

I U

THESIS FOR GRADUATION.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

or

THE WISDOM OF JESUS THE SON OF SIRACH

AND ITS RELATION TO THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

by

JULIUS HENRY MEYER

Mic. 5/79

[1897]

Preface.

It should be generally understood that the author claims no originality of thought in the following pages. His claim to originality might be in his method of treatment, but even here, he has been anticipated (as he afterwards learned) by another. The last chapter on the Relation existing between Ecclesiastical and Proverbs has, nowhere before been worked up in any sort of form, at least, as far as he knows.

The Author wishes to express his sincere thanks to Dr. I.M.Wise who suggested the subject to him and who kindly loaned him some necessary books for the carrying on of his work; and to Drs. Mielziner, Deutsch, Margolis and Prof.Feldman for the use of their private libraries, and for their valuable suggestions.

The text used in quotations is the Revised Version of

the Apocrypha issued at the University Press, Oxford. The following is a partial list of books that were examined during the preparation of this Thesis:

GUTMAN, M. Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, Altoona 1841.

SCHÜRER, E. The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ,
Scribner's 1896.

BISSELL, E. C. The Apocrypha in Lange's edition, also "Proverbs"
in same edition, Scribner's 1896.

REUSS, Edward. Gesch. des Alten Testaments, Braunschweig 1890.

GEÖRER, August. Philo, Stuttgart 1831.

^R

DÄHNE, A. F. Geschichtliche Darstellung der Jüdisch-Alexandr.
Religions-Philosophie, Halle 1834.

WILDEBOER, D. G. Origin of the Canon of the O. T. London 1895.
Literature of the Old Testament, Göttingen 1895.

JOEL, M. Blicke in die Religions-Gesch. Breslau 1880.

LOWTH, Robert. Hebrew Poetry, 1829.

CHEYNE, J. K. Job and Solomon, 1887.

BIGG, Ch. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 1886.

HERDER. Poetry of Hebrews.

EWALD. History of Israel.

Z A W XV Article by W. Frankenberg.

FRITZSCHE, O.F. Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach, 1859.

STANLEY. History of Jewish Church.

SMITH. Bible Dictionary.

GRÄTZ. History of the Jews.

MOULTON, R.G. Literary Study of the Bible, 1896.

Ecclesiasticus, 1896.

Proverbs, 1896.

WISE, I.M. History of Second Jewish Commonwealth, 1890.

ZUNZ. Die Gottesd. Vorträge der Juden, Frankfurt a. M. 1892.

VAIHINGER. ^{Theologische}
A Studien und Kritiken, 1857.

HOLTZMAN, O. Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.

WRIGHT. The Book of Koheleth, 1883.

STUART, Moses. Proverbs, 1864.

SCHECHTER, S. ^{The} A Fragment of original text of Ecclesiasticus,
London 1896.

CONANT, T.J. Proverbs, 1872.

TOY, C.H. Judaism and Christianity.

EICHORN, A. 1891. ?

Many magazine articles and various commentaries on
Proverbs & Ecclesiasticus which need hardly be mentioned here by
name.

The Author.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION --- Gnostic Literature.

CHAPTER II. ECCLESIASTICUS.

§1. The Title.

§2. The Personality of the Translator.

§3. Personality of the Author.

§4. Divisions of the Book.

§5. Date of Original and Translation.

§6. The Language of the Original.

§7. Canonical Character of the Book.

CHAPTER III. ECCLESIASTICUS (continued)

§8. Figures of Speech in the Book.

§9. Doctrines and Views of the Book.

CHAPTER IV. ECCLESIASTICUS (continued)

§10. Spirit of the Book.

CHAPTER V. ECCLESIASTICUS AND PROVERBS.

§11. Relation of Ecclesiasticus to
Proverbs.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION.

Gnomic Literature.

The process of procuring the grains of wheat by separation from the chaff is not altogether reproduced in the history of Modern Literature. It is true, much has been written and but little preserved; here, however, the similitude vanishes, for we are not prepared to say that it is only the wheat that has been kept and the chaff thrown away. In the history of Ancient Literatures, the comparison still holds good. Everything said or written passes through the threshing process of years and is, finally, found at its best.

These grains of preserved wisdom are naturally short, pithy and pointed in form that they might be the more indelibly impressed upon the memory of their hearers or readers. For this was, after all, their prime importance. Since printing was not then in vogue and writing was slow and tedious, the majority

of these had to be transmitted by direct communication. They were not put into a written form until they had passed through many hands. It is but natural, then, that they should be pointed, pithy and principally short in form. They must and do contain as in a nutshell some ethical or practical suggestion, either the result of an individual observation or the reflection of a universal experience. Sometimes, they take on the form of maxims whose moral importance is paramount and whose practical bearing is unquestioned; at other times, they are mere expressions and by-words of the popular mind. Another essential characteristic is their self-evidence. To be in accord with this, they need not be, necessarily, simple assertions of facts; yet, they ought never give any cause for doubtfulness. When the proverb falls short of this, it may be said to have missed its mark.

The Remnants of all Ancient Literatures are replete

with such aphorisms. In Greece this class of literature was well represented in its highest perfection, in the writings of Plato and Xenophon: these exhibit the conversations of the martyr, Socrates, who abounded in maxims. The maxim is found to a large extent, in a didactic poetic form in the 'choruses' of the Greek Tragedies: above all perhaps, in the words of the religious and moral poet of Greece -- in the dramas of Aeschylus. Plutarch and Epictetus are also store houses of such wisdom. We might call particular attention to the fact that some of the Greek writers have been called Gnomici Poetae Graeci (viz. Theognis, Solon, Simonides, Hesiod and Menander). Besides, we hold in mind the well known Spartan brevity of expression, the oracles of the Python priestess and the many scattered adages of the New Testament(cf.e.g. I Cor.15:33). The Greeks required

an artificial arrangement of long and short syllables i.e. measure, while the Hebrews were satisfied with a sort of rhythm. We shall see later what this rhythm was. This attention to the formal side of the Gnome, by the Greeks, gave to their sayings a certain ornamentation. They are useful, too, as well as ornament; ^{al}this we must confess. Yet, they lack that fervor in praising righteousness and that pungent strength in rebuking wickedness that we find so characteristically evident among the Hebrews. Greece has given the world her Culture, her sense of "the beautiful", but must yield the palm to Judea for her gift of Religion, "the true and the good".

Nor were the Roman authors slow in using this form of expression. We may observe a strict adherence of Cicero's "Gravissime sunt ad beate vivendum breviter enuntiae sententiae",

long before, it was, itself, enunciated. The earliest literature of the Romans was rules for conduct and in the works of later writers (cf. an anthology of Juvenal, Horace, Persius etc.) we constantly come upon them. The main requisite of the Roman maxim was intense practicality; in this we see a difference from the Greek as well as Hebrew gnome. The Romans knew little, or took small cognizance, of virtue and vice. To Rome is attributed the honor of having given the world its sense of Justice -- the law. And no one will dispute the thought that law is the embodiment and crystallized form of past experiences. This is exactly one of the views of חכמה which obtain in Hebrew literature viz. that it is the instruction which a father gives his son, - an instruction that has been learned from original sources, misfortunes; the father warns his son to refrain from that which has given him

trouble. This is the origin of law among the Romans and of the Gnome among the Hebrews.

The brightest gems of Arabian thought are found in the Koran. Even a casual glance through this remarkable volume will reveal the presence of a large mass of Arabic proverbial lore. We are often confronted with a similarity of spirit between the Arabian and Hebrew proverb; this may be due to a likeness of "family" traits -- they are both Semites. The most noticeable difference lies in the tendency to exhibit, in many of their proverbs, the sensuous and ostentatious character of their life.

Besides the above mentioned literature the Orient furnishes an abundance of similar character. Buddha's teachings inasmuch as they were personally delivered, were necessarily of

of this kind. And Confucius gave forth his mandates in similar clothing.

In general, while these proverbs mirror an experience, either a fortunate one to be repeated, or an unfortunate one to be eluded, they lack the religiousness of the Hebrews. In the Orient, there was much more of a blending of poetry and religion than in Greece and Rome, and in Judea this blending becomes indistinguishable. Hebrew poetry is almost interchangeable with Religion. To use Victor Hugo's extravagant figure, all these gnomes are as infinitely inferior to those of the Hebrews as the imprints of a duck's foot in a mudpuddle are to the stars of heaven.

We now come to a discussion of the Hebrew proverb.

With the Hebrews, it is a natural offspring and as such is cared

for in the history of this people, much as a favorite style.

