THE ROSE OF SHARON

The rose of Sharon (Cant. 2:11) is the autumn-flowering pale-lilac meadow-saffron, i.e. *Colchicum autunnale* (BL 117, 1.7) in the park-like tract (about 8-12 miles wide and 44 miles long) of the Palestinian Maritime Plain extending along the Mediterranean from Joppa to Mt. Carmel. DB 4, 477$^b$ says of Sharon: Throughout its whole extent it is gay with myriads of brightly colored flowers (cf. BL 115). Sharon is not a proper name, but a common noun; it is therefore used with the article (GK § 125, d). Nor is it connected with *mišör*, plain; it is not level, but undulating; there are groups of hills 250-300 feet high. *Sharon* is a form like *raçon* from *raçà*, tertiary; the stem is *šarà* (=Arab. *tarâ*-šatrû) from which *mišrà*, juice, is derived (see above, p. 144).$^1$ Similarly we have *ḥazôn*, vision; *gaʾôn*, highness; *jağôn*, grief; *a'ûôn*, sin, from *ḥazâ*, *gaʿá*, *jağá*, *a'ûá*; but *zağôn*, insulance; *ḥamôn*, roar; *šaʾòn*, crash; *lašôn*, tongue, must be derived from stems *medix* $^y$ or $^i$ (see Mic. 76). The meaning of *šarôn* is luxuriance (Assyr. *mešrû*). Sharon was famous for its luxuriant vegetation (Is. 35:2). We might render it The Park (cf. the name Carmel derived from *kûrm*, garden, especially *vineyard*). EB 4431 states: There is a long extent of park-like scenery in the neighborhood of Mukhâlid in the very North. Formerly there were large oak-groves; therefore $^G$ renders in Is. 33:9, 35:2, 65:10: $^δ$ *dómuós*.

Paul Haupt.

**HEB. ĀMŠ, YESTERDAY = ASSYR. INA MÛSI, AT NIGHT**

In my paper on Heb. *mašâl* (above, p. 140 ff.) I have combined Assyr. *ina mûsi* *mašli*, at midnight, with Arab. *mâllâ*, in the beginning of the night. This semantic difference is not exceptional: Assyr. *lîlāti* (=Heb. *lêlôt*) means *evening*, and *mûsu* (for *muššu*, *mušîn*) denotes *night*, while in Arabic and the other Semitic languages *lâjalâ* (Ethiop. *lêlit*) is used for *night*,

$^1$ According to König's *Wörterbuch* (1910) *mišrà* denotes *marmalade*. 
and masá' ( Ethiop. mēsēt; cf. Assyr. mūšitu) for evening. 
Heb. āmš, yesterday, is originally in the evening = Assyr. ina 
mūši, at night, i. e. last night; the day was reckoned from sun-
set to sunset (inter duos occasus, Plin. 2, 188). In Assyrian 
the adverb mūšā-na, at last night, is used for yesterday. Shake-
speare (Merchant, ii, 5, 21: For I did dream of money-bags 
to-night) uses to-night for last night; similarly Schiller (Wallen-
steins Tod 2619: Ein starkes Schiessen war ja diesen Abend) 
uses diesen Abend for yesterday evening (cf. the edition of the 
Bibliographische Institut, vol. 4, p. 358) just as Heb. hal-lāqā, 
this night, may mean last night (1 S 15: 16).

The initial ā in Heb. āmš and ātnōl is a remnant of the prepo-
sition ina which is common in Assyrian. I have shown in 
JSOR 1, 42² that Ethiop. ēnta, in the direction of, in the manner 
of, is a feminine form of the preposition ina, just as we have in 
Hebrew: bēlī and bīlī. The masculine form appears in Ethiop. 
en-bāla, en-zā, and en-kā. The final i in Arab. āmesi, yesterday, 
is the ending of the genitive depending on the prefixed prepo-
sition ina (contrast WdG 1, 290, A; ZA 11, 352). Assyr. amšāt, 
yesterday (HW 92b) is shortened from ina mašātī, the plural of 
a form like amātu, word, or Heb. mēnāt, part, and qēcāt, end. 
The ina prefixed to amšāt is pleonastic; cf. Arab. bi-l-āmesi and 
Heb. bi-bēlī (AJSL 22, 259). For the significal difference in 
Assyr. ina mūši mašlī and Arab. mālta we may also compare 
Assyr. šarru, king, and malku, prince = Heb. šar, prince, and 
mālk, king, originally counselor (JBI 34, 54).

