

# The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1925

---

## THE STATE OF THE CHURCH

The Church has been passing through troubled waters. This is no new or strange experience for the Church, but has been her history from the very beginning, ever since Christ said to His disciples, "In this world ye shall have tribulation." As the ocean is the home of storms, so is the world the home of unbelief and of opposition to the kingdom of God. But even in the ocean there are different kinds of storms; the winds blow out of different quarters; and, after suddenly arising and blowing with great vehemence for a season, they will as suddenly subside and there will be a great calm. Now that the roar of this particular storm through which our Presbyterian Church has been passing, and indeed, all Churches, begins to subside, though for a season only, and one of a great number who tried to keep a sort of mariner's log during this voyage of the past few years, I would like to put down some of the entries from the log-book. Perhaps these entries will be of suggestion to others who want to know from what direction the prevailing winds blew, whether the storm arose suddenly and unexpectedly, or whether in falling barometer and obscured heavens there were unmistakable signs of its approach.

How shall we describe this stormy wind that has left no Church untouched and unruffled by its breath? From what quarter did it blow? To answer this question is not as easy as it might appear. Unbelief, like God, never changes; from everlasting to everlasting it is the same. However he changes his accent, the tempter has never really said anything different from what he said at the very beginning: "Hath God said?" Yet the metempsychosis of error and unbelief is a very curious thing. How diverse and numerous its

## ARAMAISMS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

An Aramaism is an Aramaic word which has been taken over into another language, and used instead of, or for lack of, a native word. Thus in Arabic, probably all the words ending in *ut* are adopted from the Aramaic. A Babylonism in like manner, is a word of the Babylonian language (or perhaps originally Sumerian) which has been taken over into another language. Thus in the Syriac about thirty words beginning with *k* alone are probably of Babylonian origin;<sup>1</sup> and a goodly number of Babylonisms are to be found in the first twenty chapters of Genesis, in Daniel and other books of the Old Testament, especially in those written in the time of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires.

Now the determination and number of Aramaisms in the Old Testament would be of little account, were it not for the fact that critics for the last hundred years or more have been asserting that the presence of Aramaisms in a given document proves the lateness of that document; and secondly, that some three or four hundred words, which they enumerate, are Aramaisms. Putting the whole case in the form of a syllogism, they assume as a major premise, that the presence of Aramaisms in a document shows that it was written, or edited, after the Captivity, or more probably after the time of Nehemiah. As the minor premise they assume that such and such words are Aramaisms; and the conclusion is that such and such documents are post-captivity or post-Nehemiah.

### I. THE MAJOR PREMISE

To this major premise, that Aramaisms might not be employed by Hebrew writers before the Captivity, there are at least three objections.

I. The Biblical records state clearly that there were Ara-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Kuratu, kissatu, kusidrinu, kiskirru, karu, karballatu, kiyallu, kurku, karkyannu, kaspu, kapru, kupru, karasu, kurkanu, kussu, kutallu, kitinnu, kuttinu, kabalu, kudinnu, kubbu, kaiowamu, kasu, kuru, kakku, kisu, kakkaru, kamunu.*

means as early as the time of Abraham, and that Rebecca, Leah and Rachel were all from the country of Aram Naharaim. Laban, the brother of Rebecca, calls Galeed by the Aramaic phrase Jegur-Sahadutha (Gen. xxxi. 47). Again in Jud. iii. 8 it is said that Chushan-Rishathaim the king of Aram Naharaim conquered the Israelites in Palestine. Further, David and Solomon reigned over all the Arameans as far at least as the river Euphrates, and David is said, in the heading of the Sixtieth Psalm, to have fought with Aram Naharaim. Later the kings of Israel were in continual contact with the Arameans of Damascus until the Assyrians overthrew the latter. Besides, that the rulers of Judah in the time of Isaiah understood Aramaic is certified by the fact that they requested the ambassadors of Sennacherib to speak to them in that language. Lastly, the fact that about half of the books of Daniel and Ezra are written in Aramaic gives *prima facie* evidence that the Jews of the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. had begun to treat the Aramaic as equally current with their native Hebrew.

2. The documents of Egypt and Assyria show that the Arameans flourished during this whole period from Abraham to Ezra.

*a.* The inscriptions from the XVIIIth and XIXth dynasties of Egypt stately call the country beyond the Euphrates by the name of Naharin. This would seem to indicate that already the country called Aram Naharaim was known by the Aramaic name of Naharain.

*b.* There is abundant evidence to show that the Arameans were known to the writers of the Babylonian records at least as early as the time of Hammurabi.<sup>2</sup> From the time of Assurbanipal, the last great king of Nineveh (666-626 B.C.) the word *Aramu* can be traced back almost reign by reign to the time of Tiglath-Pileser I about 1100 B.C. In the cylinder inscription of this latter king<sup>3</sup> he speaks of taking his way into the wilderness into the midst of the Aḥlamê of the land

---

<sup>2</sup> See especially Kraeling's *Aram and Israel*, pp. 14-30.

<sup>3</sup> Col. V. 44 f.

of the Arameans and of plundering the land as far as Carchemish. These Aḥlamê whom Tiglath-Pileser says to have been of the land of the Arameans are mentioned twice in tablet 200<sup>4</sup> of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters. In his inscription Adadnirari connects these Aḥlamê with the Suti.<sup>5</sup> The Suti are mentioned a number of times in the Amarna letters<sup>6</sup> and also in a letter from the time of Hammurabi.<sup>7</sup>

c. Real or alleged Aramaisms are found in everyone of the twenty-two books of the Hebrew Canon. They are found also in everyone of the documents into which the critics have attempted to divide up the first six books of the Bible, in each of the books of the Psalter and in all the parts of the book of Isaiah. The late Professor Kautzsch of Halle-Wittenberg made a collection of words which either he or others considered to be Aramaisms in the Old Testament.<sup>8</sup>

The following tables will give the number of these *words* in each of the books or "documents" of the Old Testament, together with the *times* of their occurrence as well as the extent of the document in *pages*.<sup>9</sup>

Since no one affirms that all of the documents of the Old Testament were written after the Captivity, it is obvious, with regard to the alleged Aramaisms that one of three ways of accounting for the enormous number of them scattered through the whole Old Testament must be maintained.

1. First, from the time that the first documents of the Old Testament were written, the relation between the Hebrews and Arameans must have been such as that the Hebrew writers of the documents may have used Aramaisms. In

<sup>4</sup> Winckler, 295.

<sup>5</sup> KB. I. 5. MKA No. 91. 15f.

<sup>6</sup> Knudtzon, Nos. 16, 122, 169, 195, 297, 318.

<sup>7</sup> See Ungnad, *Briefe aus der Zeit Hammurabis*, No. 154.

<sup>8</sup> *Die Aramäismen im Alten Testament*, untersucht von E. KAUTZSCH, Halle, 1902. Professor Kautzsch was editor of several editions of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, wrote a Grammar of Biblical Aramaic, and was the chief editor of the new German edition of the Bible including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

<sup>9</sup> The number of pages in the documents of the Hexateuch is only approximate.

	Words	Times	Pages		Words	Times	Pages
Gen.	24	91	88	Hexateuch			
Ex.	16	52	73	J.	5	9	} 100
Lev.	31	139	52	E.	5	6	
Num.	30	106	73	D.	7	15	} 70
Deut.	15	30	64	H.	6	21	
Josh.	8	19	46	P.	36	243	} 226
Jud.	3	9	44	The Twelve			
Sam.	11	17	107	Hosea	3	3	11
Kings	21	39	112	Joel	3	3	5
Is. Part I.	43	96	45	Amos	1	1	9
Is. Part II.	35	65	31	Obad.	2	2	1
Jer.	31	52	96	Jon.	5	5	3
The Twelve	26	28	74	Mic.	2	2	7
Ezek.	68	187	84	Nah.	0	0	3
Dan.	25	33	27	Hab.	1	1	3
Chron.	42	71	111	Zeph.	2	2	11
Ezra.	12	18	18	Hagg.	1	1	3
Neh.	23	44	25	Zech.	2	2	14
Est.	24	83	15	Mal.	4	6	4
Prov.	35	44	32	Book of Psalms			
Cant.	31	39	6	Book I.	31	41	26
Ecc.	27	84	13	II.	37	49	19
Ruth	4	5	6	III.	22	22	13
Lam.	8	11	7	IV.	19	25	12
Job	53	110	37	V.	34	49	25
Psalms	108	186	95	Ben Sira	62	134	62
				Zad. Frag.	17	33	20

view of what has been shown above about the antiquity of the Arameans, it is no longer possible to deny that Moses himself and certainly David and Solomon may have adopted Aramaic words. In fact the inscriptions of Thothmes III. and the autobiographies of his contemporaries show us that long before the time of Moses the kings of Egypt were mingling their prisoners from Syria and Mesopotamia in one common serfdom and subjection. The biography of Amenhotep, officer of Thothmes III. contains probably two Aramaic words, the one, *merain* meaning two lords, and *nahrin* the two rivers.<sup>10</sup> His geographical inscriptions contain many Hebrew words, and the Tel-el-Amarna Letters of his successor have more than a hundred Hebrew common terms. What the literary production of the early Arameans may have been, we do not know. The North Syrian inscriptions of the eighth century prove that they already had developed a literary style, and the copy of the Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspes, and the story of Achikar from the seventh century B.C.

