

Takamitsu Muraoka

# **The Wisdom of Solomon in the Septuagint**

**PEETERS**

**THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON  
IN THE SEPTUAGINT**

# 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 in 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.

# **The Wisdom of Solomon in the Septuagint**

by

Takamitsu Muraoka

**Peeters**

**Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT**

**2024**

*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](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)).

Senior editor: [Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch](mailto: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 978-90-429-5086-3

eISBN 978-90-429-5087-0

D/2024/0602/51

© 2024, 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.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD .....	VII
PREFACE .....	IX
ABBREVIATIONS.....	XI
Chapter 1.....	3
Chapter 2.....	12
Chapter 3.....	23
Chapter 4.....	31
Chapter 5.....	39
Chapter 6.....	50
Chapter 7.....	64
Chapter 8.....	81
Chapter 9.....	92
Chapter 10.....	103
Chapter 11.....	116
Chapter 12.....	127
Chapter 13.....	140
Chapter 14.....	150
Chapter 15.....	164
Chapter 16.....	173
Chapter 17.....	187
Chapter 18.....	198
Chapter 19.....	211
APPENDIX: HAPAX LEGOMENA .....	223
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	225



## FOREWORD

I have the honour of having a third linguistic, text-critical commentary on a Septuagint book published. Unlike my monograph on the books of Hosea and Mica (2022), this third one [Wi], together with yet another monograph on Ben Sira [Si], belongs to the Apocrypha.

Both these extra-canonical books belong to the sapiential literature along with the book of Proverbs. All the same Wi markedly differs from the two principal representatives of the genre, Proverbs and Ben Sira, in that instead of a series of unconnected sayings, we have here a logical sequence. The acrostic poem on the model housewife (Pr 31.10-31) and the advice to beware whores (Pr 7.6-27) are two rare exceptions.

In another important feature Wi differs from Si and Pr. The latter two were originally composed in Hebrew, whereas Wi was written in Greek. As a significant consequence the author of Wi shows himself to be rather well acquainted with earlier or contemporary Greek literature and schools of thought. Our document provides a valuable piece of information regarding the contemporary intellectual, cultural sphere of the diaspora Judaism around the turn of the era.

In terms of the Greek language its level is outstanding and extremely high among Septuagint books. This applies not only to its vocabulary, but also aspects of its grammar.

In this apocryphal book we have then a most important document, important out of very many perspectives.

We are again deeply thankful to Peeters, Mr. B. Verrept, and his staff for agreeing to publish this work and working hard on its production.

T. Muraoka  
Oegstgeest, The Netherlands

16 August, 2022





## PREFACE

The Greek original of Wi studied and translated into English here is, with very few exceptions, based on that edited by Joseph Ziegler and published in the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint in 1962. We have also studied its two ancient Syriac translations, i.e. Peshitta and Syro-Hexapla, and the Old Latin version. For these we have taken advantage of a Leiden edition prepared by Emerton and Lane (1979)<sup>1</sup>, a codex Ambrosianus published by Ceriani (1874), and *Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam versionem* II (1969)<sup>2</sup> respectively. Quotations from the two Syriac versions have been transcribed with the Hebrew alphabet and vocalised and mostly provided with an English translation. There is another ancient version, though preserved in a limited quantity [9.8b - 10.2], namely in Christian Palestinian Syriac. In spite of its conventional label, the language is an Aramaic dialect which was current in the Melkite Christian community in Palestine and Transjordan, and written in a Syriac alphabet.<sup>3</sup>

Both the Peshitta and the Old Latin are important because they are older than any MS of the Septuagint (Holmes 1913.520). And yet relatively few commentators refer to the Syriac versions.<sup>4</sup>

In the Foreword we have mentioned an impressive quality of the Greek language as used in Wi.

1) Given the modest size of the document the number of hapax legomena is striking. According to our calculation the total comes to 228,<sup>5</sup> some of which occur more than once in Wi,<sup>6</sup> and 36 are at the moment unattested prior to the Septuagint. Though we need to remember that our knowledge of the usage of Greek in ancient times is extremely limited, some could be innovations by our author. Our complete list of hapax in Wi is found as an appendix below, pp. 223-24.

<sup>1</sup> Simultaneously consulting an earlier edition by de Lagarde (1861).

<sup>2</sup> Though published in the edition of Vulgate, Jerome did not touch the Old Latin version.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted here as “GBS” or PS. See under GBS or in the attached bibliography.

Reider refers to “Palest. Syr.” from time to time, when no **PS** has been preserved. E.g. ad 2.9 he is actually quoting from the Peshitta.

<sup>4</sup> On the versions in general of Wi, cf. Larcher 60-74.

<sup>5</sup> The figure mentioned by Clarke (1973.7) is higher: 335. Clarke may be dependent on Reese (1970.3), who states that “all statistics about Wis are based on personal research” (loc. cit., f.n. 6). Neither scholar provides a list of hapax legomena, which does not enable us to decide who is right.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. ἀβλαβής 18.3, 19.6; παντοδύναμος [not attested prior to Wi] 7.23, 11.17, 18.15. See the appendix below on hapax legomena.

The appearance of rare data is not confined to lexemes, but we ought to pay attention to how lexemes are used: syntagmatics, senses, and morphology. For instance, ἐφ' ὕστερῳ 19.11 is a phrase which is not extraordinary, but this expression in the sense of “later,” a synonym of ὕστερον, is unattested prior to Wi. A more elaborate study has been undertaken by Reese (1970.3-6) under the heading “Usage not found in the LXX.”

2) A grammatical phenomenon which goes under the label of *hyperbaton* is extremely common. E.g. ἐκ μέσου μύστας θιάσου ‘initiates out of a banquet’ 12.5 and τὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἀποκτεῖναι νήπια ‘to kill the babies of the saints’ 18.5. There is nothing extraordinary here in Classical Greek with its vast freedom in word order, but Septuagint translators would not have written Greek like this, but gone for μύστας ἐκ θιάσου and ἀποκτεῖναι τὰ νήπια τῶν ὁσίων respectively.<sup>7</sup>

The general freedom of word order is exemplified in καὶ φάσματα ἀμειδίτοις κατηφῇ προσώποις ἐνεφανίζετο ‘and gloomy phantoms would appear to unsmiling faces’ 17.4 and αἰφνίδιος γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσδόκητος φόβος ἐπεχύθη ‘for unforeseen and unexpected fear was directed at them’ 17.15.

3) Reider (1957.22-27) presents a most cogent and persuasive argument that this book was originally written in Greek, and not translated from Hebrew as argued by Margoliouth 1890. Occasional, apparent Hebraisms such as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς] = Heb. עַל-עֵינַיִם 3.2 are best interpreted as Septuagintalisms. Throughout Wi we can easily ascertain the profound familiarity on the part of our author with the Septuagint. At many a juncture he alludes to the Septuagint version of the biblical source text, though he appears to have been competent in the Hebrew / Aramaic original of the Bible.

4) The high level of the grammar is illustrated by ἐφόβει in 17.9. This high-frequency verb, attested 435 times in LXX, is used only here in the active voice. Elsewhere it is in the middle voice or pseudo-passive such as ἐφοβήθη ‘he feared.’

5) The best description of the general nature of Greek of our document and a convincing argument against an alleged Hebrew original is that by Reider (1957.22-29). Even he, however, makes no reference to the use of hapax legomena in Wi. Inter alia, we totally agree with him that some features of the Greek language of Wi which could be considered Hebraisms or Aramaisms are to be attributed to the influence of the Septuagint.

6) Some scholars are inclined to view some influence of our book on New Testament writers, St Paul in particular. So Holmes (1913.526f.), for instance.

<sup>7</sup> Rees (1970.26f.) presents a wider survey of hyperbaton in Wi.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Some frequently quoted reference works are also indicated in an abbreviated form.  
See Bibliography.

acc.	= accusative
Aor.	= Aorist
adj.	= adjective
adv.	= adverb
Art.	= definite article
BG	= Biblical Greek
BH	= Biblical Hebrew
CG	= Classical Greek
dat.	= dative
Fut.	= Future
Ⲑ	= the edition of Wi by Ziegler
gen.	= genitive
Ⲛ	= Hebrew (text)
Impf.	= Imperfect
impv.	= imperative
inf.	= infinitive
KG	= Koine Greek; Kühner - Gerth
Ⲛ	= <i>Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem</i> , R. Weber (ed.), 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1969.
nom.	= nominative
NP	= noun phrase
NTG	= New Testament Greek
<i>o</i>	= object as against subject or predicate
<i>p</i>	= predicate as against subject or object
Pf.	= Perfect
Plpf.	= Pluperfect
prep.	= preposition
ⲡⲤ	= Christian Palestinian Syriac
ptc.	= participle
Rahl	= A. RAHLFS (ed.), <i>Septuaginta</i> , Stuttgart, 1935.
<i>s</i>	= subject as against object or predicate
Ⲥ	= Peshitta
ⲤⲚ	= Syro-Hexapla
SG	= Septuagint Greek
sim.	= similar, similarly
v.l.	= varia lectio, "variant reading"
Zgl	= J. ZIEGLER (ed.), <i>Sapientia Salomonis</i> , Göttingen, 1962.



ΣΟΦΙΑ ΣΑΛΩΜΩΝΟΣ



## CHAPTER 1

The title of a book is normally anarthrous. Likewise Λῆμμα Νινευη· βιβλίον ὀράσεως Ναουμ τοῦ Ελκεσαίου Na 1.1.

- 1.1) Ἀγαπήσατε δικαιοσύνην, οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν,  
φρονήσατε περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀγαθότητι  
καὶ ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας ζητήσατε αὐτόν.

*Love righteousness, o those who judge the land,  
give thought to the Lord earnestly  
and seek Him with sincerity of heart.*

Ἀγαπήσατε] Ἀγαπάω, a word that is of cardinal importance in BG means here “to attach great importance and value and act accordingly, not devalue and turn away from it” (*GELS* s.v. ἀγαπάω 2).<sup>1</sup>

οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν] A comma has been inserted before and after the participial phrase to mark it as being in the vocative. A vocative constituent is often prefixed with the definite article. See *SSG* § 22 **yd**.

The ptc. here is substantivised, equivalent to οἱ κριταί, and such a ptc. can be expanded, here with a direct *o*. See *SSG* § 31 **bba**. On our author’s concern about the mission entrusted to rulers, see below at 5.23, 6.1ff. as pointed out by Sekine (1977.341). Writing about a substantial community of Alexandria counting at least half a million Jews Holmes (535) quotes from Josephus: “There is also an ethnarch at their head who rules the people and dispenses justice, and sees that obligations are observed” (*Ant.* 14.7), a description that underlines that a ruler is discharged with the important duty of seeing to the maintenance of justice.

περὶ τοῦ κυρίου] The use or non-use of the article with κύριος as a title of God is not subject to any rigid rule, hence πρὸς κύριον ἤξει 1.9.

ἐν ἀγαθότητι] This abstract noun, ἀγαθότης, is also used in Si as an indication of one’s firm determination: ἐν ἀγαθότητι προθυμίας ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ‘with the commendable determination in his heart’ Si 45.23. *Pace SD* f.n. the phrase is unlikely to refer to God’s goodness, though שְׁטָחָא בְּטָחָא ‘good qualities’ probably refers to God’s qualities.

ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας] Note a description of King David’s prayer in ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας προεθυμήθη πάντα ταῦτα אֲנִי בִישָׁר לְבָבִי הִתְנַדְּבָהּ כָּל־אֶלֶף 1Ch 29.17.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Muraoka 2020.89-94.



καρδίας] This might be governing the preceding ἀγαθότητι as well: “.. the goodness (of heart) and .. the singleness of heart,” *SSG* § 42 e.

ζητήσατε αὐτόν] With God as the *o* ζητέω does not mean ‘to search (what or who is lost),’ but ‘to pursue as desirable’ (*GELS* s.v. 2). So in ὁ ζητῶν κύριον יהי' שָׁקַבְךָ Ex 33.7 and δικαιοσύνην ζητήσατε קְדֻשָּׁתִי שָׁקַבְךָ Zp 2.3.

- 1.2) ὅτι εὐρίσκεται τοῖς μὴ πειράζουσιν αὐτόν,  
ἐμφανίζεται δὲ τοῖς μὴ ἀπιστοῦσιν αὐτῷ.

*It is because He is found by those who do not test Him,  
but manifests Himself to those who do not mistrust Him.*

εὐρίσκεται] God is found available to those who seek Him, cf. (1c) above.

πειράζουσιν] The devil, who worked on Jesus in the wilderness, is called ὁ πειράζων. The devil was not working as a fair examiner, but his intention was “to entice (Jesus) to improper behaviour, *tempt*” (BDAG s.v. 4.).<sup>2</sup> The verb here is being used as a synonym of ἀπιστέω below. Cf. τί πειράζετε (יִסְתִּי) κύριον; Ex 17.2; // δοκιμάζω Ps 94.9.

The following dative phrase marks the agens of passive verbs, as synonymous with ὑπὸ τῶν. For details, see *SSG* § 22 wo.

ἐμφανίζεται] Middle rather than passive, though the following dative phrase is similar to the preceding case, neither presenting a compliment. Cf. Wi 17.4.

- 1.3) σκολιοὶ γὰρ λογισμοὶ χωρίζουσιν ἀπὸ θεοῦ,  
δοκιμαζομένη τε ἡ δύναμις ἐλέγχει τοὺς ἄφρονας.

*For crooked thoughts move (one) away from God,  
When put to a test, His power denounces the fools.*

χωρίζουσιν] An *o* is anticipated. This verb, when in the active voice, is transitive, whilst in the middle it could mean “to depart; to part with,” e.g. εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐχωρίσθη ‘he departed to Antioch’ 2M 5.21 and ἀπὸ τοῦ Γαδδὶ ἐχωρίσθησαν (יָבִדְךָ) πρὸς Δαυὶδ ‘they parted with Gaddi and joined hands with David’ 1C 12.9. Cf. שִׁלְיָן פָּרְשׁוּ ‘are distanced.’ שִׁלְיָן פָּרְשׁוּ is equivocal: act. = פָּרַשׁ or pass. = שִׁלַּח.

- 1.4) ὅτι εἰς κακότεχνον ψυχὴν οὐκ εἰσέλυσεται σοφία  
οὐδὲ κατοικήσει ἐν σώματι καταχρέω ἁμαρτίας.

*Because wisdom would not enter a soul that plans evil  
nor would dwell in a body under the control of sin.*

<sup>2</sup> *SD* uses “versuchen” and Holmes “tempt.” Whilst the devil was commissioned by God to test (πειρασθῆναι Mt 4.1) Jesus, we doubt that he would have dared to tempt God.

κακότεχνον] cf. κακότεχνος ἐπίνοια Wi 15.4 and **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא כְּפִלְתָּמָּ**<sup>3</sup> ‘snared with evils’ and **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא תְּמִינָא** ‘skilful in evils.’

εἰσελεύσεται .. κατοικήσει] The Fut. indicates a theoretical possibility, i.e. unlikelihood. Cf. SSG § 28 ge.

καταχρέω] a hapax in SG.<sup>4</sup> This is one of many adjectives governed by a nominal in the genitive case as in πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν ‘full of sins’ Is 1.4. Cf. SSG § 22 r. Cyril of Alexandria, however, seems to have found this construction unnatural: ἐν σώματι καταχρέω ἁμαρτίαις.

- 1.5) ἅγιον γὰρ πνεῦμα παιδείας φεύζεται δόλον  
καὶ ἀπαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λογισμῶν ἄσυνέτων  
καὶ ἐλεγχθήσεται ἐπελθούσης ἀδικίας.

*For a holy spirit for education would evade deception  
and shun nonsensical arguments  
and be proven right when unrighteousness attacks.*

παιδείας] a genitive marking a purpose, SSG § 22 v (xiv). Cp. λογισμὸν εἰρήνης ‘thought for welfare’ Je 29.11. “Education” here is not about general education, but specifically religious and ethical. Cf. Οὐ μὴ λάβητε παιδείαν (רְמִיָּה) τοῦ ἀκούειν τοὺς λόγους μου; ‘are you never going to take to heart what I say to you?’ Je 42.13.

φεύζεται] Φεύγω often governs ἀπό τινος. The construction with τι occurs in LXX twice more: + ἁμάρτημα Si 20.8f and + κενοδοξίαν 4M 8.19. The syntagm <+ acc.> is very common in CG, e.g. θάνατον Hom. *Il.* 1.60; for more examples, see LSJ s.v. **II 1 a**.

ἀπαναστήσεται] a hapax in LXX. It does not appear to be very common in CG, in which it is not used figuratively as here, but usually with a location as in ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας Thuc. *Hist.* 1.61.3.

ἐλεγχθήσεται] The difficulty presented by this word is evident in **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא** ‘it hides’ and **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא תְּמִינָא** ‘it will hide itself.’<sup>5</sup> None of the generally known senses of ἐλέγχω appears to fit here. We are inclined to adopt the sense 2 of ἐλέγχω in GELS: “to demonstrate verbally the virtue, justice or efficacy of” as in ἐπλασέν με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν παιδείαν αὐτοῦ ‘he formed me in order to prove his teaching right’ Hb 1.12.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> **בְּיָשָׁתָא** (with a seyyame) ed. Lagarde is definitely preferable.

<sup>4</sup> κατάχρεω in Zgl and Rahl is a misprint.

<sup>5</sup> Siegfried’s “wird vom Rügegeist erfüllt werden” departs a fair bit from G. Likewise Holmes’s “will be scared away.” According to SD (II 2130) “wird abgewiesen werden” is contextually justifiable.

<sup>6</sup> Pace SL s.v. the noun, **אֲרִיָּה**, is of common gender, not only fem. Cp. **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא תְּמִינָא** ‘the spirit of the Lord filled’ // **שְׁלֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָא** ..

<sup>6</sup> Cf. BdA ad loc.

- 1.6) φιάνθρωπον γὰρ πνεῦμα σοφία  
καὶ οὐκ ἁθρώσει βλάσφημον ἀπὸ χειλέων αὐτοῦ·  
ὅτι τῶν νεφρῶν αὐτοῦ μάρτυς ὁ θεὸς  
καὶ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐπίσκοπος ἀληθὴς  
καὶ τῆς γλώσσης ἀκουστής.

*For wisdom is a spirit that loves humans  
and would not allow a blasphemer free use of his lips  
because God is a witness of his inner being,  
and a true investigator of his heart,  
and a listener to (his) tongue.*

σοφία] v.l. in quite a few MSS, also **𐤌 𐤍𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤍𐤕𐤓** ‘the spirit of wisdom.’<sup>7</sup>  
ἀπὸ χειλέων αὐτοῦ] All the three parallel phrases consist each of a substantive referring to part of a human body in the gen., with no preposition preceding. It appears that ἀπὸ has been added in view of its addition to ἁθῶς in the sense of “*exempt from accountability for that which one might do to sbd*” (GELS s.v. **2 b**) as in Ἀθῶός εἰμι τὸ ἅπαξ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, ὅτι ἐγὼ ποιῶ μεθ’ ὑμῶν κακά Jdg 15.3 AL.

νεφρῶν] lit. ‘kidneys,’ but here a metaphor for a centre of attitudes and intentions, so also ἐγγὺς εἶ σὺ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ πόρρω ἀπὸ τῶν νεφρῶν αὐτῶν Je 12.2 (// καρδία vs. 3) and ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἕως νυκτὸς ἐπαίδευσάν με οἱ νεφροί μου Ps 15.7.

τῆς γλώσσης] Some MSS add αὐτου.

- 1.7) ὅτι πνεῦμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην,  
καὶ τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα γινώσιν ἔχει φωνῆς.

*Because the spirit of the Lord has permeated the world  
and that which holds control of everything recognises (every) sound.*

πεπλήρωκεν] Most modern translations consulted use the Present tense, which can be misleading as if the author meant to say that the spirit of the Lord does filling all the time. What is meant can be translated: “the universe is full of the spirit of the Lord.” A state that once happened still prevails and has not changed. This perspective has been captured by **𐤌 𐤕𐤕𐤓 𐤍𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤍𐤕𐤓** ‘the spirit of the Lord filled’ // **𐤌𐤕 𐤍𐤕𐤓** ..., and **𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕** *replevit*.<sup>8</sup>

τὸ συνέχον] The neut. gender suggests that it refers to πνεῦμα κυρίου. The message of the clause is affiliated to that of (6e) and goes farther, not just recognising sounds and words (ἀκούω), but also finding out their message

<sup>7</sup> **𐤌 𐤍𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤍𐤕𐤓** is probably an error missing **𐤕**.

<sup>8</sup> In order to justify his translation with “filleth” Holmes refers to Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται Joh 11.11, which actually speaks against Holmes, for the text means “Lazarus has died and is lying in a grave.”

(γινώσκω). In **§** and **§**הַיְיָ הַיְיָ ‘he who holds’ the referent appears to be personal, i.e. God, though this does not necessarily mean that their *Vorlage* read ὁ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, which is not found in any LXX MS. The spirit of the Lord has been personified.

Winston (104) mentions a few earlier texts where a similar thought is found. E.g. ὁ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον συνάπτων τε καὶ συνέχων ‘he who coordinates and holds the entire universe’ Xen. *Memor.* 4.3.13, where one of Greek gods is being referred to.

- 1.8) διὰ τοῦτο φθεγγόμενος ἄδικα οὐδεὶς μὴ λάθῃ,  
οὐδὲ μὴ παροδεύσῃ αὐτὸν ἐλέγχουσα ἡ δίκη.

*For this reason nobody talking unrighteous things could escape unnoticed nor would justice ever pass him by, taking no notice without remonstrating him.*

λάθῃ] Λανθάνω is at times used without a mention of someone whose notice an action escapes. More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. **c**.

παροδεύσῃ] This verb, παροδεύω, occurs six times in LXX, five of which in Wi. and thrice <+ acc.> [2.7, 6.22. 10.8].<sup>9</sup>

ἐλέγχουσα] ‘being charged with the task of remonstrating when required.’

- 1.9) ἐν γὰρ διαβουλίῳις ἀσεβοῦς ἐξέτασις ἔσται,  
λόγων δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀκοὴ πρὸς κύριον ἥξει  
εἰς ἐλεγχὸν ἀνομιμάτων αὐτοῦ.

*For designs of an ungodly person shall be subjected to examination, a report of what he says is to reach the Lord for punishment of his illegal deeds.*

ἐν] The function of ἐν here may come under **15** in *GELS* s.v.: “marks the object of a discourse or thought.”

γὰρ] The frequency of this discourse particle in Wi is striking: 156 times in a book with a total of 436 verses, so nearly once in every three verses. Though the book is thought to be part of the wisdom literature, the book of Pr, which is thicker, uses this particle 109 times. This remarkable discrepancy must be due to a difference in literary genre of the two documents. Pr has long sections in which proverbs follow one after another without any logical progress, whilst Wi, though containing sayings which can be called proverbial sayings, presents thoughts in logical order. More or less the same can be said about ὅτι, though it has a function other than causal.

<sup>9</sup> Dr A. Thompson of Cambridge kindly drew my attention to a very rare attestation of the verb prior to Wi, i.e. Theocritus (4th-3rd cent. BCE): μὴ παροδεύσης “Don’t by-pass!”. Though the verb is used absolutely without an *o*, it carries the same sense as in our instance.

διαβουλίοις] The noun, διαβούλιον, on its own is what one plans and designs, and that can be evil or not. See οὐκ ἔδωκαν τὰ διαβούλια αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν Ho 5.4. Thus renderings such as “intrigues” (NETS) and “Anschläge” (Siegfried) are a little biased.

- 1.10) ὅτι οὗς ζηλώσεως ἀκροᾶται τὰ πάντα,  
καὶ θροῦς γογγυσμῶν οὐκ ἀποκρύπτεται.

*Because an eager ear catches everything,  
and a noise of grumbles does not remain unnoticed.*

ζηλώσεως] SG is rich in derivationally related words of √ζηλ such as ζήλος, ζηλοτυπία, ζηλόω, ζήλωσις, ζηλωτής, ζηλωτός. They express two aspects, *jealous* and *zealous*, and they are not mutually exclusive. Our οὗς ζηλώσεως can refer to an ear of someone who cannot stand his partner, colleague, or adherent speaking to a rival in too familiar, friendly a manner. Then it becomes a *jealous* ear. Siegfried considers this a case of Hebraism, i.e. reflecting  $\text{זְהִיבָה}$ , for instance. However, in CG we find the use of ζήλος in ζήλον οὐ σμικρὸν γάμων ἔχουσα ‘being a target of a fierce competition for me as wife’ Eur. *Hec.* 352 and αἱ πολύτροποι τοῦ βίου ζηλώσεις ‘the variegated eager pursuits of life’ Ph. 1.362. Cf.  $\text{זְהִיבָה זְהִיבָה}$  ‘an envious ear’ //  $\text{זְהִיבָה זְהִיבָה זְהִיבָה}$  either ‘.. of jealousy’ or ‘.. of jealousy.’ The Latin translator is content with a phonetic transcription of the Gk word: *zeli*. As pointed out in *SD* ad loc. the God of the Bible is called θεὸς ζηλωτής at a number of places in LXX: e.g. Ex 20.5, Dt 4.24, Na 1.2.

In οὗς ζηλώσεως Winston (105) sees “an imitation of Heb. adjectival genitive.” But in CG we find examples of the genitive of quality. KG (II 1.264) mentions, e.g. ὁ τᾶς ἡσυχίας βίοτος ‘quiet life’ Eur. *Ba.* 389. Examples in SG are mentioned in *SSG* § 22 v (xvi).

- 1.11) Φυλάξασθε τοίνυν γογγυσμὸν ἀνωφελῇ  
καὶ ἀπὸ καταλαλιᾶς φείσασθε γλώσσης·  
ὅτι φθέγμα λαθραῖον κενὸν οὐ πορεύεται,  
στόμα δὲ καταψευδόμενον ἀναιρεῖ ψυχὴν.

*Beware then of a useless grumble  
and guard your tongue against slandering,  
because a secretive utterance would not go with no after-effect,  
a lying mouth destroys a soul.*

καταλαλιά] a hapax in LXX. We are not as sure as Holmes, who holds that, parallel to γογγυσμός, this second noun means “blasphemy against God.” Though τοίνυν marks a logical sequence of this verse to vs. 10, the causal clause that follows suggests that the application is broader. Besides,

if γογγυσμός in this verse is concerned with an utterance addressed to God, an adjective other than ἀνωφελῇ might be anticipated.

φείσασθε] Another instance of the syntagm <φείδομαί τινος ἀπό τινος> is found in ἐφείσατο (𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤒) δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ θανάτου καὶ μὴ πεσεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν πολέμῳ Jb 33.18.

λαθραῖον] another hapax in LXX.

κενὸν] Alternatively this adjective could be analysed as attributive, “empty.” So 𐤔𐤗 𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘a concealed, empty talk’ as against 𐤕 in *vacuum non ibit*, for instance. Then the verb πορεύομαι is perhaps being used in the sense of “to work, function” (GELS s.v. 4).<sup>10</sup>

ἀναιρεῖ ψυχὴν] cf. ὁδόντες λέοντος οἱ ὁδόντες αὐτῆς ἀναιροῦντες ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων Si 21.2, where αὐτῆς = ἁμαρτίας. Winston’s (100) “self-destruction” is questionable. Even admitting occasional use of ψυχὴ as equivalent to a reflexive pronoun,<sup>11</sup> that cannot be applied to “mouth.”

- 1.12) μὴ ζηλοῦτε θάνατον ἐν πλάνῃ ζωῆς ὑμῶν  
μὴδὲ ἐπισπᾶσθε ὄλεθρον ἐν ἔργοις χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

*Do not become too desirous of death through your erroneous way of life  
nor attract ruin through works of your hands;*

ἐπισπᾶσθε] The *o* can be desirable or undesirable, e.g. πρὸς τὴν αὐτῆς τῆς βίβλου μελέτην ἐπισπώμενος ‘inviting the hearer to study this very book’ Si prol II and ἐπισπάσασθαι βοήθειαν ἑαυτῷ ‘to draw help towards himself’ 1M 14.1 // ἐπισπώμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὡς σχοινίῳ μακρῷ ‘.. sins as if with a long string’ Is 5.18.

𐤔𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘you will be drawn’ shows that the Gk verb here has been analysed as passive, though the following acc. renders such an analysis difficult, and highlights a consequence that would ensue.

- 1.13) ὅτι ὁ θεὸς θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν  
οὐδὲ τέρπεται ἐπ’ ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων.

*because God did not produce death  
nor enjoys the perdition of the living.*

τέρπεται] Another instance of <τέρπομαι ἐπὶ τινι> is ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μου ἀγαλλιάσεται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ, τερφθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ σωτηρίῳ αὐτοῦ Ps 34.9, where the parallelism with ἀγαλλιάομαι is to be noted. In a stative form selected by 𐤔𐤗 an emotion rather than an action is underscored: 𐤗𐤕 𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕 ‘it is not pleasant for Him with the perdition.’

<sup>10</sup> In any event it can, *pace* Winston (100), scarcely mean “unheeded.”

<sup>11</sup> On our reservations, see Muraoka 2005.60-65 and SSG § 8 g.

We fail to see why Winston (107f.) finds here a bold statement. Did not God Himself warn Adam that if he ate of the forbidden tree, he would surely die (Gn 2.17)? See also what Paul says on Adam in δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος Ro 5.12. See also Wi 7.1.

ἀπωλεία] Synonymous with θάνατος, but not a complete synonym. The message is that, whilst man is responsible for his mortality, God does not take delight in it; He would have wished the most important of His animate creation to remain immortal.

- 1.14) ἔκτισεν γὰρ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα,  
καὶ σωτήριοι αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐταῖς φάρμακον ὀλέθρου  
οὔτε ᾗδου βασιλείον ἐπὶ γῆς.

*For He created everything for the sake of their existence  
and all that came into existence in the world are meant for perpetual  
existence  
and in them there is no poison for perdition  
nor is there the dominion by Hades on the earth.*

τὸ εἶναι] Whilst BJ f.n. ad loc. makes an interesting point by referring to הָיָה אֵלֶיךָ עֲשֵׂה אֵלֶיךָ 'Egō eīmi ὁ ὢν Ex 3.14, its translation with “que tout subsiste” represents more accurately what Ⲫ here means.

τὰ πάντα] functioning as the *s* of the infinitive as well as the *o* of ἔκτισεν.

The three last clauses are all in the present tense, describing the current situation of the world. ἔστιν (14c), being an existential verb, and not a mere copula, cannot be missed and it is the predicate of (14d) as well.

σωτήριοι] “the products of the world *are* healthsome” (Holmes); “healthsome for humans”? αἱ γενέσεις is most likely referring back to τὰ πάντα, neuter in gender.

αἱ γενέσεις] The selection of the pl. form suggests that the reference is to creatures, not “creation, birth” as in Ⲫ ⲁⲙⲗⲉⲩⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ ‘the birth of the world’ as against Ⲫⲏ ⲁⲙⲗⲉⲩⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ ‘those born in the world.’ The rendering “the generative forces” (NETS) is disputable. Ⲛ nationes = γέννη.

SD (II 2131) Wi is said to use the sg. more often, but as in ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν 3.12 the selection of the sg. here is logical, where it means ‘their birth, arrival, Entstehung.’

βασιλείον] This substantivised neut. adj. in the sense of “dominion, rule” occurs also in αὐτῇ ἡ ἰσχύς καὶ τὸ βασιλείον καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία ‘this is the power and dominion and authority’ 1E 4.40, τὸ βασιλείόν σου παρέλαβες ‘you received your rulership’ ib. 43. In ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις Lk 7.25 referred to by Siegfried it is about royal palaces.

1.15) δικαιοσύνη γὰρ ἀθάνατός ἐστιν.

*For righteousness is immortal.*

Some scholars, e.g. Holmes, find this verse out of place and are inclined to insert an antithetical clause said to be found in some Latin MSSs, which reads “iniustitia autem mortis acquisitio est.” We, however, agree with *SD* (II 2131) and follow Ziegler. In the preceding verses the author maintained that wickedness, unrighteousness (ἀδικία), and enmity towards God are bound to be punished by God as declared to the first human couple מות מות Gn 2.17.

1.16) Ἄσεβεῖς δὲ ταῖς χερσὶν καὶ τοῖς λόγοις προσεκαλέσαντο αὐτόν,  
φίλον ἡγησάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐτάκησαν  
καὶ συνθήκην ἔθεντο πρὸς αὐτόν,  
ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι.

*However, to the impious, given what they do and say, it served right,  
having thought it friendly, they crumbled  
and reached an agreement with it,  
because they deserved the share given by it.*

προσεκαλέσαντο] lit. “invited”<sup>12</sup>; the author sounds sarcastic. Note the application of φίλος to death in the next line. Also note the last clause saying to the effect that death became their legacy, which is, by definition, bequeathed to survivors.

ἐτάκησαν] Τήκω primarily means “to melt (of liquid),” but is used here figuratively, “to melt away, disappear.”

συνθήκην ἔθεντο] cf. Ἐποιήσαμεν διαθήκην μετὰ τοῦ ἄδου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου συνθήκας נָתַן יְיָ לְאַשְׁמֹנִי וְלַמָּוֶת אֶת־תְּהֵנוּ כְּרִיתָ Is 28.15.

τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος] The phrase is equivalent to τῆς μερίδος αὐτοῦ.

εἶναι] This appears to be redundant. We doubt that the gen. τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος can be the predicate of εἶναι as implied by “sie verdienen es, zum Anteil von jenem zu gehören” (*SD*). An example of <ἄξιος + inf.> as in ἄξιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι στερηθῆναι φωτός ‘For they deserved to have light deprived’ Wi 18.4 is of a different character.

<sup>12</sup> In *CG* we find the verb being used in the sense of “to call sbd to one’s aid” in προσκαλέσασθαι βουλόμενοι Θετταλοὺς καὶ Θεβαίους ‘wanting to win over the Thessalians and Thebans’ Dem. 18.166. I am grateful to Dr A. Thompson of Cambridge for localising this reference.



## CHAPTER 2

- 2.1) εἶπον γάρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λογισάμενοι οὐκ ὀρθῶς  
Ὀλίγος ἐστὶν καὶ λυπηρὸς ὁ βίος ἡμῶν,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἴασις ἐν τελευτῇ ἀνθρώπου,  
καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώσθη ὁ ἀναλύσας ἐξ ἁδου.

*For they said among themselves after incorrect reasoning,  
‘Our life is brief and sorrowful,  
at one’s death there is no cure  
and one who came back from Hades is unknown.*

For the message of (1b), cf. Ps 90.10.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἰασις] The author probably wants to say that, when one has reached one's life-span, even if not critically ill, death is unavoidable.

*ἀναλύσας*] Ἀναλύω is used in the sense “to return to the point of origin” (*GELS* s.v. 3) also in τμηθεὶς δ’ ἄηρ εὐθὺς εἰς ἐαυτὸν ἀνελύθη ‘the parted air soon closed up again’ Wi 5.12. Cf. *℣ sit reversus ab inferis* and *ܩܗ ܕܚܝܢܐܬܐ* ‘he who returned.’ In spite of his translation, “returned from Hades” Holmes argues for analysing the Gk verb here as transitive on the basis of the above-quoted Wi 5.12. Many forms which are passive in form are not passive in sense, but merely pseudo-passive.<sup>1</sup> Holmes’ own translation of Wi 5.12 reads “The air disparted closeth up again immediately.” Cf. *ܫܠܡܐܘܬܐ ܕܚܝܢܐܬܐ* ‘one who was released’ and “one who releases” (Sekine 1977.23), and “man kennt keinen, der (je) aus der Unterwelt befreit hat” (*SD*), but whom?<sup>2</sup> See also below at 16.14.

- 2.2) ὅτι αὐτοσχεδῶς ἐγενήθημεν  
καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐσόμεθα ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες·  
ὅτι καπνὸς ἢ πνοὴ ἐν ῥισὶν ἡμῶν,  
καὶ ὁ λόγος σπινθήρ ἐν κινήσει καρδίας ἡμῶν.

*Because we came into existence by chance,  
after this (life) also we are going to become as if we had never existed.  
Because the breath in our nostrils is smoke,  
our reasoning also is a spark when our heart beats.*

<sup>1</sup> See *SSG* § 27 db.

<sup>2</sup> So also “on ne connaît personne qui délivre de l’Hadès” (*BJ*), though “qui soit remonté” is suggested as an alternative.

αὐτοσχεδίως] cf. **§**, **§**ה אֶלֶּיךָ מִן ‘all of a sudden,’ and **¶** *ex nihilo*. This lexeme is a hapax in LXX and unknown prior to LXX.

ἐγενήθημεν] chosen by Ziegler against ἐγεννηθημεν, lit. ‘we were born,’ attested by many MSS. Γίνομαι indisputably carries the sense of ‘to be born’ in ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣ ἐγενήθη מוֹלְדֵתוֹ בְּאֶרֶץ Ge 11.28, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου αὐτῷ לִי הַנּוֹלֵד־לִי בְנִי-בְשֵׁם ib. 21.3. More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. **2 b**.

ὑπάρξαντες] An Aor. ptc. does not necessarily indicate the action as having taken place prior to that expressed by its principal verb. When the latter is in the Fut. tense, however, it often indicates a prior action. For more examples, see *SSG* § 28 **dff**. For the message, see καὶ ἔσονται καθὼς οὐχ ὑπάρχοντες הָיוּ בְּלֹא הָיוּ Ob 16, where the selection of the Pres. in **¶** represents a different philosophy. Closer to our Wi text is ἀπώλοντο ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς οὐ γεγονότες הָיוּ הָיוּ לֹא כְאֶשֶׁר Si 44.9.

For (2c) cf. הָיוּ בְּאֶפְרַיִם נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה Ge 2.7.

On the philosophy represented in (2d) as found with classical authors, cf. Winston 117.

- 2.3) οὐ σβεσθέντος τέφρα ἀποβήσεται τὸ σῶμα  
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διαχυθήσεται ὡς χαῦνος ἀήρ.

*After it is quenched, the body will turn to ashes  
and the spirit will spread all over like thin air.*

ἀποβήσεται] Here ἀποβαίνω is not completely synonymous with γίνομαι, but implies the emergence of a surprising state of affairs, e.g. ἀπέβης δέ μοι ἀνελεημόνως<sup>3</sup> ‘You became to me merciless’ Jb 30.21, what Job could not anticipate.

- 2.4) καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἡμῶν ἐπιλησθήσεται ἐν χρόνῳ,  
καὶ οὐθεὶς μνημονεύσει τῶν ἔργων ἡμῶν·  
καὶ παρελεύσεται ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ὡς ἵχνη νεφέλης  
καὶ ὡς ὀμίχλη διασκεδασθήσεται  
διωχθεῖσα ὑπὸ ἀκτίνων ἡλίου  
καὶ ὑπὸ θερμότητος αὐτοῦ βαρυνθεῖσα.

*And our name will be forgotten in a while  
and nobody will remember our works;  
and our life will vanish like traces of a cloud,  
and will be dispersed like mist,  
chased by rays of the sun  
and burdened with its heat.*

<sup>3</sup> Against Ziegler’s ἐπέβης ‘You assailed me.’

ἐν χρόνῳ] This idiomatic combination recurs at 14.16. Every human corpse, if not buried, would eventually become totally invisible. To have our name buried in history is the destiny of the great majority of us. Another wisdom teacher is more pessimistic: “of the wise man, even as of the fool, there is no remembrance for ever; seeing that in the days to come all will have been long forgotten” (Ec 2.16).

ἡλίου] on the absence of the definite article here, see below at 16.28.

βαρυνθεῖσα] The verb does not have to be taken in its literal sense, ‘to overweigh,’ since the sun light has no weight. Its figurative use as applied to a mental pressure is illustrated in ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐβαρύνθη ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἡ χεὶρ σου Ps 31.4 and φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχὴν ‘a perishable body weighs a soul down’ Wi 9.15, in which latter case the parallelism with βρίθω is to be noted, v.a.l.

- 2.5) σκιᾶς γὰρ πάροδος ὁ καιρὸς ἡμῶν,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναποδισμὸς τῆς τελευτῆς ἡμῶν,  
ὅτι κατεσφραγίσθη καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναστρέφει.

*For our time is a shadow passing away  
and there is no way back after our death  
because it is securely sealed up and nobody could turn back.*

ὁ καιρὸς ἡμῶν] cf. שְׁלֵי־יְלֵי אֵינָהּ ‘our life’ and שְׁלֵי־יְלֵי ‘our life.’ Cf. Ec 6.12. τῆς τελευτῆς] a genitive of ablative force, ‘away from,’ cf. δόξα ἀνδρὶ ἀποστρέφεσθαι λοιδορίας ‘praise to a man turning away from slandering’ Pr 20.3. See SSG § 22 q. Alternatively, if one takes ἀναποδισμός in the sense of “reversal,” it would imply resuscitation and postponement of death. Then the genitive would be objective.

ἀναποδισμός] unknown prior to LXX, though the cognate verb, ἀναποδίζω, is known to CG.

ἀναστρέφει] The context suggests an intransitive verb *pace* “overturns it” (Winston 111). See also Scarpat I.178.

- 2.6) δεῦτε οὖν καὶ ἀπολαύσωμεν τῶν ὄντων ἀγαθῶν  
καὶ χρησώμεθα τῇ κτίσει ὥς ἐν νεότητι σπουδαίως·

*Come on, then, let's enjoy our current pleasures  
and make the best use of the nature as in our youth.*

δεῦτε] It often introduces a proposed action or a request. The same function is rendered also by δεῦρο, e.g. δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον καὶ κοιμηθῶμεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ Ge 19.32, where two daughters of Lot are discussing a joint action.

Both particles are often joined with the main verb through καί, but also asyndetically, e.g. Δεῦρο εἴσελθε Ge 24.31 and δεῦτε οἰκοδομήσωμεν ib. 11.4. For more details, see *GELS* s.vv.

ἐν νεότητι] Ziegler prefers MSs which read without the preposition. The author is unlikely addressing the proposal to young people only. The general tone of the message in these verses indicates that it is addressed to people who are no longer young. A temporary dative is unlikely here. Cf. שְׁנֵי יְלָדֵינוּ 'in our youth,' sim. שִׁי and L. Cf. Ec 9.7ff. and 11.9 and a discussion in Scarpat I 179f.

The present verse and the sequel seem to indicate our author's familiarity with the Epicureanism.

- 2.7) οἶνου πολυτελοῦς καὶ μύρων πλησθῶμεν,  
καὶ μὴ παροδευσάτω ἡμᾶς ἄνθος ἔαρος·

*Let's consume plenty of expensive wine and perfumes,  
and let's not miss flowers of spring.*

μύρων] presumably perfumes added to wine for their fragrance. Grim (1860.73) quotes μύρω οἶνον μιν γνύντες οὕτως ἐπινον 'mixing wine with perfume they thus drank wine' Aelianus *Var. Hist.* 12.31. Alternatively the noun signifies "ointment"; anointing one's body with plenty of ointment.

ἄνθος ἔαρος] *flos temporis*; the translator perhaps learned the first steps of flower arrangement, for every season of a year produces beautiful flowers.

- 2.8) στεψώμεθα ῥόδων κάλυξιν πρὶν ἢ μαρανθῆναι·

*Let's put on crowns of rosebuds before they wither.*

- 2.9) μηδεὶς λειμὼν ἄμοιρος ἔστω τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀγερωχίας,  
πανταχῇ καταλίπωμεν σύμβολα τῆς εὐφροσύνης,  
ὅτι αὕτη ἡ μερίς ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κλῆρος οὗτος.

*Let no meadow miss a share of our fun,  
let's put down everywhere tokens of our joy,  
because this is our share and this is what we deserve.*

λειμὼν] not supported by any Gk MS. Rahl reads ἡμῶν. Among the ancient versions *℣* with *pratium* supports Ziegler. According to Busto Saiz (1991) the word carries a euphemistic sense of female genitalia as attested in Eur. *Cyc.* 171.<sup>4</sup> To present a male as providing such a pleasure to a woman is typical of the contemporary male-dominated society.

שׁ has a plus at the end of (9a): שְׁנֵי יְלָדֵינוּ אֶתְּמָר 'till (our) old age.'

<sup>4</sup> The same idea is expressed by Scarpat I 182f.

- 2.10) καταδυναστεύσωμεν πένητα δίκαιον,  
μὴ φεισώμεθα χήρας  
μηδὲ πρεσβύτου ἐντραπῶμεν πολιάς πολυχρονίους·

*Let's overpower a righteous pauper,  
let's not take pity on widows  
nor let's revere the ancient grey hairs of the elderly.*

χήρας] **§** adds **עַל יְתָמָא אֵל אֶפְלָא** ‘nor on orphans.’ These two groups are in God’s special care as shown by **אֲבִי יְתוּמִים וְדִין אֶלְמָנוֹת אֱלֹהִים** Ps 68.6 and the attitude displayed here is in direct contradiction to the biblical moral as shown in **לֹא תַעֲנוּן וְיָתוֹם כָּל-אֶלְמָנָה וְיָתוֹם** Ex 22.21 and elsewhere.

πολιάς] Whilst this adjective, πολίός, is a colour term, “grey,” SG applies it mostly to hair, hence the selection of the fem. gender with θρίξ understood.<sup>5</sup> Once, however, ἀπὸ προσώπου πολιοῦ (**מִפְּנֵי שֵׁיבָה**)<sup>6</sup> ἐξαναστήση καὶ τιμήσεις πρόσωπον πρεσβυτέρου Le 19.32 it is applied to an elderly man. Grey hair is a symbol of the high esteem enjoyed by old people: **הַתְּפִאֲרָה בַּחַיִּים כְּהֵם** **וְהָדָר וְקִנְיִם שֵׁיבָה** Pr 20.29.

- 2.11) ἔστω δὲ ἡμῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς νόμος τῆς δικαιοσύνης,  
τὸ γὰρ ἀσθενὲς ἄχρηστον ἐλέγχεται.

*Let our power be the yardstick of justice,  
for the weakness is declared to be useless.*

τῆς δικαιοσύνης] Odd is **iniustitiae**, though there is a v.l. **iustitiae**.

τὸ .. ἀσθενὲς] On its own **§** **אָרְיָא** could mean ‘a weak person.’ Likewise **§** **הַמְּחִילָא** ‘weak.’

ἐλέγχεται] cf. **GELS** s.v. **3** “to pass a negative judgement on sbd or sth as.” Another example of this sense is ἡλεγάξεν αὐτὸν κύριος 2C 26.20, where a leprous priest was declared to be unsuitable to minister.

- 2.12) ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστὶν  
καὶ ἐναντιοῦται τοῖς ἔργοις ἡμῶν  
καὶ ὀνειδίζει ἡμῖν ἁμαρτήματα νόμου  
καὶ ἐπιφημίζει ἡμῖν ἁμαρτήματα παιδείας ἡμῶν·

*Let's wait in ambush for the righteous one  
because he is hard for us to handle  
and interferes with our works  
and accuses us of sins against the law  
and ascribes to us sins as due to our upbringing.*

<sup>5</sup> In CG it can be applied to anything grey, e.g. **πολίῳ** .. **σιδάρῳ** ‘with a grey knife’ Eur. *Herac.* 758.

<sup>6</sup> In the light of the parallel **πρόσωπον πρεσβυτέρου** the phrase cannot mean ‘a grey face.’

δύσχρηστος] This hardly means “nutzlos” (SD) and *inutilis*. It is also applied to a righteous person in Δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ‘Let’s tie him up, ..’ Is 3.10.<sup>7</sup>

παιδείας ἡμῶν] difficult to harmonise with *סְתִיחָהּ* ‘our boldness.’

ἀμαρτήματα παιδείας ἡμῶν] The precise nature of the two genitive components is difficult to determine. Especially what is the logical relationship between the first two? “Sins against” (Holmes and NETS) would imply that we have fallen short of what is required of what we have learned. “unsre Vergehungen gegen die Zucht uns vorhält” (Siegfried) represents the analysis of the phrase as <(a + b) + c>, which would imply that the righteous and we share the same teaching and upbringing. Given what appears to be a deep sense of mutual hostility the educational background shared by the two parties does not sound very plausible. Cf. *nos peccata disciplinae nostrae* and “sagt uns Verfehlungen nach gegen unsere Erziehung” (SD).

- 2.13) ἐπαγγέλλεται γινῶσιν ἔχειν θεοῦ  
καὶ παῖδα κυρίου ξαυτὸν ὀνομάζει·

*He announces that he has knowledge of God  
and calls himself a child of the Lord.*

ἐπαγγέλλεται] cf. γνώσεως δὲ ἀμοιρῶν μὴ ἐπαγγέλλου ‘having no share of knowledge, do not make profession’ Si 3.25. Cf. *סִפְּתָהּ* ‘he supposes.’

παῖδα κυρίου] Though the same two nouns are combined in καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος καὶ ἡ θεράπαινα ὡς ἡ κυρία Is 24.2 it is a merely superficial similarity, since in Is it is about a reversal of social status.<sup>8</sup> Closer is Οὐχ ὁ λαὸς μου τέκνα οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσωσιν; Is 63.8, though μου goes with ὁ λαός (H *מִי*). Cf. also ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ Ro 8.16 and ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι Joh 1.12.<sup>9</sup> See below vs. 16, where God is called πατήρ.

- 2.14) ἐγένετο ἡμῖν εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐννοιῶν ἡμῶν,  
βαρὺς ἐστὶν ἡμῖν καὶ βλεπόμενος,

*He began to reprove our thoughts,  
he is a burden to us, even just to behold,*

εἰς] This preposition is sometimes added to a predicate, and when this happens with a verb meaning “to become” as here, a transformation becomes explicit. This may have been influenced by the Heb. preposition *לְ*, but we find this usage twice more in our document, 2.16 and 10.17.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Justly noted by Fichtner 1938.16.

<sup>8</sup> Winston (12) deals with the oscillation in LXX Is between παῖς and δοῦλος, on which see Van der Kooij 2020.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. BDAG s.v. τέκνον **4 b**.

<sup>10</sup> See GELS s.v. εἰς **6** and εἰμί **3**; SSG § 61 **bb** and BDF § 145.1.

- 2.15) ὅτι ἀνόμοιος τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ,  
καὶ ἐξηλλαγμέναι αἱ τρίβοι αὐτοῦ·

*because his life-style is so different from that of others  
and his ways are weird,*

ἀνόμοιος] a hapax in SG.

τοῖς ἄλλοις] **Σ** is more logical and understandable, **וְיִהְיֶה כִּדְמֵי אֲחֵרִים** ‘it is not like that of others.’ Sim. **Σ**h. Cf. 7.3.

ἐξηλλαγμέναι] Pf. ptc. pass. of ἐξαλλάσσω. Also in its only other attestation in SG it is a ptc.: ἐξαλλασσοῦσας στολάς ‘exceptionally (fine) robes’ Ge 45.22. Though the form is a verb, it is equivalent in function to an adjective as shown by its parallel here, ἀνόμοιος, cf. SSG § 31 **gc**.

- 2.16) εἰς κίβδηλον ἐλογίσθημεν αὐτῷ,  
καὶ ἀπέχεται τῶν ὁδῶν ἡμῶν ὥς ἀπὸ ἀκαθαρσιῶν·  
μακαρίζει ἐσχάτα δικαίων καὶ ἀλαζονεύεται πατέρα θεόν.

*As far as he is concerned, we are spurious  
and he keeps away from our ways as if from dirty things  
and extols the future of the righteous as fortunate and is proud of  
calling God his father.*

κίβδηλον] applied to idols at 15.9. On the rection <λογίζω + acc. + εἰς>, cf. καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην **וְיִהְיֶה לְאֵלֶיךָ לְדִבְרֵי צֶדֶק** Ge 15.6, in which, however, αὐτῷ = τῷ Ἀβρααμ and is distinct from that in the case under consideration, for here we have to do with a dat. commodi.<sup>11</sup> Note also εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθήσονται Wi 3.17 and εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται ib. 9.6. In CG the adj. κίβδηλος is used of false money, e.g. ἀργύριον κίβδηλον Xen. *Oec.* 10.3.7. εἰς ἀργύριον λογισθέντα ‘when reduced to cash’ Xen. *Cyr.* 3.1.33. LSJ s.v. III confines this usage to the passive voice, though in SG we find a case such as ἐλογίσσατο αὐτήν Ηλι εἰς μεθύουσιν ‘Eli thought her to be drunk’ 1K 1.13. Note also Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ge 15.6. Just as the Engl. verb “reckon”, this metaphorical use of λογίζομαι seems to us to derive from an act of mathematical calculation. We wonder if there is a papyrus with an accountant’s table with multiple columns for credit, debit etc. and multiple rows for clients. If Yes, λογίζομαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην could signify that the row for Abraham had δικαιοσύνη written in the column for divine verdict. A metaphorical, non-mathematical, use of

<sup>11</sup> On the selection of the passive voice here, cf. Muraoka 2020.103-05. Besides, **Σ** and **Π** differ in their perspective, the former focusing on Abraham and the latter on God.

λογίζομαι is known to CG: ἀθάνατον οὐδ’ ἐξ ἐνὸς λόγου λελογισμένου ‘it has not been considered immortal by any reasoning’ Pl. *Phadr.* 246c. In *GELS* s.v. εἰς 6 we find “Indicates transformation, added to the predicate of a nominal clause.” Then we could be here having to do with a transitive transformation, *GELS* loc. cit., **b**.

αὐτῷ] Just as in the above quoted Ge 15.6, this is a dative of relationship, and not a marker of the *s*, “by him.”<sup>12</sup>

τῶν ὁδῶν ἡμῶν] The gen. is ablative<sup>13</sup> in value, which is lexicalised in the following parallel, ἀπὸ ἀκαθαρσιῶν. This is typical of the trend in KG as abundantly exemplified in *SSG* § 22 **c** (i).

πατέρα] cf. παῖδα κυρίου vs. 13 above. Winston (120) refers to Is 63.16, 64.7, and Si 23.1, 4 as texts referring to God as father.

- 2.17) ἴδωμεν εἰ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ἀληθεῖς,  
καὶ πειράσωμεν τὰ ἐν ἐκβάσει αὐτοῦ·

*Let’s see whether what he says is true,  
and test how his end is going to turn out.*

ἐκβάσει] a word used only in Wi; elsewhere at 8.8, 11.14.

- 2.18) εἰ γάρ ἐστιν ὁ δίκαιος υἱὸς θεοῦ, ἀντιλήμψεται αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ῥύσεται αὐτὸν ἐκ χειρὸς ἀνθεστηκότων.

*For if the righteous is a son of God, He should help him  
and rescue him out of the hands of opponents.*

ὁ δίκαιος υἱὸς θεοῦ] Both **SH** and **SH** have taken ὁ δίκαιος as substantivised: אֱלֹהִים הַיָּדֵי אֱלֹהִים ‘the righteous one, a son of God.’ In other words, it is he that is right and we are wrong. This appears to be the right analysis, and not “the righteous son of God.” So Kahana (477): אֱלֹהִים הַיָּדֵי אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים. On υἱὸς θεοῦ, see above at vs. 13.

- 2.19) ὕβρει καὶ βασάνῳ ἐτάσωμεν αὐτόν,  
ἵνα γνῶμεν τὴν ἐπιείκειαν αὐτοῦ  
καὶ δοκιμάσωμεν τὴν ἀνεξικακίαν αὐτοῦ·

*Let’s test him through violence and torture  
so that we could discover his fairness  
and scrutinise if he could stand wrongdoings.*

<sup>12</sup> On the dative of relationship, see *SSG* § 22 **wk**, and its rare use to mark the *s* of a passive verb, § 22 **wo**.

<sup>13</sup> I.e. “distancing, away from.”



*SD* (2134) points out that the three verbs used here occur also in δοκίμασόν με, ὁ θεός, καὶ γνῶθι τὴν καρδίαν μου, ἔτασόν με καὶ γνῶθι τὰς τρίβους μου שְׁרַעֲפֵי יְדַע לִבִּי בְּקֶרְבִּי אֶל יְדַע לִבִּי Ps 138[139].23 and τίς γνώσεται αὐτόν; ἐγὼ κύριος ἐτάζων καρδίας καὶ δοκιμάζων νεφροὺς אֲנִי יְדַעְנִי מִי יִדְעֵנִי Je 17.9f. In the former the psalmist is challenging God and in the latter God Himself is presenting Himself.

Winston (120) assigns the sense “to afflict” to ἐτάζω here on the basis of καὶ ἤτασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Φαραὼ ἐτασμοῖς μεγάλοις Gn 12.17, where, however, *GELS* s.v. 2 suggests “to subject to a trying experience,” cf. וְיִנְגַּע יְהוָה אֶת־פָּרְעֹה נְגַעִים גְּדֹלִים.

ἐπιείκειαν] This is also a character of God as indicated in 12.18. Does שִׁיבִיחוּתָא דְּמִכְיָהוּ mean ‘the intensity of his humility’? Cf. נְגִירוּת רִוְחָא שִׁיבִיחוּתָא דְּיְהוָה ‘the patience of his spirit.’

ἀνεξικακίαν] a hapax in Wi.

- 2.20) θανάτῳ ἀσχήμονι καταδικάσωμεν αὐτόν,  
ἔσται γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐκ λόγων αὐτοῦ.

*Let's have a disgraceful death sentence pronounced on him,  
for his interests will be served by what he himself has said.*

θανάτῳ] Reider (69) considers the selection of the dat. unclassical. *LSJ* s.v. καταδικάζω 1 mentions examples of + θανάτῳ and + θάνατον. Note τούτους κατακρινῶ θανάτῳ ‘these I shall condemn to death’ Da 4.34<sup>a</sup> LXX.

What (20b) means is that, if he were right in his statements, a death sentence demanded by us would be turned down.

αὐτοῦ ἐπισκοπὴ] The gen. is objective. Cf. γῆ, ἣν κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐπισκοπεῖται αὐτήν ‘a land that the Lord your God will take care of’ De 11.12.

- 2.21) Ταῦτα ἐλογίσαντο, καὶ ἐπλανήθησαν·  
ἀπετύφλωσεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡ κακία αὐτῶν,

*So they reasoned, but they made a mistake;  
for their wickedness blinded them,*

ἐλογίσαντο] S supplies an explicit s: פְּיִיחָא ‘the fools.’ Cf. λογισάμενοι οὐκ ὁρθῶς 2.1.

- 2.22) καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν μυστήρια θεοῦ  
οὐδὲ μισθὸν ἠλπίσαν ὁσιότητος  
οὐδὲ ἔκριναν γέρας ψυχῶν ἀμώμων.

*and they did not recognise God's mysteries  
nor anticipate a reward for piety  
nor decide in favour of a reward due to blameless souls.*

μισθὸν] In SG, under the influence of Heb., ἐλπίζω is often combined with a preposition such as εἰς, e.g. οἱ φοβούμενοι κύριον, ἐλπίσατε εἰς ἀγαθὰ καὶ εἰς εὐφροσύνην αἰῶνος καὶ ἔλεος Si 2.9. For a discussion with examples, see SSG § 52 c.

2.23) ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ  
καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ιδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν·

*Because God created man as an immortal being  
and as a reflection of His own character He made him.*

τὸν ἄνθρωπον] Pace “men” (NETS) we prefer the sg. We have here an echo back to the creation of Adam. For that reason τὸν is probably not generic, but a reference to *that* man.

ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ] The concept of immortality is going to be taken up later at 6.18f. Cf. *℣ inexterminabilem*.

The prep. ἐπί here with a dat. denotes “aiming at” (GELS s.v. II 9). So also ἐξωλεθρεύθησαν οἱ ἀνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακίᾳ ‘all those who practise illegal things aiming at evilness were annihilated’ Is 29.20. Cf. “auf Unvergänglichkeit hin” (SD). SD (II 2134) appropriately mentions ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ (ⲡ ⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲛⲉ) ἐκλήθητε Gal 5.13 and οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ (ⲡ ⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲛⲉ) 1Th 4.7.

(23b) is an allusion to Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Ge 1.26. Cf. ⲡ ⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲣ ⲉⲃⲣ ⲉⲃⲣ ⲉⲃⲣ<sup>14</sup> ‘in the image of His likeness He executed his formation’ and ⲡ ⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲣ ⲉⲃⲣ ⲉⲃⲣ ‘in the image of His eternity He made him.’

ιδιότητος] a reading already chosen by Swete and later adopted by Ziegler against ἀιδιότητος ‘perpetuity’ (Rahlf's), a reading represented by many Gk MSs, what, according to Ziegler (65), is a dogmatically motivated change.

2.24) φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,  
πειράζουσιν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες.

*But through the devil's envy death entered the world,  
and those who are affiliated with him experience it.*

φθόνῳ] In Ge 3.1 the snake is characterised as φρονιμώτατος ‘the cleverest.’ Cf. ⲡ and ⲡ ⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲛⲉ ‘envy.’ GELS defines the sense of the noun as “malevolent envy.” On φθόνος compared with ζῆλος, see Trench 1880.86-90, according to whom the latter can be used in a good sense, but φθόνος is “incapable of good” (87).

<sup>14</sup> ⲉⲃⲣ in ed. de Lagarde is to be retained.

διαβόλου] Winston (121) writes: “it [= this text] is one of the earliest extant Jewish texts to equate the serpent with the devil.”

τὸν κόσμον] Another indisputable example of κόσμος in the sense of “the created world” (*GELS* s.v. **1 b**) is τῇ τοῦ τετιμημένου κατὰ τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ἱεροῦ σεμνότητι 2M 3.12.

πειράζουσιν] The sense “to experience” of this verb meets us also in ἀξίαν θεοῦ κρίσιν πειράσουσιν ‘they will experience an appropriate judgement by God’ 12.26 and ἀγαθὰ γὰρ καὶ κακὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπείρασεν ‘for he has experienced both good and bad things with people’ Si 39.4.

## CHAPTER 3

- 3.1) Δικαίων δὲ ψυχὰι ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ,  
καὶ οὐ μὴ ἄσχηται αὐτῶν βάσανος.

*The souls of the righteous are under God's control  
and hardship would never affect them.*

ἐν χειρὶ] a standard equivalent of Heb. **בְּיָד**, on which see Sollamo 1979.156-90. Χεῖρ in a case like this “denotes sphere of control and authority” (*GELS* s.v. **1 g**). A couple of additional examples are ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτούς *Si* 33.13 and ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ψυχὴ πάντων τῶν ζώντων καὶ πνεῦμα παντὸς ἀνθρώπου *Jb* 12.10.

αὐτῶν] Probably the masc. gender is meant, as *SD* f.n. ad loc. suggests. But both **שׁ** and **שׁה** **יְהִי**, fem., refer it the souls.

βάσανος] **℣** *tormentum mortis* probably means “deadly torment” rather than “torment ending in physical death.”

- 3.2) ἔδοξαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀφρόνων τεθνάναι,  
καὶ ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἢ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν

*They seemed, in fools' eyes, to have died,  
and their departure was considered to be misery*

ἔδοξαν] Here is one of a few instances of δοκέω taking an infinitival predicate. For more examples, see *SSG* § 30 **bed**.

ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς] = Heb. **בְּעֵינַי**, cf. Sollamo 1979.123-46. Another instance in *Wi* of this Hebraism occurs at 9.9.

κάκωσις] an *o* complement of ἐλογίσθη. The clause could be rewritten as ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις εἶναι. Another alternative is εἰς κάκωσιν, cf. *SSG* § 59 **d**, 61 **bb**.

ἔξοδος] The figurative sense “death” of this noun is unknown prior to *SG*. Here it is parallel to τεθνάναι. It occurs in *NTG*: with reference to the anticipated death of Jesus in *Lk* 9.31 and its application by Peter to his own death μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον *2Pt* 1.15. We encounter the same lexical development in 7.6, where it is contrasted with εἴσοδος ‘entry,’ i.e. birth, v.a.l. We are not aware of an analogous phenomenon in Hebrew or Aramaic.

- 3.3) καὶ ἡ ἀφ’ ἡμῶν πορεία σύντριμμα,  
οἱ δὲ εἰσιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

*and their move away from us to be a loss,  
but they are in peace.*

πορεία] referring to death just as ἔξοδος in vs. 2. Fichtner (18) refers to τὴν εἰς Ἀΐδου πορείαν ‘the journey to Hades’ Plato *Phaed.* 115a.

- 3.4) καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὄψει ἀνθρώπων ἐὰν κολασθῶσιν,  
ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης·

*For from a human perspective they might have been punished,  
their hope, however, is full of immortality.*

ἐν ὄψει ἀνθρώπων] The phrase <ἐν ὄψει τινος> occurs also at 7.9, 8.11, and 15.19 below.

ἀθανασίας] **𐤌 𐤍𐤒** ‘life.’ Here is one of the two attestations of this substantive in SG, the other being οἱ δὲ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ἀθανασίας δένδρον καρπιῶνται ‘those who do what is pleasing to Him will enjoy the fruits of the tree of immortality’ Si 19.19. It is used in NT thrice by Paul: 1Cor 15.53, 54, and 1Ti 6.16. Si 17.30 declares: οὐκ ἀθάνατος υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

- 3.5) καὶ ὀλίγα παιδευθέντες μεγάλα εὐεργετηθήσονται,  
ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐπείρασεν αὐτοὺς  
καὶ εὗρεν αὐτοὺς ἄξιους ἑαυτοῦ·

*Though disciplined a little, they will be shown much kindness,  
because God tested them  
and found them worthy of (being linked) with Himself.*

ἄξιους] one of a number of adjectives governing a genitive, cf. *SSG* § 22 r.

As for the last two lines, Winston (127) adduces “And the Lord tried them and their spirits were found pure” (1En 108.9).

- 3.6) ὡς χρυσὸν ἐν χωνευτηρίῳ ἐδοκίμασεν αὐτοὺς  
καὶ ὡς ὁλοκάρπωμα θυσίας προσεδέξατο αὐτούς.

*As gold in a smelting-furnace He tested them  
and as a whole burnt-offering of sacrifice He accepted them.*

χωνευτηρίῳ] χωνευτήριον unattested prior to SG, which uses it also in 3K 8.51, Zc 11.13bis, and Ma 3.2.

ὁλοκάρπωμα θυσίας] **𐤌 𐤍𐤒𐤕 𐤍𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕** ‘sacrifices and ?? sacrifices’ Le 3.1, where the precise meaning of the last word is uncertain. **𐤌** reads **𐤍𐤒𐤕**.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *SL* s.v. **𐤍𐤒𐤕** 2 merely says: “type of sacrifices,” for which **𐤌** Lv 3.1 is one of two references.

- 3.7) καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀναλάμψουσιν  
καὶ ὡς σπινθῆρες ἐν καλάμῃ διαδραμοῦνται·

*And at the time of their examination they will shine  
and like sparks they will spread fast among the stubble.*

ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς] cf. τί ποιήσουσιν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς  
(לְיוֹם פְּקֻדָּהּ); Is 10.3.

ἀναλάμψουσιν] cf. οἱ συνιέντες ἐκλάμψουσιν (יִהְיֶה) ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης  
Da 12.3 TH.

Š reads quite different: וְיִבְנֶנָּה נְהוּא בִּיקְרָהוֹן וְאִיךְ בְּלִצְוִיָּהּ בְּקִנְיָה נְרָהֲטוֹן וְיִדְקֶא בִּינְת רְשִׁיעָא ‘and at the (appointed) time there will happen their examination and like sparks the righteous will run in the stubble among the wicked.’

- 3.8) κρινοῦσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσιν λαῶν,  
καὶ βασιλεύσει αὐτῶν κύριος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*They will judge nations and exercise power over peoples,  
and the Lord will reign over them for ages.*

κρινοῦσιν ἔθνη] cf. וְיִדְקֶא יְהוָה לְקִדְשֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין Da 7.22 and וְיִבְדּוּ בְּחִירוֹתַי יְהוָה אֵל אֶת מִשְׁפַּח כּוֹל הַגּוֹיִם ‘and God will give His elect ones the task of judging all the nations’ 1QpHab 5.4. Note שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן ‘they will judge’ and שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן ‘they will jubilate,’ but *Š iudicabunt* = *Θ*.

κρατήσουσιν] שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן (and שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן, a graphic variant) appears to have taken the Gk verb in the sense of “to gain control over.”<sup>2</sup>

βασιλεύσει] Parallel with κρατήσουσιν it shows that they are not going to be dictators, for they themselves have a king over them.<sup>3</sup>

- 3.9) οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ’ αὐτῷ συνήσουσιν ἀλήθειαν,  
καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ·  
ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.

*Those who trust Him would understand truth,  
and the faithful ones will remain attached to Him, loved by Him,  
because grace and mercy are for His holy ones  
and His concern is for His chosen ones.*

συνήσουσιν] Συνήμι, *pace* Fichtner (18), does not mean “erfahren, erkennen.”

<sup>2</sup> Syr. דְּקִי also means “to rule,” which, however, is unlikely in this instance with no preposition attached to its *o*, שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן and שְׁלֵי נְדִינּוֹן.

<sup>3</sup> Thus *pace* Reider (74): “he shall be king not only over them, but over all the world.”

ἀλήθειαν] Earlier we saw a controversy between the two parties. Hence ἀλήθεια means ‘truth’ rather than Clarke’s (29) “that he is true.”

ἐν ἀγάπῃ] In view of the following causal clause God’s love rather their love of God is meant. Furthermore, the verb πιστεύω, influenced by Heb. **בָּאֱמוּנָה**, sometimes governs ἐν as in μὴ πιστεύσης ἐν αὐτοῖς **בְּאֱמוּנָתְךָ** Je 12.6, though the same Hebraism is not known to occur with πιστός. Hence “die an (seine) Liebe glauben” (SD) is questionable. Pace Fichtner (18) we doubt that the rection is deliberately vague.

προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ] Pace SD (II 2136) the verb governs a dat. also as in προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ Ac 11.23.

Due to a homioteleuton (αὐτοῦ .. αὐτοῦ) the last line is absent in a number of MSS and versions, and δόσις and ἐκλεκτοῖς have been swapped for each other.

S has a plus at the end: **עַל חֲסִידָיו** ‘and His help is on His saints.’

- 3.10) Οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς καθὰ ἐλογίσαντο ἔξουσιν ἐπιτιμίαν  
οἱ ἀμελήσαντες τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἀποστάντες·

*But the impious, as they argued, will suffer punishment,  
those who were indifferent to righteousness and distanced themselves  
from the Lord;*

καθὰ ἐλογίσαντο] Their argument introduced against the righteous (2.20) would now be applied against them.

ἐπιτιμίαν] a hapax in Wi and prior to SG unknown in the sense of “punishment.” The underlying verb, ἐπιτιμάω, means “to censure, rebuke,” not “to punish.” Ἐπιτίμιος apparently means “liable to punishment,” translating **יָחִי** at Si 8.5. Cf. **סִי צָרָא** ‘rebuke’ and **סִי חֲתָא** ‘rebuke’ = **℣** *corruptio*. A couple of examples of the noun in the sense of “penalty, punishment” in papyri are mentioned in MM s.v.<sup>4</sup> and BDAG mentions 2Co 2.6.

τοῦ δικαίου] possibly masc., referring to the righteous God, parallel to τοῦ κυρίου, which follows. So Fichtner (18) and Siegfried (484).

τοῦ κυρίου] gen. of ablative value, cp. ἀπέστη ἀπὸ θεοῦ σωτήρος αὐτοῦ De 32.15. Cf. SSG § 22 q.

- 3.11) σοφίαν γὰρ καὶ παιδείαν ὁ ἐξουθενῶν ταλαίπωρος,  
καὶ κενὴ ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ κόποι ἀνόνητοι,  
καὶ ἄχρηστα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν·

*for one who despises wisdom and discipline is miserable  
and their hope is vain and their toils are fruitless,  
and their works are useless.*

<sup>4</sup> Hence, pace Reider (75), not confined to Ecclesiastical Greek.

ὁ ἐξουθενῶν] the sg. shifts subsequently to the pl.

ἀνόνητοι] ܣ ܐܢܢܐ ܠܝܬ ܗܝܬ ܠܝܬ ‘there is no knowledge in it’ = v.l. ἀνόνητοι // ܣܠܝܢ ܝܚܬܝܢ ܐܠܐ ‘fruitless’ = ܬ sine fructu.

- 3.12) αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν ἄφρονες,  
καὶ πονηρὰ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν,  
ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν.

*Their wives are fools,  
and evil are their children,  
a curse is their birth.*

πονηρὰ] ܬ nequissimi is said from a pragmatic rather than moral perspective, “good for nothing.” Cp. ܣ and ܣܠܝܢ ܝܚܬܝܢ.

ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν] The absence of καὶ at the beginning of the last line appears to indicate that it is dependent on or subordinate to the preceding two lines that go about the parents. The very birth of the children was a curse, it should not have happened, contrary to the prevalent notion that the arrival of a child is a blessing for the parents and their family. Hence “their lineage” (Winston) and “their offspring” (NETS) are misleading, since the phrase is not about the third generation. Similar are “verflucht ist, was sie hervorbringen” (SD) and “maudite leur postérité !” (BJ). The pronoun, αὐτῶν, most likely refers back to τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν rather than to their mothers.

