

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1927

The Aramaisms in the Psalms

J Henry Gienapp

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_gienappj@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gienapp, J Henry, "The Aramaisms in the Psalms" (1927). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 663.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/663>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Briggs, International Critical Commentary, Psalms, 2 Volumes, New York: Scribners, 1906.

Horstmann Gunkel, Die Psalmen, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1900.

Parsons, The Book of Psalms, 2 Volumes, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1907.

Eighth Edition. THE ARAMAISMS IN THE PSALMS

Stoekhardt, Auserwählte Psalmen, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1884.

Kittel, Die Psalmen, Leipzig, Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1902.

A Thesis

Hengstenberg, Commentar über die Psalmen, Berlin, 1829.

Presented to the Faculty of

Melittsch, Commentar über die Psalmen, Leipzig, 1829.

Concordia Seminary

3 Volumes, Edinburgh, 1829.

St. Louis, Mo.

Montfleur, In and Around the Book of Psalms, London, 1923.

Knowledge, London, 1923.

By

Wilson, Studies in the Book of Psalms, London, 1907.

J. Henry Gienapp

Wilson, In Higher Criticism, London, 1907.

Wilson, A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, London, 1907.

Philadelphia, in partial fulfillment of the

requirement for the degree

of

Baccalaureus Divinitatis

Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, London, 1907.

Berlin, Revised Edition, 1907.

Sheek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin, 1907.

Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament, New York, 1907.

York, 1907.

Fuerbringer, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin, 1907.

St. Louis, 1913.

Fuerbringer, Theologische Hermeneutik, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1907.

1914.

Kautsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 27, London, 1914.

1919.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Briggs, International Critical Commentary, Psalms, 2 Volumes, New York, Scribners, 1906.
- Hermann Gunkel, Die Psalmen, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1925.
- Perowne, The Book of Psalms, 2 Volumes, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1892, Eighth Edition.
- Stoeckhardt, Auserwählte Psalmen, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.
- Kittel, Die Psalmen, Leipzig, Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.
- Hengstenberg, Commentar über die Psalmen, Berlin, Ludwig Oehmigke, 1843.
- Delitzsch, Commentar on the Psalms, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 3 Volumes, Edinburgh, 1893.
- Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1923.
- Wilson, Studies in the Book of Daniel, Putnam's Sons, New York, 1917.
- Wilson, Is Higher Criticism Scholarly?, Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, 1922.
- Wilson, A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, .
- Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, Scribners, Revised Edition, 1922.
- Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Reimer, Berlin, 1870.
- Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament, The Text, Scribners, New York, 1923.
- Fuerbringer, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1913.
- Fuerbringer, Theologische Hermeneutik, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1912.
- Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, trans. by Cowley, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1910.

- Kautzsch, Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament, Halle, Niemeyer, 1902.
- Gesenius-Buhl, Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, Leipzig, Vogel, Vogel, fourteenth edition, 1905.
- Koenig, Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig, Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1910.
- Davidson, Introductory Hebrew Grammar, T & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Twentieth Edition, 1919.
- Davidson, Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, London, Bagster and Sons.
- Hall, Ancient History of the Near East, Methuen, London, Sixth Revised Edition, 1924.
- Price, The Monuments and the Old Testament, Judson Press, Chicago, 1925.
- Breasted, History of Egypt, New York, Scribners, 1919.
- Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, New York, Scribners, 1909.
- Davis, Dictionary of the Bible, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1924.
- Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, American Book Company, New York, 1889.
- Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, Authorized Edition, Revised.
- Genung, The Working Principles of Rhetoric, Ginn and Company, Chicago, 1900.
- Robertson, Essays and Sermons, Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh, 1892.
- Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, Vol. XVII, Vol. III, No.3.

I. Introductory Remarks.

1. The Scope.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introductory Remarks 1-8

 The Scope 1

 The Prevalent Opinion 1

 The Ground for Claims 3

 The Plan of Discussion. 4

 Aramaisms Defined 4

II. The Study on the Basis of History. 9-14

 The Testimony of the Bible. 9

 The Testimony of the Monuments. 11

 Conclusion. 12

 The Argument in a Circle. 13

 Additional Considerations 14

III. The Study on the Basis of Language. 15-27

 The Nature and Plan of Discussion 15

 General Methods and Principles Examined 16

 Assumptions Answered. 16

 Grounds Investigated. 24

 Kautzsch's Alleged Aramaisms. 28-68

 Addenda

Wie hat z. B. Kautzsch gesagt, ein Wort wie *šalm* ist als Äquivalent des gemischtsprachigen *šp* nur dreimal in Hebräisch, je einmal in Joel und in der Chronik, dagegen häufig in aramäischen Texten vorkommt, sei doch es *šp* als ein Wort abgedrungen, „Aramaismus“ gewesen, und sein Vorkommen in Joel gerade somit allein, seiner Prophetenschrift ihren Platz unter den nachexilischen Erzeugnissen der hebräischen Literatur anzuweisen.“ (Kautzsch, Die Aramaismen in Allen Testament, Halle, 1902, 2-3.)

THE ARAMAISMS IN THE PSALMS

I. Introductory Remarks.

1) The Scope.

The above title suggests in a general way the topic to be considered. Naturally a subject of this kind permits varied treatment. The philologist, the grammarian, the exegete - each, guided by his peculiar interest, will present the matter in such a manner as to lay emphasis on that phase of the topic which to his mind is most essential. To us, also, this subject is of a special interest. We are concerned with the Aramaisms in the Psalms as evidence of their date of composition. We are interested in finding out what part Aramaisms play in fixing the date of the Psalms. This interest, then, will determine, in a general way, the scope of the following discussion.

2) The Prevalent Opinion.

The prevalent opinion among scholars regarding the Aramaisms as marks of age is this: The appearance of one or more of these words in any document stamps that document or, at least, that portion of the document which contains the words as post-exilic. Prof. Kautsch, who is usually recognized to be an authority on the subject of Aramaisms, verifies this statement:

"Man argumentiert vielmehr einfach ex concessis, wenn man z. B. geltend macht, ein Wort wie $\eta' \Delta$ Ende, das als Äquivalent des genuinhebräischen $\gamma \rho$ nur dreimal im Koheleth, je einmal im Joel und in der Chronik, dagegen fünfmal im aramäischen Daniel vorkomme, sei dadurch es ipso als ein spät eingedrungener 'Aramaismus' erwiesen, und sein Vorkommen im Joel genüge somit allein, dieser Prophetenschrift ihren Platz unter den nachexilischen Erzeugnissen der hebräischen Literatur anzuweisen."
(Kautsch, Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament, Halle, 1902, p.5.)

The above principle, then, applied to the Psalms means that the origin of the Psalms - at least of the majority of them - due to the Aramaisms, must be assigned to the post-exilic period or even later.

This method of fixing the date of the Psalms is followed by many of the greatest scholars. A few quotations selected from their writings will show their position.

Briggs states: "It is full of Aramaisms and late." (The International Critical Commentary, New York Scribner's, 1906, Psalms, Vol. II, p. 520.) Again: "The Aramaic אִן is also an evidence of late date" (op. cit. Vol. II, p. 21.).

Baethgen, cited by Prof. J. D. Davis, says: "A couple of strong Aramaisms in the first part (that is verses 3 and 5 of Psalm 19) make it advisable not to date this part either before the time of Job" (The Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. III, No. 3, p. 371. Since the original copy was not available, this reference could not be verified).

Cheyne makes this statement: "The Aramaism אִן , not to urge אִן , confirms the natural view that this Psalm (Psalm 19) of creation is post-exilic" (The Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. III, No. 3, p. 371. Also this reference could not be verified due to the fact that the original source was not available.).

In stating that the titles of the Psalms are spurious, which is the same as saying the Psalms were not written at the time of David, but at a much later date, Driver advances, as one of the reasons for his position, this: "Some (Psalms) have pronounced Aramaisms" (Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Scribners, New York, 1922, p. 374.) In another place Driver says of certain Psalms: "The rest in these two books will

—43.
be post-exilic, some, perhaps, late in the post-exilic period - especially those Psalms in which Aramaisms are marked." (Driver, op.cit., p.385.)

Kautsch expresses himself thus: "Dem gegenüber vertraue ich mich jedoch nunmehr zu behaupten: abgesehen von einigen wenigen Beispielen ist ein zweifelloser Aramaismus immer eine starke Instanz für die Ansetzung des betr. Abschnitts in exilischer oder nachexilischer Zeit." (Kautsch, op.cit., p.104.)

The argumentation as has just been explained is followed by most scholars. But mention must be made of the fact that a difference exists as to the importance attached to it. Some scholars consider the argument from the Aramaisms as secondary proof. In view of this, Kautsch speaks of "strengthening" of the proofs for the late origin of a Biblical book by pointing to several Aramaisms. (Kautsch, op.cit., p.5.)

3) The Ground for Claims.

Those men who entertain the view that Aramaisms in the Psalms indicate a late origin justify their stand by appealing to history. History states that for some centuries after the exile the people of Palestine were bilingual, speaking Aramaic for ordinary purposes, but still at least understanding Hebrew, and that during this period, due to the conditions obtaining in Palestine, Hebrew began to decline and Aramaic to gain the ascendancy (Ency.Brit.). From this fact they make the inference that a Hebrew document, or at least a portion of such a document, which is marked by Aramaic words, must have been written during this time when one would expect Aramaic elements to have been taken over into the Hebrew, and

that since the Psalms - a majority, at least - are bestrewn with Aramaisms, these had their origin in the post-exilic period or even later.

4) The Plan of Discussion.

If one judges from the array of scholars quoted above, it would seem as though the final word has been said in respect to the Aramaisms of the Psalms as proof of their date. And because of the recognized scholarship of these men one might readily be inclined to give credence to their conclusions. The consequences, however, which these involve are of such a nature as to forbid the acceptance of the views of these scholars as decisive without first investigating the evidence involved for one's self. Therefore, an investigation shall now be undertaken in order to arrive at some conclusions independently. According to the nature of the subject, the investigation will divide itself into two distinct phases. The one has to do with the history; the other, with the language. These phases, then, will determine the divisions of the following discussion. In the first part, the Aramaisms of the Psalms, as evidence of their date, will be studied on the basis of history. In the second part, this subject will be studied on the basis of language.

5) The Aramaisms Defined.

Such a discussion as has been proposed must necessarily be prefaced by a definition of an Aramaism. The definition that is usually accepted by scholars Kautzsch puts in these words:

"Die Bezeichnungen des alttestamentlichen Wortes als.

'Aramaismus' dürfte alter Gewohnheit zufolge immer von der Voraussetzung ausgehen, dass es sich um ein dem Hebraischen ursprünglich fremdes, aber infolge des vielfältigen Verkehrs mit den benachbarten Aramäern ins Hebräische eingedrungenes und vielleicht sogar vollständig eingebürgertes Element handle." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.5.)

According to this explanation the distinguishing feature of an Aramaism is that it is a loan-word, a loan-word in the Hebrew from Aramaic. Excluded, then, from all consideration are those words, which are common property of both Hebrew and Aramaic due to the origin of the two languages from the same Grundsprache.

This definition is acknowledged by Kautzsch but with some modification. He extends the definition by classing as an Aramaism also those words which appeared in early Hebrew, but, having been lost, were subsequently introduced in a new meaning into Hebrew by way of the Aramaic. His expression on this point is:

"Unmöglich ist es immerhin nicht, dass ein ursemitischer Stamm oder Ausdruck in einem Dialekt vollständig erloschen war und erst nachträglich aus einem anderen wieder eingeführt wurde." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.7.)

As there may be some words whose history is such as has just been set forth, the added specification of Kautzsch is not altogether out of place. But as a standard, according to which words should be classified, it is impracticable. For, in trying to make it bear in the case of certain words, one is never able to avail himself of any facts from which to make his conclusion, but can only hazard a guess.

Furthermore, Kautzsch limits the general definition inasmuch as he excludes all loan-words which have come into Hebrew from the Aramaic at an early age and which, consequently, have lost their foreign character and become an essential element of Hebrew. In his own words he expresses it thus:

"Durch die oben von uns angenommene Definition des Begriffs 'Aramaismus' fällt aber noch ein anderer Kreis von Stämmen und Wörtern ausser Betracht, dessen Vorhandensein analog einer Fülle verwandter Erscheinungen in anderen Sprachen auch für das Hebräische a priori vorausgesetzt werden müsste, selbst wenn der Nachweis konkreter Belege nur teilweise gelingen sollte. Ich meine solche Lehnwörter, die schon frühzeitig und zwar naturgemäß gerade aus dem Bereich des Aramäischen ins Hebraische eingedrungen sind, hier aber in einem solchen Grade Bürgerrecht erlangt haben, dass von einem 'Fremdwort' keine Rede mehr sein kann." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.8.)