<sup>10</sup> Breasted, *Egypt*, II, 585, 581.

would indicate that they may have had a literature that has passed out of existence. This is what we would have expected at the courts of Samal and Damascus. It is a noteworthy fact that the inscriptions of the kings of Northern Syria contain a number of good Hebrew words.<sup>11</sup> This indicates either that the writers of these inscriptions borrowed words from the Phenicians or Hebrews or that at that early time the Hebrew and Aramaic had not yet separated as completely as afterwards happened. At any rate, it would be a bold man who, with our present knowledge of the relations existing between the various tribes speaking Hebrew and Aramaic in the period from 500 to 2000 B.C., and with our ignorance of what the literary accomplishments of the early Arameans may have been, would deduce that the pre-captivity Hebrew writers could not have used so-called Aramaic words, just as the kings of Samal used Hebrew. Especially might great scholars, like Moses and Solomon, and great poets like David, be expected to indulge in foreign words, in order to express their new ideas?

2. A second way of explaining the presence of Aramaic words in pre-captivity Hebrew literature is by assuming that they are due to post-captivity editors, who for reasons best known to themselves, changed the original words and inserted new ones. It is well for us all to remember that there is not the slightest direct evidence in favor of this kind of a redaction. It is purely an expedient used by those who must admit that there does exist a pre-captivity Hebrew literature and yet are determined to hold on fast to their theory that such works cannot have contained Aramaisms, inasmuch as Aramaisms are to them a sure sign of post-captivity authorship. No one today knows enough or has the means of knowing enough about the peoples, languages and literature from Abraham to Nebuchadnezzar to prove that Moses, David, Solomon and Isaiah may not have used all the so-called Aramaisms that they chose. No one knows enough about the history of the Hebrew people from Nebuchadnezzar to the Mac-

<sup>11</sup> Such as הרג, "to kill," לקח, "to take," and נתן "to give."

cabees to prove that there ever was a scribe bold or wicked enough to change the text of their ancient sacred books in any such way as the critics suggest. We do know that, since the Law was taken to Samaria and since the Greek translation was made, there has been no substantial change in the Hebrew text, and probably not the intentional change of a single letter.

3. The third way of explaining the so-called Aramaisms is by showing that they are not really Aramaisms at all. And this brings us to the consideration of our minor premise.

## II. THE MINOR PREMISE

While it is easy to see that the Old Testament writers may have adopted a number of Aramaic words, just as they did in the case of Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian; yet it is difficult to admit that they may have been induced to use so many as has been suggested by the critics. It seems, therefore, that our first step must be to subject these alleged Aramaisms to a scientific test to see how many of them are really Aramaisms at all. It does not make a word an Aramaism to say that it is one; nor, we admit, does it cause a word not to be an Aramaism just to affirm that it is not. Consequently we shall submit these alleged Aramaisms of the Old Testament documents to the three tests of comparative phonetics, comparative morphology, and comparative *usus loquendi*; or in short to the tests of sound, form, and sense.<sup>12</sup> These tests will show the slight foundation for the Minor Premise.

### I. *The Test of Sound.*

In the Semitic group of languages there are three great families, which may be designated as the Hebrew, the Arabic and the Aramaic. In these great families the radical sounds, ' , *h*, *b*, *m*, *p*, *g*, *k*, *q*, *l*, *n* and *r* are usually written uniformly

---

<sup>12</sup> These tests have already been discussed in my article "Scientific Biblical Criticism" (pp. 422-25, 401-5, 426-30) which was published in this REVIEW in July 1919. For the convenience of the reader this material is here repeated in somewhat different form and with many additions.

with corresponding signs, *i.e.*, Hebrew *b* corresponds both to Arabic *b*, and the Aramaic *b*; and *h* (*ch*), *w*, and *y*, correspond commonly in Hebrew and Aramaic. In preformatives and sufformatives Hebrew *h* is ' in the others; and in sufformatives Hebrew *m* is *n*. In the other eight (or nine, counting  $\text{ׁ}$ ) radical sounds, however, certain regular changes occur, and seem to differentiate the three families. These changes may be illustrated by the following table, which is based upon a collection of all the roots in the Hebrew Old Testament containing one or more of these eight radicals and upon a comparison of their roots in Arabic and Aramaic. There are 727 such roots in Hebrew which have corresponding roots in both Arabic and Aramaic. The numbers to the right show how often each correspondence is found in the roots of the Old Testament Hebrew.<sup>13</sup>

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots	Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Numbers of Roots
<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	100	<i>s</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>s</i>	5
<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>t</i>	1	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	45
<i>d</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>d</i>	10	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	7
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	71	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	36
<i>t</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	2	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	1
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	2	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>z</i>	1
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	42	<i>š</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>š</i>	3
<i>t</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>t</i>	5(?)	<i>š</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>š</i>	10
<i>sh</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>t</i>	18	<i>š</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>š</i>	11
<i>sh</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	4	<i>š</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	1
<i>sh</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>sh</i>	83	<i>š</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	9
<i>sh</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>sh</i>	5 or 6(?)	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>	54
<i>sh</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>s</i>	1	<i>z</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>d</i>	18
<i>š</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>s</i>	29	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	110
<i>š</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	5	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	26
				<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	1 <sup>14</sup>

These three families have obviously, according to the above table, certain laws of consonantal change resembling

<sup>13</sup> For the Hebrew and Aramaic *s* =  $\text{ס}$ , ' =  $\text{י}$ . *š* =  $\text{ש}$ , *sh* =  $\text{שׁ}$ , *š* =  $\text{שׂ}$ . For the Arabic, the English equivalents as given in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* have been used.

<sup>14</sup> The best discussions of the characteristics of the different Semitic families will be found in Wright's *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*; Zimmern, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*; Brokelmann, *Kurzgefasste vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*; and Driver, in an appendix to his work *On the Tenses in Hebrew*.



Grimm's law in the Indo-European languages. Thus, when a Hebrew root has the radical consonant *sh* (*š*) it is generally *ś* in Arabic; and in this case should be *sh* in Aramaic. Sometimes, however, the Hebrew *sh* corresponds to an Arabic *th*; and in this case the Aramaic is *t*. A *t* in Hebrew would be represented by a *t* in Arabic and by a *t* in Aramaic. These three series of changes are all common or regular and no proof of *borrowing* can be derived from the consonants themselves where these series exist. If, however, we have *t* in Hebrew, *th* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Hebrew word would probably be derived from the Aramaic, since the Hebrew form should according to rule have *sh*. Or, if we had *sh* in Hebrew, *t* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Arabic has probably been derived from the Aramaic.

Observing, then, the exceptions to the regular changes, we find that there are four or five roots or words in the Old Testament Hebrew that may have been derived from the Aramaic, to wit, נָדַר *nadar*, עֵתֶר *athar*, טִלֵּל *ṭillel* (Neh. iii. 15), בְּרוֹת *beroth* (Cant. i. 17), and מְדִיבַת *medibath* (Lev. xxvi.26).

*a.* As far as נָדַר, "to vow", is concerned, the fact that its root and its derivative noun for "vow" are found in Isaiah twice, Proverbs three times, Judges four times, Samuel seven times, eleven times in Deuteronomy and sixty-four times elsewhere in the Old Testament Hebrew, shows that if this irregularity indicates an Aramaic origin, it indicates also that Aramaic words were taken over into Hebrew as early as the time of the composition of Proverbs, Isaiah, Deuteronomy and the sources of Judges and Samuel.