- 3.13) ὅτι μακαρία στεῖρα ἡ ἀμίαντος,  
ἥτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι,  
ἔξει καρπὸν ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ψυχῶν,

*Because blessed is a barren (woman) who is undefiled,  
who did not experience any illegal intercourse,  
she will have fruit at the examination of souls.*

ἡ] an instance of a relatively rare syntagm, <noun phrase - article - adjective>.<sup>5</sup> This is rather common in Syriac, thus here ܣ ܐܢܢܐ ܠܝܬ ܗܝܬ ܠܝܬ and ܣܠܝܢ ܝܚܬܝܢ ܐܠܐ ‘a sterile woman who is undefiled.’ The indeterminate nature of the noun is also shown by the following relative pronoun, ἥτις, and not ἥ.

παραπτώματι] We are not certain that this, as insisted by Reider (76f.), for instance, refers to intermarriage, and not extra-marital intercourse, for instance.

<sup>5</sup> See SSG § 37 **bbc**.



- 3.14) καὶ εὐνοῦχος ὁ μὴ ἐργασάμενος ἐν χειρὶ ἀνόμημα  
μηδὲ ἐνθυμηθεὶς κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου πονηρά,  
δοθήσεται γὰρ αὐτῷ τῆς πίστεως χάρις ἐκλεκτῇ  
καὶ κληρὸς ἐν ναῷ κυρίου θυμηρέστερος.

*So also a eunuch who has not done any unlawful things with his hand  
nor has conceived wicked things against the Lord,  
for he will be given a special favour due to his belief  
and a very delightful share in the temple of the Lord.*

ὁ μὴ] On the addition of the definite article see above on ἡ ἀμίαντος in the preceding verse.

γὰρ suggests that the preceding two lines constitute a logical sequel to (13c), so that καὶ introducing this verse means “also,” and not “and.” A eunuch, by definition incapable of sexual intercourse and production of children,<sup>6</sup> will be duly rewarded for the way he conducts himself, for he could do wrong things with his hands, cf. שְׁמוֹנֶה עָבְרֵי יְהוָה אֲבָדוּ אֶת־לֵבָבָם וְאֶת־מִצְוֹתָיו ‘and a eunuch whose hands did not practise transgression of the law.’ Cf. Fichtner 484, f.n. w.

τῆς πίστεως] a genitive of cause,<sup>7</sup> cause of admiration, accusation or contempt in particular, e.g. τῶν τιμῶν μακαρίσαιμ’ ἅν ‘I would call (them) blessed on account of the honours (conferred on them)’ 4M 1.10, where μακαρία in vs. 13 above is to be noted. More examples may be found in SSG § 22 o. Cf. שֶׁבִּיבֹהוּתָהּ וּבְטוֹבוֹתָהּ ‘because of his goodness and faith.’

θυμηρέστερος] Θυμήρης is a hapax in Wi.<sup>8</sup> A comparative with elative value, cf. SSG § 23 ba.<sup>9</sup> The separation of the attributive adj. from κληρὸς is easily explicable in an originally Greek document.

On favours conferred on eunuchs, see Is 56.4f.

- 3.15) ἀγαθῶν γὰρ πόνων καρπὸς ἐκκληής,  
καὶ ἀδιάπτωτος ἡ ρίζα τῆς φρονήσεως.

*For painful, but good works produce reputable results,  
and the prudence as the basis is infallible.*

ἀδιάπτωτος] a hapax in Wi, cf. παραπτώματι vs. 13 above.

ἡ ρίζα τῆς φρονήσεως] Reider (78) sees here a genitive of apposition, “the root, which is understanding.” So we do: SSG § 22 v (iii), though in SG the

<sup>6</sup> Despite the footnote, “wörtlich *Der Eunuch/zeugungsunfähige Mann*,” to translate “der Kinderlose” (SD) is going a shade too far.

<sup>7</sup> Alternatively a genitive of price, Reider (78).

<sup>8</sup> Pace Reider (78) it was known prior to LXX, even in Homer, in an alternative spelling, θυμάρης.

<sup>9</sup> Even if the author is alluding to Is 56.4f., he is unlikely using the comparative in its standard value: “more delightful than” that to be conferred on sons and daughters mentioned in Is 56.5.

appositive genitive is mostly confined to proper noun as the first constituent, e.g. ἡ γῆ Αἰγύπτου Ge 13.10. An extremely rare, additional exception is ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς ‘with blood, which is life’ Ge 9.4 (יִמְיָ יְשׁוּפָנִי).<sup>10</sup>

- 3.16) τέκνα δὲ μοιχῶν ἀτέλεστα ἔσται,  
καὶ ἐκ παρανόμου κοίτης σπέρμα ἀφανισθήσεται.  
*But children of adulterers will die young,  
and those born out of unlawful intercourse will be annihilated.*

τέκνα δὲ μοιχῶν] It is not necessary to apply this expression, as Fichtner (485, f.n. c) does, exclusively to renegade Jews. *BJ* mentions another possibility, namely mixed marriage.

ἀτέλεστα] This can be understood literally, not figuratively in the sense of not reaching immortality as Fichtner (485, f.n. c) interprets. Note the contrast with μακρόβιοι in the next verse.

- 3.17) ἔάν τε γὰρ μακρόβιοι γένωνται, εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθήσονται,  
καὶ ἄτιμον ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τὸ γῆρας αὐτῶν·  
*For even if they lived long, they would count for nothing  
and in the end their old age is not worth a thing.*

εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθήσονται] on εἰς see our remarks above at 2.16.

ἄτιμον] cf. πηλοῦ τε ἀτιμότερος ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ‘his life is of less value than clay’ 15.10.

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων] cf. ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ ‘at the end of his life’ Je 17.11 < יְהִי־הַחַיָּת rather than “bei der letzten Entscheidung” (Siegfried 485).

*Contra* Holmes (540), Reider (79), and Clarke (34) our author is not going against the position expressed in Je 31.28f. and Ez 18 and saying that children are punished for their parents’ sins. Parents whose children die young are naturally sad, being punished that way. Si 41.5 mentioned by Reider is irrelevant to the question under discussion. Nor is our author moderating his position at 11.23, v.a.l.

- 3.18) ἔάν τε ὀξέως τελευτήσωσιν, οὐχ ἔξουσιν ἐλπίδα  
οὐδὲ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διαγνώσεως παραμύθιον·  
*If they die quickly, they would have no hope  
nor any encouragement on the day of final decision.*

- 3.19) γενεᾷς γὰρ ἀδίκου χαλεπὰ τὰ τέλη.  
*For the end of an unrighteous family is hard.*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. SSG § 22 v (iii).

γενεᾶς] On γενεά in the sense of “*whole body of blood-relations*” (*GELS* s.v. 3), cf. ἐπηρώτησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὴν γενεὰν ἡμῶν Ge 43.7. See שׁ אֶהְיֶה ‘family,’ but שׁ אֶהְיֶה ‘generation,’ *I nationis*, “race” (*BJ*), and “Generation” (*SD*). The pl. τέλη may signify deaths of various members of the family

## CHAPTER 4

- 4.1) κρείσσων ἀτεκνία μετὰ ἀρετῆς·  
ἀθανασία γάρ ἐστιν ἐν μνήμῃ αὐτῆς,  
ὅτι καὶ παρὰ θεῶν γινώσκεται καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις.

*Better is childlessness with virtue,  
for immortality is in its memory,  
because it is known both to God and to people.*

ἀτεκνία] In comparison with שֶׁן בְּנִי לֹא דָּלָה ‘childless’ שֶׁן אֶתְיָוִימָה ‘lack’ would be obscure without the context.

ἀρετῆς] Ἀρετή, a term of fundamental importance for moral philosophy, occurs twice more in Wi: 5.13 and 8.7. In the former it is opposed to κακία as in Xen. *Memor.* 2.1.21. In CG the primary meaning of the word is “excellence.” In LXX, too, we find it used with reference to soldiers’ valour in 2M 10.28. That דִּוָּה and הִלְהִי are the only two Heb. words translated in LXX with ἀρετή, twice and four times respectively, points to the generic excellence as its primary lexical component. The above-mentioned Wi 5.13 proves that it can refer to moral excellence, hence “virtue” as against κακία ‘vice.’<sup>1</sup>

αὐτῆς] = ἀρετῆς.

(1b) probably means that one’s virtuous life will not be forgotten by God and fellow humans.

γινώσκεται] The *s* is most likely ἀρετή.

- 4.2) παροῦσάν τε μιμοῦνται αὐτήν  
καὶ ποθοῦσιν ἀπελθοῦσαν·  
καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει  
τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα.

*When it is around, one emulates it  
and yearns after it when it is vanished.  
It marches on all the time, bearing a crown on its head,  
having won in the contest for undefiled prizes.*

ποθοῦσιν] Given the semantic and syntactic parallelism between the first two lines, αὐτήν can be easily supplied. Note 6.11 below.

ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι] αἰών meaning ‘a very long stretch of time’ as in τὸν μακάριον βιοῦσιν αἰῶνα ‘they live a long, happy period of time’ 4M 17.18.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. BDAG s.v., introduction and Bauernfeind 1964. The Gk word can denote superb level of wisdom, but, *pace* Reider (80), cannot be synonymous with wisdom.

νικήσασα] An example in CG of this verb with an acc. is Ὀλύμπια νενικήκоти ‘a victor at the Olympian games’ Thuc. 1.126.5.

- 4.3) πολύγονον δὲ ἀσεβῶν πλῆθος οὐ χρησιμεύσει  
καὶ ἐκ νόθων μοσχευμάτων οὐ δώσει ρίζαν εἰς βάθος  
οὐδὲ ἀσφαλῆ βάσιν ἐδράσει·

*A highly productive crowd of the impious would be of no use  
and none of cross-bred seedlings would strike deep root  
nor would lay a secure foundation.*

πολύγονον] According to SD (II 2137) the adjective is normally used of animals, hence here derogatory, but in 4M 15.5 it is applied to a very respectable human mother.

πλῆθος] many children in contrast to the ἀτεκνία (vs. 1) of a barren woman and a eunuch.

(3a) is somewhat confusing, because πολύγονος is meant to apply to the parents, hence not to πλῆθος, i.e. πλῆθος τέκνων.

νόθων μοσχευμάτων] שִׁי נִרְבָּנִי .. נִפְרִי ‘alien seed’ and שִׁי נִתְּנִינִי נִפְרִי ‘false branches.’ On the semantic range of νόθος, see Larcher 320f.

- 4.4) καὶ ἄρ ἐν κλάδοις πρὸς καιρὸν ἀναθάλη,  
ἐπισφαλῶς βεβηκότα ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευθήσεται  
καὶ ὑπὸ βίας ἀνέμων ἐκριζωθήσεται.

*For even if they sprout in branches for now,  
poised precariously, they would shake under the wind,  
and would be uprooted by violent winds.*

πρὸς καιρὸν] Whilst καιρός, as opposed to χρόνος, is known often to mean ‘the right time,’ that does not apply here *pace* Engel “zur richtigen Zeit.” Such an analysis does not apply to πρὸς καιρὸν λιπαίνει σὸν φάρυγγα ‘for a while she [= a whore] satisfies your palate’ Pr 5.3, immediately followed by ὅστερον μέντοι ‘later, however.’

βεβηκότα] Βαίνω is a verb indicating physical movement, whilst in the Pf. and Plpf. it denotes “to be standing,” i.e. a state reached after the movement. So also in οὐρανοῦ μὲν ἤπτετο, βεβήκει δ’ ἐπὶ γῆς ‘it [= the word of God] was touching the sky, but was stationed on the earth’ Wi 18.16 and πλησίον τοῦ ᾗδου, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ βεβηκότες ‘near it [= Hades], but rather (having already arrived and) standing by it’ 3M 6.31.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> For references see LSJ s.v. Α Ι 2.

- 4.5) περικλασθήσονται κλώνες ἀτέλεστοι,  
καὶ ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῶν ἄχρηστος, ἄωρος εἰς βρῶσιν  
καὶ εἰς οὐθὲν ἐπιτήδειος·

*Immature twigs might break off,  
and their fruit is useless, too early to be eaten  
and good for nothing.*

ἀτέλεστοι] In 3.16 this word was applied to children. Here twigs are compared to growing children.

- 4.6) ἐκ γὰρ ἀνόμων ὕπνων τέκνα γεννώμενα  
μάρτυρές εἰσιν πονηρίας κατὰ γονέων ἐν ἐξετασμῷ αὐτῶν.

*For children born out of illicit sleeps  
bear witness, when examined, to the wickedness of their parents.*

ὕπνων] **§** as well as **§h** are straightforward with **נִשְׁכָּח**<sup>3</sup> ‘sleeps’ or ‘intercourses.’<sup>4</sup> We doubt, however, that ὕπνος ever means “sexual intercourse” itself, thus *pace* “illicit sex” (Winston 131) and “unioni illegittime” (Scarpata I 277).

- 4.7) Δίκαιος δὲ ἐὰν φθάσῃ τελευτῆσαι, ἐν ἀναπαύσει ἔσται·

*But if a righteous person dies early, he will be in rest.*

Δίκαιος] To highlight the contrast the *s* is not only fronted, but also outside of the conditional clause. More examples of this phenomenon are mentioned in *SSG* § 76 **ea**.

φθάσῃ τελευτῆσαι] Fichtner (21) says that only in non-classic Greek φθάνω is complemented with an inf., and not a ptc., but LSJ s.v. III 3 does mention a few early instances including ὁ φθάσας θαρσῆσαι ‘he who first ventured to seize it’ Thuc. 3.82.7.<sup>5</sup> In SG we see **נִשְׁכָּח** is rendered with a variety of Gk verbs complemented with an inf. E.g. καὶ ἐτάχυνεν τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτό Ge 18.7, κατέσπευδεν δὲ Φαραὼ καλέσαι Μωϋσῆν καὶ Ααρὼν Ex 10.16, σπεύσατε ἀπελθεῖν 2K 15.14L<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> No seyyame is present in **§**.

<sup>4</sup> In *GELS* s.v. 2 we mentioned “sexual intercourse,” though such a sense is unknown prior to SG. We wonder whether we should take this instance and Wi 7.2 as cases of euphemism. In terms of technical parlance our author seems to have left a little to be desired; if ἐξετασμῷ is meant a court proceeding, children involved could not be called as witnesses (μάρτυρες).

<sup>5</sup> Note Kühner - Gerth II 2 § 484.32: “Φθάνειν wird nur sehr selten bei den Klassikern, häufiger aber bei den Späteren .. mit dem Infinitive verbunden.”

<sup>6</sup> Where the same Heb. verb is also rendered with φθάνω: μὴ φθάσῃ ὁ λαὸς καὶ καταλάβῃ ἡμᾶς נִשְׁכָּח נִשְׁכָּח. On complementary infinitives, see *SSG* § 30 **bg**.

- 4.8) γῆρας γὰρ τίμιον οὐ τὸ πολυχρόνιον  
οὐδὲ ἀριθμῶ ἐτῶν μεμέτρηται,

*For respectable longevity is not about the length of time,  
nor has it been counted with number of years.*

μεμέτρηται] The selection of the Pf. is striking. Is the author thinking of a recently deceased acquaintance of his?<sup>7</sup> On the basic value of the Pf., see SSG § 28 **ea**.

For the message of the verse we think of Mozart, who lived only 35 years. Holmes (540f.) mentions more ancient and modern thinkers on the subject, starting with Philo of Alexandria and ending with Philip James Bailey (1816-1902).

- 4.9) πολλὰ δέ ἐστιν φρόνησις ἀνθρώποις  
καὶ ἡλικία γήρως βίος ἀκηλίδωτος.

*Grey hair is prudence to humans,  
and a spotless life is old age.*

ἀκηλίδωτος] § אָהֲרָה ‘quiet; gentle’ // § אֲשֶׁר לֹא ‘unpolluted.’

Reider (84) quotes a Talmudic saying: הַמָּזִק הַשֶּׁקֶל מִי אֶלָּא יֵן אֵין ‘there is no old man except one who acquired wisdom’ bQid 32b.

- 4.10) εὐάρεστος θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη  
καὶ ζῶν μεταξὺ ἁμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη.

*Becoming well-pleasing to God he was loved  
and while still living in the midst of sinners, he was transferred.*

μετετέθη] a verb applied to Enoch’s<sup>8</sup> ascent heavenwards, μετέθηκεν (הִקְלִיף) αὐτὸν ὁ θεός Ge 5.24, where the first half [εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ] is alluded to here. So also Ἐνὼχ εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη אֲנֹכִי הִנֵּה הָיָה עִמָּךְ הַיּוֹם Si 44.16. The source text does not use any adjective that marks Enoch’s moral character, but says instead “he walked with God (וַיֵּלֶךְ אִתָּהּ הָאֱלֹהִים),” which is rendered in LXX as εὐηρέστησεν δὲ Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ in both Ge 5.22 and 5.24. God’s pleasure with Enoch is apparent also in a Qumran Aramaic document: הוּא רַחֵם וְיִגַּד אֱלֹהֵא ‘he is beloved and a fav[ourite of God] 1Q20 2.20.<sup>9</sup> The selection of the Nif. form

<sup>7</sup> Pace Scarpat (I 283) we doubt that the Pf. can be selected to express a general philosophy of life.

<sup>8</sup> For an account of attempts to explain the anonymity in comparison with Si, see Winston 139f.

<sup>9</sup> The same tradition is found also in the NT: Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ ἠδρίσκετο διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως μεμαρτύρηται

קלל in the above-quoted Si 44.16 as against Qal קלל with God as the s in its source text (Gn 5.24) indicates that μετετέθη here is a genuine, passive form, not pseudo-middle. Thus Enoch's move heavenwards was not due to natural death. This analysis equally applies to ἡρπάγη in the following verse.

- 4.11) ἡρπάγη, μὴ κακία ἀλλάξῃ σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ  
ἢ δόλος ἀπατήσῃ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ·

*He was moved away so that wickedness would not change his understanding*

*or deception would lead his soul astray.*

ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ] **SH** and **SH** הַשִּׁפְטִי 'his tongue (or: language)' is probably an error for הַשִּׁפְטִי 'his soul.'

Winston (140) quotes a Rabbinic text that seems to suggest a thought that is similar to what we find here: וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ קִדְּשׁוּ אֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ הַזֶּה 'the Holy One blessed be He said: While he [= Enoch] is yet righteous, I shall remove him' GnR 25.1.

- 4.12) βασκανία γὰρ φαυλότητος ἀμαυροῖ τὰ καλὰ,  
καὶ ῥεμβασμὸς ἐπιθυμίας μεταλλεύει νοῦν ἄκακον.

*For the bewitching power of wickedness obscures good things  
and the wavering through desire perverts an innocent mind.*

ῥεμβασμὸς] **SH** אַתְּוָשָׁן<sup>10</sup> 'incitement' but **SH** אֶתְוָשָׁן 'wandering.' This Gk word is a hapax in SG and unknown prior to it, a noun derived from ῥεμβεύω or ῥέμβομαι, both meaning 'to roam about,' and the former unknown prior to SG.

μεταλλεύει] a verb that has to do with mining, which does not suit our context.<sup>11</sup> Our author uses it in μεταλλευομένη 16.25 in the sense of "to transform." For a lexicographical discussion on μεταλλεύω, cf. Winston 141f. and Scarpat I 286.

- 4.13) τελειωθεὶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ ἐπλήρωσεν χρόνους μακρούς·

*Having passed away in a short time he completed long years.*

τελειωθεὶς] If we are still on Enoch, who lived 365 years, our author might be thinking of other people in that period; Enoch's father, Yered,

εὐαρεστηκέναι τῷ θεῷ Heb 11.5. On Rabbinic legends on the translation of Enoch, see Ginzberg 1909.I 137-42.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Leiden reads אַתְּוָשָׁן 'its disturbance.'

<sup>11</sup> LEH s.v. glosses the verb as "to undermine," but it is not certain that Gk has undergone such a metaphorical evolution as shown by Engl. *undermine*.



lived 962 years, and a son of Enoch, Methuselah, lived 969 years. Τελειόω in the passive in the sense of “to die” is unknown prior to SG.

Reider (86) insists that the verb here means “to be perfected.”<sup>12</sup> The versions seem to support him: **℣** *consummatus*, **ܣ** ܠܠܚܬܫܐܢܬܐ and **ܣ** ܠܠܡܬܫܐܢܬܐ, which latter, however, can also mean “to die.”

ἐν ὀλίῳ] A noun such as χρόνος is understood. Note two other prepositions attached to this adjective without a substantive and both being temporal expressions and in Wi: πρὸ ὀλίγου ‘a short while ago’ Wi 14.20 and μετ’ ὀλίγον ‘shortly later’ ib. 15.8.

- 4.14) ἀρεστὴ γὰρ ἦν κυρίῳ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,  
διὰ τοῦτο ἔσπευσεν ἐκ μέσου πονηρίας·  
οἱ δὲ λαοὶ ἰδόντες καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες  
μηδὲ θέντες ἐπὶ διανοίᾳ τὸ τοιοῦτο,

*For his soul was pleasing to the Lord,  
therefore he dashed quickly out of wickedness.*

*But the peoples, though having seen (it), and not having thought about it  
nor having paid attention to such a matter,*

ἔσπευσεν] **ܣ** ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ ‘he hurried.’ Σπεύδω is occasionally used transitively, which, however, cannot apply here in view of the absence of its *o*.<sup>13</sup>  
ἰδόντες] This and the following two Ptc’s lack their principal verb.

- 4.15) [ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ.]  
*because grace and mercy are among His chosen ones  
and His care is for His saints.*

τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ] **ܣ** ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ ‘His saints’ // ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ = τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ, sim. **ܣ** ܠܠ and **℣**.

In spite of the square brackets added by Ziegler the text is found in the MSS.

- 4.16) κατακρινεῖ δὲ δίκαιος καμὼν τοὺς ζῶντας ἀσεβεῖς  
καὶ νεότης τελεσθεῖσα ταχέως πολυετὲς γῆρας ἀδίκου·  
*An (already) dead righteous man would condemn (still) living impious  
ones,  
and a youth, quickly perfected, an aged unrighteous man.*

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Kahana (480): ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ ܥܕ, where ܬܡܝܡ reminds us of the above-quoted Si 44.16, where Enoch is called ܬܡܝܢ.

<sup>13</sup> Though Siegfried (486) refers to Gn 18.6, his translation reads “eilte her [mit ihr] hinweg.” Reider (86f.), however, referring to Siegfried and adding 1Kg 22.9, translates “he hastened him away,” though calling it “a forced translation,” cf. **℣** *properavit educere illum*, “He hastened him” (Holmes), “he urged it forth” (Winston), and “l’a-t-il retirée en hâte” (BJ). On the two BH instances, both with Impf. of ܠܠܠܚܬܐܢܬܐ, cf. JM § 102 g.

νεότης] Opposed to γῆρας also in Si 25.3.

4.17) ὄψονται γὰρ τελευτήν σοφοῦ  
καὶ οὐ νοήσουσιν τί ἐβουλεύσατο περὶ αὐτοῦ  
καὶ εἰς τί ἡσφαλίσατο αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος.

σοφοῦ] § כִּי־יָדָע = δικαίου, so one MS.

ἐκγελάσεται] In CG ἐκγελάω is intransitive, ‘to laugh loud,’ but in SG we find its transitive use, <+ τινα>. An additional example is ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐκγελάσεται αὐτούς Ps 2.4 (// ἐκμυκτηρίζω), where *ἡ* reads only *ρηψ*, but followed by *יִמְזַגֵּץ*, but we also encounter ἐκγελάση αὐτούς *יִמְזַגֵּץ* ib. 58.9. In SG the verb is probably used in a figurative sense. *GELS* admits two senses: **1.** “to think of and treat with contempt” and **2.** “to make a laughing-stock of,” both unknown prior to SG, for the latter of which *μη ἐκγελάση τὴν δούλην σου* 4K 4.16*L* is mentioned in *GELS*.

4.19) καὶ ἔσονται μετὰ τοῦτο εἰς πῶμα ἄτιμον  
καὶ εἰς ὕβριν ἐν νεκροῖς δι' αἰῶνος,  
ὅτι ῥήξει αὐτοὺς ἀφώνους πρηνεῖς  
καὶ σαλεύσει αὐτοὺς ἐκ θεμελίων,  
καὶ ἔως ἐσχάτου χερσωθήσονται  
καὶ ἔσονται ἐν ὁδῷ,  
καὶ ἡ μνήμη αὐτῶν ἀπολείται.

ἔσονται .. εἰς] = γενήσονται. Εἰμί εἰς in the sense of “to become” and in the indicative past and future tenses and the subjunctive is confined to SG, most likely a calque of Heb. **לִּיהְיֶה**, cf. *GELS* s.v. **3**.

χερσωθήσονται] Χερσώω ‘to cause to become barren and desolate’ is unknown prior to SG. His translation “shall they be dried up” notwithstanding, Reider wonders whether it could take a human as *o*. A synonym, ἐρημόω, does take ἔθνος as *o* in τὰ ἔθνη ἐρημίᾳ ἐρημωθήσονται Is 60.12, and ἔρημος is applied to a woman, possibly unmarried or divorced, ib. 54.1

- ἐλεύσονται] probably to a court.

The message of S is quite distinct: נָעוּל לְמַחְשָׁבָתָא דְסִכְלֵתְהוֹן נִכְלָא וְתַפָּס׃<sup>15</sup> ‘for the consideration of their sins guile will be taken into account and their aberration will render them guilty openly.’

<sup>14</sup> None of the three senses mentioned in *SL* fits our context: 1 “abuse, reproach,” 2 “wickedness,” and 3 “lasciviousness.” Cf. rather Jennings (1926) s.v.: “ignominy, disgrace” as applicable to **בְּצַרְרָא שְׁדִירוּתָא** ἡτίμασαν Mk 12.4.

<sup>15</sup> Ed. Leiden adds a seyyame, thus **מחשבתא** 'thoughts.'

## CHAPTER 5

- 5.1) Τότε στήσεται ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ ὁ δίκαιος  
κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θλιψάντων αὐτὸν  
καὶ τῶν ἁθετούντων τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ.

*Then the righteous man will stand with great confidence,  
confronting those who oppressed him  
and think nothing of his toils.*

θλιψάντων αὐτὸν .. ἁθετούντων] It is reasonable to assume that the author deliberately changed the tense from the Aor. to the Pres., the former referring to a past action and the latter to a still persistent action. Clarke (39) and Fichtner (22) are exceptional in this regard: “.. oppressed .. made light of ..” and “bedrängten .. verwarfen.”<sup>1</sup> *BJ* (874) distinguishes the two per aspect: “ont opprimé .. avaiant.”

αὐτὸν .. αὐτοῦ] There is no absolute reason for regarding ὁ δίκαιος as pl. as shown in “them .. their” (*NETS*).<sup>2</sup>

πόνους] In view of the preceding line the word most likely refers to toils wrongly inflicted on him. In *GELS* s.v. **1 b** we see an example such as ὠδίνησεν ἀδικίαν, συνέλαβεν πόνον καὶ ἔτεκεν ἀνομίαν Ps 7.15, where the noun is parallel to ἀδικία and ἀνομία. Thus πόνος differs from κόπος as used in 3.11.

- 5.2) ἰδόντες ταραχθήσονται φόβῳ δεινῷ  
καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς σωτηρίας·

*At the sight they will be upset with tremendous fear  
and will be astonished at (his) unimaginable salvation.*

ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς σωτηρίας] In comparison with שְׁלֵמֹת וְנִסֵּי שְׁלֵמֹת דְּמִשְׁלָתוֹ ‘the marvel of his salvation’ שֶׁ כִּשְׁמֵי שָׁמַיִם בְּיָמָיו כִּדְּנִיחָא ‘when they see his glory’ is a truly astonishing rendering.

According to Reider (91) the use of *subitatio* ‘suddenness’ in *ſ in subitacione inasperatae salutis* ‘suddenness of unexpected salvation’ is attested in documents originating in Africa, which shows the African origin of this Latin version.

Winston (146) mentions a number of texts describing the last day of the universe such as 1En 27.3, 62.3.

<sup>1</sup> Scarpat (I 318), though aware of the tense distinction in *Θ*, translates both verbs in the plain preterite: “perseguitarono” and “disprezzarono.”

<sup>2</sup> This is not the only instance in *NETS*, see also 4.17, for instance.

- 5.3) ἐροῦσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς μετανοοῦντες  
καὶ διὰ στενοχωρίαν πνεύματος στενάζονται καὶ ἐροῦσιν

*They will say among themselves in remorse  
and will sigh out of mental distress and say,*

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] exactly as in εἶπον γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Wi 2.1. So Scarpat I 320. Cp. ܫ ܕܝܢܝܬܐ ‘within themselves,’ so also at 2.1, but ܫܝܕ ܕܝܢܐ. Hence not a reciprocal expression: “to one another”: they want to keep their sense of remorse to themselves.

στενοχωρίαν] “gasping for breath”? So Winston (144), but Scarpat (I 315) “per l’angoscia del loro spirito gemeranno.” The latter stresses the collocation of the noun in NTG with θλίψις. Note τὸ πνεῦμα στενοχωρούμενος καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀγχόμενος ‘mentally oppressed and physically constricted’ 4M 11.11,<sup>3</sup> and GELS s.v., esp. interesting in view of the verb’s use in the parallelism of a human πνεῦμα to σῶμα. Besides, πνεῦμα means “air in the atmosphere,” but not “air to be inhaled.”

- 5.4) Οὗτος ἦν, ὃν ἔσχομέν ποτε εἰς γέλωτα  
καὶ εἰς παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ οἱ ἄφρονες·  
τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ ἐλογισάμεθα μανίαν  
καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον.

*This was the one whom we once regarded to be a laughing-stock  
and (whom) we fools (turned into) a target of insult.  
His life we thought to be madness  
and its end not worth a thing.*

ἔσχομέν] For ἔχω in the sense of “to look upon as” (GELS s.v. 9), cf. φίλον ἔξιν ‘to treat (him) as friend’ 2M 7.24 and πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην Mt 21.26.

παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ] The gen. phrase may have been found difficult for the Syr. translator with his ܐܬܝܬܐܝܬܐ ܐܬܝܬܐܝܬܐ ‘dishonour and parables.’ Note ἔδωκας ἡμᾶς εἰς διαρπαγὴν καὶ αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ θάνατον καὶ παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν To 3.4 6<sup>1</sup>.

- 5.5) πῶς κατελογίσθη ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ  
καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις ὁ κληρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔστιν;

*How was he counted among the sons of God  
and is his share among the saints?*

On the theological significance of the message of this verse, cf. Hübner 70f.

<sup>3</sup> On the use of the acc. τὸ πνεῦμα .. καὶ τὸ σῶμα, cf. SSG § 22 **xh** with f.n. 3 on p. 185.

- 5.6) ἄρα ἐπλανήθημεν ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ ἀληθείας,  
καὶ τὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης φῶς οὐκ ἔλαμψεν ἡμῖν,  
καὶ ὁ ἥλιος οὐκ ἀνέτειλεν ἡμῖν·

*We then erred away from the way of truth,  
and the light of righteousness did not shine for us,  
and the sun did not rise for us.*

ἄρα] an inferential particle, *pace* ‘verily’ (Holmes)<sup>4</sup> and “Surely” (*NETS*). According to LSJ s.v. **B 1** “more subjective than οὖν.”

In SG, unlike in CG, this particle is usually clause-initial. Three exceptions mentioned in *GELS* s.v. **1 b**, happen to follow a conditional clause.<sup>5</sup>

ἔλαμψεν] cf. ἐπιλάμψει ὁ θεὸς ἐν βουλῇ μετὰ δόξης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Is 4.2.  
ἡμῖν<sup>1</sup>] a dative of advantage, *pace* ‘on us’ (Reider and *NETS*) as in φῶς  
λάμψει ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ׀ׁלְכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל Is 9.2. The same analysis applies to ἡμῖν<sup>2</sup>.<sup>6</sup>  
Note שׁ and שׁה לְ .. לְ.

- 5.7) ἀνομίας ἐνεπλέχθημεν τριβόλοις καὶ ἀπωλείας  
καὶ διωδεύσαμεν ἐρήμους ἀβάτους,  
τὴν δὲ ὁδὸν κυρίου οὐκ ἔγνωμεν.

*We became entangled in prickles of unlawfulness and destruction  
and we journeyed impassable deserts,  
we did not know of the way of the Lord.*

ἐνεπλέχθημεν] a reading preferred by Ziegler (32) against ε(νε)πλησθησαν preserved by all Gk MSS and versions, but rejected by Engel (2139).

ἀπωλείας] destruction caused by us or suffered by us? Probably the former as parallel to ἀνομίας, cf. τῆς τῶν ἀναμαρτήτων νηπίων παρανόμου ἀπωλείας ‘the lawless slaughter of the innocent babies’ 2M 8.4, where παρανόμου is to be noted as affiliated with our ἀνομίας.

- 5.8) τί ὠφέλησεν ἡμᾶς ἡ ὑπερηφανία;  
καὶ τί πλοῦτος μετὰ ἀλαζονείας συμβέβληται ἡμῖν;

*What benefit did the pride bring us?  
and what has wealth with arrogance contributed to us?*

<sup>4</sup> Holmes cites Donaldson: “Hence it amounts sometimes to an expression of regret,” which is mixing up a lexical meaning and a contextual one. According to Denniston (1950.35) the particle “denotes, not interest in general, but in particular the interest or surprise occasioned by enlightenment or disillusion.”

<sup>5</sup> In *GELS* loc. cit. both Ps 7.5, 6 should be listed beside Jb 31.8. Actually there are five instances in which the particle does not follow a conditional clause, but still not clause-initial: Ps 30.23, Jb 23.3, 31.6, Wi 6.20, Is 56.3.

<sup>6</sup> Thus *pace* “upon us .. for us” (Reider) and “pour nous .. sur nous” (*BJ*).

ὠφέλησεν] possibly a scribal error for ὠφέληκεν, which would be a better parallel to συμβέβληται in the following clause, though we do not find such a v.l.

Here we have a rare instance of ὠφελέω taking double objects. Another is Αἰγύπτιοι μάταια καὶ κενὰ ὠφελήσουσιν ὑμᾶς ‘Egyptians will be only of dubious value to you’ Is 30.7.<sup>7</sup>

πλουῦτος .. συμβέβληται] cp. οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι χρυσίον ἐκ μαρσιπίου ‘those who contribute gold out of a bag’ Is 46.6.

- 5.9) παρῆλθεν ἐκεῖνα πάντα ὥς σκιὰ  
καὶ ὥς ἀγγελία παρατρέχουσα·

*They all vanished like a shadow  
and like a message that passes away.*

παρῆλθεν] Reider (93) holds that the verb is emphatically fronted, an analysis not easy to prove, given the general freedom of word order in Greek. Searching verbal clauses nearby which also contain *s* and *o*, we find three, in none of which Reider’s claim appears to work: 3.2, 3.8, and 4.16. In 3.2 a parallel verb, ἔδοξαν, also is fronted, though not followed by *s* nor *o*.

§ as published in ed. Leiden contains a repetition of vs. 8. Ed. Mossul reads אֲשֶׁר יָרָחַב כְּבִרְיָתָא וְכִי יִהְיֶה כְּבִרְיָתָא אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה כְּבִרְיָתָא ‘like shadows they all move away and like a message of a runner.’ On “runner,” cp. *℣ nuntius*. Reider (93) quotes קָלוּ מִן־יָמַי Jb 9.25, though our author is not citing Θ ὁ δὲ βίος μου ἐστὶν ἐλαφρότερος δρομέως.

- 5.10) ὥς ναὺς διερχομένη κυμαινόμενον ὕδωρ,  
ἥς διαβάσης οὐκ ἔστιν ἵχνος εὐρεῖν  
οὐδὲ ἀτραπὸν τρόπιος αὐτῆς ἐν κύμασιν·

*Like a ship sailing through the raging water  
the trace of whose movement is impossible to find  
nor the track of its keel among waves*

διερχομένη] followed by an acc. marking an extent of space, sim. θάλασσαν Je 31.32; more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. διέρχουμαι **1 a** and *SSG* § 22 **xe**.

διαβάσης] διάβασις is a verbal noun of διέρχουμαι used in the first line. Many translations take the noun as meaning “completed passage,” e.g. “when it has gone by,” but the boat meant is a very light, small skiff as Reider (93) thinks, and it would not leave much trace when it is moving. Our case here is distinct from ἐπιβάσεως in (11f) on account of μετὰ τοῦτο there.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion on this issue, see *SSG* § 60 **b**.

ἔστιν ἵχνος εὐρεῖν] This illustrates the syntagm < εἰμί + inf. > with a modal value of possibility. On diverse modal values expressed by this syntagm, see SSG § 30 **bec**. ἵχνος is in the acc., the *o* of εὐρεῖν and at the same time governed by διαβάσης, which in turn governs ναῦς, a rather complicated syntactic hierarchy.<sup>8</sup>

ἀτραπὸν] also acc. as another *o* of εὐρεῖν.

Note (10c) in **שְׁבִילֶיהָ בְּשִׁבְלֶיהָ לֹא וְלֹא** ‘and its paths are not in the paths of the waves.’

- 5.11) ἥ ὥς ὀρνέου διυπτάντος ἀέρα  
 οὐθὲν εὐρίσκεται τεκμήριον πορείας,  
 πληγῇ δὲ μαστιζόμενον ταρσῶν πνεῦμα κοῦφον  
 καὶ σχιζόμενον βίᾳ ῥοίζου  
 κινουμένων πτερύγων διωδεύθη,  
 καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο οὐχ εὐρέθη σημεῖον ἐπιβάσεως ἐν αὐτῷ.  
*or as when a bird flies through the air  
 no sign of its movement can be found,  
 so the light wind lashed by the beat of its pinions  
 and split with the force of fast movement,  
 with wings moving it flew through,  
 and after that a proof of its entering there was not found.*

ὥς] This particle of comparison can be followed by a gen. abs. as in ὥς οὐχ ὑπαρχόντων ὀφθαλμῶν ψηλαφήσουσιν ‘as if there were no eyes present they will grope’ Is 59.10. A few more examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. **I 1 c**. This analysis is superior to making πορείας dependent on ὀρνέου as in “wie von einem die Luft durchfliegendem Vogel kein Eindruck des Flugs gefunden wird” (Siegfried 487). In a similar metaphorical statement in vs. 12 there is no word in (12b) to which the gen. is subject. We would not follow Reider (93), who views διυπτάντος as attributively used: “as a bird that flies .. of whose passage no token is found.” Sim. Siegfried (487). He apparently sees (11a) syntactically analogous to (10a), but the gen. ὀρνέου qualified with ὥς cannot be subordinate to either of the two nouns in (11b).

σχιζόμενον] **ש** adds **אֵר** ‘air,’ distinguished from the preceding **רוּחַ** ‘wind’ < πνεῦμα.

διωδεύθη] Our translation above implies a pseudo-passive with ὀρνέον as the *s*. However, it could be analysed as a genuine passive form with ἀήρ ‘atmosphere’ as the *s*. The verb can take a substantive indicating a space to

<sup>8</sup> “Whereof, when it is gone by, there is no trace to be found” (Holmes) is not accurate in making ἵχνος depend on ναῦς. Sim. “keine Spur von ihm [= vom Schiff]” (SD).



be covered as its *o*, e.g. οἱ διοδεύοντες ὁδόν Ps 88.42, διοδευσον τὴν γῆν εἰς τε τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς Ge 13.17.<sup>9</sup> Note שֶׁ הָיָה יָבִיטָה ‘it was made firm’!

ἐπιβάσεως ἐν αὐτῷ] The bird’s flight through the atmosphere must be meant.

Syntactic analysis of the verse is challenging. We find three finite verbs – εὑρίσκεται .. διοδεύθη .. εὑρέθη – and four participial clauses – διπτάντος .. μαστιζόμενον .. σχιζόμενον .. κινουμένων. The synonymity between εὑρίσκεται and εὑρέθη with a synonymous *s* respectively, τεκμήριον .. σημείον could imply that the word ὥς, contrary to what our analysis above, is a usual conjunction introducing a comparative clause ending with πορείας and the particle δέ (c) is introducing the principal clause. The tense opposition between εὑρίσκεται and εὑρέθη could support such an analysis, i.e. the ὥς-clause making a generic statement and the principal clause referring to a particular application. Even so the participial clause of (b + c) is difficult of analysis. πνεῦμα κοῦφον must be the *s* of the two passive participles, when we could anticipate another genitive absolute structure.

At the end of the verse ש adds הָיָה לָא אִתְּרַחֵץ שְׂמִינִי ‘and nobody finds a sign of its path.’ Winston (147) holds that the noun means “assault,” but a bird just flying in the atmosphere is not attacking anything.<sup>10</sup> It is parallel to δίοδος (vs. 12), which does not denote any hostile activity. Note “passaggio” (Scarpata I 317). The verb ἐπιβαίνω is used at times in the sense of “to attack,” e.g. ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια ὑμῶν Mi 5.5.

5.12) ἢ ὥς βέλους βληθέντος ἐπὶ σκοπὸν  
τμηθεὶς ὁ ἀήρ εὐθέως εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀνελύθη  
ὥς ἀγνοῆσαι τὴν δίοδον αὐτοῦ·

*Or as when an arrow was cast at a target,  
the air, once split, immediately closed up again,  
not having discovered its way through.*

βέλους βληθέντος] As shown on ὀρνέου in vs. 11, this can be only a gen. abs. So thinks also Reider (93f.).

In (12b) ש reads הָיָה לָא אִתְּרַחֵץ שְׂמִינִי ‘which splits the air. And at once emerges the air in its place.’

ἀνελύθη] On the semantic analysis of ἀναλύω, see above at 2.1.

ὥς ἀγνοῆσαι] a syntactically difficult infinitival clause, which is probably consecutive,<sup>11</sup> a usage known to CG according to LSJ s.v. **B III**. Its *s* is probably ὁ ἀήρ; “men” (Holmes) and “no one” (*NETS*) and the like are unlikely. δίοδον] a verbal noun of διοδεύθη (vs. 12).

<sup>9</sup> So “viene attraversata” (Scarpata I 317) and “a été traversé” (Larcher 370).

<sup>10</sup> Larcher’s (370) “qu’il ait été foulé” sounds a little antagonistic.

<sup>11</sup> So also Larcher 375: “si bien qu’on ignore” and Scarpata I 317: “si che è impossibile.”

- 5.13) οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς γεννηθέντες ἐξελίπομεν  
καὶ ἀρετῆς μὲν σημεῖον οὐδὲν ἔσχομεν δεῖξαι,  
ἐν δὲ τῇ κακίᾳ ἡμῶν κατεδαπανήθημεν.

*So we also, having come into existence, passed away  
and we had no proof of virtue to show,  
but in our wickedness we became exhausted.*

γεννηθέντες] Rahlfs has opted for a v.l., γεννηθεντες, ‘having been born.’  
ἐξελίπομεν] Ἐκλείπω is a poetic synonym of ἀποθνήσκω, e.g. τὸ ἀπο-  
θνήσκον ἀποθνήσκέτω, καὶ τὸ ἐκλείπον ἐκλείπέτω Zc 11.9. For more  
examples in SG see *GELS* s.v. **II 1**.

Winston’s (145) “we were dead as we were born” suggests a case of still-  
birth. Si 44.9 mentioned by him is concerned about the extreme brevity of  
our earthly life. Cf. “à peine nés, nous avons disparu” (Larcher 370).

ἀρετῆς] On ἀρέτη, see above at 4.1. In both of these instances **Sh** uses  
**ܐܬܝܪܬܝܢܐ** ‘excellence.’

οὐδὲν] one of the rare instances of the attributively used negator follow-  
ing its noun head; on details, see *SSG* § 39 **ac**.

κατεδαπανήθημεν] < καταδαπανάω, a hapax in Wi. Cf. **ܫܝܢܚܒܬܝܫܐ**<sup>12</sup> ‘we  
perished by being overturned’ and **ܫܝܢܚܒܬܝܫܐ** ‘we perished.’

Holmes (542) notes an addition in **℣** at the end of the verse: *talia dixerunt  
in inferno hi qui peccaverunt*, indicating that this is an addition made by our  
author, not by the sinners, who were speaking from vs. 4.<sup>13</sup>

- 5.14) ὅτι ἐλπίς ἀσεβοῦς ὡς φερόμενος χνοῦς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου  
καὶ ὡς πάχνη ὑπὸ λαίλαπος διωχθεῖσα λεπτή  
καὶ ὡς καπνὸς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου διεχύθη  
καὶ ὡς μνεῖα καταλύτου μονοήμερου παρώδευσεν.

*Because the hope of an infidel is like chaff carried by a wind  
and like thin frost pursued by rain-storm  
and like smoke it is spread by a wind far and wide  
and like a memory of a one-day guest just happens to pass by.*

The central theme of the verse, ἐλπίς ἀσεβοῦς, is described through four  
similes introduced by ὡς. The four, however, are syntactically distinct: the  
first two are a nominal clause with no finite verb, whereas the last two have  
their respective finite verb. The two Aor. finite verbs are best viewed as gno-  
mic, an analysis which accords with the two preceding nominal clauses. It is  
not apparent why the author decided not to write διαχυθεῖς and παροδεύσασα.

<sup>12</sup> Ed. Leiden reads **ܫܢܚܒܬܝܫܐ**, a form unknown to Syriac.

<sup>13</sup> This is the reason of an additional numbering of verses in Ziegler’s edition from this verse.

ὅτι] Larcher (377) translates the conjunction as “En vérité,” viewing ὅτι as equivalent to the affirmative Heb. **וְ**.<sup>14</sup> However, is such a **וְ** ever translated in LXX with ὅτι?

πάχνη] so read by Ziegler, Rahlfs, and Swete. Holmes (543) prefers a v.l. αραχνη ‘spider’s web.’ Risberg (209f.) and Larcher (378) argue in support of another v.l. αχνη, which, however, means ‘chaff.’ That would be too close to χνοῦς in (a). Scarpat (I 334-36) prefers αχνη, which he translates “schiuma.”

(14d) reads somewhat different in S: **וְאֵיךְ דִּכְרָנָא דְיִימָה דְעֵבֶר אוֹרְחָא הָכֵנָּה** וְעֵבֶר ‘and like the memory of the day of a traveller thus we passed.’

- 5.15) Δίκαιοι δὲ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζῶσιν,  
καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτῶν,  
καὶ ἡ φροντίς αὐτῶν παρὰ ὑψίστῳ.

*But the righteous live for ever,  
and in the Lord is their reward,  
and their care is with the Most High.*

αὐτῶν<sup>2</sup>] objective genitive: the Most High takes care of them.

- 5.16) διὰ τοῦτο λήμψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπείας  
καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου,  
ὅτι τῇ δεξιᾷ σκεπάσει αὐτοὺς  
καὶ τῷ βραχίονι ὑπερασπιεῖ αὐτῶν.

*For this reason they will receive a comely tiara  
and a beautiful diadem from the hand of the Lord,  
because with His right hand He will provide a protective cover  
and with His arm He will shield them.*

τὸ βασίλειον] Holmes (543) renders this substantivised neut. adj. as “a kingdom.” So Siegfried (487) with “das Reich,” Larcher (381) with “royauté,” and Scarpat (I 317) “il regno.” Though in 1.14 it is used in the sense of “rule, kingship,” the parallelism here to διάδημα is to be taken into account. Holmes bases himself precisely on 1.14, where, however, his rendering reads “Nor hath Hades royal dominion over earth”; “a kingdom” and “dominion” are not exactly the same. Reider (96f.), though aware of an alternative rendering, “crown,” translates our text as “the kingdom of splendour.”<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> On the so-called “emphatic” **וְ**, see Muraoka 1985.158-64.

<sup>15</sup> He refers to 1.14, where his rendering reads: “Nor is the kingdom of death upon earth.” Kingdom with no subjects in it! LSJ does not admit βασίλειον in the sense of “kingdom.” Nor does MM. Thackeray’s “kingdom” (1909.157) is not convincing. E.g. the substitution of βασίλειον in Da 7.22 LXX with βασιλεία in TH does not necessarily mean that for the reviser the two meant the same thing. No such usage is mentioned in Preisigke s.v.

An allusion to (a+b) is found in καὶ ἔσθι στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου καὶ διάδημα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ σου Is 62.3.

In (16d) **Sh** reflects the etymology of ὑπερασπιεῖ: **שׁי אֶת יְמֵינוּ כְּמָגֶן** ‘and with His arm He will protect them as with a shield (ἀσπίς).’

For the rection of ὑπερασπίζω with τινος pers., see κύριος παντοκράτωρ ὑπερασπιεῖ αὐτῶν **יְהוָה יִגְדָּל וְיִשְׁמְרֵנוּ** Zc 9.15 and ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου Ge 15.1, where **ע** is a plus to **ח**.

- 5.17) λήμψεται πανοπλίαν τὸν ζῆλον αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ὅπλοποιήσκει τὴν κτίσιν εἰς ἄμυναν ἐχθρῶν.  
*He will take His zeal as full armour  
and will use the creation to ward off enemies.*

ζῆλον] It is true that in SG ζῆλος is at times used in conjunction with or parallel to θυμός or ὀργή as in Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Ἐζήλωσα τὴν Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ τὴν Σιών ζῆλον μέγαν καὶ θυμῷ μεγάλῳ ἐζήλωσα αὐτήν Zc 8.2, but ζῆλος on its own does not mean anger, as suggested by Winston’s rendering here “his anger.” Cf. Larcher’s (386) “Son zèle vengeur.”

τὴν κτίσιν] For the notion of the nature fighting on the side of the righteous, see vs. 20, 16.17, 24. Cf. also Is 59.16-18. Winston (149f.) mentions several contemporary sources which say that God recruits the universe for battles against enemies of the righteous.

ἄμυναν] The underlying verb, ἀμύνω, can mean “to help and defend” as well as “to ward off (an assailant).” The latter applies to ἀντέστησαν πολεμίους καὶ ἐχθρούς ἡμύναντο 11.3.

- 5.18) ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνην  
καὶ περιθήσεται κόρυθα κρίσιν ἀνυπόκριτον.  
*He will wear righteousness as a coat of mail  
and put on sincere judgement as a helmet,*

θώρακα] **שׁ** and **Sh** **אֶת הַחֹסֶן** ‘breastplate.’

ἀνυπόκριτον] **שׁ** **אֶת הַחֹסֶן בְּלֹא דִבְעָבָר** ‘without deception’ and **Sh** **אֶת הַחֹסֶן בְּלֹא חֲסִידוּת** ‘without partiality.’<sup>16</sup> *Pace NETS* this adjective does not mean “impartial.”

Cf. Eph 6.11-17, where Paul exhorts believers to arm themselves with τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, saying ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης. See also Si 6.31.

- 5.19) λήμψεται ἀσπίδα ἀκαταμάχητον ὁσιότητα,  
*He will take invincible holiness as a shield,*

<sup>16</sup> Cf. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ **אֵין חֲסִידוּת לִפְנֵי יְהוָה** Ro 2.11.

ἀκαταμάχητον] We follow Fichtner (24), *SD*, and *BJ* in taking the adj. as an attribute of ὁσιότητα: “unbesiegbare Heiligkeit” and “sainteté invincible.” Sim. Winston, Larcher, and Scarpata (I 317), but Siegfried “unangreifbaren Schild.” The word is unattested prior to Wi, but later instances favour this analysis, e.g. νομίζων ἀκαταμάχητος εἶναι ‘thinking myself to be invincible’ Test. Jud. 19.4.

- 5.20) ὁξυνεῖ δὲ ἀπότομον ὀργὴν εἰς ῥομφαίαν,  
 συνεκπολεμήσει δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κόσμος ἐπὶ τοὺς παράφρονας.  
*He will sharpen relentless wrath for a sword,  
 but the world will fight together with Him against the senseless.*

ἀπότομον] Ἀπότομος occurs in LXX in Wi only, and four more times (6.5, 11.10, 12.9, 18.15).

συνεκπολεμήσει] The rection of this verb attests to two other patterns as well: <τινα μετά τινος> in αὐτὸς συνεκπολεμήσει αὐτοὺς μεθ’ ὑμῶν ‘He will fight them with you’ Dt 1.30 and <τινά τινι> in συνεκπολεμήσαι ὑμῖν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν ib. 20.4.

- 5.21) πορεύσονται εὖστοχοι βολίδες ἀστραπῶν  
 καὶ ὥς ἀπὸ εὐκύκλου τόξου τῶν νεφῶν ἐπὶ σκοπὸν ἀλοῦνται,  
*Shafts of lightning will move, hitting the targets well  
 and as from a well-curved arrow of the clouds, they will fly at the target,*

εὐκύκλου τόξου τῶν νεφῶν] Reider (98) sees here a reference to “the rainbow, the token of divine mercy, which now is turned into a weapon of destruction,” which seems to be evident in **שְׁ נִינְיָ נְהַשְׁרֵי נְהַשְׁרֵי נְשִׁי תִּנְיָ** ‘and like a symbol of an arch of rainbow of the clouds.’ Similar is **שִׁי**.

- 5.22) καὶ ἐκ πετροβόλου θυμοῦ πλήρεις ῥιφήσονται χάλασαι·  
 ἀγανακτήσει κατ’ αὐτῶν ὕδωρ θαλάσσης,  
 ποταμοὶ δὲ συγκλύσουσιν ἀποτόμως·  
*and from a catapult hails, full of anger, will be thrown;  
 the water of the sea will violently move against them,  
 and rivers will relentlessly engulf them.*

πετροβόλου] With his rendering “dall’ira trasformata in fionda” Scarpata (I 346-48) argues that this is an attributive adjective, which we find implausible in terms of its meaning. It occurs six times in LXX,<sup>17</sup> and is always

<sup>17</sup> *GELS* needs a minor correction: Ez 13.13 should be added after ib. 13.11, and also 1K 14.14.

substantivised.<sup>18</sup> In λίθους πετροβόλους Ez 13.11 and τοὺς λίθους τοὺς πετροβόλους ib. 13 πετροβόλους is in apposition, not attributive, i.e. ‘stones, instruments for throwing stones.’

In (22a) § presents an explicit description of God’s punitive action: אַפְּאֵס אֶת־הַבָּרָאָה בְּאֵי־בָרָאָה וְיִהְיֶה לָּהֶם כְּבָרָאָה כְּבָרָאָה ‘and with fury He will hurl on them hail-stones like rocks as weapon.’ The root תַּמַּח is used also to express the surge of sea waters: וְיִהְיֶה לָּהֶם כְּבָרָאָה כְּבָרָאָה ‘and the sea waters will become furious against them.’

5.23) ἀντιστήσεται αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα δυνάμεως  
καὶ ὥς λαῖλαψ ἐκλικμήσει αὐτούς·  
καὶ ἐρημώσει πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἀνομία,  
καὶ ἡ κακοπραγία περιτρέψει θρόνους δυναστῶν.

*A mighty wind will rise against them  
and winnow them away like a violent rain-storm;  
and unlawfulness will lay the entire earth waste,  
and evil-doing will overturn the seats of potentates.*

πνεῦμα δυνάμεως] §<sup>19</sup> אֶת־הַבָּרָאָה וְיִהְיֶה לָּהֶם ‘a mighty wind.’ Fichtner (24) renders πνεῦμα with “der Geist,” referring it to “der Geist Gottes,”<sup>20</sup> but Sekine (1977.346) justly takes note of its parallelism with λαῖλαψ.

In §, except the first, all the remaining verbs are in the 3ms, which most likely refers to God.

πᾶσαν] Swete’s πᾶσα is highly implausible.

ἡ κακοπραγία .. δυναστῶν] We doubt that even the freedom of word order in Greek supports the syntactic analysis as represented in Fichtner’s (24) rendering: “das Verbrechen der Herrscher Throne umstürzen.”

<sup>18</sup> In CG it is found as substantivised in οἱ πετρόβολοι ‘the stone-throwers’ Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.12, but much later as a genuine adjective as in πετροβόλων τινῶν ὀργάνων ‘of some stone-throwing instruments’ Anna Comnena (11th cent. CE) *Alex.* 2.8.5.

<sup>19</sup> Both ed. Leiden and ed. Mosul read אֶת־הַבָּרָאָה וְיִהְיֶה לָּהֶם ‘a terrifying wind.’

<sup>20</sup> So also *SD*: “der Geist der Macht.”

## CHAPTER 6

- 6.1) Ἀκούσατε οὖν, βασιλεῖς, καὶ σύνετε·  
μάθετε, δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς·

*Hear, then, o kings, and understand;  
learn, o judges of the ends of the earth;*

βασιλεῖς] Since leaders of the diaspora Jewish community were unlikely to be addressed as “kings,” the author must be thinking of gentile rulers, what accords with the parallel address to the judges of the ends of the earth.

- 6.2) ἐνωτίσασθε, οἱ κρατοῦντες πλήθους  
καὶ γεγαυρωμένοι ἐπὶ ὄχλοις ἐθνῶν·

*Listen, o those who have dominion over many people  
and make boast of crowds of nations,*

γεγαυρωμένοι] Why the Pf. ptc., following Pres. κρατοῦντες, has been selected is vague. Cp. **𐤌 𐤒𐤍𐤕𐤍** ‘boast,’ **𐤌𐤇 𐤒𐤍𐤕𐤍** ‘being wanton,’ and **𐤕** *placitis vobis*.

- 6.3) ὅτι ἐδόθη παρὰ κυρίου ἡ κράτησις ὑμῖν  
καὶ ἡ δυναστεία παρὰ ὑψίστου,  
ὃς ἐξετάσει ὑμῶν τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὰς βουλὰς διερευνήσει·  
*because the control has been given you by the Lord  
and the authority is from the Most High,  
who will examine your works and scrutinise your designs,*

παρὰ κυρίου] Whilst παρὰ τινος is occasionally equivalent to ὑπό τινος, marking an agent of a passive verb as in παρὰ κυρίου τὰ διαβήματα ἀνθρώπου κατευθύνεται ‘a man’s steps are straightened by the Lord’ Ps 36.23,<sup>1</sup> we seem to have here a slightly different nuance: “you owe your control to the Lord,” which is well represented in *SD* with “Vom Herrn her wurde euch Herrschaft gegeben.” This equally applies to παρὰ ὑψίστου in the next line.

κράτησις] a noun derived from a common verb, κρατέω, and a hapax in LXX and unknown prior to LXX. Its meaning is defined in *GELS* as “being possessed of supreme political and military power.” It is evidently parallel to δυναστεία in the next line.

<sup>1</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. παρά **I 2**.

παρὰ ὑψίστου] **𐤌 𐤍𐤕𐤕 𐤓** ‘from the high one,’ an unusual rendering of ὑψιστος as a divine title. The usual rendering is **𐤍𐤕𐤕** as in **𐤌** here.

δς] Larcher’s “c’est lui qui ..” (401) is questionable. The author is saying that earthly rulers are appointees of God, who naturally regards them accountable for their deeds, and not that there is somebody else to whom they are accountable.

- 6.4) ὅτι ὑπηρεταὶ ὄντες τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας οὐκ ἐκρίνατε ὀρθῶς  
οὐδὲ ἐφυλάξατε νόμον  
οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπορεύθητε.

*because, though being ministers in His kingdom, you did not judge correctly,  
nor observed the law  
nor walked in keeping with God’s will.*

ἐκρίνατε] Whilst this clause is introduced with a causal conjunction, vs. 3 makes no reference to legal, juridic issues. Hence, in spite of the introduction of νόμον in the next line, we are inclined to assign a generic sense to the verb κρίνω as used here as defined in *GELS* s.v. **6 b** “to take a decision over,” as in κρίναι τὰ πράγματα τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθείᾳ ‘to decide on the matters with the help of God’ 2M 13.13. Reider (100) mentions the biblical notion of “unfair judgment, consisting in condemning the innocent and whitewashing the guilty.” For such a notion δικαίως suits better than ὀρθῶς.<sup>2</sup> Cf. κρίνετε δικαίως (**𐤌 𐤕𐤕𐤓**) ἀνὰ μέσον ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφοῦ De 1.16 and κρίνε δικαίως (**𐤌 𐤕𐤕𐤓**) Pr 31.9. See also διακρινῶ τὸν λαόν σου δικαίως Wi 9.12.

νόμον] Despite the absence of τὸν, the author must be referring to any of the principles of justice applicable to any community, not only Jewish. Grimm (1837.146) and Laroche, despite his “la loi” (405), rightly take the noun in the sense of universally valid law and principle, not confined to the Mosaic law.

- 6.5) φρικτῶς καὶ ταχέως ἐπιστήσεται ὑμῖν,  
ὅτι κρίσις ἀπότομος ἐν τοῖς ὑπερέχουσιν γίνεται.

*Shockingly and quickly He will confront you,  
because relentless judgement takes place against people in power.*

φρικτῶς] a hapax in Wi and unknown prior to SG. The underlying adj., φρικτός, occurs at 8.15, applied to τύραννοι.

ἐπιστήσεται] **𐤌** adds **𐤍𐤕𐤕** ‘elimination’ as *s.*

<sup>2</sup> Also Clarke (44): “you have not been upright judges.”



This high-frequency verb (72× in LXX), ἐφίστημι, with a dat. of disadvantage<sup>3</sup> occurs also in Τοῖς δὲ ἄσεβέσιν .. θυμὸς ἐπέστη ‘wrath confronted the ungodly’ Wi 19.1. See also below at vs. 8. It means “to present oneself (or itself) with an unwelcome, hostile intention.” One could understand why Scarpat (I 380) finds it difficult to determine the s, though he comes down, justly, we believe, on God.

ἀπότομος] Used only in Wi, a favourite word in its vocabulary, appearing four more times, see above at 5.20. We could include here its adverb, ἀποτόμως, used only once in SG: Wi 5.22. Siegfried’s (488) “plötzliches” is debatable.

ἐν] “indicates a person to whom something is done” (GELS s.v. 10, where a number of examples are mentioned, for instance, ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ποιήσω τὴν ἐκδίκησιν Ex 12.12). Scarpat (I 380) mentions ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ [= ἐν Ἡλίου] ὅσα ἠθέλησαν Mt 17.12; it is not a question of the equivalence of ἐν to εἰς.

τοῖς ὑπερέχουσιν] This substantivised ptc. appears also in Jd 5.25B // ἰσχυρός ib. A.

6.6) ὁ γὰρ ἐλάχιστος συγγνωστός ἐστιν ἐλέους,  
δυνατοὶ δὲ δυνατῶς ἐτασθήσονται·

*For the lowliest is pardonable on account of mercy.*

*The powerful, however, shall be vigorously examined.*

συγγνωστός] In SG we find another three derivationally related lexemes, all having to do with leniency shown to others: συγγινώσκω, συγγνώμη, συγγνωμονέω. For details, see GELS s.vs.

ἐλέους] a gen. of cause as in καὶ ταύτης ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου ‘my heart was disturbed over this matter’ Jb 37.1 ¶. Cf. SSG § 22 o. Referring to Philo Jos. 53 and Philostratus *Vitae sophistarum* Winston (153) says that a gen. with this adj. is “usually that of the thing in respect of which pardon is given.” The only possible instance in LSJ s.v. is σύγγνωστοι .. τῆς φιλοτιμίας ‘they may be forgiven for the rivalry’ Philost. VS 1.8.3. Larcher’s (409) solution, according to which the selection of the gen. here is influenced by an adjective meaning “worthy,”<sup>4</sup> justifies his rendition “Le petit, lui, est excusable et digne de pitié,” though it is too imaginative.

ἐτασθήσονται] Referring to ὕβρει καὶ βασάνῳ ἐτάσωμεν αὐτόν 2.19 Holmes opines that the verb ἐτάζω means here “to torment,” but there the feature of tormenting is explicitly indicated with the two nouns, and the verb itself does not mean “to torment.”

<sup>3</sup> On which see SSG § 22 wg.

<sup>4</sup> Larcher is probably thinking of a word such as ἄξιος.

Cf.  $\text{מֶלֶכָּא גִיר מְכִיכָא קָרִיב לְרַחֲמִין וְחִילָתָנָא חִילָתָנָאִית וְנִשְׁתַּאֲלֹן}$  ‘for a modest king is close to mercies but powerful ones will be questioned vigorously.’

6.7) οὐ γὰρ ὑποστελεῖται πρόσωπον ὁ πάντων δεσπότης  
οὐδὲ ἐντραπήσεται μέγεθος,  
ὅτι μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν  
ὁμοίως τε προνοεῖ περὶ πάντων,

*For the lord of all will not be partial  
nor will feel overawed by greatness,  
because it was He that made small and great  
He will give thought equally to all.*

(7a) expresses the principle of fair, unprejudiced judgement from the perspective of God, a principle which is to be applied in any human society as stated in οὐ μὴ ὑποστείλῃ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου De 1.17. Note that this biblical law is preceded by οὐκ ἐπιγνώσῃ πρόσωπον ἐν κρίσει, κατὰ τὸν μικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τὸν μέγαν κρινεῖς and followed by ὅτι ἡ κρίσις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. That  $\text{S}$  is aware of this source is shown by its translation of Dt 1.17, which starts with  $\text{לֹא תִכְיֹר פָּנִים}$  for  $\text{לֹא תִסְבֵּן בְּאִפָּא בְּדִינָא}$ .

In view of this message and also the selection of masc. μέγαν, not neut. μέγα, πάντων is more likely to be masc. in gender,<sup>5</sup> referring to humans, though in ὁ πάντων δεσπότης Wi 8.3 all creatures might be included. In Jb 5.8 God is called κύριον τὸν πάντων δεσπότην, where the gender of πάντων is opaque.

μέγεθος] greatness in terms of one's status in the society.<sup>6</sup> Hence μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν is not concerned about one's physical stature or weight.<sup>7</sup>

προνοεῖ] In another instance in Wi of this verb we find < gen. [pers.] > indicating care and concern, 13.16, v.a.l. Note a verbal noun, πρόνοια, in 14.3 and 17.2.

6.8) τοῖς δὲ κραταιοῖς ἰσχυρὰ ἐφίσταται ἔρευνα.

*But a tough investigation confronts the powerful.*

ἔρευνα] a hapax in Wi.

ἐφίσταται] Another example of <ἐφίστημί τινι [pers.]>, a dat. of disadvantage occurs in Wi 19.1. Cf. also ὁ θυμός μου ἐπέστη Is 63.5.

S concludes with  $\text{מְבַצָּא בְּשֶׁרָא}$  ‘He investigates with truth.’

<sup>5</sup> Scarpat (I 382) analyses it as neut., with no explanation offered.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 4, p. 107.

<sup>7</sup> In Ge 19.11 the pair could be about age, a parameter which does not apply here.

- 6.9) πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὖν, ὃ τύραννοι, οἱ λόγοι μου,  
ἵνα μάθητε σοφίαν καὶ μὴ παραπέσητε·

*To you, therefore, o rulers, I am speaking  
in order that you may learn wisdom and not err,*

πρὸς ὑμᾶς] On the selection of πρὸς here, see Οὗτος ὁ λόγος κυρίου  
πρὸς Ζοροβαβελ Zc 4.6.

τύραννοι] Larcher (412f.) convincingly argues that here a non-pejorative, neutral sense is preferable, thus not “tyrant, despot” or such like; his rendering is “souverains.”

ἵνα] In order to analyse this as a standard conjunction indicating a purpose, we need to view the preceding nominal clause virtually as a verbal clause as shown in our translation. Cf. SSG § 66 b.

παραπέσητε] Note the appearance of παραπίπτω parallel to ἁμαρτάνω in Wi 12.2. For a possible, moral connotation of παράπτωμα, see above at 3.13. For a good semantic analysis of the verb, cf. Scarpat I 383f.

- 6.10) οἱ γὰρ φυλάξαντες ὁσίως τὰ ὅσια ὁσιωθήσονται,  
καὶ οἱ διδαχθέντες αὐτὰ εὐρήσουσιν ἀπολογίαν.

*for those who have piously observed pious matters will be regarded as  
pious,  
and those who have been taught them will know how to defend themselves.*

ὁσίως τὰ ὅσια ὁσιωθήσονται] unquestionably a play on words. Following a careful analysis, Larcher (414f.) comes to his rendering “seront déclarés saints.”

εὐρήσουσιν ἀπολογίαν] cf. *¶ invenient quid respondeant*. Alternatively “they will find someone who will defend them.”

ἀπολογίαν] a hapax in LXX.

- 6.11) ἐπιθυμήσατε οὖν τῶν λόγων μου,  
ποθήσατε καὶ παιδευθήσεσθε.

*Desire therefore my words,  
eagerly seek and then you will be (properly) educated.*

τῶν λόγων] A verb of desiring is one of many verbs which govern a gen. *o*, cf. SSG § 22 *p*. However, it is at times found competing with a rec-tion with an acc. as in ἐπιθυμοῦντες τροφήν ‘yearning after food’ Wi 16.3, cf. SSG § 55 *aa*.

ποθήσατε] a rare instance of an absolutely used ποθέω. Cp. 4.2 above. We can mentally supply αὐτούς.

παιδευθήσεσθε] The Fut. here is not a mere syntactic variant of the preceding two Impvs, but indicates a result<sup>8</sup> that could emerge when the two actions have been taken. Moreover, the Fut. here might be an indication of theoretical possibility, on which value of the Fut., see SSG § 28 **ge**.

This verse reminds us of the exhortation made to kings in *καὶ νῦν, βασιλεῖς, σύνετε· παιδεύητε, πάντες οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν* Ps 2.10.<sup>9</sup>

- 6.12) Λαμπρὰ καὶ ἀμάραντός ἐστιν ἡ σοφία  
καὶ εὐχερῶς θεωρεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγαπώντων αὐτήν  
καὶ εὐρίσκεται ὑπὸ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν,  
*Wisdom is radiant and unfading  
and is easily observable by those who love her  
and is found by those who search after her,*

On (12a), cf. τί .. ἂν εἴη λαμπρόστερον ἢ τηλαυγέστερον θείου λόγου ..; ‘What could be more radiant or more conspicuous than the divine Logos?’ Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* 3.59.

ἀμάραντος] a hapax in LXX. A derivationally affiliated synonym occurs in NTG: τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον ‘the unfading crown of glory’ 1Pt 1.4.

θεωρεῖται] This is about mental, not visual, observation; cf. *GELS* s.v. **1 c**. So Ἀδικίαν εἰ ἐθεώρουν ἐν καρδίᾳ μου Ps 65.18. All the same, in view of εὐρίσκεται that follows, we have reservations about Larcher’s (418) “est discerné, perçue.” We are concerned with mental observation, contemplation, a process that necessarily precedes discovery.

(12c) is omitted in a few MSS due to homoioteleuton. Cf. οἱ δὲ ἐμὲ ζητοῦντες εὐρήσουσιν יִמְצְאוּנִי מְחַיֵּהֵם Pr 8.17.

- 6.13) φθάνει τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας προγνωσθῆναι.

*it surprises those who desire (it), becoming known beforehand.*

Here we are faced with a syntactically challenging clause,<sup>10</sup> what is manifest in *שֶׁיִּתְגַּלֵּי לְמַבְעִינֵי דְרַגְלֵי לְאֵלֵינוּ* ‘it becomes revealed to those who are zealous in seeking it.’

προγνωσθῆναι] most likely an exegetical inf., subordinate to φθάνει.<sup>11</sup> On the use of the inf. instead of the ptc. with φθάνω, see above at 4.7. Though

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Scarpat (I 385) on *καὶ*: “*consecutivum*, <e così>”.

<sup>9</sup> Larcher (417) holds that our author is alluding to τὸν φιλόσοφον σοφίας φήσομεν ἐπιθυμητὴν εἶναι Pl. *Rep.* 475b.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. a strenuous effort shown by Larcher 419f.

<sup>11</sup> In spite of his translation, “making herself known beforehand,” Reider (103) insists that the inf. indicates a purpose.



- 6.15) τὸ γὰρ ἐνθυμηθῆναι περὶ αὐτῆς φρονήσεως τελειότης,  
καὶ ὁ ἀγρυπνήσας δι' αὐτὴν ταχέως ἀμέριμνος ἔσται·

*For to ponder over it is perfection of prudence,  
and one who sacrifices sleep for it will soon be free from worries,*

ἐνθυμηθῆναι] *GELS* s.v. ἐνθυμέομαι **1** suggests “to give serious thought to,” but also **3** “to infer, conclude,” a stage that one could reach after pondering. Either interpretation looks acceptable.<sup>14</sup>

φρονήσεως] Reider's (105) “understanding” is questionable, not only in SG, but also in Greek in general.<sup>15</sup> According to *Index* s.v. φρόνησις is the second commonest rendering of מְרִימָה (8×) following הִנְיָוָה (10×). Cf. *℣* *sensus*.

ἀγρυπνήσας] not only rising early in the morning, but also losing a few hours' sleep, thus not figuratively “vigilant” (Winston 154).