Its extensiveness was remarkable, even as early as the days of

Solomon, who, according to the author of Kings "spoke three

thousand proverbs" (I K 5:42). The best representatives of

this class in Hebrew literature are found in the canonical books

of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, parts of Job and Psalms (e.g. Ps. 78,

111); in the apocryphal books of "Wisdom of Solomon" and "Eccle-

siasticus"; and also in the sayings of the early sages 'פרקי

אבות. The thought penetrating throughout these works is not

only wisdom and sage advices but this added to religion. This

most essential and characteristic feature of the literature takes

its root in that famous axiom, "The fear of Jahweh is the begin-

ning of Wisdom" (Prov. 1:2). Its further substance is but a deve-

lopement of this basal thought with its reflection on and appli-

cation to this life. (A fuller account of Wisdom is found fur-

ther on).

Besides this special character of its contents, the Hebrew proverb is unique as far as concerns its form of expression. It is from this feature it obtains the distinctive name *ḥup* i.e. likeness proverb. This 'likeness' in the simplest form consists of two symmetrically constructed clauses. These clauses may be in various relations to each other. They may be synonymous, where the second part is but a repetition of the meaning of the first. They may be antithetic, where an opposite thought is presented in the second division. They may also bear a synthetic, integral or Parabolic relation to each other.

We can have nothing to do, here, with that Biblical gnomic literature before spoken of, nor anything to do with the Mishnic sayings but our purpose in these pages is to treat of the Apocryphal phase classed "Ecclesiasticus" or "The wisdom of Jesus b. Sirach."

CHAPTER II.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

§ 1. The Title.

The title of "Wisdom of Jesus (Heb. Joshua or ²Jason) the Son of Sirach ", Σοφία Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σεφάχ appears on the Greek MSS. The name "Ecclesiasticus" is given by the Vulgate, or Latin translation. It is thus termed from the fact that the Church (Schürer "J. P. in time of Chr." 2nd Div. III p. 28) beginning with the New Testament sanctioned this, as a work to be used as a text book for instruction i.e. a "Church book", also, to distinguish it from the "canonical" books. The Egyptian Jews had taken up the book first but the most prominent usage of it, was made by the early Christians; it is thought that this was done because they had not much literature of their own at that time. The Church fathers sometimes call it briefly Σοφία Σεφάχ or ἡ σοφία and very often ἡ πανάρετος σοφία or simply πανάρετος.

§ 2. The Personality of the Translator.

Very little is known of the translator beyond the bit of information he vouchsafes us in his introduction or prologue. He tells us that he went to Egypt and "having continued there some time " found "a copy affording no small instruction". Thereupon he set himself to the task of interpreting or translating the 'copy' with great diligence. His grandfather Jesus wrote the original and he wished to put this into Greek in order that those " who in the land of their sojourning are desirous to learn may do so. Tradition has it that he had the same name as his grandfather. This is very plausible, as it was and is yet quite customary among the Jews today to find a man having the same name as his grandfather. The line runs: Jesus ben Sirach , next Sirach ben Jesus and then our translator Jesus ben Sirach. His modesty in preferring the request to his readers, to bear with him in any defects they might find in his work, is exceedingly commendable. His ability is easily recognized by a conception of the merit of his translation.

§ 3. Personality of the Author.

Ecclesiasticus is the largest book of the whole wisdom-literature, either in the Apocrypha or in the Bible that was composed by a single author. It certainly would take strong proof to overthrow its authorship inasmuch as he names himself at the end of the work. προσευχή Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ - a prayer of Jesus the son of Sirach - appears after ch. 50 and previously, in 50:27, the authorship (Ἰησοῦ υἱὸς Σειράχ) is expressly stated. From this passage in 50:27 we also discover that he is from Jerusalem (ὁ Ἱερουσαλυμίτης) and anything further that we may affirm of his personality is more or less guesswork.

Some (Grotius, quoted by Eichorn and others) think for example, the man Jesus b. Sirach was a physician. This is based on the passage in 38:1-15 where he speaks very highly of the medical profession. Another (Linde: "Neue ausgabe

der Uebersetzung des buches Sirach" Einleit. p.8) goes farther and makes of him a priest, because among the Hebrews the art of medecine was practiced by the priests and from the further fact that he believes Jerusalem to be the seat of the one, true and only God. (cf. 24:11, 38:13, 50:23). Besides his priestly character is further attested to in 7:30, 14:11 and 32:2. While these verses are not thought to be real proofs of the fact, yet when taken in the light of other events are claimed as strong links in the chain of evidence. Learning, too (which our author certainly had, cf. ch. 44-50) was restricted to the priesthood-- they were the repositories of all religious and civil history. Again his unusually clear knowledge of the high priests points to a close connection with the priesthood.

The author is even further identified as a high priest, (Georg. Syncellus, Chron. ed. Dindorf I p. 525, quoted by Schürer) and he is compared with and thought to be, on account

of the identity of names, Jesus or Jason, (175-172 B.C.) the son of Simon II. This guess is too far at random. Jason was a rascally reprobate (cf. II Macc. 4:7-26; IV Macc. 15-17), and as fit to write a book on morals as to fly. He could hardly speak of Justice and Order after the disgraceful and patent purchase of his lofty title; and he certainly could not have written 33:1-17 after passing into his office over his brother's grave.

One thing further we might say of him-- he was well-read. (cf. 38:24--39:11) He had before him tradition and with him his own experience from travel. He had learned from his predecessors; he had traveled among strangers; he had studied the prophets; he had gathered the sayings of wise men; and had searched out saws. In his prayer, of the final chapter, he thanks God for a deliverance from a great danger, incurred by a misrepresentation probably before the king of Egypt. Fritzsche

suggests that he may have been a Scribe, and Cheyne argues to the same point. He undoubtedly had a friendly word for them at all times (cf. 10:5,38 24f.,44:4) and this is probably the basis for the suggestion. At all events, what we do know of the author as positive is his name and home.

No Gnostic Alexandrian would speak of Wisdom as the especial product of Zion. (cf. 24:10ff.) There is a certain local coloring--the mention of high priest (cf. 50:1f.) and the hatred against Samaritans, Philistines etc. (cf. 50:25f.)

§ 4. Divisions of the Book.

Our book seems to have about as much continuity as the canonical book of " Proverbs ", to which it bears many striking resemblances. " Proverbs " is an " anthology of anthologies ": it contains about five different collections

put together by an unknown author. This book has also many divisions, which view has been vigorously supported by many critics. It does not necessarily ^{express} the thought that there were more than one author but it does insist that there are natural breaks in the book. Eichorn(Einleit. p.50 f.) sees a three-fold division in the work, 1-23, 24-42:14, 42:15-50:24; He thinks that Sirach wrote the whole book himself although he took previous gnones as his basis and to this end quotes 33:16 -18. Edersheim (in Wace's "Commentary") also has divided the book but his is a five fold division(same number as in the Thorah) based on an analysis of the matter. Fritzche (Einleit. p. 32) believes the book to contain groups of maxims and he classifies the work under seven divisions,

(1-16:21) : (16:22-23:27) : (24:1-30:24; 33:12-36:16a; 30:25-27) :
 (30:28-33:11; 36:16b-22) : (36:23-39:11) : (39:12-42:14) : (42:15-50:24)

Moulton(Introd. of Ecclus. p.14) partly agrees with this di-

vision but makes the personal outbreaks on the part of the author, the dividing lines. Ewald (Hist. of Israel V 263 -4; Jost in his "Gesch. des Judenth." I 312, also argues more than one author) thought that two older books of proverbs were put to make 1-36:22 i.e. (1-16:21) and (16:22-36:22); the first he further believed to be complete while the second was in mere fragments. His second grand division of the book was 36:23-51.

On the whole we feel that one man speaks throughout the work and that the divisions are as before stated, a mere matter of grouping. The few detached proverbs here and there throughout the work are easy of explanation when we understand that Sirach's name was considered a synonym for an author of proverbs and all current saws were ascribed to him, and perhaps, inserted later by his grandson.

§ 5. Date of Original and Translation.

