

*THE ORIGINAL HEBREW OF A PORTION OF
ECCLESIASTICUS.*

WHEN the first news came of the discovery of a Hebrew fragment of the Book of Sirach,¹ it occurred, doubtless, to many others as well as to myself to suppose that it was only some mediæval re-translation possibly from a Latin text. But as soon as the fragment brought to Cambridge by Mrs. Lewis appeared in *THE EXPOSITOR* (vol. iv., pp. 6 ff.) no competent judge could any longer doubt that we had a portion of the original before us. This resulted at once from its relation to the two direct translations which have long been known—the Greek and the Syriac.² These are related to the Hebrew text as two mutually independent translations. The Hebrew is reproduced with greater accuracy now by one and now by the other, and cannot be derived directly or indirectly from either of them. Moreover, the language throughout gives the impression of an original. It is hardly to be conceived that Hebrew such as this could be written by any one at the close of the classical period or in the Middle Ages. The genuineness of the fragment is now brilliantly confirmed by the larger portion which has since come to light, and been brought to Oxford by Prof. Sayce. The two fragments are immediately consecutive. Thanks to the strenuous labours of Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer, many almost illegible passages of the Codex, which was written somewhere about A.D. 1100, have been deciphered, and thus Sir. 39. 15–49. 11 now lies before us in a Hebrew text and in a carefully edited

¹ The name of the author is, of course, properly *Jēshūā'* (Jesus) *ben Sirā*. Syriac writers often turn the unmeaning *Sirā* into *Asirā*, *i. e.* "the captive." The reason of the Greek form *Σιράχ*, *Σειράχ* with the termination *χ* is not yet cleared up.

² I signify the Greek translator or the Greek translation usually by Gr., the Syriac translator or his work by S.

form.¹ Among all the rich documentary discoveries of our time this one claims a foremost rank. In the field of the Old Testament nothing like it has happened before.

It is true that in Rabbinic literature we had already a number of passages which are derived from this book, whether with or without reference to its author. But, as is now evident, only a small proportion of these reproduce the original text with absolute or even approximate accuracy.² In particular, the diction of the most of these passages has been much altered, and has become much more Rabbinic. We could not certainly ascertain from them in what degree the old translations were verbally accurate or inaccurate. Now however we are in quite a different position for deciding this question. It is evident that the Greek translator by no means reproduces the work of his grandfather with verbal accuracy. I should not, for my part, be inclined to ascribe this to the fact that his knowledge of Hebrew was so slight. In many cases he intentionally gives a free translation; *e.g.*, when he renders **יפיל ארצם**, 47. 22, by *διαφθαρῆ*. Here and there he tries to improve upon the original. Thus he writes *λαμπάς*, which appears more suitable, for "furnace," **תנור**, 48. 1. Still more distinct is *ἀγάπησις σοφίας* for **אהבת דורים**, 40.

¹ "The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix. 15–xliv. 11), together with the Early Versions and an English Translation followed by the quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Edited by A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A. With two facsimiles. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1897 (pp. 41 and xlvi., 4to).

² The edition provides us with everything which the learning of the editors has been able to collect, including the pseudonymous allusions. Especially good are sections iv., viii., ix., xx., xxiii., xxviii., xl., xli. (where **בְּחִיק** is either a mistake or an intentional alteration of **בְּחִלֵּק**), liv. (where in the Greek we should read *πρὸ τῆς χρείας*; cf. also the Syriac), lv. These are, however, almost all quotations from Sadija, who had a manuscript of the book in his possession. Most of the other passages tell us much the same as Ben Sira; in some instances the connection is quite a slight one. In xxiv. we have two passages combined (27. 9a and 13. 16b), and xvii. consists of Proverbs 4. 8a and Sirach 11. 1a. Further, lxi. may be useful in restoring to some extent the passage 42. 9 ff.

20. In 50. 24 S shows that Simon and his posterity are in question. This has been obliterated by the Greek translator, in whose time another family, the Hasmonean, held the high-priestly office.

The writer was not wholly without Greek culture,¹ but of philological ἀκρίβεια he knew nothing. Moreover he worked, in all probability, very rapidly. With the uncertain meaning of the Hebrew script, especially in a case where it was only very scantily furnished with vowel-letters, misunderstandings of many kinds could not fail to creep in.² We may imagine how often even an educated Englishman would misunderstand Walter Scott or Dickens if their works were written in English words but in Semitic writing, and according to the true Semitic system.