ἀμέριμνος] Cf. the use by Jesus of in μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· τί φάγωμεν; ἢ· τί πίωμεν; ἢ· τί περιβαλώμεθα; Mt 6.31. One who follows the author's advice could turn happy, seeing his bank account remaining in good shape?

- 6.16) ὅτι τοὺς ἀξίους αὐτῆς αὕτη περιέρχεται ζητοῦσα  
καὶ ἐν ταῖς τρίβοις φαντάζεται αὐτοῖς εὐμενῶς  
καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἐπινοίᾳ ὑπαντᾷ αὐτοῖς.

*because it goes about on its own, looking for those worthy of it  
and along the ways it makes appearance to them in a friendly manner  
and over whatever subject it goes to meet them.*

αὕτη] Sweet's reading adopted by Ziegler as against Rahlfs' αὐτὴ, which latter is also preferred by Larcher (423). The demonstrative pronoun highlights the focus better. Scarpat (I 389) also prefers αὕτη, viewing it as emphatic.

ζητοῦσα] *℣* אָרָפּ 'it visits.'

εὐμενῶς] *℣* הַיָּדְוָה<sup>16</sup> and *℣* *hilariter*.

ἐπινοίᾳ] *Ἐπίνοια* means “that which one mentally conceives,” which could be translated in a variety of ways, but to translate this line as “in all their purposes meets them half-way” (Clarke 46) makes the wisdom a little too kind.

<sup>14</sup> BDAG s.v. mentions a few CG instances of ἐνθυμέομαι περί τινος, e.g. ἐνθυμηθῆναι περὶ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων ‘to give thought to the generally applicable matters’ Isocr. *Ep.* 9.8.

<sup>15</sup> Oddly he objects (104) to Grimm's “prudence” (a misunderstanding of German “Klugheit .. die verstandesmäßige Einsicht in die Verhältnisse des Lebens, die Berechnung und Nutzung der Umstände zum eigenen Vortheil,” 1860.129) as emphasising the intellectual quality. Isn't “understanding” something intellectual?

<sup>16</sup> A word not listed in *SL*, but Payne - Smith has it on p. 4014, glossed as “*pacifice, benevole.*”

ὕπαντᾷ] Another example of <ὕπαντάω τινι (pers.)> is μὴ ὑπάντα γυναικὶ ἐταιριζομένῃ ‘Do not go to meet a prostituting woman’ Si 9.3 < אַל תִּקְרַב > אֶל אִשָּׁה זָרָה. An example of a more respectable encounter is Σαρρα δὲ ὑπήντησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐχαιρέτισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτοὶ αὐτήν ‘Sarrah met them and greeted them, and they her’ To 7.1 6<sup>1</sup>.

6.17) ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία,  
φροντὶς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη,

*For its fundamental guideline is very genuine desire for education  
but education is concerned about love,*

The thought expressed here is rather philosophical and abstract. See רִישׁ שִׁי חֲבָא רְגֵתָהּ גִּיר קוּשְׁתָּא וּמִרְדּוּתָא וְרִנְיָה דְּמִרְדּוּתָא חֲבָא שׁוּרְיָא גִּיר וְחֵן שְׁרִירָא רְגֵתָהּ דְּמִרְדּוּתָא. ‘צִיפּוּתָא דִּין דְּמִרְדּוּתָא חֲבָא רְגֵתָהּ’ ‘for the top of what it desires is truth and discipline and the concern of discipline is love’ and שׁוּרְיָא גִּיר וְחֵן שְׁרִירָא רְגֵתָהּ דְּמִרְדּוּתָא ‘for its beginning is a true desire for discipline; the concern of discipline is love.’<sup>17</sup> For the message carried in (a), cf. ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ Pr 1.7. But ἀρχὴ .. αὐτῆς here can be analysed as a complete NP, thus the *s*, ‘its beginning is ..,’ or part of the structure <NP - gen. pron. - Art. - Adj.>, then ‘its true beginning is .. desire for education.’ Cf. SSG § 37 **bbc**, p. 455 in particular.

Besides, the lexeme ἀρχὴ here does not appear to signify the initial or early phase of engagement with or learning of Wisdom, but “*that which is fundamental and of prime importance*” (GELS s.v. 5).<sup>18</sup> Our author does not speak anywhere of τέλος σοφίας.

ἀληθεστάτη] Though in the superlative degree in form, it is elative, intensifying; cf. SSG § 23 **bc**.

παιδείας] The selection of the gen. case is due to the fact that the underlying verb ἐπιθυμέω often takes its *o* in the genitive. On this question, see SSG § 22 **d**.

6.18) ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς,  
προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας,

*Love is the observance of its laws,  
and paying attention to the laws ensures immortality.*

αὐτῆς] = τῆς σοφίας. The logico-semantic relationship between νόμοι and σοφία is most likely topical, i.e. laws concerning wisdom. Cf. SSG § 22 **v** (xi), e.g. ὁ νόμος τοῦ πάσχα ‘the law pertaining to the Pascha’ Ex 12.43. Is the

<sup>17</sup> רִישׁ שִׁי חֲבָא is grammatically problematic. Given its delayed position it is hardly an attributive adjective of the preceding שׁוּרְיָא, whereas it is more unlikely an attributive adj. of the following רְגֵתָהּ because of the gender discord and its fronting.

<sup>18</sup> Scarpata (I 389) opines that it means either “fondamento” or “inizio.”

author alluding to **וּבְכָל-נֶפֶשׁ וּבְכָל-מְאֹדָה** Dt 6.5 and **וְאֶהְיֶה לְרֵעֶךָ כְּמוֹתִי** Lv 19.18, the two commandments, which would subsequently be presented by Rabbi Jesus as the greatest (Mt 22.36-40)? **ס** uses, however, the sg., **הַמִּוֶּסֶד**.

With “love for her” Winston adds **αὐτῆς** to **ἀγάπη** as well, which is unnecessary. (18a) presents how the important notion called **ἀγάπη** and introduced in vs. 17 is to be understood; it is not a question of affection or emotion, but an attitude manifested through **ἀγαπάω**, “to display respect for and authority of” (*GELS* s.v. 2).<sup>19</sup>

**προσοχή δὲ νόμων**] a case of objective genitive, cf. **προσέχετε** [Impv.] **νόμον θεοῦ** Is 1.10. Likewise **βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας**, though, for some reason unknown to us, the ancient translators found **βεβαίωσις** difficult to handle: **ס** **סוּכָּלָא** ‘understanding,’ **ש** **בּוּיָנָא** ‘intelligence,’ and **℣** uses *custoditio* for both **τήρησις** and **προσοχή**.

Larcher (428) holds that, by selecting the pl. of **νόμος**, a phenomenon rare<sup>20</sup> in SG, the author wants to present “les préceptes de la Sagesse comme les lois régissant un royaume spirituel qui transcende les royautés terrestres.”

**ἀφθαρσίας**] According to Reider (105) **ἀφθαρσία** “means literally ‘incorruption’,” but, whatever he means with “literally,” it refers to both moral and physical, bodily features, and in LXX always the former. But cf. *GELS* s.v. **φθείρω** 1 “to damage physically, disfigure” and 3 “to morally corrupt.” See also *GELS* s.v. **φθοά**.

6.19) **ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ**.

*Immortality leads to proximity to God.*

**ἀφθαρσία**] **ס** carries on the theme of immortality out of a different perspective: **וְעֵבְרָא דְּלֹא תִבָּלָא** ‘and the incorruptible deeds.’

**ποιεῖ**] On the construction <**ποιέω** + inf.> in the sense of “to cause, compel though not necessarily against one’s will”<sup>21</sup> see *GELS* s.v. **I 14** as illustrated by **ποιεῖ λαλεῖν** ‘it makes talk’ 1E 3.20, where also the *s* of the inf. is missing.

**θεοῦ**] **Ἐγγύς** is one of several adverbs which govern a genitive as in **οἱ ἐγγὺς τοῦ βασιλέως** Es 1.14. For details, see *SSG* § 22 s. Clarke (48) is right in saying that this proximity is not physical in nature, but likeness, what is appropriate to a man created by God **בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדִמוּתֵנוּ** (Gn 1.26). So Siegfried (26): “Gott=ähnlich=sein.”

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Larcher (428): “un amour éclairé et délibéré, résultant d’une connaissance et d’une affinité croissantes. .. la fidélité pratique est essentielle à l’amour que Dieu réclame.” On the notion of **ἀγάπη** in BG, cf. Paeslack 1954 and Muraoka 2020.89-94.

<sup>20</sup> See also *GELS* s.v. **νόμος** **I c**. Note **ἐν βιβλίῳ νόμων** Μωυσῆ 4K 14.6 (H **בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה-מִשְׁנָה**).

<sup>21</sup> “though not .. will” is absent in the current edition of *GELS*.



6.20) ἐπιθυμία ἄρα σοφίας ἀνάγει ἐπὶ βασιλείαν.

*Hence appetite for wisdom leads (you) up to kingship.*

ἄρα] instead of γὰρ preserved in many MSs. The former is superior in concluding a six-part rhetorical device known as *sorites* that started off in vs. 17.

βασιλείαν] not quite “kingdom” (Holmes, Reider, and *NETS*).

6.21) εἰ οὖν ἤδεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνοις καὶ σκήπτροις, τύραννοι λαῶν,  
τιμήσατε σοφίαν, ἵνα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσητε.

*If you, therefore, enjoy thrones and sceptres, o rulers of nations,  
value wisdom, so that you could rule for ever.*

ἐπὶ] Another instance of <ἡδομαι ἐπὶ τινι> is ἦσθετο ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς 4M 8.4, where the *s* is a τύραννοι gazing at four young men. In CG the verb displays a great diversity of rections, including <+ ἐπὶ τινι> as in ἐπὶ τε τοῖς ἐμοῖς καλοῖς .. ἡδεται ‘he enjoys .. my good fortune’ Xen. Cyr. 8.4.11.<sup>22</sup> Since Xenophon uses ἀγάλλεται as coordinate, Scarpata (I 391) thinks that ἡδομαι here is used as a synonym of it, and offers “se vi compiacete.”

σκήπτροις] **Σ** and **Σh** add **אֲנִיכֵי מַלְכֻת** ‘of kingship,’ what is superfluous in view of the following **אֲנִיכֵי יָדָא** ‘o tyrants!’.

τύραννοι] The context speaks against the pejorative meaning, ‘tyrants, dictators.’

τιμήσατε σοφίαν] cf. τὴν σοφίαν τιμήσασα προήχθη Pr 6.8c. The Gk verb here, as Larcher (432) thinks, might mean “to show respect by practising the teaching of Wisdom.” Note Scarpata (I 377) “honorate.”

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] Reider (105) justly wonders if this is a typically biblical hyperbolic expression or alludes to “the immortality supposed to attend on just deeds and merciful actions.” In vs. 20 the author is turning to kings and rulers, leaving the theme of ἀφθαρσία, what could apply to everybody. Thus we would opt for the first analysis.

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσητε] found attached in some MSs inclusive of some major ones to ζήσεσθε at Pr 9.6a, an addition judged by Rahlfs to be an intrusion from our document.

6.22) τί δέ ἐστιν σοφία καὶ πῶς ἐγένετο, ἀπαγγελῶ  
καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψω ὑμῖν μυστήρια,  
ἀλλὰ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς γενέσεως ἐξιχνιάσω  
καὶ θήσω εἰς τὸ ἐμφανὲς τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῆς  
καὶ οὐ μὴ παροδεύσω τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

<sup>22</sup> For details see LSJ s.v.

*Now, what wisdom is and how it emerged I shall tell  
and I shall not hide mysteries from you,  
but I shall trace (it) from the beginning of (its) emergence  
and I shall bring its knowledge into the open  
and I shall never pass the truth over.*

ἐγένετο] One Gk MS adds μοι. Namely, how Solomon came to possess the wisdom. Such a use of γίνομαι occurs in LXX, e.g. ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτῷ κτήνη προβάτων Ge 26.14, καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ γῆ Φαραω ib. 47.20. Although such a thought is not implausible, the omission of the pronoun would be unlikely, as Larcher (435) holds, if it were Solomon's intention to disclose his personal experience. Note (22c): ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενέσεως, which can be rewritten as πῶς ἐγένετο ἐν ἀρχῇ 'how it emerged at the beginning.'

ἀποκρύψω] This is a rare instance of ἀποκρύπτω + τι (pers.), for which the usual construction is <+ ἀπό τινος>, e.g. μὴ ἀποκρύψῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου Ps. 118.19. The same is true where the verb is passive as in Ἀπεκρύβη ἡ ὁδός μου ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ..; Is 40.27 and οὐ μὴ ἀποκρυβῇ ἀπὸ σοῦ οὐθέν Je 39.17. So with κρύπτω as in Μὴ κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβρααμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ; Ge 18.17. The dative is best analysed as that of disadvantage, on which see SSG § 22 **wg**.<sup>23</sup>

γενέσεως] is a verbal noun, alluding back to ἐγένετο (a), and not the creation of the universe. Cf. *℣ nativitatis*. According to Pr 8.22ff. the wisdom preceded the universe. Hübner (28) writes "Kaum auf πῶς ἐγένετο bezüglich (es fehlt αὐτῆς), sondern wohl Schöpfung," but translates "will ich **ihr** nachspüren." The whole pericope is about Wisdom, and it should be possible mentally to supply a preposition referring to it. Likewise μυστήρια (b) must be about mysteries pertaining to Wisdom.

ἐξιχνιάσω] Ἐξιχνιάζω is unattested prior to SG. However, ἐξιχνεύω, a synonym, which is also used in SG, is used prior to it.

τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῆς] Probably an objective genitive, i.e. 'what I know of it.' Cf. ὅσα τέ ἐστιν κρυπτά καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔγνων· ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία 7.21.

παροδεύσω] On this verb, see above at 1.8. Four times it governs an acc. *o*, always signifying "to pass over deliberately," not "to fail to notice."<sup>24</sup> Larcher (437), taking the etymologically affiliated συνοδεύω in the next verse, prefers the etymological meaning of παροδεύω, but his rendering "Je

<sup>23</sup> LSG s.v. **I 1** mentions an instance of <ἀποκρύπτω + τι(ν) τι>: ἀπέκρυψεν δέ μοι ἵππους 'he hid away my horses' Hom. *Il* 11.718, i.e. to prevent me from using my own horses.

SG attests to another structure, <κρύπτω + τινά τι>, e.g. τίς γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ κρύπτων σε βουλὴν; see also ib. 15.18, a construction known to CG as well, e.g. οὔτε σε ἀποκρύψω .. τὴν ἑμαντοῦ οὐσίαν 'I will neither conceal .. the quantity of my property from you' Hdt. 7.28.1.

<sup>24</sup> This can apply to μὴ παροδευσάτω ἡμῶς ἄνθος ἔαρος 'let's not miss flowers of spring.'

ne passerai certes pas à côté de la vérité” does not make much sense. According to Scarpat (I 393) this metaphorical use is unknown to CG.

For the general message of the verse, cf. ἀναγγελῶ δέ σοι, ἄκουέ μου· ἃ δὴ ἐώρακα, ἀναγγελῶ σοι, ἃ σοφοὶ ἐροῦσιν καὶ οὐκ ἔκρυψαν πατέρας αὐτῶν Jb 15.17f.

- 6.23) οὔτε μὴν φθόνῳ τετηκότι συνοδεύσω,  
ὅτι οὗτος οὐ κοινωνήσῃ σοφίᾳ.

*Nor with one who has become powerless against malevolent envy I  
shall ever walk,  
because such could have nothing to share with Wisdom.*

μὴν] an emphatic, asseverative particle.

τετηκότι φθόνῳ] The Pf. tense of the verb, τήκω, speaks against translations such as “consumptive envy” (*NETS*), “pining envy” (Winston, Holmes, and Reider), “mit zehrendem Neide” (Fichtner, sim. Siegfried), and “l’envie desséchante” (*BJ*), and *℣ cum invidia tabescente*. This seems to suggest to us that τετηκότι here is not an attributively used ptc., but a substantivised one with φθόνῳ as an instrumental dative qualifying τετηκότι.<sup>25</sup> Cf. τακῆσονται ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν ‘they will dissolve in their injustices’ Ez 4.17; δὸς αὐτοῖς δειλίαν καὶ τῆξον θράσος ἰσχύος αὐτῶν ‘Give them cowardice and dissolve the boldness of their strength’ 1M 4.32.

Quite a few scholars take φθόνῳ as the *o* of συνοδεύσω. Both the meaning of τήκω and the its Pf. tense speak against such an interpretation. Cp. “chi si consuma nell’invidia” (Scarpat I 377) and see her extensive discussion (393f.).

Winston (160) refers to a number of ancient Greek philosophers, including Philo, who spoke very negatively on the vice of envy (φθόνος).

συνοδεύσω] Opposed to παροδεύσω (vs. 22), hence οὔτε instead of οὐ. Though the two verbs are semantically distinct from each other, the formal affinity between them meant not a little to our author.

- 6.24) πλῆθος δὲ σοφῶν σωτηρία κόσμου,  
καὶ βασιλεὺς φρόνιμος εὐστάθεια δῆμου.

*The abundance of wise people is a salvation for the world,  
and a prudent king (guarantees) the stability of a nation.*

σωτηρία] SG does not use this noun, used ca. 150 times, in the strictly religious sense as in NTG. Here it is parallel to εὐστάθεια.

<sup>25</sup> So *SD* “Mit einem, der sich vor Neid verzehrt,” though their alternative rendering is not convincing: “Mit sich selbst verzehrendem Neid.” Besides, their analysis of the Pf. is debatable. Scarpat (I 393f.) is in agreement with us.

κόσμου] referring to the humanity rather than the universe. Cf. Larcher 439.

§ expresses explicitly the causal relationship between the *s* and *p* in (a) through the addition of the prep. **ב:** אֲנֹנִי דְּעֻלָּמָא וְהִי דְּהַכִּימָא וְהַסְוִיגָא הוֹן דְּהַכִּימָא ‘and in the abundance of sages is the salvation of the world.’<sup>26</sup> Cf. “bedeutet” (*SD*). In (b) εὐστάθεια has been converted to a verb, producing a verbal clause: אֶמְלֵךְ אֶמְלֵךְ אֶמְלֵךְ אֶמְלֵךְ ‘and a wise king establishes a people.’

6.25) ὥστε παιδεύεσθε τοῖς ῥήμασίν μου, καὶ ὠφεληθήσεσθε.

*Receive, therefore, instructions through what I say, and you will be benefited.*

ὥστε] An inferential particle equivalent to διὰ τοῦτο, ἄρα or οὖν. Mostly it is followed by a finite verb, and then it is clause-initial. Another instance in LXX is ὥστε εἴ σοι δοκεῖ βασανίζειν μὴ μιαιοφαγοῦντα, βασάνιζε ‘Hence, if you think it right to torture me for not eating defiled foods, torture!’ 4M 11.16. For details, see Muraoka 1973.210.

ὠφεληθήσεσθε] We fail to see how *SD* could grammatically justify its bracketed addition: “und ihr werdet (bleibenden) Nutzen haben!”, though the preceding Impv., παιδεύεσθε, is in the Pre. aspect. Note § וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁלָח וְתִשְׁלָח ‘and you will attain salvation.’

<sup>26</sup> Ed. Leiden prefers not to add the preposition.

## CHAPTER 7

- 7.1) Εἰμὶ μὲν καὶ γὰρ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος ἴσος ἅπασιν  
καὶ γηγενοῦς ἀπόγονος πρωτοπλάστου·  
καὶ ἐν κοιλίᾳ μητρὸς ἐγλύφην σὰρξ

*I also am a mortal human like everybody  
and a descendant of the first product of the earth;  
and I was carved as flesh in (my) mother's womb,*

In Chapters 7-9 we have King Solomon speaking.

πρωτοπλάστου] Πρωτόπλαστος, a hapax in Wi and unknown prior to LXX. It is a compound of πρῶτος and πλάσσω. Note καὶ ἐπλασεν (𐤇 𐤒𐤕𐤁𐤍) ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς Ge 2.7, what is alluded to with γηγενοῦς. Cf. also υἱὸς γηγενοῦς (𐤇 49.33 𐤍𐤕𐤁𐤍𐤁) Je 30.11 // ἄνθρωπος (𐤇 𐤕𐤁𐤍).

- 7.2) δεκαμηνιαίῳ χρόνῳ παγεῖς ἐν αἵματι  
ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἡδονῆς ὕπνῳ συνελθούσης.  
*during a ten-month period solidified in blood,  
out of a man's semen and the pleasure accompanying sleep.*

δεκαμηνιαίῳ] an adjective first attested in Greek.

ἡδονῆς ὕπνῳ συνελθούσης] a poetic, euphemism for what went on between the parents in bed.<sup>1</sup>

We totally agree with Larcher (447) and make ἡδονῆς subordinate to ἐκ, and not to σπέρματος, and συνελθούσης is attributively used, complementing ἡδονῆς.

- 7.3) καὶ ἐγὼ δὲ γενόμενος ἔσπασα τὸν κοινὸν ἀέρα  
καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁμοιοπαθῆ κατέπεσον γῆν  
πρώτην φωνὴν τὴν ὁμοίαν πᾶσιν ἴσα κλαίων·  
*And I, thus having come into being, inhaled the common air  
and fell on the earth, which feels the same (as with others),  
weeping with the first similar voice like everyone.*

τὸν κοινὸν ἀέρα] Sekine (1977.348) stresses that, *pace* Reider, κοινὸν here means “common to all humans,” not “common to animals as well.”

<sup>1</sup> By contrast, *NET*'s “intercourse” for “sleep” is straightforward.

Larcher (447f.) points out that the same idiom is also used by Plutarch, and that also in a description of a new-born baby.

ὁμοιοπαθῇ] The affinity is not between Solomon and the earth, but between him and all other human inhabitants on the earth.<sup>2</sup> The adj., being acc., qualifies γῆν.<sup>3</sup> The earth suffers from a baby dropping on it and that suffering is experienced with every new birth.<sup>4</sup> So Scarpat (II 89): “capitai in quella terra che ha per tutti le stesse sofferenze.”

πρώτην φωνήν] a cognate *o* as in ἔκλαυσαν κλαυθμὸν μέγαν Jd 21.2. The delayed τὴν has an advantage in that ὁμοίαν qualifies πρώτην φωνήν as a whole, not only φωνήν, as evidenced in שְׁלֹחַן שֶׁלֹּחַן לְדָמָא וְהָדָמָא לְדָמָא בְּכִיתָ בְּכִיתָ שְׁוִיָּאִית בְּכִיתָ ‘with the first voice, that which is similar to that of everyone, I cried in a similar way.’ Cf. 3.13 above.

ἴσα] n.pl. of ἴσος + dat. used adverbially as in CG, rather common in Jb, e.g. χόρτον ἴσα βουσὶν ἐσθίει ‘it eats grass like oxen’ Jb 40.15. See GELS s.v. 2 b and SSG § 23 gc. Though correctly recognising ἴσα as adverbial, Fichtner (28) subordinates πᾶσιν to ὁμοίαν, as shown in his translation: “den ersten allen gleichen Laut gleicherweise weinend.”<sup>5</sup> One could say φωνήν τὴν ὁμοίαν τῇ ἐμῇ, but not φωνήν τὴν ὁμοίαν ἐμοί. On the syntax of ὁμοίαν πᾶσιν, see above at 2.15.

Larcher’s rendering of (3c) reads: “car mon premier cri fut semblable à celui de tous, des pleurs également.” For this we would anticipate πρώτην φωνήν τὴν ὁμοίαν τῶν πάντων ἴσα κλαίων. Whilst CG uses n.pl.acc. ἴσα on its own and adverbially, in LXX we find only <ἴσα + dat.> as often as 12 times in Jb and once in Wi, e.g. χόρτον ἴσα βουσὶν ἐσθίει ‘they eat grass like oxen’ Jb 40.15.

7.4) ἐν σπαργάνοις ἀνετρέφην καὶ φροντίσιν.

*I was brought up with swaddling-bands and carefully nursed.*

φροντίσιν] It is difficult to say whether this dative is instrumental or dependent on the preceding ἐν; the intervening verb should be no hindrance for this analysis, yet another example of the highly frequent hyperbaton. שְׁלֹחַן seems to have adopted the second analysis, though the absence of the preposition is unnatural: אֶתְּרִיבִית אֶתְּרִיבִית בְּעִוְרָא בְּעִוְרָא ‘with swaddling-bands and care I was brought up.’ Sim. ⅆ: *in involumentis nutritus sum et curis magis.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. οὐκ ἔχοντες παραδείγματα ὁμοιοπαθῇ τοῖς πονηροῖς ‘they do not have within themselves patterns likely to react in the same way as the wicked would do’ Pl. *Rep.* 409b.

<sup>3</sup> A marginal note added in שְׁלֹחַן on ὁμοιοπαθῇ displays a slightly mechanical interpretation: “because it [= the earth] is also a recipient of pains as we are.”

<sup>4</sup> Larcher (448f.), though aware of this analysis, prefers another: “je suis tombé sur la terre où l’on souffre pareillement.”

<sup>5</sup> The verbatim rendering in SD is similar: “als erste Stimme die allen ähnliche gleicherweise weinend.”

7.5) οὐδεὶς γὰρ βασιλεὺς ἑτέραν ἔσχεν γενέσεως ἀρχήν,

*For no king had the beginning of his life different than this,*

βασιλεὺς] preferred by Ziegler to βασιλεων in many MSS, an example of οὐδεὶς or μηδεὶς used attributively and formally agreeing with a noun. Another example is ἐπ' οὐδενὶ λόγῳ 'over nothing' Am 6.13. Cf. SSG § 35, p. 440.

ἑτέραν] Here we have an instance of the sequence <ἕτερος - NP> (16x in SG) as against <NP - ἕτερος> (ca. 200x).<sup>6</sup>

γενέσεως] In GELS s.v. 2 "physical existence and living" we would add this example beside πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς γενέσεώς μου 'all my life so far' Ju 12.18.

7.6) μία δὲ πάντων εἴσοδος εἰς τὸν βίον ἔξοδος τε ἴση.

*everyone enters the life in one and the same way, and exits in the same way.*

ἔξοδος] on this noun applied to death, see above at 3.2.

7.7) διὰ τοῦτο εὐξάμην, καὶ φρόνησις ἐδόθη μοι·

ἐπεκαλεσάμην, καὶ ἦλθεν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας.

*Therefore I pleaded, and prudence was conferred on me;*

*I appealed, and a spirit of wisdom came to me.*

διὰ τοῦτο] What the pronoun refers to is not evident. According to Siegfried (489, f.n. e), because nobody comes into the world with wisdom. Whereas that is a generally valid truth, we are not certain that our author said so in the preceding verses.

εὐξάμην] The pleading may have taken the form of prayer, for which, however, the author could have written προσευξάμην, though we do admit that one of the meanings of εὐχομαι is "to pray" (GELS s.v. 2) and is used to translate לַחֲסֹדֶה 9 times in LXX. This equally holds for the parallel ἐπεκαλεσάμην. At 13.17 προσευχόμενος has a v.l. ευχομενος preserved in quite a few MSS. In the temple the new king Solomon said: καὶ δώσεις τῷ δούλῳ σου καρδίαν ἀκούειν καὶ διακρίνειν τὸν λαόν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ συνίειν ἀνὰ μέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ 1Kg 3.9, and we read that God was pleased that Solomon had asked for (ἤσπῃ ἡτήσατο) this, not prayed for it.

7.8) προέκρινα αὐτὴν σκῆπτρων καὶ θρόνων

καὶ πλοῦτον οὐδὲν ἡγησάμην ἐν συγκρίσει αὐτῆς·

*I gave it preference over sceptres and thrones*

*and did not think very much of wealth in comparison with it.*

<sup>6</sup> For a full listing of the first sequence, see SSG p. 447, f.n. 4.

σκήπτρων καὶ θρόνων] This is a rare instance of the genitive of comparison used with a verb, SSG § 22 g, 23 d. Scarpat (II 99) attributes the gen. to the preformative *προ-* of the verb in question, referring to Pl. *Ap.* 35b and Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.19. It is true that proclitics could play a role in the selection of the gender of the *ο* of compound verbs, as we have seen above in ἡδονῆς ὑπὸ συνελθοῦσης 7.2. It should also be noted that a non-compound, simplex verb can take its *ο* in the genitive with comparative value as in πῦρ ἴσχυεν ἐν ὕδατι τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως ‘fire, in water, exceeded its own strength’ Wi 19.20. Note a fluctuation between φωτὶ συγκρινομένη ‘compared with light’ (+ dat.) Wi 7.29 and our συγκρίσει αὐτῆς (+ gen.).

οὐδὲν] an *ο* complement, as in δόξαν ἡγεῖται ὅτι κίβδηλα πλάσσει ‘he considers it a glorious thing that he moulds counterfeits’ Wi 15.9. On the notion of *ο* complement, see above at 3.2.

συγκρίσει] *Pace* Scarpat (II 99) the sense “comparison” of σύγκρισις is already known to CG. LSJ s.v. II mentions an instance in Philemo of 4th/3rd cent. BCE. The underlining verb συγκρίνω is used in the sense of “to compare” by Aristotle in *Rh* 1368<sup>a</sup> 21.

In 8.5 wisdom is compared with wealth.

7.9) οὐδὲ ὁμοίωσα αὐτῇ λίθον ἀτίμητον,  
ὅτι ὁ πᾶς χρυσὸς ἐν ὄψει αὐτῆς ψάμμος ὀλίγη,  
καὶ ὥς πηλὸς λογισθήσεται ἄργυρος ἐναντίον αὐτῆς·

*Nor did I consider any priceless stone as valuable as it  
because any amount of gold is a little bit of sand when compared with it  
and silver would be considered as clay before it.*

ἀτίμητον] The sense of this adjective is equivocal. In CG it means “unhonoured,” thus “wertlos” (Fichtner), but *Š* has אִמְּךָ תִּרְיָקָה ‘expensive.’<sup>7</sup> Note also τὴν ἀτίμητον πολιτείαν ‘the priceless citizenship’ 3M 3.23.

ὁ πᾶς χρυσὸς] i.e. ‘the entire amount of gold owned.’ Alternatively the phrase may be synonymous with πᾶς χρυσός ‘every piece of gold’ as in καιρὸς τῷ παντὶ πράγματι ‘there is a season for every matter’ Ec 3.17 // παντὶ τῷ ποιήματι *וְהָאֵם הַשְׁמַחֲהָ לְכָל הַיּוֹם לְכָל הַיּוֹם*. Cf. SSG § 38 *ia*.

χρυσὸς .. ἄργυρος] In early BH texts the sequence <כָּהָן .. אֲרָגוֹן> = <ἀργυρος .. χρυσός> is the norm.<sup>8</sup> In a data-base compiled by Dr A. Thompson of Cambridge<sup>9</sup> consisting of ca. 600 examples in early Greek texts the reverse sequence <ἀργυρος .. χρυσός> is somewhat commoner in later periods, though not half as consistent as in BH.

<sup>7</sup> Most likely so also *Š* אִמְּךָ תִּרְיָקָה ‘priceless.’

<sup>8</sup> See BDB s.v. כָּהָן II. See also Muraoka 1992.43f., where it was pointed out that in earlier BH texts אֲרָגוֹן precede כָּהָן, e.g. אֲרָגוֹן-כָּהָן > *Θ* πρόβατα καὶ μόσχοι Gn 12.18.

<sup>9</sup> A private e-mail (17.2.2022).



ἐν ὄψει αὐτῆς] “in her sight” (*NETS*), a rendering reflecting the alleged personification of Wisdom as if it had eyes. The parallelism between this phrase and ἐναντίον αὐτῆς is shown in *§* through the same rendering repeated, מִן־מַעַן. The same Gk phrase occurs also at 3.4,<sup>10</sup> 8.11, and 15.19.

ὀλίγη] In contrast to its antonym, πολὺς, this quantifying adjective shows in SG no great statistical difference between <ὀλίγος - NP> (7×) and <NP - ὀλίγος> (9×). See *SSG* § 37 *baaa*, p. 448.

Reider mentions GnR 35.9.16, where כִּי־טוֹבָה הַמָּהָר מִפְּנִינִים וְכָל־פְּצִיִּים בְּיֹשֶׁר לֹא Pr 8.11 and הָיָה יָקָרָה הֵיא מִפְּנִינִים וְכָל־פְּצִיִּים לֹא יֹשֶׁרִיב. 3.15 are quoted.

7.10) ὑπὲρ ὑγίειαν καὶ εὐμορφίαν ἠγάπησα αὐτὴν  
καὶ προειλόμην αὐτὴν ἀντὶ φωτὸς ἔχειν,  
ὅτι ἀκοίμητον τὸ ἐκ ταύτης φέγγος.

*I liked it more than good health and good looks  
and I preferred to have it instead of light  
because its brightness is inexhaustible.*<sup>11</sup>

ὑπὲρ] On the comparative value of <ὑπέρ + acc.> see *GELS* s.v. *II*.

προειλόμην] supplemented by an infinitival phrase; a few more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. προαιρέω<sup>12</sup> 2 ad finem: Pr 21.25, 2M 6.9, 3M 2.30. In each of those four cases the *s* of προαιρέω is made to decide whether to act as indicated by an infinitival clause or not. Solomon, of course, did not live in a pitch-dark palace, but he concluded that, in order to live a truly meaningful life as king, he badly needed a non-physical light that would never go out. With his translation Larcher (452, 455f.) represents an alternative analysis: “j’ai même choisi de l’avoir de préférence à la lumière.”

αὐτὴν here is not the *o* of προειλόμην, but of ἔχειν.<sup>13</sup> This verb is used as a Stoic, technical term to denote free choice, on which see Scarpat II 100f.

ἀντὶ] This prep. comes under *GELS* s.v. 5 “as a substitute for,” as in Jacob saying to Rachel μὴ ἀντὶ θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἶμι ..; Ge 30.2. Cf. Scarpat “scelsi lei come mia luce” (II 89).

ταύτης] In this document Wisdom is often referred to by means of this fem.sg. demonstrative pronoun, a likely indication of the author’s focus and concentration on it. So also αὕτη 7.29, 10.1, 5, 6 for instance.

<sup>10</sup> Where Scarpat (I 231) rightly points out that the phrase is paralleled to ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τινος two verses earlier.

<sup>11</sup> The entry for ἀκοίμητος in *GELS* need be corrected: its sense is “unlikely to become inactive.”

<sup>12</sup> This verb is mostly used in the middle voice in SG, the only exception occurring in Ju 13.15.

<sup>13</sup> *BJ*’s “je l’ai préférée à la lumière” is ambiguous.

- 7.11) ἤλθεν δέ μοι τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὁμοῦ πάντα μετ' αὐτῆς  
καὶ ἀναρίθμητος πλοῦτος ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῆς·

*There came to me together all good things with it  
with innumerable wealth in its hands.*

δέ] a particle underlining Solomon's surprise on obtaining not only wisdom, but also abundant material goods. Solomon would subsequently hear from God: הָיָה עֲשִׂיתִי כְּדִבְרֶיךָ הַנֶּה נָתַתִּי לְךָ לֵב חָכָם וְנָבוֹן אֲשֶׁר כָּמוֹךָ לֹא־הָיָה אֲשֶׁר כָּמוֹךָ וְאֶת־שְׂאֵלָתְךָ נָתַתִּי לְךָ גַּם־עֲשָׂרָה גַם־כְּבוֹד אֲשֶׁר לְפָנֶיךָ וְאֶת־רִיחֶךָ לֹא־יָקוּם כָּמוֹךָ: וְגַם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־שְׂאֵלָתְךָ נָתַתִּי לְךָ גַּם־עֲשָׂרָה גַם־כְּבוֹד אֲשֶׁר לְפָנֶיךָ לֹא־הָיָה כָמוֹךָ אִישׁ בְּמַלְכִּים כָּל־יְמֵיךָ 1Kg 3.12f.

With “et ses mains m’apportaient ..” Larcher (456) supplies a verb in (11b).<sup>14</sup> So does Hübner: “war.” The second line is equivalent to a Heb. circumstantial clause that often appears as a nominal clause. E.g. הָיָה רִבְקָה יָצְאת עֲלִישְׁכָּמָה Gn 24.45. Our author would be familiar with such a feature in SG.

- 7.12) εὐφράνθην δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἡγεῖται σοφία,  
ἡγνόουν δὲ αὐτὴν γενέτιν εἶναι τούτων.

*I was overjoyed at everything, because wisdom controls all,  
though I did not know it to be their producer.*

In **§** we find a distinct message: אֶתְבַּסְּמַת בְּהֵלֵין כְּלֵהֵין דְּחִכְמָתָא מְדַבְּרָא לְהֵין וְלֹא יָדַע הָיִית דְּקִדְמָא הֵי מִן כָּל אֶתְבַּסְּמַת בְּהֵלֵין כְּלֵהֵין דְּחִכְמָתָא מְדַבְּרָא לְהֵין וְלֹא יָדַע הָיִית דְּקִדְמָא הֵי מִן כָּל ‘I was overjoyed at all these things that wisdom is governing them and I did not know that it was prior to all.’

ἡγνόουν] Engel justifies the selection of the past Pf. in his German translation: “ich hatte aber nicht erkannt” as against “ich freute mich” (Aor. εὐφράνθην) by suggesting “Das Impf. ἡγνόουν bezeichnet den Zustand der Unkenntnis zur Zeit der „Wahl“ der Weisheit.” Then “ich wußte nicht” would have been much simpler. Cp. Hübner “Nur wußte ich zunächst nicht.” Ἀγνοέω has two distinct meanings: “to be unaware, ignorant” and “to fail to realise”: *GELS* s.v. **3 a-b**. The selection of the Impf. here suits the first. Cp. ἡγνόησεν τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτὸν Wi 15.11. Cp. “j’ignorais” with “je me suis réjoui” (*BJ*). Larcher (458-60) appears to be happy with “j’ignorais.”

γενέτιν] surely superior to γενεσιν ‘emergence’ in Ben Sira and others, the latter chosen by Swete.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Scarpat’s (II 89) “e ricchezza incalcolabile è nelle sue mani” is odd for the Pres. tense.

<sup>15</sup> Fichtner (30) states that it is not a hapax, since it is used by Aglaïas (1st cent. CE), but our document had been written earlier.

It is more sensible to view γενεσιν as a scribal error from γενετιν than to suggest, as Siegfried does (489, f.n. h), “abstractum pro concreto,” which is unknown of this common lexeme in Greek.

- 7.13) ἀδόλως τε ἔμαθον ἀφθόνως τε μεταδίδωμι,  
τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀποκρύπτομαι·

*Without any ulterior motive I learned, and I share ungrudgingly,  
I do not conceal its riches,*

ἀδόλως] We see now that our interpretation agrees with that of Scarpat with her “Senza secondi fini” (II 89).

ἀποκρύπτομαι] In a similar context the teacher announces ἀπαγγελῶ καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψω ὑμῖν μυστήρια 6.22, using the active voice of ἀποκρύπτω. In view of his stance expressed as ἀφθόνως the selection of the middle voice here could be deliberate, i.e. “for my own benefit.” He may be denying, for instance, that his teaching activity is basically an important source of income.

- 7.14) ἀνεκλιπῆς γὰρ θησαυρός ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις,  
ὃν οἱ κτησάμενοι πρὸς θεὸν ἐστείλαντο φιλίαν  
διὰ τὰς ἐκ παιδείας δωρεὰς συσταθέντες.

*for it is inexhaustible treasure for people;  
those who obtain it create friendship with God,  
commended on account of the gifts obtained through education.*

ἀνεκλιπῆς] A closely affiliated idiom is found in πλοῦτος ἀνεκλιπῆς 8.18 and ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Lk 12.33. Both ἀνεκλιπῆς and ἀνέκλειπτος are derived from ἐκλείπω in its sense of “to cease to exist” (GELS s.v. **II 1 a**). Cf. 𐤀𐤋𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤁 ‘which is imperishable’ = 𐤏𐤍𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤁.

Whether or not the position of the adjective before, and not after, θησαυρός, is because the author is thinking of a contrast with its antonym, ἐπικλῆς, which is unattested in LXX and occurs only rarely in CG, is difficult to say.<sup>16</sup>

οἱ κτησάμενοι] Fichtner’s (30) “die ihn gebrauchten,” Siegfried’s (490) “die sich seiner bedienten,” Larcher’s (456) “l’ont exploité,” and Reider’s (111) “they that use” are dependent on a v.l., οἱ χρησάμενοι.<sup>17</sup> We do not know whether Ziegler’s decision was due to the fact that <χράομαι ‘to use’ + dat.>, not <+ acc.>, is the standard syntagm.<sup>18</sup> An exception is noted in GELS s.v. **II 2**: ἃς καὶ ἠξιώσαν οἱ παρακομίζοντες μὴ χρῆσθαι εἰς θυσίαν

<sup>16</sup> It is not as obvious as in a case cited by Bergson (1960.67): ὥς χαλεπὴν καὶ μακρὰν ὁδὸν .. ῥαδίαν καὶ βραχεῖαν ὁδὸν .. ‘how hard and long .. a short and easy road’ Xen. Mem. 2.1.29.

<sup>17</sup> Though not noted by Ziegler nor by Engel (SD II 2142) this v.l. is also attested to in 𐤀𐤋𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤁 𐤏𐤍𐤁 ‘those who used.’

<sup>18</sup> This is ignored by Engel (SD II 2142), who concludes that οἱ χρησάμενοι is superior.

‘which the transporters did not think it appropriate to use for a sacrifice’ 2M 4.19.<sup>19</sup> See also an argument by Scarpat (II 107f.) for *χρησάμενοι*.

*ἔστειλάντο*] a gnomic Aor., on which see *SGS* § 28 **dc**.

*πρὸς θεὸν*] Referring to *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν* 1Th 1.8 Fichtner (30) points out that the prepositional phrase is qualifying *φιλίαν*. Apart from the fact that such a use of a prepositional phrase is quite common,<sup>20</sup> not refined to *πρὸς* the separation of the two constituents makes it more likely that the phrase is expanding *ἔστειλάντο*.

*ἔστειλάντο*] Reider (111) analyses the Aor. as gnomic in value, on which cf. *SSG* § 28 **dc**.

*δωρεὰς*] Most likely referring to skills and knowledge acquired through education rather than material acquisitions. By contrast, Reider (111) thinks of good works performed by well educated people.

*συσταθέντες*] Under the sense “to commend” of *συνίστημι* *GELS* I 5 mentions, as Reider (111) does, 1M 12.43, though there the commendation results in material gains, *καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δόματα*. Note also the passive form in *ὁ δὲ συσταθεὶς τῷ βασιλεῖ* 2M 4.24. Both instances are concerned with personnel changes.

7.15) Ἐμοὶ δὲ δόξη ὁ θεὸς εἰπεῖν κατὰ γνώμην  
καὶ ἐνθυμηθῆναι ἀξίως τῶν δεδομένων,  
ὅτι αὐτὸς καὶ τῆς σοφίας ὁδηγός ἐστιν  
καὶ τῶν σοφῶν διορθωτής.

*May God allow me to say according to a sound opinion  
and contemplate in a way that fits what I have been given,  
because He is also a guide of wisdom  
and a leader of the wise.*

Ἐμοί] The longer form and up front is probably indicative of Solomon’s modesty. Cf. *SSG* § 7 **c**.

*κατὰ γνώμην*] rather vague on its own. Exactly the same phrase occurs in 2M 9.20.<sup>21</sup> In both cases *℣* reads *ex sententia*, which is synonymous with *ܫܠܝ ܢܝܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܐܠܗܐ* ‘as I please.’<sup>22</sup> In LSJ s.v. *γνώμη* II 2 we read “*will, disposition*,

<sup>19</sup> *ἄς* could be an *o* of *παρακομίζοντες*.

<sup>20</sup> In the above-quoted 1Th 1.8 no other analysis is possible, given the repeated, definite article, but note an anarthrous construction as in *τὸν γογγυσμὸν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ* ‘your grumble against God’ Ex 16.7 and *σάλπιγξ πολέμων εἰς τροπὴν* ‘a trumpet for retreat on battlefield’ Si 26.27 ¶. For more examples, see *SSG* § 44.

<sup>21</sup> Read “20” instead of “19” in *GELS* s.v. 2 **c**.

<sup>22</sup> Siegfried (30) offers “nach seinem Sinn,” writing in a f.n. “sc. αὐτοῦ; beachte den par. memb.,” though we fail to see what constitutes the parallel member. This Syriac evidence is not mentioned by Winston, whose rendering (172) reads “with his wish.” In a short clause in which both a speaker and his interlocutor are mentioned the latter is most unlikely to remain in the background.

*inclination*,” citing κατὰ γνώμην ἐμήν ‘to my satisfaction’ Eur. *Andr.* 737 and ἐμπιμπλὰς ἀπάντων τὴν γνώμην ‘having satisfied the expectations of every one of them’ Xen. *An.* 1.7.8. Otherwise we may suggest an alternative interpretation as translated above.

τῶν δεδομένων] v.l. λεγομένων = **𐤌 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕** and **𐤌 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕**.

The gen. case has been selected, since ἄξιος often governs a gen. as in εὑρεν αὐτοὺς ἄξιους ἑαυτοῦ ‘He found them worthy of (being linked) with Himself’ Wi 3.5.<sup>23</sup> Thus, *pace* Hübner’s (93) “würdig über das, was mir gegeben wurde, nachdenke,” which has nothing to do with the subject-matter of contemplation.

αὐτὸς] **𐤌 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕** underlines that it is none other than God who serves as the guide of the wisdom. However, καὶ is left out;<sup>24</sup> it is not only the wisdom that is under His guidance. In **𐤌**, by contrast, we read: **𐤏𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕** ‘He is also the guide of wisdom.’

τῆς σοφίας ὁδηγός] a gen. phrase indicating engagement as in μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος ‘messenger of great counsel’ Is 9.6; δυνατοὶ πολέμου ‘able warriors’ 2C 17.18.<sup>25</sup> Larcher’s view that we have here an objective gen. is implausible, for the *ο* of ὁδηγέω is normally personal as in ὁδηγήσει με ἐν ταῖς πράξεσί μου σωφρόνως Wi 9.11, where the *s* is σοφία.

7.16) ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ λόγοι ἡμῶν  
παῦσα τε φρόνησις καὶ ἐργατειῶν ἐπιστήμη.

*For in His hand are both we and our words,  
and every thought and understanding of what is done.*

ἐν .. χειρὶ αὐτοῦ] a well-known Hebraistic phrase with “hand” as a symbol and source of strength.

ἐργατειῶν] This hapax probably means “His works, what He does and makes.” **𐤌** and **𐤌 𐤏𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕** ‘works’ and **𐤌 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕** *operum* are as vague. Some scholars, e.g. Reider and Siegfried, understand the word in the sense of human, manual skills and handicrafts. Cf. καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῖον σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ Ex 31.3, where God is speaking of Bezalel. But in this and the following verses the author is narrowly focusing on God the Creator. With his “toute compétence technique” Larcher (463, 466f.) argues for “des œuvres réalisées selon des techniques précises.” Note the use of the pl. as against the sg. ἐργασία with reference to professional, manual labour in Wi 13.19 and 14.20.

<sup>23</sup> On adverbs governing a noun or pronoun in the gen. case, see *SSG* § 22 s.

<sup>24</sup> So in *BJ*: “il est lui-même le guide de la Sagesse.”

<sup>25</sup> On this matter, see *SSG* § 22 v (xvii).

τε] Our author is varying < καὶ A .. καὶ B > to < A τε .. καὶ B >. Both mean “both A and B.” Another example of the latter is ὁ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Ge 3.1.<sup>26</sup>

7.17) αὐτὸς γὰρ μοι ἔδωκεν τῶν ὄντων γινῶσιν ἀψευδῇ  
εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων,

*For it is He who gave me correct knowledge of all that exists  
to enable me to grasp the formation of the universe and how its com-  
ponents operate,*

εἰδέναι] The inf. clause can be analysed as qualifying the preceding γινῶ-  
σιν, ‘knowledge with which to know ..’ (so SSG § 30 **bd**) or loosely final-  
resultative in value, “so that I could know ..”.

σύστασιν] Σύστασις is an action noun of συνίστημι as in ὥστε δυσφη-  
μίας ἐν τοῖς τόποις συνίστασθαι ‘so that malicious reports arose in those  
places’ 3M 2.26.

σύστασιν κόσμου] Scholars, e.g. Fichtner (30) and Reider (112), drew our  
attention to the use of the phrase by Plato in *Tim.* 32c. Holmes (546) sees  
here a manifestation of the author’s contemporary, Hellenistic, scientific view  
of cosmology, chronology in (18a), astronomy (18b), and zoology (20a).

ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων] For another instance of this scientific observation,  
see 19.18.<sup>27</sup> In *Tim.* 48b Plato mentions four elements (στοιχεῖα), i.e. fire  
and water, air and earth, of which the universe consisted, an idea introduced  
by an older philosopher, Empedocles.

7.18) ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος καὶ μεσότητα χρόνων,  
τροπῶν ἀλλαγὰς καὶ μεταβολὰς καιρῶν,  
*the beginning and end and middle of times,  
the alternation of solstices and the change of seasons,*

For (a) Engel (2142) points out that in the Egyptian and Greek world  
a year was divided into three periods: spring (ἀρχή), winter (τέλος), and  
summer - autumn (μεσότης).

In (b), which consists of two genitive phrases, each constituent of which  
is in the plural, **Sh** is consistent and logical in its way in that the first con-  
stituent of each phrase is in the singular: **אֲנִי־תָּבִיר אֲתֵּי־נִפְתָּרִי־וְאֵת־הַיָּשׁוּר אֲפִלְּחִי**  
‘succession of seasons and change of times.’<sup>28</sup>

τροπῶν] short for τροπῶν ἡλίου, so De 33.14.

<sup>26</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. τέ 1.

<sup>27</sup> On the use by Paul of the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, cf. BDAG s.v. στοιχεῖον 2.

<sup>28</sup> We do not know for sure, though, if the average reader thought that these synonymous  
substantives expressed four distinct natural phenomena.

7.19) ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλους καὶ ἄστρον θέσεις,  
*the cycles of the years and the constellations of the stars,*

7.20) φύσεις ζώων καὶ θυμούς θηρίων,  
 πνευμάτων βίας καὶ διαλογισμούς ἀνθρώπων,  
 διαφορὰς φυτῶν καὶ δυνάμεις ῥιζῶν,  
*the natures of animals and tempers of beasts,  
 the strengths of spirits and thoughts of humans,  
 differences of plants and abilities of roots,*

ζώων .. θηρίων] **Sh** differentiates the two as **אֲנֵשׁ תַּיִת** .. **אֲנִי תַּיִת**, the latter literally meaning ‘animals of teeth.’

φύσεις] **S** **אֲנֵשׁ** ‘nature’ (sg.). The pl. φύσεις probably refers to the diversity of nature of animals.

βίας] f.pl.acc. of βία and an *o* of εἰδέναι (17b). Of the six genitive phrases this is the only one displaying the sequence <gen. - acc.>. Moreover, in the remaining five cases every constituent in the gen. refers to a living entity. Hence πνευμάτων is unlikely a reference to winds.<sup>29</sup> According to Kittel 6.339 the use of πνεῦμα in the sense of “spirit” is foreign to secular Greek. However, though it may not be half as common as in BG, LSJ s.v. **III** does mention “divine inspiration,” one example for which is ἱερὸν καὶ δαιμόνιον ἐν μούσαις πνεῦμα ‘a spirit of poetry, holy and inspired’ Plut. *Mor.* 605a.

διαλογισμούς ἀνθρώπων] The same phrase is found in a totally different context in κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι Ps 93.11 < **לֵבָבִי הִמְהִימָה אֲדָם מִשְׁבֹּת יָדַע מְהִימָה** >.

δυνάμεις ῥιζῶν] Many are of the view that this is a reference to medicinal powers possessed by plants. See Winston 176 and Scarpat II 111.

7.21) ὅσα τέ ἐστὶν κρυπτὰ καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔγνων·  
*What is hidden and and also (what is) evident I learned;*

7.22) ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία.  
*for the designer of everything, Wisdom, taught me.*

For the message of the verse, cf. 6.22 above, where ἀποκρύπτω is contrasted with ἐμφανής.

τεχνίτις] Note that, at Wi 13.1, God is called τεχνίτης. This is a word used in Wi alone, and twice more, where, too, it is applied to Wisdom: 8.6 and 14.2. Note that God is called κτίστης πάντων 4M 11.5.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. also Larcher 474f. and Scarpat II 52.

Ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον,  
 μονογενές, πολυμερές, λεπτόν,  
 εὐκίνητον, τρανόν, ἀμόλυντον,  
 σαφές, ἀπήμαντον, φιλάγαθον, ὀξύ,

*For there is in it an intelligent, sacred spirit,  
 only-begotten, composite, subtle,  
 agile, clear, undefiled,  
 distinct, harmless, benevolent, sharp,*

ἐν αὐτῇ] A good number of MSs, including A, read αὐτη, i.e. αὕτη. However, a plain, nominal clause beginning with ἐστιν is rather anomalous. There is no problem with a genuine existential ἔστιν heading a nominal clause in the sense of “there exists,” and not “it is.”

νοερόν] **שׁ תְּעִידָהּ** ‘of knowledge,’ **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘intelligent.’

μονογενές] **שׁ תְּיִחָהּ** ‘small unit’(?) // **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘in single part.’

λεπτόν] > **שׁ**; **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘thin.’

τρανόν] **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘clear in voice,’ **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘pure.’

σαφές] **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘wise and true’ (= σοφὸν καὶ ἀληθές !), **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘visible.’

ἀπήμαντον] **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘not inclined (?)’ and **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘not liable to injuries.’ As Scarpata (I 119) shows, the adj. here has an active meaning of “harmless, not injurious.”

ὀξύ] **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘wise’ (!), **שׁ הַנִּיחָהּ** ‘sharp.’

See Grimm (1837.197) on the 21 epithets or attributes ascribed to Wisdom from here to (23c).<sup>30</sup> Without counting πνεῦμα the list comes down to 20, and all the twenty adjectives are n.sg. according with πνεῦμα as its attributes. Hence Ziegler has not added a comma after πνεῦμα. Or do (23b+c) constitute the 21st quality, preceded by the only καὶ here? But this one consists of two lines (!) as a participial phrase, a pseudo verbal clause! Grimm (1837.193-95) says nothing about this grammatical peculiarity and extra length of the last, i.e. 21st epithet. 21 is obtained by multiplying 3 with 7, both of which are said to be sacred numbers. But is 3 sacred in the pre-Christian Judaism?

7.23) ἀκώλυτον, εὐεργετικόν, φιλόανθρωπον,  
 βέβαιον, ἀσφαλές, ἀμέριμνον,  
 παντοδύναμον, πανεπίσκοπον  
 καὶ διὰ πάντων χωροῦν πνευμάτων  
 νοερῶν καθαρῶν λεπτοτάτων.

<sup>30</sup> He (196) also mentions 7×3, and for “3” as “heilige Zahl” he mentions as evidence Nu 19.12, where it is about “third day” of a week, and Si 25.1 where it is about three pleasant, human characters, and ib. 25.2, where Ben Sira mentions three types of detestable people.

On the use of these epithets in CG, see Larcher 479-96, Scarpata II 111-28, Winston 180-82, and Hübner 101-09.



*undisrupted, beneficent, friendly,  
steadfast, secure, carefree,  
omnipotent, concerned about everybody  
and spreading broadly among all intelligent,  
clean, most subtle spirits.*

ἀκώλυτον] **לֹא מְתַכְּלִינָא**<sup>31</sup> ‘not prevented’ = **לֹא מְתַכְּלִינָא** **לֵן**.  
εὐεργετικόν] **לֵן מוֹתְרִינָא** ‘useful,’ **לֵן שְׂפִירְתָּא** **סָעַר** ‘doing beautiful things.’  
βέβαιον] **לֵן תְּקִיפָא** ‘strong,’ **לֵן שְׂרִירָא** ‘true.’  
ἀσφαλές] **לֵן שְׂרִירָא** ‘true,’ **לֵן יְהִירָא** ‘cautious.’  
ἀμέριμνον] **לֵן יְהִירָא צִפְתָּא** **וְלֵן** ‘and it is carefree,’ **לֵן דְּלֵא מְרִינָא** ‘without concern.’

παντοδύναμον] **לֵן מְצִיָּא** **וְכָל חֵילֵינָא** ‘mighty and omnipotent,’ **לֵן מְצִיָּא** **כָּל** = G.

πανεπίσκοπον] **לֵן סְכוּלְתִינָא** **סָעַרָא** **וְלֵן** **כָּל** **סָעַר** ‘and it performs all, prudent,’ **לֵן כָּל סָעַר** ‘performs everything.’

χωροῦν] **לֵן אֲחִירָא** ‘overpowering (?)’, **לֵן עֲבַר** ‘passing (through).’  
νοερῶν] **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘intelligent.’

- 7.24) πάσης γὰρ κινήσεως κινητικώτερον σοφία,  
διήκει δὲ καὶ χωρεῖ διὰ πάντων διὰ τὴν καθαρειότητα.  
*For Wisdom is more mobile than any (other) movement,  
pervades and spreads through all because of its purity,*

κινήσεως] **לֵן חֵילֵינָא** ‘movements,’ **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘movement.’  
κινήτικώτερον] κινήτικός, a hapax in SG. **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘changes,’ **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘mobile.’ The gender does not accord with σοφία. Winston (182) mentions several similar instances in CG, e.g. ἄριστον ἄρα καὶ κάλλιστον καὶ ἡδιστον ἢ εὐδαιμονία ‘happiness is at once the best, the noblest, and the pleasantest of things’ Arist. *EN* 1099a24. The adjective is probably substantivised.<sup>32</sup>

διήκει] a hapax in SG; **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘drags itself,’ **לֵן מְתִינָא** ‘lingers.’

- 7.25) ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως  
καὶ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής·  
διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲν μεμιαμμένον εἰς αὐτὴν παρεμπίπτει.  
*for it is a vapour of the power of God  
and a pure emanation of the glory of the omnipotent.  
Hence nothing defiled penetrates it.*

<sup>31</sup> Ed. Mossul reads **לֹא מְתַכְּלִינָא** ‘not inclined,’ but ed. Leiden **לֹא מְתַכְּלִינָא** ‘not deceptive.’

<sup>32</sup> Cf. SSG § 23 f (i) and fb.



πάντα δύναται] Whilst δύναμαι is normally complemented with an inf., it can also take an acc. *o*, so also in CG as in δύναται ἅπαντα in Hom. *Od.* 4.237 (s Zeus). Sim. πάντα δύνασαι ‘You are omnipotent’ Jb 10.13.

μένουσα] followed in **Š** with כִּלְכֵּל בָּהּ כָּל וְכָל ‘and everything in her is renewed.’ No Gk MS reads καινίζεται and καινίζω is not used in the active voice as an intransitive verb. The Syr. translator was probably troubled with μένουσα ἐν αὐτῇ.<sup>36</sup> He presents us with another issue by adding a word for which we find no equivalent in **Θ**: אִתְּסִי דְּיִהוֹן נְפִשְׁתָּא דְּרַמְּשִׁי וּבְכָל דֵּר וּבְכָל דֵּר מְשַׁנָּא ‘and in every generation it grants peace to the souls of holy people.’<sup>37</sup> The author probably means to say that Wisdom, without moving out, is capable of every activity.

κατὰ γενεάς] On the distributive use of <κατά + acc.>, see *GELS* s.v. **II 8 a**, mostly with a sg. noun. Another instance of a pl. noun used in this construction is πλανήσουσιν Αἴγυπτον κατὰ φυλάς ‘they will mislead Egypt tribe after tribe’ Is 19.13.

℣ *per nationes* = κατὰ γένη or κατὰ γένος, what is not found in the critical apparatus in Ziegler’s edition.

φίλους θεοῦ] Possible Hellenic background of this expression has been discussed by many scholars. The phrase is applied to Abraham in φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη Jam 2.23. Though φίλος is not used, Abraham is mentioned as the object of God’s love in Αβρααμ, ὃν ἠγάπησα אַבְרָהָם אֶבְרָהָם Is 41.8, אַבְרָהָם אֶבְרָהָם Αβρααμ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ σου 2Ch 20.7.<sup>38</sup> It is important to note that θεοῦ here represents a subjective genitive, so in CG as in εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέπειν ὡς φίλον τοῦ θεοῦ μηδὲν φοβούμενον τῶν συμβῆναι δυναμένων ‘to look up into the sky as a friend of God, worrying nothing of what could happen’ Epict. 2.1.29. Though it looks similar, we have a distinct construction in ἀγαπώμενος τῷ θεῷ ἦν 2E 23.26 אֱהֹוָה לְאֱלֹהֵי הָיָה (℣ Neh 13.26), which is said of Solomon. Here we have a dative of relationship.<sup>39</sup> An example in CG is θεῶ φίλος ‘dear to God’ Pl. *Leg.* 4.716d, so πρῶτον δεῖ θεοῖς εἶναι φίλον ‘it was his first duty to be a friend to the gods’ Epict. 3.24.60.<sup>40</sup> Cf. also a discussion by Deissmann 1895.159-61. One of his remarks is “Die Frage, ob *Freund Gottes* aufzulösen sei durch *der Gott lieb hatte* oder durch

<sup>36</sup> Larcher (506) is also troubled, and suggests whether the text should be emended to μένουσα ἢ αὐτῇ.

<sup>37</sup> In ed. de Lagarde we find a full stop at the end of אִתְּסִי, whereas ed. Leiden and Mosul shift it further down, turning the following אֱלֹהֵי דְּיִהוֹן ‘God’s friends,’ which would then stand in apposition to the preceding אִתְּסִי and making προφῆτας the only *o* of κατασκευάζει.

<sup>38</sup> Larcher (508f.) says that φίλος θεοῦ is unknown in the Old Testament and in Αβρααμ, ὃν ἠγάπησα Is 41.8 and Αβρααμ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ σου 2Ch 20.7 LXX uses a periphrastic phrase with ἀγαπάω. Even so it is God who loves and in 2Ch 20.7 the Antiochaeian version reads τοῦ φίλου σου [= τοῦ θεοῦ]. On this v.l. cf. Hanhart 2014.24.

<sup>39</sup> See *SSG* § 22 **wk**.

<sup>40</sup> The same applies to ἐκείνῳ [= τῷ θεῷ] φίλος ἦ Pl. *Tim.* 53d and φίλοι ὧμεν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς *Rep.* 621c.

*den Gott lieb hatte*, ist nicht nur unentscheidbar, sondern überflüssig.” We object to his “überflüssig.”

7.28) οὐθὲν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεὸς εἰ μὴ τὸν σοφία συνοικοῦντα.

*for God loves nothing other than one who lives with Wisdom.*

οὐθὲν] **¶** *neminem* = οὐδένα, a v.l. in one MS. Scarpat (II 131) holds that the neut. is a little more generic and comprehensive than the masc., and as such it is at times equivalent to a collective referring to a person, for which τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος ἐυλογεῖται Heb 7.7 is cited, though the NT author here is comparing specific individuals, Abraham and Melchizedek. Cf. *SSG* § 20 ee.

συνοικοῦντα] On the use of this verb as an indication of close, intimate relationship in the context of marriage, see *GELS* s.v. **2** and *New Documents* 3.85f. That our author is possibly inclined to apply this verb to the metaphor of marital relationship with the wisdom, “cohabitation,” may be concluded from his interest in the “partner’s” physical charm as described in the following verse.

τὸν σοφία συνοικοῦντα] **¶** שְׁמֵהֶם בְּחֹן בְּהִיָּה דְּעִמְרָא לְאִיִּיזְרָא ‘those in whom Wisdom dwells.’

7.29) ἔστιν γὰρ αὕτη εὐπρεπεστέρα ἡλίου  
καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἄστρον θέσιν.  
φωτὶ συγκρινομένη εὐρίσκεται λαμπρότερα·

*For it is comelier than the sun  
and above every constellation of stars  
and compared with light it is found more radiant.*

εὐρίσκεται] This use of εὐρίσκω is analogous to that of Engl. *find* as in “As I listened to him, I found him quite intelligent.” Sim. Νωε εὐρέθη τέλειος δίκαιος Si 44.17.<sup>41</sup>

λαμπρότερα] a minority reading [six minuscules] in comparison with προτερα, which is hardly used in the sense of “to excel.”<sup>42</sup> Also questionable is “superiore” (Scarpat II 91, 133f.). The dimension concerned is that of time, not quality.

7.30) τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ διαδέχεται νύξ,  
σοφίας δὲ οὐ κατισχύει κακία.

*For night does succeed it,  
but evilness does not overpower wisdom.*

<sup>41</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. εὐρίσκω **4 b**.

<sup>42</sup> Engel (II 2143) prefers προτερα, viewing it as *lectio difficilior*.

τοῦτο] referring back to φωτὶ, “the light of the sun.”

κατισχύει] The verb κατισχύω in the sense of “to overpower” takes, *pace* Reider (118), a genitive *o* elsewhere, too: κατισχύσει βασιλείας Da 11.21 τη, where, in the light of the immediately preceding ἔδωκαν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν δόξαν βασιλείας, the *o* is unlikely to be an acc. pl. Verbs in the lexical field of ruling and governing often take a gen. *o*, e.g. κατακυριεύσατε γῆς γῆς Ge 1.28.<sup>43</sup>

This Gk verb can also govern an acc. *o* as in κατίσχυσαν αὐτοὺς ‘they overpowered them’ 1E 5.49, but the context precludes the analysis of σοφίας as acc. pl.

<sup>43</sup> More examples are mentioned in *SSG* § 55 a.

Larcher adopts ἀντισχύει, the majority reading, rendering it “reprend l’avantage.” That verb begins to occur with certainty only in post-Christian texts, e.g. Dio Cassius (2nd/3rd cent. CE) 48.11. Thus, *pace* Scarpat (II 134), ἀντισχύω is not an absolute hapax in Greek. According to *Thesaurus linguae graecae* it occurs in quite a few texts.

## CHAPTER 8

- 8.1) διατείνει δὲ ἀπὸ πέρας ἐπὶ πέρας εὐρώστως  
καὶ διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα χρηστῶς.

*It stretches from one end to the other vigorously  
and administers all well.*

πέρας .. πέρας] **שׁ אַפִּיט .. אַפִּיט**, both pl. Is the translator thinking of the four cardinal directions?

εὐρώστως] **שׁ תִּיִרְיָשׁ** ‘truly,’ **שׁ תִּאֲמָלִיָּה** ‘soundly.’ Both diverge not a little from **ט**.

χρηστῶς] i.e. ‘for the best benefit of those who follow her.’ Cp. “benignly” (Clarke) and “avec bonté” (Larcher 506, 516f.). Cp. ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα Wi 15.1.

- 8.2) Ταύτην ἐφίλησα καὶ ἐξεζήτησα ἐκ νεότητός μου  
καὶ ἐζήτησα νύμφην ἀγαγέσθαι ἑμαυτῷ  
καὶ ἑραστής ἐγενόμην τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῆς.

*I liked her and pursued (her) since my youth  
and I sought to fetch her as a bride  
and I became a lover of her beauty.*

ἐφίλησα] the only instance in Wi of φιλέω. Even with σοφία as *o* ἀγαπάω is preferred as in the following verse. So also at 6.12 and 7.10. The frequency alone of ἀγαπάω (9×) in Wi suggests that the selection of φιλέω here is deliberate. Larcher (519) thinks that it is used here to indicate “une affection qui s’apparente à l’amitié et suscite le désir d’une société de vie malgré l’inégalité foncière des conditions.” Cf. our remarks in Muraoka 2020.89-94.

ἐξεζήτησα] Though a hapax in Wi, ἐκζητέω is rather frequent in LXX, 131 times, and only rarely used in the sense of “to search and look for something lost.” The use here comes under “to engage oneself earnestly and devotedly in (+ acc.)” *GELS* s.v. 2. In Si 24.34 its *o* is σοφία and in ib. 39.1 this verb is coordinate with ἀσχολέομαι ‘to occupy oneself (with something).’

ἐκ νεότητός μου] Solomon’s long-standing love of Wisdom is comparable to the relationship between Ben Sira and Wisdom as is manifest in Ἔτι ὦν νεώτερος πρὶν ἢ πλανηθῆναι με ἐζήτησα σοφίαν προφανῶς ἐν προσευχῇ μου Si 51.13.

ἀγαγέσθαι] The *o*, whether αὐτήν or ταύτην, is understood. Then νύμφην would be an *o* complement. Exactly the same form (ἀγαγέσθαι) is used



- 8.5) εἰ δὲ πλοῦτός ἐστιν ἐπιθυμητὸν κτῆμα ἐν βίῳ,  
τί σοφίας πλουσιώτερον τῆς τὰ πάντα ἐργαζομένης;

*If wealth is a desirable possession in life,  
what is more wealthier than wisdom that produces everything?*

ἐπιθυμητὸν] **𐤌𐤇 𐤍𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁**, a variant spelling of **𐤍𐤁𐤁𐤁**.

Unlike in 7.8, the author, Hübner (116) thinks, positively evaluates wealth. However, we may be reading here on a widely current view which the author may not share.

ἐργαζομένης] The selection of the Pf. **𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤌** probably reflects a theological notion that Wisdom took part in the creation of the universe. Cp. **𐤌𐤇 𐤍𐤇𐤁𐤁** Ptc.

According to *GELS* s.v. ἐργάζομαι this high-frequency verb can also mean **1** “to perform a certain deed” and **2** “to expend energies and efforts on.” It is difficult to say which is meant here. Any of the three senses seems to make sense.

- 8.6) εἰ δὲ φρόνησις ἐργάζεται,  
τίς αὐτῆς τῶν ὄντων μᾶλλον ἐστιν τεχνίτις;

*If prudence is so productive,  
who among those that exist is a greater designer than she?*

φρόνησις] used here as synonymous with σοφία; in 7.7 the two terms appear in parallelism.

τῶν ὄντων] We agree with Fichtner (32, f.n.), according to whom the gen. ptc. is partitive and subordinate to τίς, and not a relational genitive as in “the artificer of all that is” (Winston) and “wisdom which makes all things” (*NETS*).<sup>4</sup> With his “l’artisan des êtres” Larcher (526) finds the position of αὐτῆς between τίς and τῶν ὄντων problematic. But if we analyse αὐτῆς as comparative subordinate to τίς, there would be no problem. More problematic is the long distance between τῶν ὄντων and τεχνίτις. Cf. Scarpat (II 179): “chi fra gli esseri più di lei è artista?”.

τεχνίτις] Note 7.22 above, where Wisdom is called πάντων τεχνίτις.

- 8.7) καὶ εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις,  
οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί·  
σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει,  
δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν,  
ὧν χρησιμώτερον οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν βίῳ ἀνθρώποις.

<sup>4</sup> On the logico-semantic relationships of genitive noun phrases, see *SSG* § 22 v.



*And if someone values justice,  
the fruits of her toils are virtues;  
for she teaches self-control and prudence,  
justice and bravery,  
than which there is nothing more beneficial in life for man.*

πόντοι] The sense of “product of toil” of this word is known to CG; LSJ s.v. **III** mentions, e.g. τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόντον Eur. *Phoen.* 30 (applied to a baby born). So also below at 10.10.

In LXX this sense of the substantive is rather frequent (*GELS* s.v. **3**) and confined to the pl., whereas no such restriction applies in CG. Whilst the pl. cannot naturally be selected in the above instance from Euripides, we also find a case such as παλαιὰ γέῃσα, τεκτόνων πόντον ‘an ancient parapet, the work of masons’ Eur. *Or.* 1570.

ταύτης] = σοφίας, not δικαιοσύνης (a). On the use of this demonstrative pronoun referring to Wisdom, see above at 7.10. Larcher (528) identifies here an allusion to Pr 31.10-31, but, whilst our Wisdom is portrayed as a spouse, the wisdom of the model wife praised by Solomon in Pr 31 is practical wisdom.

σωφροσύνην .. καὶ φρόνησιν .. δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν] A philosophical discourse in 4M 1 mentions these four virtues (vs. 18), and φρόνησις is said to be the most important ἀρετή. In Plato *Phaed.* 69c and *Laws* 631c σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, and φρόνησις are mentioned as four manifestations of ἀρετή. A more detailed description is found in Larcher 528f.

ἐκδιδάσκει] a verb used by a Jewish leader speaking to a pagan tyrant with the Jewish kind of φιλοσοφία as *s* and σωφροσύνη as *o* 4M 5.23 (and also εὐφροσύνη at ib. 5.24). Larcher (528) holds that this compound verb is more emphatic than διδάσκω, “enseigne à fond, complètement.”<sup>5</sup>

The second line appears to have been found a little difficult for S: **הַתִּיבָה הַזֹּאת** ‘it is astonishing by nature.’

8.8) εἰ δὲ καὶ πολυπειρίαν ποθεῖ τις,  
οἶδεν τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εἰκάζει,  
ἐπίσταται στροφᾶς λόγων καὶ λύσεις αἰνιγμάτων,  
σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα προγινώσκει  
καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων.

