Contributions and Comments.

On 'Belial.'

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR CHEYNE.

IN a communication to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. ix. 1897, p. 91 f.), Professor Cheyne defends afresh his theory of the Assyro-Babylonian origin and the primary and proper meaning of the Hebrew בְּלִיַּיָּאֵל, against the conclusions of Graf v. Baudissin stated in the same periodical the previous month (pp. 40 ff.; cf. also Herzog's *RE*³, art. 'Belial'). Professor Cheyne refers at the same time to my communications to Professor v. Baudissin, quoted by the latter in his article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 41). He remarks that I have not shown the least inclination to deny that the Babylono-Assyrian goddess *Belili*, with whose name Professor Cheyne connects the Heb. *bēliyyā'al*, was originally an earth goddess, that she became thoroughly identified with the underworld, and that she could therefore be taken as a representative of it. As to these three assertions, or—Professor Cheyne's way of expressing himself leaves one in some doubt of his meaning—only the last of them, I have to reply that we, at all events I, have no ground for denying these three things (or one of them), but that we have just as little reason to affirm them. We cannot apodictically deny that the moon is inhabited, but we are as little entitled to affirm it. It may, however, be added that there is a Babylonian female name *Bililitum*, which certainly derives its origin from the name of the goddess *Belili*. Now, amongst such a superstitious people as the Babylonians, would one not have shrunk from giving to a daughter a name which stood in necessary connexion with the gloomy realm of death? Might not this name alone suffice to prove that *Belili*, like her brother *Tamūzu* (Tammūz), instead of being a constant dweller in the kingdom of the dead, is a goddess of the spring with its newly awaking life and joyousness, with its verdure and flowers, a goddess who, like her brother, sojourns only temporarily, once every year, in the land of the dead? But in this case she would lack the qualification to stand as a representative of the realm of death. And what is there to allege against such a conception of *Belili* as I have just

suggested? At all events, there is no ground for another explanation such as that which Professor Cheyne finds necessary for his position. On the other hand,—in this I entirely concur with Professor v. Baudissin,—the explanation (not essentially new) of *bēliyyā'al* as the under-world, which is defended by Professor Cheyne, is one which no passage of the Old Testament compels us to adopt, and that passage, which according to him most strongly supports his interpretation, really tells much more against it. According to Ps 18⁵, 'streams of *bēliyyā'al*' make the Psalmist afraid. Hence they must have been approachable by, and visible to, the *living*; but the realm of the dead is outside the sphere of vision of the living, and of streams on the earth which, according to Jewish notions, continue their course in the underworld, and might hence be called 'streams of the under-world,' we know nothing. It must be admitted then that the opinion adopted by Professor Cheyne scarcely rests on anything better than mere assertion, and that even for Ps 18⁵ we have to abide, for the present, by the sense which *bēliyyā'al* has elsewhere, viz. 'harmfulness' (*das Unheilvolle*).

Professor Cheyne and Professor Hommel, who (the latter in this following the former) assume a connexion between *bēliyyā'al* and *Belili*, explain it as a case of borrowing, Cheyne deriving *bēliyyā'al* from the Babylonian, Hommel deriving *Belili* from the West Semitic. But one has no right to *affirm* borrowing unless the form of a word *proves* it to be a foreign term, or to *affirm* a connexion between two words of different languages except where their *demonstrable* meanings are identical or nearly allied. Both these conditions, however, as Professor v. Baudissin and myself have pointed out, are wanting in the present instance. And against a primitive affinity of the two words which, after all, one might take into consideration, there is perhaps an initial objection in the very form. If *bēliyyā'al* is genuinely Hebrew, the first part of the word is identical with בְּלִי, 'not.' But the Babylono-Assyrian equivalent of this is *bal*, with *a*, not *e*, which is the first vowel of the Babylono-Assyrian word *Belili*. I feel constrained, therefore, to identify myself completely with the con-

clusions of Professor v. Baudissin as against Professor Cheyne.

