient error of the text for דָּלָא. 

2 This Talmudic terminology might be cited as evidence for the opinion of Lenormant, followed by Dr. W. H. Ward, that Daniel and Ezra were originally written entirely in Hebrew, and that portions of them being lost, their place was supplied by the corresponding Aramaic Translation (Targum). See Old Testament Student for Nov., 1883, pp. 90, 91. [T.]

2 נָלָא is not protected, indeed, from the suspicion of an ancient copyist-error, a suspicion which lies near at hand, by the fact that it is enumerated by the Jews (naturally according to
West-Aramaic idiom. The clearly Hebrew word מַשָּׁה mentioned at the close, if it belongs to the gloss at all, must have been added by a Hebrew copyist.

The Aramaic sections in Daniel and Ezra are distinguished more by lexical, than grammatical peculiarities. At all events, the few differences, which we will mention in their proper places, do not justify the verdict, that in the book of Daniel, the decomposition of the Aramaic has already advanced much further (Renan, Hist. générale, p. 219).

§ 8. THE TEXTUAL TRADITION AND GRAMMATICAL TREATMENT OF THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

The Aramaic texts, of a religious content, proceeding from Jews and Samaritans, are all, in the nature of things, originally more or less strongly influenced by the Hebrew; and, in this sense, the distinction mentioned above (§ 6, 1), of Jewish and Christian Aramaic (the latter largely influenced by the Greek) is justified. Similarly, the Biblical Aramaic also bears strong traces of the Hebrew influence; only, a great part of the Hebraisms might be placed to the account of later copyists, of whom some were ignorant of Aramaic, and some designedly adjusted it to the Hebrew. The text has suffered no less corruption in the printed editions, however; until such a multitude of asserted variations has arisen as, e. g., the stereotype edition of Hahn finds it necessary to present. The prevailing confusion was very recently checked, for the first time, by the superior text which S. Baer fixed in his edition of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah (Lpz., Tauchnitz, 1882) on the basis of the best manuscript and other witnesses. Hence, we have everywhere based our assertions upon it. In so doing, it must never be forgotten that even this text is only the relatively oldest and most certain form of the Massoretic tradition, and in no wise offers security that we have before us, in all particulars of writing and pronunciation, the texts intended by the authors of Daniel and Ezra. This assumption is impossible; because the Massoretes, in certain cases, have, without reason, substituted another pronunciation for the one demanded by the consonant text; in other places, have conspicuously wavered in the vocalization of the same form, and sometimes have made mistakes which may be demonstrated. Not rarely, also, reference to the form of West-Aramaic, acquired from the Targums, may have influenced the pointing (cf. Renan, in the work mentioned, p. 220). Although, therefore, the grammatical exposition must everywhere proceed from the critically fixed Massoretic tradition, it must, nevertheless, at least not withdraw from a criticism of this tradition, when the text, by its deviation from analogous phenomena of the Biblical Aramaic, or of West-Aramaic in general, is suspicious.

The literature of grammars for Biblical Aramaic is considered in Steinschneider's "bibliograph. Handbuch über die theoret. und prakt. Liter. für hebr. Sprachkunde" (up to 1850), Lpz. 1859. Cf., further, the survey in Petermann's Porta Chaldaica, ed. II., p. 80 sq.; by Volck, in Herzog's Prei, 604 sq.; Reuss, Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. Test., p. 511; Strack, Einleitung ins A. Test., p. 191 sq.—

Jcr. x., 11), among the four, seven, or ten names of the earth, but is so by its unquestionable occurrence upon the large fragments brought from the Assyrian Royal-palaces to the British Museum (cf. Levy, Gesch. der jued. Muenzen, Leipzig, 1883, p. 149). For כַּהַר in Mandac, cf. Noeldeke, Mand. Gramm., p. 73. The change of sound appears sufficiently guaranteed by the Aramaic כָּהַר, to smoke, beside the Hebrew כָּהַר, to burn incense.

1 For the Hebraisms in the Targum of Onkelos, which is commonly regarded as the most genuine monument of the South-Western Idiom, cf. Geiger in ZDMG, xvii., 653 sq.
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

There have been added, since these were published: the Paradigms placed at the beginning of the edition of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah by Baer (see above); tolerable caution is necessary in using these, since, for the sake of completeness, many forms are adopted which cannot be made good, and which even contradict the remaining analogy; further, the third edition of Winer’s “chaldäische Grammatik für Bibel und Targummim,” enlarged by directions for the study of the Midrasch and Talmud, edited by Rabbi B. Fischer, Lpz., 1882. Fortunately, the editor has distinguished his own additions by cursive type, and, in that way, has facilitated the omission of them, which, for the beginner, is, in the highest degree, necessary.

CORRECTION.—P. 102, l. 5. For “cf. Schuerer p. 505 and in other places,” read “cf. Schuerer in the place mentioned p. 505.”

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

BY PROF. JOHN P. PETERS, PH.D.


In the 9th edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, in the article “Amalekites,” occurs what seems to be a curious case of the propagation of error. We read: “It has been generally supposed that the Haman of the Book of Esther, called “the Agagite,” belonged to the royal line of the Amalekites; but it is now found, from Assyrian records, that Agagi was the name of a country east of Assyria, from which it may be assumed that the title was derived. See Lenormant, Lettres Ass. I., 45.” M. Lenormant mentions as eighth among the minor cantons of Media “Agazi…., called Agagi…., in the inscriptions of the Fastes. It is the Agagi of the Book of Esther.” In the Fastes M. Oppert gives the cuneiform characters for Agazi, but transliterates falsely Agagi. M. Lenormant has copied his error, and on that error the article in Enc. Brit. has based a new theory regarding Haman. It is curious to observe that at Esther III., 1, the Septuagint reads for ἹΑΓΑΓΗ, Ἰωβαννίων, while in III., 10; VIII., 3, 5, the Gentile name is omitted, and in IX., 24, ὁ Μακεδών is used. Josephus Ant. Jud., XI., 6, 5, translates Agagite by Ἀμαλχάς. M. Lenormant cites from Ptolemaeus the name Ἀχαγα or Ἀχαζ as probably the Median canton called Agaji by the Assyrians.

Prof. Noeldeke, in the Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, gives a provisional account of an Aramæan inscription discovered by Prof. Euting at Teima (תימא, תימא), in an oasis of Northern Arabia, on the borders of the Syrian desert. In Gen. xxv., 15; 1 Chron. i., 30, נקילא appears as a son of Ishmael. It is mentioned in Is. xxi., 14, in the נקילא. In Jer. xxv., 23 and Job vi., 19 (נאכ) it appears as a commercial place or people. The Septuagint writes it θαμών, confusing it with the famous Edomite canton of that name. Ritter and Wetzstein identify נקילא with Taima in the Hauran, whom Cheyne has followed in his commentary on Isaiah. A somewhat similar confusion will be found to exist regarding הברה, which is connected in Isaiah and Jeremiah with נקילא. The inscription, which is confidently assumed to antedate the Persian conquest, belonging to a period between 500 and 800 B. C., has been, so far as preserved, transliterated into Hebrew characters, as follows:
(Lines 1—9 are gone almost entirely.)

דנש לֶחֶם אֲלֵיהֶם.

10.

תַּאֱמָה (-required) לְלָכָסָה שֹׁבָא וְרָפָא.

11.

וְהָלִיצוּת בְּבָטָא לָכָסָה עַד הַנּוֹר.

12.

שְׁקִלָה סְקָלָה וּבֵלָכָסָה אֲלֵיהֶם.

13.

וְיִוְכִלָּה אֲלֵיהֶם תַּאֱמָה.

14.

גְּנַחְוָהוּ וְיָגוּרָה שְׁומָה מְאָמְנוֹן.

15.

וֹיֵאם וְרָא אֲבָרֵחַ וַיְהֵשֵׁבּוּהוּ בַּרְאנָם.

16.

בְּלָכָס יִמְחֵר. שְׁטַנְגֵלָה אֵאָשָׁה.

17.

אֲלֵיהֶם תַּאֱמָה לָכָסָה וּבֵלָכָסָה אֲלֵיהֶם.

18.

םֵתוּכָלָה רָכִּילָה... מָסָה שֵׁמָה.

19.

שֵׁמָה רָכִּילָה... מָכָלָה רָכִּילָה III. יֵלָכָסָה.

20.

לָכָסָה אֶלְאָלָד הָאָלָד הָאָלָד הָאָלָד.

21.

םֵתוּכָלָה רָכִּילָה... מָכָלָה רָכִּילָה.

22.

לָכָסָה לָכָסָה וּלָכָסָה וּלָכָסָה.

23.

For this is suggested the translation:

10. יְהוָה. But may the gods

11. of Teimâ protect (?) the image of יְהוָה, son of Petosiri,

12. and his seed in the house of the image of יְהוָה. And a man

13. who injures this? . . . . . may the gods of Teimâ

14. remove him and his seed and his name from the surface

15. of Teimâ! And this is the duty which . . . .

16. the image of . . . .

17. the gods of Teimâ to the image of יְהוָה:

18. from the field ten date-palms and from the treasure

19. of the king ten date-palms, altogether of date-palms

20. twenty-one . . . . year by year. And gods and men

21. shall derive no profit from the image of יְהוָה, son of Petosiri.

22. . . . . . and to his seed and his name . . . .

To the left hand, above, is a sceptre-bearing image, which Euting describes as "the portrait of king in pure Assyrian costume." Below this is a priest offering at an altar, underneath which is written יְהוָה יָשָׁב בְּמֵרָה, "Image of יְהוָה, the priest."

The language of the whole is Aramaean, and the characters are said to belong to the oldest type, resembling those on the Babylonian contract tables and the lion of Abydos. For the wide-spread use of the Aramaean language, in the time of the Assyrian supremacy, Noeldeke and Landauer compare 2 Kgs. xvin., 26, and Is. xxxvi., 11. The name Petosiri is explained as the Egyptian Pet-Osiri. The stone itself is now on the way to Germany.

In the possession of a gentleman in New York is a fragment of a synagogue roll which claims a romantic history. In the last Kurdo-Persian war the little town Meyandop was sacked by the Kurds, and among the other plunder was a synagogue roll. This was purchased by a shoemaker, who used the greater part of it in his trade. Before it was entirely destroyed, however, a missionary from Oroomiah saw and bought it. From him part passed into the hands of an Armen-
ian student, who brought it to this country, but the larger part is said to have gone
to the St. Petersburg Museum. The part in this country contains Ex. xxxix., 32,
to end of book. The length of the roll is twenty inches, about six inches of which
are margin. There are fifteen columns of manuscript. It does not seem to be old.