*If someone also wants to have much experience,  
she knows the past and works out the future,  
she is knowledgeable about twists of words and solutions to riddles  
she knows signs and portents beforehand  
and outcomes in seasons and times.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. “teach thoroughly.”

καὶ<sup>1</sup>] We have here a student wishing to go beyond elementary lessons.  
 πολυπειρίαν] Instead of a plain Impf. **נָתַן** **שֶׁ** uses a periphrastic structure: **נָתַן** **אֵינֶנּוּ** **יָדָע**, a structure which is syntactically synonymous with **נָתַן**.<sup>6</sup> The selection of the ptc. underlines the student's ambition to pursue his teacher's path, for in (8c) she is said to be knowledgeable (**נָתַן** ptc.).

εἰκάζει] The overwhelming majority of MSS read εἰκαζειν as an *o* of οἶδεν. Larcher (530f.) regards εἰκάζει to be an error, though his translation reads: “elle connaît le passé et conjecture l’avenir.”

στροφὰς λόγων] The same phrase occurs in Pr 1.3. As alternative renderings “Kunstformen von Sprüchen” (Siegfried), “wohlgeformte Reden” (*SD*), “maximes” (*BJ*), and “subtleties of speech” (*NETS*) have been suggested. The problem set by Samson was called πρόβλημα (**הַתְּלִימָה**) Jdg 14.12.

Holmes (548) refers to νοήσει τε παραβολὴν καὶ σκοτεινὸν λόγον ῥήσεις τε σοφῶν καὶ αἰνίγματα Pr 1.6, whilst our Solomon jr. might be speaking of his teacher's competitors, since she would not be resorting to riddles and allegories. Students of the older version of Proverbs are expected to welcome twisted expressions: δέξασθαι τε στροφὰς λόγων Pr 1.3.

σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα] a combination very frequent in LXX as a rendition of **אֲמוּנָה** **וּמִלֵּא**, e.g. Ex 7.3.

καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων] a combination also found in Da 2.21, both nouns in the pl. (MT **אֲמֻנָה** **וּמִלֵּא**).

8.9) ἔκρινα τοίνυν ταύτην ἀγαγέσθαι πρὸς συμβίωσιν  
 εἰδὼς ὅτι ἔσται μοι σύμβουλος ἀγαθῶν  
 καὶ παραίνεσις φροντίδων καὶ λύπης.

*I then decided to welcome this figure for symbiosis  
 with the knowledge that she will be an advisor for my benefit  
 and a counsellor at times of worries and sorrow.*

τοίνυν] Our rendering with “then” notwithstanding, it is an inferential particle, not temporal.

ἀγαγέσθαι] See above at vs. 2.

συμβίωσιν] See above at vs. 3.

σύμβουλος] Being a noun of the second declension this noun can be applied to σοφία, just a boy's mother is called σύμβουλος 2M 7.25.

Together with the gen. ἀγαθῶν the phrase bears the value of purpose, not of time as in “ma conseillère aux jours heureux” (*BJ*).

παραίνεσις] Being an action noun it is not exactly parallel to σύμβουλος. An anticipated form such as παραινήτρια or παραινέτης is only rarely used outside of LXX as well. Fichtner (32) thinks that the original reading was

<sup>6</sup> See Muraoka 2005a § 89.

probably *παραινέτις*, though he knew that such a form is not attested in Greek. LSJ lists only its masc. form *παραινέτης*, for which only one attestation is recorded as π. γυναικῶν ‘seducer of women’ (!).

- 8.10) ἔξω δι’ αὐτὴν δόξαν ἐν ὄχλοις  
καὶ τιμὴν παρὰ πρεσβυτέρους ὁ νέος·

*Thanks to her I shall achieve fame in public  
and in my youth respect among senior people.*

ἔξω] The selection of the preterite form in **§** is incomprehensible: לִי הָיָה אֶת־הַכְּבוֹד ‘she became for me a source of glory.’ Because of *ἐκρίνα* vs. 9?

ὄχλοις] Unlike *ἔθνη* or *λαοί*, *ὄχλοι* does not signify “nations,” but rather “crowds, assemblies.” Note esp. καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ ἐκήρυξε τοῖς ὄχλοις Ὑμῶν παραγγέλλεται, ἔθνη καὶ χῶραι, λαοὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι כֹּהֵן לִי בָּרָא קָרָא וְאָכַר אֶת־נַפְשִׁי אֶת־אֶמְצָא אֶת־מַחְרִי Da 3.4 LXX.

ὁ νέος] a *s* complement, i.e. “as a young person.”

- 8.11) ὁξὺς εὐρεθήσομαι ἐν κρίσει  
καὶ ἐν ὄψει δυναστῶν θαυμασθήσομαι·

*I might be found to be sharp as a judge  
and marvelled at in the eyes of powerful people,*

εὐρεθήσομαι] In **§** הָיָה לִי Solomōn is still giving credit to her.

ἐν ὄψει] Probably an attempt to improve on the common Hebrew calque,<sup>7</sup> e.g. Ποίει τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου הָיָה בְּעֵינַי הַטּוֹב וְשִׁי 1K [= 1Sm] 1.23; καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν הָיָה נִפְלְאָת בְּעֵינַי Ps 117 [= MT 118].<sup>23</sup><sup>8</sup>

- 8.12) σιγῶντά με περιμενοῦσιν καὶ φθεγγομένῳ προσέξουσιν  
καὶ λαλοῦντος ἐπὶ πλεῖον  
χεῖρα ἐπιθήσουσιν ἐπὶ στόμα αὐτῶν.

*Whilst I am silent they will wait patiently, and when I am speaking,  
they will pay attention,  
and if I speak too long, they will put their hand on their mouth.*

προσέξουσιν] **§** לִי הָיָה ‘they look at me.’ The reader can mentally supply *μοι* by the analogy of *με* as the *o* of *περιμενοῦσιν*. This analysis, however, would not work with the following ptc., the genitive case of which is part of the genitive absolute construction.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See SSG 26 i. Note וְעֵינַי נִדְיָבִים Kahana 489.

<sup>8</sup> In any event, our *Wi* example cannot be translated as “les grands, à ma vue, seront émerveillés” (*BJ*).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. SSG § 31 **hb** for more examples.

χειρα] The v.l. χειρας, so also שׁ יְדֵיהֶם ‘their hands’ and שׁ יְפִיתָם, does not necessarily mean that the audience put both of their hands on their mouths, but only that they all did the same action. Note θαυμάσατε χειρα θέντες ἐπὶ σιαγόνι פִּי-לֹעַ דְּיִמּוּ Jb 21.5.

- 8.13) ἔξω δι’ αὐτὴν ἀθανασίαν  
καὶ μνήμην αἰώνιον τοῖς μετ’ ἐμὲ ἀπολείψω.  
*Thanks to her I shall attain immortality  
and leave an eternal memory to my posterity.*

The second half of the verse makes it plain that what the author means with immortality is that the personal history of the deceased will remain alive in his posterity’s memory.

- 8.14) διοικήσω λαούς, καὶ ἔθνη ὑποταγήσεται μοι·  
*I shall govern peoples, and nations will be subjugated to me.*

λαούς] Parallel to the following ἔθνη. It is not clear whether any difference is intended between the two. Though the phrase λαοὶ Ἰσραήλ does not occur in LXX, it does turn up in NTG: σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ Acts 4.27, undoubtedly referring to the twelve tribes of Israel.

ὑποταγήσεται] In spite of our translation above this form can be analysed as pseudo passive or middle: “they will submit to me.” On this complicated question, see SSG § 27 **db**.<sup>10</sup>

- 8.15) φοβηθήσονται με ἀκούσαντες τύραννοι φρικτοί,  
ἐν πλήθει φανοῦμαι ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀνδρεῖος.  
*Having heard (all this), rulers will fear me, shuddering  
in the community I shall be seen as good and brave in war.*

με] Some translations subordinate the pronoun to ἀκούσαντες, e.g. “wenn sie von mir hören” (Hübner), but the acc. of ἀκούω as a topic is anomalous without the contents of the information. By referring to καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας φοβηθήσεται Dt 17.13 Scarpat (II 196) shows that our verb can be used absolutely, but contradicting his own translation: “.. saranno presi da timore udendo le mie parole.” In Ziegler’s accentuation the pronoun is attached backwards, which we would rather prefer.

φρικτοί] שׁ יִרְדּוּ אִתָּךְ ‘they will be sharply chastised’; שׁ יִפְּחוּ ‘frightened.’<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> About the 12 year old Jesus we read ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς Lk 2.51 (שׁ יִפְּחוּ אִתָּךְ). Did Jesus have to be ordered around all the time?

<sup>11</sup> A marginal note says that it means שׁ יִפְּחוּ ‘terrified.’ Cf. φρικτῶς Wi 6.5 > שׁ יִפְּחוּ.

ἀγαθὸς καὶ .. ἀνδρεῖος] Fichtner (34) mentions a description of Agamemnon as ἀμφοτέρων βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής 'both a noble king and a valiant spearman' Hom. *Il.* 3.179.

- 8.16) εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου προσαναπαύσομαι αὐτῇ·  
οὐ γὰρ ἔχει πικρίαν ἢ συναναστροφή αὐτῆς  
οὐδὲ ὀδύνην ἢ συμβίωσις αὐτῆς,  
ἀλλὰ εὐφροσύνην καὶ χαράν.

*Entering my home I shall find rest in her company,  
for my companionship with her does not have harshness  
nor her symbiosis pain,  
but pleasure and joy.*

The notion of personified wisdom has here reached its peak.

The Lebensphilosophie advocated here is in stark contrast with the painful pessimism displayed in another document associated with Solomon, Ecclesiastes.

αὐτῇ] The selection of the dative case here has to do with the use of <πρός τι> to mark close vicinity as in ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς 'she heard it very near the entrance of the tent' Gn 18.10.<sup>12</sup> Likewise with προσοδύρομαι at 19.3. Larcher's "le dat. est régulier avec un vb. composé" (1049) is much too generic. Though a little less generic and applied to one prepositional prefix only, Sparcat's (III 314) "costruito con il dativo come altri verbi composti con προς-" is as questionable. It is not the feature of word derivation, but a semantic parameter that is determinative here. Thus προσαναλεξάμενος δὲ αὐτοῖς 'telling them moreover' 2M 8.19, where we have a verbum dicendi, and αὐτοῖς προσαποστείλας 'sending emissaries to them' ib. 11.13, where the dative is a function of ἀποστέλλω.

- 8.17) ταῦτα λογισάμενος ἐν ἑμαυτῷ  
καὶ φροντίσας ἐν καρδίᾳ μου  
ὅτι ἀθανασία ἐστὶν ἐν συγγενείᾳ σοφίας

*Having contemplated these matters myself  
and pondered in my mind  
that immortality consists in close affinity with Wisdom*

καρδίᾳ] used in the sense of "seat where human thoughts, intentions, and attitudes are generated and take shape" (GELS s.v. 3).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Cf. GELS s.v. πρὸς II 1 a.

<sup>13</sup> For a semantic analysis of Heb. בֶּלִי, cf. Muraoka 2022a.75 on 1QS 2.3.

ὅτι] Φροντίζω can be complemented through a gen. pers. or an acc. as an object of contemplation.<sup>14</sup> This is the sole instance of an object clause introduced with ὅτι, not only in SG, but also, as it seems, in CG.<sup>15</sup>

ἀθανασία] **𐤌 𐤁𐤓** ‘life’! Cp. **𐤌 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓** ‘immortality.’

συγγενεία] **𐤌 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓** ed. Leiden is a phonetic spelling for **𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓** ‘kinship,’ so **𐤌𐤓**.

- 8.18) καὶ ἐν φιλίας αὐτῆς τέρψις ἀγαθὴ  
καὶ ἐν πόνοις χειρῶν αὐτῆς πλοῦτος ἀνεκλιπῆς  
καὶ ἐν συγγυμνασία ὁμιλίας αὐτῆς φρόνησις  
καὶ εὐκλεία ἐν κοινωνίᾳ λόγων αὐτῆς,  
περιῆειν ζητῶν ὅπως λάβω αὐτὴν εἰς ἑμαυτόν.  
*and in friendship with her there is good enjoyment  
and from toils of her hands inexhaustible wealth  
and in joint training under her tutelage prudence  
and good reputation in linkage with her words,  
I began to walk about, trying to take her in.*

Each of the first four lines appears to be an existential clause, all of the pattern <ἐν τι + NP>. They continue (17c) as *o* clauses of φροντίσας.

In (18 c-d) **𐤌** reads rather different from **𐤌**: **𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓** ‘in the discourse round her words knowledge and beauty and in the communion of her thoughts non-deceptive truth.’

Larcher (550) mentions ζητεῖ δὴ οἶμαι καὶ οὗτος περιῶν τὸ καλὸν ‘he, too, I imagine, goes about, seeking the good object’ Pl. *Symp.* 209B.

- 8.19) παῖς δὲ ἤμην εὐφυῆς  
ψυχῆς τε ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς,  
*I was a well-grown child,  
also obtained a good soul,*

This passage has aroused an intensive, penetrating discussion on the fundamental nature of man out of theological, philosophical perspectives, the origin of man’s soul and its relation to his body. The rare adjective used here, εὐφυῆς, is applied to a part of a human body in *μηροὶ εὐφύες* ‘well-built thighs’ Hom. *Il.* 4.146f. By contrast, Plato applied it to body and soul alike in *τοὺς μὲν εὐφυεῖς τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς θεραπεύουσι* ‘they heal

<sup>14</sup> For details, see *GELS* s.v.

<sup>15</sup> In LSJ s.v. **II 1** we note an instance with ὥς: φροντίσας .. ὥς δώσει δίκην ‘thinking .. that he [= the king] would punish him’ Hdt 8.100.1. Such a ὥς is equivalent to ὅτι.

well-built people in body and soul' Pl. *Rep.* 410.1. In our verse the author is clearly viewing the two parts as separate. Cf. **ס** and **סל** אָרָנִי 'skilled, well-trained.'

ἐλαχον] **ס** נָהַרַשׁ 'I picked up' and **סל** נִהַרַשׁ 'it reached me,' which is a little modest. On Solomon's modesty, see above at 8.4. Though λαγχάνω does not necessarily imply some personal credit due to its *s* as shown in τὴν ἡλικίαν ἣδη λελογχώς 3M 6.1, where the *s* is a priest who reached old age, all the same, the shifting of the *o* to ψυχὴ might not be totally meaningless. Cf. "a good soul fell to my lot" (Holmes).

Larcher (552f.) stresses that the verb here means "avoir part à, obtenir possession de, recevoir en partage," not that, through his endeavours, Solomon obtained a good soul.

8.20) μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἤλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον.

*Or rather, being good-natured, I entered an undefiled body.*

μᾶλλον δὲ] On the value of this phrase, 'to be more precise,' introducing a qualification of an earlier statement (*GELS* s.v. μᾶλλον **I 4**), see also Larcher 553f.

ἀμίαντον] *Pace* Reider "I came into a body undefiled" the adj. is attributively used with σῶμα. The same reservation applies to the rendering by Holmes. If I were undefiled, we would anticipate ἀμίαντος.

8.21) γνοὺς δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλως ἔσομαι ἐγκρατής, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ θεὸς δῶ,  
καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἦν φρονήσεως τὸ εἰδέναι τίνος ἡ χάρις,  
ἐνέτυχον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐδεήθην αὐτοῦ  
καὶ εἶπον ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας μου

*Having realised that I would not acquire (it) unless God gave,  
and one also needed be prudent in order to know whose favour it was,  
I petitioned the Lord and pleaded with Him  
and said from the bottom of my heart –*

γνοὺς] We believe that the Aor. ptc. here is to be distinguished from the Pf., εἰδώς 'knowing, being aware that.' Thus *pace* "sachant" (Larcher 546), "sapendo" (Scarpata II 181), "knowing" (Winston 197) etc. as against "ich erkannte" (Hübner 120). Cp. εἰδώς vs. 9 above: "sachant" (Larcher 535), "perché sapevo" (Scarpata II 179), "knowing" (Winston 191) as against "im Wissen" (Hübner 113).

ἐγκρατής] αὐτῆς is understood, as is αὐτήν with δῶ in the following clause. Sim. in ἐγκρατής γενόμενος μὴ ἀφῆς αὐτήν Si 6.27. With his "non sarei mai stato virtuoso" Scarpata (II 167f.) he holds that the adjective here is being used without a complement on the basis of οὐκ ἔστιν σταθμὸς πᾶς

ἄξιος ἐγκρατοῦς ψυχῆς Si 26.15, but ἐγκρατοῦς is substantivised and complemented with ψυχῆς.<sup>16</sup>

ἐάν] Here we have a rare instance of a protasis of a conditional clause delayed.<sup>17</sup>

τοῦτο] cataphoric, referring in anticipation to the following infinitival clause, sim. ἀνόητον τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ἀπολαύειν τῶν χωρὶς ὀνειδους ἡδέων ‘it is irrational not to enjoy the pleasures above every reproach’ 4M 5.9. It is very similar to the use of *it* in English as in “it is good to know that he is still around.”<sup>18</sup>

τίνος] The genitive can be subjective with God as the giver or objective with Solomon as recipient of the gift, for he had realised that he was badly needed the gift.

<sup>16</sup> See Muraoka 2023.392 ad Si 26.15. Besides, does our adjective mean “virtuous”?

<sup>17</sup> Several more cases in SG are mentioned in SSG § 89 g.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. SSG § 12 hhh.



## CHAPTER 9

- 9.1) Θεὲ πατέρων καὶ κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους  
ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου

*O God of the fathers and Lord of mercy,  
who made all with Your word,*

Θεὲ] The vocative of this noun is non-classical, though it does occur in 3M 6.2 and 4M 6.27. It occurs five more times in LXX, and θεέ μου, θεέ μου Mt 27.46 as a translation of הלי הלי (לִי לִי Ps 22.1). See SSG § 22 ya, p. 189, f.n. 3.

κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους] שִׁמְךָ מְרַחֵם הֵי הֵמָּנָה ‘their Lord of mercy’ rather than ‘the Lord of the mercy.’ In theory either analysis is acceptable, but it sounds more natural to analyse the suffix pronoun as referring back to אֲבוֹתַי ‘my forefathers,’ underlining Solomon’s ancestral attachment. A different perspective is evident in שִׁמְךָ מְרַחֵם הֵמָּנָה אֲדָנִי ‘the Lord of Your mercy,’ = L. Quite a few MSS read σου after ἐλέους, possibly influenced by λόγῳ σου at the end of the verse.

- 9.2) καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον,  
ὥς δεσπόζει τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γενομένων κτισμάτων

*and with Your wisdom constructed man,  
so that he would control all things that came into being through You*

τῇ σοφίᾳ σου] Pace Larcher (565f.) our author’s theology at this point appears to be creative. As Larcher himself is aware, biblical passages such as Ps 104.24, Pr 3.19, and Je 10.12 all speak of the important role played by God’s will, but the *o* there are the heaven and the earth, and mankind is not explicitly mentioned. Hence, whilst (1b) and (2a), both about God’s creative activity, display structural parallelism with synonymous verbs and prepositional phrases of instrumental value, they differ from each other. (1b) is about the work done on the first five days and (2a) on the sixth day.

κατασκευάσας] As the author wrote this verse, he was, it appears, aware of two instances of this verb in Is: ὁμοίωμα κατεσκεύασεν αὐτόν; Is 40.19, where an artisan and a goldsmith are being compared to God the Creator, and ἐν γὰρ τῇ δόξῃ μου κατεσκεύασα αὐτόν καὶ ἔπλασα καὶ ἐποίησα αὐτόν 43.7, where the first verb translates אָבַן. These texts can be said to be

alluding to Gn 1, esp. the creation of man: Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Ge 1.26. Note the use of ὁμοίωμα in Is 40.19, where  $\mathfrak{H}$  has nothing that would represent ὁμοίωμα. In vs. 1 above God made (ποιήσας) everything with word. But in the creation of man wisdom played a special role. Our (2b) is of course an allusion to Gn 1.26b. The idiom <κατασκευάζω ἄνθρωπον> occurs also in 4M 2.21. Later, at 11.24, κατασκευάζω is used parallel to ποιέω, both with God as their respective s. Winston (201) refers to God's creative wisdom as expressed in a Qumran document: ביהם הכינות בחוכמתכה [ ] ימים ותהומות 'the seas and abysses .. You constructed with Your wisdom' 1QH<sup>a</sup> 1.14f., see also ib. 20.

δεσπόζῃ] Cf. κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς [= τῆς γῆς] καὶ ἄρχετε τῶν ἰχθύων κ.τ.λ. Gn 1.28.

ὑπὸ σοῦ] < ὑπό + gen. > is sometimes used with a verb which is morphologically not passive, though the notion of a third party's involvement is implied. Another example is ἐὰν κακὸν πάθωσιν ὑπὸ τινος 'if they suffer evil at somebody's hands' Ep Je 33.<sup>1</sup>

γενομένων] Larcher (567) wonders whether the selection of the verb γίνομαι is a probable reference to καὶ ἐγένετο in Gn 1. The phrase occurs tens of times there, but it is only once that it has as its s an object created by God: καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς vs. 3, and in vss. 24-25, where what man is going to control is created, γίνομαι is not used at all.

κτισμάτων] As pointed out by Larcher (566f.) the use of κτίσμα in the sense of 'creature' is unknown prior to SG.

9.3) καὶ διέπη τὸν κόσμον ἐν δσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ  
καὶ ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς κρίσιν κρίνῃ,

*and exercise authority over the world with piety and justice  
and conduct judgement with the attitude of integrity,*

διέπη] < διέπω, a hapax in Wi, occurring also at 12.15.

κρίσιν κρίνῃ] The complementation of a verb with a substantive derivationally close to the verb is very frequent in SG. Another example is οὐκ ἐπλημμελήσατε ἐναντίον κυρίου πλημμέλειαν Jo 22.31.<sup>2</sup> Such a substantive can also appear in the dative as in πλημμελείᾳ ἐπλημμέλησεν ib. vs. 20. Note also μὴ καὶ κρίσιν κρίνῃν; Gn 19.9, though the attitude of the speakers has very little to do with integrity unlike in κρινοῦσιν τὸν λαὸν κρίσιν δικαίαν Dt 16.18.

<sup>1</sup> For further details, see SSG § 63 e, p. 567. Note an example quoted by Scarpat (II 255) from CG: ἀπώλετο ὑπὸ λιμοῦ 'they died of hunger' Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.5.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. SSG § 57 dc.

- 9.4) δός μοι τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν  
καὶ μὴ με ἀποδοκιμάσῃς ἐκ παίδων σου.

*give me wisdom seated as counsellor in one of Your thrones  
and do not reject me out of Your servants as a failure.*

τῶν σῶν θρόνων] The grammatical function of the genitive, and that plural, is vague.<sup>3</sup> It is perhaps a local genitive in relation to πάρεδρον. The same adjective happens to occur in a similar syntactic context in Wi: πάρεδρον γὰρ εὕρήσει τῶν πυλῶν αὐτοῦ ‘for he would find her seated in front of his gates’ 6.14.<sup>4</sup> **Sh** appears to be struggling with the pl. θρόνων: לְךָ דִּי־חָכְמָה קְרִיבָה לְכֹרְסָתָא דִּי־חָכְמָה ‘wisdom, that which is close to Your thrones.’

Reider (127) holds that the pl. is the pl. of dignity or majesty, recurring in v. 12 and 18.15. One wonders how extensive such a use of the pl. is in Greek. One example quoted in Schwyzer II 45 reads κτενεῖν νιν τοὺς τεκόντας ἦν λόγος ‘the rumour was that he would slay his father’ Soph. OT 1176. Other nouns Schwyzer mentions under this category include τέκνα ‘child,’ παιδεύματα ‘pupil,’ ἐχθροί ‘enemy,’ hardly majestic persons. No noun referring to an inanimate object is mentioned. He also speaks of “soziativer Plural.” In Schwyzer II 44 another notion is mentioned, pluralis poeticus, as examples of which he mentions θρόνοι, μάχαιραι, σκῆπτρα, all inanimate referents including our θρόνοι.<sup>5</sup> In BH, too, the plural of majesty is mostly confined to personal entities, e.g. אֱלֹהִים (not heathen gods), אֱדֹנָי יְהוֹה as against הַמֶּלֶךְ אֱדֹנָי.<sup>6</sup> Then our plural form here is typical of poetic elegance. It so happens that, in every occurrence in Wi of this noun, it is in the pl.: 5.23, 6.21, 7.8, 9.4, 12, and 18.15.

In SG, adjectival possessive pronouns mostly precede their noun head, most likely on account of the emphasis laid on them, and this is all the more true in translated books, since Hebrew and Aramaic attach those elements to nouns concerned. We allow ourselves to cite a passage from SSG § 11 a: Some emphasis is not out of place in a protest – ἵνα τί οὕτως ποιεῖς τοῖς σοῖς οἰκέταις; ‘why do you treat your servants like this?’ Ex 5.16, but for a second time an unmarked form is used: τοῖς οἰκέταις σου vs. 17; εἰσπεπόρευμαι πρὸς Φαραω λαλῆσαι ἐπὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ‘I went in to Ph. to speak in Your name’ 5.23; μνησθεῖς Αβρααμ καὶ Ισαακ καὶ Ιακωβ τῶν σῶν οἰκετῶν ‘remembering .. Your servants’ 32.13, where Moses is putting in a special plea, invoking the divine pledge to the patriarchs.

<sup>3</sup> **U** presents a similar problem with *da mihi sedium tuarum adsistricem sapientiam*. On θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν רַמְיִי קְרִיבָה Dn 7.9, cf. Collins 1993.300f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. SSG § 22 i.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also Turner 25-26.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. JM § 136 d-e.

με ἀποδοκιμάσης] **ܣ** ܝܠܝܬܐ ‘you reject me.’<sup>7</sup>

παίδων σου] Παῖς can also mean “child.” But it is not used with God as father, for which NTG often uses τέκνον, e.g. ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι John 1.12.<sup>8</sup> Note **ܣ** ܩܝܕܝܬܐ and **ܣ** ܠܗ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ‘Your servants.’

9.5) ὅτι ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου,  
ἄνθρωπος ἀσθενὴς καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνιος  
καὶ ἐλάσσων ἐν συνέσει κρίσεως καὶ νόμων·

*For I am a servant of Yours and a son of Your handmaid,  
a frail and short-lived human  
and rather deficient in understanding of judgement and laws;*

ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς] The question of word order of the nominal clause still leaves a vast virgin field. Thus, leaving out the question of word order and that of use or non-use of the definite article, this nominal clause could be written in two other patterns:

δοῦλος σὸς εἰμι  
ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς εἰμι.<sup>9</sup>

(a) is very close to **ܐܠܗܝܢ** κύριε, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σός, ἐγὼ δοῦλος σὸς καὶ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου Ps 115.7 (**ܐ** 116.16). This likely dependence on the biblical source probably accounts for the fact that this is the only instance in Wi of the adjectival possessive pronoun following its noun head. See above at vs. 4.

One is curious whether **ܣ** had any particular reason for repeating **ܐܢܐ** in **ܐܢܐ ܩܝܕܝܬܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ**. The initial pronoun may be a syntactic marker of the king’s self-consciousness: in spite of his royal status, when it comes to to his relation to God, he is but a servant of His.<sup>10</sup>

υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης σου] a sign of Solomon’s self-deprecation, cf. what Sarah said to Abraham on Hagar and Ishmael – Ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς Gn 21.10.

ἐλάσσων] Comparative in form, but elative in value. Another example is ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος (**ܐ** just ܩܝܬ) ‘my lord is rather old’ Ge 18.12.<sup>11</sup> Larcher’s (574) argument that Solomon is implicitly comparing himself with senior, more erudite and experienced people does not convince.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ed. Leiden has a misprint here: ܝܠܝܬܐ.

<sup>8</sup> See BDAG s.v. τέκνον 4 b.

<sup>9</sup> For results of an initial attempt made on SG, see SSG § 94 e.

<sup>10</sup> Without having done any systematic research on the subject in Classical Syriac, let us compare **ܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܐܪܝܬܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܩܝܕܝܬܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ** ‘I am the first and I am the last, there is no god except me’ Is 44.6 with **ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ** ‘she is my sister .. he is my brother’ Ge 20.5.

<sup>11</sup> More SG examples are mentioned in SSG § 23 ba.

<sup>12</sup> His translation (563), however, reads: “bien peu expert.”

συνέσει] Larcher (574) justly draws to the reader's attention to the use of συνίημι in the plea made to God in the early stage of his reign: τοῦ συνίειν ἀνὰ μέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ (1Kg 3.9) and God's reaction to it with ἡτήσω σαυτῷ σύνεσιν τοῦ εἰσακούειν κρίμα (ib. vs. 11).

9.6) κἂν γάρ τις ἦ τέλειος ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων,  
τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ σοφίας ἀπούσης εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται.

*For even if someone were perfect among fellow human beings,  
he would be counted as worth nought when wisdom from You is lacking.*

ἐν] more likely to be local than Winston's (200) "in the eyes of man."

υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων] a rendering of **בְּנֵי אָדָם** in Gn 11.5, Jl 1.12, Ps 12.2, where in **בְּ** both nouns have the definite article. By contrast, when both substantives are sg., they are anarthrous. As in our case here, the phrase is used at times to highlight man's or men's limitations, frailty or worthlessness, e.g. ἐφοβήθη ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οἷ ὥσει χόρτος ἐξηράνθησαν Is 51.12; κύριε, τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι ἐγνώσθης αὐτῷ, ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι λογίζῃ αὐτόν; Ps 143.3; υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου σκώληξ '.. a worm' Jb 25.6; τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμήσκη αὐτοῦ, ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν; Ps 8.5.

τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ σοφίας] The word sequence is non-Hebraic and common in original LXX compositions and translated documents not very close to **אָ**.<sup>13</sup>

ἀπούσης] **אָ** makes a sensible addition: **מֵאֵתָּ** 'away from him.'

λογισθήσεται] Larcher (576) holds that the fut. here is gnomic in value, though we would say that it indicates a theoretical possibility.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, we agree with him that the author is not speaking of the final judgement by God.

9.7) σύ με προείλω βασιλέα λαοῦ σου  
καὶ δικαστὴν υἱῶν σου καὶ θυγατέρων·

*It was You that have chosen me as king of Your people  
and judge of Your sons and daughters;*

σύ] The identifying force of the pronoun is skilfully represented in **סָ: אָנִי הֵנִי הַיְּהוָה** 'You are the one who chose me.' Sim. **אָנִי הֵנִי הַיְּהוָה אָנִי**.

προείλω] In view of προ- this compound verb, προαιρέω, could imply selection out of multiple alternatives.<sup>15</sup> Hence the bracketed addition in SD:

<sup>13</sup> See SSG § 44 a. In the KG data studied by Mayser (II 2 161) this is a far more frequent pattern than its competitors such as ἡ σοφία ἢ ἀπὸ σοῦ and ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ σοῦ.

<sup>14</sup> On this value, see SSG § 28 ge.

<sup>15</sup> As one of the values of πρό- in compound nouns, LSJ s.v. πρό **D I 2** mentions "priority of rank" as in προεδρία 'privilege of the front seats in a public assembly.'

“.. mich als König .. (anderen) vorgezogen hat.” Likewise Winston’s (203) “above all.” Whilst God did not personally get involved, Solomon did have a rival in Adonijah, a half-brother. But did Schechem want (προείλατο) to marry Dinah, when his parents thought of looking for a candidate in their own tribe? Note *σὲ προείλατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἶναί σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, ὅσα ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς Dt 7.6.

Scarpat (II 258) assigns the *pro-* here a temporal value, suggesting that the author is talking about a divine predestination. He quotes Dt 7.6, which scarcely lends support to such an interpretation.

*υἱὼν σου καὶ θυγατέρων*] a rather unique label applied to the people of God. Reider (127) justly refers to Is 43.6:<sup>16</sup> ἄγε τοὺς υἱοὺς μου ἀπὸ γῆς πόρρωθεν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας μου ἀπ’ ἄκρων τῆς γῆς יְהוָה בְּנֵי מִקְרָהוּ בְנֵי מִקְרָהוּ, where “my sons and daughters” must be an endearing expression for “my men and women,” as suggested already by Qimchi.

The mention of women alongside men is striking in the biblical literature, and Solomon as their judge. Engel (153) points out that shortly after Solomon’s enthronement two quarrelling women came to him and the decision he made was generally evaluated as evidence of the wisdom of God within him to administer justice (1Kg 3.16-28).<sup>17</sup>

9.8) εἶπας οἰκοδομῆσαι ναὸν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ σου  
καὶ ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς σου θυσιαστήριον,  
μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας, ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς.

*You told (me) to build a temple in Your holy mount  
and an altar in the city of Your settlement  
on the model of the holy tabernacle, which you had planned long before.*

*εἶπας*] *Εἶπον* in the sense of “command” with an *inf.* clause, the *s* of which is sometimes only implied.<sup>18</sup> Another example is *εἶπεν κύριος ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς* ‘the Lord told (us) to do them’ Ex 35.1.<sup>19</sup> The same question remains also when one follows Scarpat (II 259), who reads *εἶπας*, i.e. a *Ptc.* On the non-standard spelling *εἶπας* in lieu of *εἶπες*, see Thackeray 1909.210-12, § 17.2.

*ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς σου*] cf. *ἡγιάσθη ὁ ναὸς τῆς κατασκηνώσεως τοῦ ὑψίστου* To 1.4 𐤄<sup>I</sup> (𐤄<sup>II</sup> .. τοῦ θεοῦ).

<sup>16</sup> *SD* (II 2144) adds Is 45.11, though 𐤔 lacks יְהוָה.

<sup>17</sup> Scarpat (II 259) refers to *καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱούς καὶ θυγατέρας*, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ 2Cor 6.18. New Testament scholars opine that Paul is referring to 2Sm 7.14, where, however, God is promising to David about Solomon, hence the *sg.*, αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν.

<sup>18</sup> Larcher (578) finds the absence of *μοι* or *με* justifiable, since it was David that received this command.

<sup>19</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. 3. See also *SSG* § 69A aa).

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] “at the start of the history of Israel.”

On diverse theological issues raised by (8c), cf. Larcher 580-83.

- 9.9) καὶ μετὰ σοῦ ἡ σοφία ἡ εἰδυῖα τὰ ἔργα σου  
καὶ παροῦσα, ὅτε ἐποίεις τὸν κόσμον,  
καὶ ἐπισταμένη τί ἄρεστὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου  
καὶ τί εὐθὲς ἐν ἐντολαῖς σου.

*And with You is Wisdom who knows Your works  
being beside (You), when You were making the world,  
and understanding what is proper in Your eyes  
and what is right according to Your commandments.*

παροῦσα] **§** correctly adjusts the tense: הָיָה עִמָּךְ ‘it was with You.’ So **§** and sim. **§**הָיָה קָרִיבָה ‘it was near by.’ Larcher (584) mentions the use of the Impf. in a contextually related Pr 8: συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ [= κυρίῳ] vs. 27 and ἦμην παρ’ αὐτῷ vs. 30.

ἐποίεις] Impf., the implication of which is manifest in **§**הָיָה עִמָּךְ and **§**עַד הָיְיתָ עִמָּךְ, underlining that Wisdom was present there every day.

ἄρεστὸν] The adj. ἄρεστός carries a moral implication. It is parallel to εὐθὲς here.

ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς] On this Hebraism, see above at 3.2. In the next verse it is replaced with an idiomatic Gk phrase: εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν παρὰ σοί. What did the average reader of **℣** understand with *quid placitum esset oculis tuis*, we wonder?

εὐθὲς] n.sg. < εὐθής. There is no need to postulate a local, Alexandrian dialectal form for εὐθύ < εὐθύς, as Reider (129) and Scarpat (II 262) do. The two adjectives are synonymous. See Thackeray 1909.177f.

- 9.10) ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτήν ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν  
καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον αὐτήν,  
ἵνα συμπαροῦσά μοι κοπιάσῃ,  
καὶ γνῶ τί εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν παρὰ σοί.

*Send her out from the holy heaven  
and from Your glorious throne dispatch her  
so that, being in my company, she could labour  
and I could discover what is acceptable to You.*

ἐξαπόστειλον .. πέμψον] Both **§** and **§**הָיָה read הִרְחִיץ twice. Likewise **℣** *mitte illam*. The author may have meant a slight differentiation: with the first, Wisdom is moved out of her current domain of activity, whereas with the second she is made to part with her current honourable status. The use of the two different prepositions, ἐκ and ἀπό, is to be noted. Ἐξαποστέλλω does not mean “to summon,” *pace* “Mande-la” (BJ).



ἀγίων οὐρανῶν] This is a rare instance of ἅγιος qualifying οὐρανός. Another example is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ Ps 19.7.

Larcher (586) is of the view that the pl. indicates “les cieux par excellence.” But in Wi both the sg. and pl. occur three times as against the LXX as a whole – sg. 564x // pl. 57. We are inclined to view the pl. as a Hebraistic syntactic variant.<sup>20</sup>

θρόνου δόξης] For this phrase, see Θρόνος δόξης ὑψωμένος ἁγίασμα ἡμῶν Je 17.12.

συμπαροῦσά] // παροῦσα (9b). Once she was beside God, and now I want her to be beside me.

μοι] It is uncertain whether this goes with συμπαροῦσά or with κοπιάσῃ as a dative of advantage. ἡνίκα ἡτοίμαζεν τὸν οὐρανόν, συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ in the source text, Pr 8.27, indicates the former as more likely. There is no alternative verb present in συμπαρήμην σοι ‘I was with you’ To 12.12 𐤓<sup>1</sup>. Even under the latter assumption we cannot follow “sie .. alle Mühe mir teile” (SD), for which we would anticipate συγκοπιάσῃ<sup>21</sup> nor “elle m’assiste et peine avec moi” (Larcher 577, 587f.).

παρὰ σοί] The use of παρά with a dat. pers. in the sense of “in the estimation of” appears to be rather common in Pr, e.g. ἔστιν ὁδὸς ἣ δοκεῖ ὀρθὴ εἶναι παρὰ ἀνθρώποις 14.12; more references are given in GELS s.v. II 3.

9.11) οἶδε γὰρ ἐκείνη πάντα καὶ συνίει  
καὶ ὁδηγήσει με ἐν ταῖς πράξεσί μου σωφρόνως  
καὶ φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς·

*For that one knows everything and understands  
and will guide me prudently in all my actions  
and guard me in her glory.*

πάντα] taken by some as an *o* of συνίει as well, e.g. Scarpat (II 253). But one could know something without understanding it.

συνίει] an anomalous form in lieu of συνίησι.<sup>22</sup>

σωφρόνως] 𐤔 𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓 ‘wisely,’ 𐤔𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓 ‘modestly(?)’, and 𐤔𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓.<sup>23</sup>

(11c) is not easy to understand. She will ensure that I shall remain in the domain of her glory?

φυλάξει] 𐤔, 𐤔𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓 and 𐤔𐤕𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓 ‘she protects me.’

<sup>20</sup> So also Scarpat (II 263). Cf. GELS s.v. **b** and SSG § 21 g.

<sup>21</sup> As problematic is “qu’elle peine avec moi” (BJ).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Thackeray 1909 § 23.1, 6.

<sup>23</sup> Diverse interpretations have been suggested for this adverb derived from 𐤕𐤕𐤁 ‘to be pure’: “purely” (GBS 24), “Lat. pure” (Schulthess s.v.), and “soberly” (Müller-Kessler - Sokoloff 251).



- 9.12) καὶ ἔσται προσδεκτὰ τὰ ἔργα μου,  
καὶ διακρινῶ τὸν λαόν σου δικαίως  
καὶ ἔσομαι ἄξιος θρόνων πατρός μου.  
*And my works could be acceptable  
and I shall judge Your people with justice  
and could deserve thrones of my father.*

προσδεκτὰ] The adj. προσδεκτός, affiliated with προσδέχομαι, is unknown prior to LXX, in which it occurs twice more, Pr 11.20 and 16.25, the latter of which the author might be conscious – ἐν φωτὶ ζωῆς υἱὸς βασιλείως, οἱ δὲ προσδεκτοὶ αὐτῷ ὥσπερ νέφος ὄψιμον, where the reference to a prince is to be noted.

ἔργα] As justly pointed out by Larcher (590) the noun could refer to deeds, actions, activities, and products. Cf. *GELS* s.v.

διακρινῶ] Does this compound verb mean the same as κρινῶ? Reider (129) holds that it has to do more with administration than with juridic activities. Cf. *℣ disponam*. But *𐤓𐤇 𐤏𐤕𐤕* ‘I will judge.’

θρόνων] On the pl., see above at vs. 4.

πατρός μου] Unlike Θεὸς πατέρων above (vs. 1) this, sg., is a reference to David.

- 9.13) τίς γὰρ ἄνθρωπος γνώσεται βουλὴν θεοῦ;  
ἢ τίς ἐνθυμηθήσεται τί θέλει ὁ κύριος;  
*For who, being a human being, would know God’s plan?  
or who could infer what the Lord’s will is?*

τίς γὰρ ἄνθρωπος] We would analyse ἄνθρωπος as a *s* complement rather than “which person?,” so *℣ quis hominum* and *𐤓𐤇 𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕* ‘for who among humans would know ..?’ Cf. *𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕* ‘for who is a person who ..?’<sup>24</sup>

ἐνθυμηθήσεται] On the meaning of the verb, ἐνθυμέομαι, see above at 6.15.

- 9.14) λογισμοὶ γὰρ θνητῶν δειλοί,  
καὶ ἐπισφαλεῖς αἱ ἐπίνοιαι ἡμῶν·  
*For thoughts of mortals are despicable,  
and our logics are precarious.*

λογισμοὶ] It is difficult to decide whether or not λογισμός here is being used as completely synonymous with the following ἐπίνοια. Given the two

<sup>24</sup> See *SSG* § 18 c. For examples of the attributively used interrogative pronoun, see *GELS* s.v. τίς, τί V.

clauses form a perfect parallelism we are inclined to view them as slightly different from each other: “pondering” as an action noun vs. “thought, conclusion arrived at.” Since both substantives can mean either, we cannot say which means which. **ש** appears to have struggled, repeating **מְשַׁבְּחֵהוֹן**.<sup>25</sup> **ש** is skilful in using two synonyms derived from the same root: **חֻשְׁבֵּיהוֹן** ‘their modes of thinking’ followed by **דִּילָן מְשַׁבְּחָא** ‘our thoughts.’ Cp. **℣** *cogitationes .. provientiae*.

δειλοί] **ש** **מְחִילָן** ‘weak,’ **ש** **שְׁפִלָן** ‘insignificant.’

- 9.15) φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχὴν,  
καὶ βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφρόντιδα.

*For a perishable body burdens a soul,  
and an earthly tent weighs down a mind full of thought.*

**ש** has preserved only (a): **פְּגָרָא גִיר דְּחֶבְלָא יְקִיר עַל נַפְשָׁא** ‘for a body of perdition is heavy on a soul.’

σκῆνος] As a metaphorical synonym of σκηνή as applied to a human body as a residence of its soul this lexeme is known to CG<sup>26</sup> and is found also in NTG in ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνούς 2Cor 5.1.

βρίθει] **℣** **מְבַרָא** ‘weighs down.’<sup>27</sup>

πολυφρόντιδα] used with a negative connotation, “full of worries, wrong ideas.” Cf. **ש** **נָתַע מְשַׁכְּנָא אֶרְעֻנָא לְהוֹנָא סְגִי צָפְתָּא** ‘an earthly tent pulls down a mind full of worries’ and **℣** *sensum multa cogitantem*.

- 9.16) καὶ μόλις εἰκάζομεν τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς  
καὶ τὰ ἐν χερσὶν εὐρίσκομεν μετὰ πόνου·  
τὰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανοῖς τίς ἐξιχνίασεν;

*We hardly make inferences about matters on the earth  
and find with difficulty about things in our hands,  
then what is in heaven, who tracked out?*

(b) is expanded in S: **דְּקָדָם עֵינֵינוּ בְּלֹא וְתָא מְשַׁכְּחִין חֲנָן וְאֵילִין דְּבִאֲדִין בְּעַמְלָא** ‘what is in front of our eyes we find with fatigue and what is in our hands we have trouble in finding.’

ἐξιχνίασεν] The Aor. could be gnomic in value, see SSG § 28 **dc**.

- 9.17) βουλὴν δέ σου τίς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν  
καὶ ἔπεμψας τὸ ἄγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων;

<sup>25</sup> Sim. **℣** **חֻשְׁבֵּתָא דִּילֵהוֹן** ‘their thoughts.’

<sup>26</sup> For references, see Larcher 596.

<sup>27</sup> So Müller-Kessler - Sokoloff (200) *pace* GBS (25) **מְדַרָא**.

*Who then got to know Your plan, unless You gave wisdom  
and sent Your holy spirit from the highest spot?*

τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα] This might not be referring to σοφίαν (a). In Wi we find σοφία tens of times attested, and only once it has σου attached with God as a referent, 14.5, where some MSS omit it and others attach it to another substantive nearby. Hence its presence here as against its absence from σοφίαν may need to be taken note of. Note further πνεῦμα σοφίας 7.7 with a qualitative genitive. Note **פס** רוחא דקודשך, which would, in Heb., represent רוחך קדשך. Larcher (602) mentions three LXX examples of the phrase ἅγιον πνεῦμα – Ps 50.13, Is 63.10, 11. In all these three cases αὐτοῦ or σου attached makes it evident that as in our case here the spirit is divine unlike an example in our own document in ἅγιον πνεῦμα παιδείας 1.5, where it is part of a human constitution.

ὑψίστων] Cf. Si 43.9, where τὰ ὑψίστα (**מרומים**) is parallel to οὐρανός (**שמים**), and Lk 2.14, where it is opposed to γῆ.

- 9.18) καὶ οὕτως διωρθώθησαν αἱ τρίβοι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς,  
καὶ τὰ ἄρεστά σου ἐδιδάχθησαν ἄνθρωποι,  
καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν.

*And in that way the ways of those on the earth have been straightened,  
and people were taught what pleases You,  
and were rescued with wisdom.*

τῶν] > **ס**.

τῇ σοφίᾳ] **ס** and **פס** בחכמתך ‘with Your wisdom,’ on which see above at vs. 17.

ἐσώθησαν] Survival or earthly well-being rather than eternal salvation is meant here.

Naturally much has been written on exactly what the author means with “salvation” here. Cf. Larcher 603-05 and Hübner 132-35, for instance.

## CHAPTER 10

- 10.1) Αὕτη πρωτόπλαστον πατέρα κόσμου  
μόνον κτισθέντα διεφύλαξεν  
καὶ ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου,  
*This one carefully guarded the first-formed father  
of the world, created alone  
and rescued him from his own transgression,*

From here to the last chapter we see how Wisdom guarded the world in its history.

Αὕτη] In this passage Wisdom is often [7 times] referred to with this demonstrative pronoun, every time as the first word of a clause.

πρωτόπλαστον πατέρα κόσμου] i.e. Adam. None of the individuals in the last ten chapters is named, what might not have helped many of the non-Jewish readership.

Nobody would doubt that the referent here is Adam. He, however, can bear this title only when κόσμος here is taken in the sense of ‘humanity’ as in 2Ma 3.12, so *GELS* s.v. **1 b**. So also “der Menschheit” (Hübner 131).

μόνον] Since Eve was God’s own handiwork, the author must mean that Adam was created alone prior to Eve.

ἰδίου] § πῶς. Grimm (1837.242) thinks this is merely equivalent to a possessive pronoun, i.e. = αὐτοῦ.<sup>1</sup> However, the author might be thinking of the biblical description of the original sin, in which Adam as well as Eve ascribe their respective error to the snake and his wife (Gn 3.12-13). Cf. also Larcher (612-14), who defends his rendering “sa transgression propre” (608). We doubt that the author, who has mentioned a role played by the devil (2.24), would declare Adam innocent. Both Larcher and with his “dalla sua caduta” Scarpato (II 331, 335f.) lay emphasis on the syntactic features, namely the presence of the definite article and the intermediate position of our word as in διὰ τῶν ἰδίων κολάσεων ‘through their own penalties’ 11.13. True, this syntactic feature is observable in Wi quite often, 8 times, but there are also three exceptions, e.g. ἐν ἰδίῳ γενεῖ ‘in its original nature’ 19.6; see also 17.10 and 18.14.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For such examples in LXX, see *GELS* ἴδιος **d**. This usage is rather rare in SG *pace* Deissmann (1895.120f.), for our criticism of whose position, see *SSG* § 8 **h**. Though not mentioning Wi in particular, he stresses that apocryphal books originally written in Greek are prominent in this respect. Grimm (1860.192) notes that this usage is known in NT as well.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Larcher’s (612) “toujours” is plainly wrong.

10.2) ἔδωκέν τε αὐτῷ ἰσχὺν κρατῆσαι πάντων.

*She also gave him strength for controlling all.*

ἀπάντων] usually analysed as neut., “all things, alles,” which fits Gn 1.26-29. The reference is plausibly to animate beings, thus flora and fauna.

10.3) ἀποστάς δὲ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἄδικος ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ  
ἀδελφοκτόνοις συναπώλετο θυμοῖς.

*A wicked person stood away from her in his anger,  
perished with him because of fratricidal fury.*

ἄδικος] referring to Cain, Gn 4.8. **Σ** is a little more specific: **אָרִיז** ‘one who falsely accuses.’ In naming Cain **Σ** is being more helpful to its readership.<sup>3</sup> This is often done in the sequel. **Σ**h, by contrast, stays close to **Θ**.

συναπώλετο] What is the value of the preformative συν-? Unlike in συνοικῆσαι λέοντι καὶ δράκοντι εὐδοκήσω ‘I would prefer living with a lion and a snake’ Si 25.16 θυμός is not meant to perish. Its dative case indicates a cause, as in τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ συναπολῇ ‘you might perish together because of his folly’ Si 8.15. Holmes (551) and Scarpata (II 287) refer to Philo, who was of the view that Cain, by murdering Abel in an unrighteous manner, killed himself: ἀνέστη Κάιν καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἕτερον.<sup>4</sup>

10.4) δι’ ὃν κατακλυζομένην γῆν πάλιν ἔσωσεν σοφία  
δι’ εὐτελοῦς ξύλου τὸν δίκαιον κυβερνήσασα.

*Wisdom rescued again the earth flooded because of him,  
serving as the guide of the righteous one through cheap timber.*

τὸν δίκαιον] **Σ** **אֲרִיז הַיָּשָׁר** ‘Noah the righteous.’

δι’ ὃν] According to the biblical account in Gn 6 the guilt was not laid only at Cain’s door. Reider’s (133) suggestion of reading δι’ ὃ still blames Cain. Is there any certain instance of the n.sg. ὃ referring to the preceding account as a whole? A case such as καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσσαχαρ, ὃ ἐστὶν Μισθός Ge 30.18 is different in that the relative pronoun refers back to a preceding, particular phrase and the relative clause is an explanatory gloss.

Our author must have known that Cain was, by no means, the only sinful human being that would cause the flood. He is made to represent the entire humanity, excepting Noah and his seven family members. For a theological debate arising here, cf. Larcher 618f.

<sup>3</sup> Pace Larcher (615) **Σ** does not do this every time, e.g. Adam (vs. 1).

<sup>4</sup> Philo, however, must have known that the biblical source says **וַיַּהַרְגֵהוּ** ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν Gn 4.8. Did he read αὐτόν ‘himself’? Philo is perhaps attempting to account for the συν- here.

κατακλυζομένην] a verb that alludes to κατακλυσμός, which appears in the biblical account of the flood in Gn 6-7.

εὐτελοῦς] < εὐτελής ‘poor in quality,’ used only in Wi; three more times, 11.15, 13.14, 15.10.

- 10.5) αὕτη καὶ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ πονηρίας ἐθνῶν συγχυθέντων  
 ἔγνω τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἐτήρησεν αὐτὸν ἄμεμπτον θεῷ  
 καὶ ἐπὶ τέκνου σπλάγχνοις ἰσχυρὸν ἐφύλαξεν.

*This one, when nations fell into confusion, designing similar evilness, recognised the righteous one and guarded him as irreproachable to God and in the matter of the mercies for (his) child kept him firm.*

αὕτη] see above at vs. 1.

ὁμονοία πονηρίας] presumably a reference to the gigantic project for building a tower at Babel (Gn 11).

ἐθνῶν] In a description of this early epoch in the history of mankind ἔθνη would scarcely refer to “gentiles” specifically.

συγχυθέντων] a reference to the multilingual society emerging after the building of the tower of Babel. See **Θ** συγγέωμεν ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν τὴν γλῶσσαν Ge 11.7. **ⲥ** **ⲓⲣⲱⲁⲛⲏⲛ** ‘and they were poured’ is too mechanical a rendering as against **ⲥⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛ** ‘who became confused.’

τὸν δίκαιον] see καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ge 15.6.

At the age of ninety-nine Abram was told by God: **ⲙⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛ** γίνου ἄμemptos Gn 17.1.

ἐπὶ] This prep. with a dat. can mean “in the matter of, regarding”; for other examples, see *GELS* s.v. B II 4. Larcher’s (619, 621) “malgré” is questionable. On the other hand, Scarpata’s (II 340) “contra” is known to CG<sup>5</sup>; his translation reads “gli diede fermezza per resistere all’affetto che provava per il figlio.”

τέκνου] Isaac whom God told Abram to offer as a sacrifice, Gn 22. In **ⲥ** **ⲙⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛ** precedes. The gen. is objective.

σπλάγχνοις] < σπλάγχνα, one of a small number of substantives that are used in the pl., so-called plurale tantum.<sup>6</sup>

- 10.6) αὕτη δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο  
 φυγόντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πενταπόλεως,

*Whilst the ungodly were perishing, this one rescued a righteous person, who escaped the fire descending on Pentapolis,*

<sup>5</sup> E.g. συνιστᾶς τοὺς Ἀρκάδας ἐπὶ τῇ Σπάρτῃ ‘he strove to unite the Arcadians against Sparta’ Herod. 6.74.

<sup>6</sup> See *SSG* § 21 e.

δίκαιον] named in **§** as Lot.

ἐξαπολλυμένων] which Scarpat (II 332) emends to ἐξ ἀπολλυμένων, claiming that the compound form is rather rare in Greek. However, it is already attested in Homer. The reading with the preposition ἐξ accords with **§h** and **℣**.

καταβάσιον] an adj. derived from καταβαίνω, hapax and unknown prior to LXX. CG uses instead καταβάσιος.

πῦρ Πενταπόλεως] Gn 19.24. Five cities to the south of the Dead Sea are named in Gn 10.19 and 14.2,<sup>7</sup> though Gn 19.24 names only two of them, Sodom and Gomorrah, as destroyed by fire and sulphur. The Gk place name is a collective name covering all the five cities, and is grammatically treated as sg., hence ἥς in the following verse. The rendering in **§** is, by contrast, **נִי־מִן שְׁמֵה**. Cp. **§h** **אֶת־מִן שְׁמֵה** ‘a group of five cities.’

Pace Reider (134) the gen. Πενταπόλεως is not subject to καταβάσιον, but to πῦρ, a genitive indicating a target,<sup>8</sup> “fire targeting at Pentapolis.” Larcher (622) attributes the selection of the gen. to the prefix of καταβαίνω. Cf. ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος, καταιβάτης κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα ‘the unsleeping bolt of Zeus came upon him, the swooping lightning brand with breath of flame’ Aesch. *Promet. vinc.* 359.

Hübner (137) is amazed at the unbalanced attention paid by our author to Abraham and Lot: “Abraham erhält nur einen Vers mit drei Stichoi, Lot jedoch drei Verse mit elf Stichoi!”

10.7) ἥς ἔτι μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας  
καπνιζομένη καθέστηκεν χέρσος,  
καὶ ἀτελέσιν ὥραις καρποφοροῦντα φυτά,  
ἀπιστοῦσης ψυχῆς μνημεῖον ἑστηκυῖα στήλη ἀλός.

*as evidence of whose wickedness  
it became a smoking, barren land, and is still there  
and plants are bearing fruits in wrong seasons,  
as a memory of a distrustful soul a pillar of salt is standing.*

The verse is syntactically rather complicated, constituted by a relative clause. Its only finite verb is καθέστηκεν, whose *s* is the antecedent of the relative clause, Πενταπόλις in the preceding verse. Καθίστημι, when used intransitively, does not mean “to exist,” but its Pf. or Plpf. means “to have acquired the quality of,” virtually “to be so and so” (*GELS* s.v. **II 3 b**). The adverb ἔτι explicitly marks the perfective aspect of the Pf. form selected here.

<sup>7</sup> They are named in an Ebla tablet engraved in the third millennium BCE; cf. Freedman 1978.

<sup>8</sup> See *SSG* § 22 v (xiv).

χέρσος] The fire and sulphur destroyed not only the inhabitants of the two cities but also the growing plants, πάντα τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐκ τῆς γῆς Gn 19.25. This second declension adjective is substantivised, probably with γῆ implicit, cf. ἀπὸ τῆς χέρσου ‘from the barren land’ Is 7.25.<sup>9</sup>

§ has simplified Ⲫ: ⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲛ ⲁⲗⲏ ⲁⲗⲏ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲃⲉⲛ ⲁⲗⲏⲓⲁⲓ ‘and the trees which are inside them do not bear fruits.’

καρποφοροῦντα .. ἑστηκυῖα] Both participles are being predicatively used and can be rewritten as καρποφοροῦσιν .. ἑστηκεν. Whilst in CG the ptc. is only rarely used predicatively, it is quite common in SG.<sup>10</sup> Hence neither φυτά nor στήλη is the *s* of the preceding καθέστηκεν.<sup>11</sup>

μνημεῖον] parallel to μαρτύριον, and both substantives are qualified by a noun in the gen., each noun indicating a vice.

στήλη ἁλός] a phrase describing what Lot’s wife had turned into, Gn 19.26. Holmes (551) refers to Josephus, who says: στήλην ἁλῶν .. ἱστορήσα δ’ αὐτήν, ἔτι γὰρ καὶ νῦν διαμένει ‘a pillar of salt .. I inquired into it, for it still remains now also’ (JA 1.11.4).

10.8) σοφίαν γὰρ παροδεύσαντες

οὐ μόνον ἐβλάβησαν τοῦ μὴ γινῶναι τὰ καλὰ,  
ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀφροσύνης ἀπέλιπον τῷ βίῳ μνημόσυνον,  
ἵνα ἐν οἷς ἐσφάλησαν μηδὲ λαθεῖν δυνηθῶσιν.

*For having passed over, not noticing wisdom  
they were not only hindered from learning good things,  
but also left to the world a memory of their folly,  
so that they could not even leave their errors unnoticeable.*

παροδεύσαντες] Pace Larcher (621, 626) the ptc. here is circumstantial in function, not the *s* “Ceux qui ont dédaigné la Sagesse.” The *s* of ἐβλάβησαν is the residents of the Pentapolis of the preceding verses.

τοῦ μὴ γινῶναι] In spite of our translation above the gen. τοῦ here does not retain a genuine, possibly ablative value,<sup>12</sup> but a grammaticalised marker of the infinitive like Engl. *to* or Germ. *zu*.<sup>13</sup> The inf. indicates a result, not an *o* of ἐβλάβησαν as in ἐπετάγη αὐτῷ ἀπενέγκαντι πάντα τὰ σκεύη ταῦτα

<sup>9</sup> In *GELS* s.v. “5.25” is an error for “7.25.”

<sup>10</sup> See *SSG* § 31 g.

<sup>11</sup> Engel (*SD II* 2145) holds that στήλη is a third *s* of καθέστηκεν, an analysis based on the wrong assumption that this verb means “es gibt da.”

<sup>12</sup> The sole instance of the syntagm βλάπτω τινά τινος listed in *LSJ* is τόν γε θεοὶ βλάπτουσι κελεύθου ‘gods are thwarting him of his return’ Hom. *Od.* 1.195.

<sup>13</sup> As in οὐκ ἠδυνήθην τοῦ βλέπειν ‘I could not see’ Ps 39.13. More examples may be found in *SSG* § 30 d.



ἀποθεῖναι ἐν τῷ ναῷ ‘he was ordered to take all these instruments and put them in the temple’ 1E 6.18, for otherwise the negator μὴ would make no sense.<sup>14</sup> Analogously the conjunction ἵνα in the parallel clause indicates a result, not a purpose as in ἵνα εἴπωσιν σήμερον ‘as a result people say today’ Ge 22.14.

ἀπέλιπον τῷ βίῳ μνημόσυνον] A similar phrase occurs in καὶ μνήμην αἰώνιον τοῖς μετ’ ἐμὲ ἀπολείψω ‘I shall .. and leave an eternal memory to my posterity’ Wi 8.13.

τῷ βίῳ] For βίος in the sense of “*the world we live in*,” see Wi 14.21, and also ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος 4M 17.14. Cf. *℣ hominibus*.

ἵνα] which Larcher (627) views as final in value,<sup>15</sup> but Lot’s wife did not intend to become a pillar of salt. The resultative ἵνα is firmly established; see *GELS* s.v. 2.<sup>16</sup>

λαθεῖν] On λανθάνω used without a mention of someone whose notice an action escapes, see above at 1.8.

10.9) σοφία δὲ τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὴν ἐκ πόνων ἐρρύσατο.

*However, those who wait on her Wisdom rescues out of distresses.*

Wisdom is not only personified, but also deified.

θεραπεύοντας] This verb in LXX does not exclusively refer to religious or cultic service, as shown by ἄνθρωπος μέγας θεραπεύων ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως Es A 2 ο’.<sup>17</sup>

ἐρρύσατο] analysed in *§* as a gnomic Aor., *רִצְּצָהּ* ‘she rescues’ as against *סִחָהּ* *רִצְּצָהּ* Pf.

With the determinate *ο* the clause may be concerned with a particular incident in the past whether in the author’s memory or Solomon’s.

10.10) αὕτη φυγάδα ὀργῆς ἀδελφοῦ δίκαιον

ὠδήγησεν ἐν τρίβοις εὐθείαις· ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ βασιλείαν θεοῦ

καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ γινῶσιν ἁγίων·

εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις

καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ·

<sup>14</sup> Fichtner (38f.) is apparently aware of this problem, which he resolves with his rendering: “erlitten nicht nur dadurch Schaden, daß sie das Gute nicht erkannten, sondern ..,” cf. *μεγάλα βεβλάφθαι* ‘to have a great damage inflicted’ Xen. Cyr. 5.3.30. However, he takes τοῦ as a genuine genitive, which is unlikely in view of the example quoted above from Homer, in which *κέλευθος* is not a damage to be inflicted. Larcher (626) views the negator as “*explétive*,” but we would like to be shown an indisputable case of such μὴ with *βλάπτω*.

<sup>15</sup> Likewise “in order that” (*NETS*).

<sup>16</sup> Scarpit (II 345) sounds unsure. Likewise Hübner (138).

<sup>17</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. 1.

*To a righteous person fleeing from the fury of a brother  
she pointed to straight paths. She showed him the rule of God  
and gave him knowledge about holy things  
and provided him with much help to deal with hardships  
and increased produce out of his toils.*

φυγάδα ὀργῆς] The gen. is a primitive ablative<sup>18</sup> as in φυγάδα πάσης τῆς χώρας ‘a fugitive from his whole country’ Xen. *HG* 4.1.7.<sup>19</sup>

ἀδελφοῦ δίκαιον] Most likely a reference to Jacob running away from Esau. Cf. **ܣ ܒܝܪܥܝ ܢܚܝܝ** ‘the righteous one, Jacob.’ On the unqualified application by our author of the title δίκαιος to Jacob, cf. Hübner 138f.

ἀγίων] Most likely n.pl. Cf. **ܣ ܢܫܝܬܐ** ‘holiness’ vs. **ܣܝ ܢܫܝܬܐ** = ἄγιοι, cf. οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἄγιοι αὐτοῦ To 11.14 **ܥ**<sup>1</sup>.<sup>20</sup>

εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν] The verb εὐπορέω, when transitively used, means, according to LSJ, “to supply, furnish, procure” with <acc. rei + dat. pers.>. Here we have a case of <+ acc. pers.>. On the other hand, ἐν μόχθοις is scarcely equivalent to acc. rei. The prep. is basically local in value.

Scarpat (II 348) proposes finding here our author displaying another innovative feature, namely εὐπορέω used transitively in the sense of ‘to make sbd rich’: “lo arricchì.” This, however, makes the synonymic parallelism between (d) and (e) go a little too far –

εὐπορέω // πληθύνω  
μόχθοι // πόνοι.

And basically the same idea is repeated in vs. 11.

πόνους] See above on 8.7 and Scarpat (II 349). Larcher’s (628, 631f.) “ses descendants” represents his emendation, τοὺς ἐκγόνους or ἀπογόνους.

10.11) ἐν πλεονεξία κατισχυόντων αὐτὸν παρέστη  
καὶ ἐπλούτισεν αὐτόν·

*As his greedy oppressors were active, she stood by  
and enriched him.*

ἐν πλεονεξία] The prep. here must basically mark a situation in which greedy opponents attempted to rob and impoverish him. Cf. ἐν μόχθοις in vs. 10 above.

κατισχυόντων] Some translations<sup>21</sup> seem to reflect their identification here of a genitive absolute. SG does attest to the phenomenon where the s

<sup>18</sup> See *SSG* § 22 q.

<sup>19</sup> More examples in CG are adduced in Scarpat (II 347f.).

<sup>20</sup> Quite a few alternative interpretations are mentioned in Larcher (629f.).

<sup>21</sup> E.g. “When .. *men* dealt hardly with him” (Holmes) and “When .. men were trying ..” (NETS).

is easily identifiable in the context,<sup>22</sup> which is not the case here since we would then have here an impersonal construction.

παρέστη] She stood by, not just watching, but to support him. The addition of αὐτῷ could have helped. One MS reads αὐτῷ in lieu of the preceding αὐτον. Cf. ⲩ ⲡⲗ ⲛⲙⲁⲣ ‘she stood by for him.’<sup>23</sup>

ἐπλούτισεν αὐτόν] Cf. LXX ἐπλούτησεν ‘he [= Jacob] became rich’ Gn 30.43. Cp. κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλουτίζει 1K 2.7 with πλούσιοι ἐπτώ-χευσαν Ps 33.11.

- 10.12) διεφύλαξεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν  
καὶ ἀπὸ ἐνεδρευόντων ἡσφαλίσατο·  
καὶ ἀγῶνα ἰσχυρὸν ἐβράβευσεν αὐτῷ,  
ἵνα γινῶ ὅτι παντὸς δυνατωτέρα ἐστὶν εὐσέβεια.

*She guarded him carefully from enemies  
and from those who lay in ambush she kept him safe  
and acted as an umpire at his tough race  
so that he would know that piety is mightier than anything.*

ἀγῶνα ἰσχυρὸν] Most likely a reference to Jacob’s whole-night struggle with an angel (Gn 32.24ff.). Note the use of two derivationally related key-words in ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός Gn 32.28 (MT 29). The acc. is that of respect and specification.<sup>24</sup>

ἐβράβευσεν] ⲩ ⲡⲗⲛⲁⲣⲓ ‘she led him to victory,’ *℣ certamen forte dedit illi ut vinceret*, an interpretation followed by Holmes (551) with his “she guided him to victory.”

εὐσέβεια] ⲩ ⲡⲗⲛⲁⲣⲓ ⲡⲗⲛⲁⲣⲓ ‘the fear of God.’

- 10.13) αὕτη πραθέντα δίκαιον οὐκ ἐγκατέλιπεν,  
ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἁμαρτίας ἐρρύσατο αὐτόν·

*She did not abandon a righteous person who had been sold,  
but rescued him from sin;*

πραθέντα] cf. εἰς δοῦλον ἐπράθη Ἰωσηφ Ps 104.17.

δίκαιον] named in ⲩ as Joseph (Gn 37.29).

(b) must be a reference to the abortive attempt by Potyphar’s wife to rape Joseph (Gn 39). With a *peccatoribus* ‘from sinners’ *℣* is probably referring to Joseph’s brothers.

<sup>22</sup> See SSG § 31 **hb**.

<sup>23</sup> Without reference to Ⲫ this could mean “she stood up.”

<sup>24</sup> See SSG § 22 **xh**.

ἐξ ἁμαρτίας] cf. πῶς ποιήσω τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο καὶ ἁμαρτή-  
σομαι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ; Ge 39.9.

- 10.14) συγκατέβη αὐτῷ εἰς λάκκον  
καὶ ἐν δεσμοῖς οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν,  
ἕως ἥνεγκεν αὐτῷ σκήπτρα βασιλείας  
καὶ ἐξουσίαν τυραννούντων αὐτοῦ·  
ψευδεῖς τε ἔδειξεν τοὺς μωμησαμένους αὐτόν  
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δόξαν αἰώνιον.

*She went down with him into an underground cell  
and did not leave him fettered  
she even brought him a sceptre of reign  
and authority over those who were lording it over him  
and she also exposed as liars those who had accused him  
and conferred on him permanent honour.*

λάκκον] used of Joseph's cell in Gn 40.15 (לֶחָבֶרֶט).<sup>25</sup> The space where he was confined is also called ὀχύρωμα (39.20) and δεσμωτήριον (39.22), בֵּית רִחֹב in both cases. Note ἐν δεσμοῖς (14b).

ἕως] This is not being used here as a normal temporal conjunction; it does not mean that she would leave him in chains thereafter, but it marks an extraordinary case.<sup>26</sup>

σκήπτρα] Reider (137) notes that the pl. is poetical and peculiar to CG. In combination with θρόνος the pl. may indicate the entity as a generic term in προέκρινα αὐτὴν σκήπτρων καὶ θρόνων Wi 7.8, sim. ib. 6.21. In SG, excepting these two cases, the pl. is confined<sup>27</sup> to its Hebraising use in the sense of “tribes” as in πάντα τὰ σκήπτρα Ἰσραὴל כָּל-שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 1Sm 10.20. We hardly recognise any contrast between σκήπτρῳ τῷδε Eur. *Androm.* 588 and σκήπτρα .. τάδε ib. 1223, both said by King Menelaus.

ἔδειξεν] Here we have a verb governed by an *ο* and a complement of it, which two constitute a nominal clause. To simplify the matter, ἔδειξα αὐτοὺς δικαίους ‘I showed them to be righteous’ can be rewritten as ἔδειξα αὐτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι or ἔδειξα ὅτι δίκαιοι εἰσίν. The same applies to εὑρον πάντα τὰ σώματα νεκρά ‘they found all the bodies dead’ Is 37.36.<sup>28</sup>

μωμησαμένους αὐτόν] an allusion to the false accusation by Potiphar made to her husband (Gn 39.14-18). The selection of the pl., μωμησαμένους,

<sup>25</sup> The pit into which his brothers had thrown Joseph into is also called בֹּר, which is rendered with λάκκος in LXX.

<sup>26</sup> In *GELS* there is a reference to this usage absent s.v. ἕως B.

<sup>27</sup> The only possible exception is Od 4.9, where, however, σκήπτρα could mean ‘tribes.’

<sup>28</sup> For details see *SSG* § 61 c.

is probably because the woman told her story to the household staff, some of whom may have believed her.

δόξαν αἰώνιον] In Egypt Joseph's status would reach an incredible height as told in Gn 41.37-45. Note also ἀπαγγείλατε οὖν τῷ πατρί μου πᾶσαν τὴν δόξαν μου τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ge 45.13.

10.15) Αὕτη λαὸν ὅσιον καὶ σπέρμα ἄμεμπτον  
ἐρρύσατο ἐξ ἔθνους θλιβόντων.

*She rescued a holy people and an impeccable race  
from a nation of harassing people.*

λαὸν ὅσιον καὶ σπέρμα ἄμεμπτον] The author has been criticised for being a shade too kindly to his own nation. However, at vs. 9 above we remarked that the Aor. tense in this section is unlikely to be gnomic. Then he is not saying here that this statement had been true in the whole history of his nation. He would then have been able to refer to certain periods, however brief, of which he could be justly proud.

The founder and forefather of this nation is designated as ἄμεμπτος, vs. 5 above. Whilst σπέρμα is at times close to ἔθνος or λαός (*GELS* s.v. σπέρμα 2 c) as in Is 1.4, where it is parallel to these two nouns, the lineage from Abraham can still be at the back of the author's mind.

Shortly after the rescue of the nation out of the hands of the harassing Egyptians Moses heard a message from God: ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον Ex 19.6. On behalf of our author Hübner (142) adds: "Auch heute in Ägypten!"

θλιβόντων] a verb used with Egyptians as its *s* in καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ κραυγὴ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἥκει πρὸς με, κἀγὼ ἐώρακα τὸν θλιμμόν, ὃν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτοὺς Ex 3.9.