Undoubtedly, the religion of the Western Semites and that of the Assyro-Babylonians were not without influence upon one another, but no less certainly one has to observe great caution in accepting alleged examples of mutual borrowing. This remark applies to names, things, and conceptions. It may, for instance, be regarded as beyond question that the Babylonian *Ashratu*, wife of the weather god *Rammān* (see my forthcoming book, *Hittiter und Armenier*, p. 172 f.), is an Amorite goddess imported from the Westland, and that she is identical with the Hebrew-Phœnician *Ashērā* (*Ashirtu*), wife of the sky-and-weather god Baal, or perhaps at one time even of Jahweh. It is equally clear that the *Kēwān* of Am 5²⁶ is to be traced back to the Babylonian-Assyrian *Kai(w)ānu*. But there are few instances of borrowing in the religions of the ancient East so certain as these two. No sober judge will deny that scholars like Gunkel have, in their views of the influence of Babylonia upon Judaism, gone worlds beyond the limits of what is allowable and capable of being discussed. The attempt to convert what is genuinely Israelitish into Babylonism has reached its climax in Gunkel's book. The reaction is inevitable. In future the great matter will be to examine the Old Testament in the light of the Assyro-Babylonian and other monuments, with a view to showing how much there is in its religion and its legends whose affinity with the ideas and the names of the Babylonians rests upon a primitive affinity. For instance, there is the important circumstance that with the Babylonians the masculine *Apsū*, 'ocean' (*Weltmeer*), and the feminine *Tiāmat*, 'sea,' form in the myth a pair, and (or but) that with the Hebrews side by side with the masculine *yām*, 'sea,' stands the originally only feminine *tēhom*, 'ocean.' Again, a star is with the Babylonians a *šābu*, 'warrior,' while with the Hebrews the stars are *šēbhā'ōth*, 'hosts,' etc. To the same class of parallels belong, above all, the Hebrew traditions about the Creation and the Flood, in which I now feel myself unable to deny the existence of a genuine Hebrew nucleus. I mention this matter because Professor Cheyne, in the course of his discussion, declares himself in favour of a Babylonian origin even for the Hebrew name for the Flood, and uses this (p. 92) in support of his etymology of *bēliyya'al*. The Heb. *מַבּוּל*, *mabbūl*,

he identifies with the Assyro-Babylonian *abūbu*. But from Ps 29¹⁰ it may be presumed that *mabbūl* means properly a downpour of rain (*Regensturz* or *Regenflut*), while *abūbu* = 'storm,' and only secondarily = the Flood occasioned by a storm from the sea. I see no reason whatever to doubt the Hebrew origin of *mabbūl*. The Hebrew Flood takes place—as does probably also the Babylonian—according to one tradition, in the rain-month named *Būl*. *Baul* in Arabic means 'urine,' and also 'children,'—rain is the urine and the seminal fluid of the lord of heaven,—*bāla* = *mingere*, *mabbūl*, probably 'burst of rain,' and, according to the other Hebrew legend, the Flood is merely the result of a burst of rain. In these circumstances we seem compelled to connect *mabbūl* with the Heb. *būl*, and to derive it from a lost verb *בָּל*, meaning 'to rain.' 'But how would that be possible? Well, in Syriac *mabbūl* is represented by the loan-word *māmōlā*, which points back to a Hebrew *mābūl*. But *mābūl*, with the meaning of 'a rained matter,' is the form we should expect in a derivative from *בָּל*. I would suggest then (and it is hard to believe that the supposition is wrong) that it was the Massoretes who first altered the primitive *mābūl* into *mabbūl*. But why, and after what model? The answer is not difficult to find. The model was the Heb. *מַבְוֵא*, *mabbū'a*, 'fountain.'

The identification of *Belili* with *bēliyya'al* thus finds no support in the (supposed) identity of *mabbūl* and *abūbu*.

P. JENSEN.

Marburg i. H.

Did the Sun and the Moon Stand Still?