In his *Keilschrifttexte Sargon’s*, Dr. Lyon adds one word to our knowledge of
the Hittite language. In the *Stier-Inschrift*, 67–69, we read: “bit apātē tamšil 
ēkal Ḫattē ša ina lisān māt ʾaḫarrē bit ʾhilānī ʾassāšū usēpiša mēḥrit bāḇēšin.” (A
portico after the manner of a Hittite temple, which in the language of the West-
land bit-ḥilānī they call, I caused to be built before their doors.) For this partic-
ular form of architecture compare also 1 Kgs. vi., 3.

In his latest work, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, note on p. 61, Prof. Friedrich
Delitzsch practically announces his acceptance of the view of Schrader and Hom-
mel, that the ʾhēb in Gen. ii., 13, x., 8, is a mistake for ʾēb. Such a mistake
would be a natural and easy one to make, both being originally written ʾēb. In Assy-
rian inscriptions we find Ku-u-šu or Ku-su, Ethiopian, the ʾēb of Gen. x., 7, and
Kaššu, which is the ʾēb (or ʾē) of x., 8. In *Wo lag das Paradies*, Delitzsch
maintained a different view, supposing ʾēb of Gen. x., 7 to be identical with ʾēb
of Gen. x., 8, and similarly connecting the Kūšu and the Kaššu. The Kaššu were
the “Elamite-Sumerian” stratum of peoples to the north and west of the Persian
gulf. He was also inclined to connect them with the Kašā or Kaldū (ḵāšmā). In
the present work, on the other hand, he attempts to prove, from an examination
of the forty or more Kossaean words now known, that no linguistic connection ex-
isted between the Kaššu and either the Sumerian-Accadians or the Elamites. Mr.
Theo G. Pinches writes, in opposition to this view, in the *Journal of the Royal
Asiatic Society*, Vol. XVI., Part 2, maintaining the linguistic connection of Kos-
sæan and Sumerian-Accadian. Prof. Haupt, writing in the *Andover Review*
(July), also seems to think that the little we know points in the direction of such
a connection. Prof. Delitzsch holds that the Kaššu came from the mountains of
the north-east, and gained control of Babylonia about 1500, B. C. Karduniš (his
Ištar) was the special seat of their settlement. The nine kings of an Arabian
dynasty, mentioned by Berosus, he regards as Kossæan, and, like Karduniš, they
have names ending in āš. He still inclines to connect the Kašā, or Chaldees,
with the Kaššu. Mr. Pinches, on the other hand, seeks the origin of the Kaššu in
the north-west. “The cuneiform style of writing was in use in early times in Cap-
padocia, and the country around seems to have borne the name of Cush.” Thence,
in his opinion, the Accadian race, including the Kaššu, emigrated to Babylonia.
On the ground of some newly discovered texts, Prof. Delitzsch also deals consider-
ably with the difficult subject of early Babylonian chronology. In the May number
of the *Proceedings of Biblical Archaeology*, Mr. Pinches also deals with the same
subject, on the ground of still more recent discoveries. The two together leave the
matter in a very unsatisfactory condition.

By the liberality of Miss C. L. Wolfe, of New York, an American expedition
to Babylonia has at last been rendered possible. The main object of the expedi-
tion is exploration. One of the members is the Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D., of the
*Independent.*

In his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, p. 118, Prof. Wellhausen says:
“As a lunar festival, undoubtedly the Sabbath also reached back to a great antiqui-
ty. Among the Israelites, however, this day acquired a quite peculiar significance,
by which it was distinguished from all other festivals; it became the day of rest 
καρ 'ίζων. Originally the rest was only a consequence of the festival, etc." With 
this compare the following from the summing up in Dr. Lotz's *Quaestionum de 
Historia Sabbati*: "11) Sabbata [apud Babylonios] non erant dies atri sed oti 
severe quidem imperati, verum minime tristis. 12) Non ad Lunae cultum sabbata 
principio pertinuerrunt. 13) Sunt fortasse ex eo orta, quod numerus senarius Bab 
ylonii numerus principalis (*Grundzahl*) mensurarum erat, quare semen dierum 
laboris quasi plenus videbatur esse laboris modus, quem subseque diem quietis 
consentaneum esset. 14) Israelitae Sabbata a Babylonii acceperunt, etc."

Dr. Carl Abel, of Dresden, the well-known Coptic scholar, has in the press a 
book on the relations between the Japhetic, Semitic and Hamitic families of lan 
guages.

W. A. I., vol. V., 2nd part, has appeared. Among its plates is an edition of 
the "Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I.," published last year by Dr. H. Hilprecht 
as "Inaugural-Dissertation" under the title "Freibrief Nebuchadnezzar's I." It 
is in archaic characters; and, in addition to the original, the editors have, therefore, 
given us a transcription into the common later Babylonian characters. A similar 
transcription of this inscription, together with transliteration and translation, the 
latter differing in some particulars from those of Dr. Hilprecht, were published by 
Messrs. Pinches and Budge, in the April number of the *Proceedings of the Society 
of Biblical Archæology*. Messrs. Pinches and Budge, as well as Dr. Hilprecht, 
have assigned Nebuchadnezzar I. to the middle of the 12th century B. C. Prof. 
Friedr. Delitzsch did the same in his *Sprache der Kossäer*, on the ground of the so 
called synchronous history in II. R. 65, where a Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon seems 
to be the cotemporary of Assureši, father of Tiglathpileser I., king of Assyria. 
In the list of Babylonian kings, published by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings for 
May*, we find the 12th century filled up from 1175 onward. From 1154 to 1146 
rulled a king whose name Mr. Pinches has failed to transliterate. Unless this 
should turn out to be Nebuchadnezzar, it would seem as though the synchronous 
history, the list of Babylonian kings, or the Assyriologists had made a mistake. 
In the July number of the *Andover Review*, Prof. Haupt ascribes to the monarch 
in question the date 1300 B. C., but does not give his reasons. The above mentioned 
list also seems to show that the name which Prof. Delitzsch (p. 15) conjectured 
to be Nabûkudûrusur was Ninipkudûrusur, who reigned in the 10th century B. C. 
This is important, on account of the ingenious use Prof. Delitzsch made of this 
conjecture in the work above referred to. Besides Nebuchadnezzar, the most im 
portant king affected by the change is Simmas-sigu, whom Delitzsch placed about 
1175 B. C., now dated 1003–985.

Among the texts published in the new part of V. R., which have been already 
described or discussed, in the *Transactions or Proceedings of the Society of Biblical 
Archæology*, we notice especially Plates LX. and LXI., a "stone tablet from the 
temple of the Sun-god at Sippara, containing an inscription of Nabû-bal-iddina." 
Of this stone there appeared a photo-lithograph, with description and general 
summary of contents, in *Transactions*, Vol. VIII., Part 2, and in the *Proceedings 
for May* will be found a further notice of the same.

Plate XLIV. contains the "list of names of ancient Sumerian and Accadian 
kings," of which Prof. Delitzsch has made such large use in the *Sprache der Kossäer* (cf. pp. 20, 21), and which was discussed by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings for 
January, 1881.*
The famous Nabonidus cylinder from Sippara, which carried us back to the date 3800, B.C. (Sargon of Akkad), a portion of which was published and discussed in the Proceedings for November, 1882, appears as Plate LXIV.

The texts of this latest publication are almost, if not quite, all from the discoveries of Mr. Rassam, and are chiefly Babylonian, in distinction from Assyrian. A new edition of IV. R. is now in press.

In the Independent of September 4th, Dr. I. H. Hall gives some account of a valuable Syriac MS., belonging to Mr. R. S. Williams, of Utica, N. Y. Its chief value lies in the fact that it contains 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. The date of writing is 1471, A. D. The text is in substantial agreement with the "Bodleian manuscript, as reported by Pococke. It is also a little closer to the Greek text of the critical editions than is the text of Pococke." It comes from Further Asia, where it was probably written by a trinitarian Christian; but it is written "in a rather western Syrian hand." It attempts to be critical, and has a number of Syriac and Arabic marginal notes about points, vowels, and the like, "which give the manuscript a high value in linguistic science."

PIRKE ABOOTH; OR, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS,

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

Translated from the Hebrew Edition of Prof H. L. Strack, of Berlin, Germany.

CHAPTER II.

1. Rabbi saith, Which is the right way that a man should choose for himself? All such as is honorable to him who treads therein, and gets him honor from man. Moreover, be as careful about the performance of a light precept as of a weighty one, because thou canst not estimate the award due to the respective precepts. Compute always the temporal damage sustained by the performance of a duty by its eternal reward, and the temporary gain acquired by transgression by the damage in eternity. Contemplate three things, and thou wilt avoid the occasions for transgressions. Consider what is above thee: an All-seeing eye, and an hearing ear, and all thy deeds are written in a book.

2. Rabban Gamaliel, the son of Rabbi Judah, the prince, said: The study of the law accords well with worldly pursuits; the twofold occupation causes sin...
to be forgotten. And all the study of the law, that is not supported by business, will become of none effect, and will be the cause of sin. And whoever is engaged in the service of the congregation ought to act for God's sake; then will the merit of their ancestors support them, and their righteousness endure forever. As for you, I entitle you to great reward as if ye had performed them.

3. Beware of the powers that be, for they do not patronize except for selfish purposes; they appear as friends while men are useful to them, but they do not stand by a man when he is in distress.

4a. He used to say: Make His (God's) will as if it were thine own, that He may make thy will as if it were His will. Nullify thy will on account of His will, so that He may nullify the will of others on account of thy will.

4b. Hillel said: Separate not thyself from the community; and have no confidence in thyself until the day of thy death; and judge not thy fellow-man until thou art placed in his position; and utter not a word that is incomprehensible, (under the impression) that it will eventually be comprehensible; and say not, When I shall be at leisure, I shall study; mayhap thou wilt not have leisure.

5. He also said: A boor cannot be fearful of sin, nor can a rustic be a saint: the bashful will not become learned, nor the passionate man a teacher; nor will the engrossed merchant be a sage; and where there are no men, strive thou to be a man.

6. He having also seen a skull floating on the water, said: "Because thou hast caused others to float, thou hast been floated; and the end of those who floated thee will be that they will be floated."

---


2 ḫa? use, profit; Ḫa? (Niphal of Ḫa? ) iv., 5b, vi., 1, to profit by.

3 [Comp. Matt. viii., 21.]

4 [Comp. Matt. xxxi., 22.]

5 [Comp. 1 John ii., 15, 17. In Xenoph. Memor. ii., 1, 28 we read: "Wilt thou have the favor of the gods, serve the gods."]