From this statement it becomes evident how Kautzsch would have the general definition understood. For him the Aramaic words which have come into Hebrew divide themselves into two groups. On the one hand there are those words which are not consciously felt to be foreign words; on the other, those which are consciously perceived to be foreign. This latter group he defines as Aramaisms. To sum up: Kautzsch defines an Aramaism as a loan-word in the Hebrew from the Aramaic which the Hebrew writers perceived to be distinctly foreign words.

A study of Aramaisms on the basis of this definition will show that it is untenable. For, in trying to classify רַב , the question on which everything hinges and which would have to be answered is, Did David perceive it to be a foreign word or not? As no records exist which indicate David's impressions when he employed רַב , no one will be able to say that this word is an Aramaism nor will any one, it must be admitted, be able to maintain, the same condition existing, that it is not an Aramaism. The conclusion is evident: No words could ever be definitely called Aramaisms. Kautzsch himself admits the impossibility of knowing whether a word is perceived to be foreign or not. He says:

"Ob aber ein solcher Aramaismus vom lebendigen Sprachgefühl also Fremdwort empfunden wurde oder nicht, dass entzieht sich leider unserem Urteil."
(Kautzsch, op.cit., p.10.)

According to his own definition, how can he consistently point to some forty words of the Psalms as "zweifellose Aramaismen"? Robert Dick Wilson defines an Aramaism thus:

"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."
(Princeton Theol.Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.234.)

Speaking particularly with reference to the Hebrew language, he explains an Aramaism in these words:

"An Aramaism in a Hebrew document must be defined as an Aramaic word which the writer of the Hebrew document has used to denote a thing, or to express a thought, either because there was no Hebrew word that he could equally well employ, or because he was himself strongly under Aramaic influence, or because he wanted to show off his acquaintance with foreign tongues." (A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, Robert Dick Wilson, Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, 1926, p.140)

Suggested, then, by the points in which the above explanations largely agree, the definition adopted and adhered to in this treatise is: An Aramaism is a word belonging to the Aramaic language which has been used in the Hebrew because the writer was unacquainted with a word in his own language which would adequately express his idea, or because he was unable to distinguish between Aramaic words and the domestic words of the language in which he was writing, or because he had some special purpose in view when he used the word.

Moreover, it was no mean rival. The extent of its territory speaks for no insignificant prestige. According to Gen 15, Aramaean territory extended from Damascus to Aven. So large was the territory that topographically it was divided into districts: Aram-Naharain, Aram-Damascus, Aram-choch, and perhaps several others. (Gen.28,2; 2 Sam.8,3; 2 Sam.10,3.) As to power the Aramaeans were no mean match for the Israelites. In the early period of the judges

II. The Study on the Basis of History.

1) The Testimony of the Bible.

In studying the proposed subject on the basis of history, an attempt will be made to establish the part that the Aramaisms played in the Semitic civilization, especially in the Hebrew civilization. As the primary source of information about these people, the Bible comes into consideration.

Shortly after the time of Noah, in the second generation, the Aramaean people made their first appearance. (Gen.10,22,23.) Although at this early time they were but a tribal family, they very quickly assumed prominence and their name became attached to the district which they occupied. Already at the time of the patriarchs their land was recognized as a distinct country. (Gen. 28,2.6.) While the Israelites were still ruled by judges, a portion of these had already an established government with a king at the head and was powerful enough to subjugate the Children of Israel and keep them in bondage for eight years. (Judges 3,8.) During the reign of Saul and David another flourishing Aramaean kingdom played into history. (1 Sam.14,47; 2 Sam.8,3; 2 Sam.10,6.) Even after the division of the kingdom the Aramaeans continued to be a powerful people, warring and negotiating with Israel and Judah. Thus the Aramaean nation was a rival and neighbor of Israel from Abraham's time until the Israelite kingdom passed from history.

Moreover, it was no mean rival. The extent of its territory speaks for no insignificant prestige. According to Amos 1,5, Aramaean territory extended from Damascus to Aven. So large was the territory that topographically it was divided into districts: Aram-Naharaim, Aram-Damascus, Aram-Zobah, and perhaps several others. (Gen.28,2; 2 Sam.8,5; 2 Sam.10,6.) As to power the Aramaeans were no mean match for the Israelites. In the early period of the judges

the Aramaeans were their masters. (Judges 3,8.) In Psalm 60, in which David prays for deliverance while contending with Aram-Naharaim and with Aram-Zobah, a formidable foe is implied.

Having a neighbor and rival of such description, the Hebrews naturally had intercourse with it. Instances of such intercourse are on record. Abraham journeyed from Haran, an Aramaean city, to Canaan. (Gen.12,5.) Eliezer visited Aram-Naharaim to find a wife for his lord. (Gen.24.) Jacob traveled to Padan-Aram. (Gen. 28,2.) In David's wars with the Aramaeans this intercourse became very pronounced. Captives were brought into the country. (2 Sam. 8,4.) Hebrew garrisons were put into the subjugated cities. (2 Sam.8,6.) Negotiations were carried on in order to bring about peace. (2 Sam.8,6.) The Hebrew form of government which was placed over the subdued Aramaean people necessitated intercourse. During Solomon's time an era of commerce and trade was ushered in. (1 Kings 2.) Products were gathered from remote countries. (1 Kings 10,15.22.) Evidently this commercial intercourse extended also to the nations in the immediate neighborhood of Israel. In the subsequent wars waged by the divided kingdom with the Aramaeans delegations passed back and forth. (1 Kings 20.) Ahas introduced Aramaean architecture. (2 Kings 16,10.)

This intercourse between the Aramaeans and Israelites could not go on without bringing the Aramaic language into contact with the Hebrew. For this contact the Biblical records offer proof. When Laban and Jacob had erected a peace memorial, the one gave it an Aramaean name; the other, a Hebrew. (Gen.31,47.) David had as a scribe at his court Shaysha. (1 Chr.18,16.) The opinion held concerning this man is that he was an Aramaean, employed at David's court to handle foreign affairs. (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, New York, Scribners, 1909, p.842.) The conclusion suggests itself,

then, that at David's time the diplomatic language possibly was Aramaic. At the time of Sannacherib's invasion the Hebrew captains ask that the contemplated conference be held in Aramaic, indicating thereby that already at this time Aramaic was "the international language of business and diplomacy." (Davis, Dictionary of Bible, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1924, p.49.) Jeremiah uttered a short speech against idols in Aramaic. (Jer.10,11.)

2) The Testimony of the Monuments.

This information about the Aramaeans, drawn from the Bible, is corroborated and supplemented by statements in the monuments. As the original documents are not available, the evidence from this source is taken from the works of reliable scholars who have examined the documents. Breasted knows of Aramaean people in Syrio-Palestine before 1500. (Breasted, History of Egypt, New York, Scribners, 1919, p.259.) Fricke lists as sources of information about the Aramaeans the Egyptian records of Thutmose III, the Tell el-Amarna tablets of the fifteenth century B.C., the annals of the early Babylonian kings, the royal records of the Assyrian monarchs. Then, excavations have given to posterity a few of the original documents of these people from the eighth and seventh century B.C. (Fricke, The Monuments and the Old Testament, Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1925, p.417.) That the Aramaeans are mentioned in these records urges the conclusion that they existed at least as early as 1500 B.C. and continued to exist until 500 B.C.

Furthermore, records show that Aramaic-speaking people settled among other nations at an early date. During the fifth century B.C. at Assouan and Eléphantine a colony of Jews existed whose language was Aramaic. (Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel, London,

1919, p.229.) Finally, these extra-Biblical records bring evidence that Aramaic words crept into other languages. "The biography of Amenhotep, officer of Thothmes III, contains probably two Aramaic words, the one, merain meaning two lords, and nahrin, two rivers." (Breasted, Egypt II, 585,581. Cited by R.Dick Wilson in Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.237. Breasted's book not being available, this reference could not be verified.)

3) The Conclusion.

With this knowledge of the Aramaeans and of their relation with the Hebrews, based on facts from the Bible and corroborated by the monuments, one can readily see that Aramaic words may have crept into the Hebrew during the entire period from Abraham down to the time of Ezra, and one might reasonably expect to find Aramaic words in the works of Moses as well as in the works of the writers after his time. Furthermore, one might expect to find Aramaisms in Psalms which antedate the post-exilic period. To turn to the period after the exile as the only time in which Aramaisms may have been embodied in the Hebrew is putting a false construction on historical facts.

The claim, therefore, that due to Aramaisms the Psalms are post-exilic is unfounded. All history testifies against such argumentation. Kautzsch himself admits it to be self-evident that Aramaisms in the sense in which the term was defined above and is used in this discussion entered the Hebrew. He puts the thought in the form of a question, expecting an answer in the affirmative:

"Ist es nun nicht selbstverständlich, dass auch das alte Israel bei dem Übergang vom Nomadentum zu Ackerbau, Garten- und Weinbau eine Menge neuer Bezeichnungen insbesondere sogenannte Kunstausdrücke, aus dem Bereich der kühneren Kultur, in die es eintrat, übernehmen musste, und zwar nicht blos von den Kanaanitern, sondern auch von den Aramäern, mit denen es im Norden und Nordosten

des Landes in steter Berührung stand?" (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.9.)

It was stated before that one might expect Aramaic words to have been embodied in the early Hebrew documents as well as the late. This anticipation becomes a reality on the basis of claims which critics themselves make. The claim is made by critics that certain words are Aramaisms. Kautzsch, for example, lists 153 words which are Aramaisms to his mind without a doubt. An examination of this list reveals the fact that these words are found in almost all the books of the Old Testament, in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentation, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Haggai and Zechariah. Furthermore, critics hold that at least some of these books are pre-exilic. An attempt to harmonize these two claims necessitates the admission that Aramaic words exist in pre-exilic documents. Thus, on the same ground on which critics plant their deductions, stand the conclusions to which the facts of history lead.

4) The Argument in a Circle.

When critics, however, meet with the situation that a word which they have stamped as an Aramaism occurs in an evidently early document, they say the word is a late gloss or the portion of the document which contains the word is a late addition. Here, then, the argument is: a late word, therefore a late document. At another place this argument is found: a late document, therefore a late word. A logician will immediately see that here is a fine example of the argument in a circle. Such reasoning is discredited

in any kind of discussion and cannot be countenanced here.

5) Additional Considerations.

As to the Psalms in particular, if one calls to mind the author of most of the Psalms and the time in which they must have been written, the Aramaisms in these Psalms seem still less unusual. First of all, David was a literary man and as such he, undoubtedly, had an aptitude for other languages. If, then, in his writing he should use a borrowed word, it should not be considered otherwise than natural. David was a king. In this capacity he had to associate with Aramaean dignitaries and embassies. It is most natural to think that in this way he would adopt an Aramaic word here and there. The time in which these Davidic Psalms were written was one in which the intercourse existing between the Aramaeans and Israelites was beyond the ordinary. Especially in such a time one might expect to find Aramaic traces in the Hebrew.

Instead of the question whether the Aramaisms are Aramaic, the question whether the words claimed to be Aramaisms are really Aramaic will be the topic for consideration. The relation that this question has to the main issue is very apparent. If the words said to be Aramaic are in reality not such, then the whole structure which has been built on the foundation of Aramaisms falls. In other words, all theorizing about Aramaisms will be discredited because of a false premise.

In taking up this investigation to see whether words considered to be Aramaic are really such, an examination of the general methods and principles which are put into practice in order to classify words will first be undertaken. Thereupon will follow an examination of the individual words of the Psalms which have been regarded as Aramaic to see whether the evidence justified their

III. The Study on the Basis of Language.

1) The Nature and Plan of Discussion.

With what has been said above, the problem connected with determining the date of the Psalms from the presence of Aramaisms has been definitely settled. The Aramaisms do not indicate post-exilic origin. And, therefore, this discussion might be brought to a close. But there is another phase to the subject which deserves consideration in a treatise of this kind, if it is to be complete. Some attention ought to be given the linguistic side of the problem. While it is true that any new consideration, no matter what the result to which it leads may be, ^{it} will not overthrow the conclusion which has been made in the previous section. It may, however, strikingly confirm that conclusion.

In the following section, then, of this treatise the Aramaisms of the Psalms as evidence of their date of composition will be investigated as a problem of language. This procedure will shift the discussion somewhat. Instead of the question whether the Aramaisms are evidence, the question whether the words claimed to be Aramaisms are really Aramaisms will be the topic for consideration. The relation that this question has to the main issue is very apparent. If the words held to be Aramaisms are in reality not such, then the entire structure which has been built on the foundation of Aramaisms falls. In other words, all theorizing about Aramaisms will be discredited because of a false premise.

In taking up this investigation to see whether words considered to be Aramaisms are really such, an examination of the general methods and principles which are put into practice in order to classify words will first be undertaken. Thereupon will follow an examination of the individual words of the Psalms which have been regarded as Aramaisms to see whether the evidence justified their

being classed as such.

