The necessary, unending antagonism between the two types of religion is illustrated by the fact that Jesus fell a victim to priestly hatred. The priests brought about His death, even forcing the hand of the reluctant Pilate (who knew that 'for envy they had delivered Him up') by firing the passions of the multitude, and threatening himself with charges of disloyalty to Rome, saying, 'If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend.' Jesus met the fate which many of God's witnesses in the past ages of Israel's history had suffered. The martyr Stephen, before he was stoned, cut his persecutors to the heart with these words: 'Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed them which showed before of the coming of the Righteous One; of whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers.'

This conflict has never since ceased. It is being carried on to-day, and it behoves all who know what spiritual religion is to be faithful in their testimony and worthy of the great cloud of prophetic witnesses. It is the same old struggle, and there is the same call for fidelity.

History's pages but record
Oxen death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt all systems and the Word;
Truth for ever on the scaffold, Wrong for ever on the throne—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own.  

The Origin of the New Hebrew Fragments of Ecclesiasticus.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

AFTER I have stated my views (see the Aug.–Nov. numbers of The Expository Times) on the Hebrew texts of Ecclus., which were published by Cowley and Neubauer in 1897, one will expect me not to be silent about the new fragments recently put forth by Schechter and Taylor. Besides, I myself feel the necessity of examining whether the judgment I have passed on the origin of the earlier published fragments is confirmed in presence of these new fragments.

The first question which arises concerns, of course, the internal character of the new texts, when these are viewed simply by themselves.

This question is directly answered by the texts themselves. For the MS. which Schechter and Taylor call A, and which contains parts of chaps. 3–16, while it has, indeed, no marginal notes, except at 314 1214 1410a. 15 16b, is yet not seldom corrected in the body of the text itself. One finds, for instance, נֵ֖ר in 61a 1218b 1318c. 16b. 22b 1418a. 16b. 23a 159b. 14 1618b, 18b. 22a, 23b. But have all the mistakes in this MS. been removed by these corrections? One will not hesitate to answer this question in the negative, when I cite the following uncorrected readings:—In 4a the MS. has וֹו, which cannot be derived from וֹו, because רַ֖חַב הבו יָ֖שֶׁה which follows. Rather has the וּ֖ב of וּב arisen from ו, just as in the O.T. as well these two letters are frequently interchanged (cf. אָֽבְּהִי we-ָהִי, No. 123), and the same interchange has taken place also in Sir 72a 1411a. Further, in 14a I find that מַֽעַבְּרָה suits v.1b, and this form is therefore incorrectly read by G as מַעַבְּרָה. Schechter and Taylor come to the reverse conclusion. But they have acutely discovered a great number of false readings in the MS. A, to which I would offer only a few additions:—In 42a is not touched upon by Schechter in his excellent 'Notes on the Text,' but is correctly rendered by Taylor, 'with thy tongue' (cf. אֶֽפֶל in 3618b, whose י is recognized by both scholars as incorrect). Again, in 62b we are not to suppose, with Schechter, מַעַבְּרָה, but should find a dittography of י, and thus read the imperat. מַעַבְּרָה. In 1218b we are not to suppose, with Schechter, יִֽכְָת בִּלְתָּה שֵׁם לֹֽא, and not יִֽכְָת בִּלְתָּה שֵׁם לֹֽא.——Further, how deplorable is the origin of the new textual fragments of Ecclesiasticus?—For the occurrence of וֹו in 314 1214 1410a. 15 16b, is yet not seldom corrected in the body of the text itself.
the condition of the MS. B (from which now parts of 301-5180 have been published) is shown by the numerous marginal notes by which the text is surrounded. And yet, in spite of their number, these do not correct all the errors of the text. The first error that survives, is found in הַֽוָּה of 3217b. For this Schechter would substitute הַֽוָּה or הַֽוָּה, and, as a matter of fact, the latter word, on account of the phonetic resemblance between the spirant כ and ק, might readily be contracted to הַֽוָּה. Further, ב in 33b is changed on the margin to ב, but I would suggest that a following כ was overlooked, and that the reading intended was יִשָּׁהוּ (cf. also יִשָּׁהוּ). The MS. of 3520b is well emended by Taylor to בְּעֵנֶה. Again, יִשָּׁהוּ of 3831b stands for יִשָּׁהוּ (cf. י in the imperf. in Hos 8b, etc., in Hos 8b, etc.). The same haplography is the cause of our now reading anarthrous בֵּן as a parallel to בֵּן in 5016. יִשָּׁהוּ was intended.