6 With Hillel's maxims 4b-7 (others, see above i., 12-14), the traditional chain is again taken up, which was interrupted by the inserted sentences of men from the house of Hillel (i., 16-2, 4a).

7 ᵁ? separar. Heb. xi., 25 μη ἀφαίρεται ὑπερκρίται. [Dean Stanley quotes Ewald as saying on this maxim: "Separate not...death." "This," Ewald remarks, "is a strange truth for a Pharisee to have uttered; one which, had the Pharisees followed, no Pharisee would have ever arisen. Yet," he adds, with true appreciation of the elevation of the best spirits above their party, "it is not the only example of a distinguished teacher protesting against the fundamental error of his own peculiar tendencies."]

8 [Comp. Ecclus. xi., 7: Blame not before thou hast examined; think over first, and then rebuke.]

9 ʾḏy (an expression already occurring Ezek. vii., 27, though not in that same significance) denotes the great mass devoid of the knowledge of the law, John vii., 49: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ᾿Αβγος ὁ μὴ γνώσαται τοῦ θεοῦ. Here, as in other passages, e. g. vi., 10, an individual is meant [comp. '11 = gentile], then plur. ʾḏy ʿy ʿi, 10b. Observe the special prominence which is attached to the intellectual above the ethical.

10 Only a seeming contradiction with Shabbath, fol. 63, col. 1, towards the end: [when the rustic is a saint] live not in his neighborhood.

11 Bashful, here: he that is ashamed of putting a question.

12 ʾḏy also vi., 5 (traffic) cf. Ezek. xxvii., 15, comp. Eruvin fol. 55, col. 1, where it is said on Deut. xxxix., 13: Rabbi Johanan said: ʾḏy ʾḏy [not in heaven], the law is not found among the high-minded; neither is it beyond the sea, neither is it found among the merchants. [Comp. also Ecclus. xxvi., 29: "A merchant will hardly keep himself free from doing wrong, and a huckster will not be declared free from sin.""]

13 The same maxim is given in the Aramaic Beratham, fol. 63, col. 1.

14 Comp. Sota i., 7: "With the measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you," and Hillel's dictum Shabbath, fol. 31, col. 1: "What is hateful to you, do not unto thy neighbor."
7. He also said: He who increases flesh increases worms; he who increases riches, increases cares; he who increases wives, increases witchcraft; he who increases maid-servants, increases lewdness; he who increases men-servants, increases robbery; he who increases his knowledge of the law, increases life; he who increases his study in college, increases wisdom; he who increases counsel, increases prudence; he who increases justice, increases peace; if a man has gained a good name, he has gained it for himself; if he has gained the words of the law, he has gained for himself eternal life.

8a. Rabban Jochanan, the son of Zaccai, received the tradition from Hillel and Shammai. He used to say: If thou hast studied the law much, do not consider it as a good deed on thy part, since thou wast created for that very purpose.

8b. Rabban Jochanan, the son of Zaccai, had five disciples, and these are they; Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos, the priest, Rabbi Simeon, the son of Nathanael, and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach. He thus estimated their worth: Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos, is as a well-plastered cistern, which loses not a drop; Joshua, son of Hananya, happy are his parents; R. Jose, the priest, is a saint; R. Simeon, the son of Nathanael, bears sin; and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach, is an ever-flowing spring. He used to say: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale of the balance, and R. Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, in the other, he would outweigh them all. Abba Saul said, in his name: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale, and Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, with them, and Eleazar, the son of Arach, in the other, he would outweigh them all.

9. He said to them: Go forth and consider which is the good path to which a man should cleave. Rabbi Eliezer said; A good eye; Rabbi Joshua said, A good comrade; Rabbi Jose said, A good neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, One who perceives the future; Rabbi Eleazar said, A good heart. He said to them: I prefer the words of Eleazer, the son of Arach, to your words; as his words include yours. He also said to them: Go forth and consider which is the bad way that man should shun. Rabbi Eliezer said: A bad eye; Rabbi Joshua said: A bad comrade; Rabbi Jose said, A bad neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, The borrower who does not repay, for when one borrows from man, it is as if he borrows from God, for it is said: "The wicked borroweth and payeth not again; but the

---

1 Continuation to i., 15.
2 A disciple of Hillel; according to Rosh ha-shana, fol. 31 col. 2, he became 120 years old, the same age—the Mosaic—which was ascribed to Hillel and R. Agiba.
3 Comp. Luke xvii., 10; 1 Cor. ix., 16.
4 "Τραπεζαίοντος. The meaning of this name, which already occurs in the second century B. C. (John Hyrcanus, 135–106) is not yet ascertained.
5 In the first half of the second century A. D.
6 According to v., 19, the disciples of Abraham have "a good eye," those of Balaam "a bad eye." Comp. also Prov. xxii., 9 [and Matt. vi., 23].
7 [i.e., susceptible of every good, comp. Matt. v., 8; Luke vi., 46.]
8 [i.e. the way which leads to destruction. In the Scriptures πάθος means often "darkness," for the evil one likes the darkness. Thus Prov. ii., 13: "who leave the paths of uprightness to walk in the way of darkness;" comp. also Peter ii., 15.]
9 [the eye is the mirror of the soul, comp. Matt. vi., 23.] πάθος means to be envious, malicious.
10 [Literally, "place," which is often used in Jewish writings for God, because there is no place which is not pervaded by His presence. Philo de somn. says: "ό θεός καλείται τόπος τῷ περιπτείνειν, κτλ.

---

1 Continuation to i., 15.
righteous showeth mercy and giveth." Rabbi Eleazar said: a bad heart. He said to them: I prefer the words of Eleazer, the son of Arach, to your words, as his words include yours.

10. They also said three things: Rabbi Eliezer said: Let the honor of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own; and be not easily provoked, and repent one day before thy death, and warm thyself by the fire of the sages, and be careful that their coal does not burn thee, for their bite is as the bite of a jackal, and their sting like the sting of a scorpion, and their burn is the burn of a fiery serpent, and all their words are as fiery coals.

11. Rabbi Joshua said: The bad eye, the bad thought, and misanthropy draw man out of the world.

12. Rabbi Jose said: Let the property of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own, and prepare thyself to study the law, for it will not be bequeathed to thee by inheritance; and let all thy deeds be to promote the name of God.

13. Rabbi Simeon said: Be careful of reading the Shema and the Prayer; and when thou prayest consider not thy prayer as fixed, but pray for mercy and supplicate for grace in the presence of God, "for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil," and be not impious in thine own sight.

14. Rabbi Eleazar said: Be diligent to study the law, and consider what thou mayest rejoin to an epicurean, and consider also for whom thou workest, and who is thy employer, who is to pay the wages for thy labor.

15. Rabbi Tarphoni said: The day is short, and the labor vast, but the
laborers are indolent, though the wages be large and the master of the house is pressing.

16. He used to say: It is not incumbent upon thee to finish the work, and yet thou art not at liberty to be idle about it. If thou hast studied the law much, great reward will be given thee; for faithful is thy employer, who will award to thee the hire of thy labor; but know that the reward of the righteous is in the future.

Remarks on the Ethiopic.—That a magazine which is devoted to the interests of Hebrew study, which looks at the language of the Old Testament rather from a philological standpoint than as the medium of pre-Christian revelation, should not pass by unnoticed the claims of the cognate tongues, will probably be accepted without debate. Indeed it is one of the objects of HEBRAICA to encourage such discussions. Accordingly the language and literature of Ethiopia, "the Switzerland of Africa," have a right to a hearing in its columns from time to time. And this they richly merit. Both the character of the Ethiopic language, in that it has worked out the common Semitic genius in its own peculiar way, and thus contributes its portion to the solution of the problems of this group of languages, as also the large literature which is treasured up in this language, are well worthy of study. Ethiopic is not a mere twig from some larger limb, not a mere dialect of which only fragmentary remains or a few enigmatical inscriptions have been preserved; but possessing an extensive literature, it has a complete grammar and a full lexicon, and thus offers ample material for wide research.

It is not a matter of difficulty to assign to this language its position in the Semitic group. Geographical reasons point to a closer affinity between the Ethiopic and the Arabic, an affinity which would appear all the closer from the historical reason that both languages about the same time became the vehicles of an extensive literature, and that they thus would have reached the same stage of development. Of course this latter feature, in consideration of the well known conservatism of the Semitic languages, as this is apparent, e. g., in the virtually uniform character of Biblical Hebrew and in the primitive character of the Arabic, would seem of little moment, yet for the purpose of comparing the two languages it has its importance. An examination of the language shows that what history and geography suggest is correct. The Ethiopic language belongs to the Southern Semitic group, of which the Arabic is the representative and most important member. This connection is evident e. g. in the partition of ב and י into two letters of different intensity (like the Arabic ة and ق for מ, and ص and ث for י although it no longer splits the מ, י, ב and י into two each, as is the

1 [Comp. Matt. ix., 37, 38.]
2 [Comp. Rom. xii., 4, 5.]
3 [Comp. Matt. xx., 6.]
4 [Comp. ibid. xx., 8, 9.]
case in Arabic, but in the room thereof has developed an emphatic \( p \) sound and a number of \( u \)-containing gutturals and palatals); further, in the frequency of the short vowels at the end of words, in the wealth of verbal forms, making use of every possibility offered in this connection, and thus producing twelve regular and full conjugations of the triliteral verb; in the large number of verb roots of four and more letters; in the inner, or broken and collective plural and formatonis; in the regular accusative; in the separating of the subjunctive and voluntative from the imperfect; in the possibility of suffixing two personal pronouns to a single verb, and in a number of other less important grammatical peculiarities. In the lexicon the relation is equally close and apparent. The \textit{copia verborum} indeed contains quite a number of what are probably African vocables, or at least can as yet not be explained from a Semitic basis, but yet the great mass of words and meanings are the same as in Arabic; and in many cases where the latter has developed roots and significations of its own, not found in the North Semitic branch, the Ethiopic has the same peculiarities as its southern neighbor. One very marked feature of the Ethiopic language is its syntax. The Arabic has surpassed exceedingly the stiff and stereotyped character of Hebrew and Syriac syntax, but the pliability of the Arabic is nothing compared with the elegance and variety of the grammatical structure of the Ethiopic. The latter language, probably because its literature was nourished under Greek example and Greek incitement, has a fineness of syntax unequalled by any other of its sister Semitic languages, and yet it cannot be said that any of its syntactical features are unnatural or un-Semitic. While the Greek may have furnished the models and idea, the syntax of the Ethiopic grammar exhibits only the development of what is contained in germ in the structure of the other languages, partly in the Arabic and partly in the North Semitic.