S gives, no doubt, a text which in general is easily read, but his work is distinctly superficial, and follows an original which had been severely mutilated.³ But where he understood the text without difficulty, he has reproduced it for the most part *verbatim*, and, thanks to the close relationship of the two languages, he often gives a more accurate reproduction of the original than Gr. Nevertheless the wise words of the preface find abundant justification—ὄ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῆ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν. And the editors truly remark that the inaccuracy of the Greek translation which is now made manifest “may perhaps serve as a warning to

¹ My colleague, Prof. Keil, has pointed out to me that his preface shows a knowledge of the classification and even the technical nomenclature of the schools of rhetoric. Certainly there is in his preface an effort to write an artificial Greek à la mode, which has, however, not been particularly successful.

² Even similar consonants have been in some cases confused, as, for example, in 44. 23b, where he read ויביןנהו, ἐπέγνω for ויבוננהו.

³ That the mutilation did not befall the Syriac itself in the first instance is shown by 41. 19 ff., where the translator makes as best he can a connected whole of the half-verses 19b and 20a, separated as they are by several clauses. The explanatory addition which follows is doubtless derived from a later hand.

those scholars who are inclined to overrate the authority of the LXX. of the Old Testament" (preface, p. ix., note 5).

The author's style is, on the whole, good Hebrew. His diligent study of the Holy Scriptures referred to in the Greek prologue reveals itself even in his diction. Naturally he has most contact with the Book of Proverbs, but not so much with the main portion of it, which consists of short independent sayings, as with the consecutive passages of admonition in the first section (1. 1-9, 18). He has made great use of Job also. Many passages remind us very specially of the later Psalms. Unfortunately, the section that has been preserved does not contain the conclusion, which displays entirely the style of the Psalms, and terminates with an actual Psalm. Bickell showed long ago that this Psalm is alphabetic¹; according to the Syriac text at least three-fourths of the original acrostic words can be easily and confidently recognised. Without entering upon the question whether the Psalter was by that time practically closed, I may at least express the opinion that at the period of this author, that is to say about B.C. 200 or a little later, Psalms were still being composed.² That the author was familiar with the Pentateuch and the whole of the "Prophets" (Joshua-Malachi) is clear from many passages in the Hebrew text, even more than in the Greek. Fortune has ordained that the very last verse which has been preserved should be the one about the Twelve (Minor) Prophets, a verse whose genuineness ought never to have been doubted, seeing that it occurs also in S. Further, especial reference is made (48. 10) to a passage in the last

¹ *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, vi. 319 ff.

² It follows, of course, at least in my opinion, that many Psalms, which in the main are of a different character, are *considerably* older. Furthermore, reference to those passages in Sirach, which take the form of psalms, may serve to display the exaggeration of those who would identify the "I" of the Psalms never, or hardly ever, with the individual,—always, or almost always, with the community.

of these Twelve, Malachi (4. 5 f.).¹ I emphasize the fact that the author had carefully studied all these writings in order to anticipate the inference that the Hebrew which he wrote was at that time the *speech of the people*. On the contrary, it is extremely probable that in Palestine at that time Aramaic was already more spoken than Hebrew. It is by no means for the "common people" that the book is written; neither would they have been able to read it in any case. The author was a man highly educated after the education of his time, and one who looked down upon the *βάνανσοι* with no little contempt (cf. 38. 24 ff.). I can hardly doubt, moreover, that he was a *priest*. He brings the priesthood and the hereditary character of their office into the greatest possible prominence (e.g. 45. 13); he addresses the priests distinctly as his relatives (45. 25 ff.), and devotes to Aaron, the founder of the priesthood, just double the space he allots to Moses. The great eulogy on the High Priest Simon (50. 1 ff.) gives undoubtedly the impression that he stood in close personal relation with him. His deep interest in the details of the Temple worship is also to be observed. In the case of such a man an accurate use of the sacred speech is not surprising, even after it had ceased to be the speech of the people. It is true that the chapters which now lie before us contain a number of Aramaic words; but the editors justly remark concerning the style: "It stands throughout on an altogether higher level than that, for instance, of Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, or the Hebrew parts of Daniel" (Pref. p. xiii.). They might have added the book of Esther also. All these books may, of course, be somewhat later than Ecclesiasticus.²

¹ In 49. 11b, which cannot now be read in the Hebrew, the last prophet but one is used, Haggai 2. 23.

² I should not lay any weight upon the correspondence of a few words in Sir. 41. 12a with those in Ecclesiastes 8. 15. It is probably accidental.