Does this condition of H permit the supposition that its original form was preserved absolutely intact? A negative answer to this question is favoured also by other circumstances. It is, to be sure, a merely external point that is involved in the fact that in reproducing the text one vacillated between a non-stichic (as in the MS. A) and a stichic (as in B) form of writing. Of an equally external character is the circumstance that the MSS differ in the extent to which they exhibit punctuation (cf. in A, יָּהַֽוָּה 313b, etc., 18b, 22b 42b, 21b, 29b 65b, 11b, 25b 73b 1213b 133d, 6b, 8b, 14a, 11a, 16a, 26a 1510b, 16b, 16b, 16b, 16b, whereas the text of B shows punctuation only in 3020b 38 [not 33] 36b 3915c 4010a, 10a, apart from י of v. 30a. By the way the two points of דָּעַֽוָּה in 423a and of ק in v. 19a are the sign for Holem in the supra-linear punctuation (Smend, p. 5), and the marginal note דָּעַֽוָּה in 3317a may have in view the Niphal of דָּעַֽוָּה (cf. דָּעַֽוָּה, I S 4b, etc.). Moreover, differences in orthography are to be noted on comparing the two manuscripts. In A the employment of vowel letters is not quite so frequent as in B. For instance, long e is not indicated in הַֽוָּה (=רְוַֽוָּה) 144b, and in יִשָּׁהוּ (=יִשָּׁהוּ) 1611b. Long i wants the sign in יָּהַֽוָּה 620b (cf. יִשָּׁהוּ Pr 155b 1925). Long o is not represented by i in יָּהַֽוָּה 313a (where יָּהַֽוָּה might have been intended, but where יָּהַֽוָּה is demanded by a point that has been added), or in יִשָּׁהוּ 3227b, 5b, etc., 419a, 13a (יִשָּׁהוּ = יִשָּׁהוּ) 136, יִשָּׁהוּ 1320a, 13a (יִשָּׁהוּ = יִשָּׁהוּ) 1513a, יִשָּׁהוּ 164b. I do not mean to assert that examples of scriptio defective are entirely wanting in the parts of B which are now published (cf. יִשָּׁהוּ = יִשָּׁהוּ 3220b, יִשָּׁהוּ יִשָּׁהוּ 366b), but I have the impression that the vowel letters prevail to a greater extent in this MS., and especially towards the end of it.—More weight is due to the testimony of the marginal notes. This proves directly that the two MSS of the Heb. text differed from one another in respect of quantity. For instance, at 321 there is written in Persian on the margin, 'This is not found in this verse in another exemplar.' The meaning of this note is clear enough, although there is a small blank space after ב (not`). Further, from the Persian note found on the margin of 3520b ('this verse [is] from [1] other exemplars') it results with certainty that a difference between various copies of the Sirach text in regard to the amount of their contents is spoken of. Again, the Persian marginal note at 458 runs, 'This exemplar extended thus far,' and from this verse onwards the marginal notes, which up to this point have accompanied this MS. B in closest array, are wanting everywhere, with the solitary exception of 478. From this it follows that the source of the readings, which down to 458 appear on the margin, was a comparison with the MS., which 'extended thus far,' and which—in all probability—was a MS. of the Hebrew Ecclesiastics, else it could not be called simply 'this exemplar.' The last-mentioned marginal note shows then indirectly that the MSS differed from one another in regard to quality, and thus the view is confirmed which had already been adopted on the ground both of the internal differences between the sources of G, and of the differences between G, S, and Vetus Latina (cf. Herkenne, de Vet. Lat. Ecclesiastici capitibus i—viii., 1899, p. 4 f.), the view, namely, that different recensions of the Heb. Ecclus. were in existence.