The time of the work may be computed with some assurance of correctness. In ch.50, the author gives us a eulogy of a certain high priest Simon, the son of Onias. It is a glowing description of how this Simon once appeared in his official capacity. " How glorious was he when the people gathered around him, at his coming forth out of the Sanctuary! as the morning star in the midst of a cloud, as the moon at the full: As the sun shining forth upon the temple of the Most High, and as the rainbow giving light in clouds of Glory: As the flower of roses in the days of new fruits, as lillies at the water spring, as the shoot of the frankincense tree in the time of summer: As fire and incense in the censer, as a vessel of beaten gold adorned with all manner of precious stones: As an olive tree budding forth fruits, and as a cypress growing high among the clouds" so he offered. (50:5-11) This tribute

20

is evidently (all critics save one- Grätz, Monatschrift-agree) the description of an eye-witness to the ceremony. The extravagance of the metaphors and the extreme vividness seem to make it real. The author must have had some personal recollection of the event. Further evidence of this is found in the use of the phrase in 50:1 of "who in his life repaired to the house etc." implying his death at that time.

Granting this, we are not yet on firm ground. There were two such high priests-Simon-and both sons of an Onias, to whom the reference could possibly have been made. There was Simon I (called by Josephus "The Just" of whom the Mishna -Aboth 1:2 - says that he was one of the last members of the Great Synod; and further of whom the Talmud tells-Yoma 69- that remarkable tale in connection with Alexander the Great, who, notwithstanding his wrath against the Jews was awed by the appearance of the high priest in his glorious robes.) son of Onias

I (319-291 B.C.), and Simon II (Stanley, Hist. of Jewish Church III p.247, asserts that Derenbourg has proved to his satisfaction that Simon II was Simon the Just and that he is the Simon of Eccclus. There seems to be some doubt as to who was "the Just" son of Onias II (219-199 B.C.). Now, of which were those words in ch.50 uttered? Some hold (cf. Vaihinger "Studien u. Kritik" 1857 p. 93-99 and others) that it was to Simon I others (Eichorn, Fritzsche, Ewald and Dillman) to Simon II.

Strangely enough a similar problem presents itself in connection with the translator. Yet here we find a clue. In his prologue or preface, he states: For having come into Egypt ἐν τῷ ὁδοῦ καὶ τριακοντῷ ἔτεσι ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως and having continued there , etc. Now, from a comparison (Hag.1:1 ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτεσι ἐπὶ Δαρείου - בְּשָׁנָה שְ�נִיָּה בְּיָמֵי דָרְיוֹשׁ) with the Septuagintal renderings of Zach.1:7,8:1,

Hag.1:1,2:1 and also from I Mac.13:42-14:27 that this greek passage can only mean "in the 38 th year of King Euergetes"

Allowing two generations (about fifty years) for the time elapsed between the author and the translator, we would come upon a king, Euergetes by name, in the instance of each Simon.

Fifty years after Simon I lived Ptolemy III (Euerget. I) and fifty years after Simon II lived Ptolemy VII and Euerget. II (Physkon). It is in the expression "38th year" we must find the solution. Euergetes I ruled but 25 years (247-222 B.C.) hence, he has no "38th year". But Euergetes II ruled 25 years (170-145 B.C.) conjointly with his brother and 29 years (145-116 B.C.) alone. He however, began the count of his reign from the time when he first ascended the throne. Evidently then the second Euergetes must be the one meant. This would place the translation about 132 B.C. (Lange p.280, says that the translation was made at this date and that the author was contemporary with Simon I -310-

290 B.C.--. He takes *ὁ παῖς* ~~pro~~ to be "ancestor" not "grandfather". Zunz does the same.) and the original about 182 B.C. The content of the book also argues in favor of Simon II as the contemporary of the author and not Simon I. The hard times, tyranny, oppression etc. complained of(In 183 B.C. Seleuces Philopator sent Heliodorus to plunder the temple) in 33:1-14, 36:17-22, 31:11, 50:24-29, 51:1-12, would be out of place after Simon I, for then peace hovered over Israel; but quite the contrary after Simon II.(The legend of Simon II referred to in 3 Macc. I&II finds perhaps an allusion in Ecclus. 50:4). Another argument for this date is found in the fact that the translator made frequent use of the Septuagint version. (cf. 20:29 w.Dt.16:19 ; cf.44:16,17,19,21 w. Gn.5:24,6:9,17;4,22:18 ; cf. 45:8f w. Ex.28:35f; cf. 49:7 w. Jer.1:10 etc. See Lange "Apoc." p. 277.) The version was hardly in general use under Ptolemy III but under Physkon, we might reasonably expect its widespread use.

§ 6. The Language of the Original.

Within the past few years what is claimed to be the original manuscript has been found. It has been edited by Budde(Der Neuentdeckte Urtext des Buches J.S. 1896) and Schechter (A fragment of original text of Eccles. 1896) this places the question regarding the original language of the author of Ecclesiasticus rather prominently forward. The manuscript is in Hebrew. Everything, before the finding of this old manuscript(which our own Dr. G. Deutsch has seen and says is undoubtedly genuine) seemed to point to such a conclusion. The translator testifies in his prologue that Hebrew was the original text and that he translated it, but pleads that "things originally spoken in Hebrew have not the same force in them when translated into another tongue" We are told (Guttman Einleit. § 5) also, that Hieronymus says he saw the Hebrew original. There are a number of passages which in their

present form make no sense whatever, and, their real meaning can only be gotten, by a re-translation into Hebrew.

In 26:15 $\omega\lambda\gamma$ is given the meaning of $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ -head- when "poison" is equally good and makes better sense in the context.

Similarly in 24:27 the translation read $\gamma\iota\alpha$ "light" instead of $\gamma\iota\alpha$ "river" or "Nile"; in 38:28 the $\gamma\tau$ "to know" must have been read for $\gamma\chi$ "to tire oneself with"; and in 43:18 $\delta\gamma\gamma$ "Tyrians" was read for $\delta\gamma\gamma$ "enemies". (Reuss p. 578 and Lange "Apoc." p. 276).

Many of the Greek text verses are found in the Talmud and what is more significant, these are in Hebrew. (Wright in "Ecclesiastes" gives: 3:21, 6:6, 7:10, 9:8, 9, 10, 11:1, 12:4, 5, 13:15, 13:25, 14:11, 17, 17:23, 25:3, 4, 25:17, 26:1, 3, 28:12, 30:22, 23, 33:10, 24, 37:12, 38:1, 48, 40:30, 42:9, 10. Zunz also p. 108 e. gives a complete list of about forty passages.) Many of the verses assigned to Ben Sirach, that are

not in the Greek text and are found in the Talmud(cf. Sanhed.

סבס, קורטא, קורטא), are invariably in Aramaic. Thus,

the Hebrew and Greek ones are drawn from a like source, while

the Aramaic ones assigned to him are probably current by-words

in the popular tongue assigned to his name on account of his

preeminence as an originator of Proverbs. In conclusion

while the Hebrew was no longer spoken in the author's time,

it was undoubtedly the written language especially for books

of this character.

Other versions of this book are based on the Greek

translation. This is especially evident in the Latin where

many Greek words are preserved and carried bodily over in the

Latinized form.(cf. 13:19 "in eremo" for "ἐν ἐρήμῳ" etc.)

The Syriac was also made from the Greek; while the Arabic

version was undoubtedly made from the Syriac.

§ 7. Canonical Character of the Book.

That it was not generally regarded as canonical is evident from the fact that it is put as Apocryphal to the O. T. literature. Besides this, there are various reasons why it should and also why it should not be of the canon. The first evidence is drawn from the book itself.

In the prologue of the translation we have three distinct mentionings of a triple division of the scriptures. We could hardly base a theory, on the date of biblical canonization, on this. It does not show that the books of כְּתוּבִים had already been decided on; but it does seem sufficient ground to warrant the assumption of the uncanonical character of Ecclesiasticus. The book itself disclaims any such honor as canonicity.

The passages read (when put in nom. case)

1. ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφηταὶ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς
ἡ κοινὴ διήκοτες.

2. ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πατρία βιβλία.

3. ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων.