2) General Methods and Principles Examined.

a) Assumptions Answered.

The gist of the argumentation which is observed in order to show that a word is an Aramaism is as follows: If a word occurs infrequently, if it occurs in late documents, and if the same word is widely used in Aramaic, then it follows that the word is an Aramaism. The concise form in which the argumentation has been presented may arouse the suspicion that the case has been misrepresented. It is well, therefore, to insert the requirements for Aramaisms listed by Kautzsch, two of which, if they are found in a suspicious word, are sufficient, as he claims, to confirm it as an Aramaism. His words are:

"Als Lehnwörter aus dem Aramäischen sind mit absoluter Sicherheit eigentlich nur solche Stämme und Wörter zu betrachten, die,

a) in einer dem Aramäischen eigentümlichen Wortform auftreten;

b) mindesten aus dem Bereich des Westaramäischen und zwar in der gleichen Bedeutung als durchaus gewöhnlich, dagegen aus dem Kanaanitischen und Südsemitischen überhaupt nicht zu belegen sind (letztere Bedingung hat natürlich auch dann als erfüllt zu gelten, wenn das fragliche Wort erwiesenermaßen erst als aramäisches Lehnwort ins Arabische eingedrungen ist);

c) sich in der sicher vorexilischen Literatur entweder gar nicht oder nur in anderer (dem Aramäischen unbekannter) Bedeutung finden, seit dem Exil aber so häufig werden, dass ältere genuine-hebräische Stämme und Wörter geradezu durch sie verdrängt erscheinen." (Op.cit., p.15.)

To sum up the argument: If a word meets with the given requirements, it is an Aramaism. Now, in order to hold in many instances that this is the necessary conclusion which follows from the given premises certain assumptions are involved.

The first of these is: An internal development is a negligible factor in the Hebrew vocabulary. An internal development

is to be understood as changes taking place within the vocabulary of a language itself in distinction from an external development, which is a changing in the vocabulary due to words coming in from some other language.

An example will serve to illustrate the line of argument and the supposition involved. In speaking of לָחָם "war", Kautzsch concludes that this word must be viewed as an Aramaism and then adds as one of his reasons "das ganz späte Auftauchens des Wortes an Stelle von חָרָב ." (Kautzsch, op.cit.p.5.) Evidently the principle here established is this: because an older word, meaning "war", is replaced in later documents by another word, meaning "war", the latter must be regarded as borrowed. Stated differently, the thought is that the idea of war as far as the Hebrew is concerned ought always be expressed by the same word, even after the passing of centuries. And this is the same as saying the Hebrew vocabulary remains fixed unless words enter from without.

The possibility that such a word like לָחָם might be borrowed must be granted. But this is by no means the only way of explaining the replacement of one word by another of the same meaning. It is a known fact that the vocabulary of a nation changes. That of a Shakespeare is not the same as that of a writer of today. Likewise, the German spoken by Luther varies from the German of the present century. What holds true in the case of modern languages holds true in the classics. The Latin of Augustine's day does not have the same vocabulary as the Latin of Augustus' day. The Churches of Paul would have found some difficulty in reading a letter of Aristotle. In the light of these analogies, it is not unreasonable to expect changes in the Hebrew vocabulary. It is true that these changes may not be so great as those in other languages. Neverthe-

less, their existence cannot be denied entirely. Green holds this view: "The Hebrew underwent a considerable change between the beginning and the end of the Old Testament." (Green, op. cit., p.21.)

Since changes might reasonably be expected in the Hebrew language, these may be accounted for on the analogy of other languages in other ways besides regarding them due to this that words were taken over from the Aramaic. Words drop their original meaning and assume new. Take the English word "conversation"; at one time it meant "conduct", now it means "talk". Or the word "let"; originally "hinder", now "allow". Or the word "careful"; originally "anxious", now "cautious". Take the German "Lente"; originally "soldiers", "servants"; now "people". Take the Greek ἐκκλησία; originally "assembly", then "church". When, therefore, it is claimed that, although the verb קָרַן has the special meaning "to be honored", the noun קָרַן did not develop the specific meaning "honor", but borrowed it from Aramaic, a deduction is made which does not necessarily follow.

Another way of accounting for internal changes in a vocabulary is the coining of new words. Every living language is confronted with the necessity of making new words to express its thoughts. Thus in the English language some recently coined words are: solarium, rotogravure, normalcy, mortuary, 'enthuse', 'pep'. In the Greek, it is suggested that ὀφθαλμοδουλεία is a coined word. (Peake, Expositor's Greek New Testament, Vol.III, p.542.) Consequently, it is not unreasonable to expect a number of words to have been coined in Hebrew.

The suggestion that certain Hebrew words may have changed their meaning and that certain words were coined as occasion demanded becomes more plausible when one remembers the time interval in

which this might have taken place. Four hundred years show noticeable changes in this respect in the English language; four centuries are enough to stamp words considered good usage in Luther's day as obsolete; three centuries are sufficient time for the $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\eta$ to supplant classic Greek. With a language, then, whose literature is distributed over a period of 1100 years, as the Hebrew, there is to be expected a noticeable difference between the vocabulary of the early documents and that of the late. Furthermore, a transition from a nomadic to a national life, such as the Hebrews experienced, speaks for a more than ordinary language development, especially as regards the making of new words.

Objection may be raised to the discussion above on the grounds that the allegations of critics have been misconstrued. For nowhere do they make the claim that the Hebrew language remains unchanged internally. In fact, statements might be gleaned where the contrary is asserted. Although it cannot be denied that certain statements on the part of critics are an indication that they are not unaware of internal changes in Hebrew, yet the disregard for this fact in the consideration of some words justifies the detailed treatment of this point.

A second assumption involved in the arguments for regarding certain words as Aramaisms is: The Hebrew language is stereotyped. That is to say, a certain thought in Hebrew is always clothed in the same word and a certain word is confined to one meaning. That such an assumption is made seems unnatural; in fact so much so that one begins to question whether such a supposition is made at all. The following examples, however, will readily show that the above statement is based on facts. In his treatment of the word $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\eta$ Kautzsch says:

"Dagegen entspricht es in der Bedeutung gemeinaramäischer כָּנָה, mag dort auch der Begriff d. Schlagens, genau wie bei hebr. כָּנָה, je nach dem Zusammenhang zu dem des Erschlagens gesteigert sein." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p.54.)

That the author makes this statement in order to establish the meaning of the word כָּנָה arouses no objection. But that he takes this as evidence for stamping כָּנָה as an Aramaism is unwarranted. To say that because כָּנָה is the usual Hebrew word for "to smite", כָּנָה, which has the same meaning cannot be a Hebrew word is a non-sequitur. This would be a virtual denial of the existence of synonyms in Hebrew and would be ascribing to the Hebrew language a characteristic which is not found.

Any such view of the Hebrew vocabulary must be changed when one reviews a few notations which Green makes on the Hebrew language. He states:

"The language shows in some direction at least a remarkable richness of terms, an affluence even of synonyms. Thus there are eight terms denoting darkness of various grades or variously conceived; there are seven or eight names for lions of different species or different ages; four names for the ox; eleven for rain of different sorts or various intensity; eighteen words meaning to break different materials or in different ways; ten for the act of seeking and nine for the act of dying." (Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament Text, Scribners, New York, 1923, p.31.)

Again, in his remarks on פָּרַד Kautzsch states:

"Der ältere Gebrauch des Stammes im Hebräischen lässt noch überall die im Arab. vorliegende Grundbedeutung spalten, trennen deutlich erkennen. Dagegen ist die Bed. auslösen, loskaufen, befreien gemeinaramäisch." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p.74.)

The contents of this quotation can be put thus: The word פָּרַד has the meaning "to split, to separate", in Hebrew; when it appears in the meaning "to free" it is an Aramaism. The assumption is evident: פָּרַד as far as it is a Hebrew word has one meaning. To assume, however, that a Hebrew word has one meaning is unwarranted.

For it is an unquestioned characteristic of Hebrew words to have primary and secondary, root and derived meanings. Sometimes the meanings that a word has do not show any relation in thought. Thus the verb נָחַח is capable of expressing "to enjoy" and "to despise." (Green, op.cit., p.33.)

A third assumption is: In Hebrew literature the diction is specified and determined by the form of composition, by stylistic tastes of authors and by the subject matter only in a negligible degree, so that these literary considerations can be discounted in discussing the usage of words. Objection will be raised to this charge on the grounds that facts have been misrepresented. For in some instances, at least, Kautzsch concedes the possibility of a word having a poetic usage and, consequently, places it among his list of doubtful Aramaisms. He states:

"Und da die Hauptmasse der hebräischen Poesie nach dem heutigen Stand der Literarkritik erst aus dem Zeitraum des Exils und der nachexilischen Zeit stamme, so sei es kein Wunder, wenn uns zahlreiche alte poetische Wörter erst in so später Zeit entgegen-treten. Gewiss mag es sich in einer Anzahl von Fällen so verhalten." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.7.)

In answer to this objection it must be said that, although the possibility that diction is determined by literary considerations is recognized, an acknowledgment does not vouch for its application. In the remarks on נָחַח , the fact that this word occurs only in poetry is passed over in silence. The procedure, portrayed in this instance, justifies the conclusion that the above assumption is made. The validity of this assumption will now be put to a test.

Does the form of composition qualify the vocabulary of Hebrew literature? As prose and poetry are the two forms of composition which come into consideration, the discussion will be limited to these two. It is universally recognized that, although poetry has

a vocabulary in the main the same as prose, it employs many words peculiar to itself. This quality is demonstrable in the English language. Prof. Earle, warning his students against using poetic words in prose, lists the following examples of words peculiar to poetry: brethren, for brothers; charger, palfrey, steed, for horse; welkin, for sky; whilome, for once; eve, for before; vale, for valley; thrall, for slave; thralldom, for slavery. (Earle, English Prose, p.153.) On the analogy of the English one might expect to find differences in the diction of Hebrew poetry and Hebrew prose. Moreover, that this is actually the case is confirmed by scholars. In speaking about the Hebrew vocabulary, Green says: "The differences created in Hebrew by different species of composition are considerable and important." (Green, op. cit., p.19.) Then, to prove his point, he lists twelve words which are used only in poetry in the stead of a commonplace prose word. They are: אָרָה, אֶרְבָּה, אֶפְסָה for the prose word אָרָה "word"; אָרָה for אִישׁ "man"; אֶרְבָּה for אָרָה "man"; אָרָה for אֶרְבָּה "declare"; אָרָה for בֹּא "come"; אָרָה for אָרָה "do"; אָרָה for אָרָה "plant"; אָרָה for אָרָה "war"; אָרָה for אָרָה "gold"; and אָרָה for אֵל "not".

In view of this well established characteristic of the Hebrew language, it is unreasonable when an unusual Hebrew word makes its appearance in the Psalms, as for instance אָרָה and אָרָה, to assign it to the class of Aramaisms without taking cognizance of all phases of the word.

Does the individual taste of an author influence the diction employed in certain documents? Is the fact that certain words are used by certain writers, while another writer employs another word expressing a similar thought, to be accounted for in the way that the latter borrowed from the Aramaic or that the latter was guided

in his choice by his peculiar tastes? That each author employs words peculiar to himself is a known fact. As an appellation for Jesus a sectarian writer favors "Master"; a Lutheran writer, "Savior". This assertion is the result of an investigation of religious literature. In one sermon of the former class "Master" occurs six times; "Savior", not at all. In one belonging to the latter class, "Savior" is found three times; "Master", not at all. Thayer lists 137 words peculiar to Matthew; 1,026, to Mark; 851, to Luke; and 133, to John. Nevertheless, no one would be inclined to regard this out of the ordinary.

A parallel in the New Testament will serve to illustrate the case in point. The usual word in the New Testament for death is *θάνατος*; it occurs 113 times in the entire New Testament; seven times in Matthew. Peculiarly, however, Matthew uses in one instance, (2,15) *τελευτῆ* for death. On the basis of these figures it would be absurd to conclude that *τελευτῆ* is a foreign word. The occurrence of this word must be attributed to the individuality of Matthew.

While the examples which have been proposed compel one to make the inference that the Hebrew writers selected their words according to their own likes and dislikes, the most striking proof for this procedure is offered by the Hebrew itself. Amos, the shepherd-prophet, for example, uses the words *-פ'יב* (2,13) and *וּלְיָד* (5,11), which occur only with this writer and peculiarly enough betray a shepherd's language. (Dr. Fuerbringer, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, St. Louis, 1913, p.83.) If, then, some more unusual words make their appearance in the Psalms, the possibility dare not be overlooked that these are result of the taste and peculiarities of the author.