IN REPLY TO DR. PALMER.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of last month Dr. Palmer says that in my article on the Joshua miracle, I 'gave a very fair résumé of the argument advanced in' his 'book, though most readers would hardly recognize it from the slight passing allusion made to that volume.' In reply to this accusation allow me to say—

1. My interpretation of the passage was elaborated and preached before I read Dr. Palmer's book.

2. I distinctly deny that my statement is a

résumé of his argument. (a) The central point in Dr. Palmer's argument is the interpretation of *ἵς* (stand still). 'This furnishes a keynote to the entire passage, and is the cardinal point on which all the rest will turn,' and to this he returns in his contribution to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (February). In my argument the essential point is the time when Joshua's prayer was offered. (b) According to Dr. Palmer the time when the prayer was offered was when 'the crisis of the battle was over'—in the pursuit—when Joshua 'dreaded that a rally might be made'; or, again, it was when the 'sun was well up in the sky and approaching his meridian altitude.' My suggestion is that Joshua prayed *before the battle*, 'at the first approach of day,' in order that he might *surprise* the Gibeonites. (c) The bulk of Dr. Palmer's book is made up of illustrations of the figurative expression, 'the silence of the sun,' drawn from many languages and a vast number of poetic writings. In what Dr. Palmer calls 'a very fair résumé of his argument,' I do not give a single instance of these, but refer to his book as supplying them. 'A very fair résumé' ought at least to have included an account of his *chief* argument. (d) Dr. Palmer, while recognizing that we have two accounts of what happened, accepts the position of the quotation from the Book of Jasher as indicating the time when the prayer was offered. It was when 'the routed host cast themselves headlong down the precipitous descent to Beth-horon . . . that the sun and moon were obscured.' In my argument I emphasize the *absolute independence* of the narratives, and claim liberty to suggest that the prayer was offered before the attack was made.

These points are sufficient, it seems to me, to indicate that my study of this passage is certainly not a résumé of Dr. Palmer's argument.

3. Further, let me recall the fact that in the first sentences of my paper I distinctly said, 'the main facts to be considered are in the possession of everyone who has studied the passage. There can be no claim to originality in regard to the chief points which affect the question under review,' and that it was my purpose 'to review them in relation to a suggestion of a particular time when Joshua's prayer was offered.' This is what I have done, and I refuse to allow Dr. Palmer to claim as a résumé of his argument the statement of a line of study which is not so much as mentioned in his book.

4. Every student reaps where he has not sown, but he is not a plagiarist who after reading the literature of a subject, takes an independent line. It is impossible that one writer can follow (in time) another, in a study of the same subject, without approximations and resemblances, but Dr. Palmer should remember that he has no monopoly of the information that the Book of Jasher was a collection (probably) of national songs, or of the principle that poetry is not to be interpreted as prose, or of the use of a Hebrew dictionary and concordance.

JOHN REID.

Dundee.

The Name Judas Iscariot in the Fourth Gospel.

I AM sincerely grateful to Professor Nestle for his courteous notice of the few words I wrote in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of the month before last (p. 189) on this subject.

Professor Nestle now asks the question, 'If the "paraphrastic representation" [*i.e.* ἀπὸ Καρνώ-*των*] was of later origin, of Syriac or any other, why was it confined by all these documents (Codex Bezae, Sinaiticus first hand, Ferrar-group, Harklean Version margin, Palatinus) to the Fourth Gospel? . . . Does it not point to the conclusion that the "paraphrastic representation" belonged originally to this Gospel and its author?'

I might reply to this question by another. If St. John's phrase was ἀπὸ Καρνώ-*των*, how comes it that it has been preserved in only a small group of authorities, and by no member of that group (except Codex D) in more than one passage of St. John? I should add that the character of members of this group as witnesses is, when they are cross-examined, seriously damaged.

But the fact that this 'paraphrastic representation' of Iscariot is confined to St. John is in complete harmony with the theory which finds in assimilation to old Syriac texts an explanation of many of the phenomena of the 'Western' or 'Syro-Latin' texts. It is not likely that in early times all the Gospels were translated into Syriac by one and the same hand. We may feel sure that one Gospel was translated by one man, another by another. If, then, we adopt the very natural supposition that an early Syriac translator of St. John's

Gospel (but not of the other Gospels) represented Ἰσκαριώτης by the paraphrase in question, we at once have a simple explanation why this equivalent of *Iscaiot* is found only in texts of St. John's Gospel.