The carefully constructed glossary contributed by Prof. Driver contains all the words which for any reason are noteworthy. Some remarks on this glossary will be found below in an appendix. The syntax of the writer is almost entirely that of pure Hebrew. It may be that he has absolutely avoided even the use of the Perfect with Vav in the sense of the simple Perfect. Of the six cases which are registered in Preface p. xiii. *note*, 48. 12*d*, being quite obscure, falls out of consideration. In some cases a slight displacement may perhaps be assumed, as וּבֵא, 44. 20*d*, for וּבֵא, and in other cases this combination might ultimately be justified from the standpoint of Old-Hebrew grammar. The author of the *Treatise on the Use of Tenses in Hebrew* is in the best position to judge of this. Aramaic particles are not employed in the book. One Aramaic construction I recognise at any rate in the use of ל as a mark of the object לַכְּפִירִים שָׁחַק וּלְרוּבִים 47. 3. Further, combinations like אִין לְאִמֵר, 39. 34, and others which appear elsewhere in the latest documents of the Old Testament,¹ are of Aramaic origin.²

The artistic method of the book is entirely that which prevails in the Book of Proverbs. The verses consist throughout of two parallel members. Of course in many cases several of these pairs are closely combined. Whether there were originally any verses that were constructed with

Certainly the tone of Ben Sira, cheerful in spite of its seriousness, is totally distinct from the melancholy tone of the Preacher. He has no such arresting passage to show as the opening of the Preacher's address. Further, it is almost certain that the writer knew Nehemiah only as an independent document, that is, in its original form, and not in its later combination with Ezra. The whole work of Chronicles is unknown to him. Otherwise he could not have failed to notice, in accordance with his whole tendency, both Ezra and the additions to the older history made by the Chronicler,—for example, the liturgical institutions of Hezekiah. Of course we cannot deduce from this that the whole work, Ezra—Nehemiah—Chronicles, was not compiled till a later date, though this appears to me probable.

¹ Cf. Brown's Lexicon, *s.v.* אִין, no. 5.

² Thus ; אִין אִין. See my *Syrische Grammatik*, § 286.

three or any other uneven number of members, is, in my opinion, doubtful. The separate members contain for the most part three words—short words, like על, את, מה, being of course not counted. But it happens by no means rarely that a member, especially the first, has four words, and again frequently that one member has only two words. Seeing that many of these deviations from the usual practice are firmly established by the concurrence of the text and the translations, all attempts to discover a stricter law of form must be hopeless.¹ We find on the one hand verse-members like the following:—

עטרת פו מעיל ומצנפת, 45. 12a ;
 כופר ונעלם ממני לקחתי, 46. 19c ;
 בגדי קדש זהב תכלת, 45. 10a ;
 ושני תולעת מעשה אורג, 45. 11a ;

and on the other hand such as

ויגישו לערפל, 45. 5d ;
 ותמשילם בגייתך, 47. 19b ;
 ויחילו כילודה, 48. 19b ;
 ולהנחיל את ישראל, 46. 1f.

A work in which these verse-forms appear respectively cannot have been cast into any form in which importance was attached to an equal number of accented syllables. And much less can we think of a metre constructed according to feet and quantities either here, or in the Book of Proverbs, or, as I believe, in any part of the Old Testament.

The manuscript to which our fragments belong was very carefully and clearly written. Unfortunately it has been injured in many places. Single letters and groups of letters are often missing, in many cases whole verses. In

¹ I do not mean of course to assert that the game of discovering strict rhythmical form in Hebrew will not soon be applied to the fragments of Sirach. It is, on the contrary, extremely probable.

other places the letters are now difficult to distinguish. Whatever can be read has been brought to light by the strenuous labours of the editors.¹ But even if the MS. had been uninjured, we should not have had the author's original. No one would expect that from a copy made twelve or thirteen centuries afterwards. Upon inner grounds, and upon a comparison of the translations, we are confirmed in the opinion that the text has been considerably disturbed. It is further to be noticed that the writer has inserted in the margin many variations out of another MS. These are in part better than the readings of the text; in part they are worse; often the choice is difficult. Some changes are only orthographical; some Aramaic words in the margin are only explanations of the Hebrew in the text. The variations cease at 45. 7. According to a remark in Persian on the margin, the MS. which was being compared, went only so far. Certainly we miss its help all the less in the following chapters, since the copyists, like ourselves, found the *שבח אבות עולם*, the *ὑμνος πατέρων*, which is based upon the historical books of the Old Testament, easier to understand than most of the rest of the book, and so copied it more correctly.

If, even in the canonical Hebrew books, especially in the older ones, we have to assume that many of the vowel-letters are later additions, and not always correct, the same is even more certain here. For in regard to this book which was not regarded as canonical, there are many cases of short *ū* and *ī* represented, according to rabbinic fashion, by *ו* and *י* respectively. For example, *ניסוי דבִּים=דְּבִים=דְּבִים* (cf. Driver's table, p. xxxvi).² It is scarcely likely

¹ I must acknowledge that I have not taken the trouble to decipher more. For what the editors, with their knowledge of palæography, have been unable to discover, I, who have almost never given attention to Hebrew MSS., could not hope to discover with certainty from the facsimile.

