

named the overseers (קָרַם, *kuddam*) of *Manawât*, and in Gl. 343, 2 (*ibidem*) it is said:—

[חַפְּטָם] נֶפֶשׁ וּמְנַחַת וְאֵהָל אֲמַנְחָה

i.e. 'and the dead-watchers [a class of priests; cf. נֶפֶשׁ, "tomb"], and *Manawât*, and the people of *Amnât*.' This last designation, which occurs several times besides,¹ appears likewise to apply to a class of priests, and in all probability to those who stood in a special relation to the goddess *Manawât*. For, as there is no verb *manaha*, the ה in אֲמַנְחָה will be here, as elsewhere in *Minæan*, only *graphic*, and thus *amnâtân* will be the *status emphaticus* of an inner plural *amnât*, which then, of course, can come only from the same root, *manawa*, from which *Manawât* itself comes.

Munich.

FRITZ HOMMEL.

P.S.—In my article on the Hittite Inscriptions in the July issue (p. 460^b) '*mu-hatimmu* (written *amêlu*, 'man,' and *MU*) = "baker," is of course a printer's error for '*nu-hatimmu*,' etc. (*nu* being ideogram for *amêlu*, as in the word *nu-gish-sar*, 'gardener'), just as in the August number. (p. 528^a), in Jensen's unfortunate reply, '*Jarkhu*' is a misprint for '*Tarkhu*.' I have then to ask the reader kindly to make the above correction of '*mu*-' into '*nu*-' . To everything else which Jensen has brought forward in the August number I shall reply elsewhere, as too heavy a demand has already been made in this matter upon the readers of this magazine. My end, which was to show that other attempts at decipherment besides Jensen's have their possibilities, has been abundantly served, and that this is the general impression I gather from Professor Ramsay's note last month (p. 527^b).

Professor Ramsay and the Hittite Inscriptions.

Now that the controversy between Professor Hommel and myself is at last closed, as far as the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are concerned, I have no wish to enter upon a new discussion with Professor Ramsay, but I may be allowed to offer a few *final* remarks on his note in last month's issue (p. 527). Two undeniable facts are established: (1) that Sayce in 1893 (*Recueil de travaux*) gave so full a transcription and translation of several Hittite inscriptions as deserved no other name than a 'decipherment,' and his article was entitled accordingly, 'The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions'; (2) that in 1898 (EXPOSITORY TIMES, December, p. 115^b) he spoke of the inscriptions as 'undeciphered,' from which I could

¹ *E.g.* Hal. 237, 2, and Gl. 282, 1.

draw no other conclusion than that he had abandoned his former results. I could judge only from Sayce's *published* utterances, and not from his *private* communications, incompatible therewith, with Professor Ramsay, to whom, it appears, he confessed long ago that his attempts at decipherment had been fruitless. Although Professor Ramsay is right then from *his* point of view, I may confidently leave the reader to judge whether, in view of the above facts, I can fairly be charged with 'extraordinary misrepresentations' of Sayce's position, and the like.

For the rest, I for one do not think that Professor Ramsay by his statement has improved Professor Sayce's position. P. JENSEN.

Marburg.

The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus.

I.

I HAVE read Professor König's first article, and have no intention of answering him, however many he may write. It is sufficient to notice one of his comments to show the grounds of this resolution.

43^{4c}.—לְשֹׂאֵן מֵאוֹר תִּנְמַר נֹשֶׁבֶת. He ascribes the translation, 'blowing out a tongue of light that blazes' to *me*; it is the translation of Ben-Sira's grandson, *i.e.* the ancient Greek version, ἀτμίδας πυρώδεις ἐκφυσῶν! One thing that is absolutely certain is that no Hebrew Ben-Sira that differs widely from the Greek translation has any chance of being genuine. Here, however, the difference between the two is obviously slight. The Hebrew 'tongue of flame' is represented by 'sparks'; the Hebrew 'blowing' by 'blowing out'; and, thirdly, the Hebrew תִּנְמַר by 'fiery.' Therefore, either Ben-Sira (if the Cairene text is genuine) used תִּנְמַר in the sense of 'fiery,' or his grandson thought he meant 'fiery' by it; of this, supposing the Cairene text to be genuine, there is no question. But to make it mean 'fiery' we must suppose it to be the Arabic *tajammar* or *tujammir*, which is only found in *vulgar* and *provincial* glossaries, and which is therefore a late word. Now, neither Ben-Sira nor his grandson can have been acquainted with a late Arabic word; therefore the Cairene text is spurious. What does Professor König mean by saying an appeal to the Arabic is out of place? Have the readings of the Greek translation, which was in all probability made from an autograph copy of the original, no authority?