*b.* עֵתֶר if it means "to be rich" would undoubtedly be an Aramaism as far as the sounds indicate, the proper Hebrew root being עֵשֶׂר to correspond to the Arabic *athara* and the Aramaic *atar*. Kautzsch, (page 109), rightly says, however, that the citations which imply this sense are "entirely doubtful." The verb is found only in Prov. xxvii. 6 and Ezek. xxxv. 15 and a derivation in Jer. xxxv. 6. In not one of these

verses does any of the ancient versions give the meaning "rich." Nor do the versions agree with each other, nor are they consistent with themselves in the way they render the root, the four great primary versions giving seven different translations of it.

c. טלל which is found only in Neh. iii. 15 is admitted to be to all appearances an Aramaism. Since, according to the critics, it is the Memoirs of Nehemiah, it must have been used by the author as early as the fifth century B.C.

d. ברות for the more usual ברוש may not be an Aramaism, but a peculiarity of the Hebrew dialect of North Israel, where, to quote Dr. Driver (LOT 449), "there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah," and "approximated to the neighboring dialect of Phoenicia." Or, it may be the equivalent of the Babylonian *berutu* "choice timber."

e. As to the כריבת in Lev. xxvi. 16, it is the wont of the critics to assume that it is the Hiphil participle of a verb זיב which occurs in Aramaic, as the equivalent of the Hebrew זיב "to flow." In our opinion, however, it is better to take it to be the Hiphil participle of דאב, "to be weak," and for the following reasons:

(1) זיב is used in Lev. xx. 24, xxii. 4, both passages as well as xxvi. 16 belonging to what the critics call the Law of Holiness. The verb and its derivatives are found also, in P thirty-four or more times, in Deuteronomy six times, in J in Ex. iii. 8, xiii. 5, in E in Ex. iii. 17, and in JE in Ex. xxxiii. 3. Why should the writers of H, or the various *later* redactors have used two methods of spelling?

(2) זיב is used of the flowing of various issues and of milk and honey, but is never employed with *soul*, nor in any but a physical sense except perhaps in Lam. iv. 9; but even there it probably refers to the flowing of the blood of the slain.

(3) None of the Aramaic versions, except possibly the Syriac, render Lev. xxvi. 16 as if they considered the participle to come from a verb "to flow."<sup>15</sup>

(4) דַּחֲבֹן in Deut. xxviii. 65 is rendered by Onkelos and Jonathan by כַּפְחַת, Samaritan דַּחְבֹּת, and Syriac דְּחִיבָא, showing that the Hebrew scholars who made these versions considered the Hebrew word in Deut. xxviii. 65 to have the same root as the word in Lev. xxvi. 16.

(5) דַּחֲבֵי in Jer. xxxi. 12, 25, is rendered in the Targum by יַחֲבֵי "to be vexed" and a derivative in Job. xli. 14 by דַּחֲבֹן.

(6) The Aramaic of the Talmud confuses the two verbs דַּחֲבֵי and דַּחֲבֹן.<sup>16</sup>

(7) The א is frequently omitted in the Hebrew and Aramaic forms and manuscripts.<sup>17</sup>

For these reasons we feel justified in refusing to admit that the מְדִיבַת of Lev. xxvi. 16 can be used as proof that there is an Aramaism in H.

The critics of the radical school are at liberty to make the most out of the presence of one good case in the memoirs of Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 15), which was written at a time when the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa, and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business and correspondence. The wonder is that there should be only one sure instance of an Aramaism in Hebrew, to be proven by the variations of the consonants out of a total of 727 possibilities.

## 2. Test of Form.

In one of the standard introductions to the Old Testament<sup>18</sup> the assertion is made that the use of "the frequent abstract formations in *ûth*, *ôn* and *ân*" in the book of Ecclesiastes is among the proofs "so absolutely convincing and

<sup>15</sup> Onkelos has כַּפְחַת, Jonathan כַּפְיפָא, the Samaritan כַּדְבִיא, the Peshitto מְדִיבַת. In this word which is of infrequent occurrence in Syriac, it is probable that the א has been changed to י. Compare Nöldeke's *Syriac Grammar* §33B.

<sup>16</sup> Dalman, *Aram.-Neu-Heb. Wörterbuch*, p. 84.

<sup>17</sup> Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, 32, 33, 35; Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 7 g; Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuheb. Sprache*, § 14; Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 44-47.

<sup>18</sup> Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O. T.*, p. 449.

irrefutable" of the late date of the work," that as Delitzsch exclaims: 'If the book of Koheleth be as old as Solomon, then there can be no history of the Hebrew language.'" Since Prof. Cornill here cites Delitzsch as his authority, let us rule Cornill out of court as giving hearsay evidence and address ourselves to what Delitzsch says.<sup>19</sup> He was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times today as expert witnesses, as Professor Langley in aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phœnician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered. These documents prove that the old-time alleged histories of the Hebrew language were largely subjective; and that the presence of words with endings *ûth*, *ôn*, and *ân*, is no indication of the age in which a document was written.

*a.* As to the ending *ûth*, we have abundant evidence to show that it was common in every one of the four great Semitic families of languages except Arabic.<sup>20</sup>

For example, in Assyrio-Babylonian, there are three of them in the seven creation tablets,<sup>21</sup> six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi,<sup>22</sup> thirteen in the Code of Ham-

<sup>19</sup> In his *Commentary to Ecclesiastes* (1875).

<sup>20</sup> Wright in his *Arabie Grammar* gives four examples of forms of words with this ending. See Vol. I, p. III.

<sup>21</sup> King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, pp. 252, 254, 262.

<sup>22</sup> King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, 259-296.

murabi,<sup>23</sup> thirteen in Dennefeld's omen tablets,<sup>24</sup> fifteen in the Amarna letters,<sup>25</sup> eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I,<sup>26</sup> two in the incantations published by Thompson,<sup>27</sup> and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor.<sup>28</sup> These inscriptions cover the period from 2000 B.C. to about 625 B.C.

In the pre-Christian Aramaic we have five words with this ending in the Sendschirli inscriptions from north Syria of about the year 725.<sup>29</sup> The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra each have four and the Sachau Papyri four or five.

In the Old Testament we find from 41 to 55 forms.<sup>30</sup> These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except Ruth and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen in Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel-Kings, one in Hosea and one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *ûth*, Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six.<sup>31</sup> Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs and Isaiah, placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>23</sup> R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi*, 147-191.

<sup>24</sup> *Babylonish-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, 220-232.

<sup>25</sup> Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, 1-34.

<sup>26</sup> Lotz, *Die Inschrift Tiglath-pileser's I*, pp. 204-218.

<sup>27</sup> *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, II, 165-179.

<sup>28</sup> *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon*, II, 113-152.

<sup>29</sup> מלכו, ככרו, זכרו, אלהו, אנרו.

<sup>30</sup> Fifty-five, if we count the forms in *ûth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh*.

<sup>31</sup> Of these words the only ones not found in the documents which the critics place before the exile are עכרות (Ezra and Nehemiah), התחכרות (Dan. xi. 23), חלמות (Job vi. 6), אילות (Ps. cx. 3; Ecc. xi. 9, 10), מלאכות (Ps. lxxiii. 28, and Haggai i. 3), and שהרות, מכלות, הוללות in Ecclesiastes.

Proverbs xxx and xxxi, according to Dr. Driver, "doubtless of post-exilic origin,"<sup>33</sup> have no words ending in *ûth*. In the documents claimed as post-exilic by the critics, the only words with this ending, not occurring in exilic or pre-exilic documents, and found in documents alleged by any one to be from the Maccabean times are ילדות (Ps. cx. 3)<sup>34</sup> and התחברו (Dan. xi. 23).

Ecclesiasticus (180 B.C.) has four words in *ûth* not occurring in Biblical Hebrew<sup>35</sup> and the Zadokite Fragments (40 A.D.) have two,<sup>36</sup> Ecclesiastes has six words in *ûth*, of which four do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament.<sup>37</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic. The ending simply denotes *abstract* terms. In the account which Bar Hebraeus gives of the life of Mohammed, he has but one abstract ending in the account of his active career and seven in the account of his doctrine.<sup>38</sup>

So in the Bible the books treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words;<sup>39</sup> whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more

<sup>32</sup> The words ending in *ûth* in Is. xl-lx occur in xli. 12, xlix. 19, l. 1, 3 and liv. 4. All of these passages are put by Duhm and Cheyne in the original work of Deutero-Isaiah (LOT, p. 245).

<sup>33</sup> LOT, p. 406.