And yet the Ethiopic is by no means merely a dialect of the Arabic. Already the fact that many of the words for the most common objects in existence and for the most frequently occurring acts are in Ethiopic not the same as those used in Arabic, shows that at a comparatively early period the Ethiopic language entered upon a development of its own. Its vowels are not so abundant, \( \dot{a} \) and \( \dot{e} \) being its only short vowels; its nominal and adjective formations are not as varied and numerous; its prepositions and conjunctions are nearly all peculiar; it has no diminutive or elative forms, and no genitive; its alphabet is syllabic and reads from left to right, although this is a later development, the older inscriptions still showing the \textit{βιοστροφάδω} style, and thus pointing to an original method from right to left. And while a number of facts seem to show that the language of Ethiopia occupied an independent position over against the Arabic, which was the classical tongue at least of Northern and Middle Arabia, whatever its nearer relation may have been to the comparatively unknown but nearer languages of Southern Arabia; a number of other facts, both in grammar and lexicon, point to a closer connection with the North Semitic languages, or, rather, indicate that the Ethiopic retained and developed some features of the one original and undivided Semitic tongue which the northern branch also developed, but which the Arabic did not develop, or at any rate dropped. Still another class of peculiarities show that in the Ethiopic the process of decay had already commenced when it became a literary language. All these features combined will aid in giving the language its proper position as a branch, but one marked by individuality in character and development, of the Semitic family.
The Ethiopians call their tongue "lezāna Gečz," the language of the free. Originally it was the language spoken in Tigre, a district in the northern part of Ethiopia; but when a powerful government was established at Uxum, the capital of Tigre, and spread over the rest of the country, the language of the district became the language of the country. This is a phenomenon often observed in history. The Arabic of the Koran and of literature was originally the dialect of the tribe Kinânâ, to which the Kuraisch family, of which Mohammed was a member, belonged. With the conquests of the new religion it spread also. In the Germany of the reformation period a similar transformation took place through Luther's Bible and other writings. Although the alphabet and beginnings of Ethiopic literature cannot be ascribed to Christian influences, as is proved from the fact that these old inscriptions date back to pre-Christian days and convey sentiments decidedly heathenish, yet the literature of the language as such is entirely of a Christian and ecclesiastical sort. And to the present day, although the Amharic and other dialects have supplanted it in the mouths of the people, and even the priests and educated people understand but little of it, it continues to be used in the services of the Church as the lingua sacra.

At the head of Ethiopic literature stands the version or versions of the Bible; and with these words the two chief characteristics of this literature have been expressed—it is sacrō γραφή churchly, and a literature of translations partly from the Greek and partly from the Arabic. The position here assigned to the Ethiopic translation of the Bible is based not only or chiefly on chronological grounds, but rather on the fact that this translation gave character and form to all the literature that followed. Dillmann, the greatest of Ethiopic scholars, in the Prolegomena to his Lexicon, says, "Inter ea (i.e. Ethiopic literature) primum locum obtinent Biblia AEthiopica, quae omnium literarum Abyssiniarum fundamentum sunt et norma, et quam reliquos scriptores suum dicendique scribendique genus conformaverunt." These words in nowise overestimate the importance or influence of this version for the literary life of Ethiopia. This translation made from the Septuagint soon after the Christianization of Ethiopia, is a fair and reliable one, and should be heard in settling one of the vexed questions of old Testament Science, viz., the text of the LXX. As yet the whole Old Testament has not been published. In 1701 Job Ludolph published the Psalms, and in 1853 Dillmann issued a critical edition of the Octateuchus (i. e. the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and Ruth) and of 1 and 2 Kings, and lately also of the prophet Joel. The New Testament was published in Rome as early as 1548 by the Abyssinian Tesfa-Zion, which version was received into the great London Polyglot Bible, and in 1880 Th. P. Platt issued an edition for the British Bible Society; but neither of these can be called critical. About the same time with the Bible, or soon after, a number of other books were translated, which, owing to the vague ideas of Biblical canon among the Ethiopians are sometimes found among the canonically received books. Fortunately a large number of these translations are of works of which the originals have been lost, and in this case the translations have a greater than the mere literary value of aiding in determining or understanding the original texts. A number of Pseudepigraphi of the Old Testament have thus been preserved to the church. Without doubt the chief of these is the enigmatical Book of Enoch, of which a new translation, with extensive introduction and notes, by the writer appeared at Andover in 1882. Dillmann has published the Ethiopic text and a German translation. Allied in spirit to Enoch is the haggadistic production
called the Kufale, or the Book of Jubilees, or also the Smaller Genesis, in which the contents of Genesis are reproduced under the scheme of Jubilee periods, and filled out with all kinds of rabbinical stories. Dillmann published the Ethiopic texts in 1859 and a German translation in the *Goettinger Gelehrter Anzeiger*, but no English translation has as yet been made. Other works of this kind, well known through the patristic citations, are the *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Apocalypse of Ezra. The Ethiopic text of the former was published by Dillmann in 1876, and of the latter by Platt in 1820. A most peculiar work is the *Physiologus*, the representative of a strange class of Christian literature in the early middle ages, in which the objects of nature are used to teach and illustrate Christian doctrine and morality, and of this Hommel edited the Ethiopic text and made a German translation in 1877. The latest work of this kind issued is the contest of Adam, edited in Ethiopic by Trumpp, and translated into English by Malan. The literature is also rich in liturgical work, of which, however, but little has been translated. Trumpp in 1878 published the Ethiopic Baptismal Book of which the present writer soon after made a translation in the *Luthern Quarterly,* Gettysburg, Pa.; and Rodwell, in 1884 and 1867, published in London, chiefly from MSS., a large collection of Ethiopic Prayers and Liturgies. Some few works are extant on other subjects, such as exegesis, mostly translations from Chrysostom; a collection of Monastic commands called the Rules of Pachominy; confessions of faith, both of the Church as a whole and of prominent individuals; and one or two works on philosophy, law and medicine. The ascetic literature, as can be expected, is very large, the lives of the saints being described *in extenso*. The Ethiopic almanac has a saint for every day, and a biography of every saint. Wüstenfeld recently published a German translation of this saints' biographical calendar, called the *Synaxarium*. Poetry also is to be found, but it has stood in the service of the Church, consisting chiefly of antiphones, prayers and laudations of Mary and the saints. A kind of a Speculum *Æthiopicum* in English translation was given by the writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January 1882. Of course we have not given here anything like a complete list of Ethiopic works, not even of all that have been published, but have endeavored to furnish only enough material for readers to form a judgment as to the character and scope of this literature.

The facilities for studying Ethiopic are very good for any one who understands German, but very poor for a person who does not. And this is nearly all the work of a single man, Professor A. Dillmann, of Berlin, a pupil of Ewald. It is true that before his day we had the grammar and lexicon of that enthusiastic scholar Job Ludolf, the author of the very valuable *Historie Æthiopica* and the accompanying *Commentarius in Hist. Æthiop.*; but Dillmann's work threw all this into the shade. His *Grammatik, Lexicon Æthiopicum Latinum* and *Chrestomathia Æthiopica* offer not only the beginner, but also the advanced student vast material for work. They are all the fruit of ripe scholarship, written upon the solid basis of comparative Semitic philology, and will repay study. Other aids also are at hand. Schrader, the well known Assyrian scholar, has written a well digested and careful treatise on the relation of the Ethiopic to the other Semitic tongues, entitled "De Linguae Æthiopicae Cum Conatis Linguis Comparatæ Indole Universae;" Stade, now Professor in Giessen and the author of a new and excellent Hebrew Grammar, wrote a dissertation on the pluraliteral stems in Ethiopic; Hommel has made some contributions to the Ethiopic lexicon in his *Physiologus* and his
CONTRIBUTED NOTES.

Namens der Längethieres beiden Suedsemit. Völkern; Trumpp has also done something in this direction in his various contributions to Ethiopic; König, the author of the new Hebrew grammar based on Qimhî, has published two series of studies on the alphabet, pronunciation and forms of the Ethiopic language, and others have done similar work. From this last, which of course is by no means exhaustive, it is apparent that there is plenty of material at the disposal of scholars for both the critical and the literary study of the Ethiopic language. It is only to be regretted that so few find inclination and time to devote more attention to this interesting subject.

G. H. S.

Kautzsch's Aramaic Grammar.—This work deserves special commendation from the fact that the author has restricted himself to the Aramaic as presented in the Old Testament, and that he did neither intend, nor pretend, as some others before him have done, to write a grammar of the Aramaic in general. The Aramaic dialects, as we have them preserved in Daniel and Ezra, in the various Targums, in the two Talmuds, in the Midrashic and in some other branches of the ancient Jewish literature, differ very considerably, grammatically as well as lexically. In time and in place the remains of the Aramaic literature lie almost as widely asunder as the writings of Chaucer and of Macaulay, as the Scotch dialect and that of Wales. Could we now reasonably expect that one grammar of the English language should give us at the same time the rules governing modern English and old English, the English of Northumberland and the English of Sussex County? Any attempt to do so, would result in our confounding one dialect with another, and would be misleading.

So we find in some of the Aramaic dialects the verb יָנָה (to see), while in others only יָנָה is used. In some, water is designated by the noun יָנָה, in others by יָנָב, or יָנָב. In some the plural of masculine nouns ends in ינ, in others the ending is ינ, and ינ (men). In some the p. Sing. Perf. of the verb ends in ינ, in others in ינ, comp. יָנָי (I have said), יָנָי and יָנָי (I have seen). And thus there are hundreds of differences to be found.

Facts enough are recorded proving that even in Judea the dialect of the neighboring Galilee was understood with difficulty in the Talmudic age, and vice versa. In Talmud Babyl. Erub. 53b, for instance, we find several anecdotes showing this. For example: A Galilean had come to Judea, and there he asked, Who has an יָנָא? Who has an יָנָא? And they answered him, Thou foolish Galilean, what dost thou desire with thy יָנָא? Dost thou mean a יָנָא (donkey) to ride upon, or יָנָא (wine) to drink, or יָנָא (cool) to clothe thyself with, or יָנָא (a lamb) to kill it? In Genesis Rabba, chap. xxiv., Rabbi Eliezer is quoted as having made the remark that in Galilee they say אֲנִי instead of יָנָא (serpent). If such grammatical and lexical differences were prevailing in the speech of the inhabitants of Southern and of Northern Palestine, how still more marked must have been the difference between the Eastern Aramaic spoken in the Euphrates valley and the Western Aramaic spoken on the shores of the lake of Genesareth?

