



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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTES TO SIRACH XLIII. 20 AND XL. 12.

צינת רוח צפון ישיב וכרקב יקפיא מקורו

DR. TAYLOR'S interpretation of this passage (in the *JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, X, 471 sq.) has the advantage that it does justice to the text without any alterations or conjectures. But the proof that the LXX took the word רִקֵב in Job xiii. 28 to mean "skin-bottle," does not alter the fact that the word was misunderstood in that passage, and that it is an Aramaic word which Sirach would not have used, because it does not occur in holy writ. But apart from this, the possibility of the word having been used by Sirach in that sense is disproved by the incongruity of the expression. You can collect liquids in a skin-bottle, but you cannot make them freeze to it.

All other attempts to explain the passage are objectionable because they attribute most incongruous similes to the poet, besides having recourse to violent alterations of the text. The reading is correct beyond doubt, even Smend has nothing to say against its accuracy. Bacher's suggestion to read וּכְרִיקֵי (J. Q. R., IX, p. 552) is inadmissible, because the alteration is gratuitous, and the simile would become improbable. Schlatter, p. 48, inserts his conjecture וּכְ[חֵל]ב into the text; but it is just the passage in Job x. 10 which proves that Sirach would not have employed the congelation of milk as a metaphor of the power of the frost which hardens all water. Nöldeke conjectures from the Greek translator that these must have been וּכְקֶרֶח in his copy. But the absence of any particle of comparison in *καὶ παγήσεται κρύσταλλα ἀφ' ὕδατος* proves that there was no כ in his text. I am of opinion that he had an abbreviated word in his text, namely וּכְרִק', of which he made וּכְרִקֵת instead of וּכְרִקֵב, and which he translated *κρύσταλλος* (cf. Israel Levi in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXIV, 14). The passage must certainly not be translated *et comme se durcit la boue*, both the words and the metaphor are against it¹.

¹ Isr. Levi, *L'Écclesiastique*, Paris, 1898, p. 75.

The phenomenon which Sirach wishes to describe is the sudden metamorphosis of the liquid into the solid state, the moveable into the rigid. It is therefore necessary that the metaphor he would employ should be something symbolizing firmness and hardness. It is known how easily a ך is sometimes misread for a ך in Hebrew writing, and this at once disposes in our passage of all that the metaphor demands. God causes the cold north wind to blow, and he causes the springs¹ to become rigid like a winepress—**וּכְיָקֵב**. The icy surface of the spring resembles the smooth, hard bottom of the vat of the winepress. The springs, which formerly moved joyfully between their banks, have now become like so many winepresses by the frost of the north wind. The striking aptitude of the simile is obvious, and the probability of the suggestion is clear from a poetical point of view. But it is, besides, supported, firstly by the Greek translator, and secondly by several parallel cases in the Hebrew original. In the immediately following verse: **יָרִים מִיָּם יָרִים**, the translation runs: *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὕδατος καταλύσει*, the translator's copy had evidently had **יָרִים** which he misread as **יָרִים** = *καταλύσει*². Another obscure passage in Sirach also receives light from the assumption that the letters ך and ך were sometimes interchanged. The introduction to the description of the glorious rising of the sun has at its very beginning the following stumbling-block: **שָׁמֶשׁ מְבִיעַ בְּצֵרְתּוֹ בְּמָה**. It is true the marginal note **בְּצֵאָתוֹ** clears the way, but how can we explain the troublesome **בְּצֵרְתּוֹ** of the MS.? I think that one of the MSS., from which the various readings of our Sirach text took their origin, showed **בְּצֵיָתוֹ** instead of **בְּצֵאָתוֹ**, which again was turned into the enigmatical **בְּצֵרְתּוֹ**.