Yet, notwithstanding this repudiation on its own part, we find it quoted in several places in the Talmud and later literature as canonical, and in several places merely as a set of proverbs. As the first Talmudic mention of it I shall give

Baba Kamma "(92⁴) which reads: א"ל וברא לרבה בר מרי מלא היא

מילתא דאמרי אינשי מטייל ואזיל דיקלא בישיא גבי קוניה
דשרכי אמר ליה דבר זה כתוב בתורה שנוי בנביאים ומשולש
בכתובים וג'

and after showing that it is found in תורה in Gen.29:9 "And Esau went to Ishmael etc.", in נביאים in Jd.11:3 "And there were vain men gathered to Jephthah etc." the teacher remarks:
ומשולש בכתובים דכתיב כל עוף למינו ישכון ובני אדם
לדומה לו:

Now this quotation is really from Ecclus.(probably 27:9a or 13:15). This fact would tend to show up Sirach as part of

כְּתוּבִים but the ambiguity is explained away by many with the
 thought that Bar-Mari quoted from memory^{and}, this being appro-
 priate, he accidentally used it for perhaps, an equally appro-
 priate verse from כְּתוּבִים. Such "lapsi^{us} memoriae" are not in-
 frequent in the Talmud. As the second Talmudic reference ,
 I shall call attention to Erubin 65:a. Here, Rav says that a
 man who is not of calm mind should not pray שְׂמֵחַ בְּרֹאשׁ יוֹמָא
 cf. Ecclesiasticus 7:10 to this. The point is, since שְׂמֵחַ in-
 variably introduces a biblical quotation we ought to regard a
 quotation from Ecclesiasticus as biblical. Such slips in
 memory (Strack "Kanon des altes testaments") as this and the
 preceding one are perfectly explicable. The men had much to
 remember and it would be no small wonder should they be cor-
 rect at all times.

We next consult the famous chapter חֵלֶק of Sanhed-
 rin (100:b). In the first mishna of this XI chapter, we read:

ואלו שאין להם חלק לעולם הבא, האומר אין תחיית המתים
 מן התורה ואין תורה מן השמים ואפיקורוס. ר' עקיבא
 אומר אף הקורא בספרים החיצונים וכו' /

In a discussion later on as to what books constitute the
 ספרים החיצונים and an attempt is made to prove that there is
 nothing objectionable in Ecclesiasticus (בן-סירה), consequen-
 tly it must have been regarded as an " extraneous book ", which
 R. Akiba believed, to read was to forfeit a hold on a portion
 in the future world .

From this reference we see too, that while the pub-
 lic reading of the book was not prohibited yet the private rea-
 ding, (Sanhed. X 28:a) הקורא בהן כקורא ביאגרת, as much as a letter,
 permitted. The תורה was to be studied and time was not to be
 frittered away with other works.

In Tosephta Yadaim II we find:

הגליונים וספרי המינין אינן מטמאים את הידים. ספרי (ספר)
 בן-סירה וכל ספרים שנכתבו מכאן ואילך אינן מטמאין את-
 הידים :

which may be translated thus: "Heretical books are not holy, the book(s) of Ben Sirach is not canonical. Lit. Heretical books do not defile the hands, the book of Ben Sira and all books written from them and on, do not defile the hands.

It might also be mentioned here that Ben Sirach is supposed by some (Joel: "Blicke in die R." p.72) to be the ultimate boundary to which the time of the canonical books extended. Daniel, although written later, was put forth as a pseudonymous work purporting to have been written as a prophecy long before.

In Bab. Talm. Berach. 48:a and Jer. Talm. Berach.

VII 11:b after an introduction of בְּסִפְרֵי דְבֵן סִירָא כְּתִיב

(applied to Biblical books) we are told Jer. Talm. and Midr.):

סֶלֶסְלִיָּה וְתַרְוִמָּאךְ וּבֵין נֶגִידִים תּוֹשִׁיבָךְ;

The first two words are found in Prov. 4:8 the rest may be Ben Sirach's although nowhere quoted in the Greek text.

There are many other passages both in Talmud and Midrash which might be quoted ^p to show how the book was regarded as Biblical (canonical) e.g. B. Bathra 98:b, Midr. Beresith chap. 8, 10, 73, Midr. Leviticus chap. 33, Nidda 16:b, Yebamoth 63:b, Kethuboth 110:b and elsewhere.

It seems from the above that while Ecclesiasticus was often mistaken as a canonical book, perhaps on account of its similarity to Proverbs, it nevertheless did not enter the canon. Various reasons may be assigned for this fact. One has already been stated viz. it is just outside of the boundary of the canon. Another is, it is not sufficiently original in treatment and matter, the author knew his "Proverbs" too well. Another is, his wavering of opinions made him unpalatable to the orthodox. Besides he says of himself that he was not inspired (Cheyne p. 186, believes he does claim in spi-

piration. cf. 24:32-34 and 50:28&29) and speaks of phrophecy as belonging to the past; this was fatal to a realization as canonical. I do not think that these were the actual reasons for its being left out but any or all may have been operative.

CHAPTER III

ECCLESIASTICUS (continued)

§ 8. The Figures of Speech in the Book.

Allusion, Simile and Metaphor are the most common figures of speech in the book. Personification is used with telling force in one instance i.e. in the treatment of Wisdom.

Ecclesiasticus contains the first allusions to the early records of the Jewish race. In the canonical books of the Prophets and Psalms, we find, here and there, passing references to the representative characters of the preceding history; but, in this book is found a remarkably clear mention of them all. In 17:1 a reference to that wonderful story of Gn. 1:1 is made for the first time. In 16:7 he recalls the "old giants" of Gn. 6:2. Sodom and Gomorrah are alluded to in 15:8. The covenant of death of Gn. 2:17 and 3:19 finds a reference in 14:17. Adam's 'earthly' origin is referred to in 33:10. The trial of Abraham is found alluded to in 44:20.

In fact, almost throughout his "praise of famous men" (chap. 44-50) he alludes to Pentateuchal events. In 46:4 however the author makes a false allusion to Joshua's miracle. Sirach has it that Joshua commanded the sun to go back, while in point of fact (Jsh.10:12,13) the sun was merely commanded to stand still.

His Similes and Metaphors are drawn in the true Biblical style from the lofty cedars of the Lebanon, from the widespreading terebinth and the thick-growing fir-trees.² Sweet roses, fragrant lilies and, besides, the noble palm-tree are found. Frequent mention is made of the well watered garden of Jericho.(24:13-19 and 50:8-12) A very peculiar metaphor is found in 39:12 where, in speaking of himself as having many thoughts to communicate he says " I am filled as the moon at full."

Sirach's style, in general, is lucid and clear, except when he commences to give out a fundamental dogmatic thought. He then seems to hide his meaning under a cloak of unintelligible words. It would not be surprising to learn that much of his vagueness in thought, on fundamental points, is due to the unintelligibility of his language.

§ 9. Doctrines and Views of the Book.

It ought not to be difficult to discover the real views of the book, as our author, himself says that it is not his desire to withhold anything. In fact, he gives his instruction to us quite freely (51:23-30). Yet, at times he is so vague in his statements as to make us quite undetermined as to what constitutes his clear opinions. ^WHe will, at any rate, seek for a more perfect and clear understanding "in the house of instruction" as he terms his work, and endeavor to fulfil all his desire, expressed in 39:32, of communicating his words.

Wisdom. We might say the main doctrine of the book is concerned with the topic-Wisdom. It is preeminently a 'wisdom' book. Wisdom exhibits two aspects or relations, one as

original, the other as derived. As original, she is with God from eternity to eternity.(1:4) and by her He pervades all things (15:18-19). We cannot discover in this relation. As derived, she comes from God(1:1); He poured her over all his works(1:9) and bestowed her on them that love Him(1:10). She traveled through all lands in search of a resting place(24:7) and finally settled with Israel(24:10).

There is a Talmudic legend quoted in the Midrash which relates a similar story-how God offered the תורה to all peoples of the earth and Israel, alone, was found ready to accept it.(Midr. Rab.Dt.33)

She is revealed in the Mosaic Law(24:23). Jerusalem became the seat of her power(24:11) and there she dwelt. In order to obtain possession of her, we must seek her(4:11,14:22-24)

and pass through a course of discipline at the outset(4:17, 6:17). She is variously compared; principally, however, to a plant, of whose produce we should eat; but the appetite will only be sharpened, and not sated, with the eating(24:21). He who possesses her is blessed and safe from evil(14:20,25-27); he need never fear of being ashamed of her, for there is no necessity for such(24:22); he will serve God and be beloved of Him(4:11-14).

In this last connection we can easily discover its attribute- φόβος Κυρίου-fear of God, reverence. With this, it stands in almost interchangeable relation. This seems to be the burden of thought in the book-the fear of God is the beginning of Wisdom(1:20 cf.also 7:30). There can be no doubt but that the author looked upon Wisdom as a distinct entity

41

and not an attribute of God. In ch. 24 Wisdom praises herself; she is present in the congregation of the Most High, she is older than all creatures, nay more, she is eternal - existing before all creation and assisting in all creation (24:5,6). She is with Him in His dominion over the world (42:21). She came forth from the mouth of God and covered the ^{earth} like a mist (24:3).

