

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

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 4<sup>10</sup>: 'I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt.' But the ordinary meaning of the word (דָרַךְ) 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 39<sup>20b, 30c</sup> 40<sup>9b</sup> 41<sup>9a</sup> 45<sup>7e, 25f</sup> 46<sup>19a</sup>. Have these passages the marks of secondary origin? In the first place, the question, 'Is there a number to his salvation?' (39<sup>20b</sup>) was not so natural a one as to awaken the suspicion that it is an interpolation.<sup>1</sup> Again, is the remark that the wild beasts, etc. (39<sup>30ab</sup>), were 'created for their use' (v.<sup>30c</sup>) of such a kind that anyone would feel disposed to insert it? Further, 'pestilence and bloodshed, fever and drought,' as

<sup>1</sup> Regarding Smend's reading ('Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach,' in *Abhandl. d. Götting. Gesells. d. Wissensch.*, 1897) of 39<sup>20b</sup> I reserve my judgment, but his view that מַשְׁחָה is a substantive derived from מַשַּׁח appears to me extremely uncertain.

Cowley and Neubauer rightly take to be the meaning<sup>1</sup> of 40<sup>9a</sup>, is followed by the supplementary 'devastation and destruction, evil and death' (v. 9<sup>b</sup>). 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 41<sup>9</sup>, where the synonymous forms of expression used in v. 9<sup>abd</sup> might readily be contracted into a single *stichos*. The next *plus* of H, namely, 45<sup>7e</sup> ('and clothed him with bells') probably owes its origin to the word וילבישוהו ('and clothed him'), with which the following *stichos* (v. 8<sup>a</sup>) commences, having been twice written by a copyist, and then פעמונים (v. 9<sup>a</sup>) having been added as object.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the clause 'who has crowned you with glory' (45<sup>25f</sup>) is secondary, for it assigns the motive for the foregoing call to bless the Lord (v. 25<sup>e</sup>), and is presupposed by the following ויתן. This last word, moreover, is more probably original than the δέψη of G, for the Syriac, too, has a verb in the past נתן, 'who gave,' or 'that he gave.' It is possible, however, that the words of 46<sup>19e</sup>, 'also till the time,' etc., are a Hebraic augmentation. It might appear as if there was a *lacuna* between v. 19<sup>cd</sup> and 'after his death' (v. 20<sup>a</sup>), and this may have been filled up by the words 'also till the time,' etc. (19<sup>e</sup>).

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 everything will be sought out in his season' (39<sup>17ab</sup>). But the first *stichos* (v. 17<sup>a</sup>) is wanting also in Codex Vaticanus of G, and both *stichoi* are absent from the Old Latin version. This appears to furnish a sufficiently plain indication that these clauses are a later expansion of the text.—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 imposed upon it' (39<sup>21e</sup>), 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

<sup>1</sup> When 'bloodshed' has been already mentioned, Smend's דגב, 'sword' (for דגב, 'drought') is less probable.

<sup>2</sup> I have noticed since that this same view has been expressed by, among others, Schlatter, *Das neugefundene hebr. Stück aus Sirach* (1897), p. 61.

of the τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς κ.τ.λ. of 40<sup>2ab</sup>. Are these words not the interpretation of ἀσχολία and ζυγός of v. 1<sup>ab</sup>? And does not the same relation subsist between v. 11<sup>ab</sup> and v. 12<sup>ab</sup>? There is of course also the possibility that in the textual history of H v. 12<sup>ab</sup> 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: 41<sup>22ab</sup> (G), 42<sup>5b</sup> (G) 18<sup>cd</sup> (GS) 22<sup>ab</sup> (GS), 43<sup>91ab</sup> (G), 44<sup>11c, 12ab</sup> (GS) 15<sup>a</sup> (GS) 15<sup>b</sup> (G), 45<sup>26bd</sup> (GS), 46<sup>12a</sup> (GS) 20<sup>d</sup> (GS), 47<sup>16</sup> (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 Eccclus. 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 45<sup>9f</sup>, with the exception of 47<sup>8f</sup>: לכן is written for לכן in 46<sup>8a</sup> (משואל for מושאל in v. 13<sup>b</sup>); משפט for מקרש in 47<sup>10d</sup>; נבא for נבא in 48<sup>13b</sup>; נחלה for נחל in v. 17<sup>c</sup>; probably נחל for נחלה in 49<sup>2a</sup>; ביר for בימי in v. 6<sup>c</sup>. 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 Eccclus. 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) 40<sup>16</sup> reads in H: בקרמות על גפת נחל מפני כל מטר נרעבו. The question has already been asked by Cowley and Neubauer whether קרמות is not corrupted from קרומיות, and they have rendered the latter word by '(reed-) stalks.' Further, they have, following the marginal note, replaced מפני by לפני, and also suggested that מטר is corrupted from חציר. As the לפני of the mar-

