



Notes on the Old Testament

Author(s): John P. Peters

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 15, No. 1/2 (1896), pp. 106-117

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268834>

Accessed: 12/03/2010 14:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Notes on the Old Testament.

JOHN P. PETERS.

NEW YORK.

1. **The Site of the Tower of Babel** (Gen. xi. 1-9).—In Dillmann's *Genesis* (ed. 4, p. 191) we read: "In this Babel there must have been a gigantic, towerlike, but uncompleted building of much notoriety, and to this our story attaches itself." A little later, on the same page, Dillmann says: "Now there exist on the west side of the Euphrates, nine kilometres south of Hillah, huge ruins of such a tower, called Birs Nimrud, and long ago this ruin was identified with the Bel sanctuary of Herodotus, the tower of our passage." He then goes on to call attention to the fact that, "There are still similar towers in many places in that country, always built in the same style, some with three, some with five, some with seven diminishing stages, so that it is not probable that it was precisely this Borsippa building to which our narrative refers. It is rather to be supposed that the present ruin of Babil, to the north of the city of Babylon itself, on the left side of the river, the most imposing of all the ruins, and the ancient temple of Bel-Merodach, rising as a high pyramid, likewise later rebuilt by Nebuchadrezzar, is the building referred to."

It was my good fortune to visit and examine both Babil and Birs Nimrud in January of 1889. I also revisited the former the following year. Babil has been used, I presume from time immemorial, as a quarry for bricks, and the deep holes and trenches enable one without excavation to study to some extent the character of the mound. I found on the summit a mass of unbaked brick, some thirty feet or so in height. Beneath this was a solid but not homogeneous structure of baked brick. Most of the bricks which we observed bore the inscription of Nebuchadrezzar. One bore the inscription of Nabopolassar. At one point a deep excavation revealed a door. This had been built up, and later a solid mass of baked brick had been built against the wall through which it had formed an entrance. In another place some piers had been built up in the same way. Originally there had been a structure resting on the piers, between which there were openings. These openings had been built up, and then a solid

mass of brick erected by the side of them. What would be revealed by scientific and systematic excavations on this mound it is difficult to conjecture, but what the present excavations reveal is unlike any Ziggurat of which we have information, and while *a priori* I should expect to find in this enormous and most prominent mound of Babylon the remains of the famous Ziggurat of the Temple of Bel-Merodach described by Herodotus, the Esaggil of the inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar, it seemed to me after examination of the place very improbable that Babil could represent that Ziggurat.

Now Ziggurats are not by any means so numerous in Babylonia as Dillmann's statement would imply. A great many temples and some of the most famous temples are built without Ziggurats. There was no Ziggurat in connection with the Temple of the Sun at Sippara. There was no Ziggurat in connection with the temple unearthed by de Sarzec at Tello. The only Ziggurats discovered up to this time in Babylonia are those at Borsippa, at Nippur, at Erech, and at Ur, nor could there have been many more than this in Babylonia. A Ziggurat by its very nature must have, we should suppose, ruins of a peculiar shape and of considerable prominence. Now most of the ruin sites in Babylonia, while they have not been excavated, have nevertheless been visited by explorers, and from the description given by those explorers it would seem that there are comparatively few in which it is likely or even possible that the remains of any Ziggurat can be found.

This being the case, our choice of sites for the legend of the tower of Babel is really very limited. Moreover, the name Babel, if it does not compel us to look for the place in Babylon itself, would certainly seem to require a site in the immediate neighborhood of that city. I admit that the name of Babel would be best satisfied by a site in Babylon itself. On the other hand, the description of the ruins of the Ziggurat of Nebo at Borsippa before Nebuchadrezzar's time, as given by Nebuchadrezzar, is most suggestive in connection with this story of the eleventh chapter of Genesis.

That description is contained in the clay cylinders of Nebuchadrezzar found in the corners of the Ziggurat of Birs Nimrud. The inscription on these clay cylinders reads as follows :

Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, the rightful ruler, the expression of the righteous heart of Marduk, the exalted high priest, the beloved of Nebo, the wise prince, who devotes his care to the affairs of the great gods, the unwearying ruler, the restorer of Esagila and Ezida, the son and heir of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, am I.