The idea is suggested at this point by Gfröhrer (Philo II p. 21) that the חכמה or σοφία is nothing other than the "רוח" of Gn.1:2. In the next few verses 24:4-6 the suggestion gains some enforcement; yet, the idea is perhaps too far fetched. The author may have instituted a comparison between חכמה and "רוח" in his mind, as he wrote these verses, but is it not going too far, to say he identified them?

The more exact relation of σοφία and φόβος Κυρίου is found in 1:26 where, our author says, Wisdom leads to a fear of God and keeping of the commandments leads to Wisdom.

Idea of God. The old Israelitish view of God as a father or husband, which is found throughout the prophets (cf. Hos. 11:1, Jer. 2:1, 3:4, Is. 62:5) is also found in Sirach's writings (24:1, 2). This conception, however, does not seem to be a favorite one, as the national feeling at this time was strong enough to depress it. Ecclesiasticus does retain the notion that He is the one, self-existing Creator and Preserver, the all-powerful Ruler to whom all creatures are subjects. Nature proves the existence of God for "the sun when he appeareth bringing tidings as he goeth forth is a marvelous instrument of the Most High." (43:2). There is only one God who judges all men according to their deeds. (33:7-15). His penetrating

Wisdom sees more than the exterior, he "beholds all the ways of men and looks into secret places" (23:39). He hates the sinner (12:6) and punishes each man according to his work (13:4). Yet, the wicked are not altogether without hope "for the Lord is full of compassion and mercy" (2:11). He is ready to forgive, His only desire is that the wicked cease from sinning, become wise and fear Him (1:4 and 2:7) then, the "reward shall not fail" (2:8). God's mercy is much emphasized in the book.

ἔλεος 2:18, 5:6, 13:11, 47:22, 51:3.

ἐλεημοσύνη 16:14, ἐξιλασμός 16:12.

χάρις 1:13.

It is a widespread mercy in its exercise but is not an advance over the O.T. canonical conception. It did not reach the N.T. universalism, there is yet a narrowness that is reflected

from the times.

The primary meaning "mercy", "pity" degenerated into "showing of mercy" of LXX and, later, into almsgiving(17:22). The degrading notion of alms atoning for sins is found in this connection (3:30, 29:12, 40:17, 40:24).

Sirach urges a sinner not to rely on this attribute of God(mercy) for a pardon(5:4) and reminds us much of a later proverb found in ~~XXV~~ 8:9.

"If one think: 'I will sin and then repent', there will be given him no help to repent; if one think: 'I will sin and the day of atonement will obtain a forgiveness of my sin', the day of atonement will bring him no forgiveness". Guttman has also called attention to this similarity.

God has so arranged things that Death, Bloodshed, Strife,

Sword, Famine, Tribulation and even the Flood should exist and have existed for the wicked. The righteous, I suppose, must endure it all as a discipline.

God created Wisdom(1:9) and she(personified)played a great part in the creation. He has dominion over the whole world(10:4) and sets over it whom he chooses. In 42:15 the author begins to"mention the works of the Lord" and concludes in 43:33 with the words" for the Lord made all things" . This hymn to creation is an excellent description of God's marvelous deeds and cites all natural phenomena as coming into existence by His word of command. No one has seen God "that he may declare Him"(43:31). He is an invisible spirit. Dr. I. M. Wise ("Second Commonwealth" on"Jesus b.Sirach") claims that it is generally acknowledged that the first reference to the Shekinah idea in Hebrew Literature is found in this

46

book.(24:10-12). If this be so, it is certainly an evidence in confirmation of this idea of Sirach's view on God viz. that He is a Spirit.

Inspiration. Our author we have shown before does not claim any inspiration for his writings but does attribute that characteristic to the canonical writings.

Cheyne, with others, believes that in 24:32-34 Sirach does plainly claim some inspiration for himself. Lowth(Lect.24 p.209) translates the passage (24:33) into Hebrew thus: וַיִּדְּ לִרְחַם כְּנִיזָה אֲשֶׁר and urges that this does not prove any claim. In Lect.34 p. 288 he speaks of Elihu as "endowed with a singular wisdom, which he attributes entirely to the inspiration of God"; and further on commends his "modesty". It must have been "a characteristic of the later wise

47

men' so to account for their wisdom" says Cheyne,
himself, (p.186).

He believes in the continuity of Inspiration. The Mosaic Code is undoubtedly the greatest(49:4); and in his praise of famous men(44-50) all the prophets are mentioned in turn as inspired preachers. For example, Jeremiah's claim to have been sanctified as a prophet in the womb(Jr.1:10) is here repeated(49:7).

Messianic Hope. In Cheyne's words, we must confess that, in Ecclesiasticus, "the messianic hope, in the strict sense, has faded away." We have a few references and they are, at best, vague. We no longer have the positiveness of the canonical writers. The author of Ecclesiasticus believes in the eternal existence of the Jewish people(37:25,44:13) and expresses the desire that the prophecies concerning them be fulfilled (36:11-17). God will judge all righteously (35+17). In a

material way, the heathen must be smitten to fragments(35:18) for the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah awaits them (39:23) and this punishment will take place before the very eyes of Israel (36:10). The tribes of Jacob, he hopes, will be restored (48:10ff.) and the family of David(47:11) will not only get possession of Palestine but will also rule over all the nations. Ewald and Cheyne mention 37:17-19, 11:5sq., 33:1-12, 10:13-17 as other passages pointing to a messianic hope; but these are not at all clear.

Eschatology. The doctrines bearing on this subject outside the Messianic Hope, are rather weak and betray the Sadducean origin of the book. Cheyne(p.189) is here of the opinion that later "christian readers effected an entrance for their cherished beliefs by violence". Such references as we have are found; in 22:11 where we are bidden to weep for the dead

for he hath lost the light; in 17:27-30 where it is asked "who will praise the Most High in Hades", and closes with the words "the son of man is not immortal"; in 14:11-19 where we are advised to make our means the measure of our pleasure; and in 48:11 where Cheyne sees a rank interpolation of the words "for we also shall surely be alive", by unscrupulous hands. Lange quotes Herzfeld (Gesch. II 35) thus: "Sirach's belief in resurrection is proved also from 46:12 and 49:10, where he, in a figure supposedly borrowed from Ezek. 37 says first of the Judges, then of the prophets 'let their bones revive again from their graves'. The fact that this expression is twice used goes to show that it was then a common formula. All in all, Sirach may here be characterized best as 'wavering'; he gives us nothing definite and what he does give us is doubtful.

Angelology and Demonology. The most pronounced sentence in Ecclesiasticus that might have supported a strong dogmatic view in regard to this topic is found in 39:28, where we read: "There be πνεύματα that are created for vengeance" etc. Here, however, πνεύματα is taken by the majority of commentators (e.g. Guttman and Fritzsche) to mean "winds" and not "spirits". (The word was probably נחמ"ח in the original). Indeed, this is probably correct, as the views he expresses elsewhere are too little developed for such a dogmatic statement as would be otherwise expressed. Although we must understand a probable reference in 17:17, 48:21 to a prevailing view, at this time, of a guardian angel for each nation. (cf. Dan. 10:13, 20, 21). The δόξη ἀρίων of 45: 2 may as well mean "priests" or "patriarchs" as "angels", so, we cannot place much stress on this. The mention of Satan in 21:27, though made in so many words, is believed to have a reference to the גר גס of the Talmud.

Fritzsche translates τὸν ρατρά as "accuser" (See Cheyne, "Job and Sol." note 1 p.189 and Appendix note 20). In a word, we can but restate what was before said, the views on this subject must have been as yet undeveloped, otherwise our author would certainly have been more emphatic. Daniel (written about 164) is clear cut on this point, but, we must take the fact into consideration, that it was written some thirty years later. In that length of time the doctrine had a chance to develop.

Medicine. On account of 38:1ff. our author was thought to have been a physician. In this passage, he advises every one to call in a physician for his ailments. This was probably written to counteract that prejudice against medicine and the medical profession which was based on a mistaken interpretation of Ex.15:26. In 38:9-10 he urges the sick to the duty and

efficacy of prayer. We might state his thought thus: with the hope of divine healing, we should also call upon a physician. The N.T. view is different from this: in James 5:14-15 prayer is made the panacea for all ills.

Anthropology. The author's whole treatment of this subject savors much of the first chapters of Genesis. God made man(15:14a) in his own image(17:3) and gave to him "free choice"(15:14b).

The opposite of this seems to be taught in 33:13,14. God is said there, to foreordain and mould man's destiny as does the potter his clay. To reconcile these extremes is impossible. I cannot account for the wide difference, and the course I have pursued is to accept the one at the expense of the other. One thing, however, is noticeable: the author in this last reference makes the foreordination controlled by Wisdom. At any rate, this is no "blind destiny."