10.16) εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ψυχὴν θεράποντος κυρίου  
καὶ ἀντέστη βασιλεῦσιν φοβεροῖς ἐν τέρασι καὶ σημείοις.

*She entered into the soul of one who served the Lord  
and he resisted awesome kings with portents and signs.*

εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ψυχὴν] On Wisdom's intimate relationship, see above at 1.4 and 7.27.

θεράποντος] According to Larcher (641) θεράπων is, in religious context, applied only to Moses. Depending on how one understands "religious," one would exclude many other cases such as μνήσθητι Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν θεραπόντων σου Dt 9.27. More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. θεράπων.



- 10.18) διεβίβασεν αὐτοὺς θάλασσαν ἐρυθρὰν  
καὶ διήγαγεν αὐτοὺς δι' ὕδατος πολλοῦ·

*She helped them cross the red sea  
and led them through vast water;*

θάλασσαν ἐρυθρὰν] According to LSJ s.v. ἐρυθρός Herodotus mentions ἡ ἐρυθρὴ θάλασσα, referring to the Indian Ocean, but also including the Red Sea: 1.180, 2.11, 158, 4.22. At times, as here, LXX reverses the sequence, e.g. τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς Dt 11.4. Even where in a description of the same historical event we find at times no definite article, e.g. Ἐξῆρεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς Ex 15.22, likewise Wi 19.7. **𐤓** presents a slightly different perspective: .. **𐤇𐤓𐤕 𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤏𐤕 𐤀𐤓𐤕 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤕** ‘the awesome sea of Sof .. mighty waters.’ **𐤇𐤓** is a transliteration of **𐤇𐤓**.

The use of φιαβιβάζω as doubly transitive is also attested in μὴ διαβιβάσσης ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἰορδάνην Nu 32.5.

- 10.19) τοὺς δὲ ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν κατέκλυσεν  
καὶ ἐκ βάθους ἀβύσσου ἀνέβρασεν αὐτούς.

*She drowned their enemies,  
and caused them to move fast up out of the depths of the abyss.*

κατέκλυσεν] The Vorlage of **𐤓 𐤀𐤓𐤕 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤕** ‘and water covered’ may have read κατεκλυσαν, a v.l. preserved in A, and the translator may have supplied the *s*. However, for him the *s* of ἀνέβρασεν was σοφία as is shown by **𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕** ‘she lifted.’ By contrast, **𐤓𐤏** reads **𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤕** ‘she flooded.’

Scarpat (II 334) prefers the majority reading κατέπαυσεν, translating it as “portò alla distruzione [= led to destruction].” Hübner (144) points out that at vs. 4 the same verb as here, κατακλύζω, is used of the disastrous flood.

βάθους ἀβύσσου] With his “unergründliche Tiefe” Fichtner (39) analyses ἀβύσσου as a genuine adjective as in CG. An indisputable instance is identifiable in ἀπὸ ἀβύσσων πηγῶν ‘from very deep springs’ Dt 33.13.<sup>31</sup> However, ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα ‘I walked about in the depth of the abyss’ Si 24.5 there is no syntactic ambiguity: ἀβύσσων<sup>32</sup> is substantivised and subordinate to βάθει, the same noun as in our Wi passage. Hence our ἀβύσσου could be a substantivised adjective.

ἀνέβρασεν] Aor. of ἀναβράσσω, a verb extremely rare in SG (3×).

<sup>31</sup> Pace Scarpat (II 360) this is a rare exception similar to πηγὰι ἄβυσσοι Hdt 2.28. Nor is this a case of Hebraism, for **𐤏𐤕𐤕** is not used as an adjective.

<sup>32</sup> In SG the pl. ἄβυσσοι is very common: 13 out of 46 instances.

- 10.20) διὰ τοῦτο δίκαιοι ἐσκύλευσαν ἄσεβεῖς  
καὶ ὕμνησαν, κύριε, τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιόν σου  
τὴν τε ὑπέρμαχόν σου χεῖρα ἤνεσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν·

*Hence the righteous despoiled the ungodly  
and sang hymns, o Lord, to Your holy name  
and unanimously praised Your protective hand,*

ὕμνησαν] Possibly an allusion to Ex 15.1-19, traditionally known as תְּהִי לַיהוָה שִׁירָא. LXX begins with Τότε ἤσεν Μωσῆς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ψῆδὴν ταύτην τῷ θεῷ Ex 15.1, where αἰνέω is used instead of ὑμνέω, the sole instance of the equation שִׁיר ὑμνέω.

In **Σ** we find in (b) a plus, אֶחָד פִּיָּהּ ‘with one mouth,’ which is parallel to אֶחָד אִישׁ ‘as one (person)’ = ὁμοθυμαδόν (c).

- 10.21) ὅτι ἡ σοφία ἤνοιξεν στόμα κωφῶν  
καὶ γλώσσας νηπίων ἔθηκεν τρανάς.

*because Wisdom opened the mouth of the dumb  
and made the tongues of infants clearly articulate.*

The author is possibly alluding to Moses confessing to God “I have never been eloquent, neither in the past nor since you have spoken to your servant. I am slow of speech and tongue (ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγὼ εἰμι)” (Ex 4.10).

ἔθηκεν τρανάς] This use of τίθημι in the sense of “to cause to be, render” (*GELS* s.v. **I 3**) is known to CG as in ἐφασκον θήσειν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον ἡματα πάντα ‘I said that I would make him immortal and ageless all his days’ Hom. *Od.* 5.136.<sup>33</sup>

τρανάς] cf. τρανή ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιγάλων ‘the tongue of stammerers ..’ Is 35.6.

<sup>33</sup> More examples are mentioned in LSJ s.v. **B I**. The asterisk in *GELS* s.v. **I 3** is to be removed, though Heb. מִשֵּׁן is used in a similar fashion, e.g. מִשֵּׁן לְרַחֵם וּלְשׁוֹן Is 13.9 > θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον, but מִשֵּׁן does not take an adjective as a second *o*.

Moreover, in *GELS* loc. cit. θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον Is 13.9 is to be deleted, since ἔρημον is substantivised, hence not ἐρήμην.



## CHAPTER 11

11.1) Εὐδόδωσεν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἐν χειρὶ προφήτου ἁγίου.

*She guided well their works through the spirit of a holy prophet.*

Εὐδόδωσεν] Winston (225) views the verb as used intransitively: “Their works prospered.” In support of his analysis he mentions three instances in LXX, but two of them (Je 12.1 and 2Ch 18.14<sup>1</sup>) are passive (!), and the remaining, Is 54.17, is not convincing at all.<sup>2</sup>

αὐτῶν] not referring back to any of δίκαιοι (10.20), κωφῶν (21), or νηπίων (21), but to Israelites.

προφήτου] In Dt 34.10 Moses is mentioned as a distinguished prophet. Cf. also Ho 12.14. In Nu 18.15 Moses calls himself a prophet.

11.2) διώδυσαν ἔρημον ἀοίκητον  
καὶ ἐν ἀβάτοις ἔπηξαν σκηνάς·

*They journeyed through an uninhabited wilderness  
and pitched tents in lands difficult for passage.*

From this point on Wisdom is not present any more, she is not referred to with αὕτη or any of αὕτης, αὕτῃ, or αὕτην, and God is addressed as *You* in the second person singular.

σκηνάς] Probably a reference to Ex 12.37, where, however, we find Σοκχωθα in G, a transliteration of **𐤓𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤁**, a reasonable rendering, since **𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤁** is **𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤁** expanded with an adverbial /-ā/, which makes the added εἰς redundant, in εἰς Σοκχωθα.

ἀβάτοις] an adjective that occurs parallel to ἔρημος in Jb 38.26f. as well.

11.3) ἀντέστησαν πολεμίοις καὶ ἐχθροὺς ἡμύναντο.

*They resisted antagonists and warded enemies off.*

11.4) ἐδίψησαν καὶ ἐπεκαλέσαντό σε,  
καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου ὕδωρ  
καὶ ἱάμα δίψης ἐκ λίθου σκληροῦ.

*They thirsted and called upon You,  
and water was given them out of a steep rock  
and a cure of thirst out of a hard stone.*

<sup>1</sup> In his Göttingen edition Hanhart reads εὐδοδώθησιν.

<sup>2</sup> Winston is following Reese (1965.392), whose philological argument does not convince us at all.

ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου ὕδωρ] cf. ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου πηγὴν ὕδατος  
 מִצֹּר הֵחָלְמִי Dt 8.15. We have here an allusion to Ex 17.1-7 and Nu 20.1-13.

11.5) δι' ὧν γὰρ ἐκολάσθησαν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν,  
 διὰ τούτων αὐτοὶ ἀποροῦντες εὐεργετήθησαν.

*For through what their enemies were penalised with,  
 therewith, while they were in distress, they benefited.*

The argument presented in this verse is a little obscure. 1) How does this verse get linked through γὰρ with what precedes? 2) ὧν in δι' ὧν appears to introduce an antecedentless relative clause,<sup>3</sup> but is not preceded by any explicit antecedent. In αὐτοὶ “the Israelites after the exodus” are likely to be implicit, contrasted with the preceding οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν. 3) The same would hold for τούτων. 4) What happened to the same water of the Red Sea affected the two warring parties totally differently, and this logical contrast is highlighted by the addition of the focusing αὐτοὶ, which is contrasted with οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν. The antecedent must be ὕδατα: the sea waters that destroyed all the chasing Egyptians in contrast with the miraculous water that saved thirsty Israelites in the desert.

ἐκολάσθησαν .. εὐεργετήθησαν] The two verbs are contrasted in 3.4f. as well. See also 16.2.

One sees that שׁ is struggling with מִן בְּעֵלְדָבָיָהוּן הַנּוֹן חֶסֶד ‘for in that they revenged on their enemies, they lost and it (?) was given to them.’ See also בִּיד גִּיר אֵילִין דְּקִבְלֹ מָסַם בְּרִישָׁא בְּעֵלְדָבָא נָל ‘for through that with which their enemies were penalised, through these, when they were in need (of help), something good was done to them.’

ἐκολάσθησαν .. εὐεργετήθησαν] The contrast between these two verbs occurs also in δυναίμην δ’ ἂν ὥσπερ κολάζειν τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντάς μου τοῖς ἐπιτάγμασιν, οὕτω καὶ εὐεργετεῖν τοὺς εὐπειθοῦντάς μοι ‘I could penalise those who disobey my instructions as well as benefit those who obey me’ 4M 8.6.

11.6) ἀντὶ μὲν πηγῆς ἀενάου ποταμοῦ  
 αἵματι λυθρῶδει παραχθέντος

*Instead of the source of an ever-flowing river  
 stirred up with defiling blood,*

The verse refers to the Nile, into which newly-born and slaughtered male babies of Israelites were thrown, but the water of the Nile changed to blood when Aaron, holding a stick, lifted his hand over the river (Ex 7.19-21).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. SSG § 86 ba.

ἀενάου] In theory it could be qualifying πηγῆς.

ταραχθέντες] Some commentators adopt a v.l. ταραχθέντες, but we see no appropriate *s* in the context. Οἱ ἐχθροὶ suggested by Holmes, for instance, is syntactically impossible. A participial clause with a *s* that is different from that of the principal verb, ἔδωκας (vs. 7), is ungrammatical.

Note the whole verse in **Š**: אֶמְצֵא מִמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִפְּרֹץ מַעַן מֵי מַיִם אֲדָמָה יִפְּרֹץ  
'instead of the source of a river that pours with blood of red water.'

- 11.7) εἰς ἔλεγχον νηπιοκτόνου διατάγματος  
ἔδωκας αὐτοῖς δαψιλὲς ὕδωρ ἀνελπίστως  
*as a rebuke for the command of infanticide*  
*You unexpectedly gave them abundant water,*

ἔδωκας] **Š** in the Mosul ed. vocalises תְּהַבַּי as /yehbay/, i.e. 'she [= Wisdom] gave.'

- 11.8) δείξας διὰ τοῦ τότε δίψους  
πῶς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἐκόλασας.  
*showing through the thirst (occurring) then*  
*how You punished the opponents.*

τοῦ τότε δίψους] a rare case of an adverb qualifying a substantive as in ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ 'in the present time' Ex 9.14.<sup>4</sup>

τοὺς ὑπεναντίους] Unlike in ἐκολάσθησαν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν (vs. 5) there is no gen. pronoun, though we can safely assume αὐτῶν here, too.

- 11.9) ὅτε γὰρ ἐπειράσθησαν, καίπερ ἐν ἐλέει παιδευόμενοι,  
ἔγνωσαν πῶς ἐν ὀργῇ κρινόμενοι ἀσεβεῖς ἐβασανίζοντο.  
*For when they were tested, though being mercifully disciplined,*  
*they realised how the ungodly, when judged with anger, were tormented.*

ἐν ὀργῇ] μετ' ὀργῆς, a v.l. adopted by Rahlfs, following many MSS.<sup>5</sup> But μετὰ τινος is used in LXX extremely rarely with the value of instrumental. **GELS** s.v. **I 12** mentions a mere two instances: ἐξερευνήσω τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ λύχνου 'I shall search J. with a candle' Zp 1.12 and παιδεύων μετὰ συμφορᾶς 'disciplining with calamities' 2M 6.16. Larcher (663) mentions εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν δακρύσας μετ' ὀργῆς 3M 6.23. Despite the identity of the phrase the preposition indicates an accompanying action, not an instrument.<sup>6</sup> Nor is Heb. מֵעֵצ or מֵעַז so used. Hence the v.l. is not a case of Hebraism.

<sup>4</sup> See *SSG* § 24 b, 46.

<sup>5</sup> Engel (*SD* II 2145) and Scarpata (II 402f.) concur with Rahlfs.

<sup>6</sup> Neither LSJ nor BDAG assign instrumental force to μετὰ τινος.

- 11.10) τούτους μὲν γὰρ ὡς πατὴρ νουθετῶν ἐδοκίμασας,  
ἐκείνους δὲ ὡς ἀπότομος βασιλεὺς καταδικάζων ἐξήτασας.

*For the former You scrutinised as an admonishing father  
but the latter You examined thoroughly as a relentlessly condemning  
king.*

καταδικάζων] **ס** תָּהַרַק ‘You killed,’ slightly illogical preceding תָּבִיחַ ‘You condemned.’ Here **ס** vocalises the verb as 2ms, likewise in (a) – תָּבִיחַ תָּהַרַקְךָ בְּיָדֶיךָ.

ἐξήτασας] *Pace* Larcher (664f.) ἐξετάζω is not known to mean “to torture,” though torturing is a notorious method of investigation. Holmes’ and Reider’s “thou didst search out” is based on a v.l. ἐζητησας or ἐξεζητησας.

- 11.11) καὶ ἀπόντες δὲ καὶ παρόντες ὁμοίως ἐτρύχοντο·

*Whether they were away or present, they became as worn out.*

What is meant by **ס** הֵיוּ רָחֵקִין דִּין וְכֵן קָרִיבִין בְּהַבְדָּמָה שֶׁהֵיוּ רָחֵקִין וְכֵן קָרִיבִין? “And when they are far away and when they are nearby, exactly in the same way they would melt”?

Syntactically the *s* of the two nom. participles and that of ἐτρύχοντο must be identical. This is *pace* Reider (142): “.. the Egyptians suffered both when the Israelites were with them .. and when they were away ..”.

Scarpat (II 404) argues that ἀπόντες καὶ παρόντες means just “tutti” (“all”). As evidence he quotes τὰς οὐσας τέ μου καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἐλπίδας *Soph. El.* 305f. and οἱ τ’ ὄντες οἱ τ’ ἀπόντες *Soph. Ant.* 1109, though his respective translation reads “le mie speranze sia presenti sia assenti” and “presenti e lontani.”<sup>7</sup> Apart from the fact that our text uses παρόντες, and not ὄντες, it also adds ὁμοίως.

- 11.12) διπλῇ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἔλαβεν λύπη  
καὶ στεναγμὸς μνημῶν τῶν παρελθόντων·

*For a twofold grief took hold of them,  
grief of the memories of the past events added.*

μνημῶν] Engel (*SD* II 2146) notes that, not only in *Wi* but also in *LXX* in general, μνήμη occurs always in the sg. He mentions Scarpat, who proposed to emend the text to read μνήμων, an attributive adj. subordinate to στεναγμὸς, and his rendering reads “(ein Seufzen) gedenkend (des Vergangenen).” *Sim.* Scarpat (III 395): “gemettero alla memoria del passato.”<sup>8</sup> Cf. *SD*:

<sup>7</sup> Hübner (153), who follows Scarpat, accordingly assigns “überaus stark” as the meaning of διπλοῦς in vs. 12, a meaning unknown anywhere in Greek.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. also Grimm (1837.261), where his Latin rendering reads: “gemitus memor praeteritorum.”

“Seufzen bei der Erinnerung ..”. But according to *GELS* s.v. the word μνήμη can mean not only “*being retained in memory*” as in μνήμης ἀγαθῆς ἀξία ‘deserving of fond memory’ 2M 7.20, but also “*that which is remembered from the past*” as in ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῇ μνήμῃ τῆς ἀγιωσύνης αὐτοῦ ‘you shall make a confession of what you remember of His holiness’ Ps 29.5. Then the use of the pl. μνήμαι is no problem.<sup>9</sup> In LXX our lexeme occurs 17 times, always sg. except here. Elsewhere it does occur in the pl., *pace* Scarpat, not only in the sense of “monuments.” One such example is αἱ πολλαὶ μνήμαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος μιᾶς ἐμπειρίας δύναμιν ἀποτελοῦσιν ‘the numerous memories of the same thing eventually produce the effect of a single experience’ Arist. *Metaph.* 980<sup>b</sup> 29. Whilst μνήμων is used in the sense of “mindful, remembering” as in μνήμων εἰμί ‘I remember (him)’ Hom. *Od.* 21.95, as Scarpat (III 406) mentions, we are not certain that the lexeme is also used with an active sense, “capable of reminding,” which is required for Scarpat’s rendering. Larcher’s proposal (667) to read μνήμη and to analyse it as a dative of cause does not convince us.

Two other variant readings are known: μνημη and μνημης. Cf. an analysis by Larcher (667). His accentuation μνήμη and rendering “un gémissment au souvenir” (655) are questionable. As questionable is Larcher’s analysis of the dative as causal as modifying the preceding substantive. Likewise “Seufzen aufgrund der Erinnerungen an das Vergangene” (*SD* II 2146). Every single case of causal dative cited in *SSG* § 22 **wn** qualifies a verb, although στεναγμός is a verbal noun derived from στενάζω. By contrast there is no problem at all with a causal genitive: στεναγμός μνημῶν ‘grief arising from memories’.<sup>10</sup>

παρελθόντων] an Aor. ptc. rendered in **Sh** with an active ptc., **עֲבָרִין**, which is about still on-going events // **שֶׁ עֲבָרָה**, cf. a v.l. in several minuscule MSS, παρεληλυθοντων, a Pf. ptc. Another v.l., παρελθουσων concords with μνημῶν (< μνήμη), thus not a substantivised n.pl. ptc. [= παρελθόντων].

11.13) ὅτε γὰρ ἤκουσαν διὰ τῶν ἰδίων κολάσεων  
εὐεργετοῦμένους αὐτούς, ἤσθοντο τοῦ κυρίου.

*For, when they heard that through their own punishments  
they were being well treated, they began to become aware of (the  
presence of) the Lord.*

<sup>9</sup> In LXX our lexeme occurs 17 times, always sg. except here. Elsewhere it frequently occurs in the pl., not always in the sense of “monuments.” One such example is αἱ πολλαὶ μνήμαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος μιᾶς ἐμπειρίας δύναμιν ἀποτελοῦσιν ‘the numerous memories of the same thing eventually produce the effect of a single experience’ Arist. *Metaph.* 980<sup>b</sup> 29.

<sup>10</sup> See *SSG* § 22 v (xxi).

ἤκουσαν] <Ptc. + acc. ptc.>, in which the ptc. is not an attributive complement, is known to CG.<sup>11</sup> For more examples in SG, see SSG § 31 **gd**. Our case can be rewritten as ἤκουσαν .. αὐτοὺς εὐεργετεῖσθαι or ἤκουσαν ὅτι εὐηργετοῦντο.

εὐεργετούμενους] A good number of MSS read the Pf., εὐεργετημένους, also chosen by Rahlfs.

αὐτούς] = Israelites.

ἦσθοντο] As a verb of sense perception αἰσθάνομαι can take a gen. **o**.<sup>12</sup>

Note the verse in **§**: יְעֹזֵב לֹא יָדָע בְּכֹחַ דְּנִפְשָׁא דְּפִרְעָא יִצְחָק לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲרָמָא 'because they heard of their own punishment that, when it was good for them, they did not know the Lord.'

- 11.14) τὸν γὰρ ἐν ἐκθέσει πάλαι ριφέντα ἀπεῖπον χλευάζοντες,  
ἐπὶ τέλει τῶν ἐκβάσεων ἐθαύμασαν  
οὐχ ὅμοια δικαίοις διψήσαντες.

*For one who was once thrown away, exposed, scoffed at, and disowned  
they marvelled at the end of the chain of events,  
having thirsted in a way different than the righteous.*

τὸν] Rahlfs reads ὃν, what is represented by quite a few MSS and is an implausible reading, since there is no appropriate antecedent in the context.

ἐκθέσει] This noun, ἑκθεσις, is used in CG in a specialised sense of exposing an infant to die in the open, e.g. Hdt 1.116, and its verb, ἐκτίθημι, is used in an analogous way in Hdt 1.112. We have here a reference to what happened to the baby Moses. Note the underlying verb, ἐκτίθημι, used against the same historical context at 18.5 below.

ἀπεῖπον] LEH list several instances of this verb under ἀπαγορεύω, e.g. 1K 11.2, 4M 1.33, but morphologically there is no linkage at all between the two verbs.

ὅμοια] an adverbial use of a substantivised neut. pl. adjective.<sup>13</sup>

- 11.15) ἀντὶ δὲ λογισμῶν ἀσυνέτων ἀδικίας αὐτῶν,  
ἐν οἷς πλανηθέντες ἐθρήσκευον ἄλογα ἔρπετα καὶ κνώδαλα εὐτελῆ,  
ἐπαπέστειλας αὐτοῖς πλῆθος ἀλόγων ζῴων εἰς ἐκδίκησιν,

*Against their injustice coming from foolish arguments,  
by which they were confused and ministering to irrational reptiles and  
despicable wild animals,  
You caused very many irrational animals to visit them for punishment,*

<sup>11</sup> E.g. ἀκούει τοὺς πολεμίους προσιόντας ἡμῖν 'he hears that the enemies are approaching us' Xen. Cyr. 2.4.12.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. SSG § 22 **p**, p. 138.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. SSG § 23 **gc**.



ἡπόρει] This is an extremely rare instance of ἀπορέω complemented with an inf. [ἐπιτέμψαι], which, however, is not an *o*.<sup>19</sup>

χείρ] Pace Reider (145) we doubt that χεῖρ here is used in the same sense as λόγος or ῥῆμα. “Hand” here is an instrument of activity. Reider comments that in יְדִי כְּדָרְךָ Is 48.13 the Targum says “my word” (מִמְרִי), where the Targumist is aware that on the first five days of the creation God only spoke and only on the sixth day Adam was created as His handiwork. ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος at 18.15 does not refer to God’s utterances as the creator of the universe.

καὶ] We follow Ziegler as against ἡ of all the MSS, also *℣ manus tua quae creavit*. שֶׁ presents a mixed form: וְיָ = καὶ ἡ.

κτίσσασα] attributively used parallel to παντοδύναμός in order to qualify χεῖρ, but note שֶׁ יָרְךָ ‘which You created.’<sup>20</sup>

ἀμόρφου] שֶׁ אֵינָהּ יְדוּעָה ‘which (was) unknown.’ (17b) has occasioned an intensive theological discussion; cf. Larcher 677-80.

ἄρκων] Note שֶׁ יְרֵבֵּי ‘wolves’; שֶׁ יְרֵבֵּי ‘flies.’

11.18) ἢ νεοκτίστους θυμοῦ πλήρεις θήρας ἀγνώστους

ἢτοι πύρπνοον φυσῶντας ἄσθμα

ἢ βρόμον λικμωμένους καπνοῦ

ἢ δεινοὺς ἀπ’ ὀμμάτων σπινθήρας ἀστράπτοντας,

*or just recently made beasts full of rage that (were till then) unknown,*

*either breathing out fiery breath*

*or dispersing foul-smelling smoke*

*or hurling terrifying sparks from their eyes,*

ἢτοι] a hapax, introducing multiple choices with ἢ prefixed to each of the following components: ἢτοι .. ἢ .. ‘either /a or B.’

θήρας] pl. acc. of θήρ, and not of θήρα. Larcher (681) holds that the word means here “monster,”<sup>21</sup> a meaning recognised in LSJ s.v. 3.

ὀμμάτων] The substantive ὄμμα, occurring ten times in SG as synonymous with ὀφθαλμός, is confined to Pr (5×), Wi (3×), and 4M (2×).

11.19) ὧν οὐ μόνον ἡ βλάβη ἡδύνατο συνεκτρίψαι αὐτούς,

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ὄψις ἐκφοβήσασα διολέσαι.

*not only the wound caused by which could destroy them utterly,*

*but also whose look was scary enough to ruin (them).*

<sup>19</sup> Cf. SSG § 30 bef, p. 354f. A rare example in CG is ἡ βουλὴ χῶ δῆμος ὅταν κρῖναι μέγα πρᾶγμα ἀπορήσῃ ‘if the senate and the people have trouble in deciding some important matter’ Aristoph. *Wasps* 590.

<sup>20</sup> This is preceded by כֵּן ‘this,’ whose syntactic value is vague.

<sup>21</sup> Likewise Winston, Clarke, and *NETS*.





ἀντιστήσεται] fut. expressing a theoretical possibility; see *SSG* § 28 ge. κράτει βραχίονός σου] The use by God of His right arm is usually a metaphor of His protective or supportive action, though that same action can come through to His enemies as hostile and devastating. Cf. 5.16 and 16.16.

- 11.22) ὅτι ὡς ῥοπή ἐκ πλαστίγγων ὅλος ὁ κόσμος ἐναντίον σου  
καὶ ὡς ῥανὶς δρόσου ὀρθρινὴ κατελθοῦσα ἐπὶ γῆν.

*because the entire universe is before You like a tiny addition to the scales  
and like a drop of morning dew that descends on the earth.*

ῥοπή ἐκ πλαστίγγων] § נִיּוּץ הָפֶךְ ‘the twinkling of an eye,’ = νεῦμα, an emendation proposed by a few scholars at vs. 20 above.

A comparable instance of a figurative use of ῥοπή is ῥοπή ζυγοῦ Is 40.15.

ὀρθρινή] Strictly speaking, the adj. qualifies ῥανίς. The author is possibly thinking of the phrase δρόσος ὀρθρινή Ho 6.4, 13.3. The phrase ῥανίς δρόσου occurs in Eurip. *Andr.* 227.

- 11.23) ἐλεεῖς δὲ πάντας, ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι,  
καὶ παρορᾷς ἁμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν.

*You show mercy on everybody, because You are capable of everything,  
and You disregard people’s sins for the sake of repentance.*

παρορᾷς] This verb does not mean that God does not view a sin as a sin or looks away from it. See on 2Sm 12.13 in Muraoka 2020.48. God may delay punishment, hoping that sinners may repent. On God’s mercy in this context, see also Ro 2.4 and 2Pet 3.9. Cp. a theological discussion by Larcher 691f.

εἰς μετάνοιαν] § represents a different perspective with כִּדְּתוּבוֹן ‘when they repent.’

- 11.24) ἀγαπᾷς γὰρ τὰ ὄντα πάντα  
καὶ οὐδὲν βδελύσσει ὃν ἐποίησας·  
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μισῶν τι κατεσκεύασας.

*For You love every creature  
and do not loathe anything of what You made.  
For You would not have fashioned anything You hate.*

βδελύσσει] Opposite to ἀγαπάω, also in καὶ ἐγένοντο οἱ ἡγαπημένοι ὡς οἱ ἐβδελυγμένοι Ho 9.10.

ὃν] introducing an antecedentless relative clause and a partitive genitive dependent on οὐδὲν.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See *SSG* § 22 x.

ἄν] The use of this particle with an Aor. verb is idiomatic in an apodosis of an unreal conditional clause, though we miss here a protasis.<sup>24</sup> μισῶν on its own cannot constitute a protasis; it is rather a circumstantial qualifier of κατεσκεύασας.

Whereas vs. 23 is concerned about human beings, the author's horizon broadens here, what is manifest in the selection of the neut. gender: τὰ ὄντα .. οὐδὲν .. τι. This is reflected in שׁוּ in the selection of the fem. gender: לְכָל־הַיְּצִירִים 'all those (things) which exist.'

11.25) πῶς δὲ διέμεινεν ἄν τι, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἠθέλησας,  
ἢ τὸ μὴ κληθὲν ὑπὸ σοῦ διετηρήθη;

*How could anything have continued to exist if You had not so intended or could that which was not called into existence by You have been sustained?*

ἄν] see above on vs. 24. The use of the particle here is standard, though its force extends to διετηρήθη in (b), which is neatly formalised in שׁוּ אִיכְנָא אֶת־פְּקָדֵי דְרַגְנָתָא לֹא אֲלֵי מָדָם הָא מְטַר מְטַר 'or how would anything have been preserved unless you had commanded?'

κληθὲν] Probably the sense "to call upon, summon sbd or sth (acc.) so as to perform some task" (GELS s.v. καλέω 3) could apply here, though no task is mentioned. Fichtner (44) mentions יְהוָה יַעֲמִדוּ יְצִירָתָא Is 48.13, where we have a description of the creation of the universe. He also quotes τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι 'He called the non-existent into existence' Philo *de spec. leg.* 4.187 and ὁ καλῶν τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα Rom 4.17.<sup>25</sup>

11.26) φείδῃ δὲ πάντων, ὅτι σὰ ἐστίν, δέσποτα φιλόψυχε·

*You spare all, because they are Yours, o soul-loving master!*

φείδῃ] another verb that indicates God's attitude towards His creatures. Others are ἀγαπάω (24) and ἐλεέω (23).

δέσποτα] Engel (II 2147) makes an interesting observation: as divine titles in Wi δεσπότης indicates God as the master of the universe, whereas κύριος is used for God as the lord of mankind. Here the first applies; πάντων is neuter as shown by the immediately following σὰ.

φιλόψυχε] a hapax. In CG the second component of the word, ψυχή, is applied to the speaker's own self, hence the word means "cowardly, self-loving."<sup>26</sup> Whether or not ψυχή here means 'life' depends on the overall theology represented by the author.

<sup>24</sup> See SSG § 89 b.

<sup>25</sup> Note also ἐκτίσεν γὰρ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα 'For He created everything to remain in existence' 1.14 above.

<sup>26</sup> For references to the use of the word in the patristic literature, see Lampe s.v.

## CHAPTER 12

12.1) τὸ γὰρ ἄφθαρτόν σου πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσιν.

*For Your immortal spirit is in everybody.*

ἄφθαρτόν] a hapax, also occurring at 18.4 and of the light of God's law.  
πᾶσιν] masc., so שִׁי רִיחֶזָּ and *pace* "all things" (Holmes, Reider, Larcher [699], *NETS*), "toutes choses" (*BJ*), and "allem" (Fichtner, Siegfried). We are back to humans, as is evident in the masc. τοὺς παραπίπτοντας in vs. 2. See also Scarpat II 430.

12.2) Διὸ τοὺς παραπίπτοντας κατ' ὀλίγον ἐλέγχεις  
καὶ ἐν οἷς ἁμαρτάνουσιν ὑπομιμνήσκων νουθετεῖς,  
ἵνα ἀπαλλαγέντες τῆς κακίας πιστεύσωσιν ἐπὶ σέ, κύριε.

*Therefore You rebuke little by little those who err  
and admonish them, reminding them of sins they commit  
so that moving away from the evilness they may trust on You, o Lord.*

παραπίπτοντας] Etymologically the verb means "to fall beside," whereas in BG it is only figuratively used of falling into a morally wrong way of life. Note a derivative of it, παραπίπτωμα 'transgression.'<sup>1</sup>

κατ' ὀλίγον] In S ed. Leiden we see a dot after לִיְלִי לִיְלִי 'little by little,' which analyses the prepositional phrase as dependent on παραπίπτοντας.

ὑπομιμνήσκων] In ὅρκους πατέρων καὶ διαθήκας ὑπομνήσας 18.22 we have two ο's of the verb explicitly mentioned, whilst here we have only one in the form of an implicit antecedent of ἐν οἷς.

ἀπαλλαγέντες] Though formally passive, a third party such as a religious counsellor is not mentioned. The form is thus virtually middle.

τῆς κακίας] The gen. is of ablative value; *SSG* § 22 q.

πιστεύσωσιν ἐπὶ σέ] Here we have the sole instance in LXX of πιστεύω ἐπὶ τινα 'to trust someone,' whereas NTG proffers far more examples, e.g. ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν Ac 11.17; more examples are mentioned in BDAG s.v. πιστεύω 2 δ. Another common syntagm is <πιστεύω ἔν τινι (pers.)> as in ἐπίστευσεν ἐν τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ Da 6.23 TH.

<sup>1</sup> An instance in CG of its use in the literal sense is ἐγγὺς τῶν τειχῶν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Λυσάνδρου παραπεπτώκός 'Lysander having his body fallen near the walls' Plut. *Lys.* 29.2.5.

12.3) καὶ γὰρ τοὺς παλαιοὺς οἰκήτορας τῆς ἁγίας σου γῆς

*For also the former inhabitants of Your holy land*

If we are to follow Ziegler's punctuation, a long, new sentence begins here, following the full stop at the end of vs. 2, and ends with another at the end of vs. 7. The sentence has only one finite verb, ἐβουλήθη in vs. 6, which is expanded by ἀπολέσαι, which latter has one circumstantial ptc. in the nominative, μισήσας in vs. 4. This is a general, syntactic analysis of the sentence here. Cf. also Scarpat II 456.

παλαιοὺς] A v.l. πάλαι would mean the same. On the use of an adverb to qualify a noun phrase, see SSG § 24 b, 46.

οἰκήτορας] an *o* of μισήσας in vs. 4.

τῆς ἁγίας σου γῆς] a relatively rare instance in SG of the pattern <Art. - Adj. - Pron. gen. - Noun>. Another example is ἡ δεξιὰ σου χεὶρ Ex 15.6 // ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς τῆς δεξιᾶς μου Je 22.4.<sup>2</sup>

The standing phrase, "the Holy Land," is rather rare in early biblical literature: שְׁטַרְתָּ תְּמַרְתָּ תִּהְיֶה גִּילָה תִּהְיֶה אֶרֶץ זָכָרָה Zc 2.16 and τῆς ἁγίας γῆς 2M 1.7.<sup>3</sup>

12.4) μισήσας ἐπὶ τῷ ἔχθιστα πράσσειν,  
ἔργα φαρμακειῶν καὶ τελετὰς ἀνοσίους

*You disliked for practising most distasteful things,  
practices of sorcery and profane rites of mysticism*

ἐπὶ] causal with an infinitive. The addition of the definite article is normal when the infinitival clause is prefixed with a preposition; SSG § 30 **aba**.

ἔχθιστα] the superlative of ἐχθρός with relative, intensifying force and substantivised; see SSG § 23 **bb**, p. 197.

φαρμακειῶν] cf. φάρμακος De 18.10.

12.5) τέκνων τε φονέας ἀνελεήμονας  
καὶ σπλαγχνοφάγον ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν θοῖναν καὶ αἵματος,  
ἐκ μέσου μύστας θιάσου

*and merciless murderers of children  
and a meal of human flesh of internal organs and blood,  
initiates out of a banquet*

φονέας] a second *o* of μισήσας in vs. 4. Note τε. We do not know what led Rahlfs to adopt φονάς, a reading proposed by Fritzsche (1875), Risberg

<sup>2</sup> More examples are mentioned in SSG § 37 **bba**, pp. 450f.

<sup>3</sup> For a few more references, see Winston 238.

(1913.213), and Larcher (707).<sup>4</sup> On God's hatred of infanticide, see Dt 12.31, Ps 106.37f. etc.

θοῖναν] Following οἰκήτορας (3) and followed by μύστας, both of which are an *o* of μισήσας (4) and refer to humans, this new *o* is coordinate with the two because it is concerned with cannibalism, though not human victims themselves.

ἐκ μέσου μύστας θιάσου] a remarkable instance of the free word order in Greek, hyperbaton. Even so, with his “in blutigem Festschmaus” Fichtner (46) is going a shade too far; σαρκῶν and αἵματος constitute a sensible pair.

Cf. **מִקְשָׁלִין הָיוּ בְּנֵיהֶן דְּלֹא הָיוּ אֲכָלִין הָיוּ בְּסָרָא רְחֵמָא דְּבְנֵי אֲנָשָׁא בְּנֵיהֶן** סוֹמִים לֹא בְּנֵיהֶן רָאָה בְּמַצָּעָא עֲבָדָא דְּאֲכָלָהּ דְּמִוְתָּא דְּאֲבָדָהּ עֲבָדָהּ ‘they were murdering their children mercilessly, they were eating flesh, the internal organs of people in their midst, making a figure of ruin. They made in the meantime symbols illegally.’

12.6) καὶ αὐθέντας γονεῖς ψυχῶν ἀβοηθήτων,  
ἐβουλήθης ἀπολέσαι διὰ χειρῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν,

*and murderous parents of helpless souls*  
*You wanted to destroy with our fathers' hands,*

αὐθέντας] a substantive used adjectivally, as often happens with nouns ending in -τής or -της (fem. -τις) and denoting people engaged habitually or professionally in a certain activity, bearing a certain character, or belonging to a certain ethnic group.<sup>5</sup>

αὐθέντας γονεῖς] **שִׁטְאֵי אֲבִיכֹן** ‘dominant parents,’ in which αὐθέντης was taken in the sense of “perpetrator, author.”<sup>6</sup>

ἐβουλήθης] Larcher (710) asserts that, due to its relation to the Aor. ptc. μισήσας (vs. 4), this verb has the value of the plpf., and his rendering is accordingly “tu avais voulu.” Is there any reason why our author has not written plpf. ἐβεβούλυτο?

<sup>4</sup> Reider (150), though reading φονάς, renders it “murderers,” which should be “murders.” He also (151) wants to emend *σπλαγχοφάγον* to *σπλαγχοφάγους* to concord with φονέας, translating the phrase as “entail-devourers’ banquet.” He further adopts an emendation proposed by Goodrick (259), *μιστάθεια*, a word unknown to Greek, and translates the phrase as “orgy.”

<sup>5</sup> This feature is also known in CG, though the meaning of αὐθέντης differs, e.g. αὐθέντης φόνος ‘murder of the same blood’ Aesch. *Eum.* 212 and *θανάτοις αὐθένταισι* ‘by murder of kin’ ib. *Ag.* 1572. Cf. “eigenhändige (Mörder) hilfloser Leben” (*SD*). See *SSG* § 33 d.

<sup>6</sup> Winston (240f.) mentions a scholar who held that, in late prose, the Gk word could not have been used in the sense of “murderer” in a text written in the first cent. BCE, so that Wi must have been written in the first cent. CE. But why, if our author knew what the word meant in Attic Greek, should he be prevented from using it in that way?

- 12.7) ἵνα ἀξίαν ἀποικίαν δέξηται θεοῦ παίδων  
ἢ παρὰ σοὶ πασῶν τιμιωτάτη γῆ.

*so that the most valuable among Your lands  
would receive God's servants as worthy immigrants.*

ἀποικίαν] “group of individuals forcefully moved to a new dwelling-place” (GELS s.v. 2), which is not a most appropriate designation of Israelites that reached the promised land. The feature of force may be contextual. In CG that feature is not apparent, but simply “away from home, in a foreign land,” what some of the emigrants felt in the course of the 40 year long journey out of Egypt.

παίδων] **𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍** ‘His servants.’ On the possibility of παῖς meaning ‘child,’ see above at 9.4 and cf. **𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍** ‘children’ here.

- 12.8) ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἐφείσω  
ἀπέστειλάς τε προδρόμους τοῦ στρατοπέδου σου σφηκας,  
ἵνα αὐτοὺς κατὰ βραχὺ ἐξολεθρεύσωσιν.

*but You spared them also as humans,  
sending wasps as an advance contingent of Your army  
so that they would destroy them by degrees.*

The verse is alluding to Ex 23.27-30. Specially noted is **𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍** vs. 28, which is rendered in **𐤀** with σφηκιά ‘swarm of wasps.’ Another related source text is Dt 7.21-24, where we find the gradual annihilation of enemies expressed with **𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍 𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍** vs. 22 > **𐤀** κατὰ μικρὸν μικρόν.

- 12.9) οὐκ ἄδυνατῶν ἐν παρατάξει ἀσεβεῖς δικαίοις ὑποχειρίους δοῦναι  
ἢ θηρίοις δεινοῖς ἢ λόγῳ ἀποτόμῳ ὅφ’ ἐν ἐκτρίψαι,

*Not being unable to make infidels in battle surrender to the righteous  
or thrash them instantly with fearsome beasts or with a relentless order,*

ἄδυνατῶν] On the syntagm <ἄδυνατέω + inf.>, see above at 11.17 on a synonymous verb ἀπορέω. In CG no instance is known of ἄδυνατέω taking an impersonal *s* as in μὴ ἄδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα; ‘Is anything impossible with God?’ Ge 18.14.

ὅφ’ ἐν] Larcher (715) refers to ὅφ’ ἐνα καιρὸν ἅμφω τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπιδεδόκασιν ‘they had surrendered both their bodies and souls at the same moment’ Philo. *Mos.* 1.301.

- 12.10) κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδους τόπον μετανοίας  
οὐκ ἄγνωῶν ὅτι πονηρὰ ἢ γένεσις αὐτῶν  
καὶ ἔμφυτος ἢ κακία αὐτῶν  
καὶ ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀλλαγῇ ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

*judging gradually You provided a chance for repentance,  
not being unaware that they are wicked by nature  
and their evil is innate  
and that their mode of thinking will not change for ever.*

κρίνων] We are not certain that this, as Larcher (716) thinks, comprises also execution of a verdict felled.

γένεσις] As justly pointed out by Fichtner (46), ἔμφυτος (10b) and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (11a) show that the word does not mean "was sie hervorbrachten" (SD).

οὐ μὴ] On the double negator, which is typical of a stylistically higher register in SG, see SSG § 83 ca.

Fichtner (46) refers to καὶ μὴ δῶς τόπον ἀνθρώπῳ καταράσασθαί σε 'nor give people an excuse for cursing you' וְלֹא תִתֵּן לּוֹ מְקוֹם לְקַלֵּלךָ Si 4.5. Larcher (716) appears to be inclined towards a possible Latinism. To what extent was our author subject to Latinism? And how much was Ben Sira familiar with Latin?

12.11) σπέρμα γὰρ ἦν κατηραμένον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς,  
οὐδὲ εὐλαβούμενός τινα ἐφ' οἷς ἡμάρτανον ἄδειαν ἐδίδους.

*For they were a race accursed from the beginning  
nor did You, out of discretion, relieve anybody of anxiety over sins  
they committed.*

κατηραμένον] in lieu of κεκατηραμένον, a Pf. ptc. of καταράω. Cf. κεκατηραμένος Si 3.16.<sup>7</sup>

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] שֶׁ אֶתְּחִלָּה 'before the Lord.'

εὐλαβούμενός] Larcher (719) and Scarpata (II 469) claim that, in late prose,<sup>8</sup> εὐλαβέομαι also means 'to fear, dread' as in μηδὲν εὐλαβηθῆς 'Don't be afraid of anything' Philo Abr. 206. But the notion of God dreading a Canaanite sounds rather odd. The author is more likely saying that, with His knowledge of the inborn nature of Canaanites, He needed not take any special precaution.

τινα] The sg. sounds a little more natural, though it discords with the pl. of the following verb, ἡμάρτανον.

ἄδειαν] There is no absolute need to depart widely from the etymological meaning of the word, < δέομαι 'to fear,' thus *contra* "impunity" (Reider), "pardon" (NETS), "Straffreiheit" (Fichtner), "Straflosigkeit" (Siegfried), "répit" (Larcher), and "l'impunité" (BJ).

In (b) שֶׁ reads לֹא הָיָא מְטוֹל דְּדַחֲלֵת מִן חַטֵּיִא אֲוִרְכָּתָ לְהוֹן 'not because You were afraid of sinners You gave them much time.'

<sup>7</sup> For the absence of reduplication, cf. Helbing 1907.77.

<sup>8</sup> So in LXX; see GELS s.v. \*4.



- 12.12) τίς γὰρ ἔρεϊ Τί ἐποίησας;  
 ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου;  
 τίς δὲ ἐγκαλέσει σοι κατὰ ἐθνῶν ἀπολωλότων ἃ σὺ ἐποίησας;  
 ἢ τίς εἰς κατάστασίν σοι ἐλεύσεται ἔκδικος κατὰ ἀδίκων ἀνθρώπων;

*For who would say "What have You done?"*

*or who would object to Your judgement?*

*Who would charge You over diminished nations You made?*

*or who would come to You as an advocate to plead for unjust people?*

(a) = τίς ἔρεϊ αὐτῷ Τί ἐποίησας; Jb 9.12b.

(b) = τίς οὖν κρίματι αὐτοῦ ἀντιστήσεται; Jb 9.19b.

κατὰ] <+ gen.> “in respect of, concerning” – GELS s.v. **I 3**. This interpretation must be applied to κατὰ<sup>2</sup> (12c) as well *pace* Siegfried’s (496) “Wer kann dich verklagen hinsichtlich dessen, was du an den verlorenen Völkern gethan hast?”; placing the prepositional phrase outside of the relative clause sounds unnatural. Cf. also SSG § 58 a.

- 12.13) οὔτε γὰρ θεός ἐστιν πλὴν σοῦ, ᾧ μέλει περὶ πάντων,  
 ἵνα δείξῃς ὅτι οὐκ ἀδίκως ἔκρινας,

*For there is no god except You, either, who cares enough for everybody  
 to demonstrate that You have not judged unfairly,*

πάντων] Since γὰρ indicates this verse to be a logical sequel to vs. 12, (c + d) in particular, πάντων is plausibly masc. in gender rather than neuter, “alles” (Fichtner, Siegfried, and SD).

μέλει] Impersonal, our translation above notwithstanding.<sup>9</sup> Larcher (722) rightly points out that the antecedent of ᾧ can be either θεός or σοῦ.

ἵνα] consecutive or resultative, though not indicating an actual result. Cf. GELS s.v. **2** and BDF § 391.5.

- 12.14) οὔτε βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος ἀντοφθαλμῆσαι δυνήσεται σοι περὶ ὧν  
 ἐκόλασας.

*Neither a king nor a ruler could challenge you over punishments  
 You brought down.*

<sup>9</sup> Cf. SSG § 87 c, f.n. 5.

The entry μέλω in GELS is to be revised to read:

μέλω.†

*to be a matter of concern*, ‘to matter’: + dat. pers. and a ὅτι-clause as s, οὐ μέλει μοι ‘it doesn’t matter to me’ To 10.5Θ<sup>1</sup>; impersonal + dat. pers. and περὶ τίνος – ᾧ μέλει περὶ πάντων ‘he is concerned about everybody’ Wi 12.13, also 1M 14.42, 43, Jb 22.3 (τί ‘why?’). Cf. ἀμελέω, ἐπιμελέομαι.

ὧν] which could be masculine in gender. Whilst the majority of instances of κολάζω in LXX have a personal *o*, we find one intriguing instance, and that in our document in τὸ πραχθὲν σὺν τῷ δράσαντι κολασθήσεται ‘what has been done shall be punished together with one who has done it’ 14.10, where we have a twofold *o*, personal and impersonal. The next verse, a logical sequel as indicated with δὲ and the use of κολάζω, has τὰ πάντα διέπεις, what renders it plausible that here also we have to do with deeds rather than with doers. Whilst either analysis makes sense, neither Larcher nor Scarpata has addressed the issue.

ἀντοφθαλμησαι] a very rare word that occurs only once more in LXX: ὁ δὲ ἀντοφθαλμῶν ἡδοναῖς στεφανοῖ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ ‘But he who defies pleasures would be crowning his life’ Si 19.5.

The second half of the verse in S reads as תִּתְּנֶנִּי לְפָנֶיךָ מִמַּה שֶׁצִּדַּקְתָּ לִּי ‘to stand before You regarding what You justly punished.’

12.15) δίκαιος δὲ ὧν δικαίως τὰ πάντα διέπεις  
αὐτὸν τὸν μὴ ὀφείλοντα κολασθῆναι καταδικάσαι  
ἄλλότριον ἡγούμενος τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως.

*Being righteous, you take charge of everything righteously,  
thinking it to be incongruous with Your authority  
to pass a ‘Guilty’ sentence on one who does not deserve to be punished.*

Though Ziegler’s edition has a full stop at the end of vs. 14, this verse is, along with vs. 14, a logical sequel to vs. 13. Note οὐκ ἀδίκως ἔκρινας (13b), which is parallel to δίκαιος δὲ ὧν δικαίως vs. 15.

διέπεις] a hapax in Wi. See above at 9.3.

αὐτὸν] A proleptic *o* pronoun does not suit the character of the Greek of Wi, which is mostly free from Hebraisms. An example in LXX is αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ‘the readers’ Si prol. 4.<sup>10</sup>

ἄλλότριον] qualified with a gen. of ablative value as in ἄλλότριον .. τῶν αὐτοῦ .. πραγμάτων ‘hostile towards his government’ 2M 4.21; cf. SSG § 22 r.

ἡγούμενος] This participial clause is explanatory in relation to (15a).

Another instance of <ἡγέομαι + infinitival *o* + adj.> is ἀναγκαῖον ἡγήσαμην φροντίσαι τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἀσφαλείας ‘I thought it necessary to give thought to the general security of all’ 2M 9.21.

We fail to see what S means in (b + c): הָאֵלֶּה הֵם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ וְכָל מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ הֵם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ וְכָל מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ הֵם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ ‘and anything that deserves to be punished with a penalty in accordance with your authority belongs to foreign matters (?).’

<sup>10</sup> Cf. SSG § 84 b, 85.

- 12.16) ἡ γὰρ ἰσχὺς σου δικαιοσύνης ἀρχή,  
καὶ τὸ πάντων σε δεσπόζειν πάντων φείδεσθαι σε ποιεῖ.

*For Your strength consists in righteousness as the basis  
and absolute authority and control over all leads you to show concern  
for all.*

ἀρχή] Holmes (555) refers to 14.27, where the word is parallel to αἰτία. Hence it may not mean “beginning,” but there it is also parallel to πέρας “end.”

πάντων<sup>2</sup>] Given the meaning of φείδομαι its ο πάντων more likely refers to persons. By analogy, the same would hold for πάντων<sup>1</sup>.

ποιεῖ] Ποιέω + inf. can mean “to cause, compel to do,” though not necessarily against the will of the actor. For other examples, see *GELS* s.v. 14.

- 12.17) ἰσχὺν γὰρ ἐνδείκνυσαι ἀπιστούμενος ἐπὶ δυνάμεως τελειότητι  
καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰδόσι τὸ θράσος ἐξελέγχεις·

*For You show power when disbelieved over Your utmost might  
and among the knowledgeable You blame (their) insolence.*

ἀπιστούμενος] Grimm (1860.227) notes that this is the sole instance of this verb in the passive voice. Probably because the verb is rarely used in the first instance. For πιστεύω, for instance, we have a case such as ἐπιστεύθη Σαμουὴλ προφῆτης γενέσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ ‘Samuel was believed to have become a prophet of the Lord’ 1K 3.21, where the s is human.<sup>11</sup>

§ appears to be struggling with this difficult verse:<sup>12</sup> וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת הַכֹּחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָם וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַכֹּחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָם וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַכֹּחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָם וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַכֹּחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדָם. ‘You showed powers and they did not believe, only in the power of perfection. Those whom You know You severely reproach.’

- 12.18) σὺ δὲ δεσπόζων ἰσχύος ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ κρίνεις  
καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς φειδοῦς διοικεῖς ἡμᾶς·  
πάρεστιν γάρ σοι, ὅταν θέλῃς, τὸ δύνασθαι.

*Though You possess power, You judge fairly  
and with much gentleness govern us,  
for the capacity is with You, when You wish (to take advantage of it).*

πάρεστιν] which is better represented in § with a v.l. עָתִיד than with עָתִיד ‘rich, abundant’ in ed. Leiden. Cf. § קָרִיבָא ‘be near.’

<sup>11</sup> Grimm (1837.286) justly rejects Schleusner’s emendation, ἀπιστουμένοις on the ground that ἀπιστέομαι in the middle voice is unknown as a deponent verb.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. a text-critical and exegetical discussion by Larcher 726-28.

- 12.19) Ἐδίδαξας δέ σου τὸν λαὸν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἔργων  
ὅτι δεῖ τὸν δίκαιον εἶναι φιλόανθρωπον,  
καὶ εὐέλπιδας ἐποίησας τοὺς υἱοὺς σου  
ὅτι διδοῖς ἐπὶ ἁμαρτήμασιν μετάνοιαν.

*You taught Your people through these acts  
that the righteous ought to love people,  
and made Your sons full of hope  
because You grant (a chance to) repent of sins.*

- 12.20) εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου καὶ ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ  
μετὰ τσαύτης ἐτιμωρήσω προσοχῆς καὶ διέσεως  
δοὺς χρόνους καὶ τόπον, δι' ὃν ἀπαλλαγῶσι τῆς κακίας,

*For if You punished enemies of Your sons and those deserving death  
with such careful attention and lenience  
providing them time and place to part with the wickedness,*

ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ] The way ὀφείλω is used in the passive voice here differs from τῆς ὀφειλομένης κολάσεως ‘the punishment they deserve’ 3M 7.10, in which the *o* is punishment, whereas here the *o* are people to be punished and the penalty is expressed in the dative. What is similar to our case is found in a papyrus: ὀφειλόμενος τοῖς προγόνοις καὶ ἐνφανῆς θεὸς Καίσαρ ‘the caesar, god manifest, who was obliged to pay his debt to his ancestors’ P Oxy VII 10 21<sup>1</sup> (CE 54).<sup>13</sup>

δι'] The prep. here can be best brought under *GELS* s.v. **I 4** “indicates a means for achieving an end” as in τὴν ὁδόν, δι' ἧς ἀναβησόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ ‘the road through which we shall go up on it’ De 1.22.

ῆς κακίας] basically ablative in force, cf. ὅπως ἀπαλλαγῆς τῶν βασάνων ‘so that you may be spared the tortures’ 4M 9.16.

- 12.21) μετὰ πόσης ἀκριβείας ἔκρινας τοὺς υἱοὺς σου,  
ὧν τοῖς πατράσιν ὅρκους καὶ συνθήκας ἔδωκας ἀγαθῶν ὑποσχέσεων;  
*how precisely did You judge Your sons,  
to whose forefathers You vowed and pledged wonderful prospects!*

ἀκριβείας] Larcher (734) mentions an instance in a 164 BCE papyrus, where it means “soin, Sorgfalt.”<sup>14</sup>

πόσης] An interrogative word often introduces an exclamatory clause. See *SSG* § 95. This πόσης corresponds to τσαύτης in the protasis (20b).

ἀκριβείας] = **𐤀𐤊𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁**, but **𐤀𐤊𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁** ‘care.’

<sup>13</sup> Mentioned in *MM* s.v. ὀφείλω.

<sup>14</sup> No such instance is mentioned in *MM*.

ὅρκους καὶ συνθήκας] The selection of the pl. forms is probably because they were communicated to the patriarchs more than once.

Συνθήκη is to be examined in comparison with a synonym of it, διαθήκη. Statistically, there is no comparison: συνθήκη 13x and διαθήκη 345x. The former occurs mostly in the pl. with the only exception in Wi 1.16, whereas the pl. of διαθήκη occurs a mere six times. The covenant between God and Israel is thus expressed through διαθήκη. Thus the use of συνθήκη here is exceptional. Cf. ὅρκους καὶ διαθήκας 18.22.

- 12.22) Ἡμᾶς οὖν παιδεύων τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν ἐν μυριάτῃ μαστιγοῖς,  
ἵνα σου τὴν ἀγαθότητα μεριμνῶμεν κρίνοντες,  
κρινόμενοι δὲ προσδοκῶμεν ἔλεος.

*Hence, whilst You teach us, You beat our enemies ten thousand times  
so that, when we judge (them), we might turn our attention to Your  
goodness,  
but when we are judged, we might look forward to (Your) mercy.*

ἐν μυριάτῃ] etymologically derived from μυριάς ‘myriad,’ but a hapax and unknown prior to LXX. The function of ἐν with a numeral is also obscure. With no MS support Kuhn (1931.449) proposed an emendation to μεριότητι ‘to a modest measure.’<sup>15</sup>

- 12.23) ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ ζωῆς βιώσαντας ἀδίκως  
διὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἐβασάνισας βδελυγμάτων·

*Therefore, also those who led a life of injustice as fools  
You tortured with their own loathsome objects,*

βδελυγμάτων] βδέλυγμα, esp. pl. βδελύγματα, often refers to an object of pagan worship.

ἰδίων] Deliberately separated from its head, βδελυγμάτων, for the sake of emphasis. A phenomenon known as “hyperbaton.” So also in Wi 16.23. See SSG § 37 c.

- 12.24) καὶ γὰρ τῶν πλάνης ὁδῶν μακρότερον ἐπλανήθησαν  
θεοὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ καὶ ἐν ζῴοις τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἄτιμα  
νηπίων δίκην ἀφρόνων ψευσθέντες.

*for they wandered off very much far even from stray paths,  
thinking the ugly, despicable, worthless even among animals to be gods,  
having been deceived like stupid kids.*

<sup>15</sup> Accepted by Vanhove 1962 and Gilbert 1976. Scarpat (II 480f.) argues for retaining μυριότητι.

πλάνης ὁδῶν] The first gen. is that of quality and the second is ablative in value. See *SSG* § 22 **q**.

μακρότερον] comparative of relative, intensive value.<sup>16</sup> See *SSG* § 23 **ba**.

ὑπολαμβάνοντες] In the sense of “to form a mental assumption” ὑπολαμβάνω can enter a variety of constructions to indicate the contents of the assumption:

- a) a noun phrase: ἃ ἐπέλαβες τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ‘that which you mentally assumed’ Da 2.30 LXX
- b) a ὅτι-clause: ὑπολαμβάνω ὅτι ἔσονται σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς παιδιά ‘I expect that you will have children from her’ To 6.18
- c) an infinitival clause: πολλοὶ τῶν νέων ὑπολαβόντες Ελεαζαρὸν .. μεταβεβηκέναι ‘many of the young supposing that E. .. had gone over’ 2M 6.24.

Since our case here has two *ο*’s, θεοὺς and τὰ .. ἄτιμα, it basically represents the pattern (c). The inf. εἶναι is understood: θεοὺς εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ καὶ ἐν ζώοις τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἄτιμα. See also below at 13.3 on ἐνόμισαν. The two *ο*’s constitute a nominal clause, cf. *SSG* § 59.

ἐν ζώοις] Risberg’s (1913.214) “in den Augen der Tiere” is highly questionable.

αἰσχυρῶν] against ἐχθρῶν in the majority of MSS, a reading that Engel (*SD* II 2148) defends. The major text-critical difficulty presented by this reading as represented by four minuscules and adopted by Rahlfs and Ziegler notwithstanding, would one go along with an emendation proposed by Larcher (739f.) with no MS support, namely νεκρῶν? Scarpata’s (II 452) reconstruction is τὰ καὶ ἐν ζώοις τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἄτιμα.

δίκην] the only instance in LXX of the idiomatic use of <δίκην τινος> ‘like, in the manner of.’ Cf. LSJ s.v. δίκη 2, where δίκην τοξότου ‘like an archer’ Pl. *Laws* 705e is cited.

ψευσθέντες] ψεύδομαι in the sense of “to deceive, beguile,” see ψεύσονται σε οἱ ἐχθροί σου ‘your enemies will lie to you’ De 33.29.

- 12.25) διὰ τοῦτο ὡς παισὶν ἀλογίστοις  
τὴν κρίσιν εἰς ἐμπαιγμὸν ἐπεμψας.

*Therefore You sent (to them) as if to children incapable of logical thinking  
(their) judgement for a joke.*

<sup>16</sup> Larcher (739) objects by saying that then the gen. would remain unaccounted for, but his rendering “ils s’étaient égarés au-delà des chemins possibles de l’erreur” does not represent μακρότερον.

ἐμπαιγμὸν] alluding to ὅσα ἐμπέπαιχα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ‘how I made fun of the Egyptians’ Ex 10.2.

12.26) οἱ δὲ παιγνίοις ἐπιτιμήσεως μὴ νοθετηθέντες  
ἀξίαν θεοῦ κρίσιν πειράσουσιν.

*But those who did not accept counsel through rebuking games  
are going to experience God’s proper judgement.*

παιγνίοις] To compare the multiple plagues that hit Egyptians to games is indicative of our author’s sense of humour? The author possibly has at the back of his mind the above-cited ὅσα ἐμπέπαιχα (𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤍) τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις Ex 10.2.<sup>17</sup> The equation ἐμπαίζω 𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤍 occurs also at Nu 22.29 and 1Sm 6.6.

πειράσουσιν] On the verb πειράζω, see above at 2.24.

12.27) ἐφ’ οἷς γὰρ αὐτοὶ πάσχοντες ἠγανάκτουν,  
ἐπὶ τούτοις, οὓς ἐδόκουν θεοὺς, ἐν αὐτοῖς κολαζόμενοι  
ιδόντες, ὃν πάλαι ἠρνοῦντο εἰδέναι, θεὸν ἐπέγνωσαν ἀληθῆ·  
διὸ καὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς καταδίκης ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐπῆλθεν.

*For at what in their suffering they were very displeased,  
precisely at them whom they thought to be gods, being punished by them,  
having seen one whom they used to refuse knowing, they recognised as  
a true god.*

*Hence also the severest possible punishment came upon them.*

ἐφ’ οἷς] The antecedent is made explicit in (b) with τούτοις, which in its turn must refer to ζῷα (vs. 24b). The analysis underlying Holmes’s “because through their own sufferings .. Against those creatures ..” is questionable.<sup>18</sup> As questionable is the analysis by Reider, for whom the same preposition means two different things in (a) and (b); ἐπὶ is not reflected in his translation: “For through the sufferings whereas they were indignant, being punished by means of those very creatures whom they esteemed gods.”

αὐτοῖς] emphatic, ‘they of all people.’

ἐδόκουν] As in the case of ὑπολαμβάνω, a synonym (vs. 24 above), εἶναι can be understood, cf. ἔδοξεν αὐτὴν πόρνην εἶναι ‘he thought her to be a whore’ Ge 38.15. The same analysis is applicable to ἐπέγνωσαν.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Rashi glosses 𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤍 as 𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤍 ‘I played,’ referring to the above quoted two OT cases.

<sup>18</sup> Holmes mentions ἐφ’ ᾧ Ro 5.12 and Phil 3.12, where some scholars translate the phrase “because.” But note that the rel. pron. is not οἷς, pl.

<sup>19</sup> GELS ἐπιγινώσκω is incomplete. S.v. 4 we would add: “+ two objects,” ὃν πάλαι ἠρνοῦντο εἰδέναι, θεὸν ἐπέγνωσαν ἀληθῆ ‘him, whom they used to deny knowledge of, recognised as a true god’ Wi 12.27. Cf. SSG § 69 ba.

The imperfective aspect of ἐδόκουν as well as ἤρνοῦντο (c) is contrasted with the Aor. of ἰδόντες .. ἐπέγνωσαν(c). Note the imperfective aspect also used with other verbs expressing what used to be experienced: πάσχοντες ἡγανάκτουν (a), κολαζόμενοι (b).

ἰδόντες] ‘having seen (God in action).

ἤρνοῦντο εἰδέναι] The verb ἀρνέομαι in the sense of ‘to refuse (to do)’ is complemented with an inf. also in 16.16 and 17.10, the former of which is very similar to ours, and also with God as *o*. An example in CG is in ἀρνεομένους εἶναι χρηστούς ‘refusing to be serviceable’ Herod. 6.13.2. When we take ἀρνέομαι in this sense, its infinitival complement, εἰδέναι, here can only mean ‘to get acquainted,’ but not ‘to be acquainted.’

τέρμα] “*end or limit beyond which there is no further progress or movement*” (GELS s.v.). The only other occurrence of the word in LXX is οὐκ ἦν τέρμα τῷ σταθμῷ τοῦ χαλκοῦ ‘there was no end to the weight of the bronze’ 3K 7.32.

The author is most likely referring to the death of the firstborn in every Egyptian family and the drowning of Egyptian soldiers



## CHAPTER 13

- 13.1) Μάταιοι μὲν γὰρ πάντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει, οἷς παρῆν θεοῦ ἀγνοσία  
καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναι τὸν ὄντα  
οὔτε τοῖς ἔργοις προσέχοντες ἐπέγνωσαν τὸν τεχνίτην,

*For worthless by nature are all people, who were ignorant of God  
and from good things that were visible they were not able to recognise  
Him who exists*

*nor by paying attention to (His) works did they recognise the producer,*

Μάταιοι] a rare instance of this adjective applied to humans, though known in CG.<sup>1</sup>

Cf. Scarpāt (III 71) “stolti [= fools]” and Larcher (748) “vains.”

φύσει] Scarpāt (III 74) argues for the meaning “in realtà [= “actually”],” not taking note, however, of πάντες ἄνθρωποι τοῦ εἰδέναι ὀρέγονται φύσει ‘all men naturally desire knowledge’ Arist. *Metaph.* 1.980a, as pointed out by Engel (*SD* II 2148).<sup>2</sup> Cp. “born fools” (Goodrick 275). Larcher (751) holds that φύσει here is subordinate to ἄνθρωποι: “des hommes par nature,” but we fail to see why our author should highlight the stupidity of the mankind. Are there model intelligent creatures other than we?

οἷς] which appears to introduce a rather long, non-restrictive relative clause. The omission in Holmes of a corresponding relative pronoun is justifiable: “.. all men were foolish, and had no perception ..”.<sup>3</sup>

παρῆν] Whilst the sense “to have arrived” is solidly attested for the verb πάρεμι (*GELS* s.v. 2) Larcher’s “s’est installée” (748, 751) does not convince, for the guilt assuredly lies at our own door. By contrast, he is certainly right in stressing that θεοῦ ἀγνοσία is more than mere ignorance, intellectual deficiency. Here we could mention the use of γινώσκω as in Ἀδαμ δὲ ἔγνω Εὐαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ Ge 4.1 and οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν Mt 1.25.<sup>4</sup> It is about failure to act in a certain way.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. **I 2**; one example cited is μάταιος καὶ παιγνιήμων ‘idle and playful’ Hdt 2.173. For a theological analysis of the usage of the word in BG, cf. Bauernfeind in Kittel 4.519-23.

<sup>2</sup> Two CG examples cited by Scarpāt speak against him: ἄνθρωπος οὗτός ἐστιν ἄθλιος φύσει ‘this fellow is a congenital loser’ Aristoph. *Pl.* 118 and φύσει δλίγον ‘rare by nature’ Pl. *Leg.* 918c.

<sup>3</sup> A non-restrictive relative clause is exemplified in *I shouted at my son playing in the garden, who, however, kept ignoring me* as against *I shouted at a child who was busy playing with a baby doll.*

<sup>4</sup> The sense “to know carnally” (LSJ s.v. γινώσκω III) may not be a biblicism since it occurs in τὰς τε κόρας πρὸ τοῦ γαμίσκεσθαι αὐτὸς ἐγίνωσκεν ‘he himself would know carnally the virgins before they married’ Heraclides *Pol.* 64. For examples in SG, see *GELS* s.v. **13**.

ἰσχύσαν] This is unlikely a gnomic Aorist, since the parallel verb (a) παρῆν is Impf., which is not known to be used gnomically. Likewise Aor. ἐπέγνωσαν (c).

<ἰσχύω + inf.> is at times equivalent to <δύναμαι + inf.> as in τίς ἰσχύσει οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτῷ οἶκον; 2C 2.5; οὐκ ἰσχύσεις ἐξῆραι ἀδικίας Si 7.6.<sup>5</sup> In this sense χεῖρ is often used as *s*, e.g. ἰσχύει ἡ χεῖρ μου κακοποιῆσαί σε ‘I could harm you’ Gn 31.29. As regards the question whether or not this use of ἰσχύω is influenced by Hebrew, see our discussion in Muraoka 2023 ad Si 17.16.<sup>6</sup>

ἐπέγνωσαν] On this verb with God as its *o*, see above at 12.27.

τεχνίτην] a term applied in 8.6 to φρόνησις ‘prudence.’ On the term in the Greek philosophy, cf. Larcher 754-56.

τὸν ὄντα] generally thought to be an allusion to Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν Ex 3.14. On what our author possibly means with this divine title, see a discussion by Larcher 752-54.

13.2) ἀλλ’ ἢ πῦρ ἢ πνεῦμα ἢ ταχινὸν ἄερα

ἢ κύκλον ἄστρων ἢ βίαιον ὕδωρ

ἢ φωστῆρας οὐρανοῦ πρυτάνεις κόσμου θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν.

*but fire or wind or swift air*

*or a circle of stars or powerful water*

*or luminaries in the sky they thought to be gods ruling the universe.*

φωστῆρας οὐρανοῦ] Note that the sun and the moon are called φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Ge 1.14.

πρυτάνεις] pl. of πρύτανις, a hapax in LXX and often applies to gods in CG, though not so constrained.

ἐνόμισαν] The syntactic structure of νομίζω here with two *o*’s is identical with that of ὑπολαμβάνω touched upon at 12.24. Note 𐤔 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤕 = ἐνόμιζον, but 𐤔𐤒 𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤕 = 𐤔.

13.3) ὧν εἰ μὲν τῇ καλλονῇ τερπόμενοι ταῦτα θεοὺς ὑπελάμβανον,

γνώτωσαν πόσῳ τούτων ὁ δεσπότης ἐστὶ βελτίων,

ὁ γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους γενεσιάρχης ἔκτισεν αὐτά·

*If they, enjoying their beauty, considered these to be gods,*

*let them know how much their master is superior to them,*

*for the creator of the beauty created them.*

<sup>5</sup> A few more examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. **2 b**.

<sup>6</sup> An affiliated, though not exactly homogeneous, example in CG is mentioned in LSJ s.v. ἰσχύω **2 b**: ἢ νομίζετε τὸν μὲν καιρὸν ποτ’ ἰσχύειν καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ δικαίου τὸ συμφέρον πράττειν ..; ‘Or do you think that opportunity sometimes so prevails that men pursue expediency even apart from justice ..?’ Dem. 17.9.

ὑπελάμβανον] The selection of the Impf. appears to imply that that was their usual position, not that they expressed their view on one occasion. Larcher's (761) statement is odd: "il est ici à l'impft, car l'auteur envisage un état de fait qui s'est prolongé dans le passé." The selection of the tense / aspect is a function of what people did, not of what of the situation they observed. Just as odd is his analysis of γνώωσαν, "ils aurait dû savoir." The author is demanding a change of mind. Our reservation also applies to Larcher's rendering of νοησάτωσαν (4b): "qu'ils réalisent" (749).

On the syntactic analysis of this verb, see above at 12.24 and SSG § 69 **ba**. πόσω] a dative marking a difference in degree.<sup>7</sup>

τούτων] Fichtner (50) and Larcher (761) are probably right in not subordinating the gen. to βελτίων, but to δεσπότης, thus *pace* Siegfried and *NETS*, and *SD*. **Sh** has subordinated βελτίων to both: מִן הַלֵּזִין מָרָא דִּלְהוֹן מִיָּקָר 'their master is superior to them.' Cf. **S** יִהְיֶה טַב בְּיָדָא דְּעָבְדִּי הָ כְּמָא דְּהוּ 'how much superior to them he who made them!'

βελτίων] In spite of the preceding καλλονή and the following κάλλος the selection of βελτίων, the comparative of ἀγαθός, makes better sense than that of καλλίων, the comparative of καλός, because the referent is God.

γενεσιάρχης] not only a hapax in LXX, but also unknown prior to it.

κάλλους] Whereas κάλλος here is a virtual synonym of καλλονή (a), there is none the less a noteworthy difference: the latter is applied to specific objects, whereas the former denotes the abstract notion of beauty, which is applicable to anything. Its use as a gen. of quality sounds more natural: στέφανος κάλλους, which could be rewritten as στέφανος καλός Is 62.3. Sim. θεᾶν πλοίων κάλλους 'sight of beautiful ships' ib. 2.16.