Marduk the great god formed me aright and commissioned me to perform his restoration; Nebo guider of the universe of heaven and earth placed in my hand the right sceptre. Esagila, the house of heaven and earth, the abode of Marduk, lord of the gods, Ekua, the sanctuary of his lordship, I adorned gloriously with shining gold. Ezida I built anew, and completed its construction with silver, gold, precious stones, bronze, *musukkani* wood, and cedar wood. *Timinanki*, the Ziggurat of Babylon, I built and completed; of bricks glazed with lapis-lazuli (blue) I erected its summit.

At that time the house of the seven divisions of heaven and earth, the Ziggurat of Borsippa, which a former king had built and carried up to the height of forty-two ells, but the summit of which he had not erected, was long since fallen into decay, and its water conduits had become useless; rainstorms and tempests had penetrated its unbaked brick-work; the bricks which cased it were bulged out, the unbaked bricks of its terraces were converted into rubbish heaps. The great lord Marduk moved my heart to rebuild it. Its place I changed not and its foundation I altered not. In a lucky month, on an auspicious day I rebuilt the unbaked bricks of its terraces and its encasing bricks, which were broken away, and I raised up that which was fallen down. My inscription I put upon the *kiliri* of its buildings. To build it and to erect its summit I set my hand. I built it anew as in former times; as in days of yore I erected its summit.

Nebo, rightful son, lordly messenger, majestic friend of Marduk, look kindly on my pious works; long life, enjoyment of health, a firm throne, a long reign, the overthrow of foes, and conquest of the land of the enemy give me as a gift. On thy righteous tablet, which determines the course of heaven and earth, record for me length of days, write for me wealth. Before Marduk, lord of heaven and earth, the father who bore thee, make pleasant my days, speak favorably for me. Let this be in thy mouth, "Nebuchadrezzar, the restorer king."

Nebuchadrezzar describes the ruined condition in which the Ziggurat was when he found it. It was built long before his day, and built with very ambitious ideas. It was forty-two ells in height, but the summit had never been completed. The consequence of this failure to erect the summit was that the water struck into the unprotected mud bricks forming the mass of the interior of the Ziggurat, dissolved them, and broke and bulged out the casing walls of baked bricks by which the different terraces were held in, reducing the whole to a huge mass of ruins. The water conduits referred to are such as Mr. Haynes found on the sides of the Ziggurat at Nippur, designed to carry off the water from the surfaces of the upper terraces, and save the whole structure from decay. These conduits are useful only in case proper arrangements are made to carry into them the water falling on the surfaces of the upper terraces. The failure in this case to "erect the summit," and the consequent soaking of the water into the clay bricks of the interior soon rendered these conduits useless.

The striking similarities of this story to that of the tower of Babel are, outside of the site, the extremely ambitious nature of this Ziggurat of Borsippa which Nebuchadrezzar found in ruins, and the fact that after it had been raised to a great height the work was suddenly abandoned, leaving the building in such an incomplete condition that its ruin was inevitable.

As Nebuchadrezzar found it, the tower was little more than an enormous mass of ruins. He built it over entirely, and made it a seven-staged Ziggurat. It is the ruins of Nebuchadrezzar's Ziggurat which constitute the present Birs Nimrud, and the explorations which have been conducted there revealed the seven stages still existing.

Now Nebuchadrezzar gives no similar description of the ruined and incomplete condition of any other Ziggurat which he rebuilt. He rebuilt among other places the Ziggurat of Esaggil in Babylon, but he has nothing to tell us of its ruined condition. Evidently the ruined condition of the Ziggurat at Borsippa, in connection with its great size and ambitious design, made a strong impression upon his mind, or the mind of the writer of his inscription. This is not a positive proof that it made a similar impression on the world at large, yet the natural induction is that the ruined condition of this Ziggurat was notorious and impressed all beholders. How long before the time of Nebuchadrezzar it had fallen into such a condition it is impossible from our present information to say. Nebuchadrezzar says "long since," and does not mention the name of the original builder, calling him merely a "former king," as though its original construction were a thing of the remote past, the details of which were long since forgotten. But whatever the date, Nebuchadrezzar's account of the ruins of this Ziggurat corresponds so well with the story of the eleventh chapter of Genesis that one is inclined to attach that story at least tentatively to this ruin.