F. H. CHASE.

Cambridge.

'Studies in Hebrew Synonyms.'¹

MR. KENNEDY enters here upon a field little cultivated, particularly by English scholars, and indeed by scholars of any country. While the synonyms of the New Testament have been carefully investigated, those of the Old Testament have not attracted much attention. The usage in a few groups of words has been examined, such as the terms for 'Time and Eternity' by von Orelli, and those for 'the True and the Good' by Ryssel; but, though Girdlestone's work has a wider scope, much ground still remains to be overtaken. Consequently, Mr. Kennedy's results are due to his own researches and reflection; and how careful and wide his examination has been is shown by the multitude of illustrations gathered from the whole extent of the literature which he adduces.

Just as with the syntax, the investigation of synonyms would need to begin with the classical prose. Prophets and poets are apt to use a more exquisite phraseology, and the poetical parallelism, while it suggests that words are allied in meaning, of necessity tends to obscure the distinctions between them. The usage, also, of different ages would need to be considered, perhaps even of different districts of the country. And the investigator must beware of the natural temptation to define too closely, and draw the distinction too wide; and even when a general usage seems discoverable, place must be allowed for exceptional uses in poetry and later style, and even by writers who may affect a rarer terminology. Thus, while Mr. Kennedy may be right in saying that *dagan*, 'corn,' signifies 'grain in general, viewed as a product of the soil, and does not mean corn prepared, ready for use as food,' a poet makes the children expiring of hunger cry, 'Where is the *dagan* and the wine?' (La 2¹²).

Mr. Kennedy investigates *nineteen* groups of synonymous words, those signifying 'to flee,' 'a wall,' 'to wash,' 'a lion,' 'oil,' 'sleep,' 'fool,' 'poor,' etc. Some of his conclusions are interesting, such as that the term, *kîr*, 'wall,' means wall-face, whether outside face or inside face. Thus while Balaam rode between two fences

(garden walls, *gader*), the ass crushed his leg against the wall (*kîr*), which was one of them. Other passages corroborate this conjecture, though some may think that the command to Ezekiel (chap. 12) to dig through the wall (*kîr*), as a symbol of the king's attempt to escape out through the wall (*kîr*), is proof that the usage has exceptions. In investigating the words for 'oil,' *yizhar* and *shemen*, Mr. Kennedy argues that the 'two sons of oil' (*yizhar*) cannot mean 'the two anointed ones' (Zec 4¹⁴), otherwise the word *shemen* would have been used. We certainly agree with his conclusion that Joshua and Zerubabel cannot be meant, and that the expression signifies not 'anointed ones' but oil-producers, sources of oil. We should hesitate to accept his interpretation of 'angel-mediators,' unless 'angel' were as elsewhere in this prophet a mere symbolic impersonation of the spirit of God. The passage is a good illustration of the interesting results to which study of the synonyms may lead.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Kennedy may be encouraged to give further instalments of his studies, particularly to take up the synonyms that have ethical and religious meaning. With the exception of terms for 'fool' and 'folly,' often used in a moral sense, and those for 'poor,' which frequently have a shade of religious meaning, the groups of words which he investigates lie outside the moral vocabulary. As was to be expected from Mr. Kennedy's accurate scholarship, the book is faultlessly correct, and reflects credit on all engaged in the production of it.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

New College, Edinburgh.

The Hebrew בֵּגֶט and הוֹלִיד, etc.