Paul Haupt.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE SEPTUAGINTAL ADDITION TO HAGGAI 2:14

After Hag. 2:14 6 has the addition ἔνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αυτῶν 
tῶν ὑδραγόντων, ἀδινυπήτωσι τῶν προσώπων τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔμεινεν εἰ 
πώλεις ἄλγχοντας, i. e. according to Jerome: propter munera 
forum matutina dolebunt a facie laborum suorum et oderatis in

1 Dr. Ember has called my attention to the Egypt. mājt, evening meal.
2 For the abbreviations see above, p. 75.
3 For the abbreviations see above, p. 75, n. 1.
portis argumentem; cf. Reinke’s Haggai (Münster, 1868) pp. 24. 98. Wellhausen thinks that the last clause is derived from Am. 5:10, and that G read in the first clause: ‘â’n lîqîhotâm šahâr instead of ‘â’n lîqahtêm šoḥêl, because ye have taken a bribe; the second clause, he thinks, may be a gloss on v. 14. whereas the first and third clauses have no connection with the text. Nowack and Marti follow Wellhausen, even in reading ēgêxônta instead of ēlêxôntas and lîqîhotâm (plur. of lāqîh?) as well as in translating: sic quâlen sich ab mit ihren profanen Arbeiten. The suggestion that the last clause, vài ēmâseîte en pûlûs ēlêxôntas, was derived from Am. 5:10 was made long ago by Drusius (Johannes van der Driesche, 1550-1616). But Am. 5:10, ēmâseîn en pûlûs ēlêxônta = Heb. šanî ’û baš-ša’r mókîh, they hate (GK § 106, g) him who argues (a cause) at the gate, i. e. who pleads with a court in favor of a (poor) defendant, is a tertiary gloss to the last line of the pentastichic Am. 5:11. 12, and this stanza is a secondary addition to Am. 8:4 (see JBL 35, 156; cf. also 287). The last clause of the addition to Hag. 2:14 in G is not derived from the tertiary gloss in Am. 5:10; both glosses are illustrative quotations (BL 26).

The Hebrew original of the first and third clauses of the addition to Hag. 2:14 in G was, it may be supposed, ‘â’n miq-pîq-háhûm šoḥêl (cf. 2 Chr. 19:7) and yê-sîn’atâm baš-ša’r mókîh. The plural pûlûs is due to dittography of the initial m in mókîh, and pûlûs is responsible for ēlêxôntas instead of ēlêxônta. G also read yê-šêînîtêm for yê-sîn’â-tâm (GK § 115, d). The Hebrew text of the second clause may have been yai-îâmêrû mîp-pêne ‘âmâlâm, and they were in bitterness because of their labor. G read yê-îâmêrû. We find òthvûthísonnû for hamêr in Zech. 12:10; the emendation hamê (ZDMG 66, 401) is gratuitous. We might also read yai-îâgû for yai-îâmêrû; G has òthvû for îagôn in Gen. 44:31; Pss. 13:3, 107:39. According to Geo. A. Smith the Hebrew text of the third clause was îniannû mîp-pêne ‘âchêhêm.

This gloss belongs, not to v. 14, but to v. 16, and the two clauses because of their acceptance of bribes and their hatred of pleaders at the gates must be assigned to the final triplet of

---

2 Wellhausen would say sie patschen hinter... p. 160.
this poem in Zech. 8:16. 17 (JBL 32, 107; 33, 161). Hag. 2:3-9 and Zech. 8:9-17 may have been written in two parallel columns, and this gloss was inserted between them; afterwards it crept into the wrong column, just as the protest against Gen. 3:16\(^b\) appears now in Gen. 4:7 where we must read *elâîlek* and *att timšëli* (CoE 508).

*Paul Haupt.*

A PATRISTIC PARALLEL TO 1 COR. 7:18, 21

Attention has already been called to the parallel afforded in Tebtunis Papyri II, no. 421, to the syntax of 1 Cor. 7:18, 27. (American Journal of Theology, XII, pp. 249, 250). The papyrus is a letter about some clothes among other things: in particular a certain turquoise tunic; "You wish to sell it, sell it; you wish to let your daughter have it, let her." This is like Paul's "Thou are bound to a wife; seek not to be loosed; thou art loosed from a wife; seek not a wife." Similar alternative assertions doing the work of conditions occur in ver. 18 and James 5:13, 14.

A similar construction appears in Tatian's Address to the Greeks, 4:1. "προστάττει φόρους τελείν ὁ βασιλεύς, ἵτομος παρέχειν, δουλεῖν ὁ δεσπότης καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν, τήν δουλείαν γινώσκω. "The emperor bids us pay taxes; I am ready to comply. My master bids me be a slave and serve him; I acknowledge my servitude." Tatian is perhaps influenced by Paul's construction in 1 Cor. 7:21: "Thou wast called while a slave; do not care about it." The translator of Tatian in the Ante-Nicene Library, vol. 22, very interestingly falls into something approaching this form of expression in translating two genuine conditional clauses in the Address to the Greeks, 11:1: "'Am I a slave, I endure servitude; Am I free, I do not make a vaunt of my good birth'" (p. 69). But this too may be due to a reminiscence of Paul's syntax in 1 Cor. 7:21. At any rate Tatian in 4:1 supplies a new instance of Paul's construction, in which a pair of crisp alternative affirmatives do the work of conditional clauses.

*Edgar J. Goodspeed.*