God has endowed him with reason(17:7a) and a power to distinguish between Right and Wrong(17:7b). "Before man is life and death, whichever he liketh shall be given him"(15:17). The image of God in man gives him a certain superiority over other creatures(17:4a) and thus he possesses a dominion over them (17:4b).

Labor.

Sirach seems to depreciate labor in 38:25-30.

He appears to believe that they who drive the ox, who hold the plough, who give their mind to furrow making, who give themselves to making life-like pictures and alike- all these cannot get time enough nor the opportunity to perform their highest duty, which is, the acquiring of Wisdom. Nevertheless he finds a ready excuse for them in 28:31ff. Such men, he maintains there, are quite necessary to the building up and populating of a city. It is true they will not be sought in coun-

sel, they will not sit on a judge's seat, they will not bring light upon instruction nor will they be found where parables are spoken; yet, "they will maintain the world"(28:34). In a word, while the opportunity, for the acquirement of knowledge outside of their sphere, is not given them, still, the importance of their labor cannot be gainsaid. His advice as to the treatment of servants is unnecessarily harsh in 33:24-29. He recommends "bread and correction and work for a servant", and would permit of no idleness. If the servant is disobedient, punish him the harder for it. This severity is inconsistently followed in 33:30,31 where a man is cautioned thus: "If thou hast a servant, let him be as thyself". This treatment, it is further explained is the most effectual method of binding a servant to himself.

Women.

A wicked woman is worse to dwell with than

with a lion or a dragon(35:1b). Her husband hears of her, with a sigh, from his neighbors(35:18). Do not desire a woman for her beauty(35:21) nor give to a wicked woman the freedom of speech(35:25). A good woman, on the other hand, is a great happiness to her husband(36:1). A wife, therefore, is desirable for "who will trust a nimble robber that skippeth from city to city? even so, who shall trust a man that has no nest and will lodge wherever he finds himself at nightfall?"(36:26). A daughter is great worry to a father throughout her life: when she is young, he must see that she marries at the proper age(42:9) and when she is married, he must worry lest she be hated(ibid.); when she is a virgin, she must watch her lest she be defiled(42:10) and when she is married, lest she be untrue to her husband(ibid.). A man's duty towards a congenial ^{wife} is evident but his position towards an uncongenial one may be

changed by a divorce(7:2, 25:26,28:15). Ewald (Rev.p.364 note) says that the author's view of woman"and sharp summary counsel of divorce place him far below the height of the Hebrew Bible."

Lending and Suretiship. A merciful man will lend to his neighbor,(29:1 cf.Dt.15:7,8). Of course, some borrowers are always found to be scamps, who will reckon borrowed money as a wind-fall, which need not be paid back(29:4). He will give the lender trouble and will attempt to put off the payment by assuming a doleful countenance and complaining about hard times (29:5). On the other hand, those who are really in need should appeal to one's mercy(29:8) and it is to be remembered that giving to an unworthy coreligionist is better, at any rate, than miserly hoarding of wealth.(29:10). One thing more, do

not lend to a man that is mightier than you are(8:12) for he will never pay his debts to you. As for suretyship, a good man would do that much for his friends(29:16) yet, let not friendship lead you too deep into it(29:20,8:13) for many a great and wealthy man has been driven from his home through this (29:18).

Never trust your enemies(12:10) "and though he may be humble himself and go crouching take heed to thyself and beware of him"(12:11). A happy man is he who will see the downfall of his enemies(25:7). His happiness usually drawn from a dutiful son(30:4) who will occupy his place, is increased from the knowledge of the fact that in him he will have one to avenge him upon his enemies, even after his own death(30:6).

Sirach does not believe in total abstinence, for he

says "Wine is as life to men"(31:27) but he shows his belief in temperance by adding "if it be drunk in its measure"(ibid.). Drunkenness is deprecated because its effects are bad(31:30). A drunkard will ever be poor(19:1). Know how to act at a wine-party(31:31) and learn what to speak of: where banqueting and ~~and~~ music are going on, you should not discuss abstruse problems and show your wisdom(32:5). Beginning with 36:18 our author treats of various social relations of men and continues this to 39:11. The passage contains warnings against false friends(37:1ff.) as well as rules of etiquette(also 31:21). His advice, regarding various attitudes to be assumed on various occasions is eminently practical.

In fact, in this we find a characteristic mannerism of style in Sirach's work. He is preeminently wordly and re-

cognizes the necessity of wordly advice. ^{He} It carries this so far as to give rise to a libel on Ecclesiasticus. It has been said, to his discredit, that many of his maxims are written from a purely selfish standpoint. This criticism is sharply and keenly put upon him because it was thought, he claimed inspiration. Now, urging as we do, that he does ^{not} substantiate any claim to the divine origin of his words, we do not see any impropriety in his giving out a few practical, and perhaps necessary, suggestions. His teachings are human. He enters into minute details, a thing never attempted by canonical books, and for this we cannot censure him. On the fundamental and important theological views, he is wavering. This doubtfulness and uncertainty is what probably kept him out of the canon. An extreme case of this intense regard for the external side of

a matter, in the book has already been mentioned. I refer to his degenerated view of 'mercy'. Charity is merely an atonement for sins; no higher motives enter into consideration at all. On the whole, there is not so much of moral instruction in the book as an application of maxims to conduct.

41

CHAPTER IV

ECCLESIASTICUS (continued)

§ 10. The Spirit of the Book.

Before we can obtain an adequate comprehension of what influences bore upon the author, we must first glance at the condition of affairs, the state of culture, at the time this book was written. To this end we notice the following:

The Greeks had extended their colonies and the accompanying influence, to all the districts that surrounded the Jewish region. They had penetrated the oriental culture on the "barbarian" lands and had scattered their own Hellenic culture over them in its stead. Schürer (2nd Div. I p.11) points out that this "victorious penetration" is most clearly shown in the "religious worship". While the original religious cults held their own for a time, they had finally to acknowledge the superiority of purely Greek deities. Gaza, Caesarea and almost all the others fell

easy victims. The Grecian gymnastic games were introduced as religious rites; and with them came forms that could not be kept out. The fact that many native citizens of these districts became famous in Greek literature gives an added proof to the truth of the assertion that these peoples were easily Hellenised.

Girt round with Greek influence and possessions, as was Judea, it, too, had necessarily to be subjected to this test of faith. After the smoke of the first battle, between these contending forces of Grecian and Jewish Culture, had cleared away, two parties might be seen. On the one hand were the Hassidim who would not yield one inch from purely Jewish culture; and, on the other hand were the Hellenists who had been captivated and captured by Grecian culture. The former were represented by Jerusalem and the latter by Alexandria - the seat of Grecian culture

Hellenism entered Judea perforce and steadily gained headway but its stronghold was with the people of its own cities. In the Jewish country, proper, the religious aspect of Hellenism was repulsed by the decided victories of the Maccabees. The other aspects of Greek Culture were permitted without restraint, except for the burdens which they placed upon the people. The scribes were continually discovering minute details whereby the people might make themselves unclean, in a religious sense. The Mosaic laws of Cleanness and Uncleanness were the most emphasized observances of all their practices.

The Jew was forbidden to enter into any sort of contact with Gentiles for business purposes (whether for lending or borrowing, for paying or receiving payments) during the three days that precede and follow their festival. (Avoda Zora I 1,2). On the festival day, no Jew was to do any business (Avoda Zora I 4). Heathen wine must not be drunk for fear it had been used in a religious exercise; nor was it to be made an object of commerce. (Avoda Zora II 3).

25

This intensely Jewish position, of the people of Jerusalem, was powerful in the two or three decades that immediately precede the Maccabean outbreak; and the violence of that move was but a culmination of the whole affair - a fit of desperation after years of toleration. As before said, this condition as elucidated in the above paragraphs were as pronouncedly present twenty years before the war as at that time. With this idea clearly in mind, we are ready to look at the work of Jesus the son of Sirach.

When we recall the fact that the author names himself and claims Jerusalem as his home, we cannot but readily admit that the influences which must have surrounded him, while engaged on this book, were certainly Jewish and not Greek. Yet, we cannot rest here, as some have urged the claim that outside of this passage, the book contains strong evidences of Greek influence. In

46

this connection we might recur to another argument for the view which regards the book as strictly Jewish. The Hassidim found their stronghold in the Scribes and as Cheyne has pointed out (p. 185) Sirach "was a true 'scribe' and gloried in the name(38:24)". Let us notice a few of the points which are thought to be of Greek origin.

