

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.¹

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

II.

A SPECIAL series is made up of passages in which Professor Margoliouth thinks to account for a 'nonsense' in H² by recourse to the *Persian* language.

(l) The series begins with 42¹⁴. The expletives which Margoliouth (p. 13) showers upon the text of H 42^{14a} I find superfluous. For, seeing that it is an established fact (see above, 2 *ad init.*) that the text of H has come down to us in a corrupt form, it may be that in this instance too the words offered in the marginal note exhibit the original text. This suggests that also in v. 14^b we should turn from the text to the marginal note, the language of which may mean, 'And the house of a woman that likes to scorn pours forth scorn.' The feminine form **חַבִּיעַ** may be due to the influence of the feminine genitive **מִחֶרְפָּה**, as in **חַצִּי הַחֶרְפָּה** of Ex 26¹², etc. (see my *Syntax*, § 349a), and 'the house of a woman' might all the more readily be simplified by G into 'woman' (**γυνή**), because **בֵּית**, 'house,' is a frequent term for 'woman' in later Hebrew (Levy, *NH WB* i. 224b). Then v. 14^{ab} forms a climax *ad peius*, and the final **חֶרְפָּה** of the original, to which also **ὀνειδισμὸν** points, may have been displaced by **אִשָּׁה**, because the latter stood at the end of v. 13^b and v. 14^a, and thus a *homoioteleuton* took place. Schlatter (p. 39) prefers the *text* of v. 14^b. He regards the terminal word **אִשָּׁה** as original, and renders, 'and in the house of a scorner (fem.) the woman chatters.' But mere 'chattering' would be no such abhorrent quality; and in this way neither could G have been derived from H, nor H from G. Finally, Margoliouth (p. 13) seeks to restore the text of

v. 14^b from the *Persian* language. He invites us to translate the four words of this text literally into Persian, and then we shall see what was meant by **וְבֵית מִחֶרְפָּה חַבִּיעַ אִשָּׁה**. I have sought to follow his directions, but have failed to discover a sound sense for v. 14^b. Margoliouth says expressly that the Persian word for 'woman' is to have the indefinite article and the accusative sign. Well, the Persian word for 'woman' is **زَن**, the indefinite article is **ی** (*i*), and the accusative sign is **را** (*ra*). The Persian rendering of v. 14^b, as proposed by Margoliouth, would thus have ended with the accusative *zan-i-ra*, and this would have been reproduced by the Hebrew retranslator as **אִשָּׁה**. But neither do I see how this *zanira* of the Persian translation could originate from **γυνή αἰσχύνουσα εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν**, nor how it could give a good sense to the **אִשָּׁה** of H.

(m) Regarding 43^{2a}, I cling, in the first place, to the idea that the **ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ** of G is connected with **בְּצַרְתּוֹ**. Or may not **צוּרָה**, 'form' (**צוּרָה**), 'image', be contained in **בְּצַרְתּוֹ**? 'Picture' and 'appearance' are cognate notions. Or did **בְּצַרְתּוֹ** originate from **בְּצַרְתּוֹ**, and the latter from **בּוֹרְתּוֹ**, 'at his rising or appearing' (2 Ch 26^{10b})? Neither supposition is easy; but is there then no connexion between **ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ** and **בְּצַרְתּוֹ**? Let us, however, assume that **צַרְתּוֹ** is, with the marginal note, to be changed into **צִאָתּוֹ**. Then the rendering would be, 'The sun, when it goes forth, causes the beams of light to stream out.' For, as **מִבִּיעַ** is connected with the **יִבִּיעַ** of Ps 19^{3a}, so is the **חֶמָה** borrowed from Ps 19^{7b}, where it is used for the beams of light. The latter conclusion is commended also by the circumstance that the commencement of 43^{3a} still deals with the illuminating function of the sun, and that it is only from the closing words of v. 3^a onwards that the author comes to speak of his warmth.—Margoliouth, for his part, is full of praise (p. 9) for G in 43^{2a}, namely, **ἡλιος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ διαγγέλλων ἐν ἐξόδῳ**. But, if **חֶמָה** and **הַצְהִיר** did

¹ The whole of Professor König's examination of Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet is in the Editor's hands, but it is too long for one insertion, and there is the less need for inserting it all at once that its method and general result are now apparent, and Professor Margoliouth has stated that he intends to make no reply.

² H stands for the Hebrew text of Cowley and Neubauer, G and S stand for the Greek and Syriac versions respectively.

not speak of the light-giving quality of the sun, this latter function would not be touched on at all. Moreover, if the sun was referred to as 'proclaiming by his appearance,' the following, 'by his forthcoming,' would be tautological; and if ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ was intended to mean 'by his shining,' the sun would do this all the time he shines, and not merely at his rising.