² Even *שֵׁנַת*, 40. 5*d*, that is, according to the later Aramaic pronunciation, *שֵׁנַת* for *שֵׁנַת*, "sleep," in stat. constr.

that the author himself expressed by the vowel-letters those vowels originally short in כּוּפֶר = כּוּפֶר, מֵיעִים = מֵיעִים, etc. And even vowels originally long were more rarely expressed than in our text. If מֵעִיל had appeared originally in 45. 12a, Gr. would hardly have taken it for מֵעִל, and translated it ἐπᾶνω. In 42. 24a, Gr. and S must have found שְׁנַיִם, which they translated δισσά, 𐤑𐤍𐤁𐤁, while in our text a ם is properly inserted, שְׁנַיִם. Thus Gr. found still perhaps אֵיב in 49. 9a, and understood it wrongly as אֵיב; in our text the correct אֵיב is clearly marked, the word which was read also by S.

The inconsistency in the writing of ם and ש (ש), which appears also in other Old Testament writings, may also be traced to later writers, although it is possible that already in our author's time ש was pronounced exactly like ם, and so the two signs were easily confused.

We must, further, make no mistake as to the fact that in the Book of Sirach not only the text, but also the sense itself, is often very uncertain. In course of time close study will certainly make clear many things which, to me at least, are still obscure. But I fear many passages will still remain from which we shall be able to wring a passable sense only by force. Such application of force is, of course, very usual in the exegesis of corrupted passages of the Old Testament.

In what follows I propose to offer some suggestions for the improvement of certain passages. The majority of these suggestions are tolerably obvious, and I hope that for the most part they will meet with approval. I take my stand chiefly on the translations. Once more I would expressly declare that there are many passages which I have tried in vain to emend. Doubtless I have here and there overlooked a corruption of the text. A few corrections, which appear doubtful to myself, I have held in reserve.

39. 21c, *d* should be struck out; it is rightly omitted by Gr. and S, being identical with *v.* 34. In 39. 23a, read כן for כ' *כ*, οὕτως, כן; possibly the illegible note on the margin had כן. In 39. 33a, probably מעשי, and *b*, יספקו (Qal or Hiphil?). In 39. 35a, ופה should be read in the marginal note, καὶ στόματα. 40. 9b, ורעב, καὶ λιμός. In 41. 2c perhaps we should read שב כושל, as in margin of 42. 8, or, in any case, איש שב כושל for איש כושל; Gr. has in both places ἐσχατογήρως, S has here שׁבן שׁבן. 42. 6a, probably תחתם for חתם. In *v.* 6a, *b*, 7a, the finite verb stands in place of the substantives, "be thou not ashamed for this, that thou . . ." In margin of 42. 10b read תשנא for תנשה, μισηθῆ, ἠδω. 43. 2b gives indeed a good sense, but the concurrence of Gr. and S compels us to the alteration כלי נורא מעשה. In 43. 4a, for מהם, probably in accordance with ἐν ἔργοις, במעשה. In 43. 4b, שולח and שולח can hardly be correct; *τριπλασίως*, ἄλλ, point to שלש. Can that by itself signify "triple"? Compare Proverbs 24. 16, שבע, "seven times." In 43. 10a, read בדבר קדוש יעמדו כחק, cf. ἐν λόγοις ἀγίου στήσονται κατὰ κρίμα; שׁבן שׁבן. 42. 20b, קרח for כרקב (?), κρύσταλλος; מקורו might be מקורו, "from its coldness"; "the spring" or "well," מקור, does not suit the passage, although Gr. with its ἐφ' ὕδατος (the right reading) may have taken it so. 44. 8b, בתהלתם, ἐπαίνους, ἔπαινον, as in 15b (wanting in the Hebrew), ἔπαινον, *v.l.*, ἔπαινον. 44. 18a, ברית עולם (as frequently in the Old Testament, and here again, 45. 15c), διαθήκαι αἰῶνος, ἕσπε; the subsequent כרת to be taken as active, in accordance with the marginal reading. 45. 6a, an equivalent to ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, כאל, must be put either before or after הקדוש; the second verse-member (*b*) is formed by את אהרו לכמא לוי. 45. 7c, probably ויאשרהו, καὶ ἐμακάρισεν αὐτόν: S has ויבחרהו (?) 45. 7e is rightly omitted by both Gr. and S: it is a doublet from