The strongest used, upon which to base this claim, is found in 17:17 it reads: "For every nation he appointed a ruler; and Israel is the Lord's portion". Now, it is urged that there is a strong dogmatic position taken here regarding the doctrine of guardian angels; and further that this doctrine is of Platonic origin. To the first part of this we assent, to the latter part, we are opposed. There does seem to be a clearly defined notion of guardian angels in Ecclesiastical; but can we say that this

idea is due to the influences of Plato's "Timaeus"? We notice that the LXX introduces this version into Deuteronomy 38:8-9 when translating the words *כי חלק יהוה עמו*. Still, we cannot say this view is confined to the Greeks. Bissell (in Lange's Commentary) says: "on the contrary, it is clear that the idea was a familiar one in Palestine in later times (cf. Dan. 10:13, 20, 21, Is. 24:21, 22 and Riehm's Handwörterb., art. "Engel")". Again we might offer Dähne's excuse that the grandson, who translated the book into Greek for the Alexandrian Jews put this thought into the text. The difficulties that arise, come, as a rule, from the fact that many ideas were common to the Jewish and Hellenistic schools. We are prone to forget this when attributing a purely Jewish thought to a Greek origin.

The next passage, with which the claim of Alexandrian

origin is advanced is found in 44:13 and reads: "Enoch pleased well the Lord, and was translated, an example of repentance to the generations". Whence is this thought derived? In Gn.5:22-24 we read: "And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah: and Enoch walked with God after he begat M. three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: and all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years: and Enoch walked with God: and he was not: for God took him." From this, it does not seem to follow in any way that Enoch was an especially fitting example of repentance. We are nowhere told so in Genesis. Again we ask, whence was this thought derived? One has already said *that* that is due to the same influence that caused Philo to make the same point in his writings. He took the expression כִּי לָקַח אֹתוֹ (Gr. ὅτε μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός) and weaved an allegory

around it. Fritzsche (Introd. p.36) has explained away the difficulty, in a satisfactory manner. He says, that the Hebrew text when carefully studied might have brought a Palestinian reader to this thought. Notice the expression אחריו הולידו את - after he begat Methuselah. We can almost see the process of thought evolving in the Jewish mind, by which it was argued: Enoch only walked with God after he begat Methuselah etc., hence his repentance dated from that time; for, walking with God after a certain fixed specified time seems to indicate that before that time he did not walk with God. In view of this repentance, he is here cited as an "example of repentance".

These two points are given the most prominence by both Dähne and Görer, as far as the argument for an Alexandrian influence is concerned. Can we not see how weak these are? especially

so, since they are not supported by any thing better or further.

Now, let us consider one or two arguments pointing to a purely Jewish spirit in the book.

We have already alluded, in a previous chapter, to the lack of belief in the "future life" as characterized in such verses as "The son of man is not immortal" (17:30) and "Who shall praise the Most High in Hades?" (17:27). We have to refer to 41:12 and 44:8ff. also, in which he speaks merely of a name that is left behind us after death. This view can only be Palestinian, says Dähne (II p.127). The next argument is based on 11:14 "Good things and evil, life and death, poverty and riches are from the Lord". The Alexandrians were very cautious about ascribing the origin of sin to God. Here too is a distinctively Jewish sentiment and a clear evidence of Palestinian origin, a-

gain says Dähne(II p.129).

All in all, we cannot subscribe to Dean Stanley's statement, in which he remarks (Hist. of Jewish Ch. III p.269) "it is evident that the Grecian spirit has touched it (Ecclesiasticus) at its core and raised it out of its Semitic atmosphere". nor can we allow ourselves to draw, with him, this extravagant figure: " the closed hand of the Hebrew Proverb has opened into the open palm of Grecian rhetoric". Dean Stanley has here fallen into an error, into which, many others carelessly allow themselves to fall. There are two positions possible and only one can be correct. Either the book shows a strong Greek tinge from the fact that it is the result of the first contact between Alexandrianism and Judaism - which we do not believe; or, the book is of pure

Palestinian and Jewish origin and strictly orthodox in its coloring -which we do believe.

Ewald's apt application of the term "Zwischenschriften" to the Apocrypha, in general, only finds a partial substantiation in the book of Ecclesiasticus. Sirach's work is intermediate between Old Testament and New Testament in point of time, only, but not in doctrines. The doctrines are eminently Jewish; the form, as we shall see, is strictly of Hebrew gnomic literature; And the Spirit is therefore clearly and merely Jewish.

CHAPTER V

ECCLESIASTICUS AND PROVERBS.

§.11. Relation of Ecclesiasticus to Proverbs.

The present book, under consideration, is much more copious than its canonical counterpart (Proverbs has 31 chapters) containing as it does some 51 chapters of ordinary length. Yet differing in ⁿquantity, we still observe a striking resemblance in quality. The contents, and the literary form into which it is cast, exhibits a remarkable similarity to Proverbs. Each of the two books have been aptly termed by Prof. R. G. Moulton a "Miscellany of Wisdom". Parallels, too, in thought and language, between the two books abound.

On "Wisdom", the parallels are especially numerous and the conception of it is perfectly similar.

Eccclus.1:14. To fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and it was created together with the faithful in the

womb.

Prov.1:7. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge;

But the foolish despise wisdom and instruction.

Prov.9:10. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;

And the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding.

Ecclus.24:3. I came forth from the mouth of the Most High;

and covered the earth as a mist.

Prov.2:6. For the Lord giveth wisdom;

Out of the mouth cometh knowledge and understanding.

Eccl.6:27. Search and seek, and she shall be made known unto thee;

And when thou hast got hold of her, let her not go.

Prov.2:4,5,6. If thou seek her as silver,

And search for her as for hid treasures; etc.

Eccles.24:5. Alone I compassed the circuit of heaven,

And walked in the depth of the abyss.

Prov.3:27. When he established the heavens I was there:

When he set a circle upon the face of the deep.

Eccles.14:24. He that lodges close to h^r house

Shall also fasten a nail in her walls.

Prov.9:1. Wisdom hath builded her house;

She hath hewn out her seven pillars.

Eccles.4:12. He that loveth her loveth life;

And they that seek her early shall be filled with

gladness.

Prov.8:17. I love them that love me

And those that seek me diligently shall find me.

Prov.4:7,8. Wisdom is the principal thing,

therefore get wisdom; Yea, with all thou hast gotten
get understanding.etc.

Ecclus.1:4. Wisdom hath been created before all things,

And the understanding of prudence from everlasting.

Ecclus.24:9. He created me from the beginning before the world;

And to the end I shall not fail.

Prov.8:22. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way

Before his work of old.

Ecclus.14:22. Go forth after her as one that tracketh

And lie in wait in her ways.

Prov.8:34. Blessed is the man that heareth me

Watching daily at my gates

Waiting at the posts of my doors.

It is quite natural that at this point, the two books should

be so similar in spirit as they are, both of them parts of

the great Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews. But, besides these,

we come upon other points of similarity, touching a variety of subjects. Some of these topics we might point out as follows:

Ecc1.1:12, Prov.10:27.-; We are promised "length of days" for Godliness.

Ecc1.3:2b, Prov.1:8, 3:20 --- The law, to obey and honor father and mother, is similarly emphasized.

Ecc1.6:5, Prov.15:1, ---- Speak kindly.

Ecc1.6:2, Prov.17:17, --- Have a true friend.

Ecc1.12:8, Prov.17:17, 19:4, 7, --- A friend is tried in adversity.

Ecc1.22:13, Prov.13:20, --- Don't go with a fool.

Ecc1.22:15, Prov.27:3, --- Sand, salt or iron is easier to bear than the fool.

Ecc1.6:10, Prov.14:20, 19:4, --- Riches bring friends; Poverty looses them.

Ecc1.22:5, Prov.9:13,13:16, --- Fools bring disgrace by their
folly.

Ecc1.41:12, Prov.22:1, --- Good name is better than riches.

Ecc1.13:13, Prov.13:20, --- Be careful of your associates.

Ecc1.14:6, Prov.11:7, --- A man is his own worst enemy or best
friend.

Ecc1.33:1a, Prov.12:21, --- Righteous believers are safe.

Ecc1.6:16, Prov.18:24, --- Again, possess a true friend: especially
God.

Ecc1.10:7, Prov.29:23,18:12, --- Pride brings low.

Ecc1.10:29, Prov.8:36,20:2, --- No one honors him who sins
against himself.