On page 16 of his grammar, Prof. Kautzsch gives a specimen of the Aramaic as still spoken in three villages on the eastern slope of the Anti-Lebanon mount-
ain. If from this short specimen we would be justified in determining the characteristics of the Aramaic as still living in the mouths of a few hundred Syrians of the present day, we might say that in that dialect even radical letters are often dropped. For \( \text{אנהא} \) (brother) they say \( \text{אנהא} \), for \( \text{נהה} \) (it was) they say \( \text{נהה} \). The same peculiarity we find in the old Aramaic literature, especially in the Jerusalem Talmud, where for \( \text{נהה} \) (see) the form \( \text{נהה} \) appears, for \( \text{אנהא} \) (to speak) the form \( \text{אנהא} \), for the proper noun \( \text{אנהא} \) the shortened form \( \text{אנהא} \), and so forth.

In § 5, No. 3 of his book, Prof. Kautzsch says that we are still lacking a good critical edition of the Targum, both in regard to the consonant-text and to the vocalization thereof. This complaint has now happily become groundless, at least in part. For within a few months, A. Berliner's excellent edition of the Onkelos Targum has left the press (Berlin, 1884), accompanied by notes, introduction, and indexes,—an edition which will satisfy the demands of every student.

B. FELSENTHAL.

The Study of Arabic in the University of Cincinnati.—The study of Arabic has been carried on in the University of Cincinnati for more than five years. The whole number of students that have taken it as a part of their curriculum, amounts to twelve or thirteen. The course, as laid down in the catalogue, is one of two years, but in many instances students have given four or five years to Arabic, making it a main or a secondary branch in a post-graduate course. The authorities of the Hebrew Union College strongly urge those under their charge to engage in the study thereof as long as possible.

At first the students were supplied by the instructor with different books in Arabic, by which aids they were taught to read the text. By means of dictation, paradigms and a vocabulary were acquired, and this was followed by the translation of simple sentences from Arabic into English and vice versa. A knowledge of the most common rules of Syntax was imparted in the same way. The students then took up Wright's Arabic Grammar and Arnold's Chrestomathy, omitting much in the former as being unnecessary. At least two thirds of the Chrestomathy were read, and it was succeeded by the Muallakat, with commentary (Arnold's edition). There was some doubt about the expediency of laying before young students a text so difficult. It was very hard, for a while; but in a short time, there were very few passages that they could not translate. There were four of the Muallakat read.

The last book that is given to the students is the Koran, with Beidhawis' Commentary (Fleischer's edition). The most important Suras with commentary are selected, translated, and the commentary pointed. It is best to accustom students very early to unpointed text. They will not find it, by any means, so difficult as they would think.

Every other year a course of lectures is given on the Semitic languages. These are more of an encyclopedic than philological nature.

Hebrew is not taught in the University of Cincinnati, on account of the advantages offered by the Hebrew Union College. Nearly all of the students that take Arabic have already received instruction in Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac. The University of Cincinnati has not yet any professor that devotes his time exclusively to teaching the Semitic languages. It will, without doubt, not be very long before such a chair has been established.
One great hindrance to the study of Arabic is the cost of books, and it might even be added, the lack of the right kind of books at any cost. There is not one grammar that gives, in a succinct and clear form, such an insight into Arabic as is furnished by fifty Latin, or Greek grammars to those wishing to pursue either of these languages.

W. SPROULL.

"Eden" (Heb. יָדָן) had originally nothing to do with יָדָן, pl. יָדָן. The Hebrews received the word (meaning "field," "plain") from the Babylonians. The usual Assyrian ideograph for "field," "Steppe," "plain," is explained in the syllabaries (vid. Haupt, ASK, 18, No. 312) by i-d-i-n-u, i.e., יָדָן, and as this word appears, in the left column of the syllabary (as i-d-i-n), it may be supposed that it was an old (uraltes), non-Semitic word, which later passed over into the Semitic (Del.). Eden, as used by the Hebrew writer, is, of course, a proper name, which the Hebrews, as often happens in such cases, interpreted after their own etymology, and which they probably connected with יָדָן in the meaning "joy," "pleasure."—In this "field" Jahveh planted a "garden," in which he placed the man. The ideograph in Assyrian for the conception "garden," read k a r and g a n, is explained, as regards its meaning in the syllabaries (vid. III., R, 70, 96; ASK, 15, 217) by Assyr. g i n a (g i-nu-u), Accad. g a-n a, and, aside from this, it is, for the Assyrian, made clear through i-k-u, i.e., יָדָן, "field." It must remain undecided whether this word which is found in all the Semitic languages, also in the Ethiopic, is to be regarded as non-Semitic, but Sumero-Accadian (Sayce, Haupt, Del.), i.e., as a foreign word in these languages, as "Park" in ours. The possibility that this word passed from the Semitic into the Accadian is, in our opinion, equally as probable, because (vid. F. Del. PD. 135) the proper and, at all events, older word for "garden," in the Accadian, seems to have been k a r; g u n, g i n replaced k a r, as far as we now see, for the first in the time of Asurbanipal (Assurb. Smith, 183). The etymology of the word is also, to say the least, made no less satisfactory by the acceptance of its Semitic origin than by the acceptance of its coming out of the Accadian.—Schrader's KAT.2

R. F.

וֹדוֹן (Gen. ii., 14), the Hebrew name of the Tigris, occurring also in Dan. x., 4. Noteworthy, as is known, is the pronunciation with prefixed הָי, which we meet neither in the Aramaic, nor in the Arabic, nor, finally, in the Persian form of the name. It is, however, not specifically Hebraic. It is found also in the Assyrian, but not, however, in the usual texts; these also present only the form "Diglat," e.g., the Behistun (l.c.) inscription, Babyl. text l. 35 (Di-i-g-l a-t). We meet it, however, in the more complete syllabaries. One of these (II. Rawl. 50, 7) explains the ideograph in Beh. 34, and known to represent the Tigris (BARTIK.KAR) by I-d-i-g-l a-t, i.e., as the syllables a, i, u, in the Assyrian represent also ה, ה, ה, ה, = H i-diglat, a form which, as proposed, corresponds very nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation, and joins itself with the Samaritan הֹדוֹן. The hardening of ה(י) to ה(י), in transfer from one language to another, is, in general, not infrequent. As the Persian A h r a m a z d a, in the inscription of N a k s c h-i-R u s t a m, certainly became the Babylonian A h r a m a z d a' (together with U r i m i z d a or U r a m a z d a, also U r i m i z d a' of the Behistun inscription), and as the same probably holds good in the Assyrian...
itself in the case of the foreign names Hamattu and Amattu "Hamath," Ha-midī and Amidî "Amid," so it is also probable that this Assyrian and Aramaic \(\text{חַמַּת}\) is only hardened in pronunciation from an original \(\text{חַמַּת}\)—and that the pronunciation with \(\text{ח}\) goes back to a still earlier form with \(\text{ח}\). Probably the matter stands thus, that Dīglāt, especially Dīglāt (the latter in the Behistun inscription) was the weaker Babylonian pronunciation, as reflected in the Persian Tigrā, and as retained to the present day in the Arabic دژله, while, in the Hebrew and (cf. تکمه) Aramaic, the specifically Assyrian pronunciation received precedence. In other cases it is also known that, in Assyrian, a hard, emphatic \(\text{ח}\) corresponds to a weak \(\text{ח}\) in the Babylonian, and that, in still other respects, differences exist between the Assyrian and Babylonian pronunciations, is no less well known. Worthy of notice is the rejection of the fem. ending (a,t) in the Hebrew and Aramaic; while the Assyrian and the other languages mentioned above, including the Neo-Persian, have constantly retained it. Cf. the reverse in the Assyrian-Ilimjaritic-Aramaic •ographer, •ographer, in contrast with the Hebrew-Canaanitic •ographer.—Schrader's KAT.²

-----

The Study of Assyrian.—The impression prevails that, unless one has a life-time to devote to it, little can be accomplished in the study of Assyrian. This impression is a mistaken one. It is true, of course, that one's entire life might profitably be devoted to the study; that, to become recognized as an authority in Assyrian, one must give himself up exclusively to this and kindred subjects. But are we to take it for granted that, unless a man is to become a specialist in a given department, there is nothing in connection with that department which he may profitably study? Shall no man study Latin except the prospective professor of Latin? It is probable that the difficulties of Assyrian study have been exaggerated. Or, perhaps the statement may better be made thus: The difficulties which originally existed,—and, it must be conceded, they seemed almost insuperable,—thanks to the arduous labors of such men as Delitzsch, Schrader, Oppert, Sayce, are now largely removed. Difficulties, to be sure, still remain; but, compared with those which have been overcome, they are of a minor character. The greatest difficulty for the student is the mastery of the syllabary, now that it has been quite definitely determined. But we think that an important and helpful step in advance was made during the past summer, when it was decided by an eminent Assyriologist—a practical instructor—that it was expedient, first to get some knowledge of the language through transliterated texts, and then, gradually to master the signs. This method has two advantages: it will encourage the student; and it will enable him to acquire the syllabary all the more rapidly and thoroughly, because he will know the meaning and significance of the roots and formative elements for which the signs stand.

The adoption of this method will induce five men to take up Assyrian where, otherwise, one would have hesitated. Nor need we fear that men will not learn the syllabary, after having gained some knowledge of the language. Surely that
which he would earlier have been compelled to do, will now be done all the more willingly; for not only will the student find it more easy, but he will be more fully persuaded of its importance.

The question arises: For whom is a study of Assyrian important? Whom will it pay? We answer:

1) The professors of Hebrew. We cannot understand how any one whose business it is to instruct in Hebrew, or to teach the Old Testament, can well afford to be without some knowledge, at least, of that language and literature which has already affected so largely the very questions which he is called upon daily to discuss in the class-room, viz., the forms of Hebrew words, the meaning of Hebrew words, the history of a nation so closely connected with that of Israel. The example of a learned professor of Hebrew, nearly sixty years of age, in a Southern seminary, who has spent his vacation, just closing, in the class-room study of Assyrian, because, indeed, he felt that a knowledge of this language was necessary to fit him for the better performance of his duties as a professor of Hebrew,—the example of this man deserves to be imitated by younger men. There is much time spent in these days by our theological professors in the discussion of questions which are of no possible moment, however they may be settled. Why not devote a portion of this time to the study of Assyrian? We profess to follow the historico-grammatical method in our interpretation of Scripture. Are there any questions then so fundamental as questions of grammar, of lexicography, of history? Is there any one source from which so much aid may be gained as from Assyrian?

