Will you furnish some explanation of the expression which is found in Am viii. 14: 'The manner of Beersheba liveth'?—E. St. J. W.

The whole verse according to the Authorized Version is, 'They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth.' This translation comes from the Geneva Bible of 1560, which contains a marginal note: 'That is, the commune maner of worshiping and the service or religion there used.' The Hebrew word is thus taken in the sense of 'ritual,' 'cult,' 'manner of worship,' and that it is just possible to take it so is shown by the fact that elsewhere it is sometimes rendered 'manner' in the sense of custom. Thus Am 410: 'I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt.' But the ordinary meaning of the word (יהל) is 'way,' 'road,' 'path,' and Driver prefers its usual translation, quoting from G. A. Smith and Doughty as to the Arabic custom of swearing by the way to a place. This is probably what is intended by the R.V. 'the way of Beersheba liveth.'

EDITOR.

---

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

The request of the Editor of The Expository Times that I would review Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet on The Origin of the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus reached me when I was engrossed with other work. I have readily turned from this, however, because it is important to arrive at a verdict on the question Margoliouth raises. I must add that I should gladly have devoted somewhat longer time to the examination of the subject, but the interest of the readers of The Expository Times has been so powerfully awakened by the July number (p. 433 f.), that I have determined to communicate in the August issue the results I have reached up till now. In what follows I will use for the Hebrew text published by Cowley and Neubauer the symbol H, and for the Greek and Syriac versions of Ecclus, the symbols G and S respectively.

An important principle to be observed in the examination of the question appears to me to be this, that in the first instance only the text of H furnishes the object of investigation. The marginal notes are a matter by themselves, and have only a secondary claim to be taken into account. It is confusing when at one time something from the text and at another a marginal note is brought under notice—a fault in form which Margoliouth has not entirely avoided (cf. p. 3 f., 6).

1. It is the natural course to look at the text first of all from the point of view of quantity. Margoliouth has not touched upon this at all, and all that Schechter (in Cowley and Neubauer, p. xii) says about it is that 'The Hebrew omits whole clauses which are to be found both in the Greek and in the Syriac. Certain clauses, again, are to be found in H which are wanting in both versions.' But even Schechter neither gives examples nor devotes any special discussion to the bearing of this quantitative relation of H, G, and S upon the originality of H.

Now, the plus of H, as compared with G and S, is made up, apart from particular words, of 3920b. 80c 408b 418b 457b 26f 467b. Have these passages the marks of secondary origin? In the first place, the question, 'Is there a number to his salvation?' (3920b) was not so natural a one as to awaken the suspicion: that it is an interpolation.1 Again, is the remark that the wild beasts, etc. (3930b) were 'created for their use' (v. 300b) of such a kind that anyone would feel disposed to insert it? Further, 'pestilence and bloodshed, fever and drought,' as

1 Regarding Smend's reading ('Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesu Sirach,' in Abhandl. d. Götting. Gesells. d. Wissensch., 1897) of 3920b I reserve my judgment, but his view that מְלָתוּנ is a substantive derived from מָלַת appears to me extremely uncertain.
Cowley and Neubauer rightly take to be the meaning of 408a, is followed by the supplementary ‘devastation and destruction, evil and death’ (v.10). Is it more probable that H lengthened the list of evils than that G lessened the great number of closely allied terms? Precisely the same probability meets us in 419, where the synonymous forms of expression used in v.86ab might readily be contracted into a single stichos. The next plus of H, namely, 4516 (‘and clothed him with bells’) probably owes its origin to the word ἀρατός (‘and clothed him’), with which the following stichos (v.89a) commences, having been twice written by a copyist, and then θύσιν (v.98a) having been added as object. On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the clause ‘who has crowned you with glory’ (4516a) is secondary, for it assigns the motive for the foregoing call to bless the Lord (v.25a), and is presupposed by the following ἤμ. This last word, moreover, is more probably original than the ἔμεν of G, for the Syriac, too, has a Hebraic augmentation. It might appear as if there was a lacuna between v.126 and ‘after his death’ (v.29a), and this may have been filled up by the words ‘also till the time,’ etc. (19n).

