

Takamitsu Muraoka

Wisdom of Ben Sira

PEETERS

WISDOM OF BEN SIRA

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Founded by Othmar Keel

Editorial Board: Susanne Bickel, Catherine Mittermayer, Mirko Novák,
Thomas C. Römer et Christoph Uehlinger

Published on behalf of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the
Bible+Orient Foundation

in cooperation with
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,
the Institute de Archaeological Sciences, Near Eastern Archaeology section, University
of Berne,
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg,
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,
and the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich

Author

Born in Hiroshima in 1938, educated at Tokyo Kyoiku University (BA, MA), and The Hebrew University, Jerusalem (PhD 1969). Taught at Manchester University (1970–80), Melbourne University (1980–91), and Leiden University (until 2003). Awarded in 2017 by the British Academy the Burkitt Medal in recognition of his research products in the fields of Hebrew syntax and Septuagint studies, many of which have been published by Peeters, among which *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2009), *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (2016), *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew* (2020) and numerous other monographs and articles.

Wisdom of Ben Sira

by

Takamitsu Muraoka

Peeters

Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT

2023

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis publishes monographs, multi-author volumes and conference proceedings in the fields of Biblical Studies (Hebrew Bible and Septuagint), Ancient Near Eastern Studies and Egyptology broadly understood (including archaeology, history, iconography and religion). The editorial board and affiliated institutions reflect the series' high academic standards and interdisciplinary outlook. Manuscripts may be submitted via a member of the editorial board. They are examined by the board and subject to further peer review by internationally recognized scholars at the board's discretion. The series is committed to worldwide distribution, notably through open access publication (Gold or Green). Past volumes are archived at the digital repository of the University of Zurich (www.zora.uzh.ch).

Senior editor: Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch



The open access publication of this book has been facilitated by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-4914-0

eISBN 978-90-429-4915-7

D/2023/0602/41

© 2023, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

To the late Professor Doctor Masao Sekine (1912-2000)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	IX
INTRODUCTION.....	XI
TECHNICAL TERMS AND OTHERS.....	XIII
Prologue	1
Chapter 1.....	15
Chapter 2.....	30
Chapter 3.....	37
Chapter 4.....	57
Chapter 5.....	80
Chapter 6.....	92
Chapter 7.....	119
Chapter 8.....	147
Chapter 9.....	161
Chapter 10.....	175
Chapter 11.....	200
Chapter 12.....	217
Chapter 13.....	228
Chapter 14.....	242
Chapter 15.....	258
Chapter 16.....	269
Chapter 17.....	287
Chapter 18.....	297
Chapter 19.....	309
Chapter 20.....	320
Chapter 21.....	332
Chapter 22.....	342
Chapter 23.....	354
Chapter 24.....	366
Chapter 25.....	376
Chapter 26.....	386
Chapter 27.....	397
Chapter 28.....	405
Chapter 29.....	412
Chapter 30.....	422
Chapter 34 (31).....	435

Chapter 35 (32).....	453
Chapter 36 (33).....	466
Chapter 31 (34).....	479
Chapter 32 (35).....	487
Chapter 33 (36).....	497
Chapter 37.....	512
Chapter 38.....	534
Chapter 39.....	553
Chapter 40.....	572
Chapter 41.....	592
Chapter 42.....	614
Chapter 43.....	637
Chapter 44.....	657
Chapter 45.....	676
Chapter 46.....	696
Chapter 47.....	711
Chapter 48.....	728
Chapter 49.....	741
Chapter 50.....	751
Chapter 51.....	770
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 799

FOREWORD

I have the great pleasure of presenting here results of my renewed study of the book of Ben Sira. My first engagement with this book goes back to the 70s of the last century when I took part in the publication of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Bible in the form of a briefly annotated Japanese translation, accepting a request by Prof. M. Sekine, who had patiently guided me through the initial stage of my study of the biblical languages at Tokyo Kyoiku University, now Tsukuba University, in the early sixties of the last century. Since then some new Hebrew fragments of Ben Sira have been published. I have also deepened my interests in the linguistic studies of the relevant languages, namely Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and Syriac.

Since my expertise lies in linguistics, my observations in the present publication are focused there, and only rarely make some unprofessional remarks on issues touching on the contemporary Judaism, for instance.

It is my hope that this book makes some useful contributions to our understanding of the oldest and full version of the document, namely its Septuagint version.

Once again I am grateful to Peeters Publishers, Mr Bert Verrept and his staff for their encouragement and immense, practical assistance. I am also grateful to the editorial board of *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* for including this volume in their outstanding series.

Prof. (emer.) Dr. T. Muraoka
Leiden University
The Netherlands

18 January, 2022

INTRODUCTION

Our English translation offered here testifies to our principal interest in philological-linguistic aspects of the document. By contrast, Snaith's translation is presented in idiomatic English, so much so that Ben Sira, if he had been resurrected and mastered English in the meantime, would be delighted to hear about a huge crowd cherishing and memorising his proverbs in English garb. We often address text-critical issues with an aim to find out the form of the original Hebrew text. For that purpose we compare the survived fragments of the Hebrew text with its ancient translations, notably the Septuagint, two Syriac versions (Peshitta and Syrohexapla), and the Old Latin version. In the course of our attempt to establish the original Hebrew text, we needed to compare multiple Hebrew manuscripts, and our interest was often aroused as we compared the ancient versions with the Hebrew manuscripts.

Where Syriac is transliterated with the Hebrew alphabet, the vocalisation is ours for the Syrohexapla, whereas for the Peshitta the Mosul edition has been consulted, though not uncritically followed.

Both the edition of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (BHS) and that by Beentjes (1997) present the Hebrew text of every manuscript in two columns. In some manuscripts, however, the text is written as a continuum. This matter need be borne in mind, since it could have implications for our grammatical analysis. Very often a colon is inserted in the manner of *soph pasuq*, and there is space before and after it.

Apart from the printed editions of the Hebrew manuscripts we have also consulted the text as published by M. Abegg in the Accordance Bible and the online edition, <https://bensira.org/>, which includes photos and an English translation of all the Hebrew manuscripts.

Now we present some remarks on points of detail.

Lévi relies only on the manuscript A, whereas Segal has a photo of a page of B on pp. 48f., but hardly ever mentions v.l. in B and others.

In the apparatus criticus of his edition of the Hebrew text Smend does not deal with vv.ll. systematically.

MS F, not incorporated in BHS, has been consulted in Beentjes (1997.109-11) and Abegg.

Since the textual data that concern Greek manuscripts are fully presented in Ziegler's edition, we refer to them only when they throw special light on our investigation conducted here.

Lévi firmly believes in the strong influence of the Peshitta on the Hebrew version, but Smend (503) is rather sceptical. Di Lella (1966) discusses retroversions from Syriac, though he does not discuss at all what historical and cultural circumstances led the Syriac translation to be translated back to Hebrew. Nor does he consider the possibility of the influence in the reverse direction.

The theory of wholesale retroversion from Syr., Gk or even Persian is no longer acceptable in view of the Qumran scrolls of BS, but partial retroversion is possible.

On an attempt to account for divergences between \mathfrak{S} , \mathfrak{G} , and \mathfrak{H} , cf. Joosten 2017.

The Greek text contains here and there data that were added in the course of its transmission, but they do not represent a wholesale new translation or recension. They are known under the label \mathfrak{G}^{II} , and in Ziegler's edition these data are printed in a smaller font. We present them as enclosed within $\langle \mathfrak{H} \dots \mathfrak{H} \rangle$, e.g. 1.5 and 1.7. On \mathfrak{G}^{II} , cf. Ziegler 1965.74f.

On the characterisation of the Heb. of BS out of historical perspective, a bridge between BH and RH, see Hurvitz 1997.83-86.

TECHNICAL TERMS AND OTHERS

Arb.	= Arabic
Arm.	= Aramaic
b	= prefixed to the name of a tractate of the Babylonian Talmud
BA	= Biblical Aramaic
BH	= Biblical Hebrew
BHS	= Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, Stuttgart, ⁴ 1967/77.
CBH	= Classical Biblical Hebrew
CG	= Classical Greek
cp	= conjunctive pronoun
d	= determinate
dem	= demonstrative
Diss., diss.	= Ph.D. dissertation
DJD	= <i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</i>
DO	= direct object
dp	= disjunctive pronoun
du.	= dual
EBH	= Early Biblical Hebrew
f	= feminine
fem.	= feminine
Fut.	= Future
Ἑ	= Greek version
ἔ	= Hebrew version
HG	= Hellenistic Greek
Impf.	= Imperfect
Impv.	= Imperative
Inf.	= Infinitive
IO	= indirect object
j	= prefixed to the name of a tractate of the Palestinian (Jerusalem) Talmud
JA	= Jewish Aramaic
ℒ	= <i>Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem</i> , R. Weber (ed.), 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1969.
LBH	= Late Biblical Hebrew
LXX L	= the proto-Lucianic or Antiochaeian version of the Septuagint. Quoted for Sm, Kg, and Ch from the edition by N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz (Madrid, 1989, 1992, 1996).
m	= prefixed to the name of a Mishnah tractate, e.g. mMeg. = tractate Megillah; masculine
MH	= Mishnaic Hebrew
n, nt	= neuter
NTG	= New Testament Greek
o	= grammatical object
pace	= Lat., in disagreement with, against
Pf.	= Perfect
pl.	= plural

prep	= preposition
Pres.	= Present (tense)
Ptc.	= Participle
QH	= Qumran Hebrew
QHBS	= proceedings of international conferences on Hebrew of Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira and Mishnaic Hebrew. The first conference was held in 1995 at Leiden University.
R	= prefixed to the name of a midrash, e.g. RGn = Bereshit Rabba
RH	= Rabbinic Hebrew
s	= grammatical subject
sg.	= singular
§	= Peshitta quoted from Lagarde 1861
§h	= Syrohexapla quoted from Ceriani 1874
sim.	= similarly
suf. pron.	= suffix pronoun
Syr.	= Syriac
Trg.	= Targum
TO	= Targum Onkelos
v.a.l.	= vide ad locum, i.e. “(Go and) see the place.”
v.l.	= varia lectio, “variant reading”
Vulg.	= Vulgate

PROLOGUE

- 1) Πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν
- 2) καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοῦς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων,

Many and great things have been given to us through the law and the prophets and the others that followed after them,

Since the prologue was written by the translator, there is no Hebrew text, and it is missing in some Greek manuscripts, the Ethiopic and Armenian versions, though both were translated from the Greek text.

Πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων] The gender is most likely neuter, and likewise δεδομένων.

τῶν ἄλλων] The definite article suggests that this is not coordinate with πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων, but is continued with αὐτοῦς, a mpl, which must be carrying on τῶν προφτῶν, hence the followers of the prophets, though we do not know which prophets and authors the author had in mind. Moreover, the “prophets” follow the “law,” and his grandfather is said to have eagerly read “the law and the prophets and the other ancestral writings” (8-10), “the prophets” must mean the prophetic books, which, in accordance with the Jewish terminology, included the historical books such as Sm and Kg, the so-called **רַשׁוּנִים אֶתְרִוּנִים** as against **נְבִיאִים אֶתְרִוּנִים**, the latter designating the prophets *par excellence*, i.e. the major and minor prophets.

This is the first mention of the tripartite division of the Jewish Bible in the post-biblical period. About 150 years later Jesus would speak of “the law, the prophets, and the psalms” (Lk 24.44).¹

κατ' αὐτοῦς] *Pace* “die auf sie gefolgt sind” (*SD*) <κατά + acc.> does not mean ‘after’ in time. Preferable is “die ihnen nachgefolgt sind” (Ryssel).² The governing verb here, ἀκολουθέω, expresses the notion of following someone in spirit and pursuit, rather than in time, thus *pace* “den Sinn der zeitlichen Folge” (Smend 2). This reminds us of a saying like εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι Mt 16.24. The way the cognate adverb, ἀκολούθως, is used is instructive: προσενέγκαι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ὀλοκαυτώσεις ἀκολούθως

¹ Jesus could not possibly have excluded the books other than the Psalms from the Writings (כתובים), but meant to say that in this third division the book of Psalms contained the most significant Messianic sayings. Cf. Koole 1965.

² This subtle difference is well expressed in Ryssel (259, fn. d): “sc. als Schriftsteller; daß die Genannten in der gleichen Bethätigung die Nachfolger der Propheten waren.”

τοῖς ἐν τῇ Μουσέως βίβλῳ .. διηγορευμένοις ‘to offer on it wholly burnt offerings in conformity with what is explicitly prescribed in the book of Moses ..’ 1Es 5.48 (𐤀 Ezr 3.2 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁).³

- 3) ὑπὲρ ὧν δέον ἐστὶν ἐπαινεῖν τὸν Ἰσραηλ παιδείας καὶ σοφίας,
on account of which it is proper to praise Israel for its good education and wisdom,

ὑπὲρ ὧν] Seeing the object of praise is given as Ἰσραηλ, the preposition, as often occurs with τινος, is indicating here a motive or argument for praise. The message treasured in those sacred writings leads to, and facilitates, good education and wisdom.

ἐπαινεῖν] On this verb governing a gen. for a reason of praise, see τὸν μὲν Σίμωνα τῆς εἰς τὸν βασιλέα κηδεμονίας ἐπαινεῖ ‘he praised Simon for his concern about the king’ 4M 4.4. Likewise ib. 1.10, and for further examples in SG, see SSG § 22 **oa**.

- 4) καὶ ὡς οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας δέον ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμονας γίνεσθαι,
and since it is incumbent not only on them, those who read, to become capable of understanding,

αὐτοὺς] We analyse this as proleptic, referring in advance to its referents, i.e. τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας.⁴ Though not very frequent, such a use of pronouns does occur in SG, e.g. καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν αὐτὴν τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς οἶκον Δαγῶν 1K 5.2L.⁵ For more examples, see SSG § 85. It so happens that this phenomenon is mostly confined to SG, where an influence of post-biblical Hebrew can be suspected. This example may be witnessing to our translator also being under such an influence, a rare case of Hebraising Greek; on this issue, see below at 21-23 (pp. 6-8).

τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας] The present aspect points to habitual readers, not casual ones. In 1Es 8.8, 9, 9.42 the actor noun of the verb, ἀναγνώστης, is part of the official title of Ezra, e.g. 8.8 πρὸς Ἐσδραν τὸν ἱερέα καὶ ἀναγνώστην τοῦ νόμου κυρίου, and its Aramaic equivalent is 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁 (MT Ezr 7.12), and in the preceding verse in Hebrew we find 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁, a profession which would subsequently become a title for professional Bible

³ We would slightly revise the entry for ἀκολουθέω in *GELS*: read “to follow after (κατὰ + acc.)” instead of “to come after in time.”

⁴ Cf. “.. nicht allein die, die lesen (können)” (*SD*) = Syh. 𐤁𐤏𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁, where 𐤏𐤁 outside of the relative clause can hardly function as a direct object of the participle, hence ‘not only to them, i.e. to those who are capable of reading.’

⁵ Rahlfs’ edition lacks τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ in agreement with 𐤀.

scholars, γραμματεῦς in the Gospels, one engrossed in the γραφή, ‘scribes’ in the traditional parlance.

ἐπιστήμονας] Not only the subject of an inf., but also its predicate, if it inflects in respect of case, appear in the accusative.

5) ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐκτὸς δύνασθαι τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας χρησίμους εἶναι
6) καὶ λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας,

but also on eager students to be able to become useful to outsiders as well whether through speaking or writing,

τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας] Being an explanatory addition to τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας, it shows that the latter is actually a reference to enthusiastic students and scholars. The selection of the striking expression, τοῖς ἐκτὸς, is indicative of these scholars’ awareness of being insiders forming a closed circle.

Another example of <article + adverb> is οἱ πόρρωθεν ‘those who are from far away’ Is 33.13. For more details, see SSG § 6 a (ii).

It is not explicitly said that these eager students were ignorant of Hebrew. The same can be said of a related adjective, φιλομαθής (13). Any translation of the Bible is, in a sense, a concise commentary. Through his translation the translator can engage fellow coreligionists or scholars in an exchange and discussion, some of whom may be able to compete with the translator in terms of the knowledge of the original language(s) of the Bible.

7) ὁ πάππος μου Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἑαυτὸν δοῦς 8) εἷς τε τὴν τοῦ νόμου
9) καὶ τῶν προφητῶν 10) καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατριῶν βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν

My grandfather, Jesus, having devoted himself for a very long time to the reading of the law and the prophets and the other ancestral books

ἐπὶ πλεῖον] LSJ s.v. ἐπὶ III [+ acc.] 10 reads: “*up to, as far as, to the extent of.*” Another example applied to an extent of time is ἐποίησεν .. πότον .. ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ‘he threw .. a banquet lasting as long as seven days’ Es 2.18 ο’.

πλεῖον, comparative of πολύ, exemplifies an elative value often carried by the comparative degree; see SGH § 23 ba and LSJ s.v. πολὺς d.⁶ The selection of the neuter gender might be indicative of ἐπὶ πλεῖον being equivalent to ἐπὶ πλεῖονα χρόνον, cf. τὸν πλεῖονα χρόνον Ba 4.35.⁷ Alternatively it might

⁶ Ryssel (260) sees here a genuine genitive: “*der sich mehr [als andere] .. gewidmet .. hatte.*”

⁷ BDAG s.v. ἐπὶ at the end assigns ‘for a long time’ as the meaning of this combination at Ac 20.9, 24.4, quoting several other instances including 3M 5.8 (correct to ‘5.18’). One could add a few more LXX examples, e.g. διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πλεῖον γεγονέναι τὸν πότον ‘because the banquet had lasted long’ Ju 13.1.

indicate this ancient scribe's general devotion to the study of the scriptures. Ἀνάγνωσις here is unlikely to mean 'silent reading,' but 'reading aloud,' on which he would expend quite an amount of physical energy.⁸

11) καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἱκανὴν ἔξιεν περιποιησάμενος
and having acquired considerable proficiency in them

12) προήχθη καὶ αὐτὸς συγγράψαι τι τῶν εἰς παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν ἀνηκόντων,
he also was induced to put together in writing something that relates to education and wisdom

εἰς παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν ἀνηκόντων] As regards the combination ἀνήκω εἰς, LSJ s.v. **I 3** ἀνήκω cites from Dinarchus (4/3 cent. BCE) τὰ ἀδικήματα εἰς ἀργυρίου λόγον ἀνήκοντα 'illegal affairs which involve a monetary affair.'

13) ὅπως οἱ φιλομαθεῖς καὶ τούτων ἔνοχοι γενόμενοι
so that those eager students, having become fascinated by these also,

ἔνοχοι] an adjective which usually means 'punishable, accountable (for some illegal or wrong-doing),' what obviously does not fit our context.⁹ On the other hand, the sense adopted in our translation is unknown prior to the LXX. Our understanding is largely based on contextual considerations.

The grammatical analysis of τούτων is also tricky. The preceding καὶ renders it unlikely that it refers back to τούτοις (11), but the pronoun is probably neut., referring back to τῶν εἰς παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν ἀνηκόντων (12).

⁸ So "über die Maßen" (SD), "avec persévérance" (BJ), and "industriously" (Snaith).

On the likelihood that, in the ancient world, the notion of our 'silent reading' was unknown, see Muraoka 2022.131 ad פּרָא בּוֹרַח לִקְרָא IQS 6.6.

⁹ Cf. "se soumettant aussi à ces disciplines" (BJ), a meaning which we think is unattested elsewhere. As debatable is "... eingehend beschäftigen würden" (Ryssel); "instructed in these things" (Box - Oesterley) is allegedly based on a v.l. ἐνηχοι, which is said to agree with Syh., but there we find *sāmō'ē* 'hearers.' LSJ defines it as "*sounding within*" (< ἦχος 'sound'), which is an absolute misfit in our context, and the dictionary cites our passage with a caveat ("s.v.l."), defining its meaning as "*acquainted, conversant with*," presumably a source of Box - Oesterley's translation. Smend (2) also mentions Syh. as according with ἐνηχοι, and refers to ἐνηχέω and ἐνήχησις as used in Patristic Greek. Lampe (1962.474) mentions as senses of ἐνηχέω **3 a teach**, **b. pass. + acc., be informed about**, **4 pass. be inspired**, which last is somewhat close to our analysis, but of ἔνοχοι(!). Another reason why the sense usually assigned to this adjective is unlikely here is that in that sense it takes a dative.

14) πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπιπροσθῶσιν διὰ τῆς ἐννόμου βίωσης.

they may add much more through living in conformity with the law.

πολλῶ] a dative indicating a difference in degree, see *SSG* § 22 **wp**, ‘by much, to a great degree.’¹⁰

ἐπιπροσθῶσιν] a hapax in LXX, and s.v. ἐπιπροστίθημι in LSJ we see that it is extremely rare in Greek in general, and for Act. *add beside* is indicated.¹¹ “Adding to their current knowledge” is probably meant.

15) Παρακέκλησθε οὖν

Do therefore allow me to urge you

A Pf. Impv., which is rather rare, is used with a sense of urgency and insistence, cf. *SSG* § 28 **hca**.¹²

16) μετ’ εὐνοίας καὶ προσοχῆς 17) τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιῆσθαι 18) καὶ συγγνώμην ἔχειν

to read enthusiastically and attentively and leniently to judge

ποιῆσθαι] A Mid. voice form of ποίεω often takes a verbal noun as here as a periphrasis, in this case, for ἀναγινώσκειν; for more examples, see *GELS* s.v. **II 1**.

συγγνώμην ἔχειν] a combination well-known to CG, cf. LSJ s.v. συγγνώμη **1 a**. No case of <+ ἐπί τινι> is mentioned there, but cf. ἴλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου ‘Be forgiving of the wickedness of Your people’ Ex 32.12.

19) ἐφ’ οἷς ἂν δοκῶμεν 20) τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν πεφιλοπονημένων τισὶν τῶν λέξεων ἀδυναμεῖν·

those matters over whose interpretation worked hard at we could think that our ability was not good enough for some of the words,

δοκῶμεν] Seeing that the translator is excusing himself in advance, is the pl. in lieu of δοκῶ a case of the so-called “diplomatic *We* for *I*”? For a few examples in SG, see *SSG* § 7 **h**.

¹⁰ Cf. ἐπετίμων αὐτῶ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν Mk 10.48.

¹¹ Our example here deserves a mention, being earlier than the only Act. case mentioned as attested in Longinus of the Byzantine period. Interestingly Longinus is also speaking about eager students: χρηστομαθεία.

¹² According to Apollonius Dyscolus III 101 it indicates τὴν ἔκπαλαι ὀφείλουσαν διάθεσιν γενέσθαι ‘the condition that should have emerged long since.’

The form here can be parsed as Indic., so e.g. “Vous êtes donc invités” (*BJ*), though the Impv. appears to us more plausible.

“we may be thought” (*NETS*), for instance, points to an alternative interpretation of the verb, which also means “to have the appearance of being or doing, seem” (*GELS* s.v. 1). Our translation makes the translator sound more honest, not insinuating that his readers could be mistaken in their reading.

The selection of the subjunctive with ἄν as here is often made in generalising relative clauses; for details, see *SSG* § 29 c.

κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν] < + κατὰ + acc.> is not recorded in *LSJ* under φιλοπρονέω. We suggest that our case means *facing, over against* (*GELS* s.v. κατὰ 3); another instance adduced there is στῆθι κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐγὼ κατὰ σέ Jb 33.5, where it is not about a challenge to fight, but a discussion and dialogue. Our translator confronted and faced some *cruces interpretis*.

In *GELS* s.v. we have defined the sense of ἑρμηνεία as “act of translating.”¹³ ‘Act of interpreting’ might be acceptable here, seeing every written translation or oral interpretation presupposes interpretation. However, if our author is referring here to what he mentions below with μεθερμηνεύσαι (30), this latter can only signify ‘translation.’ To add to the complication, ἑρμηνεύω in SG signifies ‘to translate’ only¹⁴ as in ἔγραψεν .. Συριστὶ καὶ ἡρμηνευμένην ‘I wrote .. in Aramaic and translated (it)’ 2E 4.7. As he spoke to his brothers, Joseph had ἑρμηνευτῆς Ge 42.23 beside him. See *GELS* s.v. ἑρμηνεία, ἑρμηνεύς, ἑρμηνευτῆς, ἑρμηνεύω.¹⁵

τισὶν τῶν λέξεων] Wagner (1999.118) is probably right in saying “Die wortsyntaktische Verknüpfung mit λέξεις schränkt .. auf übersetzungstechnisches und rhetorisches Unvermögen ein,” in other words, possible imperfections in his translation did not concern the substance of the text. Readers are reassured that the translator has no trouble with Hebrew.

The dative case with ἀδυναμέω indicates confrontation, cf. δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ ‘I shall prevail over him’ Ho 11.4, cf. *SSG* § 22 wi.

21) οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ 22) αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστί λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῆ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν·

for some things said in Hebrew on their own, when translated into another language, are not equivalent.

ἰσοδυναμεῖ] *LSJ* lists a derived adjective ἰσοδυναμος meaning ‘equivalent in meaning’ in Menander Protector (6 cent. CE).

Smend (3) maintains that the translator is referring to lexemes (*Wortlaut*), not to what the Heb. original means (*Sinn*), and that he is excusing himself

¹³ Cp. “gemäß der Übersetzungskunst” (*SD*) and “Übersetzungsarbeit” (Ryssel), but *pace* “interpreting” (Box - Oesterley).

¹⁴ Elsewhere we encounter the sense ‘to explain’ also. E.g. ἑρμήνευέ μοι ‘Interpret (that) to me!’ Soph. *OC* 398.

¹⁵ Cf. Wagner 1999.126f. and Spicq 1994 I.312-17.

not for his free translation (*Freiheit*), but for the verbatim one (*Wörtlichkeit*). A comparison, however, between the preserved Hebrew text and the Greek rendition makes it plain that he took a fair bit of freedom with the Hebrew text. Take just a look at three verses for which we have only one Hebrew fragment preserved, MS A:

1.8	בני במאמר ובמעשה כבד אביך עבור ישיגוך כל ברכות	ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου, ἵνα ἐπέλθῃ σοὶ εὐλογία παρ' αὐτοῦ·
1.9	ברכת אב תיסד שרש וקלת אם תנתש נטע	εὐλογία γὰρ πατρός στηρίζει οἴκους τέκνων, κατὰρα δὲ μητρὸς ἐκριζοῖ θεμέλια.
1.10	אל תתכבד בקלון אביך כי לא כבוד הוא לך	μὴ δοξάζου ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ πατρός σου, οὐ γάρ ἐστὶν σοὶ δόξα πατρός ἀτιμίας·

Of course some of the differences even in this minimal selection of the text could have arisen due to the translator's *Vorlage*, which may have read differently than MS A. All the same, the dictum of *Traduttore traditore* could have applied at any point.

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] i.e. 'in the original language.'

Ἐβραϊστὶ] Smend (3) justly underlines that this is the first occurrence of this adverb in Greek, and here the identity of the language is in no doubt, "Hebrew" as distinct from "Aramaic." Not a single scrap of the book in Aramaic has come down to us.

μεταχθῆ] from a compound verb, μετάγω.¹⁶

23) οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, 24) ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι
25) καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων 26) οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν
ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.

Not only these, but also the Law and the Prophets and the rest of the books themselves differ not a little when said on their own.

ταῦτα] Most likely a reference to his own translation in Greek, so "dieses [Werk]" (Ryssel).

καὶ αὐτὸς] The pronoun refers to ὁ νόμος only, but must be meant to be construed with the two coordinate noun phrases as well. The syntagm < αὐτός - article - noun phrase > is used when special discourse focus is intended, cf. SSG § 14 d. The author must be referring to differences between the Hebrew / Aramaic original of the Jewish Bible and its Greek translation, which implies that, in the second half of the second century BCE, when the Hebrew Ben Sira was done into Greek, "the Septuagint" was already in existence.

¹⁶ LSJ lists our place as the only case for the specific sense 'translate from one language to another.'

Here we have yet another formulation of the tripartite division of the Jewish Bible. From αἱ προφητεῖαι it is clear that the earlier οἱ προφηταί refers to books, not to prophets as persons. Moreover, the noun used here, despite “die Prophezeiungen” (*SD*), is not a reference to prophetic utterances, but the books coming under the label מִגְּבֻרֵי אִיּוֹם.

μικράν] not attributively used, ‘small difference,’ but as an object complement: ‘they have the difference not to a small degree.’ In such a case there is a nominal clause latent, e.g. ἔλαβον τὴν πόλιν ὑποχείριον ‘they got the city under their control’ 2M 12.28, i.e. ἡ πόλις αὐτοῖς ὑποχείριος. Cf. *SSG* § 61 c.

The selection of οὐ instead of μή is partly conditioned by the fact that the adjective is predicatively used, on which point see *SSG* § 83 be.

ἔχει] The number discord is only apparent. The three preceding coordinate terms are most likely perceived as a single unit, “the Scripture,” cf. *SSG* § 77 m.

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα] see above at line 22.

27) Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλείως
For in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of King Euergetes,

Euergetes II, i.e. Ptolemy VIII, was on the throne in the years 170-117. The translator arrived in Egypt, then, in 132 BCE. Wilcken (1906.321f.) demonstrated that ἐπί τινος is mostly used with reference to a ruler no longer in life.¹⁷ Hence the translation was apparently undertaken after 117 BCE.¹⁸

28) παραγενηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ συγχρονίσας
having arrived in Egypt and tarried (there),

συγχρονίσας] SG also uses χρονίζω in the sense of *to tarry* as in ἐχρόνισα ἕως τοῦ νῦν ‘I have tarried up to now’ Ge 32.4, see *GELS* s.v. 1. Moreover, συγχρονέω is used in the sense of ‘to be contemporary (with someone),’ see *LSJ* s.v. 1. This could be taken to mean that the translator was a contemporary of Euergetes till the latter’s death, what would fit our position that the translation was undertaken after 117 BCE.¹⁹

¹⁷ Whilst Smend (3) objects, Moulton & Milligan (1930.233b), s.v. ἐπί, accept Wilcken’s position (1899 iii 320f.). See also Deissmann 1895.255-57.

¹⁸ Box - Oesterley (293) assumes that the translation was complete shortly after the translator’s arrival in Egypt, hence sometime between 132 and 116, though no mention is made of Wilcken’s (1906) study.

¹⁹ Having taken this detail into account, Smend (3f.) comes round to Wilcken’s (1906.321f.) position. Harl et al. (1988.111) postulates instead a period of 132-17 BCE.

29) εὐρῶν οὐ μικρᾶς παιδείας ἀφόμοιον

having found a copy (of a writing) of not negligible educational (value)

According to Auvray (1957.285-87) the last three words signify “an example of considerable intellectual pursuit.” Since, however, they are explicitly referred to as βίβλον (30) to be translated, we would rather prefer our analysis.

ἀφόμοιον] a substantivised adjective, n.sg. Its meaning here is disputed. It appears to be a rare word. LSJ lists only two references, each with its own meaning: **1.** *unlike* and **2.** *likened, made like*.²⁰ Our case is put under the second, glossed as *copy*. Several derivatives are registered, semantically all related to the notion of similarity, e.g. βουλόμενοι ἀφομοιοῦν ‘(painters) wishing to make a copy’ Plato, *Crat.* 424d. Should we opt for *copy*, it would imply that our translator did not inherit the original manuscript of the document from his grandfather, but used a copy of it.²¹

30) ἀναγκαιότατον ἐθέμην καὶ αὐτός τινα προσενέγκασθαι σπουδῆν καὶ φιλοπονίαν τοῦ μεθερμηνεῦσαι τήνδε τὴν βίβλον

I also deemed it most necessary to expend some eagerness and strenuous effort in order to translate this book

ἀναγκαιότατον] The superlative of ἀναγκαῖος < ἀνάγκη ‘necessity’ is here used with the value of elative, cf. *SSG* § 23 **bb**. Another example is πλεῖστον ποιεῖν γάλα ‘to produce very much milk’ *Is* 7.22.

ἐθέμην] One might be tempted to see here a rare instance of Hebraised Greek in the strain of $\square\psi$ with double objects as in $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ 2Kg 17.34.²² $\square\psi$, however, is never used in the sense of ‘to consider A as B or to be B’ as τίθημι is used here.²³

καὶ αὐτός] In view of the nom. case of the pronoun it need be construed with ἐθέμην. Though it comes to the same thing, καὶ ἐμέ could have been said. With “also” the author must be thinking of his predecessors, who had translated the Bible into Greek, not of his grandfather.

²⁰ In a personal communication (14.10.2020) Dr A.A. Thompson informs me that the entry in TLG for this lexeme adduces a total of six cases, in all of which its meaning appears to be ‘similar.’

²¹ In $\square\psi$ here we read $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$, and in the margin pertaining to $\square\psi$ there is a most interesting addition: $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ ‘which resembles that of his grandfather.’ This marginal note must be attributed to a later scribe or Bishop Paul of Tella, to whom we owe *Sy*.

²² On this use of $\square\psi$, see BDB s.v. **Qal 5 b**.

²³ On this use of τίθημι, see *GELS* s.v. II **9**, where the remaining attestations mentioned from the high register of Literary Greek – 2M, 3M, Jb. Thus *pace* “.. nahm ich mir vor” (*SD*).

LSJ s.v. **B II 5** mentions τῶν θεμένων ψυχὴν ἁρμονίαν εἶναι ‘of those who assume that the soul is a harmony’ Plato, *Phd.* 93c.

προσενέγκασθαι] In LSJ s.v. προσφέρω **C 3** we find an illuminating instance: *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν καὶ μηχανὴν προσφερόμενος* ‘applying all of his zeal and inventive skill’ Polybius 1.18.11.

φιλοπονίαν] ‘labour of love.’ Our author used an affiliated verb, φιλοπονέω, at line 20 above.²⁴

τοῦ μεθερμηνεῦσαι] Cf. our remarks on ἐρμηνεία (20), p. 6.

The grammatical, syntactic analysis of the gen. τοῦ prefixed to the infinitive is quite a challenge. We would suggest three alternative explanations:

- i) A τοῦ infinitive can indicate a purpose or result, what was known to CG. An example out of many in SG is τοῦ κατασκέψασθαι αὐτήν ‘in order to spy it out’ 2K 10.3, preceded by ὅπως ἐρευνήσωσιν τὴν πόλιν καὶ κατασκοπήσωσιν αὐτήν, cf. SSG § 30 **baa**. The article in our case was not necessarily added in order functionally to differentiate between μεθερμηνεῦσαι and the coordinate προσενέγκασθαι, which cannot be final-resultative, but is a direct object of ἐθέμην. No rigid functional opposition exists between the two structures; cp. τοῦ ἰδεῖν Ge 8.7 vs. ἰδεῖν ib. 8, where both mean ‘in order to see.’
- ii) Grammaticalisation. In general, the gen. τοῦ prefixed to an inf. can have diverse values. However, there are also attested very many cases in which such a τοῦ does not appear to carry any of those specific values except as a mere morphological marker like Engl. *to* in *To see is to believe*, for one cannot say **See is believe*. Cp. Οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι 3K 13.16 with οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἐπιστρέψαι ib. 4, cf. SSG § 30 **d**, 57 **e**. The syntactic function of the inf. clause here is that of a direct object of the transitive verb, τίθημι, cf. πιστεύω τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἐν γῆ ζώντων ‘I believe in seeing the Lord’s bounties in the land of the living’ Ps 26.13, cp. πιστεύοντες θεοῦ καθεστάναι τὸν νόμον ‘believing that the law originates with God’ 4M 5.25. Πιστεύω in the sense of ‘to accept the veracity of’ never takes a genitive, hence in the latter example there is no τοῦ added. The use of the τοῦ inf. in this function is unknown to CG, see SSG § 30 **d**.
This alternative is not contradictory to the first one, since a bare inf. can be final-resultative in force.
- iii) Equivalent to τοῦ joining two nouns or noun phrases as in τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ δούλου. What logico-semantic relation obtains between the two components is irrelevant here. Cp. πόλεις τοῦ κατοικεῖν ‘towns to dwell in’ Ez 45.5 with τὴν γῆν τῆς παροικήσεώς σου ‘the land for you to settle down there’ Ge 28.4, cf. SSG § 30 **bdc**. Our σπουδὴν καὶ φιλοπονίαν

²⁴ Whilst Wagner (1999.134) maintains that, unlike σπουδῆ, this word is negative in its nuance, the first component, φιλο-, seems to suggest otherwise, hence not hard work imposed on the translator against his will.

τοῦ μεθερμηνεῦσαι may be compared with τῆ τῶν δρόμων φιλοπονία ‘laborious effort of running’ Demosthenes 61.24.

τήνδε τὴν βίβλον] The ὅδε series of demonstrative pronouns can be used for near deixis, pointing to a referent situated in the speaker’s or writer’s proximity, whether physically or mentally, cf. *SSG* § 13, e.g. τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τήνδε ‘this epistle’ 3M 3.25, where King Ptolemy is addressing his Jewish readership. As he wrote this, was the translator’s copy of the Hebrew book lying on the desk? Literally his *Vorlage*. Alternatively, he may be referring back to what he had just alluded to with ἀφόμοιον, i.e. “a copy of this book.” An example of such an anaphoric value of this demonstrative pronoun is διὰ τήνδε τὴν αἰτίαν ‘for this reason (just mentioned)’ 2M 12.40.

In our context βίβλος can only mean *written text*, not *writing material* such as papyrus roll. This holds for its diminutive, βιβλίον (33).

31) πολλὴν ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ ἐπιστήμην προσενεγκάμενος
expending much sleepless care and expertise

ἀγρυπνίαν] a favourite word of our author; nine out of its ten occurrences in SG! Twice it is used in the literal sense of *insomnia*, e.g. Θυγάτηρ πατρὶ ἀπόκρυφος ἀγρυπνία Si 42.9, where it is about a father who misses sleep without his daughter’s knowledge. By contrast in Ἀγρυπνία πλοῦτου ἐκτίκει σάρκας, καὶ ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ ἀφιστᾷ ὕπνον Si 34.1 the parallelism with μέριμνα may suggest abnormal concentration of attention. Either way our author’s extraordinary degree of dedication is indicated. Cf. *GELS* s.v.

32) ἐν τῷ διαστήματι τοῦ χρόνου
in the course of the time

33) πρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ πέρας ἀγαγόντα τὸ βιβλίον ἐκδόσθαι
in order to bring (the task) to completion and publish the book

πρὸς τὸ .. ἐκδόσθαι] <πρὸς + acc.> can indicate a purpose as in ὠχύρωσεν αὐτὴν πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν τῆς χώρας ‘he fortified it for the security of the area’ 1M 14.37, and this feature is here extended to an infinitive as in πρὸς τὸ πείσαι τὸν βασιλέα ‘in order to persuade the king’ 2M 4.45.

34) καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ βουλομένοις φιλομαθεῖν 35) προκατασκευαζομένους τὰ ἥθη 36) ἐννόμως βιοτεύειν.

also for the benefit of those in the diaspora desiring to study eagerly as they acquaint themselves beforehand with the (local) habits to live in conformity with the law.

We are faced with a syntactically demanding formulation.

τοῖς must be a *dativus commodi*. But the following *acc. ptc.*, the grammatical subject of which must be the same as that of the preceding *dat. ptc.*,²⁵ must be perceived as circumstantial and expanding the preceding *inf.*,²⁶ φιλομαθεῖν, whose subject is at the back of the author's mind. The *inf.* at the end, βιοτεύειν, is likely final in value, indicating a purpose of advance preparation.

What about the *acc.* case of τὰ ἥθη? Προκατασκευάζω is not a very frequent lexeme in Greek in the first place. LSJ s.v. mentions in the middle voice one instance of < + *acc.* > Polybius 4.32.7, but φίλους.²⁷ Alternatively we can think of the *acc.* of respect, i.e. 'in terms of, as regards.' Cf. "in Beziehung auf ihr sittliches Verhalten" (Ryssel) and "in respect of their moral culture" (Box - Oesterley).

Is our author addressing prospective immigrants? In that case, ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ would mean 'those who, on arrival in this diaspora, desire to ..'.

The definite article of τῇ παροικίᾳ could be generic,²⁸ hence a diaspora anywhere, but the author can be thinking of *the* local Jewish community in Egypt.

This second prologue is preserved only in MS 248. It is a biography on the translator, a grandson of the author. Though dismissed by Box - Oesterley (316, f.n. a) as "spurious," it has some value on the author Ben Sira as known by his grandson and perceived by him. Hence we offer here its translation with a simple commentary. The Gk text has been included in Ziegler's edition of the book itself, but a translation of it is not widely available.²⁹

One manuscript, 248 of the 13th cent., the most important of three manuscripts said by Ziegler (64) to represent the Lucianic recension, contains an alternative prologue entitled Σοφία Ἰησοῦ Υἱοῦ Σιραχ. Important to note is that the author of this alternative prologue is not the translator of the Hebrew document, for the author of the Hebrew original is referred to as 'his grandfather,' whereas in the prologue preserved in the mainline Greek tradition the author is referred to as 'my grandfather.' Thus we have here a biography of the translator, but not an autobiography.

The Greek text is to be found in Ziegler (127). We provide here an English translation for the sake of comparison and information.

²⁵ According to Ziegler C^c and some minuscules read -votς, which grammatically reads smoother, perhaps inferior precisely for that reason.

²⁶ For this analysis, see SSG § 31 dh.

²⁷ Cf. "dass sie sich (ihre) Gesinnung (so) zurichten lassen" (SD) and "réformer leurs mœurs" (BJ). Given the relative infrequency of the verb in Greek, the non-attestation of <+ *acc. rei*> might be accidental.

²⁸ On this question, see SSG § 1 d.

²⁹ It is found in the King James version of the Bible, Peters 1913.5, and SD.

Πρόλογος¹

Ἰησους οὗτος Σιράχ μὲν ἦν υἱός, ἔγγονος¹⁾ δὲ Ἰησοῦ ὁμωνύμου αὐτῶ· οὗτος οὖν ἐν χρόνοις κάτω γέγονε²⁾ μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν, καὶ μετὰ τοὺς προφήτας σχεδὸν ἅπαντας· ὁ οὖν πάππος αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς καθὰ καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ,³⁾ φιλόπονός τε γέγονεν ἀνὴρ ἐν Ἑβραίοις καὶ φρονιμώτατος, ὃς οὐ μόνον τὰ ἐτέρων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συνειληθέντων ἀποφθέγματα συνήγαγεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἴδιά τινα ἀπεφθέγγετο, πολλῆς συνέσεως καὶ σοφίας γέμοντα· ἐπεὶ οὖν τὴν βίβλον ταύτην ὁ πρῶτος Ἰησοῦς σχεδόν τι συνειλεγμένην καταλιπὼν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ᾤχετο, Σιράχ οὗτος⁴⁾ μετ' αὐτὸν πάλιν λαβὼν τῶ οἰκείῳ παιδί καταλίπειν Ἰησοῦ⁵⁾· ὃς δὴ ταύτης λαβόμενος⁶⁾, εἰς ἅπασαν ἐναρμόνιον σύνταγμα συνήγαγε, σοφίαν ἐπὶ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶ τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τῶ πάππου ὀνόματι κεκληκώς,⁷⁾ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς σοφίας ὀνόματος ἀγαπητῶς μᾶλλον ἔχειν τὸν ἀκροατὴν⁸⁾ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῆς⁹⁾ τῆς βίβλου μελέτην ἐπισπόμενος· λόγους οὖν φρονήσεως, αἰνίγματά τε καὶ παραβολὰς περιέχει, καὶ μερικὰς τινὰς παλαιὰς θεοφιλεῖς ἱστορίας, περὶ τε ἀνδρῶν εὐαρεστησάντων τῶ θεῷ, καὶ εὐχὴν καὶ ὕμνον αὐτοῦ¹⁰⁾· ἔτι δὲ ὧν¹¹⁾ ὁ θεὸς εὐεργεσιῶν ἠξίωσε τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὧν¹²⁾ ἔπλησε κακῶν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν. ὁπαδὸς τοῦ Σολομῶντος οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς γέγονεν¹³⁾, οὐδὲν ἦττον ἐκείνου περὶ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ παιδείαν εὐδοκιμήσας, πολυματῆς ἀληθῶς καὶ ὦν καὶ καλούμενος.

Prologue

This Jesus was a son of Sirach, whereas he was a grandson of Jesus, his namesake.² Therefore this person was born in a period quite after the exile and the restoration, and after nearly all the prophets. Now his grandfather Jesus, as he himself testifies, became a man enthusiastic over Hebrew documents³ and very prudent, who collected not only sayings of his intelligent predecessors, but himself made some sayings full of much understanding and wisdom. When, therefore, Jesus the elder, leaving this book nearly finished, departed from among the mankind, this Sirach inherited it and bequeathed it

¹ In the edition by Hart we read at the top
ΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑCTΙΚΟC Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιραχ

The first word must be a misprint for ΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑCTΙΚΟC, i.e. Ἐκκλησιαστικός.

² On the difficulty of establishing the name of the author, see Box - Oesterley 270f., 291f., Segal 1-3, and Burkill (1962.15a).

³ *Pace* Peters (1913.5) and *SD*: “unter den Hebräern.”

to his own child, Jesus, who, taking it, put together into one complete, homogeneous compilation and called it *Wisdom* after his own and his father's, but also his grandfather's name, by the very name of *Wisdom* lovingly inviting the hearer to study this very book.

As its contents, therefore, it had words of prudence, intriguing sayings, proverbs, some particular, old stories dear to God about people with whom God was pleased, and also supplication and hymn over Him. Also kind deeds God conferred on His people as meriting them, and abundant calamities He visited their enemies with. This Jesus became a successor of Solomon, having attained distinction no less than the latter as regards wisdom and education, and he was, and was called, truly erudite.

¹⁾ Including this case, ἔκγονος occurs in LXX as often as 34 times. Except here the Göttingen LXX and the edition of Rahlfs consistently use this form, though there are variants ἔγγονος preserved. Ἐκγονος appears typical of Koine Greek. Moulton - Milligan has no entry for ἔγγονος.⁴ In a document originally composed in Gk we find a masc. form: τοὺς ἐκγόνους τῶν ἱερέων 'the descendants of the priests' 2M 1.20. Otherwise, even parallel to υἱός we find a neut. form as in πλὴν τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ μόνον καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτοῦ διὰ παντός (בני twice) Si 45.13. It is not absolutely certain that the meaning of ἔγγονος in the case under discussion is specifically 'grandchild' or more generically 'offspring,' though the translator calls the author of our document, ProL. 7.

²⁾ Γίνομαι, *pace* "lebte" (SD), hardly means 'to live.'

³⁾ See ProL. 7-11.

⁴⁾ I.e. the author's son.

⁵⁾ I.e. the translator.

⁶⁾ ταύτης λαβόμενος] Λαμβάνομαι occasionally takes a gen. ο. A couple of other examples are ἐλάβοντο ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τῆ ἀριστερᾷ αὐτῶν τῶν λαμπάδων Jd 7.20 A and λαβόμενος τῆς χλαμύδος 2M 12.35.

⁷⁾ The name meant here is: "Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, son of Jesus," cf. the name given to the book in the Peshitta as it appears in the ed. Lagarde: אִתְּךָ רַבִּי יֵשׁוּעַ בֶּן־יֵשׁוּעַ.

⁸⁾ Not ἀναγνώστην 'reader.' It is assumed that the book is to be read aloud in the presence of people listening to its content.

⁹⁾ αὐτῆς] On the pronoun αὐτός added to the articular substantive in order to underscore the feature of identity, see SSG § 7 bj.

¹⁰⁾ αὐτοῦ] The pronoun may be referring to the author, i.e. supplications made by him and prayers said by him. However, the reference to God is more likely.

¹¹⁾ ὧν] The selection of the gen. case is due to the verb ἀξιόω in the following relative clause; its rection is < acc. pers. + gen. rei >. The clause could be rewritten as εὐεργεσίας ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἠξίωσε τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. The acc. εὐεργεσίας is parallel to several preceding substantives, all indicating the contents of the book: λόγους etc.

¹²⁾ ὧν] See the preceding note. The verb πίμπλημι takes the same rection. Hence we could rewrite the clause as κατὰ ὧν ἐπλησε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν.

¹³⁾ γέγονεν] The Pf., not Aor. ἐγένετο, indicates that when the translator emerged, the author had already attained the status indicated here. The same analysis applies to γέγονεν above in the second clause.

⁴ Cf. BDAG s.v.

CHAPTER 1

- 1.1) Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ κυρίου
καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
*Every wisdom is from the Lord
and it is with Him for ever.*

ἐστὶν] This copula in the present tense is serving both nominal clauses. On εἶναι as a copula, see *SGG* § 94 **d**, **da**.

- 1.2) ἄμμον θαλασσῶν καὶ σταγόνας ὑετοῦ
καὶ ἡμέρας αἰῶνος τίς ἐξαριθμήσει;
*The sand of the seas and the drops of rain
and the days of eternity, who could count up?*

One is challenged to count up these three things. However, ἄμμος, which occurs 32 and 5 times in SG and NTG respectively, is never used in the plural. On the collectively used singular, see *SSG* § 21 **c**.

ἐξαριθμήσει] The future tense here expresses theoretical possibility, *SSG* § 28 **ge**.¹ The compound form of this verb means something different from its simplex counterpart: ‘count up, count completely, work out the total’ vs. ‘to count, reckon.’ Cf. Ἀνάβλεψον δὴ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμησαὶ αὐτούς Ge 15.5, where \mathfrak{H} is the same for both and the translator is unlikely engaged in stylistic variation. Thus “auszählen” (*SD*) is preferable to “zählen” (Ryssel). Note also ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἣ οὐκ ἐκμετρηθήσεται οὐδὲ ἐξαριθμηθήσεται ‘.. the sand of the sea which cannot be completely measured nor counted’ Ho 1.10, where the two semantically affiliated verbs are both prefixed with ἐκ-.

τίς] We have the interrogative pronoun not fronted six times in this passage: 2, 3, 6 (2×), 7 (2×). This must be a deliberate rhetorical style. For other examples in SG, see *SSG* § 76 **h**, p. 637.

Smend (6) sees a poetic break after ὑετοῦ, but syntactically speaking, the whole verse constitutes a single clause as shown by the acc. of ἄμμον .. καὶ σταγόνας. The same holds for his analysis of vs. 3, and 49.4.

¹ Pace Segal (4) \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{N} \mathfrak{M} \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Z} \mathfrak{M} \mathfrak{N} \mathfrak{M} ‘who could count?’ is not free interpretation.

- 1.3) ὕψος οὐρανοῦ καὶ πλάτος γῆς
καὶ ἄβυσσον καὶ σοφίαν τίς ἐξιχνιάσει;

*The height of the sky and the width of the earth
and the abyss and the wisdom, who could track (them) out?*

ἄβυσσον καὶ σοφίαν] The lack of parallelism with the two preceding phrases is manifest and stands out. Accordingly Smend (6) reconstructs βάθος ἄβύσσου ‘the depth of the abyss’ and, with Pesh.,² deletes σοφίαν as “spätere Korrektur.” However, this and the preceding verse must be meant to be a comparison between wisdom presented in vs. 1 as the very theme of this passage and the whole book alike on one hand and the features of the universe on the other. Thus it is most appropriate to find wisdom mentioned at the end as something beyond human investigation.³

ἄβυσσον] “Abgrund” (*SD*), and the German translators believe “‘Tiefe des Meeres’ ist eine weiterführende Textinterpretation” (*SD* II 2173). In LXX, however, the word lies in the lexical field of water as shown in αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἄβύσσου Ge 7.11, 8.12, and in Ez 31.4 it indicates a source of rivers, something that cannot lie deep in the underground, cf. *GELS* s.v.

ἐξιχνιάσει] Once again a compositum with ἐκ- is used as against its simplex in ἐκ νεότητός μου ἵχνευον αὐτήν [= σοφίαν] ‘since my youth I have been tracing it’ 51.15. Cf. τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς τίς ἐξιχνιάσεν; ‘what is in heaven, who has tracked out?’ Wi 9.16.

- 1.4) προτέρα πάντων ἔκτισται σοφία
καὶ σύνεσις φρονήσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος.

*Prior to everything (else) the wisdom was created
and intelligent understanding is from eternity.*

προτέρα πάντων] thus prior to the creation of the physical universe, cf. the famous introduction to the fourth Gospel: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν Joh 1.1-3.

προτέρα, a fem. sg. nom., is a subject complement. The gen. case of πάντων is that of comparison, cf. *SSG* § 22 g.

² The Syriac translator has very widely departed with his ܡܝܫܟܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ (4) ܡܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ‘the vast abyss, who could measure (it)? (4) then all these wisdom is vaster ..’.

³ *SH* agrees with Ziegler’s text. Snaith (9, n. [a]) is wrong: “Some witnesses add or wisdom.” No Gk MS omits σοφίαν.

- 1.5) ¶ πηγὴ σοφίας λόγος θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις,
καὶ αἱ πορεῖαι αὐτῆς ἐντολαὶ αἰώνιοι ¶
*The fountain of wisdom is God's word in the highest,
and its paths are eternal commandments.*

A verse is found in some manuscripts but printed by Ziegler in a small font.

- 1.6) ῥίζα σοφίας τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;
καὶ τὰ πανουργεύματα αὐτῆς τίς ἔγνω;
*The origin of wisdom, to whom was it revealed?
And its wonderful feats, who came to know (them)?*

[ρίζα] Does the author mean where wisdom originates, what it was like in the beginning, just as every plant has a root before it starts growing? Or is the word meant as the fundamental part of wisdom? According to Segal (5) it could also denote something invisible like the root of a plant in the ground.

[πανουργεύματα] a word usually used in *sensu malo*, ‘knavery, trick.’ So cp. ἔστιν πανουργία καὶ αὕτη βδέλυγμα Si 19.23 and μήποτε πανουργεύσεται (מְרָעָה) 1K 23.22. However, the sense must be positive here. In ἄβυσσον καὶ καρδίαν ἐξίχνευσεν καὶ ἐν πανουργεύμασιν αὐτῶν διανοήθη Si 42.18 the sense of our substantive is neutral, since it is applied to the abyss as well, not only to a human heart. A derived adjective is used when a father advises his son: πανοῦργος ἔση (מְרַעֵת) Si 6.32, see further in *GELS* s.v.

- 1.7) ¶ ἐπιστήμη σοφίας τίνι ἐφανερώθη;
καὶ τὴν πολυπειρίαν αὐτῆς τίς συνῆκεν; ¶
*Knowledge of wisdom, to whom was it revealed?
And the rich experience of it, who understood it?*

In view of the use of synonyms, ἀποκαλύπτω vs. φανερόω, πανούργευμα vs. πολυπειρία, and γινώσκω vs. συνίημι this verse was probably added as a rewritten version of vs. 6.

- 1.8) εἷς ἔστιν σοφός, φοβερὸς σφόδρα,
καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ.
*(Only) one is the wise one, very awesome,
seated on His throne.*

Φοβερὸς is an epithet of the God of Israel in κύριος ὑψιστος φοβερὸς Ps 46.3. Note also ἅγιον καὶ φοβερὸν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ps 110.9 and τῷ φοβερῷ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματί σου Od 12.3.

- 1.9) κύριος αὐτὸς ἔκτισεν αὐτὴν
καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτὴν
καὶ ἐξέχεεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ,

*It is the Lord, He, who created it
and saw and counted it up
and poured it on all His works,*

αὐτὸς] The pronoun, added to a substantive, is identificatory, hence the use of a cleft sentence in our translation. ה may have read הוא הוה ברא .⁴ Another example is αὐτὸς (> ה) κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἦξει ‘the Lord Himself (, taking the initiative,) will come for judgement’ Is 3.14. Cf. *SSG* § 7 bj.

εἶδεν] Whether or not the created wisdom was visible or not, the verb echoes the creation narrative with the repeated καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεός Ge 1.4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31. Cf. also τότε εἶδεν αὐτήν (= σοφίαν) Jb 28.27.

ἐξηρίθμησεν] No human can count up some of the elements created by God (vs. 2), but God could count up even wisdom, something invisible.⁵

πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ] Not only animate creatures, but also inanimate? In order to function right the latter might need a measure of wisdom.

- 1.10) μετὰ πάσης σαρκὸς κατὰ τὴν δόσιν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐχορήγησεν αὐτὴν τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

*with each flesh in accordance with His gift,
and He gave it liberally to those who love Him.*

μετὰ] Difficult. The translator’s *Vorlage* should have read על , not עם . Cf. *Vulg.*, which has accordingly rectified it with *super*. Likewise סל ‘al.’⁶

κατὰ τὴν δόσιν αὐτοῦ] Probably meant to say that He gave wisdom generously and prudently to meet each creature’s specific need. The same phrase means something different in δὸς ὑψίστω κατὰ τὴν δόσιν αὐτοῦ Si 32.12.

There follows a secondary addition:

¶ ἀγάπησις κυρίου ἔνδοξος σοφία, οἷς δ’ ἂν δπτάνηται, μερίζει αὐτὴν εἰς ὄρασιν αὐτοῦ ¶

The love of God is glorious wisdom. To those He makes Himself visible, He gives it as a gift for a sight of Him.

⁴ Segal (3) has not added הוה .

⁵ In spite of the close affinity in thought to Jb 28.27, where we find הוה ספד , Segal’s (3, 5) הוה ספד is unlikely here; the Piel verb cannot be made to mean “He narrated it [= wisdom] to Himself, going over all its features.” The translator likely read הוה ספד .

⁶ ס cannot mean “unter allem Fleisch” (*SD*).

- 1.11) Φόβος κυρίου δόξα καὶ καύχημα
καὶ εὐφροσύνη καὶ στέφανος ἀγαλλιάματος.

*The fear of the Lord is glory and pride
and pleasure and a crown of joy.*

καύχημα] As what flows out of one's piety it cannot mean boasting, but a status of which one need not be ashamed of, but can be justly proud of.

ἀγαλλιάματος] Segal's (3) רַחֲמֵי has little to do with 'joy.' That we do have תַּפְאֵרֶת for στέφανον ἀγαλλιάματος 6.31 would not justify such a restoration. The following verse is entirely about joy brought about by wisdom.

- 1.12) φόβος κυρίου τέρπει καρδίαν
καὶ δώσει εὐφροσύνην καὶ χαρὰν καὶ μακροήμερουσιν.

*The fear of the Lord would delight the heart
and give joy and pleasure and longevity.*

μακροήμερουσιν] On longevity resulting from piety, see also below at vs. 20.

τέρπει .. δώσει] In vs. 11 what flows out of piety was stated as permanently valid and already recognisable among the pious. Here what is bound to result, a reassurance, cf. *SSG* § 28 **gb**. Segal's (3) תַּפְאֵרֶת .. חַיִּים could be improved with יָתֵר .. חַיִּים.

There follows a secondary addition:

¶ φόβος κυρίου δόσις παρὰ κυρίου, καὶ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγαπήσεως τρίβους καθίστησιν. ¶

The fear of the Lord is a gift from the Lord, for it lays paths also on love.

ἐπ' ἀγαπήσεως τρίβους] Some see here a genitive phrase, e.g. "sie stellt auf die Pfade des Liebens" (*SD*), but an **o** of the verb is anticipated.⁷

- 1.13) τῷ φοβουμένῳ τὸν κύριον εὖ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων,
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ εὐλογηθήσεται.

*To him who fears the Lord it would be good at the end,
and on the day of his death he would be praised.*

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων] Parallel to the immediately following ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ it most likely refers to the last period of his earthly life, not one particular day, hence pl., cf. ἐπ' ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ 'in his last days' Si 30.1 and Je 17.11 (יְתֵרֵי אֲבָרָם). See also 3.26.

⁷ Ryssel supplies it as "[den Gottesfürchtigen]."

Εὖ ἔστι or εὖ γίνεται is often used impersonally with dat. pers. So e.g. ὅπως ἂν εὖ ἦ ὑμῖν Je 7.23, ὅπως ἂν εὖ μοι γένηται Ge 12.13. What is meant here is probably that the person would die happy and content. The parallel εὐλογηθήσεται would hardly mean ‘would be blessed.’⁸ Not a prayer said by a priest at the last rite, but rather a eulogy said by mourners at his funeral. Cf. ὁ δὲ κύριος εὐλόγησεν τὰ ἔσχατα Ἰωβ ἢ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν Jb 42.12. Segal (6) thinks that the text means ‘he will die in good old age, leaving righteous sons and good reputation,’ which sounds somewhat tautologous with the first half of the verse.

1.14) Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον,
καὶ μετὰ πιστῶν ἐν μήτρᾳ συνεκτίσθη αὐτοῖς.

*The most important about wisdom is fearing the Lord,
and with the faithful it was created together with them.*

The first line is a rewritten version of Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ Pr 1.7. The anarthrous θεοῦ, which could be misunderstood in the Hellenistic world as a reference to any of tens of divine beings known there, has been replaced with the articular τὸν κύριον. Our translator was also perhaps aware that in two other affiliated places (Pr 9.10 and Ps 111.10) as well the phrase found is יהוה יראת, not יראת אלהים. The genitive phrase is subject to diverse interpretations, whilst the verb phrase makes it plain that it is an objective genitive. Another advantage of the selection of the verb phrase is an option of aspects; the present aspect underlines that the piety in mind is an habitual, permanent attitude. At Pr 1.7 Ⓞ significantly departs from Ⓢ: יראת יהוה: ראשית דעת חכמה ומוסר אוילים בון: The relative sequence of the two genitive phrases of the first half has been reversed, and that sequence fits our text better, the central theme of which is wisdom. Ⓢ is more accurately represented in the third line of the expanded Ⓞ rendition: εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως. For the reason just mentioned Ben Sira preferred the first line of Ⓞ with σοφία to the third with αἰσθησις.

Ἀρχή] a word that translates ראשית, the first noun in the Hebrew Bible. There both words can only denote ‘beginning’ in a temporal sense. A shift from first in time to first in importance or value is easily understandable, “*that which is fundamental and of prime importance*” (GELS s.v. 5).⁹ This latter appears to be meant with ראשית here and also with תחלה in יראת חכמה יראת יהוה Pr 9.10 (Ⓞ ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου). The same semantic shift appears to have taken place with ἀρχή. Likewise at Si 10.12.

⁸ On “*to say words of praise for*” as one of the senses of εὐλογέω, see GELS s.v. 2.

⁹ Cf. Smend 10 and Segal 6, and “principe” (BJ). Some retain the temporal sense, e.g. “Anfang” (Ryssel, SD) and “beginning” (Box - Oesterley, NETS).

αὐτοῖς] The associative dative is very common, e.g. οὐχὶ τοῖς πατρά-
σιν ὑμῶν (וְיִנְיָבְנֵי־תְּאֵ) διέθετο κύριος τὴν διαθήκην ταύτην, ἀλλ’ ἢ πρὸς
ὑμᾶς (וְיִנְיָבְנֵי) De 5.3. Another instance of this associative dative used with a
συν- verb as here is συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς ‘he sat next to them’ Ge 15.11. See
SSG § 22 wj. The preposition μετὰ here does not imply that the faithful were
co-creators, for right at the start Ben Sira said “Every wisdom is from the
Lord.” The preposition here comes under *GELS* s.v. 14: “marks a person
whose concern something is.” It is equivalent to Germ. *bei* as in *Bei mir ist
alles in Ordnung*, ‘With me everything is OK.’ In other words, the faithful had
wisdom already at their birth, cf. “zugleich” (Ryssel, *SD*).¹⁰ Is this a doctrine
of predestination?¹¹ However, αὐτοῖς can be analysed as a dative of advan-
tage, ‘for their benefit.’

1.15) μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰῶνος ἐνόσσευσεν
καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν ἐμπιστευθήσεται.

*With people it built an eternal foundation
and with their posterity it shall be trusted.*

μετὰ] The same analysis as for vs. 14 applies, cf. “parmi” (*BJ*).

ἐνόσσευσεν] The verb νοσσεύω is related to νοσσιά ‘nest.’ A metaphori-
cal use of קָנַן ‘to make a nest (קָן)’ was presumably known to our translator.
An example is found in בְּרַב אֹכֵל יִקְנֶיךָ חוּלִי Si 37.30 D (Θ ἐν πολλοῖς βρώμα-
σιν ἔσται νόσος), where, however, he has translated it simply as ἔσται. For
birds their nest is of fundamental importance.

Apparently following Smend (11) in part, Segal (3) retroverts Θ to עַם
הַקָּנָה מְעוֹלֵם חֶסֶד אֲנִשֵּׁי. If this had stood in his *Vorlage*, the translator’s com-
mand of Hebrew would be incredibly deplorable. We would rather think that
his Hebrew text read something like עַם אֲנִשֵּׁי סוּד עוֹלָם קִנְיָה.

ἐμπιστευθήσεται] For ἐμπιστεύω as used here *GELS* has proposed
a sense 1 “to trust in, give credence to.” Its future tense here could then
carry an injunctive, prescriptive value (SSG § 28 gc). However, a sense
unknown prior to SG: 3 “to demonstrate as reliable and trustworthy” could
also apply, and in that case its future tense would indicate a theoretical pos-
sibility (SSG § 28 ge). Two instances, both from our book, have been men-
tioned: 36.21 (passive) and 50.24 (active). The latter is especially illumi-
nating on account of a thought similar to our case here and its formulation:
ἐμπιστεύσαι μεθ’ ἡμῶν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ‘May He demonstrate His mercy
with us as reliable!’.

¹⁰ But note 𐤀𐤎 ‘*ammhon*’ *’etbaryat*.

¹¹ Cf. Box - Oesterley 319 fn.

- 1.16) πλησμονή σοφίας φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον
καὶ μεθύσκει αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῆς·

*Fearing the Lord leads to abundant wisdom
and it treats them liberally with its fruits.*

πλησμονή] Used mostly with reference to food in contrast to μέθη ‘intoxication.’ See its verb, μεθύσκω, in parallelism. Thus φάγεσθε στέαρ εἰς πλησμονὴν καὶ πίεσθε αἶμα εἰς μέθην Ez 39.19, but we also find πλησμονὴν ἀτιμίας ἐκ δόξης πίε ‘Drink a full measure of ignominy from glory (?)’ Hb 2.16. However, καρποί ‘fruits’ here need be understood in a broader sense, ‘produce,’ not just edible fruits. Cf. its specification in τὸν καρπὸν τῆς γῆς σου, τὸν σῖτόν σου καὶ τὸν οἶνόν σου καὶ τὸ ἔλαιόν σου De 7.13. Either way the word here is used figuratively, not literally.

φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον] The selection of the synonymous φόβος κυρίου in vs. 18 and elsewhere does not imply, *pace* Smend (11), a mistranslation of יהיה יראתו. An infinitive clause can serve as the subject of a nominal clause as in καλὸν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν με ἢ ζῆν με Jn 4.3, see *SSG* § 30 **bea**. Smend (10) has not queried the authenticity of Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον vs. 14.

- 1.17) πάντα τὸν οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐμπλήσει ἐπιθυμημάτων
καὶ τὰ ἀποδοχεῖα ἀπὸ τῶν γεννημάτων αὐτῆς.

*It could fill their entire family with (their) desires
and their storehouses with its produce.*

αὐτῶν] a reference to the pious. Segal’s (3) בְּיַהֲוֵהוּ is hardly justifiable.

ἀποδοχεῖα] a word used in a different context at ἀποδοχεῖα ὑδάτων ‘water reservoirs’ Si 39.17 practically denoting huge amounts of water; ~~Ⲛ~~B reads only אוצרות¹², a Heb. word which can mean ‘treasure’ as well as ‘treasure-house.’ The same Gk phrase appears also in Si 50.3 for מקנה, i.e. מקנה מים.

ἐπιθυμημάτων] A verb of filling with acc. and gen. is normal, but not with <ἀπό + gen. rei> as in the second half. The same phenomenon occurs in πλησον Σιων ἀρεταλογίας σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης σου τὸν λαόν σου Si 36.19, where the parallel clause displays the normal construction, translating ומכבודך את היכלך¹³ as against the second half with מלא ציון את הודך.

¹² The suffix pronoun, as noted by Smend (359), cannot refer to מים, which would require אוצרות or אוצרותם. At the end of the first half of the verse, which has not been fully preserved in a fragmentary manuscript, there probably stood מים נד, read in BSH cautiously as נד. Ⲙ reads ὡς θημωνιά ὕδωρ ‘water as a heap,’ which undoubtedly alludes to כְּמֹדֵי נְלִים Ex 15.8 and נְד מִים כְּמוֹ נְד Ps 78.13.

¹³ A marginal variant, מהדררך, is most likely a secondary adjustment to מכבודך.

These two cases witness to the influence of Hebrew on the translator. Another instance in SG is ἔπλησεν τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς μου (עֲרִיבֵנִי) Je 28(51).34; more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἐμπλήμι 2.

- 1.18) στέφανος σοφίας φόβος κυρίου
ἀναθάλλων εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν ἰάσεως.
*The fear of the Lord is a crown of wisdom,
causing peace and health restored.*

ἀναθάλλων] This is a verb normally intransitive, ‘to sprout afresh.’ Its causative use is unknown prior to SG.¹⁴ The text must be about conflicts in families or societies restored and diseases cured.

Then follows a secondary addition:

- ¶ ἀμφοτέρα δέ ἐστιν δῶρα θεοῦ εἰς εἰρήνην,
πλατύνει δὲ καύχησις τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. ¶
*Both are gifts of God for peace,
pride increases to those who love Him.*

πλατύνει] The intransitive use of πλατύνω as well as the sense ‘to increase’ are unknown prior to SG. This new sense is possibly attested in αἱ θλίψεις τῆς καρδίας μου ἐπλατύνθησαν ‘the sufferings of my heart increased’ Ps 24.17 (עֲרִיבֵנִי).

- 1.19) [καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτήν,]
ἐπιστήμην καὶ γνῶσιν συνέσεως ἐξώμβρησεν
καὶ δόξαν κρατούντων αὐτῆς ἀνύψωσεν.
*[and He saw it and counted it up.]
He caused data and knowledge through understanding to pour out like rain
and He heightened the glory of those who grip it.*

The first line must be an accidental intrusion from vs. 9.

ἐπιστήμην καὶ γνῶσιν] If these are to shower down on the pious, they must denote something concrete rather than abstract qualities or capabilities.¹⁵

ἐξώμβρησεν] ἐξομβέω is a denominative from ὄμβρος ‘rain.’ Smend (13) makes ὁ φόβος τοῦ κυρίου the grammatical subject of this verb, but we are not so sure about it. Smend goes as far as to draw to the translator’s attention αὐτῆς as an error for αὐτοῦ.

¹⁴ St Paul is possibly so using it in Phi. 4.10. On its normal value, see BDAG s.v. 2.

¹⁵ Smend (13) writes: “Von der Erkenntnis, die die Gottesfurcht verleiht, erwartet man hier nicht zu hören.” What should one expect to hear of then?

- 1.20) ῥίζα σοφίας φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον,
καὶ οἱ κλάδοι αὐτῆς μακροημέρευσις.

*To fear the Lord is what is fundamental to wisdom,
and its branches are longevity.*

ῥίζα σοφίας] See above at vs. 6.

κλάδοι] Branches are what emerge when a root grows, cf. Si 24.16.

μακροημέρευσις] **𐤌** *ḥayyē da-l-‘ālam* ‘eternal life’ is probably indicative of Christian influence.

- 1.21) ¶ φόβος κυρίου ἀπωθεῖται ἁμαρτήματα,
παραμένων δὲ ἀποστρέψει πᾶσαν ὀργήν. ¶

*The fear of the Lord removes sins,
one who persists does away with every anger.*

ὀργήν] The addition of πᾶσαν renders it likely that this is about human anger.

- 1.22) Οὐ δυνήσεται θυμὸς ἄδικος δικαιωθῆναι·
ἢ γὰρ ῥοπή τοῦ θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ πτώσις αὐτῶ.

*Unjust anger could not be justified,
for the end of his anger is a fall for him.*

θυμὸς ἄδικος] There is just anger; in the Bible God often gives vent to His anger, cf. *GELS* s.v. θυμός 1. Even so the notion of unjustifiable unjust anger sounds odd. Hence Ziegler notes variants such as ἀνηρ θυμωδης, ἀνθρωπος θυμωδης. The first is Origenic, hence **𐤌** *ḡavrā ḥemṭānā*. Moreover, the common verb, δικαιῶ, normally takes an acc. pers. *GELS* s.v. 1 mentions as the sole exception δικαιώσαισαν ὅσιοι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ‘May the pious consider their God’s judgement just’ PSol 2.15. αὐτοῦ and αὐτῶ most likely refer to a person. In the *Vorlage* there may have stood **עֲשֶׂה הָאֵל** or **עֲשֶׂה לְנִי** as a st. cst. phrase with **עֲשֶׂה** not as an attributive, but substantivised adjective. If Ziegler’s θυμὸς ἄδικος be genuine and original, this might be a very rare instance of mistranslation.

ῥοπή] “fall of the scale-pan” (*GELS* s.v. 1). The use of scales for determining the weight of an object can be metaphorically used with reference to evaluation of a person’s character as in **יִשְׁקַלְנִי בַמֶּאֱזִיזִים וְיִדַּע אֱלֹהֵי תְמִי** in Jb 31.6. The author may be saying that the irascible is going to end up in his own down-fall. Though S* does read οργη, that is not necessarily the original reading, though ροπη (ΡΟΠΗ) and οργη (ΟΡΓΗ) look quite similar to each other. The two synonyms, θυμός and ὀργή, are often combined for the sake of intensification in either sequence, e.g. ὀργή θυμοῦ κυρίου Nu 25.4,

ὁ θυμὸς τῆς ὀργῆς μου ib. 14.34; more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ὀργή.

αὐτῷ] better αὐτῷ ‘for himself’?

- 1.23) ἕως καιροῦ ἀνθέξεται μακρόθυμος,
καὶ ὕστερον αὐτῷ ἀναδώσει εὐφροσύνη·

*A patient person shall wait until an opportune moment,
and later joy will burst out for him.*

καιροῦ] In contrast to χρόνος, καιρός denotes “point in time suitable for something to happen or when it is expected to happen, right moment” (*GELS* s.v. 4).

ἀνθέξεται] Whilst in *GELS* s.v. ἀντέχω II 4 we have entered a sense “to hold and endure without reacting,” such a sense is not attested elsewhere in SG nor outside of it. A few authorities¹⁶ read instead ανεξεται < ἀνέχομαι, one of the senses of which is “to restrain oneself so as not to react” (*GELS* s.v. II b), e.g. σιωπήσομαι καὶ ἀνέξομαι Is 42.14. We should perhaps discard ἀνθέξεται as a slight scribal error for ἀνέξεται, so Smend 15.

ἀναδώσει] Intransitively used.¹⁷ LSJ s.v. ἀναδίδωμι II 4 ‘burst, issue forth’ mentions πηγὰ ἀναδιδούσι Μαιάνδρου ποταμοῦ ‘the source of the river M. rises’ Hdt. 7.26.3.¹⁸

- 1.24) ἕως καιροῦ κρύψει τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ,
καὶ χεῖλη πολλῶν ἐκδιηγῆσεται σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ.

*Until an opportune moment he shall hide his words,
and many people’s lips will recount his intelligence.*

πολλῶν] A v.l. πιστῶν ‘of pious people’ is represented by a good number of sources.

- 1.25) Ἐν θησαυροῖς σοφίας παραβολαὶ ἐπιστήμης,
βδέλυγμα δὲ ἁμαρτωλῶ θεοσέβεια.

*Among treasures of wisdom are found intelligent proverbs
but piety is an abomination to a sinner.*

παραβολῆ] The pl. παραβολαὶ of a fair number of manuscripts sounds truer; the sg. as read by Ziegler is probably an assimilation to θεοσέβεια, which would scarcely be used in the plural. Hardly is ‘just one parable’ meant

¹⁶ One could add שִׁיבְרָקָה.

¹⁷ Cf. שִׂיבְרָקָה ‘(joy) will sprout.’ Segal’s (7) הַחַיִּים יִלְקָחֵם is based on a v.l. εὐφροσύνην.

¹⁸ “will pay him back” (*NETS*) = ἀποδώσει.

nor parable as a literary genre. Cf. ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς Mt 13.34, where the opposition in tense between ἐλάλησεν and ἐλάλει is to be noted; the former refers to several parables (pl.) Jesus had just told, whilst the latter means that He habitually took recourse to this didactic, discourse style (sg.).

The widely known sense of the word, παραβολή, is unknown prior to SG, so also to contemporary Koine papyri and inscriptions.¹⁹ Its primary meaning in CG is ‘juxtaposition, comparison.’ The feature of comparison is found in many parables told by Jesus. In the parable of the sower (Mt 13.3-8, 18-23), for instance, the seed is compared to the word of God. The way this word is used in SG, some 45 times [9 times in Si], significantly differs from its use in the New Testament, esp. in the synoptic Gospels as used by Jesus. For SG *GELS* s.v. lists two senses: 1 “*mocking or hurting speech*” and 2 “*proverbial saying*.” In Nu 23 and 24 Balaam tells a parable (παραβολή ܠܦܫܐ) to Balak several times. These parables are prophetic, oracular speeches. The story Nathan told David (2Sm 12.1-4) may be called a parable, though neither ܠܦܫܐ nor παραβολή is actually used. The prophet may be telling the king what actually happened. What we may regard as a prototype of parables told by Jesus is found in Ez 17.2-21. None of the Synoptic Gospel writers composed a parable; they are simply recording parables as told by Jesus. They are most probably stories made up by Him, and they usually take a narrative form in contrast to terse, short statements, proverbial sayings which we find collected in the book of Proverbs and in our book.²⁰

1.26) ἐπιθυμήσας σοφίαν διατήρησον ἐντολάς,
καὶ κύριος χορηγήσει σοι αὐτήν.

*Yearning after wisdom, adhere to the commandments,
then the Lord will liberally give it to you.*

[ἐπιθυμήσας] Some sources read the Aor. Indic., ἐπεθύμησας. The difference is slight. The Ptc. can be paraphrased: ‘Once you have confirmed your desire for,’ as captured by ܫܝܗ ܢܩܪ ܕܒ.

[χορηγήσει] On this verb with God as the subject, see at vs. 10.

1.27) σοφία γὰρ καὶ παιδεία φόβος κυρίου,
καὶ ἡ εὐδοκία αὐτοῦ πίστις καὶ πραῦτης.

*For the fear of the Lord is wisdom and education,
and fidelity and humility are what please Him.*

¹⁹ Moulton + Milligan 480b, s.v. παραβολή: “Our sources throw no light upon this word.”

²⁰ For a compact survey of this literary form in the biblical literature, see Mowry 1962.649a-54a.

On 27a scholars mention Pr 15.33, whose LXX form is very close to our text here: φόβος θεοῦ παιδεία καὶ σοφία, whereas in \mathfrak{H} $\text{יְרֵאת יְהוָה מוֹסֵר מוֹסֵר עֲנֵנִי הַכֹּבֵד עֲנֵנִי}$ we have a cst. phrase. The use of *πραῦτης* here suggests that the Heb. *Vorlage* probably read עֲנֵנִי , and that our translator did not allow himself to be influenced by Pr 15.33 LXX, which reads in its second half $\text{καὶ ἀρχὴ δόξης ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτῇ}$, where a form of עָנָף ‘to answer’ is represented. Note $\text{ἐν πίστει καὶ πραῦτητι}$ (B באמונתו ובענותו) αὐτὸν ἠγίασεν Si 45.4.

γὰρ] This implies that this verse logically follows vs. 26, where the adherence to the commandments was presented as a *sine qua non* for the gift of wisdom. The fear of the Lord is to take the practical form of adherence to the commandments.

1.28) $\mu\eta\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \phi\acute{o}\beta\omega\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$
καὶ $\mu\eta\ \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσοῆ.

*Do not resist (the demand of) the fear of the Lord
nor approach it half-heartedly.*

$\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma$] This verb, $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, when used in the sense of ‘to resist, disobey,’ usually takes a dat. pers. vel rei, e.g. $\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ Nu 11.20 and $\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ De 11.26. Both Segal (7) and Kahana (451) offer $\text{אֵל תִּמְר בְּיִרְאַת יְי}$, probably relying on $\text{בּו\ \אל־תִּמְר בּו\ וְשָׁמַע בְּקִלּוֹ אֶל־תִּמְר בּו}$ Ex 23.21, where on תִּמְר already Ibn Ezra honestly admitted its difficulty and \mathfrak{G} reads $\mu\eta\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$.²¹ We would rather suggest אֵל תִּמְאַס ב־ , cp. $\text{עַן יִרְיָה הָיָה מֵאַסְכָּח בְּדָבָר הָיָה}$ ‘because you rejected this word’ Is 30.12 (\mathfrak{G} $\text{Ὅτι ἠπειθήσατε τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις}$). In any event, φόβος κυρίου need be understood as one’s philosophy of life that can be so verbalised.

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$] This can refer to either φόβος κυρίου or κύριος. Προσέρχομαι τι (pers.) is common, but in our book we find <+ dat. rei> in $\omega\varsigma\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\tau\rho\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\acute{\nu}\ \pi\rho\acute{\sigma}\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\eta}$ 6.19, where, thanks to the grammatical gender, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\eta}$ can only refer to σοφία mentioned at the end of vs. 18. \mathfrak{H} (A and C) reads קָרַב אֵלַי . In vs. 30 we do find precisely $\text{οὐ προσῆλθες φόβω κυρίου}$. Wisdom is compared to an agricultural product to be looked after by a farmer. The sense of the verb, “to apply oneself to”²² (GELS s.v. 3) is also attested, though used absolutely in $\text{καθ’\ ὄν\ ἔδει\ τ\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu\ \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota}$ ‘in a way those who have courage to avoid should go about’ 2M 6.20.²³

²¹ In *Index* s.v. $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ we have suggested מַרָּה hi., thus תִּמְר .

²² A meaning known to CG, see LSJ s.v. I 6.

²³ This reference is to be added to GELS s.v. 3. In Box - Oesterley 321, fn. “Draw not nigh to uprightness with a double heart” Enoch 91.4 is mentioned.

ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσοῆ] Not πορεύεσθαι ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν 3K 2.4. On this rare, metaphorical use of δισσοῦς, cf. δύο λήμασι δισσοῦς ‘two people, two in temper’ Aesch. Ag. 122.

1.29) μὴ ὑποκριθῆς ἐν στόμασιν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσίν σου πρόσεχε.

*Do not act as a hypocrite (as you) talk to people
and be careful about your lips.*

ὑποκριθῆς] The sense of ‘to act as a hypocrite’ appears to be unknown prior to SG. This sense is attested three more times: Si 35.15, 36.2, PSol 4.20. Segal (7) reconstructs $\eta\lambda\eta\lambda\eta\eta$, mentioning that at 35.15 ὑποκρίνομαι corresponds to $\eta\lambda\eta\lambda\eta\eta$. This Heb. verb is extremely rare; it is a hapax in BH (Pr 26.18) and obscure of meaning. Just as this BH instance, that in Si 35.15 has little to do with hypocrisy. One does not know how Kahana (451) has arrived at $\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta$.

ἐν στόμασιν] For this intriguing expression Ryssel (264, f.n.) and Box - Oosterley (321, f.n.) reconstruct $\eta\eta\eta$ in lieu of $\eta\eta\eta$. However the parallelism with χεῖλεσιν later indicates manners of speech. The Origenic recension including $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ does read ἐνώπιον = $\eta\eta\eta$.

ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσίν σου] The syntagm <προσέχω ἔν τινι> is unknown prior to SG. Probably a Hebraism as can be seen from Πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ ἐν τῇ ἀφῆ ($\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$) τῆς λέπρας De 24.8. Note the rection of a synonym, φυλάσσομαι as in φυλάξασθε ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν ($\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$) Ma 2.15, 16.

1.30) μὴ ἐξύψου σεαυτόν, ἵνα μὴ πέσης
καὶ ἐπαγάγῃς τῇ ψυχῇ σου ἀτιμίαν,
καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὰ κρυπτά σου
καὶ ἐν μέσῳ συναγωγῆς καταβαλεῖ σε,
ὅτι οὐ προσῆλθες φόβῳ κυρίου
καὶ ἡ καρδία σου πλήρης δόλου.

*Stop exalting yourself so that you may not fall
and bring dishonour to your soul,
and then the Lord might disclose your secrets
and bring you low in public,
because you did not apply yourself to the fear of the Lord
and your heart is full of deceit.*

ἐξύψου] This verb is used in sensu bono in ὕμνον καὶ ἐδόξαζον καὶ εὐλόγουν καὶ ἐξύψουν τὸν θεό ν Da LXX 3.51.

ἐπαγάγῃς] Ἐπάγω is often used with a noun (acc.) which denotes something intolerable, e.g. πένθος μέγα Ba 4.9. For more examples, see GELS s.v. 1. Exceptional is ἐπάξει ἐπὶ σὲ εὐφροσύνην Zp 3.17 (s God).

τῆ ψυχῆ σου] Parallel to σεαυτόν in the first line, it looks like equivalent to σεαυτῶ, but it is concerned with one's inner hurt. Hence "your soul." In BS we encounter tens of instances of < ψυχὴ τινος pers. > and it is our contention that it is not a mere variant of a standard reflexive pronoun, e.g. τὴν ψυχὴν σου ≠ σεαυτόν or σεαυτήν. One would not say ἐκοιμήθην ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ τῆς ψυχῆς μου for 'I slept in my own bed.'²⁴ We do translate it often as a reflexive pronoun, but that is little more than a translation expedience, because it is not easy to bring out the full sense of such a ψυχὴ in English concisely.

προσηλθεῖς] See above at vs. 28. Smend (17) is of the view that οὐ is not in its place, being a mere intrusion from vs. 28. He invokes Pesh., which lacks the negator. But what does 'eštammat there mean? 'You boasted'? What Greek word is it supposed to translate? This evidence sounds to us irrelevant.

²⁴ See Muraoka 2005.60-65 and SSG § 8 g.

CHAPTER 2

- 2.1) Τέκνον, εἰ προσέρχῃ δουλεύειν κυρίῳ,
ἐτοίμασον τὴν ψυχὴν σου εἰς πειρασμόν·

*Child, if you are going to endeavour to serve the Lord,
prepare your soul for trying times.*

Τέκνον] In Si this word in the voc. occurs tens of times as an address of endearment to the readership. 𐤓, if preserved, is 𐤓𐤁. Segal (10) points out that this Heb. word is also frequent with the same function in Pr with the significant difference, not mentioned by Segal, that in Pr it is consistently rendered *υἱέ*.¹ In its first occurrence, Pr 1.8, and also 6.20, 𐤓𐤁 is being addressed by 𐤓𐤁𐤁. Also when the pl. is used: 𐤁𐤁 𐤓𐤁𐤁 𐤓𐤁𐤁 𐤓𐤁𐤁 Pr 4.1, where 𐤓, however, reads *παῖδες*. Though we are not certain that the same father - son relationship is in the background every time, 𐤓𐤁 is possibly a bit more than a mere rhetorical device in the biblical sapiential literature. Note τέκνον, ἀντιλαβοῦ ἐν γήρᾳ πατρός σου Si 3.12. The selection of τέκνον has one advantage in that it is gender-neutral.

προσέρχῃ] This verb in the sense of “to apply oneself to” can be governed not only by a noun in the dat. as in 1.28, 30, but also by an inf. clause as here.

τὴν ψυχὴν σου] What we have said about this noun above at 1.30b applies here, too. *Pace* “bereite dich” (*SD*) and “prépare-toi” (*BJ*) we would say “Prepare mentally.” Note the parallelism with τὴν καρδίαν σου vs. 2a.

- 2.2) εὐθύνον τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ καρτέρησον
καὶ μὴ σπεύσης ἐν καιρῷ ἐπαγωγῆς·

*Make your mind straight and bear patiently
and do not get upset at the time of an emergency.*

εὐθύνον] The noteworthy combination <εὐθύνω καρδίαν> meets us also at εὐθύνετε (𐤓 𐤁𐤁) τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν πρὸς κύριον θεὸν Ἰσραηλ Jo 24.23. Probably “Don’t get distracted, focus your heart” is meant. The nuance here is then different from that in εὐθεῖς τῆ καρδία ‘the upright of heart’ Ps 63.11 (𐤓 𐤁𐤁 𐤓𐤁𐤁).

καρδίαν] “*seat where human thoughts, intentions and attitudes are generated and take shape*” (*GELS* s.v. 3) rather than “*seat of emotions*” (s.v. 4). On the semantic analysis of 𐤓, cf. Muraoka 2022.19.

¹ Only once at Si 7.3 we find *υἱέ* in some of the ancient versions, Vetus Latina, Ethiopic and Armenian. In 𐤓𐤁 we find 𐤓𐤁 *bēr(y)*.

καρτέρησον] The absolute use of καρτερέω also occurs with reference to a woman in labour at ἐκαρτέρησα ὡς ἡ τίκτουσα Is 42.14, which is preceded by ἀνέξομαι ‘I shall endure.’ The syntagm < + acc. rei > is exemplified in βάσανον διὰ πυρός ‘torture with fire’ 4M 9.9 and θάνατον ib. 10.1.

σπεύσης] The verb which primarily has to do with high speed appears to have here a new sense unknown prior to SG: “*to become mentally unsettled*” (GELS s.v. 3). It is so human, when faced with an emergency, to farewell one’s intelligence, panic, and act rashly. Cf. לְהַבִּיחַ, which means ‘to haste’ as well as ‘to be dismayed,’ and Arm. הִלְהִיבְתִּיהָ קָרְיָהּ הַיָּדָא ‘he got alarmed and got to his feet fast’ Da 3.24. If his *Vorlage* had a form of לְהַבִּיחַ, we would not qualify the translator’s selection of this Gk verb as “schlecht” (Smend 18). Cf. the synonymous σπουδάζω “*to become mentally unsettled*” (GELS s.v. 2), a sense unknown prior to SG.

ἐπαγωγῆς] The underlying verb, ἐπάγω, is used in a similar sense in vs. 4a and 1.30b, in the second instance of which it is about a self-inflicted distress. The noun occurs eight more times in Si, each time indicating some sort of unwelcome happening befalling a person. In one of them we find a phrase close to what we have here: ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπαγωγῆς 5.8 (Ⲙ A עברה ‘[God’s] fury’).

2.3) κολλήθητι αὐτῷ καὶ μὴ ἀποστῆς,
ἵνα ἀυξηθῆς ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων σου.

*Cling to Him and do not move away,
so that you may multiply at the end of your (days).*

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων σου] Cf. εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα αὐτοῦ ‘for his posterity’ Da 11.4 TH. Is this an image of a person surrounded by many children and grandchildren at his deathbed?

2.4) πᾶν, ὃ ἐὰν ἐπαχθῆ σοι, δέξαι
καὶ ἐν ἀλλάγμασιν ταπεινώσεώς σου μακροθύμησον·

*Whatever might befall you, accept it
and when things begin to take a downward turn for you, hold it out,*

ἐπαχθῆ] cf. ἐπαγωγή ‘calamity,’ a substantive derived from this verb as used at vs. 2 above.

ἀλλάγμασιν ταπεινώσεώς σου] A difficult phrase to understand. Ἄλλαγμα probably means a changed or changing circumstance, and the action noun of ταπεινώω could be affiliated to one of the verb’s senses, “*to cause to feel to be low in estimation*” (GELS s.v. 1 c), e.g. ἐν ψυχῇ συντετριμμένα καὶ πνεύματι τεταπεινωμένω (TH ταπεινώσεως) προσδεχθείμεν Da 3.39 LXX.

- 2.5) ὄτι ἐν πυρὶ δοκιμάζεται χρυσὸς
καὶ ἄνθρωποι δεκτοὶ ἐν καμίνῳ ταπεινώσεως.

*Because gold is scrutinised in fire
and decent people in an oven of humiliation.*

¶ ἐν νήσοις καὶ πενία ἐπ’ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς γίνου. ¶

In diseases and poverty learn to rely on Him.

χρυσὸς] There does not appear to be any difference in meaning between χρυσὸς and χρυσίον. The difference is statistical in their frequency:

	χρυσός	χρυσίον	ἄργυρος	ἀργυρίον
Si	2	14	0	6
LXX	13	290	11	383

πεποιθὼς γίνου] An interesting periphrastic construction. The Pf. ptc. indicates a state, “reliant, trustful.” Whereas its combination with ἴσθι stresses a continuing state as in Τί πεποιθὼς εἶ; ‘Why are you trustful?’ Is 36.4, the combination here with a form of γίνομαι indicates a process, ‘become trustful,’ and the impv. in the present aspect indicates a habit or repetition, i.e. ‘every time you get ill or poor, become trustful.’

- 2.6) πίστευσον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀντιλήμψεται σου·
εὐθύνον τὰς ὁδοὺς σου καὶ ἔλπισον ἐπ’ αὐτόν.

*Believe Him, and then He will come to your assistance;
make your paths straight and set your hope on Him.*

εὐθύνον τὰς ὁδοὺς σου] You might have diverse objectives and destinations. Each of your paths is to be clear of obstacles and distractions.

The Origenic recension reads 2.6b differently: καὶ ἐλπίζε ἐπ αὐτον, καὶ εὐθυνει τας οδους σου = $\text{סִי} \text{יְלִיךְ} \text{אֶתְהַרְרֵךְ} \text{וְיִרְרֶךְ} \text{בְּ} \text{בַר} \text{בַּ}$, which makes for perfect parallelism between the two lines and Smend (19) prefers this to the majority reading.

- 2.7) Οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον, ἀναμείνατε τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ ἐκκλίνητε, ἵνα μὴ πέσητε.

*Those who fear the Lord, look forward to His mercy
and do not turn away so that you may not fall.*

- 2.8) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον, πιστεύσατε αὐτῷ,
καὶ οὐ μὴ πταίση ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν.

*Those who fear the Lord, believe Him
and your reward will never fail.*

πταίση] Πταίω, when used intransitively, means ‘to stumble, trip, fall.’ *GELS* s.v. 2 reads “to fail to materialise.” Cf. π. τῆς ἐλπίδος ‘to be baulked of what one has hoped for’ Herodian [hist.] 8.5.1. On the double negator, οὐ μὴ, see *SSG* § 83 ca.

- 2.9) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον, ἐλπίσατε εἰς ἀγαθὰ
καὶ εἰς εὐφροσύνην αἰῶνος καὶ ἔλεος.

*Those who fear Him, hope for good things
and for eternal joy and (His) mercy.*

εἰς ἀγαθὰ] For the rection <ἐλπίζω εἰς>, see also εἰς βοήθειαν .. τοῦ θεοῦ PSol 15.1.

The context suggests that ἀγαθὰ here is pragmatically, not religiously or ethically, conceived.

¶ ὅτι δόσις αἰωνία μετὰ χαρᾶς τὸ ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῦ. ¶

For His reward is an eternal gift with joy.

- 2.10) ἐμβλέσατε εἰς ἀρχαίας γενεάς καὶ ἴδετε·
τίς ἐνεπίστευσεν κυρίῳ καὶ κατησχύνθη;
ἢ τίς ἐνέμεινεν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐγκατελείφθη;
ἢ τίς ἐπεκαλέσατο αὐτόν, καὶ ὑπερεῖδεν αὐτόν;

Look into olden generations and see.

Who believed the Lord and was disappointed?

or who held on to His fear and was abandoned?

or who called on Him and was not taken notice of?

ὑπερεῖδεν αὐτόν] Strictly speaking, it means “He, i.e. God took no notice of him.”

- 2.11) διότι οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ κύριος
καὶ ἀφίησιν ἁμαρτίας καὶ σφύζει ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως.

For the Lord is compassionate and merciful,

and forgives sins and rescues at times of distress.

οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων] These two adjectives are often combined in the characterisation of God. The sequence can be reversed, e.g. Ps 110.4. The Heb. equivalent is יְגַחֵם וְיִרְחֵם or יְרַחֵם וְיִגַחֵם .

Some sources add after 11a: μακροθυμος και πολυελεος, derived from a fuller version as found in Ex 34.6, Ps 85.15, for instance. **Sh** also presents a longer version.

- 2.12) Οὐαὶ καρδίαις δειλαῖς καὶ χερσὶν παρειμέναις
καὶ ἄμαρτωλῶ ἐπιβαίνοντι ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους.

*Woe to faint hearts and paralysed hands
and a sinner embarking on two paths.*

καρδίαις δειλαῖς] Though in δειλὸς τῆ καρδία Dt 20.8 the adjective qualifies a person, it is in fact an attribute of καρδία. In **H** we read כָּבֵלָהּ הָרָ, which can be rewritten as יְכַבְּלָהּ הָרָ שִׁשְׁרָ שִׁאֵהָ.² Likewise at 2Ch 13.7.

ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους] It is difficult to decide if there is a difference in meaning from <ἐπιβαίνω + acc.> as in ἐπιβῆναι τρίβους Je 18.15.

- 2.13) οὐαὶ καρδία παρειμένη, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύει·
διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σκεπασθήσεται.

*Woe to a feeble heart, for it does not believe.
Therefore it will not be shielded.*

σκεπασθήσεται] Segal (8) translates this as סִקְרָה, which is misleading, since, just as πιστεύει in 13a, it could indicate a deliberate action undertaken by the person concerned. σκεπασθήσεται, by contrast, is genuinely passive: he will not be provided with protection and cover.

- 2.14) οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν τὴν ὑπομονήν·
καὶ τί ποιήσετε ὅταν ἐπισκέπτηται ὁ κύριος;

*Woe to you who have let go of perseverance.
What on earth are you going to do when the Lord comes for the final reckoning?*

τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν τὴν ὑπομονήν] Precisely this combination is used later: ἀπολωλεκότι ὑπομονήν 41.2. There, however, it is about a senior citizen the end of whose earthly life is just round the corner, as poignantly expressed in **H** M as הִקְתָּ אֲבָרָה ‘hopeless.’ By contrast, here, ἀπόλλυμι indicates a wilful action. Ben Sira is not commiserating, but criticising, cf. ἀκούσατέ μου, οἱ ἀπολωλεκότες τὴν καρδίαν οἱ μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης Is 46.12 and “a good man will stand surety for his neighbour, but a man who has lost all sense of shame (ἀπολωλεκῶς αἰσχύνην) will abandon him” Si 29.14.

² On the syntax of the adj. in st. cst., see JM § 129 *i-ia* and SQH § 21 e.

καὶ τί] This ubiquitous conjunction sometimes “introduces an emotionally charged question,” *GELS* s.v. 16.

- 2.15) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον οὐκ ἀπειθήσουσιν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οἱ ἀγαπῶντες αὐτὸν συντηρήσουσιν τὰς δόδους αὐτοῦ.

*Those who fear the Lord shall not disobey His words
and those who love Him shall adhere to His ways.*

ῥημάτων] Ἀπειθέω, as in CG, usually governs an object noun in the dative. In SG we encounter another two instances of <+ gen.>: ἀπειθήσαντες τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ θεοῦ Jo 5.6 and οὐκ ἀπειθήσουσιν τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ Si 16.28.³

ἀγαπῶντες] We have here a good example showing that the love of God (objective genitive) has little to do with our sentimental, emotional attachment to Him. Note *GELS* s.v. 2: “to display respect for and accept authority of.” This equally applies to 𐤅 𐤁𐤓𐤁.⁴

- 2.16) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον ζητήσουσιν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οἱ ἀγαπῶντες αὐτὸν ἐμπλησθήσονται τοῦ νόμου.

*Those who fear the Lord shall seek His pleasure
and those who love Him shall be fully occupied with the law.*

ἐμπλησθήσονται τοῦ νόμου] Just as in vs. 15b above, this indicates what those who love the Lord are supposed to do, not a result arising from loving Him.⁵ The future tense of the verb here is obligative, injunctive in value, not indicating a consequence.

- 2.17) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον ἐτοιμάσουσιν καρδίας αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ταπεινώσουσιν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν.

*Those who fear the Lord shall prepare their hearts
and before Him keep their souls low.*

ἐτοιμάσουσιν καρδίας] Two other examples of ἐτοιμάζω taking something incorporeal as *o* are ἐτοιμάσον τὴν ψυχὴν σου εἰς πειρασμόν 2.1 above and ἐτοιμάσατε (וְיִכְיֶה) τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν πρὸς κύριον 1K 7.3, where Israelites are told to remove objects of their idol worship and serve the Lord alone.

³ LSJ s.v. 1 refers to an apparently non-literary text from Cos, and Helbing (1928.204) refers to a similar document dated to 183 BCE.

⁴ Cf. Muraoka 2020.89-94. Note 𐤅 here: 𐤅𐤁𐤓𐤁 𐤅𐤁𐤓𐤁 𐤅𐤁𐤓𐤁 ‘.. love His law’; no Gk manuscript attests to νόμος here, what evidences the translator’s understanding of ἀγαπάω τὸν θεόν.

⁵ Cf. a f.n. in *BJ*: “Ainsi Ben Sira, loin d’amour et obéissance, les identifie.” We are also referred to a passage in Mishnah: “Don’t be like slaves who serve their master in order to receive a reward, but be like slaves who serve their master not in order to receive a reward, and may the fear of God (מִרְיָא מִרְיָא) be upon you!” mAbot 1.3.

τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν] On our objection to seeing here an equivalent of ἑαυτοῦς, see above at 1.30. Here it is concerned with one's attitude and disposition. Cf. ὅσοι καὶ ταπεινοὶ καρδίᾳ Da 3.87; ἐν ψυχῇ συντετριμμένη καὶ πνεύματι τεταπεινωμένῳ ib. 3.39.

2.18) ἐμπεσοῦμεθα εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου
καὶ οὐκ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων·
ὥς γὰρ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη αὐτοῦ,
οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.

*We should fall into the Lord's hands,
and not into people's hands,
for as His greatness
so is His mercy as well.*

:וכשמו כן מעשיו: (A

The Origenic recension begins the verse with λέγοντες, which makes for smooth transition to the following direct speech.

ὥς .. οὕτως] No tertium comparationis is mentioned. Perhaps “dependable” or “excellent, wonderful”?

As far as the LXX text of this verse is concerned, we see from Ziegler's edition hardly any significant variant except the above-mentioned λέγοντες. The reconstruction of the Heb. *Vorlage* is a question of its own. Scholars such as Ryssel and Box - Oesterley assume that **Ⲛ** is a translation of a Heb. text and translate accordingly, adding, inter alia, a line parallel to vs. 18cd, “And as His name, so also are His works” (Box - Oesterley) < **Ⲛ** *wa'k šmēh hākannā 'vādāwhy*. Smend and Box - Oesterley state that this line has been shifted after **Ⲙ** 6.17. No explanation is forthcoming why this bit of the text should make such a long-distance move. Smend opines that the rhythm calls for this addition. See Segal's (8) reconstruction of the first half:

כי כנגדלו כן גם חסדו וְכִשְׁמוֹ כֵּן מַעֲשָׂיו:

The second half has been preserved in **Ⲙ**A, which BSH (3) has printed as part of 2.18, though in 6.17 in the Geniza manuscript A it does indeed follow רעהו. The Gk text as given above, however, is perfect in its rhythm. To make its last two lines into one would produce too long a line, which the translator would have shunned. Moreover, in **Ⲑ**, **Ⲛ**h, and **Ⲛ** at 6.17 we find nothing which would correspond to **Ⲛ** *wa'k šmēh hākannā 'vādāwhy*.

CHAPTER 3

3.1) Ἐλεγμὸν πατρός ἀκούσατε, τέκνα,
καὶ οὕτως ποιήσατε, ἵνα σωθῆτε·

*Children, hear your father's reproach,
and practise accordingly so that you may be saved.*

Ἐλεγμὸν] A word unknown prior to SG and used once in NT, 2Ti 3.16 // διδασκαλία, πανόρθωσις, and παιδεία. On a variant ἐμοῦ τοῦ πατρός.

τέκνα] At 2.1 we had the sg., τέκνον. Already in vs. 8 the author reverts to the sg.: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου.

The first sixteen verses are concerned with filial duties. Their importance in the Old Testament human, social ethics is underlined by them being given a commandment of their own in the Decalogue.¹

Rahlfs reads 3.1a rather differently: Ἐμοῦ τοῦ πατρός ἀκούσατε, τέκνα. Ziegler (1964.465f.) appears to be largely relying on La, *Judicium patris audite filii*. O presents κρισιν πατρος, but whence his ἐλεγμὸν comes is not clear. In vs. 3 the mother's intervention is expressed with κρίσις. On the other hand, what οὕτως is referring to becomes more intelligible with κρίσις or ἐλεγμός in the opening line.

σωθῆτε] Snaith (1974.20) writes: “.. is not to be taken in any Christian sense of salvation from sin or from hell; it is rather safety from disastrous consequences in times of crisis.” Similarly Box - Oesterley (323). Our analysis should be more inclusive. The verb ἐλέγχω is mostly concerned with ethical, religious judgement and criticism. Its derivative used here, ἐλεγμός, is used in our book six more times, and in three of them the religious, moral perspective is apparent: μισῶν ἐλεγμὸν ἐν ἵχνει ἁμαρτωλοῦ ‘hating reproach, following closely behind a sinner’ 21.6, ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐκκλινεῖ ἐλεγμὸν ‘a sinful person turns away criticism’ 35.17, and ἀκούων ἐν Σινα ἐλεγμὸν καὶ ἐν Χωρηβ κρίματα ἐκδικήσεως ‘hearing a rebuke in Zion and verdicts of judgement in Horeb’ 48.7. A father may, of course, advise his child(ren), for example, against a certain decision which could bring about huge financial losses. Ἀπωλεία would scarcely mean perdition in the hell at ἔσωσας γάρ με ἐξ ἀπωλείας καὶ ἐξείλου με ἐκ καιροῦ πονηροῦ Si 51.12, and at ἐκεῖ σωθήσομαι Gn 19.20, where Lot is thinking of saving his skin.

¹ Here the Near East and Far East meet, since, in the Confucian, Japanese culture, special importance is accorded to filial duties.

- 3.2) ὁ γὰρ κύριος ἐδόξασεν πατέρα ἐπὶ τέκνοις
καὶ κρίσιν μητρὸς ἐστερέωσεν ἐφ' υἱοῖς.

*For the Lord has imposed a duty on children to respect their father
and her sons to take seriously their mother's judgement.*

ἐπὶ τέκνοις] *Pace Smend* (23) we would not correct Ⲫ to read ἐπὶ τέκνα. He is presumably influenced by the Sahidic version, which he translates as “denn Herr gab dem Vater mehr Ehre als den Söhnen.” *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ **II 10** suggests “indicates one with whom responsibility or obligation lies.” The same analysis can be applied to ἐφ' υἱοῖς. Ⲫⲓ presents Ⲡⲛⲓⲛ for both, whereas Ⲫ differentiates, though in a strange manner, with Ⲡⲛⲓⲛ followed by ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.

υἱοῖς] Are sons being singled out for special attention or is this little more than a stylistic variation, i.e. synonymous with the gender-neutral τέκνοις?

κρίσιν] *Pace BJ* “le droit de la mère sur ses fils” and *SD* “das Recht der Mutter über ihre Söhne” we doubt that κρίσις ever signifies a legal right to do or not to do something. Rather we have here a synonym of ἐλεγμός in the preceding verse and agree with *Ryssel* “.. hat die Ehrung des Vaters den Kindern zur Pflicht gemacht,” but “die Rechte der Mutter hat er für die Söhne festgestellt” fails to take into account the clear parallelism between ἐπὶ τέκνοις and ἐφ' υἱοῖς.

- 3.3) ὁ τιμῶν πατέρα ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας,

One who honours his father is in effect atoning for sins,

ἐξιλάσεται] Obviously not meant in its usual, cultic sense. Such a rite is priests' prerogative. By paying respectful attention to one's father's teaching and advice, one is effectively fighting sin's harmful effects.

- 3.4) καὶ ὡς ὁ ἀποθησαυρίζων ὁ δοξάζων μητέρα αὐτοῦ.

*and one who respects his mother is as if he were storing much treasure
away.*

ἀποθησαυρίζων] Unlike its simplex, θησαυρίζω, the compound form here signifies “to store away for future access.” Observance of filial duties could result in tangible, material benefits.

- 3.5) ὁ τιμῶν πατέρα εὐφρανθήσεται ὑπὸ τέκνων
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ προσευχῆς αὐτοῦ εἰσακουσθήσεται.

*One who honours his father will be given joy by children
and on the day of his prayer he will be heard.*

εὐφρανθήσεται] *Eυφραίνω* is found used as a genuine, transitive, active verb as in *γυνὴ ἀνδρεία εὐφραίνει τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς* Si 26.2. On the other

hand, a passive form of it can be intransitive as in εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν αὐτῇ ‘my heart found joy in her’ Si 51.15. In our case here, however, ὑπό speaks for the passive voice. Yet it does not have to refer to children inviting their father to a gorgeous dinner. We would rather think that whoever takes seriously the commandment “Thou shalt honour they father and mother” can count on the pleasure of fathering many a child. This preposition may not indicate a person who is willingly acting to cause something to happen to another person or thing, but simply a cause or ground for something happening, e.g. ὑφ’ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ μὴ ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων τοῦτο παθεῖν ‘to endure this at your own hands and not at the enemies’ Thucyd. 4.64.

εἰσακουσθήσεται] The subject of the verb is more likely to be personal as in ἐδεήθημεν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ εἰσηκούσθημεν 2M 1.8, although προσευχῆ as the subject cannot be entirely precluded.² While the simplex indicates that a sound wave reached someone’s ears, εἰσακούω underlines the hearer’s special attention or interest. The opposition is roughly that of Engl. *to hear* as against *to listen*.³ Cf. καὶ ἐδεήθη τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου περὶ παντὸς τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ κύριος εἰσήκουσεν προσευχὴν παντὸς ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ PSol 6.5, οἰκτίρησόν με καὶ εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου Ps 4.2

- 3.6) ὁ δοξάζων πατέρα μακροημερεύσει,
καὶ ὁ εἰσακούων κυρίου ἀναπαύσει μητέρα αὐτοῦ.
*One who respects his father will live long,
and one who listens to the Lord gives rest to his mother.*

... מכבד אמו (A)

ἀναπαύσει] **Sh**, along with the Origenic and Lucianic recensions, sensibly adds an explanatory phrase: אַפְּרָאָה גַּם ‘from pain,’ probably mental pain, worries. **Th** reads אמו מכבד = τιμῆσει μητέρα αὐτοῦ.

- 3.7) ¶ ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον τιμήσει πατέρα, ¶
καὶ ὡς δεσπόταις δουλεύσει ἐν τοῖς γεννήσασιν αὐτόν.
*One who fears the Lord shall honour his father,
and as his masters he shall serve those who gave birth to him.*

δουλεύσει ἐν] Δουλεύω ἔν τινι pers. is unheard of.⁴ So is כָּבַד in the sense of ‘to serve someone.’⁵ In BH grammars one speaks of כ of transitivity,

² **Sh** עֲמִיחָא can only mean ‘he will be heard,’ for אֲתִיחָא ‘prayer’ is a fem. noun.

³ Cf. our remarks on εἰσηκούσεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδίου Ge 21.17 in Muraoka 2020.98.

⁴ Cf. SSG § 57 c, where a reference is made to an analogous, but rare instance of Syr. כַּלַּב, though here **Sh** shows that it has ignored ἐν: אֲתִיחָא לְיִלְוִדָא דִּילְוִדָא דִּילְוִדָא פְּלַח עֲבָדָא פְּלַח דִּילְוִדָא.

⁵ Smend (24) remarks that ἐν can correspond to לָ, referring to Si 10.18 אֲשֶׁה לִּילּוּד אֲשֶׁה > ἐν γεννήμασιν γυναικῶν, which most probably means ‘among those born by women,’ and οἱ

and a case such as **וַיִּרָם בְּמִטָּה** ‘and he lifted up the rod’ Ex 7.20 is adduced.⁶ All the examples adduced in JM § 125 *m* share one important matter, namely a substantive attached to the preposition denotes a member of a human body or what we do with it such as **קוֹל**, which does not apply to our case here. Since **δουλεύσει** is here preceded by **δεσπότης** in the dat., the likelihood of a scribal error is seriously to be considered. A dittography of sorts? Written with capital letters EI and EN do not look much different from each other. Very many manuscripts and versions leave **ἐν** out. Is Ziegler following the principle of *lectio difficilior melior*?

3.8) **ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου,**
ἵνα ἐπέλθῃ σοι εὐλογία παρ’ αὐτοῦ·

בני במאמר ובמעשה כבד אביך עבור שיגוך כל ברכות: (A)

*By deed and word honour your father,
 so that all blessings from him may come your way.*

ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ] **במאמר ובמעשה** **א**. If his *Vorlage* read as **א**, has the grandson a different message from his grandfather? **א** and Eth. follow **א**.

ἵνα] **עבור**, which is unknown as a conjunction with Impf. in Hebrew of all ages. A scribal error for **בעבור**?⁷ In BS occurs **בעבור** 11 times, but no more the shorter **עבור**. Note in one case **בעבור**, as in BH, is followed by Impf.: **הַעֲבוֹר תְּמוֹשׁ כֻּלָּהּ** ‘so that an annihilation may be averted’ 38.17.

ἐπέλθῃ] The compound verb appears to have a nuance slightly different from its simplex; “to befall, materialise, become the lot of.” The subject is usually negative, e.g. **θλίψις** ‘hardship’ Ge 42.21; for more examples, cf. *GELS* s.v. **3**. We have here a rare instance of something desirable coming one’s way. Another example is **ἕως ἃν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ** ‘until a spirit may descend on you from high up’ Is 32.15. **א** reads **שיגוך** ‘they reach you.’ Smend (24) justly mentions **וְבָאוּ עֲלֶיךָ כָּל־הַבְּרָכוֹת הָאֵלֶּה** Dt 28.2.

εὐλογία] This may be rendered “praise” (so Snaith). The father’s blessing could be more than verbal, “All the best, son!,” but also substantive and tangible. This latter aspect fits better the sense of **ἐπέρχομαι** touched upon above.

παρ’ αὐτοῦ] Some witnesses read **παρ αὐτῶν**, most likely a reference to ‘his parents’ (vs. 7b), but a secondary v.l., since this verse is about a son vs. his father.

ἐργαζόμενοι ἐν ἐμοί ib. 24.22 (no **א**), where *GELS* s.v. **ἐργάζομαι 2 b** assigns instrumental value to **ἐν**, so “durch mich werken” (*SD*).

⁶ Classified by Beyer (1992.95) under “Beth comitantes [= of accompaniment].”

⁷ Smend’s (24) “neuhebräisch” is inaccurate, for in MH we only find **בְּעָבוֹר**.

- 3.9) εὐλογία γὰρ πατὴρ στήριζει οἴκους τέκνων,
κατὰρα δὲ μητὴρ ἐκρίζοι θεμέλια.

*For a blessing by a father strengthens children's families
but a curse by a mother uproots (their) foundations.*

(A) ברכת אב תיסד וקללת אם תנתש נטע:

\mathfrak{H} reads quite differently: ‘A blessing by (your) father firmly lays a root and a curse by (your) mother uproots a plant.’ No less so \mathfrak{S} : בּוֹרֵכֶתָא דְאַבָּא בּוֹרֵכֶתָא דְאַבָּא תְּעָקֹר עֲקָרָא ‘a blessing by a father will build up residences and a curse by a mother will uproot roots’ and \mathfrak{S} לֵן בּוֹרֵכֶתָא דְאַבָּא מְשַׁרְרָא לְבַתָּא דְבִנְיָא לְוִטְתָּא דִּין אִמָּא עֲקָרָא שְׁתָּאסָא ‘a blessing by a father strengthens the families of the sons, but a curse by a mother uproots (their) foundations.’

- 3.10) μὴ δοξάζου ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ πατρὸς σου,
οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν σοι δόξα πατρὸς ἀτιμία·

*No thumbs up over your father's disgrace,
for there is nothing for you to glory over your father's disgrace.*

(A) אל תתכבד בקלון אביך כי לא כבוד הוא לך:

δοξάζου] LSJ s.v. does not admit the middle voice for this verb, but only the active and passive. If the form here is to be analysed as passive, it could only mean “Do not agree or allow yourself to be highly valued.” Precisely the same expression appears later in μὴ δοξάζου ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ σου 10.26, where it is inconceivable that one would allow oneself to be praised up to heaven when one is hard up. *GELS* s.v. **1 c** “to concern oneself unduly with one's reputation.”

ἀτιμίᾳ] parallel to ἀδοξία suffered by a mother (vs. 11).

- 3.11) ἢ γὰρ δόξα ἀνθρώπου ἐκ τιμῆς πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ὄνειδος τέκνοις μήτηρ ἐν ἀδοξίᾳ.

*For a person's repute (derives) from the respect accorded to his father
and a mother in disrepute is a black spot to her children.*

(A) כבוד איש כבוד אביו ומרבה חטא מקלל אמו:

τιμῆς] \mathfrak{H} uses כבוד for both δόξα and τιμή. So \mathfrak{S} אִיקָרָא, but \mathfrak{S} לֵן follows \mathfrak{G} . The latter's selection of τιμή suits 3.10b better contextually.

The second line shows a substantial discrepancy in relation to \mathfrak{H} ‘one who curses his mother is multiplying sin.’ Likewise \mathfrak{S} חֲוַבַּא רְוּבָא מִן דְּמַצְעָר לְאִמָּה ‘many sins are what disgraces his mother,’ probably reading חטא חֲרַבָּה.⁸

⁸ \mathfrak{S} לֵן is very close to \mathfrak{G} .

Smend and Box - Oesterley propose reading מקלה [= מקלה] ‘treats with contempt’ for מקלה. Cf. מקלה אביו ואמו > Θ ὁ ἀτιμάζων πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ Dt 27.16.

3.12) τέκνον, ἀντιλαβοῦ ἐν γήρα πατρός σου
καὶ μὴ λυπήσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ·

*Child, help your father in (his) old age
and do not grieve him as long as he is alive.*

(A) בני התחזק בכבוד אביך ואל תעובהו כל ימי חייו:

Here again Θ differs considerably from ℑ ‘Son, seek strength in your father’s reputation and do not neglect him [or: it] all your life.’⁹ ℑ is nearly identical with ℑ: בְּרִי אֲתַעֲשֶׂן בְּאִיקָרָה דְּאִבּוּךָ וְלֹא תִשְׁבּוּק אִיקָרָה כָּל יוֹמֵי חַיֶּיךָ: where the second אִיקָרָה is probably a secondary addition meant to underline that the object suffix הוּ in תִּעֲבֹהוּ is not to be taken as referring to אִבּוּךָ. ℑ, which follows ℑ almost verbatim, did not require such an addition, because in this version there is only one m. sg. noun, אֲבָא דִּילָךְ.

ἀντιλαβοῦ] Smend (25) postulates הִחֹק = הִחֹק. Cf. הִחֹק בּוּ גַר וְתוֹשֵׁב. Cf. ἀντιλήμψη αὐτοῦ ὡς προσηλύτου καὶ παροίκου Lv 25.35 and וַיִּתְּיֹקוּ בְּשִׁבְיָהּ ἀντελάβοντο τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας 2Ch 28.15, and in both cases the verb takes a ב- object.

πατρός] This is to be construed with ἀντιλαβοῦ, a gen. governing verb, not with γήρα. ℑ so analysed: עֲדַר בְּסִיבּוּתָא לְאֲבָא דִּילָךְ.

ἐν γήρα] This has nothing to do with בכבוד.

ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ] Preferable to ℑ.

3.13) καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολείπη σύνεσιν, συγγνώμην ἔχε
καὶ μὴ ἀτιμάσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν πάσῃ ἰσχύι σου.

*Even if he has become senile, make allowances (for him)
and do not disgrace him when you are in your prime.*

(A) וגם אם יחסר מדעו עזוב לו ואל תכלים אותו כל ימי חייו:

καὶ ἐὰν] = ℑ גם, which suggests that καί is not a neutral, additive καί ‘and,’ but emphatic, ‘even, also,’ see GELS s.v. καί 2 e. Likewise ℑ אֲפֹן, but ℑ וְאֵן.

⁹ Segal (15) cites בתפילה נתחזק ‘he prayed intensely’ bBer 32.1. We could mention another RH example: “if you see people whose efforts in the study of the Talmud dwindled very much, then arise and spend all your energy on it (התחזק בה), and you will receive a reward meant for all of them” pBer 9.5. כבוד can be vocalised as כְּבוֹד, a Piel verbal noun. Then our text might mean “Do your utmost to show respect for your father.”

συγγνώμην ἔχε] a felicitous, idiomatic rendition of 𐤌 𐤋 𐤅𐤍𐤁 𐤋𐤍 ‘Leave the matter at it for his sake.’ Whilst 𐤅 could be rendered “for it,” namely for his condition, 𐤌 𐤋 leaves no doubt: the referent can be only “him.” 𐤍’s 𐤍𐤁𐤋𐤍 instead of 𐤍𐤁𐤋𐤍𐤁 = 𐤍𐤁𐤋𐤍𐤁 may be indicative of the Syriac translator’s similar awareness.

ἐν πάσῃ ἰσχύϊ σου] This can represent 𐤁𐤋𐤋 𐤁𐤋𐤋𐤁 = 𐤁𐤋𐤋 𐤁𐤋𐤋𐤁, which cannot be harmonised with 𐤌 𐤍𐤁 𐤍𐤁 𐤍𐤁. Smend (26) thinks that 𐤌 is an adjusted intrusion from the end of vs. 12, 𐤋 𐤍𐤁 𐤍𐤁. 𐤅 can hardly be said to be a corruption of 𐤌. The graphic difference between 𐤁𐤋𐤋 and 𐤍𐤁 𐤍𐤁 is not marginal. Furthermore, 𐤍𐤁 need be accounted for. 𐤅, as it stands, makes good sense. However, 𐤌 does also make sense in a different way: one is to remain respectful towards one’s father all his life, till the closing phase, even in his senility. Segal (15) adduces “Even if spittle is dripping over your father’s beard, you should obey him at once” Eliyahu Rabba 27 (11 cent. CE). On the use of ἐν here, see below at 48.15.

3.14) ἐλεημοσύνη γὰρ πατρός οὐκ ἐπιλησθήσεται
καὶ ἀντὶ ἁμαρτιῶν προσανοικοδομηθήσεται σοι.

*For mercy shown to your father will not be forgotten,
but will be added as an extension to your house to pay for your sins.*

(A) צדקת אב לא תמחא ותמור הטאת היא תנתע¹⁰:
(C) צדקת אב אל תשכח תחת ענותו תנצצ:...

ἐλεημοσύνη γὰρ πατρός] an objective genitive, on which see SSG § 22 v (xiii). That ἐλεημοσύνη often denotes not merely kindly, charitable disposition, but also practical manifestation of it can be concluded from the fact that it often appears as a direct object of ποιέω with a human subject. This is especially conspicuous in the book of Tobit.¹¹ Note esp. the pl. in ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς ἐποίησα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου καὶ τῷ ἔθνει μου τοῖς πορευθεῖσιν μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων εἰς Νινευη To 1.3 𐤅¹, see also ib. 1.16. As in these two instances in To the manifestation can take the form of almsgiving to the needy. This holds for our book as well at 29.8 and 34.11. In the post-biblical Judaism, as we know, almsgiving was one of the three essential manifestations of piety along with prayer and fasting, cf. ἀγαθὸν προσευχὴ μετὰ νηστείας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης To 12.8 𐤅¹, where the juxtaposition of ἐλεημοσύνη and δικαιοσύνη is noteworthy.¹²

¹⁰ In the margin we see תנצצ.

¹¹ Cf. Fitzmyer 2003.103.

¹² Cf. Skehan - Di Lelia 1987.156.

This sense of קִדְּוָה is unknown to BH, but also occurs in Si 3.30, possibly also ib. 7.10, and $\text{עֲוֹנוֹתָי לִי אֲבִי יוֹנֵה לִי אֲבִי יוֹנֵה}$ 4Q424 3.9.¹³

Because we have no Aramaic fragment preserved for To 12.8, we cannot know what ἐλεημοσύνη is a rendering of. It could be קִדְּוָה , an Aramaic equivalent of Heb. קִדְּוָה , which is found in our Si passage, and at To 14.2 we see the equivalence between קִדְּוָה and ἐλεημοσύνη . Then δικαιοσύνη at To 12.8 must correspond to a word derived from a root other than $\sqrt{\text{קִדְּוָה}}$.¹⁴ One possibility is טִשָּׁק as attested as a rendering of δικαιοσύνη at To 13.6 ט .

Since our passage goes over filial duties towards one's aged parents, it is interesting to see ἐλεημοσύνη put in the mouth of two fathers nearing the end of their life: $\text{ποιήσεις ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐλεημοσύνην}$ (ח דִּקְוָה) $\text{καὶ ἀλήθειαν τοῦ μή με θάψαι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ}$ Ge 47.29 (Jacob to Joseph) and $\text{τοῖς παιδίοις ὑμῶν ἐνυποταγήσεται ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην}$ To 14.9 ט^{II} (said by the dying Tobit).

The genitive πατρός here must be objective, so ח אב קִדְּוָה here and ט^{II} אב קִדְּוָה .

ἐπιλησθήσεται = ח C תשכח , \neq A תמת . Note ט אֲנִי־טִשָּׁק .

οὐκ] The use of (C) אל as equivalent to (A) לא is one of a number of cases mentioned by Van Peursen 1999.226. See also Rey 2015.168f., where the author speaks of “predictive sense” of לא , and not prohibitive, but this is somewhat simplistic, for nobody would analyse לא used in the negative commands of the decalogue as predictively used.

ἀντὶ ἁμαρτιῶν] The pragmatic, redemptive effect of almsgiving is indicated in ἐλεημοσύνη (ח צדקה) $\text{ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας}$ Si 3.30; $\text{ἐλεημοσύναις καὶ πίστεσιν ἀποκαθαίρονται ἁμαρτίαι}$ Pr 15.27a; $\text{πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις}$ (Arm. קִדְּוָה) λύτρωσαι Dn 4.24 LXX. ח C ענות (A חטאת) must be an error for $\text{עונות} = \text{עונות}$.

ח A תמור (C תחת) as a variant of תמורה occurs also at 4.10, translated with ἀντί . *DCH* s.v. mentions only these two Si examples, whereas Segal (15) mentions a couple of examples from a later period such as $\text{תמור חיים מות תמור רע שלום}$ Breshit Rabbati 1.1.¹⁵

$\text{προσανοικοδομηθήσεται}$] This compound verb, προσανοικοδομέω , is unknown prior to SG and hapax in it. One of the known values of the first prefix, προσ- , is to indicate addition as in προσδίδωμι ‘to give in addition.’¹⁶

¹³ Cf. *DCH* VII 85a s.v., where Ps 112.3 and 9 are hesitantly mentioned. On the 4Q424 example, cf. *DJD* 36.345.

¹⁴ In our Si passage ט uses a pseudo-etymological equivalent, אֲנִי־טִשָּׁק , a word used only in the sense of “alms,” whereas another derivative, אֲדִיק , as well as an adjective, אֲדִיק , and verb forms mostly have to do with the notion of justice. This specialised noun is a constant rendering (some 11 times) of ἐλεημοσύνη in the Peshitta New Testament. Cf. *SL* s.vv.

¹⁵ According to *Maagarim* these two Si instances are followed by 292 more.

¹⁶ Smend (26) holds that this prefix has resulted from the misunderstanding of אב קִדְּוָה as a subjective genitive. He apparently believes that “towards” is meant by the prefix.

LSJ Sup. s.v. defines it as *to build on as an annex or support*. The second prefix, *ἀνα-*, indicates an upward movement, in this case about a building moving upwards as it is built on the ground. Caird (1969.30) has captured this metaphorical use of the verb with his rendition: “.. will go to build up extra credit for you to offset your sins,” similarly already Box - Oesterley ad loc. This metaphorical sense of *οἰκοδομέω* is well established in NTG, e.g. *αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον* 1Pt 2.5.¹⁷

For this Gk verb we find in *HC* *תתנצ* and A *תנתע* to be corrected to *תנטע*. If *Θ* of this verse is closer to C as shown with reference to *ἐπιλησθήσεται* above, C *תנצ*, most likely to be restored as *תתנצב*, fits the building metaphor better than A’s *תנטע*. Heb. *נטע* is not rendered in SG with verbs which have to do with building, but often with *פָּוּ*, *פּוּטֵעוּ* ‘to plant.’¹⁸ Note also *תתנצב* and *תתנצב*, the former of which is closer to *תנטע*. *תתנצב*, however, presents one difficulty; the root *נצב* is not used in Hitpael, though the synonymous root *יצב* is.

3.15) *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεώς σου ἀναμνησθήσεται σου·*

ὡς εὐδία ἐπὶ παγετῶ, οὕτως ἀναλυθήσονται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

On a day of your distress he will remember you.

As fair weather with frost so will your sins melt away.

(A) ביום¹⁹ תזכר לך כחם על כפור להשבית עוניך:
(C) ביום יזכר לך וכחורב על קרח נמס חטאתיך:

[*ἀναμνησθήσεται σου*] The subject is most likely the father.²⁰ *Θ* and *Σ* have taken the verb as genuinely passive²¹ and read *σοι: תִּתְדַכֵּר לְךָ* ‘it [= *רַחֲמָנוּתָא* vs. 15] will be remembered for you²².’ This accords with *HA* *לך תזכר*, whereas *Θ* goes with C *לך יזכר*, most likely = *יזכר* with *צדקתך* understood as the object. Alternatively, *יזכר* can be analysed as impersonally used passive, *יזכר*.²³ Cf. *לֹא יִזְכְּרוּ לּוֹ כָּל־פְּשָׁעָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לֹא יִזְכְּרוּ לוֹ* πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτοῦ, ὅσα ἐποίησεν, οὐ μνησθήσεται Ez 18.22 (with dat. incommodi in *Θ*), where, however, we have no impersonal construction.

¹⁷ Cf. BDAG s.v. *οἰκοδομέω* 2.

¹⁸ Cf. *לְבָנוֹת וְלִגְטוּעַ לְבָנוֹת וְלִגְטוּעַ* ἀνοικοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν Je 1.10.

¹⁹ *ביום* most likely fell out after *צרה*.

²⁰ But cf. “Dieu se souviendra de toi” (*BJ*).

²¹ *SD* parses it as middle: “wird man sich deiner erinnern,” but this passage is about a direct personal relationship between father and son. Similarly Ryssel: “wird deiner gedacht werden.” “it will be remembered of you” (*NETS*) is debatable, for the grammatical object of remembrance is *you*.

²² “to thy credit” (Box - Oesterley).

²³ On this question with special reference to Qumran Hebrew, see *SQH* § 37 b. *BSH* (133) parses the verb here as Nifal.

ὡς εὐδία] What is meant must be “As on a day of fine weather,” for, strictly speaking, fine weather cannot be compared with sins. Moreover, εὐδία is a rather free rendering of A חם ‘warmth,’ i.e. the sun shining over frost²⁴ and melting it. In C we find חורב, which is, as here, contrasted with קרח in הלך קרח בקרח בלילה תִּישׁ בַּיּוֹם אֲכַלְנִי חֶרֶב וְקָרַח בַּלַּיְלָה תִּישׁ נֹכְתוֹס Gn 31.40. שִׁלְךָ would not mean ‘they will melt,’ but ‘you will be free from the destructive grip of your sins.’

παγετῶ] Both S and Sh use אֲגַלְיָדָא ‘ice,’ which agrees with C קרח [= קרח].

ἀναλυσθήσονται] LSJ s.v. ἀναλύω II 3 mentions Plut. 2.898a, where it is used of snow melting. H is = C נמס, i.e. נמס. This is followed by חטאתיך; the text, וכחורב על קרח נמס חטאתיך ‘like parching heat on melting snow your sins,’ is as loosely worded as in A כחם על כפור ‘like heat on frost.’

3.16) ὡς βλάσφημος ὁ ἐγκαταλιπὼν πατέρα,
καὶ κεκατηραμένους ὑπὸ κυρίου ὁ παροργίζων μητέρα αὐτοῦ.

*One who abandons his father is like a blasphemer,
and one who angers his mother has been cursed by the Lord.*

(A) כי מזיד בוזה אביו ומכעיס בוראו מקלל אמו:
(C) כמגדף העוזב אביו וזועם אל יסחוב אמו:

H A considerably differs from C: ‘because one who despises his father is presumptuous and one who curses his mother is angering his Creator.’ It is said by many that the Peshitta was translated from Hebrew.²⁵ Looking at A and C we find the matter rather complex. S reads: מְטוּל דְּמַגְדָּף מִן דְּשָׂאט ‘because one who abandons his father is blaspheming and one who insults his mother is cursed in the presence of his Creator.’ Smend (27) is of the view that C has substituted מכעיס and מקלל for each other, reading the latter as מְקַלֵּל, but the preceding half cannot be harmonised with C.

ὡς] Though interpreted by S מטול ד- as a causal conjunction, this verse scarcely indicates a cause of what is stated in the preceding verse. Its *Vorlage* probably started off with כי מגדף.

3.17) Τέκνον, ἐν πραύτητι τὰ ἔργα σου διεξάγε,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον δότην ἀγαπηθήσῃ.

*Child, conduct your affairs in humility,
and then you will be loved more than a giver.*

²⁴ Pace Smend (27) παγετός is an accurate rendering of כפור.

²⁵ E.g. Brock 2008.13 and Van Peursen 2007.16. The latter (p. 31) discusses, inter alia, cases which have been said to represent a mixture of C and H. Here we have a mixture of the two Hebrew text forms, A and C.

(A) בני בעשרך התהלך בענוה ותאהב מנותן מתנות:
(C) בני את כל מלאכתך בענוה הלוך ומאיש מתן תאהב:

The first half is very close to \mathfrak{H} C as against A. In the former, הלוך exemplifies obligative or injunctive value which the inf. abs. sometimes carries,²⁶ cf. *SQH* § 18 *oe*. However, the transitive use of Qal הלך is unheard of.²⁷

διέξαγε] \mathfrak{H} ’s נפק, probably נפק, is obscure. Possibly an error for אפק Afel, for which *SL* s.v. 14 has “w. לְעִבְדָּא to finish,” what we actually read in \mathfrak{H} : לְעִבְדָּא דִּילָךְ.

ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον δότην] A reading proposed by Smend (27) and adopted by Ziegler against υπο ἀνθρώπου δεκτοῦ of Rahlfs²⁸ and all Gk manuscripts. The reconstructed text is closer to \mathfrak{H} C מאיש מתן תאהב than to \mathfrak{H} A תאהב מנותן מתנות. This modern reconstruction, however, was unknown to \mathfrak{H} : ומן ברנשא מקבלא תתרחם: ‘by a respectable person,’ which is based on מקבלא read as a Pael passive ptc.²⁹ Ἄνθρωπος δότης is a free rendering of איש מתן ‘a man of gift(s),’ i.e. a generous alms giver. We have here an example of a frequently occurring structure of apposition <generic - specific>, basically a Hebrew calque, e.g. καὶ θυγάτηρ ἀνθρώπου ἱερέως כהן איש ובת איש Le 21.9.³⁰ Δότης is unknown prior to SG.³¹

3.18) ὄσω μέγας εἶ, τοσοῦτω ταπεινῷ σεαυτόν,
καὶ ἔναντι κυρίου εὐρήσεις χάριν.

*The greater you are, the humbler be,
and then you will find favour in the presence of the Lord.*

(A) מעט נפשך מכל גדולת עולם ולפני אֵל תמצא רחמים:
(C) בני גדול אתה כן תשפיל נפשך ובעיני אלהים תמצא חן:

\mathfrak{C} is closer to \mathfrak{H} C than to A.³²

ὄσω .. τοσοῦτω] Here we have an idiomatic use of the dative indicating difference in degree. For further examples in SG, see *SSG* § 22 *wp*. This is superior to ὄσον .. τοσοῦτον in some manuscripts.

²⁶ According to Smith (2000.262) this is the only case in BS of the predicative use of the inf. abs.

²⁷ In view of the equation πόρευσις / מְלֶאכָה Gn 33.14 Kister (1990.314f.) holds that BS was using the latter in the sense of “journey,” a rather bold suggestion.

²⁸ Rahlfs’ text means, *pace* SD, “von einem erwünschten Mann,” not “als ein erwünschter Mann.”

²⁹ In the margin of Codex Ambrosianus of \mathfrak{H} we see an editorial gloss: הו דִּמְקַבֵּל עַל אֱלֹהֵי אֵלֶיךָ. ‘one acceptable to God.’ Cf. ἀνθρώποι δεκτοί Si 2.5 > \mathfrak{H} אַנְשָׁא מְקַבְּלָא \mathfrak{H} .

³⁰ For further details, see *SSG* § 33 *c*.

³¹ Add our example in *GELS* s.v.

³² Though not translated into Gk, עולם here apparently means “world,” a rare use in BH, as noted by Nöldeke (1900.84).

σεαυτόν] 𐤊 נפֿשׁך. One might be tempted to see here confirmed the widely held view that שׁפָּך attached to a suffix pronoun is equivalent to a reflexive pronoun, thus נִפְשִׁי ‘myself.’ Similarly Si 4.7, 27 +. See above at 1.30. Let it be noted, however, that the use of הַשְּׁפִיל here is semantically distinct from a case such as הַשְּׁפִילְתִּי עַץ גִּבְהַתְּהִתִּי עַץ שְׁפָל Ez 17.24.

עוֹלָם here used in the sense of “the world,” referring, though, to אֶת־הָעוֹלָם נָתַן בְּלִבָּם Ec 3.11, where already in BH such a use is known.³³

3.19) 𐤀 𐤏𐤋𐤋𐤀𐤀 𐤀𐤓𐤌𐤁𐤀 𐤁𐤏𐤌𐤁𐤀 𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤃𐤀𐤁𐤀,
 ἀλλὰ πρᾶεσιν ἀποκαλύπτει τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ. 𐤀

*There are many who are high-ranking and renowned,
 but He reveals his mysteries to the humble.*

The verse is not found in 𐤊, whereas 𐤍 has preserved it labelled with an asterisk.

ἀποκαλύπτει] The active form chosen by Ziegler is attested by 𐤍 alone. 𐤍 reads a passive form: מְתַגְלִין or מְתַגְלִין.

(19b) is a rendering of 𐤊 vs. 20b.

3.20) ὅτι μεγάλη ἡ δυναστεία κυρίου
 καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ταπεινῶν δοξάζεται.

*Because great is the might of the Lord
 and is glorified by the modest.*

(A) כי רבים רחמי אלהים ולענויים יגלה סודו:

μεγάλη ἡ δυναστεία κυρίου] Quite distinct from 𐤊.

Δυναστεία can also signify ‘reign, rulership,’ so understood in 𐤍 שׁוֹלְטָנָה.

δοξάζεται] ≠ 𐤊 יגלה. At Si 43.28 in the margin of 𐤊A we see יגלה, for which 𐤍 reads δοξάζοντες. Probably a rendering of נגדל or נגדלה. In LXX δל נגד Pi. is rendered with δοξάζω five times. However, *יגדל סודו is difficult. Even if one parsed יגדל as Pual, the preposition ל־ is a problem. It is not the obvious marker of an actor in a passive construction, on which see JM § 132 f. Should we retain יגדל here, it could be Qal יגְדַל and 𐤍 is a free rendition – ‘His mystery will be great in the estimation of the modest.’ 𐤍 מְתַגְלִין רְאוּא מְתַגְלִין ‘mysteries are revealed to the modest’ is a free rendition of יגְלֶה.

On the textual, versional complication here, cf. Smend 28.

³³ The interpretation of the noun עוֹלָם here is disputed. Ginsberg (1961.74) would read הַעֲמָל here.

- 3.21) χαλεπώτερα σου μὴ ζήτηι
καὶ ἰσχυρότερα σου μὴ ἐξέταξε·

*Do not inquire what is too difficult for you
nor scrutinise what is beyond your competence.*

(A) פלאות ממך אל תדרוש ומכוסה ממך אל תחקור:
(C) פלאות ממך אל תחקור ורעים ממך אל תדרוש:

χαλεπώτερα] In both manuscripts of \mathfrak{H} we read פלאות, with which most likely the pl. of פלא is meant. However, it means ‘wonders, marvels,’ e.g. Ps 119.129, Dn 12.6. So also in Si: 11.4, פלאות מעשי יי, as captured by \mathfrak{G} θαυμαστά τὰ ἔργα κυρίου and פלאות תמהי מעשהו 43.25 > τὰ παράδοξα καὶ θαυμάσια ἔργα.³⁴ In the light of this an emendation to נפלאות, i.e. a Nif. ptc., נפלאות, might be suggested. Note וְלֹא־הִלַּכְתִּי בְגִדְלוֹתַי וְלֹא־רָמוּ עֵינַי וְנִפְלְאוֹת מְמֹנֵי Ps 119.129 and וְנִפְלְאוֹת מְמֹנֵי Jb 42.3. Both passages are notionally close to our Si passage, and the use of מן as in our Si passage – פלאות ממך – is to be noted.

ζήτηι] Parallel to ἐξέταξε in the second hemistich, ζητέω is an intellectual activity: “to inquire into sth as obj. of intellectual pursuit” (*GELS* s.v. 8), a meaning known in CG, too. Cf. also ζήτημα ‘issue, question’ Ac 15.2.

ἰσχυρότερα] The primary meaning of the adjective is “strong.” Its use in ἀγῶνα ἰσχυρόν Wi 10.12 exemplifies a gradual semantic shift to the notion of “difficult”; in a wrestling match it would be difficult to contend with a strong opponent. Engl. “tough” could cover both notions. What רעים in $\mathfrak{H}C$ is supposed to mean is rather obscure. By contrast, מכוסה in $\mathfrak{H}A$ is more intelligible: ‘covered, hidden’ with reference to inscrutable, mysterious matters.

- 3.22) ἡ προσετάγη σοι, ταῦτα διανοοῦ,
οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν σοι χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν.

*What has been prescribed to you, ponder those things,
for there is no need for you of hidden matters.*

(A) במה שהורשית התבונן ואין לך עסק בנסתרות:
(C) באשר שהורשיתה התבונן ועסק אל יהי לך בנסתרות:

δ] C) באשר ש- is an infelicitous attempt to restore A) במה ש- to the more orthodox form. The scribe could have been content with באשר.

προσετάγη] quite a departure from \mathfrak{H} both A and C, הורשית(ה) ‘you have been permitted’ = \mathfrak{S} אֶתְּפַקֵּד לְךָ and \mathfrak{S} אֶשְׁלִטְךָ = \mathfrak{G} .

³⁴ In the latter case the equation between the two Hebrew words and their Greek renderings is problematic, on which see ad loc.

διανοοῦ] “To ponder” as a sense of διανοέομαι was unknown prior to SG and occurs in Si alone, as often as 8 times with the sole exception of Da 10.11 LXX. A syntagm almost identical with what we find here occurs in διανοοῦ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασιν κυρίου 6.37, where the same Heb. verb as here is used: הַתְּבוּןָה.

χρεία] עסק 𐤁 both A and C; A עסק בנסתרות לך אין may be idiomatically rendered “hidden matters are none of your business.” 𐤍 תּוֹכְנָא ‘confidence,’ i.e. confidence in one’s intellectual competence. 22b is missing in 𐤍. Cf. עשק 𐤁 A 11.10 (𐤀 αἰ πράξεις σου). In RH we find 𐤍, e.g. 𐤍 עשק בהן שלמה בדברים שלא היה לו צורך בהן ‘Solomon busied himself with many things of which he had no need’ Tanchuma 73a.³⁵

3.23) ἐν τοῖς περισσοῖς τῶν ἔργων σου μὴ περιεργάζου·
πλείονα γὰρ συνέσεως ἀνθρώπων ὑπεδείχθη σοι.

*Do not waste your labour on what is other than your works,
for more than what human intellect can handle has been shown to you.*

(A) וביותר ממך אל תמר כי רב ממך הראית:

περισσοῖς] Most likely neuter in gender, independently of the attached τὰ ἔργα. Cf. τὰ περισσὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰούδου ‘the rest of the words of Judas’ 1M 9.22.

τῶν ἔργων σου] Given σύνεσις in 23b “the works (ἔργα)” here must refer to intellectual pursuits and occupations rather than manual labour. Thus this carries on the theme of 3.22.

Compared with 𐤁A ממך יותר 𐤀 is rather expansive. So is 𐤍 יתירתא 𐤍 דִּלְךָ דְעַבְדָּא דִּילְךָ. The 3ms suffix in 𐤍 שְׂרָכָא דְעַבְדְּוָהּ is odd. Is it a reference to God? Nor makes 𐤍 הִמְרָה < תְּמָר ‘to rebel’ any sense here.

περιεργάζου] a hapax in SG. LSJ I 1 mentions τί περιεργάζοντο δοκέοντες ‘why did they trouble themselves, pondering ..’ Hdt 2.15.2. How to account for the selection of this verb to render 𐤁A תמר is quite a challenge. BSH (208) derives it from √מרר, but what bitterness has to do with this proverb, “embitter” (Hi. תְּמָר)?³⁶ The grandson may have given up. Note ἀπὸ περιεργίας παιδίσκης αὐτοῦ ‘from occupying yourself with your own³⁷ handmaid’ 41.22 < 𐤁 M לך 𐤍 𐤍 מהתעשק 𐤍 ע, where the Gk deverbial noun is a rendition of the verb התעשק, and עסק, a noun derived from which occurs in 3.22.

πλείονα γὰρ συνέσεως ἀνθρώπων] This is also expansive vis-à-s 𐤁A וביותר ממך הראית ‘for more than you can cope with you has been shown’ =

³⁵ Smend (30) failed to locate the passage, because he was looking at p. 73b!

³⁶ Cf. Wagner’s (1999.266-68) and Kister’s (1990.315f.) brave struggle.

³⁷ On this gen. pronoun, see below ad loc.

§. §h = G. G is probably an attempt to explicate H, which is obscure: “you have been shown more than you.”

3.24) πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐπλάνησεν ἢ ὑπόλημψις αὐτῶν,
καὶ ὑπόνοια πονηρὰ ὀλίσθησεν διανοίας αὐτῶν.

*For their speculation has led many astray
and wrong speculation has caused their minds to slip.*

(A) כי רבים עשתוני בני אדם ודמיונות רעות מתעות:

ἐπλάνησεν] The two lines are both verbal clauses consisting of a verb, its subject and object. The addition of this verb makes for beautiful grammatical parallelism, and it is semantically synonymous with ὀλίσθάνω. Our translator is mindful not only of a message, but also of its aesthetic packaging.

ὑπόλημψις] hapax in SG.³⁸ HA has עשתוני. In BH all three words derived from √תש are hapax: הִתְעַשֵּׂת ‘to think’ Jn 1.6, עֲשֵׂתוֹת ‘thought’ Jb 12.5, וְעֲשֵׂתוֹן ‘thought’ Ps 146.4. Their extreme rarity notwithstanding, we could say that they are semantically neutral. H might be saying that men’s thoughts, suppositions are very diverse in character, some respectable but others plain wicked. In our Si passage here, however, that can hardly be said of ὑπόλημψις. Its parallel, ὑπόνοια, is explicitly marked as πονηρὰ. Likewise HA דמיון by itself is innocuous, but here qualified as רע.

αὐτῶν] This must be referring back to ἀνθρώπων added by our translator in vs. 23. To follow HA בני אדם עשתוני verbatim would have made the line too long.

ὑπόνοια] §h וְכִבְרִיתָא = καὶ ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ. G can be so accentuated, but then the above-mentioned parallelism in clause-syntax between a and b would be gone. §h has captured here the negative connotation of ὑπόνοια, because וְכִבְרִיתָא signifies “illusion, fantasy.”

This Gk noun corresponds to דמיונות, pl. of דמיון, a hapax in BH in the sense of “likeness” in Ps 17.12, a sense which does not fit our Si context. In post-BH it also means “something that one sees with his power of imagination” (Ben Yehuda 1959.960a), which is close to its parallel, עשתון.³⁹ The etymological Syriac equivalent in § בִּישְׁתָּא וְדְמוּתָא בִּישְׁתָּא מְטַעֵן appears to carry the same sense as illustrated in § מִן חֶלְמָא בִּישְׁתָּא וְמִן דְמוּתָא שְׂכִירְתָּא.⁴⁰

On the verb ὀλίσθάνω, see below at 19.16.

³⁸ On this lexeme, cf. Caird 1969.38f.

³⁹ On the interpretation of דמיונים in a description of horses in a battle field (1QM 6.13) no consensus has been reached yet, cf. van der Ploeg 1959.108.

⁴⁰ Quoted from Ephrem in Payne Smith 1868-1901 s.v. None of the nine senses mentioned in SL fits our Si example.

- 3.25) ¶ κόρας μὴ ἔχων ἀπορήσεις φωτός,
γνώσεως δὲ ἀμοιρῶν μὴ ἐπαγγέλλου. ¶

*Having no pupils (in your eyes), you will sorely miss light,
having no share of knowledge, do not make profession.*

(A) באין אישון יחסר אור ובאין דעת תחסר חכמה:

Whereas no trace of this verse is present in **S**, we find **S**h equal to **Ḫ**:
כָּד בְּבִתּוּלָא לָא אִית לָהּ תְּתַגְלוּ מִן נוֹהָרָא כָּד דִּין לָא מְשֻׁתָּף אִנְיָ בִידְעָתָא לָא לְאִשְׁתּוּדָא
‘when you have no pupils, you will be deprived of light. When you do not
share in knowledge, you shall not profess.’

μὴ ἔχων] = באין, i.e. באין, a negator attested only once in QH, but a number
of times in Si.⁴¹

ἐπαγγέλλου] i.e. to talk in public as if you possessed a good measure of
knowledge. This can hardly be harmonised with **Ḫ** ‘you are going to lack
knowledge.’

- 3.26) καρδία σκληρὰ κακωθήσεται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων,
καὶ ὁ ἀγαπῶν κίνδυνον ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπολείται.

*A stubborn heart will suffer badly in the end,
and one fond of danger will perish in it.*

(A) לב כבד תבאש אחריתו ואוהב טובות ינהג בהם:

καρδία σκληρὰ] = **ḪA** לב כבד. In combinations of לב with כבד, whether
a verb or an adjective, βαρύνω serves as an equivalent of כבד, e.g. כבד לב
פָּרַעַתָּה Beβάρηται ἡ καρδία Φαραω Ex 7.4. Also ib. 9.7 and 1Sm 6.6 (twice).
Hence noteworthy is עוֹד תִּקְשׁוּ עוֹד לָא תִּקְשׁוּ וְעַרְפְּכֶם לִבְבְּכֶם וְעַרְפְּכֶם לִבְבְּכֶם
καὶ περιτε-
μεῖσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν οὐ σκληρονεῖτε
ἔτι Dt 10.16, although σκληρ- does not represent כבד. The Gk translator’s
fondness of this combination is also apparent in σκληροκαρδίως 16.9 and
σκληροκαρδία 16.10.

κακωθήσεται] = **Ḫ** תבאש. In BH the verb from this root and באש have
to do with stinking smell of edible things, land, water etc. One could think
of a loose, figurative use of the verb here. However, an Aramaic influence
is more likely. In Aramaic this root is the standard equivalent of Heb. רע.
Note **S** שְׂבִיבָא and **S**h שְׂבִיבָא here.

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων] Not necessarily = ‘on death,’ but ‘in later years’ or ‘in the
closing period of one’s earthly life.’ Cf. also 1.13 and 30.1.

For 26b it is not easy to harmonise **Ḫ** and **Ḫ**.

⁴¹ For details, see (*SQH* § 40 n) and Van Peursen 1999.235.

- 3.27) καρδία σκληρὰ βαρυνθήσεται πόνοις,
καὶ ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς προσθήσει ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις.

*A stubborn heart will be weighed down with pains,
and a sinner will add a sin on top of sins.*

(A) לב כבד ירבו מכאביו ומתחולל מוסיף עון על עון:
(C) לב כבד יכביד כאבן וחוטא יוסיף חטא על חטא:

The (C) text, according to Elizur (2010.24), seems to have intruded between 6.15 and 6.18 of this Hebrew MS.

βαρυνθήσεται] = (C) יכביד. The Hi. stem here can be assigned ingressive value: “become heavy.” Cf. also שִׁבְיָא קְשִׁיָּא נְגוּן כְּאֲבוּהִי. שִׁבְיָא = (A): לְבָא קְשִׁיָּא נְגוּן כְּאֲבוּהִי ‘a stubborn heart – its pains will increase.’ Alternatively we could retain the standard causative value of הַכְבִּיד by reading כֶּאֱבָב or כֶּאֱבָבָא as *o*.

ἁμαρτωλὸς] Hardly a rendering of מְחֹלֵל, which in turn is difficult to account for. Its usual meaning ‘to whirl’ hardly fits the context.⁴²

Smend (32), out of nowhere, suggests emending the form to מְחֹלֵל ‘acting like a madman.’ מְחָרָא ‘audacious’⁴³ suggests מְחַלְלֵל = מְחַלְלֵל ‘bragging.’

ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις] Segal (19) interprets מְחָרָא in the sense of ‘punishment,’ which is known to BH, see BDB s.v. 3. Analogously ἁμαρτία is at times used as meaning “penalty incurred for committing a sin” (GELS s.v. 4). However, such a sense is alien to Syr. מְחָרָא used here in שִׁבְיָא and שִׁבְיָא.

מְחָרָא (Elizur 2010.24) almost perfectly represents מְחָרָא. The only discrepancy is כֶּאֱבָב, for which A reads מְחָרָא ‘his pains.’

- 3.28) ἐπαγωγῆ ὑπερηφάνου οὐκ ἔστιν ἴασις·
φυτὸν γὰρ πονηρίας ἐρρίζωκεν ἐν αὐτῷ.

*For a calamity (descended on) an arrogant person there is no cure,
for a plant of evilness has taken root in him.*

(A) אל תרוץ לרפאות מכ(ל)ת לץ כי אין לה רפואה:
כי נטע רע נטעו:

At the start of the verse there is nothing in מְחָרָא that would correspond to מְחָרָא ‘Don’t rush to cure.’ Likewise שִׁבְיָא. מְחָרָא would make 28a too long and does not look original.

ἐπαγωγῆ] Apparently = an imperfectly preserved מְחָרָא, i.e. < מְחָרָא ‘blow,’ = שִׁבְיָא מְחָרָא. This is the only instance of this equation in SG.

⁴² Segal (19) adduces מְחָרָא הוא מְחָרָא Jb 15.20, saying that that is how a wicked person is called, but writhing is a consequence of his wickedness.

⁴³ The phrase in שִׁבְיָא מְחָרָא מְחָרָא is syntactically odd, if it is supposed to mean ‘one who is audacious adds,’ for which we would anticipate something like מְחָרָא (ה) מְחָרָא.

ὑπερηφάνου] This Gk. adjective has basically to do with attitude. By contrast, its equivalent here 𐤏 𐤒𐤋 pertains to oral deeds. Its precise sense is disputed. Thus BDB and *DCH* “scorn,” *HALOT* “brag, speak boastfully,” and Kaddari 563a “to talk aloud.” 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 = 𐤏. Cf. 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 ‘one who mocks.’

φυτόν .. πονηρίας ἐρρίζωκεν] In comparison with 𐤏 𐤒𐤋 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 the paronomasia has vanished, but the Gk formulation comes over as more powerful.

ἐρρίζωκεν] In the active voice ῥίζωω, affiliated to ῥίζα ‘root,’ is normally transitive, meaning ‘to cause to strike root, plant.’ CG uses it in the passive voice in the sense of ‘to strike root,’ see LSJ s.v. **I**. It is used here in the active voice as an intransitive verb. Likewise in Si 24.12 and Ps 47.3, *GELS* s.v. **b**.

3.29) καρδία συνετοῦ διανοηθήσεται παραβολήν,
καὶ οὖς ἀκροατοῦ ἐπιθυμία σοφοῦ.

*The mind of an intelligent person will ponder parables,
and the ears of an attentive listener are what a sage desires.*

: לב חכם יבין משלי חכמים ואזן מקשבת לחכמה תשמח: (A

καρδία συνετοῦ] According to Smend (33) our translator has got the syntax wrong, for we have here, so we are told, have the syntagm <noun - attributive adjective>, what is right in view of the parallel 𐤏 𐤒𐤋 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 ‘an attentive ear.’ So 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 as against 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 ‘a mind of prudence.’ 𐤏, however, presents a beautiful parallelism: <part of a person [nom.] + the person’s character [gen.]>. On the other hand, συνετός appears to be normally said of a human being. Hence καρδία συνετή is an unlikely combination. One exceptional case involving two synonymous adjectives is δέδωκά σοι καρδίαν φρονίμην καὶ σοφίην 𐤏 𐤒𐤋 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 3K 3.12. It is interesting to note that 𐤏 has had a difficulty with בפה חכם ‘with an intelligent mouth’ 15.10, where we read ἐν σοφίᾳ, and cf. 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 ‘with the mouth of wise people’ and 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 = 𐤏.

διανοηθήσεται] On the interesting semantic feature of this verb, see above at 3.22. 𐤏 𐤒𐤋 in 𐤏 is morphologically ambiguous, for it can be parsed as either Qal or Hif. In Qal it can mean, in BH, not only ‘to comprehend,’ but also ‘to ponder’; see BDB s.v. Qal **3**, but not in Hif.⁴⁴ In the light of 29b we are talking here about a student, not a graduate, although διανοέομαι is also used in the sense of ‘to comprehend,’ thrice in Da; see *GELS* s.v. **4**.⁴⁵ Cf. 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏, though the Syr. verb can mean ‘to comprehend’ as well as ‘to consider.’⁴⁶ 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 definitely means ‘to consider.’

⁴⁴ *Pace* BSH 105, where our form is parsed as Hif. Apparently likewise Segal (20): “because he has knowledge.”

⁴⁵ We would be less confident than Smend (33): “natürlich = „es versteht“.” So Box - Oosterley “understands” and Skehan - Di Lella “appreciates.”

⁴⁶ 𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤔𐤏 in Lagarde ed. must be a misprint.

οὗς ἀκροατοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A און מקשבת \mathfrak{H} A. We could say that the Heb. text is displaying a syntactic parallelism of its own with an attributive Ptc. here parallel to an attributive adjective כחכ in 29a. \mathfrak{S} אָדָּנָא דְּמַשְׁמָעָא is syntactically ambiguous; אָמְרָא can be parsed as a predicatively used Ptc., but it can also be a substantively used masc. Ptc. ‘of the hearer,’ cf. \mathfrak{S} ה אָמְרָא דְּמַשְׁמָעָא. If we opt for the first analysis, the syntactic difference from אָמְרָא דְּמַשְׁמָעָא would stand out, for why not אָמְרָא דְּמַשְׁמָעָא? However, \mathfrak{H} can be rendered: ‘an ear eager to listen to wisdom will experience joy (= חמשת).’

The selection of the sg. “ear” instead of the du. אָזְנֵי or pl. \mathfrak{O} τα should not be particularly problematic. We have here a parallelism of pondering mind and listening ear.

ἐπιθυμία σοφοῦ] This departs rather widely from \mathfrak{H} A תשמח לשמה, in which there is nothing that expresses a notion of desire. To suggest, as Segal (19) does, multiple scribal errors or the Gk translator’s misreading sounds a little too arbitrary: לחכמה > לחכם and תשמח > חמדת [= חמדת], which also presupposes transference of the two words to become חמדת חכם. Smend (33) proposes construing לחכמה with מקשבת, parsing תשמח as Piel transitively used, and understanding חכמים as its object. This is acceptable as an analysis of \mathfrak{H} , but that is not how \mathfrak{G} understood it.

σοφοῦ is most likely a reference to a teacher or scholar, as in RH.

- 3.30) πῦρ φλογιζόμενον ἀποσβέσει ὕδωρ,
καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας.

*Water can extinguish burning fire,
so alms can atone for sins.*

(A) אש לוחטת יכבו מים כן צדקה תכפר חטאת:

καὶ] \mathfrak{H} כן. For the translator καὶ here was not a mere “and” joining two clauses, but “but also, even”: animal sacrifices can atone for sins, but alms given, too. For the collocation ἐξιλάσκομαι ἁμαρτίαν, cf. τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου ἐξιλάσεται Si 5.6. This has been captured by Cyprian, who begins the verse with *sicut* and renders καὶ with *sic*.

On ἐλεημοσύνη in the sense of “almsgiving” see above at 3.14.

- 3.31) ὁ ἀνταποδιδούς χάριτας μέμνηται εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πτώσεως εὐρήσει στήριγμα.

*One who requites favours done has taken (these) into consideration,
looking forward to the future,
and at the time of a fall he will find support.*

(A) פועל טוב יקראנו בדרכיו ובעת מוטו ימצא משען:

The first half presents quite a challenge in \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} alike as also testified by diverse translations, both ancient and modern. Take \mathfrak{S} $\text{דְּעֵבֶד דְּשִׁפִּיר עֲתִיד}$ בְּאַרְחֵהּ ‘one [= human] who does charitable things is prepared on his way (for any calamity)’ or ‘He [= God] who does favours is ready (to help him) on his way.’ Where does עֲתִיד come from? As for the Heb. text, פּוֹעֵל is ambiguous: פּוֹעֵל (Ptc.) or פּוֹעֵל (noun)? If Ptc., is the referent God or a human? If a noun, does it refer to what is done by God or by a human? Segal (20) opposes it to אָסוֹן ‘accident.’ Can מַעֲשֵׂה טוֹב mean “accident-free journey”? He further mentions an alternative sense, ‘decent reward,’ derived from Aram. פּעֵלָא טבָא .⁴⁷ יִקְרָאוּנוּ must be derived from קָרָה ‘to meet’ with God as the subject or from קָרָא ‘to call’ with a human as the subject calling God for help.

\mathfrak{G} here gives us a glimpse into the struggle its translator faced. If his *Vorlage* looked more or less like \mathfrak{H} , he had to be content with a rather free translation. The sense ‘to take into consideration’ (*GELS* s.v. $\mu\mu\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ 5) can be identified also in $\epsilon\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\mu\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ‘in all your talks take your future into consideration’ Si 7.36. See also 1E 3.20, 4.21. LSJ s.v. **B III** notes “give heed to” already in Homeric Greek, e.g. $\mu\epsilon\mu\nu\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron}\varsigma$ ‘think of (my) father and mother’ Hom. *Od.* 18.267. In the Pf. there is no morphological opposition between the two voices.⁴⁸ Should $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ be parsed as passive in meaning, the do-gooder has taken God into account. Furthermore, this verb can mean here ‘to commit to memory’: God has committed his kind deeds to His memory. Whether or not the Pf. here is used in the sense of ‘He committed to His memory, has not forgotten, still remembers’ is immaterial.

Our above-given translation is roughly equivalent to \mathfrak{S} $\text{וְאַיִנָּא דְּפָרַע לֵן}$ $\text{טִיבּוֹתָא נְתִדְכֵר בְּהִלִּין דְּבִתֵּר כֵּן}$ ‘and One who requites good deeds will remember these thereafter.’

⁴⁷ So argued by Lieberman in *Revue des études juives* 97 (1934) 51.

⁴⁸ In a tense such as Aor. which has two separate forms, we meet a form clearly marked as passive as in $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\eta\ \mu\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ‘his deeds of justice will not be remembered’ Ez 3.20. Even in such a tense, however, not every passive form is passive in sense, e.g. $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\eta\ \mu\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \pi\rho\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon$ ‘they will never remember the past history’ Is 65.17.

CHAPTER 4

- 4.1) Τέκνον, τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ πτωχοῦ μὴ ἀποστερήσης
καὶ μὴ παρελκύσης ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπιδεεῖς.

*Child, do not deprive the poor of a chance of survival
nor keep the eyes of the needy looking at you long.*

(A) בני אל תלעג לחיי עני ואל תדאיב נפש עני ומר נפש:

ἀποστερήσης] לַעַג of 𐤗 means something quite different, ‘to mock, make fun of.’ In 𐤗 one is advised to take the desperate situation of the poor seriously. Pace Smend (34) good sense can be made of this Heb. text: some aspects of the lives of poor people might look laughable and despicable to the middle class. Segal (21) mentions לַעַג לְרֵשׁ הַרְהַר עֲשֵׂהוּ Pr 17.5, where we find the same collocation as here. The lesson taught there differs from what Ben Sira wants to get across.

παρελκύσης] 𐤗 of 𐤗 means something quite different, ‘to make faint.’ In BH only Qal is used, and that only twice. In one of them we note a significant collocation with נפש as here: ‘Do not drive the soul of the poor and embittered to despair’ // הַרְוִיתִי נֶפֶשׁ עֵינָי וְכָל־נַפְשִׁי // אַל תְּדַאֲבֵן נַפְשׁ עַנִּי וְמַר נַפְשׁ Je 31.25. Note also וְכָל־יֹוֹן עֵינָי וְדַאֲבֹן נַפְשִׁי Dt 28.65. The Heb. collocation is about loss of mental energy and despair. By contrast, the Gk verb, *παρέλκω*, signifies ‘to draw aside,’ which does not fit our context.¹ The combination with acc. ὀφθαλμοὺς is highly innovative. The verb can mean, intransitively used, ‘to be prolonged, continue,’ which does not syntactically fit our example with an acc. object. Cf. 𐤗 𐤗 𐤗 ‘you avert, avoid (the eye of the needy).’ Moreover, ἐπιδεεῖς is used of a person.² Cf. 𐤗 𐤗 𐤗 ‘the eye of the needy.’ What 𐤗 is trying to say is probably: “Don’t keep the poor waiting on and on with their beseeching looks towards you.”

𐤗 𐤗 𐤗 ‘and do not harass the blind³ poor’ also differs widely from 𐤗.

- 4.2) ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν μὴ λυπήσεις
καὶ μὴ παροργίσης ἄνδρα ἐν ἀπορίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

¹ On this verb found in LXX only in Si, cf. Wagner 1999.265f.

² A v.l. preferred by Smend (34), ὀφθαλμὸν ἐνδεοῦς ‘the eye of a needy person,’ looks like a later attempt to smooth over this odd collocation.

³ Joosten (2007.*51) argues for the sense “miserable” as under putative influence of Western Aramaic, in which it means ‘poor’ as well as ‘dark.’

*Do not grieve the soul of the hungry
nor anger a man helpless with no way-out.*

(A) דָּוָה נַפְשׁ חֲסִירָה אֶל תְּפֹחַ אֶל תִּהְמָר מְעֵי דָךְ:

In \mathfrak{H} the verse begins with a mysterious, half-vocalised דָּוָה.⁴

ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν] What is meant is ψυχὴν πεινῶντος.⁵ See above on ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπιδεεῖς 4.1. Here it is not about spiritual hunger. Unlike in vs. 1, however, here \mathfrak{H} also shows the same syntactic structure: נַפְשׁ חֲסִירָה. \mathfrak{S} has understood חֲסִירָה as a reference to the shortage of food in particular, probably in view of מְעֵי in 2b.

λῦπῆσῃς] \mathfrak{H} תְּפֹחַ, analysed as Qal from פּוּחַ, which is a rare verb in BH in the sense of “to breathe,” attested twice in יְפוּחַ הַיּוֹם ‘the day breathes, i.e. it grows cool’ Ct 2.17, 4.6. Segal (22) mentions an illuminating case from RH: ‘why should I go to him to anguish him?’ Tanch. Balaq 13. It would then be needless to emend the form to תְּפִיחַ ‘to breathe out,’ a Hif. from נָפַח.⁶ Kahana quotes from the Talmud הֵלֵךְ לְבֵיתוֹ נַפְשׁ בְּפָחֵי ‘he went home depressed’ bShab 127b.

4.2b reads quite different in \mathfrak{H} : אֶל תִּהְמָר מְעֵי דָךְ ‘Do not add stress to the bowels of the oppressed.’ No less different is \mathfrak{S} וְלֹא תִטַּעַא רוּחָה דְאִנְשָׁא דְתַבְרָא ‘nor forget the crushed spirit of a person.’ For the Heb. text Smend (35) justly refers to מְרָמְרוּ מְעֵי La 1.20 and מְרָמְרוּ מְעֵי ib. 2.11. In these biblical passages it is about one’s internal agony, whereas in our Si case מְעֵים is meant literally, namely empty stomach with starvation round the corner. Note πεινῶσαν in 4.2a. DCH s.v. חָמַר I takes the verb in a literal sense of “to cause to ferment,” i.e. agitation in the bowels. In MH, however, it is used in the sense of “to make hard, difficult” as in אַחֲרִים מְחָמֵר in אֶף עַל פִּי שֶׁמֶקֶל אֲנִי עַל אַחֲרִים מְחָמֵר ‘whilst I make it easier for others, I make it harder for myself’ bBer 22.

4.3) καρδίαν παρωργισμένην μὴ προσταράξῃς
καὶ μὴ παρελκύσῃς δόσιν προσδεομένου.

*Do not trouble further the heart of the angry
nor put off giving to the needy.*

(A) וְקָרַב עֲנִי אֶל תְּכַאֵיב אֶל תִּמְנַע מֵתֵן מִמְסַכִּינָךְ:

καρδίαν] \mathfrak{H} קָרַב = קָרַב, an equivalence occurring six more times in LXX. We find a literal interpretation in \mathfrak{S} מְעֵיָהּ ‘his intestines.’

⁴ BSH 328 does not know how to record it. Segal (21) mentions diverse solutions, among which a corruption of רוּחַ = רוּחָה, which has been added at the end of the clause in \mathfrak{S} נִפְשָׁא דְחֲסִירָה לֹא תִכְאֵב רוּחָה.

⁵ Pace Smend (35) we doubt that נִפְשׁ on its own can mean “hunger.”

⁶ As attempted by Smend (35) and Skehan - Di Lella (166).

παρωργισμένην] יַעֲנִי, an intrusion from vs. 2.

προσταράξιης] < προσταράσσω, a verb unknown prior to SG. The prefix signifies repetition or addition, which has been captured in ܠܐ ܚܘܨܐ ܕܚܘܨܐ ܕܚܘܨܐ. This asyndetic concatenation of two verbs in the same tense and mood is uncommon in Syriac. *SL* s.v. ܦܫܐ Af. 4 mentions two examples.⁷ The same phenomenon can be observed in another verb, ܦܫܐ, in the same meaning; for examples, see *SL* s.v. Pe. 2 g.⁸

προσδεομένου] The Gk verb can be taken in the sense of “to beg, ask for,” whereas we note ܘܢܚܢܝܢ, ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ and ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ. The message may be that you should not wait for the needy to come to knock on your door, but identify needs and take an initiative fast.

4.4) ἰκέτην θλιβόμενον μὴ ἀπαναίνοιο
καὶ μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ πτωχοῦ.

*Do not refuse a suppliant in distress
nor turn your face away from the poor.*

(A) ܘܠܐ ܬܒܘܙܐ ܫܘܠܘܬ ܕܠ ܘܠ ܬܬܥܠܡ ܡܡܕܟܕܟܕ ܢܦܫ:

A rather free translation altogether.

ἰκέτην] ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ was probably read as ܫܘܠܘܬ = ܫܘܠܘܬ = ‘requests,’ and translated freely. Cf. ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ.

4.5) ἀπὸ δεομένου μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς ὀφθαλμὸν
καὶ μὴ δῶς τόπον ἀνθρώπῳ καταράσασθαί σε·

*From the impoverished do not look away
nor give people an excuse for cursing you.*

(A) ܘܠܐ ܬܬܢ ܠܘ ܡܩܘܡ ܠܩܠܠܝܚ:

δεομένου] Just like the compound equivalent, προσδέομαι (4.3), its simplex can mean ‘to ask for’ as well as ‘to be needy,’ though the former applies to the majority of instances and *GELS* s.v. 2 mentions only two others⁹ for the latter, 4M 2.8 and Wi 16.25, where the verb appears as a substantivised ptc. just as in our Si passage here. The complete parallelism with the immediately preceding 4.4b speaks for our analysis as against “vom Bittenden” (Smend 36), “von einem Bittenden” (*SD*) and “one who begs” (*NETS*). Note also ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ, so also in 4.3.

⁷ In one of which the syntagm is not really indicative of the Gk prefix, for ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ, which translates προσημαίνω, of which the prefix is προ.

⁸ On this question in BH see Muraoka 2024. In the case of ܘܢܚܢܝܢܐ the second verb is expressed with an inf. (Is 52.1, 47.1, 5, Ho 1.6) or -ܝ + Impf. (Gn 4.12, Jb 27.1).

⁹ This Si example is to be added.

- 4.6) καταρωμένου γὰρ σε ἐν πικρία ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ
τῆς δεήσεως αὐτοῦ ἐπακούσεται ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν.

*For when he curses you with bitterness inside,
the One who made him will hearken to his appeal.*

(A) צועק מר רוח בכאב נפשו ובקול צעקתו ישמע צורו:

γάρ] This indicates a logical connection between 4.5b and 4.6. If the needy is driven so far as to curse you, his Creator would step in, and then He would not be pleased with you.

ἐν πικρία ψυχῆς] This is an abbreviated version of מר רוח בכאב נפשו. Καταρωμένου rather than κρίζοντος, for instance, renders the logical link between 4.5b with καταρᾶσθαι and 4.6 clear. The same Gk phrase, ἐν πικρία ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, recurs in 7.11.

Hanna, in her despondency and despair, was described as אָשָׁה מֵרַת נַפֶּשׁ 1Sm 1.10 and she called herself רַחֵם אֱשָׁה קִשְׁת רֹיחֵ ib. 1.15.

ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ] In spite of מר רוח נפשו αὐτοῦ is not to be construed with ψυχῆς ‘his soul,’ but is functioning as the grammatical subject of καταρωμένου, a gen. abs. construction. Given the considerable freedom of word order in Greek the separation of the pronoun from the verb should be no great hindrance to this analysis.¹⁰ The *s* αὐτοῦ loosely refers back to δεομένου in the preceding verse. מְטוֹל דְּלֶא הַיְיָ דְּאִןְּ לִי < כִּד גַּיֵּר לְאַטְּ לָהּ וְנָהּ with no pronominal subject, what is normal in Syriac in a subordinate clause as in, e.g. מְטוֹל דְּלֶא הַיְיָ דְּאִןְּ לִי < כִּד גַּיֵּר לְאַטְּ לָהּ וְנָהּ *על-בלי הגיד לו כי < מטול דלֵא הַיְיָ דְּאִןְּ לִי < כִּד גַּיֵּר לְאַטְּ לָהּ וְנָהּ* Gn 31.20, see also Nu 22.12, 22.

ἐπακούσεται] ישמע מֵ. Despite its derivation from ἀκούω, the compound verb signifies more than aural reception, a sound wave reaching someone’s ears. Cp. ἐπακήκοεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδίου σου שְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים שְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים Gn 21.17, where the translator is making a subtle distinction by starting the verse with εἰσήκουσεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδίου וְשָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים as if wanting to say that God had heard attentively to the crying boy, and now the angel was assuring his mother that he had taken due note of the situation.¹¹ Here we have אֱלֹהִים following אֱלֹהִים, and in our Si passage בקול.

ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν] = יוצרו, i.e. יוצרו in lieu of מר צורו = צורו ‘his rock,’ which, of course, does make sense. Cf. מְטוֹל דְּלֶא הַיְיָ דְּאִןְּ לִי ‘his Creator’ and מְטוֹל דְּלֶא הַיְיָ דְּאִןְּ לִי ‘He who made him.’

- 4.7) προσφιλή συναγωγῆ σεαυτὸν ποίει
καὶ μεγιστᾶνι ταπείνου τὴν κεφαλὴν σου.

¹⁰ For an alternative analysis, see SSG § 84 b.

¹¹ For our exposition of this passage, see Muraoka 2020.98.

*Make yourself well-thought of by (your) community
and keep your head down before a nobleman.*

(A) האהב לנפשך לעדה ולשלטון עוד הכאף ראש:

προσφιλη] Scarcely about favouritism, but one is advised to strive to live as a decent, respectable member of the society.

אֲהַב לנפשך לעדה is grammatically unusual. The verb is unlikely a Nif. Impv., אֲהַב, but Hif. אֶהַב. The verb is not used in Hif. in BH, but in RH we do find a case in “all the diseases that You bring down on me are in order to make me lovable to you (בשביל להאחיבני לך)” CtR 2.5.1 on אָנִי אֶהְבֶּה אָנִי Ct 2.5.¹² Note אֶהְבֶּה and אֶהְבֶּה .. אֶהְבֶּה. Then the *lamed* of אֶהְבֶּה would be a direct object marker equivalent to אֶת, a use common in QH under Aramaic influence.¹³

συναγωγῆ] אֲהַב, the Jewish community in the first instance, but perhaps also the society at large. אֲהַב has a strange עוד following, which corresponds to אֶת דְּמִדְּיָנָא = עִיר.

μεγιστᾶν] אֲהַב, i.e. person or persons in authority. Cf. μεγιστᾶν καὶ κριτῆς καὶ δυνάστης δοξασθήσεται Si 10.24, where we are told, however, that none of them is superior to the pious, however low on the social ranking, and // ἡγούμενος 39.4. The Heb. word used here occurs only twice in BH, Ec 8.4, 8, meaning ‘mastery,’ but not a person invested with such as here as in MH.¹⁴

ταπεινῶν] אֲהַב, a Hif. Impv. of אֶהַב recorded in *Maagarim* as its sole attestation.¹⁵ In BH we find only אֶהַב, and basically the same collocation as here occurs in לָכֵן כָּאֲנִי רֵאשִׁי Is 58.5. See also כִּי רֵאשִׁי Si 30.12, rendered κάμψον τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ. In Is 58.5 also אֶהַב uses τράχηλος. In any event the verb means ‘to bend, direct downwards.’

4.8) κλῖνον πτωχῶ τὸ οὖς σου
καὶ ἀποκρίθητι αὐτῷ εἰρηνικὰ ἐν πραύτητι.

*Incline your ear to the poor
and answer him gently with humility.*

(A) הט לעני אונך והשיבהו שלום בעונה:

¹² In the database *Maagarim* 20 more instances are recorded.

Pace Dihi (2000.60) our instance is not reflexive, which is being expressed through אֶהַב. Neither Smend nor Segal finds here a reflexive construction. The former (37) mentions Syr. אֶהַב.

¹³ For details, see *SQH* § 31 h.

¹⁴ See Jastrow 1903 s.v. 2. Smend (37) dismisses the pl. in some manuscripts, μεγιστᾶσι, and אֶהְבֶּה as indifferent (*gleichgültig*), arguing that Jews had no mayor in Jerusalem, but a city council. So Box - Oosterley. But did Ben Sira write the book for the Palestinian Jewry alone?

¹⁵ BSH 167a, however, parses כִּי Si 30.12 as a Pi. Impv. of אֶהַב.

κλῖνον πτωχῶ τὸ οὖς] The collocation κλίνω τὸ οὖς is very common in SG, also in Si, e.g. 6.33, and can combine not only with dat. pers. as here, but otherwise. For details, see *GELS* s.v. κλίνω II 2.

ἀποκρίθητι αὐτῷ εἰρηνικὰ] \mathfrak{H} A הַשִּׁיבֵהוּ שְׁלוֹם הַשִּׁיב meaning ‘to reply’ with שְׁלוֹם as a direct object is unique. Interestingly, however, the synonymous הַשִּׁיב does attest to such a combination in תַּעֲנֵן אִם-שְׁלוֹם תַּעֲנֵן Dt 20.11 and is rendered as here with ἐὰν μὲν εἰρηνικὰ ἀποκριθῶσίν σοι.¹⁶ Smend (37) is of the view that \mathfrak{C} erred by reading too much into a mere greeting which is often followed by a request. That would not apply to Dt 20.11, for שְׁלוֹם there is used as an antonym of מִלְחָמָה. Israelites are told to offer a choice between peace and war to a group of potential enemies. It is a little more than “Hello, how are you?” (שְׁלוֹם לְךָ).¹⁷ As for the pronominal suffix directly attached to the verb, הַשִּׁיב differs from תַּעֲנֵן; the former cannot be rewritten as הַשִּׁיב אֵת, whereas the latter can be rewritten as תַּעֲנֵן אֵת as in וַתַּעֲנֵנוּ אֵתִי Dt 1.14 (\mathfrak{C} καὶ ἀπεκρίθητέ μοι). הַשִּׁיב is analytically worded as לֹא הַשִּׁיב לוֹ, cf. לֹא הַשִּׁיב לְךָ 2Ch 10.6, where we probably have the original combination with דָּבָר, often elided, and note that in MH הַשִּׁיב ל־ is the usual collocation as in מָה שֶׁתַּשִּׁיב לְאַפְּיִקוּרוֹס ‘what you should answer to an Epicurean [= unbeliever]’ mAb 2.14. Cf. הַשִּׁיבֵנִי Jb 33.5 (\mathfrak{C} δός μοι ἀπόκρισιν).

4.9) ἐξελοῦ ἀδικούμενον ἐκ χειρὸς ἀδικούντος
καὶ μὴ ὀλιγοψυχήσης ἐν τῷ κρίνειν σε.

*Rescue one who is being wronged from the hand of the wrongdoer
and do not be feeble-minded when you sit as a judge.*

(A הוֹשַׁע מוֹצֵק מִמְצִיקוֹ וְאֵל תִּקּוֹן רוּחַךְ בְּמִשְׁפַּט יוֹשֵׁר:

ἐκ χειρὸς] Smend (38) surmises that \mathfrak{C} may be a rendering of מִיד instead of \mathfrak{H} A מ־.¹⁸

ἀδικούντος] \mathfrak{H} A pl. מִצִּיקוֹ = \mathfrak{S} אֶלּוֹצְוֵהוּ.

μὴ ὀλιγοψυχήσης] \mathfrak{H} A אֵל תִּקּוֹן. A close parallel in BH is found in מוֹסֵר תוֹתוֹ וְיָהוָה בְּנִי אֶל-תִּמְאָס וְאֶל-תִּקְוָן בְּתוֹכָהֶן Pr 3.11, where both verbs are about one’s decision not to have anything to do with something, abhorrence, loathing, and the second verb, as in our Si case, takes a ב־ object. Of the total of eight occurrences of Qal קָק six are in the past tense expressing the notion “to feel sick of (one’s past experience)” as in e.g. Rebecca’s קָצַתִּי בְּחַיִּי Gn 27.46. On

¹⁶ Ryssel mentions Gn 41.16 as well, where we read אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֵה אֶת-שְׁלוֹם פְּרַעֲהַ, which is not quite the same, for Joseph is reassuring Pharaoh that through him [= Joseph] God will show a solution for the nightmare, reassuring him a peace of mind.

¹⁷ Some others are as critical of \mathfrak{C} : Box - Oesterley, Segal (22), and Skehan - Di Lella.

¹⁸ We fail to see what Smend means by saying: “Im Kanon kommt הַצִּיק nicht so vor.” This verb in the sense of ‘to oppress, push into a corner’ is solidly established in BH. The collocation with מִיד is very common with הוֹשִׁיעַ used here.

הַיָּהוָה as the subject, note נַפְשֵׁנוּ קָצָה בְּלִקְלֵהָם הַקֶּלֶקֶל ‘we are mentally sick of this lousy meal’ Nu 21.5. See also below at 7.10.

By contrast, for our ὀλιγοψυχέω *GELS* s.v. 2 suggests “to be infirm of will and purpose.” To take on a powerful wrong-doer and to announce a fair verdict that may not be to his liking would certainly require a fair measure of courage and determination. Since ὀλιγοψυχέω, ὀλιγοψυχία, and ὀλιγοψυχος in SG often correspond to √קצר,¹⁹ Smend may be right in proposing to reconstruct \mathfrak{H} as תקצר, which may have come about through a haplography: תקצר רוחך > תקצר רוחך, so Segal 23. Cf. \mathfrak{S} תִּתְכַרֵּא רוּחְךָ, where the primary meaning of √כרי is ‘short.’ However, given what we have said above on the Heb. expression here, Smend’s restoration does not appear to us absolutely called for.

4.10) γίνου ὀρφανοῖς ὡς πατήρ
καὶ ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς τῆ μητρὶ αὐτῶν·
καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς υἱὸς ὑψίστου,
καὶ ἀγαπήσει σε μᾶλλον ἢ μήτηρ σου.

*Be like a father to orphans
and for their mother in place of her husband,
and then you will have become like a son of the Most High,
and He will love you more than your mother.*

(Aa) היה כאב ליתומים ותמור בעל לאלמנות:
(Ab) ואל יקראך בן ויחנך ויצילך משחת:

The first two lines remind one of אָבִי יְתוּמִים וְדָוִן אֶלְמָנוֹת אֱלֵהִים בְּמַעוֹן קְדָשׁוֹ Ps 68.6.

ὡς πατήρ] \mathfrak{S} lacks the preposition,²⁰ what does not necessarily imply adoption of orphans, rather a virtual father. In the second line \mathfrak{H} תמור is rendered with תְּכַרֵּא, without which a bigamy could ensue. On this Heb. preposition, see above at 3.14.

τῆ μητρὶ αὐτῶν] \mathfrak{H} לאלמנות ‘to widows.’ Is the grandson’s heart going out for the fatherless kids? Note the last line with μήτηρ σου totally independent of \mathfrak{H} .

ὑψίστου] On the striking absence of the definite article, see *SSG* § 2, p. 11, f.n. 1. This adjective as equivalent to עֲלִיּוֹן ‘the Highest’ occurs tens of times in Si and is anarthrous far more times than it is articular. See also at 19.17.

ἀγαπήσει σε μᾶλλον ἢ] \mathfrak{S} תִּתְכַרֵּא יְתִירָאִית ‘(your mother) will love you more,’ which shows that the unaccented H was read as הֵ, not הִ.

¹⁹ See *Index* s.vv., pp. 84b-85a.

²⁰ Lagarde, p. iv, notes תְּכַרֵּא added in Walton’s London polyglot.

וְיִחַנֵּךְ וְיִצִּילֶךָ מִשְׁחַת 𐤀 ‘and He will be gracious to you and rescue you from the pit,’ where the second clause sounds out of place.

4.11) Ἡ σοφία υἱοὺς αὐτῆς ἀνύψωσεν
καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν.

*Wisdom exalted her sons
and will reach out to those who seek her.*

(A חכמות למדה בניה ותעיד לכל מבינים בה:

Ἡ σοφία] 𐤀A חכמות, the pl. number of which in חכמות למדה בניה ותעיד לכל מבינים בה is in discord with what follows. In BH, however, we come across a similar phenomenon: חֲכָמוֹת בְּנֵתָהּ בֵּיתָהּ הִצְבָּה עֲמוּדֶיהָ שְׁבָעָה Pr 9.1 as against חֲכָמוֹת בְּחוּץ מְרִנָּה בְּרַחֲבוֹת תִּתֵּן קוֹלָהּ ib. 1.20, where one verb is in the pl. and the other in the sg. Cf. König 1897 § 262d, and the notion of the plural of majesty is sometimes invoked, e.g. Segal (24) and JM § 136 d.

ἀνύψωσεν] clearly ≠ 𐤀A למדה. In order to overcome this discrepancy Smend adopts ἐνεφυσίωσε cited by Clemens, but not by a single Gk manuscript. This verb, ἐμφυσίω occurs only twice in SG and presumably also rare outside of it. The definition given in *GELS* s.v., ‘to infuse life into,’ derives from LSJ s.v., which has only two SG instances for the definition. It occurs in ἀνεγίνωσκον τὸν νόμον τοῦ κυρίου ἐμφυσιοῦντες ἅμα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν 1Es 9.48 and ἐνεφυσιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν, οἷς ἐδιδάχθησαν ib. 55. The way the Bible was read aloud and explicated did not come over to the audience as dull. Though the verb is used in 1Es in the context of teaching, inspiring teaching is as much removed as uplifting teaching in our Si passage.

The second half of the verse is as problematic as the first. 𐤀 means ‘and she will admonish all those who understand her.’ Smend mentions 𐤀 תְּנַהֵר ‘she will enlighten,’ = תְּאִיר. If we are to go for a graphic solution, we could suggest תְּעוֹד; on this meaning of the verb, see Midrash Ps on Ps 146.9.

ἐπιλαμβάνεται is wide apart from תְּעוֹד. If תְּעוֹר was meant, a more straightforward equivalent such as βοηθέω could have been used.

ζητούντων is as difficult to relate to מבינים, which would hardly refer to those who have already achieved a respectable level of understanding, for they would not need much help from Wisdom, but rather people who are striving to reach such a level. BDB s.v. בִּין Hiph. 2 indicates as one of its senses: “give heed to, attend to, observe, discern,” and similarly Zorell s.v. Hi. 2 “*attendit, animum applicuit ad rem.*” In one of the examples mentioned in BDB the verb takes a ב object, הִבִּינוּ בְּדַבְרֵיִם Ne 8.12. Note that in הִצְדִּיק אָבָד וְאִין אִישׁ Is 57.1 מְבִין is parallel to שָׁם עַל־לֵב > 𐤀 ὁ δίκαιος ἀπώλετο, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐκδέχεται τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἴρονται, καὶ οὐδεὶς κατανοεῖ.

The selection in \mathfrak{H} of the f.sg. forms concords with \mathfrak{H} . But we have here more than a purely grammatical matter. The author is personifying Wisdom as shown in \mathfrak{B} . We hesitate therefore to translate it as “its sons.” Some scholars apply such a perception of Wisdom when the author speaks of his love of Wisdom in 51.13-26. Whether or not we should say “her children” instead is a separate issue.

4.12) δ ἀγαπῶν αὐτήν ἀγαπᾷ ζωήν,
καὶ οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης.

One who loves her loves life,

and those who eagerly look to her will be filled with joy.

אהביה אהבו חיים ומבקשיה יפיקו רצון מיי: (A)

δ ἀγαπῶν αὐτήν] \mathfrak{H} אהביה. Why \mathfrak{G} has selected the sg. in contrast to οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες is not clear. \mathfrak{H} has מבקשיה.

οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν] As \mathfrak{G} could have said οἱ ζητούντες αὐτήν as in vs. 11, the verb chosen underlines the intense eagerness and anticipation on the part of the seekers of wisdom. True to its etymology – ὀρθρος ‘very early in the morning’ – the verb is at times used to translate \mathfrak{H} ‘to rise early in the morning,’ but that cannot be meant here. The sense defined in *GELS* s.v. 2 as “to seek and turn in eager anticipation” is amply attested in SG. Not just “to turn,” but also “to turn to,” is due to the fact that in four of its five attestations mentioned in *GELS* s.v.²¹ the verb is further expanded with πρὸς τινα.²² Our translator may be conscious of Qal \mathfrak{H} , but mostly Pi. \mathfrak{H} , derived from \mathfrak{H} ‘dawn,’ as used in the sense of “to seek eagerly,” e.g. \mathfrak{H} Pr 8.17, an example justly mentioned by Smend.²³ Note שחריהו \mathfrak{H} Si 6.36 > ὀρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτόν; שחריהו ib. 35.14 > οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες. See further below at 6.36.

ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης] \mathfrak{H} יפיקו רצון יי ‘they will elicit pleasure of Yahweh.’ There is thus quite a difference between the two texts: human

²¹ As a matter of fact there are more attestations: Ps 7.34, Si 6.36, 39.5, Je 25.3, Od 5.9, Jb 8.5.

²² The only exception is δ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ αὐτήν οὐ κοπιᾷσει Wi 6.14. However, πρὸς is also strongly represented by manuscripts, and Ziegler refers to Si 39.5, where he himself has opted for πρὸς. The same collocation is attested in καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὀρθρίζεν πρὸς αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ Lk 21.38. Here, too, our Gk verb hardly means just ‘to rise early in the morning.’ Note the the Impf. used, i.e. day in day out. Of course it is possible to construe the prepositional phrase with ἀκούειν. Cf. the nuanced exposition by Plummer 1922.488f. Interestingly \mathfrak{S} has \mathfrak{H} .

In Wi 6.14 mentioned above αὐτήν = σοφίαν. So in πρὸς αὐτήν Si 4.12. In both cases wisdom is personified, hence our formulation πρὸς τινα is justified.

²³ For more Heb. examples, see BDB and *DCH* s.v., and see a discussion in Muraoka 2008.

centred as against God centred, so much so that we miss the tetragrammaton (יְהוָה) in Ⓞ. To be exact, it is a trisgrammaton.²⁴

4.13) ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς κληρονομήσει δόξαν,
καὶ οὗ εἰσπορεύεται, εὐλογεῖ κύριος.

*One who holds fast to her will inherit glory,
and where he enters the Lord blesses.*

(A ותמכיה ימצאו כבוד מיי ויחנו בברכת יי:

κληρονομήσει] ימצאו. After the pl. in 12b we are back again to the sg. in Ⓞ.

The Heb. מצא means not only ‘to find (something or someone searched),’ but also ‘to come upon, light upon (sometimes unexpectedly),’ from the latter of which κληρονομέω is not so wide apart.

δόξαν] The Tetragrammaton is left untranslated again: כבוד מיי. It is, however, present in the second line.

εἰσπορεύεται] Rather free and generic for a rendering of יחנו ‘they settle.’

εὐλογεῖ] The grammatical object is missing: ‘him’ or ‘the place where he enters’? The latter is represented in ואתרא דברך מריא בית משריהון ‘and the place which the Lord blessed is their place of dwelling.’ ויחנה מריא מברך דעאלא לריא ‘and where it [= glory] enters, the Lord blesses’ is ambiguous as Ⓞ.

4.14) οἱ λατρεύοντες αὐτῆ λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίω,
καὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾷ ὁ κύριος.

*Those who serve her dedicatedly will serve the Holy,
and those who love her loves the Lord.*

(A משרתי קדש משרתיה ואלהו במא ויהא:

²⁴ This spelling of the divine name appears to be unique, if we are not mistaken, to three Ben Sira fragments, *pace* Segal (24, f.n. 2), not A alone. It occurs in B at 10.22 for the first time and very many times over, in C at 5.4, and in H only at 36.11. Given the spread of this practice among multiple manuscripts, it might go back to the original author. We might say that, out of their utmost piety, they would repeat the first letter of the tetragrammaton only, occasionally reduce the number of characters by one, and raise the one in the middle, all this in order to minimise its similarity in appearance to יהוה. *Pace* Segal (49, § 63) this shape does not represent the vowel symbol *seghol* upside down: it is written as three genuine *yod*'s, not three dots. The addition of a *shva* under the first *yod* and a *qamats* under the third is also his initiative. It is no wonder that in its tens of occurrences in Heb. Si it never occurs with אלהים following as often happens in the Heb. Bible, e.g. יהוה אלהים Gn 2.8. To do so would be beating the intended manifestation of piety. The only exception is יהוה אלהי ישראל Si 20.22, but the exception is nothing but apparent, for without the addition of אלהים one would not be able to add “of Israel.”

οἱ λατρεύοντες αὐτῆ] As in the preceding two verses, humans are put up front as the grammatical subject as against \mathfrak{H} here: משרתי קדש משרתיה.²⁵

$\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{G}$: מְשַׁמְּשֵׁנִי מְשַׁמְּשֵׁנִי קוֹדֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים.

λειτουργήσουσιν] In contrast to \mathfrak{H} the selection of two semantically related Gk verbs is most likely deliberate, not a mere stylistic variation. Whereas λειτουργέω is a couple of times used in a non-technical sense, i.e. not a cultic service, even in Si 8.8, here the standard use is to be postulated. Moreover, the Fut. tense of the verb is to be noted. \mathfrak{G} probably means that such people are on the way to achieve an honourable office in the temple. Cf. *BJ*: “.. rendent un culte au Saint.”

In \mathfrak{H} the second line is in a hopeless mess. One would not know whether or not \mathfrak{S} had a superior Heb. text: וַיְהִי וַיְהִי רַחֵם אֱלֹהִים ‘and God loved His dwelling-place.’²⁶

4.15) ὁ ὑπακούων αὐτῆς κρινεῖ ἔθνη,
καὶ ὁ προσέχων αὐτῆ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθώς.

*One who hearkens to her will judge nations,
and one who pays attention to her will dwell confidently.*

(A שומע לי ישפט אמת ומאזין לי ייחן בהדרי מבית:

ἔθνη] \mathfrak{H} אמת was analysed as אמת or the *Vorlage* was written אומות.

αὐτῆς .. αὐτῆ] In \mathfrak{H} Wisdom is addressing: לי . . לי.

κατασκηνώσει] BSH 144b parses \mathfrak{H} ייחן as Qal Impf. of הִנַּח, though the double *yod* is anomalous, and the selection of the jussive form is abrupt. Should we restore הִנַּח = הִנַּח?

πεποιθώς] The Pf. of this common verb πείθω, esp. its Ptc. as here, is often used in the sense of “*to feel confidence, secure and free from worries*” (*GELS* s.v. 2), and not a few times with verbs meaning ‘to live, dwell’ as here. Thus, e.g. κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πεποιθότες Le 25.18.

We fail to see how πεποιθώς has been arrived at from \mathfrak{H} בהדרי מבית. And \mathfrak{S} לְגַן מְנִי ‘inside of me’?

4.16) ἐὰν ἐμπιστεύσῃ, κατακληρονομήσει αὐτήν,
καὶ ἐν κατασχέσει ἔσονται αἱ γενεαὶ αὐτοῦ·

*If he trusts, he will attain her,
and his (future) generations will have her in possession.*

²⁵ If we are to reconstruct \mathfrak{H} of (14b) as “וְאוֹהֲבָה אוֹהֵב הַ” the *o* is, according to Kister (1990.317), God. That goes against \mathfrak{G} .

²⁶ Lagarde has put a diacritical dot below π, whilst the Mossul edition vocalises רַחֵם Ptc. ‘loves.’

This verse appears to have inadvertently fallen away in \mathfrak{H} , and it appears in \mathfrak{S} as אָן נְהִימָן בִּי נֶאֱרַתְנִי וְנִקְבְּלֵנִי לְכוֹלְהוֹן דְּרֵא דְעָלְמָא 'if he believes me, he will inherit me and will receive me for all the generations for ever.'

ἐμπιστεύσει] \mathfrak{S} הִימְנִיה 'he trusts her.'

κατακληρονομήσει αὐτήν] Whilst Smend is right in saying that the Gk verb used here can also mean "to give as possession" (*GELS* s.v. 4), his emendation of \mathfrak{C} to αὐτῇ κληρονομήσει²⁷ makes one wonder what it is that he is going to give her.

κατασχέσει] *SD* translates the second line with "und in ihrem Besitz werden seine Nachkommen sein."²⁸ The notion of Wisdom coming into possession of humans sounds odd. Κατάσχεσις does mean 'possession, that is what is possessed,' but also 'act of holding in possession' (*GELS* s.v. 1). We could add 'state of being in possession of something.'²⁹

4.17) ὅτι διεστραμμένως πορεύσεται μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν πρώτοις,
φόβον καὶ δειλίαν ἐπάξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν
καὶ βασανίσει αὐτὸν ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῆς,
ἕως οὗ ἐμπιστεύσει τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πειράσει αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν αὐτῆς·

*For in a haphazard fashion she will walk with him initially,
fear and dread she will bring upon him
and torment him with her education
until he comes to trust her with his (whole) heart,
and she will test him with her ordinances.*

כי בהתנכר אלך עמו ולפנים יבחרנו בנסיונות: (Aa)
ויסרתיהו באסורים: (Ab)
ועד עת ימלא לבו בי (Ac)

The difference between \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{C} is again quite substantial. The former means 'for pretending to be a stranger I shall walk with him and in the beginning he will choose him with testings and I shall reproach him with prohibitions and until the time he gains courage through me.' Furthermore, we identify some difficulties of analysis in the text. a) ולפנים is probably to be emended to לפנים, a dittography. b) If יבְּחַרְנוּ is meant, who does the pronominal suffix refer to? And what has choice got to do with here, and that

²⁷ The simplex, κληρονομέω, sometimes means 'to give as an inheritance' and 'to give as possession,' both unique to SG, *GELS* s.v. 4, 5.

²⁸ Ryssel is a precursor of *SD*: "und in ihrem Besitz werden [auch] seine Nachkommen bleiben."

²⁹ *LSJ Supp.* s.v. II reads "taking possession."

followed by בנסיונות? Smend holds that בחר here means ‘to test’ as in Is 48.10. \mathfrak{S} here reads אֲבַקְוֵהוּ ‘I shall test him.’³⁰

ὅτι] כִּי, a usual causal conjunction *pace* Segal (25), who writes that it introduces a new topic. The two BH instances, Pr 30.2 and Jb 28.1, invoked by Segal are among many others which were said by some scholars to attest to the “emphatic” כִּי. BDB s.v. I כִּי 1 e is justly hesitant on such an analysis.³¹

διεστραμμένως] \mathfrak{S} הִפְכָּאִית³² ‘in a contrary fashion’ or ‘in a perverse manner,’ \mathfrak{S} בְּנִסְיוֹנָא [= \mathfrak{I} *in temptatione*]. This amazing variety shows the difficulty presented by \mathfrak{H} בהתנכר. The same verb root is rendered in a more straightforward way in במחמדיך [י]נכר[י] ἀπαλλοτριώσει σε τῶν ἰδίων σου ‘he will make you a stranger to your own folks’ Si 11.34. Διεστραμμένως exemplifies adverbs derived from adjective-like Pf. participles; so also κεκρυμμένως ‘secretively’ Je 13.17 (< κρύπτω) and πεποιθώς ‘with confident hope’ Zc 14.11 (< πείθω).

ἐν πρώτοις] \mathfrak{S} קְדָמִי³³ = \mathfrak{H} .

δειλίαν ἐπάξει] This collocation occurs also in ἐπάξω δειλίαν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν Le 26.36. \mathfrak{S} עָלְוֵהָ אָרְמָא וְעוֹתָא וְדָלְתָא וְעוֹתָא has nothing common to \mathfrak{H} , and is totally dependent on \mathfrak{G} . The combination of these two Syr. synonyms occurs also at Ex 15.16.

ἐμπιστεύση] Some take the subject of the verb as Wisdom, “until she has faith in his soul” (*NETS*). This, however, contradicts \mathfrak{H} . For the collocation ἐμπιστεύω ψυχῆ τινος (pers.), note μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῆ ὑμῶν Mt 6.25 and καρδίᾳ πιστεύεται Ro 10.10.

On \mathfrak{H} ימלא BSH is unsure as to whether the form is Pi. or Ni. In BH, however, the collocation with לָב occurs only in Qal in the sense of ‘to have courage’ with לָב as the subject: רַע מְלֵא לָב בְּנִי־הָאָדָם בְּהֵם לַעֲשׂוֹת רַע Ec 8.11 and הוּא אֶשְׁר־מְלֵאוֹ לָבוֹ לַעֲשׂוֹת בֵּן Est 7.5. But BSH 198b parses מלא in מלא לָבָן 10.13 as Qal Ptc. Cf. \mathfrak{S} here: בִּי לָבָן רַע.

4.18) καὶ πάλιν ἐπανήξει κατ’ εὐθειᾶν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ εὐφρανεῖ αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτῷ τὰ κρυπτὰ αὐτῆς.

And again she will move straight back to him and make him happy and reveal to him her hidden matters.

(A) אשוב אאשרנו וגליתי לו מסתרי:

³⁰ One wonders why בחר was not selected, for one of its meanings is precisely ‘to examine, test,’ and at Is 48.10, one of a few places where Heb. בחר is sometimes said to mean ‘to examine,’ \mathfrak{S} does read וּבַחֲרָתְךָ.

³¹ For a further discussion on the matter, see Muraoka 1985.158-64.

³² So vocalised in *SL*. The Mossul edition reads הִפְכָּאִית.

³³ Smend’s emendation to קדמית = קדמית is unnecessary, because קדמִי can be used adverbially, e.g. טב הוּא לִן דְנָמוּת כְּלִן קְדָמִי ‘we had better all die first’ *Apoc. Bar.* 33.3.

The first line is rather expansive in \mathfrak{C} for \mathfrak{H} אשוב אאשרנו. The notion of repetition is expressed twice, for ἐπανήκω means ‘to move back,’ though she may not be repeating the act of returning. Πάλιν appears redundant. Furthermore, אשוב אאשרנו appears to have been doubly translated: whether or not אָשַׁר in the sense of ‘to pronounce happy’ is the same verb as אָשַׁר ‘to go straight on,’ they are two distinct notions.³⁴ Also ἐπανήξει κατ’ εὐθεΐαν πρὸς αὐτὸν is rather mouthful for אשוב אאשרנו, though the meaning is rightly represented.

πάλιν] אשוב. This Qal Heb. verb is not used in its common, literal sense “to return, go or come back to the point of origin,” for Wisdom was not away a while. It is adverbial in value, indicating repetition of a past action and used with another verb following, which carries the principal sense. This is typical of BH as in ישוב ירחמנו ‘May He be merciful to us again’ Mi 7.19. Here we have two verbs not joined with each other. They can be joined with a *waw* or the second verb can take the form of an inf. cst.³⁵ Another example in Si is found in בנסוי ישוב ונמלט ‘in a trying situation he will come through safe again’ 36.1 > \mathfrak{C} ἐν πειρασμῷ καὶ πάλιν ἐξελεΐται. On the use of a *w-qatalí* form for the second verb, note אשוב וְלִקְחֵתִי דָּגְנִי בְעֵתוֹ וְתִירוּשִׁי בְמוֹעְדוֹ וְהִצַּלְתִּי אֶת־עַרְוֹתַי חֶמְדִּי וְכִסְיוֹתַי וְכִסְיוֹתַי חֶמְדִּי וְכִסְיוֹתַי חֶמְדִּי Ho 2.11.

κατ’ εὐθεΐαν] The selection of the fem. form is probably due to the latent ὁδός, see *SSG* § 20 d.

πρὸς αὐτὸν] \mathfrak{C} has taken the Heb. verb here as intransitive. A suffix pronoun directly attached to a Heb. verb does not always represent a direct object. Note, for instance, קדשתיך ‘I am holier than you’ Is 65.5.³⁶ Alternatively, אשוב אאשרנו = אָשַׁר אָשַׁרנו can mean ‘I will lead him on,’ which fits the context better. In any event, the verb, *pace* Smend (42), does not mean “stärke (oder unterstütze) ich ihn.”

4.19) ἐὰν ἀποπλανηθῆ, ἐγκαταλείψει αὐτὸν
καὶ παραδώσει αὐτὸν εἰς χεῖρας πτώσεως αὐτοῦ.

*If he is led astray, she will abandon him
and give him up to the consequences of his fall.*

אם יסור ונטותיהו (Aa)

אם יסור מאחרי אשליכנו ואסגירנו לשדדים: (Ab)

In \mathfrak{H} the first line starts off with אם יסור ונטותיהו, the last word of which is incomprehensible.³⁷ It could be a scribal error, and the scribe of this particular

³⁴ HALOT, for instance, has set up two separate lexemes.

³⁵ On a syntactic and syntagmatic description of this and other related verbs in BH, see Muraoka 2024.

³⁶ On this question, see JM § 125 *ba-bb* and Segal 1935.115. The above-mentioned example in Is 65.5 was already picked up by Ibn Ezra, cf. Muraoka 2012a.54.

³⁷ Smend emends it to ונטותיהו.

manuscript may have forgotten to erase the whole line, but gone on writing what appears to be the right text: **אם יסור מאחרי אשליכנו** ‘should he move away from me, I shall cast him away.’

εἰς χειρας] Both **℥** and **ℑ** lack **יד**. Παραδίδωμι + acc. + εἰς χειράς τινος is a standing collocation meaning ‘to hand A over to B (so that B does to A as B pleases),’ most likely a Heb. calque, e.g. **καὶ παραδοθήσεσθε εἰς χειρας ἐχθρῶν** Le 26.25 < **וְנִתְּתֶם בְּיַד־אֹיִב**. However, B is personal. Hence the use of πτώσεως is striking. **Θ** probably wants to say that she wouldn’t care how far downwards he might fall and how he might end up. The use of the pl. **χειρας** is as idiomatic as the sg. **יד** as in the above-quoted Lv 26.25. The mechanical representation of the Heb. sg.³⁸ is also attested, e.g. **παρεδόθημεν ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἡμῶν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ ἡμῶν ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέων τῶν ἐθνῶν** 2E 9.7 < **נָתַנוּ אֲנַחְנוּ מְלָכֵינוּ כְּהַגִּינוּ בְּיַד מְלָכֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת** Ezr 9.7.

πτώσεως] **℥** **שדדים** ‘robbers,’ a rather free rendering. In Si πτώσις renders diverse Heb. lexemes, see Smend 1907.206. Cf. **ℑ** **שׁוֹטְפָא** = **℥**.

4.20) **Συντήρησον καιρὸν καὶ φύλαξαι ἀπὸ πονηροῦ
καὶ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς σου μὴ αἰσχυνθῆς·**

*Observe the time well and beware of evilness
and do not feel ashamed of your own soul.*

(A בני עת המון שמר ופחד מרע ואל נפשך אל תבושׁ:

καιρὸν] **℥** **עת המון**, an unusual collocation. The second word is not represented in any source, and is likely not original.

In **℥** the verse begins with **בני**. So **℥** *fili*. The two verbs in (20a) appear reversed in **℥**.

φύλαξαι] The same collocation with **ἀπό** τινος occurs also in **φύλαξαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ**, translating a synonymous Heb. expression: **להתירא ממנו** Si 12.11. This is a nuance unknown to BH of the two Heb. verbs. Besides, Hit. **התירא** is unknown prior to Si, with ingressive value ‘to become **יָרָא**.’ It is no wonder that these two Heb. - Gk equations are not found anywhere else in SG, see *Index* 126a s.v. φυλάσσω.

περὶ] **℥** **אל**, most likely indicative of the contemporary weakening of gutturals, esp. **ע** and **ה**.

The second line probably means to say that there is nothing wrong with maintaining self-respect, but one should be ashamed of wrong-doings committed by oneself.³⁹

³⁸ On the idiomatic sg. in Heb., see *SQH* § 8 aa.

³⁹ Skehan - Di Lella (175f.) see here a call to Ben Sira’s contemporary coreligionists not to succumb to the appeal and charm of the Hellenistic culture.

- 4.21) ἔστιν γὰρ αἰσχύνη ἐπάγουσα ἁμαρτίαν,
καὶ ἔστιν αἰσχύνη δόξα καὶ χάρις.

*For there is shame that leads to sin(s)
and there is shame (that is) honour and grace.*

(A) כי יש בשאת משאת עון ויש בשת כבוד וכן
(C) יש בשת משאת עון ויש בשת חן וכבוד:

ἔστιν] As indicated by its initial position in the clause and accentuation this is no mere copula of equation, but denotes existence, which corresponds to **𐤀** **ש** and also captured in **𐤅** and **𐤅** **𐤇** with **אֵת**.

αἰσχύνη] For instance, a sense of inferiority and jealousy one might suffer, when confronted by the blinding wealth of neighbours.

ἐπάγουσα ἁμαρτίαν] **𐤀** **שאת עון**, where the verb was rightly parsed by Smend as Hi. **אָפּוּ**, thus **אָפּוּ**, and for this analysis he refers to Ex 28.43 and Lv 22.16, which latter instance is especially illuminating: **וְהָיָא אֹתָם עוֹן** וְהָיָא אֹתָם עוֹן. Note **𐤅** **καὶ ἐπάξουσιν ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀνομίαν πλημμελείας**, where the formulation is very close to our Si passage here, where **ἐπι σεαυτόν** can be understood. A participle in the st. cst. can be followed by a direct object, e.g. **וְהָיָא תְּמִימָה מְשִׁיבֵת נֶפֶשׁ עֲדוּת יְהוָה נְאֻמָּה מְחַכֵּמֵת פְּתִי: פְּקוּדֵי יְהוָה** תּוֹרַת יְהוָה תְּמִימָה מְשִׁיבֵת נֶפֶשׁ עֲדוּת יְהוָה נְאֻמָּה מְחַכֵּמֵת פְּתִי: **פְּקוּדֵי יְהוָה** תּוֹרַת יְהוָה תְּמִימָה מְשִׁיבֵת נֶפֶשׁ עֲדוּת יְהוָה נְאֻמָּה מְחַכֵּמֵת פְּתִי: Ps 19.8f., cf. *SQH* § 31 r 4).

It is perhaps not a mere coincidence that the above quoted Ex 28.43 is preceded by a description of the official garments to be worn by priests, in which we find **וְלִכְבוֹד וְלִתְפָאֲרָה** Ex 28.40 > **ποιήσεις αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν** (**𐤅** vs. 36).

δόξα καὶ χάρις] Following the sequence in **𐤀**A **כבוד וכן** [= **𐤅**, **𐤅** **𐤇**], not C **חן וכבוד**.

This entire verse has been inserted into **𐤅** after Pr 26.11. Seeing that **𐤀** has nothing corresponding at Pr 26.11, this proverb must be ascribed to Ben Sira, and a later copyist of **𐤅** borrowed it from the Greek Si.

- 4.22) μὴ λάβῃς πρόσωπον κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σου
καὶ μὴ ἐντραπῆς εἰς πτώσιν σου.

*Do no pay regard to others to the extent of your own disadvantage
nor show respect, causing your own fall.*

(A) אל תשא פניך על נפשך ואל תכשל למכשולך:
(C) אל תשא פנים לנפשיך ואל תבוש למכשול לך:

κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σου] **Κατὰ τινος** is undoubtedly expressing disadvantage, though this is the sole instance in SG of the use of **κατὰ** in this idiomatic expression. In **𐤀** we see a fluctuation between A **על נפשך** and C **לנפשיך**. Both

⁴⁰ *Maagarim* lists our case as a substantive **מְשָׂת** 'gift,' the first attestation in Hebrew.

prepositions carry the nuance of enmity or disadvantage, the latter being so-called *dativus incommodi*. That the latter is acceptable is shown by **לא ישא** ל אל דל οὐ λήμψεται πρόσωπον ἐπὶ πτωχοῦ Si 32.16, where **לא** is a poor alternative for **ל**. In BH there is no example of this phrase with a person to be advantaged or disadvantaged shown with a preposition added, and all that we find is a cst. phrase as in **לא תשא פני־דל לְאֵל תְּהַדֵּר פְּנֵי גְדוֹל** Lv 19.15. Hence the data in BS are unique. Another noteworthy innovation in BS is making the face that of the *s* of the verb.⁴¹

אל [μη]. Here begins a very long series of negative advices: up to 5.9, all beginning with this negator, interrupted only twice (4.24, 28), and some verses contain their respective second line also beginning with **אל**. In **Θ** we consistently find **μη** negating either a Pres. Impv. or Aor. Subj.

ἐντραπής] **ΘA** was emended by Smend to **תבוש** (with an inadvertent dittography of **ל**), what we find in C. Segal (28) thinks that the corruption went the other way.

4.23) **μη** κωλύσης λόγον ἐν καιρῷ χρείας·

¶ **καὶ** **μη** κρύψης τὴν σοφίαν σου εἰς καλλονήν· ¶

Do not withhold a word when it is needed,

nor conceal your wisdom for the sake of good manners.

(A) **אל** תמנע דבר בעולם **אל** תצפין את חכמתך:
(C) **אל** תמנע דבר בעיתו **ואל** תקפוץ את חכמתך:

ἐν καιρῷ χρείας] = **ΘC** בעיתו, ≠ A בעולם, which latter makes little sense; for ‘forever’ or ‘never’ with a negative as here we anticipate לעולם. **כְּזִבְנָא דְפוּרְקָנָא** ‘when someone need be rescued’ represents what all the manuscripts read. **χρείας** is an emendation proposed by Smend and adopted by Rahlfs and Ziegler.

κρύψης] Unlike in the case of **ἐν καιρῷ χρείας** we find here **Θ** = **ΘA** **תצפין**, = **Θ** **תשא**, but ≠ C **תקפוץ** ‘spare.’

εἰς καλλονήν] This addition is missing in both **Θ** and **Θ**. Even if it were a free addition, that makes for good parallelism to **ἐν καιρῷ χρείας**. Smend thinks this to be a later addition, but omitted in only three minuscules and the Armenian version.

4.24) **ἐν** γὰρ λόγῳ γνωσθήσεται σοφία

καὶ παιδεία ἐν ῥήματι γλώσσης.

*For wisdom can become known verbally
and education (takes place) orally.*

(A) **כי** באומר גודעת חכמה **ותבונה במענה לשון**:

⁴¹ A point that has been missed by Kister (1999.170), who discusses only (C).

ἐν .. λόγῳ] **ש**ל בְּפִי אֱמָרָא in contrast to another organ of speech אֲשַׁנְא לְ גְלוֹס־סִיחָא, though both can denote “language.” **ל** *lingua* here is as ambiguous.

γνωσθήσεται] **ח** נודעת, Ptc. for a generic statement of permanent applicability, whereas the Gk Fut. can indicate a theoretical possibility, on which see SSG § 28 ge. But cf. **ש**ל מְתִידָעָא.

παιδεία] **ח** תבונה, which is sometimes used in BH in the sense of “object of knowledge,” esp. when coordinate with חכמה as in וַיִּתֵּן אֱלֹהִים חָכְמָה לְשַׁלְמֵהּ חֵן וְתְבוּנָה רַבָּה 1Kg 5.9, see also ib. 7.14, Pr 5.1, Ps 49.4, although in many other instances mentioned in BDB s.v. **ב** the word can denote the faculty of understanding or act of it. Analogously παιδεία signifies “body of knowledge to be taught” as well as “education, instruction,” cf. *GELS* s.v. Then these nouns can be the grammatical subject of נודעת and γνωσθήσεται respectively. We prefer the interpretation represented in **ש** סִפְקָא ‘understanding’ and **ש**ל מְרִדוּיָא ‘education.’

ἐν ῥήματι γλώσσης] **ח** במענה לשון. The collocation מְעִנָּה לְשׁוֹן is found in Pr 16.1 and attributed to God: וְלֹאֲדָם מְעִנָּה לְשׁוֹן וּמִיָּהוָה מְעִנָּה לְשׁוֹן, which is unfortunately absent in **ס**. Even-Shoshan s.v. defines the sense of the phrase as ‘right answer,’ of which we are not convinced. מְעִנָּה and its verb עָנָה can mean not only “answer (to a question)” or “solution of a problem,” but also “to orally react, respond to one’s interlocutor.” Hence the cst. phrase can be taken in the sense of “oral exchange and communication.” Cf. **ש** and **ש**ל בְּעִנְיָא דְלִשְׁנָא ‘oral conversation.’

4.25) μὴ ἀντίλεγε τῆ ἀληθείᾳ
καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀπαιδευσίας σου ἐντράπηθι.

*Do not contradict the truth
and feel ashamed of your lack of education.*

אל תסרב עם האל ואל אלהים היכנע: (A)

The whole verse reads rather different in **ח**: ‘Do not bicker with God, but give way to God.’ In the first half **ש** follows **ח**: לָא תִסְרֹב עַל קוּשְׁתָּא, but the second line differs: וּמִן סְכָלְוֹתְךָ אֶתְכַלֵּי ‘and from your follies withdraw yourself.’⁴² **ש**ל concludes with an emphatic plus: אַף בְּמַדָּם ‘not even in one matter.’

τῆ ἀληθείᾳ] The selection of the dative case is not a function of λέγω, but carries the value of confrontation or opposition, and is used with verbs such as μέμφομαι Si 41.7 and ἐπιτιμάω Ge 37.10. For further details, see SSG § 22 wi.

⁴² Smend writes: “neuhebr. כְּנִיעָה (die Scham) und aram. אַתְכַנַּע (sich schämen),” but we are not convinced. It is, however, true that in SG ἐντρέπομαι is a frequent (12×) equivalent of νῆν, and once each of αἰσχύνομαι and κατανύσσω.

4.26) μὴ αἰσχυνοῦσθε ὁμολογῆσαι ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις σου
καὶ μὴ βιάζου ῥοῦν ποταμοῦ.

*Do not hesitate to admit to your sins
nor swim against the current.*

:אל תבוש לשוב מעון ואל תעמוד לפניי שבלת: (A

αἰσχυνοῦσθε] **שוב**. There is a subtle difference in nuance of the meaning of the verb in both Heb. and Gk from their respective normal meaning, which is “to feel ashamed over a wrong-doing, moral or otherwise.” The Gk verb is often followed by a preposition, e.g. αἰσχύνεσθε ἀπὸ πατρός καὶ μητρός περὶ πορνείας Si 41.17, ἀπὸ δράσεως γυναικὸς ἐταίρας ‘over staring at a woman of the streets’ ib. 20. By contrast, here one is urged to admit one’s sins. The verb is used here with an infinitive, and for this syntagm *GELS* s.v. 4 has entered a sense “to feel diffident about and hesitate to do.” Another two instances can be cited from SG, and in both cases there is no purely ethical perspective involved: ἡσχύνθην αἰτήσασθαι παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως δύναμιν καὶ ἰππεῖς 2E 8.22, ἡσχύνθην καὶ ἐνετρέπην τοῦ ὑψῶσαι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου πρὸς σέ ib. 9.6, in which a multitude of sins, it is true, are admitted to, but to raise one’s face is no sinful act.⁴³ In both of these 2E cases **ח** reads **חִשְׁבָּ**. This specific nuance of the Heb. verb is usually unrecognised with the exception of *HALOT*, which has gone as far as to register a homonym, **ח** **בוש**, mentioning Arb. *bassa* ‘to drive a camel or a caravan slowly’ and Ugr. *bš* ‘to be slow.’

ὁμολογῆσαι ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις σου] **ח** **שוב מעון**. According to G one’s parting with sins, whether of commission or omission, must be preceded by one’s admitting to one’s guilt, whether to God or to a third party to whom one is guilty.⁴⁴

The <ἐπί τι [= wrongdoing]> is unknown elsewhere. In SG there is one instance of <+ acc. rei> in τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτῶν ‘their lust’ Su 14 TH, cf. an example from NTG cited in fn. 44 below.

μὴ βιάζου ῥοῦν ποταμοῦ] a rather free rendition of אל תעמוד לפניי שבלת. Maybe **חִשְׁבָּ** reminded the translator of the River Jordan (Jd 12.6). He may have known that what should have been phonetically transliterated is actually translated in **ח** as either **στάχυς** or **σύνθημα**. With **חִשְׁבָּ** **ח** probably identified a form of **חִשְׁבָּ** spelled as with **ח**.

⁴³ LSJ **B II 2 c** enters a few examples of <+ inf.> in CG. To cite just two: ἡσχύνου τὸ πεῦδος λέγειν ‘you were so bashful about coming out with your lie’ Pl. *Rep.* 414e, and οὐκ αἰσχυνοῦμαι τοὺς φιλόνηδρους τρόπους λέξαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ‘I shall not be ashamed to confess in your presence my fondness for my husband’ Aesch. *Ag.* 856, where, I would remark, the ancient Athenian culture must have differed from what I personally represent, for in my society back home a husband speaking in public in praise of his wife would be frowned upon.

⁴⁴ Cf. ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθάρισι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας 1Joh 1.9.

- 4.27) καὶ μὴ ὑποστρώσης ἀνθρώπῳ μωρῶ σεαυτὸν
καὶ μὴ λάβῃς πρόσωπον δυνάστου.

*Do not fall flat on your face before a fool
nor be partial in favour of a powerful man.*

(A) אַל תַּצַּע לִנְבֵל נַפְשִׁי וְאֵל תִּמְאַן לִפְנֵי מוֹשְׁלִים:

ὑποστρώσης] תַּצַּע = תַּצַּע. ὑποστρώννυμι means precisely the same as תַּצַּע. The collocation נִפֹּשׁ נִפְשִׁי appears to be unattested elsewhere. One could be tempted to do what one is advised not to when a fool in the neighbourhood might be able to provide a badly needed financial help.

In \mathfrak{H} of Col. 2 there seems to come through quite a different message: ‘Do not say “No” to powerful people.’ However, we may harmonise the two texts, should we take \mathfrak{C} as meaning that, if you honestly believe that a powerful man is wrong, you should be frank and dispute him. By contrast, \mathfrak{S} לֹא תִתְקַרָּא ‘Do not oppose’ indicates complete submission.⁴⁵ Faced with this apparently difficult אַל תִּמְאַן, Smend emends it, on the basis of \mathfrak{C} , which is silently followed by Segal (29), who goes farther by suggesting that אַל תִּמְאַן corrupted to (ת)אִמָּן; he has gone a shade too far, for there is precious little graphic similarity between the two Hebrew forms.

On this mechanical rendering of the Heb. idiom, נִפֹּשׁ נִפְשִׁי, as λαμβάνω πρόσωπον, see Harl 1992.152f. and Dogniez 2002.10-13.⁴⁶

- 4.28) ἔως θανάτου ἀγώνισαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας,
καὶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς πολεμήσει ὑπὲρ σοῦ.

*Strive for truth, putting your life on the line,
then Lord the God will fight on your side.*

(A) עַד הַמּוֹת הַיַּעֲצָה עַל הַצַּדִּיק וַיִּי גַלְחָם לְךָ:

ἀγώνισαι] \mathfrak{H} הַיַּעֲצָה, probably a *plena* spelled Ni. Impv. <√צה. No such Heb. verb in the sense of “to fight” is known.⁴⁷ Smend mentions Syr. √צה precisely carrying this sense, though one wonders why \mathfrak{S} here writes אֶתְכַתֵּשׁ instead of יַעֲצֵ or אֶתְעַצֵּ.

τῆς ἀληθείας] \mathfrak{H} הַצַּדִּיק. With its קוֹשֵׁשׁ ‘truth’ \mathfrak{S} also took צַדִּיק in the sense of “general truth,” not “(legal, religious) justice.” Cf. יִנְחֵנִי בְּמַעְגְּלֵי צַדִּיק.

⁴⁵ *SL* s.v. רִי Ethpe. 2 mentions Is 1.20 as instancing the equation with Heb. מָאן, but there \mathfrak{S} actually reads אֶתְכַתֵּשׁוּן וְתִתְקַרְרוּן < אֶן לֹא תִתְקַפְסוּן וְתִתְקַרְרוּן; the equation is thus with קָרָה.

⁴⁶ From this idiom NTG created derivatives: προσωπολήμπτέω, προσωπολήμπτης, προσωπολημψία. Dogniez (2002.13) holds that this collocation is not to be analysed as idiomatic as in *GELS* s.v. III 2, but as a Semitism. Luke, who used προσωπολήμπτης at Ac 10.34, must have understood what LXX translators meant with λαμβάνω πρόσωπον, and Luke was virtually ignorant of Hebrew. On Luke’s familiarity with SG, see Muraoka 2012.

⁴⁷ *DCH* s.v. has created such an entry solely on the basis of our instance.

Ps 23.3, where a shepherd's concern is the choice of right, not dangerous, paths for his flock; **ש** קְבוּצָתוֹ שְׂבִיִּלְיָהּ as against **Θ** ὠδήγησέν με ἐπὶ τριβύβου δικαιοσύνης.

κύριος ὁ θεὸς] **י**. The longer divine title occurs in SG some 970 times, mostly translating **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים**. For a possible reason for the use of the shorter title in this particular form, see above at 4.12, p. 66, fn. 24.

πολεμήσει] The Fut. in **Θ** corresponds to the Ptc. in **י**, which is typical of a circumstantial clause.⁴⁸ God is going to fight beside you, not after your fight is over, which latter would require **יִי וְנִלְחָם**, a *w-qatalti* form or **יִי וְנִלְחָם**.

ὑπὲρ σοῦ] **ש** רַחֵם לְפָנַי 'instead of you' and **ש** לְמַעַן מְטוֹלְתָּ 'for your sake.' For the general idea, cf. Ex 14.14.

4.29) μὴ γίνου θρασύς ἐν γλώσση σου
καὶ ἄωθρος καὶ παρειμένος ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου.

*Do not be audacious in speech
and sluggish and neglectful in your works.*

(A) אַל תְּהִי גִבְהֵן בְּלִשׁוֹנֶיךָ וּרְפִי וּרְשִׁישׁ בְּמִלְאֲכֶתְךָ:

θρασύς] **י** גִּבְהֵן 'proud,' the only occurrence of the word in the entire history of Hebrew.⁴⁹ Cf. **ש** שְׁבָהֲרָן 'boastful' and **ש** קְלִילָא בְּלִשְׁנָא 'glib-tongued.'

παρειμένος] **ש** מְשֻׁרְיָא 'crippled,' not a medical condition, but deliberate negligence and sloth.

4.30) μὴ ἴσθι ὡς λέων ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου
καὶ φαντασιοκοπῶν ἐν τοῖς οἰκέταις σου.

*Do not be like a lion at home
and looking at your domestic servants suspiciously.*

(A) אַל תְּהִי כְּכֹלֵב בְּבֵיתְךָ וּמוֹזֵר וּמְתִירָא בְּמִלְאֲכֶתְךָ:

(C) אַל תְּהִי כְּאַרְיֵה בְּבֵיתְךָ וּמְתַפְחֵז בְּעַבְדוֹתְךָ:

ὡς λέων] = **Θ** כְּאַרְיֵה, ≠ A כְּכֹלֵב, a corruption from **כְּלָבִיא**. Note **ש** כְּלָב, not preceded by **אִיִּי**, a particle of comparison.

φαντασιοκοπῶν] a word unknown prior to SG. LSJ defines its sense as "indulge vain fantasies." Apart from the difficulty of interpretation of this Gk hapax both Heb. manuscripts differ not a little from **Θ** here. If the above-mentioned emendation can be accepted, we can understand this proverb as addressed to the head of a household, perhaps with a servant or two included.

⁴⁸ Cf. *SQH* § 35 da. Pace Van Peursen (2004.219) **נְלָחָם** here is not a genuine Fut. form as in **אָבֹוא לִינ פּוּה הַלַּיְלָה מְחָר אָבֹוא** 'Stay here tonight. I'll come tomorrow,' for which you would not say **מְחָר אָנִי בָּא מְחָר**.

⁴⁹ Pace Dihi (2008.17) *Maagarim* has no record of the word elsewhere.

Such a person is advised then to deal with members of his household gently, not yelling, and not to look like an alien, outsider (מוֹרֵךְ) and not dreaded (מִתְיָרָא), a meaning which is not attested elsewhere in Hebrew. Possibly a scribal error for מִירָא = Pi. מִירָא ‘scaring, terrifying,’ cf. כִּי כָלֶם מִירָאִים אוֹתָנוּ Ne 6.9. Cf. דִּחִיל ‘frightening.’

In any case φαντασιοκοπῶν has little to do with either Heb. text. Because of the obscurity of \mathfrak{H} the translator may have gone for free translation.

The Heb. root פָּחַח, which has to do with wantonness, recklessness, occurs in BH a few times, but as a verb in Qal only, and that twice (Jd 9.4 and Zp 3.4). The form in C here can be taken as Hitpael of simulating value,⁵⁰ ‘to behave like a wanton person.’

τοῖς οἰκέταις σου] C עבודתך ≠ עבודתך, but = עבודתך ‘your body of servants,’ an analysis preferred by Segal (29), who refers to מְקַנְה־צֹאֵן וּמְקַנְהַ מְקַנְהַ בְּקָר וְעַבְדָּה רַבָּה Gn 26.14, where the preceding coordinate terms are to be noted, similarly in Jb 1.3. מְלֹאכֶתֶךָ in A looks like a consequence of עבודתך having been misread as עבודתך.

4.31) μὴ ἔστω ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐκτεταμένη εἰς τὸ λαβεῖν
καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδόναι συνεσταλμένη.

*Do not let your hand be stretched out in order to receive
but be drawn back when you are to give back.*

(A) אל תהי ירך פתוחה לקחת וקפוצה בתוך מתן:
(C) אל תהי ירך מושטת לשאת ובעת השב קפודה:

ἐκτεταμένη] = \mathfrak{H} C מושטת, ≠ A פתוחה. \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{S} ן פשיטא = \mathfrak{H} C. The selection of the Gk Pf. form in this periphrastic structure gives a glimpse of someone patiently waiting for a benevolent donor to react. Cf. SSG § 31 fd. The separation of a Ptc. from a form of εἰμί often occurs in imitation of the underlying Heb. text, here \mathfrak{H} C אל תהי ירך מושטת לשאת, cf. SSG § 31 fj.

λαβεῖν] \mathfrak{H} C לשאת, A לקחת. λαμβάνω can render either Heb. verb. In Si it renders נָשָׂא at 35.2 and 38.2. In SG, according to *Index* s.v. λαμβάνω, Qal לָקַח more than 261× and Qal נָשָׂא more than 58×.

ἀποδιδόναι] = \mathfrak{H} C השב, ≠ A מתן = δίδοναι. Thus it is not about a work of charity, *pace* Skehan - Di Lella “give,” “im Geben” (SD), and \mathfrak{S} לְמַתָּל.⁵¹ Here ἐν was viewed as temporal in value, whereas in 3.31 עַת was translated with καιρός: καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πτώσεως מוֹטוּ בַעַת מוֹטוּ. Kister (1990.317) emends the difficult בתוך to בתור, i.e. בְּתוֹר as in וּבְהַגִּיעַ תְּרִי־אֶסְתֵּר ‘when the turn of Esther arrived’ Est 2.15.

⁵⁰ See JM § 53 i.

⁵¹ This secondary reading has penetrated the early church as shown in Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι συσπῶν *Didache* 4.5. \mathfrak{H} still has *ad reddendum*.

συνεσταλμένη] = $\mathfrak{H}A$ קפוצה. \mathfrak{C} appears to be wavering between A and C. We could postulate a scribal error from the original קפוצה, and we would see the word order agreeing between $\mathfrak{H}C$ and \mathfrak{C} . קפד 'to roll up' does not suit the context, for one does not roll up one's hand. Cf. \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}ה$ קפיסא 'drawn back.'

CHAPTER 5

5.1) Μὴ ἔπεχε ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασίν σου
καὶ μὴ εἶπης Αὐτάρκη μοί ἐστίν.

*Do not rely on your possessions
and do not say “I have enough.”*

(A1) אל תשען על חילך ואל תאמר יש לאל ידי:
(A2) אל תשען על כוחך ללכת אחר תאות נפשך:

ⲬA has preserved two variant versions. Ⲭ appears to be following the first.

ἐπεχε] Ⲭ תשען = תשען. The Gk verb ἐπέχω in the sense of “to count on, depend on for help” (*GELS* s.v. 3) appears to be in our translator’s favourite vocabulary. All five¹ instances of it mentioned in *GELS* are from Si. It is used in a very similar proverb: Μὴ ἔπεχε ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν ἀδίκους 5.8. The second halves of the two versions totally differ from each other. That of the second version looks like an intrusion from 5.2.

τοῖς χρήμασίν σου] חילך. חיל in the sense of “material possessions, wealth” is widely attested in BH, see BDB s.v. 3, whereas חֵן, a synonym of the former, is so used only twice according to BDB s.v. 5. Cf. Ⲭ נְכֻסְיָךְ ‘your possessions’ and Ⲭ מְרֻהָטָא דִּילְךָ ‘your possessions.’² See also below at 40.13.

Αὐτάρκη] The idiomatic Heb. combination, יש לאל יד, e.g. יש-לאל יד, has been interpreted slightly differently, for Ⲭ was probably meant to say “I am rich enough to do anything as I please.” Ⲭ departs farther: Ⲭ סִפְקָא לי אִיתִיהוֹן לְחַיָּא ‘I have enough in order to live on.’

5.2) μὴ ἐξακολούθει τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ τῇ ἰσχύι σου
πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις καρδίας σου·

*Do not conform to your soul and your power
to pursue your heart’s desires.*

(A) אל תלך אחרי לבך ועיניך ללכת בחמודות רעה:

The relation between Ⲭ and versions is utterly complicated. For an attempt to disentangle this intricacy, see Smend ad loc.

¹ Our present case could be added to make the total six.

² According to *SL* s.v. this new meaning of the Syriac noun has recently been spotted in the Harklean version at Mk 10.23, where it translates χρήματα.

τῆ ἰσχύι σου] Irreconcilable with **ח** עיניך ‘your eyes,’ which pairs well with the preceding לבך.

ס follows the second **ח** variant of the preceding verse: לא תתקל על חילך למאול בצבני לבך.

5.3) καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς Τίς με δυναστεύσει;
ὁ γὰρ κύριος ἐκδικῶν ἐκδικήσει.

*Nor say “Who could wield power over me?,”
for the Lord will certainly requite.*

(A) אל תאמר מי יוכל כחו כי ייי מבקש נרדפים:

The syntagm of 3a in **ח** מי יוכל כחו is unusual, even after emending כחו to כחי ‘my power.’ BDB s.v. יכל 2 b gives a list of eleven OT passages where the verb in the sense of “to overcome, prevail” is complemented by means of a substantive, not an infinitive, but always prefixed with ל-, e.g. לו לא יכל לו Gn 32.26, never אתו or suchlike.³ An object pronoun in these cases unexceptionally refers to a person. That no example of לגבור with a substantive is found is most likely accidental.⁴ After all, it might be an error for לכחי.⁵

ἐκδικῶν ἐκδικήσει] How could **ס** arrive at this from **ח** מבקש נרדפים? Among the six Heb. words and/or roots translated in SG with this Gk verb as listed in *Index* s.v. there is none which is even minimally similar to these two Hebrew words. **ס** indicates a figura etymologica in its *Vorlage* as in ידע ידע גינאסאון גנאסאון Gn 15.13 et passim, see *SSG* § 31 db. **ס** is pretty close to **ח**: מריא הן תבועא דכלהון עליבא: ‘the Lord is the one who enquires into all the oppressed.’

As far as the general thought expressed in **ס** is concerned, האלהים יבקש את־גֹּדְדֵיךָ Ec 3.15 mentioned by Smend may have been at the back of our translator’s mind. According to Smend the text means “.. dass Gott das Vergangene wiederkehren lässt.” Smend could have referred to an illuminating **ס** there: ὁ θεὸς ζητήσῃ τὸν διωκόμενον ‘God will seek out the persecuted,’ though the Gk rendition of a renowned sapiential document of the Holy Writ was most likely not yet around when Ben Sira’s grandson worked on the latter-day Ecclesiastes.⁶

³ יכלתיו Ps 13.5 mentioned by Smend is no counter-example. On the equivocal nature of a suffix pronoun directly attached to a verb, see above at 4.18, p. 70, fn. 36.

⁴ **ס** has an intriguing reading: מנו מצא חילי. *SL* s.v. 2# מצי Pe. 1 writes “w. acc. to be equal,” though the only cited instance has, alas, a personal suffix attached to the verb, אָמְצִיָּהּ.

⁵ The addition in **ס** at the end of the first line, מטול עבדא דילי, agrees with δια τα εργα μου found in some sources mentioned by Ziegler.

⁶ Vinel 2002.24 writes: “.. sa traduction en grec du début du II^e siècle après le Christ, donc après 70.”

- 5.4) μὴ εἴπῃς Ἥμαρτον, καὶ τί μοι ἐγένετο;
ὁ γὰρ κύριός ἐστιν μακρόθυμος.

*Do not say: "I have sinned, and what happened to me?"
For the Lord is not in a hurry.*

(A) אל תאמר חטאתי ומה יעשה לי מאומה כי אל ארך אפים הוא:⁷
(C) אל תאמר חטאתי ומה יהיה לו כי יי ארך אפים הוא:

τί μοι ἐγένετο;] Did Θ read נעשה = נַעֲשֶׂה in $\mathfrak{H}A$ לִי מֵה יַעֲשֶׂה לִי? \mathfrak{S} , taking note of a one-word answer to this rhetorical question, מאומה, presents a dynamic translation with לֹא הָיָא לִי מִדָּם 'nothing happened to me.' In Θ there is nothing that corresponds to מאומה, which is absent in $\mathfrak{H}C$.

Only one witness, 785, reads γένοιτο, which can be seen as an optative of potentiality: "What could happen to me?". Ziegler refers to $\mathfrak{H}A$ מֵה יַעֲשֶׂה לִי, but $\mathfrak{H}C$ can also be mentioned – מֵה יִהְיֶה לוֹ, where לוֹ is likely an error for לִי.

ὁ .. κύριός] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אל, $\mathfrak{H}C$ יי. \mathfrak{S} מְרִימָא נַח = ὑψιστος as in some Gk sources.

- 5.5) περὶ ἐξιλασμοῦ μὴ ἄφοβος γίνου
προσθεῖναι ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίας·

*As regards atonement do not become fearless,
adding sin upon sins.*

(A) אל סליחה אל תבטח להוסיף עון על עון:
(C) אל סליחה אל תבטח להוסיף עון על עון:

περὶ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ and C אל, which need be emended to על, so \mathfrak{S} על and \mathfrak{S} מְטוּל.

ἄφοβος] One is warned against taking advantage of long-suffering God's mercies. The way the adjective is used here is different from a case such as ἐὰν γὰρ κάθη, ἄφοβος ἔσῃ, ἐὰν δὲ καθεύδῃς, ἠδέως ὑπνώσεις 'for, if you are seated, you will have nothing to be afraid of, and when you sleep, you will have a sweet sleep' Pr 3.24. Note, rather, φόβος κυρίου εἰς ζωὴν ἀνδρί, ὁ δὲ ἄφοβος ἀβλισθήσεται ἐν τόποις, οὗ οὐκ ἐπισκοπεῖται γνῶσις 'for people the fear of the Lord leads to life, but one who does not have that fear will reside in places where knowledge does not keep watch' ib. 19.23. Thus we are back to one of the author's principal themes, the fear of the Lord (1.11-30). The mode of word-formation in Syriac in cases corresponding to the use of the alpha privativum in Greek makes this theological thinking manifest: ἄφοβος > \mathfrak{S} לֹא דְלֵא דְחֵלָהּ תְּהוּא נַח.⁸

⁷ Some confusion has occurred in this MS. This line is actually continued with what is printed as (Aa) of the vs. 6 below.

⁸ This subservience is extended even to a verb in μὴ ἀγνόει > \mathfrak{S} לֹא תִדְעֵנִי Si 5.15. One wonders what the average reader with no Greek made of such a Syriac text.

προσθεῖναι] an exegetical, explicative infinitive, on which see *SSG* § 30 **bc**. The same value is carried by הוסיף here: על עון תבטח להוסיף עון על עון; on such a value of the Heb. inf. cst., see *SQH* § 18 **g**.

5.6) καὶ μὴ εἶπης Ὁ οἰκτιρμὸς αὐτοῦ πολὺς,
τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου ἐξιλάσεται·
ἔλεος γὰρ καὶ ὀργὴ παρ' αὐτῷ,
καὶ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοὺς καταπαύσει ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.

*Nor say "His compassion is abundant,
the multitude of my sins He will forgive."
For (both) mercy and wrath are with Him
and on sinners His anger will come down to settle.*

(Aa) אל תאמר רחום יי וכל עונותי ימחה:
(Ab) ואמרת רחמיו רבים לרוב עונותי יסלח:
(Ac) כי רחמים ואף עמו ואל רשעים ינוח רגזו:
(Ca) ואמרת רבים רחמיו לרוב עונותי יסלח:
(Cb) כי רחמים ואף עמו ועל רשעים ינוח רגזו:

In the first two lines the relationship between the Gk and Heb. texts is problematic. \mathfrak{H} , which has come down in two versions, reads as follows:

\mathfrak{H} MS	Line 2	Line 1
Aa	וכל עונותי ימחה	אל תאמר רחום יי
Ab	לר[ב] עונותי יסלח	ואמרת רחמיו רבים
C	לרוב עונותי יסלח	ואמרת רבים רחמיו
\mathfrak{S}	τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου ἐξιλάσεται	καὶ μὴ εἶπης Ὁ οἰκτιρμὸς αὐτοῦ πολὺς

\mathfrak{S} does not display complete agreement with any of the three Hebrew text-forms. In 1) it is a compromise between Aa and C, whereas in 2) it agrees with Ab and C, though the translator may not have followed his Heb. text mechanically word for word. In any case there is no meaningful difference in the message conveyed by any of the text in Heb. and Gk.

καὶ μὴ εἶπης] No Gk manuscript or version misses the conjunction except \mathfrak{S} . We should perhaps restore ׀ at the beginning of Aa, line 1. A more important variation is the use of the inversive *w-qatalti* in Ab and C, and the absence of the negator as a consequence. This implies that a logical continuation between vs. 5 and vs. 6 was perceived. The wording in Aa with or without a *waw*, however, does not necessarily mean that the two verses are independent of each other in terms of the message.

οἰκτιρμὸς] \mathfrak{H} ורחם occurs once more in Si, also as applied to God: לפני ורחם > κατέναντι ἐλεήμονος 50.19. Hence the nominal clause in \mathfrak{C} is unlikely based on \mathfrak{H} Aa. Note also the presence of πολὺς. Which word order of the Heb. nominal clause, Ab or C, in the translator's *Vorlage* stood is difficult to say, since he seems to be taking a fair bit of liberty in this respect, though we have not done any systematic enquiry on the question of word order of the nominal clause in the Hebrew of Si and its reflections in Greek. With its מְרַחֵם הוּא מְרַחֵם \mathfrak{S} is close to \mathfrak{H} Aa, but in its sequel it approaches Ab and C: וְלִסְוֵנָא דְחֻבִּי הוּא שְׂבָק לִי.

τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου] The addition of the preposition *lamed* to the object of Qal חָלַץ is well established in BH, e.g. וְלִחְטָאתֵינוּ וְלִסְוֵנָא Ex 34.9; more examples are listed in BDB s.v. חָלַץ Qal.

ἐξιλάσεται] In theory the subject of the verb can be “His compassion” as in ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας Si 3.30 < \mathfrak{H} צדקה תכפר חטאת. This instance, however, appears to be a rare exception. Besides, חָלַץ and חָלַץ with an inanimate subject is unknown. *DCH* s.v. חָלַץ Qal stresses that its subject is always Yahweh and the object sin. By contrast, probably due to its frequent use in ritual contexts, כָּפַר often takes a non-human object as its subject, e.g. כָּפַר Lv 17.11.

ἐπι] \mathfrak{H} A אל, a contemporary phonetic spelling in lieu of the orthodox על in \mathfrak{H} C.

καταπαύσει] = \mathfrak{H} A ינוח, ≠ \mathfrak{H} C יניח, which latter, as a transitive verb, would require τὸν θυμὸν αὐτοῦ.

5.7) μὴ ἀνάμενε ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς κύριον
καὶ μὴ ὑπερβάλλου ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας·
ἐξάπινα γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ὀργὴ κυρίου,
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐκδικήσεως ἐξολῆ.

*Do not put off returning to the Lord
nor delay (it) from day to day.*

*For all of a sudden could the wrath of the Lord come out
and at the time of punishment you will perish.*

(Aa)	אל תאחר לשוב אליו	ואל תתעבר מיום אל יום:
(Ab)	כי פתאום יצא זעמו	וביום נקם תספה
(Ca)	אל תאחר לשוב אליו	ואל תתעבר מיום ליום:
(Cb)	כי פתאום יצא זעמו	וביום נקם תספה:

πρὸς κύριον] More explicit than \mathfrak{H} A, C אליו. \mathfrak{S} קְדַמְוֵהוּ is unusual. Smend refers to Si 48.20, where we read \mathfrak{H} ויפרשו אליו כפים, \mathfrak{C} ἐκαπέτσαντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν, and \mathfrak{S} וּפְרַס חֻזְקָא קְדָם מְרִיא אִידְוֵהוּ.

ὑπερβάλλου] On the meaning of this verb, “to postpone,” there is no difficulty. Not only on account of its parallel, ἀναμένω, but also supported

by CG, e.g. ποιέειν αὐτίκα μοι δοκείει καὶ μὴ ὑπερβάλλεσθαι ‘we should act at once and not put it off, methinks’ Hdt 3.71.2.⁹

The Heb. **הִתְעַבֵּר**, however, is slightly problematic. The context precludes a BH denominative derived from **עָבַר**, thus ‘to become furious.’ *DCH* 6.242b, we believe, is right in identifying a third homonymous root, attested in Hitpael alone and bearing the sense of “**delay, procrastinate, be negligent.**” The equation **הִתְעַבֵּר** / **הִתְשַׁחַח** ‘you procrastinate’ 5.7 may be regarded as supporting this proposal under discussion. Breaking away from the past Hebrew lexicography,¹⁰ the dictionary includes **הָרַע וְרָא וְרָא וְרָא וְרָא וְרָא** Pr 14.16 as a BH example; a fool, even when aware of his evil deeds, does nothing, confident that everything will be OK. We believe that the basic meaning of this rare Heb. verb is ‘to linger, deliberately taking no action.’ It could be a development from the standard **עָבַר** > ‘to allow time to move on.’ There does not seem to be any comparative Semitic etymology for this Hitpael verb. What is more important are the three more attestations of this verb in Si itself:

- 7.10 **אל תקצר בתפלה ובצדקה אל תתעבר** ‘Don’t cut your prayers short and in alms giving don’t say “Wait, next time.”’ > **ἄ μὴ ὀλιγοψυχῆσης ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ σου καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην ποιῆσαι μὴ παρίδης** ‘Don’t be feeble-minded in your prayer and don’t let a chance for alms-giving go away.’
- 7.16 **אל תחשיבך במתי עם זכור עכרון לא יתעבר** ‘Don’t join the uneducated crowd. Remember. Retribution will not be slow in coming.’ > **ἄ μὴ προσλογίζου σεαυτὸν ἐν πλήθει ἁμαρτωλῶν· μνήσθητι ὅτι ὄργη οὐ χρονηεῖ** ‘Don’t count yourself as one of the crowd of sinners. Remember that (God’s) wrath will not be delayed.’
- 38.9 **בני בחלי אל תתעבר התפלל אל אל כי הוא ירפא** ‘My son, when you are ill, don’t just be stuck in your bed. Pray to God, for He will heal you.’ > **ἄ Τέκνον, ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου μὴ παράβλεπε, ἀλλ’ εὖξαι κυρίῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεται σε** ‘.. in your sick-bed don’t look away in a wrong direction, doing nothing, but pray to the Lord, for He is the one who can cure you.’

- 5.8) **Μὴ ἔπεχε ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἀδίκοις· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει σε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπαγωγῆς.**

*Do not rely on your ill-gotten possessions,
for nothing will be of use to you on the day of calamity.*

אל תבטח על נכסי שקר כי לא יועילו ביום עברה (A

οὐδὲν] The verb is in the sg., though referring to **χρήματα ἄδिका**. “Nothing of those possessions” comes over as more emphatic.

⁹ For more examples, see LSJ s.v. **ὑπερβάλλω B II**.

¹⁰ Segal (32) mentions Pr 14.16 and is rather close to the analysis proposed here: “Do not detach yourself from the matter, i.e. do not delay the matter.”

ἐπαγωγῆς] עברה ‘(God’s) wrath.’ Greek has quite a few words for “anger, wrath.” Ἐπαγωγή is not one of them. This is the sole case in SG of this equation. The Gk word denotes serious damage, disaster. It occurs once more and in the same combination as here, **יום עברה** 34.6. Though the relationship between **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ** there is rather complicated, we could perhaps identify this Heb. noun there with ἀπώλεια ‘perdition.’ **Ⓢ עקתא** ‘pain’ is rather feeble, cf. **Ⓢ תבעתא** ‘punishment.’

5.9) Μὴ λίκμα ἐν παντὶ ἀνέμῳ
καὶ μὴ πορεύου ἐν πάσῃ ἀτραπῷ·
οὕτως ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς ὁ δίγλωσσος.

*Seize the right moment
nor go along any path you might fancy.
So does a double-tongued sinner.*

אל תהיה זורה לכל רוח ופונה דרך שבולת: (A)
אל תהי זורה לכל רוח ואל תלך לכל שביל: (C)

μὴ λίκμα] **ⓈC** uses the orthodox jussive **אל תהי** as against **ⓈA** **אל תהיה**. On the widespread inconsistency in the Heb. of Si in this respect, see Van Peursen 2004.92f. No manuscript is consistent, either. E.g. at 4.29 we find **אל תהי** A.

Here we encounter the first example of the periphrastic construction in Si, <a form of **היה** + active ptc.>.¹¹ In our case here, however, the imperfective aspect is not particularly evident, though winnowing takes a while to be complete. In Qumran Hebrew, as in MH, this construction often carries the value of common law.¹² Such a value is congenial to proverbs which are meant to be of permanent validity. Cf. **Ⓢ לָא תְדָרָא נָ** as against **Ⓢ לָא תְהוּא דְרָא**, which latter is probably a mechanical reproduction of the Heb. structure.¹³

ἐν] **ⓈA** + C **ל**. The Heb. preposition is probably locative; the chaff is so directed for it to be carried away with the wind.

παντὶ] **ⓈA** + C **כל**. Both words are often used to express absolute, categorical negation, “none whosoever, nothing whatsoever, whichever etc.” Here, however, it is for partial negation. One cannot harvest wheat or barley without winnowing. To do it a wise farmer chooses the ideal weather condition, the right force and direction of the wind. The same analysis applies to **πάσῃ** in the next line.

Our translation given above is idiomatic. The proverb is scarcely meant for farmers only. In the Ptolemaic Egyptian diaspora Jewish farmers would have been a scarcity anyway.

¹¹ Three more instances are mentioned in Van Peursen 2004.227.

¹² For details, see *SOH* § 17 **fb**a.

¹³ **דָרָא** is probably a scribal error as noted by Smend.

There is no doubt that Θ is a translation of $\mathfrak{H}C$ **ואל תלך לכל שביל**, whereas C **ופונה דרך שבולת** is followed by \mathfrak{S} **לכל שביל ומתפנה** ‘and turning to every road,’ a rather obscure statement.

Line 4 is missing in $\mathfrak{H}A + C$ and \mathfrak{S} , but is found in $\mathfrak{S}h$. Most likely an intrusion from 6.1, where Θ is identical with its reading here, cf. also $\mathfrak{S}h$ there. Its message, however, is affiliated to that of 5.10b.

5.10) ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος ἐν συνέσει σου,
καὶ εἶς ἔστω σου ὁ λόγος.

*Remain stable in your view
and be consistent in your speech.*

(A) היה סמוך (לדעתך) [על דעתך] ואחד יהי דברך:
(C) היה סמוך על דברך ואחר יהיה דבריך:

[ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος] On the periphrastic tense with a Pf. participle, see above at 4.31. A noteworthy example of the collocation ἐστηριγμένος ἐν is found in ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείᾳ 2Pet 1.12, where a noun phrase preceded by ἐν expresses an abstract, intangible entity, ‘the truth which is with you,’ just like our σύνεσις.

With our above-given translation ἐστηριγμένος has been parsed as a genuine passive of **στηρίζω** ‘to place firmly.’ The author’s advice is for us to hold fast to the understanding of the *Lebensphilosophie* arrived at after much study, trials and errors. Such a stance would also become manifest in unambiguous, consistent speech. The preposition ἐν can be assigned an instrumental value: “by means of, through.” Thus not locative as in κλίμαξ ἐστηριγμένη ἐν τῇ γῆ ‘a ladder firmly planted in the ground’ Ge 28.12. Cp. rather καρδία ἐστηριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοήματος βουλῆς ἐν καιρῷ οὐ δειλιάσει ‘a heart firmly placed on intelligent thought will not fear at any time’ Si 22.16. We are, however, attracted to an alternative analysis proposed in *GELS* s.v. **στηρίζω** 1 c, where our verb in the middle voice is said to mean “to form a firm and enduring link with.” Another instance quoted there also comes from Si: ἐν Σίῳ ἐστηρίχθην Si 24.10.

In our discussion here we assume that **סמוך** in $\mathfrak{H}A + C$ **היה סמוך** is a Qal passive participle, **סָמוּךְ** ‘supported, upheld,’ though this sense is, it is true, slightly different from that of the passive **ἐστηριγμένος**. Furthermore, our position is that **סָמוּךְ** in **סמוך יצר**, an important expression in Qumran documents, is an adjective meaning ‘trustful.’ We see that our Gk translator did not understand **סמוך** here in that sense, though in theory that was possible as shown by \mathfrak{S} **הוֹיָתָ סָמוּךְ** as against $\mathfrak{S}h$ **הוֹיָתָ מְשֻׁרָר**.¹⁴

¹⁴ On the optative value of this Syriac construction, see Nöldeke 1966 § 260 and Muraoka 2005² § 87.

ἐν συνέσει σου] = 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 = 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀, ≠ 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀, which latter is a corruption due to דברייך at the end of the verse. The preposition על instead of ב could have favoured the sense ‘trustful’ for סמוך, cf. עָלְיָךְ נִסְמָכְתִּי Ps 71.6 and וַיִּסְמָכוּ הָעָם עַל-דְּבָרֵי יְהוֹקִיָּהוּ 2Ch 32.8. The selection of ἐν is due to our translator’s interpretation of סמוך.

𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 is closer to 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀, cf. Syr. Peal טַעַם ‘to understand, perceive.’
 εἶς] 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀, an obvious misspelling of 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀.

- 5.11) Γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου
 καὶ ἐν μακροθυμία φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν.

*Become quick to listen
 and take time in stating an answer.*

(A) היה ממהר להאזין ובארך רוח השב פתגם:
 (C) היה נכון בשמועה טובה ובארך ענה תענה נכונה:

For the entire verse 𐤀 is much closer to 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 than to 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀.

ταχὺς] ממהר. On the combination of מָהַר with an inf. cst., see Muraoka 2024 I (Bc). The message conveyed by this parable recurs in ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι Jas 1.19.

ἀκροάσει] 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 = 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀.

μακροθυμία] A ארך רוח. In BH we find only once a similar combination as here in הַטֹּב אֶרְךָ-רוּחַ מְגִבָּה-רוּחַ Ec 7.8 > 𐤀 ἀγαθὸν μακρόθυμος ὑπερ ὑψηλὸν πνεύματι, where, however, as correctly analysed in 𐤀, אָרַךְ is an adjective in the cst. st. For the expression of patience and long-suffering the combination of ארך with אפים is the standard as in אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנוּן אָרַךְ אָפִים Ex 34.6. 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 must be amiss, since ארך on its own is not used in these expressions. 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 may have had such a text in its *Vorlage*. In the light of this Syr. rendering 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 might mean “Take your time, no hurry, before you answer.” The Syr. מְתִינוּתָא signifies “slowness,” as nicely exemplified in לִיקְבֵּל מְתִינוּתָא קְלִילוּתָא ‘slowness as against quickness,’ cited in SL 867b. Other than this detail 𐤀 follows 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀. Mopsik translates 𐤀𐤅𐤁𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 as “et avec patience retourne une sentence,” saying that פתגם here means “parole d’ autorité, recommandation,” but we see no hindrance in admitting here an Aramaising language, for which cf. פָּתְנָם לְהַתְבוּתָךְ Dn 3.16, where in Heb. one would say לְהַשִּׁיב לְךָ דְבָר or לְהַשִּׁיבָךְ דְבָר as in הֲשִׁבֵנִי דְבָר Gn 37.14 and 𐤀 had no problem with leaving out פָּתְנָם, thus just ἀποκριθῆναί σοι.

- 5.12) εἰ ἔστιν σοι σύνεσις, ἀποκρίθητι τῷ πλησίον·
 εἰ δὲ μή, ἢ χεῖρ σου ἔστω ἐπὶ τῷ στόματί σου.

*If you have a view, answer your neighbour,
 but if not, your hand be on your mouth.*

(A) אַם ישׁ אתךְ ענה רעךְ ואם אין ירךְ על פיךְ:
 (C) אַם ישׁ אתךְ ענה ריעךְ ואם אין שים ירךְ על פיךְ

σύνεσις] In neither $\mathfrak{H}A$ nor $\mathfrak{H}C$ we find anything that would correspond to this word. It does appear in vs. 10, but the current verse hardly carries on the message of vs. 10. מְלֵתָא in \mathfrak{S} is scarcely translatable with σύνεσις.¹⁵ Besides, in vs. 10 \mathfrak{S} uses a different Syr. noun, טַעֲמָא ‘knowledge.’

ἔστω] This can be a free rendering of $\mathfrak{H}C$ שים, or a free addition to $\mathfrak{H}A$ ואם אין ירךְ על פיךְ. Smend refers to שִׁימוּ יָדְ עַל-פִּיָּהּ Jb 21.5. \mathfrak{S} = $\mathfrak{H}C$ אִדְךָ אִדְךָ סִים עַל פּוֹמְךָ.

5.13) δόξα καὶ ἀτιμία ἐν λαλιᾷ,
 καὶ γλωσσοσά ἀνθρώπου πτωσίς αὐτῶ.

*Honour and dishonour through speaking
 and a man's tongue (can become) his fall.*

(A) כבוד וקלון ביוד בוטא ולשון אדם מפלתו:
 (C) כבוד וקלון ביד בוטה ולשון אדם מפליטו:

ἐν λαλιᾷ] $\mathfrak{H}C$ ביד בוטה, corrupted to $\mathfrak{H}A$ ביוד בוטא. The Heb. pseudo-preposition has been taken in \mathfrak{C} in its instrumental force, not locative. Cf. בְּהִלֵּל דְּוִיד בְּיָדָם 2Ch 7.6, where the suffix of יָדָם refers back to בְּכִלְי־שִׁיר earlier in the verse.¹⁶ This analysis by our translator has necessitated him to transform the substantivised Ptc. to a verbal noun.¹⁷ By contrast, \mathfrak{S} follows \mathfrak{H} : בְּיָד מִן דְּמַמְלָל בְּמַמְלָלָא נָן. Smend appropriately mentions מוֹת וְחַיִּים בְּיַד-לְשׁוֹן וְאַהֲבָיָה יֹאכֵל פְּרִיָּהּ Pr 18.21, where \mathfrak{C} is too mechanical with ἐν χειρὶ γλώσσησιν.

This rare BH verb (only 4x) is often assigned a negative connotation, e.g. BDB s.v. “to speak rashly, thoughtlessly.” The definition in Even-Shoshan s.v. is neutral “to speak, utter words.” Though in Pr 12.18 בִּטּוּהַ is in antithetical parallelism to לְשׁוֹן הַחֲכָמִים, Pi. בִּטּוּהַ in אוֹ לְהִיטִיב אוֹ לְהָרַע is said to “connote an impulsive statement” (Milgrom 1991.299). However, the interpretation represented in \mathfrak{C} with διαστέλλω “to state precisely, spell out” is neutral: ψυχῆ, ἢ ἄν ὁμόση διαστέλλουσα τοῖς χεῖλεισιν κακοποιῆσαι ἢ καλῶς ποιῆσαι.¹⁸

πτωσίς] $\mathfrak{H}C$ מפלתו, corrupted to $\mathfrak{H}A$ מפליטו.

¹⁵ Some patristic sources read λογος or λογος συνεσεως.

¹⁶ So Qimhi: עַל פִּי נִיגוֹן הַכִּלִּים ‘with the playing of the instruments’ but Rashi: הַהוֹדוּת בִּידֵם ‘the praises through Levites.’ In any case not locative. On the instrumental בְּיָד, see BDB s.v. דָּ 5 d.

¹⁷ Smend invents a Hebrew word unknown anywhere: בּוֹטָא or בִּיטָא.

¹⁸ Cf. Rashi on בְּשִׁפְתָיִם: לֹא בִלְבָב, i.e. “to express orally what is on his mind.”

5.14) Μὴ κληθῆς ψίθυρος
καὶ τῆ γλώσση σου μὴ ἐνέδρευε
ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ κλέπτῃ ἐστὶν αἰσχύνη
καὶ κατάγνωσις πονηρὰ ἐπὶ διγλώσσου.

*Do not be called a slanderer
nor lie in ambush with your tongue,
for there is shame for a thief
and grave denunciation on a double-tongued.*

In \mathfrak{H} two variant texts are to be seen for the first two lines:

ובלשונך אל תרגל רע:	אל תקרא בעל שתיים	(Aa)
ואל לשונך אל תרגל:	אל תקרא בעל שתיים	(Aa*)
חרפה רעהו בעל שתיים:	כי על גנב נבראה בשת	(Ab)

[a] is superior. אל לשונך in [a*] makes little sense. With על לשונך as a possible phonetic variant this version could be alluding to $\text{לא־רַגַל עַל־לְשׁוֹנוֹ}$ ‘he did not slander with his tongue’ Ps 15.3.

$\psi\theta\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$] \neq בעל שתיים , but rather = $\delta\acute{\iota}\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ at the end of the verse, as shown in 6.1, where that equation is found. For $\Psi\acute{\iota}\theta\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\iota}\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ Si 28.13 there has not come down any Heb. fragment. \mathfrak{S} reads there $\text{לְשׁוֹנָא תְּלִיִּיתָא}$ ‘a triple tongue.’

ἐνέδρευε] Though this equation is attested in SG only here, the version [a] took the verb רגל in the more common of its two senses in Pi., i.e. “to spy.” One could lay an oral trap. \mathfrak{S} תִּתְקַל ‘you stumble’ indicates that the translator recognised רָגַל as latent in תרגל . \mathfrak{S} תִּתְקַמֵּן = \mathfrak{G} .

An equivalent of [a] רע , most likely רַע , is not represented in \mathfrak{G} . However, its rendering here, \mathfrak{S} $\text{מְהֵלֵךְ בְּתַרְתִּינִי}$ is odd. The same expression is used to render בעל שתיים at the end of the verse, and there its referent is clearly human, as shown with the addition of מִן דְ ‘he who,’ so in the next verse, 6.1. The reference can scarcely be to a human being walking on two legs. Smend postulates “zwei Wege.”

ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ κλέπτῃ [נבראה בשת] כי על גנב . Ἐπί here probably indicates a target: “aiming at” (GELS s.v. II 9) as idiomatically expressed by Snaith “in store for.” על can also bear a value of enmity, hostility; see BDB s.v. 7 d. Thus scarcely locative as in “upon the thief” (NETS) and “über einem Dieb” (SD). \mathfrak{H} נבראה ‘was created’ fits the first analysis better. The selection of the existential verb instead of κτίζω may be due to our translator’s hesitancy to state that God created not only glory and honour, but also shame.

From the context we see that גנב is not about a common thief. As pointed out by Kister (1990.317f.) RH uses the word metaphorically as well, e.g. $\text{כול הגוֹנְבֵי דַעַת הַבְּרִיּוֹת נִקְרָא גִנָּב}$ ‘everyone who cheats people is called a thief’ TosBQ 7.8.

Based on ח $\text{חרפה רעהו בעל שתיים}$ the fourth line in ט could be translated back as $\text{חרפה רעה על בעל שתיים}$.¹⁹ The current text of ח , which looks like a nominal clause, is syntactically difficult. One should perhaps accept a slight emendation put forward by Segal (34): רעהו לרעהו for רעהו . We could then translate: “Humiliation is in store for his colleague the double-tongued.”²⁰

$\text{πονηρὰ]$ The adjective here does not, of course, express “morally, ethically evil,” but “pragmatically bad,” say, “disastrous.” See *GELS* s.v. 2. The same applies to Heb. רע .

Cf. also below at 28.13.

5.15) $\text{ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μὴ ἀγνόει}$

Whether in an important matter or in a trivial one, do not act, ignoring (the law).

(A) מעט והרבה אל תשחת

$\text{ἀγνόει]$ תשחת , an interesting equation. Cf. לֹא תִסְרוּחַ . *SL* s.v. סרח mentions that this Syr. verb renders שָׁחַת in Ex 21.26, where, however, it is about seriously damaging someone’s eye. The Gk verb used here is, of course, not about blissful ignorance. *GELS* s.v. has listed our case under 2 “*to sin by wilfully ignoring and disregarding divine injunctions.*” Precisely the same phrase as here renders אַל-יִאָשֶׁם at Ho 4.15. Ἀγνοέω so used is more serious than Segal’s (34) interpretation of ט here as equal to תִּשְׁגָּה ‘to make an error, mistake.’

¹⁹ The preposition, על , is better taken in the same sense as that in line 3 for the sake of parallelism, which also justifies our preference for ἐπὶ διγλόσσω or ἐπὶ διγλόσσοις found in quite a few manuscripts as against Ziegler’s genitive form. Ἐπὶ τινος is not known to have the value we are assigning to ἐπὶ τινι here.

²⁰ Mopsik’s “le mépris d’autrui” is grammatically impossible; for such a translation חרפת רעהו , i.e. תְּרַפֵּת רְעָהוּ , is required.

CHAPTER 6

- 6.1) καὶ ἀντὶ φίλου μὴ γίνου ἐχθρός·
ὄνομα γὰρ πονηρὸν αἰσχύνῃν καὶ ὄνειδος κληρονομήσει·
οὕτως ὁ ἄμαρτωλὸς ὁ δίγλωσσος.

*Do not become an enemy instead of a friend,
for he might cause (you) a bad name, shame, and humiliation.
So is a double-tongued sinner.*

(Aa) ותחת אוהב אל תהי שונא:

(Ab) שם רע וקלון תוריש חרפה כן איש רע בעל שתיים:

In 1b) \mathfrak{H} reads rather differently: ‘Disgrace will bequeath a bad name and contempt.’ \mathfrak{S} read the verb as Qal (תִּירַשׁ): תִּאֲרַת, but 2ms, and חרפה was construed with the next clause: וְהַיָּדָא וְהַנְּבִיא ‘and the disgrace and sins are ..’ Though κληρονομέω in SG, probably under the influence of Heb. הוֹרִישׁ, sometimes means “to give an inheritance to” (GELS s.v. *4) + τινα or + τινά τι and “to give as possession” (GELS s.v. *5) + τινί (pers.) τι, and none of these syntagmatic conditions is met in this case, which could be accidental, given the small number of attestations of these two senses of the Gk verb, senses unique to SG.¹ Two important differences between \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} are to be noted: 1) the conjunction *waw* has been shifted and 2) the verb has been shifted to the end of the clause. This perhaps suggests that the translator decided not strictly to follow his *Vorlage*. He may have mentally read יוריש, making שונא its s. We had then better insert a comma between πονηρὸν and αἰσχύνῃν, and mentally insert σοι.² \mathfrak{S} attempted to parse תוריש as 2ms, but a futile attempt, since the Heb. causative form cannot be rendered as תִּאֲרַת. As questionable is \mathfrak{S} וְנִאֲרַת הוּא ‘he will inherit.’

ἀντὶ [תחת] The Gk prep. + gen. can also mark enmity, so “gegenüber dem Freund” (SD), but תחת does not.

- 6.2) Μὴ ἐπάρης σεαυτὸν ἐν βουλῇ ψυχῆς σου,
ἵνα μὴ διαρπαγῇ ὡς ταῦρος ἡ ἰσχὺς σου·

*Do not think too highly of yourself as you consider your desire
in case your strength is sapped as (that of) a bull.*

(A) אל תפול ביד נפשך ותעבה חילך עליך:

¹ We doubt that the verb can mean ‘to produce’ as suggested in “une mauvaise réputation produit ..” (BJ). “a bad name will inherit ..” (NETS) makes little sense.

² We would remove the reference to this example from GELS s.v. κληρονομέω 1 b.

⊕ of the whole verse reads quite different from ℑ. In 2a) ℑ most likely means “Do not succumb to your desire,” cf. Ⓢ לֹא תִשָּׁתְּלֵם בְּאִדָּא דְּנַפְשָׁךְ. Since the Heb. text presents no particular difficulty, our translator must have wished to present his own thought on the issue of all-consuming desire somewhat like the translator of the canonical Proverbs, who at times composed his own proverbs.³ Hence, to identify βουλῆ with דָּ, as Smend does, is too mechanical.⁴

σεαυτὸν] ≠ נפשך, which is rendered at the end of the line as ψυχῆς σου. Thus *pace* Smend “zweimal übersetzt.”

βουλῆ] “l’excès” (BJ) is a shade too free.

ψυχῆς σου] One of the principal senses of ψυχή in SG is “*incorporeal, inner existence and strength*” with particular reference to “desire,” see an extensive listing in *GELS* 743b-744a s.v. 3 b, thus not exactly “your soul” (*NETS*). This is also true of Heb. נֶפֶשׁ.

2b) is far more challenging. Segal (33) vocalises תַּעֲבֶה as תַּעֲבֶה ‘it fattens,’ knowing himself that this makes no sense,⁵ and quietly follows the emendation proposed by Smend, i.e. תַּבְעֵר = תַּבְעֵר ‘it consumes,’ a rather plausible proposal. He appropriately refers to Si 36.30, where we read יְבוֹעֵר כֶּרֶם > διαρπαγῆσεται κτήμα.⁶ Now ⊕ and ℑ nearly correspond to each other, with the only difference that the former, preferring the passive form, underlines the destructive effect suffered by “your power.”⁷

ὡς ταῦρος] In ℑ no bull is around. כְּשֹׂר may have inadvertently dropped out; it is there in Ⓢ אֵיךְ תִּנְרָא. Anyway, ταῦρος can hardly be the subject of διαρπαγῆ. Hence we suggest a loose, ellipsis for ὡς ἡ ἰσχυὸς ταύρου. The translator might be envisaging a bull which, having spotted an attractive green pasture at some distance, starts dashing after it, but gets exhausted midway. The replacement כֹּאשׁ is too arbitrary in Skehan - Di Lella “lest like fire it consume your strength.”

Whether כְּשֹׂר was originally in 2b) or at the end of 2a) as possibly suggested by ℑ *velut taurus ne forte* ..., the phrase is a little too substantial to be freely added by the translator.

³ Cf. Cook 1997.202.

⁴ Smend does the same at 37.7 ἐξάρει βουλῆν ‘he extols a decision (proposed by himself)’ for יִנְיָ יָד, where we have to do with an idiomatic expression.

⁵ We fail to see how Mopsik’s “il [= ton appétit] alourdirait ta vigueur” can be made to mean “elle [= ta vigueur] deviendrait trop pesante pour toi.” Besides, תַּעֲבֶה is not about heaviness, but about thickness.

Kahana suggests תַּעֲבֶה, a lengthened Pi. Impv.: “Make your power detestable to you,” which is not convincing.

⁶ Probably, on the basis of this proposal *SL* has entered Pael בְּעֵי ‘to consume’ with our passage as the only reference, where the traditional reading is תַּבְעֵה Pael. A rather questionable lexicographical approach. “To look after with a hostile intent” makes reasonable sense here.

⁷ Segal (35) is wrong by parsing the Gk verb as active and translating back as וְתַבְעֵר כְּשֹׂר וְנַפְשָׁךְ.

[עליך] At the end of the verse, *pace* Smend, it does not have to be an intrusion from the beginning of the next verse, where, spelled in the same way, it means ‘your leaves’ < עלה. The preposition על is at times used to underline a damage, hurt or inconvenience suffered, thus having the value of *dativus incommodi*, e.g. מָתָה עָלַי רָחֵל Gn 48.7, which in Colloquial English we could translate ‘Rachel died on me,’ not that Rachel was lying on top of Jacob at her death.⁸

6.3) τὰ φύλλα σου καταφάγεσαι καὶ τοὺς καρπούς σου ἀπολέσεις
καὶ ἀφήσεις σεαυτὸν ὡς ξύλον ξηρόν.

*You will eat up your leaves and destroy your fruits
and leave yourself as a dry tree.*

(A) עליך תאכל ופריך תשרש והניחתך כעץ יבש:

ἀπολέσεις] 𐤀 תשרש. Derived from שָׂרַשׁ the verb means either ‘to take root’ or ‘uproot.’ Here we see an extension of the second sense applied to fruits, not to trees.⁹ Note וּבְכָל-תְּבוּאָתַי תִּשְׂרַשׁ ‘and it [= a wild fire] will destroy my entire produce’ Jb 31.12.¹⁰ As Smend rightly points out, 𐤀 understood all three Heb. verbs as 2ms,¹¹ when they could be parsed as 3fs with נפשך as their common subject. However, ultimately it comes down to the same thing, as you are being driven by your desire.

6.4) ψυχὴ πονηρὰ ἀπολεῖ τὸν κτησάμενον αὐτήν
καὶ ἐπίχαρμα ἐχθρῶν ποιήσει αὐτόν.

*An evil desire will destroy him who acquired it
and make him laughed at by enemies.*

(A) כי נפש עזה תשחת בעליה ושמחת שונא תשיגם:

פונהר] ≠ 𐤀 עזה ‘intense, overpowering.’

ἀπολεῖ] In the preceding verse we note ἀπολέσεις. These are two synonymous, variant Fut. act. forms of ἀπόλλυμι: ἀπολώ and ἀπολέσω. The latter occurs only a few times in SG.¹²

⁸ For a discussion on this matter with more examples, see JM § 133 f.

⁹ Mopsik’s “déracinerait tes fruits” is illogical, because fruits have no roots.

¹⁰ On an internet site we read: “Plants need leaves to photosynthesise, converting solar energy to sugars and other compounds required by fruit as they mature.” Thus our translator, *pace* Segal (35), is not translating without taking the Heb. usage into account.

¹¹ In BH we find no example of a suf. pron. directly attached to a verb functioning as a reflexive pronoun (JM § 146 k), but the change from a case such as וְיָרְאוּ שָׂרְי בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֹתָם (𐤀 ἑαυτούς) בָּרַע Ex 5.19 to בָּרַע .. יְרֵאוּם is minimal. The use of σεαυτόν for ך in 7.7 and 7.16 shows that this use of the suf. pron. was an integral part of Ben Sira’s Hebrew. See also Nöldeke 1900.87.

¹² For details cf. Thackeray 1909.230.

τὸν κτησάμενον αὐτῆν] **ח** בעליה, pl. in form, but a so-called plural of majesty, well known to BH, e.g. וְגַם-בְּעַלְיָו יוּמָת ‘also its owner shall be put to death’ Ex 21.29.¹³ Hence αὐτόν at the end of the verse, though **ח** תשיגם has adjusted the pronoun to the preceding בעליה. בעליה could, of course, be meant literally plural. However, **ט** and **ס** תַּעֲבֹדְיָהּ .. מָרָה went the other way, understanding בעליה as virtually singular.

Though the Aor. participle does not always imply that the action indicated with it preceded in time that of its principal verb,¹⁴ in our case ‘her possessor’ is unlikely in view of the meaning of the verb, which does not signify ‘to own, to be owner,’ but ‘to obtain, acquire.’

On the message of (4a), see also 19.3.

On the message of (4a), see also 19.3. תשיג אוֹתָם ≠ תשיג להם [תשיגם αὐτόν 4.18.

On the basis of **ט** as well as **ס** and **ש** תַּעֲבֹדְיָהּ, and **י** *dat illum* Smend proposes to emend תשיגם to תשימנו or תעשנו.¹⁵ However, תשיגם can be retained: ‘it will gain for him a jeering by his enemies.’

6.5) Λάρυγξ γλυκὺς πληθυνεῖ φίλους αὐτοῦ,
καὶ γλῶσσα εὐλαλὸς πληθυνεῖ εὐπροσήγορα.

*A sweet way of speaking increases friends
and an eloquent tongue increases courteous responses.*

(A) חֵךְ עָרַב יִרְבֵּה אוֹהֵב וּשְׁפָתַי חֵן שׁוֹאֵלוֹ שְׁלוֹם:
(C) חֵךְ עָרַב יִרְבֵּה אוֹהֵב וּשְׁפָתַי חֵן שׁוֹאֵלֵי שְׁלוֹם:

Λάρυγξ ‘larynx’] **ח** חֵךְ ‘palate.’ Cf. **ס** פִּימָא ‘mouth’ is easier to envisage as an organ of speech, and note **ש** גְּנָרְתָא ‘throat.’ As a translation **י** *verbum dulce multiplicat amicos* is more “dynamic” à la Eugene Nida.

φίλους αὐτοῦ] **ח** אוֹהֵב, sg. and with no suffix pronoun, which must loosely refer to a speaker, not his larynx, but **ש** דִּילָהּ ‘its, i.e. of the throat.’ The pl. agrees with that of the following שׁוֹאֵלֵי שְׁלוֹם, misspelled (A) שׁוֹאֵלוֹ.¹⁶

γλῶσσα εὐλαλὸς] **ח** שְׁפָתַי חֵן. **ט** has now opted for a more dynamic equivalent than a “formal” one, which would be χεῖλη. In the other of the two SG instances the adjective occurs in Jb 11.2, where **ח** interestingly reads אִישׁ שִׁפְתָּיִם.

¹³ For details, see JM § 136 *d*. Unlike other substantives, this kind of plural is used with **כ** only when a suffix pronoun is attached to it.

¹⁴ Cf. *SSG* § 28 *dff*. Thus *pace* “him who possesses it” (*NETS*), “ihren Besitzer” (*SD*), and “ceux qui le possèdent” (*Mopsik*). We fail to follow “la perte d’un homme” (*BJ*). Cf. **ש** לְאִינָא לְדַקְנָה ‘one who acquired it.’

¹⁵ It should be either תשיגם or תעשם with the suffix referring back to בעליה.

¹⁶ Correctly as שׁוֹאֵלֵי in C (Elizur 2010.21).