I need scarcely call attention to the fact that the story, as we know it in the eleventh chapter of Genesis, comes from the Yahwistic narrative, and was written down probably somewhere in the early part of the eighth century before Christ, two hundred years or so before Nebuchadrezzar. How much older the story itself may be it is difficult to say. It certainly, however, implies connection by travellers, merchants, and the like with Babylonia, from which place the story would seem to have been imported into Judæa.

2. The Three Children in the Fiery Furnace (Dan. iii.; Jer. xxix. 22).—It is a matter of great surprise to me that I have

never seen these passages brought into conjunction. Suppose we turn first to the passage in Jeremiah, which is much the older of the two. Jeremiah, we are told, addressed a letter to the captive Jews in Babylonia, bidding them to build houses and dwell in them; and to plant gardens and eat the fruits thereof; to take wives and beget sons and daughters; and to take wives and husbands for their sons and daughters, so that they also might have sons and daughters. He bids them to seek the peace of the land where they are, and not to listen to the prophets and diviners among them, and tells them, "After seventy years be accomplished for Babylon, I will visit you and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place." Then he mentions by name Ahab, son of Kolaiah, and Zedekiah, son of Maaseiah, who have evidently been stirring up the Jews in Babylonia to revolt against Nebuchadrezzar, saying that they are prophesying a lie, and that Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, shall slay them, and that they shall become a byword to all the captives of Judah who are there in Babylon, saying, "The Lord make thee like Zedekiah and like Ahab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire."

What put into Jeremiah's head the idea that these men would be punished in such a manner? Presumably the fact that Nebuchadrezzar was known to have made use before of this form of punishment. Giesebrecht in his commentary on Jeremiah refers to "similar Persian customs," and I suppose it probable that this barbarous method of punishment by burning can be established as practised in that and surrounding countries at various times. But, however that may be, the fact that this statement in Jeremiah's letter was preserved and has been handed down to us may fairly be regarded as evidence that this was no idle wish of Jeremiah, but that this punishment was actually inflicted upon these two prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah.

Now it must be remembered that the position which these two men represented was the so-called patriotic position of that day, while that of Jeremiah was the so-called unpatriotic position. He was often in a minority of one or two in advocating the policy of submission. He was regarded by the bulk of his compatriots as a 'copperhead,' to use an expressive term of our civil war. The Babylonians seem on the other hand to have regarded him as a sort of secret ally, and after the capture of Jerusalem he was treated by them with marked honor.

The book of Daniel made over again for a special purpose traditions which had come down, sometimes in a very confused form, from an

earlier period. It seems to me that in the story contained in the third chapter of Daniel, of the three children, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego, who were cast into the fiery furnace and miraculously saved, we have the legendary account of Nebuchadrezzar's treatment of Ahab and Zedekiah, or some of their compeers. It has come down to us through the medium of the popular, patriotic party, the party opposed by Jeremiah, but the party which was both the most numerous and the most influential in his time.

While it has no direct bearing on this subject of the burning of the prophets, nevertheless, since it is interesting as showing the cruel methods of punishment in Babylonia, and the disregard of human life there prevalent from time immemorial, I may add that Mr. Haynes in excavating the Ziggurat of the Temple of Bel at Nippur discovered a quantity of skulls built in with the bricks. They may have been 'striking' workmen who were thus summarily dealt with, or they may have been offenders of some other sort. The find was interesting merely as showing the barbarous disregard of life, and the cruelty of the punishments inflicted in Babylonia in those days.