The first minus of H, as compared with G and (or) S, concerns the words, ‘None should say, What is this? wherefore is that? for every thing has suffered corruption. It is possible, however, that the words of 4616, ‘also till the time,’ etc., are a Hebraic augmentation. It might appear as if there was a lacuna between v.126 and ‘after his death’ (v.29a), and this may have been filled up by the words ‘also till the time,’ etc. (19n).

The next minus of H meets us in the words, ‘by His word takes place the rising of the sun, and by His word is its setting’ (3021). Which are found only in S. But who would not conclude that these words may readily have taken their rise as a detailed unfolding of the contents of the preceding general statement? Nor do I think it would be wrong to pass essentially the same judgment upon the origin of the ὁ δὲ διάλογος κ.τ.λ. of 4616. Are these words not the interpretation of ἄρατος and ἐγράφη of v.1ab? And does not the same relation subsist between v.11ab and v.12ab? There is of course also the possibility that in the textual history of H v.12ab may have got lost. In the one way or the other we may explain all the other instances of minus which H shows, as compared with G and S: 4132ab (G), 422 (G) 1scd (GS) 22ab (GS), 4316ab (G), 4413, 12ab (GS) 15a (GS) 15a (G), 4526bd (GS), 461a (GS) 20a (GS), 4716 (GS).

I cannot deny that the instances of plus on the part of H appear to me to constitute a feature which speaks in favour of the originality of this text. On the other hand, the instances of plus on the part of G (and S) may easily be traces of an intra-Jewish or even intra-Hellenistic development of Ecclesiasticus.

Before we proceed to look at the three leading forms of the text of Ecclus. from the qualitative point of view, it may be well to raise the preliminary question whether H, when examined by itself alone, bears unmistakable traces of textual corruption. These are to be found even in those passages of H on which there are no marginal notes, i.e. n 4516, with the exception of 4716: 2 is written for 2 in 4616 (? 2 2 2 for 2 in v.12b); 22ab for 2 for 21 in 4716; 22ab for 2 for 2 in v.17c; probably 2 in 492ab; 2 for 2 in v.66. My view of these passages agrees with that of Cowley and Neubauer, and their corrections of H, in all the passages cited, except the last, have been adopted unquestioningly even by Smend. Consequently, there can be no talk of doing injustice to the text of H, if in some other passage it is held that this text has suffered corruption.

2. In going on now to look at the three leading forms of the text of Ecclus. from the point of view of quality, it appears to me advisable to follow in the track of Professor Margoliouth, only I will take the passages with which he deals in the order in which they occur in the text.

(a) 4016 reads in H: ἐκκρεμομένος ἄλλη κεφάλη πλέον. The question has already been asked by Cowley and Neubauer whether ἐκκρεμομένος is not corrupted from ἐκκρεμόμενος, and they have rendered the latter word by ‘reced-‘ stalks.’ Further, they have, following the marginal note, replaced the older reading by ἐκκρεμόμενος, and also suggested that ἐκκρεμόμενος is corrupted from ἐκκρεμόμενος. As the λεγεῖν of the mar-

1 When ‘bloodshed’ has been already mentioned, Smend’s reading ἐκκρεμομένος, (or) στιχον for ἐκκρεμομένος, ‘drought’ is less probable.
2 I have noticed since that this same view has been expressed by, among others, Schlatter, Das neugriechische hebr. Stück aus Sirach (1897), p. 61.
original note may result from a comparison with G or S, so also may the הָנָה suggested by Cowley and Neubauer, and Margoliouh (p. 7 f.) regards it as beyond question that in v. 16a G can have derived the word אָכֵל only from a reading הָנָה in the real original. 'Clearly,' says Margoliouh, 'the Greek would not have used a Coptic word, had he not found it in his original; this акел, therefore, was used by Ben-Sira himself, who got it from Job (הכז 811b). But it is not an incontrovertible fact that the translator could not have independently selected the word אכשל, for there are both negative and positive elements in the Hellenistic Old Testament which point to an Egyptian residence on the part of some at least of its authors. Let one recall, on the one hand, the avoiding of the terms 'ass' and 'hare' (cf., on this point, my Einleitung, p. 106 f.), and, on the other hand, the choice of Egyptian terms: e.g., קָבָד (Gn 444); בָּא ס for הָנָה (Lv 1117||Dt 1410); ἀπράβη for הָנָה (Is 510); and this very word אכשל is not only chosen in passages where הָנָה is found in the Hebrew (Gn 418, Job 811b), but is also used in Is 919 to translate הניע. Consequently, the same term, אכשל, might be employed also in Ecclus 4016, partly in order to call up a frequently occurring Egyptian plant,—such a regard to the Egyptian Jews is not, in view of the translator's prologue, improbable, and partly because this passage appeared to contain a parallel to Job 812.