9a, which however properly belongs, as in Gr., to the second member (b), since the sounding of the bells answers to the "resounding," נעימה, in 9c. 45. 8b, בְּכִלֵי עוֹ, σκεύεσιν ἴσχυος, כַּחֲזֵי לֵי. 45. 10c, Gr. seems to have read אורים ותמים. 45. 20d, in accordance with מַעֲרָכָה; מַעֲרָכָה, perhaps מערכת לחם חלקו: just as we have מַעֲרָכָה; מַעֲרָכָה for מערכת לחם in 2 Chronicles 13. 11. Moreover ἄρτον . . . ἡτοίμασεν (ערך) agrees with this; לחם must be removed from 20c. 45. 25c, for כבודו without doubt לבדו: preceding that perhaps נחלת מלך לבנו, κληρονομία βασιλέως υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου, לֵי כַחֲזֵי לֵי. 46. 1c, כשמו (as 43. 8a, margin), κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (מושיע יהושוע) (מושיע). 46. 5d, I supply ש to ש [אלגבי]: perhaps אלגביש אבני (Ezek. 13. 11, 13). 46. 16c, following Gr. and S, בהעלתו, מַלְאָה חלב. 47. 4b, חרפת העם, ὀνειδισμὸν ἐκ λαοῦ, מַלְאָה; מַלְאָה. 47. 41d, ישראל for ירושלם, Ἰσραήλ, \\\; מַלְאָה. 47. 22d, [אודה] ביו, without Vav before it, as genitive to ונכד, cf. Appendix, below. 48. 8a, perhaps תשלימות מלך, βασιλεῖς εἰς ἀνταπόδομα, מַלְאָה; מַלְאָה; the passage depends, of course, upon 2 Kings 19. 15f. 48. 10d, יעקב instead of ישראל, in accordance with Gr. and S following Isaiah 49. 6, and consequently read earlier להקים, καταστήσαι. 49. 5a, לאחר, ἐτέρους, מַלְאָה, is wrongly completed to לאחר. The parallel demands the former. An antithesis to the "exaltation of horns" (47. 1) would certainly not be found in turning backward.

The different names of God, אֵל, אֱלֹהִים, קדוש, etc., appear to be somewhat confused. I suppose it will be possible, by close observation, to recover to some extent the original form.

I will specify only a few of those words which are still obscure to me. In 40. 6c we have מעט טע, τεθορυβημένον: the מעט may have crept in from a in the same verse. 40. 15a, for ינקו (which was readily suggested to the copyist by his memory) we require an expression to signify "to

produce twigs," or the like, cf. *πληθύνει κλάδους*. 41. 19a, ור or וד, *κλοπής*. 43. 4c, נושבת: the word which should appear here seems to belong to *d*. 43. 6b, [מ]משלת: ἀνάδειξιν, |Δ.מ.ל, are confirmed by the parallel איות. The wording of the following verse is quite unintelligible. 43. 22b, פורע: the Aramaic עירע or אורע is hardly admissible, although it would exactly accord with ἀπαντῶσα. 48. 12d, ונלמד. 49. 9b, המכלכל כל. 40. 26d, [מטמ]ן, can hardly be right. What is required is a word with the sense of "helper" or "help," cf. *βοήθειαν*, |י.ג.ב.

The Editors in the English translation have wisely kept close to their Hebrew text, and as a rule have accepted only a very few, and those entirely certain, emendations (among which I reckon even the elimination of נבלי in 43. 8c) as well as insertions which are beyond doubt. As between the text and the marginal readings they had, however, a free choice. And they have given the preference now to the one and now to the other, recording the alternative in each case in the notes. In the following cases I should differ from them by preferring the marginal or the superscribed reading: 41. 4d, תוכחת חיים (Prov. 15. 31), *ἐλεγμὸς ζωῆς*. 42. 3a, וארח (וארח), *ἔδοιπόρων*. 42. 15c, מעשיו, τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, |ח.ב.ס. 43. 8a, בשמו, κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, |מ.פ.ס. 43. 9b, ערי, *κόσμος*. 44. 22a, בן, οὕτως. 45. 2b, במוראים, ἐν φόβοις ἐχθρῶν, |ח.ב.ס. In 40. 29c the good marginal reading זבד מטעמי has been overlooked (see Appendix).

I cannot accept the alteration of לאיש אונים into לאין אונים in 41. 2b. I believe that אונים here signifies "misery"; compare להם אונים Hosea 9. 14, בני אוני Genesis 35. 18, ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπιδεομένῳ, |ח.ב.ס.

In proverbial writings of this kind one member of a verse or even a whole verse easily slips out. This has often occurred in the Greek text (*e.g.*, 39. 21b, c; 40. 19b, c), and sometimes in the Hebrew also. Thus the following

are missing: 40. 2; 40. 12; 41. 20*b*; 41. 22*b* (the verse-member here marked 20*b* and 21*a* are in reality 21*c*, 22*a*); 42. 22; 44. 12; 44. 21*c*, *d*; 46. 12*a*, and probably 12*c* also; 46. 20*d*, and 47. 16.