Is the diction determined by the subject-matter also in Hebrew? To answer this let the following analogies serve. The twenty-seventh chapter of Acts presents portionally an unusual amount of hapax legomina. As the author and the style remain the same for this chapter as for the other chapters, this irregularity must be accounted for by the subject-matter. The portrayal of the shipwreck of Paul and its perils necessarily called for infrequent words. The Gospel of St. John has 114 words found only in this document; his epistles have eleven such words. Again, since the author is the same and the style more or less the same, the subject-matter must determine largely the vocabulary. Thus, the vocabulary of the Psalms will naturally deviate in some instances from that of some other books, for its subject-matter is not historical nor legal, but didactic and reflective.

The rather detailed consideration which has been undertaken in the above paragraphs will serve to impress this that the assumptions made in connection with certain words are unsound. Consequently, these words, which have been definitely called Aramaisms, grow questionable.

b) Grounds Investigated.

A close investigation of the grounds for supposing a word to be an Aramaism discloses three of a general nature. As these are brought to bare in the discussion of various words time and again, they shall not be considered in connection with each individual word, for this would necessitate needless repetition; but they will be taken up at once and their validity weighed.

The first ground is the late appearance of a word "das späte Auftauchen eines Wortes." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.78.) Expressed differently, the thought is: if a word appears in a document which

is considered late, the word is evidently late and as such makes the possibility of its being an Aramaism very probable. Granted that the lateness of a word is a strong point in favor of accepting the same as an Aramaism - this need not necessarily be true - yet, this conclusion cannot stand because the premise is false. To say a word is late because it occurs in a late document is a deduction which does not necessarily follow. "If a late document was the only survival of a once numerous body of literature, every word in it would be late; which is absurd." (Wilson, A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, Philadelphia, Sunday School Times, p.132.) Then, the mere fact that a word appears in a document considered late does not necessarily say the word is late; it may have existed in the language of the people long before there was occasion to use it in writing. This consideration becomes more forceful when it is called to mind that the extant Hebrew literature is comparatively small and is all of a religious nature. Even Kautzsch realizes the uncertainty connected with classifying a word as late. He says:

"Ebenso misslich ist aber schliesslich auch das argumentum e silentio gegenüber dem späten, vielleicht erst nachexilischen Auftauchen eines hebräischen Wortes. Dieses Auftauchen kann sehr wohl das Wiederauftauchen eines an sich gut hebräischen, aber im Gebrauche zurückgetretenen Wortes sein. Ebensogut kann es aber auch ein allezeit lebendiges Wort betreffen, das nur uns in der wenig umfangreichen vorexilischen Literature zufällig vorenthalten blieb." (Kautzsch, op.cit.,p.17.)

Even if there were some method of definitely establishing that certain words are late, this would not be absolute proof of their being Aramaisms. In another connection it was pointed out how words which are evidently late might be accounted for besides regarding them as borrowed. They may, namely, be newly coined words or words which have divested themselves of their original meaning and appear in a new dress.

A second ground which is urged is the infrequency of appearance, "das seltene Vorkommen." What is evidently meant is that the rare usage of a word speaks strongly for an Aramaism. It must be admitted that a foreign word, as a rule, occurs infrequently. But the converse cannot be admitted: an infrequent word is foreign. Take the word $\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, (Col.2,9); it occurs only once in the New Testament. Yet, this does not make it a foreign word. The frequency or infrequency of the use of a word depends on other considerations. Sometimes the idea conveyed by such a word is of such a nature that an author would find little or no occasion to employ it. For example, the word for a special type of ax 𐤁𐤓𐤁 will have but very limited use. Sometimes the peculiar connotation of a word would move an author to use a word in isolated instances. In that case, the whole matter would resolve itself into a question of stylistic differences. As such, it is nigh impossible for a man today to determine why a certain word, especially if it occurs seldom, was used by an author over two thousand four hundred years ago.

A third ground is: the word must have an established usage in Aramaic literature. A word which occurs infrequently in Hebrew very often occurs frequently in Aramaic. But to say that, because it is frequent in Aramaic and infrequent in Hebrew, it is of Aramaic origin is a non-sequitur. Such a word may have belonged to that common stock which was possessed by the parent language of this family, and was transmitted from it to all the Semitic tongues. In the Aramaic, then, it may have been retained in familiar use, while in Hebrew it passed into comparative disuse. Various other considerations make such a conclusion very improbable. First: By far the greatest portion of words of the Aramaic and of the Hebrew language belong to common Semitic stock. Other things being equal,

the natural conclusion would be, if one is confronted with a word which occurs in Hebrew and in Aramaic, to regard it as common Semitic stock. Second: In Babylonian and Arabic some roots which were considered Aramaisms have been discovered. This necessitates calling such roots common Semitic stock. Third: "Most of the Aramaic documents were written by people of the Jewish race and religion and whose literature was almost entirely Hebrew." (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.252.) Accordingly, one might expect many words, instead of being Aramaisms in Hebrew, to be Hebrewisms in Aramaic. Prof. Wilson finds about six hundred such Hebrewisms. Fourth: Many of the proofs offered to show that a word existed in Aramaic is limited to an Aramaic dialect and to an Aramaic document only written by Jews. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.252.) This makes the possibility that one is dealing with Hebrewisms instead of Aramaisms so much greater. Fifth: 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. In such cases the possibility of an Aramaism is very remote.

Herewith the weakness of the general grounds for supposing a word to be an Aramaism has been sufficiently exposed. However, this refutation will call forth the objection that the various requirements have been divorced from each other and have been considered independently, the intention, however, being that these should be found together. This objection is by no means insuperable. For if in an argument which has several premises any one of them is false, the entire conclusion is false, even if some of the premises are correct.

3) Kautzsch's Alleged Aramaisms.

Now that the discussion of the general arguments for accepting certain words as Aramaisms has been brought to a close, an examination can be entered upon of the special arguments advanced for individual words. Such an examination will take cognizance of the specific objections raised against a Hebrew word and the available data on each. However, it must be continually borne in mind that the three general grounds set forth above, while not restated in connection with the individual words except in such cases where they present an additional problem, are continually urged, but that these have been adequately refuted. As various words in the Psalms have been called Aramaisms by various men and at various times, it is almost impossible to study every such word. Therefore, only a representative list of Aramaisms will be considered. As such Prof. Kautzsch's list has been selected. According to him there are forty-four Aramaic roots in the Psalms.

As a preface to this proposed examination, a statement deserves to be made concerning the standards by which one may determine whether a word is borrowed or not. Skeat, a renowned philologist, has formulated this canon:

"When words in two different languages are more nearly alike than the ordinary phonetic laws would allow, there is a strong probability that one language has borrowed the word from the other."
(Skeat, Etymological Dictionary of English Language, Oxford, 1910, p.xxviii.)

In order to apply the canon it will be necessary to know what the phonetic laws are which govern the Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic languages. Prof. Robert Dick Wilson by diligent and painstaking work has prepared tables which establish these laws. According to his finds "the radical sounds ʔ, h, h, m, p, g, k,

q, l, n, and x are usually written uniformly with corresponding signs..... In preformatives and sufformatives Hebrew h is ' in the others; and in sufformatives Hebrew m is n. In the other eight (or nine, counting sin) radical sounds, however, certain regular changes occur." (Wilson, Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament, p.141.) If, now, in comparing the consonants of Hebrew and Aramaic words, it is found that they make exception to the regular changes, there is a possibility that the word is borrowed. The principle can well be illustrated in the related language, German, English, and Dutch. The English word "think" is "denken" in German, "denk" in Dutch. The English "thin" is "dünn" in German, "dun" in Dutch. The law of consonantal changes on the basis of these examples would be: a th in English is a d in German. A comparison of the word throne in English and the German word Thron shows that the German has a th as well as the English. This being contrary to the regular changes, the suspicion is justified that the word is borrowed. According to these phonetic laws the Hebrew and Aramaic words in most instances have identical sounds. Only in those instances where the words contain consonants which are subject to change is there a possibility of detecting on the basis of phonetics whether a word is borrowed. Thus, as far as phonetics are concerned, no evidence can be produced for the majority of words to show that they have been borrowed.

The only way of testing this class of words, then, is on the basis of form and sense. If a word has a formation that is typical of the Aramaic and its sense is in agreement with the Aramaic *usus loquendi* one may suspect it of having been borrowed. However, as the form and sense of words in the Semitic languages is the same in most cases, little evidence can be produced also in this respect

for supposing a word to be borrowed.

. רָקַד "to look after", Ps.27,4.

Kautzsch tabulates this word as an Aramaism. (op.cit. p.23.) He is followed in his view by Briggs. (op.cit.Vol. II,p.243.) The reasons advanced to substantiate their claims are: רָקַד occurs late; it is rare in Hebrew; it corresponds in form and meaning to the Aramaic רָקַד and is the equivalent of the Hebrew רָקַד ; the writers who employ this word perceive it to be a foreign word.

As to the lateness of רָקַד , it must be said that all the arguments set forth in an above paragraph to show that it is unsafe to say a word is late just because it appears only in late documents apply here. What is more, רָקַד occurs in the earliest Hebrew documents; it is found in Lev.13,36 and 27,33. Furthermore, רָקַד occurs in a document which critics themselves consider to be one of the oldest; it occurs, namely, in 2 Kings 16,15. Finally, Hebrew knows a derivative of this same root, רָקַד , a fact which indicates that the root was well established.

Although it is generally admitted that the passage from 2 Kings is early, nevertheless, those who consider רָקַד an Aramaism are not ready to discard their views on the basis of this passage. For they hold that according to the context this verb "denotes some religious service to be performed by the king himself." (R.Smith, The Religion of the Semites. This reference is found in Brown, Driver, and Briggs' Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.) This, then, would give a root meaning which is in no wise connected with רָקַד "to look after." This attempt at interpreting רָקַד in this passage cannot be sanctioned. For, first of all, the meaning "to look after" gives very good sense in this passage. Then, a

verb which has the meaning "to perform some religious ceremony" would occur only in this passage. Finally, the type of ceremony that would be implied by such a rendition of this verb finds no parallel in the Old Testament.

It is held that קָרַב is the equivalent of קָרַב . From this premise the deduction is made that because the one word is well established in Hebrew the other must be borrowed.

Kautzsch's own words in this matter are:

"Der Beweis für die Entlehnung wird sich zwar in zahlreichen Fällen mit annähernder Sicherheit führen lassen, besonders dann,wenn dem verdächtigen Wort ein vielgebrauchtes zweifellos Hebräisches Wort zur Seite geht." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.10.)

Although there is a relation in the thought conveyed by the two words, differences are likewise very outstanding. The Hebrew

קָרַב is used of visiting (1 Sam.17,18) and also of chastising (Is.24,21.) The word קָרַב occurs nowhere in the meaning "to chastise." Lev.19,20 has been advanced to show that the root

קָרַב has the meaning "to chastise." But the best rendition of this word is "investigation." This rendition is supported by the LXX. It is adopted by Koenig. In Lev. this verb occurs in two other passages where it evidently means "to investigate as a priest." This meaning fits well in this passage. Furthermore, קָרַב means "to enquire searchingly." It is used especially in this sense, of priests and in connection with the ceremonial law. (Lev.13,36; 27,33.) The verb קָרַב is not used of visiting in general. Thus, that both of these verbs cannot be good Hebrew words on the grounds that they have the same meaning has no support.

Again, it is held that the Hebrew writers perceived קָרַב to be a foreign word because in using the word they employ the aram. infinitive where one would expect the regular Hebrew infinitive.

The section appealed to is Ezra 34,11,12. The word that occurs here may have the form of an Aramaic infinitive. But there is no reason why this cannot be a regularly formed Hebrew substantive from the root קָן . In view of such words as קָן־קָן־קָן , a substantive from the root קָן , occurring already in Gen.7,22, and קָן־קָן , from קָן , Ps.119,50, this explanation is very plausible. And besides, קָן forms its infinitive according to Hebrew, Ps.27,4.

Prof. Wilson's investigations show that קָן occurs also in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.258.) As the Babylonian documents antedate both the Hebrew and the Aramaic documents, קָן cannot be considered a word borrowed from the Aramaic. It evidently belongs to common Semitic stock or it may be a Babylonianism in Hebrew. At any rate, the evidence is against its being an Aramaism.

. קָן "Son", Ps.2,12.

Kautzsch classes this word as an Aramaism without offering a cogent reason for his view. (op.cit.p.24.) Gunkel speaks of קָן as an "unerträglich" Aramaism. (Gunkel, Die Psalmen, Göttingen, 1925, p.12.) Stoeckhardt makes this note on the word: "Das Substantive קָן , hier und Prov.31,2, ist Aramaismus für קָן ." (Stoeckhardt, Auserwählte Psalmen, Concordia Pub.House, St.Louis, 1915, p.38.) Driver calls it a "strong" Aramaism. (Driver, op.cit., p.403.)