But even this last view is by no means beyond question, and I take the liberty of proposing the following interpretation of Ecclus. 4016. I accept Cowley and Neubauer's suggestion that הָנָה may be corrupted from חָיָה, but I find from Immanuel Löw's work, Aramäische Pflanzennamen (p. 202), that this word was used to designate poppy-heads (Mohnköpfe), which glow like torches. Thus, perhaps, may be explained the choice of the expression חָיָה, which means literally, 'they are extinguished.' On this basis, it appears to me, 4016f. of H may be rendered: 'The fruit (primarily in a personal sense) of violence (abstractum pro concreto) shall not remain free from evil consequences (experiences) [cf. for נָשָׂא (Nu 510, Jg 1538)], for the root of a godless one is on the tooth of a crag, is like poppy-heads on the bank (or by the side) of a brook, through every burst of rain they (both the root and especially the poppy-heads) are extinguished (i.e. destroyed). It may be added that one might also render, 'which through every burst of rain are wont to be extinguished,' for סֶфа is found in 3930d 4011a 4213 4330a 486a.

(b) The fragments of the last word of 4026d (sic) have been restored by Cowley and Neubauer under the form ¶[םתס], 'treasure,' and this corresponds very well with the parallel, הָנָה, 'want,' of v. 28c. But Smend offers as the conclusion of v. 26d הָנָה, and Margoliouh (p. 7) remarks that this הָנָה is 'the equivalent for the Greek "help" and Syriac "helper." That word (unknown in this sense in Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac) is... given in Syro-Arabic glossaries.' But this remark is superficial, and all that is built upon it collapses if the closing word of v. 26 was הָנָה, in favour of which the 1 read by Cowley and Neubauer may testify. By the way, in earlier periods of Hebrew writing 1 and 2 were frequently of similar length (cf. Chwolson, C. I. H. p. 420; my Einleitung, pp. 74, 152). The word הָנָה is rendered in Ps 9099 by קַטָּב, 'refuge,' which has the same meaning as בֹּקֶבֶת offered by G in Ecclus 4026d.

(c) 4112b reads, according to H, 'fear for (thy) name, for that will cling to thee more than thousand treasures of wisdom.' S has 'treasures of wickedness,' and G 'treasures of gold' (ץפורה). Margoliouh (p. 14) argues in favour of הָנָה as the original reading. This, he thinks, is supported directly by G, and indirectly by S, because הָנָה could be pronounced like הָנָה. Margoliouh holds, further, that הָנָה may actually have been the original expression in 4112b. Now, as this word הָנָה is 'often' reproduced in Syriac by חָיָה ('science'), Broekelmann, Lex. Syr. p. 255a, 'fraus, dolus'), Margoliouh proceeds to argue that the Syriac word happening in 4112b to be preceded by the genitive exponent מ, the re-translator took the consonants חָיָה to be one word, and derived this from עָנָה ('he knew'). This word חָיָה ('science'), which has no existence in Syriac, he is supposed to have attributed to the Syriac text of 4112b and reproduced 'science,' not by חָיָה, 'wisdom,' but by חָיָה, 'wisdom.'

It will be admitted, we presume, that the way in which this last term (שבח) in 4112b is supposed to have been arrived at is far from a simple one, and if the supposed re-translator had so slight an acquaintance with Syriac, how could he have translated from the Syriac Ecclesiastics? Hence I propose the following solution of the difficulty:—I should favour חָיָה (which in all the six passages...
[Zec 9, Ps 68, Pr 3 4 8 10 16] where it occurs is rendered by χρυσόν, or ἡ δοξή 'desire' (the marginal reading), as the original word, were I not restrained by the following circumstance. Margoliouth, who so vigorously combats the claim of ἀληθές, 'wisdom,' to be the original conclusion of 4112, has not observed the ἐπιμέρισμα ἀληθές, 'buried wisdom,' of v. 14, which certainly is a backward allusion to v. 12. Hence I am disposed to give the preference to ἀληθής, 'wisdom,' as the term with which v. 12 originally closed. The meaning intended by the statement in v. 12 that a good name is of more value than thousand treasures of wisdom was this, that intellectual culture and the fame of the scholar are not to be regarded as the highest possessions. The sentiment was too fine for some readers, who began to question whether it was correctly expressed. Hence came the reading in one MS., ἀληθῶς, 'desire,' which might be converted by the Greek translator into 'gold,' the concrete object of widely diffused desire, while the other reading of H, namely, ἀληθές, 'wisdom,' 'prudence,' might be restricted by S, in the interest of the context, to the more special ἐτής, 'cunning,' 'deceit.'