ginal note may result from a comparison with G or S, so also may the חציר suggested by Cowley and Neubauer, and Margoliouth (p. 7 f.) regards it as beyond question that in v.<sup>16a</sup> G can have derived the word ἀχελ only from a reading אחר in the *real* original. 'Clearly,' says Margoliouth, 'the Greek would not have used a Coptic word, had he not found it in his original; this *achei*, therefore, was used by Ben-Sira himself, who got it from Job (אחר [8<sup>11b</sup>]).' But it is not an incontrovertible fact that the translator could not have independently selected the word ἀχελ, 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., κόδον (Gn 44<sup>2</sup>); ἴβρις for יִשְׁבֵּרָה (Lv 11<sup>17</sup> || Dt 14<sup>16</sup>); ἀράβη for חֶמְרָה (Is 5<sup>10</sup>); and this very word ἀχελ is not only chosen in passages where אחר is found in the Hebrew (Gn 41<sup>2, 18</sup>, Job 8<sup>11b</sup>), but is also used in Is 19<sup>7</sup> to translate ערות. Consequently, the same term, ἀχελ, might be employed also in Eccus 40<sup>16</sup>, 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 8<sup>12</sup>.

But even this last view is by no means beyond question, and I take the liberty of proposing the following interpretation of Eccus. 40<sup>16f</sup>. I accept Cowley and Neubauer's suggestion that קרדמות may be corrupted from קרומויות, 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 נרעכו, which means literally, 'they are extinguished.' On this basis, it appears to me, 40<sup>16f</sup>. 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 יקנה (Nu 5<sup>19b</sup>, Jg 15<sup>3a</sup>)], 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 *Sifa* is found in 39<sup>30d</sup> 40<sup>11a</sup> 42<sup>1a</sup> 43<sup>30a</sup> 48<sup>5a</sup>.

(b) The fragments of the last word of 40<sup>26d</sup> (*sic*) have been restored by Cowley and Neubauer under the form [מטמן], 'treasure,' and this corresponds very well with the parallel, מחסור, 'want,' of v.<sup>26c</sup>. But Smend offers as the conclusion of v.<sup>26d</sup> מעין, and Margoliouth (p. 7) remarks that this מעין 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 superfluous, and all that is built upon it collapses if the closing word of v.<sup>26d</sup> was מעין, in favour of which the ו read by Cowley and Neubauer may testify. By the way, in earlier periods of Hebrew writing ו and י were frequently of similar length (cf. Chwolson, *C. I. H.* p. 420; my *Einleitung*, pp. 74, 152). The word מעין is rendered in Ps 90<sup>2</sup> 91<sup>9</sup> by καταφυγή, 'refuge,' which has the same meaning as βοήθεια offered by G in Eccus 40<sup>26d</sup>.

