

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.'¹

¹ Ac 7⁵².

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

ONE 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.²

² Lowell, *On the Present Crisis*.

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 14^{16d. 18c} 15^{3b} 16¹³, is yet not seldom corrected in the body of the text itself. One finds, for instance, הוּא in 6^{11a} 12^{13ab} 13^{2ac}. 11c. 22b 14^{9a. 16c. 23a} 15^{9. 14} 16^{15b. 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 4^{2a} the MS. has רוּחַ, which cannot be derived from רוּחַ, because נֶפֶשׁ חַסִּירָה follows. Rather has the ך of רוּחַ arisen from ך, just as in the O.T. as well these two letters are frequently interchanged (cf. *Okhla we-okhla*, No. 123 f.), and the same interchange has taken place also in Sir 7^{20a} 14^{11a}. Further, in 14^{2a} I find that חֶסְרוֹתוֹ suits v.^{2b}, and this form is therefore incorrectly read by G as חֶסְרוֹתוֹ. 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:—בְּלִשְׁוֹנֶיךָ of 4^{29a} is not touched upon by Schechter in his excellent 'Notes on the Text,' but is correctly rendered by Taylor, 'with thy tongue' (cf. שְׁבַתֶּיךָ in 36^{13b}, whose ך is recognized by both scholars as incorrect). Again, in וּבְמַצּוֹתָיו וְהִגָּה of 6^{37b} we are not to suppose, with Schechter, חֶהְגָּה, but should find a dittography of ן, and thus read the imperat. הִגָּה. In 12^{18b} was not רֹבֵב הַלְחָשׁ intended, and not רֹבֵבָה לְחָשׁ?—Further, how deplorable is

the condition of the MS. B (from which now parts of 30¹¹-51²⁰ 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 תוּחָה of 32^{17b}. For this Schächter would substitute תוּרָה or תוּבַחָה, and, as a matter of fact, the latter word, on account of the phonetic resemblance between the spirant כ and ח, might readily be contracted to תוּחָה. Further, שָׁב in 33^{1b} is changed on the margin to וּשָׁב, but I would suggest that a י following נִיטוּי was overlooked, and that the reading intended was (ו)יֵשׁוּב (ו)נִמְלֵט. כַּעֲנַנּוּ of 35^{20b} is well emended by Taylor to כַּעֲנַנּוּ. Again, הוֹעִילוּ of 38^{21b} stands for הוֹעִילוּ (cf. ו in the imperf. in יִרְפּוּ, etc., in Hos 8³, etc.). The same haplography is the cause of our now reading the anarthrous הִכַּל as a parallel to הַבַּיִת in 50^{1c}. הַהִיכַל 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, גְּרוּלָתָא 3^{18a}, אֵל, etc., 18b, 24a, 4^{2ab}, 21a, 29b, 6^{5a}, 11a, 22b, 7^{23b}, 12^{13a}, 13^{2c}, 6a, 8b, 9a, 14^{9a}, 11a, 16a, 20a, 15^{10a}, 19b, 16^{5b}, 18b, whereas the text of B shows punctuation only in 30^{20b}, 38 [not 33] 26^b, 39^{15c}, 40^{9a}, 10a, apart from יי in v. 26^c. By the way the two points of וַאֲרַח in 42^{3a} and of חִקְרָה in v. 18^a are the sign for *Holem* in the supra-linear punctuation (Smend, p. 5), and the marginal note תָּהֵם in 38^{17a} may have in view the Niph'al of הוּם (cf. וַתָּהֵם, 1 S 4⁵, 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 רַע (= *re'a*) 14^{14c}, and in תָּמָה (= *thimma*) 16^{11b}. Long *i* wants the sign י in תַּעֲרָם 6^{32b} (cf. יַעֲרָם Pr 15^{5b}, 19²⁵). Long *o* is not represented by ו in גְּרוּלָתָא 3^{18a} (where גְּרוּלָתָא might have been intended, but where *gedlōth* is demanded by a point that has been