<sup>34</sup> Cheyne puts this psalm in Maccabean times. Christ according to Matt. xx. 44, Mark xii. 36 and Luke xx. 42 and Peter according to Acts ii. 34, ascribe it to David in terms as explicit as language can employ. Matt. xxii. 44 introduces the citation from Psalm cx. 1 by saying: How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? Mark xii. 36 says: For David himself said by the Holy Ghost. Luke xx. 42 says: David himself saith in the Book of Psalms. Lastly, in Acts ii. 34 Peter, in his great sermon on the day of Pentecost says: For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. Reader, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? What think ye of the Holy Ghost? Was Peter filled with Him? (Acts ii. 4.)

<sup>35</sup> תכחות and נברות. בהלות, אבלו.

<sup>36</sup> עשרות and יעריות.

<sup>37</sup> שפלות and שהרות, סכלית, הוללות.

<sup>38</sup> See the *Chronicon Syriacum*, Paris, 1890, pp. 97-99.

words with this ending whatever the date.<sup>40</sup> JE, the earliest part of the Pentateuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in *ûth*,<sup>41</sup> whereas P, the latest part, has only two.<sup>42</sup>

b. That Hebrew nouns ending in *n* (*nûn*), *i.e.*, the forms in *ôn* and *ân*, should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *ûth*. For, exclusive of proper names, there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic.<sup>43</sup> Besides in many cases, as in *שִׁלְחָן*, the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age.

Of the one hundred and forty nouns ending in *n* found in Biblical Hebrew, sixty-three of these are met with in the Pentateuch. Of the sixty-three, the Targum of Onkelos renders twelve by the same nouns ending in *n*, and fifty-one by other nouns, most of them not ending in *n*. Onkelos, however, contains sixty-three nouns ending in *n*. It will thus be seen that where the subject-matter is exactly the same, the Hebrew original and the Aramaic version have exactly the same number of words ending in *n*. Judging from this fact, it is left to our readers to determine, if they can, whether the ending *n* is more characteristic of Aramaic than of Hebrew.

Again, in the case of the twelve words out of the sixty-

<sup>39</sup> Josh. two, Jud. one, 1 Sa. two, 2 Sa. two, 1 K. two, 2 K. two, 1 Ch. two, 2 Ch. three, Ezra two, Neh. three, Dan. one.

<sup>40</sup> Thus, Prov. has seven, Is. nine, Jer. eight, Ecc. six, (Ecclus. eleven).

<sup>41</sup> מַלְכּוֹת, אֱלֹכִינוֹת, כְּבָדוֹת, עֲרוֹת.

<sup>42</sup> עֲרוֹת found also in JE. and מַלְכּוֹ in Jos. xiii. 21, 27, 30, 31 a word found also in Hos. I. 4, 1 Sam xv. 28, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, and Jer. xxvi. 1. The opinion of Delitzsch was probably founded on the numerous occurrences of this ending in the version of Onkelos, where there are sixty, or sixty-one nouns with this ending (see Brederick's *Konkordanz*).

<sup>43</sup> See Wright's *Arabic Grammar* § 267; Hommel's *Sûd-Arabische Chrestomathy*, § 56; Dillmann's *Aethiopische Grammatik*, § 122; Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*, p. 398 (for Phœnician); Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 195; and Nöldeke's *Syriac Grammar* §§ 128-132.

three where they agree, is it more likely that the original Hebrew borrowed from, or was influenced by the Aramaic version, or *vice versa*, especially in view of the fact that according to the critics themselves, the version was not written for from 500 to 1000 years after the original?

As might be inferred from the example of the usage of words with the ending *n* in the Pentateuch, it will be found that in the best specimens of Aramaic literature the number of nouns with this ending varies with the kind of literature. Thus in *Joshua the Stylite*, we find that in the first four chapters, where the dedication occurs, there are nineteen words of this kind; whereas in certain chapters of the purely narrative parts, such as xix, lxiv and lxv, no word with this ending is found, and even long chapters like xxi and xxii have but one each, and xxiii and lxvi but three each. In Bar Hebraeus, also, we find but two nouns of this kind in the narrative of the crusaders' first conquest of Jerusalem, one of them a word similar to one found in the Hebrew glosses of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters.<sup>44</sup>

Notwithstanding these general considerations and this common use of nouns with the ending *n* in Hebrew documents, the critics are wont to argue that certain parts of the Old Testament are late because they contain nouns of this kind. The most glaring example of the argument is that the presence of a number of such words in Ecclesiastes is due to Aramaic influence, the assumptions being made that many of the words in Ecclesiastes with this ending are Aramaisms, and that the mere use of Aramaisms indicates a late date. In answer to these assumptions three statements of fact and evidence may be made.

(1) In general, it may be said that the number of different words of this kind in Ecclesiastes is small compared with what we find in Aramaic documents of a like character. For in twelve chapters, or ten pages, of Ecclesiastes, there are but seventeen words all told of this class, whereas in the first

<sup>44</sup> *I.e.* אחרון. Cp. *ahrana* in the letter of Biridiya to the King of Egypt (Winckler, 196, line 10).



four pages of *Joshua the Stylite* there are nineteen. Yet in the ten pages of *Joshua the Stylite* from 63 to 73 inclusive, there are but twelve as against thirty-four in the first ten pages, showing that the number of such words varies in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew in accordance with the subject treated of. It seems clear that the relatively large number of these words in *n* in Ecclesiastes as compared with other Old Testament books is due to the character of the subject-matter rather than to the lateness of the time of composition. Further, it is a noteworthy fact, not mentioned by the critics, that of the 140 words in the Old Testament ending in *n*, only 26 are found in Syriac. Of these 26, six are said in Brockelmann's *Lexicon* to have been derived by the Syrians from the Hebrew, and eight more are found in either Babylonian or Arabic, or both; thus reducing to twelve the number of words which could possibly be derived by the Hebrews from the Syriac. But—

(2) Of the twelve words remaining, seven occur in Ecclesiastes. As to these, the following facts rule out the supposition that the Hebrew could have derived them from the Aramaic:

*a.* Not one of them is found in any Aramaic document written before 200 A.D. The latest date given by any critic for Ecclesiastes is about 100 B.C.

*b.* Since the Aramaic literature in which any of the words occur was written by Jews who had adopted Aramaic, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Jewish writers of Aramaic documents borrowed from their own literary and native language, than that early Hebrew writers borrowed from the Aramaic. At least, there is no evidence that these words existed in early Aramaic.

*c.* The forms of יתרון and חסרון, have an *u* in the first syllable in Aramaic and an *i* in Hebrew.

*d.* שלמון it is true, is found only in Ecclesiastes viii. 4, 8; but its root occurs in Babylonian as well as in Hebrew and Arabic, and the form occurs in Arabic as well as Syriac.

*e.* קנין is found in Onkelos and Syriac; but in Hebrew

it occurs in Prov. iv. 7 in a passage which the critics put among the earliest parts of the Old Testament. Besides, to call it late in the Hebrew language, we would have to prove that Gen. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 23, xxxvi. 6, Lev. xxii. 11, Jos. xiv. 4 and Ezek. xxxviii. 12, 13, where it occurs also, are late.

f. רעיון is found only in Eccl. i. 17, ii. 22, iv. 16, but it is singular that, if it meant the same here as in Aramaic, the Syriac version should render it by צבין in ii. 22 and by טירפא in i. 17 and iv. 16 and the Aramaic Targum in all three cases by תביוהת.

The corresponding word in Syriac is rendered by Brockelmann by *cogitatio*, *fictio*, *consilium* and *voluntas*; in Dalman by *Gesinnung*, *Gedanke*. Must the writer of Ecclesiastes have borrowed the Aramaic form and have given it a different meaning? Why not rather suppose that he found the word already in Hebrew, formed regularly from the good old Hebrew root רעה, as פדיון from פדה and נאיון from נאה?

g. Finally כשרון is the worst specimen of evidence of all. To be sure, it happens that in the Hebrew of the Old Testament it is used in Ecclesiastes alone; but how it can be said to have been derived by the writer from the Aramaic passes belief when we observe that the word has not been found in any Aramaic document of any dialect or time.