(c) 41<sup>12ab</sup> 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' (χρυσίου). Margoliouth (p. 14) argues in favour of הן as the original reading. This, he thinks, is supported directly by G, and indirectly by S, because הן could be pronounced like אן. Margoliouth holds, further, that אן may actually have been the original expression in 41<sup>12b</sup>. Now, as this word אן is 'often' reproduced in Syriac by ܐܢܐ *'ettâ* (Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* p. 255<sup>a</sup>, 'fraus, dolus'), Margoliouth proceeds to argue that the Syriac word happening in 41<sup>12b</sup> to be preceded by the genitive exponent ܐ, the 're-translator' took the consonants ܐܢܐ to be *one* word, and derived this from ܐܢܐ ('he knew'). This word ܐܢܐ ('science'), which has no existence in Syriac, he is supposed to have attributed to the Syriac text of 41<sup>12b</sup> and reproduced 'science,' not by דעת, but by חכמה, 'wisdom.'

It will be admitted, we presume, that the way in which this last term (חכמה) in 41<sup>12b</sup> 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 Ecclesiasticus? Hence I propose the following solution of the difficulty:— I should favour חרין (which in all the six passages

[Zec 9<sup>8</sup>, Ps 68<sup>14</sup>, Pr 3<sup>14</sup> 8<sup>10</sup>. 19 16<sup>16</sup>] where it occurs is rendered by *χρυσολον*, or חמרה 'desire' (the marginal reading), as the original word, were I not restrained by the following circumstance. Margoliouth, who so vigorously combats the claim of חכמה, 'wisdom,' to be the original conclusion of 41<sup>12b</sup>, has not observed the חכמה טמונה, 'buried wisdom,' of v. 14<sup>b</sup>, which certainly is a backward allusion to v. 12<sup>b</sup>. Hence I am disposed to give the preference to חכמה, 'wisdom,' as the term with which v. 12<sup>b</sup> originally closed. The meaning intended by the statement in v. 12<sup>ab</sup> 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., חמרה, '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, חכמה, 'wisdom,' 'prudence,' might be restricted by S, in the interest of the context, to the more special 'cunning,' 'deceit.'

(d) In 42<sup>11e</sup> 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 *shebak*, '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 *k* (koph) and the Arabic substantive with the ordinary *k* (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 42<sup>11e</sup> 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. 11<sup>f</sup>) cannot have been trans-

lated from the Syriac. For S says, 'And among the houses let her not be going about,' but H has, 'Nor let it (the place where she tarries) be a house (*or* chamber) looking upon the entrance round about.' Margoliouth (p. 16) maintains that the observance of this rule is either quite impossible, or at least that it would impose upon the father to whom a daughter is born, the necessity of erecting a wall round his house. But this difficulty need not be found. The text may presuppose that there are several rooms in a house, and the counsel of H may be to the effect that for a young maiden a room should not be chosen which commands a view on all sides.

(e) In 43<sup>40</sup> H has the words לשאון מאור תנמר נושבת, which Margoliouth (p. 7) renders, 'blowing out a tongue of light which blazes.' He thus takes נושבת to be the active participle of נישב. But, in the first place, this occurs in the O.T. (Is 40<sup>7</sup>) only as an intransitive verb, whereas the active sense is expressed by the hiph'il, הושיב, and so also in Ecclus 43<sup>20a</sup>. Again, the context supplies no feminine substantive to which the feminine participle נושבת could refer. Hence this participle must be regarded as the passive form ('the inhabited [country]') and as the object of תנמר. The latter word may signify 'she brings to an end,' for נמר might have the sense of 'finish' (*vollenden*) in a negative sense as well, just as the Aramaic נמר actually signifies 'end,' 'destroy' ('beendigen, vernichten'—Dalman *Aram.-neuh. Wörterb.*, 1897, p. 77<sup>b</sup>). Consequently, an appeal to the Arabic *gamara* ('dedit prunam ignis') is out of place. Finally, it is by no means beyond doubt that the א of לשאון is due to imitation of the Arabic لسان. If the 're-translator' had meant to render in Hebrew, he could not have written the words after the manner of Arabic. May not the א have been due to a careless copyist who was thinking of שאון, 'ruin,' 'destruction' (Jer 46<sup>17</sup>, Ps 40<sup>3</sup>)?