added), or in עוֹן 32^{7b} 5^{5b}, אַהֲבִיָּה, etc., 4^{12a}, 13^a, הַשִּׁיעַ (= הוֹשִׁיעַ) 13⁶, עִקְבָתָא (= *ikēbōth*) 13^{26a}, תַּעֲבָה 15^{18a}, בְּנֵרִים 16^{4b}. I do not mean to assert that examples of *scriptio defectiva* are entirely wanting in the parts of B which are now published (cf. מוֹקֶשֶׁת = *mōkēshōth* 32^{20b}, לַעֲיִנָּה 36^{4a}), 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 נִי ('not'). Further, from the Persian note found on the margin of 35²⁰ ('this verse [is] from [;] 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 47^{8f}. 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 Ecclesiasticus*, 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.-xlili.*, 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 *ψ* is found only in 30^{11d}, 12^b, 31^{10a}, whereas אֲשֶׁר meets us in 38^{13a}, 14^b, 15^a, 27^b, 44^{20a}, 45^{23c}, 24^c, 47^{13c}, 49^{10c}, 50^{1b}, 2^a, 3^a, 24^c, 27^{cd}, 51^{8b}, 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 כש once (30^{12b}), does not this word occur twice in Qoheleth (9¹² 10³)? Moreover, the employment of the synonymous באשר predominates, occurring as it does in 4^{27b} 12^{12e} 30^{20b} 36^{4a}. Further, in regard to the verb, לירר in 30^{17d} runs parallel with לכות. The ideal affinity of לירר with the Infinitive is thus clear, and my opinion that the forms ליפול, etc. (Mishna, *Berachoth*, ii. 8, etc.), are a syntactical substitute for the use of the Infinitive (*ZDMG*, 1897, p. 331), is supported by the parallelism of לירר and לכות. 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 להוה (Dn 2²⁰, etc., Ezr 4¹², etc.) thus early favour the choice of forms like לירר? In like manner may not כרי, 'according to sufficiency' (= 'corresponding to'), 13^{9b}, or ביוצא בו, 'corresponding to it,' 38^{17b}, or איליו, 'these,' 51^{24a}, 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 Mishnic 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 של, as in שלחו של אדם, 'the sent of a man' (*Berachoth*, v. 5; for instances from the later centuries see my *Syntax*, § 284 e). 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 של is five times

attributed to Ben-Sira in the tradition about his Sayings (cf. *ap.* Cowley and Neubauer, pp. xix ff. the numbers xiv., xliii., lviii., lix., lxviii.).

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

H has in 38^{1b} the verb חלק, but G, which gives $\xi\kappa\tau\omega\epsilon$, and S, which has ܚܝܠܩܬ , express the notion of 'create.' Professor Margoliouth in the August number (p. 528^b) 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 ברא (or ציר), but by the Arab. خلق. Yet the author of H meant to restore the Heb. form of the Sirach oracles, and in Heb. 'create' is ברא, to the choice of which word, moreover, the retranslator would have been guided by the similarly sounding verb employed in S! How then could the supposed *re*-translator have stumbled upon the Arab. خلق (= חלק)? Before this can be assumed, the other possibility must first be examined, namely, whether Ben-Sira may not have written the Heb. חלק. He may have chosen this word, intending it in the sense of 'assign,' which it actually has in 2 Ch 23¹⁸. This conception of 'assign or destine to something' is allied to the conception of 'produce or furnish,' and also the Arab. خلق has the senses 'quantitate et mensura definivit, disposuit, procreavit.' Moreover, if one is to recall the Arab. خلق, 'to be smooth,' reference ought to be made also to the Heb. החליק, 'to smooth,' 'to work over,' in Is 41⁷. The meaning of Sir 38^{1b} 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 חלק of 38^{1b} by 'apportioned.'] The Heb. חלק, as it meets us in 2 Ch 23¹⁸, might be reproduced by $\xi\kappa\tau\omega\epsilon$, and it is not necessary to attribute to the author of H the choice of the Arab. חלק.

But the new Fragments contain also the words 'וכשמש משרקת ונ' (57^{7a}). They thus offer in their text a form of the verb משריק, in point of fact the participle משריק which we have found in a marginal note to 43^{9b}. Here emerges the question of *Arabisms in the O.T.* which I have already discussed in THE

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 אלקים of Pr 30^{81b}. For the notion 'a king with whom is the army' (*al-kaumu*) suits the context excellently. Neither are we to seek in אלקים a corrupted אלקים, nor to render with Wildeboer, *Kurzer Hdcomm.*, 1897, *ad loc.*, 'against whom there is no opposition,' because this rendering does not tally with the עמו, 'with him.' Frankenberg, it is true, who edited *Proverbs* in Nowack's *Handkomm.* (1898), substitutes points (.) for אלקים עמו, and remarks that we must not appeal, in favour of אלקים as an Arabism, to אלנביש, אלמנים, 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 Mühlau, *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 Têman, were renowned for their wisdom (Jer 49⁷, Ob 8, Job 2¹¹, Bar 3^{22f.}). 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 30¹ 31¹, Job 1¹, and 'the wisdom of all the children of the east country,' 1 K 5¹⁰ [Eng. 4⁸⁰]. 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 אלקים, 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 אלנביש, 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 שרק. For it was precisely from this word (which designates the sun-rising, the East) that the בני קדם, or 'children of the East,' whose wisdom is celebrated in the O.T. (1 K 5¹⁰), received the name by which they were known — *ash-sharkijjâna*, 'the Orientals,' 'the Saracens'! It may be added that these two words אלקים and שרק might make their appearance in Hebrew literature all the more readily, because the former has an ideal affinity with the