1. Is בֵּגֶט 'beget' an inexact term, and הוֹלִיד 'beget' (side by side with בֵּגֶט) an 'Arabism'?

In the Pentateuch the simple בֵּגֶט in the sense of 'beget' is used in Gn 4¹⁸ 10⁸ 13. 15. 24. 26 22²³ 25³. Also the Infinitive בִּלְיָה in 25²⁶ can as readily be rendered with the Pesh. (בֵּגֶט, אִנִּי) 'when he begat them' as with Onkelos (בֵּר יִלְדָה יְהוֹן) *שֶׁ עָשָׂה אֹתָם* 'when she (Rebekah) bore them.' On the other hand the derivative stem הוֹלִיד (also in the perf.) is found in the Pentateuch in Gn 5³ 4^{etc.} 6¹⁰ 11¹¹⁻²⁷ 17²⁰ 25¹⁹ 48⁶, Lv 25⁴⁵, Nu 26²⁹, Dt 4²⁵ 28⁴¹. Thus in whole sections (Gn 4¹⁸ 10) a preference is shown for the one verbal formation, and again in whole sections (5^{3ff.} 11^{11ff.}) a preference for the other.

Rupprecht (*Die Lösung des Pentateuchräthels*, 2 Hälfte (1897), p. 82), in seeking to explain this

¹ *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*. By James Kennedy. Williams & Norgate. 1898.

changing usage, remarks, 'That הוֹלִיד is an exact (*präciser*) term for the father's act cannot be denied.' Does he mean, then, that the narrator in Gn 4¹⁸ or in ch. 10 intended to use an *inexact* term, or that he did not intend to say precisely *aliquem genuisse*? Does he mean that in יִלְדָהּ of Ps 2⁷ we have an *inexact* expression? Or can one and the same narrator have employed throughout whole sections in succession (Gn 10) the *inexact* term, and again throughout other whole sections (5^{3ff.} 11^{11ff.}) the *exact* one? Accordingly there is no foundation for what Rupprecht goes on to say, 'Hence it is, probably, that הוֹלִיד alone is used in the genealogy of the Chosen Race, where greater precision and formality were of importance.' Does he mean that if the form יִלְד had been used in Gn 5³ as it is in 4¹⁸, a reader would have sought in Adam the *mother* of Seth? No, the writers who employ the term יִלְד cannot be reproached with any inclination to inexactness of expression. Moreover, we could point to exceptions to this alleged rule whereby the exact term is used only in the genealogy of the Chosen Race. For instance, in Gn 10²⁴ 'Shelah יִלְד Eber.' But Eber, the ancestor of the 'Ibrim, stood in at least as direct a relation to the line of the Chosen Race as say Kenan of 5⁹. Yet it is the simple יִלְד that is used of Eber, while the derivative הוֹלִיד is used of Kenan.

This varying preference now for the simple יִלְד and again for the derivative הוֹלִיד is susceptible, however, of explanation if we only attend to the history of the language as that lies before us in the Old Testament. For the latter contains express testimony that in the time of Jeremiah the simple יִלְד was no longer the usual term for *generavit*, and that later the act of generation was more and more expressed by the derivative הוֹלִיד. Does not Jeremiah (30⁶) put the question אִם יִלְד זָכָר, a question which in the time of the author of Gn 4¹⁸ 10⁸ 13. 15. 24. 26 22²³ 25³, where יִלְד is predicated again and again of a זָכָר, would have been quite impossible? The prophet asks, Can the function denoted by יִלְד be attributed to one of the male sex? At a later period people certainly *understood* the meaning of יִלְד when it was used to designate the act of the man, but in designating it themselves, they preferred to use הוֹלִיד. For while the יִלְד of Gn 10^{8ff.} is retained in 1 Ch 1^{10f.} 13. 18. 20, the יִלְד of the other passages in Gn is not repeated in Ch, and whenever the Chronicler himself wishes to express *generavit*, he uses הוֹלִיד, 1 Ch 1³⁴ 2¹⁰ etc. (see all the O.T. passages in my *Einleitung*, p. 229 f.).

Upon consideration it will be seen to be quite

natural that the simple verbal stem should have been originally applied to the act either of the man or of the woman, but that later the linguistic usage should have shown a disposition to mark the two acts by different verbal formations. We have here a parallel to the process whereby the originally epicene נָעַר became later differentiated into נָעַר and נָעֵרָה (cf. my *Historisch-comparative Syntax d. Hebräischen*, 1897, § 246 b. c., 247). Rupprecht, however, is completely silent regarding the explanation of the change from יִלְד in Gn 4¹⁸ etc., to הוֹלִיד in 5³ etc., which is furnished by the history of the language of the Old Testament.