### 3. *The Test of Sense.*

Lastly, when we leave the region of sounds and forms and enter that of sense and meaning, we find that here also the critics make assertions with regard to the derivation and borrowing of words which are demonstrably contrary to the facts. In cases such as טלל (*tillal*, Neh. iii. 15), it is easy to show the probability that the word is an Aramaism, because the proper letter for the first radical should have been ש, not ט, if the word had the probable original Hebrew form of writing and sound. In cases such as התהבחות (Dan. xi. 23), it is easy to suppose an Aramaism, because the form is common in Aramaic and is met with but once besides in the Old Testament Hebrew. But when we come to words which have no indication (*indicia*) either in sound or form

that they are of Aramaic origin, we often find the critics simply asserting as a fact that a word is an Aramaism without producing any proofs whatever to support the assertion.

Thus DeWette-Schrader<sup>45</sup> speak of **בטל**, **פֶּשֶׁר** and **כתל**, as Aramaic, and a proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes and of the Song of Songs. They give no proof except the fact that the words are found in Aramaic. The evidence from this fact is nullified by the discovery that all four words are found in Babylonian, and all but the last one, in Arabic with exactly the same sound, form, and meaning which are characteristic of the Hebrew.

Again, Dr. Driver in LOT mentions among the words in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs "having usually affinities with the Aramaic,"<sup>46</sup> **בטל**, **פֶּשֶׁר**, **יִצָא**, **שֵׁשׁ**, **תִּקֵּן**, **שֵׁשׁ**, **שְׁלֵהֲבַת**. Every one of these words is found with appropriate sound, form and meaning, in the Babylonian language and in documents long antedating the time of the captivity. In fact, **אמן** (master-workman) and **שְׁלֵהֲבַת** are so distinctively Babylonian in form and sense that there can be no doubt that Aramaic as well as Hebrew derived them from the Babylonian.

It is evident, then, that a word in one language may have the same form and sound as in another and not have the same meaning. In such a case, the direct evidence is against the one's being derived from the other. Where, however, sound, form and meaning are the same in any two languages, there is a *prima facie* ground for supposing that a given word may have been borrowed by one language from the other. In the case of the Semitic languages the *prima facie* evidence is weakened in most cases by the fact that the sounds, (with the regular changes shown above, under I), and forms are generally the same in all the languages. In view of this fact, if the alleged Aramaisms in the Hebrew documents, are limited to words which have the same sound, form and sense, the whole matter would resolve itself into the question

<sup>45</sup> *Einleitung*, pp. 543, 561.

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 440, 474.

as to whether these words were Aramaisms in Hebrew or Hebraisms in Aramaic, or whether both of the languages had inherited the words from a time when they were one language, or finally, whether they had developed the words independently from the same common roots. It must not be forgotten that most of the Aramaic documents were written by people who were of the Jewish race and religion and whose literature was almost entirely in Hebrew. This leads us to expect that these Aramaic documents will be largely filled with Hebraisms, and such we find to be the case. The Egypto-Aramaic, Daniel, Ezra, Palestinian Syriac, the Targums of the Samaritans, of Onkelos, Jonathan and all the rest, have many Hebraisms. About six hundred of these borrowed words that are not found in Syriac are found in Dalman's dictionary of the new Aramaic.<sup>47</sup> In regard to such words it should be presumed that they were borrowed by the Hebrew writers and translators of Aramaic documents from the original Hebrew. It is astonishing that the critics of the Old Testament should repeatedly cite as Aramaic words in the Old Testament Hebrew words which are not found in any Aramaic dialect or in any Aramaic document that was not written by Jews. Especially surprising is this procedure when we consider that most of the Aramaic documents containing these words were written hundreds of years and some even a thousand years, after the Hebrew document, which is alleged to have borrowed them.

When we come to close investigation of the principles and methods of Dr. Kautzsch's examination of the alleged Aramaisms of the Old Testament, we would be much pleased with the thoroughness of his discussion, provided we were ready to admit that in such an examination the Aramaic and Hebrew dictionaries alone were to be considered. We are disappointed to find however that he ignores all the testi-

---

<sup>47</sup> This statement is based upon the following consideration. I compared all the words in the dictionary of the Hebrew of the Old Testament with the New Aramaic dictionary, and every root found in both but not found in Syriac, or some other of the relatively pure Aramaic dialects, was accounted to be a Hebraism.

mony of both the Old Testament and the extra-Biblical sources as to the early relations existing between the Hebrews and the Aramaic-speaking peoples. He seems to write entirely as if there was no possibility of the Hebrew writers borrowing Aramaic words before the time of Isaiah. This disappointment is turned into amazement, when we find that in his introduction he never so much as mentions the Assyrio-Babylonian as a possible source of many of the so-called Aramaisms; and that in his discussions he rarely mentions the Babylonian as having any bearing upon the subject. Furthermore, he depreciates the importance of the Arabic branch of the Semitic family of languages, never so much as alluding to the Sabean or Ethiopic. Before entering upon the consideration of Prof. Kautzsch's collection of alleged Aramaisms, it is well, therefore, to recall to our readers' recollection that there are four great branches of the Semitic family of languages. According to location, they may be called the Northern, the Eastern, the Southern and the Western. According to nationality, the first may be called Aramaic, the second the Babylonian, the third the Arabic, and the fourth the Hebrew.<sup>48</sup> As to age of literary documents, the Babylonian certainly comes first, going back before the time of Abraham. The Hebrew of the Old Testament, in so far as it can be treated as original and the Phœnician come second; Sabean, a branch of the Arabic, third; and the Aramaic fourth. In the study of the vocabularies of these languages and dialects I have made use of the best

<sup>48</sup> The ancient Aramaic has ten or twelve dialects: (1) The Zenjirli or Northern Syrian = Z. (2) That of Daniel = D. (3) The Egypto-Aramaic = Ea. (4) That of Ezra = E. (5) The Nabatean = Na. (6) The Palmyrene = Pal. (7) The Palestinian Syriac = Ps. (8) The Syriac of Edessa = S. (9) The Aramaic of the Targum of Onkelos = O. (10) The Aramaic of the Samaritan Targum = Sa. (11) The Aramaic of the Talmud and of the other Targums (which may be subdivided). (12) The Aramaic of the Mandeans = M. For short (9) (10) and (11) are called New Aramaic and designated as NA. The Babylonian embraces the Assyrian as well as the dialect of Babylon. Under Arabic are the Sabean and Ethiopic. Under Hebrew are the New Hebrew = NH, Ben Sira = BS, the Zadokite Fragments = ZK, Phœnician and Punic = Ph and Pu, the Moabite = Mo, and the Old Testament Hebrew = H.

available general dictionaries and concordances and of many special ones.<sup>49</sup> For every one of Kautzsch's alleged Aramaisms, I have searched the evidence in every one of the dictionaries and concordances. I have refrained almost entirely from conjectures, and the discussions and reasons for my conclusions will be given only in cases where there seemed to me to be reason for some doubt or some necessary explanation.

Finally, let me present clearly in a few words what I propose to do. We have before us in the Old Testament a number of Hebrew documents of which many claim to have been written at a certain time. Because of the presence in some of these Hebrew documents of alleged Aramaisms, the charge is made that these documents are not authentic. I am now going to present evidence to show that most of these alleged Aramaisms cannot be shown to be words borrowed from the Aramaic and that, hence, the charge falls.

Professor Kautzsch gives 360 words of which he considers 153 to be Aramaisms, and 207 which he thinks probably or possibly Aramaisms (mögliche, wenn nicht wahrscheinlicherweise Aramäismen).

The following lists of these 360 words classified according to the languages and dialects in which they actually occur, will be the best answer to Professor Kautzsch's conclusions.

#### I. WORDS IN HEBREW ALONE

1. My investigation shows that 51 of the 360 words occur in no other language or dialect except the Old Testament Hebrew. While the root of some of these is found in one or more of the other Semitic languages or dialects, not one of them is found in root, form and meaning and hence none of these can have been borrowed.

אהוה	<i>declaration</i>	מדהה	<i>wound</i>	יחב	<i>burden</i>
איל	<i>help</i>	מדחפה	<i>thrust</i>	יעה	<i>weariness</i>
אילות	<i>help</i>	דיכ	<i>circumcalation</i>	כאה	<i>be despondent</i>
בכרת	<i>inquisition</i>	דמיון	<i>likeness</i>	כאה	<i>despondent</i>
נאל	<i>to pollute</i>	חידות	<i>intrigues</i>	מכמן	<i>treasure</i>
גדופה	<i>taunt</i>	חניך	<i>trained</i>	התכנס	<i>to wrap self</i>
גהה	<i>to heal</i>	מטוה	<i>web</i>	מכסה	<i>number</i>
גהה	<i>healing</i>	הטריף	<i>to feed</i>	כשרון	<i>success</i>
דחי	<i>falling</i>	יאב	<i>to long for</i>	כרסם	<i>to devour</i>

<sup>49</sup> Compare the list given at the end of this article.

