ain. If from this short specimen we would be justified in determining the characteristics of the Aramaic as still living in the mouths of a few hundred Syrians of the present day, we might say that in that dialect even radical letters are often dropped. For אָדָם (brother) they say אדם, for היה (it was) they say היה. The same peculiarity we find in the old Aramaic literature, especially in the Jerusalem Talmud, where for גל (see) the form גל appears, for מה (to speak) the form מה, for the proper noun מֶלֶךְ the shortened form מלך, and so forth.

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

B. FELSENTHAL.

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

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

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

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

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

W. SPROULL.

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

R. F.

לבנה (Gen. ii., 14), the Hebrew name of the Tigris, occurring also in Dan. x., 4. Noteworthy, as is known, is the pronunciation with prefixed הָי, which we meet neither in the Aramaic, nor in the Arabic, nor, finally, in the Persian form of the name. It is, however, not specifically Hebraic. It is found also in the Assyrian, but not, however, in the usual texts; these also present only the form "Diglat," e. g., the Behistun (l. c.) inscription, Babyl. text 1. 35 (D-i-g-lāt). We meet it, however, in the more complete syllabaries. One of these (II. Rawl. 50, 7) explains the ideograph in Beh. 34, and known to represent the Tigris (BAR.TIK.KAR) by I-di-g-lat, i. e., as the syllables a,i,u, in the Assyrian represent also ha,h,i,h,u.=Hidiglat, a form which, as proposed, corresponds very nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation, and joins itself with the Samaritan הַכֵּל就能够. The hardening of h(i) to h(i), in transfer from one language to another, is, in general, not infrequent. As the Persian Ahuramazdâ, in the inscription of Naksch-i-Rustam, certainly became the Babylonian Ahuramazda' (together with Urimzda or Uramzda, also Urimzda' of the Behistun inscription), and as the same probably holds good in the Assyrian