This word, however, occurs elsewhere in Hebrew poetry besides here, namely, Prov.31,2. Thus the prima facie evidence points to a good Hebrew poetic word. In addition to this, there is reason to believe that קָן is a poetic word because of its connotation. Although both קָן and קָן mean "son," the former implies the ad-

ditional idea that divine power is the ultimate source of children in distinction from בן which denotes a son merely as the natural offspring of parents. The grounds for believing בן to have this connotation is based on a comparison of the roots from which בן and בנה are derived. According to Davidson, בן comes from בנה , a verb used only of divine creating. בנה is derived from בנה a verb used of a human act and in the special sense of begetting children. (Gen.30,3.) The connotation implied by the two words for "son" is in a measure reproduced in the two names for boys, Eugene and Theodore.

The word בן is used in this verse instead of בנה in order to avoid the cacophony of בנה-בנה . Stoeckhardt suggests this explanation: "Vielleicht sollte auch der Missklang בנה-בנה vermeiden werden." (Stoeckhardt, op.cit.,p.38.) This view is also entertained by Delitzsch. He remarks on this passage that בן "helps one over the dissonance of בנה-בנה ." (Delitzsch, Commentary on the Psalms, T. & T. Clark, 1871, p.98.)

It is held that בן is perceived to be a borrowed word because it occurs in a passage that shows other Aramaic traces. The passage referred to is Prov.31,2.3 where the Aramaic plural בנות is found. But even if the latter word be Aramaic, that would in no wise say that בן would need to be Aramaic. Moreover, in another connection it will be shown that, although the plural ending ות is called by grammarians an Aramaic plural; its usage can be considered good Hebrew.

Even critics who are inclined to consider every unusual word as an Aramaism regard בן as a good Hebrew word. Briggs expresses himself to this effect that בן and two other words of Psalm 2 "are all good Hebrew words." (Briggs, op.cit.Vol.I,p.13.)

Besides in Hebrew, כָּדַח is found according to Wilson, in Phoenician, Palestinian Syriac, New Aramaic, Mandaean, Daniel, Ezra, Syriac, North Syriac, Egypto-Aramaic, Nabatean, and Palmyrene. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 260.) This array of languages and dialects leads to the conclusion that כָּדַח is common Semitic stock and, therefore, as good a Hebrew word as it is Aramaic.

כָּדַח "thrust", Ps. 140, 12.

Although many scholars, due to the limited information, leave the classification of this word an open question, Kautzsch accepts it as an Aramaism about which there can be no doubt. (Kautzsch, op. cit. p. 25.)

The fact to be noted above all in discussing this word is that it is a hapax legomenon and as such there is a great deal of difficulty in establishing the meaning. Hengstenberg, Ols-hausen, Baethgen, and Duhm, cited by Delitzsch and Briggs, interpret the word as meaning "push upon push." Delitzsch adopts "by hastenings." (Delitzsch, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 360.) Briggs' interpretation is "the place of utter thrusting out." (Briggs, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 306.) Koenig renders it "Abgrund." If, then, the meaning of כָּדַח is a subject of so much conjecture, a positive assertion that it is an Aramaism becomes impossible.

According to the studies of Prof. Wilson, this word is found in no other language or dialect except the Old Testament Hebrew. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 254.) Therefore, it is absurd to speak of borrowing from the Aramaic.

Judged according to form, כָּדַח is a good Hebrew word. The noun כָּדַח is an example of an analogous formation. (Is. 14, 4.)

The root from which this noun is derived occurs in Hebrew. It is found in 2 Chr.26,20 and several times in Esther. Although these passages are found in late documents, that does not make the word late, as has been stated above. And even if קַרְנֵי is a late word, that does not make it an Aramaism.

. קַרְנֵי "corner", Ps.144,12.

The only authority to be found who accepts this word as an Aramaism is Kautzsch. (Kautzsch, op.cit.,p.27.) The arguments advanced for his claim are evidently the infrequent occurrence of the word and the appearance in Aramaic of the same word.

In answer to the first argument, let it be said that קַרְנֵי is used in Hebrew as a term of architecture. It is used of the corners of an altar and of a corner decoration. As such a term it would naturally have a limited use.

Also in Zech.9,12, this same word is employed. This instance is prima facie evidence that קַרְנֵי is a good Hebrew word.

Compared to forms like קַרְנֵי , קַרְנֵי , and קַרְנֵי , this word has a formation well established in Hebrew.

Prof. Wilson's investigations show that this word occurs in Hebrew, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic and Syriac. (Wilson, Princeton Theol.Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.259.) Thus, since the word occurs in the three main branches of the Semitic family, the prima facie evidence leads to accepting קַרְנֵי as a common stock word.

• עָרַף "to erect", Ps.145,14; 146,8.

Without giving any grounds, Driver refers to עָרַף as an Aramaism. (Driver, op.cit., p.374.) Likewise, Kautzsch calls this verb an incontestable Aramaism. The facts to which the latter makes reference in order to make his view plausible are the rare use of the word in Hebrew, the occurrence of the same word in Aramaic, and the employment of שְׁ to introduce the object of the infinitive according to the Aramaic manner.

The inadmissibility of the rare use of a word as proof for its being an Aramaism has been commented on above, and all that was said there in general will apply in this case. That the object of this word in the first reference is introduced by שְׁ after the Aramaic fashion is not necessarily an indication that the author, when dealing with עָרַף , perceived its foreign character and that, consequently, it has the requisites of an Aramaism. For in Ps.146,8 the same construction is used without the שְׁ . Furthermore, although שְׁ has been called the Aramaic nota accusativa by grammarians to distinguish it from לְ , there is no good reason for not believing שְׁ to be an additional nota accusativa in Hebrew beside לְ as such to belong to good Hebrew. For already in the oldest documents this construction is found, occurring in Num. 10,25 (שְׁ לְעֹלֹתֶיךָ).

Noteworthy is the fact that critics who otherwise readily catalogue infrequent words as Aramaisms find the evidence too little in the case of this word to permit its being called an Aramaism. Briggs says, "There is no good reason for taking it as a late word." (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.529.)

A study of the passages where עָרַף occurs shows that this verb means "to erect into an upright position and to sustain thus." As no other Hebrew word, used to express the idea "to raise", ex-

presses exactly the scope of $\eta\text{פ}\text{ז}$, there is no good reason for supposing that $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ is not a current Hebrew word which was employed when this particular concept was intended.

Wilson's studies have brought to light that this very verb is used in Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, Ezra, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 259.) Being found already in Babylonian, this verb is in no wise original with the Aramaeans. It could rather be a Babylonianism in Hebrew as the Babylonian literary documents antedate the earliest Hebrew documents. However, it is also found in Arabic. Therefore, it had better be regarded as common property of the Semitic language.

. $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ "to rejoice". Ps. 21, 7.

Practically the only scholar to class $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ as an Aramaism is Kautzsch. He opines:

"Angesicht dieses so äusserst spärlichen Gebrauchs ist wohl nicht zu bezweifeln, dass in $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ das im Jud.-Aramäischen und Syrischen vielgebrauchte Äquivalent für das ebenso häufige hebr. $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ vorliegt." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 30.)

The main assertion of this sentence by which Kautzsch substantiates his claim is that the word is rare. The validity of this claim was tested in a previous paragraph and it was found that the rare use of a word must be discounted as evidence of its being an Aramaism. This applies with equal force to the word in question.

Furthremore, it is held that $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ is an Aramaic substitute for the good Hebrew $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$. More natural, however, is the explanation that $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$ is a synonym for the good Hebrew $\eta\text{ק}\text{ז}$. For on the analogy of other languages it is natural that the prime emotions like rejoicing should be expressed also

in Hebrew at least by several synonyms. While the limited use of נָתַן makes it impossible to distinguish between the type of rejoicing expressed by נָתַן and that expressed by נָצַח , nevertheless, a comparison of the number of times each one occurs suggests that נָצַח is a general term, while

נָתַן is more specific. This comparison extended to the substantives derived from these roots reveals the same fact, even if such a comparison is limited to the late documents. In Nehemiah נָתַן occurs once; נָצַח , four times. In the two books of Chronicles נָתַן occurs once; נָצַח eleven times. According to this tabulation, *prima facie* evidence points to the fact that each writer was acquainted with both words, employing, however, the general term more often than the specific.

In addition to what has been said, there are good reasons for supposing that the root נָתַן is well established in Hebrew. A derivative of this root is found, namely, $\text{נָתַן$ referred to above. David in Psalm 21,7 used the phrase $\text{נָתַן אֱלֹהֵינוּ$

נָתַן אֱלֹהֵינוּ . This shows his acquaintance with both roots.

Wilson has found this word in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 257.) This fact points to a Babylonianism in Hebrew rather than an Aramaism.

• נָתַן "To show", Ps. 19, 3.

Gunkel speaks of this word as Aramaic. (Gunkel, op.cit., p. 76.) The same view is entertained by Kautzsch, who remarks that it is "das gemeinaramäische Äquivalent für hebr. נָתַן ." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p. 30.)

The occurrence of נָתַן in several instances were one might expect נָתַן ought be no reason for calling it an Aramaism.

For the type of word which is being considered easily explains this and accounts for its limited use.

וַיְהִי is a poetic word. For it occurs only in poetic passages. Some of the greatest scholars consider it as such. Briggs calls it a poetic form. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II,p.172.) Green lists it as a word not found in prose. (Green, op.cit., p.19.) Likewise, Bleek embodies this word in his list of good Hebrew, poetic words. (Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin, 1870, p.92.)

Other considerations which stamp the word as good Hebrew are: It occurs elsewhere in Scripture, namely, Job 32,10,17. Davis accepts it as a common Semitic stock. He remarks: "It is common to several Semitic languages; it belongs to the Semitic stock." (Davis, Princeton Theol.Review, Vol.III,No.3, p.372.)

The context in which the word is used necessitated the Psalmist's employing a more unusual word. Davis explains it thus:

"While singing his hymn and while yet unfolding his first thought, he had practically exhausted the ordinary synonyms of two words; and he was obliged to draw upon terms of rarer use in literature. He had already employed the verb declare, show, utter; and he needed another verb of similar meaning. The poverty of the English language is revealed by the fact that the translators repeat the word show. The Hebrew poet was able to give expression to the same idea in a fourth form, hiwah, belonging to common Semitic stock." (Davis, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.III, No.3, p.372.)

. הַרְתִּי "Riddle", Ps.49,5.

Among the commentators on this word whose works were accessible, Kautzsch is the only one who regards this word as an Aramaism. Following de Lagarde, Kautzsch has assigned an interesting development to this word which deserves to be reproduced so that the entire discussion may become more comprehensible. In his view הַרְתִּי comes from the Syriac ܠܗܪܬܐ, the same verb as the Hebrew ִרְתֵּן. From this root the noun הַרְתִּיִּם was formed. In the course of time the יִ was dropped and the word became הַרְתִּי. Kautzsch concludes his discussion with the remark:

"Für die"Übernahme aus einem aram. Dialekt ist das ܠ statt ִ ausrechender Beweis." (Kautzsch, op. cit., I.31.)

In general it must be said the stages of development through which the word passed according to Kautzsch. in order to reach its present form, are highly artificial. Whether he considers these stages in development to have taken place in the Aramaic and the word in its final form to have been taken over into Hebrew or not is not stated. This indefiniteness will make a refutation somewhat difficult.

The following statements, however, deserve mention. The root of הַרְתִּי is evidently ܠܗܪܬܐ. For in Heb.17,2 the author writes: ִרְתֵּן וְכִשְׁלֵם ִרְתֵּן. The author is plainly using הַרְתִּי and ִרְתֵּן as cognate objects of ִרְתֵּן and ִרְתֵּן respectively. Furthermore, upon an examination of all the pe-aleph roots which Harper lists as occurring more than twenty-five times, no derivative is found which drops the first radical. If, then, הַרְתִּי is derived from ִרְתֵּן, a purely hypothetical case is advanced. Finally, הַרְתִּי is a good Hebrew noun forma-

tion from ayin-jodh and ayin-waw roots. As examples will serve: פִּינָה ; קִינָה ; אִינָה .

Attention must also be called to the fact that the root אִינָה actually occurs in Hebrew in a meaning which has nothing in common with the root from which אִינָה is to be derived, Hex.21,21.

There are other grounds for accepting אִינָה as a good Hebrew word. It occurs already in early Hebrew literature, namely, Num.14,12 and 1 Kings 10,1. The latter passage even critics accept as one of the oldest.

According to Wilson, this word in form and meaning occurs only in Hebrew and Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol.Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p. 255.) In no wise can it be said that the word was loaned from Aramaic.