LSJ defines εὐλάλος as meaning ‘sweetly-speaking,’ though in LSG we find under εὐλαλία ‘eloquence.’¹⁷

εὐπροσήγορα] שׁוֹאֵלֵי שְׁלוֹם ‘well-wishers.’ Unlike the parallel φίλους this substantivised n.pl. adjective cannot refer to persons, hence our above-given translation. Maybe we could understand ῥήματα, φθέγματα or suchlike. שֵׁשׁ אַנְיָאֲדָ ‘of the righteous (people)’ is odd. In this particular instance, *pace* SL s.v. אַתְּלָאֲשׁ, what we find in שֵׁשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ and שֵׁשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ must mean more than *greeting*, “Hello, how are you?”¹⁸

6.6) οἱ εἰρηνεύοντές σοι ἔστωσαν πολλοί,
οἱ δὲ σύμβουλοί σου εἶς ἀπὸ χιλίων.

*Let your well-wishers be many,
but your advisors be one out of thousands.*

(A) אַנְשֵׁי שְׁלוֹמְךָ יְהִיו רַבִּים וּבַעַל סוּדְךָ אַחַד מֵאַלְפֵי
(C) אַנְשֵׁי שְׁלוֹמֶיךָ יְהִיו רַבִּים וּבַעַל סוּדְךָ אַחַד מֵאַלְפֵי

οἱ εἰρηνεύοντές σοι] Not only אַנְשֵׁי שְׁלוֹמְךָ,¹⁹ but also שֵׁשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ and שֵׁשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ ‘those who strive for harmonious, peaceful state of affairs for you’ appear to render some support to our analysis of εὐπροσήγορα in the preceding verse.

ἔστωσαν πολλοί רַבִּים] We have reservations on identifying here a periphrastic construction as Van Peursen (1997.164) does. Any adjective, by definition, indicates a more or less permanent state, not an action. Likewise 13.9, 13.13, 35.22, 42.8, 44.22, 44.22. Moreover, attention ought to be paid to word order: רַבִּים הֵיוּ 34.6, תְּהִיָּה .. צְמֵאָה 51.24, קָטַן הֵייתִי 51.27.²⁰

οἱ δὲ σύμβουλοί σου] אַחַד סוּדְךָ ‘your confident,’ cf. מְתֵי סוּדִי ‘my closest friends’ Jb 19.19 and אַנְשֵׁי סוּדִי ‘men of my intimacy’ 1QH^a 6.29.

χιλίων] אַחַד אֶלֶף ‘one thousand.’ The pl. of אַחַד underlines the intent of the message. The pl. of σύμβουλοί has been accordingly adjusted.

¹⁷ Among the attestations of this adjective, which Dr A. Thompson has kindly collected from TLG, in at least two of them (AP5.148, 155) it definitely means “eloquent,” whereas in a couple of places (AP9.229, 525) it is applied to a maiden enticingly speaking.

¹⁸ We find one of quite a few instances illuminating in which Syr. uses אַתְּלָאֲשׁ as a verb in conjunction with אַתְּלָאֲשׁ הֵוּ אַבּוּכֹן סְבָא: שֵׁשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ אַתְּלָאֲשׁ וְאַמְרָא לְהוֹן לְהוֹן וְאַמְרָא לְהוֹן וְאַמְרָא לְהוֹן ‘and he [= Joseph] enquired about their well-being and then said to them, “Is your aged father well?”’. The addition of the preposition בְּ and the suffix pronoun הוֹן make it likely that we have here more than a mere, conventional greeting.

¹⁹ אַחַד (Elizur 2010.21) reads שְׁלוֹמֶיךָ. There is no place for a pausal form here. Hence a scribal error? Or the pl. of the nomen regens influencing the nomen rectum as in שְׁנֵי לְחַת אֲבָנִים ‘two stone tablets’ Dt 5.18? Three cases of שְׁלוֹמִים in BH (Je 13.19, Ps 55.21, 69.23) are all dismissed as “dubious” in BDB s.v. שְׁלוֹם.

²⁰ Classical Syriac, in which the periphrastic forms are extremely common, the two sequences are semantically distinct from each other. See Muraoka 2005 § 85-89.

This proverb appears to have become well known in the subsequent Judaism as stated by Segal (36), who quotes a good number of passages from the post-biblical Jewish literature, e.g. רַבִּים יִהְיוּ דוֹרְשֵׁי שְׁלוֹמֶךָ גְּלֵה סוֹד לְאַחַד מֵאַלְּךָ. bYeb 63.2.²¹

6.7) εἰ κτᾶσαι φίλον, ἐν πειρασμῶ κτῆσαι αὐτὸν
καὶ μὴ ταχὺ ἐμπιστεύσης αὐτῶ.

*If you are to make a friend, make one by testing him
and do not be in a hurry to trust him.*

(A) קנית אוהב בניסוֹ/ן קנהו ואל תמהר לבטוח עליו:
(C) קנית אוהב בנסיון קנהו ואל תמהר לבטוח עליו:

εἰ κτᾶσαι] \mathfrak{H} קנית. \mathfrak{G} is followed by \mathfrak{S} in identifying here a conditional clause not introduced by a conjunction such as \mathfrak{A} and the Heb. Pf. in the protasis with no preterite value: \mathfrak{A} ן קְנֶה אָנֹת. So also \mathfrak{I} *si possides*. The apodosis has a verb form with volitive value, Impv. in this instance. This particular syntagm, <Pf. - volitive verb form>, is not attested any more in Si²² nor in MH. In examples adduced by Segal (1958a § 484) the Pf. verb in the protasis indicates what is assumed already to have taken place, e.g. קְרָא וְטָעָה 'if he recited it but made an error, he should return to the place where he made an error' mBer 2.3.²³ Outside of this particular syntagm, a Pf. verb in the protasis can be non-preterite in value, e.g. יֵינן יִצָּא סוֹד 'if wine enters, a secret comes out' bSanh 38a and bErub 65a just as in מִצָּא טוֹב אִשָּׁה מִצָּא טוֹב Pr 18.22.

6.8) ἔστιν γὰρ φίλος ἐν καιρῶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ οὐ μὴ παραμείνη ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως.

*For there is a friend for the time that suits him
and he will never be around on the day of (your) trouble.*

(A) כי יש אוהב כפי עת ואל יעמוד ביום צרה:
(C) יש אוהב בפני עת ולא יעמד ביום צרה:

ἐν καιρῶ αὐτοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A כפי עת. This pseudo-preposition²⁴ is rather rare in BH, a total of 14 occurrences, and also extremely rare in RH. HALOT (915b, 10)

²¹ See also Mopsik 2003.92, fn. 5, where a passage from CG is also mentioned: *παύροισιν πίσυρος μεγάλη ἀνδράσιν ἔργ' ἐπιχείρει, μὴ ποτ' ἀνίκεστον, Κύρνε, λάβης ἀνίην* 'Trusting few people, put your hand to major tasks, lest, Cyrenus, you land ever on an incurable sorrow' Theognis 75f. My national culture has a proverb which says: "Too many oarsmen make a boat go up a hill," an English version of which would be "Too many cooks spoil the broth."

²² See Van Peursen 2004.348-50, § 21.2.

²³ See also Segal 1932.192-94.

²⁴ So labelled because the constituent substantive, פֶּה, is not used with its primary sense of "mouth" in any of its attestations. Cf. SQH § 11 c.

assigns it the sense applicable to its Akkadian equivalents, *ana pī, kī pī* “corresponding to, in accordance with,” as in *כְּפִי שְׁנֵי* “according to the number of years” Lv 25.52. The above-given translation is based on our contextual analysis of this clause. Whereas *שֵׁן בְּזִנְיָא דִּילָה נָן* is straightforward, *שֵׁן בְּאִפִּי אֲתָשָׁ* is problematic. It can hardly represent Heb. *בְּפָנָי*, since it makes no sense in the context and though precisely *עַת בְּפָנָי* is what we find in *HC* (Elizur 2010.23).²⁵

οὐ μὴ] *ח* *לא*, which we, following Smend, emend to *לא*, so read in *HC* (Elizur 2010.23). Here no wish or prohibition is being expressed. If the master copy of *HA* were written in two columns, the scribe’s eyes might have wandered upwards; 7b) begins with *ואל*, which is in its place. This Gk double negative appears very much liked by our translator, so also by his predecessors translating poetic books; for details, see *SSG* § 83 ca. Moreover, in 10b almost the same thought is expressed, and there we see *לא*.

θλίψεως] Preferring the reading in some daughter versions and readings in patristic sources, Ziegler has deleted σου attested in all the Greek manuscripts. *ש* with a bare substantive, *בְּעֵדְנָא דְאֹלְצָנָא*, agrees with *ח* *צרה*, though *צָרְתָךְ* would make good sense, for one misses something like σοι to go with *παρამεῖνη*, cf. *παρამεῖνῶ σοι παῖς* ‘I will stay beside you as a slave’ Ge 44.33. Exactly the same problem recurs in vs. 10, q.v.

6.9) καὶ ἔστιν φίλος μετατιθέμενος εἰς ἔχθραν
καὶ μάχην ὀνειδισμοῦ σου ἀποκαλύψει.

*And there is a friend who turns round for hostility
and he will publicise a quarrel (between you) to humiliate you.*

:יש אוהב נהפך לשנא ואת ריב חרפתך יחשוך: (A)
:יש אוהב נהפך לשונא ואת ריב חרפתך יחשוך: (C)

καὶ ἔστιν] *ח* starts off with *יש* with no *ו*. Whether the Heb. *Vorlage* had the conjunction or not, it makes sense as a second clause beginning with *יש אוהב* and followed by it (vs. 10).

εἰς ἔχθραν] = לשנא, i.e. לשנאָה in lieu of *ח* *לשנא*, i.e. לשנאָה (= C). **Ἐχθρα* forms a better antonymic parallelism with the immediately following μάχη.

²⁵ *SL* s.v. אָפִּי 85b, 10 cites our case as the only attestation meaning *for*, hence “for the moment.” We are referred to *בְּאִפִּי* in the Babylonian Talmud, and all examples adduced in Sokoloff 2002.153b appear to attest to such a usage, though what follows this pseudo-preposition is a personal entity. On the other hand, from Payne Smith 1879.278b-279a s.v. אָנְפָא we see that this Syriac pseudo-preposition is attested quite a few times, and our Si example is rendered: “propter horam, h.e. praesentis voluptatis causa,” ‘because of the time, i.e. because the willingness is there.’

μάχην ὀνειδισμοῦ σου] The genitive σου is subjective, whilst the same case of ὀνειδισμοῦ σου expresses a purpose or aim of an action undertaken. Basically the same logical relationships subsist between the three components of \mathfrak{H} here, ריב הרפתך.²⁶

\mathfrak{H} יהשוך יחשוך can only be a direct object marker, thus *pace* Mopsik's "avec la querelle il étale ta honte."

The collocation יהשוך יחשוך is unknown elsewhere. It might have to do with a quarrel that has been up to now a personal one known to no third party. In any event, (C) יהשוך, i.e. יהשוך, does make no sense here.

6.10) καὶ ἔστιν φίλος κοινωνὸς τραπεζῶν
καὶ οὐ μὴ παραμείνη ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως·

*And there is a friend who sits at the same table with you
but will never be around on the day of (your) trouble.*

(A) יש אוהב חבר שלחן ולא ימצא ביום רעה:
(C) יש אוהב חבר שלחן ולא ימצא ביום רעה:

καὶ ἔστιν] On the conjunction added in \mathfrak{C} , see above at vs. 9.

τραπεζῶν] pl. as against \mathfrak{H} שלחן. Is it about the two inviting each other? On \mathfrak{H} שלחן here, cf. בעלי לחמך Si 9.16.

θλίψεως] On the deletion by Ziegler of σου at the end of the verse, see above at vs. 8.

παραμείνη] \mathfrak{S} consistently renders this Gk verb with נִכְתַּר 'he will remain' in 6.8 as well, where \mathfrak{H} uses a different verb, יעמוד as against ימצא, i.e. ימצא 'will be found,' here.

6.11) καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς σου ἔσται ὡς σὺ
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας σου παρρησιάσεται·

*When things are going well for you, he will be your second self
and will speak boldly to your domestic staff.*

(A) בטובתך הוא כמוך וברעתך יתגדה ממך:

τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς σου] טובתך. In Hebrew a gender-free, abstract notion can be expressed with an adjective in the fem. gender. E.g. "you meant to do me harm (רָעָה)" Gn 50.20, "a tongue speaking great things (גְּדִלוֹת)" Ps 12.4.²⁷ By contrast, Greek uses the neut. gender, e.g. ἀπέναντι τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν 'good is opposed to evil' Si 36.14, where the referents, however, are personal

²⁶ On this morphosyntactic matter, see *SSG* § 22 v (xii) and (xiv), and *SQH* § 21 b (xiii) and (xvi) for Greek and Hebrew respectively.

²⁷ See JM § 134 n, 152 h.

in \mathfrak{H} רשע טוב איש נִכְחַת. Hence, in our case, we most likely have τὰ ἀγαθά at the base.²⁸

We agree with Smend in seeing \mathfrak{H} 11b, וברעתך יתנדה ממך ‘when things are going badly for you, he will dissociate himself from you,’ as an intrusion of a variant text of 12b. As a consequence no trace of the original \mathfrak{H} 11b has been preserved. \mathfrak{S} basically agrees with \mathfrak{H} .

ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας σου παρρησιάζομαι ἐπὶ τινα is a noteworthy rection, not mentioned in the current lexica. In *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ III 4 we read: “indicates one to whom or that to which action, attention, thought, emotion or utterance, etc. are directed.” Thus we see that it carries a slightly different nuance from < + τι vi pers. >. A good number of examples referring to speech acts are mentioned under **d**, e.g. Ἐβαρύνετε ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν ‘your remarks were intolerable to me’ Ma 3.13.

6.12) ἐὰν ταπεινωθῆς, ἔσται κατὰ σοῦ
καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου κρυβήσεται.

*If you decline, he will be against you
and will disappear out of your sight.*

(A) אם תשיגך רעה יהפך בך ומפניך יסתר:

(C) אם תשיגנו נרפך בך ומפניך יסתר:

ἐὰν ταπεινωθῆς] This is difficult to reconcile with \mathfrak{H} A אם תשיגך רעה ‘if a calamity befalls you.’²⁹ \mathfrak{S} אַן תַּפֹּל ‘if you fall’ supports \mathfrak{C} . \mathfrak{H} C is harder: what is the s of the verb? and who does the suf. pron. נו- refer to?, and נרפך?

ἔσται κατὰ σοῦ] \mathfrak{H} יהפך בך. Smend just refers to יְהִי אֶהְיֶה וְנִהְפְּכֶיךָ Jb 19.19, which render’s Kahana’s vocalisation יְהִי־הִפְּךָ more plausible than Segal’s (35) יְהִי־פְּךָ.

6.13) ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου διαχωρίσθητι
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων σου πρόσεχε.

*Distance yourself from your foes
and beware of your friends.*

(A) משנאיך הבדל ומאהביך השמר:

(C) משונאיך הבדל ומאוהביך השמר:

τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου .. τῶν φίλων σου] \mathfrak{S} uses the sg.: רְחַמְךָ .. סְנֵאָךָ.
πρόσεχε] In its margin \mathfrak{S} h corrects יְהִי ‘See!’ to אֲזַדְּהָר ‘Beware!’.

²⁸ See *SSG* § 23 f, fb.

²⁹ \mathfrak{H} C is in quite a messy state: אם תשיגנו נרפך בך (Elizur 2010.23).

- 6.14) φίλος πιστὸς σκέπη κραταιά,
ὁ δὲ εὐρὼν αὐτὸν εὗρεν θησαυρόν.

*A trustworthy friend is a strong shelter,
one who has found such has found a treasure.*

(A) אוהב אמונה אוהב תקוף ומוצאו מצא הון:
(C) אוהב אמונה מגן תקוף ומוצאו מצא הוא הון:

πιστὸς] אמונה, אמת = אמת, i.e. אמת.

σκέπη] אהב, an impossible equation. As far as Heb. is concerned, *pace* Smend, אהב תקוף, is not impossible. This abstract noun occurs no more in Si, and only a few times in BH, and that in LBH. All the same, the cst. phrase can be viewed as equivalent to the gen. of quality, e.g. סלע עוֹזי 'my rock of strength' 1QH^a 17.28 and υἷον δυνάμεως 'powerful man' 3K 1.52 (בן-חיל).³⁰ Because of the glaring discrepancy between σκέπη and אהב Smend's proposal to emend אהב to אוהל, i.e. אהל, is reasonable. In the Near Eastern milieu a tent provides protection against the intense heat in summer, freezing cold in winter, and terrifying downpour. All the same, the best solution is provided in אהב מגן (Elizur 2010.23), what our *Index* (107a s.v. σκέπη) has proposed for Jd 9.15A; we can now add our Si case.

κραταιά] אהב תקוף, i.e. תקוף = תקוף 'strength,' a spelling typical in QH of *qutl* segholate nouns, see Qimron 2018.331-34, § E 2.5.1-5. תקוף found in אהב (Elizur 2010.23) is a reasonable alternative.

ὁ δὲ εὐρὼν αὐτὸν] מוצאו; in view of the following מצא, i.e. מצא, the Aorist Ptc. can be safely assigned preterite value. מוצאו is equivalent to המוצא אותו. When the action indicated by a Ptc. is preterite, the definite article is often added or the Ptc. is otherwise determinate. Hence the Heb. Ptc. here can also be so analysed.³¹

הוא] Is the pronoun highlighting the extraposed, fronted מוצאו?

- 6.15) φίλου πιστοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σταθμὸς τῆς καλλονῆς αὐτοῦ.

*A trustworthy friend is priceless,
and the weight of his beauty is immeasurable.*

(A) לאוהב אמונה אין מחיר ואין משקל לטובתו:
(C) אוהב אמונה אין מחיר ואין משקל לטובתו:

φίλου πιστοῦ] In אהב the same Heb. word, אמונה, is rendered הימנותא, thus differently than in vs. 14. For the message of 15a, cf. אשת-חיל מי ימצא ורחק מפרנינים מכרה Pr 31.10.

³⁰ For details, see SQH § 21 b (xviii) and SSG § 22 v (xvi).

³¹ For details, see JM § 121 i and SQH § 17 h.

In the first clause of (C) we expect as in (A) אוהב or אין לו מחיר, if אוהב is extraposed.

ἀντάλλαγμα] \mathfrak{H} מחיר, \mathfrak{S} דְּמִיָּא ‘price,’ \mathfrak{S} תְּחִלְפָא ‘substitute.’

6.16) φίλος πιστὸς φάρμακον ζωῆς,
καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον εὐρήσουσιν αὐτόν.

*A trustworthy friend is vital medicine,
and those who fear the Lord will find him.*

(A) צרור חיים אוהב אמונה ירא אל ישיגם:

φάρμακον] \mathfrak{H} צרור. The Heb. collocation as used here, צרור חיים, occurs in יהיִי נְפֶשׁ אֲדֹנָי צְרוּרָה בְּצְרוּר הַחַיִּים אֵת הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ 1Sm 25.29 (\mathfrak{G} ἐν δεσμῶ τῆς ζωῆς). There is nothing here that has to do with medicine. In *Index s.v.* φάρμακον we suggested רִי, ‘balsam, balm’ (?) as a Heb. equivalent. In all its six occurrences in BH it is rendered in \mathfrak{G} with ῥητίνη ‘resin.’ Significantly it is used once in a medical context: λάβετε ῥητίνην τῆ διαφθορᾶ αὐτῆς, εἰ πως ἰαθήσεται ‘Take balm for her critical condition, in case she can somehow be cured’ Je 28.8 < \mathfrak{H} (51.8) לְמִכְאוּבָה אֵלֵי תְרַפָּא קָחוּ, where, as Smend points out, \mathfrak{S} reads סְמִמְנָא. If our equation is right, \mathfrak{S} סְמִמְנָא הוּא דְּחַיָּא could support our analysis; then it is no evidence for \mathfrak{G} ’s influence. Note also \mathfrak{I} *medicamentum vitae et immortalitatis*. One reason for Smend rejecting this position, which he once held himself, is that in SG φάρμακον and its derivatives are used only in the sense of a device used in sorcery. Smend should have distinguished between two derivationally related, but distinct lexemes: it is a masc. noun φάρμακος that is used in the sense of sorcerer. Si 38.4, which he himself mentions, speaks against him: κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα τρωφῶτα מוציא תרופות אל מארץ מוציא תרופות, where Smend renders the text as “Gott hat aus der Erde die Heilmittel geschaffen,” of course not “Zaubermittel.” Lévi (II 33, fn.) mentions a Talmudic collocation, סם חיים: which occurs in נמשלה כסם חיים תורה ‘Torah was compared to an elixir of life’ bQid 30b.

In 16b) \mathfrak{S} וְאֵינָא דְּדַחַל לְאֵלֵהָא הוּוּי ³² ‘one who fears the Lord is him’ gives a message different from that of both \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{H} ירא אל ישיגם.

εὐρήσουσιν αὐτόν] In \mathfrak{H} the object suffix is plural: ישיגם. Its referent is probably חיים.

6.17) ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον εὐθυνεῖ φιλίαν αὐτοῦ,
ὅτι κατ’ αὐτόν οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλησίον αὐτοῦ.

*One who fears the Lord will strive for smooth friendship,
for his neighbour is like himself.*

(A) כי כמוהו כן רעהו וכשמו כן מעשיו:³³

³² Or “it” referring to the medicine.

³³ In Smend (II 5) and BSH the second half of the line is missing.

For 17a \mathcal{G} reflects nothing in \mathcal{H} , but it is reflected in \mathcal{S} אֲלֵהֶם יִרְאוּ אֱלֹהֵי דָאֲלֵהֶם וְנִשְׂרֹן רִחְמֵנוּתָהּוֹן ‘those who fear God demonstrate their love’³⁴ and this is followed by what would roughly reflect the first half of \mathcal{H} : מְטוֹל דְּאֶכְוֶתָהּ הַכְּנָא: ‘because as he is, so are his friends.’ This and the following verse \mathcal{H} has been only partially preserved. Smend (II 10), with his translation “Der Gottesfürchtige lenkt seine Zuneigung richtig,” assigns a generic sense to $\phi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$ or אֶהְבֶּהָ. The pious so understood would be practising the golden rule: אֶהְבֶּהָ אֶהְבֶּהָ לְרַעְיָךְ כְּמוֹךְ Lv 19.18. $\mathcal{H}A$ for 17b, which is missing in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{S} , is precisely about the practising of this golden rule.

On $\text{בני מנוער כן מעשיו}$, see also above at 2.18.

6.18) Τέκνον, ἐκ νεότητός σου ἐπίδεξαι παιδείαν,
καὶ ἕως πολιῶν εὐρήσεις σοφίαν.

*Child, from your youth on receive education,
and until (your) old age you will (keep) finding wisdom.*

(C בני מנוער קבל מוסר ועד שיבה תשיג חכמה):³⁵

The verse is missing in its entirety in $\mathcal{H}A$.

νεότητός] What age range do νεότης and νέος cover? In SG the former is used twice to render יְלֻדוֹת Ec 11.9 and 10, in the former of which νεότης also renders בְּחַוּרוֹת. In וּבְגִיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּ הַיּוֹם טוֹב וְרָע Dt 1.39 \mathcal{G} speaks of πᾶν παιδίον νέον. According to one rabbi a boy, at the age of five, was to start learning the Bible, mAbot 5.21. Should we then translate “from your childhood on”? But note \mathcal{I} *a iuventute tua*.

ἐπίδεξαι] Rejecting the virtually unanimous Greek sources, which read ἐπίλεξαι ‘Choose!’, Ziegler is following here Smend’s emendation.³⁶ The two scholars took note of \mathcal{S} קִבַּל and \mathcal{I} *excipe*.

πολιῶν] Though not apparent, the form is f.pl., as can be seen in ὡς ὄραϊον πολιαις κρίσις ‘How beautiful is judgment to (a person with) grey hair!’ Si 25.4. Cf. the literal rendering in $\mathcal{S}h$ אֶהְבֶּהָ אֶהְבֶּהָ.

6.19) ὡς ὁ ἀροτριῶν καὶ ὁ σπείρων πρόσσελθε αὐτῆ
καὶ ἀνάμενε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς·
ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἐργασίᾳ αὐτῆς ὀλίγον κοπιᾶσεις
καὶ ταχὺ φάγεσαι τῶν γεννημάτων αὐτῆς.

*Like one who ploughs and one who sows apply yourself to her
and look forward to her good fruits.*

*For in cultivating her you will toil a little,
but soon you will be eating of her produce.*

³⁴ *SL* records only רַחֲמֵנוּתָהּ ‘mercy,’ but the context is about friendship. Hence a new lexeme, אֲהַבֵּנוּתָהּ, had better be added. Of the remainder of $\phi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$ attested in Si only at 9.8 we have \mathcal{H} preserved where אֶהְבֵּיהָ ‘her lovers’ is rendered with $\phi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$.

³⁵ BSH has printed only the last two words.

³⁶ Cf. also Ziegler 1964.466f.

וקוה לרב תבואתה:	כחורש וכקוצר קרב אליה
ולמחר תאכל פריה:	כי בעבודתה מעט תעבוד
וקוה לרב תבואתה:	כחורש וכקוצר קרב אליה
ולמחר תאכל פריה:	כי בעבודתה מעט תעבוד

σπείρων] \mathfrak{H} קוצר 'harvesting' = \mathfrak{S} תבואתה. \mathfrak{G} sounds more logical.

πρόσελθε αὐτῇ] \mathfrak{H} קרב אליה. The syntagm < προσέρχομαι τιμι pers. > is found used about a visit at a teacher's in ὧνπερ ἔνεκεν καὶ Σωκράτει προσῆλθον 'on which account also they visited Socrates' Xen. Mem. 1.2.47. Such an analysis might apply to our Si case. Moreover, Heb. קרב אֵל does not signify 'to apply oneself to ..'³⁷ In another example mentioned in GELS s.v. προσέρχομαι 3 'to apply oneself to,' οὐ προσῆλθες φόβῳ κυρίου Si 1.30 the fear of the Lord can hardly be called a teacher.

αὐτῇ [אליה] The fem. sg. pronoun, when referring to σοφία and חכמה respectively, is not a merely mechanical reproduction, but in this document indicative of the personification of wisdom. This feature is observable quite often.

ἀνάμενε] \mathfrak{H} קוה, most likely = קנה. With תְּהַמּוּל דְּעַלְלֵתָהּ 'and plenty of its crops you could collect' \mathfrak{S} has identified here a homonym, קנה 'to collect.'³⁸ Has it analysed ל- in לרוב תבואתה as equivalent to את as in Aramaic?

τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς] לר(ו)ב תבואתה. It appears that for \mathfrak{G} the quality counted more than quantity.

τῇ ἐργασίᾳ αὐτῆς] \mathfrak{H} (C; A virtually same) עבודתה. Smend holds that the wisdom is perceived as a farmer. We would say that the cst. st. here is not equivalent to subjective genitive, but genitive of origin. The same can be said of \mathfrak{G} : work directed and assigned by the wisdom.³⁹

ὀλίγον] מעט. Smend is right in saying that ὀλίγον can mean 'a short while.' E.g. ἔτι ὀλίγον 'yet a while' Ps 36.10 < עוד מעט >. Cf. \mathfrak{S} אֵיךְ עִמְלָא 'like a bit of labour.'

κοπιάσεις] \mathfrak{H} תעבוד. \mathfrak{G} is more graphic than, say, ἐργᾶ, cf. ἄνθρωπος γεννᾶται κόπῳ Jb 5.7. Note \mathfrak{S} תְּלֵאָא.

ταχὺ] \mathfrak{H} למחר, a combination attested a few times in BH (BDB s.v. מָחָר 1 a). \mathfrak{G} has identified here מהר, i.e. מָהָר. Note \mathfrak{S} וְבַעֲנָל = \mathfrak{G} .

τῶν γενημάτων αὐτῆς] partitive genitive (SSG § 22 m). Cf. οὗτοι φάγονται τῶν ἄρτων αὐτοῦ // οὗτος φάγεται ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων αὐτοῦ Lv 22.11. \mathfrak{G} 's Vorlage here may have read בפריה or מפריה. Ziegler notes that some sources add απο.

³⁷ \mathfrak{S} קרוב עליה is unusual, since one anticipates here לְהַתָּה, for a usage as in קרבת עלי-חד Dn 7.16 is foreign to Syriac.

³⁸ SL s.v. חמל Pe. 4 mentions an interesting parallel in 'I have nowhere to store my crops' Lk 12.17.

³⁹ For details on such a morphosyntactic analysis, see SSG § 22 v (iv) and SQH § 21 b (iv) for Gk and Heb. respectively.

- 6.20) ὡς τραχεῖά ἐστιν σοφία τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις,
καὶ οὐκ ἔμμενεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀκάρδιος·

*How harsh Wisdom is to the uneducated,
and an insensible person will not be able to keep up with it.*

(A עקובה היא לאויל ולא יכלכלנה חסר לב:

ὡς] This exclamatory word is preserved in all the versions: **Ⲛ** כְּמָא, **Ⲛ** אִיָּה, **Ⲛ** *quam*. Something like **ⲙ** may have dropped out.

τραχεῖά] **Ⲙ** עקובה. Τραχύς means “rugged, rough,” esp. in a description of geophysical features. In that sense it is close to עָקַב, which is applied in Is 40.4 to a steep, hilly terrain and in contrast to מִישׁוֹר ‘a smooth, level terrain.’ Interestingly Plato applies the former to laws: νόμοι τραχύτατοι γίγνονται ‘the laws could be most severe (to such a person)’ Pl. *Leg.* 864c. What we have here is a characterisation of Wisdom, and as such it cannot be meant to be pejorative. What is meant is rather how it comes over to the third party, its students. In *GELS* s.v. **3** we have proposed “*hard to take and handle.*”

σοφία] All Gk MSS read σφόδρα ‘very.’ Only **Ⲛ** has preserved אֲחַמְתָּא, not found in **Ⲛ**, which has nothing for σφόδρα, either, but its morphosyntax makes it plain that the clause has a noun of the fem. gender: קְשִׁיתָא אִתְיָה.

ἀπαιδεύτοις .. ἀκάρδιος] With the use of these epithets our translator is not necessarily taking an aristocratic or middle-class stance. We are not having here to do with secular education, what diploma you have. Even highly educated people could be so called if they lack the right attitude for humbly learning the divine wisdom.

ἔμμενεῖ] **Ⲙ** יכלכלנה, translatable as “he will not stand it,” whilst the use of ἐν suggests that ἐμμένω here means something like ‘to abide with, stay in,’ hence our above-given translation. For Heb. רַחֵם אִישׁ יְכַלְכֵּל מַחְלָהּוּ, cf. כְּלָכַל, Pr 18.14 and מִי מְכַלְכֵּל אֶת־יָוִם בְּוָאוֹ MI 3.2.

- 6.21) ὡς λίθος δοκιμασίας ἰσχυρὸς ἔσται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ,
καὶ οὐ χροنیει ἀπορρῖψαι αὐτήν.

*It will be a hard testing-stone on him
and he will lose no time in throwing it off.*

(A כאבן משא תהיה עליו ולא יאחר להשליכה:

δοκιμασίας] ≠ **Ⲙ** משא, i.e. מְשָׂא ‘burden, load.’ A more likely Heb. equivalent is מָצָה, which is in SG rendered with πεῖρα 1× and πειρασμός 7×. In what situation such a testing stone used to be used is not clear.⁴⁰ **Ⲙ** אבן

⁴⁰ In *GELS* s.v. δοκιμασία we have written “for weight-lifting contest,” relying on Spicq 1994 I 357, fn. 23, where, however, he does not cite any text from CG or HG. Kautzsch, however, refers to Jerome, who, commenting on Zc 12.3, writes that in his days in cities and

אִשׁ here is as unclear. No such combination occurs elsewhere. Reference is made by scholars, e.g. Smend, to אֶבֶן מַעֲמָסָה ‘a stone heavy to carry’ Zc 12.3, where, however, there is no notion of testing. In \mathfrak{S} there is nothing that would correspond to מִשָּׂא or מִסָּה, but יִקְרֶהָ ‘heavy.’⁴¹

χρονιει] \mathfrak{H} יֵאָחַר, for which \mathfrak{S} reads נִחֹר ‘he will look,’ an obvious error for נִוָּחַר as noted by Smend.

6.22) σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστὶν
καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστὶν φανερά.

*For wisdom is rightly so called
and to many people it is not evident.*

כי המוסר כשמה כן הוא ולא לרבים היא נְכוּחָה: (A
... (Q
:כֵּה.. ...

σοφία] \mathfrak{H} המוסר, an equation attested nowhere in SG. With its יוֹלְפָנָה $\mathfrak{S}^{42} = \mathfrak{H}$; its fem. suf. pronoun refers to הַחֲכָמָה ‘wisdom,’ i.e. instruction concerning wisdom. Whether Ben Sira said מוסר or חכמה, it is quite an intellectual challenge for many. But that is not indicated by either noun on its own, its derivation or whatever. Is it indeed evident to anybody?⁴³

τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς] \mathfrak{H} שמה can be vocalised as שְׁמָה. Cf. כֵּלָה, a spelling as common in BH as כֵּלִי, JM § 94 h.

φανερά] \mathfrak{H} נְכוּחָה. The vocalisation, which takes no account of the *waw*, cannot be of the original scribe. The true Heb. equivalent of φανερός is נְכוּחַ as shown in a speech by Wisdom in πάντα ἐνώπια τοῖς συντιοῦσιν כְּלָם כְּלָם לְמַבִּין נְכוּחִים Pr 8.9. Though \mathfrak{S} מְתַבְּחָרָא ‘scrutinised’ is pretty close to φανερά, it is not straightforward as \mathfrak{S} גְּלִיתָא לְ.

The vocalised Heb. form, נְכוּחָה must be either Nif. Pf. or Ptc. of כָּחַל, but what such could mean in this context is obscure.⁴⁴

6.23) Ἄκουσον, τέκνον, καὶ ἔκδεξαι γνώμην μου
καὶ μὴ ἀπαναίνου τὴν συμβουλίαν μου.

*Listen, child, and accept my opinion
and do not reject my advice.*

villages there were laid heavy stones which youngsters would shift or lift in order to improve their physical skills and compete among themselves.

⁴¹ Smend (58) seems to be wondering if \mathfrak{S} יִקְרֶהָ should be emended to יִקְרָתָא (*sic* for אִיקְרָתָא) ‘burden.’

⁴² But at Si 23.2, where \mathfrak{H} is not preserved, we find \mathfrak{S} יוֹלְפָנָה = \mathfrak{G} σοφία.

⁴³ For Box - Oesterley “her name expresses her essence,” but how? According to Smend, Ben Sira is not etymologising, but simply saying: “die Weisheit ist eben Weisheit,” ‘Wisdom is, after all, wisdom, period.’

⁴⁴ כֵּה preserved at the end of the verse in $\mathfrak{H}Q$ can be analysed as either נְכוּחַ, נְכוּחָה or נְכוּחָה, referring to נְכוּחָה in either case.

This and the following verse have not been preserved in any Heb. MS. Instead 27.5-6 have intruded here, probably because of the contextual affinity, i.e. agriculture, so Segal 41. The Heb. text restored by Segal (39) reads:

23 שִׁמְעַתְּ בְּעֵצְתִּי וְאֵל תִּמְאַס׃ בְּעֵצְתִּי
24 וְהִבֵּא רִגְלֵיךָ בְּרֶשֶׁתַּי וְצִוְּאֵרְךָ בְּחַבְלוֹתַי׃

γνώμην] A fairly frequent (32×) word in SG, but only here in Si. **ש** has 'יולִּפְנֵי' 'my teaching,' i.e. 'what I teach.'⁴⁵ **ש**לִי 'my pleasure' is odd. **ש**לִי 'more straightforward. Smend appropriately mentions שִׁמְעַתְּ עֵצְתִּי מוֹסֵר Pr 19.20 > **ש** מְרֵדוֹתָא וְקַבְּל מְרֵדוֹתָא אֵל מוֹסְרֵי.

τήν συμβουλίαν μου] **ש** מְרֵדוֹתָא might be a rendering of מוֹסְרֵי.

6.24) καὶ εἰσένεγκον τοὺς πόδας σου εἰς τὰς πέδας αὐτῆς
καὶ εἰς τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτῆς τὸν τράχηλόν σου·

*And put your feet into her fetters
and your neck into her collar.*

τοὺς πόδας σου] This makes better sense than **ש** רִגְלֵךָ 'your foot.'
τὰς πέδας αὐτῆς] **ש** מְצִידָתָא 'her net' is odd. Cf. **ש**לִי פְּכָרָא דִּילָהּ 'her bonds.' Πέδες occurs also in Si 21.19, where also **ש** uses אֲתָאֲרָא, but **ש**לִי כַבְּלָא 'chains, fetters.'

τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτῆς] **ש** טַעֲנָא 'her sack'; **ש**לִי קוֹלְרָא דִּילָהּ 'her iron collar.'
τὸν τράχηλόν σου] = **ש** צַוְּרָא 'her neck'; **ש**לִי קַדְּלָהּ 'the nape of your neck.'

6.25) ὑπόθεες τὸν ὄμῶν σου καὶ βάσταξον αὐτήν
καὶ μὴ προσοχθίσης τοῖς δεσμοῖς αὐτῆς·

*Put your shoulder down and carry her
and do not become sick of her bonds.*

(B) הַט שְׂכַמְךָ וְשֵׂאָהּ וְאַל תִּקַּח בְּחַבְלוֹתֶיהָ:

ὑπόθεες] **ש** A טה. Smend rightly refers to Gn 49.15, where we read וַיֹּט שְׂכַמּוֹ > **ש** ὑπέθηκεν τὸν ὄμῶν αὐτοῦ, the same Gk collocation as here in Si, and cf. **ש** וְאַרְבָּנָן בְּתַפְּחֵי, the same collocation as in **ש**לִי in our Si text here. The selection in **ש** of קָרַב 'Put near' is odd.

προσοχθίσης] **ש** A תִּקַּח 'you loathe, abhor.' Both Syr. versions have captured the general connotation well: **ש** תִּתְעִיק 'you become disgusted'⁴⁶ and

⁴⁵ SL s.v. 1 "instruction, training," is misleading. The Syr. word can certainly mean 'act of teaching, manner of teaching' as in "they were amazed at his teaching (וּלְפָנָהּ), because he was teaching (מְלִיךְ) them as one who had authority" Mk 1.22 et passim. But in Ro 16.17 it means what is taught or what is learned: "straying from the teaching (וּלְפָנָהּ) which you learned (וְלִפְתָּהּ)." Brockelmann had written "disciplina, doctrina."

⁴⁶ Pace SL this Ethpa. verb scarcely means 'to be grieved' as is evident in אֵל תִּתְעִיק בְּשׂוֹעֵיכֶם אֵל דְּסָבָא 'Do not become fed up with stories by old folks' Si 8.9, cf. אֵל תִּמְאַס. Cf. Brockelmann s.v. "eum taeduit," which has little to do with grief or sorrow.

שׁוֹן לְךָ תִּמְאֵן ‘you become weary,’ in which latter we have an impersonal construction with a 3f verb.

τοῖς δεσμοῖς αὐτῆς] 𐤒A תחבולתיה 𐤒 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ ‘her load’ could be improved, cf. 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ אֶסְרָא ‘her chains.’ Though 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ makes a good, phonetic match with its verb, 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ ‘Carry her.’

Heb. תְּבִלּוֹת, a plurale tantum, is typical of the biblical sapiential books: Job (1×) and Pr (5×), and when translated, it appears in 𐤒 as κυβέρνησις ‘steering of a boat,’ hence ‘direction, guidance.’ Obviously such a sense has nothing to do with bond, chain, fetter or the like. Ben Sira probably used the word in this BH sense, whereas his grandson took it as derived from 𐤒𐤒𐤒 ‘rope, cord,’⁴⁷ though its pl. does not take תוּ. The same form appears twice more in Si, 35.16 and 37.17, q.v.⁴⁸

6.26) ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ σου πρόσσελθε αὐτῇ
καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ δυνάμει σου συντήρησον τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς·

*With all your soul apply yourself to her
and with all your ability hold fast to her ways.*

:ה... ..

(Q)

𐤒(Q) has preserved only the last letter of the verse, most likely a 3fs suffix pronoun of either דרכיה or ארחותיה.

ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ σου] Segal (39) restores 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ. An alternative restoration with 𐤒 is also possible, cf. 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ אֶסְרָא > 𐤒 ἐν ὅλῃ ψυχῇ σου εὐλαβοῦ τὸν κύριον Si 7.29. Note also 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ.

πρόσσελθε αὐτῇ] The same expression has occurred at v. 19 above, rendering קרב אליה.

ἐν ὅλῃ δυνάμει σου] Segal (39) restores 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ, an idiom used at 𐤒 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ אֶסְרָא > 𐤒 ἐν ὅλῃ δυνάμει ἀγάπησον τὸν ποιήσαντά σε Si 7.30, an obvious allusion to 𐤒 𐤍תְּקוּלָּהּ אֶסְרָא > 𐤒 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου Dt 6.5.

συντήρησον τὰς ὁδοὺς] a collocation that meets us also in οἱ ἀγαπῶντες αὐτὸν συντηρήσουσιν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ [= τοῦ κυρίου] Si 2.15.

6.27) ἐξίχνευσον καὶ ζήτησον, καὶ γνωσθήσεται σοι,
καὶ ἐγκρατῆς γενόμενος μὴ ἀφήῃς αὐτήν·

*Track out and search, and then she will become known to you,
and, having attained her, let not go of her.*

:דרש וחקר בקש ומצא והחזקתה ואל תרפה (A)

⁴⁷ There are scholars, e.g. Smend and Lévi (II 36), who emend the form in 𐤒 to תבולת or תבולת from תבולת, but תבולת in the sense of ‘bond’ does not exist.

⁴⁸ On תבולת as used in BH, see HALOT s.v.

27a is structured differently in \mathfrak{H} with two pairs of four imperatives, each pair with a conjunction *waw* in between, no such between the two pairs. The equation $\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{H}$ / ἐξιχνεύω occurs only twice in SG, the other case being Si 42.18. $\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{R}$ may not have been in the *Vorlage* of \mathfrak{G} , which has only three verbs. The insertion of the conjunction before $\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{K}$ is no hindrance.⁴⁹ Alternatively, the translator may have found the sequence of the first three synonymous verbs excessive, deleting the first on his own bat.⁵⁰ Another measure of freedom he took may be seen in the rendition of $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$. A mechanical retroversion of $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota$ could be $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$.⁵¹ Ni. $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$ occurs 7 times in Si, but is never rendered with a form of γίνωσκομαι.

$\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota$] The dat. here is no indication of an agent with a passive verb. The text can be reformulated as $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ or the like.⁵²

$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$] \mathfrak{H} $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$. Here arise a number of linguistic questions:

i) The meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. In *GELS* our passage has been brought under 1) *having possession of*. In two instances in Si it takes a gen.: τοῦ νόμου 15.1 and αὐτῶν 27.30. Has αὐτῆς been dispensed with in our passage as self-evident in view of the following αὐτήν? Cf. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}$ ‘when you are her possessor.’ In CG, however, it is also used true to its etymology (< κράτος ‘strength’). E.g. σώματα ἔγκρατέστατα ‘the strongest bodies’ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.23. Cf. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}$ ‘and be strong’ (Impv.), which points to $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$ as a *plena* spelling of $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$. $\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$ with the ingressive, not causative force of Hif., is attested, e.g. in $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$ ‘he became very strong’ 2Ch 26.8. Since in our Si passage it cannot be about physical or military strength, but moral, mental, we could render the collocation as “and becoming strong-willed, firmly determined.”⁵³

ii) The syntactic question of verb tenses in \mathfrak{H} . As noted in the fn. 51 below, \mathfrak{S} may have read $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$, i.e. $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$. In CBH we would anticipate $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$. This, however, would become incongruous with a case of the standard CBH usage in $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$, which Van Peursen (2004.128, § 8.2) regards as a *w-qatalí* form.

iii) Another syntactic question here concerns the *he* at the end of $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$. Both Segal (39) and Kahana (459) take it as an object suffix as shown by their vocalisation: $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$, which would be equivalent to $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{H}$, not

⁴⁹ For the question of concatenation of coordinate terms, see *SSG* § 78 c and f and *SQH* § 38 a-c.

⁵⁰ \mathfrak{H} has gone farther by leaving out another verb: *investiga illam et manifestabitur tibi*.

⁵¹ $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{H}$ = $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}$, but what has happened to $\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{H}$? Lévi (II 36) opts to follow \mathfrak{S} .

⁵² Cf. *SSG* § 22 wo. It escapes us how Lévi (loc. cit.) can justify his translation: “et tu la connaîtiras.” Freely translated?

⁵³ The apparent non-attestation in CG of such a figurative application of the adjective could be due to accidental, incomplete preservation of documents. LSJ s.v. ἔγκρατεια mentions ἔγκρατειαν ἑαυτοῦ ‘self-control’ Pl. *Rep.* 390b and ἡδονῶν τινῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἔγκρατεια ‘a continence of certain pleasures and desires’ ib. 430e, with which cp. Ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς Si 18.30 as a section title.

הָתָּהּ תְּקַיְּמֶנָּהּ, which latter would mean ‘and you will strengthen her,’ and that is precluded by the context.⁵⁴ It means rather “and hold on to her fast!”.

6.28) ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων γὰρ εὐρήσεις τὴν ἀνάπασιν αὐτῆς,
καὶ στραφήσεται σοὶ εἰς εὐφροσύνην·

*For in the end you will find rest (offered by) her,
and she will become your delight.*

:ונהפך לך לתענוג: כי לאחור תמצא מנוחתה (A)

:ותהפך לך לתענוג: כי לאחור תמצא מנוחתה (C)

:נג.. (Q)

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων] 𐤀 לאחור > 𐤄 ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου Is 41.23, τὰ ὑπερχόμενα 42.23. In both of these passages we do not have to do with the very end, but the future, ‘hereafter.’ Ἐσχάτος can signify the absolute end, but also ‘later,’ thus a relative perspective and equivalent to ὕστερος. Thus “afterward” (Skehan - Di Lella). Cp. ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων σου ‘in your latter days’ Si 2.3 with ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ ‘at the end of his life’ Je 17.11. Should we opt for the absolute end, it would mean ‘the end of pursuit.’

εὐρήσεις] 𐤀 תמצא, which in theory can be parsed as Ni. 3fs, i.e. תמצא with מנוחתה as its grammatical subject, an analysis not adopted by any version.

τὴν ἀνάπασιν αὐτῆς] 𐤀 מנוחתה, a Heb. substantive that can also mean ‘resting-place,’ as in ואת־מנוחת־יְעֲדִי־עַד פֶּה־אֶשֶׁב Ps 132.14, where 𐤄 correctly uses κατάπασσις, not ἀνάπασσις that never means ‘resting-place.’ Wisdom, however, never gets tired, so that her “resting-place” is her abode as in Ps 132.14. He who has been groping in the darkness will eventually spot her.

Ἀνάπασσις here means freedom attained from a strenuous, concentrated search, now stability. 𐤄 has two nouns, both in the pl. emphasising abundance (?): נַחַח וְתַפְנִיקָא ‘rest and pleasure.’

καὶ στραφήσεται] 𐤄 ותהפך is definitely to be preferred over A ונהפך; an impersonal 3ms is unlikely. Most likely a scribal error. The grammatical subject of στραφήσεται can be either σοφία or ἡ ἀνάπασσις αὐτῆς. The same ambiguity applies also to 𐤄 תתהפך.

28b is quite distinct in 𐤄: וְתִתְּחַדַּא בְּאַחֲרֵיתָּהּ ‘and you will rejoice at her end,’ whatever that might mean. Lagarde mentions a v.l. in Walton’s polyglot: בְּאַחֲרֵיתָּהּ.⁵⁵ Does it mean ‘in your deathbed’?

εὐφροσύνην] 𐤀A and C לתענוג. BSH reads נג for 𐤀Q at the end of the verse, but in *DJD* 3.76 we see לְתַעֲנוּג restored.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ On the question of a suffix pronoun directly attached to a verb as not equivalent to < תא + suf. >, see above at 4.18.

⁵⁵ The same reading is found also in the Mosul ed. of the Peshitta.

⁵⁶ Mopsik (99, fn. 4) maintains that in the MS, 2Q18, there is no space except for נג, which he restores to לְתַעֲנוּג, and since in Is 58.13 the Sabbath is called לְתַעֲנוּג, the wisdom is said to be the Sabbath for the spirit.

6.29) καὶ ἔσσονται σοι αἱ πέδαι εἰς σκέπην ἰσχύος
καὶ οἱ κλοιοὶ αὐτῆς εἰς στολὴν δόξης.

*And the fetters will be a mighty defence for you
and her collars a glorious robe.*

: והיתה לך רשתה מכון עז וחבלתה בגדי כתם: (A
: בגדי כתם: (Q

In vs. 24 her fetters and collar symbolised total, miserable subjugation.

ἔσσονται .. εἰς] \mathfrak{H} היתה. As indicated in *GELS* s.v. $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ *3 is a Hebraising / Aramaising use of < $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ + $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ >, under the influence of Heb. לְהִיָּה and Aram. לְהִיָּה , to indicate that A serves or functions as B, and is confined to the fut., past tenses, and subjunctive.⁵⁷ Since this feature is no oddity in SG, it can occur even when \mathfrak{H} lacks, as in our case here, the preposition *lamed* that corresponds to $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

σκέπην ἰσχύος] \mathfrak{H} מכון עז. We doubt *pace* Smend that this Heb. phrase is translatable as “herrlicher Standort.” As questionable is “un trône majestueux” (Mopsik). The Gk phrase here could refer to a solidly built tent which can withstand intense heat or violent typhoon. The gen. is that of quality. Hence the phrase can be reworded as σκέπην ἰσχυράν, cf. \mathfrak{S} מִוְתָּבָא עֲשִׂינָא. The same can be said of the Heb. st. cst. here.⁵⁸ The same analysis applies to στολὴν δόξης כתם בגדי in 29b.

οἱ κλοιοὶ αὐτῆς] // sg. τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτῆς vs. 24 above. A harmonisation with αἱ πέδαι?

στολὴν δόξης] \mathfrak{H} בגדי כתם ‘golden robes.’ Our translator would know the sense of כְּתָם , which occurs 9 times in BH. His rendition of it here may be due to his desire to avoid the repetition of χρυσσοῦς in close proximity, for he was to use this in 30a as a rendering of בְּהָי , a synonym of כתם. And one verse later he was to write στολὴν δόξης to render בגדי כבוד!

6.30) κόσμος γὰρ χρύσεός ἐστιν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς,
καὶ οἱ δεσμοὶ αὐτῆς κλῶσμα ὑακίνθινον·

*For golden ornaments are on her,
and her bonds are a blue cord.*

: עלי זהב עולה ומוסרתיה פתיל תכלת: (A
: תכלת: (Q

κόσμος] \mathfrak{H} עלי. Smend’s emendation to עדי, i.e. עדי, is more persuasive than Segal’s (39) עלי ‘yokes of’⁵⁹ and Kahana’s (459) עלי זהב. What is meant

⁵⁷ For examples in SG, see *GELS* loc. cit.

⁵⁸ Cf. *SSG* § 22 v (xvi) and *SQH* § 21 b (xviii).

⁵⁹ As Segal himself remarks, the pl. of על is unknown, and it is odd in this particular case. Possibly a scribal error for עול? Snaitch (40) mentions mAbot על תורה and Mt 11.28-30, where to be a disciple of Jesus involves putting His yoke on.

with ‘her yoke is on gold’? יָדַי כֹּסֶמֶס is the most frequent (9×) equation in SG. We would also follow Smend in reading עֹלֶיהָ for עֹלָהּ.

κλω̄σμα ὑακίνθινον] 𐤒 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕. This same equation is found in Nu 15.38, where Israelites are told to put a blue cord on each of the tassels at the corners of their garments as a reminder of their duty to observe the law, see Snaith 40.

6.31) στολήν δόξης ἐνδύσῃ αὐτήν
καὶ στέφανον ἀγαλλιάματος περιθήσεις σεαυτῶ.

*As a glorious robe you will wear her
and as a crown of joy you will wear (her) for yourself.*

:בגדי כבוד תלבשנה ועטרת תפארת תעטרנה: (A
:תפארת תעטרנה ... (Q

ἐνδύσῃ αὐτήν] 𐤒 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕. The grammatical analysis of this common Heb. verb appears to have proved to be problematic. Thus 𐤔 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤔 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘she will clothe you with a glorious robe,’ i.e. the Heb. verb has been parsed as Hi. 3fs. The obj. suffix of 𐤔 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 can refer to either Wisdom or the preceding 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘robe,’ but the verb is Peal in view of 𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕.

αὐτήν is not resuming στολήν δόξης, for the latter corresponds to בגדי כבוד, mpl in 𐤒. στολήν δόξης is an object complement: between it and αὐτήν there is a latent nominal clause, ‘she is a glorious robe.’ The same grammatical analysis is applicable to the Heb. text here.⁶⁰

ἀγαλλιάματος] 𐤒 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕, an equation not attested anywhere else in LXX. The same combination as here occurs in Si 1.11: στέφανος ἀγαλλιάματος, for which, however, no Heb. text has been preserved. In 𐤔, however, we read 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕, which might indicate that 𐤒 there read as here, 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕. Since 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕, on its own, has little to do with joy, our Gk translator might be going through what is called in German “sich einfühlen,” i.e. feeling for the joy of the successful seeker after Wisdom. It is interesting to note that in the above-mentioned 1.11 the Gk phrase occurs parallel to καύχημα: Φόβος κυρίου δόξα καὶ καύχημα καὶ εὐφροσύνη καὶ στέφανος ἀγαλλιάματος, where we see εὐφροσύνη, one of the key words in our passage here. The verb, ἀγαλλιάμαι, occurs a few times in conjunction with καυχάομαι, e.g. εὐφράνθητε ἐπὶ κύριον καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, δίκαιοι, καὶ καυχᾶσθε, πάντες οἱ εὐθεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ Ps 31.11, see also ib. 149.5 and 3M 2.17. It is of course about pride not in the sense of arrogance or haughtiness.

περιθήσεις] 𐤒 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕. This Heb. form also appears to have been problematic. Thus 𐤔 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘and you will put on a crown of glory on yourself.’ 𐤕 has adopted the same syntactic analysis as in the first

⁶⁰ On the feature of object complement, see *SSG* § 59 and *SQH* § 31 j.

line, but has left out *αὐτὴν* as self-evident. *σεαυτῶ* does not necessarily imply that its *Vorlage* read *ךרעטת*, though such a suffix can be reflexive in force. The translator probably wants to stress that you are conferred prestigious symbols which actually belong to Wisdom.

6.32) Ἐὰν θέλῃς, τέκνον, παιδευθήσῃ,
καὶ ἐὰν ἐπιδῶς τὴν ψυχὴν σου, πανούργος ἔσῃ·

*If you so wish, child, you can be educated
and if you put your mind to it, you can become clever.*

(A) אַם תּחפּוּץ בְּנִי תתּחכּם וְאִם תּשִׂים לְבַבךָ תּעֲרָם:

[παιδευθήσῃ] *תּתּחכּם* ‘you could become wise.’ On the loose equivalence between *ט* and *תּ*, see a discussion in Smend.

[ἐπιδῶς] *תּשִׂים*, an error for *תּשִׂים*, i.e. *תּשִׂים*.⁶¹ *ט* translates *תּ* לב with *לְבָבְךָ* ‘attention,’ a sensible choice.

[πανούργος ἔσῃ] *תּעֲרָם*. Though the serpent was called *עָרָם*, the root *עָרָם* and its derivatives do not always carry a pejorative connotation.⁶² E.g. *עָרָם* > *עָרָם* *תּוֹכַחַת* > *ט* *דֵּב* *פּוֹלָטוֹן* *עֲנֹלָטוֹן* *פּוֹלָטוֹן* *עֲנֹלָטוֹן* Pr 15.5, where we should note the adjective *פּוֹלָטוֹן*.⁶³

6.33) ἐὰν ἀγαπήσῃς ἀκούειν, ἐκδέξῃ,
καὶ ἐὰν κλίνῃς τὸ οὖς σου, σοφὸς ἔσῃ.

*If you like listening, you will absorb (much),
and if you incline your ear, you will become wise.*

(A) אַם תּוֹבָא לְשִׁמְעָה וְהִטְאָנְךָ תּוֹסֵר:

תּוֹבָא לְשִׁמְעָה is not in order, for an apodosis is missing. Both *ט* and *ט* have filled in the lacuna, the latter with *תּאָלְמַךְ* ‘you will learn.’ *ט*’s *ἐκδέξῃ* is incomplete,⁶⁴ so that *ט* has supplied a direct object, *תּקִבֵּל סִכּוּלְתּוֹנְוֹתָא* ‘you will gain prudence.’ Likewise *דּוֹכְרִינָא*. Probably *ט*’s *Vorlage* was already amiss.⁶⁵

[ἀγαπήσῃς] *תּוֹבָא*, on which Smend writes: “die Orthographie wie Prv. 1,10.” He must be referring to the final *aleph* for the anticipated *heh*.

⁶¹ “if you surrender your soul” (*NETS*) is scarcely acceptable.

⁶² See BDB s.vv. *עָרָם* 2.

⁶³ On the situation in CG, see LSJ s.v. *פּוֹלָטוֹן* II and LSG s.v. *פּוֹלָטוֹן*, where Pr 27.12 and Si 21.12 are mentioned as exemplifying its use in *sensu bono*.

⁶⁴ This verb alone cannot mean “tu t’instruiras” (*Lévi* II 37).

⁶⁵ Smend, noting that *ἐδεξάμην* stands alone at Si 51.16, wonders whether *לְקַבֵּל* or *קָבַל* can also be used on its own as in Aramaic, for which he gives no example, and we are unaware of such a use in Aramaic. Besides, as shown in *דּוֹכְרִינָא*, which adds *illam* [= *sapientiam*], the context is about the author’s reminiscence of his youthful engagement with Wisdom. Hence the reader can easily supply the object. This does not apply to our passage in Si 6.

Smend proposes with some hesitation **ב תאהב** in lieu of **תובא**. In BH **הִתְבַּחַח** takes an inf. cst. as a direct object only twice (Ho 10.11, Is 56.10), whereas < ἀγαπάω + inf. > does occur a few times in SG; for further examples, see *GELS* s.v. **3 c**.

ἐκδέξιη] The interpretation of ἐκδέχομαι here is problematic. None of the senses mentioned in the major extant lexicons appears to fit our context. The context indicates Ryssel's "in dich aufnehmen" as acceptable.⁶⁶

ἐὰν κλίνης] **ה טה**, Impv. There is no absolute need to postulate **אמ תטה**, though **ס** does read **אן תרִכֵן אן**, likewise **סל אן תצִלֵא אן**. Smend also finds the absence of the conjunction in **תוסר** objectionable. We are comfortable with the Heb. structure as has come down to us. In CBH **ותוסר** would indicate a purpose.⁶⁷ The sentence structure of parables is not always as meticulous as in prose. Hence it sounds a little unfair to blame Ben Sira for an error ("Fehler") in Hebrew here, as Smend does.

The phrase **אן תטה** occurs also in 51.16 and is well established in BH, e.g. **הִתְבַּחַח אֲנִי קְלִי־וֹנ תּוֹסֵר סוֹסֶיךָ סוֹסֶיךָ** Ps 45.11.

6.34) ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων στῆθι·
καὶ τῆ σοφίᾳ αὐτῶν προσκολληθήτι.

*Stand in a large crowd of elders
and follow their wisdom closely.*

This whole verse is missing in **ה**. **ס** **מְנִי מְנִי חֲכִים וְהוֹי קֶאֱמִי הוֹי קֶאֱמִי קֶאֱמִי** **הִתְבַּחַח לְבָבְךָ**, which may be a translation of **דְּבַק מִי חֲכָם. דְּבַק מִי חֲכָם**.⁶⁸ The second half is very similar in clause structure to 36a **הִתְבַּחַח מִה יִבִּין רָאָה** **וְשִׁרְיָהוּ** > **ס** **וְשִׁרְיָהוּ**. The above-given text, **תְּהִי סוֹפִיָּא אֲטוֹנ**, has been established by Ziegler. This reading is not supported by any Gk MS, but only by **Λ** *sapientiae illorum* and Sahidic version. The conventional text as found in Rahlfs **τίς σοφός; αὐτῶν** may need be restored.

στῆθι] We doubt that this can be translated as "Tritt (in die Versammlung der Alten)" (Smend II 11).

6.35) πᾶσαν διήγησιν θεϊαν θέλε ἀκροᾶσθαι,
καὶ παροιμίαι συνέσεως μὴ ἐκφευγέτωσάν σε.

*Be willing to listen to every godly discourse
and do not let proverbs of wisdom escape you.*

⁶⁶ Are translations such as "learn" (Snaith), "lernen" (Smend II 11), "apprendras" (*BJ*), "verstehen" (*SD*) also contextually based? Or are some of them dependent on **ס** **תִּלְמַד** 'you will learn'?

⁶⁷ See JM § 116 *a-d*.

⁶⁸ Likewise Ryssel. Segal (40) begins with **בְּעֵדֶת**. Cf. **הִתְבַּחַח מִי חֲכָם** Ps 149.1, but **עֵדֶת צְדִיקִים** Ps 1.5.

(A) כל שיחה חפוז לשמע ומשל בינה אל יצאך:
 (C) כל שיחה חפוז לשמוע ומשל בינה לא יצאך:

διήγησιν θείαν] ܘ שיחה, cf. שיחת חכמים > ܘ διήγημα σοφῶν Si 8.8. Θείαν is probably a free addition designed to stress that it is not about mundane, worldly chats.

παροιμία συνέσεως] ܘ משל בינה. The use of the pl. is probably influenced by *πᾶσαν* in the first colon. ܘ uses the pl. for both: מְתִלָּא .. מְתִלָּא. The gen. case of *συνέσεως* may be indicating a purpose, i.e. proverbs designed to cultivate wisdom, or a topic. The same holds for the st. cst. of the Heb. phrase.⁶⁹

ἐκφευγέτωσάν σε] ܘ יצאך = ܘ יצא מְמָךְ. On the non-accusative value of a suffix pronoun directly attached to a verb, see above at 4.18 and also Segal 1935.115. Note יצא מְמָנִי Je 10.20, which Rashi reformulated as יצאו ממני.⁷⁰ Our ܘ here and ܘ נְפִלְטוּנְךָ, *pace* Lévi II 38, do not have to imply that ܘ here read a form of פלט. Note also ܘ נְעַרְקֵן. All the same, as indicated in *GELS* s.v. ἐκφεύγω 2 the verb means here ‘to let slip away unnoticed,’ a meaning which neither Heb. יצא⁷¹ nor the two Syriac verbs mentioned here⁷² bear. It is thus different from a case such as ἄρτι τὸν θάνατον ἐκπεφυγότες ‘having now escaped the death’ 3M 6.29. By contrast, ܘ here means that one should hold on to proverbs of wisdom, treasure them, and not let go of them.

6.36) ἐὰν ἴδῃς συνετόν, ὀρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτόν,
 καὶ βαθμοὺς θυρῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκτριβέτω ὁ πούς σου.

*If you spot an intelligent person, turn to him eagerly,
 and let your foot rub his doorsteps thoroughly.*

(A) ראה מה יבין ושחריהו ותשחוק בסיפי רגלך:

ἐὰν ἴδῃς] ܘ ראה, i.e. Impv. רֵא. One can make sense of the Impv. Hence there is no absolute need to emend it to אמ תראה or suchlike. Cf. ܘ הוּי = ܘ.

The immediately following ܘ מה יבין is impossible and is to be emended to either מי יבין or מבין (Ptc.). Cf. ܘ מנו חכמים ‘Who is wise?’.

ὀρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτόν] ܘ שחריהו, a *plena* spelling for שְׁחַרְהוּ. True to its etymology, ὀρθρίζω derived from ὄρθρος ‘dawn’ is at times used in the sense of “to rise early from bed in the morning,” e.g. ὀρθρίσαντες ἀπελευσέσθε Gn 19.2. For this idea Hebrew never uses Qal שָׁחַר and more frequently Pi.

⁶⁹ See *SSG* § 22 v (xiv) and *SQH* § 21 b (xvi).

⁷⁰ Cf. Muraoka 2012a.54.

⁷¹ *Pace* Segal (42): “Let it not pass you without you learning it.”

⁷² We suspect that ܘ is here influencing ܘ. What would the average Syriac reader have made of ܘ מְתִלָּא דְחַכְמִימָא לָא נְפִלְטוּנְךָ? The same question arises regarding ܘ נְעַרְקֵן מְנָךְ לָא נְעַרְקֵן מְנָךְ.

שָׁהָר, undoubtedly derived from שָׁהָר ‘dawn,’ but Hi. הַשָּׂקִים. In SG our Gk verb is also used in two senses which were unknown to CG. According to *GELS*, *2. “to seek and turn in eager anticipation (to somebody, πρὸς τινα)” and *3. “to act eagerly.” There is scarcely any doubt that these new senses were triggered by the link between שָׁהָר and the verb שָׁהָר / שָׁהָר ‘to look eagerly, diligently for’ in general and irrespective of the time of the action. E.g. “My soul yearns for you in the night; my spirit within me earnestly seeks you (שָׁהָרְךָ > ὀρθρίζει .. πρὸς σέ)” Is 26.9. Whether or not this bilingual interaction suggests that Ben Sira is exhorting people to visit the teacher early in the morning is difficult to say, but there would be no harm in acting as early birds. When we read in Gn 22.3 that Abraham, who was more than 100 years old, got up early in the morning, most likely ahead of his two domestic servants, and harnessed his donkey to set out on a painful journey, this brief note was scarcely added for nothing.⁷³ We would also note that the Gk Impv., ὀρθρίσει, is in the Present aspect, suggesting a series of daily, early-morning lessons. Cp. God’s command to Moses: Ὀρθρίσον τὸ πρῶτῃ καὶ στῆθι ἐναντίον Φαραῶ καὶ ἔρεῖς πρὸς αὐτόν Ex 9.13, a one-off action. Note that the Impv. in the second column is also in the Present aspect: ἐκτριβέτω. Frequent visits are bound to leave marks on the threshold or sills of the door at the rabbi’s. See our discussion above at 4.12.

βαθμοὺς θυρῶν αὐτοῦ] 𐤀 סיפי, a difficult form, for it cannot be in the st. cst. ‘the doorsteps of your foot.’ סיפו = ספו or ספו in lieu of ספיו.⁷⁴ 𐤀’s θυρῶν looks like a free addition.

ἐκτριβέτω] 𐤀 תשחוק, the s of which can be either “you” or “your foot.” Both 𐤀 and 𐤀 opted for the latter.

6.37) διανοοῦ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασιν κυρίου
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ μελέτα διὰ παντός·
αὐτὸς στηριεῖ τὴν καρδίαν σου,
καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σοφίας δοθήσεται σοι.

*Ponder over the injunctions of the Lord
and on His commandments meditate always.*

*He will support your mind,
and (your) desire for wisdom will be granted to you.*

(Aa) והתבוננת ביראת עליון ובמצותו והגה תמיד:
(Ab) והוא יבין לךך ואשר איותה יחכרך:

διανοοῦ] 𐤀 והתבוננת. The conjunction *waw* is absent in 𐤀 as well. Both 𐤀 and 𐤀 have rightly taken the Heb. verb form here as pseudo inversive,

⁷³ On וַיִּשְׁכַּם Rashi briefly notes: הוֹדְרוֹ לַמְצוּהָ ‘he was eager to do God’s command.’

⁷⁴ 𐤀 אֶקְפָּתָהּ ‘his spades, forks’ is mysterious.

i.e. *w-qataltí*. It is no genuine, inversive form, since there is no logical sequence between the actions expressed by it and the immediately preceding *yigtol* of volitive force, תשחוק. Hence one could have used here a conjunctive *waw*: ותתברן. In other words, our והתבוננת is inversive in form only, but not in function, hence our label “pseudo inversive.” One of the concluding remarks made by Van Peursen (2004.141) on the *w-qataltí* in Ben Sira is “*w^eqataltí* is also used for non-consecutive situations.” However, in his discussion (2004.136) of our example he analyses it as “an independent, volitive perf. cons.,” which, however, is a contradiction in terms. If it is independent, it is no longer consecutive.

Here the verb *διανοέομαι* is complemented with *ἐν τινι*. Its formal equivalence with *ח ב-* is accidental, hence no Hebraism. The verb in the sense of “to ponder, reflect on,” a sense unique to SG,⁷⁵ displays diverse reactions beside *ἐν τινι*. Thus (i) < + acc. >, e.g. ταῦτα διανοοῦ Si 3.22; (ii) < ἐπί τινι >, e.g. ἐπὶ παντὶ πράγματι διανοοῦ Si 34.15; (iii) < + dat. rei > διανοήθητι τοῖς προστάγμασιν Da 10.11 LXX.

According to Ziegler the Origenic and Lucianic recensions add *τελειως* ‘wholly, thoroughly’ either immediately after *διανοοῦ* or after *κυρίου*, a plus represented in *משמלי־אית ה*.⁷⁶

τοῖς προστάγμασιν κυρίου] *יראת עליון ה* ‘the fear of the Most High,’ quite a discrepancy vis-à-vis *ח*, which shows, however, good parallelism with the following *ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ*. Moreover, the equation *עליון / κύριος* does not occur any more in Si. Smend mentions the rarity of this cst. combination in Si, whereas *תורת עליון* occurs a few times, e.g. 41.4.

μελέτα] *והגה ה*; the conjunction is missing in *ח* and *ס*. In theory the Heb. verb here can stand without an object complement. Whilst BSH has printed the verse in two columns and in two lines, the MS is a single line with no space in between. The line concerned begins with *רגלך:* and ends with *תמיד:* no space between *ובמצותו* and *והגה ה*. Then *והתבוננת* would have two prepositional objects, and you are being advised to philosophise. All the same it looks preferable to emend *והגה ה* to *ובמצותו הגה ה*, a case of erroneous dittography. This would result in an anomalous sequence of < *w-qataltí* - Impv. >, but see our remarks above on *διανοοῦ* as regards the sequence of tenses in Si.

We would note that both Impvs. are in the Present aspect.

⁷⁵ Pace Smend (151 ad Si 16.23), this sense is attested in LXX six times: Da LXX 9.2, 10.1, 12.10, Si 3.29, 16.23bis.

⁷⁶ This Gk adverb is not attested in any LXX book for which a Semitic original can be postulated with absolute certainty. The only possible exception is *τελειως πῶμα ποιήσει μετὰ σοῦ ὁ θεός* ‘God will do the thing about you impeccably’ Ju 11.6; where one mediaeval Hebrew text reads *את פעולתו עמך ישלים ה* (Dubarle 1966 II 66) and *באידך בלמדם בתלםם בלמדם עמך אלהא*.

ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ] **ח** מצותו, possibly read as מְצוֹתוֹ, but not necessarily. Likewise **ס** וּבְפוֹקְדוֹהִי.

αὐτὸς] **ח** הוא. The identifying force of the personal pronoun in both languages has been well captured by Ryssel: “Er ist’s, der dein Herz stark machen wird.”

σθηριεῖ] **ח** יבין. *Index s.v.* σθηρίζω has proposed identifying יבין, i.e. יָבִין, as having been rendered with σθηριεῖ. This, however, is no emendation of יבין, for לבך can be the subject of the verb. See לָבְבוּ יָבִין Is 6.10, לָבְבֵי נְמַהְרִים, לָבְבֵי יָבִין לְדַעַת ib. 32.4. Here then we would be having to do with a causative transform with לבך as the object. Note also **ס** נִתְקַן אוֹרְהֶתֶךָ ‘He will prepare your ways.’ Whilst Smend draws to our attention cases such as הִכִּינוּ לְבַבְכֶם אֱלֹהֵינָהּ 1Sm 7.3, also 2Ch 12.14, Ezr 7.10 and notes that in all these cases the *s* is human, which makes him retain יבין. But, theologically speaking, we humans need take the initiative to learn, but we badly need help, stimulation, and encouragement from above. Hence we see no theological difficulty here.

καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σοφίας δοθήσεται σοι] **ח** ואשר איותה יחכמך. There is no way of reconciling the two text forms. The grandson, if in his *Vorlage* he saw אשר, may have mentally replaced it with כאשר and translated the clause somewhat freely. **ס** also appears to have found **ח** difficult to handle: מִן מָא אֶתְרִנְרַנְתָּ נִלְפֶךְ מאשר. Unlike לָמַד Pi. חָכַם and Hi. הִחֲכִים are not known to be bitransitive, taking two direct *o*’s. Hence we find debatable Smend’s (II 11) “(wird er ..) was du begehrest, dich lehren” and Lévi’s (II 39) “(lui ..) t’enseignera ce que tu désires” is as debatable. An alternative analysis is to take אשר איותה as a *casus pendens* as in Mopsik’s translation: “quant à ton désir: il fera de toi un sage.” There is one difficulty with this analysis, namely, an extraposed element up front is normally taken up or resumed subsequently by means of a pronominal element or an equivalent that refers back to the extraposed component. E.g. אֲשֶׁר־יָכֶה אֶת־קַרְיַת־סֹפֶר וְלִכְדָּהּ וְנָתַתִּי לּוֹ אֶת־עֶבְכָּהּ בְּתִי לְאִשָּׁה Josh 15.16 and אני לאל משפטי ‘as for me, my justice belongs to God’ IQS 11.2.⁷⁷

איותה is a *defectiva* spelling in lieu of איייתה, cf. אִוְתִיָּהּ Ps 132.14.⁷⁸ But the first *yod* is *plena*. Rather confusing! A case of inadvertent transposition of the two letters?

⁷⁷ For details, see JM § 156 and SQH § 36 (5).

⁷⁸ A Qumran manuscript reads איייתה 11Q5 6.7.

CHAPTER 7

7.1) Μη ποίει κακά, καὶ οὐ μή σε καταλάβῃ κακόν·

Do not do evil things; then no calamity will ever befall you.

(A) אל תעש לך רעה ואל ישיגך רעה

(C) אל תעש רע . . . ישיגך רע

There appear to be subtle differences in perspective between the two text forms. Scribes of the Heb. text also appear to be struggling. \mathfrak{H} is preserved in two manuscripts with slight differences:

We see here a few problems and ambiguities.

i) Which of the two known, principal senses of the adjective רע is meant here? The same question arises for κακόν. Ethically “evil, wicked” or pragmatically “bad, unpleasant, harmful etc.”? The fem. רעה can be used either way. However, at least in the second clause רע is to be preferred because of the gender concord with its verb ישיגך. This, however, does not have to mean that רע is the right form in the first clause as well.

Since השגיג is unlikely to mean “to prevail upon someone and cause him or her act against his or her own wish,” but rather “to befall,” רע is most likely being used in a non-ethical sense. \mathfrak{G} seems to agree. For the selection of καταλαμβάνω we find an illuminating case in μη καταλάβῃ με τὰ κακά καὶ ἀποθάνω Gn 19.19.

ii) What is the function and meaning of לך, absent in C? If it is to be retained, the immediately following רעה can scarcely be taken in an ethical sense. Is “Do not bring about a calamity on your own head!” meant? But then the two clauses would become tautologous. We are perhaps better off without לך, though it is difficult to explain why it intruded here in the first place.

οὐ μή] This double negator, as here, often negates a verb in the Aor. subjunctive. The verb then can function not only with a volitive force, but also as an equivalent of the Future.¹ Also in the following verse, the first clause uses an Impv., followed by καὶ and a Fut. verb. By contrast, in \mathfrak{H} the two verbs are both volitive, negated with אל; אל תשיגך; אל תעש .. אל תשיגך. Thus it is up to us to ensure that we are spared any calamity. Thus אל ידבר is equivalent to אל תתן לו לדבר ‘Don’t allow him to speak.’ We are facing here a fundamental, methodological issue, namely how to read, interpret, or analyse a translated

¹ For details see *SSG* § 29 **ba** (ii-a) and 83 **cb**.

The current translations all use the Fut. tense for the second verb in both verses except Skehan - Di Lella with a mixture – “neither let evil overtake you .. and it will turn aside from you.”

part of the Septuagint books. For *GELS* we decided to read, analyse, and describe the lexical data of those books from the perspective of “a reader in a period roughly 250 BCE - 100 CE who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic or both” (*GELS* p. VIII).

7.2) ἀπόστηθι ἀπὸ ἀδίκου, καὶ ἐκκλινεῖ ἀπὸ σοῦ.

Distance yourself from wrong, then it will turn away from you.

(A) הרחק מעון ויט ממך:

(C) רחק מעון ... ממך:

ἀπόστηθι] H A קרח, C רחק. Hi. of a stative verb can have ingressive value, “entering a condition,” e.g. אֶל-תְּרַחֲקוּ מִן-הָעִיר מָאָד Josh 8.4. Hence there is little difference between the Hi. Impv. and Qal Impv. here.

καὶ ἐκκλινεῖ] H A ויט. The Gk. Fut. does not necessarily represent ויט. As pointed out above regarding οὐ μή (7.1), we have here two co-ordinate volitive forms, hence ו, a jussive form. Because Greek has Impv. also in the third person, ἐκκλινέτω (Pres.) or ἐκκλινάτω (Aor.) could have been said. In either person, however, the Impv. is an expression of the speaker’s will to the interlocutor, “you,” not the subject of the third person Impv., e.g. οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ ‘you shall have no gods other than Me’ Ex 20.3.² The Fut. is here being used by our translator with injunctive, prescriptive force. However, a reader of his translation ignorant of Hebrew could take the Fut. as a tense form indicating what is going to emerge: if you do not do evil things, then you will be spared .. if you distance yourself from wrong, it will not bother you. Our translation above with “then .. will” indicates a result.³ In S h) this is evident in its use of the Ptc. with the value of the Fut.⁴: לֹא נִשְׁכַּחַךְ .. נִתְרַחַק לֹא לְךָ מִדְּרָכָא .. מִסְּטָאָּ as against the Impf. in S נִתְרַחַק .. נִשְׁכַּחַךְ.

7.3) υἱέ, μὴ σπεῖρε ἐπ’ ἀβλακας ἀδικίας,

καὶ οὐ μὴ θερίσης ἀντὰ ἑπταπλασίως.

Son, do not sow in furrows of unrighteousness,

then you will never harvest them sevenfold.

(A) אל תדע חרושי על אח פן תקצרהו שבעתים:

H is hopelessly corrupted in 3a and hardly makes any sense. On the basis of G and S לֹא תִזְרַע עַל כְּרָבָא דְחֻטְיָא the following emended text has been proposed by Segal (44): אֵל תִּזְרַע עַל חֲרוּשֵׁי עוֹל.⁵

² Cf. *SSG* § 28 *gc*.

³ Ryssel’s “so wird” is similar: “so wird dir nichts Böses widerfahren .. so wird es dich verschonen.”

⁴ See Muraoka 2005² § 83.

⁵ According to Segal חֲרוּשֵׁי means ‘ploughed places.’ Schechter (1899.III 45) reads חֲרוּשֵׁי, accepted by Lévi (II 39), who translates it as “sillons,” but חֲרוּשֵׁי signifies “a season of ploughing.”

θερίσης αὐτὰ] \mathfrak{H} תקצרהו. Both Ziegler and Rahlfs reject αὐτάς, possibly resulting from wrongly parsing ἀδικίας as f.pl.acc., but what does the n.pl. αὐτὰ refer to? There is no n.pl. substantive in the context. Are we mentally to supply ἔργα or the like? Cf. ὁ σπείρων φαῦλα θερίσει κακά < \mathfrak{H} עָרַע אֲנָרְ-יִקְצָרְ-עוֹלָה יִקְצוֹרְ-יִקְצָרְ Pr 22.8. As vague is the f.pl. of \mathfrak{H} לְהִינֹן.

7.4) μὴ ζήτητι παρὰ κυρίου ἡγεμονίαν
μηδὲ παρὰ βασιλέως καθέδραν δόξης.

*Do not ask the Lord for leadership
nor a king for a seat of distinction.*

(A) אל תבקש מאל ממשלת וכן ממלך מושב כבוד:
(C) אל תבקש מא[ל ממ]שלת וכן כמלך מושב ...

κύριου] On its own the referent can be a human master, but not so in \mathfrak{H} A אל, \mathfrak{S} אֱלֹהִים and \mathfrak{H} מְרִאָה, a title not used of a human.⁶
καθέδραν] \mathfrak{H} A + C מושב \mathfrak{H} ; מוהבתא \mathfrak{H} ‘gift,’ an error for מוּתְבָא.

7.5) μὴ δικαιοῦ ἔναντι κυρίου
καὶ παρὰ βασιλεῖ μὴ σοφίζου.

*Do not play a righteous man before the Lord
and in the presence of a king do not play a sage.*

(A) אל תצטדק לפני מלך לפני מלך אל תתבונן:

δικαιοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A תצטדק. This Heb. form exemplifies a “simulating” value of the Hitpael.⁷ We believe that a similar value can be admitted for the middle voice in Gk, a variant on the reflexive.⁸ A few examples in SG are: ἠλλοτριούτο (\mathfrak{H} וַיִּתְנַבֵּר) ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ‘he feigned to be a stranger to them’ Ge 42.7; μαλακίσθητι (\mathfrak{H} הִתְהַלַּח) ‘Feign sickness’ 2Sm 13.5, where μαλακίζομαι ‘to be or become ill,’ a deponent verb, is being used with the value of the middle voice, and Amnon’s friend cannot possibly order him “You fall ill!,” for he is not condemning Amnon to a sick-bed;⁹ Ἔως πότε μεθυσθήσῃ (\mathfrak{H} תִּשְׂכַּרְיִן); ‘How much longer are you going to behave like an inebriated woman?’ 1Sm 1.14, where Hanna was not pretending to be drunken, but to Eli, as he watched her, she looked like behaving like inebriated. For our

Like קציר ‘a season for harvesting,’ the pattern *qatīl* is typical of nouns denoting agricultural operations, JM § 88 E b.

⁶ See, e.g. מְרִאָה מְלִכָא < מְרִאָה הַמְלִיךָ 1Sm 26.17.

⁷ For more examples, see JM § 53 I and SQH § 12 f (6).

⁸ We doubt that this is widely recognised in Gk grammars, CG or KG. We find no mention of such in an extensive discussion of the Gk middle voice in Moulton 1908.152-63.

⁹ The more primitive, Antiochaeon version interestingly reads: Προσποιοῦ ἐνοχλεῖσθαι ‘Make it look like you’re ill.’ On the interpretation of one of the Heb. key-words in this pericope, הִתְהַלַּח, see Muraoka 2020.54.

Si passage, note “Ne joue pas au juste .. ni au sage” (*BJ*) and “Do not pose as a righteous man .. or play the sage ..” (*Snaith*). This analysis of ours applies to σοφίζου as well.

κυρίου] \mathfrak{H} מלך to be emended to אל, i.e. אַל.

παρὰ] \mathfrak{H} פני, corrupted from לפני. So \mathfrak{S} קדם and \mathfrak{S} לָת.

σοφίζου] \mathfrak{H} תתבונן. This is not a very accurate equation, but is reasonably close; cf. Smend. Hitpolel being equivalent to Hitpael, תתבונן here would mean ‘you consider yourself to be מְבִין.’ Pace Smend, who writes “Das Hith-pael ist in der Bedeutung „seine Weisheit beweisen“ nicht belegt,” מְזַקְנִים Ps 119.100 can mean ‘I regard myself more intelligent than senior people.’

7.6) μὴ ζήτει γενέσθαι κριτῆς,
μὴ οὐκ ἰσχύσεις ἐξῆραι ἀδικίας,
μῆποτε εὐλαβηθῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου δυνάστου
καὶ θήσεις σκάνδαλον ἐν εὐθύτητί σου.

*Do not aspire to become a judge,
in case you will not be capable of eradicating injustices,
you might perchance cringe to a powerful person,
then you would be compromising your integrity.*

(Aa) אל תבקש להיות מושל אם אין לך חיל להשבית ודון:
(Ab) פן תגור מפני נדיב ונתונה בצע בתמימך:
(Ca) אל תבקש להיות אם אין לך חיל להשבית ודון:

κριτής] \mathfrak{H} A מושל, an unusual equation. The Qal Ptc. מושל occurs in Si some 8 times. Where its straightforward Greek rendering can be determined we find: δυνάστης 4.27, ἡγούμενος 9.17, 30.27, and κυριεύουσα מושלת B 37.18. There are two instances which are slightly problematic: μεγαίστων καὶ κριτῆς καὶ δυνάστης 10.24, where we have two Heb. texts with the three nouns in question in two different sequences: A מושל וּשׁוֹפֵט .. and B שׁוֹפֵט וּמוֹשֵׁל. In the light of the rendering δυνάστης 4.27 we would regard \mathfrak{G} reflecting B. Only one Gk MS, 672, follows the sequence of A. Likewise \mathfrak{S} רָבָא וְשְׁלִיטָא וְדִינָא. In καὶ ὁ κύριος εὐδοκᾷ αὐτόν 15.10 the *s* must be Yahweh, whilst \mathfrak{H} A reads וּמוֹשֵׁל בֵּה יִלְמְדָנָה, a most unusual equation. In \mathfrak{S} וְשְׁלִיט בָּהּ נְאֻלְפִיָּה the subject could be an erudite rabbi.¹⁰

μὴ οὐκ ἰσχύσεις] \mathfrak{H} אם אין לך חיל ‘if you do not have enough strength,’ which makes good sense in the context. Why has \mathfrak{G} restructured the Heb. sentence quite substantially?¹¹ As surprising is \mathfrak{S} אֵלָא אֵן אִית בָּהּ חֵילָא ‘unless

¹⁰ Referring to \mathfrak{I} *dominator*, Box - Oesterley proposes to emend κύριος to κυριεύων.

¹¹ Fassberg (1997.59) mentions three more possible cases of a delayed protasis. On QH, cf. *SQH* § 41 f.

you have strength with you.’ The Gk conjunction μή often indicates an apprehension on the part of the speaker.¹²

μήποτε] Synonymous with μή in the preceding line, a standard equivalent of 𐤎 𐤓 here. 𐤎 𐤓 is a good rendering of 𐤓. This Syr. word, however, means “perhaps” in 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 Gn 24.39 for 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓, cf. 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 Mήποτε οὐ πορεύσεται ἡ γυνὴ μετ’ ἐμοῦ.¹³ LSJ s.v. μήποτε mentions “perhaps” for later Gk, e.g. μή ποτε δὲ οὐ καλῶς τοῦτο λέγεται ‘maybe this is not an appropriate statement’ Arist. *EN* 1172^a33 and μήποτε οὐκ αἰσθανόμεθα τοῦ μεγέτους αὐτοῦ ‘perhaps we are not understanding his greatness’ Arr. *Epict.* 3.22.80. It cannot be anything else in μήποτε οὐ μὴ ἀρκέσει ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν ‘perhaps there may not be enough for us as well as you’ Mt 25.9.¹⁴

Both of these Gk negators, when expressing a fear and apprehension, can be used with a verb in the Indic. or Subj.

εὐλαβηθῆς] 𐤎 𐤓. In *GELS* s.v. εὐλαβέομαι *4 ‘to feel anxious and fearful’ is mentioned as unknown prior to SG. This Gk verb is used as often as 9 times, whereas only here it renders 𐤓, in the only other occurrence of which in Si we find πρόσεχε ἀπὸ κακούργου < 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 11.33.

δυναστού] 𐤎 𐤓. 𐤎 𐤓 ‘the rich’ is rather free, though wealth and power often go together.

Heb. 𐤎 𐤓 refers to a member of the upper class in a society. It occurs in six passages in Si and its renderings are rather diverse: δυναστής 7.6, 13.9, βασιλεύς 8.2, μεγιστάν 11.1, 38.3, πρόγονος ‘forefather, ancestor’ 8.4.

Line 4 is difficult in 𐤎: 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓. What is the subject of 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓? It cannot be 𐤎 𐤓 ‘ill-gotten profit,’ a masc. noun. What is “your 𐤎 𐤓” supposed to mean? The *Vorlage* of 𐤎 may have been as confusing, making the grandson translate freely. The same may be said of 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 ‘and you might do something questionable since you are scared.’¹⁶

7.7) μή ἀμάρτανε εἰς πλῆθος πόλεως
καὶ μή καταβάλης σεαυτὸν ἐν ὄχλῳ.

*Do not sin against the community of (your) city
and do not submit yourself to humiliation among the folks.*

(A) אל תרשיעך בעדת שערי אל ואל תפילך בקהלה:

¹² For details, see *GELS* s.v. VII and *SSG* § 29 **ba** (iv), 83 **ba** (v). We fail to follow Smend: “μή οὐκ könnte nur final verstanden werden.”

¹³ As far as the first half of the clause is concerned, 𐤎 and 𐤎 agree with each other at Gn 24.5, whilst 𐤎 varies with 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 ‘if (the woman) does not wish to ..’

¹⁴ So BDAG s.v. μήποτε 4.

¹⁵ We fail to see why Schechter (1899.III 45), followed by Smend and Lévi, could suggest 𐤎 on the basis of the above quoted 𐤎.

¹⁶ Pace Smend 𐤎 𐤓 𐤁 𐤓 can scarcely mean “deine Gottesfurcht,” which is incongruous with 𐤎 𐤓.

ἀμάρτανε] 𐤒 תרשיעך. We agree with Segal (45) in taking the suf. object as reflexive in force. He finds this grammatical feature anomalous and refers to **וַיְרֵאוּ שְׂטָרֵי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־בְּרַע** Ex 5.19 (ἑαυτοῦς).¹⁷ Thus an analogical extension of this rare syntactic feature. The reflexive force of the pronoun is explicitly marked with σεαυτὸν for תפילך in the next line. See also תחשיבך προσλογίζου σεαυτὸν Si 7.16 and note 𐤍 לֹא תַחֲבֵב נַפְשְׁךָ בְּכַוּוֹשָׁתָא דְּמַדְיִנְתָּא 𐤍.¹⁸

Smend makes עדת שער the subject of תרשיעך. That would work with תפילך, but not with תרשיעך, for the latter's subject cannot follow its verb because of the preposition בַּ, which makes בעדת שער an adverbial adjunct of תרשיעך.

πόλεως] 𐤒 שערי אל 'the gates of God,' which hardly fits the context. שער could be an error for עיר. So 𐤍 as quoted above. Mopsik points out that the city-gate used to be a location where a court of justice was set up as shown in, e.g. Gn 23.10, but can the mere mention of שער be so interpreted?

Schechter (1899.III 45) thinks that here is perhaps an allusion to Dt 25.1-2, but it appears that BS's grandson did not take the hint, for הַפִּילֹו in Dt 25.2 is about making the guilty literally, physically lie on the ground to be flogged.

אל is generally agreed to be an inadvertent dittography of the following אל, i.e. אַל.

7.8) μὴ καταδεσμεύσης δις ἁμαρτίαν·
ἐν γὰρ τῇ μιᾷ οὐκ ἄθῶος ἔσῃ.

*You should not have to deal with a sin twice,
for even with one sin you would not come out innocent.*

(A) אל תקשור לשנות חט כי באחת לא תנקה:

καταδεσμεύσης] 𐤒 תקשור. Καταδεσμεύω was unknown prior to SG and occurs in Si only, and that twice. The other instance is in 30.7 with τραύματα αὐτοῦ 'his wounds' as the ο, where it means "to put a bandage around as medical treatment." קשר is not, by itself, especially difficult of interpretation: "to bind" and "to conspire." However, the way it is used here in context appears to have been found troublesome. The author most likely meant it in the second sense. His grandson, however, failed to comprehend it, and took the verb in the first sense, but then in a rather specific sense. 𐤍 gave up on this verb, no trace of which is found in his rendering: לֹא תַתְּנֵא לְמַחְטָא: לֹא תַחֲבֵב נַפְשְׁךָ אֶת־בְּרַע 'you shall not repeat to commit sins [lit.: to sin sins].' Moreover,

¹⁷ For a few more cases of this rare feature in BH, see JM § 146 k, and see above at 6.3, fn. 11, and also Rey 2008.168-71.

¹⁸ Unlike its Heb. equivalent < נַפְשְׁךָ + suf. pron. > in Syr. often functions as a reflexive pronoun. E.g. הָאֵל הָאֵל גִּיר נַפְשֵׁן מִכְּרִינָן < Οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοῦς κηρύσσομεν 2Cor 4.5. On Heb. < נַפְשְׁךָ + suf. pron. >, see above at 1.30.

καταδεσμεύω as used here appears to have presented a problem for **Sh** **אֵל תִּסְרֹר דְּתַרְתִּין קְטִיָּה**, a verbatim reproduction of **H**. One wonders what the average Syriac reader would have made of this clause. At 30.7, however, we find a straightforward rendering of **G** περιψύχων υἱὸν καταδεσμεύσει τραύματα αὐτοῦ ‘one who pampers his son will end up bandaging his wounds’ > **הָלֵה לְבָרָא נְעֻזֹב לְצוּלְפָתָא דִּילָהּ** ‘one who loves his son will bandage his wounds,’ where, however, the love may be of a genuinely caring, not spoiling, parent. By contrast, **S** **סִי נְסַנְנִין צוּלְפָתָהּ בְּרָה דְּמַפְּקָא בְּרָה** ‘one who gladdens his son - his wounds will multiply’ its *Vorlage* seems to have had a form of **קִשְׁרָא**¹⁹ and the translator did not know how to handle it.

7.9) μὴ εἶπης Τῶ πλήθει τῶν δώρων μου ἐπόψεται
καὶ ἐν τῷ προσενέγκαι με θεῶ ὑψίστῳ προσδέξεται.

Do not say: “Because of the multitude of my offerings He will favourably look upon me.

And when I offer (them) to the highest God, He will accept (them).”

No Heb. MS has preserved this verse, and in **HA** we find vs. 15 here.

S reads **לֹא תֵאמַר דְּחָאָר בְּסוּנָאָא דְּקוּרְבָנֵי וְדְמִקְרָב אֲנָא לְמַרְיָמָא קוּרְבָנֵי מְקַבְּל** ‘Do not say: “He looks at the multitude of my offerings, and because I offer my offerings to the Most High, He accepts them”.’

Τῶ πλήθει] a dative of reason or cause, see *SSG* § 22 **wn**. A dative is not known to indicate an object of ἐφοράω, but only an accusative. Segal’s (43) reconstruction **לְרַב מְנִהְתֵּי יְבִיט** is debatable.

ἐπόψεται] We find a synonymous Gk verb (ἐπεῖδον) used in a context similar to ours in καὶ ἐπεῖδεν (**H** **וַיִּשַׁע**) ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Αβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ Gn 4.4.

ἐν τῷ προσενέγκαι] For **S** < ἐν + inf. > expresses a reason, whereas for **Sh** it is temporal in value – **וְכִד**. This Gk syntagm is often temporal in value, see *SSG* § 30 **aba**, pp. 334f. In *GELS* s.v. ἐν **11 b** only one example of causal force is mentioned: ἐν τῷ φείσασθαι κύριον αὐτοῦ ‘because the Lord took pity on him’ Gn 19.16.

θεῶ ὑψίστῳ] This compound divine appellation occasionally occurs anarthrously, thus Si 24.23, 41.8, 50.17, in which latter two **H** reads **עֲלִיּוֹן**. In BH, when **עֲלִיּוֹן** is applied to God, it is consistently anarthrous, e.g. **שְׁלֹם לְעֲלִיּוֹן נְדָרֶיךָ** Ps 50.14, though **G** optionally adds the article as here ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχὰς σου, see also ἦν δὲ ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου Ge 14.18 < **הוּא כְהֵן לְאֵל עֲלִיּוֹן**.

προσδέξεται] The latent object could be “me.” Cf. προσδέξεται σε [= one offering a sacrifice] Ma 1.8 // προσδέξομαι αὐτά [= sacrifices] ib. 1.13. **Sh**

¹⁹ No Heb. MS has been preserved for this verse.

is explicit: *מְקַבֵּל קוֹרְבָּנַי דִּילִי* ‘He accepts my offerings.’ ¶ presents a mixed construction: *offerentem me Deo altissimo suscipiet munera mea*.

7.10) μὴ ὀλιγοψυχῆσης ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ σου
καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην ποιῆσαι μὴ παρίδης.

*Do not become weary of your prayer
and do not neglect the duty of almsgiving.*

(A) אל תקצר בתפלה ובצדקה אל תתעבר:

¶ *ὀλιγοψυχῆσης*] ¶ *תקצר*, which has justly been parsed by our translator as 2ms. However, you can grow in height, but not the other way round. ¶ *לֹא תִתְעַיֵק* ‘Do not become impatient’ is close to what is meant by ¶ .²⁰ This is the first attestation in Hebrew of *תקצר*. In subsequent periods its *s* is not a human being. We have here an extension of *תקצר* *רוחך בתפלה*, i.e. *אל תקצר רוחך בתפלה*.²¹ The preposition *ב* indicates an occasion for impatience, loss of perseverance.²² Cf. *וְתִקְצַר נַפְשֵׁךָ בְּדַרְךָ* Nu 21.4, *וְתִקְצַר נַפְשֵׁךָ בְּעַמְלָה* Jdg 10.16, *וְתִקְצַר נַפְשֵׁי בְּהֵם* Zc 11.8. Note also the rection of a semantically affiliated verb, Qal *קוץ*, through *ב* in Si 4.9, 6.25, 50.25. See also above at 4.9, where the verb in question is *ὀλιγοψυχέω* as here. ¶ proffers an etymological rendering: *לֹא תִזְרַע נִפְשֶׁךָ*, and at 4.9 with a slight variation: *לֹא תִזְרַע בְּנִפְשֶׁךָ*.

¶ *παρίδης*] ¶ *תתעבר*, a verb which was unknown prior to our book. See above at 5.7.

7.11) μὴ καταγέλα ἄνθρωπον ὄντα ἐν πικρίᾳ ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ·
ἔστιν γὰρ ὁ ταπεινῶν καὶ ἀνυψῶν.

*Do not deride a person in his mental bitterness,
for there is One who brings low and raises high.*

(A) אל תבו לאנוש במר רוח זכר כי יש מרים ומשפיל:

For the general thought, cf. ¶ *κύριος > יְהוָה מוֹרִישׁ וּמַעֲשִׂיר מִשְׁפִּיל אֶת־מְרוֹמֵם*. *παταγίζει καὶ πλουτίζει, ταπεινοῖ καὶ ἀνυψοῖ* 1Sm 2.7.

¶ *ταπεινῶν καὶ ἀνυψῶν*] In Si we encounter literally tens of examples of anarthrous, substantivised participles introduced with *ἔστιν*, e.g. *ἔστιν*

²⁰ Segal (45): “Do not shorten your prayer too much,” which would have been expressed as *אל תקצר תפלתך*. Lévi (II 41) holds that “Ne sois pas trop court dans la prière” is also possible, but we doubt that one could say *קָצַר אֶתָּה בְּתַפְלָה* or some such thing with *תקצר* as an ingressive Hitpael.

²¹ Kister (1990.319) mentions *אתקצרת* ‘I became impatient’ 11Qtrg 18.5, an Aram. Trg for *אֶתְקַצַּרְתָּ* Jb 31.13, and accordingly interprets our *תקצר*. But “to be loathe” is what leads to a shortened prayer. Hebrew expresses one’s emotions in terms of length, thus *קצר אפנים* as against *אָרַךְ אַפְיִם*.

²² Pace Clines *DCH* 7.286a: “during” and Mopsik (105) “pendant.”

κοπιῶν καὶ πονῶν καὶ σπεύδων 11.11. Here we have a case with the definite article, the sole instance in Si, and the addition of ὁ is for good reason, the participle referring to *the* God.

ἐν πικρία ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ] exactly as in 4.6 above. Hanna was in a comparable mental condition: וְהָיָא מְרַת נִפְשָׁא 1Sm 1.10, whilst she herself describes it as אִשָּׁה קִשְׁת־רוּחַ אֲנֹכִי ib. 15. The selection of the gen. ψυχῆς renders support to our position presented in Muraoka 1977 that an adj. in the st. cst. modifies the following noun, not the preceding component, so that what was מְרַת is not Hanna, but נִפְשָׁא.

The first word in line 2, זכר וְ, i.e. זכר ‘Remember’ (Impv.), is missing in both ④ and ⑤. If both had זכר in their respective *Vorlage*, they present a slightly different perspective. Ben Sira does not explicitly specify who is mindful of what is being done to the embittered victim, but states that derision towards him will not pass unnoticed.²³ By contrast, ④ and ⑤ are assuming the knowledge of that on the part of their readership and explicitly reminding them of his identity as shown by the use of the definite article. Latin, which lacks the article, compensates with greater explicitness: *Il est enim qui humiliat et exaltat circumspexerit Deus*. The conjunction כִּי, which most likely introduces here a content clause, “Remember that ..,” has been transformed into a causal conjunction: ④ γάρ and ⑤ מִטְּלָ ד־. The use of the existential verb ἔστιν,²⁴ not a mere copula, ἐστί, fits this perspective: “He is there, watching.” This has been well captured by אֵית הוּ גִיר הוּ דְמִמְכָּד וּמְרַמָּם לוֹ ⑤. ⑤ is slightly different: מִטְּלָ דְאֵית דְמַרְיִם וּמַשְׁפָּל ‘because there is one who exalts and brings low,’ which may be simply *alluding* to Him.

7.12) μὴ ἀποτρία ψευδὸς ἐπ’ ἀδελφῶ σου
μηδὲ φίλῳ τὸ ὅμοιον ποίει.

*Do not sow a deceit against your brother
nor do the same to a friend.*

(A אַל תַּחְרוּשׁ חֲמַס עַל אַח וּכְנַעַל רַע וְחִבֵּר יַחֲדוּ:

ἀποτρία] תַּחְרוּשׁ, an unusual equation which also occurs in Jb 4.8 in a similar context: אֶנְיָן > ④ τοὺς ἀποτριῶντας τὰ ἄτοπα. The metaphorical use of this verb in the sense of ‘to devise, design’ is well established in BH.²⁵ The same is not true of ἀποτριάω prior to SG. However, the sense of תַּחְרוּשׁ here and in Jb 4.8 cannot be anything other than metaphorical. This Gk verb is known outside of SG in a couple of variant forms: ἀποτριάω,

²³ This vagueness of identification is well captured in Lévi’s (II 41) translation: “Souviens-toi qu’il y a quelqu’un ‘qui élève et abaisse’.”

²⁴ See *GELS* s.v. εἶμι I, and cf. ὅτι ἔστιν ‘that He exists’ Heb 11.6.

²⁵ Lévi (II 42) compares אֶל־תַּחְרוּשׁ עַל־רַעְדָּה רַעְדָּה Pr 3.29, where ④, however, reads μὴ τεκτῆνη ἐπὶ σὸν φίλον κακὰ ‘Do not bring about difficulties to your friend.’

ἀροτρεύω, ἀροτρόω²⁶, ἀροτρίαζω²⁷, ἀρώ. The last appears to be the dominant form, though, as a translation of קָרַח, SG attests to ἀροτρίαώ alone.²⁸ CG proffers one illuminating instance in which ἀρώ is used in the sense of ‘to sow’: εἰς Ἀδώνιδος κήπους ἀρῶν ‘sowing (seeds) into the gardens of Adonis’ Pl. *Phdr.* 276b. Unless one postulates a Heb. calque of קָרַח ‘to devise,’ as S has done with תְּתַרְעָא ‘you contrive,’²⁹ this appears to be a reasonable analysis. Interestingly, at Jb 4.8, ἀροτριῶντας is coordinate with σπείροντες וְתַרְעִי.

ψεύδος] וְחַמַּס, yet another unusual equation.

ἐπ’ ἀδελφῶ σου] וְעַל אַח. Smend remarks that S took עַל in the sense of “gegen,” but so did C as in αἱ χεῖρές σου ἔσονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐν πρώτοις ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν Dt 13.9, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἐπί II 9.

Line 2 in C is miles apart from וְכֵן עַל רַע וְחֹבֵר יַחַדוּ ‘and likewise against a fellowman and an associate put together.’

7.13) μὴ θέλε ψεύδεσθαι πᾶν ψεῦδος·
ὁ γὰρ ἐνδεδελεχισμὸς αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἰς ἀγαθόν.

*Do not wish to tell any lie whatsoever,
for getting into the habit of it will not end well.*

(A אל תחפץ לכחש על כחש כי תקותו לא תנעם:

ψεύδεσθαι πᾶν ψεῦδος] וְלִכְחַשׁ עַל כְּחַשׁ; כַּל is obviously an error for כָּל. πᾶν with a negator, just as כָּל, reinforces total, categorical negation when used with a noun in the sg., see *SSG* § 83 fa and *SQH* § 40 g.

ἐνδεδελεχισμὸς] וְתִקְוָה, an equation attested nowhere. וְתִקְוָה לֹא תִנְעָם probably means “what you hope to achieve by lying will not turn out pleasant for you.” Cf. S קִרְתָּהּ ‘its end,’ i.e. what you will achieve in the end. This is, however, quite distinct from habitual lying, what has become one’s second nature. In this connection we find noteworthy וְאֵיךְ אֶפֶּוּ תִקְוֹתַי וְתִקְוֹתַי מִי יִשְׁוּרְנָהּ > C ποῦ οὖν μου ἔτι ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς; ἢ τὰ ἀγαθὰ μου ὄψομαι; Jb 17.15.

Lévi (II 42) says that תִּקְוָה and אַחֲרִית are synonymous, without mentioning any evidence.³⁰ Smend also thinks that Ben Sira is using תִּקְוָה in the sense

²⁶ Added in the Supplement (1996) of LSJ.

²⁷ Deleted in both editions of the Supplement (1968, 1996), though it is attested at Is 7.25 as a v. l. of ἀροτρίαώ in three minuscules.

²⁸ Cf. Lee 1983.113.

²⁹ Is S תְּכַרֵּב דְּגִלּוֹתָא נֹחַ ‘you plough deceit’ merely a mechanical rendition?

³⁰ The coordination of the two words in question nor their use in parallelism does not necessarily mean their synonymity. Thus אַחֲרִית וְתִקְוָה Je 29.11 (“the hoped-for future” according to BDB s.v. תִּקְוָה 3), אֵל תְּהִי אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ לְהַכְרִית וְלֹא תִקְוֹתֵנוּ לְמַפָּח נַפֶּשׁ, ‘May our end not be annihilation and our hope turned into disappointment’ pBer 7d. Cf. *HALOT* s.v. II תִּקְוָה 1781b. One would seriously doubt that מִרְשִׁית הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד אַחֲרִית שָׁנָה Dt 11.12 can be rewritten as מִרְשִׁית הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד תִּקְוַת שָׁנָה.

of ‘end,’ and refers to vs. 17, on which, however, see our analysis ad loc. Even-Shoshan s.v. תַּקְנָה mentions as a metaphorically used sense “end, target,” for which he mentions two instances פָּרוּ לְאֵין תַּקְנָה 1QH^a 11.28, where, however, the standard meaning, ‘hope,’ makes good sense,³¹ whereas the second case is significant – הַנּוֹתֵן תַּקְנָה לְנִירוֹתָיו אֵין מְתִירִין אוֹתוֹ לְגַלְחָה ‘one who sets a time limit to his Nazirite vow should not be allowed to have his beard shaved’ pNaz 51.3.

In summing up we would say that our Gk translator failed to get down to precisely what his grandfather had meant, and translated freely. His struggle is more apparent in vs. 17, where he would take greater freedom in his translation.

7.14) μὴ ἀδολέσχει ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων
καὶ μὴ δευτερώσης λόγον ἐν προσευχῇ σου.

*Do not chatter in a gathering of elderly people
and do not repeat same things in your prayer.*

(A) אַל תְּסוּד בְּעֵדַת שְׂרִים וְאֵל תִּישֵׁן דְּבַר בַּתְּפִלָּה:

ἀδολέσχει] תְּסוּד, the first instance in Heb. of √סוד as a verb and not repeated in the subsequent history of Hebrew. Neither BSH nor *Maagarim* can decide if the form used here is Qal or Piel. Both Ben Yehuda 1959.3983a and *Maagarim* relate the word to סוּד, i.e. ‘to talk about secrets.’ So תְּסַתֵּר here. In our context it might be referring to informal, casual talk, chat. In that case, Piel with pluralising value³² might be more plausible. Our author uses this verb root four times in Hitpael, in one of which we read עָם זוֹנָה אֵל תְּסַתִּיד 9.3, where it is about intimate conversation. Cf. Syr. סוּד ‘to converse.’

πρεσβυτέρων] שְׂרִים. Given this equation we may conclude that πρεσβύτερος means here not only “advanced in age,” but also carrying authority in a community. Smend identifies πρεσβυτέρων with שְׂבִים, i.e. שְׂבִים, referring to 6.34, for which no Heb. text has been preserved, though we have exactly same phrase as here: ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων. Note, however, that שְׂ reads here בְּכַנּוּשָׁתָא דְשְׁלִיטְנָא, but there בְּכַנּוּשָׁתָא דְסַבָּא. But see also below at 35.9.

δευτερώσης] תִּישֵׁן, i.e. a *plena* spelling for תִּישֵׁן or תִּישֵׁן, a Qal jussive of תִּישֵׁן. Qal תִּישֵׁן ‘to repeat’ is unknown to BH, but common in MH. The same advice would subsequently be given by Jesus, Mt 6.7.³³ תִּשְׁחַלְחֵל represents תִּישֵׁן, i.e. Pi. תִּישֵׁן.

³¹ Cf. Licht 1957.86.

³² Cf. JM § 52 d and SQH § 12 c (2).

³³ Kister (1990.320) and *Maagarim* identify here תְּפִלָּה ‘folly, nonsense’ as in RH, תְּפִלָּה של תְּפִלָּה TBer 7.7.

§ concludes with an additional line: מִן אֲנָשָׁא דְעַמְךָ לֹא תִרְחַם נַפְשְׁךָ ‘Do not love yourself more than people of your nation.’

7.15) μὴ μισήσης ἐπίπονον ἐργασίαν
καὶ γεωργίαν ὑπὸ ὑψίστου ἐκτισμένην.

*Do not hate toilsome work
and farming created by the Most High.*

(A אל תאיץ בצבא מלאכת עבדה הי כאל נחלקה:

μισήσης] 𐤀 תאיץ, most likely an error for תקוץ, which smoothly combines with the immediately following preposition, see e.g. נַפְשְׁנוּ קָצָה בְּלֶחֶם Nu 21.5. Mopsik’s (107) translation, “Ne déteste pas dans la corvée le travail servile,” has not taken into account that קוץ ‘to loathe’ does not take a zero-object, but is mediated with either בִּי as in Nu 21.5 or מִפְּנֵי as in וַיִּקְרָא לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מוֹאֵב מִפְּנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Nu 22.3. Moreover, the cultic ministry performed by Levites, called צָבָא in Nu 4.23, for instance, is hardly comparable with what Ben Sira is going on about, hard, painful, physical, and manual labour.

ἐπίπονον ἐργασίαν] 𐤀 צבא מלאכת עבדה, which hardly makes any sense. צבא had better be deleted.

In 𐤀 line 2 is also amiss: הי כאל נחלקה. 𐤀 probably represents היא מאל נחלקה.

This verse has completely dropped out from §.

ἐκτισμένην] 𐤀 נחלקה. Our author is probably thinking of passages such as Gn 2.15 and 3.19. Seeing that the creation (κτίζω, κτίσις) was over long since, the translator must be using κτίζω here in the sense of ‘to assign (for the first time and to the first human being).’ All the same it is remarkable that this Gk verb should have been selected in this context. Also elsewhere we note this equation, e.g. גם אתו חלק אל > καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν [= ἰατρόν ‘physician’] ἔκτισεν κύριος Si 38.1 and ἔκτισται חלק 40.1.³⁴

From this verse Box and Oesterley (339) conclude: “already in the time of Ben-Sira manual labour .. was held in high esteem.” Why then did Ben Sira find it necessary to write this proverb?

7.16) μὴ προσλογίζου σεαυτὸν ἐν πλήθει ἁμαρτωλῶν·
μνήσθητι ὅτι ὀργὴ οὐ χρονηεῖ.

*Do not regard yourself as one of the crowd of sinners.
Remember that (divine) wrath will not be delayed.*

(A אל תחשיבך במתי עם זכור עכרון לא יתעבר:

³⁴ Barr (1968.260f.) argues that the use of חלק in Si is not explicable with reference to Arb. *ḥalaqa* ‘to create.’

προσλογίζου σεαυτὸν] 𐤏 תחשיבך. The verb תחשיב does not occur in Hi. in BH. QH proffers another possible instance in יהשיבוני וקלם להרפה ה' 'they consider me as a reproach and a derision' 1QH^a 11.7. The editors of the text prefer reading Qal יהשובוני on the ground that no Hi. of this verb is attested in any other QH text and parses החשבו 'they were regarded' 1QS 5.11 either as Ho. or Hit.³⁵ If one admits Ho., however, the non-attestation of its active counterpart is likely a consequence of imperfect documentation. This Si instance need be taken into account.

What does יהשיב mean? According to Segal (46) it means "to attach importance," so Even-Shoshan s.v. חשב. Then "Do not think of yourself as an important person among your compatriots!" Our Gk translator obviously thought otherwise, identifying here a Qal form.

The object suffix pronoun has been correctly analysed as reflexive, σεαυτόν.³⁶

πλήθει] 𐤏 מתי, the only instance of the equation מתיים / πλήθος admitted in *Index*.

ἀμαρτωλῶν] 𐤏 עמ. Is this remarkable rendering indicative of the translator's sense of religious superiority? 𐤏 לא תרחם נפְשְךָ מִן אֲנָשׁ דְעַמְךָ 'Do not love yourself more than members of your nation' appears more moderate and less discriminating in tone.

On the preposition ב־ prefixed to the object of תחשיב, Smend mentions ובגוים 1QH 23.9. We now have a better example in הוא נתחשב 'we will not consider ourselves as part of the local peoples' 4Q504 6.9, an allusion to the just adduced Nu 23.9. See also הוא החשבו בבירתו 'they did not count themselves (as under) His covenant' 1QS 5.11.³⁷ On the selection of προσλογίζομαι in 𐤏, cf. ἐν ἔθνεσιν οὐ συλλογισθήσεται 𐤏 Nu 23.9, where a derivationally and also notionally affiliated συλλογίζομαι is used.

𐤏τι] There is found no corresponding conjunction in 𐤏, but it is not absolutely necessary. 𐤏 has ׀. See also below at 8.7.³⁸

𐤏רגה] 𐤏 עכרון, an extremely rare word which occurs only a couple more times in the whole history of Hebrew so that one finds it difficult to determine precisely what it means. Even-Shoshan's definition – עֲנָשׁ, פְּרָעוֹנוֹת, 'punishment, penalty' – is little more than a contextual inference. *DCH* s.v., VI 384, suggests "trouble," apparently on the basis of the verb, עָכַר 'to trouble.' The *Vorlage* may have read *עכרון, a word totally unknown elsewhere, but derivable

³⁵ So *DJD* 40.148. We (Muraoka 2022.117) have also parsed the 1QS instance as Hit. Qimron (2020.I 72) indicates the epigraphical uncertainty by adding a vertical stroke over the letter in question: יהשׁבוני.

³⁶ On this matter, see above at vs. 7 with תרשיעך.

³⁷ Cf. *SQH* § 12 f (1).

³⁸ Cf. Van Peursen 2004.301-04, § 18.4.

from עֲבָרָה ‘wrath,’ and would form a good figura etymologica with the following verb יתעבר.³⁹

χρονιεῖ] יתעבר. On this Heb. verb, see above at 7.10, and also below at 38.9.

7.17) ταπεινώσον σφόδρα τὴν ψυχὴν σου,
ὅτι ἐκδίκησις ἀσεβοῦς πῦρ καὶ σκώληξ.

*Lower your stance very much
for judgement of the impious is fire and worms.*

כי תקות אנוש רמה:	מאד מאד השפיל גאווה (Aa)
גל אל אל ורצה דרכו:	אל תאיץ לאמר לפרץ (Ab)
כי תקות אנוש לרמה:	מאד מאד השפל גאווה (C)

σφόδρα] מאד מאד with an intensifying repetition and also positioned up front.

τὴν ψυχὴν σου] This is no Hebraising substitute for a reflexive pronoun. In יתעבר we see no נפש. We are here having to do with our mental attitude. On the alleged Hebraising use of ψυχή, see above at 3.18.

As regards line 2 reference is often made to שְׁפַל רוּחַ שְׁתַּקוּת mAb 4.4, a saying attributed to Rabbi Levitas, who was most likely familiar with the proverb of Ben Sira. It is important to note that, just as in our Si proverb, in the Mishnaic version there is nothing said on fire. Fire must be meant here as an instrument of divine punishment (ἐκδίκησις), a thought that apparently emerged between the time of Ben Sira and his grandson⁴⁰ and inherited by a namesake of the former some two centuries later to be built into his eschatological teaching as we see in καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται Mk 9.47f. Moreover, Ben Sira and Levitas state that worm is the universal lot of mankind, irrespective of their ethical status. This is highlighted in סֵת קֵץ אֲנָשָׁא בְּנֵי דְכָל הוֹן בְּנֵי אָנְשָׁא ‘the end of all human beings.’ Let us note “worms shall be their bed” Enoch 46.6, that is, a form of postmortem punishment awaiting those who in their lifetime arrogantly enjoyed the luxurious life oblivious of its benefactor. In ib. 98.3 we read “their spirits shall be cast into the furnace of fire.”

On the interpretation of תקוה, see above at vs. 13.

In these two lines ט departs from יתעבר in no small measure:

C מאד מאד השפיל גאווה	‘Lower (your) pride very, very much
C כי תקות אנוש לרמה:	for people’s hope leads to worms.’

³⁹ Kister (1990.321) suggests that the word means “death,” though such is not attested anywhere, which holds for the sense “anger.”

⁴⁰ See also Snaith 43 and Skehan - De Lella 201f.

This extensive departure cannot be easily accounted for by postulating a *Vorlage* different from the form as has been preserved in \mathfrak{A} and C.⁴¹ The translator is presenting his own position, building on his grandfather's message, though not contradicting it.

Not only that, but for some reason or other, a complete Heb. line seems to have gone missing. In A we read $\text{אל תאיץ לאמר לפרץ גל אל אל ורצה דרכו}$. A tentative translation can be: 'Do not hasten to tell to break out. Commit yourself to God and be content with His way.' We have parsed לפרץ as a Qal Inf. functioning as an Impv.⁴² On גל אל אל , cp. $\text{גל אל-יהוה ופלטתה ויצילהו}$. In Ps 22.9. In terms of the message, however, this additional line does not fit as the first of the series of proverbs all beginning with אל and concerned about human relationships. The line might not be original.

7.18) $\text{Μη ἀλλάξῃς φίλον ἔνεκεν διαφόρου}$
 $\text{μηδὲ ἀδελφὸν γνήσιον ἐν χρυσίῳ Σουφίρ.}$

Do not change friends for the sake of money
nor true brethren (even) for the sake of the gold of Sufir.

א (A) אל תמיר אוהב במחיר ואח תלוי בזהב אופיר:
 D) אל תמיר אוהב במחיר ואח תלוי בזהב אופיר:

διαφόρου] \mathfrak{H} מחיר. The use of a substantivised n. διάφορος in the sense of 'ready money, cash' is a development in the Hellenistic period and amply attested in inscriptional data.⁴³ \mathfrak{H} בְּשֵׁנְמָא שְׁ 'by chance' (?) is mysterious.

διαφόρου is read only in a small number of minuscules, the majority reading being ἀδιαφόρου 'a trifle, triviality.'

γνήσιον] \mathfrak{H} תלוי. The Heb. phrase must refer to a colleague, friend for whom his relationship with you is of vital importance. Why γνήσιος has been selected is not clear.⁴⁴ As strange is \mathfrak{S} אָחָא דְאִית לָךְ 'a brother whom you have.'

ἐν] \mathfrak{H} ב-. The Gk preposition selected here is a Hebraising equivalent of the so-called *beth pretii*, i.e. *beth* of price. See *GELS* s.v. *4. In view of the

⁴¹ \mathfrak{A} reads basically the same.

⁴² So Lévi (II 43), though his translation reads: "Ne t'empresse pas de prendre des résolutions subversives" and, slightly reworded, "... de se proposer de renverser." Smend thinks that לאמר does not fit תאיץ , but what about $\text{לְנַחְמֵנִי לְנַחְמֵנִי}$ Is 22.4 and לְבֹאֵךְ לְבֹאֵךְ Josh 10.13? In פרץ Segal (46) identifies a noun פָּרָץ , which, according to him, means 'disaster, catastrophe,' but one would not speak to a condition and situation.

⁴³ See LSJ s.v. II 4 b and Moulton - Milligan s.v.

⁴⁴ With his rendering, "véritable," Lévi (II 43) has apparently given up, adopting \mathfrak{S} 's γνήσιον . Pace Mopsik (208) and Segal (48) this Gk adjective does not mean "connu." Furthermore, as regards Smend's "einen leiblichen Bruder" and Mopsik's "un frère de lait," they are influenced by Nöldeke's (1900.85) emendation, תלוי to תלים , and the latter mentioned a cognate in Assyrian, thought without spelling it out. Akk. *talimu* means 'favourite,' which is not exactly identical with "leiblich." Samaritan *talim*, also quoted by Nöldeke, is not of much help, either. What should one do with "brother brother"?

parallelism between the two lines the preposition attached to **במחיר** most likely bears the same value, but rendered differently, showing the financial prospect could play a vital role, i.e. to make friends with some other guy might bring in more.

Σουφίρ] **אופיר**. The *sigma* in **אופיר** looks like an inadvertent intrusion. **הב אופיר** ‘the gold of Ophir’ 1Kg 9.28 et passim is proverbial precious metal.

7.19) μὴ ἀστόχει γυναικὸς σοφῆς καὶ ἀγαθῆς·
ἢ γὰρ χάρις αὐτῆς ὑπὲρ τὸ χρυσίον.

*Do not let go of a wise and good woman,
for her attraction exceeds that of gold.*

(A) אל תמאס אשה משכלת וטובת חן מפנינים:

(D) אל תמאס אשה משפלת וטובת חן מפנינים:

γυναικὸς] a genitive of ablative value – keeping away from her, cf. SSG § 22 q.

καὶ ἀγαθῆς] = **וטובה** instead of **אופיר**.

The st. cst. form of **וטובה** can be analysed in the same manner as **מרת** and **קשת** mentioned above at vs. 11. In other words, it is not about **אשה טובה**, but about **חן טוב**. This latter phrase can be identified in **נבחר שם מעשר רב מכסף** **חן טוב**. This latter phrase can be identified in **חן טוב** Pr 22.1. **חן טוב** is often analysed and translated as a predicate: “grace is better than ...,” but note **αἰρετώτερον ὄνομα καλὸν ἢ πλοῦτος πολὺς, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον χάρις ἀγαθή**. For “better” we would say **βελτίων**. Hence **נבחר** and **αἰρετώτερον** are also functioning as the predicate of the respective second clause. The Masoretic accentuation attaches a conjunctive accent to **חן**, thus **חן טוב**, making **טוב** an attributive adjective, ‘lovely charm.’ < ὑπὲρ + acc. > is sometimes used with an adjective in the comparative degree, e.g. **ὄξύτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς λύκους τῆς Ἀραβίας** ‘swifter than the wolves of Arabia’ Hb 1.8; for more examples, see *GELS* s.v. **ὑπὲρ II 1 b**.

The second half of the verse is syntactically complicated. If this is meant to be a self-standing nominal clause, its *s* is wanting, for **חן טובת** can be only its predicate. Besides, what we have given in our translation above would have to be worded differently in Hebrew.⁴⁵ Cf. the formulation of the biblical “proof text” that is probably at the back of the author’s mind: **אשת-חיל מי ימצא ורחק מפנינים מכרה** Pr 31.10.

א presents yet another reformulation of the underlying message: **לֹא תִחַלֵּךְ לֹא תִחַלֵּךְ לֹא תִחַלֵּךְ לֹא תִחַלֵּךְ** ‘Do not swap a good and good-looking woman for pearls.’ **א** also zooms in on the woman’s physical charm: **לֹא**

⁴⁵ Mopsik’s (108) rendering does not exactly match **א**: “celle qui est dotée de grâce vaut mieux que les perles.” He also states that **חן טובת** derives from Na 3.4 and **פנינים** from Pr 31.10, but our author must have known that the former is said of a whore (**זונה**) and the latter of a model housewife.

תָּפֹד מִן אֲתֵתָא חֲכִימָתָא וְטָבָתָא יְאִיִּוְתָא דִּילָהּ מִיְתְרָא הִי מִן דְּהָבָא בְּקָיָא
 ‘You shall not go away from a wise and good woman. Her beauty exceeds that of tested gold.’

7.20) μὴ κακώσης οἰκέτην ἐργαζόμενον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ
 μηδὲ μίσθιον διδόντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ·

*Do not mistreat a domestic staff working dutifully
 nor a wholly dedicated employee*

(A) אַל תַּדַּע בְּאֵמֶת עֹבֵד אֵמֶת וְכֵן שׁוֹכֵךְ נוֹתֵן נַפְשׁוֹ:
 (C) אַל תִּרְעֵ עֶבֶד עֹבֵד אֵמֶת וְכֵן שְׂכִיר נוֹתֵן נַפְשׁוֹ:
 (D) אַל תִּרְעֵ בְּאֵמֶת עֹבֵד אֵמֶת וְכֵן שְׂכִיר נוֹתֵן נַפְשׁוֹ:

Because of its poor spelling of 𐤀𐤁A one would prefer C.⁴⁶

ἐν ἀληθείᾳ] 𐤀𐤁𐤁 suggests that perhaps באמת is to be adopted,⁴⁷ though a modal adverb can directly modify a verb. E.g. בלכתנו קרי בחקי הברית ‘as we walked contrary to the ordinances of the covenant’ CD 20.29 in dependence on וְהִלַּכְתֶּם עִמִּי בְּקָרִי Lv 26.27.⁴⁸

7.21) οἰκέτην συνετὸν ἀγαπάτω σου ἢ ψυχῆ,
 μὴ στέρησῃς αὐτὸν ἐλευθερίας.

*You should cordially love an intelligent domestic staff,
 do not deprive him of freedom.*

(A) עֶבֶד מִשְׁכִּיל חָבֵב כֹּנֶפֶשׁ [א] ל תִּמְנַע מִמֶּנּוּ חֶפֶשׁ:
 (C) עֶבֶד מִשְׁכִּיל אֱהוּב כֹּנֶפֶשׁ אַל תִּמְנַע מִמֶּנּוּ חוֹפֶשׁ:
 (D) עֶבֶד מִשְׁכִּיל חָבֵב כֹּנֶפֶשׁ אַל תִּמְנַע מִמֶּנּוּ חֶפֶשׁ:

σου ἢ ψυχῆ] 𐤀𐤁A and C כנפש, which, as a prepositional adjunct, can scarcely be the subject of the verb חבב A or אהוב C.⁴⁹ Unless one postulates as its *Vorlage* something like עבד משכיל תאהב נפשך, 𐤀 represents a remarkable departure, focusing on your mental attitude as the determining player. Ψυχῆ in the nominative case cannot substitute for a reflexive pronoun, “you yourself.” Even in the accusative case, ὡς τὴν ψυχὴν σου, is not, in our view, equivalent to “yourself” (σεαυτόν) as is often understood, “comme

⁴⁶ D presents a mixed picture. *Pace* its editors, Elizur and Rand (2011.204), the text reconstructed by them as original, אַל תִּרְעֵ עֹבֵד אֵמֶת, does not agree with 𐤀𐤁𐤁 לְעֵבֶדָא דְּפִלְחָא בְּקִישְׁתָּא, in which the participle is not substantivised. The repetition of אמת is poor, and Abegg reads תַּדַּע. In any event, תַּדַּע here makes no sense.

⁴⁷ Schechter’s (III 46) proposal to read באמר ‘by word’ is contradicted by 𐤀𐤁C and 𐤀𐤁. He further proposes reading נשא instead of נותן on the basis of what he regards as parallel in אֲלִיוֹ הוּא נֹשֵׂא אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ ‘he is looking forward to it [= his wages] eagerly’ Dt 24.15, what is no parallel at all.

⁴⁸ Cf. *SOH* § 31 v (3). *Pace* Smend the bare אמת is not an error.

⁴⁹ Note 𐤁𐤁 D.

toi-même” (Lévi, BJ, Mopsik), “wie dich selbst” (Smend), and “as thyself” (Schechter). We are in favour of “from the bottom of your heart” (Snaith) and “von ganzer Seele” (Ryssel).

In none of the three \mathfrak{H} manuscripts נפש has a suf. pron. attached to it.⁵⁰ \mathfrak{G} often adds a pronoun in the genitive case with a personal referent against \mathfrak{H} , e.g. τῆ προσευχῆ σου < תפילה Si 7.10, 14 et passim.⁵¹ But note τὴν ψυχὴν σου < לבך Si 6.32. It might be going a little too far to suggest that our author meant to say: “Value his humanity, do not treat him just as a useful tool.” Even so we would note that σου ἡ ψυχὴ immediately follows τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ in vs. 20, a kind of fair quid pro quo.

ἀγαπάτω] \mathfrak{H} A חבב, D חבב, and C אהוב. Is there any difference between the two verbs? In BH $\sqrt{\text{חבב}}$ occurs a mere two times: once as a Qal verb, חבב עמיה Dt 33.3 and once as a noun meaning “bosom” חֲבֹי עֲוֹנֵי Jb 31.33. By contrast, in Aramaic it is very common, used here by both \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{H} .⁵² If Ben Sira had at the back of his mind חֲבֹי כְמוֹד Lv 19.18, חבב may be the original reading.⁵³

ἐλευθερίας] \mathfrak{H} A and D חפש, C חופש. חפש in the sense of “freedom” is unknown to BH, though occurring as a fem. noun, חֲפְשָה, in Lv 19.20. This is probably a reference to an ordinance according to which a Hebrew slave is to be set free after six years’ service, see Ex 21.2 and Dt 15.12.

7.22) κτήνη σοί ἐστιν; ἐπισκέπτου αὐτά·
καὶ εἰ ἔστιν σοι χρήσιμα, ἐμμενέτω σοι.

*Have you cattle? Take good care of them.
If they are useful, let them stay with you.*

בהמה לך ראה עיניך (A) ואם אמנה היא העמידה:
בהמָה לְךָ ראה עיניך (D) ואם אִמְנָה היא העמידה:

κτήνη] \mathfrak{H} בהמה could be collective (JM § 135 b), but does not have to be, as shown in \mathfrak{S} בְּעִירָא.

ἐπισκέπτου] \mathfrak{H} ראה. On the meaning of ἐπισκέπτομαι, cf. Je 23.2 and Zc 11.16, where its s is a shepherd and its o his flock. Another possible

⁵⁰ In the photo of \mathfrak{H} D there is no trace of it.

⁵¹ So \mathfrak{S} אִרְשָׁךְ נִפְשָׁךְ.

⁵² Aramaic uses also $\sqrt{\text{רחם}}$ as a synonym. In the well-known dialogue that took place at the shore of the Lake Galilee between Jesus and his chief disciple, Simon Peter, the former asks twice ἀγαπήσθε με Joh 21.15f., to which Peter answers each time φιλω σε, whilst for the third time Jesus Himself changes the question to φιλεῖς με ib. 17. Understandably, a lot of ink has been spilled over the question whether or not the two Greek verbs are mere stylistic variants. We believe they are not, see Muraoka 2020.91f. In an Aramaic dialect called Christian Palestinian Aramaic thought to be affiliated to Mishnaic Hebrew Jesus begins with מְחַב, then changes to חֲחַב, whereas Peter is consistent with חֲחַב. See Lewis and Gibson 1899.226.

⁵³ Even so חבב Piel should have been included in *Index* as an equivalent of ἀγαπάω.

meaning is “to consider, give thought to” (*GELS* s.v. 2), cf. **סָעוּר לֵן**, which can mean either “Attend (to)” or “Inspect,” whereas **סָ בְקִיָּה** means ‘Test it.’

בְּעֵינֶיךָ must be an error for **עֵינֶיךָ**.

χρήσιμα] **ⲐA** and **D** **אִמְנָה**, which cannot mean “useful.” The translator apparently gave up and translated the Heb. word freely. Supposing that it is of **קָטוּל** pattern, we find **אֲמוּנִים** ‘faithful people’ Ps 12.2. The quality of loyalty and trustworthiness can be found with domestic animals. Segal (49) takes it in the sense of “well-trained,” but we find no evidence for such. **שְׂרִירָא** obviously linked **אִמְנָה** with **אִמְתָּ**, but what would “a cattle of truth” mean?

ἐμμενέτω] **ⲐA** and **D** **הַעֲמִידָה**, which can be analysed as a causative form of **Qal עָמַד** as in **שָׁם בְּאַרְץ לֹא עָמַד** 2Kg 15.20.

7.23) τέκνα σοί ἐστίν; παίδευσον αὐτὰ
καὶ κάμψον ἐκ νεότητος τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν.

*Have you children? Educate them
and bend their neck from their youth.*

(A)	בָּנִים לְךָ יִסֵּר אוֹתָם	וְשָׂא לָהֶם נְשִׁים בְּנְעוּרֵיהֶם:
(C)	בָּנִים לְךָ יִסֵּר אוֹתָם	וְשָׂא לָהֶם בְּנְעוּרֵיהֶם:
(D)	בָּנִים לְךָ יִסֵּר אוֹתָם	וְשָׂא לָהֶם נְשִׁים בְּנְעוּרֵיהֶם:

παίδευσον] **ⲐA** **יִסֵּר**, spelled *plena* in lieu of **D** **יִסֵּר**, i.e. **יִסֵּר**. Given the nature of our document the frequency (14×) of the verb, **παιδεύω**, is no wonder. It does not mean, however, “to pass on purely intellectual knowledge or skills” as **διδάσκω**, what is apparent in its Heb. equivalent here. Likewise in 10.1 and 30.13. Cf. *GELS* s.v. **παιδεύω** 2 “to teach lesson by way of punishment, discipline.”

All that **Ⲑ**, in **A**, **C**, and **D**, has common in 23b with **Ⲙ** is **נְעוּרֵי** ‘youth.’ **Ⲙ** agrees with **Ⲑ**. **Ⲑ** says ‘and take them wives in their youth.’⁵⁴ **Ⲙ** reads **וְכֹוּף מִן טְלִיֹּתָא לְצוּרָא דִּילְהוֹן** ‘and bend from (their) youth their neck.’ An erect neck is symbolic of arrogance and haughtiness, cf. **ὕψηλῶ τραχήλῳ** Is 3.16. Note also **οὐδ’ ἂν κάμψῃς ὡς κρῖκον τὸν τράχηλόν σου** Is 58.5. We find an almost verbatim copy of our text in **κάμψον τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ ἐν νεότητι** Si 30.12.

שָׂא] Segal (49) remarks that this is equivalent to **Hi. הַשָּׂא**, referring to **הַאֵב** **הַשָּׂא** **וְלֵהֲשִׂאוּ אִשָּׁה** bQid 28a. But already in **BH** we encounter **Qal נָשָׂא** taking as its *s* not only a bridegroom to be, but also his father. Cp. **נָשָׂא וְלִבְנֵיהֶם** **אֶל־תְּשָׂאוּ לְבָנֵיכֶם** **מִבְּנֹתֵיהֶם לָהֶם וְלִבְנֵיהֶם** **יִב**. 12. See also **Neh 13.25**.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ In **C** **נְשִׁים** has inadvertently dropped out.

⁵⁵ *Pace Lévi* (II 44f.) and *Mopsik* (110) not only the sense “marier,” but also “se marier” are typical of **LBH**. See **BDB** s.v. **נָשָׂא** **Qal 3 d**.

נְעוּרִים as well as זְקוּנִים ‘old age’ are plurale tantum, indicating as the pl. of extension ‘a period in one’s life.’ The pl. suf. pron. in נְעוּרֵיהֶם is not an influencing factor, as is apparent in בְּנְעוּרֶיהָ ‘in her youth’ ἐν νεότητι αὐτῆς Si 42.9 and בְּתוּלֶיהָ ‘in her virginity’ ἐν παρθενίᾳ ib. 10. See *SQH* § 8 d.

7.24) θυγατέρες σοί εἰσιν; πρόσεχε τῷ σώματι αὐτῶν
καὶ μὴ ἰλαρώσης πρὸς αὐτὰς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου.

*Have you daughters? Give heed to their body
and do not be too much of a darling father to them.*

(A) בנות לך נצור שארם ואל תאיר אלהם פנים:
(C) בניים לך נצור שארם ... תאר להם פנים:
(D) בנות לך נצור שארם ואל תאיר אליהם פנים:

[θυγατέρες] HC בניים, plainly an error for A and D בנות.

[τῷ σώματι αὐτῶν] H שארם. In BH שָׂאָר never means “visible, tangible body of an animate being,” but “flesh (as meat)” and “kinsman.” But that is what it means in Si: עוֹשֵׁר שָׂר > C ὑγιεία σώματος ‘bodily health’ 30.16;⁵⁶ שָׂאָר > C τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ‘his cadaver’ 38.16. See also 34.1. The sole exception is B רַעַךְ, M שארך > συγγενοῦς ‘of a kinsman’ 41.21. The message of the proverb is of course about chastity, sexual purity.

The suf. pron. ם־ in lieu of ן־ reminds us of the tendency in QH of the masc. forms replacing the classical fem. ones.⁵⁷ The same holds for A אלהם, D אליהם and D להם.

[ἰλαρώσης] It is difficult to say with certainty whether A תאיר is a *plena* spelling for the Juss. תָּאִיר or indicative of the classical opposition between the Juss. and the Indic. תָּאִיר. C presents תאר. Note D תָּאִיר.⁵⁸

This clause reminds one of יָאֵר יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ וַיְהַנֶּךְּ Nu 6.25. We would not know if some of the author’s readership or audience frowned upon the vulgarisation of the sanctity of the high-priestly blessing. Another example of this idiomatic collocation is found in בְּכֹל מַעֲשֶׂיךָ הָאֵלֶּיךָ פָּנִים ‘whatever you do, look cheerful’ > ἐν πάσει δόσει ἰλαρώσον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ‘when-ever you make an offering ..’ Si 32.11.

7.25) ἔκδου θυγατέρα, καὶ ἔση τετελεκῶς ἔργον μέγα,
καὶ ἀνδρὶ συνετῷ δώρησαι αὐτήν.

*Give (your) daughter in marriage, then you will have completed a big job
and present her to an intelligent fellow.*

⁵⁶ In the margin a more orthodox spelling, שאר, is found.

⁵⁷ For details, see Qimron 2018.284f., § D 2.6.3.

⁵⁸ Cf. an extensive discussion in Van Peursen 2004.82-86, § 6.3.

- (A) הוצא בת ויצא עסק ואל נבון גבר חברה:
 (C) הוציא[א] .. ויצא עסק ואל ג[בר] נבון זבדה:
 (D) הוצא בת ויצא עסק ואל נבון גבר חברה:

ἔκδοσ] \mathfrak{H} A הוצא, C הוציא; the same orthographical fluctuation as between תאיר vs. תאר in the preceding verse.

The use of הוציא in the sense of “to marry (a daughter)” is remarkable. We are not aware of any other instance of $\sqrt{\text{צא}}$ used of marriage. Here is a play on words: הוצא and יצא. When a daughter marries and leaves her father’s care, a major burden or task has left him.

ἔση τετελεκῶς] The author could have said πεποιηκῶς. However, bringing a daughter out into the world, raising her carefully and lovingly, finding a respectable partner, and arranging a wedding is a major task (ἔργον μέγα). When she goes off on a honeymoon, he could sigh a deep sigh of relief and mumble, Τετέλεσται ‘Mission complete!’ The selection of the personal subject, 2ms, as against the impersonal, עסק, as the *s* of יצא is rather felicitous as an expression of the sense of achievement. Furthermore, a rare instance of the periphrastic < ἔσσομαι + pf. ptc. act. > underlines the continuation of a state of affairs that has emerged as in ἡμαρτηκῶς ἔσσομαι πρὸς σὲ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ‘I shall remain a sinner against you the rest of my life’ Gn 43.9;⁵⁹ now that she is married, I shall remain free from her care for good.⁶⁰

ἔργον μέγα] \mathfrak{H} עסק, a substantive unknown to BH, but quite common in MH, הוֹי מְמַעַט בְּעֵסֶק וְעֵסֶק בְּתוֹרָה, ‘Decrease your involvement in business and occupy yourself in the Law’ mAb 4.10. In Si alone we find it attested five times: 3.22, 7.25, 11.10, 38.24, 40.1.⁶¹

ἀνδρῖ] \mathfrak{H} A and D: גבר. Though ἀνήρ can mean ‘husband,’ that cannot, *pace* Snaith (44), have been intended here by the translator.

συνετῶ] The position of the adjectival Ptc. is odd in \mathfrak{H} A and D נבון גבר as against C גבר נבון. If נבון is meant as substantivised, hence in the st. cst., we would expect נבון גברים.

δώρησαι] \mathfrak{H} C זבדה, i.e. זָבְדָה ‘Bestow her,’ quite distinct from A חברה, i.e. הִבְרָה ‘Connect her.’ Whilst δίδωμι, a far more frequent synonym, has a rather wide range of meanings, δωρέω, which occurs only 8 times in SG and always in the middle voice, signifies, true to its derivation from δωρεά ‘gift,

⁵⁹ Cf. *SSG* § 31 fi (ii).

⁶⁰ *Pace* Fassberg (1997.58) ויצא עסק cannot be analysed as an apodosis of a conditional statement, since what precedes introduced with הוצא, an impv., cannot constitute a protasis. Likewise הִיטב לַצְדִיק וּמַצָּא תְשׁוּבָה וּמַצָּא תְשׁוּבָה וּמַצָּא תְשׁוּבָה וּמַצָּא תְשׁוּבָה 12.2. Καί can “introduce an apodosis and indicate a consequence to follow when a request or a command is acted upon” (*GELS* s.v. 10), e.g. Ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με, καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς אָלֶיְכֶם וְאָשׁוּב יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְאָשׁוּב אֵלַי נָאם זc 1.3.

⁶¹ We fail to see whence “sorrow” of Box - Oesterley (341) comes. Likewise “soucis” (*BJ*).

present,’ means ‘to present, bestow.’ A father has invested much in raising a daughter of his about to marry as a valuable gift to her future husband. The translator may be conscious of what Leah said: זְבַדְנִי אֱלֹהִים אֲתִי יָבֵד טוֹב > \mathfrak{G} Δεδώρηται μοι ὁ θεὸς δῶρον καλόν Gn 30.20, where the gift is, however, a baby boy.

7.26) γυνή σοί ἐστιν κατὰ ψυχὴν; μὴ ἐκβάλλῃς αὐτήν·
καὶ μισουμένη μὴ ἐμπιστεύσῃς σεαυτὸν.

*Have you a wife you are happy with? Do not expel her.
And do not entrust yourself to a distasteful one.*

אשה לך אל תתעבה וישנאיה אל תאמן בה: (A)
אשה לך אל תתעבבא וישנאיה אל תאמן בה: (D)

κατὰ ψυχὴν] a plus in \mathfrak{G} , but $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{H}$. Smend, justly referring to the three preceding verses, which are all analogously worded with לך, holds that there is no place for this plus. However, the logical relationship between the two halves of those three verses and that in the current verse are not the same. The Gk translator may have thought that the following μισουμένη calls for an antonymic counterpart. Then his grandfather was introducing an exception to the general rule formulated in the first line.

ἐκβάλλῃς] which could represent הוצא in vs. 27. \mathfrak{S} לֹא תִשְׁבַּקֶיהָ ‘Do not leave [= divorce] her’ is closer to \mathfrak{G} than to \mathfrak{H} . \mathfrak{G} might be envisaging a step a husband is advised not to take in accordance with his assessment of his spouse as abhorrent.

μισουμένη] \mathfrak{H} הוואה, which is extraposed up front. \mathfrak{G} is slightly more elegant in style than mechanically translated καὶ μισουμένη μὴ ἐμπιστεύσῃς σεαυτὸν αὐτή. \mathfrak{S} reads עֲוֵלָה ‘wicked.’ Did the translator ask himself why the woman could be hated?

7.27) Ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ σου δόξασον τὸν πατέρα σου
καὶ μητρὸς ὠδίννας μὴ ἐπιλάθῃ.

*Honour your father wholeheartedly,
and do not forget your mother’s birth-pangs.*

This and the following verse have not been preserved in any of the three Hebrew manuscripts, probably a case of homioiarcton with vss. 27 and 29 beginning with בכל לבך, so Smend. But \mathfrak{S} reads יְקַר לְבָבְךָ לְאָבוּיָךְ וְלִמְאֵתְךָ אֶתְּמַעֲא דִי לֹא תִשְׁבַּחֶיהָ ‘with your whole heart honour your father and the mother who bore you you shall not forget’ is not exactly identical with \mathfrak{G} , hence probably had a Heb. *Vorlage*. Then, in view of \mathfrak{S} יְקַר, \mathfrak{S} שִׁבַּח ‘praise’ may not be an accurate rendering of δόξασον, although \mathfrak{S} does at times represent δοξάζω, e.g. Si 3.2.

7.28) μνήσθητι ὅτι δι' αὐτῶν ἐγεννήθης,
καὶ τί ἀνταποδώσεις αὐτοῖς καθὼς αὐτοὶ σοί;

*Remember that you were born through them,
and what could you repay them as they have done for you?*

§ reads: זָכוֹרְתָּ אֶת־כָּבוֹדָם וְלֹא־יִשְׁכַּחְתָּ אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם וְלֹא־יִשְׁכַּחְתָּ אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם 'Remember that but for them you would not exist and what could you repay them who have raised you?'

δι' αὐτῶν] שְׁחַחְתָּ אֶת־הֵרָא 'through her.'

7.29) ἐν ὅλῃ ψυχῇ σου εὐλαβοῦ τὸν κύριον
καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοῦ θαύμαζε.

*With your whole soul revere the Lord
and show respect to His priests.*

(A) בְּכָל־לִבְךָ־פָחַד־אֱלֹהִים וְאֶת־כֹּהֲנָיו־הַקְּדוֹשִׁים:

(D) בְּכָל־לִבְךָ־פָחַד־אֱלֹהִים וְאֶת־כֹּהֲנָיו־הַקְּדוֹשִׁים:

εὐλαβοῦ] פָּחַד. Both Lévi and Smend justly point out that in BH the verb does not take a zero-object. We need bear in mind, however, that the verb is only rarely used in Qal and in only two cases, Ho 3.5 and Mi 7.17, its object is God, where the preposition אֶל is used.

θαύμαζε] שִׁבַּח, an unusual equation attested only here. § reads קָרַב 'Honour!'. Does שִׁבַּח mean here "Relate to His priests as those set apart for His service"? For a rather unusual meaning of θαυμάζω, cf. ἐγὼ καθ' ἑνὸς ἐκάστου ὑμῶν θαυμάζω 'I admire each one of you' 4M 8.5 // ὑπερτιμάω 'to think very highly of.' Cf. § *sanctifica*.

7.30) ἐν ὅλῃ δυνάμει ἀγάπησον τὸν ποιήσαντά σε
καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπη.

*With all (your) ability love the One who made you
and His ministers do not leave in the lurch.*

(A) בְּכָל־מְאֹדְךָ־אָהַבְתָּ־עוֹשֶׂה־יְהוָה וְאֶת־מְשָׁרְתָיו־לֹא־תַעֲזֹב:

(D) בְּכָל־מְאֹדְךָ־אָהַבְתָּ־עוֹשֶׂה־יְהוָה וְאֶת־מְשָׁרְתָיו־לֹא־תַעֲזֹב:

7.31) φοβοῦ τὸν κύριον καὶ δόξασον ἱερέα
καὶ δὸς τὴν μερίδα αὐτῷ, καθὼς ἐντέταλταί σοι,
ἀπαρχὴν καὶ περὶ πλημμελείας καὶ δόσιν βραχιόνων
καὶ θυσίαν ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ ἀπαρχὴν ἁγίων.

*Fear the Lord and honour the priest
and give him the share (due to him), as you have been commanded,
first-fruits and guilt-offering and a gift of shoulders
and a sacrifice of sanctification and first-fruits of sacred things.*

(Aa)	כבד אל והדר כהן	ות[ן ח]לקם כאשר צוותה:
(Ab)	לחם אברים ותרומת ד'	[זבח ח] צדק ותרומת קדש:
(Da)	כבד אל והדר כהן	ותן חלקם כאשר צויתה: ⁶²
(Db)	לחם אבירי־ם תרומתה	... צדק ותרומת קדש:

φοβοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A כבד and D כבד, the only instance in SG of this unusual equation. \mathfrak{S} לחם אבירי־ם is odd with the fem. suf. pronoun, for there is no fem. noun in the neighbourhood.

ἐντέταλται σοι] \mathfrak{H} A צוותה and D צויתה, Pu. Whereas in Heb. this verb in Pu. can have as its subject a person receiving an order, this is transformed in Gk to an impersonal construction as here. So כִּי־יִכַן צוֹיְתִי Lv 10.13 > οὕτω γὰρ ἐντέταλται μοι. Also כִּי־אֲשֶׁר צוֹיְתִי Ez 24.18 > ὃν τρόπον ἐπετάγη μοι. Alternatively a person commanding is made the subject as in כִּי־יִכַן צוֹיְתִי Lv 8.35 > οὕτως γὰρ ἐνετείλατό μοι κύριος ὁ θεός. So also Ez 12.7, 37.7.

Then follows a list of what is to be given to priests. We note some discrepancy between \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} not only in the contents of things to be given, but also in their number, four as against five. In \mathfrak{S} we see a drastic reduction, merely two: \mathfrak{S} לחם אבירי־ם = \mathfrak{G} לחם אבירי־ם.

ἀπαρχῆν] \mathfrak{H} A לחם אבירים and D לחם אבירי־ם, a most unusual phrase, not known as part of the cultic terminology.⁶³ Even if לחם is taken in a generic sense of “food,” what would “food of bulls,” whether “food for bulls” or “meat of bulls,” mean? Readers of \mathfrak{G} might justly ask: “first-fruits of what?”. Alternatively, לחם may have been read by the translator as חלב, i.e. חלב ‘fat (on the surface of animals’ skin).’ This equation occurs 5 times, all in Nu 18, e.g. πᾶσα ἀπαρχὴ ἐλαίου καὶ πᾶσα ἀπαρχὴ οἴνου καὶ σίτου, ἀπαρχὴ αὐτῶν, ὅσα ἂν δῶσι τῷ κυρίῳ 18.12 < כָּל חֶלֶב יִצְהָר וְכָל־חֶלֶב תִּירוֹשׁ וְדָגָן < רֵאשִׁיתם אֲרָר־יִתְּנוּ לַיהוָה, where ἀπαρχὴ once translates ראשית as well and Ὅταν ἀφαιρῆτε τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ λογισθήσεται τοῖς Λευίταις ὡς γέννημα ἀπὸ ἄλω καὶ ὡς γέννημα ἀπὸ ληνοῦ 18.30 < בְּהַרְימְכֶם אֶת־חֶלְבוֹ < מִמֶּנּוּ וְנָתַתְּם לְלוֹיִם כְּתִבוּאָת גִּזְרֹן וְכְתִבוּאָת יָקָב תּוֹרַת הָאֲשֶׁם תִּגְזֹר, where the offering is a share due to Levites. The usual rendering of חלב is στέαρ. It is somewhat doubtful that the average reader could have understood ἀπαρχὴ in the sense of ‘animal fat’ without wider context.

περὶ πλημμελείας] a plus. The meaning must be “(an offering) made to atone for sinful acts,” but a mere prepositional phrase cannot be analysed as substantivised. This holds for a mechanical rendering in \mathfrak{S} מִטּוֹל סְכֻלוֹתָא.

On the combination with περί, see ὁ νόμος τοῦ κριοῦ τοῦ περὶ τῆς πλημμελείας Lv 7.1, quite expanded from תּוֹרַת הָאֲשֶׁם, and ἀργύριον περὶ ἀμαρτίας καὶ ἀργύριον περὶ πλημμελείας 4Kg 12.17 < כֶּסֶף אֲשֶׁם וְכֶסֶף תְּשׂאוֹת.⁶⁴

⁶² Though Abegg reads צוותה, the third letter looks distinctly *yod* in the MS.

⁶³ Smend reads אשמים, which is now accepted by nobody.

⁶⁴ On the complicated syntactic behaviour of πλημμέλεια, see *GELS* s.v.

δόσιν βραχιόνων] $\mathfrak{H}A$ י' תרומת. D is amiss: תרומתה.

θυσίαν ἁγιασμοῦ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ זבחי צדק. There is no instance in SG of the equation קדֶּשׁ / ἁγιασμός.

In summing up, the grandson appears to have had quite a struggle. That applies to \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}h$.

7.32) Καὶ πτωχῶ ἔκτεινον τὴν χειρὰ σου,
ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ εὐλογία σου.

*Also extend your hand to the poor
so that your blessing may be completed.*

(A) וגם לאביו[ן הן] שׂיט יד למען תשלם ב[ר]כתך:
(D) וגם לאביו הושיטה יד למען תשלם ברכתך:

Καὶ] not a usual “and,” as shown in \mathfrak{H} גם. One is to be concerned not only about priests, but also about the poor. $\mathfrak{S}h$ וְלְבִישָׁא is too mechanical.

πτωχῶ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ לאביו. לאביו in D must be a scribal error.

ἔκτεινον] $\mathfrak{H}A$ הושיט // D הושיטה. For a discussion of the long imperative with a critical assessment of Fassberg’s (1994.13-35) view, see Qimron 2018.170-73.

ἡ εὐλογία σου] ‘the blissful state conferred on and enjoyed by you’ rather than ‘the benediction pronounced by you.’ That is, an objective, not subjective genitive.⁶⁵ If this proverb echoes “so that the Levites (who have no allotment or inheritance of their own) and the foreigners, the fatherless and the widows who live in your towns may come and eat and be satisfied, and so that the LORD your God may bless you in all the work of your hands” Dt 14.29, then it would be a blessing to be conferred by God, and τελειωθῇ could imply a realisation of the divine blessing.⁶⁶

7.33) χάρις δόματος ἔναντι παντὸς ζῶντος,
καὶ ἐπὶ νεκρῶ μὴ ἀποκωλύσης χάριν.

*A charitable gift to every living being
also from the dead do not withhold charity.*

(A) תן מתן לפני כל חי וגם ממת אל תמנע חסד:
(D) תן מתן לפני כל חי וגם ממת ל תמנע חסד:

χάρις] = חן, ≠ $\mathfrak{H}A$ and D תן ‘Give!’. Whereas 33b) is a normal verbal clause, תן מתן לפני כל חי is a clause formed in a rather awkward fashion. This

⁶⁵ On this syntactic question, see *SSG* § 22 v (xii-xiii).

⁶⁶ Segal (50) mentions *Secrets of Enoch* 50.1, where we read: “Stretch forth your hands to the orphan and to the widow, and according to your power help the poor, and thus you shall find your reward on the judgement-day.”

may have led the Syriac translator to a distinct syntactic analysis: $\text{סִי הִי הַקְּדָא הִי בְּרִיתָא}$ ‘for a gift is charity in the eyes of all people.’

ἐναντι] MA and D לפני. This Heb. pseudo-preposition can scarcely be used as equivalent to the dative indicating someone who is given something. Ἐναντι cannot be used that way, either. If תן לפני were original,⁶⁷ the combination would mean ‘Place before!’ נתן as a synonym of שם is well known, e.g. וַיִּתֵּן לְפָנֵיהֶם ‘and he set it [= food] before them’ 2Kg 4.44.⁶⁸ Segal thinks otherwise, referring to וַיִּתֵּן לְפָנֵיכֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ Dt 1.8, where Israelites are looking forward to the promised land,⁶⁹ and תִּתְּנוּ לְפָנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Josh 10.12, where the defeat of Amorites took place in the sight of Israelites.

παντός ζῶντος] MA and D כל חי, which, *pace* Segal (50), does not include animals, for ζῶντος is in contrast to νεκρῶ. In ὑψοῦτε αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον παντός ζῶντος, καθότι αὐτὸς ἡμῶν κύριός ἐστιν To 13.4 and ἡτοιμάσας χορτάσματα ἐν ἐρήμῳ παντὶ ζῶντι PSol 5.10 (a reference to Israelites’ 40 years in the wilderness) the phrase refers to humans.

καὶ] MA and D וגם; see above at vs. 32, and note S הַאֲנִי as against the bare S הַ.

ἐπὶ νεκρῶ] MA and D ממת. Gk verbs meaning “to withhold, prevent” often combine with ἀπό.⁷⁰ *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ II 17 says “Marks a personal entity who is or could be affected by a given utterance or deed” and adduces only one example, ἐφ’ ὑμῖν ἀγαθόν ‘acceptable to you’ 1C 13.2. We could add our example here. As an example of a charitable deed to the dead Segal (50) mentions Gn 47.29, where Jacob requests Joseph to bury him back home, not in Egypt, and that is said to be a display of וַאֲמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ. According to Smend, not only proper burial,⁷¹ but also food and drink offered at an ancestral grave are meant. Smend refers to To 4.17, on which cf. Fitzmyer 2003.176f.

7.34) μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαιόντων
καὶ μετὰ πενθούντων πένθησον.

*Do not absent yourself from (a gathering of) mourners
and with mourners mourn.*

אל תתאחר מבוכים ועם אבלים התאבל: (A)
אל תתאחר מבוכים ועם אבילים התאבל: (D)

⁶⁷ Rejected by Smend: “falsch, denn dem Gottlosen soll man nichts geben,” but the biblical teaching is surely more generous, e.g. a day-off once a week was to be provided for alien employees, for Israelites were such in Egypt.

⁶⁸ A considerable number of examples with diverse prepositions are mentioned in BDB s.v. נתן Qal 2 a.

⁶⁹ Cf. Rashi ad loc. “with your own eyes you see; I am not speaking by guessing or passing on a rumour.”

⁷⁰ Which Smend thinks to be original, but has been corrected in order to discourage the pagan practice of the worship of the dead.

⁷¹ “die [letzte] Gnade” (Ryssel).

ύστερει] \mathfrak{H} A and D רתתא 'you will be too late,' likewise \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sh} רתתת. The value of ־מ and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$ is difficult to determine. In *GELS* s.v. $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ its sense is defined as "to be absent," adducing also $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o} \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ Jb 36.17. Scholars mention $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha} \chi\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, $\kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha} \kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ Ro 12.15.

7.35) $\mu\eta \delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\nu\epsilon\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$.

*Do not hesitate to visit a sick person
 for by such people you shall be loved.*

(A) אל תשא לב מאוהב כי ממנו תאהב:

It is extremely difficult to make sense of the first line in \mathfrak{H} . \mathfrak{S} = לֹא תִמְאַן לְךָ 'and do not be weary of visiting the sick.' All that can be retrieved with a measure of confidence is the last word to be read as כּוֹאֵב 'those in pain.' It would then mean something like "Do not turn your mind away from those in pain!"

$\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$] This is one of a few rare instances of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ being equivalent to the more usual $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$ marking an agent with a passive verb, see *GELS* s.v. 9 and *SSG* § 63 e. That it is not necessarily a Hebraism is proven by $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ 'I am being wronged by you' Gn 16.5 < \mathfrak{H} $\text{עָלֶיךָ מְסִי עֲלֶיךָ}$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\theta\eta\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega \sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\omega\theta \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon \tau\epsilon\theta\lambda\iota\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon$ 'gifts will be offered to the Lord .. by an afflicted people' Is 18.7 < \mathfrak{H} $\text{וּבְלִשִׁי לִיְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עִם מְשֻׁךְ עִם}$. A slightly different perspective is evidenced in \mathfrak{S} מְטוֹל 'on account of' and \mathfrak{Sh} בְּיַד 'through.'

$\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$] \mathfrak{H} תאהב, i.e. תאהב. Is this a prediction of a consequence bound to ensue? Or obligative? "Don't say, 'I couldn't be bothered with sick people. I would rather seek friendship with healthy people.' Those in pain would appreciate your care and attention. It is such people that you should be concerned about." This analysis accords with the fronted $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$.

Many assign $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ and ־מ a causal function and parse $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ as neut., not masc. Thus "dafür" (Smend), "auf Grund solcher Dingen" (Ryssel), "en" (Lévi), "par de tels actes" (BJ), "for that" (Box - Oesterley), "for these things" (Skehan - Di Lella), "by such visits" (Snaith), "because of such deeds" (NETS), but "de lui" (Mopsik). \mathfrak{S} מְטוֹל הֵלֵן probably falls under the former, but \mathfrak{Sh} $\text{בְּיַד דְּאִיךָ הֵלֵן}$ possibly under the latter.

7.36) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu \tau\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\varsigma \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma \sigma\omicron\upsilon \mu\iota\mu\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon \tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\alpha$,
 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\chi \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

*Whatever you do, remember the end,
 and you shall never sin.*

(A) בכל מעשיך זכור אחרית ולעולם לא תשחת:
 (D) בכל מעשיך זכור אחרית ולעולם לא תשחת:

τοῖς λόγοις σου] ܡܥܫܝܟܢܐ. Readers ignorant of Heb. might take λόγος here as meaning “word uttered.” This Gk substantive, most likely influenced by ܡܢܚܐ, which can mean “matter, affair” as well as “word uttered,” means at times in SG “*course of action, step to be taken*” (*GELS* s.v. 5). In four out of five instances mentioned in *GELS* it corresponds to ܡܢܚܐ and a direct object of ποιέω, e.g. τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ λόγον, ὃν ποιήσομεν Je 49(ܡ 42).3. In one instance the noun is a direct object of λέγω as well as ποιέω: τοῦτόν σοι τὸν λόγον, ὃν εἶρηκας, ποιήσω Ex 33.17. See also Jd 21.1 A, Zc 8.16. The exception mentioned is πᾶς λόγος οὐχ ὑπερῆρεν αὐτόν ‘nothing was too hard for him’ Si 48.13 < ܡܢܚܐ ܢܦܠܐ ܡܡܢܐ. In ܡܢܚܐ ܡܠܝܟܐ ܩܠܝܢܐ the noun can mean “affair” as well as “word,” but never “deed.” By contrast, ܡܢܚܐ = ܡܥܫܝܟܢܐ.

ἁμαρτήσεις] ܡܢܚܐܢܐ. What value to be assigned to these verbs is the same as the question discussed in vs. 35. E.g. “wirst .. nicht sündigen” (Smend, Ryssel, *SD*), “ne pécheras” (*BJ*), “will never go wrong” (Snaith), “non peccabis” (*L*). By contrast ܡܢܚܐܢܐ in ܡ and ܡܢܚܐ is more likely to be injunctive.⁷²

⁷² On the values of the Syriac tenses, cf. Muraoka 2005 § 82.

CHAPTER 8

8.1) Μὴ διαμάχου μετὰ ἀνθρώπου δυνάστου,
μήποτε ἐμπέσης εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

*Do not contend with a powerful person,
in case you fall into his hands.*

ⲘA and D have preserved two alternative versions. We see that Ⲙ follows neither version consistently. A and D disagree among themselves only in one detail: the last word in their respective first version.

(Aa) אל תריב עם איש גדול למה תשוב על [ל]בו
 (Ab) אל תריב עם קשה מ[מך] למה תפול בידו
 (Da) אל [ת]ר[יב עם איש גדול] ל[מה] תשוב על ידו
 (Db) אל תריב [עם קשה] ממך למה תפול בידו

διαμάχου] In SG this verb appears to indicate an armed conflict, as it translates גָּלַח in διαμάχεσθαι Dn 10.20 LXX // τῆ πολεμῆσαι. By contrast, Heb. רָב expresses verbal conflict or contest. This is the case also in רִיבְנָה אוּ בָאָנְרָה אֶת־רַעְוָהּ בְּאָבְנָהּ Ex 21.18, where what started off as a quarrel (Ⲙ λουδορῶνται) deteriorates to a bodily, physical fight. Cf. Ⲙⲓ תִּנְצָא ‘you quarrel’ and μὴ ἔριζε ‘Do not quarrel!’ in vs. 2.

ἀνθρώπου δυνάστου] Ⲙ (Aa) איש גדול. Δυνάστης is a substantive meaning “powerful person,” which makes ἀνθρώπου superfluous. This is modelled on a Heb. phrase such as איש כֹּהֵן Lv 21.9, an appositional phrase in which the first component is generic and the second more specific.¹ Here δυνάστης is virtually an adjective.

μήποτε] Ⲙ למה. It is not impossible to see here a rhetorical question: “Why should you ..?,” but as justly noted by Segal (52) the word with Impf. is virtually equivalent to פֶּן. For more examples, see BDB s.v. מָה 4. Also note that, in vs. 2, פֶּן stands in a comparable position: < אַל - Impf. וְ - Impf. >. See also below at 37.8 and 38.21.

Ⲙⲓ תשוב על לְבוֹ, an obscure expression. All that is known to BH of the combination of the verb שָׁב, of whichever conjugation, and לֵב or לִבָּב is where it means “to bring back to mind, take into consideration” with Hi. הָשִׁיב, as in וְאֵת אֲשֵׁיב אֶל־לִבִּי La 3.21 > Ⲙ ταύτην τάξω εἰς τὴν καρδίαν μου.² Obviously this does not apply here.

¹ Cf. JM § 130 b, SQH § 29 c, and SSG § 33 c, d.

² For more attestations, see BDB s.v. שׁוּב Hiph. 8.

τάς χειρας αὐτοῦ] \mathfrak{H} (Ab) and (Db) ידו. There is no absolute need to postulate a *defectiva* spelling for ידו. Where ד is used as a metaphor for “control, power,” there is no absolutely rigid rule about the grammatical number of χεῖρ as its rendering as shown in καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ παραδίδωμι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἕκαστον εἰς χεῖρας τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς χεῖρας βασιλέως αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατακόψουσιν τὴν γῆν, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξέλωμαι ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῶν Zc 11.6 < וְהָיָה אֲנֹכִי מְמַצֵּא אֶת־הָאָדָם אִישׁ בְּיַד־רֵעֵהוּ וּבְיַד מְלִכּוֹ וְכַתְּתוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ < וְלֹא אֶצִּיל מִיָּדָם. In Heb. the sg. is very common. In δὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν εἰς λιμὸν καὶ ἄθροισον αὐτούς εἰς χεῖρας μαχαίρας (עַל־יְדֵי־חֶרֶב) Je 18.21 it is not necessarily about a double-bladed sword.

- 8.2) μὴ ἔριξε μετὰ ἀνθρώπου πλουσίου,
μὴποτε ἀντιστήση σου τὴν ὀλκὴν·
πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀπώλεσεν τὸ χρυσίον
καὶ καρδίας βασιλέων ἐξέκλινεν.

*Do not quarrel with a wealthy person
in case he outweighs you.
For gold destroyed many
and led the heart of kings astray.*

(Aa) אל תחרש על] איש לא הון פן ישקל מהירך ואבדת:
(Ab) כי רבים הפחזו זהב וה[ון י]שגה ל[ב נ]דיבים:
(Da) אל תחרוש [על] איש לו הון [פ]ן [ישקל] ל[מ]הירך ואבדת:
(Db) כִּי רַב־בַּיִתָּה [פחזו זהב] והֵן מִשְׁנֵה לְבוֹתָ [נ]דיבים:

ἔριξε] \mathfrak{H} A תחרש, *plena* spelled in \mathfrak{H} D תחרוש ‘you plot,’ a rather free rendition. Or is תחרב meant as we have proposed in *Index* on the basis of 4K 3.23? There in the proto-Lucianic Antiochaeon version we read ἐρίσαντες γὰρ ἤρισαν οἱ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς < \mathfrak{H} הַרְבּוּ הַמְלָכִים < \mathfrak{H} A לא, corrected in the margin to לו as in \mathfrak{H} D.

We have here an asyndetic relative clause, איש אשר לו הון = איש לו הון.³ \mathfrak{S} מְרֵא דְהַבָּא ‘a possessor of gold’ may have mentally erased לא, which may have stood in his *Vorlage* uncorrected, and parsed איש as being in the st. cst. \mathfrak{S} ן בְּרִנְשָׁא עֲתִירָא \mathfrak{N} ן ‘a rich person’ is straightforward.

ὀλκὴν] \mathfrak{H} מחיר ‘price, value,’ which makes sense with a rich man as the s than ‘weight.’ So \mathfrak{S} מתקלה ‘your weight.’ Even so it is not here about a wrestling or sumo match, “weight” must be meant in its metaphorical, financial sense. Segal (52) and Mopsik⁴ take ישקל in its literal sense, i.e. weighing money in order to bribe the judge. Are they running away with their creative imagination?

³ On this syntactic feature, see JM § 158 b and SQH § 44 d.

⁴ According to him נדיבים is a reference to judges.

The conjunctive ואבדת ‘then you will perish’ is missing in \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{S} , in which latter it emerges in the form of אָרָבַד ‘it destroyed’ as a rendering of הפחית.

ἀπώλεσεν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ הפחית ‘it made reckless.’

καρδίας] = $\mathfrak{H}D$ לבות, ≠ $\mathfrak{H}A$ ל.

βασιλέων] $\mathfrak{H}A$ דִּיבִים and D דִּיבִים, a rather free rendering. Cf. \mathfrak{S} מְלִכָא = \mathfrak{C} .

ἐξέκλινεν] Either Impf. or Aor., which latter concords with ἀπώλεσεν in 2c). By contrast, $\mathfrak{H}D$ reads משגה as against A שגה, which could be restored as השגה, i.e. השגה. שגה as restored in BSH could indicate a theoretical possibility: ‘it could lead astray,’ cf. *SQH* § 15 *dae*. Then it would be synonymous with משגה. Cf. \mathfrak{S} אַטְסָמ, Ptc.

- 8.3) μὴ διαμάχου μετὰ ἀνθρώπου γλωσσώδους
καὶ μὴ ἐπιστοιβάσης ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτοῦ ξύλα.

*Do not contend with a talkative person
and do not pile up wood on his fire.*

אל תינץ עם איש לשון (A) ואל תתן על אש עץ:
אל תינץ עם איש [לשון] (D) [ואל תתן] על אש עצים:

διαμάχου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ and D תינץ, a shortened Ni. jussive of נָצַץ ‘to struggle’ spelled *plena*, i.e. נָצַץ. On this Gk verb, see above at vs. 1.

ἀνθρώπου γλωσσώδους] $\mathfrak{H}A$ איש לשון. The same Heb. phrase occurs also in Ps 140.12 > \mathfrak{C} ἀνήρ γλωσσώδης. There \mathfrak{H} appears to mean “slanderer.” However, our Gk adjective is used in Si 25.20 about a talkative wife as against a quiet (ἡσυχος) husband. The same sense appears to be applicable to our case here, cf. \mathfrak{S} גַּבְרָא פְּכָנָא ‘chatterbox’ and \mathfrak{S} לְשׁוֹן לְשׁוֹןָא ‘loquacious person.’ No Heb. text has been preserved for the phrase. See also below at 9.18.

ξύλα] $\mathfrak{H}A$ עץ, D עצים. The latter may have stood in the *Vorlage*;⁵ note the selection of the pl. for “firewood” in אֵשׁ בְּעֵצִים πυρὸς ἐν ξύλοις Zc 12.6 and הָיָה הָעֵץ הַזֶּה לְאֵשׁ וְהָעֵץ הַזֶּה לְאֵשׁ נִתַּן דְּבָרֵי בְּפִיךָ דְּעָמְרִי דְּעָמְרִי דְּעָמְרִי דְּעָמְרִי דְּעָמְרִי δέδωκα τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς τὸ στόμα σου πῦρ καὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ξύλα Je 5.14.

- 8.4) μὴ πρόσπαιζε ἀπαιδεύτω,
ἵνα μὴ ἀτιμάζωνται οἱ πρόγονοί σου.

*Do not make fun of uneducated people
in order that your ancestors may not be dishonoured.*

... תרגיל עם איש אויל (A) פן יבוז לנדיבים:
א [ל] תרגיל עם איש אויל (D) פן יבוז ל[נדיבים]:

⁵ As Segal (52) rightly notes, the space after the *tsade* is illegible. *Pace* Smend there is plenty of room after the letter.

πρόσπαιζε] \mathfrak{H} A and D תרגיל, a rare verb in BH and none of its commonly agreed meanings fits in here. MH uses Hi. הִרְגִּיל in the sense of “to accustom,” a causative of רָגַל “accustomed, in the habit of.” We suggest that in our case it is an ingressive Hi.,⁶ “to become accustomed.” Hence “Do not meet him too often!”

ἀπαιδεύτω] \mathfrak{H} A and D איש אויל ‘a foolish person.’ Cf. \mathfrak{S} וְלִילָא ‘shameless.’

ἀτιμάζονται] \mathfrak{H} A and D יבוז ‘he despises.’ The transformation of the active to the passive voice underlines an impact on the victim.

Cf. \mathfrak{S} וְנִצְעָרוּךְ יִקְרָא ‘nobles will disgrace you.’

πρόγονοί] \mathfrak{H} A and D נדיבים ‘nobles,’ an unusual rendering. Equally unusual is βασιλεῖς in vs. 2.

8.5) μὴ ὀνειδίξε ἄνθρωπον ἀποστρέφοντα ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας·
μνήσθητι ὅτι πάντες ἐσμὲν ἐν ἐπιτίμοις.

Do not insult a person who turns away from sin.

Remember that we are all liable to punishment.

: אל תכלים איש שב מפשע זכר כי כלנו חייבים (A)

: אֵל תְּכַלִּים אִישׁ שֶׁבַּ מַפְשַׁע זָכַר כִּי כָלְנוּ חַיִּיבִים (D)

ὀνειδίξε] \mathfrak{H} A and D תכלים. *GELS* s.v. regards ὀνειδίξω as meaning “to censure, criticise.” But it also admits “to insult” as another. In the light of \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{S} / \mathfrak{S} ל תְּהַסֵּד the latter can be selected. One is advised not to remind a remorseful penitent of the dark pages of his past.⁷

ἐν ἐπιτίμοις] lit. ‘among those liable to punishment,’ \mathfrak{H} A and D חייבים = \mathfrak{S} חֲטִיין. חוב occurs a mere three times in BH, whereas חַיִּב in the sense of “guilty” is quite common in MH. Cf. \mathfrak{S} ל בְּכַאֲתָא ‘in reproaches,’ for which the margin mentions \mathfrak{G} written in Greek.

8.6) μὴ ἀτιμάσης ἄνθρωπον ἐν γήρᾳ αὐτοῦ
καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν γηράσκουσιν.

*Do not despise a person for being old
for some of us are also growing old.*

: אל תבייש אנו[ש] שיש כִּי נמנה מוקנים (A)

: כִּי נמנה מוקנים ... (D)

ἀτιμάσης] \mathfrak{H} A תבייש. When the verb is used in MH in Pi. as equivalent to Hi. in BH, there is no need, *pace* Smend, to parse the form alternatively as Hi. Cf. \mathfrak{S} תִּגְהֶךְ ‘to laugh at,’ slightly free unlike \mathfrak{S} ל תְּשִׁיט = \mathfrak{H} .

⁶ Cf. *SQH* § 12 d (3).

⁷ Lévi (II 49) mentions mBM 4.10 זָכַר מַעֲשֵׂיךְ הָרָאשׁוֹנִים: זָכַר יִמְרָ לּוֹ: אִם הָיָה בְּעַל תְּשׁוּבָה לֹא יִאֲמַר לּוֹ:

γῆρα] 𐤁A שישׁ, i.e. שישׁ, a poetic synonym of קָן occurring only in Jb, four times. Used once more in 42.8.

ἐξ ἡμῶν] 𐤁A and D נמנו, which makes no sense and need be emended to ממנו, i.e. מִמְּנוּ. 𐤁 presupposes גם. But to emend the text to כי גם ממנו might be going a little too far. For the idiomatic, “partitive,” use of the preposition in ממנו is well known in BH, e.g. טָקַם לְלֵקֶטֶט Ex 16.27, cf. 𐤁 ἐξ ἡλ-θουσάν τινες ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ συλλέξαι.⁸

γηράσκουσιν] 𐤁A and D מזקנים, spelled *defectiva* for מְזַקְנִים, Hi. of ingressive value, on which see above at vs. 4. Once in BH at יָקַן 𐤁 גִּהְרָשָׁה Jb 14.8.

8.7) μὴ ἐπίχαιρε ἐπὶ νεκρῷ·
μνήσθητι ὅτι πάντες τελευτῶμεν.

Do not rejoice over the death of someone.

Remember that we all die.

(A) אל תתהלל על גוע זכר כלנו נאספִים:
(D) אל תתהלל על גוע זכר כלנו נאספִים:]

νεκρῷ] Some sources add an explanatory word, εχθροτατω or εχθρωτατω, similarly 𐤁 נִתְּנָה לְךָ בְּעֵלְךָ בָּבֶן מִיִּתָּא לְהוּ דְסַנִּי ‘the death⁹ of one who is very hostile to you.’ In BH there is only one instance of Qal גוע, Ps 88.16 מְנַעַר עֲנִי אֲנִי וְנֹגַע מְנַעַר, where it has nothing to do with death. Both here and in 48.5 the form does not mean “being in the process of dying,” but “(already) dead.”¹⁰ In another instance in Si of גוע at 14.18 it simply means “to die.”

Smend mentions Nöldeke, who suggested reading here נֹגַע, i.e. adjective.¹¹ Though such a form is not attested in Heb. so far, this suggestion is attractive.

ὅτι] 𐤁 כי is not absolutely necessary, but where a clausal *o* follows, it is introduced with 𐤁 also at 7.11, 8.5, 9.12, 14.12. 𐤁 has ׀. See also above at 7.16.

τελευτῶμεν] 𐤁A נאספִים, a well-known BH use of נֶאֱסַפִּים as synonymous with מָת, usually of natural death. E.g. כִּאֲשֶׁר נֶאֱסַפִּי אֶהְרֹן אֶחָיִךְ Nu 27.13. The verb is usually followed by אֶל אַבְוֹתָי, אֶל עַמִּי, and the like, and in this Nu passage the text is preceded by וְנֹאֲסַפְתָּ אֶל־עַמִּיךָ גַם־אֶתָּה. Hence אֶל עַמִּי or suchlike is understood after אֶחָיִךְ.¹²

⁸ For more BH examples, see BDB s.v. מן 3 b, and also GELS s.v. ἐκ 3.

⁹ Probably an error for מִתָּא.

¹⁰ Pace Segal (431), who holds that the form means “about to die,” the son of the widow in Zarephath was not just critically ill, but already dead (1Kg 17.17).

¹¹ Both Segal (51) and Kahana (462) vocalise the form as נֹגַע, Qal Ptc. Likewise BSH 115. On a case such as החורר 1QS^a 66.2 as against MT הַחֶרֶד, see Qimron 2018.189. We have not succeeded in locating Nöldeke’s remark.

¹² For more references in BH, see BDB s.v. נֶאֱסַפִּי Niph. 2 (a).

- 8.8) μή παρίδης διήγημα σοφῶν
καὶ ἐν ταῖς παροιμίαις αὐτῶν ἀναστρέφου·
ὅτι παρ' αὐτῶν μαθήσῃ παιδείαν
καὶ λειτουργῆσαι μεγιστᾶσιν.

*Do not disregard tales told by sages,
and engage yourself in their proverbs
for from them you can learn lessons
and how to wait upon ruling people.*

(Aa) אַל תטש שיחת חכמים ובחידתיהם התרטש:
(Ab) כי ממנו תלמוד לקח להתיצב לפני שרים:
(Da) אל [ת]טש שיחת [חכמים] ובחידתיהם התרטש:
(Db) [כ] ממנו תלמוד לקח להתיצב לפני שרים:

παροιμίαις αὐτῶν] \mathfrak{H} A הידיתהם. This is the only attestation in SG of this equation.

The message emerging from the first two lines is very close to that of 6.35, where διήγησις is parallel to παροιμία. It cannot be a mere coincidence that this latter Gk word is the title of the book of Proverbs and the first word in it – Παροιμίαι Σαλωμῶντος.

ἀναστρέφου] \mathfrak{H} A התרטש. This rare Heb. verb root occurs only six times in BH, Pi. and Pu., in the sense of “to dash in pieces.” This does not help us clarify what its Hit. form means. We are left to guessing.¹³ \mathfrak{G} gives good sense in the context. \mathfrak{S} רַשׁוּ is obscure, whereas \mathfrak{H} אָתְּהַפֵּךְ is close to \mathfrak{G} .¹⁴

παρ' αὐτῶν μαθήσῃ] \mathfrak{H} A and D ממנו תלמוד; both Heb. forms are dubious, for one would anticipate תלמד מהם, cf. \mathfrak{S} מְנַהֵן יוֹלְפָנָא.¹⁵ However, the tendency of the statistically dominant pattern *yiqtol* pushing out *yiqal* is widespread in QH, e.g. יִשְׁכּוּב 1QS 7.10.¹⁶

καὶ] missing in \mathfrak{H} , in which the following Inf. clause may be viewed as explanatory, specifying, whilst in \mathfrak{G} the preceding verb has two direct objects. \mathfrak{S} also, without the coordinating conjunction *w*, continues with בְּעֵדְנָא דְתְקוּם קְדָם שְׁלִיטְנָא “when you stand before rulers.”

¹³ As Smend does: “vermuten,” starting from Aramaic רַשׁוּ, mainly in Targumic Aramaic, then to “umherschweifen,” “sich in einer Sache umtun.”

Ben Yehuda’s lexicon does not register Hit. of the verb, and Even-Shoshan’s has “to occupy oneself intensively,” but our Si example is the only instance mentioned.

¹⁴ *SL* s.v. הפך Etpa. 3 “to occupy o.s., be engaged in s.t.” adduces אָתְּהַפֵּךְ 2Cor 1.12 < ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ, ἀνεστράφημεν, but as the comma inserted in modern editions of the New Testament shows, ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ means ‘by means of, through.’

¹⁵ *Pace Lévi* (II 50) there is no way to take ממנו as meaning “par cela, ainsi.” As unacceptable is Smend’s “dadurch.”

¹⁶ For details on this subject, see Qimron 2018.187-89, § C 3.2.1.

- 8.9) μὴ ἀστόχει διηγήματος γερόντων,
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν·
ὅτι παρ' αὐτῶν μαθήσει συνέσιον
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ χρείας δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν.

*Do not give a miss to a talk by elderly folks,
for they also learned from their forefathers,
because from them you could learn how to understand
and how to give an answer when needed.*

אשר שמעו מאבתם:	אל תמאס בשמיעת שבים	(Aa)
בַּעַת צַרְךָ לְהַשִּׁיב פִּתְגָם:	כי ממנו תקח שכל	(Ab)
אֲשֶׁר [שִׁמְעוּ מֵאֲבוֹתָם]:	[אל תמאס] בְּשִׁמְעוֹת שְׁ[בִי]ם	(Da)
בַּעַת צַרְךָ לְהַשִּׁיב [פִּתְגָם]:	[כי ממנו תקח] שְׁכָל	(Db)

ἀστόχει] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תמאס; the same equation is found at 7.19 in a similar context: μὴ ἀστόχει γυναικὸς σοφῆς < $\mathfrak{H}A$ אשה משכלת אשה. The genitive of ablative value is seen in both cases. However, the syntactic structure in \mathfrak{H} differs: a zero-object, אשה, vs. a prepositional object, בשמיעת שבים. In BH, too, מאס occurs in both constructions, e.g. תִּקְוֵתִי מְאָסוּ Ez 20.24 // בְּתִקְוֵתִי מְאָסוּ Lv 26.15. We have here thus free variants. Likewise with an antonym, רָצָה, e.g. רֹצֵחַ יְהוָה בְּעֵמוּ Ps 147.11 // אֶת־יְרָאִיו רָצָה Ps 149.4.

διηγήματος] $\mathfrak{H}A$ שמיעת, the first attestation in Heb. of this verbal noun.¹⁷ Whilst BH attests to no instance of מאס with an inf. cst., such does occur in QH, e.g. כֹּל הַמוֹאֵס לְבוֹא בְּצַרְיֵת לֵאמֹר 'everyone that refuses to enter the covenant' 1QS 2.25. A verbal noun often functions as equivalent to its corresponding inf. cst., cf. *SQH* § 18 aa. In terms of meaning, שְׁמִיעָה is not the same as διήγημα. Ἀκρόασις, which we find in 5.11, could have been used instead. Cf. שׁוֹעֲרֵתָא 'the tales.'

καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔμαθον] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אשר שמעו. There is no real contradiction between the two texts; the former skilfully conveys what the latter must have meant to say.

τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אבתם. The selection of the shorter form instead of אבותיהם is noteworthy, for in BH the former is preferred in earlier books: according to BDB s.v. אָבֹתֵיהֶם, 1Ch 4.38 + 32x vs. אָבוֹתָם Ex 4.5 + 106x.¹⁸

¹⁷ Smend emends שמיעת on the basis of 5.11. *Pace Lévi* (II 50), we doubt that שמיעה can mean "la tradition."

שמיעה in D is vocalised by Elizur and Rand (2011.205) as שמיעות, and they claim that the conventional reading שמיעת in A is wrong, to be read as שמיעות, but in the manuscript concerned there is no space enough for two letters after ע.

¹⁸ See JM § 94 g and Qimron 2018.286, where we read that QH prefers the shorter form very much to the longer one. See his discussion on this dichotomy in loc. cit. 288-90. Furthermore, Bar-Asher (2004.144) has found that in Si the shorter form predominates, 11:1.

παρ' αὐτῶν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ ממנו, a form as dubious as in vs. 9. \mathfrak{S} reads here exactly as in vs. 9.

καὶ ἐν καιρῶ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ דַּעַת צִוּרֵךְ, D בַּצֵּת צִוּרֵךְ. Here, as in vs. 9, we find καὶ inserted under the same syntactic conditions.¹⁹ Besides, here the Inf. is preceded by a prepositional complement: להשיב פתגם: דַּעַת צִוּרֵךְ.

- 8.10) μὴ ἔκκαιε ἄνθρακας ἁμαρτωλοῦ,
μὴ ἐμπυρισθῆς ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς αὐτοῦ.

*Do not ignite coals of a sinner,
so that you may not be burnt in the fire of his flame.*

(A) אל תצלה בנחלת רשע פן תבער כשביב אשו:
(D) אל ת[צלה] מִי [נחלת רשע פן תבע] רַ בְּשִׁבִיב [יב אשו]:

The first line in $\mathfrak{H}A$ is irreconcilable with \mathfrak{G} .²⁰ As difficult is D אל תצלה בנחלת רשע. The Vorlage of \mathfrak{G} was probably as tricky, so that the translator composed a proverb of his own. Note also \mathfrak{S} לֹא תִהְיֶה אֶתְּהוּא שְׂוֹתֶפֶא לְרִשְׁיָעָא גְמִירָא 'Do not become an associate of an utterly wicked person.'

DCH 7.123a mentions צלה III "set ablaze, kindle," adducing Si 8.10 and Am 5.6, for both of which, however, the text requires emendation.

ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς αὐτοῦ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ כשביב אשו. The reading of the first letter is epigraphically uncertain, as indicated in $\mathfrak{H}D$ בְּשִׁבִיב אשו.

\mathfrak{G} has reversed the sequence of the two substantives. Even so αὐτοῦ, just as the suf. pron. of אשו, can be construed with the entire noun phrase, thus (a + b) + c, and not a + (b + c).

- 8.11) μὴ ἐξαναστῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὑβριστοῦ,
ἵνα μὴ ἐγκαθίσῃ ὡς ἐνεδρον τῷ στόματί σου.

*Do not stand in front of an arrogant person
so that he may not be seated as in ambush, watching your mouth.*

(A) אל תזוח מפני לץ להושיבו כאורב לפניך:
(D) [אל תזוח מפני לץ להושיבו כאורב לפניך]:

¹⁹ We agree with Mopsik (118): "Ici, la «sagesse», même confondue avec la «tradition», n'est pas un corps de doctrine précise, mais une discipline de savoir et une attitude personnelle, une aptitude à comprendre et à intervenir avec pertinence," though we question his rendering "tradition."

²⁰ Elizur and Rand (2011.205) argue that נחלת is a st. cst. of a fem. variant of נחל 'stream,' adducing Ps 124.4 נַחֲלֵה עֵבֶר עַל-נַפְשֵׁנוּ. They are aware that in the Tiberian tradition the word is accented on the first syllable. Even conceding that our 2nd cent. BCE author was not aware of this accentuation, we find it unfair to him to assume that he ignored the masc. gender of the verb, עֵבֶר. Acc. to Lévi (II 50) Perles (1897.53f.) said that נחלת is an error for נמרת 'coal of'. Even-Shoshan refers to jMaaser sheni 56.3, but no such word is recorded in *Maagarim*. Cf. גִּימְרָא 'burning, glowing coal' in Aramaic.

ἐξαναστῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου] מִפְּנֵי הַיּוֹזֵף. Precisely the same Gk collocation occurs in ἀπὸ προσώπου πολλοῦ ἐξαναστήσει Lv 19.32 < מִפְּנֵי שִׂיבָה תִּקּוּם, where, however, it is about a gesture of respect towards elderly people, which hardly applies to our case here. The verb הָיָה is unknown to BH, but occurs in MH in the sense of either ‘to be elated, cheerful’ or ‘to be proud, overbearing’ (so Jastrow), which two nuances do not have to be mutually contradictory; if you run away with self-glorification in public over your extraordinary capabilities or resources, you are taking leave of the virtue of modesty. שִׂיבָה תִּקּוּם = אֲשֶׁר.

ἵνα μὴ ἐγκαθίστη] מְהֵרָה לְהוֹשִׁיבוֹ. Whereas הוֹשִׁיב can only be transitive, ἐγκαθίζω can be intransitive as well as transitive: “to make sit” and “to lie in ambush.” The suf. pron. of לְהוֹשִׁיבוֹ can be only a direct object referring back to הָיָה. Who is then the subject of the infinitive? It can be impersonal or “you”: some people get someone entrap you or you may end up having someone sitting under your nose intent on entrapping you. The message conveyed by the proverb is thus: “Be cautious about what you say or do not say or how you say it, in case you end up in such a dreadful situation.” The infinitive here is then resultative in force. Cf. אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִהְיֶה נֶחֱמָא קְדָמְךָ ‘so that there is no ambush in front of you.’

ὡς ἔνεδρον] מְהֵרָה כְּאֹרֶב = מְהֵרָה כְּמֵאֲנָה, whilst מְהֵרָה lacks the preposition. Hebrew and Greek can do without this preposition, אֹרֶב serving as a subject complement, hence not “in the manner of” (similarity), but “as” (identity).²¹ Incidentally, ἔνεδρον means ‘ambush,’ not ‘someone lying in ambush,’ which is ἐνεδρεύων as a substantivised participle, though ἔνεδρον can signify ‘a party of men or soldiers laid in ambush’ as in ἤλπισαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔνεδρον Jd 20.36.

τῷ στόματί σου] מְהֵרָה לִפְנֵיךָ = מְהֵרָה לִפְנֵיךָ. אֲשֶׁר underlines the possibility of a potential enemy watching for your slips of tongue.²²

8.12) μὴ δανείσης ἀνθρώπῳ ἰσχυροτέρῳ σου·
καὶ ἐὰν δανείσης, ὡς ἀπολωλεκὸς γίνου.

*Do not lend money to a person more powerful than yourself,
but if you do lend, think you have virtually lost it.*

(A) אַל תְּלוֹה אִישׁ חֹזֵק מִמֶּךָ וְאִם הִלִּיתָ כְּמֵאֲנָה:
(D) [אַל תְּלוּהוּ אִישׁ חֹזֵק מִמֶּךָ] וְאִם הִלִּיתָ כְּמֵאֲנָה [בְּדָם]:

8.13) μὴ ἐγγυήσῃ ὑπὲρ δυνάμιν σου·
καὶ ἐὰν ἐγγυήσῃ, ὡς ἀποτείσων φρόντιζε.

²¹ On this syntactic category, see *SQH* § 31 t and *SSG* § 61 a and b.

²² Cf. ‘Then the Pharisees went out, discussing how to trap him in words (αὐτὸν παγιδεύσασιν ἐν λόγῳ)’ Mt 22.15.

*Do not give surety beyond your means,
but if you do give surety, start thinking as if you could end up repaying it.*

אל תערב יתר ממך ואם ערבת כמשלם: (A)

אל תערב יתר מִמֶּךָ ואם ערבת כמשלם: (D)

This and the preceding verse deal with financial management, and both \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} display a beautiful harmony in formulation and syntactic structure:

In H the verse begins with a negatively worded piece of advice <אָל + Jussive + comparative expression> – Advice in case of the first advice not followed <וְאִם + Pf. + כִּי + Ptc.>.

The Ptc. in vs. 12 is Pf., ἀπολωλεκώς: at the moment that an action contrary to the advice given is performed, it is already a fait accompli, whereas in vs. 13 we have the Ptc. in Fut., ἀποτείσων, that which must be already viewed as likely to emerge at some point in future, i.e. repayment of the loan.

8.14) μὴ δικάζου μετὰ κριτοῦ·
κατὰ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ κρινοῦσιν αὐτῷ.

*Do not sue a judge,
for a decision appropriate to his prestige is likely to be made.*

אל תשפט עם שופט כי כרצונו ישפֹט: (A1)

אל תשב עם שופט עול כי כאשר כרצונו תשפט עמו: (A2)

אל תשפוט עם שופט כי כרצונו ישפט: (D)

\mathfrak{H} A has preserved two versions. \mathfrak{G} is following the first version. So is \mathfrak{H} D. \mathfrak{S} roughly agrees with A2: לֹא תִתֵּב עִם דִּינָא עֲוֹלָא כְּדִינָא דְלָא אִיךְ צְבִינְהָ תְדוּן: ‘Do not sit with a wicked judge in a court case in order that you may not be contesting with him at his pleasure.’

δικάζου] Smend holds that this middle voice points to תשפט as Ni., whilst \mathfrak{H} D שפוט was unknown to him. Likewise תשפט in Segal (51) and Kahana (463). But Smend then runs into difficulties of interpretation of ישפט. It seems to us that we have here to do with someone taking a “Guilty” verdict felled against him to an appeal court.

κατὰ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ] a somewhat free rendering of \mathfrak{H} כרצונו ‘to his pleasure.’

ישפט, so clearly preserved in \mathfrak{H} D, can be analysed as Qal ישפט, an impersonal 3ms, the court effectively, or as Ni. תשפט. κρινοῦσιν ‘they will reach a decision’ can reflect either.

αὐτῷ] dativus commodi.

8.15) μετὰ τολμηροῦ μὴ πορεύου ἐν ὁδοῦ,
ἵνα μὴ βαρύνῃ τὰ κακά σου·
αὐτὸς γὰρ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ πορεύεται,
καὶ τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ συναπολή.

*Do not go on a journey with someone reckless
in order that he may not cause you unbearable sufferings,
for he will go as he likes
and you might perish together because of his folly.*

(Aa) עם אכזרי אל תלך [פן] תכביד את רעתך
(Ab) כי הוא נוכח פניו ילך ובאולתו תספה:
(Da) עם אכזרי אל תלך פן תכביד את רע[ת]ך:
(Db) כי ה[ו]א נכח פניו ילך וב[א]ולתו תספה:

τολμηροῦ] **HA** אכזרי. This Heb. adjective and a synonym of it, אַכְזָר, are usually thought to have to do with cruelty. Hence ἀνελεήμων ‘merciless’ is the commonest rendering (7×) of אַכְזָר, and it also renders אַכְזָר and אַכְזָרִית each once, and no other Heb. word. But ‘someone cruel’ does not suit our context. However, Kaddari (2006 s.v. אַכְזָר) admits “fearless” as a second sense.²³ Cf. **S** קָשִׁיא ‘bold, impudent.’

ἐν ὁδῶ] absent in **HA** and **D**. The addition makes it plain that πορεύου is not used here in its metaphorical sense as in πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίας καρδίας σου Si 5.2. **S** also has this plus: באורֶהָא.

βαρύνη] **HA** תכביד. The reading preferred by Smend and followed by Ziegler is a minority one; the majority of sources read a passive form, which is reflected in **S** נֶאֱקָרְן בִּישָׁתָא דִּילְךָ מְטוּלָה נֵן ‘your troubles become heavy because of him.’ Neither accurately reflects תכביד. All that one can say in defence of this 2ms Hi. form is to interpret it in the sense of “you could be yourself making your sufferings unbearable.” Cf. **S** נֶקְשָׂא ‘he makes hard.’

κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ] **HA** פניו נוכח, which probably means ‘he moves on looking straight ahead, unconcerned about his companion’s feeling or situation,’ which is idiomatically represented in **G**.

πορεύσεται] **HA** ילך. Smend, mentioning **S** אָוֶל and **V** vadit, maintains that ποιήσει in all Greek sources must be a correction of πορεύσεται, though we fail to see why the former can represent a correction of the latter. All the same, since the Sahidic version is said to represent πορεύσεται, this reading must be considered as well-founded.

τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ συναπολή] a dative of cause as in ἵνα μὴ συναπόλη ταῖς ἀνομίαις τῆς πόλεως < **H** פֶּן־תִּסָּפֶה בְּעוֹן הָעִיר Gn 19.15 and here באולתו תספה. Cp. a more literal rendering in μὴ συναπόλησθε ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτῶν Nu 16.26 < **H** פֶּן־תִּסָּפּוּ בְּכָל־הַטָּאֲתָם.²⁴

²³ Jb 41.2 and La 4.3 are mentioned for this sense, and Kaddari refers to our Si example. Kaddari may not be aware that Delitzsch (1876.533) had translated אַכְזָר Jb 41.2 as “Tollkühner” (= “foolhardy”). Likewise Smend, also referring to Jb 41.2.

²⁴ On the causal dative, see SSG § 22 wn.

- 8.16) μετὰ θυμώδους μὴ ποιήσης μάχην
καὶ μὴ διαπορεύου μετ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔρημον·
ὅτι ὡς οὐδὲν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ αἷμα,
καὶ ὅπου οὐκ ἔστιν βοήθεια, καταβαλεῖ σε.

*Do not fight with an irascible person
nor go with him through a desert,
for to him bloodshed does not mean a thing,
and where you can expect no help, he will knock you down.*

(Aa) עם בעל אף אל תעזו מצח ואל תרכב עמו בדרך:
(Ab) כי קל בעיניו דמים ובאין מציל ישחיתך:
(Da) עם בעל אף אל תעין] מ[צח ואל תרכב עמו בדרך]:
(Db) [כי קל בעיניו דמים] ובאין] מ[ציל] ל' ישחיתך:

ποιήσης μάχην] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תעזו מצח, a collocation unknown to BH, in which we only find הָעֵזוּ פְּנִים Pr 7.13 and הָעֵזוּ בְּפָנִים Pr 21.29. פְּנִים / מֵצָח means “insolence, effrontery,” and has little to do with fighting. \mathfrak{S} appears to be influenced by \mathfrak{G} : לֹא תִצָּא מִצֹּחַ ‘Do not have a quarrel.’ Smend infers that \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{S} represent מֵצָח, but he does not know what to do with ποιήσης.

διαπορεύου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תרכב. Why \mathfrak{G} has chosen a generic word for movement instead of a more specific one such as ἵππεύω is not clear.

τὴν ἔρημον] $\mathfrak{H}A$ בדרך. Does \mathfrak{G} represent במדבר? Cf. \mathfrak{S} בְּאַתְרָא חוּרְבָא.²⁵ ὡς οὐδὲν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ קל. This Heb. adjective in the sense of “slight, unimportant” is unknown to BH, but very common in RH. It occurs once in QH in בחרו בקלות ‘they chose worthless things’ 4Q171 1-2i19. BH uses נָקַל in this sense as in כֹּאֵן אֵין יִרְבָּעוּ יְרֻבְעוּת לְכֹתוּ בְּהַטְאוֹת יְרֻבְעוּת 1Kg 16.31. Pace Lévi (II 53) \mathfrak{G} ≠ כֹּאֵן אֵין, for אֵין never means on its own “nothing.”

In $\mathfrak{H}A$ we read קל בעיניו דמים, where the apparent number discord between sg. קל and pl. דמים is because the latter signifies here ‘murder,’ not ‘a pool of blood.’ Likewise in הָהִיא עֲלֵיךָ דָמִים Dt 19.10.

ὅπου οὐκ ἔστιν βοήθεια] $\mathfrak{H}A$ באין מציל. <בָּאֵין + noun or nominalised participle> occurs in BH 10 times; its distribution is noteworthy – Is 1×, Ez 1×, Pr 8×.²⁶ We find two instances with a nominalised participle in בָּאֵין מְבִין Is 57.1 and וּבָאֵין נִרְגָן יִשְׁתַּק מְדוֹן Pr 26.20, where \mathfrak{G} ὅπου δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν δίθυμος, ἡσυχάζει μάχην ‘where there is no dissident around, a strife quietens’ is close to our Si case.

- 8.17) μετὰ μωροῦ μὴ συμβουλευέου·
οὐ γὰρ δυνήσεται λόγον στέξαι.

²⁵ Cf. Pesh. בְּאַתְרָא חוּרְבָא Mk 1.45 < ἐπ’ ἐρήμοις τόποις.

²⁶ In QH it occurs only once: באין רצונכה ‘without your consent’ 1QH^a 18.8 // בלוא רצונכה ib. 4. See SQH § 40 n.

*Do not consult a fool,
for he would not be able to keep anything secret.*

(A) עם פותה אל תסתייד כי לא יוכל לכסות סודך:
(D) [עם פותה אל תסתייד כי לא] יוכל לכסות סודך:

μωροῦ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ פותה, i.e. פוּתָה, one of the favourite words in Si, occurring eight times. פתִּי is typical of the biblical, sapiential literature. Note esp. לַפְתָּה לְתַעְרָב שְׁפָתָיו לֹא תִתְעָרֵב ‘Do not associate with a silly babbler’ Pr 20.19.

μη συμβουλευού] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אל תסתייד סוד. ‘council, counsel’ is very common in BH, but its root is not used as a verb.²⁷

Smend is of the view that הסתייד here means “sich beraten mit jemandem,” for which, however, התייעץ could have been used. The feature of private consultation appears to be present. Cf. \mathfrak{S} לֹא תִקְטֹר רְאֵזָא ‘Do not enter intimate relationship.’

δυνήσεται] $\mathfrak{H}A$ and D יוכל. Both Gk Fut. and Heb. Impf. indicate a theoretical possibility.²⁸ The future is fittingly used in a conditional statement as uttered by a sceptic envoy, εἰ δυνήσεσθε δοῦναι ἀναβάτας ἐπ’ αὐτούς ‘if you could put riders on them’ Is 36.8, after which he asks more confidently with an indicative present: πῶς δύνασθε ἀποστρέψαι εἰς πρόσωπον τοπάρχου ἐνός; ‘how can you turn straight towards one governor?’ vs. 9, where the envoy derisively suggests that the Israelites assume they can.

λόγον] $\mathfrak{H}A$ and D סודך. In both languages an indeterminate, sg. noun can be used in an expression of categorical, absolute negation. Besides, ῥῆμα, just as דְּבַר, can be used as equivalent to an indefinite pronoun,²⁹ but not λόγος, which retains here its usual meaning, “word uttered in a verbal exchange” or “matter, issue discussed.” \mathfrak{S} is content with לְמַכְסִיּוּתָהּ ‘to conceal it,’ with a suf. pron. referring back to רְאֵזָא ‘secret’ mentioned explicitly in 17a.

8.18) ἐνώπιον ἀλλοτρίου μη ποιήσης κρυπτόν·
οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται.

*In front of a stranger do not do anything secret,
for you do not know what it might lead to.*

(A) לפני זר אל תעש רז כי לא תדע מה ילד ספו:
(D) לפני זר אל ת[עש רז כי לא] תִדַע ..

τέξεται] $\mathfrak{H}A$ ילד ספו ‘its end might produce.’

²⁷ Even-Shoshan (903b) registers הַסְתוּדָה ‘to speak secretly,’ a lexeme not recorded in Ben Yehuda nor in *Maagarim*.

²⁸ Cf. SSG § 28 **ge** and SQH § 15 **dae**.

²⁹ See SSG § 10 **da**.

With his “er” Smend takes ἀλλότριος as the subject of the verb.³⁰ It appears to us more natural to view κρυπτόν³¹ or your revealing it to a stranger as the subject. Cf. οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί τέξεται ἢ ἐπιούσα ‘for you do not know what tomorrow will bring’ Pr 3.28 and μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὐριον· οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἢ ἐπιούσα ib. 27.1 < אֶל־תִּתְהַלֵּל בְּיוֹם מָחָר כִּי לֹא־תִדְעַ < מֵה־יָלֵד יוֹם.

8.19) παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ ἔκφαινε καρδίαν σου,
καὶ μὴ ἀναφερῆτω σοὶ χάριν.

*To nobody disclose what is on your mind
and do not expect a return of favour from him.*

(A) לכל בשר אל תגל לבך ואל תדיח מעליך הטובה:

παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ] אֶל־לכל בשר] Here we have a case of categorical negation, thus *pace* Smend “nicht jedem Menschen” as against “keinem Menschen” (*SD*), “niemandem” (*Ryssel*), “à n’importe qui” (*BJ*), and “à personne” (*Mopsik*). Partial negation is represented also in אֶל־לכל בְּרִנָּשׁ “to all comers” (*Snaith*), “to every man” (*Box - Oesterley*), and “à tout le monde” (*Lévi*). On כל and πᾶς reinforcing categorical negation, see above at 7.13 and without such an addition, see at 8.17.³²

μὴ ἀναφερῆτω σοὶ χάριν] אֶל־אל תדיח מעליך הטובה] What אֶל means is not manifest. Seeing the verb is transitive, הטובה must be its direct object, hence the verb is 2ms. Then the clause possibly means “Do not end up depriving yourself of benefits that could arise from your project or thought if you did not disclose it to somebody.” This, however, has little to do with אֶל. Its verb ἀναφέρω denotes a movement towards, not away from you (מעליך).³³ Smend is inclined to emend אֶל to ידיח עליך, i.e. “Let him not impose on you a duty to feel thankful to him.”

For χάρις in the sense of “favour,” see χάριτες δὲ μωρῶν ἐκαχυθήσονται ‘fools give out excessive favours’ Si 20.13 < טובת כסילים ישפוך. For another sense of χάρις, also translating טוב, see ὃς εὗρεν γυναικᾶ ἀγαθήν, εὗρεν χάριτας Pr 18.22 < מְצָא אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוֹב.]³⁴

³⁰ Probably also *Ryssel* “was er anstellen wird” and *BJ* “tu ne sais pas ce qu’il peut inventer.”

³¹ This option is not on with מְנֵה יָלֵד (masc.) with the fem. subject, כְּסִימָא. Cf. *SD*: “was (daraus) hervorgehen wird,” which, however, cannot be derived from “was (daraus) geboren werden wird,” for τέξεται is in the middle voice, not passive τεχθήσεται.

³² An example in BH without כל is וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־רְשָׁעִים קְבָרוֹ וְאֶת־עֲשִׂירֵי בְמִתְיוֹ עַל לֹא־הָמָס עֲשָׂה כֹל is 53.9. Cf. *JM* § 160 *oa*.

³³ אֶל is difficult, esp. נְחִיבָךְ in טְבִיבָתָא. Lagarde mentions a v.l. נְחִיבָךְ, i.e. נְחִיבָךְ, which is easier to follow.

³⁴ Thus, *pace Lévi* (*II* 53), χάρις is a reasonable rendering, which does not necessarily represent אֶל.

CHAPTER 9

- 9.1) Μὴ ζήλου γυναῖκα τοῦ κόλπου σου
μηδὲ διδάξης ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν παιδείαν πονηράν.

*Do not become jealous of the wife of your bosom
in case you teach her a bad lesson against yourself.*

(A) אל תקנא אשת חיקך פן תלמד עליך רעה:

γυναῖκα τοῦ κόλπου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אשת חיקך, an expression that occurs also in Dt 13.7, though \mathfrak{S} renders it with a slight variation as ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἐν κόλπῳ σου, sim. ib. 28.54. On the temporal / locative value of the genitive, see *SSG* § 22 v.

διδάξης] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תלמד, obviously read as תלמד, for which one might anticipate a personal object, albeit not absolutely necessary: תלמדנה or תלמד אתה. \mathfrak{S} הלך represents תלמד.

ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ עליך. That על does not introduce here a subject-matter or topic has been justly captured by the selection of < ἐπί + acc. >, which hardly ever means “concerning, about.” Here it signifies “to the disadvantage of,” see *GELS* s.v. ἐπί III 7, e.g. κλαίουσιν ἐπ’ ἐμέ ‘they weep to my annoyance’ Nu 11.13.

- 9.2) μὴ δῶς γυναικὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου
ἐπιβῆναι αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν σου.

*Do not become infatuated with a woman
to allow her to gain control of your resources.*

(A) אל תקנא את אשת נפשך להדריכה על במותיך:

δῶς] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תקנא, most likely an inadvertent intrusion from vs. 1. Read תתן as in \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{S} תתן. Smend appropriately refers to $\mathfrak{H}A$ vs. 6 אל תתן לזונה and נפשך.

ἐπιβῆναι αὐτὴν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ להדריכה. Almost an identical Heb. collocation occurs in \mathfrak{S} עד שיבה עמדה עמו להדריכם על בִּמְתֵי ארץ ‘until his old age it [= the strength (הַצְּמָה)] given by God to Caleb] stayed with him to lead them on to the high places in the land’ Si 46.9 > \mathfrak{S} ἕως γήρους διέμεινεν αὐτῷ, ἐπιβῆναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς γῆς. This parallel instance allows us to analyse the suf. pron. in להדריכה as a direct object. Significantly the suf. pron. in להדריכם has been converted in \mathfrak{S} to the subject of ἐπιβῆναι. All this speaks against Smend’s position that ἐπιβῆναι in our current Si passage is transitive with αὐτὴν as

its object. He mentions as supporting his analysis a related verb of movement, ἀναβαίνω, in Ἰνα τί παρηνώχλησάς μοι ἀναβῆναί με; 1Sm 28.15 < 𐤁 לְמָה אֲתִי הִרְגִּזְתָּנִי לְהַעֲלוֹת אֵת. In all the three examples under discussion the pronominal constituent of the infinitive is the latter's direct object, but it is objectionable to suggest that these Gk verbs are exceptionally being used transitively,¹ when we could analyse the acc. pronouns in 𐤁 as the subject of the infinitive² and view the latter as resultative or epexegetical in value.

τῆν ἰσχὺν σου] 𐤁A בְּמוֹתֶיךָ 'your high places.' 𐤁 represents a metaphorical interpretation of this Heb. word as a symbol of military strength.³ Its collocation with the verb הִלֵּךְ also occurs in [בְּתִי] 𐤁 בְּמוֹתֵי [בְּתִי] מִי יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְיִרְדַּךְ וְדָרְךָ עַל-בְּמוֹתַי [בְּתִי] מִי יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְיִרְדַּךְ וְדָרְךָ עַל-בְּמוֹתַי מִי יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְיִרְדַּךְ וְדָרְךָ עַל-בְּמוֹתַי Am 4.13. In both passages the subject is God. Ben Sirá's message is: Don't you allow a woman to do to you as she pleases. Cf. 𐤁 לָא תַתְּלֵל לְאִנְתָּא נַפְשָׁךְ לְמַשְׁלֻטָתָהּ עַל כָּל מָא דְאִית לָהּ 'Do not give your soul over to a woman to allow her to exercise control over everything that you have,' in which the suf. pron. of להדריכה has been analysed as a direct object.

The lexeme ἰσχὺς here can hardly mean 'physical or military strength,' but rather 'financial, material strength,' see *GELS* s.v. *3. Note the above-quoted 𐤁, and one can interpret in a similar way 𐤁 על חֵילְךָ לְךָ.

- 9.3) μὴ ὑπάντα γυναικὶ ἐταιριζομένη,
μῆποτε ἐμπέσης εἰς τὰς παγίδας αὐτῆς.
*Do not go to meet a prostituting woman
in case you fall into her traps.*

𐤁A has preserved two variant forms:⁵

(Aa) אַל תִּקְרַב אֶל אִשָּׁה זָרָה פֶּן תִּפּוֹל בְּמַצּוֹדֶתֶיהָ:
(Ab) .. עַם זֹנָה אֶל תִּסְתַּיֵּד פֶּן תִּלְכַּד בְּלִקּוֹתֶיהָ:

ὑπάντα] 𐤁Aa תִּקְרַב. This is the sole instance of this equation in SG, though ὑπαντάω is not of very frequent occurrence, 6 ×.

Segal (56) holds that אֶל תִּקְרַב here signifies befriending, not sexual intercourse. Is it not a euphemism for the latter? Beside Gn 20.4 mentioned by him BDB s.v. קָרַב Qal 1 a lists quite a few instances of the collocation

¹ Nor do we follow his translation: "dass du ihr Gewalt über dich gibst."

² Hence we would parse the verb as Peal rather than Afel in 𐤁 על חֵילְךָ לְךָ.

The above-mentioned Si 46.9 is illuminating in 𐤁: וְעַדְמָא לְסִיבֵיתָהּ אֶתְקִימַם עִמָּה לְמַשְׁלֻטָתָהּ: עַל תּוֹקֶפָה דְאַרְעָא

³ Smend remarks that also in Dt 32.31 Heb. בְּמוֹת is rendered with 𐤁 ἰσχὺς and 𐤁 תִּקְרַב respectively, but in our 𐤁 we see עוֹשֵׁנָא, albeit synonymous to תִּקְרַב.

⁴ To the only two reference given in *SL* s.v. חֵילָא for 3 c "resources, possessions of a household" we could add חֵילָא דְעִמָּמָא Is 10.14 < 𐤁 חֵילָא דְעִמָּמָא.

⁵ Partially vocalised in the manuscript.

with sexual overtone. Is a woman befriending an animal in אִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר תִּקְרַב אֶל-כָּל-בְּהֵמָה לְרִבְעָה אֲתָה Lv 20.16?

Smend is inclined to read תִּקְרַה or תִּקְרֵא on the ground that קָרַב אל signifies sexual intercourse, which does not harmonise with the latter half of the verse. But an experienced, clever harlot could know not a few tactics and devices to entice a man and keep him as a frequent client. An instance in Si of the equation קָרַה / ὑπαντάω is irrelevant, for in κακὰ ἐὰν ὑπαντήσῃ σοι אִם רַע קָרַךְ Si 12.17 the *s* is impersonal and the act is not deliberate, ‘if a disaster befalls you.’⁶

ἐταιριζομένη] אָא זָרָה. LSJ s.v. ἐταιρίζω 2 notes that it is also used as equivalent to ἐταιρεύομαι, whilst the former is said to mean “to be a courtesan” and the latter “to prostitute oneself.” We doubt that our author would not mind your going for a cheap whore. We further think that the selection of the middle voice is deliberate; it is not about a woman sold by her indigent parents to a geisha-house, thus worse than Smend’s “buhlerische Frau” (“coquette”).

אִשָּׁה זָרָה occurs twice in the sense of “harlot” in Pr 2.16 and 7.5, where, however, we read γυνὴ ἀλλότρια in א, a literal translation, and the same in אִשָּׁה זָרָה נֹכְרִיתָא. By contrast, in our Si case אִשָּׁה is explicit and straightforward: זָרָה. See also below at 41.20.

εἰς τὰς παγίδας αὐτῆς] אָא בְּמִצּוֹדֶיהָ. אָב בְּלִקְוֶתֶיהָ is mind-blogging. Segal (56) emends it to בְּמִלְקוֹתֶיהָ said to be parallel to בְּעוֹנוֹשֶׁיהָ vs. 5. However, if he means מְלִקוֹת unknown to BH, in RH it means ‘punishment of lashes,’ a highly specific form of punishment, something that does not fit our context here. Our scribe or vocaliser had a word beginning with *lamed* in mind. BSH registers לִקָּה with a question mark.⁹

9.4) μετὰ ψαλλούσης μὴ ἐνδελέχιζε,
μήποτε ἄλωξ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιχειρήμασιν αὐτῆς.

*Do not be stuck with a geisha girl
in case you become captured with her tactics.*

(A עִם מְגִינֵי אֵל תִּדְמוּךְ פֶּן יִשְׁׁ) (ר) בְּפִיפִיתָם:

ψαλλούσης] אָא מְגִינֵי, a *Qre* spelled anomalously for מְגִינֵי. אִשָּׁה also reads sg. זָרָה, followed by a sg. verb, תִּבְדֹּדךְ ‘she destroys you.’

⁶ Likewise ὃ τι ὑπαντήσῃ (יקָרַה) τῷ λαῶ σου ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ‘that which would befall Your people at the end of the days’ Da 10.14 LXX. On b) תִּקְרֵיךְ see at 7.14 above.

⁷ At Pr 2.16 א departs from א widely. Cf. Wagner 1999.207f.

⁸ In אִשָּׁה we find מִתְרַחֲמֵינָא, an unusual word, not admitted in *SL*, and in the margin, however, we do find a gloss saying that it means זָרָה.

⁹ The Babylonian Talmud, in explicitly quoting this verse, presents a mixed text: פֶּן תִּלְכֹּד בְּמִצּוֹדֶתָה Sanh 100b and Yeb 63b.

ἐνδελέχιζε] 𐤒𐤀 𐤓𐤓𐤕. √דמך ‘to sleep with a woman for sex’ is unknown to Heb., but occurs in Samaritan Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Syriac.¹⁰ 𐤍 reads 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘you converse, speak.’ 𐤍𐤋 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘you persevere’ is close to 𐤍. Whilst at Si 27.12 εἰς μέσον δὲ διανοουμένων ἐνδελέχιζε no Heb. text is available, it is interesting that 𐤍 there reads 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘to converse always’ and 𐤍𐤋 𐤓𐤓𐤕.

ἀλῶς] almost certainly = 𐤓𐤓𐤕 9.4 𐤒𐤀Ab.

The second half of 𐤒𐤀 is quite a challenge: 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘in case they burn you with their mouths’(?).¹¹ This obviously has nothing to do with 𐤍. Cf. 𐤍 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘in case she destroys you with her tales.’

9.5) παρθένον μὴ καταμάνθανε,
μήποτε σκανδαλισθῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτιμίαις αὐτῆς.

Do not become curious about a virgin

in case you are brought down over damages payable on her account.

(A בבתולה אל תתבונן פון תוקש בעונשיה:

παρθένον] 𐤒𐤀 בתולה. *GELS* defines the sense of παρθένος as “young woman.” Virginity is usually implied, which is evident in γηραιαὶ παρθένου ‘old maids’ Philo. *Contemp. Life* 68. By contrast, in בתולה virginity is an ingredient of its sense and low age is a contextual, circumstantial ingredient as clearly highlighted with its frequent combination with נַעֲרָה as in נַעֲרָה בתולה τὴν παῖδα τὴν παρθένον Dt 22.28. Hence Lévi’s (II 57) “jeune fille” is debatable, and Smend’s and Ryssel’s “Jungfrau” is equivocal.

καταμάνθανε] 𐤒𐤀 תתבונן. Καταμανθάνω means “to observe and study carefully out of curiosity and interest.” Similarly 𐤍 and 𐤍𐤋 𐤓𐤓𐤕.

σκανδαλισθῆς] 𐤒𐤀 תוקש, i.e. 𐤓𐤓𐤕. There is a slight difference in meaning between 𐤍 ‘you are brought down to a fall’ and 𐤒 ‘you become ensnared.’ 𐤍 is rather free: 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 ‘you are made to pay her a dowry twice over.’ This Gk/Heb. equation occurs once more in SG, and that in Si: ὁ ζητῶν νόμον ἐμπλησθήσεται αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος σκανδαλισθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ 35.15 < 𐤒B דורש תורה יפיקנה ומתלהלה יוקש 12 בה.

ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτιμίαις αὐτῆς] 𐤒𐤀 בעונשיה. Both ἐν and ב are instrumental and also causal in value. αὐτῆς and ה indicate a cause, of course not in the sense of her having brought penalties down on the male, but in the sense of

¹⁰ See Tal 2000.187a, Sokoloff 2014.92a, and *SL* 310b. Wagner (1999.192) raises a possibility that the *Vorlage* read לתמיד, i.e. תמיד.

¹¹ Mopsik, reading (121) ביפייתם, suggests “être brûlé par leur beauté,” but יפייה, a BH hapax mean ‘beauty’? Cf. עגלה יפה פיה מצרים Je 46.20 > 𐤍 δάμαλις κεκαλωπιμένη Αἴγυπτος.

¹² Cf. Wagner 1999.289f.

penalties arising from relationships entered by him with her. \mathfrak{S} is interesting: $\text{אָפּפּאַ בּפּרִיטֵהָ אַפּפּאַ תְּתִיב בְּפִרְיֵהָ}$ ‘you become obliged to pay her dowry double.’¹³

- 9.6) μὴ δῶς πόρναις τὴν ψυχὴν σου,
ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσῃς τὴν κληρονομίαν σου.

*Do not abandon yourself to harlots,
in order that you may not lose your inheritance.*

(A אל תתן לזונה נפשך פן תסוב את נחלתך:

πόρναις] \mathfrak{H} A לזונה. Note \mathfrak{S} לְיִנְיָהָ ‘to a harlot.’

ἀπολέσῃς] \mathfrak{H} A תסוב. Whether vocalised as תִּסּוּב or as תִּסּוּב, a Qal verb כִּבֵּב¹⁴ cannot be harmonised with the notion of “loss.” \mathfrak{C} here = \mathfrak{S} תִּבְדֹּד. Segal proposes deleting את and interpreting the clause as going about unintended transfer of ownership. E.g. לֹא־תִסַּב נַחֲלָה לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמַּטָּה אֶל־מַטָּה Nu 36.7, also ib. 9. In Ni. we find וְנָסְבוּ בְּתֵיבָם לְאַחֲרֵי שְׂדוֹת וְנָשִׂים יַחְדָּו Je 6.12, but then we would anticipate here תִּסַּב = תִּסּוּב. An alternative proposal made by Smend is to read here Hi., תִּסִּיב = תִּסּוּב, for which we could mention יִסֵּב וְיִיָּד אֶת־הַמְּלוּכָה לְדוֹיֵד (\mathfrak{C} ἐπέστρεψε) 1Ch 10.14.¹⁵ All the same we rather anticipate mention of a person who would benefit from the transfer. Besides, transfer is not quite the same as loss.

- 9.7) μὴ περιβλέπου ἐν ῥύμαις πόλεως
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις αὐτῆς μὴ πλανῶ.

*Do not gaze round in streets of your town
and do not wander about in its deserted places.*

(A להתנבל במראה עיניך ולשומם אחר ביתה:

\mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} vastly differ from each other.

μὴ περιβλέπου] \mathfrak{H} A להתנבל. As an inf. cst. can be used to express an absolute command,¹⁶ one could emend the text to read לא להתנבל, but Heb. does not appear to have a verb root נבל meaning “to look, see, gaze.” \mathfrak{S} וְתִצְעַר ‘and you suffer insult, abuse’ is hardly to be harmonised with \mathfrak{H} .¹⁷

¹³ We fail to follow Lévi (II 56f.): the meaning is “d’être puni en même temps qu’elle,” hence “de peur de partager sa punition.” What sin has she committed? Pre-marital sex? That is not explicitly stated in the text.

What is meant by “double penalty” is probably what is to be paid to her parents (50 shekels) and the duty of marrying her with no possibility of divorcing her for any reason, as established in Dt 22.28-29.

Ziegler (1965.75) suggests a possible emendation, > ἐπιστιμίως. No such word is listed in LSJ.

¹⁴ תִּסּוּב is unlikely to be influenced by Aram. נָסַב ‘to take’; the Impf. of this Aram. verb is תִּסֵּב.

¹⁵ יִסְבוּ is Aramaising in lieu of תִּסְבוּ, cf. JM § 82 h.

¹⁶ See JM § 124 l and SQH § 18 c.

¹⁷ Thus *pace* Lévi (II 56), whose rendering is “Tu te dégraderais.”

Smend's proposal to read **אל תתנבט** is difficult, since this verb root is attested nowhere in Hit. He mentions its Pi. in RH, but the meaning is "to have a vision." Segal's (57) analysis does make sense: "to become **נָבַל**," although a verb form affiliated to **נָבַל** is not attested in Hit. in BH.¹⁸

ἐν ῥύμαις πόλεως] **𐤉𐤁** במראה עיניך 'with what you see.' **𐤅** = **𐤍** בְּשׂוֹקֵי אֲמִידֵינָא. Lévi (II 56), followed by Smend, notes that at Si 14.22 both **𐤅** and **𐤍**¹⁹ render **𐤉𐤁** מבוא with a word meaning 'road,' emending the text here to **במבאי עיר**, which is quite a radical departure from **𐤉**.

ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις αὐτῆς] **𐤉𐤁** לשומם. Words derived from **שׂוֹמֵם** are often rendered in LXX with ἔρημος. Our translator may have been conscious of passages such as **שׂוֹמֵם** לְהַנְחִיל נְחִלֹת שׂוֹמֵם Is 49.8 (**𐤅** κληρονομησαι κληρονομίαν ἐρήμου) and **שׂוֹמֵם** בְּעוֹלָה מְבִינֵי שׂוֹמֵמָה מְבִינֵי רַבִּים ib. 54.1 (**𐤅** πολλά τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα), though in both cases we have a fem. ptc. The ms. sg. **שׂוֹמֵם** is rendered at Dn 8.13 with ἐρήμωσις 'desolation,' see also ib. 9.27, 12.11. We see that these are not precisely what our translator means, someone looking for a one-night stand away from inquisitive eyes. Lévi (II 56) would read **שׂוֹמֵם** 'errerais,' though it is not certain that the feature of 'errant, stray' is an essential, semantic ingredient of the verb.

μη̄ πλανῶ] has nothing whatsoever to do with **𐤉𐤁** אחר ביתה 'after her house.' We see our translator struggling hard.²⁰

9.8) ἀπόστρεψον ὄφθαλμόν ἀπὸ γυναικὸς εὐμόρφου
καὶ μὴ καταμάνθανε κάλλος ἀλλότριον·
ἐν κάλλει γυναικὸς πολλοὶ ἐπλανήθησαν,
καὶ ἐκ τούτου φιλία ὡς πῦρ ἀνακαίεται.

*Turn your eyes away from a shapely woman
and do not become curious about someone else's beauty
for women's beauty many went astray
and because of this, love starts burning like a fire.*

(Aa) העלים עין מאשת חן ואל תביט אל יפי לא לך:
(Ab) בעד אשה השחתו רבים וכן אהביה באש תלהט:

γυναικὸς εὐμόρφου] **𐤉𐤁** אשת חן 'a charming woman.' Εὐμορφος relates not only to face, but also to other parts of a human body.²¹ **𐤅** has not taken

¹⁸ **נָבַל** can be assigned an ingressive as well as simulating value, i.e. 'to behave like **נָבַל**.' See JM § 53 *i* and SQH § 12 f 3 and 6.

¹⁹ The latter does read **שׂוֹמֵם**, but Ziegler has opted for εἰσόδοις supported by B^c alone in preference over ὁδοῖς.

²⁰ Mopsik (122) has no difficulty with the Heb. text of the verse. His translation of **שׂוֹמֵם** is "te rendant ahuri," for which one would anticipate **שׂוֹמֵם**.

²¹ Cf. an elaborate description of Sarai's bodily beauty in *Genesis Apocryphon* col. 20, where the source text is content with **שׂוֹמֵם** יפת־מראה Gn 12.11. Cf. Wagner 1999.213f.

יְהוָה תִּשָּׂא here in the sense of ‘gracious woman’ as in Pr 11.16, where Ⓞ reads γυνή εὐχάριστος ‘an anmutige Frau’ of Smend here. According to Ⓞ it is not about deportment and manners.

καταμάνθανε] ⓂA תביט. The same Gk verb renders תִּבְּוֹן in vs. 4, which, unlike תביט, expresses contemplation not only visual.

κάλλος ἀλλότριον] ⓂA לך לא יפי, most likely referring to a pretty woman already married or still betrothed, hence untouchable.²²

לך לא can be analysed as an asyndetic relative clause, but one would then miss הוא in יפי אשר לא לך*. A few examples of this construction are known to BH: בְּאֶרְץ לֹא לָהֶם Gn 15.13 (Ⓞ ἐν γῆ οὐ ἰδίᾳ), לָכֶם Je 5.19 (Ⓞ ἐν γῆ οὐχ ὑμῶν), מִשְׁכָּנֹת לֹא-לוֹ Hb 1.6 (Ⓞ σκηνώματα οὐκ αὐτοῦ). Especially interesting is ריב לא-לוֹ Pr 26.17 (Ⓞ ἀλλοτρίᾳ κρίσεως), where the adjective ἀλλότριος is to be noted. All the examples have an indeterminate substantive as the core followed by <ל- + suf. pron.>.

ἐν κάλλει γυναικός] ⓂA בעד אשה; κάλλει is probably a free, contextually motivated addition. However, in the quotation of this proverb in the Talmud, see above at 9.3, we read בתואר אשה יפה רבים הושחתו. Smend rejects בעד, preferring ב-, but Pr 6.26 mentioned by himself eloquently speaks in support of בעד: > Ⓞ τιμὴ γὰρ πόρνης ὅση καὶ ἐνὸς ἄρτου, γυνὴ δὲ ἀνδρῶν τιμίας ψυχᾶς ἀγρεύει, where τιμὴ ‘price’ is to be noted.

As in 7.18 above ἐν here is equivalent to the Heb. *beth pretii*. Chasing after good-looking women could cost a lot.

ἐπλανήθησαν] ⓂA תִּשְׁחַתּוּ. In the MS A there is no space enough for a *waw*, which is present in the Talmudic citation adduced above.

תִּשְׁחַתּוּ is used in BH not a few times in the sense of ‘to destroy physically, annihilate’ as in כִּי-בָּא אַחַד הָעַם לְהַשְׁחִית אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲדֹנָיָהוּ 1Sm 26.15. By selecting πλανᾶω Ⓞ indicates that its translator takes the Heb. verb in the sense of moral corruption and depravity. Otherwise he could have used a word such as διαφθείρω as in 1Sm 26.15. Ⓜ אַבְדּוֹ is as equivocal as Heb. תִּשְׁחַתּוּ.

φιλία] = אֲהַבָּהּ ‘love towards her,’ ≠ ⓂA אהביה = אֲהַבָּהּ ‘those who love her,’ a direct object of תלהת ‘she arouses fiery passion with her lovers.’ Ⓜ = Ⓞ: רַחֲמֵהָ אִיָּה נִרְאָה יָקָרָה. Pace Lévi (II 57) there is no need to read אהבת, i.e. אֲהַבָּהּ, for אֲהַבָּהּ is equivalent to אֲהַבָּהּ in אֵילַת אֲהָבִים וַיַּעֲלֵתָהּ in ἔλαφος φιλίας .. Pr 5.19, where אֲהַבָּהּ is parallel to חן. Lévi’s correction would naturally necessitate another correction, כּאש > באש.²³

ὡς πῦρ] = כּאש, i.e. כָּאֵשׁ, ≠ ⓂA באש.

²² Lévi (II 57) most appropriately refers to a story told in Herodotus *Hist.* 1.8 about King Candaules trying to get Cyges, a bodyguard of his, look at his beautiful wife naked.

²³ Smend reads אהבה כּאש תלהת.

- 9.9) μετὰ ὑπάνδρου γυναικὸς μὴ κάθου τὸ σύνολον
καὶ μὴ συμβολοκοπήσης μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν οἴνῳ,
μήποτε ἐκκλίνη ἢ ψυχὴ σου ἐπ' αὐτήν
καὶ τῷ αἵματί σου ὀλίσηθης εἰς ἀπώλειαν.

*Do not dine with a married woman at all
nor make a habit of feasting with her over wine
in case your heart inclines towards her
and you slip into perdition, (paying) with your blood.*

עם בעלה אל תטעם וא[ל] ת[ט]ע עמו שכוּר: (Aa)
פן תט[א] ליה לב ובדמים תטה אל שחת: (Ab)

ὑπάνδρου γυναικὸς] 𐤐𐤁 בעלה, i.e. בְּעֵלָה, as in עֵלֶת-בְּעֵל אִישׁ שְׁכַב עִם-אִשְׁתּוֹ בְּעֵל-בְּעֵלָה Dt 22.22, see also Is 54.1. Note also 𐤎 and 𐤎𐤏 אֲנַתַּת גַּבְרָא [= Heb. אִשְׁתּ אִישׁ Lv 20.10].²⁴

κάθου] 𐤐𐤁 טעם. The same Gk verb is used with reference to a guest invited by a king: ἐγὼ καθίσας οὐ καθίσομαι (𐤐𐤁 לְאֹכּוּלָהּ עִם-הַמֶּלֶךְ לְשֹׁבֵי אִשְׁבָּא) μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως φαγεῖν 1Sm 20.5.

τὸ σύνολον] a plus in 𐤌, a word occurring always adverbially in this form in the sense of ‘altogether,’ whether positively or negatively. The distribution of its occurrence, 8 in all, is interesting: apart from our case here and Es E 24 and 6 times in 3Mc.

συμβολοκοπήσης] 𐤐𐤁 טַב. Rashi and Qimhi interpret טַב 1Sm 16.11 as meaning ‘to sit at a dinner-table (גֻּשְׁבֵי לַאֲכוּל).’ Though neither mentions it, Trg there reads גֻּשְׁבֵי, which means the same. RH uses Hi. טַב in the same sense. Note also 𐤐𐤁 טַב תְּסוּבָה כאָתִיסוּן Si 35.1, where the context is probably a dinner party and in the manuscript the third letter can be only *waw*. Hence טַב is unlikely in Si.

μετ' αὐτῆς] In view of ὑπάνδρου γυναικὸς בעלה above this is the only natural reading as against 𐤐𐤁 עמו.

ἐκκλίνη] 𐤐𐤁 טת. From the manuscript the first letter cannot be *yod*, hence לב is meant as the direct object of the verb, Hi. טת. Ἐκκλίνω is used intransitively as well as transitively. Though transitive, it is used in a contextually affiliated case at ἐξέκλινεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν (וַיֵּט אֶלְיָהָ) τὴν ὁδὸν Gn 38.16 (Judah and Tamar).

τῷ αἵματί σου] By being beheaded by the jealous husband, for instance.

²⁴ 𐤎 as quoted by Lévi (II 57) is substantially different from that of Lagarde, on which our remarks are based. The former agrees with that in the Mossul edition of 1950: עַם מְרַת בְּרַתָּא: עַם מְרַת בְּרַתָּא עִם מְרַת עַמָּה חֲמָרָא עֲתִיקָא דְלָמָא נָסְטָא בְּתָרָה לְבָרָךְ וְחִיב מוֹתָא תְּחוּת לְשִׂוּי ל' לָא תְּסַמְּוֶךְ יַצִּיקֶךְ וְלָא תְּמוּזָג עַמָּה חֲמָרָא עֲתִיקָא דְלָמָא נָסְטָא בְּתָרָה לְבָרָךְ וְחִיב מוֹתָא תְּחוּת לְשִׂוּי. 'With a housewife you should not extend your elbow and drink old wine with her in case your heart turns towards her and you go down into the hell, sentenced to death [not "coupable de mort" (Lévi)].'

ὀλίσθης] H^{A} H^{A} H^{A} . The author is most likely using the same verb deliberately, though with a slight phonetic difference, H^{A} vs. H^{A} . For the translator both were Qal, though he knew that his grandfather was using the verb in two different binyans.

- 9.10) M^{H} ἔγκαταλίπης φίλον ἀρχαῖον,
ὃ γὰρ πρόσφατος οὐκ ἔστιν ἕφιστος αὐτῷ·
οἶνος νέος φίλος νέος·
ἐὰν παλαιωθῆ, μετ' εὐφροσύνης πίεσαι αὐτόν.

*Do not abandon an old friend,
for one not well-known yet is no equal of his.
A new friend is new wine.
If it has aged, you will drink it with pleasure.*

אל תטש אוהב ישן כי ה[ד]ש לא יד[ו]ע[ו]ת[ו]ת (Aa)
יין חדש אוהב חדש וישן אהר תשתינו: (Ab)

ἕφιστος αὐτῷ] The only letters that can be deciphered with certainty are H^{A} . He is still an unknown quantity? H^{A} is rather close to H^{A} . The use of the dative here is comparable with that of H^{A} .

οἶνος νέος φίλος νέος] The non-use of a copula in proverbial sayings is highly common, see *SSG* § 94 **dc**.

μετ' εὐφροσύνης] a plus in H^{A} .

ἐὰν παλαιωθῆ] H^{A} H^{A} , i.e. H^{A} .²⁵

- 9.11) M^{H} ζηλώσης δόξαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ·
οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί ἔσται ἡ καταστροφή αὐτοῦ.

*Do not envy a sinner's success
for you do not know what his end is going to be like.*

... תקנא באיש רשע כי לא תדע מה יומו: (A)

ζηλώσης δόξαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ] H^{A} H^{A} H^{A} . H^{A} combined with H^{A} , whether meaning ‘to envy’ or ‘to be jealous of,’ usually takes a personal object.²⁶ Ζηλώω in the sense of “to aspire and ardently strive to attain” is used with H^{A} in CG (LSJ s.v. **II**), but H^{A} is not used in BH in that sense.

οἶδας] H^{A} H^{A} , an Impf. indicating a theoretical possibility, i.e. ‘even if you tried, you wouldn’t be able to find out.’ On this value of the Impf., see *sqh* § 15 **dae**.

²⁵ Van Peursen (2004.349) identifies here a protasis of a conditional sentence.

²⁶ Syriac allows such a construction as is evident not only here H^{A} H^{A} H^{A} but also in H^{A} H^{A} H^{A} 1Cor 14.1 (ζηλοῦτε τὰ πνευματικά).

ἡ καταστροφή αὐτοῦ] **HA** יומו. **G** makes explicit what is implied in **H**. So also **S** הַתְּרָה ‘his end.’

Whilst καταστροφή can also mean “ruin,”²⁷ we doubt that that is what is meant here, since it is markedly different from **יו**. The meaning “end” is assured. Cp. especially τὴν ἄδηλον τοῦ βίου καταστροφήν ‘life’s uncertain conclusion’ 3M 4.4 with ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν οἰκτίστῳ μὶ ῥῶ κατέστρεψεν τὸν βίον ‘he ended in the mountains with a most pitiable fate’ 2M 9.28.²⁸

9.12) μὴ εὐδοκίης ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ ἀσεβῶν·
μνήσθητι ὅτι ἕως ἄδου οὐ μὴ δικαιωθῶσιν.

Do not seek happiness in the sort of prosperity of infidels.

Remember that they will not be able to stay innocent until Hades.

א ל ... בודון מצליח זכר כי עת מות לא ינקה: (A

εὐδοκίης] a lacuna in **HA**. **S** הַתְּרָה suggests **לא תקנא** as in vs. 11. The repetition of εὐδοκ- in **G** does not imply a comparable repetition (paronymy) in its Heb. *Vorlage*, since **HA** זדון מצליח ‘insolence of a successful person’ has nothing to do with εὐδοκ-. The translator also may have faced a Heb. text in disarray and chosen to rewrite the proverb.

S עוֹלָא דְּמַצְלִיחַ = עוֹלָא דְּמַצְלִיחַ (so Segal 58 and Kahana 464), and not דְּדוֹן מַצְלִיחַ.

ἕως ἄδου] = עד מות, ≠ **HA** עת מות, in which latter the absence of some preposition at the beginning is odd. Is the idea that at the moment of death your future destiny is determined? Or alternatively, “they will not go scot-free all their lives” (Snaith 52)?

οὐ μὴ δικαιωθῶσιν] **HA** לא ינקה. The selection of the pl. form in **G** is due to ἀσεβῶν. **S** takes ינקה as 3ms impersonally used, hence וְאֵין לָא יִנְקָא ‘none will be innocent.’

9.13) μακρὰν ἄπεχε ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου, ὃς ἔχει ἐξουσίαν τοῦ φονεῦειν,
καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑποπτέυσης φόβον θανάτου·
κἂν προσέλθῃς, μὴ πλημμελήσῃς,
ἵνα μὴ ἀφέλῃται τὴν ζωὴν σου·
ἐπίγνωθι ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ παγίδων διαβαίνεις
καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπάλλεων πόλεως περιπατεῖς.

²⁷ So understood in **S** הַפְּרִיקָה ‘destruction,’ *SD* “sein Untergang” and *NETS* “his undoing.”

²⁸ In spite of his translation with “Katrastrophe” Ryssel suggests סופו as lying in the background, mentioning καταστροφῆς τοῦ λόγου ‘the end of the story’ Dn 7.27 (MT 28 סוף אַתְּמִי־דִי) LXX, where we note τὸ πέρασ τοῦ λόγου TH, which means only ‘the end of the story.’

*Keep far away from a person who has authority to put to death,
but never be scared too much of death.*

*Even if you came near to him, do not make a faux pas,
so that he may not take your life.*

*Remind yourself that you are walking through a field of traps
and walking on battlements of a city.*

(Aa) רחק מאיש . . ט להר[וג] ואל תפחד פחדי מות:
(Ab) ואם קרבת לא תאשם פן יקח [א]ת נשמתך:
(Ac) דע כי בין פחים תצעד ועל רשת תתה[לך]:

ὄς ἔχει ἐξουσίαν] The only letter remaining in \mathfrak{A} ט can be safely restored as \mathfrak{S} שְׁלִיט. So \mathfrak{S} דְּשִׁלִּיט. One plausibly reconstructs an inf. להרוג to follow. No other instance of \mathfrak{S} שְׁלִיט complemented with an inf. is found in BH nor in RH. By contrast, in Syriac, as here \mathfrak{S} שְׁלִיט לְמַקְטִיל, it is a commonplace. E.g. תְּלַמִּידֶיךָ עֲבָדִין מְדָם דְּלָא שְׁלִיט לְמַעְבָּד בְּשַׁבְּתָא Mt 12.2.

καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑποπτεύσης φόβον θανάτου] \mathfrak{A} ואל תפחד פחדי מות. We do not know why our translator has selected a rather rare verb, ὑποπτεύω, when he could have used φοβέομαι in order to translate this typically BH paronomastic structure as in φοβηθήσονται φόβον Ps 52.6 < \mathfrak{A} פְּחָד־פְּחָד. Cf. \mathfrak{S} וְלֹא תִדְחַל מִן דְּחֻלְתָּא דְּמוֹתָא.

A double negator²⁹ may be used for stringent prohibition: οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου ‘you shall not eat from any tree under any circumstances’ Ge 3.1. Such an analysis fits our case here well and hence no need to postulate a scribal error of אל in lieu of לא. This use of < οὐ μὴ + subj. > for strict prohibition is optional, for in Gn 3.3 Eve answers the snake: Οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. We doubt that she is as clever as the snake and toning the divine stricture down. In both we read לא תאכלו. In the third line we read μὴ πλημμελήσης for לא תאשם. There is no mechanical correlation between אל and οὐ μὴ. See above at vs. 12 οὐ μὴ δικαιωθῶσιν // לא ינקה, where אל can not be used.

The pl. פחדי may express diverse forms and manifestations of fear or its great intensity, see *SQH* § 8 **cb, cc** and König 1897 § 262a. BH attests once to the pl. of this word in קול פְּחָדִים Jb 15.21.³⁰

πλημμελήσης] תאשם. The error meant here might be a little more serious than a mere faux pas, say, bowing only once instead of thrice. At Si 23.23 the verb is used with reference to adultery. In CG it may refer to a false note

²⁹ On double, even triple, negation see *SSG* § 29 **ba (ii-a)**, 83 **c-cf**.

³⁰ If in “craintes mortelles” (Lévi II 59) and “angoisses mortelles” (Mopsik 124) “mortel” is being used as a mere intensifier as in Engl. “deadly dullness,” we would note that Hebrew does not use מות in such a manner, and that the author is using the word here in its literal sense is confirmed by the preceding להרוג.

συνετῶν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ נבון. The considerable discrepancy in 15b between the two texts notwithstanding, בנינותם ‘in their midst’ presupposes the pl. נבונים.

ὁ διαλογισμὸς σου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ חשבונך. The only other instance in LXX of this equation is at Si 27.5: πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐν διαλογισμῷ αὐτοῦ כמוהו איש על חשבונו.

διήγησις σου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ סוד, the sole instance in LXX of the equation διήγησις / חשבון. Cf. \mathfrak{S} שׁוֹעִיטָךְ ‘your stories’ or ‘your lessons.’

ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ בינותם, cf. \mathfrak{S} באור־התה דְּמַרְיָא ‘about the ways of the Lord.’

In the second line ἔστω and יהי found in the first line are understood. We have then a single proverb, and the second half means “Don’t go to see sages merely for a social chat.”

9.16) ἄνδρες δίκαιοι ἔστωσαν σύνδειπνοὶ σου,
καὶ ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου ἔστω τὸ καύχημά σου.

*Let righteous people be your companions at your dinner-table
and your pride be in the fear of the Lord.*

(A) אַנְשֵׁי צְדָק בְּעַלֵי לַחֲמֶךָ וּבִירַאת אֱלֹהִים תִּפְאָרְתְּךָ:

ἄνδρες δίκαιοι] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אַנְשֵׁי צְדָק instead of אַנְשֵׁים צְדִיקִים. Similar cst. phrases indicating quality occur also in בחירי צדק 1QH^a 10.15, בחורי צדק 4Q184 1.14 and אשישי צדק 4Q502 6-10.9, all with צְדָק in the st. rectus.³⁵

σύνδειπνοὶ σου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ בְּעַלֵי לַחֲמֶךָ, a cst. phrase unknown elsewhere. Cf. σύνδειπνοὶ σου φίλος κοινωνὸς τραπεζῶν Si 6.10.

Smend misses a copula in אַנְשֵׁי צְדָק בְּעַלֵי לַחֲמֶךָ, but bipartite nominal clauses are all over the place in Hebrew. Just to cite two examples: כבוד איש כבוד אביו 3.11 A and יין חדש אוהב חדש vs. 10 A. Is Smend expecting to find יהיו?

τὸ καύχημά σου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תִּפְאָרְתְּךָ. The author is perhaps saying: “Your first-class cutlery should not be what your guests are to be impressed with.” According to Segal (60) the piety is that of the guests.³⁶

9.17) ἐν χειρὶ τεχνιτῶν ἔργον ἐπαινεσθήσεται,
καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος λαοῦ σοφὸς ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ.

*In the case of artisans their handicraft could be praised
and one who rules a people (is to be) wise in his speech.*

(A) בַּחֲמֵי יָדַיִם יִחַשֵׁךְ יוֹשֵׁר וּמוֹשַׁל בְּעַמּוֹ חָכֵם:

The general discrepancy between the two texts, at least in words, is substantial:

³⁵ Cf. *SQH* § 21 xviii.

³⁶ In Tob 2.2 Tobit, having feasted his eyes on the gorgeous meal set on the table, instructs Tobias, his son, to go to Nineveh and fetch as a guest a poor compatriot who has not yet forgotten his God.

ⲘA: ‘among [or: through] artisans straightness could be preserved and one who rules his people is wise.’ Practical wisdom or skill is contrasted with intellectual wisdom. For our translator **הַכְּמָה** of craftsmen is not to be put on a par with that requisite for national leaders. Hence σοφός is reserved for the latter only and one manifestation of the wisdom is highlighted as eloquence in oratory. By contrast that in which artisans could excel, **יושר**, remains unmentioned: the smooth surface of a door, for instance. Is this a biased view of manual labourers on the part of our middle-class translator? In the application of **הַכְּמָה** and **הַכְּמָה** to dexterity in practical skills there is no difficulty, see BDB s.v. **הַכְּמָה** 1 and **הַכְּמָה** 1.

Ⲙ departs from Ⲙ no less than Ⲙ: **בְּהַכְּמַתָּה דְדִינָא תְתִקֵּן מְדִינָתָא וְדִשְׁלִיט**: **בְּעֵמְמָא חֲקִים וְסִכּוּלִתָּן** ‘With the wisdom of a judge a city will remain stable and one who rules peoples is wise and prudent.’³⁷

9.18) φοβερὸς ἐν πόλει αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ γλωσσώδης,
καὶ ὁ προπετὴς ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ μισηθήσεται.

*A chatterbox is a terror in his city,
and a rash speaker would be detested.*

(A) ביטה נורא בעד איש לשון ומשא על פיהו ישונא

The Heb. text of the verse is replete with difficulties. Ⲙ is to be compared with this:

אִתְּרֵיב בְּקִרְיָתָא גְבָרָא פְּכֻנָא וְדִנְסָב עַל פּוּמָה מְסֻתָּנָא ‘a garrulous person is dreaded in his city and one who is boastful in speech³⁸ is detested.’

ביטה, even after being emended to **בוטה**, would be hanging in the air, not connected with what follows. However, note **בוטה** rendered with *λαλία* above at 5.13. Could we analyse it as a substantivised ptc., ‘dreadful speaker’? In any event there is nothing in Ⲙ and Ⲙ that would correspond to **בוטה**.

ἐν πόλει αὐτοῦ] = **בעיר** or **בעירו**.

ἀνὴρ γλωσσώδης] Cf. ἀνθρώπου γλωσσώδους in 8.3 above, translating the same Heb. phrase.

προπετὴς] There is no linkage whatsoever with **משא** irrespective of its vocalisation. The author probably meant: “one would loathe to be lectured by such a speaker,” i.e. **מְשָׁא** ‘oral message.’

μισηθήσεται] Pu. **אִשְׁנָא** is unattested in BH, but occurs once in QH: **כמשונא** 4Q179 1.2.3. More importantly, its active Pi. occurs in BH as often as 15 times, and all in poetry.

³⁷ Mopsik’s (126) translation of the first line is scarcely justifiable: “À cause des manipulateurs la droiture s’obscurcit.”

³⁸ For this definition as offered in *SL* s.v. **אִשְׁנָא** pe. 22 our Si passage is the only reference to this unusual collocation.

CHAPTER 10

10.1) Κριτής σοφός παιδεύσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἡγεμονία συνετοῦ τεταγμένη ἔσται.

*A wise ruler shall educate his people,
then a stable government of a prudent person would be established.*

(A) שופט עם יוסד עמו וממשלת מבין סרידה:

Κριτής] H^A שופט. I *iudex*, S and S^h אִיִּן, Mopsik “législateur,” and NETS “judge” take the words concerned in their narrow, juridic sense. It is well known that they are very often used in a broader sense, ‘leader, ruler,’ in the book of Judges. A different interpretation is represented in Lévi (II 63) “magistrat,” Smend “Fürst,” Ryssel “Herrscher,” Box - Oesterley “governor,” *BJ* “gouvernant,” Skehan - Di Lella “magistrate,” and Snaitch “ruler.” Whereas in the book of Judges the function of military leadership plays an important, albeit not exclusive, role of שָׁפֵט / κριτής, such a role is probably not on the mind of Ben Sira, given the contemporary geopolitical position of his coreligionists. At 8.14 above, for instance, he is using the word in its narrow sense and his translator is using κριτής in the sense of “judge,” but, as pointed out by Ryssel (287), at 41.18 he is using the same Gk word to render H^B and M אֲדוֹן. Likewise in vs. 2 below οἱ λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ scarcely designate a judge’s secretarial staff.

One implication of this analysis is that κριτής σοφός (a) and συνετός (b) most likely designate one and the same person.

παιδεύσει] H^A יוסד ‘he established’ has been read as ייסר, i.e. יִיָּסַר. So S נִלְחָם. σοφός] = חכם, ≠ H^A עם ‘of a nation.’

τεταγμένη ἔσται] H^A סרידה, what makes little sense. BH knows $\sqrt{\text{סדר}}$ only in the hapax סְדָרִים ‘order, i.e. not chaos’ Jb 10.22. By contrast it is extremely common in QH and RH, as a verb as well as a substantive.¹ E.g. שְׂדֵרֵי אִישׁ אַחַר אִישׁ ‘(seven forward rows) arranged [= סְדוּרִים] in order; the station of each man behind his colleague’ 1QM 5.4. We would then read our Si text as סְדוּר, i.e. סְדוּר, so Smend and Segal (60).

In contrast to the plain Fut., ταχθήσεται, the periphrastic structure with a pass. Pf. ptc. indicates that a condition that will have emerged is going to remain so for long, hence *stable* in our translation above,² cf. *SSG* § 31 **fd**, **fi** (iii) and also see above at 4.31.

¹ See *DCH* 6.122f. and Jastrow 1903.958f.

² Cf. I *stabilis erit*.

- 10.2) κατὰ τὸν κριτὴν τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτως καὶ οἱ λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡγούμενον τῆς πόλεως πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες
αὐτήν.

*Like nation's ruler, like his ministers,
and like mayor of the city, like all its residents.*

כְּשׁוֹפֵט עַם כֵּן מְלִיצִיּוֹ וְכִרְאֵשׁ עִיר כֵּן יוֹשְׁבָיו: (A

κατὰ .. οὕτως καὶ] \mathfrak{H} A כֵּן .. כִּי as in Engl. *Like father like son*.³ The same formula is repeated in 2b) in \mathfrak{H} A, but in \mathfrak{G} we have πάντες = כל for כֵּן.

οἱ λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A מְלִיצִיּוֹ. An Egyptian interpreter who sat beside Joseph in his exchange with his brothers is called מְלִיצִי Gn 42.23. In Is 43.27 people serving as middlemen between God and His people are called מְלִיצִים. Here then we have a group of office-bearers between a nation's highest authority and the general public.

οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν] = יוֹשְׁבֵיהֶּ as against \mathfrak{H} A יוֹשְׁבָיו 'his citizens.' From the Heb. perspective the relationship between a mayor and *his* residents, not where they dwell. Let us also note that οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτῆς would be unidiomatic, cf. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν Lv 25.10 (\mathfrak{H} בְּאַרְץ לְכָל-יֹשְׁבֵיהָ).⁴ Note \mathfrak{S} עֲמֹרִיָּה (3fs. suf.).

- 10.3) βασιλεὺς ἀπαιδευτος ἀπολεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πόλις οἰκισθήσεται ἐν συνέσει δυναστῶν.

*An uneducated king ruins his people
and a city is built up with (its) leaders' intelligence.*

מֶלֶךְ פְּרוּעַ יִשְׁחִית עִיר וְעִיר נוֹשֶׁבֶת בְּשֹׁכֵל שְׂרִיָּה: (A

ἀπαιδευτος] \mathfrak{H} A פְּרוּעַ. פְּרוּעַ occurs twice in BH: of Israelites who completely took leave of their senses, making and worshipping golden calves (Ex 32.25) and of a leper who needed go around with the hair of his head hanging down loose (Lv 13.45). Neither helps us understand why ἀπαιδευτος has been selected. Lévi (II 63) says nothing on his "dément." Mopsik (128) has "inconséquent"; a king need be a little worse than inconsistent in order to ruin a city under his rule.⁵

τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ] \mathfrak{H} A עִיר. \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}\eta$ = \mathfrak{G} .

For the message of 3b, cf. 16.4 below.

³ The subtitle of a segment in our 2020 book, p. 53, and cf. בְּהָאָהָהָה Ez 16.44 (\mathfrak{G} Καθὼς ἡ μήτηρ, καὶ ἡ θυγάτηρ). Cf. also Snaith (52): "Like ruler, like ministers; like sovereign, like subjects."

⁴ Cf. SSG § 31 **bbb**.

⁵ Mopsik's suggestion that Ben Sira is enjoying a play of words by using a word that shares the root with פְּרָעָה, whose blind obstinacy led to his people's ruin is fantastic.

- 10.4) ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου ἡ ἐξουσία τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸν χρήσιμον ἐγερεῖ εἰς καιρὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς.

*The sovereignty over the world is in the hand of the Lord
and He will raise on time the right (person) over it.*

(A) ביד אלהים ממשלת תבל ואיש לעת יעמד עליה:

ἐν χειρὶ] \mathfrak{A} ביד. The use of the sg. form does not mean that the Lord runs the world single-handed. It is an idiomatic, pseudo preposition, as shown in $\text{בִּיד עֲרִיצִים לֹא נִתְּנָם}$ ‘into the power of the violent He did not deliver them’ 4Q434 1.5, cf. *SQH* § 8 aa.

τῆς γῆς] \mathfrak{A} תבל. Of diverse senses of γῆ it denotes here “the entire inhabited world, the world,” thus synonymous with οἰκουμένη, see *GELS* s.v. γῆ 4 c. One such example is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς Gn 22.18.

τὸν χρήσιμον] \mathfrak{A} איש. Cf. שׁוֹכֵר דְּכָשָׁר ‘one who is suitable’ and שׁוֹכֵר דְּחָשָׁב ‘one who is required, suitable.’ Though once in LXX כָּשָׁר is rendered with χρήσιμος To 3.10 C^{II} , where it is about whether hanging oneself is ethically proper or not, the two Heb. words are graphically quite distinct from each other. Hence the selection of this Gk word here is plausibly a result of free translation.

ἐγερεῖ] \mathfrak{A} יעמד, which can be taken as Qal, i.e. יַעֲמַד . However, יַעֲמַד ⁶ accords better with God’s sovereignty mentioned in the preceding line.

εἰς καιρὸν] \mathfrak{A} לעת. The word order has been changed in $\text{שׁוֹכֵר לְעֵדְנָה לְנֶאֱמָר}$, suggesting that εἰς καιρὸν is being construed with χρήσιμον , an analysis that Greek syntax would hardly tolerate.⁷

- 10.5) ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου εὐδοκία ἀνδρός,
καὶ προσώπῳ γραμματέως ἐπιθήσει δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

*In the hand of the Lord is man’s success,
and He will make a leader’s face shine.*

(A) ביד אלהים ממשלת כל גבר ולפני מחוקק ישית הודו:

εὐδοκία] \mathfrak{A} ממשלת. Neither εὐδοκία nor any of the derivationally related words, i.e. εὐδοκος, εὐδοκόω, εὐδόκος, is rendered with a word derived from מִשְׁלָה .⁸ ממשלת in the preceding verse may have intruded, though ממשלת does make good sense in the context. שׁוֹלְטָנָא is = \mathfrak{A} .

⁶ So Smend and Kahana (464) as against Segal (58) יַעֲמַד and BSH (244).

⁷ Cf. also “the person useful for the time” (*NETS*). Likewise Smend: “den Mann für die Zeit,” for which we would rather anticipate אִישׁ לְעֵת . Pace Mopsik’s (128) “un homme pour un temps y est promu” we doubt that our author is going on about a temporary, short-term appointment [“pour un temps bref et déterminé”].

⁸ מצלח suggested by Smend has too little graphic similarity with ממשלת.

ἀνδρός] $\mathfrak{H}A$ גבר. Though ἀνήρ is often used as a gender-neutral synonym of ἄνθρωπος (*GELS* s.v. ἀνήρ 2), the use of גבר here speaks against such an analysis. Our author has written quite a few proverbs touching on women, e.g. 9.1-9, 25.15-26.18, but he never directly addresses them. By contrast, many proverbs begin with בני in the vocative, 3.12 et passim, and it is mostly translated with τέκνον. Only once υἱέ occurs: 7.3. In the whole of LXX τέκνον is specifically applied to a daughter in To 7.17 \mathfrak{G}^1 only and parallel to θύγατερ. All this is understandable against the background of the contemporary male-dominant culture.

προσώπῳ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ לפני. Apparently \mathfrak{G} took the Heb. pseudo preposition literally, so על פְּרִצּוּפָא נִי.⁹ That, however, sounds odd in the context. Segal (60) holds that לפני is equivalent to על פני. But in none of the references he invokes there is used פְּנֵי על.

γραμματέως] $\mathfrak{H}A$ מחוקק ‘legislator,’ a very specific word in comparison with γραμματεὺς, though the context here points to a leader in the faith community. Cf. Mopsik 128.

δόξαν αὐτοῦ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ הודו. The referent is ambiguous: God’s or the leader’s? \mathfrak{S} disambiguates with נְתַל אִיקְרָהּ נְתַל לְדָחֵלְהָ ‘He bestows His glory on those who fear Him.’

10.6) Ἐπὶ παντὶ ἀδικήματι μὴ μηνιάσης τῷ πλησίον
καὶ μὴ πᾶσσε μηδὲν ἐν ἔργοις ὑβρεως.

*Over any wrongdoing do not deal with your neighbour angrily
and do not do anything arrogantly.*

(A [ב] כל פשע אל תשלים רע לריע ואל תהלך בדרך גאווה:

παντὶ] We hereby withdraw our hesitation indicated in *GELS* s.v. πᾶς **II b**. < πᾶς + sg. noun > not immediately preceded by a negator expresses categorical negation, e.g. Τί ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ θεός Οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ Gn 3.1, where the snake is cleverly insinuating: “Surely God could not possibly have forbidden you to eat off any tree whatsoever?”. By contrast, when a negator immediately precedes < πᾶς + sg. noun > the negation meant is partial, where the negator is to be construed with πᾶς, e.g. οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν συμφέρει, καὶ οὐ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐν παντὶ εὐδοκεῖ ‘not everything benefits everybody, and not every soul is pleased in all circumstances’ Si 37.28; μὴ πάντα ἄνθρωπον εἴσαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου ‘Don’t allow everyone into your home’ Si 11.29; μὴ παντὶ λόγῳ πίστευε ‘Don’t believe every word’ 19.15, cf. *SSG* § 83 **fa, ff**.

⁹ So Mopsik (128): “sur la face du dignitaire.”

μηνιάσῃς] Quite different from $\mathfrak{H}A$ תשלִים ‘you requite, pay back.’¹⁰ The expression רָצַח תְּחַת טוֹבָה, which occurs three times in the Heb. Bible (Gn 44.4, Ps 35.12, 38.21), must have been well known to our translator.¹¹ Precisely the same Gk expression recurs at Si 28.7, where we have no Heb. text preserved. \mathfrak{S} also behaves in an unusual manner: 10.6 לֹא תִטְלוּם רְחֻמְךָ ‘you shall not accuse your friend wrongly’ and 28.7 לֹא תִסְנֵא חֲבֵרְךָ ‘you shall not hate your colleague.’ At the three above-mentioned OT passages we find the phrase פָּרַע בִּישָׁתָא חֲלָף טַבְתָּא.

When Heb. uses an adjective on its own to express an abstract notion, the fem. gender is the norm as in the above-quoted BH idiom. For more examples, see JM § 134 *n*. We should note, however, this pair of adjectives appearing in the masc. gender in וְרָע עַץ הַדְּעַת טוֹב וְרָע Gn 2.9, וְרָע וְרָעִי יְדִיעֵי טוֹב וְרָע, ib. 3.5, sim. 3.22.

In the second hemistich it is difficult to reconcile the two texts, though they do not contradict each other in thought: $\mathfrak{H}A$ ‘and you shall not walk in an arrogant manner.’

\mathfrak{S} presents doublets with something totally different in between: וְלֹא תִהְלֵךְ בְּאִוְרְחָא דְנִאֲוִתְנָא מִן כָּל חֻטְיָא וְכַדְבּוּתָא אֲרִיחֵךְ וְלֹא תִהְלֵךְ בְּרוּחָא דְרְמָתָא ‘and you shall not walk in the manner of the proud. From every sin and deception keep away, and you shall not walk with an arrogant spirit.’

10.7) μισητή ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὑπερηφανία,
καὶ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πλημμελῆς ἢ ἀδικία.

*Arrogance is detestable in the presence of the Lord and people
and to both is unjust intolerable.*

(A שְׂנוּאָה לְאָדוֹן וְאִנְשִׁים גְּאוּה וּמִשְׁנִיָּה מֵעַל עֶשֶׂק;

κυρίου] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אָדוֹן, an extremely rare equation attested in Si only once more as a gloss for אֱלֹהִים ‘God’ in 32.22 $\mathfrak{H}B$. As one rare example in OT Segal (62) mentions מִלְפָּנֵי אָדוֹן חוּלֵי אֲרָץ מִלְפָּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי יִעֲקֹב Ps 114.7.

πλημμελῆς] $\mathfrak{H}A$ מֵעַל. This Gk word is a hapax in LXX. In *GELS* s.v. we defined its sense as “out of favour.” With ἀδικία as its *s* a more condemnatory rendering might be preferable.¹² On πλημμελέω, see above at 9.13.

¹⁰ *Pace Lévi* (II 63) the Heb. verb here does not mean “punir”; his translation leaves רַע out - “ne punis pas ton prochain.”

¹¹ According to Smend the Heb. text here is amiss: “Dass man dem Nächsten niemals Böses mit Bösem vergelten solle, erwartet man hier nicht zu hören. Denn גְּאוּה ist nicht die Rache für das Unrecht, sondern das Unrecht selbst.” We are sceptical that פָּשַׁע and נִאֲוָה here are meant to be blamed on one and the same person. רָע וְרָעִי is scarcely translatable with “vergewaltigen.” What is wrong with identifying in Ben Sira a precursor of Jesus, who adamantly spoke against the lex talionis (Mt 5.38f.)? So would later two of his renowned disciples: Paul (Ro 12.17) and Peter (1Pt 3.9).

¹² In CG it does not appear to be used in connection with ethical, moral perspectives when used with a non-human referent.

In 𐤂 (7b) we see a simple nominal clause with no copula, whereas 𐤃 cannot be so analysed: משניהם מעל עשק, which could be vocalised as מְשִׁינְהֵם מְעַל עֶשֶׂק. Do the last two words constitute a construct phrase?¹³ But meaning what? “Treachery for the purpose of gains of extortion”?¹⁴ 𐤄 has a conjunction between them: וְטוֹפְיָא וְטוֹמְיָא. This could be applied to 𐤃, but then the two masc. subjects would be sharing the fem. sg. predicate with the preceding גאווה: שנואה לאדון ואנשים גאווה.

10.8) βασιλεία ἀπὸ ἔθνους εἰς ἔθνος μετάγεται
διὰ ἀδικίας καὶ ὕβρεις καὶ χρήματα.
¶ φιλαργύρου μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀνομώτερον·
οὗτος γὰρ καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἔκπρακτον ποιεῖ. ¶

Empire passes from nation to nation

because of injustices and arrogance and monies.

*For nothing goes against law more than someone greedy for money
for such a person makes his own soul available for purchase.*

(A) מלכות מגוי אל גוי תסוב בגלל חמס גאווה:

As in the preceding verse the second hemistich shows similar discrepancies between the two texts. 𐤃A (חמס גאווה) has two nouns with no *waw* linking them, whereas in 𐤂 we see three substantives joined with *καί*. The Heb. phrase can be analysed as a cst. chain, ‘violence characterised or motivated by arrogance.’¹⁵ 𐤄 shows three coordinate terms joined with the conjunction וּ: עוֹלָא וְנִלְא וְצִרְיָא ‘sins and arrogance and mammon.’ Likewise 𐤄N עוֹלָא וְנִלְא וְצִרְיָא ‘iniquity and depravities and ill-gotten monies.’

The additional two lines are absent in 𐤄, but present in 𐤄N, the first half of which is not easy to understand: טב מן רחם כספא מן גיר ולא מדם לא נמוסא. הקנא גיר ולנפשא דילה מובנתא עבד.

[φιλαργύρου] Since Gk has φιλαργυρία, a substantive meaning ‘love of money,’ we are inclined to parsing φιλαργύρου as masc. rather than neut. used to indicate an abstract notion as in ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν Gn 3.5. More importantly we find οὗτος in the following line, not τοῦτο. Its referent is unquestionably a personal entity; a thing does not have ψυχή. All the same we could have anticipated οὐδεὶς ἀνομώτερος. Furthermore, ἔκπρακτον can be taken as either masculine or neuter. In the latter case it would mean ‘something up for sale.’¹⁶

¹³ So 𐤄N מְסַכְלָנְתָא דְעוֹלָא ‘the error of iniquity.’

¹⁴ On cst. phrases in which the first term indicates a purpose for the second, see *SQH* § 21 b (xvi). E.g. מכשול עוונו ‘a trap for his iniquity’ 1QS 2.12.

¹⁵ So Smend ‘wegen übermütiger Gewalttat,’ Segal (61f.) גָּאָוָה, and Mopsik (129) ‘la violence de l’orgueil.’

¹⁶ *SL* does not list a self-standing, fem. substantive. Apparently it would parse מובנתא in 𐤄N as Pael f.s. participle, ‘a seller,’ an analysis which might be justified with reference to נַפְשָׁא, a fem. noun.

- 10.9) τί ὑπερηφανεύεται γῆ καὶ σποδός;
ὄτι ἐν ζῶῃ ἔρριψα τὰ ἐνδόσθια αὐτοῦ.

*Why does (someone comparable to) dust and ashes act arrogantly?
For I activated his entrails.*

(A) מה יגאה עפר ואפר אשר בחייו יורם גִּיּוֹ:

τί] 𐤀A. Both can be idiomatically used in the sense of “Why?”.

γῆ καὶ σποδός] 𐤀C *עפר ואפר*, a standing idiom denoting something of negligible account in both languages, e.g. Gn 18.27, Si 17.32, 40.3.

We wonder if 9b) in 𐤀 is an allusion to the story of the creation of the first human couple, that of Eve in particular (Gn 2.21f.). In any event, with his ἔρριψα ‘I cast,’ 𐤀 presents God on the stage. We suggest that ἐν is being used here as equivalent to εἰς as occasionally happens in SG, e.g. τὰ παιδιά, ἃ εἶπατε ἐν διαρπαγῇ ἔσσεσθαι Nu 14.31 // αἱ γυναῖκες ἡμῶν καὶ τὰ παιδιά ἔσσονται εἰς διαρπαγὴν ib. 14.3. Especially intriguing is ἔρριψεν αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ μέτρου, followed by καὶ ἔρριψεν τὸν λίθον τοῦ μολίβου εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς Zc 5.8. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. 17.

ἔρριψα] 𐤀A יורם.¹⁷ Lévi (II 64) wonders whether we should read יורם. Reference is made to יָרַם תּוֹלְעִים וַיִּבְאֵשׁ ‘it became wormy and stank’ Ex 16.20. The mention of תּוֹלְעָה two verses further on indicates that our author is probably alluding to this incident recorded in Ex 16, what, however, appears to have escaped the translator. Then 𐤀A אשר בחייו יורם גִּיּוֹ could be translated as ‘whose body will have worms crawling over it while still in life,’ i.e. already in life, not only after death, cf. בְּמֹת אָדָם יִנְחַל רֵמָה (vs. 11) and many biblical passages, e.g. Jb 25.6. Cf. 𐤀 דְּבַחְיָהּ תּוֹלְעָא רְחֶשֶׁן ‘when he is alive worms are crawling.’ This is followed by an extensive plus: 𐤀 נְבֻחָהּ וּמְעֻהָ אֶסְיָא נְצָרָא וּמְנָא מְהַלְךְ וּמְחַר מְאָת מְאָת ‘a doctor will dissect his sides and intestines. He is walking about¹⁸ today, but tomorrow dying’; the last statement is close to 10b.

We are still in the dark as to how our translator, starting from יורם or ירום, has arrived at ἔρριψα. Though רמה is a common verb meaning ‘to throw’ in Aramaic, רמית and ירום do not exactly resemble each other.¹⁹

τὰ ἐνδόσθια αὐτοῦ] 𐤀A גִּיּוֹ. In BH the affiliated noun meaning “body, corpse” is גִּיּוֹה, fem. Syriac has גִּי ‘intestine.’ Whoever vocalised 𐤀A, his Hebrew vocabulary had גִּי or something like that, cf. פָּרִיּו > פָּרִי.

Ἐνδόσθια is unknown prior to SG. In CG it appears as ἐντόσθια, originally from an adjective, ἐντόσθιος ‘intestinal’²⁰ and is mostly substantivised.

¹⁷ From the facsimile of the manuscript we cannot be absolutely certain about the last letter, but ירום is reasonable, a reading adopted by BSH, Beentjes, and Abegg.

¹⁸ מהלך read as מלך.

¹⁹ 𐤀 reads אֶסְיָא ‘he rejected’ or ‘he despised.’ Ziegler, presumably following Smend, postulates εἰσοδουσαν as lying behind 𐤀, but there is no such variant among Greek manuscripts.

²⁰ In LSJ we find only one reference for CG.

As in SG it is always n.pl., meaning ‘intestines.’ It is the use of the plural for indicating a large quantity, e.g. τὰ δάκρυά μου ‘my tears’ Ps 55.9.²¹ Hebrew also admits a similar use of the plural, e.g. דְּמַיִם ‘bloodshed’ 1QH^a 15.6, probably alluding to a pool of blood shed.²² But יָדוֹ can mean ‘a piece of fruit in his hand’ as well as ‘fruits in his hand.’

10.10) μακρὸν ἀρρώστημα σκώπτει ἰατρόν·
καὶ βασιλεὺς σήμερον, καὶ αὐριον τελευτήσει.

A chronic disease makes mockery of a doctor.

And today a king, and tomorrow he might die.

(A) שמץ מחלה יצהיב רופא מלך היום ומחר יפול:

μακρὸν] H^A שמץ. The widely agreed meaning of שמץ ‘whisper’ Jb 4.12, 26.14 does not apply here.²³ On the other hand, the noun is known to mean ‘small quantity’ in RH, see Jastrow s.v. However, that would be exactly opposite to μακρός.²⁴ Our translator is consistent in translating the same Heb. word at 18.32 with πολὺς. Moreover, הַצְהִיב cannot be harmonised with σκώπτω.²⁵ The author probably meant to say: “Just a mere sign of illness,” the doctor might smile, but his diagnosis turned out to be fatally wrong, the condition of his patient, a king, suddenly degenerates and it is only one day before he dies.²⁶ To match such an understanding the first clause of C must look significantly different from Ziegler’s text: μικρὸν ἀρρώστημα σκώπτει ἰατρός, which might lie behind L *brevem languorem praecidit medicus* ‘a physician does not take a short-term disease seriously(?)’.²⁷

τελευτήσει] H^A יפול ‘he might fall.’ נָפַל is often used in the sense of ‘to die,’ esp. violent death, see BDB s.v. **Qal 2 a**.²⁸ Cf. S and Sh מָאָתָּה.

²¹ For details, see *SSG* § 21 b.

²² Cf. *SQH* § 8 d.

²³ However, cf. Smend and *HALOT* s.v. שמץ.

²⁴ Cf. Sh מְהֵלָּה אֶרְיָא מְהֵלָּה אֶרְיָא ‘a doctor scoffs at a chronic disease.’

²⁵ Segal (62) says that the verb can mean, in MH, “to make one’s face red out of joy, anger or sadness,” so that our proverb could mean that a chronic disease could make a doctor sad when he realises that he is not capable of handling the situation. But in the only one instance of הַצְהִיב listed by Jastrow as meaning ‘to grieve,’ it is used intransitively, ‘to grieve over a deceased person being transported on a bier’ bM. Kat. 24b. This then does not apply to our example. Ben Yehuda (1959.5401a) takes the verb in our Si example as meaning ‘to gladden.’

²⁶ Alternatively, שמץ מחלה can be viewed as the subject of יצהיב, not as a piece of direct speech: Even a slight disease might gladden the doctor as an opportunity to make himself useful or to add something to his pocket.

²⁷ Cf. Schleusner 3.98 [not II 83 in Ziegler]. Ziegler seems to think that L read here a form of κόπτω.

²⁸ Pace Segal (62) we are not aware of a case in which נָפַל with a personal subject means “to go down in status.”

10.11) ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀποθανεῖν ἄνθρωπον
κληρονομήσει ἕρπετὰ καὶ θηρία καὶ σκώληκας.

For when a man dies

he will inherit insects and animals and worms.

(A) במות²⁹ אדם ינחל רמה ותולעה כניוים ורמש:

κληρονομήσει] Although ינחל, positioned before the three coordinate substantives, can take the latter as its subjects, the subject of κληρονομήσει can be only ἄνθρωπος in view of the accusative case of σκώληκας. The whole idea, however, sounds unusual, for the notion of worms covering and crawling over a human corpse is well known from passages such as Jb 7.5, 21.26 and 24.20. Important in this context is σήπη καὶ σκώληκες κληρονομήσουσιν αὐτόν ‘pus and maggots will take possession of him’ Si 19.3, where no Heb. text is preserved. Note שׁ בְּמוֹתָהּ דְּבִרְנָשָׁא רְמָתָא מְנַתָּה וְתוֹלְעָה קְדַמּוּהִי ‘on a man’s death maggots are his share and worms are creeping in front of him,’ with which cp. שׁ יֵיר דְּמָאָת בְּרַנְשָׁא יְרַמִּין לָהּ רְהָשָׁא וְחִיָּת שָׂנְאָה ‘for when a man dies, crawling animals and sharp-toothed animals and worms with pus will inherit him.’

ἐρπετὰ] This label can comprise a wide variety of species, including even aquatic species and flying insects. See *GELS* s.v. By contrast, רְמָה is much narrower in its application; *worm* is a widely agreed translation.

We need to deal with another complicating issue here. In \mathfrak{H} we have four groups of animals, in \mathfrak{G} , \mathfrak{I} ,³⁰ and \mathfrak{S} three, and in \mathfrak{S} two. Θηρία, ‘undomesticated land animal’ (*GELS*) of generous size, sounds out of place in this list, corresponding to any of the four in \mathfrak{H} . The translator of \mathfrak{S} may have added אֲנָשׁ, being uncomfortable with אֲנִישׁ alone and maybe thinking of such animals as lions and tigers feeding on human corpses. כניוים for כניוים ‘maggots, lice’ (?) is absent in any version.

10.12) Ἀρχὴ ὑπερηφανίας ἀνθρώπου ἀφίστασθαι ἀπὸ κυρίου,
καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸν ἀπέστη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ.

*The most important about a man’s arrogance (lies in) his moving
away from the Lord*

and his heart moved away from the One who had made him.

(A) תחלת גאון אדם מועצו ומעשהו יסור מלבו:

The first hemistich of \mathfrak{H} is syntactically unusual. גאון is most likely in the st. cst. תחלה and מועצו cannot constitute a nominal clause. The latter had better be viewed as an attributive ptc., but then the whole hemistich becomes one

²⁹ Pace BSH we see no difficulty at all in reading this word.

³⁰ *Serpentes et bestias et vermes* = \mathfrak{G} .

single component continued by a verbal clause. What the author wanted to say is reasonably well represented in \mathfrak{G} , but at the expense of an infinitive clause added that has nothing corresponding in \mathfrak{H} , but in the dependence on the second hemistich.³¹ This difficulty was also sensed by the Syriac translator: \mathfrak{S} רִישׁ הַחַטִּיאוֹת דְּבְנֵי אָנָּשָׁא גְּאִיִּיתְהוֹן 'the beginning of the sins of men is their pride.'

\mathfrak{A} ρχή] \mathfrak{H} A תחלת, see above at 1.14. Cf. Smend: "das Wesen."

ἀπέστη] Ben Sira is unlikely to use an archaic preterite Impf., but יסור expresses here a theoretical possibility or likelihood. Is his grandson thinking back of the original sin committed by Adam?

מוּעָז 'moved to take an impudent, defiant stance,' cf. עוּ פָּנָיו 'his impudence, cheekiness' Ec 8.1.

מלבו] Unquestionably an error for לבו. One wonders how \mathfrak{S} has arrived at \mathfrak{H} וְעִבְדוֹהֶיּ מְשִׁיבֵי לְבָבוֹ 'and his works lead their heart astray.' The translator may have reconstructed the text as \mathfrak{H} מְעִשָּׂהוּ יָסִיר לְבוֹ.

10.13) ὅτι ἀρχὴ ὑπερηφανίας ἁμαρτία,
καὶ ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς ἐξομβρήσει βδέλυγμα·
διὰ τοῦτο παρεδόξασεν κύριος τὰς ἐπαγωγὰς
καὶ κατέστρεψεν εἰς τέλος αὐτούς.

*Because the most important about arrogance is sin,
and he who holds on to it will make abomination pour out like rain.
Therefore the Lord made the calamities very severe
and utterly ruined them.*

(Aa) כי מקוה ודון חטא ומקורה יביע זמה:
(Ab) על כן מלא לבו רע
(Ac) ויבא אלהים נגעה ויכהו עד כלה:

\mathfrak{A} ρχή] on the meaning of which see at the preceding verse. However, it is unlikely to be a translation of מְקֻנָּה 'a collection, assemblage,' thus *pace* Lévi's (II 67) "l'origine."³² מְקוֹר in the following clause is a more likely candidate. מְבוּעָא in \mathfrak{S} derives from the same source: מְבוּעָא דְחַטִּיאוֹת גְּאִיִּיתָא וְזִנְיָאוֹת מְבוּעָא דְתַרְתִּיאוֹת 'the source of sin is arrogance and adultery is the source of both of them.' Similar is the first clause of \mathfrak{S} רִישׁא דְחַטִּיאוֹתא מְשִׁקְלוֹתא וְנֹחַ 'the beginning of sinfulness is pride.'