(f) In 43<sup>8d</sup> the moon is described as מרצפה וגו', 'paving the firmament with (40<sup>28a</sup>) her shining,' the meaning of which has been admirably illustrated by Canon Driver through a quotation from *Romeo and Juliet* (see Cowley and Neubauer, p. xxxv). I confess that the word 'paving' or 'embroidering' (in connexion with the stars) strikes me as more poetical, when spoken of the moon, than 'illuminating.' There is something of pleonasm in 'illuminating the firmament with her light.'

Yet Margoliouth (p. 6) prefers to derive מַרְצֵף 'from the Arabic'—he must be thinking of מַרְצֵף, *radfun*, and the denominative verb رَضَف 'durch einen Glühstein erwärmen,'—and to render *m'rassef*, as he himself (p. 7) transcribes the word, by 'illuminating.' He does this, because G reads ἐν στερεώματι οὐρανοῦ ἐκλάμπων, and S agrees. But, with the confident expectation of an answer in the negative, I would put these two questions: Does the form of the sentence in G and S look like the poetical original? Is there any probability that a translator should have given to the words of G and S, both of which have the expression 'in the firmament,' the form which we find in H, where 'firmament' forms the object? No, on the other hand, G and S present a simplified form of the words, and it is not the *text* of H which rests on a comparison with G or S, or both. On the marginal note, which is found at 43<sup>8d</sup>, see below.

(g) In 43<sup>9a</sup>, both G and S have the plural, 'stars' (ἀστρων, and כוכבים with the two points of *Ribbāi*). Margoliouth (p. 17, where he incorrectly cites the passage as 44<sup>9</sup>) thinks that the 're-translator' overlooked the plural points in the Syriac. But was the plural, 'stars,' overlooked also in the Persian version to which, according to Margoliouth, the re-translator owed his knowledge of G? In any case he must have found the singular, 'star,' in 'both his sources' (p. 17), and regarded it as a possible reading. And is it wholly improbable that the moon should be called 'glory of a star,' *i.e.* a splendid specimen of a star? Might it not readily happen that this *genetivus appositionis* passed into a *genetivus partitivus*?

(h) In 43<sup>20</sup>, too, Margoliouth finds a recurrence of 'the phenomenon: the Greek is sound sense, the "Original Hebrew" absurd' (p. 10). Let us test this instance. H says, 'The cold of the north wind (Pr 25<sup>13a</sup>) He (the so-called logical subject of the context, *i.e.* God) causeth to blow, and like rottenness He makes contracted (consistent, or the like) His spring,' *i.e.* the spring which God Himself has made, and destined to bubble up with living water and *not* to be congealed. God, then, is said to abolish the original nature of the springs just as rottenness changes the original character of any object. It is, therefore, not beyond question that the marginal reading, which replaces מקור 'His spring,' by מקוה '(each) collection of water' (cf. Gn 1<sup>10</sup>), is to be preferred. It is *not*

probable, because the standing waters are mentioned in v.<sup>20cd</sup>. But even if מקוה in v.<sup>20b</sup> were to be preferred, yet the language of H would not be 'absurd.' For ריב, 'rotteness,' at which Margoliouth takes most offence, might assume the more general sense of 'corrupt condition' (*Verdorbenheit*), and be transferred to the *curdling* of milk and other liquids. And once more the question arises: Which is more likely, that the words of G, 'a cold 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<sup>24a</sup> 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. קצה—Gn 47<sup>2</sup>, Nu 22<sup>41</sup>, Is 56<sup>11</sup>, Ezk 33<sup>2</sup>). 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.<sup>24a</sup> 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 קצה, '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<sup>20b</sup>, 'and he declared to the king his ways,' *i.e.* his fortune (cf. Ps 105<sup>37</sup><sup>5a</sup>), 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.<sup>20b</sup> to Samuel, was in reality the *end* of Saul, is it incredible that this concept should have been expressed by G in the form τὴν τελευταίην αὐτοῦ? Margoliouth (p. 13 f.) makes a threefold assumption: (α) the original was אחריתו, 'his end'; (β) this word was *misread* by S as ארחיו, 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.)