• סִבֵּן "to cover", Ps.119,69.

Among the commentators examined, Kautzsch is the only one to regard this word as an Aramaism. The grounds to support his claim are the usual ones: the rare use of the word, the use of the same word in Aramaic, and the late appearance of the word. In addition to this, Kautzsch observes:

"Der genuin-hebräische Stamm ist vielleicht in סִבֵּן Tünche, Ez.13,10 ff., erhalten."
(Kautzsch, op.cit., p.35.)

In answer to these claims several additional remarks to what has been said in a general way deserve to be made. First of all, סִבֵּן occurs in Hebrew only in a figurative sense. There is, then, no good ground for supposing it to be the same word as the Aramaic סִבֵּן . Furthermore, סִבֵּן does not show the original Hebrew root. For סִבֵּן "a substance for covering, paint" does not come from a root סִבֵּן "to cover", but

from שִׁטְט "to be insipid" according to Koenig.

That שִׁטְט is a good Hebrew word is testified by its occurrence in other Hebrew documents besides the Psalms.

It occurs, namely, twice in Job, Job 13,4 and 14,17.

Wilson classes this word as appearing in Hebrew, Babylonian, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p. 257.) Again, the conclusion is more natural that the word is a Babylonianism in Hebrew than an Aramaism.

. לִּטְט "burden", Ps.55,23.

Briggs defines this word as "lot" and considers it an Aramaism. This view is maintained by Kautzsch who remarks:

"Alles erwogen, bleibt die Annahme eines aram. Substantivs in der Bedeutung 'Schicksal' das Wahrscheinlichste." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.37.)

While it is true that this word is unusual and causes some difficulty in interpreting, nevertheless, the root לִּטְט from which authorities derive this word is well established in Hebrew.

It occurs as early as Gen.29,21 in the imperative form לִּטְט.

According to Robert Dick Wilson's investigations this word is not found in root, form and meaning in any other language or dialect except Hebrew. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.252.) Consequently, a case of borrowing is evidently out of the question.

. קִטְט "honor", Ps.37,20; 49,13.21.

Kautzsch is practically the only commentator who calls קִטְט an Aramaism. The reason for his view can be summed up thus: The root is genuine Hebrew; but in the sense of "honor" it has been taken over from the Aramaic. Also the qetal form of the noun argues for an Aramaism.

One point that comes into consideration in connection with this word is the form. The assumption is that a noun formation with a schwa in the first syllable and a patach in the second is typical of the Aramaic. Although this particular noun formation is quite prevalent among Aramaic nouns, this does not in any way necessitate the conclusion that it is not a good Hebrew formation and that, consequently, רָקַץ is borrowed from Aramaic. On the basis of nouns like בְּרִיָּה , רִבְיָה and רָקַץ , רָקַץ appears to be a good Hebrew word. Objection may be voiced on the grounds that רִבְיָה and בְּרִיָּה are also Aramaic formations. Nevertheless, even critics admit that רָקַץ is a good Hebrew word.

The main issue in Kautzsch's argument for accepting רָקַץ as an Aramaism is the meaning of the word. He admits that the verb רָקַץ has the meaning "to be heavy" and also "to be esteemed" (1 Sam. 18, 30). Furthermore, he admits that the root רָקַץ in the sense "worth" is good Hebrew. Now, if the root in the one instance can have the related meanings, there surely can be no reason why רָקַץ cannot have developed the meaning "honor" without borrowing from the Aramaic.

The strongest proof against an Aramaic loan-word in the case of רָקַץ is this that it occurs also in Babylonian and Arabic according to Wilson. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 258.)

. לְמָנָה "full moon", Ps. 81, 4.

Kautzsch stands quite alone in regarding לְמָנָה as an Aramaism. His own words will best explain his position:

"Vielmehr ist es nur natürlich, dass die im Hebr. fehlende und doch schwer zu entbehrende

Bezeichnung des Vollmonds gern aus dem aram. Sprachbereich ergänzt werde." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p.42.)

At the outset it is to be noted that Kautzsch has no facts to bolster up his conclusion, but is merely making some conjectures.

Kautzsch assumes that a term for full moon was lacking in Hebrew. Now, the idea of a full moon evidently existed from the earliest times. Is it to be supposed that this idea passed from generation to generation for more than some ten centuries without a proper appellation until during the post-exilic time an appropriate term was found in the language of the Aramaeans?

This word is also found by other writers. Solomon uses it, Prov.7,20. Thus the *prima facie* evidence argues for a current Hebrew word. Objections may be raised on the ground that in the one passage this word is written with an aleph and in the other with a he. But this interchange of aleph and he is not unusual; the Hebrew word for sleep is written אָן אֵי as well as הָן אֵי. Kautzsch says concerning this he:

"It is evident that final ה as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance." (Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, trans. by Cowley, p.62.)

According to Wilson this word is found in Phoenician. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.261.) Judged by Kautzsch's own standard that, if a word occurs in the Canaanite language, it has no ground for being called an Aramaism, this word cannot be an Aramaism.

. שִׁלְטָן "axe", Ps. 74,6.

Brown regards this word as an Aramaic loan-word.

Kautzsch supports this view because it appears only in the Mishna and Judean Aramaic.

First of all, the root of this noun is well established in Hebrew. It occurs in the early as well as late writings.

This in itself is a good ground for supposing שִׁלְטָן to be a current Hebrew word. In view of such Hebrew nouns and adjectives as קִיָּץ, רִפְּוּ, אֲבָר, אֲפִי.

שִׁלְטָן, this noun formation, although perhaps somewhat unusual, is not foreign to the Hebrew. Another noun which signifies an implement somewhat related to an axe, אֲפִי "knife", has exactly the same formation.

The root meaning "to knock against" readily permits a noun formation which means "an instrument for knocking against." This will seem more natural when it is remembered that the repeated knocking against, an idea associated with the implement, is indicated by the intensive stem.

Objection may be raised on the grounds that the piel of שִׁלְטָן does not occur in Hebrew and therefore a noun formation from this stem is impossible. Upon an examination of Harper's list of verbs occurring only in the simple and causative stems, it is found that several of these have derivations which are formed from an intensive stem: e.g., אֲפִי, אֲבָר, אֲפִי, אֲבָר, אֲפִי, אֲבָר, אֲפִי, אֲבָר.

Being the name of an implement, this word evidently has an origin that must be associated with the inventing of the implement. Again, as an implement of this type, the word שִׁלְטָן is a technical term and therefore would be used but seldom.

• כִּוְלֵי "welfare", Ps. 68,7.

Kautzsch remarks on this word as follows:

"Sicher gehört von diesem Stamme zu den Aramaismen כִּוְלֵי Ps.68,7." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 44.)

The Syriac word kuschschara is regarded the same as the word under discussion. Although it is possible that both words have the same root, they do not have the same form, and consequently a case of borrowing becomes very improbable.

Moreover, indications are that the text in this instance is probably corrupt and that כִּוְלֵי is a better reading than כִּוְלֵי. First, many of the versions lead to an original כִּוְלֵי: the LXX has ἐν ἀρδῆσι; the Vulgate and the Version of Jerome have "in fortitudine"; Symmachus has εἰς ἀπόδυναν; and Theodotian has εἰς εὐδύνην. Secondly, a 7 may have easily been mistaken for a 3 by a copyist; such errors are found elsewhere. For example, in 2 Chron.22,2 a 3, the symbol for twenty, has been mistaken for a 7, the symbol for forty. (Dr. Fuerbringer, Theologische Hermeneutik, St. Louis, 1912, p.7.) Thirdly, כִּוְלֵי would be intimately related to כִּוְלֵי which also means "condition of prosperity," Ps.26,12. But regardless of which reading is adopted, the evidence is too insufficient to maintain that כִּוְלֵי is an Aramaism.

• כַּלַּח "to talk haltingly", Ps.114,1.

Kautzsch explains this word as an Aramaism on the grounds that it has a parallel root in Aramaic.

As has been shown above, this fact must be discredited as proof.

In connection with this word it must be noted that רָשׁוּ is the only word in Hebrew which expresses the idea of "halting talk" or specifically of "speaking in a foreign tongue." If, then, this word was taken over from the Aramaic, the Hebrews passed the greater part of their history without having a word to express this particular idea, which surely was not foreign to them.

Wilson's finds show that this word appears in Arabic. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.259.) Since this word is found in the three main branches of the Semitic language, there is good reason for supposing it to be common Semitic stock.

. רָשׁוּ "to give over", Ps.89,45.

In explaining the verb הִרְשָׁוָה Kautzsch states that here "liegt aram. רָשׁוּ sicher vor." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.48.)

Wilson places this word among those "whose classification depends upon pointing and other doubtful indications." (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2.) The question is whether הִרְשָׁוָה should not be read הִרְשָׁוָה on the basis of passages like Micah 1,6 where the form הִרְשָׁוָה occurs in the meaning "hurling down." If this reading is accepted, then the verb that is being discussed is not רָשׁוּ , but רָשַׁו . Although the matter will never be solved sufficiently, nevertheless, it is quite absurd to say with absolute certainty, in view of such indefiniteness, that the verb under discussion is an Aramaism.

. פִּיֹּס "to mock", Ps. 73,8.

Gunkel speaks of this verb as having a meaning according to the Aramaic, "nach dem Aramaischen." (Gunkel, op. cit., p.317.) Kautzsch remarks:

"So sehe ich keinen Grund, die Herkunft des Wortes aus dem Aramäischen mit Buhl in Frage zu stellen." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.53.)

The limited information available does not permit the positive conclusion that פִּיֹּס is an Aramaism. Being a hapax legomenon, its meaning is difficult to establish. If it means "to speak wickedly" as the Authorized Version renders it, then this is the only word which the Hebrew has meaning specifically "to speak wickedly", and as such there is no good reason for supposing that this word did not exist in the Hebrew language from early times.

According to Robert Dick Wilson's investigations this word is found in Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac and Mandaean. On this evidence it might be suspected of being an Aramaism. As to sound, form and sense, however, it may just as well be a primitive Semitic word.

. שָׁפַט "to strike", Ps. 98, 8.

Among prominent commentators Kautzsch is the only one to class this word as an Aramaism. He considers it an Aramaic substitute for the good Hebrew verb שָׁפַט.

In Hebrew this verb is used specifically to denote a gesture of the hand. Therefore, this word might well be regarded a good Hebrew synonym for שָׁפַט.

This word is found elsewhere in Hebrew literature, namely, in Is. 35,12 and Hez.25,6. These facts lead to calling שָׁפַט a current Hebrew word.

The tabulations of Wilson show that this word is found also in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.258.) Consequently, $\times\eta\zeta$ may well be a Babylonianism in Hebrew. Since it is a recognized fact that Babylonianisms entered the Hebrew language and since the Babylonian language was prior to the Hebrew, the possibility becomes quite plausible.

. $\eta\eta\zeta$ "haven", Ps. 107, 30.

Brown considers this word a loan-word and interprets it "city". Giesebrecht, cited by Kautzsch, calls it an "unverkennbarer Aramaismus", and to this view Kautzsch readily agrees.

The first fact to be noted in connection with this word is that in Aramaic its usual meaning is "city, market-place". If, then, the Hebrew loaned this word, why did it not adopt it in this meaning but in the meaning "haven"?

In answer to this question it will be stated that $\eta\eta\zeta$ has the meaning "city" in the verse in question. Although it is true that there is some difficulty in establishing the meaning of this word definitely as it is a hapax legomenon, nevertheless, there are several considerations which make "haven" the better interpretation of this word. It fits into the figure which is used in this verse and the preceding one. The LXX has *ἐπὶ ἰσθμῶν*. And it is translated thus by many commentators.

Taken in the sense of "haven", this word would have but limited use in Hebrew. For being an inland people, the Hebrews would find little occasion to use this word. However, this does not say that the idea of "haven" was foreign to them.

In view of the navigation under Solomon's time, this idea must have been among the Hebrews at an early time.

The list of Wilson shows that this word appears also in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 258.) If, then, 𐤏𐤓𐤑 is not a common Semitic word, it is easy to see how the Hebrews took this word from the Babylonians rather than from the Aramaeans.

. 𐤏𐤑𐤕 "to pine away", Ps. 106, 43.

In discussing this word Kautzsch states:

"In allen drei Belegen liegt die Grundbedeutung des *gemeinaram. Stammes* 𐤏𐤑𐤕 vor." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p. 57.)

As to sound or form there is no reason why this word should be regarded as an Aramaism.

On the basis of Robert Dick Wilson's tabulations this word occurs, besides in Hebrew, only in New Hebrew and New Aramaic. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 256.) As the documents of the latter dialects are all later than the Hebrew documents, it is more natural to suppose that the word is a Hebrewism in Aramaic than vice versa. At any rate, the possibility of an Aramaism is excluded.

