useful for determining the nature of the 'ūrim and tummim. Now, an excellent Mesopotamian parallel exists, as E. Reiner has already pointed out 1), but it seems to have been overlooked by most biblical scholars 2).

An assur text published by E. Ebeling 3) attests the practice of psephomancy 4) by means of two dice called, respectively, aban erēšī, "the desirable die", and aban la erēšī, "the undesirable die". The subscript of this psephomantic text describes the nature and the use of these stones: [IN] IM. INIM. MA EŠ. BAR NA4. GIŠ. NUx. GAL NA4. KUR-nu [DIB. BA TAR. RE], "conjuration to foretell the future by means of a white stone (lit. alabaster) and a black stone (lit. haematite)" 5). This confirms the opinion that the 'ūrim and tummim of the Bible were originally two stones and gave a "yes" or "no" answer.
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IS THE SEPTUAGINT AMOS VIII 12-IX 10 A SEPARATE UNIT?

G. Howard has recently attempted to demonstrate that the LXX version of Am. viii 12-ix 10 is to be ascribed to a different hand than that worked upon the rest of the book 6). In judgement of the present writer, however, he does not seem to have made his point in a sufficiently convincing manner.

Apart from his hardly understandable disregard of the study of Ziegler 7) that is undoubtedly of fundamental importance for the

3) E. Ebeling, Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, Berlin, 1953, № 137.
4) This practice is discussed by J. Nougayrol, in OLZ 51 (1956), p. 41.
7) J. Ziegler, Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch, Braunsberg 1934. Howard does not even mention this work, while he does mention a casual note made by S. E. Johnson in JBL 56 (1937), p. 331.
question discussed by him, I believe that some rationale or motive must be sought which would justify such a division, for the second section does violence to the natural flow of the prophet’s words; the paragraph containing the first part of “B” opens with “Behold, the days are coming” in vs. 11, and not 12. Arguments usually produced to establish a similar case of the plural hands translating a single book or of a later hand retouching part of a work originally produced single-handedly do not apply to our book: the bulk of the book to be translated, as in the case of Jeremiah 1), or logical division as in the case of 1-4 Kg 2).

We shall now closely look into the evidences Howard brings forward. His thesis is based on four points.

1) The translator of “A” is said to be weak in geographical knowledge, as may be shown in ii 2 ἄργιῳ τῶν πόλεων 3). Let’s note however that the place is not a very familiar one; rather, its precise identification is notoriously a matter of controversy. Further, it occurs no more in Amos; elsewhere Jer. xxxi (xlvi) 24 Καραθθ, 41 Αχαρίω, Jos. xv 25 αἱ πόλεις. Even Targ., product of Palestinian Judaism (!), employs an appellative krk’.

Howard also mentions v 5 β’το κέ το φρέκρ τοῦ ὄβρου (// byt ‘l, glgl transliterated), while in “B” we read βηματία at viii 14. However, one can hardly think of someone ignorant of Beersheba being responsible for the production of the Greek Old Testament. Even the translator of the book in which the city in the Negeb plays a central role may render it exactly like our translator of Amos: see Gn. xxvi 33 ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα τῆ πόλει φρέκρ τοῦ ὄβρου and xxi 31 φ’ τοῦ ὄβρου. One possible explanation for the rendering as found in v 5 may well be that Beersheba was not easily recognized (by the translator or those for whose sake he is translating) as a cult centre, as Bethel and Gilgal were, so that the need was felt to make it clear by employing the appellatives which manifestly carry cultic connotation. Indeed, we should rather think of one and the same trans-

3) The text quoted in this note is Ziegler’s edition for the LXX and Biblia Hebraica for the MT.
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