The main point, however, is the following. Margoliouth (p. 9) attaches his explanation of 43^{3a} to διαγγέλλων, 'proclaiming,' which, in my opinion, is borrowed somewhat mechanically from Ps 19^{3a}, the מביע חמה of H having been forced into the background by a reminiscence of יביע אמר of Ps 19^{3a}. Let us see whether the explanation of Margoliouth is to be preferred. He presupposes that חמה means 'warmth, heat,' and discovers the common source of 'proclaiming' (G) and 'discharging heat' (H) in Persian-Arabic. For 'between the Persian word for "speech" (ساختن) and the Arabic word for "heat" (ساختن), which a Persian may use if he likes, there is nothing but the context to distinguish.' Notwithstanding, the case does not appear to me to be quite so simple. For it is assumed that the 'retranslator's' Persian friend who, according to Margoliouth, translated G for him, chose precisely the phrase, *sukhuan afshāndan* as the equivalent of διαγγέλλων, and that the retranslator himself supposed that he had before him not a Persian but an Arabic word. Besides, the Persian translator of G would thus have dropped either ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ or ἐν ἐξόδῳ. Perhaps, then, my suggestion as to the connexion between מביע חמה and διαγγέλλων deserves the preference.

(n) 43⁶ reads in H, 'and also moon by moon the times (or seasons) return: a dominion over the end (i.e. forming the boundaries of time), and a sign for the hidden time (i.e. the latest future).' In the eyes of Margoliouth (p. 11), this is 'a piece of nonsense.' I wait with composure to see whether many will agree with him in this judgment. Meanwhile let us examine his view of G and S. G offers, 'and the moon in all things to her season, showing of times and a sign of eternity,' while S is to be rendered, 'and the moon ariseth to her time, a showing of times and a sign from everlasting.' According to Margoliouth 'the Syriac and the Greek help us to excellent sense,' and he derives H from G thus: 'The corrupt

Greek "in all" has been literally rendered باهر, and that word sometimes means "the moon." (He means by this that the Persian با = 'with,' 'to,' and هر = 'every one, all,' and that the Arabic باهر, *bâhirun*, signifies 'mirabilis, splendens luna.') He adds that the Greek 'unto her time' was probably rendered by the words بر بار (the Persian بر = 'at,' and بار = 'time' [Germ. *Mal*]). The Hebrew plural עתות is not taken into account by Margoliouth. On the other hand, he thinks to derive the שכות, '(are) returning,' in such a way that the final letter of بار (namely, r) was supplied with a point and read as z: *ôāz* [Persian [باز] = 'again,' 'back.' I confess that this derivation of H in 43⁶ appears to me neither necessary nor probable.

(o) 43^{13a} is wanting in S and reads in G, 'By His command He hurried down the snow,' whereas H has, 'His might marks out the lightning.' Margoliouth (p. 10) thinks that he can derive this last with certainty from a Persian source, because 'snow' = Persian برف, *barf*, and 'lightning' = Persian برق, *barq*. But here again one may be permitted to offer certain objections. Let us assume that H had a Persian exemplar before him, yet we must ask if in this exemplar not only were the forms of ف and ن precisely alike, but also the important points in ف and ق respectively neglected? Hence I venture, in spite of Margoliouth's confident opinion to the contrary, to suggest that the coincidence of 'snow' (G) and 'lightning' (H) with the Persian *barf* and *barq* is a fortuitous one. Further, I regard the ברק of H as more original than the 'snow' of G. The latter version might consider it necessary to avoid 'lightning' in v. 13^a because it employed ἀστραπή in v. 13^b. The 'snow,' moreover, appears to me as almost too usual a phenomenon to be presented as the subject of a special Divine command. Besides, snow is spoken of in v. 17^c. And why, finally, should the supposed Persian translator of G have replaced 'by His command' by 'and His might'?

(p) In 43^{17c} H has 'like lightning (s?) he scattereth snow.' Was perhaps רשפין (cf. רשפים, 'lightnings,' in Ps 78⁴⁸) intended, and is not the ו שלנו a dittography of the following ו? G has ὡς πετεινὰ κατιπτάμενα, 'like birds flying,' Margo-

liouth (p. 11 f.) holds that the Persian translator of G used the word *parwāz*, and that this signifies (1) 'flight, flying,' and (2) 'light, splendour.' In point of fact, the first sense of پرواز is 'alarum solutio, i.e. volatus' (Vullers, *Lex. Pers. s.v.*), but if the plural *περενά* had been given to the Persian to translate, would it have been natural to select پرواز as the rendering of this? Moreover, the participle *καθιπτόμενα* would thus have been passed over by him. For me it is not yet made out that this was the course of events. I see in the 'birds' of G an obvious simplification.