13.4) εἰ δὲ δύναμιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐκπλαγέντες,  
νοησάτωσαν ἅπ' αὐτῶν πόσω ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτὰ δυνατώτερός  
ἐστιν·

*If, however, surprised at (their) power and operation,  
let them consider in their light how much more powerful is He who  
produced them,*

εἰ] introducing an anomalous protasis that contains no finite verb.<sup>8</sup> One would anticipate ἐπλάγησαν. In the parallel verse, 3, τερπόμενοι, is subject to ὑπελάμβανον.

ἐκπλαγέντες] This verb, ἐκπλήσσω, occurs a mere 8 times in LXX, and all in the passive voice with a personal *s*, whereas its synonyms, though occurring far more frequently, θαυμάζω and ἐξίστημι, are used in the active

<sup>7</sup> Cf. SSG § 27 **wp**.

<sup>8</sup> For a few instances, see SSG § 89 **k**. Neither Larcher nor Scarpat touches on the matter.

voice as well.<sup>9</sup> As regards the government of ἐκπλήσσω, we find another case of <+ acc.><sup>10</sup>, indicating an occasion for surprise: ἐκπλήσσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ νεανίσκου ψυχὴν ‘(for them) to be astonished at the spirit of the youth’ 2M 7.12.<sup>11</sup> In τῆς εὐπρεπείας ἐκπλαγεῖς ‘astonished at (their) handsomeness’ 4M 8.4 we probably have a causal genitive.

- 13.5) ἐκ γὰρ μεγέθους καὶ καλλονῆς κτισμάτων  
ἀναλόγως ὁ γενεσιουργὸς αὐτῶν θεωρεῖται.

*for on the basis of the size and beauty of created things  
their producer can be observed by analogy.*

μεγέθους καὶ καλλονῆς] Some MSS omit καὶ, possibly a case of haplography. So Ⲫ ⲡⲣⲱⲱⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲓⲃⲓⲛ ‘the greatness of His beauty.’<sup>12</sup>

ἀναλόγως .. γενεσιουργὸς] Both are hapax in Wi. On the latter, cf. γενεσιάρχης vs. 3c above.

- 13.6) ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἐπὶ τούτοις μέμψις ἐστὶν ὀλίγη,  
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ τάχα πλανῶνται  
θεὸν ζητοῦντες καὶ θέλοντες εὐρεῖν.

*Having said that, however, criticism of these (people) is to be restrained,  
for perhaps they, too, are wandering,  
seeking God and wanting to find (Him);*

τούτοις] most likely referring to the animal-worshipping Egyptians.

ὀλίγη] cf. ἥττον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀδίκουσι ‘they [= worshippers of the sun and the moon] are less wrong than the others [= those who construct graven images and worship them]’ Philo *Dec.* 66, cited by Larcher 769 and Scarpat III 80.

καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ] Winston (247) is right in not leaving out καὶ: “they too.” εὐρεῖν] Ⲫ adds another *o*, ⲁⲛⲓⲃⲓⲛ ‘knowledge.’

- 13.7) ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ ἀναστρεφόμενοι διερευνῶσιν  
καὶ πείθονται τῇ ὄψει, ὅτι καλὰ τὰ βλεπόμενα.

*for they busily scrutinise His works  
and give credence to what they see, for what they see is splendid.*

<sup>9</sup> In CG the use of ἐκπλήσσω in the active voice is well established, e.g. μ’ ἐκπλήσσει λόγος ‘it frightens me from speaking’ Eur. *Or.* 549.

<sup>10</sup> Helbing (1928.35) sees a causal dative in the v.l. here, δυνάμει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ.

<sup>11</sup> An example from CG is ἐκπλαγέντα τὰ προκείμενα ἀγαθὰ ‘to be amazed at the splendour laid before him’ Hdt 9.82. In θαυμάσαντες καὶ καταπλαγέντες ‘struck with admiration and astonishments’ Philo *Praem.* 42 we note the coordination of θαυμάζω.

<sup>12</sup> Pace Reider καὶ has not been added by scholars between μεγέθους and καλλονῆς.

ἀναστρεφόμενοι] Both Reider and *NETS* propose: “being conversant,” a sense unknown elsewhere in Greek. Likewise an alternative rendering of *BJ*: “versés dans ses œuvres.” *GELS* defines its meaning in the middle voice as “to busy oneself with sth, engage oneself in sth.” Cf. ἀναστρεφόμενος ἐν ἔργοις αὐτῶν ‘he busies himself with their works’ Si 38.25 and ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται ‘he will occupy himself with enigmas of maxims’ ib. 39.3.

διερευνῶσιν] *S* ed. Leiden reads מתבלין ומבחנין ‘they are destroyed and examine.’ For the first verb a v.l. מתשכחין ‘they consider’ is to be preferred.

πειθόνται] An alternative analysis is to take this verb in the sense of “to become convinced, to believe” with the following ὅτι-clause as its *o*. Such a use of the verb is attested in πειθόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν Heb 13.18. An affiliated case in CG with ὥς in lieu of ὅτι is οὐ γὰρ πείσονται οἱ πολλοὶ ὥς σὺ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἠθέλησας ἀπέναι ἐνθένδε ‘most people will not believe that you did not want to go away from here’ Plato *Cri.* 44c. Then we would have an instrumental dative in τῇ ὄψει. The analysis represented in the above translation of ours is based on our perception of the ὅτι-clause as in εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν Gn 1.4.<sup>13</sup>

13.8) πάλιν δ’ οὐδ’ αὐτοὶ συγγνωστοί·

*But even they are not pardonable for a second time round.*

πάλιν] No discourse marker as implied by the addition of a comma in *NETS* “But again,” or a colon in *SD* “Wiederrum aber:”. The author is not repeating what he said earlier. The word is a normal adverbial to go with συγγνωστοί; as shown in the following verse, they should have learned a lesson earlier.<sup>14</sup> Cf. Larcher (768): “Mais eux non plus ne sont pas pour autant pardonnables.”

13.9) εἰ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναι  
 ἵνα δύνωνται στοχάσασθαι τὸν αἰῶνα,  
 τὸν τούτων δεσπότην πῶς τάχιον οὐχ εὔρον;

*For if they were capable of learning so much  
 that they could enquire into the eternity,  
 how come that they did not find faster the master of these?*

τοσοῦτον] The form is opaque; it could be analysed as masc.sg.ac. The context, however, suggests that it is more likely neut., whether a normal direct *o* or a sg. acc. used adverbially.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of this type of clause, see *SSG* § 60 k.

<sup>14</sup> We have some reservations on “on the other hand, in turn” (LEH s.v.).

ἵνα] resultative; another instance occurs in 10.8. Cf. *GELS* s.v. 2. In this instance it is a logical consequence rather than factual as in Engl. *He is so tired that he cannot walk even ten feet*.

στοχάσασθαι] Winston (256) informs us that this verb is used by Philo in his description of people who “advanced from down to up by a sort of heavenly ladder and by reason and reflection happily inferred the Creator from His works (στοχασάμενοι τὸν δημιουργόν)” (*Praem.* 43).

τὸν αἰῶνα] His extensive consideration of this pericope (13.1-9) notwithstanding, Reese (1970.51-62) would not assert that the keyword αἰών here means not only “a long stretch of time,” but also “a vast expanse,” i.e. universe. Such a usage of the word is unknown to CG and to Patristic Greek, on the latter of which cf. Lampe s.v. Thus *pace* “the world” (Reider,<sup>15</sup> *NETS*), “die Welt” (Fichtner, Siegfried, Hübner, *SD*), “the Universe” (Clarke, Winston), “au monde” (Larcher), “l’universo” (Scarpat), and “l’univers” (*BJ*).<sup>16</sup> Cp. “le cours éternel des choses” (Larcher 768, 770f.). In post-biblical Heb. עֲוֵן also means “world,” for which Wi., however, uses κόσμος, see 2.24, 10.1, also 2M 3.12.<sup>17</sup> See also below at 14.6 and 18.4.

τάχιον] טַחֵי לִי = ταχύ.

13.10) Ταλαίπωροι δὲ καὶ ἐν νεκροῖς αἱ ἐλπίδες αὐτῶν,  
οἵτινες ἐκάλεσαν θεοὺς ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων,  
χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον τέχνης ἐμμελέτημα  
καὶ ἀπεικίσματα ζώων  
ἢ λίθον ἄχρηστον χειρὸς ἔργον ἀρχαίας.

*But wretched are they and their hopes hang on dead things,  
those who called crafts of human hands gods,  
gold and silver, products of workmanship  
and fakes of animals  
or a useless pebble fashioned by a human hand long since.*

Ταλαίπωροι] It can be fem., thus descriptive of αἱ ἐλπίδες. We are, however, inclined to relate it to οἵτινες.

νεκροῖς] We agree with Fichtner (50) in taking it as neuter, referring to idols made from precious stones and metals or the like.

<sup>15</sup> Is Reider not contradicting himself with his statement “*Aiōn* is the world in time, while *kosmos* is the world in space” and his rendering “to conjecture about the world”? As questionable is “ὁ αἰὼν umfasst die Welt in ihrer zeitlichen und räumlichen Erstreckung” (*SD* II 2149).

<sup>16</sup> Neither LSJ nor Lane nor the latest Greek lexicon, J. Diggle et al., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon* (2021) recognises “world” as a sense of αἰών. Cf. also Sasse in Kittel 1.197-209.

<sup>17</sup> BDAG admits 3 “the world as a spatial concept,” without pointing out that all the four NT examples mentioned use the pl., and the section ends with “But many of these passages may belong under 2, ‘a segment of time as a particular unit of history, *age*’.” BDAG s.v. 3 mentions Wi 13.9, 14.6, 18.4.

ἐκάλεσαν] Larcher (773, 775) is right in saying that καλέω can mean “invoquer,” “summon” (*GELS* s.v. 3), but we are not certain that the clause can be rendered “.. ont invoqué comme dieux les œuvres de mains humaines.”

- 13.11) εἰ δὲ καὶ τις ὑλοτόμος τέκτων εὐκίνητον φυτὸν ἐκπρίσας  
 περιέξυσεν εὐμαθῶς πάντα τὸν φλοιὸν αὐτοῦ  
 καὶ τεχνησάμενος εὐπρεπῶς  
 κατεσκεύασεν χρήσιμον σκεῦος εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν ζωῆς,  
*If a certain carpenter agilely sawed timber  
 and skilfully scraped every bark of it,  
 and, working away attractively,  
 manufactured a tool handy for daily life,*

εὐκίνητον] which we would analyse as parallel to εὐμαθῶς, thus not an attributive qualifier of φυτὸν as in “a tree that is easy to handle” (*NETS*), but a neut.sg.acc. used adverbially; see *SSG* § 23 *ga*.<sup>18</sup>

- 13.12) τὰ δὲ ἀποβλήματα τῆς ἐργασίας  
 εἰς ἐτοιμασίαν τροφῆς ἀναλώσας ἐνεπλήσθη,  
*the waste of the work, however,  
 having used for preparation of a meal, he had his fill,*

ἐνεπλήσθη] Larcher (779) mentions κρέας ὀπτήσας ἔφαγεν καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ‘having roasted meat, he ate (it) and was full’ *Is* 44.16.

- 13.13) τὸ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπόβλημα εἰς οὐθὲν εὐχρηστον,  
 ξύλον σκολιὸν καὶ ὄζοις συμπεφυκός,  
 λαβὼν ἔγλυψεν ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ ἀργίας αὐτοῦ  
 καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ ἀνέσεως ἐτύπωσεν αὐτό,  
 ἀπείκασεν αὐτὸ εἰκόνι ἀνθρώπου  
*What still remains is of no use for anything,  
 bent timber with many knots grown up.  
 Picking (it) up he carved (it) in his idleness,  
 and in his spare time he skilfully moulded it,  
 making something looking like a human.*

ἐξ αὐτῶν] The pron. refers back to the pl. ἀποβλήματα, hence ‘refuse out of refuse, the worst refuse’; “le rebut des rebuts” (Larcher 779).

εὐχρηστον] The absence of τὸ before εἰς implies that (13a) is a complete nominal clause and (13b) is in apposition to the preceding prepositional

<sup>18</sup> A relevant instance of this adj. in CG is found in σώματα .. εὐκίνητα ‘human bodies .. easily movable’ *Hipp. Aphor.* 3.17.

phrase. Hence, *pace* Winston's "taking .." (258) and Scarpat's "uno di questi scarti .., lo prende" (III 73), τὸ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπόβλημα cannot be analysed as an *o* of λαβὼν, although one would anticipate αὐτό to go with it.

§ has added an extra line between (a) and (b): קָרַח מִן הַבֵּל מְאֵד מִתְּחִלָּה אֶת־הַבֵּל 'and he made out of his own initiative a vessel designed for impurity.'

- 13.14) ἢ ζῶν τινὶ εὐτελεῖ ὁμοίωσεν αὐτὸ  
καταχρίσας μίλτῳ καὶ φύκει ἐρυθήνας χροάν αὐτοῦ  
καὶ πᾶσαν κηλῖδα τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ καταχρίσας  
*Or he made it resemble some petty animal,  
smearing (it) with red paint and dyeing its colour red with orchil  
and smearing over all the stain in it*

τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ] The definite article shows that the prep. phrase qualifies κηλῖδα, and not καταχρίσας. Note Οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ Ge 3.1, where but for τοῦ God may have been implying that it is alright to eat the fruit outside of the garden.<sup>19</sup>

§ concludes the verse with an exaggerating addition: אֶת־כָּל־הַיָּפְאוֹת הַבְּיָרָה אֲשֶׁר־עַל־הָאָרֶץ 'and he fashioned it with all the elegance that is on the earth.'

- 13.15) καὶ ποιήσας αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ ἄξιον οἶκημα  
ἐν τοίχῳ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἀσφαλισάμενος σιδήρῳ.  
*and building for it a niche deserving it,  
he put it within the wall, securing it with iron.*

- 13.16) ἵνα μὲν οὖν μὴ καταπέσῃ, προενόησεν αὐτοῦ  
εἰδῶς ὅτι ἀδυνατεῖ ἑαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι·  
καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν καὶ χρειάν ἔχει βοηθείας.  
*So that, therefore, it may not fall down, he took steps for it,  
being aware that it cannot help itself;  
for it is an image and has need of help.*

ἵνα] a rare instance of a ἵνα-clause ahead of the principal clause.  
προενόησεν] on the syntagm of this verb, προνοέω, see above at 6.7.  
ἀδυνατεῖ] Another instance of <ἀδυνατέω + inf.> = <οὐ δύναμαι + inf.> is found in 12.9. For a syntactic analysis of the combination with an inf., see SSG § 30 bef, pp. 354f.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> More similar examples are mentioned in SSG § 44 ac.

<sup>20</sup> On second thoughts we would not have to see the inf. clause here as the *s* of ἀδυνατεῖ.



- 13.17) περὶ δὲ κτημάτων καὶ γάμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τέκνων προσευχόμενος  
οὐκ αἰσχύνεται τῷ ἄψυχῳ προσλαλῶν  
καὶ περὶ μὲν ὑγιείας τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἐπικαλεῖται,

*Praying about his property and wedding feasts and children  
he does not feel shame to speak to the lifeless (object)  
and consults the feeble over health,*

προσευχόμενος] Quite a few MSS have preserved ευχομενος, a synonym, as a v.l.; see above at 7.7.

γάμων] The pl. of γάμος ‘wedding feast’ signifies diverse events associated with a wedding feast. The coordination here with τέκνων does not imply, *pace* Siegfried, that γάμοι means “wives.”

αἰσχύνεται .. προσλαλῶν] An instance in CG of <αἰσχύνομαι + ptc.> is οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι ξύμπλουν ‘I am not ashamed to sail together’ Soph. *Ant.* 540.<sup>21</sup>

ἄψυχῳ] By drawing attention to (18a) Larcher (784) argues for “lifeless” rather than “soulless” as meant by the adj. here. Winston (262) mentions ἄψυχος applied to gods in contrast to ἔμψυχος ‘living’ in Plato *Leg.* 931a. Cp. *℣* ‘cum illo qui sine anima est.’

- 13.18) περὶ δὲ ζωῆς τὸ νεκρὸν ἀξιοῖ,  
περὶ δὲ ἐπικουρίας τὸ ἀπειρότατον ἱκετεύει,  
περὶ δὲ ὁδοιπορίας τὸ μηδὲ βάσει χρῆσθαι δυνάμενον,

*On life he pleads the dead,  
on aid he entreats the most inexperienced,  
on a journey something incapable of even using a foot,*

ἀξιοῖ] “to put a request to” (*GELS* s.v. 2), used as here parallel to verbs such as ἱκετεύω, and also αἰτέομαι, δέομαι, ἐπικαλέομαι, εὔχομαι.

ἐπικουρίας] See *ND* 3.67f.

βάσει] The context suggests ‘foot’ as its meaning, not ‘act of walking.’ Cf. ἐστερεώθησαν αἱ βάσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σφυδρά ‘his feet and ankles were made strong’ Acts 3.7; τὴν βάσιν ἰσχυρὰν ἔχει ‘they have strong feet’ Arist. *GA* 750<sup>a</sup> 4.

- 13.19) περὶ δὲ πορισμοῦ καὶ ἐργασίας καὶ χειρῶν ἐπιτυχίας  
τὸ ἀδρανέστατον ταῖς χερσὶν εὐδράνειαν αἰτεῖται.

*On making of profits and work and success in work  
he begs for bodily strength from the most incompetent worker.*

<sup>21</sup> More examples are mentioned in *LSJ* s.v. **II c**.

πορισμοῦ] “means of livelihood” (Winston and *NETS*) and “moyens d’existence” (Larcher) are unacceptable. No less satisfactory is “Handel” (Fichtner). In its only other occurrence in LXX, Wi 14.2, it probably means “gains and profits made.” Note the verb πορίζω in 15.12, where it is to be rendered “make money.”

ἐργασίας] On the use of the sg., cp. ἐργατειῶν Wi 7.16.

δρανέστατον] Fichtner (50) rightly points out the lexical contrast between ἀδρανής and εὐδράνεια, which latter is a hapax unknown prior to LXX, but registered in a lexicon by Hesychius of 5th-6th cent. CE. The only Gk word that is derivationally related, εὐδρανής ‘vigorous,’ is, according to LSJ s.v., listed in a lexicon of a 10th cent. CE lexicographer, Photius.<sup>22</sup>

ταῖς χερσίν] a dative of respect; see *SSG* § 22 wc.

αἰτεῖται] Another instance of αἰτέομαι τινά τι is μή τι ὑμᾶς ἤτησα ..; ‘Did I beg you for anything ..?’ Jb 6.22. See also Is 58.2.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. also Gilbert 1973.93.

## CHAPTER 14

- 14.1) Πλοῦν τις πάλιν στελλόμενος καὶ ἄγρια μέλλων διοδεύειν κύματα τοῦ φέροντος αὐτὸν πλοίου σαθρότερον ξύλον ἐπιβοᾶται.

*Again, someone getting ready to sail and about to go through violent waves*

*shouts for help at timber more rotten than the boat carrying him.*

πάλιν] a discourse marker introducing an additional or new topic, *furthermore, moreover, besides*.<sup>1</sup>

στελλόμενος] On an example in CG of <στέλλομαι + inf.>, see ἐστέλλετο .. ἀπιέναι ‘he got ready to depart’ Herod. 3.124.<sup>2</sup>

σαθρότερον] Σαθρός occurs only twice in LXX; ξύλον σαθρόν Jb 41.19. We also find its verbal form once in Jd 10.8 A. This infrequency renders it difficult to determine its meaning with certainty. As an alternative “fragile” has been suggested.

ξύλον] plausibly an idol made from timber.

ἐπιβοᾶται] **§** states for what purpose he shouts: **יְהִי עֲזָרָתִי** ‘so that it could help him.’

On (b) Larcher (788) comments: “le navigateur invoque la protection de l’idole placée à la proue du navire,” which reminds of Jesus sleeping unconscious in the stern of a boat in the midst of the raging storm in the Lake of Galilee (Mk 4.38). Cf. ἀνεβόων ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν Jon 1.5.

- 14.2) ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ ὄρεξις πορισμῶν ἐπενόησεν,  
τεχνίτις δὲ σοφία κατεσκεύασεν·

*For a yearning after profits conceived it  
and a clever carpenter constructed (it).*

ἐκεῖνο] = πλοῖον (1).

πορισμῶν] a substantive used close by, 13.19, where it seems to signify “business, commercial activity.” **§** uses here **אֲחִיזָרָה** ‘commercial activities.’ So **§** in the sg.

τεχνίτις δὲ σοφία] On the surface we have an appositional phrase, but σοφία is virtually an attributive adjective, *σοφή*. For more examples in LXX, see SSG § 33 **b**. The fem. gender of τεχνίτις is made to accord with σοφία,

<sup>1</sup> This function of πάλιν is missing in *GELS*. For more examples, see BDAG s.v. **3**. LEH’s “in so far as” is debatable.

<sup>2</sup> Pace Larcher (788), according to whom στέλλομαι means also “to be ready to depart, to travel,” LSJ s.v. **II 2** act. mentions “to prepare to go, start, set forth.”

hence not τεχνίτης. **Sh** reverses the sequence: אֱמָנָה אֶתְחַכֶּה. **S** differs farther: חָכְמָה עָבַדְתָּ אֱמָנָה ‘the workman made it with his wisdom,’ which roughly represents the majority reading, τεχνίτης, and σοφία, i.e. τεχνίτης σοφία.<sup>3</sup> We agree with Winston (167), who considers σοφία here as human, and not Wisdom the divine. Fichtner (51) compromises: “Die menschliche (aber von Gott verliehene) Weisheit.” Cp. “die Werkmeisterin Weisheit” (*SD*) and “la sagesse artisanne” [= “l’habilité technique de l’artisan, fruit de la Sagesse”] (*BJ*).

An alternative syntactic analysis of τεχνίτις δὲ σοφία is represented by Hübner (171): “Die Weisheit aber als die Verfertigerin hat es erbaut,” i.e. τεχνίτις as a *s* complement.<sup>4</sup>

14.3) ἡ δὲ σή, πάτερ, διακυβερνᾷ πρόνοια,  
ὅτι ἔδωκας καὶ ἐν θαλάσῃ ὁδὸν  
καὶ ἐν κύμασιν τρίβον ἀσφαλῇ

*Your providence, Father, steers (it) through (the voyage),  
for You provided even in the sea a way  
and a safe path in waves,*

σή] Adjectival possessive pronouns are no mere stylistic variants of indeclinable gen. pronouns; see *SSG* § 11. In this particular case we would also note a considerable distance from πρόνοια. Thus renderings such as “it is your providence, Father, that pilots ..” (Winston, *NETS*) and “c’est ta Providence, ô Père, qui ..” (Larcher, *BJ*) are justifiable. Sim. Reider and Clarke.

The frequency of σός in *LXX* is interesting: Pr 69x and Wi 14x out of a total of 135x, thus 61% in two sapiential books.

πάτερ] In the OT we find God referred to as “father,” e.g. אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲבִי Is 63.16.<sup>5</sup> Our example here is noteworthy for being in the vocative, which is unknown to OT, but well known of course in the NT. This is found also κύριε πάτερ Si 23.1 and κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὸς ζωῆς μου ib. 23.4. Cf. also Larcher 792.

διακυβερνᾷ] In the only other occurrence in *LXX* of this verb it has God as the *s* and κτίσις ‘universe’ as its *o* – ὕψιστε παντοκράτωρ θεὸς τὴν πᾶσαν διακυβερνῶν ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς κτίσιν 3M 6.2.

πρόνοια] **Sh** is less specific: אֲחִיפּוּתָא ‘care.’ Likewise at 17.2 below. **S** is rather expansive: בְּרִיתְךָ כָּל מַדָּם בְּחָכְמָתְךָ וּבְאַפְסוּתְךָ ‘You created everything with Your wisdom and with Your care.’ Here we may mentally supply πλοῖον (1) as its *o*.

ἐν θαλάσῃ ὁδὸν] most likely a reference to the crossing of the Red Sea.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion on the two readings, cf. Larcher 790f.

<sup>4</sup> On this notion, see *SSG* § 61 b.

<sup>5</sup> For more references, see BDB s.v. אָב 2 and *GELS* s.v. πατήρ 1 a.

- 14.4) δεικνὺς ὅτι δύνασαι ἐκ παντὸς σῶζειν,  
ἵνα κἂν ἄνευ τέχνης τις ἐπιβῇ.

*showing that You are capable of saving out of any (circumstance)  
so that even without technical skill one can board (a ship).*

ἵνα] On the nuance of ἵνα here, see above at 13.9.

κἂν] a protasis of a conditional clause may lack a finite verb, ἔστιν here.  
On this question, see SSG § 89 k.

- 14.5) θέλεις δὲ μὴ ἀργὰ εἶναι τὰ τῆς σοφίας σου ἔργα·  
διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐλαχίστω ξύλῳ πιστεύουσιν ἄνθρωποι ψυχὰς  
καὶ διελθόντες κλύδωνα σχεδία διεσώθησαν.

*You want the products of Your wisdom not to be inactive.  
Hence people entrust their lives even to a most tiny piece of timber,  
and sailing over waves they were rescued with a raft.*

σου] On this rare addition to σοφία in Wi, see above at 9.17.

In (a) שׁ is rather independent: אֲלֵךְ בְּחַיִּים כִּי עָשִׂיתָ כָּל וְכָל וְכָל חֵסֶד וְכָל חֵסֶד  
אֲלֵךְ בְּחַיִּים מִן הַיָּם ‘because it was You that wanted and made all and Your wis-  
dom is not idle from works.’

ἐλαχίστω] Though superlative in form, virtually elative, which is a discrep-  
ancy not infrequent, see SSG § 23 bb.

- 14.6) καὶ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀπολλυμένων ὑπερηφάνων γιγάντων  
ἢ ἐλπίς τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ σχεδίας καταφυγοῦσα  
ἀπέλιπεν αἰῶνι σπέρμα γενέσεως τῇ σῇ κυβερνηθεῖσα χειρί.  
*For, also at the beginning, as arrogant giants were perishing,  
the hope of the world, having fled aboard a raft,  
left to the future descendants for regeneration, piloted with Your hand.*

ἀρχῆς] genitive of time; see SSG § 22 h.

γιγάντων] Known in the Heb. source, Gn 6.4, also known as גִּימְלִים.

ἢ ἐλπίς τοῦ κόσμου] referring to Noah and his family.

αἰῶνι] On the interpretation of this important word in Wi, see above at 13.9. Cf. also a convincing discussion by Larcher (797).<sup>6</sup>

σπέρμα γενέσεως] We would bring γένεσις here under “reproductive sys-  
tem” (GELS s.v. 1 b), and σπέρμα would then mean “fundamental ability and  
facilities for reproduction,” though not necessarily “male semen.”

σῇ] more emphatic than σου, cf. GELS s.v. See also above at 14.3 and SSG § 11 a.

<sup>6</sup> Pace Scarpat (III 120), who sees in αἰών a stylistic variant of κόσμος (b).

14.7) εὐλόγηται γὰρ ξύλον, δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη·

*For the wood with which righteousness is performed has become a blessing.*

εὐλόγηται] Pf., whereas “blessed is” (Reider, Winston, and *NETS*) and “gesegnet ist” (Fichtner, Siegfried, *SD*) would represent a v.l. εὐλογεῖται or εὐλογημενος.

δικαιοσύνη] an indirect allusion to Noah the righteous. Cf. שׁוֹׁן הָעֵץ הַצֶּדִיק ‘blessed is the wood out of which the righteous man is visible.’

14.8) τὸ χειροποίητον δέ, ἐπικατάρατον αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτό, ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἠργάζετο, τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν θεὸς ὠνομάσθη.

*The handmade (product), it is cursed and so is he who made it, because he constructed (it), but something perishable was named god.*

χειροποίητον] used in LXX with reference to idols.<sup>7</sup> It is also used as an attributive adjective as in ἡλόγουν τὰ εἰδῶλα τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῶν Da 5.4 LXX.

ὁ μὲν] This is a residue of the archaic use of the definite article as equivalent to a third person pronoun in the nominative, always followed by μὲν or δέ. Likewise at vs. 19 below. For details, see *SSG* § 1 a.

*Pace* Fichtner (53) there is in (b) nothing comparable to a circumstantial clause in Hebrew; we have two independent clauses, neither of which is subordinate to the other.

14.9) ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ μισητὰ θεῷ καὶ ὁ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἡ ἀσέβεια αὐτοῦ·

*For both the impious and his impiety are equally abominable to God.*

ἐν ἴσῳ] missing in S.

μισητὰ] The selection of the neut. form is remarkable, given the genders of the two s's. Cf. *SSG* § 77 ce.

ἀσεβῶν] This is the sole instance in Wi of a substantivised ptc. of ἀσεβέω. By contrast, the adjective, ἀσεβής occurs 14 times, mostly masc. and substantivised with the sole exception of ἀσεβὲς ἔθος ‘impious custom’ 14.16. With the selection of ἀσεβῶν, and not ἀσεβής, the action of building an idol is better highlighted.

14.10) καὶ γὰρ τὸ πραχθὲν σὺν τῷ δράσαντι κολασθήσεται.

*For the deed shall also be penalised with the doer.*

<sup>7</sup> In CG there is no such limitation, e.g. σκηπτρον χειροποίητον ‘a handmade stick’ Herod. 1.195.

καὶ] The additional value, “also,” is made more explicit with ἤα ‘also’ in **Sh** and with **אָהָהָהָהָ** ‘together’ in **S**.

δράσαντι] Larcher (802) holds that in Greek the *ptc.* often carries pejorative nuance. It is difficult to imagine that such an analysis is applicable to most of substantivised participles. In this particular case our author more likely chose to use this verb category in order to underline an *agens* and an *actum*.

14.11) διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν εἰδώλοις ἐθνῶν ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται,  
ὅτι ἐν κτίσματι θεοῦ εἰς βδέλυγμα ἐγενήθησαν  
καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων  
καὶ εἰς παγίδα ποσὶν ἀφρόνων.

*Therefore, the idols of gentiles would be dealt with (by God),  
because in spite of being God's creation they have become abominable  
and stumbling blocks for people's souls  
and a trap for fools' feet.*

ἐν εἰδώλοις] The prep. marks “a person to whom something is done” (GELS s.v. **10**), e.g. ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ποιήσω τὴν ἐκδίκησιν Ex 12.12.

ἐπισκοπή] One of the principal meanings of this word and its underlying verb, ἐπισκέπτομαι, is to show interest or concern which can have diverse motives, not always welcome on the part of a person concerned. In our case here the motive appears to be punitive. In slightly archaic English we come across a word such as *visitation*. Cf. ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀπολοῦνται Je 10.15. This lexico-semantic feature applies to Heb. **רָקַף** as well. Taking **רָקַף** alone the equation with ἐπισκέπτομαι occurs in LXX more than 65 times. In one case the Gk verb is used of visiting a sick person: μὴ ὀκνεῖ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ἄρρωστον ‘Do not hesitate to visit a sick person’ Si 7.35.<sup>8</sup>

ἐν κτίσματι θεοῦ] more literally – ‘being found among God's creation.’

ἐγενήθησαν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα .. καὶ εἰς παγίδα] cf. ἔσονται ὑμῖν εἰς παγίδας καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα Josh 23.13. Both forms of damage suffered occur to people during their journey. In the biblical world view our life is often compared to a journey. E.g. אָרַח הַיָּם לְמַעַל לְמַשְׁכָּל אָרַח הַיָּם תִּדְרֹג אֶרֶץ אֲרָם Ps 16.11, מִצֵּן מִצֵּן מִצֵּן מִצֵּן Pr 15.24, עַל-דֶּרֶךְ אֶת-בְּשָׂרְךָ תִּכְרֹץ Gn 6.12. Cf. BDB s.v. אָרַח **3** and דֶּרֶךְ **5** and **6**.

14.12) Ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων,  
εὐρεσις δὲ αὐτῶν φθορὰ ζωῆς.

*For the beginning of fornication is conception of idols,  
their invention is ruin of life.*

<sup>8</sup> In a CG document written in the 2nd cent. CE the verb is used of a physician visiting a patient. See LSJ s.v. ἐπισκοπέω **2**.

Rabbinic sources cited by Winston on prostitution and idolatry are vague. In Pr 5.3-5, 23.27f. prostitutes are condemned as dangerous, but no linkage is made with idolatry. Whores must have been around in ancient Israel. In the OT your relationship with God is often metaphorically described in matrimonial terms.<sup>9</sup> Πορνεία here must signify, first and foremost, infidelity towards God. That could manifest itself in an act of infidelity against one's marriage partner. With his "infidélité religieuse" Larcher (805f.) is convincing.

14.13) οὔτε γὰρ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὔτε εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔσται·

*For they were not there from the beginning nor will they remain for ever.*

ἦν] In spite of the sg. form its *s* is εἶδωλα (12), n.pl. So שָׁהָיוּ יְהוָה 'they were there.' Note αὐτῶν in vs. 14.

14.14) κενοδοξία γὰρ ἀνθρώπων εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,  
καὶ διὰ τοῦτο σύντομον αὐτῶν τὸ τέλος ἐπενοήθη.

*For they entered the world through people's vainglory  
and hence their quick end was conceived.*

κενοδοξία] read in שָׁהָיוּ as κενοδοξία: .. תָּעַל .. אֶתְּוֹבָה 'the vain-glory .. entered ..' and also in שָׁהָיוּ .. תָּעַל .. אֶתְּוֹבָה 'the greed .. entered ..'. Larcher (804) prefers "vain opinion" as the meaning of this noun here. Let's note that in one of its rare occurrences in LXX it is coordinate with φιλαρχία 'lust for power' 4M 2.15.

σύντομον] a *s* complement. Hence the underlying construction is τὸ τέλος σύντομον, and not τὸ τέλος τὸ σύντομον. Cf. SSG § 61 **a-b**. Thus *pace* Larcher (804) "leur fin brutale a-t-elle été décidée," Scarpata (III 113) "la loro rapida fine," and Hübner (176) "ein jähes Ende."

14.15) ἄνθρωπος γὰρ πένθει τρυχόμενος πατήρ  
τοῦ ταχέως ἀφαιρεθέντος τέκνου εἰκόνα ποιήσας  
τόν ποτε νεκρὸν ἄνθρωπον νῦν ὡς θεὸν ἐτίμησεν  
καὶ παρέδωκεν τοῖς ὑποχειρίοις μυστήρια καὶ τελετάς·

*For a father who is worn out with an untimely bereavement,  
having made an image of a child taken away suddenly,  
honoured now as a god a person who was now dead,  
and passed on mystic rites and rituals to the family members.*

ἄνθρωπος .. πένθει] the same phrase in its reverse sequence recurs in Si 16.3, also about a premature death of a family member.

ὑποχειρίοις] 'subordinate to one's authority.'

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Hauck / Schulz in Kittel 6.587. Philo says that the Bible metaphorically (συμβολικῶς) calls idolaters "children of a whore" (*Spec.* 1.332).



- 14.16) εἴτα ἐν χρόνῳ κρατυνθὲν τὸ ἀσεβὲς ἔθος ὡς νόμος ἐφυλάχθη.  
καὶ τυράννων ἐπιταγαῖς ἐθρησκεύετο τὰ γλυπτὰ,

*Then, the ungodly practice was eventually ratified and observed as a law  
and with the orders of rulers the carved images began to be worshipped,*

ἐν χρόνῳ] This idiomatic combination recurs at 2.4.

ἐθρησκεύετο] The Impf. can be assigned habitual value, so Fichtner (53).

§ is somewhat explanatory: כָּרַךְ רוּשָׁעָא וְאַתְחִיל מַסַּת וְנָא יוּלְפָנָא אִיךְ נְמוּסָא 'the crime became widespread and it became powerful in a while and he observed the teaching like a law and with the order of rulers they served the idols.'

- 14.17) οὓς ἐν ὄψει μὴ δυνάμενοι τιμᾶν ἄνθρωποι διὰ τὸ μακρὰν οἰκεῖν  
τὴν πόρρωθεν ὄψιν ἀνατυπώσμενοι  
ἐμφανῇ εἰκόνα τοῦ τιμωμένου βασιλέως ἐποίησαν,  
ἵνα ὡς παρόντα τὸν ἀπόντα κολακεύωσιν διὰ τῆς σπουδῆς.

*whom people cannot honour because they live far away  
they formed through imagination an image of the king far off to be  
revered*

*in order to flatter in earnest the one absent as though present.*

The syntactic relation between this verse and the preceding is difficult to establish. The antecedent of οὓς must be τύραννοι (16). The ptc. δυνάμενοι (17a) looks causal in relation to the following ἀνατυπώσμενοι (17b), which in turn is circumstantial to ἐποίησαν (17c).

τιμωμένου] Larcher (818) finds the Pres. ptc. odd for “*véneré, respecté,*” which, according to him, would be expressed with τετυμημένου, preserved as a v.l. We are not convinced.

διὰ τῆς σπουδῆς] חֵל וְכֹחַ אִתְּפִיאוּתָא בִּידְ בִּידְ 'with obstinacy,' § כּוּלָּהּ הִפְיִטוּתָא וְכָל דְּמִלְכָּא 'with all the diligence of production (?).'

- 14.18) εἰς ἐπίτασιν δὲ θρησκείας καὶ τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας  
ἢ τοῦ τεχνίτου προετρέψατο φιλοτιμία·

*The artisan's yearning after honour pushed  
even those who did know (him) to involvement in cult.*

Cf. § וְהָאֵלֶּינָא דְלֹא יָדַע לָהּ וְדִנְהוּא מְשֻׁמָּה לָהּ דְאַכּוּתָהּ הֵּוָּ אֻמְנָנִיתָהּ דְאַמְנָא § וְכִבְדָּהּ 'and also him who does not know him and who could serve it like one who is like him the skill of the artisan strengthened him' and § לְשׁוּשָׁטָא דִּין § 'for the extension of the piety and those who do not know the love of honour of the artisan enticed.'

- 14.19) ὁ μὲν γὰρ τάχα κρατοῦντι βουλόμενος ἀρέσαι  
ἐξεβιάσατο τῇ τέχνῃ τὴν ὁμοιότητα ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιον·

*For he, perhaps desiring to please the ruler,  
exploited (his) skill to improve on mere resemblance.*

ὁ μὲν] On the definite article followed by μὲν or δέ as equivalent to an independent personal pronoun, see above at 14.8.

κρατοῦντι] A participle can be substantivised without the definite article being added. More examples are mentioned in SSG § 31 **ba**.

- 14.20) τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐφελκόμενον διὰ τὸ εὐχαρι τῆς ἐργασίας  
τὸν πρὸ ὀλίγου τιμηθέντα ἄνθρωπον νῦν σέβασμα ἐλογίσαντο.

*The crowd, attracted by the charm of his work,  
regarded now as an object of worship the human who was just respected  
a short while ago.*

πλῆθος] Though sg. in form, this noun must be the *s* of the pl. ἐλογίσαντο. The pl. **שׁ** אַפְּסָהּ לֵךְ is an unnecessary adjustment.

ἐφελκόμενον] Given the absence of the definite article, this must be circumstantial in value, not attributive; § 31 **dd**.

σέβασμα] an *o* complement.

**שׁ** presents a unique interpretation of (b): לְהִי אֲתָדָסָה עֲבָדִי קָדְשׁ מִן קִדְשׁ בְּרִיךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲשֶׁר בְּרִיךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ ‘which a short while ago he turned into an object of worship one whom he respected as a human.’

- 14.21) καὶ τοῦτο ἐγένετο τῷ βίῳ εἰς ἔνεδρον,  
ὅτι ἢ συμφορᾷ ἢ τυραννίδι δουλεύσαντες ἄνθρωποι  
τὸ ἀκοινώνητον ὄνομα λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις περιέθεσαν.

*And this became a trap for the world,  
because, having been enslaved whether to a disaster or to tyranny,  
humans gave pieces of stone and timber the meaningless name.*

βίῳ] On βίος in the sense of “the world we live in,” see above at 10.8. Cf. **שׁ** here: אֲמַחַד but **שׁ** אֲמַחַד ‘living, life’ and **ל** vitae humanae. In this case, however, “life” cannot be totally precluded.

ἀκοινώνητον] a hapax meaning ‘that cannot be shared with or communicated to others’? Which name the author had in mind has been discussed by commentators. E.g. Larcher 823f. In this context Hübner (18f.) appears to be denying that it is the tetragrammaton, for Egyptians did not address any divine being with that name. Hübner is of the view that we are not concerned here with any name of God, but God Himself. Is our author using ὄνομα in the sense of “species” and is he talking about addressing, speaking to a god, not naming him? See below at vs. 27.

περιέθεσαν] With קִדְשׁ 2m.pl. **שׁ** personalises the thought.

- 14.22) Εἴτ' οὐκ ἤρκεσεν τὸ πλανᾶσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν,  
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ ζῶντες ἀγνοίας πολέμῳ  
τὰ τοσαῦτα κακὰ εἰρήνην προσαγορεύουσιν.

*Then the confusion over the knowledge about God was not enough;  
even fighting a major war against ignorance,  
they call such great evils peace.*

τὸ πλανᾶσθαι] Larcher (825) holds that τὸ should not have been added. It is true that in CG, when ἀρκέω is used with an inf., the latter is bare. But the addition of the definite article is quite common in CG, also when the inf. clause is not preceded by a preposition.<sup>10</sup> The inf. clause here can be analysed as the *s* of ἤρκεσεν.<sup>11</sup> Some MSS and versions add αυτοῖς; though not absolutely necessary, a dat. pers. is found with this verb more often than not in both BG and CG.

περὶ] With an acc. the prep. can mark an issue or topic as in ἤλεγξε περὶ αὐτοὺς βασιλεῖς 'he criticised kings over them' 1C 16.21 *L*. Cf. *GELS* s.v. *περί* II 5.

τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσιν] The genitive can be objective, namely getting to know God, or topic, namely knowledge and information about God, i.e. theology. However, γνῶσις, a word of 60 occurrences in LXX, is not used as an action noun. Hence the first alternative is unlikely. This applies to the other five occurrences of it in Wi. – 1.7, 2.13, 6.22, 7.17, 10.16. Cf. also *GELS* s.v.

ἀγνοίας πολέμῳ] An objective genitive can be identified here. Πολεμέω can govern an acc. referring to an antagonist, e.g. οὗτος ἐπολέμησεν βασιλέα Μωαβ Nu 21.26. Alternatively we may identify here a causal genitive (*SSG* § 22 o) subordinate to ζῶντες, cf. also Larcher (824) "guerre qui résulte de l'ignorance."

In (22b) *Sh* reads *וְכִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת הַיְּהוָה וְכִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת הַיְּהוָה* 'but when they live intensely without knowledge of wars.' *Sh* diverges widely from both *Th* and *Sh*: *וְכִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת הַיְּהוָה וְכִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת הַיְּהוָה* 'it was not enough for you that you did not know God, but you fought a war in order to make name without knowing the evil.'

On the issue of war and peace in Wi, cf. Gilbert 1973.161-64.

- 14.23) ἢ γὰρ τεκνοφόνους τελετὰς ἢ κρύφια μυστήρια  
ἢ ἐμμανεῖς ἐξάλλων θεσμῶν κώμους ἄγοντες

*For holding child-slaughtering rites or secretive, mystic rites  
or frenzied, anomalous, formal revels*

<sup>10</sup> See *SSG* § 30 *abb*.

<sup>11</sup> By contrast, *LSJ*, s.v. ἀρκέω 5, identifies it as impersonally used in, e.g. ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρκεῖ τοῦτον ἐν δόμοις μένειν 'I am content that he stay within his tent' *Soph. Aj.* 80.



long inventory ending in vs. 26 is in apposition to πάντα δὲ ἐπιμίξῃ χει, and exemplifying. The adverbial predicate, ἐπιμίξῃ, indicates that the author started off classifying the vices into pairs, which he stopped after having presented two pairs, each with καὶ connecting the two related vices. **§** carries on the pairing for the entire verse, also adding a period between the adjoining pairs.

14.26) θόρυβος ἀγαθῶν, χάριτος ἀμνηστία,  
 ψυχῶν μiasμός, γενέσεως ἐναλλαγή,  
 γάμων ἀταξία, μοιχεία καὶ ἀσέλγεια.

*agitation of decent people, kindness forgotten,  
 defiling of souls, interchange of sex roles,  
 disorderly marital relationship, fornication and promiscuity.*

(a) is missing in **§**h. The first half reads in **§** as כּוֹלֵהֵינִי לְפָנָיִךְ אֵלֵּיךְ כּוֹלֵהֵינִי לְפָנָיִךְ ‘all these are torments for those who do them.’

θόρυβος ἀγαθῶν] Larcher (832) holds that, if ἀγαθῶν be masc., the phrase would mean “persecution of Jews,” but “persecution” is expressed with a more explicit term. Hence “perversion des valeurs.” Was our author as nationalistic as to think that not a single πονηρός could be found among his coreligionists?

ἀμνηστία .. μiasμός .. ἐναλλαγή] **§** has converted the three verbal nouns to their corresponding Impf. form – כּוֹלֵהֵינִי .. כּוֹלֵהֵינִי .. כּוֹלֵהֵינִי אֵלֵּיךְ.

μiasμός] Winston (280) notes that this is the first attestation in moral sense, which, however, could be due to accidentally incomplete preservation of data. Its underlying verb, μιάινω, is applied in CG to a moral context: e.g. κλέος τοῦμοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ ἂν μιάιναιμ’ ‘I would not defile my father’s fame’ Eur. *Hell.* 1000, and according to LSJ s.v. 3 this extension is frequent.

ψυχῶν] Larcher (833) discusses an alternative rendering, “vies,” but ψυχή = *life* signifies ‘life’ as against ‘death,’ not ‘a life one leads.’ See *GELS* s.v. 1.

γενέσεως ἐναλλαγή] i.e. homosexual practices. Note an etymologically related verb applied to Lesbians in αἶ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν [*< μεταλλάσσω*] τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν Ro 1.26.

Goodrick (304) proposes emending γενέσεως to γένους ‘sex, gender,’ though not supported by any MS.

ἀσέλγεια] **§**h אִתְּיָהּ ‘immodesty.’

14.27) ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἀνωνύμων εἰδώλων θρησκεία  
 παντὸς ἀρχῆς κακοῦ καὶ αἰτία καὶ πέρας ἐστίν.

*For the worship of anonymous idols is  
 the beginning and cause and goal of every evil.*

ἀνωνύμων] שְׂמָא הִלְ שְׂכִירִי ‘named wrongly gods.’ Is our author differentiating idols from gods in the contemporary pagan religions? Many of them had a name of their own.

Note שְׂמָא אֲבִידִי וְתַשְׁמֶשֶׁתְּהוֹן רִישָׁא דְכּוּלָּהּ בִּישְׁתָּא ‘the manners of their anonymous idols and their service are the core of every evil.’ How should one analyse the initial ד־? It is preceded by גּוּרָא וְטַנְפוּתָא ‘adultery and impurity,’ but any genitive relationship between the two noun phrases is difficult to establish. Furthermore, in the ed. Mossul דְּדוּבְרָא concludes vs. 26.

Some say that the Gk adj. also means “not to be named, unspeakable.”<sup>15</sup> According to LSJ s.v. 3 the only reference is found in a work authored by Aelius Aristides of the 2nd cent. CE. Here it is not concerned about what Adam was told to do by God and name every animal in the garden: one species was called בָּקָר, another צֹאן, and so on (Gn 3.16), which was different from what Jesus as a good shepherd would do every morning, standing at the gate of his sheep-fold (John 10.14). In summing up we could say that the idols were wrongly called gods.<sup>16</sup> See also above at vs. 21.

If each of the idols had its own name, it should not be mentioned. See שֵׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֹא תִזְכְּרוּ לֹא יִשְׁמַע עַל-פִּיךָ Ex 23.13.

πέρας] cf. πῶς ἂν ἀχθεῖν τοῦτο ἐπὶ πέρας ‘how this could be achieved’ Es B 3.

κακοῦ .. πέρας] We could identify here an appositive genitive; SSG § 22 v (iii).

14.28) ἢ γὰρ εὐφραίνόμενοι μεμήνασιν ἢ προφητεύουσιν ψευδῇ  
ἢ ζῶσιν ἀδίκως ἢ ἐπιόρκοῦσιν ταχέως·

*For they are happy, having gone mad, or prophesy lies  
or live unrighteously or immediately swear falsely;*

μεμήνασιν] Pf. in form, emphasising that they have taken leave of their senses and are unawares that they are in a miserable state, but rejoicing and having fun. Cf. SSG § 28 **hc**. Note מְטַנְפִּין ‘they are defiling themselves.’

προφητεύουσιν] most likely in the sense of ‘make public statement’ rather than ‘foretell.’

ταχέως] Freely rendered in שְׁ with לֹא נִשְׁרֹן ‘they are not speaking the truth,’ tautologous following וְאִן נֶאֱמֹן בְּדִנְלוּתָא ‘and if they swear falsely.’

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Winston 280.

<sup>16</sup> We have reservations about Engel’s analysis of our adjective: “wesenlos, in Wirklichkeit nicht-existierend” (SD II 2151), for they do exist, but not as gods as their worshippers believe.



לֹא הָיָא הָנָא חֵילָא דְּפוֹרְעָנוּתָא מְטוּל מוֹמְתָא אֱלָא פּוֹרְעָנָא לְחֻטִּיתָא דְּחֻטִּיא § Cf. יְחִיבוּתָא הֵו לְטוֹמָא בְּמַדְם דְּעֵבְדוּ ‘this was not the power of retribution against the oaths, but a retribution for the sin of sinners and condemnation of lies concerning anything that they committed.’



## CHAPTER 15

- 15.1) Σὺ δέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, χρηστὸς καὶ ἀληθής,  
μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα.

*But, You, our God, are kind and sincere,  
long-suffering and administers everything mercifully.*

Cf. καὶ σύ, κύριε ὁ θεός, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός Ps 85.15. On the use of these multiple labels as applied to God and their use in the biblical literature, see Larcher 847-49.

ἀληθής] Although the immediately preceding section went about idols which are only wrongly and falsely worshipped by pagans as gods, θεός applied to them is misguided, ἀληθής here does not appear to be contrasted to “false, fake.” This is because it is coordinate with χρηστός. It is also immediately followed by μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα.

διοικῶν τὰ πάντα] **ܣ ܢܝܟ ܢܚܪܝܗ ܠܚܝܬܐ**, where the *o* probably means ‘everybody,’ = πάντα, though it is not certain that this, on its own, can be used as equivalent to πάντα ἄνθρωπον.<sup>1</sup> This Syr. verb seems usually to take a personal *o*. Cp. διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα χρηστῶς Wi 8.1, also with God as *s*.

- 15.2) καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἁμαρτῶμεν, σοὶ ἔσμεν, εἰδότες σου τὸ κράτος·  
οὐχ ἁμαρτησόμεθα δέ, εἰδότες ὅτι σοὶ λελογίσμεθα.

*For even if we sin, we belong to You, knowing Your power,  
but we shall not sin, knowing that we have been declared to be Yours.*

σοὶ ἔσμεν] Larcher (849) quotes πάτερ, σός εἰμι Soph. Ant. 635, said by Haemon to his father.

σου τὸ κράτος] The notion of God’s capability of dealing with human sins is unique in the pre-Christian Judaism.

οὐχ ἁμαρτησόμεθα] The Fut. here expresses the speaker’s pledge; see SSG § 28 gg.

λελογίσμεθα] On the meaning of λογίζομαι here, see GELS s.v. 9. This is an important word occurring in LXX 115 times. In terms of its function this form can be genuinely passive. Alternatively middle. The connection with someone else can be expressed in more than one way: <+ dat.>, <πρός +

<sup>1</sup> In GELS s.v. **ܢܝܟ** **I a** we find only two examples: **ܢܝܟ ܕܥܠ ܬܝܪܐ** ‘everyone who was on the dry land’ Ge 7.22 and **ܢܝܟ ܕܥܠ ܥܝܢܐ** ‘everybody who calls the name of the Lord’ Jl 2.32.

acc.>, <ἐν + dat.>, <μετά + gen.>. Details may be found in *GELS* s.v. λογίζομαι 9. The first can be considered a transformation of what we find in (2a), σοί ἐσμεν.

For a theological discussion on vss. 2-6, cf. Larcher 849-58.

- 15.3) τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί σε ὁλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη,  
καὶ εἰδέναι σου τὸ κράτος ῥίζα ἀθανασίας.

*For to become well acquainted with You is the entirety of righteousness,  
and to know Your power is the kernel of immortality.*

Three important Gk verbs for knowledge are γινώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι, and οἶδα, the last two of them are used in vss. 2 and 3. All of them mean both “to come to know,” i.e. an act, and “to be acquainted,” i.e. a state. Which is meant in a given case largely depends on the context. Contextual consideration, however, might leave a measure of ambiguity. In this verse, “to be acquainted with” cannot be entirely precluded.

ὁλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη] Let it be noted that, for our author, righteousness or justice lies at the centre of his theology, just as it would with Paul the apostle. Justice is opposite to sin as expressed with ἁμαρτάνω in the preceding verse.

- 15.4) οὔτε γὰρ ἐπλάνησεν ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων κακότεχνος ἐπίνοια  
οὐδὲ σκιαγράφων πόνος ἄκαρπος,  
εἶδος σπιλωθὲν χρώμασιν διηλλαγμένοις,

*For people's malevolent design did not lead us astray, either  
nor scene-painters' fruitless toil,  
an image stained with various colours,*

ἐπίνοια] Unlike in 9.14, where this substantive is parallel to λογισμός, it does not refer here to man's intellectual, mental produce in the form of ideology, philosophy and the like, but to tangible products or practices and in Ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων 14.12 sexual misbehaviour is said to be ultimately attributable to one's refusal to accept a god who sternly forbade extramarital sexual relationship (the seventh of the Ten Commandments). Hence, ἐπίνοια here refers to concrete manifestations of idolatry.

σκιαγράφων] LSJ provides an eloquent definition of σκιαγραφία: “*painting with the shadows* so as to produce an illusion of solidity at a distance.”

οὐδὲ] The same negator, οὔτε (a), could have been repeated as in some MSS, cf. SSG p. 688, n. 2.

σπιλωθὲν] an Aor. ptc. pass. nt. sg. from σπιλώω ‘to stain,’ expressive of the author's pejorative, cynical view on the painting art.

Š deviates substantially: לֹא אֶטְעִיּוֹן עָבַד אִידִיהוֹן דְּבִנֵּי אֲנָשָׁא רִיקְנוּתֵהוֹן טָלְלָא 'the work of people's hands did not mislead us.'<sup>2</sup> Their emptiness is a shadow of their writings, a toil of their hands with no fruits in it, worthless images and various shapes.' Much less so Šh.

15.5) ὃν ὄψις ἄφροσιν εἰς ὄρεξιν ἔρχεται,  
ποθεῖ τε νεκρᾶς εἰκόνοσ εἶδος ἄπνουν.

*whose sight arouses the interest of fools;  
it also yearns after the breathless sight of a dead image.*

ὃν] referring to idols and their visually attractive features mentioned in vs. 4.

ὄψις] either "outward appearance, what they look like" (GELS s.v. 1) or "act of visually perceiving" (loc. cit. 3), most likely the latter.

εἰς ὄρεξιν ἔρχεται] For ἔρχομαι εἰς τι "to come to face a certain condition" cf. GELS s.v. ἔρχομαι 1 e.

ποθεῖ] The sg. form is difficult to handle. Its *s* is hardly ὃν ὄψις. Fichtner (54) holds that ἄφροσιν is distributively used, i.e. "each fool," which is a rather anomalous use of the plural.<sup>3</sup> BD's "leur fait désirer la forme .." is implausible.

15.6) κακῶν ἐρασταὶ ἄξιοί τε τοιούτων ἐλπίδων  
καὶ οἱ δρῶντες καὶ οἱ ποθοῦντες καὶ οἱ σεβόμενοι.

*Those who manufacture and those who desire and those who worship  
are lovers of evils and worthy of these hopes.*

κακῶν ἐρασταὶ] Š פְּעִילָא אָנוֹן בִּישָׁא 'they are evil workers.'

καὶ<sup>1</sup>] This does not link (6a) and (6b),<sup>4</sup> but is the first of three καί's. Holmes's "Both" is unacceptable for the series of three coordinate terms. This type of καὶ is usually added to each of two coordinate terms, but occasionally to more, e.g. διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἅγια καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κινδυνεύειν 'because the city and the temple and the sanctuary were all in danger' 2M 15.17.<sup>5</sup>

δρῶντες] Δράω usually means "to act and do." Is our author using it by false analogy of ποιέω?

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Lagarde reads אֶטְעִיכּוֹן 'it did not mislead you (pl.).' The reading in ed. Leiden looks like a scribal error, for the *s* of the verb is m.s.

<sup>3</sup> Scarpat (III 155) emends ποθεῖ τε το ποθεῖ τίς τε 'and someone yearns after ..'.

<sup>4</sup> So Hübner (182): "Und sie sind es, die ..".

<sup>5</sup> See GELS s.v. καὶ 2 b.

- 15.7) Καὶ γὰρ κεραμεὺς ἀπαλὴν γῆν θλίβων ἐπίμοχθον  
 πλάσσει πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν ἡμῶν ἐν ἑκάστον·  
 ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἀνεπλάσατο  
 τὰ τε τῶν καθαρῶν ἔργων δοῦλα σκεύη  
 τὰ τε ἐναντία, πάντα ὁμοίως·  
 τούτων δὲ ἐτέρου τίς ἐκάστου ἐστὶν ἡ χρῆσις, κριτὴς ὁ πηλουργός.  
*For also a potter, working hard and kneading soft soil,  
 makes each one for our use,  
 but moulds from the same clay  
 the tools to be used for the clean works,  
 their opposites, all in the same fashion;  
 what the use of each of them is up to the clay worker to decide.*

ἀπαλὴν] We fail to see why Heinisch (290) thinks that this adj. cannot be an attributive qualifier of γῆ.

ἐπίμοχθον] a nt.sg. acc. adjective used adverbially, cf. SSG § 23 ga.

ἐν ἑκάστον] In S<sup>h</sup> we see a marginal note reading: “it is said about the potter’s tools.”

ἀνεπλάσατο] most likely a gnomic Aorist.

δοῦλα] Here we seem to have a rare example of the primitive adjective, δοῦλος, appearing in its n.pl. form. Another example is τὰ σύμπαντα δοῦλα σά ‘all are your subordinates’ Ps 118.91, where δοῦλα is substantivised.<sup>6</sup>

πηλουργός] a hapax; an adj. meaning “*working in clay*” substantivised.

(7f) is syntactically rather loose. Instead of κριτὴς its verbal form, κρίνει, could have been used.

- 15.8) καὶ κακόμοχθος θεὸν μάταιον ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πλάσσει πηλοῦ  
 ὃς πρὸ μικροῦ ἐκ γῆς γενηθεὶς  
 μετ’ ὀλίγον πορεύεται ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη,  
 τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος.

*Wasting energy he moulds a meaningless god from the same clay,  
 he who, having been produced out of the earth a while before,  
 a short while later goes to where he was taken from,  
 having been demanded to return the soul which was on loan.*

κακόμοχθος] a s complement.

καὶ κακόμοχθος] S<sup>h</sup> אֶתְּחַבֵּר בְּחִלָּה ‘with poor skill,’ which makes the true nature of his product manifest. The translator may have had trouble with this hapax, resorting to a mechanical, etymological rendering.

<sup>6</sup> The description in SSG § 23 h is based on our ignorance of the fact that δουλ- can be used as an adjective as well as a substantive. A CG example cited by Scarpit (III 158) is δούλαις τισὶ .. ἡδοναῖς ‘certain slavish .. pleasures’ Pl. Rep. 587 (not 586) c.

*Pace* Goodrick's (312) "evil is his toil" κακό- here is most likely meant pragmatically, and not morally. Cf. Larcher (859): "Employant mal sa peine."

αὐτοῦ] separated from πηλοῦ, technically known as hyperbaton; *SSG* § 14 **b**.

ὅς] most likely an antecedentless relative pronoun, though *Σ* has taken the preceding θεὸν as the antecedent: *הַיְהוָה אֲשֶׁר יָצָא אֶת הָאָדָם מִן הָאָרֶץ* 'to the One who a short while before had produced him out of the earth,' where, however, a radical reinterpretation of ἐλήμφθη has been necessitated. Larcher (863) takes ὁ πηλός (a) as the antecedent, but the source text, Gn 2.7 and 3.19, to which our author seems to be alluding, makes such an analysis questionable. Note esp. *ἔως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθης· ὅτι γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ* Gn 3.19.

ὀλίγον] χρόνον is understood. Note the preceding πρὸ μικροῦ; *SSG* § 23 **fc**.

ἐξ ἧς] The antecedent of ἧς is unquestionably the preceding γῆς, but the author could have written πορεύεται εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη.

ψυχῆς .. χρέος] appositive genitive; *SSG* § 22 **v** (iii).

ἀπαιτηθεῖς] In the active voice this verb, ἀπαιτέω, can take two accusative ο's,<sup>7</sup> but one can also be governed by ἀπό as in τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ Lk 12.20.

τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεῖς χρέος] *JB* "il lui sera demandé compte de sa vie" is questionable.

Though expressed slightly differently, the idea of (d) is repeated in vs. 16b, where πνεῦμα is used as a synonym of ψυχὴ here.

15.9) ἀλλ' ἔστιν αὐτῷ φροντὶς οὐχ ὅτι μέλλει κάμνειν  
οὐδ' ὅτι βραχυτελῇ βίον ἔχει,  
ἀλλ' ἀντερείδεται μὲν χρυσοῦργοις καὶ ἀργυροχοοῖς  
χαλκοπλάστας τε μιμεῖται  
καὶ δόξαν ἡγεῖται ὅτι κίβδηλα πλάσσει.

*But his worry is not that he is going to get exhausted  
nor that he has a life of short duration,  
but he is competing with goldsmiths and silversmiths,  
and emulating bronze workers  
and he thinks it respectable, producing counterfeits.*

κάμνειν] On the tense/aspect of this verb, see above at 4.16 as well.

ἡγεῖται] Here is a rare instance of a doubly transitive verb the first ο of which is a ὅτι clause, *SSG* § 59 **g**.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> E.g. ἀπαίτεε αὐτοὺς τὰ ἀριστήια 'from them he demanded the victor's prize' Hdt 8.122.

<sup>8</sup> No such instance is mentioned in LSJ, which mentions an example with an inf. clause such as ὑμέας ἡγῆμαι ἄνδρας Μήδωβ εἶναι 'I hold you fully as good men as the Medes' Hdt. 1.126.6.

Larcher (868) holds that here the conjunction may be introducing an object clause or a causal clause.

- 15.10) σποδὸς ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ, καὶ γῆς εὐτελεστέρα ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτοῦ,  
πηλοῦ τε ἀτιμότερος ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ,

*His heart is (mere) ashes, and his hope is more worthless than soil,  
and his life is more valueless than (even) clay.*

σποδὸς] cf. γνῶτε ὅτι σποδὸς ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, καὶ πλανῶνται ‘.. they are going astray’ Is 44.20. If our author was thinking of this Is text, he was either ignorant that this is a mistranslation of *דַּעַת עַפְרָא לִבָּא > דַּעַת עַפְרָא לִבָּא*, i.e. *דַּעַת עַפְרָא לִבָּא* or he appreciated the value of the Greek text as it was.

καρδία] Possibly used in the sense of “mind,” on which see *GELS* s.v. 3 and Muraoka 2022a.19.

ἀτιμότερος] < ἄτιμος, a synonym of εὐτελής. Whilst the latter is used only in Wi (4×), the former is used 5× in Wi, but also in other LXX books, a total of 11×. See above at 10.4.

- 15.11) ὅτι ἡγνόησεν τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτὸν  
καὶ τὸν ἐμπνέυσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν  
καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν,

*because he refuses to recognise the one who moulded him  
and the one who infused energising life into him  
and breathed a life-giving spirit,*

ἡγνόησεν] most likely a gnomic Aorist. The verb ἀγνοέω signifies a deliberate action, not mere ignorance, i.e. Engl. *ignore* rather than Fr. *ignorer*. Note “méconnaît” (*BJ*), and not “ignorait.”

ἐμπνέυσαντα] Scarpat (III 164), “da Omero in poi è verbo riservato agli dèi.”

Cf. ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν Ge 2.7.

- 15.12) ἀλλ’ ἐλογίσατο παίγνιον εἶναι τὴν ζωὴν ἡμῶν  
καὶ τὸν βίον πανηγυρισμὸν ἐπικερδῆ,  
δεῖν γάρ φησιν ὅθεν δὴ, καὶ ἐκ κακοῦ, πορίζειν.

*but he thought our life to be a pastime  
and our existence a festivity for profit-making,  
for he says that, wherever from, even from an evil source, we have  
to make profits.*

ἐλογίσατο] So Swete and Ziegler as against Rahlfs’ ἐλογίσαντο, which makes little sense. Both readings are found in MSS.

πανηγυρισμὸν] a hapax and unknown prior to Wi., “festive celebration” of πανήγυρις ‘public festival.’

δή] strengthens an indefinite notion. So also ὅς δὴ ποτ' οὖν ἦν ἐκεῖ 'whoever happened to be there' Wi 17.16. No precise time or location is specified.

- 15.13) οὗτος γὰρ παρὰ πάντας οἶδεν ὅτι ἁμαρτάνει  
ῥλης γεώδους εὐθραυστα σκεύη καὶ γλυπτὰ δημιουργῶν.

*For this person knows better than anybody that he is committing sins,  
as he constructs easily breakable and carved instruments from  
earthen stuff.*

εὐθραυστα] Scarpat (III 166f.) opts for a v.l. ευθλαστα, a lexeme (εὐθλα-  
στος "easily indented or bruised" LSJ s.v.).

- 15.14) πάντες δὲ ἀφρονέστατοι καὶ τάλανες ὑπὲρ ψυχὴν νηπίου  
οἱ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου καταδυναστεύσαντες αὐτόν,

*The enemies of Your people dominated them,  
though all most foolish and miserable more than an infant's soul,*

Here begins the criticism of the ancient Egyptians. This historical background is not evident in the ptc.  $\overline{\text{ר}^{\text{ח}}\text{פ}^{\text{ח}}\text{ה}^{\text{ח}}}$  'are overpowering' § and "... people that oppress them" (Reider).

ἀφρονέστατοι] elative in force, though superlative in form; SSG § 23 **bb**.

ὑπὲρ] indicating comparison with an acc. It could be accompanied by a comparative adj. or adv. as in ὀξύτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς λύκους τῆς Ἀραβίας 'swifter than Arabian wolves' Hb 1.8; more examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. ὑπέρ **II 1 b**.

καταδυναστεύσαντες] Though this ptc. can be circumstantial, the addition of οἱ before that as in some MSS would make it attributive.

- 15.15) ὅτι καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐλογίσαντο θεούς,  
οἷς οὐτε ὀμμάτων χρῆσις εἰς ὄρασιν  
οὐτε ῥῖνες εἰς συνολκὴν ἀέρος  
οὐτε ὦτα ἀκούειν  
οὐτε δάκτυλοι χειρῶν εἰς ψηλάφησιν  
καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἀργοὶ πρὸς ἐπίβασιν.

*because all the idols of the nations were also considered to be gods,  
who had no eyes to use in order to see  
nor any nostrils for inhaling air  
nor ears for hearing  
nor hands with fingers for groping  
and their feet were unworkable for walking with.*

The three clauses (b - d) are existential clauses in the last three of which *oĩs* is to be understood, and only (e) is a normal nominal clause. In *Š*, by contrast, the pattern of (e) has been made to apply to the preceding three clauses as well, and the suffix pronoun */-hōn/* has been added to all the four nouns denoting body parts: *לֹא אֵדְנִיּוֹן מְרִיחִין .. לֹא נִחְרִיּוֹן מְרִיחִין .. לֹא עֵינֵיהֶן .. לֹא רַגְלֵיהֶן* *וּבִטְלִין רַגְלֵיהֶן .. לֹא רִחֶן .. לֹא צָבָעָתָא .. שְׁמֵעָן* ‘their eyes do not see .. their nostrils do not smell .. their ears do not hear .. the fingers do not crawl .. their feet are idle ..’.

*ἐλογίσαντο*] Strictly speaking, ‘they considered,’ an impersonally used 3pl, hence  $\neq$  *ἐλογίσθησαν* (passive).

15.16) ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς,

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα δεδανεισμένος ἔπλασεν αὐτούς·

οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅμοιον ἄνθρωπος ἰσχύει πλάσαι θεόν·

*For a human made them,*

*and one with a borrowed spirit moulded them;*

*for no human is capable of moulding something similar to himself  
as a god.*

τὸ πνεῦμα δεδανεισμένος ἔπλασεν αὐτούς·

οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅμοιον ἄνθρωπος] *Š* אַפְסִידָא אֶרֶר ‘a spirit of fraud’ as the *s* of *ἔπλασεν*. On the general thought, see vs. 8 above. *Pace* Fichtner (56), in spite of the notional similarity, there is a syntactic difference: in vs. 8 ἀπαίτηθεις is in the passive voice unlike δεδανεισμένος, which is in the middle voice.

15.17) θνητὸς δὲ ὢν νεκρὸν ἐργάζεται χερσὶν ἀνόμοις·

κρείττων γὰρ ἐστὶν τῶν σεβασμάτων αὐτοῦ,

ὃν αὐτὸς μὲν ἐζήσεν, ἐκεῖνα δὲ οὐδέποτε.

*Being mortal he fashions a mortal one with unlawful hands,*

*for he is superior to his objects of worship;*

*he lived, but they never.*

ὃν] “genet. partit., der αὐτός und ἐκεῖνα umfaßt” (Fichtner). Likewise Engel (*SD* II 2153), but gen. part. with a personal pronoun? V.l. ἀνθ’ ὃν, which Siegfried prefers and translates with “da”. We are faced with a rather anomalous syntactic phenomenon.

15.18) καὶ τὰ ζῷα δὲ τὰ ἐχθιστα σέβονται·

ἀνοία γὰρ συγκρινόμενα τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ χείρονα·

*And they revere the most inimical animals,*

*for, considered by their lack of intelligence, they are worse than others.*



ἀνοία] Given the punctuation with a comma following אֲנִי־יִשְׁׁבֵּי ‘with insanity,’ **Σ** makes this indicative of the worshippers’ attitude.<sup>9</sup>

The verb συγκρίνω is found at times with a dative, but the meaning of the verb, however, differs from what we find here: φωτὶ συγκρινομένη ‘compared with light’ Wi 7.29 and συνέκρινεν αὐτοῖς Ἰωσήφ ‘Joseph interpreted (it) to them’ Ge 40.22.<sup>10</sup> Here the dative is basically instrumental: “to consider a matter in the light of ..,” though we cannot cite any other instance of this verb so used.

15.19) οὐδ’ ὅσον ἐπιποθῆσαι ὡς ἐν ζώων ὄψει καλὰ τυγχάνει,  
ἐκπέφευγεν δὲ καὶ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔπαινον καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν αὐτοῦ.

*They do not even look pretty as animals to arouse our desire for them,  
they have missed God’s praise as well as His blessing.*

ὅσον] a frequent pronoun occurring in LXX 597 times, of which only 16 times in the sg. This is the only occurrence in Wi. Moreover, in one of its two cases it is used with an inf. in the sense of “*so much as is enough for*” (*GELS* s.v. **1 g**)<sup>11</sup>; the other case is φάγη σταφυλὴν ὅσον ψυχὴν σου ἐμπλησθῆναι ‘eat as many grapes as would satisfy your appetite’ De 23.25.

τυγχάνει] This verb, in conjunction with a ptc.,<sup>12</sup> can mean “*to turn out to be on examination*” as in τυγχάνεις ἀδελφὸς ὦν ‘you happen to be a kinsman’ To 5.14 **Θ**<sup>II</sup>, where **Θ**<sup>I</sup> lacks ὦν, as in our case ὄντα is absent. More examples of this construction are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. τυγχάνω **2**.

<sup>9</sup> On ἄνοια preferred by certain scholars, see Grimm 1861.261f.

<sup>10</sup> For more details, see *GELS* s.v. **1** and **2**.

<sup>11</sup> Scarpata (III 174) quotes an example in CG: ἐλείπετο τῆς νυκτὸς ὅσον σκοτίους διελθεῖν τὸ πεδῖον ‘enough of the night remained to allow them to cross the plain in the dark’ Xen. *Anab.* 4.1.6.

<sup>12</sup> For other verbs supplemented with a ptc., see *SGS* 31 e.

## CHAPTER 16

- 16.1) Διὰ τοῦτο δι' ὁμοίων ἐκολάσθησαν ἀξίως  
καὶ διὰ πλήθους κνωδάλων ἐβασανίσθησαν.

*Therefore they were punished by similar (animals), which they deserved  
and were tormented by a multitude of vermin.*

κνωδάλων] < κνώδαλον, a hapax occurring also at 11.15 (|| ἄλογα ἔρπετα  
'irrational reptiles') and 17.9 (|| ἔρπετων).