However, Professor König says this rendering of the Hebrew is wrong, because נֹשֶׁבֶת is only used intransitively in the Hebrew Bible. As the word occurs only once, this seems a trivial objection; however, we learn from it that, in Professor König's

opinion, *Ben-Sira can in no way have deviated from biblical usage.* For if he may not have used with an accusative a word which, only occurring once in the Bible, is used without one, he clearly can have taken no liberties with biblical words.

Therefore the right translation is 'a tongue of light consumeth the inhabited country.' But what has become of our canon about biblical words? נמר is used *five times* in the Hebrew Bible, and never once in his way! Apparently then the rule about biblical words only applies when the genuineness of the Cairene document is attacked; but when it is being defended it does not apply.

But granting that this is the right translation, Ben-Sira is made to say that the sun is or has a tongue of light that annihilates the inhabited country! I have called that statement blasphemous folly, and can think of no other description that would suit such nonsense. If the sun's light annihilated the inhabited country, instead of rendering it habitable, there would be no Ben-Sira and no Professor König.

Professor Schlatter, the only editor who seems to think it even desirable that Ben-Sira should talk sense, justly objects to the 'tongue of light.' The Greek translator would not have rendered this by 'sparks,' therefore it must be a rendering of the Greek. Now in Persian a form of the word for 'tongue' is regularly used for 'flame'; 'tongue' is *zabān*, but 'flame' *zabānah*. This accounts for the introduction of the 'tongue'; hence I should be prepared to argue the spuriousness of the Hebrew out of this line alone.

In order, therefore, to win on this one point Professor König (1) makes *me* the author of the ancient Greek version; (2) makes Ben-Sira rave; (3) starts an absurd canon, and grossly violates it the moment it goes against him.

Since Dr. Schechter rightly states that his 'Ben-Sira' exhibits the developed Rabbinic dialect,—I might add not only exhibits it, but shows its author very imperfectly acquainted with it,—I have in any case won on the original controversy; for it was the assertion that Ben-Sira wrote a post-biblical language which brought down a storm ten years ago.

I do not think the Cambridge fragments will be defended by any one; hence the Oxford portion will fall with them. But in any case it is evidently useless for me to argue any more with Professor König.¹

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

II.

Professor Margoliouth, in a notice headed 'The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus,' on p. 528 of the August

¹ *Gumre* was used for 'coals' by the real Ben-Sira 810. The denominative would mean 'to fumigate.' See B. *Shabbath* 18 a, b.

number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, makes the following remark: 'It would seem difficult to outdo the mistakes of the Baghdad Jew; but Dr. Schechter has succeeded. He explains the fact that the differences between Greek and Hebrew are explicable from Persian by supposing that the Greek may have been made from a Persian translation of the Hebrew. The Greek translation was made before 100 B.C., and we have MSS. of it earlier than 500 A.D.; and the Persian language did not come into existence before 650 A.D.!'

1. On this wanton attack I beg to remark that the words which Professor Margoliouth perverts (not quotes) are to be found in Dr. Taylor's part of the work, p. lxx, *not in mine*. In fact, I did not think Professor Margoliouth's *pas-quit* sufficiently important to make it a subject of discussion at all in what I considered a serious piece of work.

2. His attack on Saadyah is not to the point. Saadyah may have been mistaken as to the question of points and accents,—just as so many thousands of divines were mistaken about this question when they thought that the Bible was originally provided with vowels and points,—but this does not alter the fact that Saadyah did know our text. The famous occasion, then, improvised by the Laudian Professor, when the Baghdad Jew cheated and the Christian pelted him with texts from the Apocrypha, must have taken place some generations earlier than the Laudian Professor assigns to it. I may perhaps add here that it was I who first drew Professor Margoliouth's attention to the existence of the *Sepher Haggalui* when I met him at the Oriental Congress in Paris, and even borrowed the book for his use from Professor Derembourg.

3. The proofs of Professor Margoliouth in paragraphs 1 and 2 only show what has been pointed out so many times that our copyist made use of various MSS, inserting all their doublets and mistakes. Est 1¹⁰ (Mehuman) will explain the *Neeman*. Comp. Paulus Cassel's Commentary on this verse.

4. I have 'tasted the delights of authorship' long before the Laudian Professor began his famous career of literary failures, both in Aryan and Semitic languages. In my youth I even enjoyed a controversy, when conducted on gentlemanly lines; but I must decline any further correspondence against Professor Margoliouth, whose methods do not recommend themselves to me as either gentlemanly or scholarly.

S. SCHECHTER.

Cambridge.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.