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

That the text of the new Fragments of the Heb. Eccclus. contains also *Persian* elements has not yet been asserted. But I touch upon this question because Professor Margoliouth in the September number (p. 568^a) says, 'The Greek translator would not have rendered this ["a tongue of light"] by "sparks" (*ἀτμίδας*).' Now, the expression, לשון אש, 'tongue of fire' (Is 5²⁴), is a well-known metaphor for 'flame of fire,' and the same expression as the לשון טאור of Sir 43⁴⁰ is found in the *Targum sheni* (ed. by Moritz David, 1898) to the Book of Esther, at 6¹³, namely, לישנה דנורה, and the Arab. لسان النار is used in the same way; cf. also γλώσσαι ὡσεὶ (γλώσσαι) πυρός, Ac 2³. What right then has Professor Margoliouth to say that the Greek translator could not have reproduced the Heb. 'tongue of light' by *ἀτμίδες* = '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 زبان (*zabân*), 'tongue, speech,' namely, *zabânah*, 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 *καταισχύνουσα* of G by the Arab. ptcp. خانیه, 'una quae turpia verba facit.' But if we are to assume, further, that the late author of H replaced this participle by בית, 'house,' he must have neglected the letter ی in that Arab. word, and read for the latter the *Persian* خانه, 'house.'¹

But are there not other grounds still which

¹ I may here add a word of explanation regarding my discussion of 43^{8d} in the August number (p. 516a). I inadvertently assumed, owing to Professor Margoliouth's transliteration of his Arabic (p. 7 of his pamphlet) that what he had in view was رصف instead of رصف (which in Dozy, i. 534, is quoted from a late glossary with the meaning *briller, reluire*). 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 Eccclus. is a retranslation?

In 30^{11cd. 12ab} fathers are exhorted to check the defiant spirit of their sons, and we read that they are to apply chastisement to the shoulders (^{11c}), the loins (^{11d}), the head (^{12a}), and the loins (^{12b}). It would not be unnatural in this connexion for the loins to be twice mentioned. In point of fact they must have been so, for in G we find v.^{11c} (κάμψον τὸν τράχηλον, κ.τ.λ.) and v.^{11d}, while S again has v.^{12a} ('bend his head,' etc.) and v.^{12b}. If now G correctly reproduced the original Eccclus., 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^a), '30¹² is rendered twice, the Greek has θλάσων, the Syriac, *pakka*. The first is rendered רציין, the second בקע!' 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 (שוא), 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 Eccclus. to be traced to textual repetition; cf. מי, מי 31^{9. 10}; לפני, לפני 32^{9. 10}; דורש vv. 18-15; אל vv. 21. 22; לא 33^{13. 14}; עד vv. 18-20; רחם 36^{12. 13}; תן vv. 15. 16.

30^{20b} reads in H 'as an eunuch embraceth a maiden and groaneth,' and these words belong,

as the 'as' (כאשר) 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 כן נאמן has arisen from כנאמן by dittography, and נאמן is the confidant κατ' ἐξ., *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 נאמן as an imitation of the Syr. *ḥḥḥḥ*.

Further, as has been already shown, כנאמן 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 εὐνούχου, κ.τ.λ. of Eccclus 20^{5a} as well as from Ebers' (*Aegypten u. die Bücher Mose's*, 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 30^{20a} of G (οὕτως ὁ ἐκδιωκόμενος κ.τ.λ.) and 30^{19cd. 20a} of S ('so is he who has riches and uses not his own, and sees it with his eyes and sighs'). Professor Margoliouth's view of the origin of the three clauses of H above quoted is not then probable.

In 30^{21a} 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 ו and י have been interchanged in דין of v.^{21a}, just as איותה is written instead of איותה in 6³⁷, and ושאן, etc., instead of ישאן, etc., in 13^{22c} 14^{10a} 49^{14a}. Ben-Sira may then have intended דין, *dawōn*, a word cognate with די (Ps 41⁴) = '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. *duwānā*. By the way, where then did G get the term λύπη? Had Ben-Sira's grandson also the *duwānā* of the Syr. before him?

The preceding investigations appear to me *not* to render the supposition *necessary* that the newly discovered Heb. texts of Eccclus. 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 31^{1b} 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. Eccclus. we meet with such a passage. In 3⁸ 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 6^{4b} H says, 'and the joy of an enemy (or of enemies) shall overtake them' (the possessors who were formerly indicated by בעליה). בעליה might also mean a single possessor, as in Job 31³⁹, Qoheleth 5¹⁰, etc. (see all the instances in my *Syntax*, § 263 k), and in this singular sense בעליה is taken in the *adverb* 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.