- 16.2) ἀνθ' ἧς κολάσεως εὐεργετήσας τὸν λαόν σου  
εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ὀρέξεως ξένην γεῦσιν  
τροφὴν ἡτοιμάσας ὀρτυγομήτραν,

*Unlike that punishment, being kind to Your people  
in order to satisfy appetite, as an unusual meal  
You provided quails for food,*

κολάσεως εὐεργετήσας] Note a similar contrast between κολάζω and  
εὐεργετέω at 11.5 above.

ξένην γεῦσιν] The adjective occurs three more times in Wi: ξένοις ὑετοῖς  
16.16, ξένον εὖρωσι θάνατον 19.5, and εὐεργέτας ξένους 19.14, in the last  
of which we do not have to think that every alien is kindhearted.

ὀρτυγομήτραν] S.v. ὀρτυγόμητρα LSJ writes: “a bird which migrates with  
quails, perh. corncrake, landrail, *Rallus crex*,” to which Supplement (1996)  
adds ‘(Hesychius explains ὀ. as ὀρτυξ ὑπερμεγέθης, and this may be the mean-  
ing in LXX ll.cc., al.).’ In the first occurrence of the Gk word in Ex 16.13 *BdA*  
renders it with “caille,” making no mention of the addition in LSJ Sup-  
plement, though under Nu 11.31 Hesychius, a native lexicographer of 5th or  
6th cent. CE, is mentioned. It also refers to Arist., *HA* 597b.

- 16.3) ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦντες τροφὴν  
διὰ τὴν εἰδέχθειαν τῶν ἐπαπεσταλμένων  
καὶ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν ὄρεξιν ἀποστρέφονται,  
οὗτοι δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγον ἐνδεεῖς γενόμενοι  
καὶ ξένης μετὰσχωσι γεύσεως.

*so that they, desiring to have food,  
because of the odious look of the arrived articles,  
also got rid of the necessary appetite,  
but these, having suffered a need for a while,  
also partook of an unusual meal.*

ἵνα] The general context suggests that the conjunction here indicates a result rather than a purpose; cf. *SSG* § 72 **h** (v).

ἐκείνοι] Contrasted with οὗτοι<sup>1</sup> (4), as also indicated with μὲν .. δέ; Egyptians contrasted with Israelites. See also below at vs. 4.

εἰδέχθειαν] ‘odious, ugly look,’ a hapax in Wi and also unknown prior to SG.

ἐπ’ ὀλίγον] Ἐπί + acc. can indicate duration of time,<sup>2</sup> e.g. ἐπὶ πολὺ ‘for a long time’ Thuc. 1.6.3 and ἐπ’ ὀλίγον χρόνον ‘for a short period of time’ Lycurg. 7.

ξένης .. γεύσεως] the same phrase as in vs. 2 repeated, mentioning the tradition, according to which the food provided came over as unfamiliar.

16.4) ἔδει γὰρ ἐκείνοις μὲν ἀπαραίτητον ἔνδειαν ἐπελθεῖν τυραννοῦσιν, τούτοις δὲ μόνον δειχθῆναι πῶς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν ἐβασανίζοντο.

*For it was necessary for an unavoidable shortage to befall those tyrants, but for these only to be shown how their enemies were being tormented.*

What the *Vorlage* of **§** looked like is a mystery: וְלָהֶן שְׂדֵרָת מְטִיל טְרוֹנָהֶן כַּפָּא וּמְטִיל טְרוֹנָהֶן כַּפָּא וּמְטִיל טְרוֹנָהֶן כַּפָּא וּמְטִיל טְרוֹנָהֶן כַּפָּא ‘and to them You sent because of their mumbling (?)’<sup>3</sup> and because of their tyranny famine and poverty and to them You declared that You beat their enemies.’

16.5) Καὶ γὰρ ὅτε αὐτοῖς δεινὸς ἐπῆλθεν θηρίων θυμὸς δῆγμασίν τε σκολιῶν διεφθείροντο ὄφεων, οὐ μέχρι τέλους ἔμεινεν ἡ ὀργή σου·

*For also when a terrifying anger of animals befell them and they were ruined with bites by crooked snakes, Your wrath did not remain in force till the end;*

ἐπῆλθεν] The selection in **§** of Afel is striking: וְאַתָּה בָּרַכְתָּ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וְאַתָּה בָּרַכְתָּ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים ‘and You brought upon them the anger of snakes.’

σκολιῶν .. ὄφεων] for the phrase, cp. ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς τὴν μάχαιραν τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ τὴν μεγάλην καὶ τὴν ἰσχυρὰν ἐπὶ τὸν δράκοντα ὄφιν φεύγοντα, ἐπὶ τὸν δράκοντα ὄφιν σκολιὸν καὶ ἀνελεῖ τὸν δράκοντα Is 27.1, where ἐπάξει, which is semantically affiliated to our ἐπῆλθεν, is to be noted.

διεφθείροντο] Impf. They did not die all at once, but the painful tragedy went on and on and snakes kept attacking, thus *pace* “étaient détruits” Larcher (895).

<sup>1</sup> The majority reading is αὐτοί, which is inferior, given the above mentioned contrast, so Fichtner (58) as well.

<sup>2</sup> Quite a number of examples are listed in BDAG s.v. **18** (c) β.

<sup>3</sup> אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים is not registered in the lexicon of Payne Smith nor in that of Sokoloff, though a verb, נָטַח ‘to mumble’ is. A scribal confusion with וְאַתָּה בָּרַכְתָּ, that immediately follows, is not precluded. Lagarde suggested וְאַתָּה בָּרַכְתָּ ‘their impurity’ as an emendation.

μέχρι τέλους] see below at 19.1.  
σου] Its absence in **Σ** is critical.

- 16.6) εἰς νοθεσίαν δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐταράχθησαν  
σύμβολον ἔχοντες σωτηρίας εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου·  
*They were disturbed for a while, though it was meant as a warning,  
experiencing a symbol of salvation as a reminder of the command of  
Your law;*

ἐταράχθησαν] **Σ** יִדְּרְהָם ‘they were chastised [or: educated],’ less disturbing than **Θ** = **Θ** הִשְׁתַּדְּרְהָם.

πρὸς ὀλίγον] See above εἰς ὀλίγον vs. 3, and ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε ἢ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη Jam 4.14.

σύμβολον ἔχοντες σωτηρίας] generally thought to be an allusion to the story of the serpent of bronze (ὄφης χαλκοῦς) as told in Nu 21.7-9.

- 16.7) ὁ γὰρ ἐπιστραφεὶς οὐ διὰ τὸ θεωρούμενον ἐσώζετο,  
ἀλλὰ διὰ σὲ τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα.  
*for one who repented was saved not because of what was seen,  
but because of You the saviour of all.*

ἐπιστραφεὶς] cf. ἐπιστρέψει καὶ μετανοήσῃ ‘.. and repent’ Jl 2.14; *GELS* s.v. ἐπιστρέφω **Π 1** “to reverse the direction of movement and return to the point of origin,” **b** esp. as a result of change of heart, where many examples are mentioned. Some translations, e.g. Holmes, Reider, Winston, Clarke, and Goodrick add “toward(s) it [= the serpent].” So *BJ* “vers lui,” “verso di lui” (Scarpāt III 187), and “dem” (Fichtner). Both **Θ** and **Θ** seem to be suggesting a subtle contrast between two verbs of seeing: הִשְׁתַּדְּרְהָם ἰδὼν vs. 8 as against הִשְׁתַּדְּרְהָם ἐπέβλεψεν vs. 9.<sup>4</sup> Cf. a reference to the story in Nu 21 in a Talmudic passage: “when Israelites watched (יִשְׁתַּדְּרְהָם) upwards and subjugated their mind to their heavenly father, they were cured” bRH 29a.

οὐ διὰ τὸ θεωρούμενον ἐσώζετο] Our author is daring contradict even what God said at the time: πᾶς ὁ δεδηγμένος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ζήσεται Nu 21.8.

- 16.8) καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἔπεισας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν  
ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ρυόμενος ἐκ παντὸς κακοῦ·  
*In this (matter) also You convinced our enemies  
that You are One who rescues (us) out of every disaster;*

ὅτι] Here is an instance of a clause as a second **ο**. Another example is ἐκακολόγει τὸν Ονιαν, ὡς αὐτὸς τε εἶη .. ‘he kept accusing O. that he was ..’ 2M 4.1.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Larcher 901 and Scarpāt (III 194f.).

- 16.9) οὓς μὲν γὰρ ἀκρίδων καὶ μυιῶν ἀπέκτεινεν δῆγματα,  
καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη ἴαμα τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν,  
ὅτι ἄξιοι ἦσαν ὑπὸ τοιούτων κολασθῆναι·

*for bites by locusts and flies kept killing them off,  
and no cure was found for their life,  
because they deserved to be punished by such,*

οὓς μὲν] in contrast to τοὺς δὲ in vs. 10.

ἀπέκτεινεν] The form can be either Impf. or Aor.; on an implication of the Impf., see above at vs. 5.<sup>5</sup>

εὐρέθη] *GELS* s.v. εὐρίσκω **6 b** pass. “to exist, to be present, often with a negator.”

- 16.10) τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς σου οὐδὲ ἰοβόλων δρακόντων ἐνίκησαν ὀδόντες,  
τὸ ἔλεος γὰρ σου ἀντιπαρῆλθεν καὶ ἰάσατο αὐτούς.

*but Your sons venom-shedding snakes’ teeth did not overwhelm, either,  
for Your mercy came along and healed them.*

For (a) **ש** reads **וְכִין וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן** ‘but your sons were overpowering the serpents’ fang and their heads.’ In (b) it is more God-centred: **וְכִין וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן** ‘(to) whom you sent your mercy and cured them.’ This represents a syntactic reversal of **ש**’s *o-s* to *s-o*. In contrast, **ש** = **ש** as far as the word order is concerned: **וְכִין .. וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן**.<sup>6</sup>

δρακόντων] On δράκων in LXX, see Eynikel and Hauspie 2004.

ἰοβόλων] cf. τὰ δῆγματα τῶν ἰοβόλων *Arist. HA* 607a28.

ἀντιπαρῆλθεν καὶ ἰάσατο αὐτούς] **ש** **וְכִין וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן וְלִרְיָשִׁיָּהוֹן** ‘they used to come by and cured them,’ underlining God’s constant and frequent care. On this compound tense, see Muraoka 2005a § 86.

ἀντιπαρῆλθεν] what a Jewish priest and a Levite did in contrast to a good Samaritan, who προσελθὼν κατέδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. *Lk* 10.31-34. The Jewish scribe, in response to whose question Jesus told the parable, knew to recognise in the good Samaritan ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἐλεος μετ’ αὐτοῦ *Lk* 10.37; ἐλεος is a key word used by our author as applicable to God.

- 16.11) εἰς γὰρ ὑπόμνησιν τῶν λογίων σου ἐνεκεντριζοντο  
καὶ ὀξέως διεσφάζοντο,  
ἵνα μὴ εἰς βαθεῖαν ἐμπεσόντες λήθην  
ἀπερίσπαστοι γένωνται τῆς σῆς εὐεργεσίας.

<sup>5</sup> The stem of the verb is attested in diverse forms, see BDF § 73.

<sup>6</sup> **כִּין** is Pe. 3fpl. with **כִּין** ‘the teeth’ as its s.

*For they were stung in order to have Your oracles called back into memory  
and they started quickly being saved  
so that they would not fall into deep oblivion,  
and become inattentive to Your kindness.*

εἰς γὰρ ὑπόμνησιν] cf. εἰς ἀνάμνησιν vs. 6 above. The virtual synonymy of the two substantives is also supported by the contextual affinity between the two verses.

λογίων] < λόγιον uttered by God, so also in λόγια θεοῦ Nu 24.4, 16, and τὰ λόγια κυρίου λόγια ἁγνά Ps 11.7.

μή] negates ἐμπροσόντες, not γένωνται. Larcher (908f.) argues for the second analysis, but isn't our author exhorting his readership to keep focusing on God's kindness? He is apparently followed by Scarpat (III 198), who points out that in Si the negator, μή, is never separated from a participle.<sup>7</sup>

ἀπερίσπαστοι] “*having one’s attention not distracted from*” (GELS s.v. **b**), + gen. Scarpat (III 199) mentions an instance of this syntagmatic feature in τὸν γάμον ἀξίῳ ἐῖναι καὶ ἀπερίσπαστον τῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀγάπης ‘considering the marriage to be inseparable from the love for the Lord’ Clemens Alex. *Stromata* 7.XI.64.2.<sup>8</sup> Cf. “abgezogen würden” (Siegfried), “verlustig gingen” (SD), and “ils ne fussent exclus” (BJ). Alternative interpretations have also been proposed. E.g. “*not able to be roused by it*” (LSJ s.v.), presumably contextually determined.<sup>9</sup> Cf. **יְשׁוּעָה דְּשׁוּיָן הָיוּ לְטַבְחָךְ** *יְשׁוּעָה* ‘they forget that they were worthy of Your kindnesses’.<sup>10</sup> There is found also a v.l. ἀπερυστατω, which some, e.g. Reider (189), adopt, though his rendering “bereft (of thy beneficence)” is unattested anywhere.

Quite a distinct message comes through from **ש**: וַתִּדְבְּרוּן מִלֶּיךְ דְּפָצִית אֲנֹן: 'so that they would remember Your words because (?) You rescued them and you were fast in offering them comfort so that they would not fall into the depth and forget You that they deserved Your kind acts.'

<sup>7</sup> Her translation, however, reads: “in modo che non cadessero in profonda dimenticanza divenendo privi” (III 187).

<sup>8</sup> With his “7,9,64,2” Scarpato has misread “XI” for “IX”.

Cf. ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν Lk 10.40, where Jesus advises Martha not to distract her sister away from the right choice she had made: Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς (vs. 42).

<sup>9</sup> Possibly dependent on the revised version of the Bible (1894); from information collected by Dr A. Thompson of Cambridge it appears the above-quoted interpretation in LSJ and applied specifically to our Wi case appears to be under the influence of the 19th cent. English Bible. Winston's (294, 296) "complacent through your kindness" sounds to us far-fetched.

<sup>10</sup> שִׁלּוּ מִן הַמִּשְׁכָּן 'inexperienced' may represent a v.l. (547) ἀπειραστοί, so Ziegler.

- 16.12) καὶ γὰρ οὔτε βοτάνη οὔτε μάλαγμα ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς,  
ἀλλὰ ὁ σός, κύριε, λόγος ὁ πάντα ἰώμενος.

*For neither herb nor emollient healed them,  
but, o Lord, Your word that cures all.*

πάντα] v.l. παντας ‘all people,’ plausibly attracted by αὐτούς (a). Πάντα here in the sense of ‘everybody’ is unlikely. When πᾶς is substantivally used, it is mostly in the plural.

- 16.13) σὺ γὰρ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις  
καὶ κατάγεις εἰς πύλας ᾗδου καὶ ἀνάγεις·

*For it is You that have authority over life and death  
and take (people) down to the gates of Hades and brings (them) up  
(from there);*

ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου] The sequence is reverse in **§** כִּי־חַיִּים כִּי־מָוֶת. So also in La<sup>LXX</sup> and Sa<sup>TH</sup> according to Zgl.

Commentators mention κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ, κατάγει εἰς ᾗδου καὶ ἀνάγει 1K 2.6 and κατάγει εἰς ᾗδην καὶ ἀνάγει To 13.2 **Θ**<sup>I</sup>.

- 16.14) ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἀποκτέννει μὲν τῇ κακίᾳ αὐτοῦ,  
ἐξελθὼν δὲ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀναστρέφει  
οὐδὲ ἀναλύνει ψυχὴν παραλημφοθεῖσαν.

*A man could kill (someone) with his evil,  
but not bring back the breath that has gone out  
nor release a soul that has been taken in.*

πνεῦμα] We follow Larcher (913) taking the noun in the sense of “souffle” rather than “spirit” (e.g. *NETS*). Though this sense, “breath,” is rather rare in SG, it renders πνεῦμα four times and Arm. ܡܝܬܝܐ or ܡܝܬܝܐ once. Note in particular οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἰσχύς, καὶ πνεῦμα οὐ κατελείφθη ἐν ἐμοί Da 10.17 LXX, where πνεῦμα is parallel to ἰσχύς.<sup>11</sup> Cf. *GELS* s.v. πνεῦμα **1 c**, **2 b**.<sup>12</sup>

ἀναστρέφει] possibly used intransitively with ἐξελθὼν πνεῦμα as *s*, but οὐδὲ shows that (b + c) constitute a doubly negated statement, which makes it more sensible to have an identical *s* in both clauses and the *s* of the third clause can only be ἄνθρωπος.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> In TH we also find πνεῦμα, though only in B in contrast to all the remaining MSS, which read πνοή.

<sup>12</sup> For an example in CG see σάλπιγξ βροτείου πνεύματος πληρουμένη ‘a trumpet filled with human breath’ Aesch. *Eum.* 568.

<sup>13</sup> On the return of a dead soul from Hades, see an example of this verb in CG: τὰ μὲν πανούργα καὶ παλιντριβῇ χαίρους ἀναστρέφοντες ἐξ Ἄδου ‘they seem delighted to allow the evil and villainous in turning back from Hades’ Soph. *Philo.* 449.

παραλημφθεῖσαν] Do we have an earlier Jewish document telling about Hades where souls of the deceased are being awaited and admitted? We find a different perspective in ἀνοίγονται δέ σοι φόβῳ πύλαι θανάτου, πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾧδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν; ‘Are the gates of death opened to you with fear? Did the porters of Hades cover, when they saw you?’ Jb 38.17.

16.15) Τὴν δὲ σὴν χεῖρα φυγεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν·

*It is impossible to escape Your hand;*

Commentators mention οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐκφεύζεται τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ To 13.2 6<sup>1</sup>.<sup>14</sup>

16.16) ἀρνούμενοι γάρ σε εἰδέναι ἀσεβεῖς  
ἐν ἰσχύι βραχίονός σου ἐμαστιγώθησαν  
ξένοις ὑετοῖς καὶ χαλάζαις καὶ ὄμβροις διωκόμενοι ἀπαιρημένοι  
καὶ πυρὶ καταναλίσκόμενοι.

*for the impious, refusing to become acquainted with You,  
were flogged with Your mighty arm,  
pursued with extraordinary rains and hails and unmerciful storms,  
and devoured with fire.*

ἀρνούμενοι γάρ σε εἰδέναι] on this phrase, see above at 12.27, and note Fichtner’s (60) “die dich nicht kennen wollten” *pace* Siegfried’s (502) “welche leugneten, dich zu kennen,” *sim.* *SD* and *BJ* “qui prétendaient ne pas te connaître.”

ξένοις ὑετοῖς] Except along the Mediterranean seacoast, precipitation is generally rather low in Egypt.<sup>15</sup> Cf. Ex 9.13-35.

We are inclined to view the following four datives as instrumental in value, for the real actor is God.<sup>16</sup>

16.17) τὸ γὰρ παραδοξότατον, ἐν τῷ πάντα σβεννύντι ὕδατι  
πλεῖον ἐνήργει τὸ πῦρ,  
ὑπέρμαχος γὰρ ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶν δικαίων·

*For the most unexpected was that, against the water that quenches all,  
the fire was rather energetic,  
for the world is a defender of the righteous.*

<sup>14</sup> 6<sup>II</sup> reads .. οὐδὲν, ὃ ..

<sup>15</sup> Cf. “the land is not watered like other countries by the downpour of rain (ὑετῶ .. νιφομένης)” Philo *Mos.* 2.195.

<sup>16</sup> On the issue of the dative indicating the actor of a passive verb, cf. *SSG* § 22 **wo**.



τὸ γὰρ παραδοξότατον] On a syntactic analysis of this phrase, cf. *SSG* § 22 **xh**. An alternative analysis is offered in loc. cit. § 33 **e**, p. 431 in particular: “fire effected the most astonishing thing in all-extinguishing water than anywhere else.”

ἐν τῷ πάντα σβεννύντι ὕδατι] Larcher (917) prefers assigning the prep. its standard, locative sense, “dans.”

In (2) **§** is rather expansive with **וְבַתְּהוֹדוֹתַי לְךָ מֵיָּדָאֵךְ** ‘and in Your great praise the water did not extinguish it.’

πλεῖον] could be genuinely comparative, i.e. more energetic than water. On the elative value of the comparative degree, see *SSG* § 23 **ba**.

κόσμος] in the sense of “universe, nature,” cf. “the cosmic order” (Winston 297) and “les éléments” (Larcher 915).

16.18) ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἡμεροῦτο φλόξ,  
 ἵνα μὴ καταφλέξῃ τὰ ἐπ’ ἀσεβεῖς ἀπεσταλμένα ζῶα,  
 ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ βλέποντες εἰδῶσιν ὅτι θεοῦ κρίσει ἐλαύνονται·

*For, at times, a flame was brought under control  
 so that the animals dispatched at the impious would not burn,  
 but by watching they would realise that they were suffering from  
 God’s judgement.*

ποτὲ] Fichtner and *SD* read “bald.” Does the Gk word ever mean “soon, shortly” or suchlike? Cp. “Das eine Mal .. Ein ander Mal” (Hübner 195).

ἡμεροῦτο] In *GELS* s.v. this hapax is analysed as in the middle voice. It could be passive. Cf. “se modérait” (Larcher 915).

The wording in **§** of (a) enhances the role played by God in the natural phenomenon concerned: **וְכַד צָבָא אֱנִתְּ מְפִיִּיךָ וְנִרְאָה לְךָ** ‘and when You so wish, the fire agrees not to burn.’ Sim. in (19a) **וְכַד צָבִיתָ יְרֵאָה וְנִרְאָה בְּמֵיָּא** ‘and when You so wish, the fire burns in the water etc.’

καταφλέξῃ] According to *GELS* s.v. the verb can be used either transitively “to burn” or intransitively “to burn,” for the latter of which cf. ἔθετο τὰς βροχὰς αὐτῶν χάλαζαν, πῦρ καταφλέγον ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν Ps 104.32. In our case either analysis makes good sense.

ὅτι θεοῦ κρίσει ἐλαύνονται] **שֶׁיִּתְרַדְּפִין מִתְּהוֹרָא דְּאֵלֵּיךְ** ‘that they are being persecuted with God’s judgement.’

16.19) ποτὲ δὲ καὶ μεταξὺ ὕδατος ὑπὲρ τὴν πυρὸς δύναμιν φλέγει,  
 ἵνα ἀδίκου γῆς γενήματα διαφθείρῃ.

*At other times, even in the midst of water it burned above the force  
 of fire  
 so that it might ruin products of the unrighteous earth,*

ποτὲ δὲ] in contrast to ποτὲ μὲν (18a).

φλέγει] Given the rhetorical parallelism between (18a) and (19a) this Present form is best analysed as a case of historic present.<sup>17</sup>

ἵνα] Alternatively the conjunction here indicates a result.

ἀδίκου γῆς] § אַדִּיקוּתָּהּ לְהַעֲרִיף ‘of the land of the barren.’

γῆς γενήματα] Whilst Thackeray (1909 § 7,38) argued for a semantic differentiation between γένημα < γίνομαι ‘produce of earth’ and γέννημα < γεννάω ‘offspring,’ he himself is aware of indisputable exceptions. It looks more sensible that LXX translators and authors at times used the two forms as mutually interchangeable, graphic variants. Fichtner (60) justly refers to τοὺς τῶν ἐχθρῶν καρποὺς in vs. 22 as an indication that our author is referring here to agricultural products.

16.20) ἀνθ’ ὧν ἀγγέλων τροφήν ἐψώμισας τὸν λαόν σου  
καὶ ἔτοιμον ἄρτον ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ παρέσχες αὐτοῖς ἀκοπιάτως  
πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἰσχύοντα καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρμόνιον γεῦσιν·

*instead of which You fed Your people with angels’ food  
and provided them with ready bread from heaven for not a single  
drop of sweat shed  
and that intensifies every joy and suits every taste,*

ἀγγέλων τροφήν] In Ps 77.25 the manna is called ἄρτος ἀγγέλων.

ἔτοιμον] The position up front is possibly emphatic: “bread already toasted!”

παρέσχες] On the use of the verb παρέχω in the sense of “to supply (food and drink),” note ὅς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρώσιν τε πόσιν ‘who provides you with food and drink’ Hom. *Od.* 15.490.

ἀκοπιάτως] an adverb obviously derived initially from κόπος ‘toil, hard work,’ and then from a derivative of the latter, κοπιάζω ‘to toil, labour hard.’ In spite of God as the *s* of παρέσχες it is contextually unlikely that it signifies God as a never tiring supplier of meals, thus *pace* “untiringly supplied them” (*NETS*).<sup>18</sup> Cf. § and § הַאֲדָרָה לְהַעֲרִיף ‘without toil.’ More plausibly our author is thinking of God’s people who were delivered three meals every day for forty years. Our author is ahead of Jesus, who advised His audience to watch birds in the sky which do not saw seeds, harvest, but are daily fed by someone up there (Mt 6.25f.).

<sup>17</sup> On the historic Present in SG, see *SSG* § 28 b (ii) with f.n. 1 on p. 255.

<sup>18</sup> So “instancabilmente” (Scarpat III 189) and Larcher (922) “tu leur as fourni .. sans fatigue un pain ..” and cf. his argument (pp. 924f.). Cf. also *SD*’s “.. Brot vom Himmel hast du ihnen unermüdlich gewährt” is as opaque.

ἰσχύοντα] The use of this verb as transitive is rather rare. Another example is in ἐν μεγαλείῳ αὐτοῦ ἰσχυσεν νεφέλας ‘with His splendid might He fortifies clouds’ Si 43.15, an example which appears to have been unknown to Larcher (925), who, with his rendering “ayant la capacité de tout plaiser,” holds that the accompanying acc. is that of respect.<sup>19</sup>

16.21) ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασίς σου τὴν σὴν πρὸς τέκνα γλυκύτητα ἐνεφάνιζεν,  
τῇ δὲ τοῦ προσφερομένου ἐπιθυμία ὑπηρετῶν  
πρὸς ὃ τις ἐβούλετο μετεκινᾶτο.

*For Your support revealed Your sweetness to children,  
but satisfying the desire of the consumer  
it adjusted itself to whatever he or she wanted.*

σὴν] The emphasis laid on this adjectival possessive pronoun in lieu of σου is highlighted through its fronted position away from γλυκύτητα. See above at 9.4.

πρὸς τέκνα] The verb ἐμφανίζω normally takes a dat. pers. Ziegler (1937.15) mentions, however, ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ Acts 23.22.<sup>20</sup> Alternatively we could construe the prep. phrase with γλυκύτητα? So Hübner “.. offenbarte deinen Kindern deine göttliche Liebe.”

γλυκύτητα] The taste of the manna is thought to be indicative of God’s character, cf. τὸ δὲ γεῦμα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐγκρίς ἐν μέλιτι Ex 16.31 and μέλιτι γὰρ ἦν τὴν γλυκύτητα καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐμφορές ‘it had the sweet and delicious taste like honey’ Josephus *Ant.* 3.28. On the ground that, in BG, neither γλυκός nor γλυκύτης is applied to God,<sup>21</sup> Ziegler (op. cit. 15f.) proposes to apply the sweetness to the manna and understand the phrase in question as meaning ‘die von dir (dem Manna) verliehene Süßigkeit.’

προσφερομένου] Note προσσηνέγκατο τὴν τροφὴν αὐτῆς πρὸς ἑσπέραν ‘she took her meal towards the evening’ Ju 12.9.

ὑπηρετῶν] No m.sg. substantive can be found as a *s*. The same applies to μετεκινᾶτο (*c*). Possibly ἄρτος (*vs.* 20) in the generic sense of “food, meal”?<sup>22</sup> Note the use of this verb in *vs.* 25 in conjunction with θέλησις, a noun semantically close to ἐπιθυμία used here. Examples of a non-human entity to be served are χρηστηρίῳ τε βουλόμενοι ὑπηρετέειν ‘wishing to obey the oracle’ Hdt 8.41 and ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ Ac 13.36.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. a discussion by Grimm 1837.339f.

<sup>20</sup> See Scarpat (III 208): “con πρὸς anche in Act. 23,22.”

<sup>21</sup> In CG they are often applied to humans, but, as Ziegler himself (op. cit.) is aware, they are at times applied to divine beings.

<sup>22</sup> Μάν and μάννα, used in LXX as transcriptions of Heb. מָן, are neuter in gender, and neither occurs in Wi. Grimm (1837.341) speaks of a constructio ad sensum.

- 16.22) χιών δὲ καὶ κρύσταλλος ὑπέμεινε πῦρ καὶ οὐκ ἐτήκετο,  
 ἵνα γινῶσιν ὅτι τοὺς τῶν ἐχθρῶν καρποὺς  
 κατέφθειρε πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ  
 καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑετοῖς διαστράπτων·

*Snow and ice resisted the fire and would not melt  
 in order that people would understand that fire destroyed  
 the fruits of the enemies  
 by burning in the hail and flashing in the rains.*

ὑπέμεινε] The number discord with two immediately preceding *s*'s is noteworthy. None of the categories of number discord known in SG<sup>23</sup> can account for this case. Likewise ἐτήκετο. Hardly a case of hendiadys.

ἐτήκετο] Impf., not Aor. ἐτάκη, and cp. שִׁלְיָהּ רָשָׁע. But the following verb, κατέφθειρε, can be either Impf. or Aor., hence שִׁלְיָהּ Pf. הִלְבִּיחַ. However, no obvious argument for changing the aspect is conceivable. The preceding שִׁלְיָהּ רָשָׁע is possibly a harmonisation with the immediately following ἐτήκετο, unless the *Vorlage* read ὑπεμενε(v) as read in many MSS. By contrast, as far as the selection of tenses goes, שִׁ is consistent here: .. תָּמַדְהָרְךָ .. יִרְשָׁתָּהּ.

πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ] cf. τὸ πῦρ φλογίζον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ Ex 9.24.

διαστράπτων] a hapax. GELS s.v. διαστράπτω reads “to flash like lightning.” SG uses other semantically related derivatives of ἀστράπτω as well, namely ἐξαστράπτω and περιαστράπτω.

- 16.23) τοῦτο πάλιν δ', ἵνα τραφῶσιν δίκαιοι,  
 καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλέλησται δυνάμεως.

*This, moreover, in order that the righteous could be fed,  
 forgot even its own power.*

τοῦτο] possibly referring to πῦρ, but more plausibly the event described in vs. 22.

πάλιν] not indicating repetition of the same event or condition, but introducing a new perspective, though it refers to the fire mentioned in vs. 22.

ἰδίας] On the hyperbaton indicated here, see above at 12.23.

ἐπιλέλησται] Pf.! According to Larcher (933) it is equivalent to the Plpf., what is unknown in SG. Scarpata (III 210) mentions a v.l., ἐπιλελησθαι, but how would one account for a syntactic function of an inf. here?

The message conveyed by שִׁ is rather odd: מְשִׁיחַ דְּנִפְרָשׁוֹן יִדְיָקָא וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מְשִׁיחַ דְּנִפְרָשׁוֹן ‘in order that the righteous would depart and not forget Your power.’

<sup>23</sup> See SSG § 77 b-bm.



beggar' Si 4.5, for every animal and plant need be fed or nurtured. An alternative interpretation is represented by Larcher (933): "selon le désir de ceux qui le demandaient."

- 16.26) ἵνα μάθωσιν οἱ υἱοὶ σου, οὓς ἠγάπησας, κύριε,  
 ὅτι οὐχ αἱ γενέσεις τῶν καρπῶν τρέφουσιν ἄνθρωπον,  
 ἀλλὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου τοὺς σοὶ πιστεύοντας διατηρεῖ.  
*in order that Your sons whom You loved, o Lord, would learn  
 that not the fruits produced feed a man,  
 but Your word sustains those who believe You.*

ἠγάπησας] Not a gnomic Aorist, hence *pace* "thou lovest" (Reider), "you love" (Winston), "liebst" (Hübner), and "tu aimes" (Larcher). The author is most likely on the past history of Israel during the exodus. Our analysis is not contradicted by the Pres. in τρέφουσιν .. διατηρεῖ, which presents a lesson learned from the past experience. For the lesson, see Dt 8.3 and Mt 4.4.

Larcher (938) holds that the teaching here is more rigorous than in Dt 8.3, where "une gradation est établie." In both texts we are to adopt "Not A, but B," and not "Not only A, but also B." Hence Larcher's (933) addition, "suffit," is unjustified in "la production des fruits du sol ne suffit pas à nourrir l'homme." The same holds for "so sehr" in "Daß es nicht so sehr die einzelnen Arten der Früchte sind .., sondern daß .." (Hübner 195). In the source text this is all the more evident, because ζήσεται is used in both clauses. Both our author and Jesus are on to physical life and survival, not life in a generic sense inclusive of a spiritual life.

γενέσεις] NETS reads "the varieties (of fruits)," which represents γένη, pl. of γένος.<sup>26</sup> Likewise "die einzelnen Arten der Früchten" (Hübner), and "i frutti, di diversa specie" (Scarpata). On γένεσις signifying not an action, "production," but its product, see also above at 1.14. Then καρπῶν would be an appositive genitive, on which see SSG § 22 v (iii). Alternatively, γενέσεις here is an action noun after all. The process of food production need be repeated.

- 16.27) τὸ γὰρ ὑπὸ πυρὸς μὴ φθειρόμενον  
 ἀπλῶς ὑπὸ βραχείας ἀκτίνος ἡλίου θερμαινόμενον ἐτήκετο,  
*For what was not destroyed by fire  
 melted away just like that, warmed by a faint ray of the sun,*

On (b), cf. ἡνίκα δὲ διεθέρμαιεν ὁ ἥλιος, ἐτήκετο Ex 16.21.  
 μὴ] ≠ οὐ, so Larcher (940) "ce qui ne pouvait être désagrégé." The reality is a little more complicated; see SSG § 83 **bd**. Thus, in LXX we find τοῦ

<sup>26</sup> Fichtner (60) knowingly renders it with "Arten."

παιδίου μὴ ὄντος μεθ' ἡμῶν 'when the child is not with us' Ge 44.34 and τοὺς μὴ ζητήσαντας τὸν κύριον καὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀντεχομένους τοῦ κυρίου 'those who did not seek the Lord and those who are not devoted to the Lord' Zp 1.6. More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. μὴ **I 4**.

ἀπλῶς] Larcher (940) is of the view that the position of the adv. is emphatic, rendered "seulement par un bref rayon de soleil." Can it not be emphasising the verb at the very end of the clause?

16.28) ὅπως γνωστὸν ᾗ ὅτι δεῖ φθάνειν τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ' εὐχαριστίαν σου καὶ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν φωτὸς ἐντυγχάνειν σοι.

*so that it would become known that one ought to get up before the sun, thanking You,  
and to entreat You towards the dawn of sunlight,*

τὸν ἥλιον] The addition of the definite article is a sign of poetic licence, as shown by its absence in vs. 27. At 5.6 we find the article with the same noun, whereas it is absent in 2.4, 7.29, 16.27, 18.3. In prose the article is often added to a substantive such as ἥλιος indicating a unique, celestial body, cf. *SSG* § 5 e.

ἐπ' εὐχαριστίαν σου] < ἐπὶ τι > may indicate a target or aim as in καταβαίνοντες εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ βοήθειαν Is 31.1. For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ **III 4 f**.

πρὸς] Ὁν πρὸς in the sense of "near the beginning of a period of time," see *GELS* s.v. πρὸς **III 10**.

ἐντυγχάνειν] a verb used at 8.21 in parallelism to δέομαι and with the action directed to the Lord (τῷ κυρίῳ). Larcher (941) cites an instance from a papyrus (2nd/3rd cent. CE)<sup>27</sup>: νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐντυγχάνω τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ ὧμων 'night and day I pray to God about you.'

What knowledge שׁ wants to be conveyed is obscure: הָאֵלֹהִים יִדְעוּן יוֹנִיָּה בְּכֹחַ הַיָּם וְהַיָּם יִדְעוּן יוֹנִיָּה בְּכֹחַ הַיָּם 'so that people might come to know that the sun also rises with thanksgiving and with the appearance of the light it raises You.'

16.29) ἀχαρίστου γὰρ ἐλπὶς ὡς χειμέριος πάχνη τακήσεται καὶ ῥυήσεται ὡς ὕδωρ ἄχρηστον.

*for the hope of an ungrateful person will melt away like the winter's frost and flow away like useless water.*

χειμέριος] a hapax. Larcher (943) notes that in CG the word is typical of poetry as against χειμερινός, a synonym in prose. The latter occurs six times in LXX, but never in Wi.

<sup>27</sup> See MM s.v.

## CHAPTER 17

- 17.1) Μεγάλαι γάρ σου αἱ κρίσεις καὶ δυσδιήγητοι·  
διὰ τοῦτο ἀπαίδευτοι ψυχαὶ ἐπλανήθησαν.

*For Your judgements are great and hard to recount;  
therefore uneducated souls erred.*

δυσδιήγητοι] a hapax in Wi and unknown prior to Wi. The author may mean “difficult to be told in detail by teachers.” Cp. ὁ διηγούμενος μωρῷ Si 22.10 parallel to ὁ διδάσκων μωρόν ib. vs. 9.

κρίσεις] Just as in the case of the underlying verb, κρίνω, topics of κρίσις need not be confined to legal, or even religious issues. Nor need actions involved be so restricted. They could involve considering and pondering. Μεγάλαι, then, cannot be about physical size, but about vast extent and complexity of issues concerned, what is implied by δυσδιήγητοι, a coordinate adjective. Note esp. cases of κρίνω ‘to interpret’ (GELS s.v. 8) and κρίσις ‘interpretation’ (GELS s.v. 8). Even so it is not about one possible interpretation, but one that carries God’s authority.

ἀπαίδευτοι] Ⲫⲓⲣⲁⲓⲛⲁ ‘audacious, obstinate’ indicates an interesting nuance of refusal to be educated, “eigenwijs, i.e. opinionated” in Dutch. Cf. Fichtner: “Unbelehrbare.”<sup>1</sup>

ἐπλανήθησαν] possibly a gnomic Aorist.

The passive voice here could be equivalent to the middle, making the *s* of the verb wholly responsible. Alternatively genuinely passive: “were misled,” then by teachers. On the uncertainty of analysis cf. SSG § 27 db.

- 17.2) ὑπειληφότες γὰρ καταδυναστεύειν ἔθνος ἅγιον ἄνομοι  
δέσμιοι σκότους καὶ μακρᾶς πεδῆται νυκτὸς  
κατακλεισθέντες ὀρόφοις φυγάδες τῆς αἰωνίου προνοίας ἔκειντο.

*For, having set about overpowering a holy people, though being themselves lawless,  
captives of darkness and prisoners of long night(s)  
they lay confined under roofs, running away from eternal providence.*

<sup>1</sup> SD 1083 offers a similar rendering, adding a f.n.: “sinngemäß »Menschen, die sich gegenüber Zucht und Bildung verschlossen.«” Can this be said about the use of the word in CG? Cf. Sekine: “those who refused to be educated.”



ὑπειληφότες] Ὑπολαμβάνω with an inf. signifies at times “to undertake some task” (*GELS* s.v. 6).<sup>2</sup> Another example is ὑπέλαβον τοῦ γνῶναι τοῦτο ‘I set about getting to know this’ Ps 72.16.

ἄνομοι] The laughable arrogance on the part of the Egyptians is highlighted in *§*, which brings the adjective up front: דְּנִשְׁעָבְדִּין גִּיר הָיוּ סְבָרִין ‘for sinners were planning to enslave ..’. The Syr. translator’s focus is on the enemies’ perspective: אֲסוּרֵיהֶּי דְּחֻשׁוֹכָא וּמְלוֹכֵיהֶּי דְּלֵילָא אָתְחַשְׁבוּ בְּנַפְשֵׁיהוֹן ‘they thought of themselves as chains of night and counsellors of night.’<sup>3</sup>

πρόνοια] On *§* אֲפִיחָא ‘care’ see above at 14.3.

νυκτός] cf. *GELS* s.v. νύξ *b* “night as a symbol of intellectual and moral darkness and ignorance” as exemplified in νυκτὶ ὁμοίωσα τὴν μητέρα σου Ho 4.5, on which cf. Muraoka 2022b.41.

κατακλεισθέντες ὁρόφοις] a difficult phrase. In spite of its prefix, κατακλείω does not signify some action taking place *under* something, as is evident in εἰς τὴν ἀσίδηρον εἰρκτὴν κατακλεισθεῖς ‘shut up into a prison not made of iron’ vs. 16.<sup>4</sup> Larcher’s (945) rendering “sous des toits” is based on his analysis of the dat. here as locative.<sup>5</sup> We doubt, however, that the locative in Greek can be as specific as “at a location under something.”<sup>6</sup> We could be having to do here with an instrumental dative. Note an example in CG: πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν νόμῳ κατακλείσῃτ’ ἐπὶ τῷ πολέμῳ μένειν ‘you are legally to bind the entire army to serve for the duration of the war’ Demost. 4.33.7.

17.3) λανθάνειν γὰρ νομίζοντες ἐπὶ κρυφαίοις ἁμαρτήμασιν  
ἀφεγγεῖ λήθης παρακαλύμματι  
ἔσκορπίσθησαν θαμβούμενοι δεινῶς  
καὶ ἰνδάλμασιν ἔκταρασσόμενοι.

*For, thinking that they could get away with hidden sins,  
under the oversight of a pitch-black veil  
they were scattered, horribly alarmed  
and thrown off balance by spectres.*

ἐπὶ κρυφαίοις ἁμαρτήμασιν] The value “in the matter of, regarding” (*GELS* s.v. III 4) applies to ἐπὶ τινι here. One of the two alternative values mentioned by Larcher (950), “à la suite de,” is unknown to SG.

λήθης] Over his own rendering “forgetfulness” Reider (197) adds: “Probably forgetfulness of God.” When God says ἔσσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις

<sup>2</sup> Larcher’s (945) rendering is “Pour avoir prétendu asservir la nation sainte.”

<sup>3</sup> Our *lawless* might be found too weak by Larcher (948), whose rendering is “bandits.”

<sup>4</sup> An example in CG is ἐς Προσωπίτιδα τὴν νῆσον κατέκλεισε ‘they shut themselves up in the island of Prosopitis’ Thuc. 1.109.4.

<sup>5</sup> Pace Scarpata (III 223) “nelle loco case” ὁροφος cannot be equivalent to, say, οἰκία.

<sup>6</sup> For details, see SSG § 22 wf.

αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶν ἔτι Je 38.34 < אֶסְלַח לְעוֹנָם > 31.34, one should not conclude that God might suffer at times from amnesia.

ἐσκορπίσθησαν] Holmes (563) and Risberg (218f.) prefer a v.l., ἐσκοτισθησαν ‘they became darkened.’ Cf. Larcher’s (951f.) textcritical discussion.

§ is rather free: סְבָרִין הָיוּ לְמַעַרְק מִן מַחְשַׁבְתָּהּ דְּעָלְמָא. וְלִמְטָשֵׁי קִטְיָהּ וְיִן וְסָבְרִין הָיוּ. בְּמָדָם דְּעָבְדוּ אֶתְקַסְסוּ וְאֶתְבְּדְרוּ. וְדָחְלוּ תְּמִיחָאִית. וְאַתְדַּלְחוּ וְאַשְׁתַּדְּיוּ ‘they were inclined to think that they could escape the thoughts of the world and they thought that they could hide their sins. In anything that they did they hid themselves and were scattered and they feared dreadfully and became confounded and were thrown down.’

17.4) οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ κατέχων αὐτοὺς μυχὸς ἀφόβους διεφύλαττεν,  
ἦχοι δ’ καταράσσοντες αὐτοὺς περιεκόμπουν,  
καὶ φάσματα ἀμειδίτοις κατηφῇ προσώποις ἐνεφανίζετο.

*For the nook in a house which held them would not keep them fearless,  
either,  
mind-shattering noises sounding all around,  
and gloomy phantoms would appear to unsmiling faces.*

διεφύλαττεν] The Impf., so also in περιεκόμπουν and ἐνεφανίζετο, is suited for a description of repeated and/or lasting scenes in the past. The author is consistent up to vs. 9.

καταράσσοντες] Apart from diverse vv.ll.<sup>7</sup>, this reading chosen by Ziegler appears to present exegetical difficulties. When used in the active or genuinely passive voice, καταράσσω is a transitive verb, thus *pace* “sounds rushing down” (Holmes, *NETS*) and “se répercutant” (Larcher).

*GELS* s.v. admits two senses under this verb: **1** “to break in pieces” and **2** “to hurl forcefully downwards.” The latter hardly applies here. However, does a noise split your body into tiny pieces? Its destructive effect being considered must be mental, not bodily. If you could hear the noise as foreboding an oncoming disaster, your heart or mind could be shattered. Such an analysis has been applied by us to ἀνεκαύθησαν ὡς κλίβανος αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καταράσσειν αὐτούς ‘their hearts became hot like an oven, as they broke (them) in pieces’ Ho 7.6, cf. Muraoka 2022b.98.

προσώποις] *Pace* “with unsmiling faces” (Holmes), “cheerless ghosts with gloomy faces” (Reider, sim. Fichtner, *SD*, *BJ*, Winston, and *NETS*), and “des spectres mornes aux faces lugubres” (Larcher)<sup>8</sup>, the dat. cannot be assigned

<sup>7</sup> E.g. ἐκταράσσοντες ‘dismaying’ (Reider).

<sup>8</sup> Larcher (953) states explicitly that from the position of κατηφῇ between ἀμειδίτοις and προσώποις this dative phrase is shown to be subordinate to φάσματα κατηφῇ, and not to ἐνεφανίζετο.

such a value, i.e. “having, equipped with,” but it must be construed with ἐνεφανίζετο as in ἐμφανίζεται δὲ τοῖς μὴ ἀπιστοῦσιν αὐτῷ ‘He manifests Himself to those who do not mistrust Him’ 1.2 above.

- 17.5) καὶ πυρὸς μὲν οὐδεμία βία κατίσχυεν φωτίζειν,  
οὔτε ἄστρον ἔκλαμπροι φλόγες  
καταυγάζειν ὑπέμενον τὴν στυγνὴν ἐκείνην νύκτα.

*And no amount of power of fire was strong enough to illumine,  
nor immensely bright flames of stars  
could submit to shining brightly in that abhorrent night.*

καταυγάζειν] We have analysed the verb as intransitive<sup>9</sup> and the following acc. as an adverbial with temporal value, on which see SSG § 22 **xc-xd**. Cf. κατηύγαζεν ὡς λαμπάδες πυρὸς ‘it kept glowing as lamps of fire’ 1M 6.39, where the *s* is ὁ ἥλιος, a celestial body as here. Alternatively the verb can be analysed as transitive, so GELS s.v. 2.<sup>10</sup>

ὑπέμενον] Ὑπομένω in the sense of “to submit to a difficult or undesirable task” (GELS s.v. 4) is well established in LXX, occurring four times with an inf. indicating the task. So also τίνος πατρὸς χειρὶ σφαγιασθῆναι διὰ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ὑπέμεινεν Ἰσαακ 4M 13.12.

ἐκείνην] The position, not before τὴν or after νύκτα, represents the commonest sequence in CG, cf. SSG § 34 **b** and Humbert 1960, § 46. Likewise in vs. 6. See an alternative pattern in 18.6 below.

- 17.6) διεφαίνετο δ’ αὐτοῖς μόνον  
αὐτομάτῃ πυρὰ φόβου πλήρης,  
ἐκδειματούμενοι δὲ τῆς μὴ θεωρουμένης ἐκείνης ὄψεως  
ἠγοῦντο χεῖρῳ τὰ βλεπόμενα.

*Something burning, rather scary  
automatically shined through to them alone,  
but frightened by that invisible sight  
they thought what was (actually) seen to be worse.*

τῆς .. ὄψεως] a gen. of comparison to be construed with χεῖρῳ. Laroche (1957) and Scarpata (III 235) identify here a genitive absolute, but the author must say “worse than what?”.

ἐκείνης] On the striking position of the pron., see above at vs. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Dr A. Thompson of Cambridge has kindly mailed to me an example mentioned in LSJ as the only instance of its intransitive use, Heliodorus 5.31, in which the verb can be analysed only as intransitively used: Χαρίκλειαν .. χρυσοῦφεϊ στολῇ καταυγάζουσιν ‘Chariclea .. glistening with a garment garnished with gold.’

<sup>10</sup> An example in CG is καταυγάζει τὸν περὶ τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἢ τὴν δύσιν ἄερα ‘it [= the sun] enlightens the atmosphere to the east and west’ Str. 2.5.42.



active voice is not uncommon in CG. This rare attestation here says something about the literary level of our author.

- 17.10) διώλλυντο ἔντρομοι  
καὶ τὸν μηδαμόθεν φευκτὸν ἀέρα προσιδεῖν ἀρνούμενοι.  
*they perished, trembling*  
*and refusing to look at the absolutely unavoidable air.*

In (b) **§** reads רָתַם וְאֵבְדוּ וּמִן אֶרֶץ דְּמָדָם לֹא אִתְּוּהָ עָרְקוּ כְּפֹרָא דְלָא נִהְיִמְנָן  
‘and they trembled and perished and from the air which is nothing ran away those who deny that they do not believe.’

- 17.11) δειλὸν γὰρ ἰδίως πονηρία μαρτυρεῖ καταδικαζομένη,  
ἀεὶ δὲ προσεῖληφεν τὰ χαλεπὰ συνεχομένη τῇ συνειδήσει.  
*For wickedness confesses fear peculiarly, as it is declared guilty,*  
*but it always exaggerates the difficulties, afflicted by its own conscience;*

The textual uncertainty of the first half of the verse is extensive, as is manifest in the apparatus criticus in Ziegler’s edition.<sup>13</sup>

δειλὸν] Not being δειλὴ, this cannot be construed with πονηρία. Then its syntactic value within the clause is ambiguous. Is “als etwas Erbärmliches” (Hübner, a *s* complement) possible? We would analyse it as an *o* of μαρτυρεῖ. An instance of μαρτυρέω taking a direct *o* is found in μάρτυς ἄδικος ἐμαρτύρησεν ἄδικα De 19.18.<sup>14</sup> The word is missing in **§** and **§h**.

ἰδίως] We propose revising our definition of this adverb in *GELS*: “by itself” > “in a peculiar, individualistic fashion, severally, peculiarly.”

τὰ χαλεπὰ] The selection of the superlative degree by Hübner and Siegfried, “das Schlimmste,” is probably due to the presence of the definite article τὰ, certainly a possible analysis, but not the only possible one.

On συνειδήσις in BG, see Maurer 1977.

- 17.12) οὐθὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν φόβος εἰ μὴ προδοσία τῶν ἀπὸ λογισμοῦ βοηθημάτων,

*For fear is nothing but parting with helps provided by contemplation,*

λογισμοῦ] alternatively “reason” in the sense of Germ. *Vernunft*.

βοηθημάτων] The pl. implies that such a help can be expected often or to deal with diverse difficulties.

<sup>13</sup> See a detailed discussion by Larcher (962f.) and Scarpata (III 238-41).

<sup>14</sup> A CG example is τοῦτο γέ οἱ σαφέως μαρτυρήσω ‘on this point at least I will clearly bear witness for him’ Pi. O. 6.21.

17.13) ἔνδοθεν δὲ οὕσα ἤτιτων ἢ προσδοκία  
πλείονα λογίζεται τὴν ἀγνοιαν τῆς παρεχούσης τὴν βάσανον αἰτίας.

17.14) οἱ δὲ τὴν ἀδύνατον ὄντως νύκτα  
καὶ ἐξ ἀδυνατοῦ ἄδου μυγῶν ἐπελθοῦσαν  
τὸν αὐτὸν ὕπνον κοιμώμενοι

αὐτὸν ὕπνον] meaning “they did lie in bed, but could not really get down to sleep”? The accusative virtually represents a cognate object, cf. *SSG* §57 **da**

as in ἐπάταξεν κύριος τὸν λαὸν πληγὴν μεγάλην σφόδρα ‘the Lord struck the people with a very great blow’ Nu 11.33.

- 17.15) τὰ μὲν τέρασιν ἡλαύνοντο φαντασμάτων,  
τὰ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς παρελύνοντο προδοσίᾳ·  
αἰφνίδιος γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσδόκητος φόβος ἐπεχύθη.

*Some would be harassed with imaginary miracles,  
others would become exhausted by giving up their soul,  
for unforeseen and unexpected fear was directed at them.*

τὰ μὲν .. τὰ δὲ] an idiomatic, adverbial use, which is distinct from a case such as ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ‘and he said,’ where ὁ has a distinct referent, but in the former the article is not referring to any n. pl. noun near by in the context. Cf. *GELS* s.v. ὁ, ἡ, τό **IV**.<sup>15</sup>

τέρασιν] *Pace* “monstrous” (Holmes, *NETS*) τέρας has little to do with monsters.

φαντασμάτων] an instance of qualitative genitive, on which see *SSG* § 22 v (xvi).

αἰφνίδιος] Larcher (972) mentions an interesting instance of this adjective in ‘Hence it is thought a sign of still greater courage to be fearless and undismayed in sudden alarms (ἐν τοῖς αἰφνίδιοις φόβοις) than in dangers that were foreseen’ Arist. *EN* 1117<sup>a</sup>18<sup>16</sup>.

ἐπεχύθη] a metaphorical use of ἐπιχέω, the *o* of which is mostly liquid. See *GELS* s.v. But note ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς μου χεῖται ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον Je 7.20 and ἐκχεῶ τὸν θυμὸν μου ἐπ’ αὐτὴν Ez 14.19.

The freedom of translation of **ש** bears witness to the difficulty that the text presented its translator with: **וְכָל מַדְבַּר הָיָה לְךָ נֶפֶשׁ וְכָל מַשְׁכָּל הָיָה לְךָ נֶפֶשׁ** ‘and in your sleep you saw (in) your soul that you were leading it and everything that you saw you blew with it.’ Note the use of the 2ms forms, which personalise the message. **ש** does the same in vs. 16f.

- 17.16) εἴθ’ οὕτως, ὃς δὴ ποτ’ οὖν ἦν ἐκεῖ καταπίπτων,  
ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν ἀσίδηρον εἰρκτὴν κατακλεισθείς·

*Then thus, whoever happened to be there, falling down,  
would be guarded, shut up in a non-iron prison;*

δὴ] see above at 15.12.

<sup>15</sup> A CG example cited in LSJ s.v. ὁ, ἡ, τό **A VIII 4** is instructive: νόμοισι δὲ τὰ μὲν Κρητικοῖσι τὰ δὲ Καρικοῖσι χρέωνται ‘their customs are in part Cretan and in part Carian’ Hdt. 1.173.4.

<sup>16</sup> Not 17, *pace* Larcher.

ἦν ἐκεῖ καταπίπτων] Possibly not the periphrastic construction discussed in SSG § 31 **fb**. Note **𐤏𐤃 𐤋𐤏𐤔𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤃 𐤏𐤃𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤏𐤕** ‘he was there a faller.’

ἔφρουρεῖτο] Larcher (974) opines that φρουρέω here does not mean “to guard,” but “to imprison, detain,” what LSJ does not recognise.

- 17.17) εἴ τε γὰρ γεωργὸς ἦν τις ἢ ποιμὴν  
 ἢ τῶν κατ’ ἐρημίαν ἐργάτης μόχθων,  
 προλημφθεὶς τὴν δυσάλυκτον ἔμενεν ἀνάγκην,  
*for, whether he was a peasant or a shepherd  
 or a hard-working labourer in the desert,  
 once seized, he would endure the ineluctable destiny,*

εἴ τε] *Pace* Larcher (975) this phrase here and in 18b do not appear to constitute a pair, “signalant deux éléments d’un ordre différent.” We miss ἦν in the latter.

γεωργὸς ἦν τις] The separation of τις from γεωργὸς is no surprise in Wi, unlike in ὥς εἴ τις τροφοφορήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ‘as if someone feeds his son’ De 1.31, for instance. On this type of hyperbaton, see SSG § 10 c.

κατ’ ἐρημίαν] <κατά + acc. rei> can mean “*throughout* a space or surface” as in ὁ κατοικῶν κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον Nu 21.1. Alternatively it could indicate “a pattern, model, norm, or criterion to be followed or adopted” (*GELS* 7 i) as in κατὰ σπουδὴν ἔρχεται ‘it is speedily executed’ Si 21.5. Then “in solitude” as “in der Einsamkeit” (*SD*).

προλημφθεὶς] We are not certain that, due to the prefix πρό-, the feature of surprise is part of the sense of the verb προλαμβάνω, and not contextually specific to a particular instance. Larcher’s (973) rendering is “saisi à l’improviste.”

δυσάλυκτον] **𐤏𐤃 𐤋𐤏𐤔𐤕 𐤏𐤃𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤕𐤏𐤕** ‘which you did not anticipate.’

ἔμενεν] Many interpret μένω here in the sense of “to await.” For our analysis, cp. Μείνόν με μικρὸν ἔτι ‘Bear with me still a little longer’ Jb 36.2. Note “aushalten” (*SD*).<sup>17</sup>

- 17.18) μιᾷ γὰρ ἀλύσει σκότους πάντες ἐδέθησαν·  
 εἴ τε πνεῦμα συρίζον  
 ἢ περὶ ἀμφιλαφεῖς κλάδους ὀρνέων ἦχος εὐμελῆς  
 ἢ ῥυθμὸς ὕδατος πορευομένου βία

<sup>17</sup> An example in CG is ἐμὸν δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος ἔμεινας ‘you withstood my far-shadowing spear’ Hom. *Il.* 6.126. See also ὅταν .. μένη τὰς ἐπιφορὰς τῶν ἀλκιμωτάτων ζώων ‘when he .. stands the onslaughts of the most powerful beasts’ Polyb. 6.6.8.



*for with one chain of darkness they were all tied;  
Whether it was a whistling wind,  
or melodious sound(s) of birds round thickly grown branches,  
or a rhythm of powerfully flowing water,*

§ begins with **וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמְעוּ אֶת הַקוֹל** *‘one is the entrance of darkness and all are praying about it, for with one chain of darkness all were tied.’*

ἰὼ γὰρ ἁλύσει] Winston (310) refers to ἐν ἁλύσει μιᾷ δεδεμένους πολλούς ‘to see many bound by one chain’ Dio Chrysostom *Discourse* 30.17.

ῥυθμός] **וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמְעוּ** ‘unity’ and **וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמְעוּ** ‘the sound of.’

17.19) ἢ κτύπος ἀπηνῆς καταρριπτομένων πετρῶν  
ἢ σκιρτώντων ζώων δρόμος ἀθεώρητος  
ἢ ὀρυομένων ἀπηνεστάτων θηρίων φωνή  
ἢ ἀντανakλωμένη ἐκ κοιλότητος ὀρέων ἡχώ,  
παρέλυσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκφοβοῦντα.

*or a loud din of rocks hurled down,  
or a rush of animals jumping around, no attractive sight,  
or a noise of most horrible, roaring beasts,  
or an echo reflected out of mountains’ hollow,  
they would paralyse them by terrorising (them).*

καταρριπτομένων] Larcher (977) thinks that the form is in the middle voice, “falling rocks,” though such a usage is unrecorded in LSJ.

ἀθεώρητος] i.e. “presenting no attractive sight” rather than “invisible.”<sup>18</sup> Alternatively, according to Larcher (97), the people, confined in darkness, can only hear animals rushing round, but not see them.

ἀπηνεστάτων] one and the same adj. applied to two distinct entities in this verse. The superlative degree is elative in force; see *SSG* § 23 **bc**.

παρέλυσεν] an Impf., which, in view of the consistent use of forms of the Pres. aspect in this description from (18b), is definitely preferable to a v.l., παρέλυσεν as represented by a good number of MSS inclusive of B and S.

ἐκφοβοῦντα] In spite of the number discord in relation to the preceding παρέλυσεν, what appears to be n.pl.nom. is most likely a reference to the seven phenomena mentioned in vs. 18-19 with ἢ repeated six times, one of which is considered to be a possible cause of the resultant paralysis.

<sup>18</sup> The latter sense is attested in νυκτὸς τὰς ἄρκτους ἀθεωρήτους ‘at night the bears are not visible’ Diod. Sic. *Bibl. hist.* 2.35.2 and πάση θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος ‘he became invisible to every mortal being’ Arist. *De mun.* 399<sup>b</sup>22 (s God).

17.20) ὅλος γὰρ ὁ κόσμος λαμπρῶ κατελάμπετο φωτὶ  
καὶ ἀνεμποδίστοις συνέχετο ἔργοις·

*For the whole world was shining with radiant light  
and was busying itself unhindered,*

ἀνεμποδίστοις ἔργοις] i.e. “works proceeding without any interference.”  
Note the same adjective at 19.7.

17.21) μόνοις δὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπετέτατο βαρεῖα νύξ  
εἰκὼν τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτοὺς διαδέχεσθαι σκότους,  
ἑαυτοῖς δὲ ᾗσαν βαρύτεροι σκότους.

*Only over them a heavy night was spread,  
an image of the darkness about to replace them,  
though they thought themselves to be heavier than the darkness.*

ἐπετέτατο] For this Plpf. mid./pass. of ἐπιτείνω Ziegler mentions a good number of variant readings, and follows Rahlfs and Thackeray (1909.281, f.n. 4), the latter of whom regarded ἐπετατο (B, A, and many others) as a corruption.

Larcher (1980) identifies here a likely reference to ἐπὶ νύξ ὀλοή τέταται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι ‘baneful night is spread over wretched mortals’ Hom. *Od.* 11.19.

διαδέχεσθαι] a verb used earlier also with reference to the night succeeding the sun: τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ διαδέχεται νύξ ‘for night does succeed it’ 7.30.

סְחַלְבּוֹלִי, which could represent δέχεσθαι, a v.l. that has not been preserved, or = לְמַבֵּל ‘to succeed, follow’.<sup>19</sup>

In (c) סִּי departs with יִקְרָא לֵילָא לְהוֹן הָאֵל ‘it was a heavy night for them.’

(c) might represent an objective rather than a subjective view, not what they themselves think, but what the author thinks of them.

<sup>19</sup> A sense mentioned in *SL* s.v. קבל Af. 9, though the sole reference mentioned there is not our instance, and it is said to be possible to parse the form as Pa’el.

## CHAPTER 18

- 18.1) Τοῖς δὲ δόσις σου μέγιστον ἦν φῶς·  
ὃν φωνὴν μὲν ἀκούοντες μορφὴν δὲ οὐχ ὁρῶντες,  
ὅτι μὲν οὐ κάκεινοι ἐπεπόνθεισαν, ἐμακάριζον,  
*Your saints, however, had a very great light;  
whose voice they heard, but did not see their figure,  
because they had escaped suffering, they found them happy.*

μέγιστον] the superlative with elative force, cf. *SSG* § 23 **bc**. The source text is Ex 10.23.

Something similar to what is described in (b) and is equally valuable for the history of humankind would happen in the following century: οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοί, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες Acts 9.7.

ὅτι] Causal clauses mostly follow their main clause, but there are exceptions as here. Another example is Ὅτι ἐποίησας τοῦτο, ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν ‘because you have done this, you are the most cursed of all animals’ Ge 3.14.<sup>1</sup>

οὐ] The v.l. οὐν ‘therefore’ attested by many MSS makes little sense and is to be viewed as a scribal error.

κάκεινοι] It is difficult to express the force of καί in compact English. What is meant is that the Israelites did not suffer as the Egyptians did. For a discussion of complicated textcritical matters of (c), cf. Larcher 985f.

ἐπεπόνθεισαν] The selection of the Plpf. of πάσχω is probably because the author is thinking of the preceding eight plagues. Cf. *SSG* § 28 f. and Grimm 1837.355f.

- 18.2) ὅτι δὲ οὐ βλάπτουσιν προηδικημένοι, ἠὲ χαρίστου  
καὶ τοῦ διενεχθῆναι χάριν ἐδέοντο.  
*Because they do not damage, though having been previously wronged,  
they thanked  
and asked for a favour to be regarded as different.*

βλάπτουσιν] an example of a historic present equivalent even to the Impf., cf. *SSG* § 28 **b** (ii).

<sup>1</sup> More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ὅτι **1**.

ηὐχαρίστουν] The v.l. ευχαριστουσιν has been rejected by Ziegler. Since either Pres. or Impf. is grammatically acceptable, consistency in the same verse might be text-critically preferable.<sup>2</sup>

χάριν] *Pace* Holmes, *NETS*, Fichter, Siegfried, and *BJ* χάρις does not signify “forgiveness,” though forgiving can be taken as a favourable gesture by the guilty party.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, we withdraw herewith our analysis of χάριν here as a pseudo causal preposition as presented in *GELS* s.v. χάρις 6 c. Though SG does not attest to a case of <δέομαι + acc. rei> in the sense of ‘to beg for,’ the syntagm does occur elsewhere, e.g. δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους 2Cor 8.4, where the use of χάριν is to be noted, and an example in CG is ξύμφορα δέονται ‘they are asking for beneficial things’ Thuc. 1.32.1. The Egyptians were begging the Israelites to consider the possibility of mutual and peaceful coexistence, but not departure as implied in “they should part company” (Clarke, *sim.* Winston, and *SD*<sup>4</sup>).

We agree with Larcher (1987), who points out the difficulty presented by the Aor. tense of διενεχθῆναι. If the Egyptians had been begging the treatment received so far to be continued, the author could have written ἔτι διαφέρεισθαι or the like.

### 18.3) ἀνθ’ ὧν πυριφλεγῆ στυλόν

ὁδηγὸν μὲν ἀγνώστου ὁδοιπορίας,  
ἥλιον δὲ ἀβλαβῆ φιλοτίμου ξενιτείας παρέσχεας.

*Instead of which You provided (them with) a column set ablaze,  
as a guide for an unfamiliar journey,  
a harmless sun for a highly precious life abroad.*

The verse is a poetic expansion of ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡγεῖτο αὐτῶν, ἡμέρας μὲν ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδόν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἐν στύλῳ πυρός Ex 13.21, though the reference to the moon is missing.

ἀνθ’ ὧν] The antecedent of ὧν must refer to the terrors of darkness described above in detail. A similar use of ἀνθ’ ὧν occurs above at 16.20. Cf. *GELS* s.v. ἀντί 5.

ἀγνώστου] With “un voyage vers l’inconnu” is Larcher (1984) subjecting the gen. to ὁδοιπορίας, and not analysing it as attributive to the latter?

<sup>2</sup> Ziegler accords with Rahlfs, whilst Swete reads εὐχαριστουσιν of B and S.

<sup>3</sup> Scarpat (III 279) agrees, but we fail to see how he could justify his rendering of (b) as “pregavano di non tener conto delle inimicizie passate” (III 275).

<sup>4</sup> In *SD* II two possible senses of διαφέρειν are mentioned: “differieren, in Meinungs- und/oder Interessenverschiedenheit stehen, sich in Streit und Auseinandersetzung finden” and “sich ausbreiten, sich entfernen,” which latter is said to be preferable. However, LSJ does not recognise the second meaning.

ἥλιον δὲ ἀβλαβῆ] instead of a scorching sun. Very often during their journey no shade was within easy reach of the Israelites. At 19.6 this adj., a hapax for Wi, is used in a passive sense, “suffering no harm.”

φιλοτίμου] cf. φιλοτιμία ‘yearning after honour,’ characteristic of an ambitious artisan.

ξενιτείας] a hapax and unknown prior to Wi, though it is used by Philo, e.g. *Joseph*. 254.3. Most likely a reference to a future life in the promised land than a life during the journey thereto.<sup>5</sup> *Pace BJ* the journey itself could hardly be called “glorieuse migration.” The gen. phrase marks a purpose.<sup>6</sup> Engel (*SD* II 2156) identifies the whole of ἀβλαβῆ φιλοτίμου ξενιτείας as predicative in relation to ἥλιον: “(du gewährtest) die Sonne aber als nicht-schädlich bei dem ehrenvollen Auslandsaufenthalt,” which fails to account for the selection of the genitive case.

παρέσχες] positioned at the very end of the three-line clause. So in **Sh** **תָּרַחֵ** and **I** *praestisti*.

**S** has a message of its own: **תָּרַחֵ אֶת־הָאֵשׁ וְהָאֵשׁ תָּרַחֵ אֶת־הָאֵשׁ וְהָאֵשׁ תָּרַחֵ אֶת־הָאֵשׁ** ‘that the column of fire was showing them the way and You gave them the advantage of the warmth of the sun.’

18.4) ἄξιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι στερηθῆναι φωτὸς καὶ φυλακισθῆναι σκότει οἱ κατακλείστους φυλάξαντες τοὺς υἱοὺς σου,  
δι’ ὧν ἡμελλεν τὸ ἄφθαρτον νόμου φῶς τῷ αἰῶνι δίδοσθαι.

*For they deserved to have light deprived and be confined in darkness,  
those who kept Your children shut up,  
through whom the immortal light of the law was going to be given for  
the future.*

στερηθῆναι] The substantival character of the inf. is evident in a combination of the inf. with the adjective ἄξιος. Cp. ἀποθανεῖν ἄξιος ‘deserving death’ 4M 4.12 with ἄξιος θανάτου 2K 12.5L.<sup>7</sup>

ὧν] referring back to τοὺς υἱοὺς σου (b).

ἄφθαρτον] a hapax, also occurring at 12.1 of a divine spirit.

τὸ ἄφθαρτον νόμου φῶς] cf. λύχνος ἐντολῇ νόμου καὶ φῶς Pr 6.23, and note also Λύχνος τοῖς ποσίν μου ὁ λόγος σου καὶ φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις μου Ps 118.105.

τῷ αἰῶνι] the dative indicating the recipient, not a point in time. The eternal nature of the light is made manifest in the preceding ἄφθαρτον.

<sup>5</sup> Lampe s.v. **1** mentions a few patristic writers who use the word in the sense of “sojourn or travel in a foreign land, exile.”

<sup>6</sup> See SSG § 22 v (xiv).

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion with more examples, see SSG § 30 aa.

18.5) Βουλευσαμένους αὐτοὺς τὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἀποκτεῖναι νήπια,  
καὶ ἑνὸς ἐκτεθέντος τέκνου καὶ σωθέντος  
εἰς ἔλεγχον τὸ αὐτῶν ἀφείλω πλῆθος τέκνων  
καὶ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀπώλεσας ἐν ὕδατι σφοδρῶ.

*Those who had decided to kill babies of the saints,  
and one child was abandoned but survived,  
as a rebuke You deprived them of a large number of children  
and destroyed them altogether in violent water.*

ἐκτεθέντος] Deane (1881.209), referring to Hdt. 1.112 and Aristoph. *Clouds* 531, points out that this verb is used to designate abandonment of children. Cf. its verbal noun, ἐκθεςις, in 11.14 above.

εἰς ἔλεγχον] ‘for their discomfiture’ (Winston), far too weak for ἔλεγχος.

τὸ αὐτῶν ἀφείλω πλῆθος τέκνων] another case of hyperbaton. The clause can be rewritten as ἀφείλω αὐτῶν τὸ πλῆθος τέκνων, and αὐτῶν is a second *ο* of ἀφείλω with ablative value, a 2nd Aor. mid. 2s of ἀφαιρέω.<sup>11</sup> So *BJ* “tu leur enlevas .. la multitude de leurs enfants,” sim. Scarpat III 275. Alternatively, αὐτῶν may be a standard possessive pronoun to be construed with

<sup>8</sup> S reads לעמא דבעלדבניהן 'the people of their enemies.' In Syriac "for ever" is לעלם.

<sup>9</sup> On the ptc. expanding an oblique case pronoun, see *SSG* § 31 **ch**. Another example is αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν τῶν ἀκουόντων .. τοὺς λόγους τούτους ‘your hands, of you who are hearing .. these words’ Zc 8.9.

<sup>10</sup> In spite of his rendering, “tu leur as enlevé une multitude d’enfants,” Larcher (1995) analyses Βουλευσαμένους as an *o* of both finite verbs.

<sup>11</sup> In *GELS* s.v. ἀφαιρέω 4 at the end we would add: “d. + τινός τι Wi 18.5.”

We fail to grasp the analysis proposed by Fichtner (64) in a footnote attached to “Strafe”: “Nicht zu σωθεντός, sondern zu ἀφείλω (c. dopp. acc.).” With “double accusatives” he must mean αὐτοὺς .. τὸ πλῆθος. However, the syntagm <ἀφαιρέω τινά τι> is unattested in SG, whilst it is known in CG, e.g. *πολλίους τ’ ἀφείλου πατέρας εὐγενῇ τέκνα* ‘you robbed grey-haired fathers of their noble children’ Eur. *Andr.* 613.

With “für das eine ausgesetzte und gerettete Kind zur Strafe hast du .. weggenommen” *SD* has done what Fichtner rejected.