The Greek and Syriac translations are printed along with the text in so convenient a way that we find the corresponding texts before us at a single opening. No one will blame the editors because they have not yet set to work on a thorough examination of the text of this particular portion of Gr. It would, however, have been very satisfactory if this had been done by some other scholar at home in this field. It is precisely in England that special activity has always been devoted to the study of the Greek Bible. Swete's text, however, which has been printed without any various readings, is here of very little use. If the intention was to avoid wholly the introduction of various readings, it would have been better simply to reprint Fritzsche's text, which is, at any rate, the result of a critical estimate. Using only Fritzsche's apparatus, and what is provided by Tischendorf's edition and Nestle's additions, it is now quite possible, in many cases where the original is before us, to arrive at the original form of the Greek translation. This may be shown by the following list of better readings, in forming which I have, of course, made use also of the *Vetus Latinus* printed by the editor, and occasionally of the Ethiopian translation. I need hardly add that this list makes no claims whatever to completeness.

In 39. 18*b* we should probably read ἐλάττωσις εἰς for ὅς ἐλάττώσει τό, ל, מעצור, 39, 23*a*, ὄργη. 39. 25*b*, [ἀγαθὰ καὶ] κακά, according to the Latin *bona et mala*, טוב ורע, כבב, (v.l. כבב, כבב, כבב). The elimination of "good" was easily suggested. In 39. 26 καὶ γάλα καὶ μέλι, ש, חלב ודבש, כבב, כבב. 40. 9*b*, ἐπαγωγαὶ καὶ λιμὸς καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μᾶστιξ should be restored. 40, 25*b*, βουλή

for γυνή, גַּבְרָה (Hebrew wanting). 40. 30^b, ὡς πῦρ, כְּמוֹ אֵשׁ . 41. 9^a, ἐὰν γὰρ πληθυνθῆτε εἰς ἀπώλειαν should be restored to its place. In 42. 17 τὸ πᾶν ought perhaps to be struck out; it is wanting in the Latin. 42. 18^b, διανοήθη, יִתְבּוֹנֶן . 43. 4^a, φυσῶν, נִפְחָה . 43. 8^c, παρεμβολῶν, צְבָא . 43. 9^b, κυρίου, אֵל (במרומי). 43. 10^a, ἀγίου, אֵל (בדבר). 43. 17^a, ὠδίνησεν, יָחִיל . 43. 23^b, ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους, בְּתוֹךְ אֵיִים . 43. 26^a, εὐδοοὶ ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ, יִצְלַח מְלָאךְ . 44. 3^c, βουλευόντες or βουλευταί, הַיּוֹעֲצִים . 45. 24^b, the reading προστατεῖν ἀγίων καὶ λαοῦ seems to correspond, at least better than the other reading, to בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם לכולכל קדש. 45. 25^b, add בֶּן יִשׂוּ וְיִשְׁשַׁי . 46. 3^b, πολέμους κυρίου, מִלְחָמוֹת יְיָ . 46. 13^a, add Σαμουήλ, שְׁמוּאֵל (13^d). 46. 15^b, ἐν ῥήματι αὐτοῦ or ἐν ῥήμασιν αὐτοῦ, בְּדַבְרֵוֹ . 47. 11^c, βασιλείας, מַלְכוּת (i.e. מַלְכוּת or מַלְכוּת). 47. 20^d, καταυγῆσαι, אֲנַחַת . 48. 17^b, εἰς μέσον αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, אֵל תּוֹכַה מַיִם . The curious reading τὸν Γώγ must be, as A. Geiger thought, a corruption of τὸν ἀγωγόν; these words were written either in the margin or above the text as an explanation. In 48. 18^c, καὶ ἐπήρην τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, וַיִּטְיֵן יָדוֹ . 49. 5^a, ἔδωκε, וַיִּתֵּן . 49. 6^a, ἐνεπύρισαν, וַיִּצִיתוּ . 49. 10^c, παρεκάλεσαν, וַיְחַלְּלוּ . 49. 10^a, ἐλυτρώσαντο, וַיִּשִׁיבֻהוּ .

In this section of the Book of Sirach the *Complutensian* and *Cod.* 248 often have the right reading. In any critical edition of the Greek Sirach they must be particularly taken into account. On the other hand B is just here a bad authority. It has, for example, in 43. 23^b the absurd reading αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς.