2) Ministers who know Hebrew. There are some clergymen, let us thank God, who are familiar with Hebrew, who read the Hebrew of the Old Testament, as they read the Greek of the New. These, as compared in number with those who do not possess this knowledge, are, it must be confessed, few. But they are growing more numerous. Ten years ago they might be counted by tens. To-day they may be counted perhaps by hundreds. For this class of men, we can think of no more profitable linguistic study. Even a slight knowledge of Assyrian will enliven their Hebrew, and make it again as fresh as when first learned. Besides, who ought to be more fully equipped for the study of the Divine Word than the minister? Not even the specialist. If the Assyrian language and history will assist one in understanding the Hebrew language and history, shall it not be studied?

3) Students of Ancient History and of Comparative Religions. The discoveries in Assyria have opened a new field in Ancient History. What student in this department or in that of Comparative Religions,—now a science in itself,—can well afford to be ignorant of a language, of a literature, and of a history which promise so much to the investigator. Nor need one suppose that he can understand the history or religion of a people, any more than its literature, without an acquaintance with its language. The greatest of all Hebrew historians, Ewald, was likewise the greatest of all Hebrew scholars.

It is objected, first, that the books for the study of Assyrian are very expensive. This is true; but what library is worthy of the name that has not an Assyrian apparatus? and, besides, what are a few dollars in a matter of this kind. It may not be long, perhaps, until we shall have Assyrian text-books prepared by American professors, and then the objection of expense will no longer exist.

It is objected, secondly, that it is impossible to obtain instruction. This was
true three years ago, but is no longer true. At Cambridge, Professor D. G. Lyon has classes in Assyrian; in New York City, Professor Francis R. Brown; in Philadelphia, Professor John P. Peters; in Baltimore, Professor Paul Haupt. There was, during the past summer, and there will also be, the coming summer, an opportunity for gaining this instruction. Shall all this kind of work be done in Germany? Shall not American scholars show that they have a deep interest in whatever concerns the Word of God, or the language in which that Word is written?

Unaccented Open Syllables with a Short Vowel.—With Professor Strack’s admirable treatment of “Syllables in Hebrew” the discussion in *Hebraica* of the so-called “Intermediate” Syllable will close. We regret that we cannot take space for the publication of other articles on this subject which have been received.

In closing the discussion, a few words may be regarded as in place:—

From the lack of a clear treatment of this subject by grammarians, and from the opinions of eminent teachers expressed orally and by letter to the writer, it is inferred that the subject is one not deemed worthy of attention. But what are the facts?

1) The Hebrew vowel-system, “while not authentic, and by no means to be regarded as an intrinsic part of the text,” is not merely valuable, but indeed necessary, as an aid in learning the language. No accurate knowledge of the Hebrew can be obtained aside from an absolute mastery of the principles of the Massoretic system of punctuation, whether these be regarded as natural or artificial, real or imaginary. And the regularity of the system is all the more a reason why seeming departures from it should be closely examined.

2) There are in the first chapter of Genesis 454 syllables ending with a vowel, including those ending with a quiescent letter. Of these, 181 are accented, 273 unaccented (the Méthég not being regarded as an accent). In all grammars the law is laid down that unaccented simple (or open) syllables must have a long vowel; but of the 273 unaccented syllables, 39, i.e., one in seven, has a short vowel. There is, of course, a clear reason in every case for this seeming violation of the rule. But why, when so large a number of such cases occurs, should no mention be made of them?

3) That student who fails to notice this deviation, and to classify the instances of it, cannot be called a critical student. That teacher who will not take into account a fact which, in violation of a most fundamental principle, occurs at least twenty times on every page of the Hebrew Bible, is not a critical teacher.

4) In our study of the Hebrew upon the basis of the Massoretic punctuation, we find, as a matter of fact, repeated instances of unaccented syllables ending in a short vowel. Why not, for the sake of convenience, designate these syllables by some definite and appropriate term? Professor Green has used the expression “intermediate;” Gesenius (Kautzsch) “half-open;” Strack suggests for some “loosely closed,” for others, “opened.” For our own part, any one of these terms would be satisfactory.

[In the article on “The Aramaic Language,” § 1, the spelling “Shemitic” was allowed to stand, by an oversight, instead of “Semitic.” Hereafter \( \psi \) will be transliterated by \( w \), and \( \Upsilon \) by \( \varsigma \).—*Ed.*]
KAUTZSCH'S GRAMMAR OF THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC.*

This is a complete Reference-grammar for Biblical-Aramaic, and will make a convenient companion volume to the edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar by the same author. It is about half as large as that work, and follows, in the main, the arrangement pursued there. The Introduction (a translation of which is given in this number) contains twenty-three pages; Orthography comprises seventeen pages; Etymology, ninety-one; and Syntax, forty-one. The real excellence of the book consists in the thoroughness with which the comparison with Hebrew is maintained, and differences noted, and in the free communication of the author's opinion on difficult questions. In dealing with the latter, everything which may shed light upon the matter in hand seems to have been consulted. The Index to Scripture passages shows that all but forty-seven Aramaic verses have been cited in the body of the work, and one passage has eleven such references.

For details, it may be sufficient to refer to what our author has done for the noun. This subject, so difficult of treatment and, hitherto, so loosely treated, is here handled with scientific accuracy and with a fullness never attempted. Forty pages, more than half of them in minion type, are given to the Etymology alone. In this division of the grammar, the Biblical citations are very numerous, at least one passage being referred to in the case of every form, and all forms occurring in Biblical Aramaic are said by the author to be enumerated in the classification which he gives. The general method of classification is like that in Gesenius, except that feminine nouns of a particular class are discussed with the masculines of the same class. Many interesting facts are here brought into prominence, as, e. g., in the statement, on p. 84, that מ is not used by Hebraism for נ, but is to be regarded as just as good Aramaic and at least as old as the latter; and in the one on page 91, that forms like כ are really Segholates of the A-Class, while forms like כ are I-Class Segholates. The remarks on foreign words, though brief, are, for the most part, satisfactory. In the discussion of the noun, as everywhere else in the book, forms not actually occurring in the Bible are distinguished by a special sort of type.

The Syntax of the Noun may be so estimated by the following list of sections printed in the contents. They are:—The Genders; The Numbers; The Emphatic State; The representation of the Genitive relation by the so-called Const. State; The Genitive by circumlocution with י; The Noun in exclamation; The Noun in apposition; The Noun governed by Verbs; The Adjective as attributive and the expression of it by circumlocution; The Numerals.

For purposes of reference the volume before us renders all other books of the sort well nigh useless, so far as concerns Biblical Aramaic; and the author deserves the thanks of all friends of Semitic study.

C. R. B.

In the title to his work, Professor Brown seems to have been obliged to choose between unscientific inaccuracy and a correctness that is slightly indefinite. For he has rejected the old, but really inaccurate, name of Chaldee, and substituted for it the more correct, but also more indefinite name Aramaic. Yet his book is only designed to be an introduction to the more thorough study of the so-called Chaldee of the Bible and the Targums. It is not easy to see, however, how one possessed of the scholarly spirit of which Professor Brown's book gives evidence, could have done otherwise.

It is certainly to be regretted that we cannot have some name more true to the philological facts of the case than the old name of Chaldee, by which to distinguish the language of the Targums from that other offshoot from the old common stock, i.e. the language, or dialect, known as the Syriac.

Professor Brown's excellent book consists substantially of three parts: (1) Selections from the Targums, (2) scholarly and helpful Notes on these selections, and also on the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (for the text of these the student is referred to the Hebrew Bible), and (3) a carefully prepared Vocabulary. Thus the book is essentially, as is stated in the Preface, a Reading Book, or Chrestomath. The Preface also informs us that it is only the First Part of a work yet to be completed by the issue of Part II, which will consist of a Grammar. The Chrestomathy is published before the Grammar, because the design of Professor Brown is that his completed work shall be used in the "acquisition of the elements of Aramaic by the so-called Inductive Method." In this method, the student is first led to see the facts in the language itself, and learns the principles and laws underlying these facts afterwards.

To aid in the accomplishment of his purpose, Professor Brown has printed in his book the text of the first ten chapters of the Targum of Onkelos, with the corresponding portions of the Hebrew text on the opposite pages. By this means, the student will be able, with the help of a skilful instructor, to discover for himself all the important resemblances and differences between the Hebrew and the Chaldee, and thus become prepared for a systematic study of the Chaldee Grammar. As a partial compensation for the yet unpublished Part II, Professor Brown has inserted in this Part I, before the title page, a complete set of Chaldee paradigms, so that the book, as it now stands, will form, in the hands of a competent teacher, a complete apparatus for giving the student command of the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament, and such a knowledge of the language of the Targums, as will fit him to enter upon the more thorough study of them.

The print, both English and square character (Hebrew and Chaldee) is good and clear, and the appearance of the pages is very pleasing to the eye. To those who know anything of the difficulty of securing good work of this sort in our country, the press-work reflects no small credit upon the publishers.

Professor Brown has made a real and valuable contribution to the study of the so-called Chaldee; and one proof of the excellence of his work is, that his book already, so soon after its publication, has been adopted as a text-book in at least five important Theological Seminaries.

S. B.
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Ante-Seminary Hebrew.

What are the facts in relation to the study of Hebrew in the seminary? What is the evil resulting from these facts? What is the remedy for this evil?

First: Students enter the theological seminary with preparation made for every department except one, the Hebrew. Their philosophical training in college has prepared them for the theological work; their historical training for the work in Church History; their training in classical Greek for the work in the New Testament; their rhetorical and literary work for the homiletical department. But for the Old Testament department no preparatory work of any kind has been performed. This is one fact.

Sight is lost of a most important item, that, properly speaking, the study of Hebrew as a language ought not to be included in the Old Testament department. On no just ground can purely linguistic instruction be legitimately expected of the professor of Hebrew, any more than of the professor of Greek. And yet, instead of giving to the department of Hebrew more time, in order that the language may be properly taught and there yet be left opportunity for historical, exegetical and theological work, in many seminaries an amount of time is allotted, even less than that given to some other department. The second fact.

The laborious and distasteful linguistic work is done, but too often only because it is required. The study is, seemingly, unprofitable. It is drudgery. The divinity student has been under the impression for years that his "preparatory" work was at an end, and he does not relish the idea of again submitting to the process of "drill." The task is a toilsome, disheartening one. Only that is done which must be done, and this without interest and without care. The third fact.

The professor of Hebrew, not sufficiently courageous to hold the class down to that hard, uncompromising class-drill which is absolutely essential in order to gain the end desired, viz., a knowledge of Hebrew, yields too soon to any inclination to enter upon exegetical study. That very moment progress ceases. The effort of the student to do exegetical work without an accurate knowledge of the original languages to serve as a basis on which to rest the work, is a failure. No student is prepared, in any proper sense, for exegetical work, who has not a command of the language. Time, therefore, rightly belonging to the preliminary linguistic work is too frequently given up to what is called "exegetics." The fourth fact.