Then follow in \mathfrak{H} four self-standing clauses, whereas we find only three in \mathfrak{G} . In terms of the message that emerges from them the last two Hebrew

³¹ The overwhelming majority of Gk manuscripts read a Ptc. ἀφίσταμενου, which is syntactically much worse. *Pace* Smend there is no place for a gen. abs. here.

³² Lévi refers to Si 43.20 as a proof that מְקוֹר and מְקֻנָּה are synonyms. Water may issue forth out of a water reservoir, which, however, does not prove the synonymy of *reservoir* and *source*.

clauses roughly reflect the last two Greek ones, whereas the second Greek clause conveys something rather unrelated to the second and third Hebrew clauses.

ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς] Lévi (II 66) assumes that the translator read קוּגַה instead of מְקוּרָה, but κρατέω, a high-frequency verb (140×), does not translate קוּגַה elsewhere in LXX. We would rather see here a case of free translation.

ἐξομβρήσει] מְבִיעַ. Both מְבִיעַ and ἐξομβρέω have to do with movement of fluid, though used here figuratively.

παρεδόξασεν] Lévi (II 66) derives this translation from מלא read as הפליא. In *Index* s.v. παραδοξάζω we also have mentioned this equation, though מלא is an integral part of an impeccable clause, “and therefore his heart filled up with evilness,” of which there is little trace in מְבִיעַ. מלא may have been read instead of מְבִיעַ.

τὰς ἐπαγωγὰς] = מְבִיעַ rather than מְבִיעַ. The holam, if it is, of the former does not fit the vocalisation.

κατέστρεψεν] This is the sole instance in LXX of the equation מְבִיעַ = καταστρέφω.

τέλος] מְבִיעַ, i.e. מְבִיעַ. Nowhere in LXX we find this equation. *Pace* Smend (II 17) τέλος does not mean “Vernichtung,” but thoroughness of operation, as is evident in its collocations such as ἵνα ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν εἰς τέλος ‘so that they will be ruined completely’ Ju 14.13.³³ The same applies to the inf. abs. Pi., מְבִיעַ, albeit in other forms the verb can mean ‘to destroy, exterminate,’ see BDB s.v. I מְבִיעַ Pi. 2 c.

10.14) θρόνους ἀρχόντων καθεῖλεν ὁ κύριος
καὶ ἐκάθισεν πραεῖς ἀντ’ αὐτῶν·

*The Lord demolished thrones of rulers
and seated humble people instead of them.*

(A) כְּסָא גֵאִים הִפְךָ אֱלֹהִים וַיִּשֶׁב עֲנִיִּים תַּחְתָּם:

ἀρχόντων] מְבִיעַ = גֵאִים ‘proud, arrogant,’ which is in antithetical parallelism to the following עֲנִיִּים. מְבִיעַ reflects an awareness of this with מְבִיעַ ‘arrogant chiefs.’

καθεῖλεν] מְבִיעַ ‘He put upside down, overturned,’ an equation not attested anywhere else in LXX.

καὶ ἐκάθισεν] מְבִיעַ, correctly vocalised by Segal (61) and Kahana (465) as מְבִיעַ. Lévi (II 67) and Mopsik (131) use the present “reverse .. met.” So Box - Oesterley (350) “overthroweth .. setteth” and Snaith (54) “overturns .. enthrones,” sim. Skehan - Di Lella (222). None of them presents an argument for such translations. Van Peursen (2004.74) regards the use of the Pf. here

³³ “until a process begun reaches its conclusion” *GELS* s.v. 3 b iii.

as “gnomic.” We would rather see here an allusion to events, though not specified explicitly, in the past history of Israel that would confirm the validity of this proverb. Cf. **ש** בַּחֲבֵיבֵי .. הַחֶסֶד (Pf.), **ש** הַחֲבֵיבֵי .. רָקַץ (Pf.), **י** *destruxit .. fecit*. SG does use the Aor. very infrequently with gnomic value, once in Si, ἀπὸ γὰρ θαλάσσης ἐπληθύνθη διανόημα αὐτῆς ‘for her thought is vaster than sea’ 24.29.

πραεῖς] **י** עֲנִיִּים. Smend wonders whether, as at 3.19, עֲנִיִּים should be read here, too. Let it be noted, however, that in LXX the equation עֲנִיִּי פִּרְאֻס occurs three more times, e.g. בְּיָמֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה עָלְמוֹר וְעַל-עַרְבֵי בְּנֵי-אֲחֵינוּ פִּרְאֻס καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον Zc 9.9.

10.15) ῥίζας ἐθνῶν ἐξέτιλεν κύριος
καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ταπεινοὺς ἀντ’ αὐτῶν·

*The Lord plucked out the roots of gentiles
and planted lowly people instead of them.*

This verse is absent in its entirety in **י**. Given a considerable degree of similarity in wording and thought between it, vs. 14, and vs. 16, we probably have here a doublet.³⁴ Its respective *Vorlage* of **ש**, **ש**ה, and **י** seems to have had the verse.

ῥίζας] **ש** אֲרָקַץ ‘root(s).’

ἐθνῶν] **ש** גֵּאוֹתֵינוּ, a word used also in vs. 14 to render **י** גֵּאִים, showing the mutual influence of the two verses. ἐθνῶν, however, makes a poor anti-thetic parallel to ταπεινοὺς, another indication of the secondary nature of this verse. The addition in many sources³⁵ of ὑπερηφάνων is indicative of the difficulty felt, though ἐθνῶν ὑπερηφάνων is unlikely to be original.

10.16) χώρας ἐθνῶν κατέστρεψεν κύριος
καὶ ἀπόλεσεν αὐτὰς ἕως θεμελίων γῆς·

*And the Lord ruined territories of gentiles
and destroyed them down to the foundations of the earth.*

עֲקַבְתָּ גוֹיִם טַמְטַם אֱלֹהִים וְשַׂרְשָׁם עַד אֲרָץ קַעֲקַע: (A

χώρας] **י** עֲקַבְתָּ = עֲקַבְתָּ, pl. of עֲקַבְתָּ ‘heel; footprint,’ an equation not attested anywhere in LXX. Cf. **ש** עֲקַבְתָּ אֶתְּ.

ἐθνῶν] **י** גוֹיִם, i.e. גוֹיִם, but **ש** גֵּאוֹתֵינוּ = גֵּאִים, on which see above at vs. 14.

κατέστρεψεν] a verb used in vs. 13 to render הִכָּה. טַמְטַם unattested in BH and occurring here in Hebrew for the first time means ‘to fill in, stop.’

³⁴ So Box - Oesterley 350 and Segal 63.

³⁵ Including **ש** הַמַּמְאָה מִקְּלָא **ש**ה.

In 𐤇 God is erasing traces of the former presence of gentiles. Cf. 𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘and He destroyed their memory from the land.’

ἀπόλεσεν αὐτὰς] = 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘He uprooted them.’ This equation is attested twice more: Si 6.3, and esp. interesting is 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 Jb 31.12, where also ἀπόλλυμι and ῥίζα are collocated.

Θεμελίων] Probably = 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 instead of 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍. This latter appears to be yet another Pilpel verb unattested in BH, but is known in MH in the sense of “to stamp out, exterminate.” Our translator possibly had a difficulty with this rare verb and took 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 as a verb, and not 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 “their root.” This further led to an anomalous word order of 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 instead of 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍.

10.17) ἐξῆρην ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπόλεσεν αὐτοὺς
καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν.

*He removed (many) out of them and destroyed them
and effaced from the land their memory.*

(A) 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍

ἐξῆρην] 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍, i.e. 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘and he swept them away.’ In the manuscript 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 has been corrected to 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍. Cf. 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 Si 48.15 > 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ἐπρονομεύθησαν ‘they were taken away as spoils of war.’ 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘and He made (them) dry’ represents a v.l. ἐξῆρανεν B et al.

ἀπόλεσεν αὐτοὺς] 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍. The latter can be read as 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍, i.e. from 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘He abandoned them,’ which, however, is difficult as a continuation of 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍, for it does not mean “some of them were taken elsewhere for execution.” The same difficulty is presented by 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 as well. One possible way-out is to correct the text to 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍, i.e. 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘and they became desolate.’ 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 has three synonymous verbs, possibly indicative of the difficulty faced by its translator: 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘He destroyed them and he uprooted them and he overthrew them.’

καὶ κατέπαυσεν] = 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍. Should the dot in the manuscript above the letter 𐤏 be meant as a *cholam*, is the use of the verb here comparable to that in 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 Gn 8.22?

10.18) οὐκ ἔκτισται ἀνθρώποις ὑπερηφανία
οὐδὲ ὀργὴ θυμοῦ ἐν γεννήμασιν γυναικῶν.

*Pride was not created for humans
nor violent anger among those born of women.*

(A) 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍

ἔκτισται] which cannot reflect 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 ‘is fitting.’ 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤍 does not sound very likely, either. Is God conceivable as the creator of a vice? Or does the

author want to say that God may burst into anger? He is angry all over the Old Testament, though not for nothing.

Lévi (II 67), followed by Smend, noting אָתְּפַלְגַּת ‘was divided,’ suggests that the original reading was נִחַלְק or נִחַלְקָה , and our author was using this verb in the manner of Arb. *halaqa* ‘created.’ Whereas it is true that the equation חַלַּק κτίζω is found in Si as many as 6 times (Qal 5x [38.1, 39.25, 40.1, 44.2] and Nif. 1x [7.15]), it is never about God’s work of cosmic creation.³⁶ An example such as Κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπον 17.1 does not occur, although this Gk verb appears to be one of the favourite words³⁷ of our translator: out of a total of 67 occurrences in LXX his translation accounts for 23!

And yet it is no less easy to explain how the postulated חַלַּק or נחלק has come down to us as נארה than to account for the equation ἔκτισται נארה .

On the Heb. expression לֹא נֶאֱרָה לִי , cf. $\text{לֹא נֶאֱרָה לְתַעֲנוּג}$ Pr 19.10, sim. ib. 17.7, 26.1, Ps 33.1 mentioned by Lévi (II 67).

ἀνθρώποις] אָנוּשׁ . Unlike אִישׁ , אָנוּשׁ is often used collectively, i.e. ‘a group of people,’ hence pl. ἀνθρώποις , e.g. אָנוּשׁ מְזַעַר Is 24.6 > $\text{καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι}$, also ib. 33.8, 51.7, Ps 66(65).12, 73(72).5

ὀργῆ θυμοῦ] אָהַב עוֹת אָה , which ἔ took as meaning ‘the intensity of anger,’ and expressed by combining two synonyms. However, the Heb. phrase could also mean ‘impudence,’ presenting an expression synonymous with the preceding וְדוּן . Cf. $\text{אָרוּר אַפָּם כִּי עָו}$ > $\text{ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐθάδης}$ ‘Accursed is their anger, because it is selfish’ Gn 49.7. It might be too daring to see an Aramaism in אָה here, for in Aramaic אָה means ‘face,’ and one could compare עו פְּנֵי ‘his impudence’ > $\text{ἀναιδῆς [= עו]} \text{ προσώπω αὐτοῦ}$ Ec 8.1.

Lévi (II 67f.) holds that אָה here means “également”; see his translation “Ni l’insolence à l’enfant de la femme.” Then we would expect אָה עוֹת .

ἐν] Mentioning several cases in Si where ἐν corresponds to לִי , Smend maintains that ἐν is authentic here. However, it is absent in four majuscule and 13 Gk manuscripts, and the parallelism between $\text{ἀνθρώποις ὑπερηφανία}$ and γεννήμασιν ought to be fully taken into account. Thus Ziegler’s text is in need of revision here. Note אָהַב אֲנִי אֲנִי as against אָהַב אֲנִי אֲנִי

$\text{γεννήμασιν γυναικῶν}$] אָהַב אֲנִי . On the collective pl. γεννήμασιν , see above on ἀνθρώποις . The pl. of γυναικῶν , however, is better viewed as due to the analogy of γεννήμασιν . Many women produce more than one child.

³⁶ This point was justly stressed by Barr 1968.260f. Cf. also Smend (277f.) ad 31.13. See also Nöldeke 1900.85f.

³⁷ Ziegler (1957.283f.) mentions 18 words as our translator’s “Lieblingswörter.” See also at prol. 31, 5.1, 8.17, 14.1, 19.23.

The pl. number of a nomen rectum is known at times to induce the selection of the pl. form of its nomen regens, e.g. לַיְהוֹת הָאֲבָנִים ‘the stone tablets’ Dt 9.9 and אֲנָשֵׁי מִידוֹת Is 45.14 IQIs^a // MT אֲנָשֵׁי מִדָּה ‘men of stature.’³⁸

The phrase יָלִיד אִשָּׁה occurs thrice in BH: Jb 14.1, 15.14, 25.4, each time translated in \mathcal{G} as γεννητὸς γυναικός. Though it is not impossible to read here יָלִיד אִשָּׁה, such does not occur anywhere in a vocalised text.

- 10.19) Σπέρμα ἔντιμον ποῖον; σπέρμα ἀνθρώπου.
σπέρμα ἔντιμον ποῖον; οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον.
σπέρμα ἄτιμον ποῖον; σπέρμα ἀνθρώπου.
σπέρμα ἄτιμον ποῖον; οἱ παραβαίνοντες ἐντολάς.

Valuable offspring – what is it like? Human offspring.

Valuable offspring – what is it like? Those who fear the Lord.

Valueless offspring – what is it like? Human offspring.

Valueless offspring – what is it like? Those who transgress commandments.

(A) זרע נכבד מה זרע לאנוש זרע נקלה עובר מצוה:

(B) זרע נקלה מה זרע לאנוש זרע נקלה עובר מצוה:

With its repetitiveness \mathcal{H} B is evidently amiss. \mathcal{H} A also seems to have suffered deteriorations in the course of its transmission. Due to a homoio-teleuton – זרע לאנוש repeated twice – the second and third lines have dropped out. A positive counterpart of עובר מצוה is indispensable. The lacuna has been preserved in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{S} וְרֵעָא יְקִירָא מָא דְזָרִיעַ לְאִנְשָׂא. וְרֵעָא יְקִירָא מִן וְרֵעָא יְקִירָא מִן דְנִטְר פּוֹקְדָנָא. וְרֵעָא זְלִילָא מָא דְזָרִיעַ לְאִנְשָׂא. וְרֵעָא דְדָחַל לְאִלְהָא. וְרֵעָא יְקִירָא מִן דְנִטְר פּוֹקְדָנָא. וְרֵעָא זְלִילָא מִן דְלֵא נִטְר פּוֹקְדָנָא. ‘valuable offspring is what was sown by men; valuable offspring is one who fears God. Valuable offspring is one who observes commandments. Slight offspring is what was sown by men; slight offspring is one who does not observe commandments.’ \mathcal{S} h is slightly different: וְרֵעָא מִיְקָרָא אִינָא. וְרֵעָא דְבְרִנְשָׂא. וְרֵעָא מִיְקָרָא אִילִין דְדָחַלִין מִן מְרִיא. וְרֵעָא מְצַעְרָא אִינָא. וְרֵעָא דְבְרִנְשָׂא. אָף וְרֵעָא דְטְעִיּוֹתָא אִילִין דְעִבְרִין פּוֹקְדָנָא ‘Esteemed offspring – what is it like? Offspring of humans. Esteemed offspring is those who fear the Lord. Despicable offspring – what is it like? Offspring of humans. Also offspring of heresy, those who transgress commandments.’

Taking \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{S} into account, we would reconstruct the earlier form of \mathcal{H} as below:

זרע נכבד מה זרע לאנוש:

זרע נכבד מה יראי ייי:

³⁸ See JM § 136 n and SQH § 8 f. A standing expression in MH such as בְּמֵי כְנְסִיּוֹת ‘synagogues,’ e.g. mAb 3.10, would be well known.

זרע נקלה מה זרע לאנוש:
זרע נקלה מה עברי מצוות:

Σπέρμα ἔντιμον ποῖον;] \mathfrak{H} זרע נכבד מה \mathfrak{H} . Here we have a discourse topic placed first, followed by an elliptical one-member nominal clause. There are found other cases in which an interrogative is delayed and the preceding constituent is highlighted, e.g. ואני מה 'and me, what am I?' 1QH^a 19.6, 23.24 and יהי ואלה מתי יהיו 'now, these things, when are they going to happen' 4Q385 2.3.³⁹

σπέρμα ἀνθρώπου] \mathfrak{H} זרע לאנוש \mathfrak{H} . The virtual synonymy of זרע לאנוש and זרע אנוש is shown by the use of the genitive case in \mathfrak{C} . On the use of the periphrastic construction by means of ל-, see JM § 130 a and § SQH § 21 fa.

ἄτιμον] \mathfrak{H} נקלה, i.e. נקלה. We find the same contrast as here in הנקלה טוב נקלה וטוב לו ממכתבד \mathfrak{C} > \mathfrak{C} ὁ ἄτιμος πρὸς τὸν ἔντιμον Is 3.5, cf. מכתבד טוב נקלה וטוב לו ממכתבד \mathfrak{C} > \mathfrak{C} κρείσσων ἀνήρ ἐν ἀτιμία δουλεύων ἑαυτῷ ἢ τιμὴν ἑαυτῷ περιτιθείς καὶ προσδεόμενος ἄρτου Pr 12.9.

10.20) ἐν μέσῳ ἀδελφῶν ὁ ἡγούμενος αὐτῶν ἔντιμος,
καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ.

*Among brethren their leader is esteemed,
and those who fear the Lord (merit esteem) in His view.*

(A) בין אחים ראשם נכבד וירא אלהים בע..
(B) בין אחים ראשם נכבד וירא אלהים נכבד ממנו:

ἀδελφῶν] \mathfrak{H} אחים. Both ἀξ and ἀδελφός can be used in the sense of 'member of one's faith community' as in Si 50.12, where they refer to fellow colleagues of Simon the high priest. By contrast, in Si 25.1, where no Heb. text has been preserved, οἱ ἀδελφοί are contrasted to οἱ πλεσιόν, and the former are more likely a brother and his siblings. Another instance is most illuminating: ἡγούμενος τῶν ἀδελφῶν 49.15, a reference to Joseph in Egypt. Though \mathfrak{H} here substantially differs from \mathfrak{C} , so much so that the former has nothing corresponding to ἀδελφός, the phrase ἡγούμενος τῶν ἀδελφῶν reminds us vividly of ὁ ἡγούμενος αὐτῶν in our Si passage here. If our translator was conscious of this appellation of Joseph, he obviously did not understand ראשם here in the sense of "their eldest brother."⁴⁰ Since our translator is unlikely to have taken this proverb as pertaining to a family relationship, ἀδελφοί here must be understood as meaning "brethren," and not "brothers."

ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ] Obviously \mathfrak{H} ≠ \mathfrak{B} ממנו 'than him.' The absence in \mathfrak{C} of what would correspond to the preceding נכבד implies that \mathfrak{C} is not translating \mathfrak{H} B, as in \mathfrak{S} מִיָּקָר הוּא מִנֵּה. The end of the second line has been restored

³⁹ See SQH § 1 c (iii), 42 e, 76 h.

⁴⁰ Hence \mathfrak{S} מִיָּקָר here probably means 'elder,' and not 'older.'

by Smend as בעצור contextually required, “verlangt der Sinn.” Behind Ⓞ we see בעיניו, probably נכבד understood, cf. Mopsik (132): “et celui qui craint Dieu l’est à ses yeux.”

- 10.21) ¶ προσλήψεως ἀρχὴ φόβος κυρίου,
ἐκβολῆς δὲ ἀρχὴ σκληροσμός καὶ ὑπερηφανία. ¶
*Acceptance begins with the fear of the Lord,
but rejection begins with obduracy and arrogance.*

No Heb. text has been preserved for this verse, and perhaps no such has ever existed, seeing that the verse is also absent in Ⓢ. The respectable antiquity of this plus is, however, ensured by its presence in Ⓢ₁: רִישָׁא דְנְסִיבוּתָא וּמְשַׁקְלִיּוּתָא רִישָׁא דִּין דְּמַפְקָתָא קְשִׁיּוּתָא וּמְשַׁקְלִיּוּתָא ‘acceptance begins with the fear of the Lord, but the expulsion begins with the obstinacy and arrogance.’⁴¹ 21a meets us in 19.18, also in Ⓞ¹¹ and in an almost identical wording – φόβος κυρίου ἀρχὴ προσλήψεως, for which there is no Heb. text nor Ⓢ preserved, either. This time no trace of it is found in Ⓢ₁, either.

σκληροσμός] On this hapax legomenon in SG, cf. Wagner 1999.345f.

- 10.22) προσήλυτος καὶ ξένος καὶ πτωχός,
τὸ καύχημα αὐτῶν φόβος κυρίου.
*A proselyte and an alien and a poor (person) –
the fear of the Lord is their pride.*

(A) גר וזר נכרי ורש תפארתם י[רא]ת אלהים
(B) גר זר נכרי ורש תפארתם יראת יי

προσήλυτος] Ⓢ₁ גר, i.e. גֵּר. In the dictionary by LEH s.v. προσήλυτος we read: “immigrant in Israel (proselyte?) Nu 9.14.” However, the text in question concludes with νόμος εἷς ἔσται ὑμῖν καὶ τῷ προσηλύτῳ (Ⓢ₁ לְגֵר) καὶ τῷ αὐτόχθονι τῆς γῆς (Ⓢ₁ לְאֶזְרָח הָאֶרֶץ) καὶ τῷ αὐτόχθονι τῆς γῆς. The opposition does not concern ethnic background, a Jew vs. a gentile converted to Judaism, but residency, a Jew born in Israel and resident there ever since vs. a Jew returned from overseas (עוֹלָה קְדָשׁ). In the three occurrences of the word in NTG, Mt 23.15, Ac 2.11, 6.5, it means “proselyte.”⁴² In the first occurrence Jesus is speaking about Jews eagerly evangelising overseas far and wide to win even a single convert. All the same we wonder whether we could admit here the precursor of this subsequent linguistic evolution in both Heb. and Gk. Were recent Jewish immigrants looked down in the early third century BCE? A truly slight difference between the two Heb. versions might be in support

⁴¹ Segal (66) mentions Rom 11.15, where we find προσλήμνις opposed to ἀποβολή.

⁴² Each time Ⓢ uses גֵּירָא, a Syriacised form of Heb. גֵּר.

of this conjecture of ours. In 22a \mathfrak{G} has three coordinate nouns linked with $\kappa\alpha\iota$ twice as against four in \mathfrak{H} . (A) displays a pattern <a-waw-b c-waw-d>, but (B) <a-b-c-waw-d>. Unless one postulates an inadvertent omission in (A) of a waw between b and c, we find four words grouped into two. When more than two coordinate terms are brought together, there are more than one mode of concatenating them. 1) A coordinating conjunction can be attached to the second and all the subsequent terms, 2) it can be added only to the final term, or 3) the terms can be arranged into two or more groups in accordance with some logical parameter. This holds for Greek and Hebrew alike.⁴³ Our translator's *Vorlage* probably looked like (A), and he saw that the first two terms⁴⁴ refer to people of non-Jewish background, but thought that the following נכרי , too, belonged there, so he deleted it as redundant.

The first line as presented by Ziegler is significantly different from the traditional text form as presented by Thackeray and Rahlfs, namely $\pi\lambda\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$. From the apparatus criticus of Ziegler's edition we see that the first two adjectives as presented by him are not found in any Greek manuscript. We hardly comprehend how this variant reading has emerged, whether or not a Heb. text that would be close to it, say, עשיר ונכבד ורש , has ever existed, and why the text as reconstructed by Ziegler has disappeared from the Greek tradition, leaving some traces in the Syriac⁴⁵ and Sahidic tradition only.

\mathfrak{H} has taken $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ as the logical subject of the clause: $\text{שׁוֹבֵהֶרָא דִּילְהוֹן אִיתִיָּה דְּחֻלְתָּה דְּמָרְיָא}$ 'it is the fear of the Lord that makes their pride.' Note that the fem. suffix of אִיתִיָּה agrees with דְּחֻלְתָּה .

10.23) οὐ δίκαιον ἀτιμάσαι πτωχὸν συνετόν,
καὶ οὐ καθήκει δοξάσαι ἄνδρα ἁμαρτωλόν.

*It is not right to disgrace a poor (but) intelligent person,
and it is not proper to honour a sinful man.*

(A) אין לבוות דל מִשְׁכִּיל ואין לכבד כל איש חכם:
(B) אין לבוות דל משכיל ואין לכבד כל איש חמס:

οὐ δίκαιον] \mathfrak{H} אין. In BH <אין + inf. > expresses either a possibility or a need as in $\text{לְלוֹמַם אֵין לְשִׂאת אֶת־הַמְּשָׁכָן}$ Ec 3.14 and $\text{עָלְיוֹ אֵין לְהוֹסִיף וּמִמֶּנּוּ אֵין לְגַרֵעַ}$ 2Ch 23.26.⁴⁶ More references may be found in BDB s.v. אין 5. However, BH appears to use the construction to express non-permissibility very rarely,

⁴³ Cf. *SSG* § 78 f, i and *SQH* § 38 f-g.

⁴⁴ ד is an obvious scribal error for ר .

⁴⁵ Here are the two Syriac versions of the first half of the verse – $\text{תּוֹתְבָא אַכְסְנָיָא דְּמִסְכִּין}$ 'a foreign resident who is poor and is finding things painful'; $\text{נְסִיבָא מִן עַמְמָא נֹל}$ 'brought from nations and poor and distinguished.'

⁴⁶ Cf. a discussion by Van Peursen 1999.227-30.

e.g. אֵין לְבוֹא אֶל-שַׁעַר הַמִּלְחָמָה בְּלִבּוֹשׁ שָׂק. ⁴⁷ This usage, however, is well known to QH, e.g. לוא לסור ימין ושמאול ואין לצעוד על אחד מכול דבריו 1QS 3.10, see *SQH* § 18 c, d, and 40 i 3).⁴⁸ \mathfrak{C} could have used here a similar construction such as οὐκ ἔστιν ἀτιμάσαι κ.τ.λ. Likewise below at 14.16, 39.21, 39.34. With the selection of δίκαιον the nuance of non-permissibility has become explicit.

συνετόν] \mathfrak{S} וְדִקָּא ‘righteous,’ an extraordinary rendering.

ἀμαρτωλόν] cannot reflect $\mathfrak{H}A$ כַּח, which does not make sense in the context, either. Most likely a scribal error. Though *Index* s.v. ἀμαρτωλός says that this equation, $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{S}$ ἀμαρτωλός, occurs in LXX once only, our example here need be added.

In \mathfrak{S} לְעִתְיָא עֹלָא ‘iniquitous, rich person’ the contrast with the preceding מְסַכְנָא ‘poor’ is explicit.

οὐ καθήκει] \mathfrak{H} אין. The translator has decided not to repeat himself. What we have said above on οὐ δίκαιον equally applies here, and see also *SSG* § 30 **beb**. Accordingly $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}$ also varies: לָא כְּאַנָּא .. אַפְלָא וְלָא.

ἀνδρα] \mathfrak{H} כל איש. We miss πάντα as expressive of absolute, categorical negation.

10.24) μεγιστὰν καὶ κριτῆς καὶ δυνάστης δοξασθήσεται,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν τις μείζων τοῦ φοβουμένου τὸν κύριον.

A courtier and a judge and a ruler shall be honoured,

but there is none among them who is greater than he who fears the Lord.

... מוּשֵׁל וּשׁוֹפֵט נִכְבְּדוּ וְרִיבָן גְּדוּל מִירָא אֱלֹהִים: (A
(B שׁוֹפֵט וּמוּשֵׁל נִכְבְּדוּ וְרִיבָן ...:

The position in \mathfrak{C} of “judge” in the middle agrees with that in $\mathfrak{H}B$. $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{H}A$. δοξασθήσεται] \mathfrak{H} נִכְבְּדוּ. The Pf. sounds rather odd. It is possibly a scribal error for יִכְבְּדוּ, i.e. יִכְבְּדוּ. Note \mathfrak{S} יִקְרָ, i.e. Impv.

The selection in \mathfrak{C} of the sg. form can be accounted for as a case of hendiadys, namely the three terms are conceived as a single unit, which is a widespread phenomenon.⁴⁹ See *SSG* § 77 **bg**.

⁴⁷ Note \mathfrak{C} οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἔξὸν αὐτῶ εἰσελεθεῖν .. with ἔξὸν ‘permissible.’

⁴⁸ The analogous, syntactic feature we find in \mathfrak{S} is not necessarily a Hebraism: לִית לְמַצְעָרוּ ‘one is not to insult a poor person.’ *SL* s.v. לִית לְמַצְעָרוּ mentions only a construction of a subordinate clause with לְ, but ours is not an isolated example. A casual survey has discovered quite a few examples, e.g. לִית לְמִבְצָר וְמִנְּה לִית לְמִבְצָר Ec 3.14 (possibility). *SL*, s.v. לְאָרְאָ ‘fitting,’ notes that it can be complemented with <לְ + Impf.> and also with an inf., which latter is attested in our passage here. On <אֵין + inf.> in the Heb. of Si in comparison with BH, see Hurvitz 1999.143f.

⁴⁹ δοξασθησονται in some manuscripts as well as $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}$ מְשַׁתְּבְּחִין \mathfrak{H} are a secondary alteration or revision.

An argument for quite a considerable rewriting in \mathfrak{Sh} is not apparent: $\text{מִן מְרֵאָה הֲלִין דִּין רַב אִינָא דְדָחַל מִן מְרֵאָה לִיתְּ.}$ ‘greater, however, than these is one who fears the Lord.’ $\xi\sigma\tau\upsilon\nu$ has been analysed as a copula, not a particle of existence, ‘there is,’ as against \mathfrak{S} לִיתְּ.

10.25) οἰκέτη σοφῶ ἐλεύθεροι λειτουργήσουσιν,
καὶ ἀνήρ ἐπιστήμων οὐ γογγύσει.

*A wise household servant has a few free men waiting upon him
and a man of understanding would not grumble (over it).*

(A) עבד משכיל הורם ועבד .. ס .. לא יתאונן:
(B) עבד משכיל חביב כנפש
] .. ד משכיל חביב כנפש ..
עבד משכיל חורים יעבדוהו וג...
(עבד משכיל חביב כנפש וגבר מ... ..):

The state of preservation of \mathfrak{HB} is rather disturbing. Every letter in the last line has a dot inserted in the middle, most likely indicating that the scribe rejects this text form. One wonders, however, why he has not added dots in the remaining lines except the second last, which differs from the rest on account of חורים יעבדוהו , which accords with \mathfrak{G} .⁵⁰

$\text{עבד משכיל חביב כנפש}$ ‘an intelligent servant is dear as one’s own soul’ in \mathfrak{HB} appears to be a mysterious intrusion from 7.21 \mathfrak{HA} .

$\text{עבד} [\text{חורים יעבדו}]$ possibly corrupted from חורם יעבדו or חורים יעבדו . It is to be noted that, whilst BSH presents the text in two columns throughout the book, only three manuscripts, i.e. B, E, and F, show such a division, only the sof pasuq, /:/, is regularly added. Hence ועבד with ample space before it in BSH does not imply that this is the beginning of the second half of the verse. Besides עבד would scarcely have been rendered with ἀνήρ.

$\text{οἰκέτη σοφῶ} [\text{עבד משכיל}]$ \mathfrak{HA} and B. The Heb. phrase is in casus pendens, and is subsequently resumed with a conj. pron. in יעבדוהו . Both \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sh} are content with adding the preposition ל- and not adding a resumptive object pronoun:⁵¹ $\text{לְעַבְדָּא חַיִּמָּא חֲאָרָא נְפֻלְחֹן} \mathfrak{S}$ and $\text{לְעַבְדָּא חַיִּמָּא חֲאָרָא נְפֻלְחֹן} \mathfrak{Sh}$.
 $\text{חֲאָרָא נְשֻמְשׁוֹן}$.

$\text{ἐλεύθεροι λειτουργήσουσιν} = \mathfrak{HB}$ (line 4) and \mathfrak{S} חֲאָרָא נְפֻלְחֹן .

We have here a rare instance of λειτουργέω applied to domestic service, not formal, public or cultic. Note that Elisha’s personal assistant is called $\text{λειτουργός} (\mathfrak{M}\text{שָׂרָת})$ Ελισαιε 4Kg 6.15.

⁵⁰ Moreover, line 3 is written in a different colour, *pace* Beentjes (1997.49, fn. 1) not “in a smaller script.”

⁵¹ An exception is a manuscript labelled *w* by Lagarde (1861.v): נְפֻלְחֹנִיָּה .

ἀνήρ ἐπιστήμων] The only remaining letter, hard to decipher, in $\mathfrak{H}A$ has been read in BSH as \mathfrak{c} and by Beentjes (1997.35) as \mathfrak{m} , presumably for \mathfrak{hkm} . What did the Heb. *Vorlage* of the beginning of the second half of the verse look like? Since ἀνήρ here is unlikely to represent \mathfrak{cbr} , we would suggest \mathfrak{cbr} נוסר, i.e. \mathfrak{cbr} נוסר. Smend's (9) reconstruction is \mathfrak{cbr} לא יתאונן. A look at the facsimile of $\mathfrak{H}A$ shows far more letter spaces before לא. Another instance of \mathfrak{cbr} Ni occurs in a similar context at \mathfrak{cbr} הַט אֲוֹנָן תּוֹסַר \mathfrak{cbr} ἐὰν κλίνης τὸ οὖς σου, σοφὸς ἔση Si 6.33. \mathfrak{cbr} מְתַרְדָּא in \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sh} seems to reflect נוסר. Likewise παιδευομενος in some manuscripts.⁵² However, both \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sh} have an equivalent of ἀνήρ ἐπιστήμων as well: \mathfrak{S} גַּבְרָא סְכוּלְתָנָא, \mathfrak{Sh} גַּבְרָא נְדוּעָתָנָא.

The Ni. of נוסר here can be assigned *tolerative* value: “be willing to be educated,” as in \mathfrak{cbr} בְּהִמְלוֹ בְּשֵׁר עָרְלָתוֹ ‘when he consented to have the flesh of his foreskin circumcised’ Gn 17.24. For our Si context we see an instructive case in \mathfrak{cbr} הָאֲדָרְשׁ אֲדָרְשׁ לָהֶם ‘Should I agree to be consulted by them at all?’ Ez 14.3.⁵³

The participle נוסר in \mathfrak{cbr} גַּבְרָא נוסר is used attributively. Both \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sh} represent its analysis as circumstantial: \mathfrak{cbr} כַּד מְתַרְדָּא and \mathfrak{cbr} מָא דְמְתַרְדָּא respectively. The above-mentioned v.l. παιδευομενος can be so analysed,⁵⁴ so \mathfrak{M} , which preserves this v.l.: *vir prudens disciplinatus non murmurabit correptus*. Similarly Smend (9), who mentally supplies \mathfrak{hkm} or \mathfrak{cbr} before נוסר, translates his reconstructed text as “und der Verständige murrst nicht, wenn er zurechtgewiesen wird.” However, could Engl. “they went out of the house, singing loud” be translated \mathfrak{cbr} יצאו מן הבית שָׂרִים בקול רם instead of \mathfrak{cbr} יצאו מן הבית בְּשִׂירִים בקול רם?⁵⁵

10.26 Μὴ σοφίζου ποιῆσαι τὸ ἔργον σου
καὶ μὴ δοξάζου ἐν καιρῷ στενοχωρίας σου.

*Do not resort to devious sophistication to perform your labour
and do not care much for your reputation when in financial distress.*

(A) אַל תתחכם לעבֵד הפצך ואל תכבֵד צמורֵד צרכך:
(B) אל תתחכם לעשות הפצך ואל תתכבֵד ...

⁵² The reconstruction by Skehan and Di Lella (1987.231) and adopted by Mopsik (132), \mathfrak{cbr} נוסר, is unacceptable. The remaining letter is hardly \mathfrak{w} , but \mathfrak{c} . Though the spelling fluctuation between \mathfrak{w} and \mathfrak{c} is well known, \mathfrak{cbr} הַשְׂכִּיל and \mathfrak{cbr} שְׂכָל, two key-terms for our book, occurring 8× and 14× respectively, are never spelled with \mathfrak{c} .

⁵³ On this matter cf. JM § 51 c and SQH § 12 d 5.

⁵⁴ This is a very common use of the participle in Gk; see SSG § 31 d.

⁵⁵ Prof. Fassberg of Jerusalem refers me [mail of 24.2.2021] to JM § 126 b, where “pre-dicative accusative of state” is being described, a feature known under the label of *hāl* in the Classical Arabic grammar. One difficulty here, however, is that, unlike in our Si case here, such an “accusative” always follows its verb, e.g. \mathfrak{cbr} אֶת־אֲשֵׁרִיהֶם מְקַעֲיִים אֶת־יְהוָה 1Kg 14.15, so also many Arabic examples adduced in Wright (1898 II § 44 c), e.g. *jā'a zaydun rākiban* ‘Zayd came, riding.’

σοφίζου] תתחכם \mathfrak{H} A and B. \mathfrak{S} תתהבנן ‘you show yourself unwilling, lazy’ appears to be a contextual interpretation. In \mathfrak{I} *extollere .. cunctari* the two verbs have been reversed.

On the simulating value of the Gk middle voice and the Heb. Hitp. see above at δικαίου .. σοφίζου תתבונן .. תצטדק 7.5.

ποιῆσαι] \mathfrak{H} A לעבד, B לעשות. What function the Inf. in Gk as well as Heb. plays is not immediately apparent. Van Peursen (2004.337) holds that its value is temporal “while doing.” As another BS instance he mentions \mathfrak{M} 43.24, which BSH (293) justly, in our view, parses as a noun, שמע, i.e. ‘at what our ears hear we are astonished,’ cf. \mathfrak{C} ἀκοαῖς ὠτίων ἡμῶν θαυμάζομεν. Van Peursen (loc. cit.) cites as a rare BH example \mathfrak{I} דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־יְרֵמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא לְבוֹא נְבוּכַדְרֶאֱצַר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל לְהַפּוֹת אֶת־אֲרָץ מִצְרַיִם Jr 46.13. The inf. clause, however, cannot be a temporal adjunct of דִּבֶּר. Are we to construe it with the following verse הַגִּידוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם וְגו’⁵⁶ When an infinitival clause introduces a temporal complement, the former is usually attached to one of such prepositions as ב, כ, ע, אחר, but extremely rarely with ל- in such standing expressions as לְבַקֵּר רְנָה Jdg 19.26 // לְבַקֵּר רְנָה Ps 30.6 preceded by בְּעֵרֵב יַלִּין בְּכִי. Let the presence of בְּקֵר be noted, a word belonging to a semantic field of time.⁵⁷

τὸ ἔργον σου] \mathfrak{H} A and B הפצר, an impossible equation. \mathfrak{S} עבדך, \mathfrak{N} עבדך דילך = \mathfrak{C} . The message of \mathfrak{H} is probably: “Do not keep playing a sage, doing what you normally fancy to do, avoiding humiliating manual labour.”

στενοχωρίας σου] \mathfrak{H} A צרכך ‘your need,’ a reasonable equation. צרתך, i.e. צרתך is a possible alternative. Cf. תצרי מיושב > στενοχωρήσει ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικούντων Is 49.19.

The general message is that when one is financially hard pressed, one should take on toilsome manual work that the average sage would normally shun.⁵⁸

The key notion of vss. 26-31 is honour, pride. In each verse we find either δόξα or δοξάζω, and in vs. 31 ἄδοξος as well. On δοξάζομαι, see above at 3.10.

⁵⁶ Cf. \mathfrak{C} (26.13) Ἄ ἐλάλησεν κύριος ἐν χειρὶ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ ἐλθεῖν Ναβουχοδονοσορ τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος τοῦ κόψει τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου ‘what the Lord spoke through Jeremiah, namely that Nebuchadnezzar was going to come ...’ on which see *SSG* § 69 d.

⁵⁷ BDB s.v. ל 6 a mentions two other cases, both of which are disputable: ראיתי הַמְיוֹן הַגָּדוֹל רָאִיתִי הַמְיוֹן הַגָּדוֹל וְאֶת־עַבְדְּךָ יוֹאֵב וְאֶת־עַבְדְּךָ יוֹאֵב וְאֶת־עַבְדְּךָ יוֹאֵב וְאֶת־עַבְדְּךָ יוֹאֵב 2Sm 18.29, where the text is hopelessly corrupted, and Driver (1913.332) justly points out that יוֹאֵב as the subject of the inf. cannot be positioned after its object, and הַמְאָה וְדָבַשׁ יֹאכַל לְדַעְתּוֹ מֵאוֹס בָּרַע וּבָחוּר בְּטוֹב Is 7.15, where the usual interpretation of ל- as meaning ‘until’ is unjustified. Qimhi plausibly argues that לְדַעְתּוֹ is to be construed backwards as well as forwards.

Van Peursen (loc. cit.) adduces from QH אל ישא איש עלו סמנים לצת ולכוא בשבת CD 11.9, a translation of which by Lohse (1971.89) is reasonable, “.. um damit aus- und einzugehen am Sabbat.” Cf. also Yifrach 1996.288.

⁵⁸ “A motto for unemployed university graduates,” as nicely put by Snaith 58. Segal (66) mentions “Skin a carcass in the market and take payment, but do not say: I am a priest, or: I am a great man, and this matter disgusts me” bPes. 113a.

- 10.27) κρείσσων ἐργαζόμενος καὶ περισσεύων ἐν πᾶσιν
ἢ περιπατῶν δοξαζόμενος καὶ ἀπορῶν ἄρτων.

*Better is one who labours and has more than enough in everything
than one who walks about, proud of his status but lacking bread.*

(A טוב עובד ויותר הון ממתכבד וחסר מתן:
(B טוב עובד ויותר הון ממתכבד ...:

περιπατῶν] om. **S**, **Sh**, and **L**.

ἄρτων] ≠ **HA** מתן ‘gift,’ most likely corrupted from מזון, i.e. מזון ‘food,’
cf. **S** מזונא and **Sh** לְמִזְנָה.

- 10.28) τέκνον, ἐν πραῦτητι δόξασον τὴν ψυχὴν σου
καὶ δὸς αὐτῇ τιμὴν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν αὐτῆς.

*Child, in humility maintain your self-respect
and value it duly as it deserves.*

(A בני בענוה כבד נפשך ויתן לך ט... כיוצא בה:
(B בני בענוה כבד נפשך ותן לה טעם כיוצא ...:

ἐν πραῦτητι] = **H**. Whence **Sh** בְּנִיחוּתָא ‘in serenity’ comes is obscure.
καὶ δὸς] = **HB** ותן, which is = **S** וְהָבָה. **HA** ויתן ‘and he will give’ makes
no sense at all.

τιμὴν] **H** טעם, a rather free rendering. What **S** טעמא could mean here
escapes us.

κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν] **H** כיוצא ב-, a collocation well-known in MH as illus-
trated by Segal (67), e.g. הָרִי הוּא יוֹצֵא בְּפִנְדִּיּוֹן ‘it was worth a *pondion*’
mM.Sh. 4.8.⁵⁹ Cf. **S** מָה דְּמִתְבְּעָא לָהּ ‘that which is required for her.’ **Sh** אִיךָ
הָלָהּ שׁוֹלְטָנָא דִּילָהּ = κατ’ ἐξουσίαν αὐτῆς, a variant not attested by any Gk MS.

This same equation recurs later in שית אבלו כיוצא בו πείνησον τὸ πένθος
κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ ‘make your mourning as befits him’ 38.17.

αὐτῆς] **HA** בה must be a simple error for בה.

- 10.29) τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίς δικαιώσει;
καὶ τίς δοξάσει τὸν ἀτιμάζοντα τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ;

*Who would justify one who sins against himself,
and who would respect one who belittles his own life?*

(A מרשיע נפשו מי יצדיקנו ומי יכבד מקלה נפשו:
(B בני מרשיע נפשו מי יצדיקנו ומי יכבד ...:

ἁμαρτάνοντα εἰς] **H** מרשיע. The Gk verb displays diverse reactions to
indicate the victim: τινι, εἰς τινα, ἐναντί τινος, ἐναντίον τινος, ἐνώπιόν

⁵⁹ Pace Segal loc. cit. not “4.5.”

τινος, πρὸς τινα.⁶⁰ By contrast, הַרְשִׁיעַ in the sense of ‘to act sinfully against’ does not take a zero-object. מְרַשְׁיָעֵי בְרִית Dn 11.32, so IQM 1.2, is equivocal, for it can be rewritten as מְרַשְׁיָעִים בְּבְרִית. Cp. in this context באֵי הַתְּבָה ‘those who entered the ark’ CD 5.1, followed by a biblical proof text, שָׁנִים בָּאוּ אֶל-הַתְּבָה Gn 7.9.⁶¹ We submit that מרשיע here is in the st. cst. We find a most instructive instance in μη ἀμάρτανε εἰς πλῆθος πόλεως אל תרשיעך בעדת שערי אל Si 7.7, on which see ad loc. Another rare example of this verb with a prepositional object is הרשיע על בחירו ‘he acted wickedly against His chosen one’ 1QpHab 9.11. Our Si example could then be rewritten as מרשיע על נפשו or מרשיע בנפשו. מן דְּמַחֵב נַפְשָׁהּ ‘one who condemns oneself’ and Lévi’s (71) “Celui qui s’accuse lui-même” are contextually doubtful.⁶²

τῆν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ] ᾠΑ נפשו. Whilst שָׁנָה means ‘life,’ the manifest parallelism between the two parts of the verse suggests that the word is used in the same sense twice over. However, by shifting from ψυχὴ to ζωή, ᾠ is underlining a significant difference in meaning to be attached to שָׁנָה here. The first half is moving in the domain of faith and ethics, the second in that of human dignity.

10.30) πτωχὸς δοξάζεται δι’ ἐπιστήμην αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πλούσιος δοξάζεται διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ.

*A poor man is respected on account of his knowledge
and a rich man is respected on account of his wealth.*

(A) יש דל נכבד בגלל שכלו ויש נכבד בגלל עשירו:
(B) דל נכבד בגלל שכלו ויש עשיר נכבד בגלל ...

ᾠ repeats אֵית [= יֵשׁ] twice, whereas ᾠב does not use it at all, = ᾠ.

πλούσιος] ᾠB עשיר [= ᾠ], which must have inadvertently dropped out in ᾠA. Otherwise 30b makes little sense.⁶³

10.31) ὁ δεδοξασμένος ἐν πτωχείᾳ, καὶ ἐν πλούτῳ ποσαχῶς;
καὶ ὁ ἄδοξος ἐν πλούτῳ, καὶ ἐν πτωχείᾳ ποσαχῶς;

*One who has attained status in poverty, how much more in wealth
and one who is despised in wealth, how much more in poverty!*

⁶⁰ For details, see *GELS* s.v. 1.

⁶¹ For a more extensive discussion on this question, see *SQH* § 31 r.

⁶² Mopsik (133) follows Lévi, and mentions עֲצָמָךְ בְּפִנֵּי רֵשַׁע בְּפִנֵּי עֲצָמָךְ mAb 2.13, which message, however, is that one is to be critical about oneself, even when others are not aware of your defects, or even when you are on your own and others would not notice what evil things you might be doing.

⁶³ Pace Smend (101) “überflüssige”, but “unentbehrlich.”

- (Aa) נכבד בעשרו איככה ונקלה בעיניו איככה:
 (Ab) הַתְּכַבֵּד בְּדִלּוֹתוֹ בַּעֲשָׂרוֹ מִתְּכַבֵּד יִתֵּר:
 (Ac) והנקלה בעשרו בדלותו נקלה יותר:
 (Ba) הנכבד בעיניו בעשרו איככה ונקלה בעשרו בעיניו איככה:
 (Bb) המתכבד בדלותו בעשרו מתכבד יתר:
 (Bc) והנקלה בעשרו בדלותו נקלה יתר:

Our verse in \mathfrak{C} consists of two parts of antithetical parallelism with regard to contrast between material wealth and poverty. Both \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} have come down in three varieties, none of which agrees completely with \mathfrak{C} . Let's leave Aa) out, which is rather defective. Ba) is complete by itself, and so are \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}h$. By contrast, Ab) need be read together with Ac), and Bb) with Bc).

$\epsilon\nu \pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha]$ An abstract noun, דְּלוּת 'poverty,' is unknown in BH.⁶⁴ Its adjective, דָּל, occurs several times in BS, e.g. vss. 23 and 30 above, translated with $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$. By contrast, בעיניו (twice) in Ba) cannot represent בְּעֵינָיו, but a corruption from בְּעֵינָיו.

$\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha\chi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma]$ $\mathfrak{H}Ba$ איככה, a poetic synonym of אֵיךְ in BH, used in rhetorical questions at Ct 5.3 (2x) and Est 8.6 (2x).⁶⁵ $\Pi\sigma\sigma\alpha\chi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ 'in how many ways, in how many senses' in CG occurs only here in SG. Neither of these two meanings fits our Si context. We would rather follow Wagner (1999.275), who sees here an expression of קָל וְהַמֵּר, *a minori ad maius*, an interpretation reflected in \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}h$ קָדַם כְּמָא לֵן. יו(ת)ר. 'more' is not as powerful in its rhetorical effect as איככה.⁶⁶

$\acute{o} \acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\zeta\omicron\varsigma]$ $\mathfrak{H}Ba$ נקלה, for which the parallel הנכבד makes one anticipate הַנְּקֵלָה as in $\mathfrak{A}3$, the first occurrence.

A possible retroversion of \mathfrak{C} to Heb. might look like:

הַנְּכַבֵּד בְּעֵינָיו בַּעֲשָׂרוֹ אִיכְכָה הַנְּקֵלָה בַּעֲשָׂרוֹ בְּעֵינָיו אִיכְכָה.

⁶⁴ Given this attestation in BS, we see, *pace* Dihi (2008.24), no reason for its frequent occurrence in RH as evidence of its innovation by Amoraim.

⁶⁵ These examples are not taken into account by Kister 1999.161f.

⁶⁶ Cf. also Ben-Ḥayyim 1973.216.

CHAPTER 11

11.1) Σοφία ταπεινοῦ ἀνυψώσει κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν μέσῳ μεγιστάνων καθίσει αὐτόν.

*The wisdom of a lowly man would enhance his public stature
and grant him a seat in the midst of important people.*

(A) חכמת דל תשא ראשו ובין נדיבים תשיבנו:
(B) חכמת דל תשא ראשו ובין נדיבים תשיבנו:

A very similar thought is expressed over a physician in Si 38.3 – ἐπιστήμη ἱατροῦ ἀνυψώσει κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔναντι μεγιστάνων θαυμασθήσεται < בציתי מיבידנ ינפלו ושאר מירת אפור תעד > אָשׁוּן is replaced with a synonymous מִרְהָשׁוּ. This Heb. collocation is also used in the sense of restoration of former status of honour: Gn 40.13 and 2Kg 25.27, where the simplex is used in LXX: ὑψώω τὴν κεφαλὴν. See also below at vs. 13.

11.2) Μὴ αἰνέσης ἄνδρα ἐν κάλλει αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ βδελύξῃ ἄνθρωπον ἐν ὀράσει αὐτοῦ.

*Do not praise a man for his good looks
nor loathe a person for his look.*

(A) אל תהלל אדם בתארו ואל תתעב אדם מכוער במראהו:
(B) אל תהלל אדם בתוארו ואל תתעב אדם * מעזב/שבֵּר * במראהו:

κάλλει αὐτοῦ] **TA** בתארו. The noun תָּאָר means “the way a person or a thing looks to a viewer.” In one rare instance, however, “good looks” is meant in the context: אִישׁ תָּאָר 1Sm 16.18 in a description of David as a shepherd lad, as captured in **U** ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς τῷ εἶδει.² Cf. **S** here: שְׁפִיר בְּחֻזָּה.

ἄνθρωπον] **U** אדם. **U** has probably selected a different synonym for the sake of variation, and nothing more.

TA מכוער is not absolutely necessary. Its root is known in MH, but not in BH. Just as תָּאָר can be understood with “good” as latent in the context, so its synonym מְרָאָה with “ugly [מְכַעֵר]” as latent in the context.³

¹ Abegg reads the second alternative as מכוער.

² Cf. also another instance, though of מְרָאָה, not of תָּאָר, mentioned by Smend (102): וְלֹא־מְרָאָה וְנִחְמְדָהּ > καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος Is 53.2.

³ BSH restores the messy **UB** as אל תתעב אדם מכוער.

- 11.3) μικρὰ ἐν πετεινοῖς μέλισσα,
καὶ ἀρχὴ γλυκασμάτων ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῆς.

*The bee is small among the flying animals,
and yet its produce is at the top of sweet foods.*

(A) אליל בעוף דברה וראש תנובות פריה:
(B1) קטנה בעוף דבורה וראש תנובות פריה:
(B2) אליל בעוף דבורה וראש תנובות פריה:

μικρὰ] אֲלִיל in BH means “worthless,” e.g. of idols, but not “small (in size).” This is its sole instance in BS. Given the message of 3b, then, קטנה is to be preferred. The Vorlage of S appears to have read אליל: מְטוּל דְּשִׁטָּא ‘because the bee is contemptible among flying creatures.’ Otherwise the addition of the causal conjunction would be uncalled for.⁴

ἀρχή] שֵׁ ראש. On this use of ἀρχή, cf. ἀρχὴ δυναστείας αὐτῶν ‘the mainstay of their strength’ Je 2.3 and ἀρχὴ υἱῶν Αμμων ‘the elite troops [or: aristocracy] of the Ammonites’ Da 11.41 TH.

γλυκασμάτων] שֵׁ תנובות, a word not known specifically to refer to sweet agricultural product. Hence we have here a contextually determined, free rendering.

- 11.4) ἐν περιβολῇ ἱματίων μὴ καυχῆσθαι
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δόξης μὴ ἐπαίρου·
ὅτι θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα κυρίου,
καὶ κρυπτὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώποις.

*When you wear garments, do not boast
and on a gala day do not become puffed up,
for the works of the Lord are marvellous
and His works are hidden to humans.*

(Aa) בעטה אָרַר אל תהתל ואל תקלס במרירי יום:
(Ab) כי פלאות מעשי ייי ונעלם מְאָדָּם פעלו:
(Ba) במעוטה בנדים אל תתפאר ואל תקלס כמרירי יום:
(Ba1) בעוטה אזור אל תהתל ואל תקלס כמרירי יום:
(Bb) ונעלם מאנוש פעלו:

περιβολῇ] a noun which means either ‘what one wears’ or ‘act of wearing.’ The first is precluded in view of the following ἱματίων. In S we find two lexemes: A) עטה, probably *defectiva* spelled for Ba1) עוטה, and Ba) מעוטה, presumably מְעוּטָה, though this verb root occurs in BH only in Qal, meaning ‘to envelop oneself,’ but in RH we encounter וּמְתַעֲטֵף לְבָנָיִם וּמְתַעֲטֵף לְבָנָיִם

⁴ In S the second half of the verse is also expansive: וְרִישׁ טוּבָא דְכָל עֲלֵלְתָא אָבָה ‘her produce is the top of excellent products.’

לְבָנִים ‘an old man clothed in white and covered up in white’ LvR 21 as cited by Even-Shoshan.⁵

If אפר has been rightly restored, עטה אפר would refer to a mourner, cf. וַיִּלְבַּשׁ שָׂק וְאַפֵּר Est 4.1. It is not clear, however, how אָזוּר ‘waist-cloth’ fits this context. Hardly a symbol of one’s lowly status.

καυχῆσθαι] אBa תתפאר. καυχάομαι cannot reflect אA and אBa1 תהתל ‘you deride, make fun of.’⁶

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δόξης] אA במרירי יום. How on earth א has arrived at this translation totally escapes us.⁷ Has מְרוּמֵי יוֹם or מְרוּם יוֹם been read?

The phrase יום מרירי is fraught with difficulties. BH has a hapax מְרִירִי in מְרִירִי קָטָב ‘bitter destruction’ Dt 32.24. In view of its parallelism with the first half of the verse, it most likely means ‘having a hard time’ and in the sg.⁸, cf. קִשְׁה־יוֹם Jb 30.25. BSH 208, however, lists our case under מְרִירִי. Indeed in יום מְרִירִי Jb 3.5 we find exactly the same phrase, but this BH phrase happens to be a long-standing crux interpretum.

ἐπαίρου] א תקלס. In view of the parallelism with תהתל, this rendering is another mystery. The same Gk verb is used in the active voice with σεαυτόν at Si 6.2. Cf. SSG § 27 cac.

We see that the message that comes through א is substantially different from that of א, as far as the first half of the verse goes.

τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ] א פעלו, which need not be seen to be = פּ לָ. The plural concord is due to the parallelism with פלאות מעשי יי.

11.5) πολλοὶ τύραννοι ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ ἐδάφους,
ὁ δὲ ἀνυπονόητος ἐφόρεσεν διάδημα.

*Many rulers came to sit on the ground,
whereas an unsuspected one wore a diadem.*

(A) רבים נדכאים ישבו על כסא	ובל על לב עטו צניף:
(B1) . . . על כסא	ובל על לב עטו צניף:
(B2) . . . כסא	ושפלי לב יעטו צניף:

τύραννοι] ≠ אA נדכאים ‘contrite’ as in תְּבֹהָה לֹא אֱלֹהִים לִב־נִשְׁבֵּר וְנִדְכָה אֱלֹהִים Ps 51.19. Does א possibly reflect מְדַכָּאִים? Lévi’s alternatives, נדיבים or נכבדים, are graphically a shade too dissimilar to נדכאים, though once in LXX τύραννος renders נדיב Pr 8.16. Cf. the use of דְכָא as at Ps 72.4, 94.5, 143.3. Cf. שִׂטָא ‘despised people.’

ἐπὶ ἐδάφους] א על כסא. If this is what in א’s Vorlage stood, we must be having to do with a free rendering. Smend (103) holds that א is either an

⁵ Mr R. Medina of Jerusalem informs me that, according to the best manuscript available, the verb used is Hitpael as against Pual as given by Even-Shoshan.

⁶ On this Heb. verb, cf. Blau 1955.340f. Smend (102) opines that א reflects תהתלל.

⁷ The v.l. במרירי in BSH had better be read במרירי, since the verb קלס, just like its parallel התל, requires the preposition ב.

⁸ So אָנְשָׁא בְר.

error or a correction for ἐπι δίφρου ‘on a seat,’ which latter, however, does not say much, for where on earth would rulers sit?

ὁ δὲ ἀνυπονόητος] **ס** הוּ דְּלֵא הֵן מְסַתְּבֵר דְּלֵא **ל** is probably an error for הוּ דְּלֵא מְסַתְּבֵר, cf. **ס** דְּלֵא דְּחֵלְתָא **א** 5.5 above.

To analyse the prepositional phrase as substantivised is syntactically difficult. Smend (103) is probably right in assuming that עֲלִים, i.e. עֲלִים, has accidentally fallen out. See also **ס** adduced below.

ἐφόρεσεν] Though not harmonising with the parallel ἐκάθισαν (pl.), **ב** לַבּ is number-neutral. **ס**, however, is more attentive to the parallelism: יַעֲטוּ in the doublet of **ב** presupposes reading יִשְׁבוּ as יִשְׁבוּ, which contextually is as acceptable as יִשְׁבוּ.

διάδημα] **ס** לְבוּשָׁא דְּאִיקְרָא ‘glorious garments,’ too generic.

The doublet of **ב** לַבּ שְׁפִלֵי לַבּ is likely to be a harmonisation to שְׁפִלְרִוּחַ Is 57.15.

11.6) πολλοὶ δυνάσται ἠτιμάσθησαν σφόδρα,
καὶ ἔνδοξοι παρεδόθησαν εἰς χεῖρας ἑτέρων.

*Many people in power were greatly humiliated
notables also were delivered into the hands of others.*

(A) רְבִים נְשָׂאִים נְקָלוּ מְאֹד וְהִשְׁפְּלוּ יַחַד וְגַם נְכַבְּדִים נְתַנוּ בְיַד:
(Ba) . . . דְּ. וּנְכַבְּדִים נְתַנוּ בְיַד זְעִירִים:
(Bb) . . . נְקָלוּ מְאֹד וְהוּשְׁפְלוּ יַחַד וּנְכַבְּדִים * נְתַנוּ בְיַד **:
(Bc) * וְגַם ** . . . דְּ. וְהוּשְׁפְלוּ יַחַד . . . בְיַד
(Bd) . . . אֹל. וּבְקַהֲל טַעַם שְׁפוּט:
(Be) . . . אֹל. וּבְקַהֲל טַעַם שְׁפוּ:

[רְבִים נְשָׂאִים] The anomalous fronting of the attributive adjective is known to BH, esp. with this adjective, e.g. לְרְבִים צִיָּדִים Je 16.16, see JM § 141 b. Similarly with רְבִים נְכַבְּדִים vs. 5 above and מְרַבּוֹת צָרוֹת ‘out of many distressful situations’ Si 51.3. This feature of Heb. syntax appears to be unknown to **ס**, which reformulates the clause as מְלִכָּא דְּאַצְטַעְרוּ אַכְחָדָא ‘many are kings who were insulted together.’ Sim. in vs. 5. In Si 51.3, however, there was not available an option of similar reformulation: מְרַבּוֹת צָרוֹת הוּשְׁעַתְנִי > מִן סוּנְאָא מִן דְּעַקְתִּי שׁוּבְבַתְנִי.

On נְשָׂאִים ‘exalted (in status),’ see also 2Ch 32.23 וַיִּנְשָׂא לְעֵינָיו כְּלֵהֲגוּיִם (of Hezekiah). In spite of the vocalisation in **ב**A, HR equates δυνάστῃς with נְשָׂאִ, the sole instance in LXX of this equation.

וְהִשְׁפְּלוּ יַחַד] om. in **ס**, **ל**, and **א**.⁹ Adding little to נְקָלוּ, it probably is not original.

⁹ **ס** has preserved, though, יַחַד in the form of אַכְחָדָא.

ἐτέρων] After $\mathfrak{H}A$ בְּדָרְךָ something may accidentally have fallen out.¹⁰ Ba) does have זְעִירִים ‘minor ones.’ The *Vorlage* of \mathfrak{S} appears to have been defective, hence a rather free translation: וְדַמְיָקְרִין דְּאִתְבְּצְרוּ מִן אִיקְרָהוּן ‘and those who were highly positioned who suffered a loss of their high status.’

Some MSS read εταίρων ‘of colleagues’ and others εχθρών ‘of enemies.’

Of $\mathfrak{H}Be$ there is no trace in any version. Does the second half mean something like “Judge in the midst of a sensible assembly”? But how does such fit the immediate context?

11.7) Πρὶν ἐξετάσης, μὴ μέμψη·
νόησον πρῶτον καὶ τότε ἐπιτίμα.

*Do not blame before you have examined well.
Consider first and then rebuke.*

בְּטָרְם תְּחַקֵּר אֶל תְּסַלֵּף בְּקָר לְפָנִים וְאַחַר תִּזְיֶה: (A
... תַּהַקֵּר אֶל תְּסַלֵּף בְּקָר לְפָנִים וְאַחַר תִּזְיֶה: (B

Πρὶν] This is the sole instance in SG of this temporal particle used with a finite verb. Usually it is followed by an inf., whether or not preceded by ἢ as in the following verse. See also *SSG* § 29 c (v), and p. 335, fn. 4.

μέμψη] Since Heb. סָלַף means “to pervert, twist,” a slight semantic twist has occurred here, i.e. “to falsify, make a false accusation.” \mathfrak{S} appears to have had some difficulty here: לֹא תִשְׁתַּתְּוֶתָּה ‘you shall not get involved,’ or alternatively ‘you shall not have intercourse’ in the light of what follows: עֲקֹב לִוְקָדָם: וְהִזְדִּין עֲבָד שְׂדָפֵא ‘Investigate first and then make a proposal,’ quite a departure from \mathfrak{H} .

זְיֶה] $\sqrt{\text{זיה}}$ is unknown to BH, whilst MH uses זָהַר in the sense of ‘to be angry, rebuke.’ This is the first attestation of Hif. הִזְיֶה.

11.8) πρὶν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι μὴ ἀποκρίνου
καὶ ἐν μέσῳ λόγων μὴ παρεμβάλλου.

*Before you have heard out, do not answer
and do not interrupt when someone else is speaking.*

בְּנִי אֶל תְּשִׁיב דְּבַר טָרְם תְּשַׁמַּע וּבְתוֹךְ שִׁיחָה אֶל תְּדַבֵּר: (A
... אֶל תְּשִׁיב וּבְתוֹךְ שִׁיחָה אֶל תְּדַבֵּר: (B

בְּנִי] om. in \mathfrak{G} , \mathfrak{S} , \mathfrak{Sh} , and \mathfrak{L} .

παρεμβάλλου] \mathfrak{Sh} תַּתְּרַמָּא reflexive ‘you throw yourself (into)’ rather than passive ‘to be thrown,’ cf. *SL* s.v. רמי Ettaf. 1.

¹⁰ On some rare instances in BH where an anticipated nomen rectum or a suf. pronoun is missing, cf. Driver 1913 ad 1Sm 26.23.

- 11.9) *περὶ πράγματος, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν σοι χρεία, μὴ ἔριζε
καὶ ἐν κρίσει ἁμαρτωλῶν μὴ συνέδρευε.*

*Over a matter which is none of your business do not contest
nor act as a counsellor in a strife among sinners.*

(A) באין עצבה אל תאחר וברב זדים אל תקומם:
(B) בִּאֵין עצה אל תתור וברִיב זדים אל תקומם:

The Heb. text in B) as well as A) presents some difficulties. Whilst *עצבה* is unattested in BH, the root *עצב* occurs in multiple lexemes, all having to do with “pain, grief, hurt,” mostly of spiritual, mental suffering. *באין עצה*, *si vera lectio*, could mean “unless you are strongly advised to take action.” Either Heb. substantive, however, has nothing to do with *χρεία*. *שִׁילָא* would reflect *עצמה*.

Both *תאחר* and *תתור* are generally thought to be corrupt, and a form of *√רח* is restored, *תתור* (Lévi 73). Cf. *ש* and *שח* *תתורא*.

- 11.10) *Τέκνον, μὴ περὶ πολλὰ ἔστωσαν αἱ πράξεις σου·
ἐὰν πληθύνῃς, οὐκ ἀθωωθήσῃ·
καὶ ἐὰν διώκῃς, οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃς·
καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγῃς διαδράς.*

*Child, do not make yourself busy over too many matters.
If you multiply (your activities), you will never come away blameless.
Even if you pursued, you will never catch up with it,
and you will never escape, even if you have run away.*

(Aa) בני למה תרבה עשקך ואץ (להרבות לא ינקה:
(Ab) בני אם לא תרוץ לא תגיע ואם לא תבקש לא תמצא:
(B*) אם תברח לא תדביק ולא תמלטנו אם תנוס:
(Ba) בני למה תרבה עושקך ואץ להרבות לא ינקה:
(Bb) בני אם לא תרוץ לא תגיע ואם לא תבקש לא תמצא:

Aa) and Ab) are almost totally identical with Ba)¹¹ and Bb) respectively. However, how does B*) fit in the B) text? The last two lines of *ש* follow B*) more closely than Ab) or Bb). Thus *καταλάβῃς*, *תדביק*, *ἐκφύγῃς*, *תמלטנו*,¹² and *διαδράς* *תנוס*. Another curiosity is that in the B MS B*) comes first.

περὶ πολλὰ] On < *περὶ* + acc. > to indicate an object or activity to attend to, see *GELS* s.v. II 4 and cf. *οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ τὴν γεωργίαν ἐγίνοντο* ‘the Jews were getting busy as farmers’ 2M 12.1.

¹¹ In the right-hand margin there is written *עשקך*.

¹² BSH (200) parses the form as Piel. But what would “if you run away, you will let it escape” mean? We would rather parse it as Ni. and the suf. pronoun as equivalent to *מִמֶּנִּי* ‘from it.’ It is well known that a suf. pronoun directly attached to a verb does not always represent a zero-object, in this case *אתה*. See fn. 36 at 4.18 above, and for our example here *קדשתיך* Is 65.5 adduced there is of special interest, for *קדשתיך* = *מִמֶּנִּי*.

πληθύνῃς] 𐤇 𐤆𐤀, which is a substantivised ptc., “one who hurries, is eager,” and the grammatical subject of the following 𐤇. 𐤇 is unifying the two halves.

Sمند’s (18) “nach Reichtum jagt” is too narrowly focused; 𐤇𐤆𐤀 is probably understood as the object of the inf.

ἀθωωθήσῃ] 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀, i.e. 𐤇𐤆𐤀. Lévi (74f.) justified his rendering “réussira” by pointing out that MH and Aram. 𐤇𐤆𐤀 means not only “to be pure, innocent,” but also “to make success”; he appears to be running away with his competence in comparative Hebrew - Aramaic linguistics.

11.11) ἔστιν κοπιῶν καὶ πονῶν καὶ σπεύδων,
καὶ τόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑστερεῖται.

*There is a person who toils and labours hard and hurries,
but is all the more behind schedule.*

: 𐤀 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 (A)

ὑστερεῖται] 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 [𐤇𐤆𐤀, however, also signifies ‘to be lacking,’¹³ which is how 𐤇𐤆𐤀 has understood the text here: 𐤇𐤆𐤀 ‘lacking.’ Cf. 𐤇 *non abundat*.

𐤇𐤆𐤀] on the analysis of which cf. Segal (70), who also rectifies the vocalisation to 𐤇𐤆𐤀. See also below at 13.9.

11.12) ἔστιν νωθρὸς προσδεόμενος ἀντιλήμψεως,
ὑστερῶν ἰσχύι καὶ πτωχεῖα περισσεύει·
καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπέβλεψαν αὐτῷ εἰς ἀγαθά,
καὶ ἀνώρθωσεν αὐτὸν ἐκ ταπεινώσεως αὐτοῦ

*There is a person sluggish in need of help,
lacking in strength, but having more than enough of poverty.
And the eyes of the Lord kindly watched him
and lifted him out of his depression.*

: 𐤀 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 (Aa)

: 𐤀 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀 (Ab)

νωθρὸς] 𐤇 𐤇𐤆𐤀. BH knows 𐤇𐤆𐤀 Pol. in the sense of “to crush, shatter,” attested only twice. The word is usually understood as meaning “feeble, weak,” which νωθρὸς does not mean. This Gk adjective interestingly occurs at Si 4.29 as a rendering of 𐤇𐤆𐤀, most likely 𐤇𐤆𐤀,¹⁴ where, however, it is a description of the vice of sloth, which does not apply here, but we are having to do with someone who is mentally or physically handicapped, making him to work rather slowly.

¹³ See *GELS* s.v.

¹⁴ The sole instance of the lexeme in the entire history of Hebrew.

προσδεόμενος ἀντιλήμψεως] This has little to do with אָבַד מהלך ‘having lost his way.’ On < προσδέομαι τινος >, see SSG § 22 q.

יִשְׁחָו] אָבַד כָּל = אָ. אָ = לִיל?

πτωχεία] = אָ מְסַכְּנִיחָא. Smend (106) restores אֹנֶשׁ, i.e. אֹנֶשׁ “Unglück,” a word unknown in Hebrew anywhere,¹⁵ though Qal, Ni. אֹנֶשׁ ‘to be (medically) sick, weak’ is well established in BH.

יִיָּי] אָ מְאָמְרָה דְּמָרְיָא, indicative of anti-anthropomorphism¹⁶? The verb has perforce been adjusted: אָבַד.

ἐπέβλεψαν αὐτῶ] אָ צַפְתְּהוּ. Another example of < ἐπιβλέπω τινι (pers.) > is οὐ προσθήσει ἐπιβλέψαι αὐτοῖς (אָ לְהַבִּיטֶם) La 4.16.

מַעְפָּר צַהֲנָה] אָ מְעַפָּר וּמֵן עַפְרָא וּמֵן עַפְרָא, a repetition of two synonyms; was the translator unfamiliar with the BH hapax, צַהֲנָה ‘stench’?¹⁷

The last line of אָ represents quite a departure from אָ “and He wholly shook stinking dust off him.”

11.13) καὶ ἀνύψωσεν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἀπεθαύμασαν ἐπ’ αὐτῶ πολλοί.

*And He raised his head
and many were astonished over him.*

(A) נִשָּׂא בְּרָאשׁוֹ וַיִּרְמָמְהוּ וַיִּתְמְהוּ עָלָיו רַבִּים:

[נִשָּׂא בְּרָאשׁוֹ] see above at 11.1, where, however, the preposition בַּ was absent. Though not attested with this particular collocation, its value of transitivity is well established. E.g. אֶנְיַעָה עָלֶיְכֶם בְּמוֹ רֹאשִׁי ‘I would shake my head at you’ Jb 16.4. For further details, see JM § 125 *m-mb*.

וַיִּרְמָמְהוּ] om. in אָ, but אָ מְרָמְמָהוּ.

11.14) ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά, ζωὴ καὶ θάνατος,
πτωχεία καὶ πλοῦτος παρὰ κυρίου ἐστίν.

*Good fortune and misfortune, life and death,
poverty and wealth are from the Lord.*

(A) טוֹב וְרַע חַיִּים וּמוֹת רִישׁ וְעוֹשֶׁר מִיַּי הוּא:

ἐστίν] אָ הוּא. The preceding six (virtual) substantives are perceived as constituting a single concept, hence not εἰσίν (= אָ אֶיִן), cf. SSG § 77 *m*. This notion of unity is perceived somewhat differently in אָ “fortune and misfortune, life and death, the rich and the poor are equal before God (קָדָם)

¹⁵ *Maagarim* registers our case as the sole attestation of this lexeme, but four question marks added speak for the great, epigraphical uncertainty. Segal’s (71) עוֹנִי ‘indigence’ is out of the question.

¹⁶ So also Lévi 75.

¹⁷ צַהֲנָהוּ ‘his stench’ JI 2.20 > אָ קוֹתָהוּ ‘odour of his roast meat,’ not necessarily stench.

ןָוִן אָנֹן.” Unlike **§**, **Ⓢ** is consistent in viewing all the six constituents as referring to impersonal entities.

11.15) ¶ σοφία καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ γνῶσις νόμου παρὰ κυρίου,
ἀγάπησις καὶ ὁδοὶ καλῶν ἔργων παρ’ αὐτοῦ εἰσιν.

*Wisdom and understanding and knowledge of the law is from the Lord,
love and the way of good works are from Him.*

(Aa) חכמָה וְשִׁכְל וְהִבִּין דְּבַר מִיֵּי הוּא:

(Ab) חטא ודרכים ישרים מִיֵּי הוּא:

ἐπιστήμη] **§** נְכַפּוּתָא ‘modesty’!

νόμου] **Ⓢ** דְּבַר, which is too generic. Cf. **§** and **Ⓢ**וּנְמוּסָא דְּ

דְּבַר [הִבִּין דְּבַר] which Mopsik (136) renders “savoir dire,” taking recourse to בְּנוֹן דְּבַר ‘eloquent, fluent’ 1Sm 16.18, but בְּנוֹן is a substantivised participle, whereas our הִבִּין is an infinitive.

ἀγάπησις] probably = חבא, i.e. הִבָּה, cf. **§** הוּבָא and **§** מִתְּבוּנָתָא. **Ⓢ** חטא originating with God is theologically far too controversial, whereas misfortune and poverty (vs. 14) can be regarded as divine punishments.

εἰσιν] The selection of the pl. form immediately following ἐστίν (vs. 14) shows that here is no question of a rigid rule. In **Ⓢ** both verses end with הוּא.

11.16) πλάνη καὶ σκότος ἀμαρτωλοῖς συνέκτισται,
τοῖς δὲ γαυριῶσιν ἐπὶ κακία συγγηρᾷ κακία. ¶

*Error and darkness have emerged together for sinners,
and wickedness grows old together with those who show off wickedness.*

(A) שְׁכָלוֹת וְחוּשֵׁי לַפְשָׁעִים נוֹצְרָה וּמְרַעִים רַעֵה עִמָּם:

[שְׁכָלוֹת] for the standard spelling סְכָלוֹת. Cp. סְכָלוֹת Ec 2.3+ // once שְׁכָלוֹת ib. 1.17.

συνέκτισται] **Ⓢ** נוֹצְרָה. The Gk Pf. has no morphological opposition between the middle and passive voices. However, in a tense which such an opposition is built into, such as Aor., the passive does not necessarily imply the presence of a third party. Thus in καὶ διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο Gn 3.7 God did not open the eyes of the first human couple. We have introduced a new label, “self-propelling action” (SSG § 27 cc). The same analysis can be applied to the Heb. Nifal, just as in וַתִּפְקְחֶנָּה Gn 3.7. For further details on this feature in Hebrew, see SQH § 12 d 6). E.g. תַּגְלָה .. הַאֲבֵן ‘the stone will emerge’ 4Q376 1i1.

The sg. concord with multiple subjects has been touched on above at vs. 14. Here, however, נוֹצְרָה is not only sg., but also fem. Is the first noun determinant? We are not aware of similar examples elsewhere, whether in

Heb. or Gk. Our case differs from, e.g. אל ישראל ומלאך אמתו עזר לכול בני אור ‘God of Israel, assisted by the angel of His truth, helped all the sons of light’ IQS 3.24; see further *SQH* § 32 ci.

συγγηρᾶ κακία] a rather graphic formulation, i.e. “they will never grow out of wickedness.” This Gk verb appears to be a free addition by our translator, though συγ- reflects עמ-.

§ אִילִין דְּמִתְרַבֵּין בְּבִישְׁתָּא בִישְׁתָּא עֲמֵהוֹן סְאָבָא ‘with those who are reared with wickedness wickedness will grow old with them’ is most likely dependent on Ø.

The verses 15-16 are generally thought not to have been part of the original document. See Lévi 76, Smend 107, Segal 71, Skehan - Di Lella 237 and others.

11.17) δόσις κυρίου παραμένει εὐσεβέσις,
καὶ ἡ εὐδοκία αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εὐδοωθήσεται.

*A gift of the Lord will remain with the pious,
and His pleasure will prosper for ever.*

(A) מִתֶּן צְדִיק לְעַד יְצִמֵד וּרְצוֹנוֹ יִצְלַח לְעַד:

εὐσεβέσις] The dat. case calls for לצדיק, i.e. לצדיק. Note § לְדַחְלָהּ. Likely a simple scribal error.

ἡ εὐδοκία αὐτοῦ] רצנו. In view of the pl. εὐσεβέσις, αὐτοῦ can refer only to the Lord, hence subjective genitive. By contrast, the suf. pronoun of רצנו can refer to צדיק, then an objective genitive as in יְכַרְנִי יְהוָה בְּרִצּוֹן עִמָּךְ ‘.. the favour You bear to Your people’ Ps 106.4. With his רצנו של הצדיק Segal (71) presumably means a subjective genitive, i.e. ‘what the righteous desires.’

11.18) ἔστιν πλουτῶν ἀπὸ προσοχῆς καὶ σφιγγίας αὐτοῦ,
καὶ αὕτη ἡ μερὶς τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

*There is one who becomes rich through his attention and frugality
and that is his share of reward.*

(A) שׁ מִתְעַשֵּׂר מֵהֲתַעֲנוֹת וְיִחְיֶיב שְׂכָרוֹ:

The Heb. text as it is manifestly is not in order. שׁ cannot introduce a verbal clause, though its restoration is probably defensible in view of § אֵית, which, however, is followed by דְּלֵא לְוֹא לְהַ עוֹתְרָה ‘there is one who does not deserve his wealth.’ Besides, שְׂכָרוֹ is opaque, the first word in particular.

προσοχῆς] הֲתַעֲנוֹת. The only Heb. עֲנִי that appears to be relevant here is Qal ‘to be occupied, busy (with),’ which occurs twice only and that in Ec,

1.13 and 3.10. Its etymological equivalent in Syr., $\sqrt{\text{עני}}$ Peal in the sense of ‘to give attention, occupy oneself’ and Ethpeel ‘to be busy with, occupy oneself with’ are solidly attested. Given this range of meanings the reflexive הִנָּצַח makes good sense.

$\sigma\phi\iota\gamma\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$] no equivalent in 𐤅 . This Gk substantive, which occurs only once in BS, is unknown prior to SG. LSJ offers “greed,” which, however, is no compliment beside προσοχή ‘careful attention.’

11.19) ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν Εὐρον ἀνάπαυσιν
καὶ νῦν φάγομαι ἐκ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μου,
καὶ οὐκ οἶδεν τίς καιρὸς παρελεύσεται
καὶ καταλείψει αὐτὰ ἑτέροις καὶ ἀποθανεῖται.

*When he says, “I have found rest
and now I will feed myself on all my goodies,”
he does not know, however, how much time is going to pass
before he leaves them to others and dies.*

(Aa) ובעת . . . מצאתי נחת ועתה אכל מַטְוֹבֵי
(Ab) וְלֹא יָדַע מַה יִּ. . . חָלַף וְעָבַר לֵאחֶר וּמַת:

τίς καιρὸς] The interrogative pronoun can be used attributively. For more examples in SG, see *GELS* s.v. V. The analogous use of מה is known to BH, e.g. מַה־בְּצַע ‘what sort of benefit?’ Gn 37.26. Cf. JM § 144 *d*, and more examples are to be found in BDB s.v. מה 1 a (a). We do not know, however, what substantive, if at all, is to be restored after מה .

καὶ καταλείψει] 𐤅 here attests to the inversive *w-watalti*.¹⁸

αὐτὰ] The selection of the pl. form is appropriate in the light of the preceding τῶν ἀγαθῶν μου , but, should מַטְוֹבֵי have been correctly restored,¹⁹ the gender discord with וְעָבַר is glaring.

11.20) Στῆθι ἐν διαθήκῃ σου καὶ ὀμίλει ἐν αὐτῇ
καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ σου παλαιώθητι.

*Child, hold fast to your chosen vocation and busy yourself with it
and reach old age, still at your work.*

(A) בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ בְּחֹקְךָ וּבוֹ הִתְרַעַ וּבַמְּלֶאכֶתְךָ הִתִּישׁ:

διαθήκη] 𐤅 חֹק . The Gk word here most likely signifies “work contract” or such like, but not “covenant (with God),” for in that sense the suffix pronoun attached to διαθήκη can only refer to God. By contrast, חוק means “assignment, mission” determined and entrusted by God. Cf. $\text{מִדּוּעַ לֹא כָּלִיתָם}$. הִקְיָה ‘Why have you not completed your quota?’ Ex 5.14.

¹⁸ For a discussion with more examples, see Van Peursen 2004 § 8.3.

¹⁹ In 𐤅 we find a pl. form: מַטְוֹבֵי , which is correctly resumed with וְיָחַף .

ὀμίλει] 𐤇 𐤆𐤌𐤎, an understandable equation.²⁰ In BH 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇, affiliated to 𐤇 ‘friend, companion,’ is well established,²¹ e.g. 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎𐤇 Pr 22.24. 𐤇𐤌𐤎 has taken ὀμιλέω in another sense, “to converse”: 𐤇𐤌𐤎.

𐤇𐤌𐤎] BH does not use this verb in Hitpael, whilst its use in Nifal carries the same ingressive force,²² “to become old.” It does occur in RH in this sense.

11.21) μὴ θαύμαζε ἐν ἔργοις ἀμαρτωλοῦ,
πίστευε δὲ κυρίῳ καὶ ἔμμενε τῷ πόνῳ σου·
ὅτι κοῦφον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κυρίου
διὰ τάχους ἐξάπινα πλουτίσαι πένητα.

*Do not be surprised at a sinner's works,
but trust the Lord and abide by your toil,
for it is easy in the eyes of the Lord
to make a poor man rich fast and all of a sudden.*

𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 (Aa)

𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 (Ab)

τῷ πόνῳ σου] 𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎, = 𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘His light.’
κοῦφον] 𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎, i.e. 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘straight,’ i.e. ‘not twisted, complicated, straight-forward.’

11.22) εὐλογία κυρίου ἐν μισθῷ εὐσεβοῦς,
καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ταχινῆ ἀναθάλλει εὐοδία αὐτοῦ.

*A blessing of the Lord is part of what is allotted to a pious person,
and his prosperity will promptly sprout afresh.*

𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 (A)

ἐν μισθῷ] 𐤇 Smend (109) dismisses the addition of ἐν as inaccurate. He apparently regards 𐤇 as *Beth essentiae*, which introduces a predicate of a nominal clause. He refers to 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘the god of my father is my help’ Ex 18.4 (𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎 𐤇𐤌𐤎). It might come down to more or less the same thing, but we could say “is contained in.”²³

𐤇𐤌𐤎] 𐤇 𐤇𐤌𐤎.²⁴ There is nothing common to the two.

²⁰ Our *Index* s.v. ὀμιλέω has added “*5) 𐤇𐤌𐤎 hit.[1: Si 11.20].”

²¹ Smend (108) writes that it means “sich an etwas erfreuen,” what is unknown to Hebrew at all. He is probably thinking of an Aramaism, e.g. JA 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘to delight in’ and Syr. 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘to be content.’

²² On this notion, cf. *SQH* § 12 e 7, f 3.

²³ Cf. *SD* (1106 f.n. a): “wörtlich (*liegt*) in Lohn des Gottesfürchtigen.”

²⁴ BSH reads 𐤇𐤌𐤎 ‘my hope,’ which makes no sense. In the MS we can recognise the bottom of a *waw*.

11.23) μὴ εἴπῃς Τίς ἐστίν μου χρεία,
καὶ τίνα ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔσται μου τὰ ἀγαθὰ;

*Do not say, "What is my need?
and what will be my good possessions from now?"*

(A) אל תאמר . . . כי עשיתי חפצי ומה עתה יעזב לי:

עשיתי חפצי is not reflected in \mathfrak{C} , and whence τὰ ἀγαθὰ? Is the message in the Gk version meant for someone who has built up quite a solid financial foundation?

τίνα] This is a very rare example of the n. pl. τίνα, see SSG § 18 d.

11.24) μὴ εἴπῃς Αὐτάρκη μοί ἐστιν,
καὶ τί ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κακωθήσομαι;

*Do not say, "I have enough,
and what sort of difficulty could I undergo from now?"*

(A) אל תאמר דיי עמי איה א.. יהי עלי:

11.25) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀγαθῶν ἀμνησία κακῶν,
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κακῶν οὐ μνησθήσεται ἀγαθῶν.

*When you are happy, you do not remember your unhappiness,
and when you are unhappy, you cannot remember your happiness.*

(Aa) טובת יום תשכח רעה ורעת יִיִן תשכח טובה:
(Ab) ואחרית א(א)דם תהיה עליו:

ἀμνησία .. οὐ μνησθήσεται] \mathfrak{H} תשכח .. תשכח. BH uses $\sqrt{\text{שכח}}$ in the causative sense in Pi. and Hi. once each, La 2.6 and Je 23.27. \mathfrak{S} , shifted to vs. 27, has misunderstood \mathfrak{H} : תשכח 'it will find.'

The third Heb. clause is missing in \mathfrak{C} : "and the end of a man will be coming upon him." It is present in \mathfrak{S} vs. 27: חַרְתָּה דְּבִרְנָשָׁא תְּהוּא עָלְוֵהָ.

11.26) ὅτι κοῦφον ἔναντι κυρίου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τελευτῆς
ἀποδοῦναι ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ.

*For it is easy for the Lord on the day of death
to requite (every) man according to his ways.*

This verse seems accidentally to have fallen out in \mathfrak{H} , but forms a necessary link with vs. 27.

11.27) κάκωσις ὥρας ἐπιλησμονὴν ποιεῖ τρυφῆς,
καὶ ἐν συντελείᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκάλυψις ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

*Distress of a merely one hour makes one forget luxury,
and on the day of his death every man's past will become exposed.*

(Aa) עָתָּה רַעַה תִּשְׁכַּח תַּעֲנוּג וְסוֹף אָדָם יִגִּיד עֲלָיו:
 (Ab) בַּטֶּרֶם תַּחְקֹר אָדָם אֶל תֹּאשְׁרָתוֹ עַיִן בְּאַהֲרָיִתּוֹ יֹאשֶׁר אָדָם:

The second half of \mathfrak{H} , which is missing in \mathfrak{G} , appears to be a doublet of vs. 28: “Before you have investigated a person, do not call him happy, for at his end a person will be declared happy.”

κάκωσις ὄρασι] $\neq \mathfrak{H}$ “when a disaster strikes.”

τρυφῆς] One cannot say with certainty whether this is a reference to the good times in the past or one does not have time now for pleasure, most likely the latter. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{h}$ focuses on a specific kind of pleasure: בּוֹסְמָא סְנִינְאָא ‘abundant food,’ which is a more likely interpretation in view of the added adjective. On the semantics of τρυφή, see further below at 41.1.

יגיד] which Smend (13) reads as אחריית אדם תחיה, of the first and last words of which there is no trace whatsoever.

11.28) πρὸ τελευτῆς μὴ μακάριζε μηδένα,
 καὶ ἐν τέκνοις αὐτοῦ γνωσθήσεται ἀνὴρ.

*Before his death do not call anyone happy,
 and through his children he could be recognised for what he was.*

(A) לפני מות אל תאשר גבר ובאחריתו ינכר איש:

μακάριζε] \mathfrak{H} תאשר. For the equation, cf. Μακάριος ἀνὴρ Ps 1.1 and the nine beatitudes pronounced by Jesus, all beginning with μακάριοι (Mt 5.3-11). See also below at 14.20.

μηδένα] \mathfrak{H} גבר, which could have been rendered verbatim with ἄνδρα or ἄνθρωπον. But the selection of μηδένα is more idiomatic for an expression of absolute, categorical negation, on which see *SSG* § 10 **da** and *SQH* § 40 **g**, also 83 **fb**.

τέκνοις αὐτοῦ] \mathfrak{H} אחרייתו, similarly in יהי־אֲחֵרִיתוֹ לְהַכְרִית בְּדוֹר אֲחֵר יִמָּה Ps 109.13 > \mathfrak{G} γεννηθήτω τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ εἰς ἐξολέθρευσιν κτλ.

γνωσθήσεται] \mathfrak{H} ינכר. In BH we find Ni. נִכַּר only once: לֹא נִכְרוּ בַּחֲוֻצוֹת La 4.8 > \mathfrak{G} οὐκ ἐπεγνώσθησαν ἐν ταῖς ἐξόδοις.

11.29) Μὴ πάντα ἄνθρωπον εἴσαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου·
 πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ ἔνεδρα τοῦ δολίου.

*Do not allow everybody into your home,
 for many are the snares laid by a deceitful person.*

(A) לא כל איש להביא אל בית ומה רבו פְּצָעֵי רוּכַל:

πάντα] \mathfrak{H} כל. On the opposition between categorical and partial negation, see above at 10.6.

τὸν οἶκόν σου] = \mathfrak{S} . Pace Smend (111) we fail to see why ביתך cannot be used in this inf. clause.

εἴσαγε] להביא, an infinitive with injunctive value, esp. common in prohibitions. E.g. אין לבוא 'one may not enter' Est 4.2; לוא לסור ימין ושמאל 'one is not to deviate right or left' IQS 3.10.²⁵

מה] interjection, 'How many ..!'. Cf. מה־רבו צָרִי Ps 3.2. Our translator could have used ὥς as in ὥς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἔργα σου, κύριε Ps 103.24 < מה־רבו מעשיך יהוה \mathfrak{H} .²⁶

ἔνεδρα] \mathfrak{H} פצע' 'hurts caused by.' Note \mathfrak{S} כְּמֵאֲנִיָּהּ = \mathfrak{C} .

δολίου] \mathfrak{H} רוכל, which in BH means 'merchant, tradesman' with no pernicious nuance. In our context רכיל 'slanderer, tale-bearer' would have suited better.²⁷ Tales told by such people are often false, malicious, and hurting. The equation Qal רכל / δόλιος occurs only here in LXX.

A v.l. of the second line has become dislocated as the fifth line of vs. 30: מה ירבו פשעי בוצע 'How many are the offences committed by a profiteer!'

11.30) πέρδιξ θηρευτῆς ἐν καρτάλλῳ, οὕτως καρδία ὑπερηφάνου,
καὶ ὥς ὁ κατὰσκοπος ἐπιβλέπει πτώσιν·

A decoy-partridge in a basket, that is what the heart of an arrogant man is like

and like a spy he feasts his eyes on your downfall.

(A כְּכֵלֶיב מְלֵא עוֹף כֵּן בְּתֵיהֶם מְלֵאִים . . .
כְּעוֹף אַחוּז בְּכֵלֶיב לֵב גֵּאָה כִּזְאֵב אֲרֵב לְטָרֶף:
מֵה יִרְבוּ פִשְׁעֵי בּוֹצֵעַ:
כְּכֹלֵב הוּא בֵּא כָּל־בֵּית וְחוֹמָס:
כֵּן בּוֹצֵעַ בֵּא וּמְשִׁים רִיב לְכָל טוֹבֹתָם:
אוֹרֵב חֲרוּכֵל כְּדוֹב לְבֵית לְצִים וּכְמִרְגֵל יִרְאֵה עֲרוּהַ:

The \mathfrak{H} text is in hopeless disarray with not a few doublets and a complete, dislocated text (5th clause). \mathfrak{C} appears to have preserved the original text: the first line is pretty close to the third clause in \mathfrak{H} and the second line to the very last clause in \mathfrak{H} . Thus

כְּעוֹף אַחוּז בְּכֵלֶיב לֵב גֵּאָה וּכְמִרְגֵל יִרְאֵה עֲרוּהַ:

An English translation of \mathfrak{H} would be something like:

*Like a cage full of birds so their houses are full ...
Like a bird held in a cage is the heart of an arrogant man
like a lion lying in wait for games.
How many are the offences committed by a profiteer!
Like a dog he enters every house and ravages.
So comes along a profiteer and starts up a dispute over all their good things.*

²⁵ Cf. JM § 124 l and SQH § 18 c.

²⁶ More examples are mentioned in DCH V 158a-159b 2.

²⁷ According to Dihi (2008.21) we have in our רוכל a case of semantic innovation.

²⁸ Delete the conjunction waw.

*The tale-bearer lies in wait like a bear for a house of scorners
and like a spy he would spot a weak spot.*

§ appears to be based on this extended text, though the last clause of § is missing.

πτῶσιν] § ערוה, doubtlessly an allusion to לְרֵאוֹת אֶת־עֲרוֹת מְרַגְלִים אֲתֶם Gn 42.9.

11.31) τὰ γὰρ ἀγαθὰ εἰς κακὰ μεταστρέφω ἐνεδρεύει
καὶ ἐν τοῖς αἰρετοῖς ἐπιθήσει μῶμον.

*Lying in wait he makes bad of good
and picks holes in the best things.*

(A טוב לרע יהפך נִרְגַן ובמחמדיך יתן קשר:

ἐνεδρεύει] § נִרְגַן, a rare verb in BH in the sense of “to backbite, slander.” Since ἐνεδρεύω has little to do with it, § possibly construed נִרְגַן with the second clause, leaving out קשר as contextually difficult.

11.32) ἀπὸ σπινθῆρος πυρὸς πληθύνεται ἀνθρακιά,
καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰς αἵμα ἐνεδρεύει.

*By a spark of fire charcoal is fed,
and a sinful man lies in wait for a chance to kill.*

(A מנצוץ ירבה גחלת ואיש בליעל לדם יארב:

σπινθῆρος] § נצוץ; the same equation occurs in σπινθῆρες πυρός Is 1.31 (נצוץ), where נצוץ is the only occurrence in BH of this substantive. Let it be noted that in this Is instance πυρός is an addition as in our Si passage here.

πληθύνεται] § ירבה. Whilst a verb preceding its subject may appear in 3ms as the representative verb form, that usually occurs when the two are separated with an intervening word or words, see JM § 150 *j*. Alternatively we can analyse מ־ of מנצוץ as partitive, “some of the spark” and ירבה as transitive, ירבה, so Kahana (468) and Segal (74).²⁹

11.33) πρόσεχε ἀπὸ κακούργου, πονηρὰ γὰρ τεκταίνει,
μήποτε μῶμον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα δῶ σοι.

*Watch out for a bad guy, for he brings about wrong things,
in case he makes you bear a black spot for ever.*

(A גור מרע כי רע יוליד למה מום עולם תשא:

μήποτε] § למה. On the virtual equivalence of לְמָהּ to לְמָהּ, see above at 8.1.

²⁹ BSH (274) vacillates. Smend’s (14) proposal to emend the text to read either תרבה or כי נצוץ is uncalled for, though his translation (20) reads: “Von einem Funken kommen viel Kohlen.”

11.34) ἐνοίκισον ἀλλότριον, καὶ διαστρέψει σε ἐν ταραχαῖς
καὶ ἀπαλλοτριώσει σε τῶν ἰδίων σου.

*Take on a stranger as a lodger. Then he would throw you into
disruptions,
and make a stranger of you to your own (folks).*

לא תדבק לרשע ויסלף דרכך ויהפוך מבריתך: (Aa)
משוכן זריו זָהִיר דרכך וינכריך במחמדיך: (Ab)

The first line in **℣** appears to be a variant of vs. 33 and is absent in **℣**, whereas **℣** has preserved this variant text, having nothing to correspond to the second line of **℣**. Furthermore, in the Heb. MS this line is followed by 12.1.

ἐνοίκισον ἀλλότριον] **℣**'s *Vorlage* may have been in disarray. **℣** appears to reflect מְשׁוּכֵן זָר יִזְהַר, and καὶ διαστρέψει σε ἐν ταραχαῖς is probably his own free composition. There is no absolute need to change שׁוֹכֵן to שֵׁן.

τῶν ἰδίων] The gen. case here retains an ablative force, cf. *SSG* § 22 **qa**. Likewise τῶν πατρῶν δογμάτων ἀπηλλοτριωμένος 'having become estranged from the ancestral teachings' 3M 1.3.

℣ מחמדיך means 'ones who are dear to you.'

CHAPTER 12

12.1) Ἐὰν εὖ ποιῆς, γνῶθι τίμι ποιεῖς,
καὶ ἔσται χάρις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς σου.

*If you act kindly, be sure to know who you are acting so for,
and you should be thanked for your good deeds.*

(A) אם טוב תדיע למי תטיב ויהי תקוה לטובתך:

γνῶθι] H תדיע, an obvious error for תדע.

καὶ ἔσται] H ויהי. Van Peursen (§ 12.9, p. 191) holds that the *waw* introduces an apodosis. We would rather admit two co-ordinate volitive forms: יהי . . . תדע. Nor do we believe that ויהי expresses a purpose as understood by Smend (20) “damit deiner Güte Dank zu Teil werde.”¹

תקוה] Not represented in G ; the message is likely to be “you should be able to anticipate words of thanks ..”

12.2) εὖ ποιήσον εὐσεβεῖ, καὶ εὐρήσεις ἀνταπόδομα,
καὶ εἰ μὴ παρ’ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ ὑψίστου.

*Act kindly to a godly person, and then you will attain a reward,
and that if not from him, then from the Most High.*

(A) היטב לצדיק ומצא תשלומת אם לא ממנו מיי:

εὐρήσεις] H מצא, Impv.² Did the translator fear that the selection of εὐρέ might sound as if one is not doing a good deed for its own sake, but for some ulterior purpose? Note also S אַטאַב לַזְדִּיקָא וְתִשְׁכַּח and S עָבַד .. וְתִשְׁכַּח.

12.3) οὐκ ἔσται ἀγαθὰ τῷ ἐνδεδελχίζοντι εἰς κακὰ
καὶ τῷ ἐλεημοσύνην μὴ χαριζομένῳ.

*A persistent wrong-doer is not to expect any good
nor one who does not give alms.*

(A) אין טובה למנוח רשע וגם צדקה לא עשה:

ἀγαθὰ] טובה, which S understood as meaning “thanks, gratitude” – טְיִבוּתָא, so at 20.2. But can טובה mean “thanks”?

¹ On this question, see JM § 116 b, n. 2.

² Unlike in בהמה לך ראה עיניך ואם אמנה היא העמידה 7.22, where, as Fassberg (1997.58) points out, the parallelism with אם indicates that we also have a conditional statement in the first half of the verse, though אם is missing. That analysis, however, does not apply here, because the first half consists of two imperativial clauses.

ἐνδελεχίζοντι] Our translator has the monopoly of this Gk verb in LXX and uses it as often as 9 times. Here it basically means “to continue to exist, to be (at it) all the time.” This, however, cannot be harmonised with 𐤒. Lévi (85), Smend (115), Segal (74), and Kahana (468)³ emend the text to למניח, i.e. 𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤇⁴ and take the verb in the sense of “to make comfortable,”⁵ for which meaning, however, another minor emendation would be required, לרשע, unless we vocalise the form as 𐤏𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤇 as against Segal and Kahana 𐤏𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤇. On the rection of the verb, see, e.g. 𐤇𐤏𐤇𐤏𐤇𐤏𐤇 Ex 33.14 and 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 Josh 1.13. 𐤏 may be a free rendering, also reading רשע as רשע, not רשע.

μη χαριζομένω] 𐤒 לא עשה לה. Should we follow the free rendering of 𐤏, there is no syntactical difficulty in assuming that the preposition ל- is understood, e.g. 𐤌𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤌 לא עשה לה.

12.4) δὸς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ μὴ ἀντιλάβη τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ.

Give gifts to the god-fearing and do not help sinners.

תן לטוב ומנע מרע (A)

τῷ εὐσεβεῖ] The definite article is not anaphoric, referring to a particular individual, but generic, e.g. in ὁ φοβούμενος τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου τῶν θεραπόντων Φαραῶν the reference is not to a particular individual, but ‘whoever among Ph.’s servants fears the word of the Lord’ Ex 9.20.⁶ In 11.17 above we see an alternative construction: δόσις κυρίου παραμένει εὐσεβέσιν (sg. indet. צדיק), and yet another alternative in εὖ ποίησον ταπεινῶ καὶ μὴ δῶς ἄσεβεῖ in the next verse. The same holds for τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ here. Exactly the same can also be said of the Heb. definite article, e.g. שלושת מיני הצדק ‘three types of justice’ CD 4.16.⁷

12.5) εὖ ποίησον ταπεινῶ καὶ μὴ δῶς ἄσεβεῖ·
ἐμπόδισον τοὺς ἄρτους αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ δῶς αὐτῶ,
ἵνα μὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς σε δυναστεύσῃ·
διπλάσια γὰρ κακὰ εὐρήσεις
ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς ἂν ποιήσῃς αὐτῶ.

הקיר מך ואל תתן לרע: (Aa)

למה בם יקביל אליך: (Ab) כלי לחם אל תתן לו

פי שנים רעה תשיג בעת צורך: (Ac) בכל טובה תניע אליו:

³ Perhaps Lévi (87) as well with his “des armes.”

⁴ Schechter and Taylor (47), taking recourse to Arb. *manaḥa* ‘to bestow gifts,’ analyse the verb as Qal inf., 𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤇. Such a Heb. verb, however, is not attested anywhere nor in Aramaic.

⁵ E.g. “der dem Bösen erquicket” (Smend 20).

⁶ See further in SSG § 1 d.

⁷ See further in SQH § 7 c. Cp. לטוב (Kahana 469) with לטוב (Segal 74).

*Be kind to the modest and do not give to the ungodly.
Withhold bread from him and do not give him
in order that he may not wield power over you with it,
for you might experience twice as (grave) damages
for all good things you do to him.*

εἶ ποίησον] 𐤀 𐤇𐤊𐤏 = 𐤇𐤊𐤏 Hif. impv., “to deal with respect, to value”?
ταπεινῶ] 𐤀 𐤇𐤊 = 𐤇𐤊, Qal ptc. Though quite common in Aramaic, this
root, 𐤇𐤊, occurs in BH as a Qal verb only once, and that not in the sense of
‘to be humble,’ but ‘to be humiliated’ – 𐤇𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤁𐤂𐤏𐤍 Ps 106.43. However,
note 𐤍𐤁𐤊𐤏 ‘humble.’ Alternatively the root may be 𐤇𐤊⁸ with a related sense
of “to be low, depressed, poor.” In BH we have a Ptc.: 𐤇𐤊 Lv 25.47.

ἐμπόδισον] 𐤀 𐤇𐤊 = 𐤇𐤊 pronounced 𐤇𐤊 instead of the standard 𐤇𐤊.
We submit that αὐτοῦ here is ablative, “from him, away from him.”⁹

The difficulty of the Heb. text is manifest in the repetitiveness of the two
clauses in 𐤇 5b). The pl. suf. pron. in 𐤁𐤌, if its referent is 𐤇𐤊, is anomalous.
Schechter and Taylor (xxv), Segal (78), Kahana (469), and BSH (188) read
𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘weapons,’ some mentioning 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 Jdg 5.8, where 𐤇𐤊 ‘bat-
tle’ is a hapax in BH, and this instance remains to be a crux interpretum.
In Muraoka 1977a.396 we proposed 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘warrior’s instruments.’

δυσαστεύση] 𐤀 𐤇𐤊. 𐤇𐤊 occurs twice only in BH in the sense of ‘to
be situated opposite each other’ in Ex 26.5 and 36.12. Here we have a special
nuance of confrontation of hostility added. No instance of this verb with such
a connotation is attested anywhere. Its etymological equivalent in Syriac
is found in 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘the handles are positioned one
opposite the other’ Ex 36.12, whilst its military application also occurs as
in 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘Let’s fight each other’ 2Kg 14.8. However, this is not
what 𐤇𐤊 signifies. The translator may not have been familiar with
this particular nuance of 𐤇𐤊. Note 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘he fights.’

διπλάσια] 𐤇 𐤇𐤊 We have here an instance of what Joosten (1999.154)
calls “pseudo-classicism”; in CBH 𐤇 𐤇𐤊 means “two portions of a whole”
as in Dt 21.17.¹⁰

εὕρησις] 𐤀 𐤇𐤊. It seems that 𐤇 parsed 𐤇𐤊 as 3fs with 𐤇𐤊 as its sub-
ject: 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊, which cannot mean ‘you will find ..’, for which
𐤇𐤊 is indispensable. Heb. Qal 𐤇𐤊 is often used in the sense of ‘to befall,
happen to,’ e.g. 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 Dt 31.17.¹¹

⁸ So BSH 194a.

⁹ Cf. an example in CG ἐμποδίσειν τοὺς τῆς πόλεως καιρούς ‘to deprive the city of the
chances’ Aeschines 3.223.

¹⁰ In MH both usages coexist: 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘the son takes two portions of the
father’s possessions’ mBB 8.4 // 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘its length is twice as its breadth’ mErub 2.5.

¹¹ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. Qal 3 e. As an example of Syr. 𐤇𐤊 in this
sense, see 𐤇𐤊 𐤇𐤊 ‘repentance occurred to him’ cited in Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus*, 4148b.

סִלְּךָ presents yet another alternative reading: בְּיִשְׁתָּא גִיר עֲפִיפְתָּא נְשָׁכַח לָךְ מִטְּשִׁי־אֵיתִי מִטְּשִׁי־אֵיתִי ‘for he will secretly conceive twice as many damages for you.’

בְּעֵת צוֹרָךְ om. in Ⓞ for whatever reason: “precisely at the moment when you would appreciate some help from him.”

בְּכָל טוֹבָה] The prep. is *Beth pretii*.

וְאֵיךְ] We have here a rare instance of the asyndetic relative clause. In BH such a clause has more often than not an indeterminate antecedent as here, see JM § 158 *a-b*. See also below at 14.1.

פוֹיִהֶשֶׁתְּךָ] תְּנִיעַת, which can be parsed as either 2ms or 3fs. Either way the combination with טוֹבָה as either direct object or subject is unusual, when it presumably means ‘goodness of heart, kindness, friendliness,’ and not something tangible such as interest-free loan.

- 12.6) ὅτι καὶ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐμίσησεν ἁμαρτωλοὺς
καὶ τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ἀποδώσει ἐκδίκησιν,
¶ φυλάσσει δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκδικήσεως αὐτῶν. ¶

*Because the Most High also detests sinners
and the ungodly He will requite with punishment,
and He is keeping them for the day of their punishment.*

(A) כִּי גַם אֶל שׁוֹנֵא רְעִים וְלִרְשָׁעִים יִשִּׁיב נֶקֶם:

ἐμίσησεν] תְּנִיעַת שׁוֹנֵא. The Gk Aor. here is gnomic in value, expressing permanent truths. Our book, a book of proverbs, naturally provides wide scope for this gnomic use of the Aorist. Cf. SSG 28 **dc**. “hated sinners” (*NETS*) is incongruous with ἀποδώσει.

ἡμέραν] סִלְּךָ has an extended form: יוֹמָא מְחֻסָּנָא ‘a firmly fixed date (?).’

- 12.7) δὸς τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ μὴ ἀντιλάβη τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ.

Give to the good and do not help sinners.

This is a virtual doublet of vs. 4, the only difference being τῷ ἀγαθῷ instead of τῷ εὐσεβεῖ.

- 12.8) Οὐκ ἐκδικηθήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ὁ φίλος,
καὶ οὐ κρυβήσεται ἐν κακοῖς ὁ ἐχθρός.
*A friend will not be penalised for (his) good deeds
and an enemy will not be concealed for (his) evil deeds.*

(A) לֹא יוֹדַע בְּטוֹבָה אוֹהֵב וְלֹא יִכּוֹסָה בְּרָעָה שׁוֹנֵא:

ἐκδικηθήσεται] יוֹדַע. Though not immediately apparent from their respective critical apparatus precisely which Gk manuscripts support this reading, both Swete and Ziegler have rejected other readings which are closer

to \mathfrak{H} such as *επιγνωσθησεται* and *εκφανεσεται*. Though many prefer *επιγνωσθησεται*, e.g. Lévi (86) and Smend (116), continuity with vs. 6 is to be noted with divine requital (*ἐκδίκησις*) as the key concept. True, the message that would come through would be substantially different: with *επιγνωσθησεται* we are told that one can better appreciate the value of friends when one has run into hardship. The second half would mean that the wicked cannot remain in hiding, but his deeds will one day be disclosed for punishment. Has our translator possibly read *ירוע*, i.e. Ni. *יְרוּעַ* ‘to suffer hurt’?¹²

12.9) ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδρὸς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν λύπῃ,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ φίλος διαχωρισθήσεται.

*When things are going well for you, your enemies are in sorrow
and when things start going badly for you, even friends might stand apart.*

(A) בטובת איש גם שונא ריע וברעתו גם ריע בודד:

ἐν λύπῃ] most likely = *ברע* or *ברעה*, i.e. *בְרַעַ* or *בְרַעָּה*. This common Heb. adjective occasionally has to do with sadness or grief. E.g. the aged Jacob speaks of the fear of *הַלָּה שְׂאֵלָה בְרַעָּה שִׁיבְתִי אֶת־הוֹרְדָתָם* καὶ κατὰξέτέ μου τὸ γῆρας μετὰ *λύπης* εἰς ἄδου Gn 44.29. The patriarch expresses his fear once more with a slight variation in the wording: *הַלָּה שְׂאֵלָה בְּיָגוֹן שִׁיבְתִי* καὶ κατὰξέτέ μου τὸ γῆρας μετὰ *λύπης* εἰς ἄδου ib. 42.38.¹³ Once Joseph speaks of his father’s sentiment: *הַלָּה שְׂאֵלָה אָבִינוּ בְּיָגוֹן שְׂאֵלָה* καὶ κατὰξουσιν οἱ παῖδες σου τὸ γῆρας τοῦ παιδός σου πατρὸς δὲ ἡμῶν μετ’ *ὀδύνης* εἰς ἄδου ib. 44.31. In BS itself we find *רע לטפח לבב יבנה עצבה* καρδίας κάμψει ἰσχύν Si 38.17, where *רע* is an abstract noun, *רַע*. In any case, *רַעַי* has nothing to do with *λύπη*. Later in the verse it is rendered as *φίλος*. Note also how Jonah’s reaction is described in LXX: *יַרְעֵ אֶל־יוֹנָה רַעָּה גְדוֹלָה* Καὶ ἐλυπήθη Ἰωνᾶς λύπην μεγάλην καὶ συνεχύθη Jn 4.1.¹⁴

12.10) μὴ πιστεύσης τῷ ἐχθρῷ σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·
ὡς γὰρ ὁ χαλκὸς ἰοῦται, οὕτως ἡ πονηρία αὐτοῦ·

*Do not trust your enemy ever,
for as bronze rusts, so his wickedness.*

(A) אל תאמין בשונא לעד כי כנחשת רועו יחליא:

ἰοῦται] \mathfrak{H} יחליא. In BH we find no verb root *חלא*, but such is possibly known to MH. E.g. *מעות שְׂהַחֲלִיאוּ* ‘coins that have rusted’ mMaaSh 4.2, with a v.l. *שְׂהַחֲלִיָּה*, which is likely to be more authentic in view of a substantive

¹² For the sake of curiosity we note *רוע כסילים רועה* ὁ δὲ συμπορευόμενος ἄφροσι γνώσθησεται Pr 13.20.

¹³ Cf. remarks in BA I 282 ad Gn 42.38.

¹⁴ On this LXX text, cf. Muraoka 2020.100.

as הַלֹּחֵד ‘rust.’ And yet Lévi (87) refers to הַלֹּחֵד (better הַלְאָתָהּ) in Ez 24.6, a word which is usually understood to mean ‘rust.’ The substantive occurs a few more times in the immediate context (Ez 24.11, 12), and we find most interesting הַלְאָתָהּ תִּתֵּם בְּתוֹכָהּ וְנִתְּשָׁהּ ib. 24.11, where הַלְאָתָהּ is to be noted.¹⁵ Note שִׁמְטָהּ חֲבֵרָה ‘he defiles his friend,’ which reflects רִיעוּ.

12.11) καὶ ἐὰν ταπεινωθῆ καὶ πορεύηται συγκεκυφώς,
ἐπίστησον τὴν ψυχὴν σου καὶ φύλαξαι ἅπ’ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔση αὐτῷ ὡς ἐκμεμαχῶς ἔσοπτρον
καὶ γνώση ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατίωσεν.

*Even if he takes a low view of himself and walks stooping,
stay alert and watch out for him
and be to him like a mirror dusted off
and make sure that he would not become rusty all over.*

(Aa) וגם אם ישמע לך ויהלך בנחת תן לבך להתירא ממנו
(Ab) היה לו כמגלה רו ולא ימצא להשחיתך
(Ac) ודע אחרית קנאה:

ταπεινωθῆ] **ח** לשמע לך ‘he obeys you.’

συγκεκυφώς] **ח** בנחת ‘quietly.’ **ט** is further developing the notion of modesty (ταπεινωθῆ), which in turn somewhat departs from **ח**. **ס** adds קִדְמֶיךָ ‘ahead of you’ so that he could not do any funny thing behind you.

Whilst *GELS* treats συγκύφω as a variant spelling of συγκύπτω, there is none among the forms occurring in LXX that can be only derived from the latter. Our decision is due to the fact that the former is unknown prior to SG.¹⁶

ἐκμεμαχῶς ἔσοπτρον] **ח** מגלה רו ‘one who exposes secrets.’¹⁷ Mirrors or looking-glasses in ancient times were not made from glass, but from metal, so that they needed constant cleaning to prevent them from rusting and becoming useless. One is thus advised to ensure that others are in the presence of someone who can see through their inner thoughts and intentions. **ט** has made a skilful use of a metaphor which is absent in **ח**. Literally **ט** means ‘one who has dusted a mirror off,’ but note **ס** מְקִיָּיָהּ מְרִיקָתָא ‘a cleaned mirror.’

¹⁵ For comparative Semitic data, see Cohen et al., 9.867b.

¹⁶ The synonymous stem κυφ- was known in CG as shown by words such as κυφαγωγός ‘with neck arched and head down,’ κυφός ‘bent forwards, stooping,’ and κύφον ‘bent yoke of plough.’ Among the instances of the interchange between Π - Φ adduced by Thackeray (1909.106) these two verbs are not mentioned, though it is not a straight interchange between πτ and φτ.

¹⁷ Lévi (87f.) surmises that **ט** read ראי, i.e. ראי ‘mirror,’ instead of רו, and even if, as Smend (117) writes that Arb. *jalā* means ‘to clean, polish,’ we need to know that not only Hebrew itself, but also a closely related cognate such as Aramaic or Syriac does know of $\sqrt{\text{גלה}}$ that carries such a meaning.

ךְ וְלֹא יִמְצָא לְהַשְׁחִיתָךְ] ‘and let him not find a chance to destroy you,’ om. in \mathfrak{G} , but preserved in \mathfrak{S} : וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּח לְמַחְבְּלֹתָךְ] ‘and he will not be able to ruin you.’ γνώση ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατίωσεν] Quite different from \mathfrak{H} וְדַע אַחֲרֶיךָ קָנָא. Whether \mathfrak{G} read here הַלְתָּהּ in lieu of קָנָא is difficult to say. However, let’s note that in its present form \mathfrak{H} does make good sense: “Discover where (his) zeal is heading for.” Note that $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{H}$: וְתֵדַע הִרְתָּא דְקָנָתָהּ] ‘and you shall know the final destination of his zeal.’

12.12) μὴ στήσης αὐτὸν παρὰ σεαυτῶ,
 μὴ ἀνατρέψας σε στῆ ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον σου·
 μὴ καθίσσης αὐτὸν ἐκ δεξιῶν σου,
 μήποτε ζητήσῃ τὴν καθέδραν σου
 καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων ἐπιγνώσῃ τοὺς λόγους μου
 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ῥημάτων μου κατανυγήσῃ.

*Do not position him next to yourself,
 in case he removes you and occupies your position.
 Do not seat him at your right hand
 in case he comes after your seat
 and in the end you will come to appreciate my words
 and what I said will cut you to the heart.*

(Aa) אל תעמידהו אצלך למה יהדפך ויעמד תחתך:
 (Ab) אל תושיבהו לימינך למה יבקש מושבך:
 (Ac) ולאחר תשיג אמרי ולאנחתי תתאנח:

μῆ²] Synonymous with μήποτε below, expressing apprehension over an undesirable consequence.¹⁸ On the synonymy of לְמָהּ with פֶּן, see above at 8.1.

ἐπιγνώσῃ] \mathfrak{H} תשיג. We find here an extension of הַשִּׁיג to an intellectual, mental domain. Likewise later in ובאחרית תשיג אמרי 34.22.¹⁹

Some view the last two clauses as governed by למה of the preceding clause, e.g. “Et plus tard tu ne comprendras .. et ne t’attriste ..” (Lévi 89) and “verstehst .. seufzest” (Smend 21), but the shift in \mathfrak{G} from the subj. to the fut. points to another, but not necessarily the only right, direction.

τῶν ῥημάτων] \mathfrak{H} אנחתי. For whatever reason, our translator chose not mechanically to represent the figura etymologica in \mathfrak{H} , but to vary the preceding τοὺς λόγους. He may also have thought that the notion of groaning does not fit the context. \mathfrak{S} also appears to be struggling: וּבְמֵאמְרֵי תִתְדַמֵּר] ‘and you will marvel at my sayings.’

¹⁸ In this regard the description in *GELS* s.v. VII a is in need of rectification: Je 45.19(f) mentioned there illustrates such a clause with a verb in the subj., not indic.

¹⁹ \mathfrak{G} καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων εὐρήσεις τοὺς λόγους μου appears to be a rendition of a variant Heb. text: תמצא דברי . . .

תתאנא] the first occurrence of the verb in Hitp.; in BH it occurs in Ni. alone. In BS we find another two instances at יתאנא 25.18 and מתאנא 30.20, where Θ ἀνεστενάξεν and στενάζων respectively demonstrate the translator's familiarity with this Hebrew verb. Cf. S יִתְנַחַם לְךָ 'you will repent (!).'

12.13) τίς ἐλεήσει ἐπαισιδὸν ὀφιόδηκτον
καὶ πάντας τοὺς προσάγοντας θηρίοις;
*Who would show pity for a charmer bitten by a snake
and any of those who approach beasts?*

(A) מ(ה) יוחן חובר נשוך וכל הקרב אל ח"ת שן:

יוחן] instead of the standard spelling, יחון, i.e. יחון, so Smend (14). Segal (75)²⁰ vocalises יוחן and claims that, just as מה מי also could mean 'How?,' mentioning as an instance מי יקום יעקב Am 7.2, where מי can be analysed as a subject complement, "as what sort of person?." An inadvertent transposition of letters is a commonplace.

θηρίοις] H שן ח"ת 'animals with teeth' is more precise. In the margin of (A) we see יעו, which can be analysed as a substantive, יעו, as in מגדל-יעו Jdg 9.51.

12.14) οὕτως τὸν προσπορευόμενον ἀνδρὶ ἁμαρτωλῶ
καὶ συμφορόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτοῦ.
*Likewise one who approaches a sinful man
and gets involved in his sins.*

(A) כן חובר אל אשת זדון ומתגלל בעונתיו:

תאש] Retained by Kahana (469), but the entry of a woman at this point is abrupt, and the ms. suf. pron. of עונתיו speaks against such a reading. Hence read אש. Cf. I viro iniquo.

מתגלל] S מִתְחַבֵּךְ 'gets mixed up.' On a homonym of התגולל, see, e.g. התגוללה בדרכי רשע 1QS 4.19.²¹ Smend (118) holds that the verb here means "sich zu besudeln," and that is what is meant with συμφορόμενον. But Gk has verbs meaning 'to defile' such as μαιίνω and βεβηλόω.²² Defilement is a consequence of association with sinners, but the Heb. verb here does not by itself signify 'to become defiled.'

Instead of this second clause S presents something quite different: לא יָעַבְרָא עַדְמָא דְתִאֲקַד בֵּה נִרְאָא 'he will not depart until he is caught by fire.' According to Smend (118) this clause is an intrusion from 23.16 οὐ μὴ παύσηται ἕως ἂν ἐκκαύση πῦρ. Though no Heb. text is available there, the *Vorlage* of

²⁰ Presumably so BSH 144b.

²¹ See ad loc. in Muraoka 2022.91.

²² See *Index* how often they are used to translate √לל and √מאט.

§ appears to have had such a clause, though the text reads נָתַן־יָנִי ‘he will rest’ instead of נָעֲבֹר. Yet, it is odd that such a long-distance dislocation should take place.

12.15) ὄραν μετὰ σοῦ διαμενεῖ,
καὶ ἐὰν ἐκκλίνης, οὐ μὴ καρτερήσῃ.

*For a while he will remain with you,
and should you just go out of the way, he would never wait for you.*

(Aa) כאשר יבוא עמך לא יתגלה לך ואם תפול לא יפול להצילך:
(Ab) עד עת עמד לא יופיע ואם נמוט לא יתכלכל:

This verse is replete with difficulties. The two halves of \mathfrak{H} look like doublets, but then very incomplete ones. \mathfrak{G} does not reflex either in its entirety. E.g. $\mathfrak{H}Ab$ is nowhere to be found in \mathfrak{G} . \mathfrak{G} 15a) is close to $\mathfrak{H}Ab1$, but with nothing that would correspond to לא יופיע. The selection of the 3ms in $\mathfrak{H}Ab2$ makes little sense.

ἐκκλίνης .. καρτερήσῃ] reflects nothing in \mathfrak{H} .

12.16) καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτοῦ γλυκανεῖ ὁ ἐχθρὸς
καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ βουλεύσεται ἀνατρέψαι σε εἰς βόθρον·
ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ δακρύσει ὁ ἐχθρὸς,
καὶ ἐὰν εὔρη καιρόν, οὐκ ἐμπλησθήσεται ἄφ’ αἵματος.

*With his lips the enemy might sound sweet
but in his heart he could be planning to hurl you into a pit.
From his eyes the enemy might shed tears,
but if he found a chance, he would not stop at bloodshed.*

(Aa) בשפתיו יתמהמה צר ובלבו יחשוב מהמרות עמוקות:
(Ab) וגם אם בעיניו ידמיע אויב אם מצא עת לא ישבע דם:

γλυκανεῖ] \mathfrak{H} יתמהמה. In BH the verb means ‘to delay,’ which hardly suits here. Is “to mumble” or suchlike meant? § רָמַז ‘he sends a signal’ is an odd rendering.

[מהמרות] a hapax in BH: בְּמִהְמָרוֹת בְּלִי־יְקוּמוּ Ps 140.11, where \mathfrak{G} uses ταλαιπωρίαί ‘miserable conditions’ for מִהְמָרוֹת. It is noteworthy that, at Ps 140.11, Symmachus uses βόθυνος, a synonym of βόθρος.²³ Cf. Vulg. *foveas*, Qimhi שוחות עמוקות ‘deep pits.’ Most likely we have a free rendering in § תְּרַעֲיָתָא עֲמִיקָתָא ‘a deep plan.’

²³ See Field 1875.II 296a, fn. 16: καταβαλεῖς αὐτοὺς εἰς βοθύνους οὐ μήποτε ἀναστῶσιν.

Among the three early revisers of the LXX Symmachus is known for his concern about the linguistic quality, which speaks for the generally high level of our translator’s Greek. On this matter, see Ziegler 1957.284-87.

ἀφ' αἵματος] The use of the preposition does not necessarily reflect מִמֶּנּוּ. The verb עָבַד can take not only an object with מִן attached, but also a zero-object, e.g. מִן־עֲבָדֶיךָ Ex 16.12. Likewise ἐπίμπλημι + gen., e.g. ὄλην τὴν νύκτα ὑπνοῦ Ἐφραιμ ἐνεπλήσθη Ho 7.6.²⁴

12.17) κακὰ ἐὰν ὑπαντήσῃ σοι, εὐρήσεις αὐτὸν πρότερον ἐκεῖ σου,
καὶ ὡς βοηθῶν ὑποσχάσει πτέρναν σου·

*Should a misfortune befall you, you will find him there ahead of you,
and pretending to be helping you, he will trip your heel up.*

(A) אַם רַע קְרָאךְ נִמְצָא שָׁם כִּאִישׁ סוֹמֵךְ יִתְפֶּשׂ עִקְבּוֹ:

ἐὰν] This particle does not necessarily stand at the head of a protasis of a conditional clause.²⁵

ὑπαντήσῃ σοι] ❧ הָתָּה, undoubtedly a misprint for הָתָּה, so in ed. Mossul.

ὡς] In conjunction with a ptc. this particle indicates the motive or reason of the action expressed by the principal verb, in this case a false motive.²⁶

12.18) τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ κινήσει καὶ ἐπικροτήσῃ ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ
καὶ πολλὰ διαψιθυρίσει καὶ ἀλλοιώσει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.

*He might move his head and clap his hands,
but utter much by way of slanders, showing a different face.*

(A) רֵאשׁ יִנִּיעַ וְהִנְיָה יָדוֹ וְלָרֹב הִלְחֵשׁ יִשְׁנָא פָּנָיו:

לָרֹב] How is one to analyse this phrase syntactically? לָרֹב, which occurs 53 times in BH and very often in 1-2Ch, is usually used as an adverbial adjunct, e.g. וְתוֹשָׁיָהּ לָרֹב הוֹדַעְתָּ ‘and you taught (him) sound knowledge in great abundance’ Job 26.3.

לָרֹב is always preceded by a substantive, which is indeterminate²⁷ with two exceptions only. In the light of these two syntactic parameters our BS case does not illustrate the syntagm < substantive + attributive adjective >. There is no problem in understanding וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם הַמְּזוֹן לָרֹב 2Ch 11.23 as “and he gave them this food in large quantities,” thus an adverbial adjunct. Likewise וַיַּעַשׂ שְׁלֵמָה כְּלֵי־כֶלִים הָאֵלֶּה לָרֹב מְאֹד 2Ch 4.18. In וַיִּבְאֵהוּ שְׁפָט וְעָמוּ לְבָו 2Ch 4.18. In וַיִּמְצְאוּ בָהֶם לָרֹב אֶת־שְׁלָלָם וַיִּמְצְאוּ בָהֶם לָרֹב 2Ch 20.25 we could understand שְׁלָלָם as latent before לָרֹב. By implication לָרֹב הִלְחֵשׁ cannot be the subject of יִשְׁנָא, whose

²⁴ For more examples, see BDB s.v. עָבַד Qal 1 b, c and GELS s.v. 6. Cf. also SSG § 22 ca.

²⁵ More examples may be found in GELS s.v. I 10.

²⁶ Cf. GELS s.v. I 12.

²⁷ Smend (15), in restoring the text as וְלָרֹב מִלְחָשׁ יִשְׁנָא פָּנָיו, may have been conscious of this matter.

subject must be “he.” We would further view הלחש לרוב as a rather loosely hanging circumstantial clause, “his slanderous remarks being abundant.” In a case such as זָהָב וְכֶסֶף וּבְגָדִים לָרֹב מְאֹד Zc 14.14 we would not say that לָרֹב had become an adjective, but the addition of מְאֹד is due to the fact that the adjectival notion of “abundant” is latent in the substantive רֹב.

CHAPTER 13

- 13.1) Ὁ ἀπτόμενος πίσεως μολυνθήσεται,
καὶ ὁ κοινωνῶν ὑπερηφάνῳ ὁμοιωθήσεται αὐτῷ.

*One who touches pitch would become dirty,
and one who associates with an arrogant person would become like him.*

(A) נוגע זפת תדבק ידו וחובר אל לץ ילמד דרכו:

[תדבק ידו] It is illogical to make ידו the *s* of תדבק.¹ What would you touch pitch with if not with your hand? Thus § is sensible: דַּקְרָב לְזַבְתָּא דְּבָקָא בְּאִידָהּ ‘one who approaches pitch, it clings to his hand.’ However, this common Heb. verb, דָּבַק ‘to cling,’ does not take a zero-object, but a prepositional one, mostly ב־, but also ל־ and אֶל. A scribal error of ידו in lieu of בידו suggests itself, so Smend. פֶּן־תִּדְבַּקְנִי הֶרְעָה נַמְתִּי Gn 19.19 is no exception. Cf. our remarks above at 4.18.² Moreover, נוגע זפת is in casus pendens, resumed by the suf. pron. יו in ידו.

[חובר אל] a collocation used above in a similar sense at 12.14, where it is rendered as προσπορευόμενον.

[ὑπερηφάνῳ] לץ. This equation occurs six times in LXX, out of which four times in BS. Both words belong to their respective vocabulary of BS: ὑπερήφανος occurs 12 times out of a total of 41 for the whole of LXX and לץ 10× in BS. The Heb. verb, however, is commonly thought to signify “scoffer.” Is BS then perceiving scoffing as a verbal, oral manifestation of arrogance?

- 13.2) βάρος ὑπὲρ σὲ μὴ ἄρῃς
καὶ ἰσχυροτέρῳ σου καὶ πλουσιωτέρῳ μὴ κοινωνῶναι.
τί κοινωνήσῃ χύτρα πρὸς λέβητα;
αὕτη προσκρούσει, καὶ αὕτη συντριβήσεται.

*Do not lift a load too heavy for you,
and do not associate with one more powerful and richer than you.*

How could a pot work with a cauldron?

The one might hit, then the other would be smashed.

(Aa) כבד ממך מה תשא ואל עשיר ממך מה תתחבר:
(Ab) מה יתחבר פרוור אֶל סיר אשר הוא נוקש בו והוא נשבר
(Ac) או מה יתחבר עשיר אל דל:

¹ Pace Lévi (91) and Mopsik (145): “sa main s’y colle.”

² The instance in Gn 19.19 is one of the examples, which König (1897.9, § 22) singled out from one of the cases in which “Pron. pers. suff. ersetzt präpositionale Rection.” To analyse יָנִי as “acc.” (so BDB s.v. דָּבַק Qal 2 c) is misguided.

מִה] \mathfrak{H} written above the line. It is parallel to the same word in the next clause, thus essential. In both cases it signifies “How?” or “Why?” in a rhetorical question “expressing what is regarded as an impossibility” (BDB s.v. \mathfrak{H} 2 a).

ἰσχυροτέρῳ] om. in \mathfrak{H} . \mathfrak{S} has both, but in the reverse order: וְלִדְעֵתִיר וְחֵלְקָן ‘and to the rich and powerful.’

אשר] a particle of obscure value here.³

נוקש] *Pace Lévi* (91) this is no Aramaism; the lexeme occurs in BH in the sense of “to knock, strike.”

χύτρα πρὸς λέβητα] = \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{S} , but \mathfrak{S} reads קָרָא דְפָרָא לְאִרְא דְנָחַשׁ ‘a pot of clay with a pot of bronze’; the difference in strength of the materials is underlined. We observe here also a vacillation between a synthetic structure with a dative in ἰσχυροτέρῳ σου καὶ πλουσιωτέρῳ μὴ κοινώνει (2b) and an analytic one mediated through πρὸς with the same verb.⁴

The last Heb. clause, present in \mathfrak{S} , but absent in \mathfrak{C} , is a reformulation of the second clause: “or how would the rich associate with the poor?”

13.3) πλούσιος ἠδίκησεν, καὶ αὐτὸς προσενεβριμήσατο·
πτωχὸς ἠδίκηται, καὶ αὐτὸς προσδεηθήσεται.

A rich man does wrong, and he dares yell out of displeasure.

A poor man is wronged, yet he is made to beg.

(A) עשיר יענה הוא יתנוה ועל דל נעוה הוא יתחנן:

ἠδίκησεν] \mathfrak{H} יענה, an inaccurate equation. Smend’s (122) proposal to read יעוה instead is reasonable, either Qal or Hi. יַעֲוֶה.

ἠδίκηται] \mathfrak{H} נעוה. The verb $\sqrt{\text{עו}}$ occurs in BH only infrequently when compared with $\sqrt{\text{צו}}$, and that only in Qal and Hi. על־הַמֶּלֶךְ לְבַדּוֹ עוֹתָהּ וְשָׁתִי Est 1.16 is interesting on account of the rection with על just as here. \mathfrak{C} has correctly analysed נעוה as Ni. of passive value. Here ἠδίκηται is a genuine passive form with πτωχὸς as its *s*, whereas נעוה is impersonal.⁵ The form can be either נַעֲוֶה (ptc.) or נַעֲוֶה (pf.), more likely the former.

LXX appears to attest to Ni. of $\sqrt{\text{עו}}$ in נַעֲוִיתִי מִשְׁמַע Is 21.3. Though the verb here is often thought to mean ‘to twist’ or some bodily impediment, \mathfrak{C} reads ἠδίκησα τὸ μὴ ἀκοῦσαι. It is not passive, which cannot be applied to our BS case, for 3b) focuses on the victim. Hence, we would not translate it “he [= the rich] wronged the poor.” Note also \mathfrak{S} מִסְכָּנָא הָטָא ‘the poor sins,’ which makes little sense; על is not represented.

³ Fassberg (1997.60) considers it to be possibly equivalent to אָם.

⁴ See *SSG* § 56 c (ii).

⁵ Hence, *pace Lévi* (92), Smend (122) and Segal (83), על is indispensable. On the impersonal passive in Hebrew, see *SQH* § 37 b. One out of many BH examples is וְנִסְלַח לָהֶם ‘and they shall be forgiven’ Lv 4.20.

προσενεβριμήσατο] 𐤉 תנוה; both are very rare words in their respective language. On προσεμβριμάομαι we read in *GELS*: “to orally express indignant displeasure besides causing some other discomfort or injury.” It is a hapax in SG and is unknown prior to LXX.⁶ In BH 𐤒𐤓𐤓 occurs only once: 𐤒𐤓𐤓 𐤇 𐤃𐤌𐤔𐤗𐤍𐤔𐤗𐤍𐤔𐤗𐤍 Ex 15.2. Related to 𐤒𐤓𐤓, it is believed to have to do with beauty. Then “he decorates himself, arranging a make-up and calling a barber”? It is difficult to see how 𐤇 has arrived at 𐤇𐤓𐤓 ‘he neglects, cannot care less.’ Cf. 𐤇𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 ‘he groans, sighs.’

προσδεηθήσεται] This is no passive form, since the verb does not take an acc. pers. nor does its simplex, δέομαι.⁷

The prefix προς- carries a special nuance here. Instead of demanding compensation, the victim finds himself begging the perpetrator to be more kindly in the future. Our translator is deliberately using two verbs in this verse, both with this prefix. In the former case, προσεμβριμάομαι, the nuance is nicely expressed by Snaith (67): “A rich man does wrong, and adds insult to injury.” Moreover, in both cases the focusing αὐτός is added for the best effect. Note also the repeated 𐤇𐤓𐤓.

In 𐤇𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 ‘the poor sins and prays’; he does not turn to the perpetrator, but to God as a sinner!

13.4) ἐὰν χρησιμεύσης, ἐργᾶται ἐν σοί·
καὶ ἐὰν ὑστερήσης, καταλείψει σε.

*If you are useful, he would employ you for work,
but if you are in need, he would abandon you.*

(A) אַם תְּכַשֵּׁר לוֹ יַעֲבֹד בְּךָ וְאִם תִּבְרַע יִחְמַל עֲלֶיךָ:

ἐργᾶται] a so-called Attic future of ἐργάζομαι instead of ἐργάσεται.⁸

ἐν] This preposition is instrumental in value, so also οὐκ ἐργᾷ ἐν τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ μόσχῳ σου ‘.. by using your first-born calf’ Dt 15.19. Heb. עֲבַד בִּי is comparable, as in 𐤗𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 Dt 15.19, also with a human as a tool as in 𐤗𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 Je 22.13.

ὑστερήσης] 𐤉 תברע, which may be read 𐤗𐤓𐤓𐤓 ‘you succumb (under the severity of labour).’ That would make a rather kind-hearted, compassionate man of the rich employer: “.., he would let you off.”

The message that comes through in 𐤇 sounds rather different from that of 𐤉. It could be: “Should you run behind schedule, he would fire you.”

⁶ Cf. Wagner 1999.280f.

⁷ There are deponent verbs which are used in the genuinely passive voice, but this does not apply to our case here. See *SSG* § 27 a (ii).

⁸ This feature was fast disappearing from Koine Greek, but SG still retains some traces of it. Cf. Thackeray 1909.229f.

⁹ So Lévi (92), Smend (II 15), Segal (81), Kahana (470), Beentjes (40), and Abegg.

Alternatively: “Should you be found lacking in necessary skills and stamina, he would fire you [or: he would not take you on].” \mathfrak{S} represents a variation on this second alternative: $\eta\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \nu\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ‘if you become poor, he would abandon you.’ At this juncture we would note that our BS case here could be one of two examples of the equation $\eta\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$. The other example is $\mu\eta\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\ \nu\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \eta\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \iota\eta\upsilon\eta\ \beta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\delta\upsilon$ *οὐκ ὄν ὑστερήσωμεν προσενέγκαι τὸ δῶρον κυρίῳ* Nu 9.7. Yet we would like to know what you are postponing. Completion of the assignment? A deliberate, delaying tactic aimed at the maximum length of employment?

13.5) $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\iota\varsigma$, $\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\iota\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\iota$
καὶ ἀποκενώσει σε, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐ πονέσει.

*If you have (a fair bit of funds), he would come to live with you
and strip you bare (of all you have), he himself not feeling the slightest
pain.*

(A) אם שלך ייטיב דבריו עמך וירששך ולא יכאב לו:

[שלך] an error for $\eta\iota\ \lambda\eta = \mathfrak{S}$ אן אית לך.

$\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\iota\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\iota$] Quite a free rendering of \mathfrak{H} “his words would ring sweet in your ears.”

$\sigma\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$] \mathfrak{H} $\eta\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\ \eta\upsilon$ ‘he would not toil’ provides a different perspective, namely, his joie de vivre would be all at your expense, not that he wouldn’t suffer from guilty conscience. Indeed, $\pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\omega$ is, first and foremost, about physical hard work, toil, not morally tinged mental pain such as remorse. In 11.11 it is used in conjunction with $\kappa\omicron\pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\omega$.¹⁰

13.6) $\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\eta\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon$, καὶ ἀποπλανήσει σε
καὶ προσγελάσεται σοι καὶ δώσει σοι ἐλπίδα·
λαλήσει σοι καλὰ καὶ ἔρεϊ Τίς ἢ χρεία σου;

*If he finds a need of you, he would even deceive you,
smiling at you and raising your hope.*

He would speak nicely to you and say, “Anything you need?”

(A) צריך לו עמך והשיע לך ושחק לך והבטיחך:

καὶ ἀποπλανήσει] \mathfrak{H} והשיע. BSH mentions two alternative ways of parsing the verb: $\eta\psi\iota\epsilon$ ($\sqrt{\psi\epsilon}$ 166a) or $\eta\psi\iota\epsilon$ ($\sqrt{\psi\epsilon\epsilon}$ 296b), i.e. “to rescue you when you are cornered” or “to provide some fun for you.” \mathfrak{S} has not opted

¹⁰ Smend (123) is thinking in terms of financial losses, “er erleidet keine Verluste.” We doubt, however, that $\pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\omega$ can mean that. He also refers to: $\eta\kappa\lambda\eta\lambda\eta\kappa\eta\ \eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\beta\eta\ \tau\kappa\alpha\beta\upsilon\ \beta\alpha\alpha\beta\iota\mu\iota\mu$: 2Kg 3.19. One need remember that, in the biblical world, mountains and rivers shout for joy. Then they could also weep from pain and damage inflicted on them. For a morphological analysis of $\eta\psi\iota\epsilon$, see Reymond 2021.271f.

for either, but for הַשִּׁיחַ 'he beguiles you,' as justly suggested by Segal (83).¹¹ Cf. הַשִּׁיחַ לְכֶם הַזְקִיחוּ 2Kg 18.29 // Is 36.14¹² with -ל- as in our case.

Furthermore, BS's use of the conjunction *waw* here is somewhat loose: the preceding nominal clause can be analysed as a protasis not introduced with אִם. An apodotic *waw* preceded by an unmarked protasis and attached to an inversive *w-qatalti* is unknown to BH and QH.¹³ Another mark of this loose syntax is the immediately following קְשׁוּחַ unless we emend it to קְשׁוּחָה, i.e. קְשׁוּחָה.

6c) is absent in \mathfrak{H} .

13.7) καὶ αἰσχυνεῖ σε ἐν τοῖς βρώμασιν αὐτοῦ,
ἕως οὗ ἀποκενώσῃ σε δις ἢ τρίς,
καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων καταμωκῆσεται σου·
μετὰ ταῦτα ὄψεταί σε καὶ καταλείψει σε
καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ κινήσει ἐπὶ σοί.

*and he might embarrass you with his meals
until he drains your resources twice or thrice,
and in the end he would make a fool of you.*

*After that, when he sees you, he will take no notice of you,
just nodding his head at you.*

(Aa) עד אשר יועיל יהתל בך פעמים שלש יעריצך:
(Ab) ובכך יראך והתעבר בך ובראשו יניע אליך:

The immense gap between \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} can be easily seen by comparing our translation given above and that of \mathfrak{H} : 'Until he makes enough profit (out of your service), he will mock you. A few times he might treat you with due respect. And then when he spots you, he would pass by, just nodding his head at you.'

7a $\mathfrak{S} < \mathfrak{G}$: וְנִבְהַתְּךָ בְּתוֹקְנוֹיָהּ 'and he will embarrass you with his meals.' Its sequel in \mathfrak{S} appears to reflect the first clause in \mathfrak{H} : עַדְמָא נְעַבְדַּ צְבִינְגָה בְּךָ 'until he attains through you what he was after.'

עַד אֲשֶׁר] Pace Smend (II 22) "Während" and Lévi "Tout le temps qu'il" this compound conjunction means "until."

ἀποκενώσῃ σε:] To invite your generous host back was expected. Hence the admonition given by Jesus: "When you give a luncheon or dinner, do

¹¹ See also Smend 123. Lévi (93) holds that הַשִּׁיחַ is possibly a variant form of שַׁעֲשַׁע, whose two meanings agree with \mathfrak{G} . We know of no such use of שַׁעֲשַׁע.

¹² Cf. \mathfrak{G} μὴ ἀπατάτω σε in the latter.

¹³ See JM § 166 b, 176 d f-o and SQH § 41 c. A case such as הַשִּׁיחַ לְכֶם הַזְקִיחוּ 'every soul that would not mortify itself on this very day shall be ostracised from its people' 11Q19 25.11 does not belong here, since we find no self-standing nominal clause as a protasis. Note a discussion in Van Peursen 2004.351.

not invite your friends, your brothers or sisters, your relatives, or your rich neighbours; if you do, they may invite you back and so you will be repaid” (Lk 14.12).

שְׁלֵשׁ פְּעָמִים שָׁלַח [פעמים שלש] וְכַנְהָא וְתַרְתִּין [פעמים שלש] ‘once or twice’; a bit kindly towards the rich man?

καταμωκήσεταιί σου] An object of admiration, accusation or contempt can be expressed with a noun in the genitive.¹⁴

הַתְּעַבֵּר בָּךְ] a rather ambiguous expression. The selection of Hit. as well as the government with בִּי are unusual. BSH (232b) analyses the verb as meaning “to become angry.” Then the preposition בִּי is uncontroversial. But does anger fit our context? A new homonym, הַתְּעַבֵּר ‘to delay,’ identified at 5.7, is perhaps applicable here. Let’s note the rection with בִּי also at two other examples of this verb, 7.10 and 38.9.

13.8) πρόσεχε μὴ ἀποπλανηθῆς
καὶ μὴ ταπεινωθῆς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ σου.

*Be careful not to be deceived
and do not be humiliated with your folly.*

(A) השמר אל תרהב מאד ואל תדמה בקסירי מדע:

ἀποπλανηθῆς] תרהב. This Heb. verb is known to have to do with impudence or arrogance, but not with deception, though this theme is a continuation from vs. 6.

ταπεινωθῆς] תדמה, yet another curious equation. ת probably means “Do not become like one of those wanting in knowledge.” Cf. לֹא תִטְעָא [לֹא תִטְעָא] ‘Do not be misled by his lack of knowledge.’

מדע] inaccurate for מדע.

13.9) Προσκαλεσαμένου σε δυνάστου ὑποχωρῶν γίνου,
καὶ τόσῳ μᾶλλον σε προσκαλέσεται·

*When summoned by a powerful man, keep a distance,
then he would be all the more eager to summon you.*

(A) קרב נדיב היה רחוק וכדי כן יגישך:

Προσκαλεσαμένου] = קרא, i.e. קרא, ≠ קרב. קרא here not in the sense of ‘to invite as a guest,’ for which καλέω is used, e.g. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ βασιλέως for וַיִּקְרָא אֶבְשָׁלוֹם לְכָל־בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ 2Sm 13.23. Then καλέω is used in the active voice; for more examples, see GELS s.v. 6. Of course, you could be summoned for a variety of reasons, including an invitation for a meal.

¹⁴ See above at Prol. 3 and SSG § 22 oa.

ὑποχωρῶν γίνου] a variation on the standard periphrastic syntagm, <εἶμι + ptc.>, used when the start of a process rather than a state is to be indicated. Note also the reversal of sequence as against H .¹⁵

τόσφ μᾶλλον] H כדִּי כן, an equation that has occurred at 11.11 above.

יגִּי] Since this verb form appears to be parallel to קָרַב,¹⁶ it most likely means ‘he would approach you’ rather than ‘he would bring you near.’ Then a Qal form would be more appropriate. Hence יִשָּׁאֵל and the suf. pron. can be rewritten as יִלֵּךְ.

13.10) μὴ ἔμπιπτε, μὴ ἀπωσθῆς,
καὶ μὴ μακρὰν ἀφίστω, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλησθῆς.

*‘Don’t be pushy, in case you are rejected,
and do not stand aloof, so that you may not be ignored.*

אל תתקרב פן תתרחק ואל תתרחק פן תשנא: (A)

ἀπωσθῆς] H קתרת ‘you distance yourself,’ instead of which we would rather anticipate Hof. קתרת ‘you might be moved away,’ although that would reduce the morphological parallelism between three verbs to that between two.

ἐπιλησθῆς] H תשנא ‘you might be hated’ (so S תשנא) does make sense, but תשנא = S sounds better. Incidentally, ἐπιλανθάνομαι does not signify temporary memory loss, but “to refuse to retain in memory, and disregard or neglect to act in accordance with one’s knowledge of” (GELS s.v. 1), e.g. ἐπελάθου θεοῦ τοῦ τρέφοντός σε preceded by θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε ἐγκατέλιπες Dt 32.18.

13.11) μὴ ἔπεχε ἰσηγορεῖσθαι μετ’ αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ πιστεύε τοῖς πλείοσιν λόγοις αὐτοῦ·
ἐκ πολλῆς γὰρ λαλιᾶς πειράσει σε
καὶ ὡς προσγελῶν ἐξετάσει σε.

*Do not think of speaking with him on equal terms
and do not believe in his long-winded talk,
for he might be testing you with his long talk
and, though broadly smiling, he might be sizing you up.*

אל תבטח לחפש עמו ואל תאמן לרב שיחו: (Aa)

כי מהרבות שיחו נסיון ושחק לך וחקרך: (Ab)

ἔπεχε] a bit differently nuanced from H תבטח ‘you are sure that you are doing right.’ S נִסְיוֹן has opted for another sense of ἐπέχω “to wait for” (GELS s.v. 2).

¹⁵ Cf. SSG § 31 fk.

¹⁶ Having apparently noticed this, S uses the same verb root, albeit in two distinct stems: יִקְרַב .. יִקְרַב. The latter, Peal form indicates affinity with Qal יִשָּׁאֵל.

ἰσηγορεῖσθαι] 𐤁 להפֿשׁ. BSH (146b) offers two alternative analyses: Qal inf. and substantive, שִׁפְּחָה ‘freedom.’ In BH שִׁפְּחָה as a verbal root occurs only once in Pi. at Lv 19.20 in the sense of “to be liberated (from the status of slave).”¹⁷

The Gk inf. here is analysable as complementary in function, whereas its Heb. equivalent is presumably epexegetic.¹⁸

𐤁 [וּשְׁחַק לְךָ וְחַקְרָה] Whilst Segal (82), Kahana (470), and BHS (299) admit here *qatalti* forms, the inersive *waw* following a nominal clause introduced by causal כִּי is as implausible as in vs. 6 above.

𐤁 translates 11d rather freely: וְנִלְאָא לְךָ עֲדָמָא דְנִדְעָה הָרְתָהּ ‘he wears you out till he gets down to the bottom of your character.’ See also 𐤁 מְעַקֵּב נֹסֶה לְכַסְיָתָהּ ‘he tracks down your secrets.’¹⁹

13.12) ἀνελεήμων ὁ μὴ συντηρῶν λόγους
καὶ οὐ μὴ φείσεται περὶ κακώσεως καὶ δεσμῶν.

*He who does not keep words is savage
and would not care less about mistreating and imprisoning (you).*

(A) אכזרי יתן מושל ולא יחמל על נפש רבים קושר קשר:

𐤁, its first clause in particular, is not easy to understand. All that is common to 𐤁 and 𐤄 is אכזרי ἀνελεήμων. In 𐤁 יתן מושל turns up as מְתַפְרַע פּוֹרְצָנָא ‘he takes revenge.’

ὁ μὴ συντηρῶν λόγους] 𐤁 differs considerably: נִטְר מְלֵא דִילָךְ ‘he listens carefully to your words.’ Smend (125) rightly points out that συντηρέω is used in SG in sensu bono, though one of its common Heb. equivalents, שָׁמַר, can imply malicious intention as in, e.g. לְשָׁמְרוֹ וְלִהְיֵיתוּ 1Sm 19.11.

No less difficult is how to relate the two versions of 12b). Our translator’s *Vorlage* may have looked just as challenging, forcing him to go for free translation. Δεσμῶν is hardly relatable to קשר; one would expect a form of אסר. In 𐤁 we find nothing that could correspond to קושר קשר.

13.13) συντήρησον καὶ πρόσεχε σφοδρῶς,
ὅτι μετὰ τῆς πτώσεώς σου περιπατεῖς.

*Watch out and stay very cautious,
because, as you walk, a fall could be round the corner.*

(A) השמר והיה זהיר ואל תהלך עם אנשי חמס:

In 13b) 𐤄 represents quite a departure from 𐤁: ‘Do not walk with men of violence.’

¹⁷ *Maagarim* lists only three additional examples, all Qal passive ptc.

¹⁸ For details, see *SSG* § 30 **bg** and *SQH* § 18 **g**. Cf. also Van Peursen 2004.258.

¹⁹ Ziegler mentions τα κρυπτα σου as a v.l. for σε in some sources and 𐤁 *de absconditis suis*.

*Every animal congregates according to its kind
and a human forms a close bond with his like.*

(A) מִן כָּל בֶּשֶׂר אֲצִלּוֹ וְאֵל מִיָּנוּ יַחֲבֹר אָדָם:

κατὰ γένος] S has read the preposition מִן: מִן כָּל בֶּשֶׂר לְיָתֵהּ.

προσκολληθήσεται] H יַחֲבֹר. The Gk form here can be analysed as middle, and pseudo-passive in form. Smend (126) holds that the Pu. stem of יַחֲבֹר here is reflexive in value. Can the internal passive stems, Pu. and Ho., be so used? In the interest of harmonious life and social stability you could be virtually enforced to associate with your own kind. S and Sִּלְמַתְּדַבֵּק נֶאֱמַר can be analysed as genuinely passive, though possibly reflexive.²³

13.17) τί κοινωνήσει λύκος ἀμνῶ;
οὕτως ἁμαρτωλὸς πρὸς εὐσεβῆ.

*What has a wolf in common with a lamb?
Likewise a sinner with a godly person.*

(Aa) מָה יַחֲבֹר זֶאֵב אֶל כֶּבֶשׂ כִּי רָשָׁע לְצַדִּיק
(Ab) וְכֵן עֲשִׂיר אֶל אִישׁ נֹאצֵּל:

τί] a standard interrogative, whilst H מָה most likely means “How?”.

[יַחֲבֹר] Scarcely reflexive. The first clause of H could be rendered as “How could a wolf and a lamb be assigned to the same kind?”

H has an extra clause at the end, “and likewise a rich man with?”. נֹאצֵּל is obscure. Segal (85) suggests an emendation: to insert רָשׁ ‘poor’ after אִישׁ and delete נֹאצֵּל as a corruption of אֲצִלּוֹ.

On the fluctuation between <+ dat.> (ἀμνῶ) and <+ prep.> (πρὸς εὐσεβῆ), see above at vs. 2.

13.18) τίς εἰρήνη ὑαίνη πρὸς κύνα;
καὶ τίς εἰρήνη πλουσίῳ πρὸς πένητα;

*What sort of peace is there between a hyena and a dog?
and what sort of peace is there between a rich man and a poor man?*

(A) מֵאִישׁ שְׁלוֹם צְבוּעַ אֶל כֶּלֶב מֵאִין שְׁלוֹם עֲשִׂיר אֶל רָשׁ:

τίς] H מֵאִישׁ need be emended to מֵאִין. So מֵאִין in 18b. On the adjectival use of τίς here, see SSG § 18 c.

²³ Smend takes recourse to הִתְקַבְּרָה כְּסֵא הָיוֹת מִי אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר [יִתְבַּר] אֶל כָּל־הַחַיִּים Ec 9.4 and יִצַּר עֲמָל עֲלֵי־חַק Ps 94.20. We see no real difficulty in viewing the first instance as genuinely passive. The second is irrelevant; the *beth* should have a dagesh forte. GKC (§ 60 b) view the form as anomalous for הִתְקַבְּרָה, i.e. Qal.

[צבוּע] There is an uncertainty about the vowel represented with a *waw*. Jastrow (1257) reads צְבוּעַ as against BSH (260a) צְבוּעַ. The closest cognate is Arb. *ḏabu*, which should turn up in Heb. as צְבוּעַ. Ours is the earliest attestation in Hebrew, followed by a few in the Babylonian Talmud.

13.19) κυνήγια λεόντων ὄναγροι ἐν ἐρήμῳ·
οὕτως νομαὶ πλουσίων πτωχοί.

*Wild asses in a desert are fodder for lions,
so the poor are a feeding ground for the rich.*

(A מאכל ארי פראי מדבר כן מרעית עשיר דלים:

13.20) βδέλυγμα ὑπερηφάνῳ ταπεινότης·
οὕτως βδέλυγμα πλουσίῳ πτωχός.

*Humility is an abomination to the arrogant,
likewise the poor are an abomination to the rich.*

(A תועבת גאווה ענוה ותועבת עשיר אביון:

[ὑπερηφάνῳ] ἦ גאווה ‘arrogance,’ for which one might anticipate גאה, i.e. גאָה parallel to עשיר, although גאווה contrasts with ענוה.

On the absence of a copula, see above at 9.10.

13.21) πλούσιος σαλευόμενος στηρίζεται ὑπὸ φίλων,
ταπεινὸς δὲ πεσὼν προσαποθεῖται ὑπὸ φίλων.

*A rich man, tottering, is held up by friends,
but a lowly man, when fallen, is ignored by friends.*

(A עשיר מוט בסמך מרע ודל נמוט נדחה מרע אל רע:

[σαλευόμενος] The selection of the Pres. ptc. in contrast to the Aor. πεσὼν indicates that the action is in progress.²⁴ On the other hand, Pf. πεπτωκός would imply that he was already lying flat on the ground.

מוט is parsed as Qal pass. Ptc. in BSH (193b).²⁵ A Pf. passive participle indicates a state that has arisen out of an action taken and is still in force at the point of reference. Thus at times it could have an active meaning, e.g. ידוּעַ ‘and knowledgeable about illness’ Is 53.3.²⁶ By contrast, the Ni. stem of the Ptc. נמוט, could be assigned “self-propelling” value.²⁷

²⁴ Cf. SSG § 28 dff.

²⁵ Pace Lévi (96), who proposes emending the form to נמוט or מט (Qal act. ptc.). For a form in QH such as שוע עינים ‘one whose eyes are plastered’ 4Q424.3, see Qimron 2018.220, § C 3.2.7.2.

²⁶ For a discussion with examples, see SQH § 17 g.

²⁷ On such an analysis, cf. SQH § 12 e 6, e.g. ולא נסתר עמל ‘a fountain opened for me .. and toil did not vanish’ 1QH^a 19.22.

στηρίζεται] This may reflect בסמך , i.e. הַמְּסָךְ in lieu of בְּסִמְךָ .

προσαποθεῖται] The prefix προς- underlines the feature of addition. On account of his poverty the poor man is ignored by his friends in general. Now on top of that, even when he falls, he is left alone to suffer.²⁸ This προς- is reproduced in סִלְ by means of $\text{מְּוֹסָךְ מְּוֹסָךְ קָ}$: ‘he is also expelled.’²⁹

מרע אל רע] One friend after another looks away.

13.22) $\text{πλουσίου σφαλέντος πολλοὶ ἀντιλήμπτωρες· ἔλάλησεν ἀπόρητα, καὶ ἐδικαίωσαν αὐτόν. ταπεινὸς ἔσφαλεν, καὶ προσεπετίμησαν αὐτῷ· ἐφθέγγατο σύνεσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ τόπος.}$

Should a rich man fall, there is no dearth of helpers.

Should he say something improper, he would even be excused for.

Should a poor man fall, they would even blame him.

Should he make a sensible remark, no credit would be given him.

(A עשיר מדבר ועזריו רבים ודבריו מכוערין מהופין:
דל נמוט גע גע ושא ודבר משכיל ואין לו מקום:

σφαλέντος] בְּסִמְךָ makes no sense. In view of ἔσφαλεν נמוט two lines later, נמוט or suchlike must be read here, too.

The two different voices of σφάλλω here, active (ἔσφαλεν) and passive (σφαλέντος), it appears, are being used indiscriminately in the active sense.

ἀπόρητα] Given the following ἐδικαίωσαν , the faux pas apparently concerned the substance of the speech, which his friends lost no time in justifying and defending. However, $\text{בְּסִמְךָ מְּוֹסָךְ מְּוֹסָךְ}$ ‘ugly, beautifying’³⁰ suggests that the matter concerned the wording and formulation. Maybe his parlance was a shade too vulgar or said dirty jokes, improper for a public address.

מהופין] A rare example of the Hi. or Ho. morpheme ה not syncopated in a participle.³¹ In Qumran Aramaic the non-syncopation is attested twice and in Biblical Aramaic far more.³² Taking the typically Aramaic pl. ending ין in our case, an Aramaic influence here is very plausible.

προσεπετίμησαν] On the prefix προς- , see above at vs. 21. They made sure in no unambiguous terms that their displeasure and disapproval got through to him. This translation, however, departs somewhat from בְּסִמְךָ גע גע

²⁸ See also above at 3.14 and Wagner 1999.280.

²⁹ Cf. *SL* s.v. יִסָּף Af. 4.

³⁰ Cf. Smend (II 23) “Redet er Hässliches, so nennen sie es schön” and Mopsik (149) “ses paroles les plus répugnantes sont trouvées belles.”

³¹ The *heh* is written above the line in the manuscript.

The syncopation is the standard in BH in the Fut. and Ptc. with a few exceptions for the former, see JM § 54 b.

³² See Muraoka 2011.111 and Bauer 1927.176f.

ושא, where, correcting ושא to ישא, i.e. ישא with the object קול understood,³³ we might translate it as “one would scream, *Boo, boo.*” Note ש גוע, also an interjection expressive of disgust and contempt.

[משכיל] This is not the subject of דבר, but a subject complement: ‘he spoke as an intelligent person.’³⁴

In 22d) ש appears to be dependent on ט: וְאֵן אָמַר דְּשַׁפִּיר לָא יְהִינן לֵיה אֲתָרָא.

13.23) πλούσιος ἐλάλησεν, καὶ πάντες ἐσίγησαν
καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἀνύψωσαν ἕως τῶν νεφελῶν.
πτωχὸς ἐλάλησεν καὶ εἶπαν Τίς οὗτος;
κἂν προσκόψη, προσανατρέψουσιν αὐτόν.

*A rich man talks, and all become quiet
and praise his speech up to the sky.*

A poor man talks and they say, “Who is this?”

and should he stumble, they might give an extra kick to him.

(Aa) עשיר דובר הכול נסכתו ואת שכלו עד עב יגיעו:

(Ab) דל דובר מי זה יאמרו ואם נתקל גם הם יהדפוהו:

[ἐλάλησεν] ש (2x) דובר. It would be unfair to blame our scribe for a wrong spelling twice over, i.e. דובר in lieu of דיבר. In BH this high-frequency verb is used in Qal only in the Inf. and Ptc. Hence we have here דוֹבֵר in spite of the shift to the Pf. in the following verb, נסכתו.

[נסכתו] This verb root occurs in BH only once, and that in Hi., הַקִּיֶּת Dt 27.9.

[נתקל] προσκόψη. The same equation also occurs in ἐν ὁδοῦ ἀντιπτώματος μὴ πορεύου καὶ μὴ προσκόψης ἐν λιθώδεσιν ואל תלך ואל ליθώδεσין בדרך מוקשת אל תלק בנגף פעמים Si 35.20. On הַתְּקִיל, see below at 15.12.

[προσανατρέψουσιν] Here we have yet another verb, a hapax in SG, with πρως-, on which see above at vss. 21 and 22. The message appears to be that the poor speaker, out of a sense of remorse and regret, would be taking a step back, whilst the audience might wish themselves to push him out of the hall. A similar sentiment is expressed differently in ש through גם הם.³⁵

13.24) ἀγαθὸς ὁ πλοῦτος, ᾧ μὴ ἐστὶν ἁμαρτία,
καὶ πονηρὰ ἡ πτωχεία ἐν στόμασιν ἄσεβοῦς.

*The wealth to which no sin is attached is good,
and the poverty is evil in the view of the ungodly.*

(A) טוב העושר אם אין עון ורע העוני על פי זרון:

³³ On this matter, see JM § 125 *be*.

³⁴ On the question of subject complement, cf. *SSG* § 61 **a-b** and *SQH* § 31 **t**. *Pace Lévi* (97) משכיל is no adverb nor an abstract noun.

³⁵ Cf. Wagner 1999.278f.

μή ἐστίν] The use of μή with a verb in the indicative mood is because the relative clause here is of generic nature and can be rewritten as ἐάν μή ἢ αὐτῷ ἁμαρτία, cf. SSG § 83 **ba** (i).

ἐν στόμασιν ἄσεβοῦς] The pl. is odd, which was apparently noticed by S, and the latter reads the sg. בְּפִמֶּה דְרַשִׁיעָה ‘in the mouth of the wicked.’

Smend (129) takes על פי as meaning “gemäss, verursacht durch,” hence “die Armut, die aus Sünde kommt” (II 23). We doubt, however, that this Heb. pseudo-preposition can bear such a meaning.

13.25) Καρδία ἀνθρώπου ἀλλοιοῖ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ,
ἐάν τε εἰς ἀγαθὰ ἐάν τε εἰς κακά.

*A man's heart changes the look of his face
whether for the better or for the worse.*

(A) לב אנוש ישנא פניו אם לטוב ואם לרע:

See [אם .. ואם] See הָמָה אִם־יִשְׁמְעוּ Ex 19.13 and אִם־בְּהֵמָה אִם־אִישׁ לֹא יִהְיֶה .. ואם Ez 2.5.³⁶ Smend (129) rightly notes that precisely this saying is quoted in a rabbinic document with this idiom, however, substituted by one typical of RH: בר סירא אמר לב אדם ישנא פניו בין לטוב בין לרע (Ber. Rab. 73.12).

13.26) ἶχνος καρδίας ἐν ἀγαθοῖς πρόσωπον ἰλαρόν,
καὶ εὗρεσις παραβολῶν διαλογισμοὶ μετὰ κόπων.

*A sign of a happy heart is a cheerful face
and the creating of proverbs (entails) laborious contemplation.*

(A) עקבת לב טוב פנים אורים ושיג ישיח מחשבת עמל:

‘a shining face,’ cf. יָאֵר יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ Nu 6.25.

For 26a, cf. πλουσίου δὲ καὶ πτωχοῦ καρδία ἀγαθή, ἐν παντί καιρῷ πρόσωπον ἰλαρόν Si 26.4, where no Heb. text has been preserved.

[לב טוב] From the context it is clear that the phrase means ‘happy heart,’ not ‘morally, ethically good heart.’ We would not know why the translator has not said καρδία ἀγαθή. Did he suspect that it might be misunderstood? But note λαμπρά καρδία καὶ ἀγαθὴ ἐπὶ ἐδέεσμασιν Si 33.13b and ἐν εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαθῇ καρδίᾳ לִבְבִּי וּבְטוֹב לִבִּי Dt 28.47.

εὗρεσις] Lévi (98) is probably right in his assumption that E reflects here a form of הָשִׁיג ‘to attain.’ He further refers to כִּי שִׁיחַ וְכִי־שִׁיג לוֹ 1Kg 18.27 as being on the mind of BS, of which his grandson could not have been thinking of; παραβολῶν cannot be but free translation.

³⁶ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. אָם 1 b (1).

CHAPTER 14

14.1) μακάριος ἀνήρ, ὃς οὐκ ὀλίσθησεν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ
καὶ οὐ κατενύγη ἐν λύπῃ ἁμαρτιῶν·

*Blessed is a man who did not slip with his mouth
and was not cut to the heart with sorrow for sins.*

(A) אַשרי אַנוש לאַ עזבו פיהוּ וְלאַ אבה עליו דין לבוּ:

ὃς] In \mathfrak{H} we have another rare instance of asyndetic relative clause, on which see above at 12.5. We find in BS another four asyndetic relative clauses all introduced with אַשרי as here and with an indeterminate antecedent: 14.2, 14.20, 34.8, 50.28. These are most interesting in comparison with the star example of this theologically charged beatitude, i.e. אַשרי־הַאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָקֵד טוֹבוֹהֶׁהָ לְגַבְרָא Ps 1.1, where the antecedent is determinate.

οὐκ ὀλίσθησεν] a free rewording; \mathfrak{H} says “whose mouth did not cause him sorrow.” This Gk verb, ὀλισθάνω, belongs to the favourite vocabulary of \mathfrak{G} , occurring in BS as often as 7 times and elsewhere in LXX only twice. It renders נטה qal, נפל qal, שחח qal, תעה qal each once. Cf. \mathfrak{S} טוֹבוֹהֶׁהָ לְגַבְרָא \mathfrak{H} ‘Blessed is a man whose mouth did not ruin him.’¹

In 1b \mathfrak{H} is hopelessly complicated. The *Vorlage* of \mathfrak{G} may have looked just as complicated.² It is impossible to harmonise \mathfrak{G} with \mathfrak{H} .

λύπη] \mathfrak{H} דין לבוּ; on this equation, see below at 30.21.

14.2) μακάριος οὗ οὐ κατέγνω ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ.

*Blessed is he whose conscience was not pricked
and who was not disappointed of his hope.*

(A) אַשרי אישׁ לאַ חסרתו נפשוּ וְלאַ שבתה תוחלתוּ:

¹ *SL* s.v. קלקל assigns this example and two others in BS under 2 “revile, scorn.” But “his mouth did not revile him” makes little sense.

² For some attempts to cope with the text, see Lévi 99, Smend 130, Segal 88f. and Mopsik 151. Segal’s reconstruction is לבוּ דין עליו דין לבוּ לאַ הביא עליו דין לבוּ (דיאון = דין), which Mopsik follows, but his translation is unlikely, because לבוּ is not the subject: “que son cœur n’a pas chargé de remords.”

Ben-Hayyim (1973.216) maintains that אבה shares its root with אבוי, an exclamation of pain and that our translator represents the same analysis. He also takes לבוּ as the subject and דין as an internal object. In *Maagarim* our passage is the only attestation of אבוי.

κατέγνω] = כסדתו, i.e. חסדו 'it reproached him' = כסרתה. However, חסרתו, i.e. חסרתו 'it made him feel shortage' does make sense, cf. לְמִי אֲנִי עֹמֵל וּמְחַסֵּר אֶת־נַפְשִׁי מִטוֹבָה 'for whose sake am I toiling and depriving myself of happiness?' Ec 4.8.

ἔπεσεν] The collocation of שָׁבַת with תּוֹקֵלַת as the *s* is novel: "his hope was not realised." For the sense of the verb here, cp. לֹא תִשָּׁבֵית מְלַח בְּרִית 'לא תִשָּׁבֵית מְלַח בְּרִית' Lv 2.13.

14.3) Ἄνδρι μικρολόγω οὐ καλὸς ὁ πλοῦτος,
καὶ ἄνθρωπῳ βασκάνῳ ἵνα τί χρήματα;

*Wealth ill becomes a mean person,
and what is the use of possessions for a begrudging person?*

(A) לָלֵב קִטְן לֹא נֹאוּה עוֹשֵׁר וְלֹאִישׁ רַע עֵין לֹא נֹאוּה חֲרוּץ:

μικρολόγω] referring to an extremely meticulous accountant who cannot tolerate an error of even one cent. The Heb. phrase לֵב קִטְן is a neologism.³

βασκάνῳ] Lévi points out that this adjective translates רַע עֵין at Pr 28.22, in fact also at 23.6. As against an affiliated phrase רַע עֵין, we have here a cst. phrase, but רַע is an attributive adjective in relation to the preceding אִישׁ.⁴ As a matter of fact, the underlying verbal phrase occurs already in the Pentateuch in a description of manifestations of sheer selfishness and meanness to which people are reduced even among married couples and family members: הָאִישׁ הָרָךְ בָּךְ וְהַעֲנֹג מֵאֵד תִּרַע עֵינָיו בְּאֶחָיו וּבְאִשְׁתּוֹ חֵיקוֹ וּבְנִתּוֹ בְּנִיו אֲשֶׁר > ὁ ἀπαλὸς ἐν σοὶ καὶ ὁ τρυφερὸς σφόδρα βασκανεῖ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ καταλειμμένα τέκνα, ἃ ἂν καταλειφθῆ Dt 28.54, sim. in vs. 56 describing the behaviour of a wife and mother. From these examples we see that what is evil is not אִישׁ in spite of the surface structure, but עֵין; if applied to a woman, in our Si case we would have אִשָּׁה רַעַת עֵין. Gk βάσκανος and βασκαίνω primarily had to do with sorcery and witchcraft, in which the practitioner's malignant eyes are directed at his clients, and from there the sense of "begrudge, slander" would evolve.⁵

χρήματα] חֲרוּץ 'gold,' a poetic synonym of הַבָּ that occurs in BH in poetic books only. In BS we meet with it only once more at 34.5, where ⚡ uses διάφορον.

³ Segal (89) and Mopsik (151) mention גָּדֵל לֵב Is 9.8 and 10.12 as antonym, which, however, is that only in form, for it means "arrogance."

⁴ On the adjective in st. cst., see above at 7.11.

⁵ We find a verbatim Gk rendering, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, in a series of vices at Mk 7.22, which is distinct from ἐὶν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ἦ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται Mt 6.23, with which cp. ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ἐστὶν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθὸς εἶμι; Mt 20.15.

- 14.4) ὁ συνάγων ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ συνάγει ἄλλοις,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ τρυφήσουσιν ἕτεροι.

*One who is saving, depriving himself, is saving for others
and others are going to enjoy his possessions.*

(A מונע נשו יקבץ לאחר ובטובתו יתבעבע זר:

ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ] 𐤒 נשו, which is to be emended to 𐤒 נפשו = 𐤒 נפשה = 𐤒 נפשו. τρυφήσουσιν] 𐤒 יתבעבע. The verb is listed in BSH (108b) under √בעבע as its Hitp. We find it simpler to derive it from √בוע Qal ‘to rejoice,’ which occurs in BS at אל תבעבם 16.2 to be emended to אל תבעבם (𐤒 μὴ εὐφραίνου ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς). According to *Maagarim* both BS cases are the only attestations in Hebrew. In Jewish Aramaic, however, √בוע ‘to rejoice’ is rather common. In Trg Is, for instance, the verb occurs in Peal as often as 15 times,⁶ e.g. בועו בָּהּ ‘Exult over her’ Is 66.10 (𐤒 גִּילוּ בָּהּ). Our יתבעבע is equivalent to Hitpael with iterative, habitual value⁷: “Keep enjoying.”

- 14.5) ὁ πονηρὸς ἑαυτῷ τίνι ἀγαθὸς ἔσται;
καὶ οὐ μὴ εὐφρανθήσεται ἐν τοῖς χρήμασιν αὐτοῦ.

*A person mean to himself, who could he be generous to?
and he would never be happy with his own possessions.*

(A רע לנפשו למי ייטיב ולא יקרה בטובתו:

πονηρὸς] 𐤒 רע, which we are inclined to take as abbreviated for רע עין.⁸ The seven verses, 4-10, can be considered to be dealing with stinginess in its extreme form. In 37.11 this shortened form is actually rendered with βάσκα-νος: רע עם איש רע μετὰ βασκάνου. See also the following verse.

εὐφρανθήσεται] 𐤒 יקרה, a dubious equation. The Syr. 𐤒 קדי used here in 𐤒 is unknown to Heb.: 𐤒 קדא ‘he will delight.’ The *Vorlage* of 𐤒 may have read the same as 𐤒, and the translator allowed himself a measure of freedom.

- 14.6) τοῦ βασκαίνοντος ἑαυτὸν οὐκ ἔστιν πονηρότερος,
καὶ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα τῆς κακίας αὐτοῦ·

*None is more stingy than he who begrudges himself
and this is a recompense for his evilness.*

(A רע לנפשו אין רע ממנו ועמו תשלומת רעתו:

⁶ According to Van Zijl 1979.24. Cf. also Levy 1959.1 85b. It has turned up once in Qumran Aramaic: חדי ובויעי ‘Rejoice and be glad!’ 4Q196 f18.2 [= To 13.13⁶! χάρηθι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι].

⁷ Cf. *SQH* § 12 f (4).

⁸ Though Skehan - Di Lella (257, 259) do translate this with “who is stingy with himself,” in their exposition we read “The miser ‘is evil to himself.’”

רע לנפשו] Focused in casus pendens and resumed later with a suf. pron. in ממנו.

κακίας] רעתו was probably meant to be an abstract noun of רע עין, whilst the translator, in summing up the three mutually affiliated verses, qualifies it from a more generic, ethical perspective, not using πονηρία.

14.7) κὰν εὖ ποιῆ, ἐν λήθῃ ποιεῖ,
καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων ἐκφαίνει τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ.

Even if he does something good, he would be doing it unintentionally and in the end would his evilness be there for all to see.

For this and the following verses no Heb. text has come down to us. It is most likely an accident of transmission, as shown by S, which is close to C, but not entirely dependent on it: וְאִן נָדַשׁ וְאַטְאַב מְטַעַ הֵן טַעַ אַבְאִהֲרִיתָהּ נְחִיאַ וְאִן נְחִיאַ בְּבִישׁתָּהּ ‘if it happened that he did something good, he did it himself being unaware of it, and in the end he will see his evilness.’

14.8) πονηρὸς ὁ βασκαίνων ὀφθαλμῶ,
ἀποστρέφων πρόσωπον καὶ ὑπερορῶν ψυχάς.

Wicked is a man who signals meanness with his eye, turning his face away and overlooking life-threatening situations.

S lacks this verse.⁹

πνηρὸς] Because the verb βασκαίνω itself is used here, πνηρὸς must carry the standard, morally tinted meaning, “wicked, evil.” Our translator appears to be playing on words by calling in ὀφθαλμός, a key component of the Greek version of רע עין. We also see that not only your eye, but also your face are made to play a role of its own, for ἀποστρέφων ὀφθαλμόν could have been said, as in ἀποστρέφει τὸν ὀφθαλμόν αὐτοῦ Pr 28.27 (מְעַלִּים עֵינָיו).

14.9) πλεονέκτου ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἐμπίπλται μερίδι,
καὶ ἀδικία πνηρὰ ἀναξηραίνει ψυχὴν.

The eye of a greedy person does not get sated with his own share and wicked injustice leads to a parched soul.

(A) בעין כושל מְעַט הוא חלקו ולוקח חלק רעהו מאבד חלקו:

In the Heb. MS we see מְעַטְהוּ.

This whole verse sounds out of context, having nothing to do with the running theme of meanness and stinginess.

⁹ In his translation Smend (II 24) moves too far away from C: “Schlecht [gegen sich selbst] ist der Geizige, und wer sich dem Nächsten entzieht, entzieht sich selbst.”

πλεονέκτου] cannot be reconciled with **ח** כושל ‘one who trips.’ Some time ago¹⁰ we said that the translator may have had on his mind **בוצע**. We referred to **רע בצע בצע** ó πλεονεκτῶν πλεονεξίαν κακὴν Hb 2.9 and **למען בצע בצע** ὅπως πλεονεξία πλεονεκτῶσιν Ez 22.27. We see now in *Index* 96b that in LXX πλεονεκτέω is equivalent to **בצע** qal only (3×) and πλεονεξία to **בצע** only (5×). Moreover, as regards ἀδικία πονηρὰ in 9b) we would note **רעון בצע** Is 57.17. In **ס** we see **סכלא** ‘one who deceives’ as equivalent to כושל, in **ש** **עלובא** ‘the unjust,’ and **ז** reads *in parte iniquitatis* for μερίδι. Accumulating of ill-gotten wealth or greed and stinginess are two distinct vices.

μερίδι] The verb ἐμπίμπλημι can take an accusative of that which you fill someone or something with. We find here an alternative as in πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται Si 39.6. Cf. *SSG* § 60 j.

The whole of 9b in **ט** has nothing to do with **ח**: ‘he who takes his neighbour’s share loses his own share.’

14.10) ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς φθονερὸς ἐπ’ ἄρτον
καὶ ἐλλιπὴς ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης αὐτοῦ.

*A niggard would not part with bread
and provides but little at his dinner-table.*

(Aa) עין רע עין תעיט על לחם ומהומה על שלחנו:

(Ab) עין טובה מרבה הלחם ומעין יבש יזל מים על השלחן:

[עין רע עין] Those who retain the second עין take the first as in the st. cst. So Segal (87)¹¹ and Kahana (472) with עין רע עין. Note **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע**.¹² However, עין רע, if = **ט** ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, raises a difficult syntactic issue, i.e. why not רעה עין? Exactly the same difficulty arises in MH: עין הרע mAb 2.11 as against רעה עין ib. 2.9.¹³ If the phrase in BS is akin to this MH idiom, עין רע is precluded.

φθονερὸς] **ח** תעיט. Reference is made by many authorities to **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** 1Sm 14.32 and **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** ib. 15.19, and it is said that this is a metaphorical use of the verb to the effect that the person’s eye, in the manner of a bird of prey (**ע**), darts to the bread. But in the two biblical passages the subject is human, and here the person would rather put the food away for fear of it being consumed by someone else or because of his inclination not to touch it. Taking into consideration 10c+d, which is missing in

¹⁰ Muraoka 1977a.402.

¹¹ In his commentary (90), however, he prefers reading **רע** in line with **ט**.

¹² **ז** *oculus malus ad mala* = **רע** **רע** **רע**.

¹³ Mr R. Medina of Jerusalem has drawn our attention to a short article by Berggrün (1973).

Segal 1927 does not address himself to this difficulty; an example such as **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** **ע** discussed in § 376 (iv) does not belong here, since there is a proper number concord here.

⊕ and Ⓢh, Segal (90) sensibly suggests that תמעט would make a good antonymic parallel as against Ⓢ 10c. As regards the preposition על, we would mention its use with verbs such as סָהַק, e.g. עֵינֶיכֶם אֶל-תְּהַס עַל-כָּל־יָכֶם Gn 45.20 and הִמְלִיךָ, e.g. הִמְלִיךָ הָעַם עַל-מִיטֵב הַצֵּאן וְהַבָּקָר 1Sm 15.15.¹⁴

ἐλλειπής] Ⓢ מהומה, which was by Smend plausibly corrected to מאומה אִין ‘there is nothing.’

Ⓢ 10c-d may be translated as “A good eye multiplies bread and a dry fountain will flow with water on to the table.” A homoioarcton, 10a and 10c both opening with עֵין may have caused the disappearance of this part of the verse. Ⓢ presents a confused picture of the entire verse: עֵינָא בִישָׁתָא מְסֻגָּא לְהִמָּא וְיִבְשָׂא רְמָא עַל פְּתוּרָא ‘an evil eye multiplies bread and a dry one lies cast on the table.’

14.11) Τέκνον, καθὼς ἐὰν ἔχης, εὖ ποίει σεαυτὸν
καὶ προσφορὰς κυρίῳ ἀξίως πρόσσχε·

*Child, to your best ability, enjoy yourself,
and take fitting offerings to the Lord.*

בני אם יש לך שְׁרוֹת נפֶשׁךָ וְאם יש לך הִיטִיב לך (Aa)
ולאל ידך הדשן: (Ab)

Leaving the vocative (בני) out of consideration, Aa1) and Aa2) look like accidental doublets. The quotation in the Babylonian Talmud (Erub 54a) agrees with Aa2). Ⓢ presents Aa1) and Aa2), leaving Ab) out.

It is rather difficult to relate ⓈAb and Ⓢb to each other. Possibly our translator failed to comprehend the Heb. text. לאל ידך, as in 5.1, probably means here ‘as best you can,’ but הדשן ‘Get fat, add weight!’? Lévi (103) offers “suivant tes ressources, fais liesse” and Smend (II 24) “so gut du es kannst, pflege dich.” We are not aware of such a use of the verb anywhere in Hebrew.

εὖ ποίει σεαυτὸν] The same collocation, presumably meaning the same, takes a dative in εὖ ποίει φίλῳ vs. 13.

ἀξίως] The translator is familiar with an idiomatic syntagm of <יש לאל ידך + inf.> as in יֵשׁ-לְאֵל יָדִי לַעֲשׂוֹת עִמָּכֶם רָע Gn 31.29, and mentally thought of אִם יש לך לאל ידך הדשן by analogy of the preceding אִם יש לך הדשן.¹⁵

14.12) μνήσθητι ὅτι θάνατος οὐ χροنیει
καὶ διαθήκη ᾗδου οὐχ ὑπεδείχθη σοι·

*Remember that death will not fail to come
and the covenant of Hades has not been shown to you.*

¹⁴ As we (Muraoka 1977a.403) suggested earlier.

¹⁵ Cf. an analysis by Joosten 1999.155.

(Aa) זכור כי לא בשאול תענוג ולא מות יתמהמה
(Ab) וחוק לשאול לא הגד לך:

om. in **G**, **S**, **S_h** and **I**. In terms of message, ‘there is no fun in Hades,’ its proper place is the preceding verse. Or an intrusion from vs. 16?

The position of לא is unusual.¹⁶

διαθήκη] חוק **H** ‘determination (about the life in Hades).’ Cf. **S** גזירת שׁוֹל ‘a decision about Hades.’ Smend (134) finds difficult the notion of Hades determining man’s day of descent there, but the cst. phrase or a substitute of it through ל־, expresses a topic as in משפט האוב ‘the injunction pertaining to ghosts’ CD 12.3.¹⁷

14.13) πρίν σε τελευτῆσαι εὖ ποίει φίλῳ
καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἰσχύν σου ἔκτεινον καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ.

*Before you die, be kindly to a friend
and as much as you can, extend (a helping hand) and give to him.*

(A) בטרם תמות היטב לאוהב והשיגת ירך תן לו:

[השיגת ירך] ‘give him as much as you can afford.’ השיגת must be meant to be a Hi. verbal noun cst., but anomalous, for we anticipate השגת, i.e. השָׁגַת. It looks like a conflation of this with Pf. 3fs השיגָה יָדָךְ. We encounter a standard formation in יד בהשגת יד Si 32.12 (**G** καθ’ εὐρεμα χειρός).¹⁸ Odd is **S** מָדָם דְּשָׁאֵל לָךְ ‘that which he asks you for.’

ἐκτεινον] On the understood χεῖρα, see Καὶ πτωχῷ וגם לאביון הוֹרִישִׁי יד χεῖρά σου Si 7.32. See further *GELS* s.v. ἐκτείνω **3 b**.

14.14) μὴ ἀφυστερήσῃς ἀπὸ ἀγαθῆς ἡμέρας,
καὶ μερὶς ἐπιθυμίας ἀγαθῆς μὴ σε παρελθάτω.

*Do not deny yourself a day’s pleasure
and do not let go of your share of hearty enjoyment.*

(Aa) אל תמנע מטובת יום ובהלקח אח אל תעבר
(Ab) וחמוד רע אל תחמוד:

G, **S_h**, and **I** lack 14c, whilst **S** lacks 14b.

[תמנע] Segal (87) and BSH (202a) parse the form as Qal, whereas Smend (134) and Kahana (472) see here a Ni. form, with which latter we concur. In BH נִמְנַע occurs with something to be withheld as *s* and with מן + pers.,

¹⁶ Smend (17) has, with no comment, normalised the word order. Segal (90) holds that it is for the sake of assonance, a dubitable assumption.

¹⁷ For more examples in QH, see *SQH* § 21 b (xii).

¹⁸ Cf. Ewald 1870 § 156 d, 239 b.

e.g. יִמְנַע מִרְשָׁעִים אֹרְרָם Jb 38.15, sim. JI 1.13. Once with a personal *s* with מן + thing: אֶל-נָא תִמְנַע מִהֶלֶךְ אֵלַי Nu 22.16, which is rather close to our case. לֹא נִמְנָעוּ בֵּית שְׁמַאי מִלְשָׂא נָשִׁים e.g. in MH, e.g. 'the school of Shame did not refrain from marrying women' mYeb 1.2. Where the *s* is a person, Ni. may be reflexive.

ἀγαθῆς ἡμέρας] Unlike מְטוֹבַת יוֹם, this is syntactically equivocal as shown by שֵׁשׁ יוֹמָא טְבָא נְשָׁא 'a good day' as against שֵׁשׁ יוֹמָא טְבָא נְשָׁא.¹⁹

מְ of Aa2) is unquestionably defect. מְ might be retroverted to חֲמֻדָּתְךָ or חֲמֻדָּתְךָ אֶל תַּעֲבֹר.²⁰

שֵׁשׁ reads for 14b: וְרָגַתָּ סְנִיתָא לָא תְרַגַּי 'Do not love a detestable pleasure.'

מְ of Ab) might mean "and do not crave a neighbour's pleasure." Segal (87) vocalises רַע as against Kahana (472) רַע, for which latter אַח in Aa2) may speak.

14.15) οὐχὶ ἐτέρῳ καταλείψεις τοὺς πόρους σου
καὶ τοὺς κόπους σου εἰς διαίρεσιν κλήρου;

*You are leaving fruits of your hard work to another
and the fruits of your toil for division by lots, aren't you?*

(A) הלא לאחר תעזב חילך ויגיעך ליודי גורל:

οὐχὶ] מְ הלא. Both particles introduce a question to which an affirmative answer is expected. Where a negative answer is expected, μή is used.²¹

ἐτέρῳ] מְ לאחר. Both are fronted as emphatically focused.

τοὺς πόρους σου] מְ חילך. That πόρος means in its pl. form not only hard work, but also what results from it is well known. See *GELS* s.v. 3. However, חֵיל means not only 'power,' but 'wealth,' often a powerful weapon, but not as specific as πόροι. On the other hand, יְגִיעַ signifies not only 'weariness,' but also 'fruits of weary labour,' which holds also for κόποι, the pl. of κόπος 'toil.' See *GELS* s.v. d. We submit that the selection of πόροι as a rendering of חֵיל is under the influence of its parallel, יְגִיעַ.

The pl. of these two substantives does not necessarily mean a large number or quantity. One might invest one's savings into the purchase of a huge bar of gold. What is meant is rather a vast extent of toil and hard labour, months and years of hard work, and more than a few different types of toil. See *SSG* § 21 b. Incidentally, among about a dozen cases of יְגִיעַ 'product' only once the pl. occurs: יְגִיעַי Ho 12.9.

διαίρεσιν] מְ יודי, which Segal (87) vocalises as יוּדִי, deriving it from יָדָה 'to throw.' This verb, however, occurs in Qal in BH only once, Je 50.14, where it is about shooting of arrows. There are two other Qal verbs in BH

¹⁹ We fail to follow Smend (134): "Gr. umstellend."

²⁰ Smend (II 17) proposes ובהלק חמודי נאה or טוב instead of נאה.

²¹ For details, see *SSG* § 83 ce, g, ga, and gb.

which take precisely גִּרְל as the object, namely, יָדָד and יָרָה. Hence either יִוֹדֵד or יוֹרִי suggests itself as a plausible emendation.

14.16) δὸς καὶ λάβε καὶ ἀπάτησον τὴν ψυχὴν σου,
ὄτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ᾧδου ζητῆσαι τρυφήν.

*Give and take and enjoy yourself,
because you cannot look for luxury in Hades.*

(Aa) תן לאח ותין ופניק נפשך כי אין בשאול לבקש תענוג:
(Ab) וכל דבר שיפה לעשות לפני אלהים עשה:

δὸς καὶ λάβε] A drinking party where wine glasses are given and taken may be in view. ~~Θ~~ need be emended to read תן וקח.

ἀπάτησον] ~~Θ~~ פניק 'indulge.' Ἀπατάω primarily means "to lead astray." So "Take leave of your common sense and codes of proper behaviour, spoil yourself." This Gk verb would occur once more in ἀπάτα τὴν ψυχὴν σου (פת נפשך) 30.23.²²

οὐκ ἔστιν] In < εἰμί + inf. > the infinitival clause is basically the subject of a nominal clause, but bearing modal values such as obligation, permission or possibility. This equally applies to the corresponding Heb. structure.²³ See above at 10.23.

ἐν ᾧδου] Note also the gen. in εἰς ᾧδου Ps 30.18 // εἰς ᾧδην 3M 5.42. The selection of the gen. as in ἐξ ᾧδου Ps 29.4 is not necessarily dependent on the preposition.²⁴

~~Θ~~ lacks Aab), but has preserved Aba): וְכָל מַדָּם דְּשִׁפִּיר לְמַעַבְד קָדָם אֱלֹהָא 'everything that is good to do do (it) before God.' In substance, however, this clause looks out of place, most likely a later gloss.

The Heb. -שׁ as equivalent to שָׂרָא occurs a few more times in BS, e.g. קטן קשהוא נער .. שעודנו נער 'since he is still a youth .. when he is small' 30.12.

14.17) πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιοῦται·
ἢ γὰρ διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰῶνος Θανάτῳ ἀποθανῆ.

*Everybody wears out like a garment;
for the eternal covenant (says): Thou shalt surely die.*

(A) כל הבשר כבגד יבלה וחוק עולם גוע יגועו:

[כל הבשר] see above at 13.15. On the thought expressed in 17a, cf. Ps 102.27.

²² GELS s.v. ἀπατάω 2 "to allow to have fun" may have gone a shade too far out of contextual consideration.

²³ For details, see SSG § 30 bec and SQH § 18 d.

²⁴ On this subject, cf. BDF § 162 (8).

We doubt, *pace* “Man’s body” (Snaith 73), that our physical, bodily existence is being contrasted here with a non-physical one. Cf. **כְּלֶהֱוֶן בְּנוֹשָׂא**.

The first **וְ** handed down to the mankind read: **θανάτω ἀποθανεῖσθε** מות תָּמוּת Gn 2.17. Likewise **גוּע** in **גוּע יגועו** is an inf. abs. Qal, **גוּע**.

14.18) ὡς φύλλον θάλλον ἐπὶ δένδρου δασέος,
τὰ μὲν καταβάλλει, ἄλλα δὲ φύει,
οὕτως γενεὰ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος,
ἢ μὲν τελευτᾷ, ἕτερα δὲ γεννᾶται.

*Like a leaf growing vigorously on a thickly covered tree,
some fall off, others grow.*

*Likewise a generation of flesh and blood,
one dies, another is born.*

(A) כפרח עלה על עץ רענן שזה נובל ואחר גומל צומח:
כַּן אֶחָד כֵּן דוֹרוֹת בֶּשֶׂר וְדָם אַחַד גּוּע וְאַחַד גּוֹמֵל:

[כפרח עלה] vocalised by Segal (88) and Kahana (472) as **כְּפָרַח עֹלָה**. Segal (91) and BSH (258b) mention also an alternative analysis by admitting an inf. cst., **כְּפָרַח עֹלָה**.²⁵ We would mention yet another alternative, namely analysing **כִּי** not as a preposition, but as a conjunction equivalent to **כְּאֲשֶׁר**, thus **כְּפָרַח עֹלָה**. One example in BH is **כְּאֵיל תְּעָרַג עַל-אַפְיִקֵי-מַיִם כֵּן נַפְשֵׁי תְעָרַג אֶלְיָי אֱלֹהִים** Ps 42.2, where **כְּאֵיל**, and not **כְּאֵיל**, suggests that an asyndetic relative clause is intended, but **וְ** took it otherwise: Ὁν τρόπον ἐπιποθεῖ ἡ ἔλαφος ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, οὕτως ἐπιποθεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός.²⁶ On the collocation of **פָּרַח** with **עֹלָה** as its *s*, see **וְכַעֲלָה צְדִיקִים יִפְרָחוּ** Pr 11.28.

[שזה] The particle **שֵׁ** indicates that what follows is concerned with its antecedent **פרח**, a collective sg., cp. **שֵׁ אֵיךְ טָרְפָא דְאֵילָנָא** ‘like leaves of trees.’ That **φύλλον** is perceived as collective sg. is evident in **τὰ μὲν .. ἄλλα δὲ**, which refers back to **φύλλον**.

μὲν .. δὲ] a well-known rhetorical device for highlighting a contrast, used again in 18d. **וְ** is using two distinct formulas: **זה .. אחר || אחר .. אחד**. However, we have here a variation on the standard formula, which would read: **τὰ μὲν .. τὰ δὲ .. ἢ μὲν .. ἢ δὲ ..**²⁷

γενεὰ] **וְ** דורות pl. // **פרח** sg. **וְ** is consistent with the selection of the sg.: **φύλλον .. γενεά**.

γεννᾶται] **וְ** גומל, a rather unexpected antonym of **גוּע** ‘to perish, expire.’ The sense ‘to ripen’ (used intransitively) is the sense of **גָּמַל** that can be regarded as loosely antonymic in relation to **גוּע**. See Is 18.5 **וּבִסֵּר גָּמַל יִהְיֶה נֹצֵה**.

²⁵ On **כִּי** prefixed to an inf. cst., see BDB s.v. **כִּי** 3 a.

²⁶ For a few more BH examples, see JM § 174 d.

²⁷ Cf. SSG § 1 a.

- 14.19) πᾶν ἔργον σηπόμενον ἐκλείπει,
καὶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος αὐτὸ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀπελεύσεται.

*Every rotting work will vanish
and he who has made it will depart with it.*

(A) כל מעשיו רקוב ירקבו ופעל ידיו ימשך אחריו:

σηπόμενον] The translator has made no special effort to reproduce the *figura etymologica* in \mathfrak{H} . The ptc. can be analysed as attributive, but also as a subject complement, “will vanish, rotting.”²⁸ The Present aspect of the ptc. implies that it is in the process of rotting.

- 14.20) Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐν σοφίᾳ μελετήσῃ
καὶ ὃς ἐν συνέσει αὐτοῦ διαλεχθήσεται,

*Blessed is a man who would ponder over wisdom
and who would converse over his comprehension.*

(A) אשרי אנוש בחכמה יהגה ובתבונה ישעה:

In terms of poetic, proverbial discourse the following eight verses (20-27) in \mathfrak{H} appear to constitute an integrated whole. Prior to beginning a verse by verse detailed analysis we attempt here a general overview of its syntax and style. This segment goes about an individual declared blessed who engages himself with Wisdom in diverse ways. He is introduced as an anonymous אנוש (20).

His characteristic activities are expressed through various syntactic structures: 1) asyndetic relative clause (20), 2) articular participle (21 השם, 23 המשקף, 24 החונה), 3) anarthrous participle (25 נוטה, 27 חוסה), 4) Imperfect (21 יתבונן), 22 ירצד, 23 יצותת, 26 ישים, 27 ישכן, 5) ו- + perfect (24 והביא, 25 ושכן).

Each of the eight verses consists of two parts, each containing a verb, either finite or infinite, and the two parts are consistently joined with the conjunction *waw*.

The sequence of the two verbs in each verse do not follow any rigid or standard CH rules, but the shift from one verb to the other is syntactically loose, e.g. יתבונן .. ושכן .. וישים (25-26). This is largely due to the fact that not all the actions are meant to occur one after another.²⁹ The only exceptions are the asyndetic relative clause (20) in which two Imperfects are coordinated, and two Imperfects the first of which starts off with [-ו + Perfect] (26). We thus find sequences such as [Ptc. - Impf.] (21, 23, 27), [ptc. - ו- + Perfect] (24, 25).

²⁸ On the subject complement, see above at 12.22.

²⁹ Van Peursen (2004.133) refers to JM § 119 *n, r*, where examples of a ptc. continued with *w-qatalti* are adduced, but in BH the two actions follow one after the other, which does not apply to our BS cases.

As we shall see below in detail, \mathfrak{C} does not adhere in detail to this overall pattern of \mathfrak{H} .

Μακάριος] see 11.28 above.

μελετήσει] \mathfrak{H} יהגה. One naturally is reminded of .. אֲשַׁר־יִיאִישׁ אֶשְׂרַיְי־אֶשְׂרַיְי (μελετήσῃ) וּבִתְוֹרָתוֹ יִהְיֶה יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὅς .. καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός Ps 1.1f. In one aspect of this traditional formula of beatitudes our document differs from this time-honoured model of Ps 1.1: in BS we find אֲשַׁר immediately followed by an indeterminate noun,³⁰ which serves as the antecedent of an asyndetic relative clause. In addition to our case here we find it in אֲשַׁר־יִיאִישׁ אֶשְׂרַיְי 14.1, אֲשַׁר־יִיאִישׁ אֶשְׂרַיְי 14.2, and אֲשַׁר־יִיאִישׁ אֶשְׂרַיְי 50.28, which last is of particular interest in view of the presence of יהגה. Here we may recognise BS's mastery of the biblical classics and his confidence in the biblical language and his non-subservience to it.

In view of ἐν σοφίᾳ the verb μελετάω denotes an intellectual activity of meditation and pondering. However, the very first occurrence in BH of יהגה is very illuminating: אֶשְׂרַיְי־אֶשְׂרַיְי וְיִיאִישׁ אֶשְׂרַיְי אֶשְׂרַיְי אֶשְׂרַיְי בּוֹ יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה: καὶ οὐκ ἀποστήσεται ἡ βίβλος τοῦ νόμου τούτου ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου, καὶ μελετήσεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός Josh 1.8. In view of ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου we can only conclude that Joshua is not being instructed by God to begin every day with a “quiet” time, but with reading the Bible aloud and reciting it. Most probably under the influence of this Hebrew - Greek equation SG uses μελετάω in two senses unknown prior to LXX. According to *GELS* (2) “to recite constantly in order to ponder over” and (3) “to raise gentle voice.” For (2) the subject of the verb is often an organ of speech, e.g. γλῶσσα, στόμα. For details, see *GELS* s.v. Silent reading is a rather modern practice. Otherwise Philip the evangelist, who was walking beside a chariot carrying a high-ranking Ethiopian official, would have not been able to figure out that the Ethiopian was reading Isaiah 53 (Acts 8.26-30).

αὐτοῦ] When the two hemistichs in both \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} show perfect parallelism, this possessive pronoun is disruptive. It is absent in \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{Sl} . With some difficulty we can take the phrase in the sense of “that which he comprehends” or “aided by his intellectual ability.”

διαλεχθήσεται] \mathfrak{H} ישעה, the sole instance of this equation. Heb. Qal הָשָׁעַ is a verb in the semantic field of visual perception, “to gaze,” but in a couple of cases it is a metaphor of intellectual observation. Especially interesting is אָשַׁעְהָ בְּחַקֶּיהָ תַּמִּידַי μελετήσω ἐν τοῖς δικαιομασίῃ σου διὰ παντός Ps 119.117, where the use of μελετάω and the collocation בְּ- הָשָׁעַ are to be noted.

³⁰ In both BH and QH the noun אֲנוּשׁ is never prefixed with the def. article, though one cannot be absolutely certain in a case like אַל תְּבוּ לְאֲנוּשׁ בְּמַר רוּחַ Si 7.11.

14.21) ὁ διανοούμενος τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις αὐτῆς ἐννοηθήσεται.

*One who ponders her ways in his mind
shall also meditate over her mysteries.*

(A) השם על דרכיה לבו ובתבונתיה יתבונן:

The clause structure of the verse is somewhat complicated. Ziegler has added a comma at the end of vs. 20. He probably regards vs. 21 as being in apposition to ἀνήρ (20). In both verses we find two verbs in both H and G . There is, however, a syntactic difference between the two verses: in vs. 20 the two Heb. verbs are in the same tense and coordinate, joined with ׀, whereas in G we find two coordinate relative clauses linked with καί, each introduced with ὅς. In vs. 21, by contrast, we find in H a Ptc. and an Impf. linked with ׀. Besides, the first hemistich is merely an expanded noun phrase, not a complete clause.³¹ For neat parallelism we would anticipate המתבונן. Unlike Gk καί the Heb. conjunction ׀ is not used as equivalent to ׀. ³² The only possibility is to take it as apodotic with the first hemistich in casus pendens as the subject of יתבונן. To do justice to our translator's endeavour, vs. 21 should be made a complete clause on its own and replace the comma at the end of vs. 20 with a full stop.³³

It is difficult to follow S נָסָתְכֵל .. דְּנַפְנָא 'who turns .. and ponders ..' and S וְבִמְשֹׁשׂוּתָא דִּילֵה נְתִיבֵינָא 'he who contemplates .. will consider his mysteries thoroughly.' Both Syr. versions see here a continuation of vs. 20 and vs. 21 as the subject of μακάριος vs. 20. Such an analysis is syntactically difficult: for S we would expect המתבונן.

αὐτῆς] = τῆς σοφίας.

על] pace Segal (93) no error for אל, cf. H g 1.5, שִׁימוּ לְבַבְכֶם עַל-דְּרֹכֵיכֶם. sim. ib. 7, Jb 1.8.

τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις αὐτῆς] H תבונתיה 'her comprehensions,' a highly unusual equation. It is as difficult to make sense of תבונתיה as its parallel in vs. 20, תבונה. S reads שְׁבִילֵיה 'her paths,' parallel to the preceding אֲרֻחֶתָהּ 'her ways.' On the basis of this Schechter and Taylor (51) plausibly emend the form to נתיבותיה < נתיבה 'path.'

14.22) ἔξελθε ὀπίσω αὐτῆς ὡς ἰχνευτῆς
καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰσόδοις αὐτῆς ἐνέδρευε.

³¹ Thus "der ihre Wege .. erwägen wird und ihre Verborgheiten im Sinn behalten wird" (*SD*) is questionable.

³² *NETS* also renders καὶ with "also."

³³ So *NETS*. Swete has διαλεχθήσεται.

*Go after her like a hunter
and at her entrance lie, [waiting for her].*

(A) לצאת אחריה בחקר וכל מבואיה ירצד:

Because in 𐤂 vs. 21 is already complete as a clause, the translator can begin this verse with an imperative not necessarily addressed to the subject of the preceding verse, but any reader of the document. By contrast, in 𐤄 the infinitival clause here can be subordinate to the preceding verse, either expressing a purpose, result or epexegetic, i.e. elaborating the immediately preceding verb, but see an alternative analysis below.

ἐξελθε] 𐤄 לצאת. The Heb. inf. can be used as equivalent to an impv., e.g. על אחד להבדיל הטהרה ‘according to one (witness) the separation from the purity is to be established’ CD 9.23.³⁴ This analysis might be neater in that it fits the general structure of each verse containing two verbs which are not syntactically subordinate to each other. Since Syr. does not use the inf. in such a fashion, 𐤍 וְלִמְפַק must be a mechanical reproduction of 𐤄.

𐤍 [בחקר] most likely an error for כחקר, cf. 𐤍 אִיָּהּ מְעַקְבָּנָא ‘like a pursuer.’ ἐνέδρευε] 𐤄 ירצד, the sole attestation in LXX of this equation.³⁵ This hapax legomenon in BH (Ps 68.17) and also in BS is also attested in JA.³⁶ Did 𐤂 read רצד Impv. or תרצד? In any case, for 𐤂 the two Imperatives express two coordinate actions linked with καί.

ἐν ταῖς εἰσόδοις αὐτῆς] so that you can get a chance to speak with her when she goes out or comes home. Ziegler has adopted εἰσόδοις attested only by one Gk MS, B^c, the remainder of MSS reading οδοῖς. Likewise 𐤍 על שבילה and 𐤍 בארְחָתָא דִּילָהּ נִלְ.

כל] 𐤄, most likely an error for על.

14.23) ὁ παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων αὐτῆς
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θυρωμάτων αὐτῆς ἀκροάσεται,

*He who peers through her doors
will also listen attentively at her doors,*

(A) המשקיף בעד החלונה ועל פתחיה יצותת:

23a naturally reminds one of διὰ τῆς θυρίδος παρέκυσεν [AL διεκυσσεν] μήτηρ Σισαρα Jd 5.28B (𐤄 בְּעַד הַחֲלוֹן נִשְׁקָפָה וְתִיבָב אִם סִסְרָא), which probably led 𐤄 to start writing the definite article, subsequently deciding to change the form.

³⁴ For a discussion with further examples, see *SQH* § 18 c.

³⁵ Correct the reference in *Index* 41b s.v. from “5.14”.

³⁶ See Jastrow 1492a. Cf. Arb. *rašada* in the same meaning, “to lurk.”

ἀκροάσεται] 𐤇 יצותת, the sole instance in LXX of this equation. The verb root צות ‘to listen’ is unknown to BH, but is attested in RH in Hi. Note 𐤍 תאָצַ וְהָאָזְנָא and 𐤍 יצותת.

- 14.24) ὁ καταλύων σύνεγγυς τοῦ οἴκου αὐτῆς
καὶ πῆξει πάσσαλον ἐν τοῖς τοίχοις αὐτῆς,
*One who lodges near her residence
will also firmly strike pegs in her walls.*

(A) הַחֹנָה סְבִיבוֹת בֵּיתָהּ וְהִבִּיא יִתְרֵיוּ בְקִירָהּ:

σύνεγγυς] an adverb functioning like a preposition. Such has an advantage of greater transparency than a standard, multivalent preposition such as ἐπί as in ἐστηκότος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν καμήλων ‘as he stood by the camels’ Ge 24.30. See SSG § 26 e.

πάσσαλον] 𐤇 יִתְרֵיוּ יִתְרָהּ need be restored instead of יִתְרָהּ ‘cord.’ Note 𐤍 סְכָרָהּ ‘his nails.’

- 14.25) στήσει τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ κατὰ χεῖρας αὐτῆς
καὶ καταλύσει ἐν καταλύματι ἀγαθῶν,
*he will pitch his tent in the domain of her guidance
and lodge happily,*

(A) וְנוֹטָה אֶהְלוּ עַל יָדָהּ וְשָׁכַן שָׁכַן טוֹב:

κατὰ χεῖρας αὐτῆς] In view of 𐤇 עַל the selection of κατὰ is striking. All the more so, because we find a more literal rendering in οὗς κατέστησεν Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ χεῖρας (𐤇 עַל-יְדָיָהּ) ἄδόντων 1Ch 6.26.³⁷ What is instructive here is εἰ μὴ πορεύεται κατὰ χεῖράς σου ‘if she [= your wife] does not follow your guidance’ Si 25.26.³⁸ These are the only two attestations of this phrase, κατὰ χεῖράς τινος (pers.) in LXX.

שָׁכַן] a rare verbal noun, attested in BH as a hapax, וְשָׁכַן? Dt 12.5.

- 14.26) θήσει τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ σκέπη αὐτῆς
καὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς κλάδους αὐτῆς ἀλίσθησεται,
*he will place his children under her protection
and will reside under her branches,*

(A) וְיִשִּׁים קְנוֹ וְיִפְיָהּ וּבְעֵנְפֵיהָ יִתְלוֹנֵן:

τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ] 𐤇 קְנוֹ, literally ‘his nest,’ but here extended to mean ‘his nestlings.’³⁹

³⁷ Cf. GELS s.v. χεῖρ 1 *i.

³⁸ Unfortunately no Heb. text has survived of this verse. Cf. 𐤍 אֲזַלָּא תַחֲתֵי אִידָךְ 𐤍.

³⁹ Segal (93) thinks that 𐤇 misread the form as בְּנוּ, i.e. בְּנָיו.

ἐν τῇ σκέπῃ αὐτῆς] 𐤀 𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄 𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈 ‘in her foliage.’ In BH there occurs 𐤏𐤐𐤑 (K עפאים) as a hapax at Ps 104.12. The MS has added a vowel sign to the *ayin*, indicating the *waw* to be a mater lectionis. עופיה, however, cannot mean ‘her birds,’ because the substantive עוף does not appear in the pl. It can be used as a collective noun, “birds.”

14.27) σκεπασθήσεται ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ καύματος
καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς καταλύσει.

*he will be protected by her from heat
and in her glory will reside.*

(A וחוסה בצלה מחרב ובמענותיה ישכן):

σκεπασθήσεται] 𐤀 𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄 𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈 ‘and he seeks refuge.’

𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄] ‘in her dwellings.’ So 𐤏𐤐𐤑 𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕. Smend (139) thinks that our translator was thinking of Is 4.5f. It is not, however, immediately apparent why the translator thought of this particular passage, which is about Mount Zion.

𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄 𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈 𐤉𐤐𐤑 ‘he will be walking about,’ an error from 𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄 𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈 ‘he will be under a shade.’

CHAPTER 15

- 15.1) Ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον ποιήσει αὐτό,
καὶ ὁ ἐγκρατὴς τοῦ νόμου καταλήμψεται αὐτήν·

*He who fears the Lord shall do this,
and he who holds the law fast will grasp it.*

: א כי ירא ייי יעשה זאת ותופש תורה ידריכנה: (A)

: ב כי ירא ייי יעשה זאת ותופש תורה ידריכנה: (B)

αὐτό .. αὐτήν] The use of these anaphoric pronouns indicates the continuity with what precedes; αὐτό cannot be referred back to any particular neuter substantive, whilst the referent of αὐτήν must be σοφία. Though not represented in ⚭, ⚮, ⚮, ⚮ also shows that here we have a sequel to what precedes.

ὁ ἐγκρατὴς τοῦ νόμου] ⚭ תופש תורה, a phrase that indicates in Je 2.8 specialists in the law alongside priests. Here it does not refer to a professional סופר γραμματεὺς, which is captured by ⚭. ⚭ at Je 2.8 reads οἱ ἀντεχόμενοι τοῦ νόμου, which is synonymous with what we have here.

καταλήμψεται αὐτήν] ⚭ ידריכנה, a rather unusual equation. Smend is right in pointing out that in Aramaic the same verb root can mean “to reach, catch up with.” E.g. Syr. אָדָרָא. The same equation as here is found in vs. 7, where ⚭ reads נְדָרְכֹנָה.

- 15.2) καὶ ὑπαντήσεται αὐτῷ ὡς μήτηρ
καὶ ὡς γυνὴ παρθενίας προσδέξεται αὐτόν·

*And it will look after him like a mother
and like a virgin bride welcome him.*

: א וקדמתהו כאם וכאשת נעורים תקבלנו: (A)

: ב וקדמתהו כאם וכאשת נעורים תקבלנו: (B)

ὑπαντήσεται] ⚭ וקדמתהו. In view of the parallel προσδέξεται and the context both verbs must mean more than just “to say Hello, nice meeting you.”

⚭ [‘a wife you got to know as a young maiden.’ Cf. ⚭ μετὰ γυναικὸς τῆς ἐκ νεότητός σου < אָשֶׁת נְעוּרָיָא Pr 5.18, sim. Is 54.6, MI 2.14, 15. Here παρθενίας highlights the feature of virginity. Note ⚭ אַנְתָּתָא דְּבְתוּלִיתָא

- 15.3) ψωμιεῖ αὐτὸν ἄρτον συνέσεως
καὶ ὕδωρ σοφίας ποτιεῖ αὐτόν·

*It will feed him bread of understanding
and give him water of wisdom to drink.*

(A) והאכילתהו לחם שכל ומי תבונה תשקנו:
 (B) והאכילתהו לחם שכל ומי תבונה תשקנו:

The notion of food and drink in a metaphorical, spiritual sense is carried on by Jesus: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς Jo 6.35 and ὁς δ' ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἄλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ib. 4.14.

15.4) στηριχθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτήν καὶ οὐ μὴ κλιθῆι,
 καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐφέξει καὶ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνηθῆι·

*He will rely on it for support and will never tilt
 and will depend on it for help and will never be disappointed.*

(A) ונשען עליה ולא ימוט ובה יבטח ולא יבוש:
 (B) ונשען עליה ולא ימוט ובה יבטח ולא ...:

As pointed about above at 14.20, there might be temporal progression from ידריכנה (vs. 1) to וקדמתהו (vs. 2), and from תקבלנו (vs. 2) to והאכילתהו (vs. 3), but there is none from תשקנו (vs. 3) to ונשען (vs. 4). The author keeps to the *formal* model typical of CH, but not in terms of communicative substance.

στηριχθήσεται] **נשען**. For another example of this metaphorical use of στηρίζω, see καρδία ἐστηριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοήματος βουλήs Si 22.16.

15.5) καὶ ὑψώσει αὐτὸν παρὰ τοὺς πλησίον αὐτοῦ
 καὶ ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ἀνοίξει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ·

*And it will exalt him above his colleagues
 and in the midst of an assembly it will open his mouth.*

(A) ורוממתהו מרעהו ובתוך קהל תפתח פיו:
 (B) ורוממתהו מרעהו ובתוך ק ...:

παρὰ] on the value of “than” of comparative, see below at 43.28.

ῥעהו] used exceptionally in BH as equivalent to רעיו, i.e. pl. רָעוּ, Jb 42.10, 1Sm 30.26.

ἀνοίξει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ] in order for him to deliver an address, cf. καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων Mt 5.2. Without reference to **Ἡ**A the subject of ἀνοίξει can be “he,” cf. ἤνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα Si 51.25.¹

15.6) εὐφροσύνην καὶ στέφανον ἀγαλλιάματος
 καὶ ὄνομα αἰῶνος κατακληρονομήσει.

¹ For examples in BH and QH, see *DCH* VI 801a b (2).

*Joy and a crown of jubilation
and an eternal fame he will attain.*

(A) ששון ושמחה ימצא ושם עולם תורישנו:
(B) ששון ושמחה תמצא וש... :

[ימצא] om. G and S₁. In this paragraph the main player is Wisdom. The v.l. εὐρησει found in many sources appears to be secondary. However, S₁ תְּמַלֵּא (הו) = תְּמַלֵּא (הו) may reflect the original Heb. text. B actually reads תמצא, which has been changed to ימצא in the margin.

[κατακληρονομήσει] This Gk verb, κατακληρονομέω, can mean ‘to take possession of’ as well as ‘to give as possession.’² The latter reflects A₁ תורישנו = S₁ תְּמַלֵּא as against S₁ נָאֲרַת. For the first meaning we would rather anticipate αὐτῷ ‘him,’ which is present in A₁ תורישנו. Hence BS probably said יירש, i.e. יִרֶשׁ.

15.7) οὐ μὴ καταλήμψονται αὐτὴν ἄνθρωποι ἀσύνητοι,
καὶ ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν αὐτήν·

*People incapable of understanding will never grasp it
and sinful men will never see it.*

(A) לא ידריכוה מתי שוא ואנשי זדון לא יראוה:
(B) לא ידריכוה מתי שוא ואנש^ו... :

[καταλήμψονται αὐτήν] B ידריכוה; see above at vs. 1.

οὐ μὴ is occasionally used with a verb in the Fut. tense, so in the next verse as well. See SSG § 83 ca.

[ἀσύνητοι] B שוא, an equation unattested elsewhere in LXX. That this Heb. abstract noun was assigned by LXX translators a wide range of meanings is evident in that it is equivalent to as many as 15 Greek words and phrases.³ In BS, apart from ἀσύνητος, we encounter ἄχρηστος 16.1, πικρός 30.17, and δακνηρός 37.11. The same Heb. phrase as here also occurs at Jb 11.11 and Ps 26.4, though its respective Gk rendering is not ἀσύνητος.

15.8) μακρὰν ἔστιν ὑπερηφανίας,
καὶ ἄνδρες ψευῆσται οὐ μὴ μνησθήσονται αὐτῆς.

*It is far removed from arrogance
and deceitful men will never show interest in it.*

(A) רחוקה היא מלצים ואנשי כזב לא יזכרוה:
(B) רחוקה היא מלצים ואנש^ו... :

² So its simplex, κληρονομέω.

³ For details, see *Index* s.v. 361b.

ὑπερηφανίας] We recognise here the ablative force of the genitive case and it is dependent on an adverb; see *SSG* § 22 **qb, s**.

15.9) οὐχ ὠραῖος αἴνος ἐν στόματι ἁμαρτωλοῦ,
ὅτι οὐ παρὰ κυρίου διεστάλη·

*Not proper is a praise uttered by a sinner,
for it was not assigned to him by the Lord.*

(A) לא נאתה תהלה בפֿי רשע כי לא מאל נחלקה לו:
(B) לא נאתה תהלה בפֿי רשע כי לא ...:

The scribe of $\mathfrak{H}A$ inadvertently left this verse out, and subsequently wrote it above vs. 10.

[נאתה] This use of a stative verb in a proverbial saying supposed to be permanently valid is most appropriate. Cf. הלוא כול העמים שנאו עול וביד. כולמֶה יתהלך ‘all the peoples hate wickedness, don’t they? Yet it is rampant at the hands of all of them’ 1Q27 1.8.⁴

In spite of the morphological difficulty surrounding the three attestations of the related verb, what we have here must be Qal 3fs, i.e. נִאָתָה. Especially noteworthy are לִישְׁרִים נִאָה תְהִלָּה Ps 33.1 and נְעִים נִאָה תְהִלָּה Ps 147.1.

ἐν στόματι ἁμαρτωλοῦ] The use of בפֿי, when פֿה refers to an organ of speech, is unknown in BH. Likewise at 20.19, 24, 21.26, 39.35.

διεστάλη] a reading chosen by Ziegler against all the Gk MSS, following Hart (1909.135), who compares אֲשֶׁר הֶלַק דְּוִיד אֵס דיεστειλεν Δαυιδ 2Ch 23.18. Cf. אֶת־יְהוָה בַּת ‘it was given.’

15.10) ἐν γὰρ σοφία ῥηθήσεται αἴνος,
καὶ ὁ κύριος εὐοδώσει αὐτόν.

*For in Wisdom a praise should be raised,
and the Lord will help it to the end.*

(A) בפֿה חכם תאמר תהלה ומשל בה ילמדנה:
(B) בפֿי חכם תאמר תחלה ומשל בה ...:

[בפֿה] $\mathfrak{H}A$, most likely a scribal slip for בפֿי $\mathfrak{H}B$.⁵ \mathfrak{C} ’s translation here is rather free. Cf. 3.29.

[תחלה] $\mathfrak{H}B$, another obvious error for תהלה $\mathfrak{H}A$.

⁴ For a discussion with examples, see *SQH* § 14 c.

⁵ Strangely Smend (II 18) offers בפֿה, though he translates: “Im Munde des Weisen” (II 25). He also mentions לב חכם Si 3.29, which he renders as “Ein weises Herz,” but \mathfrak{C} καρδία συνετοῦ is quite acceptable, and in בְּפִה הַגֵּר Pr 11.9 הַגֵּר is not a nomen rectum, but the subject of the following יִשְׁתָּחֶה.

The second hemistich appears to be in order in \mathfrak{H} . Note also \mathfrak{S} וְשִׁלַּט בְּהַ נְאֻלְפִיָּה 'and He who rules it will teach it.' \mathfrak{G} 's departure from \mathfrak{H} , for whatever reason, is then substantial.

15.11) Μῆ εἶπης ὅτι Διὰ κύριον ἀπέστην·
ὃ γὰρ ἐμίσησεν, οὐ ποιήσει.

*Do not say "Because of the Lord I have become an apostate";
what He hates, He would not do.*

(A) אל תאמר מאל פשעי כי את אשר שנא לא עשה:
(B1) אל תאמר מאל פשעי כי כל אשר שנא אמר לך...
(B2) אל תאמר מה פעלתי כי את אשר שנא לא אעשה:

Including the doublet (B2), none of the three transmitted Heb. versions can be right in every detail. With some difficulty (A) could be viewed as meaning “.. because what he hates he could not possibly have done.” The second hemistich of (B1) is hopelessly corrupt. Could (B2) mean “Don’t say, ‘What have I done? For what He hates I will not do’”? All in all, (A) appears to lie the closest to \mathfrak{G} . The only adjustment required is to emend עשה to יעשה.⁶

ὅτι] absent in \mathfrak{H} . Just as כִּי, ὅτι optionally introduces direct speech. It is known as ὅτι *recitativum*.⁷

15.12) μὴ εἶπης ὅτι Αὐτός με ἐπλάνησεν·
οὐ γὰρ χρείαν ἔχει ἀνδρὸς ἀμαρτωλοῦ.

*Lest you say "It is He who led me astray,"
for He has no need of any sinful man at all.*

(A) פן תאמר הוא התקילני כי אין צורך באנשי חמס:
(B) פן תאמר היא התקילני כי אין לי חפץ באנשי חמס:

μὴ] \mathfrak{H} פן. Schechter + Taylor (XXXII) render the particle with “Lest,” whilst Lévi (111) and Mopsick (157) see here a mere prohibition: “Ne dis pas.” If we are to retain the particle, such an approach is problematic. פן, like μή, expresses an apprehension.⁸ Note \mathfrak{S} דְּלִמָּא ‘lest.’

ὅτι] see above at the preceding verse.

ἐπλάνησεν] \mathfrak{H} התקילני. No verb from וְקָלַל occurs in BH. RH knows נִתְקַל and הִתְקַל in the sense of “to stumble,” which does not fit our example.

⁶ Lévi (110) regrets \mathfrak{G} 's failure to comprehend \mathfrak{H} A, which, according to him, says “Ne fais pas,” for which we would expect either אל תעשה (better: אל תעש) or תעשה לא.

⁷ For details, see JM § 157 c and SSG § 79 c.

⁸ Smend (II 25) offers “Sage ja nicht,” taking recourse to הִזְקִיחְוּ אֶתְכֶם הַזְקִיחְוּ Is 36.18, on which Luzzatto (1867.276) writes: הישמרו לכם פן יסית ‘Beware lest he mislead you,’ i.e. a warning. Cf. GELS s.v. μὴ VII a.

At 13.23 and 35.20 we encounter נִתְקַל. On the other hand, JA attests to אֶתְקַל “to cause to stumble,” precisely equivalent to what we find here.⁹ Note אֶתְקַלְנִי.

Αὐτός] 𐤅 הוא. Both are emphatic: “It is none other than He,” pointing the finger at God.¹⁰ B) היא is a sheer scribal error.

χρείαν] 𐤅 צורך, B חפץ. BH and RH know a substantive צָרָה ‘need.’ In JA we find צֹרְכָא ‘need’ alongside צָרוּךְ ‘worth, benefit,’ which latter is reflected in אֶתְקַל here. חפץ ‘what one desires to have’ is closer to the former.

לי] 𐤅 B, an odd form, for which we anticipate לו, which is missing in 𐤅 A. Note אֶתְקַלְנִי.

ἀνδρὸς] 𐤅 אנשי. 𐤅’s selection of the sg. instead of the pl. ἀνδρῶν is possibly deliberate, for a sg. noun in a negative clause is known to indicate absolute, categorical negation, on which see above at 8.17 and also SSG § 83 f. Note אֶתְקַלְנִי בְּבָרְנָשָׁא עָוְלָא ‘a wicked person.’

15.13) πᾶν βδέλυγμα ἐμίσησεν κύριος,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαπητὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.

*Every abomination the Lord detests,
and it is not liked by those who fear Him.*

(A) רעה ותעבה שׁנא י״י ולא יאננה ליראיו:
(B) רעה ותעבה שׁנא אלהים ולא יאננה ליראיו:

πᾶν βδέλυγμα] = כל תועבה as against 𐤅 רעה ותועבה. In (B) רעה has been added in the margin. The unedited form of (B) appears to be the original. Note also the sg. object suffix in יאננה. 𐤅 represents the longest version: כּוּל בִּישׁוּתָא וּמְרָחֻתָא ‘every wickedness and boldness.’

ἔστιν ἀγαπητὸν] 𐤅 יאננה. 𐤅 probably means “He will not entice to it those who fear Him.”¹¹ 𐤅 וְלֹא נִתְּלַ אֲנִין לְרַחֲמֵיהִי ‘and He will not allow them to those who love Him,’ where the pl. pronoun is to be noted.¹²

15.14) αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον
καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ.

*He, at the beginning (of the creation), made man
and left him free to make his own mind up.*

⁹ See Jastrow 1950.1691a.

¹⁰ Cf. Muraoka 1985.47-59, JM § 146 a (1), SQH § 1 c (i).

¹¹ So understood, *pace* Smend (142) it is not very far removed from 𐤅: “God will not make it attractive, likeable to ..” Smend, adopting a reading suggested by Knabenbauer (1902), ἀπαυτητόν, not registered in LSJ, translates (II 25) “er lässt es nicht zustossen denen, die ..”.

¹² *Pace* Lévi (110) 𐤅 cannot be reflecting אֶתְקַל, m.sg.!

	ה
	(Aa) אלהים מבראשית (א) ברא אדם
וינתנהו ביד יצרו:	(Ab) וישתיהו ביד חותפו
	(Ba) הוא מראש ברא אדם
וינתנהו ביד יצרו:	(Bb) וישתהו ביד ...

Long before post-biblical Jewish theologians and philosophers began to debate the question of free will of mankind, we have here Ben Sira taking the matter up.

αὐτὸς and הוא (Ba) must have been deliberately added, for, in purely grammatical terms, neither is absolutely requisite. We would also note that they are positioned right at the head of the respective clause, and ℳAa uses אלהים, also fronted. The author probably wishes to underscore God's sovereignty. He is the principal player on the stage.

ἐξ ἀρχῆς] ℳAa מבראשית, a more explicit allusion to Gn 1 than ℳBa מראש.

ἐποίησεν] ℳ ברא. The primary source text regarding the creation of mankind is, of course, Gn 1. It need be pointed out that, even where ברא is used, it is consistently rendered with ποιέω when it goes about the creation of man: Gn 1.27 (3×), 5.1, 2, 6.7, Is 45.12, the sole exception to be found in למן-היום אֲשֶׁר בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם עַל-הָאָרֶץ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Dt 4.32.¹³

ἄνθρωπον] ℳ אדם; ℳ בני אנושא 'men, humans.' The Heb. text is focusing on the prototype, Urmensch, whose emergence is narrated in Gn 1,¹⁴ whereas the perspective of ℳ is forward-looking, viewing the first human as representative of mankind as a whole.

The first clause of the second hemistich in ℳ is absent in ℳ, ℳh, and ℳ. It is a virtual doublet of the second clause.

פּוֹר] As a verb occurs חתף only once in BH: הן יחַתֵּף מִי יִשְׁיָבּוּ Jb 9.12. In RH and JA חטף 'to snatch, rob' is much commoner. In Si 50.4 חתף is parallel to צר 'besieger.' חוֹתֵף thus denotes some potentially hostile entity.

יצרו] This concept (יצר) of fundamental importance to the subsequent Rabbinic anthropology makes its first appearance here. Its only other occurrence in BS¹⁵ reads λόγος ἐνθυμήματος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου < חשבון על יצר אחד Si 27.6.¹⁶

¹³ On the equation ברא ποιέω at the very beginning of the Bible, cf. Muraoka 2020.89.

¹⁴ The interlinear addition of ה, the definite article, might point in that direction. BSH has printed (א) on the line, but the facsimile is clear. So read also by Beentjes 1997.44.

¹⁵ However, see below at 17.6.

¹⁶ Schechter (51) refers to RGn 94.8: מושלמים ליצרם. The sense of the verb is unknown elsewhere but is an Aramaism, as demonstrated in ℳ וְאֵשְׁלַם אָנוּן בְּיַד יִצְרָהוֹן 'and He handed them to their inclination.' The quote from RGn is continued with תחת טובה 'and they pay kindness back with cruelty,' where we see the same root is used in its normal meaning.

For our translator, with his selection of διαβούλιον, a human being, granted free will, is no robot, but is capable of deliberating and reaching a decision as to what would please his Creator, and is accountable for his decision and subsequent execution.

15.15) ἐὰν θέλῃς, συντηρήσεις ἐντολὰς
καὶ πίστιν ποιῆσαι εὐδοκίας.

*If you so wish, you shall observe commandments
and loyalty to do (His) pleasure.*

: ותבונה לעשות רצונו	אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה	(Aa)
: גם אתה תחיה:	אם תאמין בו	(Ab)
: ואמונה לעשות רצון אל:	אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה	(Ba)
: גם אתה תחיה:	ואם תאמין בו	(Bb)

πίστιν] = \mathfrak{H} B אמונה, which fits better the following gloss with תאמין. Smend (143) holds that אמונה is predicate, as shown in his translation (II 26): “und Treue ist es, das ihm Wohlgefällige zu tun,” not impossible, but there is no difficulty in taking אמונה as a second direct object of תשמר and the following inf. clause as epexegetic, “by doing God’s will.”

εὐδοκίας] best parsed as pl. acc. parallel to ἐντολὰς.¹⁷

The last two clauses, “If you believe in Him, you will also survive,” have been preserved only in \mathfrak{S} , which lacks the preceding two clauses. Lévi (111) suspects that this is a Christian interpolation.¹⁸

15.16) παρέθηκέν σοι πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ·
οὗ ἐὰν θέλῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὴν χειρὰ σου.

*He has set before you fire and water;
wherever you wish, you shall put your hand out.*

: באשר תחפץ שלח ידך:	מוצק לפניך אש ומים	(A)
: באשר תחפץ תשלח ידך:	מוצק לפניך מים ואש	(B)

The first hemistich is linguistically anomalous in a couple of points. Firstly, number discord, for we anticipate מוצקים, though the subjects are of mixed gender: fem. and masc. Secondly, the combination of “fire and water” is striking as a menu for choice.

ידך] possibly a scriptio plena for sg. ידך. Cf. \mathfrak{S} אידך.

παρέθηκέν] \mathfrak{H} מוצק is an unusual equation, esp. with אש as a direct object. Since we find παρατίθημι הציג once at Gn 30.38, we could read here מוצג or

¹⁷ So “und die Treue, Wohlgefälligkeiten zu tun” (SD), and not “und Treue üben kannst du, wenn es dir gefällt” (Ryssel). In GELS we would list Si 15.15 under εὐδοκία 1 b.

¹⁸ Lévi writes that he is following Ryssel here, but we cannot locate anything of the kind said by the latter.

מוצגים, transformed by \mathfrak{C} as an active voice form. \mathfrak{S} שְׁבִיקִין suggests מוֹנֵחַ or מוֹנְחִים. However, Qal יָצַק, which means ‘to pour (liquid, including metal to be cast)’ extended its meaning in Hi. to that of ‘to set down, spread out on a surface,’ e.g. וַיִּצְקוּ אֶת־אֲרוֹן־הָאֱלֹהִים και ἔστησαν τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ 2Sm 15.24 and וַיִּצְקוּ אֶת־הַיַּיִן לְפָנָיו και ἔθηκον αὐτὰ ἐναντι κυρίου Josh 7.23, where the objects are diverse spoils of war. Παρατίθημι then could be accepted as a reasonable equivalent of הִצִּיק.

15.17) ἐναντι ἀνθρώπων ἡ ζωὴ και ὁ θάνατος,
και ὁ ἐὰν εὐδοκήσῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.

*Before men there are life and death,
and what he prefers will be given to him.*

(A) לפני אדם חיים ומוות אשר יחפץ ינתן לו:
(B) לפני אדם חיים ומות וכל שיחפץ ינתן לו:

ἀνθρώπων] \mathfrak{H} אדם, which is often collectively perceived. In the second hemistich, however, it is resumed in the sg. form. \mathfrak{S} is consistent: דְּגַבְּוֹן חַיִּים וְנִשְׁבָּקוּן מוֹתָא ‘so that they may choose life and leave death.’

Cf. רָאָה נְתַתִּי לְפָנָיָהּ הַיּוֹם אֶת־הַחַיִּים וְאֶת־הַטּוֹב וְאֶת־הַמָּוֶת וְאֶת־הָרָע Dt 30.15.
ὁ ἐὰν] \mathfrak{H} B כל ש- as substituting כל אֲשֶׁר כל is idiomatic in MH.

15.18) ὅτι πολλὴ ἡ σοφία τοῦ κυρίου·
ἰσχυρὸς ἐν δυναστείᾳ και βλέπων τὰ πάντα,

*Because the wisdom of the Lord is plenteous,
He is powerful with might and views everything.*

(A) כִּי סִפְקָה חִכְמַת יְיָ אִמְיָן גְּבוּרוֹת וְחוּזָה כָּל־ם:
(B1) כִּי לְרַב־ חִכְמַת יְיָ אֵל בְּגְבוּרָה וּמְבִיט לְכָל־:
(B2) סִפְקָה חִכְמַת יְיָ אִמְיָן גְּבוּרוֹת וְחוּזָה כָּל־:

None of the three Hb versions is an exact match of \mathfrak{C} .

πολλή] \mathfrak{H} B לְרַב־, which is used as a predicate in לְרַב־ הָיָה ‘it was plentiful’ 1Ch 22.14.

ἰσχυρὸς .. βλέπων] \mathfrak{H} מְבִיט / חוּזָה .. אִמְיָן. The syntax is loose, for the adjective and the ptc. in both \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} lack their s. Ἰσχυρὸς can hardly be a rendering of אֵל.

הִפְקָה] As a hapax in BH שָׁפַק means “to suffice,” which is not,¹⁹ however, the same as “many” or “much.”

βλέπων τὰ πάντα] Nothing could escape His eyes.

¹⁹ Pace Segal (98).

τὰ πάντα] $\mathfrak{H}B1$ and 2 כל $\mathfrak{H}A$ כלם makes no sense. Smend thinks that ם is a corruption of ך, but what or who does it refer to?

15.19) καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιγνώσεται πᾶν ἔργον ἀνθρώπου.

*And His eyes are upon those who fear Him,
and He can recognise every human work.*

(A) עיני אל יראו מעשיו והו יכיר (על) כל מפעל איש:
(B) ו... מעשיו והוא יכיר כל מפעל אנוש:

In the first hemistich there is a discrepancy between \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} “the eyes of God see his deeds.” \mathfrak{C} can be retroverted to ועיניו על יראיו. \mathfrak{S} is substantially distinct for the entire verse: וְכָל מַדְמָה עֵינָיו רֹאֶה וְכָל חֵשֶׁב בְּלִבּוֹ תִּרְעֵתָהּ וְכָל דְּבַר בְּנִי אָדָם. ‘everything His eyes see and He recognises all the thoughts of humans.’

αὐτὸς] \mathfrak{H} (הוא); on the emphatic function of the independent personal pronouns, see above at vs. 14.

(על)] Justly marked in the MS for deletion.

15.20) οὐκ ἐνετείλατο οὐδενὶ ἀσεβεῖν
καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἄνεσιν οὐδενὶ ἁμαρτάνειν.

*He did not command anybody to act impiously
nor did He give anybody leave to sin.*

(Aa) לא צוה אנוש לחטא ולא החלים אנשי כוב:
(Ab) ולא מרחם על עושה שוא ועל מגלה סוד:
(Ba1) . . . לחטא ולא למד שקרים לאנשי כוב:
(Ba2) כוב:
(Bb) ולא מרחם על עושה שוא ועל מגלה סוד:

οὐδενὶ] $\mathfrak{H}A$ אנוש; the feature of categorical negation has been captured by the translator, see above at vs. 12.

ἔδωκεν ἄνεσιν] $\mathfrak{H}A$ החלים, which in the context means something like “encouraged, induced,” a meaning that cannot be attributed to this verb anywhere. However, we find החלימו את יעקב παρακάλεσαν γὰρ τὸν Ἰακώβ Si 49.10.²⁰

כוב ‘deceitful people’] \mathfrak{C} οὐδενὶ, simplified and parallel to οὐδενὶ in the first hemistich.

The use of the object marker *lamed* in (B) is noteworthy. In BH Pi. לָמַד, whether used as monotransitive or bitransitive, takes a zero *o* with a person as a referent as in וְיִלְמַד עַנְוִים דְּרָכֹו Ps 25.9; more examples are mentioned in

²⁰ Schechter (52) proposes החליק, taking recourse to אֶלְיוּ בְּעִיְנוּ Ps 36.3.

BDB s.v. לָמַד Piel. So also in BS, e.g. 45.17 וַיִּלְמַד אֶת עַמּוֹ חֶק. A rare exception is הִלְמַד־דָּעַת Jb 21.22. See also below at 45.5.

The entire next line is missing in \mathfrak{C} , dropped out possibly due to the homoioarcton (לא): “He does not love him who performs acts of vanity and discloses a secret.” The first hemistich has been preserved in \mathfrak{S} וְלֹא מְרַחֵם וְעַל עֲבָדָי שׁוֹקֵרָא ‘and He does not love those who practise deceptive deeds.’

CHAPTER 16

16.1) Μὴ ἐπιθύμει τέκνων πλῆθος ἀχρήστων
μηδὲ εὐφραίνου ἐπὶ υἱοῖς ἀσεβέσιν·

*Do not want to have many useless children
nor rejoice over impious sons.*

(A) אל תתאוה תואר נערי שוא ואל תשמח בבני עולה:
(B) . . . שוא ואל תשמח על בני עולה:

ἐπὶ υἱοῖς] $\mathfrak{H}A$ בבני // B על בני. One should not jump to the conclusion that \mathfrak{G} reflects (B). \mathfrak{G} governs either preposition to indicate the occasion for joy. *εὐφραίνομαι* can govern ἐν and ἐπί (+ dat. as well as + acc.).¹ Beside instances such as *εὐφρανθήσῃ ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς* Dt 26.11 and *εὐφρανθήσῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐφρανθήσεται* Is 9.16 we also find not a few cases such as *εὐφρανθήσῃ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, οὗ ἂν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβάλητε* Dt 12.7.

πλῆθος ἀχρήστων] Nobody in his right mind would desire to have lots of useless children. The message must be that, even if you had many kids, why should you be happy or proud if most of them were good for nothing?

Ἄχρηστος is parallel to ἀσεβής, but the focus is on practical, utilitarian aspects. This differs from \mathfrak{S} בְּנֵי אֱשֵׁרָא .. בְּנֵי דְשׁוֹקְרָא.

\mathfrak{G} 's *Vorlage* could not have read תאר, though the proverb, as it stands, does make sense, because handsome sons could be an asset, not only pretty daughters. Τέκνον is gender-neutral, which cannot be said of נַעַר. Hence Ben Sira is focusing on lads.

16.2) ἐὰν πληθύνωσιν, μὴ εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτοῖς,
εἰ μὴ ἐστὶν φόβος κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν.

*Even if they multiply, do not rejoice over them
if there is no fear of the Lord with them.*

(A) וגם אם פרו אל תבעבם אם אין אתם יראת יי:
(B) . . . תשמח במ כי אין אתם יראת יי:

εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτοῖς] $\mathfrak{H}A$ תבעבם. Though in the MS there is no space, *εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτοῖς* must be meant; *תבעבם* is ensured by (B). *בועב* 'to rejoice' is unknown to Heb., but we find it in JA, e.g. *אָבוֹעַ בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם וְיִהְיֶה דוֹן בָּהּ עִמִּי* 'I will rejoice over Jerusalem and my people will exult over it' Trg Is 65.19. See above at 14.4.

¹ For details, see *GELS* s.v. *εὐφραίνω*.

[כי אין] If the two Heb. versions are to mean the same thing in the second hemistich, this need be emended to **כי אם** ‘unless.’ Though it comes to the same thing, *εἰ μὴ* here can mean ‘unless,’ cf. *GELS* s.v. *εἰ* 7 a. **Ⓢ**, however, appears to have the causal **כי**, though the text is slightly reworded: **מִטּוֹל דְּלֹא מְטוֹל דְּאֵלֵּהּ אֲדִלְהוֹן בְּדַחְלֵתָהּ דְּאֵלֵּהּ** ‘because they are not in the fear of God.’

16.3) μὴ ἐμπιστεύσης τῆ ζωῆ αὐτῶν
καὶ μὴ ἔπεχε ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν·
¶ στενάζεις γὰρ πένθει ἄωρφ,
καὶ ἐξαίφνης αὐτῶν συντέλειαν γνώση. ¶
κρείσσων γὰρ εἷς ἢ χίλιοι
καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἄτεκνον ἢ ἔχειν τέκνα ἀσεβῆ.

*You shall not count on their survival²
and do not depend on their multitude,
for you might sigh with untimely sorrow
and all of a sudden come to know of their decease.
For better is one than a thousand
and to die childless than to have impious children.*

(Aa) אל תאמין בחייהם ואל תבטח בעקבותם:
(Ab) כי לא תהיה להם אחרית טובה:
(Ac) כי טוב אחד עושה רצון מאלף ומות ערירי
(Ad) ממי שיהיו לו בנים רבים עֹלֵה ומאחרית זדון:
(Ba1) . . . חֵיִיהֶם ואל תבטח בחיליהם:
(Ba2) . . . עֲקֻבוֹתָם ...
(Bb) כי לא תהיה להם אחרית טובה:
(Bc1) . . . אחד עושה רצון אל מאלף ומות ערירי מאחרית זדון:
(Bc2) מִטּוֹב מוֹת עֲרִירִי
(Bd) ממי שיהיו לו בנים רבים בני עֹלֵה ומאחרית זדון:

Obviously we are faced with an extremely complicated textual situation here.

Let us first present **Ⓢ**: **לֹא תִתְקַל עַל תְּיִיְהוֹן וְלֹא תִהְיֶימָן דְּהוּא לְהוֹן הִרְתָּא טְבָתָא**: **מִטּוֹל דְּטַב הוּ חַד דְּעַבְד צְבִינָא מִן אֵלְף וְהוּ דְּמֵאֵת דְּלֹא בְנִיא מִן הוּ דְּהוּיִן לֵה בְנִיא סְגִינָא** **דְּעוֹלָא** ‘You shall not rely on their survival and do not believe that they will have a happy end, because better is one (child) who practises the will (of God) than a thousand, and he who dies without children (is better) than he who has many wicked children.’³ This Syr. version lacks the second hemistich of **Ⓢ**Aa

² Cf. *BJ* “une longue vie” and Mopsik (161): “longévité.” There is no basis for Segal’s (98) comment: “they will live, they will not die.”

³ Chrysostom appears to know a tradition which retains part of (Bc1) and (Bd): *καὶ κρείσσων εἷς ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα Κυρίου ἢ μύριοι παράνομοι.*

and (Ba1), whilst it has preserved a skeleton of $\mathfrak{H}Ab$ and (Bb), the message of which is somewhat different⁴: “for they shall not have a happy end.” \mathfrak{S} may have understood this as a prediction rather than a theoretical possibility and found the message too harsh and abrupt, hence the addition of “you shall not believe” and the deletion of לֹא . Finally, we also find the last two words of (Ad + Bd) not reflected in \mathfrak{S} .

$\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$] a minority reading preferred by Ziegler over $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ and $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ $\kappa\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$. בְּעִקְבוֹתָם ‘their posterity,’⁵ though pl. in form, does not necessarily imply a large number. By contrast, הִלִּיָּהֶם ‘their hosts,’ here not in a military sense, does carry such a nuance. Is the author, with the use of the pl., thinking of each child producing a large number of children?

3c-d are found preserved only in a small number of sources. We find no trace of this text in either of the two Heb. versions. All the same this addition makes for a good commentary on 3a.

$\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\omega\rho\omega$] The same phrase occurs at Wi 14.15, also about a father grieving on the death of a still young child of his.

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ η $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omicron\iota$] For whatever reason \mathfrak{G} focuses solely on the numerical contrast.

η] This particle of comparison, “than,” is used as a substitute for the genitive of comparison as in $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ‘my products are superior to choice silver’ Pr 8.19 in lieu of .. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omega$ η $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{o}\nu$. In our Si case, the selection of this latter, analytic structure has the advantage in that the contrast between the two numbers stands out a little more clearly than $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega\nu$. In the second instance there is no option, for the second member of comparison is an infinitive unless we add a redundant inf. marker: $\tau\acute{o}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta$.⁶

3f represents a substantially abbreviated version of \mathfrak{H} (Abc + Bbc), which could be retroverted to $\text{וְמוֹת עֲרִירֵי מֵאֲהָרִית זָדוֹן}$. The formulation in \mathfrak{H} leaves something to be desired, for it is not comparing like with like, though one could live with the absence of a tertium comparationis, as טוֹב in (Bd) can be said to be latent in the background.⁷

רִצּוֹן אֵל] $\mathfrak{H}Bc1$ makes better sense than רִצּוֹן אֱלֹהִים .

We encounter the equivalence $\text{עֲרִירֵי אֱטֵאֲנוֹס}$ for the first time in LXX at $\text{אֲנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ עֲרִירֵי עֶגְלוֹ דֵּה אֲפֹלֹוֹמַי אֱטֵאֲנוֹס}$ Gn 15.2.

⁴ *Pace* Lévi (113): “H.= S. exactement .. la similitude parfaite.” E.g. H. “to die” \neq S. “one who dies.”

⁵ According to Smend (145) it means “ihr (gutes) Ende, (ihre Zukunft),” and explained through (Ab, Bb), though he felt it necessary to add “(gutes).” He further proposes a Heb. word known nowhere so far: עִקְבוֹת .

⁶ On the use of this comparative η , see SSG § 23 **bd**.

⁷ As a matter of fact a trace of the adjective has been preserved in a secondary version of (Bb).

אחרית] Ad, Bc1, Bd means ‘posterity’ unlike the same word in (Ab, Bb) meaning ‘end.’⁸

16.4) ἀπὸ γὰρ ἑνὸς συνετοῦ συνοικισθήσεται πόλις,
φυλὴ δὲ ἀνόμων ἐρημωθήσεται.

*For from one man of understanding a (whole) city could be populated,
but (even) a clan of lawless people could turn into a waste land.*

(A) מאחד ערירי ירא ייי תשב עיר וממשפחת בגדים תחרב:
(B1) מאחד ערירי ירא ייי תשב עיר וממשפחות בוגדים תחרב:
(B2) מאחד . . . תשב עיר וממשפחת בוגדים תחרב:

γὰρ] Its addition as against Ad indicates the translator’s awareness of the close affinity between this and the preceding verses. Cf. גיר §.

ἐνὸς] Ad + B אחד. Since this cardinal numeral, when qualifying a noun phrase or its equivalent does not precede, but follows the latter,⁹ אחד is to be taken as self-standing, “one” contrasted to “multiple.” אחד is contrasted to משפחה ‘clan, family.’ Cf. סוגאא § ‘the multitude.’

Three Heb. words following אחד are compressed in Ad into one. Given our just presented syntactic analysis of the numeral, what follows was presumably meant as something like “even childless, as long as God-fearing.” The fear of God and the childlessness were two important subject matters in the preceding two verses.¹⁰ The translator must have been aware of this, but decided to replace them with another important theme, knowledge and understanding of things divine.

συνοικισθήσεται] Ad + B תשב. Cf. מְקַצֵּץ יְהוָה לֹא תִשָּׁב וְהִיָּתָה שְׂמֵמָה כָּלָה. ἀπὸ ὀργῆς κυρίου οὐ κατοικηθήσεται καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἀφανισμόν πᾶσα Je 50 (27).13.¹¹

φυλὴ] Ad, B ממשפחת, B ממשפחות. In Ad the preposition is indispensable on account of the parallelism with מאחד.¹² Whilst in Ad the subject of תחרב is עיר, Ad has slightly reformulated the message of the proverb. Note וְמִן סוגאא דְּבְנֵי־נִשְׂאָ ‘and from the multitude of people.’

⁸ In BSH the phrase מאחרית ודון is wrongly positioned in the second column below פורב מות ערירי.

⁹ Cf. SQH 26 b. A rare exception is found in in אהת פעם בשנה 11Q19 18.9 the non-standard, reverse sequence is emphatic, ‘only once (a year)’ // פעם אחת בשנה // 11Q19 22.16. Is our אחד also emphatic?

¹⁰ Segal (99) finds it logically implausible that a city is populated by a childless man, but he may have a wife, siblings, parents, domestic staff and a man of understanding could be childless.

¹¹ Thus, *pace* Lévi (114), there is no absolute need to emend the text to תושב or תנישב.

¹² Smend (146) accentuates the noun as φυλῆ, for which our translator would have said ἀπὸ φυλῆς.

- 16.5) Πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἑώρακεν ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου,
καὶ ἰσχυρότερα τούτων ἀκήκοεν τὸ οὖς μου.

*Many such things has my eye seen,
and more powerful things than these has my ear heard.*

(A) רבות כאלה ראתה עיני ועצמות כאלה שמעה אזני:
(B) רבות כאלה ראתה עיני ועצמות כאלה שמעה אזני:

[רבות .. עצמות] As shown by the n.pl. adjectives in Ⓞ here, the fem., esp. fem. pl., is often equivalent to abstract nouns. E.g. כול הנגלות ‘all that is revealed’ 1QS 1.8.¹³

[τούτων] = מאלה, ≠ ⓂA כאלה, cf. Ⓜן הלין. Ⓜ in ⓂB is implausible. In the facsimile of the MS we find כ more likely.

- 16.6) ἐν συναγωγῇ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐκκαυθήσεται πῦρ,
καὶ ἐν ἔθνει ἀπειθεῖ ἐξεκαύθη ὄργη.

*In a gathering of sinners a fire shall be set,
and among a disobedient nation wrath was ignited.*

(A) בעדת רשעים יוקדת אש ובגוי חנף נצתה חמה:
(B) בעדת רשעים רשפה להבה ובגוי חנף נצתה ...

[ἐν ἔθνει] ⓂA + B בגוי. Just as *Beth* of enmity, ἐν could “indicate a person to whom sth is done” (*GELS* s.v. 10).¹⁴

[ἐξεκαύθη] ⓂA + B נצתה. Smend (146) is right in saying that נצתה can be parsed not only as Pf., but also as Ptc., so Ⓜ שלטא. It is, however, very likely that our translator was thinking of אש ותכער-בם אש יהיה and ἐθουμώθη ὄργη, καὶ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτοῖς πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου Nu 11.1. He is sounding a warning: History might repeat itself.

[רשפה] ⓂB, the only attestation of the verb in Early Hebrew. An affiliated substantive, רשף ‘flame,’ occurs a few times in BH.¹⁵ להבה ‘a flame,’ which follows, suggests its synonymity with יקד in ⓂA. Our translator may have been unfamiliar with this rare word, given his rendering at כרשה ὡς πετεινὰ ‘like birds’ Si 43.17.

- 16.7) οὐκ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων,
οἱ ἀπέστησαν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτῶν·

*He was not forgiving towards the ancient giants,
who stood away with their power.*

¹³ Cf. JM § 151 d and SQH § 6 c.

¹⁴ Cf. Lévi (115): “contre un peuple impie,” but the parallelism asks for “Contre l’assemblée” rather than “Dans l’assemblée.”

¹⁵ In Samaritan Aramaic we find a substantive, רשף ‘flame’; Tal 2000.855b. Likewise רשף in JA: Levy 1959.II 440a.

(A) אשר לא נשא לנסיכי קדם המורים עולם בגבורתם:
 (B) אשר לא נשא לנסיכי קדם המורדים בגבורתם:

רשא] whose function is vague. It cannot be serving as a relative pronoun, for we miss an antecedent for it in the context. It is absent in \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{I} alike.

ἐξιλάσατο] $\mathfrak{H}A + B$ נשא ‘forgave,’ the sole instance in LXX of this equation. Ἐξιλάσκομαι primarily means “to atone,” which does not suit here. *GELS* s.v. *6 reads “to deal forgivingly with sbd,” which is applied to our case and also Κύριος ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐξιλασάσθω ὑπὲρ (דְּכַפֵּר בְּעַד) ¹⁹πάσης καρδίας κατευθυνούσης ἐκζητῆσαι κύριον 2C 30.18f.

τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων] referring to Gn 6.1.

ἀπέστησαν] which can be a rendering of either $\mathfrak{H}A$ המורים or $\mathfrak{H}B$ המורדים: the former equation occurs 2x and the latter 14x in LXX.

On a determinate ptc. referring to the past, see *JM* § 121 *i* and *SQH* § 17 *h*, and also at 6.14 above. Note also \mathfrak{S} דְּמָלוּ עֲלָמָא ‘who filled the world.’ Did \mathfrak{S} read הממלאים?

16.8) οὐκ ἐφείσατο περὶ τῆς παροικίας Λωτ,
 οὓς ἐβδελύξατο διὰ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν αὐτῶν·

*He did not take pity on Lot's neighbours,
 whom He loathed because of their haughtiness.*

(A) ולא (ע) חמל על מגורי לוט המתעברים בגאותם:

ἐφείσατο] \mathfrak{H} חמל. On φείδομαι περὶ τινος ‘to take sympathetically into consideration,’ see above at 13.12.

παροικίας] \mathfrak{H} מגורי ‘areas where one dwells,’ which παροικία can signify, but here, as shown by the following οὓς, is used in the sense of “resident(s) in the area.” So understood also by \mathfrak{S} : עֲמוּרָא דְקָרְיַתָּה דְלוֹט ‘the inhabitants of the city of Lot.’ $\mathfrak{S}b$, by contrast, is struggling: לָא חָס מְטוּל תְּוֹתְבוּתָה דְלוֹט ‘He did not pity on account of Lot’s residing (there) on those whom He rejected.’

ἐβδελύξατο] ≠ \mathfrak{H} המתעברים. The most likely restoration appears to be המתעבים, i.e. הַמְתַעְבִּים, which was transformed into the active voice. There is no הַתְעַבֵּר that would make some sense in our context.¹⁶ Despite his detailed discussion on the form in \mathfrak{H} we see nothing of the word reflected in Smend’s (II 26) translation: “die sicher waren in ihrem Hochmut.”

¹⁶ We have no idea what is the basis for Lévi’s (116) “se plaire aux transgressions.” Also Schechter’s (xxxiii) “transgressed.” As questionable is BHS’a (232b) “to become angry,” a sense assured in BH. Likewise Segal (99): המכעיסים “who make someone angry.” Does Hitp. have a causative value?

16.9) οὐκ ἠλέησεν ἔθνος ἀπωλείας
 τοὺς ἐξηρμένους ἐν ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν
 ¶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐποίησεν ἔθνεσιν σκληροκαρδίας,
 καὶ ἐπὶ πλήθει ἀγίων αὐτοῦ οὐ παρεκλήθη. ¶

*He did not take pity on a doomed people,
 those obliterated in their sins.*

*All these things He did to stubborn peoples
 and over the plentitude of His saints He was not moved.*

(A) ולא חמל על גוי חרם הנודשים בעונם:

ἀπωλείας] Here we have the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἔθνος ἀπόλλεσθαι, whilst we find ἔθνος ἀπόλλυμι (1x) and ἔθνος hi. (1x). Note ⚡ אָמַר אֶמְרָה 'a damned people.'

ἐξηρμένους] ⚡ נִדְּמָה, required to be corrected to נִדְּמָה 'trampled.' The translation is somewhat free, but cf. ⚡ נִדְּמָה בְּיַד ה' ἐν θυμῷ κατάξεις ('you shall destroy') ἔθνη Hb 3.12. ⚡ is rather free: ⚡ נִדְּמָה בְּיַד ה' מִטּוֹל לְמַאֲבַד מִטּוֹל לְמַאֲבַד 'He decreed against them that they should perish on account of their sins.'

παρεκλήθη] Here we encounter a use of the verb unknown prior to LXX: according to GELS s.v. *6 pass. c. "to allow oneself to be swayed by a plea to help."

16.10) καὶ οὕτως ἑξακοσίας χιλιάδας πεζῶν
 τοὺς ἐπισυναχθέντας ἐν σκληροκαρδία αὐτῶν.
 ¶ μαστιγῶν ἑλεῶν τύπτων ἰώμενος
 κύριος ἐν οἰκτιρμῷ καὶ παιδείᾳ διεφύλαξεν ¶

*And likewise six hundred thousand foot-soldiers,
 who gathered (in rebellion) with their stubbornness.*

*Flogging, pitying, striking, healing,
 the Lord, with mercifulness and discipline, guarded (them all through).*

(A) כן שש מאות אלף רגלי הנאספים בודון לבם:

The author alludes to Nu 11.21, where Moses is said to have 600,000 foot-soldiers under his command, and our author would later say that only two out of them, Joshua and Caleb, survived (Si 46.8). And yet, as Smend (148), the translator appears to have misunderstood נאספים here, which must mean 'perished' as in ⚡ נִדְּמָה בְּיַד ה' ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἴρονται Is 57.1, where we should note the preceding ⚡ נִדְּמָה בְּיַד ה' ὁ δίκαιος ἀπόλλετο. Note ⚡ אָמַר אֶמְרָה 'they were brought together.'

τοὺς] The direct *o* is conceived to carry on οὐκ ἠλέησεν (vs. 9).

The message of ⚡ is that, unlike what happened to gentiles, God's treatment of Israel flowed out of His loving concern for them.

- 16.11) Kån ḥ̄ eĩz skληροτράχηλος,
 θαυμαστὸν τοῦτο εἰ ἀθωωθήσεται·
 ἔλεος γὰρ καὶ ὀργὴ παρ' αὐτῷ,
 δυνάστης ἐξιλασμῶν καὶ ἐκχέων ὀργήν.

*Even if (only) one man is stubborn,
 it would be a marvel if he can get away unpunished,
 for He has mercy and anger,
 being an emperor ready to atone but also pouring out wrath.*

(Aa) ואף כי אחר מקשה ערף תמה זה אם ינקה:
 (Ab) כי רחמים ואף עמו ונושא וסולח ועל רשעים יגיה רגו:

εἶς] אחר, obviously an error for אחר. Its fronting is emphatic, hence “*Even if (only) one.*”

δυνάστης] probably = נשיא instead of אשׁף.

ἐκχέων] = יגיה, i.e. יגיה. The combination of this verb, whether in Qal or Hi., with יגיה is innovative. Pace Beentjes (1993), who opts for retaining יגיה, “on sinners He let shine His wrath” makes no sense: God’s wrath burns, but not shines.

- 16.12) κατὰ τὸ πολὺ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, οὕτως καὶ πολλὸς ὁ ἔλεγχος αὐτοῦ·
 ἄνδρα κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ κρινεῖ.

*Matching His great mercy is His criticism not negligible.
 He judges men in accordance with their deeds.*

(A) כרב רחמיו כן תוכחתו איש כמפעליו ישפט:

- 16.13) οὐκ ἐκφεύξεται ἐν ἀρπάγματι ἀμαρτωλός,
 καὶ οὐ μὴ καθυστερήσει ὑπομονὴ εὐσεβοῦς.

*A sinner would not get away with an ill-gotten gain
 and the patience of the pious would never remain unrewarded.*

(A) (א) [לא] ימלט בגול עול ולא ישבית תאות צדיק לעולם:

א] a correction inserted in the margin.

The second hemistich in א means “and He would not leave the desire of the righteous disregarded for ever.” S = G: לְאָ נְבֻטְל סְבָרָהוֹן דְּיִדְיָקָא לְעָלְם: ‘and the hope of the righteous would not remain idle for ever.’¹⁷

לְעָלְם] missing in G.

- 16.14) πάση ἐλεημοσύνη ποιήσει τόπον,
 ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει.

¹⁷ Pace Smend (148) the Mossul ed. does not read נְבֻטְל.

*He would make allowance for every deed of charity,
each would find (a reward) in accordance with his deeds.*

(A) כל העושה צדקה יש לו שכר וכל אדם כמעשיו יצא לפניו:

The translation is somewhat free. \mathfrak{H} , as it stands, would mean: “Everyone who performs a deed of mercy has his reward, and every man would, in accordance with his deeds, come out as acceptable in His presence,” where יצא is taken as an ellipsis for יצא ידי חובתו as in MH.

[כל העושה צדקה] Extraposed in casus pendens. Hence, *pace* Lévi (117), there is no need to read לכל. On the definite article, see above at 13.15.

[εὐρησει] = ימצא = \mathfrak{S} מְשַׁכַּח. A direct object need mentally be supplied, say שָׂכָר. If there stood מְפַעְלֵי, מְפַעְלֵתוֹ, פְּעֻלָּתוֹ ‘his recompense’ could be supplied. פְּעֻלָּה means “recompense” as well as “deed,” e.g. פְּעֻלַּת צְדִיק לְחַיִּים Pr 10.16.

16.15) ¶ κύριος ἐσκαλήρυνε Φαραω μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτόν,
ὅπως ἂν γνωσθῆ ἔνεργήματα αὐτοῦ τῆ ὑπ’ οὐρανόν.

*The Lord made Pharaoh too stubborn to get to know Him
so that His performances could become known to (the world) under
heaven.*

(Aa) י״י הקשה את לב פרעה
(Ab) אשר לא ידעו שמעשיו מגולין תחת השמים:

This and the following verse, though part of \mathfrak{G}^{II} , are exceptionally preserved in a Heb. manuscript.

[ἐσκαλήρυνε] Most likely Aor. rather than Impf. Cf. וְאֲנִי אֶחֱזַק אֶת־לְבוֹ εἶγὼ δὲ σκαληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ Ex 4.21.

[εἰδέναι αὐτόν] \mathfrak{G} took אֶשְׁכַּח as marking a purpose, but then one would expect ידעהו, i.e. יִדְעֵהוּ. So \mathfrak{S} יִדְעֵהוּ. Otherwise we would read the clause as meaning “who did not know Him [= יִדְעוֹ].” Cf. Pharaoh’s own words: לֹא יִדְעֵתִי אֶת־יְהוָה Ex 5.2.

[ὅπως] \mathfrak{H} -שׁ. In MH, albeit not in BH, -שׁ can introduce a purpose clause, but then we would anticipate an Impf., מְעֵשִׂי מְגֻלִּין or suchlike.¹⁸ Hence Lévi’s (117) “Afin que ses actions fussent révélées” is debatable. When we take the -שׁ clause here as a standard content clause, the ptc. מְגֻלִּין is grammatically perfectly in order.

This -שׁ clause is comparable to καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν Gn 1.4. See further in *SQH* § 31 I and *SSG* § 60 k; the -שׁ clause here elaborates on the preceding יו ‘Him.’

¹⁸ Cf. Segal 1927 § 514, where יְהוָה מִיְמֵי נַפְסָלִין שֶׁלֹּא יְהִי מִיְמֵי נַפְסָלִין ‘that its water may not be disqualified’ mYo 3.10 is cited.

ἐνεργήματα] On this hapax in BS, occurring also at 17.5, again in 6^{II}, cf. Wagner 1999.336f.

τῆ ὑπ' οὐρανόν] The substantivisation of the prepositional phrase is indicated through the definite article, see SSG § 6 a (i). Cf. the parallel πάση τῆ κτίσει in the next verse.

16.16) πάση τῆ κτίσει τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ φανερόν,
καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐμέρισε τῷ Ἀδαμ. ¶

*His mercy is manifest to the entire creation
and He portioned out His light and darkness to Adam.*

(A) רחמיו יראו לכל בריותיו ואורו ושבחו חלק לבני אדם:

φανερόν] יראו, i.e. Ni. יראו.

τὸ σκότος] 6 must have read either שבו or שבוה instead of 6's שבחו 'His praise.'

τῷ Ἀδαμ] 6 לבני אדם. In all the three remaining occurrences of Ἀδαμ in BS it refers to the husband of Eve, not the entirety of his descendants as here, e.g. ἐπὶ υἱοῦς Ἀδαμ 40.1 (6B על בני אדם).

16.17) Μὴ εἶπης ὅτι Ἀπὸ κυρίου κρυβήσομαι,
καὶ ἐξ ὕψους τίς μου μνησθήσεται;
ἐν λαῷ πλείονι οὐ μὴ γνωσθῶ,
τίς γὰρ ἢ ψυχὴ μου ἐν ἀμετρήτῳ κτίσει;

*Do not say "I could be hidden from the Lord
and who up there would care about me?"*

*In the midst of a very big crowd I could not possibly be noticed.
For in the unmeasurable universe what is my soul worth?"*

(Aa) אל תאמר מאל נסתרתִי ובמרום מי יזכרנו:

(Ab) בעם כבוד לא אודע ומה נפשי בקצות רוחות כל בני אדם:

ὅτι] introducing a direct speech, known as ὅτι recitativum. Its Heb. equivalent, כִּי, can also be so used as in וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי אֶת־שְׁבַע כְּבֹשֶׁת תִּקַּח מִיָּדַי καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβρααμ ὅτι Τὰς ἐπὶ ἀνάδασ ταύτας λήμψη παρ' ἐμοῦ Gn 21.30.¹⁹ Hence כִּי may have accidentally dropped out.

μου μνησθήσεται] 6 יזכרנו. In this case both μιμνήσκομαι and זָכַר mean "to take notice of and show interest in or care about" (GELS s.v. 4), not merely "I still have your name in my address-book." Cf. Lévi (119): "... se soucie de moi." One anticipates יזכרני.

¹⁹ More examples are listed in BDB s.v. כִּי 1 b. On the Greek ὅτι analogously used, see SSG § 79 c.

πλείονι] Strictly speaking the form is of the comparative degree of πολύς. A comparative may be used not only in lieu of a superlative, but also for an elative, “very much.” E.g. ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος ‘my lord [= husband] is rather old’ Gn 18.12;²⁰ see SSG § 23 **ba**.

The adjective כָּבֵד here has to do with a large number, not weight. Likewise in the same phrase in עַם כָּבֵד ‘a massive army’ Nu 20.20.

τίς] מַה. Here τίς is equivalent to τί, which is allowed where the noun referred to is of masc. or fem. gender. So also τίς σου ἢ ἐργασία ἐστίν; ‘What is your job?’ Jn 1.8. For more examples, see GELS s.v. τίς **I b**.

ἐν ἀμετρήτῳ κτίσει] The gap is huge vis-à-vis מְ “among the wide ranges of human spirits (?).”

כֹּל בְּנֵי אָדָם] This makes for too long a clause, absent in 𐤄 and 𐤅 but present in 𐤆: 𐤔𐤕𐤁𐤇𐤏𐤓 𐤁𐤏 𐤁𐤏 𐤁𐤏.

- 16.18) ἰδοὺ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
 ἄβυσσος καὶ γῆ ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ αὐτοῦ σαλευθήσονται.
 ¶ ἅπας ὁ κόσμος γεγωνὸς καὶ γινόμενος ἐν θελήματι αὐτοῦ. ¶
*Behold, the heaven and the heaven of the heaven,
 abyss and earth would shake at His visit.
 The entire universe has emerged and is emerging in His will.*

הַן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְשָׁמַיִם וְשָׁמַיִם וְהַיָּם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ (Aa)
 בְּרַדְתּוֹ עֲלֵיהֶם עֲמוּדִים בְּפִקְדוֹ וּכְרַגְשׁוֹ (Ab)

[שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם] This represents a well-known pattern of two identical substantives repeated and forming a cst. chain as an elative expression or equivalent to the superlative. E.g. הֵן לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְשָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאָרֶץ וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ. ἰδοὺ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ Dt 10.14. An example in QH is .. קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים .. מֶלֶךְ מַלְכִים ‘the holiest one .. the supreme king’ 4Q381 76+77.7. The same feature is shared also by SG: αὐτός ἐστι θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων Dn 4.37, which is an expansion of BA מֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיִם.²¹

In 18b there is a significant disharmony between 𐤄 and 𐤅, which latter is problematic textually as well. In עֲמוּדִים we have a kind of Ktiv (עֲמוּדִים) and Qre (עֲמוּדִים). Is standing up as a gesture of respect meant? One does not know, however, how heaven can stand erect. Scholars, e.g. Lévi (118) and Smend (150), have suggested מעֲדִים, i.e. מְעֲדִים. 𐤄’s σαλευθήσονται suggests יְרַגְשׁוּ, i.e. יְרַגְשׁוּ, a suggestion which presupposes that in the *Vorlage* of 𐤄 there did not stand מעֲדִים, for the verb רָגַשׁ can reflect

²⁰ Presumably not: “I myself am pretty old, having experienced the menopause ages ago, and he is even older than I.”

²¹ Cf. SSG § 22 **g** and SQH § 9 **c**.

σαλευθήσονται. We are inclined to think that \mathfrak{S} did not read the preceding ברדתו עליהם ‘as He descended on them,’ either,²² though that makes for an unusually short hemistich. Note \mathfrak{S} ’s second hemistich, which is as short, albeit in a different way: $\text{בְּגִלְגָּנָה דְּעִלְיָהוּן קָמִין}$ ‘on His appearance to them they stand.’

γεγονώς καὶ γινόμενος] The Ptc. may substitute a finite verb, thus in lieu of $\text{γέγονε καὶ γίνεται}$. On this morphosyntactic aspect fairly common in SG, see SSG § 31 g.

16.19) ἄμα τὰ ὄρη καὶ τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς
ἐν τῷ ἐπιβλέψαι εἰς αὐτὰ τρόμῳ συσσειόνται.

*Likewise the mountains and the foundations of the earth
would dreadfully shake together when He glances at them.*

(A) אָף קצבני הרים ויסודי תבל בהביטו אליהם רעש ירעשו:

[קצבני] a synonym of the following יסודי is missing in \mathfrak{S} , whilst the same cst. phrase occurs in Jn 2.7, where \mathfrak{S} , in vs. 6, reads εἰς σχισμὰς ὀρέων ‘into the crevices of mountains.’

τρόμῳ] \mathfrak{H} רעש. \mathfrak{S} reproduces the Heb. paronomasia by using a substantive that is semantically, but not derivationally, close to the verb, συσσειῶ ; the selection of σεισμάτι , σεισμῶ or συσσεισμῶ was an option. \mathfrak{S} is equivocal: רעש or רעש . Pace Segal (101) the use of the dative case here does not necessarily reflect בְּרעש . Note βρώσει φάγη ‘you are to eat by all means’ < אָכַל תֹּאכַל Ge 2.16.²³

[בהביטו] The *s* attached as a suf. pron. is not reflected in \mathfrak{S} . This can happen in SG when the *s* can be inferred from the context. See SSG § 69A ae and ag.

16.20) καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς οὐ διανοηθήσεται καρδία,
καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ τίς ἐνθυμηθήσεται;

*No human mind would ponder over them,
and who would consider His ways seriously?*

(A) גַּם עָלַי לֹא יִשִּׁים לֵב וּבְדַרְכֵי מִי יִתְבּוֹנֵן:

The gap between \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{H} is striking. The latter could be translated as ‘Nor would He pay attention to me and who would look into my ways?’ In the first hemistich \mathfrak{S} also diverts: $\text{יִאָּנָא אָנָא לֹא אָסִים עַל לְבַי}$ ‘Nor would I turn my mind (to them).’

²² Lévi (118) justly reminds us of the incongruity in tense of the two verbs: ptc. vs. impf. See also a convincing analysis by Segal (101).

²³ See SSG § 56 b for a discussion with more examples in SG.

διανοηθήσεται] The basic meaning of the verb is “to give thought to, consider.” Hence, *pace* Lévi (119), the form here would not reflect ישכיל or יין. Only once in LXX we find the verb used in the sense of “to understand, comprehend,” a sense unknown prior to SG: οὐ μὴ διανοηθῶσι (יְבִינֻ) πάντες οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί Da 12.10 LXX. Moreover a verb meaning “to comprehend” is unlikely to govern ἐπί τι.

καρδία] One of the definitions assigned in *GELS* to this high-frequency word applies here: 3. “*seat where human thoughts, intentions and attitudes are generated and take shape.*” A human heart does not think or consider. A heart (so *NETS*) or “Hertz” (*SD*) is a seat of emotions.

16.21) καὶ καταίγῃς, ἦν οὐκ ὄψεται ἄνθρωπος,
τὰ δὲ πλείονα τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις.

*A hurricane that nobody would notice,
very many of His deeds are hidden.*

אם חטאתי לא תראני עין או אם אכזב בכל סתר מי יודע: (A)

One can scarcely think of a greater gap between the two versions. \mathfrak{H} is a straightforward text: “If I committed a sin, no eye would see me, or, if I lie in perfect secrecy, who would find out?” What possibly motivated the translator so widely to depart from it? \mathfrak{S} is very much closer to \mathfrak{H} : לא אֶחְטֵא לָא אֵין אֶחְוִינִי עֵינֵי אֵין אֶחְדָּגְל בְּכָל אֶתֶר דְּמִטְשִׁי מִגּוּ יַדְע ‘if I sin, no eye would see me. Or if I lie in any hidden place, who could know?’

16.22) ἔργα δικαιοσύνης τίς ἀναγγελεῖ;
ἢ τίς ὑπομενεῖ; μακρὰν γὰρ ἡ διαθήκη.
¶ καὶ ἐξέτασις ἀπάντων ἐν τελευτῇ. ¶

*Who would announce deeds of justice?
or who could endure (it)? For the covenant is far off.
And there is an examination of all in the end.*

(מה) [מעשה] צדק־ מי יגידנו ותקות מה כי אצוק חוק: (A)

Ⓜ [מעשה] צדק־] In the MS we see מה on the line and מעשה above it. What did the scribe intend? In view of another interrogative, מי, following, the scribe must have meant to replace מה with מעשה, which accords with \mathfrak{C} . In \mathfrak{S} this verse is missing.

In 22b אצוק is a puzzler. BSH (161b) parses it as Qal Impf. of יצק, but its collocation with חוק is difficult, and in the edition of the text (p. 23) we see אצוק(!). This difficulty may have induced our translator to take a bit of liberty with his *Vorlage*. One cannot be certain that it read רחוק or ירחק. Is it far-fetched to read אועק, i.e. אֶזְעַק?²⁴ “What could one expect

²⁴ To the present amateur epigraphist the fourth letter looks more like *ayin* than *waw*.

for me to be expected to keep shouting קח?" For such a rhetorical question, cf. מָה־אֲנוֹשׁ כִּי־תִזְכְּרוּנוּ וּבִן־אָדָם כִּי תִפְקְדוּנוּ Ps 8.5.²⁵

ἀπάντων] “everybody (mpl)” or “everything (npl)”?

16.23) ἐλαττούμενος καρδία διανοεῖται ταῦτα,
καὶ ἀνήρ ἄφρων καὶ πλανώμενος διανοεῖται μωρά.

*One with a small mind thinks such things,
and a foolish and erring person thinks stupid things.*

:חסדי לב יבינו אלה וגב[ר] פֹתֵה יחשב זאת: (A

חסדי] Universally corrected to חסרי. Ⓞ has adjusted the grammatical number to יחשב (sg.) in the second hemistich.

διανοεῖται] On a sense of this verb, “to ponder,” unknown prior to SG, see above at 6.37. The verb בין in Qal can mean not only ‘to comprehend’ but also ‘to give thought and attention to, ponder,’ e.g. בֵּין תְּבִין אֶת־אֲשֶׁר לְפָנֶיךָ בֵּין נוֹהֵטִים נֹוֵי תὰ παρατιθέμενά σοι Pr 23.1.²⁶

גב[ר] What looks like *waw* is written in the MS above the word, but גבור semantically fits ill פוּתֵה ‘stupid.’ נָבֵר = Ⓞ, which is Ⓢ = גְּבָרָא, is preferable.

πλανώμενος] > Ⓞ. It is difficult to say with certainty what Ⓢ reflects: אֲנִי אֶבְרָא עָוִלָא ‘a wicked man.’

μωρά] Ⓢ זאת, which might represent a later attempt to vary the parallel אלה, which latter then was misread as אלת, i.e. אֲנִילֵת.²⁷ Note its collocation with נְחִלֵי פְתָאִים אֲנִילֵת in פְּתָאִים Pr 14.18.

16.24) Ἄκουσόν μου, τέκνον, καὶ μάθε ἐπιστήμην
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων μου πρόσεχε τῇ καρδίᾳ σου·

*Listen, child, and learn knowledge
and let your mind be attentive to my words.*

:שמעו אלי וקחו שכלי ועל דברי שימו לב: (A

From this point on Ben Sira presents a theological response to some sceptic views expressed in vss. 17-22: the creation of the universe by God (16.24-28), the creation of man (16.29-17.10), and the creation of Israel (17.11-14).

Ἄκουσόν] This Impv. form occurs twice more, both times, as here, uttered by Ben Sira to his descendant(s) or readership: 6.23 and 31.22, in the latter of which Ⓢ reads שמע בני. We submit that this implies oral instruction. On the question of reading aloud as against silent reading, see above at 14.20.

²⁵ Segal (102) would read אצור, whilst Smend (151) found the unqualified, indeterminate קוח as the o of נצר ‘to observe’ problematic.

²⁶ For more examples in BH, see HALOT s.v. בין qal 2.

²⁷ So Segal 102.

Whilst Ben Sira is addressing an audience consisting of more than one individual, as shown by the use of the pl. Imperatives, 6 individualises the text, which is also manifest in the added τέκνον.

16.25) ἐκφανῶ ἐν σταθμῶ παιδείαν
καὶ ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἀπαγγελῶ ἐπιστήμην.
*I shall disclose information systematically
and pass on (my) view accurately.*

(A) אביעה במשקל רוחי ובהצנע אחוה דע׃

ἐν σταθμῶ] 𐤀 במשקל ‘by weight.’ The author probably means that every proverb or every section of related proverbs is meant to be weighty, not to be treated casually.

παιδείαν] Information which embodies the author’s *Weltanschauung* or philosophy of life.

ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ] 𐤀 בהצנע, on the intriguing semantic aspects of which latter, see Smend (153), who justly refers to הצנע שכל ἐν ἀκριβεί ἐπιστήμη ‘with accurate knowledge’ Si 35.3.²⁸ On the difficulty presented by this Heb. word to another translator, see Muraoka 2022a.249.

Reading this verse in Gk, we get the impression as if the translator, presumably well versed in the Greek culture, were attempting to make the vocabulary and the wording congenial to his educated readership in the Hellenistic diaspora.

16.26) Ἐν κτίσει κυρίου τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς,
καὶ ἀπὸ ποιήσεως αὐτῶν διέστειλεν μερίδας αὐτῶν.

*When the Lord created all His works at the beginning,
by making them He assigned them to their (own) domains.*

(A) כברא אל מעשיו מראש על חייהם ...

κτίσει] a reading according with 𐤀 and preferred by Ziegler against all the extant sources, which read κρίσει,²⁹ which makes little sense.

Though κτίσει is a substantive, it is perceived as a verbal noun, and its verbal character is evident in the syntactic structure here. For, strictly speaking, κτίσει cannot govern an accusative case. Once this substantive has been selected there was no other option, for it cannot take two genitives, subjective and objective. By contrast, the Heb. inf. cst. can be followed by a substantive as a nomen rectum and a self-standing direct object as illustrated in the form here – ברא אל מעשיו, which could be rewritten as ברא אל את מעשיו.

²⁸ On an instructive discussion on the intriguing use of הצנע, see Smend 153.

²⁹ Ziegler is following Smend (153), who, however, had been preceded by Lévi (120).