3. The Nebuchadrezzars of Daniel. — History is strangely turned about and confused in the book of Daniel. A curious example of this confusion we find in the relation of the conquest of Belshazzar by Darius. According to the book of Daniel, Nebuchadrezzar was succeeded by his son Belshazzar, and Belshazzar was conquered and slain by "Darius the Mede." Now no Belshazzar son of Nebuchadrezzar ever reigned in Babylon, and the only Darius who can possibly be intended by the designation "Darius the Mede" is Darius Hystaspes, who was not an almost immediate successor of Nebuchadrezzar, but was separated from him by several reigns; neither was it he who overthrew the Babylonian empire and established the rule of the "Medes and Persians." Nebuchadrezzar was succeeded by Evil-Merodach, he by Neriglissar, he by Labashi-Marduk, and he by Nabonidus, who was overthrown by Cyrus. Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses, he by Pseudo-Smerdis, and he by Darius. It is difficult, at first sight certainly, to understand how in the stories contained in the book of Daniel history can have become so confused as to bring Darius into such close proximity to Nebuchadrezzar, and to make him the conqueror of Babylon in the time of Nebuchadrezzar's son. It seems to me that some light is thrown upon this difficulty by the Behistun inscription. In this inscription (l. 31 ff.) we read this account of a revolt against Darius in Babylon :

Further there was a Babylonian, Nidintubel his name, son of Aniri, who rebelled in Babylon, lying to the people, and saying, "I am Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus." Then all the Babylonians went over to that Nidintubel, Babylon rebelled, he made himself king over Babylon. . . . Thus saith Darius the king: Then I marched to Babylon and against that Nidintubel who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintubel was placed upon ships; the shores of the Tigris they occupied.

The next two lines are not altogether intelligible in detail, but state in general that Darius forced the passage of the Tigris and defeated the army of Nidintubel.

On the 26th day of the month Kisleu we delivered battle. Thus saith Darius the king: Then I marched toward Babylon. I had not yet reached Babylon when Nidintubel, who had said, "I am Nebuchadrezzar," marched against me with an army to deliver battle, to a city named Zazanu on the shore of the Euphrates. There we joined battle. Ormuzd was my strong helper; by the grace of Ormuzd I smote the army of Nidintubel. One part was driven into the water, and the water swept them away. We joined battle on the second day of the month Anamaka. Thus saith Darius the king: Then this Nidintubel with a few mounted soldiers came to Babylon. Then I came to Babylon. By the help of Ormuzd I took Babylon and captured Nidintubel; and I slew Nidintubel in Babylon.

Further on in the same inscription (l. 84 ff.) Darius describes another revolt against himself of the Babylonians, in which again the pretender to the throne claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus.

Thus saith Darius the king: While I was in Persia and Media the Babylonians revolted against me for a second time. A man named Arakhu, an Armenian, son of Haldita, arose against me. There is in Babylonia a district named Dubala. From this place he arose against me. He deceived the people of Babylon, saying, "I am Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus." Thereupon the people of Babylon rebelled against me and went over to this Arakhu. He took Babylon; he became king in Babylon. Thus saith Darius the king: Then I sent an army to Babylon. Vindaфра, a Mede, my servant, I made commander; I sent him out, saying, "Go thither and smite the army of the rebels." Ormuzd brought me help; by the grace of Ormuzd Vindaфра took Babylon and smote the army of Babylon, the rebels, and took them captive.

In l. 90 ff. he mentions in succession the various pretenders who rebelled against him at one time or another. Gomates, a Magian, who claimed to be Bardes son of Cyrus; Ashina, who raised a revolt in Elam; Nidintubel, a Babylonian, who claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus, and who made himself king of Babylon;

Martes, a Persian, who led a rebellion in Elam ; Phraortes, a Median, who claimed to be Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares, and who raised Media against Darius ; Sitrantachmes, a Sagartian, who also claimed to be a descendant of Cyaxares and raised part of the same country on much the same grounds as the preceding ; Parada, a Margian, who led a rebellion in Margu ; Veisdates, a Persian, who claimed to be Bardes son of Cyrus and raised a rebellion in Persia ; and Arakhu, an Armenian, who claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus and raised a revolt in Babylon. It is worthy of note that both pretenders to the throne in Babylon make use of the name Nebuchadrezzar, although according to Darius each claimed also to be the son of Nabonidus. It is clear that Nebuchadrezzar was the name to conjure by in Babylonia, so that when a man sought to raise a revolt he laid claim to this name as a sure means of arousing popular sentiment in his favor. This may serve to show us that that confusion of Babylonian history in the book of Daniel which sets chronology at naught and gathers everything about the name of Nebuchadrezzar was not altogether an invention of later Jewish legends, but that it had its origin in the popular ideas of the Babylonians themselves.