2. Professor Hommel, in the last number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 235), thinks to explain the phenomenon in a different way. He says that 'הוֹלִיד = "beget" (side by side with יִלְד) is an Arabism.' But—

(a) The history of every language must be drawn from its own documents. From them we must ascertain whether any item in the vocabulary belongs to the category of the older or the younger, the native or the foreign constituents of the language. Well, what do the documents of the Hebrew literature teach regarding יִלְד and הוֹלִיד? That the change from the one to the other is a symptom of the development *in course of time* of the Hebrew linguistic usage. See above, and note further the circumstance that the Samaritan Pentateuch also shows that the equation הוֹלִיד = 'beget' corresponded to the later linguistic preference. For the Samaritan Pentateuch twice (Gn 10⁸ 22²³) replaces יִלְד by הוֹלִיד, and in the other passages in Gn where יִלְד = *generavit*, the Samaritans read the Qittēl *yelled* (cf. Petermann, *Versuch einer hebräischen Formenlehre nach samaritanischer Aussprache*, pp. 44, 165, etc.).

(b) It is altogether a precarious procedure, in explaining a phenomenon of linguistic usage, to call in a foreign origin. This expedient is permissible only upon three conditions: (a) the language with which one is dealing cannot itself furnish an explanation; (β) the doubtful phenomenon must present itself at an era of time when the nation in question was brought into contact with that foreign dialect from which the explanation is sought to be derived; (γ) the linguistic phenomenon to be explained must as a matter of fact be present in the foreign dialect and in it alone.

But (a) the first of the above conditions is not satisfied in the matter of יִלְד and הוֹלִיד. For the transition in usage from a preference for יִלְד to one for הוֹלִיד is explicable from the extant Hebrew literature. (β) At the time when beyond question הוֹלִיד was preferred, *i.e.* at the date of Ezra—

Nehemiah–Chronicles, no influence of *Arabic* upon Hebrew can be proved. (γ) The equation הוֹלִיד = “beget” (side by side with יָלַד) is not a phenomenon which can be called an ‘Arabism.’ For also in *Assyrian* the Qaṭal וִלַּד means both ‘bear’ and ‘beget’ (Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gramm.* § 111). In *Assyrian* thus, in the sense of ‘to make to bear,’ the Qaṭal agrees with the Causative (šaqaṭal) which corresponds to הוֹלִיד. (Del. *Assyr. Handwörterb.* 1896, p. 233). It is the same in several branches of the *Aramaic*. In the *Aramaic* of the Targums יָלַד means both ‘bear’ and ‘beget’; cf. e.g. לְעַמּוּיָהּ דַּעְתִּיד לְמִיָּד, ‘To His people whom He will beget,’ Ps 22³¹ (Manuscript ap. Levy, *Targum-Wörterbuch*, s.v.). Consequently here also יָלַד (יָלַד) and הוֹלִיד agree in signifying ‘beget.’ So also in *Syriac* the Qaṭal ܠܝܕܐ = ‘peperit’ and ‘genuit’ (e.g. Ac 13³³, cf. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* s.v.) as the latter sense attaches also to the Causative ܠܝܕܐ. It is not only ‘in ancient Arabic,’ then, ‘that one finds the Causative *haulada* used side by side with *walada* = “beget”’; e.g. in *Ethiopic*, *walāda* = ‘peperit et genuit’ and ‘*aulāda* = ‘genuit’ (Dillmann). Hence it is not at all surprising that also in *Sabæan* הוֹלִיד should have the sense of ‘beget.’ Moreover parallels borrowed from *Ethiopic* and *Sabæan* cannot be adduced in proof of the usage of the *earlier* Hebrew. For it is questionable whether the *Sabæan* inscriptions go back to ‘c. 1000 B.C.’ (Hommel, ‘*Ägypten in den südarabischen Inschriften*’ in *Ägyptica*, eine Festschrift für Georg Ebers, 1897, p. 26). In any case they do not represent a stage of development of *Arabic* essentially earlier than is presented in the history of the Hebrew language, say by the Hebrew of Jeremiah (see above). The *Ethiopic* again represents a much later phase in the history of that branch of Semitic language to which it belongs.