κυρίου] a subjective genitive, as shown by Ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔκτισεν τὰ πάντα κοινῇ Si 18.1.

[על חייהם] for which Smend (II 20) holds that the original form presumably was עַם חַיִּים, which he renders: “da er sie ins Leben rief.” He refers to רוח־אֵל עֲשָׂתֶנִּי וְנִשְׁמַת שְׂדֵי תַחֲיִי Jb 33.4, the only possible חַיִּים in BH, which looks like rendering support to Smend. This instance reminds us of נִשְׁמַת וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו גִּשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם Gn 1.26, followed by וַיִּפַּח לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיִּים ib. 2.7. These two key passages indicate that חַיִּים in Jb 33.4 cannot mean “ins Leben rufen, schaffen” (Smend 153), which meaning is carried in fact by עֲשָׂה. Besides, God breathed His breath of life into the nostrils of Adam only, not animals and plants. As an alternative emendation we suggest עַם הַיּוֹתָם ‘when they emerged, came into existence.’ S’s Heb. *Vorlage* may have read this: עַם בְּרִיתָהוֹן.³⁰ Given Ben Sira appears to have the narrative of the creation of the universe in Gn 1-2 at the back of his mind, we would note that the first to be created was light. When God created (בָּרָא) heaven and earth, וַיֵּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי אוֹר (Gn 1.4). Here the sequence of the two key verbs is בָּרָא followed by הִיא. This accords well with our proposed emendation.

ποιήσεως] *Pace Segal* (104) this is no redundant repetition of the preceding בָּרָא. The latter is announcing the general theme of the current passage.

16.27) ἐκόσμησεν εἰς αἰῶνα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν·
οὔτε ἐπείναςαν οὔτε ἐκοπίασαν
καὶ οὐκ ἐξέλιπον ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν·

*He set their works in an orderly manner for ever
and their domains for their (coming) generations.
They did not starve nor became exhausted
and they did not neglect any of their works.*

ἐκόσμησεν] *Pace Segal* (104) κοσμέω does not mean here “to adorn, decorate.” Cf. κοσμησαι (לְסַדֵּר) προσφορὰν ὑψίστου παντοκράτορος Si 50.14, but שִׁנְיָ צִבְּטָ ‘decorated.’

τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν] a minority reading preferred by Ziegler, also according with עֲבָדֵיהֶוֹן. Ways in which creatures operate and function are probably meant.

τὰς ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν] Ben Sira is likely going on here about the creation of the heavenly luminaries.³¹ Note καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦς δύο φωστῆρας

³⁰ We follow ed. Mossul here as against Lagarde’s ed., which adds a seyame above the word, בְּרִיתָהוֹן “their creations” or “their creatures” makes little sense here.

³¹ So Segal (104), Skehan - Di Lella (281), and Snaith (85), for instance.

τοὺς μεγάλους, τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν ἐλάχιστον εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός, καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας Gn 1.16.

οὔτε ἐπείνασαν] One would anticipate οὔτε ἐδίψησαν to follow, which actually happens in **שׁוֹרָה־לֵךְ** ‘nor did they thirst.’³²

καὶ οὐκ ἐξέλιπον] What the verb means here is somewhat ambiguous, for it could mean “to lose stamina from their labours” (*GELS* s.v. ἐκλείπω **3**), which, however, would be tautologous vis-à-vis the preceding ἐκοπίασαν. We would also take into account the selection of a different negator, καὶ οὐκ vs. οὔτε. Hence our choice of *GELS* s.v. ἐκλείπω **1** “to abandon, desert, neglect.”

ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν] The preposition is an attempt to express the notion of “partitive” by means of a separate lexeme as in καὶ ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τῶν λίθων τοῦ τόπου (**וַיִּקַּח אֶת אֶחָד מֵהַאֲבָנִים**) ‘and he took one of the stones at the place’ Gn 28.11. This substitution of the classical genitive case by means of one of the more explicit prepositions such as ἀπό or ἐκ is typical of Koine Greek, and the process was, in the case of SG, most likely accelerated by the analogous use of **מִן** in Hebrew and Aramaic.³³ Note a v.l. in some sources: ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν αὐτοῦ οὐθέν.

16.28) ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξέθλιψεν,
καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐκ ἀπειθήσουσιν τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ.

*They did not harass one another
and they will not disobey His word for ever.*

ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ] a well-known reproduction of Heb. ... **וְאֵין אֶחָד מֵאֶחָד** for an expression of reciprocity in lieu of ἀλλήλους. See *SSG* § 9 **a, b**. The verb in this structure may optionally appear in the plural, e.g. ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον ‘so that they would not be able to understand one another’s speech’ Gn 11.7. See *SSG* § 77 **bb**.

τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ] The genitive of *showing concern for* meets us also in οὐκ ἀπειθήσουσιν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ Si 2.15, albeit here we are about anti-theological analogy. See further in *SSG* § 22 **p** (p. 139 and fn. 2 there).

16.29) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κύριος εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐπέβλεψεν
καὶ ἐνέπλησεν αὐτὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῦ·

*And thereafter the Lord looked at the earth
and filled it with His good things.*

³² The emendation suggested by Katz (1936.278), ἐπόνεσαν, has been rejected by Ziegler.

³³ Cf. *SSG* § 22 **c** and **v (x)**, and on the lexicalisation in Hebrew of the cst. chain with partitive value, see *SQH* § 21 **b (viii)**.

16.30) ψυχῆ παντὸς ζώου ἐκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς,
καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν ἡ ἀποστροφή αὐτῶν.

*He covered its surface with the soul of every living being
and it is their point of return.*

ψυχῆ] A large number of MSS read ψυχὴν, which Smend (155) justified on the ground that אִלַּם is doubly transitive, but the verb here is not אִלַּם, but most likely הִפָּק. This high-frequency Pi. verb occurs in BH only twice with two direct objects: יִשְׁׁ הַפָּקָאֵי Ez 16.10 and הַיְהוָה הִפָּק אֶת־מִצְרַיִם וְאֶת־מִצְרַיִם MI 2.16. However, we know of no instance of καλύπτω governing two acc. objects. The norm is <+ acc. - dat.> as in πόντω ἐκάλυψεν αὐτούς Ex 15.5.

For the general thought expressed in 30b, cf. a divine message to Adam, ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν Gn 3.19, and τὰ πάντα ἐπιστρέφει εἰς τὸν χοῦν Ec 3.20. See also Si 17.1.

ζώου] see above at 13.15.

CHAPTER 17

- 17.1) Κύριος ἔκτισεν ἕκ γῆς ἄνθρωπον
καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτήν.

*The Lord created man from the earth
and He returned him back into it.*

ἀπέστρεψεν] Whilst the notion of man returning to the earth on his death is part of the foundation of the biblical anthropology as is stated, e.g. in the last verse of the preceding chapter and that is the destiny determined by His creator, the statement here is striking all the same when we are told that God takes the initiative there with ἀποστρέφω here used as a transitive verb with God as its subject as against the same verb in Ge 3.19 used intransitively with man as its subject.

- 17.2) ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ καὶ καιρὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς.

*He gave them a limited number of days and the time
and gave them rulership over all that is on it.*

ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ] Most likely reflecting **יָמֵי מְסָפָר** or **יָמֵי מְסָפָר**. This idiomatic use of **מְסָפָר** occurs a few more times in BH,¹ but the use of the gen. is unattested elsewhere. Cp. ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ **רַבְרָבִים יָמֵי** Nu 9.20, ἄνδρας ἀριθμοῦ **מְסָפָר מְשָׁאָר** Ez 12.16

καιρὸν] Most likely the day of death is meant. **§** presents a theological exposition: **מִנְיָן אֲתָא דְיִמְיָא פְּלִגְ לְהוֹן דְנִהוּוֹן קְיָמִין** ‘He allocated to them the number of days for their life.’²

ἐξουσίαν] The words actually used in LXX are *κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς* [= τῆς γῆς] καὶ *ἄρχετε* τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Gn 1.28.

- 17.3) καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐνέδυσεν αὐτοὺς ἰσχυρὸν
καὶ κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

*As He saw it fit He fitted them with strength
and according to His image He made them.*

¹ See BDB s.v. **מְסָפָר 1 a**, and also *GELS* s.v. ἀριθμός **1 b**.

² Literally “they are around, alive.” We doubt, *pace* Segal (105), that the phrase alludes to **חַיִּית הַמֵּתִים** ‘the resurrection of the dead.’

καθ' ἑαυτὸν] The overwhelming majority of sources read κατ' ἑαυτοῦς 'to meet their need(?)'. Translations such as "Sich selbst [ähnlich] kleidete er ihn in Macht" (Smend II 28) and "in a strength like himself" (*NETS*) might have frightened man. Does **ס** הַתְּמַכְּתָּא mean "to His best knowledge"?

In view of καθ' ἑαυτὸν we could accent κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, see *SSG* § 11 a, p. 63, fn. 1.

17.4) ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάσης σαρκὸς
καὶ κατακυριεύειν θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν.

*He imposed the fear of him upon every flesh
and (the task of) ruling animals and birds.*

αὐτοῦ] = ἀνθρώπου. The shift to the sg. from the pl. (vs. 4) is confusing. **ס** is consistent with הַתְּמַכְּתָּא.

σαρκὸς] = θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν in 4b.

For the thought expressed in 4b, see Gn 1.28 quoted under the preceding verse. On the thought of animals showing respect or fear of man, see מְרַאָּתָּא מִפְּנֵי הָאָדָם עָלֵינוּ עַל כָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה עַל כָּל־הַחַיָּוִת עַל כָּל־הַיְּצֵרִים Gn 9.2.

17.5) ¶ ἔλαβον χρῆσιν τῶν πέντε τοῦ κυρίου ἐνεργημάτων,
ἕκτον δὲ νοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐδωρήσατο αὐτοῖς μερίζων,
καὶ τὸν ἕβδομον λόγον ἐρμηνεῖα τῶν ἐνεργημάτων αὐτοῦ. ¶

*They received the use of the five functions of the Lord,
As a sixth one He shared and conferred on them intellect,
and the seventh, word, an interpreter of His activities.*

πέντε] i.e. the five senses.

ἕκτον] an object complement, hence not 'a sixth intellect.'

λόγον] Snaith (86): "reason," = Germ. *Vernunft*, which is represented by νοῦν. In our view, λόγος here signifies the faculty and capability of verbalising our thoughts and communicating them verbally.

According to Grotius, a 17th cent. Dutch scholar, cited by Smend (156), this verse appears to have been inserted by a reader of writings of Stoic philosophers who spoke of eight functions, the last of which is missing here, namely σπερματικόν 'procreative function.'

17.6) διαβούλιον καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὀφθαλμούς,
ὄτια καὶ καρδίαν ἔδωκεν διανοεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς.

*A plan and a tongue and eyes,
ears, and mind He gave them to consider.*

διαβούλιον] This appears to be out of place next to three visible parts of human body. **ס** adds another limb of a human body: וְרַאָּתָּא מִפְּנֵי הָאָדָם עָלֵינוּ עַל כָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה עַל כָּל־הַחַיָּוִת עַל כָּל־הַיְּצֵרִים

וְעֵינָא וְאָדָנָא וְלִבָּא ‘and He created for them a mouth and a tongue and eyes and ears and mind.’ Smend (156) is probably right in restoring יצר misread by \mathfrak{C} as יצר in lieu of יצר. Note the equation יצר / διαβούλιον at 15.14 above. This restoration accords with \mathfrak{S} as just adduced. The first και may have been freely added by the translator as a consequence of his analysis of the presumed יצר.

ὄτα] As in \mathfrak{S} we anticipate here the conjunction γ , and the following και introduces the second hemistich.

ἔδωκεν] = \mathfrak{S} פּלַג, which according to Smend (156) might go back to חלק, which supposedly signifies “schaffen”.³

17.7) ἐπιστήμην συνέσεως ἐνέπλησεν αὐτοὺς
καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς.

*He filled them with knowledge (conducive to) understanding
and showed them good things and wicked things.*

ἐπιστήμην συνέσεως] a cst. chain in which N_1 is used to achieve, attain N_2 , e.g. τὴν ὁδὸν | τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς ‘the way leading to the tree of life’ Gn 3.24.⁴ \mathfrak{S} is rather free for 7a: יְחַכְמֵם וְיַחְשְׁבֵם ‘He filled their mind with wisdom and thought.’

ἐνέπλησεν] On the question of doubly transitive verbs, see *SSG* § 60 a-b.

17.8) ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν
δειξαι αὐτοῖς τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ,
¶ καὶ ἔδωκεν δι’ αἰώνων καυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ. ¶
*He imposed the fear of Him upon their minds
to show them the magnificence of His works.
and He allowed (them) to pride themselves for ages over His marvellous
works.*

The first hemistich is almost verbatim identical with 4a above, only the action was directed to non-human animate beings.⁵ Perhaps for this reason \mathfrak{S} lacks 4a and is followed by quite a distinct text: לְמַחְיוֹ אֲנֹן גְּבוּרָתָא דְעַבְדֵּיהּ ‘in order to show them His mighty, wondrous works so that they could understand His miracles so that they would tell of His fear in the world.’

φόβον] So read by Ziegler against the majority reading οφθαλμον.

³ Without saying it in so many words, he might be thinking of Arb. *halaqa* ‘to create.’ On this etymologising, see above at 7.15.

⁴ For a discussion with more examples, see *SSG* § 22 v (xiv).

⁵ Given ἔθηκεν (sg.), Smend (II 28) is hardly right in his translation: “damit [sie] seine Furcht in ihr Herz fassten.”

ἔδωκεν] This could also mean “He made it obligatory.” Cf. *GELS* s.v. δίδωμι 7, e.g. ἔδωκα αὐτῷ ἐν φόβῳ φοβεῖσθαι με MI 2.5 as against οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς κακοποιῆσαί με Gn 31.7 (*GELS* s.v. 16).

17.10) καὶ ὄνομα ἁγιασμοῦ αἰνέσουσιν,
and they shall laud the holy name,

Cf. **שׁ** יִהְיֶה שְׁמֵךְ יְיָ וְיִשְׁבְּחוּךָ אֱמֻנָתְךָ ‘and they would be praising His holy name.’

17.9) ἵνα διηγῶνται τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.
in order that they would relate the magnificence of His works.

17.11) προέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστήμην
καὶ νόμον ζωῆς ἐκκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς.
¶ εἰς τὸ νοῆσαι ὅτι θνητοὶ ὄντες ὑπάρχουσι νῦν. **¶**
*He set knowledge before them
and bequeathed them the law of life.
for them to realise that, though mortal, they are now alive.*

προέθηκεν] a reading adopted by Ziegler, following a couple of his predecessors, and agreeing with **שׁ** יוֹהֵמְךָ מִפִּי. The conventional reading προσέθηκεν is reflected in **שׁ** הוֹסִיף ‘He added.’

ἐπιστήμην] **שׁ** אֱמֻנָה ‘covenant.’
ἐκκληροδότησεν] **שׁ** הִלְמִי ‘He taught.’ Possibly a graphic confusion between שְׁרִיחַ and הִרְיָה?

17.12) διαθήκην αἰῶνος ἔστησεν μετ’ αὐτῶν
καὶ τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς.
*He established with them an eternal covenant
and showed them His injunctions.*

διαθήκην αἰῶνος] The second noun indicates a quality of the covenant. This is a well-established type of the genitive case, see *SSG* § 22 v (xvi), and this use of αἰών is typical of Si, *GELS* s.v. αἰών 1 c. Cf. διαθήκην αἰωνίαν Gn 9.16.

17.13) μεγαλεῖον δόξης εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν,
καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἤκουσεν τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν.
*Their glorious magnificence their eyes saw
and the glory of His voice their ear heard.*

τὸ οὖς] The shift to the sg. from the pl. οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ is striking. **שׁ** is consistent with יָרְיָהוּ וְאָזְנוֹ .. יָרְיָהוּ וְאָזְנוֹ. **¶** vacillates in the reverse direction: *oculus illorum .. aures illorum.*

17.14) καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Προσέχετε ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδίκου·
καὶ ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ἐκάστῳ περὶ τοῦ πλησίον.

And He said to them, "Avoid every wickedness."

And He commanded each of them about (his) neighbour.

ἐκάστῳ περὶ τοῦ πλησίον] This illustrates one of the well-known formulas for expression of reciprocity, “each other, one another,” as in ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον ‘so that they would not be able to understand one another’s speech’ Gn 11.7.⁶ The present case, however, differs from the majority of examples in which the first constituent is in the nominative case, serving as the subject of a clause. Here the dative case is due to the preceding αὐτοῖς. The Lord taught them about mutual relationship. Cf. **שׁ הַרְבֵּה עַל רֵבֵב אֲנֹן דַּבַּרְנָה**, where the selection of אֲנֹן, and not רֵבֵב, does not necessitate the attachment of a preposition to רֵבֵב.

17.15) Αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτῶν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ διὰ παντός,
οὐ κρυβήσονται ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ.

Their ways are always before Him,

they would not be hidden from His eyes.

17.16) ¶ αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκ νεότητος ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρά,
καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν
ἀντὶ λιθίνων ποιῆσαι σαρκίνας·

From their youth on their ways are focused on evil things

and they were not strong enough to make their hearts

from flesh instead of from stones.

ἴσχυσαν] The verb ἰσχύω, often with an inf., can be used as synonymous with δύναμαι, and esp. with χεῖρ as the grammatical s, e.g. ἰσχύει ἡ χεῖρ μου κακοποιῆσαί σε ‘I could harm you’ Gn 31.29. This verb, however, could mean the same without χεῖρ as in our present case. In BS we have a relevant case in μὴ οὐκ ἰσχύσετε ἐξῆρααι ἀδικίας] **אם אין לך חיל** ‘if you do not have enough strength to eradicate injustices,’ where, however, our verb is etymologically reflected in חיל.⁷ In our case its **ח** may have read **א** ל חיל היה להם חיל. That this usage is not a Hebrew calque is shown in its occurrence in books such as Wi (13.1, 9) and 4M (4.1), and even in non-biblical Greek.⁸ Finally, our case could come under *3 “to make strenuous efforts, endeavour” (GELS s.v.). In that case ל חיל did not have to be present in **ח**. **ל חיל** may have been there, though in LXX there is no instance of < ἰσχύω + inf. > translating this Heb. auxiliary verb.

⁶ For details, see SSG § 77 bb.

⁷ For more examples in LXX, see GELS s.v. ἰσχύω 2.

⁸ For data, see BDAG s.v. 2 (b).

On hearts of stone and hearts of flesh, cf. καρδία λιθίνη .. καρδία σαρκίνη Ez 11.19 and 36.26.

17.17) ἐν γὰρ μερισμῷ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς γῆς πάσης ¶
ἐκάστῳ ἔθνει κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον,
καὶ μερὶς κυρίου Ἰσραηλ ἐστίν.

*For in dividing nations of the entire world
He appointed a leader for each nation,
and the portion for the Lord is Israel.*

Ἰσραηλ] That this is the predicate of the clause is evident in **Sh** in view of the masculine gender of the suf. pronoun attached to the pseudo-copula: **וְהָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל דְּמַרְיָא דְּמַרְיָא**.

17.18) ¶ ὃν πρωτόγονον ὄντα τιθηνεῖ παιδείᾳ
καὶ μερίζων φῶς ἀγαπήσεως οὐκ ἀνίησιν αὐτόν. ¶

*Whom, because of his being the firstborn, He brings up through
education
and conferring (on him) the light of love He does not abandon him.*

17.19) πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνδελεχεῖς ἐπὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν.

*All their works are before Him like (under) the sun,
and His eyes are constantly (fixed) on their ways.*

At the end of 19a **S** adds **דְּגִיחֵי** ‘manifest,’⁹ which is parallel to **וְגִלֵּי** ‘and exposed’ in 19b.

17.20) οὐκ ἐκρύβησαν αἱ ἀδικίαι αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν ἔναντι κυρίου.

*Their injustices are not concealed from Him,
and all their sins are before Him.*

ἐκρύβησαν] Most likely a gnomic Aorist,¹⁰ cf. **S** **כָּסִין** as against the mechanical reproduction of **Sh** **יִשְׁתַּחֲסֵי**, and that makes sense in view of the second hemistich, a nominal clause, which is hardly a circumstantial clause, but a parallel statement.

πᾶσαι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν] Reworded in **S**: **אֲשֶׁר בְּנִגְוֹתָם דְּכָל הוֹן בְּנִגְוֹתָם** ‘the sins of all men.’

⁹ Pace Segal (106) the Syr. word here does not mean **דְּגִיחֵי** ‘rising’ (of celestial luminaries), for which we would expect **דְּגִיחֵי**.

¹⁰ On the gnomic Aorist, cf. *SSG* § 28 **dc**.

- 17.21) ¶ κύριος δὲ χρηστὸς ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ,
οὔτε ἀνῆκεν αὐτοὺς οὔτε ἐγκατέλιπε φειδόμενος αὐτῶν. ¶
*But the Lord, being benevolent and knowing His creature,
did not abandon them nor forsake (them), taking pity on them.*

ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς .. φειδόμενος] The use of the circumstantial participle is highly typical of Classical Greek and relatively rare in SG, partly because the participle in Hebrew and Aramaic is hardly so used. Hence its use testifies to the high literary standard of a given composition and/or its translator.¹¹

τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ] Most likely = יִרְצֵי. The underlying noun, רִצְיָה, cannot mean here “inherent, inborn disposition,” for which we would expect מְרִצְיָה.

- 17.22) ἔλεημοσύνη ἀνδρὸς ὡς σφραγὶς μετ’ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ χάριν ἀνθρώπου ὡς κόρην συντηρήσει.
¶ μερίζων υἱοῖς καὶ θυγατράσι μετάνοιαν. ¶
*Man’s kindness is like a signet-ring with Him
and a person’s graciousness He would preserve like the pupil of the eye.
Apportioning repentance to sons and daughters.*

σφραγὶς] a figure of valuable possession, cf. 49.11, Je 22.24, and esp. θήσομαι σε ὡς σφραγίδα (מְחַתְּמֵךְ), διότι σὲ ἠρέτισα Hg 2.23. See also שֶׁמֶטְלָה אֶמְצֵא אֶמְצֵא ‘sealed and deposited with Him.’

ὡς κόρην] a well-known figure of something very dear to oneself, meriting protection at all costs, cf. διεφύλαξεν αὐτὸν ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ Dt 32.10, also Ps 17.8, Pr 7.2, Zc 2.8.

- 17.23) μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξαναστήσεται καὶ ἀνταποδώσει αὐτοῖς
καὶ τὸ ἀνταπόδομα αὐτῶν εἰς κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν ἀποδώσει·
*After this He will arise and requite them
and their recompense He will bring down on their heads.*

- 17.24) πλὴν μετανοοῦσιν ἔδωκεν ἐπάνοδον
καὶ παρεκάλεσεν ἐκλείποντας ὑπομονήν.
*However, He gives the penitent a chance to come back (to Him)
and encourages those who have lost patience.*

πλὴν] This introduces a qualifying statement vis-à-vis what precedes, GELS s.v. 5.

ἔδωκεν .. παρεκάλεσεν] It is difficult to say with certainty whether the Aor. here is gnomic or a genuine preterite tense alluding to some events in the past history of Israel.

¹¹ See SSG § 31 d.

ἐκλείποντας ὑπομονήν] Smend (160) compares τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν τὴν ὑπομονήν Si 2.14 and ἀπολωλεκότι ὑπομονήν ib. 41.2, and remarks that in the former we have to do with rebels, and the latter is neutral, which could apply to our case here. But in 41.2, though describing very old people having little hope for the future (𐤏𐤓𐤌 𐤇𐤒𐤏 𐤇𐤃𐤁), the expression is parallel to ἀπειθοῦντι 'insubordinate.' Not every old man is a gentleman, but could behave like an obstinate, impatient person. All the same such a person would not be singled out as worthy of God's encouragement.¹²

17.25) Ἐπίστρεφε ἐπὶ κύριον καὶ ἀπόλειπε ἁμαρτίας,
δεήθητι κατὰ πρόσωπον καὶ σμίικρυνον πρόσκομμα·
*Return to the Lord and leave sins,
entreat Him personally and reduce stumbling-blocks.*

κατὰ πρόσωπον] With no gen. following, the phrase means "personally, individually," cf. ξ̄γνω κύριος αὐτὸν πρόσωπον κατὰ πρόσωπον Dt 34.10.¹³

17.26) ἐπάναγε ἐπὶ ὕψιστον καὶ ἀπόστρεφε ἀπὸ ἀδικίας
¶ αὐτὸς γὰρ ὀδηγήσει ἐκ σκότους εἰς φωτισμὸν υγείας, ¶
καὶ σφόδρα μίσησον βδέλυγμα.
*Go back to the Most High and part with injustice,
for He will lead (you) out of darkness into the light of health,
and utterly hate abomination(s).*

υγείας] One MS, 493, offers an etymologically orthodox v.l., i.e. υγιειας. Cf. υγιειαν Si 1.18, υγείας ib. 30.16. The shorter form appears first in the 2nd cent. CE.¹⁴

17.27) ὕψιστῳ τίς αἰνέσει ἐν ᾗδου
ἀντὶ ζώντων καὶ διδόντων ἀνθομολόγησιν;
*Who could praise the Most High in Hades
other than those who are alive and offer a confession?*

𐤏's wording differs a fair bit: ַּטוּל דַּמְנָא הַגְּנַנָּא אֵית לָהּ לְאֵלָהָא כּכּלּ מִן דְּאַבְדּוּ ַּאִתּוּ שָׁתּוּבָא לְהַ שְׁתּוּבָא לְהַ לְהַ וְהַבִּין לְהַ לְהַ דְּחִין דְּחִין אֵלֵּין הַלְּתָּא בְּעֵלְמָא הַלְּתָּא 'for what use is there for God in all those who perished in the world except those who are alive and offering praise to Him?'

¹² We can hardly follow Segal's (108) pastoral theology: "He comforted the sinners over their distress by promising them forgiveness."

¹³ For more examples, see GELS s.v. πρόσωπον 6 g, and cf. BA ad Dt 7.10, and Sollamo 1979.325-27.

¹⁴ On this orthographic / phonological development, see Thackeray 1909.63f.

- 17.28) ἀπὸ νεκροῦ ὡς μηδὲ ὄντος ἀπόλλυται ἐξομολόγησις·
ζῶν καὶ ὑγιῆς αἰνέσει τὸν κύριον.

*From a dead person, being non-existent, acknowledgement disappears.
One who is alive and sound could praise the Lord.*

ὡς μηδὲ ὄντος] < ὡς + ptc. > gives the reason or motive of the action expressed by the lead verb. See *GELS* s.v. ὡς 12. The selection of the gen. case is due to the preceding νεκροῦ; without the subject of its own ὄντος cannot be part of the gen. abs. construction.

ἐξομολόγησις] The underlying verb, ἐξομολογέω, cannot be said with certainty to signify “to thank.” *GELS* defines its meaning as “to express recognition, acknowledge orally and in public, often appreciative and laudatory.”

- 17.29) ὡς μεγάλη ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου
καὶ ἐξιλασμὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτόν.

*How great is the Lord’s compassion
and atonement for those who return to Him!*

ὡς] The use of this common, multivalent particle as exclamatory, with an adjective in particular, is quite idiomatic. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. VI.

μεγάλη] The selection of the fem. sg. form illustrates the tendency of the first of two or more coordinate terms following to become determinative.¹⁵

ἐξιλασμὸς] ܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ‘His mercy,’ tautologous vis-à-vis the preceding ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܪܝܚܝܗ ‘the mercy of the Lord.’ ‘Ἐξιλασμὸς denotes an act (ἐξιλάσκομαι) manifesting God’s merciful disposition.¹⁶ Cf. ܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ‘who forgives.’

- 17.30) οὐ γὰρ δύναται πάντα εἶναι ἐν ἀνθρώποις,
ὅτι οὐκ ἀθάνατος υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

*For not everything is possible for men,
because a human being is not immortal.*

The formulation in ܘܗܝ is quite distinct: ܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ‘because it is not like these among men. Nor is His [= God’s] thought like the thought of men.’ Cf. ܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ Is 55.8. The first hemistich as restored by Smend (162) deviates a shade too much from ܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ ܕܡܚܘܒܝܗ, even assuming, as Smend does, that our translator mistook ܡܚܘܒܝܗ for ܡܚܘܒܝܗ.

¹⁵ Cf. *SSG* § 77 kb.

¹⁶ *Pace* Smend (161) this Syriac substantive does not mean “Vergebung,” though its underlying Pael verb does mean that as well as “to be merciful,” inter alia.

υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου] **Sh** אֲשַׁנְאֲךָ בְּרַב, and not the standard אֲשַׁנְאֲךָ. Can the Gk phrase refer to a specific human individual?

17.31) τί φωτεινότερον ἡλίου; καὶ τοῦτο ἐκλείπει·
καὶ πονηρὸν ἐνθυμηθήσεται σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα.

*What is brighter than the sun? It, too, eclipses.
And flesh and blood conceives evils.*

S is rather expansive, midrashic: הוּא הוּ הָאֵל מִן אִמְמָא אֶלְמָא דְעֵבֶר דְעֵבֶר שְׁמַשׁ מְטוּל דְרַבְרָא הוּ וְדַמָּא הוּ וְדַמָּא הוּ לֵהּ הַשְׁמָשׁ הַכּוֹאֵהָ הֵן בְּרִנְשָׁא דְלֵא כְּבָשׁ יִצְרָהּ מְטוּל דְרַבְרָא הוּ וְדַמָּא הוּ וְדַמָּא הוּ ‘when the sun leaves the daytime, it is also affected by darkness. Thus is any man who does not control his inborn inclination, because he is flesh and blood.’

ἡλίου] a rather rare exception of the absence of the article, the addition of which is the rule with nouns referring to heavenly bodies, *SSG* § 5 e.

τοῦτο] One anticipates οὗτος, maybe due to the preceding τί.

ἐκλείπει] Smend (162) holds that this rendering follows **S**.¹⁷ But עֵבֶר means that the sun leaves the domain assigned to it, what ἐκλείπω does not mean here. Cf. *GELS* s.v.

πονηρὸν] This key word is absent in **Sh**.

17.32) δύναμιν ὕψους οὐρανοῦ αὐτὸς ἐπισκέπτεται,
καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες γῆ καὶ σποδός.

*He passes under review the power of the sky high up,
and men are all soil and dust.*

αὐτὸς] It is up to Him and His exclusive prerogative.

γῆ καὶ σποδός] Cf. Αβρααμ εἶπεν Νῦν ἠρξάμην λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον, ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι γῆ καὶ σποδός Gn 18.27 and ἀπὸ καθημένου ἐπὶ θρόνου ἐνδόξου καὶ ἕως τεταπεινωμένου ἐν γῆ καὶ σποδῷ Si 40.3, also 10.9.

Here again **S** presents its own theology: אֵל לְכַנֵּי אֱלֹהִים דְּשָׁמַיָא דְּשָׁמַיָא דְּשָׁמַיָא דְּשָׁמַיָא דְּשָׁמַיָא דְּשָׁמַיָא ‘God judges the heavenly hosts, also human beings who are dust and ash.’

¹⁷ A position often – too often in our view – taken by Lévi. The influence in the reverse direction is far more plausible. Van Peursen (2007.23-32) does not even discuss the possibility of **S** influencing **G**.

Smend (161) retroverts the second hemistich as ורע יצר בשר ודם “nach Syr.,” with which he probably means that both versions share the general thought expressed in vs. 31b, for **S** as it stands does not textually accord with his reconstruction. Ben Sira’s grandson and the Syriac speaking Christian community sharing some theological positions is not impossible. But when he writes “Syr. hat die schlechte Lesart καὶ ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐνθυμήσεται mit dem hebräischen Text kombiniert,” he is piling a hypothesis on a hypothesis, for no such Gk v.l. is known.

CHAPTER 18

18.1) Ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔκτισεν τὰ πάντα κοινῆ·

The One who lives for ever created everything altogether.

κοινῆ] ‘with all constituents involved’ (*GELS* s.v. κοινός **B**). Therefore no place for the theory of evolution. See also ‘Then all the people altogether [i.e. without an exception] (τότε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς κοινῆ κατέσπευσαν) hurried .. to worship their Lord’ Si 50.17.

Let’s note that **⚈** opens this new paragraph with what we find in 4b-5a in **⚈**, then follows (1): .הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִי מְשַׁבֵּחַ אֶת־מַעְשָׁיו אֲתָם אֵין מִיּוֹצֵר עָבְדֵיהֶם הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ **⚈** ‘Who can narrate His works or who can enumerate His mighty deeds? The entire universe is tested (?)¹ altogether.’

18.2) κύριος μόνος δικαιωθήσεται.

¶ καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ.

Only the Lord shall be considered just.

And there is none other than He.

18.3) ὁ οἰακίζων τὸν κόσμον ἐν σπιθαμῇ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ,

καὶ πάντα ὑπακούει τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ·

αὐτὸς γὰρ βασιλεὺς πάντων ἐν κράτει αὐτοῦ,

διαστέλλων ἐν αὐτοῖς ἅγια ἀπὸ βεβηλῶν. **¶**

*One who steers the universe with the span of His finger,
and all obeys to His will.*

*For He is the king of all, which are under His control,
telling among them the sacred from the profane.*

18.4) οὐθενὶ ἐξεποίησεν ἐξαγγεῖλαι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·

καὶ τίς ἐξιχνιάσει τὰ μεγαλεῖα αὐτοῦ;

Nobody was good enough to recount His works.

Who indeed could track out His great works?

ἐξεποίησεν] The verb is here impersonally used as in οὐκ ἐξεποίησεν τοῖς ἁγίοις κυρίου ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι πάντα τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ Si 42.17, where the syntagm <dat. pers. + inf.> is identical and **⚈** has a personal

¹ Possibly a scribal error for **⚈** ‘created,’ so Smend (163).

construction, B וְגוֹ' לְסַפֵּר אֶל הַסְּפִיקוֹ קְדוֹשֵׁי אֱלֹהִים 'the saints of God did not manage to recount ..'.

καὶ] The conjunction “reinforces an argument” (*GELS* s.v. 14).

ἐξιχνιάσει] preferred by Ziegler over the majority reading, ἐξιχνεύσει. The two verbs are synonymous. At Si 42.18 Ziegler has chosen the latter, ἐξιχνεύσεν. Two verses below there is no v.l. for ἐξιχνιάσαι (vs. 6).

18.5) κράτος μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται;
καὶ τίς προσθήσει ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι τὰ ἔλεη αὐτοῦ;

Who could size up His great strength?

Who could indeed keep on recounting His merciful deeds?

κράτος μεγαλωσύνης] We would identify here a qualitative genitive,² hence not “the strength of greatness.”

ἐξαριθμήσεται] Given the nature of the object, “strength,” the verb cannot mean here “to count up.” All the same the size of an object can be numerically (ἀριθμός) expressed. Hence instead of הַגָּמֵל (Segal 107, Kahana 477) we would restore דָּמָה from דָּמָה.

προσθήσει] Smend (163) suggests Qal הָסִי or Hi. הָסִי rather than הָסִי. But the suggested verb, rather rarely used in BH, means in Hi. “to annihilate,” which hardly suits our case. See Je 8.13, Zp 1.2, 3. Each new generation experiences God’s kindnesses, and they go back in the history, recalling numerous similar instances. Not a few people might not have enough mental stamina or memory power to keep recalling and retelling all those countless instances.

18.6) οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλαττώσαι οὐδὲ προσθεῖναι,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξιχνιάσαι τὰ θαυμάσια τοῦ κυρίου·

There is no decreasing nor increasing,

nor is there tracking out the wonders of the Lord.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλαττώσαι] The syntagm < εἰμί + inf. > may carry one or another modal value, in this case potential. The universe created by God was complete. It can be obligative as in οὐκ ἔστιν χαίρειν τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ‘the impious are to have no chance for rejoicing’ Is 48.22. For a discussion with examples in SG, see *SSG* § 30 **bec**.

18.7) ὅταν συντελέσῃ ἄνθρωπος, τότε ἄρχεται·
καὶ ὅταν παύσῃται, τότε ἀπορηθήσεται.

² Cf. *SSG* § 22 v (xvi). E.g. γογγυσμὸν πονηρίας [= γογγυσμὸς πονηρός] B דְּבַח רַעַב [‘evil gossip’ Si 46.7.

*When a man finished, that is just the beginning,
and when he pauses, he could then find himself in a dire, severe
difficulty.*

Unlike in the case of God, man's stamina and capacity is limited. He often finds it unavoidable to take some rest, but then he need start where he left off, and might not know how to carry on from there. In Segal's (109) view the author is still on man's exploration of inexhaustible wonders accomplished by God.

- 18.8) Τί ἄνθρωπος, καὶ τί ἡ χρῆσις αὐτοῦ;
τί τὸ ἀγαθὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τί τὸ κακὸν αὐτοῦ;

*What is man and what is his use?
What is good about him and what is bad about him?*

τί ἡ χρῆσις αὐτοῦ;] **§** is slightly expansive with יוֹתְנָהּ יִמְנָהּ יוֹתְנָהּ חֲנֻכָּהּ 'what is his weakness and what is his strength?'

- 18.9) ἀριθμὸς ἡμερῶν ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ ἔτη ἑκατόν·
¶ ἀλόγιστος δὲ ἐκάστου πᾶσιν ἡ κοίμησις. ¶

*The number of man's days is a hundred years at the most.
The time of anybody going to sleep for good can nobody logically explain,*

πολλὰ ἔτη ἑκατόν] Did man's life expectancy improve by twenty years since Ps 90.10 had been written? Ryssel (319) refers to Seneca, who, in his *De brevitae vitae* (3), says that even in his 100th year a man's true life-span may have been much shorter, wasted on lots of troublesome affairs.

ἐκάστου] The position of this pronoun vis-à-vis κοίμησις is striking in a book translated from Hebrew.

κοίμησις] a verbal noun of κοιμάω, a euphemism for "to die" and according to *GELS* s.v. **5** "to join one's forefathers on one's death." Cf. μακάριοι οἱ ἰδόντες σε καὶ οἱ ἐν ἀγαπήσει κεκοιμημένοι (**HB** **תמ**) Si 48.11. This is, in LXX, a word unique to BS.³

- 18.10) ὡς σταγὼν ὕδατος ἀπὸ θαλάσσης καὶ ψῆφος ἄμμου,
οὕτως ὀλίγα ἔτη ἐν ἡμέρα αἰῶνος.

*like a drop of water from the sea and a grain of sand,
so few years in endless time.*

In 10b **§** reads: אֲלֶיךָ אֲמַלְצָה אֶת יְמֵי אִתְּךָ וְאֶת יְמֵי אֲמַלְצָה מִן שְׁנֵי הַלְּאָ 'a thousand years from this world are not like one day in the life of the righteous.'

³ Cf. Wagner 1999.231f., 339.

18.11) διὰ τοῦτο ἔμακροθύμησεν κύριος ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἐξέχεεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.

*Therefore the Lord was long-suffering towards them
and poured out His mercy on them.*

ἔμακροθύμησεν] *GELS* s.v. μακροθυμέω **b.** defines its sense applicable here as “to take long to act and respond to.” The same verb is used elsewhere in BS with a different nuance, though with κύριος as the *s* and ἐπὶ τι (pers.) just as here: ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνη οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήση ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ‘the Lord will never tarry not keep them [= the pleading poor] waiting’ *Si* 32.22.

18.12) εἶδεν καὶ ἐπέγνω τὴν καταστροφὴν αὐτῶν ὅτι πονηρά·
διὰ τοῦτο ἐπλήθυνεν τὸν ἐξιλασμὸν αὐτοῦ.

*He saw and realised that their end was bad.
Therefore He atoned them more generously.*

On the syntactic structure of (12a), see above at 16.15. The message is that, according to God’s assessment, if humans continued to live as they were doing, their future prospect was not rosy.

καταστροφὴν] Two MSS, 315 and 679, read ἀναστροφὴν ‘life-style,’ which makes good sense, though ⸑ נְהַרְהֵרָה ‘their end,’ ⸑ הַ אֲרִיכָה ‘overthrow, and ⸑ subversionem all speak for καταστροφὴν.

18.13) ἔλεος ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ,
ἔλεος δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα·
ἐλέγχων καὶ παιδεύων καὶ διδάσκων
καὶ ἐπιστρέφων ὡς ποιμὴν τὸ ποιμνιον αὐτοῦ.

*Man’s compassion is directed towards his neighbour,
the Lord’s compassion towards every human,
questioning and disciplining and teaching
and bringing back as a shepherd (does) with his flock.*

τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ] This appears to be confined to one’s coreligionist or compatriot. In the fundamental source text on the principle of neighbourly love הַמַּצְוֵה הַזֶּה could have been cited to justify such a limitation: אֱמָרְךָ לְרֵעִי: הָיִיתָ יָאֵר הַמֶּלֶךְ וְהַמַּלְאָכִים וְהַמִּשְׁתָּבְּחִים וְהַמִּשְׁתָּבְּחִים וְהַמִּשְׁתָּבְּחִים לְפָנָיו לְרַחֵם אֶת לֵבְבִי לְפָנָיו לְרַחֵם אֶת לֵבְבִי לְפָנָיו *Lv* 19.18

ἐλέγχων] The grammatical *s* of this and the following three participles cannot be ἔλεος of neuter gender, but only κύριος.

ἐπιστρέφων] Turning those who are gone astray to their right path.

18.14) τοὺς ἐκδεχομένους παιδεῖαν ἑλεᾶ
καὶ τοὺς κατασπεύδοντας ἐπὶ τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ.

*He shows compassion to those who accept disciplining
and also those who hurry to His precepts.*

§ differs considerably: טַבִּיחוֹן לְאַיִלִין דְּמַסְבְּרִין לְרַחֲמֵיהּ וְלְאַיִלִין דְּמַקְבְּלִין לְדִינֵיהּ ‘Blessed are those who are hoping for His love and those who accept His precepts.’ מַסְבְּרִין = προσδεχομένους.

ἐπί] Ἐπί τι marks a target of action: “those who dash to get to His precepts.” Cf. *GELS* s.v. III 4 f.

18.15) Τέκνον, ἐν ἀγαθοῖς μὴ δῶς μῶμον
καὶ ἐν πάσῃ δόσει λύπην λόγων.

*Child, in doing kindnesses do not scold
and anytime when you make a gift, (make) no stinging remark.*

§ reads: בְּרִי לִמְן דְּמַטְאַב לְחַבְרָה לָא תְכַלָּא וּבִמְן דְּיַהֲב לָא תְבֹאֵשׁ עֵינַךְ ‘Child, do not impede one who is doing kindness to a friend of his nor be stingy to one who you are giving to.’

18.16) οὐχὶ καύσωνα ἀναπαύσει δρόσος;
οὕτως κρείσσων λόγος ἢ δόσις.

*Does not dew give respite from a khamsin?
So is word better than giving.*

Jesus is reported (Ac 20.25) to have said μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν. As long as one takes the message of vs. 15 to heart, there are occasions when giving is a blessing.

18.17) οὐκ ἰδοὺ λόγος ὑπὲρ δόμα ἀγαθόν;
καὶ ἀμφοτέρα παρὰ ἀνδρὶ κεχαριτωμένῳ.

*Behold, is (a kind) word not superior to a good gift?
And both are found with someone exceedingly favoured.*

ὑπὲρ] With an acc. it can mean ‘more than,’ cf. ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἀλαζονεΐα ‘superhuman boastfulness’ 2M 9.8. Smend (167), mentioning a v.l., ἀγαθός, writes that ἀγαθόν, its gender notwithstanding, can be the predicate of λόγος.⁴ § seems to be pointing in that direction: אֵית גִּיר מְלִתָּא טְבָתָא דְּמֵן מְהֵבֵתָא טְבָא הִיא ‘for there is a good word which is better than a gift.’ Likewise § לָא הָא מְלִתָּא תִּיר מִן מְהֵבֵתָא טְבָא נְל ‘Is not a word better than a gift?’

κεχαριτωμένῳ] Χαριτώω, a verb used only twice in LXX, the other occurrence in Es 4.25 L, and unattested prior to SG. Here “favoured by God” is probably meant. That is how Cambe (1963) understands κεχαριτωμένη as

⁴ On the discord of the neuter gender in SG, see *SSG* § 77 ce.

Mary was saluted by Gabriel (Lk 1.28).⁵ Possibly a misrepresentation of קִיָּוִי, which means “kind” as well as “pious”? ש has אֲנָשִׁים כְּשָׂרָא ‘proper people.’⁶ The preceding prep., however, ל, is probably an error for ע. שׁן reads גְּבָרָא אֲדִיָּוִי or גְּבָרָא אֲדִיָּוִי ‘happy, rejoicing man.’⁷

This proverb is cited as a Talmudic saying: “One who gives a penny to a poor person receives six blessings and one who comforts him with words receives eleven blessings” (bBB 9.2).

18.18) μωρὸς ἀχαρίστως ὀνειδιεῖ,
καὶ δόσις βασκάνου ἐκτῆκει ὀφθαλμούς.

*A fool might accuse ungraciously
and a gift by a niggardly person your eyes can not stand.*

ἀχαρίστως] Our semantic analysis of this word had better take into account the fact that it is an adverb derived from ἀχάριστος. This latter is fairly well attested in the Greek literature, albeit only four times in LXX, twice of which in Si. LSJ mentions two main senses: “ungracious” and “ungrateful.” Both ἀχάριστος and ἀχαρίστως ultimately go back to χάρις, which, in addition, carries another two senses: “kindness” and “favourable estimation.” All these four senses are well established in LXX.⁸ In derivational terms, χάρις is the farthest removed from ἀχαρίστως. Hence we find it more sensible to choose between “ungracious” and “ungrateful.” In our context a fool has nothing to be thankful for or nobody to be thankful to, hence our *ungraciously*,⁹ which is contra “undankbar” (SD) and Wagner (1999.169) “in undankbarer Weise.” We find as debatable Smend’s (II 30) “ohne eine Wohltat zu erweisen.” Do BJ “ne donne rien” and Skehan - Di Lella “before giving” depend on שׁן עַד אֲתָא טִיבּוּתָא לְ עַבְדָּא טִיבּוּתָא ‘before he does any kind thing’?¹⁰

⁵ Cambe does not refer to our Si example. Of the modern translations of Si consulted by us *NETS* alone interprets the word this way; others take it as indicating a personal character, “charming, gracious.” So Wagner (1999.325): “sich charmant/liebenswert/taktvoll erweisen.” LEH (660) apparently expect us to choose between three alternatives: “to be favoured, to be gracious, to be justified.”

On NT and the affiliated literature, cf. BAGD s.v., where the sense of the word is defined as “to cause to be the recipient of a benefit, *bestow favor on, favor highly, bless.*” BAGD l.c. also refers to καὶ μετὰ τοῦ κεχαριτωμένου χαριτωθήσῃ Ps 17.26 Sym.

⁶ *Pace* Box - Oesterley (380) the Syr. word here does not mean “saintly.”

⁷ Under דִּיָּוִי *SL* mentions its nominal use, ‘happiness,’ in one attestation of which it corresponds to κεχαριτωμένη, the above mentioned Lk 1.28 in the Harklean Syriac version.

⁸ For details see *GELS* s.v.

⁹ So Box - Oesterley and *NETS*, Ryssel “unliebenswürdige Weise,” and Snaith “tactless.” We propose revising accordingly the entry ἀχαρίστως in *GELS*.

¹⁰ *SL* s.v. עַד 2 b (2) confines לְ עַד in the sense of ‘before’ to its conjunction with the Impf. In a longer list of references in the *Lexicon* of Payne-Smith, s.v. עַד (2799a) we find a case with a Ptc., in addition to our Si example: עַד לְאֵלָּא טִיבּוּתָא ‘before he comes up’ 1Sm 9.13. *Pace* Smend (167) our Si example unlikely means: “während er nicht tut Güte.” In 1Sm 9.13 שׁן reads יְעִלָּא בְּתַרְסָא, which does not mean ‘whilst he is not coming up.’

- 18.19) Πρὶν ἢ λαλῆσαι μάθανε
καὶ πρὸ ἀρρωστίας θεραπεύου.

*Before speaking, learn
and before becoming ill, take good care of yourself.*

The first hemistich reads in **§** as אָרְוֶה לְ עֵז בְּעֵי שְׂתַכְתְּךָ לְ עַד ‘before you contest, look for a helper,’ where “look for” has a parallel in the second hemistich: אָרְוֶה לְ עֵז בְּעֵי הַרְבֵּה לְ עַד ‘before you fall ill, look for a doctor,’ what Smend (II 30) has adopted.¹¹ Pick a good home doctor?¹² It is difficult to fathom what stood in (19a) in **¶**.

θεραπεύου] One of the senses of θεραπεύω is ‘to cure.’ Here its middle voice means “virtually to cure yourself by taking good care of your body.”¹³ **¶** אָרְוֶה לְ עֵז בְּעֵי הַרְבֵּה לְ עַד ‘Be cured’ is too mechanical, making little sense.

- 18.20) πρὸ κρίσεως ἐξέταξε σεαυτόν,
καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς εὐρήσεις ἐξιλασμόν.

*Before judgement examine yourself,
and at the time of the enquiry you will experience atonement.*

κρίσεως] Either the judgement at the end of the world or on the yearly New Year’s Day (הַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׂמֵנָה).

ἐξέταξε] Pres. Impv.: not just on the eve of the judgement, but regularly and habitually.

ἐπισκοπῆς] On God’s visit as the judge, see above at 16.18.

εὐρήσεις] *GELS* s.v. εὐρίσκω mentions a sense of the verb unique to SG: “to undergo and experience,” most likely a calque of Heb. אָפַק. Note also ὁ ἐκδικῶν παρὰ κυρίου εὐρήσει ἐκδίκησιν Si 28.1.

§ is mysterious: וְעַד לְ אֵל תִּמְטֵךְ עָרְוֶה לְ עֵז. וְלִבְנֵי דְעָרְוֶה תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְתַעֲבֹד. ‘before a trouble befalls you, pray, and at the time of the trouble you will find it, but it will respond to you.’

- 18.21) πρὶν ἀρρωστῆσαι σε ταπεινώθητι
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἁμαρτημάτων δεῖξον ἐπιστροφὴν.

*Before you fall ill, humble yourself
and at the time of sins committed, show your repentance.*

ἀρρωστῆσαι] Smend (168) thinks that, after vs. 19, there is no more place for a talk about illness. The hypothetical **¶** is said to have had a form of כְּשֶׁל, which is often translated in LXX with ἀσθενέω, and he invokes **§** תִּתְקַל.

¹¹ Box - Oesterley has taken **§** over for the entire verse.

¹² Is this what Snaith means with “consult a doctor”? Can θεραπεύου mean that?

¹³ So also Ryssel “sorge für deine Gesundheit.” Cf. Skehan - Di Lella “prepare the cure.”

ταπεινώθητι] This might indicate an attitude taken at the time of fasting, as in καὶ ἐκάλεσα ἐκεῖ νηστείαν ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν Αουε τοῦ ταπεινωθῆναι (𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆𐤆) ἐνώπιον θεοῦ ἡμῶν 2E 8.21, see also Da 10.12 LXX.

ἐπιστροφήν] Most likely = 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆, on which see below at 49.2.

One's sense of guilt and remorse could be outwardly visible, e.g. by being seen as fasting or by visiting a neighbour from whom one stole something and returning it with an apology. Cf. the words of John the Baptist: ποιήσατε οὖν καρπὸς ἄξιους τῆς μετανοίας Lk 3.8, sim. Mt 3.8.

Note 𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤇 𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 'Before you stumble, pray and entreat. And before you commit a sin, give alms.'

18.22) μὴ ἐμποδισθῆς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι εὐχὴν εὐκαιρῶς
καὶ μὴ μείνης ἕως θανάτου δικαιοθῆναι.

*Do not become impeded in fulfilling (your) vow in good time
and do not wait till your death for you to come free.*

𐤏 is rather expansive: 𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 'Do not be delayed in removing your sins. And do not keep neglecting until it begins to hurt you. Do not take too much time to part with your sins. Remember that death does not become delayed.'

18.23) πρὶν εὐξασθαι ἐτοίμασον σεαυτὸν
καὶ μὴ γίνου ὡς ἄνθρωπος πειράζων τὸν κύριον.

*Before making a vow, prepare yourself
and do not become like a man testing the Lord.*

σεαυτὸν] As Smend (168) notes, a couple of daughter versions presuppose τὴν ψυχὴν σου, which could be an error for τὴν εὐχὴν σου 'your vow.' Did copyists of *all* the Gk MS's of Si attempt to remove a Hebraistic reflexive pronoun with a proper equivalent? We are not convinced.

πειράζων] To find out if God will penalise you for an oath you have failed to fulfil.

At the end 𐤏 adds: 𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤅𐤒𐤆 'Do not continue to commit sins, because with the first ones you did not come clean.' When 𐤏 as it stands makes good sense, there is hardly any place for Smend's (169) assumption that the underlying Heb. was כמתעב 'as one misleading' instead of כמנסה.

18.24) μνήσθητι θυμοῦ ἐν ἡμέραις τελευτῆς
καὶ καιρὸν ἐκδικήσεως ἐν ἀποστροφήῃ προσώπου.

*Remember (God's) anger in the final era
and the time of punishment when He turns His face away.*

ἡμέραις] The Impv. is addressed to a single individual. It is difficult to imagine that the dat. pl. is a reference to the day of his death.¹⁴ Ziegler as well as Swete and Rahlfs have rejected the v.l. ἡμερα preserved by a considerable number of witnesses.

καιρὸν] // θυμοῦ (gen.), sim. μνήσθητι ἐντολῶν .. καὶ διαθήκην ὑπίστου Si 28.7.

In vs. 24b of S we see quite a different image of God: אֵל אֲהַרְצֶךָ אֲנִי־בְיָמֶיךָ אֶפְרָח לְפָנֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ 'on the day of (your trouble) He will not turn (His) face away from you.'

18.25) μνήσθητι καιρὸν λιμοῦ ἐν καιρῷ πλεθμονῆς,
πτωχείαν καὶ ἔνδειαν ἐν ἡμέραις πλούτου.

*Remember the time of famine in the time of plenty,
poverty and scarcity in the days of wealth.*

18.26) ἀπὸ πρωῒθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας μεταβάλλει καιρὸς,
καὶ πάντα ἔστιν ταχινὰ ἔναντι κυρίου.

*Time changes from early morning till evening,
and all happen fast in front of the Lord.*

ἀπὸ πρωῒθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας] also at Ex 18.13 = בְּרַצְיָה־עַד־רַבְצָה־מָוֶן. The message of the clause must be about constant movement forward of time, not from A to B.

ταχινὰ] S יִרְפָּשׁ 'beautiful.'

18.27) Ἄνθρωπος σοφὸς ἐν παντὶ εὐλαβηθήσεται
καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις ἁμαρτιῶν προσέξει ἀπὸ πλημμελείας.

*A wise person acts cautiously in everything
and in the days of sins shall beware of error(s).*

ἐν παντὶ] Segal (112) dismisses this off as a scribal error for διὰ παντός 'always' (his דַּיָּמָה), which is not much more than an unfounded assertion. Cf. S יִיָּהֵב לְיָיָהּ, S וְאֵלֶיךָ מְדַבֵּר, and X *omnibus*.

εὐλαβηθήσεται] S יִשָּׂא 'will be anxious, concerned.'

Note the end of vs. 27b in S: אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה־לְּךָ מִן־הַרְּעָה אֵלֶיךָ 'he will not be afraid of the evil.'

¹⁴ Thus "in den Tagen deines Todes" (Ryssel) and "in days of death" (NETS) are debatable. To translate the phrase as "the latter day" and take it as meaning "the day of death" (Box - Oesterley) is confusing. Smend's (169) "die letzten Lebensjahre des Einzelnen" sounds artificial.

18.28) πᾶς συνετὸς ἔγνω σοφίαν
καὶ τῷ εὐρόντι αὐτὴν δώσει ἐξομολόγησιν.

*Every intelligent person came to know wisdom
and to the one who found it he shall give thanks.*

ἐξομολόγησιν] The word might mean ‘confession, recognition.’

The second hemistich appears to be in disarray. One would anticipate it to start with καὶ ὁ εὐρών. Segal (112f.) presents a unique analysis, retroverting δώσει to **וְהָיָה**, thus with σοφία as the grammatical *s* and the wisdom giving full marks to its finder and praising him to the sky. The collocation δίδωμι ἐξομολόγησιν occurs in LXX twice, once in ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ἐξομολόγησιν ἀγίῳ ὑψίστῳ ῥήματι δόξης Si 47.8, where the subject is Nathan, and the other in Δὸς δόξαν σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ Ἰσραηλ καὶ δὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν καὶ ἀνάγγειλόν μοι τί ἐποίησας, καὶ μὴ κρύψῃς ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ Josh 7.19, where Achan, caught red-handed, confesses his sins to Joshua. All in all, Segal’s exegesis does not quite convince us.

Note some gap between **ו** and **ש**: **לְכָל חָכָם וְלְכָל יוֹדֵי חָכְמָה יְהִי עֲלֵיהֶם לְעֵשֶׂת דְּבָרִים וְלְכָל יוֹדֵי חָכְמָה יְהִי עֲלֵיהֶם לְעֵשֶׂת דְּבָרִים** ‘it is incumbent on every wise man to teach wisdom and on those who know it to give an expression of thanks.’

18.29) συνετοὶ ἐν λόγοις καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσοφίσαντο
καὶ ἀνώμβρησαν παροιμίας ἀκριβεῖς.
¶ κρείσσων παρρησία ἐν δεσπότῃ μόνῳ
ἢ περ νεκρῶ καρδία νεκρῶ ἀντέχεσθαι. ¶

*The intelligent in discourse, they, too, performed wisely
and poured forth proverbs to the point.*

*Candid discourse in dependence on the only master is better
than to be devoted with a lifeless heart to a lifeless (god).*

συνετοὶ ἐν λόγοις] An alternative understanding has been suggested by Smend (170): “diejenigen, welche die überlieferte Weisheit begriffen haben.” On ἐν marking the object of understanding, cf. σύνες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, οἷς ἐγὼ λαλῶ πρὸς σέ Da 10.11 TH.¹⁵

ἐσοφίσαντο] On the basis of **ש** **וְהָיָה כְּמִלְחָמָה** Smend (171) postulates **וְהָיָה כְּמִלְחָמָה** as latent in **ו** and offers a more focused interpretation: “als Weisheitslehrer auftreten.”

Note (29b) in **ש**: **אֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ לְיָדָם לְדַבֵּר אֶת הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים וְלְדַבֵּר אֶת הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים** ‘and they would come to know thoroughly the words of proverbs and the words of wisdom and teaching of the soul.’

¹⁵ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. συνίημι **1a**.

Ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς
Self-control

- 18.30) Ὅπισω τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν σου μὴ πορεύου
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέξεόν σου κωλύου·

*Do not follow your desires
and abstain from what you yearn for.*

The wording in **§** of vs. 30b differs slightly: **וּמִן רְנָתָךְ כְּלֵי־הָ** ‘and from its desire restrain it.’

- 18.31) ἐὰν χορηγήσης τῇ ψυχῇ σου εὐδοκίαν ἐπιθυμίας,
ποιήσει σε ἐπίχαρμα τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου.

*If you let yourself fully sated with your desire,
it will make you an object of malicious joy of your enemies.*

:אשונא... ... (C)

In **HC** only the last¹⁶ word of the verse has been preserved: אשונא.

- 18.32) μὴ εὐφραίνου ἐπὶ πολλῇ τρυφῇ,
μὴ προσδεηθῆς συμβολῇ αὐτῆς.

*Do not revel in very much partying
so that you may not be begging to cover its expenses.*

:אשחמ אל שמץ תענוג אשר פי שנים רישו (C)

ἐπὶ] **ח** **א**; the occasional use of **א** in lieu of **ע** is well known.

πολλῇ] **ח** **ש**, on which see above at 10.10.

In the second hemistich **§** is closer to **ח**: **וְלֹא תִהְיֶינָה תְּרִינִי תְּהוּא מְסֻכִּין** ‘so that you may not become twice as poor.’ By contrast, the gap between **ח** ‘the poverty (arising from it)¹⁷ is twice as much’¹⁸ and **Ⓞ** cannot be filled.

- 18.33) μὴ γίνου πτωχὸς συμβολοκοπῶν ἐκ δανεισμοῦ,
καὶ οὐδέν σοί ἐστιν ἐν μαρσιππίῳ.
¶ ἔση γὰρ ἐπίβουλος τῆς ἰδίας ζωῆς. ¶

¹⁶ Though Beentjes (1988) has it printed as the first word, the reading of the MS is in no doubt.

¹⁷ The logico-semantic value of the cst. phrase here is that of cause. Cf. *SQH* § 21 b (xxv).

¹⁸ Smend’s (172; II 31) “die doppelt schnell zur Armut führt” is hardly acceptable as a translation of **ח**. Box - Oesterley’s “double in purse and double in health” is reasonable for **ח**, but not for **Ⓞ**.

*Do not become poor, feasting with borrowed money
when you do not have a cent in your wallet.
for you could be plotting against your own life.*

(C) אל תהי זולל וסובא ומאומה אין בכיס:

In vs. 33a **Ⓞ** is quite a free rendition of **ⓗ** ‘Do not become a glutton and a drunkard’; the Heb. phrase is well known from Dt 21.20, where **Ⓞ** reads $\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\kappa\omicron\pi\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\phi\lambda\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, which shows that our translator is alluding to this source text. Whilst this text is part of a complaint made by a father in public about his recalcitrant son, another OT example is closer in **ⓗ** to our Si passage: **אל-תְּהִי בְּסִבְאֵי-יָיִן בְּזִלְלֵי בָשָׂר לְמוֹ כִּי סִבָּא וְזוּלֵל יִגְרַשׁ** Pr 23.20f.

$\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\kappa\omicron\pi\tilde{\omega}\nu$ here does not constitute a periphrastic structure along with $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon$, for the latter has $\pi\tau\omega\chi\omicron\varsigma$ as its predicate, and the participial clause is circumstantial in nature.¹⁹

Ⓢ is again expansive: **לֹא תִהְיֶה מְסֻכִּין וְרוֹא וְזוּלֵל וְפִקֵּק** ‘Do not be a pauper and a drunkard and extravagant and a chatterbox.’

$\xi\sigma\tau\iota\nu$] This is part of a circumstantial clause introduced with $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, whilst the principal clause is an imperatival clause. This syntactic structure is shared by Hebrew and Greek.²⁰ Such a clause indicates an attendant circumstance or action.

¹⁹ See *SSG* § 406, fn. 1, and on the circumstantial participle, see id. § 31 d.

²⁰ See *SQH* § 39 and *SSG* § 91.

CHAPTER 19

- 19.1) ἐργάτης μέθυσος οὐ πλουτισθήσεται·
ὁ ἐξουθενῶν τὰ ὀλίγα κατὰ μικρὸν πεσεῖται.

An alcoholic worker would not grow rich.

One who marginalises small amounts (of money) would fall in no time.

(C) פועל זאת לא עשיר ובוזה מעוטים יתערער:

οὐ] In the MS of **℥** we see א ל written above the line.

ἐργάτης μέθυσος] = **℥**. Ziegler, by not indenting the first line of the verse, apparently assumes that this chapter is a continuation of the preceding verses. In that case, the introduction here of “labourer” sounds abrupt, as Lévi pointed out (122). Then **℥** makes better sense: “One who does such a thing.” μέθυσος was probably added freely by our translator on the strength of the continuity with what precedes.

ὀλίγα] **℥** מעוטים, which BSH (203a) parses as Qal pass. ptc. Is there any particular reason to regard the form here as a verb, though BH does use מעט as a normal stative verb? According to Ben Yehuda (3152b) it is synonymous with מצט. We see no hindrance in viewing עצום ‘mighty’ and ערום ‘shrewd’ as normal adjectives.

κατὰ μικρὸν] **℥** בקליל קליל ‘gradually, little by little.’

For vs. 1b **℥** presents a free composition with two parallel components: אהבת בשר ירושה ‘and he who loves meat will inherit poverty.’

- 19.2) οἶνος καὶ γυναῖκες ἀποστήσουσιν συνετούς,
καὶ ὁ κολλῶμενος πόρναις τολμηρότερος ἔσται·

Wine and women mislead intelligent people,

and one who seeks a close relationship with whores becomes very reckless.

(C) יין ונשים .. יו לב

ἀποστήσουσιν συνετούς] **℥** מפזיזין לבא ‘they make their mind wanton.’¹
τολμηρότερος] no genuine comparative, but used with relative force.²

- 19.3) σήπη καὶ σκόληκες κληρονομήσουσιν αὐτόν,
καὶ ψυχὴ τολμηρὰ ἐξαρθήσεται.

¹ Beentjes (97) reads יפחיו as assured, but in the MS there is no trace of יפ.

² See *SSG* § 23 **ba**.

*Pus and maggots shall take possession of him,
and a reckless soul shall be obliterated.*

ונפש עזה שחית בעליה: (C)

The first hemistich is altogether missing in **S**.

σήπη is not only a hapax in LXX, but also unknown prior to it.³ It is most likely derived from σήπω ‘to make rot.’ Parallel to “maggots” it probably denotes a result of rotting process, thus something rotten and decayed.⁴

The second hemistich in **C** is a somewhat free rendering of **H** ‘a reckless soul could destroy its owner.’ We find an almost identical Heb. sentence in Si 6.4.

ψυχὴ τολμηρὰ] **נפש עזה**. The cognate Heb. collocation occurs in a cst. chain in **נפש עז נפי** Si 40.30 **HM** // **נפש עז נפי** **HB**. **C** interprets the phrase otherwise than here: ἐν στόματι ἀναιδοῦς ‘in the mouth of a shameless person.’

19.4) Ὁ ταχὺ ἐμπιστεύων κοῦφος καρδία,
καὶ ὁ ἁμαρτάνων εἰς ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ πλημμελήσει.

*One who rashly believes is thoughtless,
and one who sins is making a sinful error against himself.*

κοῦφος καρδία] **שן קליל בלבה**, on which there is an explanatory gloss in the margin: **נא הנה דין דין דלך אהנה** ‘such is thus thoughtless.’ The dative is that of respect; *SSG* § 22 **wc**.

πλημμελήσει] We have no idea as to what the basis is for Smend’s (II 31) “talkative” in his translation – “und gegen sich selbst sündigt der Klatschsüchtige.”

For vs. 4b Smend (174) justly refers to **נפשו מי יצדיקנו** τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίς δικαιώσει; Si 10.29.

S has construed the prepositional phrase backwards: **נמנה נפשו מני** ‘in the case of one who condemns himself, who could restore his innocence?’ In the above quoted 10.29 that is the right syntactical analysis. And there **S** reads precisely the same as here.

19.5) ὁ εὐφραινόμενος κακία καταγνωσθήσεται,
¶ ὁ δὲ ἀντοφθαλμῶν ἡδοναῖς στεφανοῖ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ.

*He who rejoices in wickedness shall be pronounced guilty.
But he who defies pleasures would be crowning his life.*

³ Unknown even to LSJ!

⁴ *Pace* LEH s.v. “decay, putrefaction.” We agree with Wagner (1999.288) that the word, not being expanded with a prefix or suffix as in εἰρηνικός < εἰρήνη, is unlikely a neologism invented by our translator.

κακία] Suggested first by Schleusner (III 182) and accepted by Ziegler against the majority reading καρδία, which looks redundant. Note also § לַע אַתְּשִׁיב, § לַע אַתְּשִׁיב, and § iniquitati.

In SG this common noun can bear not only a moral, ethical sense, but also practical: “*physically or materially hard or distressful circumstance*” (GELS s.v. *2). This can apply here, too. Cf. Smend (II 31) “Schadenfrohe,” i.e. indulging in malignant joy.

19.6) ὁ ἐγκρατευόμενος γλώσση ἀμάχως βιώσεται. ¶
καὶ ὁ μισῶν λαλιὰν ἐλαττονοῦται καρδία.

*For one who controls his tongue the life would be plain sailing.
And he who dislikes a dialogue is heedless.*

μισῶν] § אִנִּי ‘repeat.’ There appears to have occurred a confusion between אִנִּי and הִנִּי.

λαλιὰν] In our context the word cannot carry a negative connotation of “gossiping.”

ἐλαττονοῦται καρδία] or “narrow-minded.”

καρδία] The textual fluctuation between καρδία and κακία still continues. In § לַע אַתְּשִׁיב אִנִּי אֶלְלֵךְ אִנִּי אֶלְלֵךְ the noun אֶלְלֵךְ must be assigned a negative nuance of “gossiping,” thus ‘and he who hates gossiping would be committing less wickedness,’ a message quite distinct from that of §.

19.7) μηδέποτε δευτερώσης λόγον,
καὶ οὐθέν σοι οὐ μὴ ἐλαττονωθῆ.

*Never repeat a rumour
then you would suffer nothing.*

ἐλαττονωθῆ] § ἡτῶν ‘he will revile you.’ According to Smend (175)⁵ ἡτῶν, i.e. ἡτῶν may have been misread as ἡτῶν, i.e. ‘nothing would be wanting for you, you would have everything you need.’ In *Index* 85b the equation Pi. ἡτῶν ὀνειδίζω ‘to censure’ has been proposed for Pr 25.10.

19.8) ἐν φίλῳ καὶ ἐχθρῷ μὴ διηγοῦ,
καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐστὶν σοι ἁμαρτία, μὴ ἀποκάλυπτε·

*Don’t tell nasty stories about (your) friend or enemy,
and unless it could be counted as a sin of yours, don’t disclose things
about them.*

⁵ So also Muraoka 1977a.417.

έν] a preposition marking a topic of communication comparable to Heb. **ב**. E.g. διηγήσασθε ἐν τοῖς πύργοις αὐτῆς ‘Narrate about its towers’ Ps 47.13; καὶ λαλήσεις ἐν αὐτοῖς [= ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν] **בְּתִבְרֵיךָ** Dt 6.7.⁶

εἰ μὴ ἐστὶν σοὶ ἁμαρτία] If you happen to be an eye-witness to some crime and deliberately keep quiet about it in a court of law, for instance, you would be virtually transgressing the ninth commandment of the Decalogue. See Lv 5.1.

Note (8b) of **ס**: **לֹא תְשַׁמְרֵם אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה. וְעַיְנֵיכֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה. וְעַיְנֵיכֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה. וְעַיְנֵיכֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה.** ‘if you have sins, supplicate over them. You shall never slander people.’⁷

19.9) ἀκήκοεν γάρ σου καὶ ἐφυλάξατό σε,
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ μισήσει σε.

*For he may have heard you talk and become alerted over you
and in time will hate you.*

ἀκήκοεν] Pf., not Aor. ἤκουσεν parallel to ἐφυλάξατο, underlining that his friend or enemy once heard you talk, and that memory is still with him.

Let’s note **ס**: **כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה. וְעַיְנֵיכֶם לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶתְּכֶם מִכְלָמֵי יְהוָה.** ‘in order that whoever hears would hate you and regard you as a disturber.’

19.10) ἀκήκοας λόγον; συναποθανέτω σοὶ·
θάρσει, οὐ μὴ σε ῥήξει.

*Have you heard a rumour? Let it die with you.
Cheer up, it is not going to tear you apart.*

συναποθανέτω] Smend (176) prefers a v.l. here, εναποθανετω, seeking support in **ס**, inter alia: **בְּתִבְרֵיךָ**. In LXX this alternative verb occurs with a human heart as the *s*, e.g. ἐναπέθανεν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ 1K 25.37, where Nabal passed out on hearing a shocking report, and twice with a human as the *s*, thus synonymous with ἀποθνήσκω 4M 6.30, 11.1. Thus Ziegler’s reading appears preferable. Besides, how to interpret σοὶ in the alternative reading? A dative of advantage?

⁶ More examples may be found in *GELS* s.v. ἐν 15. Certainly not “in Gegenwart von Freund und Feind” (*SD*), “Bei deinem Freund und auch bei deinem Feind” (Ryssel), and “among friend and foe” (*NETS*), for which one would expect ἐνώπιον, ἐναντι or suchlike. As questionable are *amico et inimico* (**Σ**) and “à ton ami comme à ton ennemi” (*BJ*) and “to friend and foe” (Skehan - Di Lella). This all comes down to the issue of verbal rection or the government of verb.

⁷ We find here a pan-Aramaic idiomatic expression originating in Akkadian, *karṣi akālu* ‘to accuse falsely, slander.’ It occurs in the Peshitta NT, e.g. **אֵינָא כְּלִין דְּנִבְרִין** ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ ‘in order to denounce him’ Mt 12.10. It occurs also in BA: Dn 3.8, 6.25, where Nebuchadnezzar’s courtiers say slanderous things to the king about Daniel, being jealous of this alien colleague’s astonishing advances.

ρήξει] In spite of μή as a component of the double negator the future is sometimes used, see above at 15.7.

In vs. 10b **Ⲛ** reads: ⲡⲓⲡⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ‘it was not an arrow meant to tear you up and leave.’

- 19.11) ἀπὸ προσώπου λόγου ὠδινήσει μωρὸς
ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου βρέφους ἢ τίκτουσα.

*A fool might agonise over a report heard
like a woman in labour thinking of the face of a baby to emerge.*

ὠδινήσει] **Ⲛ** ⲕⲁⲛⲏⲛⲓ. Both ὠδίνω and Pa. ⲕⲁⲛⲏⲛⲓ are often used of the excruciating pain and agony of a woman in labour, which is compared with the anxiety and agony a fool who has heard a rumour goes through.

- 19.12) βέλος πεπηγὸς ἐν μηρῷ σαρκός,
οὕτως λόγος ἐν κοιλίᾳ μωροῦ.

*An arrow stuck in a thigh of his body
is comparable to a rumour in the belly of a fool.*

- 19.13) Ἔλεγετον φίλον, μήποτε οὐκ ἐποίησεν,
καὶ εἴ τι ἐποίησεν, μήποτε προσθή.

*Question your friend, maybe he has not done anything wrong,
and if he has, in order that he would not do it again.*

Ἔλεγετον] **Ⲛ** and **Ⲛ** ⲉⲗⲉⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ. The Syr. verb means “to reproach, admonish.” The person who does so is assumed to be convinced of the other party’s guilt or moral weakness. Note **Ⲛ** ⲉⲗⲉⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲏⲛⲓ ‘in order that he may not do something evil.’ We see here that the Gk verb, by contrast, does not necessarily imply such an assumption.

μήποτε is used in a single verse in two distinct senses, which is also manifest in the contrast in mood of the two verbs following it. The final value of the second μήποτε is confirmed by ἵνα exactly in the same position in the parallel clause in the following verse.

- 19.14) ἔλεγετον τὸν πλησίον, μήποτε οὐκ εἶπεν,
καὶ εἰ εἶρηκεν, ἵνα μὴ δευτερώσῃ.

*Question your neighbour, maybe he has not said anything,
and if he has, so that he would not repeat it.*

τὸν πλησίον] Smend (176) prefers a v.l., τον φίλον, presumably in the interest of harmony with vs. 13. He chooses the same form in vs. 17, though there is no witness supporting it. A measure of stylistic variation is to be allowed.

- 19.15) ἔλεγξον φίλον, πολλάκις γὰρ γίνεται διαβολή,
καὶ μὴ παντὶ λόγῳ πιστεύε.

*Question your friend, for false accusation is a common occurrence
and do not believe every word said.*

μὴ παντὶ] On the question of partial, not categorical, negation, see above at 10.6.

- 19.16) ἔστιν ὀλισθάνων καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς,
καὶ τίς οὐχ ἤμαρτεν ἐν τῇ γλώσση αὐτοῦ;

*One slips, though not on purpose,
and who has not sinned with his tongue?*

ὀλισθάνων] a word rather popular in the wisdom literature, esp. Si, which accounts for 7 out of a total of 9 attestations in LXX.

That it is not about slips in general is manifest from the second hemistich, and cf. μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς οὐκ ὀλίσθησεν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ Si 14.1 and μακάριος .. ὃς ἐν γλώσση οὐκ ὀλίσθησεν 25.8. However, it is not confined to slips of tongue, as shown by ὑπόνοια πονηρὰ ὀλίσθησεν δια-νοίας αὐτῶν ‘wrong speculation has caused their minds to slip’ 3.24. For some reason or other **§** is generalising the semantic domain of the verb: אִישׁוֹן אֶלִּי הִקְרַתְּמָהּ תִּיאַן הַבַּל מִן אֶלִּי אֲטוּתָהּ יֵרָא תִיאַ ‘for there is one who sins, but not out of his heart and there is one who tripped up, but not with his tongue.’

- 19.17) ἔλεγξον τὸν πλησίον σου πρὶν ἢ ἀπειλῆσαι
καὶ δὸς τόπον νόμῳ ὑψίστου.

*Question your neighbour before threatening (him)
and let the law of the Most High play its role.*

πλησίον] Smend (177) is right in assuming that **§** אִישׁוֹן is due to misreading **עַר** as **עַר**.

νόμῳ ὑψίστου] On the absence of the definite article with ὑψίστου, see above at 4.10, and cp. τὸν νόμον τοῦ ὑψίστου עליין תורת, 49.10, where the Heb. form is not determinant, since יְיָ as a reference to the God of the Bible is always anarthrous.

- 19.18) ¶ φόβος κυρίου ἀρχὴ προσλήμψεως,
σοφία δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἀγάπησιν περιποιεῖ.

*The fear of the Lord is the prerequisite for acceptance by God
whilst wisdom ensures love from Him.*

ἔμφοβος] “of possibly committing a sin.” This is a hapax in LXX and the word is not very often used elsewhere, either. In NTG it occurs more frequently and always in the sense of “terrified,” e.g. πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν Lk 24.37.¹¹ Some authorities, e.g. Smend (II 32) and Wagner (1999.189), prefer “gottesfürchtig.”

- 19.25) ἔστιν πανουργία ἀκριβῆς καὶ αὕτη ἄδικος,
καὶ ἔστιν διαστρέφων χάριν τοῦ ἐκφᾶναι κρίμα.
¶ καὶ ἔστι δικαίων κρίσει σοφός. ¶

*There is impeccable cleverness, but is unjust
and there is one who distorts (data) in order to disclose what is right.
and there is a wise person who justifies himself by going to court.*

αὕτη] Smend (178) would accentuate the pronoun as αὐτή without arguing for it. Not only Ziegler, but also Sweet and Rahlfs agree to read αὕτη. Would Smend correct οὗτος in ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος, οὗτος Εὐφράτης Gn 2.14 to αὐτός? What we have here is a circumstantial clause of a sort: “when it is in reality injustice.” Cf. SSG § 12 d.

χάριν] a preposition to indicate a purpose, *GELS* s.v. 6 c. To take it as meaning “favour” (*NETS*) or “wohlwollen” (Ryssel) is implausible. What kind of favour is meant?¹²

- 19.26) ἔστιν πονηρευόμενος συγκεκυφὼς μελανία,
καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ πλήρης δόλου·

*There is one practising evils, going round with bent knees with gloomy
look
yet inside full of deception.*

πονηρευόμενος] Through expanding the rest of the clause, *Š* has left this key word out: אִישׁ נְבִיז וְרַגְלָיו מְכֻּבָּא וְאִישׁ מְהַלְקֵי אֵיט ‘there is one who looks humble and broken-hearted.’ Cf. *Š* הַיְהוּדִים מְהַלְקֵי אֵיט ‘there is one who goes round, hunchbacked and pale,’ where מְהַלְקֵי is a reflexion of πορευόμενος, a v.l. in a good number of MS’s.

συγκεκυφὼς] cf. πορεύεται συγκεκυφὼς Si 12.11.

μελανία] a hapax in SG and rare also elsewhere, derived from μέλας ‘black.’ It is doubtful, however, that the sense is here as specific as “in schwarzer Trauerkleidung” (*SD*), cf. “wearing mourning” (Snaith). *LSJ* Sup. s.v. adds “(morbid) darkening of the skin” Lxx Sch. Le 13.39, which is hardly

¹¹ Cf. *BDAG* s.v.

¹² Cf. Box - Oesterley 384, fn.

applicable in our case, since the man is not genuinely ill, but only feigning to be so.¹³ Cf. “sous le chagrin” (*BJ*).

πλήρης] on the gender and number discord, see *SSG* § 22 r with fn. 6 there.

19.27) συγκύφων πρόσωπον καὶ ἐθελοκωφῶν,
ὅπου οὐκ ἐπεγνώσθη, προφθάσει σε·

*With face down and pretending to be deaf,
where nobody is aware, he would act ahead of you.*

συγκύφων] On this synonym of συγκύπτω, see above at 12.11.

πρόσωπον] Wagner (1999.100) appears to be of the view that a v.l. προσώπω (dat.) is grammatically wrong. However, we do find a dat. in συγκύψας τῷ προσώπῳ στενάξω Jb 9.27, and note also κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς σώσει ib. 22.29. Our respective translator may have been visualising forms such as בפניו and בעיניו, though in the Job cases neither Hebrew noun is used in MT. Hebrew is known to use a ב- object instead of a more standard zero object, e.g. להָרִים־בְּקוֹלֵי תוֹ הַפְּסוֹמִים ἐν φωνῇ (proto-Lucianic) ‘to raise one’s voice’ 1Ch 15.16 and הַיְיָ בְּיָדָיו צִיּוֹן פְּרָשָׁה Lam 1.17. See above at 11.13.¹⁴

In vs. 27b § appears to be rather free: וְאֵי תִּיְיָ לֵאמֹר לֹא יָדָעוּ אֲנִי לְהַקְרִיב לְהַקְרִיב לְהַקְרִיב לְהַקְרִיב ‘and where people do not know him, they call him just.’

προφθάσει] §h has an explanatory addition: וְיִקְדֶּמְךָ לְמַבְאֵשׁוֹ ‘he might steal a march on you to do evil.’ Sim. a few MSS, which Ziegler notes are influenced by vs. 28b.

19.28) καὶ ἐὰν ὑπὸ ἐλαττώματος ἰσχύος κωλυθῆ ἁμαρτεῖν,
ἐὰν εὔρη καιρόν, κακοποιήσει.

*And if he is prevented to sin for the lack of strength,
when he finds a chance, he would commit evil.*

καὶ ἐὰν] § is probably correct with אֵי תִיְיָ ‘there is one who ...’ for here we are probably having to do with a person of a different type.

ἁμαρτεῖν] on the absence of the ablative τοῦ, see *SSG* § 30 c, 361f.

19.29) ἀπὸ ὀράσεως ἐπιγνωσθήσεται ἀνὴρ,
καὶ ἀπὸ ἀπαντήσεως προσώπου ἐπιγνωσθήσεται νοήμων·

*One can tell a man by his looks,
a prudent person can be identified by meeting him in person.*

¹³ Ryssel’s and Wagner’s (1999.245) “Trauer,” and LEH’s “grief, mourning” are to be so understood.

¹⁴ Cf. JM § 125 m, *SQH* § 31 eb, and Jenni 1992.99.

19.30) στολισμὸς ἀνδρὸς καὶ γέλωσ ὀδόντων
καὶ βῆμα ἀνθρώπου ἀναγγελεῖ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ.

*His dressing style and his teeth when he laughs,
and his manner of walking tell a lot about him.*

γέλωσ ὀδόντων] presumably whether or not his teeth show when he laughs. This might not say much about his character, but about his social background. In my Japanese culture, to show your teeth when you laugh is frowned upon, cf. Ryssel 329, fn. d.

In vs. 30a **§** departs not a little from **Ⓢ**: **Ⓢ**: **הַזֶּה הַדְּגִבָּרָא מְחַוֵּא עֲבָדוּתָהּ** ‘a man’s looks reveal his deeds.’

CHAPTER 20

- 20.1) Ἔστιν ἔλεγχος ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ὠραῖος,
καὶ ἔστιν σιωπῶν καὶ αὐτὸς φρόνιμος.

*There is a criticism which is not timely,
and there is one who keeps quiet, and he is prudent.*

- 20.2) ὡς καλὸν ἐλέγξαι ἢ θυμοῦσθαι,

How much better is to question than to become angry!

§ departs widely from ⑤: לִּיתְּ לֵה טִיבוֹתָא לְמֵן דְּמַכְסֵּ לְעוֹלָא וּמְשַׁתְּבַּח מִן דְּלֵא לִּיתְּ לֵה לְמְשַׁתְּבַּח וְיֵא לֵה לֵא 'there are no thanks said to him who admonishes a wicked person, and one who does not merit being praised is praised.'¹ This has apparently inspired Smend (II 33), whose translation reads: "Keinen Dank bekommt wer den Frevler zurechtweist." He restores 𐤊 as אֵין טוֹבָה לְמוֹכִיחַ, which is said to have been misread as אֵין טוֹבָה לְהוֹכִיחַ. At 12.4 we questioned his view that טוֹבָה means "thanks." We are not convinced, either, that a predicative adjective of an infinitival clause can take a fem. form. Cf. לֵא-טוֹב הָיִיתְּ לְבַדָּהּ Gn 2.18.²

καλὸν] Though ἢ is equivocal – "or" or "than" – the context indicates the latter.³ The absolute degree of adjectives can double for the comparative, thus καλὸν in lieu of καλλίον.⁴

- 20.3) καὶ ὁ ἀνθομολογούμενος ἀπὸ ἐλαττώσεως κωλυθήσεται.

and one who admits (his guilt) saves himself loss (of face).

ἐλαττώσεως] What kind of loss is meant is not immediately apparent. At Si 20.9 and 22.3 it is material, financial loss and damage. דְּחָהּ 'shame, humiliation' may have been misread as דְּחָהּ, so Smend (180). We now have a convincing piece of evidence in this direction in לֹדְגוֹן דְּנַעֲדִיסְמוּ דְּבַרֵּי דְּחָהּ [JM] Si 41.22.

¹ In place of the second מִן, the ed. Lagarde reads מִן כֵּר, vocalised in the ed. Mossul as מִן כֵּר 'from where,' which makes no sense.

² See further JM § 124 b, § 152 d.

Smend further writes: "Gr. ist in a sinnlos. Denn nach 1 handelt es sich um Fälle, in denen Schweigen das Beste ist." We do not think that vs. 1 says that; it only says that there are occasions where silence is the best course, which implies that, on occasions, confronting and admonishing the evil-doer is required.

³ As equivocal is וְ in 𐤊.

⁴ For a discussion with examples in LXX, see SSG § 23 ba.

An adjective can be construed with it as an object complement as here, e.g. εἶδρεν αὐτοὺς ἀξιόους ἑαυτοῦ Wi 3.5. Also εἶδρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς Rev 2.2, an instance mentioned in BAGD s.v. 2.

ברויב] an obvious error for ברויב, i.e. בְּרוּב.

20.6) ἔστιν σιωπῶν, οὐ γὰρ ἔχει ἀπόκρισιν,
καὶ ἔστιν σιωπῶν εἰδῶς καιρόν.

*There is one who stays quiet, for he has no answer,
and there is one who stays quiet, knowing the right time to speak.*

(C) יש מחריש מאין מענה ויש מחריש כי ראה עת:

The preposition מן indicates a reason or ground attached to a nominal clause. So also וּבְתֹפֶת יִקְבְּרוּ מֵאֵין מְקוֹם לְקְבוֹר 'and they will bury the dead in Tophet since there is no place for burial' Je 19.11. The causal value of the construction is confirmed by כִּי in the parallel clause.

εἰδῶς] BSH (272), Segal (119), and Kahana (479) parse ראה as Pf. The selection of the Pf. implies that the person has already given thought to a matter in question and come to a certain conclusion, to which he holds, when the matter rises for a discussion. This is different from what Lévi's (123) and Mopsik's (168) translation suggests: "parce qu'il considère les circonstances."

ש is altogether puzzling: אֵית דְּמַמְלֵל אִיכָא דְלֹא וְלֹא לֵה לְמַמְלֵלוֹ 'there is one who speaks when it is not proper for him to speak.'

20.7) ἄνθρωπος σοφὸς σιγήσει ἕως καιροῦ,
ὁ δὲ λαπιστής καὶ ἄφρων ὑπερβήσεται καιρόν.

*A wise person remains silent until the right time
but a silly swaggerer jumps the gun.*

(C) חכם יחריש עד עת וכסיל לא ישמור עת:

λαπιστής] שִׁי מְקַלְפֵּנָא 'babblers who polishes words,' so according to a gloss in the margin of שִׁי. It is interesting that λαπίζω and Syr. ܩܠܦ mean the same thing, "to peel, strip off." According to Smend (182) this is an error for λεπιστής, which, however, means 'liar,' and a v.l. ψευστης is read in two MS's.

ἄφρων] Wagner (1999.236) is probably right in thinking that this is a secondary gloss added to facilitate the understanding of the preceding, rare word unknown prior to LXX.

20.8) ὁ πλεονάζων λόγῳ βδελυχθήσεται,
καὶ ὁ ἐνεξουσιαζόμενος μισηθήσεται.
¶ ὡς καλὸν ἐνεγχεῖντα φανεῶσαι μετάνοιαν·
οὕτως γὰρ φεύξῃ ἐκούσιον ἀμάρτημα. ¶

*A talkative person would be loathed
and one who pretends to be an authority would be hated.
How wonderful for someone criticised to show his penitence!
For this way he would not commit a sin deliberately.*

ἀμάρτημα] Here we have a straightforward acc., whereas a periphrasis by means of a preposition is also an option as in φύγης ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμαρτίας To 4.21 𐤄^{II}.⁹

Note vs. 8b in 𐤎: ַיְהִי־נִוֶן־נִסְתַּנְּחַל אִישׁ וְדַמְתַּנְּחַל אִישׁ ‘and one who exalts himself has his life hated.’

20.9) Ἔστιν εὐοδία ἐν κακοῖς ἀνδρί,
καὶ ἔστιν εὖρεμα εἰς ἐλάττωσιν.

*There is a good turn for people in difficulties
and there is a bargain which could turn out as a loss.*

20.10) ἔστιν δόσις, ἣ οὐ λυσιτελήσει σοι,
καὶ ἔστιν δόσις, ἥς τὸ ἀνταπόδομα διπλοῦν.

*There is a gift which would not benefit you,
and there is a gift whose return is double.*

The proverb is most likely about a gift one gives someone else.

This and the following verse are absent in 𐤎, in which we read instead: אִכְנַף גִּיר דְּתַשְׁדָּא כֹּאפָא בְּעָפָא וְתַפְרִחִי־יְהִי. הַכְנָא תִּנְבֹּד רְחֻמֵּיהּ דְּרַחֲמֵךְ דְּשָׂרְרָא וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח־יְהִי ‘for just as you throw a stone at a bird and make it fly away, so you will lose the friendship of your true friend and will not find him.’

20.11) ἔστιν ἐλάττωσις ἔνεκεν δόξης,
καὶ ἔστιν ὃς ἀπὸ ταπεινώσεως ἤρην κεφαλὴν.

*There is loss for the sake of glory
and there is one who from a lowly status rose to eminence.*

ἐλάττωσις] Probably a consequence of misreading 𐤎𐤏 i.e. 𐤎𐤏 as 𐤎𐤏, i.e. 𐤎𐤏. See above at vs. 3.

ἤρην κεφαλὴν] Most likely a rendering of the idiomatic collocation אִשָּׁא וְרָא, e.g. אִשָּׁא וְרָא תִּשְׁפֹּחַ לְשָׂאֵת אִשָּׁא וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח־יְהִי and οὐ προσέθεντο ἄραι κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν Jdg 8.28.¹⁰ Although it is the combination of the same two words, it signifies something different with A raising B’s head in נִשָּׂא בְּרִאשׁוֹ Si 11.13.

⁹ On this question, see SSG § 22 c.

¹⁰ For more examples, see BDB s.v. אִשָּׁא Qal 1 b (2) and Clines DCH V 760b, 1c (1).

20.12) ἔστιν ἀγοράζων πολλὰ ὀλίγου
καὶ ἀποτιννύων αὐτὰ ἑπταπλάσιον.

*There is one who buys a lot for a mere penny
and ends up paying for them sevenfold.*

ἀγοράζων] § 71₇ ‘borrows.’

ὀλίγου] a genitive of price, see SSG § 22 I.

ἀποτιννύων] The use of the verb as doubly transitive is unknown prior to SG.¹¹

Smend (183) finds the logic of the proverb incomprehensible. If one is not cautious, one could end up buying something of bad quality and paying a fair bit for its repair. Furthermore, Smend takes the proverb figuratively as teaching a lesson about charitable works. There is nothing wrong with Ben Sirá giving practical advice for weekend shoppers at the market place, “Penny wise and pound foolish.” Then, *pace* Segal (121), it is unjustified to supply ἔστιν for vs. 12b: it is about one kind of shopper.

20.13) ὁ σοφὸς ἐν ὀλίγοις ἑαυτὸν προσφιλῆ ποιήσει,
χάριτες δὲ μωρῶν ἐκχυθήσονται.

*The wise could make himself lovable with a little expenditure,
but fools pay out a lot for charitable works.*

חכם במעט דבר נפשו וטובת כסילים ישפוך: (C1)

... חכמה (C2)

ὀλίγοις] a reading established by Ziegler on the basis of one MS, the rest reading either λογῶ or λογοῖς; see also below at vs. 27. Smend (183) recommends a compromise, ὀλίγοις λόγοις, but the virtue of few words was already taken up in vs. 8. Accordingly, χάριτες does not have to be confined to something oral, verbal as in “compliments” (Snaith) and “blandishments” (Skehan - Di Lella).

Without looking at 8, 9 is rather difficult. Is דבר a substantive or a verb? If the former, is it a nomen rectum of a cst. chain with מעט? Then is חכם נפשו a nominal clause, but meaning what? If the latter, is נפשו the object of דבר, but meaning what? As for the second hemistich, is טובת in st. cst.? If not, כסילים would have to be the subject of ישפוך, which, however, is in the sg. Taking טובת as a *defectiva* spelling for טובות does not resolve the problem of number discord.

προσφιλῆ ποιήσει] Where on earth does this come from? Lévi (124) restores a rare Hif. אהב unknown to BH, יאהיב. In 4.7 we do find it, and that

¹¹ In CG an affiliated verb, ἀποτίνω is so used, as noted in LSJ s.v., but in the middle voice and meaning “to exact” as in κάποτείσασθαι δίκην ἐχθροῦς ‘to exact retribution from his enemies’ Eur. *Heracl.* 852.

translated exactly with the same Gk phrase as here: *הההב לנפשך לעדה* προσφιλή συναγωγῆ σεαυτὸν ποίει. Lévi (ib.) wonders whether there is a place for another word after *כח*. Indeed there is.

ἐκχυθήσονται] Lévi (124) proposes emending *ךשפ* to *ךשפת*, i.e. *ךשפת*. However, his proposal of reading *כח* ‘in vain’ for *כמה* has been rightly rejected by Smend (183) on the ground that the blank space preceding it is too large, though there is no end of the verse mark. *כמה* is said to have strayed to the end of the part of this Heb. manuscript as published earlier by Gaster.¹²

- 20.14) δόσις ἄφρονος οὐ λυσιτελήσει σοι,
 ¶ ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ βασκάνου δι’ ἀνάγκην αὐτοῦ. ¶
 οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀνθ’ ἐνὸς πολλοί.
*A gift from a fool would not benefit you,
 likewise one from a miser given under compulsion.
 for his eyes are many instead of one.*

σοι] *ס* presupposes *אֲתֹפֶּה*: *הֲלֹא אֲתֹפֶּה לְךָ אֶת־הַמְּהֵבָה* ‘a gift from a fool is worthless to him,’ in other words, he gives away that which is of no value to himself and tries to impress the beneficiary how generous he is. Smend (184) regards *אֲתֹפֶּה* as correct, though unsupported by any MS.

The above-given translation of the second hemistich is verbatim. *ס* may have captured what it really means: *מִטּוֹל עֵינָיו הֵד בְּשִׁבְעָא סִימָן לְפִוּרְעוֹנוּתָא* ‘because his eyes are seven times directed at the return (on his investment).’ Note *oculi enim illius septimplices sunt*. In an earlier study (Muraoka 1977.419) we referred to the use in BS of *עֵי* against the background of *רַע עֵי* and *טוֹב עֵי* in MH. So the author could be saying that the niggard’s gift is one euro, on which he is expecting a return of ten euros. Cf. also Ryssel 331 with fn. (k).

- 20.15) ὀλίγα δώσει καὶ πολλὰ ὀνειδίσει
 καὶ ἀνοίξει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡς κῆρυξ
 σήμερον δανιεῖ καὶ αὔριον ἀπαιτήσει,
 μισητὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ τοιοῦτος.
*He gives a little and criticises a lot
 and opens his mouth like a loud speaker.
 Today he lends and tomorrow demands to be repaid.
 Such a person is disgusting.*

ἄνθρωπος ὁ τοιοῦτος] The presence of the definite articles shows that this pronoun differs from another synonymous one, *οὗτος*, for one never inserts

¹² Elizur 2010.24.

the article following an anarthrous substantive; ἄνθρωπος ὁ οὗτος is out of the question. This is unknown outside of LXX, and Hebrew influence is a possibility, cf. ἐν ἔθνει τῷ τοιούτῳ הַיְּבֵר־רַשָּׁאִי בְּגוֹי Je 5.9, 29, and sim. 9.8.¹³ Another two patterns are attested: 1) διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἔργων ‘through such works’ Wi 12.19 and 2) τὸ πάσχα τοιούτου ‘such a passover’ 1E 1.18. Cf. *SSG* § 34 e and *GELS* s.v. τοιούτος a.

- 20.16) μωρὸς ἐρεῖ Οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι φίλος,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν χάρις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς μου ἄ
οἱ ἔσθοντες τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ φαῦλοι γλώσση,
*A fool says: “There is no friend for me,
and there is no word of thanks for my kind deeds.”
Those who eat his bread are dirty of tongue,*

φαῦλοι] **Sh** is more specific: יַיִן־הַיְּבֵר־נֶפֶשׁ ‘deceitful.’

In vs. 16c **S** reads: אֲכָלֵךְ נַפְשִׁי כִּי־אֵי־מִי־לִי־בָרֶךְ ‘those who eat my bread are like a stone rock.’ **Sh** also reads ‘my bread.’ In reading αὐτοῦ Ziegler is in the footsteps of his predecessors, Rahlfs and Bretschneider,¹⁴ against all Gk MSS and versions. Ziegler’s punctuation with a comma at the end of the verse accords with αὐτοῦ in the next verse, which becomes a direct sequel of vs. 16. On the other hand, Smend (184) is uncomfortable with μου, since the fool is not supposed to know what guests are saying behind his back. A solution is offered, according to Smend, by **S**, which makes the guests inanimate and insensitive.

- 20.17) ποσάκις καὶ ὅσοι καταγελάσονται αὐτοῦ;
¶ οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἔχειν ἐν ὀρθῇ αἰσθήσει εἴληφε,
καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ὁμοίως ἀδιάφορον αὐτῷ. ¶
*how often and how many would scoff at him!
for what he has he has not received with right attitude
and to what he has not he is as indifferent.*

Ziegler makes a question of 17a, but it can be equally taken as an exclamatory utterance. LSJ does not admit such a value for ποσάκις nor ὅσος. In many languages, including Hebrew, some interrogative words are at times used in exclamatory utterances. That could apply here, cf. *SSG* § 95.

- 20.18) Ὀλίστημα ἀπὸ ἐδάφους μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπὸ γλώσσης,
οὕτως πτώσις κακῶν κατὰ σπουδὴν ἦξει.

¹³ Cf. *SSG* § 34 e (i).

¹⁴ And Thackeray, whose edition Ziegler apparently did not consult here.

*One would trip on a pavement rather than through tongue,
so will the fall of the evil come speedily.*

μᾶλλον] When not joined to an adjective, adverb or an adjectival verb, the word means “*by preference*” (GELS s.v. 2), so also in σὲ κακώσομεν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκείνους ‘we shall harm you rather than them’ Gn 19.9.

What Zeno, a Stoic philosopher, said is recorded in Diogenes Laertius 7.1: κρεῖττον εἶναι τοῖς ποσὶν ὀλισθεῖν ἢ τῇ γλώττῃ ‘it is better to slip with (one’s own) feet than with (someone’s) tongue.’¹⁵ S offers a proverb of its own composition: כִּי מִיָּא דְּשִׁיבָא עַל שַׁוְיָא דְּכַפְּא. אֲפֵא הַכְּנָהּ הַגְּנִיף אֲלָא בֵּית אֲרָא ‘like water that is spilled on a stone rock so is the tongue of the wicked in the midst of the righteous.’

20.19) ἄνθρωπος ἄχαρις, μῦθος ἄκαιρος·
ἐν στόματι ἀπαιδευτῶν ἐνδελεχισθήσεται.

*An ungrateful person, an untimely talk;
such is a perpetual phenomenon in the mouth of the uneducated.*

Note S: אֲלָא בֵּית אֲרָא מְלִמָּה אֲלָא אֲרָא לְכַתְּתָא אֲלֵיָא מְשַׁבָּח אֲלָא אֲרָא אֲרָא אֲרָא אֲרָא ‘just as a tail can not be eaten without salt, so is a word that is not said in its time.’

20.20) ἀπὸ στόματος μωροῦ ἀποδοκιμασθήσεται παραβολή·
οὐ γὰρ μὴ εἶπη αὐτὴν ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῆς.

*A proverb coming out of the mouth of a fool shall be rejected
for he never says it in its time.*

οὐ γὰρ μὴ] On this frequently occurring double negator, see SSG § 83 ca.

20.21) Ἔστιν κωλύμενος ἁμαρτάνειν ἀπὸ ἐνδείας,
καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει αὐτοῦ οὐ κατανογῆσεται.

*There is one who is prevented from sinning because of poverty
and, relaxing, he would not suffer from a guilty conscience.*

κωλύμενος ἁμαρτάνειν] The syntagm <κωλύω + acc. + inf.> is known to CG as in κωλύοντας ἐς θάλασσαν ἐκρέειν τὸν Νεῖλον ‘preventing the Nile from flowing into the sea’ Hdt 2.20. Cf. SSG § 30 c, pp. 361f.

With the first hemistich Ben Sira is hardly saying that the poor are saints, but that there are sins to which you are liable precisely because of your

¹⁵ Quoted from the edition by R.D. Hicks; his spelling is slightly different from what one finds in Smend 185. This legacy of the sapiential literature appears to go farther back in time, for we find in Ahiqar in a Syriac version: “Better is to slip with a foot than with a tongue.”

wealth. It is a dark warning to the rich, cf. 21b in **§**: מְנוּ הַנָּא דְהָא וְדִי קָא וְעַל עוֹתְרָה מְתַתְנִיהַי 'who has become a righteous man and is content with his wealth?'

κατανυγήσεται] On the second hemistich, cf. λέγετε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς κοίταις ὑμῶν κατανύγητε 'Say (it) in your hearts, and grind your teeth in bed' Ps 4.9.

20.22) ἔστιν ἀπολλύων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ δι' αἰσχύνην,
καὶ ἀπὸ ἄφρονος προσώπου ἀπολεῖ αὐτήν.

*There is one who ruins himself because of being too shy
and could do the same by feigning to be a fool.*

(C) יש מאבד את נפשו מבושת ובאולת פנים יורישנה:

ἀπὸ ἄφρονος προσώπου] **Ⲭ** באולת פנים. Let's leave the preposition in both languages out of discussion for the moment. The collocation אולת פנים is unusual, occurring nowhere else. What on earth "folly of face" is supposed to mean? As mysterious is **§** כּוּפִי אֶפְהָה 'the covering of his face.'¹⁶

Any less demanding is ἄφρονος προσώπου. If syntactically parallel to אולת פנים, ἄφρονος would be a substantivised adjective of neuter gender expressing a trait of a person, and the gen. case of προσώπου is not due to the gen.-governing preposition, but because the noun is subordinate to ἄφρονος, in other words, the phrase, without the preposition, would be rewritten as ἄφρον προσώπου. This adjective occurs in LXX as often as 133 times, very frequent in Si as well, but when substantivised, its referent is always a person, thus never equivalent to ἀφροσύνη 'foolishness, folly.' Then the phrase can only mean 'the face of a fool,' representing the reversal of the word order vis-à-vis its Heb. counterpart. Another significant syntagmatic aspect that is to be taken into account is that, whether substantivised or not, the referent of ἄφρων is always personal. This means that ἄφρονος here cannot be an attributively used adjective, hence ≠ 'a foolish face.'

Another lexical question that is raised here by both Greek and Hebrew is what *face* has to do with. Καρδία or לֵב is reasonable. Cf. וְכָל-חַכְמֵי-לֵב וְכָל-הָאֵלֹהִים וְכָל-הַבָּשָׂר וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד יְהוָה וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הָאָדָם וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הַבְּהֵמָה וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הַדְּוָלִים וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הַדְּוָלִים וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הַדְּוָלִים וְכָל-הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד הַדְּוָלִים Ex 35.10.

After all this consideration we are still in the deep ends.

ἀπολεῖ αὐτήν] **Ⲭ** יורישנה. In BH הוֹרִישׁ means either "to dispossess" or "impoverish," but then the object is a possessor or owner, but not possession, as in הַגְּזָה אֶדְנִי יְהוָה וְהָיָה לְיָדְךָ זֵרָה Zc 9.4, where the object suffix refers to Tyre. This is another puzzle of the verse.

¹⁶ According to Smend (186) the face is not his own, but then whose?

- 20.23) ἔστιν χάριν αἰσχύνης ἐπαγγελλόμενος φίλω,
καὶ ἐκτήσατο αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν δωρεάν.

*There is one who, out of a sense of shame, makes promises to a friend,
and ends up by acquiring him as an enemy for nothing.*

(C) יש נכלם ומבטיח רעהו וקונהו שונא חנם:

- 20.24) Μῶμος πονηρὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ψεῦδος,
ἐν στόματι ἀπαιδευτῶν ἐνδεδελεχισθήσεται.

*A lying habit is an evil defect in men,
in the mouth of the uneducated it is prevalent.*

- 20.25) αἰρετὸν κλέπτῃς ἢ ὁ ἐνδεδελεχίζων ψεύδει,
ἀμφοτέροι δὲ ἀπώλειαν κληρονομήσουσιν.

*A thief is preferable to a habitual liar,
but both will inherit perdition.*

- 20.26) ἦθος ἀνθρώπου ψευδοῦς ἀτιμία,
καὶ ἡ αἰσχύνη αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐνδεδελεχῶς.

*A lying person is doomed to lead to a shame
and his ignominy is with him perpetually.*

§ reads somewhat different: הַתְּהִיבָה אֶתְּהִיבָה לְלֵךְ אֶתְּהִיבָה דְּבִרְתָּהּ הַתְּהִיבָה לְטוֹמֵאָה עִמָּו 'because the end of a lying person is condemnation and his shame shall perish with him,' where the last sentence probably means that he shall be burdened with ignominy till his death.

ἦθος] Smend (187) holds that this rendering is due to תִּירָה (so §) having been misread as תִּירָה, but Ryssel (333, fn. m) disputes it.

Λόγοι παραβολῶν

Words of parables

- 20.27) Ὁ σοφὸς ἐν ὀλίγοις προάξει ἑαυτόν,
καὶ ἄνθρωπος φρόνιμος ἀρέσει μεγιστᾶσιν.

*The wise (even) with a few (words) could help his own promotion,
and a prudent person would please courtiers.*

ὀλίγοις] a reading established by Ziegler against all MSS, which read either λογῶ or λογῶις. At vs. 13 above Ziegler has made the same decision, though supported by one MS. The general context is common to the two passages. Here again we may be dealing with an ellipsis for ὀλίγοις λόγῶις.

For vs. 27a **§** reads: **הַשְׁבִּיחַ אֶת־עַצְמוֹ וְעָרַב אֶת־חֵן אֶת־מִלְמָלָה** ‘One who is full of proverbs of wisdom shows himself as small,’ where the subtitle of this section is incorporated into the clause, which is totally rewritten. Does **אֶת־חֵן** reflect *προδείξει*?

προάξει *ἑαυτόν*] cf. *προήχθη* ‘he was promoted’ Es 2.21 o’.

ἀρέσει *μεγιστᾶσιν*] **אֶת־חֵן אֶת־מִלְמָלָה** ‘he could exercise influence among the courtiers.’

20.28) ὁ ἐργαζόμενος γῆν ἀνυψώσει θημωνιὰν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ὁ ἀρέσκων μεγιστᾶσιν ἐξιλάσεται ἀδικίαν.

A farmer heaps up his crops

and one who pleases courtiers reaps forgiveness for a misdeed.

If the two parts of the verse are correlated with each other, it is difficult to apply only the latter to the Jewish community in the diaspora as Smend (188) would, making this proverb a piece of advice meant for the community leadership.

20.29) ξένια καὶ δῶρα ἀποτυφλοῖ ὀφθαλμοὺς σοφῶν
καὶ ὡς φιμὸς ἐν στόματι ἀποτρέπει ἐλεγμοὺς.

Donations and gifts blind the eyes of the wise

and as a muzzle in your mouth avert criticism.

ἀποτυφλοῖ] The selection of the sg. is due to the neuter gender of the subjects. The two subjects, synonyms, has been perceived as a single unit.¹⁷

σοφῶν] absent in **§**, what leads to Smend’s (188) assumption that this is a secondary intrusion from *τὰ γὰρ δῶρα ἐκτυφλοῖ ὀφθαλμοὺς σοφῶν* Dt 16.19. However, *pace* Smend, the word may have stood in the *Vorlage* of **¶**, for MT there reads **כִּי הִשְׁחֵד יַעֲרַר עֵינֵי חֲכָמִים**.

ἐλεγμοὺς] which, according to Smend (189), reflects **חֲרָה** in the sense of “Strafe,” but the Heb. noun does not mean “punishment,” whether bodily or pecuniary. A public, verbal criticism or admonition by an authorised individual or court could come to the person concerned as punishment.

20.30) σοφία κεκρυμμένη καὶ θησαυρὸς ἀφανής,
τίς ὠφέλεια ἐν ἀμποτέροις;

Hidden wisdom and invisible treasure,

what is the usefulness of either?

(C) *טמונה ואוצר מ* [...] *ומה תולעת בש* [...]

¹⁷ Smend’s discussion here (188f.) is confused: he speaks of “der Plural in a von Gr.,” but he is dealing with the pl. ptc. in **§** **מְבַהֲתִין** for *ἀποτυφλοῖ*, and there is no pl. verb in **¶**.

טמונה is supposed to be preceded by חכמה, which has strayed away to the end of vs. 31. Parts of this and the following verse are found in two new leaves of $\mathfrak{H}C$ as published by Elizur (2010.24). Note also \mathfrak{S} חֲכָמָתָא טְמִירָתָא ‘hidden wisdom.’

תולעת] an obvious error for תועלת ‘benefit.’

κεκρυμμένη] In indicating a resultant state a passive Pf. Ptc. verges on an adjective as shown by the parallel ἀφανής here. Cf. *SSG* 28 ea, pp. 277f.

This and the following verse recur at 41.14, where we see מוסתר ($\mathfrak{H}B$) following אוצר.

20.31) κρείσσων ἄνθρωπος ἀποκρύπτων τὴν μωρίαν αὐτοῦ
ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἀποκρύπτων τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ.

*Better is a person who conceals his foolishness
than a person who conceals his wisdom.*

(C טוב איש מצפין] [...] מאיש מצפין חכמ] [...]

The shift in voice is inexplicable in $\mathfrak{S}1j$: טב הו בר אנשא דמטשא אַ שטיוּתא אַ דילא אַ אַו ברנשא דמטשא חכמתא דילא אַ ‘a person whose silliness is hidden than a person who hides his wisdom.’

20.32) ¶ κρείσσων ὑπομονὴ ἀπαραίτητος ἐν ζητήσῃ κυρίου
ἢ ἀδέσποτος τροχηλάτης τῆς ἰδίας ζωῆς. ¶

*Better is unshakable patience in one’s search after the Lord
than masterless carriage-driver of his own life.*

τροχηλάτης] On this hapax in Si, see Wagner 1999.347f.

This verse is preserved only in MS 248, the most important of the MS’s representing the Lucianic recension.

CHAPTER 21

21.1) Τέκνον, ἡμαρτες, μὴ προσθῆς μηκέτι
καὶ περὶ τῶν προτέρων σου δεήθητι.

*Child, (if) you have sinned, do not repeat it any more,
and for your former (sins) entreat forgiveness.*

ἡμαρτες] As long as we follow Ziegler's punctuation, it is not possible to see here a question as in, e.g. "tu as péché?" (BJ). A conditional clause with its protasis lacking an introductory word such as **ἂν** is well known, e.g. **ἂν ἡμαρτες ἡμαρτες ἡμαρτες ἡμαρτες ἡμαρτες ἡμαρτες** but **ἂν ἀσυνθετήσητε, ἐγὼ διασκορπιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς** Ne 1.8. Cf. JM § 167 a (1).¹ But an unmarked conditional sentence with no εἰ, εἰαν and suchlike added is unknown in SG. However, since the introduction of punctuation is relatively late, the author may have intended here a question that could be indicated in speech with an intonation typical of questions.

μηκέτι] Where **ἔτι** would have sufficed, the repetition of negators is for the sake of intensification. See also **οὐκέτι μὴ εἴπωμεν** 'we shall never say again' Ho 14.4. Cf. SSG § 83 c.

21.2) ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὄφρα φεῦγε ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας·
ἐὰν γὰρ προσέλθῃς, δήξεταί σε·
ὀδόντες λέοντος οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῆς
ἀναιροῦντες ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων.

As from a snake's face, run away from sin.

For if you go near, it will bite you.

Its teeth are a lion's teeth, destroying people's lives.

ἀπὸ προσώπου] This is not a compound preposition synonymous with the following, parallel **ἀπό**. A snake has a face, but sin does not. It is an image of a man being stared at by a snake before him. Cf. "vor dem Anblick einer Schlange" (SD). It is true that in many similar compound prepositions, their second component, often indicating a member of a human body, has lost its literal meaning as in **οὕτως ποιήσω ὑμῖν, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, ἀπὸ προσώπου κακιῶν ὑμῶν** Ho 10.15 and **ὀδυνηθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου πόνων αὐτῶν** 'they will be defiled on account of their fruits of labour' Hg 2.14, where we

¹ An example in NTG is **θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ** Ro 13.3, cited in BDF § 471(3), though the current standard editions insert <> instead of <,>.

ought to note ἔνεκεν in the preceding clause, μιανθήσεται ἔνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αὐτῶν ‘he will become unclean because of their gains.’ By contrast, in ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ Is 2.19, the difference between ἀπὸ προσώπου and ἀπὸ is comparable to what we have pointed out regarding our Si example.

ἀναιροῦντες] This participle is to be construed with the immediately preceding οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῆς, functioning as a circumstantial participle.²

ψυχὰς] Translated here “lives,” the noun is to be taken not merely as referring to physical life, but the totality of human existence with emphasis on its spiritual, ethical aspects. Unlike the primeval snake none of its descendants touches its human victim’s inner life.

In vs. 2b+c we read in **§**: אֲשַׁנְיִנְבְּרִי אֶת־שָׂפָה אֶלְבָּרְמָהּ וְהִיא אֶרְאֵת אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹתָיִם ‘like the teeth of a lion is deception and destroys people’s souls.’

21.3) ὡς ῥομφαία δίστομος πᾶσα ἀνομία,
τῆ πληγῆ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἴασις.

*Every unlawful deed is like a double-edged sword,
there is no cure for its blow.*

δίστομος] a figure of great effectiveness.

ἀνομία] **§** is more specific – אֶרְאֵת ‘prostitute.’

αὐτῆς] What does this refer to? ῥομφαία or ἀνομία? In **§** there is no ambiguity in the way it is vocalised in the ed. Mossul: אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ וְנִיתָא. אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ לִיתָא אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ ‘a sword whose blades are two is a harlot and there is no cure to her blow.’ אֶת־רֶמְסֵי is masculine in gender as shown in פּוּמְוֵהָ.

21.4) καταπληγμὸς καὶ ὕβρις ἐρημώσουσιν πλοῦτον·
οὕτως οἶκος ὑπερηφάνου ἐκριζωθήσεται.

*Intimidation and arrogance could lay riches waste,
so the home of the haughty could be uprooted.*

This is a rather obscure text. Its Heb. *Vorlage* may have been as obscure, and that is probably why **§** departs quite widely from **Ⓞ**: אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ וְנִיתָא אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ לִיתָא אֶת־רֶמְסֵי דְתַרְיָן פּוּמְוֵהָ ‘from morning till evening she ruins residences and uproots many palaces,’ where the subject is probably a harlot, cf. vs. 3 in **§**.

καταπληγμὸς] a hapax in LXX and unknown prior to SG. According to Wagner (1999.228f.) it means “das Niederschlagen, Gewalttätigkeit.” The underlying verb, καταπλήσσω, means, according to *GELS*, ‘to terrify.’ One

² The use of a relative clause leads to ambiguity in this regard in “ses dents sont des dents de lion qui ôtent la vie ..” (*BJ*). There is no ambiguity in **§** as quoted below, where “sin” appears as “deception” and the fem.sg. noun agrees with the fem.sg. ptc.

could terrify and intimidate by alluding to eventual acts of violence with “If not, ...” but the verb does not signify actual execution of such acts. This rare Gk word may have been difficult for **SH**, which reads **אָתְּוֹלְבָּרְוּתָא** ‘hostility.’

οἶκος] The meaning of the word does not have to be confined to a house as a dwelling place, hence our *home*. It could be *family*, *household*.

ἐκριζωθήσεται] a reading undocumented by any Gk MS, but based on Smend’s (190) view; he refers to **SH** **אָרְבָּע** and **TL** *eradicabitur*. Segal (125) reconstructs **SH** as **אָרְבָּע**.

21.5) δέησις πτωχοῦ ἐκ στόματος ἕως ὠτίων αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ κατὰ σπουδὴν ἔρχεται.

*A request of a poor man (reaches) from his mouth up to His ears,
and His decision is executed fast.*

ἕως ὠτίων αὐτοῦ] **SH** **אָרְבָּע** ‘to His ear.’ According to **SH** the prayer is not said just in the direction upwards, but is sure to reach its destination, and He holds His both ears wide open. Although God has not been mentioned in the immediately preceding passage, He *is* in the immediately following verse.³

SH is a little more picturesque with **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** ‘and it rises to come before the eternal judge.’

21.6) μισῶν ἐλεγμὸν ἐν ἵχνει ἁμαρτωλοῦ,
καὶ ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον ἐπιστρέψει ἐν καρδίᾳ.

*One who hates admonition is in the footsteps of a sinner,
and one who fears the Lord should return (to Him) sincerely.*

ἐν ἵχνει ἁμαρτωλοῦ] By way of explanation **SH** adds in the margin **אָרְבָּע** ‘is walking.’⁴

ἐν καρδίᾳ] It is about penitence, not a physical walk-back.

21.7) γνωστὸς μακρόθεν ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν γλώσσει,
ὁ δὲ νοήμων οἶδεν ἐν τῷ ὀλισθάνειν αὐτόν.

*The competent orator is known from afar,
but the thoughtful knows when he slips.*

³ Ryssel’s (335, fn. o) view that the referent of αὐτοῦ is the haughty one of vs. 4 is not convincing. When the poor is assured that such a hostile person is doomed to perdition, why should the poor entreat him?

⁴ Smend’s (190) translation of **SH** in vs. 6a is: “es hasst die Zurechtweisung der frevelhafte Mann.” But **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** can also mean ‘one who hates admonition is a wicked person.’ A bipartite nominal clause in Syriac is quite normal as in **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** ‘your people are my people, your god is my god’ Ru 2.1 instead of **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע**. The ptc. **אָרְבָּע** can be viewed as in the st. cst. as in **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** **אָרְבָּע** οἱ ἔσθοντες τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ Si 20.16. On the bipartite nominal clause in Syriac, see Muraoka 2005 § 103.

Cp. **Ⓞ** with **Ⓢ**: **חַכְמָא מִן קְבוֹל עֵינָיו הֵי מְשַׁתְּדֵדַע. וְבָקָא הוּ בְעַגְלָא לְעוֹלָא** ‘the wise recognises in front of him and spots the wicked immediately.’ For vs. 7a Smend’s translation (II 35) appears to be dependent on **Ⓢ**: “Der Weise erkennt, wen er vor sich hat,” presumably reading **מִן** instead of **מִן**, but we would expect then **מִן דְ**, and **קְבוֹל** as a preposition is not used on its own.

21.8) ὁ οἰκοδομῶν τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐν χρήμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις
ὡς συνάγων αὐτοῦ τοὺς λίθους εἰς χῶμα.

*One who builds his house with borrowed money
is like one who is gathering stones for his own grave.*

[χῶμα] The sense of the word is defined as “*elevation consisting of soil*” (*GELS* s.v.), and it is applied to grave at Jb 17.16[¶]. Some manuscripts add **ταφῆς** ‘of grave.’⁵ The majority reading, **εἰς χειμῶνα** ‘for winter’ makes little sense; it must be a scribal error. Sim. **Ⓢ** **לְבַתְּנָא בְּחַיָּתָא** ‘in winter.’

21.9) στιππύον συνηγμένον συναγωγὴ ἀνόμων,
καὶ ἡ συντέλεια αὐτῶν φλόξ πυρός.

*A group of the unlawful is a collected tow
and they end up as a burning flame.*

Note **Ⓢ**: **אִךְ מִסְקַתָּא דְחַלָּא בְּרַגְלֵיהִי דְגַבְרָא קְשִׁיָּא. הַכְּנָא תּוֹקְפָהּ הֵי דְעוֹלָא לְוַת** **וְנָרָא** ‘As soil rising on the feet of an old man so is the strength of the wicked facing fire.’

21.10) ὁδὸς ἀμαρτωλῶν ὠμαλισμένη ἐκ λίθων,
καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων αὐτῆς βόθρος ὕδου.

*The way of sinners is levelled, free from stones,
but at its end there is a pit down into the hell.*

Ⓢ reads as follows: **הַיְבִילָה דְרִישִׁיעָא תּוֹקְלָתָא הֵי לְ מְטוּל דְחַרְחָתָא גּוֹבָא הֵי** **וְעַמִּיקָא** ‘and the way of the evil leads to a stumbling block to him, because its end is a deep pit.’ This differs somewhat from the message that comes through **Ⓞ** in 10a: the path the wicked walks along might look safe, smooth, and free from any risk.⁶ Cf. **πλατεῖα ἢ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἢ ὁδὸς ἢ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν** Mt 7.13.

⁵ We fail to see how Smend (II 35) has arrived at “Schandmal,” i.e. “blot.”

⁶ Smend (191) is right in saying that here cannot be a talk about a paved way, which would be too modern. Thus **ἐκ** could ultimately go back to **מִן**, which can signify not only “out of” (material), but also absence as in **מִן דְ** **בְּתִיָּהּ שְׁלוֹם** Jb 2.9. For more examples in BH, see BDB s.v. **מִן** **1 b**.

- 21.11) Ὁ φυλάσσω νόμον κατακρατεῖ τοῦ ἐννοήματος αὐτοῦ,
καὶ συντέλεια τοῦ φόβου κυρίου σοφία.

*He who observes the law has his thought under his control
and the fear of the Lord ends in wisdom.*

τοῦ ἐννοήματος αὐτοῦ] **ס** הַרְצֵי ‘his inclination,’ for which **ח** may have read **יִרְצֵי**.⁷

Note **ס** in vs. 11b: **מִדָּם הֲלֵי רִסְקָה לֹא לְאֵהָלָהּ לְדָרְדָרִי** ‘and one who fears God would lack nothing.’

- 21.12) οὐ παιδευθήσεται ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν πανούργος,
ἔστιν δὲ πανουργία πληθύνουσα πικρίαν.

*One who is not clever is unteachable,
but there is cleverness that aggravates bitterness.*

- 21.13) γνῶσις σοφοῦ ὡς κατακλυσμός πληθυνθήσεται
καὶ ἡ βουλή αὐτοῦ ὡς πηγὴ ζωῆς.

*Knowledge of a wise man multiplies like flood water,
and his counsel is as a fountain of life.*

κατακλυσμός] **ס** מְבוּצָה ‘fountain,’ on the basis of which Smend (192) rightly postulates a misreading of **ח** מְבוּצָה for **מְבוּלָה**.

πηγὴ ζωῆς] **ס** מַיִם חַיִּים ‘living water,’ which Smend (192) correctly retroverts to **ח** מַיִם חַיִּים ‘fresh water.’ However, there is nothing wrong with **מַיִם חַיִּים**. See a combination of the two notions in φρέαρ ὕδατος ζῶντος Gn 21.19 for **מַיִם בְּאֵר**, and cf. also ὕδωρ ζῶν Jn 4.10, which Jesus offered the Samaritan woman, and **מַיִם חַיִּים חַיִּים** mAb 2.8, 6.1.

- 21.14) ἔγκατα μωροῦ ὡς ἀγγεῖον συντετριμμένον
καὶ πᾶσαν γνῶσιν οὐ κρατήσει.

*The brain of a fool is like a broken jar
and will not hold any knowledge whatsoever.*

ἔγκατα] a plurale tantum that means “something that is inside.” Cf. **ס** הַבֶּהַר אֲצִיָּוֶרֶךְ ‘the heart of the evil.’ At To 6.5 **ס**^{II} it refers to intestines of fish.

- 21.15) λόγον σοφὸν ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ ἐπιστήμων,
αἰνέσει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν προσθήσει·
ἤκουσεν ὁ σπαταλῶν, καὶ ἀπήρεσεν αὐτῷ,
καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν ὀπίσω τοῦ νότου αὐτοῦ.

⁷ On this hapax in LXX, cf. Wagner 1999.194f.

*If a person capable of understanding hears a wise saying,
he would praise it and improve on it.
Having heard it, a voluptuous would reject it
and throw it away behind his back.*

λόγον σοφὸν] A rare collocation, which Smend (193) proposes changing to λόγον σοφῶν or λόγον σοφοῦ, but note οὗ ἂν φανῆ τὸ ῥῆμα αὐτοῦ σοφώτερον τοῦ ἑτέρου 1Es 3.5.

αἰνέσει] **ש** אֲדַמָּ, which probably reflects **ש** הִדָּי; both can signify ‘to praise’ as well as Smend’s (193) “er gibt Bekenntnis.”

ὀπίσω τοῦ νότου αὐτοῦ] **ש** יְהִי מִן מְּוֹתָו לְאֶחָד מִן צַדָּיָו ‘to one of his sides,’ probably due to misreading Heb. וְצַדָּיָו לְאֶחָד מִן צַדָּיָו.

ἤκουσεν] This and the following two aorists are gnomic in value. This shift in tense is likely a stylistic variation.

21.16) ἐξήγησις μωροῦ ὡς ἐν ὀδῶ φορτίον,
ἐπὶ δὲ χεῖλους συνετοῦ εὐρεθήσεται χάρις.

*A fool’s chatter is as a load on the back of a journeyman,
but on the lips of a sage would a charm be found.*

ἐξήγησις] *SD* (2191) is uncertain about the meaning of the word, translating it with “Schilderung,” but for that we need to know what is described as in τὴν ἐξήγησιν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ‘.. of the dream’ *Jd* 7.15 B. The same objection holds for “explanation” (*NETS*).⁸

φορτίον] expanded in **ש** to אֲרִיקָי אֲנַשׁוּ ‘a heavy burden.’

χάρις] We doubt that the word means ‘pleasure’ (“Anmut” [*Smend* 193; *SD*]). Cf. ἐξεχύθη χάρις (ἦ) ἐν χεῖλεσίν σου *Ps* 44.3, ἔάν σε λόγοις τοῖς πρὸς χάριν ἐμβάληται ‘.. with words meant to charm you ..’ *Pr* 7.5. See also ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ *Lk* 4.22.

21.17) στόμα φρονίμου ζητηθήσεται ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ,
καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ διανοηθήσονται ἐν καρδίᾳ.

*The mouth of a prudent person shall be sought after in a meeting,
and his words shall be seriously considered.*

ἐκκλησίᾳ] which could mean here ‘the community.’

διανοηθήσονται] impersonal, whereas a v.l. διανοηθήσεται would have ἐκκλησία as its subject.

⁸ “the explanation of the dream and its interpretation” (*NETS*) is tautologous.

- 21.18) Ὡς οἶκος ἠφανισμένος οὕτως μωρῶ σοφία,
καὶ γνῶσις ἀσυνέτου ἀδιεξέταστοι λόγοι.

*To a fool wisdom is as a house in ruins
and to the unintelligent knowledge are words beyond proof.*

οἶκος ἠφανισμένος] **ס** בַּיִת אֶסְרָא ‘prison’ suggests בַּיִת כְּלָא as found in the *Vorlage* and misread as בַּיִת כְּלָא.⁹ The notion of wisdom as restrictive and constraining your freedom of action appears to be latent, which is apparent in the following verse.¹⁰ Smend (193) mentions מַשְׁמַד, i.e. מְשָׁמֵד, a misreading for מַשְׁמַר, i.e. מְשָׁמֵר.

γνῶσις ἀσυνέτου] not ‘knowledge possessed by ...’ but ‘.. meant for ...,’ cf. παρακαταθήκας εἶναι χηρῶν τε καὶ ὀρφανῶν ‘savings earmarked for widows and orphans’ 2M 3.10. For further details, see *SSG* § 22 v (xiv). Analogously in Heb. as in הַקְהָלָה אֶתְּחַטֵּא ‘a sin-offering for the congregation’ 11Q19 26.9, cf. *SQH* 21 b (xvi).

ἀδιεξέταστοι] derived from διεξετάζω ‘to thoroughly check, examine,’ and a hapax in LXX and unknown prior to it.¹¹ Smend (193) dismisses this Gk reading as “falsch,” without suggesting an alternative.

- 21.19) πέδαι ἐν ποσὶν ἀνοήτου παιδεία
καὶ ὡς χειροπέδαι ἐπὶ χειρὸς δεξιᾶς.

*For an unintelligent person education are fetters on his feet
and shackles on his right hand.*

πέδαι] **ס** offers a different figure: אֶתְּמַצְיָא ‘a net, trap.’

The author might be playing with the phonetic similarity of מוֹסְרִים and מוֹסְרֵימוֹת as suggested by Ryssel (338, fn. w).

- 21.20) μωρὸς ἐν γέλωτι ἀνυψοῖ φωνὴν αὐτοῦ,
ἀνὴρ δὲ πανοῦργος μόλις ἤσυχη μειδιάσει.

*A fool raises his voice in laughter,
but a clever man might quietly smile at the most.*

μειδιάσει] The shift in tense (pres. > fut.) is possibly deliberate: the one is factual, a certainty, whilst the latter a potentiality. **ס** is consistent with the ptc.: חָנַן .. קָלָהּ. Sim. **ס** חָנַן אֶתְּחַטֵּא .. מְרִים ‘raises .. quietly rejoices.’

- 21.21) ὡς κόσμος χρυσοῦς φρονίμῳ παιδεία
καὶ ὡς χλιδῶν ἐπὶ βραχίονι δεξιῶ.

⁹ Segal (128) mentions בַּיִת כְּלָא ‘a temporary house,’ which cannot be meant by **ס**.

¹⁰ Cf. Muraoka 1977a.420.

¹¹ Cf. Wagner 1999.139f.

*For a prudent person education is as a golden ornament
and as a bracelet on his right arm.*

χλιδῶν] LSJ has χλίδων.

- 21.22) πούς μωροῦ ταχὺς εἰς οἰκίαν,
ἄνθρωπος δὲ πολύπειρος αἰσχυνθήσεται ἀπὸ προσώπου.
*The feet of a fool (dash) indoors,
but a more experienced person might hesitate at the front door.*

(C) רגל נבל ממהרת א[...] בית וכבוד לאיש בח[...]

According to Segal (129) this and the following verses are included in S. Schenblum, *שלושה ספרים נפתחים* (Lemberg, 1877).

ταχὺς] Without first knocking at the door.

οἰκίαν] Most likely not one's own house, though a certain Rabbi says ואפילו 'even into his own house' with regard to our text quoted (mNid. 16.2). If this verse is to be taken with the following one, however, this alternative interpretation would be implausible.

ἀπὸ προσώπου] a rather odd expression. **§** reads מִרְכַּן אָפוּהָ 'he lowers his face.' **§h**, however, is puzzling: נִתְקַחַד פְּרָצוּפָא 'he would stand in awe of the face.' Cf. Ryssel's (339, fn. d) desperate efforts to deal with this crux.

י] כבוד לאיש בח is difficult to harmonise with **§**.

- 21.23) ἄφρων ἀπὸ θύρας παρακύπτει εἰς οἰκίαν,
ἀνήρ δὲ πεπαιδευμένος ἔξω στήσεται.
*A fool peeps at the door into the house,
but an educated person would stand outside.*

(C) יעמוד כסיל מפתח יביט אל בית ואיש מזומת

§ reads in vs. 23b: לְבַר וְנִמְלֵל: 'and it is proper for the man to stand outside and speak.'

- 21.24) ἀπαιδευσία ἀνθρώπου ἀκροᾶσθαι παρὰ θύραν,
ὁ δὲ φρόνιμος βαρυνθήσεται ἀτιμία.
*It is bad manners for a man to listen at doors,
and the prudent would be overwhelmed with shame.*

ἀτιμία] The majority reading ατιμιαν makes no sense.

- 21.25) χεῖλη ἀλλοτρίων ἐν τούτοις διηγήσονται,
λόγοι δὲ φρονίμων ἐν ζυγῷ σταθήσονται.
*Lips of strangers talk about these matters,
but words of the prudent shall be weighed carefully.*

ἀλλοτριῶν] Presumably זרִים, i.e. זָרִים ‘the ill-mannered,’ misread for זרִים, i.e. זָרִים.

ἐν τούτοις] On ἐν marking the object of a discourse or thought, see above at 6.37 and *GELS* s.v. 15.

ἐν ζυγῶ] Lit. ‘with a balance.’

21.26) ἐν στόματι μωρῶν ἢ καρδία αὐτῶν,
ἐν δὲ καρδίᾳ σοφῶν στόμα αὐτῶν.

*In their mouth is the mind of the fool,
but in their mind is the mouth of the wise.*

(C) יכניע פנים בפי כסילים לבם ובלב חכמים פיהם:

ἐν δὲ καρδίᾳ] The majority reading is καρδία δε, with which the contrast between the two hemistichs becomes less apparent. S expresses this logical contrast by differentiating their respective syntactic structure: פִּימֵה דְּסִכְלָא פִּימֵה דְּחַכְמָא בְּלִבָּהּ הוּוּ לְבָהּ. ‘it is the mouth of the fool that his mind is and the mouth of the wise is in his mind.’

21.27) ἐν τῷ καταρᾶσθαι ἀσεβῆ τὸν σατανᾶν
αὐτὸς καταρᾶται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν.

*When an impious person curses his adversary,
he is cursing nothing other than his own soul.*

σατανᾶν] This hapax in LXX is not being used as a reference to a personal entity hostile to God, Satan, as in the period following BS, e.g. NT, but as a synonym of אֲוִיב.¹² Though basically a transliteration of Heb. יִשָּׁפ, it is here partly Grecised, declinable. Even in its pure transliteration it is a normal substantive: Καὶ ἤγειρεν κύριος σαταν τῷ Σαλωμων τὸν Αδερ τὸν Ἰδουμαῖον καὶ τὸν Εσρωμ υἱὸν Ελιαδαε τὸν ἐν Ραεμμαθ Αδραζαρ βασιλέα Σουβα κύριον αὐτοῦ· καὶ συνηθροίσθησαν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἄνδρες, καὶ ἦν ἄρχων συστρέματος καὶ προκατελάβετο τὴν Δαμασεκ· καὶ ἦσαν σαταν τῷ Ἰσραηλ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Σαλωμων 1Kg 11.14, where σαταν is virtually plural and the text after Ἰδουμαῖον is absent in MT. Where one might expect to find Σαταν as a virtual personal name, we find διάβολος, so ὁ διάβολος for יִשָּׁפ Jb 1.6 and Καὶ ἔστη διάβολος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ עֲלֵי־יִשָּׁפ: 1Ch 21.1.

S’s הָלֵ אֲפִי מִן אֲפִי ‘he who did not sin against him’ is puzzling, whereas S^h’s אֲפִי is presumably a Christian intrusion.

τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν] Box - Oesterley and *NETS* are exceptional in translating this phrase as we do, and not “himself,” “soi-même,” and “sich selbst.”

¹² Cf. Snaith 109 and Muraoka 1977a.421.

Our translation is appropriate on account of *ἑαυτοῦ*, and not *μου*. On *ψυχῆ τινος* pers., see above at 1.30. Note also **§** *הַיְיָ מְלִיץ לְנַפְשׁוֹ* with the emphatic pronoun up front instead of the enclitic *הֵּ מְלִיץ*: one who is cursing him is none other than he himself.

21.28) *μολύνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ὁ ψιθυρίζων
καὶ ἐν παροικίᾳ μισηθήσεται.*

*One who whispers slanders is defiling his own soul
and he would be hated as sojourner.*

παροικήσει] < *παροίκησις*, a status in which one lives as a resident alien, *πάροικος*.

The majority reading of the start of 28b is *καὶ οὐ ἐὰν παροικήσῃ* ‘and wherever he might be sojourning.’

§ offers a proverb of its own: *דְּלֹא יָדַע מָנָא עַל סְכָלָא. עֵינֵיקָא נַפְשָׁהּ דְּחַבִּימָא עַל סְכָלָא.* *נַאמַר לְהַ* ‘the soul of the sage agonises over the fool, for he does not know what to say to him.’

22.3) αἰσχύνη πατρός ἐν γεννήσει ἀπαιδεύτου,
θυγάτηρ δὲ ἐπ’ ἐλαττώσει γίνεται.

*It is a shame of one who fathered an uneducated boy
and with a daughter born ensues a diminution of family resources.*

ἀπαιδεύτου] Since there does not exist ἀπαιδεύτη, the form here can, in theory, be fem., but the contrast with the second hemistich resolves the ambiguity.

The male dominant society lies in the background. No interest in the education of daughters. All that matters is the costs of preparing them for marriage. Unlike in v s. 4 here it is about daughters in general, wise or silly. Thus Ryssel’s “eine [derartige] Tochter” and “eine (solche) Tochter” (SD) are questionable.

22.4) θυγάτηρ φρονίμη κληρονομήσει ἄνδρα αὐτῆς,
καὶ ἡ καταισχύνουσα εἰς λύπην γεννήσαντος·

*A prudent daughter would win a husband
and one who brings about shame is a pain for her begetter.*

Starting from *filia prudens hereditas viro suo*, Smend (197) argues that κληρονομέω reflects in LXX לִיְהִיָּה and κληρονομία ἄνδρός or ἄνδρι should have been the correct rendering.² This equation occurs a mere two times:³ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος κληρονομήσει υἱοὺς υἱῶν יִבְרָכְךָ בְּיָהִי לְיָהִי לְטוֹב Pr 13.22; Is 49.8. The first instance is interesting because the acc. object refers to persons, and that a genitive phrase as in our Si case, but the logical relationship between the two nouns differs from that between a man and his wife. Hence GELS s.v. κληρονομέω assigns our Pr instance to *4. “to give an inheritance to.” In Is 49.8 the heir is not mentioned in MT: תִּמְשֹׁךְ תִּלְהַיְי לְיִהִיָּה, whereas in Ⓞ κληρονομήσει κληρονομίαν ἐρήμου it is “you” mentioned earlier in the verse – ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην ἐθνῶν τοῦ καταστῆσαι τὴν γῆν. In any event, this instance does not help Smend’s reconstruction of the Heb. *Vorlage*.

γεννήσαντος] The masc. form ignores the vital role of her mother.

22.5) πατέρα καὶ ἄνδρα καταισχύνει ἡ θρασεῖα
καὶ ὑπὸ ἀμφοτέρων ἀτιμασθήσεται.

*A brazen daughter makes her father and husband feel ashamed
and would be despised by both.*

πατέρα καὶ ἄνδρα] Ⓢ הַאָּבִי הַאִמָּה ‘her father and her mother.’

² Cf. his translation: “ein Erbteil für ihren Mann.”

³ *Index* s.v. κληρονομέω says “3,” which is to be corrected; the third is a v.l. at Si 46.1, where Ziegler reads κατακληρονομέω. Si 46.1 should be removed at GELS s.v. κληρονομέω 4.

- 22.6) μουσικὰ ἐν πένθει ἄκαιρος διήγησις,
μάστιγες δὲ καὶ παιδεία ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ σοφία.

*An untimely talk is music at a funeral,
lashing and remonstrance are a wise course at any time.*

διήγησις] In this context, *pace* Smend (197), the noun hardly means “die Lehrrede des Weisen,” though such is meant in, e.g. διήγησιν θεῖαν 6.35 above.

σοφίας] *Contra* Rahlfs and Swete, Ziegler prefers σοφία supported by two MSS and a couple of daughter versions alone.⁴ Would the clause mean “lashing and remonstrance are wisdom itself, its embodiment”?

- 22.7) ¶ τέκνα ἐν ἀγαθῇ ζωῇ τὴν τροφήν ἔχοντα
τῶν ἰδίων γεννητόρων κρύψουσι δυσγένειαν.

*Children who are raised properly
conceal the lowly background of their own parents.*

γεννητόρων] < γεννήτωρ, a hapax in LXX. Wagner (1999.333) notes that words with a suffix -τωρ are mainly distributed in poetic books or books of high, literary register, i.e. Si, Jb, Is, Pr, 2-4Mc.

- 22.8) τέκνα ἐν καταφρονήσει καὶ ἀπαιδευσίᾳ γαυριώμενα
συγγενείας ἑαυτῶν μολύνουσι τὴν εὐγένειαν. ¶
*Arrogant children, despising good manners and undisciplined,
discredit the respectable background of their own kinsmen.*

- 22.9) συγκολλῶν ὄστρακον ὁ διδάσκων μωρόν,
ἐξεγείρων καθεύδοντα ἐκ βαθέος ὕπνου.
*One who teaches a fool is gluing potsherds together,
waking up someone out of deep sleep.*

- 22.10) διηγούμενος νυστάζοντι ὁ διηγούμενος μωρῷ,
καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ ἔρεϊ Τί ἐστιν;
*He who narrates to a fool is narrating to someone dozing,
and at the end he would say “What is it?”*

The simile in vs. 10a is worded differently in S: כַּד אֵן אָנֹכִי אֹכֵל לֶחֶם וְאֵין אֲנִי רָעָב וְאֵין אֲנִי אֹכֵל לֶחֶם ‘and like someone who eats bread when he is not yet hungry.’

ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ] S רָעָב וְאֵין אֲנִי אֹכֵל; the verb is 3fp with the following אֲנִי אֹכֵל as its subject: “when your words have come to an end.”⁵

⁴ Ryssel (341, fn. o) vigorously defends σοφία.

⁵ Lagarde mentions a MS that spells the word as רָעָב with two dots above the letter Resh.

22.11) ἐπὶ νεκρῶ κλαῦσον, ἐξέλιπεν γὰρ φῶς,
καὶ ἐπὶ μωρῶ κλαῦσον, ἐξέλιπεν γὰρ σύνεσιν·
ἥδιον κλαῦσον ἐπὶ νεκρῶ, ὅτι ἀνεπαύσατο,
τοῦ δὲ μωροῦ ὑπὲρ θάνατον ἢ ζωὴ πονηρά.

*Weep over the dead, for he has taken leave of light,
and weep over the fool, for he has taken leave of intelligence.
Weep not so grievously over the dead, for he has entered rest,
but the life of the fool is worse than death.*

על מת לבכות כי חדל אורו ועל כסיל לבכות כי חדל בינה (C
כות על מת כי נח [...] ממות חיים רעים]

κλαῦσον] 𐤀 לבכות, an inf. cst. with an injunctive value, which has been correctly understood by our translator. Cf. *SQH* § 18 c. In this verse we have the same לבכות twice more.

ἐξέλιπεν] The Gk verb can be used both transitively and intransitively. However, the parallel clause in the next line takes care of the ambiguity, for σύνεσιν makes the verb transitive. Yet συνεσις is read by a good number of MSS. However, Qal חדל is an intr. verb. Thus חדל אורו means ‘his light ceased to exist.’ Then need we identify a scribal error in חדל בינה for חדלה בינה? Our scribe can retain his honour if we read it as בִּינָה, i.e. cst. of a verbal adjective, חָדַל, as in חָדַל אִישִׁים ‘lacking (supporting) men’ Is 53.3, and note also מָה־חָדַל אָנִי ‘what do I lack?’ Ps 39.5; in both cases the subject is human. In spite of the incongruity between the two languages in respect of the transitivity vs. intransitivity parameter we would analyse ἐξέλιπεν in ἐξέλιπεν γὰρ φῶς as transitive.⁶ That way we are making the fool accountable for deliberately farewellling intelligence.

This syntactic behaviour of חָדַל is observable in its synonym, חָסַר, as in אָדָם חָסַר־לֵב Pr 17.18, 24.20. See also זָקֵן עִם־מְלֵא יָמִים ‘an old man together with one still very young’ Je 6.11.⁷ The st. cst. of adjectives in these cases fundamentally differs from a case such as קִשְׁת־רוּחַ אָנֹכִי 1Sm 1.15, where the logical subject of קִשְׁת is רוּחַ, not אִשָּׁה.⁸

ἥδιον] Comparative of ἡδύς ‘pleasant, happy,’ being used here with elative value, ‘very merrily.’ To take it as genuinely comparative in relation to the fool would be a bit too sarcastic. Cf. 𐤀 לִית לְמִבְכָּא עַל מִיתָא דְמִתְנִיחַ 𐤀 ‘there is no crying over the dead who is at rest,’ on the basis of which Elizur (2010.27) reconstructs the lacuna of 𐤀 as [אין ל]בכות. An alternative reconstruction is [מעט ל]בכות. Smend (198) mentions Chrysosthom’s ὀλίγον and 𐤀 modicum.

⁶ Cf. 𐤀 שְׁבַק גִּיר נוֹהֲרָא 𐤀 ‘that he was deprived of the light’ and 𐤀 שְׁבַק גִּיר נוֹהֲרָא 𐤀 ‘for he has left the light.’

⁷ Cf. Muraoka 2018.

⁸ On this question, see JM § 129 *i-ia*.

ἀνεπαύσατο] The notion of death as the starting point of rest is found in Is 57.2, Dn 12.13, and bMQ 25b.

The last line reads in **Š** as **אִישׁוֹן גַּר מִן מוֹתָא הֵיא בִישׂא** ‘for worse than death is a bitter life.’

- 22.12) πένθος νεκροῦ ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι,
 μωροῦ δὲ καὶ ἀσεβοῦς πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ.
*Mourning of the dead lasts seven days,
 but for a fool and impious man it lasts all the days of his life.*

וְע שְׁבַעַת יָמִים [...] (Ca)

רַשׁ כָּל יְמֵי חַיָּו [...] (Cb)

Elizur (2010.27) reconstructs the lacuna as **אָבַל גָּנַע**, i.e. **אבל גנע**. However, **רש** is difficult; for a discussion, see Elizur loc. cit. In the lacuna a maximum of four letters can be accommodated.

μωροῦ δὲ καὶ ἀσεβοῦς] This can relate to a single individual, whereas **שְׁח אִישׁוֹן גַּר מִן מוֹתָא הֵיא בִישׂא** is possibly concerned about two individuals, though the closing word is **הֵיא** ‘his,’ perhaps ‘their respective life.’

- 22.13) μετὰ ἄφρονος μὴ πληθύνῃς λόγον
 καὶ πρὸς ἀσύνετον μὴ πορεύου·
 ¶ ἀναισθητῶν γὰρ ἐξουθενήσει σου τὰ πάντα. ¶
 φύλαξαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ κόπον ἔχῃς
 καὶ οὐ μὴ μολυνθῆς ἐν τῷ ἐντιναγμῶ αὐτοῦ·
 ἔκκλινον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐρήσεις ἀνάπαυσιν
 καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀκηδιάσης ἐν τῇ ἀπονοίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
*Do not talk too long with a fool
 and do not visit a stupid man.
 Being mentally obtuse he will despise everything about you.
 Keep away from him so that you may not get into troubles
 and do not become defiled through contacts with him.
 Turn away from him. Then you will find relief
 and you would never feel weary through his madness.*

μὴ πληθύνῃς λόγον] **שְׁח לֹא תַשְׁפַּר שׁוֹעִיטָא** ‘Do not tell pretty stories.’⁹ Smend (198) refers to **Š** in 46.12, where the same clause occurs, though as widely deviating from **℣** as here.

πρὸς ἀσύνετον μὴ πορεύου] **שְׁח עַם חֲזִירָא לֹא תֵאָזַל בְּאֶרְצָא** ‘with a pig do not go on a journey.’ Smend (199) follows **Š**, saying that **℣** is deliberately toning down.

⁹ We are doubtful that this Syr. clause can mean “finde nicht angenehm die Unterhaltung” (Ryssel 342, fn. h).

έντιναγμῶ] A broadly preserved v.l. reads εκτιναγμῶ ‘shaking off,’ but we need to know what he shakes off.

έν τῇ ἀπονοίᾳ αὐτοῦ] **ש** הַתְּיָשׁוּדִי אֲנָסוּבָּ ‘with many of his stories’; **ש** הַלְּיָדָה אֲתִרְשָׁעֵמְצָבָּ ‘with his pride.’

22.14) ὑπὲρ μόλιβον τί βαρυνθήσεται;
καὶ τί αὐτῷ ὄνομα ἄλλ’ ἢ μωρός;
*What could be heavier than lead?
and what is its name other than ‘fool’?*

22.15) ἄμμον καὶ ἄλα καὶ βῶλον σιδήρου
εὐκοπον ὑπενεγκεῖν ἢ ἄνθρωπον ἀσύνητον.
*Sand and salt and a block of iron are
an easier load to bear than a stupid person.*

εὐκοπον] Many MSS read ευκοπωτερον, a more orthodox, comparative form. The selection of the absolute degree is indicative of the greater flexibility in this respect in Koine Greek. Another example is τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν ἐλάσσω εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός, καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας Gn 1.16. See *SSG* § 23 **ba**.

ὑπενεγκεῖν] **ש** **ע** **מ** **ע** **מ** **ל** **ה** ‘to live with.’ The underlying Heb. is most likely **אָשָׂן**, which means not only ‘to carry a load’ in its literal sense, but also metaphorical, “to put up with, endure,” as in **וְעָלְיָהּ עֲלֵיךָ רַחֵם יְיָ** Je 15.15 and **מִי יִשְׁאָנָה מִי נִכְאָה וְיָרוּחַ** Pr 18.14.¹⁰ In LXX, unlike in CG,¹¹ we find ὑποφέρω used only in its metaphorical sense, as can be seen in *GELS* s.v. The verb used in **ש** **ה** **ל** **מְסִבְרוּ** is to be compared with Pr 18.14 **ש** **מִן** **מְכֻאָבָּתָא** **וְהָיָה** **הִרְיָבָרְיָנָה**.¹²

22.16) Ἴμάντωσις ξυλίνη ἐνδεδεμένη εἰς οἰκοδομὴν
ἐν συσσεισμῶ οὐ διαλυθήσεται·
οὕτως καρδιά ἐστηριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοήματος βουλῆς
ἐν καιρῷ οὐ δειλιάσει.
*A piece of timber-beam bonded into a building
would not come loose in an earthquake.
So a mind firmly grounded on the design with wise counsel
would not be scared at any time.*

¹⁰ More BH examples are listed in BDB s.v. **אָשָׂן** Qal 2 d.

¹¹ Cf. ὄπλα ὑποφέρειν ‘to carry arms’ Xen. Cyr. 4.5.57.

¹² Segal (133) appropriately mentions a line in the Proverbs of Ahiqar: נשאת חלא וטענת [א] יקר מן ופת[א] מלא ולא איתי זי יקר מן ופת[א] ‘I carried sand and hauled salt but there is nothing that is heavier than [de]b[t]’ (11) in Lindenberger 1983.98.

Ἰμάντωσις] a hapax in LXX, defined in LSJ as meaning “piece of timber used instead of a bond-stone.” Cf. **ס** אַתְּקַתְּ עֲרָקָא ‘beam’ and **קוּטְר** **ס** לְ ‘a binding of beams.’ **ס** is elaborate: **אֲתִיבְתִּי אֶתְּקַתְּ דְּאֶרְסִי אֶתְּקַתְּ דְּאֶרְסִי אֶתְּקַתְּ דְּאֶרְסִי** ‘a wooden beam bonded in the walls at the corners of the building.’

καιρῶ] A sg. ind. noun in a negating clause can indicate absolute, categorical negation, on which see SSG § 83 f. Another example is ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἦν ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν γῆν ‘there was not a man to till the ground’ Gn 2.5. The same analysis could apply to συσσεισμῶ, though this noun is less generic than καιρός. **ס**, sensing this, has added **כּ**: **וְכֹל דְּתִיבְתִּי לָא תִיבְתִּי** ‘no scare at all would shake him.’ In this Gk syntagm, a form of πᾶς is added in order to reinforce the feature of categorical negation, e.g. Οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντός ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ‘you shall not eat from any tree whatsoever’ Gn 3.1.¹³ As a matter of fact, a good number of MSS do add παντι at this point.

Ryssel’s (343) “zur Zeit [der Gefahr]” is not convincing; it fails to take into account the parallelism between ἐν συσσεισμῶ, which he translates “durch ein Erdbeben,” and ἐν καιρῶ.

συσσεισμῶ] Smend (199) holds it wrong to confine the shake to earthquake, translating the word as “durch keine Erschütterung” (II 37). There is no absolute argument for generalising the application of the noun. “Irrespective of the location of the epicentre, the intensity of the quake or its frequency” is perfectly acceptable. All the more so when the grammatical subject of the clause is part of a building.

On the ground that this Gk word translates **עַרְס** Je 23.19 and **הַרְעָה** 2Kg 2.1 Ryssel (343, fn. e) holds that it could be translated here with “Sturmwind,” but a stormy wind can be viewed as the cause of a quake, but not the quake itself.

22.17) καρδία ἠδρασμένη ἐπὶ διανοίας συνέσεως
ὡς κόσμος γλύμματος τοίχου ξυστοῦ.

*A mind rooted in intelligent thinking
is like an ornament of an engraved figure on a smoothed wall.*

ἠδρασμένη] < ἐδράζω, a rare word occurring a mere three times in LXX and meaning “to position firmly” as in πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι ‘before mountains were firmly positioned [at the time of the creation]’ Pr 8.25, and here used metaphorically. Cf. **ס** לְ מִסְתָּא ‘firmly placed’ and ed. Mossul **שְׂרִירָא** ‘firm.’

γλύμματος] an emendation proposed by Smend (200) and Katz (1936.278), now accepted by Ziegler for ψαμμοτός ‘of plaster or stucco’ (LSJ, s.v.). Cf. **ס** אֶפְרָא ‘engraving’ and **ס** לְ אֶפְרָא ‘engraved.’

ξυστοῦ] **ס** אֲתִיבְתִּי מְצַבְתִּי ‘decorated’ and **ס** לְ אֶתְּלִיבְתִּי ‘hewn.’

¹³ See SSG § 83 fa.

22.18) χάλικες ἐπὶ μετεώρου κείμενοι
κατέναντι ἀνέμου οὐ μὴ ὑπομείνωσιν·
οὕτως καρδία δειλή ἐπὶ διανοήματος μωροῦ
κατέναντι παντὸς φόβου οὐ μὴ ὑπομείνη.

*Pebbles lying on a high spot
would never withstand a wind.*

*Likewise a fearful mind (dependent) on a fool's thought
would never withstand any terror.*

§ presents a proverb almost of its own: צָרָא וְעוֹרָא עַל כְּאֶפְא דְרָמָא וְדִקְלִיל טַב קְדָם רוּחָא לָא מְשַׁכַּח לְמַקְם אִין מְאֵנָא דְכִתְנָא וְעַמְרָא חוֹרָא קְדָם עַלְעָלָא לָא נְתַקִּימוּן מְקַם לְבָהּ הַכְנָא לְבָהּ דְסַכְלָא בְמַעוּהָ תְבִיר וְקְדָם עַקְתָּא לָא מְשַׁכַּח לְמַקְם ‘a small bag on a high rock and very light cannot hold a stand before a wind just as a garment of flax and white wool before a storm would not be able to hold a stand. So is the mind of a fool internally broken and cannot stand before the difficulty.’

χάλικες] A good number of MSS read χάρακες ‘palisades.’

μωροῦ] Smend (200) identifies a parallelism between διανοήματος μωροῦ here and διανοίας συνέσεως in the preceding verse, and analyses μωροῦ as expressing an abstract notion, presumably a substantivised adjective, “of foolishness.” We are not totally convinced. Are διάνοια and διανόημα synonyms?

22.19) Ὁ νύσσων ὀφθαλμὸν κατάξει δάκρυα,
καὶ ὁ νύσσων καρδίαν ἐκφαίνει αἴσθησιν.

*One who pierces an eye would cause tears to flow out,
and one who pierces a mind activates its perception.*

νύσσων] שְׂוַי דְעַר ‘incites, stimulates.’ For this use of the Syr. verb we find an illuminating instance cited in *SL* s.v. Pe. 4: בְּדָמוֹת עוֹקְסָא לְמִדְעָה וְלְרֵעֵנָה: 4: דְעָרָא וְמַנְדָּא וְמַעֲרָא ‘like a sting to his mind and thinking it incites, arouses and wakens,’ and we are informed that the Syr. verb renders νύττειν, a variant form of νύσσειν.

καρδίαν] § probably took לֵב or לֵבָב in the sense of ‘heart’: וְמַחוּתָא דְלֵבָא ‘and a blow of the heart destroys friendship.’

ἐκφαίνει] Segal (135) holds that this is a result of the translator misreading תביע as תופיע. For a possible instance of this equivalence see γεώργιον ξύλου ἐκφαίνει ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ Si 27.6, where ܩܘܪܝܝܢܘܬܝܢ reads על עבודת עץ יהי פרי and for יהי פרי we could postulate יפיע פרי.

22.20) ὁ βάλλον λίθον ἐπὶ πετεινὰ ἀποσοβεῖ αὐτά,
καὶ ὁ δνειδίζων φίλον διαλύσει φιλίαν.

*One who casts a stone at birds scares them away,
and one who insults a friend would make an end of friendship.*

ὄνειδιζων] ⚈ לְךָ ‘deprives,’ a puzzling rendering.

At the end of the verse ⚈ adds what looks like an explanatory comment: אַתָּה לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲקֵשׁ לְרֵעִי וְאִם תִּשְׁתַּחֲקֵשׁ לֹא תִחְשַׁב אִתּוֹ רֵעוּתָא ‘You shall not betray your friend, and if you did betray, you shall not think that you (still) have with him friendship.’¹⁴

22.21) ἐπὶ φίλον ἐὰν σπάσης ῥομφαίαν,
μη ἀφελπίσης, ἔστιν γὰρ ἐπάνοδος.
*Even if you drew a sword against a friend,
do not give up hope, for there is (still) a way back.*

(C) אַל אֶרְהֹב אֶל תְּשֻׁלוּךְ חֵרֶב אֵל תְּגוֹר כִּי יֵשׁ כּוֹפֵר:

ἐὰν] which makes more sense than ⚈ אַל, though the position of the prepositional phrase outside of the protasis, though not impossible, is unusual. Exactly the same applies to ἐὰν ἀνοίξεης ⚈ תִּפְתַּח אֶל in the following verse.

ἀφελπίσης] ⚈ תְּגוֹר ‘you dread,’ cf. ⚈ תַּחֲהַל ‘you despair.’

ἐπάνοδος] Going back to a friend or to God as a penitent? Cf. μετανοῶσιν ἔδωκεν ἐπάνοδον 17.24 above, where God is the s, and ⚈ לְךָ אֵת גִּירֵי פְּוֹנְיָא ‘for there is (a chance) of repentance.’ Cf. ⚈ לְךָ אֵת גִּירֵי מִפְּקֻנָּא ‘for he has an exit.’

22.22) ἐπὶ φίλον ἐὰν ἀνοίξεης στόμα,
μη εὐλαβηθῆς, ἔστιν γὰρ διαλλαγή·
πλὴν ὄνειδισμοῦ καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ μυστηρίου ἀποκαλύψεως
καὶ πληγῆς δολίας,
ἐν τούτοις ἀποφεύξεται πᾶς φίλος.

*If you quarrel with a friend,
you shall not be afraid, for there is reconciliation (possible)
except insult and arrogance and disclosure of privacy
and deceitful blow.*

These committed, every friend would part with you.

(C) אַל אֶרְהֹב אֶל תִּפְתַּח פֶּה אֵל תְּדַאֵג כִּי יֵשׁ תְּשׁוּבָה:

ἐὰν] see at the preceding verse.

πλὴν ὄνειδισμοῦ] בַּר הַקְּדָא ‘a disgraceful person.’ There follows nothing that would correspond to ὑπερηφανίας, but we find מִן דְּגִלְא רְאָזָא ‘one who exposes a secret.’ Smend (201) suspects that this is possibly an error for לְבָר מִן הַקְּדָא ‘except insulting.’ He mentions מִן הַקְּדָא לְבָר מִן הַקְּדָא Si 36.5, where we read ⚈ אֵין אֵלהים וְזֹלְתֵיךְ and ⚈ οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν σου. However, how

¹⁴ We are sceptical over Smend’s understanding of this Syriac verb, הַתְּחַלֵּךְ: “gegen deinen Freund sage nichts weiter.” It basically means “to change oneself.”

would this restored Syr. text link up with what follows: **ܐܝܢܐ ܐܠܝܗܐ**? Cf. **ܫܝܢ ܐܕܝܩܗ ܡܢ ܪܘܫܐ** ‘except insulting,’ which, however, continues smoothly with the following **ܐܝܢܐܗܘܐ ܐܠܝܗܐ ܐܠܝܗܐ ܐܠܝܗܐ** ‘and arrogance and exposure of secrets.’

22.23) πίστιν κτῆσαι ἐν πτωχείᾳ μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον,
 ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ ὁμοῦ πλησθῆς·
 ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως διάμενε αὐτῷ,
 ἵνα ἐν τῇ κληρονομίᾳ αὐτοῦ συγκληρονομήσης·
 ¶ οὐ καταφρονητέον γὰρ ἀεὶ τῆς περιγραφῆς,
 οὐδὲ θαυμαστὸς πλούσιος νοῦν οὐκ ἔχων. ¶

*Gain the trust of a neighbour by being with him in poverty
 so that you may share the pleasure in his prosperity.*

*At the time of his trouble stay close to him
 so that you may have a share in his inheritance.*

*¶ The dressing code is never lightly to be thought of,
 nor is there anything surprising about someone with no brain being
 rich. ¶*

πίστιν κτῆσαι .. τοῦ πλησίον] **ܫܝܢ ܐܬܝܢܐܘܢ ܡܢ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ** ‘Support your friend in poverty,’ which is close to 23c: **ܐܪܒܐ ܗܠ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܬܝܢܐܘܢ ܕܡܝܢ** ‘at the time of his difficulty be a friend to him.’

Smend (202) is surprised by the combination πίστιν κτάομαι. However, we have another instance of an intangible entity as *o* in καρδία φρονίμου κτᾶται αἴσθησιν ‘the mind of a prudent man gains understanding’ Pr 18.15.

μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον] It is not easy to express succinctly what the preposition here means. Smend (202) refers to καρδίαν ἐκτησάμην μετ’ αὐτῆς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ‘being close to her I acquired understanding right from the start’ Si 51.20.

ἵνα] Does this indicate a purpose, an egoistic motive? This conjunction can indicate a result, a plain result, not an intended one, as in ἵνα εἰπωσιν σήμερον ‘as a result people say today’ Gn 22.14.¹⁵ The conjunction, *so that*, not *in order that*, chosen in our translation above reflects this ambiguity of ἵνα.

πλησθῆς] Supported by one Gk MS alone, B, whilst the remainder read a form of εὐφραίνω ‘to rejoice,’ so **ܫܝܢ ܡܫܒܗܩܗ**.¹⁶

περιγραφῆς] What “outline” (*NETS*) is supposed to mean is beyond us.

The selection of the gen. case here is due to the underlying verb, καταφρονέω, which governs a gen.¹⁷

¹⁵ Cf. *BA* ad loc. “de sorte qu’on dit” and *VL unde .. dicitur*. On the analogous use of the conjunction in NTG, see *BDAG* s.v. 3. The second reference mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἵνα 2, Je 43.3 is now marked with a question mark. Cf. also *GELS* s.v. ὅστε 2 and Muraoka 1973.

¹⁶ For an extended argument in favour of the majority reading, see Ryssel 344, fn. i.

¹⁷ Cf. *GG5* § 22 r.

22.24) πρὸ πυρὸς ἀτμίς καμίνου καὶ καπνός·
οὕτως πρὸ αἱμάτων λοιδορίαί.

*Before a flame appear first steam of the furnace and smoke,
so bloodshed is preceded by abusive quarrels.*

ἀτμίς καμίνου καὶ] **שׁוֹרֵץ** ‘goes up, rises.’

αἱμάτων] The pl. expresses a large quantity. Αἵματα is often used with reference to murder, awakening the image of a pool of blood. Cf. *SSG* § 21 **b** and *GELS* s.v. αἷμα **1 a**. The same holds for מִיָּדָה, on which see *BDB* s.v. מָדָה **f**.

22.25) φίλον σκεπάσαι οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι
καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ κρυβῶ,

*I shall not be ashamed of protecting a friend
and I shall never feign absence to him.*

In **שׁ** the author is applying the lesson to his readership and is more specific: וְגַם אִם יִפְּרוֹץ סֵתֶרֶךָ לְפָנַי וְלִפְנֵי כָל אֶחָד מִן הָעָם אֲנִי לֹא אֶשְׁתָּבֵשׁ ‘if your friend landed in poverty, you shall not leave him feeling ashamed ..’

22.26) καὶ εἰ κακὰ μοι συμβήσεται δι’ αὐτόν,
πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων φυλάσσεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

*And should hardship befall me because of him,
everyone who hears the news would stay away from him.*

Note **שׁ**: אֲנִי לֹא אֶשְׁתָּבֵשׁ כִּי יִפְּרוֹץ סֵתֶרֶךָ לְפָנַי וְלִפְנֵי כָל אֶחָד מִן הָעָם אֲנִי לֹא אֶשְׁתָּבֵשׁ ‘if your friend disclosed a secret to you, do not publicise it so that everyone who hears you may keep a safe distance from you and regard you as a scum.’

22.27) Τίς δώσει ἐπὶ στόμα μου φυλακὴν
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειλέων μου σφραγίδα πανοῦργον,
ἵνα μὴ πέσω ἀπ’ αὐτῶν
καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά μου ἀπολέσῃ με;

*Oh that I had a sentinel to guard my mouth
and a dextrous seal to guard my lips
in order that I may not fall because of them
and my tongue may (not) destroy me!*

Τίς δώσει] Though phrased as a question, this is a mechanical reproduction of the well-known Hebrew formula beginning with מִי יִתֵּן and expressing a fervent desire.¹⁸ Another example is Τίς δώσει μοι πτέρυγας ὥσει

¹⁸ See Muraoka 2000. Segal (136) reads מִי יִשֶׁת, which is unknown to us as equivalent to this idiomatic מִי יִתֵּן. *SD* translates it verbatim: “wer wird .. ?” Likewise *BJ* “Qui mettra .. ?”, Skehan - Di Lella “Who will set .. ?”, and *NETS* “Who will grant .. ?”

περιστερᾶς καὶ πετασθήσομαι καὶ καταπαύσω; Ps 54.7 < מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי אֶבֶר > כִּי־יִנָּה אֶעֱפֹה וְאֶשְׁכַּנָּה. Some LXX translators, taking note of the idiomatic nature of this formula, used an optative form of δίδωμι, e.g. τίς δώη πάντα τὸν λαὸν κυρίου προφήτας ..; ‘Would that all the Lord’s people were prophets ..!’ Nu 11.29 < מִי יִתֵּן כָּל־עַם יְהוָה נְבִיאִים > § appears to be unfamiliar with this Heb. idiom: מִן דִּין אַקִּים וְגוֹ ‘who then posted ..?’¹⁹

σφραγίδα πανούργων] § דִּקְרָא דְאִתְּמָר בְּהוֹן נְכֻלָּא ‘a respectable (?) seal’ is odd.

ἐπὶ τῶν] Why the shift to the gen. case? The two prepositional phrases share one and the same verb and both refer to parts of a human body. A sheer stylistic variation?

ἵνα μὴ πέσω ἅπ’ αὐτῶν] § דִּלְקָא אִמְר בְּהוֹן נְכֻלָּא ‘so that I may not say deceits with them.’

αὐτῶν] Its referents might be χεῖλέων alone, or also στόμα included. The latter option is more likely for § בְּהוֹן, since סְפֹתָיִם is fem. in gender, requiring בְּהוֹןִי. The majority reading, αὐτῆς, is difficult, a reading that Ryssel (345, fn. g) prefers and makes it refer in advance to ἡ γλῶσσά μου. But a proleptic, anticipatory pronoun, whether independent or suffixal, refers in Hebrew to a constituent in the same clause, not to a following, separate one.

¹⁹ The use of אָהָה with optative value is known, which, however, is not extended to other verbs. See Nöldeke 1966 § 260. All the same in Muraoka 2005 § 81 an example which is rather close to the phenomenon under discussion is found: מִן דִּין עֲנֵל לִן כְּאֶפָא Mc 16.3, which renders Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ..; ‘who could roll the stone away for us ..?’ Another instance which does not fit the syntactic conditioning Nöldeke laid down, namely אָהָה before an adjective or participle, is אֶמְתֵּי דִין הָאָרְמֵשׁ ‘we wish that it were evening!’ Dt 28.67, where, for some reason or other, morning and evening were reversed.

CHAPTER 23

- 23.1) κύριε πάτερ καὶ δέσποτα ζωῆς μου,
μὴ ἐγκαταλίπησ με ἐν βουλῇ αὐτῶν,
καὶ μὴ ἀφῆς με πεσεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

*Lord, father, and master of my life,
do not abandon me in their counsel,
and do not give me up to fall among them.*

πάτερ] God is called ‘father’ several times in BH, e.g. אָבִינוּ כִּי אֲבִרְהָם אֲתָה הָיָה אֲבִינוּ מְעוֹלָם מִשְׁמַשׁ לֹא יִדְעֵנוּ וְיִשְׁרָאֵל לֹא יִכְיֶרְנוּ אֲתָה הָיָה אֲבִינוּ אֲבִינוּ מְעוֹלָם מִשְׁמַשׁ לֹא יִדְעֵנוּ וְיִשְׁרָאֵל לֹא יִכְיֶרְנוּ Is 63.16. More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. אָב 2.

שׁ] reads וְאָבִינוּ, though ‘our Father’ is used as in the above-cited Is 63.16, a Christian influence of *Pater noster* Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Mt 6.9 cannot be precluded. Cf. also SD II 2191f.

δέσποτα ζωῆς μου] This is a rare instance in LXX of δεσπότης modified by a gen. nominal which is not an animate entity as in δέσποτα τῶν πατέρων 1E 4.50. The use of the voc. δέσποτα referring to God is widespread in LXX.

αὐτῶν, αὐτοῖς] Who the referents are is ambiguous. Ryssel (345, fn. i) maintains that this verse originally stood in vs. 3, where we do find τῶν ὑπενα-
ντιῶν, but how has vs. 1 shifted backwards?

ἀφῆς] Though a high-frequency verb, exactly what ἀφίημι means here is not easy to understand. “To allow me, let me” is unlikely, for nobody would request God to be allowed to fall. Thus *pace* “ne me laisse pas trébucher” (*BJ*), “permit me not to fall” (Skehan - Di Lella), and “do not let me fall” (*NETS*). *SD*’s “lasse nicht zu, dass ich ihretwegen falle” and Ryssel’s “laß nicht zu, daß ich durch sie zu Falle komme” are better. *GELS* s.v. 3 b states that, in our particular instance there is a collateral notion of abandoning somebody to his fate, and this is something in addition to what we find in a case such as οὐκ ἀφῆκά σε ἄψασθαι αὐτῆς Gn 20.6.

- 23.2) τίς ἐπιστήσει ἐπὶ τοῦ διανοήματός μου μάστιγας
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς καρδίας μου παιδείαν σοφίας,
ἵνα ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγνοήμασίν μου μὴ φείσωνται
καὶ οὐ μὴ παρῆ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν,

*Who would apply whips to my thinking
and discipline of wisdom to my mind
so that they would not take a charitable view of my errors of ignorance
and he would never disregard their sins,*

ἐπιστήσει] To the verb ἐφίστημι here we propose applying the sense 2 in *GELS*: “to place firmly, mostly metaph.” It is to be noted that, when ἐπί is added to indicate where to place, it usually takes an acc., e.g. ἐπιστήσω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἔσθουσας τὸ αἶμα Lv 17.10.

φείσονται] Who the subjects are is again obscure.

παρῆ] The *s* of this verb is probably τίς at the start of the verse.

We view παρῆ here as a form of παρήμι as transitively used. By contrast, *SD* “und ihre Verfehlungen nicht (mehr) existieren,” in which πάρειμι has been identified. Whereas this second verb can mean “to be present near by” as in ἀπόντες δὲ καὶ παρόντες ὁμοίως ἐτρέχοντο Wi 11.11, we are sceptical that such a use applies to our case with τὰ ἁμαρτήματα as its subject.

23.3) ὅπως μὴ πληθυνθῶσιν αἱ ἄγνοιαί μου
καὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου πλεονάσωσιν
καὶ πεσοῦμαι ἔναντι τῶν ὑπεναντίων
καὶ ἐπιχαρεῖται μοι ὁ ἐχθρός μου,
¶ ὧν μακρὰν ἔστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ ἐλέους σου; ¶
*so that my (areas of) ignorance may not increase
and my sins multiply
and I fall before (my) opponents
and my enemies rejoice over me,
far from whom is the hope of Your mercy?*

ὅπως] § 197, a causal conjunction.

; ¶] The editions by Swete and Rahlfs add the question mark at the end of the preceding line, since they do not contain the last line.

ἐπιχαρεῖται μοι] The verb ἐπιχαίρω displays a variety of constructions showing over whom or what joy, mostly malicious, is expressed. In addition <+ τινι pers.> as here there occurs a case of <+ τινι rei> as in ἐπιχαρέντες τῇ σῆ πτώσει ‘having rejoiced over your fall’ Ba 4.31. On the shift from the subj. φείσονται (vs. 2) .. πληθυνθῶσιν .. πλεονάσωσιν to the fut. πεσοῦμαι .. ἐπιχαρεῖται, see *SSG* § 28 **gib**, 29 **a**.

ὧν] Is τῶν ὑπεναντίων, though not in the immediately preceding clause, the antecedents of the rel. pron.? Otherwise the selection of the gen. case would be inexplicable. Cf. μακρὰν ἔστιν ὑπερηφανίας ‘She is far removed from arrogance.’ With “deren Hoffnung” *SD* construes ὧν with ἡ ἐλπίς, though, even so, we need to determine the antecedents of ὧν.

23.4) κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὸς ζωῆς μου,
μετεωρισμὸν ὀφθαλμῶν μὴ δῶς μοι
*Lord, Father, and the god of my life,
do not allow me to raise a haughty look*

θεῆ] on this vocative unknown to CG, see *SSG* § 22 y, p. 189, fn. 3.

We find a different threefold appellation in **§** – אֲלֹהֵי אָבִי וְמַרְהוֹן דְּחַיִּי – cf. **§** הַיְיָ דִּילֵי דְּחַיִּי וְאֵלֵהּ אֲבֹנֵי אֲרָא. **§** offers an extra appeal to God: לֵא תִרְמִינִי לֵא בְּטָעִי וְיִהְיֶה בְּטָעִי ‘Do not cast me in their error.’

μετεωρισμὸν] **§** הַיְיָ פִּהּ ‘wandering,’ which represents a slightly different metaphor, i.e. someone gazing at and selecting a wrong path.

μετεωρισμὸν ὀφθαλμῶν] a phrase applied to whores at Si 26.9.

23.5) καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν ἀπόστρεψον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ·

and remove lust from me.

ἐπιθυμίαν] Most likely of sexual connotation. Cf. **§** לֵבָא פְּהֻאָ ‘debauched heart.’

23.6) κοιλίας ὄρεξις καὶ συνουσιασμός μὴ καταλαβέτωσάν με,
καὶ ψυχῆ ἀναιδεῖ μὴ παραδῶς με.

*Let not the yearning of stomach and sexual drive lay hold of me
and do not hand me over to a shameless soul.*

κοιλίας ὄρεξις] **§** רֶבֶבֶת דְּבִשְׁתִּי פִּהּ ‘debauchedness of flesh,’ the first substantive being derivationally related to **§** אֲרָא, an adjective used in vs. 5. Cf. **§** הַיְיָ דְּכַרְכָּרָא דְּכַרְכָּרָא ‘desires of stomach.’ With his **§** הַיְיָ דְּחַיִּי Segal (136) has taken **§** over, but his view of **§** חַיִּי as meaning ‘lust (138)’ (**§** חַיִּי) is questionable.

Παιδεία στόματος

Discipline in speech

The subtitle of the passage is absent in **§** and **§** alike, but present in **¶**:
DOCTRINA ORIS.

23.7) Παιδείαν στόματος ἀκούσατε, τέκνα,
καὶ ὁ φυλάσσων οὐ μὴ ἀλῶ.

*Children, hear about the discipline in speech
and one who adheres (to it) would never be captured.*

στόματος] **§** חַיִּי is syntactically equivocal, for the suffix pronoun can be construed with **§** חַיִּי alone, i.e. ‘the instruction given by me orally,’ or with the whole noun phrase, ‘my oral instruction.’

ἀλῶ] = **§** חַיִּי דְּחַיִּי, but **§** חַיִּי דְּחַיִּי ‘he will be reproached.’ However, the former, by means of the addition of **§** חַיִּי דְּחַיִּי ‘on account of his acts of speech,’ makes it plain that it is not about physical arrest; the added phrase has actually been imported from the first line of vs. 8.

23.8) ἐν τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ καταληφθήσεται ἁμαρτωλός,
καὶ λοῖδορος καὶ ὑπερήφανος σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

*With his lips a sinner would be captured
and one who speaks abusively and one who is haughty would be brought
down with them.*

For the entire verse the reading of **ס** is rather distinct: **דַּקְתָּ מְצִיר הִלְלָמָּה בְּמִלֵּךְ מְפֹמֵם אֶלְכָּסִי אֶפְשָׁר** ‘for someone who is wicked is captured through his speech and one who is foolish with his mouth is tripped up.’

σκανδαλισθήσονται] cf. Wagner 1999.289f. The pl. form indicates that the preceding two adjectives refer to two distinct persons, thus *pace* “kommt” (Smend II 39) and “he is tripped up” (Snaith.).

23.9) ὄρκω μὴ ἐθίσῃς τὸ στόμα σου
καὶ ὀνομασίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ συνεθισθῆς·

*Do not accustom your mouth to (swearing) an oath
and do not get into the habit of mentioning the Holy One.*

ὄρκω] The selection of the pl. **אָתָּמָה** in both **ס** and **סִי** suggests that there exist diverse formulations of oath and diverse occasions for oath.

Wagner 1999.260f. points out the theological significance of both “swearing” and “mentioning God’s name” being forbidden.

ἐθίσῃς] *Pace* Smend (206) and Segal (139) **ס** **הִלְאָתָּה** appears to mean “to accustom,” not “to teach,” cf. *ἀπαιδευσίαν ἀσυρή μὴ συνεθίσῃς τὸ στόμα σου* v. 13, where **ס** reads **דְּמִן הִלְתָּ אֶל אֲתִילִסְתָּ** ‘Don’t accustom your mouth to folly.’ The use of the prep. **בְּ** in **סִי** **דַּעַתְּ אֶל אֲתָמוּמָה** is too mechanical, for the dative ὄρκω is an indirect object, not instrumental. Cf. Wagner 1999.309f.

23.10) ὥσπερ γὰρ οἰκέτης ἐξεταζόμενος ἐνδελεχῶς
ἀπὸ μώλωπος οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσεται,
οὕτως καὶ ὁ ὀμνύων καὶ ὀνομάζων διὰ παντὸς
ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας οὐ μὴ καθαρισθῆι.

*For, just as a domestic servant being constantly scrutinised
would not have bruises decreasing,
so one who swears and mentions the Holy Name all the time
would never become purified of sins.*

οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσεται] **ס** **אָבָי**, a harmonisation with καθαρισθῆι **אָבָי**. The government of the verb here by means of a preposition is indicative of a diachronic change, cf. *ἤ ἐλαττοῦμαι ἐπιλήμπτων ἐγὼ ...*; ‘Haven’t I got enough of madmen on my hands?’ 1K 21.16R.¹

ὀμνύων καὶ ὀνομάζων] **ס** **אָמַרְי לְאָדָּמָה** ‘lies and swears’!

¹ Cf. SSG § 55 e.

- 23.11) ἀνήρ πολύορκος πλησθήσεται ἀνομίας,
καὶ οὐκ ἀποστήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ μάστιξ·
ἐὰν πλημμελήσῃ, ἁμαρτία αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ,
κὰν ὑπερίδῃ, ἥμαρτεν δισσωῶς·
καὶ εἰ διὰ κενῆς ὤμοσεν, οὐ δικαιωθήσεται,
πλησθήσεται γὰρ ἐπαγωγῶν ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ.

*A man who swears much would be involved with much lawlessness
and his family would never be free from a blow.*

Should he err, his sin would be with him,

and should he mistake, he would have sinned twice over.

*And if he swears meaninglessly, he would not be justified,
for his family would meet with many calamities.*

איִשׁ שְׁבוּעוֹת יִמְלֵא אִשְׁמָה (Ca)

וְלֹא יִמּוֹשׁ מִבֵּיתוֹ הַנֶּגַע (Cb)

πολύορκος] The constituent πολύ- corresponds to the pl. of שְׁבוּעוֹת. Cf. Wagner 1999.272f.

πλησθήσεται] שָׁמַלְתִּי, which is more likely שָׁמַלְתִּי rather than שָׁמַלְתִּי; the Nifal can be ingressive in value, equivalent to Hitp., e.g. הַגִּיד נִמְלֵא דָם ‘the artery filled up with blood’ 4Q266 6i12.² Cf. שָׁמַלְתִּי here.

ἀνομίας] Where πίμπλημι is used in the sense of ‘to become or be full,’ and not ‘to fill,’ an acc. *o* is unlikely. Thus parse ἀνομίας as gen. sg. Hence *pace* “heaps up offenses” (Skehan - Di Lella).

μάστιξ] שָׁמַלְתִּי, i.e. שָׁמַלְתִּי, indicates that the author did not mean a literal “whipping” alone, but “affliction,” which could include “whipping.” Note ἐπαγωγῶν at the end of the verse. Note the use here in שָׁמַלְתִּי of שָׁמַלְתִּי, the sense of which is not confined to “whipping,” either.

διὰ κενῆς] On the idiomatic use of the fem. adj., cf. SSG § 20 f.

- 23.12) Ἔστιν λέξις ἀντιπαραβεβλημένη θανάτῳ,
μὴ εὑρεθῆτω ἐν κληρονομίᾳ Ἰακωβ·
ἀπὸ γὰρ εὐσεβῶν ταῦτα πάντα ἀποστήσεται,
καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις οὐκ ἐγκυλισθήσονται.

*There is a manner of speech comparable to death,
let it not be found in Jacob’s legacy,
for all these things shall be kept away from the godly
and they shall not get involved in sins.*

ἀντιπαραβεβλημένη θανάτῳ] “terrifying, scary as death”?

² Cf. SQH § 12 e (7), *pace* Segal (139) הָיָה עֲבֹרָה.

εὐρεθήτω] = שׁ כַּתְּוּתָּהּ; שׁ כַּתְּוּתָּהּ, i.e. כַּתְּוּתָּהּ ‘shall be praised,’ is probably a scribal error.

κληρονομία Ιακωβ] a rendering of כַּרְבֵּי תְּלֵינָה at Is 58.14, most likely a reference to the land of Israel.³

23.13) ἀπαιδευσίαν ἄσυρῆ μὴ συνεθίσης τὸ στόμα σου·
ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ λόγος ἁμαρτίας.

*Do not accustom your mouth to lewd lack of education,
for sinful speech is in it.*

συνεθίσης] Unlike the simplex, ἐθίζω at vs. 9 (+ τί τινι), we have its compound form here being used as dually transitive.

λόγος ἁμαρτίας] שׁ is more specific: אַרְבֵּי שֵׁבַע אֱלֵזָה ‘words of falsehood.’

23.14) μνήσθητι πατρός καὶ μητρός σου,
ἀνὰ μέσον γὰρ μεγιστάνων συνεδρεύεις,
μήποτε ἐπιλάθῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν
καὶ τῷ ἐθισμῷ σου μωρανθῆς
καὶ θελήσεις εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθης
καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ τοκετοῦ σου καταράσῃ.

*Remember your father and mother,
for you are seated in the midst of courtiers
in case you forget (the right manners) in front of them
and act foolishly on account of your habit,
and you might wish that you were not born
and curse the day of your birth.*

μεγιστάνων] which Kuhn (1930.104) proposes emending to μαστιγίων < μαστιγίας ‘one who deserves whipping, a rogue.’

μωρανθῆς] This could be analysed as genuine passive, ‘you are declared foolish.’

θελήσεις] Though there are found in LXX a few cases of μήποτε that expresses apprehension and has its head-verb in the indicative instead of the subjunctive,⁴ we are inclined to view the future as deliberately chosen as different from θελήσης⁵ (subj.), indicating a theoretical possibility.⁶

³ Pace Segal (140), since the land of Israel is inhabited by descendants of Jacob, there is no real difficulty with our interpretation.

⁴ See SSG § 29 **ba** (iv).

⁵ So in the overwhelming Gk MSS.

⁶ Thus pace Smend (II 39): “damit du nicht .. kommst, .. wirst, und wünschst .. verfluchst.” Likewise SD, Ryssel, BJ.

θελήσεις εἰ] This remarkable use of < θέλω εἰ > can be admitted in θελήσουσιν εἰ ἐγενήθησαν πυρίκαυστοι ‘they might wish that they had been burnt with fire’ Is 9.5.⁷

23.15) ἄνθρωπος συνεθιζόμενος λόγοις ὀνειδισμοῦ
ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ παιδευθῆ.

*A person accustomed to disgraceful words
would never be educated on any day of his life.*

λόγοις ὀνειδισμοῦ] **Ⓢ** אֲתֵּלְטְבֵּי אֵלֶּיךָ ‘empty, meaningless words.’

Ⓢ concludes the verse with another clause: וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ ‘and a man who acted lewdly with his membrum virile receives no education.’

23.16) Δύο εἶδη πληθύνουσιν ἁμαρτίας,
καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐπάξει ὀργήν·
ψυχὴ θερμὴ ὡς πῦρ καιόμενον,
οὐ μὴ σβεσθῆ ἕως ἂν καταποθῆ·
ἄνθρωπος πόρνος ἐν σώματι σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,
οὐ μὴ παύσεται ἕως ἂν ἐκκαύσῃ πῦρ·

*Two types (of men) multiply sins,
and the third would bring about (God's) anger.
A zealous soul is like a burning fire,
it would never be quenched until it is swallowed down.
A person fornicating with a limb of his flesh
would never stop till the fire consumes (him).*

Line 1 in **Ⓢ** reads: תְּרִין וְנִין סִנַּת נַפְשִׁי ‘Two types my soul hated.’

Line 2 also differs from **Ⓞ**: וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִסָּרְסָרֶיךָ ‘and with three he [= a human?] raises (God's) anger.’ Cp. **Ⓢ**וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ = **Ⓞ**.⁸

Lines 3 and 4 are absent in **Ⓢ**.

Line 5 is likely to be the grammatical subject of οὐ μὴ παύσεται starting the next line rather than a self-standing nominal clause. The same noun phrase follows in vs. 17 as well: ἀνθρώπων πόρνων. Then the addition of a comma at the end of ἐν σώματι σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as in modern editions of Ziegler, Rahlfs, Trench, and Swete is somewhat odd.

τὸ τρίτον] The mention of additional instances is known from Proverbs, e.g. Pr 30.15f. Similarly in Si 25.1, 2, 7, 26.5, 28, and 50.25.⁹ Here, however,

⁷ Pace “they will be willing to do so even if they have been burned by fire” (*NETS*) and other translations. Alongside our two instances in LXX BDAG (s.v. θέλω 1) mentions τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη; ‘How I wish that it were already kindled!’ Lk 12.49.

⁸ Segal's (141) וְיִזְכֶּרְךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ is questionable.

⁹ Cf. also Ziegler 1965.76-78.

we would like to know what the three kinds are. This adds to the difficulty of understanding precisely what kind of person is meant with ἄνθρωπος πόρνος here and ἀνθρώπων πόρνῳ (vs. 17). Smend (211) holds that it refers to adulterer, hence the use of πόρνος in 𐤄 and אִיִּף in 𐤊 is said to be wrong. The ms. πόρνος occurs in SG only in our two instances here. However, πόρνη occurs far more frequently, referring to harlot. Parents in the Old Testament times might not have been overjoyed at their son proposing to marry a whore. Unless one was married, a sexual intercourse with a prostitute, whether male or female, would not have constituted an infringement of any of the Ten Commandments.

ἄνθρωπος] is gender-neutral. Hence the selection of αὐτοῦ is a function of the grammatical concord, so that “his flesh .. consumes him” could be as valid as “her flesh .. consumes her.”

It is almost certain that Lines 4-5 are concerned with sexual sins. Their precise definition, however, is disputed.¹⁰ Lv 18.6 possibly points to masturbation,¹¹ and Lv 25.49 to incest.

23.17) ἀνθρώπων πόρνῳ πᾶς ἄρτος ἡδύς,
οὐ μὴ κοπάσῃ ἕως ἂν τελευτήσῃ.

*To a fornicating person every bread is sweet,
he would never stop till he dies.*

Line 1 in 𐤊 reads: אִיִּף בָּסָרָא לְכָל אִיִּף אִיִּף אִיִּף אִיִּף ‘for the flesh of a fornicating man every flesh is sweet,’ which Smend (210) dismisses as a poor rendering. However, ἄρτος (𐤊 אִיִּף) here is rather odd. On the contrary, 𐤊 makes better sense: for a fornicating person, what matters is that he can enjoy sexual intercourse, and wealth, intelligence, elegance of the partner carries no weight.

23.18) ἄνθρωπος παραβαίνων ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ
λέγων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ Τίς με ὄρᾳ;
σκότος κύκλω μου, καὶ οἱ τοῖχοί με καλύπτουσιν,
καὶ οὐθεὶς με ὄρᾳ· τί εὐλαβοῦμαι;
τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου οὐ μὴ μνησθήσεται ὁ ὕψιστος.

*A person who moves away from his wedlock,
saying to himself, “Who is looking at me?
it is dark round me, and the walls are covering me,
and nobody is looking at me. What should I fear?
The Most High would never remember my sins.”*

¹⁰ Cf. Wagner 1999.274f.

¹¹ A view not taken by the LXX translator at Lv 18.6.

ἄνθρωπος παραβαίνων] The clause-structure is anomalous; one would anticipate Ἔστιν ‘There is a person who ..’.

παραβαίνων] § קַרְשָׁמַי ‘who tells a lie,’ such as ‘my bed is out for repair for the moment’?¹²

Given our remarks above on πόρνος (17), we must be dealing here, *pace* Smend (211), with a case of adultery. Otherwise the use of ἀμαρτιῶν would be odd.

τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ] § קִרְוַת אֲתִיּוֹשָׁה ‘the cover of his bed.’

οὐθείς] = οὐδεὶς, on which see the bibliography mentioned in *GELS* s.v.

τί ἐυλαβοῦμαι;] τί could be taken in the sense of “Why?” (so Snaith, *NETS*, and *SD*), but the pronoun can be a direct object, “What should I feel anxious and fearful of?”. Cf. μηδὲ ἐυλαβεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν ἀδίκως παραγινομένων ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς ἐθνῶν πολυπλήθειαν (‘a large number’) 2M 8.16 and ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον οὐδὲν ἐυλαβηθήσεται Si 31.16, where οὐδὲν could mean ‘in no way.’ § הַ אֲנִי לִמָּוֶת אֲנִי is as equivocal.

The last clause of theological importance reads in § merely: לִּי לֹא אֶפְשָׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁחֲמַד ‘who forbids me to sin?’.

23.19) καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀνθρώπων ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου
μυριοπλασίως ἡλίου φωτεινότεροι
ἐπιβλέποντες πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀνθρώπων
καὶ κατανοοῦντες εἰς ἀπόκρυφα μέρη.

*His fear is people's eyes,
he has not learned that the Lord's eyes are
immensely brighter than the sun,
gazing at all the ways of people
and closely observing (their) hidden parts.*

μυριοπλασίως] Wagner (1999.252f.) is inclined to view the word as numerical, “ten thousand times.”

Smend (212) compares the last line with καὶ ἀποκαλύπτων ἴχνη ἀποκρύφων Si 42.19 וְגַלְתָּ אֶת־מַגְלֵי הַיָּם וְאֶת־מַגְלֵי הַיָּם

23.20) πρὶν ἢ κτισθῆναι τὰ πάντα ἔγνωσται αὐτῷ,
οὕτως καὶ μετὰ τὸ συντελεσθῆναι.

*Before their creation everything was known to Him,
so also after their completion.*

¹² Segal's (141) reconstruction is questionable: יִשְׁעַר עַל שְׁפָתָיו אִישׁ ‘a man who commits adultery on his bed.’

Note the theology presented in 20 and 21 in **§**: מְטוּל דְּעַד לָא הוּא כֻּל מְדָם: אֲשָׁנָא בְּרַבְרָא לְהַלְבֵּי לְבָבָא הוּא דְאֵין לָהּ בְּכֻמְדָּא דְּרַבְרָא דְּרַבְרָא דְּרַבְרָא 'because when not everything has emerged yet, it is revealed before Him and also after the completion of the world He judges it and also over what people did not think that they would be captured.'

συντελεσθηῖναι] A few MSS add καθορα τα παντα 'He observes all.'

23.21) οὗτος ἐν πλατείαις πόλεως ἐκδικηθήσεται,
καὶ οὗ οὐχ ὑπενόησεν, πιασθήσεται.

*This person shall be judged in streets of a city
and arrested where he has not suspected.*

23.22) Οὕτως καὶ γυνὴ καταλιπούσα τὸν ἄνδρα
καὶ παριστῶσα κληρονόμον ἐξ ἄλλοτρίου.

*So also a woman who left her husband
and got an heir from an unrelated man.*

καταλιπούσα] **§** אָהָרָא 'sinned.'

ἄλλοτρίου] **§** and **§** אַן אַרְיָא = ἄλλου 'another man.'

23.23) πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου ἠπειθήσεν,
καὶ δεύτερον εἰς ἄνδρα αὐτῆς ἐπλημμέλησεν,
καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐν πορνείᾳ ἐμοιχεύθη
καὶ ἐξ ἄλλοτρίου ἀνδρὸς τέκνα παρέστησεν.

*For, first, she disobeyed the law of the Most High
and, secondly, she committed a sinful error against her husband,
and, thirdly, she committed adultery with fornication,
and brought forth children from an unrelated man.*

ἐν νόμῳ] The government of ἀπειθέω with ἐν, unknown elsewhere in LXX, is most likely a reflexion of the corresponding Heb. government as in καὶ ἠθέτησεν ἐν τῷ βασιλειᾷ Ἀσσυρίων < אֲשָׁא-הֶלְמָא בְּרַבְרָא 2Kg 18.7, cf. SSG § 22 ca.

ἄνδρα αὐτῆς] **§** אֲהָרָא לְבָבָא 'the husband of her youth,' innovative in comparison with BH, אֲהָרָא לְבָבָא Pr 5.18 (**§** אֲהָרָא לְבָבָא).

τὸ τρίτον] Why the article is added only to this numeral here is unclear. On the adverbial use of ordinals in n.sg., cf. SSG § 25 c.

23.24) αὕτη εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐξαχθήσεται,
καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται.

*This (woman) should be taken out into a congregation
and over her children there should be an enquiry.*

εις ἐκκλησίαν ἐξαχθήσεται] **§** מן כְּנוּשָׁתָא תְּפִיחַ 'she should be expelled out of the community.' Smend is of the view that women had no membership in a Jewish religious community. Cf. Dt 23.2. The situation in the Qumran community was apparently different, cf. Kim 2012.

ἐπισκοπή] Difficult of interpretation. Could it mean “The care of her children should be entrusted to someone else”?¹³ **§** appears to be more sympathetic towards her children: עַל יְלֵדֶיהָ הַטָּהוּת נִדְּבָרָהּ 'on her children her sins would be remembered.' Children would not be punished, but would suffer hardship all the same, cf. Wi 3.16-19.

23.25) οὐ διαδώσουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς εἰς ρίζαν,
καὶ οἱ κλάδοι αὐτῆς οὐκ ὄσουσιν καρπὸν.

*Her children would not grow to take root,
and her branches would not bear fruits.*

εις ρίζαν] Smend (214) points out that the preposition is absent in two MSS and **§h**, in which latter the absence is due to the combination **לָא נִתְּלִין .. עֲקָרָא**. Likewise **§** **לָא נִרְמִין .. עֲקָרָא בְּאַרְעָא**. Cp. οὐ δώσει ρίζαν εἰς τὸ βάθος Wi 4.3 (**§** **לָא נִתְּלִין עֲקָרָא בְּעוֹמָקָא**).

23.26) καταλείψει εἰς κατάραν τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς,
καὶ τὸ ὄνειδος αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται,

*She would leave her memory as accursed
and her disgrace would not be effaced.*

τὸ ὄνειδος αὐτῆς] **§** הַחַיִּיבָה 'her sins.'

23.27) καὶ ἐπιγνώσονται οἱ καταλειφθέντες
ὅτι οὐθὲν κρεῖττον φόβου κυρίου
καὶ οὐθὲν γλυκύτερον τοῦ προσέχειν ἐντολαῖς κυρίου.

*And people left behind would realise
that nothing is better than the fear of the Lord
and nothing is sweeter than to pay heed to the Lord's commandments.*

οἱ καταλειφθέντες] **§** כְּלָהוֹן עַמּוּרֵי דְּאַרְעָא 'all the inhabitants of the earth,' which is further expanded with **כּוּל דְּמִשְׁתַּחֲרִין בְּתַבִּיל** 'and all who remain in the world will understand.'

τοῦ προσέχειν] On the vital, syntactic function of τοῦ here, see *SSG* § 30 **abb**.

¹³ “ihre Schuld” (Smend II 40), “the consequences” (Snaith), “visitation” (Box - Oesterley), and “Heimsuchung” (Ryssel and *SD*) are questionable.

23.28) ¶ δόξα μεγάλη ἀκολουθεῖν θεῷ,
μακρότης δὲ ἡμερῶν τὸ προσλημφθῆναί σε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ¶
*It is a great honour to follow God
but for you to be accepted by Him (results in) longevity.*

Σοφίας αἴνεσις
Praise of wisdom

CHAPTER 24

- 24.1) Ἡ σοφία αἰνέσει ψυχὴν αὐτῆς
καὶ ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ αὐτῆς καυχήσεται·
*Wisdom would praise herself
and in the midst of her people it would feel pride.*

On the overall, literary structure of our book and the place within it of the present chapter, cf. Snaith 120.

λαοῦ αὐτῆς] 𐤀 𐤍𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤓𐤕 ‘the people of God.’

- 24.2) ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑψίστου στόμα αὐτῆς ἀνοίξει
καὶ ἔναντι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ καυχήσεται
*In the congregation of the Most High it would open its mouth
and would feel pride in the presence of His strength:*

- 24.3) Ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον
καὶ ὡς ὀμίχλη κατεκάλυψα γῆν·
*I came out from the mouth of the Most High
and like a mist covered the earth.*

Ἐγὼ] Skehan (1979.377) is right in rejecting Segal’s (145) 𐤏𐤓𐤕, an archaic form which does not occur in BS instead of 𐤍𐤏𐤕 (4×). The addition of the pronoun is expressive of the author’s self-consciousness, on which see *SQH* § 1 c (iii).

Just as in Pr 8, wisdom is here personified and speaks in the first person.

Segal (147) wonders whether our author is conscious of the notion of λόγος in the Greek thought. Note also the fourth evangelist who identifies Jesus as λόγος going back to the creation of the universe: John 1.1.

- 24.4) ἐγὼ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα,
καὶ ὁ θρόνος μου ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης·
*I dwelled high up
and my throne (was) in a pillar of cloud.*

ἐγὼ] see above at vs. 3.

κατεσκήνωσα] The addition in *GELS* s.v. 1 “to dwell” applies here: “not in a house, but not specifically in encampment or tent,” in spite of the etymological link with σκηνή, with which cp. 𐤀 𐤍𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤓𐤕

‘I pitched my tent in the most high places,’ sim. **Sh** without **אֲלֵךְ**. Note that in 14.25 and 27 **וְכַן** is used with reference to a site for temporary stay.

- 24.5) γῦρον οὐρανοῦ ἐκύκλωσα μόνη
καὶ ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα.
*I alone encircled a ring of the sky
and walked about in the depth of the abyss.*

Line 1 appears in **S** as **וְיָרַח אֶתְכֶם הַמַּעַרְבִּים בְּיָמַי** ‘in the sky I stayed with Him together.’

- 24.6) ἐν κύμασιν θαλάσσης καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ
καὶ ἐν παντὶ λαῶ καὶ ἔθνει ἠγήσάμην.
*The waves of the sea and the entire earth
and every people and nation I directed.*

ἐν (3×): a calque of the Hebrew construction such as **בְּלִשְׁכָּתִי**, cf. ἀνήρ ἠγούμενος ἐν Ἰσραὴλ **לְאָרְשָׁי בְּלִשְׁכָּתִי** **וְאֵל** 2C 7.18. In Gk < + gen. > is the norm, e.g. ὁ ἠγούμενος λαοῦ σοφὸς ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ Si 9.17. So also at ib. 10.2, 30.27, 46.18, 49.15.

ἠγήσάμην] a reading represented only by **S**^c, **I** *primatum habui*, and **S** **וְאֶתְכֶם**. All other sources read *εκτησαμην* = **שִׁנְיָתִי** ‘I acquired,’ but **אֶתְכֶם** is implausible.¹

- 24.7) μετὰ τούτων πάντων ἀνάπαυσιν ἐζήτησα
καὶ ἐν κληρονομίᾳ τίνος ἀυλισθήσομαι.
*With all these I sought after some rest
and one in whose legacy I could relax.*

τίνος] For other examples of the interrogative τίς as equivalent to a relative pronoun, see *GELS* s.v. **IV**, and *SSG* § 18 **b**, and in this instance it is also antecedentless. **Sh** appears unfamiliar with this Gk syntax: **וְאֶתְכֶם אֶרְשָׁא בְּמַנְתְּךָ** ‘and in whose legacy should I reside?’ Cf. Segal (143): **וְאֶתְכֶם אֶרְשָׁא**.

- 24.8) τότε ἐνετείλατό μοι ὁ κτίστης ἀπάντων,
καὶ ὁ κτίσας με κατέπαυσεν τὴν σκηνὴν μου
καὶ εἶπεν Ἐν Ἰακωβ κατασκήνωσον
καὶ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατακληρονομήητι.

¹ Kuhn (1930.195) rectified this to *εκδημησα* ‘I travelled abroad,’ which, however, should be spelled *εξεδημησα*. Besides, the difference between *εκδημησα* and *εξεδημησα* is too big. In terms of the message, “travelled abroad” fits the context.

*Then the Creator of all commanded me
and He who created me put my tent to rest
and said: 'Dwell in Jacob
and settle legally in Israel.'*

κατέπαυσεν] Since a form of $\sqrt{\text{רר}}$ is implausible here, ש א ש ר must be a scribal error for ש ר י א , i.e. Afel impv. fs. < $\sqrt{\text{ר י}}$.²

24.9) πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με,
καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπω.

*In the primeval period, at the beginning, He created me,
and I would never disappear for ever.*

For the theological thought here, cf. κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ²³πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέν με ἐν ἀρχῇ Pr 8.22f.

οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπω] $\text{ש ל א נ ב ט ל ד ו כ ר נ י}$ 'my memory will not cease.'

24.10) ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγία ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐλειτούργησα
καὶ οὕτως ἐν Σιων ἐστηρίχθην·

*In a holy tent in front of Him I ministered
and thus I firmly established myself in Zion.*

ἐστηρίχθην] ש ק מ ת א נ א 'I stood.'

24.11) ἐν πόλει ἠγαπημένη ὁμοίως με κατέπαυσεν,
καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ἡ ἐξουσία μου·

*In a beloved city He likewise made me rest,
and my authority is in Jerusalem,*

Smend's (II 41) translation of the first hemistich reads "In der Stadt, die er wie mich liebt, liess ich mich nieder," which follows $\text{ש ב ק ר י ת א ד ר ח י מ א}$ $\text{ת ת א נ י א ת א ת י א כ נ ת י ל ה}$. But his syntactic analysis of ὁμοίως με is difficult to sustain. Is an adverb ending with -ως ever modified with a nominal in the accusative? As questionable is Segal's (145) $\text{ב ע י ר א ה ו כ ה כ מ ו נ י נ ח ת י}$.

24.12) καὶ ἐρρίζωσα ἐν λαῷ δεδοξασμένῳ,
ἐν μερίδι κυρίου κληρονομία μου.

*I took root among the glorified people
and my heritage is in a portion of the Lord.*

² The v.l. ו א ש ר י (Lagarde VI) must be a scribal error for ו ש ר י , Pe. impv. f.s. < $\sqrt{\text{ר י}}$.

ἐρρίζωσα] **ש** אֶרְרִיבִית ‘I was reared (?).’

Line 2 reads in **ש**: לְבָנוֹתֶיךָ יִבְנֶנּוּ וְבְמִנְחָתְךָ אֶרְרִיבִית ‘in the portion of the Lord and inside the legacy of Israel.’

The overwhelming majority of resources read κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ at the end of the verse. What is it supposed to mean? Is κληρονομίας in the accusative case, as a direct object of ἐρρίζωσα? Or should we read κληρονομία?³ Then κληρονομία αὐτοῦ is not too bad a reading, cf. Rysstel: “seinem Eigentum.”

24.13) ὡς κέδρος ἀνυψώθην ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ
καὶ ὡς κυπάρισσος ἐν ὄρεσιν Αερμων·

*I grew high like a cedar in Lebanon
and like a cypress in mountains of Hermon.*

ἀνυψώθην] a verb that signifies growth in height, whereas **ש** אֶרְרִיבִית can also indicate growth crosswise. The same applies to vs. 14 (2×), and cf. ἐξέτεινα κλάδους μου vs. 16.

Skehan (1979.374, 378), *pace* Segal (145), prefers to reconstruct רִמְמָתִי on the ground that it fits “the high degree of alliteration.” However, in the verses concerned (13-15) and as reconstructed by him, we count a total of 33 words without including prepositions and conjunctions, and among them we see רִמְמָתִי three times, רָעַנְנָה and הִיָּה once each, far from impressive frequency.

ἐν ὄρεσιν Αερμων] Geographically **ש** is more detailed: אֶרְרִיבִית בְּהַר שֵׁנִיר ‘in Senir, the snowy mountain.’

24.14) ὡς φοῖνιξ ἀνυψώθην ἐν Αιγγάδοις
καὶ ὡς φυτὰ ῥόδου ἐν Ιεριχω,
ὡς ἐλαία εὐπρεπῆς ἐν πεδίῳ,
καὶ ἀνυψώθην ὡς πλάτανος.

*I grew high like a phoenix in Engedi
and like rose plants in Jericho,
like a comely olive-tree in a plain,
and I grew high like a plane.*

πλάτανος] **ש** אֶרְרִיבִית בְּצַד מַיִם ‘plane trees beside water.’

24.15) ὡς κιννάμωμον καὶ ἀσπάλαθος ἀρωμάτων
καὶ ὡς σμύρνα ἐκλεκτὴ διέδωκα εὐωδίαν,
ὡς χαλβάνη καὶ ὄνυξ καὶ στακτὴ
καὶ ὡς λιβάνου ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ.

³ Cf. also Skehan 1979.377f., where excessive importance appears to be assigned to a phonetic factor, namely *i*-assonance.

*Like cassia and aromatic camel-thorn
and like choice myrrh I produced fragrance,
like galbanum and onycha and oil of myrrh
and like gas of frankincense in a tent.*

- 24.16) ἐγὼ ὡς τερέβινθος ἐξέτεινα κλάδους μου,
καὶ οἱ κλάδοι μου κλάδοι δόξης καὶ χάριτος.
*I, like a terebinth, extended my branches,
and my branches are glorious and gracious branches.*

τερέβινθος] § אֲנִי־תִרְיָו ‘oleander.’

- 24.17) ἐγὼ ὡς ἄμπελος ἐβλάστησα χάριν,
καὶ τὰ ἄνθη μου καρπὸς δόξης καὶ πλούτου.
*I like a grape-vine caused grace to sprout,
and my flowers (were) produce of glory and wealth.*

τὰ ἄνθη μου] § גִּזְרֵי ‘my branches.’

- 24.18) ¶ ἐγὼ μήτηρ τῆς ἀγαπήσεως τῆς καλῆς καὶ φόβου
καὶ γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ὀσίας ἐλπίδος,
δίδωμι δὲ σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς τέκνοις μου
ἀειγενεῖς τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ. ¶
*I, mother of splendid love and fear (of God)
and knowledge and sacred hope,
hand on to all my children
called by Him ever-emerging.*

μήτηρ] Remarkable in the mouth of our male author; she gives birth to the four following qualities and rear them and hand on to her children.

The interpretation and syntactic analysis of the last two lines are quite a challenge. *a)* Are the preceding four substantives latent direct objects of δίδωμι? *b)* Children are hardly joint givers. Then σὺν is a mechanical rendering of אִתּ ‘with.’ *c)* τοῖς λεγομένοις most naturally refers back to πᾶσι τοῖς τέκνοις μου. *d)* δίδωμι probably means “to pass on as legacy,” cf. ἀπὸ τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, ἧς ἔδωκας ἡμῖν 2Ch 20.11 < אֲנִי־תִרְיָו רִשְׁוֹן תִּתְּנֵנִי. *d)* The selection of the masc. ἀειγενεῖς⁴ instead of neut. ἀειγενῆ is presumably due to semantic (κληρονόμοι) rather than morphological (τέκνα) consideration. The wisdom is looking ahead to generations of descendants expected to inherit her valuable, religious and spiritual possessions. The adjective is best viewed as a subject complement as in ἀκάθαρτος κεκλήσεται ‘he shall have been called unclean’ Le 13.45.

⁴ On this hapax in LXX, see Wagner 1999.330f.

- 24.19) προσέλθετε πρός με, οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντές μου,
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γεννημάτων μου ἐμπλήσθητε·

*Draw near to me, o those who desire me,
and be sated from my produce.*

ἐμπλήσθητε] **ש** יִקְרָבֶנְתָּ ‘you shall enjoy.’ On the construction with < ἀπό τινος >, see below at 33.19.

τῶν γεννημάτων μου] **ש** אֲתָבֹט יְהִלְעַ ‘my good products.’

- 24.20) τὸ γὰρ μνημόσυνόν μου ὑπὲρ τὸ μέλι γλυκύ,
καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου ὑπὲρ μέλιτος κηρίον.

*For the memory of me is sweeter than honey,
and to inherit me is (sweeter) than honeycomb.*

μνημόσυνόν μου] objective genitive, hence ≠ ‘what I remember.’ The same analysis applies to κληρονομία μου ≠ ‘what I inherit.’ Questionable is אֲתָבֹט יְהִלְעַ לִּי מִן פְּקָרֵי קֶמֶחַ ‘and to those who inherit me (sweeter) than honeycomb.’

τὸ μέλι] The definite article may optionally be added to a substantive denoting material or substance. Note its absence in μέλιτος κηρίον.⁵

The second hemistich is somewhat ambiguous. Since ὑπὲρ in the sense of “more than” requires an accusative, κηρίον is unlikely to be a predicate analogous to γλυκύ. **ש** is questionable with אֲתָבֹט יְהִלְעַ מִן חֵיָּוִי מִן חֵיָּוִי ‘more than the honey of honeycomb.’

- 24.21) οἱ ἐσθίοντές με ἔτι πεινάσουσιν,
καὶ οἱ πίνοντές με ἔτι διψήσουσιν.

*Those who eat me could still hunger
and those who drink me could still thirst.*

πεινάσουσιν .. διψήσουσιν] **ש** adds לִּי ‘me’ in each case.

- 24.22) ὁ ὑπακούων μου οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσεται,
καὶ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσουσιν.

*One who listens to me would not become ashamed
and those who work through me would not sin.*

αἰσχυνθήσεται] **ש** לִּפְּנֵי ‘would fall.’

The second hemistich reads in **ש** as אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹדוּ לִּי וְלֹא יִכָּרְתוּ מְעַשָּׂיו ‘and none of his works would be ruined.’

- 24.23) Ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου,
νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωσῆς
κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ἰακωβ,

⁵ Cf. SSG § 5 k.

*All these are a book of covenant of the Most High God,
a law which Moses commanded to us
and inheritance for communities of Jacob,*

The first line reads in **§** as כּוּלֵהֵיִן הֵלִיִן בְּסֵפֶר־אֱמֻנָה דְּמִרְיָא כְּתִיבִין ‘all these are written in the book of the covenant of the Lord.’

θεοῦ ὑψίστου] on the absence of the definite article, see above at 7.9 and below at 41.8.

νόμον] The acc. case is one of rare instances in which the following relative pronoun exercises attraction to its preceding antecedent, for one would anticipate νόμος just as βίβλος. On this phenomenon, see *SSG* § 86 *af*. In our case, however, the source text cited below, Dt 33.4, may have played a role.

The whole verse is an allusion to כָּבַדְתָּנוּ מִשְׁפָּרְיֵינוּ תְּלֵקָה יְצַקֵּנוּ νόμον, ὄν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωσῆς, κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ιακωβ Dt 33.4, where, unlike our pl. συναγωγᾶς, the sg. appears in **Ⲑ** and **Ⲑ** alike, probably reflecting the Jewish diasporas spread beyond the Holy Land.

Moreover, in Dt 33.4 **Ⲑ** νόμον, ὄν ἐνετείλατο notwithstanding, we are not dealing with an asyndetic relative clause, but simply “Moses gave us a law ...,” cf. **§** אֲשֶׁר לָן מִשְׁפָּרֵינוּ אֲשֶׁר לָן, **Ⲑ** הַשְׁפָּרֵינוּ לְהַבִּיבֵנוּ אֲשֶׁר לָן, and **Ⲑ** *legem praecepit nobis Moses*.

24.24) ¶ μὴ ἐκλύεσθε ἰσχύειν ἐν κυρίῳ,
κολλᾶσθε δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν, ἵνα κραταιώσῃ ὑμᾶς.
κύριος παντοκράτωρ θεὸς μόνος ἐστίν,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν αὐτοῦ σωτήρ. ¶

*Do not leave gaining strength in the Lord,
but attach yourselves firmly to Him, so that He might strengthen you.
The Lord almighty is the sole God,
and there is no saviour apart from Him.*

ἐκλύεσθε] Another example of < ἐκλύομαι + complementing inf. > is “Ἐως τίνος ἐκλυθήσεσθε κληρονομήσαι τὴν γῆν .. ; ‘How long are you going to be slack about taking the land into possession .. ?’ Jo 18.3.

24.25) ὁ πιμπλῶν ὡς Φισων σοφίαν
καὶ ὡς Τίγρις ἐν ἡμέραις νέων,
*One that like Pishon fills wisdom
and like Tigris in the season of first-fruits,*

ὁ πιμπλῶν] probably referring back to βίβλος in vs. 23. *SD* (1124, fn.), however, mentions κύριος (vs. 24) as an alternative, but the verse is not part

of the original Greek text. In **Š** this ptc. corresponds to אִלְמַדְתָּ, whose fem. gender cannot refer back to אֲרָפֶס nor to אֲרָמֶנֶן, both masc., but it most likely refers to אֲרָפֶסוֹנָה (= συναγωγή). By contrast, **Šh** reads in both vs. 25 and 26 אִלְמַדְתָּ הָאֵל or אִלְמַדְתָּ הָאֵל, masc., which points to אֲרָפֶס or to אֲרָמֶנֶן; both **Š** and **Šh** lack vs. 24.

Φισων] On the rare absence of the definite article with names of rivers well-known in the Bible in vss. 25-27, see *SSG* § 5 **cbb**.

24.26) ὁ ἀναπληρῶν ὡς Εὐφράτης σύνεσιν
καὶ ὡς Ἰορδάνης ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ,
*one that supplies comprehension like Euphrates
and like Jordan in the season of harvesting,*

24.27) ὁ ἐκφαίνων ὡς φῶς παιδείαν,
ὡς Γηῶν ἐν ἡμέραις τρυγῆτου.
*one that discloses education like light,
like Gihon in the season of harvest.*

The first hemistich appears in **Š** as אֲרָפֶסוֹנָה יוֹלֵךְ אֶת הַנֹּרָא 'and it pours forth education like a river.' אֶת הַנֹּרָא may be a scribal error for אֶת הַנֹּרָא 'light,' so **Šh**. Moreover, since in vss. 25, 26, 27 < ὡς + name of a river > systematically occurs, here also ὡς φῶς may represent אֶת הַנִּיל 'like the Nile' misread as אֶת הַנִּיל. This, however, would imply that our author was unaware of or in disagreement with the identity of Gihon with Nile.

24.28) οὐ συνετέλεσεν ὁ πρῶτος γνῶναι αὐτήν,
καὶ οὕτως ὁ ἔσχατος οὐκ ἐξιχνίασεν αὐτήν·
*The first did not finish recognising her
and likewise the last did not track her down.*

24.29) ἀπὸ γὰρ θαλάσσης ἐπληθύνθη διάνοη αὐτῆς
καὶ ἡ βουλὴ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ ἀβύσσου μεγάλης.
*For her thought was filled from the sea
and her opinion from the vast abyss.*

θαλάσσης] expanded in **Š** as אֲרָפֶס אֶת הַיָּם as in אֲרָפֶס אֶת הַיָּם for ἀβύσσου
μεγάλης.

διάνοη] a word that occurs in conjunction with βουλὴ also at 25.5.

24.30) Καὶ ὡς διῶρυξ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ
καὶ ὡς ὕδραγωγὸς ἐξῆλθον εἰς παράδεισον·

*I am also like a canal leading from a river
and like a channel flew out into a garden.*

§ seems to be presenting its own view of the Near Eastern landscape:
אֲנִי כְּנַחַל מְשָׁקֵי אֶרֶץ נְהַרָא דְּמִשְׁקֵי אֶרֶץ אֲנִי כְּנַחַל מְשָׁקֵי אֶרֶץ נְהַרָא
'and I also am like a river that irrigates and like an aqueduct that flows down into gardens.'

24.31) εἶπα Ποτιῶ μου τὸν κῆπον
καὶ μεθύσω μου τὴν πρασιάν·
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγένετό μοι ἡ διῶρυξ εἰς ποταμόν,
καὶ ὁ ποταμός μου ἐγένετο εἰς θάλασσαν.
*I said: "I shall irrigate my orchard
and irrigate my garden-plot well."
And behold, the canal became for me a river,
and my river became a sea.*

Ποτιῶ] §¹ אֲנִי אֶשְׁקֶה. For this version, as shown by the fem. ptc., the speaker is still Wisdom, so also אֲנִי אֶשְׁקֶה 'I make shine' (vs. 32), אֲנִי אֶשְׁפֹּךְ 'I pour' (vs. 33). The wisdom, however, is represented and embodied by Ben Sira, which is manifest in the selection of the fem. suf. pronoun in אֶשְׁפֹּךְ 'and I will leave her' (vs. 33) and אֶשְׁקֶה 'seeking her' (vs. 34).

ἐγένετο εἰς θάλασσαν] § אֶשְׁקֶה עַל יַמָּא 'it reached the sea.'

24.32) ἔτι παιδείαν ὡς ὄρθρον φωτιῶ
καὶ ἐκφανῶ αὐτὰ ἕως εἰς μακράν·
*Besides I will make good education shine like the dawn
and disclose them far and wide.*

ἔτι] Here ≠ 'once again, still,' repetition of a past action, but something new. So also Smend (223): "damit ist angedeutet, dass c. [= caput, Kapitel – TM] 24 einen neuen Abschnitt einleitet; vgl. 39,12." See ἐξάνετειλεν ὁ θεὸς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς πᾶν ξύλον ὡραῖον 'God has also (i.e. in addition to other vegetation already created, 1.12) caused every kind of beautiful tree to sprout' Ge 2.9. Syr. ܒܘܬܘܢ used here in both § and §¹ has as wide a range of usage.

The second hemistich reads in § as אֲנִי אֶשְׁפֹּךְ לְדוֹרֵי דְּרַבִּי 'and I will leave it for many generations,' where the object pronoun must refer back to אֲנִי 'my teaching' earlier in the verse. What αὐτὰ refers to is not apparent. §'s εἰς μακράν indicates the author's educational activities spreading to diverse diaspora communities, whereas in § the author's thought extends to generations following his departure. Better still is to assume with Segal (151) that for § the second hemistich changed its position with that in vs. 33.

24.33) ἔτι διδασκαλίαν ὡς προφητείαν ἐκχεῶ
καὶ καταλείψω αὐτήν εἰς γενεὰς αἰώνων.

*Besides I will pour out teaching like prophecy
and leave it for eternal generations.*

ἔτι] on which see above at vs. 32.

24.34) ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῳ ἐκοπίασα,
ἀλλ' ἅπασιν τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτήν.

*See that I have not toiled for me alone,
but in the interest of all who seek it.*

CHAPTER 25

- 25.1) Ἐν τρισὶν ἠράσθη ἡ ψυχὴ μου,
καὶ ταῦτά ἐστιν ὠραῖα ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων·
ὁμόνοια ἀδελφῶν, καὶ φιλία τῶν πλησίων,
καὶ γυνὴ καὶ ἀνὴρ ἑαυτοῖς συμπεριφερόμενοι.

*To three things my soul was deeply attracted,
and they are beautiful before the Lord and people;
thought shared by brothers and neighbourly love,
and a woman and a man moving together.*

The first two lines above as reconstructed by Ziegler differ substantially from what other modern editions read.¹ E.g. in Rahlfs we find Ἐν τρισὶν ὠραῖσθην καὶ ἀνέστην ὠραῖα ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων, where Wisdom is still speaking in the first person. Note ⚡: קָרַבְתִּי לַחַיִּים וְשָׂרָה נְחִימָה וְנָחַם אֶת אֶתְנַחֲשֵׁת וְנָחַם אֶת אֶתְנַחֲשֵׁת וְנָחַם אֶת אֶתְנַחֲשֵׁת, which is almost identical with Ziegler's text.

ἑαυτοῖς συμπεριφερόμενοι] The selection of the masc. gender is a case of its use as *genus potius*. Cf. *SSG* § 77 **cd**.

- 25.2) τρία δὲ εἶδη ἐμίσησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου
καὶ προσώχθισα σφόδρα τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν·
πτωχὸν ὑπερήφανον, καὶ πλούσιον ψεύστην,
γέροντα μοιχὸν ἐλαττούμενον συνέσει.

*My soul hated three types (of men),
and I became rather sick of their life:
an arrogant poor man, and a lying rich man,
an aged adulterer lacking understanding.*

ψεύστην] A substantive ending with -τής or -της (fem. -τις) can function as an adjective. Here it is parallel to ὑπερήφανον. But there is scope for ambiguity as shown in some translations, e.g. “einen reichen Lügner”(SD). Cf. *SSG* § 33 **d**.

μοιχὸν] ⚡ אֶתְנַחֲשֵׁת ‘foolish.’

- 25.3) Ἐν νεότητι οὐ συναγείοχας,
καὶ πῶς ἂν εὖροις ἐν τῷ γήρῳ σου;

¹ For the persuasive argument by Ziegler, see Ziegler 1965:76-78. Cf. also Smend 224f.

*If you did not gather in youth,
how could you find (it) in your old age?*

συναγείοχας] **Š** is sensible in adding **ܟܬܘܒܝܢ** ‘wisdom’ as a direct object.

25.4) ὡς ὄραϊον πολιαιῖς κρίσις
καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἐπιγνῶναι βουλήν.

*How splendid is (good) judgment to (a person with) grey hair
and to reach good view to elderly people!*

πολιαῖς] The f.pl. of this adjective is used in the sense of ‘grey hair (of an aged person)’ or ‘old age.’ Likewise ἕως πολιῶν ‘until old age’ Si 6.18; πολιαιῖ ἐξήνθησαν αὐτῷ ‘grey hairs sprouted to him’ Ho 7.9. The pl. of a fem. noun, τρίχες < θρίξ, may be latent. See τρίχωσιν πολιῶν ‘grey hair’ Aristotle, *De generatione animalium* 722^a8.

25.5) ὡς ὄραία γερόντων σοφία
καὶ δεδοξασμένοις διάνοημα καὶ βουλή.

*How splendid is the wisdom of old people
and thought and opinion to respected people!*

διάνοημα καὶ βουλή] The two nouns occur in a pair also at 24.29.

25.6) στέφανος γερόντων πολυπειρία,
καὶ τὸ καύχημα αὐτῶν φόβος κυρίου.

*Much experience is a crown of old people
and their pride is the fear of the Lord.*

25.7) Ἐννέα ὑπονοήματα ἐμακάρισα ἐν καρδίᾳ
καὶ τὸ δέκατον ἐρῶ ἐπὶ γλώσσης·
ἄνθρωπος εὐφραινόμενος ἐπὶ τέκνοις,
ζῶν καὶ βλέπων ἐπὶ πτώσει ἐχθρῶν·

*I personally considered nine types of man as possibly happy
and I could mention a tenth;
a person rejoicing over (his) children,
witnessing in life-time the fall of foes.*

: אשׂרי אישׁ שמח באחריתו חי וראה בשבר צריו: (C

Ἐννέα] **Šh**, starting with the line 3 here, has the first nine letters of the Syriac alphabet inserted in the right margin.

ἐμακάρισα] **Š** **ܬܗܒܝܫ** ‘I praised.’

What has been preserved of **Ⲑ** is close to **Ⲛ**: **גְּבָרָא דְחָדָא בְּאַחֲרֵיתָהּ עַד הוּ** 'a man who is happy at his end while in life he will see the fall of his foes.'

25.8) μακάριος ὁ συνοικῶν γυναίκα συνετή,
καὶ ὃς ἐν γλώσσει οὐκ ὠλίσθησεν,
καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἐδοῦλευσεν ἀναξίῳ ἑαυτοῦ·

*Happy is one who lives with an intelligent wife
and who did not slip in tongue*

and who did not serve someone who does not deserve oneself.

(Ca) אשרי שלא נפל בלשון ולו עבד נקלה ממנו:

(Cb) אשרי בעל אשה משכלת ולא חורש כשור עם חמור²

In **Ⲑ** the first hemistich of **Ⲙ** appears as the third, which is followed by another saying, 'and he does not plough like a bull with an ass,' that is preserved in **Ⲛ**, **דְּלָא דְּבַר פְּדָנָא בְּתוֹרָא וּבְחֶמְרָא אַכְחָדָא** 'who did not plough with a bull and a donkey at the same time.' **כשור** in **Ⲑ** may be an error for **בשור**.

συνοικῶν] **Ⲑ** בעל 'husband,' sim. **Ⲛ**.

γυναίκα συνετή] **Ⲛ** אִנְתָּא טְבָתָא 'a good wife'; we are not told precisely what her good quality is.

לא עבד] an error for **לו עבד**.

ἀναξίῳ ἑαυτοῦ] Ἀνάξιος is one of several adjectives which are modified by a term in the genitive case. For more examples, see *SSG* § 22 r.

The syntactic structure of (Cb) is mixed in character. The first half is a self-standing nominal clause, but **אשרי** is meant to apply to the second half, and then it would have been better to begin with **שֵׁשׁ** **אשרי** as in (Ca).

25.9) μακάριος ὃς εὔρεν φρόνησιν,
καὶ ὁ διηγούμεενος εἰς ὅτα ἀκουόντων·

*Happy is one who found prudence
and one who has ears to listen.*

φρόνησιν] **Ⲛ** רְחֵמָא 'favours, sympathies,' **Ⲛⲓ** עֲרִימוּתָא 'cleverness.'

25.10) ὡς μέγας ὁ εὐρῶν σοφίαν·
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπὲρ τὸν φοβούμενον τὸν κύριον·

*How great is one who has found wisdom,
but there is none who is above one who fears the Lord.*

² On the decipherment of this verse, see Di Lella 1988.237.

οὐκ ἔστιν] שׁלֹא אֵי־תוֹהִי לֵאמֹר ‘who is not.’

§ has a totally different saying here: טוֹבוּהָ לִנְבוּרָא דְלֵא תְּבַרְתָּהּ מְסַכְנוֹתָא וְלֵא תְּבַרְתָּהּ עֲנִיּוּתָא ‘Happy is a man whom poverty did not break and humility did not break.’

25.11) φόβος κυρίου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑπερέβαλεν,
ὁ κρατῶν αὐτοῦ τίτιν ὁμοιωθήσεται;

*The fear of the Lord exceeds everything,
Who could he who holds on to it be compared with?*

ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑπερέβαλεν] § על כָּל־הֵינִי הַלְיִין אֶת־תְּרִימָתָא ‘it exceeded all these.’
The second hemistich is missing.

Ἐπερβάλλω belongs to verbs which have quite distinct senses in different voices. Cp. μή ὑπερβάλλου ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ‘don’t delay it from day to day’ Si 5.7 (middle voice).³

25.12) ¶ φόβος κυρίου ἀρχὴ ἀγαπήσεως αὐτοῦ,
πίστις δὲ ἀρχὴ κολλήσεως αὐτοῦ. ¶

*The fear of the Lord is the essence of His love,
Belief is the essence of attachment to Him.*

Exceptionally⁴ § has preserved this verse that belongs to 𐤄^{II}: רַשׁ דְּהִלְתָּא: רַשׁ דְּמַרְיָא לְמַרְחָמָה וְרַשׁ הַיְמָנוּתָא לְמַאֲוָל בְּתַרְהָא. אַחֲוִידְיָהּ בְּרֵי וְלֵא תְּרַפִּיּוּהָ ‘the beginning of the fear of the Lord is to love Him and the beginning of belief is to walk after Him. Hold on to it and do not let it go away.’ It is also preserved in 𐤆: *timor Dei initium dilectionis eius, fidei autem initium adglutinandum est ei.*

ἀρχὴ] “that which is fundamental and of prime importance” GELS s.v. ἀρχή 5. Cf. Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον Si 1.14, ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου Ps 110.10, Pr 1.7.

αὐτοῦ (2×)] objective genitive.

25.13) Πᾶσαν πληγὴν καὶ μὴ πληγὴν καρδίας,
καὶ πᾶσαν πονηρίαν καὶ μὴ πονηρίαν γυναικός·

*Any wound and not a wound to the heart,
and any misfortune, and not a misfortune through (your) wife,*

(C) כל מכה ולא כן [..] לב כל רעה ולא כרע [ת ..]:

³ Cf. SSG §27 a (iii).

⁴ A relatively rare phenomenon, see Van Peursen 2004.15.

Πᾶσαν πληγὴν] The accusative case of this and all the following substantives, including those in vs. 14, is inexplicable.⁵ The context indicates that one would rather avoid suffering from what is indicated by them. In vss. 15 and 16 we are also presented with two options, though there the choice is expressed with no syntactic ambiguity. A syntactic analysis adopted in **℣** presents a thought which is not in **℥**: e.g. *omnis plaga tristia cordis est* etc. Analogously Ryssel (360 fn. a): “Jeden Schlag [will ich], nur nicht einen Schlag, der das Herz trifft.”⁶ Unless the nota obiecti, אַת, is added, one could live in Hebrew with such a loose syntactic structure.⁷

No less ambiguous is the function of the preposition כִּי as in כִּרְעִיתָ **ח**, on the basis of which we could reconstruct כִּי [מַכְתָּ] לֵב in the first half; so Segal 155. The synonymous preposition כִּי־אֵי attached to every substantive in **℣** here suggests that its Hebrew *Vorlage* read as we have just reconstructed **ח**.⁸

In **℣** every substantive positively worded and preceded by כִּי is in the pl., e.g. כִּי אֵי־לְצַנִּין ‘all hardships.’ By contrast the contrastive, negatively worded substantive is in the sg. every time, hence אֵי־לְצַנִּין **א**.⁹

Each negative counterpart is prefixed with μή, and not οὐ or οὐκ, which indicates that a negative imperative or a negative subjunctive with injunctive force is latent in the background.

25.14) πᾶσαν ἐπαγωγὴν καὶ μὴ ἐπαγωγὴν μισούντων,
καὶ πᾶσαν ἐκδίκησιν καὶ μὴ ἐκδίκησιν ἐχθρῶν.

*Every calamity and not a calamity (afflicted by) one's haters,
and every punishment and not a punishment (brought out by) one's foes.*

25.15) οὐκ ἔστιν κεφαλὴ ὑπὲρ κεφαλὴν ὄφραως,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν θυμὸς ὑπὲρ θυμὸν γυναικός.

*There is no head (worse) than a snake's head
and there is no anger (worse) than (one's) wife's fury.*

⁵ In SSG § 90 i we have offered an explanation that reads:

“our translator may have intended to supply a verb that governs an accusative, say, ὑποίσω ‘I could bear,’ but when he saw the superb poetic parallelism in H, he may have decided to leave it at that, for otherwise the poetic beauty would have been halved by repeating the same verb four times or otherwise being left with the first line longer by one word than the following three. The two verses have each two lines of equal length, and each of the four lines has the same structure: πᾶσαν X (acc.) καὶ μὴ Y (acc.) Z (gen.).”

⁶ Ryssel refers to the commentary on Pr by Delitzsch (p. 9), where he introduces the notion of “emblematisch,” but examples adduced, e.g. Pr 11.22, 25.25, are all about two options similar to each other.

⁷ Neither in **℣** nor in **℣** the preposition לִי is found with any of the substantives here.

⁸ In bShab 11a mentioned by Lévi (125) the prep. is absent: כִּי אֵי־לְצַנִּין .. כִּי אֵי־לְצַנִּין **א**.

⁹ Only the vocalised, Mossul ed. (1951) reads אֵי־לְצַנִּין (sg.) at vs. 13, but ed. Lagarde adds a seyame, hence אֵי־לְצַנִּין (pl.).

γυναικός] a reading attested by one Gk MS only (795). So also **S**. The majority reading is εχθρου. The context is focused on wife versus husband. Is εχθρου possibly a revelation of a Christian theology that derives from the narrative in Gn 3? Cf. vs. 24 and Ryssel (360, fn. d). Smend (229) postulates that both **G** and **S** failed to see that Heb. שֶׂרָאשׁ and מָמָה could also mean ‘poison’ and ‘venom’ as in וְיָנֵם וְרָאשׁ פְּתָנִים אֶכְרֹר Dt 32.33, where **G** translates both with θυμός.

For the same contextual reason ἀνὴρ and γυνή must mean ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ respectively. So note the use of בְּעֵלָא instead of גְּבִרָא in **S**, though **S**_h shows preference for the latter.

- 25.16) συνοικῆσαι λέοντι καὶ δράκοντι εὐδοκῆσω
ἢ συνοικῆσαι μετὰ γυναικὸς πονηρᾶς.

*I would prefer living with a lion and a snake
than living with an evil wife.*

ἢ] indicating preference, not alternative, cf. *SSG* § 23 **bdb**.

συνοικῆσαι²] Ziegler mentions multiple variant readings such as ενοικησαι, συνοικειν, οικησαι, συνοικησις. However, the focus is on your living partner.

- 25.17) πονηρία γυναικὸς ἀλλοιοῖ τὴν ὄρασιν αὐτῆς
καὶ σκοτοῖ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς ὡς ἄρκος·

*The evilness of wife changes her look
and darkens her face (to look like that of) a bear.*

(C) רע אשה ישחיר [...] מראה איש ויקדיר פְּנֵי לְדוּב:

From the partly preserved **M** we see that what her evil nature is going to affect is not her own look, but that of her husband, which is clear from וְיִנְיָ, and מראה איש could be an error for מראה אישה, i.e. מְרָאָה אִישָׁה. Note also **S**: בִּישׁוּתָהּ דְּאִנְתָּתָא בִּישְׁתָּא תִּרְק אֲגִין אֲפֹהָ דְּבַעְלָהּ ‘the evilness of an evil wife would make her husband’s face a leaden colour.’¹⁰

- 25.18) ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσεῖται ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς
καὶ ἀκουσίως ἀνεστέναξεν πικρά.

*Her husband would recline (for a free meal) among his neighbours
and groan bitterly against his own wish.*

(C) בין רעים ישב בעלה ובלא טעמו יתאנח:

¹⁰ *SL* s.v. ירק Af. quotes from Bedjan, P. 1898.146:20, but if the quote reads like Pesh., the s is not “she.” The text reads: אֲנָתָתָא בִּישְׁתָּא תִּרְק אֲגִין אֲפֹהָ דְּבַעְלָהּ. Here the subject is “the wife”.

ἀκουσίως] a minority reading, also = **§** **לְאֵל בְּצַבְיָהּ** ‘without his wish.’ However, without being told what he would hear, the majority readings, ακουσσασα and ακουσας, make little sense; the former, being fem. with no subject, is worse. Note esp. **¶** **בְּלֹא טַעְמוֹ** ‘without his intention.’

ἀνεστενάξεν] BH uses **√אנח** in Ni., but not in Hitp., but our author so uses it twice more – **לֹא אֲנַחְתִּי תַתְּנָה** 12.12 > ἐπὶ τῶν ῥημάτων μου κατανυγήση ‘what I said will cut you to the heart’ and **נַעְרָה וּמַתְּנָה** 30.20 > περιλαμβάνων παρθένον και στενάζων ‘hugging a lassie and sighing.’ **הַתְּנָה** is typical of post-biblical Hebrew. It occurs once in QH: 11QT 59.5. See also Jastrow 82b. At 30.20 we find in **§** **מְתַנְּנָה** < **√אנח**, a Syriac equivalent of Heb. **הַתְּנָה**.

25.19) μικρὰ πᾶσα κακία πρὸς κακίαν γυναικός,
κλῆρος ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἐπιπέσοι αὐτῇ.

*Any wickedness is slight when compared with a wife's wickedness.
May a sinner's lot fall upon her!*

(C מעט רעה כרעת אשה גורל חוטא יפול עליה:

[מעט] one of quantifying words that are optionally indeclinable, whether preceding or following a noun head. Cp. **מַעַט מַיִם** ‘a little water’ Gn 18.4 with **מַעַט סְבִלּוֹת** ‘a little folly’ Ec 10.1. Cp. *SQH* § 28 f.

πρὸς] On the value of the preposition, < πρὸς + acc. >, cf. *GELS* s.v. III 7, where another instance is cited: ἐμεγαλύνθη δὲ ἡ μερίς Βενιαμιν .. πενταπλασίως πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνων ‘the portion of B. was five times larger .. in comparison with theirs’ Ge 43.34.¹¹

ἐπιπέσοι] The selection of the optative is entirely due to the translator, for **יפול** is not exclusively optative on account of its form and position in the clause. The same could be said of **§** **תִּפֹּל**.¹²

The first hemistich of **§** departs widely from both **¶** and **¶**: **סְגִיָּא בִישְׁתָּא וְלֹא אֶרְךָ וְעוֹרוֹת בִּישׁוּתָּה דְאֲנַתְתָּה** ‘the wickedness is considerable and not like the small quantity of the wife's wickedness,’ which Smend (231) takes to mean “die grösste Bosheit des Mannes reicht nicht an die geringste der Frau.”

25.20) ἀνάβασις ἀμμώδης ἐν ποσὶν πρεσβυτέρου,
οὕτως γυνὴ γλωσσώδης ἀνδρὶ ἡσύχῳ.

¹¹ Smend (230f.) mentions three more cases in Si, but they are not comparable to our case here: φίλον πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ‘a friend matching yourself’ 27.16, Τίμα ἱατρὸν πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ τιμαῖς αὐτοῦ ‘Honour a doctor in view of his contributions’ 38.1, and μία ἡμέρα ἐγενήθη πρὸς δύο ‘one day became two’ 46.4.

¹² Snaith (129, fn.) suggests as an alternative rendition “May it fall to her to marry a scoundrel!”.

*An old man climbing a sandy hill with feet
is like a talkative wife to a quiet husband.*

(C) כמעלה חזק לאיש ישיש אשת לשון לאיש מך:13

[ἀμμώδης .. γλωσσώδης] Wagner (1999.146f.) assumes a deliberate choice of parallel words with identical formation.

ἡσύχῳ] ⚙ מביכא ‘humble.’

⚙ is closer to ⚗ than to ⚘: אִיךְ מִסְקַתָּא דְחָלָא בְּרַגְלֵיהִי דְגַבְרָא קְשִׁישָׁא הֶכְנָא ‘like an ascent in sand with an old man’s feet is a wife whose tongue is talkative towards a humble husband.’ A minor harmony with ⚘ is the initial אִיךְ representing כִּי.

25.21) μὴ προσπέσης ἐπὶ κάλλος γυναικὸς
καὶ γυναιῖκα μὴ ἐπιποθήσης.

*Do not be carried away with a woman’s beauty
and do not become too enthusiastic about a woman.*

(C) אל תפול אל יופי אשה ועל יש לה [א]ל תמהר:

[תפול אל] This figurative use of <נפל אָל> differs from what we find in a case such as אֶל־הַמְּחִנָּה אָרָם 2Kg 7.4 and אֶל־הַפְּחַת Is 24.18.

על מה יש לה = [על יש לה] A similar instance of an asyndetic and substantivised relative clause is עַמִּי הִמִּיר כְּבוֹדוֹ בְּלוֹא יוֹעִיל ‘my people have changed its glory for what is of no benefit’ Je 2.11. For more examples in BH, see JM § 158 d.

The second hemistich in ⚗ differs from ⚘: ‘Do not hurry for what she possesses.’ Cf. אֶפְן אֵית לָהּ נְכֻסָּא ‘even if she has possessions.’ ⚗ is repetitive: וְלֹא־נִתְתָּא לָא תְרַחֵם בְּשׁוֹפְרָא ‘and do not love a woman for the sake of beauty.’

In this verse, γυνή appears to mean ‘woman,’ not specifically ‘wife.’

25.22) ὀργὴ καὶ ἀναίδεια καὶ αἰσχύνῃ μεγάλη
γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐπιχορηγῇ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.

*If a wife financially looks after her husband,
(there will ensue) anger, shamelessness, and great shame.*

(C) כי בעדה [...] ובושת אשה מכלכלת [...] בעלה:

Smend (232) holds that ⚗ read בעדה as עברה, i.e. עֲבָרָה, whereas פּוֹלְחָנָא in ⚙ is a rendering of עבדה, i.e. עֲבָדָה as meant by the author. קְשִׁיא in ⚙ suggests then [קְשִׁיא] עֲבָדָה ‘hard work’ (Smend II 22).

¹³ On the decipherment of this and the following verses, see Di Lella 1988.238.

- 25.23) καρδία ταπεινή και πρόσωπον σκυθρωπὸν
 και πληγὴ καρδίας γυνή πονηρά·
 χεῖρες παρειμένα και γόνατα παραλελυμένα
 ἥτις οὐ μακαριεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς.

*Depressed in heart and a gloomy face
 and a stricken heart (result from) a bad wife;
 hands paralysed and knees slackened
 (result from) her who could not make her husband happy.*

(C) רפיון ידים [וכ] שלון ברכים אשה לא תאשר את בעלה:

§ reads: שְׁשׁוּכָּה וּמְחֻזָּה דְלֵבָא אֲנִתָּהּ בִּישְׁתָּא רַפְיוּתָא דְאִידָּהּ וְתַבְרָא דְבוּרְכָּא בְעָלָהּ
 הַלְקָה וּמְשַׁבְּחָהּ דְלֵא מִיְקָרָא וּמְשַׁבְּחָהּ בְעָלָהּ ‘darkness and wounded heart (from) a bad
 wife, weakness of hands and fracture of knees (from) a wife who does not
 honour and praise her husband.’ § shortens the last line to הָיָה דְלֵא יְהָבָא טוּבָא
 הָיָה דְלֵא לְגַבְרָא דִּילָהּ ‘she who does not give glory to her man.’

Heb. תאשר, *pace* Smend (232), does not mean “sie stärkt oder unterstützt ihn”; the same objection applies to his analysis at 4.18 above. It is rightly rendered with μακαριεῖ.

- 25.24) ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας,
 και δι’ αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν πάντες.

*From woman is the beginning of sin,
 and because of her we all die.*

(C) מאשה תחלת עון ובגללה גוענו יחד:

This is unquestionably an allusion to the narrative in Gn 3.1-7. Though Eve is there Adam’s wife, γυνή here may be taken in the sense of “woman.” It is known, however, that theologians, both Jewish and Christian, did not completely agree on this issue. St Paul, for instance, states that ‘Death came through one person (δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου, i.e. not δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνδρός nor διὰ μιᾶς γυναικός)’ Ro 5.11 and he also points out specifically on Eve that she was deceived by the serpent (1Tim 2.14).¹⁴

ἀποθνήσκομεν] = § מִיְתִיָּן חַיִּין, § מִיְתִיָּן. The preterite tense form, גוענו, ‘we became mortal,’ links the verse closer to the narrative in Gn.

πάντες] § יחד, the universal mortality of mankind, not the first human couple only.

¹⁴ Cf. Levinson (1985), who argues that the reference here is not to Eve. We are dubious about his translation, “the [evil] wife .. we [husbands].” In this passage, § consistently writes γυνή πονηρά (vss. 16, 23, 25). There is no justification for precluding women from mortality.

25.25) μὴ δῶς ὕδατι διέξοδον
μηδὲ γυναικὶ πονηρᾷ παρρησίαν·

*Do not allow water to keep flowing out
nor give an evil wife licence of tongue.*

παρρησίαν] As against **SH**'s transliteration, in **S** we find אַפָּא וְשׁוּלְטָנָא 'face and authority (?).' Many MSS read ἐξουσίαν. But authority to do what?

25.26) εἰ μὴ πορεύεται κατὰ χειρὰς σου,
ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν σου ἀπότμε αὐτήν.

*If she does not follow your guidance,
cut her off away from your unity.*

Is the second hemistich an allusion to אֶל-כֵּן יַעֲזֹב-אִישׁ אֶת-אָבִיו וְאֶת-אִמּוֹ Gn 2.24? Cf. **S** כָּסַרְךָ קָצַץ הֵב לָהּ וְשָׂרִיחַ מִן בֵּיתְךָ 'Cut your flesh, give (it) to her, and expel her from your home.'

CHAPTER 26

- 26.1) Γυναικὸς ἀγαθῆς μακάριος ὁ ἀνὴρ,
καὶ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτοῦ διπλάσιος.

*The husband of a good wife is blessed,
and the number of his days would double.*

(C) אשה טובה אשרי בעלה ומספר ימיו כפלים:

The first half begins with אשה טובה in casus pendens and is followed by a complete nominal clause. All could have been written as אשרי בעל אשה טובה or אשרי בעל לו אשה טובה. The same could be said of § here: אִתְּתָא טְבָתָא דְאִתְּתָא טְבָתָא הוּ נְבָרָה: 'Of a good wife her husband is blessed.' Note our remarks on the use of the acc. at 25.23 above. Smend (233) refers to proverbs such as אֲשֶׁרִי [עֲנִיִּים] מְחֻנְגִּין עֲנִיִּים Pr 14.21 and וּבֹוֹטֵה בֵיהּ אֲשֶׁרִי ib. 16.20. All the same the fronted *good wife* carries special prominence.

Γυναικὸς ἀγαθῆς] אשה טובה Segal (158) mentions this saying quoted as אשה יפה in bYev 63.2 and bSanh 100.2, but the quote is preceded by אשה טובה.¹ Given the advice such as “Do not be carried away with a woman’s beauty” 25.21 the mention of אשה יפה probably indicates the Talmudist’s perspective.

- 26.2) γυνὴ ἀνδρεία εὐφραίνει τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς,
καὶ τὰ ἔτη αὐτοῦ πληρώσει ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

*A staunch wife gladdens her husband
and he would complete his years in peace.*

(C) אשת חיל תדשן לבעלה ושגון[תו .. תשמ[ח]:

γυνὴ ἀνδρεία] אשת חיל; the same equation is found in Pr 12.4, 31.10. This Heb. phrase, in its remaining attestation in the OT, is rendered as γυνὴ δυνάμεως Ru 3.11.

εὐφραίνει] better fits תשמ[ח at the end of the verse; תדשן means ‘she fattens.’ Note also § תבסם, though נשם = πληρώσει.

On ל- as a direct object marker, see above at 4.7.

τὰ ἔτη αὐτοῦ] § שני חייה ‘the years of his life.’

- 26.3) γυνὴ ἀγαθὴ μερὶς ἀγαθῆ,
ἐν μερίδι φοβουμένων κύριον δοθήσεται.

¹ See also Lévi (127).

*A good wife is a good portion,
she would be granted as a portion for those who fear the Lord.*

(C) אשה [ט] טובה מנה [] [ובחלק ירא יי תנת[ן]:

μερίς] מנה] for which a quote from our text reads מתנה ‘gift’ in bSanh 100.2, which Smend’s (II 22) Heb. restoration follows: אשה טובה מתנה טובה.

יי ירא sg.] מנה = pl.

ἐν μερίδι] בחלק. In the above-mentioned Talmudic text we read בחיק ‘into the bosom,’ which with נתן is rendered differently in מנה .. בחיקך. και ἔδωκα .. ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ σου 2Sm 11.8. In this latter case ἐν is purely locational, whereas its use in our ἐν μερίδι could be compared with ἐν κλήρῳ δέδωκα τοῖς υἱοῖς Ησαυ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σηיר Dt 2.5. For more examples in SG, see GELS s.v. ἐν 12 “in the character, function, role of,” comparable to the so-called *beth essentiae* of Heb. -ב.²

26.4) πλουσίου δὲ καὶ πτωχοῦ καρδία ἀγαθή,
ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ πρόσωπον ἰλαρόν.

*Whether of a rich (husband) or of a poor one, his is a delighted heart,
at all times a cheerful face.*

We have another loosely constructed saying. It must be about a husband who has a good wife. מ is slightly better at the start of the verse: אן עתיר ‘whether he is rich or he is poor, his heart is happy all the time.’ Note the second half in MS 248: ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ πρόσωπον ἔχοντες ἰλαρόν γαυριάσουσιν ‘at all times, having a cheerful face, they act proudly.’

26.5) Ἀπὸ τριῶν εὐλαβήθη ἡ καρδία μου,
καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τετάρτῳ προσώπῳ ἐφοβήθην·
διαβολὴν πόλεως, καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ὄχλου,
καὶ καταψευσμόν, ὑπὲρ θάνατον πάντα μοχθηρά.

*Three things my heart found fearful,
and to the fourth I dreaded to turn my face:
criticism by your city and a gathering of a crowd,
and calumny, all (this) distressful more than death.*

τετάρτῳ] an ordinary numeral difficult to analyse. מ turned it into a cardinal equivalent: מן ארבע סני דחלת ‘of four I feared very much.’ What is מ supposed to mean? על פרוצופא רביעיאתיהבת ‘on a fourth face I was given (!).’ Our analysis is to take the numeral as an instrumental dative³ modifying the following verb. The presence of diverse variae lectiones for the verb

² Cf. Jenni 1992 B 4.11, p. 89.

³ See SSG § 22 wl.

(ἐφοβήθην) bears witness to the general difficulty of the text: ἐδεηθην ‘I requested,’ ἐδοθην ‘I was given,’ and ἐδειλιασε ‘it [= my heart] was fearful.’ Not only grammatically, but also in terms of the message, this numeral is difficult, for only three objects of fear are mentioned.

26.6) ἄλγος καρδίας καὶ πένθος γυνὴ ἀντίζηλος ἐπὶ γυναικὶ
καὶ μάστιξ γλώσσης πᾶσιν ἐπικοινωνοῦσα.

*Grief of heart and sorrow is a woman fighting a woman
and a scourge of tongue is common to all.*

μάστιξ γλώσσης] a phrase also found at Jb 5.21, a rendition of נִשְׁבַּח טוֹשׁ.
γυνὴ ἀντίζηλος ἐπὶ γυναικὶ] Either two women jostling for a man’s affections or an already married wife jealous of a former rival. Either way it is a friction arising in marital relationships.

πᾶσιν] all the above mentioned difficulties.

§ renders the second hemistich as וְהָיָה כְּמַלְחָמָה בְּשֵׁנֵי אִשָּׁה ‘and they are altogether an attack of a tongue.’

26.7) βουζύγιον σαλευόμενον γυνὴ πονηρά,
ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς ὡς ὁ δρασσόμενος σκορπίου.

*A bad wife is a violently shaking ox-yoke,
he who takes hold of her is like one who grasps a scorpion.*

σαλευόμενον] § אִשָּׁה.

κρατῶν] Smend (235) views the verb as meaning “to marry.” He sees §’s מְסִיבָה ‘he bears, supports’ as a mistranslation of the supposed Heb. אִשָּׁה, which can mean “to marry.”⁴ As regards κρατέω, a sense such as “to gain possession of” or “to lord it over” is known in SG, but such is never applied to a husband in his relationship with his wife. SG does not attest to the equation κρατέω אִשָּׁה Qal, in whatever sense of this common Heb. verb.

26.8) ὀργὴ μεγάλη γυνὴ μέθυσος
καὶ ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς οὐ συγκαλύψει.

*A drunkard wife is greatly irritating
and she would not cover her pudenda.*

μέθυσος] § וְהָיָה וְהָיָה ‘intoxicated and roaming.’ MS 248 adds also ρεμβας ‘roaming.’

ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς] § צַרְצָרָהּ ‘her (moral) shame.’ Syr. commonly uses פְּוִרְסָהּ to denote a sexual organ, whether of a male or a female, but

⁴ So Skehan - Di Lella (344): “marries her” and Segal (159) “הַגְּוִשָּׁה.”

note $\text{הַמֶּלֶךְ עָרַוּתָּא אִמְרָהּ}$ 1Sm 20.30 rendered as $\text{הַמֶּלֶךְ עָרַוּתָּא אִמְרָהּ}$. Here סִי reads $\text{הַלְיָהּ אִתְּהָרָה}$ ‘her disgrace.’

26.9) $\text{πορνεία γυναικὸς ἐν μετεωρισμοῖς ὀφθαλμῶν}$
 $\text{καὶ ἐν τοῖς βλεφάροις αὐτῆς γνωσθήσεται.}$

*A wife's evil character can be spotted
 in her haughty eyes and eyelids.*

26.10) $\text{ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἀδιατρέπτω στερέωσον φυλακὴν,}$
 $\text{ἵνα μὴ εὐροῦσα ἄνεσιν ἑαυτῇ χρήσεται.}$

*Keep a vigilant eye on a headstrong daughter
 so that, having found freedom, she might not take advantage of it.*

The first hemistich recurs identically in Si 42.11, where HM reads בַּבַּיִת מִשְׁמַשׁ [ק]זח, where [ק]זח is most likely קִיח, Pi. impv.

θυγατρὶ] Even though the preceding verse goes about wife, in no way, *pace* Smend (235), can θυγάτηρ be made to mean “wife.”

ἀδιατρέπτω] סִי אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה ‘shameless.’ Ἀδιάτρεπτος is unknown prior to SG, and recurs at 26.25 and 42.11, and each time with reference to a woman.⁵

ἄνεσιν] which Ryssel (365, fn. e) refers to laxity in guard’s attention.

χρήσεται] Smend (236) says that the Gk verb means “to perform sexual intercourse.” No such instance is known to SG. LSJ, s.v. χράω C med. IV 2 mentions one case for “sexual intercourse”: $\text{τῆσι δὲ ἄλλησι γυναιξὶ ἐχράτο}$ Hdt 2.181, where the clause is preceded by $\text{μίσγεσθαι οὐκ οἶός}$, where the inf. explicitly means ‘to have sexual intercourse,’ so that it is not impossible that ἐχράτο means “he treated” in bed. Whereas שִׁמְשַׁם does not occur in BH and only once in BS at 38.12 with an obscure meaning, its Pi. in the sense of “to perform sexual intercourse” is well-known to MH, in which a verbal noun, שִׁמְשָׁת , also denotes such an act beside “use, utilisation,” a notion affiliated to χράομαι . Ryssel (364, fn. f) goes a step farther, suggesting that it is a case of onanism.⁶ ἑαυτῇ here is best viewed as a case of *dativus commodi*.

A somewhat different message is heard in ס : $\text{לְעַלְמָא אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה}$ $\text{עַל אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה}$ $\text{עַל אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה אִתְּהָרָה}$ ‘on an audacious one increase guards because she would not be satisfied unless she got away secretly.’

26.11) $\text{ὀπίσω ἀναιδοῦς ὀφθαλμοῦ φύλαξαι}$
 $\text{καὶ μὴ θαυμάσης, ἐὰν εἰς σὲ πλημμελήσῃ.}$

⁵ Cf. Wagner 1999.138f.

⁶ Practised by women as well?

*(Being) behind a shameless eye watch out
and do not be surprised if she gets at you.*

This and the following verse do not appear to be concerned with a wife.

The fem. gender has been selected in both **ש** תִּדְגַלְגַּל .. הַצַּיִת עֵינָא ‘one who is audacious in eyes .. she deceives’ and **ש** הַמְּסַלְלָא .. אִימְדִינִית בְּעֵינָא ‘one who is audacious in eyes .. she deceives.’ Strictly speaking, ἀναιδοῦς can be either masc. or fem. and substantivised, but then one would not know how syntactically to analyse the genitive case of ὀφθαλμοῦ. Smend adduces for comparison Heb. עוֹ פְּנִים, which, however, is syntactically distinct: a cst. phrase, עוֹ פְּנִי Ec 8.1, where **ע** significantly reads ἀναιδῆς προσώπῳ with a dat. of respect. When the nomen regens is an adjective or a ptc., esp. passive, the nomen rectum is never rendered with a genitive noun in **ע**, e.g. Καὶ ἦν Ἰωσηφ καλὸς τῷ εἶδει καὶ ὠραῖος τῇ ὄψει σφόδρα < יְהִי יוֹסֵף הַיְהוָה מְרֵאָה מְרֵאָה Gn 39.6.⁷

φύλαξαι] in the middle voice of reflexive force. **ש** רַחַץ is an anomalous spelling in lieu of רַחַץ ‘Run!’. The mid. verb φυλάσσομαι does not require ὀπίσω to indicate what or who one should beware of, but ἀπό as in φυλάξῃ ἀπὸ παντὸς ῥήματος πονηροῦ De 23.9.⁸ Hence ὀπίσω ἀναιδοῦς ὀφθαλμοῦ indicates a place. Segal (159) translates the first hemistich with אֶרְרֶה שְׂמֵר אֶרְרֶה, though he is aware that < אֶרְרֶה שְׂמֵר > is unattested elsewhere (162).

26.12) ὡς διψῶν ὀδοιπόρος στόμα ἀνοίξει
καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδατος τοῦ σύνεγγυς πίνεται,
κατέναντι παντὸς πασσάλου καθήσεται
καὶ ἔναντι βέλους ἀνοίξει φαρέτραν.

*As a thirsty wayfarer would open (his) mouth
and drink from any water close by,
she would sit in front of any oblong object
and open (her) quiver towards an arrow.*

τοῦ σύνεγγυς] an adverb being used as equivalent to an attributive adjective, and the added τοῦ exemplifies a rare structure < noun - article - adjective > as in ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά ‘the high mountains’ Ps 103.18.⁹

πασσάλου .. βέλους .. φαρέτραν] euphemistically used for ‘penis,’ ‘phallus,’ ‘vagina’ respectively.

⁷ For more examples of this structure in BH, see JM § 129 *i-ia*.

⁸ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. 2.

⁹ On the former feature, see *SSG* § 26 e (p. 222), and on the latter, id. § 37 **bbc**.

§ is rather extended: אֵיךְ צִהְיָא דְעָאָל מִן אוֹרְחָא וְפוּמָה פְּתִיחַ לְמֵיא קְרִירָא וּמִן כָּל מִין שְׁתָּא וְעַל כָּל קִיס מְסֻתְמָךְ וְקָדָם כָּל גְּאֹרָא פְּתִיחַ קְטָרְקָה הֶכְנָא הִי אֲנִתְתָּא נְיָרְתָּא הַחֲמָה דְלָכֵל אֲנִשׁ פְּתִיחַ רְחֻמָּה ‘as someone thirsty who enters from a travel and whose mouth is open for cool waters and who drinks from any water and relies on every pound (of water?),¹⁰ and whose quiver is open before every arrow, so is an adulterous woman whose sexual organ is available to everybody.’

26.13) Χάρις γυναικὸς τέρπει τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς,
καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ πιανεῖ ἢ ἐπιστήμη αὐτῆς.

*The charm of a wife gives delight to her husband
and her knowledgeableness nourishes his bones.*

(C אשה [מט] יב בעלה [] ידשן שכלה):

[Χάρις] Given the masc. ptc., אשה must have been preceded by a m.s. substantive towards the end of the preceding line, thus not constituting the first word of the line in the Heb. MS. הן comes to everybody’s mind.

The parallelism with ידשן suggests אשה [מט] יב as a more plausible restoration.

26.14) δόσις κυρίου γυνή σιγηρά,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα πεπαιδευμένης ψυχῆς·

*A quiet wife is a gift from the Lord
and there is no substitute for an educated soul.*

[σιγηρά] § בְּטָא ‘good.’

Segal (162) mentions a Talmudic saying: עשרה קבים שיחה ירדו לעולם ‘Ten qav units of chatting descended to the world. Women took nine of them’ bQid 49.2.

[ψυχῆς] Smend’s (237) analysis sounds odd: “Genetiv der Restriction,” with which he apparently means what one thinks of the dative of respect. Among the twenty-five values one could identify in the genitive case in SG (SSG § 22 v) there is not a single suitable candidate. According to Smend πεπαιδευμένης is presumably not attributive, but substantivised: “of a (wife) educated in soul.”

26.15) χάρις ἐπὶ χάριτι γυνή αἰσχυνηρά,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σταθμὸς πᾶς ἄξιος ἐγκρατοῦς ψυχῆς.

*A modest wife is charm upon charm,
there is no weight at all suitable for a self-controlled (wife).*

(C חן ע[ל] חן] אשה ביישת ואין משקל לצרורת פה):

¹⁰ Smend (236): “jedes Holz.”

παῶς] Presumably to indicate categorical negation with a sg. noun, though the position of such παῶς usually precedes a negated substantive. Cf. *SSG* § 83 **fa**.

ἐγκρατοῦς] most likely not an attributive adjective, but substantivised, and the gen. case of ψυχῆς is typical of this adjective, often governing a gen. term, e.g. ὁ ἐγκρατῆς τοῦ νόμου ‘he who holds the law fast’ Si 15.1. Thus we have here a concatenation of two terms in the gen. case: ἄξιος governing a gen. and ἐγκρατῆς governing a gen. of its own. See *SSG* § 42 **d**.

The grammatical nature of פה צרורת פה, a cst. chain, is observable in a case such as אֲשֶׁר־יְנַשְׂרֵי־נַשְׂוֵי־פְשָׁעֵי־כְסוּי־הַטָּאָה ‘blessed is one whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered’ Ps 32.1. Thus our Si example can be reworded as אֲשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר צָרוּר פִּיהָ. Cf. JM § 129 *ia*.¹¹

26.16) ἥλιος ἀνατέλλων ἐν ὑψίστοις κυρίου
καὶ κάλλος ἀγαθῆς γυναικὸς ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκίας αὐτῆς·
*A sun rising in the heights of the Lord
and the beauty of a good wife in her decorated house,*

(C שמש [זורחת] במרומי מעל יפה א[שה] בדביר בחור:

ἥλιος] On the absence of the expected definite article, see *SSG* § 5 **e**.
κάλλος [יפה] an anomalous spelling for יפי, i.e. יפי ‘the beauty of,’ as in יפי עִם־יָפֵה עֵינָיִם Ez 28.7? Otherwise one could adduce the much debated יפה מְרֵאָה 1Sm 16.12 and יפה מְרֵאָה ib. 17.42, both translated in *Θ* as μετὰ κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν.

An alternative analysis is to take יפה as יפה. So BSH 160. In view of the word order [יפה א]שה can only mean ‘a woman is pretty,’ and it cannot correspond to ἀγαθῆς γυναικὸς, for which our author would have written אשה טובה.

דביר בחור] ‘a select, special innermost chamber’? Let it be noted that the noun דְּבִיר in BH always refers to the throne-room of Yahweh. This forms good parallelism with מרומי מעל.

26.17) λύχνος ἐκλάμπων ἐπὶ λυχνίας ἁγίας
καὶ κάλλος προσώπου ἐπὶ ἡλικία στασίμη·
*A lamp shining on a sacred lamp-stand
and the beauty of (her) face on her solid height.*

(C נר שרף על מנורת קדש הוד פנים על קומת תוכן:

¹¹ Mopsik’s (175, fn. 6) alternative interpretation that “mouth” is a euphemism for vagina is unlikely.

In § the second hemistich reads: **הַכֶּנֶף שׁוֹפְרָהּ הַרְחִיבָהּ אֶת־בְּתוּלָתָהּ בְּמוֹתֵב בְּיָתֶיהָ** ‘so is the beauty of a good wife in the way she sits at home.’

26.18) στῦλοι χρύσειοι ἐπὶ βάσει ἀργυρᾶς
καὶ πόδες ὠραῖοι ἐπὶ πτέρνοις εὐστάθοις.

*Golden pillars on a silver base
and beautiful legs on well-balanced heels.*

πτέρνοις] chosen by Ziegler over against the meaningless στέρνοις ‘breasts’ as read in many MSS.

For an interpretation of the complicated text of § here, cf. Smend 238.

26.19) ¶ τέκνον, ἀκμήν ἡλικίας σου συντήρησον ὑγιῆ,
καὶ μὴ δῶς ἄλλοτρίοις τὴν ἰσχύν σου.

*Child, save the prime of your manhood safe,
and do not give your power away to strangers.*

In the first hemistich we read in §: **בֶּרֶךְ אֶת־יְהוָה בְּנוֹבְנָא דְעַלְמוֹתָא** ‘Son, be cautious at the time of your youth.’

26.20) ἀναζητησᾶς παντὸς πεδίου εὐγεων κλῆρον,
σπεῖρε τὰ ἴδια σπέρματα πεποιθὸς τῇ εὐγενείᾳ σου.

*After having looked for a piece of good soil in the whole field,
sow your own seeds, trusting in your noble birth.*

πεποιθὸς τῇ εὐγενείᾳ σου] § **תְּבִיחָתְךָ בְּתוֹלְדֶיךָ** ‘with your reproductions confidently.’

26.21) οὕτως τὰ γενήματά σου περιόντα,
καὶ παρρησίαν εὐγενείας ἔχοντα μεγαλυνούσι.

*That way your products being successful,
and, being free to act due to (their) noble birth, would be praised high.*

μεγαλυνούσι] Many contemporary translations appear to have taken the verb as intransitive – “groß wachsen” (Ryssel), “become great” (Box - Oesterley), “growing up” (Skehan - Di Lella), “become great” (NETS). The only exception is “hoch preisen” (SD). In the active voice μεγαλύνω is always transitive, which is true not only in BG, but also in CG. What are the subject and the object of μεγαλυνούσι as a transitive verb? We suggest that the former is “people,” the 3pl. verb being used impersonally, and the τὰ

γενήματά σου the object.¹² The way the two participles are being used here could be compared with a case such as ὑπέδειξε τὸν τῆς συμποσίας καιρὸν ἤδη παρατρέχοντα ‘he pointed out that the time for the banquet was already slipping by’ 3M 5.15.¹³

26.22) γυνὴ μισθία ἴση σιάλω λογισθήσεται,
ὑπανδρος δὲ πύργος θανάτου τοῖς χρωμένοις λογισθήσεται.
*A hired woman shall be considered equal to spittle,
but one who is subject to a husband shall be considered as a tower of
death for those who use her.*

ἴση] The adjective is functioning as a predicate as in πιστοὶ ἐλογίσθησαν ‘they were considered to be reliable’ Ne 13.13.

πύργος θανάτου] What does this mean? Ryssel (366, fn. a) refers to 2M 13.5ff. where a 50-cubit tower is mentioned as a site of execution.

26.23) γυνὴ ἀσεβῆς ἀνόμω μερὶς δοθήσεται
εὐσεβῆς δὲ δίδεται τῷ φοβουμένῳ τὸν κύριον.
*An impious woman could be given as a portion to a lawless (man)
and a pious (woman) is given to a (man) who fears the Lord.*

26.24) γυνὴ ἀσχήμων ἀτιμίαν κατατρίψει,
θυγάτηρ δὲ εὐσχήμων καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐντραπήσεται.
*An unseemly woman would be often engaged in acts of infamy,
but a decent woman would feel shy even before her husband.*

θυγάτηρ] Just as Heb. **נַצְּ**, this Gk word is sometimes used in the sense of a female other than daughter in the standard sense; see *GELS* s.v. **3** and **4**. In this verse it is clearly parallel to γυνή.

26.25) γυνὴ ἀδιάτρεπτος ὡς κύων λογισθήσεται,
ἢ δὲ ἔχουσα αἰσχύνην τὸν κύριον φοβηθήσεται.
*A headstrong woman would be considered as a dog,
but one who has a sense of shame would fear the Lord.*

κύων] The dog was not man’s best friend in Jewish society.¹⁴

¹² *SD* displays a different analysis: “So werden deine Nachkommen beständig sein und die Zuversicht auf die edle Herkunft hoch preisen.”

¹³ For a discussion with more examples, see *SSG* § 31 **gd**.

¹⁴ Cf. Schwartz 2004.

- 26.26) γυνὴ ἄνδρα ἴδιον τιμῶσα σοφὴ πᾶσι φανήσεται,
 ἀτιμάζουσα δὲ ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ ἀσεβῆς πᾶσι γνωσθήσεται
 γυναικὸς ἀγαθῆς μακάριος ὁ ἀνὴρ·
 ὁ γὰρ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ διπλάσιος ἔσται.

*A wife who respects her own husband would appear to all as wise,
 but one not respecting with haughtiness would be known to all as impious,
 blessed is a husband of a good wife,
 for the number of his years would double.*

ἴδιον] a rare instance of ἴδιος as a substitute of a reflexive pronoun, here
 ἐαυτῆς. See SSG § 8 h.

ἀσεβῆς] inadvertently missing in S.

On the clause structure of vs. 26c, see above at 26.1.

- 26.27) γυνὴ μεγαλόφωνος καὶ γλωσσώδης
 ὡς σάλπιγξ πολέμων εἰς τροπὴν θεωρηθήσεται.
 ἀνθρώπου δὲ παντὸς ψυχὴ ὁμοιότροπος τούτοις,
 πολέμου ἀκαταστασίαις τὴν ψυχὴν διαιτηθήσεται. ¶

*A wife who speaks loud and much
 could be seen as an army trumpet calling for flight,
 everybody's soul is similar to these,
 one would subject one's life to disruptions of war.*

ὁμοιότροπος] Wagner (1999.342) notes that compound words beginning
 with ὁμοιο- and ὁμο- are especially common in books originally written in
 Greek, what speaks of the elegant style of the Greek of our document.

- 26.28) Ἐπὶ δυσὶ λελύπηται ἡ καρδία μου,
 καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τρίτῳ θυμὸς μοι ἐπῆλθεν·
 ἀνὴρ πολεμιστῆς ὑστερῶν δι' ἔνδειαν,
 καὶ ἄνδρες συνετοὶ ἐὰν σκυβαλισθῶσιν,
 ἐπανάγων ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαν·
 ὁ κύριος ἐτοιμάσει εἰς ῥομφαίαν αὐτόν.

*On two (types of man) my heart has felt sorrow,
 on the third anger came over me:
 a warrior lacking much because of poverty,
 and intelligent people disregarded as useless,
 one returning from righteousness back to sin.
 The Lord would prepare him for a sword.*

δυσὶ] S דַּוְּיָן תְּרִינִי 'two matters.'

λελύπηται] S רָתַ 'it was amazed.'

26.29) Μόλις ἐξελεῖται ἔμπορος ἀπὸ πλημμελείας,
καὶ οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κάπηλος ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας.

*A merchant would scarcely keep clear of a wrongdoing
a tradesman would not be innocent of a sin.*

ἐξελεῖται] *Pace* Smend (241) there is no absolute need to view this middle voice form as passively used.¹⁵ It is about a merchant trying to keep away from wrongdoings, not about seeking help from others in that direction. See also below at 36.1.

¹⁵ See his translation: “Nicht leicht bleibt ein Kaufmann vor Vergehen bewahrt.”

CHAPTER 27

- 27.1) χάριν διαφόρου πολλοὶ ἥμαρτον,
καὶ ὁ ζητῶν πληθῦναι ἀποστρέψει ὀφθαλμόν.

*For the sake of money many people sinned,
and one who seeks to increase (income) would look away.*

χάριν] a pseudo-preposition of causal force. It may be also post-positioned, e.g. τούτων χάριν ‘because of these things’ Si 31.13. See *GELS* s.v. χάρις 6.

§ is more explicit: אֲהַטֵּה יַיִּוּסִים לְאֲבָרֵי אֲתֵלְתֵּי הַהַבָּלִית מְטוּב טוֹתֵי אֲנִיִּסוּ ׀ הַיִּנְיָעֵי אֲמַמְהָ ‘many are those who sinned because they have no fear (of the Lord) and he who wants to increase sins averts his eyes.’

ἀποστρέψει ὀφθαλμόν] §H adds in the margin: אֲבָרִים מִן ‘from the poor.’ One might also be tempted to take no notice of obvious traps for illegal gains.

- 27.2) ἀνὰ μέσον ἄρμων λίθων παγήσεται πάσσαλος,
καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον πράσεως καὶ ἀγορασμοῦ συνθλιβήσεται ἁμαρτία.

*Between joint stones a peg would be placed fast,
and between selling and buying a sin might creep in.*

πράσεως καὶ ἀγορασμοῦ] § אֲנִיִּבִּימֵי אֲבִוִּי ‘a buyer and a seller.’

συνθλιβήσεται] We prefer adopting this emendation suggested by Fritzsche (1871.453) *pace* Ziegler’s συντριβήσεται, ‘might be crushed,’ which is rather difficult in the context; cf. also Ryssel 367, fn. f. To the literal translation in §H, קִרְתָּשָׁה, a marginal alternative has been added: תִּלְפָּתָה ‘be performed.’

- 27.3) ἐὰν μὴ ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου κρατήσῃ
κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐν τάχει καταστραφήσεται αὐτοῦ ὁ οἶκος.

*If he does not adhere to the fear of the Lord,
his house would be ruined fast, in no time.*

ἐν] In contrast to the normal < + gen. > with this verb we most likely have here a Hebraism, e.g. בְּדֹרֵי אֲנָשִׁים וַיִּקְרָא וַיִּקְרָא Gn 19.6 and וְשׂוֹב בְּעֵקֶב אֲתָתָה דָּוִדִּיב. 25.26. Hence we are not convinced with Smend’s (242) “wenn du nicht in der Gottesfurcht stark, d.h. reich wirst.”¹

§ begins with אַתָּה and the verbs are in the second person. κρατήσῃ may have been found difficult; because of the opening ἐὰν μὴ and the following

¹ In Smend (II 46) he offers “wenn du nicht an der Gottesfurcht festhältst,” but he continues with “dein Haus.”

αὐτοῦ, the verb here cannot be parsed as fut. mid. 2sg.² In SG the third person sg. non-passive verb does occur impersonally, but literally impersonally with no personal subject, e.g. Ἔστω κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου ‘Let it be as you say’ Ge 30.34. More examples are mentioned in *SSG* § 87 c.

- 27.4) Ἐν σείσματι κοσκίνου διαμένει κοπρία,
οὕτως σκύβαλα ἀνθρώπου ἐν λογισμῶ αὐτοῦ.
*If one shakes a sieve, rubbish could remain behind,
so sheer nonsense of a person in his argument.*

The message of **ש** is rather distinct: אִךְ תִּנָּאן סִנְיָאָא לְעַל מִן נוּרָא הִכְנָא שׁוֹעִינְתָּא לְפַרְפִּיּוֹרָא מַלְאָכָא וְעַל חִשְׁבֹּנוֹתָא ‘like much smoke above fire, so are man’s statements over a thought.’³

- 27.5) σκεύη κεραμέως δοκιμάζει κάμινος,
καὶ πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐν διαλογισμῶ αὐτοῦ.
*A furnace tests a potter’s instruments,
and a man’s test is in his reasoning.*

(A כּלי יוצר לבער כבשן וכמהו איש על חשבונו:

δοκιμάζει] Rather difficult to harmonise with לבער ‘to ignite.’ And what is the first Heb. clause supposed to mean? “A potter’s instruments are there to ignite an oven”?

διαλογισμῶ] probably a stylistic variant of λογισμός in the preceding verse. In both cases *SD* has viewed αὐτοῦ as objective genitive: “beim Nachdenken über ihn.” Though we find no syntactic difficulty there, is not “die Erprobung eines Menschen geschieht beim Nachdenken über ihn” much too obvious?⁴

- 27.6) γεώργιον ξύλου ἐκφαίνει ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ,
οὕτως λογισμὸς ἐνθυμήματα καρδιάς ἀνθρώπου.
*Fruits show the quality of a farmer’s working on trees,
so an argument what a person’s thoughts are in his mind.*

(A על עבדת עץ יהי פרי כן השבון על יצר אחד:

λογισμὸς] **ש** חִשְׁבָּנָא ‘reasoning, arguing’ as a verbal noun, also in vs. 7, whereas in vss. 4 and 5 we find מַחְשְׁבָתָא ‘thought,’ as a result of reasoning as in Gn 6.5 and Dn 11.24.

² Besides, **ש** presents a rather free translation: בֶּרִי אֵן עַל דְּחַלְתְּהָ דְאַלְהָא תַּעֲבֵר קְלִיל זְכָנָא בֶּרִי אֵן עַל דְּחַלְתְּהָ דְאַלְהָא תַּעֲבֵר קְלִיל זְכָנָא ‘Child, if you go against God a little, you would lose much time.’

³ Smend (242f.) holds that this text is that of vs. 5, with which the text adduced above is totally irreconcilable.

⁴ See *SD* in its commentary ad loc., p. 2200.

ἐνθυμήματα καρδίας ἀνθρώπου] This presents quite a departure from
דָּקָא רִצָּר.⁵

27.7) πρὸ λογισμοῦ μὴ ἐπαινέσης ἄνδρα·
οὗτος γὰρ πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπων.

*Before (hearing his) argument, do not praise a man,
for this is a proof of people.*

27.8) Ἐὰν διώκης τὸ δίκαιον, καταλήμψῃ
καὶ ἐνδύσῃ αὐτὸ ὡς ποδήρη δόξης.

*If you pursue righteousness, you would acquire,
and would wear it like gorgeous robes.*

τὸ δίκαιον] **שֶׁ אֱמָשִׁק**, the commonest equivalent of which is ἀλήθεια.
Cf. **שֶׁ אֱמָשִׁק־דִּי**. In SG the commonest equivalent of √δικοιο- is √דקצ. Thus
we find δίκαιος rendering **תִּמְצָא** a mere five times, in four of which the
Heb. noun carries a religious or ethical overtone, e.g. καὶ ἐξ ἀδικίας ἀπο-
στρέψει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, κρίμα δίκαιον ποιήσει ἀνὰ μέσον ἀνδρὸς καὶ
ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ **שִׁי לְ אִישׁ בֵּין אִישׁ הַיָּצִי אֶמְצָא טַפְשָׁמִ יָדָּי וְשִׁיב לִי מִצָּרָה**
Ez 18.8. See also Zc 7.9, Is 61.8, Je 49(42).5. The only possible exception is
Ex 18.21.

27.9) πετεινὰ πρὸς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καταλύσει,
καὶ ἀλήθεια πρὸς τοὺς ἐργαζομένους αὐτὴν ἐπανήξει.

