



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE HEBREW ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE problem is so complicated, and my contribution so small, that it would be unsafe to theorize. What one wants to know chiefly is the method of working. What is, for instance, free translation? how is one to know when the translator misread or misunderstood the original, and when he knowingly diverged from it? Take, for example, the conjectural *מִיָּי* *strings* (xxxix. 15 c), which is in the Greek quite different; the only example cited to confirm the conjecture is in an admittedly corrupt Psalm (xlv. 9), and there is no ancient authority for this interpretation of *מִיָּי*. In such a context, and where so many *ש*'s occur, we ought probably to read *ישן שמנים שמהוך* (cf. Is. xxv. 6). Or take *בחרועה*, next line, where Gk. *ἐν ἐξομολογήσει*, Lat. *in confessione*, imply *בתורה*; whether the translator, overlooking the quiescent *ע*, misread the original, or had *בתורה* in it, cannot from the Greek alone be decided. But the Syriac proves almost to a certainty that something is wrong with his original. *מא ובתורתא ובקלא רמא* is either a double translation of *בחרוע* (cf. *Syr. Vulg.*, Num. xxiii. 21), or represents alternative readings. It will, therefore, be more practical to begin with the lesser difficulties.

xxxix. 18 b, *מעצור*, Gr. *ὁς ἐλαττώσει*, implies *מעציר* (cf. Gr. Jer. xxx. 19). *לחשועתו*, Gk. *τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ*; Syr. *לפוקרנה* must therefore be an error for *לפוקרנה*. xxxix. 24 b, *יפתוללו*, Gk. *προσκόμματα* may be an error for *προσχώματα* (cf. 2 Sam. xx. 15, 2 Kings xix. 32, Ezek. xxi. 27, Dan. Theod. xi. 15). xl. 2 a is wanting in the MS., but the Gk. *τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν* and Syr. *תשבוחתהון* imply a misreading, by one of them, of an original form of *חשב* or *שבה*; it must therefore have existed in Hebrew. xl. 6 a, *לחוק*: as the Greek is also

obscure, I should suggest that *γελῶν* or *γελᾶν*, representing an original *לשחול*, fell out as dittograph after *δλίγον*. xl. 6 c, *מעט מעט*: the error here is due to the *מעט* immediately above, the original being *מטעמעט*, formed like *מחעחע*, Gk. *τεθορυβημένος*, Lat. *cor turbatus* (conturbatus); the Syrian translator, however, read it as a form of *עץ*, e. g. *דמתמלך*. xl. 14 b, *פחאם*, Gk. *οἱ παραβαίνοντες*, Lat. *praevaricatores*, implies *פשעים* (cf. LXX, Is. lx. 24, and Vulg. Amos iv. 4). xl. 15 a, *ינקא*. It is to be noticed that, according to the margin, *כי*, 15 b, belongs to this line, and is not represented by Greek or Latin; which suggests that, owing to the similarity of the words of *לַיִן יִינֵק*, the original was corrupted. Gk. *πληθυνεῖ κλάδους*. Compare LXX *πληθυνθήσονται* for *ינובן* (Ps. xcii. 15). xl. 16 a, *בקרדמות*: the editors' conjectural *reeds* is a genuine Talmudic word (cf. *T. B. Shabbath*, viii. 1; *Erubin*, xxii. 1). Gk. *ἄχει* is the same word which stands for *אחי* (Gen. xli. 2, 18). The Latin has a double translation, e. g. *sonant*, the last word in 15 b represents *ἄχει* as verb (Doric for *ἡχει*), and *viriditas* is the meaning of *אחו* in Egyptian (see Brown's *Hebr. Lexicon*). xl. 16 b, *מטר*, Gk. *χόρτου*, Syr. *יורק*, suggests *מָרְרָה*, the error being, perhaps, due to the *פ* immediately above. In Exod. x. 15, *ירק*, the single instance of the word being used for *green* of tree and herb, is represented by Syr. *טרפא*. xl. 18 b, *ומשניהם*, Syr. *ומגנישיהם*, misreading *ומגנישיהם* being generally represented by *קרב* (cf. Syr. xlv. 5 b, 16 b). xl. 19 a, *ילד ועיר*, Syr. *רובתא ואיקרא* is an error of transposition. Read *רובא וקריא*. xl. 19 d, *נחשקת* has not much sense in this context; it is, perhaps, an error for *נחשבת*, the Gk. *ἄμωμος λογίζεται* represents the latter in the sense in which it is often used in the Talmud. xl. 26 d: Nöldeke is right in saying that *מטמן* "can hardly be right" (*Expositor*, May, 1897, p. 358). *βοήθειαν* and Syr. *מערנא* suggest *מנן*, which is so rendered by these Versions in Ps. vii. 11. The latter often represents the word by *מערר מסיע* (cf. Gen. xv. 1, Deut. xxxiii. 29, 2 Sam. xxii. 3, 31 = Ps. xviii. 3, 31; Ps. iii. 4, xxviii. 7, Prov. ii. 7). xli. 1 b, *מכונתו*, Gk. *ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ*, Syr.