The letters ך and ך ought to be utilized as clues for the solution of several difficulties in the text of our translator. His translation of xxxix. 16 **יִסְפִּיק בְּעֵתוֹ צוּרְךָ** by *καὶ πᾶν πρόσταγμα ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ ἔσται* can be understood at the first glance. His text had the abbreviated written word **צוּר** which he misread as **צוּי** instead of completing it into **צוּרְךָ**. Again, in xl. 11 b **מֵרוֹם אֵל מֵרוֹם** was turned into *καὶ ἀπὸ ὑδάτων εἰς θάλασσαν ἀνακάμπει*: the case is simply that he misread **מֵ** אֵל **מֵ** for **מֵ** אֵל **מֵ** of his text. In the same way I see the reading of his text through the break in chapter xlii. 3 b. There **נִחְלָה וַיֵּשׁ** is rendered *κληρονομίας ἐταίρων*. Now, the ך was in all ancient MSS. usually written with only two heads when occurring at the end of a word, and was thus easily

¹ I assume that the original copy had **מְקוּרִי** which must be completed into **מְקוּרִי**.

² Cf. Levi, l. c. 74.

mistaken for a ϵ . The translator read ויע for ויש . A clinching proof for the frequent confusion of the two letters caused by the writing is afforded also by xlvi. 13 b, where נברא בשר is rendered $\text{καὶ ἐν κοιμήσει ἐπροφήτευσεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ}$: here it is evident that נבִיא was read for נברא .

This confusion of the vowel letters of the original text of Sirach was not of rare occurrence, especially of the letters י and ו , which were of almost identical shape in the old writing. We need only think of the substitution of ויוח for the tetragrammaton, where thus י and ו appear as quite identical. But I will add one other example which will solve a riddle of the Greek translation. Verse xl. 12 has not, unfortunately, been preserved in the Hebrew original. What then may have been the stumbling-block in the text by which the translator was tripped up? For such nonsense as $\text{πάν δῶρον καὶ ἀδικία ἐξαλειφθήσεται}$ cannot have been written by Sirach. Why should the gift be destroyed? How can the innocent gift be synonymous with injustice? I do not doubt but that the copy before the translator was written כל שו ושקר . Our poor Hebraist read this as כל שי ושקר ¹.

But the verse xliii. 20 is also syntactically unexceptionable. צינת רוח צפי is not bad Hebrew, certainly not as Isr. Levi, l. c. 74, assumes. Instead of the adjective—in this case the cold north wind—a substantive joined to the final word in *status constructus* is used, quite in accordance with a nice syntactic usage in Hebrew. Thus Genesis iii. 23, instead of a “flaming revolving sword” we have להט ההרב , and instead of the “fulminating weapon” we read in Nahum iii. 3 ברק חנית . So also here, instead of the “cold north wind” we have in unexceptionable Hebrew צינת רוח צפון .

Sirach keeps faithfully to Biblical Hebrew in other passages also. Thus, in xli. 3 he has $\text{אל תפחד ממות חוקין}$, quite after the pattern of הטריפני לחם חקי , Prov. xxx. 8. Strange enough, no translator has hitherto noticed this. In modern usage the verse says: “Do not be afraid of thy assured death.”

Altogether, Sirach is so full of biblical reminiscences, and applies quotations to such an extent, that passages from the Bible must be constantly referred to for the purpose of elucidating his tropes and expressions. Thus, he says, xliii. 20 c על כל מעמד מים , only because it reminds us of the expression על הרים יעמדו מים of Ps. civ. 6, a fact of some weight in the explanation and justification of an expression which may otherwise appear strange and questionable.

In the same way it seems to me that the expression xlii. 4 שלוה

¹ This disposes of Levi's explanation in *R. É. J.*, XXXIV, 43 sq.

שמש ידליק הרים, which the Variants prove to be the correct reading, is established by a Biblical reference. The *τριπλασίως* of the Greek translator, who is slavishly followed by the Syrian, is a desperate shift, which does not hold good against the readings שולה and שלוח. His copy had undoubtedly the abbreviation של', which he could not complete into anything except the unmeaning שלוש. But Sirach wrote without doubt שלוח, and intended to imitate therewith a classical passage of the Bible. He thought he was allowed to form an expression שלוח שמש in imitation of גֶּרֶשׁ יִרְחִים of Deut. xxxiii. 14. This parallel would secure the reading as meaning "the shooting out of the beams of the sun."

DAVID KAUFMANN.