*Birds would seek a nest with their likes
and truth would return to those who practise it.*

27.10) λέων θήραν ἐνεδρεύει,
οὕτως ἀμαρτία ἐργαζομένους ἄδικα.

*A lion lies in wait for prey,
so sin for those who commit unrighteous deeds.*

27.11) διήγησις εὐσεβοῦς διὰ παντὸς σοφία,
ὁ δὲ ἄφρων ὡς σελήνη ἀλλοιοῦται.

*A story by a pious person is always wisdom,
but a fool keeps changing like the moon.*

27.12) εἰς μέσον ἀσυνέτων συντήρησον καιρόν,
εἰς μέσον δὲ διανοουμένων ἐνδελέχιζε.

⁵ Smend (II 23) hypothesises **דָּקָא רִצָּר**.

*Among the thoughtless watch out for the right time (to leave),
among the thoughtful linger on.*

εἰς μέσον (2×)] mostly in the sense of “into the midst of,” but here the conjunction with ἐνδελέχιζε ‘linger on, stay on,’ and not ‘come frequently’ suggests that on rare occasions εἰς μέσον can be synonymous with ἐν μέσῳ, so *GELS* s.v. μέσος **II D b**.

- 27.13) διήγησις μωρῶν προσόχθισμα,
καὶ ὁ γέλωσ ἀυτῶν ἐν σπατάλῃ ἁμαρτίας.
*A story by fools is boring,
and their joke is about sinful luxury.*

ἐν] a preposition which, like its Heb. counterpart, ׀, can mark the object of a discourse or thought. So also, e.g., διηγῆσασθε ἐν τοῖς πύργοις αὐτῆς ‘Narrate about her towers’ Ps 47.13. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. ἐν **15**.

σπατάλη ἁμαρτίας] Alternatively translatable as “unbridled sin.” Cf. **§** merely **אָהִיבָהּ** ‘boldness’ // **§ה** **אֲהִיבָהּ אֲהִיבָהּ** ‘extravagance in sin.’

- 27.14) λαλιὰ πολυόρκου ἀνορθώσει τρίχας,
καὶ ἡ μάχη αὐτῶν ἐμφραγμὸς ὠτίων.
*A talk by excessive curser makes the hair stand on end
and when they quarrel, people stop their ears.*

The second hemistich is replaced in **§** with vs. 15.

αὐτῶν] The selection of the pl. pronoun is because the translator was not thinking of a monologue, by one person, but of a conversation.

- 27.15) ἔκχυσις αἵματος μάχη ὑπερηφάνων,
καὶ ἡ διαλοιδόρησις αὐτῶν ἀκοή μοχθηρά.
*A quarrel between arrogant people (ends up in) bloodshed
and their mutual railing is unbearable to listen to.*

According to Smend (246) the first hemistich means that their quarrel is as bad as bloodshed.

The second hemistich is missing in **§**.

- 27.16) Ὁ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια ἀπόλεσεν πίστιν
καὶ οὐ μὴ εὔρη φίλον πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ.
*One who discloses secrets loses trust
and would never find a friend comparable to his own life.*

§ begins with an extra message: **בְּיַת רְשָׁעִים לֹא תֵשֵׁב וּמָה תִּהְיֶינָה אָזְנוֹתַי כִּי יִשְׂכַּח אֶת־דְּבָרֵי** ‘in the midst of the wicked do not sit, and when they laugh, stop your ears.’
 πρὸς] On < πρὸς + acc >, see above at 25.19.

27.17) στέρξον φίλον καὶ πιστώθητι μετ’ αὐτοῦ·
 ἐὰν δὲ ἀποκαλύψῃς τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ,
 μὴ καταδιώξῃς ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.

*Show affection for a friend and stay faithful with him.
 But if you disclose his secrets,
 do not chase him.*

στέρξον] § אֶפֶס ‘Try,’ § הַרְחֵץ ‘Make secure.’ Wagner (1999.296f.) draws attention to the relative rareness in BG of this word in comparison with those semantically affiliated such as ἀγαπάω and φιλέω.

27.18) καθὼς γὰρ ἀπώλεσεν ἄνθρωπος τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ,
 οὕτως ἀπώλεσας τὴν φιλίαν τοῦ πλησίον·

*For just as a person loses his (friend) to death,
 so you have lost the friendship of your neighbour.*

τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ] § הַחֵלֶק ‘his portion, his share’; § הַיָּבֵשׁ ‘his foe,’ which latter is the majority reading among Gk MSS, τὸν ἐχθρὸν αὐτοῦ.
 τοῦ πλησίον] § הַיָּרֵךְ ‘of your friend.’

27.19) καὶ ὡς πετεινὸν ἐκ χειρός σου ἀπέλυσας,
 οὕτως ἀφῆκας τὸν πλησίον καὶ οὐ θηρεύσεις αὐτόν.

*And just as you have a bird let escape out of your hand,
 so you have let go of your neighbour and could not hunt him (again).*

οὕτως ἀφῆκας τὸν πλησίον] absent in §, so that this whole verse constitutes a comparative clause of the preceding verse.

27.20) μὴ αὐτὸν διώξῃς, ὅτι μακρὰν ἀπέστη
 καὶ ἐξέφυγεν ὡς δορκὰς ἐκ παγίδος.

*Do not chase him, because he has moved far away
 and escaped like a gazelle out of a trap.*

ὅτι] What follows in § reads somewhat different: **מִן־פְּתָאֵי מִן־פְּתָאֵי וְאֵלֶּיךָ מִן־פְּתָאֵי וְאֵלֶּיךָ מִן־פְּתָאֵי** ‘because he escaped like a gazelle out of a net and like a bird out of a trap.’⁶

μακρὰν ἀπέστη] § הָרְחַק אֶת־הָאֵלֶּיךָ ‘moved to a distant mountain.’

⁶ It is uncertain whether or not אֶת־הָאֵלֶּיךָ denotes some specific bird such as ostrich or nightingale.

- 27.21) ὅτι τραῦμα ἔστιν καταδῆσαι,
καὶ λοιδορίας ἔστιν διαλλαγή,
ὁ δὲ ἀποκαλύψας μυστήρια ἀφήλπισεν.

*Because a wound can be bandaged,
and there is reconciliation for railing,
one who disclosed secrets, however, is hopeless.*

ἔστιν καταδῆσαι] an example of < εἰμί + inf. > with a modal value of ability or possibility, e.g. οὐκ ἔστιν μάλαγμα ἐπιθεῖναι 'it is not possible to put on emolument' Is 1.6. For more examples, see SSG § 30 (bec).

- 27.22) Διανεύων ὀφθαλμῷ τεκταίνει κακά,
καὶ ὁ εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἀποστήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ·

*One who winks is bringing mischief out,
and one who knows him should keep away from him.*

Διανεύων ὀφθαλμῷ] § הַיַּיִן הַגָּדוֹל 'and he whose eye is high.' What follows is obscure: הַיַּיִן הַגָּדוֹל 'one at whom his eye is raised is going to be his prey' ?

- 27.23) ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου γλυκανεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων σου ἐκθαυμάσει,
ἕστερον δὲ διαστρέψει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου δώσει σκάνδαλον.

*Before your eyes his mouth is sweet
and he might marvel at your words,
but later he would change his tune
and cast your words in a bad light.*

- 27.24) πολλὰ ἐμίσησα καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίωσα αὐτῷ,
καὶ ὁ κύριος μισήσει αὐτόν.

*Many things I have hated, but nothing comparable to him.
and the Lord would hate him.*

μισήσει αὐτόν] § וְקָלַלְתָּ 'and curse him,' without which the second hemistich might come out too short.

- 27.25) ὁ βάλλων λίθον εἰς ὕψος ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ βάλλει,
καὶ πλεγήθῃ δολία διελεῖ τραύματα.

*One who throws a stone upwards is throwing it down on his head
and a deceptive blow would create injuries all round.*

εἰς ὕψος] *Pace* Smend (248) this is absent in **Š**, for a stone, only when thrown upwards, might fall down on the thrower's head; the verb chosen by **Š**, **רָחַף** 'it comes back' is non-sensical, unless the stone is thrown upwards.

The second hemistich is read in **Š** as **בְּחֵיבִי אֲבִיבִי אֲבִיבִי אֲבִיבִי** 'and one who strikes in secret shall be delivered to annihilation.'

27.26) ὁ ὀρύσσων βόθρον εἰς αὐτὸν ἐμπεσεῖται,
καὶ ὁ ἰστῶν παγίδα ἐν αὐτῇ ἁλώσεται.

*One who is digging a hole could fall into it
and one who is setting a snare could be captured in it.*

ἐμπεσεῖται .. ἁλώσεται] To view "theoretically possible" as one of the values of the future tense applies here very well, for certainty of some future event is obviously not intended here. On this question, see *SSG* § 28 **ge**. All modern translations consulted⁷ are misleading in this regard.

27.27) ὁ ποιῶν πονηρά, εἰς αὐτὸν κυλισθήσεται,
καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐπιγνῶ πόθεν ἦκει αὐτῷ.

*When one does evil things, they could roll back to him,
and he would never know whence they came to him.*

ὁ ποιῶν πονηρά] in *casus pendens* and resumed through αὐτὸν, and the *s* of κυλισθήσεται is πονηρά. This somewhat complicated syntactic feature has been resolved in **Š** with **לְעוֹלָם בְּיַד אֲשֶׁר בִּישָׁרָה אֵינִי** 'he who does evil things could roll in them.' **Š** is distinct: **לְנֶפֶשׁ אֵינִי** 'he [= ὁ ποιῶν πονηρά] falls into it.'

27.28) ἐμπαιγμὸς καὶ ὀνειδισμὸς ὑπερηφάνῳ,
καὶ ἡ ἐκδίκησις ὡς λέων ἐνεδρεύσει αὐτόν.

*Mocking and insulting are (typical of) an arrogant person,
and the punishment would be waiting in ambush for him like a lion.*

ὑπερηφάνῳ] A large number of Gk MSS read *υπερηφανων*, which is unacceptable in view of the sg. αὐτόν in the second hemistich. Some MSS read *αυτους*, but not all of them read *υπερηφανων*. Either number would do, as long as the selection need be consistent. *υπερηφανων*, just as *υπερηφάνῳ*, could be analysed as predicative, not possessive genitive.

⁷ Including Brenton and Box - Oesterley with "shall," for it is implausible that ὁ ὀρύσσων and ὁ ἰστῶν should refer to wrong persons destined to be punished this way.

27.29) παγίδι ἀλώσονται οἱ εὐφραϊνόμενοι πτώσει εὐσεβῶν,
καὶ ὀδύνη καταναλώσει αὐτοὺς πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν.

*Those who rejoice at the fall of the godly would be captured with a snare
and pain would devour them before their death.*

One hears quite an independent piece of message in **§**: **וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ** וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ ‘snares and traps, these are for those who know them and they would accompany them till the day of their death.’

πτώσει] a rare example of <εὐφραίνω + dat.>. Another instance in LXX is ἐπιστρέψει κύριος ὁ θεός σου εὐφρανθῆναι ἐπὶ σὲ εἰς ἀγαθά, καθότι ἠὺφράνθη ἐπὶ τοῖς πατράσιν σου Dt 30.9, where the dat. is parallel to the acc., though in **ח** we see **עַל** twice, **וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ**. <ἀγαλλιάομαι + dat.> occurs a little more frequently: see *GELS* s.v. **a**, and see also s.v. χαίρω.

εὐσεβῶν] **וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ** ‘of the wicked.’

27.30) Μῆνις καὶ ὀργή, καὶ ταῦτά ἐστιν βδελύγματα,
καὶ ἀνήρ ἀμαρτωλὸς ἐγκρατῆς ἔσται αὐτῶν.

*Fury and anger, and these are loathsome,
and a sinful person could be in possession of them.*

Μῆνις καὶ ὀργή] **וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ** ‘jealousy and anger.’

§ does not appear to have what would correspond to the second hemistich, and it is not clear that what follows is supposed to represent this: **וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ** וְיִיָּהּ אֶמְצִידֶהָ ‘a deceptive man loses his way.’

CHAPTER 28

28.1) ὁ ἐκδικῶν παρὰ κυρίου εὐρήσει ἐκδίκησιν,
καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ διατηρῶν διατηρήσει.

*One who avenges could receive vengeance from the Lord
and He would definitely retain his sins in memory.*

διατηρῶν διατηρήσει] This illustrates one of the two¹ commonest ways of translating the well-known Hebrew structure, sometimes called *figura etymologica*, < verb + infinitive absolute >, a syntagm that intensifies the verbal notion in one way or another. E.g. הַגְּבִיחַ הַבְּרִיחַ Πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὰς λύπας σου Gn 3.16. Cf. SSG § 31 *db*, and JM § 123 *e-l*.

28.2) ἄφες ἀδίκημα τῷ πλησίον σου,
καὶ τότε δεηθέντος σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου λυθήσονται.

*Forgive your neighbour an act of unrighteousness,
and then, when you implore, your sins would be made to lose their grip.*

We detect here a predecessor to Jesus, in whose model prayer we are taught to say: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν Mt 6.12.

The first hemistich reads in S: רַחֵם אֱלֹהִים אֶת לִבִּי ‘Forgive what is in your mind.’

28.3) ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπῳ συντηρεῖ ὀργήν,
καὶ παρὰ κυρίου ζητεῖ ἴασιν;

*A person retains anger at a fellowman
and seeks healing from the Lord?*

28.4) ἐπ’ ἄνθρωπον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεος,
καὶ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ δεῖται;

*He has no mercy for a person like him
and yet supplicates over his (own) sins?*

This reminds us of the second of the two greatest commandments: “Love your neighbour, who is like yourself.”²

¹ Another common translation technique is the use of a cognate substantive derivationally and/or semantically affiliated to the main verb. See Tov 1990.70. A comparable syntactic feature is observable in S here: וְכָל חַטָּאתָיו בְּרָאָהוּ ‘and all his sins are certainly memorised.’ מִשְׁרַחֵם is distinct from the standard infinitive, מִשְׁרַחֵם.

² On an important syntactic issue regarding Lv 19.18b, cf. Muraoka 1978.

28.5) αὐτὸς σὰρξ ὢν διατηρεῖ μῆνιν,
τίς ἐξιλάσεται τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ;

*He, being flesh and blood, retains anger,
who would atone for his sins?*

28.6) μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα καὶ παῦσαι ἐχθραίνων,
καταφθορὰν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ ἔμμενε ἐντολαῖς.

*Remember the end (of your life) and stop being hostile,
decaying and dying, and abide by laws.*

παῦσαι] One of quite a few instances of this verb, παύομαι, being complemented with a Pres. participle. Je 38.37 τὸ γένος Ἰσραὴλ παύσεται γενέσθαι ἔθνος κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου is an extremely rare case of complementation of this verb through an infinitive.

28.7) μνήσθητι ἐντολῶν καὶ μὴ μηνίασης τῷ πλησίον,
καὶ διαθήκην ὑψίστου καὶ πάριδε ἄγνοιαν.

*Remember laws and do not act with wrath against your neighbour,
and the covenant of the Most High, and overlook (his) ignorance.*

διαθήκη] Most likely to be construed as a direct object of μνήσθητι in spite of the intervening verbal clause.³ This is an example of quite a few cases of double objects vacillating between the genitive and the accusative; cf. SSG § 55 aa.

ὑψίστου] On the absence of the definite article, see below at 37.15.

πάριδε] **§**ה אָרְיָא, on which there is a marginal note in the MS: קִבּוּשׁ ‘Forgive.’

Note **§**: הַלְיִסְרִיךְ מִן הַלְיִהוּ אֶהְיָא עִמְךָ רַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים וְלִי אֶתְּקַן פּוֹדֵתְךָ
‘Remember the law and do not hate your colleague in front of God, and give him what he lacks.’

28.8) Ἐπόσχου ἀπὸ μάχης, καὶ ἐλαττώσεις ἁμαρτίας·
ἄνθρωπος γὰρ θυμώδης ἐκκαύσει μάχην,

*Keep away from a fight, then you could minimise sins,
for an irascible person might excite a fight,*

ἐλαττώσεις] Alternatively ‘you should minimise,’ but following an impv., theoretical possibility sounds more plausible, indicating a consequence; the same nuance is apparent in the following clause. Cf. Snaith: “To avoid a quarrel is a setback for sin.”

The second hemistich is missing in **§**.

³ An analogous interruption is found in the preceding verse: καταφθορὰν καὶ θάνατον are coordinate with τὰ ἔσχατα in the first line.

28.9) καὶ ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς ταραξεί φίλους
καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον εἰρηνευόντων ἐμβάλει διαβολήν.

*A sinful man upsets friends
and between people in harmony throws mutual accusation in.*

ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς] is further qualified in **S** ironically as **אִיִּיִּי הַמִּשְׁפָּט** ‘who likes justice.’

28.10) κατὰ τὴν ὕλην τοῦ πυρὸς οὕτως ἐκκαυθήσεται,
καὶ κατὰ τὴν στερέωσιν τῆς μάχης αὐξηθήσεται.
κατὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ ἔσται,
καὶ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον ἀνυψώσει ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ.

*In proportion to the firewood a fire would burn,
and in proportion to the vehemence of a strife, it would intensify,
and in proportion to the power of a man, his fury would ensue,
and in proportion to (his) wealth he would level his anger up.*

All the four clauses open with < κατὰ τι > and each substantive expresses a diameter that determines a consequence. In the way the first two clauses are worded, however, their respective grammatical subject is not there. In each case the gen. substantive within the prepositional phrase is providing it.

The difficulty, not only in wording, but also message, that the original Heb. text may have presented is visible in **S**: **כָּל דֵּתְרָמָא בְּגוּרָא גְּאֻדָּ וְכֹל אֵי דְתַתְּרָא בְּדִינָא מְּגַא סְגֵא אֵיךְ תְּשִׁבּוּתָא דְאִיִּדִּיא דְאַנְשָׁא הַכְּנָא רֹוּגָהּ וְאֵיךְ סוּגָא דְתַתְּרָא רֹוּגָהּ אֵיךְ הַכְּנָא רְמָא הַהָא דְגְּזָרְהָי הַכְּנָא רֹוּגָהּ** ‘all that you throw into a fire would burn and all that you increase in a lawsuit would increase indeed like the applause by a person’s hands, so is his anger and like the multitude of his possessions so high is his spirit.’

28.11) ἔρις κατασπευδομένη ἐκκαίει πῦρ,
καὶ μάχη κατασπεύδουσα ἐκχέει αἷμα.

*An accelerated strife ignites fire,
and a speeded up fight sheds blood out.*

ἔρις κατασπευδομένη .. μάχη κατασπεύδουσα] **S** **דִּינַא .. אַרְיָא וְעֵצֵי אַרְיָא** ‘cedar bark and cedar oil .. many lawsuits.’

κατασπευδομένη] **S**h does not see here anything to do with speed: **מתכבבא .. מתכבבא**. **√תכבב** does mean ‘to accelerate’ in Peal, but not in any derived conjugation.⁴

⁴ So in the current Syriac dictionaries. **כָּבַבְתָּ** is said to mean “to be tormented,” but **תָּכַבְתָּ** and **תָּכַבְתָּ**, both meaning “quarrel,” make no sense as the s of this verb. If the verb in Peal means “to accelerate,” one wonders what is wrong with “to be accelerated” in Ethpeel.

- 28.12) ἐὰν φυσήσης εἰς σπινθήρα, ἐκκαήσεται,
καὶ ἐὰν πτύσης ἐπ' αὐτόν, σβεσθήσεται·
καὶ ἀμφοτέρω ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου ἐξελεύσεται.

*If you blow at a spark, it would be ignited,
and if you spit at it, it would stop burning,
and both come out of your mouth.*

πτύσης] **ש** אִמַּם סִירָה 'you sprinkle water.'

This proverb is cited in Midrash Lev 33, and cf. also Jam 3.10f.

- 28.13) Ψίθυρον καὶ δίγλωσσον καταράσασθε·
πολλοὺς γὰρ εἰρηνεύοντας ἀπόλεσεν.

*Curse a slanderous and double-tongued one,
for such has ruined many harmonious people.*

See above also at 5.14.

Ψίθυρον καὶ δίγλωσσον] **ש** אִתְּיָהּ אֲנַפְלָהּ אֶתְּיָהּ 'and also a third tongue,'
which is an inadvertent intrusion from the next verse.⁵

Ⓞ has taken the two adjectives as applicable to one person in the light of the sg. ἀπόλεσεν unlike **ש**ה, which ends with יִדְבְּרוּ 'they destroyed.'⁶

- 28.14) γλῶσσα τρίτη πολλοὺς ἐσάλευσεν
καὶ διέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ἔθνους εἰς ἔθνος
καὶ πόλεις ὀχυρὰς καθεῖλεν
καὶ οἰκίας μεγιστάνων κατέστρεψεν.

*A third tongue shook many people
and separated them among nations
and destroyed fortified towns
and overturned houses of noblemen.*

γλῶσσα τρίτη] the tongue of a third party not directly involved in a conflict.

διέστησεν] **ש**ה קָהַרְגָה, i.e. caused them to move from one nation to another as refugees.

πόλεις ὀχυρὰς καθεῖλεν] **ש** דַּרְבֵּי יִרְיָהּ מִן אֲתָרֵי דְמִדְבָּרָא מִיְקָרָא אֲנַפְלָהּ 'honourable people of cities it chased away from their houses.'

- 28.15) γλῶσσα τρίτη γυναικας ἀνδρείας ἐξέβαλεν
καὶ ἐστέρεσεν αὐτὰς τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν.

⁵ Smend (253) prefers **ש**, though we are not convinced.

⁶ Segal (173) reconstructs the first line as דַּרְבֵּי יִרְיָהּ מִן אֲתָרֵי דְמִדְבָּרָא מִיְקָרָא אֲנַפְלָהּ, saying that it agrees with **ש**, but see our remark above on **ש** in this verse.

*A third tongue caused staunch wives to be thrown out
and made their efforts worthless.*

The first hemistich of **§** is identical with that of vs. 14. The msc. pron. in the second hemistich shows that the latter is not concerned with women: **וְהִיָּאֵם לָהֶם וְהִיָּאֵם לָהֶם** ‘and made their (msc.) possessions unavailable to them (msc.).’

28.16) ὁ προσέχων αὐτῇ οὐ μὴ εὖρη ἀνάπαυσιν
οὐδὲ κατασκηνώσει μεθ’ ἡσυχίας.

*He who pays attention to it would never find relief
nor would be able to settle with peace of mind.*

The verse is missing in **§**.

28.17) πληγὴ μάστιγος ποιεῖ μώλωπα,
πληγὴ δὲ γλώσσης συγκλάσει ὀστᾶ.

*A hit by a whip causes a bruise,
but a hit by a tongue could break bones.*

28.18) πολλοὶ ἔπεσαν ἐν στόματι μαχαίρας,
καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ πεπτωκότες διὰ γλώσσαν.

*Many fell with a sword’s edge,
but not as many as the fallen because of a tongue.*

[στόματι μαχαίρας] So also in Heb.: **בְּפִי חֶבֶר**, unlike in English, to which “mouth of sword” is alien.

28.19) μακάριος ὁ σκεπασθεὶς ἀπ’ αὐτῆς,
ὃς οὐ διῆλθεν ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῆς,
ὃς οὐχ εἴλκυσεν τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῆς
καὶ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐδέθη.

*Happy is one who was protected from it,
who did not undergo its fury,
who did not carry its yoke along
and was not tied with its chains.*

[οὐ διῆλθεν ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῆς] **§** **וְלֹא חֵטְאָהּ לֹא חֵטְאָהּ** ‘and did not experience its heat,’ where **θερμῶ** must be latent.

28.20) ὁ γὰρ ζυγὸς αὐτῆς ζυγὸς σιδηροῦς,
καὶ οἱ δεσμοὶ αὐτῆς δεσμοὶ χάλκαιοι.

*For its yoke is an iron yoke,
and its ropes are copper chains.*

ζυγὸς σιδηροῦς] אָשָׁךְ אֲרָנִי ‘a hard yoke.’

- 28.21) θάνατος πονηρὸς ὁ θάνατος αὐτῆς,
καὶ λυσιτελῆς μάλλον ὁ ἄδης αὐτῆς.
*The death dealt out by it is a harsh death
and her hell is rather more tolerable.*

The second hemistich reads in S: הַתַּיְתָּוּ מִןּ בַּטְּ לְיִשְׁבָּא תִּיא אֲרָנִי ‘and rest is in the hell is better rather than beside it [= a third tongue].’

- 28.22) οὐ μὴ κρατήσῃ εὐσεβῶν,
καὶ ἐν τῇ φλογὶ αὐτῆς οὐ καήσονται.
*It should never apprehend pious people
and in its flame they should not burn.*

Cf. S דְּמִיִּיִּי לֹא אֲרָנִי אֲרָנִי אֲרָנִי דְּקִיִּיִּי לֹא ‘it should not burn against the righteous and flames of fire should not burn on you.’ One recalls the miraculous rescue experienced by Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Dn 3.26).

- 28.23) οἱ καταλείποντες κύριον ἐμπεσοῦνται εἰς αὐτήν,
καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκκαήσεται καὶ οὐ μὴ σβεσθῆ·
ἐπαποσταλήσεται αὐτοῖς ὡς λέων
καὶ ὡς ἀρδάλις λυμανεῖται αὐτούς.
*Those who forsake the Lord would fall into it
and it would burn at them and would never be quenched
and it would jump at them like a lion
and like a leopard it would injure them.*

- 28.24a) ἰδὲ περίφραξον τὸ κτῆμά σου ἀκάνθαις,
Behold, build a fence round your estate with thorn-bushes,

- 28.25b) καὶ τῷ στόματί σου ποίησον θύραν καὶ μοχλόν.
also for your mouth make a door and a bolt.

- 28.24b) τὸ ἀργύριόν σου καὶ τὸ χρυσίον κατάδησον·
Bind your silver and gold fast.

τὸ ἀργύριόν σου καὶ τὸ χρυσίον] The first position taken by silver does not necessarily mean that it was viewed as more valuable than gold.

Elsewhere we encounter the reverse sequence: χρυσίον και ἀργύριον ἐπιστήσουσιν πόδα 40.25, cf. also συνήγαγες ὡς κασσίτερον τὸ χρυσίον και ὡς μόλιβον ἐπλήθυνας ἀργύριον 47.18; at these two latter places the relative sequence agrees with that in **℣**. According to BDB s.v. **בְּהִי** **11**, in earlier books of the OT and sometimes in later books also, **הִפְּ** normally precedes **בְּהִי**, e.g. **בְּהִי** **וְהִפְּ** **הַקֶּנֶן** **בְּמִדְּ** **דָּבָר** **דְּבָרִים** **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** Gn 13.2 as against **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** **וְהִפְּ** Ez 28.4.⁷ Usually **℣** agrees: Αβραμ δὲ ἦν πλούσιος σφόδρα κτήγεσιν και ἀργυρίῳ και χρυσίῳ Ge 13.2 vs. ἐποίησας σεαυτῷ δύναμιν και χρυσίον και ἀργύριον ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς σου Ez 28.4. The mention of gold as the yardstick of value is understandable in this light in cases such as ἡ γὰρ χάρις αὐτῆς ὑπὲρ τὸ χρυσίον Si 7.19 and λυσιτελήσει σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον 29.11; in both cases the definite article is generic, not indicating a particular piece of gold, hence not ‘the gold.’ See also at 51.28.

28.25a) και τοῖς λόγοις σου ποίησον ζυγὸν και σταθμὸν

And for your words make a yoke and a balance

28.26) πρόσεχε μήπως ὀλίσθης ἐν αὐτῇ,
μὴ πέσης κατέναντι ἐνεδρεύοντος.

Be cautious so that you would not slip in it

so that you would not fall beside one who is laying in ambush.

ἐνεδρεύοντος] **℣** **וְהִפְּ** ‘your enemy.’

⁷ Cf. Muraoka 1992. This historical change in BH probably reflects the rise in value of gold as against silver at some point in the pre-Christian era in the Holy Land for one reason or another.

CHAPTER 29

29.1) Ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος δανιεῖ τῷ πλησίον,
καὶ ὁ ἐπισχύων τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ τηρεῖ ἐντολάς.

*He who practices mercy should lend to his neighbour
and he who lends personal support is practising laws.*

δανιεῖ] In Secular Gk the verb δανείζω normally means “to lend money with interest,” what is forbidden in the OT, see Ex 22.25.¹ Hence we are not here on financial business aiming at some gains, but a religious, moral issue.

τῇ χειρὶ] τὰς χεῖρας could have been more idiomatic. A synonymous verb, κραταιῶ ‘to make strong,’ is so used a couple of times: ἐκραταιώσεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐν κυρίῳ **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** 1Sm 23.16, κραταιῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐν ἔργοις οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** 2E 6.22. In both cases the hands are not those of the actor, but those of one(s) else being supported. By contrast, in τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ would be equivalent to ἑαυτοῦ, not τοῦ πλησίον. Cf. also Rysse (375, fn. o).

29.2) δάνεισον τῷ πλησίον ἐν καιρῷ χρείας αὐτοῦ
καὶ πάλιν ἀπόδος τῷ πλησίον εἰς καιρόν·

*Lend to a neighbour at the time of his need
and repay to a neighbour on time.*

πάλιν ἀπόδος τῷ πλησίον] **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** ‘Meet your friend’s expectation,’ a translation dismissed by Smend (256) as poor, since according to him the verb means “versprich.” Does it really?

πάλιν, in view of the following ἀπόδος, sounds redundant. Segal’s (176) **יְהוָה יְדִי וְיָמֵי** sounds correct, “Do return,” which has been possibly misunderstood by the translator.

29.3) στερέωσον λόγον καὶ πιστώθητι μετ’ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ εὐρήσεις τὴν χρείαν σου.

*Keep (your) promise and remain faithful with him,
then you would always find all your need (provided).*

¹ Jesus taught that if someone asks for money, one should just give him (δός), but if someone wishes to borrow money, one should not refuse (Mt 5.42).

The first line is extended in **§**: **אֲשֶׁר מְלַתְךָ וְאִקִּים מְלַתְךָ וְאִתְּקִים עִם חֲבֵרְךָ** ‘Make your word firm and fulfil your word, and remain in firm relationship with your friend.’

29.4) πολλοὶ ὡς εὖρεμα ἐνόμισαν δάνος
καὶ παρέσχον κόπον τοῖς βοηθήσασιν αὐτοῖς.

*Many find a loan as a (mere) windfall
and cause trouble(s) to those who helped them.*

In **§** the cause for the undesirable consequence is not made clear: **אֲנִי־סוּן הָיָה לְמִוֹפְנֵי הָרֶרֶה וְהָרֶרֶה יוֹפֵא דְבָעוּן יוֹפֵא דְבָעוּן** ‘for many are borrowers who asked for a loan and bothered their lenders.’

29.5) ἕως οὗ λάβῃ, καταφιλήσει χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων τοῦ πλησίον ταπεινώσει φωνήν·
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἀποδόσεως παρελκύσει χρόνον
καὶ ἀποδώσει λόγους ἀκηδίας
καὶ τὸν καιρὸν αἰτιάσεται.

*Until he receives (a loan), he would be kissing his hands hard
and in respect of the wealth of the neighbour he might lower his voice,
and at the time of repayment he might put the time off
and might give an irrelevant answer
and blame the current season (of economic recession).*

αὐτοῦ] There is no ambiguity in **§**: **אֲנִי־סוּן** ‘of the lender.’

ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων] The prep. ἐπὶ governing a gen. appears to have the value of “in respect of” (*GELS* s.v. **I 7**), e.g. ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων σου ἐκθαυμάσει **Si** 27.23 above. Cf. **§h** here: **עַל מְהָרָה** ‘about the possessions.’

ταπεινώσει] **§** is antonymic: **מָרַם** ‘he lifts’; according to Segal (177) ‘in order to entreat aloud’ as against **ע** ‘out of modesty.’ What the rest is supposed to mean in **§** is rather obscure: **וְלִי־בְנֵי נִפְחָה מִפִּי חַטָּאת וְיִתְּנֵהוּ לִי וְיִתְּנֵהוּ לִי** ‘and at the time for repaying the loan he puffs himself up and allows himself a lot of time (?).’

29.6) ἐὰν ἰσχύσῃ, μόλις κομίσεται τὸ ἥμισυ
καὶ λογιεῖται αὐτὸ ὡς εὖρεμα·
εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀπεστέρησεν αὐτὸν τῶν χρημάτων αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐκτίσατο αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν δωρεάν·
κατάρας καὶ λοιδορίας ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ
καὶ ἀντὶ δόξης ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ ἀτιμίαν.

*Even if he showed himself tough, he would scarcely regain the half,
and would have to take it as a windfall.*

*But otherwise, he virtually robbed him of his resources
and he gained him as an enemy for no good reason.*

*He would give him back curses and abuses
and instead of honour would give him back dishonour.*

It is not absolutely clear which of the two sides, lender and borrower, is a referent of each of 3sg. verbs and personal pronouns. Thus, *s* of κομίσεται is undoubtedly the lender, which our translation has applied to ἰσχύση. By contrast, Snaith, offers: “if he can pay.” Sim. “Wenn er [zu zahlen] im stande ist” (Ryssel), “Wenn er zahlen kann” (Smend II 49), “Wenn er (wieder) stark wird” (SD), “Peut-on s’acquitter?” (BJ). Apparently so also שׁ כִּפְּשׁוּן יִכְּרֵת ‘for if he can.’ We doubt, however, that ἰσχύω, whether in BG or elsewhere, can refer to financial capability, not just bodily strength. Our translation² is based on a case such as ἐὰν ἰσχύση (רִיבִּי) τοῦ φυλάξασθαι τὰς ἐντολάς μου 1C 28.7, cf. GELS s.v. ἰσχύω *3 “to make strenuous efforts, endeavour.”

εἰ δὲ μὴ] i.e. if he had not repaid the loan in full. Cf. שׁ הִיטְרָמְלִי לְיִתְרָן וְאֶנְלִיפִי בְּרִיבִּי ‘if he became strong enough to pressurise, he might obtain the half back’ and note that the Lucianic version adds ο δους ‘the giver, i.e. lender.’

We see no real justification for deleting this phrase as Smend (257) does.

29.7) πολλοὶ οὐ χάριν πονηρίας ἀπέστρεψαν,
ἀποστειρηθῆναι δωρεὰν εὐλαβήθησαν.

*Many keep away (from lending money), not because of their evilness,
they are wary of being robbed for no good reason.*

ἀπέστρεψαν] Slightly too generic, a feature which has been well taken care of in שׁ: פִּיּוּמִי לְיִרְכָּתִי ‘they were disinclined to lend money.’

ἀποστειρηθῆναι] Cp. with the active voice in vs. 6 above, ἀπεστέρησεν αὐτόν.

29.8) Πλὴν ἐπὶ ταπεινῷ μακροθύμησον
καὶ ἐπ’ ἐλεημοσύνη μὴ παρελκύσης αὐτόν.

*However, be patient to a lowly person
and do not keep him in waiting for your alms.*

μακροθύμησον] “Be long-suffering,” even when you might find him a shade too demanding.

² So Segal (178).

The second hemistich is missing from **Š**, whereas **Šh** reads: אַתָּה דִּקְדָּוֶיךָ מְנִי לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה אֶתְּנָה לֵךְ, which is probably meant to say “and do not withhold charity.’ Is לֵךְ possibly to be emended to הֵלֵךְ?

Segal (176), in whose retroversion to Hebrew a blank line has been inserted between verses 7 and 8, appears to think that the new paragraph is still about borrowing and lending money. Hence on 8a הֵאָרַךְ הַיָּמִים לֵאמֹר הֵאָרַךְ he comments: “if he does not repay on time” (178). 8b has been retroverted to וְיִשְׁכַּח הַיָּמִים לֵאמֹר “.. postpone the time of repayment.”

- 29.9) χάριν ἐντολῆς ἀντιλαβοῦ πένητος
καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔνδειαν αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς αὐτὸν κενόν.
*Help a poor person for the sake of commandments
and in view of his need do not send him away empty-handed.*

χάριν ἐντολῆς] According to bBB 9a observance of the law of charity and almsgiving is as valuable as observance of any other commandment.

Vs. 9b reads in **Š**: לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה אֶתְּנָה לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה אֶתְּנָה לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה ‘and if it comes to some expenditure and loss, do not mind.’

- 29.10) ἀπόλεσον ἀργύριον δι’ ἀδελφὸν καὶ φίλον,
καὶ μὴ ἰωθήτω ὑπὸ τὸν λίθον εἰς ἀπώλειαν.
*Lose some money for the sake of a brother and a friend,
and do not get it rusty under a stone to your loss.*

ἀδελφὸν καὶ φίλον] The application of ἀδελφός to a member of one’s religious community, not necessarily a sibling, is well established in LXX; see *GELS* s.v. **1 d, e**. Hence it is difficult to determine whether the two substantives are meant to refer to two individuals or one. **Š** leaves little room for doubt in view of the repetition of the preposition: לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה לֵךְ אֶתְּנָה.

εἰς ἀπώλειαν] **Š** אֶתְּנָה ‘and a wall.’

On 10b, cp. Jam 5.1-3.

- 29.11) θές τὸν θησαυρόν σου κατ’ ἐντολὰς ὑψίστου,
καὶ λυσιτελήσει σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον.
*Lay your treasure aside in accordance with the commandments of
the Most High,
then it could be more beneficial to you than gold.*

θές] *GELS* s.v. τίθημι **I 1 b** suggests ‘to lay aside,’ and, in addition to our case here, also refers to θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν

ἀνάγκης ‘for you are laying up for yourself a good treasure for a day of emergency’ To 4.9[Ⓞ]!

κατ’ ἐντολὰς ὑψίστου] Expounded in **§** in more practical terms: **נְהַנְתָּ בְּנִי אֱהַיְתָּא בְּרִי** ‘in terms of righteousness [or: almsgiving] and love.’

τὸ χρυσίον] On the grammatical value of the definite article, see above at 28.24b.

In 11b **§** reads **לְךָ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לְךָ** ‘all that you have,’ which Smend (259) finds preferable, but it looks to us better to mention specifically “better than what?”.

29.12) σύγκλεισον ἐλεημοσύνην ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις σου,
καὶ αὕτη ἐξελεῖταί σε ἐκ πάσης κακώσεως·

*Firmly keep something for almsgiving in your storerooms,
then that would rescue you from every distress.*

ἐλεημοσύνην] Here this substantive does not appear to denote an attitude or disposition, but a tangible manifestation of it. Cf. **אֱהַיְתָּא**, in both **§** and **§h**, which signifies what one gives as alms. Such a meaning is not attested in LXX or prior to it. According to BDAG s.v. **2**, however, this second sense applies in three cases in a story about a permanently handicapped beggar seated at the entrance to the temple in Jerusalem. Especially significant is that the noun is used as a direct object of αἰτέω and λαμβάνω: αἰτεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην παρὰ τῶν εἰσπορευομένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ‘to beg alms from those who enter the sanctuary’ Acts 3.2 and ἠρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν ‘he kept begging to receive alms’ ib. 3.5. BDAG further mentions an instance in an early Christian document: Ἰδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, μέχρις ἂν γνῶς, τίτι δῶς ‘Let your alms sweat into your hands till you know who you are to give it to’ (*Didache* 1.6). We find no absolute argument for denying that this second meaning can be applied to our Si passage. In practical terms, you are being advised always to have a couple of objects ready to be made available to any neighbour who would appreciate it. When you find yourself in a tight corner, neighbours who have witnessed your almsgiving might be pleased to pull you out of the deep ends.

29.13) ὑπὲρ ἀσπίδα κράτους καὶ ὑπὲρ δόρυ ὀγκῆς
κατέναντι ἐχθροῦ πολεμήσει ὑπὲρ σοῦ.

*It would fight for you against (your) foe
(more effectively) than a mighty shield and a heavy spear.*

ἀσπίδα κράτους καὶ .. δόρυ ὀγκῆς] Both phrases contain a genitive of quality.

29.14) Ἄνῆρ ἀγαθὸς ἐγγυήσεται τὸν πλησίον,
καὶ ὁ ἀπολωλεκὸς αἰσχύνῃν ἐγκαταλείπει αὐτόν.

*A good man would stand surety for (his) neighbour,
and he who has lost sense of shame would abandon him.*

Whereas the book of Proverbs is full of warnings against acting as a guarantor, e.g. 6.1-5, our author considers its considerable values out of the perspective of neighbourly love.

29.15) χάριτας ἐγγύου μὴ ἐπιλάθῃ·
ἔδωκεν γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ σοῦ.

*Do not forget kindnesses of a guarantor
for he has sacrificed his life for your sake.*

29.16) ἀγαθὰ ἐγγύου ἀνατρέψει ἀμαρτωλός,

A sinner might overthrow favours shown by a guarantor

ἀγαθὰ] Being parallel to χάριτας in the preceding verse, its meaning is most likely not “goods, possessions.”

29.17) καὶ ἀχάριστος ἐν διανοίᾳ ἐγκαταλείψει ῥυσάμενον.

and a person of ungrateful disposition might disregard his rescuer.

ἀχάριστος] alternatively a subject complement, thus ‘being ...,’ hence not an anarthrous, substantivised adjective functioning as the subject of ἐγκαταλείπει.

§ sounds like a Christian application: הַקֹּרֵב קִבֵּץ הַיְיָ קִבֵּץ וְדַל ‘and one who forsakes his creator is forsaking his saviour.’

29.18) ἐγγύη πολλοὺς ἀπόλεσεν κατευθύνοντας
καὶ ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς ὡς κῦμα θαλάσσης·
ἄνδρας δυνατοὺς ἀπόκισεν,
καὶ ἐπλανήθησαν ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἀλλοτρίοις.

*Acting as a guarantor disrupted the plain sailing of many people
and shook them like a giant wave of the sea.
It forced powerful people to move houses,
and they ended up living in the midst of alien peoples.*

ἀπόλεσεν] Does this have to mean that guarantors actually died? Note § and §h הַקֹּרֵב.

ἐσάλευσεν αὐτοὺς] § הִקְרַבְתָּ קִבֵּץ ‘and they abandoned their property.’

ἄνδρας δυνατούς] **ש** וְנָבְרָא עֲשִׂינָא **ש** וְנָבְרָא, possibly a reference to people wielding political influence, but Smend postulates a mistranslation of **אנשי חיל**, i.e. **אנשי חיל**.

ἀπόκισεν] **ש** וְרָקַת, on the basis of which Smend proposes reading ἀπεκένωσε ‘made (them) poor.’ He further refers to 13.5, where ἀποκενώσει σε is rendered in **ש** with **וְרָקַת**. We are not convinced, however, that this Syr. verb signifies ‘to make poor’ itself, not as a consequence of emptying, cf. **מְרִיקִים שְׂקִיהֶם < מְסִרְקִין סְקִיהוֹן** Gn 42.35. Besides, the only object in our Si passage is **לְמִרְי נְכָסָא** ‘the owners of property,’ though we can analyse the phrase as a *dativus incommodi*.

29.19) ἀμαρτωλὸς ἐμπροσθὼν εἰς ἐγγύην
καὶ διώκων ἐργολαβίας ἐμπεσεῖται εἰς κρίσεις.

*A sinner ending up as a guarantor
and pursuing illegal profits could end up in lawsuits.*

διώκων] “Der Sünder fällt in Bürgerschaft und wer ungerechtem Gewinn nachjagt, verfällt dem Gericht” (Smend II 50) suggests that this Ptc. refers to a second person.³ The conjugational shift of the same verb, ἐμπίπτω, from ἐμπροσθὼν (Ptc.) to ἐμπεσεῖται (Fut., a finite verb) sounds odd. There could be situations in which even a sinner could not possibly avoid serving as a guarantor, but eventually his second nature exposes itself. **ש** uses three participles: **נָפַל .. רָדַךְ .. נָפַל** ‘falls .. chases .. falls,’ which does not look natural, either.

The message of the whole verse in **ש** comes over as quite distinct from that of **ט**: **חֲטִיָּא דְעֵבֶר עַל פּוֹקֵדְנִיהָ דְמִרְיָא בְּעַרְבוּתָא נָפַל וְדַרְדֵּךְ לְמַקְבְּלוּ עֲלוֹהָ׃ חֲטִיָּא דְעֵבֶר עַל פּוֹקֵדְנִיהָ דְמִרְיָא בְּעַרְבוּתָא מִתְיָאָא סְגִיָּא חֲטִיָּא בְּדִנְיָא נָפַל בְּדִנְיָא חֲטִיָּא נָפַל בְּדִנְיָא חֲטִיָּא סְגִיָּא מִתְיָאָא בְּעַרְבוּתָא דְמִתְאַלֵּץ מִנְּוֹמְשֶׁכַּב דִּנְיָא** ‘a sinner who transgresses the commandments of the Lord falls into suretyship and one who seeks to receive on himself sin (ful gains) falls into a lawsuit. Suretyship causes many sins by one who endeavours for no good reason and finds a lawsuit.’

29.20) ἀντιλαβοῦ τοῦ πλησίον κατὰ δύναμίν σου
καὶ πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ μὴ ἐμπέσης.

*Help your neighbour to the best of your ability
but take care that you would not get trapped.*

ἐμπέσης] **ש** מִן אֲפָא ‘from doubling,’ which Smend (261) plausibly assumes to be a mistranslation of **מנפל**, i.e. **מנפל** as **מכפל**, i.e. **מכפל**.

³ Sim. Ryssele, Skehan - Di Lella, and *SD*.

29.21) Ἀρχὴ ζωῆς ὕδωρ καὶ ἄρτος καὶ ἱμάτιον
καὶ οἶκος καλύπτων ἀσχημοσύνην.

*The essentials for life are water and bread and clothes
and a respectable house.*

ἀσχημοσύνην] **שְׁחִימוּתָא**, one sense of which is sexual organs of a human being, which, however, hardly applies here, since clothes mentioned earlier cover them. Smend (261), however, holds that καὶ ἱμάτιον is to be in the next line and ἀσχημοσύνην signifies the part of human bodies mentioned above: “und Kleidung und Haus zur Bedeckung der Blösse” (II 50).⁴ But we surely do not wear clothes and live in a house just to cover our privy parts.

Segal (180) notes that in the patriarchal period the fundamental needs were bread, including water, and clothes (Gn 28.20, Dt 10.18), whereas later a house came to be added (Is 3.7).

29.22) κρείσσων βίος πτωχοῦ ὑπὸ σκέπην δοκῶν
ἢ ἐδέσματα λαμπρὰ ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις.

*A poor man’s life under the cover of beams is better
than gorgeous meals at aliens’.*

ὑπὸ σκέπην δοκῶν] a noun phrase which meets us at Ge 19.8 as a rendering of **בְּצֵל קַרְתִּי**.

ἐδέσματα λαμπρὰ] There is no focus on meals in **שְׂעִיבֵי אֲבָיָה** ‘abundant wealth.’

29.23) ἐπὶ μικρῷ καὶ μεγάλῳ εὐδοκίαν ἔχε,
καὶ ὄνειδισμὸν παροικίας οὐ μὴ ἀκούσης.

*Whether with little or much, remain satisfied,
and never hear offensive words about you being a resident alien.*

μικρῷ καὶ μεγάλῳ] which could still be carrying on vs. 22 about meals.

שְׁ reveals its own *Lebensphilosophie*: **עַם סְגִיָּא וְעַם זְעוּר אֲנִשׁ לֹא יָדַע. וּמְנָא הֲלֵי הוּא לֹא הוּא הֲלֵי עֲבַד בְּגוּן בֵּיתָא אֲנִשׁ לֹא הוּא הֲלֵי** ‘Whether you have much or little nobody knows; and whatever you do in your house nobody is looking at you.’

The translator of **שְׁ** appears also to have struggled, as is apparent from how he translated vs. 23b: **הוּא יִגְדֵל וְהוּא יִקְטֵן** ‘for there is one who lowers (you) and exalts (you).’ Smend (262) holds that this is dependent on 1Sm 2.7 (not 2.6: TM), where **יְהוָה מוֹרִישׁ וּמַעֲשִׂיר מִשְׁפִּיל אֶת־מְרוֹמָם** and **יְהוָה** κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλουτίζει, ταπεινοῖ καὶ ἀνυψοῖ. Even this, however, is quite a departure from our Si version in **שְׁ**.

⁴ One would then emend καλύπτων to καλύπτοντες. Segal (180) has a rhetorical argument for leaving **ובית מצסה ערנה** in the middle: **ובגד ובית מצסה ערנה**.

- 29.24) ζωὴ πονηρὰ ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν,
καὶ οὐ παροικήσεις, οὐκ ἀνοίξεις στόμα·

*A miserable life (of moving) from house to house
and where you are a resident alien, you would not open your mouth.*

οὐ παροικήσεις] **§** על דִּינֵי רִבְנָא ‘on many lawsuits.’ According to Segal (181) this is a result of misinterpretation of a form of גָּרַר ‘to quarrel.’

- 29.25) ξενιεῖς καὶ ποτιεῖς εἰς ἀχάριστα
καὶ πρὸς ἐπὶ τούτοις πικρὰ ἀκούσῃ

*You might entertain and offer drinks to ungrateful people
and on top of that you might hear bitter comments.*

ἀχάριστα] The n.pl. suggests that this is an abbreviation for ἀχάριστα στόματα.

πρὸς] being used adverbially in the sense of “besides, over and above,” *GELS* s.v. πρὸς **IV**, cf. πρὸς κλίνη ἡμῶν σύσκιος ‘besides, our bed is shaded’ Ct 1.16. Cf. also *SSG* p. 219, fn. 2.

Smend’s analysis of the first hemistich as is evident in his translation, “Ein Fremdling bist du und musst Schmach hinunterschlucken” (II 51), is heavily dependent on **§**: אַ כְּסָנָא אֲנִי וְאַתָּה זָרָא ‘you are a foreigner and drink humiliation.’ He maintains that ξενίζω here is to be viewed as intransitive. In CG it sometimes means “to speak with a foreign accent,” but scarcely “to be a foreigner,” i.e. ξένος εἶναι. Besides, ποτιεῖς most probably is based on מִשְׁקָה, i.d. מִשְׁקָה, in the Heb. *Vorlage*, and translating it with אֲתָשׁ only testifies to the translator’s incompetence. Nor does Smend say a thing on εἰς.

- 29.26) Πάρελθε, πάροικε, κόσμησον τράπεζαν,
καὶ εἴ τι ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου, ψώμισόν με·

*Come over, foreigner, put the dinner-table in good order,
and if you have anything in your hand, feed me.*

ψώμισόν με] **§** אֲכַל ‘Eat!’, which Segal 181 plausibly suggests that it is a misinterpretation of וְאָכַל, i.e. אָכַל as אָכַל.

- 29.27) ἔξελθε, πάροικε, ἀπὸ προσώπου δόξης,
ἐπεξένωταί μοι ὁ ἀδελφός, χρεία τῆς οἰκίας.

*Get out, foreigner, away from an honourable person,
My brother has arrived on a visit; he needs a space in the house.*

χρεία τῆς οἰκίας] absent in **§**. A very simplified construction; syntactically it does not fit in – ‘there is a need to accommodate him.’

29.28) βαρέα ταῦτα ἀνθρώπῳ ἔχοντι φρόνησιν,
ἐπιτίμησις παροικίας καὶ ὄνειδισμὸς δανειστοῦ.

*These things are burdensome to a prudent person,
rebukes aimed at a foreigner and insults by a creditor.*

The list of hardships in **§** is very extensive: **כְּאֵתָא חֲכִימָא. פְּאֵתָא** יְקִירָן הֶלִין לְגַבְרָא חֲכִימָא. **פְּאֵתָא** וְיִזְפְּתָא דְמוֹזְפָּנָא. **טָב טָב** הֵב לְמִסְכְּנָא. **וּמִן מָא** דְבֵאֵידֵךְ אֶזְכְּלִיהֵי. **וְאֵן** עֲרִטְלֵי הוּ אֶלְבָּשִׂיהֵי. **מִטְל** דְּבִסְרָךְ אֵת מְכַסָּא וְלֹאֲלֵהָ הֵן מוֹזְףָּא אֵת וְהוּ פִרְעֵ לָךְ חַד בְּשַׁבְעָה ‘These are heavy for a perceptive person: rebuke and interest and loan from creditors. Give to the poor very much, and out of what you have feed him, and if he is naked, clothe him, because you cover your body and you are loaning to God, and He would repay you sevenfold.’

CHAPTER 30

Περὶ τέκνων

About children

- 30.1) Ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐνδελεχίσει μάστιγας αὐτῶ,
ἵνα εὐφρανθῆ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ·

*One who loves his son whips him regularly
so that he could rejoice at the end of his life.*

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ] a phrase that recurs at Je 17.11, where \mathfrak{H} reads $\text{יָצַח בְּלִבּוֹ הַיְהוָה יִתְרִיבֵּנוּ וְנִצְבְּנוּ [וְיָמֵנוּ] מִיּוֹמָיו$. “His life” must be that of the father. On the need of disciplining your children, see Pr 23.13f.

- 30.2) ὁ παιδεύων τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ὀνήσεται ἐπ' αὐτῶ
καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον γνωρίμων ἐπ' αὐτῶ καυχήσεται·

*One who educates his son would have pleasure out of him
and among his acquaintances could be proud of him.*

ἐπ' αὐτῶ καυχήσεται] \mathfrak{S} 's $\text{הָיָה מְבֹרָךְ עָלָיו}$ can mean either ‘he would be praised over him’ or ‘he would be proud over him.’

- 30.3) ὁ διδάσκων τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ παραζηλώσει τὸν ἐχθρὸν
καὶ ἔναντι φίλων ἐπ' αὐτῶ ἀγαλλιάσεται.

*One who teaches his son would arouse (his) enemy to jealousy
and in front of friends he would rejoice over him.*

ἐπ' αὐτῶ] Used twice in the preceding verse.

- 30.4) ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτοῦ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὥς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν·
ὅμοιον γὰρ αὐτῶ κατέλιπεν μετ' αὐτόν.

*When his father passes away, it looks as if he has not died,
for he has left behind him a perfect image of himself.*

- 30.5) ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν καὶ εὐφράνθη
καὶ ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔλυπήθη·

*When alive, he saw (much) and rejoiced,
and as he died, he had no sorrow.*

εἶδεν] § הִיָּה 'he saw him,' the suffix most likely referring to his son and his life-style. Cf. Si 44.13-15.

30.6) ἐναντίον ἐχθρῶν κατέλιπεν ἔκδικον
καὶ τοῖς φίλοις ἀνταποδιδόντα χάριν.

*He left behind someone who could defend him over against enemies
and express to friends thanks on his behalf.*

§ lacks an equivalent for κατέλιπεν. Consequently the two participial objects in the accusative have been treated as if they were in the nominative functioning as the predicate with בְּרָה 'his son' as the subject: מְתַפְּרַע .. פְּרַע, where the sequence of the two lines has been reversed.

30.7) περιψύχων υἷὸν καταδεσμεύσει τραύματα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ βοῇ ταραχθήσεται σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.

*One who spoils a son would bandage his wounds,
and every time he cries his heart would be deeply shaken.*

περιψύχων] § מְפַנֵּק 'delights' can be said of a model father, whereas its Heb. equivalent, מְפַנֵּק, is used in sensu malo, "to pamper, spoil," as in מְפַנֵּק מְנוּן וְהָיָה מְנוּן וְאַחֲרָיִתוֹ יִהְיֶה מְנוּן Pr 29.21. The Syr. translator possibly misunderstood this Heb. word.

καταδεσμεύσει] see above at 7.8.

Pace Smend (265) there is no absolute need to assume that in § the wounds suffered are those of the father: הַמְפַנֵּק בְּרָה נִסְגָּן צוֹלְפֶתָה 'he who spoils his son, his wounds could be many.'

Ziegler has rightly rejected the majority reading, περι ψυχων υτων, which makes little sense.

30.8) ἵππος ἀδάμαστος ἐκβαίνει σκληρός,
καὶ υἷὸς ἀνειμένος ἐκβαίνει προαλής.

*An unbroken horse turns out stubborn,
and an uncontrolled son turns out headstrong.*

ἐκβαίνει¹] rightly preferred by Ziegler over the majority reading αποβαινει, which is inferior in view of the parallel ἐκβαίνει². In terms of syntactic analysis, this verb, when used in the sense of 'to turn out, become,' is similar to verbs such as γίνομαι, ὑπάρχω in that it can take a subject complement.¹

¹ For details, cf. SSG § 61 b, where as an example we have cited ἐγὼ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος 'I depart childless' Ge 15.2.

For the message of the proverb, cf. Pr 29.15. That of **§** is abbreviated: אִי־סוֹסִיָּא עֵילָא דְלָא מְכַבֵּשׁ הַכְּנָא בְרָא מְרוּדָא דְלָא שָׁמַע לְאִבּוּהִי ‘Like a young horse which has not been controlled so is a rebellious son who does not listen to his father.’

30.9) τιθήνησον τέκνον, καὶ ἐκθαμβήσει σε·
σύμπαιξον αὐτῷ, καὶ λυπήσει σε.

*Bring up a child, and then he might astonish you,
be soft with him, and then he might make you sad.*

§ reads as a whole: אֲרַדִּי בְרַךְ דְלָא תַתְמַיֵּק ‘Educate your son so that you will not be derided.’

30.10) μὴ συγγελάσης αὐτῷ, ἵνα μὴ συνοδυνηθῆς,
καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων γομφιάσεις τοὺς ὀδόντας σου.

*Do not laugh with him, so that you would not grieve with him,
and end up gnashing your teeth.*

[συνοδυνηθῆς] a reading which Smend (266) rejects on the ground that in this context the son cannot be thought to suffer as well as his father. Smend translates the clause “damit er dich nicht kränke” (II 51), without suggesting any possible Heb. verb that may have been in the translator’s *Vorlage*. A recalcitrant son could easily cause his father sorrow.

Note **§**: וְאֵן תִּגְחַךְ עִמָּה גְּשִׁנְךָ לֹא תֵאָנֹל עִמָּה אִי־צְבַנְגָּה דְלָא נְרַנְךָ וְלִחְתָּתָא נִקְהָא ‘if you laugh with him, he will vex you. Do not go with him in accordance with his desire so that he may not anger you and in the end he may make your teeth blunt.’

30.11) μὴ δῶς αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ἐν νεότητι·
¶ καὶ μὴ παρίδης τὰς ἀγνοίας αὐτοῦ.

*Do not allow him freedom of action in (his) youth.
¶ Nor overlook his errors.*

(B) אַל תַּמְשִׁילֵהוּ בַנְעוּרָיו וְאֵל תִּשָּׂא לְשַׁחִיתוֹתָיו:

[ἐν νεότητι] בַּנְעוּרָיו. The use of the pl. is idiomatic, a plural of extension,² e.g. נְעוּרֵיכִי Ps 103.5, but not in Gk, so ἡ νέότης σου.

[παρίδης] By not selecting one of the standard words for “to forgive,” ἀφίημι, the translator may be saying that the use of אָשַׁן here is problematic. But he must be aware that the same collocation has been used earlier, but then not in a prohibition: παρίδε ἄγνοιαν 28.7.

² Cf. *sqh* § 8 d.

Another question to be raised here is what this rare Hebrew word שחיתה, i.e. הַחִיתָּה means. It is unknown to MH or RH, but is known in Aramaic: first in BA, Da 2.9 and 6.5 LXX, in the latter of which we find οὐδὲμίαν ἀμαρτίαν οὐδὲ ἄγνοιαν < הַחִיתָּה וְשָׁעֲלָה כָּל-עֲלָהּ וְשָׁחֲתָהּ.³

We may conclude that ἄγνοια is not quite an accurate rendering; it is the best choice for הַחִיתָּה, three times in LXX.

In S^h vss. 11b and 12a are missing, whereas both are present in S, which latter reads: וְלֹא תִשְׁבּוֹק לְהַ כֹּחַ סוּרְתָּנֶהּ כֹּחַ רֵאשֵׁה עַד הוּא טָלָא ‘Do not forgive any of his sins. Bend his head while he is a child.’

30.12) κάμψον τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ ἐν νεότητι, ¶
 θλάσον τὰς πλευρὰς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἔστιν νήπιος,
 μήποτε σκληρυθῆεις ἀπειθήσῃ σοι.
 ¶ καὶ ἔσται σοι ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁδύνη ψυχῆς. ¶

*Bend his neck in (his) youth, ¶
 hit his sides hard while he is a lad
 in case he grows stubborn and disobeys you,
 ¶ and you experience through him mental pain. ¶*

(Ba) כפתן על חי תפגע רציץ מתניו שעודנו נער:

(Bb) כיה ראשו בנערותו ובקע מתניו כשהוא קטן:

(Bc) למה ישקה ומרה בך ונולד ממנו מפח נפש:

It is difficult to find in S what would correspond to the extremely difficult first half of S^h (Ba), whereas its second half is a variant of the second half of (Bb).⁴

[כיה] analysed in BSH (179a) as Qal Impv. The verb occurs only five times in BH and its morphological data are scanty. One instance, however, is instructive: הַלְכִי כִּי כָּאֲנִי רֵאשׁוּ Is 58.5, not לְכִי, and its object is רֵאשׁ as in our passage. We wonder if we should emend כִּי to יכִי, i.e. יכִי, hence Impf. Alternatively one could emend it to כֹּחַ.⁵

[θλάσον] (Bb) בקע // רציץ (Ba). Smend prefers the former on the ground that it appears to be attested also at 38.28, 30, which, however, is untrue. On a syntagmatic ground we prefer the latter. The two verbs are synonymous to a certain extent. However, בקע never occurs with part of a human body, whereas רציץ does with רֵאשׁ at Ps 74.14 and הַרְצִיץ with גְּלַגְלֶתָּ at Jdg 9.53.

[שעודנו] on the conjunction ש, see above at 14.16. Fassberg (1997.67) takes ש and the parallel כש as introducing circumstantial clauses, an analysis that departs a little from the common understanding that the conjunction waw

³ Jastrow (1903.1548) also mentions שחיתה ‘perversion, fault’ used twice in Targumic Aramaic: Ps 17.3 and Ru 4.22.

⁴ For an attempt to interpret the Heb. text, see Schechter (xxxv), Lévi (128) and Mopsik (177).

⁵ *Maagarim* marks the *yod* as anomalous. Cf. Reymond 2021.263f.

introduces a circumstantial clause. We see no problem in analysing כ־ש as introducing a temporal clause and emending שְׂעוּדוֹנוּ to כ־שְׂעוּדוֹנוּ. Cf. עַד הוּא זָעוּר עַד הוּא זָעוּר ‘while he is a child .. while he is young.’

σκληρυνθείς] In \mathfrak{B} we see three different forms: ישקה in the main column, but יקשיח and ישקיה in the margin. Hebrew does not have a root שקח, but it does have יקשיח ‘to harden,’ already in BH. ישקה, of course, need be emended to יקשה,⁶ possibly יקשה, on which cp. מִי־הִקְשָׁה כַּח וְאִמְיָן כַּח הַחֵם לִכְבּ וְאִמְיָן כַּח מִי־הִקְשָׁה. Jb 9.4, where \mathfrak{C} interestingly reads .. τίς σακληρὸς γενόμενος ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὑπέμεινεν;. The value of Hif. of יקשה is not causative, but ingressive like השמין ‘to become fat,’ cf. JM § 54 d and SQH § 12 d (3).

The sequence of Hebrew tenses in (Bc) is idiomatic: < yiqtol – w-qatalí – w-qatalí >.

Underneath these letters we see ולד written and ולוד in the margin. What on earth is meant with this? Lévi (129) wants to read this as לך, which would correspond to σοι², but what about the initial waw?

מפח נפש] a phrase occurring in Jb 11.20, ἀλώλεια in \mathfrak{C} .

30.13) παίδευσον τὸν υἱόν σου καὶ ἔργασαι ἐν αὐτῷ,
ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ ἀσχημοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ προσκόψῃς.

*Educate your son and work on him
lest you stumble for his disgraceful manner.*

(B) יסר בנך והכבד עולו פן באולתו יתלעבך:

παίδευσον] According to \mathfrak{S} the curriculum is to consist in טורפא דנפשא ‘mental agony.’ Smend (267) holds that this Syr. phrase corresponds to מפח נפש in vs. 12. Semantically that is fine, but what then would be the s of נולד ממנו? Actually he has translated otherwise: “und dir Seelenkummer an ihm erwachse” (II 52).

ἔργασαι ἐν αὐτῷ] עולו הכבד ‘Make his yoke heavy,’ cf. \mathfrak{S} אקשא עלוהי ‘Make it heavy on him’ < הקשה עליו >.

τῇ ἀσχημοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ] אולתו; this is the sole instance of this equation. The Gk noun commonly renders ערונה, 38 times in LXX.

יתלעבך] an odd equation. In the Heb. MS we see יתעל in the margin, which Lévi (129) adopts as apocopated from יתעלה, translating it with “il ne s’élève contre toi,” against which Segal (184) objects, saying that one would expect עליך rather than בך. But a semantically related verb such as מרד, displays both constructions: e.g. העל המלך אתם מרדים Ne 2.19 vs. 9.26. Mopsik (178), DCH IV 554, and BSH (189) introduce into Hebrew a new verb, התלעב ‘to deride,’ though in BH we find הלעיב in that sense. But the Hitpael form of this verb is not known anywhere in the whole history of Hebrew.

⁶ Which Smend (267) spots in the MS, but we do not.

30.14) Κρείσσων πτωχὸς ὑγιῆς καὶ ἰσχύων τῆ ἕξει
ἢ πλούσιος μεμαστιγωμένος εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

*A poor person who is healthy and going strong is better
than a rich person who is beaten healthwise.*

(B) טוב מסכן וחי בעצמו מעשיר ונגע בבשרו:

‘but living on his own,’ i.e. not so poor in health as to need constant help by someone else to the extent of living as a boarder with a family member other than his or her spouse. The conjunction *waw* here carries an adversative value. The same holds for the *waw* in ונגע.

Segal (186) writes that חי can also mean ‘healthy,’ thus equivalent to בריא, apparently implying that that is how the Gk translator understood חי here. Segal mentions a number of BH passages where his interpretation of חי supposedly applies. Most of the cases, however, are where the word is opposed to death, thus signifying survival. E.g. Nu 21.8, where Israelites bitten by venomous snakes and many of them died, but when they looked up to a marvellous bronze snake made by Moses, they survived: ויאמר יהוה אל-משה עשה לך שרף ושים אתו על-גס והיה כלה-הנשוף וראה אתו וחי. Similarly 2Kg 1.2-4, 8.8-10. The only exception is Josh 5.8 with a description of circumcision performed on male Israelites, the majority being adults. Though rather rare, we understand, the operation can be fatally risky. In sum, the point here for Ben Sira is that, even when your heart is fully beating, life with a serious, chronic disease, for instance, is not worth living.

[ἰσχύων] Is the verb, derived from ἰσχύς ‘strength,’ an indication that עצמו derives from עָצָם ‘power’? In BH, however, this rare substantive does not denote the bodily strength requisite for health. See, e.g., כְּחַי וְעָצָם יָדִי עָשָׂה, לִי אֶת-הַחַיִּל הַזֶּה Dt 8.17. Hence עצמו here is more likely typical of the use in MH of עָצָם with a suf. pron. attached as equivalent to a reflexive pronoun:⁷ e.g. הַתּוֹלֵה בְּעַצְמוֹ הַזֶּה ‘he who can depend on himself is culpable’ mHor 1.1. Lévi’s (129) “de corps” is unduly influenced by שׁ’s גּוּשְׁמָה ‘his body.’

μεμαστιγωμένος] ונגע, which is vocalised as נָגַע by Kahana (492) and Segal (185) alike, the latter of whom thinks that both ט and ט (כְּתִישׁ)⁸ reflect the same reading of ט here as נָגַע.

30.15) ὑγίεια καὶ εὐεξία βελτίων παντὸς χρυσοῦ,
καὶ πνεῦμα εὐρωστον ἢ ὄλβος ἀμέτρητος.

*Good and sound health is better than all gold put together
and a stout spirit than immeasurable felicity.*

(B) חיי שר איתתי מפו ורוח טובה מפנינים:

⁷ Cf. Segal 1927 § 429.

⁸ One could add ט (מְמַחֵי ט).

ὕγίεια καὶ εὐεξία] The two nouns are near-synonyms, hence they are treated as a coherent unit, leading to the selection of the sg. βελτίων. On this seeming number discord, see *SSG* § 77 **bg**.

§ with its חַיִּי דְשָׁרָא ‘the life of truth’ probably indicates a difficulty created by the sudden shift of theme from health to general life-style. The translator must have known that Heb. has no root semantically related to Aramaic / Syriac √רר.⁹

εὐεξία is a compound noun consisting of two parts, the second of which is derivationally affiliated with another noun, ἐξίς ‘physical, bodily condition,’ which meets us in the preceding verse.

חַיִּי שָׁר which Segal (185) vocalises as שָׁר חַיִּי, apparently thought to mean ‘strong health.’ Under the previous verse we have argued against his interpretation of חַי as meaning ‘healthy’ and, just above, against the unlikeliness of √רר in Heb. in the sense of “strong.” Besides, it is one thing to say that the sg. adjective חַי can mean ‘healthy’ and its pl. חַיִּים can mean ‘health.’¹⁰ For Kahana (492f.) the phrase means ‘health of body’ under the assumption that שָׁר is a variant spelling of שָׂאָר, i.e. שָׁאָר. True, in the margin of the MS we see שָׂאָר, and also for vs. 16. However, does שָׁאָר ever mean ‘body,’ not part of it, i.e. ‘flesh’ as distinct from blood, for instance? In the margin we also see another gloss, בָּשָׂר. Even if one of these graphic alternatives has been accepted, the semantic difficulty concerning חַיִּי remains with us.

An alternative solution is to read here שָׁר חַיִּי ‘life as a prince or a high-ranking courtier.’ This, of course, creates a thematic break from the preceding and the following verses. However, in the course of transmission of the Hebrew original, this line may have wrongly intruded here. Such a dislocation is going to confront us shortly in the following paragraph, and there are quite a few additional examples in this document.

ὄλβος] Our translator was presumably familiar with מִימְצָא וְרַחֵק אֵשֶׁת-חַיִּל מִימְצָא מְכָרָה מִפְּנִינִים Γυναίκα ἀνδρείαν τίς εὐρήσει; τιμωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν ἢ τοιαύτη Pr 31.10, but may have felt that the mention of valuable metals and objects was enough with פּוֹ χρυσίον.

Περὶ βρωμάτων

About foods

30.16) οὐκ ἔστιν πλοῦτος βελτίων ὑγείας σώματος,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εὐφροσύνη ὑπὲρ χαρὰν καρδίης.

⁹ *SL* s.v. רָרָא mentions “firmness” as another meaning of the word. The only reference mentioned is אָקִים רַגְלֵהּ בְּשָׂרָא סְגִיָּא ‘he lifted his feet very firmly’ PsSol 8.20, where ⚭ (vs. 18) reads μετὰ ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς ‘with much confidence in security.’ In either case, we have here little to do with health.

¹⁰ There should be no problem with חַיִּים ‘life’ as a plural of extension.

*There is no wealth better than the health of body
and there is no joy above the happiness of heart.*

(B) אין עושר על עושר שר עצם ואין טובה על טוב לבב:

οὐκ ἔστιν¹¹] This is possibly analysable as a negation of “Wealth is not better ..”. But the same phrase in vs. 16b, also fronted, can only indicate non-existence. This syntactic parallelism suggests that we had better analyse the first clause in an identical manner. Cp. the first hemistich of vs. 15, which also contains βελτίων, but not an indicative form of εἰμί, and the clause cannot be existential. Note the use of לִיַּת twice in S of the current verse and לָא אֵית in S₁, both explicitly existential.

The Heb. text of vs. 16a is as difficult as that of 15a. As in the latter case, this may have led to the translator adopting a measure of freedom. We cannot find any word as being translated with ὑγιεία. In the margin of the Hebrew text we see שאר for שר. But apart from the difficulty of assigning the broad sense of “body” to this Hebrew gloss, as mentioned above, עושר באר has little to do with good health; already in ancient times not a few people must have suffered from obesity and must have known of thin people enjoying wonderful health.

Furthermore, what on earth is שאר עצם supposed to mean? Segal’s (185) solution is שר עצם ‘the strength of bone(s),’ but our objection to his interpretation of שר is still there.

Let it be noted that 16b has nothing to do with bodily health.

30.17) κρείσσω θάνατος ὑπὲρ ζωὴν πικρὰν
καὶ ἀνάπαυσις αἰῶνος ἢ ἀρρώστημα ἔμμονον.

*Death is preferable to a bitter life
and a lasting relief to a chronic infirmity.*

(Ba) טוב למות מחיי שוא ונוחת עולם מכאב נאמן:
(Bb) טוב למות מחיים רעים ולירד שאול מכאב עומד:

(Ba) and (Bb) are unquestionably variant texts, doublets, and not two distinct texts. However, S does not agree with one of them consistently. Thus ζωὴν πικρὰν is closer to (Bb),¹¹ but ἀνάπαυσις αἰῶνος to (Ba), in which לירד שאול is not represented at all.¹² S does represent it: וְלַמַּחַת לְשִׁיּוֹל מִן כְּאֵב דְקָיָם: ‘and to descend to the underworld than perpetual pain.’

ὑπὲρ] one of the prepositions used as an equivalent of the genitive of comparison,¹³ and in this particular case it is parallel to another particle of comparison, namely ἢ.

¹¹ A small number of Gk MSS do read πονηραν.

¹² לירד, i.e. לִירַד is a typically MH inf. cst. in lieu of לְרַדָּת. Cf. reservations expressed by Nöldeke (1900.84) over this analysis.

¹³ Cf. SSG § 22 ga and 23 bd.

οὔτε¹ .. οὔτε²] Repeated in disjunctive negation, “neither .. nor.” Both verbs could be further negated with μή as in οὔτε μή κόψησθε οὔτε μή κλαύσητε ‘you will neither mourn nor will you weep’ Ez 24.23.¹⁶

30.20) βλέπων ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ στενάζων (21)
ὥσπερ εὐνοῦχος περιλαμβάνων παρθένον καὶ στενάζων.
¶ οὕτως ὁ ποιῶν ἐν βία κρίματα. ¶

*Looking with (his) eyes and sighing
like a eunuch embracing a virgin and sighing.
¶ So is he who forcefully executes judgements. ¶*

... בְּעֵינָיו ... (B) כאשר סירים יחבק נערה ומתאנח:

εὐνοῦχος] Since the general context requires the sg., סירים need be emended to סרים, i.e. סָרִים, which also concords with יחבק.

στενάζων²] Being a eunuch, he cannot, alas, go any farther with the virgin.

What 𐤄^{II} adds here is difficult to see. As Smend (270) rightly points out, it comes from 20.4b, which also follows a clause concerning a eunuch with a lass. What is found in 𐤍 in our current verse is as mystifying: וּמְרִיאָ תִבֵּעַ בְּאֵי־הָיָה ‘and the Lord demands from him.’

מתאנח] For a BH equivalent אָנַח, see above at 25.18.

30.21) Μὴ δῶς εἰς λύπην τὴν ψυχὴν σου (22)
καὶ μὴ θλίψῃς σεαυτὸν ἐν βουλῇ σου.

*Do not pay excessive attention to sorrow
nor oppress yourself with your (own) view.*

(B) אל תתן לדין נפשך ואל תכשל בעונך:

λύπην] 𐤍 דוֹנָא ‘misery,’ which suggests a necessary emendation¹⁷ of 𐤄 דין to דון, i.e. דִּן ‘grief’; the same emendation is called for at 14.1 and 37.2 as well. One likely attestation of it is found in QH as well at 4Q385 4.1.

בעונך] in the margin of the Heb. MS agrees with ἐν βουλῇ σου in 𐤄. A second marginal reading leads to a different grammatical structure: אל תכשילך עצתך, in which עצתך is now the grammatical subject: ‘Let your view not upset you.’ The subject is “you” in both 𐤍 תִּתְקַל לָּךְ ‘you shall not stumble’ and 𐤍 לֹא תִאֲלֹץ אֶנְתָּ לָּךְ ‘you shall not press yourself.’

30.22) εὐφροσύνη καρδίας ζωὴ ἀνθρώπου, (23)
καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα ἀνδρὸς μακροημέρευσις.

¹⁶ Cf. SSG § 83 cb.

¹⁷ So suggested already by Smend (270).

*Gladness of heart is a life for (any) person
and a man's joy (ensures) longevity.*

(B) שמתח לבב הם חיי איש וניל אדם האריך אפו:

ה] This pronoun holds an important key for our syntactic analysis of the first clause, a nominal clause of the pattern <P - dp - S>.¹⁸ In view of the pl. number of the pronoun we analyse חיי איש as the subject of the clause: paraphrastically, the clause could be translated – “what could be viewed as a man's life truly is tantamount to the gladness in his heart; if a man is not glad in heart, he cannot be said to be truly alive.” The syntactic structure of the Greek text above does not by itself necessitate such an understanding.¹⁹ S displays exactly the identical clause structure here: חַדְוֹת לְפָא אָנוֹן גִּיר חַיִּיהֶ׃ דְּכִרְנָנְשָׁא.

μακροημέρευσις] a hapax occurring only in Si, and that twice more (1.12, 20),²⁰ and unknown prior to LXX.

אפו in פת האריך אפו is rather strange. μακροημερεύω is used in LXX five times to translate תַּסְגֵּא חַיִּיהֶ׃ ‘it would increase his life-span.’ Hence the strange Heb. phrase can be emended to האריכם, the suffix referring back to חיי איש.²¹ The Pf. here probably has gnomic value.²²

30.23) ἀπάτα τὴν ψυχὴν σου καὶ παρακάλει τὴν καρδίαν σου (24)
καὶ λύπην μακρὰν ἀπόστησον ἀπὸ σοῦ·
πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀπόλεσεν ἢ λύπη, (25)
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὠφέλεια ἐν αὐτῇ.

*Enjoy yourself and encourage your heart
and keep sorrow far away from you.
For sorrow destroyed many
and there is no benefit in it.*

(Ba) פת נפשך ופייג לבך וקצפון הרחק ממך:
(Bb) כי רבצפון הרג דין ואין תעלה בקצפון:

ἀπάτα] Many MSS read αγαπα. It is probably secondary, since ἀπατάω can carry a negative connotation, such as “to entice,” which agrees with פת here. But the verse is carrying on a negative view of sorrow, and our translator himself uses this Gr verb in an unquestionably positive sense at δὸς

¹⁸ [dp] = disjunctive, non-suffixal pronoun. Cf. Muraoka 1999.207f. and SQH § 33 eb.

¹⁹ The minuscule 248 has αὐτή in the middle of the clause, which leads to <S - dp - P> as a clause structure.

²⁰ No Heb. text has survived for these two cases.

²¹ Van Peursen (2004.74) identifies here a standing idiom, translating the text “and a man's cheerfulness makes him patient.” In this frequent collocation, however, אָךְ, normally appears as a dual noun with the sole exception being אָךְ אָךְ Je 15.15. Is our אפו then = אָפּו?

²² So Rogland 2003.19.

καὶ λαβὲ καὶ ἀπάτησον τὴν ψυχὴν σου, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄδου ζητῆσαι τρυφὴν 14.16, where the verb translates קָנַן. On the Gk verb ἀπατάω, see above at 14.16.

παρακάλει] פִּיַּי, an extremely rare verb; *Maagarim* mentions only one more attestation, in a poetic text supposedly dating to the 6th cent. CE. Curiously enough **§** reads here פִּיַּי ‘Alleviate.’

λύπην] קָצַפּוֹן, an odd equation, since the Heb. noun means ‘anger.’ Also in (Bb) דוֹן is resumed through קָצַפּוֹן. **§** uses אֲהִיָּוָה ‘grief’ twice. Likewise **§**h with אֲהִיָּוָה ‘sorrow’ twice. However, as Smend (271) points out, λυπέω often translates in LXX the verb of this root: Qal 6x and Hitp. 1x.

μακρὰν] Undoubtedly used adverbially rather than attributively. LXX proffers a good number of this particular form, f.sg.acc., of μακρός adverbially used. For more examples, see *SSG* § 23 **gb**.

ἢ λύπη] דִּין, which is to be emended to דוֹן as in vs. 21 above.

ὠφέλεια] תַּעֲלָה. *Index* has identified this equation twice: Je 26(46).11 and ib. 37(30).13, where MT vocalises the word as תַּעֲלָה. RH knows a synonym in the form of תַּעֲלָה.

30.24) ζῆλος καὶ θυμὸς ἐλαττοῦσιν ἡμέρας, (26)
καὶ πρὸ καιροῦ γῆρας ἄγει μέριμνα.

*Too much enthusiasm and wrath reduce (your) days,
and in no time anxiety advances your old age.*

(B) קנאה ואִיָּוָה קָצַפּוֹן ימים ובלא עת תזקין דאגה:

ἐλαττοῦσιν] Abegg restores קָצַפּוֹן, which represents a twofold discord, in gender and number alike. In QH we have found an example in which the two subject nouns are semantically close to our case: יָשׁוּב נָא אִפְכָּה וְחַמְתְּכָה מֵעַמְכָּה: ‘May Your anger and fury turn away from Your people!’ 4Q504 2.11. Both **§** and **§**h use a m.pl. verb, מְבַלִּין and מְבַצְרִין respectively, whereas the two subject nouns of **§** are masculine – אִיָּוָה וְרִיָּוָה – and those of **§**h are mixed – אִיָּוָה וְרִיָּוָה.

§ expresses 24b in a colourful mode: וְדָלָא בְּוַבְנֵיהּ מִפְקָא הוֹרְתָא צְפָתָא ‘and a worry makes lots of white hair come out prematurely.’²³

33.13b) λαμπρὰ καρδία καὶ ἀγαθὴ ἐπὶ ἐδέσμασιν (30.27)
τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτῆς ἐπιμελήσεται.

*A joyous and contented heart over meals,
it should be seriously interested in its foods.*

(B) שנות לב טוב תחת מטעמים ומאכלו יעלה עליו:

²³ For “prematurely,” cf. a felicitous translation in Snaith: “anxiety brings premature old age.”

τῶν βρωμάτων αὐτῆς וְלֵבָבָא] In terms of gender concord there is no problem in either version. However, “food for a heart” is a somewhat odd notion. ἐπιμελήσεται] On the rection of this verb with gen., see *SSG* § 22 p, p. 139, fn. 2.

According to Thomas 1960, תגש is a verb form from תגש related to Arb. *sanā* ‘to shine, gloom.’

CHAPTER 34 (31)

34[31].1) Ἀγρυπνία πλούτου ἐκτῆκει σάρκας,
καὶ ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ ἀφιστᾷ ὕπνον.

*Insomnia for wealth saps bodily strength,
and anxiety over it drives sleep away.*

(B) שקר עשיר ימחה שארו דאגת מחיה תפריע נומה:

[Ἀγρυπνία] Very difficult to harmonise this with שקר ‘falsehood.’ Following Lévi (135) and Smend (272), the v.l. שקד is to be adopted, i.e. שקד, likewise at 42.9. Both S and S^h read שְׁהָרָא ‘vigil,’ which is close to S. Note also I *vigilia*.

[πλούτου] = עשר, i.e. עֶשֶׂר. The gen. phrase can be viewed as expressing a purpose: “N₁ is used to achieve, attain, or meant or designed for, N₂” (SSG § 22 v [xiv]). But עשיר = πλούσιος is easier to understand, and αὐτοῦ harmonises with it better, although this gen. phrase can also be analysed in the same way as the first, in other words, αὐτοῦ = πλούτου. Note S דַּעַתְרָא = πλούσιου.

[σάρκας] Only two Gk MSS read sg. σαρκᾶ. We probably have here a pl. of extension: “all over the body.”

[ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ] דאגת מחיה, more specific; “anxiety over survival”? A marginal reading, דאגתו, = S. Pace Smend (273) this Heb. phrase is scarcely concerned with wealth. However, in the shorter form, דאגתו, as a continuation of the first hemistich, the anxiety would be that over wealth.

[ἀφιστᾷ] תפריע, for which we see a marginal reading, תפריג. This latter is used in the next verse, which is a doublet of vs. 1. The latter is a rare verb; *Maagarim* cites only two other instances in an early mediaeval document, NuR 1.14. Cf. S מַפְרָדָא ‘it disturbs’ and S^h מְרַקָא ‘it keeps away.’

34.2) μέριμνα ἀγρυπνίας ἀποστήσει νυσταγμόν,
καὶ ἀρρώστημα βαρὺ ἐκνήψει ὕπνον.

*Anxiety over insomnia could keep (even) a short nap away,
and severe infirmity could keep (a sleeper) awake.*

(Ba) דאגת מחיה תפריג נומה ומחלי חזק תפריע נומה:

(Bb) רע נאמן תניד חרפה ומסתיר סוד אוהב כנפש:

[μέριμνα ἀγρυπνίας] ≠ דאגת מחיה, on which latter see at the preceding verse.

§ narrows down מחיה to מזונא ‘food, nourishment.’

[תפריע] See above at vs. 1.

υσταγμόν] The translator is apparently going for a stylistic variation; as against ח, which repeats נומה, it is rendered with ὕπνος for a second time.

ἀρρώστημα βαρὺ] The parallelism of (Ba) suggests that מחלי חזק is the grammatical subject of the second clause and that, in view of the fem. תפריע, the subject is required to be fem. Such a requirement can be met by emending מחלי to מחלת, st. cst. < מְחֻלָּה. The st. cst. can be viewed as qualitative: מְחֻלָּה חֻזְקָה = מְחֻלָּת חֻזְקָה.¹ E.g. לבב קושי 1QM 14.7, = לִבָּב קָשָׁה ‘a stubborn heart’ and עֲצִי רוֹם 4Q286 5.5, = עֲצִימֵי רְמִים.² Segal’s analysis is לִי חֻזְקָה מִלִּי חֻזְקָה and regards the prep. min as comparative,³ מחיה דאגת מחיה continuing as the subject of תפריע. We think that to have the respective subject and verb of the two clauses slightly different enhances the nature of parallelism. Cf. § מרעא תקיפא ‘grave illness’ and § כורהנא יקירא נא ‘difficult illness.’

(Bb) appears to be an intrusion from elsewhere; its message is out of context.

34.3) ἐκοπίασεν πλούσιος ἐν συναγωγῇ χρημάτων

καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει ἐμπίμπλαται τῶν τρυφημάτων αὐτοῦ.

A rich person toils in amassing possessions

and when he rests, he thoroughly enjoys his dainties.

(B) עמל עשיר לקבל הון ואם ינוח לקבל תענוג:

ἐκοπίασεν] For ח we follow a marginal reading instead of עמלי, which is in the body of the MS, but difficult, unless one takes the clause as meaning “Toils by a rich man are for the purpose of amassing possessions.” Can the second clause be analysed similarly, “When he takes rest, it is in order to ..”? Such sounds to us like an unusual clause structure. The prep. ἐν, however, does not indicate a purpose, but rather temporal: “while he was amassing ..”.

συναγωγῇ] Lévi sounds right in his assumption that לקבל¹ is an error induced by לקבץ² and is to be emended to לקבץ.

34.4) ἐκοπίασεν πτωχὸς ἐν ἐλαττώσει βίου

καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναπαύσει ἐπιδεῆς γίνεται.

A poor person toils (as if to see) his livelihood to diminish

and when he rests, he becomes deficient.

(B1) יגע עני לחסר ביתו ואם ינוח יהיה צריך:

(B2) עמל עני לחסר כחו ואם ינוח לא נחה לו:

¹ חז in a marginal reading, מחלה חז, is perhaps to be corrected to חזק.

² For a discussion with more examples, see *SQH* § 21 bx (xviii).

³ So already Smend (273).

Here again we have a pair of variant texts in \mathfrak{H} . Smend (275) holds that the primitive form was עמל עני לחטר כחו ואם ינוח יהיה צריך.

ἐν¹] on which, see above at the immediately preceding verse; “as his livelihood was diminishing.”

ἐλαττώσει βίου] which Smend (274) understands in the sense of “shortening of your life expectancy.” However, βίος can also mean “financial, material resources needed to live.” Cf. αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν ὄλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς Mk 12.44⁴ and ἀπὸ γεωργίας τὸν βίον ποιῆσθαι ‘to get a living by husbandry’ Xen. *Oec.* 6.11.⁵

ἐπιδεῆς γίνεται] He should be working non-stop, even without the Sabbath. לֹא נָחָה [לֹא נָחָה] ‘he did not really rest,’ taking נָחָה as נָחָה, Pf. 3fs used impersonally.

34.5) Ὁ ἀγαπῶν χρυσίον οὐ δικαιοθήσεται,
καὶ ὁ διώκων διάφορα ἐν αὐτοῖς πλανηθήσεται.

*He who loves money would not come out innocent
and one who chases after cash would go wrong because of it.*

(B) רודף חרוץ לא ינקה ואוהב מחיר בו ישגה:

ἀγαπῶν .. διώκων] in reverse order when compared with \mathfrak{H} .

On the message of vs. 5a in \mathfrak{H} , cf. יָנַקְהוּ לְהַעֲשִׂיר לֹא יִנְקָה Pr 28.20b.

χρυσίον] חרוץ; on this poetic synonym of חָבֵה, see above at 14.3.

διάφορα] שִׁחַיָּה, on which there is a marginal note indicating its Greek equivalent as ΔΙΑΦΘΟΡΑ, implying that the Syr. word meant is חֲבֵהָ ‘destruction,’ and not חָבֵהָ ‘destroyer’ nor חֲבֵהָ ‘rope.’⁶ This marginal note points to (δια)φθοράν, and not the n.pl. διάφορα as proposed by Smend (274f.) and accepted by Ziegler.

πλανηθήσεται] שִׁחַיָּה נִשְׂבַּע ‘he would become sated,’ = πλησθήσεται, the reading of all Gk MSS. The form given above had been proposed by Smend (274f.) and adopted by Ziegler.

34.6) πολλοὶ ἐδόθησαν εἰς πτώμα χάριν χρυσίου,
καὶ ἐγενήθη ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν.

*Many were abandoned to a downfall because of gold,
and their ruin came to stare at them.*

(Ba) רבים היו חבולי זהב והבוטח על פנינים:
(Bb) ולא מצאו להנצל מרעה וגם להושע ביום עברה:

⁴ For more examples in NTG, see BDAG s.v. 2.

⁵ For more examples in CG, see LSJ s.v. II.

⁶ Another option, חֲבֵהָ ‘throes, pains’ is precluded, since there is no *seyamei* attached to the word to this *plurale tantum*.

חבל] > חללי in the margin. Both appear to mean “wounded, injured.” חבל occurs in MH in the sense of ‘to injure, wound,’ and Nif. ‘to be injured,’ e.g. mSheb 7.3, where it is found in both stems, חָבַל .. הֻבַּל. The situation is comparable in Aramaic. For instance, חָבַל ‘to destroy’ is solidly attested in Syriac.⁷ In our Si context, destruction or injury is not bodily or physical, but mental in view of its connection with gold. “Downfall” is a different figure. That the nomen regens indicates a cause⁸ is expressed in 𐤄 by means of χάριν. Note דם חללי אשמתם ‘the blood of those fallen because of their guilt’ IQM 6.17.

Smend (275) adopts a v.l. attested by MS 248 only: ἐδέθησαν ‘they were tied up,’ a view which was not accepted by whomever wrote חללי in the margin.

The two temporal phrases appear to be in reverse order, when compared with the above-given text. ביום מרעה may need be emended to ביום רעה.

(Bb) reads in the margin: ‘and they were not rescued on the day of wrath and not to be saved on the day of disaster.’ We regard הושיע as a variant spelling of הושע, i.e. Ni. inf., הוֹשִׁיעַ, for Hif. הוֹשִׁיעַ makes no sense.

Note 𐤔: סניאא גיר דהון עתירא ואתתקלו על נכסיהון ולא אשכחא למפציו אגון מן. ‘for many are those who were rich and trusted on their possessions and one could not deliver them from a disaster nor to rescue them on the day of their end.’ We see that 𐤔’s Heb. *Vorlage* was very close to 𐤄, but irreconcilable with 𐤄. It is quite a mystery where the latter originates. Even if one accepted Smend’s (275)⁹ emendation of פנינים to פניהם, 𐤄’s second line is nowhere near הבוטה על פניהם, which makes little sense.

אמצא as equivalent to יכלו, i.e. יְכָלוּ, is rather odd. A Syriacism here is unlikely to the utmost.¹⁰

34.7) ξύλον προσκόμματός ἐστιν τοῖς ἐνθουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶ,
καὶ πᾶς ἄφρων ἁλώσεται ἐν αὐτῶ.

*It is a stumbling block for those who are madly fascinated by it
and every fool gets trapped in it.*

(B) כי תקלה הוא לאויל וכל פותה יוקש בו:

⁷ Lévi (137) indicates the meaning of חבל as “blesser,” but his translation of the text, “qui ont été les prisonniers de l’or,” is quite different.

Smend (275) denies that the meaning “to injure” as in Aram. and RH could apply here. What he writes about חללי we fail to follow: “Man könnte das חללי des Randes zur Not nach 28,18 (Gr. πίπτειν) verstehen und annehmen, dass Gr. Wendungen wie Dan. 7,11. Ez. 31,14. Esra 9,7 im Sinne hatte.”

DCH III 150a suggests “the ones corrupted of gold,” rather questionable, since “to act corruptly,” an intransitive verb cannot be passivised.

⁸ Cf. SQH § 21 b (xxv).

⁹ Lévi (138) had already mentioned this possibility, but without emending his Heb. text.

¹⁰ Skehan - Di Lella (381) maintain that this is “a manifest retroversion” from Syriac. How convincingly has been a case made for such a retroversion?

προσκόματός] תקלה, i.e. תִּקְלָה ‘stumbling block’ is well-known to MH. *ἔστιν*] In **S** the subject is explicit: מְטוּל דְּתוֹקְלָתָא הֵן מְמוֹנָא לְסַכְלָא ‘because money is a stumbling for fools.’ The addition of “because” shows that this verse is a logical sequel to the preceding verse; the same function is fulfilled in **H** by means of הוא and בו, and in **G** by means of αὐτῶ, pronouns of anaphoric value.

ἐνθουσιάζουσιν] a free rendering of אָוִיל ‘foolish.’¹¹ Twice in Si it is rendered with ἀπαιδευτος ‘uneducated’ 6.20 and 8.4. It is not an extremely rare word. It may have been thought to be tautologous with פוּתָה in the next clause.¹²

34.8) μακάριος πλούσιος, ὃς εὐρέθη ἄμωμος
καὶ ὃς ὀπίσω χρυσίου οὐκ ἐπορεύθη·

*Blessed is a rich man who has been found impeccable
and who has not gone after gold.*

(A אשרי איש נמצא תמים ואחר ממון לא נלוו:

πλούσιος] **S** also focuses on the rich: טוֹבָהָהּ לְעִתִּיקָא דְּאִשְׁתְּכַח דְּלָא מוּמָא ‘Happy is the rich who has been discovered to be unblemished.’

ὃς εὐρέθη] The use of the relative clause does not have to mean that נמצא תמים was analysed by our translator as an asyndetic relative clause. There is no hindrance to parsing נמצא as a Ni. ptc. being used attributively. Segal (191) analyses נמצא in the margin as impersonally used, which sounds to us unnatural, ‘a person one found impeccable.’¹³

χρυσίου] ממון, i.e. מְמוֹן, the first occurrence of this word in Hebrew.

ἐπορεύθη] נלוו is a little more than just going. **S** has captured this subtle nuance with לָא טְצָא ‘he die not go astray.’

34.9) τίς ἐστιν; καὶ μακαριοῦμεν αὐτόν·
ἐποίησεν γὰρ θαυμάσια ἐν λαῶ αὐτοῦ.

*Who is he? We would consider him as blessed,
for he did marvellous things among his people.*

(B מי הוא זה ונאשרנו כי הפליא לעשות בעמ¹⁴:

καὶ μακαριοῦμεν αὐτόν] **S** וְנִשְׁבְּחֵיהֶּי ‘and we would praise him.’¹⁵

¹¹ Many MSS read θουσιάζουσιν or ἐνθουσιάζουσιν, dubious readings. Our passage is the only instance of the latter mentioned in LSJ. Cf. also Wagner 1999.193f.

¹² פתח ‘opening’ in the margin is an obvious scribal error.

¹³ We are doubtful about the suitability of Lévi’s translation: “.. l’homme riche qui reste intègre” (139). It is more likely about the discovery of examination and consideration of the character of the man concerned.

¹⁴ What is found in the margin does not merit serious consideration: מי הוא תאשרנו כי הפליא לעשות.

¹⁵ Pace Fassberg (1979.68) this is hardly an expression of purpose, for which we need a clause expressing an action.

34.10) τίς ἐδοκιμάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐτελειώθη;
καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ εἰς καύχησιν.
τίς ἐδύνατο παραβῆναι καὶ οὐ παρέβη,
καὶ ποιῆσαι κακὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν;

Who was tested in this and passed?

He can be proud of himself.

*Who could have transgressed and did not transgress,
could have done evil things and did not?*

והיה לו שלום והיה לו תפארת:	(Ba) מי הוא זה שנדבק בו
איהיה לך תפארת:	(Bb) כי ברבות שלום חייו
היא לך תפארת:	(Bc) מי ברכו וישלם חייו
ולהרע רעה ולא אבֵּה:	(Bd) מי יוכל לסור ולא סר

ἐδοκιμάσθη] = נבדק, as proposed in *Index* s.v. δοκιμάζω. Whereas at לְבָדוֹק [בְּדוֹק וְלִהְיוֹת וְלִהְיוֹת 2Ch 34.10 many Heb. dictionaries take the verb בְּדוֹק in the sense of “to repair,” *DCH* (II 96b) admits “to examine.” This usage is well known to MH, e.g. כִּי־צַד בּוֹדְקִים אֶת הַעֲדִים ‘how does one examine the witnesses?’ mSanh 3.6.¹⁶ Cf. אָתְּדַבֵּק ‘he adhered (to it).’

ἔσται] The grammatical subject of the verb is his successful completion of the test, ἐτελειώθη, just as the subject of ²היה in (Ba) is שלום.

The Heb. text of (Bb) and (Bc) does not belong here. The selection of 1sg. אהיה and 2msg. לך is rather odd. Probably the presence of תפארת induced the intrusion of the text from somewhere else in the document.

ἐδύνατο] = יכול, i.e. יוכל, and ≠ יוכל, i.e. יוכל. In view of the following Pf. סר this explanation is simpler than to assume as Van Peursen (2004.113) does that יכול exemplifies the use of self-standing *yiqtol* denoting capability.¹⁷

κακὰ] In BH הרע occurs as often as 68 times, but never takes רעה as an object. Hence Smend’s reading (רעה ‘his neighbour’) makes sense. Likewise ש הרע, but *facere mala*.

אָל [לֹא אָבֵה] ‘he refused.’ In BH this verb is mostly used with לֹא or אָל.

34.11) διὰ τοῦτο στερεωθήσεται τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας αὐτοῦ ἐκδιηγῆσεται ἐκκλησία.

Therefore his goods would become solid,

and his deeds of mercy would become a talk of the congregation.

(B) על כן חזק טובו ותהלתו יספֵּר קהֵל:

τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῦ] טובו most likely = טובו. In BH טובה sometimes takes a suffix pronoun as in טובתי Ps 16.2, but not the masc. טוב.

¹⁶ See also Ben-Yehuda, I.467b.

¹⁷ We would rather say *possibility*, since the verb יכול of itself signifies capability.

Just as the n.pl. ἀγαθά, טוב in BH indicates at times material goods, e.g. הַאֲכֹל אֶת־פְּרִיָּהּ וְאֶת־טוֹבָהּ Ne 9.36 and אֵין־שָׁרִיד לְאֶכְלוֹ עַל־כֵּן לֹא־יִחַיִּל טוֹבוֹ Jb 20.21 > Ⓞ .. διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀνθήσει αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀγαθά. Analogously Syr. טובא, which is used in Ⓢ here. Note also Ⓢ here: הָלֵךְ טְבַתָּא דְלֵיהּ ‘his goods.’ ἐκκλησία] Ⓢ כְּנוֹשְׁפֵי ‘congregations,’ i.e. not just one.

- 34.12) Ἐπὶ τραπέζης μεγάλης ἐκάθισας;
μὴ ἀνοίξης ἐπ’ αὐτῆς φάρυγγά σου
καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς Πολλά γε τὰ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς. (13)

*Did you ever sit at a big dinner-table?
Do not put your tongue out there
nor say “How abundant here!”*

מוסר לחם ויין יחדו
(Ba) בני אם על שלחן שיש גדול ישבתה אל תפתח עליו גרנך:
(Bb) אל תאמר ספוק עליו:

The Heb. text adds a title: “Instruction on a public dinner”
אם] a sensible addition introducing a conditional clause. Found also in Ⓢ. MS 248 emends ἐκάθισας; to a circumstantial ptc., καθίσας.
שש] an addition visible in the margin of the MS: “the table of a nobleman.” Note Ⓢ דְּגַבְרָא עֲתִירָא ‘of a rich man.’

Πολλά γε τὰ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς] Ⓢ לֹא סָפֵק לִי ‘Not enough for me,’ quite different table manners.

Is ספוק to be compared with MH ספויק ‘sufficiency’?

τὰ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς] Strictly speaking, עליו cannot be equal to אָשַׁר עָלָיו. It must mean either “about it” or “at it,” i.e. “seated at the table.”

- 34.13) μνήσθητι ὅτι κακὸν ὄφθαλμὸς πονηρός. (14)
πονηρότερον ὄφθαλμοῦ τί ἔκτισται; (15)
διὰ τοῦτο ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου δακρύει.

*Remember that an evil eye is wicked.
What has been created as more evil than an eye?
Therefore it pours tears from every face.*

זכור כי רעה עין רעה: (Ba)
רע עין שונא אל ורע ממנו לא ברא: (Bb)
כי זה מפני כל דבר תזוע עין ומפנים דמעה תדמע: (Bc)
רע מעין לא חלק אל על כן מפני כל נס לחה: (Bd)

[רעה עין רעה] a play on words? The translator, coming to (Bb) may have thought that he has had enough of it, leaving the first half untranslated, changing ממנו, i.e. מן רע עין, to ממנה, i.e. מן עין רעה, necessarily reading ברא

as נברא, and shortening (Bc) “for this is why an eye gets agitated over anything and it makes tears stream down from your face.” זה here is rather odd. Perhaps מִפְּנֵי זה is to be emended to זה מפני = διὰ τοῦτο.

By translating רע עין as “l’avidité” Lévi (141) parsing רע as an abstract noun, רע? Is רע עין attested elsewhere just as רע לְבָבְךָ 1Sm 17.28? Otherwise רע עין as in Pr 23.6 is preferable. So Segal (192) and Kahana (494). And yet note § בִּישׁוֹת עֵינָא §.

[חלק] Substituting ברא in (Bb). On the former, which does not occur in BH in the sense of “to create,” but meets us in Si quite a few times, see above at 10.18.

נס לַחָהּ = נָס לַחָהּ, a combination unquestionably alluding to Dt 34.7, where, however, it is used in a negative clause, “his [= Moses’] vitality had not yet departed.” For § the suf. pron. is fem., referring to עֵינָּךְ.

² [מפני כל] Unlike in (Bc) the phrase means, as Segal justly points out, “from everybody’s face,” to which § is close.

34.14) οὐδ' ἂν ἐπιβλέψῃ, μὴ ἐκτείνῃς χεῖρα. (16)

καὶ μὴ συνθλίβου αὐτῶ ἐν τρυβλίῳ. (17)

*Wherever he looks, do not extend your hand
nor fall over yourself against him for a bowl.*

(B) מקום יביט אל תושיט יד ואל דיחד עמו בטנא:

[מקום יביט] One would anticipate some prepositional phrase preceding, whether אל כול or בכול. Cf. § לְאִיָּכָא דְאֵן תְּחֹר נָה ‘wherever you look at.’ Smend (278) refers to יהי מקום תגור אל יהי 42.11, which, however, presents other grammatical difficulties, v.a.l.

[דיחד] To be replaced by תיחד as in the margin.

[סυνθλίβου] תיחד, i.e. תִּיָּחַד ‘you take part, join.’

[עמו αὐτῶ] The referent of the pronoun is mentioned in the next verse: “neighbour.” Likewise the subject of יביט. Segal (194) thinks of גדול (vs. 12) as a referent, but it is too far removed, and the intervening verses are no longer concerned with גדול.

[טρυβλίῳ] טנא is a basket for putting products of soil in, not exactly a piece on a dinner table. Another example indicative of our translator’s urban background? See also below at 42.4.

34.15) νόει τὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἐκ σεαυτοῦ (18)

καὶ ἐπὶ παντὶ πράγματι διανοοῦ.

*Think of your neighbour’s affairs as if they were yours
and think carefully about every matter.*

(B) דעה רעך כנפשך ובכל ששנאת התבונן:

νόει] Possibly represents רָעַח, on which we could take into account the same Syriac root which means ‘to consider, contemplate.’¹⁸ Smend (278) mentions an alternative Aramaic root: in Syriac, for instance, we have a homonym, רַעִי ‘to please,’ related to Heb. רָצִי. We are then reminded of the second great commandment: וְאַהֲבָתְךָ לְרֵעֶךָ כְּמוֹךָ Le 19.18, on which see above at 28.4.

Missing in Ⓞ. The second clause is absent altogether in Ⓢ.

Lévi (143) prefers אֲשֶׁר שְׂנֵאתָ, a marginal reading. Though this is a rare instance of ש־ in the extant MSS of Si, it is firmly positioned in BH. See JM § 38. Another two instances meet us in (Bb) of the following verse, שְׂרַעַךְ .. שְׂשָׁם, i.e. שְׂשָׁם .. שְׂרַעַךְ.¹⁹

For the message of 15b in Ⓜ, cf. ὁ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσης To 4.15 Ⓞ¹, a negative version of Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς Mt 7.12.

34.16) φάγε ὡς ἄνθρωπος τὰ παρακείμενά σοι (19)
καὶ μὴ διαμασῶ, μὴ μισηθῆς.

*Eat like a human being that which is laid before you,
and do not chew so that you may not be hated.*

(Ba) הסב כאיש אשר נבחר ואל תעט פן תנעל:
(Bb) דע שרעך כמוך ואכול כאיש דבר ששם לפניך
(Bc) ולא תהיה גרגרן פן תמאס:²⁰

[φάγε] = אכל in the margin of (B).

[παρακείμενά] (Bb) שם, i.e. שָׁם, Qal pass. ptc. as in בָּסָלַע קָנָךְ Nu 24.21 and אִם-בֵּין כּוֹכְבִים שִׁים קָנָךְ Ob 4.

[μὴ διαμασῶ] Ⓢ לֹא תִהְיֶה גִּגְרָן ‘do not become a glutton.’ Ⓢ accords with the second half of (Bb) and the whole of (Bc).

Ⓞ means something substantially different from Ⓜ: “Take a seat as someone selected, and do not snatch in case you are loathed.” In the margin we read: תנעל ואל תגלו תגלע “Eat as a person present and do not ..”²¹

34.17) παῦσαι πρῶτος χάριν παιδείας (20)
καὶ μὴ ἀπληστεύου, μήποτε προσκόψῃς.

¹⁸ Likewise in Christian Palestinian Aramaic, see Sokoloff 2014.406.

¹⁹ According to Accordance Bible it occurs in Si 22 times.

²⁰ This line is found in the margin of the MS.

²¹ With a twofold scribal error at the end of the line: תגלו to be deleted, and תנעל for תגלע. In Segal’s (195) view, נכח is to be emended to נכחך ‘that which is laid before you,’ for which, however, we need אָשָׁר before it, hence a fourth emendation.

*Be the first to stop for the sake of discipline
and keep your appetite under control, in case you commit an offence.*

(B) אֵל תֵּלַע פֶּן תִּמְאַס׃ וְאֵל תֵּלַע פֶּן תִּמְאַס׃

πρώτος] a subject complement. Likewise אֵל תֵּלַע.²²

ἀπληστεύου] a verb derived from πίμπλημι, “to be impossible to become full, i.e. insatiable, greedy.” Is תֵּלַע = תֵּלַע < לִיעַ ‘to swallow’? So Lévi (144).²³

προσκόψης] Προσκοπτω can mean “to stumble,” though such a meaning is unknown prior to LXX. E.g. μὴ προσκόψης (תתקל) ἐν λιθώδεσιν Si 35.20. So אֵל תֵּלַע פֶּן תִּמְאַס׃, but אֵל תֵּלַע פֶּן תִּמְאַס׃. The second clause is absent in א.

34.18) καὶ εἰ ἀνὰ μέσον πλειόνων ἐκάθισας, (21)
πρότερος αὐτῶν μὴ ἐκτείνῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου.

*Even if you sat amongst many
do not stretch your hand out ahead of them.*

(B) וְגַם אִם אָמַר בֵּין רַבִּים יִשְׁבַּת לִפְנֵי רַע אֶל תּוֹשֵׁט יָד׃

ἐκάθισας] א adds אֵל תֵּלַע ‘in order to dine.’

πρότερος] another example of a subject complement; see at the preceding verse, though here we have a comparative case. Likewise in οἱ προφηῆται οἱ γεγονότες πρότεροί μου ‘the prophets who emerged earlier than I’ Je 35.8.

אֵל תֵּלַע: ‘before a fellow guest (אֵל תֵּלַע).’²⁴

αὐτῶν] The selection of the pl. is due to harmonisation with the preceding πλειόνων. So also אֵל תֵּלַע פֶּן תִּמְאַס׃.

34.19) Ὡς ἱκανὸν ἀνθρώπῳ πεπαιδευμένῳ τὸ ὀλίγον, (22)
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀσθμαίνει.

*Since little is sufficient to a well-educated person,
even on his bed he does not breathe hard.*

(B) הֲלֹא דִּי אָנוּשׁ נִבּוֹן מִזְעָר וְעַל יִצְוֵיוּ לֹא יִשְׁיֵק׃

Ὡς] It appears to us best to view this conjunction as causal in force.
πεπαιδευμένῳ] אֵל תֵּלַע ‘righteous.’

²² Cf. SSG § 61 b and SQH § 31 t, j.

²³ Smend (279) mentions Arb. /walaḡa/ ‘to lap’ (of a dog). Such a root is not mentioned as existent in Hebrew or Aramaic: Cohen 7.554a. Margolis (1901.271) mentions an alternative, אֵל תֵּלַע, ‘to swallow.’

²⁴ Scholars refer to a Talmudic passage: שנים שהיו יושבין על שלחן אחד הגדול שבהן שולח יד תחלה ואחר כך הקטן ‘if two are seated at one table, the senior puts his hand out first, and then the junior’ (bDEQ 7.1).

[ישיק] According to Segal (195) this means that your body temperature would not rise. He apparently associates the verb to $\sqrt{\text{סלק}}$ in Aramaic, hence his vocalisation of the form as יִשִּׁיק . The primary meaning of this common Aramaic root is ‘to rise.’ But many things other than your body temperature can rise. Are we familiar with such a specific use of this root in Aramaic? You might be shouting, asking for more food, for instance. By contrast, Smend (280) mentions $\sqrt{\text{שנק}}$ in Targumic Aramaic, in which it is used in Pael in the sense of “to choke, suffocate” but יִשִּׁיק can be only Hifil, i.e. Afel in Aramaic, and would not mean “stöhnen” (II 54), and what about the absence of the *nun*?²⁵ Lévi (144) holds that we have here a form of $\sqrt{\text{שוק}}$ ‘to vomit.’ However, we are not aware of such a root in Hebrew or Aramaic, whether spelled with ש or שׁ .²⁶

In the margin of (B) we note erroneous variants: $\text{נכון מועד .. יצוריו}$.

34.20) ὕπνος ὑγιείας ἐπὶ ἐντέρω μετρίῳ· (24)
 ἀνέστη πρωῖ, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ.
 πόνος ἀγρυπνίας καὶ χολέρας (23)
 καὶ στρόφος μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἀπλήστου·

Sound sleep from moderate eating.

He gets up early and his spirit is with him.

Suffering of insomnia and nausea

and colic are with a man of insatiable (appetite).

(Ba) מכאוב ונדד ישינה וצער ותשניק ופני הפוכות עם איש כסיל:
 (Bb) שנות חיים על קרב צולל וקם בבקר ונפשו אהו:
 (Bc) ש... .. ש נפון ... לין עד בקר ונפשו עמו:

ἐπὶ] With a dat. the value of ἐπί can be causal. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. ἐπί II 6.

ἐντέρω] Ἐντέρον literally means ‘intestines *or* piece of the guts,’ thus an internal organ of human bodies.

Our translator appears to be struggling with the technical jargon not only of agriculture, but also of medicine. ישינה as a verbal noun, “sleep,” occurs in RH.²⁷ The MS itself has a correct, marginal reading: פנים in lieu of פני . S is also very widely different from H and very much shorter.

34.21) καὶ εἰ ἐβιάσθης ἐν ἐδέσμασιν, (25)
 ἀναστάς ἔμεσον πόρρω, καὶ ἀναπαύσῃ.

²⁵ In the following verse we do encounter תשניק .

²⁶ A recent discussion on this form is Reymond 2021.269-71.

²⁷ See Dihi 2008.20. The combination of נדה and שנה occurs not only in BH, but also in BA. E.g. שנתה נדת עלוהי Est 6.1, and שנת המלך Gn 31.40, שנתה מעיני Gn 31.40, and שנתה נדת עלוהי Dn 6.19.

*If you have been forced to take foods,
get up and vomit at a distance, and you should get relief.*

28: ... וַגַּם אֵם ... נו ותמצא נחת: (B)

ἀναστὰς ἔμεσον] which Smend (281) correctly analyses as a rendering of קוּם קוּם in the margin, which, in his view, is to be emended to קוּם קוּם; the second verb is known to BH as meaning “to vomit.”

Ziegler has opted for ἀναστὰς as against ἀνάστα of the overwhelming majority of the MSS including S^h. In SG there are plenty of instances of two verbs of the same inflexional category juxtaposed without any coordinating conjunction. E.g. Ἀνάστα φάγε 3K 19.7 (= **Ⓜ**) vs. Ἀνάστηθι καὶ (om. **Ⓜ**) φάγε 19.5. For a discussion with more examples, see *SSG* § 82, and, on an analogous phenomenon in Hebrew, *SQH* § 38 a-b.

34.22) ἄκουσόν μου, τέκνον, καὶ μὴ ἐξουδενώσης με, (26)
καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων εὐρήσεις τοὺς λόγους μου·
ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ἐντρεχῆς, (27)
καὶ πᾶν ἄρρώστημα οὐ μὴ σοι ἀπαντήσῃ.

*Listen to me, child, and you should not disregard me,
in the end you would find my words (right).
In all that you do become skilful,
then no illness whatsoever would befall you.*

(Ba1) שמע בני ואל תבוז לי ובאחרית תשיג אמרי
(Ba2) שמע בני וקה מוסרי ואל תלעיג עלי ובאחרית תמצא דברי
(Bb) בכל מעשיך היה צנוע וכל אסון לא יגע בך

ἐξουδενώσης] There is a frequent alteration between four synonymous verbs: ἐξουδενέω, ἐξουδενόω, ἐξουθενέω, ἐξουθενόω. Here, too, a good number of MSS opt for the -θεν- variant, and one for -δεν- variant.

Our *Index* mentions this instance as the only example of the equation between **הִלְעִיג**²⁹ and any of the above-mentioned four variants of the Gk verb, although the latter is not a very accurate rendering. Nor is **תְּבַסֵּר** ‘you despise,’ unless its Heb. *Vorlage* read תבוז.

וְקִבַּל מְלִי missing in **Ⓞ**, but present in **Ⓢ** with **וְקִבַּל מְלִי**.

εὐρήσεις τοὺς λόγους μου] = תמצא דברי (Ba2) for (Ba1) תשיג אמרי ‘you would grasp what my words mean’(?).

²⁸ In BSH there is a doublet, which comes below vs. 22 and forms the second half of the line, the first half being identical with the first clause of vs. 19: וַגַּם אֵם נֹאנְסָתָה בַּמַּטְעָמִים קָהָה. The last clause beginning with קָהָה is found in the margin.

²⁹ Qal **תִּלְעַג** is once rendered with this verb. In the margin of (B) we read **תִּלְעַג**. Is this meant to be Qal **תִּלְעַג** or Hi. **תִּלְעַג**? Van Peursen (2004.83) is of the view that the form was intended as Qal.

έντρεχίς] cf. **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 ‘humble,’ **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 ‘proper,’ and **𐤒** *velox*. **𐤒** is closest to **𐤒**.

34.23) λαμπρὸν ἐπ’ ἄρτοις εὐλογήσει χεῖλη, (28)
καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία τῆς καλλονῆς αὐτοῦ πιστή.

*(People’s) lips would bless a person generous (in handing out) foods
and the report on his kind spirit is credible.*

(B) טוב על לחם תברך שפה עדות טובו נאמנה:

λαμπρὸν] As we can easily understand between the derivational affinity between this adjective, λαμπρός, and λάμπω ‘to emit light’ or λαμπάς ‘torch,’ its primary meaning has to do with shining light as in φῶς λαμπρὸν λάμπει ‘a bright light will shine’ To 13.11 **𐤒**^{II}. One of its metaphorical senses, “generous, munificent, liberal,” is already known to CG, cf. LSJ s.v. II 2. Though *GELS* s.v. mentions only our Si passage under this sense, we believe its description is justifiable.³⁰ **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 of **𐤒** indicates the penetration into Syriac of this typically idiomatic Hebrew phrase. See also **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 (𐤒 𐤒𐤓𐤓) Si 14.3. The translators of both **𐤒** and **𐤒** were probably thinking of this Heb. idiom, for both λαμπρός and טוב are not that specific, but cover a wider range of semantic domains.

34.24) πονηρῶ ἐπ’ ἄρτω διαγογγύσει πόλις, (29)
καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία τῆς πονηρίας αὐτοῦ ἀκριβής.

*Townfolk would grumble against a miser over food
and the report on his miserliness is accurate.*

(B) רע על לחם ירגו בשער רעת רועו נאמנה:
... (F) בשער

διαγογγύσει] In view of **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 Dt 1.27 > καὶ διεγογγύζετε ἐν ταῖς σκηναῖς ὑμῶν we had better restore **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 instead of **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓.³¹

ἡ μαρτυρία] What we see in the margin, **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓, is certainly correct.

ἀκριβής] // πιστή in vs. 23, a clear example of stylistic variation.

We agree with Segal (199) that here it is not about a good guest vs. a bad guest, as Smend (282) maintains, for a bad guest arousing the whole town up against him is unlikely to be on the mind of Ben Sira.

34.25) Ἐν οἴνῳ μὴ ἀνδρίζου· (30)
πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀπώλεσεν ὁ οἶνος.

³⁰ So also LEH. We are thus not satisfied with “.. der sich bei Broten prächtig (benimmt)” (*SD*).

³¹ Segal (199) refers to bNid 16.2, where a rabbi discussing this text mentions the existence of two different readings, **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓 and **𐤒** 𐤒𐤓𐤓.

*With wine do not be a macho,³²
for wine ruined many.*

וגם על היין אל תתגבר (B) כי רבים הכשיל תירוש:
... (F) תתגבר ... רבים

[Not only our author, but also his grandson would have known that not only new, fresh wine (תירוש), but also old wine could be risky. The translator then did not think it necessary to differentiate between them. For that matter we ourselves do not know if there is a special Gk word to indicate fresh wine, one word, and not something like οἶνος νέος.³³ Strangely, with עתיקא ‘old’ ש also appears to be struggling.

34.26) κάμινος δοκιμάζει στόμωμα ἐν βαφῆ, (31)
οὕτως οἶνος καρδίας ἐν μάχῃ ὑπερηφάνων.

*A furnace tests steel by dipping (it) in water
so does wine (test) hearts in a battle of the arrogant.*

כור בוחן מעשה לוטש³⁴ (B) כן היין למצות לצים:
גבון בוחן מעשה מעשה (B*) כן שכר לריב לצים:
.....מעשה לוטש (F) כן היין למצות לצים:

Once again our Gk translator appears to be struggling hard. In 𐤇 there is absolutely nothing that would justify his selection of βαφή. For לוטש is an artisan who sharpens metal. He probably selected water as a liquid counterpart of wine being used for testing in the second clause.

The first half of the variant text, (B*), is quite distinct from its counterpart in (B): “a prudent person tests every single deed³⁵” as against “an oven tests the work of a blacksmith.”

Smend (283) assigns temporal value to the preposition ל־ in למצות and לריב, thus “beim Zank” (II 54). Alternatively, it could be instrumental, indicating a piece of weapon.

34.27) ἔφισον ζωῆς οἶνος ἀνθρώποις, (32)
ἐὰν πίνῃς αὐτὸν ἐν μέτρῳ αὐτοῦ.
τίς ζωῆ ἐλασσομένῳ οἶνω; (33)
καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκτισται εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς. (35)

³² So NETS.

³³ The Hatch - Redpath *Index* compiled by Dos Santos indicates that οἶνος translates יין 131 times, and תירוש 36 times. E.g. יין ותירוש ויין οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα Ho 4.11, where in Modern Greek we read οἶνος καὶ μέθη. Μέθυσμα is unknown prior to LXX.

³⁴ בִּיתָן in the margin for בוחן must be a scribal error.

³⁵ Lévi (148) holds that the second מעשה is either a dittography of the preceding מעשה or a Pi. ptc. in the same sense. We have never heard of Pi. עשה.

*Wine has the same value as people's life
if you drink it in a modest quantity.*

What is life when wine is running out?

Besides, it was created for enjoyment right at the beginning.

אם ישתנו במתכונתו:	למי היין חיים לאנוש	(Ba)
שהוא מראשית לשמחה נוצר: ³⁶	מה חיים הסר היין	(Bb)
והוא לגיל נחלק מראש:	חיי מה לחסר תירוש	(Bb*)
אם ישתנו חיים לאנוש	(Fa)
שהוא מראשית ... :	.. חיים חסר היין	(Fb)
והוא לגיל	חיים למה יחסר תירוש	(Fb*)

[ἔφισον] This is not being used as a predicative adjective, as shown by its gender, n. and not ἔφισος in agreement with οἶνος. It is substantivised: “something that has the value of life.” Though subtle, it differs from ἔφισος in *Mē ēgkataλίπης φίλον ἀρχαῖον, ὁ γὰρ πρόσφατος οὐκ ἔστιν ἔφισος αὐτῷ* ‘Do not abandon an old friend, for one not well-known yet is no equal of his’ *Si* 9.10.

[ἐλασσομένου οἶνον] The preposition ל־ appears to have dropped out inadvertently from להסר.³⁷ חסר is most likely in the st. cst., חסר, and its referent is personal, “one for whom wine is running out,”³⁸ but the translator wrongly analysed it as attributive, יין חסר. His error may be due to an error in *℣*, which should have read היין חסרי היין, i.e. חסרי. *℣* also appears to have struggled: וּמָנָא אָנוּן חַיָּיהָ: ‘wine is for people like fresh, living water’ = כּמִים חַיִּים הַיַּיִן לְאַנוּשׁ.³⁹ Note also the first clause of (Bb) in *℣*: וּמָנָא אָנוּן חַיָּיהָ: דְּחַסְרֵי חַמְרָא, which can mean only “What is life of him for whom wine is lacking?” or “What is his life ..?” with “his” referring back to (Ba), but חסרי cannot have חַיָּיהָ, a pl. noun, as its subject.

In contrast to the interrogative מה in (Bb) and its variant (Bb*) does not present any serious difficulty, so it has been rendered with τίς, but מי in (Ba) is a headache, and has been dropped by our translator.⁴⁰

[καὶ] which we construe with the following clause as a whole, and not with αὐτὸς alone; the clause makes an additional remark on the *raison d’être* of wine. There appears to be general consent to take αὐτὸς as referring to wine, not mankind. In “Und er ist ja geschaffen zum Frohen für die Menschen”

³⁶ In the margin we see נוצרו. The pl. number may be an illogical attempt to harmonise יין with חיים.

³⁷ Lévi supplies ב־, thus בחסר, i.e. בחסר ‘with the lack of.’

³⁸ So understood by *℣* in spite of *℣*: אֵילִין חַיָּא לְדַבְצִיר מִן חַמְרָא: ‘what sort of life is there for one who is running out of wine?’.

³⁹ Di Lella (1988.231) would read למו as a poetic equivalent to ל־, postulating a graphic fluctuation between *yod* and *waw*.

⁴⁰ Lévi (148) offers, with a measure of hesitation, a literal translation: “À qui le vin est-il vie (ou santé)? À l’homme.”

(Ryssel 389) the addition of “für die Menschen” makes it plain. One could think of a number of relevant biblical statements, e.g. **יִין יִשְׂמַח לְבַב־אָנוּשׁ** Ps 104.15, also Jd 9.13 and Ec 10.19. See also **וְהוּ אֶתְבְּרִי לְחַדוֹתָא** here: **וְהוּ אֶתְבְּרִי לְחַדוֹתָא** ‘and it was created for joy for human beings.’

On **חַלַּח** as a synonym of **בְּרָא**, see above at 10.18.

34.28) ἀγαλλίαμα καρδίας καὶ εὐφροσύνη ψυχῆς (36)
οἶνος πινόμενος ἐν καιρῷ αὐτάρκῆς·

Joy of heart and delight of soul

is wine supplied to be drunk at the right moment.

(B) שמחת לב וששון ועדוי יין נשתה בְּעֵתוֹ וראי:

(F) לב וששון ועדוי יין נשתה ב....:

ψυχῆς] If the Heb. *Vorlage*⁴¹ read **עֲדוֹן** = RH **עֲדוֹן** ‘delight,’ the translator may have thought that there are enough synonyms for ‘joy’ in this short clause and decided to attempt free translation. Cf. also **חַדוֹתָא דְּלֵבָא וְתַפְנִיקָא וְעֲדָנָא** here: **חַדוֹתָא דְּלֵבָא וְתַפְנִיקָא וְעֲדָנָא** ‘joy of heart and pleasures and good times.’

34.29) πικρία ψυχῆς οἶνος πινόμενος πολὺς (39)
ἐν ἐρεθισμῷ καὶ ἀντιπτώματι.

*One’s soul feels bitter when wine is drunk too much
in irritation and quarrel.*

(B) כאב ראש לענה וקלון יין נשתה בתחרה וכעס:

(F) כאב ראש לענה ורוש יין נשתה בתחרה וכעס:

[לענה וקלון] Missing in **Ⓞ**. Here again we have three synonyms piled up. **Ⓢ** has three nouns one after another, but not all synonyms: **כָּאֲבָא וְמִסְכְּנִיתָא וְכָאֲבָא** ‘pain and poverty and headache.’ Lévi (150) is of the opinion that the second word reflects **רָאשׁ**, so that **ראש** has been translated in **Ⓢ** twice. MS F reads **רוש**. By contrast, in the second hemistich, one of two synonyms has been dropped: **חַמְרָא דְּמִשְׁתָּתָא בְּחֶרְיָנָא** ‘the wine that is drunk in a quarrel.’

34.30) πλῆθύνει μέθη θυμὸν ἄφρονος εἰς πρόσκομμα (40)
ἐλαττῶν ἰσχὺν καὶ προσποιῶν τραύματα.

*Drunkenness increases the anger of a silly person, making him stumble
decreasing (his) strength and adding to injuries.*

(B) מַרְבָּה חֲמַר לְכַסִּיל מוֹקֵשׁ מַחְסֵר כַּח וּמִסְפֵּק פִּצְעַ:

(F) מַרְבָּה חֲמַר לְכַסִּיל נוֹקֵשׁ מַחְסֵר כַּח וּמִסְפִּיק פִּצְעַ:

⁴¹ MS F reads the same as MS B.

μέθη] The selection of this word instead of οἶνος is commendable, since earlier the author said not a little in stressing the values of wine. On the other hand, *הַמֶּר* is an etymological counterpart of Aram. *חמר*, which is a standard equivalent of Heb. *יין* and carries on its own no pejorative nuance.

מֶרֶק occurs in BH a mere twice as a poetic equivalent of *יין*: Dt 32.14 and Is 27.2. Its use here is not poetic in particular, but indicative of the intrusion of Aramaic into the contemporary Hebrew. Ben Sira uses it once more: 37.27.

πρόσκομμα] In the margin we see *שׁוֹקֵשׁ* for *מוֹקֵשׁ*.⁴² It is unacceptable, because a direct object required by *מִרְבָּה* cannot be a victim, “stumbler,” but a consequence, “stumbling.”⁴³ Hence *שׁ* and *שׁוֹ*’s *תִּקְלָתָא* ‘stumbling’ is correct.

MS F reads all the letters in (B) with a stroke above them securely. Two words are spelled slightly differently: *שׁוֹקֵשׁ* for *מוֹקֵשׁ*, and *מַסְפִּיק* for *מַסְפֵּק*. In the latter pair of Pi. and Hi. there is not much semantic difference in MH – ‘to furnish, provide what is needed,’ though the notion of abundant supply is not there. The aspect of plena / defectiva spelling is a question of its own.

- 34.31) ἐν συμποσίῳ οἴνου μὴ ἐλέγξῃς τὸν πλησίον (41)
καὶ μὴ ἐξουδενώσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ·
λόγον ὀνειδισμοῦ μὴ εἴπῃς αὐτῷ (42)
καὶ μὴ αὐτὸν θλίψῃς ἐν ἀπαιτήσῃ.

*At a drinking party do not blame your neighbour
nor despise him when he is in a cheerful mood.*

*Do not say a critical word to him
nor harass him avenging.*

במשתה היין ל... רע ו... ל... (Ba)
דבר חרפה אל... (Bb)

The concluding clause in *שׁ* reads: *וְלֹא תִצָּא עִמָּה לְעֵין בְּנֵי אַנְשָׁא* ‘and do not quarrel with him in front of people.’ In the margin of the Heb. MS (B) we read *עֲמֹ לְעֵינֵי בְנֵי אָדָם*, which agrees with *שׁ*, but substantially differs from *שׁ*.

Furthermore, the margin reads *תחרפהו*, which reflects *ἐξουδενώσῃς αὐτὸν. λόγον ὀνειδισμοῦ*] = (Bb) *דבר חרפה*, i.e. *דְּבַר חֲרָפָה*.

⁴² The marginal gloss is what we find in MS F.

⁴³ *Pace Lévi* (151) there is no need to correct *מרבה* to *הרבה*, i.e. *הַרְבֵּה* as in his translation: “l’abondance du vin.” As shown by *עֲבָדָת*, *שׁ* offers a slightly free translation with *סְגִיאֹתָא* *תִּקְלָתָא* *עֲבָדָת* *עֲבָדָת* *דְּחַמְרָא* ‘the large quantity of wine caused the fool to stumble.’ The ptc. *מחסר* stands morphologically in antonymic parallelism to *מרבח*.

MS F provides us a much better picture:

במשתה יין אל תוכח רַע ואל תוֹנֶהוּ בחדותו: (Fa)
 דבר חרפה אל תאמר לו ואל תקמיעהו בנגשה ואל תריב (Fb)
 עמו לעיני כל אדם:

ἐξουθενώσης αὐτὸν] (Fa) תוֹנֶהוּ, i.e. תוֹנֶהוּ. The Hi. verb הוֹנָה ‘to cause grief or sorrow’ is well established in BH. Cf. § תְּהַרְיֵהוּ ‘you harm him.’

[חדותו] On the position of the noun חדוה in Hebrew and cognate languages, see Dihi 2013.32-39.

θλίψης] Di Lella (1988.232) says that the verb קמע is an Aramaism, though no such verb in the sense of “to squeeze” is found in Aramaic.⁴⁴ It is, however, known to MH. נגשה here might be a defectiva spelling for נְגִישָׁה⁴⁵ ‘pressurising,’ though synonymous with the main verb. Cf. Mopsik’s (190) rendering: “Ne te lie pas à lui en entrant en conflit.”

The last clause of (Fb) is preserved in § quoted above.

⁴⁴ Maybe “Arabism” is meant. Arabic knows a verb *qama’a* ‘to curb, suppress.’ For a discussion of relevant data in Heb. and Arm., see Kister 1990.336f. and Dihi 2013.39-43.

⁴⁵ Dihi (2013.44, fn. 69) conjectures either נְגִישָׁה or נְגִישָׁה.

CHAPTER 35 (32)

35.1) Ἠγούμενόν σε κατέστησαν, μὴ ἐπαίρου·
 γίνου ἐν αὐτοῖς ὡς εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν,
 φρόντισον αὐτῶν καὶ οὕτω κάθισον· (2)

*If you have been elected as supervisor, do not put on airs.
 Become among them as one of them,
 give thought to them, and recline in that way.*

(B) היה להם כאחד מהם דאג להם ואחר תסוב:
 (Fa) ראש סמוך אל תותר ובראש עשירים אל תסתורה והיה לך כאחד מהם:
 (Fb) דאג להם ואחר תסוב:

A whole line must have been lost at the start of MS B. There must be people mentioned there to whom αὐτοῖς and αὐτῶν refer to. S reads there: **כְּרִבְּא אֶקְיִמוּךָ לְא תְּתַרְיִם וּבְרִישׁ עֲתִירָא לְא תְּסַתְּמָךְ** ‘they appointed you as a chief. Do not get puffed up and at the head of the rich do not recline.’ MS F is not easy of analysis at a number of points. Does the first clause mean something like “Do not be there as a supported, served guest till the end”? What about the verb תסתור? לך looks like an error for להם as found in (B).

[תסוב This reminds us of **פֹּה לֹא־נִסְבַּ עַד־בָּאוּ** 1Sm 16.11, where **κατακλιθῶμεν** (*L ἀνακλιθῶμεν*) ‘to lie down’ is to be noted. Whereas this example has been much debated, S applied it to people having a meal.¹ Note an analogous use of this verb in RH in both Qal, Pi., Hi., and Ho., see Jastrow s.v.

[תסתורה (Fa)] Di Lella (1988.232) does not know how to analyse and interpret this. Neither do we.

35.2) καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χρεῖαν σου ποιήσας ἀνάπεσε,
 ἵνα εὐφρανθῆς δι’ αὐτοῦς (3)
 καὶ εὐκοσμίας χάριν λάβῃς στέφανον.

*After having done all your duties, recline
 so that you could rejoice on account of them
 and over your decent conduct receive a crown.*

(Ba) הכין צרכם ואחר תרביץ:
 (Bb) למען תשמח בכבודם ועל מוסר תשא שכל:
 (Fa) הבו צרכם ובכנ תרביץ:
 (Fb) למען תשמח בכבודם ועל מוסר תשא שכל:

¹ So also Rashi and Radaq. Cf. Driver 1913.134. Both forms are used quite a few times in this sense in NTG, see BDAG s.vv.

τὴν χρείαν σου] \mathfrak{H} B and F צרכם ‘their need,’ i.e. ‘services for them to be provided by you.’

ποιήσας] (Ba) הכין ‘Prepare’ // (Fa) הבו ‘Give, i.e. provide.’ The selection of the aor. ptc. renders “and then” almost redundant. בָּכָן (Fa) and in the margin of (Ba) in the sense of “and then” is typical of LBH, e.g. וּבָכָן אָבוּא וְאֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ καὶ τότε εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Es 4.16 o’.

δι’ αὐτοῦς] = בעבורם, i.e. בַּעֲבוּרָם?

εὐκοσμίας] מוסר On this strange equation, cf. Wagner 1999.212f.

στέφανον] Segal (202) holds that שָׁכַל here is synonymous with הָן, though such a meaning of the word is unknown to us.

35.3) Λάλησον, πρεσβύτερε, πρέπει γάρ σοι, (4)
ἐν ἀκριβεῖ ἐπιστήμῃ, καὶ μὴ ἐμποδίσης μουσικά. (5)

*Dear elder, speak, for it befits you,
but with precise knowledge, and do not shut musical entertainments out.*

(B) מלל שב כי הוא לך והצנע שכל ואל תמנע שיר:
(F) מלל שבט הוא לך והצנע שכל ואל תמנע שיר:

שב] a scribal error for (B) שב, i.e. שָׁב.

ἐν ἀκριβεῖ ἐπιστήμῃ] slightly different from הצנע שכל, = ‘not showing off your knowledge (?).’ לכת, a marginal gloss for שכל, must be an allusion to הַצְנַע לְכַת Mi 6.8, so Lévi (153).

35.4) ὅπου ἀκρόαμα, μὴ ἐκχέης λαλιὰν (6)
καὶ ἀκαίρως μὴ σοφίζου.

*Where entertainment is going on, do not keep up your talk,
and do not show off your knowledge at wrong moments.*

(B) במקום היין אל תשפך שיה
(B*) ובלא מזמר מה תשפך שיה ובל עת מה תתחכם:
(F) במקום שכל אל תשפך שיה ובלא מזמור אל שיה תשפך:

In \mathfrak{H} the first hemistich appears to be represented through two variant texts, \mathfrak{G} being closer to (B).

ὅπου] Neither \mathfrak{G} nor \mathfrak{S} בַּאֲתָרָא דְּ, has interpreted במקום, i.e. בְּמָקוֹם in the sense of “instead of.”

ἀκρόαμα] a word that in CG denotes what one enjoys through hearing as in καὶ θεάματα καὶ ἀκροάματα ἡδιστα παρέχεις ‘you are offering us very delightful sights and sounds’ Xen. *Symp.* 2.2, said by a guest after two youths played musical instruments.²

² Taylor - Schechter (III 56) state that \mathfrak{G} reflects here במ’ האיוין, but the use of inf. cst. to modify a noun is rather rare, cf. *SQH* § 30.

Pace Wagner (1999.145f.) the Gk word here is scarcely to be linked with היין.

ἐκχέεις] Whilst both Heb. עָרַךְ and Gk (ἐκ)χέω occasionally take as their respective *o* a non-liquid object, their selection in this particular case is felicitous in harmony with wine. E.g. ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐκχέω ὡς ὕδωρ τὸ ὄρημα μου < עָרַךְ תִּי > כְּמִים עָרַךְ תִּי Ho 5.10, where *like water* is to be noted.

καὶ ἀκαίρως] **S**, an unconditional ban.

מה .. מה] The interrogative word, in both cases, could be taken, with some difficulty, as introducing a rhetorical question, “How?”. However, both **G** and **S** have identified two negative clauses. In (F) we read אל in lieu of מה¹. Since the context implies negation, we might have here to do with מה used in BH in a rhetorical question anticipating a negative answer as in מה־לִּי וְלְכֶם ‘what interest do we share with one another? [Nothing at all]’ 2Sm 16.10.³ Besides, in both cases מה can be analysed as an object: “What could you pour out as a talk? ..”⁴

ἀκαίρως] No instance of < בַּל + noun > is known in Hebrew. However, בלא is well-known, e.g. בָּנָה בֵּיתוֹ בְּלֹא־צָדֵק Je 22.13. A more important example is בְּלֹא עֵתָךְ ‘when it is not your time’ Ec 7.17.⁵ We could then postulate either a defective spelling for בל, i.e. בַּל, or a scribal error for בלא.⁶

On the unusual position of the negator in (F) אל שיה, cf. Rey 2015.173.

35.5) σφραγίς ἄνθρακος ἐπὶ κόσμῳ χρυσῷ (7)

σύγκριμα μουσαῶν ἐν στυμπασίῳ οἴνου·

A signet ring of ruby with a golden ornament,

a musical concert in a wine-drinking party.

שיר אל על משתה היין:	כחותם על כיס זהב	(Ba)
משפט שיר על משתה היין:	כומו אודם על ניב זהב	(Bb)
כך נאים דברים יפים על משתה היין:	כרביד זהב ובו נפך וספיר	(Bc)
שירת אל על משתה היין:	כחותם על כיס זהב	(Fa)
משפט שיר על משתה היין: ⁷	כומו אדם על טס זהוב	(Fb)

A number of discrepancies between **G** and **F** are to be noted:

ἄνθρακος] Nothing that would reflect this noun, ἄνθραξ, is to be found in (B) nor in (F).

κόσμῳ] כיס ‘bag, purse’ is more specific than κόσμος. (Fb) reads טס instead, which is, according to Di Lella (1988.233), an Aramaism.

³ For more examples, see BDB s.v. מָה d.

⁴ Smend (287), without addressing this syntactic and lexicographical issue, dismisses מה² as an intrusion of מה³, and translates (II 55) both clauses as negative as in **G**.

⁵ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. לֹא 4 a.

⁶ See also Smend 287. **S**'s בְּכָל עֵדֶן reflects another likely scribal error, i.e. בְּכָל עֵת.

⁷ Emend זהוב in (F2) to זהב, i.e. זָהָב.

σύγκριμα μουσικῶν] ≠ שיר אל ‘music of God’ [or: ‘divine music,’ or: ‘music of praise of God’], cf. the second hemistich of **ס**: הַכְּנָא הִי תְשִׁבוּחָתָא : דְּאֵלֵהָא עַל מְשִׁתָּיָא דְחִמְרָא ‘so is the divine praise on a wine party.’⁸

(B2) and (B3) are totally lacking in **ס**. (B2) looks like a variant on (B1). To a lesser extent is (B3).

(F) represents a conflation of (B1) and (B2).

35.6) ἐν κατασκευάσματι χρυσῶ σφραγίς σμαράγδου (8)
μέλος μουσικῶν ἐφ’ ἠδεῖ οἶνω.

*A musical melody accompanied with sweet wine is
a seal of emerald among golden furniture.*

(B) מלואות פז וחותרם ברקת קול מזמור על נועם תירוש:
(F) כדביר זהב בו נופך וספיר נואי דברים על מש' היין:
(F*) כלי מלא פז וחותרם ברקת קול מזמור על נועם תירוש:

μέλος μουσικῶν] Music has totally disappeared from **ס**: מְלָא שְׁפִירְתָּא עַל : מְשִׁתָּיָא דְחִמְרָא ‘delightful words accompanied by wine drinking.’ Likewise in (F).

[מלואות] known to BH in e.g. מְלֵאֹת אֶבֶן ‘precious stones’ Ex 28.17, where also σμάραγδος is mentioned. There is a marginal gloss: מלא, and cf. כלי מלא ‘a vessel full of’ (F*).

[דביר (F)] a scribal error for רביד, as pointed out by Di Lella (1988.233f.).⁹ See also vs. 5 in (B3). Cf. וַיִּשֶׁם רְבֵד הַזֶּהב עַל־צִנְאוֹרוֹ Gn 41.42.

‘מש’ = משתה, i.e. מְשִׁתָּא.

[נואי] synonymous with נועם (B) and a variant spelling of נוי as in אַל תִּתֵּן נֹי ‘Do not direct your eyes to (their) beauty’ mTaan 4.8. In (B3) we read נאים.

35.7) Λάλησον, νεανίσκα, εἰ χρεία σου, (10)
μόλις δις ἂν ἐπερωτηθῆς· (11)

*Speak, lad, if you need,
but twice at most if you are asked to.*

(B) דבר נער אם צריך אתה בחזק פעמים ושלש אם ישאלך:
(F) דבר נער צורך אותך פעמים ושלש אם ישאלך:

[μόλις] a good rendering of בחזק, though we are not aware of this use of בְּחִזְק elsewhere in Hebrew. Smend (288) suggests an alternative analysis,

⁸ Only at the level of “folk-etymology” one could go along with Lévi (154), who views σύγκριμα as “la traduction parfaite de משפט.” For Smend’s “der kunstgerechte Gesang” we would rather anticipate שיר משפט. Possibly an inadvertent, erroneous reversal.

⁹ Beentjes (1993.181) retains the MS reading, assigning it the meaning “a backroom [of the temple],” but what “gold of a backroom of the temple” is supposed to mean?

namely construing it with צריך: “durchaus” (II 55). We are not aware of any instance of such a usage of כחזק elsewhere in Hebrew. Smend further construes μόλις forwards, but we see no reason why פעמים ושלש should not be construed backwards with דבר.

צורך איתך (F)] Anomalous in Hebrew. Is it a scribal error for צורך איתך, i.e. צורך איתך ‘there is a need with you’? Besides, we would prefer σοι, a v.l. preserved by several MSS, and not σου.

ישאלך = ישאלך or a defectiva spelling for ישאלוך? Both would be impersonal: “if one asks you.”

35.8) κεφαλαίωσον λόγον, ἐν ὀλίγοις πολλά· (12)
γίνου ὡς γινώσκων καὶ ἅμα σιωπῶν.

Summarise what you say, much but with few words.

Show that you know, but at the same time be not talkative.

(B) כל לאמר ומעט הרבה ודמה ליודע ומחריש יחדו:

κεφαλαίωσον] Lévi (154) כלל אמר, which he claims is supported by Ⓞ.¹⁰ However, we do not know of an instance in which the Heb. verb means “to summarise.”¹¹ We would rather suggest reading כל as an alternative spelling for כלה, i.e. כלה.¹² The advice is to finish speaking at an appropriate point and not going on and on.

ἐν ὀλίγοις πολλά] The translator probably read the two words as adjectives, but the first can be read as Pi. impv., i.e. מְעַט הַרְבֵּה ‘Reduce data that you may have in plenty.’ We could go on a step farther and parse דמה also as impv. (Qal).¹³

35.9) ἐν μέσῳ μεγιστάνων μὴ ἐξουισιάζου (13)
καὶ ὄπου γέροντες μὴ πολλὰ ἀδολέσχει.

*In the midst of important people do not show your authority off
and where elderly people are present, do not chatter too much.*

(B) בין זקנים אל תקומם ושרים אל תרב לטרד:

We read earlier a proverb similar to the second hemistich: μὴ ἀδολέσχει ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων 7.14. In addition to the parallel זקנים here, שרים is very likely an error for שבים, i.e. שבים.

לטרד] This Qal verb in the sense of ‘to make weary’ is well known to MH; a chatterbox could easily become a tiresome nuisance for old people.

¹⁰ Epigraphically there appears to be enough blank space between the two *lameds*.

¹¹ Smend (288), without quoting an example, writes: “כלל bedeutet neuhebr. freilich im Kal = zusammenfassen.”

¹² Cf. JM § 79 j.

¹³ In this parsing of the three verbs, we agree with Segal (198).

35.10) πρὸ βροντῆς κατασπεύδει ἀστραπή, (14)
καὶ πρὸ αἰσχυνηροῦ προελεύσεται χάρις.

*A lightning speeds before a thunder,
and a welcome would go before a modest person.*

(B) לפני ברד ינצה ברק ולפני דכא ינצה חן:
(B*) לפני ברד ינצה ברק ולפני בושי חן:

[κατασπεύδει] Has the Heb. verb, נָצַח, been taken in the sense of “to proceed up front and give leadership”? Leadership is no semantic ingredient of κατασπεύδω. Kister (1999.161) mentions Syr. נָצַח ‘to flash,’ which fits here ⲛ and in two other instances of the same verb root at 43.5 and 43.13.

[בושי] morphologically anomalous. BSH (104a) parses the form as Qal ptc., for which the standard form is בוש as in והיית בוש באמת Si 41.17 and בושים Ez 32.20. Is בושי here an error for בושים? But (B) reads דכא, sg. Or an error for בוש? ¹⁴ The pl. cst. is implausible in the light of the parallelism in this verse.

35.11) ἐν ὥρᾳ ἐξεγείρου καὶ μὴ οὐράγει, (15)
ἀπότερχε εἰς οἶκον καὶ μὴ ῥαθῦμει·

*At a right moment get up and do not be the last to leave.
Head for home and do not hang round.*

(B) בעת מפקד אל תתאחר פטר לביתך ושלם רצון:
(B*) פטר ל..ך ושלם רצון:
(F) פטר לביתך ושלם רצון:

The message in Ⲛ looks like rather differently conveyed: בַּעֲדָנָא דְפְתוּרָא לֵא תִסְנֵא לְמִמְלֵלוּ וְעַד אֵית בְּךָ עוֹהֲדָנָא פְטֵר לְבִיתְךָ ‘at the time of a banquet do not talk too much and whilst you still remember (when to leave), head home!’ . It actually represents a rendering of the text as preserved in (Ba) of the next verse.

[ἐξεγείρου] can be only a free rendering of מִפְקֵד. This Heb. word, מִפְקֵד, is used in the sense of “appointed place” as in Ez 43.21. It could be extended to “appointed time agreed beforehand.” ¹⁵

We know that in BH Ni. נִפְקֵד often means “to be absent, missing,” but to say as Segal (203) does that מִפְקֵד here means “withdrawal (from a banquet)” appears to us to be going a shade too far.

¹⁴ Smend (290) mentions a suggestion made by Bacher: בושי as a wrong abbreviation of בוש ינצה.

¹⁵ בעת מִפְקֵד “au temps prescrit” (Lévi 156) is unlikely, since עת is feminine of gender. Schechter - Taylor (III 57), referring to וּשְׂרָפוּ בְּמִפְקֵד הַבַּיִת Ez 43.21, suggests “in the appointed time,” but in the cited text we do not have בְּבַיִת הַמִּפְקֵד.

ἀπότρεχε] In BH the verb פטר in Qal is normally transitive. A case of its use as an intransitive verb is וַיִּפְטֹר מִפְּנֵי שְׂאוּל 1Sm 19.10. In MH Ni. נפטר is used for that purpose.

μη ῥαθῦμαι] One wonders how שׁו has arrived at לֹא תִבְסֹר ‘Do not despise!’. For that matter this Gk text is not found in any of the extant Hebrew manuscripts. It is possibly an addition freely made by the translator.

35.12) ἐκεῖ παῖζε καὶ ποίει τὰ ἐνθυμήματά σου (16)

καὶ μὴ ἀμάρτησιν λόγῳ ὑπερηφάνῳ.

*Have fun there and do what you care to do
but do not sin with any word of arrogance.*

בעת שלחן אל תרבה דברים ואם עולה על לבך דבר: (Ba)

ביראת אל ולא בחסר כל: (Bb)

ביראת (F)

ἐκεῖ παῖζε] looks like a free addition made by the translator. By contrast, what follows is a rendering of the end of the preceding verse: ושלם רצון. ושלם could represent שָׁלַם, Pi. impv. as in וְשָׁלַם אֶת־הַקֵּיַת 1Kg 9.25. A better alternative is to postulate a scribal error for השלם = הַשָּׁלַם, Hi. impv. This latter option is attractive in the light of וְכָל־הַפְּצֵי יְשָׁלַם Is 44.28, where a synonym of רָצוֹן, i.e. חָפֵץ, functions as a direct object of the verb. Cf. שׁ: וְעַבְדְּ צָבִינָךְ בְּדַחְלֹתַי דְּאֵלֶיךָ וְלֹא בַחֹסְרֵיךָ ‘and do what you desire with the fear of God and with nothing lacking,’ the latter part of which is a sequel to that which has been mentioned under the preceding verse and carries on to (Bb) of the present verse.

On (Ba) see under the preceding verse, but it is absent from Ⓞ. Also absent from Ⓞ is (Bb).

35.13) καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις εὐλόγησον τὸν ποιήσαντά σε (17)

καὶ μεθύσκοντά σε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῦ.

*And about these matters bless the One who made you
and allows you to drink out of His precious things.*

וּשְׁלַל כָּל אֱלֹהֵי בְרַךְ עוֹשֵׁךְ הַמְרוּךְ מִטוֹבוֹתוֹ: (B)

וּשְׁלַל כָּל אֱלֹהֵי בְרַךְ עוֹשֵׁךְ הַמְרוּךְ מִטוֹבָתוֹ: (F)

ἐπὶ τούτοις] 𐤀 “*super his omnibus*” and “*außerdem preise den ..*” (SD) represent an alternative understanding of the preposition, i.e. addition, “on top of, beside.” Heb. על may carry such a force as in וַיִּקַּח אֶת־מַחְלַת בְּתִישְׁמַעְיָאֵל וְלֹאֲשָׁה בֶן־אֲבִרְהָם אֲחֹות נְבוֹיֹת עַל־נְשָׁיו לוֹ לְאִשָּׁה Gn 28.9; more examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. על 4 b. It is also known to indicate a ground or cause for an action

as in **וַיְבָרַךְ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ עַל־הָאָרֶץ הַטְּבָה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן־לְךָ** Dt 8.10, which is particularly interesting on account of its use with the verb **בָּרַךְ** as here.¹⁶

In both **ח** and **ט** we find two participles both of which describe the relationship between God and His creature. The two are grammatically different in both languages. In both **ח** and **ט** their respective participles look like substantivised. In **ח** only the second ptc. is articular, whereas in **ט** one definite article is construed with both participles. The addition of the article to a participle that carries a personal suffix as in **הַמְרוּךְ** is anomalous. The two Gk participles differ in aspect: aorist and present. **ποίησαντά** indicates what God did once, whereas **μεθύσκοντά** indicates what He does habitually. The non-standard addition of the Heb. definite article here allows us to interpret **עוֹשֶׂךָ** and **הַמְרוּךְ** not as two distinct entities, and analyse the latter as an attribute of the former: “your Maker who allows you to drink ..” This might have suggested to our translator that the addition of the article is permissible; he could have cited a phrase such as **עוֹשֶׂךָ הַצְדִיק** ‘your righteous Maker’ as a justification. The absence of the conjunction *waw* before **הַמְרוּךְ** is in favour of this analysis of ours. **ח**, it appears, has captured this subtle and meaningful morphological opposition in **ט**: **הוּא דַעֲבָדְךָ וְמְרוֹא לְךָ** ‘He who made you and satiates you.’ In comparison, **ט** leaves something to be desired: **בְּרַךְ שְׁמֵהּ דְאֵלֵהָא דְסַבְעָךָ** ‘Bless the name of God who satiated you.’

μεθύσκοντά σε] **הַמְרוּךְ**. The selection of these verbs instead of, e.g. **ψομίζοντά σε** **הַמְאַכִּילְךָ** ‘who feeds you’ is understandable in the light of the appreciation of wine as one of the principal themes in the preceding proverbs.

τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῦ] possibly **טוֹבְתוֹ = טוֹבְתוֹ**; God’s wine-cellar was overflowing. Cf. **ט** **טְבָתָהּ**, **ח** **טְבָתָהּ דִּילָהּ**, **ח** “(ab) omnibus bonis suis,” “(mit) seinen Gütern” (*SD*), “ses biens” (Lévi), “ses bienfaits” (BJ), and “his good things” (*NETS*), but “sa bonté” (Mopsik) = **טוֹבְתוֹ**. The selection of the pl. in the ancient versions does not have to mean that their Heb. *Vorlage* actually read **טוֹבוֹתָיו** or **טוֹבוֹתָיו**, but they intended to highlight actual manifestations of God’s goodly character.

35.14) Ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον ἐκδέξεται παιδείαν, (18)

καὶ οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες εὐρήσουσιν εὐδοκίαν.

*He who fears the Lord would receive instruction,
and the early risers would find His pleasure.*

ומתלהלה יוקש בו:	דורש אל יקוה רצון (Ba)
ומשחרהו ישיג מענה:	דורש אל יקח מוסר (Bb)
ויענהו בתפלתו:	דורש חפצי אל יקח לקח (Bc)

¹⁶ Segal (204) mentions a passage in the traditional Jewish grace (ברכת המזון), in which we read **וְעַל הַכֹּל יי אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנַחְנוּ מוֹדִים לְךָ וּמְבַרְכִים אוֹתְךָ** **עַל**, in which **עַל** cannot express anything other than a reason and ground.

(Fa) דורש אל חי וקוה רצון וגם מתלהלה יוקש בו:
 (Fb) דורש הפצי אל מוצא לקה ויענהו בכל תפלתו:

The complex relationship between the texts in the two languages notwithstanding, ㊤ appears to be closest to (Bb).

The equation Qal דרש / φοβέομαι is unknown elsewhere. Another non-standard equations here are Qal קוה / ἐκδέχομαι and מענה / εὐδοκία, also unknown elsewhere.

οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες [משחרהו] Early birds are metaphorically compared to people seeking something or someone very earnestly. See above at 4.12.

The first half of the text very close to (Fa) is found in the margin of MS B: דרש אל חי וקוה רצון.

(Bc) is somewhat close to the second half of vs. 13 in ㊤: דְּבַעַא פּוֹלְחָנָא 'one who seeks the fear of God would receive instruction and when he prays before Him He will answer him.'

35.15) ὁ ζητῶν νόμον ἐμπλησθήσεται αὐτοῦ, (19)
 καὶ ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος σκανδαλισθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ.

*One who seeks the law would be fully provided it,
 and one who only pretends would suffer a fall through it.*

(B) דורש תורה יפיקנה ומתלהלה יוקש בה:

The second hemistich of (B) appears in an almost identical form in vs. 14 in (Ba) and (Fa), but is missing in ㊤.

ἐμπλησθήσεται] This is the only instance of the equation Hi. הַפִּיק / ἐμίμπλημι.

[מתלהלה] This quadriliteral BH hapax is commonly thought to mean “madman” in מתלהלה Pr 26.18.

σκανδαλισθήσεται] ㊤) נְתַכְשֵׁל בִּי, an equation found also in μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῆ ἐν ἐμοί Mt 11.6. See also above at 9.5.

35.16) οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον εὐρήσουσιν κρίμα (20)
 καὶ δικαιώματα ὡς φῶς ἐξάψουσιν.

*Those who fear the Lord would find justice
 and make his decisions of justice shine like light.*

ותחבולות מנשף יוציא:	ירא יי בין משפט	(B)
וחכמות רבות יוציאו מלבם:	יראי יי בינו משפטו	(B*)
ותחבולות מנשף יוציא:	.. בִּין משפט	(E)
וחכמות יִצְיֵאוּ מלבם:	... נו משפטו	(E*)
ותחבולות מנשף יִצְיֵאוּ:	בִּין משפט	(F)
וחכמות יוציאו מלבם:	בִּין משפטו	(F*)

Here again the textual relationship between the two languages is complicated.¹⁷ On top of that each Heb. MS has two variant forms. Di Lella (1988.235) rightly draws our attention to the proximity between (F*) and \mathfrak{S} : דְּחִלְיָהּ דְּאֵלֵהָא נְתַחְכְּמוּן בְּדִינְוָהּ וְחִקְמָתָא סְגִיאתָא מִן לְבָהוּן נְפָקוּן ‘those who fear God would understand His judgements and would produce much wisdom out of their heart.’ Di Lella goes as far as to claim that \mathfrak{H} is a retroversion from \mathfrak{S} , but that would surely not hold for the second hemistich.

חכמות [תחבולות] ‘strategies,’ what does not lie in the ethical, moral domain as חכמות.

35.17) ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐκκλινεῖ ἐλεγγμόν (21)

καὶ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει σύγκριμα.

A sinner would pervert criticism

and find an interpretation that would suit his desire.

(B) איש חכם יטה תוכחות ואחר צרכו ימשך תורה:¹⁸

(E) ... יטה תוכחות ויאחר צרכו למשך תורה:

(F) איש חכם יטה תוכחות ויאחר צרכו למשך תורה:

[ἐλεγγμόν] ≠ חכם, but = חכם in (F); see the fn. below. We do not know whether חכם can be used cynically, say “cunning, crafty.”¹⁹

ἐλεγγμόν] תוכחות, a plural of extension? A sinner often takes this tactic. Cf. ארץ המדות ‘a land satisfying every desire’ 4Q374 2ii5 and איש המודות ‘a man charming in many ways’ Dn 10.19, mentioned in *SQH* § 8 d.

κατὰ] יאחר (E, F) makes no sense. אחר, i.e. אָחַר, must be correct, as justly represented in \mathfrak{S} וְבָתַר צְבִינָה עָבַד אֹרְחָה ‘and he adjusts his course to his desire.’ Note also \mathfrak{S} וְאִךְ צְבִינָה דִּילָהּ נְשַׁכַּח שְׁוִיּוֹת דִּינָא ‘and in accordance with his desire he would find what agrees with justice,’ where there is a marginal gloss on the penultimate word, “namely, those which accord with His justice.”

35.18) Ἄνηρ βουλῆς οὐ μὴ παρίδῃ διανόημα, (22)

ἀλλόττριος καὶ ὑπερήφανος οὐ καταπτῆξει φόβον.

A thoughtful man never ignores an idea,

an alien and arrogant man would not cower beneath fear.

(B) איש חכם לא יכסה כחמה ולץ לא ישמר לשונו:²⁰

(B*) זד ולץ לא ישמר תורה:²¹

(E) ... הַ חכמה ולץ לא ישמר לשונו:

¹⁷ Cf. Beentjes 1999.55f.

¹⁸ There are three marginal glosses: חכם .. יאחר .. למשך.

¹⁹ So Lévi: “rusé” and \mathfrak{S} עֲרִימָא as distinct from חֲכִימָא.

²⁰ A marginal gloss reads חכמה for חכמה.

²¹ A marginal gloss reads חכם for חכם.

זד ולץ לא יקה מצוה: ... לא יקה שכל (E*)
 ולץ לא ישמור לשונו: איש לא יכסה חכמה (F)
 זד ולץ לא יקה מצוה: איש חמס לא יקה שכל (F*)

[διανόημα] שחד ‘bribery’ (B*) introduces an idea foreign to the context, though it is not clear whence it has intruded here.

[ἀλλότριος] = זר, i.e. זר, far more fitting in the context than זד in B*, E*, and F*.

[καταπτήξει φόβον] which hardly reflects any version of the Heb. text.

35.19) ἄνευ βουλῆς μηθὲν ποιήσης (24)

καὶ ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαί σε μὴ μεταμελοῦ.

*Without deliberation do nothing
 and once having started, have no second thoughts.*

בלא עצה אל תפעל דבר ואחר מעשיך אל תתקפץ: (B)
 ... תפעל דבר ואחר מעשיך אל תתקפץ: (E)
 בלא עצה אל תפעל דבר ואחר מעשיך אל תתקפץ: (F)

[βουλῆς] This Gk word, as in CG, can mean “advice” or “opinion sought after and conveyed.” E.g. καὶ ἐγκατέλιπεν τὴν βουλήν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἃ συνεβουλεύσαντο αὐτῷ 3K 12.8, which is a sequel to Πῶς ὑμεῖς βουλευέσθε καὶ ἀποκριθῶ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ λόγον; ib. 12.6. Is Ben Sira saying that, before we start undertaking something, we are to seek advice from somebody? He could have been a little more specific such as βουλῆς τοῦ πλησίον. Cf. Ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἔργου λόγος, καὶ πρὸ πάσης πράξεως βουλή Si 37.16 < B) לפני כל פעל היא מחשבת and D) לפני כל פעל היא מחשבת. However, Heb. עצה means at times something different from “piece of advice” given to somebody else. E.g. וְנָחָה עָלָיו רוּחַ יְהוָה רוּחַ חֶכְמָה וּבִינָה רוּחַ עֲצָה וּגְבוּרָה רוּחַ דָּעַת וְנָחָה עָלָיו רוּחַ יְהוָה וְיָרָאת יְהוָה Is 11.2 where עצה is joined with גְבוּרָה, and parallel to וּבִינָה etc., and מְחַשְׁבָּה [עֲלֵיכֶם] עֲצָה וְחָשַׁב עָלֵיהֶם [עֲלֵיכֶם] Je 49.30 where it is parallel to מְחַשְׁבָּה. Both ח and ח use here מְחַשְׁבָּה, which never means “act of pondering,” but “advice.”

[μεταμελοῦ] תתקפץ (E, F) is to be emended to (B) תתקפץ. This Gk verb does not express anger, but rather dissatisfaction. Note ח לא תכרא לך ‘Do not be sorry’ and ח אַתְּתָוִי ‘Regret!’²²

[ἐν τῷ] An odd rendering of אחר. The text might mean: “Once you have made up your mind and started working, do not regret midway and stop working.” Note ח מִן בְּתֵר דְּעָבָד אַנְתָּ, which also indicates that you are still in

²² In the latter we would anticipate ח תתָוִי. In the Vorlage μη had dropped out.

Di Lella (1988.235) states that, excepting the above-mentioned scribal error in תתקפץ, this verse is a rare instance in which all the (three) Heb. MSS, ח, ח, and ח agree with one another. He apparently did not take into account the odd ending of the verse in ח.

the middle of your work, what is better expressed in **מֵא דְעַבְדָּךְ אֵינְתָּ לִי** ‘when you are working.’ **ל** could mean something different, e.g. ‘once you’ve reached the end, do not blame yourself too much!’

35.20) ἐν ὁδῶ ἀντιπτώματος μὴ πορεύου (25)
καὶ μὴ προσκόψῃς ἐν λιθώδεσιν.

*Do not walk a way full of potholes
nor stumble on stony roads.*

בדרך מוקשת אל תלך (B)
וּאל תתקל בנגף פעמים:
... אל תלך (E)
וּאל תתקל בדרך פֿעמײם:
בדרך מוקשת אל תלך (F)

[תתקל] cf. 15.12.

ἐν λιθώδεσιν] Hart (1909.184) proposes an emendation, probably on the basis of (B + E) פעמים, to ἐν λίθω δίς, but cf. Wagner 1999.238.

35.21) μὴ πιστεύσῃς ἐν ὁδῶ ἀπροσκόπῳ

Do not trust (even) in a road free from potholes.

אל תבטח בדרך מחתף (B)
אל תבטח בדרך רשעים (B*)
... דרך רשעים (E)
אל תתחר בדרך רשעים (F)

ἀπροσκόπῳ] This reflects neither of the two Heb. words concerned, both of which point to a risky road, “of a highway robber (מִחְתֵּף?)” and “of bad guys.”

Segal (205) vocalises מחתף as מִחְתֵּף and interprets the preposition as having the value of deprivation, and Smend’s (II 56) translation reads “Sei unterwegs nicht sorglos vor Ueberfall.” We are not convinced of such an analysis of the preposition here. Whilst Pi. מִחְתֵּף is unattested, its synonym מִחְתֵּף is used in Pi. in MH, e.g. הֵן מִחְתֵּפִין וּמִכִּין אִישׁ אֶת חֵבְרוֹ ‘they are robbing and hitting one another’ mSuk 4.4.

μὴ πιστεύσῃς] (F) אל תתחר ‘Do not compete’?

35.22) καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου φύλαξαι. (26)

Beware of your children.

ובאחריתך השמר: (B)
ובאחריתך הזהר: (B*)
ובאחריתך היה זהיר: (E)
ובאחריתך היה זהיר: (F)

τῶν τέκνων σου] Most likely a misreading or scribal error for אַרְחֲתִיךָ, i.e. אַרְחֲתִיךָ ‘your ways.’ So (B*) and ⚙ ובאורְחֲתֶךָ הַנּוֹתָ זֶהִיר ‘and on your ways be careful.’²³

35.23) ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ πίστευε τῇ ψυχῇ σου· (27)
καὶ γὰρ τοῦτό ἐστιν τήρησις ἐντολῶν.

*Whatever you do, be self-confident,
for this is about the observance of commandments.*

(B) בכל דרכיך שמור נפשוך כי כל עושה אלה שומר מצוה:
(B*) בכל מעשיך שמור נפשוך כי עושה זה שומר מצוה:

35.24) ὁ πιστεύων νόμῳ προσέχει ἐντολαῖς, (28)
καὶ ὁ πεποιθὼς κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσεται.

*One who believes the law is attentive to commandments,
and one who trusts the Lord would not come out a loser.*

(B) נוצר תורה שומר נפשו ובוטח ביי לא יבוש:
(E)ה נוצר נפשו ובוטח ביי לא יבוש:
(F) נוצר תורה נוצר נפשו ובוטח ביי לא יבוש:

κυρίῳ] Di Lella (1988.236) and Hart (1909.184) note that the v.l. αὐτῷ of MS 248 accords with ⚙, but “*illo*” in the latter refers back to “*Deo*” earlier in the verse where ⚙ has νόμῳ.

There cannot be too many verses in our book where ⚙ and ⚙ differ from each other as substantially as in this verse:

- (1) שומר נפשו or נוצר נפשו is not visible anywhere in ⚙.
- (2) יבוש and ἐλαττωθήσεται are two totally separate notions. Likewise נוצר and πιστεύων.
- (3) In ⚙ we see nothing that would correspond to ἐντολαῖς, a key concept.

It is beyond us to figure out why the grandson decided to move so far away from his grandfather’s Hebrew original. The three extant Hebrew texts are almost identical with one another and there is hardly anything that could present any difficulty for any beginner of Hebrew.

²³ So Hart (1909.184). See also Beentjes 1993.183.

CHAPTER 36 (33)

36.1) Tḥ φοβουμένῳ κύριον οὐκ ἀπαντήσῃ κακόν,
ἀλλ' ἐν πειρασμῷ καὶ πάλιν ἐξελεῖται.

*A disaster would not befall him who fears the Lord,
but in a trying situation he could come out unharmed again.*

(B) ירא יי לא יפגע רע כי אם בנסויל.:
(E) ... יפגע רע כי אם בניסוי ישוב ונמלט:
(F) ירא יי לא יפגע רע כי אם בניסוי ישוב ונמלט:

Tḥ φοβουμένῳ [ירא יי] With no preposition prefixed to ירא, the phrase is extraposed and in casus pendens. In such a case it is normal for a pronominal element to follow and to refer back to the fronted constituent. Thus יפגענו, i.e. יפגענו or יפגענו בו. It could be a case of poetic licence. רע, as in the two Syr. versions, could be analysed as *s*, but then ירא יי need be explicitly marked as *o*, e.g. בירא יי. See **ש** באינא דדחל מן שן and **ש** באינא דדחל לא נפגע בה בישא. Cf. also **ל** “*timentī Dominum non occurrent mala.*” The prep. *lamed* may have inadvertently dropped out.

ἀλλ' [כי אם] has been analysed as a single constituent following a negative statement, “not .. but,” and not two independent conjunctions “because if.” Cp. **ש** אלא בנסוינא אן בנסוינא with **ש** אלא בנסוינא.

נסוי] As rightly pointed out by Smend (295), this is the first attestation of the noun, which is known to MH. It recurs at 44.20. Action nouns of the pattern קטיל, however, are well represented in BH, e.g. שקוי. For more examples, see JM § 88 I e. A synonym in a different formation, גיסין, also occurs at 4.17, 6.7, and 13.11. Both are unknown prior to BS.

καὶ πάλιν] The conjunction is, just as its Heb. counterpart, used at times to “introduce an element of surprise or something unexpected” (*GELS* s.v. **καὶ** 5).¹ MS B has **ושב** in the margin. If the reading be genuine, the conjunction *waw* is apodotic, introducing an apodosis in a conditional clause,² and not inersive, introducing *we-qatalī*. This would imply that **כי** was taken as causal, which contradicts the analysis represented in **ס**. Our **καὶ** then looks like a mechanical representation of this apodotic *waw*, if that stood in its *Vorlage*. On the two Syriac versions, see at the end of the next paragraph.

ישוב ונמלט] This is also syntactically problematic. **ונמלט** is unquestionably an inverted, *we-qatalī* form. Outside of BS we come across a small number

¹ But not “à chaque fois” (Mopsik 196).

² Cf. JM § 176 d.

of the semi-auxiliary verb **שָׁב** continued with a *we-qatalti* form. E.g. **אָשׁוּב אִם יִשׁוּב וְנִיתָפָס** Ho 2.11; **אִם יִשׁוּב וְנִיתָפָס** CD 9.19.³ The *s* of these two Heb. verbs here is clearly **יִרָא**. On the other hand, can he be the *s* of **ἐξελείπεται**? In purely morphological terms this is in the middle voice and in opposition to the passive, **ἐξαιρεθήσεται** Ec 7.26. Then the Lord must be the actor. Note also **Μόλις ἐξελείπεται ἔμπορος ἀπὸ πλημμελείας** Si 26.29, v.a.l., and **ἐξελοῦμαι τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τιμωρίαν** 2M 6.26. However, the question of the three voices, their opposition and / or fluctuation can be quite a challenge especially when the verb concerned is transitive and in tenses such as future and aorist shows three distinct formations, e.g. **ἀκούσω, ἀκούσομαι, ἀκουσθήσομαι**. In our particular case any one of two options, i.e. ‘he will rescue himself [middle]’ and ‘he will be rescued (by God) [passive]’ appears to make sense. For the moment we leave the options open. The focus, however, remains on **יִרָא** in **וְנִתְפָּלֵט וְנִתְפָּוֶרֶךְ וְנִתְפָּלֵט** and **וְנִתְפָּצֵא לֵא**.

36.2) ἀνήρ σοφὸς οὐ μισήσει νόμον,
ὁ δὲ ὑποκρινόμενος ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐν καταίγιδι πλοῖον.

*A wise man does not detest the law,
but one who handles it like a hypocrite is like a boat in a storm.*

(B) **לֹא יַחֲכֵם שׁוֹנָא תּוֹרָה וּמִתְמוֹטֵט כְּמֹסֶ... :**
(E) **... שׁוֹנָא תּוֹרָה וּמִתְמוֹטֵט כְּמִסְעָרָה אֲזוֹנִי :**
(F) **לֹא יַחֲכֵם שׁוֹנָא תּוֹרָה וּמִתְמוֹטֵט כְּמִסְעָרָה אֲזוֹנִי :**

Our translator knew of course that **שׁוֹנָא תּוֹרָה** is the *s* of **יַחֲכֵם**, but wanted to avoid analysing **מִתְמוֹטֵט** as coordinate with **שׁוֹנָא**, also a *s* of **יַחֲכֵם**. In other words, in his view, we have here two independent clauses, one verbal and the other nominal, not one verbal clause.

Even so he was confronted with some difficulties in the latter hemistich. **מִתְמוֹטֵט**, the only instance in BH of Hitpo. **√מוט** ‘to shake’ occurs in Is 24.19. This verb does not express an ethically negative stance, as **ὑποκρίνομαι** does. The basic sense of this verb root is known to our translator as is clear in his rendering of it with **πιῶσις** 3.31 and **σαλεύομαι** 13.21, for instance. It is then a free addition which expresses another aspect of the hate of the divine law. As for **ἐν** a marginal gloss in (B) reads **בְּמִסְעָר**, though **מִסְעָר** as a substantive is unknown elsewhere. For a very strange form, **אֲזוֹנִי**, it has been suggested to emend it to **אוֹנִי** (Segal 209) or **אֲנִיָּה** (Marcus 1931.230).⁴ One would, however, anticipate the preposition **כִּי** prefixed to it.

³ Cf. *SQH* § 31 u and Muraoka 2024 § Be. Segal (209) takes **שָׁב** here in the sense of “to repent.”

⁴ Smend (29) reads **אֲנִיָּה**.

- 36.3) ἄνθρωπος συνετὸς ἐμπιστεύσει λόγῳ,
καὶ ὁ νόμος αὐτῷ πιστὸς ⁽⁴⁾ὡς ἐρώτημα δήλων.

*A man of understanding believes the Word
and the law is to him believable like an answer by means of oracles.*

(B) אִישׁ נְבוֹן יִבִּין דְּבַר וְתוֹרָתוֹ טֹבָה כִּי... ..

[λόγῳ] as read by Ziegler against νομῶ as read by all MSS. The plain דְּבַר, however, sounds odd. Lévi (162) reconstructs ⁵⁵דְּבַר.

תְּפִלָּה [“beads used as charms, ornament worn on the forehead, frontlet” (Jastrow s.v.).

- 36.4) ἐτοιμάσον λόγον καὶ οὕτως ἀκουσθήσῃ,
σύνδησον παιδείαν καὶ ἀποκρίθητι.

*Prepare what you are going to say and that way you should be listened to,
put (your) learning together and give answers.*

... .. יְךָ וְאַחַר תַּעֲשֶׂה וּבֵית מְנוּחָה וְאַחַר תִּגִּיה: (E)

(F) הַכִּין אוֹמֵר וְאַחַר תַּעֲשֶׂה וּבֵית מְנוּחָה וְאַחַר תִּגִּיה:

[λόγον] (F) may have meant אִמְרָךְ, i.e. אִמְרָךְ. Beentjes (1993.185) holds that אִמְרָ here means “something,” and he refers to וְתִגְוֹרֵי-אוֹמֵר Jb 22.28 for a support. We doubt that אִמְרָ can be used in such a way just like דְּבַר. We doubt that you could say in Hebrew רָאִיתִי אִמְרָ בַשָּׁמַיִם, meaning “I saw something in the sky.” In Jb 22.28 it is concerned with some oral message, say, “instruction.”⁵

ἀκουσθήσῃ] difficult to harmonise with תַּעֲשֶׂה, which itself is not easy to comprehend. The use of a personal *s* is remarkable. We doubt that Heb. allows passive transformation of אָתְנּוּ שְׂמֵעוּ אֲתָנוּ to נִשְׁמָעְנוּ. אֲתָנוּ is equivocal, since its *s* can be the preceding מְלִתָּא (= λόγον).

בֵּית מְנוּחָה] ‘Have some rest!’⁶ But this is extremely difficult to harmonise with σύνδησον παιδείαν.

ἀποκρίθητι] = תִּגִּיב, i.e. תִּגִּיב ‘you shall reply’?⁷

- 36.5) τροχὸς ἀμάξης σπλάγχνα μωροῦ,
καὶ ὡς ἄξων στρεφόμενος ὁ διαλογισμὸς αὐτοῦ.

*The bowels of a fool like a chariot’s wheel
and his thinking revolves like an axle.*

⁵ Cf. Kahana 1968.123.

⁶ Beentje’s (1993.185) proposal to construe this phrase with the preceding הכִּין as its *o* is not convincing; the totally different semantic ranges of the two *o*’s do not render support to such an analysis.

⁷ As first proposed in Muraoka 1977a.442.

(E) ... לב נבל ואופן חוזר מחשבותיו:
 (F) גלגל קל לב נבל ואופן חוזר מחשבותיו:

‘fast-moving wheel.’ = § גלגל קל

σπλάγχνα] a remarkable rendering supposed to refer to an intellectual organ. Σπλάγχνα, in addition to its literal meaning, is also used to refer to a human organ as a seat of feelings and affections, even compassion as in σπ. τέκνου ‘compassion for a child’ Wi 10.5.⁸

στρεφόμενος] חזר wrongly read as חזיר, i.e. חזיר, by § חזירא.⁹

36.6) ἵππος εἰς ὀχεῖαν ὡς φίλος μωκός,
 ὑποκάτω παντὸς ἐπικαθημένου χρεμετίζει.

*A mocking friend is like a breeding horse,
 it neighs under any rider above.*

(E) ... אוהב שונא תחת כל ... יצהל:
 (F) כסוס מוכן אוהב שונא תחת כל אוהב יצהל:

Marcus (1931.231) goes on and on about a restored reading, מיון ‘well-fed,’ which now means little with the discovery of (F). The latter’s סוס מוכן [= § סוסיא עתידא] probably means ‘a horse ready [for copulation, mating].’ We fail to see how Di Lella (1987.394) could account for his “distracted stallion.”

36.7) Διὰ τί ἡμέρα ἡμέρας ὑπερέχει,
 καὶ πᾶν φῶς ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦ ἀφ’ ἡλίου;
*How come that one day exceeds some other day
 when the light of every day of a year is from the sun?*

(E) ... ם יום כי כלו אור שונה מעל שמש:
 (F) מה על יום יום כי כלו אור שונה על שמש:

The Heb. text is extremely difficult of interpretation.

שמש] The absence of the definite article is probably a case of poetic licence, for substantives denoting heavenly bodies normally do take the article. For more examples, see SSG § 5 e.

36.8) ἐν γνώσει κυρίου διεχωρίσθησαν,
 καὶ ἡλλοίωσεν καιροὺς καὶ ἑορτάς·
*With the knowledge of the Lord they were differentiated,
 and He changed some into periods and feast days.*

⁸ For details, see GELS s.v., and also cf. Muraoka 2020.70f.

⁹ So Smend 297 and Ryssel 395.

.. מַתּ בַּחֲכַמַּת יְיָ נִשְׁפָּטוּ וְיֵשׁ מֵהֶם מוֹעֲדֵי־ם: (E)
 אבל בחכמת יי נשפטו ויש מהם מועדי־ם: (F)

ἐν γνώσει κυρίου] With God's omniscience. Cf. **ש** בְּחֻכְמַת דָּאֵלֵהָא 'with the wisdom of God.'

διεχωρίσθησαν] Hardly = נִשְׁפָּטוּ.¹⁰ An error for נִפְרָשׁוּ, i.e. נִפְרָשׁוּ? Note **ש** and **ש** אֶתְפָּרְשׁוּ, with which cp. **ש** דְּמֵן יוֹמָא פְּרִישׁ 'why is there a day in the year which differs from (another) day?' (vs. 7).

ἡλλοίωσεν] Ordinary days were given a special status. Marcus (1931.231) proposes emending **ו**יֵשׁ to **ו**יֵשׁם, i.e. **ו**יֵשׁם. Cf. the following verse.

36.9) ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀνύψωσεν καὶ ἡγίασεν (10)
 καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔθηκεν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν.

*Some out of them He gave a higher status, making them sacred
 and others He made them secular days.*

... בְּרַךְ וְהַקְדִּישׁוּ וּמֵהֶם שֵׁם לְיָמֵי מַסְפָּר: (E)

ἀνύψωσεν] A strange translation of **ש** בְּרַךְ = **ש** בְּרַךְ.

ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν] An odd reflexion of **י**מֵי מַסְפָּר, the meaning of which here is obscure. Our above-given translation is based on our contextual consideration. Does the author mean that the remaining, secular days are there to complete the total number of days of a year? Cf. Segal 210f. and "... sollen [nur] die Zahl der Tage [des Jahres] voll machen" (Ryssel). We doubt, *pace* Smend (298), "Alltage" can be expressed this way, whether in Heb., Gk or Syr. (**מְנִינָא דְיוֹמַתָּא**).

36.10) καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἀπὸ ἐδάφους,
 καὶ ἐκ γῆς ἐκτίσθη Ἀδὰμ·

*All humans are from the ground,
 and out of the soil Adam was created.*

... לֵי חֲמַר וּמִן עֶפְרָא נֹוצַר אָדָם: (E)

ἀπὸ ἐδάφους] This is the only instance in LXX where ἔδαφος is said to be the origin of human beings. At Ge 2.7 Adam is said to be **חוֹטֵץ** ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς [עֶפְרָא מִן הָאָדָמָה]. See also **εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη**· ὅτι γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελευσῆ [מִמְנָה כִּי מְנָה] **עַד שׁוֹבָה אֶל־הָאָדָמָה** Ge 3.19, where man's origin and final destination are indicated in LXX as γῆ, which corresponds to two different Heb. words. In this Si example **ש** uses **עֶפְרָא** for the two distinct Greek words.

¹⁰ Marcus (1931.231) claims that the verb is used here in its original sense of "discriminate." But were two days or seasons competing in the presence of God?

Another matter to be addressed here is the distinction between the material from which mankind was made and the location of the material. In contrast to רמח, i.e. רמח, ἔδαφος can indicate a location.

36.11) ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης κύριος διεχώρισεν αὐτοὺς
καὶ ἠλλοίωσεν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν·

*With (His) rich knowledge the Lord differentiated them
and changed their ways.*

וישם אותם דרי הארץ .. תבדילם (E)
:וישׁוּת אֵל דרכיהם

ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης] Understood by Smend (298) as meaning “aus unbekanntem Gründen.” To allocate diverse groups of humans to different locations may have necessitated the exercise of extensive knowledge on the part of God. Πλήθος is first and foremost concerned with quantity, what is implied in the second Heb. clause, which has not been translated into Gk.

διεχώρισεν] Because of the fem. gender of the verb in ח its s cannot be י. Marcus (1931.232), referring to שׁ אֵל דְּרָכָהּ אֵל דְּרָכָהּ¹¹, reconstructed י. חכמת י.

36.12) ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐλόγησεν καὶ ἀνύψωσεν
καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἡγίασεν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤγγισεν·
ἀπ’ αὐτῶν κατηράσατο καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν
καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ στάσεως αὐτῶν·

*Some of them He blessed and exalted
and some others He sanctified and drew near to Him.
Some others He cursed and brought low
and removed them from their office.*

:א... ..א... ..א... ..א... (E)
:ממערב... ..א... ..א... ..א... ..א...

ἀνύψωσεν] After years’ debate we still have a faint idea as to how to deal with the last two letters of the first clause.

στάσεως αὐτῶν] *Index* 260b has suggested מְעַבְדֵּם instead of מְעַבְדֵּם.¹²

36.13) ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ
πλάσαι αὐτὸ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ, (14)
οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοῦ
ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ.

¹¹ The preposition ב is unwarranted, possibly influenced by vs. 8. An alternative reconstruction is Abegg’s אבד.

¹² So already Marcus 1931.232. The same equation occurs four more times in LXX: 3K 10.5, 2C 9.4, 35.15, Is 22.19. Segal’s (206) אבד is impossible in Hebrew.

*Like a potter's clay in his hand
to mould it as he likes,
so are humans in the hand of the One who made them
handed according to His conclusion.*

... יוצר (E) לאהוו כרצון:
... עושהו להתיצב מפניו חלק:

πλάσαι αὐτὸ] **Sh** כולהין אורחתה **Sh** 'all His ways' accurately reflects the majority of Gk MSS which read *πασαι αι οδοι αυτου*. **Sh** represents an admixture of both: "*plasmare illud et disponere omnes viae eius*."

αὐτὸ] What this neut. pronoun refers to is not clear.

ἀποδοῦναι] **S** לְמַקְמוֹתָהּ 'to post him.' This might represent לְהַצִּיבוֹ, but the sequel, בְּכָל עֲבֹדָתָהּ, can in no way be harmonised with the extant **Sh**.

To relate the last infinitival clause in **Sh** to the last line of **Sh** is most difficult. **Sh** does not fit ἀποδοῦναι. The Heb. inf. probably has humans as its *s*, but then how are we syntactically to analyse חלק. Cf. **S** בְּכָל לְמַקְמוֹתָהּ בְּכָל עֲבֹדָתָהּ 'to post him in all his [or: His] works.'

36.14) ἀπέναντι τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν, (15)
καὶ ἀπέναντι τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ζωή,
οὕτως ἀπέναντι εὐσεβοῦς ἀμαρτωλός·

*Opposite evil is good,
and opposite death is life,
so opposite pious is sinful.*

... טוֹב (E) ונוכח חיים מות:
נֹכַח אִישׁ טוֹב רָשָׁע ונוכח האור הַשָּׁר:

The pairing of opposite members is made explicit in **S** through the insertion of 'was [or: were] created,' e.g. לְיִקְבַּל בִּישָׁא אָתְבָרִי טְבָא 'opposite evil was created good.' This depicts also darkness as created by God: וְלִיקְבַּל נְהָרָא: אָתְבָרִי הַשּׁוּכָא.

Sh is very logical in placing a negative feature first, so in the last pair it offers *הַכְּנָא לִיקְבַּל חַטָּא שְׁפִיר דְּחִלְתָּא* 'thus opposite sinful is pious.' In this regard **S** accords with **Sh**.

Sh and **Sh** lack the last pair of **Sh**, whereas **S** lacks the third pair; maybe it was felt that the third pair is covered by the first, for in both pairs the adjectives are masc. sg., whereas **Sh** uses the f.sg. in the first, indicating the referents are impersonal, but abstract: לִיקְבַּל בִּישָׁא טְבָתָא.

In vs. 14a of **Sh** the neuter gender of τὸ ἀγαθόν implies that the first pair is concerned with impersonal terms just as in the second pair. On the use of substantivised adjectives of the neut. gender as referring to abstract entities, see *SSG* § 20 **ea**, 23 **fb**.

36.15) καὶ οὕτως ἔμβλεπον εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ὑψίστου,
 δύο δύο, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός.

*And thus look at all the works of the Most High,
 two two, one opposite one.*

(E) הַבְּטָא אֵל כָּל מַעֲשֵׂהָ אֵל
 כּוֹלֵם שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם
 זֶה לְעוֹמַת ...

ἔμβλεπον] שִׁי בְּלִהוֹן אֵלְהָא עֲבָדָהּ יְהוָה ‘God showed all His works.’ Thus לֵא has been read as אֵל, not אָל. But the verb בִּיטֵי is never used as a genuine causal verb.¹³

πάντα τὰ ἔργα] representing the analysis of מַעֲשֵׂה as pl. cst. in lieu of the standard spelling, מַעֲשֵׂי, whereas it could be analysed as sg. cst., “every single produce of God.” This alternative analysis is precluded on account of the following כּוֹלֵם ‘all of them,’ though this is missing in C. Cf. שִׁי בְּכִלְהוֹן אֵלְהָא דְמַרְיָא ‘(Look) at all the works of the Lord.’

κατέναντι] חֵ לְעוֹמַת, a stylistic variant on נוּכַח in the preceding verse rendered with a synonymous variant, ἀπέναντι. For another example of this stylistic variation, see κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου Psol 2.11 // ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου ib. 2.12.

36.16a) Καὶ γὰρ ἔσχατος ἡ γρύπνησα

And I, too, lay awake as the last

(E) וְגַם אֲנִי אַחֲרַיִוֹן שְׁקַדְתִּי¹⁴

ἔσχατος] Marcus (1931.234) is sure of the reading אַחֲרַיִוֹן. Abegg has removed the strokes above the last two letters. Note שִׁי אַחֲרַיִת ‘later.’ Segal (212) argues for אַחֲרַיִן, adding that the author is counting himself as the last of the sages of the biblical period.

30.25) ὡς καλαμώμενος ὀπίσω τρυγητῶν·
 ἐν εὐλογίᾳ κυρίου ἔφθασα (33.17)
 καὶ ὡς τρυγῶν ἐπλήρωσα ληνόν.

*like a gleaner behind harvesters.
 With a blessing of the Lord I was the first to act
 and like a harvester I filled up (my) trough.*

(E) וּכְמוֹ עוֹלֵל אַחֲרַיִן
 בְּ... אֵל גַּם אֲנִי קִדְמַתִּי וּכְבוֹצָר מִלְּאֲתִי ...

¹³ DCH V 587b s.v. נבט mentions Si 43.1 (v.a.l.) and several instances in QH, all of which are rather doubtful on epigraphical grounds.

¹⁴ אַחֲרַיִן כִּימִי קִדְמַתִּי inserted in BSH as part of MS B is to be relocated to 33.13.

ὀπίσω τρυγητῶν] A word, probably בוצר, appears inadvertently to have dropped out.

ἐφθασα] ❧ קמת, representing a wrong reading of 𐤒 as קמתי.

30.26) ατανοήσατε ὅτι οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῳ ἐκοπίασα, (18)
ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ζητοῦσιν παιδείαν.

*Take note that I did not toil solely for myself,
but for all those who seek education.*

(E) ראו כי לא לבדי עלמתי כי לכל מבקשי ... :

ἐμοὶ μόνῳ] Marcus (1931.234) is right in emending (E) to read לא לי לבדי [עלמתי] an obvious error for עמלתי.

30.27) ἀκούσατέ μου, μεγιστᾶνες λαοῦ, (19)
καὶ οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐκκλησίας, ἐνωτίσασθε.

*Listen to me, the top of the people,
and the leaders of the community, give ear to me.*

(E) שמעו אלי שרי עם רב ומשלי קהל ה... :

λαοῦ] With עממא ‘the peoples’ ❧ presents a global message. Does the pl. represent רב?

30.28) Υἱὸν καὶ γυναικί, ἀδελφῶν καὶ φίλων (20)
μὴ δῶς ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ σὲ ἐν ζωῆ σου·
καὶ μὴ δῶς ἐτέρῳ τὰ χρήματά σου,
ἵνα μὴ μεταμεληθεῖς δέη περι αὐτῶν.

*In your lifetime do not allow a son, (your) wife,
brother or friend to exercise authority over you.
Do not give someone else your property,
in case you may come to ask for it and regret.*

(E) בן ואשה אהב ורע אל תמשיל בחיך:
אל תתן שלך לאחר לשוב לחלות א... :

ἀδελφῶν] = אה, not אהב, which is synonymous with רע. Note ❧ אהא.

ἐπὶ σὲ] The translator added this phrase, probably because he did not analyse בחיך as *o* of תמשיל, but as its adverbial, temporary complement, although in < ἐξουσία ἐν τινι > the dat. substantive can indicate a person or a thing that is under someone’s authority and control, as in ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων Da 4.28 LXX. ❧ is the same as ❧: לָא תְשַׁלֵּט בְּךָ בְּחַיֶּיךָ.

❧ has shifted the second hemistich to the end of the following verse: לָא תְתַל לְאַחַרְנָא נְכֻסֶיךָ לְמִפְּךָ וְלְמִבְּעַא מְנַהוֹן.

- 30.29) ἕως ἔτι ζῆς καὶ πνοῇ ἐν σοί, (21)
μὴ ἀλλάξῃς σεαυτὸν ἐν πάσῃ σαρκί·

*Whilst you are still alive and breathing,
do not abandon yourself to any other person.*

(E) עד עורך חי ונשמה בך אל תשלט בך כל ...:

ἕως] not ‘until.’ On the sense of ἕως “as long as,” see *GELS* s.v. **B d**, and this value is underlined with ἔτι here. On the same value of עד, see *BDB* s.v. עד **II 2**.

- 30.30) κρεῖσσον γάρ ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα δεηθῆναί σου (22)
ἢ σὲ ἐμβλέπειν εἰς χεῖρας υἱῶν σου.

*For it is better for your children to be begging you
than for you to be looking into your sons’ hands.*

(E) כי טוב לחלות בְּנֵיךָ פִּנְיָךְ מֵהִבִּיטְךָ עַל יְדֵי ...:

- 30.31) ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ὑπεράγων, (23)
μὴ δῶς μῶμον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου.

*In all your works become someone who excels,
do not leave a scar on your honour.*

(E) בכל מעשיך יהיה עליין ואל תתן מום בכ...:

ὑπεράγων] עליון, which Heb. word Segal (214) takes in the sense of “to be subordinate to nobody.” We are inclined to follow the ancient versions: “to perform to one’s best ability.” So **ש** מְעֵלִי ‘superb, excelling,’ **ש** קְדִים נֶה ‘ahead of everyone,’ **א** *praecellens esto*.

- 30.32) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ συντελείας ἡμερῶν ζωῆς σου (24)
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ τελευτῆς διάδος κληρονομίαν.

*On the day of the end of your life
and at the end distribute (your) possessions.*

(E) בעת מספֿר מצער ימֿיך ביום המות הנחֿל ...:

בְּעֵת מִסְפֵּר מִצְעַר יָמֶיךָ] an unusually worded phrase, for which one would anticipate בְּעֵת מִצְעַר מִסְפֵּר יָמֶיךָ ‘at the time when the number of the days of your life shrank.’

κληρονομίαν] Here this common substantive, κληρονομία, signifies what one bequeathes to his children rather than what one inherited and was given by his parents.

ש adds לְבְנֵיךָ ‘to your children’ at the end.

- 30.33) Χορτάσματα καὶ ῥάβδος καὶ φορτία ὄνων, (25)
 ἄρτος καὶ παιδεία καὶ ἔργον οἰκέτη.

*Fodder and stick and loads for a donkey,
 bread and instruction and work for a domestic servant.*

(E) מספוא ושוט ומשא לחמור ומרדות מלאכה לע...:

Several MSS bear a subtitle for vss. 33-40, Περὶ δούλων ‘About slaves,’ which suits the message of the paragraph.

ἀρτος] Missing in \mathfrak{H} , perhaps due to haplography, לחמור < לחם. ¹⁵ \mathfrak{S} has three substantives in a different sequence: ומְרִדוּתָא וְלִמְמָא וְפִילְהֶנָּא ‘and the education and the fodder and the work.’ \mathfrak{S} ’s translator, though his Heb. *Vorlage* showed the same sequence as \mathfrak{G} , probably wanted to underscore the etymological affinity between מרדות and מְרִדוּתָא.

- 30.34) ἔργασαι ἐν παιδείᾳ, καὶ εὐρήσεις ἀνάπαυσιν· (26)
 ἄνες χεῖρας αὐτῷ, καὶ ζητήσῃ ἐλευθερίαν.

*Work him with (strict) discipline, and then you would feel relaxed.
 Leave your hands off him, and then he would seek liberation.*

(E) העבד עבדך שלא יבקש נחת ואם נשא ראשו יבגד ...:

The discrepancy between the two texts is substantial. \mathfrak{H} could be translated as ‘Work your slave in such a way that he would not ask for comfortableness and if he raised his head, he would betray ..’ Cf. \mathfrak{S} as well: וְלֹא תִתֵּן לֵהּ נִיְהָא וְלֹא תִתֵּן לֵהּ נִיְהָא ‘and do not concede to him easy going, and if you raise his head, he would be demanding liberation.’ This is, however, partly followed in \mathfrak{S} by the start of vs. 34 in \mathfrak{H} : פְּלוּחַ בְּעַבְדְּךָ דְּלֵא נְמַרְדַּ מְטוּל דְּסוּנָאא ‘Make your slave work so that he would not rebel because a lazy fellow does lots of dreadful things,’ the last clause of which reflects οἰκέτη κακούργω in the following verse.

Cf. 20.11.

- 30.35) ζυγὸς καὶ ἰμάς τράχηλον κάμψουσιν, (27)
 καὶ οἰκέτη κακούργω στρέβλαι καὶ βάσανοι·

*A yoke and leather strap would keep the neck down,
 and to a naughty domestic worker (suit) racks and tortures.*

(E) ... חוטר תומכו על עבד רע הרבה

τράχηλον] Continuing a parallelism between a donkey and a domestic staff (vs. 33), a donkey’s neck must be meant.

¹⁵ So already Marcus (1931.235).

30.36) ἔμβαλε αὐτὸν εἰς ἐργασίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἀργῆ, (28)

Set him working so that he would not become lazy.

העבד עבדך שלא ימרוד (E)

ἀργῆ] ימרוד. An odd equation, though a slave who goes lazy is rebellious.

Cf. our remarks above under vs. 34 regarding **§**, which reflects in part **¶** here.

30.37) πολλὴν γὰρ κακίαν ἐδίδαξεν ἡ ἀργία· (29)

For laziness induced much harm.

כי הרבה רעה עו... (E)

30.38) εἰς ἔργα κατάστησον, καθὼς πρέπει αὐτῷ, (30)

κἂν μὴ πειθαρχῆ, βάρυνον τὰς πέδας.

καὶ μὴ περισεύσης ἐπὶ πάσῃ σαρκί

καὶ ἄνευ κρίσεως μὴ ποιήσης μηδέν.

Get him working, as befits him,

and if he does not obey, add weight to his fetters.

But do not overdo it to anybody

and do not do anything unfair.

הרב... (Ea)

אל תֹתֵר על כל אדם ובלא משפט... (Eb)

πρέπει] an instance of the impersonal use of non-passive, 3rd pers. sg. forms, see *SSG* § 87 c.

30.39) Εἰ ἔστιν σοι οἰκέτης, ἔστω ὡς σύ, (31)

ὅτι ἐν αἵματι ἐκτήσω αὐτόν·

εἰ ἔστιν σοι οἰκέτης, ἄγε αὐτὸν ὡς ἀδελφόν,

ὅτι ὡς ἡ ψυχὴ σου ἐπιδεήσεις αὐτῷ·

*If you have a household servant, let him be like you
because you obtained him for blood.*

*If you have a household servant, treat him like a brother,
because you might need him as yourself.*

אִהְיֶה עבדך כִּי... (Ea)

אחד עבדך כאח השבתי לְתִקְנָא... (Eb)

The numeral, אַחַד, is found also in **§**, but missing in **¶**. Does the numeral suggest “even if you could afford only one servant”? Such a person might become easily arrogant and start treating the servant harshly.

Vs. 39b is problematic. Nobody knows what **במשך** is. **ש** reads **מְטוּל דְּאִקְוֶתְךָ** **מְטוּל דְּאִקְוֶתְךָ** ‘because like you so is your lack.’ As distinct is **ש**, and much shorter: **מְטוּל דְּאִיךָ נִפְשָׁא דִּילְךָ תִּסְתַּנֶּק עָלְיָהּ** ‘because you will need him like yourself,’ which is only vs. 39c+d.

ἐν ἀίματι] If the *Vorlage* had **בדמי**, the translator wrongly derived it from BH **בד**, and not from RH **דמים** ‘price.’

אֵין תִּקְנָא] Nothing that could correspond to this is to be found in **ש** nor **ש**. The meaning must be “Do not be jealous of ..”.

ὡς ἡ ψυχὴ σου] This could have been worded: ὡς τῆ ψυχῆ σου. Cp. ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέθηκέν μοι μίτραν καὶ ὡς νύμφην κατεκόσμησέν με κόσμῳ ‘as a bridegroom he put on me a head-dress and as a bride he decorated me with ornaments’ Is 61.10. For more examples and a discussion, see *SSG* § 26 n (2c), 77 **da**.

αὐτῷ] The dative case with a verb meaning ‘to have need of’ is highly exceptional. The genitive case is the norm.

30.40) ἐὰν κακώσης αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπάρας ἀποδρᾷ, (32)

ἐν ποίᾳ ὁδῷ ζητήσεις αὐτόν; (33)

*If you mishandle him, and he escapes and runs away,
in which way would you look for him?*

(E) כי אם עניתו יצא ואבד באיזה דרך ... :

ἐν ποίᾳ ὁδῷ] **ש** **בְּאִדָּא רוּחָא** ‘In which direction?’. According to Segal (215) **רוחא** is an error of **אורחא**, i.e. **אורחא** ‘way.’

CHAPTER 31 (34)

31.1) Κεναὶ ἐλπίδες καὶ ψευδεῖς ἀσυνέτω ἀνδρί,
καὶ ἐνύπνια ἀναπτεροῦσιν ἄφρονας.

*Empty and false hopes are typical of a senseless person,
and dreams excite silly people.*

(E) רִיק תִּדְרֹשׁ תִּזְחַלֵּת כּוֹב וּחְלוּמוֹת ...:

§ is substantially reworded: **אִךְ אֲנִשׁ דְּאֶחֶיד טְלֵלָא וּמְפָרָה עֹנְפָא** ‘one who seeks futility finds falsehood and a dream is meaningless joy.’ The first hemistich of **Ⲫ** departs no less from **Ⲭ**: “a false hope is after vanity.”¹

ἀναπτεροῦσιν] **Ⲩⲓ** מְפָרְהִין ‘they make fly,’ out of excitement (?).

31.2) ὧς δρασσόμενος σκιᾶς καὶ διώκων ἄνεμον
οὕτως ὁ ἐπέχων ἐνυπνίους·

*As one who takes hold of a shadow and chases a wind,
so is he who depends on dreams.*

§ has a message of its own to present: **אִךְ אֲנִשׁ דְּאֶחֶיד טְלֵלָא וּמְפָרָה עֹנְפָא** ‘as a person who is grasping a shadow and making birds fly is he who believes in a nocturnal vision.’

ἐπέχων] Not so much “takes notice” (Snaith), “pays heed” (*NETS*) as “puts trust (in)” (Skehan - Di Lella) and “sich an (Träume) hält” (*SD*).

31.3) τοῦτο κατὰ τούτου ὄρασις ἐνυπνίων,
κατέναντι προσώπου ὁμοίωμα προσώπου.

*What you see in dreams is a reflection
as your face looks like another face opposite.*

τούτου] Many MSS read τοῦτο, but the gen. makes better sense, “behind, in the rear of.”

ὄρασις ἐνυπνίων] Depending on **Ⲩ** **ⲩⲏⲟⲩⲁ** ‘a vision and a dream’ Segal (216) proposes **ⲙⲣⲁⲗⲁ** **ⲩⲏⲟⲩⲁ**, though we think the other version makes better sense.

¹ Given this general character of the translation of this verse, there is no much sense in the attempt by Marcus (1931.237) to translate **Ⲫ** back to **Ⲭ**: רִיק תִּקוֹת נִבַּל תּוֹחַלֵּת כּוֹב.

*For dreams misled many
and they fell, trusting them.*

For the first hemistich **§** reads: אַרְבָּעַת אֲנָשִׁים טָעוּ דְּבַחְלָמָא טָעוּ אֲנָשִׁים ‘Many are those who lost their way through a dream.’

31.8) ἄνευ ψεύδους συντελεσθήσεται νόμος,
καὶ σοφία στόματι πιστῶ τελείωσις.

*The law is to be completed without a lie,
and wisdom is to achieve perfection with a trustworthy mouth.*

§ carries a message that is quite distinct from **Ⓞ**⁴: אַרְבָּעַת אֲנָשִׁים טָעוּ דְּבַחְלָמָא טָעוּ אֲנָשִׁים ‘at a place where there are no sins God is pleased because the sin of wicked people is trusted at night.’

Smend (306) maintains that the first hemistich means “die Verheissung, die das Gesetz dem Frommen gibt, erfüllt sich.” We doubt, however, νόμον συντελεῖν can mean “cause the law to fulfil its promise.”

31.9) Ἄνῆρ πεπλανημένος ἔγνω πολλά,
καὶ ὁ πολὺπειρος ἐκδιηγῆσεται σύνεσιν·

*A widely-travelled man learned a great deal,
and a much experienced person could explicate understanding.*

πεπλανημένος] semantically vague. In vs. 7 above the verb definitely carried a negative connotation, but not here in the light of the parallel πολὺπειρος. See also πεπλανημένος in vs. 11, where it is unquestionably positively viewed, and note also vs. 12 where a related verb, ἀποπλανέω, is used with reference to the author’s own enriching experience. Cp. **Ⓢ** אֲנָשִׁים טָעוּ ‘straying.’⁵ Some modern translations prefer a v.l. πεπαιδευμενος, thus e.g. “ein wohlunterrichteter Mann” (Ryssel).

31.10) ὃς οὐκ ἐπειράθη, ὀλίγα οἶδεν,

He who has not been put to a test knows little.

§ presents a contrastive pair by combining this verse with the following: אַרְבָּעַת אֲנָשִׁים טָעוּ דְּבַחְלָמָא טָעוּ אֲנָשִׁים ‘one who has not been tested knows little and one who has been tested has increased wisdom.’

31.11) ὁ δὲ πεπλανημένος πλεθυνεῖ πανουργίαν.

He who travelled widely is rich in cleverness.

⁴ Cf. Smend’s (307) endeavours to harmonise the two with each other.

⁵ **Ⓢ** אֲנָשִׁים טָעוּ ‘wise’ is difficult to account for.

⁶ Pe. pass. ptc. Alternatively אֲנָשִׁים Pa. pf. ‘he tried.’

- 31.12) πολλὰ ἐόρακα ἐν τῇ ἀποπλανήσει μου,
καὶ πλείονα τῶν λόγων μου σύνεσις μου·

*I have seen a lot in my travels away from home
and my understanding is beyond my expression.*

ἀποπλανήσει] Unlike in Dt 29.19, where ἀποπλάνησις denotes “wandering away (from the truth),” here it is used with positive connotation.⁷

Note **§**: סַגִּי קִוִּית כַּד נִסִּית צְבֻתָא סַגִּיאָתָא עֲלֵי עֵבֶר ‘I saw a lot when I tried; many things came my way.’

- 31.13) πλεονάκις ἕως θανάτου ἐκινδύνευσα
καὶ διεσώθην τούτων χάριν.

*Often I was near the danger of death,
and because of these (experiences) I was saved.*

τούτων] This appears to be referring back to πολλὰ in vs. 12. In **§**, however, the fem. gender of the pronoun in מְטוּלָתְהֵינִי suggests a reference back to סַגִּיאָתָא סַגִּיאָתָא, “many things experienced on the way,” vs. 12. The pl. number in **¶** and **§** alike does not support Smend (308), who takes τούτων as cataphoric.

At the end of the verse **§** reads: הַו סַבְרָה הוּ סְטוּל מְרִיא עֲבַד מְרִיא דְדָקְדָקָהּ עָבְדָא דְדָקְדָקָהּ ‘the desire of those who fear Him the Lord fulfills because His hope is great and rescues.’

- 31.14) πνεῦμα φοβουμένων κύριον ζήσεται·

The spirit of those who fear the Lord would survive.

As Smend (308) points out, the spirit of a human as the *s* of “to live” is remarkable. However, it could go dead, but that would not happen, we are told, to those who fear the Lord.

§ reads: הַו סַבְרָה הוּ סְטוּל מְרִיא עֲבַד מְרִיא דְדָקְדָקָהּ, which is a rendering of vs. 17.

- 31.15) ἡ γὰρ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν σώζοντα αὐτούς.

For their hope rests on the One who rescues them.

- 31.16) ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον οὐδὲν εὐλαβηθήσεται
καὶ οὐ μὴ δειλιάσῃ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐλπίς αὐτοῦ.

*He who fears the Lord has nothing to be afraid of
and he would never feel scared, for He is his hope.*

⁷ The entry in *GELS* is hence in need of slight revision.

31.17) φοβουμένου τὸν κύριον μακαρία ἡ ψυχὴ·

The soul of one who fears the Lord is blessed.

31.18) τίτι ἐπέχει; καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ στήριγμα;

What does he count on? And who is his support?

τίτι] Parallel to the following τίς, its gender can be masc., then “Whom ..?”
If unvocalised, **Sh** מנו is equivocal: = על מנו ‘on whom?’ or = על מנו ‘on what?’. By contrast, **S** reads: אָל מִן אֲתֵתְךָ וּמִן הָאֱלֹהִים לָאֵלֶיךָ מִיָּדָא ‘on whom did he trust and who was a supporter for him?’

31.19) οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτόν,
ὑπερασπισμὸς δυναστείας καὶ στήριγμα ἰσχύος,
σκέπη ἀπὸ καύσωνος καὶ σκιά ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας,
φυλακὴ ἀπὸ προσκόμματος καὶ βοήθεια ἀπὸ πτώσεως,

*The eyes of the Lord are on those who love Him,
a powerful protection and a strong support,
a shelter against a sirocco and a shade at midday,
a guard against stumbling and a help against a fall,*

Let’s note how **S** reads: עֵינָיו דְּמַרְיָא עַל כָּלֵהוּן עֲבָדֵיהּ וּמִן אֲתֵתְךָ וּמִן הָאֱלֹהִים לָאֵלֶיךָ מִיָּדָא הוּא רַבָּא וּמִסְתַּרְגָּנָא מִן אֲנָא וּפְרוּקָא מִן בְּעַלְדָּבְבָא וּמִשְׁוֹבְנָא הוּא מִן מַחֲוֵי וּמִן מְסִיחָא וּמִן מְסִיחָא וּמִן מְסִיחָא וּמִן מְסִיחָא ‘the eyes of the Lord are upon all His servants and He protects and saves and He is a great support and a defender against the enemy and the saviour from the devil and the deliverer from blow(s) and the defender against fall(s).’

The general clause structure of **G** is somewhat loose here: the last three lines must be all nominal clauses in which “the Lord” as *s* need be mentally inserted. If they are meant to be explanatory additions to αὐτόν, all the following predicates should be in the accusative: ὑπερασπισμόν .. στήριγμα .. σκέπην .. σκιάν .. φυλακὴν .. βοήθειαν.

This syntactic remark applies equally to **S**: the initial, standard nominal clause is continued with two verbally used participles without their *s*, two nominal clauses with **יה** functioning each time as a pseudo *s*, and finishing off with another clause with a verbally used participle with no *s*.

In either **G** or **S**, the reader would have little difficulty in understanding the message correctly. It is just that the clause structure is not very neat. However, some of these clauses, when recited or read as a single clause, would become rather confusing.

31.20) ἀνυψῶν ψυχὴν καὶ φωτίζων ὀφθαλμούς,

ἵασιν διδοὺς ζωῆς καὶ εὐλογίαν.

*He lifts soul(s) and enlightens eyes,
gives cure of life and blessing.*

Note **⚙**: חַדוּתָא דְלִבָּא וְנוֹהָרָא דְעֵינָא וְאַסְיּוּתָא דְחַיָּא וְבוֹרְכָתָא ‘the joy of the heart and the light of the eyes and the cure for life and blessings.’ All that precedes is summed up with: הָלִין כּוֹלְהִין אַעְפָּא עַל וְדִיקָא גְּאֹתִין ‘all these would doubly descend on the righteous.’

What has been said about the loose clause structuring under the preceding verse applies here, too. In this regard, **⚙** accords with **⚙**, but departs from it in this verse: דְּמַרְמָרִם לְנַפְשָׁא וּמְנוּהָר לְעֵינָא דְיֵהֵב אַסְיּוּתָא חַיָּא וְבוֹרְכָתָא ‘who exalts soul(s) and enlightens eyes, who gives cure, life, and blessing(s).’ The relative clauses here may be antecedentless: “One who ..”.

31.21) Θυσιάζων ἐξ ἀδίκου προσφορὰ μεμωμημένη,

*A sacrifice made as an offering out of something unjust has been
condemned as blemished.*

The syntax of this Greek clause is ungrammatical. A person who offers a sacrifice cannot be an offering itself; both are in the same case, nominative. In **⚙** the message is worded in a grammatically impeccable fashion עֲלִיָּהוֹן אֲנִין דְּעוּלָא דְּעוּלָא ‘sacrifices of iniquities are of iniquity,’ whereas **⚙** appears to be unduly influenced by **⚙**: הוּ דְּאִינָא דְּמַדְבַּח מִן עוּלָא קוֹרְבָנָהּ מְסִלָּי הוּ ‘he who offers sacrifices out of wickedness, his offering is to be rejected.’ The latter, however, is slightly better than its *Vorlage*, for אִינָא דְּמַדְבַּח מִן עוּלָא can be analysed as standing in *casus pendens*, though the initial דְּ is difficult.

31.22) καὶ οὐκ εἰς εὐδοκίαν δωρήματα ἀνόμων.

nor are gifts by the unlawful to (God’s) pleasure.

31.23) οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐν προσφοραῖς ἀσεβῶν
οὐδὲ ἐν πλήθει θυσιῶν ἐξιλάσκειται ἁμαρτίας.

*The Most High is not in favour of offerings by the ungodly
nor atones sins with multitude of sacrifices.*

31.24) θύων υἷὸν ἔναντι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ

ὁ προσάγων θυσίαν ἐκ χρημάτων πενήτων.

*One who offers a sacrifice at the expense of the poor
is like one who sacrifices somebody’s son in front of his father.*

θύων] Both **⚙** and **⚙** sensibly add דְּאִי ‘like (of comparison)’ up front. So **⚙** *quasi qui victimat* etc.

- 31.25) ἄρτος ἐπιδομένων ζωὴ πτωχῶν,
ὁ ἀποστερῶν αὐτὴν ἄνθρωπος αἱμάτων.

*Bread of the destitute is life for the poor,
he who deprives it is a murderer.*

ἐπιδομένων] **ש** אֶדְדָּהּ ‘of favour, mercy.’ Smend (310) surmises that *Vorlage* read רסח, i.e. רָחַח or רָחַץ ‘lack, deficiency,’ which was misread as רסח, i.e. רָחַץ.

ὁ ἀποστερῶν] **ש** אֲלֵהּ ‘he who withholds.’ Cf. **ש** הַיּוֹן לְגִלּוֹ אֵינָא ‘one who withholds it,’ where we follow a marginal note pointing out that הַיּוֹן (with a m.pl. suffix pronoun) is equal to אֵינָא ‘life,’ i.e. not the preceding אֲשֵׁר ‘the poor’ (also m.pl.). The author of the note was being kind to readers who, being ignorant of Greek, would not know that the suffix represents αὐτὴν [= ζωὴν].

ἄνθρωπος αἱμάτων] Smend (310) refers to אִישׁ־דְּמַי ἄνδρα αἱμάτων Ps 5.7. On the pl. indicating a large quantity, see *SSG* § 21 **b**. By adding an adjective **ש** stresses the inexcusable nature of death: אֲשֵׁר דְּמָא דְּקָא ‘shedding innocent blood,’ unlike, for instance, a case of capital punishment.

- 31.26) φονεύων τὸν πλησίον ὁ ἀφαιρούμενος ἐμβίωσιν,

He who takes away livelihood is murdering his neighbour

As often is the case, here also **ש** is expansive: יִרְתַּ חֲבֵרָה יָרַת נְכֹסֶיהָ דְּקָטַל חֲבֵרָה לְאֵלֵהּ אֲשֵׁר דְּמָא דְּקָא ‘he who kills his friend takes his property into possession and he who spills innocent blood is withholding it from God.’

- 31.27) καὶ ἐκχέων αἷμα ὁ ἀποστερῶν μισθὸν μισθίου.

and he who withholds the wages of a labourer is shedding his blood.

Cf. **ש** again: אֲשֵׁר דְּמָא דְּקָא פּוֹרְעֵנָא בִּישָׁא וְהוּ מְקַבֵּל פְּרִיָּהּ וְהוּ מְקַבֵּל פְּרִיָּהּ וְהוּ מְקַבֵּל פְּרִיָּהּ ‘he who withholds wages of a labourer is withholding away from his Creator and he will receive an awful penalty.’

- 31.28) εἷς οἰκοδομῶν, καὶ εἷς καθαιρῶν·
τί ὠφέλησαν πλεῖον ἢ κόπους;

*One is building up, and one is pulling down.
What did they gain more than toil?*

- 31.29) εἷς ἐνχόμενος, καὶ εἷς καταρῶμενος·
τίνος φωνῆς εἰσακούσεται ὁ δεσπότης;

*One prays and one curses,
whose voice would the Master hear?*

ὁ δεσπότης] specified by **Š** as אֱלֹהִים ‘God,’ **℣** as *Deus*, and by **Š** as יְיָ
‘our Master.’

31.30) βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀπτόμενος αὐτοῦ,
τί ὠφέλησεν ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ;

*Washing oneself after touching a corpse and touching it once again,
what has he gained through this washing?*

31.31) οὕτως ἄνθρωπος νηστεύων ἐπὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ
καὶ πάλιν πορευόμενος καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιῶν·
τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτοῦ τίς εἰσακούσεται;
καὶ τί ὠφέλησεν ἐν τῷ ταπεινωθῆναι αὐτόν;

*So is a person who fasts over his sins
and goes again and does the same things.*

Who would listen to his prayer?

And what did he benefit through tormenting himself?

τῷ ταπεινωθῆναι] most likely = יתענית, i.e. יתענית.⁸ Cf. יתענית Ezr 9.5 > ταπεινώσεώς μου 2E 9.5. This very word is sometimes used with reference to fasting, e.g. καὶ ἐταπείνουν ἐν νηστείᾳ τὴν ψυχὴν μου Ps 34.13 < יתענית יִשְׁפָּן בְּצוֹם בְּצוֹם Ps 35.13. For more data, see *GELS* s.v. ταπεινώ **1 c**. Note νηστεύων in the first line of our current verse. Unlike **Š**’s literal rendering, אֶתְנַחֵם בְּעַבְדוֹתָא ‘through abasing himself’ **Š**’s מַצָּ shows that יתענית is in effect equivalent to צוֹם, which is affiliated to **Š**’s מַצָּ at the start of the current verse.

⁸ Alternatively Smend (311): יתעניתה.

CHAPTER 32 (35)

32.1) Ὁ συντηρῶν νόμον πλεονάζει προσφοράς,

He who observes the law increases offerings,

§ is expansive at the end: וְיִטָּר פּוֹקֵדְנָא טוֹבִיָּה לְרוּחָהּ ‘and he who observes the commandment, blessed is his spirit.’

32.2) θυσιάζων σωτηρίου ὁ προσέχων ἐντολαῖς.

He who is attentive to commandments is one who offers a sacrifice as a thanks-offering.

θυσιάζων σωτηρίου] Unlike in the preceding verse we do not find θυσιάζει σωτήριον or σωτήρια. The use of the gen. indicates that the ptc. here is substantivised, taking an objective genitive. A subtle syntactic variation, whereas the general tenet of the message of the two verses is the same.

Cf. § רַמָּא חוּבְלָא טְבָא מִן דְּמִקְרַב קוּרְבָּנָא וְדַעְבְּד וְדִקְתָּא נְטָר נְמוּסָא ‘one who offers an offering casts good interests; and one who practises righteousness observes the law.’

32.3) ἀνταποδιδούς χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλιν,

He who repays a favour (received) is offering the finest flour.

In the light of the parallel wording in vss. 1 and 2 we anticipate ὁ ἀνταποδιδούς.

§ presents a new proverb of its own: וְיִטָּר פּוֹקֵדְנָא נְטָר נְמוּסָא ‘and he who practices righteousness is observing the law.’

32.4) καὶ ὁ ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνην θυσιάζων αἰνέσεως.

And he who practises charity is offering a sacrifice of praise.

θυσιάζων αἰνέσεως] On a substantivised ptc. taking an objective genitive, see above at vs. 2. In just these four verses (1-4) we find seven participles, all substantivised and followed by a direct object. Two of the ο’s are objective genitive, and the remaining five take an ο in the case which the participle concerned governs as a standard verb: thus acc. (συντηρῶν νόμον, ἀνταποδιδούς χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλιν, ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνην) and dat. (προσέχων ἐντολαῖς).

With a *sacrifice of praise* is meant a sacrifice offered as a token of praise to God?

- 32.5) εὐδοκία κυρίου ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ πονηρίας,
καὶ ἐξιλασμὸς ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας.

*The Lord is pleased with us keeping away from evil
and it is an atonement to keep away from injustice.*

§ varies the same inf. used twice over, ἀποστῆναι: אָפּוֹסְתִינָא אֶתְּוֹרָא דְּאִיְבוֹרָא דְּכָל דְּבִי שׁ וְכָל דְּחִלְיָא דְּלֵא תִּעְבֵּד דְּסָגְדָא וְכָל דְּבִי שׁ אֶתְּוֹרָא דְּאִיְבוֹרָא דְּכָל דְּבִי שׁ ‘the will of God is (for us) to depart from all that is evil, and prevent your power so that you do anything hateful (to God).’ § is consistent with אָפּוֹסְתִינָא.

Does the second line of § mean that to keep away from injustice was the ultimate goal of atonement?

- 32.6) μὴ ὀφθῆς ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου κενός·

Do not show up in the presence of the Lord empty-handed.

- 32.7) πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα χάριν ἐντολῆς.

For all this is due to a commandment.

The message is probably that, whilst the maintenance of ethical standards is of great importance, the observance of commandments on rituals is no less important. Quite a different message comes through from §: מְטוֹל דְּכָל לֵא וְהָיָה כִּי יַעֲשֶׂה אִישׁ מִצְוַת דְּבִי שׁ אֶתְּוֹרָא דְּכָל דְּבִי שׁ ‘because everybody that does what is good is observing the commandment.’

- 32.8) προσφορὰ δικαίου λιπαίνει θυσιαστήριον,
καὶ ἡ εὐωδία αὐτῆς ἔναντι ὑψίστου.

*An offering by a righteous person anoints an altar,
and its fragrance reaches the Most High.*

§ shows a different metaphor: קוֹרְבָּנֵיהוֹן דְּדוֹקָא צְלוֹתָא דְּפִמְהוֹן וְעִבְדֵיהוֹן ‘the offerings by the righteous are a prayer of their mouth and their deeds penetrate the sky.’

- 32.9) θυσία ἀνδρὸς δικαίου δεκτὴ,
καὶ τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐπιλησθήσεται.

*A sacrifice by a righteous man is welcome
and its record shall not be consigned to oblivion.*

The message of vs. 9b in § differs from that in §: וְדוֹקָרְנֵיהוֹן דְּדוֹקָא לֵא וְהָיָה כִּי יַעֲשֶׂה אִישׁ מִצְוַת דְּבִי שׁ אֶתְּוֹרָא דְּכָל דְּבִי שׁ ‘and the memory of the righteous would not be forgotten for ever.’

- 32.10) ἐν ἀγαθῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δόξασον τὸν κύριον
καὶ μὴ σμικρύνῃς ἀπαρχὴν χειρῶν σου.

*In praising the Lord be generous
and do not detract from the first-fruits in your hands.*

ἀγαθῶ ὀφθαλμῶ] opposite to ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός עין רע ‘niggard’ at 14.10 above.

χειρῶν σου] a gen. of origin, i.e. first-fruits brought to the temple in your hands and produced from there.

Quite a different moral code is presented in **ש**: בְּעִנְיָא טְבָתָא הַב לְמַסְכְּנָא וְלֹא תִתְיַע בְּמִוְהַבְתָּהּ ‘Give to the poor generously and you shall not be frightened¹ with your gifts.’

32.11) ἐν πάσῃ δόσει ἰλάρωσον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου
καὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἀγίασον δεκάτην.

*Whatever you give, brighten your face up
and dedicate your tithe joyfully.*

:² בכלל מַעֲשֵׂיךָ הָאֵלֹהִים וּבִשְׂשׂוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ מַעֲשֵׂיךָ (B)

δόσει] מַעֲשֵׂיךָ is odd in a description of ritual offerings. Note **ש** מִוְהַבְתָּהּ ‘your donations.’

ἰλάρωσον τὸ πρόσωπόν] On this idiom, see above at 7.24.

Note vs. 11b in **ש**: וּבְחֵדוּתָא אֲוֹרְךָ לְמִן דְּלֹא פָרַע לָךְ ‘and joyfully lend to one who might not pay back to you.’

32.12) δὸς ὑψίστῳ κατὰ τὴν δόσιν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν ἀγαθῶ ὀφθαλμῶ καθ’ εὖρεμα χειρός·

*Give to the Most High, as He gave you,
and generously to the best of your ability.*

(B) תן לוֹ מִמַּתְנִתְךָ לְךָ בְּטוֹב עֵין וּבַהֲשַׁגַּת יָד

καθ’ εὖρεμα χειρός] With אֵיךְ מְשַׁכְּחֵנוּתָא דְאִידָא ‘in accordance with the ability of hand’ **ש** shows its awareness of the Heb. idiom lying behind it as in εἰδὲ μὴ εὐρίσκη αὐτοῦ ἢ χεὶρ ζευγος τρυγόνων ‘should he not be able to afford a pair of turtle doves’ Le 5.11 < **ש** וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁיֵג יָדוֹ לְשֵׁתֵי תְרִים **ש** Lévi (163) justly emends בהֲשַׁגַּת to כַּהֲשַׁגַּת. He further notes that with its אִידָא רַבָּתָא ‘with a great hand’ **ש** saw in הֲשַׁגַּת a Syr. equivalent of אֲסַגְיָ ‘to multiply.’ On the Heb. idiom יָד הֲשַׁגַּת, see also above at 14.13.

¹ Smend (313) surmises תַּמְעַט ‘you make little in quantity’ was misread as תַּמְעַד ‘you become shaken.’

² There are two marginal glosses for the last word: מַעֲשֵׂיךָ and מַעֲשֵׂיךָ, which latter looks like a scribal error.

³ V.l. מַתְנֵהוּ.

𐤔 expands a little and combines it with vs. 13: מִן דִּי־הָב גִּיר לְמִסְכָּנָא לְאַלְהָא ‘for one who gives to a poor person is lending to God. For who is going to repay if not He?’ what we read in a marginal gloss of 𐤔 at the following verse: מלוה י״י נותן לאביון ומי בעל גמולות כי אם הוא

32.13) ὅτι κύριος ἀνταποδιδούς ἐστίν
καὶ ἑπταπλάσια ἀνταποδώσει σοι.

*For the Lord is one who is going to repay
and He would repay you sevenfold.*

(B) כי אלוה תשלומות הוא ושבעתים ישיב⁴ לך:

[ἀνταποδιδούς ἐστίν] unlikely a periphrastic construction; the general context does not favour such an analysis, and the normal sequence is < εἰμί - ptc. >.

32.14) Μὴ δωροκόπει, οὐ γὰρ προσδέξεται,

Do not bribe, for He would not accept.

(B) אל תשחד כי לא יקח:

[δωροκόπει] What is 𐤔 תִּשְׁתַּחַר ‘you linger’ supposed to mean in this context? “Do not take too long a time before you come round to offering anyway”? Cf. 𐤔 לֹא תֵלֵאֵא בְקוֹרְבָנָא 𐤔 ‘Do not be tired with offerings!’ Does 𐤔 reflect תאחר, i.e. תִּאָחַר?

32.15) καὶ μὴ ἔπεχε θυσίᾳ ἀδίκῳ·
ὅτι κύριος κριτὴς ἐστίν,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν παρ’ αὐτῷ δόξα προσώπου.

*Do not count on an unjust offering
for the Lord is a judge,
and with Him there is no favouritism.*

(Ba) ואל תבטח על זבח מעשק:

(Bb) כי אלהי משפט הוא ואין עמו משוא פנים:

[δόξα προσώπου] a unique attestation in SG of this phrase in the sense of “favouritism, partiality.” In NTG we encounter a few times προσωποληψία, e.g. οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ Ro 2.11 reflecting πρόσωπόν τινος λαμβάνειν as in οὐ λήμψη πρόσωπον πτωχοῦ οὐδὲ θαυμάσεις πρόσωπον δυνάστου < גְּדוּלַּ פְּנֵי גְדוּלַּ 𐤔 Le 19.15 and in the following verse.⁵ With its מִסְבַּב בְּאַפָּא 𐤔’s *Vorlage* most likely had a form

⁴ A marginal gloss reads ישלם.

⁵ NT authors appear to have created two more affiliated words: προσωπολημπτέω Jam 2.9 and προσωπολήμπτης Ac 10.34. Cf. also Thackeray 1909.43f.

of מְשֹׂא פָּנִים as in מְשֹׂא פָּנִים וּמְשֹׂא עוֹלָה אֵלֶיּוֹ עוֹלָה אֵלֶיּוֹ (Θ θαυμάσαι πρόσωπον⁶) 2Ch 19.7.⁷ See also above at 4.22.

32.16) οὐ λήμψεται πρόσωπον ἐπὶ πτωχοῦ
καὶ δέησιν ἠδικημένου εἰσακούσεται·

*He would not practise favouritism at the expense of the poor
and would give ear to a plea of a victim of injustice.*

(B) לֹא יִשָּׂא פָּנִים אֶל דָּל וְתַחֲנוּנֵי מִצּוֹק יִשְׁמַע:

One would anticipate עַל דָּל, on which see above at 4.22.

In *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ I *10 a new sense has been introduced: “*at the expense of, to the disadvantage of.*”⁸ This interpretation is supported through the use of κατὰ τινοσ in a rendering of the same Heb. idiom at 4.22. Can our instance be moved under 7 “*in respect of*”?

ἠδικημένου] שֵׁי רֵיקִי רוּחָא ‘the sad in spirit.’

We are curious what sense the average Syriac speaker would have made of vs. 16b of שֵׁ: לֹא נִסַּב פְּרִצוּפָא עַל בִּישָׂא, a strange rendering in view of the above-mentioned שֵׁ’s familiarity with the underlying Heb. expression.

32.17) οὐ μὴ ὑπερίδη ἱκετεῖαν ὀρφανοῦ
καὶ χήραν, ἐὰν ἐκχέη λαλιάν·

*He would never neglect a plea by an orphan,
and a widow, if she pours her mind out.*

(B) לֹא יִטֵּשׂ צַעֲקַתָּ 9 יְתוּם וְאֵלְמִנָּה כִּי תִרְבֶּה 10 שִׁיחַ:

ἐὰν] כִּי is at times used as synonymous with אִם. For a discussion, see *SQH* § 41 d.

For the general message, cf. Ex 22.21-23, Dt 24.17, and Ps 68.6.

32.18) οὐχὶ δάκρυα χήρας ἐπὶ σιαγόνα καταβαίνειν

Do not tears of a widow stream down her cheek?

(B) הֲלֹא דַמְעָה עַל לַחֵי תִרְדַּ

δάκρυα] The selection of the pl. makes sense. So שֵׁ דְמְעָיָה. In BH the noun occurs 21 times in the sg., and only twice in the pl., and in BS 4 times, all in the sg. In the only other case in BS where it is reflected in Θ the pl.

⁶ On this rendering, cf. οὐ θαυμάζει πρόσωπον < מְשֹׂא פָּנִים Dt 10.17 [*s* = God of Israel].

⁷ Cf. שֵׁ בְּאִפּוֹ לָוֶה אֶלְהָא Lv 19.15 and לֹא תִסַּב בְּאִפּוֹ מִקְּסָנָא Ro 2.11.

⁸ We would now delete a reference to Da 2.9 LXX. This makes our Si case the sole instance. The Da instance can be taken in the sense of “in the presence of.”

⁹ In the margin we see אֲנַקָּה.

¹⁰ In the margin we see תַּחְבֹּט.

form appears: ἐπὶ νεκρῶν κατάγαγε δάκρυα *על המת הויב דמעא* 38.16, where the pl. is indeed fitting.

32.19) καὶ ἡ καταβόησις ἐπὶ τῷ καταγαγόντι αὐτά;

And is not her shriek aimed at him who caused them to stream down?

(B *ואנחה על מרודיה:*)

[καταβόησις *אנחה*] On this unusual equation, the sole instance, see Wagner 1999.223.

τῷ καταγαγόντι αὐτά] = *מרודיה*, i.e. *מורידה*. There is no agreed analysis of *מרודיה*.¹¹ On the combination *καταγάγω δάκρυα*, see an example cited under 32.18.

32.20) θεραπεύων ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ δεχθήσεται,
καὶ ἡ δέησις αὐτοῦ ἕως νεφελῶν συνάψει·

*One who serves willingly would be accepted
and his supplication would reach as far as the clouds.*

(B *תמרורי רצון הנחה וצעקה ענן חשתה:*)

[*θεραπεύων*] which cannot be harmonised with *תמרורי*. According to Smend (315) it possibly reflects *תמרוקי*, for which *αἱ ἡμέραι θεραπείας* Est 2.12 LXX (*מי מרוקיהן*) is mentioned.

ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ] The cst. st. of *תמרורי* shows that this prepositional phrase need be construed backwards, with *θεραπεύων*. *Sh* probably took the alternative way: *מְנִיחָא בְּמַצְטַבְיָנוּתָא נְתַקְבַּל* ‘a servant would be received with pleasure.’

[*δεχθήσεται*] Extremely difficult to relate to *הנחה*, which Smend (315) views as an Aramaising Hi. inf. *הַנְחָה* as in Est 2.18 in the sense of “to offer soothing odour,” a solution which looks to us as complicated as the problem itself.¹²

The second clause in *Sh* is as demanding as the first. Does *צעקה חשתה* mean ‘a loud cry fell silent’? How is *ענן* to be construed with *חשתה*, an intransitive verb? On the side of *Sh*, *συνάπτω* can scarcely reflect *הַשָּׁה*. On the whole verse, cf. Lévi 164f.

32.21) προσευχὴ ταπεινοῦ νεφέλας διήλθεν,
καὶ ἕως συνεγγίση, οὐ μὴ παρακληθῆ·
καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποστῆ, ἕως ἐπισκέψηται ὁ ὕψιστος

¹¹ Cf. Ben Yehuda 3316b. Segal (220) and Kahana (401) vocalise *מְרִידִיה* without saying what it means.

¹² His translation (II 60) reads: “Die Klage des Gequälten ist ein wohlgefälliges Opfer.”

*A prayer by a lowly person penetrates clouds,
and until it draws near to its destination, he would never be comforted,
and would never move away until the Most High takes interest.*

(Ba) שועת דל ענן חל עם ועד תגיע [כי] לא תנוח:
(Bb) לא תמוש עד יפקוד אל

The first Heb. clause in (Ba) is not easy. No fem.sg. verb with *שועת דל* as its *s* is identifiable. We should most likely adopt a marginal reading *עבים* as *חלפה* '(it) penetrated clouds' in lieu of *ענן חל עם*. And what is *עם חל עם*?

[כי]: there is no grammatical role that can be played here by this particle added in the margin. See (Bb). *עד כי תגיע* in the margin is normal as equivalent to *עד תגיע* or *עד אשר תגיע*.

παρακληθῆ] *שִׁה* תִּתְּפִיס *ה* 'it will become convinced.' Lévi (165) postulates *תנחם*. Is this a Pu. form?

ש diverges quite extensively from *ש* and *ש* alike: *צְלוֹתָהוֹן דְּמִסְכְּנֵי לְעַל מִן* וְדִינָא דְּקוֹשְׁטָא עֲנָנָא סְלִיקָא. וְקִדְם מְרָא רְבוּתָא עֲלָא. לָא עֲבָרָא עֲרָמָא דְּמַבְדֵּק עֲלֵיהּ. וְדִינָא דְּקוֹשְׁטָא דְּאָן 'the prayer of the poor people ascends above clouds and enters the presence of the master of majesty. It does not depart until He investigates it and passes a judgement of truth.'

32.22) καὶ κρινεῖ δικαίοις καὶ ποιήσει κρίσιν.

καὶ ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνη
οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς,
ἕως ἂν συντρίψῃ ὄσφον ἀνελεημόνων

*And He would judge for the righteous and perform judgement.
And the Lord would never be delayed
nor would He be long-suffering for them
until He crushes the loins of the merciless.*

(Ba) שופט צדק יעשה¹³ משפט:

(Bb) גם אל¹⁴ לא יתמהמה וכגבור לא יתאפק¹⁵:

(Bc) עד ימחץ מתני¹⁶ אכזרי

καὶ ποιήσει] Two fut. forms one after another and joined with καὶ might indicate that the *Vorlage* may have read *ועושה*, i.e. *ועושה*, cf. the marginal reading, *עושה*.

Given that at the end of vs. 21 there is no *sof pasuq* symbol [:] and it does appear at the close of vs. 22 (Ba), the text in (Ba) could be part of vs. 21.

¹³ In the margin we read *עושה*, a ptc.

¹⁴ In the margin we read *אדון*. So *ש* מְרִיא. The plain, anarthrous *אדון* is never used as a divine title.

¹⁵ In the margin we read *מה יתאפק*.

¹⁶ In the margin we find *מפני*, a meaningless reading.

Then **שופט צדק ועושה משפט** can be analysed as standing in apposition to **אל** in vs. 21 (Bb). Alternatively, **שופט צדק ועושה משפט** can be analysed as a subject complement with the value of “as, in the capacity of ..”.

ג heading a clause as here is at times to be construed with the following clause as a whole, and not with the immediately following word. Hence not “God also,” but “it is also true that God would not delay,” e.g. **וּבְרַכְתִּי אֶתָּה** וְגַם **נְתַתִּי מְמָנָה לְךָ בֶן** Gn 17.16. The corresponding Gk **καί** can also be analogously used, e.g. **καὶ ἦσαν οἱ δύο γυμνοί, ὁ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠσχύνοντο** Ge 3.1.

ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς] Since it is natural that the pronoun should be referring back to **δικαίους**,¹⁷ the author probably wants to say: “Whilst it is certain that a final judgement would not be postponed for ever, even the righteous should be prepared for it, for God’s patience is not unlimited.” Thus *pace* Smend (316) **αὐτοῖς** is not “beziehungslos,” and there is no need to emend it to **ὁ κραταίος**.

The Heb. **קָטַף** ‘to restrain oneself’ is not totally alien to **μακροθυμέω**, though our case is the only instance in LXX of this equation.

32.23) **καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀνταποδώσει ἐκδίκησιν,**
ἕως ἐξάρη πλῆθος ὑβριστῶν
καὶ σαῆπτρα ἀδίκων συντρίψει,
and to the gentiles He would requite punishment
till He annihilates many of the haughty
and He would shatter sceptres of the unrighteous.

(Ba) **ולגוים ישיב נקם:**

(Bb) **עד יוריש שבט זדון ומטה רשע גדוע יגדע:**¹⁸

τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] **לגוים]** Smend (316) admits here a scribal error or a variant spelling of **לגוים**, which accords well with the following **ὑβριστῶν**. However, do not **ἀνθρώπων** and **τῶν ἀνθρώπων** express a universalistic world view rather than a nationalistic one? We do admit, though, that in vs. 25 we are back to **τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ**.

ἐξάρη] **נָרַם** ‘He will raise’; **ἐξείρω** can mean “to lift, raise,” but not here. Smend (316) argues for emending **יוריש** to **ירשש** or **ירוש** from **רשש** ‘zerschlagen,’ but the equivalence **hi. רש / ἐξείρω** in LXX is attested as often as 17 times.

πλῆθος] **שבט** a mysterious rendering. The reading **שבט** is secure as parallel to **מטה**.

¹⁷ Snaith (172) identifies them as “the wicked,” who, however, are not mentioned anywhere in the context.

¹⁸ In the margin we read **שבטי .. רשעים**.

σκήπτρα] **§** uses a phonetic transcription, סקפטרא, which is defined in the margin as שִׁבְטָא דְמַלְכוּתָא ‘sceptre of kingship.’

συντρίψει [גדוע יגדע] Did the *Vorlage* lack the inf. abs.? In BS we find a number of instances of figura etymologica as shown by Van Peursen 2004 § 15.3, where this kind of inf. abs. is handled as *o* of a finite verb. Syntactically **§** here agrees with **¶**: מְפַסְקוּ מְפַסְקוּ ‘He certainly cuts off.’

32.24) ἕως ἀνταποδῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὰς πράξεις αὐτοῦ
καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα αὐτῶν,
*until He requites every human according to his practices
and the works of humans according to their desires,*

(B) עד ישיב לאנוש פעלו וגמול אדם כמזמתו:

κατὰ¹] In view of the parallel phrase later in the verse, the preposition *kaph* may have accidentally dropped out in the *Vorlage*. Cf. תְּשִׁיב לָהֶם גְּמוּל יְהוָה ׀ קְמַעְשָׁה יְדִיָּהֶם La 3.64.

τῶν ἀνθρώπων] The selection of the pl. may be due to the analysis of אדם here as meaning ‘humankind, people’ rather than ‘a human individual.’ The addition of the sg. suf. pron. in מזמתו is nothing but a purely formal concord.

τὰ ἐνθυμήματα αὐτῶν [מזמתו] In the only other occurrence of מְזַמָּה in Si,¹⁹ 44.4, it is rendered with διαβούλιον. Cf. **§** תְּרַעְיָתְהוֹן ‘their thoughts.’

32.25) ἕως κρίνη τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ
καὶ εὐφρανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ἔλεει αὐτοῦ.
*until He declares the sentence over His people
and He would cause them to rejoice over His mercy.*

(B) ... בַּ רִיב עָמוּ וְשִׂמְחָם בִּישׁוּעָתוֹ:

κρίνη] The verb form to be restored in **¶** is most likely יְרִיב, cf. יְרִיב יְרִיב אֶת־יְרִיבִי 1Sm 24.16 > **¶** καὶ κρίναι τὴν κρίσιν μου.

εὐφρανεῖ] fut. The non-selection of a subj. form morphologically parallel to κρίνη, hence either εὐφραίνη subj. pres. or εὐφράνη subj. aor., appears to support וְשִׂמְחָה, i.e. וְשִׂמְחָה, a *w-qatalí* form, as against a marginal reading, וְשִׂמְחָה, i.e. וְשִׂמְחָה, a conjunctive form coordinate with יְרִיב. This means that the temporal clause introduced with ἕως contains one verbal clause only, and the other introduces an independent verbal clause. This passage contains a few more similar examples of the syntagm <ἕως aor. subj. - fut.>: vs. 21b-22a, 22-23a, and 23.

¹⁹ Incidentally in the entire LXX as well.

ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ] **ס** בְּפִרְעוֹנוֹתָי ‘through His vengeance’; is God giving His people a chance for *Schadenfreude*? Note also what follows (vs. 26): אֲנֵי־אֹיְבֵי־אֶבְרָם בְּעֵדְנָא סְנֵאָא וְנִבְהָתוּ ‘and their enemy would feel shame at the time of distress.’

32.26) ὄραϊον ἔλεος ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως
ὡς νεφέλαι ὑετοῦ ἐν καιρῷ ἀβροχίας.

*Splendid is (His) mercy at times of distress
like rain-bringing clouds at times of drought.*

... בְּזִמְן מְצוּקָה כַּעַת חַזְיוֹנִים בַּעַת בְּצוֹרָת: (B)

ὄραϊον ἔλεος] We follow **ס**ו, which identifies here a nominal clause, and not a noun phrase with an attributive adjective: שְׂפִירַיִן רַחֲמָא ‘(His) mercies are beautiful.’

The verse is concerned with the climatic conditions out of farmers’ perspective. Two words here belong to that semantic domain: בְּצוֹרָת ‘drought’ and חַזְיוֹנִים, which occurs three times in BH in the sense of ‘thunderbolt.’ In MH the latter also means “cloud,” what **ס**’s νεφέλαι represents. This rare Heb. word occurs once more in Si and is assigned in **ס** a slightly different sense: קוֹלוֹת חַזְיוֹנִים בְּרֹבֵת מֵגָלָה ‘an enormous thunderbolt’ 40.13, where, however, ὑετός also accompanies, v.a.l.

θλίψεως] θλίψις is a generic word meaning ‘distress.’

ὡς νεφέλαι] = כַּעַב, i.e. כְּעָב.

ἀβροχίας] This Gk word, ἀβροχία, is one of those relatively rare lexemes which, apart from in Si, are used in only one other book in LXX. In this particular case 1× in Si and 2× in Je. Ziegler (1958.279) shows that words that occur up to three times in books other than Si total 535, and, apart from the Pentateuch, they are confined to wisdom literature, 2-4Ma, Ps, Jb, Is, and Je.

CHAPTER 33 (36)

33.1) Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, δέσποτα ὁ θεὸς πάντων, καὶ ἐπίβλεψον

Have pity on us, the Lord the God of all, and watch

הושיענו אלהי הכל (B)

δέσποτα] On the use of this vocative as a reference to God, see above at 23.1.

33.2) καὶ ἐπίβαλε τὸν φόβον σου ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη·

and cast the fear of You on all the nations.

ושים פחדך על כל הגוים: (B)

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] Is **Š** precluding some minority, religious nations with **אֲמַמִּים** **לֹא יָדְעוּךָ** ‘nations who have not come to know You’? Cf. **¶** *gentes quae non exquisierunt te*, which is close to **Š**, but lacks *omnes*, whereas MS 248 does have it: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ ἐκζητοῦντά σε. Lévi mentions Ps 79.6 (// Je 10.25) as the source text: **שָׁפַךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל-הַגּוֹיִם אֶשְׁרַל-יִדְעוּךָ**, where **¶** *ἔκχεον τὴν ὄργην σου ἐπὶ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ γινώσκοντά σε* is very telling because of the anarthrous ἔθνη.

33.3) ἔπαρον τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ ἔθνη ἀλλότρια,

καὶ ἰδέτωσαν τὴν δυναστείαν σου.

*Raise Your hand upon alien nations,
and let them see Your powerfulness.*

(B) הניף יד¹ על עם נכר ויראו את גבורתיך:

ἔθνη ἀλλότρια] The shift to the pl. sounds sensible as against the sg. **עם נכר** in **¶**. Pace Smend (318) the shift is not necessarily due to the pl. *ἰδέτωσαν*, because *ἔθνος* consists of individuals. The anarthrous structure notwithstanding, Smend (318) is of the opinion that the reference must be to Greeks.

גבורתיך] possibly a *plena* spelling for **גְּבוּרָתְךָ**, for which there are a good number of examples in QH; for details, see Qimron 2018 § D 2.2.1.1-2. It is of course possible to analyse it as pl., expressing manifestations of God’s powerfulness.

¹ An addition in the margin.

33.4) ὡσπερ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἡγίασθης ἐν ἡμῖν,
οὕτως ἐνώπιον ἡμῶν μεγαλυνθείης ἐν αὐτοῖς·

*Just as Your holy character towards us was revealed in front of them,
so may Your greatness towards them be revealed in front of us.*

:כַּן לְעִינֵינוּ הַכְבֵּד בְּנֹוּ (B)

We are confronted here with a textual complication involving two sets of suffix pronouns. In addition to [a] < their - us / our - our > in the central part of the Heb. MS (B), we find in the margin [b] < their - them / our - our > and [c] < their - them / their - them >. \mathfrak{C} has preserved a fourth pattern: [d] < their - us / our - them >. The general consideration points to this last as correct. \mathfrak{S} , $\mathfrak{S}l$, and \mathfrak{I} concur with \mathfrak{C} .

33.5) καὶ ἐπιγνώτωσάν σε, καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπέγνωμεν
ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ, κύριε.

*Let them recognise You, just as we, too, recognised
that there is no god other than You, Lord.*

:כִּי אֵין אֱלֹהִים וּלְתַךְ: (B)

ἐπιγνώτωσάν] Though the verb ἐπιγινώσκω can take either an acc. *o* or a content clause as in its second example in this verse, we could be having to do with a case of the so-called σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος,² e.g. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν Ge 1.4. Then ἐπιγνώτωσάν σε is not complete as a clause; its complete form would be ἐπιγνώτωσάν σε ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ.

33.6) ἐγκαίνισον σημεῖα καὶ ἀλλοιώσον θαυμάσια,

Renew signs and change marvels,

:כְּדָשׁ אוֹת וּשְׁנָה מוֹפֵת³ (B)

ἀλλοιώσον] The translator, having identified here a synonymic parallelism,⁴ has not selected δευτέρωσον 'Repeat!', for instance;⁵ Hebrew has two distinct homonyms, I $\sqrt{\text{נָה}}$ 'repetition' and II $\sqrt{\text{נָה}}$ 'change.' BS himself uses the first with a zero object in *אל תישן דבר בתפילה* 'do not repeat (same) thing(s) in prayer!' 7.14 > μὴ δευτερώσης λόγον ἐν προσευχῇ σου.

The equation II $\sqrt{\text{נָה}}$ and ἀλλοιώω recurs at 40.5. Smend (319) opts for the equation I without saying why.⁶

² For details, cf. *SSG* § 66 c, 73 c.

³ There is an alternative reading in the margin: *חַדֵּשׁ אֶל וּשְׁנָה תָמָה* 'Renew, God, and change wonder(s)!'

⁴ As well worded in the translation by Skehan - Di Lella (413): "Give new signs and work new wonders."

⁵ Thus *pace* Lévi (169): "répète."

⁶ So Segal (225) and Kahana (402) with their *שְׁנָה*.

33.7) δόξασον χεῖρα καὶ βραχίονα δεξιόν·

Manifest the glory of Your hand and right arm.

(B) האדר יד ואמץ זרוע וימין⁷:

δόξασον] A similar equation is attested twice in LXX: יְמִינָהּ יְהוָה נֶאֱדָרָהּ: יְמִינָהּ יְמִינָהּ בְּכַח הָּ דֵּעִיָּא סוּס, κύριε, δεδόξασται ἐν ἰσχύι Ex 15.6, מִי כְּמִכָּה נֶאֱדָרָהּ, מִי כְּמִכָּה נֶאֱדָרָהּ, τίς ὁμοίός σοι, δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις ib. 11; both passages are a description of God and in the first the *o* of the verb is His right hand.

אמץ has been left out in both **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ** דְּיְמִינָא וְדָרְעָא רְמָא ‘Strengthen (Your) hand and the right arm.’

Unlike **Ⓞ**, **Ⓢ** may have been unaware of Ex 15.6 as the OT source of this proverb, so that it identified in the root אדר the notion of strength and power, translating it with תְּקַח ‘Strengthen!’, cf. בְּמִים אֲדִירִים Ex 15.10 > **Ⓢ** בְּמִים אֲדִירִים. Further support for such an analysis may have been found in the following אָמַץ, which has not been rendered. Let it also be noted that the above-quoted Ex 15.6 concludes with הָּ דֵּעִיָּא סוּס חַיִּי, κύριε, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθρούς, showing that the glory of God’s right hand is manifested in its crushing power against enemies.

βραχίονα δεξιόν] In the biblical literature the right hand is symbolic of power as exemplified in the above-cited Ex 15.6, but here we have a rare example of singling out of the right arm. If **Ⓞ**’s *Vorlage* read as in (B), the translator may have been troubled by “arm” and “right hand” serving as two coordinate *o*’s joined with the conjunction *waw*. His resultant product, however, seems to have troubled **Ⓢ**, which reads וְדָרְעָא רְמָא ‘and the high arm.’ **Ⓢ** has a solution of its own: וְדָרְעָא דְיְמִינָא, literally translated ‘and the arm of the right (hand).’⁸

Ⓢ conveys quite a different message: תִּבַּר סְנָאָא וּבְטַל בְּעֵלְדִּבְבָּא ‘shatter the hater and destroy the enemy.’ What follows the first part is totally new.

33.8) ἔγειρον θυμὸν καὶ ἔκαχεν ὀργήν,

Arouse anger and pour out wrath,

(B) העיר אף ושפוך חמה

33.9) ἔξαρον ἀντίδικον καὶ ἔκτριψον ἐχθρόν.

Remove opponent(s) and obliterate enemy(es).

(B) הכניע צר והדוף⁹ אויב:

⁷ There is a marginal reading: האריך יד וזריו ימים, quite a diversion from **Ⓞ**.

⁸ Four minuscules read *υψηλον* instead of *δεξιον*.

⁹ As for the marginal reading, הַתְּהַדוּף, no grammatical justification can be found for the selection of a *w-yiqtol* form continuing an *impv*.

ἐξαρῶν] Whilst the notions of subordination and removal are not totally exclusive of each other, this is an unlikely equation all the same. A similar complication arises from **ש** תִּבַּר ‘Break!’.

Smend (319) makes an interesting observation that at 46.18 and 47.7 ἐκτρέβω renders הִכְנִיעַ as at Ne 9.24, whilst at 47.5 ἐξάιρω renders הִדָּה, hence our translator read הִדָּה צַר וְהִכְנִיעַ אוֹיֵב. Smend, however, does not say why the translator did so.

ἐχθρόν] The pl. ἐχθρούς in a fragment found by Wright and Hahn (1975.112) does not harmonise with the parallel ἀντίδικον.

33.10) σπεῦσον καιρὸν καὶ μνήσθητι ὀρισμοῦ,
καὶ ἐκδιηγησάσθωσαν τὰ μεγαλεῖά σου.

*Accelerate the time and remember the decision (made),
and let people recount Your great deeds!*

(B) הַחַיִּשׁ קָץ וּפְקוּד מוֹעֵד כִּי מִי יֵאמֵר לָךְ מָה תַעֲשֶׂה:

καιρὸν קָץ] This is one of eight instances in LXX of this equation; קָץ normally means ‘end,’ here ‘end-time.’ In QH the sense ‘time’ is quite common, e.g. קָץ הַרְבֵּן ‘the time of destruction’ CD 5.20; more data may be found in *DCH* 7.276-78 2. See also below at 41.4.

μνήσθητι] Though פָּקַד ‘to seek with interest’ is distinct from זָכַר, this is a second instance in LXX of this equation; the other occurs in בְּצַר פְּקֻדוֹתָי ἐν θλίψει ἐμνήσθη σου [= פְּקֻדָּתַי] Is 26.16.

ὀρισμοῦ] Many sources read ὀρκισμοῦ. Decision is sometimes confirmed with an oath, e.g. ὁ ὀρισμὸς .. μεθ’ ὄρκου Nu 30.11. **ש** probably took מוֹעֵד as meaning “the time decided and agreed on.” Cf. **ש** הַחֲקָמָה ‘decree.’

Given the wide gap in 10b between **ח** ‘for who is to tell You what You should do?’ and **ש**, one wonders if the translator thought that there is a logical contradiction between the two halves of the verse, since in the first half God is being commanded twice over. In order to avert such a contradiction on the part of his readers, he may have decided to ignore the second half and compose a new clause out of his own head.

33.11) ἐν ὄργῃ πυρὸς καταβρωθήτω ὁ σφζόμενος,
καὶ οἱ κακοῦντες τὸν λαόν σου εὖροισαν ἀπώλειαν.

*Let survivors be totally ruined with fire of wrath,
and may those who torture Your people end up in perdition!*

No Heb. text has survived of this verse. In **ש** only the first half is observable in part: בְּרוּחַ אֵשׁ וּבְגוֹרָא אֹבֵד סָנְאָא ‘With fury and fire destroy the enemy.’ Then follows: וְכֹל רְוּבְנָא וְשְׁלִיטָנָא דְעַמְמָא ‘and all the leaders and rulers of the peoples.’

33.12) σύντριψον κεφαλὰς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν
λεγόντων Οὐκ ἔστιν πλὴν ἡμῶν.

*Crush the heads of the hostile rulers
who say 'There is nothing other than we.'*

(B) השבת ראש פאתי מואב האומר אין זולתי:

σύντριψον] This is the sole instance in LXX of the equation συντρίβω / להשִׁבִּית.¹⁰

κεφαλὰς] here probably meant in its literal sense.

פאתי מואב] It is generally agreed to be an allusion to Nu 24.17, where פִּאֲתֵי מוֹאָב is rendered in \mathfrak{C} as τοὺς ἀρχηγούς Μωαβ. However, what has that geographical location to the east of the Holy Land to do with the context of this proverb?¹¹ There is a marginal reading אריב for מואב, and that is reflected in \mathfrak{C} .

λεγόντων] The pl. as against the sg. האומר is likely referring back to ἐχθρῶν. The sg. ptc. in \mathfrak{H} is probably a referent to ראש, which then is to be taken in the sense of “the top person.”

33.13a) συνάγαγε πάσας φυλάς Ιακωβ (13)

Bring together all the tribes of Jacob

(B) אסוף כל שבטי יעקב

36.16b) καὶ κατακληρονόμησον αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

and make them heirs as in olden days.

(B) ויתנחלו כימי קדם:

κατακληρονόμησον] Instead of this reading found in a few minuscules belonging to the Lucianic version and adopted by Rahlfs the majority of the sources read κατακληρονομησα. So \mathfrak{H} יִרְשָׁתָם אֲנֹכִי 'I inherited them,' though it is not apparent what the obj. pron. refers to. However, it is odd that the author should be speaking like that in this context. יתנחלו, continuing a plea to God with אסוף, can be assigned optative value, what could be easily harmonised with κατακληρονόμησον αὐτοὺς as another plea. Cf. \mathfrak{S} כָּנַשׁ .. וְנִאֲרְתוּן 'Gather .. and let them inherit as You said in olden days.'

In comparison with \mathfrak{C} יתנחלו underlines the initiative to be taken by God.

¹⁰ In *Index* s.v. συντρίβω an error has crept in: (20) שבת *b. ni. is to be corrected to hi.

¹¹ Cf. an attempt by Mopsik 207, fn. 5 for an attempt to place this proverb in a contemporary historical context, namely Seleucid Assyria.

καθὼς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] found at 2K 7.10 // 1C 17.9 in \mathfrak{G} as a rendering of $\text{בְּרֵאשִׁית הַיְּשׁוּבָה}$, showing that the prep. here does not bear its normal sense, “from.”¹² Hence in the above-quoted \mathfrak{S} it is not about repetition. Note also Πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ κατώκησαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς $\text{בְּעֵבֶר הַנְּהָר הַשְּׂבִי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם}$ Jo 23(24).2, where מִ is similar to ἀπό, for their descendants (of Tera, Abraham and so on) had long since emigrated westwards. Whether this feature in Greek and Syriac can be dismissed as “schlecht” (Smend 321) is disputable, since it is so widespread. Are we having to do with a poor Septuagintalism in ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν και θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοῦς Mt 19.4? We have a totally different case in θλιῖς μεγάλη οἶα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται ib. 24.21. What כִּימִי קָדַם here means is crystal-clear and there is no justification for emending it to קָדַם כִּימִי .

36.17) ἐλέησον λαόν, κύριε, κεκλημένον ἐπ' ὄνοματί σου (14)
καὶ Ἰσραηλ, ὃν πρωτογόνῳ ὁμοίωσας.

*Have pity on (Your) people, Lord, named after Your name
and Israel, whom You treated as equal to a first-born.*

:רחם על עם נקרא בשמך ישראל בכור כיניתי: (B)

ἐλέησον λαόν] \mathfrak{S} $\text{שִׂמְחֵי עַל עַמְּךָ}$ ‘Rejoice over Your people!’, an odd rendering.

κεκλημένον] The use of the pf. ptc. suggests that נקרא בשמך has been analysed as an asyndetic relative clause with נקרא as Pf.¹³ For a ptc. with a reference to the past usually calls for the addition of the definite article in BH.¹⁴ Analogously we could analyse בכור כיניתי as an asyndetic relative clause as has been done in \mathfrak{G} .

καὶ Ἰσραηλ] Whether or not \mathfrak{G} 's *Vorlage* actually read וישראל , the conjunction cannot be joining two distinct entities, but ישראל is in apposition to the preceding עם נקרא בשמך , what renders the addition of the *waw* unlikely.

In BH it is normal for a preposition to be repeated before a proper noun which is in apposition to a preceding substantive, and LXX often follows the rule, e.g. ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν ἐπὶ Σαουλ 2K 2.5 (= \mathfrak{H}), but there are exceptions, too, e.g. διὰ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰσραηλ ib. 5.12 (= \mathfrak{H}). Even then, ועל ישראל (= \mathfrak{S}) is rather unlikely here.

Another matter to be noted here is that the whole verse is basically a single clause with רחם as the single principal verb. Although the MS B presents the text in two columns, such a mode of presentation may be unique to its scribe.

¹² Thus *pace* “as from the beginning” (*NETS*) and “wie von Anfang an” (*SD*).

¹³ So BSH 270b.

¹⁴ Cf. JM § 121 *i*.

πρωτογόνῳ ὁμοίωσας [בְּכֹר כִּינִיתָ] It is generally agreed that this is an allusion to God's statement to Moses prior to his encounter with Pharaoh: :יִשְׂרָאֵל: > .. Ὑἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου [יְהוָה בְּנִי בְּכָרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל: Ex 4.22. Our translator knew that בְּנִי בְּכָרִי was not a name and that בְּנִי is not identical with בְּכָרִי, but means 'to give a supplementary title,' hence his rendition with ὁμοίω, and not ὀνομάζω, for instance.

36.18) οἰκτίρησον πόλιν ἁγιάσματος σου, (15)

Ἱερουσαλημ τόπον καταπαύματος σου·

*Be compassionate towards a city of Your sanctity,
Jerusalem, Your resting-place.*

(B) רחם על קרית קדשך ירושלים מכון שבתך:

οἰκτίρησον] Probably intended as a stylistic variant of ἐλέησον in the preceding verse as a rendering of the same Heb. word, רחם. The use of these two Greek synonyms occurs also elsewhere, e.g. καὶ ἐλέησω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω Ex 33.19, where \mathfrak{H} , however, uses two different verbs – וְהִנֵּתִי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אָחַז וְרַחֲמֵתִי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אָרַחם, though here we are dealing with two self-standing clauses.¹⁵

πόλιν ἁγιάσματος σου [קרית קדשך] When a substantive is construed in Greek with two or more nominals in the genitive case with no conjunction such as καί or ἥ between them, there could arise ambiguity over the syntactic relationship between them. Basically the same can be said of a substantive in the cst. st. in Hebrew. E.g. as against יְמֵי שְׁנֵי חַיֵּי אַבְתִּי τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τῶν πατέρων μου Gn 47.9, בְּרִית כְּהֵנָּה עִלָּם, Nu 25.13 could be rendered as διαθήκη ἱερατείας αἰωνίας, and not with αἰωνία as in \mathfrak{C} .¹⁶ Thus our πόλιν ἁγιάσματος σου could be translated as “Your sacred city,” so “ta ville sainte” (Lévi.171) and “deine heilige Stadt” (Smend II 62). There is another alternative: “the city of Your sanctuary,” on which see below at 47.10,

[שבתיך] On the plena spelling, שְׁבִתְךָ, see above at 33.3.¹⁷

שְׁבִיתְךָ ‘Your dwelling,’ “ta résidence” (Lévi 174), “deiner Wohnung” (Smend II 62), and שְׁבִיתְךָ (Segal 225, Kahana 502, BSH 165a) all derive שְׁבִיתְךָ from Qal יָשַׁב. As far as κατάπαυμα is concerned, let it be noted that there is in LXX not a single place where this Heb. verb is rendered with κατάπαυμα, κατάπαυσις, or καταπαύω, whereas Qal and Hi. שְׁבִיתְךָ is often rendered with these Gk words. There is no ambiguity over the interpretation of \mathfrak{C} here.¹⁸

¹⁵ More LXX references are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. οἰκτιρέω.

¹⁶ Cf. JM § 129 c, *SQH* § 21 c, and *SSG* § 41 ae, 42 d.

¹⁷ Correct *Index* s.v. κατάπαυμα accordingly.

¹⁸ Cf. also Wagner 1999.226-28.

36.19) πλησον Σιων ἀρεταλογίας σου (16)
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης σου τὸν ναόν σου.

*Fill Zion with songs praising You
and Your palace with Your glory.*

(B) מלא ציון את הודך ומכבודך את היכלך:

ἀρεταλογίας] a hapax in SG, and unknown prior to it, derived from ἀρετή ‘laudatory praise.’

ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης σου [מכבודך] In BH the Pi. verb מלא usually takes two direct objects as in ותמלא את־החמה מים Gn 21.19, and only a few times מן introduces a noun indicating what fills something, e.g. מלא כרשו מעדני ‘he filled his maw with my delicate flesh’ Je 51.34, see also Ps 127.5 and Le 9.17. Here then we have an addition to this short list. In \mathfrak{H} B here we see מהדרוך in the margin. By contrast, with Greek verbs for *to fill*, the rection < acc. + gen. > is the norm. Only in exceptional cases we find < ἕκ τινος > in ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἕκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου ‘the house filled with the odour of the myrrh’ John 12.3 and < τινι >, e.g. ὁ βασιλεὺς χαρᾶ πεπληρωμένος ‘the king having filled up with joy’ 3M 4.16,¹⁹ and some examples of < ἀπὸ τινος > as here, e.g. ἐπλησεν τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς μου Je 28.34, where \mathfrak{H} 51.34 reads מ (see above), and once alongside < τινος > at τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ὀδῶν πλησθήσεται θρασκευάρδιος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν διανοημάτων αὐτοῦ ἀνήρ ἀγαθός ‘a person of very bold heart could be full of his ideas, but a good man of his own thoughts’ Pr 14.14. It appears sound to conclude that < ἀπὸ τινος > is a Hebraism in spite of an example in which \mathfrak{H} lacks the prep. *mem*, e.g. καὶ ἐμπλήσω ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματός σου ומלאתי ומותך והאיותך Ez 32.5. See also above at 1.17, where also we note the two structures used side by side.²⁰

36.20) δὸς μαρτύριον τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ κτίσμασίν σου (17)
καὶ ἔγειρον προφητείας τὰς ἐπ’ ὄνόματί σου·

*Testify about what You created at the beginning
and make prophecies spoken in Your name come true.*

(B) תן עדות למראש מעשיך והקם חזון דבר בשמך:

מראש מעשיך] a striking combination in terms of its syntax; the reverse sequence is anticipated. Cf. ש עבדך אף דמן דריש ‘Your works as they were made at the beginning.’²¹

¹⁹ A pattern already known to CG as in δακρύοισι γὰρ Ἑλλάδ’ ἄπασαν ἐπλησε ‘for she filled all of Hellas with tears’ Eur. *Or.* 1363.

²⁰ On this juxtaposition of the two structures, cf. *SSG* § 22 c (i), 55 e (ii), 65.

²¹ The vocalisation of the first word as עבדך ‘Your servants’ in ed. Mossul is strange.

τὰς] When an anarthrous noun phrase is qualified by a following prepositional phrase, the latter is often prefixed with the definite article. Another example is ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ‘from every tree in the garden’ Ge 2.16. Otherwise Adam and Eve may have understood that it was OK to eat them at home. Analogously, without τὰς, the prepositional phrase could be taken as indicating a manner of the action, ἔγειρον.²² Cf. **§** נְאֻמְךָ דְּבִינְךָ דְּמַמְלִיךְ בְּשִׁמְךָ ‘May the prophecies come true spoken by Your prophets in Your name.’

דבר] Left untranslated in **Ⓞ**; the author must have used it as Pu. pf., דְּבַר.²³ Whereas the use of Pu. of this verb in BH is extremely limited, in Pi. we do find words such as אָמַת, שָׁקַר, and כָּזַב added as *o*, e.g. וְאָמַת לֹא יִדְבְּרוּ לְמַדּוּ Je 9.4 and כָּזַב יִדְבְּרוּ. These are close to our example with חוֹזֵן.

36.21) δὸς μισθὸν τοῖς ὑπομένουσίν σε, (18)
καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ σου ἐμπιστευθήτωσαν.

*Give a reward to those who count on You,
and may Your prophets be demonstrated as reliable.*

(B) תן את פעלת קוויך ונביאיך יאמינו:

μισθὸν פעלת] With its anarthrous μισθὸν we get the impression that it is about a generic appeal to God, whereas with its את **Ⓜ** appears to be referring to a particular pledge and assurance given by God.

τοῖς ὑπομένουσίν σε] קוויך has been analysed by **Ⓞ** as pl., whereas with its מְסַכָּא, **§**, if its *Vorlage* was identical with **ⓂB**, has analysed it as a *plena* spelling.

In vs. 21b **§** accords with **Ⓞ**: וְנִבְיֵיךָ נִתְהַיְמָנוּן. Almost identical is **Ⓜj**. When Lévi (171) calls the second *yod* “mater lectionis,” he must be parsing the form as Ni. in view of his translation, “que tes prophètes soient reconnus véridiques.” **Ⓜ** has taken the clause as passive: *ut prophetae tui fideles inveniantur*.

36.22) εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, δεήσεως τῶν οἰκετῶν σου
κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου, (19)
καὶ γνώσκονται πάντες οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων.

*Give a hearing, Lord, to the plea of Your servants
in accordance with (Your) good will for Your people,
and all who are on the earth shall know
that it is You who is the Lord, the god of ages.*

²² Cf. SSG § 44 ac.

²³ We fail to follow Lévi (171), who proposes reading דבר as דבר, but his translation reads: “ceux qui ont parlé.” Whilst it is well known that דבר is used in Qal as a ptc. or inf., e.g. וְדַבֵּר אָמַת בְּלִבְבוֹ Ps 15.2, is BS thinking of a particular prophet?

(Ba) תשמע תפלת עבדיך כַּרְצוּןךָ²⁴ על עמך:
 (Bb) וידעו כל אפסי ארץ כי אתה אל עֲלֵי:

οἰκετῶν] Whilst δοῦλος is a far more common rendering of עֲבָד as a submissive designation in relation to God, οἰκετής is sometimes used as a more “respectable” equivalent. Cf. מְתַכְּשְׁפִיּוֹת שֵׁן ‘those who entreat, supplicate,’ which reflects a v.l., ικετων, pl.gen. of ἰκέτης, preserved by many MSS.

τὴν εὐδοκίαν] שֵׁן בְּרִכְתָּהּ דְּאַהֲרֹן ‘the blessing of Aaron.’²⁵ Some sources, including 𐤀 (benedictionem Aaron), add “Aaron.”

γνώσκονται] A marginal reading, ויראו, must be a reference to mental, not visual activity.

סב] The very use of the pronoun is a Greek expression of the identificatory position of אתה, for the Heb. pronoun could have been positioned at the end of the clause if not for emphatic identification. Precisely the same function is played with the insertion of the enclitic הוּ in אַתָּה הוּ אֱלֹהֵא אַתָּה הוּ אֱלֹהֵא שֵׁן ‘You alone are the god’ and אַתָּה הוּ מְרִיא אֱלֹהֵא שֵׁן ‘You are the Lord, God.’²⁶

36.23) Πᾶν βρῶμα φάγεται κοιλία, (20)

ἔστιν δὲ βρῶμα βρώματος κάλλιον.

A belly eats every food,

but (one) food is better than (another) food.

(B) כל מאכל אוכל גרגרת אך יש אוכל ..ל.ל. נְעִים:
 (B*) כל נכסד/ד תאכל חיה אך יש מכה ממכה תנעם:

κοιλία] In BH גרגרת, always in the pl., means “neck,” and “gullet” in RH,²⁷ which is suitable here. We note a gender discord, a problem that has been resolved in the alternative version, but the introduction of חיה is odd in this context, and what funny food the animal is being offered!

Vs. 23b of (B*) does not look right; we would anticipate something like מכה מכל מכה תנעם אך יש מכה מכה מכל מכה תנעם ‘but there is food that tastes better than any (other) food.’

Moreover we see quite a different version in the margin: כַּל .. תִּסְזָנָר בַּ. .. כל אך יש מאכל ממאכל תנעם ‘every .. shall be stored away in .. but there is food that would taste better than (any other) food.’

שֵׁן gets down to what the proverb signifies: כּוּל מְאָכְלָא מְקַבְּלָא נַפְשָׁא בְּרַם אֵית מְאָכְלָתָא דְּמִן מְאָכְלָתָא בְּסִימָא ‘a soul accepts every food, but there is food

²⁴ There is a marginal reading, כַּרְצוּןךָ.

²⁵ On εὐλογία as a v.l., see Ziegler 1964.467f.

²⁶ Cf. Muraoka 2005 § 104.

²⁷ Cf. Ben Yehuda II 833b and Dihi 2008.17.

that is more delicious than that food.’ This is close to (B*), and with נפש as there would be no gender discord, though מכה makes little sense.

All in all, both \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{S} make sense when compared with the messy Hebrew text in either version.

36.24) φάρυγξ γεύεται βρώματα θήρας, (21)
οὕτως καρδία συνετή λόγους ψευδεῖς.

*A throat tastes foods of game,
so a sensible mind false words.*

(B) חך בוחן מטעמי דבר ולב מבין מטעמי כזב²⁸:
(C) חך יטעם מטעמי זבד ולב נכון יטעם מטעמי כזב:

θήρας [דבר] an odd equation. However, a mere דבר is problematic. Is כל דבר meant? Cf. a discussion in Lévi 173. זבד ‘endowment’ in (C) and the margin of (B) has nothing to do with θήρα.

In vs. 24a \mathfrak{S} is pretty generic: פּוּמָא טַעֵם טַעֵמָא דְמֵאכּוּלְתָא ‘a mouth tastes the taste of food.’ So is “mouth” as against הָהָ ‘palate.’

[מבין] The author may be using this as a predicative verb parallel to בוחן, but two versions have taken it otherwise: \mathfrak{S} לְבָא דְחַכְיָמָא ‘the mind of the wise’ (substantivised) and \mathfrak{I} *cor sensatum* (attributive).

Is נכון in (C) to be emended to נבון ‘intelligent’?²⁹

36.25) καρδία στρεβλή δώσει λύπην, (22)
καὶ ἄνθρωπος πολυπείρος ἀνταποδώσει αὐτῷ.

*A crooked heart produces sorrow,
and an experienced person requites to him.*

(B) לב עקוב יתן עצבת ואיש ותיקן ישיבנה בו:

καρδία στρεβλή [לב עקוב] cf. עֵקֵב הַלֵב מִכָּל Je 17.9, where the adjective is thought to mean “deceitful.” Cf. \mathfrak{S} טְמִירָא ‘covered, hidden’ and \mathfrak{S} מִפְתָּלָא ‘twisted.’

[ותיקן] a hapax in BH.

αὐτῷ] a constructio ad sensum, “him” referring back to “a person with a crooked heart.” Or the translator is possibly thinking of לוֹ = לְלֵב עֵקֵב.

The prep. בִּי probably denotes enmity and the suf. pron. refers back to לב עקוב. In \mathfrak{S} מְסַתְכַל בְּהֵלִין ‘looks at them, contemplates over them’ the pl. suf. pron. is probably due to סְגִיָּא in סְגִיָּא צְפִתָּה ‘a hidden heart, the worry (caused by) it is considerable.’

²⁸ In the margin we read חך בוחן מטעמי זבד וכן נכון מטעמי זבד.

²⁹ So Elizur 2010.21.

- 36.26) πάντα ἄρρενα ἐπιδέξεται γυνή, (23)
ἔστιν δὲ θυγάτηρ θυγατρὸς κρείσσων.

*A woman would accept any male,
but one daughter is better than another.*

(B) פֶּל זָכָר תִּקְבֵּל אִשָּׁה אַךְ ... :

In the margin we see the initial part of what is reflected in 26b: אַךְ יֵשׁ אִשָּׁה יִפֶּה. Though we see /:/ after יִפֶּה, the four words are too few to have preserved a complete clause.

The current shape of (B) is somewhat confusing. This verse immediately follows vs. 23. The confusion is probably due to the homoioarcton of the start of the two verses, beginning with כָּל and אַךְ respectively, and the considerable similarity in wording of the second half of the verses, not only yet another homoioarcton.

The proverb reflects the typical ancient society in which a woman had no say as regards the choice of a husband, whereas a male had much more freedom. We fail to see, *pace* Segal (232), that the author is saying that women are all equal in terms of gender, but differ from one another in their look.

- 36.27) κάλλος γυναικὸς ἰλαρύνει πρόσωπον (24)
καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν ἀνθρώπου ὑπεράγει·

*A woman's beauty brightens up (one's) face
and goes beyond what every person yearns after.*

(B) תּוֹאֵר אִשָּׁה וְהִלִּיל³⁰ פָּנִים וְעַל כָּל מַחְמַד עַיִן יִגְבֵּר:
(B*) תּוֹאֵר אִשָּׁה מְכַל פָּנִים .. עַל כָּל ... יִגְבֵּר:

πρόσωπον] Whose face? Would every Syriac Christian woman be happy with ܫܘܦܪܗܐ ܕܐܢܬܐ ܢܫܒܚܐ ܐܦܝܗ ܫܘܦܪܗܐ ‘the beauty of a woman would praise her face’? For Latin readers it is her husband’s: *virī sui*. For 26, which has rendered עַיִן with ἀνθρώπου of generic application it is the face of a third party, of one who looks at her, inclusive of her own husband, but definitely not her own face.

ἐπιθυμίαν] (B) zooms in on your eyes: the most intense attraction to a woman is not effected by her intellect, family background, her eloquence, but what one can visually observe.

³⁰ יהליל in the margin is adopted by Smend (325) and parsed as Hi., which, however, requires יהל, i.e. יהל. BSH 128b retains the longer spelling, parsing it as Pi., which means, however, ‘it praises.’ Though this Hi. verb occurs in BH a mere three times, with no anomalous morphological feature: יהל Jb 31.26, תהל ib. 41.10, and יהלו Is 13.10. On anomalous forms such as inf. הַשְׁמִיּוּ Mi 6.13 and ptc. מְשַׁמִּיּוּ Ez 3.15, cf. JM § 82 k. Kahana’s (403) יהליל is disputable. We fail to work out how to parse Segal’s (229) יהליל. See also a discussion in Reymond 2021.277.

36.28) εἰ ἔστιν ἐπὶ γλώσσης αὐτῆς ἔλεος καὶ πραΰτης, (25)
οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς καθ' υἱοῦς ἀνθρώπων.

*If there are compassion and humility on her tongue,
her man is no comparison to any human being.*

(B) ועד אם יש³¹ מרפא לשון אין אשה מבני אדם:
(C) ... יש בה מרפא לשון ... אישה מבני אדם:

[ועד] In our view, justly vocalised by Segal as וְעַד, i.e. ‘moreover, on top of her beauty.’ It is not rendered in **Sh** and **Y**; the whole verse is missing in **S**.

[מרפא לשון] a phrase that occurs as מְרַפֵּא לְשׁוֹן at Pr 15.4, and rendered in **G** as ἰασις γλώσσης, indicating “the therapeutic character of speech.”³²

36.29) ὁ κτώμενος γυναῖκα ἐνάρχεται κτήσεως, (26)
βοηθὸν κατ' αὐτὸν καὶ στῦλον ἀναπαύσεως.

*One who wins a wife is beginning acquisition,
a helper suited to him and a pillar to recline on for rest.*

(B) קנה אשה ראשית קנין עזר ומבצר ועמוד משען:³³
(C) . . . אשה ראשית קנין קנה עיר מבצר .. ינה ומשען העמיד:³⁴
(D) קנה אשה ראשית קנין³⁵ עיר מבצר ועמוד משען:

[ὁ κτώμενος] To parse קנה as a ptc. and analyse it as *s* of ראשית קנין is unnatural. To be preferred is **S**'s בְּרִישׁ קְנִינָךְ קְנִי אִנְתָּא טְבָתָא ‘As the top of your possessions acquire a good wife,’ which represents the קנה, impv. On the other hand, (C), if it started off with another קנה, both could be analysed as ptc., or pf. as in a contextually related proverb, מְצָא אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוֹב Pr 18.22. ἐνάρχεται κτήσεως] a verb meaning “to begin” governing the gen. See another example in 38.16 below and cf. *SSG* § 22 p, p. 139, and for more details Helbing 1928.167-71.

One wonders whether our author and his grandson were aware of Samson, who was sold off by his love, Delilah, to his enemies and died, supporting himself (אָשְׁעֵן) Jd 16.25) on two pillars (הָעַמּוּדִים) τῶν στῦλων Jd 16.25AL) of a public hall. They may have thought that Delilah was probably a great beauty, but to fall in love with a Philistine was not evidence of the best wisdom on Samson's part.

³¹ In the margin there follows בה as in (C).

³² So McKane 1970.483.

³³ In the margin we read קונה for קנה, and עיר מבצר for עזר ומבצר.

³⁴ Most likely an error for העמוד, i.e. העמוד.

³⁵ The first half of the line as read by Abegg.