This being so, the possibility arises that the various portions that make up the MS. B were copied from exemplars of different character, and when one observes how the relative ב is found only in 3014d, 19b, 3116a, whereas מָשָׁה meets us in 313a, 14b, 16a, 27b 4420a 4524c, 24c 4713c 4916c 501b, 2a, 3a, 24c, 276d 5116b, one may be disposed to regard the
suggestion I have just put forward as more than an abstract possibility.

But, after all, the form of the newly discovered Hebrew texts may be unable to claim absolute authenticity in all points, and we may speak of its originality as a relative one, in so far as we take into account the possibility that the absolutely original form has been modified through unintentional and intentional changes. But even if we do not have recourse to this possibility, the linguistic character of the new Fragments permits the conclusion that they contain the original.

If we meet with מְדֹעַ (381b), does this word occur twice in Qoheleth (9.10, 10)? Moreover, the employment of the synonymous מְדוּעַ and מְדֹעַ predominates, occurring as it does in 4th 12th 36th 36th. Further, in regard to the verb, מְדוּעַ in 3rd runs parallel with מְדוּעַ. The ideal affinity of מְדוּעַ with the Infinitive is thus clear, and my opinion that the forms מְדוּעַ, etc. (Mishna, Berachoth, etc.), are a syntactical substitute for the use of the Infinitive (ZDMG, 1897, p. 331), is supported by the parallelism of מְדוּעַ and מְדוּעַ. Of course it may be said that this usage is not found in O.T. Hebrew. But do the linguistic phenomena that encounter us in the Mishna all bear one stamp? May not some of them have found their way sporadically at an earlier period into the literature? And might not the Aram. form מְדוּעַ (2n, etc., Ezr 4th, etc.) thus early favour the choice of forms מְדוּעַ? In like manner may not מְדֹעַ, 'according to sufficiency' ( = 'corresponding to'), 13th, or לְהַסְדוּוּי, 'corresponding to it,' 3th, or לְהַסְדוּל, 'these,' 5th, have been in use before the Mishna was committed to writing? Is it the case that the language of these Hebrew Sirach texts bears throughout a Misnic character? Nay, do not these texts show an absence of many phenomena which are quite common on the Mishna and the later Hebrew writings? I am thinking in particular of the indication of the genitive. In the post-Biblical literature of the Jews it is a prevailing usage to express the genitive by a proleptic pronoun and a following מְדֹעַ, as in מְדֹעַ לְאֵל, 'the sent of a man' (Berachoth, v. 5; for instances from the later centuries see my Syntax, § 284 6). But in the newly discovered Hebrew texts of Ecclus. we search in vain for any example of this way of indicating the genitive, although the employment of this מְדֹעַ is five times attributed to Ben-Sira in the tradition about his Sayings (cf. ap. Cowley and Neubauer, pp. 9-9). the numbers xiv., xliii., liii., lxvii.).

But do not the new Fragments of the Hebrew Ecclus. contain Arabic elements?