τέκνων. Its fronting may be due to parallelism: as a penalty for many Israelite baby boys killed by Egyptians every firstborn baby boy of theirs was to be slaughtered. So **סִיחַ יְהִי־יָדָם אֲנִי־אֶחָדֵם** ‘the multitude of their children,’ sim. **סִיחַ יְהִי־יָדָם אֲנִי־סֵם** ‘a multitude of their children.’

ἀπώλεσας ἐν ὕδατι σφοδρῶ] cf. Ex 14.26-28. The prepositional phrase reflects ἔδυσαν ὡσεὶ μόλιβος ἐν ὕδατι σφοδρῶ Ex 15.10.

The verse alludes to Ex 1.16, where Pharaoh’s order to Israelite midwives is mentioned, and the only surviving baby boy (b) is Moses.

18.6) ἐκεῖνη ἡ νύξ προεγνώσθη πατράσιν ἡμῶν,  
ἵνα ἀσφαλῶς εἰδότες οἷς ἐπίστευσαν ὅρκους ἐπευθυμήσωσιν.

*That night was previously known to our forefathers  
in order that with sure knowledge of the oaths they believed they could  
rejoice.*

προεγνώσθη] a reference to the prediction made to Abram at Gn 15.14. Pace Fichtner’s (64) “wurde vorher verkündigt” προγινώσκω is not known as meaning “to announce beforehand.” Hence the distinction between προεγνώσθη here and προεμήνυσαν vs. 19 Fichtner (65) postulates is implausible.

ἐκεῖνη ἡ νύξ] Here the demonstrative pronoun precedes an articular noun, what differs from what we find in 17.5 and 6, where we find the pattern <ἡ ἐκεῖνη νύξ>. See above at 17.5 and 6.

18.7) προσεδέχθη ὑπὸ λαοῦ σου  
σωτηρία μὲν δικαίων, ἐχθρῶν δὲ ἀπώλεια·

*Salvation of the righteous, but the perdition of the enemies  
was looked forward to by Your people,*

προσεδέχθη] **סִיחַ לְקַבֵּל** ‘was accepted’ represents another sense of προσδέχομαι. Cf. **סִיחַ אֲנִי־יָדָם אֲנִי־אֶחָדֵם** ‘and to Your people You gave salvation to the righteous.’

The verb form here, as is manifest on account of the following ὑπὸ λαοῦ σου, is a genuinely passive form, not equivalent to προσεδέξατο, which is active in value.

Pace Larcher (1000) we see no absolute need to take ἐκεῖνη ἡ νύξ (vs. 6) as the s of προσεδέχθη. He found it necessary to add “comme” at the start of (b).

18.8) ὃ γὰρ ἐτιμωρήσω τοὺς ὑπεναντίους,  
τούτῳ ἡμᾶς προσκαλεσάμενος ἐδόξασας.

*for with what You punished the adversaries  
You honoured (us) by recruiting us for this (mission).*

ϙ̃] an antecedentless relative pronoun. The structure we find here, <ϙ̃ .. τούτῳ>, we find also in δι' ὧν τις ἁμαρτάνει, διὰ τούτων κολάζεται Wi 11.16. Cf. SSG § 84 a (iy).

A v.l. ὡς has justly been rejected by Rahlfs and Ziegler; a comparative clause so introduced can hardly be resumed with τούτῳ, in lieu of which Larcher (1000) justly says we would anticipate οὕτως.

ἐδόξασας] God's extraordinary treatment of His people was thought by the translator of S as meriting two verbs – יְקַדְּשֵׁנִי וְקִבְּלֵנִי (יְקַדְּשֵׁנִי) '(You recruited us and) You sanctified us and You praised us.'

προσκαλεσάμενος] Pace Holmes, "thou didst glorify us, and call us unto thyself," this circumstantial ptc. is subordinate to ἐδόξασας. Siegfried's free addition (504), "indem du uns [zur Freiheit] riefst," cannot be justified in the context here.

18.9) κρυφῇ γὰρ ἐθυσίαζον ὅσοι παῖδες ἀγαθῶν  
καὶ τὸν τῆς θεϊότητος νόμον ἐν ὁμοσίᾳ διέθεντο  
τῶν αὐτῶν ὁμοίως καὶ ἀγαθῶν  
καὶ κινδύνων μεταλήμψεσθαι τοὺς ἁγίους  
πατέρων ἥδη προαναμέλποντες αἶνους.

*For sacred children of good people offered sacrifices in secret  
and submitted themselves with one mind to the divine law  
for the holy people equally to share  
the same benefits and dangers alike,  
already singing praises of the forefathers in advance.*

ὅσοι παῖδες ἀγαθῶν] A syntactic ambiguity of the phrase is reflected in S יְקִיָּים בְּטִבְיָתָא דְּעִבְדֵּי יְהוָה and S<sup>h</sup> בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים דְּטִבְיָא דְּעִבְדֵּי 'pious ones, children of good people.'

ἀγαθῶν] Siegfried (504f., f.n. °) insists that the form is neut., translating it as "(die fromme Söhne) des Heils." In GELS s.v. ἀγαθός 3 we note quite a number of instances of its substantivised use, all neut., e.g. τὰ ἀγαθὰ Ἰερουσαλημ 'the prosperity of Jerusalem' Ps 127.5, but no instance of τὰ ἀγαθὰ 'salvation' is found.

ἁγίους] With its "die heiligen Loblieder" SD follows Scarpata (III 286), who views the adj. as an attributive modifier of αἶνους. We would note, however, that neither in LXX nor in NT we encounter a combination of αἶνος, ψαλτηρίον, ψαλμός, ᾠδή with ἅγιος.

The songs are generally thought to refer to Ps 113-18, which begin with יְהוָה הֵלֵל עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה הֵלֵל אֲתָנָשׁ יְהוָה.

18.10) ἀντήχει δ' ἀσύμφωνος ἐχθρῶν βοή,  
καὶ οἰκτρὰ διεφέρετο φωνὴ θρηνηνόμενων παιδῶν·



*Then a disharmonious voice of enemies echoed back  
and a saddening voice over bewailed children rang through.*

θρηνουμένων] Examples of this verb with an acc. pers. are τὸν δύστηνον ἐμὸν θρῆνω πατέρ' 'I bewail my miserable father' Soph. *El.* 94 and ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν 'they kept weeping over Him' Lk 23.27.

18.11) ὁμοία δὲ δίκη δοῦλος ἅμα δεσπότη κολασθεὶς  
καὶ δημότης βασιλεῖ τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχων,

*Slave was punished together with his master with the same rule,  
and commoner suffered the same as king,*

The two clauses of the verse have each a predicative participle in the nom. case, and they are somewhat loosely subject to three standard verbal clauses in vs. 12 each with a finite verb.

δημότης] **Σ** and **Σ**η **קִנְיָוָה** 'the poor.'

βασιλεῖ] The selection of the dative form is due to τὰ αὐτὰ and on the analogy of ἴσος 'identical,' which idiomatically combines with a dative complement, cf. *SSG* § 14 **b**.

18.12) ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ πάντες ἐν ἐνὶ ὀνόματι θανάτου  
νεκροὺς εἶχον ἀναριθμήτους·  
οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸς τὸ θάψαι οἱ ζῶντες ἦσαν ἱκανοί,  
ἐπεὶ πρὸς μίαν ῥοπὴν ἢ ἐντιμότερα γένεσις αὐτῶν διέφθαρτο.

*Altogether, under one mode of death, they all  
had innumerable corpses,  
for the living were not present in sufficient numbers even to bury (them),  
because in one instant their noblest offspring had been destroyed.*

ἐν ἐνὶ ὀνόματι θανάτου] Winston (317) claims that ὄνομα can be used in periphrastic phrases, offering "by a common death." By referring to LSJ s.v. **IV**, he is presumably thinking of an instance such as τὸ κλεινὸν ὄνομα τῆς σωτηρίας Eur. *IT.* 905, on which LSJ loc. cit. notes "= σωτηρία." Cf. *SD* "eine einzige Todesart," Hübner (64): "durch die gleiche Todesart," sim. Siegfried 505, and "le seul temps de nommer la mort, à peine le temps de prononcer le nom de mort" Larcher (1010).

ἐντιμότερα] As is not infrequently the case in SG and KG, this comparative form may be assigned the value of the superlative or relative. Cf. *SSG* § 23 **ba**. The reference is to the firstborns.

18.13) πάντα γὰρ ἀπιστοῦντες διὰ τὰς φαρμακείας  
ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν πρωτοτόκων ὀλέθρῳ ὁμολόγησαν θεοῦ υἱὸν λαὸν εἶναι.

*For they were entirely distrustful because of sorcery,  
but on the perishing of the firstborns they acknowledged the people  
to be God's children.*

πάντα] “die ganze Zeit” (Hübner 64), a disputable interpretation. Syntactically, ἀπιστεύω shares a number of features with πιστεύω. Thus note ἀπιστοῦντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δίκην ‘not trusting God’s justice’ 2M 8.13, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἀπιστεύω. The author means to say that the Egyptians refused to trust and accept anything said and practised by the Israelites.

ἐπὶ] <+ dat.> could alternatively be causal, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἐπὶ II 6.

ὁμολόγησαν] This conversion on the part of the Egyptians is not recorded in the Bible.

θεοῦ υἱὸν] *BJ* mentions בְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱמֶר יְהוָה בְּכָרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל Ex 4.22 and נֶעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶהְיֶה וּמִמְצָרִים קָרָאתִי לְבָנָי Ho 11.1. Acc. to Gutmann (II 115) the Jews were called “sons of heaven” in 2M 7.34 τοὺς οὐρανίους παῖδας, a Grecised expression for τοὺς παῖδας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, in which “heaven” is probably = “God.”

18.14) ἡσύχου γὰρ σιγῆς περιεχούσης τὰ πάντα  
καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν ἰδίῳ τάχει μεσαζούσης

*For when dead silence was surrounding everything  
and the night was half-way through with its speed,*

ἰδίῳ] The word ἴδιος is at times attached to a substantive as equivalent to a pronoun in the genitive case, here αὐτῆς, as in τὸ ~ον σῶμα καὶ ἡ γῆ ἡμῶν ‘our bodies and our land’ Ge 47.18, but the author might be of the view that nature has its own will as indicated through the very use of the word τάχος. See 10.1 above.<sup>12</sup>

18.15) ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν ἐκ θρόνων βασιλείων  
ἀπότομος πολεμιστῆς εἰς μέσον τῆς ὀλεθρίας ἤλατο γῆς  
*Your omnipotent word from the heaven out of royal thrones,  
a relentless warrior, jumped into the midst of the annihilation of  
the land,*

παντοδύναμός] applied at 7.23 to a spirit that resides in Wisdom. See also at 11.17, where it is applied to God’s hand.

λόγος] Much has been discussed as to whether the word here is personified and is identifiable with the Philonian logos. Cf. Reider 210f. and Larcher 1015f. ad loc.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *GELS* s.v. ἴδιος d and *SSG* § 8 h.

θρόνων] analysed by Reider 211 as a case of pluralis maiestatis.<sup>13</sup> We are not convinced, since a king might have more than one throne for use. To apply this conventional label to a throne, not to a person such as an emperor to whom respect is due is a misnomer.

βασιλείων] most likely f.pl.gen. of the adj. βασιλείος ‘royal,’ and not pl.gen. of βασιλείον ‘palace,’ both being adjectives derived from βασιλεύς.

πολεμιστῆς] a *s* complement; ὥς ‘as, like’ could have been prefixed.

τῆς ὀλεθρίας] With its “das verderbenbringende Land” *SD* is exceptional, unlike “the land marked for destruction” (*NETS*), for instance. In terms of grammar and history both analyses make sense. Both parties are not completely spared destruction. The author probably means to say that the divine word descended to the land where both parties are involved in the process of destruction.

ἦλατο] another instance of hyperbaton.

- 18.16) ξίφος ὃξὺ τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγὴν σου φέρων  
καὶ σταὶς ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ πάντα θανάτου  
καὶ οὐρανοῦ μὲν ἦπτετο, βεβήκει δ’ ἐπὶ γῆς.  
*carrying as a sharp sword Your authentic command,  
and, having stood still, filled everything with death,  
and though touching the heaven, it had stood on the earth.*

ἐπλήρωσεν] ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος (vs. 15) appears to be continuing as the *s* of this verb and βεβήκει (*c*). With his 𐤀𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤍𐤏 ‘was walking’ the translator of *Sh* appears to have had a trouble with the Gk Plpf. There has not been preserved a v.l. such as ἔβαινε. Cp. *Sh* 𐤀𐤓𐤕.

βεβήκει] This common verb, βαίνω, is used in the Pf. and Plpf. in the sense of “to stand,” and not “to walk.”<sup>14</sup> See above at 4.4. Larcher (1018) suggests a possible allusion to οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθόνι βαίνει ‘her head is fixed in the heavens, while her feet treat on earth’ Hom. *Il.* 4.443.

- 18.17) τότε παραχρῆμα φαντασῖαι μὲν ὀνείρων δεινῶν ἐξετάραξαν αὐτούς,  
φόβοι δὲ ἐπέστησαν ἀδόκητοι,  
*Then, all of a sudden, images in terrifying dreams disturbed them,  
unexpected fears appeared,*

- 18.18) καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλαχῇ ῥιφείς ἡμίθνητος  
δι’ ἣν ἔθνησκον αἰτίαν ἐνεφάνιζεν·  
*and each thrown in a different place half-dead  
revealed a reason for which they were dying.*

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *SSG* § 21 g.

<sup>14</sup> For references, see *LSJ* s.v. **A 1 2**.

ἄλλος ἀλλαχῇ] an idiomatic phrase also in εἰς φυγὴν ὥρμησαν ἄλλος ἀλλαχῇ ‘they escaped, each moving in his own way’ 2M 12.22.

ἔθνησκον] A v.l., ἐθνησκειν (sg.), might be more logical, agreeing with ἄλλος and ἐνεφάνιζεν. **Sh** and **℣** are consistent in the sg., whereas **S** is so in the pl.

αἰτίαν] The conventional label “antecedent” notwithstanding, it follows its relative pronoun, ἣν, inside the relative clause.<sup>15</sup>

18.19) οἱ γὰρ ὄνειροι θορυβήσαντες αὐτοὺς τοῦτο προεμήνυσαν,  
ἵνα μὴ ἀγνοοῦντες δι’ ὃ κακῶς πάσχουσιν ἀπόλωνται.

*For the dreams, having upset them, informed this in advance  
so that they would not perish, not knowing why they are so badly  
suffering.*

αὐτοὺς] The preceding verb, θορυβέω, requires an *o*, which is supplied by this acc. pronoun. This latter, however, cannot serve as an *o* of προεμήνυσαν at the same time. When Greek verba dicendi are used with two *o*’s, the standard construction is <dat. pers. + acc. rei>, e.g. γνωριῶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δύναμίν μου Je 16.21 and πάντα τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ γνωριεῖς αὐτοῖς Ez 43.11. A second *o* in some modern translations must reflect an idiomatic style of the target languages concerned. Thus “.. forewarned them of this” (*NETS*), “Die sie schreckenden Träume .. hatten ihnen dies vorher kund getan” (Siegfried) and “les songs qui les avaient agités les en avaient avertis d’avance” (*BJ*).

μὴ] Like other Greek negators this one can be analysed as negating ἀγνοοῦντες or ἀπόλωνται.<sup>16</sup> What the author means in general is more or less the same either way. Where his focus lies could differ. The annihilation of the Egyptians was bound to take place, though God wanted them to know that He is a fair judge. Alternatively, God wanted to give them the last chance for them to come to Him and ask to be forgiven.

δι’ ὃ] with an antecedentless relative pronoun: “that for the reason of which.” See above at 11.16.

18.20) Ἦψατο δὲ καὶ δικαίων πεῖρα θανάτου,  
καὶ θραῦσις ἐν ἐρήμῳ ἐγένετο πλήθους.  
ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἔμεινεν ἡ ὀργή·

*Testing through death affected the righteous as well  
massive devastation took place in the wilderness,  
but the rage did not last long.*

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion with other examples in LXX, see SSG § 86 **dbe**.

<sup>16</sup> For a discussion with other examples in LXX, see SSG § 83 **d**.

θανάτου] the genitive expressing a means as in ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ‘by killing with a sword’ De 13.15.<sup>17</sup> *Pace* some translations, e.g. Larcher (1025) and *NETS*, πείρα here does not mean merely “experience.” Note ἐπείρασαν αὐτὸν ἐν πείρᾳ ‘they put him to test’ De 33.8.

πλήθους] probably a qualitative genitive subordinate to θραύσις.<sup>18</sup> Alternatively, πλήθος here might mean “crowd, community,” so Larcher (1025) “d’une multitude.” The source text is καὶ ἐγένοντο οἱ τεθνηκότες ἐν τῇ θραύσει τέσσαρες καὶ δέκα χιλιάδες καὶ ἑπτακόσιοι χωρὶς τῶν τεθνηκόντων ἔνεκεν Κορε Nu 17.14. Attention is to be paid not only to the number of victims, but also the selection of the word θραύσις.

ἐπὶ πολὺ] <ἐπὶ τι> may indicate an extent of time. E.g. πότον .. ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ‘a banquet lasting as long as seven days’ Es 2.18 ο’. The same phrase as here is found in Νεεμίου ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ μνημόσυνον ‘the memory of Nehemiah (will remain) a long time’ Si 49.13.

ἡ ὀργή] τοῦ θεοῦ is implicit. Note שְׁחַרְחָרְתָּ אֵיךְ ‘Your rage.’

18.21) σπεύσας γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἄμεμπτος προεμάχησεν  
τὸ τῆς ἰδίας λειτουργίας ὄπλον  
προσευχὴν καὶ θυμιάματος ἐξιλασμὸν κομίσας·  
ἀντέστη τῷ θυμῷ καὶ πέρας ἐπέθηκεν τῇ συμφορᾷ  
δεικνὺς ὅτι σὸς ἐστὶν θεράπων·

*For an irreproachable man quickly fought up front,  
carrying as a weapon his professional ministry,  
prayer and atonement with incense.  
He resisted (Your) rage and put a halt to the disaster,  
showing that he was a servant of Yours.*

ἀνὴρ ἄμεμπτος] alluding to Aaron, Nu 17.47.

προεμάχησεν] According to LSH this rare verb means “to fight in front,” hence προ- in a locative sense. CG appears to distinguish this verb from προμάχομαι τινος ‘to fight in defence of sbd,’ e.g. σου προμάχεται ‘he fights for you’ Aristoph. *Vesp.* 957. Should this distinction apply here, too, “kämpfte für sie” (Heinisch), “to act as their champion” (*NETS*), and others would be disputable.<sup>19</sup> Cf. שָׁחַד וְהָיָה מִלְחָמָה ‘he fought ahead of time.’ For “for their champion” we need a pron. in the genitive.

<sup>17</sup> For more examples in LXX, see *SSG* § 22 v (xxiv).

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion with other examples in LXX, see *SSG* § 22 (xvi). Cp. τὸ πλήθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ Ps 105.45.

<sup>19</sup> An example in CG of our verb absolutely used with no complement is οἱ προμαχοῦντες ‘those who fought in front (of their army)’ Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.60. An example of <+ gen.> is Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι ‘Athenians fighting at Marathon in defence of Greeks’ Simonides 90, cited in Bergk 1867 III p. 1448.

δεικνὺς] **𐤔 𐤆𐤕𐤓𐤕** ‘it became known,’ an expression of his humility?  
 σός] Unlike σου it is emphatic, and also note its fronting and the hyperbaton. Cf. “it was you whom he served” (Winston).

- 18.22) ἐνίκησεν δὲ τὸν χόλον οὐκ ἰσχύι τοῦ σώματος,  
 οὐχ ὅπλων ἐνεργείᾳ,  
 ἀλλὰ λόγῳ τὸν κολάζοντα ὑπέταξεν  
 ὅρκους πατέρων καὶ διαθήκας ὑπομνήσας.

*But he did not defeat the bitter anger with his physical strength,  
 not by making use of weapons,  
 but subjugated the punisher with the word,  
 reminding (him) of the oaths and covenants with the forefathers.*

χόλον] an emendation of οχλον,<sup>20</sup> which Heinisch (334) and Engel (SD II 2156) defend, the former pointing out that ὄχλος can also mean “Verwirrung, Beunruhigung.”<sup>21</sup> Though such a meaning cannot be ascertained in LXX, where the noun occurs 49 times, the extreme frequency of hapax legomena and the generally elevated level of Greek of Wi ought to be remembered.

- 18.23) σωρηδὸν γὰρ ἤδη πεπτωκότων ἐπ’ ἀλλήλων νεκρῶν  
 μεταξὺ στὰς ἀνέκοψεν τὴν ὁρμὴν  
 καὶ διέσχισεν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντας ὁδόν.

*For dead people having already fallen in heaps beside one another,  
 he positioned himself in between, repulsing the onrush,  
 and severed the path to the survivors.*

(a) is an allusion to Nu 17.14, where a death toll of 14,700 is mentioned.  
 (b) alludes to Nu 17.13, where Aaron stood between the dead and the survivors (ⲙ καὶ ἔστη ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν τεθνηκότων καὶ τῶν ζώντων).

ἐπ’ ἀλλήλων] alternatively “one on top of the other.”

μεταξὺ] with an explanatory addition in **𐤔 - 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤕** ‘between the dead and the living.’

This is the sole case in which the word is used adverbially, not as a preposition as in ζῶν μεταξὺ ἁμαρτωλῶν ‘living among sinners’ 4.10 above. The adverbial use is known in CG, e.g. αὐχένα μεταξὺ τιθέντες ‘by setting between them the neck’ Pl. Ti. 69e.

<sup>20</sup> So **𐤔 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕**, **𐤔𐤓 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕**, and **𐤕 turbas**.

<sup>21</sup> LSJ s.v. **𐤕** “annoyance, trouble.”



## CHAPTER 19

**19.1)** Τοῖς δὲ ἀσεβέσιν μέχρι τέλους ἀνελεήμων θυμὸς ἐπέστη·  
προήδει γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα,

*Merciless wrath confronted the impious (to be with them) till the end,  
for He knew in advance also their future,*

Τοῖς δὲ ἀσεβέσιν] On the dat. of disadvantage with ἐφίστημι, see also above at 6.8.

μέχρι τέλους] on this phrase, see οὐ μέχρι τέλους ἔμεινεν ἡ ὀργή σου ‘Your wrath did not remain in force till the end’ 16.5.

προήδει] Note § 197: ‘they knew.’<sup>1</sup>

αὐτῶν] loosely subordinate to τὰ μέλλοντα ‘their future, what was likely to happen round them.’

τὰ μέλλοντα] “what they would do” (Holmes, sim. Winston), “ce qu’ils allaient faire” (BJ), “ciò che avrebbero fatto” (Scarpata), and “ihr zukünftiges Verhalten” (Siegfried, Heinisch, Hübner) are too specific. The author could be referring also to attitudes the Egyptians would take towards the Israelites, not just what they might do.<sup>2</sup>

**19.2)** ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐπιτρέψαντες τοῦ ἀπιέναι  
καὶ μετὰ σπουδῆς προπέμψαντες αὐτοὺς  
διώξουσιν μεταμεληθέντες.

*that they, having allowed them to depart  
and having sent them forth eagerly,  
would chase (them), having changed their minds.*

ἐπιτρέψαντες] Holmes has adopted a v.l., ἐπιστρέψαντες, which he has rendered “having pressed them,”<sup>3</sup> but does ἐπιστρέφω signify “to press, pressurise”? Reider, who has also adopted this v.l., has interpreted it differently: “having changed their minds about the departure.” True, either αὐτοῖς as an *o* of the ptc. or αὐτοὺς as a *s* of the inf., could have been added. Cf. ἐπέτρεψά σοι ποιῆσαι κόμμα ἴδιον ‘I have permitted you to make your own die’ 1M 15.6.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Leiden mentions 197 as a v.l.

<sup>2</sup> On a substantivised, articular participle, see SSG § 31 bb.

<sup>3</sup> Sim. “zum Auszuge gedrängt” (Siegfried) and “après avoir permis aux siens de s’en aller et pressé leur départ” (BJ).



τοῦ ἀπιέναι] The gen. τοῦ is nothing but a marker of the inf., carrying none of the functions usually associated with the definite article. It is comparable to Engl. *to* or Germ. *zu*. LXX is full of cases such as οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ‘I shall not be able to return’ 3K 13.16 compared with οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἐπιστρέψαι vs. 4.<sup>4</sup> For more details, cf. SSG § 30 d.

σπουδῆς] On this word, see above at 14.17. Cf. καὶ κατεβιάζοντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν λαὸν σπουδῇ ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς Ex 12.33, where, however, σπουδῇ is a rendering of רַחֲמָי, which Larcher (1048) holds justifies his rendering “à la hâte.”

19.3) ἔτι γὰρ ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες τὰ πένθη  
καὶ προσοδυρόμενοι τάφοις νεκρῶν  
ἕτερον ἐπεσπᾶσαντο λογισμὸν ἀνοίας  
καὶ οὓς ἰκετεύοντες ἐξέβαλον, τούτους ὡς φυγάδας ἐδίωκον.

*For still having grievous corpses in their hands  
and mourning at the graves of the dead  
they took recourse to another silly notion  
and those whom they had got rid of by entreating, those they started  
chasing as escapees.*

ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες] We are not aware of any instance elsewhere in which “noch andauernde Beschäftigung” (SD II 2157) could apply.

πένθη] Πένθος here most likely designates an object of grief, for grief as an emotion cannot be held in one’s hands.<sup>5</sup> An example mentioned in LSJ s.v. is illuminating: πένθος ἐπ’ ὠκυάλου νηὸς ἔδωκε φέρειν ‘he handed a cadaver to transport on a fast-sailing ship’ Kaibel 228.6.<sup>6</sup>

τάφοις] The selection of the dative case is due to the syntax of the simplex of the verb concerned: ὀδυρόμενοι πρὸς τάφοις νεκρῶν.<sup>7</sup> Sim. ἀμφοτέρω δὲ αὐτοὺς μετελεύσεται τὰ δίκαια ‘justice would pursue them on both (counts)’ Wi 14.30, cf. SSG § 22 e. See also above at 8.16. Alternatively, τάφοις could be a case of *dativus loci*.

ἕτερον] On ἕτερος as a virtually quantifying adjective preceding its noun head, see SSG § 37 baaa.

ἀνοίας] a gen. of quality, cf. SSG § 22 v (xvi).

<sup>4</sup> Larcher (1047f.) is possibly unaware of this, hence proposes an unnecessary emendation of τοῦ to τούτους. Besides, GELS s.v. ἐπιτρέπω 3 mentions an instance of <+ dat. pers.>: ἐπέτρεψά σοι ποιῆσαι κόμμα ἴδιον ‘I have permitted you to make your own die’ 1Ma 15.6. LSJ s.v. ἐπιτρέπω II 1 mentions only instances of <+ dat. pers.>.

<sup>5</sup> We fail to see how Scarpit (III 314) can argue that merely on the basis of πένθος applied at 14.15 to a father grieving the loss of one child we have here a father grieving the death of many sons of his.

<sup>6</sup> Kaibel adds an illuminating f.n.: “πένθος, ut saepius κῆδος, ipsum mortui corpus est.”

<sup>7</sup> Larcher’s (1049) remark is too generic to be true: “le dat. est régulier avec un vb. composé.” Πρὸς + dat. can mean “in close vicinity of” (GELS s.v. II 1).

ἐξέβαλον] cf. σὺν παντὶ ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐκβολῇ ‘he [= Pharaoh] will take any step to get you out’ Ex 11.1, and also ib. 12.33.

- 19.4) εἶλκεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡ ἀξία ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ πέρασ ἀνάγκη  
καὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἀμνηστίαν ἐνέβαλεν,  
ἵνα τὴν λείπουσαν ταῖς βασάνοις προσαναπληρώσωσιν κόλασιν,  
*For a deserved fate pushed them to this end  
and made them forget what had happened  
so that they could get extra punishment through torments added,*

ἐνέβαλεν] Since the *o* of the verb is not something tangible, *GELS* s.v. 3 suggests “to cause to befall.” Such an extension is known to CG, as shown in *LSJ* s.v. 3.<sup>8</sup>

Two distinct interpretations have been offered on (c): “that they might fill up the punishment yet lacking to their torments” (Holmes; sim. Reider, *NETS*, Fichtner, Siegfried, Larcher, *SD*, Heinisch, *BJ*) vs. “they might suffer the torments still needed to complete their punishment” (Clarke). A CG example of the intransitively used λείπω “to be wanting or missing” (*LSJ* s.v. A II 2) is τί λείπει τῶν ἐπιτηδείων αὐταῖς; ‘what of the necessities is lacking to them?’ Polyb. 10.18.8.<sup>9</sup> If the torments here refer to what the Egyptians had already suffered, the first alternative might be better.

- 19.5) καὶ ὁ μὲν λαὸς σου παράδοξον ὁδοιπορίαν πειράσῃ,  
ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ξένον εὗρωσι θάνατον.  
*and Your people might experience an extraordinary journey,  
but they might encounter an unusual death.*

πειράσῃ] Engel (*SD* II 2157) prefers a v.l. περασῃ < περάω as a *lectio difficilior*: “they might undertake ..” Also Scarpata III 315.

- 19.6) ὅλη γὰρ ἡ κτίσις ἐν ἰδίῳ γένει πάλιν ἄνωθεν διευτυποῦτο  
ὕπηρετοῦσα ταῖς σαῖς ἐπιταγαῖς,  
ἵνα οἱ σοὶ παῖδες φυλαχθῶσιν ἀβλαβεῖς.  
*For the whole universe was being reshaped and moulded anew in its  
own nature  
obeying Your directives  
so that Your children might be protected unharmed.*

<sup>8</sup> One of the examples mentioned is ἐμβαλεῖν περὶ τούτου βουλὴν εἰς τὸ στράτευμα ‘to suggest to the army a debate on this question’ Xen. *Cyp.* 2.2.18.

<sup>9</sup> See also τὰ γὰρ λείποντα τοῦ σώματος μέλη προσαναπλήρουν τοῖς δεομένοις τῇ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐπιχορηγία ‘for I filled up the deficient parts of the body for those requesting by supplying necessities’ Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Job* Migne *PG* vol. 64 629.53.

ταῖς σαῖς ἐπιταγαῖς .. οἱ σοὶ παῖδες] The repetition in a single verse of an adjectival pronoun, σός, in lieu of σου indicates the unique focus laid on God. Cf. SSG § 11 a.

ἀβλαβεῖς] In 18.3 this hapax is used in the active sense of “harmless.”

19.7) ἡ τὴν παρεμβολὴν σκιάζουσα νεφέλη,  
ἐκ δὲ προϋφεστῶτος ὕδατος ξηρᾶς ἀνάνδυσις γῆς ἐθεωρήθη,  
ἐξ ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης ὁδὸς ἀνεμπόδιστος  
καὶ χλοηφόρον πεδίον ἐκ κλύδωνος βιαίου·

*The cloud overshadowing the encampment,  
but the emergence of dry land out of primaevael water could be observed,  
out of the Red Sea a trouble-free path  
and a field of green grass out of powerful waves,*

προϋφεστῶτος ὕδατος] “what was before water” (NETS) is reasonable, though the ptc. is attributively modifying ὕδατος. This hapax, προϋφίστημι is synonymous with another LXX hapax, προϋπάρχω Jb 42.17bγ. On our “primaevael water” going back to Gn 1.2, cf. also Winston 325.

Three prepositional phrases are all introduced with ἐκ indicating a source of miraculous blessings.

ἐθεωρήθη] to be construed also with ὁδὸς (c) and πεδίον (d) as *s*. Since νεφέλη (a) also requires a verb, this makes a rather complicated sentence structure; σκιάζουσα must be an attributively used participle. (a) could have been phrased as τῆς τὴν παρεμβολὴν σκιαζούσης νεφέλης in the form of a genitive absolute.

Is ἐθεωρήθη genuinely passive with Israelites as its implicit agentes and signify “was seen,” and not “became visible, emerged”? Scarpat’s (III 311) “si vide emergere il suolo” points to the latter. Cp. Hübner (220): “.. sah man festes Land emporragen.”

ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης] From its first occurrence in the Bible the Heb. name יַם סוּף is rendered as ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα or θάλασσα ἐρυθρά. For LXX references, see GELS s.v. ἐρυθρός.<sup>10</sup> On (c) see above at 10.18.

χλοηφόρον πεδίον] Gutmann (1841.39, f.n.) quotes, in his German translation, part of a prayer which is offered on the last day of the pesach.<sup>11</sup> “Eine

<sup>10</sup> GELS loc. cit. mentions what is written in LSJ s.v. II: “Ἐρυθρὴ θάλασσα in Hdt. *the Indian Ocean*, in which the Red Sea (Ἀράβιος κόλπος) is sometimes included (of the existence of the Persian Gulf he was ignorant).” Hence he (1.180.1) speaks of Euphrates flowing into the Red Sea.

<sup>11</sup> The Hebrew text as found in a MS in the Bodleian Library as referred to me by Dr R. Medina of Santa Barbara differs rather extensively from Guttmann’s translation. My translation of the Bodleian piece might read: “Who could narrate over the power of His mighty deeds? And who could adduce power enough to express Your praise? Even if our mouth be full of songs and adoration and all the hairs of our head be tongues for prayer, with which

ganz ähnliche Ausschmückung des Durchgangs durch das rothe Meer findet sich in einem hebräischen Gebete für den letzten Tag des Passahfestes, welches anfängt: **לְמַלְאֵי מִי יְיָ בְּיָמֵינוּ אֱמוּנָה**. Als sie nun zu Gott schrieten und fleheten, da erhörte sie der, welcher sich in allen Zeiten von ihnen finden ließ. Er schalt das Schilfmeer und es vertrockneten die Fluthen, so daß sie durch Abgründe, wie auf gebahnten Wegen, zogen. Von beiden Seiten erhoben sich mit Früchten belastete Bäume, mitten im Abgrunde ließ er für süsse Quellen für sie sprudeln, und ein Räucherwerk von köstlichen Spezereien vor ihnen her seinen Duft verbreiten u.s.w.”

ἀνεμπόδιστος] cf. “sans obstacle” (Larcher 1045) and “senza ostacoli” (Scarpata III 311). Note the same adjective at 17.20.

19.8) δι’ οὗ πανεθνὴ διήλθον οἱ τῇ σῇ σκεπαζόμενοι χειρὶ  
θεωρήσαντες θαυμαστὰ τέρατα.

*through which those shielded with Your hand journeyed altogether as  
one nation,  
having observed marvellous miracles.*

δι’ οὗ] The antecedent is πεδίον (8d) as the nearest, though the preceding ὁδός (8c) is most likely included. The latter alone, fem., would lead to the selection of δι’ ἧς.

πανεθνὴ] a rare hapax attested elsewhere only in ἕως ἀπώλοντο πανεθνὴ ‘until they perished altogether as one nation’ Strabo 5.1.6.<sup>12</sup>

θεωρήσαντες] The selection of the Aorist aspect seems to suggest that the author is referring to the miracle that had taken place in the Red Sea rather than miracles which were still to happen during the 40 year long journey. Then “having beheld” (Holmes), “after gazing” (Winston), and “geschaut hatten” (SD) are preferable to *videntes*, “beholding” (Reider) and “en contemplant” (BJ). Cf. *Ἰ* and *Ἰη* ‘they had seen.’

19.9) ὥς γὰρ ἵπποι ἐνεμήθησαν  
καὶ ὥς ἄμνοι διεσκίρτησαν αἰνοῦντές σε, κύριε, τὸν ῥυσάμενον αὐτούς.  
*For they roamed about like horses  
and like lambs they jumped round, lauding You, Lord, one who had  
rescued them.*

ἐνεμήθησαν] hardly a genuine passive, ‘they were tended.’ Tending by humans is not particularly significant in this context, though that is how

we are occupied day and night, we would not be able to speak enough.” Nothing is said here about the sea waters.

<sup>12</sup> Pace Fichtner (68) the form cannot be a dative, unless πανεθνός as a noun is attested.

שָׁנָה אֲתִרְעִי ‘they were tended’ can be understood.<sup>13</sup> In *GELS* s.v. II 2 we have suggested “*to roam about*,” though one does not find such in LSJ.<sup>14</sup> It seems to us that in Ancient Israel there is said little about feeding domestic animals in a stable, sheep-fold or cowshed, but people guided or followed animals outside,<sup>15</sup> although at times they were fed standing in a stable, for instance. One instance in LXX mentioned in *GELS* l.c. is illuminating: οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἔσονται νεμόμενοι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη Nu 14.33. The notion of the majority of Israelites on the way to the promised land working as shepherds is difficult to maintain. Ibn Ezra comments that it was common for a shepherd not to stay and rest in one place, in other words, he was on a constant move. ז is straightforward with *vagi* for רָעִים. Whilst the comparison of ancient Israelites with horses is rather surprising, Larcher (1062) justly mentions מוֹלִיכֵם בְּתַהֲמוֹת פָּסוּס בְּמִדְבָּר לֹא יִכָּשְׁלוּ > ἡγάγεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς ἀβύσσου ὥς ἵππον δι’ ἐρήμου, καὶ οὐκ ἔκοπιάσαν Is 63.13. In any case the feature of parallelism between (a) and (b) is to be duly taken into account, which speaks against taking νέμω in the traditional pastoral sense.

ῥυσάμενον] Ziegler<sup>16</sup> prefers the Pres. Ptc., ῥυόμενον, as preserved by a mediaeval (14th cent.?) commentator, Malachias Monachus. Theologically both forms make sense,<sup>17</sup> but in view of the Aor. Ptc., θεωρήσαντες, in the preceding verse, ῥυσάμενον appears far more plausible.

- 19.10) ἐμέμνηντο γὰρ ἔτι τῶν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ αὐτῶν,  
 πῶς ἀντὶ μὲν γενέσεως ζώων ἐξῆγαγεν ἡ γῆ σκνῖπα,  
 ἀντὶ δὲ ἐνύδρων ἐξηρεύξατο ὁ ποταμὸς πληθὺς βατράχων.  
*For they still remembered their experiences as resident aliens,  
 how the earth produced gnats instead of natural animals  
 whereas the river spewed lots of frogs out instead of aquatic animals.*

(b) is an allusion to Ex 8.12-14 and (c) to ib. 8.1-3.

<sup>13</sup> The Ethpeel of this verb is missing in *SL*. שָׁנָה אֲתִרְעִי probably means ‘and like horses they grazed.’

<sup>14</sup> After a detailed survey of diverse analyses Larcher (1061f.) falls back on a conventional view with “Ils furent comme des chevaux conduits au pâturage.”

<sup>15</sup> Then we would not need to see an instance of εἰς being loosely used in lieu of ἐν in πᾶν γένος κτηνῶν καὶ ὀρνέων ἐνέμοντο εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκεῖνο ‘every kind of cattle and birds was roaming into that mountain’ Hermas, *Shepherd*, *Sim.* 9.1.8.

<sup>16</sup> So does Fichtner (68). Grimm (1837.373) prefers the Pres. as an expression of “etwas auf dem Zuge durch die Wüste Fortgehendes und Gegenwärtiges.”

<sup>17</sup> So Larcher (1063), though his translation reads: “toi qui les délivrais” (1045). Incidentally, his remark that αἰνέω used here is also found in a song sung after the crossing of the Red Sea: ἤσεν Ex 15.1, where ed. Göttingen does note a v.l. ἤνεσεν, but ἤσεν is a form of ἔδω. So in Ps 105.12 also mentioned by Larcher. Cf. Scarpat (III 311): “.. che li avevi salvati.”

ζῶων .. σκνῖπα] Some translations present a problem. Thus “cattle .. lice” (Holmes, Rider, Winston, Lane) and “non d’êtres vivants .. moustiques” (BJ), sim. 𐤀 𐤁𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤍 .. 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏, and 𐤍 𐤁𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤍 𐤁𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤍 .. 𐤁𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤍 ‘animals .. creeping animals and reptiles.’ Does ζῶων ever mean ‘cattle’? And σκνίψ ‘louse’? Besides γενέσεως ζῶων is too generic to be rendered with a word signifying some specific species or type of animal.<sup>18</sup> Ἐξήγαγεν and ἐξηρεύσατο are parallel to each other, sharing the same prefix, ἐκ ‘out of.’ Hence we assume that what emerges out of the earth is parallel to what emerges out of the river. This parallelism also speaks against considering ζῶων as referring to cattle. A newly born cow emerging out of the ground is utterly implausible.

σκνῖπα] In every one of its seven occurrences in LXX of this substantive there are manuscript variations between -νιφ- and -νιπ-.

- 19.11) ἐφ’ ὑστέρω δὲ εἶδον καὶ νέαν γένεσιν ὀρνέων,  
ὅτε ἐπιθυμία προαχθέντες ἡτήσαντο ἐδέσματα τρυφῆς·

*Later, however, they saw a new emergence of birds as well,  
when, urged by appetite, they asked for luxurious foods.*

The verse is an allusion to Ex 16.11-13, and see also Nu 11.18, 31-33.

ἐφ’ ὑστέρω] a phrase that is unknown prior to Wi.

ὀρνέων] Pace Fichtner (68) this cannot be an objective genitive, for γένεσις is derived from an intransitive verb, γίνομαι.

προαχθέντες] 𐤍 𐤂𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤍 ‘they became desirous beforehand’; the translator assigned a temporal value to the prefix προ- as in 18.21.

ἐδέσματα τρυφῆς] Pace Winston we have no case of Hebraism here, but a genitive of quality so common in Greek, e.g. γογγυσμὸν πονηρίας ‘evil grumble’ Si 46.7, where a Hebrew MS reads דבב רעה, not דבב רעה; more examples are mentioned in SSG § 22 v (xvi).

- 19.12) εἰς γὰρ παραμυθίαν ἀνέβη αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ὀρτυγομήτρα.

*For to (their) relief quails came up for them from the sea.*

Here we have an allusion to Ex 16.13 and Nu 11.31.

παραμυθίαν] On this rare (only twice) LXX lexeme, see παραμύθιον, a hapax, at 3.18 above.

ὀρτυγομήτρα] see above at 16.2.

<sup>18</sup> According to Scarpata (III 318) γένεσις here is “una perifrasi per il semplice <animali>,” which does not convince. Cf. “durch die natürliche Zeugung von Tieren” (Hübner 223).

- 19.13) Καὶ αἱ τιμωρίαι τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς ἐπῆλθον  
οὐκ ἄνευ τῶν προγεγονότων τεκμηρίων τῇ βίᾳ τῶν κεραυνῶν·  
δικαίως γὰρ ἔπασχον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐτῶν πονηρίαις,  
καὶ γὰρ χαλεπωτέραν μισοξενίαν ἐπετήδευσαν.

*And the punishments came down on the sinners  
not without advance signals with powerful thunderbolts,  
for they were justly suffering on account of their own evils,  
for they went about very grievous xenophobia.*

τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς] a dativus incommodi, although <ἐπέρχεσθαι τινα> can indicate, albeit once only, something welcome happening to someone: ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου, ἵνα ἐπέλθῃ σοι εὐλογία παρ' αὐτοῦ 'By deed and word honour your father, so that a blessing from him may come your way' Si 3.8.<sup>19</sup>

κεραυνῶν] a catastrophe not mentioned in the biblical account, but found in a description by Josephus: βρονταὶ σκληραὶ .. κεραυνοὶ 'violent thunders .. and thunderbolts' *Antiq.* 2.16.3.

ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐτῶν πονηρίαις] The use of ἴδιος here is distinct from an instance such as ἰδίῳ τάχει 18.14, where it is equivalent to τῇ τάχει αὐτῆς. Here in conjunction with αὐτῶν it emphasises that the blame lies directly at their door.

χαλεπωτέραν] Up to vs. 17, as stated by Sekine (1977.360), the author is most likely envisaging the history on Sodomites (Gn 19), though without mentioning them explicitly, it is not certain that the general readership could take that hint.<sup>20</sup> Hence Fichtner's (68) "besonders starker Fremdenhaß"<sup>21</sup> is reasonable, a comparative with the value of relative,<sup>22</sup> on which see *SSG* § 23 **ba**.

ἐπετήδευσαν] Combined with τι also in τί ἐτι καλὸν ἐπιτηδεύσεις ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου τοῦ ζητῆσαι ἀγάπῃσιν; Je 2.33.

- 19.14) οἱ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας οὐκ ἐδέχοντο παρόντας·  
οὗτοι δὲ εὐεργέτας ξένους ἐδουλοῦντο.

*For whilst they would not welcome ignorant new arrivals,  
these would make slaves of beneficial foreign residents.*

(a) most likely refers to Sodomites; see on vs. 13 above. However, in the source text we read **ח** מֵאֵל לְהַחֲדִישׁ יְהוָה וְיִשְׁמְרֵם וְיִשְׁמְרֵם וְיִשְׁמְרֵם **ו** οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι

<sup>19</sup> This example could be added in *GELS* s.v. ἐπέρχομαι **3 a**, where Is 32.15 with a heavenly spirit (πνεῦμα) occurs as the *s*, though with ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

<sup>20</sup> Let it be noted that μισοξενία is a hapax unknown prior to Wi.

<sup>21</sup> Sim. "eines besonders heftigen Fremdenhasses" (Siegfried 506). Cf. "den schlimmsten Fremdenhass" (*SD*) and "la pitié des haines à l'égard de l'étranger" (*BJ*).

<sup>22</sup> Thus *pace* Reider 221: "a harsher hatred of strangers."



οἱ ἐν Σοδομοῖς πονηροὶ καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ σφόδρα Gn 13.13, which presents quite a distinct perspective.

οἱ μὲν] The definite article immediately followed by μὲν or δέ functions as equivalent to a third person personal pronoun; see *GELS* s.v. ὁ **IV** and *SSG* § 1 **a**.

ἀγνοοῦντας] probably a reference to Abram and Lot's initial ignorance of the language and culture of Sodom. Holmes' (567) "strangers" is probably due to the assumed parallelism with ἄλλοτριους in vs. 15. So *GELS* s.v. ἀγνοέω **3 c**. However, the word is unlikely to mean "to be unknown." In CG such a sense is confined to the passive transformation as in ἀγνοεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ὅπη ποτὲ ὀρθῶς ἔχει 'it is unknown to most people' Pl. *Euthphr.* 4a.<sup>23</sup>

ἐδέχοντο .. ἐδουλοῦντο] both Imperfects referring to longstanding hostile attitudes, and not one-off actions.

ξένους] On this adjective, see above at 16.2.

19.15) καὶ οὐ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἢ τις ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται αὐτῶν,  
ἐπεὶ ἀπεχθῶς προσεδέχοντο τοὺς ἄλλοτριους·

*And not only that, but there will be a punitive action against them,  
because they received the foreigners with much hatred.*

This is a rather difficult verse for interpreters.<sup>24</sup> The initial οὐ μόνον probably implies an additional comment on the Sodomites. Hence, in vs. 14 the author was rather kind towards the Sodomites, but sometimes in the future they would not be treated as totally innocent. However, (15b) can scarcely be a ground and reason for it, but it appears to be directed at the Egyptians.

ἀλλ' ἢ] This may be used to introduce a parenthetical qualifying statement, *GELS* s.v. ἀλλά **4 d**, e.g. ἀλλ' ἢ γνόντες γνώσεσθε (חַי וְעַד עַד יָא) ὅτι .. 'only, you ought to know very well that ..' Je 33.15.<sup>25</sup>

ἐπισκοπὴ] As a verbal noun of ἐπισκοπέω, this lexeme can indicate a favourable, desirable action as in ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ 'His concern is for His chosen ones' Wi 3.9, but it is also applied at times to a punitive action as in ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀπολοῦνται Je 10.15.

Note § for (b): אֲנִי לֹא חָפְזִים לְהַנְחִיחַ אֶת הַנִּזְכָּרִים 'because they were not willing to leave foreigners alone.'

<sup>23</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. ἀγνοέω **I**.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Goodrick 1913.372, where he writes "Our business is to translate and explain the text as we have it," but a glance at critical editions of Wi shows discrepancies among them, e.g. Swete's ἢ for Ziegler's ἢ. Engel (1998.303f.) argues for ἄλλη τις "eine andere" (*SD*).

<sup>25</sup> Da 10.21 TH ought to be deleted in *GELS* loc. cit.



- 19.16) οἱ δὲ μετὰ ξορτασμάτων  
εἰσδεξάμενοι τοὺς ἤδη τῶν αὐτῶν μετεσχηκότας δικαίων  
δεινοῖς ἐκάκωσαν πόνοις.

*They, however, in spite of having welcomed them with a luxurious reception,  
treated harshly with awesome pains those who had obtained the  
same rights.*

εἰσδεξάμενοι τοὺς ἤδη τῶν αὐτῶν μετεσχηκότας] Our author would of course know that, being treated with a gorgeous dinner, the just arrived hungry guests did not know yet that their host was their youngest brother.

εἰσδεξάμενοι .. μετεσχηκότας] Pace Reider's "Welcoming them that already shared the same rights," it sounds more logical to assume that the Aor. participle indicates what happened early on in the Israelites' residence in Egypt and the Pf. participle indicates a situation that would emerge subsequently after a period of interactions between the two parties.

In § we hear a message of its own: **וְהָיוּ לְהַעֲבָדִים לְעֹלָם** 'they, however, had joyously received those on whose account they received punishment because they had treated them harshly with hard labour.'

- 19.17) ἐπλήγησαν δὲ καὶ ἄορασία  
ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι ἐπὶ ταῖς τοῦ δικαίου θύραις,  
ὅτε ἀχανεῖ περιβληθέντες σκότει  
ἕκαστος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ θυρῶν τὴν δίοδον ἐζήτει.

*They were also stricken with blindness  
as the others (were) at the doors of the righteous,  
when, engulfed with wide-open darkness,  
each was searching a way-out through one's own doors.*

If the source text of the verse is Gn 19, the author's creative imagination played quite a role here. 'Εκεῖνοι would then be a reference to Sodomites as in § **וְהָיוּ לְהַעֲבָדִים לְעֹלָם**.

ἄορασία] Pace Reider (221) ἄορασία is attested already in Polybius 12.25g.4.

τοῦ δικαίου] Most likely a reference to Lot.

τῶν ἑαυτοῦ θυρῶν] a loosely used possessive genitive: 'a way-out accessible through one's own door.'

- 19.18) Δι' ἑαυτῶν γὰρ τὰ στοιχεῖα μεθαρμοζόμενα,  
ὥσπερ ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ φθόγγοι τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα διαλλάσσουσιν,  
πάντοτε μένοντα ἤχῳ,  
ὅπερ ἐστὶν εἰκάσαι ἐκ τῆς τῶν γεγονότων ὄψεως ἀκριβῶς·

*For the elements adapt themselves to a new order,  
just as with a harp notes of a rhythm change names,  
though remaining always unchanged in sound,  
what can be accurately inferred by observing what has emerged.*

μεθαρμολόμενα] As against CG the predicative use of a participle in lieu of a finite verb is rather common in SG.<sup>26</sup> The author is plausibly thinking of the creation of the universe as in 7.17,<sup>27</sup> though the selection of the present participle seems to indicate a generic observation not confined to a particular event in history.

τὸ ὄνομα] It appears to us the most natural to take the word in its usual sense of ‘name,’ for each of the notes had its own name. Thus *pace* “nature” (Larcher, *NETS*), “character” (Holmes, Reider), “Art” (Fichter, Siegfried), “Melodie” (*SD*).<sup>28</sup>

μένοντα] In the selection of the neut. pl. form the author may have been misled by τὰ στοιχεῖα; in agreement with φθόγγοι it should have read μένοντες.

ἔστιν εἰλάσαι] an instance of < εἰμί + inf. > indicating possibility; for details on this syntactic feature in SG, see *SSG* § 30 *bec*, esp. p. 350.

(d) in *Š* is rather obscure: דְּאִתְּוּהִי דְּמִוּתָא דְּתַחֲוּיָתָא דְּאִפָּא דְּאִלִּין דְּהוּי בְּשָׂרָא ‘which is a form of the manifestation of the face of those things which were in truth.’

19.19) χερσαῖα γὰρ εἰς ἔνυδρα μετεβάλλετο,  
καὶ νηκτὰ μετέβαινεν ἐπὶ γῆς·

*For land animals changed to aquatic ones,  
and swimmers landed on the earth.*

μετεβάλλετο .. μετέβαινεν] The selection of the Impf. is felicitous, indicating occasional happenings, not what happened once for all.

With אֶרֶצָא גֵיר בִּירְתָא מְתַפְפָּא הָת לְאִנְמָא וְרַחֲשָׂא מְהֵלַךְ הָוָא עַל אֶרֶצָא ‘for a barren land was turning into a meadow and a creeping animal was walking on the land’ was the translator of *Š* an urban scholar?

19.20) πῦρ ἰσχυεν ἐν ὕδατι τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως,  
καὶ ὕδωρ τῆς σβεστικῆς φύσεως ἐπελανθάνετο·

*Fire was becoming stronger than its own strength (even) in the water,  
and water was forgetting its extinguishing property.*

<sup>26</sup> For details, see *SSG* § 31 *g - ge*.

<sup>27</sup> So “the elements changed places” (*NETS*), sim. Holmes, Winston, and *BJ*.

<sup>28</sup> How could one justify “les sons changent de rythme” (*BJ*)?

τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως] a rare instance of the gen. of comparison used with an adjectival verb.<sup>29</sup> Cf. “Feuer wuchs im Wasser über seine Kraft hinaus” (Fichtner 70) with a f.n. “Wörtlich „wurde stärker als seine (normale) Kraft“.”<sup>30</sup> **ש** appears to be struggling in its own way: **הָלַךְ בְּמִצָּתָהּ** ‘fire was capable of overcoming in this water of its own strength,’ with which cp. **וַיִּתְּנֵהּ בַּמַּיָּם וְלֹא בָרָא** ‘and fire was inflamed in water and it was not burning with its strength and water, with its strength, was quenching fire.’

For the message of this verse, cf. 16.17.

19.21) φλόγες ἀνάπαλιν εὐφθάρτων ζῶων  
οὐκ ἐμάραναν σάρκας ἐμπεριπατούντων,  
οὐδ’ ἔτηκον κρυσταλλοειδὲς εὖτηκτον γένος ἀμβροσίας τροφῆς.  
*Flames, on the contrary, when perishable animals  
roamed around, did not cause (their) flesh to wither  
nor cause crystal-like, easily melting kind(s) of divinely excellent food  
to melt away.*

ζῶων .. ἐμπεριπατούντων] This can be a normal possessive genitive subordinate to σάρκα, and does not have to be a genitive absolute.

For the message of this verse, cf. 16.18.

Note (c) in **ש**: **וְלֹא אֶתְפָּשֶׁר בְּאֵפִי בְרָדָא מְחַבֵּל פֶּאֶרָא** ‘the hail stones, the destroyer of fruits, did not melt away.’

19.22) Κατὰ πάντα γάρ, κύριε, ἐμεγάλυνας τὸν λαόν σου καὶ ἐδόξασας  
καὶ οὐχ ὑπερεῖδες ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ καὶ τόπῳ παριστάμενος.  
*For in every matter You, o Lord, magnified and glorified Your people,  
and You did not overlook (them) at any time and at any place, standing  
(by them).*

παριστάμενος] With **עֲדַת אֲנֹנִי** ‘You helped them’ **ש** specifies the purpose of God’s presence. Analogously **לְמַקֵּם** ‘to stand’ has a gloss in the margin: **לְמַעַדְרָא** ‘to help.’

<sup>29</sup> Cf. SSG § 22 a, esp. pp. 117f. and § 23 d. With “.. kept the mastery of its own power” (Holmes 568), “.. had control” (Reider 223), “retained” (Winston 330), and “verfügte über ..” (SD) these scholars are presumably thinking of the common use of a verb such as κρατέω as in καὶ κρατήσῃ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ χρυσίου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἀργυρίου Da 11.43 LXX. However, no instance of ἰσχύω τινος in the sense of ‘to keep master, hold under control’ is to be found in BG or elsewhere. See also above at 7.8.

<sup>30</sup> Sim. Siegfried (507): “.. ward stärker an Kraft.”

## APPENDIX

### HAPAX LEGOMENA<sup>1</sup>

ἀβλαβής [2x], ἀδόκητος, ἀδόλως, αἰρετής\*, ἀκαταμάχητος\*, ἀκηλίδωτος\* [2x], ἀκοίμητος, ἀκοινώνητος, ἀκώλυτος, ἄλυσις, ἀμάραντος, ἀμβρόσιος, ἀμείδητος\*, ἀμέριμνος [2x], ἀμνηστία [2x], ἄμοιρος, ἀμόλυντος, ἄμορφος, ἄμυνα, ἀμφιλαφής, ἀνάδυσις, ἀναλόγως, ἀνάπαλιν, ἀναποδισμός, ἀνατυπόω, ἀνεκλιπής\* [2x], ἀνελπίστως, ἀνεξικακία, ἀνόμοιος, ἀντανακλάω, ἀντήχέω, ἀντιπαρέρχομαι, ἀνυπόκριτος [2x], ἀνώνυμος, ἀπαύγασμα\*, ἀπεΐκασμα, ἀπηνής [2x], ἀπιστία, ἄπνοος, ἀπόβλημα [2x], ἀπολογία, ἀπόρροια, ἀπότομος [5x], ἀποτόμως, ἀταξία, ἀτέλεστος [2x], αὐθέντης, αὐτοσχεδῖος, ἀφεγγής, ἄφθαρτος [2x], ἀφθόνως, ἀχανής, ἀψευδής, βλάβη, βραβεύω, βραχυτελής, βρίθω, γενεσιάρχης\*, γενεσιουργός, γενέτις\*, γεώδης [2x], δεῖμα, δεκαμηνιαῖος\*, δημότης, διάγνωσις, διασκιρτάω\*, διαστράπτω\*, διατυπώω, διαφαίνομαι, διέπω [2x], διερευνάω [2x], δίεςις, διήκω, διῖπταμαι, διόλλυμι [2x], διορθωτής\*, δυσάλυκτος, δυσδιήγητος, ἐγκεντρίζω, εἰδέχθεια\*, εἰρκτή, ἔκβασις [3x], ἐκδειματόω, ἐκλαμπρος\*, ἐκπρίω, ἐκσοβέω, ἐμμανής, ἐμμελέτημα, ἐναλλαγή, ἐξαπολύμι, ἐόρτασμα\*, ἐπευθυμέω, ἐπικουρία, ἐπιμίξ, ἐπίμοχθος, ἐπιorkία, ἐπισφαλῶς, ἐπίτασις, ἐπιτιμία, ἐπιτυχία, ἐργατεία\*, ἔρρευνα, ἐρυθαίνω, εὐάρεστος [2x], εὐδράνεια\*, εὐεργετικός, εὐθραυστος, εὐκίνητος [2x], εὐκύκλος, εὐμαθῶς, εὐμελής, εὐμενῶς, εὖστοχος, εὐτελής [4x], εὐτηκτος, εὐφθαρτος, ἐφύβριστος, ἡμερώω, ἡμίθνητος, ἦτοι, θειότης, θερμότης, θυμῆρης, ἰδίως, ἰοβόλος, κακόμοχθος\*, κακοπραγία, κάλυξ, καταβάσιος\*, καταδαπανάω, καταλάμπω, καταλύτης, κατάχρεος, κατηφής, κινητικός, κνώδαλον [3x], κοιλότης, κόρυς, κράτησις\*, κρατύνω, κρυσταλλοειδής, κτύπος, λειμών, λοχάω, λυθρώδης\*, μαγικός, μεθαρμόζω, μηδαμόθεν, μισοξενία\*, μόσχευμα, μυριότης\*, μύστης, μύστις, μυχός [2x], νεόκτιστος, νηκτός, νηπιοκτόνος\*, νοερός [2x], νοθεύω, νουθεσία, ξενιτεία\*, ὄζος, πανεθνεῖ, πανεπίσκοπος, πανηγυρισμός\*, πανοπλία, παντοδύναμος\* [3x], παντοτρόφος, παραίνεσις, παραμύθιον, παράφρων, πάρεδρος [2x], παρεμπίπτω, Πεντάπολις, περίειμι, περικομπέω\*, περιζύω, περιτρέπω, πηλουργός, πολύφροντις, πορίζω, πορισμός [2x], προαδικέω, προαναμέλω\*, προγινώσκω [3x], προδοσία [2x], προκρίνω, προλαμβάνω, προμαχέω, προμηνύω, προσαναπαύω, προσαναπληρώω, προσοδύρομαι\*,

<sup>1</sup> An asterisk, \*, is added to words which are not attested in documents written earlier than Wi.

προϋφίστημι, πρύτανις, πρωτόπλαστος\* [2x], ῥεμβασμός\*, σκιαγράφος, σπιλόω, σπλαγχνοφάγος, σπουδαίως, στέφω, συγγυμνασία\*, συγγνωστός [2x], συμβίωσις [3x], συμφύω, συνεκτρίβω, συνολκή, σφήξ, σωρηδόν, σωφρόνως, ταρσός, τάχα [2x], τεκνοφόνος\*, τεχνάομαι, τεχνῖτις [3x], τρόπις, ὕλοτόμος, φευκτός, φιλοτιμία, φιλόψυχος, φλοιός, φρικτῶς\*, φυλακίζω\*, χαῦνος, χειμέριος, χλοηφόρος, χρηστῶς

\* 36x

Total hapax 228 (335, Clarke [maybe quoting from Reese or counting actual frequencies of those which occur in Wi more than once] 7 and Reese 3; neither offers a list of the lexemes, though Reese, f.n. 6 says “all statistic about Wis are based on personal research and the total vocabulary is said to be 1734 words”; difficult to decide who is right).

Hapax: not only lexemes, but also their ways of use, syntagmatics, senses, morphology should be noted with lexemes of reasonable frequency and phraseology, e.g. ἐφ’ ὅστέρῳ 19.11.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AITKEN, J.K. and E. MATUSOVA. 2021. "The Wisdom of Solomon," pp. 599-616 in W. KYNES (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Wisdom and the Bible*. Oxford.
- ALBRECHT, A. 2015. *Die Weisheit Salomos*. Übersetzt und eingeleitet. Göttingen.
- BAUERNFELD, O. 1964. "ἀρετή," pp. I 457-61 in *TDNT*.
- BdA* = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Paris, 1986-.
- BDAG = BAUER, W., W. ARNDT, F.W. GINGRICH, and F.W. DANKER. <sup>2</sup>1979. *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. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* etc. Oxford (and its subsequent reprints).
- BDF = BLASS, F., A. DEBRUNNER and R.W. FUNK. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* etc. Chicago • London.
- BERGK, Th. 1867. *Poetae lyriici graeci* III. Leipzig.
- BERGSON, L. 1960. *Zur Stellung des Adjektivs in der älteren griechischen Prosa. Die Motive der Voran- bzw. Nachstellung in ihren Hauptzügen*. Stockholm.
- BJ* = *La sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'école biblique de Jérusalem*. Paris, 1961.
- BUSTO SAIZ, J.R. 1991. "The meaning of Wisdom 2:9a," pp. 355-59 in C.E. COX (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Atlanta, GA.
- CLARKE, E.G. 1973. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge.
- COLLINS, J.J. 1993. *Daniel: a Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis, MN.
- DEANE, W.J. 1881. *Σοφία Σαλωμων, The Book of Wisdom*. Oxford.
- DEISSMANN, G.A. 1895. *Bibelstudien*. Marburg.
- DENNISTON, J.D. <sup>2</sup>1950. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.
- ENGEL, H. 1998. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. Stuttgart.
- . 2011. Pp. 2127-57 in *SD Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, Bd II. Stuttgart.
- EYNIKEL, E. and K. HAUSPIE. 2004. "The use of δράκων in the Septuagint," pp. 126-35 in B. TAYLOR et al. (eds), *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography* [Fsch. F.W. Danker]. Grand Rapids, MI.
- FICHTNER, J. 1938. *Weisheit Salomos*. HZAT II 6. Tübingen.
- FREEDMAN, D.N. 1978. "The real story of the Ebla tablets: Ebla and the cities of the plain," *Biblical Archaeologist* 41.143-64.
- FRITZSCHE, O.F. 1871. *Libri apocryphi veteris testamenti graece*. Leipzig.
- GBS = GWILLIAM, G.H., F.C. BURKITT and J.F. STENNING. 1896. *Biblical and Patristic Relics of the Palestinian Syriac Literature from Mss. in the Bodleian Library and in the Library of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai*. Oxford.
- GELS* = MURAOKA 2009.
- GILBERT, M. 1973. *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13-15)*. AB 53. Rome.
- . 1976. "La conjecture μετριότητι en Sg 12,22a," *Bib.* 57.550-3.
- GINZBERG, L. 1909. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia.
- GOODRICK, A.T.S. 1913. *The Book of Wisdom*. Rivingtons.

- GRIMM, C.L.W. 1837. *Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit*. Leipzig.  
 —. 1860. *Das Buch der Weisheit erklärt*. Leipzig.  
 GUTMANN, M. 1841. *Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments*. Altona.  
 GUTMANN, Y. 1958-63. הספרות היהודית-הלניסטית (*The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature*), 2 vols. Jerusalem.  
 HADAS, M. 1962. "Wisdom of Solomon," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4.861a-63b. Nashville, TN.  
 HANHART, R. 2014. *Paralipomena Liber II*. Göttingen.  
 HEINISCH, P. 1912. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. EHZA 24. Münster.  
 HELBING, R. 1907. *Grammatik der Septuaginta: Laut- und Wortlehre*. Göttingen.  
 —. 1928. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta*. Göttingen.  
 HOLMES, S. 1913. "The Wisdom of Solomon," pp. 518-68 in R.H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Vol. 1. Oxford.  
 HUMBERT, J. 1960. *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.  
 HÜBNER, H. 1999. *Die Weisheit Salomons*. Göttingen.  
 JENNINGS, W. 1926. *Lexicon to the Syriac New Testament*. Oxford.  
 אברהם כהנא. 1978. *הספרים החיצונים*, vol. I. Jerusalem.  
 KAIBEL, G. 1878. *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin.  
 KG = KÜHNER, R. and B. GERTH. <sup>3</sup>1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. II 1. Hannover • Leipzig.  
 KITTEL, G. 1964-76. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Tr. from German, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI.  
 KOOLJ, A. VAN DER. 2020. "Servant or Slave: The Various Equivalents of Hebrew 'Ebed in the Old Greek of Isaiah," pp. 259-71 in E. BONS et al. (eds), *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*. Tübingen.  
 KUHN, G. 1931. "Exegetische und textkritische Anmerkungen zum Buche der Weisheit," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 103.445-52.  
 LAMPE, G.W.H. 1961-68. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. 5 vols. Oxford.  
 LARCHER, C. 1983-85. *Le livre de la sagesse ou la sagesse de Salomon*. 3 vols. Paris.  
 LEH = LUST, J., E. EYNIKEL and K. HAUSPIE. 2003. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart.  
 LICHT, J.Sh. 1968. "ספרים חיצונים וגנוזים .. חכמת שלמה," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 5.113f.  
 LIEBERMAN, S. 1950. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York.  
 MARGOLIOUTH, D.S. 1890. "Was the Book of Wisdom written in Hebrew?," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* N.S. 22.263-97.  
 MAURER, C. 1977. On σύντοιδα and συνείδησις in TDNT 7.898-919.  
 MAYSER, E. 1926-34. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Band II, Satzlehre. Berlin • Leipzig.  
 MAZZINGHI, L. 2016. "The style of the book of Wisdom," pp. 386-92 in E. BONS and J. JOOSTEN (eds), *Die Sprache der Septuaginta: The Language of the Septuagint*. Gütersloh.  
 MM = MOULTON, J.H. and G. MILLIGAN. 1930. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*. London.  
 MÜLLER-KESSLER, Ch. and M. SOKOLOFF. 1997. *A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Vol. I. Groningen.  
 MURAOKA, T. 1975. "Purpose or result? ὥστε in Biblical Greek," *NT* 15.205-19.  
 —. 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden.

- . 1992. "Biblical Hebrew philological notes (2)," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15.43-54.
- . 2005. "Apports de la LXX dans notre compréhension de l'hébreu et du grec et de leur vocabulaire," pp. 57-68 in J. JOOSTEN and Ph. DE MOIGNE (eds), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'antiquité*. Paris.
- . <sup>2</sup>2005a. *Classical Syriac, a Basic Grammar with a Chrestomathy*. PLO 19. Wiesbaden.
- . 2008. "Septuagint lexicography and Hebrew etymology," pp. 463-69 in A. VOITILA and J. JOKIRANTA (eds), *Scripture in Transition* [Fschr. R. Sollamo]. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven.
- . 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven.
- . 2020. *Why Read the Bible in the Original Languages?* Leuven.
- . 2022a. *The Community Rule IQS, IQSa, and IQSb*. OLA 308. Leuven.
- . 2022b. *The Books of Hosea and Micah in Hebrew and Greek*. OBO 294. Leuven.
- . 2023. *Wisdom of Ben Sira*. OBO 302. Leuven.
- ND = *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. 1-10. Macquarie University • Grand Rapids.
- NETS = A. PIETERSMA and B.G. WRIGHT (eds). 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* etc. New York • Oxford.
- New Documents* = *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, since 1981, published by Macquarie University, Australia.
- OSBORNE, J. 1931. "ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ," *JThSt* 32.167-79.
- PAESLACK, M. 1954. "Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte der Wörter φιλεῖν 'lieben', φιλία 'Liebe', 'Freundschaft', φίλος 'Freund' in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament (unter Berücksichtigung ihrer Beziehungen zu ἀγαπᾶν, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός)," *Theologia viatorum* V.51-142.
- PAYNE SMITH, R. 1879-1901. *Thesaurus syriacus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- PREISIGKE, F. et al. 1925-91. *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten*. 4 vols. Berlin • Amsterdam • Wiesbaden.
- RAHLFS, A. (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart.
- REESE, J.M. 1965. "Plan and structure in the Book of Wisdom," *CBQ* 27.391-99.
- . 1970. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences*. AB 41. Rome.
- REIDER, J. 1957. *The Book of Wisdom*. New York.
- RISBERG, B. 1913. "Textkritische und exegetische Anmerkungen zur Weisheit Salomos," *ZAW* 33.206-21.
- SASSE, H. 1964. "αἰών," in KITTEL 1964-76, vol. 1.197-209.
- SCARPAT, G. 1989-99. *Libro della Sapienza*. 3 vols. Brescia.
- SCHREINER, J. 1972. "Ἀντί in der Septuaginta," pp. 171-76 in id. (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zur Septuaginta* [Fschr. J. Ziegler]. Würzburg.
- SCHULTHESS, F. 1903. *Lexicon syropalaestinum*. Berlin.
- SCHWYZER, E. <sup>2</sup>1950-53. *Griechische Grammatik*. 3 vols. München.
- SD = *Septuaginta Deutsch*.
- SEKINE, M. 1977. "Wisdom of Solomon," pp. 13-65, 341-360 in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha with an Introduction and Notes in Japanese*, vol. 2. Tokyo.
- SIEGFRIED, K. 1900. "Die Weisheit Salomos," pp. 476-507 in E. KAUTZSCH, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Bd. I. Tübingen.



- SL = BROCKELMANN, C. and M. SOKOLOFF. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon*. Winona Lake, IN • Piscataway, NJ.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 2014. *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Leuven.
- SOLLAMO, R. 1979. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki.
- SSG = MURAOKA 2016.
- TDNT = G. FRIEDRICH (ed.). 1977. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols. Tr. and ed. G.W. BROMILEY. Grand Rapids, MI.
- THACKERAY, H. St J. 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge.
- TRENCH, R.Ch. <sup>9</sup>1880. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London.
- TURNER, N. 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. III, Syntax. Edinburgh.
- VANHOYE, A. 1962. "Mesure ou démesure en Sag. XII, 22," *RecSR* 50.530-37.
- VOSTÉ, J.-M. 1949. "La version syro-hexaplaire de la Sagesse," *Bibl.* 30.213-17.
- WINSTON, D. 1979. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City, NY.
- ZIEGLER, J. 1937. *Dulcedo dei: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der griechischen und lateinischen Bibel*. Münster i. W.
- , ed. 1962. *Sapientia Salomonis*. Göttingen.

## 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 Himmelskuh. 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 Utzschneider 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, Entsöhnung 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-lässigte 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 Sass 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. + XXVI 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 Nehemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nehemias*, 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 Rollsiegel 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 Ägyptens*, 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 Satyr 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., *Edipe 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<sub>(S)</sub>-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 Qeiyafa 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 Wasserman 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.
- 302 Muraoka T., *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 2023, XIV-807 p.
- 303 Münger S., Rahn N., Wyssmann P. (eds), „Trinkt von dem Wein, den ich mischte!“ *“Drink of the Wine which I have Mingled!” Festschrift für Silvia Schroer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2023, XII-632 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 Transjordanien 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-Ḥamīdiya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaraş zur Zeit der Archive von Mari<sub>(2)</sub> 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-Ḥamīdiya 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 Perserzeit*, 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 Perserzeit. 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 Perserzeit. 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 Perserzeit. 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 Perserzeit. 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.