In addition to the record of the two pretenders named Nebuchadrezzar contained in the Behistun inscription, we have also some contract tablets from the reign of one or the other of these two pretenders, presumably, according to Boscawen (*TSBA.* vi.), the first. In the fourth volume of Schrader's *Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten* are given three of these documents from the reign of "Nebuchadrezzar III," of which two are dated in "the accession year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon," and one in "the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon." The names of the members of the Egibi family mentioned in these tablets are the evidence that they do not belong to the reign of Nebuchadrezzar II, but to that of Nebuchadrezzar III.

It may be worth noting in connection with the dates of these tablets, which give us for the duration of the reign of this Nebuchadrezzar III portions at least of two years, that at the close of the third book of his history Herodotus describes the revolt of Babylon and its siege by Darius for a period of a little more than twenty months. After he had taken the city he treated it, according to Herodotus, with great severity, in striking contrast with the treatment it had received from Cyrus, dismantling its fortifications, and endeavoring to destroy forever its capacity to do mischief. This siege naturally impressed itself upon the popular imagination more strongly than the

almostly friendly capture of the city by Cyrus, and hence in folk-history Darius and not Cyrus became the conqueror of Babylon. It is this folk-history which is perpetuated in the book of Daniel.

Precisely why Belshazzar should play such an important part in the story I cannot conjecture. All the information which we possess regarding him up to the present is very little. We know that Nabonidus had a son of this name. He seems, however, to have played a role of importance, otherwise his name would not have been substituted in the tradition represented in the book of Daniel for that of Nabonidus, as it evidently has been, adding one more element of confusion to those already existing. In the folk-history of the book of Daniel, then, Belshazzar has taken the place of Nabonidus, for reasons which we do not know. He is made the son of Nebuchadrezzar, because Nebuchadrezzar was the great king of Babylon whose name every one knew, and about whom every one was grouped in the thought of the people. Darius Hystaspes takes the place of Cyrus as conqueror of Babylon, because of his capture of the city in the war against Nebuchadrezzar III, a siege and capture which impressed the popular mind much more forcibly than that by Cyrus. Why he is called the Mede I do not know.

4. Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin (Dan. v. 25).—In the explanation of these words, given in vs. 26–28, we find simply *Mene, Tekel, Peres*. Turning to the Greek text we find that in the 25th verse we have not *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, but merely *Mene, Tekel, Peres*. It seems to me almost self-evident that the Greek text is correct and the Hebrew wrong. The *Mene* in the Hebrew text seems to have been repeated by accident, and the *Peres* has either been inflected, or else we have the conjunction with the plural form of the word פֶּרְסִי, 'Persian.' If the Greek text be adopted and the pointing of the words be omitted entirely, which is what the story itself requires, the whole passage becomes plain. We have the three roots meaning simply, *number, weigh, divide* (or *Persian*). The last word may equally well be 'divide' or 'Persian,' so far as the root is concerned, and this ambiguity gives opportunity for the play which is found in the explanation. The problem given to Daniel is to explain what is meant by the three words on the wall, *number, weigh, divide* or *Persian*. His skill or his inspiration is shown in the finding of a meaning which so precisely fitted these three enigmatic roots to the circumstances. Remembering that the writing must have been without vowels, the conditions are very much the same as if we

should have put before us the letters N-M-BR-W-G-H-D-V-D, except that in this case there is not the same opportunity for a play upon words as the Hebrew affords in the last root. The language used is, of course, Aramaic. Daniel interprets the meaning of the root *number* as: "God hath numbered thy kingdom and brought it to an end." The root *weigh* he interprets to mean: "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." The third root, which might mean equally well *divide* or *Persian*, he interprets thus: "Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians."

It may be asked, Why could not the Chaldæans, soothsayers, and so forth read these letters? I do not understand that the text implies that they could not read the individual characters, but merely that they could not so read them as to make any sense out of them. "To read the writing and to make known its interpretation" (v. 8), are not two altogether different things, but either parts of the same thing, or at least most closely connected one with the other. This duplicate method of expression is characteristic of the style of the book of Daniel throughout. They could not read the letters in the sense that they could not read them so as to make any sense.