H has in 38th the verb מְדֹעַ, but G, which gives מְדֹעַ, and S, which has מְדֹעַ, express the notion of 'create.' Professor Margoliouth in the August number (p. 528) assumes that G and S lay before the author of H, and that the latter expressed the notion of 'create' not by the universally familiar Heb. word אֲנָּהוּ (or אֲנָּהוּ), but by the Arab. מְדֹעַ. Yet the author of H meant to restore the Heb. form of the Sirach oracles, and in Heb. 'create' is אֲנָּהוּ, to the choice of which word, moreover, the retranslator would have been guided by the similarly sounding verb employed in S1. How then could the supposed re-translator have stumbled upon the Arab. מְדֹעַ (= מְדֹעַ)? Before this can be assumed, the other possibility must first be examined, namely, whether Ben-Sira may not have written the Heb. מְדֹעַ. He may have chosen this word, intending it in the sense of 'assign,' which it actually has in 2 Ch 23. This conception of 'assign or destine to something' is allied to the conception of 'produce or furnish,' and also the Arab. מְדֹעַ has the senses 'quantitate et mensura definitiv, dispositiv, procreavit.' Moreover, if one is to recall the Arab. מְדֹעַ, 'to be smooth,' reference ought to be made also to the Heb. מְדֹעַ, 'to smooth,' 'to work over,' in Is 41. The meaning of Sir 38th then is that God has also raised up or commissioned the physician. [I had written these words before I made the acquaintance of Schechter's and Taylor's book in the beginning of September. Now I observe that Taylor likewise renders the מְדֹעַ of 38th by 'apportioned.'] The Heb. מְדֹעַ, as it meets us in 2 Ch 23b, might be reproduced by מְדֹעַ, and it is not necessary to attribute to the author of H the choice of the Arab. מְדֹעַ.

But the new Fragments contain also the words מְדֹעַ, 'and as the sun dawning,' etc. (57th). They thus offer in their text a form of the verb מְדֹעַ, in point of fact the participle מְדֹעַ which we have found in a marginal note to 43th. Here emerges the question of Arabicisms in the O.T. which I have already discussed in...
Expository Times (1898, pp. 286 ff., 430 ff., 474 ff.). There it was shown that one of the most certain Arabisms of the O.T. is contained in נָבִי of Pr 30:11. For the notion 'a king with whom is the army' (al-haumu) suits the context excellently. Neither are we to seek in כַּדְעִיק a corrupted כָּדְעִיק, nor to render with Wildboer, Kurser Hidcomm., 1897, ad loc.), 'against whom there is no opposition,' because this rendering does not tally with the יְהֹוָה, 'with him.' Franken-berg, it is true, who edited Proverbs in Nowack's Handhomm. (1898), substitutes points (...) for כְָָּּדְעִיק, and remarks that we must not appeal, in favour of כְָָּּדְעִיק as an Arabism, to כַּדְעִיק, כַּדְעִיק, etc. But why not? He adds no reason. Nor has he taken into consideration that the majority of approximations to Arabic linguistic usage are found in the Wisdom literature of the O.T. (cf. above all Mühla, de Proverbiorum quae dicuntur Aguri et Lemuelis origine et indole, pp. 1, 23 f., 35 f., 41 f.). What is the explanation of this? Because Eastern tribes, such as the peoples of Téman, were renowned for their wisdom (Jer 49:1, Ob 8, Job 21:1, Bar 328f.). Are there not even sections in the Book of Proverbs which are attributed to an author whose home lay in the Arabo-Syrian desert, and has not the poem of Job also its background in those Eastern regions? Cf. Pr 30:1 31:1, Job 11, and 'the wisdom of all the children of the east country,' i K 5:10 [Eng. 4:10]. Hence it is possible that the Hebrew friends of wisdom were acquainted with not a few words used by the neighbouring tribes of Arabia; and כְָָּּדְעִיק, e.g., might be employed in their writings, because this word (= 'the army') had become familiar to the Hebrews through the incursions of the Bedawin, just as כָּדָם, etc., had become familiar through commerce. And if any other Arabic word might become known to the Hebrews through intercourse on the frontier, it was כְָָּדְעִיק. For it was precisely from this word (which designates the sun-rising, the East) that the כְָָּדְעִיק נָבִי, or 'children of the East,' whose wisdom is celebrated in the O.T. (1 K 5:10), received the name by which they were known—ash-sharkijjána, 'the Orientals,' 'the Saracen's.' It may be added that these two words כְָָּדְעִיק and כְָָּדְעִיק might make their appearance in Hebrew literature all the more readily, because the former has an ideal affinity with the 

Heb. יְהֹוָה 'rise, raise oneself,' and the latter resembled phonetically the Heb. יְהֹוָה 'rise,' used of the sun.