(g) 43^{2b}, finally, reads in H, 'Dew releasing serves to make shine with fat the parched ground' (i.e. שרב, Is 35⁷). G has 'Dew appearing will bring refreshment from (or after) the scorching wind.' H is not 'ludicrous,' as Margoliouth (p. 12) supposes. Nor is there any ground for assuming that H took the verbal form *ἰλαρώσει* for the dative of the substantive *ἰλαρώσις*. Do not the infinitive with ל (*liqtol*) and the future often answer to one another in Hebrew? Cf. my *Syntax*, § 234, 399 z. May not then לרשן and

ἰλαρώσει have both a future sense? G, moreover, took שרב in its most obvious sense, namely, 'heat' (Is 49¹⁰, where the LXX reproduces שרב by the same word *καύσω*, which is used by G in Ecclus 43^{2b}), but שרב possessed also a second sense, namely, 'the parched ground' (Is 35⁷), and this was intended here. This meaning of שרב was not, however, present to the mind of every reader, and hence the marginal note exhibits the easier expression, רטב, *ratob*, which in Job 8¹⁶ signifies 'the green.' There is thus no need to trace back the לרשן of H to the Persian چربی, which signifies 'fat,' and to take this word 'in its secondary sense of "mildness," "softness."' "

In this way I have come to the conclusion that the *text* of H is neither in such a bad condition that it exhibits a corrupt form of G and S, nor is based upon a—corrupted—exemplar of a Persian translation of G. By the way, Margoliouth's theory that H is 'a translation of a corruption of a Persian translation' (p. 10) is in contradiction with his assumption (p. 20) that a Persian friend of the re-translator translated G for him into Persian.

Contributions and Comments.

The God Mani.

IN the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 526) Mr. Johns cites from *W.A.I.* iii. 66, col. 3, line 2, 'Manu the great' as the name of a god worshipped in the temple of Ninib at Asshur. Lenormant had already offered the interpretation, '*Manou le grand, qui préside au sort*' (evidently in allusion to the Arab. *maniyat*, 'fate,' 'death-lot,' and the well-known goddess Manât). The text of *W.A.I.* iii. 66 is made up of a long list of gods which I have transcribed in full in *P.S.B.A.* xxi. pp. 117-131, and partly explained (*Assyriological Notes*, § 40). There, amongst the gods worshipped in the temple of the god Ib (not Nin-ib) at the city of Asshur, a 'great Ma-nu' (not Ma-anu nor Ma-a-ni) is named. Now, since there is a well-known ideogram *ma-nu*, which, with the determinative prefix, 'wood, tree,' is read in Semitic *eru*, and since, on the other hand, among the gods who have the predicate, 'great,' the most prominent is the god of pestilence and death, *Girra-gal* (the Sumerian *gal* = 'great'), or, in a later transformation, *Irkalla*, I should be disposed to view the expression, 'the great *ma-nu* (or *eru*),' as one of the favourite Rebus puns of the Babylonians, and to see in it nothing else than *Irkalla*, or *Nirgal*. The meaning of the Sumerian *manu* is probably 'ark' (*eru* and *erinnu*, cf. ארון) along with the

divining staves kept in it, whence *manu* is actually rendered also 'staff.' In this case the supposition would not be excluded that this Sumerian *manu* is an ancient Semitic loan-word, with the original sense of 'lot,' 'fate.'

On the other hand, the Egyptian personal name cited by Mr. Johns, which has come down to us in Assyrian tradition, *Pûti-ma-a-ni* (*Pûti-mâni*), is either Πετεμίνις (as *Pûtisheri* = Περοσίρις, *Pûti-Hârû* = Περε-ῦρις or *Poti-Hor*), or perhaps better, an abbreviation of *Pûti-Amâni*, *Poti-Ammon*, just as the name פטמון of Aramaic tradition is perhaps rightly explained as from פטאמן. It thus scarcely contributes anything to the explanation of the *Meni* of Is 65¹¹.

On the other hand, I regard it as absolutely certain that the well-known Nabataean and S. Arabian goddess of destiny, *Manawât* (*plur. majest.*), or *Manât*, had originally her complement in a male deity *Meni*, especially as besides the Arabic *Manât* we find also *maniyat* (*plur. manâyât*), 'death-lot,' which in form is nothing else than the feminine of a word *manî*.¹ Also in *S. Arabia*, in very ancient times, a goddess of destiny, *Manawât*, appears to have been worshipped. In Gl. 284, l. 5 (Minæan collection in British Museum), immediately after the priests of 'the god,' κατ' ἑξοχήν (אלהין, *ilâhân* = N. Arab. *allâhu*), there are

¹ So Ges. *Wörterb.*,¹³ s.v. מני.