(Ass. šillata taqtibi) shall be liable to punishment in her own person and not in that of her husband, her sons or her daughters. It must then have been a widely known word, and as used of blasphemy against a god is singularly suitable in the passage under discussion; and there will be the correct vocalization. In the beginning of the letter of Artaxerxes occur the words אַּ֣ם הַּֽדְּמוֹן לְֽעֹזָ֣אָבׂ נַ֣חֲשַׂ חָפְצִ֗ים נַֽעֲשִׂיִּ֖ים לְֽאָֽבִֽיק (Ezra vii 12), where has been variously interpreted. The suggestion which seems at present to hold the field is that of Torrey, who proposes שלום 'perfect peace and so forth.' If, however, the letter was written in Babylonian, which was still widely used in the East at that time, this restoration is impossible; for gamāru, which means 'to be brought to an end', 'to be wholly given up', cannot be used with sulmu nor indeed is it ever so found in extant letters. I suggest then that the words נביית נכי נער rather do not contain a greeting but are an abbreviation of some such Babylonian phrase as (amēl)ardu šā lībbusu ana bēlēšu gamuruni 'the slave whose heart is wholly devoted to his lords.' It then continues the description of Ezra, to whom Artaxerxes opens his letter with the address: 'Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, (a servant whose heart is) devoted (to his lord) . . . And now, &c.' This suggestion both yields a suitable sense and accords with a known Babylonian idiom. The Jewish scribe puts in full that part of the address which is in his eyes properly applicable to Ezra but abbreviates the derogatory description of him as the devoted servant of a foreign king.

CORRECTIONS.

In a previous article 5 in explaining ר버 in 2 Chron. xxii 10 as meaning 'overthrew' I compared the N. Hebr. מְנַבֵּר used sens obsc. as denoting literally 'one who forces (a woman)' and took ר버 in the sense of 'violently entreated'. This comparison is incorrect. The Acc.

1 Scheil Lois Assyriennes 2–3, 2, 16.
2 In Ezra-Nehemiah, 581, where he compares Ezr. v 7; but the comparison is false, since there the letter is addressed to a king, here it is addressed by a king who never, at least according to Babylonian custom, sends 'peace' to a subject.
4 Harper A. B. L. 620, Rev. 6 (cp. 11, Rev. 3. 4), for which reference I am indebted to Prof. Langdon; cp. lībbusu gummuru ana bēlēšu 'his heart is wholly devoted to his lord' (Meissner in Beitr. a. Assyr. ii 566, Obv. 16).
5 In J.T.S. xxvii 159–160.
6 Cp. Dalman Aram.-Neuh. Wtb. (2nd ed.), 90, who rightly refers to מְנַבֵּר 'spoke' in the sense of 'having intercourse with (a woman)'.

1 Scheil Lois Assyriennes 2–3, 2, 16.
2 In Ezra-Nehemiah, 581, where he compares Ezr. v 7; but the comparison is false, since there the letter is addressed to a king, here it is addressed by a king who never, at least according to Babylonian custom, sends 'peace' to a subject.
4 Harper A. B. L. 620, Rev. 6 (cp. 11, Rev. 3. 4), for which reference I am indebted to Prof. Langdon; cp. lībbusu gummuru ana bēlēšu 'his heart is wholly devoted to his lord' (Meissner in Beitr. a. Assyr. ii 566, Obv. 16).
5 In J.T.S. xxvii 159–160.
6 Cp. Dalman Aram.-Neuh. Wtb. (2nd ed.), 90, who rightly refers to מְנַבֵּר 'spoke' in the sense of 'having intercourse with (a woman)'.

CORRECTIONS.

In a previous article 5 in explaining רバー in 2 Chron. xxii 10 as meaning 'overthrew' I compared the N. Hebr. מְנַבֵּר used sens obs. as denoting literally 'one who forces (a woman)' and took רバー in the sense of 'violently entreated'. This comparison is incorrect. The Acc.
dabaru ‘to overthrow’, however, is well attested, and a good example of it is found in the description of Istar as däbrat (= däbirat) šapši ‘overthrowing the violent’; and duburu or doppuru means ‘to drive away’. Now a comparison with the Arab. ḫabbū ‘followed after’ and the Eth. ṭŁ summoned ‘supinus cecidit’ suggests that the underlying root is ‘back’, the first meaning ‘pursued the back of (a person)’ and the latter ‘fell on the back’. Thus ḫabbū (Pi.) means ‘drove out’, or perhaps ‘overthrew’ in 2 Chron. xxii 10 and Ḫabbū (Hi.) in Pss. xviii 48 and xlvi 4 means ‘threw on their backs’ or ‘threw down’. Again, in another article I compared ṭēq in Isa. vi 4 with Acc. ammatu = atnatu ‘dwelling’ and so ‘ground’ or the like. The reading atnatu, however, is now known to be incorrect, and the Hebr. ṭēq in ṭēq nīm is evidently identical with the Acc. ammatu as meaning some part of a door. The Sum. Ā.SUḪ, read AŠTAR, which is equated with it, means literally ḫuṣu aḫi ‘foundation’ or ‘base of the side’, and the Acc. ammatu means not only some part of the arm, possibly ‘fore-arm’, but also part of a door, possibly ‘door-post’. Further, qisser ammatu ‘bond’ or ‘knot of the arm’ means the ‘elbow’ and, as applied to a door, apparently the ‘hinge’ or ‘pivot’; and for this, according to syllabaries, ammatu alone may be used. As part of a door, then, the precise meaning of the Acc. ammatu remains somewhat uncertain; but it is evident that this word is identical with the Hebr. ṭēq, although it is equally difficult to see what šēm ṭēq, meaning literally ‘the arms of the threshold(s)’ can denote; for the four known terms (ḫuṣu ‘threshold’, ḫašu ‘socket’ in the threshold, ṭeṣu ‘pivot’ or ‘hinge’ on the door-post which went into the socket, and ṭēq ‘door-post’) seem to cover most of, if not all, the parts of the ancient door. Finally, in my recent discussion of ṭēq nīm the vocalization of ṭēq nīm is a misprint for ṭēq niḫ א. R. Driver.

1 Ebeling Quellen i 50, R. 9.
2 Cp. LXX’s ἄνώτερον.
3 Eitan (in J.Q.R. N.S. xiv 40–41) explains ḫabbū from the same root, to which he also refers (ibid. 39–40) ḫabbū in Job xix 18 and Ct. v 6, comparing Arab. ʿadīb ‘receded before (＝ turned the back on)’ a person.
4 In J.T.S. xxiii 405.
5 Cp. Langdon Epic of Creation 663. It seems that no word ammatu meaning feste Grundlage (Buhl op. cit. 47) is known at present to exist in Assyrian.
6 Holma Körperteile 115–116.
7 The exact force of the Acc. term in relation to the Hebr. phrase is immaterial; for cognate words in different languages need not connote the same thing, although the general idea underlying the root is identical.
8 In J. T. S. xxx 371–372.