That the text of the new Fragments of the Heb. Ecclus. contains also Persian elements has not yet been asserted. But I touch upon this question because Professor Margoliouth in the September number (p. 568*) says, 'The Greek translator would not have rendered this ['a tongue of light'] by 'sparks' (אֵתָּדָה). Now, the expression, כְָֹדְעִיק, 'tongue of fire' (Is 5:19), is a well-known metaphor for 'flame of fire,' and the same expression as the קָוֶּם of Sir 43:4 is found in the Targum sheni (ed. by Moritz David, 1898) to the Book of Esther, at 6:18, namely, כְָֹדְעִיק, כְָֹדְעִיק, and the Arab. כְָֹדְעִיק is used in the same way; cf. also כְָֹדְעִיק וֹאֵי (כָֹדְעִיק) קֹוֶּם, Ac 2:3. What right then has Professor Margoliouth to say that the Greek translator could not have reproduced the Heb. 'tongue of light' by אֵתָּדָה = 'ardores,' 'sparks'? No right whatever, and therefore I cannot approve of his theory that only a Jew who was acquainted with the Persian language could have hit upon this translation, because in Persian a by-form of כְָֹדְעִיק (םָּבֵד), 'tongue, speech,' namely, כְָֹדְעִיק, means 'flame.'

He appears to me to have confused between what is found also in Persian linguistic usage, and what is expressed only in Persian.—I may take this opportunity to add this remark to my explanation of 42:14b. That Persian friend of the author of H, whose existence is assumed by Professor Margoliouth, might have reproduced the כְָֹדְעִיק אֶלֶּה by the Arab. ptcp. כְָֹדְעִיק, 'una quae turpia verba facit.' But if we are to assume, further, that the late author of H replaced this participle by כְָֹדְעִיק, 'house,' he must have neglected the letter כְָֹדְעִיק in that Arab. word, and read for the latter the Persian כְָֹדְעִיק, 'house.'

1 I may here add a word of explanation regarding my discussion of 43:8 in the August number (p. 516a). I inadvertently assumed, owing to Professor Margoliouth's transliteration of his Arabic (p. 7 of his pamphlet) what he had in view was כְָֹדְעִיק instead of כְָֹדְעִיק (which in Dozy, i. 534, is quoted from a late glossary with the meaning briller, relaire). This of course does not alter my view of the passage, as I see no occasion to have recourse to this sense.
necessitate the conclusion that the newly discovered Heb. text of Ecclus. is a retranslation?

In 30120d, 12ab fathers are exorted to check the defiant spirit of their sons, and we read that they are to apply chastisement to the shoulders (117), the loins (118), the head (119), and the loins (120). It would not be unnatural in this connection for the loins to be twice mentioned. In point of fact they must have been so, for in G we find v. 116 (κἀμιν γόνατα τῶν τριέρων, κ.τ.λ.) and v. 110, while S again has v. 116 (‘bend his head,’ etc.) and v. 120. If now G correctly reproduced the original Ecclus., Ben-Sira mentioned only the neck, apart from the loins, and if S correctly translated the original, Ben-Sira named only the head, apart from the loins, as the subject of chastisement. But what in that case can have actually stood in the original? Further, if S originated from G, whence came the mention of the head by S? Consequently the wise Ben-Sira must have specified not only the stiff neck, but also the proud head of the disobedient son as the subject of discipline. All this is left out of account by Professor Margoliouth when he says in the August number (p. 528 ff), ‘3012 is rendered twice, the Greek has θλίσανον, the Syriac, ἀχαία.’ The first is rendered יהשע, the second יהיב. No, it is simply impossible, as I have shown, that Ben-Sira in this context mentioned, apart from the loins, either only the neck or only the head.