כתבת	mark	קבל	battering ram	משכית	image
מאם	to melt	ספר	numbering	השליק	to kindle
מועקה	affliction	רנשה	tumult	שאט	contempt
מחי	smash	רהט	curl	שלטת	imperious
מלט	mortar	רע	thought	השמעות	healing
מונים	str'g'd instrum.	מרצפת	pavement	שרירות	stubbornness
נאק	to lament	שגה	to grow	שרירים	muscles
סכלות	foolishness	שכיה	sight	תך	oppression

2. Besides these there are 17 words occurring in Semitic documents only in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in that of the Talmud. By no possibility, therefore, can it be shown that any of these words were derived from the Aramaic.

אזכרה	memorial	מרפס	trodden	עדה	to be over
זזה	breast	משוּפָּף	lintel	ערוגה	bed
מירה	castle	נאכה	lamentation	ערבה	heap
טרף	blade	נתר	to free	רבוה	myriad
מדרגה	precipice	עבוט	pledge	רהיט	rafter
מקלט	asylum			תא	chamber

## II. WORDS IN HEBREW AND BABYLONIAN ALONE

### 1. Hebrew and Babylonian alone. [Eight]

הידה	riddle	כילפות	axe	ככי	to endanger
הף	clean	משרה	rule	סחרה	shield
טמה	to be nailed			עקה	oppression

### 2. Hebrew, Babylonian, and New Hebrew (i.e., the Hebrew of the Talmud). [Two]

נלש	to wallow	ש	rel. particle
-----	-----------	---	---------------

## III. WORDS IN HEBREW AND ARABIC (OR ETHIOPIC) ALONE

### 1. Hebrew and Arabic alone. [Ten]

גוה	to free	דור	dwelling	ערב	to hinder
דאב	to languish	מרגמה	stone-heap	שבר	to hope
דנב	to creep	נוט	to be moved	תוה	to provoke
		עמם	be darkened		

### 2. Hebrew and Ethiopic alone. [One]

מהיר	skillful
------	----------

## IV. WORDS IN HEBREW AND ONE ARAMAIC DIALECT ALONE

### 1. Hebrew and New Aramaic; i.e., the Aramaic of the Targums, Talmud, and Midrash. [Eleven]

אכף	blow	חרוז	string of pear	עבט	to pledge
דאכה	distress	מגדן	precious gift	רעות	thought
דאבון	fainting	כרב	obstreperous	שרד	wrought
זהר	to shine			השלה	to lead astray

### 2. Hebrew and Egypto-Aramaic. [One]

עשתות	thought
-------	---------

3. Hebrew and Syriac. [Two]

גומין <i>pit</i>	עבד <i>work</i>
------------------	-----------------

4. Hebrew, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. [Twenty]

אבדן <i>ruin</i>	כבר <i>long ago</i>	ענן <i>to shut up</i>
בור <i>to scatter</i>	לשכה <i>cell</i>	פסג <i>to consider</i>
בהרת <i>bright spot</i>	מכב <i>to pine away</i>	פתר <i>to interpret</i>
בכנ <i>therefore</i>	מכנס <i>trousers</i>	פתרון <i>interpretation</i>
בור <i>to select</i>	מן <i>manna</i>	מהה <i>to be blunted</i>
זיו <i>vermin</i>	מרד <i>rebellion</i>	שנה <i>to look</i>
הנכה <i>dedication</i>		תאב <i>to desire</i>

5. Hebrew and Daniel. [One]

רוזם *praise*

V. WORDS IN HEBREW AND TWO OR MORE ARAMAIC DIALECTS

1. Hebrew, Ezra, and Egypto-Aramaic. [One]

להן *therefore*

2. Hebrew, New Aramaic, and Egypto-Aramaic. [One]

עשתון *thought*

3. Hebrew, Palestinian Syriac, New Aramaic, and Palmyrene. [One]

היך *how?*

4. Hebrew, Daniel, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac. [One]

טלל *to shade*

5. Hebrew, Daniel, Ezra, and New Aramaic. [One]

זהר *brightness*

6. Hebrew, Daniel, Ezra, New Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaean and Palestinian Syriac. [Two]

תקיף <i>strong</i>	שליט <i>ruler</i>
--------------------	-------------------

7. Hebrew, New Aramaic, and Syriac. [Two]

אנקה <i>groaning</i>	מסה <i>measure</i>
----------------------	--------------------

8. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, and Palestinian Syriac. [Two]

קשט <i>truth</i>	שפק <i>to suffice</i>
------------------	-----------------------

9. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac and Mandaean. [One]

חסד *disgrace*

10. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. [Four]

אלף <i>to learn</i>	כזק <i>to mock</i>
---------------------	--------------------

כפן <i>hunger</i>	רעיון <i>desire</i>
-------------------	---------------------

11. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac, Mandaean, Daniel, Ezra, and Palmyrene. [Two]

נחת <i>to go down</i>	סלק <i>to go up</i>
-----------------------	---------------------

12. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Ezra, Egypto-Aramaic, Palestinian Syriac, Palmyrene and Mandaean. [One]

שנא *to be many*

13. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. [One]

שבר *to hope*



14. Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Ezra, North Syriac, Nabatean and Palmyrene. [One]

הן *if*

15. Hebrew, Daniel, and New Aramaic. [Two]  
 בהל *to hasten*      מעבד *work*

VI. WORDS IN HEBREW, NEW HEBREW, NEW ARAMAIC, AND SYRIAC.  
 [Seventeen]

אלו <i>if</i>	טעו <i>to load</i>	סד <i>stocks</i>
אנתה <i>sigh</i>	טרף <i>blade</i>	סמדר <i>bloom</i>
רות <i>cypress</i>	מגד <i>precious gift</i>	עניו <i>business</i>
הוה <i>to show</i>	משטח <i>spreading place</i>	פרח <i>to fly</i>
חסד <i>to disgrace</i>	נקבה <i>female</i>	כנין <i>wealth</i>
טוש <i>to fly</i>		שבר <i>hope</i>

VII. WORDS IN HEBREW, BABYLONIAN, AND OTHER LANGUAGES  
 AND DIALECTS

1. Hebrew, Babylonian, and Arabic. [One]  
 אגרה *pay*
2. Hebrew, Babylonian, Sabean, and Palestinian Syriac. [One]  
 צור *image*
3. Hebrew, Babylonian, Sabean, and New Aramaic. [Seven]  
 ביתן *palace*      טעם *command*      כפר *to cover with*  
 דפי *spot*      מפח *to spread*      כרבל *to clothe*  
 כבש *stool*
4. Hebrew, Babylonian, New Aramaic, and Syriac. [Ten]  
 איכה *where?*      חד *one*      סבל *foolish*  
 אכף *to oppress*      הדה *to rejoice*      סלה *to despise*  
 אלה *to lament*      חטר *rod*      עפי *foliage*  
 כפר *pitch*
5. Hebrew, Babylonian, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. [Fifteen]  
 אנה *wing*      כפור *basin*      פרשה *exact sum*  
 בדק *breach*      כתל *wall*      צוין *to look*  
 בזר *to scatter*      מוך *to be poor*      רדה *to rule*  
 ניר *chalk*      נזק *loss*      רצפה *pavement*  
 טפל *to cover*      סכן *to endanger*      שרב *heat*
6. Hebrew, Babylonian, Daniel and Palestinian Syriac. [One]  
 כנת *companions*
7. Hebrew, Babylonian and Syriac. [One]  
 בדק *to repair*
8. Hebrew, Babylonian, New Hebrew, and Syriac. [Three]  
 מסכן *poor*      מסכנות *poverty*      שתיל *plant*