(a) In 4216 H says, 'the place where she (thy daughter) tarrieth, let it be no lattice.' The meaning appears to me to be that a young maiden is not to choose a window-niche for her favourite post. But in S the sentence runs, 'in the place where she dwells let her not go out,' while in G this stichos is wanting. Margoliouth (p. 15) will have it that the Syriac verb shib'ak, 'to abandon,' was misunderstood and falsely combined with the 'familiar Arabic shubbak' (Freytag, Lex. Arab.: shibākun, fenestrae reticulatae). This happened, although the Syriac verb was pronounced with the emphatic ḫ (kaph) and the Arabic substantive with the ordinary ḫ (kaph)? Is it not more likely that the counsel given by H has been toned down by the Syriac translator? This conclusion is further recommended by other two circumstances. In the first place, the Syriac form of 4216 contains a contradiction within itself. For where else could she go out (i.e. leave her dwelling) except 'in the place where she dwells?' The words just quoted suit only the Hebrew form of this stichos, and were retained, although the concluding portion had a milder character given to it. Secondly, our conclusion is supported by the circumstance that the following clause (v. 11f) cannot have been trans-
Yet Margoliouth (p. 6) prefers to derive 'from the Arabic'—he must be thinking of "rarfuna," and the denominative verb "abyrinth, 'through a Glühstein erwärmen,'— and to render "m'razef, as he himself (p. 7) transcribes the word, by 'illuminating.' He does this, because G reads "einen Gliihstein erwärmen, '- and to render negative, I would the poetical original? Is there any probability that a translator should have given to the words of G with the confident expectation of an answer in the firmament, 'the rests on a comparison with G or the other hand, G and where 'firmament' forms the object? No, of 'stars,' also in the Persian version to which, according to rectely cites the passage as singular, 'star,' in 'both his sources' (p. H says, 'The cold of the north wind shall blow and crystal shall be congealed from water,' originated from H, or that the reverse process took place? To me the answer does not appear to be doubtful, when I observe the variety of probable references which might be discovered in the words of H.

(i) In 43 20a G has 'they that sail on the sea tell of its danger,' whereas H offers the text 'they that go down to the sea tell of its end' (or totality, cf. סנפ—Gn 47 2, Nu 22 41, Is 56 11, Ezk 33 9). This need not be understood in an absolutely affirmative sense, as if it were meant that these men actually relate that they have reached the end of the sea or explored the whole of it, although even this might happen with a boasting disposition. Nor is the view that v. 24a is intended as a question ('May they that,' etc.) quite impossible. Yet, without taking into account any of these possibilities, Margoliouth (p. 8) finds 'a correct sentiment in the translation, an absurdity in the "original.'" But, if the re-translator had found the concept 'danger' in G, would he have reproduced it by סנפ, 'end,' 'limit,' 'totality'? It is more natural to assume that the difficult concept was replaced by a more usual one.

(k) The words of 46 20b, and he declared to the king his ways,' i.e. his fortune (cf. Ps 10 5a-37 5a), are found also in S, only that the plural, 'his ways,' is replaced by the singular, and, seeing that the fortune whose announcement is attributed in v. 20b to Samuel, was in reality the end of Saul, is it incredible that this concept should have been expressed by G in the form סנפ רכז תִּלָּחָה טִלָּחָה? Margoliouth (p. 13 f.) makes a threefold assumption: (a) the original was סנפ סנפ, 'his end'; (b) this word was misread by S as סנפ, and this plural was translated by him as a singular; (γ) the singular of S ('his way') was changed by the Hebrew re-translator into the plural ('his ways.') These three assumptions appear to me to form a triple alliance that will not stand.

(To be concluded.)