36.30) οὐκ οὐκ ἔστιν φραγμός, διαρπαγήσεται κτήμα· (27)
καὶ οὐκ οὐκ ἔστιν γυνή, στενάξει πλανώμενος.

*Where there is no hedge, property could be plundered,
and where there is no wife, a wanderer would sigh.*

(B) באין גדיר³⁶ יבוער כרם ובאין אשה נע ונד:
(C) באין גדר יבוער כרם ובאין אשה נע ונד:
(D) באין גדר יבוער כרם ובאין אשה נע ונד:

[κτῆμα] **⸔** is more specific with כרם ‘vineyard.’ **⸔**, which follows **⸔** here, chooses an appropriate verb: נְתַבְעֲרוּן כְּרָמָא ‘vineyards could be gleaned.’ Let it be noted, however, that this is the most frequent equation in LXX: three more times – Pr 31.16, Ho 2.15 (17), Jl 1.11.

Note the same combination, though in Pi., in וְאַתֶּם בְּעָרְתֶם הַכְּרָם Is 3.14, where **⸔** renders the verb in its more standard meaning – ἐνεπυρίσατε τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου.

More revealing is another text in the same prophetic book, Is 5.5:

אֲדִיעֶזְנָא אֶתְכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה לְכַרְמֵי הַסֵּר מְשׁוֹכְתוֹ וְהִיא לְבָעַר פָּרֵץ גְּדֵרוֹ וְהִיא לְמַרְמָס:

ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν τί ποιήσω τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου· ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγήν, καὶ καθελῶ τὸν τοίχον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα.

Note especially the use of כרם, בער, גדר and ἀμπελών, φραγμός, διαρπαγή.

נד] a destiny to which Cain, after having murdered Abel, his brother, was condemned by God (Gn 4.12, 14); he would have no fixed habitation for safety and welfare, but on a constant move with no prospect of raising a family. The phrase is, in **⸔**, στενών καὶ τρέμων ‘groaning and trembling’; the first verb is close to στενάζω used here, both phonetically and semantically.

36.31) τίς γὰρ πιστεύσει εὐζώνῳ ληστῇ (28)
ἀφαλλομένῳ ἐκ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν;
οὕτως ἄνθρωπῳ μὴ ἔχοντι νοσσιὰν
καὶ καταλύνοντι οὐκ ἂν ὄψισι.

*For who would trust a well-girdled bandit
moving quickly from city to city?
So is one who has no nest
and spends overnight wherever he arrives late at night.*

³⁶ A plena spelling for גדר, i.e. גדר.

המדלג מעיר אל עיר:	מי יאמין בגדוד צבא (Ba)
המדלג מעיר אל עיר:	מי יאמין בצבא גדוד (Ca)
המדלג מעיר אל עיר:	מי יאמין בגדוד צבא (Da)
המרגיע באשר יערב:	כן איש אשר לא קן ³⁷ (Bb)
המרגיע באשר יסביב:	כן איש אשר אין לו קין (Cb)
המרגיע באשר יערב:	כן איש אשר אין לו קן (Db)

[גדוד צבא] The sole instance in BH and QH of a cst. chain of these two substantives is **גְּדוּדֵי צְבָא מְלַחְמָה** 1Ch 7.4 (Ⓢ ἰσχυροὶ παρατάξασθαι εἰς πόλεμον). To render **גְּדוּד** Ⓢ uses a word consisting of the identical consonants, **גְּדוּדָא**, which, however, means ‘youth.’ A youth who looks like a gazelle leaping from town to town is said to be untrustworthy. Quite a different message comes through from 31b: **הַכֵּנָא גְּבָרָא דְלִית לֵהּ אִנְתָּתָא. בְּאַתֵּר** ‘so is a man who has no wife; where he happens to find himself he would die.’³⁸

Vs. 31b is another picture of **נע ונד** in the preceding verse. Smend (326) cites a German popular saying: “Kein Weib, kein Haus.”

[יסביב] Extremely difficult.

³⁷ A correction in the margin reads **אשר אין לו קן** for **אשר לא קן**.

³⁸ According to Lévi (177) **נְמוּת** had been proposed to be emended to **נְבוּת** ‘he spends the night,’ but, as he points out, **יערב** does not mean “he spends the night.” The problem partly arises from the extreme rarity of Qal **ערב** affiliated to **עָרַב** ‘evening.’ Note also Ⓢ’s selection of **ὀψίζω**, which does not mean ‘to become evening.’

CHAPTER 37

37.1) Πᾶς φίλος ἐρεῖ Ἐφιλίασα κάγω·
ἀλλ' ἔστιν φίλος ὀνόματι μόνον φίλος.

*Every friend says, 'I have loved, too,
but there is a friend who is a friend in name alone.*

כל אֹמֵר אִמַּר אַהֲבַתִּי (B)

כל אוֹהֵב יֹאמֵר אַהֲבַתִּי (C)

כל אוֹהֵב אוֹמֵר אַהֲבַתִּי אֶךְ יֵשׁ אַהֵב שֵׁם אַהֵב (D)

Ἐφιλίασα] = אַהֲבַתִּי. In BH the Pf. of so-called stative verbs may express “a state or condition, whether physical or mental, which, though it may have been attained at some previous time, nevertheless continues to exist up to the moment of speaking” (Driver 1892.16). This might be applicable here. This feature is continued in QH to a certain extent, see *SQH* § 4 c. But in Greek such is a function of the Pf., not Aor., see *SSG* § 28 ec. See, for instance, the protest raised by Delila: אֵיךְ תֹּאמַר אַהֲבַתִּיךָ Πῶς ἐρεῖς Ἡγάπηκά σε Jd 16.15.¹ In other words, ‘How dare you say, “Some time ago I fell in love with you, and I still love you”?’ How should we then interpret Ἐφιλίασα here? A shade too mechanical reproduction of the Heb. Pf.? Both **⚙** and **⚙** use the Pf. רָחַמְתִּי, which can mean ‘I love’ (Muraoka 2005 § 81). Cf. **⚙** *et ego amicitiam copulavi*.

(C) אַהֲבַתִּי is unlikely a *defectiva* spelling of אַהֲבַתִּי, i.e. אַהֲבַתִּי, but a verbal noun, hence אַהֲבַתִּי. Would the clause mean ‘every friend would confess his love’?

The MS D almost totally agrees with what is in the margin of the MS B only with the minor difference in that the *plena* spelling, אַהֲבַתִּי, is used twice also in the second hemistich. The second half is obscure in its meaning. **⚙** is close to **⚙**: אֵיךְ תֹּאמַר אַהֲבַתִּיךָ בְּרַם אֵיךְ תֹּאמַר אַהֲבַתִּיךָ ‘but there is a friend whose title is “friend”.’

ὀνόματι] an example of the so-called dative of respect, specification; for details, see *SSG* § 22 wc.

37.2) οὐχὶ λύπη ἐγγιεῖ ἕως θανάτου
ἑταῖρος καὶ φίλος τρεπόμενος εἰς ἔχθραν;

*Isn't grief almost equal to death,
when a companion and friend turns to enmity?*

¹ In spite of minor differences between the three versions (A, B, and L), they all agree with ἠγάπηκα.

- (B) הלא דין מגיע אל מות רע כנפשך נהפך לצר:²
 (C) הלא בעת יגיע עליו דין מות רע כנפש יהפך לצר:
 (D) הלא דין מגיע עד מות ריע כנפש נהפך לצר:

Our translation agrees with most modern renditions of this verse. However, its Greek is faulty in its syntax: in the second line we expect a gen. abs. construction, ἐταίρου καὶ φίλου τρεπομένου εἰς ἔχθραν. A ptc. can be used to describe a circumstance accompanying the principal verb,³ but then the *s* of the former must be identical with that of the latter, e.g. Σαρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς, οὗσα ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ Ge 18.10. MS C appears to have preserved the right text,⁴ as a sequel to vs. 2, though its scribe himself appears to be slightly confused, since he has added a sof pasuq symbol after עליו. MS C may be translated as “Is it not true that when the moment of death determined (by God) comes to him, a colleague as dear as one’s soul could change to an enemy?”

ἐταῖρος καὶ φίλος] not a genuine case of hendiadys, see *SSG* § 77 **bg**, p. 647 with fn. 4.

In § we read וְלֹא מָטָא לְמוֹתָא. רְחֵמָא דְשָׂרְרָא אִיךְ נִפְשָׁךְ נִהוּא לְךָ ‘and he does not come as far as death. A genuine friend would be for you like yourself.’ [דין] Better emended to דון, i.e. דין ‘grief’; see above at 30.21.

[כנפשך] The other two MSS have no suf. pron. attached, which is acceptable in Hebrew, cf. “a bosom friend” (Elizur 2010.21f.). Cf. וְנִפְשׁ יְהוֹנָתָן נִקְשְׂרָה [וְנִפְשׁ יְהוֹנָתָן נִקְשְׂרָה] 1Sm 18.1. See also above at 7.21.

- 37.3) ὃ πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα, πόθεν ἐνεκυλίσθης
 καλύψαι τὴν ξηρὰν ἐν δολιότητι;
*O evil intention, where did you enter from
 to cover the dry land with deceitfulness?*

- (B) הוּי רע שאמר מדוע כן נוצרת⁵ למלא פני תבל תרמית:
 (D) הוּי רע יאמר מדוע נוצרתי למלא פני תבל תרמית:

סָנְאָא וְבִישָׂא ‘they were created’ with two *s*’s preceding, ‘a hater and an evil one.’ How has ⚡ arrived at ἐγκύλιω? Moreover, the person has shifted from the first to the second person, which accords with the absence of שאמר or יאמר.

² In the margin we see הלא דין מגיע על מות רע כנפשך נהפך לצר.

³ Cf. *SSG* § 31 **dd-de**.

⁴ Elizur (2010.22) thinks that the text of C is not original, but “an explanatory addition.” The other version is syntactically anomalous with no logical relation between the two clauses indicated, a difficulty that is resolved in C with its plus, בעת, and a consequential shift of מגיע to יגיע. Are we to apply the principle of *lectio difficilior melior*?

⁵ Obviously an error for הוּ.

⁶ In the margin we see הוּי ריע יאמר מ’ נוצרתי הוּ.

τὴν ξηρὰν [תבל] a merely twice occurring equation in LXX; the second case is in Si 39.22. The fem. sg. ξηρά translates יבֶשֶׁה far more frequently, which is semantically easily understandable. In selecting this Gk word, our translator may have silently argued that תבל refers to the entire planet earth and animate inhabitants in the sea, lakes or rivers must be excluded and the proverb is better applied to animate beings on the dry parts of the earth, humans in particular. In LXX תבל is translated with the substantivised fem. ἡ οἰκουμένη or with γῆ added as many as 25 times.

37.4) ἑταῖρος φίλου ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἡδεται
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως ἔσται ἀπέναντι·

*A mate might rejoice over a friend who is happy,
but in times of trouble he could be against.*

(B) מֵרַע אוֹהֵב מְבִיט אֶל שְׁלַחַן⁷ בְּעַת צוּקָה מִנְגִּיד⁸ יַעֲמֹד:

(D) מֵרַע אוֹהֵב מְבִיט עַל שַׁחַת וּבְעַת צוּקָה מִנוֹב יַעֲמֹד:

Ⓞ and the two Ⓢ versions are widely apart from one another, in the first hemistich in particular. ἑταῖρος could represent רַע, i.e. רַעַ, but what to do with the preposition מ־?⁹ In Ⓞ we miss something that would correspond to מְבִיט and שְׁלַחַן or שַׁחַת, and what is ἡδεται¹⁰ a rendering of? Note Ⓢ: בֵּישׁ רָאָה לְפִתּוּרָא ‘Evil is a friend that is close to a table.’

Given εὐφροσύνη and ἡδομαι belong to the same semantic field, it does not make sense to construe φίλου with ἑταῖρος as in “der Gefährte eines Freundes” (SD) and “a friend’s companion” (NETS). Our analysis is reflected in ⓈⓈ: חֲבֵרָא בְּחֵדוּתָא דְרִחְמָא מְתַהֲנָא ‘a mate derives benefit from a friend’s joy.’ Given the considerable freedom of word order in Greek there is no real problem with φίλου fronted at a distance from εὐφροσύνη. Cf. τῆς πόλεως τὴν εἴσοδον Jd 1.24B (≠ Ⓢ מְבֹאָה הָעִיר).¹¹

37.5) ἑταῖρος φίλῳ συμπονεῖ χάριν γαστρός,
καὶ ἔναντι πολέμου λήμψεται ἀσπίδα.

*A mate might toil with a friend for the sake of his belly,
but confronted by a battle he might take up a shield.*

⁷ The scribe of B, who is familiar with a v.l. in D, appears to be questioning its validity by noting מְבִיט עַל שַׁחַת מֵרַע אֲמַר מֵרַע ‘why does one say שַׁחַת עַל שַׁחַת?’

⁸ In the margin there is a reading whose decipherment is uncertain: מְנוֹב. (D) undoubtedly reads מְנוֹב, even partly vocalised, but what is the lexeme supposed to mean here?

⁹ With his rendering “Ein Bösewicht ist der Freund, ..” (Smend II 63) Smend apparently parsed מֵרַע as Hi. ptc. מֵרַע. “Un faux ami” (Mopsik 211) is unacceptable, given the word order in Ⓢ.

¹⁰ Dismissed by Segal (235) in preference for a v.l. ἔδεται ‘he will eat,’ without offering any argument for his preference.

¹¹ For more details on this subject, see SSG § 42 c.

(B) אוהב טוב נלחם עם זר ונגד ערים יחזיק צנה:¹²
 (D) אוהב טוב נלחם עם זר ונגד ערים יחזיק צנה:

In vs. 5a of **℥** and **℟** nothing is said about the motivation of joint toil. Nor is there anything said in **Ⓞ** about ערים, probably because the translator thought “cities” odd, since, according to him, his grandfather was speaking about conflicts between individuals. The use of πολέμου was, all the same, due to נלחם in the first hemistich. Alternatively ערים here may be an extremely rare Aramaism¹³ in lieu of עֲרִיִם ‘enemies,’ which may not have occurred to the translator, though he does recognise it once, translating it with τοὺς ὑπενα-ντίους 47.7. Then it would form a parallelism with the preceding זָר.

37.6) μὴ ἐπιλάθῃ φίλου ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου
καὶ μὴ ἀμνημονήσῃς αὐτοῦ ἐν χρήμασίν σου.

*Do not forget a friend in your heart
nor fail to remember him as you handle your property.*

(B) אל תשכח חברי בקרב¹⁴ ואל תעזבהו בשללך:
 (D) אל תשכח חבר בקרב ואל תעזבהו בשללך:

ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου] In **℞** [בקרבי This is the sole instance in LXX of the equation קרב / ψυχή. Καρδία is more common, 7 times including Si 4.3.

Lévi (181)¹⁵ reads the word as קרב ‘combat,’ arguing that this fits the context better. Though in the margin of (B) we see the verse ending with ונגד ערים יחזיק צנה, dislocated from the preceding verse, we pointed out at the preceding verse that the author means conflicts between individuals. We are not being advised to remember our friend at a battle front when we are recruited as soldiers. *Pace* Lévi the vocalisation in (D) of קרב should not be dismissed as evidence of ignorance on the part of the scribe.

χρήμασίν σου] In *Index* 128a we have indicated that this rendering reflects שלך, i.e. שְׁלֶךָ ‘that which belongs to you’ as in MH. Spoil of wars could end up in soldiers’ private property, what is hardly meant here. In the *Vorlage* of **℟** probably stood שללך, which the translator found odd and decided on a free rendering, בְּסִימִיּוֹתָ ‘enjoyment, pleasure.’

What 6b means in **Ⓞ** can be: “Provide in your will that on your death part of your property goes to him.”

¹² The entire line is preserved in the margin with נוחל as a v.l. for נלחם.

¹³ Cf. e.g., *HALOT* 587, which admits this sense in 1Sm 28.16 and Ps 139.20. Kaddari (2006.180) adds Is 14.21.

¹⁴ Does the marginal reading, בקבר, suggest that one should visit the grave of one’s friend from time to time?

¹⁵ Followed by Smend (328 and II 623), Segal (230), and Kahana (404).

§ departs quite widely from ℣: תְּשַׁבַּח רֵעִים בְּקִרְבָּא וְלֹא תִשְׁלֹטֵיהֶם: 'you shall not praise¹⁶ a close friend¹⁷ nor let him control your home.'

37.7) Πᾶς σύμβουλος ἐξαίρει βουλὴν,
ἀλλ' ἔστιν συμβουλεύων εἰς ἑαυτόν.

*Every advisor praises (his) advice highly,
but there is one who advises for his own benefit.*

(B) כל יועץ יניף יד אך יש יועץ דרך אל לך:¹⁸
(D) כל יועץ אומר חזה אך יש יועץ דרך עליו:

כול = הִזַּה 'Look!'. From § אָמַר < אָמַר seems to be missing: מְלוֹכָא קָזַי.

εἰς ἑαυτόν] Very difficult to harmonise with דרך אל לך or דרך עליו.

The difficulty of 7b in ℣, whether (B) or (D), is illustrated in §: בְּרַם אֵית מְלוֹכָא דְשִׁפִּיר עֲבִיד 'but there is advice which is worth following well(?).'¹⁹

37.8) ἀπὸ συμβούλου φύλαξον τὴν ψυχὴν σου
καὶ γνῶθι πρότερον τίς αὐτοῦ χρεία
καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ βουλευέσεται,
μήποτε βάλη ἐπὶ σοὶ κλῆρον

*From (any)²⁰ advisor keep yourself safe
and find out first what he is after
for he could be thinking of himself,
in case he might cast a lot against you*

(Ba) מיועץ²¹ שמור נפשך ודע לפנים מה צורכו:
(Bb) ... לנפשך²² יחשב למה זה אליו יפול:
(Da) מיועץ שמר נפ[ס]ך ודע לפנים מה צורכו:
(Db) כי גם הוא נפשו יחשב למה זה אליו יפול:

¹⁶ Reading תְּשַׁבַּח instead of תְּשַׁכַּח. We see another v.l. in the margin of (B): תַּכַּחש 'you deny.'

¹⁷ Reading קִרְבָּא instead of קִרְבֵּי. No instance is known in BH of קִרְבָּא substantivised in the sense of 'proximity, a place near by.'

¹⁸ What we find in the margin is identical with (D).

¹⁹ According to Smend (328) and Lévi (181) a similar thought is expressed in הוּי זְהִיר מִן 'Beware of one who advises you for his own interest' bSanh. 76b. Segal (236) writes that § means 'there is advice that has worked well,' for which we need עֲבִיד or עָבַד (active), not עֲבִיד (passive). Syriac scribes are not used to a *plena* spelling such as עֲבִיד for עָבַד.

²⁰ § is specific: מְלוֹכָא עֲוֹלָא 'a wicked counsellor.' Likewise בִּישָׁא נֹכָא 'bad damage' for κλῆρον.

²¹ The v.l. in the margin, מֵה יועץ, must be an error for מֵה יועץ. Lévi rejects the latter as unauthentic, because, according to him, our author does not use the def. article in a case like this, but we do find an example such as מֵה עוֹלָם in the margin of (B) at 42.21.

²² A marginal reading נִפְשֵׁי is the same as that we find in (Db).

μήποτε] The use of this lexeme, esp. in conjunction with a subj. Aor., to indicate apprehension is well known, e.g. μήποτε (מָה־פֶּן) ἐκτείνει τὴν χεῖρα .. ‘in case he stretches his hand out ..’ Ge 3.22. For more details, see SSG § 29 **ba** (iv). By opting for this syntactic feature our translator seems to have missed an alternative possibility of viewing the question as rhetorical, which would fit the current Heb. text better: “Why should this (benefit) fall to him, i.e. as his share?”²³ This alternative analysis is applicable at 8.1 above. More exemplified in BH of this use of לָמָּה in conjunction with Impf. in particular are mentioned in BDB s.v. מָה **4 d** (b), e.g. וַיֵּצֵן יְהוֹנָתָן אֶת־שָׂאוֹל יוֹצֵן יוֹמָת מָה עָשָׂה 1Sm 20.32.

37.9) καὶ εἶπῃ σοὶ Καλὴ ἡ ὁδὸς σου,
καὶ στήσεται ἐξ ἐναντίας ἰδεῖν τὸ συμβησόμενόν σοι.
and say to you, “Your way is splendid,”
but (just) stand opposite you to observe what is going to happen to you.

... לך מַטֹּב דַּרְכְךָ אֶךְ... לְהַבִּיט רִישְׁךָ: ²⁴
(D) וַיֹּאמֶר לְךָ לְהַבִּיט דַּרְכֶּיךָ וְקָם מִנְגַד לְהַבִּיט רִאשְׁךָ:

Καλὴ ἡ ὁδὸς σου] = שְׂמַח אֵיךְ אֵיךְ אֵיךְ ‘How good is your way!’ Did \mathfrak{G} ’s *Vorlage* read טובה דרכך / מה טוב or something like that?

τὸ συμβησόμενόν σοι] How this rendering has been arrived at from ראשך “your poverty” is anybody’s guess.

37.10) μὴ βουλευού μετὰ τοῦ ὑποβλεπομένου σε
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ζηλούντων σε κρύψον βουλήν,
Do not consult someone who looks at you suspiciously
and from those who are jealous of you keep your decision secret.
(D) אַל תּוֹעֶץ עִם חַמִּיךָ וּמִמְקַנְאֵי הָעַלְיָם סְרִי:

βουλευού] In spite of the sg. number the middle voice here carries reciprocal value, cf. SSG § 27 **cd**.

τοῦ ὑποβλεπομένου σε] Pace Segal (236) חַמִּיךָ cannot possibly be חַמִּיךָ ‘your father-in-law.’ There is no justification for suggesting that it is about advice concerning one’s wife.²⁵ Lévi (183), referring to שְׂמַח’s סְנֵאָר ‘your enemy,’ proposes חַמִּיךָ ‘your enemies,’ but who on earth would go to enemies for advice? This difficulty, true, lies with \mathfrak{G} here to a certain extent. \mathfrak{G} may reflect Arm. חַמִּי ‘to look,’ but mere onlookers are not disqualified for counseling, hence ὑποβλεπομένου σε, and not βλέποντός σε, for instance.

²³ Similarly Lévi (183): “Pourquoi cela lui échoit-il, à lui?”

²⁴ In the margin stand להביט for משוב, and ראשך for רישך.

²⁵ In BH the lexeme signifies ‘husband’s father,’ whilst in MH it can also signify ‘wife’s father.’

37.11) μετὰ γυναικὸς περὶ τῆς ἀντιζήλου αὐτῆς
καὶ μετὰ δειλοῦ περὶ πολέμου,
μετὰ ἐμπόρου περὶ μεταβολίας
καὶ μετὰ ἀγοράζοντος περὶ πράσεως,
μετὰ βασκάνου περὶ εὐχαριστίας
καὶ μετὰ ἀνελεήμονος περὶ χρηστοηθείας,
μετὰ ὀκνηροῦ περὶ παντὸς ἔργου
καὶ μετὰ μισθίου ἐπετείου περὶ συντελείας,
οἰκέτη ἀργῶ περὶ πολλῆς ἐργασίας,
μὴ ἔπεχε ἐπὶ τούτοις περὶ πάσης συμβουλίας.

*(Do not discuss) with a wife about her rival
or with a coward about war,
with a merchant about commercial business,
or with a buyer about sale,
with a miser about gratitude
or with a merciless person about kindness,
with an idler about any kind of work
or with a part-time labourer about finishing the work,
with a lazy household-staff about overwork,
do not expect anything of value from discussion with these people.*

ומדר אל מלחמתו ²⁷ :	עם אשה על ²⁶ צרתה (Ba)
וממקנ[ה]א ²⁸ על ממכר ²⁹ :	עם סוחר אל תתגר (Bb)
ואכזרי על טוב בשר:	עם איש רע אל תגמל ³⁰ חסד (Bc)
שומר שוא על מוציא רע ³¹ :	פועל שוא על מלאכתו (Bd)
ומלוכד על מלחמה:	עם אשה אל צרתה (Da)
ומקונה על ממכרו:	עם סוחר אל (ממכ[תתג]רו (Db)
ואכזרי על טוב בשר	עם ³² איש רע על גמילות חסד (Dc)
שכיר שנה על מוציא זרע:	פועל שכיר על מלאכתו (Dd)

τῆς ἀντιζήλου αὐτῆς [צרתה] צרתה is how Peninnah, the rival of Hannah, Elkanah's favourite wife, is called at 1Sm 1.6 in *GL* and *H* respectively.

²⁶ אל in the margin is indicative of the contemporary or mediaeval, phonetic instability of the two gutturals.

²⁷ For the second hemistich there is a marginal reading: ..ומלוכד ע' מל. The first form is apparently 'joined, combined,' though in BH, QH, or MH the verb is unknown in Pual. In any event the v.l. makes no sense here. On the other hand, על מלחמה (Da) is not easy to understand, either. לוכד could refer to a commander about to attack and take an enemy position.

²⁸ The *alef* is written above *heh*; a poor v.l., since the notion of jealousy or envy is irrelevant here. It is a buyer versus a seller.

²⁹ For the second hemistich there is a marginal reading: ומקונה ע' ממכר.

³⁰ In the margin there is a v.l., אל תגמל על גמילות, for תגמל.

³¹ In the margin the whole line is written as ..מצא זרע ש. מוציא רע על מלאכת שכיר.

³² BSH (37) has printed [על] (ל), probably indicating the editors' preference for על instead of עם, which latter is a crystal-clear reading in the MS.

μετὰ δειλοῦ] The exemplary parallelism displayed in this verse – eight (!) times μετὰ .. ἐπεὶ and the two consecutive pairs joined with καὶ four times – suggests the inadvertent absence of the prep. עַם here, so that עַם חָרַד suggests itself. The equation חָרַד / δειλός occurs in Jd 7.3B.³³ One might think that the translator shifted to the dat. case in the penultimate line, οὐκέτι ἀργῶ, just for the sake of stylistic variation, but we note that ח, both (B) and (D), lack the preposition עַם.³⁴

Basically the pattern of parallelism is also observable in ח in the shape of עַם .. עַל. In both languages the first preposition is followed by a type of person one negotiates or discusses with, and the second an issue for negotiation or discussion. In respect of מָדַר (Ba) we have also seen a text-critical implication of the parallelism. We could apply this approach to a few other cases in ח of this verse. Thus:

[i] (Bb) אַל תִּתְנֶה אֶל תַּתְנֶה is often analysed as ‘you shall not bargain.’ We propose instead עַל תִּתְנֶה ‘over the matter of sale,’³⁵ though Ben Yehuda 7665a admits תִּתְנֶה in the sense of “conflict, quarrel.” However, since Hebrew has a number of lexemes derived from √תנר³⁶ related to commercial activity, we could perhaps understand תִּתְנֶה in the sense of ‘sale, commerce,’³⁷ which often involves conflicts.

Yet the corresponding form in (Db), מִמַּכְתַּנְרָו, is most odd, though it shares √תנר in the form as reconstructed in (Bb). The mere length of the form, 7 letters without counting the final *waw*, already suggests that this is scarcely a genuine Hebrew word form.³⁸

[ii] (Bb) [מִמַּמְקַנְהָ] א can be corrected to read וְעַם קוֹנֶה, for which we find support in the v.l. cited in fn. 29 above.

[iii] (Bc) אֶל תִּגְמַל, for which there is a significant v.l. in the margin: עַל תִּגְמַל. To restore עַל תִּגְמַל is graphically less complicated. Though a hapax in BH, תִּגְמַל does occur in כָּל-תִּגְמֹלוּהִי עָלַי Ps 116.12. It is also important to note that, in all the four pairs under discussion, there is no finite verb except the just discussed תִּתְנֶה and תִּגְמַל. These, if finite verbs, would disrupt the structure of parallelism here.

[iv] For the sake of parallelism the preposition עַם had better be inserted in a few more places: אֶכּוֹרֵי (Bc and Dc); שׁוֹמֵר .. פּוֹעַל (Bd); פּוֹעַל and שׁוֹכֵר

³³ The v.l. in A and L, δειλός καὶ φοβούμενος, possibly represents the two constituents in ח חָרַד וְחָרַד as rearranged in the alphabetical order in both languages. On the question of alphabetical sequence of accumulated words, see Muraoka 1973a.26-29, (C).

In our *Index* s.v. δειλός this Si case needs to be added.

³⁴ Cf. *SSG* § 56 c (ii).

³⁵ Similarly Segal (237).

³⁶ Cf. Arb. */tājir/* ‘merchant, tradesman.’ Here we find an Arabic loan remade à la syriaque in ח תִּגְרָא, which, however, is a loan from Akk. */tamkāru/* according to *SL* 1624a.

³⁷ Dalman (1938.438) mentions תִּגְרָא ‘Handel,’ occurring in the Targum at Zc 14.21.

³⁸ Cf. ח עַם תִּגְרָא וְעַם תִּגְרָא עַל תִּגְרָא ח ‘and with a merchant about his business’ and ח עַם תִּגְרָא ח ‘and with a merchant because of a change of business.’

שנה (Dd). Our Gk translator, who displays his marvellous mastery of the rhetorical feature of parallelism, has slipped at the very end: he should have written *μετὰ οἰκέτου ἀργοῦ* in the penultimate line above. Misled by שכיר (Dd) in lieu of עם שכיר?

[v] An infelicitous spelling אל in lieu of על: (Ba), (Bb), (Bc), (Db).

Both S and Sh employ עם eight times, whereas the reflexion of על περι is not consistent at all; S uses על only twice, whereas Sh employs a highly unexpected preposition, מטול, unexpected because περι + gen. never expresses a reason, cause or ground.³⁹

βασκάνου] Lévi (185) points out that the author uses a phrase רע עין often. Indeed at 14.3 it is rendered with βάσκανος. The author may have feared that the addition of עין makes the verse a shade too long.

εὐχαριστίας] On our restoration of על תגמול, see our discussion above at [iii], and note נמילות חסד in (Dc), which reminds us of a standing MH phrase נמילות חסדיים mentioned as one of the three pillars on which the world stands (mAb 1.2).⁴⁰

χρηστοθείας] There is no difficulty about the meaning of this Gk word, but what does טוב בשר mean? טוב is likely an abstract noun טוב rather than an adjective טוב. Theoretically the latter is not impossible, but then in the st. cst. Even so, what is meant with בָּשָׂר here? Is S thinking of טוב לֵב⁴¹ or suchlike? Irrespective of the vocalisation of טוב, the Heb. phrase most likely has to do with one's moral, ethical character and stance.⁴² All the same, is the author going on about a person who does not care about a poor neighbour a tiny bit, but is busy fattening himself and making sure that he looks stunningly good?

ὀκνηροῦ] (Dd) sounds odd, for one should surely talk to a hired labourer over jobs assigned to him. The first שכיר has been dislocated from the second one and had better be changed to שוא as in (Bd).

παντὸς ἔργου] In neither (Bd) nor (Dd) we see כל. Without it מלאכתו as in (B) and (D) makes sense.

ἐπετείου] lit. '(hired) for just one year [ἔτος ἕν].'

שומר שוא (Bd)] Would a good stylist repeat the same word, שוא, in two contiguous hemistichs? The text of (Dd) is superior to that of (Bd).

συντελείας] Very difficult to harmonise with either מוציא רע (Bd) or רע מוציא (Dd); רע in the former most likely an error for זרע. The second half

³⁹ LSJ s.v. περι A II 1 writes "with verbs of fighting or contending," but there it is concerned with physical or military fight, and not oral contention, and the object is not a topic.

⁴⁰ Cf. ἀγαθὸν προσευχῆ μετὰ νηστείας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης. οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας πλησθήσονται ζωῆς To 12.8-9 6¹.

⁴¹ What could be translated "humanité" (Lévi 185), but scarcely טוב בשר.

⁴² Smend's (II 63) "(wegen) des Glückes eines Menschen" is hardly acceptable. Is בָּשָׂר ever used as an indefinite pronoun like מִי־שֶׁהוּ?

of (Dd) probably means that, when you decide who is to take seeds out for the coming year, a one-year hireling may not be the best person to consult.

πάσης συμβουλίας] with a < πᾶς + sg. noun > for absolute, categorical negation, cf. SSG § 83 fa.

In \mathfrak{H} there is no trace at all of the last two hemistichs in \mathfrak{G} .⁴³ The penultimate hemistich is unique in comparison with the preceding eight in that it begins with a dat., and not with μετά τινος, and it stands alone, not continued by και μετά. Given its message and wording the last hemistich stands on its own, summing up all that precedes: τούτοις refers to all the types of people mentioned above after μετά and there is a finite verb, the only one in this verse, a negative impv., μὴ ἔπεχε.

The last two hemistichs must have accidentally dropped out, because the beginning of the following verse, אך עם⁴⁴ איש, presupposes them.

A slightly revised version of (B) and (D) could look as below:

ועם חרד על מלחמתו:	עם אשה על צרתה	(Ba)
ועם קנה על ממכר:	עם סוחר על תגר	(Bb)
ועם אכזרי על טוב בשר:	עם איש רע על תגמל חסד	(Bc)
ועם שומר שוא על מוציא זרע:	עם פועל שוא על מלאכתו	(Bd)
ועם לוכד על מלחמה:	עם אשה על צרתה	(Da)
ועם קונה על ממכרו:	עם סוחר על ממכתתגרו	(Db)
ועם אכזרי על טוב בשר:	עם איש רע על גמילות חסד	(Dc)
ועם שכיר שנה על מוציא זרע:	עם פועל שוא על מלאכתו	(Dd)

37.12) ἀλλ' ἢ μετὰ ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβοῦς ἐνδελείχῃζε,
ὄν ἂν ἐπιγνῶς συντηροῦντα ἐντολάς,
ὃς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν σου,
καὶ ἐὰν πταισίσης, συναλγήσει σοι.

*But keep up with a person fearing God
whom you might notice observing commandments,
with whom you are of one mind,
and should you fall into a trouble, he would share your pain.*

אשר תדע שומר מצוה:	אך אם יש ⁴⁵ מפחד תמיד	(Ba)
אם תכשל יגיע אליך:	אשר עם לבבו כלבבך	(Bb)
... תדע שומר מצוה:	אך אם איש מפחד תמיד	(Da)
ואם יכשל ⁴⁶ יעבד בך:	אשר ... בלבבו כלבבך	(Db)

⁴³ $\mathfrak{S}|\mathfrak{h}$ has preserved them: לְכַר בְּיָמָא בְּטִילָא מְטוּל פּוֹלְחָנָא סְגִיָּא לָא תְתַקַּל עַל הֲנוּן מְטוּל כּל מְלָכָא 'to a useless domestic staff because of heavy work-load. Do not trust them because of any advice.'

⁴⁴ As corrected from אם (D).

⁴⁵ In the margin there is an appropriate correction to איש. Also אם need be corrected to עם, so also in (D).

⁴⁶ An error for תכשל (Bb).

ἀλλ' ἢ] Preceded by a negator this indicates contrast. This shows the verse as a logical sequence of the preceding, though in **Ⲙ** that is not evident due to the accidental loss of the preceding text.

εὐσεβοῦς] The corresponding **Ⲙ**, מפחד תמיד, does occur in Pr 28.14, as noted by Lévi (187), though it sounds unfair to criticise the translator for having misunderstood **Ⲙ** and leaving תמיד out or having taken the latter as a verb, but which verb?, a question to which Lévi has no answer.

ἐπιγνώσ συντηροῦντα] Whereas we often encounter Gk verbs expanded with a participle and its subject⁴⁷ and Heb. also knows of a similar syntactic structure,⁴⁸ ידע, a high-frequency verb, does not enter that category. What we have here differs from a case such as וישמע משה את־העם בכה Nu 11.10. Hence we interpret שומר as a substantivised ptc. and an object⁴⁹ complement: 'you will get to know him as an observer of commandment(s).'

συντηροῦντα ἐντολάς] Rendering a sg. ptc. in both (B)⁵⁰ and (D). Is שומר מצוה being used as a generic term for 'religious, pious'? In BH we find only the pl. מצוות as a nom. rectum with שמר as a nomen regens, e.g. שמרי מצותי Dt 5.10,⁵¹ see also Ex 20.6, Dt 7.9, Dn 9.4 and Ne 1.5. Cf. תשמר מצוה שונתהרשעים ἐντολάς Si 15.15 and שומר מצוה שונתהרשעים ἐντολῶν 35.23.⁵² The sg. ἐντολήν [= **Ⲙ**] is preserved only in a couple of minuscules.

καὶ ἔαν] The conjunction is needed here; ו must have inadvertently dropped out from (B).

συναλγήσει] What כך⁵³ יעבר is supposed to mean is not clear. The collocation עבד ב as in ואתה ביהוה אשר עבדת אתה ביהוה Gn 30.26 does not apply here.

In comparison with either Heb. version **Ⲙ** is rather free: עם אנשא ודיקא הוית עמה דהגון דחליו למחטא קדם אלקה. ולבהון שוא ללבן. ואן מבאש לך לנפשה הוית עמה דהגון דחליו למחטא קדם אלקה. ואן מטאב לך לנפשה הו מטאב 'you should dwell with the righteous people for they are fearful of sinning before God. Their heart is similar to your heart. If he treats you badly, he is treating himself⁵⁴ badly, and if he treats you well, he is treating himself well.'

σοι] a dat. of associative value, on which cf. SSG § 22 wj.

⁴⁷ For details, see SSG § 31 gd, 70 a.

⁴⁸ For details, see JM § 126 b, SQH § 31 k, p. 213, 2nd paragraph.

⁴⁹ Which is ὄν pace "wenn du erkannt hast" (SD), where ὄν has been wrongly taken as equivalent to ἔαν. Likewise **Ⲙ**: לך דאן תשמודע נטר פוקדנה דמריא.

⁵⁰ The suf. pron. in a marginal reading מצותי makes no sense.

⁵¹ This is quoted as שומרי מצוותי in 4Q41 3.7.

⁵² Of two marginal readings, מצות is pl., whereas מצותו can be sg.

⁵³ Abegg reads יעבר, but the penultimate letter appears to us more like kaf. Smend (332) reconstructs Ni. יעבר, what is found in the margin of (B). We are not certain that that accords with **Ⲙ** here. The sense of this Ni. verb is somewhat obscure and the value of ב to go with is not clear, either.

⁵⁴ Who the referent of the pron. suf. in נפשך is ambiguous. The text started off with "the righteous person" and continues with "their heart."

37.13) καὶ βουλὴν καρδίας στῆσον,
οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν σοι πιστότερος αὐτῆς·

*And also execute the decision reached in your mind,
for you have nobody more trustworthy than that.*

(B) וגם עצת לבב הבין מי יאמין לך אמן ממנו:⁵⁵
(D) וגם עצת לבבך כך כי אם אמון ממנו:

στῆσον] can hardly be a rendering of הבין ‘Understand!’. Nor can (D) כך, which suggests הכן, i.e. הִכֵּן.

As the meaning of ἵστημι in the 1st aor. *GELS* s.v. II 7 suggests “to execute the terms provided in,” often governing a noun indicating a message, e.g. τὸν ὄρκον μου Ge 26.3.⁵⁶ This suits our example here, when we take βουλὴ in the sense of “decision made.”

The second hemistich is rather difficult in both (B) and (D).⁵⁷ ט may represent something like נאמן ממנו כי אין לך נאמן ממנו. The equation Ni. πιστός נאמן is attested 31⁵⁸ times in LXX.⁵⁹ Note esp. in our text 44.20 and 46.15, where it is applied to a trustworthy human being.

The referent of the suf. pron. in ממנו is obviously לבב. In ט βουλή is also fem., but the context indicates καρδία as its referent. Interestingly we note a philological, editorial note in the margin of ט: לא גיר אית לך דמַהִימַן מְנָה: ט, where on the last two words with מנה marked explicitly as מְנָה there has been inserted a comment: ‘הנו דין לבך.’ On the other hand, πιστότερος is masc. and a human counsellor is being referred to.⁶⁰

37.14) ψυχὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἀπαγγέλλειν ἐνίοτε εἶωθεν
ἢ ἑπτὰ σκοποὶ ἐπὶ μετεώρου καθήμενοι ἐπὶ σκοπιῆς.

*For a man’s soul is known to inform sometimes (better)
than seven sentinels sitting high up there on a watch-tower.*

⁵⁵ In the margin the same text as that of (D) has been preserved.

⁵⁶ “stand by your heart’s counsel” (*NETS*) is questionable; the verb is used as intransitive in the 2nd aor., hence we would anticipate στῆθι. Besides the verb in this sense never governs a noun in the acc. indicating a person or an object to stand by. We are also sceptical that this verb, transitively used, bears senses expressed in “trust your own judgement” (Snaithe 179), “tiens-toi au conseil de ton cœur” (*BJ*), and “heed your own heart’s counsel” (Skehan - Di Lella 425).

⁵⁷ That the Peshitta translator struggled is evident in his product: מְטוּל דְהִימְנוּתָהּ הִי תְחִיּוּהָ ‘because his faith is what keeps him alive and he also is trustworthy like you.’

⁵⁸ Read “31” for “30” in *Index* s.v. πιστός 1) a on the basis of Ps 144.13a (11QPs^a col. xvii).

⁵⁹ Segal (238) reads אָמֵן, which, according to him, is a synonym of נאמן; he refers to Ps 12.2 and 31.24, where, however, it seems to mean “faithful, loyal.”

⁶⁰ Skehan - Di Lella’s (425) “there is nothing that you can depend on more” would not do.

(B) לב אנוש יגיד שעיותיו משבעה⁶¹ צופים על מצפה:
 (D) לב אנוש מגיד שעיותיו משבעה צפים על שן:

ἐνίοτε εἴθε] The juxtaposition of these two words, the one meaning “sometimes” and the other, εἴθε, meaning “to be accustomed,” look mutually contradictory. What is meant is probably “it is common knowledge that this or that happens sometimes.”

Since this combination is unlikely a rendering of שעיותיו, the latter is not reflected in ⚭.⁶² The noun, probably to be identified as שְׁעִיָּה,⁶³ unknown to BH, appears to be a verbal noun of Qal שָׁעָה ‘to gaze.’ As the object of יגיד or מגיד it cannot mean “act of gazing,”⁶⁴ but rather “information gathered through gazing.”⁶⁵ Cp. Engl. *observation* and *sight*. See below at 38.25.

ן] The context suggests that the particle is that of comparison, “than,” rather than “or,” but the tertium comparationis, which is not explicitly mentioned is, it seems, the quantity of information obtained and communicated.

ן] Cf. שְׁן־סֶלַע Jb 39.28.

⚭ is rather free, probably owing to the difficulty of the original text: לְבַב אִישׁ יִשְׂמַח בְּעִמְּוֹתָא דְעָלְמָא דְלֹא מְהַאֲנֵא ‘the mind of a man would rejoice over his path more than (over) the wealth of the world which gains no benefit from it.’ See also the first hemistich in ⚭: נַפְשָׁא גִיר דְגַבְבָּא: ⚭) מְעָדָא הִי אִית אָמַת לְמוֹדְעוּ ‘for the soul of a man is accustomed to announce when,’ where the use of אִית is syntactically odd and אָמַת probably reflects ὄτε, not εἴθε.

37.15) καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τούτοις δεήθητι ὑψίστου,
 ἵνα εὐθύνῃ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὁδόν σου.

*And in addition to all these (matters), implore the Most High
 so that He would truly help you to move along your path.*

(B) ועם כל אלה עתר⁶⁶ אל אל אשר יכין באמת צעדך:
 (D) ועם כל אלה העתר אל אל אשר יכין באמת צעדך:

ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τούτοις] This preposition + dat. can indicate addition, e.g. αἷματα ἐφ’ αἷμασιν μίγγουσιν ‘they mix blood with blood’ Ho 4.2; more examples

⁶¹ There is an exaggerating marginal reading: שבעים.

⁶² Segal (238) writes that the translator read שעיותיו, but it is doubtful that “his hours, times” can be rendered with ἐνίοτε.

⁶³ So vocalised by Segal (231), Kahana (405), and *Maagarim*, though there is no tradition of vocalisation for this lexeme.

⁶⁴ The database *Maagarim* defines its meaning as “turning one’s mind (לבי), getting interested (התעניינות), turning (פנייה),” all action nouns.

⁶⁵ Segal (238) writes that the word basically means “conversation, talk,” but here it means “fear,” for which there is no foundation.

⁶⁶ Corrected in the margin to העתר.

are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. **II 5**. However, it does not indicate a difference in degree or priority. Hence “above all these” (*NETS*) is questionable.

ὕψιστου] The author is unlikely suggesting “Implore some supernatural entity,” but implicitly referring to the supreme entity par excellence. An entity, whether divine, human, or whatever, which can be assumed by the participants in communication as a unique entity, can be optionally expressed without the definite article. E.g. לְדַרוֹשׁ אֱלֹהִים בְּכֹל לֵב ‘to seek God wholeheartedly’ 1QS 1.2 and לֹא בָחַר אֱלֹהִים בָּהֶם ‘God did not choose them’ CD 2.7.⁶⁷ In Si also we find a similar case such as διαθήκην ὑψίστου ‘the covenant of the Most High’ 28.7.⁶⁸

יֵאָדָּם] may indicate a purpose, e.g. וְיִשְׁמְעוּ אִישׁ שְׁפַת רֵעֵהוּ Gn 11.7 (Ὁ ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον); for more examples, see BDB s.v. וְיֵאָדָּם **8 b**. The particle here could be viewed as the ordinary relative pronoun with אֵל as its antecedent and the Impf. יִכִּין as having the value of theoretical potentiality: “who could, if He so wished.”

Another possibility is to analyse ἵνα as introducing a content clause with verbs of requesting, commanding and the like, but not of knowing, saying, and hearing. E.g. δέομαι οὖν ἵνα ποιήσῃς τὴν εὐχὴν ‘I therefore entreat you to fulfil the vow’ 1E 4.46; ἐξορκιῶ σε κύριον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὸν θεὸν τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ λάβῃς γυναῖκα τῷ υἱῷ μου Ἰσαακ ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν Χανααίων Ge 24.3 (אֲשַׁבֵּיעַךְ בִּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ) (אֲשַׁר לֹא-תִקַּח אִשָּׁה לְבְנִי מִבְּנוֹת הַכְּנַעֲנִי.⁶⁹ Let us note that in the second example \mathfrak{H} introduces the content clause with אֲשַׁר just like in our Si case.

37.16) Ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἔργου λόγος,
καὶ πρὸ πάσης πράξεως βουλή.

*Every work begins with a discussion
and before every practice there is a debate.*

(B) ראש כל מעשה דבר וראש כל פועל היא מחשבת:⁷⁰
(D) ראש כל מעשה מאמר לפני כל פעל היא מחשבת:

πρὸ] = (D). In the selection of this prepositional phrase instead of ἀρχή there is not much more than a stylistic variation. This shift has introduced a fundamental syntactic difference: the clause structure of the (B) version is <NP - dp - NP>, whereas that of the (D) version is <prep. ph. - dp - NP>. Another syntactic difference thus introduced is that now we have an existential clause: “What is prior to every action is consideration.”

⁶⁷ For further details, cf. *SQH* § 7 f.

⁶⁸ For further details, cf. *SSG* § 2.

⁶⁹ For a discussion with examples, see *SSG* 66 b.

⁷⁰ In the margin there is a text exactly identical with (D) with the sole exception of a *plena* written פועל.

איה] In the second hemistich in both Heb. versions we find this pronoun agreeing in gender and number with the following substantive, and this lays focus on מחשבת. Other patterns of agreement and other sequences are known.⁷¹ In (B) we find a tripartite nominal clause of <NP - dp - NP> type.

ש sounds like an unfinished composition: קדם בני אנשא וקדם כל מדם
‘Before people and before everything.’

37.17) ἵχνος ἀλλοιώσεως καρδία·

The heart (shows) trace(s) of change(s).

עקרת תבולות לבב: (B)

עקר תבולות לבב: (D)

ἵχνος (ת)עקר] In the light of ἵχνος καρδίας לב עקבת 13.26 𐤄 must be reflecting עקבת, the pl. cst. of עקב.⁷³ 𐤄 probably means something like “One’s policies are rooted in one’s heart [or: mind].”

ἀλλοιώσεως] Lévi opines that this rendering reflects תחליפות, cf. שיהקפא לן
‘change.’

Do the three Gk words here constitute a self-standing nominal clause? Since nobody’s heart can be by itself a trace of anything, hence our paraphrastic translation above. Basically the same difficulty would arise if by removing /-/ in Ziegler’s edition one analysed the three words as the s of ἀνατέλλει in vs. 18, what is precluded, however, unless one also adopted, pace Ziegler, a v.l. ζῶην καὶ θάνατον. שיה appears to be composing a single clause out of vs. 17 and the first hemistich of vs. 18: לעקבתא דשיהקפא דלפא
‘as trace(s) of the change of the heart four parts are disclosed.’

37.18) τέσσαρα μέρη ἀνατέλλει,
ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακόν, ζωὴ καὶ θάνατος,
καὶ ἡ κυριεύουσα ἐνδελεχῶς αὐτῶν γλῶσσά ἐστιν.

*Four parts appear,
good and bad, life and death,
and what keeps them under control constantly is a tongue.*

⁷¹ For details as regards QH, see *SQH* § 33 e-ef.

⁷² In the margin we see עקר [= D].

⁷³ Even-Shoshan admits עקבה said to mean ‘trace left by a moving object,’ without giving any reference. Such a lexeme is not recognised by *Maagarim*, and BSH 248a parses עקבת Si 13.26 under עקב. In *Index* s.v. ἵχνος 4) עקב, correct “[1]” to “[2: + Si 37.17].”

Ben-Hayyim (1973.217) derives עקרת from עקר, and maintains that the form used here is not in the st. cst., and means “essence, foundation.”

- (Ba) ארבעה שבִּטִים⁷⁴ יפְרִיחֶהוּ:
 (Bb) טוב ורעה⁷⁵ וחיים ומות ומושלת במ כליל לשון:
 (Da) ארבעה שרביטי־יפְרִיחֶהוּ:
 (Db) טוב ורע מות וחיים ומשלח במ כליל לשון:

[μέρος] This cannot be a rendering of שְׁבִיטִים or שְׁבִיטִים. In *Index* s.v. μέρος (23) שָׂכָם has been suggested with reference to TO Gn 48.22 חוֹלֶק [= שָׂכָם].⁷⁶

[ἀνατέλλει] The sg. verb does not necessarily imply that its *s* is καρδία of the preceding verse; our heart may control good or bad, but not life nor death. This is a standard rule of Greek grammar in which a pl. nt. noun as *s* can be treated as sg.

[משלח] In this context this word, however vocalised, makes little sense. Most likely an error for B's מושלת.

[כליל] The adverbial use of כָּלִיל is known at הַאֵלִילִים כָּלִיל יִחַלֶּה Is 2.18, cf. שְׁמִירָאִית 'wholly, entirely.'

Cf. quite a different message conveyed by ש: מְרִיא בְּרָא כֹל טַב וְבִישׁ. חַיָּא 'the Lord created all, good and bad, life and death, and one who controls his tongue would be saved from bad (things).'

The second hemistich of (Bb) = Ø. For a similar message, cf. מוֹת וְחַיִּים מוֹת וְחַיִּים θάνατος και ζωή ἐν χειρὶ γλώσσης Pr 18.21. But cf. שְׁלֵטַת אֵימָתָהּ 'and that which controls them truly is tongue.'

37.19) Ἔστιν ἀνὴρ πανούργος πολλῶν παιδευτής,
καὶ τῆ ἰδίᾳ ψυχῆ ἔστιν ἄχρηστος.

*There is a clever man capable of teaching many
but for his own needs he is hopeless.*

- (B) יש חכם לרבים נחכם ולנפשו הוא גואל⁷⁷:
 (C) יש חכם לרבים נחכם ולנפשו הוא גואל:
 (D) יש חכם לרבים נחכם ולנפשו הוא גואל:

[πανούργος] The selection of this adjective, a derivative of which, πανουργία, is used by our translator with a negative nuance of “knavery” (19.23) as well as in a positive sense, “cleverness” (21.12), and the non-selection of a more standard equivalent, σοφός, are possibly indicative of his cynicism.

[πολλῶν] The gender of the form is ambiguous. However, its Heb. counterpart, רבים, points to masc., “many people” rather than neut. “many things.”

⁷⁴ A marginal v.l. reads: שרביטים.

⁷⁵ A marginal v.l. reads: ורע [= D]. Likewise מושלח > מושלח.

⁷⁶ Many might disagree with Rashi, who at Gn 48.22 interprets this Heb. word as meaning ‘portion,’ for which he mentions a number of instances: Ps 21.13, 60.8, Ho 6.9, Zp 3.9. Qimhi agrees.

⁷⁷ In the margin we read גואל [= D].

for the latter of which the neut. form would be preferred as in רבות כאלה Πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἔδρακεν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου Si 16.5; a similar case is found in Jb 16.2.

ψυχῆ] Hardly a substitute of a reflexive pronoun, for the notion of reflexivity is carried by ἰδίᾳ, and the focus here is on a teacher's intellectual activities, cf. SSG § 8 g.

נחכם] This is the first attestation of Ni. חכם. It recurs in vs. 22 (D), where it is left untranslated and 23 (B).

גואל (B and C)] a plain scribal error for גואל, i.e. גואל (D) 'stupid.' Cf. S: כול מן דחכים ברעניהו הוה סכלא 'everybody who is wise in his (own) view, he is the fool,' where the st. det. of סכלא indicates the substantivisation of the adjective.

The sequence of verses 19-26 is confused: for a discussion of the question, cf. Skehan - Di Lella 435.

37.20) ἔστιν σοφιζόμενος ἐν λόγοις μισητός,
οὗτος πάσης τρυφῆς καθυστερήσει.

*There is one who shows off wisdom in eloquence and is hated,
this type of person would miss every luxuriant dinner.*

(B) יש חכם בדברו נמאס ומכל מאכל תענוג נבצר:

(D) יש חכם בדברו ימאס ומכל מאכל תענוג נבצר:

σοφιζόμενος] As rightly pointed out by Smend (334) Ⓞ has construed חכם with בדברו, whereas S analyses the former as the substantivised *s* of the existential clause: אית גיר דחכים ובשועינתה מסתנא 'for there is one who is wise and gets hated with his talks.'

μισητός] There is no argument for shifting from the ptc. (B) to the impf. (D).

τρυφῆς] a reading established by Ziegler with the sole support by the Sahidic version, whilst the rest read either σοφίας or τροφῆς. Whereas σοφίας can be safely left out of consideration, τρυφή means "that which provides material comfort and pleasure" (so GELS s.v.) and is not confined to food culture unlike τροφή, which means "food." We wonder if it is right to ignore מאכל altogether. Certainly תענוג 'pleasure, enjoyment' is better covered with τρυφή, but one could say that πάσης goes to a certain extent to indicate the quality of food at the table.

The gen. case here carries the value of ablative, cf. SSG § 22 q.

37.21) οὐ γὰρ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ παρὰ κυρίου χάρις,
ὅτι πάσης σοφίας ἐστερήθη.

*For charm was not granted to him by the Lord,
because he was deprived of all wisdom.*

παρὰ κυρίου] The agens or s of a passive verb can be indicated through a variety of prepositions, cf. *SSG* § 63 e.

The second verbal clause can be transformed to the passive voice: ἐστέρησαν αὐτὸν πάσης σοφίας, cf. ἐστέρησέν σε κύριος τῆς δόξης Nu 24.11. On this question, see *SSQ* § 55 **daa**.

The entire verse is missing in **H** and **S**. **S**h is roughly equal to **G**.

37.22) ἔστιν σοφὸς τῆ ἰδία ψυχῆ,
καὶ οἱ καρποὶ τῆς συνέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σώματος.

*There is a sage who is confident of himself
and the fruits of his understanding are (evident) on (his) body.*

ויש חכם לנפשו יחכם פרי דעתו על גויתו: (B)

ויש חכם לנפשו יחכם פרי דעתו על גויתו: (C)

ויש חכם לנפשו נחכם פרי דעתו על גויתו: (D)

[יחכם] Is this Ni. in the light of נחכם (D)?

σώματος] **S**h פומא = στόματος ‘mouth,’ so in all Gk MSS.⁷⁸

S departs substantially from both **H** and **G**: אית חכימא דבכל עדן חכים: ופאריהון דחכימא לנפשון ‘there is a wise person who is wise all the time and the fruits of the wise persons are for themselves.’

37.23) ἀνὴρ σοφὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαὸν παιδεύσει,
καὶ οἱ καρποὶ τῆς συνέσεως αὐτοῦ πιστοί.

*A wise man should educate his people,
and the fruits of his understanding are true to emerge.*

[ויש חכם לעמו נחכם פרי דעתו בגויתם:] (B)

ויש חכם לעמו יחכם פרי דעתו בגויתם: (D)

[יחכם] The same question as at vs. 22 arises. **G** most likely represents Pi. יחכם. The initial ἀνὴρ, as justly pointed out by Smend (335), reflects איש instead of ויש [= **S** אית].

The second hemistich of **H** is probably meant as an integral part of the first hemistich, indicating the aim of the education.

S sounds quite different: ואת חכימא דלנפשה חכים ופארא דעבדוהי מן חווא: דאפוהי ‘and there is a wise man who is wise for himself and the fruits of his deeds are (visible) from the look of his face.’

⁷⁸ Lévi (190) cites כל-עמל האדם לפיהו Ec 6.7, which might suggest an alternative interpretation of **G**: some wise men are interested in applying their intelligence only to satisfy their bodily needs.

⁷⁹ This entire text is in the margin.

37.24) ἀνὴρ σοφὸς πλησθήσεται εὐλογίας,
καὶ μακαριοῦσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ ὀρώντες.

*A wise man would be full of adoration,
and all who see (him) would call him happy.*

(B) חכם ל.. ע. תענוג ויאשרוהו ...
(C) חכם לנפשו ישבע תענוג וכל ה. יאשרוהו:
(D) חכם לנפשו ישבע תענוג ויאשריהו כל רואיהו:

[εὐλογία] This is not an accurate rendering of תענוג, what one enjoys and not what others say. The translator is harmonising the first hemistich with the second.

(D)] Possibly a scribal error for יאשרוהו or a *plena* spelling for יאשרהו, i.e. יאשרהו, either equivalent to יאשרנו or a genuine jussive.

(D)] As problematic as the preceding יאשריהו. Is it an irregular spelling instead of רואיו, i.e. רואיו 'all those who see him' or another irregular, *plena* spelling instead of רואהו, i.e. רואהו 'everybody who sees him'? In the light of יאשרוהו (C) and also possibly יאשרוהו (B) it might be the simplest solution to analyse both as plural. So ש' וְנִשְׁבְּחוּהוּ כָּל־הַרְוִיחַ 'and all who see him would praise him.'

37.25) ζῆν ἀνδρὸς ἐν ἀριθμῷ ἡμερῶν,
καὶ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναρίθμητοι.

*A man's life is countable by days,
but the days of Israel are innumerable.*

(B) חיי איש מספר ימים וחיי עם ישראל⁸⁰ ...
(Da) חיי אנוש ימים מספר וחיי ישרון ימי אין מספר:
(Db) [גויתתן מספר יש ל'מים וגוית שם ימי אין מספר:]

(Da)] As an equivalent to מספר ימים (B) this is syntactically striking. The same occurs once in BH: עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן Nu 9.20, where, however, it means 'a number of days, a few days,' but we also find a cst. phrase: שְׁנוֹת מִסְפָּר יָאֵתִי Jb 16.22. So at Nu 9.20 one could have said יָמֵי מִסְפָּר. However, we have here (Da and Db) a striking case of ימי governing what is theoretically a self-standing clause. In these expressions indicating a vast quantity אין מספר appears to have acquired a special syntactic status and the sense of an abstract noun, 'uncountability.' See also עֲצֵי אֲרָזִים לְאֵין 1Ch 22.4 and יָמוֹת בְּאֵין מוֹסֵר Pr 5.23. The same applies to מִשְׁקָל as in נְחֹשֶׁת לָרֵב אֵין מִשְׁקָל 1Ch 22.3. Later in Si we encounter a most instructive case: טוֹבַת חַי יָמֵי מִסְפָּר⁸¹ וטובת שם ימי אין מספר 'a happy life is of few days

⁸⁰ In the margin we see a v.l. ישרון.

⁸¹ In the margin we see a v.l. מספר ימים, which is also the reading in (M). For text-critical details, see at 41.13.

and the happiness of fame lasts innumerable days' 41.13 ([B]), where both temporal phrases, almost identical to ours here, are in the st. cst.⁸²

יִשְׂרוּן (Da) = יִשְׂרוּן, a poetic equivalent to שֵׁם (Db) can scarcely be שֵׁם 'Sem,' but 'fame'? But what does fame have got to do with 'corpses'? Is it שֵׁם? "Bodies (are) out there"?

(Db) in its present form is extremely challenging.

37.26) ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ κληρονομήσει τιμὴν,
καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

*The wise will obtain honour among his people,
and his name will live for ever.*

(C) חכם ע... ..ל כבוד ושמ... ..עולם:
(D) חכם עם ינחל כבוד ושמ עומד בחיי⁸³ עולם:

חכם עם can be analysed as a cst. phrase, חכם עם, i.e. a wise man as a member of his people, or a scribal error for חכם בעם. The former could be rendered as in \mathfrak{C} . Cf. \mathfrak{S} חֲכִימָא דְעֻמָּא. We could also recognise a cst. phrase indicative of engagement as in ποιμὴν προβάτων 'a shepherd of sheep' Ge 4.2; the wise man is concerned with his people.⁸⁴

τιμὴν] = \mathfrak{H} כבוד, whereas all Gk MSS read πιστιν, which Smend (336), followed by Ziegler, regards as corrupted from τιμην.

37.27) Τέκνον, ἐν ζωῇ σου πείρασον τὴν ψυχὴν σου
καὶ ἰδὲ τί πονηρὸν αὐτῇ καὶ μὴ δῶς αὐτῇ·

*Child, in your (daily) life test yourself
and see what is bad to you and do not allow it to yourself.*

(B) בני בחיך⁸⁵ נס נפשך וראה מה רע לה אל תתן לה:
(D) בני בחמר נס נפשך וראה מה רע לה ואל תתן לה:

(D)] None of the substantives spelled thus fits the context: חֲמֵר 'wine,' חֲמֵר 'bitumen,' חֲמֵר 'mortar; material; heap.' Possibly an error for חיך (B).

נס] This type of shortened impv. is known in BH, e.g. \mathfrak{L} Lv 6.2 in lieu of צַוהּ.⁸⁶ In Si we find פת 'Persuade!' 30.23. This is for the moment confined to Pi. and Hi.

τὴν ψυχὴν σου] Skehan - Di Lella's "your appetite" is too free. Whilst vs. 29 goes over meals, there are many other things which call for our attention in the best interests of a life healthy not only in body but also in mind.

⁸² More examples in BH of בִּאֵין of this type are mentioned in BDB s.v. \mathfrak{A} 6, and refer to the sole instance in QH in *SQH* § 40 n.

⁸³ In the margin of (B) only what appears to be this preposition is visible.

⁸⁴ For more details, cf. *SSG* § 22 v (xvii).

⁸⁵ In the margin we see a v.l. בחמר instead of בחיך.

⁸⁶ For details, cf. *JM* § 79 j.

37.28) οὐ γὰρ πάντα πᾶσιν συμφέρει,
καὶ οὐ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐν παντὶ εὐδοκεῖ.

*For not everything benefits everybody,
and not everyone is pleased with everything.*

(B) כי לא הכל לכל טוב⁸⁷ לא כל נפש כל זן תבחר:
(D) כי לא לכל טוב תענוג ולא לכל נפש כל זן תבחר:

πάντα] **§** focuses on food with **כל מאכלתא** ‘every meal.’

This πάντα as well as πᾶσα in the following line mark partial negation, cf. SSG § 83 ff.

The first hemistich of (D) is somewhat different: “For pleasure is not good for everybody.”

לכל נפש (D)] an error for **כל נפש** (B). The shift to 2ms in **תבחר** is implausible, and **זן** ‘sort, kind’ is a masc. noun and cannot be the *s* of **תבחר**, which would then be Ni.

Note the second hemistich of **§**: **ולא כל נפשׁא בקליל מתרענא** ‘and not every heart is content with little.’

37.29) μὴ ἀπληστεύου ἐν πάσῃ τροφῇ
καὶ μὴ ἐαχυθῆς ἐπι ἐδεσμάτων·

*Keep your appetite for every delicacy under control
and do not give yourself up to foods.*

(B) אל תזרע לכל תענוג ואל תשפך על כל מטעמים:
(D) אל תזרע אל תענוג ואל תתחננ על מטעמים:⁸⁸

ἀπληστεύου] Cf. ἀπληστία in the following verses, 30-31. See also above at 34.17.

תזרע “Sowing seeds” makes no sense here. Lévi restores the text as **אל תזרע** and emends **תזרע** (D) to **תזרע**. The verb in question is **תזרע** < **זרע** ‘to scatter,’ cf. **וְיִזְרַע עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם** Ex 32.20. The *o* is possibly one’s resources or oneself (**נפשׁא**). Alternatively we may admit here Ni. **תזרע**, whether 2ms or 3fs (**נפשׁא**). In view of the medio-passive **ἐαχυθῆς** as a rendering of the synonymous **תשפך** (B) both verbs may have been parsed by our translator as Nifal.

תתחננ clearly preserved also in the margin of (B). Lévi (194) refers to Syr. **אַתְחַנַּנ** ‘to desire.’⁸⁹

⁸⁷ In the margin we see a reading which is virtually identical with (D).

⁸⁸ In the margin we see a v.l. for the second hemistich: **ואל תתחננ אל מטמים**.

⁸⁹ Cantineau in Cohen 9.889 mentions Arb. /ḥanağa/ ‘incliner, pencher, tordre.’ Smend (337) postulates a possible error for **תתענוג**.

37.30) ἐν πολλοῖς γὰρ βρώμασιν ἔσται νόσος,
καὶ ἡ ἀπληστία ἐγγιεῖ ἕως χολέρας·

*For in many foods could a disease lurk,
and excessive eating could bring you near to nausea.*

(B) כי ברוב תענוג יקנן⁹⁰ חולי והמרבה יגיע אל זרא:
(D) כי ברב אוכל יקנין חולי והמזיע יגוע⁹¹ על זרא:

ἔσται] The metaphor of nesting is avoided. יקנין (D) is a *plena* spelling for יקנן, i.e. יקנן?

ἀπληστία [מרבה] Since Heb. does not have מרבה as a normal substantive, we would analyse this as a Hi. ptc., ‘one who eats too much could develop nausea.’ Cf. 51.6.

מזיע] i.e. מְזִיעַ ‘to seethe, boil.’ We do not know whether excessive eating raises the body temperature.⁹²

37.31) δι’ ἀπληστίαν πολλοὶ ἐτελεύτησαν,
ὁ δὲ προσέχων προσθήσει ζωὴν.

*Because of excessive eating many died,
but one who is cautious would add to the length his life.*

(B) בלא מוסר רבים יגועו⁹³ ועוועו והגשמר⁹⁴ יוסיף חיים:
(D) בלא מוסר רבים גועו והגשמר יוסיף חיים:

ἀπληστίαν] \mathfrak{H} with בלא מוסר is more generic: “without self-discipline,” but cf. \mathfrak{S} מְטוּל מְאֹכְלָתָא סְגִיאָתָא ‘because of overeating’ and \mathfrak{S} מְטוּל יַעֲנוּתָא נֶן ‘because of inordinate appetite.’ For the general message, cf. הוּא יָמוּת בְּאֵין הוּא מוֹסֵר Pr 5.23.

ἐτελεύτησαν] With the fut. tense a warning is issued in \mathfrak{H} B, whereas in \mathfrak{G} it is based on past experiences; (D) actually reads Pf. גועו. In the second hemistich both \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} are reassuring.

προσθήσει ζωὴν] For this collocation, see ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνεπόδισεν ὁ ἥλιος καὶ προσέθηκεν ζωὴν βασιλεῖ Si 48.23.

⁹⁰ In the margin we see a v.l., אוכל ירון, תענוג.

⁹¹ An error for יגיע (B). So על for אל (B).

⁹² On this verb, see also Smend 337 ad vs. 29.

⁹³ יגועו in the margin probably is meant to say that ועוועו is to be deleted.

⁹⁴ In the margin we see a v.l., ובהשמר, which makes the s of יוסיף ambiguous.

CHAPTER 38

38.1) Τίμα ἰατρὸν πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ,
καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος·

*Respect a doctor in view of his services,
for him also the Lord created.*

(B) רעי רופא לפני¹ צרכו² גם אתו חלק אל⁴:

(D) רעה רועה רופא לפי ...

Τίμα] Both ⚙ and ⚙ show יקר = ⚙. ⚙ could be under the influence of ⚙.

Smend (338) refers to דעה νόει 34.15. Even supposing that ⚙ reflects רעה, ‘give thought, contemplate’ and ‘respect’ are two distinct notions.⁵ Lévi (195) and Segal (245) mention an Aramaic version of this text in Rabbinic documents: אוקיר לאסייך עד דלא תצטרין ליה ‘Respect your doctor even before you need him’ jTaan. 66d and midTanchuma Miketz 10.⁶ This is, however, no philological proof that Heb. רעה means ‘to respect, honour.’⁷ Segal (245) sensibly points to Arb. *ra‘ā* ‘to respect.’

πρὸς] For the value of < πρὸς + acc. > here, cf. πρὸς ταῦτα ὑμεῖς μὲν, ὃ Ἀβρααμ παῖδες, εὐγενῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελευτᾶτε ‘In view of this perspective, o children of Abraham, die nobly for the sake of your piety!’ 4M 6.22.⁸

τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ] This could be a gen. of object: ‘the occasions when you need him.’ Cf. the above-quoted Rabbinic citation and ⚙ נְתַבְעָא עַד לָא יְהִי לְךָ ‘before he becomes necessary to you.’ צרכו then can stand as it is.

ἔκτισεν] On the equation חֵלַק / κτίζω, see above at 10.18 and 34.13. Cf. ⚙ בְּרִיָּה ‘He created him.’

38.2) παρὰ γὰρ ὑψίστου ἐστὶν ἴασις,
καὶ παρὰ βασιλέως λήμψεται δόμα.

¹ Correct to לפי as in (D). R. Elazar, mentioned in fn. 6 below, apparently had לפני in his BS text.

² A v.l. in the margin: צרכך.

³ גם precedes כִּי as a v.l. in the margin.

⁴ An entire verse follows as a v.l. in the margin: רעה רועה רופא לפי צרכך כי גם אותו חלק אל.

⁵ And how would Smend (II 65) have justified his translation “Sei Freund dem Arzt”?

⁶ In the latter we are told that R. Elazar mentioned it as a saying of Ben Sira.

⁷ Lévi (195) and Segal (245) know of Arb. רעי meaning ‘to respect, honour.’

⁸ For πρὸς ταῦτα, in LSJ s.v. πρὸς C III 2 we find Herod. 5.9, 40 mentioned.

*For healing is from the Most High.
and he should receive a gift from a king.*

(B) מאת אל יחכם רופא ומאת מלך ישא משאות:

δόμα] Compared with the pl. in **H** (pl.) the reward becomes modest. Cf. **S** מוֹהֲבָתָא ‘gifts.’

38.3) ἐπιστήμη ἱατροῦ ἀνυψώσει κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἔναντι μεγαιστάνων θαυμασθήσεται.

*The knowledge of a doctor would raise his head
and in front of courtiers he would be marvelled at.*

(B) דעת רופא תרים ראשו ולפני נדיבים⁹ יתיצב:

θαυμασθήσεται] Compared to **H** יתיצב ‘he would take up a position’ this is rather free, probably for the sake of parallelism with the first hemistich. In **H** the star is the physician, whereas **S** focuses on his reception by the public: מן תרעיתה דאסיא נרמרמונה וקדם מלכא נקמונה ‘because of the doctor’s knowledge they would extol him and they would make him stand in front of the king.’ On the high evaluation of a lowly, but wise man see above at 11.1.

38.4) κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα,
καὶ ἀνήρ φρόνιμος οὐ προσοχθεῖ αὐτοῖς.

*The Lord created medicines from the earth,
and a prudent man should not loathe them.*

(B) אל מארץ מוציא תרופות¹⁰ וגבר מבין אל ימאס בם:

ἔκτισεν] = **S**, but according to **H** (מוציא) God is still running a pharmaceutical company.

בם] Lévi (196) prefers this v.l. as morphologically better referred to with בם. He was not yet aware of the gradual disappearance of the distinctly fem. suf. pron. in QH.¹¹ Note בהם (vs. 7) referring back to גבורתו (vs. 6), i.e. גבורותיו.

אל ימאס] Pace Rey (2008.163) there is nothing against seeing a negative volition, though “would not, is unlikely to” is possible.

38.5) οὐκ ἀπὸ ξύλου ἐγλυκάνθη ὕδωρ
εἰς τὸ γνωσθῆναι τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ;

⁹ A marginal v.l. reads מלכים. So does **S**. Lévi (195) mentions במלכותו קויה איש מהיר במלכותו Pr 22.29, where the ground for evaluation differs.

¹⁰ With שמים = סמים ‘medicines.’

¹¹ For the situation in QH, see Qimron 2018.284f., e.g. בם, i.e. בנסתרות ‘in the hidden matters’ 1QS 5.12.

*Did not water become sweet from a tree
in order for His power to become known?*

(B) הלא בעץ המתיקו מים בעבור להודיע כל אנוש כח¹²:

[ἐγκάκισθη] In spite of the passive voice form it indicates a self-propelling action, on which see *SSG* § 27 cc. By contrast, המתיקו is not a genuine causative Hi., but ingressive, hence intransitive with מים as its *s*, cf. *SQH* § 12 d (3). Note § הלין 'they became sweet.'

The first hemistich is obviously a reference to the story of bitter water turned sweet with a tree thrown in (Ex 15.22-26).

[בעבור להודיע] <בעבור + inf. cst.> indicating a purpose is attested already in Ex 9.16, but with a ל- inf. first in להקיר בעבור 1Ch 19.3. In QH only the first syntagm is attested, twice.¹³

[כחו] In theory the suf. pron. can refer to either עץ or God. In the desert, when the people complained to Moses that there was no drinkable water available, he appealed to God, who instructed to throw a tree into the water. Since BS is alluding to the story, the second alternative is more plausible. Note §: ה'לה דאלהא 'God's power.' §ה has a marginal note: ה'לה 'His [or: its],' i.e. 'of the Lord.' Cf. also *ℒ aqua amara*. The v.l. כחם is a reference to מים. Whoever inserted this v.l. should have taken what the reference to the Ex story meant; he was worried, not seeing any direct, explicit reference to God nearby. He should have looked back four verses: κύριος in vs. 1, and αὐτός in the next verse. § is conscious of this background, hence מים > מים מריא 'the bitter water.'

38.6) καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιστήμην
ἐνδοξάζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ·

*And He gave people knowledge
in order to be glorified over His marvellous deeds.*

(B) ויתן לאנוש בינה להתפאר בגבורתו¹⁴:

[αὐτὸς] The addition seems to be an initiative taken by the translator: it is now clear who the principal actor is. Physicians did not acquire professional knowledge and skills on their own, but ultimately they are a gift from God.

[ἐνδοξάζεσθαι] This Gk verb is unknown prior to LXX, and no instance of the active ἐνδοξάζω is known. Though *GELS* defines its sense as "to

¹² In the margin we see a v.l. כוחם .. מעץ.

¹³ See Fassberg 1994.120, § 331.

¹⁴ בגבורתם, a v.l. in the margin, must be wrongly influenced by an earlier v.l., כוחם vs. 5. On the other hand, in view of בהם ἐν αὐτοῖς in the following verse, גבורתם here is meant to be pl., morphologically anomalous for גבורתיהם, i.e. גבורתיהם. As anomalous is גבורתו i.e. גבורותיו in the main part of the fascicule.

attain fame and esteem,” in all its eleven occurrences in LXX it is passive, not only in form, but also in meaning. By contrast, its Heb. equivalent here, **רָהֲתַפְּאֵר**, is used in BH reflexively and also passively. Thus the *s* of **להתפאר** and **ἐνδοξάζεσθαι** can be God or physicians: cp. “il se glorifiât” (Lévi 197) with “ils se glorifient” (BJ) and “damit sie sich rühmten” (Smend II 65).

38.7) ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐθεράπευσεν καὶ ἦρεν τὸν πόνον αὐτοῦ,

With them he cures and removes his pain.

(B) בהם רופא יניח מכאוב

ἐθεράπευσεν καὶ ἦρεν] two cases of the so-called gnomic Aorist, on which see SSG § 28 **dc**. Since, however, Syr. does not recognise an analogous use of the Pf., **אָקַם .. אָקַם** of **Š** are a shade too mechanical reflexion of the Aor. in **Ø**.

Here, too, what or whom pronouns refer to presents some ambiguity. First, αὐτοῖς can be referring back to τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ (vs. 6). Powerful, effective, herbal medicines and advanced surgical techniques or suchlike? Secondly, αὐτοῦ is most peculiar. Its referent cannot be a physician, but a patient of his, who is not mentioned anywhere.

38.8) μυρεψὸς ἐν τούτοις ποιήσει μεῖγμα,
καὶ οὐ μὴ συντελεσθῆ ἔργα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ εἰρήνη παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς.

*A producer of unguents could make a compound with them
but His works would never finish
and peace from Him is over the surface of the earth.*

(Ba) וכן רוקח¹⁵ עושה מרקחת:

(Bb) למען לא ישבֹת¹⁶ מעשהו ותושיה מבני אדם:

ἔργα αὐτοῦ] Most likely God's works. Obscure is **עֲבָדָא דִּילְהוֹן** ‘their works.’

38.9) Τέκνον, ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου μὴ παράβλεπε,
ἀλλ' εὔξαι κυρίῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεται σε·

*Child, in your sick-bed don't look away in a wrong direction,
but pray to the Lord, for He is the one who can cure you.*

(B) בני בחולי אל תתעבר התפלל אל אל כי הוא ירפא:¹⁷

¹⁵ In the margin we see קרָח.

¹⁶ In the margin we see ישכח.

¹⁷ In the margin we see **פלל .. במחה**. The latter, which means ‘Mediate,’ must be an error for **תפלל**.

παράβλεπε¹⁸ [תתעבר] On this striking Heb. verb, see above at 5.7.

αὐτὸς] ⚡ הוּי, which reflects the identificatory value of הוּא, so also ⚡'s αὐτὸς; there is a physician around, but in the end there is no better doctor than God Himself.

38.10) ἀπόστησον πλημμέλειαν καὶ εὐθνον χεῖρας
καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν·

*Keep away from trespassing and straighten (your) hands
and cleanse (your) heart from every sin.*

(B) ⚡ מְעוֹל וּמַחְכֵּר¹⁹ פְּנִים וּמְכַל פְּשָׁעִים טָהַר לֵב:

The second instruction differs substantially between ⚡, ⚡, and ⚡ (שׁוֹקֵרָא ‘and lie[s]’), most likely due to the difficulty of ⚡. ⚡ אַעְבֵּר עֲוֹלָא ‘Remove iniquity’ could reflect הִסֵּר מְעַל or הִסֵּר עֲוֹל. Smend (340) reconstructs ⚡ as הִבֵּר כַּפַּיִם, i.e. הִבֵּר כַּפַּיִם ‘Purify (your) hands!’

38.11) δὸς εὐωδίαν καὶ μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως
καὶ λίπανον προσφορὰν ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων.

*Offer something fragrant and a remembrance offering of fine flour
and smear an offering with oil as if you were non-existent.*

(B) . . . אֹזְכָרָה²⁰ וּדְשַׁן עֲרוּךְ בְּכַנְפֵי הַוַּיֵּן:

Apart from the fragmentary nature of ⚡, its second hemistich is frustrating. The verse is totally missing in ⚡.

If דְשַׁן be reflected in λίπανον, the former is likely to be equivalent to Pi. impv. דִּשְׁן, which could be parallel to another impv. that may have been contained in the first hemistich, perhaps תֵּן [= ⚡ הֵב].

עֲרוּךְ, however, is scarcely a substantive, a direct object of דְשַׁן, unless it is עֲרוּךְ ‘what is arranged as an offering.’ Our *Index*, s.v. προσφορά, has suggested a sense so far unknown of עֲרוּךְ ‘a ritual offering appropriately arranged and set in order.’²¹

¹⁸ The rendering “sei nicht unachtsam” (*SD*) is not convincing, but cf. ⚡ *non despicias*.

¹⁹ In the margin we see מְסִיֵּר מ’ וְהִבֵּר. Abegg reads מ’ וְהִסֵּר; the last word as הִסֵּר looks better in the facsimile, but what would Hi. הִסֵּר mean here as a transitive verb, unless we read מְעַל, and not מְעוֹל? But would the scribe write מ’ as an abbreviation of מְעַל, when this noun is not found in the immediate context? The same difficulty applies to מְסִיֵּר.

²⁰ אֹזְכָרָה in the margin occurs five times in Lv and once in Nu in the form of אֹזְכָרָה, e.g. וְקָמַץ הַכֶּהֵן מִן־הַמִּנְחָה אֶת־אֹזְכָרָהּ. Nu 5.26, and only once (Lv 24.7) as a bare form. We see no fem. sg. noun preceding. Εὐωδία may reflect רִיחַ נִיחָה as in Si 45.16, but רִיחַ is a masc. noun. Smend (341) suggests מִנְחָה. Smend (II 35) restores אֹזְכָרָה וְגַם אֹזְכָרָה, but in the facsimile absolutely nothing other than אֹזְכָרָה is visible.

²¹ In the margin of (B) we find a v.l. spelled עֲרוּךְ.

We would propose that our Gk translator was visualising כפי אינך, i.e. כפי אִינְךָ.²² We would point out that a ptc. of ὑπάρχω and in a comparative and negated expression is analogously used three more times in LXX, and that all in the Twelve Prophets:

Am 5.5 וּבֵית־אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה לְאָוֶן > καὶ Βαιθηλ ἔσται ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρχουσα²³

Ob 16 וְהָיוּ כְלוּא הָיִי > καὶ ἔσονται καθὼς οὐχ ὑπάρχοντες

Hg 2.3 הָלוּא כְמָהוּ כְאֵין > καθὼς οὐχ ὑπάρχοντα

It is striking that this feature should occur once more in Si: 44.9 B and M²⁴ וּישבתו כאשר שבתו: כאשר לא היו היו וישבתו > καὶ ἀπόλονται ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες ἐγένοντο ὡς οὐ γεγονότες, where the feature under discussion is applied to the past history and the comparative clause contains no Heb. phrase denoting non-existence, and this renders it evident that the translator is making deliberate use of this feature.²⁵ Ⲭ is plausibly using the phrase as meaning “negligible, of no value, naught,” thus counselling the virtue of humility and modesty.

38.12) καὶ ἰατρῶ δὸς τόπον, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος,
καὶ μὴ ἀποστήτω σου, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ χρεία.

*And give a place to the doctor, for the Lord created him as well,
and let him not keep a distance from you, for there is a need of him
as well.*

(B) ⲁⲓⲗ ... מקום ולא ימוש כי גם בו צורך²⁶:

καὶ ἰατρῶ] In the light of ⲁⲓⲗ Ⲭ might mean “and also,” not just “and,” but the notion of “also” is expressed in the following sentence, which appears to be an independent addition by the translator, a repetition of vs. 1b above. Cp. Ⲭ לאִסְיָא with Ⲭ לאִסְיָא.

ἀποστήτω σου] The use of a preposition, esp. ἀπό with a gen., is far commoner than that of a gen. of ablative force as here, see SSG § 22 q, e.g. εὐδοκία κυρίου ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ πονηρίας, καὶ ἐξιλασμὸς ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας Si 35.3.

38.13) ἔστιν καιρὸς ὅτε καὶ ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν εὐδοκία·

There is a time when success is held in their hands as well.

(B) כי יש עת אשר בידו מצלחת

²² His translation, “soweit du vermagst” (Smend II 65), does not show how he analysed בכנפִי.

²³ Ⲭ presumably reflects כְּאֵין.

²⁴ The second clause is not preserved in M.

²⁵ On more details of this second instance in Si, see below ad loc.

²⁶ In the margin we see ואל ישמש מאח כ' ג' ב' צרכיך. The verb ישמש must be a scribal error for ימוש. And מאח for מאתך, i.e. מֵאֵתְךָ? So Lévi (198) and Smend (341).

αὐτῶν] a strange, abrupt shift to the pl., which continues in the next verse, too, but see **ש** בְּאֵימָהּ ‘in his hand.’

εὐδοκία] **ת** מצלחת, an innovation, and very rare in subsequent phases of Hebrew, cf. **ש** מְצַלְחָתָא ‘success.’ **ש** took it as a verb, Pu. מְצַלְחָת (?), but found it necessary to insert a *s*: מְצַלְחָתָא אֶסְיִוְתָא ‘the medical treatment succeeds.’

38.14) καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ κυρίου δεηθήσονται,
 ἵνα εὐδοώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσις
 καὶ ἴασιν χάριν ἐμβιώσεως.

*For they also should entreat the Lord
 so that He would graciously grant them relief
 and healing for survival.*

:²⁷ כי גם הוא אל אל יעתיר (Ba)
 אשר יצלח²⁸ לו פשרה ורפאות למען מחיה: (Bb)

γὰρ [כי] No causal relationship with what precedes is evident. **ש** has no causal particle, but the initial ׀ is obscure in function.

ἀνάπαυσις] Physicians also badly need be relieved of long-term professional tasks by seeing their end sooner than later. This, however, cannot be harmonised with פשרה, which Rembrandt (342) associates with פִּשְׁרָא and gives it the sense of ‘diagnosis.’ We are not certain of any instance of the well-known substantive with such a highly specialised application. Kister (1990.343) holds that פשר means ‘to rescue’ in RH, without citing any instance.²⁹

ἴασιν] healing of patients in their care.

χάριν] Just as this pseudo-preposition attached to an inf. can mark a purpose as well as a cause, here it plays the same function, though followed by a substantive. Cp. ἐψόγισεν αὐτὸν χάριν τοῦ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὸν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ‘he censured him because he coveted his kingdom’ 1M 11.11 with χάριν τοῦ λαβεῖν τὰ χρήματα ‘in order to secure its treasures’ 2M 1.14.

ἐμβιώσεως] At 31.26 above the word is used in the sense of ‘livelihood.’ Is our author as pragmatic as to advise that a physician should ask God to see to it that he can stay on as a successful physician, never having troubles in making both ends meet?

38.15) ὁ ἁμαρτάνων ἔναντι τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸν
 ἐμπέσοι εἰς χεῖρας ἱατροῦ.

²⁷ In the margin there is a v.l. which has no גם.

²⁸ In the margin there is a v.l. which reads ימנה.

²⁹ In Samaritan Aramaic פשר signifies ‘rescue’ and possibly פִּשְׁרָא ‘rescuer.’ See Tal 2000 s.v.

*He who sins in the presence of the One who created him,
may he fall into a physician's hands!*

(B) אשר חוטא לפני עושהו יתגבר לפני³⁰ רופא:

Ⓢ is very close to Ⓞ: 'because he who sins in the presence of God is given to the hands of a physician.' This, however, cannot be meant with יתגבר, which would mean "he would be defiant, arrogant."

ἐμπέσοι] The selection of the optative mood and the general context suggest that this is something that the patient would not have wished for, because he may not supplicate for divine intervention, but a human doctor is the best he can hope for.

38.16) Τέκνον, ἐπὶ νεκρῶ κατάγαγε δάκρυα
καὶ ὡς δεινὰ πάσχων ἔναρξαι θρήνου,
κατὰ δὲ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ περίστειλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ ὑπερίδης τὴν ταφήν αὐτοῦ.

*Child, shed tears for the dead
and as one suffering dreadfully, begin mourning,
and as is fitting to him, cover his corpse
and do not neglect his burial.*

(Ba) בני על המת הויב דמעא התמרר ונהה³¹ קינה:
(Bb) כמשפטו אסף שארו³² ואל תתעלם בגויעתם³³:

[הויב] This is the first instance of this verb used in Hi³⁴ and tears as flowing liquid.

ὡς δεινὰ πάσχων] Difficult to harmonise with Ⓢ: √מרר does not occur in BH in Hitpael. What is meant here is probably "Grieve bitterly," cf. נתמררו בגלות rNu 13.2. The v.l., התמרר, is attested once in BH (Dn 11.11) in the sense of "to embitter oneself, to become angry," which does not apply here.³⁵

ἔναρξαι θρήνου קינה] cf. וְנָהָה נָהִי Mi 2.4. On the selection of the gen., see above at 36.29.

³⁰ In the margin there is a v.l. which reads יסתגר על ידי 'he would be handed over into the hands of.'

³¹ In the margin there is a v.l. which reads התמרר ונהה.

³² In the margin there is a v.l. which reads שארם, which makes little sense. Probably under the influence of the following גויעתם, which makes as little sense.

³³ V.l. תתחר בגויעם. Abegg reads בגויעתם 'their corpse,' to which the above-mentioned temporal value cannot be assigned. Lévi (199) takes תתחר as misspelled for תתאחר either 'to be late' or 'to stand at the back.'

³⁴ In DCH s.v. מרר another instance is mentioned: מים מצור הויב למו IQIsa^a 48.21 for MT הויל. See a further discussion in Dahi 2000.58f.

³⁵ In an early mediaeval work by דבי אליהו, according to Even-Shoshan 784a, it occurs in the sense of "to feel bitter," with לב as s.

περίστειλον אַסָּא] an unusual equation, the only other instance of which, Is 58.8, has nothing to do with burial. The collocation with νεκρόν at To 12.13 does have to do with burial, but we have no Semitic original preserved for the passage. Lévi (199) assigns the sense of burial to אַסָּא here, but in the current Hebrew lexicography, such is unknown anywhere nor does περι-στέλλω signify ‘to bury (the dead).’³⁶ The well-established use of אַסָּא as in הִנְנִי אַסָּא עַל-אַבְתָּיִךְ וְנֶאֱסַפְתָּ אֶל-קַבְרֹתַיִךְ בְּשָׁלוֹם Jdg 2.10 and 2Kg 22.20 is not about burial, but about joining at death one’s forefathers.

ὕπερίδης τὴν ταφὴν αὐτοῦ תַּתְעַלֵּם בְּגוֹיְעַתֵּם] Though הַתְעַלֵּם ‘to take no notice of, ignore’ normally combines with the prep. מִן, בִּ- here may carry temporal value, ‘when such and such takes place.’ Even so נִיָּעַץ does not signify ‘to bury,’ but ‘to pass away, die.’ Besides, enough has already been said to that effect in the preceding instructions. Is אַל תִּבְסָא עַל קַבְרֹתַיִךְ ‘and do not despise burial’ under the influence of אָ?

38.17) πίκρανον κλαυθμὸν καὶ θέρμανον κοπετὸν
καὶ ποιήσον τὸ πένθος κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ
ἡμέραν μίαν καὶ δύο χάριν διαβολῆς
καὶ παρακλήθητι λύπης ἔνεκα·

*Cry bitterly and mourn passionately
and show grief as befits his status
a day or two to avoid criticism
and receive condolences over the grief.*

(Ba) המר בני והתם³⁷ מספד ושית אבלו כיוצא בו:
(Bb) יום ושנים בעבור דמעה והנחם בעבור עון:

θέρμανον] ≠ התם, which can only mean ‘to finish, get through to the end of the mourning.’ The v.l., ההם, is possibly an error for החם,³⁸ i.e. חָם < חָם. Note that אָ uses the same root – אָם.

כִּיּוֹצֵא בּו] This is unlikely to be a usage known to MH in the sense of “something like, suchlike,” e.g. אֵין כִּיּוֹצֵא בְּהֵם בְּיַרְקוֹת שְׂדֵה “there is nothing like them among wild vegetables” mSheb 9.1. Besides, in our passage nothing else other than mourning is being raised: what is meant is probably “such a mourning as one could get away with as respectable enough.” The rendering in אָ can then be said to be reasonable.

שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים לְכַיֵּי וְשִׁבְעָה לְהַסְפִּיד [יום ושנים] Mentioning ‘three days for weeping and seven for eulogising’ (bMo Kat 27.2) Segal (249) wonders if this

³⁶ Lévi (ad loc.) also mentions אָסָּא, which basically means “to collect, gather,” but Sokoloff (*SL* s.v. כִּנָּש Pe. 1 d) mentions our Si passage and MiS 521b:36 for the sense “to bury.”

³⁷ In the margin we see בכי וההם.

³⁸ So Smend 342.

could mean ‘three days,’ but would one practise such an arithmetic exercise when it is about a single digit number?

διαβολῆς] Smend (343) corrects דמעה to דבה, i.e. דָּבָה.

παρακλήθητι] Condolences are conveyed to the bereaved of the deceased. Vs. 16 and the rest of vs. 17 seem to suggest that the author is going on the death within one’s own family.

λύπη] ח עון is justly corrected by Smend (343) to דון, i.e. דָּוֶן. דָּוֶן > λύπη in the following verse is closer. The equation דָּוֶן / λύπη is pretty frequent, 6 times, all in Si.

ἐνεκα] one of a few *postpositions*. So τούτων χάριν ‘because of these things’ Si 31.13. For details, cf. *SSG* § 26 j.

From ס we hear a striking message: וְעָבַד .³⁹ מְרַקְדִּין לְבַנְיָשָׁא דְמַרְקְדִּין. וְאֶתְבִּיא מְטוּל חַיִּי אֲבָלָא בְּנֻדְקָה יוֹמָא וְתַרְיִן מְטוּל בְּנִינְשָׁא. וְאֶתְבִּיא מְטוּל חַיִּי ‘wine and food for dancing people, and mourn as befitting a day or two for the sake of the people and feel relieved for the sake of life.’

38.18) ἀπὸ λύπης γὰρ ἐκβαίνει θάνατος,
καὶ λύπη καρδίας κάμψει ἰσχύν.

*For from grief issues forth death,
and the grief of heart would suppress strength.*

(B) מדין יוצא אסון כן רע לבב יבנה עצבה:

דָּוֶן] On the equation with λύπη, see at the preceding verse.

θάνατος [אסון] the sole instance of this equation in LXX. Smend mentions a number of instances of TO translating אסון with מותא, e.g. Gn 42.4.⁴⁰

λύπη καρδίας] This could reflect רַע לְבַב, whereas ח רע לבב could be analysed as רַע לְבַב, a cst. chain.⁴¹ Either could function as a *s* of יבנה. This verb, however, cannot be harmonised with κάμψει.

ἰσχύν] = עֲצָפָה? But the parallelism between the two hemistichs of ח here renders a substantive derived from $\sqrt{\text{עצב}}$ ‘sorrow, grief’ more in place.

38.19) ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ παραμένει καὶ λύπη,
καὶ βίος πτωχοῦ κατάρα καρδίας.

*In a calamity grief also stays long,
and the life in poverty becomes a curse of the heart.*

No Heb. text is preserved for this verse.

³⁹ Should the form be vocalised as מְרַקְדִּין ‘mourning’ as in ed. Maus.?

⁴⁰ Where, the author may have thought, Jacob would not have had courage enough to utter the right word.

⁴¹ ס לְבַב רַע = רַע לְבַב בִּישָׁא.

παραμένει] MS B alone reads παραβαίνει ‘goes away,’ but what do go away as well as sorrow? When a new calamity strikes, one could not keep on grieving over the death of a family member?

The first hemistich has been rendered by Smend (II 66) as “(Schlimmer) als der Tod ist beständiger Kummer,” but Ⓞ as it stands makes good sense, not “ganz unbefriedigend”: the grief over the departure of someone close would often not go away soon, and when attacked by another calamity in such a condition it could be a real disaster.

38.20) μὴ δῶς εἰς λύπην τὴν καρδίαν σου,
ἀπόστησον αὐτὴν μνησθεὶς τὰ ἔσχατα.
*Do not give your heart away to grief,
keep it away, keeping the future in mind.*

(B) אל תשיב אליו⁴² לב עוד פרע זכרו וזכור⁴³ אחרית:

δῶς] If the *Vorlage* read תשיב אליו לב עוד, the use of δίδωμι and the absence of ἔτι or suchlike results in an important difference, for the author is advising the bereaved to stop doing what they kept doing for a while after the departure of their beloved. Though the sequel conveys that message, there would have been no folly in underlining the importance of not allowing the past to control your present and future excessively.

אליו] The suf. pron. most likely refers back to הוּן in vs. 18, thus *pace* Skehan - Di Lella (439) “Set your heart on him no longer,” “him” = the deceased.

ἀπόστησον] On פָּרַע in the sense of “to neglect, ignore,” see e.g. פֹּרַע מוֹסֵר Pr 15.32, and for further references, see BDB s.v. III פָּרַע Qal 2.

αὐτὴν] The selection of the pronoun has led to the loss of the play on words, זכרו וזכור.

μνησθεὶς τὰ ἔσχατα [זכור אחרית] This collocation and equation occur also at 7.36, where it is not about the future, but when one starts some project, one is advised to ask oneself what one is going to achieve in the end. On τὰ ἔσχατα ‘what is expected to happen in future,’ cf. σὺ ἔγνωσ πάντα, τὰ ἔσχατα καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα· σὺ ἔπλασάς με καὶ ἔθηκας ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τὴν χεῖρά σου Ps 138.5, where אַחֲרֵי (139.4f.) אַחֲרֵי וְתַגִּי וְתַשֵּׁת עָלַי בְּפִכָּה (139.4f.) means ‘what is situated behind me, at my back.’

Ⓢ is extensively curtailed and carries a distinct message: לֹא תִתֵּן לְבָבְךָ לְמִוּמָתָא ‘Do not give your heart up to oaths.’

⁴² In the margin we see תשית עליו.

⁴³ In the margin we see והכר.

38.21) μὴ ἐπιλάβῃ, οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐπάνοδος,
καὶ τοῦτον οὐκ ὠφελήσεις καὶ σεαυτὸν κακώσεις.

*Do not forget, for there is no way back,
nor should you be benefitting this one and damaging yourself.*

(B) אל תזכרהו כי אין לו תקוה מה תועיל ולך תריע:

ἐπιλάβῃ] The author's focus on the future was apparent in the preceding verse (זכור אחרית), and this is underlined here over again through the use of the key-word (זָכַר). The translator, by contrast, does not repeat the use of the same verb (μνησθεῖς τὰ ἔσχατα), but highlights the same emphasis by using its antonym and stating what it is that is to be remembered.

οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐπάνοδος] Ben Sira may have said "Amen" to the eschatology which was to be expressed about three centuries later by Martha, whose brother, Lazarus, had passed away four days before, οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (John 11.24), but our author was being more realistic, convinced that the deceased would not return to resume their life on this planet earth. Cf. what David had said to his courtiers on realising the death of his anonymous prince begotten through Batsheva: "when the infant was still alive, I fasted and wept, for I thought, who knows?, the Lord might pity me and it might survive, but now that he is dead, why should I fast? Could I get him back? I would be going to him, but he would not come back to me" (2Sm 12.22f.). Since the funeral and burial are over, in our Si passage there is no talk of resuscitation, but resurrection.

τοῦτον] The selection of the m.s. form is a reference back to νεκρῶ 'the deceased' vs. 16 and αὐτοῦ 'his' vs. 16-17. Hence the suffix pronouns in תקוה כי אין לו do not refer back to דָּוִד any more.

מה] On the use of this rhetorical interrogative, see above at 8.1 and 37.8: "Why should you be benefitting him and harming yourself?". Cf. a discussion by Van Peursen (1999.231-33).

תועיל] As Smend (344) rightly states, לו as opposed to the following לך, cannot be missed.

§ reads totally different for the entire verse: אַתְּדַכֵּר עֲקָתָא וְאַעֲבֵר קְטָהּ. וְלֹא תִתְקַל עַל עוֹתְרָא מְטוּל דְּלִית בֵּהּ סְבָרָא. מְטוּל דְּאִיךְ פְּרַחְתָּא דְּשָׂמְיָא דְּפְרָחָא וְשָׂכְנָא הֲכֵנָּא הֵן עוֹתְרָא קְדָם בְּנִינְשָׂא. לָךְ מְחֵדָא וְלֹאֲחֻרְנָא מְבֵאֵשׁ 'Remember the pain and remove sins. And do not rely on wealth because there is no hope in it, for just as a bird in the sky it flies and comes to rest, so is wealth before people. It makes you rejoice and makes another person grieve.' Segal (250) sees here a Christian apologist fighting against the denial of the resurrection of the dead.

- 38.22) μνήσθητι τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτως καὶ τὸ σόν·
ἐμοὶ ἐχθὲς καὶ σοὶ σήμερον.

*Remember his destiny, because so is yours, too.
For me yesterday and for you today.*

(B) זכור חקו כי הוא⁴⁴ חקך לו אתמול ולך היום:

ὅτι] Lévi (201) views this particle not as causal, but as introducing a nominal clause: “Souviens-toi que son sort sera le tien.” This reminds us of a feature exemplified in BH as well, e.g. וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם כִּי־טוֹב καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν Gn 1.4.⁴⁵

οὕτως] The v.l. כן suits the context better.

ἐμοὶ] Strictly speaking ח is more logical than לי. ש is consistent with לִי אֶתְמֹלֶי ‘my fate .. for me yesterday,’ with which cp. שֶׁתִּזְכַּר לִי אֶתְמֹלֶי וְלָךְ יוֹמָנָא ‘Remember that it is your destiny: for him yesterday and for you today.’

- 38.23) ἐν ἀναπαύσει νεκροῦ κατάπαυσον τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ
καὶ παρακλήθητι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐξόδῳ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ.

*With the deceased coming to rest part with his memory
and relax away from him with the departure of his spirit.*

(B) מושבת מת ושבת זכרו⁴⁶ והנחם עם צאת נפשו:

ἀναπαύσει νεκροῦ κατάπαυσον] With the repetition of the same verb in דוּכְרַנְיָהּ בְּטָל מִיְתָא הִכְנָא בְּטָל דוּכְרַנְיָהּ ‘Just as the deceased came to an end, so came to an end his memory’ ש is more skilful reflecting the play on words in ח; ט uses two words derived from the same verb, παύω, but with two different prefixes – ἀνά and κατά. Moreover, ש is closer to the v.l. as cited in the fn. below.

κατάπαυσον] Segal (248) retains the (B) reading, vocalising it as .. מוּשְׁבַת בְּשָׁבַת, which presents a highly irregular consequence of tenses, < ptc. - ו - pf. >. It is better to follow the v.l. to vocalise it as יְשׁוּבוֹת וְכָרוֹ מֵת יְשׁוּבוֹת וְכָרוֹ, basically so ש, Lévi (202), and Kahana (408).

ἐν αὐτῷ] > ח. Can it be paraphrased as “though still bound up with him emotionally”? The second ἐν is instrumental in a broad sense.

- 38.24) Σοφία γραμματέως ἐν εὐκαιρίᾳ σχολῆς,
καὶ ὁ ἐλασσούμενος πράξει αὐτὸς σοφισθῆσεται.

⁴⁴ In the margin we see כן as a v.l.

⁴⁵ Cf. SQH § 12 I and SSG § 60 k, 66 c. Pace Lévi (ad loc.) ש, as adduced above, differs in that the verb has no ο of its own. Hence we have a standard content clause, not what is, in the classical philology, called σχῆμα καθ’ ὅλον καὶ μέρος.

⁴⁶ In the margin we see as a v.l. כשבות מת ישבות ו’.

*A scholar's wisdom (grows) out of ample, free time,
and only one who is free from routine labour could gain wisdom.*

(B) חכמת סופר תרבה חכמה וחסר עסק הוא יתחכם:

ἐν εὐκαιρία σχολῆς] In no way could we harmonise this with תרבה חכמה. S is an almost literal rendition of ח: חִכְמַתָּה דְסִפְרָא תוֹסֶף לָהּ חִכְמַתָּא ‘the wisdom of a scholar could add wisdom to him,’ which is nonsensical. The author probably meant to say: “what a scholar has gained could add something new to the current body of wisdom.” Segal (255) maintains that the first instance of חכמה here as the *s* means a scholar’s professional approach to scholarship, but we are not certain that such a sense is attested for this extremely common word anywhere in Hebrew. Smend’s (346) interpretation is similar with his “Musse” which a clever scholar acquired and utilised.

From the Mishnah we see that later rabbis did not mutually agree on the choice between full-time dedication to study and combination with secular work. R. Meir represents the former: וְעָסוּק בְּתוֹרָה וְעָסוּק בְּעֵסֶק, הָיוּ מְמַעֵט בְּעֵסֶק ‘Reduce your involvement in business, but occupy yourself with the Law’ (mAb 4.10) as against R. Gamaliel with מְשַׁכַּחַת מִשְׁנֵיהֶם מִשְׁפָּחָת שְׂיָגִיעַת אָרְצוֹ, שְׂיָגִיעַת עִם דְרָרָא אָרְצוֹ. שְׂיָגִיעַת עִם דְרָרָא אָרְצוֹ ‘Splendid is the study of the Law combined with secular work because the combination of the two makes one forget sins’ (ib. 2.2).

An Egyptian papyrus going back to the latter half of the second millennium BCE speaks in praise of learned scribes, despising diverse labourers.⁴⁷ Though we do not know whether or not BS knew of the document, he does not speak despicably of secular labourers.

38.25) τί σοφισθήσεται ὁ κρατῶν ἄρότρου
καὶ καυχώμενος ἐν δόρατι κέντρου,
βόας ἐλαύνων καὶ ἀναστρεφόμενος ἐν ἔργοις αὐτῶν,
καὶ ἡ διήγησις αὐτοῦ ἐν υἱοῖς ταύρων;

*What could be gained as wisdom by him who holds a plough
and boasts of the shaft of a goad,
drives cattle and busies himself with works,
and whose tales are on the offspring of bulls?*

(Ba) מה יתחכם תומך מלמד ומתפאר בחנית מרעיד:
(Bb) באלוף ינהג ישובב⁴⁸ בשור ושעיותיו עם ב... ..

ἀρότρου [מלמד] This equation does not occur elsewhere in LXX. מְלַמֵּד signifies “goad.” On the difficulty our translator possibly experienced with

⁴⁷ See Pritchard 1969.431-34.

⁴⁸ In the main body of the fascicule לשוד follows ישובב. Moreover, as a v.l. we see ישובב בשיר replacing the last two words.

the vocabulary relating to agriculture, see our remarks above at p. 442. Actually he uses in the next hemistich κέντρον, which can refer to goad. Smend (347) proposes reading here מְרִדֵּעַ, which occurs in post BH as a synonym of מְלִמֵּד.

καὶ ἀναστρεφόμενος ἐν ἔργοις αὐτῶν] One can hardly see how this can be harmonised with 𐤀 inclusive of the data in the margin and לְשׂוֹר added after יָשׁוּב. Our translator's *Vorlage* may have been as difficult and he may have had no choice but freely to translate. יָשׁוּב is rendered in 𐤅 as מְתִיר 'bewilder,' a bewildering rendering. Smend (347) holds that שִׁיר, i.e. שִׁיר 'song,' makes good parallelism with the following שְׁעִיּוּתִי.

ἢ διήγησις αὐτοῦ שְׁעִיּוּתִי] The Gk rendering here appears to be under Aramaic influence, cf. 𐤅 שְׁעִיּוּתָהּ 'his tale' here. See also above at 37.14 and below at 44.8.

ἐν υἰοῖς ταύρων] The use of ἐν to "mark the object of a discourse or thought" is well established (*GELS* s.v. 15). בִּי is also so used, but hardly עָם. See also above at 6.37.

38.26) καρδίαν αὐτοῦ δώσει ἐκδοῦναι αὐλακας,
καὶ ἢ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ εἰς χορτάσματα δαμάλεων.

*His attention would be directed towards shaping furrows
and he concentrates over the fodder for heifers.*

(B) ושקידתו לכלות מרבק לֵב וְשִׁית לְשׂוֹר ...

καρδίαν αὐτοῦ δώσει .. ἢ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ] It looks as if שְׁקִידָתוֹ and לֵב וְשִׁית swapped their respective position.⁴⁹ Likewise 𐤅: לְבָה רָנָא .. וְשִׁתָּהּ רָנָא 'his mind considers .. and his vigil is for the sake of finishing ..'.

On the Heb. collocation לֵב וְשִׁתָּהּ as synonymous with לֵב וְשִׁתָּהּ, see above at vs. 20 and שִׁתָּהּ לְבָה לְעֶדְרִים Pr 27.23.

ἐκδοῦναι] If לְשׂוֹר be a correct restoration, the verb would be שְׂדָד 'to harrow,' for which ἐκδίδομι is not exactly the right choice. Here we have another term out of ancient farmers' technical jargon. This Heb. verb occurs in BH a mere three times, and only once 𐤅 is pretty close to 𐤀: ἔλακω Jb 39.10. The other two are ἐργάζομαι Is 28.24 and ἐνισχύω Ho 10.11 (< שָׂרַר).

αὐλακας [מְרַבֵּק] is a stall for domestic animals. The word occurs in BH only four times, and all the LXX translators appear to have struggled, none of them hitting the nail on the head: νομάς 'nomad' 1K(𐤀 1Sm) 28.24, σιτυετός 'fatted' Je 39.(𐤀 46).21, γαλαθηνός 'milk-sucking' Am 6.4, ἐκ δεσμῶν 'let loose from tethers' MI 4.2 (𐤀 3.20). The problem, then, appears not to have been unique to Ben Sira's grandson.

⁴⁹ As noted by Lévi (203).

ἀγρυπνία] alternatively “insomnia,” i.e. he gives up sleep to ensure regular supply of fodder.

δαμάλεων] One is curious about the special attention to heifers with the exclusion of calves.

- 38.27) οὕτως πᾶς τέκτων καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων,
ὅστις νύκτωρ ὡς ἡμέρας διάγει·
οἱ γλύφοντες γλύμματα σφραγίδων,
καὶ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ αὐτοῦ ἀλλοιωῦσαι ποικιλίαν·
καρδίαν αὐτοῦ δώσει εἰς ὁμοιωῦσαι ζωγραφίαν,
καὶ ἡ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ τελέσαι ἔργον.

*So is it with every craftsman and master-builder,
who spends (his life) night and day.
Those who engrave figures on signets,
and his steadfastness is aimed at diversifying engravings.
He works wholeheartedly to copy coloured portrayals,
and his vigil is aimed at bringing his work to completion.*

... אֵשׁ לַיְלִיָּה אֲשֶׁר לַיְלִיָּה (B)

οὕτως] This might reflect כַּךְ, though הֵכָּךְ and הַכֵּן can be synonymous.

τέκτων] **Sh** specifies an artisan or craftsman as נָגַד ‘carpenter.’ Likewise ἀρχιτέκτων נָגַד רִאשׁוֹ ‘chief-carpenter.’

νύκτωρ ὡς ἡμέρας] **Sh** בְּאֵימָתָא אֵשׁ לַיְלִיָּה אֲשֶׁר לַיְלִיָּה ‘at night, also by day,’ in which אֵשׁ could be an error for אֵשׁ ‘like, as (of similarity).’

ἀλλοιωῦσαι] Although somewhat loosely used, this inf. can be said to be final in value, and this analysis can be applied to τελέσαι, and is rendered probable in view of the construction explicitly marked as final in εἰς ὁμοιωῦσαι ζωγραφίαν.⁵⁰

εἰς ὁμοιωῦσαι] a rare example of an inf. preceded by a preposition, but exceptionally without the neuter definite article, τὸ in this case.⁵¹

- 38.28) οὕτως χαλκεὺς καθήμενος ἐγγὺς ἄκμονος
καὶ καταμανθάνων ἔργα σιδήρου·
ἀτμὶς πυρὸς τήξει σάρκα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐν θέρμῃ καμίνου διαμαχήσεται·
φωνὴ σφύρης καινεῖ τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ,
καὶ κατέναντι ὁμοιώματος σκεύους οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ·
καρδίαν αὐτοῦ δώσει εἰς συντέλειαν ἔργων,
καὶ ἡ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ κοσμηῆσαι ἐπὶ συντελείας.

⁵⁰ See our discussion in SSG § 30 **bab**.

⁵¹ See our discussion in SSG § 30 **aba**.

*So is a coppersmith sitting beside an anvil
and observing how the iron is being worked.
The flame of fire would melt his skin,
and he would have to fight the heat of the furnace.
The sound of a hammer would refresh his ear,
and his eyes are staring at the pattern of his tool.
He would direct his mind towards the completion of the works,
and his vigil is aimed at a beautiful finish.*

καινεῖ] This is an odd verb in this context. Ryssel (421) thinks of an error in \mathfrak{H} of שרתי, i.e. שרתי, in lieu of שרתי, i.e. שרתי 'to make deaf.' Cf. a discussion in Ziegler ed. 32f. Rahlfs read κλινεῖ. A confusion between ט and ת on one hand and between A and Λ on the other is easily understandable.

ἐπὶ συντελείας] The prep. ἐπί + gen. is temporal in value, 'when it is finished,' cf. *GELS* s.v. **I 1**.

From this verse up to 39.15a no Heb. text has come down.

38.29) οὕτως κεραμεὺς καθήμενος ἐν ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ
καὶ συστρέφων ἐν ποσὶν αὐτοῦ τροχόν,
ὃς ἐν μερίμνῃ κεῖται διὰ παντὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐναριθμῖος πᾶσα ἡ ἐργασία αὐτοῦ·

*So is a potter seated at his work
and turning the wheel with his feet,
who is worried and overwhelmed with the work all the time
and all his work is highly regarded.*

Vs. 29c in \mathfrak{S} reads: הַתְּבָעָה לְכָל כְּלֵי עֲמָלָו 'and his eyes are on the tools of all his work.' Vs. 29d is absent.

ἐναριθμῖος] \mathfrak{S} הַתְּבָעָה 'numerable' is etymologically close to \mathfrak{C} . For its meaning, refer to LSJ s.v. **II** "taken into account, esteemed," for which reference is made to Plato, *Phileb.* 17e. For this semantic development, cp. Engl. *account* as in *a matter of no account* or *of some account*.

38.30) ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ τυπώσει πηλὸν
καὶ πρὸ ποδῶν κάμψει ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ·
καρδίαν ἐπιδώσει συντελέσαι τὸ χρῆσμα,
καὶ ἡ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ καθαρίσαι κάμινον.

*With his arm he would mould clay
and stooping, he would keep himself under control,
and would direct his mind towards finishing to glaze,
and his vigil is aimed at cleaning the furnace.*

τυπώσει] With תִּפְקַחְמָה ‘tear apart’ **§** must have had a verb somewhat different than that of its Heb. *Vorlage*. As radically different is it in 30b: תִּפְקַחְמָה תִּפְקַחְמָה אֶל עַד יָמָיו ‘before he is dead he is curved and bent.’ Note also τὸ χρῑσμα = חֲדָשָׁתוֹ ‘his work’ and καθαρίσαι = בְּנֵהוּ ‘to build.’
καθαρίσαι] On the final value of the inf., see above at vs. 27.

38.31) Πάντες οὗτοι εἰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐνεπίστευσαν,
καὶ ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ σοφίζεται·

*All these people rely on acquired confidence in their skills
and each is expert in his profession.*

38.32) ἄνευ αὐτῶν οὐκ οἰκισθήσεται πόλις,
καὶ οὐ παροικήσουσιν οὐδὲ περιπατήσουσιν.
ἀλλ’ εἰς βουλὴν λαοῦ οὐ ζητηθήσονται

*Without them city life would be impossible
and they would not be welcome as immigrants nor walk around as
beggars,
but they would not be sought after for public decision-making*

Vs. 32b reads in **§**: תַּחֲנוּן לָא יִרְיֵן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן ‘where they live they would not go hungry,’ where וִי ‘where’ instead of οὐ is postulated. Wherever they go, the technical expertise of these people would be so highly valued that they would have enough income.

In **§h** vs. 32c is missing.

38.33) καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐχ ὑπεραλοῦνται·
ἐπὶ δίφρον δικαστοῦ οὐ καθιοῦνται
καὶ διαθήκην κρίματος οὐ διανοηθήσονται.
οὐδὲ μὴ ἐκφάνωσιν παιδείαν καὶ κρίμα
καὶ ἐν παραβολαῖς οὐχ εὔρεθήσονται,

*and in a public meeting they would not occupy a prominent position,
they would not ascend the seat of a judge,
and they could not ponder juridical agreement(s).
Nor would they show off their education and view
and in maxims they would not be found.*

καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ] **§h** reads: וְיִרְיֵן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן לָא ‘but in the church they would not stand up,’ where the text is meant, we are made to understand, for Christians, and, their superb professional expertise notwithstanding, these artisans are not expected to stand up to have their voice heard in a public church meeting. By contrast there is no such manifestly Christianising analysis manifest in **§** אֶתְּרֵיהֶן ‘and in a meeting’; on the contrary, in the NT,

this word is often used to translate συναγωγή, in a special sense of “Jewish synagogue,” e.g. διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν [בְּכִנּוּשֵׁי הַיְהוּדָה] Mt 4.23.

ἐκφάνωσιν παιδείαν] On this collocation, see above at 16.25 and 24.27.

The last line is rather difficult. What Jerome meant with his literal translation we would not know: *et in parabolis non inveniuntur*. Cf. also **ס** וּבְמִתְלֵא לֹא נִסְתַּכְלוּן וְנִסְתַּכְלוּן לֹא דְחִכְיִמָּא לֹא וְבִאֲוִרְהֵן לֹא וְנִסְתַּכְלוּן לֹא ‘and the maxims of the sages they would not comprehend’ and **ס** וְנִסְתַּכְלוּן לֹא וְנִסְתַּכְלוּן לֹא ‘and they would not be found in the ways.’ Skehan’s (1961.40) suggestion makes sense, namely, *במשלים* in the *Vorlage* was misread as *במשלים* instead of *במשלים* ‘among rulers.’⁵² The analysis represented in *SD* “und in Sprüchen kennen sie sich nicht aus” is close to what we have suggested in *GELS* s.v. εὐρίσκω *8 mid./pass. “to be able to find one’s way about, capable of coping with.” The reference to MH **אָצָּר**, however, is insecure.⁵³ An example such as *הוא מצוי אצל* ‘he is knowledgeable about’ cited in Even-Shoshan 756c is unique to Mod. Heb.

38.34) ἀλλὰ κτίσμα αἰῶνος στηρίσουσιν,
καὶ ἡ δέησις αὐτῶν ἐν ἐργασίᾳ τέχνης.

Πλὴν τοῦ ἐπιδιδόντος τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
καὶ διανοομένου ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου,

*But they would firmly maintain (this) created universe,
and their concern lies in (their) professional work.*

*Excepting one who devotes himself
and ponders the law of the Most High,*

In vs. 34c **ס** specifies how the devotion manifests itself: **הוּ דְיִהֵב נַפְשֵׁהּ הוּ דְיִתְחַל לְאֵהָא וְלְמִסְתַּכְלוּ וְנִמְוָסָא דְחַיָּה** ‘he who dedicates himself to fear God and understand the law of life.’

⁵² *BJ* has apparently taken no notice of a criticism by Skehan (ad loc.): “les faiseurs de maximes.”

⁵³ In an example cited in Levy (825a) such as **עַשׂה עַד שֶׁאֵתָּא מוֹצֵא וּמְצוּי לְךָ** ‘Perform mitzvot while you still find opportunities, and you have the financial means’ bSab 151b, **מְצוּי** does not indicate an ability or capacity of the person concerned, but availability of facilities or financial means.

CHAPTER 39

- 39.1) σοφίαν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἐκζητήσει
καὶ ἐν προφητεῖαις ἀσχοληθήσεται,
*he would pursue the wisdom of all predecessors
and engage himself with prophecies,*

σοφίαν] **ס** אַהֲמָדָהּ אִי־אֵ ‘like wisdom.’ Segal (258) postulates an error of **כ** for **כ**, which epigraphically makes sense, but we would follow Smend (353), who mentions **ל**.

πάντων] In contrast to specialist craftsmen (38.27-30) this scholar’s interest is spread far and wide.

προφητεῖαις] **ס** אֲמֵרֵךְ אֲרֵבֵךְ ‘earlier prophets,’ personalised in parallelism with the preceding אֲמֵרֵךְ אֲרֵבֵךְ and specified. Our author cannot possibly leave out books such as Ps, Pr, Jb, and Ec, which are then implicitly included in πάντων ἀρχαίων as consisting of both Prophets and Writings.

ἀσχοληθήσεται] cf. a related verbal noun, ἀσχολία later at 40.1.

- 39.2) διήγησιν ἀνδρῶν ὀνομαστῶν συντηρήσει
καὶ ἐν στροφαῖς παραβολῶν συνεισελεύσεται,
*he would closely follow instruction of renowned men
and penetrate meanders of maxims,*

διήγησιν] **ס** אֲתִיבֵי־וֹשׁ ‘oral teachings.’ Here we are no longer on the written scripture, but on oral tradition, which also would subsequently be put into writing and canonised as Mishna and Talmud.

ἀνδρῶν ὀνομαστῶν] **ס** אֲמֵרֵךְ אֲרֵבֵךְ ‘secular people’ in contrast to the sacred authors of the Bible? An error from אֲמֵרֵךְ אֲרֵבֵךְ is not impossible.

στροφαῖς] a noun applied to oral message also in στροφὰς λόγων Wi 8.8, Pr 1.3.

ס might suggest a confusion between קִמְעַ ‘deep’ and MH קִמְעַ ‘crooked’¹: כִּשְׁתִּתְּךָ יִקְרָאֲךָ מְעַרְבֵי־וֹשׁ ‘and will carefully weigh profound matters.’ Does **ס** אֲתִיבֵי־וֹשׁ אֲתִיבֵי־וֹשׁ mean “distortions of parables”?

- 39.3) ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν ἐκζητήσει
καὶ ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται.
*he would seek out mysteries of proverbial sayings
and occupy himself with enigmas of maxims.*

¹ According Smend (353) A. Edersheim had made a similar suggestion.

Ⲛ is rather free: ⲗⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲧⲁⲣⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲗⲁⲓ ⲁⲧⲁⲣⲏⲧⲟⲩ ‘he would study the wisdom of maxims and contemplate all the hidden matters.’ Cf. 3b of Ⲛⲓⲛ: ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲧⲁⲣⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲧⲁⲣⲏⲧⲟⲩ ‘and in the mysteries of enigmas he would be busy.’

39.4) ἀνὰ μέσον μεγιστάνων ὑπηρετήσῃ
καὶ ἔναντι ἡγουμένων ὀφθήσεται·
ἐν γῆ ἄλλοτρίων ἔθνῶν διελεύσεται,
ἀγαθὰ γὰρ καὶ κακὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπέειρασεν.

*In the midst of courtiers he would serve
and in the presence of rulers he would make an appearance;
he would travel among foreign nations,
for he has experienced both good and bad things with people.*

ὑπηρετήσῃ] cp. Ⲛⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘he will serve’ with Ⲛⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘he will walk about.’ ὀφθήσεται] Ⲛⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ indicates what he has been called to show up for by a superior of his.

ἐπέειρασεν] Ⲛⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘he would try.’ There is a v.l. ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘he would cover,’ which makes no good sense in the context. The shift of tense in Ⲛⲓⲛ from the fut. to aor. and back again, in vs. 5, to fut. is remarkable. Is his extensive community experience a good qualification as an envoy to foreign countries? Note the causal γὰρ.

39.5) τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιδώσει ὀρθρίσαι
πρὸς κύριον τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτὸν
καὶ ἔναντι ὑψίστου δεηθήσεται·
καὶ ἀνοίξει στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐν προσευχῇ
καὶ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ δεηθήσεται.

*He would dedicate his heart to turn earnestly
towards the Lord, who made him
and would make supplications in front of the Most High;
and he would open his mouth in prayer
and would supplicate about his sins.*

ὀρθρίσαι] On this collocation, ὀρθρίζω πρὸς τινα, “to seek and turn in eager anticipation to somebody” (GELS s.v. *2), see above at 4.12 and 6.36. Given the etymology of the verb [< ⲣⲏⲩ ‘early morning’] and Ⲛⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘to get up early in the morning,’² we could be certain that in Ⲛ there stood

² Though the sense “to get up early in the morning” is assured for this Syr. verb, so *SL* s.v. **Pa. 6** the prep. following here, ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ‘towards the Lord,’ might cast some doubt on this analysis. However, in a few places we find ⲣⲏⲩ with God as the *o* translated in Ⲛ with ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, e.g. Ho 5.15, Is 26.9, Ps 63.1, 78.34.

a form of רָחַם.³ **Š** presents a free translation: **וְיִשְׁמַע לְמִצְוֵי וְיִמְן קָדְם׃** **וּבְלִבּוֹ יִשְׁמַע לְמִצְוֵי וְיִמְן קָדְם׃** ‘and in his heart he would be determined to pray and ask mercies in the presence of God.’

39.6) εἰάν κύριος ὁ μέγας θελήσῃ,
πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται·
αὐτὸς ἀνομβρήσει ῥήματα σοφίας αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν προσευχῇ ἐξομολογήσεται κυρίῳ·

*If the great Lord wills,
he would be filled with a spirit of understanding;
he would pour forth words of his wisdom
and through prayer acknowledge it to the Lord.*

ἐμπλησθήσεται] **Š** is a little modest in tone: **וְיִשְׁמַע** ‘he will become wise,’
cf. also the sequel, **וְיִשְׁמַע קָדְם׃** ‘he would utter parables, one or two.’

αὐτὸς] Both **Š** and **Šh** place **הוּא** up front for the sake of emphasis: he, on his own bat, on behalf of God. Hence αὐτοῦ at the end of the clause must be referring to himself, not to God, though he is conscious, as expressed in the last clause, that he owes all this to Him. This applies to the next two verses, too.

ἐξομολογήσεται] Taken by some as an expressions of thanks, so Box - Oesterley, Snaith, Skehan - Di Lella, and *BJ*. In *GELS* s.v. ἐξομολογέομαι we read “The feature of thanks and gratitude cannot be established with certainty.” This has got to do with a remarkable aspect of BH lexicography, namely, there does not appear to be a word or phrase that can be translated as “to thank” or “thanks.” The most likely candidates are **וְהוֹדָה** and **וְהוֹדָה**. Neither Kaddari nor Gesenius mentions “to thank” or “thanks, gratitude” under these lexemes.⁴

In **Š** vs. 6a is missing, and 6d is vague in its meaning: **וְיִשְׁמַע לְמִצְוֵי וְיִמְן קָדְם׃** ‘and they [who?] would acknowledge to him his thoughts.’

39.7) αὐτὸς κατευθυνεῖ βουλήν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμη
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις αὐτοῦ διανοηθήσεται·
*He would prepare well his advice and knowledge
and give thought to his mysterious matters.*

Vs. 7a reads quite differently in **Š**: **וְיִשְׁמַע לְמִצְוֵי וְיִמְן קָדְם׃** ‘he would ponder the maxims of sages.’

³ Cf. Muraoka 2008.

⁴ Joüon (1923.381) holds that BH “est resté au stade de l’enfance.” However that may be, the fact remains that the BH vocabulary has a hole here, whilst there are tens of occasions in the Bible when “Thank you” could have been said. *DCH* (s.v. **יָדָה** I) is unsure: “sometimes perh. give thanks, thank.” *HALOT* (s.v. II **יָדָה** **hif.** 4) says “to begin the praise and thanksgiving.”

τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις αὐτοῦ] alternatively ‘his private corners,’ cf. καὶ θήσει αὐτὸ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ < רַתְּפֹּי בְּסִפְּרֵי דֵי שְׁמִי Dt 27.15. Note also שְׁמִי הִלְכָהּ אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי, with which cp. תָּמַן אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי מִלְּהֵינִי 1Sm 23.23 < מִכָּל הַמְּחַבְּאִים אֶשָּׂר מִשְׁ אֶבְיָתִי.

39.8) αὐτὸς ἐκφανεῖ παιδείαν διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης κυρίου καυχήσεται.

*He would reveal what is to be learned from his teaching
and feel proud of the law of covenant of the Lord.*

νόμῳ διαθήκης κυρίου] in S simply אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי ‘the law of life.’

39.9) αἰνέσουσιν τὴν σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ πολλοί,
καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται·
οὐκ ἀποστήσεται τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ζήσεται εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν·

*Many would praise his understanding
and it would not be obliterated for ever;
his memory would not disappear,
and his name would live for many generations.*

αἰνέσουσιν] For S his legacy would not stop with just praises: אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי ‘they would learn,’⁵ and it would have global dimension, so אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי ‘and in the world’ for ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος. Moreover, it adds שְׁמִי ‘his name’ as the subject, and the same verb is repeated in 9d אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי מִן דֵּי לְדָרִי ‘and his name would not be forgotten from generation to generation.’ Thus his name would not suffer oblivion irrespective of time and place.

39.10) τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ διηγῆσονται ἔθνη,
καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον αὐτοῦ ἐξαγγελεῖ ἐκκλησία·

*Gentiles would tell about his wisdom,
and the (local) community would publicly praise him.*

ἔθνη] Contrasted to Jewish communities (ἐκκλησία), this adds another dimension to this scholar’s wisdom, which crosses religious boundaries. The pl. ἔθνη is also applied to gentiles at 33.2 as a rendering of גוֹיִם and at אַמַּת read as אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי 4.15.

In S אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי could refer to synagogues as in אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי דֵי הַיְהוּדִים Ac 9.20, but any gentile nation or group would come together for their religious activity. Note also that אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי, a rendering of ἐκκλησία, is in the sg.

⁵ Pace Segal (259) אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי, which would represent אֶתְּשִׁיטְּמִי ‘they would teach.’

The description of the landscape is richer in **§**: שומעוני ודיקא ונפרע בקרכון: 'Listen to me, the righteous, and may your flesh spring up like lilies and like cedars which are planted by the waters and like good meats may your odour smell sweet!'

39.14) καὶ ὡς λίβανος εὐωδιάσατε ὁσμὴν
καὶ ἀνθήσατε ἄνθος ὡς κρίνον.
διάδοτε ὁσμὴν καὶ αἰνέσατε ἅμα,
καὶ εὐλογήσατε κύριον ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔργοις,
*and like frankincense smell sweet
and make a flower like white lily bloom.
Give out fragrance and praise together,
and bless the Lord over all (His) works.*

λίβανος] **§** took לְבוֹנָה for לְבוֹנֵי, and as a consequence a need was felt to mention a plant typical of the mountain.

ἅμα] Ziegler is following Smend; the majority reading is ασμα, i.e. ὕσμα 'song.' **§** אֵיךְ אֵיךְ is = **Ⓞ**.

καὶ εὐλογήσατε] וְאָדָּוָה 'and confess.'

In contrast to the preceding verse **§** is rather brief: אֵיךְ רִיחָא דְלִבְנָן בְּאַרְזֵיהִי 'like the smell of Lebanon in its cedars and like the root of the king's lily.'

39.15) δότε τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μεγαλωσύνην
καὶ ἐξομολογήσασθε ἐν αἰνέσει αὐτοῦ
ἐν ᾠδαῖς χειλέων καὶ ἐν κινύραις
καὶ οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ἐν ἐξομολογήσει.

*Attribute majesty to His name
and confess His praise
with songs of lips and with lyres
and you should say as follows in your confession.*

(B) בְּשִׁירֹת נבל וכלי מיני וכן תאמר בתרועה:

δότε τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μεγαλωσύνην] **§** מְנַן גְּבוּרָתָהּ בְּשִׁירֹת נבל 'Count His mighty works with adorations.'

χειλέων] נבל, probably נבל or נבל meant, denotes a musical instrument. The Gk translation here is free. Lévi (2) thinks that χειλέων is a correction of error for χελύων from χέλυσ 'lyre,' unattested in SG.

κινύραις] most likely representing a transliteration of Heb. כְּנֹר. It is known that music played a significant role in ancient Israel, whether in religion or

secular life. When we come to its details, however, whether instruments played or modes of performance, we are far removed from the stage, we hear, but not see. Much is still obscure. C is translating here free, it appears. מִינֵי [= מִנִּים ?] occurs twice in BH: מִנֵּי Ps 45.9 and מִנִּים ib. 150.4 [C $\chi\omicron\rho\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ‘strings (of a musical instrument)’].

39.16) $\text{T}\grave{\alpha}$ ἔργα κυρίου πάντα ὄτι καλὰ σφόδρα,
καὶ πᾶν πρόσταγμα ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ ἔσται.

*All the works of the Lord are extremely beautiful,
and anything that He instructs would be ready on time.*

... אל כלם טובים וכל צורך בעתו יספיק: (B)

[C ὄτι] Probably introducing a content clause and to be construed with οὕτως ἔρεϊτε at the end of the preceding verse, a connection lost in S through מִטּוֹל ‘because.’ The s taken out of the clause is highlighted. Smend (358) assumes that the conjunction emphasises טובים . However, such an emphatic, asseverative כִּי is often positioned immediately before a clause-component to be emphasised, e.g. $\text{מָאֵד כִּי כִבְדָה מְאֹד}$ Gn 18.20.⁹ Smend (l.c.) further holds that in that case σφόδρα is a mere addition. In our view כִּי is not used as an intensifier of a degree, but underlines the veracity of a statement.

Vs. 16b in S is totally different: $\text{וְכָל־הֵן לְצַבֹּתָהֶן וְאֵתְבָרִיו}$ ‘all of them were created as they pleased.’ As different is F : ‘and every need He would provide on time.’ The v.l. $\text{ב' יספוקו ב' לכל צריך}$ would mean ‘they [= all that was created by Him] would supply on time everyone who [or: which] has some need.’¹⁰

In MH הַסְפִּיק can mean “to supply what is needed” as in $\text{אֵינָן מְסַפְּקִין מִיָּם וּמִזֶּן}$ ‘they do not provide water and food’ mSot 8.4.

39.17) οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν τί τοῦτο; εἰς τί τοῦτο;
πάντα γὰρ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ ζητηθήσεται.
ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἔστη ὡς θημωνιά ὕδωρ
καὶ ἐν ῥήματι στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοχεῖα ὑδάτων.

*One should not say “What is this? What is this for?”
For everything would be sought after in its time.
With His word water emerged like a heap
and with a word from His mouth cisterns of water.*

(B) בְּהַבְרֹא יִעֲרִיךְ נֶר ... אִמוּצָא פִּיּוֹ אוֹצְרוֹ:

⁹ Cf. Brockelmann § 51, Muraoka 1985.161f., and HALOT II כִּי 1.

¹⁰ Cf. Lévi 3: “À tout besoin en temps opportun elles pourvoient.” He reads צָרַךְ , i.e. צָרַךְ , which might be epigraphically preferable to צָרִיךְ . But Mopsik’s (226) צָרַךְ is not on.

οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν] This is an example of < εἰμί + inf. > with obligative value,¹¹ as has been captured by **Ⓢ**: לִית דְּנָאֵמַר.

The enormous gap between **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ** is hardly explicable by assuming that their respective Heb. *Vorlagen* differed from each other so much. In **Ⓢ** we read: וְלִית דְּנָאֵמַר הָנָא לְמָנָא וְהָנָא לְמָנָא. מְטוּל דְּכִלְהוֹן בְּוִלִיתָא עֲבִידִין. וְלִית דְּנָאֵמַר דְּהָנָא בִישׁ וְהָנָא טָב. מְטוּל דְּכִלְהוֹן בְּעִדְנָהוֹן מְתַנְנָבְרִין. בְּמֵאֵמְרָה מְדַנָּח שְׁמָשָׂא לָהּ וּבְמֵאֵמְרָה הוּ מְעָרְב לָהּ ‘It is not allowed to say “What is this for and what is this for?” because they are all made properly, and it is not allowed to say “This is bad” and “This is good,” because they all become strong in their time. With His word He makes the sun rise and with His word He makes it set.’

The surviving **Ⓜ** is quite a challenge. In the first half of the line Abegg reads only יַעֲרִיךְ with certainty. Even in comparison with **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ** we cannot say what it means. The second half is likely to mean “what proceeds out of His mouth is His resource” or suchlike, which, however, is practically impossible to harmonise with **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ**.

Something very close to the first two lines in **Ⓞ** appears at vs. 21 in **Ⓜ**.

39.18) ἐν προστάγματι αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ εὐδοκία,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐλαττώσει τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ.

*In His command He is entirely satisfied,
and there is none who would devalue His salvation.*

(B תַּנְנִיתָו רַצוֹנוֹ יַצְלִיחַ וְאֵין מַעְצֹר לַתְּשׁוּעָתוֹ:

תַּנְנִיתָו is how BSH reads the beginning of the verse, though its editors themselves do not know how to parse it as shown by their question mark (p. 382b).

ἐλαττώσει] *Index* s.v. ἐλαττώω suggests √צער hi., i.e. מְצַעֵר. Lévi profitably refers to בְּמַעַט אוֹ בְּמַעַרְבָּב 1Sm 14.6.

Ⓢ reads: בְּהִדּוּתָא צְבִיגָנָה מְתַעֲבָד וְלִית דְּמִשְׁחָחַר לְפּוֹקְדָנָה ‘in joy His will is executed and there is none who delays His commandment.’

39.19) ἔργα πάσης σαρκὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν κρυβῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ.

*Works of every flesh are under His eyes
and it is not possible to hide from His eyes.*

(B מַעֲשֵׂה כָל בִּשְׂר נִגְדּוּ וְאֵין נִסְתָּר¹² מִגַּד עֵינָיו:

¹¹ For a discussion with SG examples, see *SSG* § 30 *bec*.

¹² V.l. מְסוּתָר. A pu. as synonymous with ho. does occur in BH once: אֲהַבָּהּ מְסוּתָרָת Pr 27.5.

οὐκ ἔστιν κρυβῆναι] The construction < εἶμι + inf. > can be used not only with obligative, but also potential value, see above at vs. 17. Hence the clause could be rewritten in the same sense as οὐκ δυνατὸν ἔστιν κρυβῆναι.

κρυβῆναι] This can be a genuine passive with ἔργα as its implicit *s*: “works .. cannot be concealed.” However, it is more likely middle: “it is impossible for any human being to hide himself ..” God’s concern would be our personal accountability. Hence **שׁ** קְדָמָהּ מִן דְּטָשָׂא לִיתָ means ‘there is none who hides himself in His presence’ rather than “.. hides (his works) ..” Cp. **שׁ** הַ דִּילָהּ מִן עֵינָא דִּילָהּ לְמָחֻטְשֵׁי מִן וְלָא אִיתָ לְהַטְשֵׁי מִן עֵינָא דִּילָהּ ‘and it is not possible to hide oneself from His eyes.’ All the same, cp. αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτῶν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ διὰ παντός, οὐ κρυβήσονται ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ Si 17.15, where the *s* is more likely to be Αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτῶν than αὐτοί.

39.20) ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐπέβλεψεν,
καὶ οὐθέν ἐστιν θαυμάσιον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ.

*From age to age He looks,
and there is nothing that is surprising to Him.*

עַל כֵּן לֹא מְסַפֵּר לְתוֹשׁוּעַתּוֹ: מְבֹרָחַם וְעַד עוֹלָם יְבִיט (Ba)
אִין קְטַן וּמַעַט עִמּוֹ אִיִּין נִפְלֵא אֲחֻזְק מִמֶּנּוּ: (Bb)

ἐπέβλεψεν] In spite of **י** בִּיט¹³ we view this aor. as of gnomic value, on which we have touched at various points above, e.g. 38.7.

ἔστιν] This could be analysed as a copula of an equational clause, ‘nothing is ..,’ so **י** nihil est mirabile, Lévi (7) “rien n’est pour lui impossible ni difficile,”¹⁴ but **י** suggests an existential, or locational verb, as in οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ‘there is none like our God’ 2E 9.13.¹⁵

ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ] Lévi (6) criticises the translator of **ע** for failing to see that ממנו here means “pour lui,” but his selection of ἐναντίον is not that bad, for it means “in the estimation of” (*GELS* s.v. **II 2**).

Lévi (6) also deplores the selection of θαυμάσιος, when נִפְלֵא here means “impossible.” One would be surprised if our translator was ignorant of this fairly common usage in BH. A brilliant student would not be surprised by a hard question impossible for a colleague inferior to him to answer.

שׁ lacks (Ba), but does have (Bb), which is almost absent in **ע**: לִיתָ דְּקָלִיל: לִיתָ דְּקָדְמָהּ וְלִיתָ דְּעֵשִׂין וְקָשָׁא וְקוֹבְלָהּ ‘there is nothing that is (too) little and (too) much before Him and there is nothing that is (too) strong and (too) difficult for Him.’ In fact, the second half of (Bb) reads: “there is nothing that is (too) surprising and (too) tough for Him.”

¹³ BSH is cautious with a stroke over the *yod*; in the MS we cannot recognise הַבִּיט.

¹⁴ So also Smend (II 69), *SD* (1144), *NETS* (751), and Mopsik (227).

¹⁵ Cf. *SSG* § 93 **aa**.

The second half of (Ba) is missing in \mathfrak{C} , which, probably due to a homoioarcton, left out the first half of (Bb). The end of (Ba) means “therefore His (works of) salvation are innumerable.”¹⁶

39.21) οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν Τί τοῦτο; εἰς τί τοῦτο;
πάντα γὰρ εἰς χρείας αὐτῶν ἔκτισται.

*One should not say “What is this? What is this for?”
for everything was created for their useful purpose.*

אין לאמר זה למה זה כי הכל לצרכו נבחר¹⁷: (Ba)
אין לאמר זה רע מזה כי הכל בעתו יגבר: (Bb)

Τί τοῦτο;] \mathfrak{J} may have dropped out after לאמר. Smend (361) regards the first $\eta\bar{\iota}$ as a case of “energische Vorname,” though we do not know of such a use of $\eta\bar{\iota}$ anywhere in Hebrew, and why is it repeated afterwards?

αὐτῶν] \mathfrak{C} has taken הכל as meaning “all of them,” but \mathfrak{H} means “each one of all,” hence sg. צרכו as well as נבחר.

ἔκτισται] = נברא, most likely an error in (Ba).

The verse is missing in \mathfrak{S} ; it may have been thought an unnecessary repetition of vs. 17.

The second hemistich of (Bb) presupposes comparison between two items in the created world, hence a logical sequel to the first hemistich. Thus (Bb) is no variant of (Ba). Our translation of (Bb) is: “One should not say ‘This is worse than this, because everything would show strength in its time’; everything has a strength of its own to become effective when its time comes.” See also below at vs. 34.

A measure of confusion appears to have occurred in the course of transmission of \mathfrak{H} , \mathfrak{C} , \mathfrak{S} , and \mathfrak{L} , as addressed by Smend (360f. ad vs. 21). He is of the opinion that the identity of 17a and 21a speaks against \mathfrak{C} . The author, however, could start off with the same statement, but continue differently as shown by comparing 17b and 21b.

39.22) Ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ ὡς ποταμὸς ἐπεκάλυψεν
καὶ ὡς κατακλυσμὸς ξηρὰν ἐμέθυσεν·

*His blessing covered (the earth) like a river
and immersed the dry land like a flood.*

ברכות כיאר הציפה וכנהר תבל ריותה: (B)

¹⁶ Abegg leaves the space for the first three words blank.

¹⁷ In the margin we see בעתו יגבר, which stands at the end of (Bb).

[Ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ] Given the two fem.sg. verbs following we most likely have here an error for ברכתו, i.e. בְּרַכְתּוֹ. Hence נְהָרָא ‘flowing’ in S must be a fem.sg. ptc. predicate agreeing with בְּרַכְתּוֹ ‘His blessing,’ and not an attributive masc.sg. ptc. agreeing with the preceding נְהָרָא ‘river.’

[ἐπεκάλυπεν] This rare Heb. hi. verb is causative in BH, e.g. הִצִּיף עַל-פְּנֵיהֶם Dt 11.4 [*s* = God]. Its intransitive use as equivalent to its Qal is unknown elsewhere. One would thus have anticipated here נָפְצָה, cf. צָפוּ-מִים עַל-רֵאשֵׁי אֲמָרְתִּי גִּזְרֹתַי Lam 3.54.

[ξηράν] In 37.3 we find תָּבַל rendered as τὴν ξηράν. Is the absence of the definite article here a mechanical reproduction of תָּבַל, which never takes the article? Or is an unspecified part of the earth meant?

39.23) οὕτως ὀργή αὐτοῦ ἔθνη κληρονομήσει,
ὡς μετέστρεψεν ὕδατα εἰς ἄλμην.

*So would His fury take possession of gentile peoples,
as He turned water into brine.*

(B כֵּן זַעַמו גוֹיִם יוֹרִישׁ¹⁸ וַיְהַפֵּךְ לַמַּלַּח מִשְׁקָה:

[οὕτως ὀργή αὐτοῦ] One can recognise an antithetical parallelism between this verse and the preceding one. Note כֵּן positioned right at the beginning of the verse and it refers back to vs. 22. זַעַמו here is opposed to בְּרַכְתּוֹ (22). Just as בְּרַכְתּוֹ, so is זַעַמו *s*. Thus the nom. ὀργή chosen by Ziegler looks better than the acc. ὀργήν chosen by Rahlfs and agreeing with the majority of MSS. Ziegler notes that his choice agrees with אָ, but זַעַמו can be also *o*, in which case the *s* of יוֹרִישׁ would be גוֹיִם and the verb need be rectified to יִירָשׁוּ, i.e. Qal יִירָשׁוּ. There is no grammatical problem with ἔθνη, a n.pl. noun, in agreement with a sg. verb.¹⁹

[μετέστρεψεν] The parallelism with κληρονομήσει, Fut., suggests that this Aor. is not gnomic, but a normal preterite tense, probably with reference to events in the history of Ancient Israel, e.g. the annihilation of Sodom and Gomorrah. By contrast, in וַיְהַפֵּךְ we have a conjunctive form following another Impf., thus not וַיְהַפֵּךְ. Smend (362f.) views יוֹרִישׁ as a poetic preterite *yiqtol*, an analysis which he must be applying to וַיְהַפֵּךְ. Hence his translation – “trieb .. aus, und verwandelte” (II 69). Moreover, into his Heb. text (II 37) he did not incorporate a v.l. הוֹרִישׁ.

¹⁸ In the margin we see הוֹרִישׁ.

¹⁹ On this well-known, notable rule of Greek syntax, see *SSG* § 77 **bh**, a rule that applies even when the *s* is human, e.g. σοὶ ἔσται ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖδιά ‘you will get children from her’ To 6.18 Ⓞ.

39.24) αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὀσίοις εὐθεῖαι,
οὕτως τοῖς ἀνόμοις προσκόμματα·

*His ways are straight to the pious,
by contrast, to the unlawful, stumbling blocks.*

(B) .. תַּמִּים יִישְׂרוּ²⁰ כֵּן לִזְרוּם יִסְתַּלְּלוּ:

αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὀσίοις] This cannot represent (B), but rather אַרְחֻתָּיו אֲרוֹרְתָהוֹן דְּדוֹדֵיקָא, i.e. אַרְחֻתָּיו לְתַמִּים, so Smend 363²². S is close to (B): אֲרוֹרְתָהוֹן דְּדוֹדֵיקָא ‘the ways of the righteous are straight before Him.’

οὕτως [כֵּן] On the rhetorical value of these particles, see our remarks above at vs. 23.

τοῖς ἀνόμοις] = לְזוֹרִים; in BH זר, a rather common word, does not carry religious connotation.

προσκόμματα [יִסְתַּלְּלוּ] The Heb. הִסְתַּלְּלָה means ‘to exalt oneself, to go high.’²³ As against flat, even roads, the author may be thinking of rough roads. S מְתַפְּנִין ‘they turn back’ is obscure. Does that mean that the road of the second category of people, רְשִׁיעָא ‘the wicked,’ is blocked at one point and the walkers are advised to turn back and learn how to walk properly?²⁴ Smend (363) mentions what could be an interesting parallel in עוֹדֵךְ מִסְתַּלְּלִל Ex 9.17.

39.25) ἀγαθὰ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἔκτισται ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς,
οὕτως τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς κακά.

*Good things have been created for the good from the beginning,
by contrast, to sinners bad things.*

(B) ... לְטוֹב חֵלֶק מֵרֵאשִׁית כֵּן לְרַעִים טוֹב וְרַע²⁵:

ἔκτισται [חֵלֶק] The Heb. word may have been read as חֵלֶק with God as *s* understood or as חֵלֶק, an internal Qal passive, which, however, would presuppose a sg. *s*. On this Heb. verb as synonymous with בָּרָא with God as *s* in our document, see above at 10.18, though the masc. pl. טוֹבִים meaning “good things” is unlikely *s*, and that would also result in a case of number discord, i.e. חֵלֶק in lieu of חֵלְקוֹ.

²⁰ In the margin we see אַרְחֻתָּיו ב'. Is אַרְחֻתָּיו ב' an abbreviation of במישרים as an alternative of יִישְׂרוּ? Then to whom does this statement apply?

²¹ In the margin we see בְּמִישְׂרֵיב.

²² However, *pace* Smend there is no absolute need to read the sg., לְתַמִּים and תַּם are at times used as synonymous. Note the parallel לְזוֹרִים. Segal (264, fn. 1) is right in pointing out that תַּם Ex 26.24 and 36.29 is not about moral integrity. But how about תַּם וְיִשְׂרָר Jb 1.1 and תַּם // יִשְׂרָר at Ps 37.37?

²³ In its second occurrence at 40.28 it means something totally different. V.a.l.

²⁴ Smend (363) holds that the opposite is required, apparently assuming that Syr. אֲתַפְּנִי always indicates a favourable action. Could it not be unfavourable?

²⁵ V.l. לְרַע, an error under the influence of the preceding לְרַעִים.

The second hemistich in **ℑ**, roughly followed by **ℑ**, is rather odd: **וְאֵן לְבִישׁ לְעוֹלָא אֶן לְטָב וְאֵן לְרָע** ‘and also for the wicked, whether for the good or for the bad.’ However, this oddity may be taken care of by taking **הלק** as meaning “He distributed”; the evil had a share of both good things and bad things, as in the second hemistich of **ℑB**. This solution would not work with **ℑ**, which rendered **הלק** with **אתברר**, thus **אתבררית לטבא אתבררית** ‘the good thing was, from the beginning, created for the good (people).’ Cf. Lévi (9): “Il a attribué le bien au bon.”

κακά] ἀγαθά missing, God is presented as strictly discriminating.

39.26) ἀρχὴ πάσης χρείας εἰς ζωὴν ἀνθρώπου,
 ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ καὶ σίδηρος καὶ ἄλας
 καὶ σεμίδαλις πυροῦ καὶ γάλα καὶ μέλι,
 αἶμα σταφυλῆς καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ ἱμάτιον·

*The first things a man needs for survival,
 water and fire and iron and salt
 and flour of wheat and milk and honey,
 juice of grapes and oil and clothes.*

... כֹּל אָדָם מִים וְאֵשׁ וּבְרוֹזֵל וּמֶלַח: (Ba)

... הַלֵּב וּדְבַשׁ דָּם עֲנַב יִצְהָר וּבַגְד: (Bb)

πάσης] Abél (8), Smend (II 37), Segal (261), and Abegg restore the word preceding **אדם** as **להי**, which agrees with **ℑ** and basically also with **ℑ**: **רִישׁ כּוּלְהֵין צְבוּתָא דְמִתְבַּעֵן לְחַיָּא דְבְנֵי אֲנָשָׁא** ‘the top of all the things that are required for people’s survival.’ **כל** is found with the second noun in both text forms.

ὑδωρ .. ἱμάτιον] In the Gk list of essentials for human survival there are a total of ten items, whereas the list in **ℑ** is longer by three items. Four of the thirteen represent two gen. phrases in **ℑ** and the only real new item is **ἱμάτιον** corresponding to two synonyms in Syr.: **וְתַקְסִיתָא וְלְבוּשָׂא**. We do not know if any significant difference in meaning exists between these two synonyms. **ℑℑ** uses yet another (!) synonym, **מֵאָנָא**.²⁶

σεμίδαλις πυροῦ] **ℑ** **תְּרַבָּא וְהָטָא** ‘fat and wheat,’ where the deliberate addition of the conjunction **וְ** is to be noted. Abél (8), Smend (II 37), and Segal (261) restore **חֵלֶב חֲטִים**. This cst. chain occurs twice in BH: **חֵלֶב חֲטִים** Ps 81.17 and **חֵלֶב חֲטִים** ib. 147.14; in both cases **ℑ** understands **חֵלֶב** as ‘fat,’ translating it with **שׁוּמְנָא** and identifies there a construct phrase, **שׁוּמְנָא דְהָטָא**, a syntactic analysis significantly different than in our Si passage, where, *pace* Segal (264), **ℑ** ≠ **ℑ**.

²⁶ This Syr. word also means “tool,” what reminds us of Heb. **כְּלִי**, the primary meaning of which is “utensil,” but “garment” at times, see BDB s.v. **כְּלִי** 1 a at the end.

αἶμα σταφυλῆς] Similarly as above in **Ⓢ** עֲנָבָא וְחֶמְרָא ‘grapes and wine,’ where the different sequence of the two components is possibly deliberate – the materials and their product – the reverse sequence in **Ⓣ** is grammatically the only possible one. Cf. דָּם-עֲנָבִים Gn 49.11 (|| יין) and דָּם-עֲנָב תִּשְׁתֶּה חֶמֶר Dt 32.14, where in comparison with our case here **Ⓢ** is interesting: דְּמָא דְעֲנָבָא ‘and I will make him drink the blood of grapes as wine.’

39.27) ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν εἰς ἀγαθά,
οὕτως τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς τραπήσεται εἰς κακά.

*All these are beneficial to the godly,
by contrast they would turn damaging to sinners.*

(B) כל ... לְטוֹבִים יִיטִיבוּ כֵן לְרָעִים לְרָעָה²⁷ נִהפְכוּ:
(M) ... לְזָרָה נִהפְכוּ:

εὐσεβέσιν .. ἁμαρτωλοῖς רָעִים .. לְטוֹבִים] The religious perspective is underlined in **Ⓞ**. **Ⓢ** כִּי־שָׂא .. טָבָא = **Ⓣ**.

εἰς ἀγαθά [ייטיבו ל-] On the idiom ל- [with a person], note הִיטִיבָה הִיטִיבָה לְטוֹבִים Ps 125.4.

τραπήσεται [נִהפְכוּ] Does this Pf. bear gnomic value? It is in contrast with the Impf. יִיטִיבוּ.²⁸

κακά] **Ⓢ** לְטָטָא ‘curse.’ The v.l. לִזְרָא [= M לִזְרָה] occurs as a hapax in לְזָרָא וְהָיָה לְכֶם לְזָרָא ‘and it will become something loathsome to you’ Nu 11.20.²⁹

39.28) Ἔστιν πνεύματα, ἃ εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἔκτισται
καὶ ἐν θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἐστερέωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν·
ἐν καιρῷ συντελείας ἰσχυρὸν ἐκχεοῦσιν
καὶ τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς κοπάσουσιν.

*There are spirits which have been created for punishment
and in their wrath they made their whips tough;
and at the end time they will pour out (their) force
and temper the fury of their Maker.*

(B) ... הָרִים יַעֲתִיקוּ: ... יֵשׁ
(Ma) ... הָרִים יִצְתִיקוּ:
(Mb) ... הֵם יִנִּיחוּ:

πνεύματα] It can also mean “winds,” so *SD*, for instance. In 28d they are referred to with αὐτοὺς, not αὐτὰ, which shows their personal character.

²⁷ V.l. לִזְרָא = (M).

²⁸ According to Van Peursen (2004.74) such a value is frequently recognisable in Si; perhaps due to its high frequency our case here is not mentioned. On the gnomic Perfect in BH, see Rogland 2003.15-51.

²⁹ Then the v.l. is not quite as bad as “alberne Variante” (Smend 364).

With the selection of אֲנִיָּן ‘them’ (fem.) שׁ is consistent with the preceding אֲהִיָּא, a fem. noun. שׁ (אֲנִיָּן) is happy with αὐτοῦς. Also cp. שׁ אֲתַבְּרִי (3f.pl.) with שׁ אֲתַבְּרִי (3m.pl.)³⁰ for ἔκτισται. The same consistency is observable in other verbs and pronouns in this verse. However, Syr. אֲהִיָּא can mean either “spirit” or “wind.” ע begins with the sg. Ἔστιν, which is normal with a n.pl. agreeing with a sg. form, and that is followed with ἔκτισται, but in 28b the pl. forms – αὐτῶν³¹ ἔστερέωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν – are selected as reflecting the reality better. In 28c-d ע consistently prefers the pl.

εἰς ἐκδίκησιν] Not in order to be punished, but to execute punishment.

ἔστερέωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν] The end of 28b in מ, preserved in (M)³² as well, is supported by שׁ: וּבְרוּחָהֶן טִרְאוּ מְהֵרָא ‘and in their fury they root mountains out,’ namely by moving the base of mountains.³³ ע is a story of its own, scarcely reconcilable with מ and שׁ. At the very end, however, they emerge as homogenous to their Maker: τὸν θεμὸν > (דְּמֵן דְּבְרָא אֲנִיָּן) רִוְחָא ‘the spirit of the One who made them.’

In 28c in שׁ the spirits are still hard at work: בְּעֵדֵן רוּחָא תִּלְהִין מְחִוּוֹן ‘at the time of their anger they show their strength.’

39.29) πῦρ καὶ χάλαζα καὶ λιμὸς καὶ θάνατος,
πάντα ταῦτα εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἔκτισται·

*Fire and hail and famine and death,
all these have been created for punishment.*

(B) אש וברד רע ודבר גם אלה למשפט נבראו:
... (M) ... נבראו:

λιμὸς] = רעב, i.e. רָעַב, and ≠ מַבְּרָא שׁ. כַּאֲפָא ‘stones’ is most likely an error for כַּפְּנָא ‘famine.’

θάνατος] The equation with דְּבַר is very common in SG. Cf. שׁ דְּמוֹתָא ‘of death, i.e. causing death.’ How did שׁ arrive at מוֹתָנָא ‘pestilence’? Did the translator find death too severe, though pestilence could be fatal?

ἔκτισται] Though in שׁ there is nothing that would correspond to (B) גם, it has manifestly identified parallelism between this and the preceding verses as shown through its selection of the fem. concord, אֲתַבְּרִי לְדִינָא ‘all of these have been created for the sake of judgement’; out of the three s’s only נוֹרָא ‘fire’ can be optionally used as fem. It is odd that שׁ should

³⁰ This Syr. noun is of common gender, though mostly fem.; see Nöldeke 1966 § 87, thus *pace* Sokoloff *SL* 1445b.

³¹ Following Ziegler as against αὐτοῦ of Rahlfs, a reading probably making God its referent. Many Gk MSS are inconsistent in this verse as far as the question of concord goes.

³² A fragment discovered by Y. Yadin in 1964 in a cave in Masada.

³³ Note the use of עָקַר in RH mentioned in Jastrow 1108a, e.g. עוֹקֵר הַרִים וְטוֹחֵנָן זֶה בְּזֵה ‘he is uprooting the highest of mountains and grinding them into one another’ bSnh 24a.

use the fem. forms, *הָלִין בְּלִיָּן* .. בְּרִין, though it is only a matter of one letter, for *כלהון* could be an error for *כלהין*.

No Gk MS nor the three versions have retained *גם*, but the authenticity of the latter is in little doubt.

39.30) θηρίων ὀδόντες καὶ σκορπίοι καὶ ἔχεις
καὶ ῥομφαία ἐκδικούσα εἰς ὄλεθρον ἀσεβεῖς·

*Wild animals' teeth and scorpions and vipers
and a sword that penalises the ungodly for perdition.*

וחרב נקמות להחרים ³⁴ ... ³⁵ :	חית שן עקרב ופתן	(Ba)
והמה באוצר ולעת ³⁸ יפקדו:	כל ³⁶ אלה לצורכם נבראו ³⁷	(Bb)
	... ע׳ם ³⁹ ..	(Ma)
	(Mb)

[θηρίων ὀδόντες] The sequence of the components of the construct chain has been reversed: *𐤇* “wild beasts with (sharp) teeth” = *𐤍*. *𐤍*𐤇, probably finding *𐤇* odd, tries to improve on it, albeit in an odd fashion: *שָׁנָא דְחִיּוֹת שָׁנָא* ‘teeth of animals of (sharp) tooth.’ The phrase *חית שן* occurs also at 12.13.

In *𐤇* all the three species of animals are in the sg. Did the Gk translator think that given the scale of human immorality many animals need be around? However, we do note the sg. *ῥομφαία*. In this respect *𐤍*𐤇 is consistent: *שָׁנָא וְעַקְרָבָא וְאַכְדָּנָא* ‘teeth of animals of (sharp) tooth and scorpions and snakes’ || *שָׁנָא וְעַקְרָבָא וְחִוּתָא* ‘animal of (sharp) teeth and scorpions and snakes.’

[ἐκδικούσα] The pl. *נקמות* notwithstanding, there is no absolute need to postulate *נקמת*, i.e. *חַרְבַּ נְקָמָת* as the form that was found in the *Vorlage*, as in *חַרְבַּ נְקָמָת נְקָמָתִי* Lv 26.25 (*Ἐ μάχαιραν ἐκδικούσαν δίκην διαθήκης*). Out of a total of 27 occurrences of *נְקָמָת* it occurs in the pl. seven times. On the other hand, in the light of *εἰς ἐκδίκασιν* *למשפט* in vs. 29 the *Vorlage* of *𐤇* may not have had *נקמות*, but *למשפט* instead. Cf. *𐤍* *חַרְבָּא* *דְפּוֹרְעָנָא לְמַוְבְּדוֹ לְרַשְׁעִינָא* ‘a sword of punishment to destroy the wicked.’

[ὄλεθρον] This accords well with *להחרים*. The v.l. *..פט*.. most likely represents *למשפט רשעים* as rendered as *ἀσεβεῖς* is almost confirmed with the remaining three letters of (Ma).

³⁴ BSH finds here a v.l., *להר׳ם*, an error for *להחרים*.

³⁵ BSH finds here a v.l. in the form of *..פט*..

³⁶ There is a v.l., *גם*.

³⁷ V.l. *נבראו*.

³⁸ V.l. *באוצרו לעת*, which Lévi (11) adopts, translating the clause “Et ont été mises en dépôt dans des réservoirs pour le temps fixé.” But how would one account for the use of *המה*? In the text of (Bb), however, the pronoun is needed as the *s* of the nominal clause.

³⁹ So Yadin. BHS reads this as *בם*.. .

(Bb) is not preserved in \mathfrak{G} nor \mathfrak{S} . We may translate it as “All these were created for their needs⁴⁰ and they are in the store-room and will be deposited for the time being.” Smend (366) finds its \mathfrak{G} text in 31b, but blames \mathfrak{G} for two serious misreadings: באוצר > בארץ and לעת > לצרך, and also adds that in LXX ἐτοιμάζω is used to render פקד, but the only instance is Ez 38.8,⁴¹ where, however, the Heb. verb means “to call up for a military operation,” which is irrelevant to our Si case. Moreover, Smend thinks the second hemistich of (Bb) is preserved in \mathfrak{S} in vs. 34, on which see below.

The suf. pron. in צורכם hardly refers to רשיעים in vs. 30b.

39.31) ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ αὐτοῦ εὐφρανθήσονται
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς χρείας ἐτοιμασθήσονται
καὶ ἐν καιροῖς αὐτῶν οὐ παραβήσονται λόγον.

*On receiving His command they would rejoice
and on the earth they would be ready (when they are) needed
and in their times they would not transgress any word (of His).*

:⁴²בצותו אתם ישישו ובחקם לא ימרו פיד⁴² (B
:43:הו... .. (M

ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ αὐτοῦ] The Heb. prep. ב is undoubtedly temporal in value, ‘when He commands them.’ That is certainly possible with ἐν here and must be what the translator meant. However, εὐφραίνω ἔν τινι is at times used in the sense of ‘to rejoice over,’ the prepositional phrase indicating the occasion of joy. This alternative analysis is explicitly impossible in \mathfrak{S} וּבְעֵדָנָא לְהוּן דְּפִקְדוּ ‘at the time when He commands them.’

ἐν καιροῖς αὐτῶν] Difficult to harmonise with בחקם. See also \mathfrak{S} כּל יוֹמֵיהוֹן ‘all their days.’ For the collocation פִּי הַמַּקָּה to take another complement, בחקם, is unusual. This difficulty remains even if we followed Smend (366), who points out קה here means “gewiesene Aufgabe,” “quota imposed from above.” The prep. ב here is hardly one of enmity. Hence \mathfrak{S} sounds natural.

\mathfrak{H} , both (B) and (M), and \mathfrak{S} lack 31b. See above at the preceding verse.

39.32) Διὰ τοῦτο ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐστηρίχθην
καὶ διενοήθην καὶ ἐν γραφῇ ἀφῆκα

*Therefore, earlier on I became convinced
and pondered and left (it) in writing.*

⁴⁰ With “for their needs” we mean “for the time when they will become needed.”

⁴¹ Lv 5.23 mentioned by Smend is irrelevant to our current question.

⁴² V.l. פיהו.

⁴³ So Yadin.

(B) על כן מראש התיצבתי והתבוננתי ובכתב הנחתי:
 ... (M) ...

διανοήθη] On this verb, διανοέομαι, see above at 3.22.

The message that comes through **ש** is vastly different from that of **מ** and **ע** alike: **מ**טוּל דְּמֶן בְּרִשִׁית אֶתְבְּרִיּוֹ אֶסְתַּכַּל בְּנִינְשָׂא דְּבְכָתְבָא כְּתִיבֵן כְּלֵהִין הֶלִין ‘because from the beginning (when) they were created people observed that all these are written down.’

ἐν γραφῇ ἀφῆκα] When the author started writing this document, he had at his disposal some ideas already formulated in a written form.

39.33) Τὰ ἔργα κυρίου πάντα ἀγαθὰ
 καὶ πᾶσαν χρείαν ἐν ὥρᾳ αὐτῆς χορηγήσει,
*The works of the Lord are all good
 and He would amply satisfy the need in its time.*

(B) מעשה אל כלם⁴⁴ טובים לכל צורך⁴⁵ בעתו יספוק:

χορηγήσει [יספוק] The *s* of the former can be Τὰ ἔργα κυρίου, but that of the latter cannot be אל; in MH Qal ספק means ‘to suffice,’ which would require מעשה אל as its *s*, what is impossible because of the number concord as manifest in כלם טובים, m.pl. Hence Segal (266) proposes reading יספיקו.⁴⁶ Note also **ש**כל צבו לזבנה אַתְבְּרִיּוֹת > נון יספוק נ **ש** ‘He would supply,’ but **ש**כל צבו לזבנה אַתְבְּרִיּוֹת ‘and every thing was created for its time’! The orthographic fluctuation of nouns ending with a seghol followed by ה like מעשה is evident in כל מעשה כל מעשה מה נורא מעשי ‘all the works of God, two two’ Si 36.15 and מה נורא מעשי ‘How awesome are the deeds of the Lord’ 43.2.

39.34) καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν Τοῦτο τούτου πονηρότερον,
 πάντα γὰρ ἐν καιρῷ εὐδοκιμηθήσεται.
*One should not say “This is worse than this,”
 for all would be appreciated for its value in their time.*

(B) אל⁴⁷ לאמר זה רע מה זה⁴⁸ כי הכל בעתו יגבר⁴⁹:

οὐκ] In QH we find only one instance of אל negating an inf. cst.: אל רע עמך ונחלתך ואל ללכת איש בשרירות לבו הרע ‘Do not abandon Your people and Your inheritance and do not allow for anyone to walk in the

⁴⁴ V.I. הכל.

⁴⁵ V.I. צורך. On the orthography and pronunciation of segholate nouns of the *qutl* pattern in QH, see Qimron 2018.331-34 (§ E 2.5-2.5.5).

⁴⁶ One could also suggest יספקו, i.e. יספיקו.

⁴⁷ V.I. אין.

⁴⁸ V.I. מזה.

⁴⁹ V.I. יגבר.

stubbornness of his evil heart' 4Q393 3.3, 4, where the parallelism with the standard combination is to be noted.⁵⁰ *Pace* Van Peursen (1999.229f.) we are inclined to prefer the v.l. here, אִין.

Τοῦτο τούτου πονηρότερον] = v.l. and § הָנָא בִּישׁ מִן הָנָא. See also at vs. 21.

In § 34b is slightly expansive: מְטוּל דְּכִלְהוֹן קְפִיסִין בְּאַוְצָרָא וְלַעֲדָן וּבְנֵהוּן מְתַנְבְּרִין 'because all of them are collected in the store-rooms and at the arrival of their time they become strong.'

39.35) καὶ νῦν ἐν πάσῃ καρδίᾳ καὶ στόματι ὑμνήσατε
καὶ εὐλογήσατε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.

*And now with the heart and mouth of everyone adore
and bless the name of the Lord.*

(B) עֲתָה בְּכָל לֵב וּפֶה הַרְנִינוּ וּבִרְכּוּ אֵת שֵׁם הַקְּדוֹשׁ⁵¹:

πάσῃ] The word πᾶς going with an anarthrous sg. noun means either "every single" or "any," e.g. ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ 'in every single place' Ma 1.11 and παντὸς πράγματος ἀκαθάρτου 'any unclean thing whatever' Le 5.2, but it does not mean "whole."⁵² Thus *pace*, e.g. "with a whole heart and mouth" (*NETS*) and "mit ganzem Herzen und Mund" (*SD*). A rare exception is καὶ προσῆλθεν πᾶσα συναγωγὴ (Ⲙ ⲗⲉⲕⲉⲗⲉ) Le 9.5.⁵³

καὶ στόματι .. κυρίου] § בְּרַכּוּ לְאֱלֹהֵא וְשַׁבְּחוּ לְשֵׁמָה § 'bless God and praise His name.'

τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου [שֵׁם הַקְּדוֹשׁ] The Heb. phrase here is unusual. The literal translation is 'the name of the Holy One,' so Ryssel (428) and Smend (II 70) "den Namen des Heiligen." What is unusual here is the use of the adjective substantivised and applied to God. Is it an error for שְׁמוֹ הַקְּדוֹשׁ? *Pace* Lévi (13) "son nom saint" is impossible for (B) or the v.l., שֵׁם קְדוֹשׁ, a phrase attested in בְּטָהֳנוּ כִּי בְשֵׁם קְדוֹשׁוֹ בְּטָהֳנוּ (> Ⲙ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ ἠλπίσασμεν) Ps 33.21, see also ib. 103.1, 105.3, 145.21.

⁵⁰ See *SQH* § 40 i.

⁵¹ V.l. קְדוֹשׁ.

⁵² Cf. *GELS* s.v. πᾶς II a, c, d.

⁵³ Many MSS read πᾶσα ἢ συναγωγή.

CHAPTER 40

40.1) Ἀσχολία μεγάλη ἔκτισται παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ
καὶ ζυγὸς βαρὺς ἐπὶ υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ
ἀφ’ ἡμέρας ἐξόδου ἐκ γαστρὸς μητρὸς αὐτῶν
ἕως ἡμέρας ἐπιστροφῆς εἰς μητέρα πάντων·

*A very demanding task has been created for every person
and a heavy yoke on the descendants of Adam
from the day of their exit out of their mother’s womb
till the day of return to everybody’s mother.*

(Ba) עסק גדול חלק אל¹ ועול כבד על בני אדם:
(Bb) מיום צאתו מרחם אמו עד יום שובו אל אם² כל חי:

Ἀσχολία] אַמְינוּתָא שְׁנא ‘constancy’; what is meant is probably that our life is constant involvement in diverse tasks. שְׁנ focuses on the amount and extent of it: אַבְוּתָא רַבְרְבָתָא ‘very many affairs.’ Note 3M 5.34 and a related verb, אַשְׁחַלְעוּ, used in 39.1.

ἔκτισται] On the interpretation of חלק as synonymous with ברא, see above at 7.15. Note שְׁנא אַבְוּתָא.

ζυγὸς βαρὺς] This follows עול כבד closely, whereas גַּבְוָתָא תְּקִיפָא ‘strong kinds’ in שְׁנ is not easy to harmonise with חֲמָא. The translator may still have עסק in mind, hence “hard, challenging kinds of tasks.”

μητρὸς αὐτῶν] = שְׁנ. The pl. is more logical in view of the preceding υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ בני אדם. The same holds for שובו. “Mother” here is literally meant, but scarcely with μητέρα in the next line. The author most likely had in his mind בְּזַעַת אֶפְיָהּ תֹאכַל לֶחֶם עַד שׁוֹבֶהָ אֶל־הָאֲדָמָה כִּי מִמֶּנָּה לָקַחְתָּ כִּי־עָפָר אֲתָה Gn 3.19 and עָרַם יְצָתִי [יְצָאתִי] מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי וְעָרַם אֶשׁוּב שָׁמָּה Jb 1.21.³ The identification of the earth as mother is unique and unknown to the OT. It reminds one of the notion of “mother earth” in the Greek thought.⁴ About a century and a half later Philo of Alexandria would emerge, having learned the Greek culture and language in depth. Already at the time of Ben Sira the Jewish intelligentsia in the Hellenistic diaspora may have shown interest in the dominant Greek culture. The selection of εἰς as a rendering of אֶל indicates that חֲמָא is talking about death and burial into the ground.

¹ V.l. עליון.

² V.l. אל.

³ On this verse, cf. Dhorme 1967.13.

⁴ Cf. Lévi 14.

μητέρα πάντων **אם כל הי**] Whilst the Heb. phrase is applied by Adam to Eve (Gn 3.20), our author and his translator were scarcely thinking of Eve.

40.2) τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ φόβον καρδίας,
ἐπίνοια προσδοκίας, ἡμέρα τελευτῆς.

*Their reflections and fear of (their) heart,
thoughts on the future anticipated, the day of death.*

The text begins with two substantives in the acc., which cannot be construed with any transitive verb nearby,⁵ and then two substantives, probably in apposition, follow in the nominative. This highly anomalous syntax shows that this verse, which is absent in **ℋ** and **ℒ**,⁶ does not belong here, although its general thought carries on the mention of death at the end of the verse 2.

40.3) ἀπὸ καθημένου ἐπὶ θρόνου ἐνδόξου
καὶ ἕως τεταπεινωμένου ἐν γῆ καὶ σποδῶ,

*From one seated on a prestigious throne
to someone humiliated, (grovelling) in dust and ashes,*

(B) מְיוֹשֵׁב⁷ כִּסֵּא לְגַבָּה עַד לְשׁוֹב⁸ עֵפֶר וְאֶפֶר:

τεταπεινωμένου] Among a long list of Heb. equivalents of ταπεινώω⁹ there is none which contains **ב** and **שׁ** in whichever sequence. Smend (369) suggests **וְאֶפֶר בַּעֲפֹר** as an alternative reading. Whilst this Gk verb translates in LXX √חפש several times, **שׁ** governed with **בַּעֲפֹר וְאֶפֶר** sounds odd. **ℒ** reads **וְתָבִי** as in 3a. **שׁוֹב** ‘to return’ makes little sense here. Reading **לִישׁב**, i.e. **לִישׁב**, instead of **לְשׁוֹב** suggests itself.

Vs. 3b is best understood as a figurative expression, not to be taken literally.

40.4) ἀπὸ φοροῦντος ὑακίνθινον καὶ στέφανον
καὶ ἕως περιβαλλομένου ὠμόλινον

*from one who wears a blue-coloured (garment) and crown,
and up to one who puts on a garment of coarse linen.*

(B) מְעוֹטָה צְנִיף וְצִיץ וְעַד עוֹטָה¹⁰ שְׁמֵלָה ...

⁵ To account for this syntactical matter Smend (368) refers to 26.5, where, however, διαβολὴν κ.τ.λ. can be construed with the immediately preceding ἐφοβήθη.

⁶ *Pace Lévi* (15) it is extremely difficult to relate the current **ℒ** to **ℋ**. **ℒ** reads **תְּשׁוּבוֹתָהוֹן וְדַמְיוֹתָהוֹן** ‘their praise and the thought of their heart and the end of their words until the day of their death.’ Lévi (14) renders **תְּרַעֲיָתָא** ‘la crainte,’ which is questionable.

⁷ V.l. **מְשׁוֹכֵן**.

⁸ V.l. **לְשׁוֹב** and **לְשׁוֹב**, neither of which makes any sense.

⁹ See *Index* 116a.

¹⁰ V.l. **עוֹטָה**; **עוֹטָה** is just a *defectiva* spelling in lieu of **עוֹטָה**, i.e. **עוֹטָה**.

Cf. **⚙**: מִן קִטְרֵי תְּנָא וְעִדְמָא לְאַלְיִין דְּלִבְיִשִׁין דְּכֹשָׁא דְּמִסְכְּנֹתָא ‘from those who wear a crown up to those who are clothed with clothes of poverty.’ If (B) **⚙** stood in their respective *Vorlage* of **⚙** and **⚙**, we see here quite a departure from **⚙** “turban and rosette.” Segal (268) notes that these were worn by a high priest.

40.5) θυμὸς καὶ ζῆλος καὶ ταραχὴ καὶ σάλος
καὶ φόβος θανάτου καὶ μηνίαμα καὶ ἔρις.
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἀναπαύσεως ἐπὶ κοίτης
ὑπνος νυκτὸς ἀλλοιοῖ γινῶσιν αὐτοῦ·

*anger and jealousy and apprehension and anxiety
and the fear of death and fury and strife.
And at the time of resting in bed
a sleep at night changes what he knew.*

(Ba) אַךְ קִנְיָא דִּאֲנָה וּפְחַד אִימַת מוֹת תְּהִרָה...¹¹
(Bb) וְעַת נֹחֻו עַל מִשְׁכְּבוֹ שִׁנַּת לַיְלָה תְּשַׁנָּה¹²

θυμὸς καὶ] = אַךְ = **⚙**. אַךְ here most likely signifies “only.” אַךְ seems to fit the context better.

μηνίαμα] Since תְּהִרָה is unknown to Heb. תְּחַרָּה, i.e. תְּחַרָּה in the v.l. need be accepted.

καὶ ἐν καιρῷ] ב is anticipated: וּבְעֵצָה. So καὶ πρὸ καιροῦ κοιμήσεως: וְעַת נֹחֻו עַל מִשְׁכְּבוֹ. We encounter an exactly identical syntagm in וְעַת נֹחֻו עַל מִשְׁכְּבוֹ וּבְזִבְנָא דְּמִתְנִיחַ וְגוֹ. **⚙** 46.19, and analogously in **⚙** וּבְזִבְנָא דְּמִתְנִיחַ וְגוֹ. Fassberg (1997.66, fn. 56) mentions עַת לְדִתְנָה Jb 39.2, sim. 39.1, though here we have a different syntagm, since עַת introduces a direct *o* of the verb לְדִתְנָה, and not a temporal, adverbial phrase.

ὑπνος] Nöldeke’s¹³ suggestion that the spelling שִׁנַּת reflects a later Aramaic pronunciation שִׁנַּת¹⁴ is questionable. In QH a *plena* spelling such as מִיתִים 1QIsa^a 8.19 (MT מִתִּים) is a commonplace.¹⁵

ἀλλοιοῖ] Another example of this equation occurs at 33.6.

40.6) ὀλίγον ὡς οὐδὲν ἐν ἀναπαύσει,
καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ἐν ὑπνοῖς ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κοιτᾷ
τεθορυβημένος ἐν ὄρασει καρδίας αὐτοῦ
ὡς ἐκπεφευγὼς ἀπὸ προσώπου πολέμου·

¹¹ V.l. מִ תְּחַרָּה וְיִבְּ.

¹² V.l. תְּ רַעְתָּ. Abegg reads תְּ דַעְתָּ = **⚙**. Cf. Smend (II 70): “verdoppelt der nächtliche Schlaf sein Unglück,” but does Heb. תְּשַׁנָּה ever mean “to double”?

¹³ Mentioned in Smend ad loc., but we have no bibliographical information.

¹⁴ E.g. שִׁנַּתְהוּן ‘their sleep’ Si 40.8.

¹⁵ Cf. Qimron 2018.67f.

*When resting, it is as little as nothing,
and because of that, in sleep it is like toiling in the daytime,
totally confused about what his mind is seeing
like one who has run away from a battle front.*

(Ba) מעט לרוק¹⁶ כרגע ישקוט ומבין בְּחַלְמוֹתָהּ ..ש:

(Bb) מַעַט טַע מַחְזוֹן נַפְשׁוֹ כַּשְׂרִיד בֵּ... .. רודף:

κοπιᾶ] First suggested by Smend (370) and accepted by Ziegler contrary to σκοπίας ‘of watch-out’ preserved in many MSS.

τεθορυβημένος] ≠ מַעַט טַע, which by itself is difficult to understand in this context.

ἐκπεφευγώς] The person concerned has managed to leave the battle front as against MS 248 ἐκφυγών ‘deserter’; the Pf. ptc. is closer to שריד. S is closer to ἐκφυγών: אִיךְ גַּבְרָא דְעָרַק מִן קָדָם דְרֹדְפָא ‘like a man who runs away from the pursuer.’

40.7) ἐν καιρῷ χρείας αὐτοῦ ἐξηγέρθη
καὶ ἀποθαυμάζων εἰς οὐδένα φόβον.

*When he still needed (more) sleep, he became awake
and astonished to see that there was nothing to fear.*

(B) ... עוֹדךְ ... מְנוֹם:

χρείας] Preferred by Smend, Rahlfs, and Ziegler over σωτηρίας found in all MSS.

The message is rather vague in S: אִיךְ צְבֻנָא בְּלִבָּהּ מְתַעִיר וְחָזָא דְלִית בָּהּ: מְדָם ‘like the wish in his heart he wakes up and sees that there is nothing in it.’

40.8) μετὰ πάσης σαρκὸς ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους,
καὶ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἑπταπλάσια πρὸς ταῦτα·

*With every animate being from a human down to an animal,
and with sinners seven times more than with them are*

17:.... (B)

Cf. S עִם כְּלֵהוֹן בְּנֵי בְּסָרְא צַפְתְּהוֹן עֲמָהוֹן וְעוֹתְרָא מְגֹד שְׁנַתְהוֹן ‘with all animate beings their worry is with them and wealth drives their sleep away.’ The first clause takes care of the syntactically loose construction of 8a in S, where we miss its *s*. Strictly speaking, our English translation above is not logical, since some of the items mentioned in the next verse do not apply to animals, and τοὺς ἀνόμους in vs. 10 applies only to human beings.

¹⁶ V.I. חֶלֶק. לְרִיק. Is 49.4 and Jb 39.16 or לְרִיק Lv 26.16, 20, Is 65.23.

¹⁷ V.I. ... עָם כָּל בֵּ... .. אָף עָם.

40.9) θάνατος καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἔρις καὶ ῥομφαία,
ἐπαγωγαί, λιμὸς καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μάστιξ.

*death and murder and quarrel and armed conflict,
disasters, famine and wounding and punishment.*

(B) דָּבָר וּדְם חָרָהּ וְחָרָב שֶׁד וְשִׁבְרָה רָעָה וּמוֹת:

θάνατος] The equation θάνατος / דָּבָר occurs as often as 37 times in LXX, e.g. μήποτε συναντήσῃ ἡμῖν θάνατος ἢ φόνος אוֹ בְּחָרָב אוֹ בְּדָבָר Ex 5.3. But the Heb. verse here ends with מוֹת as the worst of eight phenomena.

ἐπαγωγαί שֶׁד [= שֶׁד]] the only instance in LXX of this equation.

ליμὸς שִׁבְרָה] an equation unknown in LXX.

Cp. the list in S1): מוֹתָא וְחִרְיָא וְסִיפָא וְדָמָא חוּסְרָא כַּפְנָא וְשִׁחְקָא וְנִגְדָא ‘death and strife and armed conflict and murder, damages, famine and censure and wound.’

Ⲙ presents a list of eight terms in four pairs, each pair having two terms joined with the conjunction Ⲁ. We cannot recognise any semantic, notional reason for each pair.¹⁸ With the exception of the last pair, each of the other three pairs consists of two terms both beginning with an identical consonant.¹⁹ We see the last pair playing a naughty boy – Ⲁ coupled with ⲙ and following ⲱ.

We see that it is quite a challenge to equate the eight terms between Ⲙ and Ⲙ. Cf. Smend 371f.

40.10) ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνόμους ἐκτίσθη ταῦτα πάντα,
καὶ δι’ αὐτοὺς ἐγένετο ὁ κατακλυσμός.

*For the unlawful were all these created
and because of them the flood occurred.*

(B) עַל רָשָׁע נִבְרָאָה רָעָה וּבִעְבוּר תְּמוּשׁ כֻּלָּהּ:

... (M) ... וְאֵשׁ כֻּלָּהּ:

ταῦτα πάντα] summarising the preceding discourse in vs. 9, whereas Ⲙ רָעָה focuses more specifically on the nature of diverse manifestations. Since God cannot be the creator of wickedness, the word here must signify ‘disaster, calumny, hardship’ or some such thing. It is difficult to assume that Ⲙ represents רָעָה .. כֻּלָּהּ, because vs. 10 is not preceded by a f.sg. noun which could be referred to by the suf. pron. of the former and would concord with

¹⁸ Cf. SSG § 78 f, i.

¹⁹ On a phonetic parameter possibly determining the sequence of co-referential terms, see Muraoka 1973a.26-29. Also noted by Segal 269 that each pair consists of two words beginning with an identical consonant, and he also remarks that רָעָה is too generic and is to be replaced with רָעַב, i.e. רָעַב, but he says nothing about מוֹת.

²⁰ V.l. וּבִעְבוּר תְּ רָעָה.

נבראה, whereas at the end of the line it could refer back to רעה, should we read it as כְּלָה, and not כְּלָה ‘obliteration.’

ἐκτίσθη] Since the author and translator could hardly be imaging God as “creating, deliberately bringing into being” the eight items mentioned in vs. 9, they must be using נבראה and ἐκτίσθη in the sense of “they came into being,” though not naturally but through human agency, “they became realities thanks to the unlawful (οἱ ἄνομοι).”

In some cases, e.g. murder and quarrel, unlawful people are perpetrators. In some other cases, however, God would not consider them accountable for famine, for instance. Besides, ἐπί τινα is not used with a verb in the passive voice in order to indicate who did the action in question. Its usage here can be referred to *7 in GELS s.v.: “to the disadvantage of sbd [= somebody],” e.g. τὰ πρόβατα καὶ αἱ βόες λοχεύονται ἐπ’ ἐμέ (עָלַי) ‘the sheep and cows are giving birth (adding to my hassle)’ Gn 33.13; ἐπ’ ἐμέ (עָלַי) ἐγένετο πάντα ταῦτα ‘all these things happened to me’ ib. 42.36. Such a usage of ἐπί is unknown prior to LXX, and is most likely under the influence of Heb. על.²¹ We could say that, in not a few cases, the unlawful are victims and victimisers at the same time, suffering practical רעה thanks to their ethical רעה.

The second hemistich, (Bb), is extremely difficult as a Heb. clause, let alone to harmonise it with Ⓞ.²² How on earth it arrived at מכול (κατακλυσμός) is anybody’s guess.

BH uses בְּעִבּוּר a few times as a conjunction, not only as a prep., e.g. בְּעִבּוּר לְעֵדָה Gn 21.30.²³ But in our Si passage it is introducing a subordinate clause, and is it preceded by its principal clause?

Segal (269) prefers reading תבוא for תמוש, but he had not yet seen the Masada fragment (M), which most likely supports (B). For an analysis of תמוש, cf. Rüger 1970.

This verse is also absent in Ⓢ.

40.11) πάντα, ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς, εἰς γῆν ἀναστρέφει,
καὶ ἀπὸ ὑδάτων, εἰς θάλασσαν ἀνακάμπτει.

*All that is from the soil would return into the soil,
and out of waters, would move back into the sea.*

(B) כל מארץ אל ארץ ישוב ואשר²⁴ ממרום אל מרום:
... כל .. מ... ..

In vs. 11b Ⓞ is quite different from Ⓢ, which agrees with Ⓢ. Did Ⓞ’s *Vorlage* actually read ואשר ממים אל ים? But in 11a and 11b in B alike the

²¹ Cf. JM § 133 f.

²² Cf. Lévi’s (19) desperate attempt, for instance.

²³ More instances are mentioned in BDB s.v. II [עִבּוּר] 2.

²⁴ V.l. ויש’. We are at a loss as regards נכשכון or נכשכון written in the margin vertically.

origin and the final destination are identical. Then we would expect ואשר מים אל מים. Smend (372) opines that the translator misread מרום as מים, but twice?

40.12) Πάν δωρον καὶ ἀδικία ἐξαλειφθήσεται,
καὶ πίστις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα στήσεται.

*Every bribery and injustice would be obliterated,
but honesty would remain for ever.*

(M) כל מש... ..

In S rings quite a distinct message: כל מן דחטא ומדגל נבטל וכשירי עלמא: אף הנון נהקמוין skilled ones, too, would survive.'

The Heb. text of the verse is missing in (B).

40.13) χρήματα ἀδίκων ὡς ποταμὸς ξηρανθήσεται
καὶ ὡς βροντὴ μεγάλη ἐν ὑετῷ ἐξηγήσεται·

*Possessions of the unjust would dry up like a river
and as a noisy thunder with rain would die away.*

(B) מחול אל חול²⁵ כנחל איתן ומאפיק²⁶ אדיר בחזיון קולות:
(M) חיל מעול ת...:

The text in C is about the ephemeral, unreliable nature of riches of the unjust, a message that is difficult to recognise in B. As a Greek clause 13a cannot mean “A is like B which ...,” whilst we could retrovert it to a Heb. clause like נבש ייבש עם כנחל ייבש with an asyndetic relative clause, “.. are like a river that would run dry.” Ποταμός here must be referring to a wady in a desert in which water flows only during the rainy season in the Middle East and Northern Africa, but remains dry in the dry season. However, נחל איתן is an ever-flowing river like the Nile.²⁷ It is unthinkable that our author and his grandson should think the Nile, precisely נחל איתן, could run dry. In B we cannot identify what would reflect the two key verbs in C, i.e. ξηραίνω and ἐξηγέω. S, confronted with a difficult Heb. text, may have sought help in C: נכסא דשוקרא אידך נחלא נתגרפון ואידך נהרותא דמלין מן עננא קלילתא: ‘the possessions (accumulated) through lies, like a river, would be swept away and like rivers that become full with thin clouds.’

²⁵ V.l. מחיל.

²⁶ V.l. וכאפיק.

²⁷ This standing phrase is rendered by Smend (II 71) as “ein reissender Winterbach.” For his extensive argument, see Smend 373f. Kaddari (2006.36) defines the word as עז, חזק. Here אדיר is parallel to אדיר.

None of the known meanings of multiple, homonymous substantives has much to do with material wealth. The v.l., מחיל אל חיל, sounds better; חיל in the sense of ‘wealth’ is well known in BH.²⁸ In 5.1 we see this Gk substantive, χρῆμα, used to render חיל. So also in vs. 26 below. ש נכסא דשוקרא then reflects the (M) חיל מעול and note חילך rendered as נכסיך at 5.1. The presence in Ⓞ of ἀδικῶν points to the affinity to (M).²⁹

βροντή] with which אפיק ‘current (of water)’ has nothing to do. אפיק אדיר is parallel to the preceding נחל איתן as shown in the v.l. וכאפיק with the same preposition attached. The selection of βροντή is rather due to the end of the verse, cf. בַּעֲשׂוֹתוֹ לְמַטֵּר חֶק וְדָרָךְ לְחַיִּי קְלוֹת Jb 28.26. On the use of אפיק here Lévi (21) justly refers to יַעֲבְרוּ כְּמוֹ-נַחַל פְּאֵפִיק נְחָלִים יַעֲבְרוּ Jb 6.15. On this Gk word, see also above at 32.26.

On אדיר qualifying אפיק, cf. אַפִּיק אַדִּירִים בְּמִים אַדִּירִים Ex 15.10.

All in all, if Ⓞ’s *Vorlage* was close to the existent Ⓜ, the translation looks rather free.

40.14) ἐν τῷ ἀνοῖξαι αὐτὸν χεῖρας εὐφρανθήσεται,
οὕτως οἱ παραβαίνοντες εἰς συντέλειαν ἐκλείψουσιν.

*As he opens his hands he would rejoice,
by contrast those who transgress (the law) would fail and perish.*

(B) עם עם שאתו³⁰ כפים יגילו כי פתאם לנצח יתם:
(M) עם שאתו כפ... ..

ἐν] *Pace* Lévi (21) this Gk prep. does not necessarily reflect עם; ב- with an inf. cst. can be temporal in value as in העלות הגולה מבבל לירושלם Ezr 1.11. This is the only example in BH, whereas in QH it is more frequent, e.g. עם צאת הקול ‘when the sound rings out’ 1QM 16.8.³¹

ἀνοῖξαι] the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἀνοίγω / נשא. The collocation ἀνοίγω χεῖρα is an expression of donation to a needy neighbour, but the Heb. verb is then פתח, e.g. δόντος σου αὐτοῖς συλλέξουσιν, ἀνοίξαντος δέ σου τὴν χεῖρα τὰ σύμπαντα πλησθήσονται χρηστότητος < תמן תוב ישבועון ידך תפתח להם ילקטון תפתח ידך ישבעון טוב Ps 104(103).28. By contrast, נשא כפים is a posture of prayer, but the Gk verb used is αἴρω, e.g. ἄρον πρὸς αὐτὸν χεῖράς σου περὶ ψυχῆς νηπίων σου < שְׂאֵי אֱלִיו כְּפֵיךְ Lm 2.19. Thus we are faced

²⁸ Cf. BDB s.v. חיל 3.

²⁹ Cf. a discussion by Yadin 1965.14. Lévi had preferred the v.l., מחיל אל חיל, saying that the author was using the Heb. word in the sense of ‘wealth’ as well as ‘violence’, and rejecting a rectification proposed to read מעול מחיל. We doubt that the Masada scribe ventured a meaningless correction. Besides, as Smend (373) justly points out, חיל never means ‘violence.’

³⁰ V.l. עם שאתו.

³¹ For more examples, see SQH § 18 k (p. 120).

with an odd rendering. The introduction at this point of the notion of generous charity donation sounds abrupt and odd. It is here being assumed that the suf. pron. of שאתו is the s of the inf. and refers to a person. But in vs. 13 we have ἀδικῶν, pl., and a substantive in the sg. there is ποταμὸς, but a river does not pray nor give out charities. With his “Mit seinem Schwall werden Felsen fortgerissen” (II 71) Smend takes the suf. pron. as referring to נחל (vs. 13). He further reconstructs the text as כַּפִּים יִגְלוּ (or) יִגְלוּ (or) יִגְלוּ. Does נָשָׂא really mean “to swell”? We are not aware of Qal נָשָׂא as an intransitive verb. As questionable is “in its rising” (Skehan - Di Lella 463).

εὐφρανθήσεται [יגילו] The Heb. pl. form may be impersonal. Reymond (2021.264-66) tries hard to derive the form from גלל/√, but when it can be analysed as a form of גיל/√ as in Ⓞ, there is no need for such an effort.³² Besides, his “when it (the wadi) rises” for שאתו is dubious; where do you find נָשָׂא qal in the sense of “to rise”?

οὕτως] = כן, i.e. כן. On the rhetorical use of this pair in antonymic parallelism, see above at 39.23. It recurs in vss. 24, 25, 27.

οἱ παραβαίνοντες] cannot be reflecting פתאים ‘all of a sudden’ nor פתאים ‘the simple-minded,’ which, even in sensu malo, is far removed from ‘transgressors of the law.’

συντέλειαν] This hardly reflects לנצח ‘for eternity,’ but rather part of doublet translation of יתם along with ἐκλείψουσιν, and that in spite of the number discord.

Ⓢ cannot be shorter: כִּד הַנּוֹן גְּלִיזוֹן נִגְמְרוֹן ‘when they are robbed, they would exist no more.’ By contrast, Ⓢ has a long insertion between 14a and 14b: וְהַיְמִינוּתָא לְעֵלְמָא תְּקוּם. מְרִהָטָא דְּעוֹלָא אִךְ נִהָרָא נִאֲבָשׁוּן ‘and the faith would stand for ever, (but) the possessions of the wicked would dry up like a river,’ where the second clause is the same as 13a.

40.15) ἔκγονα ἀσεβῶν οὐ πληθυνεῖ κλάδους,
καὶ ῥίζαι ἀκάθαρτοι ἐπ’ ἀκροτόμου πέτρας·

*The offspring of the impious would not increase branches,
and unclean roots are (hanging) on a sharp rock.*

(B) נוצר מחמס לא ינקה כי שורש חנף על שן סלע³³:
(M) נצר חמס לא י... .. עַל ... צר:

ἔκγονα] The neuter gender notwithstanding, it is likely referring to human descendants. Cf. Ⓢ בני בְּנֵיָא דְּרְשִׁיעָא: ‘the grandchildren of the wicked.’

Ⓞ apparently parsed נוצר or נצר as Ni. ptc., whereas in BSH the former is Ni. Pf. of יצר and the latter is a substantive, נִצֵּר. Yadin’s (1965.40) translation,

³² Cf. also Kister 1990.347f.

³³ V.l.: נצר חמס לא יכה בו ושורש חנף ען שן צור.

however, is questionable: “a branch sprung from violence.” The word does not refer to what is visible of a tree above the ground in the air, but what grows, shoots out from its root.

In vs. 15a **ש** is harsher than **ט**: **וְהָלְפָא לְאַנְשָׁא רְשִׁיעָא לָא תְהוּא** ‘and for wicked people there would be no descendant.’

עַל-שֵׁן-סֶלַע Jb 39.28, see also 1Sm 14.4.

(B) could be translated as “That which is produced from violence could not become clean, for a profane root is on a cliff.”³⁴ The v.l. is difficult. **יכה** (B) might be an error for **יכה בו שורש**,³⁵ but if **בו** refers to a river, a tree does not strike a root in a river nor does a branch strike a root.

40.16) ἄχι ἐπὶ παντὸς ὕδατος καὶ χείλους ποταμοῦ
πρὸ παντὸς χόρτου ἐκτιλήσεται.

*Reed-grass by every waterway and river-bank
would be plucked away ahead of every grass.*

(B) כקדמות על גפת נחל מפני³⁶ כל מטר נדעכו³⁷:
(M) כקרמית על גפות נחל ... חציר נדעך:

[**אחי**] Yadin (1965.14) argues for the authenticity of **קרמית** (M) ‘reed-stalks’ (40).

The preposition **כ** is not represented in **ט**. Cf. **אֵךְ הַבְּלָבְלָא** ‘like creeping grass.’

[**χείλους**] The selection of the sg. is probably under the influence of the preceding **ὕδατος**, for which there is no equivalent in **ט**; “banks of a river” is more natural, so (M). **גפת** can be read as **גפת**.

[**πρὸ**] = **ש קדם**, also = v.l.

[**חόρτου**] = (M) **חציר** and **ש יורק** ‘herb,’ but ≠ (B) **מטר** ‘rain,’ a mere scribal error; rain helps drying grass (Smend 375).

[**ἐκτιλήσεται**] with **אחי** as the *s*. But because of the attached preposition **כ** the corresponding **נדעכו** (B) and **נדעך** (M) present a syntactic problem. The *s* is most likely **קרדמות** or **קרמית**³⁸ respectively, but they cannot determine the number of the verb following. The pl. sounds more natural, unless **קרמית**³⁹ is a collective noun like **עשב**. There is also a question of gender

³⁴ Smend (375) translates **ינקה** as *Trieb* ‘young shoot’: “Der Gewächs des Frevels hat keinen Trieb.” In BH we find forms of **ינק** referring to young plant or twig: **יִנְקָה, יִנְקָת, יִנְק**. For details, cf. BDB 413.b. But can “Isaac has no servant” be expressed as **יִצְחָק לֹא עֶבֶד**?

³⁵ On this idiomatic collocation, see **וְיָדָה שְׂרָשְׁיָו פְּלִבְנוֹן** אהיה כסל לישראל יפרח בשושנה ויד שרשיו פלבנון Ho 14.6.

³⁶ v.l. לפני.

³⁷ v.l. נדעכה.

³⁸ Yadin (loc. cit.) expresses himself unsure to decide whether the penultimate letter is *yod* or *waw*, but in Hebrew there is no substantive written **קרמה** that would fit our context.

³⁹ Defined in *Maagarim* as ‘a plant used for baking bread.’

discord. We would reconstruct \mathfrak{H} as קרמית על גפות נחל לפני כל חציר נדעכו as קרמית, the first term vocalised as קרמית. The word order < s - o > with so many words in between is anomalous, though.⁴⁰

40.17) χάρις ὡς παράδεισος ἐν εὐλογίαις,
καὶ ἔλεημοσύνη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διαμενεῖ.

*Kindness is like an orchard with blessings,
and mercy would remain for ever.*

(B) וחסד לעולם לא ימוט וצדקה לעד תכון:
(M) חסד כעֵד לא תכרת וצדקה לעד תכון:

χάρις .. καὶ ἔλεημοσύνη] Both could be viewed as indicating God's attributes. But the introduction of such a theological discourse here sounds abrupt. \mathfrak{S} has unquestionably taken the verse with reference to mankind.

The statement about χάρις in \mathfrak{E} represents a substantial departure from \mathfrak{H} "and kindness would not totter (so B; M – be cut away)." Even supposing that \mathfrak{E} 's *Vorlage* was closer to (M) and read כעד as כעדן,⁴¹ the difference still remains considerable. The notion of blessing in the Garden of Eden recurs in vs. 27.

The collocation of חסד with מוט as its *s* or with כרת⁴² as its *o* is unusual. For the latter collocation, however, the following examples are helpful: אבדה האמונה ונכרתה מפייהם Je 7.28, where we are also to note the parallelism between נכרתה and אבדה; לא תכרת; אבדה and אבדה; כרת with שם as its *o* at 41.11.

ἐν] This prep. probably comes under *GELS* s.v. 13 "while undergoing, experiencing" or 14 "being found in a certain state or condition."

ἔλεημοσύνη] Most probably a specific manifestation of mercy by way of almsgiving is meant. On this question, see above at 3.14. \mathfrak{S} (see below) has read צדיק or צדיקים.

διαμενεῖ] \mathfrak{H} presents two self-standing verbal clauses. In \mathfrak{E} we most likely have a nominal clause in the first half of the verse.

\mathfrak{S} expands: וְעָבְדָא דְכַאנָא בְּעָדְנָא מְתַבְרְכִין. וְעָבְדָא דְוִדִיקָא לְעֵלְמָא נְתַקִּימוּן. וְדְמְתַקְרַב לְהוֹן אִיךְ אֲנֵשׁ דְמְשַׁכַּח סִימְתָא 'and the deeds of the just⁴⁴ are blessed

⁴⁰ Yadin's (1965.40) translation reads: "Like reed-stalks on the banks of a stream which are consumed [before any] grass." The non-use of punctuation marks in his translation sometimes leaves a measure of ambiguity. With which verb is this long prepositional phrase to be construed?

⁴¹ Smend (376) is going a shade too far by suggesting that \mathfrak{S} also read כעדן, which he misread as בעדן and Aramaised it, coming out with בְּעָדְנָא. This is a microscopic textual criticism.

⁴² כרת is most likely an error for יכרת.

⁴³ Reiterer (1999.257-61) does not mention any of these three cases.

⁴⁴ Rather than "Et ceux qui font le bien" (Lévi 24).

at the time (of their performance) and the deeds of the righteous would remain for ever and one who approaches them is like a person who finds treasure.’ The two kinds of deeds are differentiated: the former is appreciated when they are performed and the latter is evaluated for ever. \mathfrak{S} makes no such a distinction, whereas \mathfrak{H} accords permanency to both in that (M) uses almost the identical adverbial phrase, כעד .. לעד.

40.18) Ζωὴ αὐτάρκους καὶ ἐργάτου γλυκανθήσεται,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα ὁ εὐρίσκων θησαυρόν.

*The life of a self-employed person and a labourer could be sweet,
but more than both of them is (that of) one who discovers a treasure.*

(B) חיי יין ושכר⁴⁵ ימתקו ומשניהם מוצא אוצר⁴⁶:
(M) חיי יתר שכר ימתקו ומשניהם מוצא ...:

αὐτάρκους καὶ ἐργάτου] This appears to be a little free rendering of יתר ושכר read as יתר וְשֶׁכֶר ‘abundance and wages.’ By contrast B most likely represents יין וְשֶׁכֶר ‘wine and strong drink.’

ἐργάτου is contrasted to αὐτάρκους, as is manifest in Snaith (199) “To be employed and to be one’s own master.” Hence renderings such as “hard-working person” (*NETS*) and “Fleißigen” (*SD*) are questionable.

The phrase יין ושכר is found in vs. 20, and followed by משניהם as here.

θησαυρόν] \mathfrak{S} חכמתא ‘wisdom.’ One wonders whether the Syr. translator felt disappointed on seeing Ben Sira saying that good fortune is better than industry and hard work. But see vs. 19 Ba.

Where does vs. 18 of \mathfrak{S} come from? רבותא ואיקרא נקימון שמא ומן תריהון? מן דמשכח חכמתא ‘the majesty and honour would establish (one’s) name. And better than both of them is one who discovers wisdom.’⁴⁷

The complicated correspondence between \mathfrak{H} B and \mathfrak{S} looks approximately like this:

verse	\mathfrak{H}	\mathfrak{S}
	18a	
	18b	
	19a	19a?
	19b	18b
	19c	
	19d	19b?

⁴⁵ V.l. יותר שכל ‘more intelligence.’

⁴⁶ V.l. סימה, known to RH as synonymous with אוצר.

⁴⁷ We fail to follow Lévi (26), according to whom רבותא is pl. in the sense of “enfants.”

40.19) τέκνα καὶ οἰκοδομὴ πόλεως στηρίζουσιν ὄνομα,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρω γυνὴ ἄμωμος λογίζεται.

*Children and founding of a city make one's name solid,
but an impeccable wife is counted as far more precious than both.*

(Ba) ילד ועיר יעמידו שם ומשניהם מוצא חכמה:
(Bb) שגר ונטע יפריחו שם ומשניהם אשה נחשקת:
(Ma) ילד ו... יצא שם ומשניהם מוצא...:
(Mb) ... י. שאר ...

[ἄμωμος] a free addition. נחשקת here, in our view, means ‘attractive, lovable, desirable.’⁴⁸ This is the first occurrence in Heb. of נחשק. Cf. חֲכִימָה ‘wise.’

λογίζεται] = נחשבת, i.e. נחשבת.

⊗ lacks two hemistichs in the middle, maybe due to the homoiocron of נחשבת. The lacking text is translatable as “and more than both of them is one who finds wisdom. Offspring and plantation would make the name flourish.” In BH neither נטע nor שגר is applied to humans, but belongs to the vocabulary of agriculture and pasturage. Instead of repeating שם (M) selected נחשק in (Mb), a word that applies to humans only. Yadin (1965.15f.) argues that it is the original form of the text. His translation (40), however, does not sound like a counsel of wisdom: “[Young cattle and planting maketh (*sic*)] a kinsman [to flourish].”

Note an equally short version of ⊗: מְבַרְכֵי שְׁמָא וְמִן תְּרִיהוֹן: אֲנִתָּהּ חֲכִימָהּ ‘Building and founding (of a city) renew the name and more (important) than the two is a wise wife.’ The selection of חֲכִימָהּ as an attribute may have to do with חכמה (Ba), and the translator might be thinking of מְצָא טוב אִשָּׁה מְצָא טוב Pr 18.22.

40.20) οἶνος καὶ μουσικὰ εὐφραίνουσιν καρδίαν,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρω ἀγάπησις σοφίας.

*Wine and music gladden heart(s),
but more than both of them love of wisdom.*

(B) יין ושכר יעליצו לב ומשניהם אהבת דודים:

[οἶνος καὶ μουσικὰ] ⊗ חֲמָרָה עֲתִיקָה ‘old wine.’ Why the etymological equivalent of שכר has not been selected is not clear.⁴⁹ Cf. יין ושכר אל־תִּשְׁתֶּה (⊗ חֲמָרָה) (ישכרא לא תשתה) Lv 10.9. See also Pr 31.6.

⁴⁸ *Maagarim*'s definition is הִשְׁתַּקַּק ‘to fall in love’; then it is one's wife who is in love with her husband. There are many things that could make a woman desirable, not only devotion to her husband, as Smend (377) seems to think with his “anhänglich, treu” and Dihl (2000.63). Cf. also Ben Yehuda 1808b and Segal 282.

⁴⁹ It is not true, *pace Lévi* (27), that this is the normal rendering in ⊗; once only עֲתִיקָה is used at Nu 28.7, and not only in conjunction with יין, but also שכר on its own is also rendered as שְׁכָרָה at Ps 69.13.

☞ read שיר for שִׁיר, an equation occurring as often as 6 times in LXX, and perhaps the translator was also thinking of the following verse.

εὐφραίνουσιν [יעליצו] Here is the first attestation in Heb. of Hi. הַעֲלִיצוּ.

σοφίας] a strange rendering of דוּדִים ‘friends.’ Possibly indicative of the translator’s dislike of homosexuality?⁵⁰ Cp. שֵׁשׁ רֵחַמֵיךָ רֵחַמֵיךָ ‘the love of a friend,’ which could be equivalent to a subjective genitive or objective genitive, but no question of mutual love.

40.21) αὐλὸς καὶ ψαλτήριον ἠδύνουσιν μέλη,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα γλῶσσα ἠδεῖα.

*A flute and harp accompany sweet melodies,
but more than both of them a rejoicing tongue.*

הַלֵּלִי⁵¹ וּנְבִל יַעֲרִיבו שִׁיר וּמְשֻׁנִּיָּה לְשׁוֹן בְּרָה: (B

ἠδεῖα] Chosen for the sake of parallelism with the preceding ἠδύνουσιν? שֵׁשׁ דְּרָכָא ‘clean’ = 𐤇.

40.22) χάριν καὶ κάλλος ἐπιθυμήσει ὀφθαλμός,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα χλόη σπόρου.

*An eye would yearn after charm and beauty,
but more than both of them the first green shoot(s) of seed.*

... מִיְדוֹ⁵² עֵין וּמְשֻׁנִּיָּה צְמַחֵי שְׂדֵה⁵³: (B

ἐπιθυμήσει] Apart from the fact that this is the first attestation in Heb. of Hi. הַחֲמִיד, it is causative in meaning as well, “to cause (sbd or sth) to love (sbd or sth).” This must have been known to our Gk translator in spite of his selection of the acc. case for the first two substantives. He must have known of course that the m.pl. יַחֲמִידוּ cannot have עֵין as its *s*. All the same, one would anticipate a second direct object as in Engl. *The pianist’s performance made me love Bach all the more.*⁵⁴

χλόη] Many MSS read the acc. χλόην in parallelism with χάριν καὶ κάλλος.

40.23) φίλος καὶ ἑταῖρος εἰς καιρὸν ἀπαντῶντες,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα γυνὴ μετὰ ἀνδρός.

⁵⁰ We fail to see why this is expressive of extreme modesty on the part of translator, as Segal (272) suggests. There is no absolute need to think that the author is carrying on the theme of lovable wife in the preceding verse, thus love between husband and wife.

⁵¹ V.l. הַלֵּלִי.

⁵² BSH reads מִיְדוֹ. The reading presented above is in Ben Yehuda (1959.1609a), Lévi (26), *Index*, and now also so read by Abegg.

⁵³ V.l. שְׂדֵה.

⁵⁴ Hence in an example quoted by Even-Shoshan s.v. 402b וּמְקַמְדִים גְּדוּלִים עֲנַבִּים ‘clusters of big and attractive grapes’ הַפֶּה ‘mouth’ could have been added.

*A friend and a colleague meet each other at an appropriate time,
and more than both of them is a wife with (her) husband.*

... ת. ינהגו ומשניהם אשה משכלת⁵⁵: (B)

ἀπαντωντες [ינהגו] the sole instance of the equation ἀπαντάω / qal נהג. μετὰ ἀνδρός] Even at the expense of ignoring משכלת, **Ⓞ**, it seems, intends to carry on the theme of encounters between two persons highlighted in vs. 23a on the assumption that the reader would take אשה / γυνή in the sense of ‘wife.’ Then the message of **Ⓢ** comes through as vague: וּמִן תְּרִיהוֹן אֲנִתָּא: ‘and more than the two of them a good woman.’

40.24) ἀδελφοὶ καὶ βοήθεια εἰς καιρὸν θλίψεως,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρω ἐλεημοσύνη ῥύσεται.

*Brothers and help are for a time of hardship,
and more than both of them charity could be a rescue.*

אח ... צרה ומשניהם צדקה⁵⁶ מצלת: (B)

ἐλεημοσύνη] In the light of מצלת we anticipate a fem. noun to precede, hence the v.l., הצדקה, a word often used in the sense of “almsgiving,” is to be adopted. See above at 3.14.

ῥύσεται] This represents the analysis of מצלת as a predicative verb. However, this is better analysed as an attributive ptc. Starting at vs. 18 and finishing at vs. 26 we find a recurring rhetorical formula: a proverb begins with a statement about two entities, then follows ומשניהם / ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρω, and except at vss. 19 and 25 this closing part is not a self-standing clause.⁵⁷ The rhetorical nature of this formula is recognisable in the consistent selection of the neut. ἀμφοτέρω irrespective of the gender of the two substantives in the introduction, e.g. in the current case, ἀδελφοὶ (m.pl.) καὶ βοήθεια (f.sg.).⁵⁸ This discord applies also to **Ⓢ** and **Ⓢ**, e.g. both **Ⓢ** and **Ⓢ** יְאִיתָא וְשׁוֹפְרָא ‘charm and beauty’ [f.sg. - m.sg.] vs. 22 / תְּרִיהוֹן ‘they [m.] two.’ Therefore we cannot reconstruct (24a) with certainty: אָח וְעֹזֵר, אָח וְעֹזֵר, or אָח וְעֹזֵר.

As regards the message תְּצִיל מִמָּוֶת צְדָקָה Pr 10.2, also 11.4 and 6 are mentioned by e.g. Lévi (29), Smend (378), and Segal (273). But with its selection of δικαιοσύνη in these passages **Ⓞ** is justified in the light of their context.

⁵⁵ Abegg adds here a long text taken from the margin of the fascicule B: כל ימי עני רעים. In view of “Ben Sira says” this is a mediaeval scribal note, though it is quoted in bKet 110b and bBB 146a. In the margin of (B) there is said to be a note in Persian to the effect that this was not in the original BS, see Smend II 41 and Segal 273.

⁵⁶ V.l. צדקה.

⁵⁷ Therefore Smend’s (379) idea of analysing καὶ as equivalent to גם and taking βοήθεια as an explanatory addition is rather disputable.

⁵⁸ Cf. also SSG § 77 ce.

40.25) χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον ἐπιστήσουσιν πόδα,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα βουλὴ εὐδοκιμεῖται.

*Gold and silver secure one's position,
but more than both of them advice is appreciated as valuable.*

(B) זהב וכסף ... ל.. ומשניהם ... :

[χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον] On the sequence of these two major precious metals, see below at 51.28.

[βουλὴ] **⚡** is a little more cautious with מְלָכָא טָבָא ‘good advice.’

40.26) χρήματα καὶ ἰσχὺς ἀνυψώσουσιν καρδίαν,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα φόβος κυρίου·
οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου ἐλάττωσις,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιζητῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ βοήθειαν·

*Possessions and power could uplift one's heart
but more than both the fear of the Lord;
there is no decrease in the fear of the Lord,
and with it there is no need to seek (any other) assistance.*

(Ba) חיל וכח יגִילוּ .. לב ומשניהם יראת אלהים:

(Bb) אין ביראת יי מחסור ואין לבקש עמה משען:

(Ma) .. שנייהם ... :

(Mb) אין לבקש עמה משען: ..

[ἀνυψώσουσιν יגִילוּ] Though there is no other instance of this equation, ἀνυψώω ‘to uplift’ and Hi. הִגִּיל ‘to gladden,’ it is a reasonable rendering.⁵⁹ Here is the first attestation in Heb. of הִגִּיל; in BH this common verb is used in Qal alone. In vs. 14 יגִילוּ is Qal.

[ἐλάττωσις] Not that the fear of the Lord is subject to fluctuation, increase or decrease, but as long as one fears the Lord, one would not suffer any decrease in one's strength and possessions.

[αὐτῷ] The pron. on its own can refer to either the Lord or the fear of the Lord. The context suggests the latter as more likely, and **⚡** עמה is more likely to be vocalised as עָמָה rather than עִמָּה. Cf. also **⚡** עָמָה, i.e. דְּחֻלַּתָּהּ ‘with the fear of God.’ **⚡** goes on: דְּחֻלַּתָּהּ דְּאֵלֵהָא עַל כָּל מְדָם אֲתַתְרִימַת. **⚡** goes on: אַחַדְיָה בְּרִי וְלֹא תִפְרִיָּה. מְטוּל דְּלִית אַכְוָתָהּ ‘the fear of God rose on everything. Hold on to it, child, and do not let go of it, because there is nothing like it.’

The prep. ἐν here is not locational in value, indicative of a source of support, but *GELS* s.v. 13 “while undergoing, experiencing,” could come into

⁵⁹ יגִילוּ was read by Lévi, now also by Abegg. Smend's (379) יגוללו cannot be rendered “machen jubeln” (II 71). *Maagarim* does not know any instance of Polel of גִּיל ‘to rejoice.’

play and that has been captured by $\text{לִית לְמִבְעָא עִמָּה מְעַדְרָנָא}$ ‘there is no need to look for a helper (as long as you are) with it.’

40.27) φόβος κυρίου ὡς παράδεισος εὐλογίας,
καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δόξαν ἐκάλυψεν αὐτόν.

*The fear of the Lord is like an orchard of blessing,
and more than any prestige it covers him.*

(B) יראת אלהים כעדן ברכה וכן כל כבוד חפתה:
(M) ועל כל כבוד חפתה: ...

αὐτόν] The *s* of חפתה (3f.sg.) is most likely אלהים, but in ח 27a we see nothing that would refer to this Gk pronoun. The *orchard* would make no sense as something to be covered. Though somewhat abrupt, the introduction of *a god-fearing, pious person* is a possibility.⁶⁰

We agree with Yadin (1965.16) that (M) על כל כבוד [= $\text{לְעַל מִן כָּל אִיקָר}$] ‘above any kind of glory’ is superior to (B) כן כל כבוד. The verb חפה used in BH in Qal, Pi., and Ni. requires two entities to complement it: “to place something as a cover (o_a) somewhere (o_b), e.g. אֶת הַבַּיִת הַגָּדוֹל חָפָה עַץ בְּרוֹשִׁים 2Ch 3.5. There is not a single instance where o_b is preceded by על as here. This is meaningful since a verb such as חָפָה is construed with על, e.g. וַיִּכְסּוּ עַל-הָאָרוֹן הַכְּרוּבִים 2Ch 5.8.⁶¹ על in our Si case is undoubtedly different in meaning than the same preposition at 2Ch 5.8. We would suggest that it indicates excess beyond something. In הַגְּדִלְתָּ עַל-כָּל-שְׁמִי אֲמַרְתָּהּ Ps 138.2 the poet is acknowledging that God has magnified and multiplied what He said and promised beyond what His name, יהוה, allowed him to expect.⁶² In our case here the fear of the Lord provided protection beyond what any glorious, prestigious status could guarantee.

40.28) Τέκνον, ζῶην ἐπαιτήσεως μὴ βιώσης·
κρεῖσσον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ἐπαιτεῖν.

*Child, do not lead a beggar’s life;
It is better to die than to beg.*

(B) מני⁶³ חיי מתן אל תחי טוב נאסף ממסתולל:
(M) טוב מני חיי מתן אל תחי טוב נאסף ממסתולל: ...

ἐπαιτήσεως] Being a verbal noun of ἐπαιτεῖν at the end of the verse, it cannot mean ‘act of giving,’ i.e. δόσις. חיי מתן must mean “life dependent

⁶⁰ So *SD* fn. Cf. Snaith: “it shelters a man better than any riches.”

⁶¹ More references are to be found in BDB s.v. כסה 6 and על II 1 a (a).

⁶² See BDB s.v. על II 2 (p. 755a).

⁶³ V.l. בני.

on gifts and donations by others.” The translator of **§** appears to have got confused: **יִלְאָ תְהוּאָ טָב לְמַקְטֵל** ‘one who begs you you shall not turn away.’ What follows also displays quite a distinct perspective: **יִלְאָ תְהוּאָ טָב לְמַקְטֵל** ‘you shall not be good at murdering but be good at helping (him) live.’⁶⁴

[תחי] The verb **יִלְאָ** is intransitive. Hence, in spite of the acc. **ζωήν**, the nom. regens of **מתן** **חיי** is no direct *o*. Traditionally it is called a cognate accusative. Likewise in **וַיִּזְעַק וַיִּצְעַק נְדָלָהּ וּמָרָהּ** Est 4.1 and **וַיִּבְכוּ בְּכִי גָדוֹל** και **ἔκλαυσαν κλαυθμὸν μέγαν** Jdg 21.2.

ἀποθανεῖν] **נאָסָה**, i.e. **נֶאֱסָה** ‘to be gathered’ in the sense of ‘to be gathered with already deceased ancestors,’ a biblical euphemism for ‘to die.’⁶⁵ See also above at 8.7. In contrast to **ἔ** **ἀποθανεῖν**, inf., **ἔ** **נאָסָה** is a ptc. parallel to **מסתולל**.

ἐπαιτεῖν] **ἔ** **מסתולל**. The normal meanings of this Hitpolel verb, “to oppress, maltreat; to exalt oneself, be arrogant” do not exactly fit the context. The same can be said about (M) **הַצָּח**, which has to do with impudence or arrogance. Should we take the fact into account that in the contemporary Jewish society beggars may have come through as arrogant, if they thought they had a right to some financial assistance when almsgiving was counted among three essential manifestations of piety? Neither **מסתולל** nor **הַצָּח** would on its own mean “beggar,” but the preceding clause helps the reader see what the author means.⁶⁶

40.29) ἀνὴρ βλέπων εἰς τράπεζαν ἀλλοτρίαν,
οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ὁ βίος ἐν λογισμῶ ζωῆς,
ἀλισγήσει ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐδέσμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις·
ἀνὴρ δὲ ἐπιστήμων καὶ πεπαιδευμένος φυλάσσεται.

*A man who gazes at a stranger's dinner-table,
his life is not worth being counted as a life,
he would be defiling his soul with a stranger's meals.
An intelligent and educated man should be cautious.*

:אין חיי למנות חיים: Ba) איש משגיח על שלחן זר
:לאיש יודע סוד מעים⁶⁸: Bb) מעגל נפש מטעמי⁶⁷
:למנות חיים: ... Ma) ...
:לאיש יודע⁶⁸ סוד מעים: ... מטעמי Mb) ...

⁶⁴ Pace Lévi (30) “mais soi bon à vivre”; we have here an Afel inf. with causative value.

⁶⁵ Cf. BDB **הָסָה** Niph. 2.

⁶⁶ Cf. Dihi (2021.43f.), who translates the Heb. verb as “to beg,” without explaining how that can be harmonised with the same verb in Ex 9.17, where it is about Pharaoh’s arrogance.

⁶⁷ V.l. מעגל נפשו מטעמי זבד. Apart from **מנאל** as proposed above, this v.l. fits **ἔ** much better.

⁶⁸ V.l. יסוד מיעים.

Mund des Unverschämten klingt süß die Bettelei” (Smend II 72), “he speaks as if begging were sweet” (Snaith 201). However, we prefer taking the noun here as referring to a mouth where one feels a taste. For a shameless person begging is like a piece of sweet, delicious cake. For this analysis of ours we find a measure of support in Μνημόσυνον Ιωσίου εἰς σύνθεσιν θυμιάματος ἐσκευασμένον ἔργω μυρεψοῦ· ἐν παντὶ στόματι ὡς μέλι γλυκανθήσεται καὶ ὡς μουσικὰ ἐν συμποσίῳ οἴνου 49.1, where שם יאשיהו כקטרת does not use the word פה, but הך ‘palate’. Moreover, the equation ימתיק / γλυκανθήσεται is to be noted. Since palate is no organ of speech, we are told that a history about Josiah tastes like honey. In our Si passage here, in spite of the use of שאלה the act denoted by it is not necessarily oral.⁷²

ἀναιδοῦς] In this verse Ⓞ is much closer to (M) than to (B). Hence עו had better be viewed as an adjective, עו, rather than an abstract noun, עו. Then we have a substantivised adjective in the st. cst.,⁷³ equivalent to אִישׁ עו נָפֵשׁ ‘a shameless person.’ The combination of נָפֵשׁ with עו or עו occurs only once in BH at אִישׁ יָדְעוּ שְׂבָעָה לֹא יִדְעוּ שְׂבָעָה Is 56.11. However, in Si we find it twice more: נִפְשׁ עוֹה 6.4 פִּשְׁחָהּ פּוֹנְהָרָא ‘an evil soul,’ 19.3 פִּשְׁחָהּ טוֹלְמְהָרָא ‘a reckless soul.’ This fluctuation in translation might indicate the translator’s uncertainty on this innovative combination in Hebrew. The similarity of our Si instance to οἱ κύνες ἀναιδεῖς τῆς ψυχῆς Is 56.11 is noteworthy, though it does not concern dogs with poor owners. Note Ⓢ הַצִּיפָא ‘audacious, bold,’ sim. Ⓢ גּוֹמְדָנָא. All the same the wording in (B) is not grammatically incorrect. It could be analysed as (a - {b - c}), i.e. a construct chain marking quality as in גּוֹיִם רְשָׁעִים 1QM 14.7 = גּוֹיִם רְשָׁעִים ‘wicked nations.’⁷⁴

⁷² As a student in Jerusalem in the sixties of the last century I often saw beggars in Ben Yehuda St., not orally begging passers-by, but just winking or smiling at them.

⁷³ As regards the syntactic issue concerning adjectives in the st. cst. discussed in JM § 129 *i-ia*, it is to be noted that the alternative structure represented in (B) עוֹה נִפְשׁ, demonstrates that עו in נִפְשׁ is an attribute of נִפְשׁ, not of אִישׁ.

⁷⁴ Cf. SQH § 21 b (xviii).

CHAPTER 41

41.1) ὦ θάνατε, ὡς πικρόν σου τὸ μνημόσυνόν ἐστιν
 ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντι ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ,
 ἀνδρὶ ἀπερισπάστῳ καὶ εὐδοουμένῳ ἐν πᾶσιν
 καὶ ἔτι ἰσχύοντι ἐπιδέξασθαι τρυφήν.

*O death, how bitter is it to be reminded of you
 for a person living quietly with his possessions,
 for a man free from distractions and successful all round
 and still strong enough to enjoy luxury!*

(Ba) חיים! למות מה מר יברך	לאיש שוקט על מכונתו:
(Bb) איש שליו ומצליח בכל	ועוד בו ה'ל לקבל תענוג:
(Ma) ה' ... זכרך	לאיש שקט על מכונתו:
(Mb) ... שלו ומצליח בכל	עוד בו כח לקבל תענוג:

ὦ] (B) probably went for חיים as opposed to מות, but Ⓞ undoubtedly reflects הוי (M). This Heb. interjection may be followed by ל- as in למתפרות כסותות ל- הוי Ez 13.18, where Ⓞ uses οὐαί. Cf. Ⓢ א.

σου τὸ μνημόσυνόν] = M זכרך, i.e. זכרך. B's יברך makes no sense.

τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν] Difficult to relate to מכונה, which Smend (381) says means “Wohnstätte,” a meaning unknown elsewhere, though in Ⓞ at 44.6 we find κατοικία in a rendering of מכונה על שקט; v.a.l.

Ⓢ appears to be under the influence of Ⓞ: לנגברא עתירא דיתב על נכסיה ‘to a rich man who is sitting on his possessions.’

ἀνδρὶ] The prefixing of ל- as in the preceding לאיש would imply that two different types of person are being considered, which is not the case, cf. ביד מושה וביד כול עבדי הנביאים ‘through Moses and through all His servants the prophets’ 1QS 1.3.² We have here then a kind of apposition.³ Unlike Ⓢ, which is = Ⓢ, לנגברא does add the preposition; this translator may have identified two kinds of person, ἀνθρώπων > ἀνδρὶ > לנגברא .. לברנשא, though in that case the addition of the conjunction ו- might have been better as in 1QS 1.3 cited above.

ἀπερισπάστῳ] a rather rare word in SG; the only other occurrence is in Wi 16.11. Did Ⓢ עשינא ‘strong’ have some trouble with this rare Gk word? Cf. also Ⓢ עשין, which is quite distinct from Heb. שלי.

¹ V.l. הוי.

² Cf. *SQH* § 38 e.

³ Lévi (32) sees here an innovation in comparison with BH, but Park (2003.xiii) writes: “Non-repetition of the prepositions or the nota accusativi is much more frequent than repetition in appositional phrases.”

ἐν πᾶσιν] **ש**ה בְּכֹל־מְדָבָר ‘in every thing’ is superior to **ש** בְּכֹל עֵדָן ‘all the time.’

τροφήν] a reading adopted by Ziegler⁴ on the basis of **ח** against τροφήν ‘food’ in all MSS and versions. Both **תענוג** and τροφή can have to do with delicious foods, but not so restricted. Cp. τῶν οἰκιῶν τροφῆς ‘luxurious residences’ Mi 2.9 // Οἱ ἔσθοντες τὰς τρυφάς ‘those who eat delicacies’ La 4.5. As regards our document, see “Do not revel in very much partying (τροφή **תענוג**) so that you may not be begging to cover its expenses” Si 18.32 and “Keep your appetite for every delicacy (τροφή **תענוג**) under control and do not give yourself up to foods” 37.29. Note **ש**ה **סִיבְרָתָא** ‘food’ and **ש** **תְּפִנְקָא** ‘sumptuous foods’ here. Thus **ח** here could mean “luxurious food, gourmet meal.”

41.2) **ὃ** θάνατε, καλόν σου τὸ κρίμα ἐστὶν
ἀνθρώπων ἐπιδειομένῳ καὶ ἔλασσουμένῳ ἰσχύι,
ἐσχατογήρῳ καὶ περισπωμένῳ περὶ πάντων
καὶ ἀπειθοῦντι καὶ ἀπολωλεκότι ὑπομονήν.

*O death, how splendid your rule is
for a person lacking much and with strength going away,
far advanced in age and full of anxiety about everything,
and recalcitrant, and having no patience left.*

האח למות כי טוב חקיקך⁵ לאיש אונים וחסר עצמה: (Ba)
איש כושל ינקש⁶ בכל סרב ואבד תקוה⁷: (Bb)
ע. למות מה טוב ... לאין אוינים וחסר עצמה: (Ma)
איש כשל ונוקש ב.. אפס המרה ואבוד תקוה: (Mb)

ὃ האח] In BH this interjection, **הָאָח**, expressive of joy including *Schadenfreude*, is always preceded by the verb **אמר**.⁸ We may conclude thus that here we have a very personal statement by the author.

καλόν σου τὸ κρίμα ἐστὶν] **ש** **מָא כְּשִׁיר אָנָת** ‘How competent you are!’, competent in dealing with diverse situations.

σου τὸ κρίμα חקיקך] In the margin of B we see, as in fn. 5 below, three words written horizontally, but one above the other. Both BSH and Abegg treat them as three distinct v.l.’s of חקיקך, but neither טוב חוק nor טוב חוק makes sense. We therefore suggest that this is an exceptional case of a clause consisting of three constituents written vertically. Thus we have a single v.l., חוק חוק חוק ‘its rule is a tough rule’ for טוב חקיקך. The selection

⁴ So already Lévi (32) and Smend (381).

⁵ V.l. חוק חוק חוקו.

⁶ V.l. ונוקש.

⁷ V.l. (a): המראה ואבד תקוה; V.l. (b): איש כושל ונוקש בכל אפס המראה ואבד תקוה. where מושל is obviously a scribal error for מושל.

⁸ In *DCH* s.v. **הָאָח** our Si case is carefully noted as exceptional.

of the 3m.sg. suf. pronoun might indicate that this v.l. is an editorial comment, not necessarily meant as a correction, whether inserted by the scribe of B or a reader of B.

חֲקִיךָ is a scriptio plena for חֲקִיךָ, an orthographic practice common in QH.⁹ Cf. חֲקִיךָ (B) // חֲקִיךָ (M) in the next verse.

The attachment of the 2m.sg. suf. pronoun indicates that, as is manifest in the use of the voc., θάνατε, the author is personally addressing the death just as at the start of vs. 1: הִרֵי לְמוֹתָ מִהַ מָר וְכָרֵךְ (M).

The gen. pronoun σου and the suf. pron. of חֲקִיךָ both indicate a topic, “concerning, in the matter of.”¹⁰

ἀνθρώπων ἐπιδεομένων] = לאִישׁ אִין אֹוֹנִים עֲצָמָה, cf. וְתַן לְיַעֲקֹב כֶּחַ וְלְאִין אֹוֹנִים עֲצָמָה, Is 40.29.

ἔσχατογήρω] Here again, as in vs. 1 above, אִישׁ, lacks the prep. לְ. In vs. 1 the same noun, אִישׁ, was rendered with two different Gk nouns (ἀνθρώπων .. ἀνδρί). Here the absence of a substantive in vs. 2c reflects the translator’s understanding that the second אִישׁ is appositional to the first one. ἀνθρώπων is modified by six attributive participles in three pairs, in each of which the two constituent participles are joined with καί – Α καὶ Β, Γ καὶ Δ, and the three pairs are joined with one another as Α, Β, καὶ Γ.¹¹ This neat syntactic structure renders support to וְנוֹקֵשׁ (v.l. and M) as more authentic than וְנוֹקֵשׁ (B). There is no good syntactic justification, either, for the abrupt introduction of the impf. here.

With its אֹוֹנִים לְאִין אֹוֹנִים parallel to חֲסֵר עֲצָמָה M has undoubtedly preserved the right text, but אֹוֹנִים in lieu of אֹוֹנִים.

ἔσχατογήρω καὶ περισπωμένω] a rather free rendering of ἔσχατογήρω “stumbles and gets trapped.” Ἐσχατογήρω is used at 42.8 to render שָׁב, and in M in conjunction with כְּשֵׁל, for which we find κρινομένου.

ἀπειθοῦντι [סָרַב] The Heb. word is a hapax in BH (סָרְבִים Ez 2.6), interpretation of which is disputed. In RH Pi. סָרַב can mean ‘to rebel,’ and sim. Syr. סָרַב. Does אֲפַס הַמְרָאה v.l. in B, sim. אֲפַס הַמְרָה (M), mean “having lost the ability to look forward”? Yadin’s (41) rendering is “devoid of sight.”¹²

ὑπομονήν] Pace SD and NETS this Gk substantive does not mean “hope,” for which ἐλπίς is the standard equivalent, but “strength to endure calmly” (GELS s.v. 1 b). Here we have to do with a somewhat free rendering of תְּקִימָה, whereas Lévi (33) postulates תְּקִימָה.

⁹ For details, see Qimron 2018 § D 2.2.1.1-2.

¹⁰ Cf. SSG § 22 v (xi) and SQH § 21 (xii).

¹¹ On the repetition or otherwise of a co-ordinating conjunction, see SSG § 78 f and SQH § 38 c, g.

¹² Yadin’s (17) view that ἔσχατογήρω may be thinking of הַמְרָה ‘rebellion’ is unacceptable in view of the preceding אֲפַס ‘lack, absence.’

Note § in vs. 2b-d: **לְגַבְרָא דְתַבִּיר וְחֹסִיר נַפְשׁ, גַּבְרָא סְבָא דְמִתְתַּקֵּל בְּכָל עֵדָן**, ‘to a man who is broken and low in spirits, an aged man who trips all the time¹³ and in want of cash and has no power to work.’

41.3) μὴ εὐλαβοῦ κρίμα θανάτου,
μνήσθητι προτέρων σου καὶ ἐσχάτων·
*Do not fear the inescapable death,
remember your past and future.*

(B) אל תפחד ממות חוקיך זכור כי ראשונים ואחרונים עמך;
(M) אל תִפְחַד מִמוֹת חֻקְךָ זָכַר קִדְמוֹן וְאַחֲרוֹן עִמְךָ;

[κρίμα θανάτου] Ⓞ has retained the genitive of topic as in vs. 2, though in Ⓢ the sequence of the two constituent substantives is reversed. In the latter we have what is close to a genitive of quality as in *ממשלת משפט* ‘rule of justice’ 11Q13 2.9.¹⁴ The syntactic value of the suf. pron. of חוקיך is different than in vs. 2, where the suffix pron. refers to death, whereas here it refers to people the author are addressing.¹⁵ Furthermore, in our view it is to be construed with the entire cst. phrase, not with חוק alone: “death is your inescapable destiny.” Cf. vs. 3a in Ⓢ: **לֹא תִדְחַל מִן מוֹתָא מְטוּל דְהוּי מְנַתְךָ** ‘Do not fear death because it is your destiny.’ Cp. **אָבִי שְׂפָחָתִי** ‘the father of my handmaid’ [a + (b + c)] with **הָרַקְדְּשׁוֹ** ‘his holy mount’ [(a + b) + c].¹⁶

[ἐσχάτων] The author is unlikely to be speaking in the strictly *eschatological* sense, but most likely referring to the future of his family after his death. One’s past is a *fait accompli*, and there is but little that one can do about it, but the future is different. Instead of worrying too much about one’s inescapable death, one could do a fair bit while one is still alive to ensure the best possible future for his family. This seems to be the message, what is underlined with עמך.

[προτέρων σου καὶ ἐσχάτων] The two Ⓢ versions differ: (B) pl. vs. (M) sg. The pl. refers to concrete details, whilst the sg. is about the generic concepts, *past and future*.

41.4) τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα παρὰ κυρίου πάση σαρκί,
καὶ τί ἀπαναίνη ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ ὑψίστου;
εἶτε δέκα εἶτε ἑκατὸν εἶτε χίλια ἔτη,
οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄδου ἐλεγμὸς ζωῆς.

¹³ Ⓢ **בכל** here probably means ‘at everything,’ cf. **בְּאַמְרֵי־פִיךָ גְּלַבְדְתָּ בְּאַמְרֵי־פִיךָ** Pr 6.2.

¹⁴ For a discussion with further examples, see *SQH* § 21 b (xviii).

¹⁵ Given the unity of these two verses we disagree with Yadin (41)’s two different renderings of the same Heb. word: “thy de[cree]” (ךָּקְךָ vs. 2) // “thy destiny” (ךָּקְךָ vs. 3).

¹⁶ Cf. *SQH* § 21 c.

*This rule is from the Lord (applicable) to every human being,
and why should you dispute what pleases the Most High?
Whether ten, or a hundred, or a thousand years,
there is no question raised in Hades about (the length of) life.*

(Ba) זה חלק כל בשר מאל ומה תמאס בתורת עליין:
(Bb) לאלף שנים מאה ועשר איש¹⁷ תוכחות בשאול חיים:
(Ma) זה קץ כל ... עליין:
(Mb) לעשר מאה ואף שנים ...

τοῦτο] In BH an attributively used demonstrative pronoun can only follow its determinate noun head as in *הַחֶרֶץ הַזֶּה* Gn 12.7, but MH optionally allows alternative models, e.g. *זֶה שׁוֹר* ‘this ox’ mMen 13.9 and *זֶה מְדַרְשׁ דְּרֵשׁ* ‘this exposition R. Eleazar expounded’ mKet 4.6.¹⁸ This, however, cannot be applied to our case because the intervening *כל בשר* would hang in the air. Then we have no choice but to analyse *זה* as used on its own, not attributively. However, to analyse *τοῦτο* analogously is problematic because we would not anticipate τὸ κρίμα, but just κρίμα, for the text is stating that this rule is divine in origin, a thought which has not been introduced before. The emphasis placed on the divine origin is also indicated by placing it ahead of *πάσῃ σαρκί* as against the word order in *Θ*. The notion of the origin is well expressed by means of *παρά* when it could have been expressed with the genitive of origin; cp. *τὴν διαθήκην μου* Gn 9.9 with *ἡ παρ’ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη* Is 59.21.¹⁹

The selection of the word *חלק* here replacing *חוק* in the preceding two verses with reference to death is to be noted. *חלק* does not mean a decree, decision or suchlike, but “share, portion” conferred or obtained. Cf. our notion of *חוק* as implying a destiny, lot that falls to every man as presented above at vs. 3.²⁰ *מה קץ זה* expresses quite a different thought; on *קץ* see above at 33.10.

τί *מה*] On the use of these interrogatives in the sense of “Why?,” see *GELS* s.v. τίς **II b** and *BDB* s.v. *מה* **2 (b)**.

ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ] In CG and outside of LXX *ἀπαναίνομαι* governs its direct object in the acc. So in Si: *ἰκέτην θλιβόμενον μὴ ἀπαναίνου* 4.4, *μὴ ἀπαναίνου τὴν συμβουλίαν μου* 6.23. The government through *ἐν* here is most likely under the influence of Heb. *מָאָס*, which, in addition to *אָת*, often takes *ב־*. See *καὶ ἀπεώσαντο τὸν κύριον ἐν παντὶ σπέρματι Ἰσραὴλ ἵνα ἴδωσιν ἵνα ἴδωσιν* 4Kg 17.20 as against *ἀπόσατο κύριος τὴν ἐλπίδα σου* *מָאָס* *יְהוָה בְּמִבְטַחְךָ* Je 2.37.

εὐδοκίᾳ *תורת*] For the moment this must remain an odd equation.

¹⁷ V.l. *אין*.

¹⁸ Examples mentioned in Segal 1927 § 411.

¹⁹ For details, see *SSG* § 22 v (iv).

²⁰ Lévi (34) justly refers to *זֶה חֶלֶק אָדָם רָשָׁע מֵאֱלֹהִים* Jb 20.29.

δέκα .. ἑκατὸν .. χίλια ἔτη] The ascending order agrees with the M text.

οὐκ ἔστιν] The v.l. **אין** must be selected for **שׂא**, an obvious scribal error.

In this concluding clause there is another scribal error: **חיים** must immediately follow **תוכחות**, forming a cst. phrase, ‘arguments about life,’ i.e. how many or few years one lived.

ἐλεγμὸς [תוכחות] On this equation note ἀκούσατε ἐλεγχὸν στόματός μου **יפי תוכחת** שְׁמַעוּנָא **תוכחת** Jb 13.6 and τὸ δὲ στόμα μου ἐμπλήσαιμι ἐλέγχων **אמלא תוכחות** ib. 23.4; ἐλεγχος is synonymous with ἐλεγμὸς.

ζωῆς **חיים**] The genitive and the cst. phrase express a topic.²¹

⚡ is extremely short: **מטיל דהדא הי חרתא דכלהון בנינשא קדם אלהא** ‘because this is the end of all people before God.’

41.5) Τέκνα βδελυρὰ γίνεται τέκνα ἀμαρτωλῶν
καὶ συναναστρεφόμενα παροικίαις ἄσεβῶν·

*Sinners' children become disgusting children,
also growing up together in families of the impious.*

(B) **נין** נמאס דבר רעים²³ ונכד אויל רשע:

(M) **נין** נמאס תולדות רעים ... רשע:

Τέκνα βδελυρὰ] It is logical to take this as the predicate rather than the subject.

τέκνα] Since **דבר** makes little sense, M’s **תולדות** restored by Yadin based on ⚡ and ⚡ **תולדותא** deserves preference.

In BH **נין** and **נכד** always occur close to each other, Gn 21.23, Is 14.22, and Jb 18.19, and **נין** always first. Later in 47.22 we find **נין** ונכד. When Abraham was made to swear “השבועה לי באלהים הנה אם-תשקר לי ולגיני ולנכדי,” he must have known which different individuals or group of individuals these two nouns were referring to. But we still do not. *Maagarim* defines **נין** as “a son of **נכד**,” but the latter is defined as קרבת משפחה ‘kinship,’ but you cannot swear to kinship. Nor did our translator, it seems, so that he did not translate **נכד**, being content with a rather free translation of vs. 5b.

It is not clear whether or not vs. 5b is about a separate group of young people or an additional description of τέκνα ἀμαρτωλῶν.

παροικίαις] The dative is not locative in value, but due to συν- of the verb, with which it goes. Semantically this Gk noun has nothing to do with **אוייל**. This is part of the free translation mentioned above.

²¹ Cf. *SSG* § 22 v (xi) and *SQH* § 21 b (xii).

²² V.l. **כי**.

²³ V.l. **ערים**. There is also found a v.l. for the whole of vs. 5a: **כן נמאס דבת ערים**, where ⚡ cannot have **ערים**, דבת, fem., as its s.

ἀσεβῶν] the pl. in parallelism with ἀμαρτωλῶν // רעים. The selection of the sg. רשע is a function of the preceding sg. אויל.

In **℣** the second hemistich does not appear to constitute a self-standing nominal clause, but a second component of a two-member *s*, תולדות רעים ונכד, אויל רשע.

41.6) τέκνων ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀπολείται κληρονομία,
καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν ἐνδελεχειῖ ὄνειδος.

*Possessions of sinful children would perish
and ill-repute would persist with their posterity.*

מבן עול²⁴ ממשלת רע ... זרשע²⁵ ... (B)
ל. תאבד ממשלה ... תמיד הרפה: (M)

ἀπολείται] Preserved in (M) תאבד.

κληρονομία] ≠ ממשלה, what makes little sense if meant in a civic sense, though with its שולטנא **℣** does reflect ממשלה. A better alternative is מורשה, i.e. מורשה, an equation occurring in LXX 6 times.

ἐνδελεχειῖ] The other occurrence in LXX of the equation ἐνδελεχειζω / תמיד is in Si 37.12.

ὄνειδος] = (M) הרפה, cf. **℣** חוקרנא ‘curse.’

41.7) πατρὶ ἀσεβεῖ μέμψεται τέκνα,
ὅτι δι’ αὐτὸν ὄνειδισθήσονται.

*Children would blame (their) impious father
for because of him they would be rebuked.*

אב רשע יקוב ילד כִּי ..לל. ... (B)
... יקב ילד ..גללו היו בוז: (M)

πατρὶ] The rection of the verb μέμφομαι with a dat. pers. is an analogy of verba dicendi (*SSG* § 22 o, p. 137, fn. 1) or it is a dative of confrontation, opposition, obedience or conformity (*SSG* § 22 wi).

μέμψεται] In **℣**, an unvocalised text, we would identify an Ethpa. form, נְתַעְדְלוּן; for in Ethpe. נְתַעְדְלוּן it means ‘they will be blamed,’ but in the former it can govern בִּי to indicate a target to be blamed as here, בְּאָבָא. Μέμφομαι is used as passive only in the present tense, though a few sources do read μέμψεται. But the analysis of בְּאָבָא would become difficult.

ὄνειδισθήσονται] Alternatively ‘they would be insulted,’ so M היו בוז,²⁶ cf. **℣** below and **℣** *sunt in opprobrio*.

²⁴ V.l. מבין ערל.

²⁵ V.l. רישם.

²⁶ Pace Yadin 41: “they suffer reproach.” בוז means ‘disgrace, insult, mockery.’

§ is explanatory: לְאַבָּא עֲוֹלָא בְּנוּהִי כְּאַנָּא נְלוּטוּנָה דְּמִטּוּלְתָּהּ הֵוּן בְּסִירָא בְּעֲלָמָא ‘his impeccable sons would curse their wicked father since because of him they are looked down in the world.’

41.8) οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀσεβεῖς,
οἵτινες ἐγκατελίπετε νόμον θεοῦ ὑψίστου·

*Woe to you, impious people,
who have forsaken the law of the Supreme God.*

... ל.. (B)
... אִשְׁרֵי עוֹ... עוֹבֵי תוֹרַת עֲלוּיִן: (M)

Cf. vs. 8a in § לְהוֹן לְאַנְשָׁא עֲוֹלָא דְּרוּנָא מְלוּנָא לְהוֹן עַדְמָא לְיוּמָא דְּמוֹתְהוֹן ‘Woe to them, wicked people, whose misery accompanies them till the day of their death!’ Vs. 8b is missing in §. For whatever reason § widely departs from ℥ and Ⓞ, in substance as well as in quantity. We present here all the remaining text with our English translation:

אֲנִתְתָּא יִלְדְתָּא לְחִדּוּתָא דְּעַמָּה. וְאַן נָמוּת אַבָּא עֲוֹלָא בְּנוּהִי כְּאַנָּא לָא נְתַאֲבְלוּן עֲלוּהִי. רְשִׁיעָא גִיר חֲרַתָּה לְאַבְדָּנָא הִי. וְשָׂמָא דְּעַבְדֵי טְבַתָּא לָא נְתַטְעָא לְעֵלַם. כְּהַ²⁷ עַל שְׂמֵךְ דְּהוּ גְלוּיךְ מִן אֲלִפָּא דְּסִימְתֵךְ דְּעֵתָא מְטוּל דְּמַבְטַל מְוַהֲבָתָא וְקַיְמָא. כּוּל דְּשָׂאֲלִין בְּשִׁלְמָה וְשִׁתִּיק. הוּ הוּ גְלוּזָא רְבָא. שְׂאֲלָתָא דְּשִׁלְמָא דִּיהָב אַנְתָּ לָּהּ לָא מְפַנָּא לָךְ. גּוּעֲלָנָא דִּיהָב לָךְ אִיכְנָא מְפַנָּא לָךְ ‘a woman, a mother for the joy of her people. If a wicked father dies, his righteous sons would not mourn him. For the end of a wicked person is for ruin. And the name of those who did good things would not be forgotten for ever. Be concerned about your name so that it would lead you away from thousands of your treasures of deception, because it ruins gifts²⁸ and contracts. Whoever greets him, he keeps his mouth shut. He is a great bandit. The greeting you make to him he would not respond to. If you leave a deposit with him, how is he going to return (it) to you?’

On the anarthrous עליון, see above at 7.9.

41.9) ¶ ἐὰν γὰρ πληθυνθῆτε, εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ¶
καὶ ἐὰν γεννηθῆτε, εἰς κατάραν γεννηθήσεσθε,
καὶ ἐὰν ἀποθάνητε, εἰς κατάραν μερισθήσεσθε.

¶ *For if you multiply, that is for perdition, ¶
and if you are born, you would be born for a curse,
and if you die, you would be allotted a curse.*

²⁷ Lagarde’s edition reads אכף, apparently Afel, though no other instance of this verb is known.

²⁸ Smend (385) proposes a correction of מְוַהֲבָתָא to מְוַמְתָּא ‘oaths,’ reasonable in view of אַקְיָמָא, which follows.

(Ba) אִם ... 29 ... יְדֵי אִסוֹן ... הַתּוֹלִידוֹ לְאִנְחָה³⁰:
 (Bb) ׀ם תְּכַשְׁלוּ לְשִׂמְחַת עוֹלָם³¹ וְאִם תָּמוּתוּ לְקַלְלָהּ³²:
 (Ma) ... ל.. ... וְאִם תּוֹלִידוֹ לְאִנְחָה:
 (Mb) ... לְשִׂמְחַת עוֹלָם וְאִם תָּמוּתוּ לְקַלְלָהּ:

πληθυνθητε] Lévi (36) postulates ירבו as a Heb. equivalent, whereas Smend (II 41) adopts תפרו, a v.l. in (B). The latter equation occurs also at 16.2 ἐὰν πληθύνωσιν פרו אִם. The author himself or a later scribe may have had in their mind the commandment to the first human couple: פְּרוּ וְרִבּוּ אֶתְהָאָרֶץ Gn 1.28.

γεννηθητε] A Ni. pausal form spelled *plena*, i.e. תּוֹלִידוֹ, is implausible in this position in the clause. The translator probably thought that an intransitive form is preferable in view of the parallel ἀποθάνητε. If the parallelism played a role in his mind, why should he have added γεννηθησεσθε and μερισθησεσθε? Did he want to differentiate 9b and 9c, the apodosis of which both consists of εἰς κατάραν? We do not know, however, why he rendered לאנחה as εἰς κατάραν. Would he have realised that his translation would not go down very well with young married couples? They would have known that raising children could be at times painful, but would have been shocked and sighed on hearing that they were now cursed with a just born baby in their hands. Even this translator, however, may have thought that his grandfather had gone a shade too far by saying that people would be overjoyed with the news of a miscarriage³³ that had happened to a neighbour of theirs, so 9c was left untranslated.³⁴

μερισθησεσθε] On the meaning of this verb, see below at 45.20.

The text of vs. 9a has been preserved in the Lucianic group. As noted by Smend (383), the conjunction καί opening 9b proves that 9a is part of the original text. All the three lines introduce a conditional clause with a protasis of the pattern < ἐὰν + subj. aor. > and with an apodosis of the pattern beginning

²⁹ V.l. תפרו.

³⁰ V.l. for the whole line: אִם תּוֹלִידוֹ וְאִם מוֹלִידוֹ לְאִנְחָה is obviously an error for תּוֹלִידוֹ.

Pace Lévi (36), who faults מוֹלִידוֹ, which he reads as מוֹלִידוֹ “il l’engendre,” on the ground that the *s* is, in his view, fem. But תּוֹלִידוֹ cannot be but masc., which is quite right, for the *s*'s are male!

³¹ The noun here most likely means “society,” hence not “eternal joy.” Cf. גדולת עולם ‘secular preeminence’ Si 3.18. This is very common in MH and RH, e.g. עַל שְׁלֹשָׁה דְבָרִים הָעוֹלָם ‘on three things the world exists: the Bible, work and charities’ mAb 1.2.

³² V.l. לקללתה.

³³ תְּכַשְׁלוּ, parallel to תּוֹלִידוֹ, is not likely intended to mean “to stumble” physically as one is walking. נִכְשַׁל can be used in a figurative sense of “to fail” already in BH as in וּבְעֵתֵים הָהֵם וּבָנִי פָרִיצִי עִמָּךְ יִנְשָׂאוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חֲזוֹן וְנִכְשְׁלוּ Dn 11.14.

³⁴ Lévi’s view is that the translator was carried away by the antithetic parallelism between birth and death.

with < εἶς τι >. Not only (B), but (M) also consisted of four parts, though the latter has preserved a mere one letter. Vs. 9a, however, is missing from S_h.

No contemporary book-review of our text, alas, has come down to us. Some contemporary readers may have thought highly of Ben Sira being realistic, honest, and frank, but also felt that, at times, as in our verse, he sounds a little too sarcastic.

41.10) πάντα, ὅσα ἐκ γῆς, εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται,
οὕτως ἀσεβεῖς ἀπὸ κατάρας εἰς ἀπώλειαν.

*Everything that is from earth shall depart into earth,
thus the impious from curse to farewell.*

(B) כל מאפס אל אפס³⁵ ישוב כִּן־ חנף מתהו אל תהו:
(M) ... אפס אל אפס ישוב כִּן חנף מתהו אל תהו:

πάντα] The selection of the neut., not πᾶς nor πάντες, evidences a broad perspective of the translator's Weltanschauung, for the biblical view represented in S_h is usually applied to human beings, see עַד שׁוֹבֵךְ אֶל־הָאָדָמָה כִּי מִמְּנָה לְקַחַת כִּי־עָפָר אֶתָּה וְאֶל־עָפָר תָּשׁוּב Gn 3.19. The deliberate nature of the translator's departure here is also manifest in his choice of ἀπέρχομαι to render ישוב. According to him, death is for a human being not a return to his origin, but also saying farewell to his family and friends, the end of his familiar, daily life.

γῆς אפס] The author himself is also showing a new perspective, his existential view: on death every human who did not initially exist returns to the same condition and would no longer exist, not only visually.

ἀπὸ κατάρας³⁸ εἰς ἀπώλειαν] Κατάρα and ἀπώλεια are two key-notions in the preceding verse. Not only that, we see here again another new perspective of our translator. He knew of course that his grandfather was conscious of וְהָאָרֶץ הִיְתָה תְּהוּ וְבַהּ אָפַס Gn 1.2 and תהו was being used as parallel to אפס 'nothing, nil.'³⁹ According to the translator death is, for infidels, a shift from an often painful, cursed daily existence to an end of that lot, a welcome (!) change. This thought may not have pleased orthodox coreligionists of the author. But כִּן implies the affinity between humans in general (10a) and

³⁵ V.l. מאנם א' אנם. Probably an error for אין אנם.

³⁶ V.l. כל מאונים א' אונים. See the immediately preceding fn. We fail to follow Segal (278), according to whom אונים is the pl. of און, a synonym of אפס and תהו. He must mean the pl. of און, which, however, is never used in the pl., and און means something totally different from "nil."

³⁷ V.l. בן.

³⁸ In MS 248 ἀπὸ κατάρας is missing, but it is indispensable in the interest of the parallelism to vs. 10a.

³⁹ Lévi justly refers to the use elsewhere of the two words in parallelism, e.g. Is 40.17 (not 18). What we find interesting here is, however, the allusion to the creation narrative in Gn.

הגנ (10b) in a certain respect, and והו was not unique to the latter. Apart from “loss; ruin, destruction” ἀπώλεια also means “termination of life,” though not a punitive act, but a natural death. See μη διηγῆσεται τις ἐν τάφῳ τὸ ἔλεός σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου ἐν τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ; ‘nobody would recount your merciful attitude when you are in a grave and your faithfulness once your life is over, would they?’ Ps 87.12. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. **2 b**.

41.11) Πένθος ἀνθρώπων ἐν σώμασιν αὐτῶν,
ὄνομα δὲ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἀγαθὸν ἐξαλειφθήσεται.

*People's sorrow concerns their corpses,
but the name of sinners, which is not good, would be eradicated.*

(B) הבל⁴⁰ אדם בגויתו אך שם חסד לא יכרת:
(M) ... ל.. אדם בגויתו אך שם חסד לא יכרת:

σώμασιν] Precisely what kind of human body is meant is evident in view of its Heb. equivalent, גויה, which, in BH, signifies at times “corpse, carcass”; see *BDB* s.v. **2**.⁴¹

The message conveyed by Ⓞ is quite different from that of Ⓢ, a discrepancy that is due to a couple of factors. i) הבל ‘vanity’ changed to אבל ‘mourning’ and ii) חסד was interpreted under the influence of Arm. חסד ‘shame, disgrace.’⁴² The translator was then compelled to ignore לא.⁴³

ἐν ב] The preposition in the two languages indicates a topic of oral communication, cf. *GELS* s.v. **15** and *BDB* s.v. **IV e**. However, with הבל it is locational in value: in the carcass of a dead human there is nothing of value.

41.12) φρόντισον περὶ ὀνόματος, αὐτὸ γάρ σοι διαμενεῖ
ἢ χίλιοι μεγάλοι θησαυροὶ χρυσίου·

*Think seriously about (your) name, for that is what is going to stay
with you
rather than a thousand large treasures of gold.*

(B) פחד על שם כי הוא ילוך מאלפי אוצרות⁴⁴ חכמה⁴⁵:
(M) פחד על שם כי הוא ילוך מאלפי ... חמדה (?)

⁴⁰ V.l. בני, probably not meant to replace הבל, but to add after it, for otherwise the emerging nominal clause would represent an odd, incomprehensible statement. But Lévi (38) is right in pointing out that this insertion would necessitate correcting גויתם to גויתו. Alternatively, we should analyse בני as בני ‘my son’ in the vocative, for, in the following verse, σοι, is most likely addressed to the translator. Then בני should be positioned before הבל.

⁴¹ Cf. an alternative analysis by Mopsik (244): “Éphémère l’homme par son corps.”

⁴² An example of this Arm. word is in א חסד Gn 34.14 TO, where it renders Ⓢ חסד.

⁴³ We entirely agree with Yadin (19) that ללא is a copyist’s error, not “probably” (so Yadin).

⁴⁴ V.l. סומות, a scribal error for סימות; note a v.l. סימה for אוצר in Si 40.18 (B), a lexical Aramism.

⁴⁵ V.l. חמדה.

περί] There is no anomaly with this preposition in conjunction with φρο-
ντίζω, whereas על פחד is a rare combination, occurring once only in BH:
עַל פְּחָדוֹ וְרָגְזוֹ עַל כָּל־הַטּוֹבָה וְעַל כָּל־הַשְּׁלֹם אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי עֹשֶׂה לָּךְ Je 33.9, where, how-
ever, על is possibly to be construed with רָגַז alone.

αὐτὸ] Just as הוא here the Gk pronoun indicates antithetical contrast.⁴⁶ Cf.
SQH § 1 c (i) and SSG § 7 ba.

הַ מִּי] Here we have no comparison, but one of the two options is rejected
as in Καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν με ἢ ζῆν μῆτι μῆτι טוב מותי מתיי מתיי Jn 4.8, where the selec-
tion of καλόν, and not the comparative, κάλλιον, is to be noted.⁴⁷

χρυσίου] ≠ חכמה, which makes no sense and one does not deposit knowl-
edge in אוצרות. Even so, whence χρυσίου comes is a puzzle. The v.l., חמדה,
is better: “thousands of delightful treasure boxes,” but still nowhere near
χρυσίου. חרין, though rendered in LXX with χρυσίον, seven times, is graphi-
cally rather dissimilar.

41.13) ἀγαθῆς ζωῆς ἀριθμὸς ἡμερῶν,
καὶ ἀγαθὸν ὄνομα εἰς αἰῶνα διαμνεῖ.

*The number of days of a good life is countable,
but a good name will remain for good.*

(B טובת חי ימי מספר⁴⁸ וטובת⁴⁹ שם ימי אין מספר:
(M טובת חי מספר ימים וטובת ... אין מספר:

ἀγαθῆς] The use of the same adjective in both parts shows that they are
about the positive quality of two entities compared. In both cases the adjec-
tive is attributive, whereas in ℑ the adjective is fem. cst., “what is positive
and commendable about ..”

The current verse in ℑ consists of two nominal clauses with no finite verb
in either of them. Their syntax, however, presents some complications, what
seems to have confused scribes. In each clause the predicate, which is the
concluding part, quantifies the entity indicated by its *s*.

אין מספר at the end of the verse means ‘quantity in terms of number.’ אין מספר
here means ‘there is no number,’ i.e. ‘there are too many to be counted,’ as
in קָדַל לְסַפֵּר כִּי־אֵין מְסָפֵר ‘he stopped counting, because there was no num-
ber (with which to quantify)’ Gn 41.49. So also in מְסָפֵר נִפְשֵׁיכֶם אִישׁ לְאִשׁוֹ Ex 16.16. This noun, also used on its own, can mean ‘few in
number,’ e.g. יְחִי רְאוּבֵן וְאַל־יָמָת וְיְחִי מְתֵי מְסָפֵר ‘May R. survive and not die
but let his men be few’ Dt 33.6. More frequently, however, מספר can follow
a pl. noun in the cst. st, e.g. וְנִשְׁאַרְתֶּם מְתֵי מְסָפֵר בְּגוֹיִם ‘you will remain as a

⁴⁶ We prefer “rather” (NETS) to “Plus que” (Lévi) and “länger .. als” (SD), for instance.

⁴⁷ For more examples in SG, see GELS s.v. הַ 2 a.

⁴⁸ V.l. טוב חי מספר ימים.

⁴⁹ V.l. וטוב.

minority group among the nations' Dt 4.27, שְׁנוֹת מְסָפָר יָאֲתִי, 'only a few years will pass' Jb 16.22.⁵⁰ In Si we find one example, ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ 'only few days' Si 17.2, which may be translated back to יָמֵי מְסָפָר, so Segal 102. In BH we find only one instance in which the preceding noun is in the st. abs.: יְהִיָּה הָעֶנָן יָמִים מְסָפָר עַל-הַמִּשְׁכָּן ἡμέρας ἀριθμῶ 'there is going to be cloud over the tent several days' Nu 9.20. Hebrew, however, has no exact equivalent of Engl. *a number of years he lived overseas*, which cannot be put into Heb. as מְסָפָר שָׁנִים הוּא גַר מֵחוּץ לָאָרֶץ. Hence מְסָפָר יָמִים in (M)⁵¹ and a v.l. in (B) is problematic, whereas יָמֵי מְסָפָר fits one of the patterns described here.⁵² This problematic pattern is reflected in 𐤄. What sense to make of vs. 13a of 𐤄 is quite problematic, for the text is not a self-standing complete clause as 13b, but merely one component of a clause: the nom. ἀριθμὸς is modified by two genitive constituents, which has been almost verbatim carried over into 𐤄, producing a syntactically odd clause: דְּחִיָּא טְבָא מְנִינָא דְּיִוְמָתָא 'of a good life the number of days,' which does not pass for a clause in Syriac. Even for a single nominal constituent we would anticipate מְנִינָא דְּיִוְמָתָא דְּחִיָּא טְבָא. For that matter the grammatical analysis of 13a in 𐤄B and M alike, is quite a challenge. Not only the clause structure, if this can be called a clause, the selection of the sg. חֵי in the sense of 'life' is anomalous. On מְסָפָר, see also above at 37.25.

How are we syntactically to analyse מְסָפָר אֵין? Is the existential clause, מְסָפָר אֵין, equivalent to a nomen rectum as in כָּל-יְמֵי הַתְּהִלָּנוּ אִתָּם 'all the days when we were living among them' 1Sm 25.15?⁵³

41.14) Παιδείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ συντηρήσατε, τέκνα·
σοφία δὲ κεκρυμμένη καὶ θησαυρὸς ἀφανής,
τίς ὠφέλεια ἐν ἀμφοτέροις;

*Children, preserve education without quarrels.
Hidden wisdom and invisible treasure,
what is the use of the two?*

(Ba) מוסר בשת שמעו בנים:
(Bb) חכמה טמונה ואוצר מוסתר⁵⁴ מה תועלה⁵⁵ בשתיהם:
(Ma) מוסר בשת שמעו בנים:
(Mb) חכמה טמונה ושימה מסותרת מה תעלה בשתיהם:

⁵⁰ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. מְסָפָר a.

⁵¹ Yadin's (41) rendering, "numbered days," is questionable.

⁵² As regards מְסָפָר שָׁנִים Jb 15.20 we follow Delitzsch (1876.261), who regards it as meaning "a limited or appointed number of years" as against מְסָפָר שְׁנוֹת 'a few years' ib. 16.22.

⁵³ Cf. JM § 129 p (3).

⁵⁴ V.l. וְסִימָה מְסוֹתֶרֶת. The Pu. מְסוֹתֶרֶת is also found in (Mb). Pace Segal (278), even in BH we find an instance: אֶהְיֶה מְסוֹתֶרֶת Pr 27.5.

⁵⁵ V.l. תעלה.

τίς] Most likely used attributively here, our translation notwithstanding, thus “what sort of use.”⁵⁶ This virtually adjectival use of the interrogative is also shared by Heb., e.g. מַה יִתְרוֹן לְאָדָם בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ ‘what kind of benefit does man have with all his toil?’ Ec 1.3.⁵⁷

ἀμφοτέροις] Though the referents are of mixed genders, this is most likely masculine, a genus potius.⁵⁸ ח here presents a mixed picture: the numeral itself refers to two feminine nouns and the suffix is masculine, though הֶן had virtually ceased to be used.

In both ח manuscripts, B and M, vs. 14a is found between vss. 15b and 16a, which appears to be the correct sequence, though שח accords with ט. Moreover, in B at 11r8 the text begins with מוסר בשת שמ, which is then deleted and continued with :מוסר בשת:⁵⁹, then begins a new line (11r9) with מוסר בשת שמעו בנים. ט and ח substantially differ from each other: the latter says “Children, listen to the teaching on shame.”

The same text as vss. 14b and 14c is found in 20.30, though its Heb. version differs slightly.

41.15) κρείσσων ἄνθρωπος ἀποκρύπτων τὴν μωρίαν αὐτοῦ
ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἀποκρύπτων τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ.

*A person who hides his silliness is better
than a person who hides his wisdom.*

(B טוב איש מצפין אולתו מאיש⁶⁰ מצפין⁶¹ חכמתו:
(M טוב איש מטמן אולתו מאיש מצפן חכמתו:

ἀποκρύπτων] The two Heb. MSS have preserved two synonyms. Given their synonymity it is not easy to decide which is reflected by ט. Besides, B uses מצפין twice, whilst M uses מצפין and מטמן verbs. ט is consistent with the selection of ἀποκρύπτω twice. Moreover, (M) is apparently using both verbs in Piel, but no Piel of צפן is known to BH. *Maagarim* records one instance, but of Pual, in a mediaeval document. As to טמן BH uses הטמין twice only, and both in 2Ch 7.8, and *Maagarim* counts a total of 332 instances, but only two cases of Piel, both in mediaeval Heb.

μωρίαν] We agree with Wagner (1999.255) that there is no semantic difference between this noun and ἀφροσύνη. The former occurs also at 20.31, but nowhere else in LXX.

⁵⁶ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. V.

⁵⁷ More examples are mentioned in *BDB* s.v. מה 1 (a).

⁵⁸ Cf. *JM* § 148 a, *SQH* § 32 ba, and *SSG* § 77 cd.

⁵⁹ Some, e.g. Lévi (40), take this as the subtitle of the following discourse, “croyons-nous” (!).

⁶⁰ מאדון. V.I.

⁶¹ V.I. מטמן.

- 41.16) Τοιγαροῦν ἐντράπητε ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί μου·
οὐ γάρ ἐστιν πᾶσαν αἰσχύνην διαφυλάξαι καλόν,
καὶ οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν ἐν πίστει εὐδοκιμεῖται.

*Therefore show due respect to my opinion,
for it is not good to keep reserve in every matter,
and not everything is honestly well appreciated by everyone.*

והכלמו על משפטי⁶² (Ba)
 (Bb) לא כל בשת נאה לשמר ולא כל הכלם נבחר:
 והכלמֹו על משפטי: (Ma)
 (Mb) לא כל בשת נאה לבֹוש ולא כל הכלם נבחר:
 (C) לא כל בושת נאה לשמור ולא כל הכלם נבחר:

ἐντράπητε הכלמו] Of the three senses of ἐντρέπομαι listed in *GELS* two appear to be applicable to our case here: 1) “to show respect to” and 3) “to feel shame for wrongdoing.” In vs. 16b \mathfrak{H} uses בִּשְׁת and again נִכְלָם. In spite of a case such as אֱלֹהֵי בְּשֵׁתִי וְנִכְלַמְתִּי לְהָרִים אֱלֹהֵי פְּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי Ezr 9.6, the two are unlikely to be freely interchangeable, complete synonyms. Ben Sira would not say exactly the same thing twice in a single breath. Given that vs. 16a appears to be a generic, introductory statement and uses only a form of נִכְלָם, this may not be being used in the same sense as in 16c. In \mathfrak{C} vs. 16c widely departs from \mathfrak{H} , and there is no trace of הכלם. The translator may have thought that בִּשְׁת and נִכְלָם are synonymic enough. Hence we are inclined to apply here the sense (1).⁶³

ἐπὶ] ‘in the matter of, regarding’ (*GELS* s.v. II 4).⁶⁴ Cf. ἐπὶ νεκρῶ κλαῦσον ἐל מת לבכות ‘Weep over the dead’ Si 22.11.

πάντα πᾶσιν] Because of the gap between \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} we do not know which Gk word is a rendering of כל.

The addition of כל⁶⁵ to the inf. cst. is indicative of its substantivisation in the direction of a verbal noun, as is also evident in the parallelism to the preceding בִּשְׁת, cf. *SQH* § 18 a, where מהכחול שקר והתגולל ברוח נדה ‘from all abhorrence of deceit and defilement with an unclean spirit’ 1QS 4.21 is cited.

On vs. 14b, cf. 4.21.

- 41.17) αἰσχύνεσθε ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς περὶ πορνείας
καὶ ἀπὸ ἡγουμένου καὶ δυνάστου περὶ ψεύδους,

⁶² V.I. משפטו.

⁶³ Cf. Snaith (203) “Show deference to my teaching,” *NETS* “show respect ...,” *SD* “achtet auf mein Urteil.” Kister (1999.167f.) holds that, for BS, בִּשְׁת here is a virtue, not a vice.

⁶⁴ Smend’s (385) “nach meiner Lehrweise” suits his understanding of הכלם: “schämt euch” (II 73). He refers to Si 18.29, where we have nothing relevant to the matter under discussion.

⁶⁵ Whether we are to analyse הכלם as an inf. abs. as Smith (2000.262) does is a separate issue. On the question of substantivisation of the inf. abs., see *SQH* § 18 oa.

Feel ashamed before (your) father and mother of sexual immorality and before a leader and a man in authority of lying.

(B) בוש מאב ומאם אל זנות⁶⁶ מנשיא יושב אל⁶⁷ כחש:
(M) בוש מאב ואם על פחז מנשיא ושר על כחש

αἰσχύνεσθε] ≠ \mathfrak{H} sg., בוש. Though proverbs are mostly addressed in the sg. impv., the pl. does occur sometimes, not only when the vocative τέκνα is added as in 3.1, 23.7, and 41.14, but also without as in vs. 16 above, which could be continuing vs. 14 with τέκνα.

ἀπὸ] From this verse up to 42.5 we are told what one ought to be ashamed of and what one does not have to be ashamed of. Especially up to vs. 19b we see a fixed pattern, < ἀπὸ τινος περὶ τινος > and < מן .. על/אל >, in which the former indicates before whom or in whose presence one ought to feel ashamed and the latter indicates of what matter one ought to feel ashamed, and for that matter the addressee is responsible. Therefore in this verse one is not being advised to feel ashamed of acts of fornication being practised by one's own parents or of lies never stopping to be told by political leaders.⁶⁸ This is indisputably proven by vss. 19a + b and 20a. From vs. 19c we see < ἀπὸ τινος > only, in which the prep. indicates either what one should be ashamed of or what one does not have to feel ashamed of. Lévi (40) is perhaps right in saying that a Hebrew writer in good old days would have written בוש לפני אב ואם מזנותו.

μητρὸς] Some sources add ἀπὸ as in (B). On the fluctuation between the addition and non-addition of prepositions or conjunctions for “and” or “or” to co-ordinate constituents, see *SSG* § 78 f-g. The same issue arises in Heb., too, as shown by B and M here; on Heb., see *SQH* § 38 e-f.

πορνείας] The variant in M, פחז, is a rare word in BH. None of its cognates, Qal פחז and an abstract noun, פחזות, has anything to do with sexual vice in particular, either.

καὶ δυνάστου] B's יושב אל is a scribal error, for which the v.l. and M have the correct text.

41.18) ἀπὸ κριτοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντος περὶ πλεμμελείας
καὶ ἀπὸ συναγωγῆς καὶ λαοῦ περὶ ἀνομίας,
ἀπὸ κοινωνοῦ καὶ φίλου περὶ ἀδικίας

*Before a judge and a ruler, of error
and before a congregation and a people, of illegality,
before a partner and a friend, of injustice*

⁶⁶ V.l. על פחז.

⁶⁷ V.l. ושר על.

⁶⁸ Thus *pace* Yadin (41): “Be ashamed of a father and mother of wantonness, Of a prince and ruler of lies.”

מאדון וגברת על שקר	מאדון וגברת על שקר	(Ba)
מאדון וגברת על שקר	מאדון וגברת על שקר	(Bb)
מאדון וגברת על קשר	מאדון וגברת על קשר	(Ma)
מאדון וגברת על קשר	מאדון וגברת על קשר	(Mb)

κριτοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντος] Quite a departure from \mathfrak{H} ‘master and mistress.’ The gender distinction has also disappeared. Note $\mathfrak{SH} = \mathfrak{C}$: דִּינָא וְרִישָׁא ‘judge and ruler.’⁷¹ Smend (386) is of the opinion that \mathfrak{H} אדון וגברת refers to kings and queens in a heathen royal court. Was the translator not in favour of close association with heathen captains? Alternatively, he may have interpreted \mathfrak{H} as referring to entities closer to the average citizen, say, master and mistress in one’s household,⁷² and wanted to raise their social standing in parallelism to the immediately following ועם פשע.

πλημμελείας] a word meaning “sinful error, trespass,” but not specific as B שקר ‘deception, lying’ and M קשר ‘intrigue.’

καὶ²] Lévi is wrong in saying that the conjunction is found in no MS. According to Ziegler it is preserved in four MSS. It is absent, though, in \mathfrak{SH} .

κοινωνοῦ] a rendering in Si of קָבַר also at 6.10 and of שִׁוְתָהּ also at 42.3. Both Heb. words are semantically close to each other, which makes it difficult to decide which is reflected in \mathfrak{C} .

41.19) καὶ ἀπὸ τόπου, οὗ παροικεῖς, περὶ κλοπῆς,
ἀπὸ ἀληθείας θεοῦ καὶ διαθήκης
καὶ ἀπὸ πήξεως ἀγκῶνος ἐπ’ ἄρτοις,
ἀπὸ σκορακισμοῦ λήμψεως καὶ δόσεως
*and before a locality where you live, of theft,
and before the truth of God and covenant
and of putting down an elbow on bread
and of looking down on receiving and giving*

וממקום תגור על זר ⁷³ :	וממקום תגור על זר ⁷³ :	(Ba)
ממטה אציל אל לחם:	... אלה וברית	(Bb)
	... אלה ⁷⁴	(Bc)
	ממקום תגור על יד:	(Ma)
וממטה אציל על לחם:	מהפר אלה וברית	(Mb)
	ממת שאלה	(Mc)

⁶⁹ V.I. משותף.

⁷⁰ V.I. ממקום.

⁷¹ Lévi (41) reconstructs \mathfrak{H} as דִּין וְגִבִּיר. The latter word occurs a mere twice in BH and is rendered in \mathfrak{C} with κύριος, Gn 27.29, 37.

⁷² Smend loc. cit. “Pagendienst.”

⁷³ V.I. ונגיר על יד. The first word is probably a scribal error for תגור.

⁷⁴ V.I. מתת שאלה.

οὔ] Indispensable in Gk, to which an asyndetic relative clause is foreign. Besides we have a cst. chain in \mathfrak{B} , hence מִמְקוֹם תְּגוּר as equivalent to מְמַקְּוֹם בּוֹ אֲשֶׁר תְּגוּר בּוֹ.⁷⁵

κλοπῆς] Difficult to harmonise this with B) זר, whereas M) יד must refer to a stealing hand, though many readers would have to think hard to arrive at that analysis.

ἀπὸ²] Here begins a departure from the set pattern observed in vss. 17-18 and 19a, i.e. < ἀπό τινος περί τινος >, with the exception of 20a, and we do not find the περί τινος component, but only the ἀπό τινος component. Furthermore, with a possible exception of our current example in 19b the noun following ἀπό is not a personal entity, but what is equivalent to what follows περί, namely what one is to be ashamed of or not to be ashamed of. Because of the freedom of word order in Gk ἀληθείας θεοῦ could mean ‘the God of truth.’⁷⁶ But (Bb) וְמִן שְׂרָרָא דְאַלְהָא וְדִיתְקָא נִן and וְכִלְהּ וּבְרִית (Bb) ‘and from the truth of God and the covenant’ go against that analysis. But the God of truth and His covenant are certainly not what one should be ashamed of. It appears then that we are in between the two patterns, and one is to be ashamed of acting against God’s truth and His covenant or to be ashamed before Him of acting against them.

It might be a better solution to take into account this departure from the set pattern already at vs. 19b by taking אלה as אֲלֵה ‘oath.’ Otherwise this would become the only instance in Si of the rare lexeme אֲלֵה ‘god.’ The translator may have admitted such a rare case here or read in אלהים his *Vorlage*.

πήξεως] a hapax in LXX. Its underlying verb, πήγνυμι, translates the verb הִטָּה Qal or Hi. rather often. Smend (386) postulates in מטה an inf., followed by Segal (281), who points it as מִטָּה.⁷⁷ Since Heb. has no inf. cst. with a preformative מ, it must be a pseudo-Aramaic form. Since in Aramaic the inf. in derived stems has a vowel following the third radical, this can be only a Qal / Peal inf. Then it would be better to vocalise the form as מִטָּה.⁷⁸ We would then have three infinitives concatenated in M: הפּר .. מטה .. מנע. This raises, however, a difficult question as to what Heb. word to restore at the head of (Bb). In no way can one harmonise ἀλήθεια with הפּר ‘to transgress, violate.’

σκορακισμοῦ] In BH we find the construction < מְנַע + acc. pers. + מִן + inf. >, e.g. מְנַעַנִי מִהָרַע אֶתְךָ ‘He prevented me from harming you’ 1Sm 25.34, sim. ib. 26.⁷⁹ Thus we could analyse מתת as מִתַּת. However, it can be a plain

⁷⁵ Cf. JM § 129 p (3).

⁷⁶ Cf. SSG § 42 c.

⁷⁷ Wagner (1999.269f.) views מטה here as a plain substantive.

⁷⁸ Note נִטָּה אֶת־יָדְךָ בְּמִטָּה עַל־הַנְּהָרָת Ex 8.1.

⁷⁹ Wagner (1999.290f.) does not even refer to this reading in M, which he apparently dismisses as “unvollständige Überlieferung.”

substantive מַתָּה 'gift' as in חַקָּה וְלִקְחָה דֹּסִיס καὶ λήμψις 'what one gives and what one receives' Si 42.7.