ינכסוהי, implies מקנתו (cf. LXX, Gen. xxxi. 18, xxxvi. 7, xlvi. 6). xlii. 6: I would suggest that ת after רפות is a dittograph, and the מ of חכם should be in its place, and to read על אשה מפתח רפות ומקום ידים רפות מפתח (cf. Greek). xlii. 8 d, Dr. Nöldeke says "צנוע is certainly not *humble*. In Jewish Aramaic צנוע is often *prudent*" (ib. p. 363). This is questionable. (1) It means to *put by* in a particular place, to *stow away*; (2) to *hide*, transitive and intransitive; (3) to *be modest*, from the notion of being reserved, retired. In Mic. vi. 8 Rashi and Kimchi explain the word *in secret*, and in Prov. xi. 2 the LXX renders ταπειῶν, and so does Theodotion as represented by the Syro-Hexaplaris, e.g. מכינא (see Buxtorf, whose citations should be read in their context). In this context, *modest* would be more suitable than *humble*. xlii. 9 c, תגור: Dr. Nöldeke is right in saying that the word cannot mean *to commit adultery* in Sirach (ib. p. 362). The ו is an error for ב, and the word is תגבור, a very common word in the Talmud, meaning *to arrive at the age of puberty*, or a woman who is beyond the age of a נערה. This corresponds with the Gk. παρακμάση. But the Syrian translator read תגבור, תצטחא. The former reading is confirmed by the fact that in the parallel passage (*Synhedrin*, 100 b), as cited by the editors (p. xxvii), the word is used, e.g. בגרה. xlii. 10 a: βεβηλωθη may represent תשטה, which the LXX represents by the same word in an identical context (Num. v. 12, 19, 20, 29). xlii. 10 d: only a ר is certain of the last word in the line, which is a remnant of תעצר, Gk. στειρώση. Compare LXX, καὶ στείραν ἐποίησα for ועצרת (Is. lxvi. 9). xlii. 21 a, תכן, Gk. ἐκόσμησεν rather represents חקן (cf. Eccles. i. 15, vii. 13, xii. 9). xliii. 2 a, Gk. ἡλιος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ διαγγέλλων ἐν ἔξοδῳ includes the marginal בנצאתו, e.g. שמש מביע בצאתו. xliii. 2 b, Gk. σκεῶς, Syr. מאנא, imply that חמה is an error for חמת (Gen. xxi. 14, 15, 19), often used in the Talmud for *waterskin*, or simply *vessel*. xliii. 4 a: a ט has fallen out as dittograph. Read ביר נפוח מחמם מוצץ. In the Gk. φυλάσσω is an error for φυσαλοῦν (not φυσῶν, Nöldeke, ib. 360), ἐν ἔργοις καύματος should be ὀργάζει χωνεύματα, Syr.