9. Hebrew, Babylonian, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Nineteen]
- |                          |                        |                            |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| אגם <i>pool</i>          | טנף <i>to be dirty</i> | מנה <i>to set</i>          |
| אמץ <i>workman</i>       | כפף <i>to bend</i>     | כותה <i>to stretch out</i> |
| בטל <i>to cease</i>      | כשר <i>to be right</i> | נכס <i>treasure</i>        |
| כרר <i>to look after</i> | כתם <i>to cover</i>    | פחה <i>to carry away</i>   |
| התה <i>to thrust</i>     | מהא <i>to strike</i>   | רוב <i>war</i>             |
| הרזה <i>joy</i>          | מהוז <i>haven</i>      | שתק <i>to be silent</i>    |
|                          | מלץ <i>to counsel</i>  |                            |
10. Same as 9 plus Daniel. [Two]
- |                   |                 |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| אב <i>verdure</i> | אכר <i>bond</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------|
11. Hebrew, Babylonian, New Aramaic, Arabic, and Syriac. [Four]
- |                    |                      |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| בעה <i>to ask</i>  | כטל <i>slaughter</i> |
| קטל <i>to kill</i> | רחם <i>to love</i>   |
12. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Ethiopic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac, Daniel and Mandaean. [One]
- שלט *to rule*
- 13a. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Ten]
- |                    |                      |                           |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| אנה <i>to sigh</i> | מכס <i>tribute</i>   | שור <i>street</i>         |
| יקר <i>honor</i>   | פרש <i>to decide</i> | שלט <i>to rule</i>        |
| מוט <i>to slip</i> | רצה <i>to pave</i>   | תקן <i>to be straight</i> |
|                    | שכיב <i>flame</i>    |                           |
- 13b. Same as 13a plus Daniel. [One]
- כרש *belly*
- 13c. Same as 13a plus Phœnician. [One]
- מלה *sailor*
- 13d. Same as 13a plus Ethiopic. [Two]
- |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| כחל <i>to paint</i> | שרה <i>to loose</i> |
|---------------------|---------------------|
- 13e. Same as 13a plus Sabeian. [One]
- חריים *free men*
14. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Nerab, Egypto-Aramaic, Nabatean, New Hebrew, and Mandaean. [One]
- נכה *to pluck out*
15. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Palestinian Syriac, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Mandaean. [One]
- כף *rock*
16. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, and Ethiopic. [One]
- טוה *to spin*
17. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Ethiopic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, and Mandaean. [One]
- ענק *necklace*
18. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Aramaic, and Palestinian Syriac. [One]
- פשר *to interpret*

19. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac. [Two]  
 יִשָּׁט *to stretch out*      כָּבַל *fetter*
20. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, and Palestinian Syriac. [One]  
 כָּבַשׁ *to subdue*
21. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Phenician, Daniel, New Aramaic and Syriac. [One]  
 רֵב *chief*
22. Hebrew, Babylonian, Phenician, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac and Palestinian. [One]  
 בּוּיָן *byssus*
23. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Palestinian Syriac, Syriac. [One]  
 כוּל *to measure*
24. Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Ezra, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. [One]  
 זָקַף *to erect*

## VIII. WORDS IN HEBREW, ARABIC, AND OTHER LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS

(For Hebrew with Arabic, Sabeian, or Ethiopic alone, See III above, and in connection with Hebrew and Babylonian, see VII: 1, 2, 11-24).

1. Hebrew, Arabic, and New Aramaic. [One]  
 רִגְמָה *stone heap*
2. Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac. [Two]  
 גִּבְנָן *top*      רָסַס *to sprinkle*
3. Hebrew, Arabic, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Seven]  
 בָּחַר *to prove*      פָּצַא *to deliver*      רָסַם *drop*  
 עָתַק *to be old*      רָבַע *lying down*      שָׁהַד *to witness*  
 רָגַשׁ *tumult*
4. Hebrew, Arabic, New Aramaic and New Hebrew. [Eleven]  
 כָּהִיר *shining*      סָמַל *to stone*      רָבַע *to lie with*  
 דָּחַף *to hasten*      עָוָה *to sin*      שָׁכִין *knife*  
 טָפַשׁ *to be stupid*      צָרַךְ *need*      שֵׁרֶף *beam*  
 לָעַב *to mock*                שִׁתַּל *to plant*
5. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Thirteen]  
 בָּדָא *to begin*      כָּסַה *to cut down*      צוּרָה *form*  
 הוֹהִיר *to stone*      לָעַז *talk haltingly*      צוּרָם *to stone*  
 זוּיַת *corner*      מִזְג *mixed drink*      רָפַס *to trample*  
 טָעָה *to err*      סָתָו *winter*      שָׁטָה *to turn aside*  
 פָּשַׁח *to pull in pieces*
6. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew and Syriac. [One]  
 פָּנִי *unripe fig*

7. Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Two]  
 נדה *to blaspheme*      חנט *to embalm*
8. Hebrew, New Hebrew and Ethiopic. [Two]  
 שרץ *to swarm*      שרץ *reptile*
9. Hebrew, Arabic, Mandaean, and Daniel. [One]  
 שלטון *rule*
10. Hebrew, Arabic, Daniel, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac and Palestinian Syriac. [Two]  
 אנס *to oppress*      פרק *to deliver*
11. Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac. [One]  
 אנק *to groan*
12. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. [One]  
 גדוף *blasphemy*
13. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Daniel. [One]  
 זמן *time*
14. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Daniel and Ezra. [One]  
 מדינה *province*
15. Hebrew, Sabeian, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. [One]  
 כסר *to deliver*
16. Hebrew, Arabic, Daniel, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Two]  
 סנר *to worship*      רגש *to rage*
17. Hebrew, Sabeian, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. [One]  
 מרד *rebellion*
18. Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac and Daniel. [Three]  
 ערוד *wild ass*      עתיק *old*      רשם *to write*
19. Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic, New Hebrew, Daniel, New Aramaic and Syriac. [One]  
 שבה *to praise*
20. Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel and Ezra. [One]  
 כתב *writing*

## IX. HEBREW AND VARIOUS OTHER LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS

## I. Hebrew and Phenician.

- (1) Hebrew, Phenician, Palestinian Syriac, New Aramaic and Mandaean. [One]  
 יאה *it becomes*
- (2) Hebrew, Phenician, Palestinian Syriac, New Aramaic, Mandaean, Daniel, Ezra, Syriac, North Syriac, Egypto-Aramaic, Nabatean, and Palmyrene. [One]  
 בר *son*

- (3) Hebrew, New Hebrew, Phenician and Syriac. [One]  
כָּסָא *full moon*
- (4) Hebrew, New Hebrew, Phenician, Syriac and New Aramaic.  
[One]  
סְפִינָה *ship*
- (5) Hebrew, New Hebrew, Phenician, Arabic, Ethiopic and New  
Aramaic. [One]  
תְּנוּת *vault*
- (6) Hebrew, New Hebrew, Phenician, Ethiopic and New Aramaic.  
[One]  
כְּנָה *to nickname*
- (7) Hebrew, Daniel, Ezra, Egypto-Aramaic, North Syriac, Phenician,  
Palestinian Syriac, Nabatean, Palmyrene, Mandaean, Arabic, Sa-  
bean and Ethiopic. [One]  
אָתָה *to come*
- (8) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac,  
Mandaean and Arabic. [One]  
בְּרָא *to create*
- (9) Hebrew, Phenician, Daniel, Ezra, Egypto-Aramaic, Palestinian  
Syriac, Syriac, New Aramaic, Nabatean and Palmyrene. [One]  
שְׁנִיָּא *many*
- (10) Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, and Phenician.  
[One]  
רִקַּע *to beat*
2. Hebrew, New Hebrew and Other Languages.
- (1) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Egypto-  
Aramaic, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. [One]  
מִלַּל *to speak*
- (2) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Egypto-  
Aramaic, Palestinian-Syriac, Mandaean and North Syriac. [One]  
מִלָּה *word*
- (3) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Daniel, Sinaitic, Pal-  
estinian-Syriac, Palmyrene and Mandaean. [One]  
דְּמָה *to be like*
- (4) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian-Syriac  
and Mandaean. [One]  
דְּמוּת *likeness*
- (5) Hebrew, Daniel, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. [Three]  
דוּר *to dwell*      סוּף *to end*      סוּף *end*
- (6) Hebrew, Daniel, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Nabatean,  
Palmyrene and Mandaean. [One]  
תְּקִיף *strength*

- (7) Hebrew, Ezra, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac, and Mandaean. [One]

בנין *building*

3. Hebrew and Egyptian.

- (1) Hebrew and Egyptian. [One]

כין *kind*

- (2) Hebrew, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac and Egyptian. [One]

זרת *span*

X. WORDS WHOSE CLASSIFICATION DEPENDS ON POINTING AND OTHER DOUBTFUL INDICATIONS. [Fourteen]

נת <i>side</i>	למה <i>that not</i>	סוג <i>to hedge</i>
הלף <i>for</i>	מגר <i>to give over</i>	עתר <i>to be rich</i>
כפן <i>to long after</i>	מדע <i>knowledge</i>	השליק <i>to kindle</i>
בושרה <i>welfare</i>	נפק <i>to go out</i>	שנא <i>to be hateful</i>
כתר <i>to wait</i>		כאחד <i>together</i>

CONCLUSION

Summing up the evidence of the above lists we find that seventy-six of these words occur in Hebrew and New Hebrew alone. Ninety-six roots and meanings are found in Babylonian as well as Hebrew and one hundred and forty-six in Arabic as well as Hebrew. Moreover, while two hundred and forty-three words occur in Hebrew and one or more of the Aramaic dialects, only eighty-one are found in Hebrew and one or more Aramaic dialects *alone*. Of these eighty-one, eleven are found only in Hebrew and New Aramaic and twenty in Hebrew, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. Since these thirty-one words are used only by Jews who were translating and commenting on the Hebrew Scriptures from 300 to 1000 years at least after those Scriptures were written, it is more reasonable to suppose that the later Jews borrowed the Hebrew words from the earlier documents than that the earlier writers borrowed Aramaic words from documents written hundreds or thousands of years after they were dead.