These, briefly stated, are the facts which exist in reference to Hebrew work, in most, if not in all, of our seminaries.

Secondly: What is the result of all this? What is the evil naturally following upon this state of affairs? The study of Hebrew to at least five out of ten men is absolutely valueless. The time spent by five out of ten men who undertake this study, is entirely lost. Is this not a stupendous evil? For this loss of time is not some one responsible? If a knowledge of Hebrew is worth having, shall a system be followed which, at the best, gives that knowledge to one half, while the other half not only do not get it, but lose the time spent in the effort to get it? Is this knowledge so precious that all men preparing for the ministry shall be required to work for it, with the positive assurance beforehand that only one half can succeed? Shall only brilliant men be encouraged to study Hebrew, men who are known to be apt in linguistic study? Yet is not this knowledge, when gained, as serviceable, if serviceable at all, to one who attains it with difficulty, as to one who attains it easily? This is the evil: Every student who enters the theological seminary is encouraged, indeed required, to take up a
study, the chances being even that the time devoted to that study will be thrown away. The department of the Old Testament is so hedged about with difficulties, as to make it impossible for any man to get what he ought to have, and for five out of ten men to get anything. Hebrew is not kept up by the minister, after leaving the seminary, in nine cases out of ten, because, forsooth, a sufficient advance in the study was not made while in the seminary, to make it possible to do this with any sort of satisfaction.

Thirdly: Is this evil a remediless one? Is there anything to be done? Can a plan be adopted, which will guarantee to every theological student who undertakes the study of Hebrew, that his time will not be lost? We answer emphatically, Yes. Let preparatory Hebrew work be done, as well as preparatory Greek work. Such ample preparation for Hebrew cannot, of course, be made as for Greek. Nor is it needed. Let a student obtain, before entering the seminary, such a knowledge of the language as will enable him to read the historical Hebrew; that is, let him acquire a mastery of the most common principles of the language, a familiarity with the most frequently recurring words.

With this start, followed up by vigorous class-room drill in the seminary, he will gain such a hold of the language, such an acquaintance with its spirit and genius that the study will be one of pleasure and profit. He will know that there is to be an outcome to his work. The remedy we propose, therefore, is ante-seminary Hebrew, i.e., the study of Hebrew before entering the theological seminary.

But here two practical difficulties present themselves.

**knowledge to be gained?**

*in colleges.* If there shall ante-seminary Hebrew not certainly be found to Hebrew will be taught while, providentially, been opened by which training can obtain it. Through the Institute of Hebrew, with its “Correspondence” and “Summer Schools” many men have prepared and are preparing themselves for the seminary.

2) But will provision be made in the seminary for men who enter the Junior class with some preparation in Hebrew? Will not such a one be compelled to wait until those who begin the study upon their entrance arrive at the point which he may have reached, or to crowd ahead into the Middle class? There may be some seminaries so lacking in efficiency and enterprise, as not to be able to provide for this class of men. There may be some professors of Hebrew so regardless of the interests of their own department, and so indifferent to the general interests of Bible study, as to refuse to furnish the necessary opportunities for such men. But such seminaries, and such professors may profitably be passed by. In every denomination, there are other seminaries in which it will be deemed a privilege to provide thus for students. To such seminaries, institutions of a wide-awake and aggressive spirit, the young men of our day should direct their footsteps.

There is no reason why preparatory work in Hebrew should not be done. There is every reason why it should be undertaken. The time has come for young men to ask for it, the professors of Hebrew to encourage and in some measure require it, for the churches to furnish opportunities by which it may be gained.

**An Important Announcement.**

The work of the American Institute of Hebrew, now in its fourth year, has grown steadily in favor, and has enlisted the sympathy and co-operation of a large number of students and instructors. Up to this time, the Institute has been conducted largely as a personal undertaking; but the character and magnitude of its work, as well as its financial needs, render this no longer practicable.

It has been decided, therefore, to place the general management of the Institute,
i. e., (1) The Hebrew Summer Schools, and (2) The Hebrew Correspondence School, in the hands of a Board of Trustees, made up of Professors of Hebrew and of related departments (of different religious denominations, and residing in different sections of the country), who consent to take an active part in advancing the interests of the work.

The Institute will henceforth be conducted with the following ends in view:

(a) To furnish preparatory instruction in Hebrew to students about to enter the theological seminary; it being proposed to influence as large a number of prospective theological students as possible to avail themselves of the opportunities thus afforded, in order that the merely linguistic work in Hebrew may be performed, at least in part, outside of the seminary;

(b) To furnish elementary and advanced instruction in Hebrew to ministers engaged in the work of the pastorate;

(c) To furnish opportunities for the study of the cognate languages, and such historical, literary and theological subjects, connected with the Old Testament, as may be desired.

The general character of the Institute will be undenominational; and all, of whatever faith, who are interested in Old Testament studies, will be invited to participate.

No educational work of a high order can be conducted merely upon the basis of the receipts from tuition-fees. This fact is recognized by all who have given attention to the question of education. The work proposed by the Institute is, really, a theological work. It aims to prepare men for the seminary, in that department in which preparation is especially lacking, and it aims to assist men, after leaving the seminary, to carry on systematic study in that department which, more than all others, is likely to be neglected. Upon this ground, therefore, it appeals to large-hearted, liberal-minded men of all denominations for funds:

a) To be used in connection with the regular revenue from tuition-fees, in meeting the general expense of the "Schools," and the salaries of instructors;

b) To be used in assisting men to avail themselves of the opportunities here offered, who would not otherwise be able to do so.

It is not deemed wise, even by those who have the future of the Institute most at heart, to attempt at present to secure funds for a permanent endowment. Nor, on the other hand, is it possible to raise each year the sum of money needed for the expense of that year. It is proposed, therefore, to secure subscriptions towards what shall be called "A Five Years' Endowment Fund." That is, a given sum will be subscribed, payable every year for five years. By this method, greater stability will be guaranteed; and at the same time the labor and expense of raising the money will be largely diminished.


The special attention of the students of the Hebrew Correspondence School is called to the Catalogue to be published in January next. It is very desirable that every person who is really a member, be included in the list. Only those, however, can fairly be considered members who have prepared and sent in for correction as many as ten lessons during 1884, unless they have been unavoidably hindered, or have entered so near the end of the year as to make it impossible.

Resuming Work.

There are still some members who have not taken up the lessons since vacation. Of course there are many hindrances that may arise to cause delay, and among so many students there will always be some who have just reason for suspending their work. But no ordinary cause should be allowed to interpose. This work is not one of the minister's "extras," but a part of his regular biblical study, and so has a right to a definite allotment of his time. "The best way to resume is to resume." Will not those who have not yet recommenced study please communicate at once with the Principal by means of a recitation or, if that is impossible, by postal.
HEBRAICA SUPPLEMENT.

The Summer Schools.

In the HEBRAICA SUPPLEMENT for April we spoke of the advantages to be gained by the members of the Correspondence School from attendance on the Summer Schools. A large percentage of the students in each of the three schools this past summer were from the Correspondence School. They were among the most enthusiastic and successful students present, and what they were able to accomplish fully justified the remarks in the article referred to above. The solid and lasting benefit accruing from a few weeks of earnest work, the real hold upon the language that can thus be gained are being recognized more and more. Let every member that can possibly do so, shape his course this year with the plan of coming to the Summer School in 1885. Everything gained beforehand is so much advantage then. The courses of work are made so to correspond that one can continue his study from one school to the other just as in the same school.

If a minister unacquainted with Hebrew had wished a few years ago to learn the language, he might well have been discouraged by the lack of facilities for study either at home or elsewhere; but now it is not only possible but is an easy and inexpensive matter to obtain such a familiarity with Hebrew as will make the reading of a page a day a recreation, and open boundless stores of Scriptural knowledge. This cannot be accomplished in a month, nor in six months, but it need not take more than two or three years of study, that can be carried on amid the regular duties of the pastorate without overcrowding, and during the summer vacation without the loss of needed recreation. Those who have been members of both schools know this by experience. We hope that an increasing number may test it every year.

New Members.

There have been a large number of additions to the Correspondence School since the beginning of September. More have come from the Methodist denomination than from any other, and more from Ohio than from any other state. Among the papers that have been sent in, nearly all of which are of excellent character, several were so nearly perfect that we regret that they were not quite so. Shall the Ohio brethren lead?

Perfect Papers.

Since our last issue faultless recitations have been received from the following students:

Rev. W. D. Akers, Rural Retreat, Va., El. 18.
J. J. Anderson, Tuscaloosa, Ala., Pr. 22.
Rev. J. M. C. Fulton, Oxford, N. Y., El. 19 and Int. 3.
E. A. Mason, Farmington, Me., El. 1.
F. M. Mitchell, Kane, Ill., Int. 19.
F. P. Ramsay, Dublin, Va., Int. 13, 14, and 17.
H. Van der Ploeg, Fulton, Ill., Int. 26.
J. T. Whitley, Salisbury, Md., El. 23.

Graduations.

FROM THE ELEMENTARY COURSE.

Sidney Crawford, Lyons, Ia.
T. F. Drake, Burlington, Ind.
J. M. C. Fulton, Oxford, N. Y.
M. L. Gates, McPherson, Kas.
Mr. Jas. Hammond, Olathe, Kas.
Rev. M. P. Hayden, Ludlow, Ill.
G. G. Hudson, Auburn, Ill.
C. H. Lyons, LaGrange, Ga.
Prof. P. Robertson, Dayton, O.
Rev. A. M. Smeallie, Kortright, N. Y.
E. A. Starkey, Dayton, O.
Mr. J. H. Thomas, Dayton, O.
Rev. A. Waterbury, Rensselaerville, N. Y.
Prof. Scott Williams, Rockland, Mich.
Harry Willis, Philadelphia, Pa.

FROM THE INTERMEDIATE COURSE.

Rev. R. C. Armstrong, Waxahachie, Tex.
Mr. Adam Charlton, Lynedoch, Ont.
Rev. D. F. Estes, Atlanta, Ga.
T. M. Evans, Sharon, Pa.
J. W. Fox, Kewanee, Ill.
Miss H. M. Prescott, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. H. P. Smith, Mt. Holly, N. J.
Mr. D. J. Strang, Monmouth, Ill.
Rev. F. G. Woodworth, Wolcott, Conn.

FROM THE PROGRESSIVE COURSE.