קנייא *casting work* or *object of casting*. For מוצק compare 1 Kings vii. 37, Job xxxviii. 38. xliii. 4 c: in this very obscure line the Gk. ἀτῦδας and Syr. עטרא imply that in לשאון there is a corruption of עשן. Ἐμφυσῶν points plainly to נושבת as a derivative of נשב *to blow*. But ἀκτίνας can only have a Hebrew equivalent in תְּמִרוֹת, which may be concealed in this and the next line. The word is oftener used in the Talmud (cf. תימור של לבנה, תימור של חמה, *Yoma*, xxviii. 2). I should, however, provisionally suggest the following: לשאון מאורה נמרא נושבת “For a multitude of lights but a (single) coal is blown upon.” But נמרא or גמרה *coal*, is found in biblical Hebrew. xliii. 5 b, אביריו, Gk. πορείαν, Syr. הלכה, plainly imply עָבְרוּ *his motion*. xliii. 6 b, ממשלה, Gk. ἀνάδειξις, Syr. תחויחה, imply that it is a participle with the sense *to liken* an *illustration*. If the first מ were a dittograph the word would be a feminine construct; for we find a plural משלות in the Talmud. The LXX, curiously enough, renders רִמְזָן, παράδειγμα (Jer. viii. 2, ix. 21, xvi. 4). xliii. 8 c: read נְבִילִי for נבלי *the regions above* (cf. Job xxxviii. 20, Mal. i. 4). xliii. 21 b, ונוה error for יכוה, parallel to ישיק, but the Greek translator read it יכבה, ἀποσβέσει. xliii. 22: the corruption in this is mainly due to the proximity of similar words, רועף, עפר, רפא. The Gk. κατὰ σπουδήν must be κατὰ σποδόν, מעפר; read πιαυθείσα for ἀπαντῶσα, and רועף for פורע. Compare LXX πιαυθήσεται for ירעפון (Ps. lxxv. 13). xliii. 23 a, שיק . . is all that is left of the original which corresponds to the Gk. ἐκόπασεν, Lat. *siluit*. From the Gk. λογισμῶ and Lat. *in sermone* it may be inferred that ב before מושבתו fell out as dittograph after שרב. Perhaps שיק is the remnant of יִשְׁק; a reminiscence of Ps. lxxviii. 15, כהחומות רבה, וישק and ישיק also occur in 21 a. The Versions show that we ought to read יִשְׁתִּיק, and רבה is nominative; for it cannot be inferred from ἀβυσσος that the Hebrew was *Hiph.* because the accusative after κοπαζ. is against idiom, and no *Hiph.* occurs in biblical Hebrew. It should be noticed that שחק occurs only four times, and in the instances where the sea is subject κοπάζω is used, and as a neuter verb,