3017 reads in G, ‘better is death than a bitter life, and better is eternal rest than a continuing weakness or disease,’ and in S we read, ‘better is it to die than a wretched life, and (better is it) to go down into Sheol than continual pain.’ H offers, ‘better is it to die than a life of vanity (אשת), and eternal rest than continual pain, better is it to die than life that is evil, and to descend to Sheol than lasting pain.’ What is Professor Margoliouth’s judgment upon this (l.c.)? That the author of H has translated ‘the verse 3017 twice.’ But ‘a life of vanity’ he would have found neither in G nor in S, and lines that commence alike are too numerous in Ecclus. to be traced to textual repetition; cf. יְהִי לָנוּפָה 3119, 10; יְהִי לָנוּפָה 3210; ישׁי יִם לָנוּפָה vv. 13-15; לָנוּפָה vv. 21, 22; לָנוּפָה 3318, 11; יְהִי לָנוּפָה vv. 18-20; יְהִי לָנוּפָה 3612, 13; לָנוּפָה vv. 15, 14.

3020b reads in H ‘as an eunuch embraces a maiden and groaneth,’ and these words belong, as the ‘as’ (אַחֲרָיִית) shows, to what precedes. Then follows, ‘So is he that doeth judgment with violence,’ and then comes ‘as a guardian of a harem who lieth with a virgin.’ For כלל has arisen from כלל by dittography, and כלל is the confidant כַּטְלָל, i.e. the guardian of the harem. Professor Margoliouth (l.c.) says, to be sure, that the first of the three clauses just quoted is an imitation of G, while the third adds the corresponding clause of S. But this is not exactly how the matter stands. It is not necessary to regard כלל as an imitation of the Syr.

Further, as has been already shown, כלל must have been the form written at a time when final letters were not yet employed. Once more, the meaning of the first and of the third of the three clauses above quoted is by no means identical; and that unfaithfulness on the part of a harem-guardian was possible, one sees from the ἐπιθυμία εὗροιχον, κ.τ.λ. of Ecclus 3026 as well as from Ebers’ (‘Egyptian u. die Bücher Mors’, 298 f.) discussion of the marriage of the eunuch Potiphar. Finally, if the author of H had before him the text of G and S, he has dropped 3020a of G (ὁ λόγος ἐκ ζημιώμενος κ.τ.λ.) and 3019d, 20a of S (‘so is he who has riches and uses not his own, and sees it with his eyes and signs’). Professor Margoliouth’s view of the origin of the three clauses of H above quoted is not then probable.

In 3026 of H the exhortation is offered, ‘Give not thy soul to strife.’ This is not meaningless, especially in view of the parallel clause, ‘and stumble not by thine iniquity.’ But it is very probable that 1 and 1 have been interchanged in יְהָעִית v. 28a, just as יְהָעִית is written instead of יְהָעִית in 697, and יְהָעִית, etc., instead of יְהָעִית, etc., in 1322c 1410m 4914e. Ben-Sira may then have intended יְהָעִית, 다וֹם, a word cognate with יְהָעִית (Ps 41a) = ‘pain or grief.’ This is the view of Schechter and Taylor. On the other hand, Margoliouth (l.c.) simply concludes that the author of H misunderstood the Syr. דועוֹמָה. By the way, where then did G get the term לֶאִית? Had Ben-Sira’s grandson also the דועוֹמָה of the Syr. before him?

The preceding investigations appear to me not to render the supposition necessary that the newly discovered Heb. texts of Ecclus. are a retranslation. But, further, this view is for more reasons than one absolutely impossible.
To begin with, the former argument of Margoliouth that the marginal notes are the result of reflexion on the part of the retranslator, has lost much of its weight owing to the circumstance that the MS. A contains no such marginal notes. But even the marginal notes contained in B cannot have the origin ascribed to them by Margoliouth. For instance, the words that stand on the margin of 311b agree with G and S. Hence the marginal notes result from a comparison of H with these two versions. Whence in that case came the text of H?

From many other passages as well it can be positively proved that the text of H cannot be derived from G and S.

Almost at the very beginning of the Heb. Ecclus. we meet with such a passage. In 3a G reads, ‘By deed and word honour thy father, that a blessing from him may come upon thee.’ S agrees with this as far as v.8a is concerned, while in v.8b it has, ‘that all his blessings may come upon thee.’ Finally, H offers, ‘By word and deed honour thy father, that all blessings may come upon thee.’