Rev. C. C. Hersman, Fulton, Mo.
Mr. G. R. Hovey, Newton Center, Mass.
Rev. J. B. Purell, Mt. Washington, Md.
THE HEBREW CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL.

MORGAN PARK, ILL.

WILLIAM B. HARPER, PH. D., PRINCIPAL.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION.

1. Aim.—The Hebrew Correspondence School gives instruction in Hebrew (1) to students about to enter the theological seminary; (2) to ministers engaged in the active work of the pastorate; (3) to others who, for any reason, desire such instruction.

Studies in the School are carried on at home, by a regular correspondence with a careful instructor. Such instruction by correspondence may not be superior to oral instruction, but the experience of many has proved it to be most valuable and practical. Such a system of study brings to the doors of the great body of busy ministers and laymen opportunities for Biblical culture which formerly were confined to a selected few.

2. The Plan.—A printed Lesson-paper is mailed to the student each week. This Lesson-paper assigns the tasks which are to be performed, furnishes assistance and suggestions, and contains questions on the Lesson, thus guiding the work of the student as though he were in the recitation-room. Every week the student mails to the Instructor a recitation-paper, on which he has written out (1) the tasks assigned in the printed Lesson; (2) the answers to such questions as may be asked therein, and (3) any questions or difficulties which may have occurred to him in the study of the Lesson. This recitation-paper is promptly returned with the errors in it corrected, and with such suggestions as it may be thought best to offer. In this manner each Lesson in the course is studied and the results of the study submitted to the Instructor for correction, criticism, and suggestion. It can not be doubted that the profit to be derived from such work is second only to that which is received from actual contact with the living teacher.

3. Tuition-fee.—The tuition-fee for Instruction and Lesson-papers is placed at $10.00 a year, payable semi-annually in advance. This includes forty Lessons. If the entire number is not taken within the year, the responsibility lies with the student. No change from this policy is made except

1) in cases of sickness; and

2) when the student expressly declares before receiving the first Lesson that he desires the Lessons at the rate of one in two weeks.

4. The Chautauqua School of Theology.—The Principal of the Hebrew Correspondence School being likewise Dean of the Department of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in the "Chautauqua School of Theology," members of the latter School who study in the department of Hebrew, do their Hebrew work according to the plans announced above.

5. Certificate.—At the end of each Course, those who have completed the work of that Course will receive a Certificate to that effect. To those who have completed the Advanced Course there will be given a Diploma.

6. Enrollment.—Students may be enrolled in the School at any time during the year. There are no classes, each student pursuing his work at home and advancing as rapidly or as slowly as desired. Each applicant for membership is furnished with an Application Form, which he is expected to fill out and return to the Principal, and on receipt of this the necessary books and papers are sent to him.
B. COURSES OF INSTRUCTION.

Four distinct Courses of Instruction have been organized. These are named for convenience: Elementary, Intermediate, Progressive, Advanced. Each Course consists of forty Lessons, and, unless a special arrangement is made, one Lesson is to be taken each week.

1. The Elementary Course.

1. For whom intended. The Elementary Course is intended chiefly for those who have never studied Hebrew. It is, however, pursued also by quite a number who have, at one time or another, paid some attention to the language, but feel that, in order to make any real progress, it is better for them to lay the foundation anew.

2. The Work. The work of this Course is as follows:
   (1) The thorough mastery of the Hebrew of the first four chapters of Genesis.
   (2) The study of the most important principles of the language, in connection with these four chapters.
   (3) The mastery of these principles as systematized and arranged in the grammar.
   (4) The memorizing of Hebrew words which occur above two hundred times—in all about two hundred.
   (5) The critical translation and word-analysis of the fifth and sixth chapters of Genesis.

3. The Lesson-Paper. Each Lesson-paper consists of four printed pages of Notes, Suggestions and Questions, including (1) A Review-lesson; (2) Grammatical Notes on a few verses; (3) Observations; (4) Grammar-lesson; (5) Word-lesson; (6) Verses to be memorized; (7) Recitation-lesson. Questions of Syntax, Lexicographical Notes and Reading unpointed Hebrew are introduced as often as is deemed wise.

4. The Books. (1) A Hebrew Manual ($1.00); (2) "Elements of Hebrew," fifth edition ($2.00); (3) "Hebrew Vocabularies," ($1.25).

2. The Intermediate Course.

1. For whom intended. Many ministers, once proficient in Hebrew, have grown so "rusty" that all their former acquaintance with the language seems to have forsaken them. For these, as well as for those who have completed the Elementary Course, there has been arranged the Intermediate Course.

2. The Work. The work of this Course is as follows.
   (1) The critical study and translation of Genesis 1-XX.
   (2) The study of the most important principles of the grammar,—the amount furnished in the Principal's "Elements of Hebrew."
   (3) The Inductive study of the most common principles of Syntax, in connection with the subject-matter translated.
   (4) The memorizing of the verbs which occur 50-200 times,—in all about two hundred and fifty words.
   (5) The memorizing of one or two verses of a familiar chapter each week.

3. The Lesson-Paper. Each Lesson-paper consists of four printed pages of Notes, Suggestions and Questions, including (1) Inductive Notes, based on the passage translated; (2) Grammatical Notes upon the passage translated, with reference to the Principal's "Elements of Hebrew;" (3) Principles of Syntax; (4) Lexicographical Notes; (5) Grammar-lesson; (6) Word-lesson, in the Principal's "Hebrew Vocabularies;" (7) Verses to be memorized, e.g., in Exodus 1., or XX.; (8) Recitation-lesson.

4. The Books. (1) Hebrew Bible ($2.25). or Baer & Delitzsch's Genesis (50 cents); (2) "Elements of Hebrew," ($2.00); (3) "Hebrew Lexicon," Gesenius's ($5.75) or Mitchell's Davies' ($3.25); (4) "Hebrew Vocabularies," ($1.25).
3. The Progressive Course.

1. For whom intended. Besides furnishing an opportunity for those who have finished the work of the preceding Courses to continue their study, the Progressive Course is intended to meet the wants of a large number of ministers who have a fair knowledge of the language, but desire the help and stimulus of an organized course of study, in prosecuting their work still further.

2. The Work. The work of this Course is as follows.

   (1) The critical translation and study of Exodus i.—XXIV.

   (2) The examination of questions of Geography, Archaeology, Exegesis, etc., which arise in the study of these chapters.

   (3) The study of the grammar in its details, Gesenius and Green being used as text-books.

   (4) The memorizing of the verbs which occur 25–50 times, and of the nouns which occur 50–100 times—in all about three hundred words.

3. The Lesson-Paper. Each Lesson-paper consists of four printed pages of Notes, Suggestions and Questions, including (1) Inductive Notes, based upon the passage translated; (2) Grammatical Notes on the passage translated, with reference to the Principal’s “Elements of Hebrew,” to Gesenius’ (Mitchell’s Davies’), and Green’s Hebrew grammars; (3) Principles of Syntax; (4) Lexicographical Notes; (5) General Questions on Geographical, Archaeological and Exegetical points which come up in the Lesson; (6) Verses to be memorized; (7) Grammar lesson; (8) Recitation lesson.

4. The Books. (1) Hebrew Bible ($2.25); (2) “Elements of Hebrew,” ($2.00); (3) Gesenius’s (Mitchell’s Davies’) Grammar ($2.25), or Green’s Grammar ($2.60); (4) Hebrew Lexicon (see above); (5) “Hebrew Vocabularies.” ($1.25).

Correspondence is invited from those who may be interested in the Course.

Address,

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

MORGAN PARK, ILL.
C. OPINIONS.

WEST HALLOCK, ILL., Oct. 8, 1884.

It is surprising what rapid and thorough progress is possible to the student, in the study of Hebrew, by your methods in the Correspondence School.

REV. J. M. COTTRELL.


With pleasure I testify to my appreciation of your methods of instruction in the Hebrew Correspondence School. Commencing as I did without any knowledge of the language I feel much gratified at the progress made in the time devoted to it, and heartily commend the School.

Yours truly,

REV. JOHN A. BOWLER.

MOUNT HOLLY, N. J., Sept. 27, 1884.

I consider Dr. W. R. Harper's work and method in the Hebrew Correspondence School a most valuable help to the thorough understanding of the Old Testament. I am using the Progressive Course, and new light breaks from the Word daily. I would suggest to pastors who have neglected their Hebrew to take it up again on this plan, and they will be refreshed, pleased, and profited.

REV. H. F. SMITH.

SALISBURY, Md., Oct. 2, 1884.

Whoever cannot learn Hebrew in Prof. Harper's Correspondence School is a hopeless case—so far as learning Hebrew is concerned. My opinion is, that the work done in this School is far more accurate and thorough than that usually done by face-to-face methods in Theological Schools. And why? Simply because every syllable must here be written, and writing ensures accuracy.

REV. J. T. WHITLEY.

Pastor Trinity M. E. Church, South.

GLENBROOK, CONN., Oct. 1, 1884.

I have formed the highest opinion of your methods, and especially as to their practicalness in the case of pastors and others who can 'by hook or by crook' devote a few hours every week systematically to the work. My own interest in Hebrew has been greatly increased since my connection with the Correspondence School.

REV. EDWARD T. BROMFIELD.

TRENTON, N. J., Sept. 6, 1884.

My work in the Hebrew School has been "like the acquisition of a sixth sense." The work of two years has done two things for me. It has made thoroughly available the wealth of critical material, a knowledge of which is demanded of the ministry of our day, and it has systematized and doubled in efficiency my habits of study.

REV. W. W. LOVEJOY.

"Surely the minister of the Gospel, charged with God's message to man, should know that message at first hand, and for himself, and not be compelled to rely wholly upon translation and commentators and other men for its meaning."
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II. Note of References to the Biblical Aramaic.
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V. Targum on the Psalms, Psalm XXIV., Psalm CL.

VI. Targum of the Megilloth, Ruth chap. II.


VIII. Vocabulary.

It is generally conceded that no good class book for the study of the Aramaic has hitherto existed. The present volume, to be followed within a year by Part II., containing a complete statement of the grammatical principles of the language, will meet the wants of practical teachers.

The method is at once comparative and inductive. A knowledge of Hebrew is presupposed, and the Elements of Aramaic are taught by comparing with the Hebrew text of Genesis I.-X., the Targum of Onkelos of the same chapters. In this manner the words corresponding to those in the Hebrew text, and likewise the grammatical forms, are most clearly, and most impressively, brought to the attention of the beginner.

The method adopted has already been commended by eminent scholars and teachers. It is believed that a careful examination of the book will lead at once to its introduction in the class-room.

A copy will be mailed, post paid, for examination, to any Professor of Hebrew for $1.15.
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