Σκορακισμός is a hapax in SG and also unknown prior to LXX.⁸⁰

λήμψεως καὶ δόσεως] Quite a puzzle vis-à-vis מַתָּה שְׂאֵל 'giving what is begged,' but חַקָּה וּמַתָּה = חַקָּה וּמַתָּה, cf. the above-cited Si 42.7. Though a couple of centuries later St Paul would say μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδοῖν ἢ λαμβάνειν Ac 20.35, to accept a gift modestly and gratefully is no less easy than to give a gift to a needy person willingly. ⚡ may be indicative, then, of the translator's pragmatic philosophy of life and a good understanding of human mentalities.

41.20) καὶ ἀπὸ ἀσπαζομένων περὶ σιωπῆς,
ἀπὸ δράσεως γυναικὸς ἐταίρας

*and before those greeting (you), of silence,
of ogling⁸¹ a whore*

.. 82 לִי.. שְׁלוֹם מִחֲרִישׁ⁸³: (Ba)

... 84 ... אֶ... מִהִבֵּית (Bb)

שְׁלוֹם הַחֲרִישׁ⁸⁵ וּמִשְׂאֵל (Ma)

... 86 מִהִבֵּית אֶ... (Mb)

ἀσπαζομένων] (B) could be confidently restored as מְשֹׂאֵלִי, i.e. מִשְׂאֵלִי. Here we are temporarily back again to the pattern, but not completely because we could have expected עַל הַחֲרִישׁ. Instead the author follows the sub-pattern introduced in the preceding verse, i.e. < מִן + inf. >.⁸⁷ In BH עַל is so used, e.g. עַל נִסְתָּם אֶת־יְהוָה Ex 17.7; more examples are mentioned in BDB 754a, s.v. עַל II f (b). An example in QH with מִן is אֶת אֲבוֹתָךְ וּמִשְׁמֵרָם אֶת מִן מֵאֲהַבְתָּם 'because He loved your forefathers and He is holding fast to the oath' CD 8.15, cf. SQH 120, § 18 (k).

The BH pattern of greeting composed of שְׁאֵל ל־ < שְׁאֵל וְשְׁלוֹם >, e.g. לְשֵׁלֵךְ לְךָ לְשְׁלוֹם 1Sm 10.4; more examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. שְׁאֵל Qal 2 a. Even when a pl. ptc. is used in the st. cst. as here, a preposition can be attached to a following noun as in יִשְׁבֵי בְּאֶרֶץ צְלָמֹת Is 9.1, though this is optional and the ptc. can take the non-cst. form as in הָעָם שְׂוֹאֵלֵי שְׁלוֹם ib.; cf. JM § 129 m (1) and SQH § 21 f. We have שְׂוֹאֵלֵי שְׁלוֹם

⁸⁰ According to LSJ the verb σκοραρίζω is attested after the 1st cent. BCE, thus after Si.

⁸¹ So Snaith 204.

⁸² V.I. מִשְׂוֹאֵל.

⁸³ V.I. שְׁלוֹם הַחֲרִישׁ, which makes little sense.

⁸⁴ V.I. אֶשֶׁל.

⁸⁵ The conjunction *waw* has been added by Qimron 1999.228.

⁸⁶ BSH has wrongly inserted here (21c); we follow the sequence as actually found in M.

⁸⁷ In (Ma) the *mem* has dropped out, a case of haplography due to the preceding שְׁלוֹם.

also at 6.5, where, however, Ἐὐπροσήγορος, is more than “greeters,” and it is parallel to φίλος.⁸⁸

γυναικὸς ἑταίρας] In Jdg 11.2 (אִשָּׁה אֶתְחַרֵּת)⁸⁹ this phrase is parallel to γυναικὸς πόρνης זונה אִשָּׁה vs. 1. The author is probably thinking of cases such as מִנְכַּרְיָהּ זָרָה מֵאִשָּׁהּ Pr 2.16, 7.5 (Ἐ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀλλοτριᾶς καὶ πονη-ρᾶς). In Pr 19.13 and 2M 6.4 ἑταίρα means “man’s extra-marital female companion in bed” (GELS s.v. ἑταῖρος 2 a). With focus on the neighbourly love the Decalogue says וְאַמְתּוֹ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְעַבְדָּתּוֹ רָעָה אִשְׁתּוֹ לֹא-תִחַמְדּוּ Ex 20.17. See also above at 9.3, where אשה זרה is parallel to זונה.

41.21) καὶ ἀπὸ ἀποστροφῆς προσώπου συγγενοῦς,
ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως
καὶ ἀπὸ κατανοήσεως γυναικὸς ὑπάνδρου,
and of looking away from a kinsman’s face
and of robbing a share and a gift
and of observing with interest a married woman,

(B) מהשב אפי⁹⁰ רעך מהש.. מהלקות מנה⁹¹
(Ma) ומהשיב את פני שארך מחשאות⁹² מחלקת מנה:
(Mc) אִמְהַתְּבוֹנֵן אֶל זָרָה:

προσώπου] M’s פני is more standard in BH; for rare instances of אַפִּים as synonymous with פָּנִים, see BDB s.v. אָף 2. Alternatively we have here an Aramaising form, אַפִּי. It is perhaps simpler to postulate a corruption of את פני (so Ma) to אפי.

συγγενοῦς] This substantivised adjective, συγγενής, can mean either “blood relation” or “close associate, colleague.” The former is more likely represented by שאר (M), and the latter by רע (B). Either fits the context here.

ἀφαιρέσεως] See Strugnell (1969.114), who identifies here שָׁאָת; ה is added above the word. About this supralinear letter he doesn’t say a word. Robbing a share due to someone and a gift given must be meant. That “someone” is not specifically mentioned, most likely συγγενής. Yadin translates

⁸⁸ Thus it is, *pace* Kister (1999.173f.), more than a mere “acquaintance.”

⁸⁹ Many MSS, including the Antiochene version, read γυναικὸς ἑτερας, probably an adjustment to ἑ.

Either the original translator of Ⲫⲓⲟ or a later scribe wrote in the margin וְנִיחָא in lieu of אֶתְחַרֵּת in the body of the text, probably thinking that the woman in question was worse than a mere girl friend.

⁹⁰ V.l. מי השע פי רעך.

⁹¹ V.l. מי השע פי רעך מחשבות מחלקות מנה, a rather messy note. Lévi’s (43) translation is “de boucher la bouche de tes amis,” apparently admitting מְהַשֵּׁעַ. Lévi (43) restores מהש[בית “De cesser” in lieu of מחשבות, so also Smend (II 42).

⁹² BSH reads מ[ח]ש[א]ת[ח]ש[א]ת. On this epigraphically difficult reading, cf. Yadin 21, who was not certain about the *alef* and restored מחשות.

his restored form, מחשׁוֹת, “Of stopping.” Is such a meaning of the verb חָשׂה supported by אֶל־תִּחַרְשׁ מִמֶּנִּי פֶן־תִּחַשְׁהָ מִמֶּנִּי Ps 26.1? Here, however, the verb is expanded with < מן + pers. >, unless we read here a verbal noun, מחִלְקָת, so BSH 196b. At 42.3 the latter option only is possible: B על מחלקות נחלה and M על מחלקת נחלה.

μερίδος] Is there any good reason to restore here the pl., though M חלקת could represent חֲלֵקָה?⁹³ Yadin’s (42) “the dividing of a portion” apparently represents חֲלֵקָת מְנָה. Or alternatively מחלקת מנה, i.e. מחֲלֵקָת מְנָה.

δόσεως] = מתנה, not מנה. The author must have meant חֲלֵקָת מְתָנָה ‘a portion of gift.’

κατανοήσεως] This noun (κατανόησις), on its own, carries no derogatory nuance.⁹⁴ Its underlying verb, κατανοέω, can take as an ο τὰς ὁδοὺς σου [= κύριου] Ps 118.15. It depends on the observer’s attitude and purpose and also the object of observation. We are reminded of a statement made by Jesus: πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἤδη ἔμοιχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Mt 5.28.

γυναικὸς ὑπάνδρου] a phrase appearing also at 9.9 in reverse sequence and rendering בעלה, i.e. בְּעֻלָּה.

41.22) ἀπὸ περιεργίας παιδίσκης αὐτοῦ
καὶ μὴ ἐπιστῆς ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην αὐτῆς,
ἀπὸ φίλων περὶ λόγων ὀνειδισμοῦ
καὶ μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι μὴ ὀνειδίξει,
*of busying oneself too much with one’s maid
and do not stand by her bed,
before friends, of insulting words,
and after giving, do not insult.*

ומהתק... ל...⁹⁵ (Ba)

מאזהב על ..⁹⁶ חרפה⁹⁷ ומאחרי מתת⁹⁸ אל תנאץ: (Bb)

מהתעשק עפ שפחה לך ומתקומם על יציעיה: (Ma)

מאהב על דברי חסד ומאחר מתת חרף: (Mb)

περιεργίας] a hapax in SG. Its underlying verb, περιεργάζομαι, also a hapax in SG, is used in ἐν τοῖς περισσοῖς τῶν ἔργων σου μὴ περιεργάζου 3.23, v.a.1.⁹⁹ ܫܗ presents מצדנותא, a form unknown to most Syriac

⁹³ In the margin of B we do see מחלקות, as shown in the preceding fn. 91.

⁹⁴ For a discussion on the equation κατανοέω / הִתְבּוֹנֵן, cf. Wagner 1999.226.

⁹⁵ V.l. מה..

⁹⁶ Abegg restores מִיִּי.

⁹⁷ V.l. חסד.

⁹⁸ V.l. שאלה.

⁹⁹ Pace Wagner (1999.267f.) the sense “Gewalt antun, vergewaltigen” scarcely fits neither of the two Si attestations of the verb. Even an erotic preoccupation does not necessarily

lexica except Payne Smith 3363a, where he lists מְצַדְדוֹתָא ‘*defixio oculorum* in alqd.’¹⁰⁰

αὐτοῦ] The shift to the third person is abrupt and strange in view of 2sg ἐπιστῆς in the next line. MS M is consistent with לך. The use of the prep. instead of a suf. pron., i.e. שפחתך, is due to distinguish between “your maid,” a maid known to the interlocutors, and “a maid of yours,” whether or not you have only one or more maids. Cf. בן ישי 1Sm 16.18 in lieu of בן ישי.¹⁰¹ This series of advice started at vs. 16 with an 2pl. Impv., ἐντράπητε. Our αὐτοῦ here could be an error for σαυτοῦ or σεαυτοῦ.

ἐπιστῆς] Just as ח התקומם here, ἐφίστημι used intransitively often implies a hostile intention. What is meant here is not just standing by her bed and chatting away. Cf. μηδὲ ἐπιστῆς ἐπὶ τὰς διακβολὰς αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι τοὺς ἀνασφζομένους αὐτῶν ‘Nor stand by their exits to destroy those trying to escape safely’ Ob 14; more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. II 1. A BH example of התקומם is יהי כרשע איבי ומתקוממי כענל Jb 27.7, where it is parallel to איב.

τὴν κοίτην αὐτῆς] The pl. in ח יצעיה is odd. In BH the substantive is יצוע. An error for יצועה? Even in a well-to-do middle class home a maid would scarcely have multiple bedrooms at her disposal.

In vs. 22c we are back again to the pattern < ἀπό τινος .. περί τινος // על .. מן >.

ὄνειδισμοῦ [חסד חסד here is Aramaising, occurring in BH only twice (Lv 20.17 and Pr 14.34).

In 22d ח is closer to (Bb) on account of the syntagm for an expression of prohibition, < אל + Impf. >. (Mb) as it stands makes little sense; for חרף would be a positive impv. “Insult!”¹⁰². Yadin’s (43) translation is debatable: “And of reviling after giving a gift.” We doubt that the prep. can be separated from its inf. instead of מתת אחר חרף. One would have anticipated ומאחר מתת אל תחרף.

involve violence and enforcement. Cf. our interpretation of Bathsheba as a consenting party in Muraoka 2020.39f.

¹⁰⁰ Listed as derived from Afel מצדד.

¹⁰¹ For a discussion with more examples, see JM § 130 b and BDB s.v. ח 5 b (a).

¹⁰² Is this how Smith (2000.262) would translate the verb, which he analyses as an inf. abs.?

CHAPTER 42

42.1) ἀπὸ δευτερώσεως λόγου ἀκοῆς
καὶ ἀπὸ ἀποκαλύψεως λόγων κρυφίων·
καὶ ἔση αἰσχυνηρὸς ἀληθινῶς
καὶ εὐρίσκων χάριν ἔναντι παντὸς ἀνθρώπου.

Μὴ περὶ τούτων αἰσχυνηθῆς
καὶ μὴ λάβης πρόσωπον τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν·

*Of repeating what you heard
and of revealing secret matters;
and then you would become truly modest
and find favour with every person.*

*Of these matters do not feel ashamed
and do not practise partiality and commit sins.*

ומחסוף כל סודי ¹ עצה:	משנות דבר תשמע (Ba)
ומצא חן בעיני כל חי:	והיית בוש באמת (Bb)
ומחשף כל דבר עצה:	אך על ² אלה אל תבוש (Bc)
ומצא חן בעיני כל חי:	משנות דבר תשמע (Ma)
ומצא חן בעיני כל חי:	והיית בוש באמת (Mb)
ומצא חן בעיני כל חי:	אך על אלה אל תבוש (Mc)

λόγου] Many MSS³ add *καὶ* before the word, which makes little sense. The three genitives are dependent on one another, thus (a + {b + c}).

ἀκοῆς] *תשמע* (Ba) constitutes an asyndetic relative clause, so that the antecedent can be in the st. cst., *דבר*, cf. *קְרִית־הַנָּה דָּוִד* Is 29.1. Cf. JM § 129 *p* (3).

ἀποκαλύψεως] Ziegler against *καλύψεως* (Rahlfs). In BH the verb is spelled with *ש* as in Ma here for a graphic variant in Ba, *חסוף*.

λόγων κρυφίων] We find nothing in *Ⲭ* that would reflect *עצה*. This Heb. word probably means here “council” rather than “counsel, advice.” *DCH* s.v. 4 admits it with hesitation about the distinction between the two senses, a hesitation which the dictionary has in respect of all BH instances mentioned, a total of seven. But as to QH no such uncertainty is expressed. E.g. *עצת עולמים* ‘an eternal council’ 1QS 2.23 and *בעצת קודש* ‘in a holy council’ ib. 25. In our passage here the community council is probably

¹ על אור V.1.

² אל V.1.

³ In *Ⲭ* *ⲛⲁⲗⲏⲧⲁ* ‘and of the word’ is odd.

meant. The second alternative, “advice given in secret” is not to be totally precluded.⁴

כל in \mathfrak{H} , also missing in \mathfrak{G} , means here not “every,” but “any whatsoever.”

καὶ ἔσθη] The selection in \mathfrak{H} ויהיית of a *w-qatalí* form indicates the conclusion of a long passage that started in 41.17 with an impv. בוש ἀισχύνεσθε and contains no clause initial verb form other than an inf. prefixed with η or a substantivised ptc.

αἰσχυντηρός] a hapax unique to Si, in which we find it twice more: applied to a modest wife at 26.15, where \mathfrak{H} significantly reads ביישת, and at 35.10 applied to a modest person (\mathfrak{H} בוישי). In our passage here it is concerned about modesty arising from awareness of one’s imperfections, defects, and limitations.

The morphology of בויש (B) and בוּיִש (M) is problematic. The analysis of בויש as ptc. is supported by בוּיִשִּׁים Ez 32.30.⁵ Then we have here a periphrastic structure < הָיָה + ptc. > continued with another ptc., מִצָּא.⁶ On the periphrasis see *SQH* § 17 fa. Segal (282) thinks that the form can be an impv. as well, וּמִצָּא.

Both Yadin (22) and Abegg read בוּיִש in Mb, but if they⁷ mean a ptc., such a form is unknown to Heb. BSH (106b) justly sees here בִּיֶּשֶׁת, a word of *qattāl* pattern. Its fem. form occurs in אִשָּׁה בִּיֶּשֶׁת γυνή αἰσχυντηρά Si 26.15.

λάβηξ πρόσωπον] On this idiomatic expression, a mechanical reproduction of a Heb. idiom, וְנָשָׂא פָּנִים, see above at 4.27. This Gk idiom occurs also at 4.22 and 35.13.⁸ In NTG we find three derivatives: προσωπολημπτέω (Jam 2.9), προσωπολήμπτης (Acts 10.34), προσωπολημψία (Ro 2.11, Eph 6.9, Col 3.25, Jam 2.1), for which LSJ quotes references from NTG alone. It appears that this calque was first innovated by LXX translators and came to take roots in the contemporary and subsequent Hellenised Jewish community.⁹

τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν] Here τοῦ is an optional, merely grammatical marker of the inf. just like Engl. *to* in *I want to go*. No function typical of the genitive case can be assigned to it, see *SSG* § 30 d. The inf. itself in this example

⁴ We fail to see where Yadin’s (43) “secret” comes from in his translation, “any piece of secret counsel.”

⁵ The use of an adj. in \mathfrak{G} , αἰσχυντηρός, does not necessarily mean that we, following Smend (388), may *grammatically* analyse בויש as an adjective unknown anywhere.

⁶ Faced with an adj., αἰσχυντηρός, which \mathfrak{S} renders as כְּהִירָא ‘venerable’ and carries on with וְדִמְשָׁבָה ‘and one who finds.’ BSH (205b) parses מִצָּא as Pf., which is impossible. For a *w-qatalí* form we would anticipate וּמִצָּאָה. Lévi (45) parses מִצָּא as impv., which is not impossible.

⁷ As Abegg does in the Accordance Bible.

⁸ *SD* renders it as “nicht die Person ansehen” with a fn. “im Sinne von <keine falsche Rücksicht nehmen>.”

⁹ Harl (1992.153) points out that erudite Jewish scholars, writing in Greek, prefer χαρίζεσθαι instead of this innovation deriving from their own community, though this more “respectable” verb does not necessarily indicate a sinful act.

may indicate a purpose; in order to perform some criminal action one might need to show partiality to a person of authority, for instance. Alternatively, one could end up in a sinful act which may not have been so intended.¹⁰

אחט is odd. Segal (279), Kahana (514), and BSH (138b) vocalise it as אַחַת, which is syntactically impossible. We would postulate a scribal error for אחטא.¹¹

42.2) περὶ νόμου ὑψίστου καὶ διαθήκης
καὶ περὶ κρίματος δικαιῶσαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ,

*Of the law of the Most High and covenant
and of a judgement requiting the impious with justice,*

(B) על תורת עליון וחוק ועל מצדיק¹³ להצדיק רשע:
(M) על תורת עליון וחוק ועל משפט להצדיק רשע:

Here we are back again to the earlier pattern with < περὶ τινος / על >. We are going to see of what matters we are not to be ashamed, see vs. 1: Μὴ περὶ τούτων αἰσχυσθῆς / תבוש אל אלה תבוש.

διαθήκης חוק] Since διαθήκη is coordinate with νόμου ὑψίστου, it appears natural to view the word as a reference to some divine determination rather than to a contract or agreement between humans. Cf. δ. θεοῦ ὑψίστου Si 24.23 and δ. ὑψίστου 28.7, and note also a conjunction with κρίμα in δ. κρίματος 38.33, and with ἀληθεία in ἀπὸ ἀληθείας θεοῦ καὶ διαθήκης 41.19. It is also to be noted that in Si חוק is rendered with διαθήκη eight more times, and among them we find a case where the Heb. word indicates a human decision, δ. σου חוקך 'your chosen vocation' 11.20.

δικαιῶσαι] This could be modifying the preceding κρίματος. In LXX we find not a few examples of an adnominal infinitive modifying a substantive, e.g. πόλεις τοῦ κατοικεῖν 'towns to dwell in' Ez 45.5.¹⁴ This sounds more natural than to view Μὴ .. αἰσχυσθῆς (vs. 1) as latent.

But what is meant with δικαιῶσαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ 'to acquit the impious'? The same semantic difficulty is presented by אַחַת רשע להצדיק. This is totally different from אַחַת רשע וְרַשׁ הַצְּדִיקוּ עָנִי וְיָתוּם עֲנִי וְיָתוּם עֲנִי וְרַשׁ הַצְּדִיקוּ Ps 82.3 (Θ κρίνατε ὀρφανὸν καὶ πτωχόν, ταπεινὸν καὶ πένητα δικαιώσατε). We actually read מְצַדִּיק רְשָׁע מְצַדִּיק רְשָׁע Pr 17.15 (Θ ὁ δὲ δίκαιον κρίνει τὸν ἄδικον,

¹⁰ For a description of these two functions, final vs. resultative, of the Gk infinitive, cf. SSG § 30 ba-bb.

¹¹ Smend (388) wants to read it as an inf., אחטא for אחט, or a substantive, i.e. אַחַת. Mopsik's (249) translation assumes that the author joined two separate verbal clauses into one: "et tu ne seras ni partial ni porteur du poids d'un péché." But none would say in English: "I am going to strike you and a light."

¹² V.l. א.

¹³ V.l. משפט.

¹⁴ For a discussion with examples, see SSG § 30 bd.

ἄδικον δὲ τὸν δίκαιον, ἀκάθαρτος καὶ βδελυκτὸς παρὰ θεῶ). Our translation is an attempt to overcome this difficulty.¹⁵

42.3) περὶ λογιμοῦ κοινωνοῦ καὶ ὁδοιπόρων
καὶ περὶ δόσεως κληρονομίας ἑτέρων,
*of jointly settling an account and (fellow-)travellers
and of offering part of a legacy to others,*

(B) על חשבון (ב) חובר¹⁶ ואדון¹⁷ ועל מחלקות נחלה ויש¹⁸:
(M) על חשבון שותף ודרך ועל מחלקת נחלה ויש:

λογιμοῦ] so Ziegler, definitely superior to λόγου (Rahlfs).

λογιμοῦ κοινωνοῦ] (B) could also mean basically the same thing as (M): “partner and master.” With one’s limited financial resources, one might shamefully need a wealthier partner to run business. As an indication of possible feeling of shame, B’s reading is superior to that of M.

We are unable to find anywhere an instance of Qal ptc. חובר (B), which means something close to κοινωνός.¹⁹ שותף (M), however, is rather close. See שֵׁן וְשֵׁן אֶשְׁתָּא ‘associate.

ὁδοιπόρων M דרך cf. הָלַךְ דָּרַךְ Is 35.8.²⁰ Cf. שֵׁן רְדִי נֵן ‘travels.’

δόσεως] At 41.21 also B has, in its v.l., the pl. מחלקות, which is implausible and need be replaced by the sg. מחלקת as in M here. Ⓞ’s interpretation there (μερίς) differs from what we find here.

ἑτέρων] Ziegler against many MSS which read εταιρων ‘of friends.’ How Ⓞ arrived at this rendering of שׁ is obscure. For this participle as a self-standing substantive in the sense of “possessions, property,” see לְהַנְחִיל אֶתְּבִי יֵשׁ וְאַצְרִיתִיהֶם אֶמְלֵא Pr 8.21.

42.4) περὶ ἀκριβείας ζυγοῦ καὶ σταθμίων
καὶ περὶ κτήσεως πολλῶν καὶ ὀλίγων,
*of the precision of scales and weights
and of purchase of much and little,*

¹⁵ Ours is close to Smend’s (II 74): “wegen des Rechtes, dass du dem Schuldigen Recht gäbest,” though a judge or someone with authority actually performs this duty, whilst the average citizen prays that that would become a reality and does everything to promote the cause. See Ryssel’s (439) struggle: “des gerechten Urteilspruchs, der [sogar] dem Gottlosen zu seinem Rechte verhilft.” Cf. Box - Oesterley (469): “probably not hesitate to acquit the ungodly man when he is proved innocent of a particular charge.”

¹⁶ V.l. שותף.

¹⁷ V.l. וארח.

¹⁸ V.l. וישך.

¹⁹ Segal (282) writes that it is synonymous with חָבַר, referring to mMen 9.9 in a Cambridge MS, whilst Albeck’s edition reads חָבַרִים.

²⁰ According to Lieberman (1968.50-52) the word is to be vocalised as either דָּרַךְ or דָּרַךְ meaning “guardian.” *Maagarim* does not recognise such words at all.

(Ba) ועל שחק מאזנים ופּלס ועל תמהות איפה ואבן²¹:
 (Bb) על מקנה²² בין רב למעט:
 (Ma) על שחקי מזנים ופּלס ועל תמחי איפה ואבן:
 (Mb) על מקנה בין רב למעט:

ἀκαρίβειας] derives from וּכְשַׁחַק מֵאֲזִינִים נִחְשְׁבוּ Is 40.15 and ἀκαρίβεια] derives from וְשָׁקֶל בְּפֶלֶס הָרִים וְגַבְעוֹת בְּמֵאֲזִינִים and ib. 12, where שַׁחַק has little to do with precision or accuracy, but means ‘dust’ and is used in a metaphor of insignificance. Even a tiny amount of dust lying on or attached to instruments of measurement could change the correct weight of goods being sold or bought.

The second hemistich is absent in Ⓞ, possibly a consequence of homoioarcton, על .. על. Or the translator found, as an urban intelligentsia, the text not easy to handle. Yadin (43) translates תמחי as “polishing,” whilst the word is registered in *Maagarim* as meaning ‘obliteration’ and occurring only here. B’s תמהות ‘surprises’ makes little sense here. The v.l. in B makes better sense: “changing between (different units of) ephah.” Alternatively one could restore וּבִן תְּמֹרֵת אֵיפָה וְאֵבֶן ‘changing between ephah and even.’

The last advice is meant for a customer who is buying a little; if he or she has a reason to believe that something funny is being done by the seller, the customer should have courage to complain.

42.5) περὶ διαφόρου πράσεως ἐμπόρων
 καὶ περὶ παιδείας τέκνων πολλῆς
 καὶ οἰκέτη πονηρῷ πλευρὰν αἱμάξαι·
of money from sale to merchants
and of intensive disciplining of children
and of causing haemorrhage in the side of a bad servant;

(B) ועל ממהיר²³ מִמְכֵר תַּגֵּר:
 (Ma) ...ממחיר ממכר תגר:
 (Mb) ה ועבד רע וצלע מהלכ/מַת:

[διαφόρου] Hardly reconcilable with B ממהיר ‘one who hastens.’ Yadin’s (23) suggestion of interpreting Ma ממחיר as meaning “bargaining, bartering” is questionable. No Heb. verb derived or action noun from מחר in such a sense is known. But מחיר, i.e. מְחִיר, without restoring a *mem* at the beginning, can be somehow harmonised with διάφορος. מחיר ממכר תגר would mean ‘a selling price of a merchant.’ The v.l. in B, מוסר, is most likely part of vs. 5b [παιδείας], which apparently disappeared due to a homoioarcton. Note מְרִדוּתָא ‘education.’

²¹ V.l. תמורת אפה ואפה.

²² חשבון.

²³ מוסר.

ἐμπόρων] an objective genitive, i.e. “act of selling to merchants,” although the verb underlying πρᾶσις, i.e. πιπράσκω, combines with a dat. pers. (buyer), e.g. πραθήσεσθε ἐκεῖ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑμῶν εἰς παιῖδας καὶ παιδίσκας Dt 28.68. תגנר, unknown in BH, occurs in RH, probably imported from Arm. תגַר. Cf. שְׁחַתְּמָא תגַר used here.

πονηρῶ] Both adjectives can mean “bad” not only morally, ethically, but also generally, practically. Hence it could be used of a servant suspected of theft, for instance, but also an idle or forgetful one. Here probably the latter, a servant, in זָלַע, i.e. צָלַע ‘limping,’ pretending to be suffering from a painful knee, for instance.

Ⓞ read זָלַע as צָלַע. Πλευρά is undoubtedly used in the sense of ‘rib’ at Gn 2.21, but it also means “side (of a human or animal body),” which must apply here. For without a surgeon nearby any damage caused to a rib of a servant’s body from outside would be invisible.

αἰμάξαι] Where this word here comes from is a mystery. Yadin (23) reads מהלכת זָלַע and translates (43) it as “feigns limping.” He refers to 1QS 3.9 מהלכת תמים as an analogous expression. It is not clear to us in what way this Qumran text throws light and justifies his rendering.²⁴ Qimron (1999.228) prefers to read מהלמת, i.e. מְהַלֶּמֶת ‘beating.’ Both Nebe (1970) and Abegg read מהלמת.

The prep. περὶ at the start of the verse must be governing this infinitival clause as well, cf. SSG § 30 **aba**.

42.6) ἐπὶ γυναικὶ πονηρᾷ καλὸν σφραγίς,
καὶ ὅπου χεῖρες πολλαί, κλειῖσον·

*Against a bad woman it is a good idea to seal (a document),
and where many hands (could be around), use a key.*

(B) על אשה רעה²⁵ חותם חכם ומקום ידיים רפות תפתח²⁶
(M) שֵׁת חוֹתֵם ומקום ידיים רבות מפתח:

ἐπὶ] The selection of this preposition to render על shows that both Ⓞ and זָ are departing again from the earlier set pattern, and what we have here is the normal clause pattern.

πονηρᾷ] Qimron (1999.229) proposes restoring טפשה, i.e. טִפְשָׁת equivalent to טִפְשָׁה ‘silly.’ See also Dihi 2008.19f.

καλὸν] Σφραγίς is fem. in gender, but the text does not read: καλὴ σφραγίς. For here it is not about the good quality of a seal, but the idea of using a seal is good. Cf. SSG § 77 **ce**.

²⁴ We (Muraoka 2022.49) have proposed an emendation of להלכת to ללכת, i.e. לְלַכְתָּ. Cf. also Strugnell 1969.114f.

²⁵ V.l. טפשה ‘stupid.’

²⁶ V.l. חותם ומ' יד' ר' תפתח. The second half makes little sense.

Similarly חותם חכם does not mean “a wise man seals [חותם חכם]” nor “a sophisticated seal [חותם חכם],” but in dealing with a bad woman the use of a seal is a clever approach. An alternative analysis is presented by Segal (280) and Kahana (515): חותם חכם ‘a wise man’s seal.’ שִׁיר הַתְּמָאָה ‘a seal is wonderful’ derives from a wrong syntactic analysis of C .²⁷

πολλάί] = M רבות, ≠ B רפּוּת ‘weak.’

ὄπου] C spotted here a cst. phrase of locational value as in מקום מים ‘a place where there is water’ CD 11.16; cf. *SQH* 21 b (va).

κλειῖσον] B תּפּתּח, an error for M מפתח ‘key.’ On שִׁיר הַתְּמָאָה ‘Shut!’ there is in the margin an explanatory comment: אִיךְ דָּאָהָד אָנְשׁ תְּרָעָא ‘similar to: “a person shuts a door”.’

Yadin (23) restores the first half of M as על אשה רעה תשת חותם, i.e. תִּשֶׁת ‘you shall put.’ But whence C καλὸν? We admit, though, that שת.. remains difficult.

For the general substance of the proverb, cf. 22.27 above.

42.7) ὃ ἐὰν παραδιδῶς, ἐν ἀριθμῶ καὶ σταθμῶ,
καὶ δόσις καὶ λῆμψις, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ·

*Whatever you entrust as a deposit, count and weigh,
and let both giving and receiving be entirely kept in writing.*

(B) על מקום תפקד יד תספור²⁸ ומתת ולקח²⁹ הכל בכתב:
(M) על... תפקיד מספר ש.. ופחתת הכל בכתב:

For 7a C and D are wide apart from each other. What the latter means is obscure. There is nothing in it that would reflect itself in C , say תשקול ‘you shall weigh.’ The function of על is opaque.

δόσις καὶ λῆμψις] The sequence of the two terms is reversed in M. Cf. a standing idiom in RH, מִשָּׂא וּמִתָּן ‘commercial transaction.’ The two different sequences are indicative of two different perspectives, one of a buyer and the other of a seller. Qimron (1999.229) proposes restoring תת[ואה] or תת[את]. Qimron further insists that תפקיד is a verbal noun meaning “deposition,” but he does not say how it relates to מספר.

42.8) περὶ παιδείας ἀνοήτου καὶ μωροῦ
καὶ ἐσχατογήρως κρινομένου περὶ πορνείας·
καὶ ἔση παιδευμένος ἀληθινῶς
καὶ δεδοκίμασμένος ἔναντι παντὸς ζῶντος.

²⁷ Lévi (48) holds that חכם is an error for חותם and an addition inserted by a reader in praise of the idea expressed here, an analysis which sounds to us a little too clever. Both Lévi (48) and Abbott add a sof pasuq /:/ after חותם, and Smend (II 43) does not add חכם on the same ground. We do not, however, see no such a sign in the facsimile of M.

²⁸ V.I. מפקד יד תחשוב.

²⁹ V.I. תתה, ושואה ותתה. תתה, obviously derived from נתן, occurs nowhere in Hebrew.

*Of disciplining an unintelligent and stupid person
and a very old man accused of fornication;
and then you could be truly educated
and approved by every person.*

על מוסר ³⁰ פותה וכסיל	ושב וישיש ונוטל ³¹ עצה בזנות ³² :
והיית זהיר באמת	ואיש צנוע לפני כל חי:
על מ.. פותה וכסיל	שב כושל ענה בזנות:
והיית זהיר באמת	... לפני כל חי:

[על εἶπε] We are back again to the style familiar to us.

ἐσχατογῆρος] **שָׁב** and **יָשִׁישׁ** are synonyms meaning ‘old, aged.’ Cf. **גַּם-שָׁב** εἶπε Jb 15.10, where the addition of **גַּם** to both shows they are not completely synonymous, and given their juxtaposition the former must indicate a range of age, not the colour of human hair, hence ‘having white hair.’ It is generally thought that the latter means ‘very old,’ which is plausible, given the sequence of the two words. The growth of white hair signals the start of old age. Ⓞ may have thought it unnecessary to indicate the progress of ageing. At 35.3 it renders **שָׁב** with *πρεσβύτερος* ‘aged.’ M also has only one word meaning ‘aged,’ and the second is replaced with another indicating a feature of old age: **כּוּשֵׁל** ‘stumbling, tottering.’³³ *Pace* Smend (391) *ἐσχατογῆρος* is correct as gen. sg. On **יָשִׁישׁ** see also above at 8.6 and see 41.2 on *ἐσχατογῆρος*.

κρινομένου] In neither B nor M is found anything that would accord with this rendering. M’s **ענה** could be compared with Syr. *pe’al* **עָנָה** ‘to occupy oneself (with ב-).’

περὶ πορνείας] Ziegler *contra* Rahlfs *προς νεους* ‘to the young.’

ἔση] The selection in **וְהִיִּית** of a *w-qatalī* form indicates, just as at 42.1, the conclusion of a long passage that started in 42.1.

ἔση πεπαιδευμένος] The periphrastic fut. instead of the plain fut., *παιδευθήση*, plays an important role of highlighting the perfected state instead of the process; the fut. is aspect-neutral.³⁴

πεπαιδευμένος] This is somewhat distinct from **זהיר**, though if you are well educated, you might become cautious (**זָהִיר**).

δεδοκίμασμένος] This is synonymous with the preceding *πεπαιδευμένος*, but rather distinct from **צנוע** ‘modest.’ However, this Heb. word may not be original, for it does not fit the context here.

³⁰ V.l. מרדות.

³¹ V.l. ושואל, a secondary correction of עונה.

³² V.l. ושב כושל ועונה בזנות.

³³ Kister (1999.162) mentions איש זקן כושל IQSa 2.7.

³⁴ Cf. SSG § 31 *fc.*

- 42.9) Θυγάτηρ πατρὶ ἀπόκρυφος ἀγρυπνία,
καὶ ἡ μέριμνα αὐτῆς ἀφιστᾷ ὕπνον·
ἐν νεότητι αὐτῆς, μήποτε παρακμάσῃ,
καὶ συνωκηκυῖα, μήποτε μισηθῆι·

*A daughter causes her father insomnia, unknown to anyone,
worrying about her, he loses sleep;
in her youth, (he worries), she might miss a chance to marry,
once married, she might be disliked (by her husband);*

:... ..תפ.. 36	דאגה	שקר	בת לאב מטמנת 35	(Ba)
:... ..פן	ובבתוליה	תגור	בנעוריה פן	(Bb)
:... ..נומה	בַת לאב מטמון ..	(Ma)
:... ..פן	וב..יה	פן	בנעוריה פן	(Mb)

[ἀπόκρυφος ἀγρυπνία] Correcting שקר to שקד as at 34.1, how could we interpret מטמנת שקד (B) or מטמון שקד³⁷? Perhaps “valuable treasure in the form of insomnia that must be kept to the father and not to be shared with others.”

ἡ μέριμνα αὐτῆς] an objective genitive.

ὕπνον] Now recovered in נומה (M), i.e. נומה as used in תלְכִישׁ נומה נומה as used in Pr 23.21.

παρακμάσῃ] from παρακμάζω, a hapax in SG and derived from ἀκμή ‘prime.’ B’s תגור ‘she may have illegal sex’³⁸ is more serious than M’s תמאס ‘she may be disliked.’ Neither Heb. form is reflected in 𐤄. תגור probably implies that a daughter, in order to meet her sexual needs, might go as far as working in a red-light district of her city.³⁹

Neither B nor M has anything that would reflect 9d. 𐤄 is close to 𐤄, though it is not certain that the former had an extra text in its *Vorlage*, not influenced by 𐤄: וּמִן בְּעֵלָה דְלָא תְסַתְנָא: ‘in case she is hated by her husband.’ In 9a there is no trace of such an influence: בְּרִתָּא עַל אַבּוּהָ יְקִירָא סְגִיָּא: ‘a daughter is a very heavy burden on her father.’

συνωκηκυῖα] The selection of the Pf. ptc. suggests that this is not about the couple’s ongoing married life, but the verb is used in the sense of “to enter marital relationship” (GELS s.v. συνοικέω 1), thus not quite “bei ihrem Zusammenleben” (SD) or 𐤄 וְכַד עָמְרָא אַכְהָדָא 𐤄: ‘and when she lives

³⁵ V.l. מטמון, possibly an attempt to replace an innovative word with a better-known, standard one.

³⁶ V.l. דאגה, definitely superior to דאגה.

³⁷ מטמון and מטמנת are synonyms. This Si passage is the first attestation of the former.

³⁸ The verb תגור as synonymous with זנה is unknown to BH, but occurs in Aramaic, e.g. תגור Jb 36.20 Trg, where the verb is Pael with causative value, but it occurs also in Peal, e.g. (אִישׁ אָשֶׁר יִנָּאֵף אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ אִישׁ 𐤄) TrgJ Lv 20.10 (גבר די יגור אתת גבר).

³⁹ Smend’s (392) proposal to read תגור is implausible, for if a daughter is attractive enough to attract young lads, her father need not worry.

together (with him).’ Smend (392) proposes to read בעולה, i.e. בעולה ‘married,’ adding that בבתוליה is an intrusion from vs. 10, what may be right, but B’s בבתוליה is also read in M, where the remaining suffix יה cannot apply to בעול.⁴⁰

42.10) ἐν παρθενία, μήποτε βεβηλωθῆ
καὶ ἐν τοῖς πατρικοῖς αὐτῆς ἔγκυος γένηται
μετὰ ἀνδρὸς οὐσα, μήποτε παραβῆ,
καὶ συνφκηκυῖα, μήποτε στειρωθῆ.

*in her virginity, (he worries), she might be deflowered
and (still) in her parental home she might get pregnant;
Being with a husband, she might commit an adultery,
and, though having officially married, she might turn out barren.*

(Ba) בבתוליה פן תפודה 41 42 ובבית ..ל..ל... 43
(Bb) בבית אביה פן ... ובבית אישה ... תפוצר:
(Ma) בבתוליה פן תחל ועל אישה ... תשטה:
(Mb) בית אביה פן תזריע ובעל...:

ββββββββ] Closer to תחל (M), i.e. Ni.⁴⁴ תחל than to תפודה, i.e. תפודה (B) or v.l. תפתה ‘she makes a fool of herself’ or ‘she gets seduced.’ Whilst Hitpael can be not only reflexive, but also passive in value, in Pu. the woman is clearly represented as a victim.⁴⁵ Cf. תפודה איש בתולה Ex 22.15. Note ש תתפרסא ‘she disgraces herself.’

ἔγκυος γένηται] M תזריע. On this remarkable Hi. verb, see אשה כי תזריע Lv 12.2, where, by using a passive form, the translator may be trying to overcome this oddity: Γυνή, ἣτις ἐὰν σπερματισθῆ [‘becomes fertilised’] καὶ τέκη ἄρσεν. However, not only Lv 12.2, but also an instance such as וְיָקַח אִישׁ אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ לְמִינָהּ וְרָעָה לְמִינָהּ Gn 1.12⁴⁶ show that תזריע means ‘to take part in reproduction and produce a result’ by allowing her husband to inject a semen (זרע).

⁴⁰ Segal (285) is aware that Heb. does not use בעולה according to the pattern of בתולים, נעורים, and זקונים. On these plural forms, cf. JM § 136 h.

⁴¹ V.l. תפתה.

⁴² V.l. בתוליה פ' תפתה.

⁴³ V.l. בית בע' ל' תנשה.

⁴⁴ We would take ββββββββ as genuinely passive. In כי תחל לזנות Lv 21.9, in which the s is a daughter of a priest so that the context is close to our Si case here, we find in ש exactly the same form: ἐὰν ββββββββ τοῦ ἑκπορνεῦσαι, where we have a case of passive in form only, for it is about a woman, whether already married or still betrothed, decided to work as a prostitute of her own accord. Hence we prefer “sich entweihen lässt, sich zu prostituieren” (SD) to “est profanée par prostitution” (BA), cf. Rashi ad loc.

⁴⁵ Cf. SQH § 12 f. On Bathsheba as a consenting party, not a victim of a rape, see Muraoka 2020.39f.

⁴⁶ Referred to by Milgrom 1991.743.

μετά] probably reflecting עַם, i.e. עַמ, rather than עַל. However, עַל is preserved in **Ⲛ** וְעַל בְּעֵלָהּ, and the Heb. עַל implies hostility, rebellion; see BDB s.v. עַל 7 d (p. 757b).

παρὰβῆναι ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ (M)] On this equation, see ἐὰν παραβῆ ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ **Ⲛ** 5.12. **Ⲛ** uses an etymologically close verb, but in a significantly different sense: תִּשְׁטַא בְּמַדְעָא ‘she goes crazy,’ followed by וְתִאָזַל אַחֲרָא אַחֲרָא ‘and she chases another man.’

συνφρακῆσθαι] See our remarks above on vs. 9. Here, too, **Ⲛ** is basically the same as in vs. 9: וְכַד עִם גְּבָרָא אִתִּיהָ ‘when she is with the man.’

στειρωθῆναι] This verb, στειρόω, is unknown prior to SG and derived from a common, substantivised adjective, στεῖρα ‘barren woman.’

Vss. 10b and 10c of **Ⲙ** appear to reflect vss. 10c and 10b of **Ⲙ**.

42.11) ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἀδιατρέπτῳ στερέωσον φυλακὴν,
μήποτε ποιήσῃ σε ἐπίχαρμα ἐχθροῖς,
λαλιὰν ἐν πόλει καὶ ἔκακλητον λαοῦ,
καὶ καταισχύνη σε ἐν πλήθει πολλῶν.

*Keep a vigilant eye on a headstrong daughter,
lest she would make you a laughingstock among (your) enemies,
a talk of the town and summoned by people in a court,
and humiliate you in a big crowd.*

... ..ל..ל..ל. (Ba)
... דבת עיר וקהלת עם והושבתך⁴⁹..עדת שער⁵⁰: (Bb)
... מקום תגור⁵¹ אל יהי אשנב ובית מביט מבוא סביב: (Bc)
... על בת חזק משמר פן ת...: (Ma)
... דבת עיר וקהלת עם ...: (Mb)
... מקום תגור אל יהי ...: (Mc)

ἀδιατρέπτῳ] On this adjective, see above at 26.10, where we find the same statement in **Ⲙ** as here.

בַּת חֲזָקָה (Ma) can be a construct phrase indicative of quality, בַּת חֲזָקָה, equivalent to בַּת חֲזָקָה, cf. לבב קושי 1QM 17.4. Cf. *SQH* 21 b (xviii). But **Ⲛ** begins the verse with בְּרִי ‘my son.’ Such could fill the lacuna at the start of (Ma). Then חֲזָקָה would be a verb, חֲזָקָה ‘Strengthen!’, which accords with στερέωσον. This latter alternative analysis looks preferable, whilst it makes ἀδιατρέπτῳ a free addition by the translator, which is absent

⁴⁷ V.I. סרה.

⁴⁸ V.I. בני על בת החזק משמר פ' תע' מ' לא'. בני על בת החזק, which may be fully written out as בני על בת החזק, Smend (393) suggests משמר פן תעשך משל לאיבים.

⁴⁹ V.I. והובישתך, a scribal error, for the form is from הוביש ‘to make dry,’ which makes no sense here.

⁵⁰ V.I. דבת ע' וק' ע' והבשת בעדת שער.

⁵¹ V.I. תשב.

in §. The second *lamed* in (Ba) may be part of the inf., לחזק, an inf. equivalent to an impv.⁵²

ἐπίχαρμα] This hardly reflects שם סרה, which pretty well corresponds with § שְׂמָא בִּישָׂא ‘a bad name.’ The v.l. סרה for סרה means ‘repulsive.’

καταισχύνη] This more likely reflects the v.l., i.e. הוֹשִׁבְתָּךְ than הוֹשִׁבְתָּךְ. Note § תְּבַהֲתֵךְ ‘she makes you ashamed.’

Ⓞ lacks (Bc / Mc) Ⓜ ‘Let her dwelling-place not become a window lattice and a theatre with an entrance all around.’ תגור is an asyndetic relative clause, thus מקום תגור, which in its turn constitutes the *s* of the following יהי; see 34.14. Note §: אַתָּר דְּעַמְרָא לָא תְּשַׁבְּקִיה נְפִקָא וּבְבִתָּא לָא תְּהוּא הֶדְרָא ‘the place where she lives you shall not allow her to leave and go round neighbourhood houses.’⁵³

42.12) παντι ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ ἔμβλεπε ἐν κάλλει
καὶ ἐν μέσῳ γυναικῶν μὴ συνέδρευε·

*Don't look anybody handsome straight in the face
and don't sit in the midst of women,*

(B) לכל זכר⁵⁴ אל תתן תאר וּבֵית נָשִׁים אֵל תַּסְתוּיֵד⁵⁵:
(M) לכל זכר אל תבן תאר :...

ἀνθρώπῳ] Though ἀνθρωπος is gender neutral and can refer here to a gay, the following clause and the immediately following two verses speak of women, which would probably apply here, too. We do not know why a more explicit noun such as ἀνήρ was not used to render זָכָר. In this regard, § is explicit: לְכָל גְּבֵר לָא תְּגַלֵּא מָא דְּבִלְבָךְ ‘Don't reveal to any man what is in your mind.’ However, this translation discloses another problem, for תתן has been parsed in § as 2ms.sg. as is shown through לְבָךְ, and not לְבָה ‘her mind.’ The message becomes: “Don't trust any guy!,” and the aspect of charming look, appearance [= תאר] is gone. Or is this a piece of advice to a father to make sure that his daughter does not disclose his inner thought to any boy friend of hers? The translator may have had a problem with תתן תאר, for what does גְּבֵר תְּגַלֵּא mean? Ⓞ apparently took it as meaning “to highly evaluate,” a questionable interpretation.⁵⁶ Did Ben Sira himself mean to say that no girl

⁵² On this question, see *SQH* § 18 c.

⁵³ Some Syr. verbs can be complemented with a ptc., e.g. שְׁבוּקוּ טְלִיא אֶתִּין לְוֹת ‘Allow the children to come to me’ (ἄφετε τὰ παιδιά και μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με) Mt 19.14. See further Muraoka 2005 § 98 d.

⁵⁴ V.l. תוּכַר, so read by Abegg.

⁵⁵ V.l. תַּסְתִּיד.

⁵⁶ Yadin's (25) understanding of בן or הבין as meaning “to expose, show, reveal” is as questionable. As a piece of evidence he refers to אֶת־הַמְרָאָה לְהַלְוֵהָ דָן 8.16. We fail to see why the standard meaning, “to help understand, explain,” is to be rejected here, cf. Ⓞ LXX and τὴν συνέτισον ἐκείνον τὴν ὄρασιν.

prior to marriage should show any man features of her physical beauty which are not visible from outside? But the use of נתן is odd.⁵⁷

We have here a dative of indirect object, on which see SSG § 22 **wb**.

ἐμβλεπε] The *s* must be masculine; nowhere in the book does the author address a woman, and every personal address is directed at בני ‘my son.’ As stated earlier at 2.1, τέκνον as vocative occurs tens of times in Si, and תּ, if preserved, is בני. This implies that נתן was analysed by the translator as m.sg. In theory it could be 3f.sg., which is rather plausible since from vs. 9 the author was dealing with a daughter, and we are also to take note of זכר here, and here we have the sole attestation of the equation זָכָר / ἄνθρωπος. It is rather unlikely that the author is suddenly addressing male readers and advising them to beware of gays.

καλλει] Heb. תֵּאֲרָ means by itself ‘appearance, look’ as in רִוּי מֵהֵתָּה ‘what does he look like?’ 1Sm 28.14, though in BH it is sometimes used following תִּפְתּוּ or תִּפְתּוּ as in מֵרֵאָה וּפִתְתֵּאֲרָה Gn 29.17, but we have a case such as אִישׁ יְפֵה / ἄνθρωπος Gn 41.19. However, we read on the future King David called אִישׁ יְפֵה 1Sm 16.18, cf. ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τῷ εἶδει [= אִישׁ יְפֵה תֵּאֲרָ].

Vs. 12b makes little sense when תַּסְתִּייד is parsed as 3f.sg., though Smend (394) thinks otherwise: “Die Jungfrau soll aber auch mit verheirateten Frauen nicht verkehren.”

ἐν μέσῳ] = בֵּין.

42.13) ἀπὸ γὰρ ἱματίων ἐκπορεύεται σῆς
καὶ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς πονηρία γυναικός.
*for out of garments comes out a moth
and from a woman the vice of woman.*

(B) כי מבגד יצא עש ומאשה רעת אשה:

(M) כי מבגד יצא סס ..ה. רעת אשה:

σῆς] עש (B) and סס (M) are synonymous. Cf. סס and סס.

In vs. 13b ס is a little explanatory: הַקְנָא טַנְנָא דְאִנְתָּתָא מִן בִּישׁוּתָהּ דְהַבְרָתָה: ‘so the jealousy of a woman (is) from the vice of her friend.’

42.14) κρείσσων πονηρία ἀνδρὸς ἢ ἀγαθοποιὸς γυνή,
καὶ γυνὴ καταισχύνουσα εἰς ὄνειδισμόν.
*A vice of a man is better than a virtuous woman,
and a woman bringing about shame leading to disgrace.*

⁵⁷ Pace Segal (287) הִמָּה נִתְּנוּ הַדְרָךְ Ez 27.10 does not prove that the verb can mean “to show.” The preceding sentence says how they went about making up Tyre.

(B) מטוב רוע איש מטיב אשה ובית מחרפת תביע אשה⁵⁸:
(M) טוב רע איש מטוב אשה ובת מפחדת מכול חרפה:

κρείσσω] The prep. of B מטוב is to be deleted as in the v.l. and M.

ἀγαθοποιὸς] B מטיב need be corrected to מטוב, i.e. טוב (an abstract noun) as in the v.l. and M.⁵⁹ The selection of this Gk adjective is due to the freedom of translation, and has nothing to do with מְטִיב, which, being masc., cannot qualify אִשָּׁה nor can be placed before the latter.

γυνή²] B's בית is naturally to be replaced by M's בת. The translator may not have seen any particular need to shift from a woman to a daughter and may have expected a new, self-standing sentence rather than what is coordinate with the preceding אשה, "the goodness of a woman and a daughter who is scared of every kind of disgrace." He may now have felt himself justified in taking a bit of freedom.

This verse is absent in S. Did the translator feel disgusted at its message? On our author's view on women, see above at 25.13-26.18.

42.15) Μνησθήσομαι δὴ τὰ ἔργα κυρίου,

καὶ ἃ ἑώρακα, ἐκδιηγῆσομαι·

ἐν λόγοις κυρίου τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

¶ καὶ γέγονεν ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ αὐτοῦ κρίμα. ¶

*I will certainly remember the works of the Lord,
and what I saw I will expound,
with His words (are) His works (executed).*

¶ *And judgement took place to His pleasure.* ¶

(Ba) אזכר נא מעשי אל וזה חזיתי ואספרה:
(Bb) באומר אלהים רצונו⁶⁰ ופועל רצונו לקחו⁶¹:
(Ma) אזכרה נא מעשי אל וזה חזיתי ואשננה⁶²:
(Mb) באמר אדני מעשיו ופעל רצנו לקחו:

From here up to the end of the next chapter the author presents his view of God the Creator of the universe.⁶³ The first hemistich is reminiscent of Ps 77.12: אֶזְכֹּר [אֶזְכֹּר] > Ἐμνήσθην τῶν ἔργων κυρίου, ὅτι μνησθήσομαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν θαυμασίων σου.

⁵⁸ V.l. טוב רע איש מטוב אשה ובית מחרפת תביע חרפה.

⁵⁹ Yadin (25) insists on טיב, but it cannot be translated as "goodness" (44); there is no such Heb. word meaning "goodness," a criticism that applies to Lévi's (54) position. On this hapax, ἀγαθοποιός, in Si, cf. Wagner 1999.137f.

⁶⁰ V.l. מעשיו.

⁶¹ V.l. לקח.

⁶² V.l. אזכרה נא מעשיו וזה חזיתי ואשננה.

⁶³ Yadin (26) refers to a complete blank in Ms B between this and the preceding verses, and also a triangular shape at the top right of M. These imply a significant break here in the flow of the document.

Μνησθήσομαι] We agree with Smend (395), who holds that there is no need to read אָזְכֵר (B) or אָזְכְּרָה. Ps 77.12 testifies to an ancient fluctuation between the two alternatives, Qre and Ketiv.

זֶה] Here the Heb. dem. pron. is functioning as an asyndetic relative pronoun, which is in BH mostly confined to poetry, but also with an antecedent as in בּוֹ שֶׁכָּנַתְּ זֶה הֶרֶץ צִיּוֹן זֶה Ps 74.2.⁶⁴ Our author is probably quoting זֶה-הַקְּזִיתִי הֶרֶץ וְאָסַפְרָה Jb 15.17, cp. the similarity between our translator's text with his predecessor's rendering of Jb 15.17: ἃ δὴ ἔώρακα, ἀναγγελῶ σοι. The only BH example in prose mentioned in BDB s.v. זֶה 5 is לִי זֶה עֲשֵׂה יְהוָה לִי זֶה בְּעָבוּר זֶה עָשָׂה יְהוָה לִי זֶה בְּצִאתִי מִמִּצְרָיִם Ex 13.8.

ἐκδιηγῆσομαι] This may be a rendering of either אִסְפְּרָה or אֲשַׁנֵּנָה, which are synonymous. It is only here in LXX, though, שָׁנַן is rendered with ἐκδιηγέομαι, whereas this Gk verb renders סִפֵּר six times.

τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ] מעשיו in M and the v.l. of B is correct; רצונו is an intrusion from the next hemistich.

κρίμα] In Smend's (395) view the translator identified לְקַח for לָקַח.

In vs. 15c S has added a verb: אֶתְבָּרִיו 'they were created,' probably alluding to the narrative on the creation of the universe in Gn 1. We do not know how the translator of S thought of the creation of Adam and Eve. Whilst God did say "I am going to make man," the product was His only handiwork.⁶⁵

42.16) ἥλιος φωτίζων κατὰ πᾶν ἐπέβλεψεν,
καὶ τῆς δόξης κυρίου πλήρης τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ.

*The shining sun looks down on everything,
and of the Lord's glory are full His work(s).*

(B) שמש זורחת על כל נגלתה וכבוד יי על כל מעשיו:
(M) שמש זהרת על כל נגלתה.. ופ כבוד אדני מלא מעשיו:

ἥλιος] The article anticipated with a celestial body is missing; it might be a case of poetic licence as well as an influence of H here; for more examples, see SSG § 5 e.

⁶⁴ Note S: מִן מָה דִּקְוִית אֲנָא מִתְנָא 'from what I observed I shall tell' and הֲלִין דִּקְוִית לִי אֶתְשַׁע 'those things which I saw I shall recount.' Jb 15.17 cited above shares another feature with our Si example, namely the conjunction *waw* prefixed to the principal verb. How syntactically to analyse this *waw* is not easy. König (III § 415 s) says that it is a link between a Vordersatz and a Nachsatz, but the preceding part is not a self-standing clause.

⁶⁵ Jacob of Serugh, a fifth-sixth century Syriac scholar and church leader has this to say: "Let us make man in our image," He said, "also after our likeness." .. This pronouncement made about Adam did not resemble those other pronouncements that had been made about (other) creatures, for He had said on every (other) thing: "Let there be so and so, and it came into being." .. Concerning Adam He did not say: "Let there be Adam," .. When He said, "Let there be light, let there be a firmament," it was a command, when they came into being with a mere signal, but when He said, "Let's make man," He lowered Himself, making them with His hands ..' Muraoka 2018a.169.

φωτίζων] M רהר, ≠ B זורה 'rising (on the horizon).' Cf. שׁרניח 'risen' vs. שׁנהר 'shining.'

ἐπέβλεψεν] Unlike נגלתה 'it became visible' ἐπέβλεψεν makes the sun a personal entity which operates with its own will. שׁ, by adding a particle of similarity, allows itself a measure of freedom: אִךְ שְׁמָשָׁא דְדַנְיָה עַל כּל אֲתְגַלְיוּ כְּלֵהוֹן עֲבָדוּהִי 'like the sun which is risen on everything the mercies of the Lord were revealed on all His works.' The focus shifted from God's creative products to the Creator Himself.

πλήρης] so Ziegler, // Rahlfs πλήρης. In the Koine period this form had begun to become indeclinable, thus not the orthodox form as in Rahlfs.⁶⁶

⊕ = M מלא, ≠ B "the glory of the Lord is upon all His works."

ἔργον] There is no absolute need to understand the word in the sense of "product of activity" rather than "activity" itself, though the former sense is not precluded.

42.17) οὐκ ἐξεποίησεν τοῖς ἁγίοις κυρίου
ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι πάντα τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ,
ἃ ἐστερέωσεν κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ
στηριχθῆναι ἐν δόξῃ αὐτοῦ τὸ πᾶν.

*The Lord's saints were not good enough
to recount all His marvellous works,
which the Lord Almighty fortified
to enable everything to stand firm in His glory.*

לספר נפלאות יי	לא הספיקו קדושי אל	(Ba)
להתחזק ⁶⁹ לפני כבוד:	אימץ ⁶⁸ אלהים צבאיו	(Bb)
לספר כל נפלאותיו:	לא השפיקו קדשי אל	(Ma)
להתחזק לפני כבוד:	אמץ אדני צבאיו	(Mb)

ἐξεποίησεν] Reconstructed by Smend (395) against ενεποιησεν in MSS and followed by Rahlfs. This impersonal use of ἐκποιέω with a dat. in the sense of "someone manages to do so and so" also occurs in οὐθενὶ ἐξεποίησεν ἐξαγγελῖαι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ Si 18.4.

τοῖς ἁγίοις κυρίου] referring to angels. Cf. יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵינוּ יְיָ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַיּוֹדוּ שְׁמַיִם פְּלִאָהּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מְבַרְכֵינוּ יְיָ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַיּוֹדוּ שְׁמַיִם פְּלִאָהּ Ps 89.6, see also Dn 8.13 and Job 15.15. Particularly interesting is a QH text: רוב קדושים לכה בשמים וצבאות מלאכים בזבול קודשכה 'there are a large number of saints for you in heaven and hosts of angels in your holy dwelling' 1QM 12.1, where the parallelism between קדושים and מלאכים is to be noted.

ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι] שׁ לְמַנָּא 'to count' = לְסַפֵּר, not לְסַפֵּר.

⁶⁶ Cf. Thackeray 1909 § 12.6.

⁶⁷ V.I. גבורותיו.

⁶⁸ V.I. אומץ.

⁶⁹ V.I. להחזיק.

τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ] v.l. גבורותיו; cf. **ש** גְּבוּרֹתָא דְּפְרִישְׁתָּהּ ‘the mighty works of His marvels.’

א] In neither B nor M we find the relative pronoun, and an asyndetic relative clause across these two lines sounds implausible. The translator appears to have failed to see that there are two self-standing verbal clauses in the verse and the *o* of the verb מָצָא(י) is צבאיו.

ὁ παντοκράτωρ] a rendering influenced by κύριος παντοκράτωρ, which fairly frequently reflects in LXX יהוה צבאות or אלהי צבאות, e.g. יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה κύριος παντοκράτωρ μετ’ αὐτοῦ 2Sm 5.10.

κύριος παντοκράτωρ μετ’ αὐτοῦ] Here כבודו is likely to be equivalent to a personal pronoun, a form of polite address, so that לפני כבודו is equal to לפני. One is reminded of the use in English *majesty*, e.g. *Is your majesty going today, sir?* in lieu of *Are you going today, sir?* Cf. כִּי יִדְעָתִי כִּי יִיטֵב בְּעֵינַי כְּבוֹדוֹ לְהִסִּיר עוֹלָה מֵאֶהְלֵינוּ ‘I knew that you, sir, would rather remove injustice out of our tents,’ mentioned in Even-Shoshan, s.v. כְּבוֹד.⁷⁰ This is opposite to the idiomatic BH use of עָבַד, e.g. אֶל־נָא תַעֲבֹר מֵעַל עַבְדְּךָ Gn 18.3, where מֵעַל עַבְדְּךָ = מֵעַל־י.

τὸ πᾶν] a free addition; as referring back to 17b τὰ πάντα could have been said.

42.18) ἄβυσσον καὶ καρδίαν ἐξίχνευσεν
καὶ ἐν πανουργέμασιν αὐτῶν διενοήθη·
ἔγνω γὰρ ὁ ὕψιστος πᾶσαν εἰδήσιν
καὶ ἐνέβλεψεν εἰς σημεῖον αἰῶνος
He fathoms the abyss and heart(s) of people
and ponders their wonderful feats;
for the Most High knows everything they know
and looks closely at eternal signs,

ובכל מערומיהם יתבונן: (B) תהום ולב חקר
ובמערמיהם יתבונן: (Ma) תהום ולב חקר
כי ידע (ל) שְׁלִיוֹן⁷¹ דַּעַת (Mb) יִבִּיט אֶתִּיּוֹת עוֹלָם:

καρδίαν לב] In spite of the preceding ἄβυσσον / תהום, לב is unlikely to be an abbreviation of הים לב. Cf. בְּלִב־יָם ἐν καρδίᾳ θαλάσσης Pr 23.34. The addition of אִישׁ ἀνθρώπου could have taken care of this ambiguity. As Lévi (57) rightly points out, αὐτῶν in the next line can hardly refer to ἄβυσσον as well. Both the author and the translator might be thinking of “human beings.”

⁷⁰ Cf. Muraoka 1977a.468, fn. 33.

⁷¹ According to Yadin (1965.27) a *lamed* appears to have been written above the *ayin* by mistake.

καὶ¹] The conjunction *waw* preserved in the v.l. is indispensable.

τὰ ἐσόμενα [נהיות] The Ni. stem of the ptc. is ingressive, assigning the verb εἶμι the sense of ‘to come into being, to emerge.’ Note הויה ונהייה ‘it is in existence and it comes into existence’ IQS 3.15, sim. כל היו עולמים ונהיות ‘all that exist for eternity and what are to emerge’ CD 2.9; cf. *SQH* § 12 e (7).

Segal (291) views נהיות as qualifying חליפות and interprets it as meaning “the things that were and were done (היו ונעשו),” an analysis that seems to us implausible. He has made the ptc. redundant, and when a ptc. refers to a past event, it is normally articular or determinate.⁷⁶ Ⓞ’s shift from the Pf. to the Fut. is impressive.

נסתרות .. [נהיות] The use of the fem. gender to indicate abstract notions is well established as in כול הנגלות ‘all that is revealed’ IQS 1.8; עשות חדשה ‘to do something new’ IQS 4.25, cf. *SQH* § 6 c.

Ⓢ is somewhat expansive in vs. 19a, continuing what ended, also expansive, the end of vs. 18: וְגַלְיִן קְדָמוֹהִי פֶל דְּאִתִּין לְעֵלְמָא דְעֵבֵר וְדַעְתִּידִין ‘and all things that happen to the world, which are of the past and which are of the future, are revealed before Him.’

42.20) οὐ παρήλθεν αὐτὸν πᾶν διανόημα,
καὶ οὐκ ἐκρύβη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ εἷς λόγος.

*No (human) design at all escapes Him,
and not even one word (said by man) is hidden from Him.*

(B) לֹא נִעְדַר מִמֶּנּוּ כָל שְׂכַל וְלֹא חִלְפוּ כָל דְּבַר⁷⁷:
(M) לֹא נִעְדַר מִמֶּנּוּ שְׂכַל וְלֹא אֲבָדוּ כָל דְּבַר:

παρήλθεν] Though both B and M read נִעְדַר ‘is lacking, absent,’ a better fit is עֵבֵר.⁷⁸ See also Ⓢ עָנְדָא ‘departs, passes away.’ At 14.14 we have reconstructed the defective ⓂA תֵּעֵבֵר אַח אַל תֵּעֵבֵר // וְהִלְקַח אַח אַל תֵּעֵבֵר // וְהִלְקַח תְּמַדְתָּ אַל תֵּעֵבֵר // καὶ μερὶς ἐπιθυμίας ἀγαθῆς μὴ σε παρελθάτω, where also παρέρχομαι is used in the same sense as here and + τινα, which syntagm occurs in Jb 14.16 as well.

καὶ] Missing in Rahlfs.

ἐκρύβη] The number discord in Ⓜ, both in B and M, is striking, all the more because in a case of absolute, categorical negation as here, the use of the sg. of the noun in question is normal, e.g. כָּל-מְלֶאכֶה לֹא-יַעֲשֶׂה בָּהֶם.

⁷⁶ On this question, see above at 6.14, 16.7, and 36.17. Segal (292) is contradicting himself by saying that נהיות means “what is about to happen.” As a piece of evidence he refers to תְּאֻנָּה תְּאֻנָּה נְהִיָּה תְּעֵבֵר לְנֶפֶשׁ Pr 13.19, where the meaning could be “one’s wish being realised is a great pleasure.”

⁷⁷ V.l. חִלְפוּ מִנּוּ כִּי דְבַר.

⁷⁸ Pace Lévi (58) and Smend (397) Ⓞ has not swapped the two verbs in (B), for as shown above, נִעְדַר is not reflected in ἐκρύβη.

Ex 12.16.⁷⁹ In \mathfrak{C} the addition of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta$ highlighting the categorical nature of the negation precludes the use of the plural. Alternatively we could follow Segal (288) and Kahana (516), who vocalise הַלְפו as הַלְפוֹ . But how are we to analyse אָבְדו ? M was yet unknown to Segal and Kahana. Yadin (45) translates M as “Knowledge is not lacking to Him, And η [o] matter is lo[s]t upon Him,” which presupposes אָבְדָא , which can be equivalent to מָמְנוֹ אָבְד .⁸⁰

The verb הָלַף (B) here means ‘to depart (unnoticed)’ and אָבְד ‘to become virtually non-existent.’ It looks as if \mathfrak{C} swapped the two Heb. verbs.

$\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] stressing $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta$, ‘not even one,’ since the preceding verb is already negated with $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$. Cf. SSG § 83 fb.

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta \text{λόγος}] \mathfrak{S} \text{כּוֹל רָאוּ גִבּוֹרֹתָא}$ ‘every secret deed of might.’

42.21) τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ ἐκόσμησεν,
εἷς ἔστιν πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·
οὔτε προσετέθη οὔτε ἡλαττώθη,
καὶ οὐ προσεδεήθη οὐδενὸς συμβούλου.

He set in order the great products of His wisdom,

He is one from eternity to eternity;

He was not added to nor was He reduced,

and He does not require any consultant.

:82 אחד הוא מעולם-	ג... ג.81 תו תכן (Ba)
:מבין לכל מבין:	ל... ל. לא נאצל (Bb)
:מאחד הוא מעולם:	מא גבורת חכמתו (Ma)
:מבין לכל מבין:	מב לא נאסף (Mb)

$\text{μεγαλεῖα}]$ גבורות of the v.l. is preferable; גבורת (Ma) can be vocalised as גְּבוֹרָת .⁸⁴

$\text{ἐκόσμησεν}]$ The translator’s assistant may have pronounced תִּכְנ as if it were תִּקְנ . On this equation, cf. $\text{מי יוכל לְתִקְנ אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָוְתוּ} // \text{τίς δυνήσεται τοῦ κοσμηῆσαι ὃν ἄν ὁ θεὸς διαστρέψῃ αὐτόν; Ec 7.13}$. If this idea of ours be correct, Lévi’s (59) “est immuable” would not hold, for that postulates תִּכְנ .⁸⁵

⁷⁹ Cf. BDB s.v. כָּל e (c), p. 482a for more examples, and see also SQH § 40 g and SSG § 83 fb. The v.l. mentioned in the preceding fn. is preferable, though מנו need be corrected to ממנו .

⁸⁰ See our remarks at 4.18 and 48.17 with a reference to JM § 125 ba.

⁸¹ V.l. גבורות.

⁸² V.l. מהעולם.

⁸³ V.l. צרך.

⁸⁴ We wonder why Smend (397) finds גבורת חכמתו dismissible as “ein geschraubter Ausdruck”; his translation is “das Riesenwerk seiner Weisheit.”

⁸⁵ A verb has dropped out from (Ma). Yadin (27) has restored תִּכְנ on the basis of (Ba). He translates it (45) “is established,” i.e. = תִּכְנ . Another two words are missing in (Mb), what would correspond to נאצל and צריך in (Bb).

εἶς] It is unlikely to be about monotheism, but He could handle any situation single-handed, which He has been doing since the beginning of the universe and will keep at it for ever.

προσετέθη] The Heb. verb which was missing in (Bb) has now been supplied in (Mb), which, however, lacks an antonym for ἡλαττώθη. On נאצל, cf. נאצל מהתהנות Ez 42.6. נאס is an anomalous spelling of נס, i.e. נס, Ni. of √הס.⁸⁶

On the message of vs. 21c Segal (292) mentions a statement of the mediaeval Judaism such as חוסר ועודף לא יהיה בך 'in You there would be no deficiency or surplus.'

συμβούλου] On the idea of God consulting someone, see τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, ὅς συμβιβῆ αὐτόν; / מִי־תִבְּן יְיָ אֱתֵּרוּחַ יְהוָה וְאִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ Is 40.13, where the presence of תִּבְּן is to be noted, though Ⓞ equated it with תִּבְּן.

συμβούλου] מִבֵּין must have been taken in the sense of "one who helps someone else to comprehend," which is fairly close to "counsellor, advisor."⁸⁷

Ⓢ is utterly short: וְחֵכְמָתָא קְדָמוֹהִי קָיְמָא לְעֵלְמִי 'and wisdom before Him remains for ever.'⁸⁸

For the message of vs. 21c, cf. Ec 3.14.

42.22) ὡς πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐπιθυμητὰ
καὶ ἕως σπινθηρός ἐστιν θεωρηῆσαι·

*How desirable are all His products!
And down to a spark they are to be observed.*

(M) הלוא כל מעשיו נחמד־ם עד ניצוץ וחזות מראה:

ὡς] The exclamatory particle accords well with הלוא (M) of rhetorical force.

ἕως] Against very many resources Rahlfs and Ziegler read ὡς. Neither of them knew of עד in M.⁸⁹ Furthermore, how could one analyse the gen. following ὡς?⁹⁰ When used as a prep., it takes an acc. to mark a destination and is attested in SG only once (*GELS* s.v. **VII**) in ὡς τὸν βασιλέα διεκομίσθη 'he betook himself to the king' 2M 4.5.

⁸⁶ See Kister 1990.355f.

⁸⁷ In *Index* s.v. we would add "(2) בֵּין hi." [1: Si 42.21].

⁸⁸ Against the punctuation of ed. Lagarde and Mossul, Smend (397) adds the last word of vs. 20, נְגַרְיָתָא, at the beginning of the verse, which would result in a number discord in אֲמַרְיָא f.sg.

⁸⁹ This prep. is not reflected in Skehan - Di Lella (484) in their translation: "delightful to gaze upon and a joy to behold!"

⁹⁰ "und wie ein Funke ist, was man schaut!" (*SD*) is impossible; θεωρέω τινος is unattested in Greek. As questionable are *et tanquam scintillam quam est considerare* (**Ⓢ**), "comme une étincelle, que l'on pourrait contempler" (*BJ*), and "they are like a spark to behold" (*NETS*).

σπινοθηρός] **ש** presents a pl. form in spite of the absence of *seyyame*, פרחרוחיתא, i.e. פרחרוחיתא from sg. פרחרוחיתא.

ש is rather peculiar: וְכָל־הוֹן עֲבָדוּהָ לְעַלְמֵם בְּקוֹשְׁתָּא מְשָׂרָא וּבְקַדְיִישׁוּתָא מְשַׁבְּחִין ‘and all His works He makes dwell in truth for ever and in holiness they all praise (Him)⁹¹ (?)’

42.23) πάντα ταῦτα ζῆ καὶ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
ἐν πάσαις χρείαις, καὶ πάντα ὑπακούει.

*All these live and remain for ever
to meet all needs, and they all respond.*

(B) הוא ...⁹² לעד ולכל צורך ... ישמע⁹³:
(M) הכל חי ועומד לעד בכל צורך והכל נשמר:

πάντα ταῦτα] **ש** [כָּל־הוֹן הָלִין f.pl., probably referring back to פרחרוחיתא ‘sparks’ in vs. 22. B’s הוא is odd, for it can only refer to God. Should we reconstruct the first half of B as הוא חי וקים לעד, we would be reminded of a statement cited by Segal (292) such as שְׁמָךְ הַגָּדוֹל חַי וְקַיָּם לְעוֹלָם bBer 32.1. μένει] B’s v.l. קים, i.e. קים, and M’s עומד, i.e. עומד, are synonymous. Cf. Hurvitz 1997.78-83.

ὑπακούει] This represents B, perhaps נשמע in its margin,⁹⁴ whereas M is distinct, meaning “all are preserved,” most likely a scribal error for נשמע.

Here, too, **ש** is as peculiar as in vs. 22: (23b) וְכָל־הוֹן צְבִינְוִהָ כּוֹלְהוֹן עֲתִידִין ‘and for all His desires they are ready and act very quickly in their domains.’

42.24) πάντα δισά, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός,
καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν ἑλλεῖπον·

*They all come in pairs, one against another
and He did not make anything lacking (the other).*

(B) כלם שונים זה מזה ולא עשה מהם שי...:
(M) כלם ... לעמת זה ולא עשה מהם ...:

δισά] = שנים, i.e. שנים. **ש** (B) means: “they are all different from one another.” For (M) 24b, cf. גם אַתְּוֹה לְעַמְתּוֹה עֲשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים Ec 7.14. Note esp. δύο δύο, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός ... לעומת זה לעומת 36.15, also about what was created by God.

⁹¹ For ‘they are all praised’ מְשַׁבְּחִין is more natural than מְשַׁבְּחִין as passive Pael.

⁹² V.l. וקים.

⁹³ V.l. לכל צורך הכל נשמע.

⁹⁴ Pace BSH 293a, Segal (288), and Kahana (517) Qal ישמע.

ἐλλειπὸν] How this can be related to the fragmentary ...שׁי is a difficult question.⁹⁵ Lévi (61) refers to שׁבט־אֵיתֵי 'vain, useless' and wonders if שׁוא, i.e. אִשָּׁ, stood in the *Vorlage*. Cf. the equation שׁוא / ἄχρηστος 'useless' at 16.1.

42.25) ἐν τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐστερέωσεν τὰ ἀγαθὰ,
καὶ τίς πλησθήσεται ὀρῶν δόξαν αὐτοῦ;

*They support one another, each with its own strength,
and who would be fed up by observing their glory?*

זה על זה חלף טובו וימי ישבצ ל...⁹⁶ (B)
זה על זה חלף טובם ומי יש(מ)צע להביט הודם: (M)

ἐν τοῦ ἐνὸς] a standard formula for an expression of reciprocity just as the repetition of הַן as here; Heb. has no word that corresponds to ἀλλήλω. The use of the pl. suf. pron. in טובם (M) is anomalous. הודם is acceptable, though, whilst αὐτοῦ is consistent in this respect just as טובו (B), cf. אִיקְרָהוּן 'their glory.' Note a similar instance in מלחמתו בכלי אִישׁ ידם אִישׁוּ 'they will each raise their hand with their weapons' 4Q491 11ii21, where the scribe (= redactor, author?) appears to be confused; in its 1QM version (16.6) we see the standard ידו.⁹⁷

τίς] B's וימי is an error for ומי (M).

δόξαν αὐτοῦ] This could be rendered as "His glory," but we follow the lead of M's הודם.⁹⁸ MS 248 actually reads δόξαν θεοῦ. Though it may come down to the same thing, "His glory" here must mean the universe manifesting His glory. On תואר in the v.l., see above at 42.12.

ἐστερέωσεν חֲ] חלף] It is difficult to argue for this equation.

⁹⁵ This speaks against Ryssel's (448) "überflüssig (תִּיר)."

⁹⁶ V.l. זה על זה חלף טובו.. ומי ישבע להביט תואר.

⁹⁷ See further *SQH* § 32 cf.

⁹⁸ Yadin (28) is confident that the last letter is a *mem*.

CHAPTER 43

43.1) Γαυρίαμα ὕψους στερέωμα καθαρειότητος,
εἶδος οὐρανοῦ ἐν δράματι δόξης.

*Clear sky is a pride high up,
the sight of the sky is a splendid view.*

(B) ... לְטוֹהַר ועצם שמים מְרִבִּיט הַדְרִי:
(M) תאר מרום ורקיע לטהר עֲצָם שָׁמַיִם מִ... רִי:

[Γαυρίαμα] Heb. תָּאָר can, in addition to the generic sense of ‘look, appearance,’ be used slightly extended in the sense of ‘good look.’ Cf. 42.12, where we note the equation of תָּאָר and κάλλος ‘beauty.’ See also below at vs. 9.

[στερέωμα] The association between στερέωμα and οὐρανός goes far back to καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν < וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְרִקְיעַ > שָׁמַיִם Gn 1.8. As to the introduction of the notion of purity in this context, both the author and translator are alluding to וְכִעֲצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְטָהָר καὶ ὥσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῆ καθαριότητι Ex 24.10.² The sense “firmament” of this Gk noun is unknown prior to LXX.³

[καθαρειότητος] a qualitative genitive, hence στερέωμα καθαρειότητος is equivalent to στερέωμα καθαρόν.

[δράματι] There is no word derivable from רַב־טַב that would fit our context. Ⓞ is apparently thinking of מְבִיט, i.e. מְבִיט ‘gazing, observing,’ cf. the v.l. Smend (400) suggests מְבִט, but his “ein herrlicher Anblick” is problematic in view of the suf. pron. in הַדְרִי, now confirmed by M. All the same vs. 1b in Ⓞ is syntactically difficult. A possible translation could be “the sky itself is like looking at His splendour.”

43.2) ἥλιος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ διαγέλλων ἐν ἐξόδῳ
σκεῦος θαυμαστόν, ἔργον ὑψίστου·

*As it appears, the sun announces its exit
a marvellous instrument, a product of the Most High.*

(B) שמש מביע בצרתו⁴ חמה מה נורא מעשי ייי:
(M) שמש מופיע בצאתו נכסה כלי נורא מעשי פֿליון:

¹ V.l. תואר מרום רקע על טהר ועצם שמים מביט נהרה.

² עֲצָם here is generally understood to mean ‘substance,’ hence ‘the sky itself.’ Cf. BA ad loc.

³ See GELS s.v. I.

⁴ V.l. מופיע בצאתו.

In \mathfrak{G} 's vs. 2a we find three verbal actions, but in \mathfrak{H} , in B as well as M, we see two only. Unless we assume a free addition by the translator, the correspondence is $\delta\pi\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha = \text{מוֹפִיעַ}$, $\delta\iota\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu = \text{מביע} [= \text{מְבִיעַ}]$, and $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{o}\delta\omega = \text{צאתו}$. From the freedom of translation displayed in \mathfrak{S} we may conclude that its *Vorlage* was possibly as complicated as that of \mathfrak{G} :⁵ $\text{עָבַד שְׁמֶשָׁא לְמִתְחָא}$ 'He made the sun (for us) to observe and to praise.' The concluding Heb. word is not reflected in \mathfrak{G} .⁶

[שמש מופיע בצאתו] As in BH שְׁמֶשׁ can be used in either gender with no semantic difference, e.g. $\text{שמש זהרת 42.16 // בידו עמד השמש 46.4}$.

[מעשי ξργον] On plenty of examples in QH of a word-final *yod* attached to a sg. noun or nominal, see Qimron 2018 § A 3.5.1.

43.3) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\mu\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\xi\eta\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota \chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\nu,$
 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu \kappa\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota;$

*Midday it dries land
 and who can stand its heat?*

(B) בהצהירו ירתיה תבל לפני חרבו מי יתכלכל:
 (M) בהצהירו ירתיה תבל ולפני חרב מי יתכולל:

$\mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\mu\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ [הצהיר] The first instance in Heb. of this verb derived from a well-known BH צָהַר 'midday.'

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\xi\eta\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$ [ירתיה] The Heb. verb has to do with boiling.

$\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\nu$ [תבל] an extremely rare instance in LXX of this equation.⁷ $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ is not used in the sense of "planet earth, world [= תבל]." The non-selection of a standard rendering such as $\gamma\eta$ as in e.g., 10.4, is a mystery.

$\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ [Both Yadin (29) and Abegg read no *waw* after the *kaf*: $\text{ל}[\text{תכל}]$ and $\text{ל}[\text{תכל}]$ respectively. The two different Heb. verb forms which lie behind this Gk verb present some ambiguities in their morphology.⁸ \mathfrak{S} might be slightly influenced by \mathfrak{G} : $\text{מִנּוּ מִשְׁכַּח לְמִקָּם}$ 'who could stand?'. 'יתכולל' was suggested by Skehan (1966.260) with some hesitation.

⁵ In (B) the first half might be translated as "the sun issues heat when in distress," whatever that might mean.

⁶ Lévi (63) holds that it is a dittography of the following מה , which would not apply in (M). נכסה (M) is analysed in BSH 178b as Ni. ptc., but not adopted in *Maagarim*. Yadin's (45) translation "The sun when he goeth forth shineth to the full" is based on his view that נכסה is to be related to כָּסָא 'full moon' in Ps 81.4, though he says nothing about the initial *nun*. Does מוֹפִיעַ mean "to shine"? Perhaps it is possible to change נכסה to ככסה ; "when it comes out (at dawn), it emerges like full moon." At the sunrise following the nocturnal darkness the sun looks like a full moon shining in the dark night. On כָּסָא , cf. *HALOT* s.v., and note esp. Syr. כָּסָא .

⁷ Another example is mentioned by Smend (401): $\text{כָּל־יְשֻׁבֵי תָבֵל}$: πάντες ὡς χῶρα κατοικουμένη Is 18.3.

⁸ BSH reads יתכולל for M, parsing it as Hitpolel of כול (169b). According to *Maagarim* this is the only instance in Hebrew, and BS is the first document that attests to התכלכל , which is parsed as Hitpalpel of כלכל (177a). Both seem to mean basically the same thing here.

- 43.4) κάμινον φυσῶν ἐν ἔργοις καύματος,
 τριπλασίως ἥλιος ἐκκαίων ὄρη·
 ἀτμίδας πυρώδεις ἐκφυσῶν
 καὶ ἐκλάμπων ἀκτῖνας ἀμαυροῖ ὀφθαλμούς.

*Blowing a furnace with blazing instruments,
 the sun heats mountains thrice as intensely;
 blowing away fiery vapours
 and beaming forth rays it is eye-blinding.*

(Ba) כּוּר נפּוּח מֵהֶם מְצוּק⁹ שׁוּלַח שֶׁמֶשׁ יִדְלִיק¹⁰ הַרִים:
 (Bb) לְשׂוֹן¹¹ מְאֹר תִּגְמַר נוֹשֶׁבֶת וּמְנֹרָה תְּכוּה עֵין:
 (Ma) מְאֹר נִפְּוֹחַ מְעֵשֵׂי מוּצֵק שׁוּלַח שֶׁמֶשׁ ...
 (Mb) לְשׂוֹן מְאֹר תִּגְמַר נוֹשֶׁבֶת ...

[φυσῶν] = נופח, i.e. נוּפֵחַ. The syntactic structure of this verse is somewhat loose.¹² In Ⓞ we find four participles, all m.sg. nom. with ἥλιος in 4b as their *s*, but we find a colon at the end of 4b, so that ἀμαυροῖ is unlikely to be construed with the first two participles as circumstantial. Then 4a+b has no verbum finitum. In “The stoker of a furnace works in the heat” (Snaith 210) φυσῶν is a substantivised ptc. Though the sun as a stoker is a strange notion, it is doubtful that 4a can serve as a parallelistic clause vis-à-vis 4b.

[ἐργοις καύματος] Probably shovel and coals and the like are meant. Instead of the meaningless מהם, מהם = מְהֵם ‘heating’ is anticipated.¹³ מְעֵשֵׂי (Ma) is reflected in ἔργοις, but what is one to do with מוּצֵק?¹⁴

[τριπλασίως] most plausibly misreading שׁוּלַח (Ma) as שְׁלוּשׁ, שׁוּלַח (Ba) being a scribal error for שׁוּלַח, i.e. שְׁלוּחַ ‘cast’ or ‘what is sent (by the sun), i.e. heat.’ The translator may have understood יְדוּת or פְּעָמִים as in קָמַשׁ יְדוּת πενταπλασίως Gn 43.34 and מְאָה פְּעָמִים ἑκατονταπλασίως 1Ch 21.3. Cf. חָד תִּלְתָּא עֲלוּהָ֑ ‘three times as much as it [= oven].’

[ἀτμίδας πυρώδεις ἐκφυσῶν] The application of the figure of tongue to light is innovative.¹⁵ The translator is probably thinking that commoner is לְשׂוֹן שֶׁמֶשׁ, but he also extended it to vapours. Then he leaves out תִּגְמַר.

[ἀκτῖνας ἐκλάμπων] The final *he* of מְנֹרָה is most likely a suf. pron. f.sg. referring back to לְשׂוֹן. In BH there does not exist נֹר, but נֵר ‘lamp,’ whilst we know of נֹר ‘fire’ in BA. The translator is shifting from the heat of the sun to its

⁹ V.l. מוּצֵק.

¹⁰ V.l. שׁוּלַח שֶׁמֶשׁ יִסִּיק.

¹¹ V.l. לְשׂוֹן.

¹² Cf. Lévi’s (64) discussion.

¹³ Cf. Reymond 2021.263.

¹⁴ Given in the context a form of $\sqrt{\text{צוק}}$, not $\sqrt{\text{צוק}}$, is expected in the context, מְצוּק (Ba) must be rejected.

¹⁵ Pace Yadin (45) מְאֹר does not mean “fire.”

light. Confronted with this difficult Heb. text, he seems to be exercising a greater measure of freedom than usual.

43.5) μέγας κύριος ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν,
καὶ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέσπευσεν πορείαν.

*Great is the Lord, who made it,
and with His words it speeds its movement up.*

(B) כִּי גָדִיל יִי עוֹשֶׂהוּ ¹⁶ וּדְבָרָיו יִנְצַח ¹⁷ אֲבִירָיו:
(M) כִּי גָדוֹל אֲדֹנָי עֹשֶׂהוּ וּדְבָרָיו ...:

[μέγας] As noted in the v.l. גָּדִיל is a scribal error for גָּדוֹל.

The preceding כִּי can be taken as causal as regards the diverse activities ascribed to God in the preceding verse. Hence there is no need to speak of emphatic כִּי.¹⁸

[κατέσπευσεν] Any of the known meanings of a verbal root נָצַח or נִצַּח (v.l.) is reflected in κατασπεύδω.¹⁹ If either Heb. form stood in \mathfrak{C} 's *Vorlage*, the translator may have found it too difficult and preferred to translate it freely. \mathfrak{B} , with גָּדִיל changed to גָּדוֹל and adding the prep. בִּ- to דְּבָרָיו, may be translated as 'For great is the Lord its maker and (with) His words it could defeat its strong (enemies).'²⁰ πορείαν is also a free rendering. The difficulty probably confronted the translator of \mathfrak{S} as well, which closely follows \mathfrak{C} : וּבְמַלְי קְדִישָׁא סְרְהָב הִלְכָתָה 'and with the words of the Holy One it accelerated its movements.' \mathfrak{S} 's אָנִיחָ 'it put to rest' reflects a v.l. κατεπαυσε(v) as represented by a number of MSS inclusive of 248.

43.6) Καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς καιρὸν αὐτῆς,
ἀνάδειξιν χρόνων καὶ σημεῖον αἰῶνος·

*The moon also is always in its season,
as an indication of times and an eternal sign.*

(B) וְגַם יָרַח יָרַח עֲתוֹת שְׁכוֹת ²² ²¹ מִמְשַׁלֵּת קֶץ וְאוֹת עוֹלָם:
(M) וְגַם יָרַח יָאֲרִיחַ עֲתוֹת מ... ..:

[ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς καιρὸν αὐτῆς] This deviates hopelessly from either Heb. MS. Besides, B, as it is, is incomprehensible, whereas M is superior: 'and also the moon sets seasons.' The second half of (B) appears to be two direct objects of יָאֲרִיחַ alongside עֲתוֹת.

¹⁶ V.l. כִּי גָדוֹל עֲלִיוֹן עֹשֶׂה.

¹⁷ V.l. יִנְצַח.

¹⁸ On the emphatic כִּי in BH, see Muraoka 1985.158-64.

¹⁹ At 35.10 also the same Heb. verb is rendered in \mathfrak{C} with κατασπεύδω as here. Cf.

\mathfrak{S} סְרְהָב = \mathfrak{C} .

²⁰ We also take the verb נָצַח Qal or Pi. as meaning "to defeat" as in MH.

²¹ V.l. עַתָּה.

²² V.l. עַד עַתָּה.

מה נורא בהשתנותו ²⁷ :	חדש בחדשו הוא מתחדש ²⁶	(Ba)
מרצה ²⁸ רקיע מזהירות:	כלי צבא נבלי מרום	(Bb)
...	הַדָּשׁ כְּשֵׁמוֹ הוּא מֵתָּ..	(Ma)
מרצה ²⁸ :	כלי צבא נבלי מרום	(Mb)

κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα] = כשמו v.l. and M. The play on words in Hebrew cannot be reproduced in Greek; etymologically μήν has nothing to do with καινός. The possessive genitive, αὐτῆς, can be only = τῆς σελήνης. One wonders what sense Greek readers ignorant of Hebrew could make of 8c.

ἐν ὕψει [מרום] נבלי, which precedes, is missing in both **Θ** and **Σ**: מֵאֵנָּה דְּמִשְׁרִיתָא דְּרֻמָּא דְּמִנְהַר בְּרְקִיעָא דְּשָׁמַיָּא ‘an instrument of the army up above which shines in the firmament of the sky.’ The phrase is, as noted by Lévi (69) and Yadin (30), plausibly synonymous with גְּבֵלֵי שְׁמַיִם Jb 38.37, where, however, it is commonly understood as meaning “skin-bottles,” i.e. clouds. Because of the difficulty of what it means in the context, the Gk translator probably left it out deliberately, untranslated.

ἐκλάμπων] Ziegler could have chosen a v.l. εκλαμπων, which would concord with σκευός, a noun of the neuter gender. The ptc. cannot have μήν as its s, since what shines is the moon.

Yadin’s (47) rendering of the last clause reconstructed according to (Bb) reads: “It pa[v]eth [the firmament with its shining].”

43.9) Κάλλος οὐρανοῦ δόξα ἄστρων,
κόσμος φωτίζων ἐν ὑψίστοις κυρίου·

*A celestial beauty is the splendour of stars,
an ornament shining in the highest regions of the Lord.*

(B) תואר שמים והדר כוכב ואורו מזהיר במרומי אל²⁹
(M) תור שמים והוד כוכב עד ומשריק במרֹ...³⁰

ἄστρων] **ח** כוכב could be the s: “a star is a celestial beauty and an ornament.” The author has now shifted from the sun and moon to the stars.³⁰ The translator knew that a sg. noun in Heb. can be used collectively as in כול הרכב היוצאים ‘all the mounts that go out’ IQM 6.11.³¹

φωτίζων [משריק (M)] Another instance of Hi. הַשְּׁרִיק meets us in 50.7.

Σ lacks vs. 9b: צָבְתָא דְּשָׁמַיָּא וְתִשְׁבּוּחַתָּא דְּכּוֹכְבָא ‘the ornament of the sky and the praise of the stars.’

²⁶ V.l. והוא כשמו.

²⁷ V.l. בתשובתו.

²⁸ V.l. מערץ.

²⁹ V.l. ועדי משריק ב' אל. On משריק Lévi (69) and Smend (404) refer to Arb. *šaraqa* ‘to rise [of the sun].’ Cp. Arb. *mašriq* ‘east’ with Heb. מִזְרֵחַ ‘a place where the sun rises.’ Hence משריק = מִשְׁרִיק. This link with Arabic had already been made by Nöldeke (1900.86).

³⁰ So Smend (II 76): “Die Pracht und Zierde des Himmels sind die Sterne.”

³¹ Cf. further *SQH* § 8 a.

43.10) ἐν λόγοις ἁγίου στήσονται κατὰ κρίμα
καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν φυλακαῖς αὐτῶν.

*As instructed by the Holy One they take a position as determined
and never leave their duty as guards.*

(B בדבר אל יעמד חק ולא ישח³² באשמרותם:

(M בדבר אדני יעמד חק ולא ישח באשמרתם:

στήσονται] The pl. form indicates that, according to the translator, it is still about stars.³³ See our remarks above concerning ἄστρων כוכב vs. 9. The number has been shifted to the pl. in אשמרותם.

43.11) ἴδε τόξον καὶ εὐλόγησον τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτὸ
σφόδρα ὠραῖον ἐν τῷ ἀγάσματι αὐτοῦ·

*Look at a bow and bless the One who made it
very beautiful in its shining brightness.*

(B ראה קשת וברך עושיה³⁴ כי מאד נאדרה³⁵ בצבור:

(M ראה קשת וברך עשיה כי מאד נהדר ...

τόξον [קשת] referring to a rainbow. See also τὸ τόξον μου τίθημι ἐν τῇ
νεφέλῃ < אֶת־קִשְׁתִּי נִתְּתִי בְּעָנָן > Gn 9.13.

נאדרה] corrected to נהדרה in the v.l. M's נהדר is faulty, given the fem.
gender of קשת.

43.12) ἐγύρωσεν οὐρανὸν ἐν κυκλώσει δόξης,
χεῖρες ὑψίστου ἐτάνυσαν αὐτό.

*It goes round the sky as a glorious arc,
the hands of the Most High stretch it out.*

(B חוק הקיפה בכבודה³⁶ ויד אל³⁷ נטתה בַּ...:

(M חֹג ... בכבודה וִיד אל נטתה בנבורה:

ἐγύρωσεν [הקיפה] The preceding, mysterious חוק has now been replaced
with a very reasonable reading in M, i.e. חוג 'heavenly vault.'

ἐτάνυσαν αὐτό] An adverbial phrase that follows in \mathfrak{H} has been left out.

ὑψίστου [אל] The v.l. לאל is anomalous; the prep. *lamed* is normally attached
when the nomen regens can be considered to be indeterminate,³⁸ e.g. בֶּן לְיֵשׁוּ
'a son of Jesse' 1Sm 16.18; Jesse had more than one son.

³² V.l. ישון. A possible error for ישנו, i.e. ישנו 'they go to sleep'?

³³ Pace Lévi (70): "il s'agit toujours de la lune." Hence it is wrong to "correct" אשמרותם
to אשמרותיו.

³⁴ V.l. עושה, a more orthodox spelling for עושה.

³⁵ V.l. נהדרה.

³⁶ V.l. הוד הקיפה בכבודו.

³⁷ V.l. 'לא.

³⁸ See JM § 130 b.

- 43.13) Προστάγματι αὐτοῦ κατέσπευσεν χιόνα
καὶ ταχύνει ἀστραπὰς κρίματος αὐτοῦ·

*With His command He accelerates snow
and speeds up lightnings in line with His decision.*

(B) גבורתו תתוה ברק ותנצח זיקות ...³⁹ :
(M) גערתו ..ה ברד ותנצח זיקות משפט:

Προστάγματι] גערתו 'His scolding' (M) is a little closer to ⚡ than גבורתו 'His might' (B).

κατέσπευσεν] Speed has little to do with making marks (תָּוּה).⁴¹ The same difficulty arises with נָצַח 'to act as superintendent.'

χιόνα 'snow' is something quite different from בְּרָק 'lightning.' In B ברק is parallel to זיקות, which means, however, "firebrands." M's בְּרָד 'hail' is closer to שֶׁלֶג 'snow.'

ταχύνει] The use of the Pres. parallel to the Aor. κατέσπευσεν shows that the Aor. here is no genuinely preterite tense, but gnomic in value, hence equivalent to κατασπεύδει. Besides, the two verbs are synonyms.

- 43.14) διὰ τοῦτο ἠνεώχθησαν θησαυροί,
καὶ ἐξέπτησαν νεφέλαι ὡς πετεινά·

*For that purpose storehouses are opened
and clouds fly out fast like birds;*

(B) למען⁴² ברא אוצָר ויעף ... :
(M) למענו פרע אוצר ויעף עבים כעֵיט :

διὰ τοῦτο] The prep. למען does need a nominal following, as shown in the v.l. and (M). And yet, the attached suf. pron. can hardly refer to an abstract notion such as "this, that." But "for Himself" sounds unnatural, what is, however, perfectly in order in δι' αὐτόν למענו vs. 26. Lévi (71) makes a sensible suggestion by seeing a referent in ברק in vs. 13.

ἐξέπτησαν] Rather than admitting here a case of number discord in ⚡ we would parse יעף (M) as Hifil with God as its implicit subject. Though this would be the first instance of הִעָף in Ancient Hebrew, *Maagarim* records a total of 131 instances. We have an instance of Hof. in מָעַף בְּיעָף Dn 9.21, cf. τάχει φερόμενος LXX. Cf. also ἠνεώχθησαν // פרע.

³⁹ V.l. נִצַּח זיקים.

⁴⁰ V.l. גערתו תתוה בקר ותנצח יקום במ'.

⁴¹ Segal (296) wonders whether תִּאָהַד is to be considered, for this rare verb is rendered in Trg with כָּוֵן 'to direct' Nu 34.7, where, however, MT has no object similar to בְּרָק or בְּרָד.

⁴² V.l. למענו.

43.15) ἐν μεγαλείῳ αὐτοῦ ἴσχυσεν νεφέλας,
καὶ διεθρύβησαν λίθοι χαλάζης·

*with His splendid might He fortifies clouds,
and hailstones crumble;*

(B) ... ל.. ך̣ ... :שׁ
(M) גבורתו חזק ענן ותגדע אֲנִי ברד:

[ἐν μεγαλείῳ αὐτοῦ] = בנבורתו rather than assuming a case of gender discord, i.e. קזק corrupt from חזקה.⁴³ However, the following תגדע need be corrected to תגדענה with גבורתו as the *s* is not impossible.

[ἴσχυσεν] *Contra* Smend (406) this is not the sole instance of transitively used ἴσχύω, e.g. πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἰσχύοντα ‘making every pleasure powerful’ Wi 16.20.⁴⁴

43.17a) φωνὴ βροντῆς αὐτοῦ ὠδίνησεν γῆν

His thunderous voice brings extreme pain to the earth

(B) קול רעמו יחול ארצו זלעפות צפון סופה וסערה:⁴⁵
(M) קול רעמו יחיל ארצו עלעול סופה וסערה:

[ὠδίνησεν] A great number of MSS read ωνειδισε(v) ‘insults.’ יחול (B) and יחיל (M) definitely render ὠδίνησεν preferable.

Already in BH the orthography of this verb in Qal fluctuates not only in the Impf., but also in the Impv., e.g. חילי Mi 4.10 vs. חילי Ps 96.9. However, the verb is transitive with ארצו as the *o*. Hence the verb must be Hif. with causative force,⁴⁶ which is possible only with יחיל.⁴⁷

[γῆν ארצו] With the suf. pron. added, יחיל underlines the fact that God is acting this way to the earth, which is His.

⊗ of the second hemistich is found as the first hemistich of vs. 17b below.

43.16) καὶ ἐν ὄπτασίᾳ αὐτοῦ σαλευθήσονται ὄρη,
ἐν θελήματι αὐτοῦ πνεύσεται νότος.

*and when He appears mountains would shake,
and with His will a south wind would blow.*

(B) ובכוחו יזעים הרים אימתו תחרף תימן:
(M) ובכוחו יניף הרים אמרתו תחריף תימן:

⁴³ Thus *pace* Mopsik 2003.266: “Sa puissance renforce les nuées.”

⁴⁴ Is 10.21 in *GELS* s.v. 4 is to be deleted.

⁴⁵ V.I. קול רעמו יחיל ארצו על עול סופה וסערה.

⁴⁶ Thus *pace* BSH 137a, where their יחול is parsed as Qal.

⁴⁷ Even in the eyes of an amateur epigraphist like myself the letter before the *lamed* can hardly be a *waw*.

ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ] Whence this comes is unclear. \mathfrak{H} 's "with His power" is quite in order. The origin of ὀπτασία is rather obscure.

σαλευθήσονται] Many MSS read σαλευθήσεται, the sg. being the norm with a pl. neut. noun. Apart from the disagreement in voice, passive vs. active, M's $\eta\gamma$ is a perfect match. B's $\eta\gamma$ may be a corruption from $\eta\gamma$, i.e. $\eta\gamma$,⁴⁸ with a suf. pron. attached in advance, proleptically.⁴⁹ Alternatively, $\eta\gamma$, i.e. $\eta\gamma$, though that way the morphological parallelism would become lost: Impf. // Impf. to Ptc. // Impf.⁵⁰

ἐν θελήματι αὐτοῦ] = "in His will verbally expressed"? This is close to $\eta\gamma$ (M), but still removed from it. B's $\eta\gamma$ 'His anger' does not come into the question at all. Lévi (72) proposes reading $\eta\gamma$, i.e. $\eta\gamma$, or $\eta\gamma$, i.e. $\eta\gamma$. Although no such equation is attested in LXX, we find the equation $\eta\gamma$ / ἐπιθυμία interesting, e.g. $\eta\gamma$ ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς σου Dt 12.20, sim. ib. 15, 21.

πνεύσεται] which has scarcely to do anything with $\eta\gamma$. We are sceptical that Yadin's (47) "bloweth keen" can be justified. Lévi (72) suggests reading $\eta\gamma$, translating it "défie," which does not account for πνεύσεται.⁵¹

43.17b) καὶ καταγιγίς βορέου καὶ συστροφή πνεύματος.

ὥς πετεινὰ καθιπτάμενα πάσσει χιόνα,
καὶ ὥς ἀκρις καταλύουσα ἢ κατάβασις αὐτῆς·

*And a sudden blast of north wind and a whirlwind.
Like birds flying down He sprinkles snow,
and its descent is like locust(s) lodging.*

.. $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ (B)
: $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ (M)

\mathfrak{H} of the first hemistich is found above as the second hemistich of vs. 17a:

ἄλῃε $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ (B)
ἄλῃε $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ $\eta\gamma$ (M)

βορέου] As in (B) the direction where winds originate is specified.

⁴⁸ *Index s.v. σαλεύω* 2) is in need of rectification accordingly.

⁴⁹ Though such a pronoun refers to a nominal which is normally determinate, there are exceptions such as $\eta\gamma$ Ez 3.21. On the question of the object prolepsis, see JM § 146 e (2) and *SQH* 31 p.

⁵⁰ Dihi (2000.61) sees no need of emendation on the ground that $\eta\gamma$ means "to cause to move, shake." We are not aware of a case of $\eta\gamma$ used in the sense of "to move" as a synonym of $\eta\gamma$ or $\eta\gamma$.

⁵¹ Segal (297) relates the form to $\eta\gamma$, rewriting it as $\eta\gamma$ 'makes cold.' Is such a use of $\eta\gamma$ as a verb known anywhere in Hebrew?

⁵² V.l. $\eta\gamma$.

⁵³ V.l. $\eta\gamma$.

עֲלֵעוֹל ‘gust, hurricane’ is unknown to BH. Note that עֲלֵעוֹל is said to come from the north in *הַצִּפּוֹן מֵהַצִּפּוֹן בָּא מִן הַצִּפּוֹן* Ba 3.4.2. We have here a rather rare word mentioned in *Maagarim* as occurring a mere four times. By contrast, וְלִעֲפָה or וְלִעֲפָה occurs in BH three times: Ps 11.6, 119.53, La 5.10. Twice it is rendered with *καταιγίς* as here, but at Ps 119.53 with *ἀθυμία* ‘rage.’ This latter reminds us of a case in QH such as *וְלִעֲפָה וְלִעֲפָה אֶחָד* 1QH^a 13.32. However, in our Si example, the correspondence with M’s עֲלֵעוֹל precludes the notion of rage. More importantly, the association with רִיחַ is to be noted at *רוּחַ וְלִעֲפָה* πνεῦμα καταγίδος Ps 11(10).6.

רֶשֶׁף ‘flame, fire-bolt’ is a natural phenomenon quite distinct from wind. The noun רֶשֶׁף has been a *crux interpretum* for ages.⁵⁴ Lévi (73) “un oiseau” and Yadin (47) “flocks of birds” continue an old school going back to *וּבְנֵי רֶשֶׁף* νεοσσοὶ δὲ γυπὸς ‘the young of vulture(s)’ and *וּבְנֵי עֹפֹא* ‘the young of birds’ Jb 5.7.

ἡ κατάβασις αὐτῆς] = v.l. and M רדתו. This inf. happens to be morphologically fem., but it does not necessarily require תשכן, though it looks more sensible to add the prep. *bet* to רדתו > ברדתו and take שלנו as the *s* of ישכן.⁵⁵

43.18) κάλλος λευκότητος αὐτῆς ἐκθαυμάσει ὀφθαλμός,
καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ βετοῦ αὐτῆς ἐκστήσεται καρδία.

*An eye would marvel at the beauty of its whiteness
and a heart would be astonished over its rain.*

(B תואר לבנה יגהה⁵⁶ עינים וממטרו יהמה לבב:
(M תור לבנו יהג עינים וממטרו יתמיה לבב:

[תואר] Smend (407) holds that the Heb. noun means here just ‘look, appearance.’ We find, however, the choice of κάλλος in *Ⓞ* more poetic.

λευκότητος αὐτῆς] The pronoun refers back to χιῶν (vs. 17), a fem. noun. The spelling with *he* is, historically speaking, earlier than לבנו (M). In BH הַלֵּל is as common as כָּלוּ.⁵⁷ In QH also we find this spelling not infrequently, e.g. דעתה ‘his knowledge’ 4Q266 8i6.⁵⁸

[ἐκθαυμάσει] If M’s יהג is a variant spelling of יהגה as in the v.l., the verb הגה makes no sense here. On the other hand, BSH (115a) parses יגהה

⁵⁴ Apparently so for our translator; see at 16.6.

For bibliographical information, see *HALOT* s.v. 4 and 5, where Si 43.14 is wrongly mentioned. Cf. also Dhorme 1967.61f. and Tur-Sinai 1972.57.

⁵⁵ Segal (298), not having seen M yet, views B’s דרתו as meaning “its residence” (דִּרְתוֹ).

⁵⁶ V.l. יהגה.

⁵⁷ Cf. JM § 94 h, p. 266.

⁵⁸ Cf. Qimron 2018 A 5.2.

as Hi. of גהה, which, however, is not to be found in *Maagarim*.⁵⁹ In Ben-Yehuda II 710b s.v. הַהָּ we read “to dazzle; éblouir; blenden,” but our Si example is the only reference mentioned. Our translator, probably not knowing what to do,⁶⁰ may have decided to maintain semantic parallelism with יתמיה, which could not have caused him any trouble.

On the other hand, B’s יהמה from הָמָה ‘to roar, groan’ is quite distinct from surprise. In BH we find the collocation לֵב הָמָה three times: Je 4.19, 48.36 (twice). Once in Si: ἡ κοιλία μου ἐταράχθη τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι αὐτήν מַעֲי הִימוּ לְהַבִּיט בָּהּ כְּתוֹר לְהַבִּיט בָּהּ 51.21, where it is about a passionate search after wisdom and a psychosomatic effect of such an effort. Alternatively we might have here a misspelling of יתמיה, i.e. יתמה, which, however, would turn לבב into the *s* ‘a (man’s) heart would be surprised.’

ὑετοῦ] Snow is compared to rain as a substance descending from heaven and, exposed to the sun a while, turning to liquid. In the generally dry climate of the Near East, snow was, it appears, welcomed as a sort of rain.

ἐκστήσεται יתמיה (M)] The verb in ⚭ is in the middle voice and intransitive, whereas that in ⚧ is causative, transitive. Hence לבב is the *o*, not *s*, which is שָׁלֵג ‘snow.’⁶¹ As in the first hemistich, part of a human body is affected by snow.

In both parts of the verse ⚭ underlines how humans react to what this particular natural phenomenon, snow, causes to them. Hence ὀφθαλμός and καρδία are in the nom. case as *s*, whereas עינים and לבב are *o* with שָׁלֵג as the implicit *s*.

43.19) καὶ πάχνην ὡς ἄλα ἐπὶ γῆς χέει,
καὶ παγεῖσα γίνεταί σκολόπων ἄκρα.

*He also pours frost like salt on to the earth
and becoming solid it turns into points of thorns.*

וגם כפור כמלח ישכון⁶² ויצין כספיר ציצים: (B)
... כפֹּר כמלח ישפך ויצמח כסנה צצים: (M)

καὶ πάχνην] M also appears to have started with וגם as in B, but the force of *also* can be missed in καὶ, i.e. not only snow, but also frost, so וְגַלְיָדָא וְגַלְיָדָא ‘and ice,’ sim. ⚧ *gelum sicut salem et cetera*.

⁵⁹ As another alternative Hi. יַהֲהֵה ‘to make grow dim’ has been mentioned (Ryssel 447, fn. d), though attested in BH only in Qal, in which the verb occurs with עֵין as *s*, e.g. וַתַּהֲהֵהוּ עֵינָיו Gn 27.1.

Cowley - Neubauer (1897.19) suggested יגהר, cf. Syr. אַגְהַר ‘to blind.’

⁶⁰ We fail to go along with Smend (407), according to whom הָהָה in Pr 25.4, 5, Is 27.8, and הָהָה in Ho 5.13 remove any lexicographical difficulty. In those places the verbs mean “to remove,” which does not help us much. His own translation (Smend II 77) reads: “Der Anblick des Weiss blendet die Augen.”

⁶¹ Thus *pace* Yadin (47): “And the heart marvelleth at the raining thereof.”

⁶² V.l. ישפך.

χέει] B's ישכון makes כפור its s.

The message of vs. 19b in **H** differs quite a bit from that of our translation above: (B) “and He causes flowers to sprout like lapis lazuli” and (M) “and He causes flowers to blossom like briar.” *He* could hardly be converted to *it* referring to frost. **סל** is no less distinct and not easy to understand: כָּד יִקָּטַר הָיָא רִישָׁא דְעוֹקְסָא ‘and when it was freezing, the hardest of pricks.’

For the general message of the verse, cf. כָּצֶמֶר כָּפֹר כְּאֶפֶר יִפְזֹר. Ps 147.16.

43.20) ψυχρὸς ἄνεμος βορέας πνεύσει,
καὶ παγήσεται κρύσταλλος ἐφ' ὕδατος·
ἐπὶ πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὕδατος καταλύσει,
καὶ ὡς θώρακα ἐνδύσεται τὸ ὕδωρ.

*A cold wind of the north would blow
and solid ice emerges on the water;
it would settle on every water pool,
and the water would put it on like a breastplate.*

וכרקב יקפיא מקורו ⁶³ :	וצינת רוח צפון ישיב	(Ba)
:מקוה:	על כל מעמד מים יקרים	(Bb)
:וכרגב יקפיא מקור:	י. ישיב ...	(Ma)
:...	... מעמד מים יקרים	(Mb)

ψυχρὸς ἄνεμος] רוח צינת as the *o* of ישיב is odd. One would anticipate רוח צינה as equivalent to a qualitative genitive. Cf. ἐν ἔργοις καύματος ‘with blazing instruments’ Si 43.4.

πνεύσει [ישיב] All the four Heb. verbs in this verse, 3m.sg., are or can be parsed as Hi. and causative / transitive with God as their *s*, whereas in **G** their equivalents are all intransitive.⁶⁴ Hence no need to view ישיב as an error for Qal ישוב, which would also lead to a case of gender discord. ילבש can be viewed as a case of *scriptio defectiva* in lieu of ילביש.

παγήσεται] On the collocation of πήγνυμι with κρύσταλλος, see ὥσπερ χιὼν ἢ κρύσταλλος πεπηγὼς ‘like snow or solid ice’ Jb 6.16.

κρύσταλλος] a word which, in LXX, renders קרה four times. The translator possibly identified קרה in כרקב, which has been corrupted to כרגב (M). Yadin (33) is of the view that M has preserved the correct text, but what “And He congealeth the source like a clod” (Yadin 47) is supposed to mean?

⁶³ V.I. מקוה.

⁶⁴ Smend (408) says that πνεύσει is transitive, and wants to change ψυχρὸς to ψυχρὸς [acc.] ‘coldness,’ but he would retain צינת. It is different from ἐπνευσεν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς, and also from πνεύσει τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ Ps 147.7 < יִשָּׁב רוּחֹו (**H**) vs. 18).

ἐφ' ὕδατος] a free rendering; ice as the source of water. The same holds for ὕδωρ מקוה in 20d.⁶⁵

καταλύσει [יקרים] The verb √קרם occurs twice in BH, both times in Qal, in the sense of “to spread” (transitive), and this is the first instance of its use in Hi. This is the sole instance of attestation of the equation καταλύω / קרם Qal or Hi.

θώρακα] = שְׂרִיץ.

43.21) καταφάγεται ὄρη καὶ ἔρημον ἐκκαύσει
καὶ ἀποσβέσει χλόην ὡς πῦρ.

*It would consume mountains and burn wilderness
and destroy young green glass like a flame.*

(B) יבול הָרִים כְּחָרֵב יִשִּׁיק וְנוֹה⁶⁶ צִמְחִים כְּלֹהֲבָה:⁶⁷

ἔρημον] If the preceding יבול means “produce, growth,” i.e. כְּחָרֵב, יְבֹול must be meant as elliptical for כִּיבֹול חָרֵב, an analysis that was not adopted by our translator.⁶⁸

ἐκκαύσει] ישיק, i.e. נִשְׂקָא < √קס. The same equation is found in vs. 4 above in יסיק as a variant of ידליק (B).

ἀποσβέσει] The verb ἀποσβέννυμι signifies two opposite notions: 1) “to extinguish, put out fire” and 2) “to exterminate through fire.” שִׁחַ presents the latter: נִחְרָךְ ‘it will burn.’ Given the parallelism between the two hemistichs here, this must apply to שִׁחַ as well. The parallelism of these two verbs occurs also in ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ ὄρυμοί, καὶ καταφάγεται ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν Is 10.18, where also fire plays a vital role as is manifest in the second half of the verse – καὶ ἔσται ὁ φεύγων ὡς ὁ φεύγων ἀπὸ φλογὸς καιομένης ‘.. a burning flame,’ where שִׁחַ has very little affinity with שִׁחַ, just as in our Si text there is nothing that is reflected with καταφάγεται nor ἀποσβέσει, the two constituents of the parallelism. נוה is not reflected in שִׁחַ, either. In view of this considerable freedom exercised by the translator, Is 10.18 in שִׁחַ appears to have played a significant role in his mind.

Segal (299) holds that the *s* of ישיק is the Lord. Did not our author write up to here tens of verses, admiring and praising Him as the creator of the inexpressibly magnificent and wise creator of the universe and nature on the

⁶⁵ As Smend (408) justly points out, the two nouns are parallel to each other at 10.13 also.

⁶⁶ V.l. וצור.

⁶⁷ According to Yadin (33) nothing has survived of the verses 21-22 in M. BSH presents parts of two words in vs. 21, but nothing in vs. 22. Abegg finds nothing in vs. 21, but in vs. 22 reads one word and one letter each of two other words. All these additions offer nothing new that would differ from the B text as given above.

⁶⁸ Lévi (74) refers to כִּי-יבֹול הָרִים יִשְׂאוּ-לוֹ Jb 40.20, where, however, there is no construct chain and הָרִים need be construed forward as the *s* of יִשְׂאוּ.

planet earth? Would He destroy this produce of His by not mentioning a single sin committed by it and its inhabitants?

43.22) ἴασιν πάντων κατασπεύδει ὀμίχλη,
δρόσος ἀπαντῶσα ἀπὸ καύσωνος ἰλαρώσει.

*Mist accelerates a general solution,
dew presenting itself out of heat makes one hilarious.*

(B מרפא כל מערף ענן טל פורע⁶⁹ לדשן שרב⁷⁰.)

In vs. 22a of \mathfrak{H} we find nothing pointing to the feature of speed⁷¹ and mist, though עֲרַפֵּל is rendered thrice⁷² in LXX with ὀμίχλη. This may have stood in \mathfrak{G} 's *Vorlage*. “Dripping of cloud” hardly makes sense. טל has been left untouched by the translator. It may be represented by δρόσος. Then δρόσος ἀπαντῶσα might represent טל מופיע, i.e. טל מופיע ‘emerging dew.’ A v.l. repeats טל.

Not supported by any Gk MS Ziegler has performed a syntactic operation on the traditional text of 22a, which Rahlfs represents as ἴασις πάντων κατὰ σπουδὴν ὀμιχλή ‘speedy cure of everything is mist.’

ἀπὸ καύσωνος] One wonders what is the value of this preposition, to which \mathfrak{H} presents nothing corresponding.⁷³ \mathfrak{H} , as it stands, makes little sense. שרב can be nothing but the *s*.⁷⁴

43.23) Λογισμῶ αὐτοῦ ἐκόπασεν ἄβυσσον
καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους.

*Having thought carefully He brought the abyss under control
and established in it islands.*

(B מחשבתו⁷⁵ .. שיק רבה ויט בתהום איים⁷⁶;
M אַמְרַתּוֹ .. תַעֲמִיקָה⁷⁷.)

Λογισμῶ αὐτοῦ] closer to B's מחשבתו. M may have read אַמְרַתּוֹ, i.e. אַמְרַתּוֹ ‘His saying.’

⁶⁹ V.l. פורע טל.

⁷⁰ V.l. רטב.

⁷¹ Segal (299) mentions an Aram. root ערף, as in בערף ‘quickly, fast,’ for details on which see Jastrow 1903.1227a.

⁷² *Index* s.v. ὀμίχλη is in need of a correction – not twice: Jb 38.9, Jl 2.2, Zc 1.15.

⁷³ Segal (299) writes: “in order to keep the land away from the dryness arising from the heat,” but we doubt that ἰλαρώω ἀπό τινοῦ can sustain such an analysis.

⁷⁴ Segal (299) writes that שָׁרַב here means ‘a land suffering from heat,’ without, however, mentioning any evidence for such a specific sense.

⁷⁵ V.l. משובתו.

⁷⁶ V.l. אוצר.

⁷⁷ BSH finds nothing in the first half of the verse.

ἐκόπασεν] The transitive use of κοπάζω is unique to BS. It is normally intransitive: **1** “to lose strength and cease to be troublesome or noxious” and **2** “to cease, stop what one is doing” (GELS s.v.). Note: + θυμόν Si 39.28, ὀργήν 48.10, γογγυσμὸν πονηρίας ‘secret plotting of wickedness’ 46.7. The only instance of intransitive use is found at 23.17. The construction of islands in the middle of the sea required that soaring waves were stopped temporarily.⁷⁸

ἄβυσσον] a substantivised adjective, fem. in spite of the masc. ending, hence ἐν αὐτῇ, cf. σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἄβύσσου Ge 1.2.

Vs. 23a appears to be a consequence of free rendering. E.g., הוהו has been shifted from 23b. Nothing in 𐤄 reflects רבב,⁷⁹ on which see also below at vs. 25.

ἐφύτευσεν] The commonest Heb. equivalent of this Gk verb is נטע Qal, 34 times according to HR, including Si 49.7. Semantically נטע makes better sense here than הִטַּן. The weak pronunciation of ט, esp. at the end of a form, could have influenced its departure here in writing, too. טַטַּן can take as its *o* words such as כַּרְמֵי ‘vineyard’ Gn 9.20 and גַּן ‘garden’ ib. 2.8.⁸⁰

43.24) οἱ πλέοντες τὴν θάλασσαν διηγοῦνται τὸν κίνδυνον αὐτῆς,
καὶ ἀκοαῖς ὄτιόν ἡμῶν θαυμάζομεν·

*Those who sail the sea tell about its danger,
and turning our ears to them we marvel.*

יורדי הים יספרו קצהו לשמע אזננו נשתומם: (B
[ל]שמע אזנינו נשמת[ם] ... (M

οἱ πλέοντες τὴν θάλασσαν] a rendering closer to οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πλέοντες αὐτήν < יורדי הים ומלאו Is 42.10 than to οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐν πλοίοις Ps 107.23. Lévi’s alternative rendering, “plongeurs [= divers]” is scarcely plausible. We suspect that the use of καταβαίνοντες here is expressive of Jerusalemites’ perspective.

κίνδυνον] Certainly a free rendering of קֶצֶף. Smend (410) renders it as “seine Weite.” Sailors would tell the crowd how many days it takes to sail from Jaffa to Greece, for instance.

θαυμάζομεν] M’s [ם]נשמת is hopelessly corrupt.

43.25) ἐκεῖ τὰ παράδοξα καὶ θαυμάσια ἔργα,
ποικιλία παντὸς ζώου, κτίσις κητῶν.

*There the unimaginable and astonishing creatures,
the multiplicity of every animal, creation of gigantic sea-fishes.*

⁷⁸ Cf. LEH s.v. “stilled.”

⁷⁹ Which Smend (409) corrects to רהר, i.e. רהב, a mythical sea monster.

⁸⁰ Thus, *pace* Lévi (76), this verb is not contextually “hardie.”

(B) שם פלאות תמהי מעשהו⁸¹ מין כל חי וגבורות רבה:
 ... (M) גבורת רהב:

καί] With this addition the translator may be attempting to overcome the syntactic complexity of two synonymous nouns in the cst. st. For Mopsik *פלאות* is in apposition to *מעשהו* “Là sont des merveilles, les plus étonnantes de ses œuvres.”

κητῶν] The use of this word, κῆτος, suggests the superiority of M’s text with *רהב*. On the mixture of these two lexemes, see above at vs. 23. B’s *גבורות רבה* is grammatically impossible.

43.26) δι’ αὐτὸν εὐοδοῖ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ σύγκειται τὰ πάντα.

*Because of Him His angel successfully completes his passage
 and with His word all things hang together.*

(B) למענו⁸² יצלה מלאך ובדבריו יפעל רצון:

[מלאך] The entry of an angel at this juncture is striking. In what is often cited as the biblical source text we see *מִלְאָכָה* ‘mission’: *יִרְדֵי הַיָּם בְּנֵי עֵשִׂי מִלְאָכָה בְּמִים רַבִּים: הִמָּה רָאוּ מַעֲשֵׂי יְהוָה וְנִפְלְאוֹתָיו בְּמִצְרָיִם* Ps 107.23f. See vs. 24 and 25 above. Our translator, however, did not notice *מִלְאָכָה*. Kister (1990.364) justly holds that the author was most likely conscious of *כִּן יְהִי דְבַר אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִפִּי לֹא יִשׁוּב אֵלַי רִיקָם כִּי אִם-עֲשֶׂה אֶת-אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי עוֹשֶׂה* Is 55.11. For BS, then, *מלאך* is not confined to personal entities, but everything that was created in this universe, what was created with His word as depicted in Gn 1.

σύγκειται τὰ πάντα] ≠ *יפעל רצון* ‘He would execute His will.’

43.27) Πολλά ἐροῦμεν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀφικώμεθα,
 καὶ συντέλεια λόγων Τὸ πᾶν ἐστὶν αὐτός.

*We could say many things but we would never get there,
 but in the end we would say: “He is everything.”*

(B) עוד כאלה לא נוסף וקץ דבר הוא הכל:

ἀφικώμεθα [נוסף] Smend (410) and BSH parse *נוסף* as Impf. Hi., an analysis we concur with.⁸³ The author’s discourse on God as the creator of this universe started at 42.15, and he is confident that he has said more than enough. In spite of this long-winded soliloquy he says, “we are not going to add any more,” the so-called royal or editorial “we” instead of “I.” Though

⁸¹ V.I. מעשיו.

⁸² V.I. למענו; למענהו.

⁸³ Segal’s (289) vocalisation is *נוסף* with modal value, “We would like to add.”

הַיְהוֹסִיָּה and ἀφικνέομαι do not match each other, Ⓞ of vs. 27a as a whole conveys what is meant by the author. נְסִינָה ‘we finish, come to an end’ proposed by Smend, though quite distinct from הַיְהוֹסִיָּה, does not contradict the author’s general thought here.

Τὸ πᾶν ἐστὶν αὐτόζ] Smend (411) theologises: “Von Pantheismus ist natürlich keine Rede.” τὸ πᾶν skilfully underlines the stress laid on הוּא: none other can make such a claim.

43.28) δοξάζοντες ποῦ ἰσχύσομεν;
αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ μέγας παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

*Even glorifying (Him), how far could we reach?
For He is the one greater than all His creatures.*

..לה⁸⁴ עוד כי לא נחקור והוא גדול מכל מעשיו: (B

Judging from the remains of Ⓢ (28a) must have been rather different from its Ⓞ version. The v.l., נגלה ‘we are going to reveal, expose,’ does not help very much. Or is נגלה ‘Let’s rejoice!’ meant? Lévi (78), sim. Segal (289), restores the form in the main body of the scroll to נגדלה ‘Nous l’exalterions encore plus.’

παρὰ] With an acc. nominal this preposition is sometimes used with the value equivalent to Engl. *than* and often followed by a form of πᾶς, but never preceded by an adjective or adverb in the comparative degree. E.g. μέγας κύριος παρὰ πάντας τοὺς θεοὺς Ex 18.11; more examples may be found in *GELS* s.v. παρά III 3. The use of the preposition *min* shows that παρά does not indicate proximity as often it does with an acc. nominal. See also above at 15.5.

43.29) φοβερὸς κύριος καὶ σφόδρα μέγας,
καὶ θαυμαστὴ ἡ δυναστεία αὐτοῦ.

*Awesome is the Lord and very great,
and His might is astonishing.*

(B ..נו... ..אד מאד ונפלאות דבריו⁸⁵:
.. (M ..תו: ..

σφόδρα] For the sake of intensification מאד is repeated, so at 7.17, but there, too, Ⓞ does not follow suit. The repetition occurs elsewhere in SG, e.g. καὶ ἀξάνῳ σε σφόδρα σφόδρα [= Ⓢ במאד מאד באתך יהפרתי] Ge 17.6; more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. σφόδρα h.

⁸⁴ V.l. נגלה.

⁸⁵ V.l. גבורתו.

ἡ δυναστεία αὐτοῦ] = v.l. גבורתו, partly supported by M. Both the B text and the v.l. cannot stand, the former due to the gender discord and the latter due to the number discord, unless we presuppose גבורתו. In either case a cst. chain looks unlikely. Alternatively, in B נפלאות could be taken as a nominal: “His words are marvels,” and not adjectival “.. are marvellous.” In the case of גבורתו we could be left with a case of number discord.

- 43.30) δοξάζοντες κύριον ὑψώσατε
καθ’ ὅσον ἂν δύνησθε, ὑπερέξει γὰρ καὶ ἔτι·
καὶ ὑψοῦντες αὐτὸν πληθύνετε ἐν ἰσχύι,
μὴ κοπιᾶτε, οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἀφίκησθε.

Glorifying the Lord, exalt (Him)

as much as you can, for He would still be beyond you;

and extolling Him, gather all your strength,

do not say “Exhausted!”, for you would never reach the end.

:בכל תוכלו כי יש עוד: בָּרִימִי קוֹל (Ba
:86: ואל תלאו כי לא ת: מְרוֹמִים תחליפו כח (Bb
:ש א: ... (M

ὑψώσατε] Whether his *Vorlage* lacked קול as an *o* of הרימו or not, the translator decided to assign that function to κύριον, for ὑψώσατε would need an *o*. In v. 28 in similar context we find ⚭ δοξάζω used without any *o*. Then an alternative translation would be: “Glorifying, exalt the Lord!”. Ὑψόω can take a word such as κύριος as an *o*, e.g. ὑψοῦτε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν Ps 98.5. Particularly interesting is the concatenation of δοξάζω and ὑψόω as in οὗτός μου θεός, καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν, θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ ὑψώσω αὐτόν Ex 15.2 and, though in the passive, καὶ ὑψωθήσεται κύριος σαβαωθ ἐν κρίματι, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος δοξασθήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ Is 5.16, in which latter case comparison with ⚭ demonstrates the combination of these two verbs in LXX had become a popular formula in eulogies. See also Ps 36.20 and Is 52.13.

ὑψοῦντες] probably reading מְרוֹמִים, a Polel ptc., not the pl. of מְרוֹם.

- 43.31) τίς ἐώρακεν αὐτόν καὶ ἐκδιηγῆσεται;
καὶ τίς μεγαλυνεῖ αὐτόν καθὼς ἐστίν;

Who saw Him and could recount?

and who could magnify Him as He is?

⁸⁶ V.l. ... מְרוֹמִים תחליפו כח ואל תלאו כי לא תחַקֶּר.

43.32) πολλὰ ἀπόκρυφα ἔστιν μείζονα τούτων,
ὀλίγα γὰρ ἐωράκαμεν τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ·

*Many hidden matters are more important than these
for we have seen (only) little of His works.*

(B רוב נפלל ויהוה פאלה מעט ראיתי ממעשיו:

ἐωράκαμεν [ראיתי] On the number shift, see below at 44.1.

43.33) πάντα γὰρ ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριος
καὶ τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἔδωκεν σοφίαν.

*For the Lord made everything
and to the godly He gave wisdom.*

... ל..:

(B את הכל ...

CHAPTER 44

Πατέρων ὕμνος

שבח אבות עולם

44.1) Αἰνέσωμεν δὴ ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους
καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τῆ γενέσει·

*Do let us praise eminent people
and our national forefathers;*

אהללה נא אנשי חסד את אבותינו בדורותם: (B
... אנ.. חסד את אב.. :... (M

The Heb. original also appears to have had a title for the following seven chapters: *Praise of our eternal forefathers*. In the facsimile of B it is written in the middle of the folio. See also **שְׁבַח אֲבוֹתָא דְּאַבְרָהָם** and **ℒ *Laus patrum***.

Lévi justly points out that the phrase **שבח אבות עולם** appears first in MH, e.g. mEdu 1.4, where it refers specifically to Hillel and Shammai. Segal (303), however, rightly objects to Lévi that the phrase does not mean “ancient fathers.”¹ Later in the book the author speaks in praise of Simon the high priest, who lived close to or during the time of Ben Sira himself. Segal opines that it refers to global giants, **גְּדוּלֵי הַתְּבֵל**.² Ben Sira, however, does not appear to be conscious that he belongs to a nation selected by God to lead the whole of humankind. Our alternative analysis, “eternal forefathers,” means that their fame is for eternity.³

The first 15 verses constitute a generic introduction about the eminent fathers, the first of whom, Enoch, is mentioned only in vs. 16.

Αἰνέσωμεν] = **שְׁבַח אֲבוֹתָא** and **ℒ *Laudemus***. **ש** stands half-way in the middle: **וְאֵנָּה אֲנִי אֲשַׁבַּח** ‘and I also would praise.’ For the author himself what follows is presented as a personal eulogy: 1sg. **אהללה**.⁴ By contrast, the translator is addressing Greek-speaking members of his community, exhorting them to practise what his grandfather used to do. See also above at 43.32.

ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους **חסד**] **אנשי חסד** The selection of ἐνδοξος for **חֶסֶד** is striking, all the more so because at vs. 10 the same Heb. phrase is rendered as ἄνδρες

¹ Likewise “Preis der Väter der Vorzeit” (Ryssel 449) and “Lob der Väter der Vorzeit” (SD II 2248).

² **תביל**, not **התביל**, follows Segal’s wording.

³ Cf. Mopsik (2003.273): “Éloge des pères de toujours” and a fn. ad loc.

⁴ Ueberschaer (2020.207) sees here an expression of authority on the part of BS.

ἐλέους, cf. דִּקְוּ מְלִכֵי 1Kg 20.31 > Θ βασιλεῖς ἐλέους 3K 21.31 and שִׂיֵּא דִּקְוּ Pr 11.7 > Θ ἀνήρ ἐλεήμων. The point the translator wants to make at the start of the following, long section is that all the prominent forefathers about to be told about stand widely known in the national history for their diverse achievements and their character as superb people. This high-frequency, important Heb. word, as a nomen rectum and with a human entity as a nomen regens as here, is never rendered in LXX with ἔνδοξος with the value of a genitive of quality.

τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν] In Ben Sira's days no woman dared raise a voice, we guess: "Is there no renowned *foremother*? How about Deborah?"

תְּחִי גֵנֶזֶסֵי] We are genetically related to our forefathers as against אֲבוֹתֵינוּ 'our fathers in their generations,' i.e. what roles they played in their generations.

44.2) πολλήν δόξαν ἔκτισεν ὁ κύριος,
τὴν μεγαλωσύνην αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

*The Lord created much splendour,
His majesty from ages ago.*

(B רב כבוד חלק⁵ עליון וגדלו מימות עולם:
(M רב כבוד חלק עליון וגדלה מ'... :

ἔκτισεν חלק] On this equation see above at 7.15 and 10.18. The Gk verb κτίζω is used in the sense of "to bring into being" in a generic sense, not necessarily with reference to the creation of the universe.⁶ Note, for instance, οὐκ ἔκτισται ἀνθρώποις ὑπερηφανία οὐδὲ ὀργὴ θυμοῦ ἐν γεννήμασιν γυναικῶν Si 10.18. Hence ἀπ' αἰῶνος here does not refer to the time of the creation of the universe, but "since olden times." The Heb. verb here means 'to confer, allocate,' for which the v.l. להם is very suitable. Sim. שִׂיֵּא אִיקְרָא סִי נְפִלּוּג לְהוֹן 'He will confer on them much honour,' where the verb חלק has been taken in the sense of "to portion, allocate."

τὴν μεγαλωσύνην αὐτοῦ] As is manifest in his translation (Smend II 78), "gross waren sie," Smend viewed גדלו as a verb, גְּדַלְו, an analysis which is now contradicted by M גדלה. Then גדלו can be analysed as גְּדַלְו or a scribal error for גדלתו, i.e. גְּדַלְתוּ. M גדלה can be analysed as גְּדַלְהָ;⁸ the suf. pron., which would reflect αὐτοῦ, is not absolutely necessary as shown by the parallel רב כבוד.

Note S for vs. 2b: עַל דְּרָא דְּעֵלְמָא 'and all their greatness on to generations for ever,' where the greatness is assigned to future forefathers.

⁵ V.l. להם inserted in-between.

⁶ Thus pace Ueberschaer (209): "urzeitlich, ursprünglich."

⁷ Likewise Lévi (81): "et qui furent illustres."

⁸ So also Kister 1990.366.

In **Sh** vs. 2b begins with **יְהִי** ‘through them,’ which corresponds with **εν αυτοις** in some MSS.

44.3) κυριεύοντες ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις αὐτῶν
καὶ ἄνδρες ὀνομαστοὶ ἐν δυνάμει·
βουλευόντες ἐν συνέσει αὐτῶν,
ἀπηγγελκότες ἐν προφητείαις·

*Some were rulers in their kingdoms
and men renowned in battlefields;
counsellors with their intelligence,
having made prophetic statements;*

ואנשי שם בגבורתם ¹⁰ :	דור ⁹ ארץ במלכותם (Ba)
וחזי כל בנבואתם:	היועצים ¹¹ בתבונתם (Bb)
וחזי כל בנבואתם:	ויועצים ¹² בתבונתם (M)

In the verses 3-6 we find a description of various types of renowned people known from the national history and diverse ways in which they achieved fame. In the four verses we find not a single finite verb. The deeds of these people are described mostly with participles. There are a total of seven participles, none of which can be said to be equivalent to a finite verb and has a nominal that can be viewed as its *s*. They are basically substantivised, indicating actors (*agentes*). This analysis largely applies to the Heb. text of these four verses as well. Some of the participles are m.pl.cst., **חוקרי** .. **נושאי** (vs. 5) and **סומכי** (vs. 6), and possibly **רודי** (vs. 3 v.l.) .. **חזי**. In Heb. no ptc. used predicatively as equivalent to a finite verb appears in the st. cst. Apart from these participles we find normal substantives, e.g. **ἄνδρες ὀνομαστοὶ ἐν δυνάμει** (vs. 3). We have thus a long list of nominals, whether straightforward nominals or substantivised participles. The list, however, is not a simple list of professions, such as “prophets, judges, priests, kings etc.” This linguistic, rhetorical feature of these verses appears to have been quite a challenge to the translators, as we shall see, and no less so to us.

κυριεύοντες] **דורי** is justly corrected in the v.l., **רודי**, i.e. **רוֹדִי**.

ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις αὐτῶν] There is no absolute need to change **במלכותם** (B) to **במלכותיהם**, i.e. **בְּמַלְכוּתֵיהֶם**; “each in his kingdom” could be meant.

βουλευόντες] The use of the definite article in **היועצים** (Bb) is ungrounded; it is justly dropped in the v.l.¹³ and M. M has instead the conjunction **ו**, which, as Ueberschaer (2020.210) points out, suggests that 3a+b have inadvertently

⁹ V.l. **רודי**.

¹⁰ V.l. **בגבורם**.

¹¹ V.l. **יד**.

¹² Qimron (1999.231) suggests choosing either **ויועצים** or **היועצים**, which latter agrees with **Sh**.

¹³ It could have restored **ו** also as in M.

got lost. S is even shorter, and also beginning with a conjunction: $\text{וְהִזְיִוּ בְּנִבְיֹתָהֶן}$ ‘and they displayed through their prophecy.’

S begins with a temporal conjunction and uses a finite verb, probably due to the use of the Pf. ptc. in C : $\text{כִּד אֲדַעֲוּ בְּנִבְיָא}$ ‘when they announced through prophets.’ C has deleted the conjunction *waw* in וְהִזְיִו and shifted the tense of the ptc., the only non-present tense in this list, and this indicates that this Pf. ptc. is meant to be circumstantial, modifying the preceding βουλεύοντες , what was picked up by S .

Moreover, the equation $\text{ἀπαγγέλλω} / \text{זִיח}$ is unusual. In *Index* 12b s.v. ἀπαγγέλλω we have suggested Arm. pa. זִיח for this example.¹⁴ Cf. $\text{וּפְשָׁרָהּ יְהִינְנִי אֲפֹאֲרֵי לַיּוֹמָהּ דְּנִי 5.7 LXX}$ and S זִיחֵי ‘they announced, informed’ here.

S has only vs. 3d: $\text{וְהִזְיִוּ בְּנִבְיֹתָהֶן}$ ‘and they announced through their prophecy.’

- 44.4) $\text{ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ ἐν διαβουλίαις καὶ συνέσει γραμματείας λαοῦ, σοφοὶ λόγοι ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν.}$
*leaders of a nation with plans
 and with understanding of issues of a nation
 and wise words in their education;*

ורוזנים במחקרותם:	שרי גוים במזמתם (Ba)
ומושלים במשמ׳/הותם:	חכמי שיה בספרתם ¹⁵ (Bb)
ורוזנים במחקרתם:	שרי גוי במזמתם (Ma)
ומשלים במ׳..:	חכמי שיה בספרתם (Mb)

$\text{λαοῦ}^1]$ Segal (304), who had yet no access to M with the sg. גוי , views גוים as non-Israelite peoples who benefitted from people such as Joseph and Nehemiah and Jewish ministers in the Ptolemaic court.

συνέσει] This appears to be a product of the translator’s guesswork. זִיח and זִיח in BH seem to have little to do with intelligence or intellectual excellence. Cf. LXX renderings: σατράπης δυνατός Jdg 5.3, ἄρχων Ps 2.2 (// βασιλεύς), δυνάστης Pr 8.15 (// βασιλεύς), 14.28, 31.4, and τύραννος Hb 1.10.

γραμματείας] This word is problematic for more than one reason. It does not appear to be known in documents prior to LXX. It occurs only twice in LXX. LSJ defines its meaning as “learning,” which we take is meant as an action noun. This, however, does not seem to work in our case here nor in the other instance, $\text{τὸ στόμα μου ἐξαγγελεῖ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου, ὅλην τὴν}$

¹⁴ In *Index* ad loc., “pi.” [= Piel] need be corrected to “pa.” [= Pael].

¹⁵ V.I. ‘במס׳. Lévi (83) reconstructs this as במוסרם ‘par leur instruction,’ but we are not aware of such a sense of מסר .

ἡμέραν τὴν σωτηρίαν σου, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνων γραμματείας Ps 70.15. *GELS* s.v. defines its sense as “subject of learning,” which suits better the pl. form in Ps 70.15, but not in our Si case, where it can be only genitive. As problematic is what appears to be reflecting with two different words in B and M. As for the former, מחקרותם (B), the root, חקר, is well known in the sense of “to investigate,” which suits our definition of γραμματεία. But מחקרות or חקר is unknown to Hebrew. On the other hand, a noun used in מחקרתם (M) is presumably חקקתם, which occurs, according to *Maagarim*, nowhere except here. It possibly means “legislation.”

We would mention an interesting detail here. שׁח reads here ספרותא for γραμματεία,¹⁶ and, though in the following clause, both B and M read בספרתם. שׁח also uses this noun at Ps 70.15 to translate חספרות.¹⁷

σοφοὶ λόγοι] a rather free rendering of שיח חכמי, which probably means ‘clever orators.’ Unlike the Heb. phrase, its Gk rendering does not refer to a group of people, hence not some forefathers, but functions as a description of the preceding ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ, on which the entire verse is focused.

The last word in (Bb) appears to present an epigraphical uncertainty. *Maagarim* mentions our passage as the sole instance of משמחה and no meaning is mentioned.

In Ⓞ another line is missing that would reflect the second hemistich of Bb and Mb.

44.5) ἐκζητοῦντες μέλη μουσικῶν
καὶ διηγούμενοι ἔπη ἐν γραφῇ·
seekers of musical tunes
and writers of librettos;

חוקרי מזמור על חוק¹⁸ (B)
חוקרי מזמור על קו ונשאי משל ... (M)

μουσικῶν] substantivised n.pl. ‘music’¹⁹ < μουσικός, thus μέλη μουσικῶν ‘pieces for music.’

חוק (B) and קו (M) most likely refer to rules that pertain to composition of musical tunes and librettos.

καὶ] ׀ had better be restored in B as in M. In vs. 3-6 not only M, but also B is consistent in their addition of the conjunction in concatenated constituents; on this question, cf. *SQH* § 38 c.

¹⁶ *SL* gives two senses for this word: “art of writing” and “letters [i.e. of an alphabet].”

¹⁷ There is an explanatory note in the margin: לִמְנָא אָתָא ‘to count letter(s).’ Note Ⓛ: Ps 70.15 “litteraturam” but juxta Hebr. “litteraturas” (pl.).

¹⁸ V.l. קוּ.

¹⁹ *Pace Lévi* (85) “des musiciens.”

ἐπη] In the light of this hapax, ἔπος, a word well-known in CG but so rare in BG Wagner (1999.205) underlines the high literary quality of Greek as used by our translator.

ἐν γραφῇ [בכתב] Both διηγέομαι and נָשָׂא מִשָּׁל are mostly used with reference to oral communication. Hence the use here is unique. With no tape recorder around, only what was put down in writing would stay more effectively in the memory of the society. Cf. § נְאֻמֵי מִתְּלָא בְּכַתְּבָא ‘and those who said proverbs in writing.’ Our author, as he wrote his proverbs, may have been dreaming of future generations appreciating his own writing.

The selection of the pl. διηγούμενοι and נושאי משל does not necessarily imply that prior to Ben Sira there was in circulation a document explicitly assigned to the genre of “Wisdom Literature” beside the canonical book of Proverbs. In the OT we find other books which include not a few sayings that could be correctly classified as proverbial and belonging to this genre even though they are not attributed to a particular individual as in the case of מְשָׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה Pr 1.1.

§ is quite distinct in vs. 5a: עַל אֵיִדֵי קִיתְרָא וְכַנְרָא ‘by means of citterns and lyres.’

44.6) ἄνδρες πλούσιοι κεχορηγημένοι ἐν ἰσχύι,
εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν κατοικίαις αὐτῶν·

*wealthy men abundantly provided with wealth,
living in their residences with no worry.*

(B) אנשי חיל וסומכי כח ושוקטים על מכונתם:
(M) אנשי חיל וסמכי כח ושקטים ...

πλούσιοι [חיל] the sole instance in LXX of this equation. However, חיל in the sense of ‘financial, material power, i.e. wealth, possessions’ is well established, cf. BDB s.v. 3.

κεχορηγημένοι [סומכי] a rare case of this equivalence. סומכי is virtually used here as an intransitive verb, equivalent to סמוכי, i.e. סְמוּכִי, then probably a scribal error. Cf. § סְמִיכֵי חֵילָא ‘those who rely on power [or: resources],’ with which cp. § סְמִיךְ עַל מוֹרְנִיתָה ‘relying on his spear’ 2Sm 1.6 (נְשָׂעַן וְעַל-חֵילָא).

ἐν ἰσχύι] The use of ἰσχύς in the sense of ‘financial, material power, i.e. wealth, possessions’ is unknown prior to SG, most likely a development under Heb. influence. See GELS s.v. 3. Note a similar use of δύναμις, for which, however, we have evidences in CG, cf. BDAG s.v. 4. Though not as frequent as חֵיל, כַּח sometimes signifies “wealth,” e.g. פְּנֵי-יְשׁוּבָעוּ וְרִים כַּחָךְ Pr 5.10 (Ⓢ .. σῆς ἰσχύος). These Heb. words here do not necessarily mean “financial power,” which is made plausible in view of 6b.

εἰρηνεύοντες] The absence of καί [= ו] shows that this ptc. is being used to modify the preceding κεχορηγημένοι, and not representing a separate group of people. Precisely the same holds for κεχορηγημένοι itself.

κατοικίαις αὐτῶν מכונתם] the sole instance in LXX of this equation. מכונה is not usually applied to a human residence. This verse is to be compared with 41.1, which, however, is rendered as ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντι ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ. The translator, it appears, found problematic the way מכונה is used in this document. The sense of סְחָפְתָּא used here is obscure, whilst at 41.1 it imitated ט: נְכֻסְתָּא 'his possessions.'

44.7) πάντες οὗτοι ἐν γενεαῖς ἐδοξάσθησαν,
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν καύχημα.

*All these people were respected in (their) generations,
and in their days celebrities.*

(B) כל אלה בדורם ²⁰ ומימיהם ²¹ תפארתם:
(M) כל אלה בדרם נכבדו
:...

ἐδοξάσθησαν] inadvertently left out in (B), but picked up in a v.l. and preserved in (M).

ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν] which agrees with a v.l. and sounds better, though their pride was to be remembered in the future generations.

καύχημα תפארתם] difficult to say with certainty whether the suf. pron. has the value of subjective or objective genitive, 'they themselves were proud of their achievement' or 'they were a national pride.' The latter accords with the parallel בדורם and has been adopted by us, so also in Ƨ: *et in diebus suis habentur in laudibus.*

44.8) εἰσὶν αὐτῶν οἱ κατέλιπον ὄνομα
τοῦ ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι ἐπαίνους·

*Among them there are some who left a name behind
to be talked about as great achievers;*

(B) יש מהם הניחו שם להשתענות ²² בנחלתם:
(M) יש מהם הניחו שם לה... :...

αὐτῶν] a partitive genitive as in εἰ ἔστιν μεθ' ὑμῶν τῶν δούλων κυρίου 'if there is with you (any) of the servants of the Lord' 4K 10.23.

²⁰ V.l. נכבדו.

²¹ V.l. ובימיהם.

²² V.l. להשתענות and להשעות.

oī] What follows has been analysed as a substantivised, asyndetic relative clause, on which see JM § 58 *d*. In vs. 9 we have אשר, which may have inadvertently disappeared here from יש מהם אשר הניחו שם. But the use of אשר here is optional. Another example of this type of relative clause occurs in 48.16.

τοῦ ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι ἐπαίνους] The link of this rendering with ἔ presents a serious headache.

The Heb. inf. has come down in three different forms. Since Heb. has שׁע as a verb root, להשתענות can be safely dismissed as a scribal error for להשתעור, one of the two variant readings in the margin of B. BSH (296) recognises this verb root in three stems: Qal, Ni., and Hitp., whereas *Maagarim* recognises only Qal. The v.l. להשעות could be an error of this rare verb for להשתעור, thus not Ni. Hitp. השׁעׁה could mean ‘to recount.’²³

As ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι is not passive, the following ἐπαίνους can be nothing but the *o* of the infinitive. But who is the subject of the infinitive? It is unlikely to be identical with the *s* of κατέλιπον. Then the inf. must be indicating a result, not intended;²⁴ it just turned out that other people, having observed the life stories of these forefathers, openly and publicly recognised their achievements. On the use of ἐκδιηγέομαι here, see above at 38.25.

ἐπαίνους נהלתם ‘their legacy’] a most unusual equation. This Gk noun, ἔπαινος, is used in LXX another four times to render תהלה; hence תהלתם may have stood in the *Vorlage*.

44.9) καὶ εἰσὶν ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν μνημόσυνον
καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες
καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς οὐ γεγονότες
καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν μετ’ αὐτούς.

*And there are those whose memory is non-existent
and perished like those who did not exist
and became like those who had never been born,
their children after them, too.*

וישבנו כאשר שבתו:	וישבתו אשר אין לו זכר	(Ba)
ובניהם מאחריהם:	כאשר לא היו היו	(Bb)
:	ויש מהם שאין לו זכר	(Ma)
:	כאשר לא היו היו	(Mb)

²³ Cf. ש and שׁה here: לְמַשְׁתַּעֲוֵי ‘in order to tell.’ Likewise Jewish Aramaic according to Jastrow 1903.1610b. Reymond (2021.268) argues for an Aramaising form, “to be supported” from שׁעׁה, but that does not make much sense in this context.

²⁴ Thus *pace NETS* “so that their praises might be told in detail,” “damit man erzähle Lobpreisungen” (*SD*, sim. Smend II 78). Their leaving their name behind could have happened like that, though some forefathers may have built a gigantic monument with his name engraved on it.

אשר אין לו זכר (Ba)] parallel to שאין לו זכר (Ma).²⁵

ἀπώλοντο] The Heb. text is inconsistent, now shifting to the pl., whilst in vs. 9a we have the sg., לו. שִׁהוֹן and שִׁהוֹן דְּיִזְכְּרוֹן ‘their memory’ are consistent in this regard. By writing וֹן (pl.), and not וֹ (sg.), the translator is quietly correcting לו to להם.

ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες] שִׁ may have found שִׁ שבתו כאשר a little odd and reformulated the adverbial clause. The author may have wished to say: “they vanished just like that without leaving any trace of their existence.” שִׁ follows שִׁ: וְבָטְלוּ אִיךְ מָא דְּבָטְלוּ ‘and they perished just as they perished.’ Cf. ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχων 38.11.

ἐγένοντο ὡς οὐ γεγονότες היו היו לא] On this Heb. expression, cp. כְּאֶשֶׁר לֹא־הָיְיִתִי אֶהְיֶה Jb 10.19 (שִׁ καὶ ὥσπερ οὐκ ὦν ἐγενόμην).

44.10) ἀλλ’ ἢ οὗτοι ἄνδρες ἐλέους,
ὄν αἱ δικαιοσύναι οὐκ ἐπελήσθησαν·

*However, these are merciful men
whose deeds of righteousness were not forgotten.*

(B) ואולם אלה אנשי חסד ותקותם ל...:ת.
(M) אולם אלה אנשי חסד וצדקותם...:

ἀλλ’ ἢ] This compound and clause-initial particle may be used to introduce a qualifying statement or condition; there is no logical opposition or contradiction to what has just been stated.²⁶ Some of these people may no longer be remembered by name, but their deeds and lives would remain recorded in the national history.

ἄνδρες ἐλέους חסד [אנשי חסד] This standard equivalence is all the more striking because it was applied to the same group of men right at the start of the chapter and rendered in a most unusual fashion with ἄνδρες ἔνδοξοι ‘eminent men.’

In 10a οὗτοι ἄνδρες ἐλέους constitutes a self-standing nominal clause, and not in extraposition to be referred back with the suf. pron. in תקותם. Lévi’s (87) “quant à ces hommes de bien, leur espoir ne sera pas déçu” goes in the face of the basic Hebrew syntax, for “ces hommes de bien” can only be said as אנשי חסד אלה.²⁷

ὄν αἱ δικαιοσύναι] which can scarcely reflect תקותם ‘their hope.’ A solution is suggested by the only letter that has survived in M: וצדקותם.

²⁵ Fassberg (1997.61f.) underscores the parallelism between אֶשֶׁר and שִׁ here.

²⁶ More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. ἀλλά 4 d.

²⁷ Lévi’s analysis was possibly influenced by שִׁ here: אֶשֶׁר וְדִיקוּתָא וְדִיבּוּתָא וְדִיבּוּתָא וְדִיבּוּתָא ‘but these people of kindness and justice, their kindness will not cease to exist.’

44.11) μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν διαμενεῖ,
ἀγαθὴ κληρονομία ἔκγονα αὐτῶν·

*It shall remain with their descendants,
their offspring a splendid inheritance.*

:... ..ל ונחלתם טובם עם זרעם נאמן טובם (B)
:... ..חגה ונחלתם טובם עם זרעם נאמן טובם (M)

διαμενεῖ] The *s* of the verb is opaque, whereas in 𐤔 it must be טובם נאמן. טובם suggests that the posterity of their respected forefathers would at times feel proud of their lineage and confirm their determination to carry on the same philosophy of life.²⁸ Only then the descendants would merit the title of “splendid inheritance.” Lévi (87) regards ἀγαθὴ κληρονομία to be the *s* of this Gk verb, but then ἔκγονα αὐτῶν would hang in the air and κληρονομία undoubtedly reflects נחלה. For some reason or other טובם is not explicitly represented in 𐤔. All the same 𐤔 of 11b is difficult to comprehend. Does ἔκγονα αὐτῶν refer to the same people indicated as τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν or grandchildren²⁹ of the respected forefathers? Ryssel’s “und ihr Besitztum fällt ihren Kindeskindern anheim” sounds reasonable, but the current B text cannot be so translated, for we would expect ἐκγόνων αὐτῶν or ἐκγόνοις αὐτῶν.

44.12) ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ¹²ἔσθη σπέρμα αὐτῶν
καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν δι’ αὐτούς·

*In written wills their posterity had a firm status
also their children because of them.*

:... ..צאצאיהם עמד זרעם כבירתם עמד זרעם (M)

ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις] What appears to be an equivalent of this in 𐤔 is positioned at the end of the preceding verse. The present verse ends in 𐤔 with an odd addition: אַבְרָהָם בְּעֵבֶר אֲרָבָה ‘through good works [or: deeds].’

The suf. pron. in כבירתם must refer to the forefathers, who had seen to it that their posterity’s future was securely and officially established by means of written wills.

44.13) ἕως αἰῶνος μενεῖ σπέρμα αὐτῶν,
καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται·

*For ages their posterity would remain,
and their glory would not be obliterated.*

²⁸ א (M) is obviously an error for עם (B).

²⁹ Cf. 𐤔) בְּנֵי בְנֵי דִילְהוֹן ‘their grandchildren.’

(B) עד עולם יעמד זכרם וצדקתם ל...
 (M) ועד³⁰ עולם יעמד זרעם וכבודם לא ימח:

Ⓞ shows an almost perfect match with (M), the two key substantives and the verb that was missing in (B).

μενεῖ σπέρμα αὐτῶν] In comparison with the preceding verse Ⓞ skillfully translated the same Heb. phrase, **עמד זכרם**, differently by the choice of two different verbs [ἵστημι / μένω] and two different tenses [Aorist and Future], and that for a good reason: a will had been written before the parents' decease and this verse concerns not only their children, but more future generations.

ἐξαλειφθήσεται] Though the reading of the last word in M is not absolutely certain, the equation ἐξαλείφω / **מחה** is in no doubt; it occurs 10 times for Qal **מחה** and as often for Ni. **מחה**.

44.14) τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐτάφη,
 καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ζῆ εἰς γενεάς·

*Their corpses were buried peacefully,
 and their name would live on for generations.*

... ל..ל... (B)
 :רשם חו לדור ודור: (M)

τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν] The selection of the pl. noun was natural in view of αὐτῶν. By contrast, given the f.sg. **נאספה**, its *s* must have been sg., **נאִיִּתָם**. The author was probably thinking of each individual's corpse.

ἐτάφη [נאספה] This is the sole attestation in LXX of the equation **θάπτω / חָפַץ**. The translator must have noticed the frequent use of this Heb. verb in contexts of burial, thus virtually synonymous with **קבר**.³¹

44.15) σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγῆσονται λαοί,
 καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον ἐξαγγελεῖ ἑκκλησία.

*People would talk about their wisdom,
 and the society would openly praise them.*

(B) חכמתם תשנה עדה ותהלתם יספר קהל:
 (M) ... עדה ותהלתם יספר קהל:

In B the text came down in the margin, and it has now been recovered in M virtually in the same form.

³⁰ The conjunction *waw* is missing in Ⓞ.

³¹ Long before the discovery of the Masada fragment Lévi (86) had restored **פגריהם בשלום** **אספו**. Similarly Smend (421).

διηγήσονται הַשְׁנִי] Both Segal (302) and Kahana (520) vocalise the verb as Qal, and the latter interprets it as meaning תִּלְמַד ‘to teach,’ a meaning known to MH in Qal. Some Aramaic dialects,³² however, use an etymologically related verb root דַּנַּי in the sense of ‘to tell, relate,’ e.g. Syr. in Peal and Pael, thus ܣܢܘܢܗ here. Teaching and telling (a story) are at times mutually supplementary.

λαοί] Though pl., this word here most likely refers to communities and groups of Israelites in the Holy Land and overseas, unless one assumes that the wisdom and prudence of distinguished coreligionists preceding the author had become the talk of the town throughout the Near East and the Mediterranean world.³³ In 39.10, where no Heb. text has survived, almost the same thought is expressed in ܥ in almost the same way as here, though ἔθνη is used instead of λαοί. דַּד is hardly ever used in BS with reference to a gentile society.

44.16) Ενωχ εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη
ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς.

*Enoch pleased the Lord and was transferred,
an example of remorse for generations.*

הַגּוֹרֵם מִצָּא תַמִּים וְהַתְּהַלֵּךְ עִם יְיָ וְנִלְקַח: (Ba)
אוֹת דַּעַת לְדוֹר וְדוֹר: (Bb)

μετετέθη הַקֶּזֶ] On the shift in ܕ from the active (הַקֶּזֶ) in the source text [= Gn 5.24] to the passive.

μετανοίας] a keyword that is missing in ܣܢ. It is an unusual rendering of דַּעַת,³⁴ and its application to Enoch is as unusual, given his reputed piety. Μετάνοια is not used anywhere else in LXX where a Heb. text is extant. Μετανοέω renders Ni. הַנִּי the most frequently (8x). ܣܢ reads ܣܢܘܢܗ ‘example,’ we are not told “of what?”. Equally ambiguous is ܕ דַּעַת here.

Vs. 16a in ܥ is very similar to ܥ καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ενωχ τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ἠδύρισκετο, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός Gn 5.24. Note also the affinity with ܕ וְיִתְהַלְךְ הַגּוֹרֵם אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֵינֶנּוּ כִּי־לִקַּח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים. The affinity with Wi 4.10 is commonly known: εὐάρεστος θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη καὶ ζῶν μεταξὺ ἀμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη, where it is also generally thought to be a reference to Enoch.³⁵

³² Smend (421) writes: “Im Neuhebräisch haben Kal und Piel diese Bedeutung [= erzählen],” but we are not aware of any such evidence.

³³ Ziegler has chosen the Fut., ἐξαγγελεῖ, contra Rahlfs with Pres. ἐξαγγέλλει. Cp. ܣ Impf. אַעֲשֶׂה, so also ܣܢ עֲדִי.

³⁴ In Lévi’s (88) view precisely דַּעַת here demonstrates that μετάνοια here is to be taken in the sense of “afterthought,” an argument which we fail to follow. Though repentance, by nature, does take place after an act, not every afterthought involves remorse.

³⁵ For a comparison with the biblical source with reference to both ܥ and ܕ, see Wagner 1999.105f.

The first half of (Ba) is missing in \mathfrak{G} ; it is mostly thought to be a take-off from vs. 17.

44.17) Νωε εὐρέθη τέλειος δίκαιος,
 ἐν καιρῷ ὀργῆς ἐγένετο ἀντάλλαγμα·
 διὰ τοῦτον ἐγενήθη κατάλειμμα τῆ γῆ,
 ὅτε ἐγένετο κατακλυσμός·

*Noah was found to be perfect (and) righteous,
 and at the time of anger he became a replacement;
 thanks to this (man) the earth could survive,
 when the flood occurred.*

:לעת 36 כלה היה תחליף: (Ba)
 :בבעבורו היה שארית ובבריתו חדל מבול: (Bb)
 :... ב... נוח צדיק נמצא תמים (M)

Νωε] The *plena* spelling in M is unattested in BH, but quite frequent in QH, 17 times, in contrast to the orthodox spelling as in Ba, which occurs only once in CD 3.1. The same applies to מושה, though the orthodox spelling occurs in QH quite a few times. The application of this *plena* spelling even to names is typical of QH.

τέλειος δίκαιος] The two adjectives are not joined in \mathfrak{H} with each other.³⁷ In \mathfrak{H} we could be having to do with a substantivised adjective, i.e. “Noah a righteous (man),” which seems to be represented in \mathfrak{S} : נוח וְדִיקָא: “Noah a righteous (man),” which seems to be represented in \mathfrak{S} : נוח וְדִיקָא: נח איש צדיק תמים הוה: The source text is decisive here: נח איש צדיק תמים הוה: Gn 6.9. \mathfrak{S} presents here a compromise with its version of Gn 6.9, נוח גִּבֹר, נוח וְדִיקָא תמים הוה.

ὀργῆς] referring to God’s anger and a free rendering of \mathfrak{H} כלה ‘annihilation,’³⁹ and \mathfrak{S} ’s טוּפָנָא ‘flood’ is contextual. In Gn 6 we see the use of Ni. נח with God as s, where \mathfrak{G} is illuminating: in vs. 6 וַיִּנְהָם יְהוָה כִּי־עָצָה אֶת־הָאָדָם: και ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, where a slightly opaque Gk verb, ἐνθυμέω, is used, which *GELS* s.v. 4 defines as “to take to heart, feel irritated,” whilst in vs. 7 \mathfrak{G} is more straightforward with ἐθυμώθη ὅτι ἐποίησα αὐτούς < נחמתי כי עציתי >, where the same Heb. verb is used as in vs. 6. The verb θυμώω “to excite to anger, irritate” (*GELS* s.v.) is at times

³⁶ V.l. ב.

³⁷ This does not mean, however, that τέλειος is used adverbially like τελείως as suggested by “parfaitement juste” (*BJ*).

³⁸ We regard שלם to be an adjective rather than a substantive שלם st. abs. So ed. Lagarde with a diacritical dot below the word: שלם. A similar example is in וְהוּא לְכֹחַן שְׁלָם עִם מְרִיא: אלקה 1Kg 8.61.

³⁹ Scarcely an inf. abs., i.e. כלה, pace Smith 2000.262. כלה as a standard verbal noun is well known in BH, e.g. וְכִלְהָ אֶל־תְּעִשׂוּ Je 5.10.

used in combination with ὀργή, e.g. καὶ ἐθυμώθη ὀργῆ ἄפו וַיִּחַר אָפו Gn 39.19 and θυμοῖ ὀργῆ ἡפּוּ הַרְהֵוּ Ex 32.11 +.

ἀντάλλαγμα ἡλιη] Noah, with his household, replaced the existing human race and made a new start possible.⁴⁰ תּחִלִּי is unknown to BH. Cp. תּלִּי ‘substitute, replacement’ in RH.

τοῦτον] a reading by Rahlfs adopted by Ziegler as against τοῦτο, the majority reading. The latter could refer to the preceding ἀντάλλαγμα or the entire thought expressed in vs. 17b.

ἐγενήθη] In contrast to ἐγένετο (17b), the *s* of which is Noah, here κατάλειμμα is the *s*. Κατάλειμμα is not an action noun, but refers to a result of the action. Hence we could translate the clause as “thanks to this (man) there emerged survivors for the earth.” The dative of τῆ γῆ is a dative of benefit or advantage.

היה is a case of gender discord; היתה is anticipated.

The message of the last clause in 17 represents its H as rephrased: “and through his covenant (granted by God) the flood stopped.” Note also a free rendition in 17: וַיִּמָּא לֵה אֱלֹהִים דְּלֵא נִהְיָא תִּיב טַפְּנָא ‘and God pledged to him that there would be no flood again.’

The initial דָּא מְטוּל of 17c, which concords with many sources, is a meaningless repetition of the same phrase in 17c.

44.18) διαθήκαι αἰῶνος ἐτέθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν,
ἵνα μὴ ἐξαλειφθῆ κατακλυσμῶ πᾶσα σάρξ.

*Eternal covenants were instituted with him
so that no animate being might be obliterated with flood.*

(B באות עולם נכרת⁴¹ עמו לבלתי השחית כל בשר:

διαθήκαι] Does the strange pl. form reflect בריתות?⁴² The pl. of this Heb. noun here would be as odd. The v.l. כרת with God as *s* is a sensible correction.⁴³ וַיִּמָּא לֵה אֱלֹהִים most likely means “an eternal sign,” referring to rainbow mentioned in Gn 9.12-17.

ἐτέθησαν] Τίθημι διαθήκην (active) is a standard collocation. The use of the passive form of τίθημι is unusual, but not ungrammatical as shown by τοῦτον γὰρ δὴ τίθεσθαι τὸν νόμον ὀρθῶς ὑποτίθεμαι μόνον Pl. Leg. 4.705e.⁴⁴ Though in 17 we do not find ברית, it is an essential ingredient of the immediately preceding clause, ובבריתו חדל מבול.

⁴⁰ Cf. a discussion by Van Peursen 2008.141-43.

⁴¹ V.l. כרת.

⁴² See below at 45.5.

⁴³ Reiterer (1999.266) rejects it as “an easier, secondary, reading,” but he does not say what the *s* of כרת is.

⁴⁴ “Covenants of eternity were added to him” (NETS) is impossible.

πᾶσα] Just like כּל this must be part of the standard syntagm < πᾶς + sg. noun > for absolute, categorical negation.⁴⁵ Thus “nicht alles Fleisch” (SD), “all flesh” (NETS), and the like are ambiguous. Noah would have shuddered at the thought of possibly another flood that might affect only part of animate beings.

44.19) Ἀβρααμ μέγας πατὴρ πλήθους ἔθνων,
καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη μῶμος ἐν τῇ δόξῃ·

*Abraham (was) a forefather of many nations,
and no defect was found in (his) glory,*

(B) אברהם אב המון גוים לא נתן בכבודו מום⁴⁶:

πατὴρ] Ἡ's אב המון גוים with this non-standard cst. form is precisely how Abraham is called in Gn 17.4f. on the occasion of his name-change. In Ⓞ at Gn 17.4 we read πατὴρ πλήθους ἔθνων.

καὶ] The absence of the conjunction in Ἡ could be a plain scribal error. Alternatively, אברהם אב המון גוים, might be in casus pendens and resumed through the suf. pron. of בכבודו. However, there is no such example in this long section. Ⓢ does have ׀. Or 19a may be an unusually long s of נתן.

μῶμος] a reading proposed by Smend (423) and adopted by Ziegler. The majority of witnesses read ομοιος. We find a very similar expression in μὴ δῶς μῶμον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου 30.31 < ..ואל תתן מום בכ.. Our text could then be rendered: “he did not mar his honour.” See also below at 47.20.

44.20) ὃς συνετήρησεν νόμον ὑψίστου
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ·
ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησεν διαθήκην
καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός·

*who adhered to the law of the Most High
and entered a covenant relationship with Him;
in his body he marked (this) covenant
and being tested was found faithful.*

(Ba) אשר שמר מצות עליון ובא בברית עמו:

(Bb) בבשרו כרת לו חק ובניסוי נמצא נאמן:

ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ [בא בברית] The same Heb. collocation as here occurs in Ez 16.8, where Ⓞ is more literal with καὶ εἰσηλθὼν ἐν διαθήκῃ μετὰ σοῦ.

⁴⁵ Cf. SSG § 83 fa and SQH § 40 g. A rare example of partial negation is found at Si 5.9.

⁴⁶ V.I. דופי.

ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ] a reference to the circumcision he underwent in his old age (Gn 17.9-11, 24).

διαθήκην] On this rendering of קח, see also 45.24. On the combination with ἵστημι (transitive), see καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου πρὸς αὐτὸν Gn 17.19 < וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתּוֹ.

קח לוֹ] For the use of the prep. ל־, here an example such as לֹא־תְכַרֵּת ל־אֶת־בְּרִיתִי לְהֵם וְלְאֵלֵיהֶם בְּרִיתִי Ex 23.32, which suggests that לוֹ is = לְאֵלֵהוּ. BDB, s.v. כָּרַת Qal 4, mentions more instances of ל־ בְּרִיתִי ל־. Though there is elsewhere no instance of ל־ חַק, the two nouns belong to the same semantic field.

ἐν πειρασμῷ] a reference to the sacrificing of Isaac, see וְהִאֲלֵהִים נֶסָה וְהִאֲבָרְכָהּ Gn 22.1. On נִסוּי, see above at 36.1.

44.21) διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὄρκῳ ἔστησεν αὐτῷ
ἐνευλογηθῆναι ἔθνη ἐν σπέρματι αὐτοῦ,
πληθῦναι αὐτὸν ὡς χοῦν τῆς γῆς
καὶ ὡς ἄστρα ἀνυψῶσαι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ
καὶ κατακληρονομησαι αὐτοῦς
ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἕως θαλάσσης
καὶ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς.

*On this account He pledged to him through an oath
that nations would become happy through his descendants,
He would multiply him like sand of the earth
and uplift his descendants like stars
and they would inherit
from sea to sea
and from (the) river to the end of the earth.*

(Ba) על כן בשׁוּעָה הִקִּים לוֹ לְבָרֶךְ בּוֹרְעוֹ גּוֹיִם:
(Bb) לֵהֲנַחִילֵם מַיִם וְעַד יָם וּמְנַהֵר וְעַד אַפְסֵי אָרֶץ:

ἐν ὄρκῳ] On oaths God swore, cf. Gn 22.16 and 26.3, where, however, ὄρκος is an *o* of ἵστημι. Here διαθήκην seems to be an implicit *o*. On the collocation ἵστημι διαθήκην, see at the preceding verse, and what follows here, starting with ἐνευλογηθῆναι indicates what the covenant provides for Abraham's posterity.

שׁ uses the pl.:⁴⁷ בְּמִוְתָא יְמָא לֵה אֱלֹהָא 'God swore to him with oaths.' Probably because there is more than one reference in Gn to God promising to Abraham. Likewise שׁj.

⁴⁷ However, the morphology of this Syr. substantive is problematic. Cp. מְוַתָּא (with two dots, a pl. marker added) τοὺς ὄρκους Mk 6.26 with מְוַתָּא אֲחֵרָתָא ἄλλον τινὰ ὄρκον Jam 5.12, where the added adjective clearly speaks for the sg. of the substantive. Cf. further Nöldeke 1966 § 78 and Payne Smith 1603f.

ἐνευλογηθῆναι] Unlike the shorter form, ἐυλογέω, this verb appears to focus on happiness. *GELS* s.v. defines its sense as “1. to make happy.” In a total of its 8 occurrences in LXX it is used as here where peoples other than Israelites are promised to become happy through the intervention of Abraham and his progeny, e.g. ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ [= Ἀβραμ] πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς Ge 12.3 and καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς ib. 22.18, sim. ib. 18.18, 26.4, 28.14. By contrast, ἐυλογέω is used in this specialised sense only once: ἐυλογήσω δὲ αὐτήν καὶ δώσω σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς τέκνον Ge 17.16, where the *s* is God and only one person, a woman [= Sara], is to be a beneficiary. By shifting the active voice of בָּרַךְ with God as the *s* into the passive voice, the peoples other than Israelites are highlighted as beneficiaries⁴⁸ and the former are to function as agents.⁴⁹

Vs. 21c-d of 𐤄 is missing in 𐤅.⁵⁰ The Gk text appears to be a secondary addition. The suf. pron. of הַנְּחִילִם could have been thought to be referring to the preceding גוֹיִם. The added text alluding to various texts in Gn renders it clear that the focus of the divine pledge is on Abraham and his descendants. In the implied source text we find ἄμμος instead of χοῦς: καὶ ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς Ge 13.16 and καὶ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς γῆς Ge 28.14. Only in a late book we find χοῦς: σὺ ἐβασίλευσάς με ἐπὶ λαὸν πολλὸν ὡς ὁ χοῦς τῆς γῆς 2C 1.9. The use of ἀνυψώω in this context is unique, cp. πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης Ge 22.17. These innovative features evidence the secondary nature of this addition in 𐤄.

This addition is found in 𐤆 as well, possibly influenced in general outlines by 𐤄: וְלִמְסַגְוֵי וְרַעַה אֵיךְ חָלָא דְיִמָּא וְלִמְתַּל וְרַעַה לְעַל מִן כְּלֵהוֹן עֲמָא, לְמִוְרְתוֹ 𐤄 and to increase his descendants like the sand of the sea and to set his descendants above all the peoples to let them inherit from the sea to the sea and from Euphrase up to the ends of the earth.’

The Heb. text of Bb is based on the biblical text: וַיְרַךְ מִיָּם עַד-יָם וּמִנְהָרָה עַד-אֲפֶסֶס־אֲרָץ Ps 72.8 and וּמִשְׁלֹו מִיָּם עַד-יָם וּמִנְהָרָה עַד-אֲפֶסֶס־אֲרָץ Zc 9.10. Both passages, however, do not represent the divine pledge made to Abraham.

⁴⁸ Pace “Dieu lui promet .. de bénir toutes les nations” (*BJ*).

⁴⁹ Only once in LXX ἐνευλογέομαι is used as middle: ἐνευλογεῖσθαι ἀπαρχῆς ‘to enjoy the first fruits’ 1K 2.29. Hence “mit seinen Nachkommen sich segnen sollten die Heiden” (Smend II 79) is debatable. Lévi (91) views the active ἐνευλογεῖν of 248 preferable, but offering no argument. According to Smend (424) לְבָרַךְ means “dass sich segnen sollten,” an analysis that is too much prompted by 𐤅. Besides, the separation of גוֹיִם from the inf. would be anomalous. A possible exception in QH is mentioned in *SQH* § 18 m, where, however, the *s* is ahead of the inf.

⁵⁰ Segal (309) attributes this to a homoioteleuton of vss. 21b and 21d, but that is based on his own restoration of 21d as וְלִתְתוֹ עֲלֵיוֹן עַל כָּל גוֹיִם.

ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς אַפְסִי אַרְץ] The sg. ἄκρου in 𐤀 makes sense because the starting point is also expressed with the sg. As logical is ἀπ’ ἄκρου τῆς γῆς ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς De 13.7, where, however, 𐤀 (vs. 8) reads אַרְץ מְקַצֵּה מְקַצֵּה אַרְץ. And in the above cited Ps 72.8 we find 𐤀 ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης (71.8).

44.22) καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσαακ ἔστησεν οὕτως
δι’ Ἀβρααμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.
εὐλογίαν πάντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαθήκηνη

*Also to Isaac He pledged likewise
on account of Abraham his father.
A blessing of all peoples and a covenant*

וגם ליצחק הקים בן⁵¹ בעבור אברהם אביו: (Ba)
ברית כל ראשון נתנו (Bb)

οὕτως] preferring the v.l., בן, in lieu of the misspelled 𐤁 (Ba).

In 𐤀 (Bb) and (Ba) of the next verse are compounded. Vs. 23 reads: וְבוֹרְכָתָא דְכָל קְדָמָיָא מִתְּנִיחָא עַל רֵאשִׁי דְיִסְרָאֵל דְקָרִייהוּ בְרִי בּוֹכְרִי יִסְרָאֵל וְיֵהֵב לָהּ יִרְתָּנָא וְאַקִימָה אָבָא לְשִׁבְטָא. וְנִפְקֹ וְאַתְפְּלִגֹ לְתַרְעֶסֶר שְׁבֻטִין וְנִפְקֹ מִגַּה גְבָרָא לְהַיְהוֹן כְּלִהוֹן חַיָּא ‘and a blessing of all (his) forefathers rests on the head of Israel, whom he called “My son, my eldest son, Israel,” and gave him the heritage and established him as the father of the tribes and they issued forth and split into twelve tribes, and they came out and were divided into twelve tribes and there issued forth out of him righteous men. He finds favour in the eyes of all living people.’

(Bb) is rather obscure. With some difficulty one could translate it as “He gave him as the first the covenant of all,” regarding נתנו as equivalent to נתן לו, so 𐤀 *dedit illi*. Besides, εὐλογίαν presupposes ברכת.

ἀνθρώπων] = אנשים, and not ראשון, which is also obscure. 𐤀 קְדָמָיָא = ראשון (Bb).

44.23) κατέπαυσεν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν Ἰακωβ·
ἐπέγνω αὐτὸν ἐν εὐλογίαις αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐν κληρονομίᾳ·
καὶ διέστειλεν μερίδας αὐτοῦ,
ἐν φυλαῖς ἔμερισε δέκα δύο.

*Καὶ ἐξήγαγεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἄνδρα ἐλέους
εὐρίσκοντα χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς πάσης σαρκός,*

⁵¹ V.l. בן.

*He laid on the head of Jacob;
He recognised his place in the blessings for him
and gave him a place in the heritage;
and separated his portions,
allotted them to twelve tribes.*

*And He brought out from him a merciful man
who found favour in the eyes of every person*

	(Ba) וברכה נחה על ראש ישראל:
ויתן לו נחלתו:	(Bb) ויכוננהו בברכה ⁵²
לחלק שנים עשר ⁵³ :	(Bc) ויציבהו לשבטים
מוצא ⁵⁴ חן בעיני כל חי:	(Bd) ויִצְאֵהוּ מִמֶּנּוּ אִישׁ

κατέπαυσεν] This verb here is used transitively with 22c as its *o*, although נחה (Ba) is intransitive.

For 23a there is a v.l. that is preferred by Lévi, who refers to Ex 4.22, where God says to Moses כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה בְּנִי בְכָרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

εὐλογίας αὐτοῦ] It is difficult to know whether the gen. pron. refers to God [said by God] or Jacob [said for Jacob]. \mathfrak{H} בברכה is of no help.

ἐν κληρονομίᾳ] A v.l. κληρονομίαν is no doubt less problematic and also accords with \mathfrak{H} . If \mathfrak{G} 's *Vorlage* had read as \mathfrak{H} , the translator must have had a good reason for offering a more difficult rendering. It might mean 'in the land Israel inherited,' and still with εὐλογίαν πάντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαθήκην (22) as an *o*.

ἄνδρα ἐλέους] Moses as a merciful person is an innovative idea. \mathfrak{H} reads merely אִישׁ.

⁵² V.l. ויכונהו בכורה.

⁵³ V.l. 'לש'.

⁵⁴ V.l. ומצא.

CHAPTER 45

45.1) ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων
 Μωσῆν, οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις·
loved by God and people,
Moses, whose memory be blessed!

... (B) לַהֵימ וְאֲנָשִׁים מִשֶּׁה זָכָרוֹ לְטוֹבָה:

In spite of the conventional chapter division we are still in part of the clause in the last verse of the preceding chapter, which is unfinished. Hence the new chapter beginning with ἠγαπημένον (acc.) continues εὐρίσκοντα χάριν (acc.). Likewise §: וְאֲרִחִים קָדְםָ אֶלְהָא וְאִף בְּעֵינֵי בְּנֵי אָנְשָׁא ‘and loved before God and also in the eyes of people.’ Note the st. abs. of אֲרִחִים¹ exactly as with מְשַׁכַּח in the preceding verse.

Μωσῆν, οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις] The wording in (B) reminds one of a standing formula in later Hebrew, according to which we could rewrite the text as מִשֶּׁה זָכָרוֹ לְבִרְכָּה ‘Moses of blessed memory,’ in a formula commonly used when one mentions someone dead respectfully. Interestingly enough we find precisely this version in §: מוֹשֶׁה דְּוִכְרָנָה לְבוֹרְכָתָא. See below at 46.11. Though no name appears, cf. זָכָרוֹנוֹ לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא bQid 31b.

45.2) ὁμοίωσεν αὐτὸν δόξῃ ἁγίων
 καὶ ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτὸν ἐν φόβοις ἐχθρῶν·

He likened him to the glory of saints
and made him great enough to be feared by enemies.

... (B) אֱלֹהִים² וַיֵּאֲמָצְהוּ בְּמִרְמִים³:

ὁμοίωσεν] It is a fair guess that the *Vorlage* had a form of שׁוּוֹי ‘equal, similar.’ A Pi. or Hi. form may have stood there. Cf. שׁוּוִיָּה רַבָּנָן כַּחֲתִיכָה דְּנַבְלָה ‘the sages equated the udder with a piece of non-kosher meat’ bHul. 97b and וְאַשְׁוִיתֵם אֶגְנוֹן עִמָּן ‘and you have treated them as of equal value as us’ § Mt 20.12.

ἐν φόβοις] = v.l. בְּמִרְמִים.

¹ Lévi (93) presumably parses the form as Afel, but one does not write an Afel of this kind with a *yod*. The initial *alpha* must be an irregular mater lectionis, cf. Nöldeke 1966 § 4 B.

² V.l. וַיֵּי.

³ V.l. בְּמִרְמִים.

45.3) ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ σημεῖα κατέσπευσεν,
 ἐδόξασεν αὐτὸν κατὰ πρόσωπον βασιλέων·
 ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ πρὸς λαὸν αὐτοῦ
 καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ·

*In line with his words He performed signs in quick succession,
 He established his fame in the eyes of kings;
 He issued commands meant for His people
 and let him see part of His glory.*

:ךלךּ ויחקהו לפני מלךּ (Ba) ... 4. בה
 :... ..ויצוהו ל (Bb)

σημεῖα] The word σημεῖον means “that which signals” as applied to the sun and the moon (Gn 1.14), for instance, but also refers to “an extraordinary event caused (ultimately) by God and carrying some message” (*GELS* s.v. 1) and often in combination with τέρας, e.g. Δότε ἡμῖν σημεῖον ἢ τέρας Ex 7.9, where Pharaoh is challenging Israelites, and πληθυνῶ τὰ σημεῖά μου καὶ τὰ τέρατα ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ ib. 7.3, where God is speaking to Moses.

κατέσπευσεν] so Smend (427) and adopted by Ziegler as against Rahlfs’ κατεπαυσεν.

ἐδόξασεν αὐτὸν ויחקהו] the sole attestation of the equation δοξάζω / possibly Pi. קִיחַ. The force in persuasion and argumentation must be meant.

ἐνετείλατο] This high-frequency verb, ἐντέλλομαι, shows a striking syntagm here: < dat. pers. + πρὸς τινα>. The dat. indicates a recipient of an order and the acc. with πρὸς a person for whom the command is meant. The first person is a messenger. In LXX we find four more instances: καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ καθὰ ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Μωσῆ καὶ Ααρων πρὸς αὐτοῦς Ex 12.50, κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαι σοι πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ ib. 25.21, αἱ ἐντολαί, ἃς ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Μωσῆ πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ Lv 27.34, and ἐνετείλαμην αὐτῷ ἐν Χωρηβ πρὸς πάντα τὸν Ἰσραηλ προστάγματα καὶ δικαιώματα Ma 4.6 (Ⲙ 3.22). In the first instance Ⲙ has nothing that would correspond to πρὸς αὐτοῦς, whereas in the second and third we see לְאַרְבָּנֵי־לְבָבִי, and in the fourth לְאַרְבָּנֵי־לְבָבִי; Ⲙ uses לְ in all the cases except the first. Though a different Gk verb is used, the same could be said on συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς Φαραω βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου Ex 6.13.⁵ Hence the restoration of ל in our passage is justified; God is indirectly addressing His people.⁶ The syntagm here is distinct from what

⁴ V.l. בדברו.

⁵ Here Ⲙ uses תְּנִי ‘towards; beside.’

⁶ We cannot accept Lévi’s (95) translation “Il le préposa à son peuple” nor Mopsik’s (282) “Il l’assigna auprès de son peuple.”

we find in *καὶ ἐνετείλατο Φαραω ἀνδράσιν περὶ Αβραμ Gn 12.20*, where Pharaoh instructed his staff as to how to accompany Abram and Sara back home and in *ח* we see *לע*.

ἐδειξεν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.] cf. Δειξόν μοι τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν Ex 33.18. *ס* expands by adding *הִלֵּךְ הַצִּיּוֹן* ‘and made him hear His voice.’

We would analyse *תִּשׁ דֹּדְזָהּ אֲטוֹ* as a case of partitive genitive.⁷

45.4) ἐν πίστει καὶ πραύτητι αὐτὸν ἡγίασεν,
ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν ἐκ πάσης σαρκός·

*For his fidelity and humility He consecrated him,
He chose him above every (other) person.*

...בּ כּל בּוּ בּחַר בּוּ מְכַל בּוּ. ⁸בּאמוּנתוּ וּבְעוֹנוֹתָיו (B

ἐν] “in view of, taking into consideration.” Cf. *GELS* s.v. **11**.

ἡγίασεν] Missing in *ח* and *ס*. A glance at the photo shows that in a space between the two columns there appears to be a word which Abegg has read as *הִלֵּךְ הַצִּיּוֹן*. *ס* has nothing there. Syntactically speaking, no *s* need be explicitly mentioned here, though a verb at the end of the first column would be welcome, but not indispensable.

πίστει καὶ πραύτητι] These two virtues are highlighted at 1.27 as two desirable qualities of any genuinely wise person.

πραύτητι *וְנִוְנוּ*] cf. Μωσῆς· ἐν ὄλω τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστιν *מִשְׁמַח אֶת הַיָּמִים בְּבֵיתוֹ* Nu 12.7 and Μωσῆς *פּרָאֵס שׁוֹפֵרָא מֵאֵד [וְנִוְנוּ]* *עָנָה מִשְׁמַח* ib. 12.3.

45.5) ἠκούτισεν αὐτὸν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ
καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν γνόφον
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐντολάς,
νόμον ζωῆς καὶ ἐπιστήμης,
διδάξαι τὸν Ιακωβ διαθήκην
καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ τὸν Ισραηλ.

*He made him hear His voice
and led him into darkness
and personally handed him commandments,
the law of life and understanding,
in order for him to teach Jacob the covenant
and Israel His ordinances.*

⁷ On this syntactic feature, see *SSG* § 22 **m** (ii).

⁸ V.I. וּבְעוֹנוֹתָיו.

(Ba) וישמיעהו את קולו ויגישוהו לערפל:
 (Bb) וישם⁹ בידו מצוה תורת חיים ותבונה:
 (Bc) ללמד ביעקב¹⁰ חקיו ועדותיו ומשפטיו לישראל:

ἠκούτισεν] This verb, ἀκουτίζω, is not documented prior to LXX. Its sense is defined in *GELS* as “to make known orally.” Its etymology (< ἀκούω) and causative value are manifest in οὐκ ἂν ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν ταῦτα Jdg 13.23 AL // .. ἠκούτισεν .. B (לֹא הִשְׁמִיעֵנוּ כְּזֹאת אֱלֹהִים). The etymological link with ἀκούω is evident in the syntagm < acc. pers. + gen. rei > in our Si passage, the only instance in Si of this syntagm,¹¹ for ἀκούω often takes a gen. rei as well as a gen. pers., e.g. Ἀκούσατε τοῦ ἐνυπνίου τούτου Ge 37.6 and ἄκουσόν μου ib. 23.11. Where ἀκουτίζω is used as doubly transitive, the syntagm attested can also be < acc. pers. + acc. rei > as in ἀκούτισόν με τὴν φωνήν σου Ct 2.14, so also in Jdg 13.23 B and Ps 50.10.

On this unique experience of Moses, see ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀκουστή ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ παιδεῦσαί σε Dt 4.36.

εἰσηγάγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν γνόφον] a reference to Μωσῆς δὲ εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν γνόφον, οὗ ἦν ὁ θεὸς ἀληθεύσας Ex 20.21.

κατὰ πρόσωπον] > אֱלֹהִים. A likely biblical source is πρόσωπον κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ὄρει Dt 5.4. In a description of Moses' descent from the mountain we read καὶ αἱ δύο πλάκες τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν ταῖς χερσίν αὐτοῦ בְּיָדָיו וְשָׁנֵי לְחַת הָעֵדֻת בְּיָדָיו Ex 32.15.

ἐντολάς καὶ מצוה] By using the sg. form the author was possibly thinking of the Pentateuch as embodying the extensive inventory of laws and ordinances applicable to diverse life situations, of which latter his grandson was thinking. ἐπιστήμη] בְּרִכְתָּא ‘blessings.’

τὸν Ἰακώβ] ≠ (Bc) ביעקב, but = v.l. ליעקב as parallel to לישראל. On the selection of *lamed* to mark a direct *o*, see above at 15.20.

ζῶης καὶ ἐπιστήμης] a unique combination.

διαθήκη καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ] Though the equation διαθήκη / קְהַח occurs 10 times in LXX, including Si 47.11, the pl. of קְהַח would not be rendered with διαθήκη, a word used understandably in the sg. in the overwhelming majority.¹² Furthermore, another component, עדותיו, is missing in אֱלֹהִים.

אֱלֹהִים has retained the three objects of lesson: לְמַלְפוֹ לְדַבַּיִת אִיסְרָאֵל נְמוֹסָהָּ וְדִינָהָּ לְעֵקוֹב וְקִמּוֹהָ וְדִינָהָּ לְעֵקוֹב ‘to teach the house of Israel His laws, and covenants and ordinances to Jacob.’

⁹ V.l. ויתן.

¹⁰ V.l. לִי.

¹¹ For other examples, see *SSG* § 55 ba.

¹² Out of a total of 345 cases the pl. occurs only 6 times, and only once with reference to covenant(s) between God and Israelites. In that sole case, Wi 18.22, not a few sources read the sg. See also above at 44.18.

45.6) *Ααρων ὑψωσεν ἅγιον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ*
ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ φυλῆς Λευι·

*He uplifted Aaron to a sacred position comparable to his,
 a brother of his from the tribe of Levi;*

וירם קדוש את אהרן למטה לוי (B

ἐκ] a reasonable choice to render the *lamed* indicating belonging as in *הַמֵּת לְיִרְבֶּעֶם* ‘a person who belongs to the house of Jeroboam and is dead’ 1K 14.11 (Θ τὸν τεθνεκότα τοῦ Ιεροβοαμ). Note esp. *מִטְּהֵאֲהָרֹן לְבֵית לְוִי* Nu 17.23.¹³

ἅγιον] *Contra NETS* “He exalted Aaron, a holy person like him” we would analyse *ἅγιον* as an object complement as in *SD* “Den Aaron erhöhte er als Heiligen gleich ihm.”¹⁴

45.7) *ἔστησεν αὐτὸν διαθήκην αἰῶνος*
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἱερατείαν λαοῦ·
ἔμακάρισεν αὐτὸν ἐν εὐκοσμίᾳ
καὶ περιέζωσεν αὐτὸν περιστολήν δόξης·

*He appointed him under an eternal arrangement
 and conferred on him the priesthood over the people;
 He congratulated him with decorum
 and put round him a glorious garment.*

וישימהו לחק עולם: (Ba

וישרתהו בכבודו¹⁶ ויתן עליו הוד¹⁵ (Bb

ויאזרהו בתועפות ראם¹⁷ וילבישהו פעמונים¹⁸: (Bc

A comparison of *℥*, *Θ*, and *ℑ* points to the considerable textual complexity. The translators appear to have faced quite a challenge. They differ in the sheer number of constituent clauses: 5 // 4 // 3. No layman was, we assume, familiar with technical, minute details of priesthood. In this and the following verses dealing with Aaron we see the translator allowing himself quite a degree of freedom.

The first clause is odd; *ἔστημι* is not used as doubly transitive nor can *διαθήκην αἰῶνος* be analysed as an *o* complement. We should perhaps adopt *αὐτῷ* as read by many MSS including *ℑ℥* *לָהּ*, which cannot represent *αὐτόν*;

¹³ More examples are listed in BDB s.v. *לָהּ* 5 c.

¹⁴ On this topic, see SSG § 61 c. Smend’s “er erhöhte ihn gleich einem Heiligen, Aharon” (II 80) is wrong; the dramatis persona has now shifted to Aaron. Therefore *את* before *אהרן* is perfectly in order.

¹⁵ *לו הודו* V.1.

¹⁶ *בברכה* V.1.

¹⁷ *תואר* V.1; the responsible scribe was not conscious of the allusion to Nu 23.22 and 24.8.

¹⁸ *תעופה* V.1.

for a direct *o* we would anticipate אָקִימָה, not לָהּ אָקִימָה. See also *statuit ei testamentum aeternum*.

διαθήκην αἰώνος] by arranging hereditary, permanent priesthood for his descendants.

חַק הָעָם? Does שׁוֹרְרָא דְעָמָא ‘the truth of the people’ represent חַק הָעָם? We are confused over שׁוֹרְרָא דְעָמָא בְּרִוּיָהּ וּנְבִיָּהּ ‘and He chose him with the height of his honour.’

A literal rendering of the third Heb. clause would be: “and he will serve Him with his honour,” of which we find nothing in *o* nor in *s*. The v.l. has “with benediction.” Referring to 25.23 Smend (429) holds that ἐμακάρισεν αὐτὸν is a rendering of יִשְׂרָאֵל.¹⁹ However, as far as *h* is concerned, Segal (313) justly refers to וְשִׁיתָ בְּגָדֶי־קֹדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן אֶחֱיִד לְכַבוֹד וּלְתַפְאֳרָתָהּ Ex 28.2.

ἐν εὐκοσμίᾳ] Wagner (1999.212f.) assumes that εὐκοσμία here reflects כְּבוֹד or בְּרָכָה, but that appears a little too microscopic, given the general complexity in this verse between *h* and *o*.

περιέζωσεν αὐτὸν] close to יִזְוֶהוּ, but the proximity between *h* and *o* ends there. The former could be rendered as “and He will gird him with the strength of a wild ox.” The prepositional phrase is an allusion to אֶל מוֹצִיָּאָם לוֹ מִמְצָרִים כְּתוּעַפַת רְאָם לוֹ Nu 23.22, sim. ib. 24.8. We have here a metaphor of an extremely important role assigned to Aaron.

o says nothing about bells (פַּעֲמוֹנִים) to be attached to a high priest’s robe: Ex 28.33f., 39.25f. Lévi (97) and Segal (413) object that one does not wear bells, but they were meant to be an indispensable attachment to their uniform they wear.

45.8) ἐνέδυσεν αὐτὸν συντέλειαν καυχήματος
καὶ ἐστεφάνωσεν αὐτὸν σκεύεσιν ἰσχύος,
περισκελῆ καὶ ποδήρη καὶ ἐπωμίδα·

*He clothed him with what deserves the highest pride
and crowned him with vessels of authority,
drawers and long robes and an ephod.*

(Ba) וילבישהו כליל תפארת²⁰ ויפארהו בכבוד ועוו:
(Bb) מכנסים כתנות ומעיל

ἐστεφάνωσεν] proposed by Smend and followed by Ziegler against the meaningless ἐστρεψωσεν ‘He fortified,’ read by all witnesses.

σκεύεσιν] ≠ כְּבוֹד. Was כִּלִּי in the *Vorlage*? It could refer to professional tools used by a high priest. Could the unusual phrase σκεύη ἰσχύος refer to tools symbolising a high priest’s power? They may have included powerful

¹⁹ We do not see which part of *s* supports his view.

²⁰ V.l. תפארתו.

musical instruments used in a temple service, cf. וּמִהֶלֶלִים לַיהוָה יוֹם בְּיוֹם הַלְלוּם. כְּלֵי עוֹז כבוד ועוז 2Ch 30.21. כְּלֵי עוֹז may be a corruption of כְּלֵי עוֹז לַיהוָה, cf. שֵׁ מִן אֲנָה דְתוֹקָפָא, which exactly concords with עוֹז כְּלֵי. In 8a, too, שֵׁ reads אֲתָתָא דְתְּקֵלָא ‘clothes of dark-blue colour,’ which reflects כְּלֵי, not כְּלֵיל. עוֹז can signify personal, social or political strength, not only physical or military. Another possibility is that σκευός here is a Hebraism, a mechanical translation of כְּלֵי in the sense of “*pieces of outfit worn on body*” (*GELS* s.v. 3), an analysis which fits the list in 8c,²¹ then a high priest’s garments symbolising his power.

καὶ ποδήρη [כתנות] The two languages are following two different rules governing the concatenation of multiple coordinated members, the one repeating the conjunction and the other adding it only between the last two members. On this subject, see *SSG* § 78 f and *SQH* § 38 c.

45.9) καὶ ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν ῥοῖσκοις,
 χρυσοῖς κώδωσιν πλείστοις κυκλόθεν,
 ἤχῃσαι φωνὴν ἐν βήμασιν αὐτοῦ,
 ἀκουστὸν ποιῆσαι ἤχον ἐν ναῶ
 εἰς μνημόσυνον υἱοῖς λαοῦ αὐτοῦ·

*And He put pomegranate-like tassels on his body all round,
 very many golden bells,
 for sounds to arise as he walks,
 to make sounds heard in the temple
 as a reminder for members of his people.*

ויקיפּהוּ פּעמונים: (Ba)

ורמונים המון סביב לתת נעימה בצעדיו: (Bb)

להשמיע בדביר קולו לזכרון לבני עמו: (Bc)

Here again the translator’s uncertainty with technical terms pertaining to liturgical convention is in evidence.²² Unlike in vs. 7 פּעמונים is translated, but has been moved forward to 9b, κώδωσιν, and רמונים backwards to 9a, ῥοῖσκοις. Further, χρυσοῖς is a free addition by the translator, who was most likely aware of phrases such as פּעמן והב Ex 28.34 and פּעמני והב ib. 28.33 and 39.25, both in a description of priests’ uniform.

Let us note a difference in the wording here and the related biblical texts. In the two Ex passages we see וַעֲשֵׂתָ (28.34) with Moses as *s* and וַיַּעֲשֵׂוּ (28.33, 39.25) with Israelites as *s*, whereas in our Si passages and many other cases in the preceding verses 3msg verbs with God as *s* are used. Of course He is

²¹ So also Lévi 98. See also Skehan - Di Lella 509. *SD* 2253 suggests בְּגָדֵי עוֹז.

²² שֵׁ lacks vss. 9-14 altogether. Vs. 8 is very brief: וַאֲלֻבְשֵׁהוּ אֲתָתָא דְתְּקֵלָא ‘and He clothed him with clothes of dark-blue colour.’

not presented here as a tailor, but diverse instructions issued by God were performed or were to be performed. Moses, in his turn, would have passed the task on to professionals.

κώδωσιν πλείστοις המון] This is a rare use of המון in the sense of “many, much.” The only case in BH occurs in 2Ch 11.23, where, however, the word is in the st. cst. Both in terms of its meaning and position to the head noun המון here is akin to הרבה, though unlike המון this high-frequency word is not a substantive, hence it has no cst. form, does not take the definite article or a suf. pron. A couple of examples are ובְּרִזָּל ובְּבָרָזַל Josh 22.8, where the addition of מָאֵד, a frequent phenomenon, is to be noted, indicating the semantic affinity with a normal adjective, רב, so that we could rewrite the phrase as ובְּשִׁלְמוֹת רבות מָאֵד, and לְעִשִׂיר מָאֵד 2Sm 12.2, with which cp. Ⓞ τῷ πλουσίῳ ἦν ποίμνια καὶ βουκόλια πολλά σφόδρα. Rare examples of the preceding הרבה are הכָּהֵן-הַבְּכֹרֶה Ezr 10.1 and לְבִי רָאָה הַרְבֵּה חֶכְמָה וְדַעַת: Ec 1.16, with which cp. עָשׂוֹת סִפְרִים הַרְבֵּה אֵין קָץ ib. 12.12.

The selection in Ⓞ of the superlative degree form, πλείστοις, instead of πολλοῖς, suggests that המון as used here is not exactly equivalent to רב, but “very many.”²³

עַיִן מְנַחֵם] an allusion to לְפָנֵי-יְהוָה תָּמִיד > Ⓞ εἰσιόντι εἰς τὸ ἅγιον μνημόσυνον ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ Ex 28.29, where Aaron could be reminding the Lord of Israel,²⁴ an interpretation which was not adopted by our translator.

45.10) στολῆ ἁγία, χρυσῶ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ
καὶ πορφύρῃ, ἔργῳ ποικιλτοῦ,
λογίῳ κρίσεως, δῆλοις ἀληθείας,

*with a holy vestment, gold and blue
and purple fabric, embroiderer's work,
an ephod for a judge, means of decision-making,*

(Ba) בגדי קדש זהב תכלת וארגמן מעשה חשב:
(Bb) חשן משפט אפוד ואזור

χρυσῶ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ καὶ πορφύρῃ] All the three words are substantives, not adjectives qualifying στολῆ. Hence “with the sacred vestment, with gold and blue ..” (NETS) with a second *with* added is preferable to “mit heiligem Gewand, golden und ..” (SD). Not the entire uniform of Aaron was to be made with gold and other precious metals, but pieces of these

²³ On the relative value of the superlative degree, see SSG § 23 bc. Pace Smend (430) [“und die Granatäpfel, ein Geläut ringsum” (II 80)] and Segal (314) המון can hardly mean here ‘noise’; would pomegranates make a big noise?

²⁴ So Segal 314.

metals were to be attached to the uniform here and there. **בגדי קדש זהב** can mean ‘golden, holy vestment,’ an analysis which our translator did not adopt. **כלי מלחמת דוד** can mean ‘David’s armaments,’ i.e. (a + b) + c pattern.

λογίω] a reading preferred by Ziegler over diverse forms of λόγος preserved in some MSS.

The phrase λόγιον κρίσεως occurs at Ex 28.15 mentioned above as a rendering of **טֶשֶׁת מְשֻׁבֶּטֶת**, which is generally understood to mean “breast-piece, sacred pouch” worn on the breast of a high priest. The phrase in our Si passage cannot mean “oracle of judgment” (*NETS*), “Orakelspruch der Entscheidung” (*SD*) and the like, for as the dative case of the phrase shows, it must be something tangible with which Aaron is to be equipped. This reservation on our part applies also to the following dative phrase, **δήλοις ἀληθείας**, thus *pace* “manifestations of truth” (*NETS*)²⁵ and “mit Offenlegungen der Wahrheit” (*SD*). The substantivised *mas.*²⁶ adjective, **δήλοι**, appears to denote some device for finding out truth and coming to a right decision. This Greek rendering is somewhat different from **אפוד ואזור** ‘ephod and belt.’ Belt is not mentioned in Ex 28.

45.11) **κεκλωσμένη κόκκω, ἔργω τεχνίτου,
λίθοις πολυτελέσιν γλύμματος σφραγῖδος
ἐν δέσει χρυσίου, ἔργω λιθουργοῦ,
εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐν γραφῇ κεκολαμμένη
κατὰ ἀριθμὸν φυλῶν Ἰσραηλ·**

*with (a vestment) spun with scarlet thread, technician’s work,
with very expensive stones shaped like an engraved seal,
with a golden chain, stone-cutter’s work,
for reminiscence in engraved writing
according to the number of Israel’s tribes;*

ושני תולעת מעשה אורג: (Ba)

אבני חפץ על החשן פתוחי חותם במלואי: (Bb)

כל אבן יקרה לזכרון בכתב חרות למספר שבטי ישראל: (Bc)

κεκλωσμένη] **στολή** (vs. 10) is understood. *NETS*’ “with twisted scarlet” would not do, since **κόκκος** is masculine in gender. As questionable is **שֵׁט** **אֶלְשֶׁת מְשֻׁבֶּטֶת** ‘with a spun scarlet garment.’

ἔργω τεχνίτου אורג [מעשה אורג] This Heb. phrase is rendered in Ex 28.32 as **ἔργον ὑφάντου** ‘work of weaver.’ **Τεχνίτης** is rather generic.

²⁵ The prep. “for” is prefixed, assigning a different value to the dative case.

²⁶ Cf. **Δότε Λευι δήλους αὐτοῦ** Dt 33.8.

ἐν δέσει] The instrumental dative that has been dominant from vs. 9 has shifted to its prepositional equivalent, which is typical of Koine Greek.²⁷

[פתוהי חותם] cf. קדש ליהוה Ex 28.36.

- 45.12) στέφανον χρυσοῦν ἐπάνω κιδάρεως,
ἐκτύπωμα σφραγίδος ἀγιάσματος,
καύχημα τιμῆς, ἔργον ἰσχύος,
ἐπιθυμήματα ὀφθαλμῶν κοσμούμενα·

*a golden crown on (his) turban
a seal engraved with holiness,
a highly estimable piece of pride, a work of might,
beautiful decorations desirable to eyes;*

(Ba) עטרת פו מעיל ומצנפת וציץ ... קדש:

(Bb) הוד כבוד ותהלת עו מחמ ... ופי:

στέφανον] We see here another syntactic departure: dative > ἐν τινι > accusative. Though in vs. 8 we read ἐστεφάνωσεν αὐτόν, it is too far away. We would rather see here a syntactic variation.

ἐπάνω] = מעל, i.e. מעיל, ≠ מעיל 'robe.'

ἐκτύπωμα σφραγίδος ἀγιάσματος] clearly alluding to ἐκτύπωμα σφραγίδος Ἀγιάσμα κυρίου ליהוה קדש ליהוה Ex 28.36 [Ⓞ 32], where קדש ליהוה is a text to be engraved, "Holy to the Lord." That must also apply to קדש (Ba). Lévi's (100) restoration is sensible: וציץ חרות ליי קודש.

καύχημα τιμῆς] Though τιμή can mean "price," what is meant here is not "highly priced," as shown by תעשה להם לכבוד ולתפארת Ex 28.40 rendered ποιήσεις αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν [vs. 36]. Here, too, the equation is τιμή / כבוד. Also שחא קרא שח.

ἔργον] Lévi (100) surmises that the *Vorlage* may have read מלאכת, but also in the preceding two verses Ⓞ uses a formula ἔργον τινος, twice to render מעשה.

- 45.13) ὥραϊα ¹³πρὸ αὐτοῦ οὐ γέγονεν τοιαῦτα,
ἕως αἰῶνος οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἀλλογενῆς
πλὴν τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ μόνον
καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτοῦ διὰ παντός.

*Prior to him such a thing had not happened,
for ages no other national would wear such
except his sons alone
and also his descendants always.*

²⁷ Cf. SSG § 22 c and wl.

(Ba) ... ל.. ל.. ל...
 (Bb) ... ל.. ל.. ל... וכן בניו לדורותם:

ὄραϊα] In Gk MSS the adjective is shifted here. So *℣ sic pulchra*, but *שׁל שפירתא דעיניא* ‘beautiful to the eyes.’

γέγονεν] On the use of the Pf. here, see *SSG* § 28 *ea*, p. 277.

ἐνεδύσατο] *Pace* “no alien put them on,” (*NETS*) “has ever put them on,” (Snaith), “fut revêtu” (Mopsik), and “a revêtues” (*BJ*) the aorist is gnomic,²⁸ for *ἕως αἰῶνος* is not used with a genuinely preterite tense.

τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτοῦ] *℣* probably took בניו as meaning בני בניו. In view of τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ rendering בניו the translator most likely distinguished the same form used twice. He must also have taken notice of לדורותם. Note also *שׁל ובני בנה׳*.

45.14) θυσίαι αὐτοῦ ὀλοκαρπωθήσονται
 καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐνδελεχῶς δις.

*His sacrifices would be offered as whole burnt-offerings
 twice daily continuously.*

(B) *מנחתו כליל תקטר* וכל יום תמיד פעמים:

θυσίαι αὐτοῦ *מנחתו*] Does *שׁל דילהון* ‘their’ refer to Aaron and his descendants?

ὀλοκαρπωθήσονται] based on *כליל תקטר* ἅπαν ἐπιτελεσθήσεται [vs. 22] Lv 6.15.

Van Peursen (2004.113) holds that *תקטר* exemplifies the use of self-standing *yiqtol* denoting repeated actions in the past, and our example here is said to be a special application of this use expressing what should or might have happened in the past. We think it simpler to regard *תקטר* and *ὀλοκαρπωθήσονται* reflecting somewhat loosely what Moses established as rules at the time of Aaron’s ordination.²⁹

καθ’ ἡμέραν] *Pace* Smend (433) there is no harm in adding the conjunction *ו* to underline that the sacrifice is to be burnt wholly and daily. The pattern < κατά + sg.acc. > for the notion of “every single” is idiomatic as in *κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν* ‘every year’ Zc 14.16 < *מדי שנה בשנה* >. More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. *κατά* II 8 b.

45.15) ἐπλήρωσεν Μωσῆς τὰς χεῖρας
 καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ·
 ἐγενήθη αὐτῷ εἰς διαθήκην αἰῶνος

²⁸ Cf. a discussion of this particular instance by Kugelheimer 2000.

²⁹ Van Peursen could have translated the above-given example as “.. should have been wholly burned ..” instead of “.. should be wholly burned ..”. Our reservation equally applies to the other instances discussed by him (pp. 113f.): Si 45.21, 22, 24.

καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμέραις οὐρανοῦ
 λειτουργεῖν αὐτῷ ἅμα καὶ ἱερατεύειν
 καὶ εὐλογεῖν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι.

*Moses consecrated him
 and anointed him with holy olive oil;
 this became to him an eternal covenant
 and through his descendants as long as heavens remain
 to minister to Him together and serve as priests
 and bless His people in (His) name.*

וימשחהו בשמן הקדש ידו ומלא משה את ידו (Ba)
 ותהי לו ברית עולם ולורעו כימי שמים (Bb)
 ולברך את עמו בשמו ולשרת ולכהן לו (Bc)

ἐπλήρωσεν .. τὰς χεῖρας] μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ‘after he [= Moses] consecrated him [= Aaron]’ Nu 7.88. Here we have an idiomatic expression for consecration to a priestly position. In Nu 7.88 **Ⲑ** has no corresponding phrase,³⁰ but we do in τίς ὁ προθυμούμενος πληρῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ σήμερον κυρίῳ; καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς 1Ch 29.5, though here it is about one’s own hands. So Ἐπληρώσατε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν σήμερον κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς Ex 32.29.³¹ With **Ⲑ** **ⲙ** ‘and Moses laid his hand on him’ the translator of **Ⲑ** may not have been familiar with this Heb. idiom, perhaps reflecting the ritual of ordination of priests in the Syrian church. A synonymous Gk verb, ἐμπίμπλημι is also used in this fashion, e.g. καὶ χρίσεις αὐτούς καὶ ἐμπίμπησεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἀγιάσεις αὐτούς, ἵνα ἱερατεύωσιν μοι καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς Ex 28.41 [**Ⲑ** vs. 37], cf. *GELS* s.v. 3. Both verbs are under Heb. influence.

ἐγενήθη [ותהי] Which fem. noun is the *s* of ותהי? It can scarcely be ידו. The same question arises with **Ⲑ** and **Ⲑ** הָיָה. Possibly ברית in the sense of “and thus emerged an eternal covenant”? This analysis could not apply to **Ⲑ** because of the following εἰς. Likewise **Ⲑ** לקימא and **Ⲑ** לדייקא. Our analysis, however, appears to work well in ברית כְּהֵנָּה לוֹ וְלִוְרַעֲוֹ אַחֲרָיו בְּרִית כְּהֵנָּה לוֹ וְלִוְרַעֲוֹ אַחֲרָיו καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτὸν διαθήκη ἱερατείας αἰωνία [no εἰς] Nu 25.13, and this follows Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτῷ διαθήκην εἰρήνης vs. 12. Here ἡ ἡ ἡ means then ‘something is [or: becomes] a possession of somebody.’ In this respect vs. 24 is much clearer.

Ⲑ’s εἰς διαθήκην is rather problematic. Its *Vorlage* could not have read לברית, which would lead to a gender-discord of תהי. Whereas a third fem.sg. verb can be used to express the neuter gender as in כְּאֲשֶׁר דְּמִיתִי כֵן הָיָה וְכָאֲשֶׁר

³⁰ On this example, cf. *BA* 4 ad loc.

³¹ In *GELS* s.v. πληρῶω **4** this reference is to be shifted to **4 b**.

תְּקוּם יַעֲצֶתָּי הֵיא תְּקוּם 'as I have planned, so it will be, and as I have purposed, so it will happen' Is 14.24, we would anticipate an explicit expression of *s* of תְּהִי.³²

ἐν²] as read by Ziegler on the basis of B against all the remaining resources that leave ἐν out, but also against לְזַרְעוֹ \mathfrak{H} , which we find a questionable text-critical decision. The priestly roles mentioned in 15c-d must also have been meant for Aaron as underlined with ἄμα. We would prefer the majority reading. Note also \mathfrak{S} וְלִזְרָעוֹ and \mathfrak{S} וְלִזְרָעוֹ דִּילָהּ = \mathfrak{H} .

ἐν ἡμέραις οὐρανοῦ שְׁמִים [כימי שמים] The Heb. phrase, also with לְזַרְעוֹ, occurs in וְשִׁמְתִּי לְעֵד וְרָעוֹ וְכִסְאוֹ כִּימֵי שְׁמַיִם Ps 89.30. כימי may have been misread as בימי. At Ps 88.30 \mathfrak{G} reads ὡς τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. See also \mathfrak{H} 50.24.

45.16) ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν ἀπὸ παντὸς ζῶντος
προσαγαγεῖν κάρπωσιν κυρίῳ,
θυμίαμα καὶ εὐωδίαν εἰς μνημόσυνον,
ἐξιλάσκεισθαι περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.

*He chose him (as better) than any living person
for him to present offerings to the Lord,
incense and fragrance as a memory,
to atone on behalf of the people.*

(Ba) ויבחר בו מכל חי להגיש עלה וחלבים:
(Bb) ולהקטיר ריח ניהח ואזכרה ולכפר על בני ישראל:

ἀπὸ παντὸς ζῶντος [מכל חי] Even with παντὸς כל added, renderings such as “entre tous les vivants” (Lévi 101), “all mankind” (Snaith), “all human-kind” (Skehan - Di Lella), and “aus allen Lebendigen” (Smend II 81) are debatable because of the sg. in \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{H} , though it is supported by \mathfrak{S} כְּלֵהוֹן הָיָא ‘all (persons) alive.’³³ Moses must have looked around and selected Aaron as the best choice. Though mechanically translated with ἀπό, the Heb. prep. מן here is probably comparative in value.

κάρπωσιν [עלה וחלבים] Two specific offerings have been reduced to one generic one. In \mathfrak{S} only three items are to be offered: עֲלֹתָא וְדְבָחָא וְבִסְמָא ‘sacrifices and animal sacrifices and fragrant offerings.’³⁴

θυμίαμα [להקטיר] The Heb. verb meaning “to make sacrifices smoke” has been rendered with a Gk substantive meaning a particular kind of offering, a word that denotes “incense” and is used in LXX the most frequently to render קִטְרַת 37+ times. Moreover, θυμιάζω and θυμιάω are used 37 times to render Pi. קטר and Hi. 25 times.

³² Cf. JM § 152 c. As an example of ambiguous reference, one might mention כִּי עֲתָה תְּבוּאָה כִּי עֲתָה תְּבוּאָה Jb 4.5.

³³ SD 2254 ad loc. refers to 44.24, which is irrelevant, since מוּצָא חַן בְּעֵינֵי כָל חַי is about every single individual.

³⁴ What difference is intended between the first two nouns is unclear.

τοῦ λαοῦ] שְׁנַי דִּילְךָ עָמָא ‘your people’ must be an error for הִלְךָ עָמָא ‘his people.’ Note שְׁ כָּלְךָ אִי־סְרָיִל ‘all Israel.’

45.17) ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ
ἐξουσίαν ἐν διαθήκαις κριμάτων
διδάξαι τὸν Ἰακωβ τὰ μαρτύρια
καὶ ἐν νόμῳ αὐτοῦ φωτίσαι Ἰσραηλ.

*He gave him, through his commandments,
the authority, in agreements of ordinances,
to teach Jacob testimonies
and, through his law, to enlighten Israel.*

: וימשילהו בחוק ומשפט (Ba)
: וילמד את עמו חק ומשפט את בני ישראל (Bb)

ἐν¹] missing in many MSS and שְׁנַי דִּילְךָ עָמָא makes little sense in the clause. שְׁ makes much better sense: הִלְךָ עָמָא וְאִשְׁלְטָהּ ‘and he gave him commandments and authorised him.’³⁵

διδάξαι [וילמד] Both Segal (311) and Kahana (521) point the form as וְיִלְמַד, which is difficult, since we are still on Aaron’s ordination. The *Vorlage* may have read ללמד. Two *way-yiqtol*’s would hardly be continued with *w-yiqtol*.

φωτίσαι] שְׁ לְמַקְרָא שְׁ ‘to call, address’ = φωνῆσαι preserved in quite a few Gk MSS.

שְׁ misses vs. 17c-d.

45.18) ἐπισυνέστησαν αὐτῷ ἄλλοτριοι
καὶ ἐζήλωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
ἄνδρες οἱ περὶ Δαθαν καὶ Αβιρων
καὶ ἡ συναγωγὴ Κορε ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ·

*Aliens conspired against him
and became jealous of him in the wilderness,
men of Dathan and Abirom,
and the group of Korah with anger and rage;*

: ויחרו בו זרים ויקנאו בו במדבר (Ba)
: אנשי דתן ואבירם ועדת קרח בעוון אפם (Bb)

ἐπισυνέστησαν [ויחרו] the sole instance in LXX of this equation, ἐπισυνίστημι / חרה. Conspirators might have been angry, since anger is the main semantic constituent of חרה. Note also שְׁ וְאִתְּחַרְיוּ עָמָא ‘and they quarrelled with him.’³⁶

³⁵ Pace Smend (433) שְׁ לְפִי־קָדְנָא דִּילְךָ שְׁ does not mean that the suf. pron. represents αὐτόν. See יְהִיבְתָנִי ‘you gave to me’ Josh 15.19 (יְהִיבְתָנִי).

³⁶ Precisely the same expression occurs in שְׁ Gn 49.23 to render וְיִמְרָרְהוּ.

If one insists on retaining יחרו as correct, it need be stressed that, in BH, the root חר in the semantic field of anger in Qal (82×) is never used with a human s, but with אף as s as in בְּרַחֵל יַעֲקֹב בְּרַחֵל Gn 30.2 or impersonally in 3m.sg., e.g. וַיַּחַר לְקִין מְאֹד ib. 4.5.³⁷ In Nifal (3×), however, the s is human and pl.: בְּנֵי אֲמִי נִחְרִיבִי Ct 1.6, where interpreters are in conflict,³⁸ כָּל הַנְּחָרִים Is 41.11, and בּוֹ כָּל הַנְּחָרִים ib. 45.24. Our ἐπισυνέστησαν here accords with the three Nifal cases in Ⓞ in that they have to do with conflict and hostility, not anger. Thus ἐμαχέσαντο Ct 1.6, οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι Is 41.11, and οἱ ἀφορίζοντες ἑαυτοῦς in 45.24. Let it further be noted that the two verb roots used here are found in parallelism in אֶל-תִּתְחַר בְּמַרְעִים אֶל-תִּקְנֵא Pr 24.19. This suggests yet another possible graphic solution, i.e. ויחרו > ויתחרו ‘and they contended, fought against him.’

Semantically, however, it is difficult to harmonise Ⓞ and Ⓢ here. SD (2254f.) sees here a graphic confusion between ויחרו and ויחדו ‘and they were together,’ which shows considerable affinity with ἐπισυνέστησαν.

ἀλλότριοι [זרים] At Nu 17.5 we see the definition of זרים as אִישׁ זָר אָשָׁר where Ⓞ uses ἀλλογενής.

θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ [עווז אפם] What Ⓢ expresses through a cst. phrase, ‘the fierceness of their anger,’ Ⓞ expresses by juxtaposing two synonyms. By contrast, in Ⓣ the feature of anger is absent: בְּתוֹקְפָא ‘with strength.’

45.19) εἶδεν κύριος καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησεν,
καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ἐν θυμῷ ὀργῆς·
ἐποίησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς τέρατα
καταναλῶσαι ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς αὐτοῦ.

*The Lord saw (it) and was not amused
and they were exterminated out of furious anger;
He acted spectacularly against them
to consume (them) with His burning flame.*

וירא יי ויתאנף ויכלם בחרון אפו: (Ba)

ויבא להם אות ויאכלם בשביב אשו: (Bb)

ἐν²) so read by Ziegler against Swete, Rahlfs, and many witnesses which omit it.

θυμῷ ὀργῆς] These two synonyms are sometimes joined with one of them in the genitive as a means of intensive expression. So at Nu 14.34. Also in the reverse order as in ὀργῆ θυμοῦ κυρίου Nu 25.4, sim. Ho 11.9, Jn 3.9, Na 1.6a, Zp 3.8. The corresponding Heb. phrase is always חרון אף, and never חרון אף. Ⓣ is more straightforward: בְּתוֹקְפָא דְרוּגְזָה ‘with the force of his anger.’

³⁷ Hence Kahana's (521) ויחרו is questionable.

³⁸ Rashi's חרתיני ‘they criticised me’ is close to Ⓣ ואתחריני עמה cited above.

σου] as if Moses' personal address to Aaron were being quoted. Quite a few resources read αὐτου instead. So also שְׁלֹשׁ מְנַחֵה אֶל־אֶהְרֹן 'his portion,' certainly a lectio faciliior. Cf. the biblical source text וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־אֶהְרֹן בְּאֶרְצָם לֹא תִנְחַל וְחִלְקְ לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ בְּתוֹכָם אֲנִי הִלְקֶךָ וְנִחַלְתָּךְ בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Nu 18.20.

Likewise the preceding αὐτὸς must be a free rendering; Aaron's share ultimately depends on God's will and decision. Lévi (104) holds that שְׂאִי is a scribal error for אֲנִי. But God's direct speech to Aaron quoted here is as unlikely as that of Moses. We go along with Segal (316), according to whom שְׂאִי is an intrusion from vs. 21.

45.23) Καὶ Φινεες υἱὸς Ελεαζαρ τρίτος εἰς δόξαν
ἐν τῷ ζηλωσάι αὐτὸν ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου
καὶ στῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τροπῇ λαοῦ
ἐν ἀγαθότητι προθυμίας ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ·
καὶ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

*Also Phinehas, son of Eleazar, third in renown,
by fearing the Lord, acted passionately,
and putting his foot down as the people took to flight
with the commendable determination in his heart
made atonement for Israel.*

גם פינחס בן אלעזר בגבורה י : (Ba)
בקנאו לאלוה כל ויעמד בפרץ עמו: (Bb)
אשר נדבו לבו ויכפר על בני ישראל: (Bc)

τρίτος] Most likely refers to his being a grandson of Aaron, but in ש we read תְּלֵתָא אִיקְרִין 'he received three honours.' שְׁלֹשׁ speaks of "a third son of Eleazar." One does not know whether Eleazar had three sons; Eleazar was the third of Aaron's four sons. This added information in ט is grammatically vague.

In vs. 23b ש fills in more details derived from the biblical account in Nu 25: בְּטַנְנָא דְטַן בְּמַדְיִנְיָתָא וּבְכַר אִיסְרָיִל: 'through the zeal that he showed against the Midianite (woman) and the Israelite man.'

ἐν τροπῇ] possibly = בְּרוֹץ, i.e. בְּרוּץ. ש = פּ: בְּתוֹרְעָתָא 'in the breach.'

The syntactic structure of the verse in ט is ambiguous. What is the status of the two infinitival clauses and the adverbial, prepositional phrase (23d)? Because of καὶ at the start of the last clause, the following finite verb, ἐξιλάσατο, can hardly be the predicate of the entire verse. שְׁלֹשׁ also appears to be struggling: 23a is made a complete nominal clause followed by a temporal clause headed by כַּד 'when' with three finite verbs – טַן .. וְקָם .. וַחֲסָא 'he was zealous .. and he stood .. and he acted for atonement.'

And yet we fail to see what syntactic difficulty Wagner (1999:277) finds in ἀγαθότητι προθυμίας.

- 45.24) διὰ τοῦτο ἐστάθη αὐτῷ διαθήκη εἰρήνης
 προστατεῖν ἁγίων καὶ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ,
 ἵνα αὐτῷ ἦ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ
 ἱερωσύνης μεγαλεῖον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*Therefore a covenant of peace was established
 for him to exercise authority over the saints and his people
 so that the honour of priesthood may remain
 with him and his descendants for ages.*

:Ba לכן גם לו הקים חק ברית שלום לכלכל מקדש:
 :Bb אשר תהיה לו ולזרעו כהונה גדולה עד עולם:

ἐστάθη] \mathfrak{H} הקים, in the active voice, most likely with God as *s*. Explicitly so in \mathfrak{S} : אלהא לה מא במומא 'God swore to him with an oath.' \mathfrak{S} is more specific with priestly duties: אדבא לה מרבא 'that he is to build an altar for Him.' That ἐστάθη can be a genuinely passive form³⁹ is shown in ἐστάθη ἡ σκηνή < ησπηη Ex 40.17. \mathfrak{S} analysed it differently: קמת לה דיתקא 'a covenant arose for him.'

προστατεῖν] a very rare verb of only 4 attestations in SG.⁴⁰

ἁγίων] On the substantivised ἅγιος and most likely with personal referent(s), see ὁμνύει κύριος κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ (ἰση) Am 4.2, καὶ ἦξει κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι (קדיש) μετ' αὐτοῦ Zc 14.5. In view of the following καὶ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, "the saints" here are probably people engaged in the running of cultic rituals or religious leadership. We would take מקדש in the standard sense of "temple, sanctuary," not Lévi's (106) "les choses saintes." \mathfrak{C} 's ἁγίων is thus m.pl.

ἵνα \mathfrak{A}] On this equation with \mathfrak{A} "so that" see above at 37.15.⁴¹

αὐτῷ] \mathfrak{H} גם is missing. Likewise in \mathfrak{S} .

The notion of eternal priesthood occurs in the phrase עולם עולם in Ex 40.15 and Nu 25.13.

- 45.25) καὶ διαθήκην τῷ Δαυὶδ
 υἱῷ Ιεσσαὶ ἐκ φυλῆς Ιουδα
 κληρονομία βασιλέως υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου·
 κληρονομία Ααρων καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ.

³⁹ Cf. SSG § 55 ac with fn. 1.

⁴⁰ The attestation in our Si passage is not mentioned in HR, probably because it is a minority reading and HR stands under considerable influence of Swete's edition of the LXX, where he adopted προστατήν, a majority reading.

⁴¹ Pace Van Peursen (2004:104) the modal (final) value is expressed here by means of \mathfrak{A} rather than through the *yiqtol*.

*Also a covenant for David,
a son of Jesse from the tribe of Juda,
succession of a king (is) from son to son only,
succession of Aaron also to his descendants.*

וגם בריתו עם דוד (Ba) בן ישי למטה יהודה:
נחלת אש לפני כבודו (Bb) נחלת אהרן לכל זרעו:
ועתה ברכו נא את יי הטוב (Bc) המעטר אתכם כבוד:

διαθήκη] Why Ziegler prefers this form over διαθηκη preserved in quite a few MSS is not clear to us. How would he account for the accusative form? The nom. form would continue ἐστάθη (24a).

υἱοῦ ἕξ υἱοῦ μόνου] Syntactically difficult. What the translator wants to say is perhaps that kingship is passed on to one of his sons only, whereas a priest can pass priesthood to more than one of his sons. What is the function of the gen. case of the first υἱοῦ? Furthermore, the gap between \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} is extensive, and what does the first cause of (Bb) mean at all?⁴² On μόνου, which is basically an adverbially used μόνον, but mechanically harmonised with the preceding υἱοῦ cf. SSG 38 b (iv); what is meant is not ‘only son,’ but ‘exclusively son, son alone.’

(Bc) is totally missing in \mathfrak{C} : ‘and now do bless the Lord the kind one, who crowns you with glory.’

45.26) δόξη ὑμῖν σοφίαν ἐν καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν
κρίνειν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,
ἵνα μὴ ἀφανισθῆ τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν
καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν.

*May He grant you wisdom in your mind
(for you) to judge His people in justice
so that their good fortune would not vanish
and their glory for ages.*

ויתן לכם חכמת לב (Ba)
למען לא ישכח טובכם (Bb) אַמְרַתְכֶם לְדוֹרוֹת עוֹלָם:

δόξη ויתן] Pace Lévi (109) we cannot have here a way-yiqtol form, since there is no qatal form preceding.

καρδίᾳ לב] On our understanding of לב as ‘mind’ rather than ‘heart,’ cf. our remarks on ויאר לבכה בשכל חיים 1QS 2.3 in Muraoka 2022.15.

αὐτῶν] In \mathfrak{H} the entire verse is addressed to you(r) (pl.). Does this shift in \mathfrak{C} to their indicate that the focus is now on the people? In this regard \mathfrak{S} and

⁴² For a desperate attempt of interpretation, see Lévi 107f. and Smend 437f.

Ση follow Θ. Η is consistent with *you(r)* (pl.), and has nothing that would correspond to “His people.”

ἀφανισθῆ [ישבת] The Heb. word is Ni. rather than Qal with God as *s. Pace* Smend (438) it cannot be changed to ישבת, for the Gk verb does not mean “aufhören” (II 82). That ἀφανισθῆ here can be pseudo-passive is demonstrated in ἀφανίσθητε ‘Vanish!’ Hb 1.5.

τῆν δόξαν] The acc. case is odd here. The preceding τὰ ἀγαθὰ must be nominative.

The Heb. word behind it, if deciphered correctly, אמורה is unknown and not included in *Maagarim*.

CHAPTER 46

46.1) Κραταιὸς ἐν πολέμῳ Ἰησοῦς Ναυη
καὶ διάδοχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείαις,
ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ
ἐκδικῆσαι ἐπεγειρομένους ἐχθρούς,
ὅπως κατακληρονομήσῃ τὸν Ἰσραηλ.

*Powerful in battle fields (was) Jesus Nave
and a successor of Moses in prophecies,
who lived up to his name,
great as a saviour of His chosen people
in hitting out risen enemies
so that he could help Israel inherit the land (promised).*

(Ba) גבור בן חיל יהושע בן נון משרת משה בנבואה:
(Bb) אשר נוצר להיות בימיו תשועה גדלה לבחיריו:
(Bc) להנקם נקמי אויב ולהנחיל את ישראל:

Κραταιὸς ἐν πολέμῳ] In BH בן חיל mostly means “well-trained, armed warrior,” though there is an exception such as אִם יִהְיֶה לְבֶן-חַיִל לְאַיִפֹּל מִשְׁעָרְתוֹ 1Kg 1.52, where the phrase is opposed to רָעָה ‘moral wickedness.’¹ Note a case of synonymous juxtaposition in כָּל-אִישׁ גָּבוֹר וְכָל-בֶּן-חַיִל 1Sm 14.52.

Since גבור חיל occurs as a synonym of בן חיל as in גבור חיל Jdg 11.1 +, בן could be eliminated as Segal (318) argues, but in the *Vorlage* of Ⓞ it was there: κραταιὸς reflects גבור, but חיל on its own would not reflect πόλεμος. Note Ⓢ: גברא בר חילא.

διάδοχος] So in Josh 1.1 Ⓢ, where Ⓞ reads ὑπουργῶ Μωυσῆ ‘to a servant of Moses.’

Let us note here one rhetorical feature with which heroes are introduced. Three modes of introduction can be identified:

- i) A name appears in the first sentence in the form of a clause with a finite verb, e.g. **Ενωχ** εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ 44.16; **Νωε** εὐρέθη τέλειος δίκαιος 44.17; **Ααρων** ὑψωσεν ἅγιον ὄμοιον αὐτῷ 45.6.
- ii) A name appears in what does not constitute a self-standing clause, which may be continued by a relative clause and its antecedent refers to the

¹ Cf. Trg גבר דחיל חטאין ‘a man who fears sins.’

person concerned, e.g. **Αβρααμ** μέγας πατήρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν, καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη μῶμος ἐν τῇ δόξῃ 44.19; Καὶ **Φινεες** υἱὸς Ελεαζαρ τρίτος εἰς δόξαν ἐν τῷ ζηλωσῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου .. καὶ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραηλ 45.23.

- iii) A name of a person appears in close connection with what immediately precedes, e.g. καὶ ἐν τῷ **Ἰσαακ** ἔστησεν οὕτως δι' Ἀβρααμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ 44.22; κατέπαυσεν ἐπὶ κεφαλῇν **Ἰακωβ** 44.23; ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων **Μωυσῆν**, οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις 45.1, where the acc. form is to be noted.

Our Joshua belongs to the second model. What משרה means our translator must have known, but his selection of (ii) renders διάδοχος a better rendering.

ἐν προφητείας [בנבואה] not in the sense of prediction, but statements made by prophets. Though the Bible does not explicitly call Joshua a prophet, he is introduced here as a successor of Moses, on whom the chapter immediately preceding Josh 1 says: לֹא־קָם נְבִיא עוֹד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּמֹשֶׁה Dt 34.10. The lexeme נְבוּאָה is typical of LBH, as underlined by Hurvitz (1979.75f.).

ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ] in accordance with the traditional interpretation of יְהוֹשֻׁעַ as meaning “Jahweh is salvation.”² The verb root יצר can be used with a human being as a product, e.g. וַיֵּצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר Gn 2.7. Though the Bible tells nothing about the birth of Joshua, that on Samson (Jdg 13.5) reminds us of a similar mission assigned by God to these two men. Note what God Himself told Jeremiah: בְּטָרְם אֶצְרֶךָ בְּבֶטֶן Je 1.5, where the use of the verb יצר is to be noted. With אֶתְנַטֵּר ‘he was preserved’ S derived H נוצר from נצר, a passive Qal or Pu., though Pi. נצַר or Pu. נצַר is unknown even to RH.

Lévi (111) and Smend (440) are of the view that בימיו is a scribal error for כשמו, i.e. כְּשֵׁמוֹ. Then the second analysis mentioned below becomes acceptable.

μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία] גדלה תשועה had best be analysed as the *s* of the infinitival clause: “in order that great salvation would take place,” whereas the use of the masc. μέγας suggests that the translator was inclined to take Ἰησοῦς as its implicit *s*. Though absent in G , בימיו supports the former analysis. Besides, the notion of “to become a salvation” is odd.

The prep. ἐπί with a dat. marks an aim of an action as in δύναμιν ἔχων ἐπὶ σωτηρία Ἰακωβ γένους ‘one who possesses power aimed at the rescue of the race of Jacob’ 3M 6.13.³

² A tradition continued in τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν Mt 1.21, a message conveyed by an angel to Joseph.

³ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ II 9.

ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ [בחיריו] The suf. pron. must be referring to God. The appearance of God here, which might sound somewhat abrupt, is probably an allusion to Joshua's name as mentioned just above. By contrast, שׁ's רַחֲמָהּ is best rendered as 'his coreligionists.'

ἐπεγειρομένους [נקמי] Finding the pl. odd, Lévi (110) proposes emending נקמי to נקמי or בקמי or בקם, but we fail to see how such can be combined with אויב. We would suggest an emendation to בקם, i.e. בַּקָּם 'when enemies arise.' An example of נָקַם נָקַם is found in לְבֵית יְהוּדָה Ez 25.12.

Though the standard position of an attributive ptc. is after its noun head, SG proffers not a few exceptions, e.g. ἐπιζητούμενη πόλις 'a sought-after city' Is 62.12.⁴ But קם אויב or קמים אויבים is no Hebrew.

κατακληρονομήση] Though the *s* could be God, Joshua is more likely the *s* in view of a source text such as וַיִּצוּ אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְחִזְקִיָּהוּ וְאֶמְצָהוּ כִי־הוּא יַעֲבֹר לְפָנָי וְנָצוּ אוֹתָם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר תִּרְאֶה (κατακληρονομήσει) הָעָם הַזֶּה וְהוּא יִנְחִיל sim. ib. 1.38.

46.2) ὡς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν τῷ ἐπᾶραι χειῖρας αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκτεῖναι ῥομφαίαν ἐπὶ πόλεις.

*How magnificent was he in raising his hands
and drawing a sword out against cities!*

(B) מה נהדר בנטותו יד בהניפו כידון על עיר:

ὡς ἐδοξάσθη [מה נהדר] מֵא יֵאָא לֵה 'How magnificent it is to him!' is said from the perspective of modern readers.

The same rendering occurs at 50.5, where also, in 𐤁, two infinitives follow, though not in 𐤂, which uses two verbal nouns, v.a.l.

ἐπᾶραι χειῖρας αὐτοῦ יד [נטותו יד] It is a signal of a military commander signalling the start of a battle and remaining in command as in ὅταν ἐπῆρεν (יָרִים) Μωσῆς τὰς χειῖρας, κατίσχυεν Ἰσραηλ Ex 17.11.

ἐκτεῖναι ῥομφαίαν] cf. ἡ ῥομφαία αὐτοῦ ἐσπασμένη ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐκτεταμένη ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἐל־יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּיָדוֹ נְטוּיָה עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַם 1C 21.16 and καὶ ἐκτενεῖ αὐτὴν [= τὴν ῥομφαίαν μου] ἐπὶ γῆν Αἰγύπτου וְנָטָה אוֹתָהּ אֶל־הָעִיר Ez 30.25.

כִּידוֹן 'dart, javelin' is a different kind of weapon from ῥομφαία, and here is the sole instance of this equation in LXX.

πόλις [עיר] With the sg. עיר the author is most probably thinking of Jericho, the first important city conquered under Joshua's command, whereas the translator is looking farther ahead. שׁ (2a) כַּד מָרִים בְּנִינְכָא דְבֵאִידָה 'when he raises the spear that is in his hand' shows that its translator was possibly conscious of יִטְ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּכִידוֹן אֲשֶׁר־בְּיָדוֹ אֶל־הָעִיר Josh 8.18, although the city concerned is Ai.

⁴ For more examples, see SSG § 31 cg.

- 46.3) τίς πρότερος αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἔστη;
τοὺς γὰρ πολέμους κυρίου αὐτὸς ἐπήγαγεν.

Who made such a stand prior to him?

For he waged the wars for the Lord.

(B) מי הוא לפניו יתיצב כי מלחמות ייי גלה⁵:

πρότερος αὐτοῦ] understanding לפני in its temporal sense, which is well established in BH, e.g. :הִיְהִי־בֶן. : προτέρα αὐτῆς οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀκρις καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα οὐκ ἔσται οὕτως Ex 10.14. Also Gn 30.30. The added οὕτως underlines this temporal value. With nothing corresponding to it שׁ מִנוּ מִשְׁכַּח לְמִקְּוֹת קְדְמוֹהִי ‘Who could stand up to him?’ took the Heb. prep. in a locative sense.⁶

ἔστη] We would postulate an error for התיצב. Van Peursen (2004.113) admits here an example of *yiqtol* with potential modality. We are sceptical, however, that such can be applied to *yiqtol* in the past context as here. But see שׁ מִקְּוֹת לְמִשְׁכַּח מִנוּ ‘who can stand?’.

αὐτὸς הוא] The emphatic value of the pronoun has been attached to the second verb.

- 46.4) οὐχὶ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνεποδίσθη ὁ ἥλιος
καὶ μία ἡμέρα ἐγενήθη πρὸς δύο;

*Was it not through him that the sun was made to stand still
and one day became two?*

(B) הלא בידו עמד השמש יום אחד ...:

ἐνεποδίσθη] In the biblical source text ἴσθημι is used in Ⲯ: καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν στάσει Josh 10.13, so also vss. 12, 13b. Many MSS use ἀναποδίζω ‘to move back’; the stopping of the movement of the sun effectively meant its moving backwards.

ἐγενήθη πρὸς] This is the sole instance in SG of < γίνομαι πρὸς + acc. > indicating “A becoming, changing to B.” More common is the use of εἰς as in καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν Gn 2.7,⁷ where Ⲭ reads יהייה הַיָּה שׁ לְנַפְשׁ הַיָּה, on the basis of which we could perhaps restore Ⲭ here as יהוה אֱמַן לְיוֹמִין, cf. Ⲭ יהוה אֱמַן לְתַרְיִן Ⲭ, but Ⲭ reads יהוה אֱמַן לְתַרְיִן Ⲭ without לְ.

⁵ Abegg restores הַיָּה. One does not accompany a war, but someone to a war. This verb needs a zero *o*.

⁶ This Syr. prep. can be used in the sense of “prior to,” which is not recorded in Sokoloff’s *SL* s.v. 1318. But Payne-Smith 3492 mentions an example such as אֱמַן לְתַרְיִן, a rendering of ἐχθὲς καὶ ἡ πρὸ αὐτῆς. Note also קְדְמוֹהִי at the above-cited Ex 10.14, לְיִן קְדְמוֹתָא הַיָּה πρὸ τοῦτων τῶν ἡμερῶν Ac 21.38, and אֱמַן לְתַרְיִן אֱמַן לְתַרְיִן Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα Jn 13.1.

⁷ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. γίνομαι 3 b. Cf. also Renehan 1975-82.II 48.

46.5) ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν ὑψιστον δυνάστην
 ἐν τῷ θλίψαι αὐτὸν ἐχθροὺς κυκλόθεν,
 καὶ ἐπήκουσεν αὐτοῦ μέγας κύριος
 ἐν λίθοις χαλάζης δυνάμεως κραταιᾶς·

*He called upon the supreme hero
 when squeezed by enemies on all sides,
 and the mighty Lord hearkened to him
 by means of most powerful stones of hail.*

כי קרא אל אל עליון כאכפֿה ל... (Ba)

ויענהו אל עליון באבני ... ל... (Bb)

τὸν ὑψιστον δυνάστην] That ὑψιστος here is not substantivised as an appellation of God is certain in view of the rendering of the same Heb. phrase as μέγας κύριος in (Bb), cf. 47.5. In both cases the word order is reversed. Joshua appealed to a commander-in-chief much superior to himself.

θλίψαι] According to *Maagarim* this is the sole instance of אכפֿה. The root occurs once only in BH at Pr 16.26 as a Qal verb in the sense of “to put pressure,” which suits our context. No help is to be had in comparative Semitics.⁸ Smend (441) finds the same verb in vs. 16, but neither BSH nor Abegg finds any single letter of it.

ἐν λίθοις χαλάζης] cf. οἱ ἀποθανόντες διὰ τοὺς λίθους τῆς χαλάζης
 דַּבְּרֵי הַבְּרָךְ יִתְּנוּ בְּאֶבְנֵי הַבְּרָךְ Josh 10.11.

46.6) κατέρραξεν ἐπ’ ἔθνος πόλεμον
 καὶ ἐν καταβάσει ἀπόλεσεν ἀνθεστηκότας,
 ἵνα γνῶσιν ἔθνη πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ
 ὅτι ἐναντίον κυρίου ὁ πόλεμος αὐτῶν.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐπηκολούθησεν ὀπίσω δυνάστου.

*He thrust a battle against the nation
 and during the descent destroyed opponents
 so that gentiles would know his full armour,
 because their war is against the Lord.
 for he was also closely following the Hero.*

... ל... (Ba)

למען דעצת כל גוי חרם כי צופה יי מלחמתם (Bb)

כי מלא אחרי אל (Bc)

ἐν καταβάσει] cf. בֵּית־חֵירוֹן בְּמוֹרֵד עַל תְּהַיָּבָה וְעַל תְּהַיָּבָה וְעַל תְּהַיָּבָה וְעַל תְּהַיָּבָה
 αὐτῶν] preserved in only one MS against αὐτοῦ.

⁸ Cf. Cohen *Dictionnaire* 1.19a.

ἐπηκολούθησεν ὀπίσω ארִי מְלֵא אֶרְרִי] This collocation, מְלֵא אֶרְרִי, occurs several times in BH, e.g. אֶרְרִי וְיִמְלֵא אֶרְרִי καὶ ἐπηκολούθησέν μοι Nu 14.24 and יְהִי הַיְהוָה אֶרְרִי מְלֵא אֶרְרִי אֲנִי יְהוָה δὲ προσετέθην ἐπακολουθῆσαι κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου Josh 14.8; in both cases we see the same equation as in our Si verse, whilst the only difference is the rection with τι, but in Josh 14.9 we do see ἐπακολουθῆσαι ὀπίσω κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

46.7) καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Μωυσέως ἐποίησεν ἔλεος
αὐτὸς καὶ Χαλεβ υἱὸς Ιεφοννη
ἀντιστῆναι ἔναντι ἐκκλησίας
κωλύσαι λαὸν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας
καὶ κοπάσαι γογγυσμὸν πονηρίας.

*And in the days of Moses he acted mercifully:
he and Caleb the son of Jephunne
standing up against the community,
preventing the people from sinning,
and curbing a secret planning of wickedness.*

:ובימי משה עשה חסד: (Ba)

:הוא וכלב בן יפנה להתיצב בפרע קהל: (Bb)

:להשיב הרון מעדה ולהשבית דבה רעה: (Bc)

ἐποίησεν ἔλεος חסד [עשה] If the allusion is to the support of Moses and Aaron shown by Joshua and Caleb in face of the general opposition of the community, the Heb. phrase here must mean more than “he conducted himself well,” so Lévi (113) “s’était bien comporté.” On ποιέω ἔλεος, see 29.1, where it is about charity.

ἀντιστῆναι .. κωλύσαι .. καὶ κοπάσαι] These infinitives are final-resultative in value and that broadly understood;⁹ they show in what the merciful intention of Joshua and Caleb became manifested. Another example is ἡ ἀγρυπνία αὐτοῦ τελέεσαι ἔργον ‘his vigil is aimed at bringing his work to completion’ 38.27.¹⁰

ἔναντι בפרע] Our translator may have been puzzled over בפרע, which could be a Qal inf. cst. indicating some hostile action.¹¹ Alternatively we would rewrite it as בפני,¹² cf. Dt 7.24 and לא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנָיָהּ עַד הַשְּׂמֵךְ אֶתֶם. ib. 11.25. See also לפני חרבו מי יתכלכל Si 43.3 (B) > ἐναντίον καύματος αὐτοῦ τίς ὑποστήσεται;.

⁹ Cf. SSG § 30 **bab**. Van Peursen (2004.265f.) uses the label “epexegetical.”

¹⁰ For a discussion with more examples, see SSG loc. cit.

¹¹ שֵׁ בְּתוֹרַעְתָּא ‘in the breach’ reflects בְּפָרֶץ.

¹² As suggested in Muraoka 1998.119d and now in *Index* 41a. Lévi (113) had gone ahead of us. Cf. שֵׁ and שֵׁל אֶרְצָא דְמַרְדָּיָא חֲלֵבָא וְדָבְשָׁא ‘a land which makes milk and honey flow.’

ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας] = מרעה, i.e. מְרַעָה, and ≠ (Bc) מעדה, i.e. מְעַדָה. Ⓢ would then mean “to remove (God’s) anger against (their) evil deed.”

γογγυσμὸν πονηρίας] cf. the source text: תְּלִנּוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֵם מְלִינִים מִלְּכֶם וְעַלְכֶם τὸν γογγυσμὸν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ, ἃ αὐτοὶ γογγύζουσιν ἐφ’ ὑμῖν [= Moses and Aaron] Nu 17.20 (Ⓢ 5).

46.8) καὶ αὐτοὶ δύο ὄντες διεσώθησαν
ἀπὸ ἑξακοσίων χιλιάδων πεζῶν
εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς κληρονομίαν
εἰς γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι.

*And they two survived
out of six hundred thousand foot-soldiers
to be led into the (land of) inheritance,
into a land flowing with milk and honey.*

(Ba) לַכֶּם גַּם הֵם בְּשָׁנִים נֹאצְלוּ מִשֵּׁשׁ מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף רִגְלֵי:
(Bb) לַהֲבִיאֵם אֶל נַחֲלָתָם אֶרֶץ זֹבַת חֵלֶב וְדִבְשׁ:

לכך] an error for לכן.

ὄντες] This can, *pace* Lévi (114), scarcely reflect הֵם, which has been rendered as αὐτοὶ. The ptc. underlines the fact that they were only two out of ten who pointed out the attraction of the land inspected.

What גַּם means here is not apparent.

διεσώθησαν] **נֹאצְלוּ**] The former most likely means here “they were spared death as a punishment in the wilderness of Paran.” “To be spared for future or other use,” which **נֹאצְלוּ** means, would not apply here. Then a scribal error for **נִצְלוּ**, i.e. **נִצְלוּ** (Segal 320) or **נִצְלוּ**, suggests itself. Cf. **אֶתְפָּצְיוּ** and **אֶשְׁתָּוְבוּ**; both verbs mean ‘to be rescued.’ Among the five instances of **נִצְלוּ** as a verbal root there is none that shows some semantic affinity with our case here.

γάλα καὶ μέλι] It is surprising that some MSS should reverse the two substantives in this standing expression occurring in the Bible twenty (!) times.

זֹבַת חֵלֶב וְדִבְשׁ are direct objects of זֹבַת.¹³

In this verse we are confronted with a somewhat confusing mixture of multiple passages in the book of Numbers. In 11.21 Moses reminded the Lord that among the huge crowd under his guidance there were 600,000 footmen, without counting women. A little later, when they were closer to the promised land, Moses dispatched a team of ten scouts, who on their return loudly stressed potential risks involved in its invasion, except Joshua and Caleb, the rest destined to die in the wilderness of Paran together with the 600,000 men

¹³ See our analysis in Muraoka 2019.312, where our earlier view in JM § 129 *ia* has been revised.

(14.38). The latter’s children would survive hardships in the wilderness and eventually enter the promised land, led by Joshua and Caleb.

Who are αὐτοὺς then? *SD*’s “um sie ins Erbteil hineinzuführen” is illogical. *BJ*’s “pour être introduits dans l’héritage” is logical, but no Gk MS reads εἰσαχθῆναι (passive). Precisely the same ambiguity arises from the suf. pron. in 𐤀 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤓.¹⁴ Likewise 𐤍 and 𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 ‘to introduce them.’ Smend (442) holds that God as *s* is implicit.

46.9) καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος τῷ Χαλεβ ἰσχύν,
καὶ ἕως γήρους διέμεινε αὐτῷ,
ἐπιβῆναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ κατέσχευ κληρονομίαν,

*And the Lord gave Caleb strength,
and till good old age it remained with him
for him to rise to the top of the land,
his posterity also gained possession of their inheritance,*

ועד שיבה עמדה עמו: ויתן לכלב עצמה (Ba)
:גם זרעו ירש נחלה: (Bb)
להדריכם על בַּמַּתִּי ארץ

The author now briefly goes over Joshua’s colleague. On the latter half of Caleb’s life Josh 14.6-15 is informative. At the age of 85 he declared: ἔτι εἰμι σήμερον ἰσχύων ὥσει ὅτε ἀπέστειλέν με Μωϋσῆς Josh 14.11.

ὁ κύριος] missing in 𐤀, but an addition that could avoid a misunderstanding as if Joshua were *s*.

ἐπιβῆναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς γῆς [הדריכם] ἐπιβῆναι is intransitive and הדריכם is transitive, so that αὐτὸν is *s*, whereas ׀ is more likely *o* with Caleb as *s*. But who are *them*? The Heb. *Vorlage* may have read להדריכו, but the translator may have decided to focus on Caleb, i.e. Caleb rose to the top of the land thanks to the strength granted to him. For Lévi’s (115) “Pour lui faire fouler les sommets de la terre” אותר is indispensable. He also refers to Josh 14.9, where, however, הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר דָּרַכָה רַגְלִי בָּהּ is only about Caleb conducting his daily life in the land, nothing special. In Am 4.13 and Mi 1.3 the phrase אֶרֶץ תֵּלֵּלֵךְ is applied to God and 𐤀 uses ἐπιβαίνω!

τὸ ὕψος τῆς γῆς] This probably refers to Caleb’s promotion in the community rather than his ascent to the highest mountain. Cf. 𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 ‘in order to place in the powerful leadership in the land.’

κατέσχευ] The Gk verb, κατέχω, can mean “to hold fast to” or “to keep in possession and not lose,” but can also mean “to gain possession of” (*GELS* s.v. 1, 2, 3), which last is the rendering closest to ירש. Note ὑμεῖς διαβαίνετε τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦτον εἰσελθόντες κατασχεῖν (𐤀 𐤋𐤏𐤍) τὴν γῆν Josh 1.11.

¹⁴ Lévi’s (115) “Pour enter dans leur héritage” is out of the question.

Morphologically *ירש* is ambiguous, for it could be either Pf. *ירש* or Impf. *ירש*. With “Afin que sa postérité en héritât aussi” Lévi (115) prefers the latter, but syntactically one would anticipate something like *ולרשת גם זרעו נחלה*. A self-standing Impf., though it could express a purpose, after an inf. with the same value, both subordinate to the preceding *ויתן* does not sound natural. *§* *וְאִף זְרַעָה יִרְשָׁתָּהּ יְיָ וְיִרְשָׁתָּהּ* ‘and his posterity will also obtain inheritance’ quoted by Lévi in support has a plain Impf.

46.10) ὅπως ἴδωσιν πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ
ὅτι καλὸν τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω κυρίου.

*in order that all the children of Israel would see
that to walk behind the Lord is good.*

(B) למען דעת כל זרע יעקב כי טוב למלא אחרי יי:

[למען] For some reason or other *§* uses a causal conjunction, *מטל ד-* // *§* *אִיכְנָא ד-* = *§*.

πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω] At vs. 6 above the same Heb. phrase is rendered *ἐπακολούθῃ* in the same context.

§ of vs. 10b is confusing: *דְּשָׁלָם נְמוּסָה דְּאִלְהָא וְדִינְהֵי* ‘who fulfilled the law of God and His injunctions.’

46.11) Καὶ οἱ κριταί, ἕκαστος τῷ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματι,
ὄσων οὐκ ἐξεπόρνευσεν ἢ καρδία
καὶ ὅσοι οὐκ ἀπεστράφησαν ἀπὸ κυρίου,
εἶη τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν ἐν εὐλογίαις:

*And the judges, each known by name,
whose heart did not occupy itself with infidelity
and who did not stray away from the Lord,
may their memory be blessed!*

(Ba) והשופטים איש בשמו כל אשר לא נשא לבו:

(Bb) ולא נסוג מאחרי אל יהי זכרם לברכה:

οἱ κριταί] Lévi (114) justly draws attention to a syntactic anomaly of the verse. Here we have the second model of introduction of personal names of forefathers to be eulogised. Only *οἱ κριταί* is no name, but what we have said above at 46.1 applies to it. With the first word untranslated, *§* does not say who the sequence is going to be about: *גְּבַר גְּבַר בְּשֵׁמָה* ‘each man according to his name.’

ὄσων .. ὅσοι] Here we have two indisputable cases of *ὅσος* used as a normal relative pronoun, cf. *SSG* § 17 e.¹⁵

¹⁵ This use is not recognised in LSJ.

- 46.13) Ἦγαπημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου αὐτοῦ Σαμουὴλ
προφήτης κυρίου κατέστησεν βασιλείαν
καὶ ἔχρισεν ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ·

*Having been loved by his Lord, Samuel
a prophet of the Lord established a kingdom
and appointed leaders over his people.*

(Ba) אוהב עמו ורצוי עושהו המשואל מבטן אמו:
(Bb) נזיר ייי בנבואה שמואל שופט ומכהן:
(Bc) נַצִּיִּאֵ 16 אל הכין ממלכת וימשח נגידים על עם:

Apart from (Bc) the relationship between Ⓢ and Ⓣ is rather problematic. What remains in the latter is only רצוי עושהו המשואל and the essential name can only be recovered by supposing a scribal error, שמואל > המשואל,¹⁷ though המשואל מבטן אמו is an allusion to the story told of his birth in 1Sm 1; note esp. what Hanna said to Eli the priest, וְגַם אֲנֹכִי הִשָּׂאֲלֹתָהּ לַיהוָה כָּל־הַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר וְנָתַתִּיו וְרַחֵם לְבָרִיָּהּ מִן דָּאֲשָׁמְאֵל Ⓢ: וְרַחֵם לְבָרִיָּהּ מִן דָּאֲשָׁמְאֵל וְרַחֵם לְבָרִיָּהּ מִן דָּאֲשָׁמְאֵל וְרַחֵם לְבָרִיָּהּ מִן דָּאֲשָׁמְאֵל וְרַחֵם לְבָרִיָּהּ מִן דָּאֲשָׁמְאֵל 'and loved by his Creator from the moment that¹⁸ he was asked¹⁹ out of his mother's womb, a Nazirite with prophetic activities,²⁰ Samuel, a judge and a priest through whose word a kingdom was established and who anointed rulers and kings for the people.' המשואל appears to have been read השואל, i.e. השואל. In the light of השואלתהו (Ba)'s המשואל need be changed to המושאל, i.e. המושאל. Furthermore, Samuel is not mentioned in the Bible as a Nazirite, but his mother's vow said: מוֹרָה לֹא־יַעֲלֶה עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ (1Sm 1.11).²¹

[βασιλείαν] probably reflecting a haplography of וימשח ומלכתו > ממלכתו וימשח.

- 46.14) ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ἔκρινεν συναγωγὴν,
καὶ ἐπεσκέσατο κύριος τὸν Ἰακώβ·

*With the law of the Lord he judged the community,
and the Lord paid attention to Jacob.*

(B) ב.. צוה עדה ויפקד אלהי יעקב:

[ἔκρινεν] best parsed as Aor. parallel to ἐπεσκέσατο.

¹⁶ As read by Abegg.

¹⁷ Alternatively ממלכת = ממלקת, a synonym of ממלקה, is possible.

¹⁸ Ⓢ may be vocalised as מן 'one who.'

¹⁹ This reflects השואל.

²⁰ Ⓢ the st. est. is odd, plausibly an error for בנביותהו.

²¹ This is said to prove that Samuel was a Nazirite (mNaz 9.5).

καὶ] At times it is difficult to determine whether a clause-initial καὶ means “and” or “also.” Here we are taking וְגַם into consideration. Samuel had learned a lesson from one of his distinguished predecessors, Joshua: ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν ὕψιστον δυνάστην ἐν τῷ θλίψαι αὐτὸν ἐχθροὺς κυκλόθεν 46.5, with which the clause here is almost identical.

On vs. 16a cf. καὶ ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὸν κύριον τὸν ἐλεήμονα Si 48.20, where מְלִיךָ אֶל-עַלְיוֹן אֵל אֵל-אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֶגְגַי speaks against Abegg’s restoration of עַל as the preposition. In the sense of “to call to somebody for help” עַל is not used.²⁷ Cf. אֲקַרְא לִי בְצַרְרִי אֲקַרְא יְהוָה וְאֶל-אֱלֹהֵי אֲקַרְא ἐν θλίψει μου ἐπεκαλεσάμην τὸν κύριον καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν μου ἐβόησα (L) 2Sm 22.7. See also vs. 5 above. Pace Smend (446) τὸν κύριον δυνάστην is not a double translation of אֵל אֵל; δυνάστην is a secondary addition influenced by אֵל אֵל-עַלְיוֹן ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν ὕψιστον δυνάστην vs. 5 above, the addition made because the translator saw the notional parallelism between the situations faced by Joshua and Samuel.

δυνάστην] an object complement. On subject complement, see above at vs. 15, and cf. SSG § 61 c.

ἐν προσφορᾷ] בעלתו BSH 242a parses בעלתו as Qal inf., which is questionable. We rather identify here a Hif. inf.,²⁸ whether a scribal error for בהעלתו or a spelling reflecting a post-biblical Heb. pronunciation.²⁹

ἀρνὸς γαλαθηνοῦ] Cornered by enemies he could not offer anything better. For the historical background, see 1Sm 7.9, where we find καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαμουηλ ἄρνα γαλαθηνὸν ἕνα דָּקָא לְבָרַךְ הַטֵּלָה שְׁמוֹאֵל וְקָיָהּ.

46.17) καὶ ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ὁ κύριος
καὶ ἐν ἤχῳ μεγάλῳ ἀκουστὴν ἐποίησεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ
and the Lord thundered from the sky
and with a loud sound made His voice heard

... (B) בפקע אדיר נשמע קלו:

ἐβρόντησεν] cf. ἐβρόντησεν κύριος ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ 1K 7.10.

46.18) καὶ ἐξέτριψεν ἠγουμένους Τυρίων
καὶ πάντας ἄρχοντας Φυλιστιμ.
and completely destroyed leaders of Tyrians
and all rulers of Philistines.

(B) ויכנע נציבי צר ויאבד ... כל סרני פלשתים:

²⁷ For other instances of אֵל אֵל-אֱלֹהֵי, see Clines, *CHD* VII 292b.

²⁸ So Segal 322 and Kahana 523.

²⁹ On the quiescence of gutturals in QH, see Qimron 2019 B § 1, where (B § 1.2.1.1) he mentions ובעלות 11QT^a 32.6.

Τυρίων] = צר, whereas \mathfrak{H} is meant to be צר ‘enemy,’ as referring to Philistine. At 47.7 no such error would occur, v.a.l.

46.19) καὶ πρὸ καιροῦ κοιμήσεως αἰῶνος ἐπεμαρτύρατο
 ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ
 Χρήματα καὶ ἕως ὑποδημάτων
 ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς οὐκ εἴληφα·
 καὶ οὐκ ἐνεκάλεσεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος.

*And before going to eternal sleep he testified
 before the Lord and His anointed
 “Possessions, even down to shoes,
 I have not taken from anybody”
 and nobody accused him.*

(Ba) ועת נוחו על משכבו העיד יי ומשיחו:
 (Bb) כופר ונעלם ממי.. תי. וכל אדם לא ענה בו:

‘עת נוחו על משכבו’ [at the time when he rested in his bed.’ Cf. הנוחו על-משכבותם Is 57.2. \mathfrak{H} here is speaking of a period in deathbed, but κοιμήσις here, as clearly shown by the added αἰῶνος, refers to death.³⁰ See below on ὑπνώσαι (vs. 20).

ἐπεμαρτύρατο [העיד Cf. 1Sm 12.2-4.

ἔναντι] This is the sole instance of < ἐπιμαρτύρομαι ἔναντί τις [pers.] >. On the other hand, < הָעֵיד אָת > means “to assert in the hearing of somebody serving as witness.” E.g. הָעֵידְתִּי בְכֶם הַיּוֹם אֶת־הַשְּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ כִּי־אָבַד תֹּאבְדוּן. διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ὅτι ἀπωλεία ἀπολείσθαι Dt 4.26, sim. ib. 30.19, 31.28.³¹ In our case here the assertion follows as direct speech, which \mathfrak{S} converts to indirect speech, אָסַדְדָּהּ קָדָם מְרִיא וְקָדָם אָסַדְדָּהּ קָדָם מְרִיא וְקָדָם מְרִיא ‘he testified before the Lord and His anointed that he had not accepted any bribe or gift .. ,’ where we would note the addition of קָדָם, which corresponds to נָגַד in מְשִׁיחוּ וְנָגַד יְהוָה וְנָגַד מְשִׁיחוּ 1Sm 12.3 (Ⓞ ἀποκρίθητε κατ’ ἐμοῦ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ).

αὐτοῦ] In theory the referent could be Samuel, who had anointed Saul (1Sm 10.1). But in view of the present context and also 1Sm 12.3 quoted above, where Samuel is speaking, the referent is most likely the Lord. Even Saul was physically anointed by Samuel, the anointment took place with God in the background.

ὑποδημάτων] in line with ὑπόδημα MT אַעֲלִים 1Sm 12.3 > נעלם i.e. נעֲלִים.³² Cf. Gn 14.23.

³⁰ Cf. Wagner 1999.231f.

³¹ Cf. an example in CG: ἐπιμαρτυράμενος τοὺς θεοὺς ‘calling the gods to witness’ Xen. HG 3.4.4. A couple of examples from papyri are quoted in Moulton - Milligan s.v.

³² We fail to see on what basis Kister (1999.176) says that נעלם signifies “bribe.”

46.20) καὶ μετὰ τὸ ὑπνῶσαι αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσεν
καὶ ὑπέδειξεν βασιλεῖ τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀνύψωσεν ἐκ γῆς τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ
ἐν προφητεία ἐξαλειψαὶ ἀνομίαν λαοῦ.

*Also after having gone to sleep he prophesied
and showed the king his decease
and raised his voice out of the ground
in order to obliterate the unlawfulness of his people as a prophet.*

(Ba) וגם עד עת קצו נבון נמצא בעיני יי ובעיני כל חי:
(Bb) וגם אחרי מותו נדרש ויגד למלך דרכיו:
(Bc) וישא מארץ קולו בנבואה:

καὶ¹] On this clause-initial conjunction, see above at vs. 16 above.

ἐπροφήτευσεν] Many MSS read ἐπροεφητευσεν. On this question, cf. Thackeray 1909 § 16, 8.

The biblical background here is most likely a narrative told in 1Sm 28 about King Saul visiting a sorceress in En-dor, through whom the dead Samuel appears and is consulted by Saul for advice. Then ὑπνῶσαι, like κοίμησις in vs. 19, refers to decease, and βασιλεῖ in vs. 20b refers to Saul. Let it be noted that שָׁן and שָׁנָה are at times metaphorically used of death, e.g. וְשָׁנוּ שְׁנַת-עוֹלָם. וְלֹא יִקְיָצוּ Je 51.39.³³ On 20c, cf. מִן-הָאָרֶץ 1Sm 28.13.

This Gk rendering reflects נבא, i.e. נבא, whereas ח means ‘he was found intelligent, not dement.’

The next two clauses in ח are absent in ט: “in the eyes of the Lord and in the eyes of every living person and also after his death he was sought after.” In the facsimile we see (Ba) written as a single line with no space between נמצא and בעיני, which makes sense because the second half is an adverbial qualifier of נמצא, thus not a complete clause.

In BH Ni. נדרש is, in the sense of “to let oneself be consulted,” always takes God as s, e.g. הָאֲדָרֶשׁ אֲדָרֶשׁ לָהֶם Ez 14.3³⁴, so also once in QH, לא אדרש להם ‘I will not be sought after for them’ 4Q 387 2ii2.

τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτοῦ] Cf. what David, shortly before his death, meant for Solomon: אָנֹכִי הִלֵּךְ בְּדַרְךְ כָּל-הָאָרֶץ וְהִזְקַתָּ וְהִיִּיתָ לְאִישׁ 1Kg 2.2. דרכו would have been more suitable, otherwise דרכיו would mean “his ways of leadership, attitudes etc.”

Whilst ס lacks (Ba), (Bc) ends with a clause which agrees almost with ט: בנביותא למבטלו הטתא ‘in order to obliterate sins with prophetic activities.’

³³ More references are mentioned in BDB s.v. שָׁן Qal and שָׁנָה.

³⁴ More references are mentioned in BDB s.v. נִדְרַשׁ Niph. 1.

CHAPTER 47

47.1) Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Ναθαν
προφητεύειν ἐν ἡμέραις Δαυιδ.

*Also after this one there arose Nathan
to prophesy in the days of David*

(B) וגם אחריו עמד נתן להתיצב לפני דוד:

ἀνέστη] עמד here is synonymous with קָם.¹

προφητεύειν] At 2Sm 7.2 Nathan is called a prophet (προφήτης, נְבִיא). Like the Chronicler, Ben Sira is also very favourable to David, but indifferent to Saul, who is not mentioned even once. Even so the equation προφητεύω / בְּהִיצַב is odd and unknown elsewhere in LXX. ℣ apparently wants to position Nathan in the succession of prophets and that in the Davidic monarchy as shown by another striking departure, ἐν ἡμέραις Δαυιδ.

47.2) ὥσπερ στέαρ ἀφορισμένον ἀπὸ σωτηρίου,
οὕτως Δαυιδ ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.

*Just as fat separated from an offering of thanks for deliverance,
so was David from the children of Israel.*

(B) כי כחלב מורם מקדש כן דויד מישראל:

ὥσπερ] ℣ lacks the preceding כִּי, which, according to Segal (324), underlines the status of Nathan allowed to serve David.

στέαρ ἀφορισμένον] In the related source text יָרִים and מוֹרָם are used (Lv 4.8, 10, 19), ℣ uses περιαιρέω instead of ἀφορίζω, e.g. πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τοῦ μόσχου τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας περιελεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Lv 4.8.

Δαυιδ] cf. מָצַח בְּחֹרֶם מְעָם Ps 89.20.²

υἱῶν] שְׁלֵן נְבִיא, an error for בְּנֵי?

47.3) ἐν λέουσιν ἔπαιξεν ὡς ἐν ἐρίφοις
καὶ ἐν ἄρκοις ὡς ἐν ἄρνασιν προβάτων.

*He played with lions as with young goats
and with bears as with small lambs.*

(B) לכפיריים שחק כגדי ולדובים כבני בשן:

¹ On עמד in LBH and post-biblical Heb. as equivalent to קָם, see Hurvitz 1997.78-83.

² Schechter and Taylor 1899.31.

ἐν λέουσιν] In spite of the pl. noun the prep. does not mean here “in the midst of.” Note the use of a sg. noun parallel to a dative in *παίξῃ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ὀρνέω* כְּצִפּוֹר בּוֹ הִשְׁתַּחֲבֹה ‘would you play with it [= a dragon, vs. 25] like with a bird?’ Jb 40.29. Ἐν here is not locative in value, but marks “a person or another animate entity to which sth is done” (GELS s.v. 10), which accords well with *לְ* here. In Jb 40.29 בִּי appears instrumental.

ἐπαιξεν *שחק*] On this equation, cf. *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲבֹה לְנוֹ* Jdg 16.25, where, however, לְ is equivalent to a dative of advantage, whereas with *καὶ παιζάτω ἐνώπιον ἡμῶν* Ⓞ regarded it as equivalent to *לְפָנֵינוּ*. Cf. *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲבֹה לְפָנֵינוּ* καὶ παιζάτωσαν ἐνώπιον ἡμῶν 2Sm 2.14.

ὡς ἐν] occurs twice in the verse with the same value, but in neither case we find in *לְ* its equivalent. In Heb. כִּי often omits the expected preposition, e.g. *כִּכֶּם לְאַחֲכֶם* Josh 1.15.³ Such a feature, however, is felt to be unnatural in Gk, hence the insertion of ἐν twice in our case.

ἄρνασιν προβάτων] influenced by the parallelism with the preceding “young goats,” for *בני בשן* is parallel to “goats” in Dt 32.14 – *הַלְבַּב כְּרִים* – *וְאַיִלִים בְּנֵי-בִשְׁן וְעִתוּדִים*.

The source text is 1Sm 17.34-36.

47.4) ἐν νεότητι αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ ἀπέκτεινεν γίγαντα
καὶ ἐξῆρην ὀνειδισμὸν ἐκ λαοῦ
ἐν τῷ ἐπάραι χεῖρα ἐν λίθῳ σφενδόνης
καὶ καταβαλεῖν γαυρίαμα τοῦ Γολιαθ;

*Did he not kill a giant in his youth
and cleanse dishonour of his people
by raising his hand with a sling and a stone
and putting the nose of Goliath out of joint?*

בנעוריו הכה גבור ויסר הרפת עולם: (Ba)
בהניפו ידו על קלע וישבר תפארת גלית: (Bb)

The source text is 1Sm 17.

ἐν νεότητι αὐτοῦ *בנעוריו*] Goliath recognised him as *נער* 1Sm 17.42, which is rendered in Ⓞ as *παιδάριον* ‘a kid.’ Cf. *בְּטִלְיֹתָהּ* ‘in his childhood,’ sim. Ⓢj.

The fronted position of the prepositional phrase is plausibly emphatic. David had been reminded by Saul of the risk of taking Goliath on: *הוא איש מנערי מלחמה מנערי* 1Sm 17.33.

οὐχὶ] Missing in MS 248 as in *לְ* and Ⓢ. *הלא* may have inadvertently dropped out.

καὶ ἐξῆρην ὀνειδισμὸν ἐκ λαοῦ] cf. *וְהִסִּיר הַרְפָּה מֵעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל* 1Sm 17.26, which belongs to a section which inadvertently dropped out of the majority

³ For a discussion with more examples, see JM § 133 h.

of Θ MSS and is preserved in the Origenic and Lucianic versions, which read here $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \delta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\ \text{I}\sigma\text{ρα}\eta\lambda$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon]$ = עמו , i.e. עמו? Sim. עמו . Smend (449) suggests מעל עם , cf. the above-quoted 1Sm 17.26. Is עולם עולם said in the sense of ‘long-standing humiliation’? Cf. $\text{וְנָתַתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם הַרְפַּת עוֹלָם וְקִלְמוֹת עוֹלָם אֲשֶׁר לֹא תִשָּׁכַח}$ Je 23.40.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota\ \chi\epsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \lambda\iota\theta\omega\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\nu\delta\acute{o}\nu\eta\varsigma\ \text{על קלע}$ cf. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\epsilon\nu\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta\ \tau\eta\nu\ \chi\epsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\nu\ \alpha\lambda\text{-}\eta\eta\kappa\lambda\iota$ 1Sm 17.49. In the sequel Θ uses a verb derived from $\sigma\phi\epsilon\nu\delta\acute{o}\nu\eta$ to render a verb affiliated with קלע ‘sling’: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\phi\epsilon\nu\delta\acute{o}\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \text{וְקָלַע}$.

$\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu\ \text{ישבר}$ ‘he shattered’] For the collocation with תפארת , cf. וְיִשְׁבְּרֵתִי $\text{אֶת־תְּפָאֲרֹתֶיךָ}$ Lv 26.19 and $\text{יִסִּיר אֶדְנִי אֶת תְּפָאֲרֹת הַעֲבֹסִים}$ Is 3.18.⁴

By juxtaposing two infinitives Θ indicates that (Bb) is intended to show what actions David took to restore his people’s honour.

וְיָרָם uses a well-known, periphrastic syntagm $\langle\ \text{קָטַל הָרָם}\ \rangle$, without underlining the repetition, but dramatising, “there he was raising his hand .. and knocking down ..” ($\text{מְרִים הָרָם אֵיזָא .. וְמִרְמָא הָרָם לְמִשְׁקָלוֹתָא}$).

Γολιαθ cf. גולית וְיָרָם and וְיָרָם .

47.5) $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \upsilon\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$,
 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega$
 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\psi\psi\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

*For he called upon the Lord the Most High,
 and He gave strength to his right hand
 to dispose of a man competent in battle
 (and) to raise the horn of his people.*

(Ba) $\text{כִּי קָרָא אֶל אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן}$ ויתן בימינו עז:
 (Bb) $\text{לְהַדָּף אֶת אִישׁ יוֹדֵעַ מַלְחָמוֹת}$ ולהרים את קרן עמו:

$\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \upsilon\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu]$ Though the same Heb. phrase, אל עליון , is also used in a similar context in $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \upsilon\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\nu$ 46.5, עליון here is substantivised.

$\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota]$ an inf. probably with resultative value, which is more apparent without $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as against וְלִהְרִים . Likewise in וְיָרָמוּ , and oddly against וְיָרָמוּ , so also וְיָרָמוּ *et exaltare*.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega]$ This can modify either $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota$ or $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$. מלחמות added in וְיָרָמוּ can only support the latter, which accords with $\text{וְיָרָמוּ הַיּוֹדֵעַ קָרְבָּא}$ ‘to kill a man who knows battle.’ וְיָרָמוּ is as ambiguous as Θ : $\text{וְיָרָמוּ בְרִנְשָׂא}$ ‘to remove the strong man in battle’ or ‘.. the man strong in battle.’

⁴ BSH 286a parses our Si example as Piel. Qal וְיָרָמוּ would mean the same thing as Pi. וְיָרָמוּ . Our scribe is not consistent in his spelling of o vowel. See, e.g. וְיָרָמוּ vs. 5, a verb which, in BH, is not used in Pi., but Qal.

- 47.6) οὕτως ἐν μυριάσιν ἐδόξασαν αὐτὸν
καὶ ἤνεσαν αὐτὸν ἐν εὐλογίαις κυρίου
ἐν τῷ φέρεσθαι αὐτῷ διάδημα δόξης·

*Thus they hailed him with “myriads”
and praised him with blessings of the Lord
as a diadem of glory was brought to him.*

(Ba) על כן ענו לו בנות ויכנוהו ברבבה:
(Bb) בעטותו צניף גלחם

Ⲙ is only imperfectly constructed on its source text: ותענינה הנשים המשקיות ותאמרנה הכה שאול באלפיו ודוד ברבבתיו 1Sm 18.7, which reads in Ⲭ as καὶ ἐξηρχον αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐπάταξεν Σαουλ ἐν χιλιάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐν μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ. Besides, Ⲭ does not follow Ⲙ very closely here: “therefore women sang for him and called him ‘with myriads’ as he was enwrapped with a turban of a warrior.” Ⲛ also goes its own way: מְטוּל הַנָּא שְׁבַחְתֶּיהָ נִשְׂא בְּרַבּוֹתָא. קָלִיל אֶתְכַתֵּשׁ בְּמַעַט גְּלָחָם ‘therefore women praised him with myriads. He fought a little,’ where the last clause possibly reflects בְּמַעַט גְּלָחָם.

οὕτως] על is left untranslated.

In BH בַּת in the st. cst. is often used to refer to a woman or women of a particular city, land, or people as in בְּנוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים ‘Philistine women’ 2Sm 1.20, but never as *girls* in colloquial English. Hence בְּנוֹת here is unique. Note Ⲛ נִשְׂא ‘women.’ In Ⲭ the role played by women is ignored, but also in Ⲙ the masc. form, יכנוהו, is used!

The key constituent that connects the three versions is ἐν μυριάσιν. Segal (1956.150f.) opines that the prep. ב־ prefixed to the numerals is equivalent to a zero-object marker, אֵת, or partitive, i.e. David killed among myriads of Philistines round him. Whether sg. רבבה or pl. רבבתיו, it is a poetic, total exaggeration, since up to that point in time Goliath was the only Philistine he killed.

The prep. ἐν appears to be instrumental in value, namely women hailed him by quoting what they said, i.e. μυριάσιν, whereas at 1Sm 18.7 it is a Heb. calque used to mark a victim as in πατάξω τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους τούτους; .. πατάξεις ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοφύλοις τούτοις 1Sm 23.2, where in Ⲙ we see בְּפִלְשְׁתִּים on both occasions.

- 47.7) ἐξέτριπεν γὰρ ἐχθροὺς κυκλόθεν
καὶ ἐξουδένωσεν Φυλιστιμ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους,
ἕως σήμερον συνέτριπεν αὐτῶν κέρας.

*For he utterly destroyed enemies around
and set Philistines the hostile to naught,
he shattered their horn as it is today.*

(Ba) ומסביב הכניע צר:

(Bb) ויתן בפלשתים ערים ועד היום שבר קרנן:

[ἐχθρούς κυκλόθεν] a phrase used at 46.5 and 46.16 as well, but there the enemy had the upper hand.

[ὑπεναντίους] = צרים, i.e. צָרִים. The author probably meant to say “and he built garrisoned cities among the Philistines.”