e. g. κοπάσει ἡ θάλασσα (Jon. i. 11, 12). xliv. 16, תע תוא, Gk. ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας. Dr. Nöldeke says, "The puzzle that Enoch is referred to as an example of repentance is removed by the Hebrew תע תוא; read ἐννοίας instead of μετανοίας." It might, however, be urged (1) how can we account for so serious an error? (2) It may be simply the translator's exegesis, of which we have a great many examples in the LXX. Take, for instance, עי. *Kal* is represented sometimes by μανθάνω, διαγιγνώσκω, ἐπισκοπέω (Exod. ii. 4, Deut. viii. 2, Esth. ii. 11). *Niph.* γνωρίζεται, ἐξίλασθήσεται (Exod. xxi. 36, 1 Sam. vi. 3). *Hiph.* συμβιβάζω, σημαίνω, δείκνυμι (Exod. xviii. 16, 20, Gen. xli. 39), ἀναγγέλλω, διδάσκω (Josh. iv. 22, Job x. 2). In such a context the word might have that meaning: the knowledge of God before death may be equivalent to repentance. (3) But it is quite possible that the translator had in his mind the tradition, preserved in the Midr. Rab. (*Gen. Paresah*, 25), that "Enoch was a תוא, sometimes he was עי and sometimes תע, and the Almighty said, 'I will take him up while he is still in his righteousness.'" xliv. 7 d, בתועפות תוא, margin for תוא תוא, Gk. περιστολήν δόξης suggests במעטפות תוא or במעטה תוא (cf. Heb. and Gk. Is. lxi. 3). xliv. 7 e, פעמונים, perhaps, פְּעָמִים, referring to the ordinary priestly garments and to those worn in the Holy of Holies. It should be noticed that תבנית and מנבעות are not mentioned in the list (Exod. xxviii. 40). xliv. 17 d, φωνῆσαι, Lat. *lucem dare* represents misreading φανῆσαι. xliv. 23 c, בקנאו, Gk. ἐν τῷ ζηλώσαι, Lat. *in imitando* implies a form of קנָה; for the Vulg. renders this word *assimilo*, *aequo* (Is. xliv. 5, Job xxxii. 21). xlv. 4 a, עמד, Gk. ἀνεπὸδισεν, Syr. קם, Lat. *impetus est* must be an error for *impeditus est*. xlv. 11 b, נשא error for תעה rather than נטה (editors). Syr. טעה, Lat. *corruptum est*, Gk. ἐξεπόρνευσεν is probably an error for ἐξεπονεύρησεν (cf. LXX, Jer. xlii. 20). xlvii. 15: Dr. Nöldeke says that קלם to praise arose out of καλῶς, *bravo* (ib., p. 363). In Rabbinic literature there are a few instances where the word may be of Greek origin, and then it is spelt קלם, to show that

it is a loan-word. But the verb קלם is identical with the biblical word; the two opposite senses having arisen from the fact that what is a triumph to one is a humiliation or mockery to the person over whom he triumphs (cf. Rashi, Hab. i. 10). לִיץ has also seemingly contrary senses. xlvi. 16 a, b is not in the Hebrew. In b for ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ σου the Latin has *in pace tua*, Syr. לשמעך. At first sight one is led to infer that, owing to the very slight difference between y and l, the Syriac is an error for לשלמך. But one hesitates to do so in the face of the following facts. Lagarde's Lat. xlvi. 16, equal editors' 13, is *dilectus a deo suo Samuhel*, Gk. ἡγαπημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου αὐτοῦ; this is all we have for the Hebrew verse, the second line of which begins המשואל. Does not all this suggest that the two verses are somehow identical, and the cause of corruption is to be traced to the similarity of המשואל, המשלמך, לשמעך, לשלמך? xlvi. 18 c, כברזל, ὡς κασσίτερον, Syr. איך אברא, equal כבריל, which is a more likely parallel to עפרה. xlvi. 22: I do not think that we can infer that the translator "intentionally gives a free translation when he renders" יפיל, διαφθαρή (Nöldeke, *ib.*, p. 348). The Greek represents a misreading יבול (cf. LXX, Exod. xviii. 18). The Latin seems to represent a double translation or alternative readings, *et non corrupet neque delebit*. We may also question the correctness of Dr. Nöldeke's statement that the translator "tries to improve upon the original" when "he writes λαμπάς, which appears more suitable, for *furnace*, תנור, xlvi. 1" (*ib.*). Who says that תנור means *furnace*? Surely, if the Greek, which has a richer vocabulary, uses ἰπνός for *furnace, oven, and lantern*, is it not probable that the Hebrew, with a very limited one, would use תנור for κρίβανος and λαμπάς? xlix. 6 a, ויציתו, Gk. ἐνεπύρισαν, Lat. *incenderunt*, Syr. עקרו, is not an error for אקרו, but implies a misreading ויתצו (cf. Syr. Exod. xxxiv. 13, Lev. xi. 35, xiv. 45, Deut. vii. 5, xii. 3). They stumble over these two words. They render נתן as יצת (Jer. iv. 26) and נתן as יצת (Jer. ii. 15).

N. HERZ.