6^{10a} reads in H, 'a bundle (*zērôr*) of life is a faithful friend.' *Zērôr* may here stand for a costly vessel, which, filled with myrrh (צֵרוֹר הַמִּירָה), was carried in the bosom (בֵּין שְׂרֵי יָדַי, Ca 1¹³). 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 *zērôr*, namely, *zōrî* (צִרִי, Gn 43¹¹, etc., cf. וּצְרִי in 37²⁵), and if *zērôr* was written defectively, simply with three letters צֵר, it would be not unlike צִרִי, for at an earlier period in the history

of writing the letter ' 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, *zōrî*, in the Old Heb. writing found on the Maccabee coins, thus— \aleph 4 ז, or, with a somewhat different form of *Resh* and *Jod*, found likewise upon the Jewish coins, \aleph 4 ז. In this way his grandson might render the opening words of 6^{10a} by φάρμακον ζωῆς, and S could offer 'a true friend is a spice (*sammā*) of life' (סמם = '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 צֵרוֹר, 'a bundle.'

Let us, again, look, for instance, at 6^{21a}. 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' (מִשָּׂא, *massā*) would recall the testing of strength by lifting heavy stones (cf. Zec 12³, a passage of extreme interest for the history of civilization), and 'test' is expressed in Heb. by a homonym of מִשָּׂא, namely, מִסָּה. Might it not then readily happen that 'stone of burden' should be replaced by 'heavy stone of testing' (λίθος δοκιμασίας ἰσχυρός) in Ben-Sira's rendering? But H could not have arisen from G. So too S, with its 'like a stone is she heavy¹ upon him,' shows a trace of that מִשָּׂא 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 12⁹ and 13⁸, and he expressly remarks that the new Fragments as well contain the original of the Heb. Eccclus. 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*

¹ \aleph 10 = 'gravis,' or, according to the Milan Codex of the Pesh. \aleph 10 = 'gravitas' (cf. Herkenne, *de Veteris Latinae*, etc., 1899, p. 92), and מִשָּׂא reflects itself also in the *λίθος* of Codd. 23 and 53.

letters came into vogue. For instance, was not the ב of בעבור overlooked after אביב of 3⁸? כ and ב are confused in Jos 4¹⁸, etc., as is already noted in *Okhla we-okhla*, No. 149 f.—Did not 6^{2b} end with חילב instead of חילך, the present ending in H? If, as I suggest, the closing words were חילב כאלופ, this would explain ὡς ταῖρος of G and אַמֶּר לְסוֹן בְּסֶלֶב (‘like a bull thy possessions’) of S. אלוֹפ or אלוֹף stands in 38^{25c}, and from this might arise עליב or עלרך, for the similarly sounding letters ע and א are probably interchanged in 7¹⁷, where לאמר was written instead of לעמר. By the way, what a clear proof this verse (6^{2b}) furnishes that G and S did not supply the basis of H!—עם, ‘people,’ read in 7^{16a} for עין, originated at a time when it was still the fashion to write עמ and עיני.—In 13^{5a} Schechter proposes to read אִם יֵשׁ לְךָ instead of שֶׁלְּךָ. He thus assumes that the letter י was overlooked. This transition might readily take place when אִם (or אַמִּיש) was written, but less readily when יֵשׁ אִם represented the form of the text.—From מאיני שלום more readily than from מאין שלום proposed by Schechter might arise the מאיש שלום which is now read in 13^{18a}. But perhaps in מאיש there is concealed *mâ-yesh* = ‘is there not?’ This would be better than to suppose that מאיני, ‘whence?’ was employed both

in v.^{18a} and v.^{18b}. That the prefixing of *ma* in later times increased in vogue we know, and the negative sense of *ma* shows itself in *Job* 31¹, etc. (cf. S’s אַל, ‘what?’).—In 30^{20b(2)} בנאמנ became כנאמנ before these two words had reached the form כנ נאמן.—The כעת of 35^{20b} is explicable from כעננ, 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 *Eccles.*, 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 retranslation 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 4⁵; the latter seems best suited to Eph 5¹⁶, Col 4⁵.—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 6²⁰ 7²³, ‘Ye are (were) bought with a price’; 2 P 2¹, ‘The Lord that bought them’; Rev 5⁹, ‘Thou wast slain and hast redeemed (bought) us to God by Thy blood’; Rev 14⁴, ‘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 20²⁸ (= Mk 10⁴⁵), ‘The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many’; 1 Ti 2⁶, ‘Who gave Himself a ransom for all.’ The word commonly translated ‘redemption’ (Ro 3²⁴, 1 Co 1³⁰, Eph 1^{7, 14} 4³⁰, Col 1¹⁴, He 9¹⁵) 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