[עד היום] The positioning up front of this Heb. phrase or a slightly longer version, **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**, is exceptional. The two phrases occur in BH a total of 70 times, indicating that what is stated in the immediately preceding clause still applies today, e.g. **וְיִאָּבְדֹם יְהוָה עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** Dt 11.4, i.e. no repairing or restoration has taken place yet. There are only two exceptions to this rule: **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הֵם עֲשִׂים כַּמְשַׁפְּטִים הָרְאשֹׁנִים** 2Kg 17.34, see also 1Sm 6.18. However, the use of this phrase at this point is odd, for the author could not possibly be speaking of David still being around, doing the same thing. Or perhaps “those hostile Philistines were destroyed by him for ever and are nowhere around now”?

47.8) ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ἔξομολόγησιν
 ἁγίῳ ὑψίστῳ ῥήματι δόξης·
 ἐν πάσῃ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ὕμνησεν
 καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτόν.

*About whatever he did he acknowledged (his debt)
 to the supreme holy one in a glorious language;
 he sang wholeheartedly
 and loved the One who made him.*

(Ba) בכל מעשהו נתן הודות לאל עליון ... בָּוֹד:

(Bb) דויד בכל לבו אוהב עושהו ובכל ..5. ... ד:

[ἔξομολόγησιν הודות] On the combination of this verbal noun derived from ἐξομολογέω and ὑμνέω, cf. ἐξομολόγησιν καὶ αἴνεσιν τῷ κυρίῳ על־הדות להלל ליהנה 1Ch 25.3.

Morphologically speaking, הודות is a Hi. inf., but functioning here as a verbal noun just as in הודות אל ‘praise for God’ 1QM 4.14, preceded and followed by several verbal nouns indicating God’s deeds.⁵ Cf. Si 51.17.

[ἁγίῳ ὑψίστῳ] Here ἁγίῳ is a substantivised adjective, ‘the holy one,’ whereas ὑψίστῳ appears to be an attributive adjective. Here, too, we see אל עליון in **Ⲭ**; see above at 46.5.

[ἠγάπησεν] One would anticipate here אהב, i.e. אָהַב.

In the margin of the Heb. facsimile we spot traces of דויד.

⁵ For a discussion with more QH examples, see SQH § 18 a. With the morpheme ית this can hardly be an inf. abs., pace Smith 2000.262.

47.9) καὶ ἔστησεν ψαλτωδοὺς κατέναντι θυσιαστηρίου
καὶ ἐξ ἡχοῦς αὐτῶν γλυκαίνειν μέλη·

¶ καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν αἰνέσουσιν ἐν ᾠδαῖς αὐτῶν. ¶

*And he appointed singers (to stand) opposite the altar
to have sweet melodies sung by them.*

¶ *and every day they shall praise with their songs.* ¶

(B) נגינות שיר הַפִּיץ ל... הַ וְקוֹל מַ... לַלַּיִם⁶ תִּיקֶן⁷:

ψαλτωδοὺς] Pace Smend (451) נְגִינָה in BH does not refer to musical instrument, but means either “song” or “singing.” What the author means here is that David saw to it that poems or psalms written by him were set to music and sung.

καὶ²] syntactically odd in the infinitival clause.

The verse reads somewhat differently in S: וְכָל יוֹם אֲמַנְאִית תְּשַׁבְּחָתָא אָמַר ‘and every day faithfully he would recite praises in front of the altar.’

47.10) ἔδωκεν ἐν ἑορταῖς εὐπρέπειαν
καὶ ἐκόσμησεν καιροὺς μέχρι συντελείας
ἐν τῷ αἰνεῖν αὐτοῦς τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀπὸ πρωΐας ἤχεῖν τὸ ἁγίασμα.

*On holidays he saw to it that everything looked attractive
and decorated the occasions perfectly,
as they praised His holy name,
even from early morning the sanctuary resounded.*

... ל... (Ba) ... שְׁנָה:

(Bb) בהללו שם קדשו לפני בקר ירון משפט⁸:

S is extremely brief: יְהִיב תְּשַׁבְּחָתָא רְוִבְתָּא כָּל שְׁנָא בְּשְׁנָא ‘he arranged great praises year after year.’

αὐτοῦς] In spite of people’s participation in festive celebrations it is difficult to view the pron. as referring to καιροὺς. Does it refer to ψαλτωδοὺς in vs. 9? The same difficulty arises with הַנּוֹן in S: כִּד מְשַׁבְּחִין הַנּוֹן ‘when they praise.’ The editors of MS B restore בהללו, where the suf. pron. must be referring to David.

ἀπὸ πρωΐας] In H with לפני בקר people were impatient to wait till the sunrise.

⁶ נבל V.1.

⁷ קול מזמור הנפִים V.1.

⁸ מקדש V.1.

ἁγίασμα] טשפמ in (Bb) is an error to be replaced with the v.l., שדקמ, which means only “sanctuary,” a meaning that fits ἁγίασμα here. For this sense of the word, cf. *GELS* s.v. 1, e.g. εἰς ἕτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου, ὁ κατειργάσω, κύριε, ἁγίασμα (שדקמ), κύριε, ὁ ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου Ex 15.17, where the parallel κατοικητήριον ‘habitation’ is to be noted. This Gk noun is unrecorded prior to LXX.

ἤχεῖν] a verb that can mean “to cause to make sound” (*GELS* s.v. 1 b). Then τὸ ἁγίασμα becomes its *s*.

47.11) κύριος ἀφεῖλεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀνύψωσεν εἰς αἰῶνα τὸ κέρασ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην βασιλείων
καὶ θρόνον δόξης ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.

*The Lord removed his sins
and raised his horn for ever
and granted him an agreement of kingship
and a glorious throne in Israel.*

גַּם יְיָ הָעֵבֶיר פִּשְׁעוֹ וַיִּרְם לְעוֹלָם קִרְנוֹ: (Ba)
וַיִּתֵּן לוֹ חֶק מַמְלָכָה וַיְכַסּוּהוּ הַכִּיּוֹן עַל יְרוּשָׁלַם: (Bb)

κύριος] יי] “Christus” (!).⁹

ἀφεῖλεν [העביר] שדקמ is remarkable. Likewise Lévi (127) “remit” and Mopsik (2003.297, fn. 8) “pardon.” If David had been forgiven, the baby just born would not have died one day too early to be circumcised and named. What is meant with שחב ‘He took’ is unclear.

τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ] ח פשעו can be vocalised as פשעו as pl., but here we appear to have an allusion to גַּם יְהוָה הָעֵבֶיר הַטָּאָתָה לֹא תָמוּת 2Sm 12.13, where as against the standard LXX version with παρέβιβασεν the proto-Lucianic version reads ἀφεῖλε in Καὶ κύριος ἀφεῖλε τὸ ἁμάρτημά σου· οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃς. Our translator is possibly conscious that the sin committed by David had multiple manifestations, i) the fornication with Bathsheba, ii) the false witness as if her pregnancy were due to her bodily contact with Uriah, and iii) the murder of Uriah.

Just as טָאָתָה in the source text, פִּשְׁעוֹ can also denote “punishment for sins.”¹⁰

The link between our ח text and the MT of 2SM 12.13 is manifest in the principal verb העביר and the particle גַּם, though the latter is absent in Ⓞ. The

⁹ So also in a late correction of LXX MS B. *Pace SD* fn. we doubt that this v.l. represents “verbessert.” If BS was thinking in terms of 2Sm 12.13, there was no place for Messianism in God’s pledge to David.

¹⁰ For references see BDB s.v. פִּשְׁעוֹ 5, טָאָתָה 3. So also their synonym, יָצוּן; BDB s.v. 3.

translator possibly mistook גַּם in the standard sense of “also,” which of course makes no sense here, when what was meant by Nathan was “you have confessed your sin. The Lord in His turn will not execute the punishment, i.e. instant death, which He will commute to natural death and allow you to remain on your throne for the time being.”¹¹

διαθήκη] an equation quite common, 10x, including the present case added in *Index* s.v.

βασιλέων [מַמְלָכֹת] 𐤀 could represent מַמְלָכוֹת, i.e. מַמְלָכוֹת. *Maagarim* has listed this case as one of the two earliest attestations of מַמְלָכֹת in Hebrew. The second instance is at 46.13, v.a.l. Whether מַמְלָכֹת or מַמְלָכוֹת, the author means to say that David would be succeeded by many kings. Cf. MS 248 βασιλείας.

טֻּוֹ Iσραηλ [ירושלם] So 𐤌, 𐤌j and 𐤌.

47.12) Μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη υἱὸς ἐπιστήμων
καὶ δι’ αὐτὸν κατέλυσεν ἐν πλατυσμῷ·

*After this one there arose an intelligent son
and thanks to him lived in security.*

(B) אַבְעָבֹרוֹ עַמַּד אַחֲרָיו בֶּן מִשְׁכִּיל שׁוֹכֵן לְבַטָּח:

The sequence of the constituent words differs not a little in 𐤌, which could be restored as אַחֲרָיו עַמַּד בֶּן מִשְׁכִּיל וּבְעַבְרוֹ שׁוֹכֵן לְבַטָּח. In (B) אַבְעָבֹרוֹ most likely means “for his, i.e. David’s, sake.” However, an alternative meaning, ‘thanks to him,’ might suit better, but not qualifying the immediately following עַמַּד, but שׁוֹכֵן. Cp. 𐤌 אַחֲרָיו עַמַּד שׁוֹכֵן לְבַטָּח ‘and there arose after him a powerful king living quietly, Solomon.’

κατέλυσεν] The Aor. hardly matches a Ptc., שׁוֹכֵן. 𐤌 apparently took this Ptc. as qualifying the preceding noun phrase, thus not David.

47.13) Σαλωμων ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν ἡμέραις εἰρήνης,
ὃ ὁ θεὸς κατέπαυσεν κυκλόθεν,
ἵνα στήσῃ οἶκον ἐπ’ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐτοιμάσῃ ἁγίασμα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

*Solomon was king in peaceful days,
for whom God made peace reign all around
in order that he could build a temple in His name
and prepare a sanctuary for all ages.*

(Ba) שלמה מלך בימי שלוה ואל הניח לו מסביב:
(Bb) אשר הכין בית לשמו ויצב לעד מקדש:

¹¹ For our analysis of this story, see Muraoka 2012b.98f. and id. 2020.47f.

κατέπαυσεν κυκλόθεν] cf. הָיָא אֲטוֹמָא עִירְהִינָה עֵקָא פִּאֲנְטוֹן טוֹן מֵרֹוֹן
κυκλόθεν מְסַבִּיב מְכַלְעֶבְרִיִּי לֹו מְלֹוֹם הָיָה לֹו 1Kg 5.4.

יְנָא] What are presented in \mathfrak{H} as facts of the past history are here David's successor's future projects. Alternatively, הכִּין might be an error for יִכִּין, i.e. יָכִין followed by יִצָּב. Lévi (127) takes אֲשֶׁר in causal sense, whilst it could be a standard antecedentless relative pronoun, "one who."

\mathfrak{S} is rather short: מְלֹוֹם הָיָה לֹו מְטוֹל דְּנִבְנָא בִּיתָא לְשִׁמָּה לְעֵלְמָא 'and God made for him secure all round so that he could build a temple for His name for ages.'

έτοιμάση] Nowhere we find in LXX the equation έτοιμάζω / הִצִּיב.

47.14) ὡς έσοφίσθης έν νεότητί σου
καί ένεπλήσθης ὡς ποταμός συνέσεως.

*How wise you were in your youth
overflowed with understanding like a river!*

(B) מה חכמת בנערךך ותצף כיאר מוסר:

ὡς [מה] Here מה is also exclamatory. On the exclamatory ὡς see above at 17.29 and 42.22.

έσοφίσθης] This is the first time when BS addresses one of the past giants in the second person. As he wrote parables, did he find Solomon close to him as the author of the classic collection of proverbs?¹² \mathfrak{S} goes as far as to insert the name itself: בְּטִלְיֹוֹתְךָ שְׁלִימוֹן 'in your youth, o Solomon!'

ένεπλήσθης [תצף] \mathfrak{E} is undoubtedly right in parsing the Heb. verb as 2ms. But what is its stem, binyan? Segal (326), Kahana (524), and BSH (261b) parse it as Hi. of צוּף. In BH this rare verb occurs in Qal once only: צָפוּ מַיִם: עַל־רֵאשֵׁי אֲמָרְתִּי וְנִגְרַתִּי Lam 3.5, which does not help our understanding of our case here. In the remaining two cases, both Hi., it carries causative force עֲלֵפְנֵיהֶם דַּת 11.4 [God as s] and וַיִּצֹף הַבְּרֹנְתָא 'and he made the iron float away' 1Kg 6.6. Does this second instance suggest that our text means "you made understanding flow like a river among the population"? In our very document we find a case which is unquestionably Hi.: בְּרֹכַת רִיוְתָא וְכִנְהַר תְּבֵל רִיוְתָא 39.22, where one would read בְּרֹכַתוֹ 'His blessing.' As we pointed out ad loc., this is a rare, intransitive use of this Hi. verb. Strictly speaking, our תצף cannot be analysed as intransitive because of מוסר that follows. All the same we are reminded of an example like וּמְלֵאוּ בְּתִיָּהֶם וְאִהִים Is 13.21, where \mathfrak{E} και έμπλησθήσονται αί οικίαι ήχου is noteworthy for the use of the same Gk verb as in our BS example. Sim. also Ex 8.17 and Jud 16.27.

¹² Later in 48.4-11 Elijah is also addressed directly.

ὡς ποταμὸς כִּיאָר] Both the author and the translator would know that, unlike נְהַר יָאָר, נְהַר mostly refers to the Nile,¹³ whereas ποταμὸς could be used as referring to a narrow river in the neighbourhood. The author is speaking of an enormous level of intelligence. The translator substituted נְהַר < נְהַר for יָאָר. He must have known that יָאָר is never used in the st. cst.

47.15) γῆν ἐπεκάλυψεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου,
καὶ ἐνέπλησας ἐν παραβολαῖς αἰνιγμάτων·

*Your spirit covered the entire earth,
and you filled (it) with enigmatic parables.*

ארץ כִּסֵּיתָ בְּנִפְשֵׁךָ וְתַקְלֵטָ/ט¹⁴ בְּמָרוֹם שִׁירָה: (B

ἡ ψυχὴ σου בְּנִפְשֵׁךָ 𐤁 lays emphasis on Solomon's outstanding, intellectual capacity. Lévi's (126) reconstruction reads בְּנִבְיָנִיתָ, but even if the *Vorlage* had כִּסֵּיתָ, it cannot be 3fs. with ארץ as s.

ἐνέπλησας] The verb [ἐμπίμπλημι] being a transitive verb, an *o* is anticipated. The two clauses of the verse basically express one thought, so that γῆν is implicit as *o*.¹⁵

ἐν παραβολαῖς αἰνιγμάτων] As shown by τὸν ἐμπιπλῶντα ἐν ἀγαθοῖς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν σου Ps 102.5, ἐν can be interpreted as equivalent to an instrumental dative as in ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ῥηθεῖσιν πληρωθεὶς βαρεῖ χόλω 'he, having been filled with fierce anger at what had been said' 3M 5.30. Note esp. אֲשֶׁר מְלֵאוּהָ מִפֶּה אֶל־פֶּה בְּטַמְאָתָם Ezr 9.11 ἔπλησαν αὐτήν ἀπὸ στόματος ἐπὶ στόμα ἐν ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν [2E 9.11]. Cf. also הַשְּׁבִיעֵנִי בְּמַרוֹרִים Lam 3.15.

Our translator may have given up on the first verb of the second clause and decided to compose a totally new clause off his own bat. Smend's (II 54) composition runs as וְתַקְלֵטָ כְּמוֹ יָם שִׁיחָה. Is it possible that at the time of our translator the use of Pi. קָלַט 'to praise' as in MH and RH was not current yet?¹⁶

47.16) εἰς νήσους πόρρω ἀφίκετο τὸ ὄνομά σου,
καὶ ἠγαπήθης ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ σου·

*Your fame has reached far-off islands
and you were loved in your peaceful periods.*

¹³ Only in a late book of Daniel we find the noun יָאָר applied a few times to Tigris, but another huge river all the same, Dn 12.5, 6, 7. Working near Tigris, the translator of 𐤁 uses נְהַרָא '(the) river.' The indeterminate ὡς ποταμὸς does not necessarily imply, *pace* Segal (428), that 𐤁 reflects כִּיאָר, not בְּיאָר, for the word is in BH used as a proper noun, the name of the river *par excellence*, hence always with the definite article.

¹⁴ Abegg reads וְתַקְלֵטָ. In its concordance BSH has no entry for וְתַקְלֵטָ.

¹⁵ We are tempted to delete the comma at the end of vs. 15a.

¹⁶ For evidences, see Jastrow 1903.1379b.

Nothing has survived in \mathfrak{H} of this verse. In \mathfrak{S} vs. 16b reads וְמִסְכֵּי־לְשֹׁמְעָךְ ‘and they are looking forward to hearing from you.’

Vs. 16b in \mathfrak{G} does not say much in this context.

47.17) ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ παροιμίαις καὶ παραβολαῖς
καὶ ἐν ἔρμηνείαις ἀπεθαύμασάν σε χῶραι.

*For (your) songs and proverbs and sayings
and for (your) expositions lands marvelled at you.*

(B) בְּשִׁיר מְשָׁל חִידָה וּמְלִיצָה עַמִּים הִסְעֲרָתָהּ :

[שיר ᾠδαῖς] This and all the three following substantives are sg. in \mathfrak{H} , but pl. in \mathfrak{G} . The former focuses on the diversity of literary genres of Solomon’s production, whilst the latter also draws attention to the vast quantity of his literary works. Cf. לְהִבִּין מְשָׁל וּמְלִיצָה דְּבָרַי הַכְּמִים וְהַיִּדְתָּם \mathfrak{G} νοήσει τε παραβολὴν καὶ σκοτεινὸν λόγον ῥήσεις τε σοφῶν καὶ αἰνίγματα Pr 1.6.

[מְשָׁל חִידָה] The two Gk words are almost synonymous, whereas the two Heb. words are semantically distinct from each other, the latter signifying a riddle-like, enigmatic saying. One of the renderings in LXX of חִידָה is αἰνίγμα, an equation which occurs four times in LXX, and the Gk word is used in Si 39.3, where no Heb. text has survived.

ἐν²] added to draw a line between the first three nouns and the fourth and to divide the verse into two halves.¹⁷ But the prep. has not been repeated with the preceding two nouns, what is quite common. By contrast, καί is repeated between every two coordinate nouns unlike in \mathfrak{H} . The repetition or non-repetition is subject to more than one factor in Greek and Hebrew alike.¹⁸

[ἐρμηνείαις מְלִיצָה] the sole instance in LXX of this equation. The word is very rare in BH, occurring twice only. One of the two attestations, the above-cited Pr 1.6, is instructive. As interesting is a related verbal form: מְלִיץ ἐρμηνευτής ‘interpreter’ Gn 42.23.

χῶραι [עַמִּים] \mathfrak{H} underlines the ethnic diversity of peoples impressed by Solomon, whereas \mathfrak{G} stresses that the impact was not confined to the Holy Land, but spread far and wide.¹⁹

\mathfrak{S} displays its own perspective: פֶּשֶׁר מִתְּלָא דְּחֻכְמָתָא בְּכַתְבָּא וּבְנִבְיִתָּא אֲתַמְהָתָּ עֲמָא ‘expounding proverbs of wisdom in writing and in prophecy you astonished nations.’²⁰

¹⁷ Ms 248 lacks the preposition. Not looking at the MS itself we cannot tell whether every verse is presented with no division of sections. The only division is between verses, which is probably due to the editor, Hart.

¹⁸ For details see SSG § 78 and SQH § 38.

¹⁹ “Städte” (SD) is a translation of \mathfrak{H} , not of \mathfrak{G} .

²⁰ In ed. Lagarde the first word has a dot above, hence ptc., not pf. פֶּשֶׁר, thus *pace* Lévi (128) “il exposita.”

47.18) ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ
 τοῦ ἐπικεκλημένου θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ
 συνήγαγες ὡς κασσίτερον τὸ χρυσίον
 καὶ ὡς μὸλιβον ἐπλήθυνας ἀργύριον.

*In the name of the Lord God
 who is called upon as the God of Israel
 you amassed gold as if it were tin
 and as if it were lead you multiplied silver.*

:נקראת בשם הנכבד הנקרא על ישראל: (Ba)
 ותצבר ככרוז זהב וכעפרת הרבית כסף: (Bb)

In vs. 18a+b Ⓞ radically differs from Ⓢ ‘you were called by the honourable name which is applied to Israel.’ For the collocation **שם נקרא על**, cf. **יהוה נקרא על־יך** Ⓞ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐπικέκληταί σοι Dt 28.10, where the selection of the Pf., just as in our Si case, is to be noted, i.e. the selection of the name as applicable to someone took place some time ago and the name is still valid. “The honourable name” is the shortened version of the tetragrammaton as a component of a new name chosen by God Himself, **יהוה**, to substitute **שֵׁלֶמָה** already chosen by David (2Sm 12.24f.). This allusion²¹ in Ⓢ probably escaped the translator, hence neither **נקראת** nor **הנכבד**²² represented in Ⓞ.

θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ] The selection of the gen. case is due to the case of its principal verb, ἐπικεκλημένου, as in Σίμωνα τὸν ἐπικαλουμένον Πέτρον ‘Simon alias Peter’ Acts 11.13. Then θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ is an *o* complement.

Since Ⓞ is not going on about the origin of Solomon’s own name, the ptc. here could be modifying the preceding θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ, whereas it could be construed with the preceding ὀνόματι because of its case, but that is the only possible analysis of **הנקרא**.

κασσίτερον] = **בדיל**, i.e. **בְּדִיל**, the main²³ equation occurring five times in LXX.

It is true that in the OT amassing precious metals is not always favourably looked upon, see, e.g. Dt 17.17, Zc 9.3, Jb 27.16. It is now, however, absolutely certain what the author’s perspective is here. In his eulogy both positive and negative aspects of the king’s reign are mentioned. In Ec 2.8-11 Solomon himself presents a balanced view on the matter.

²¹ Segal (328) holds that the reference here is not to the tetragrammaton, since, he is right, many names have the same ending. But we should remember that **ידידיה** was a name proposed by God Himself in place of **שֵׁלֶמָה**.

²² According to Segal (328) BS is not referring to **יהוה**, but **שֵׁלֶמָה** related to **שָׁלוֹם** in the light of **שָׁלוֹם יְהוָה לֹו יִקְרָא לוֹ יְהוָה שָׁלוֹם** Jud 6.24 and “Great is the peace (שָׁלוֹם) since God is called שָׁלוֹם” *Sifre bammidbar* 6.24. Cf. **וְנִאֲתַקְרִית בְּשֵׁמָה דְאֵלְהָא דְדִילְהָ הוּ אִיקְרָא דְאֵתְקָרִי עַל אִיסְרָאֵל** ‘and you were called by the name of God to whom belongs the honour that was called on Israel.’

²³ In Zc 4.10 the same Heb. word is rendered with *κασσιτέρινος*.

47.19) παρανέκλινας τὰς λαγόνας σου γυναιξὶν
καὶ ἐνεξουσιάσθης ἐν τῷ σώματί σου·

*You laid your flanks beside women
and became enslaved to your body.*

(B) ותתן לנשים כסליך ותמשילם בגורתך:

λαγόνας] Unlike Engl. *loins*, a common translation of כְּסָלִים, “the region of the sexual organs regarded as the source of erotic or procreative power,” neither לָגוֹן nor לָגוֹן necessarily carries such a nuance. Odd is כְּסָלִים ‘your kidneys.’ שִׁיבֹת ‘your strength’ appears to be contextually determined.

ἐνεξουσιάσθης] הָ means ‘you gave them [= your loins] control over your body.’ Loins are part of a human body, but simply “*the hollow on each side below the ribs*” (GELS s.v. *λάγων*). The erotic overtone derives from the entire clause in which it is found. On the multiple women Solomon associated with, see 1K 11.1-3. Alternatively תְּמַשִּׁילָם can be equivalent to תְּמַשִּׁילָן, i.e. them = women, ‘you made them control your body.’²⁴

ἐν] basically instrumental, approaching a marker of an agent with a passive verb. So also καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς Gn 12.3. מְשַׁבֵּת מִשְׁפָּחָתָהּ כָּל בְּרֵךְ וְנִבְרָכוּ בָּהּ Gn 12.3.

47.20) ἔδωκας μῶμον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου
καὶ ἐβεβήλωσας τὸ σπέρμα σου
ἐπαγαγεῖν ὄργην ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου
καὶ κατανυῆναι ἐπὶ τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ σου

*You brought a stain on your reputation
and defiled your offspring,
causing (God’s) anger to be brought down upon your children
and them to be cut to the heart over your folly*

(Ba) ותתן מום בכבודך ותחלל את יצועיך:
(Bb) ... 25 אף על צאצאיך ואנחה על משכבך:

The syntactic complexity in הָ (Bb) is reflected in its translation. The two infinitival clauses in הָ can be resultative in relation to 20b, but the second clause (20d) appears to have τὰ τέκνα σου as its *s*,²⁶ which is impossible, strictly speaking, because of the prep. in ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου. On the other hand,

²⁴ On this morphological fluctuation in QH, note בַּם, the suf. pron. = הַנְּסִתְרוּת ‘the hidden matters’ 1QS 5.12. Cf. Qimron 2018.284f.

²⁵ Smend (II 54) restores מְשַׁבֵּת, but both BHS and Abegg leave a complete blank. Note, however, מְשַׁבֵּת ‘to bring.’

²⁶ But not “me” as in “et je m’afflige sur tes folies” (BJ ad loc., fn.). Who is speaking here in the first person?

הא and אנה are hardly to be construed with תת because of the intervening, self-standing verbal clause, though each has its own *s* explicitly indicated. All the same, the general sense is not difficult to capture in **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ** alike.

μῶμον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου] On the phrase cf. 44.19.

τὸ σπέρμα σου] parallel to the following τὰ τέκνα σου, whereas יצועיך is parallel to the following משכבך,²⁷ as correctly represented in **Ⓢ** .. תְּשׁוּיָתְךָ מְשַׁכְּבֶיךָ. τὸ σπέρμα σου possibly reflects זרעך,²⁸ not זרעך, since זרע in the sense of ‘descendant’ is always used in the sg., even when “descendants” is meant. In the next verse there are two more infinitival clauses. Similarly its standard rendering, σπέρμα. The pl., σπέρματα “descendants,” is attested only twice in LXX: 4M 18.1 and Dn 11.31 תה.²⁹

κατανυγήναι אנה] On the treatment in Si of words derived from אנה, see our remarks at 12.12.

ἀφροσύνη] *φ* in **Ⓢ**.³⁰ משכבך may refer to his bed, in which Solomon indulged in stupid, sexual activities with gentile women.

47.21) γενέσθαι δίχα τυραννίδα
καὶ ἐξ Εφραιμ ἄρξαι βασιλείαν ἀπειθῆ.

*for the domain to split into two
and for a rebellious kingdom to rule out of Ephraim.*

: (B לשני שבטים ומאפרים ממלכת חמס:

δίχα] an adverb used like a predicative adjective. Sim. ἐγγὺς ἡμέρα κυρίου ‘the day of the Lord is near’ Jl 1.15. For a discussion with more examples, see *SSG* § 24 d.

ἀπειθῆ חמס] At Am 9.8 the northern kingdom is called בְּמַמְלַכְתָּהּ הַקֶּהֱתָנִים ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. Cf. **Ⓢ** אַתָּה הַקֶּהֱתָנִים ‘a heathen kingdom.’

47.22) ὁ δὲ κύριος οὐ μὴ καταλίπη τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ
καὶ οὐ μὴ διαφθείρη ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ
οὐδὲ μὴ ἐξαλείψῃ ἐκλεκτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔκγονα
καὶ σπέρμα τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος αὐτὸν οὐ μὴ ἐξάρῃ·
καὶ τῷ Ἰακωβ ἔδωκεν κατάλειμμα
καὶ τῷ Δαυιδ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ῥίζαν.

²⁷ Lévi mentions the use of the pl. in יצועיך וְהִקְלִילְךָ 1Ch 5.1, though the person concerned is one, יצא.

²⁸ In the view of Lévi (130) as an expression of prudery on the part of the translator.

²⁹ The latter is to be added in *GELS* s.v. σπέρμα 2 b.

³⁰ Lévi (430) mentions משובתך, which, however, does not mean “ta folie.” Its two occurrences in Si, 43.23 and 49.2 do not help us. *Pace SD* (2259) מְשַׁכְּבֶיךָ does not mean “deine Wohnung.”

*But the Lord would never abandon His mercy
and would never renege on His (earlier) words
nor ever annihilate the posterity of His chosen one
and the offspring of him who loves Him would never eradicate;
and to Jacob He gave survivors
and to David a root out of him.*

... ל לא יטוש חסד וּלֹא יפִיל מִדְּבָרָיו אֲרֻצָּה: (Ba

לֹא ... לֹא ... נִין וְנֹכַד וְאִיִּם כִּי לֹא יִשְׁמִיד: (Bb

וְיִתֵּן לֹא ... וְלִבְיָשׁ: (Bc

οὐ μὴ] Repeated, including οὐδὲ μὴ, as many as four times in a single verse; on this common double negator see *SSG* § 83 ca.

On the second clause of (Ba), cf. מְלִי־דְבָרָיו אֲרֻצָּה 1Sm 3.19, where οὐκ ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν is more verbatim than Si. Note also אֵל תִּפְּלֵ דְבָרְךָ מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר דְּבַרְתָּ Est 6.10 μὴ παραπεσάτω σου λόγος ὧν ἐλάλησας ὧν ἐλάλησας.

Though διαφθείρω can mean “physically to ruin, destroy” (*GELS* s.v. 1), it cannot be applied here. *Pace* Snaith “he does not destroy what he himself has made”; λόγοι cannot refer to things physically made.

τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ] שְׁלֵחַ עֲבֹדָתוֹ ‘His deeds.’

ἐκλεκτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔκγονα] שֵׁנֵי יְדִיקָתוֹ ‘the children of his righteous ones.’

ἔκγονα [נִין וְנֹכַד] see above at 41.5.

τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος αὐτὸν] The addition of the definite article does not imply reference to a particular person. Ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις .. Dt 27.15 is followed by 8 execration clauses, all beginning with < ἐπικατάρατος ὁ + ptc. >, then Ἐπικατάρατος ὃς ἂν λάβῃ .. vs. 25 and ending with Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις οὐκ ἔμμενεῖ .. vs. 26; see *SSG* § 31 bb. ῥίζαν] שֵׂא תְּהִי מַלְכוּתָא רַבָּה ‘a great kingdom.’

47.23) Καὶ ἀνεπαύσατο Σαλωμων μετὰ τῶν πατέρων
καὶ κατέλιπεν μετ’ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ
λαοῦ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ἐλασσούμενον συνέσει
Ροβοαμ, ὃς ἀπέστησεν λαὸν ἐκ βουλῆς αὐτοῦ.
καὶ Ιεροβοαμ υἱὸς Ναβατ, ὃς ἐξήμαρτεν τὸν Ἰσραηλ
καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ Εφραιμ ὁδὸν ἁμαρτίας·

*And Solomon rested with forefathers
and left after him (a successor) out of his posterity,
the foolishness of a nation and one lacking in understanding,
Rehoboam, who alienated the nation with his policy.
And Jeroboam, a son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin
and led Ephraim along a sinful path.*

ויעזב אהריו מנון:	וישכב שלמה מיואש	(Ba)
רחבעם הפריע בעצתו עם:	רחב אולת וחסר בינה	(Bb)
אל יהי לו זכר:	עד אשר קם	(Bc)
ויהטיא את ישראל:	ירבעם בן נבט אשר הטיא	(Bd)
	ויתן לאפרים מכשול	(Be)

[ישכב ἀνεπαύσατο] The use of ἀνεπαύω with reference to death occurs also at 22.11, and its verbal noun, ἀνάπαυσις is also analogously used in 30.17 and 38.28. Death is the moment of liberation from toil, to which man is born according to ἄνθρωπος γεννᾶται κόπῳ Jb 5.7. Smend (457) is right in saying that שכב on its own is not used in BH as a synonym of מָת. Our translator appears to be aware of a common collocation with אָבְתָיו as in, e.g. וְיִשְׁכַּב דָּוִד עִם־אָבְתָיו 1Kg 2.10.³¹

μετὰ τῶν πατέρων] ≠ מיואש ‘despaired.’

ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ] probably a free rendering. In BH we encounter מְנוֹן, a mysterious hapax at Pr 29.23, which attestation is entered by Clines (V 349a) with our case here under one of four (!) different homonyms, one as מְנוֹן. Our translator also may have been baffled by this word.

λαοῦ ἀφροσύνην] As an *o* of the preceding κατέλιπεν and followed by ἐλασσοῦμενον συνέσει Ποβοαμ this is somewhat unnatural. More sensible is **ס** מְסַגָּא סְכָלְתָא ‘one who multiplied follies.’

רחב אולת is said to be a play with the following רחבעם. If we vocalise the first component as רַחַב, i.e. cst. of רָחַב and take the adj. qualifying אולת,³² and not another name indicating Solomon’s successor, we need to note that אֲוֹלֶת אֲוֹלֶת is an unusual collocation. By contrast, in the following חסר בינה, the adj. חָסֵר applies to a person. Our author most likely is sarcastically alluding to רַחַב לֵב ‘broad, wide-ranging intellectual capacity,’ a quality conferred by God on Solomon (1Kg 5.9).

Ποβοαμ] born between him and Naamah, an Ammonite.

ἀπέστησεν λαὸν] His imposition of heavier taxes (1Kg 12.14) did not go down well with the populace. **ס** דְּבַר ‘he governed’ is neutral in force, with which cp. **ס** עַמָּא דְשִׁיטְיָא נֹא ‘a people of insanity’ as an *o* of שָׁבַק ‘he left.’

Any of the generally known meanings of הַפְרִיעַ fits the case here. Cf. **ס** וְאִחָט ‘and he caused (Israel) to sin.’ Even a similar collocation in תְּפָרִיעוּ מִמַּעֲשֵׂי אֲתֵהֶעַם διαστρέφετε [‘you divert’] τὸν λαὸν μου ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων Ex 5.4.

Pace Lévi (132) **Θ** did not read מעצתו in lieu of בעצתו. The former, as in the above-quoted Ex 5.4, would require ἀπό, and not ἐκ, as in ἐζήτησεν ἀποστῆσαί σε ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου Dt 13.10. Ἐκ here indicates a cause; see *GELS* s.v. 6. Cf. **℣** *consilio suo*.

³¹ More references are mentioned in BDB s.v. שכב **Qal 4b**.

³² On the syntactic analysis of adjectives or participles in the st. cst., see JM § 129 *ia*.

Mopsik (2003.301) vocalises רחב as רַחַב, referring to רַחַב לֵב mentioned above, but there it is an *o* of יָתֵן, which does not apply here.

(Bc) is totally missing in **Ⓞ** and **Ⓢ**: “until there arose ‘May he not be remembered!’.” **Ⓢ** has preserved it, **וְלֹא נִהְיָא לֵה דְיִכְרֵן** ‘and may he not be remembered!’ but immediately and without any punctuation mark followed by **לְיִרְבְּעָה**, which with a recapitulating **לְ** removes the ambiguity of **Ⓢ** **לֵה**.

ἐξήμαρτεν] In **Ⓢ** there is **אָחַי** ‘he sinned’ preceding. The source is **הַטְּאוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲתִיבִיא וְאֶשְׂרָה אֶשְׂרָה יִרְבְּעָם** 1Kg 14.16.

[**Ισραηλ**] in the sense of the northern kingdom.

ὁδὸν ἁμαρτίας] ≠ **Ⓢ** **מכשול** ‘a stumbling-block.’

47.24) **καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν σφόδρα ἀποστῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν**

*And their sins increased enormously
moving them away from their land;*

להדיחם מאדמתם (Ba)

ותגדל חטאתו מאד (Bb)

The sequence in **Ⓞ** of 24a and b should follow that in **Ⓢ** and **Ⓢ**. Then the inf. in both languages can be resultative in value rather than final, an unintended result. Our translation above has taken this into account; **ἀποστῆσαι** is transitive with **αὐτοὺς** as its **o**.

This is a reference to the eventual exile and the disappearance of the ten tribes.

ἐπληθύνθησαν] **Ⓢ** **אָסַגַּי** ‘he increased’ as against **Ⓢ** **דִּיִּהוֹן דִּיִּהוּא דִּיִּהוּא** ‘their sins increased’ suggests that the **s** is still Jeroboam. Or is Ephraim meant with “he”?

αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν] The suf. pron. in **Ⓢ** **חטאתו** most likely refers to Ephraim, whereas **Ⓞ**’s **αὐτῶν** is to the people of Ephraim. **Ⓞ** has taken **חטאתו** as collectively used sg.

47.25) **καὶ πᾶσαν πονηρίαν ἐξεζήτησαν, ἕως ἐκδίκησις ἔλθῃ ἐπ’ αὐτούς.**

*and they pursued every kind of evilness
and in the end there befell on them vengeance.*

ולכל רעה התמכר (B)

ἐξεζήτησαν] The **s** in **Ⓢ** **התמכר** ‘gave itself up’ is still m.sg. This is a more attractive rendering than a literal approach as in **וַיִּתְמַכְרוּ לְעֵשׂוֹת הָרָע** **καὶ ἐπράθησαν** [**<πιπράσκω** ‘to sell’] **τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν** 2Kg 17.17. So also 1Kg 21.(**Ⓞ** 20).20, 25. Cf. **Ⓢ** **אֶתְמַלֵּךְ** ‘he consulted.’

Vs. 25b is absent in **Ⓢ** and **Ⓢ**. Segal (430) is of the opinion that this derives from the next verse, i.e. **עד אשר בא נקם > עד אשר קם נביא**.

CHAPTER 48

48.1) Καὶ ἀνέστη Ηλιας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ,
καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο·

*Then Elijah arose, a prophet like fire
and his word burned like a torch;*

(B) עד אשר קם נביא כאש ודבריו כתנור בוער:

[Καὶ ἀνέστη] Also at 47.23 קם עד אשר appears before a new prophet is introduced and it took a while to be told who it was, but this time it takes much longer in **℣**, vs. 4.

λαμπὰς] ≠ תנור ‘oven.’ בְּעֵר כְּתַנּוּר Ma 3.19 is not a figure of a human being or God, but of the day of the Lord about to come.

48.2) ὃς ἐπήγαγεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς λιμὸν
καὶ τῷ ζήλῳ αὐτοῦ ὠλιγοποίησεν αὐτούς·

*who brought down a famine on them
and with his zeal he reduced the population.*

(B) וישבר להם מטה לחם ובקנאתו המעיטם:

ὃς] an unnatural use of the relative pronoun because of the intervening clause (1b).

ם לחם וישבר להם מטה לחם ‘and he cut their food supply off.’ מִטֵּה לֶחֶם lit. ‘staff of bread’ is a standing expression in BH,¹ e.g. בְּשִׁבְרֵי לֶחֶם מִטֵּה-לֶחֶם Lv 26.26, where **℣** is more literal with ἐν τῷ θλίψαι ὑμᾶς σιτοδεία ἄρτων. The combination with שִׁבַר is due to the basic meaning of מִטֵּה ‘staff.’

ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς] The prep. -ל here is equivalent to a dative of disadvantage.

On the use of the pl. pronoun, see above at 47.24.

וְאֵתִי עָלֵיהֶן כִּפְנָא **℣** ‘and he brought famine upon them’ is, with the exception of the initial conjunction, a rendering of **℣**.²

ὠλιγοποίησεν] **℣** בָּנַע ‘he split.’ Only seven thousand, who did not kneel to Baal, were left as survivors (1K 19.18).³

48.3) ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου ἀνέσχεν οὐρανόν,
καὶ κατήγαγεν οὕτως τρις πῦρ.

¹ More examples are mentioned in BDB 641b s.v. מִטֵּה **1**.

² Smend’s (459) view is that it is **℣** that follows **℣**.

³ As Wagner (1999.258) points out, ὠλιγοποιέω is not documented prior to SG; *GELS* s.v. is in need of correction.

*With the word of the Lord he held the sky back
and likewise brought fire down thrice.*

(B) בדבר אל עֲצַר שמים גַּם ... שלש אֵשׁוֹת:

ἀνέσχεεν οὐρανόν] As a consequence there was no rain or dew three and a half years (Lk 4.25, Jam 5.17). See also 1Kg 17.1, 18.1. The phrase עֲצַר הַשָּׁמַיִם occurs also in Dt 11.17 and 2Ch 7.13, both times with God as *s*.

τρίς [שֶׁלֹשׁ] See 1Kg 18.38, 2Kg 1.10, 12. ש expands with על מִדְבַּקְהָא וְעַל אֲנָשָׁא רְשִׁיעִיא ‘on the altar and the wicked people.’

[אֵשׁוֹת] In BH אֵשׁ occurs always in the sg. In RH we encounter this pl. form: bYoma 21b and bGit 70a.

48.4) ὡς ἐδοξάσθης, Ηλια, ἐν θαυμασίοις σου·
καὶ τίς ὁμοίός σοι καυχῆσεται;

*O Elijah, what a fame you gained with your marvels!
And who could take pride like you?*

(B) מה נורא אתה אליהו וְאִשֶׁר כַּמֹּךְ יתפאר:

ἐδοξάσθης] ≠ הֵנִי נורא ‘awesome.’ The added ἐν θαυμασίοις σου suits this Gk verb well.

[אִשֶׁר] makes little sense. Has מי dropped out? Either מי אִשֶׁר or just מי? Is it possible, as we did (Muraoka 1977a ad loc.), to admit an antecedentless relative clause, i.e. ‘he who is like you might take pride’?

καυχῆσεται] so Ziegler. Many MSS read an inf., either καυχασθαι or καυχησασθαι, but an inf. cannot be used to qualify ὁμοίος.

As he did to Solomon (47.14), the author is addressing Elijah personally in the second person. However, in this case he has only words of praise on the prophet.

48.5) ὁ ἐγείρας νεκρὸν ἐκ θανάτου
καὶ ἐξ ᾗδου ἐν λόγῳ ὑψίστου·

*He who resuscitated a dead person
and out of Hades with the word of the Most High;*

(B) המקים גוע ממות ומשׂאול כרצון יי:

ὁ ἐγείρας] It has been noted a few times that the determinate Ptc. often indicates a past action, for which the use of the Aor. here is most appropriate. See above at 6.14, 16.7, 36.17. On the determinate substantivising ptc. here followed by five more, see SSG § 31 **ba**.

νεκρὸν [גוע] On גוע, see above at 8.7.

ἐν λόγῳ ὑψίστου] הֵנִי כרצון יי ‘in keeping with the will of the Lord.’ The source is 1Kg 17.17-24.

48.6) ὁ καταγαγὼν βασιλεῖς εἰς ἀπώλειαν
καὶ δεδοξασμένους ἀπὸ κλίνης αὐτῶν·
*he who brought kings down to ruin
and famous people from their bed;*

(B) המוריד מלכים על שחת ונכבדים מַמְטוּתָם:

ὁ καταγαγὼν] In the light of our remark on ὁ ἐγείρας (vs. 5) we do necessarily have to do with a prediction as suggested by Lévi (134). In the sources mentioned here the prophet did prophesy indeed, but what matters to the author is that it eventually came true.

βασιλεῖς] One such casualty was Ahab; 1Kg 21.19-22.

κλίνης] Elijah sent back messengers of King Ahaziah of Samaria, who had been injured and was lying in bed and heard from the prophet that he would not recover; 2Kg 1.4.

εἰς [על] אַל would be more natural.

As often is the case, § summarises: מִן כּוֹרֶסְתָּהוֹן יִקְרָא ‘he who throws down honourable men from their thrones.’

48.7) ὁ ἀκούων ἐν Σινα ἐλεγμὸν
καὶ ἐν Χωρηβ κρίματα ἐκδικήσεως·
*He who heard a reproach in Sinai
and verdicts of punishment in Horeb;*

(B) והשמיע בסיני תוכחות ובחורב משפטי נקם:

ὁ ἀκούων] = השומע, of which ἤ השמיע is an error. According to 1Kg 19 it is God who spoke to Elijah. Note the participles with the definite article describing in vss. 5-6 and 8-11 what Elijah did.

We do not know what the motive is for shifting from the Aor. to the Pres. here and in vs. 8 and back again to the Aor. in vs. 9.

Note § of the entire verse: וְאֶשְׁמַע בְּנִסְיוֹנָהּ מִקְּסוֹתָהוֹן ‘and through his temptation he declared their admonition.’ The translator, according to Lévi (135) and Smend (460), mistook בסיני for בנסוי, i.e. בְּנִסּוּי.

48.8) ὁ χρίων βασιλεῖς εἰς ἀνταπόδομα
καὶ προφήτας διαδόχους μετ’ αὐτόν·
*He who anointed kings for vengeance
and succeeding prophets after him;*

(B) המושח מלא תשלומות ונביא תחליף תחתיך:

μετ’ αὐτόν] = תחתי, so § בְּתַרְהָ. The translators appear to have forgotten that the author is personally addressing Elijah.

The biblical source is 1Kg 19.15f., where Elijah is said to have anointed Hazael as a king of Aram, who would revenge the house of Jehu, and Jehu as a future king of Israel who would revenge the house of Ahab and Elisha as his successor as prophet. It is thus sensible to correct מלא to מלכי, i.e. מְלָכִי.

διαδόχους ηλιχ] Van Peursen (2008.140) mentions a convincing argument presented by Beentjes for analysing ηλιχ as a noun, ‘successor,’ and not as a verb.

48.9) ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς ἐν λαίλαπι πυρὸς
ἐν ἄρματι ἵππων πυρίνων·

*He who was taken up in a fiery wind-spout
in a chariot of fiery horses;*

(B) הגלקה בסערה מעלה ובגדודי אש ... :

ἀναλημφθεὶς ηלק] Exactly the same expression is used of Enoch’s ascent heavenwards at 49.14.

ἐν λαίλαπι πυρὸς] Also in the source text, 2Kg 2.11, we see בסערה, which, however, is rendered in \mathfrak{C} as ἐν συσσεισμῷ ‘in a commotion.’

ἐν ἄρματι ἵππων πυρίνων] closer to the source text אש וסוסי אש than to \mathfrak{H} here, “troops of fire.”

48.10) ὁ καταγραφεὶς ἕτοιμος εἰς καιροῦς
κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ,
ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν
καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ.

*He who was recorded as prepared, when necessary,
to allay (God’s) fury before its explosion,
to return a father’s heart to (his) son
and to restore the tribes of Jacob.*

(Ba) הכתוב נכון לעת להשבית הָא לפנֵי ... :

(Bb) להשיב לב אבות על בנים ולהכין שׁ... ל:

καταγραφεὶς] The reference is to Ma 3.23f.

ἕτοιμος] restored by Smend (460) and accepted by Ziegler against εν ελεγκμοις and the like in all Gk MSS. The restored form accords with \mathfrak{H} נכון.

καιροῦς] The selection of the pl. as against the sg. עת is suitable in view of multiple infinitival clauses that follow.

ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν] Cf. καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα Lk 1.17, an angel speaking to Zechariah about a son on the way and to be named John (the baptist), whom Jesus would subsequently identify as Elijah returned (Mt 17.11-13).

The last letter *lamed* of (Bb) suggests ישראל 'Israel.'

Note **⚡**: והו עתיד דנאמא קדם דנאמא יומה דמריא למפכו בנא על אבהא ויהו וְלִמְסַבְּרוּ לְשִׁבְטֵי יַעֲקֹב 'and he is ready to come before the day of the Lord comes in order to take sons back to fathers and to bring news to the tribes of Jacob.' Compared with **⚡** and **⚡** the father-sons relation is reversed, but in Ma 3.24 God tells Israel about a future prophet modeled on Elijah who is going to work in both directions, fathers' care for their children and children's obedient attention to their father.

48.11) μακάριοι οἱ ἰδόντες σε
καὶ οἱ ἐν ἀγαπήσει κεκοιμημένοι·
καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ζῶντες ζήσομεθα.

*Blessed are those who saw you
and those who deceased beloved;
for we shall remain alive.*

(B) אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ וּמַתְּ . . . יְ. . . יְהוּ:

[μακάριοι οἱ ἰδόντες σε] = אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ, i.e. אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ. Cf. **⚡** טובוהי 'Blessed is he who saw you and died.' Thus *pace* Lévi (137): “.. celui qui te voit,” which should be לְדַהֵן לְךָ. Hence the Aor. ἰδόντες is preterite in value.

Arguing that אַשֶׁר רָאָךְ is dual, Smend (461) leaves **⚡** as it is, and vocalising אַשֶׁר as אַשֶׁר, translates the text as “Selig wer dich sieht und stirbt,” a totally unacceptable interpretation.

ἐν ἀγαπήσει κεκοιμημένοι] κοιμάομαι is used to mark death as in κοιμηθίσομαι μετὰ τῶν πατέρων μου < וְשִׁכַבְתִּי עִם־אֲבֹתַי Gn 47.30. It is probably a reference to lying buried. ἐν ἀγαπήσει is a free addition: the deceased was loved during his or her lifetime. But see **⚡** *et in amicitia tua decorati sunt*, i.e. the love of Elijah.

Vs. 11c probably means: “We who are still alive shall live on in keeping with your model.” Should this correctly represent the *Vorlage* of **⚡**, the *s* of **⚡** אַשֶׁר would be 1pl., not 3ms. with Elijah as its *s*: אַשֶׁר אַשֶׁר אַשֶׁר אַשֶׁר ‘but he is not dead, but will surely become alive.’ Or is this an allusion to Elijah’s return (Ma 3.23) or a Christianised translation referring to future resurrection?

48.12) Ηλιας ὃς ἐν λαίλαπι ἐσκεπάσθη,
καὶ Ελισαιε ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος αὐτοῦ·
καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐσαλεύθη ὑπὸ ἄρχοντος,
καὶ οὐ κατεδυνάστευσεν αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς.

*Elijah, who was covered in a wind-spout,
and Elisha was filled with his spirit;
and in his life-time he was not shaken by any ruler
and nobody subjugated him.*

... ..ל.. (Ba)
 :ל.. אלישע: (Bb)
 :מימיו לא זע מכל ולא משל ברוחו כל בשר: (Bc)

Vs. 12a is probably meant to say “Now that Elias was ..”⁴. The conjunction καί of vs. 12b is unlikely to mean “Elisha as well.” Elisha is introduced here for the first time. ⚭ may be right with “אֵלִיָּא הוּ ד־ ‘Elijah is one who ..’ αὐτοῦ (12b)] referring to Elijah.

(Bb) is absent from ⚭: “the mouth of .. many signs and everything that issued forth out of his mouth was marvellous.” The incompletely preserved start of the line was likely alluding to לְאֵלִי בְרוּחֵךְ אֵלַי 2Kg 2.9, a plea by Elisha to Elijah prior the latter’s nearing ascent heavenwards.

For (Ba-b) ⚭ reads: אֵלִיָּא בְּאֻזְרָא אֶתְכַנְּשׁ לְשִׁמְיָא וְקַבֵּל נְבוֹיָתָא אֶעְפָּא אֵלִישַׁע ‘Elijah was interred in a granary to heaven and Elisha received prophesying ability twice as much and his mouth uttered many miracles and signs.’

48.13) πᾶς λόγος οὐχ ὑπερῆρεν αὐτόν,
 καὶ ἐν κοιμῆσει ἐπροφήτευσεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ·

*Nothing was beyond him
 and in his grave his body enabled him to prophesy.*

(B) כל דבר לא נפלא ממנו ומתחתיו נברא בשרו:

ὑπερῆρεν] the sole attestation in LXX of this equation, ὑπεραίρω / Ni. נִפְלָא. ἐν κοιμῆσει] מתחתיו ‘from underneath.’ Lévi (139) and Smend (463) refer to 46.12 and 49.10, v.a.l.⁵

⚭ is brief, leaving the second half out: וְכֵן מְלָא לָא אֶתְכַסִּית מְנָה ‘and nothing was hidden from him.’

ἐπροφήτευσεν] = נבא, i.e. נבא, which is graphically closer to ⚭, than Segal’s (433) התנבא. Both mean the same thing.

48.14) καὶ ἐν ζωῆ αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν τέρατα,
 καὶ ἐν τελευτῇ θαυμάσια τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

*In his lifetime he wrought wonders,
 and in death his works were astonishing.*

(B) בחייו עשה נפלאות ובמותו תמהי מעשה:

θαυμάσια] On ⚭’s treatment of the pl. cst. תמהי, see above at 43.25.

In vs. 14b ⚭ is likely alluding to the incident mentioned in 2Kg 13.21: וּבְמֹתָה אָחִי מֵיָתָא ‘and already dead he revived a dead person.’ So perhaps BS, too, though the selection of pl. תמהי is slightly odd.

⁴ Many Gk MSS do read ως. The same problem recurs at 49.8.

⁵ Cf. also Wagner 1999.231f.

48.15) Ἐν πᾶσιν τούτοις οὐ μετενόησεν ὁ λαὸς
καὶ οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν,
ἕως ἐπρονομεύθησαν ἀπὸ γῆς αὐτῶν
καὶ διεσκορπίσθησαν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ.
καὶ κατελείφθη ὁ λαὸς ὀλιγοστός,
καὶ ἄρχων ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ·

*In spite of all these things the people did not repent
and did not keep away from their sins,
and in the end they were taken from their land as spoils of war
and scattered in all the earth.
And the people survived with a negligible number,
and a ruler in the house of David;*

(Ba) בכל זאת לא שב העם ולא חדלו מחטאתם:
(Bb) עד אשר נסחו מארצם ויפצו בכל הארץ:
(Bc) וישאר ליהודה מוער ועוד לבית דוד קצין:

Ἐν πᾶσιν τούτοις] an almost verbatim reproduction of **ח** here. This particular use of ἐν with πᾶς in a negative clause carries the nuance of “in spite of.” See also ἕως τίνος οὐ πιστεύουσίν μοι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς σημείοις, οἷς ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς; Nu 14.11 and μὴ ἀτιμάσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν πάσῃ ἰσχύι σου Si 3.13, where **ח** has no בכל, showing that this use of ἐν had become an integral part of SG.⁶

μετενόησεν] only one of the two attestations of this equation, μετανοέω / Qal שב.⁷

ἐπρονομεύθησαν] In 721 BCE the northern kingdom perished when the Assyrian army under Sargon the second invaded the land, and part of the nation was taken away. For **ח** נסחו מארצם, cf. וְנִסְחָתֶם מֵעַל הָאָדָמָה Dt 28.63. Cf. **ש** here גָּלוּ מִן אֶתְרָהוֹן ‘they went into exile from their land.’

This is the sole instance in LXX of this equation: προνομεύω / Ni. נסח.⁸

ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ] effectively ‘in all the world,’ cf. **ש** בְּכָל מְדִינָתָא ‘in all the regions.’

For vs. 15d **ש** is explanatory: וַיִּתֵּר יְהוּדָא בְּלִחְדָּוְנָהּ ‘and Judah alone remained.’ By leaving יהודה out **ש** presumably wants to say that the refusal to repent and part with sins was also true of Judah, but the latter luckily survived. Hence העם applies to the nation in its entirety.⁹

⁶ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἐν 14.

⁷ The other instance is found in Is 46.8, where HR indicates “שוב hi.” with a measure of uncertainty. However, הָשִׁיבוּ פִּוְשָׁעִים עַל-לֵב, (Hi.) cannot be rendered with μετανοέω. Note the vocative in **ש**, thus פִּוְשָׁעִים was not taken as the *o* of הָשִׁיבוּ: μετανοήσατε, οἱ πεπλανημένοι, ἐπιστρέψατε τῇ καρδίᾳ.

⁸ Not Ni. נסחו (< נסח) ‘they were scraped off,’ *pace* Lévi (139).

⁹ When the conventional text makes sense, there is no need to postulate, *pace* Lévi (140), a graphic error, ιουδας > ο λαος.

ὀλιγοστός] a predicate complement, but **SH** has taken it as attributive: אַעֲמָא יְעוֹרָא ‘a small people.’ For the message, cp. אָנוֹשׁ מִזְעָרַי καὶ καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι Is 24.6.

ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ] **H** לְבֵית דָּוִד is parallel to לַיהוּדָה. Since **G** did not translate the prep. of the latter literally, he had an option to choose ἐν in translating the latter.

48.16) τινὲς μὲν αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν τὸ ἀρεστόν,
τινὲς δὲ ἐπλήθυναν ἁμαρτίας.

*Some of them did proper things,
some others multiplied sins.*

(B) יֵשׁ מֵהֶם עֲשׂוּ יוֹשֵׁר וְיֵשׁ מֵהֶם הַפְּלִיאֵי מַעַל:

τινὲς] The indefinite pronoun τις never occurs clause-initially with the exception of this pl. form. See *SSG* § 10 a.

We agree with Van Peursen (2004.312)¹⁰ in admitting in **H** here two asyndetic, antecedentless relative clauses.¹¹ Another example occurs in 44.8 parallel to a syndetic one in 44.9. Hence **H** can be rendered as “there are among them some who did proper things ..”.

τὸ ἀρεστόν] **S** טְבוּתָא ‘penitence’; an error for טְבוּתָא ‘kindness’ or טְבוּתָא ‘goodness’? If not, the rendering is under the influence of vs. 15(a).

Whilst here is the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἀρεστός / יוֹשֵׁר, the adj. יוֹשֵׁר is rendered so six times. On the collocation ποιέω τὸ ἀρεστόν, see at vs. 22 below.

ἐπλήθυναν [הַפְּלִיאֵי] The translator may have had some difficulty with this rather rare collocation, הַפְּלִיאֵי מַעַל, though an affiliated example does occur once in הָרַעַף וְאֵת מִכּוֹת רַעְיָהּ אֶת־מִכְתָּהּ וְאֵת מִכּוֹת רַעְיָהּ ‘and the Lord will inflict on your and your descendants extraordinary plagues’ Dt 28.59. **H** here probably means: “and there are among them some who did astonishing deeds of treachery.”

48.17) Ἐζεκιᾶς ὠχύρωσεν τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ
καὶ εἰσήγαγεν εἰς μέσον αὐτῆς ὕδωρ,
ὥρυξεν σιδήρῳ ἀκρότομον
καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν κρήνας εἰς ὕδατα.

*Hezekiah fortified his city
and introduced water into its midst,
he excavated a rock with iron (tools)
and constructed water reservoirs.*

¹⁰ So already Fassberg (1997.62). In other examples cited by Fassberg and all beginning with יֵשׁ, we could recognise an appositional phrase, e.g. יֵשׁ אוֹהֵב חֵבֶר שְׁלֹחַן 6.10, which can scarcely be rewritten as יֵשׁ אוֹהֵב אֲשֶׁר חֵבֶר שְׁלֹחַן. יֵשׁ אָצְוָה attached to a prepositional phrase is to be distinguished, e.g. מִפְּרִי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ־הַגֵּן Gn 3.3; on this construction, see *JM* § 130 f-fa.

¹¹ Cp. **S** here: אֵיתִי מִנְהוֹן דְּעֻבְדוֹ וְגוֹ ‘there are among them those who did ..’

(Ba) יחזקיהו חזק עירו בהטות אל תוכה מים:
(Bb) ויחצב כנחשת צורים ויחסום הרים מקוה:

Ⓢ is very short: 'Hezekiah built the city and brought water into it.'

ὠχρῶσεν] In Ⓢ you can not reproduce the play on words: *יחזקיהו חזק*.
The source text is 2Kg 20.20.

ὄρυσεν] Smend (465) justly points out that this verb as well as the noun *צור* 'rock' are used in the Siloam tunnel inscription which concerns the tunnel constructed in the reign of Hezekiah. The inscription was engraved on its wall with the completion of the tunnel. The inscription uses *נקבה* 'tunnelling.'

σιδήρῳ] The prep. of Ⓢ *כנחשת* is presumably an error of *ב-*.

The last clause in Ⓢ is problematic. The verb *הִסֵּם* is not bi-transitive; hence it cannot govern two *o*'s. The pl. *הרים* cannot be a reference to Jerusalem. *Pace* Smend (465) it is not rendered support by *צורים*, for one mountain can have multiple rocks. He also maintains that, by analogy of a verb of surrounding, *הִסֵּם* can be used as a bi-transitive verb. He does not mention any such verb. Qal *סָבַב* may be looked at. BDB s.v. Qal **2 d** mentions two instances: *מִפְּנֵי הַמְּלָחָמָה אֲשֶׁר סָבְבָהּ* 1Kg 5.17¹² and *וְדָבְרֵי שְׁנָאָה סָבְבוּנִי* Ps 109.3. It is important to note, however, that in both cases the verb has only one *o* a suf. pron. attached, and such is not always equivalent to a zero-object, so that *סָבְבוּנִי* cannot be rewritten as *סָבְבוּ אֹתִי*. In this regard we have an instructive example in *וַיִּסְבּוּ עָלַי אֶת-הַבָּיִת* Jdg 20.5. Hence *סָבְבָהּ* can be rewritten as *סָבְבוּ*.¹³ In sum, Ⓢ *הרים* is most likely a scribal error, though we do not know how to rectify it.

48.18) ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνέβη Σενναχηριμ
καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ῥαψάκην, καὶ ἀπῆρεν·
καὶ ἐπῆρεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σίῳν
καὶ ἐμεγαλῶχησεν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

*In his days Sennacherib launched a war
and sent Rabshakeh, and he departed;
and he aimed at Zion
and boasted in his arrogance.*

(Ba) בימיו עלה סנחריב וישלח את רב שקה:
(Bb) ויט ידו על ציון ויגדף אל בגאוונו:

¹² Apparently on the supposition that the *s* is "warriors" and the *o* "the war," which is not certain.

¹³ On this matter, see JM § 125 *ba*.

Ῥαψάκην [רַב שֶׁקַשׁ] This Heb. term usually understood as referring to a high-ranking military officer was taken as a personal name at its first occurrence in 2Kg 18.17.

ἀπῆρην] with Judah as his destination. This plus is also found in שִׁי לְרַשָּׁא ‘he [= Sennacherib] ordered (Rabshakeh) to set out,’ though the Gk verb was analysed as transitive, which is attested in ἀπῆρην τὴν παρεμβολήν 1Mc 6.33. Our ἀπῆρην could be a doublet in view of the immediately following ἐπῆρην; there are a few MSS that read ἐπῆρην in lieu of ἀπῆρην and omit καὶ ἐπῆρην. Cf. also 𐤀 “*et misit Rapsacen et sustulit manum suam contra illos et extulit manum suam in Sion,*” where the repetition of *manum suam* is to be noted.

ἐμεγαλάχησεν] The *o*, לַא ‘God,’ is missing. The selected Gk verb, however, would not take κύριον, for instance, as its *o*. Gk verbs that could be used here with God as *o* are παροξύνω Nu 15.30, βλασφημέω 2Kg 19.6, 22, and ὀνειδίζω Is 37.6 [// 2Kg 19.6]. Cf. 𐤌 𐤀𐤔𐤁 𐤅𐤋 .. 𐤇𐤁𐤁.

The historical background is described in 2Kg 18.13-37.

48.19) τότε ἐσαλεύθησαν καρδίαι καὶ χεῖρες αὐτῶν,
καὶ ὠδίνησαν ὡς αἱ τίκτουσαι·

*Then their hearts and hands trembled
and felt pains like women in labour;*

... מוּגוּ בַגְּאוֹן לְבָבָם יַחֲיִלוּ כִּי־לֵדָה: (B)

ἐσαλεύθησαν [גמוגו] This is the only instance of the equation Ni. מוּגוּ / סαλεύω, whilst it occurs twice in Qal and once in Hit.

καρδίαι [לְבָבָם] The preceding בַּגְּאוֹן is rather strange, and Lévi would correct it to בִּיגוֹן ‘with the grief of.’ Smend (466) holds that neither לְבָב nor יָד suits as *s* of מוּגוּ, though he himself refers to Ez 21.20, where we read לְמַצָּן לְבָב לְמוּגָל. Besides, he changes בַּגְּאוֹן to בַּגְּבָא, which makes no difference in meaning.

ὠδίνησαν [יַחֲיִלוּ] In LXX the verb ὠδίνω is highly specialised to express physical and mental pain women in labour go through, cf. *GELS* s.v. Note Si 19.11.¹⁴

48.20) καὶ ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὸν κύριον τὸν ἐλεήμονα
ἐκπετάσαντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν.
καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ταχὺ ἐπήκουσεν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ Ἡσαίου·

¹⁴ Cf. Muraoka 2014.

*and they called upon the merciful Lord,
unfolding their hands towards Him.
And the Holy One gave a hearing to them quickly from heaven
and rescued them through Isaiah;*

ויקראו אל אל עליון ויפרשו אליו כפים: (Ba)
וישמע בקול תפלתם ויושיעם ביד ישעיהו: (Bb)

ἐπεκαλέσαντο] In S the king is still on the stage: וְפָרַס חֲזֹקָא קְדָם מְרִיא וְאִידְיָהּ 'and Hezekiah extended his hands before the Lord.' And indeed, in 2Kg 19.14f., it is Hezekiah that prayed a desperate prayer.

ἐλεήμονα] ≠ עליון 'the Most High.'

ἐν χειρὶ Ησαίου] According to 2K 19.20 Isaiah was sent as a messenger to announce to the king that God had rescued Judah. That is what ביד means.

וישיעם ביד ישעיהו] Another play on words. See above at vs. 17.

48.21) ἐπάταξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων,
καὶ ἐξέτριψεν αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ.

*He struck the camp of the Assyrians,
and His angel expelled them.*

... ..וַיַּחַדְּנוּ אֲשׁוּר וַיְהִימָם בַּמַּגְפָּה: (B)

ἐξέτριψεν] Here is the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἐκτρίβω / Qal מָהַם.

According to 2Kg 19.35 [// Is 37.36] a night attack led to 185,000 casualties in the Assyrian army.

ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ] Though in 2Kg 19.35 a messenger of God is mentioned, no such is mentioned in S here; the s of יהמם is presumably the Lord. ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ as the s of both verbs is unnatural, given its position at the end of the verse. As unnatural would be a division of labour between God and His angel. Also problematic is the fact that, according to S, the Assyrian army was attacked, but just expelled, and no casualties are mentioned.

48.22) ἐποίησεν γὰρ Εζεκίας τὸ ἀρεστὸν κυρίῳ
καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν ἐν ὁδοῖς Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
ὡς ἐνετείλατο Ησαίας ὁ προφήτης
ὁ μέγας καὶ πιστὸς ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ.

*For Hezekiah did what is pleasing to the Lord
and firmly walked along the paths of David his ancestor,
which Isaiah the prophet commanded,
one great and reliable in his vision.*

... ..וַיַּחֲזֶק בְּדַרְכֵי דָוִד וַיַּחֲקִיאוּ אֶת הַטּוֹב וַיְהִי חֲזָק בְּדַרְכֵי דָוִד: (B)

Š is as long as Š, and there are quite a few minor differences between the two. Hence Š is no mere copy of Š, but must have had a Heb. *Vorlage* comparable to its current shape of Š, which reads **מְטוֹל דְּעָבַד הוֹקְיָא דְטָב וְהֵלֵךְ בְּאֹרְחֵיהּ דְּדָוִד דְּפָקְדָהּ אֲשַׁעְיָא נְבִיא מְשַׁבְּחָא דְנְבִיא** ‘because Hezekiah did that which was good and walked along the ways of David, which Isaiah the most praiseworthy among the prophets commanded him.’

τὸ ἄρεστόν **הטו]** In vs. 16 above the same collocation, ποιέω τὸ ἄρεστόν, reflects **עָשָׂה יוֹשֵׁר**.

τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ] Cf. 2Kg 18.3 **וַיַּעַשׂ הַיֹּשֵׁר בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה דָּוִד אָבִיו**.

48.23) ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνεπόδισεν ὁ ἥλιος
καὶ προσέθηκεν ζωὴν βασιλεῖ.

*During his reign the sun moved backwards
and He prolonged the king's life.*

Vs. 23a looks like a repetition of οὐχὶ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνεποδίσθη ὁ ἥλιος 46.4, where **𐤄** reads **הלא בידו עמד השמש**. Then ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ reflects a misreading of **בִּידוֹ** as **בִּימֵי** or **בִּימֹ**, i.e. **בְּיָמֹ**. Hezekiah's miraculous recovery is told in 2Kg 20.1-11.

προσέθηκεν] The *s* is hardly ὁ ἥλιος. If **𐤄** had **ריוסר**, it could have been read as either **Hi. ריוֹרֶס** or **Ni. ריוֹרֶס**, which latter is reflected in **𐤌 יִאֲתָרְסִי** **על חַיְהִיָּה דְּמִלְכָּא**, an impersonal passive.

48.24) πνεύματι μεγάλῳ εἶδεν τὰ ἔσχατα
καὶ παρεκάλεσεν τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιῶν.

*With a firm spirit he looked at the future ahead
and comforted those grieving in Zion.*

(**B**) **ברוח גבורה חזה אחרית וינחם אבלי ציון:**

πνεύματι μεγάλῳ **רוח גבורה**] which Kister (1990.371f.) identifies as “the holy spirit” (**רוח הקודש**, the articular according to Kister) and quotes Lk 3.22, where the baptism of Jesus is described as τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον descended on Him. We would not go that far, but rather see here Solomon facing with extra courage and optimism the future that looked anything other than rosy. **𐤌** is content with **בְּרוּחָא דְרַבְתָּא**, when it could have said **בְּרוּחָא דְקוּדְשָׁא**.

πενθοῦντας **אבלי**] Both verbs often signify ‘mourn the death of someone.’ They might be referring to people foreseeing the painful loss of lives threatening to become a reality in the not too distant future. For the message, cf. Is 61.2f., where **𐤄** reads τοῖς πενθοῦσι Σιῶν without the prep. ἐν.

48.25) ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπέδειξεν τὰ ἐσόμενα
καὶ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά.

*He revealed a long-term perspective of what is to come
and the hidden things before they emerge.*

(B) עד עולם הגיד נהיות ונסתרות לפני בואן:

τὰ ἐσόμενα [נהיות] see above at 42.19.

Note a shorter **Š** version: וְכִד בְּעֵלְמָא הוּ הָזָא אֶתְוֹתָא וְנִסְיֹנָא עַד לָא נָאִתּוּן ‘and while he was still in the world he saw signs and miracles before they happen.’¹⁵ Lévi (143) holds that **Š** read עוֹד בְּעוֹלָם, which, according to him, is nonsense, since עוֹלָם cannot mean ‘world’ as in Modern Hebrew. But how about עוֹלָם מְכַל גְּדוּלַת עוֹלָם Si 3.18, which Lévi translates (6) as “Diminue-toi de toutes les grandeurs du monde,” and goes on to claim that because of this use of עוֹלָם **Ḥ** here is a translation of **Š**! Already in MH we find a case such as בְּעֵשְׂרֵה מְאָמְרוֹת נִבְרָא הָעוֹלָם ‘with ten sayings the universe was created’ mAb 5.1.¹⁶

¹⁵ אֶתְוֹתָא might be an error for אֶתְיִתָּא ‘things that could happen,’ which would then be = **Ḥ**. Though Smend (468) is hesitant, נִסְיֹנָא could be an error for כִּסְיֹתָא, i.e. כִּסְיֹתָא = **Ḥ**.

¹⁶ For more examples, see also Clines *DCH* VI 306 s.v. עוֹלָם 4.

CHAPTER 49

- 49.1) Μνημόσυνον Ἰωσίου εἰς σύνθεσιν θυμιάματος
 σκευασμένον ἔργῳ μυρεψοῦ·
 ἐν παντὶ στόματι ὡς μέλι γλυκανθήσεται
 καὶ ὡς μουσικὰ ἐν συμποσίῳ οἴνου.

*What one remembers of Josiah is what a perfumer
 skilfully manufactured by putting (various kinds of) incense;
 it would be sweet in anybody's mouth
 and like music at a wine-party.*

שם יאשיהו כקטרת סמים הממלח מעשה רוקח: (Ba)
 בחך כדבש ימתיק זכרו וכמזמור על משתה היין: (Bb)

The text in **Ⓞ** and **ⓗ** alike reminds us of וְעִשִּׂיתָ אֶתָּה קְטֹרֶת רֶקֶח מֵעֵשֶׂה רֹקֵחַ וְשִׂייתָ קֶדְשׁ מִמֶּלֶח טְהוֹר קָדְשׁ וְשִׂייתָ קֶדְשׁ מִמֶּלֶח טְהוֹר קָדְשׁ καὶ ποιήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ θυμιάμα, μυρεψικὸν ἔργον μυρεψοῦ, μεμιγμένον, καθαρὸν, ἔργον ἁγίον Ex 30.35. וְשִׂייתָ in **Ⓢ** is indicative of the translator's awareness of this source text: קְלִיט בְּסִגְיוֹתָא דְּבִסְמָנָא 'mixed in plenty of (various kinds of) incense.'

Μνημόσυνον] **ⓗ** זכרו later in the verse has been shifted up front, replacing **Ⓢ**.

εἰς **Ⓢ**] Lévi (143) sees here a corruption of ὡς, unattested in any MS. The traditional reading, however, makes sense when εἰς is taken as marking an end product.

[ימתיק] On the ingressive, not causative, force of Hifil here see above at 38.5.

- 49.2) αὐτὸς κατευθύνθη ἐν ἐπιστροφῇ λαοῦ
 καὶ ἐξῆρεν βδελύγματα ἀνομίας·

*He was led straight at the time of the people's repentance
 and disposed of abominable objects of wickedness;*

(B) כי נחל על משובתינו וישבת תועבות הבל:

αὐτὸς] Emphatic; "it is he who is famous for having acted ..".

נחל] BSH 142a parses the form as Ni. Pf. of הלל, but with a question mark. Could it mean "he felt degraded over our apostasy"? An alternative solution suggested by Segal (437), for instance, is to correct the reading to נחלה, i.e. נִחַלָּה, Ni. of חלה 'he was made sick,' an analysis not taken by our translator.

[משובתינו] This noun, ἐπιστροφή, as well as its verbal base, ἐπιστρέφω, is ambiguous. According to BDAG s.v. ἐπιστρέφω 4 it means

“to change one’s mind or course of action, for better or worse.” Heb. מְשׁוּבָה is used regularly in *sensu malo*, “apostasy,” as is clear in the equation with ἀμαρτία Je 14.7.¹ By contrast, “repentance, conversion for the better” can be expressed with תְּשׁוּבָה, unattested in BH in this sense, but in MH we find an example such as תְּשׁוּבָה וּמַעֲשִׂים טוֹבִים ‘repentance and good deeds’ mAb 4.11. Since BH does use the verb שָׁב in the sense of “to repent,” the absence of תְּשׁוּבָה is possibly a mere accident. E.g. וְשָׁבוּ אֵלַי בְּכָל-לְבָבָם וּבְכָל-נַפְשָׁם 1Kg 8.48, where we note ἐπιστρέψουσιν. If we opt for the negative sense of ἐπιστροφή here, נחל could be changed to נחלה as shown above. Its positive sense is in no doubt, however, in ἐν καιρῷ ἀμαρτημάτων δεῖξον ἐπιστροφήν Si 18.21. In that case the gen. λαοῦ can represent an objective genitive: Josiah turned the people back to the right path away from sins.

נוֹשׁוּבוֹתֵינוּ is most likely pl., rather than a case of *scriptio plena* in lieu of מְשׁוּבָתֵינוּ. Cf. רבו מְשׁוּבָתֵינוּ Je 14.7.

By saying “our,” is the author identifying himself with his ancestors?

The first half reads quite differently in S: מִן דְּאֵתְּשִׁי מִן נְסִיוֹנָא ‘he who hid himself from temptations.’²

ἐξῆγεν [ישבת] On the use of הִשְׁבִּית to indicate actions taken by Josiah, see, e.g. אֶת-הַקְּמָרִים אֲשֶׁר נָתַנוּ מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה 2K 23.5.

49.3) κατεύθυνεν πρὸς κύριον τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ,
ἐν ἡμέραις ἀνόμων κατίσχυσεν τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

*He turned his heart straight to the Lord,
in the days of lawlessness he fortified piety.*

(B ויתם אל אל לבו ובימי חמס עשה חסד:

κατεύθυνεν [יתם] This is the sole instance in LXX of this equation, κατευ-θύνω / תָּמַם, whilst εὐθύτης / תָּמִים occurs twice.

In BSH 306b יתם is parsed as Hi., though it could be Qal as in אֵיָתָם ἄμωμος ἔσομαι Ps 19.14. The collocation with לָב here is to be compared with cases such as אֶתְהַלֵּךְ בְּתֵם-לִבִּי Ps 101.2.

ἀνόμων] The gender can be masc. “lawbreakers,” but חִמְסָא, i.e. חָמָס, points to the neut. Cf. אֵלָא נְמוּסִיָא [ח] most likely ‘lawbreakers.’

εὐσέβειαν] S קוּשְׁתָא ‘the truth.’ Here is the sole case in LXX of the equation εὐσέβεια / דְּרִיָּה, whereas this Heb. word is rendered not only with words such as ἐλεημοσύνη (8×), but also with δικαιοσύνη (8×). Let it be noted דְּרִיָּה is rendered not only with words such as ἐλεήμων (3×), but also with εὐλαβής (1×).

¹ Other renderings are, according to *Index* 266b, ἀδικεῖν, ἀμαρτία, ἀποστασία, ἀποστροφή.

² It may be possible to read the first word as מִן, which followed by דְּ could mean ‘from the moment that ...’ but the conjunction וְ prefixed to the following verb and αὐτὸς in S do not support such an analysis. The Mossul ed. reads דְּ מְשׁוּל, which accords with חִבּ.

49.4) Πάρεξ Δαυιδ καὶ Εζεκιου καὶ Ιωσίου
πάντες πλημμέλειαν ἐπλημμέλησαν·
κατέλιπον γὰρ τὸν νόμον τοῦ ὑψίστου,
οἱ βασιλεῖς Ιουδα ἐξέλιπον·

*Apart from David and Hezekiah and Josiah
they all committed a sinful error;
for they abandoned the law of the Most High,
the royal line of Judaea came to an end.*

:לבד מדויד יחזקיהו ויאשיהו כלם השחיתו (Ba)
:ויעזבו תורת עליון מלכי יהודה עד תמם (Bb)

καὶ Εζεκιου καὶ Ιωσίου] On the repetition of the conjunction as against the non-repetition in \mathfrak{H} here, see at 45.8. Smend holds that, in \mathfrak{H} , there is a break after מדויד and the addition in \mathfrak{C} of καὶ is wrong. But if Hezekiah and Josiah only were the *s* of השחיתו, the use of כלם would be odd, for which one would anticipate שְׁנִיָּהּ. Besides, the author praised the two kings, not only David. On this questionable analysis by Smend, see above at 1.2.

ἐξέλιπον \mathfrak{C} here is judged by both Lévi (145) and Smend (469) as poor; instead their respective rendering reads: "jusqu'au dernier," and "bis zuletzt" (II 88). Their analysis would certainly apply to וַיִּדְבֹּר מִשָּׁה בְּאַזְנֵי Dt 31.30, but not to וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי בָם וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי בָם Je 24.10, which latter instance is applicable to our Si case here and renders support to \mathfrak{C} . Note $\xi\omega\varsigma$ ἄν ἐκλίπωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς Je 24.10.

49.5) ἔδωκαν γὰρ τὸ κέρας αὐτῶν ἑτέροις
καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἔθνει ἀλλοτρίῳ.

*For they gave their horn away to others
and their honour to an alien nation.*

:ויתן קרנם לאחור וכבודם לגוי נבל נכרי: (B)

ἔδωκαν] Is the *s* of \mathfrak{H} יתן God?

ἑτέροις] = אַחֵר, ≠ אַחֵר, which latter is most likely a scribal error.

ἔθνει ἀλλοτρίῳ [גוי נבל נכרי] In LXX נָבֵל is never rendered with ἀλλότριος but with words which have to do with ignorance: ἀπαίδευτος, ἀσύνετος, ἄφρων, or μωρός, none of which is a compliment. Both \mathfrak{S} and $\mathfrak{S}h$ have only one adjective, נֹכְרִי, 'foreign.' נֹכְרִי is rendered, apart from with ἀλλότριος, also with ἀλλογενής, ἀλλοτριώσις, ἀλλόφυλος, or ἕτερος. We suspect that our translator, conscious of the negative connotation of נָבֵל, is assigning something more than ethnic origin different from that of his community.³

³ Some years ago, when I visited London, I saw that at Heathrow Airport there were two queues for just arrived passengers, the one for British nationals and the other for "aliens," not "foreigners." I was not amused. Cf. Muraoka 2022a.69f. on τέκνα ἀλλότρια Ho 5.7.

49.6) ἐνεπύρισαν ἐκλεκτὴν πόλιν ἀγιάσματος
καὶ ἠρήμωσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς

*They set fire on a chosen city of sanctity
and made its streets deserted*

ויציתו קרית קדש וישמו ארחתיה: (B)

Here a new scene is introduced, namely the Babylonian invasion of Jerusalem. Hence the *s* of ἐνεπύρισαν and ἠρήμωσαν is no longer kings of Judaea, but impersonal, implicitly referring to the Babylonian army. On Jerusalem being burnt down, see 2Kg 25.9, where the equation between וישָׁרַף and καὶ ἐνέπρησεν is to be noted; ἐμπίμπρημι and ἐμπυρίζω are synonyms.

πόλιν ἀγιάσματος קדש קרית] so also at 36.18, a phrase unattested in BH.⁴ This Gk phrase occurs also at PSol 8.4.

ἠρήμωσαν] For Smend (470) the following ארחתיה is *s* – “und es verödeten die Strassen nach ihr.” He offers no argument for this analysis. We see no problem in the analysis represented in \mathfrak{C} .⁵

49.7) ἐν χειρὶ Ἰερεμίου·⁷ ἐκάκωσαν γὰρ αὐτόν,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν μήτρᾳ ἡγιάσθη προφήτης
ἐκριζοῦν καὶ κακοῦν καὶ ἀπολλύειν,
ὡσαύτως οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν.

*by the hand of Jeremiah. For they tortured him,
but he was, when still in (his mother's) womb, was sanctified as prophet
to uproot and to harm and to destroy,
likewise to build and to plant.*

והוא מרחם נוצר נביא: ביד ירמיהו כי ענוהו (Ba)
לנתוש ולנתוץ ולהאביד להרס וכן לבנת לנטע ולהשיב: (Bb)

\mathfrak{S} is characterised by its utmost brevity: \mathfrak{S} דְּהָוָא מִן כְּרֶסָא דְאִמָּהּ נְבִיָא ‘who was since (his being in) the womb of his mother was prophet.’

ἐν χειρὶ Ἰερεμίου] Extremely difficult. Is this what some antagonists of him thought as if he was cooperating with their enemies? ביד may have corrupted from בימי as in \mathfrak{S} בְּיָמֵי אֲרָמָיָא ‘in the days of Jeremiah.’

ἐκάκωσαν] On the torturing of Jeremiah, see Je 20.2, 37.15f., 38.6.

γὰρ כִּי] Fassberg (1997.62) wonders whether כִּי can be equivalent to a relative pronoun. Is he aware of a case of כִּי as an unquestionably relative pronoun?⁶

⁴ Pace Mopsik (310) what we find in Is 48.2, 52.1, Ne 11.1, 18 is not קרית קדש, but עיר שְׁקֵדָה, and in \mathfrak{C} we find there basically πόλις ἁγία except at Ne 11.18, where we find nothing that would reflect this Heb. phrase.

⁵ Segal (436) vocalises our form as ישָׁמוּ, parsing it as Ni., which, according to him (438), holds for \mathfrak{C} . However, this verb in Ni. is not transitive, as shown in נשְׁמוּ דְרַבְכִּיָּם ἐρημωθή-σονται αἱ ὁδοὶ ὑμῶν Lv 26.22, sim. Is 33.8.

⁶ Alternatively, Kaddari (1997.89) analyses כִּי as a temporal conjunction.

καὶ αὐτὸς **והוא**] That the mission he had been entrusted with from above was disregarded is emphasised.

הַגִּיאִסְתִּי] ≠ **וַיִּצְרַח** ‘was created.’ This is an obvious allusion to **בְּטָרְם** **אֶצְוֶרְךָ** [אֶצְרְךָ] **בְּכֶטֶן יִדְעֶתִיךָ וּבְטָרְם תִּצְאָ מִרְחֶם הַקֶּדֶשׁ שְׂתִיךָ נָבִיא לְגוֹיִם נִתְתִּיךָ** **Πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλία ἐπίσταμαί σε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξέλθειν ἐκ μήτρας ἡγίακά σε, προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη τέθεικά σε** Je 1.5.

In 7c and 7d we see a clear allusion to God’s message to Jeremiah at the start of his mission as found in Je 1.10. The nature of his mission is repeated later in 31(LXX 38).²⁸ in different circumstances. The wording differs slightly between the two passages.⁷

	Ⓜ	Ⓞ
Si 49.7	לְנַתּוֹשׁ וּלְנַתּוֹץ וּלְהַאבִּיד לְהַרְסֵם וְכֵן לְבַנֵּת לְנַטַע וּלְהַשִּׁיב: 4 + 3	ἐκρίζουσαν καὶ κακοῦσαν καὶ ἀπολλύειν, ὡσαύτως οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν 3 + 2
Je 1.10	לְנַתּוֹשׁ וּלְנַתּוֹץ וּלְהַאבִּיד וּלְהַרְסֵם לְבָנוֹת וּלְנַטוּעַ 4 + 2	ἐκρίζουσαν καὶ κατασκάπτειν καὶ ἀπολλύειν καὶ ἀνοικοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν 3 + 2
Je 31.28	לְנַתּוֹשׁ וּלְנַתּוֹץ וּלְהַרְסֵם וּלְהַאבִּיד וּלְהַרְעַ כֵּן אֶשְׁקֵד עֲלֵיהֶם לְבָנוֹת וּלְנַטוּעַ 5 + 2	καθαίρειν καὶ κακοῦσαν, οὕτως γρηγορήσω ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν 2 + 2

Even if our author knew precisely how his source text ran, it is not to be taken for granted that he would cite it verbatim, as it is clear in the mere statistics. We note that the number of infinitives in **Ⓞ** is smaller in every passage. Furthermore, the selected verbs and their sequence differ among the three passages.

Does a glance at the above table help us establish equations between the Gk and Heb. infinitives in Si 49.7? Since the second half of the verse has only few problems in all the three passages, let’s concentrate on the first half. Almost incontrovertible are ἐκρίζουσαν / לְנַתּוֹשׁ and ἀπολλύειν / לְהַאבִּיד. Ἀπόλλυμι / לְהַרְסֵם does not occur anywhere in LXX. The lack of the conjunction **ו** and the the scriptio defectiva in comparison with the preceding three infinitives cast some doubt on the authenticity of the reading. Instead we suggest **Hi**. הַרְעַ, hence לְהַרְעַ in our case. Note **וּלְהַאבִּיד וּלְהַרְעַ** Je 31.28. Except our Si case, the Gk verb **κακόω** is not used with Jeremiah as a victim.

לְהַשִּׁיב is a plus in Si 49.7. Though it is not present in either Je passage, we presume that in terms of the message it belongs to Je 31, which carries a message of the restoration of Jerusalem and the nation. We would note in

⁷ In (x + y), the first figure indicates the number of infinitives in the first half, and the second that in the second half.

particular הַשִּׁיבֵנִי וְאֶשׁוּבָהּ 31.38 and הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְנִבְנְתָהּ הָעִיר לִיהוָה 31.18, where Ephraim is pleading with God by using the verb שָׁב Qal and Hi.

49.8) Ἰεζεκιηλ ὃς εἶδεν ὄρασιν δόξης,
ἣν ὑπέδειξεν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ ἄρματος χερουβιν·

*Ezekiel, who saw a vision of glory,
which He showed to him, being on a chariot of cherubs;*

(B) יחזקאל ראה מראה ויגד זני מרכבה:

The author is alluding to Ez 1 and 10.

δόξης] On this addition, cf. מְרִאָה דְּמִוֹת כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה אֲטַתְּ הִי ὄρασις ὁμοιώμα-
τος δόξης κυρίου Ez 1.28.

ἄρματος [מרכבה] This Heb. word, מְרִכְבָּה, a key word in later Jewish mysticism, is not yet used in Ez, but does occur in הַמְרִכְבָּה הַכְּרָבִים τοῦ ἄρματος τῶν χερουβιν 1Ch 28.18 together with a word for “cherubs.” כְּרָב appears in Ez 10, but not in Ez 1.

In vs. 8b Ⓞ not only departs from Ⓜ, but is also syntactically insecure if the position of the vision is to be indicated.

In Ⓢ God plays no part: וַיִּזְכֹּר יְהוָה אֶת־מְרִכְבֹּתָא וְהוּא הוּזָא ‘and Ezekiel showed a kind of chariot and saw a vision.’ As against the pl. Ⓜ זני Ⓢ uses the sg. In ed. Lagarde there is no *seyame*, a marker of the pl.⁸ In Ez 1 no chariot is mentioned, but very many wheels are moving round.

49.9) καὶ γὰρ ἐμνήσθη τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐν ὄμβρῳ
καὶ ἀγαθῶσαι τοὺς εὐθύνοντας ὁδούς.

*For He also remembered (his) enemies (coming) in a typhoon
and (the duty) to be kind to those who keep their paths straight.*

(B) וגם הזכיר את איוב נִיֵּא המכלכל כל ד.. Ⓢ דק:

ἐμνήσθη [הזכיר] a very odd equation. The *s* of הזכיר also is most likely God. In Ez 14.14, 20 Job along with Noah and Daniel are singled out as three model righteous men. איוב was mistaken for איב, i.e. אֵיב, or אויב, i.e. אֹיִב ‘enemy.’ This error adds to the difficulty of seeing what the text is supposed to mean. The use of the nota obiecti before an indeterminate noun is unnatural. That is not to speak of the use of the sg.

⁸ Both Smend (471) and Segal (438) mention the pl. form, but in ed. Lagarde no such v.l. is mentioned.

The title of “prophet” for Job is unusual.⁹

τοὺς εὐθύνοντας ὁδοῦς] The same collocation appears in 2.6.

ἀγαθῶσαι] This inf. is equivalent to a direct object.¹⁰ Moreover, this Gk verb scarcely reflects כָּלַל. Cf. שָׁן תָּרַץ ‘He set right.’

How ש arrived at his rendering is beyond us: אָמַר דְּכָלֵּהוּן ‘and also on Job He said that all His ways were righteousness.’

49.10) καὶ τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν τὰ ὀστᾶ
ἀναθάλοι ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν·
παρεκάλεσαν γὰρ τὸν Ἰακωβ
καὶ ἐλυτρώσαντο αὐτοὺς ἐν πίστει ἐλπίδος.

*Also the bones of the twelve prophets,
may they flourish out of their places.
For they comforted Jacob
and rescued them with faith of hope.*

:¹¹ תהי עצמתם פֿרֿהתתם¹¹ וגם שנים עשר הנביאים (Ba
:... .. וישׁוּהוּ בַּ... (Bb

τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν] Let it be noted that the twelve prophets are treated as one group and follow Ezekiel.¹² תהי שנים עשר הנביאים is in casus pendens, resumed through the suf. pron. of עצמתם. The extraposition is appropriate for the introduction of the new subjects.

תהי עצמתם] an instance of number discord. No sg. form עֲצַמְתָּם is known to Hebrew. Hence pl. עֲצַמְתָּם must be meant.

The optative ἀναθάλοι expresses a wish, reflecting the modal Impf. תהי, whereas the periphrastic construction in שִׁמְרֵהוּן .. מְזַהְרֵהוּן underlines, in addition, the continuation of the process.¹³

ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν תהתם] see above at 48.13.

παρεκάλεσαν] = נחמו, i.e. נְחַמְוּ, ≠ הִחְלִימוּ ‘they cured, restored health.’ But cf. תְּחַלְּמֵנִי וְהַחְיֵנִי παρακληθεὶς ἔζησα Is 38.16.¹⁴ Many Gk MSS read the sg. with God as the s (?). So בִּיאָא שָׁן.¹⁵

⁹ According to Smend (471) Josephus counts Job among prophets in his *Contra Apionem* 1.8, though we have failed to locate this information.

¹⁰ For more examples with μιμησκόμαι, see *GELS* s.v. **1 f**, and for a syntactic analysis, *SSG* § 30 **bef** and 69 **b**.

¹¹ Abegg restores תהתם.

¹² Box - Oesterley, ad loc., holds that the Minor Prophets were treated as a single book, but Ben Sira is not concerned with their literary product.

¹³ On the substitution of the Impf. through the syntagm <נְהַיָּא - Ptc.>, see Muraoka 2005 § 89.

¹⁴ *Pace Lévi* (148) our translator, precisely through his choice of παρακαλέω here, appears to be familiar with Is 38.16.

¹⁵ For the irregular repetition of the letter *alaf*, cf. Nöldeke 1966 § 35.

- 49.11) Πῶς μεγαλύνωμεν τὸν Ζοροβαβελ;
καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς σφραγὶς ἐπὶ δεξιᾶς χειρὸς,

*How could we measure the greatness of Zerubbabel?
He also (was) like a signet-ring on (the Lord's) right hand.*

... ל. א.. ... מֵהַ נִגְדַל (B)

[Ζοροβαβελ] After the return from the Babylonian exile, along with Joshua and Nehemiah mentioned below, Zerubbabel played a major role in the reconstruction of Jerusalem, which laid in ruins (Ezr 3.2-13).

Cf. חֲזַקְיָהּ בְּחֻמֵּי הַיְיָ Hg 2.23, where God is speaking about Zerubbabel and יְמִינִי עַל־יַד יְמִינִי Je 22.24 on Coniah.

- 49.12) οὕτως Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ἰωσεδεκ,
οἱ ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ᾠκοδόμησαν οἶκον
καὶ ἀνύψωσαν ναὸν ἅγιον κυρίῳ
ἡτοιμασμένον εἰς δόξαν αἰῶνος.

*Likewise Joshua son of Jehozadak,
who in their life-time rebuilt the house
and raised a holy temple to the Lord,
constructed for eternal glory.*

(B) וירימו היכל קדש המכונן לכבוד עולם:

Ⲙ for vs. 12a-b is missing. Ⲛ has preserved the text as *ⲛⲁⲩⲟⲩⲥ ⲃⲣ ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲕ* 'and Joshua son of Jehozadak also, in spite of their poverty, set up an altar.' The extent of dissimilarity with Ⲙ suggests the Syr. translator probably had a Heb. *Vorlage*.

ναὸν] Many sources, including Ⲛⲓ, read *λαον*, an inferior reading, since ἀνυψώω is not known to take a person as *o*.

- 49.13) καὶ Νεεμίου ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ μνημόσυνον
τοῦ ἐγείραντος ἡμῖν τείχη πεπτωκότα
καὶ στήσαντος πύλας καὶ μοχλοὺς
καὶ ἀνεγείραντος τὰ οἰκόπεδα ἡμῶν.

*Also the memory of Nehemiah (will remain) a long time
as one who raised for us the fallen walls
and constructed gates and bolts
and rebuilt our houses.*

(Ba) נחמיה יאדר זכרו המקים את חרבתינו:
(Bb) וירפא את הריסתינו ויצב דלתים ובריה:

[Νεεμίου] in casus pendens, referred back through the suf. pron. in זכרו.

ἐπὶ πολὺ] The sense of the prep. ἐπί + acc. is defined as “up to, as far as, to the extent of” (*GELS* s.v. III 10). In ἐπὶ πλεῖον ‘over a long period of time’ Si prol. 7 and Ju 13.1 we find a very similar use. The collocation נִאָדָר וְכָר is highly innovative.¹⁶

τοῦ ἐγείραντος [המקים] On the preterite value to be attached to a determinate ptc., see above at 6.14. It is appropriately followed by two *way-yiqtol*'s. This applies to the two following Aorist participles.

Vs. 13c and 13d in Ⓞ represents a reversal of what we find in Ⓢ.

ἀνεγείραντος [ירפא] The Heb. verb רָפָא and רָפָא can mean “to repair, restore,” not only “to heal (medically).” E.g. יִרְפָּא אֶת־מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה הַקְּרוּס הַהוּם 1Kg 18.30.

Why Ezra is not mentioned in this eulogy is, according to Segal (439), is not that the author was hostile to his work and achievements, but that in the early second cent. BCE his reputation had not reached the height he would gain in later Rabbinic Judaism. In that earlier period the book of Ezra was attached to that of Nehemiah. Although in the traditional Hebrew Bible Ezra is placed ahead of Nehemiah, Segal points out that the latter has its authorship mentioned at the beginning,¹⁷ while the former lacks such. Cf. also Kister 1990.374.

49.14) Οὐδεὶς ἐκτίσθη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοιοῦτος οἶος Ἐνωχ·
καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήμφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

*None to equal Enoch has been created on the earth
for he was also taken up from the earth.*

(B מעט נוצר¹⁸ על הארץ כהניך וגם הוא נלקח פנים:

οἶος Ἐνωχ] Ⓢ כהניך ‘your priests’ makes no sense here and must be an error for כהנוך.

נלקח] on the use of this verb, see above at 48.9 on Elijah’s ascent.

פנים] a crux interpretum.

καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς] just as Elijah (48.12 above).

49.15) οὐδὲ ὡς Ἰωσηφ ἐγεννήθη ἀνὴρ
ἡγούμενος ἀδελφῶν, στήριγμα λαοῦ,
καὶ τὰ ὀσῶα αὐτοῦ ἐπεσκεπήσαν.

¹⁶ Lévi’s (205) “.. soit exaltée sa mémoire” looks to us questionable.

¹⁷ דְּבָרֵי נְחֵמְיָה בֶּן־חַכְלִיָּה.

¹⁸ BSH reads נוצר, but in the facsimile we see no space for an extra letter; the restoration has presumably been influenced by the following כהניך, which is itself a scribal error, and possibly also by אֶתְבָּרִי ‘were created,’ where the pl. concurs with the preceding זְעִירִין ‘few people.’

*Nor was a man like Joseph born,
a leader of brothers, a support of his people,
and his bones were taken care of.*

(B) כיוסף אם נולד גבר וגם גייתו נפקדה:

οὐδέ] with reference to what was said about Enoch in the preceding verse.

אם] an interrogative particle, sometimes in a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer as here, and it does not have to be clause-initial. E.g. מִנְּךָ נִמְנָה אִם-יִרְאָה וְרִמָּה Jdg 5.8.¹⁹

Vs. 15b represents 50.1a said on Simon in מ.

τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ גייתו] מ means ‘his corpse.’ So פ.נרה. The translator appears to be conscious of Joseph’s request to his brothers וְהֵעֲלִתֶם אֶת-עֲצָמֹתַי הַזֶּה Gn 50.25, where τὰ ὀστᾶ μου in ט is to be noted.

Pace Kister (1999.180) the verb נפקדה itself does not mean “to die,” for there is no reason for highlighting the death of Joseph’s body. Hence his translation of vs. 16a as “Shem, Seth, and Enoch were visited (by death)” is questionable.

49.16) Σημ καὶ Σηθ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐδοξάσθησαν,
καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ζῶον ἐν τῇ κτίσει Ἀδάμ.

*Shem and Seth were praised among human beings,
but Adam excels every created, living being.*

(B) ושם ושת ואנוש נפקדו ועל כל חי תפארת אדם:

ἐν ἀνθρώποις] = באנוש, i.e. באנוש, not ואנוש ‘and Enosh [= a son of Seth].’
ἐδοξάσθησαν] = נכבדו, i.e. נכבדו, not נפקדו ‘were looked after.’²⁰
ἐν τῇ κτίσει] ≠ תפארת ‘the excellence [of Adam].’²¹

Ἀδάμ] the very first human being, though also the first who committed the original sin, the disaster for all his subsequent descendants.²² Lévi argues that אדם here means ‘humanity’: “*Eux qui étaient au dessus de tout vivant, la gloire de l’humanité.*” But the Bible tells hardly anything praiseworthy that Shem, Seth, and Enosh did.

¹⁹ מ mistook the word for אָם: וְאָמָא אִיךָ יוֹסֵף לֹא יָלְדָת: ‘and a mother did not bear one like Joseph.’ And yet it got the general sense right, for on Enoch it said “only few comparable to Enoch were born,” so Smend (475): “Wenige wie Henoch, keiner wie Joseph.”

²⁰ We fail to see how Mopsik (2003.313) could justify his translation “Glorieux aussi furent.” Sim. Lévi (205): “furent l’objet d’une distinction.”

²¹ On תפארת as applied to Adam, cf. Aitken 1999.5-10.

²² One would like to know how Kister with his translation, “(above) every creature possessing human form” (1999.180), would analyse the syntactic structure of the sequence consisting of three words, חֵי תפארת אדם. This is apart from “form” as a rendering of תפארת.

CHAPTER 50

50.1) Σιμων Ονίου υἱὸς ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας,
 ὃς ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ ὑπέρραψεν οἶκον
 καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐστερέωσεν ναόν·

*Simon, son of Onias, the high priest,
 who, in his life-time, patched the temple
 and during his term of office fortified the sanctuary;*

גדול אחיו ותפארת עמו שמעון בן יוחנן הכהן (Ba)
 אשר בדורו נפקד הבית ובימיו חזק היכל: (Bb)

In **Ⲑ** the verse starts with an addition: “the greatest among his colleagues and the glory of his people.” Though אַחיו appears to be parallel to עמו, it is not certain that the former means ‘his coreligionists,’ what appears to apply to **ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲗ** **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** **ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲗ** Lv 21.10 mentioned by Smend (478).

Almost all of this long chapter is devoted to this high priest. We note that the pretty detailed description of him is so vivid that it is most likely due to what the author personally witnessed. Hence the two were contemporaries,¹ which goes against identifying this Simon with Simon I (290-275[?] in office). He was rather Simon II (220-198[?]).

Ονίου] a Grecised spelling in lieu of *Ἰωαναν*, e.g. 2Kg 25.23. Josephus also uses the form *Ὀνίας* *Ant.* 12.2 § 5. **Ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲓⲁ** must be a scribal error. Cf. **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** **ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲗ** **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** > **Ⲛⲉⲛⲛⲓⲁ** **ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲗ** 2Kg 25.23. Cf. a discussion in Smend 478f.

ὁ μέγας] This is one of a number of cases in SG, known also to CG, of the construction < a noun phrase - definite article - adjective >. This is synonymous with ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** **ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲗ** Nu 35.25, so ib. 28, Hg 1.1, Zc 3.8. Cf. *SSG* § 37 **bbc**.

ὑπέρραψεν .. ἐστερέωσεν **ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛ** .. **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ**] The voice is reversed: **Ⲑ** passive² > **Ⲑ** active. The selection³ of the active voice highlights the importance of Simon with greater force. We propose to read **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** instead of **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ**.⁴ Note the combination of **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** with **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** in **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ** 2Ch 34.10.

On this work supported by Antiochus, see Josephus *Ant.* 12.2 § 3.

50.2) καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐθεμελιώθη ὕψος αὐλῆς,
 ἀνάλημμα ὑψηλὸν περιβόλου ἱεροῦ·

¹ As justly concluded by Smend (479) on the basis of **Ⲑ** ἐν ζωῇ αὐτοῦ.

² Reading **ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛ** as **ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛ**.

³ *Pace Lévi* (206), not a mistake on the part of the translator, but deliberate selection.

⁴ So proposed in *Index* 122b independently of Schechter and Taylor 1899.63.

*and by him was solidly built a high-rising inner court,
a high retaining wall of a sacred enclosure;*

(B) אשר בימיו נבנה קיר פנות מעון בהיכל מלך:

ὕψος ἀλλῆς] \mathfrak{H} just says “a wall.”

ἀλλῆς] follows Smend’s correction of διπλῆς ‘double’ (480), which is read by most Gk MSS.

In vs. 2b \mathfrak{G} departs quite a bit from \mathfrak{H} ‘the corners of a residence in the royal court.’ Much more so is \mathfrak{S} וְאַתְּבִינֵת הַחֹרֶתָא ‘and a fence was built.’

50.3) ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐλατομήθη ἀποδοχεῖον ὑδάτων,
λάκκος ὥσει θαλάσσης τὸ περίμετρον·
*in his days a water reservoir was dug,
a cistern as broad as the sea;*

(B) אשר בדורו נכרה מקוה אשיח כם בהמונו:

ἀποδοχεῖον ὑδάτων] The same Gk phrase occurs in 39.17, where no Heb. text has been preserved.

ὥσει θαλάσσης] = כים, i.e. כַּיִם. \mathfrak{H} כם ‘in them’ makes little sense.

λάκκος אשיח] \mathfrak{H} had better be corrected to אשוח as found in the Moabite Mesha inscription (line 23) or, according to Segal (443), שיח, i.e. שִׁיחַ ‘trench’ mBK 5.5.

τὸ περίμετρον] ≠ \mathfrak{H} בהמונו ‘with its roar.’

Here again \mathfrak{S} is very brief: וְחָפַר מְבוּעָא ‘and he dug a water source.’

50.4) ὁ φροντίζων τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πτώσεως
καὶ ἐνισχύσας πόλιν ἐν πολιορκήσει.
*one who pondered how to save his people from perdition
and fortified (his) city with a fortress.*

(B) הדואג לעמו מחתת ומחזק עירו מצר:

φροντίζω .. ἐνισχύσας] Both determinate participles refer to past events, on which see above at 6.14. The shift in aspect from the Pres. to the Aor. is perhaps because the security of his people was constantly on his mind, whereas the construction of a fortress was one of the steps he decided on. Note the comparable shift from the Ptc. to the Pf. in \mathfrak{S} : הוּ דִּינְצָךְ .. הוּ דִּינְלִי ‘one who was concerned .. and fortified.’

πτώσεως] The root חתח occurs at 35.21, which does not help us account for the equation here. \mathfrak{H} here means either ‘from being snatched away’ (חַתָּךְ) or ‘from one who snatches’ (חַתָּח), in either case with Simon’s people as victims.

ἐν πολιορκήσῃ] = במצר, i.e. בַּמְצָר, ≠ מצר. ~~ו~~ here could mean ‘from an enemy’ (מִצָּר). Cf. **ו** וְפָצָה לְעַמּוּהָ מִן סָנְאָא ‘and he rescued his people from enemies.’

50.5) ὡς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν περιστροφῇ ναοῦ,
ἐν ἐξόδῳ οἴκου καταπετάσματος·

*How glorious was he, as he turned round out of the sanctuary,
coming out of the temple, concealed with a veil!*

(B) מה נהדר בהשניחו מאהל ובצאתו מבית הפרכת:

περιστροφῇ] scarcely reflecting הַשְּׁנִיחַ ‘to gaze.’ Schechter - Taylor (1899.64) suggested בְּגִיחַ or בְּהִגֵּיחַ ‘to exit.’ Alternatively בְּגִיחַ. This becomes parallel to בְּצֵאתוֹ that follows.⁵

At 46.2 in a similar context, instead of < ἐν + a verbal noun >, we see < ἐν τῷ + inf. >: ἐν τῷ ἐπᾶραι χειρᾶς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκτεῖναι ῥομφαίαν. ναοῦ] Ziegler follows MS 603 against the majority reading, λαοῦ. Note also **ו** מִן הַיְכָלָא ‘out of the temple.’ The gen. case appears to be ablative⁶ in value just as the following οἴκου.

50.6) ὡς ἀστὴρ ἑωθινὸς ἐν μέσῳ νεφέλης,
ὡς σελήνη πλήρης ἐν ἡμέραις ἑορτῆς,

*Like a star at daybreak in the midst of clouds,
like a full moon on feast-days,*

(B) ככוכב אור מבין עבים וכירח מלא מבין בימי מועד:

ἑωθινὸς [אור] Lévi (208) regards אור to be a verb [a ptc.],⁷ hence “l’étoile qui brille,” which is possible, but it can be a substantive as in כְּלִכּוֹכְבֵי אור Ps 148.3. We find an example of a ptc. in פְּנִים אורִים ‘a shining face’ 13.26.

ἑορτῆς [מועד] added by Smend (482) and followed by Ziegler. Just ἐν ἡμέραις makes no sense at all. The passover may be meant here. Cf. **ו** בְּיָמֵי נִסָּן ‘on the days of Nisan.’ But the feast of tabernacles takes place under the full moon.

מבין²] an inadvertent dittography.

50.7) ὡς ἥλιος ἐκλάμπων ἐπὶ ναὸν ὑψίστου
καὶ ὡς τόξον φωτίζον ἐν νεφέλαις δόξης,

⁵ Cf. a discussion by Wagner 1999.268f.

⁶ Cf. SSG § 22 q.

⁷ Likewise Smend (482), whose translation (II 90), however, reads “wie der Morgenstern.”

*Like the sun shining on the sanctuary of the Most High
and like a rainbow casting light in glorious clouds,*

(B) וכשמש משרקת אל היכל המלך וכקשת נראתה בענן:

[ἐκλάμπων] This rare Hi. verb הִשְׁרִיק ‘to shine brightly’ meets us also in 43.9M // B הִזְהִיר. One is reminded of a common Arb. *šaraqā* ‘to rise (of the sun).’⁸

τόξον [כקשת בענן] an allusion to Gn 9.13, 14, 16. See esp. וְנִרְאָתָה הַקֶּשֶׁת בְּעָנָן Gn 9.14.

φωτίζον] could reflect נֹאֲרָת, i.e. נִאֲרָת ‘shining’ < √אור, but נִרְאָתָה may have been meant as נִרְאָתָה ‘appeared’ in an asyndetic relative clause: “like a rainbow that appeared in clouds.” S lacks a verb: וְאִיךָ קֶשֶׁתָא בְּעָנָא ‘and like a rainbow in clouds.’ The equation φωτίζω / נֹאֲרָ occurs twice more: Ps 75(76).4 and Jb 33.30A.

50.8) ὡς ἄνθος ῥόδων ἐν ἡμέραις νέων,
ὡς κρίνα ἐπ’ ἐξόδῳ ὕδατος,
ὡς βλαστὸς Λιβάνου ἐν ἡμέραις θέρους,

*Like a flower of rose in the season of new fruits,
like white lilies where water gushes out,
like a bud of Lebanon in summer days,*

(Ba) כּוּנְצַפְעַנְפִי בִּימֵי מוֹעֵד וכשושן על יבלי מים:
(Bb) כּפֶרַח לְבָנוֹן בִּימֵי קִיץ

ἀνθος [נצפפענפי Lévi (209) proposes reading this impossible sequence as נִצְפִּי בְּעָנָא and adding ם at the end. But see our fn. below. Smend’s (II 58) proposal is נִצְפִּי עֲנָפִים.

נέων] ≠ מוֹעֵד ‘feast.’ See the same Gk collocation in 24.25, where no S has been preserved.

ἐξόδῳ [יבלי] the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἐξοδος / יבֵל. The same Heb. collocation יבֵלִי מִים is attested also in Is 30.25, 44.4.

βλαστὸς Λιβάνου [פרח לבנון] The Heb. collocation פֶּרַח לְבָנוֹן occurs in Na 1.4, where, however, the flower is said to be אֲמָלֵל ‘depressed.’

50.9) ὡς πῦρ καὶ λίβανος ἐπὶ πυρείου,
ὡς σκεῦος χρυσίου ὀλοσφύρητον
κεκοσμημένον παντὶ λίθῳ πολυτελεῖ,

*Like fire and frankincense on a censer,
like a well-beaten golden tool
decorated with every kind of expensive stone,*

⁸ Note some remarks made by a distinguished Arabist in Nöldeke 1900.86. To theorise a translation from an Arabic version and a comparative Semitic perspective are two separate issues.

⁹ Abegg reads כּוּנְצַבְעַנְפִי. In the facsimile the fourth letter looks like *peh*.

(Ba) וכאש לבונה על המנחה:
(Bb) ככלי זהב תבנית אטיל הנאחו על אבני חפץ:

[πυρείου] which is not the same as מנחה. In כָּל־הַלְבֹנָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמִּנְחָה Lv 6.8 nothing is said about censer. Smend (483) proposes מחתה, i.e. מִחְמָה ‘censer.’

δλοσφύρητον] אטיל is so far unknown in Hebrew.

κεκοσμημένον נאחו] The vb. κοσμέω has little to do with אָחָז. אטיל possibly means “the tool .. held over precious stones.”

Cf. אֵיךְ רִיחָא דְלְבוֹנָתָא עַל פִּירְמָא וְאֵיךְ עָקָא דְדִהָבָא דְמַפְתַּךְ שְׁפִיר וּמְצַבַּת ס. בְּכַאפָא טְבִתָּא ‘and like smell of frankincense on a censer and like a golden necklace well-mixed and decorated with good-quality stones.’

50.10) ὡς ἔλαία ἀναθάλλουσα καρπὸς
καὶ ὡς κυπάρισσος ὑψουμένη ἐν νεφέλαις.
*Like an olive tree heavily laden with fruits
and like a cypress rising up to clouds.*

(B) כזית רענן מלא גרגר וכעץ שמן מרוה ענף:

καρπὸς גרגר] This BH hapax is applied to olive tree in Is 17.6. ס displays a different perspective: וַיִּתָּא הַדִּירָא דְרִוּרְבֵן סִכּוּהָ ‘like a splendid olive tree the branches of which are many.’

ὑψουμένη ἐν νεφέλαις] = במרום ענן, i.e. בְּמְרוֹם עָנָן? Cf. אֵיךְ אֵילָנָא ס. דְּמִשְׁחָא דְמַסְבַּע בְּעוֹפְוָה ‘and like a fat tree which is sated with its branches.’

50.11) ἐν τῷ ἀναλαμβάνειν αὐτὸν στολήν δόξης
καὶ ἐνδιδύσκεσθαι αὐτὸν συντέλειαν καυχήματος,
ἐν ἀναβάσει θυσιαστηρίου ἁγίου
ἐδόξασεν περιβολὴν ἁγιάσματος.
*As he put on the splendid uniform
and clothed himself to merit the highest pride,
climbing to the sacred altar
he glorified the sacred precinct.*

(Ba) בעטותו בגדי כבוד והתלבשו בגדי תפארת:
(Bb) בעלותו על מזבח הוד ויהדר עזרת מקדש:

[התלבשו] the first attestation of Hitp. הִתְלַבֵּשׁ. Its use as a transitive verb occurs in מְשִׁיתֵלְבֵשׁ בְּגָדֵי אוֹמְנָתוֹ ‘he who puts on his professional clothes’ pShab 7a 1. Cf. וַיִּתְפָּשֵׁט יְהוֹנָתָן אֶת־הַמְּעִיל 1Sm 18.4.

συντέλειαν καυχήματος] This Gk collocation is used in a similar context at 45.8 to render תפארת כליל. Hence one may presuppose here also תפארת כליל in lieu of בגדי תפארת. ס, however, reflects אטיל: .. מֵאֲנָא דְקוּדְשָׁא .. מֵאֲנָא דְאִיקְרָא ‘robes of holiness .. robes of glory.’

ἀναβάσει [בעלותו] Parallel to the preceding two infinitives the translator could have written καὶ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτόν. By opting not to do so the climbing becomes an adverbial modifier of the following clause, when in **ח** the three infinitives are conceived as indicating three actions which lead to the result of highlighting the beauty of the outer court.¹⁰ This thought is also syntactically expressed with the three infinitives concluded with a *way-yiqtol* form,¹¹ ויהדר. The translator's analysis may have been partly induced by the absence of the conjunction ׀ with the third inf., which is confirmed by **ס**. In this regard **ש** follows **ע** by selecting a periphrastic ptc. for the first two infinitives, but a verbal noun for the last: .. וְלָבַשׁ הָיָא .. כַּד מְתַעֲטֵף הָיָא .. שְׁבַח בְּמַסְקָנָא 'when he would put on .. and wear .. through his ascent .., he extolled ..'.

περιβολὴν [עזרת] The sense “enclosed space, precinct” of περιβολή is known to CG,¹² which escaped us. Hence *GELS* lists our example here s.v. **1** “garment of good quality,” so **ש** מְרֻטָּא ‘cloak’ and **ח** *sanctitatis amictum*.

50.12) ἐν δὲ τῷ δέχεσθαι μέλη ἐκ χειρῶν ἱερέων,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὼς παρ’ ἐσχάρα βωμοῦ,
κυκλόθεν αὐτοῦ στέφανος ἀδελφῶν
ὡς βλάστημα κέδρων ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ
καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν αὐτὸν ὡς στελέχη φοινίκων,

*As he was receiving limbs from the hands of priests,
and he himself standing by the grid of the altar,
with colleagues around him in a circle,
like a young cedar in Lebanon,
and they surrounded him like trunks of date-palms.*

בַּקְבֵּלוֹ נִתְחַיִּים מִיַּד אַחֵיו וְהוּא נֹצֵב עַל מַעְרְכוֹת: (Ba)
סָבִיב לוֹ עֲטָרַת בָּנִים כְּשֵׁתִילֵי אַרְוִים בַּלְבָּנוֹן: (Bb)
וְיִקְיֹפוּהוּ כְּעֵרְבֵי נַחַל (Bc)

δὲ] In contrast to the preceding verse here begins a description of Simon in relation to his junior colleagues.

ἱερέων [אַחֵיו] Priests are called brothers, or brethren, on one hand, and sons (Bb בָּנִים) on the other. Their senior is for them equal to “father,” just as a Catholic priest is called *padre*. בָּנִים might be an allusion to כְּשֵׁתִילֵי אַרְוִים בַּלְבָּנוֹן.

¹⁰ The juxtaposition here between the two infinitives and the substantive illustrates the substantival character of the former. For more examples, see *SSG* § 30 aa.

¹¹ Smend (484) treats ויהדר and והתלבשו in the same manner, which is questionable, since the former, a pf., is coordinate with the preceding בעטתו, which does not apply to the relationship between בעלותו and ויהדר. Van Peursen's (2004.342) treatment accords with ours.

¹² So LSJ s.v. **II**.

לְשִׁלְחָנָהּ סְבִיב זִיתִים Ps 128.3. Segal (445) takes בָּנִים here in its literal sense, “sons.” Josephus (*Antiq.* 12.5 §1) says that Simon had three sons, who would hardly make a garland around their father. Just as הָאָא does not always mean “sibling,” בֶּן can also refer to “a member of a guild, order, or class” (BDB s.v. 7) as in בְּנֵי הַגְּדוּר 2Ch 25.13 or בְּנֵי הַגּוֹלָה Ezr 4.1. In the next verse בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן cannot mean anything other than “Aaron’s descendants.”

μῆλη [נתחים] ‘sliced limbs of sacrificial animals.’ Cf. הָדָמָא דְבָסְרָא ‘limbs of flesh.’

αὐτὸς ἐστὼς] a circumstantial clause. Otherwise one would anticipate καὶ ἐστάναι or εἶναι ἐστηκότα. \mathfrak{H} והוא נצב represents the typical pattern of a circumstantial clause < ׀ + s + ptc. >, hence נִצָּב. This analysis accords with our remarks on the preceding verse. Since the clause pattern of this verse is analogous to that of the preceding verse and the dramatis persona is identical, the high priest, the s of the first inf., αὐτόν, is dispensed with. However, αὐτός as the s of ἐστὼς need be there.¹³

κυκλόθεν .. Λιβάνῳ] This can be analysed as a circumstantial clause subordinate to the preceding circumstantial clause, and not coordinate, as shown by the absence of the conjunction καὶ and ׀. However, \mathfrak{S} adds the conjunction: אֶתְּחַוֶּהּ .. אֶתְּחַוֶּהּ לְהַאֲרִיכִין לְהַאֲרִיכִין ‘and his brethren were .. surrounding him.’ However, let it be noted that \mathfrak{S} lacks (Bc).

βλάστημα [שתילי] The selection of the sg. in \mathfrak{G} is odd.

καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν αὐτὸν ויקיפוהו] On the selection of a way-yiqtol form here, see our remarks on ויהדר (vs. 11).

στελέχη φοινίκων] ≠ \mathfrak{H} ערבי נחל, i.e. עֲרָבֵי נַחַל ‘poplars on a river-bank.’ Lévi (210) also mentions יִסְבּוּהוּ עֲרָבֵי נַחַל Jb 40.22.

50.13) καὶ πάντες υἱοὶ Ααρων ἐν δόξῃ αὐτῶν
καὶ προσφορὰ κυρίου ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν
ἐναντι πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ἰσραηλ,

*and all descendants of Aaron in their glory
and offerings to the Lord in their hands
in the presence of the entire congregation of Israel,*

(Ba) כל בני אהרון בכבודם:

(Bb) ואשי יי בידם נגד כל קהל ישראל:

καὶ^{1]} missing in \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{S} . The addition of the conjunction may be due to the translator not analysing (Ba) as the s of יקיפוהו (vs. 12). In the facsimile of \mathfrak{H} , (Ba) stands at the end of the line above, though we do not know what our translator’s *Vorlage* looked like, and it is a commonplace for a verse to begin in the middle of a line in a MS.

¹³ For our analysis of αὐτός here as a nominative absolute, see SSG § 31 hf.

προσφορὰ κυρίου אֲשֵׁי יי cf. 45.21, where the same Heb. phrase is rendered as θυσίαι κυρίου. The genitive case expresses a purpose, “meant for someone or something,” as in παρακαταθήκας εἶναι χηρῶν τε καὶ ὀρφανῶν ‘savings earmarked for widows and orphans’ 2M 3.10. See also SSG § 22 v (xiv).

50.14) καὶ συντέλειαν λειτουργῶν ἐπὶ βωμῶν
 κοσμηῆσαι προσφορὰν ὑψίστου παντοκράτορος,
*And bringing to a conclusion his ministry at the altar
 to set in order the offering to the omnipotent, the Most High*

(B) עד כלותו לשרת מזבח ולסדר מערכות עליון:

עד] Though only rarely, this prep. can mean “during, in the course of” e.g. עד הִתְהַלְּקוּם ‘while they tarried’ Jd 3.26. A few more examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. I 2 b. We fail to comprehend why Smend (486) criticises Ⓞ for its alleged failure to see “den plusquamperfektischen Sinn des Ausdrucks,” for עד כלותו cannot mean “only when he had finished .. he stretched his hand out.”

λειτουργῶν] which was parsed by Ⓢh as pl.gen. of λειτουργός: אֲשֵׁי מְשַׁמְּרֵי ‘of those who minister,’ but Ⓢ consummationem fungens.

κοσμηῆσαι] on the meaning of this verb, see above at 16.27.

50.15) ἐξέτεινεν ἐπὶ σπονδείου χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
 καὶ ἔσπεισεν ἐξ αἵματος σταφυλῆς,
 ἐξέχεεν εἰς θεμέλια θυσιαστηρίου
 ὄσμην εὐωδίας ὑψίστῳ παμβασιλεῖ.

*he put his hand out on a drinking-cup
 and poured juices of wine in
 and poured it out at the base of the altar
 as fragrant odour to the Most High, the absolute monarch.*

The entire verse is missing in ⓂB, probably a homoioteleuton, עליון at the end of vss. 14 and 15. Ⓢ differs substantially from Ⓞ, probably made from its own Heb. Vorlage: וְשָׁטַע עַל קֶסֶט אֵידָהּ וְנָסַב חֲמֵרָא עֲתִיקָא וְנָסַךְ עַל גַּבִּי אֶהָא וְשָׁטַע עַל קֶסֶט אֵידָהּ וְנָסַב חֲמֵרָא עֲתִיקָא ‘he put his hand out on to the urn and ladled some old wine and poured out near the altar for fragrant odour.’

αἵματος σταφυλῆς] the same phrase at 39.26, rendering דָּם עֲנַב.

50.16) τότε ἀνέκραγον υἱοὶ Ἀαρων,
 ἐν σάλπιγγιν ἐλαταῖς ἤχησαν,
 ἀκουστὴν ἐποίησαν φωνὴν μεγάλην
 εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔναντι ὑψίστου·

*Then descendants of Aaron began shouting,
they made noise with trumpets of beaten metal
they made loud sound audible
as a reminder in the presence of the Most High;*

(Ba) אז יריעו בני אהרון הכהנים בחצצרות מקשה:
(Bb) ויריעו וישמיעו קול אדיר להזכיר לפני עליון:

τότε ἀνέκραγον [אז יריעו] Here we have an instance of the well-known BH syntagm: אָ immediately followed by a *yiqtol* form with the value of the preterite. The form is long, hence אָ יִבְּנֶה שְׁלֹמֶה, not יִבְּן, 1Kg 3.16.¹⁴ The Impf. ἀνέκραγον may be inchoative in value,¹⁵ which could hold for יריעו here.

υἱοὶ Ααρων] 𐤁 adds הכהנים ‘the priests.’

σάλπιγξιν ἐλαταῖς מקשה [חצצרות מקשה] cf. עֲשֵׂה לְךָ שְׁתֵּי תְּצוּצֹרֹת כְּסֹף מִקְשָׁה תַעֲשֶׂה. אָתָּם Ποίησον σεαυτῷ δύο σάλπιγγας ἀργυρᾶς, ἐλατὰς ποιήσεις αὐτάς Nu 10.2.

ἤχησαν] ויריעו, the first word of (Bb) should perhaps read יריעו and be attached to the end of (Ba). Then the verb would be coordinate with the initial יריעו, and *pace* Van Peursen (2004.152), where it is analysed as וַיְרִיעוּ. There is no good reason for shifting the aspect of the same verb in the same context. Alternatively we could vocalise it as וַיְרִיעוּ, continued with וַיִּשְׁמִיעוּ, both as coordinate and אז implicit with these two verbs.

In § 16b ends with כָּדָם כֹּלֵה עַמָּא דְאִסְרַיִל ‘before all the people of Israel’ and 16d reads לְמַבְרְכוֹ כָּדָם כֹּלֵה עַמָּא ‘to bless before all the people.’¹⁶

50.17) τότε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς κοινῆ κατέσπευσαν
καὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν
προσκυνῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτῶν
παντοκράτορι θεῷ ὑψίστῳ·

*Then all the people together hurriedly
fell to the ground on their faces
to prostrate to their Lord
the omnipotent Most High God;*

(Ba) כל בשר יחדו נמהרו ויפלו על פניהם ארצה:
(Bb) להשתחות לפני עליון לפני קדוש ישראל:

Vs. 17a is missing in §.

κατέσπευσαν [נמהרו] The Gk verb here, κατασπεύδω, appears to mean “to act with speed” (GELS s.v. II 2), and not “to move from A to B with

¹⁴ For details see JM § 113 *i*, where אָ יִקְהַל שְׁלֹמֶה 1Kg 8.1 is mentioned as the only exception in BH of the use of the short Impf.

¹⁵ See SSG § 28 c (iv).

¹⁶ On various proposals on how to interpret לְמַבְרְכוֹ, see Rysse 469, fn. *o*.

speed.” The principal verb can be syntactically combined as here, e.g. καὶ κατέσπευδεν καὶ ἐπένευσεν τοῦ ἀπελθεῖν ‘and he quickly agreed to withdraw’ 1M 6.57, or paratactically as in κατέσπευδεν δὲ Φαραῶ καλέσαι Μωσῆν καὶ Ααρῶν ‘Pharaoh lost no time in summoning ..’ Ex 10.16. In other words, BS does not mean to say that all the people up and down in the land arrived quickly in Jerusalem,¹⁷ but those who happened to be in the temple quickly kneeled, for which we would usually anticipate מהרו, i.e. מהירו, here.¹⁸

The selection of the pl. form in both languages can be a case of constructio ad sensum (so *SD*),¹⁹ but in the case of ⚡ it could be a reflection of נמהרו.

On the anarthrous עליון, see above at 7.9.

50.18) καὶ ἤνεσαν οἱ ψαλτωδοὶ ἐν φωναῖς αὐτῶν,
ἐν πλείστῳ ἤχῳ ἐγλυκάνθη μέλος·

*And the singers praised with their voice,
at the highest decibel a melody sounded sweet;*

(B) ויתן השיר קולו ועל המון העריכו גרו:

It appears that both the author and the translator are conscious of וְכָל־הַקְּהָלָה וְהַשִּׁיר מְשׁוֹרְרִים מְשַׁתְּחִיזִים καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία προσεκύνει, καὶ οἱ ψαλτωδοὶ ἕδοντες 2Ch 29.28.²⁰

Scholars²¹ are of the view that the second hemistich of ⚡ is to be corrected in the light of ⚡ and read ועל המון העריבו רנה, i.e. ועל המון העריבו רנה.

50.19) καὶ ἐδεήθη ὁ λαὸς κυρίου ὑψίστου
ἐν προσευχῇ κατέναντι ἐλεήμονος,
ἕως συντελεσθῆ ὁ κόσμος κυρίου
καὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτοῦ ἐτελείωσαν.

*and the people pleaded with the Lord the Most High
in prayer in the presence of the merciful
till the set order of (liturgy) for the Lord was over
and they completed His liturgy.*

(Ba) וירנו כל עם הארץ בתפילה לפני רחום:
(Bb) עד כלותו לשרת מזבח ומשפטיו הגיע אליו:

¹⁷ Apparently so in “Dann eilte .. herbei” (*SD*).

¹⁸ Segal (446), who holds that נמהרו is synonymous with מהרו. In BH Ni. נמהר usually means “hasty, impetuous.”

¹⁹ Cf. *SSG* § 77 **ba** and *SQH* § 32 **ce**.

²⁰ *Pace SD* (2265) (Ba) does not mean “und er gab das Lied,” for what would one do with קולו?

²¹ Schechter (1899.65), Lévi (212), Smend (488), and Segal (446). Mopsik (317) is an exception with a verbatim rendition: “Puis un chant s’élevait en forcissant.”

ἐδέθηθη] *ירנו* On the first appearance this looks a strange equation. In *Index* s.v. δέομαι רָנָה, a verbal noun of this verb root, has been identified twice: Is 43.14²² and Je 7.16.²³ There is then no reason for not equating δέομαι with Qal רָנָה. This Heb. verb means “to give a ringing cry in joy.” We have then a slight, semantic extension here. In ἠγγεῖν *ירון* 47.10 the emphasis is laid on the high decibel, the feature of joy being absent.

κόσμος] שִׁבְחָה אֲדָמָה ‘adornment,’ a misrepresentation of Ἔ κόσμος. Cf. *℣ honor domini*.

The second half of the verse is rather problematic, the linkage between Ἔ and ℣ as well as the interpretation of the second half of (Bb). κόσμος κυρίου can be scarcely harmonised with שֵׁרֵת מִזְבֵּחַ. τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτοῦ ἐτελείωσαν has nothing to do with מִשְׁפָּטֵי הַגֵּיַע אֵלָיו, in which we have a case of number discord. One wonders whether one should read כִּמְשַׁפְּטֵי and parse הַגֵּיַע as an inf. parallel to כִּלְוֹתוֹ. As a tentative translation of (Bb) we suggest: “until he finished serving at the altar and reached it in accordance with its rules.” The suf. pron. of מִשְׁפָּטֵי can be interpreted as marking a topic, subject matter, altar in this case, as in מִשְׁפָּטֵי כֹל ‘decisions concerning everything’ 1QS 3.16 or הוֹקִיָּהֶם ‘instructions given about them’ 1Q34 3ii2.²⁴ With his translation “und seine Gebühr ihm nahe gebracht hatte” (II 91) Smend seems to interpret הַגֵּיַע as a transitive verb.²⁵ Is הַגֵּיַע in the sense of “to perform one’s duty properly to someone” attested elsewhere?

50.20) τότε καταβάς ἐπῆρεν χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ
δοῦναι εὐλογίαν κυρίου ἐκ χειλέων αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ καυχῆσασθαι·

*Then having descended, he raised his hands
over the whole congregation of the children of Israel
to pronounce a blessing of the Lord out of his mouth
and to take pride in His name;*

אז ירד ונשא ידיו על כל קהל ישראל: (Ba)
וברכת יי בשפתיו ובשם יי התפאר: (Bb)

אז ירד] Given the following ונשא, not וישא, the preceding ירד must be יָרַד, not יָרַד. Here then we have a synonymous syntagm vis-à-vis אָ immediately followed by a long Impf. discussed above at vs. 16.

²² Ziegler reads δεθήσονται, though three minuscules are mentioned with δεθηθησονται. ℣ reads רָנָה, which cannot be harmonised with δεθήσονται ‘they will be bound.’

²³ With reference to Ziegler 1958.20.

²⁴ For further details, see *SQH* § 21 b (xii).

²⁵ So Segal 446. He apparently follows Schechter (1899.65), taking מִשְׁפָּטֵי in the sense of kinds of offerings to be brought to the altar. However, an expression such as מִנְחָתוֹ וְנִסְכּוֹ כְּמִשְׁפָּט Nu 15.24 mentioned by Schechter does not mean that the lexeme משפט means “cultic offering,” but “cultic offering prepared properly in accordance with the rules in question.”

Vs. 20c in \mathfrak{H} is a circumstantial clause, an analysis not adopted by the translator.

ὄνόματι αὐτοῦ ישׁוּי] The two are syntactically distinct from each other, though they can be analysed as a genitive phrase. The logico-semantic relationship between the two terms is “possessive” in the former, but “appositive” in the latter, hence “N₁ is owned by N₂” as against “N₁ is known under the name of, or symbol of, or expressible as N₂.” The same applies to שׁוּמֹ and שׁוּמִי .²⁶ See יהוה שׁוּמִי Ex 6.3, Je 16.21, יהוה שׁוּמִי Ps 83.19. Despite the very long tradition ultimately going back to LXX, the conventional translation “in the name of YHWH”²⁷ here would be questionable, because YHWH is the name, but it should be “in the name YHWH.” Our translator shows his awareness of this tradition by rendering ישׁוּי in its first occurrence in this verse with κύριος, but he did not repeat it in its second occurrence. It appears that, after all, he could not completely liberate himself from this tradition as shown in $\text{ישׁוּי שׁוּמִי אֵת אֲבֵרַכְכָּה אֵת שׁוּמִי}$ εὐλογήσω τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου 51.12.²⁸

50.21) καὶ ἔδευτέρωσαν ἐν προσκυνήσει
ἐπιδέξασθαι τὴν εὐλογίαν παρὰ ὑψίστου.

*and they prostrated themselves for a second time
to receive the blessing from the Most High.*

(B) וישנו לנפל שנית ... ל מפניו:

καὶ ἔδευτέρωσαν ישׁוּי] The selection of שׁוּנָה renders שנית redundant, as Smend (489) justly points out.

παρὰ ὑψίστου מפניו] Smend (489) holds that the suf. pron. refers to Simon.

50.22) Καὶ νῦν εὐλογήσατε τῷ θεῷ πάντων
τῷ μεγάλα ποιοῦντι πάντη,
τὸν ὑψοῦντα ἡμέρας ἡμῶν ἐκ μήτρας
καὶ ποιοῦντα μεθ’ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.

²⁶ Cf. SSG § 22 v (i) and (iii), and SQH § 21 b (i) and (iii).

²⁷ E.g. “le nom de YHVH” (Mopsik 318) and Ryssel’s (470) “des Namens Jahwes” are non-sensical.

²⁸ In mYom 6.2 we read of a rabbi who started his prayer with שׁוּמִי אֵת , but priests and lay people present were alerted on hearing the tetragrammaton ($\text{שׁוּמִי הַמְּכַפֵּר}$) issuing out of the mouth of a high priest and kneeled and bowed themselves, we are told. The author of the Mishnah should have written יהוה אֵת , which he did not dare. Note what a formerly distinguished scribe (סופר) had to say about his κύριος: τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα, ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πάν γόνου κάμψη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων καὶ πάσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς Phil 2.9-11.

Is what we read in $\text{יהוה שׁוּמִי בְּשׁוּמִי אֵת}$ Gn 4.26 contradictory to the usual idea that YHWH as God’s name was unknown before Moses (Ex 3.13-22)? Moses may have known that his forefathers knew God under another name, Shaddai. Moses may have wanted to know which to choose.

*And now praise the god of all
who does great things everywhere,
who raises us for days from when we were in the womb
and treats us according to His mercy.*

עתה ברכו נא את יי אלהי ישראל המפלא²⁹ לעשות בארץ (Ba)
המגדל אדם מרחם ויעשהו כרצונו: (Bb)

ἡμέρας ἡμῶν .. καὶ .. μεθ' ἡμῶν] From this verse up to vs. 24 inclusive we find that in **Θ** the author is depicted as addressing his readership and identifying himself with them. In this verse in **ℑ** there is no personal pronoun in either 1st or 2nd person plural, but **Θ** says “our” and “us.” In the next verse the 2pl in **ℑ** is shifted to 1pl in **Θ**.

τῷ μεγάλα ποιοῦντι] also preferred by Wagner (1999.242) to a compositum μεγαλοποιεῖν. On המפלא לעשות note τῷ θαυμαστὰ ποιοῦντι κυρίῳ לעשותו ומפלא ליהוה Jud 13.19 L.

τῷ θεῷ] So read by Ziegler against nine minuscules which read τον θεον. Ziegler prefers the dat. in the next line. Whilst εὐλογέω, as a verbum dicendi, governs at times a dative,³⁰ we fail to see how Ziegler would account for the acc. ὑψοῦντα and ποιοῦντα, which immediately follow and have no v.l.

τῷ θεῷ πάντων] as a divine title occurs in 45.23, where it is translated as φόβος κυρίου.

τὸν ὑψοῦντα ἡμέρας ἡμῶν ἐκ μήτρας] On the equation ὑψόω / Pi. גָּדַל, cf. υἱοὺς ἐγέννησα καὶ ὑψωσα ἱερομῆτι ἱερομῆτι Is 1.2, where God is the subject, and ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν σου, ὧν ὑψωσας ‘out of all your sons, whom you raised’ מִכָּל-בְּנֵי-גִדְלָהּ ib. 51.18.

The syntactic relationship between ὑψοῦντα and ἡμέρας is obscure. If the verb is a rendering of מגדל and means “to help grow physically and socially” (GELS s.v. *2) we are tempted to read τὸν ὑψοῦντα ἡμᾶς ἐκ μήτρας, though no Gk MS, **ℑ** or **ℒ** supports it.

Following ποιοῦντι .. ὑψοῦντα **Θ** is consistent in using the ptc. in its description of God. Hence the shift to *w-yiqtol*³¹ is remarkable.

κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ] ≠ כרצונו **ℑ** ‘as He pleases.’

Cf. **ℑ** וַיִּשְׁבַּחְו עֲמָא דִּארְעָא לְאַלְהָא דְעֵבֵד פְּרִישְׁתָּא בִּארְעָא דְבְרָא בְנֵי אֲנָשָׁא מִן אֲרֵץ צְבִינָה וַיִּשְׁבַּחְו עֲמָא דִּארְעָא לְאַלְהָא דְעֵבֵד פְּרִישְׁתָּא בִּארְעָא דְבְרָא בְנֵי אֲנָשָׁא מִן אֲרֵץ צְבִינָה ‘and praise,³² o the people of the earth, God, who wrought marvels in the earth, who created humans from the womb of their mother and guides them as He pleases.’

²⁹ המפליא must be meant.

³⁰ Cf. SSG § 56 c (i), 57 ca.

³¹ The form must be a substitute for ויעשנו, i.e. ויעשנו. Thus *pace* Segal (342) and Kahana (528) ויעשנו.

³² Smend (489) parses the verb as Pf. without any comment: “und es lobte das Volk ..”.

50.23) δῶῃ ἡμῖν εὐφροσύνην καρδίας
καὶ γενέσθαι εἰρήνην ἐν ἡμέραις ἡμῶν
ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος·

*May He grant us joy of heart
and peace to arise in our lifetime
in Israel to last for ages;*

(B) יתן לכם חכמת לבב ויהי בשלום ביניכם:

ἡμῖν] On the discrepancy between “us” and “you,” see at the preceding verse.

εὐφροσύνην] Both “joy” and “wisdom” make sense here. There is no intrinsic reason for \mathfrak{S} to opt for the latter. Hence, σοφροσύνην as suggested by Smend (490) sounds original.

γενέσθαι] This infinitival clause is coordinate with the preceding σ , εὐφροσύνην. *GELS* s.v. δίδωμι **20** defines its sense as “to grant that a desirable or wished-for situation becomes reality.” The feature of desire or wish is well expressed through the volitive יהי. What we find here is distinct from what has been discussed in Muraoka 2000, since מַי, as an essential constituent of the syntagm is absent here. However, two other instances mentioned in *GELS* represent this Hebrew syntagm. Hence our case may be interpreted as a conflation of the normal use of δίδωμι + acc. and this highly idiomatic equation.

εἰρήνην] \mathfrak{H} בשלום need be corrected to שלום; \mathfrak{H} as it stands makes no sense, since יהי is hardly impersonal and lacks a s . The prep. is absent in \mathfrak{S} as well.³³

ἐν ἡμέραις ἡμῶν] = בימינו. On the fluctuation between “our” and “your,” see at the preceding verse.

Cf. \mathfrak{S} לְמַלְאכֵי הַיְהוָה וְלְבָנֵי דָלָבָא וְנֶהְיָא אִמְרָא בְּיַדְהוֹן ‘to grant them the wisdom of mind and may there be peace in their midst.’ Thus vs. 23c is missing, likewise in \mathfrak{H} , but present in \mathfrak{Sh} and \mathfrak{L} . In Segal’s (448) view the reason is that when the translation was made the office of the high priest was no longer with the family of Simon, so that the translator deleted the clause.

50.24) ἐμπιστεύσαι μεθ’ ἡμῶν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν λυτρωσάσθω ἡμᾶς.

*May He demonstrate His mercy with us as reliable
and in our life-time rescue us.*

(Ba) יאמן עם שמעון חסדו ויקם לו ברית פינחס:
(Bb) אשר לא יכרת לו ולזרעו כימי שמים:

³³ Skehan - Di Lella (548f.) offer “may he abide among you as peace,” on the assumption that the prep. *beth* is the so-called *beth essentiae*.

ἐμπιστεύσαι] *GELS* s.v. defines the sense of this verb here as “to demonstrate as reliable and trustworthy,” an innovation in SG, and this sense is recognised in another instance in Si 36.21, where its *o* is human; v.a.l.

Ⓢ appears to have detected here an inf., ἐμπιστεύσαι, as coordinate with another infinitival clause in the preceding clause, γενέσθαι: לְמַהֲיָמֵנוּ לְמַעַן הָיִינוּ אֵלֶיךָ כְּשֶׁיָּשָׁרְתָּ אֶת־שִׁמְעוֹן עִמָּךְ. Does this mean that the author is pleading with God “Deal with us as You did with Simon”? That the translator’s perception widely diverges from his grandfather’s becomes manifest when one looks at 24b and (Bb), which latter is totally absent in Ⓞ. We see that BS is praying and interceding for his contemporary high priest: “May His mercy with Simon be lasting and may He confirm for him the covenant of Phinehas³⁴ so that it [= the line of succession³⁵] may not be abolished for him and his descendants like the days of the sky!”. Box - Oesterley (511) and Segal (348), following the widely accepted view that our document was composed after Simon’s death, hold that the author is offering an intercessory prayer on behalf of Simon’s descendants, an interpretation which sounds to us unnatural in view of שמעון עִמָּךְ. Is it inconceivable that this book was not written in Hebrew at one go,³⁶ but some parts written earlier were inserted in the final stage without being subjected to final editing?³⁷ His grandson, however, thought it inappropriate to keep the whole verse standing. His substituting “us” for “Simon” in (a) must be deliberate. He lived in an era when, following the Maccabean War and a few other political intrigues, the line of high priests as descendants of Aaron had ceased to be in force. Hence no mention of “the covenant of Phinehas.” Note also ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν, a totally new addition.

Also Ⓢ is rather short: וְנִתְקַיְּמָה עִמָּךְ שְׂמֵעוֹן הַסֵּדָא וְעִם וְרַעְיָה אֵיךְ יִוְמָתָא דְשְׂמַיָּא ‘and may the mercy remain firm with Simon and with his descendants as the days of the heaven.’

[יכרת] On the gender discord, see also 44.18, where also the *s* is likely to be ברית as here.

כימי שמים] a phrase occurring in 45.15 and rendered ἐν ἡμέραις οὐρανοῦ = בימי שמים.

³⁴ See Nu 25.12f.

³⁵ With their “so that it may not be abrogated” Skehan - Di Lella (548) apparently regards ברית as the *s* of יכרת, but with no comment on the gender discord.

³⁶ As widely agreed with regard to Si 51.1-12.

³⁷ Smend’s (490) remark that “Die Worte in a können .. sehr wohl auf einen schon Verstorbenen gehen; vgl. Gen. 24.12, 17, wo der Knecht Abrahams von seinem schon verstorbenen Herrn redet” is non-sensical. Abraham must have been overjoyed at the sight of Rebecca the servant had brought back!

50.25) δυσὶν ἔθνεσιν προσώχθισεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου,
καὶ τὸ τρίτον οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνος·

*In two nations I felt disgusted,
and the third is not a nation;*

(B) בשנו גוים קצה נפשו והשלישית איננו עם:

δυσὶν ἔθνεσιν] the Edomites and Philistines, followed by τὸ τρίτον, the Samaritans.³⁸

προσώχθισεν] If the author is still speaking of Simon still alive, קצה is better parsed as Ptc., קָצָה. By contrast, if this verse was composed after Simon's death, it is better parsed as Pf., קָצָה.³⁹ Why select a preterite tense? Is the author thinking of a particular incident or incidents?

הַיְשׁוּחִי מוֹסֵף] נפשו, in which the author is identifying himself with Simon. So נִפְשִׁי.

הַשְּׁלִישִׁית] a rather anomalous gender discord, all the more since it is immediately followed by איננו.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνος] In thought this concurs with גוֹי נִבְּלָה בְּגוֹי אֲחֵרִים בְּלֹא-עָם בְּגוֹי נִבְּלָה Dt 32.21,⁴⁰ whilst in terms of grammatical structure this is distinct from our עם איננו here, which is a self-standing nominal clause, but לא-עם is a noun phrase parallel to the immediately following גוֹי נִבְּלָה. Cp. קָרָא שְׁמוֹ לֹא עַמִּי Ho 1.9.

50.26) οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν ὄρει Σαμαρείας καὶ Φυλιστιμ
καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ μωρὸς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν Σικίμοις.

*those inhabiting in the mountain of Samaria, and Philistines,
and the stupid people living in Shechem.*

(B) יושבי שעיר ופלשת וגוי נבל הדר בשכם:

ὄρει Σαμαρείας] As a relevant biblical place name we only know of הַשְּׁעִירָה Jd 3.26; it looks like an adverbialised form of שְׁעִירָה. It is generally thought that Seir was in the domain of Edomites. One wonders how good our translator's Palestinian geography was. It is not absolutely certain that this is a local name.

³⁸ For a brief historical sketch of the relationships between these three nations and Israel, cf. Skehan - Di Lella 558. The attitude displayed by Ἰησοῦς about two centuries later towards the Samaritans was rather favourable and sympathetic as can be seen in his parable of the good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-37), his exchange with a Samaritan woman (Jn 4.7-30), and a story of ten leprats promised instant cure by Him and underlining that, after being cured on the way to a priest, only one of them was decent enough to come back and thank Him, and that exception was a Samaritan (Lk 17.11-19).

³⁹ BSH (267c) opts for the latter.

⁴⁰ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. לֹא 2 d.

50.27) Παιδείαν συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης
 ἐχάραξεν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ
 Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιραχ Ἐλεαζαρ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης,
 ὃς ἀνώμβρησεν σοφίαν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτοῦ.

*A teaching of understanding and intelligence
 has been written in this book
 by Jesus, son of Sirach Eleazar, the Jerusalemite,
 who poured forth wisdom out of his brain.*

מוסר שכל ומושל אופנים (Ba) לשמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא:
 ואשר הביע בתבונות: (Bb) אשר ניבע בפתור לבן

Unlike in any book in the Jewish Bible the author of our book introduces himself here, though only in Ⓞ.⁴¹ However, he does not do so by saying, e.g. “I am William Shakespeare,” but gives more details. In spite of this valuable piece of information, its details are full of difficulties.⁴²

Let us note that ⓂB has preserved similar information at 51.30 and some Ⓞ MSS have preserved some similar information by way of subscription. Cf. Ⓢ פְּתָנְמָנְהִי דִישׁוּע בֶּר שְׁמֵעוֹן דְּמִתְקָרָא בֶּר אֶסִירָא: שְׁלָם לְמַכְתָּב Ⓢ ‘Up to here the words of Jesus, son of Simon, who is called Barsira. Finished the writing of *Wisdom of Barsira*.’⁴³

Even in the Heb. tradition we notice some disagreements. The author’s name given above agrees with what we find in 51.30 (Bd). In the prologue written by the translator we read the author’s grandfather was also called Ἰησοῦς, p. 13 above. Since it is inconceivable that the author’s grandson is ignorant of his reputed grandfather’s genealogy, we have no choice but to postulate some corruptions in the course of transmission of the text at least in these three languages. Both Ⓜ at 50.27 and 51.30 in both (Bc) and (Bd), we could conclude that the book was attributed to Simon,⁴⁴ and already in his life-time he carried Ben Sira as a nickname as shown by שִׁירָא בֶּן סִירָא 51.30, and that this came to replace his original name, Simon. However, the substantive υἱὸς in Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιραχ Ἐλεαζαρ shows that the traditional name of the author as Ben Sira is wrong according to this tradition.

In Ⓢ we do not find a single personal name: כּוֹל מִתְּלָא דְחִכְמָא וְאוּיָהֳדָהוֹן: כְּתִיבִין בְּסִפְרָא הַנָּא ‘all proverbs of sages and their riddles are written in this

⁴¹ The majority of Gk MSS read ἐχάραξα ‘I wrote,’ but the translator would dare not speak on behalf of his grandfather on such an official matter, though the author does speak in the first person in 39.32, as pointed out in *SD* 2266.

⁴² Though in our 1977 study (Muraoka 1977b.22-27) we did devote not a little attention to this question, we confess that we have not made very much progress. The question need be left open.

⁴³ ⓈⓂ lacks Chapter 51.

⁴⁴ Smend (492; II 59) deletes it, considering as the author’s name to be ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא. MS 248 presents the shortest version: Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Σιράχ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης.

book.’ The Syr. translator may have found the onomastics to be beyond him. Moreover, no verb meaning “to write” is in \mathfrak{H} ; \mathfrak{S} may be under the influence of \mathfrak{H} .

ἐπιστήμη] \neq \mathfrak{H} מושל אופנים, which in its turn is not a phrase easy to understand. Smend (492), reading משלי, i.e. מְשָׁלִי, and referring to דָּבָר דָּבָר עַל-אֲפָנָיו Pr 25.11 and taking אפנים in the sense of “metrically correct form of verses,” thus “artistically composed proverbial sayings” as a whole. A solution which Segal (350) finds far-fetched, suggesting instead “proverbial sayings concerning manners of life.” We are not sure, however, that אָפֶן in MH can signify such without much context.

In \mathfrak{H} we find nothing that could reflect 27b. In spite of our translation above, ἐχάραξεν is active in voice with Ἰησοῦς as its *s*.

ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης] Nowhere in \mathfrak{H} we are told that the author was a citizen of Jerusalem.

Also (Bb) is challenging. ניבע is parsed as Piel in BSH 213a, and in *Maagarim* this is the sole instance of such a form. As a transitive verb Hifil is the norm, which occurs in the following clause as well as in מקורה יביע זמה and ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς ἐξομβρήσει βδέλυγμα, where ἐξομβρήσει is to be compared with ἀνώμβρησεν above (27d). Smend (II 59) reads ניבא ‘he declared.’ בפתור לבן could be taken, by reading לבו, by pondering in his mind. The concluding clause might mean “which he uttered as a collection of sapiential utterances.’ Segal (350), however, rightly objects that נְבוּאָה, even if it does not always signify prediction, is not a product of human intellect. In the Old Testament every message delivered by a prophet was divine in origin.

Segal’s proposal to read מתוך ‘out of’ instead of כפתור moves graphically too much away.

50.28) μακάριος ὃς ἐν τούτοις ἀναστραφίσεται,
καὶ θεὸς αὐτὰ ἐπὶ καρδίαν αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται.

*Blessed is he who concerns himself with these matters
and grows in wisdom, laying them on his mind.*

(B) אשרי איש באלה יהגה ונותן על לבו יחכם:

ἀναστραφίσεται [יהגה] the sole instance in LXX of the equation ἀναστρέφομαι / הִגָּה qal. This Heb. verb can signify “to read audibly,” but also “to ponder, meditate.” It is translated in Si twice with a verb which means “to meditate,” μελετάω: ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ μελέτα διὰ παντός במצותו תמיד והגה 6.37, see esp. Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐν σοφία μελετήσεται אשרי אנוש בחכמה יהגה 14.20. The major difference is that in our BS passage here we have an asyndetic relative clause. On the use here of ἀναστρέφομαι, see ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφίσεται ‘he would occupy himself with enigmas of maxims’ 39.3, where no Heb. text is preserved.

The first half of \mathfrak{H} is very close to \mathfrak{H} בְּתוֹרַת יְהוָה הִפְצוּ וּבְתוֹרָתוֹ .. אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה אִישׁ .. Ps 1.1-2, but our translator, for some reason or other, decided to depart from its LXX rendition – Μακάριος ἀνήρ, .. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός. Whether the author was suggesting that his work merited inclusion in the canon of the Jewish Bible, as *SD* (2266) suggests, is not certain. This decision by the translator is remarkable, given his translation at 6.37 and 14.20 as quoted above.

נתן θεί] The Heb. verb has been correctly analysed as a subject complement as in *בא יעקוב אבי אל לבן בורח מפני עישיו* ‘my father Jacob came to Laban, running away from Esau’ 4Q215 1.7.⁴⁵

\mathfrak{S} is quite expansive: *טובוהו לנברא דבקהליו גרנא ונאלף אגין ונחכם אגין ונעבד אגין. רומא דדחלתה דמרנא על כל מדם אתתרימת אחודיה ברי ולא תשבקיה* ‘Blessed is the man who reflects on these matters and learns them and comes to learn them and practises them. The height of the fear of the Lord that has risen above everything. Grasp it, son, and do not abandon it.’

50.29) ἐὰν γὰρ αὐτὰ ποιήσῃ, πρὸς πάντα ἰσχύσει·
ὅτι φόβος κυρίου τὸ ἴχνος αὐτοῦ.

*If he practices them, he would be able to take anything on,
because the fear of the Lord is the route he is pursuing.*

(B) כִּי יֵרֵאת יְיָ חַיִּים

In \mathfrak{H} the first line has disappeared, probably a homoioarcton; the verse may have started with *כי*, as shown by *γὰρ*.

φόβος] a reading proposed by Smend (494f.) and adopted by Ziegler and preserved in a few MSS.

τὸ ἴχνος αὐτοῦ] ≠ חַיִּים. The translator may have been baffled by \mathfrak{H} . What does “the fear of the Lord is life” mean? Looking at 42.19 Smend (495) wonders whether *חַיִּים* is meant in lieu of *חַיִּים*. His translation (II 92) is “die Furcht des Herrn ist ihr Wesen,” which sounds to us a shade too German.

¶ καὶ τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἔδωκε σοφίαν.
εὐλογητὸς κύριος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. γένοιτο, γένοιτο. ¶

*And He gave wisdom to the pious.
Blessed be the Lord for ever. So be it, so be it.*

⁴⁵ For more examples, see *SQH* § 31 t (i).

Προσευχὴ Ἰησοῦ Υἱοῦ Σιραχ

Prayer of Jesus, son of Sirach

CHAPTER 51

51.1) Ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι, κύριε βασιλεῦ,
καὶ αἰνέσω σε θεὸν τὸν σωτήρά μου,
ἐξομολογοῦμαι τῷ ὀνόματί σου,

*I shall profess You, o Lord King,
and I shall adore You, God my saviour,
I profess Your name,*

אֱהַלְלֶךָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי (Ba)

אֲסַפְּרָה שְׁמֶךָ מֵעוּז חַיִּי (Bb)

In \mathfrak{H} there is no trace of the subtitle of this concluding chapter unlike at the start of Chapter 44. Whereas (Ba) is usually considered to begin Chapter 51, in the facsimile it is in the centre of the line following 50.29, which does not end with a colon. Does this imply that in the tradition represented in this Heb. manuscript there was no break between the two chapters?

$\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}$ lacks this chapter. There is no shadow of doubt on the authenticity of the Heb. text preserved in $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{B}$ and now also in a much earlier source discovered in Qumran Cave 11 as published by Sanders in 1965 in *DJD* 4, identified here as (T). Sanders (1965.9) tentatively dates the text to the first half of the first century CE.

κύριε βασιλεῦ] This form of address to God is distinct in comparison to its use in Je 44 (\mathfrak{H} 37).20, where Jeremiah is speaking to King Zedekiah as אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ. Cf. its use in Κύριε κύριε βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ Dt 9.26, where we have the beginning of this use in Moses' address to God. Does this reflect here אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי? The application of אָב to God is not as frequent as in the New Testament, but it does occur, e.g. הָלֹא-אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ Dt 32.6, but not in the vocative.¹

אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי here is most likely a cst. chain as in אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ Ex 15.2, see also ib. 18.4. Note also who is being referred to with *my father*: אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי אֲדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ Gn 32.10, Ex 3.6.

All the same, in \mathfrak{H} we find no trace of מֶלֶךְ. \mathfrak{S} has it, see below.

¹ More examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. אָב 2.

θεὸν τὸν σωτήρᾱ μου] not vocative, but in apposition to σε as is shown by the selection of the acc. case. In \mathfrak{H} the two substantives can be parsed as vocative, though not absolutely necessary, as in $\text{הַנְּנִי אֶלֶיךָ יִשְׁבֹּת הָעֵמֶק}$ Je 21.13, often translated “I am against thee, O inhabitant of the valley.”² For the expression, cf. $\text{וְיָרֹם אֶלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ Ps 18.47 +.

ἐξομολογοῦμαι] אֲסַפְּרָה The selection of the Pres. as against the Fut. of the same verb at the head of the verse is remarkable as a rendering of the cohortative form. Is the author, according to \mathfrak{G} , admitting that he is already doing it? This analysis appears to be slightly supported because the same Gk verb is used to translate two different, not synonymous, Heb. verbs. The translator must have had some reason for changing the tense of the same verb. For him $\mathfrak{H}Bb$ formed a unity with the preceding two clauses, whereas in the facsimile (Bb), followed by (Ba) with a colon at the end, begins a new line in the right-hand column, hence מַעֲוֹהֵי forming a constituent of (Bb).

Besides, the equation ἐξομολογέομαι / סָפַר is attested nowhere else in LXX and not the most obvious equation. Cp. $\text{אֲסַפְּרָה לְאַחֶיךָ דִּיגְיָסוֹמַי}$ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου Ps. 22(21).23.

מַעֲוֹהֵי cf. $\text{מַעֲוֹהֵי יְהוָה מִמִּי אֶפְהָד}$ Ps 27.1, where מַעֲוֹהֵי is a constituent of a nominal clause. Hence in our passage, it could be in apposition to יְ in the preceding שָׁמַךְ , see above on $\text{θεὸν τὸν σωτήρᾱ μου}$. However, since there is nothing in \mathfrak{G} that could be regarded as a rendition of this nominal clause and in terms of its message it is misplaced here and should rather be an opening statement of the following verse.

The sequence of the first two clauses in \mathfrak{H} appears to have been reversed in \mathfrak{G} .

Cf. \mathfrak{S} , which is rather distinct in content: $\text{אֲדָא לְךָ מְרִיא מְלָכָא וְאַשְׁבַּח וְאֲדָא לְךָ מְרִיא מְלָכָא בְּכָל יוֹם וְאַשְׁתַּעַא שְׁמֶךָ בְּתִשְׁבְּחָתָא}$ ‘I shall praise you, o Lord King, and glorify your name, o Lord, ever day and tell about your name with praises.’ Three verbs are used in \mathfrak{H} in contrast to \mathfrak{G} , which uses one verb less.

51.2) ὅτι σκεπαστής και βοηθός ἐγένου μοι
καὶ ἐλυτρώσω τὸ σῶμά μου ἐξ ἀπωλείας
καὶ ἐκ παγίδος διαβολῆς γλώσσης,
ἀπὸ χειλέων ἐργαζομένων ψεῦδος
καὶ ἔναντι τῶν παρεστηκότων

*because You have become for me a protector and helper
and rescued my body from ruin
and from a trap laid by a malicious tongue,
from lips of those who work at lies
and in the presence of those who emerge*

² Cf. JM § 131 p.

(Ba) כי פדית ממות נפשי:
 (Bb) חשכת בשרי משחת ומיד שאול הצלת רגלי:
 (Bc) פציתני מדבת עם
 (Bd) משוט דבת לשון ומשפת שטי כזב:
 (Be) נגד קמי הייתה לי

Here we have one of the hardest verses in the whole book, almost a piece of a poem. In \mathfrak{G} we see five statements as against seven in \mathfrak{H} . Their mutual correspondence, though only approximative, is

\mathfrak{G}	\mathfrak{H}	\mathfrak{S}
a		Ba)
b	Bb) 1	Bb) 1
c	Bd) 1	Bb) 2
d	Bd) 2	
e	Be)	

For vs. 2a cf. βοηθός και σκεπαστής ἐγένετό μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν \mathfrak{C} וְזַמְרַת עֲוִי וְזַמְרַת בֹּהֶתוֹס καὶ σκεπαστής ἐγένετό μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν Ex 15.2,³ on the basis of which we may assume that 2a is a rendering of the end of the preceding verse: \mathfrak{C} מעוז חיי. This is the only attestation in LXX of the equation σκεπαστής / מעוז.

Cf. \mathfrak{S} תּוֹכְלִנִי דָמֶן עָלַם מְרִימָא דְפָרְקַת נַפְשִׁי מִן מוֹתָא וְחֹסְכַת בְּסָרִי מִן חֲבָלָא וּמִן יַד שְׂיֹל פְּרָקַת רַגְלִי 'my exalted refuse for ever who rescued my soul from death and saved my flesh from ruin and rescued my feet from the hands of Hades.'

For (Bb 1) Lévi refers to Is 38.17, where, however, we read חֲשַׁקְתָּ נַפְשִׁי הַשְׁקַת מְשַׁחַת, though \mathfrak{G} reads εἴλου γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν 'for You have chosen my soul as preferable.' We would rather mention לֹא־חֲשַׁקְתָּ מִמּוֹת נַפְשִׁי Ps 78.50 and נִפְשִׁי־מִנִּי־שַׁחַת εἰσάτο δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ θανάτου Jb 33.18.

כֹּזֵב [שְׁטִי כֹזֵב] μανίας ψευδεῖς Ps 40.5. Syntactically speaking, a non-participial form of the verb שָׁט 'to deflect' would require a preposition of destination in this case, but a ptc. in the cst. st. can dispose of it, e.g. מִכָּל־הֵי־צָאִים מִן־הַתְּבָה Gn 9.10 in lieu of יֵצְאוּ הַתְּבָה. ⁴ Since the verb שָׁט is a hapax in BH, we cannot be sure, but may note an etymologically related verb שָׁטַח in אַל־יִשְׁטֹ אֶל־דַּרְכֶיהָ לְבָבְךָ 'Let not your heart decline to her ways!' Pr 7.25.

τῶν παρεστηκότων \mathfrak{G} קָמִי is syntactically analysable in the same way as the preceding שְׁטִי כֹזֵב. It is equivalent to הַקָּמִים עָלַי. Cp. שִׁפְתַי קָמִי Lam 3.62; תַּחֲתֵי תַכְרִיעַ קָמִי תַחֲתֵי Ps 18.40. Cf. τῶν ἀνθεστηκότων μοι in MS 248.

³ \mathfrak{G} appears to reflect עֲוִי וְזַמְרַת.

⁴ For a discussion of this feature with more BH examples, see JM § 121 n.

⁵ Another etymologically related verb in Arb. is mentioned by Kaddari 2006 s.v. שָׁטַח, namely *šatta* 'to go too far.'

We wonder whether (Bc) and (Bd 1) are doublets, given the shared key word, הַבָּדָה. We have here the sole attestation in LXX of the equation διαβολή / הַבָּדָה.

51.3) ἐγένου βοηθὸς καὶ ἐλυτρώσω με
κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ἐλέους καὶ ὀνόματός σου
ἐκ βρόχων ἐτοιμῶν εἰς βρῶμα,
ἐκ χειρὸς ζητούντων τὴν ψυχὴν μου,
ἐκ πλειόνων θλίψεων, ὧν ἔσχον,
*You became a helper and rescued me
in accordance with the plenitude of Your mercy and Your name
out of the nooses waiting for a prey,
from the hands of those who were after my life,
out of very many sufferings that I experienced,*

עזרתני כרוב חסדך: (Ba)

ומיד מבקשי נפשי: ממוקש צופי סלע (Bb)

מרבות צרות הושעתנ[ו] (Bc)

ἐλυτρώσω] It is unlikely that our author was once a slave or captive, a background against which λυτρόομαι may be used, but SG employs it in a sense unknown elsewhere of “to rescue”; see *GELS* s.v. 2.

Ⲛ has only one verb in vs. 3a: פִּרְקַתְנִי ‘You rescued me’ = עזרתני.

ὀνόματός σου] a free addition; “the multitude of Your name” is odd.

ἐκ βρόχων ἐτοιμῶν εἰς βρῶμα] Quite a departure from ממוקש צופי סלע ‘from the bait set by watchmen on a rock.’ On the absence of a preposition following a ptc. in the st. cst., see above on שטי כוב (vs. 2).

βρόχων] a reading proposed by Peters (1913.440) and Smend (498) and accepted by Ziegler against βρυγμῶν ‘of gnashings.’

ἐτοιμῶν] as against ετοιμον, a majority reading referring to με (3a), probably meaning ‘ready’ from the perspective of predators. The form adopted by Ziegler would mean ‘ready to capture me as a prey.’

εἰς βρῶμα] Unlike a verbal noun, βρῶσις < βιβρώσκω ‘to eat up,’ which can also mean ‘food’ as well as ‘act of eating,’ βρῶμα means only ‘food.’ Lévi’s (218) proposal to read בלע, i.e. בִּלְע ‘what is swallowed’ as in יהוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־בִּלְעוֹ מִפִּי Je 51.44 is reasonable. Smend (II 60), though retaining סלע, follows Schechter (66), rendering the text as “die auf [meinen Fall] lauerten” (II 92). Schechter seeks support in שִׁמְרֵי צִלְעֵי Je 20.10, which seems to indicate to us that one would rather anticipate צלעי, for a mere צלע sounds unnatural.

πλειόνων] = πολλῶν σφόδρα, i.e. a comparative as equivalent to an relative. See *SSG* § 23 ba.

מרבות צרות] רב as an attributive adjective is known to show occasional reversal of the standard sequence, preceding a noun head. A couple of examples

in BH are רַבִּים צִדְדִים ‘many hunters’ Je 16.16 following דִּיגִים רַבִּים ‘many fishermen’ and רַבָּה אֲשָׁמָה לָנוּ ‘we have much guilt’ 2Ch 28.13.⁶ König (§ 334 κ) attributes this to the influence of numerals, which is probably right, but we doubt that the fronting is emphatic, given the instance of parallelism as in the above quoted Je 16.16. Gesenius (§ 132 b) analyses it as analogical, but why the standard sequence is not is unclear to us.⁷ See also above at 11.6.

51.4) ἀπὸ πνιγμοῦ πυρᾶς κυκλόθεν
καὶ ἐκ μέσου πυρός, οὗ οὐκ ἐξέκαυσα,
*from the suffocating fire round me
and out of the fire that I did not ignite,*

:... ומצוקות שלהבת (Ba)
מכבות אש לאין פחה (Bb)

πνιγμοῦ [מצוקות] the sole attestation in LXX of the equation πνιγμός / מצוקה. Other renderings are ἀνάγκη (5×) and θλίψις (3×), the former of which occurs also in Si 32.26.

ἐκ μέσου πυρός] ≠ ~~א~~ אש מכבות ‘by extinguishing [= *מִכְבוֹת*] fire.’ The absence of the conjunction וַי may suggest that (Bb) is subordinate to what precedes starting with הוֹשַׁעַתְנָן (vs. 3 end). Lévi’s (219) suggestion is to read מְבִינוֹת, i.e. מְבִינוֹת ‘out of the midst of.’⁸ This solution is perhaps better, since מן + inf. with causal force is rather rare.⁹

הוא [לאין פחה] This makes no sense, the only פחה known to Heb. is a Persian loan word meaning ‘governor.’ Could we restore פְּתָח and translate the text “for one who is blocked in (with burning fire) with no way out,” an antecedentless, asyndetic relative clause? Lévi (219) would read פּוֹחַם, i.e. “fire (that burns) without coal (פְּחָם).”¹⁰ Is such fire particularly dangerous? Smend’s (II 60) emendation is אש לא נפחה, translated “(aus der Glut eines Feuers, das nicht angeblasen)” (II 93). How would this harmonise with what precedes, ממצוקות שלהבת?¹¹

In vs. 4b and vs. 5 we miss §.

⁶ More examples are mentioned in JM § 141 b.

⁷ Lévi speaks of a possible case of lapsus calami, quoting נבון גבר 7.25, an obvious, scribal error, but apparently ignorant of the situation in BH in this regard.

⁸ Schechter (66), referring to מַלְבַּת אֵשׁ Ex 3.2, proposes reading מַלְבוֹת. Let us note, however, the form at Ex 3.2 is exceptional, substituting מַלְהֶבֶת. The pl. form actually attested is normal: מַלְהֶבוֹת cst.

⁹ Only a few examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. מן 7 a.

¹⁰ Schechter (66), referring to אֵשׁ לֹא נִפְחָה Jb 20.26, proposes reading לֹא נִפְחוּ, which, however, does not make the point that the author is not to be blamed for the fire.

¹¹ Mopsik (325) reads אש לאין פחה, which, however, cannot be translated as “Du cœur du feu sans qu’il n’en reste une fumée.”

- 51.5) ἐκ βάθους κοιλίας ἄδου
καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης ἀκαθάρτου καὶ λόγου ψευδοῦς
*out of the depth of the bottom of Hades
and from the tongue of an unclean person and a word of falsehood*

...מרחם תהוֹם לאממ: (Ba)
משפתי זמה וטפלי שקר (Bb)

[מלאמ.] Segal (354) restores לאממ, though he does not know what it means in the context. Mopsik (325) speculatively restores לאמנה, but we fail to see what an ascent to Amana, a mountain in anti-Lebanon, has to do with the author.

קרקר] an idiom also occurring in Jb 13.4.

- 51.6) βολίδος γλώσσης ἀδίκου.
ἤγγισεν ἕως θανάτου ἡ ψυχὴ μου,
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ μου ἦν σύνεγγυς ἄδου κάτω.
*an arrow of the tongue of an unrighteous person.
My life came close to death
and my life was very close to Hades below.*

: וחצוי לשון מרמה: (Ba)
ותגע למות נפשי וחיתי לשאול תחתיות: (Bb)

[βολίδος חצוי] read by Ziegler against βασιλεῖ διαβολῆ as read by all MSS and versions.¹² There is no role here to be played by a king. The equation βολίς / קרקר is attested in LXX 7 times. Vs. 6a is missing in S.

The gen. case is parallel to γλώσσης in γλώσσης ἀκαθάρτου at the end of the preceding verse.

תגע] Both Segal (352) and Kahana (529) vocalise the form as Qal, ותגע, but we would follow Smend (499), who mentions המרבה יגיע אל זרא 'one who eats too much could develop nausea' (37.30 above) cf. also יגיע לְיָמַיִם 'it came near to death.'

ψυχὴ] ζωὴ in the next line is nothing more than a stylistic variant. Cf. שְׁבַעַת שְׁבַעַת בְּרַעוֹת נַפְשִׁי וְחַיִּי לְשֵׂאוֹל הַגִּיעוּ Ps 88.4.

ἡ ζωὴ μου] = חיי, i.e. חיי, and not חיתי, which, even as equivalent to חיתי, is syntactically impossible after a way-yiqtol form, ותגע.

σύνεγγυς ἄδου] On an adverb modified by a nominal in the gen. case, see above at 14.24 and SSG § 22 s.

[שאוול תחתיות] In BH we encounter שאוול תחתית Dt 32.22 and וְהִצַּלְתָּ נַפְשִׁי חַיִּי מִשְׂאוֹל תַּחְתֵּיהָ Ps 86.13, but not with the pl. adjective. Just like the Heb. phrase

¹² See Ziegler 1964.465.

הסדיו > הסדיך, בו > כך, תנאלם > ינאלם. Hence this is a deliberate rewriting by the translator.

ἐυεργεσίας] chosen by Ziegler in preference to ἐργασίας read by the majority of the sources, which is too generic and inferior in this context. All the more so in view of חסדיו.

πονηρῶν] as read only by one MS (V) and emended by Smend (500) and accepted by Ziegler in preference to ἐθνῶν or ἐχθρῶν read by the rest of the sources including סל דבבא נל בפעל דתקין מנהו.

ἐκ χειρὸς πονηρῶν] cf. ס מן דתקין מנהו 'from one who is stronger than they.'

51.9) καὶ ἀνύψωσα ἀπὸ γῆς ἱκετείαν μου
καὶ ὑπὲρ θανάτου ῥύσεως ἐδεήθην·

*And I raised my entreaty from the earth
and pleaded for rescue from death;*

(B) וארים מארץ קולי ומשערי שאול שועתי:

ἀπὸ γῆς מארץ] Many MSS read ἐπι γης; some scribes may have been concerned that readers might wrongly think of the prayer to be already in the grave.

ἱκετείαν μου] which is more specific than קולי. Two other Heb. words are rendered in LXX with this noun: אָנָקָה and צָעָקָה, all the three once each. Since all the three Heb. words, קול and צָעָקָה in particular, are rather frequent, the selection of ἱκετεία is indicative of the high literary register of our translation.

In vs. 9b S reads only וְצִלִּית 'and I prayed.' C is a rather free translation of ח 'and from the gates of Hades I cried.'

θανάτου] a modifier of ῥύσεως, a genitive with ablative force.

ῥύσεως] ambiguous, since it could be derived from either ῥύσις < ῥέω 'to flow' or ῥύσις < ῥύομαι 'to rescue.' The latter is a neologism in SG.¹⁷ SD has opted for the former: "über dem Fluss des Todes." What that means one wonders. Can it mean "death passing away, disappearing" as understood by Jerome with his "pro morte defluenti"? We are rather doubtful.

וַיִּשְׁמַע מִהַיְכָלוֹ קוֹלִי וְשִׁוְעִתִּי בְּאָזְנוֹי] Possibly a noun parallel to קולי as in שוועתי. 2Sm 22.7. Both Segal (352) and Kahana (529) vocalise it as Piel, שוועתי.

51.10) ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου
μή με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλίψεως,
ἐν καιρῷ ὑπερηφανιῶν ἀβοηθησίας·

¹⁷ Cf. Wagner 1999.286f.

*I appealed to the Lord the father of my lord
not to abandon me in days of distress,
at the time when I face the arrogant unaided;*

(Ba) וארומם ייי אבי אתה כי אתה גבור ישעי:

(Bb) אל תרפני ביום צרה ביום שואה ומשואה:

Ⓞ lacks the second clause of (Ba) and, with the exception of (Bb 1), considerably departs from Ⓜ: ‘I extolled Yahweh, “You are my father, because You are a warrior for my rescue. Do not leave me alone on a day of distress, on a day of destruction and devastation”.’ Ⓢ is rather brief: *וְקָרִית לְאֲבִי מִן* וְקָרִית לְאֲבִי מִן ‘and I called to my Father above, “Lord, hero and saviour, do not desert me on a day of painful distress”.’¹⁸

Ⓞ [ביום שואה ומשואה] a phrase found in Zp 1.13 in an eschatological description of the day of the Lord. The combination *שואה ומשואה* occurs also in Jb 30.3 and 38.27. It is a description of physical and material dearth. In our passage here, however, we have a metaphorical application to mental, spiritual desperation.

The wording of the prayer’s appeal here is very close to *הוא יקראני אבי אמה* Ps 89.27. However, *πατέρα κυρίου μου* looks very much like a result of editorial work by Christian scribes.¹⁹ *Pace SD* (2267) we are not concerned just with “Father” as an address to God, “Father of my lord.” Their translation reads “Ich rief den Herrn, den Vater meines Herrn, an.” Aber wessen Vater ist er? It certainly is more than what *BJ* calls “une traduction fantaisiste.” Ⓜ follows Ⓞ: *Dominum patrem Domini mei*.

ὕπερηφανιῶν] literally “acts of arrogance (ὕπερηφανία),” a substantive related to ὑπερήφανος ‘arrogant.’ The three substantives here represent a hierarchical syntagm, < a + b + (c) >.

ὕπερηφανιῶν βοηθησίας] Alternatively the gen. of ὕπερηφανιῶν could be bearing ablative force in relation to the underlying βοήθεια, i.e. nobody helps me keep me away from acts of arrogant people. On the genitive with ablative force, see *SSG* § 22 q.

51.11) αἰνέσω τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐνδεδελχῶς

καὶ ὑμνήσω ἐν ἐξομολογήσει.

καὶ εἰσηκούσθη ἡ δέησίς μου·

*I shall praise Your name constantly
and I shall sing, confessing (gratitude).*

And my supplication was granted;

¹⁸ Ryssel (473) seems to us to be going a little too far when he emends Ⓢ *מִן מְרִימָא* to *מִן מְרִימָא* ‘the Most High,’ on the basis of which he emends Ⓜ ייי to *עליון*.

¹⁹ Only two minuscule MSS read *κυριον* in lieu of *κυριου*.

(Ba) אהללה שמך תמיד ואזכרך בתפילה:
 (Bb) אז שמע קולי יי ויאזין אל תחנוני:

The two parallel clauses in (Bb) have been condensed into one in 𐤂 (11c):
 “Then the Lord listened to my voice and God gave a hearing to my appeals.”

ὕμνήσω] ≠ 𐤁 אזכרך ‘I shall remember you’ = 𐤂 אַתְּדַכְרֵךְ. Pace Smend (501) the Heb. form here need not be Hi. When one prays to God, one is conscious of God’s presence in the background. See וְזָכַרְתָּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי הוּא הַזָּתָן Dt 8.18.

51.12) ἔσωσας γάρ με ἐξ ἀπωλείας
 καὶ ἐξείλου με ἐκ καιροῦ πονηροῦ.
 διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι καὶ αἰνέσω σε
 καὶ εὐλόγησω τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου.

*for You saved me from ruin
 and rescued me out of a disastrous period.
 Therefore I shall acknowledge You and praise You
 and bless with the name of the Lord.*

(Ba) ויפדני מכל רע וימלטני ביום צרה:
 (Bb) על כן הודיתי ואהללה ואברכה את שם יי:

[הודיתי ואהללה ואברכה .. εὐλόγησω .. καὶ αἰνέσω .. ἐξομολογήσομαί In 𐤁 both (Ba) and (Bb) the author is sharing his past experience, whereas in 𐤂 διὰ τοῦτο introduces his determination to live in the future, guided by this personal experience, which is made clear through the shift from the Aorist to the Future of the three verbs. In this respect 𐤂 follows 𐤂: מְטוֹל הֵנָּא אָוֶדָּא ‘because of this I shall confess and praise and bless Your holy name.’ Analogously 𐤁: *propterea confitebor et laudem dicam tibi et benedicam* .. By contrast, Smend (502) would vocalise ואהללה ואברכה as ואַהֲלֵלָה וְאַבְרַכָּהּ as Kahana (529) as against Segal (353) וְאַהֲלֵלָה וְאַבְרַכָּהּ.²⁰ As regards the cohortative we all know, however, that in LBH one optionally says, in the first person singular, רָאִיתִי אֹתוֹ מֵרְחוֹק וְאָרוּצָה אֵלָיו ‘I saw him at a distance and ran towards him’ as against אֵלַי וַיֵּרָץ אֵלַי ‘my servant saw me at a distance and ran towards me.’ E.g. וַיִּמְלֶךְ לְבַי עָלַי וְאָרִיבָה. Neh 5.7.²¹

[את שם יי τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου In both versions we have here a most unusual rection. The standard rection is with ב־, starting in BH at יְהוָה לְעַמְדֵי לְפָנָי יְהוָה Dt 10.8. אַת here must be instrumental in value. In LXX

²⁰ We wonder how Smend would justify the use of the Present tense in “Darum gebe ich Bekenntnis” followed by “und will preisen und benedeien u.s.w.” (II 93). Cf. Lévi (223): “je louerai et exalterai et bénirai ..”.

²¹ Cf. JM § 47 d, and for details Kropat 1909.75.

we find both $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$, the latter of which is found in Dt 10.8. But note also $\text{הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה אֱתֵּיְהוָה בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת}$ και εὐλόγησεν τὸν λαὸν ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων 2Sm 6.18.

Hereafter follows a psalm consisting of 16 lines, the first 14 of which all begin with הוֹדוּ and ending with $\text{כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ}$. The psalm is preserved only in the Heb. MS B. There has been a long debate about its authenticity, namely, was it written by BS or not. If not by BS, by whom then? We are disposed to agree with Segal (456), who holds that the psalm is an authentic piece composed by BS, but was not translated by his grandson since in the latter's time the high-priesthood had left the circle of Zadok's descendants.²² All the same we present here our translation of, and commentary on it.

כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה כִּי טוֹב	(Bc)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לַאֵל הַתְּשַׁבְּחֹת	(Bd)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְשׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל	(Be)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לַיוֹצֵר הַכֹּל	(Bf)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְגוֹאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל	(Bg)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְמַקְבֵּץ נִדְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	(Bh)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְבוֹנֵה עִירוֹ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ	(Bi)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְמַצְמִיחַ קַרְן לְבֵית דָּוִד	(Bj)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְבוֹחֵר בְּבָנֵי צְדוֹק לְכַהֵן	(Bk)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְמִגְן אַבְרָהָם	(Bl)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְצוֹר יִצְחָק	(Bm)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְאַבִּיר יַעֲקֹב	(Bn)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְבוֹחֵר בְּצִיּוֹן	(Bo)
כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ:	הוֹדוּ לְמֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵי מַלְכִּים	(Bp)
תְּהַלֵּל לְכָל חֲסִידָיו:	וְיִרַם קַרְן לְעַמּוֹ	(Bq)
הִלְלוּ יְהוָה:	לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עִם קִרְבּוֹ	(Br)

- (Bc) *Thank the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bd) *Thank the God to be praised, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Be) *Thank the One who guards Israel, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bf) *Thank the One who created all, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bg) *Thank the redeemer of Israel, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bh) *Thank the One who gathers Israel's dispersed, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bi) *Thank the One who built His city and sanctuary, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bj) *Thank the One who made a horn grow for the house of David, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bk) *Thank the One who chose the children of Zadok for priesthood, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bl) *Thank the One who shielded Abraham, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bm) *Thank the One who served as a rock for Isaac, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bn) *Thank the Mighty One of Jacob, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bo) *Thank the One who chose Zion, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bp) *Thank the King of kings of kings, for His mercy is for ever.*
 (Bq) *And He raised a horn for His people. Praise for all His saints.*
 (Br) *For the children of Israel close to Him. Praise the Lord.*

²² On a succinct summary of this question, see Skehan - Di Lella 1987.569.

As appropriate the preposition *lamed* in the beginning formula, הוֹדוּ ל־, is systematically followed by some or other title of God. We now offer some comments on select lines.

הוֹדוּ, which begins every of the first 14 lines, is affiliated with הוֹדִיתִי in the last line of the preceding verse. BS is inviting the congregation or readership to learn from his practice.

The concluding כִּי clause occurs in הוֹדוּ לַיהוָה כִּי טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִדוֹ Ps 136.1, 1Ch 16.34, 2Ch 20.21, and cf. many instances in Ps.

הַתְּשׁוּבָה (Bd)] This is the first occurrence of this noun. For that matter the root *שבח* in the sense of “to praise” is very common in Aramaic, but prior to BS it was unknown. *Maagarim* lists a total of 236 examples including 17 in QH. In QH the noun appears in three different spellings: תְּשׁוּבָה, תְּשׁוּבוּחָה, תּוֹשְׁבוּחָה, the last of which is attested once only and that in ראשי תושבחות ‘the chiefs of the praises’ 4Q403 1i31. Thus one does not know which pattern is represented here.²³ The cst. phrase here expresses a topic; on this analysis, cf. *SQH* § 21 b (xii).

For (Be), cf. הִנֵּה לֹא־יָנוּם וְלֹא יִישָׁן שׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל Ps 121.4.

On the notion of God gathering the dispersed (Bj), see יְהוָה מְקַבֵּץ נִדְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Is 56.8, and also ib. 11.12, Dt 30.4, Mi 4.6, Zp 3.19, Ne 1.9, Ps 147.2.

For (Bj), cf. בְּיוֹם הַהוּא אֶצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן לְבַיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל Ez 29.21.

(Bl) alludes to אֶל־תִּירָא אַבְרָם אֲנֹכִי מִגֵּן לֶף Gn 15.1.

Though צוֹר יִצְחָק (Bm) does not occur in the Bible, we encounter לְבוֹא אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב Gn 49.24 +. For אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב, see בְּהִרְיָהוּהָ אֶל־צוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל Is 30.29.

To repeat a lexeme twice for the sake of intensification, especially as a cst. chain is known elsewhere, e.g. מֶלֶךְ מַלְכִים .. מֶלֶךְ מַלְכִים ‘the holiest one .. the supreme king’ 4Q381 76+77.7,²⁴ but its repetition three times (Bp) is remarkable.

וַיִּרְם קֶרֶן לְעֵמֹד תְּהִלָּה לְכָל־חֲסִידָיו לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עִם־קִרְבּוֹ Ps 148.14.

The above selection of source texts shows that the psalm is firmly based on diverse notions and expressions in the Bible.²⁵

In five out of fourteen cases a word that is attached to the preposition *lamed* of the phrase הוֹדוּ ל־ is a substantive or a nominal (c, יי, אל d, צוֹר m, אֲבִיר n, מֶלֶךְ p), and the rest are participles. מִגֵּן in (Bl) is problematic. In the above-quoted source text it can be only a normal substantive, but here the form can be a Hi. ptc. In an early RH text we find הִגֵּן בְּעַדְנוּ: הִגֵּן ‘Protect us!’. Another important matter to be noted is that of the eleven (or ten if מִגֵּן is excluded) participles many refer to the past history of Israel, so undoubtedly (f), (h), (i), (j), (k), (o). On this question, see above at 6.14.

²³ BSH 309a opts for תְּשׁוּבָה.

²⁴ For a few more examples, see *SQH* § 8 c.

²⁵ More details are given and commented on by Skehan - Di Lella 1987.570f.

51.13) Ἔτι ὄν νεώτερος πρὶν ἢ πλανηθῆναί με
ἔζητήσα σοφίαν προφανῶς ἐν προσευχῇ μου.

*When I was still younger (than now) before going astray
I sought after wisdom openly in my prayer sessions.*

(B) אני נער הייתי וחפצתי בה ובקשתיה:
(T) אני נער בטרם תע/ותי ובקשתיה:

Here follows an acrostic poem. In the course of its transmission, however, some disruptions seem to have taken place in the number of units as well as in their sequence. In the middle ages the acrostic nature of the poem may have escaped scribes. The Qumran manuscript (T) of a much earlier date has been preserved only up to the letter *kaf*, but the text is exactly in the alphabetical order. In general (T) is closer to \mathfrak{C} than (B) with the sole exception of vs. 20, v.a.l.

אני] This pronoun has no specific grammatical function to play here. It is needed to start this acrostic poem.

πλανηθῆναί με] בטרם can be used with a Pf. as in יָלְדוּ הַרִיִם בְּטָרָם ‘before mountains came into being’ Ps 90.2, but also with an Inf. as in בְּטָרָם הִבְרָאָם ‘before they were created’ 4Q215a 1ii9.²⁶ The form here can hence be read as either תְּעִיתִי or תְּעוֹתִי.

What precedes functions as a circumstantial, temporal clause as in וְעָלִי וְקָן מֵאֲדָר וְשָׁמַע אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן בְּנֵי לְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל 1Sm 2.22.²⁷

Pace Smend (94) with “bevor ich auf Reisen ging” and Snaith (259) “before I set out on my travels” the Gk verb chosen signifies “wandering off the right path” as in καὶ πλανηθεὶς προσκυνήσης θεοῖς ἑτέροις Dt 30.17; for more SG examples, see *GELS* s.v. πλανάω 2. Let us note the modesty on the part of our author. True, in 31.9ff. the verb has no negative connotation. In fact, the author states that he found travels very beneficial and informative. All the same, here the verb תעה in (T), what Smend did not have the fortune of seeing, settles the issue, for it does not signify a pleasant travel of a holiday maker.

σοφίαν] This vital word is missing in \mathfrak{H} , which only uses a fem. suf. pron. in בקשתיה. The poem may originally have had a subtitle with חכמה in it. A similar problem arises in \mathfrak{S} אֶלָּא טָלָא וְאֶצְטָבִית בָּהּ וּבְעִיתָהּ ‘but I was young and found interest in it and sought it.’²⁸ This text clearly accords with (B). Note בָּהּ אֶצְטָבִית = וחפצתי, which is missing in (T).

²⁶ In our case Sanders (1965.42, 80) reads תעיתי without any comment.

²⁷ Cf. Van Peursen (2004.137).

²⁸ The initial אלא is a misprint of אנה, i.e. אָנָּא ‘I’ (Smend 504).

In contrast to \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{H} “it” is masculine in gender, and the only relevant referent nearby is God, which is odd. In \mathfrak{S} we find a 3f.sg. object suffix a number of times in this poem. E.g. אֶשְׁבֶּקְיוּהָ .. אֶטְעוּהָ ‘I forget it .. I forsake it’ 51.20, and it is difficult to identify a f.sg. noun in the context.

προφανῶς] In view of **והפצתי** Smend (504) suggests an emendation to **προθύμως** ‘earnestly.’

51.14) ἔναντι ναοῦ ἤξιουν περὶ αὐτῆς
καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτων ἐκζητήσω αὐτήν.

*Before the temple I kept pleading about it
and till the finish I shall pursue it.*

(B) ואתפלל תפלה בנערותי:
(T) באה לי בתרה ועד סופה אדורשנה:

The textual relationship between **Ⓞ** and the two versions of **Ⓜ** is mixed. (B) is missing in (T), and (Tb) = **Ⓞ** (14b), and (Ta) “it came to me in her beauty” is missing in **Ⓞ**.

περὶ αὐτῆς] ≠ **Ⓜ** בנערותי ‘in my youth,’ but rather = בעדה, i.e. בעדה ‘on its account,’ cf. וְתַפְלָה הָיָה וְאֵל־תְּשֹׂא בְעַדָּם רְנָה וְתַפְלָה Je 11.14. Sanders (1965.81) is consistent in personalising the wisdom: “when I looked for her .. she came in her beauty.” The Heb. morphology does not enable us to decide whether this is right or not. Nowhere in this document the author addresses the wisdom personally. This personalisation is shared by Schechter, Box - Oesterley, Snaith, and Skehan - Di Lella.²⁹ In our view **אדורשנה** speaks against such an analysis.

[בתרה] the standard spelling of which would be בתארה, i.e. בַּתְּרָה. With the letter **ב** as the first letter (T) provides a suitable text for this acrostic poem. Smend (504, II 61) emends ἔναντι ναοῦ to ἐν νεότητί μου and shifts **בנערותי** to the beginning of the verse, a rather radical exercise in textual criticism.³⁰

The spelling **תר** in lieu of **תאר** is well established in QH, e.g. כול תור בתבל ‘every beauty in the earth’ 4Q426 1i9, an indication of the weakened guttural.³¹

ἕως ἐσχάτων] One’s serious study of wisdom goes through multiple stages, starting with Alpha and concluding with Omega. Skehan (1971.391f.) identifies a *he locale*, hence “up to the end.” It is as possible to analyse the final **ה** as a 3f.sg. suf. pron.: “till its end,” i.e. till its last phase, last chapter.

²⁹ German and French translations are ambiguous due to the fem. gender of *Weisheit* and *sagesse*.

³⁰ Sanders (81) wonders if the Gk phrase is a rendering of **באהלי**, but **אהל** is never rendered with **ναός**.

³¹ Qimron (2018.83, § A 4.5) treats the word-medial **א** in **תואר** in lieu of the traditional spelling **תאר** in terms of “digraph,” the use of two vowel letters next to each other to mark a single vowel. In all of the examples he mentions the **א** is etymological. Its absence is an indication of a current phonetic process, namely the weakened guttural. Cp. **יפי התור** 11Q5 28.9 with **אשה** **יפת תואר** 11Q19 63.11. That the **א** belongs to the earlier stage of the language is proven by the Massoretic vocalisation of the word, **תֹּאֵר**, never **תור** or **תָר**.

אדורשנה] in lieu of the orthodox spelling אדרשנה, i.e. אָדְרֶשְׁנָה, a phenomenon well attested in QH, e.g. ידורשהו 1QS 6.14 // ידרושהו ib. 17 and ותהשכהו 1QH^a 4.34. For more examples in QH, see Qimron 2018.194 (§ C 3.2.3.1, 5, 6, and 8).³²

This verse is missing in S.

51.15) ἐξανθούσης ὡς περκαζούσης σταφυλῆς
 εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν αὐτῇ.
 ἐπέβη ὁ πούς μου ἐν εὐθύτητι,
 ἐκ νεότητός μου ἵχνευσον αὐτήν.

*As sprouting grapes turning black
 my heart rejoiced in it,
 my feet walked straight,
 since my youth I had been on its track.*

אדני מנעורי חכמה למדתי:	באמתה דרכה רגלי	(B)
ישמחו לב:	גם גרע נץ בבשול ענבים	(Ta)
כי מנעורי ידעתייה:	דרכה רגלי במישור	(Tb)

The inferiority of (B) to (T) is manifest with the absence of a word beginning with ג nearby. Also in terms of content, (T) is very close to G.

ὡς] *Pace NETS* “When the grape was putting out flowers ..” ὡς with temporal value is not known in SG to take a participial clause, a genitive absolute. This must be modal in value as in ὡς ἀμνητοῦ εἰσφορομένου ‘like harvest being brought in’ Is 23.4. More examples of this type of ὡς are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. I 1 c.

אדני = S מְרִי ‘my Lord.’ The sequel is almost equal to (Tb 2) מִן טְלִיּוֹתַי ‘since my childhood I knew the teaching.’

εὐφράνθη] If we accept the pl. form of ישמחו as genuine, its s can be only ענבים. The translator’s *Vorlage* may have read ישמח Qal, not Piel. However, the author seems to be sharing his past experience,³³ not stating a universally acceptable truth. Then the Pf. שמחו would better harmonise with the other three verbs: גרע, דרכה, and ידעתייה, and that may have stood in the *Vorlage* of G.

ἐν αὐτῇ] If this is a free addition by the translator, he might be underscoring that his grandfather was referring to what one might experience at a pleasant drinking party as expressed in לִבְב־אָנוּשׁ וְיַיִן יִשְׂמַח לְבַב־אָנוּשׁ οἶνος εὐφραίνει καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου Ps 104.15.

³² *Pace Skehan* (1971.392) this has nothing to do with the consonant ר, as shown by many examples quoted by Qimron, e.g. ישופטי 1QS 10.13.

³³ Cf. Sanders (1965.81) on (Ta 1): “Figurative of the young man’s reaching maturity and shedding the innocence of childhood.”

ὁ πούς μου רגלי Sanders (1965.81) wonders whether רגל carries a euphemistic connotation, i.e. male genitalia.³⁴ *GELS* s.v. πούς 1 c mentions a possible euphemism in the sense of “anus” at Jd 3.24B. However, how would one interpret במישור? Its counterpart in B, באמתה ‘in its truth’ would definitely not support such an analysis, cf. שִׁבְּקָאִתָּא ‘in truth.’³⁵ (TB) ידעתי certainly not. This questionable analysis would fit some scholars’ personification of wisdom as mentioned above under vs. 14.

ἴχνευον] The selection of the Impf. is most appropriate.

51.16) ἔκλινα ὀλίγον τὸ οὖς μου καὶ ἐδεξάμην
καὶ πολλὴν εὖρον ἑμαυτῶ παιδείαν.

*I inclined my ear(s) a little and received
and found much teaching for myself.*

והרבה מצאתי דעה: (B)
הטיתי כמעט אוזני והרבה מצאתי לקח: (T)

On the standing phrase אָן הָטָה, see above at 6.33.

ὀλίγον כמעט Cf. בָּהִיּוֹתָם מְתִי מְסֻפָּר כְּמַעֲט וְנָרִים בָּהֶּן ἔν τῶ εἶναι αὐτοῦς ἀριθμῶ βραχεῖς, ὀλιγοστοὺς καὶ παροίκους ἔν αὐτῇ Ps 105.12, where כְּמַעֲט elaborates the preceding phrase, what has been skilfully captured by the translator with his use of the superlative ὀλιγοστοὺς. It is almost certain that כמעט is opposed to the following הרבה, which is not quite the same as “I had hardly begun .. when ..” (Snaith) and “À peine ai-je tendu .. que j’ai trouvé ..” (Mopsik). שִׁבְּקָאִתָּא has misunderstood כְּמַעֲט: כִּד זְעוּר אָנָּא ‘when I was young,’ probably influenced by vs. 14a.³⁶

Since הרבה is indeclinable, it cannot be an adjective, e.g. וַיִּצְבֵּר יוֹסֵף בָּרַב. And yet in BH it is never put ahead of a substantive. It is basically adverbial in the sense of “in a large quantity (or: number).” This is contrasted with רב used as a normal adjectival modifier in שׁוּבוּ אֶל-אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק. The rare fronting in our case is explicable from this adverbial character of הרבה, fronted and separated from לקח. The fronting is highlighting the contrast.

παιδείαν לקח] The same equation is found at 8.8 above and three more times in LXX. This sense is known in BH, e.g. וְשָׁמַע הָקָם יוֹסֵף לְקַח Pr 1.5. The same Gk noun, however, is used in a contrasting pair at δόσις καὶ λήψις מתת ולקח 42.7, where no intellectual exchange is involved. By combining the

³⁴ Such is admitted in BDB s.v. 1 ad finem, *DCH* s.v. 1 a ad finem, and *HALOT* s.v. A 4; the latter two do not mention Si 51.15.

³⁵ On the relationship between the two שִׁבְּקָאִתָּא versions and שִׁבְּקָאִתָּא, see Van Peursen 2003.364.

³⁶ *Pace Lévi* (227) Syr. זְעוּר can mean “young (in age).” It is applied to Benjamin in Gn 42.15 (קָטָן) and to the prodigal son in Lk 15.12 (νεώτερος). Sokoloff s.v. 390a is in need of improvement in contrast to Payne Smith, s.v. 2. Cf. also Van Peursen 2003.364.

two parameters we could perhaps understand לקח מצאתי here in the sense of “my return was rich.”

Sanders (82) glosses the word as “seductive words,” mentioning Pr 7.21 and 16.21, in the former of which it refers to enticing words of a whore, which fits Sanders’s attribution of erotic nuances to wisdom in this passage.³⁷

51.17) προκοπή ἐγένετό μοι ἐν αὐτῇ.
τῷ διδόντι μοι σοφίαν δῶσω δόξαν.

*I scored progress in it;
the one who gave me wisdom I shall honour,*

(B) עלה היה לי לכבוד ולמלמדי אתן הודאה:
(T) ועלה היתה לי למלמדי אתן הודא/5:

[προκοπή] Our *Index* 101 s.v. suggests this Gk substantive as a rendering of עֲלִיָּה, thus emending עלה.³⁸ But for another emendation of היה (B) to היתה as in T, עליה cannot be the *s*. One could view ἐν αὐτῇ as freely added. Ⓞ, however, has nothing that could reflect כבוד. Should this be part of the original Ⓜ, one could say that good progress made in the study of wisdom might result in some significant advancement in your financial or social status. An alternative, though perhaps less convincing, solution is to interpret (B1) as meaning “its yoke (עֲלָה) was to me a heavy burden (כֶּבֶד, i.e. כּוֹבֵד emended from כבוד),” cf. Ⓢ quoted below.

Sanders (1965.81f.)³⁹ analyses עלה in T as עֲלָה ‘nurse’ as in 1Sm 6.7 +, but this f.sg. ptc. means a mother sucking her baby. Did Ben Sirá show signs of a genius as an infant? Earlier he told us about his youth: נער נεώτερος (vs. 13), נערותי (vs. 14), מנעורי ἐκ νεότητος (vs. 15). The author could have chosen אִמְנָת applied to Naomi in her old age, when she took care of a just-born baby boy of Ruth (Ru 4.16). In our 1979 study (p. 171) we pointed out that, in BH and MH, the verb עול is used only with reference to animals, and for human mothers or wet-nurses the verb used is הִינִיק.⁴⁰

τῷ διδόντι μοι σοφίαν] This, on account of the masc. gender of the ptc., cannot refer to wisdom, but the author’s teacher. The author possibly meant more than one teacher, thus מְלַמְּדֵי, but his grandson may have known one of them as respected by his grandfather as the most excellent. However, διδοσιν, a v.l. in the pl. in S*, may have preserved the original reading. Because the

³⁷ Thus *pace* “dem, der mir Weisheit gibt” (SD).

On this issue of eroticism, see our criticism in Muraoka 1979.169-78.

³⁸ Skehan (1971.393) reconstructs וְעֲלָה said to mean “advantage.” We know of no such Heb. word anywhere.

³⁹ Van Peursen (1997.164), who analyses עלה as a ptc., presumably agrees with Sanders.

⁴⁰ Van Peursen (1997.168) mentions two cases of עול used in QH with reference to humans. In fact, one of them is from a different root: עילול ‘a baby’ 1QH 15.21 and עולה ‘her baby’ 1QH 17.36.

author is reminiscing, we would analyse the determinate ptc. here as indicating his past experience.⁴¹ The present aspect of the ptc., not διδάξαντι, does not affect the question here, as shown in Λωτ τῷ συμπορευομένῳ μετὰ Ἀβραμ ‘to Lot, who was travelling with Abram’ Gn 13.5.⁴² Alternatively the teacher could be God as argued by Skehan (1971.393), referring to אֲנִי יְהוָה מְלַמֵּדְךָ Is 48.17.

יְהוָה/ו] Either reading could make sense: “honour expressed by me” (gen. of origin) or “honour due to him.”⁴³ Sanders translates the word as “my ardour,” which would apply to the time when the author was still a vigorous student.⁴⁴

Cf. שׁ: אֶתֶּל תּוֹדִיתָא וְלִמְלִפְנֵי אֶתְל לִי לְאִיקְרָא וְנִירָה הוּא לִי לְאִיקְרָא ‘its yoke became to me an honour and to my teacher I shall give thanks.’

51.18) διανοήθην γὰρ τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτήν
καὶ ἐζήλωσα τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνοῦμαι.

*For I planned to practise it
and enthusiastically pursued what is good and I shall never feel shame.*

(B חשבתי להיטיב ולא אהפך כי אמצאנו:
(T זמותי ואשקה קנאתי בטוב ולא אשוב:

διανοήθην] Whilst in LXX διανοέομαι is a rendering of נָמַן qal and חָשַׁב qal each three times, the former of (T) comes after ו of vs. 17. But Ⓞ has an *o* after the verb, which is missing in (T). However, ποιῆσαι might be a free rendering of קַח־שָׂא, which then could be analysed as Qal קַח־שָׂא or Pi. קַח־שָׂא, the suf. pron. rendered as αὐτήν, hence not Qal קַח־שָׂא or Pi. קַח־שָׂא.⁴⁵ Although a suf. pron. directly attached to a verb can represent not only an אֶת object, but also one mediated through a preposition, and the verb קַח־שָׂא whether in Qal or Piel and also its synonym, קַח־צַח, do not take an אֶת object, so that the meaning of the two verbs cannot be represented with ποιέω. In our view Ben Sira was not after fun with Wisdom, as suggested by Sander’s “I purposed to make sport: I was zealous for pleasure.”

With his “Je résolu de la triturer” Mopsik sees here a form of קַח־שָׂא ‘to pulverise.’ Taking this sense figuratively “I chewed it thoroughly” makes sense, but that has nothing at all with ποιῆσαι αὐτήν. Skehan - Di Lella also identify here קַח־שָׂא, offering as a literal translation of the clause “I resolved and wore her down (by treading)” and as a non-literal version “I resolved to

⁴¹ On this aspect in BH, see above at 6.13.

⁴² For more examples in SG, see *SSG* 28 **ha** (ii).

⁴³ On the types of the gen. or cst. st., see *SSG* § 22 **v** (i) and (iv) and *SQH* § 21 **b** (i) and (iv).

⁴⁴ For Sanders “ardor” here is symbolic of erotic lust; in Sanders (1971.435) he speaks of “virility.” But he seems to have forgotten that, in פְּנֵי־תֵתֶן לְאַחֲרֵיהֶם הוֹדֶךָ Pr 5.9 a guy is advised not to give his הוֹד to others (אַחֲרֵיהֶם masc. pl.).

⁴⁵ Thus *pace* Sanders 1965.13.

tread her paths,” a very imaginative analysis, though we doubt that such can be supported by the very known meaning of the verb.

[להיטיב] = שְׁמַטְמַטְבּוּ.

αὐτὴν] The only conceivable referent in this context is σοφία. The meaning would then be “to put the wisdom I acquired into practice.” Cf. ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου, σύνεσις ἀγαθὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιουσιν αὐτήν Ps 111.10 < לְכָל־עֲשִׂיָּהּ הַטּוֹב.

ἐζήλωσα] against ἐζήτησα preferred by Smend (506) and adopted by Ziegler. However, in the light of (T) תִּתְאָבֵד, which was unknown to Ziegler, the majority reading ἐζήλωσα appears to deserve preference: “I enthusiastically pursued the good.” Smend’s argument is that ζηλώω is used in the sense of “beneiden,” which is true, but not always. For instance, μὴ ζηλοῦτε θάνατον ἐν πλάνῃ ζωῆς ὑμῶν Wi 1.12 is mentioned in *GELS* s.v. under the sense of “to show ζῆλος for,” and ζῆλος is defined as “sense of attachment and possessiveness, ardour.” Thus it is not just “jealousy” but also “zeal.” Cf. Wi 1.12 in *SD*: “Bemüht euch nicht eifrig um den Tod auf der Irrfahrt eures Lebens.” One of the commonest equivalents of ζητέω is שָׁקַב, which, however, does not take the preposition בְּ.

αἰσχυνθῶ] ≠ אָשׁוּב, but = אָבֹשׁ, i.e. אָבֹשׁ. This is not equivalent to בּוֹשֵׁת, but the author has no regret over what he did at the time in his youth and is determined to keep pursuing the same course nor, in תְּ, will he turn back. Hence *pace* Sanders’ “I was zealous for pleasure, without pause.” Sim. (B) ךָּ אַהֲפֹךְ = שְׁ.⁴⁶ Preferable is Mopsik: “je n’en reviendrais pas.”

אִם אִמְצָאנוּ] possibly a case of haplography in lieu of אִם אִמְצָאנוּ ‘unless I find it,’ cf. לֹא אֶשְׁלַחְךָ בִּי אִם-בְּרִכְתְּךָ Gn 32.27. But what does the object suffix וְנִי refer to? No masc. sg. noun is visible in the context. An error for אִמְצָאנוּ?

As an interpretation of the Heb. text, (T) in particular, Kister (1999.177f.) is appealing; he suggests that the author is alluding to תִּתְאָבֵד וְלֹא יִפְתָּח מִפְּנֵי-רָבִב Jb 39.22. This appears to have escaped our translator.

51.19) διαμεμάχισταί ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῇ
καὶ ἐν ποιήσει νόμου διηκριβασάμην.
τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐξεπέτασα πρὸς ὕψος
καὶ τὰ ἀγνοήματα αὐτῆς ἐπενόησα.

*My soul grappled with it
and in practice of the law I was meticulous.
I unfolded my hands upwards
and noticed what I was ignorant of it.*

⁴⁶ According to Van Peursen 2003.365, this is a piece of evidence showing (B) as representing its partial retroversion from שְׁ.

(Ba) חשקה נפשי בה ופני לא אהפך ממנה:
 (Bb) ידי פתחה שעריה ולה אהדר⁴⁷ ואביט בה:
 (Ta) חריתי נפשי בה ופני לוא השפיותי:
 (Tb) ידי פתח...מְעַרְמִיָּה אֶתְבוֹנֵן כְּפִי הַבְּרוּתִי אֶל⁴⁸..

This verse is as difficult as vs. 2 above. In \mathfrak{G} we find nothing that could reflect (Ba 2) ‘I will not turn my face away from it’ and (Ta 2) ‘and I did not turn my face away.’

[διαμεμάχισται] This can hardly reflect חשקה ‘became attached’ (Ba),⁴⁹ but חריתי (Ta), and this is the sole instance in LXX of the equation διαμαχίζομαι / Qal הָרָה. In BH this verb mostly occurs in Qal in the sense of ‘to be or become angry.’⁵⁰ However, among six instances of Hitp. we find אָיַךְ אֵתְּהַרְהָ אֶתְּהַרְהָ אֶתְּהַרְהָ אֶתְּהַרְהָ אֶתְּהַרְהָ אֶתְּהַרְהָ ‘how could you contend with horses (in a race)?’ Je 12.5, where in \mathfrak{S} we find מָתְהַרָּה, a verb of the same root as our Heb. verb here. Cf. a Nif. form נָהַרְוּ ἐμαχέσαντο Ct 1.6 discussed above, p. 690.

The verb here takes a prepositional object by means of בִּי, the so-called *beth* of enmity, though BS did not find wisdom to be an enemy to fight with, but his learning of it must have been a *struggle* for him.

ינפשי in (Ta) חריתי נפשי is in apposition to the *s* of חריתי: “I, i.e. my soul, struggled.’ By contrast the same noun in (Ba) חשקה נפשי is the grammatical *s* of חשקה ‘my soul yearned after it.’⁵¹

[νόμου] Rahlfs and Ziegler as against misspellings such as λιμου and μου. τὰς χεῖράς μου (Bb, Tb) [ידי] What follows these items, however, has nothing in common between \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{H} : (Bb) “my hand opened its gates,” probably the same in (Tb). Wisdom is apparently concealed behind doors. \mathfrak{G} did not regard ידי here as used euphemistically for *penis* as shown by the use of the pl. τὰς χεῖράς μου.⁵²

[שעריה] cf. פתחיה τῶν θυρωμάτων αὐτῆς 14.23.

[לה] אהדר⁵³ ואביט בה ‘I will make entry for it and gaze at it.’

The Gk phrase here (19c) occurs also in ἐκπετάσαντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν 48.20, where \mathfrak{H} reads ויפרשו אליו כפיהם.

⁴⁷ Abegg reads אהדר. In the facsimile the third letter looks more like *dalet* than *resh*.

⁴⁸ אל כפי הברותי, though presented by Abegg, has inadvertently dropped out in BSH.

⁴⁹ Cf. אֶתְּדַבֵּקֶת \mathfrak{S} . Smend (506) is of the view that \mathfrak{G} represents עשקה, cp. התעשקו עמו Gn 26.20.

⁵⁰ Sanders’ translation reads: “I kindled my desire for her.” The Heb. verb never means “to kindle” in the literal sense. With אף as the *s* it simply means “anger was aroused.” Pace BDB s.v. הָרָה we know of no Aramaic idiom in which it means “to cause fire to burn.” Nothing of the kind is found in Cohen *Dictionnaire* 9.921f. Nor do we find here, pace Sanders, any erotic overtone. Moreover, with “desire” Sanders must mean “sexual desire.” נפש, however, never means “desire.” It could mean part of a human being or one of his or her functions or activities that leads to a desire, but not desire itself. In Hebrew you would not say מה נפשך in the sense of “What do you desire?”

⁵¹ Schechter (67) mentions נפשי השקה בתורה ‘my soul years after the Torah’ bYeb 63.2.

⁵² Did T also read פתחה? Cf. Sanders 1965:82 and Muraoka 1979:171f.

⁵³ Abegg reads אהדר. In the facsimile the third letter looks more like *dalet* than *resh*.

ἐπενόησα (Tb) אאתבונן] a reading by Ziegler against the majority reading, ἐπενθησα ‘I grieved.’

ἀγνοήματα αὐτῆς (Tb) מְעֲרֵמִיָּה⁵⁴ an objective genitive, on which see SSG § 22 v (xiii). The phrase could mean “things that are generally unknown about it.” The same Heb. collocation occurs at 42.18: בְּמַעֲרֵמֵיהֶם יתבונן ‘He ponders their wonderful feats,’ where it goes about the abyss and hearts of people.

51.20) τὴν ψυχὴν μου κατεύθυνα εἰς αὐτὴν
καὶ ἐν καθαρισμῷ εὗρον αὐτήν.
καρδίαν ἐκτησάμην μετ’ αὐτῆς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς·
διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλειφθῶ.

*I focused my spirit on it
and found it in purity.*

*I secured my mind with it from the beginning;
therefore I shall never be left alone.*

ולנצח נצחים לא אטה מִמֶּנֶה:	נפשי נתתי ⁵⁵ אחריה	(Ba)
	ובטהרה מצאתיה:	(Bb)
בעבור כן ...:	ולב קניתי לה מתחלתה	(Bc)
וברומיה לוא אשלה:	טרתי נפשי בה	(Ta)
...	כפי הברותי אל ...	(Tb)
...	... ל..	(Tc)

The word order of Ⓢ fits (Ba) better than (Ta). Sanders’ analysis of טרתי (Ta) as derived from טרדתִי is acceptable, two dentals merging into one and a phonetic spelling. This verb occurs in Qal twice only in BH in the sense of “to be continual,” דָּלְקָה טוֹרֵךְ ‘a continual dripping’ in both cases, and applied to a contentious, noxious woman. Then (Ta) could mean “I persistently occupied myself with it.” On the syntactic analysis of נפשי, see at vs. 20 above. In vs. 20a Ⓢ looks closer to (Ba) than to (Ta).

κατεύθυνα] an acceptable, approximative rendering of נתתי (Ba) ‘I positioned.’ Smend (507) emends נתתי to כווננתי, i.e. כוֹנֵנְתִי, which is acceptable, but the use of נָתַן as synonymous with שָׁם is universally known, see BDB s.v. נָתַן Qal 2. Though the sole attestation in LXX, we are happy to retain the equation κατεύθυνέω / נתן qal. Smend was obliged to change the word order as well, i.e. כווננתי נפשי אחריה in order to make this the start of a כ line, but with the Qumran text not at his disposal he has nothing to commence a ט line.

εἰς αὐτὴν] ≠ (Ba) אחריה ‘after her,’ i.e. pursuing her.

⁵⁴ In the light of this new Heb. MS Smend’s emendation to ἀγνάσματα may now be left out of account.

⁵⁵ After this Abegg inserts בה, which is not in the MS.

(Ba2) cannot be identified in \mathcal{C} nor in (T): “I shall not stray away from it for ever and ever.” However, \mathcal{S} has preserved it as $\text{וְלַעֲלָם עַלְמֵינָן לֹא אֶטְעֶיְוֶיהָ}$ ‘and for ages I shall not forget it.’

$\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}$ [טהרה] In BH the root טהר, when applied to a woman, does not refer to her virginity. Such a notion would be expressed: לֹא יִדְעָה אִישׁ .⁵⁶ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ [ולב] The conjunction ו had better be deleted to make לב start a line.

$\acute{\alpha}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\zeta]$ \neq (Bc) מתחלתה ‘from its beginning.’ \mathcal{H} could then be rendered: “and I secured my mind from Chapter One on it.”

$\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$] = (Bc) בעבור כן.

$\text{וּבְרֹמֵיהּ לֹא אִשְׁלָה כְּפִי הַבְּרֹתַי}$ (Ta) We find nothing corresponding to this in \mathcal{C} : “At its heights I cannot be quiet. My palms I cleaned ..”.⁵⁷ The first half may mean that, in the course of his study, when he reaches the high points of wisdom, he would be tempted to shout out of excitement. Skehan - Di Lella’s “never weary of extolling her” is based on their emendation of רֹמְמָה to רֹמֵמָה , i.e. רוממה.

All in all \mathcal{C} of this verse is much closer to (B) than to (T).

51.21) $\kappa\alpha\iota \eta \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\iota\alpha \mu\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\theta\eta \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\zeta\eta\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma\cdot$
 $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\nu \kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha.$

*And my belly was agitated to seek it out;
 therefore I attained a wonderful possession.*

(B) מעי יהמו כתנור להביט בה בעבור כן קניתי קנין טוב:

$\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\zeta\eta\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\iota]$ = לתור, i.e. לְתֹר, though this would be the sole attestation in LXX of this equation, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\zeta\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ / תור qal. The σ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma$ could be a free addition or a suf. pron. in כְּתֹרָה. However, since הָמָה basically has to do with loud sound, the original reading may have been ככנור as in מְעִי לְמוֹאֵב כְּכִנּוֹר Is 16.11, and esp. הָמוּ מְעִי לוֹ Je 31.20.⁵⁸ The equation $\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ / הָמָה qal occurs in LXX four times.

[להביט בה] ‘in order to gaze at it’ is missing in \mathcal{C} . Should this Heb. phrase be no mistake for בהביט בה, i.e. בְּהִבִּיט בָּהּ ‘as I gazed at her,’ it could be a free addition when ככנור had already become כתנור ‘like an oven.’

Furthermore, כתנור may have emerged after יהמו had inadvertently changed to יהמו ‘they would become hot.’ Cf. $\text{מְעִי יִקְדִין אֵיךְ תִּנּוֹרָא לְמִדְקוֹ בָּהּ}$ ‘my belly burns like an oven in order to gaze at it.’⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Pace Muraoka 1971.172.

⁵⁷ We withdraw our interpretation (Muraoka 1971.172) as a little too much influenced by Sanders.

⁵⁸ So Thomas 1969.

⁵⁹ So Thomas 1969.226, accepted by Muraoka 1977a.509. Pace Van Peursen (2003.365) the Syr. verb used here does not mean “to seek.”

ἐκτεράμην [קניתייה] The Heb. verb has a suf. pron. attached as its *o*, making טוב קנין an object complement.⁶⁰

κατήμα [קנין] Segal (362) mentions mAb 6.10, where it is said that God acquired (קנה) five (or: four) possessions (קנינים), among which, however, wisdom is not included. The five are Tora, heaven and earth, Abraham, Israel, and the temple.

51.22) ἔδωκεν κύριος γλῶσσάν μοι μισθόν μου,
καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἰνέσω αὐτόν.

*The Lord gave me a tongue as my reward,
and with it I shall praise Him.*

(B) נתן יי לי שכר שפתותי ובלשוני אהודנו:

[γλῶσσάν] ≠ שפתותי ‘my lips.’

§ has reversed the sequence of the two organs of speech: יהב מר לי לשוני ‘my Lord gave my tongue as a reward and with my lips I shall praise Him.’ Alternatively we could follow Lévi, taking שכר as being in the st. cst. So Segal (358) and Kahana (530): שָׁכַר in contrast to Mopsik with his “un salaire: mes lèvres.” But then what was the reward? This line then could be an explanation of the second half of vs. 21. Is BS referring to questions he used to put to his teacher and the Bible he had read aloud (הגה)?⁶¹ In what would the average reader of § see BS’s reward? Before starting studying on wisdom he already had a tongue, whether what he had in his mouth or the language; both γλῶσσα and לִשׁוֹן can mean either. § solved the problem, like Mopsik and §, by identifying here an object complement, on which notion see above at Prologue 26, p. 8.

[אהודנו] in lieu of אודנו. Impf. Hi. with the characteristic ה not syncopated is rare in BH, occurring perhaps, at least partly, under the influence of Aramaic; see JM § 54 b.⁶²

51.23) ἐγγίσατε πρὸς με, ἀπαιδευτοί,
καὶ ἀλίσθητε ἐν οἴκῳ παιδείας.

*Come near to me, you who are uneducated,
and you should lodge in a school.*

(B) פנו אלי סכלים ולינו בבית מדרשי:

[ἐγγίσατε] § טָּו “Drop in!”

⁶⁰ On this notion, see *SQH* § 31 j, the two constituents resulting in a nominal clause.

⁶¹ On the meaning of this verb, see above at 50.28.

⁶² No instance is attested in QH, see Qimron 2018.250, nor in MH, see Segal 1927 § 167.

Was סכלים originally fronted, starting a ס line? Or was סורי, i.e. סורי, the first word, beginning a ס line, as Lévi (229) thinks?

οἶκον παιδείας] *בית מדרשי* The important *my* is missing in ⚭. So ⚭ בית אילפנא ‘school.’ This is the first mention of this institution of Jewish education. Does לינו suggest a boarding school?

51.24) τί ἔτι ὑστερεῖστε ἐν τούτοις
καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ ὑμῶν διψῶσι σφόδρα;
*Why are you still lacking these things
and leaving your spirits so thirsty?*

(B) עד מתי תחסרון מן אילו ואילו ונפשכם צמאה מאד תהיה:

τί ἔτι ὑστερεῖστε] Quite an improvement in Ziegler compared with Rahlfs τί (Swete καὶ) ὅτι ὑστερεῖσθαι λέγετε. *Pace* Lévi (230) ⚭ and ⚭ did not read תאחרון ‘you are being late’; ὑστερέω can also mean ‘to lack’ and Syr. ḥṣr does not mean ‘to be late.’

τί ἔτι] ⚭ = ⚭ עד אמת ‘Until when?’

ἐν] On ὑστερέω ἐν τι, cf. ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρισματι 1Cor 1.7. The Heb. combination מן חסר occurs in מְחַסְרֵי מְטוֹבָה Ec 4.8.

אילו ואילו] The demonstrative pron., pl., אילו, is typical of MH as against BH אלה.⁶³ Its juxtaposition as here is also typical of MH; see Segal 1927.410. This is distinct from a case such as וְהַיְשָׁפִיל וְהָיָה יְרִים Ps 75.8 and וַיְהִי לַיְשָׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי לַיְשָׂרָאֵל Josh 8.22.

51.25) ἤνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα
Κτήσασθε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνευ ἀργυρίου.
*I have opened my mouth and spoken (about it),
‘Procure (it) for yourselves for no money,*

(B) פי פתחתי ודברתי בה קנו לכם חכמה בלא כסף:

ἐλάλησα בה] *דברתי בה* Unless בה is an error for בו, בה must mean ‘about it, i.e. wisdom.’ The preposition ב- marking a topic is well established. E.g. וַיְדַבֵּר טוֹב וְהוֹנֵחַן בְּדוֹד טוֹב 1Sm 19.3; more BH examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. ב IV e. So Mopsik (334): “je parle d’elle.”

Κτήσασθε] Both κτάομαι and קנה can mean ‘to procure by paying a price,’ e.g. καὶ ἐκτησάμην (וַאֲקִנָּה) τὸν ἀγρὸν .. Je 39(⚭ 32).9.

ἄνευ ἀργυρίου] cf. πίετε ἄνευ ἀργυρίου Is 55.1.

⁶³ Nöldeke (1900.84) objects to viewing this as typical of Late Hebrew, but the non-occurrence in BH of such a common word is to be borne in mind.

51.26) τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ζυγόν,
καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν.
ἐγγύς ἐστιν εὑρεῖν αὐτήν.

*Put your neck under the yoke,
and be mentally ready to receive instruction.
It can be found near by.*

: ומשאה תשא נפשכם (Ba) וצואריכם בעלה הביאו
: ונותן נפשו מוצא אתה: (Bb) קרובה היא למבקשיה

τὸν τράχηλον [וצואריכם] The Heb. conjunction, though supported by § and ¶, is out of place in this ⚡ line.

ζυγόν [עלה] ¶ עלה, i.e. על־הַקָּמָה = ‘the yoke of wisdom.’ A yoke is a symbol of a burden to be carried. The Heb. prep. ב־ expresses the figurative sense of על⁶⁴ better than ¶ ὑπὸ, which focuses more on its literal sense, for one does not place a thing inside a yoke.

παιδείαν [משאה] There is no need to alter משאה to מוסרה, i.e. מוסרה ‘its instruction.’ משאה is preferable as an *o* of the verb of the same root, תשא. Here משא means “a message carried and brought (by wisdom).” Cf. its use common in the prophetic literature as in לא תאמרו משא יהוה Je 23.38. Lévi’s (231) “son fardeau” is inclined towards ‘heavy burden.’

¶ has shortened (Bb): “it is close to those seeking it and one who devotes himself finds it.” The combination נותן נפשו is found also in 7.20.

51.27) ἴδετε ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν ὅτι ὀλίγον ἐκοπίασα
καὶ εὔρον ἑμαυτῷ πολλήν ἀνάπαυσιν.

*See with your eyes that I have toiled a little
and have found for myself a great deal of relief.*

: ראו בעיניכם כי קטן הייתי ועמדתי בה ומצאתיה: (B)

ὅτι [כי] cp. § מטול ד־ ‘because.’

ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν [בעיניכם] BS cannot possibly be talking about his physical stature and קטן is most likely about the intellectual, religious status he has reached, but one wonders how one could visually recognise it. ἐκοπίασα is as unlikely to refer to his physically hard work.

ὀλίγον [קטן] Smend (509) takes קטן in a temporal sense. The substantivised n. is used in the sense of ‘a short while’ as in μετ’ ὀλίγον ‘shortly later’ Wi 15.8, for instance. Smend refers to Is 54.7, where, however, we read קטן קטן. We are doubtful that קטן or קטן on its own is used in the sense of “a short while.” We also wonder how he could justify the translation of his

⁶⁴ Segal (362) appropriately refers to Mt 11.30.

reconstructed text, כִּי קָטַן עֲמַלְתִּי (II 62): “.. dass ich mich wenig gemüht .. habe” (II 95). We are not aware of such an adverbial use pf this common Heb. adjective as synonymous with קָטַן.

To take קָטַן הֵייתִי, as Segal (363) does, in the sense of “I was young” does not fit this verse.

Whatever (B2) may have looked like in its *Vorlage*, it is agreed by many that עֲמַדְתִּי cannot stand there, but need be replaced with עֲמַלְתִּי ‘I toiled,’ for instance.

Our translator’s *Vorlage* may have looked more or less the same as the current difficult text of (B) and he has done his best to produce a reasonable and sensible Gk text.

51.28) μετάσχετε παιδείας ἐν πολλῷ ἀριθμῷ ἀργυρίου
καὶ πολὺν χρυσὸν κτήσασθε ἐν αὐτῇ.

*Partake of education, paying lots of silver
and acquire lots of gold through it.*

(B) רבים שמעו למודי בנערותי וכסף וזהב תקנו בי:

Here again we are confronted with a challenging Heb. text.

[μετάσχετε] The acrostics requires that שמעו be the first word of the line. However, irrespective of its position, רבים must be the s of שמעו, which must be vocalised as שְׁמָעוּ as Segal (358) and Kahana (530) have done: ‘many heard.’ This is utterly foreign to μετάσχετε ‘Partake (of schooling)!’. Cf. שִׁבְיָ שְׁמָעוּ יוֹלְפָנִי כִּד זְעוֹר וְסֵאמָא וְדִהְבָּא תְקַנּוּן בִּי ‘they heard my teaching when I was young, and silver and gold you could acquire through me.’ Does זְעוֹר כִּד possibly suggest כְּמַעֲט ‘a little’ as its Heb. original?⁶⁵ If we follow Lévi (230) and emend רבים to רבה or רב and shift it to the end of vs. 27, as שִׁבְיָ does (וְאִשְׁכַּחְתָּהּ סְגִיָּה ‘and I found it abundantly’), שִׁבְיָ would make better sense. With שִׁבְיָ as it stands, the author is advising parents with growing children to send them to an expensive private school, as investment in education would result in good return. This, however, would contradict vs. 25. Though “.. Erziehung, (die) viel Geld wert (ist)” (*SD*) might go some way towards dealing with this contradiction, one wonders whether ἐν πολλῷ ἀριθμῷ ἀργυρίου can be so interpreted. That כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב has been separated in שִׁבְיָ is to be noted. As we have pointed out at 28.24b, gold carried more weight in this period than silver.⁶⁶ BS uses the classic sequence, whereas שִׁבְיָ could be then suggesting that one might be paying lots of silver coin for education, but in future one would be harvesting much in gold which is worth far more than silver.

⁶⁵ Examples of such a use of כְּמַעֲט are found in Is 1.9 and Ps 105.12.

⁶⁶ Cf. Muraoka 1992.43.

51.29) εὐφρανθείη ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ,
καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθείητε ἐν αἰνέσει αὐτοῦ.

*May your soul rejoice in His mercy
and you shall not feel ashamed of praising Him.*

(B) תשמח נפשי בישיבתי ולא תבושו בשירתי:

Here ends the acrostic poem.

Note the differences between the three principal versions: ℣ ‘May my soul rejoice in my lecturing and may you not feel ashamed of my singing’ // ℔ ‘your soul shall rejoice in my repentance and you shall not be embarrassed by my singing.’

Since it would have been students who were seated, not their teacher, could this Heb. word suggest that Ben Sira was running a *yeshiva* of his? Cf. “an meinem Hörerkreis” (Smend II 95). ℔ probably reflects ℔ or ℔. The equation ἔλεος / ישועה is attested only once in LXX at Si 32.25. Should we apply this here? But to speak of God’s mercy here sounds a little out of place.

αἰνέσει αὐτοῦ] = שירתי, i.e. שירה. Here שירה is used as a verbal noun, “singing.”

51.30) ἐργάζεσθε τὸ ἔργον ὑμῶν πρὸ καιροῦ,
καὶ δώσει τὸν μισθὸν ὑμῶν ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ.

*Do your work in good time,
then He will give you your reward in His time.*

והוא נותן לכם שכרכם בעתו:	(Ba) מעשיכם עשו בצדקה
ומשובח שמו לדר ודר:	(Bb) ברוך ייי לעולם
	(Bc) עד הנה דברי שמעון בן ישוע שנקרא בן סירא:
	(Bd) חכמת שמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא:
	(Be) יהי שם ייי מבורך מעתה ועד עולם:
... שכרכם בעתו: ⁶⁷	(T) ...

(Bc-e) is a signature by the author. This is a probable reason why every one of the three lines closes with /:/ but each of them is one running line with no blank space in the middle.

℣ ends with (Ba), whilst ℔ contains (Bb). That (Bb) is a secondary addition could be concluded from the fact that the Qumran MS, (T), ends with (Ba) and is immediately followed by a totally different text, 11QPs^aZion. On the

⁶⁷ BSH 67 adds below (Be) eleven lines, all extremely fragmentary. We see in every line one word, if at all, with the sole exception of the second line, where ... אל ת... is printed. We are told that these lines are from MS C. Not being able to see the MS itself in person we cannot say how much truth there is in this information. Beentjes (1997.99) has only the first line, נסה. None of the Gk MSS contains in 51.30 anything that could represent this Heb. word.

other hand, in the MS (T) this acrostic poem, which begins with Si 51.13, is immediately preceded by Ps 138.1-8. Thus the acrostic poem in 51.13-30 appears to constitute a document that may have originally not formed an integral part of Si.⁶⁸ Should we ascribe vs. 13 to someone other than Ben Sira?

On the basis of ס עבדו עבדו עבדו Van Peursen (2003.367f.) reconstructs (Ba 1) as פעלו פעלכם . He points out that two acrostic poems, Ps 25 and 34, end with an extra verse beginning with פ. We are not told, however, why this needed to be changed to מעשיכם עשו .

$\pi\rho\acute{o}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon$] \neq בצדקה , which makes little sense. In the light of דלא בעדנה ‘not in its time’ we might restore בלא עת ‘irrespective of time,’ i.e. without selecting a particular time, i.e. all the time.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omega}$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$] could mean ‘in its time,’ but the author probably wants to leave it to God to decide when to requite.

The author’s own signature in (Bd) totally agrees with his earlier self-introduction in 50.27 (Ba) in the same Heb. MS, i.e. B.

⁶⁸ So argued by Sanders 1965.83 and Muraoka 1979.166.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AARTUN, K. 1973. "Die hervorhebende Endung - w(V) an nordwestsemitischen Adverbien und Negationen," *UF* 5.1-5.
- AITKEN, J.K. 1999. "The semantics of 'glory' in Ben Sira - Traces of a development in post-Biblical Hebrew?," *QHBS* 2.1-24
- BA = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Paris, 1986 -.
- BAARS, W. 1968. *New Syro-hexaplaric Texts: Edited, Commented upon and Compared with the Septuagint*. Leiden.
- BAR-ASHER, M. 2004. "עיון בסעיף במורפולוגיה" (עיון בלשון בין המקרא ללשון חז"ל [The language of Qumran: Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (A Study on an Issue in Morphology)]," *Megil.* 2.137-49.
- BARR, J. 1968. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- BAUER, H. and P. LEANDER. 1927. *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen*. Tübingen.
- BDAG = W. BAUER, W. ARNDT, F.W. GINGRICH and F.W. DANKER. 21979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago • London.
- BDB = F. BROWN, S.R. DRIVER and Ch.A. BRIGGS. 1907 (and its subsequent reprints). *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Oxford.
- BDF = F. BLASS, A. DEBRUNNER and R.W. FUNK. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament etc.* Chicago • London.
- BEENTJES, P.C. 1988. "Hermeneutics in the Book of Ben Sira: Some observations on the Hebrew MS C," *Estudios Bíblicos* 46.45-59.
- . 1993. "A closer look at the newly discovered sixth Hebrew manuscript (MS F) of Ben Sira," *Estudios Bíblicos* 51.171-86.
- . 1997. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts & a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. Leiden.
- . 1999. "The Hebrew texts of Ben Sira 32[35].16-33[36].2," *QHBS* 2.53-67.
- BEN-HAYYIM, Z. 1973. "מתוך ערכי בן-סירא" [Some lexemes from Ben Sira]," *Lesh.* 37.215-17.
- BEN YEHUDA, E. 1959. *מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה*. New York.
- BERGGRÜN, N. 1973. "לְשׁוֹן הָרַע, עֵין הָרַע," *Leshonenu la'am* 24.224-29.
- BJ = *La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de L'École Biblique de Jérusalem*. Paris, 1961.
- BLAU, J. 1955. "Etymologische Untersuchungen auf Grund der palaestinischen Arabisch," *VT* 5.337-44.
- BOX, G.H. and W.O.E. OESTERLEY. 1913. Pp. 268-517 in R.H. CHARLES (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Oxford.
- BROCK, S.P. 2008. *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*. Piscataway, NJ.
- BROCKELMANN, C. 21928. *Lexicon syriacum*. Halle.
- . 1956. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen.
- BROCKELMANN, C. and M. SOKOLOFF. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon*. Winona Lake, IN • Piscataway, NJ.
- BSH = ספר בן סירא: המקור, קונקורדנציה וניתוח אוצר המלים. Jerusalem, 1973.
- BURKILL, T.A. 1962. "Ecclesiasticus," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 2.13-21. Nashville.

- CAIRD, G.B. 1969. "Towards a lexicon of the Septuagint. II," *JThSt* 20.21-40.
- CAMBE, M. 1963. "La χάρις chez saint Luc. Remarques sur quelques textes, notamment le κεχαριτωμένη," *RB* 70.193-207.
- CERIANI, A.M. (ed.). 1874. *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice ed.* Mediolani.
- COHEN, D. et al. 1970-. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques.* Paris • Leuven.
- COOK, J. 1997. *The Septuagint of Proverbs — Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* [VTS 69]. Leiden.
- COWLEY, A.E. and A. NEUBAUER. 1897. *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus.* Oxford.
- DALMAN, G.H. 1938. *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch.* Göttingen.
- DCH = CLINES, D.J.A. (ed.). 1993-2016. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew.* 9 vols. Sheffield.
- DEISSMANN, G.A. 1895. *Bibelstudien.* Marburg.
- DELITZSCH, F. ²1876. *Das Buch Job.* Leipzig. [Quoted here from an English translation published by Eerdmans.]
- DHORME, E. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Job.* London. [English translation of *Le livre de Job*, Paris 1926].
- DI LELLA, A.A. 1966. *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: a Text-critical and Historical Study.* The Hague.
- . 1983. "Sirach 10:19-11:6: Textual criticism, poetic analysis, and exegesis," in C.L. MEYERS, and M. O'CONNOR, (eds), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth* [Fshr. D.N. Freedman], pp. 157-64. Winona Lake, IN.
- . 1988. "The newly discovered sixth manuscript of Ben Sira from the Cairo Geniza," *Bib.* 69.226-38.
- DIHI, H. 2000. "Non-biblical verbal usages in the book of Ben Sira," *QHBS* 3.56-64.
- . 2008. "Amoraic Hebrew in the light of Ben Sira's linguistic innovations," *QHBS* 4. 15-27.
- . 2013. "Linguistic innovations in Ben Sira Manuscript F." *QHBS* 5.29-45
- . 2021. "A reappraisal of three philological comparisons between Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Ben Sira," *QHBS* 8.37-51.
- DOGNIEZ, C. 2002. "The Greek renderings of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and their treatment in the Septuagint lexica," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 28.1-17.
- DOS SANTOS, E.C. *An Expanded Index to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint.* Jerusalem.
- DRIVER, S.R. ³1892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew with some other Syntactic Questions.* Oxford.
- . ²1913. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* etc. Oxford.
- DUBARLE, A.M. 1966. *Judith. Formes et sens des diverses traditions* [AB 24], 2 vols. Rome.
- ELIZUR, Sh. 2007. "קטע חדש מהנוסח העברי של ספר בן סירא [A new Hebrew fragment of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)]," *Tarbiz* 76.17-28.
- . 2010. "Two new leaves of the Hebrew version of Ben Sira," *DSD* 17.13-29.
- ELIZUR, Sh. and M. RAND. 2011. "A new fragment of the Book of Ben Sira," *DSD* 18.200-05.
- EVEN-SHOSHAN, A. 1965. *המילון ההקדש*, 3 vols. Jerusalem.

- EWALD, H. ⁸1870. *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes*. Göttingen.
- FASSBERG, S.E. 1994. סוּנוּיַת בְּתֵּחְבִּיר הַמְּקָרָא [Studies in Biblical Syntax]. Jerusalem.
- . 1997. “On the syntax of dependent clauses in Ben Sira,” QHBS 1.56-71.
- . 1999. “On syntax and style in Ben Sira,” QHBS 2.117-31.
- FIELD, F. 1875. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt etc.*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- FITZMYER, J.A. 2003. *Tobit*. Berlin • New York.
- FRITZSCHE, O.F. 1871. *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece*. Leipzig.
- GELS = MURAOKA 2009.
- GESENIUS, W., E. KAUTZSCH and A.E. COWLEY, ²1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford.
- GINSBERG, H.L. 1961. קִּהְלֵת. Tel Aviv • Jerusalem.
- GKC = GESENIUS, KATUTSEN and COWLEY ²1910.
- GWILLIAM, G.H. and J.F. STENNING. 1896. “Wisdom IX. 8b-X. 2,” in *Biblical and Patristic Relics of the Palestinian Syriac Literature [Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series, I, 9]*, pp. 21-28. Oxford.
- HALOT = KOHLER, L. and W. BAUMGARTNER. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 vols., translated from the German ed. (1967-76) and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. RICHARDSON. Leiden • New York • Köln.
- HARL, M. 1992. *La langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens*. Paris.
- HARL, M., G. DORIVAL and O. MUNNICH. 1988. *La Bible grecque des septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Paris.
- HART, J.H.A. 1909. *Ecclesiasticus. The Greek Text of Codex 248*. Cambridge.
- HELBING, R. 1928. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta*. Göttingen.
- HR = ²1998. E. HATCH and H.A. REDPATH, with additions by R.A. KRAFT, E. TOV and T. MURAOKA, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- HURVITZ, A. 1997. “The linguistic status of Ben Sira as a link between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographical aspects,” QHBS 1.72-86.
- . 1999. “Further comments on the linguistic profile of Ben Sira: Syntactic affinities with Late Biblical Hebrew,” QHBS 2.132-45.
- Index = MURAOKA 2010.
- JASTROW, M. 1903. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York.
- JENNI, E. 1992. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*. Bd 1: *Die Präposition Beth*. Stuttgart.
- JM = P. JUON and T. MURAOKA. ²2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome.
- JOOSTEN, J. 1999. “Pseudo-classicisms in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew,” QHBS 2.146-59.
- . 2003. “«Père, j'ai péché envers le ciel et devant toi». Remarques exégétiques et textuelles sur Luc 15,18.21,” *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 83.145-56.
- . 2007. “Éléments d'araméen occidental dans la version syriaque de Ben Sira,” in A. MAMAN, S.E. FASSBERG and Y. BREUER (eds), *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, pp. *42-55. Jerusalem.
- . 2017. “Language and textual history of Syriac Ben Sira,” in G. KARNER, F. UEBERSCHAER and B.M. ZAPFF (eds), *Texts and Contexts of the Book of Sirach / Texte und Kontexte des Sirachbuches*, pp. 187-95. Atlanta, GA.
- . 2018. “The Hebrew of the Ben Sira Manuscripts from the Genizah,” in J.K. AITKEN, R. EGGER-WENZEL and S.C. REIF (eds), *Discovering, Deciphering and Dissenting: Ben Sira Manuscripts after 120 Years*, pp. 319-30. Berlin.

- JOÜON, P. 1923. "Reconnaissance et remerciement en hébreu biblique," *Bib.* 4.381-85.
- KADDARI, M.Z. 1978. "המקור הנטוי כתיאור זמן בלשון המקרא" (Construct infinitive as time adverbial in Biblical Hebrew)," *ErIsr* 14.132-36.
- . 1997. "The syntax of כִּי in the language of Ben Sira," *QHBS* 1.87-91.
- . 2006. *מילון העברית המקראית*. Ramat-Gan.
- KAHANA, A. 1968. *ספר איוב מפורש*. Tel Aviv.
- . 1978. *הספרים החיצונים* [*The extra-canonical books*]. Jerusalem.
- KATZ, P. 1936. Rev. of RAHLFS 1935, *ThLZ* 61.265-87 {278f. on Si}.
- KAUTZSCH, E. 1900. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen. [Ben Sira was translated by W. Ryssel.]
- KIM, D.W. 2012. "Hearing the unsung voice: Women in the Qumran community," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2.275-82.
- KISTER, M. 1990. "אֵלֶּיךָ בֵּן סִירָא לְפִירוּשׁוֹ שֶׁל סֵפֶר בֵּן סִירָא" [A contribution to the interpretation of Ben Sira]," *Tarbiz* 59.303-78.
- . 1999. "Some notes on Biblical expressions and allusions and the lexicography of Ben Sira," *QHBS* 2.160-87.
- KNABENBAUER, J. 1902. *Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum* etc. Paris.
- KÖNIG, E. 1897. *Historisch-comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*. Leipzig.
- KOOLE, J.L. 1965. "Die Bibel des Ben Sira," in P.A.H. DE BOER (ed.), *Kaf-Hē: 1940-1965* [Oudtestamentische Studiën 14], pp. 374-95. Leiden.
- KROPAT, A. 1909. *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen*. Gießen.
- KUHGELMEIER, Ch. 2020. "Zum Gebrauch der Verbalaspekte im Buch Sirach," in E. BONS et al. (eds), *Die Septuaginta - Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, pp. 272-90. Tübingen.
- KUHN, G. 1929, 1930. "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Jesus Sirach," *ZAW* 47.289-96, 48.100-21.
- LAGARDE, P.A. 1861. *Libri Veteris Testamenti apocryphi syriace*. Leipzig • London.
- LAMPE, G.W.H. 1961-68. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 5 vols. Oxford.
- LEE, J.A.L. 1983. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* [SCS 14]. Chico, CA.
- LÉVI, I. 1898, 1901. *L'Ecclésiastique ou La Sagesse de Jésus, Fils de Sira*, 2 vols. Paris. [Vol. 1 deals with 39.15-49.11, Vol. 2 with much of the rest.]
- LEVINSON, J. 1985. "Is Eve to blame? A contextual analysis of Sirach 25:24," *CBQ* 85.617-23.
- LEVY, J. 1959. *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* etc., 2 vols. Köln.
- LEWIS, A.S. and M.D. GIBSON. 1899. *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels*. London.
- LEH = LUST, J., E. EYNIKEL and K. HAUSPIE. ²2003. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart.
- LICHT, J. 1957. *מגילת ההודיות ממגילות מדבר יהודה*. Jerusalem.
- LIEBERMAN, S. 1934. "Ben-Sira à la lumière du Yerouchalmi," *RÉJ* 97.50-57.
- . 1967. "הוראות נשכחות" [Forgotten meanings]," *Lesh.* 32.89-102.
- LINDENBERGER, J.M. 1983. *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar*. Baltimore • London.
- LSJ = LIDDELL, H.G., R. SCOTT and H.S. JONES. ⁹1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.
- LSG = Revised supplement of LSJ by P.G.W. GLARE and A.A. THOMPSON. Oxford, 1996.
- LUZZATTO, S.D. 1867 (1970). *ספר ישעיהו - תרגום לאיטלקית ופירוש בעברית*. Padova (Tel Aviv).

- Maagarim* (מאגריים), a database of the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language being compiled by the Hebrew Language Academy in Jerusalem.
- MARCUS, J. 1931. "A fifth MS. of Ben Sira," *JQR* 21.223-40.
- MARGOLIS, M.L. 1901. "A passage in Ecclesiasticus," *ZAW* 21.271-72.
- MCKANE, W. 1970. *Proverbs* [Old Testament Library]. London.
- MILGROM, J. 1991. *Leviticus 1-16* [AB 3]. New York.
- MOPSIK, Ch. 2003. *La Sagesse de ben Sira*. Paris.
- MOULTON, J.H. ³1908. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. 1: Prolegomena*. Edinburgh.
- MOULTON, J.H. and G. MILLIGAN. 1930. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*. London.
- MOWRY, L. 1962. Entry "Parables" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 3.649a-54a. Nashville.
- MURAOKA, T. 1973. "Purpose or result? ὥστε in Biblical Greek," *NT* 15.205-19.
- . 1973a. "Literary device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8.20-30.
- . 1977. "The status constructus of adjectives in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 27.375-80.
- . 1977a. "The Wisdom of Ben Sira," in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha with an Introduction and Notes in Japanese*, vol. 2, pp. 67-207, 365-510. Tokyo.
- . 1977b. "On the publication of a Japanese translation of *Wisdom of Ben Sira*," *Journal for Evangelical Theology* [in Jap.] 8.22-41.
- . 1978. "A syntactic problem in Lev xix 18," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 23.291-97.
- . 1979. "Sir. 51, 13-30: an erotic hymn to wisdom?," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10.166-78.
- . 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem • Leiden.
- . 1992. "Biblical Hebrew philological notes (2)," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15.43-54.
- . 1998. *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint Keyed to the Hatch - Redpath Concordance*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- . 1999. "The tripartite nominal clause revisited," in C.L. MILLER (ed.), *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*, pp. 187-213. Winona Lake, IN.
- . 2000. "How to analyse and translate the idiomatic phrase מִן מִן," *BIOSCS* 33.47-52.
- . 2005. "Apports de la LXX dans notre compréhension de l'hébreu et du grec et de leur vocabulaire," in J. JOOSTEN and Ph. DE MOIGNE (eds), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'antiquité*, pp. 57-68. Paris.
- . ²2005a. *Classical Syriac. A Basic Grammar with a Chrestomathy* [PLO 19]. Wiesbaden.
- . 2008. "Septuagint lexicography and Hebrew etymology," in A. VOITILA and J. JOKIRANTA (eds), *Scripture in Transition* [Fschr. R. Sollamo], pp. 463-69. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven.
- . 2010. *A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven.
- . 2011. *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*. Leuven.
- . 2012. "Luke and the Septuagint," *NT* 54.13-15.
- . 2012a. "Could we still learn something from pre-modern Jewish Hebraists and Bible scholars?," in J. IKEDA (ed.), *Modern Spirit and Interpretation of Classical Documents*, pp. 53-64. Kyoto.

- . 2012b. "Philological notes on the David-Bathsheba story. II," in G. BONNEY and R. VICENT (eds), *Sophia – Paideia, Sapienza e educazione (Sir 1,27), Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà*, pp. 89-113. Roma.
- . 2014. "Women labouring," in K. DE TROYER et al. (eds), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, pp. 65-78. Leuven.
- . 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven.
- . 2018. "Senile or full of beans? A Far Eastern perspective on מְלֵא יָמִים Jer 6: 11," *ANES* 55.103-05.
- . 2018a. *Jacob of Serugh's Hexaemeron*, ed. and tr. [*ANES* Suppl. 52]. Leuven.
- . 2019. "The promised land in Hebrew," *ANES* 56.311-13.
- . 2020. *Why Read the Bible in the Original Languages?* Leuven.
- . 2020a. *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*. Leuven.
- . 2021. "Verbal rection in Qumran Hebrew," in S.E. FASSBERG (ed.), *Hebrew Texts and Language of the Second Temple Period*, pp. 191-203. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2022. *The Community Rule IQS, IQSa and IQSb. A Philological Commentary*. Leuven.
- . 2022a. *The Books of Hosea and Micah in Hebrew and Greek* [Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 294]. Leuven.
- . 2024. "A syntactic description of semi-auxiliary verbs in Biblical Hebrew." NEBE, G.-W. 1970. "Sirach 42, 5c," *ZAW* 82.283-86.
- NÖLDEKE, Th. 1900. "Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Ben Sīrā," *ZAW* 20.81-94.
- . 1966. *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*. Mit Anhang bearbeitet von A. SCHALL. Darmstadt.
- PARK, M. 2003. *חזרה ואי-חזרה על מילות בלשון המקרא ובלשון מנילות מדבר יהודה* [Repetition and non-repetition of particles in Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls], diss. the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
- PAYNE SMITH, R. 1879-1901. *Thesaurus syriacus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- PERLES, F. 1897. "Notes critiques sur le texte de l'*Écclesiastique*," *RÉJ* 35.48-64.
- PETERS, N. 1913. *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus übersetzt und erklärt*. Münster.
- VAN PEURSEN, W.Th. 1999. "Negation in the Hebrew of Ben Sira," *QHBS* 2.223-43.
- . 2001. "The alleged retroversions from Syriac in the Hebrew text of Ben Sira revisited: Linguistic perspectives," in R.G. LEHMANN (ed.), *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprachen des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 2, pp. 47-95. Waltrop.
- . 2003. "Sirach 51: 13-30 in Hebrew and Syriac," in M.F.J. BAASTEN and W. VAN PEURSEN (eds), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, pp. 357-74. Leuven.
- . 2004. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- . 2004a. "The Peshitta of Ben Sira: Jewish and / or Christian?," *Aramaic Studies* 2.243-62.
- . 2007. *Language and Interpretation in the Syriac Text of Ben Sira*. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2008. "The word תחליף in Ben Sira." *QHBS* 4.133-48.
- VAN DER PLOEG, J. 1959. *Le rouleau de la guerre*. Leiden.
- PLUMMER, A. ³1922. *The Gospel according to S. Luke* [ICC]. Edinburgh.
- PRITCHARD, J.B. (ed.). ³1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, NJ.
- QHBS 1 = T. MURAOKA and J.F. EWOLDE (eds). 1997. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995*. Leiden.

- QHBS 2 = T. MURAOKA and J.F. EWOLDE (eds). 1999. *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997*. Leiden.
- QHBS 3 = T. MURAOKA and J.F. EWOLDE (eds). 2000. *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- QHBS 4 = J. JOOSTEN and J.-S. REY (eds). 2008. *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period. Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- QHBS 5 = S. FASSBERG, M. BAR-ASHER and R. CLEMENTS (eds). 2013. *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period. The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources*. Leiden.
- QHBS 6 = E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR and P. VAN HECKE (eds). 2015. *Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period. Proceedings of a Sixth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- QHBS 8 = S.E. FASSBERG (ed.). 2021. *Hebrew Texts and Language of the Second Temple Period. Proceedings of an Eighth Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- QIMRON, E. 1999. "Notes on the reading" in *Masada VI*, pp. 227-31 Jerusalem.
- . 2018. *A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jerusalem.
- . ²2020. מגילות מדבר יהודה: ההבורים העבריים.
- RAHLFS, A. (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart.
- RAY, J.-S. and J. JOOSTEN. 2011. *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira*. Leiden.
- REITERER, F.V. 1999. "The Hebrew of Ben Sira investigated on the basis of his use of כרת: a syntactic, semantic and language-historical contribution," QHBS 2.253-77.
- RENEHAN, R. 1975-82. *Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones*. 2 vols. Göttingen.
- REY, J.-S. 2008. "Quelques particularités linguistiques communes à 4QInstruction et à Ben Sira," QHBS 4.155-73.
- . 2015. "'Dislocated negations': Negative אַל followed by a non-verbal constituent in Biblical, Ben Sira and Qumran Hebrew," QHBS 6.160-74.
- REYMOND, E.R. 2021. "Geminate verbs in the Hebrew of the Wisdom of Ben Sira," QHBS 6.260-79.
- RICKENBACHER, O. 1970. *Nachträge zum "griechisch-syrisch-hebräischen Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach von Rudolf Smend"*. Werthenstein.
- ROGLAND, M. 2003. *Alleged non-past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew*. Assen
- RÜGER, H.P. 1970. "Zum Text von Sir 40, 10 und Ex 10, 21," ZAW 82.102-09.
- RYSSSEL, see under KAUTZSCH 1900.
- SANDERS, J.A. 1965. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* [DJD 4]. Oxford.
- . 1971. "The Sirach 51 acrostic," in C. ANDRÉ and M. PHILONENKO (eds), *Homages à André Dupont-Sommer*, pp. 429-38. Paris.
- SCHECHTER, S. and Ch. TAYLOR. 1899. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus etc.*, in three parts. Cambridge.
- SCHLEUSNER, J.F. 1820-21. *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti*, 5 vols. Leipzig.

- SCHWARTZ, J. 2004. "Dogs in Jewish society in the second Temple period and in the time of the Mishnah and Talmud," *JJS* 55.246-77.
- SD = *Septuaginta Deutsch*. Stuttgart, 2009.
- SD II = *Erläuterungen und Kommentare II Psalmen bis Daniel*. Stuttgart, 2011.
- SEGAL, M.H. 1927. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford.
- . 1932. "בְּנִית פְּסוּקֵי הַתְּנַאי בְּעֵבְרִית הַמִּקְרָאִית וְהַמְּשֻׁנֵית" [The structuring of conditional clauses in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew], *Lesh* 4.191-211.
- . 1935. "שִׁירָא לְשׁוֹנוֹ שֶׁל בֶּן סִירָא" [The language of Ben Sira], *Lesh* 7.100-20.
- . 1956. *ספרי שמואל ערוכים ומבוארים עם מבוא מפורט*. Jerusalem.
- . ²1958. *ספר בן סירא השלם*. Jerusalem.
- . ²1958a. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford.
- SKEHAN, P.W. 1961. "They shall not be found in parables (Sir 38,33)," *CBQ* 23.40.
- . 1966. Rev. of YADIN 1965, *JBL* 75.260-62.
- . 1971. "The acrostic poem in Sirach 51:13-30," *HTR* 64.387-400.
- . 1979. "Structures in poems on wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24," *CBQ* 41.365-79.
- SKEHAN, P.W. and A.A. DI LELLA. 1987. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39]. New York.
- SL = BROCKELMANN, C. and M. SOKOLOFF. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon*. Winona Lake, IN • Piscataway, NJ.
- SMEND, R. 1906. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*. Berlin.
- . 1906a. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebräisch und Deutsch*. Berlin.
- . 1907. *Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*. Berlin.
- SMITH, M.S. 2000. "The infinitive absolute as predicative verb in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A preliminary survey," *QHBS* 3.256-67.
- SNAITH, J.G. 1974. *Ecclesiasticus*. London.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan.
- . 2014. *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Leuven.
- SOLLAMO, R. 1979. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki.
- SPICQ, C. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3 vols. [tr. from French 1978]. Peabody, MS.
- SQH = MURAOKA 2020a.
- SSG = MURAOKA 2016.
- STRUGNELL, J. 1969. "Notes and queries on 'The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada'," in A. MALAMAT (ed.) [W.F. Albright Volume], *Eretz Israel* 9.109-19.
- SWETE, H.B. ³1907. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge.
- TAL, A. 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic*. Leiden.
- TALSIR, D. and Z. TALSIR. 2008. "כֵּן נֶאֱמַן לֶךְ עִם בְּתוּלָה" (Ben Sira 20,4; 30,20). Meaning and transmission," *QHBS* 4.193-232.
- TAYLOR, B.A. 1994. *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- THACKERAY, H.St.J. 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. I, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*. Cambridge.
- THOMAS, D.W. 1960. "The LXX's rendering of שְׁנוֹת לֵב טוֹב in Eccclus. xxxiii 13," *VT* 10.456.
- . 1969. "A note on Eccclus. 51:21a," *JThSt* 20.225-26.
- TOV, E. 1990. "Renderings of combinations of the infinitive absolute and finite verbs in the LXX — their nature and distribution," in D. FRAENKEL, U. QUAST and J.W. WEYERS (eds), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu ehren*, pp. 64-73. Göttingen.
- TUR-SINAI, N.H. 1972. *ספר איוב*. Jerusalem.
- UEBERSCHAER, F. 2020. "Beobachtungen zum Lob der Väter," in E. BONS et al. (eds), *Die Septuaginta - Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, pp. 204-17. Tübingen.

- VINEL, F. 2002. *L'Ecclésiaste* [La Bible d'Alexandrie]. Paris.
- WAGNER, Ch. 1999. *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach. Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts* [BZAW 282]. Berlin • New York.
- WILCKEN, U. 1899. *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien*. Leipzig.
- . 1906. Rev. of W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1903), *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 3.313-36.
- WRIGHT, R.B. and R.R. HAHN. 1975. "A new fragment of the Greek tekst of Ben Sirach," *JBL* 94.111-12.
- WRIGHT, W. ³1896-98. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
- YADIN, Y. 1965. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*. Jerusalem.
- YIFRACH, E. 1997. "תחביר המקור הנטוי בספר בן סירא" (The construct infinitive in the book of Ben Sira)," *Lesh*. 59.275-94.
- ZIEGLER, J. 1957. "Zum Wortschatz des griechischen Sirach," in J. PEDERSEN and H.H. ROWLEY (eds), *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Forschung*, pp. 274-87. Berlin.
- . 1958. *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta*. Göttingen.
- . 1964. "Ursprüngliche Lesearten im griechischen Sirach," in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*. Vol. I, *Écriture sainte - Ancien orient*, pp. 461-87. Vatican.
- . 1965. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* [Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graece. XII, 2]. Göttingen.
- VAN ZIJL, J.B. 1979. *A Concordance to the Targum of Isaiah*. Missoula, MT.
- ZORELL, F. 1968. *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum veteris testamenti*. Roma.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- Bickel S., Schroer S., Schurte R., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources. Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel*, 2007, XLVI-560 p. + XXXIV pl.
- 25.1a Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band Ia: Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela. Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI*, 1980, 64 p.
- 25.3 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band III: Forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliographie 1799-1984 mit kritischen Anmerkungen. Mit einem Beitrag von Majella Franzmann: A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to French Scholarship 1909-1980*, 1986, XXXIV-478 p.
- 25.4 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band IV*, 1998, XII-272 p.
- 46 Hornung E., *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskub. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Dritte Auflage*, 1982, XII-133 p.
- 50.3 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, 1992, CCXLII-1150 p.
- 50.4 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4: Psaumes*, 2005, XLVIII-931 p.
- 50.5 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet et Cantique des Cantiques*, 2015, XXVIII-974 p.
- 55 Frei P., Koch K., *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage*, 1996, 337 p.
- 61 Engel H., *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*, 1985, 205 p.
- 75 Schulman A.R., *Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards. Some Historical Scenes on New Kingdom Private Stelae*, 1988, XXX-223 p. + 35 fig. + 6 pl.
- 77 Utschneider H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25-40; Lev 8-9)*, 1988, XIV-320 p.
- 78 Gosse B., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, 1988, 300 p.
- 81 Beyerlin W., *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision*, 1988, 61 p.
- 82 Hutter M., *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelbithitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*, 1988, 180 p.
- 85 Otto E., *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch». Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen*, 1989, IV-209 p.
- 89 Abitz F., *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.*, 1989, 196 p.
- 90 Henninger J., *Arabica Varia. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes*, 1989, 498 p.
- 92 O'Brien M.A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*, 1989, XIV-319 p.
- 94 Cortese E., *Josua 13-21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 1990, VI-122 p.

- 96 Wiese A.B., *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*, 1990, XVI-207 p. + XXXII Taf.
- 98 Schart A., *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüsten-erzählungen*, 1990, VI-284 p.
- 100 Keel O., Shuval M., Uehlinger C., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III: Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop*, 1990, XIV-458 p. + XXII Taf.
- 103 Schenker A., *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, 1991, VIII-302 p.
- 105 Osumi Y., *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, 1991, XII-273 p.
- 107 Staubli T., *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*, 1991, XII-308 p. + 125 Abb.
- 109 Norton G.J., Pisano S. (eds), *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 1991, XII-310 p. + VII pl.
- 114 Schneider T., *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*, 1992, XIV-482 p.
- 115 von Nordheim E., *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients. Religions-geschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104*, 1992, VI-220 p.
- 117 Richards F.V., *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*, 1992, XII-138 p. + XIII pl.
- 118 Goldman Y., *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie*, 1992, XIV-259 p.
- 119 Krapf T.M., *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernach-lässigt Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion*, 1992, XX-351 p.
- 123 Zwickel W. (ed.), *Biblische Welten. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburts-tag*, 1993, XII-248 p. + VIII Taf.
- 125 Kass B., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991*, 1993, XXIV-336 p.
- 126 Bartelmus R., Krüger T., Utzschneider H. (eds), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, X-401 p.
- 127 Ivantchik A.I., *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*, 1993, 325 p.
- 128 Voss J., *Die Menora. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem*, 1993, 112 p.
- 131 Burkert W., Stolz F. (eds), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, 1994, 123 p.
- 132 Mathys H.-P., *Dichter und Beter. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*, 1994, X-374 p.
- 135 Keel O., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I-IV*, 1994, XII-325 p. + 23 Taf.
- 136 Stipp H.-J., *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*, 1994, VIII-186 p.
- 137 Eschweiler P., *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegen-ständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, 1994, X-371 p. + XXXVI Taf.
- 143 Bieberstein K., *Josua - Jordan - Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Land-nahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6*, 1995, XII-483 p.
- 144 Maier C., *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1-9. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie*, 1995, XII-296 p.

- 145 Steymans H.U., *Deuteronomium 28 und die «adè» zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, 1995, XII-425 p.
- 146 Abitz F., *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltbüchern des Neuen Reiches*, 1995, VIII-219 p.
- 148 Bachmann M., *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst*, 1996, 80 p.
- 150 Staehelin E., Jaeger B. (eds), *Ägypten-Bilder. Akten des «Symposiums zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.-11. September 1993*, 1997, 383 p. + 96 Taf.
- 152 Rossier F., *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu*, 1996, XIV-380 p.
- 153 Kratz R.G., Krüger T. (eds), *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld. Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck*, 1997, 139 p.
- 154 Bosshard-Nepustil E., *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit*, 1997, XIV-521 p.
- 156 Wagner A., *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, 1997, VIII-199 p.
- 157 Artus O., *Études sur le livre des Nombres. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*, 1997, X-298 p.
- 158 Böhler D., *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras Alpha und Esra-Nehemia. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels*, 1997, XIV-435 p.
- 159 Oswald W., *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund*, 1998, X-286 p.
- 160.5 Veenhof K.R., Eidem J., *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5*, 2008, 382 p.
- 163 Bietenhard S.K., *Des Königs General. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2-20; 1 Kön 1-2*, 1998, XIV-363 p.
- 164 Braun J., *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen*, 1999, XII-388 p.
- 167 Bollweg J., *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit*, 1999, X-206 p.
- 168 Rose M., *Rien de nouveau. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988-1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allison*, 1999, 629 p.
- 171 Macchi J.-D., *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*, 1999, XIV-380 p.
- 172 Schenker A., *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament. Achtzehn Studien*, 2000, X-208 p.
- 173 Theuer G., *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24*, 2000, XVIII-657 p.
- 174 Spieser C., *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*, 2000, XII-398 p.
- 176 de Pury A., Römer T. (eds), *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*, 2000, VI-189 p.
- 177 Egger J., *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*, 2000, VIII-143 p.
- 178 Keel O., Staub U., *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV.*, 2000, XII-147 p.
- 179 Goldman Y., Uehlinger C. (eds), *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2001, VI-114 p.
- 180 Zwingenberger U., *Dorfkultur der frühen Eisenzeit in Mittelpalästina*, 2001, XX-593 p.
- 181 Tita H., *Gelübde als Bekenntnis. Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*, 2001, XVI-251 p.

- 182 Bosse-Griffiths K., *Amarna Studies and Other Selected Papers*. Edited by J. Gwyn Griffiths, 2001, IV-244 p.
- 183 Reinmuth T., *Der Bericht Nebemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nebemias*, 2002, XIV-383 p.
- 184 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II*, 2002, XII-194 p.
- 185 Roth S., *Gebietlerin aller Länder. Die Rolle der königlichen Frauen in der fiktiven und realen Aussenpolitik des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2002, XII-168 p.
- 186 Hübner U., Knauf E.A. (eds), *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebir-nâri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2002, VIII-331 p.
- 187 Riede P., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel*, 2002, XII-364 p.
- 188 Schellenberg A., *Erkenntnis als Problem. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*, 2002, XII-333 p.
- 189 Meurer G., *Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramiden-texten*, 2002, X-404 p.
- 190 Maussion M., *Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qohélet*, 2003, VIII-199 p.
- 192 Koenen K., *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, 2003, X-251 p.
- 193 Junge F., *Die Lehre Prahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, 2003, 286 p.
- 194 Lefebvre J.-F., *Le jubilé biblique. Lv 25 - exégèse et théologie*, 2003, XII-443 p.
- 195 Wettengel W., *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d'Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden*, 2003, VI-301 p.
- 196 Vonach A., Fischer G. (eds), *Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2003, XII-316 p.
- 199 Schenker A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, 2004, XXII-197 p.
- 200 Keel-Leu H., Teissier B., *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsigel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bibel+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*, 2004, XXII-472 p.
- 201 Alkier S., Witte M. (eds), *Die Griechen und das antike Israel. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes*, 2004, X-199 p.
- 202 Sayed Mohamed Z., *Festvorbereitungen. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste*, 2004, XVI-185 p.
- 204 Cornelius I., *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadesh, and Asherah c. 1500-1000 BCE*, 2008, XVI-216 p. + 77 pl.
- 205 Morenz L.D., *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*, 2004, XXII-373 p.
- 206 Dietrich W. (ed.), *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches*, 2004, 312 p.
- 207 Himbaza I., *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Études des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 2004, XIV-354 p.
- 208 Isler-Kerényi C., *Civilizing Violence Satyrs on 6th-Century Greek Vases*, 2004, XII-123 p.
- 209 Schipper B.U., *Die Erzählung des Wenamun. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion*, 2005, XII-383 p. + XII Taf.
- 210 Suter C.E., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE*, 2005, XXXII-395 p. + LIV pl.
- 211 Léonas A., *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, 2005, X-340 p.

- 212 Strawn B.A., *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 2005, XXX-587 p.
- 214 Böhler D., Himbaza I., Hugo P. (eds), *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2005, XXXII-472 p.
- 215 O'Connell S., *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*, 2006, XII-178 p.
- 216 Meyer-Dietrich E., *Senebi und Selbst. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*, 2006, XII-438 p.
- 217 Hugo P., *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, 2006, XXII-389 p.
- 218 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*, 2006, XXIV-254 p.
- 219 Knigge C., *Das Lob der Schöpfung. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, 2006, XII-365 p.
- 220 Schroer S. (ed.), *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art*, 2006, 383 p. + 29 pl.
- 221 Stark C., «Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? *Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei*, 2006, X-249 p.
- 222 Pruin D., *Geschichten und Geschichte. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt*, 2006, XII-398 p.
- 223 Coulange P., *Dieu, ami des pauvres. Étude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits*, 2007, XVI-282 p.
- 224 Wagner A. (ed.), *Parallelismus membrorum*, 2007, VIII-300 p.
- 225 Herrmann C., *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir. Band II: Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem und zweier Privatsammlungen*, 2007, X-125 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 226 Heise J., *Erinnern und Gedenken. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 2007, IV-385 p.
- 227 Frey-Anthes H., *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von «Dämonen» im alten Israel*, 2007, XIV-363 p.
- 228 Becking B., *From David to Gedaliah. The Book of Kings as Story and History*, 2007, XII-227 p.
- 229 Dubiel U., *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragsitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich*, 2008, XVI-270 p. + XVIII Taf.
- 230 Giovino M., *The Assyrian Sacred Tree. A History of Interpretations*, 2007, VIII-242 p. + 107 fig.
- 231 Kübel P., *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*, 2007, X-238 p.
- 232 Paz S., *Drums, Women, and Goddesses. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel*, 2007, XII-143 p.
- 233 Himbaza I., Schenker A. (eds), *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, 2007, X-151 p.
- 234 Tavares R., *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre? Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28-29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats*, 2007, XIV-306 p.
- 235 Witte M., Diehl J.F. (eds), *Israeliten und Phönizier. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 2008, VIII-295 p.
- 236 Müller-Roth M., *Das Buch vom Tage*, 2008, XII-603 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 237 Sowada K.N., *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom. An Archaeological Perspective*, 2009, XXIV-309 p. + 48 fig. + 19 pl.

- 238 Kraus W., Munnich O. (eds), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Texte der Septuaginta in Doppelüberlieferung oder in wörtlicher Übersetzung*, 2009, XII-307 p.
- 239 Mittermayer C., *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit*, 2009, VIII-386 p. + XIX Taf.
- 240 Waraksa E.A., *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct. Context and Ritual Function*, 2009, XII-246 p.
- 241 Ben-Shlomo D., *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*, 2010, X-232 p.
- 242 LeMon J.M., *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*, 2010, XIV-231 p.
- 243 El Hawary A., *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, 2010, XII-499 p. + XXIV pl.
- 244 Wälchli S.H., *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testaments und des Alten Orients*, 2012, VIII-191 p.
- 245 Steymans H.U. (ed.), *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography*, 2010, XII-452 p.
- 246 Petter D.L., *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, 2011, XVI-198 p.
- 247 Fischer E., *Tell el-Far'ah (Süd). Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2011, X-430 p.
- 248 Petit T., *Édipe et le Chérubin. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'Immortalité*, 2011, X-291 p. + 191 fig.
- 249 Dietrich W. (ed.), *Seitenblicke. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch*, 2011, 459 p.
- 250 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Langlois M. (eds), *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque organisé par les chaires d'Assyriologie et des Milieux bibliques du Collège de France, Paris, les 6 et 7 avril 2009*, 2011, VI-360 p.
- 251 Jaques M. (ed.), *Klagetraditionen. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike*, 2011, VIII-110 p.
- 252 Langlois M., *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique*, 2011, 266 p.
- 253 Béré P., *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme*, 2012, XVI-275 p.
- 254 Kilunga B., *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante»*, 2011, XVI-216 p.
- 255 Gruber M., Ahituv S., Lehmann G., Talshir Z. (eds), *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, 2012, XXVIII-475-85* p.
- 256 Mittermayer C., Ecklin S. (eds), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, 2012, XVIII-452 p.
- 257 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Hutzli J. (eds), *Les vivants et leurs morts. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 14-15 avril 2010*, 2012, X-287 p.
- 258 Thompson R.J., *Terror of the Radiance. Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant*, 2013, X-260 p.
- 259 Asher-Greve J.M., Westenholz J.G., *Goddesses in Context. On Divine Powers, Roles, Relationships and Gender in Mesopotamian Textual and Visual Sources*, 2013, XII-454 p.

- 260 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Vol. 2: Texts*, 2013, XIV-743 p.
- 261 Braun-Holzinger E.A., *Frühe Götterdarstellungen in Mesopotamien*, 2013, X-238 p. + 46 pl.
- 263 Sugimoto D.T. (ed.), *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite*, 2014, XIV-228 p.
- 264 Morenz L.D., *Anfänge der ägyptischen Kunst. Eine problemgeschichtliche Einführung in ägyptologische Bild-Anthropologie*, 2014, XVIII-257 p.
- 265 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Bürki M. (eds), *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4-5 avril 2011*, 2014, XII-223 p.
- 266 Michel P.M., *La culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, 2014, VIII-312 p.
- 267 Frevel C., Pyschny K., Cornelius I. (eds), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehūd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, 2014, X-440 p.
- 268 Bleibtreu E., Steymans H.U. (eds), *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag. A Centenary Volume*, 2014, XVI-642 p.
- 269 Lohwasser A. (ed.), *Skarabäen des 1. Jahrtausends. Ein Workshop in Münster am 27. Oktober 2012*, 2014, VI-200 p.
- 270 Wagner A. (ed.), *Göttliche Körper - Göttliche Gefühle. Was leisten anthropomorphe und anthropopathische Götterkonzepte im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament?*, 2014, X-273 p.
- 271 Heintz J.-G., *Prophétisme et Alliance. Des Archives royales de Mari à la Bible hébraïque*, 2015, XXXVI-373 p.
- 272 von der Osten-Sacken E., *Untersuchungen zur Geflügelwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, 2015, XVI-670 p.
- 273 Jaques M., *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab_(S)-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, 2015, XIV-463 p.
- 274 Durand J.-M., Guichard M., Römer T. (eds), *Tabou et transgressions. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 11-12 avril 2012*, 2015, XII-314 p.
- 275 Himbaza I. (ed.), *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible*, 2015, XIV-192 p.
- 276 Schmid K., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Laws of Heaven - Laws of Nature: Legal Interpretations of Cosmic Phenomena in the Ancient World. Himmelsgesetze - Naturgesetze: Rechtsförmige Interpretationen kosmischer Phänomene in der antiken Welt*, 2016, X-177 p.
- 277 Wasmuth M. (ed.), *Handel als Medium von Kulturkontakt. Akten des interdisziplinären altertumswissenschaftlichen Kolloquiums (Basel, 30.-31. Oktober 2009)*, 2015, VIII-175 p.
- 278 Durand J.-M., Marti L., Römer T. (eds), *Colères et repentirs divins. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 24 et 25 avril 2013*, 2015, X-393 p.
- 279 Schütte W., *Israels Exil in Juda. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie*, 2016, X-270 p.
- 280 Bonfiglio R.P., *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies*, 2016, XIV-364 p.
- 281 Rückl J., *A Sure House. Studies on the Dynastic Promise to David in the Books of Samuel and Kings*, 2016, VIII-356 p.
- 282 Schroer S., Münger S. (eds), *Khirbet Qeiyafā in the Shephelah. Papers Presented at a Colloquium of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies Held at the University of Bern, September 6, 2014, 2017*, IV-168 p.
- 283 Jindo J.Y., Sommer B.D., Staubli T. (eds), *Yehezkel Kaufmann and the Reinvention of Jewish Biblical Scholarship*, 2017, XVIII-376 p.
- 284 Nocquet D.R., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah. Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, 2017, X-354 p.

- 285 Kipfer S. (ed.), *Visualizing Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, 2017, VIII-294 p.
- 286 Römer T., Dufour B., Pfitzmann F., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Entre dieux et hommes: anges, démons et autres figures intermédiaires. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19 et 20 mai 2014*, 2017, XII-367 p.
- 287 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L. (eds), *Représenter dieux et hommes dans le Proche-Orient ancien et dans la Bible. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 5 et 6 mai 2015*, 2019, XII-386 p.
- 288 Wyssmann P., *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder*, 2019, XII-368 p.
- 289 Anthonioz S., Mouton A., Petit D. (eds), *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech according to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin*, 2019, X-138 p.
- 290 Wassermann N., *The Flood: The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary and a Literary Discussion*, 2020, X-187 p.
- 291 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L., Rückl J. (eds), *Oral et écrit dans l'Antiquité orientale: les processus de rédaction et d'édition. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 26 et 27 mai 2016*, 2021, XIV-345 p.
- 292 Himbaza I. (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)*, 2020, XII-278 p.
- 293 Galoppin T., Bonnet C. (eds), *Divine Names on the Spot. Towards a Dynamic Approach of Divine Denominations in Greek and Semitic Contexts*, 2021, VIII-256 p.
- 294 Muraoka T., *The Books of Hosea and Micah in Hebrew and Greek*, 2022, XIV-277 p.
- 295 Payne A., Velhartická Š., Wintjes J. (eds), *Beyond All Boundaries. Anatolia in the First Millennium BC*, 2021, XVI-763 p.
- 296 Bachmann V., Schellenberg A., Ueberschaer F. (eds), *Menschsein in Weisheit und Freiheit. Festschrift für Thomas Krüger*, 2022, X-603 p.
- 297 Walker J., *The Power of Images. The Poetics of Violence in Lamentations 2 and Ancient Near Eastern Art*, 2022, X-322 p.
- 298 Porzia F., *Le peuple aux trois noms. Une histoire de l'ancien Israël à travers le prisme de ses ethnonymes*, 2022, XII-406 p.
- 299 Porzia F., Bonnet C. (eds), *Divine Names on the Spot II. Exploring the Potentials of Names through Images and Narratives*, 2023, VIII-333 p.
- 300 Lenzi A., *Suffering in Babylon. Ludlul bēl nēmeqi and the Scholars, Ancient and Modern*, 2023, XIV-513 p.
- 301 Howard J.C. (ed.), *Architecture, Iconography, and Text. New Studies on the Northwest Palace Reliefs of Ashurnasirpal II*, 2023, VIII-191 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Briend J., Humbert J.-B. (eds), *Tell Keisan (1971-1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, 1980, XXXVIII-392 p. + 142 pl.
- 5 Müller-Winkler C., *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk*, 1987, 590 p. + XL Taf.
- 12 Wiese A.B., *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie*, 1996, XXII-194 p. + 93 Taf.
- 14 Amiet P., Briend J., Courtois L., Dumortier J.-B., *Tell el Far'ah. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*, 1996, IV-91 p.
- 18 Nunn A., *Die figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, 2000, XII-269 p. + 78 Taf.
- 19 Bignasca A.M., *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche*, 2000, XII-324 p.
- 20 Beyer D., *Emar IV: Les Sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, 2001, XXII-490 p. + 50 pl.
- 21 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaras zur Zeit der Archive von Mari₍₂₎ und Šubat-enlil/Šehnā*, 2001, 298 p. + 14 maps
- 22 Herrmann C., *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. Anthropomorphe Gestalten und Tiere*, 2003, X-291 p.
- 23 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 4: Vorbericht 1988-2001*, 2003, 253 p. + 8 Pläne
- 24 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band III*, 2006, XII-359 p.
- 25 Egger J., Keel O., *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Persezeit*, 2006, XVIII-510 p.
- 26 Kaelin O., «Modell Ägypten». *Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, 2006, 204 p.
- 27 Ben-Tor D., *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, 2007, XVI-211 p. + 109 pl.
- 28 Meyer J.-W., *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem 'Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*, 2008, X-655 p.
- 29 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, 2010, XIV-642 p.
- 30 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh I: The Excavation of the 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*, 2010, XII-297 p. + 176 pl.
- 31 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*, 2010, VI-461 p.
- 32 Rohn K., *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*, 2011, XIV-385 p. + 66 pl.
- 33 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*, 2013, XVI-715 p.
- 34 Golani A., *Jewelry from the Iron Age II Levant*, 2013, XII-313 p.
- 35 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-Idham bis Tel Kitan*, 2017, XVIII-672 p.

- 36 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit*, 2015, XIV-288 p. + 63 pl.
- 37 Choi G.D., *Decoding Canaanite Pottery Paintings from the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I. Classification and Analysis of Decorative Motifs and Design Structures - Statistics, Distribution Patterns - Cultural and Socio-Political Implications*, 2016, XII-272 p. + CD.
- 38 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV: Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit*, 2016, XVI-510 p.
- 39 Keel O., *700 Skarabäen und Verwandtes aus Palästina/Israel. Die Sammlung Keel*, 2020, XX-319 p.
- 40 Attinger P., Cavigneaux A., Mittermayer C., Novák M. (eds), *Text and Image. Proceedings of the 61e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Geneva and Bern, 22-26 June 2015*, 2018, XXIV-526 p.
- 41 Ahrens A., *Aegyptiaca in der nördlichen Levante. Eine Studie zur Kontextualisierung und Rezeption ägyptischer und ägyptisierender Objekte in der Bronzezeit*, 2020, XX-451 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SUBSIDIA LINGUISTICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Van Damme D., *Altarmenische Kurzgrammatik*, 2004, X-149 p.