I proceed to add a few more emendations which have not, so far as I know, any MS. authority, but yet are made tolerably certain by the Hebrew text or by the Hebrew text and S. In 41. 1^d, τρυφήν for τροφήν, לְעֵנוֹג ; thus τρυφή in Proverbs 19. 10, and τρυφήματα in Ecclesiastes 2. 8 for לְעֵנוֹג , as לְעֵנוֹג answers in Sirach also to τρυφή

(18. 31 and 37. 21) and to *τροπήματα* in 31. (34) 3. In 44. 16b the puzzle that Enoch is referred to as an example of repentance, is removed by the Hebrew אָוֹת דַּעַת; read *ἐννοίας* instead of *μετανοίας*. Enoch begins here already to appear as the wise and learned man that we find him among later writers. In 46. 14b κύριος τοῦ Ἰακώβ, אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. 48. 18b strike out καὶ ἐπῆρεν as a ditto-graphy of καὶ ἐπῆρεν which follows.

S does not offer by any means the same large number of variations as Gr. It is true I have compared in addition to Lagarde's *Apparatus* only the phototype of the old Codex Ambrosianus issued by Ceriani. Sometimes it has better readings, but sometimes it has worse. I give now a list of text-emendations according to these various readings. In doing so I pass over, of course, mere orthographical details as also the presence or omission of the plural points. I omit also those passages when the variation turns on the presence or absence of Vav="and," although in these cases also a certain reading may with probability be preferred. When Ceriani, alone or in combination with other authorities, has the better reading, I add the sign C. In 39. 23a, וְעָמְרוּ, וְעָמְרוּ, ὀργή; 39. 25b, חַסְדֵּיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ וְרַע, חַסְדֵּיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ וְרַע (see above, p. 359). 40. 5a, חַסְדֵּיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ C, קְבִיאָה רְאֵנָה, ζῆλος καὶ παραχρή. 40. 15a, חַסְדֵּיךָ C is certainly better than חַסְדֵּיךָ. 40. 19d, חַסְדֵּיךָ C, נְחֻשֶׁת, ἄμωμος. On the other hand 40. 23b, חַסְדֵּיךָ C, מְשַׁכֵּלֶת. 41. 4a, חַסְדֵּיךָ C, בָּשָׂר, σαρκί. 41. 11b, חַסְדֵּיךָ. Perhaps the same correction should be made in 44. 13b, where Gr. gives as in the other case ἐξαλειφθήσεται (Hebrew wanting here). On the other hand in 45. 20c, חַסְדֵּיךָ is right, יִשְׁכַּח. 42. 9b, חַסְדֵּיךָ (תַּפְּרִיד). 45. 7b, חַסְדֵּיךָ C, הוֹדוּ or הוֹדוּ. 45. 23d, חַסְדֵּיךָ C, עָמְרוּ (בַּפְּרָץ). 46. 13c, חַסְדֵּיךָ C. 47. 21b, חַסְדֵּיךָ is probably better than חַסְדֵּיךָ. 48. 11b, חַסְדֵּיךָ C; חַסְדֵּיךָ must have been simply a misreading. 48. 16b

dele |מִהַרְבֵּי C. 48. 18a *dele* |חַמְסֵה. 49. 2a, |אֶלְהָב; |חַמְסֵה C is at any rate better than |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה for |חַמְסֵה (?!). 49. 2b, |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה.¹

Without any MS. authority to fall back on I should like to propose the two following emendations, somewhat drastic though they are. In 39. 29a, |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה for |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה and |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה and |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה. In 44. 4a |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה for |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה; |חַמְסֵה, |חַמְסֵה.

As I have already indicated above, I have no doubt that competent scholars will devote thorough and comprehensive study to this newly discovered fragment of old Hebrew Literature, and that light will thus be shed on many dark places. Perchance the hope may yet be fulfilled that more fragments of the book may come to the light of day. But even if this expectation should be disappointed, our knowledge of this important book will have been promoted to a quite unusual extent by their discovery. It helps us better to understand even those parts which are preserved only in the translations. Moreover the Hebrew fragment affords us new light on the whole development of the language and literature. So we conclude by offering our best thanks to all the scholars who have co-operated in the work of editing, as well as to all who have contributed to the appearing in so worthy a form.

TH. NÖLDEKE.

APPENDIX.

REMARKS AND ADDITIONS TO DRIVER'S GLOSSARY.