Such fanciful interpretations of this passage from the Assyrian as Prince attempts in the *Proceedings* of the American Oriental Society (April, 1892, p. clxxxii.), the idea of which is derived from Clermont-Ganneau's similar attempt in the *Journal Asiatique* (8^{ième} Série, i. 36 ff.; cf. *Hebraica* iii. 87-102), and Nöldeke's article in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (i. 414 ff.), seem to me to be based on a radical misunderstanding of the passage. The passage is simple enough if you use an unpointed text, and make from the Hebrew itself and the Greek the text correction which I have suggested above.

The untenability of Nöldeke's interpretation, and with it of the interpretations of Hoffmann (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* ii. 45-48), Prince, and Clermont-Ganneau is set forth in a very few words and very effectively in Behrman's commentary on the book of Daniel.

One point which Nöldeke makes in his discussion of the subject is the use of the word פָּרַם in what he regards as an unreal sense. He says: "With the first two words the simple sense 'number' and 'weigh' may do, but פָּרַם, 'divide,' is no longer in actual use, while the substantive פָּרַם, in the sense 'half-mina,' was still common among the later Jews." The context (vs. 28) is the best evidence of the sense intended to be attached and capable of being attached to the root letters פָּרַם. The word is used in the same sense in the Targum to 2 Ki. iv. 39. It is true that this is not the common root

for 'divide,' but its choice in this place is for the purpose of a play on words, since the same letters also mean 'Persian.' Nöldeke is driven to conjecture to account for the pointing in the forms **תְּקַל** and **פְּרָם**, words which we do not actually find pointed in this manner in any Semitic language in any sense. **מִנָּא**, on the other hand, is properly pointed as a participle passive of the Pe'al form of the verb **מָנָא**, 'number.' Nöldeke says that this would be the correct absolute form for the Syriac word for *mina*; but, however that may be, we do not actually find the word so pointed in the sense of *mina*, which he and the others above mentioned would give it. It is tempting to add to the possibilities of the sense of the words on the wall the further meaning *mina, shekel, half-shekel*, and the letters used are certainly capable of this further sense. On the other hand the reading and explanation of the words in vs. 26-28 make no allusion to such a sense, which would have been done, I think, had such an additional sense been intended. I am inclined to think, therefore, with Behrman, that the tempting resemblance of these words to the words for *mina, shekel*, and *half-shekel* is due to accident.

The real difficulty in the passage is one of text corruption and of an erroneous late pointing. The correct text of vs. 25 is, as I have already pointed out, simply **מָנָא תְּקַל פְּרָם**. In the individual text from which our present Hebrew text is descended a scribe doubled the **מָנָא**, presumably by accident. He attached **פְּרָם** to the preceding words by the conjunction ׀, an alteration of text which is very common, as can be seen by a comparison of parallel passages in our Hebrew text of the Bible. Conscious of the play on the word 'Persian' contained in **פְּרָם**, he further changed that word accidentally or intentionally to **פְּרָסִי** (cf. Dan. vi. 29; Neh. xii. 22). A ׀ was added to it, either to put it in the plural, or purely by accident.

The pointing of the words is very perplexing. No explanation of any sort which has yet been offered seems satisfactory. Now the Hebrew and the Greek do not altogether agree in regard to the pointing. The former has a uniform pointing **מִנָּא תְּקַל פְּרָם**. The latter has a different pointing for each word, *μανή, θεκέλ, φάρες*, which would correspond to **מִנָּא תְּקַל פְּרָם**. I am inclined to think that the pointing of the Hebrew text is the more original, and that it is intentionally artificial. The words were without pointing, not intended to be spoken. They represented merely the three radicals of the three roots without vowels. But in reading the text aloud it was necessary to pronounce these three words in some manner. They were for this purpose pointed, and intentionally so pointed that

they should not be identical with any of the inflected forms from those roots, and they were pointed in a uniform manner. The pointing of מִנִּי in such a manner that it can be read as a passive participle is an accident due to the fact that that participle is regularly מִנִּי and not מִנִּי . The changes in the Greek are due in the case of the ϵ in the final syllables of $\theta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda$ and $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ to the fact that those were closed, not open, syllables as in $\mu\alpha\upsilon\eta$.