Thus on the evidence of its own literature and in a manner which is psychologically explicable, Hebrew advanced from an indifferent, and so to say, epicene use of the simple יָלַד to a preference for the derivative הוֹלִיד, and many branches of Semitic language exhibit the same use in an equivalent sense of the simple stem and the Causative of יָלַד. In the equation הוֹלִיד = ‘beget’ (side by side with יָלַד), one might thus as well discover a ‘*Babylonism*,’ etc., as an ‘*Arabism*.’ The truth is, however, that this equation took its rise within the history of Hebrew literature itself.

If one were inclined to find in this partial synonymy of יָלַד and הוֹלִיד a ‘*Babylonism*,’ the assumption would be favoured by the circumstance that the ancient Hebrew, the Canaanite

(Phœnician), the Zinjirli,¹ and the *Assyro-Babylonian* have all *anokhi-anakhu*, and that this agreement tallies with the *Babylonian* origin of Abram. But *āni* (אֲנִי), ‘I’ is most probably a shorter parallel to *ānōkhi*, just as in the first person plur., along with *ānahnu* we find *nahnu* six times and *ānu* once (Jer 42⁶). It might further be noted that in *Assyro-Babylonian* for ‘we’ also the form *aninu* appears (Del., *Assyr. Gramm.* § 55; *Handwörterbuch*, p. 103^a). The rise of the Hebrew separate pronoun *āni*, which in the Samaritan *āni* shows simply a *Hebraism*, must also have been favoured by the circumstance that the suffixed pronoun *nī* = ‘me’ and *i* = ‘my’ existed. In *Aramaic* side by side with the above-mentioned אֲנִי and אֲנִי there has been found at Zinjirli also the form אֲנִי = ‘I’ (*Wiener Zeitsch. f. d. k. d. M.* 1893, p. 128), and in the *Arabic* branch of Semitic also the word generally terminates in *a*. This form *ana* is attested also for the *Minæo-Sabæan* (Hommel, *Südarabische Chrestomathie*, 1893, § 13). Only in certain dialects (Wetzstein, *ZDMG*, xxii. p. 119) and in certain connexions (Spitta, *Grammatik des arab. Vulgärdialectes in Ägypten*, p. 72 f.) is *ani* also found, e.g. in *ādyni*. This pronunciation would be materially fostered by a tendency to assimilate to the suffixed pronoun *nī* and *i*. In *Ethiopic* also *ana* was the form until in *Tigrīna* ‘*anē* side by side with the rarer *ana*,’ and in *Amharic* *enē* (égne) arose (Prätorius, *Die amharische Sprache*, § 87c.). Prätorius offers a choice of three explanations of this final *ē* (l.c. § 6a). Either it may have originated from a ‘getrüb,’ or it may be ‘a result of the like sound of the suffix *ē* of the same person,’ or it ‘may go back direct to an old form *anya*.’ The second of these explanations is best supported by analogy.

The Hebrew *āni* could surely have originated at least as independently in Hebrew itself as a dialectic אֲנִי in *Arabic* and the above-mentioned forms in *Tigrīna* and *Amharic*. Hence it is arbitrary to pronounce the Hebrew *āni* an ‘*Arabism*.’ In any case this assumption would by no means explain the history of the use of the two forms *ānōkhi* and *āni*, regarding which exact details will be found in my *Einleitung*, pp. 168, 170, etc., cf. 571.

ED. KÖNIG.

Rostock.

¹ D. H. Müller in the *Wiener Zeitsch. f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1893, p. 128: אֲנִי and אֲנִי = ‘I.’ Also in the Samaritan *Aramaic* the form *anāki* has been transmitted (cf. Petermann, *Lingua Samaritana*, p. 11).