On |חַמְסֵה: no substantive |חַמְסֵה⁷ exists. In the passage quoted in Payne-Smith, *s.v.*, read |חַמְסֵה, feminine participle. This phrase is |חַמְסֵה⁷. |חַמְסֵה in Sirach is hardly equal to "commit adultery," as in Aramaic; neither does later Hebrew seem to know this meaning. The word signifies, in my opinion, 42. 9c, simply to "dwell" (a

¹ In 49. 1d the | has been left out before |חַמְסֵה by an error in printing.

long time, as an old maid, παρακμῶση) cf. v. 11e. On זָבַח וְזָבַח is not properly the *dos*, but the *present* made to the bride by her father. In Hebrew and in the Targums זָבַח = "to make a present," occurs apart from this passage only in Genesis 30. 20 as an explanation of the names זָבֻלִין. But how widely it was spread among different Semitic languages is shown by proper names like זְבִירָה (Hebr.), זְבִירָא (Aram.), زَبِيد (Arab.), etc. Moreover the expression זָבַח טַעְמֵי זָבַח (40. 29c, margin), "gifted delicacies," appears to be ancient, and is probably derived from an older document. I do not accept נֹתָה = "highness," 43. 21b: pronounce rather, as it appears to me, נְגִיָה צַמְחִים = "meadow" or properly "station with vegetation," answering to יְבוּל הַרִים in *a*. The superscribed הַרִים is confirmed by ὄρη. The words נִין and נִכְר, which elsewhere always stand in combination, are found separated as parallel expressions in 41. 5, and so also in 47. 22c, *d*, when the new verse-member *d* begins with וַנִּכְר לְאוֹהֲבָיו וַנִּכְר. סָרַח means neither in 42. 11b, nor in Rabbinic, "evil odour," but "corruption," or "decay." It ought to be so taken in Job 49. 7. It is likely, however, that סָרַח is right. That signifies in Aramaic, of course, "having a bad smell," and hence simply "bad," סָרַח נִשְׁמָה just like מַלְּטָה (cf. Payne-Smith, *s.v.*). فَخَر = فَخْر is very doubtful, seeming to be an old mistake in copying. But مَتَفَخَّش = مَتَفَخَّر (Jauhari, according to Ibn Sikkit) would, of course, correspond with פָּחַח. That צוּר without a feminine termination can signify "figure" either in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Arabic, is very improbable. צַנוּעַ is certainly not "humble." In Jewish Aramaic צַנוּעַ is often "prudent," in Syriac always "cunning." The former meaning suits 42. 8 as well as Micah 6. 8. חָקַל חָקַל, 47. 15, in whatever way the word may be completed, can hardly belong to the Aramaic חָלַל עָדָה, "to praise," for this verb, which arose out of καλῶς, "bravo," is not likely to have been common in Palestine in B.C. 200. For חָלַל I would write חָלַל following חָלַל.

Additions: נָוַע, 48. 5, "dead," I should pronounce נָוַע: נָוַע would surely mean "dying." חֹק, 43. 12 may possibly be "circle," cf.

حَاق, med. و and ي with ب, "to seize" (frequent in the Koran), حَوَّلَ to "surround," Aghānī 7. 129. 11. But Proverbs 8. 29 בְּחֹקוֹ מוֹסְרֵי אֶרֶץ does not belong here, for there בְּחֹקוֹ = בְּחֹקוֹ in 8. 27. Further, it is generally probable that in that passage we should

emend חוּי as the editors do. רִבָּה, as an independent word for the great Flood, I should incline to explain on the ground that the writer wrongly looked upon the ancient phrase תְּהוֹם רַבָּה in Amos 7. 4, etc., as a genitival combination, "the depth of the Flood," or something of the kind. 43. 17c, Gr. has probably reproduced רִשָּׁף exactly in the same sense the author meant by *περενώ*. This is supported by the parallel אֲרַבָּה. Whether this meaning is actually the right one, must remain undecided. It may have arisen out of a wrong conception of Job 5. 7 (cf. LXX. and Peshitto), but since LXX. in Deut. 32. 24 (like all three Targums on that passage, and like the Peshitto in Habakkuk 3. 5) translates רִשָּׁף by "birds," this meaning of the word is established precisely for the period to which our document belongs. The words שְׂהַק כִּיאוֹנִים in 42. 4a I believe to have been taken by the author in a different sense from that they bear in the original passage, Isaiah 40. 15, where, it may be added, the expression is by no means so clear as is commonly supposed. Ought not שְׂבַטִים in 47. 21a to be interpreted as by Gr. and S, "kingdoms," the word meaning properly "sceptres"? The Twelve שְׂבַטִים had not, at the period of Rehoboam, fallen apart into two stocks.

Hebrew Lexicons will require from henceforward to pay attention to our fragments as surely as to the inscriptions of Mesha and of Silvam. It might perhaps be desirable that the excellent work of Brown should incorporate in the part yet to appear, this new material so far as it belongs to them. In any case it must devote to this material a comprehensive appendix.