. 𐤏𐤓𐤕 "word", Ps. 19, 5; 139, 4.

𐤏𐤓𐤕 "to speak", Ps. 106, 2.

Gunkel speaks of this word as "aramäische." (Gunkel, op.cit., p. 77.) Briggs makes this admission: "It (Ps. 19) has a single Aramaism 𐤏𐤓𐤕 ." (Briggs, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 163.) Kautzsch accepts the root 𐤏𐤓𐤕 as Aramaic and, consequently, he considers the derivative 𐤏𐤓𐤕 a borrowed word. The reason for

his position he sums up thus:

"Die Verwendung ist eine so spärliche und überdies so späte, dass man so wenig wie bei שָׁפָּט von einem hebräischen, wenn auch nur auf die Poesie beschränkten Wort reden kann." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p.61.)

The main objections have been answered before. One new one is raised in connection with this word. It is claimed that the word הִשָּׁפֵט betrays its foreign character because it often appears in an Aramaic plural ending. However, this is not the case. Although the ending in ן־ is called the Aramaic ending, it is considered good Hebrew usage and in no wise reveals the foreign character of a word. For it is used as the plural formation of certain nouns in early sections, e.g.,

וַיִּשְׁפָּט , 1 Kings 11,33; וַיִּשְׁפָּט , 2 Kings 11,13. Gesenius speaks of this ending as a "poetical use" found "in some of the older and even oldest portions." (Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, trans. by Cowley, p.242.) Another fact that speaks for regarding ן־ a well established Hebrew ending is that הִשָּׁפֵט occurs in the Book of Job in the plural form of ן־ as well as in that of ִים־ , indicating thereby that both forms are equally well known to the Hebrew language.

The early appearance of this word demands that it be credited as good Hebrew. It occurs in 2 Sam. 23,2. The root of this word occurs already in Gen.21,7, the passage where Sarah is reflecting on the birth of Isaac. However, in this passage an attempt has been made to explain the appearance of this word. Kautzsch thinks that the speaker intentionally chose the foreign word on account of the elevated speech. This observation holds just as well if one considers שָׁפָּט a poetic word; for in elevated speech one readily employs poetic diction.

In addition to the remarks above, it deserves mention that some of the ablest scholars consider $\eta\text{פ}\text{ו}$ a poetic word of the Hebrew language. Green inserts it in his list. (Green, op.cit., p.19.) Also Bleek speaks of this word as poetic. (Bleek, op.cit., p.93.)

Davis remarks to $\eta\text{פ}\text{ו}$ in Ps. 19:

"He (the Psalmist) had also used speech, words, voice, line; he required yet another noun of the same import and found it at hand, although common in Aramaic, among his own people in their use of the root millel. And it does not escape attention that a poet is using language; and poetry is conspicuous in the literature of all peoples by reason of its fondness for rare expressions." (Davis, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.III, No.3, p. 373.)

Wilson's study shows that this word occurs in some ten different Semitic languages and dialects. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.261.) From this fact the conclusion lies close at hand that $\text{פ}\text{ו}$ is common Semitic stock.

• $\eta\text{נ}\text{נ}$ "to descend", Ps. 38,3; 18,35; 65,11.

The view entertained by Kautzsch is that $\eta\text{נ}\text{נ}$ is the general Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew $\eta\text{נ}\text{נ}$. His objection to this word as being good Hebrew is voiced in these words: "Der Gebrauch von $\eta\text{נ}\text{נ}$ ist durchweg spät." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.64.)

This objection, however, is unfounded. This word is embodied in documents which critics regard as pre-exilic. In Joel 4,11 and in 2 Sam.22,35 the word is used. This usage is not limited to one or two writers. Jeremiah uses the word, Jer.21,13; Solomon knows the word, Prov.17,10. The Psalms in which it occurs are all demonstrably Davidic.

Evidently it enjoyed a certain familiarity in David's vocabulary. That the root of this verb is current in Hebrew is attested by the derivative אָנָן which is found in Is.30,30.

Authorities express themselves to this effect that אָנָן is a good Hebrew word. Noldeke says that this word can be old Hebrew. (Koenig, Lexicon.)

The efforts of Robert Dick Wilson have brought to light that this word is a part of the Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac, Mandaean, Daniel, Ezra, and Palmyrene vocabulary. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.256.) While this evidence is not conclusive, it may strengthen the conclusion that was intimated above, namely, that אָנָן is a good Hebrew poetic word.

. אָנָן "to end", Ps.73, 19.

His reasons for terming this word as a clear Aramaism Kautzsch voices thus:

"Immerhin zeigt der überaus spärliche und spärliche Gebrauch des Stammes im Hebräischen, dass er dort - wenn einst vorhanden - völlig vergessen und erst aus dem Aramäischen wieder eingeführt war." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.68.)

In the light of the refutation given above, these arguments become ineffective.

There are, however, some positive considerations. This verb is used elsewhere in Hebrew documents, namely, Is.66,17. Am.3,15. Besides, this root has a derivative which appears in early documents; אָנָן end occurs in Joel 2,20.

. נָזַז "to despise", Ps.119, 118.

Kautzsch emphatically declares this word to be an Aramaism. Other critics take a more moderate stand and regard it a late word.

As this word is a hapax legomenon, it is difficult to establish the shade of meaning implied by this word by which it can be distinguished from other Hebrew words meaning "despise." But as a verb expressing some human emotion it may well be a synonym for נָזַז or נָזַז .

According to Wilson's investigations this word is also found in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.257.) In view of this it will hardly be possible to maintain that נָזַז is an Aramaism.

. פָּזַז "to go up", Ps.139, 8.

Briggs speaks of this word as an Aramaism. (Briggs, op. cit., p.500, vol.II.) Perowne also calls the form in this verse an Aramaism but derives it from the root פָּזַז . (Perowne, The Psalms, George Bell and Sons, London, 1893, Vol.II, p.444.) Driver lists it as Aramaism. (Driver, op. cit., p.374.) Kautzsch speaks of this word as one of the "groben Aramaismen." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.11.)

As this word is a hapax legomenon, there is no conclusive proof to show that this word in Hebrew has a special meaning "to sacrifice." Consequently, it would be a mere opinion to say that it is "genau wie im biblisch aram." פָּזַז and that it is an exact equivalent of the Hebrew נָזַז in its root meaning and specific meaning. To show that פָּזַז has in all instances the same meaning as נָזַז , פָּזַז has been

brought into the discussion as the same root as פִּזְּזָה, the sibilants merely being changed. To this it must be said that פִּזְּזָה does not occur in the meaning "to burn"; nor does פִּזְּזָה occur anywhere in the meaning "to go up". Therefore, that both words are identical is purely hypothetical. Even Gesenius remarks פִּזְּזָה is not "identical" with פִּזְּזָה.

. פִּזְּזָה "foilage", Ps. 104, 12.

With but a brief discussion Kautzsch concludes:

"Offenbar ist dieses פִּזְּזָה das aram. Äquivalent für hebr. פִּזְּזָה." (Kautzsch, op. cit., p.71.)

Compared to nouns like פִּזְּזָה and פִּזְּזָה, this noun is unquestionably a good Hebrew word. And as far as the Psalms are concerned it is used just as often as the current Hebrew,

פִּזְּזָה.

In Wilson's article this word is listed as appearing in Hebrew, Babylonian, New Hebrew and New Aramaic. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.257.) As the Aramaic dialects in which this word appears are later than the Hebrew documents, a case of borrowing from the Aramaic is impossible. If anything, פִּזְּזָה is a Babylonianism in Hebrew.

. פִּזְּזָה "thought", Ps.146,4.

A hapax legomenon and an Aramaism are Briggs' comments on this word. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.532.) Kautzsch holds, because the root is Aramaic, therefore the noun פִּזְּזָה, derived from that root, is an Aramaism.

As to the root of this word it is found already in Jonah 1,6. So the prima facie evidence points to a current Hebrew root.

Much of the objection to this noun is called forth by the form. For it is held that nouns in $\text{ג}^{\text{י}}$ -are specifically Aramaic. However, nouns ending in $\text{ג}^{\text{י}}$ - occur in Hebrew "in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic." (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.247.)

. $\text{פ}^{\text{נ}}\text{י}$ "to be old", Ps.6,8.

Although Kautzsch admits that this root in the meaning "to advance" is common Semitic stock, nevertheless, in the meaning "to be old", he considers it an Aramaism, for according to him this meaning has been adopted from the Aramaic.

In answer to this view it must be said that the idea of "advancing" is not too far removed from that of "being old" that the latter could not be a specific meaning derived from the current Hebrew root $\text{פ}^{\text{נ}}\text{י}$ "to advance". In English the relations between the two ideas is portrayed in the phrase "advanced in years." The Latin has a similar expression, namely, "aetate provihi." In Arabic this root occurs in the meanings "to precede", "pass forth", "become free", "grow old." Thus a Hebrew root in the sense of "advancing" and also of "being old" should not be considered unusual. Noteworthy is the fact that the author of Job shows his acquaintance with this root in both of its meanings. In Job 14,18 it is translated "removed"; in Job 21,7 it is rendered "become old".

The investigations of Wilson reveal the fact that $\text{פ}^{\text{נ}}\text{י}$ occurs in the three main branches of the Semitic language. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.259.)

From this it must be deduced that פִּטַּי is not an Aramaism, but common Semitic stock.

. לָבַח "to consider", Ps.48,14.

Kautzsch comments on this word and states "ein Aramaismus liegt zweifellos vor." (Kautzsch, op.cit.p.73.) His main reason is that it occurs but once in Hebrew.

However, the weakness of an argument built up on a hapax legomenon is also evident in the case of this word.

Besides in Hebrew, this word has been found only in New Hebrew and New Aramaic. As the latter documents are all later than the Hebrew documents which contains the word, the possibility is just as great, if not greater, that the word has been loaned from the Hebrew by the Aramaic as from the Aramaic by the Hebrew. At any rate, it would be untrue to facts to say definitely לָבַח is an Aramaism.

. הִצִּיחַ "to deliver", Ps. 144, 7.10.11.

This word is considered an Aramaism by Briggs and Kautzsch. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.523; Kautzsch, op. cit., p.74.) The latter recognizes הִצִּיחַ in the meaning "to open" as a good Hebrew word, but in the meaning "to deliver" it has, he holds, been influenced by the Aramaic.

There can be no question that the root is good Hebrew. It is found already in Gen.4,11. And though the idea "to deliver" and "to open" are not readily associated with the same root, there is no evidence that the one is not a specialized meaning of the word while the other is a general meaning.

That David should use this verb three times in this one Psalm can perhaps be explained as the result of the figure

which he has in mind the greater part of the Psalm.

In his paragraph on this word Kautzsch speaks of "der Ubergang zu der im aram. überweigenden Bedeutung." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.74.) If it was possible for the root נָצַח in the Aramaic to develop this special meaning, there is no reason why a similar development could not be expected in Hebrew. Furthermore, the verb נָחַח shows an analogous development. It has the meaning "to open" as well as "to set free" (Ps.105,20).

Wilson has found this root in Hebrew, Arabic, New Aramaic, and Syriac. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.259.) Since this word occurs in the main branches of the Semitic language, the obvious inference is that נָצַח is common Semitic stock.

• נָחַח "to deliver", Ps. 7,3; 136,24.

Among the commentators examined, Kautzsch is found to be the only one who regards this word as an Aramaism. Admitting, however, that the root is current in early Hebrew, he considers it an Aramaism only in the sense of "to deliver".

As in the previous word, the two meanings in which this word appears are not so far removed that they cannot be derived from the same root. The root idea of this verb is "to separate"; this could then be taken in a pregnant sense "to separate from something, as from chains or from a yoke (Gen.27,40)", a meaning which would fit well to the meaning "to deliver".

As having bearing on this discussion, it should be remembered that the majority of Hebrew verbs have a concrete idea at the basis from which a more abstract idea is developed.

This word is placed by Wilson among those which appear in Hebrew, Arabic, Daniel, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, and Palestinian Syriac. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.260.) From this the inference is justified that קָרַץ is common property of the Semitic languages.

. קָרַץ "possession", Ps. 104,24; 105,31.

Critics readily class this word as an Aramaism. Lagarde, cited by Kautzsch, speaks of it as "aus dem Aram. in das Hebräische herübergenommenen Vokabeln." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.77.)

The main reason why critics reject קָרַץ as good Hebrew is on account of the formation. They hold that the ending קָרַץ is typically Aramaic. As stated in another connection, nouns ending in קָרַץ are found in all the principal branches of the Semitic language. Strack remarks: " קָרַץ ist wahrscheinlich ursemitische Abstraktendung." (Strack, op.cit., p.20.) "Besides in many cases, as in קָרַץ , the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age." (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.247.) So why should קָרַץ not be a good Hebrew form?