We conclude, therefore, that of all the three hundred and sixty words alleged to be Aramaisms, only fifty have any apparent ground for being considered as such. Of these fifty, six occur only in Job, a book whose scene is laid in the Aramaic land of Uz, and ten only in Ezekiel, Daniel, Chron-

icles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. Eleven more are found in the works of David and Solomon. The roots of seven are found in works admitted by all to be pre-exilic. The verb **שפך** occurs only in Kings; **סוף** four times in the pre-exilic works of Amos, Zephaniah and Jeremiah to once in an indisputably post-exilic document; and **בהל** "to hasten" occurs twice in the early parts of Proverbs and once in Zephaniah. The unpointed **משטה** is a good Hebrew word, and it is not fair to call it an Aramaism on the ground of pointings that were inserted by Aramaic speaking Jews about A.D. 500. It is absurd to allow that the early Hebrews had **זכר**, the word for male, and to deny that they had **נקבה**, the corresponding word for female and the only one found in Hebrew. **טען** "to load" is found only in the Elohist document (Gen. xlv. 17) which according to the radical critics was written about 800 B.C. **סמה** occurs only in Deut. xvi. 10. To escape having an Aramaism in Deuteronomy, the critics change the text and destroy the Aramaism. The use of **אלף** in the sense of "learn" and "teach" must have arisen after the alphabet was formed and taught. It was probably borrowed from Phœnician or Aramaic after the invention of the alphabet. In the Old Testament it occurs only in Prov. xxii. 25 and three times in Job. In order to make **הן** into an Aramaism, the critics simply change the text, or assume an interpolation, wherever it occurs in an early document. **אלו** is found only once in Esther and once in Ecclesiastes, a work apparently attributed to Solomon. The verb **נחת** which in the sense "to go down," appears to be a genuine Aramaic word is in almost every case by a change of pointing assigned by the ancient versions to **התת**, **גוה**, or **גוה**. In no one of the twelve places where this root possibly occurs is there agreement in the ancient versions as to its meaning; and in only five cases out of a possible forty-eight does any one of the four primary versions take the root in the sense of "go down." The only remaining word is **דור** "to dwell," occurring in the Hebrew Bible in this sense only in Ps. lxxxiv. 11, a psalm of the sons of Korah. The root occurs

in some form or another in Babylonian, Arabic and Hebrew. When this psalm was written the Bible does not state. If after the Captivity, the word may have been borrowed easily from the Aramaic. According to sound, form and sense, however, it may just as well have been primitive Semitic; and in accord with the historic relations existing between the Hebrews and Arameans in the time of David, it may have been borrowed by the Hebrew in his time.

The most noteworthy fact brought out by the evidence given above is that the documents relating to, or purporting to come from, men living in the time when the history says that the Hebrews and the Arameans were in the closest contact, are the documents that contain nearly all of these alleged Aramaisms. In the time of Jacob and Laban we have **יִנְר** and **שֶׁהֲדוֹתָא** (Gen. xxxi. 47). From the times of David and Solomon, who probably reigned over more Arameans than Hebrews, we have, according to the documents themselves, the psalms attributed to David and Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and the larger part of the work of Proverbs. In the time after the destruction of Jerusalem, we have Ezekiel, Daniel, and all the post-captivity literature. In Job, a book describing a citizen of the Aramaic land of Uz, we have a comparatively large number of words which may be called Aramaisms. The facts and the evidence derived from history and philology thus unite in supporting the authenticity and genuineness of the Old Testament documents.

In a future article, I shall discuss the bearing of these facts upon the authorship of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and other parts of the Old Testament literature. I shall endeavor to show that the premises of the radical criticism, so far as they rest upon Aramaisms, are false; and that the conclusions derived from these premises fall with them. In the meantime, let me exhort the critics of the literature of the Old Testament to make a fresh examination of this whole question of Aramaisms in the light of present day knowledge of comparative history and philology. And, finally, let me exhort my Christian readers to continue to believe in the ac-



curacy of these records, which the Church in all ages and the Apostles and our Lord Himself considered to be true. The sciences of comparative palaeography, phonetics, philology, history, literature, and religion, corroborate the Old Testament, show that Christ and the Apostles were right in believing it, and give us a firm foundation for our faith.

*Princeton.*

R. DICK WILSON.

NOTE: \*These dictionaries naturally divide themselves into four great groups, viz., the Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Babylonian.

1. As to the Hebrew, Prof. Kautzsch defines every word in the sense in which he considers it to be an Aramaism. My first step, therefore, was to take the concordance to the Hebrew Old Testament and make out lists of all the places in which the words are alleged to be used, or might possibly be used in the sense suggested by Prof. Kautzsch. Then I proceeded to find out how the ancient versions, especially those in the Aramaic dialects, including Syriac and Samaritan, had rendered these words.

Next, I looked up Dalman's dictionary of the Hebrew of the Talmud and Midrash, called New Hebrew, to see whether these words are found there, and in what sense. Also, I found out whether and how often they occurred in the Hebrew of Ben Sira and the Zadokite Fragments, having employed for this purpose concordances of each book, which I made for myself just for such emergencies.

Lastly I consulted the Phœnician, Punic, Hebrew and Moabitic inscriptions, especially in Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik* and *Ephemeris*.

2. In Aramaic I consulted these same works of Lidzbarski's for the North Syrian, Egypto-Aramaic, Nabatean and Palmyrene dialects, referring also to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, to Sachau's *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka*, Cowley's *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, and Pogon's *Inscriptions Sémitiques*.

For the Palestinian Syriac, I made use of the *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* by Frederick Schulthess; for Mandaean, of the *Lexidion Codicis Nasaraei* by Norberg; for Syriac, of the *Lexicon Syriacum* by Brockelmann, with reference also at times to Payne Smyth's *Thesaurus*. For the Targum to the Samaritan Pentateuch, I made use of a concordance from Hebrew to Aramaic and from Aramaic to Hebrew, prepared by students under my direction. For the Aramaic of the Targum and Talmud and Midrash, I referred to Dalman's dictionary and to Brederek's concordance to Onkelos. And lastly, for the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra I prepared complete concordances for the purpose.

3. In Sabeen, I used the Chrestomathy of Prof. Hommel of Munich and the word-registers of Lidzbarski in his *Ephemeris*. For Ethiopic, the great *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicæ* of Dillmann was thoroughly searched. For Arabic, Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, the *Vocabulaire Arabe-Français* of the Beirut Catholic Press, and Cherbonneau's *Dic-*

*tionnaire Arabe-Français* were used for every word; with references to Freytag's *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* in the unabridged edition and to the *Kitab Muhit-il-Muhiti*, a Beirut Arabic Dictionary in three volumes.

4. For the Babylonian and Assyrian, I used Muss-Arnolt's *Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* as the foundation, with references to Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*. I made also a thorough study of Meissner's *Supplement* and of the vocabularies in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina*, Winckler's and Knudtson's *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, Streck's *Assurbanipal*, Schorr's *Urkunden des Alt-babylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts*, Franck's *Studien zur Babylonischen Religion*, Thureau-Dangin's *Königsinschriften*, Zehnpfund-Landon's *Die Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften*, Harper's *The Code of Hammurabi*, King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi* and *The Seven Tablets of Creation*. At times I derived good evidence from Brünnow's great work: *A Classified List of All Simple and Compound Cuneiform Ideographs*.