That is to say, in v.8a H has ‘word’ and ‘deed’ in the reverse order from G and S, while in v.8b there is the general expression all blessings; and not ‘his blessing(s).’

In 64b H says, ‘and the joy of an enemy (or of enemies) shall overtake them’ (the possessors who were formerly indicated by חסרלפ). חסרלפ also mean a single possessor, as in Job 3159, Qoheleth 510, etc. (see all the instances in my Syntax, § 263 k), and in this singular sense חסרלפ is taken in the abrōv of G, where the expressions of H are somewhat more clearly put, ‘and will make him an object of joy to enemies.’ S agrees with H, except that it has ‘his enemies.’ But the simple words of G and S would not have been transformed into what we read in H.

616 reads in H, ‘a bundle (גזרו) of life is a faithful friend.’ גזרו may here stand for a costly vessel, which, filled with myrrh (’גזרו יַפְרָר), was carried in the bosom (ךרי יַפְרָר בֵּן, Ca 13). This small vessel, which gave forth a refreshing scent, might be identified with a sweet-smelling resin, all the more readily that the latter is called by a similar word to גזרו, namely, גזרי (ך, Gn 4311, etc., cf. ויינ in 3720), and if גזרו was written defectively, simply with three letters ויינ, it would be not unlike ויינ, for at an earlier period in the history of writing the letter ו was almost as long as י (cf. Chwolson in my Einleit. p. 152, and Weir, A Short History, etc., p. 79). Hence it is even not impossible that Ben-Sira wrote the second of the two words, גזרי, in the Old Heb. writing found on the Maccabean coins, thus—ץ 4 ג, or, with a somewhat different form of Resha and Yod, found likewise upon the Jewish coins, ג,LETTE. In this way his grandson might render the opening words of 61a by וְקִמַּהוּ ג, and S could offer ‘a true friend is a spice (סמט) of life’ (סמט = pharmacum, ap. Brockelmann, s.v.). But if G and S had been the sources from which the author of H drew, he would not have selected ויינ, ‘a bundle.’

Let us, again, look, for instance, at 621a. The context speaks of wisdom, and in vv.20b. 21a it is said of her that ‘he that is void of understanding cannot bear her, and as a burdensome stone shall she be upon him.’ The expression ‘stone of burden’ (מש, massa) would recall the testing of strength by lifting heavy stones (cf. Zec 122), a passage of extreme interest for the history of civilization), and ‘test’ is expressed in Heb. by a homonym of מש, namely, מס. Might it not then readily happen that ‘stone of burden’ should be replaced by ‘heavy stone of testing’ (אָדָה בּוּקָםְו תְּאָסָר) in Ben-Sira’s rendering? But H could not have arisen from G. So too S, with its ‘like a stone is she heavy’ upon him,’ shows a trace of that מש of H. But neither could the words of S have been transformed into those of H, ‘as a burdensome stone shall she be upon him.’

I might thus go on proving by the comparison of H with G and S, that these versions cannot have been the source of H. This has been shown also by Smend (Theol. Literaturzeitung, 2nd Sept., 1899, p. 506) in the case of the two passages 12b and 13b, and he expressly remarks that the new Fragments as well contain the original of the Heb. Ecclus. and not a retranslation.