The root of this noun is well established in Hebrew. The noun itself occurs in this very meaning already in Gen. 34,23. In this same passage קָרַץ is paralleled with קָרַץ , a word which critics hold to be the good Hebrew word which is being supplanted by קָרַץ . From this passage it would seem that both words are current in Hebrew.

Upon examination of the derivatives from verbs that have a mun for the second radical and a he for the third, it becomes

evident that just those roots which occur rather frequently have a derivative with the ending $\text{ךְ}^{\text{׀}}$. This permits the conclusion that $\text{ךְ}^{\text{׀}}$ is a more unusual ending, but is used to form additional nouns in such instances where a root, due to its frequent use, has the usual types of derivatives already.

. כָּרַךְ "war", Ps. 55,22; 68,31; 78,9; 144,1.

Kautzsch objects to this word as being current Hebrew because it appears in late documents in the place of $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$ and because it is an Aramaic noun formation. The first reason has been answered sufficiently in a section above. As to calling $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$ an Aramaic formation of a noun, it can be pointed out that, although qetal forms occur more frequently in Aramaic than in Hebrew, it is, nevertheless, in view of such nouns as $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$, $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$ and $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$, a good Hebrew noun formation.

The root occurs very early in Hebrew, being found any number of times in Genesis. Furthermore, the verb כָּרַךְ occurs in a special sense "to approach for battle" (Judges 20,24). The noun itself occurs in a section considered to be early, namely, 2 Sam.17,11.

The word $\text{כָּרַךְ}^{\text{׀}}$ appears according to Wilson also in Babylonian. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p. 258.) This is an indication that a Babylonianism rather an Aramaism is the topic of discussion.

. יַבֵּן "myriad", Fs. 68,18.

In the Lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs יַבֵּן is called a "later Aramaizing synonym" of יַבֵּן, and Kautzsch definitely concludes it to be a borrowed word.

According to Wilson's investigation this word written יַבֵּן occurs in Semitic documents only in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in that of the Talmud. From this fact he draws the conclusion: "By no possibility, therefore, can it be shown that any of these words were derived from the Aramaic." (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, p. 255.) The reasoning that is followed is evidently clear. But Wilson has failed to take cognizance of the fact that יַבֵּן, according to well established rules, can also be written יַבֵּן and that this form occurs in Biblical Aramaic, namely, Dan. 7,10.

In addition to what has been said little information can be gathered about this word. A point worth noting is that יַבֵּן is found in a document which is generally accepted as pre-exilic, namely, Jonah 4,11; so there is a possibility that this word dates from early Hebrew.

. יַבֵּן "to lie down", Fs. 139, 3.

Briggs calls יַבֵּן an Aramaism for יַבֵּן. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 499.) Perowne remarks about this word: "Another apparently Aram. or later form for יַבֵּן." (Perowne, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 444.) Kautzsch, however, does not stop to call it an apparent Aramaism, but makes it definite.

The entire discussion about this word centers about the Hebrew יַבֵּן. It is held that יַבֵּן in the Hebrew is the same as יַבֵּן in Aramaic because, according to phonetic laws,

an ayin in the one is a zade in the other. If זכר and זכר are the same word, the ayin in the Hebrew does not necessarily need to be accounted for by Aramaic influences. It may indicate a Hebrew dialect. In the one dialect the word was spoken with a softer consonant in the third place; in the other with a harder. The existence of such dialects in Hebrew is substantiated by Judges 12,6 where the Ephraimites said sibboleth for shibboleth.

However, there is no good reason for not taking זכר as common Semitic stock. For it appears in the three main branches of the Semitic language. Wilson has found the word in Hebrew, Arabic, New Aramaic and Syriac. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.259.)

- . זכר "to make a tumult", Ps. 2,1.
- . זכר "tumult", Ps. 55,15.
- . זכר "tumult", Ps. 64,3.

Kautzsch is positive that this root with its derivations is an Aramaism. He states:

"Über den Aramaischen Ursprung des Hebräischen זכר kann jedoch kein zweifel entstehen angesichts des sehr spaeten und spaerlichen Auftauchens des Wortes." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.81.)

According to Wilson this root is found in Arabic in the same meaning. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.259.) This evidence speaks against its being an Aramaism and points to a root of common Semitic stock.

The derivatives that this root has just in poetry shows that the root was well established in Hebrew. One of the derivatives, זכר , occurs in sense, form and meaning only in

--#63.

Hebrew. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.255.) There is no reason, then, why this word should be a loan-word.

Even critics who are ready to call every infrequent word an Aramaism consider this word to be good Hebrew.

Briggs expresses himself to this effect that $\text{ל} \text{ך}$ is a good Hebrew word. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.I, p.13.)

. ך "thought", Ps. 139,2.17.

When Briggs takes up the discussion of this word, he states that it is "usually taken as an Aramaism." (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.493.) Kautzsch lists it as an Aramaism about which there can be no doubt. (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.81.)

The critics themselves are unable to point definitely to a root in the Aramaic from which this word might be derived. Various suggestions have been made, but these suggestions remain hypothetical and cannot be substituted as facts. And it must be remembered that in other instances critics insist upon a well established root from which the word may have been derived.

This word is listed by Wilson as occurring in Hebrew alone. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.254.) Consequently, it is not found in root form and meaning in any other Semitic language or dialect. Such being the case, there can be no talk of its being a loan-word.

. ךך "to dash to pieces", Ps.2,9.

Kautzsch lists this word as an Aramaic loan-word and calls it a "gemeinaramaisches Equivalent für gemein-hebräisch ךך und ךך ." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.83.)

This root is not uncommon in pre-exilic literature.

It is found in Job 34,24; Is. 24,19; and Prov. 18,24.

That the Hebrew has the forms $\gamma\gamma\eta$ and $\gamma\gamma\eta$ does not say that $\gamma\gamma\eta$ was borrowed from the Aramaic. This may be a case of the same word in different dialects of Hebrew. The case would be analogous to that of $\gamma\beta\eta$ and $\gamma\beta\eta$ considered above.

. $\gamma\beta\eta$ "to hope", Ps.104,27;119,166; 145,15.

. $\gamma\beta\eta$ "hope", Ps.119,116, 146,5.

Briggs holds this root and its derivative to be an Aramaism. (Briggs, op.cit., 'ol. II, 339,530.) Kautzsch speaks of "ein zweifelloser Aramaismus." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.86.)

In one place Wilson lists this word as occurring Hebrew and Arabic alone; and in another place as appearing in Hebrew, New Aramaic, Syriac, Palestinian Syriac, Mandaean, Daniel, Ezra, and Palmyrene. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.255,256.) This evidence dare not be credited in this instance.

Strack, however, in showing how the sibilants differ between Hebrew and Aramaic lists $\gamma\beta\eta$ as a genuine Hebrew word. (Strack, Biblisch-Aramäische Grammatik, München,1921,p.13.)

. $\eta\eta\eta$ "to grow", Ps. 92,13; 73,12.

Briggs calls this word an Aramaic verb. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.148.) And Gunkel speaks of it as "aramaisierend." (Gunkel, op.cit., p.318.) Kautzsch remarks:

"Das überaus späte Auftauchen des Stammes im Hebräischen an Stelle von $\gamma\beta\eta$, $\eta\eta\eta$ und ihren Derivaten, sowie die Allgewöhnheit von und zahlreichen Derivaten im ganzen Bereich des

Aramäischen lassen keinen Zweifel aufkommen, dass wir es hier mit einem 'reinem Aramaismus' zu tun haben." (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.86.)

A fact that ought to be noted in connection with this word is that another Hebrew writer uses this verb, for it is several times in Job. A derivative of this root is also found, namely, $\text{לָוַן} \text{ } \text{לָוַן}$.

As a whole, the evidence is too slight to say anything definite as to the character of this word.

• לָוַן "to praise", Ps.63,4; 117,1; 145,4; 147,13.

This word is stamped as an Aramaism by Briggs. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.75.) Kautzsch takes the same stand. He says:

"Das dieses לָוַן von dem gemeinaram.
 לָוַן entlehnt ist, dürfte wiederum durch das
sehr späte Auftauchen des Stammes an Stelle so
vielgebrauchter Stämme wie לָוַן , לָוַן ,
 לָוַן bewiesen sein. (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.87.)

In Arabic the same root is found. Thus the word is used in the principal branches of the Semitic languages and, consequently, the prima facie evidence points to a common Semitic root. Objection will, however, be raised to this on the ground that in Arabic this root is also, according to Schwally (cited by Kautzsch, op.cit., p.87.) an Aramaism. In answer to this, let it be said that this word occurs in Ethiopic, the documents of which antedate those of the Aramaic.

In four of the five instances in which this word occurs in the Psalms it is paralleled with other verbs signifying "to praise". This situation will compel the deduction that לָוַן , although perhaps a more unusual verb, was equally well known to David and the other Psalm writers.

As this verb occurs only in poetic sections it is evidently a poetic word, which naturally would be used rarely.

. $\Delta\text{S}\Delta$ "to rule", Ps.119,133.

Among the commentators examined Kautzsch is the only one who considers $\Delta\text{S}\Delta$ an Aramaism.

First of all, this root is not uncommon in pre-exilic literature. It occurs several times in Ecclesiastes, 2,19, 5,18, and in other passages. A derivative of this root is found already in Gen.42,6. In connection with this last passage, Kautzsch makes an attempt to show that the derivative $\Delta\text{S}\Delta$ can reasonably be considered an Aramaism in this passage because the author uses this loan-word intentionally to indicate Joseph's governorship in a foreign land. However, this entire theory is conjectural and tendential. And why would the author use just an Aramaic loan-word to create an Egyptian atmosphere?

Wilson has discovered this word in Hebrew, Babylonian, Arabic, New Hebrew, New Aramaic, and Syriac. (Wilson, Princeton Theol. Review, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.258.) This evidence is too strong to regard $\Delta\text{S}\Delta$ anything else but a common Semitic stock word.

. $\text{S}\Delta\text{S}\Delta$ "stubbornness", Ps.61,13.

This word has been classed as an Aramaism by Kautzsch. (Op. cit., p.90.) As grounds to justify his procedure, he advances the absence of a verb in Hebrew from which the noun might be derived and the Aramaic form of this noun.

The claim here made, however, loses all force in the light of the following facts:

Although the root of this word is found in one or more of the other Semitic languages or dialects, מ.ר.ר.א is not found in root, form and meaning in any one of them, and, therefore, the possibility of its being borrowed is excluded. The above information has been obtained from Prof. Wilson's tabulations at the end of his article. (Princeton Theol. Review, Vol.XXIII, No.2, p.255.)

Furthermore, the use of this word is not confined to late literature. It occurs already in Daut.29,18 and is a pet word of Jeremiah.

There are indications that the root from which מ.ר.ר.א is derived is a good Hebrew root. For another good Hebrew word is derived from the same root, namely, ר.ר.א "muscle."

No valid reason exists for considering this word an Aramaic form. From the double ayin root ר.ר.א Hebrew has the noun מ.ר.ר.א . Similarly, מ.ר.ר.א is a natural formation from ר.ר.א .

. ר.ר.א "to provoke", Ps.78,41.

Briggs terms this verb an Aramaism. (Briggs, op.cit., Vol.II, p.195.) The same stand is taken by Kautzsch who gives as his reason merely the occurrence of a parallel verb in Aramaic. (Kautzsch, op.cit., p.91.)

According to the finds of Robert Dick Wilson, this word occurs in root and meaning only in Hebrew and Arabic. In no possible manner can one speak of an Aramaism.

In the Aramaic of Daniel the verb ר.ר.א occurs, Dan.3,24.

But it has an entirely different meaning; it means "to be startled." To take $\aleph | \text{ש}$ as the Aramaic root from which $\aleph | \text{ש}$ might be derived has two convincing facts speaking against it: the Aramaic root has a different meaning; according to Koenig this verb is "rare".

To sum up this evidence: Many of the words alleged to be Aramaism appear in Babylonian and Arabic. This is an indication that these belong to common Semitic stock, some perhaps being Babylonianisms. Some words appear in root form and meaning only in Hebrew. In no wise can one speak of borrowing here. Furthermore, some words appear only in Hebrew and New Hebrew and New Aramaic. In such cases one may just as well have a Hebrewism in Aramaic as vice versa. In two instances everything depends upon the pointing of the word or upon textual criticism. In the case of the remaining words the evidence is sometimes somewhat insufficient to enable one to say definitely that the word is not an Aramaism. Nevertheless, in those instances it is just as insufficient for saying emphatically that it is an Aramaism. For according to form, sense and root, these words may just as well be good Hebrew words. All in all, the words alleged to be Aramaisms dare not be urged as unquestioned Aramaisms in an attempt to assign a post-exilic date to many of the Psalms.