But, instead of continuing thus to compare H, G, S, etc., I prefer to point out that I think I have discovered also in these new Fragments traces that H—leaving out of account, of course, scribal errors and secondary alterations or additions—was already in existence before the use of the final
letters came into vogue. For instance, was not the א of מְקָרָה overlooked after בִּלְבֵן of 30a? ב and ג are confused in Jos 4a, etc., as is already noted in Obhla ve-obhla, No. 149 f.—Did not 61b end with מְקָרָה instead of מְקָרָה, the present ending in H? If, as I suggest, the closing words were מְקָרָה, this would explain אֶלָּגָה of G and אֵלָּג (‘like a bull thy possessions’) of S. מְקָרָה or מְקָרָה stands in 3825c, and from this might arise מְקָרָה or מְקָרָה, for the similarly sounding letters ג and א are probably interchanged in 717, where מְקָרָה was written instead of מְקָרָה. By the way, what a clear proof this verse (61b) furnishes that G and S did not supply the basis of H!—םְמִנָּה, ‘people,’ read in 716a for מְקָרָה, originated at a time when it was still the fashion to write מְקָרָה and מְקָרָה.—In 13a Schechter proposes to read מְקָרָה instead of מְקָרָה. He thus assumes that the letter מ was overlooked. This transition might readily take place when מְקָרָה (or מְקָרָה) was written, but less readily when מְקָרָה represented the form of the text.—From מְקָרָה more readily than from מְקָרָה proposed by Schechter might arise מְקָרָה which is now read in 13a. But perhaps מְקָרָה there is concealed מְקָרָה = ‘is there not?’ This would be better than to suppose that מְקָרָה, ‘whence?’ was employed both in v. 18a and v. 18b. That the prefixing of מְקָרָה in later times increased in vogue we know, and the negative sense of מְקָרָה shows itself in Job 311, etc. (cf. S’s מְקָרָה, ‘what?’).—In 35b(2) מְקָרָה became מְקָרָה before these two words had reached the form מְקָרָה מְקָרָה.—The use of מְקָרָה is explicable from מְקָרָה as Dr. Taylor has already remarked. Such is my new contribution to the solution of the question touching the originality of the recently discovered Heb. texts of Ecclus., but I cannot close without an additional remark. Frequently in the course of this investigation the two questions ‘What is possible?’ and ‘What is impossible?’ have come up, and a constant regard to these appears to me to be the most important principle of criticism. Let us then apply this principle in seeking to solve the problem before us, and we shall be constrained to say: That the original Hebrew form of the sayings of Ben-Sira underwent change in the matter of spelling and even in some individual points besides is possible, and thus far it is possible that the newly discovered Heb. texts possess only a relative originality. But that these texts were composed with the ancient versions for their basis is impossible, for a whole series of passages in H cannot have been derived from these. Consequently the view that H is a retransliteration is to be rejected.

The Great Text Commentary.

The Great Texts of Galatians.

Galatians III, 13.

‘Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree’ (R. V.).

Exposition.

‘Christ redeemed us.’—The opening of this verse without any connecting particle lends sharpness and emphasis to the contrast. The Law brought a curse. There it stopped short. That was all it could do. The first thing that Christianity does is to undo this result of the Law by deliverance from the curse.—SANDAY.

The verb has two meanings: (1) ‘To redeem, ransom,’ especially from slavery; this is its general signification. (2) ‘To buy up,’ a somewhat exceptional sense. The former meaning is required here and in 4a; the latter seems best suited to Eph 5a, Col 4a.—LIGHTFOOT.

The deliverance is represented under the form of a ransom. Christ ‘bought off’ the human race from the penalty of its sins, the price paid being His death, cf. 1 Co 6b, 7b, ‘Ye are (were) bought with a price’; 2 P 2, ‘The Lord that bought them’; Rev 5, ‘Thou wast slain and hast redeemed (bought) us to God by Thy blood’; Rev 14, ‘These were redeemed (bought) from among men.’ The word used in these passages, as well as in that before us, is the general word for ‘buying.’ But that the ‘buying’ intended is that more definitely conveyed by the idea of ‘ransom’ appears from the use of the special word for ransom in Mt 20a (= Mk 10a), ‘The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many;’ 1 Ti 2, ‘Who gave Himself a ransom for all.’ The word commonly translated ‘redemption’ (Ro 3, 1 Co 1a, Eph 1, 14, 4a, Col 1a, He 9a) also contains the same special idea of a ‘ransoming.’—SANDAY.

‘Having become a curse for us.’—Having become on our behalf a curse. The position of curse makes it emphatic. The form of expression, ‘become a curse’ instead of ‘become accursed,’ is chosen to mark the intense degree in which the