Ecc1.4:26, Prov.28:13, --- Confess your sins, it will be im-
possible to finally conceal them.

Ecc1.5:8, Prov.10:2,11:4, --- Remember - unrighteous gains profit
nothing. of. the German proverb "Un-
recht gut gedeihet nicht".

- Ecc1.23:17, Prov.9:17, 5:15, --- The fornicator delights in secret,
unlawful sins.
- Ecc1.9:8, Prov.5:10, 6:26, 29:3, -- Yield not thyself to harlots.
- Ecc1.9:7, Prov.7:8, --- Wanderers in the street are easily caught
by her.
- Ecc1.12:11, Prov.26:24, --- Beware of the various guises of a
base man.
- Ecc1.3:18, Prov.3:34, --- The lowly find favor in the eyes of God.
- Ecc1.27:10, Prov.13:21, --- Sin is the curse of sin.
- Ecc1.37:15, Prov.3:6, --- Ask God for aid in directing your ways.
- Ecc1.37:18, Prov.18:21, --- The tongue has power over life and
death etc.
- Ecc1.27:1a, Prov.28:21b, --- Don't sin for an indifferent thing.
- Ecc1.27:22, Prov.10:10, --- Winking of the eyes is bad.
- Ecc1.30:21, Prov.12:25, 15:13, 17:22, -- You afflict yourself
by sorrow.

Ecc1.7:3,Prov.22:8, --- Sow not unrighteousness, for then
you will also reap it.

Ecc1.8:16,28:2,Prov.22:24,15:18,-- Don't go with a wrathful
man, he kindles strife.

Ecc1.14:9,Prov.27:20, --- Covetous men are never satisfied.

Ecc1.14:10,31:13,Prov.23:6,7, --- The evil eye begrudges gifts.

Ecc1.38:18,Prov.15:13,17:22, -- Sorrow affects the strength.

Ecc1.29:18,Prov.11:15,22:26, --- Beware of going surety.

Ecc1.8:13,Prov.11:15, --- Be not a surety especially above
your power or for strangers.

Ecc1.13:25,Prov.15:13, --- A merry or sorrowful heart is ex-
hibited in the countenance.

Ecc1.11:11,Prov.11:24, --- A hard worker is often in want.

Ecc1.31:27,Prov.31:6,7, --- Wine is good.

Ecc1.31:27,Prov.20:1, --- Though sometimes (in excess) bad.

Ecc1.19:1,Prov.21:17,23:21, --- A wine bibber will ever be
poor.

Ecc1.4:1,3b,Prov.3:27-28,14:21,17:5, --- Give the needy.

Ecc1.29:1,Prov.19:17, --- Lend to the poor neighbor.

Ecc1.31:23,Prov.22:9,--- Treat the poor liberally.

Ecc1.27:26a,28:25a,Prov.26:27, --- A man will fall into a pit
of his own digging and "rolling
stones gather no moss".

Ecc1.27:1b,Prov.23:5, --- Riches are for naught.

Ecc1.39:21,Prov.11:4, --- Everything has its proper use; no use
for riches in 'day of wrath'.

Ecc1.31:8,9,Prov.28:22, --- The wicked man makes riches the
object of his pursuit.

Ecc1.20:28,Prov.12:11,28:19, --- Till the ground for food's sake.

Ecc1.34:19,Prov.15:8, --- Sacrifices do not clear of sins.

Ecc1.34:18,Prov.21:27, --- Sacrifices of ill-gotten things is
a mockery.

Ecc1.30:6,Prov.18:24, --- The son will represent the father.

Ecc1.30:1,Prov.13:24, --- Whip the boy and you'll not spoil him.

Ecc1.31:12,Prov.23:13,14, --- Chastise your son.

Ecc1.10:1,Prov.20:8, --- A good ruler disciplines his people.

Ecc1.10:2,Prov.29:12, --- Rulers have the whole welfare of the
city with them.

Ecc1.26:1,Prov.31:10, --- Virtuous wives are above price.

Ecc1.26:2,Prov.12:4, --- Virtuous wives are the comfort of
their husbands.

Ecc1.25:16,Prov.21:19, --- With a wicked woman is the most
unpleasant home.

Ecc1.10:27,Prov.12:9, --- A prudent workman is better than the
improvident spendthrift.

Ecc1.10:25,Prov.17:2, --- A wise servant is greater than a
wicked free man.

Ecc1.11:8,Prov.18:13, --- A characteristic of a wise man is,
to hear first and then answer.

Ecc1.28:27,Prov.28:14, --- Another characteristic of the wise
man is carefulness.

Ecc1.21:15,Prov.9:9, --- Again, wise men all receive instruction.

Ecc1.21:13,Prov.10:11,13:14,14:27,16:22, --- The mouth of the
wise is a fountain of life.

Ecc1.37:12,Prov.13:20, --- Associate with wise men.

Ecc1.37:24a,Prov.9:12, --- Wise men are rewarded with blessing.

Ecc1.37:14,Prov.26:16,25, --- Regard for numeral -- seven.

Ecc1.3:1,Prov.4:1, --- This is but one of many possible parallels
where the authors speak in the manner of a
father to a son.

Now besides these similarities in thought, we also find a
likeness in the figures of speech. These are some of the most
prominent.

Ecc1.28:10-11, As is the fuel of the fire, so will it burn;
And as the stoutness of the strife is, so will it
burn etc.

Prov.26:21, As coals are to hot embers, and wood to fire,
So is a contentious man to inflame strife.

.....

Ecc1.34:3b, The likeness of a face over against a face.

Prov.27:19, As in water face answereth to face
So the heart of man to man.

Ecc1.21:3, All iniquity is as a two-edged sword;
It's stroke hath no healing.

Prov.5:4, But her latter end is bitter as worm-wood
Sharp as a two-edged sword.

Ecc1.22:19, He that pricketh the eye will make tears to fall
And he that pricketh the heart maketh it to show feeling.

Prov.30:33, For the churning of milk bringeth forth butter,
And thewringing of the nose bringeth forth blood.
So the forcing of wrath bringeth forth strife.

Ecc1.36:26, For who will trust a nimble robber,
That skipped from city to city?
Even so who shall trust a man that hath no nest
and lodgeth wheresoever he findeth himself at nightfall?

Prov.27:8, As a bird that wandereth from her nest,
So is a man that wandereth from his place.

Ecc1.2:5, For gold is tried in the fire,
And acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation.

Ecc1.27:5, The furnace will prove the potter's vessels,
And the trial of a man is in his reasoning.

Prov.17:3, The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold.
But the Lord trieth the hearts.

Prov.27:28, The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold.
But a man is tried by his praise.

Now, further, the two books possess identical expressions.

Here, for example, are a few passages of the sort I mean:

Ecc1.34:17, He raiseth up the soul, and enlighteneth the eyes;
He giveth healing, life and a blessing.

Prov.29:13, The poor man and the oppressor meet together
The Lord lighteneth the eyes of them both.

Ecc1.1:30, Exalt not thyself, lest thou fall, and bring dishonor
upon thy soul; And so the Lord shall reveal thy secrets,
And shall cast thee down in the midst of the congregation;

Prov.5:14, I was well nigh in all evil,

In the midst of the congregation and assembly.

Ecc1.5:12, If thou hast understanding answer thy neighbor,

And if not, let thy hand be upon thy mouth.

Prov.30:32, If thou hast done foolishly in lifting up thyself or

if thou hast thought evil, lay thy hand upon thy mouth.

After this display of parallels in the two books, we are confronted with a two-horned dilemma. Shall we say that the two works were the product of one age, in which the whole bent of literary activity was in the direction of wisdom literature? Or, shall we say that the one (probably Ecclesiasticus) is but an imitation of the other. This difficulty has been felt by many after noticing the similarity of spirit in the two books. We will discuss each horn separately.

By far, the most remarkable argument urging the view, that they were both the product of one age, is found in Z A W XV, 1895. It is an article by W. Frankenberg, which attempts to prove a sameness of date for Proverbs 1-9 and Ecclesiasticus. Some of his points of likeness are these:

1. Both books present us with a similar view of חכמה. And, further, both contain for the most part treatises on this subject. The different views of חכמה are, a) an unflinching belief in God as the great Judge who rewards us according to our deserts, and b) the results and experiences of life, handed down by tradition -- from father to son. This is the חכמה לקה. The fathers have become wise through חסר and in order to spare their children similar bitter misfortunes, they give them חסר חכמה.

2. Both books contain a peculiar conception of בַּיִטוֹן

These are men who commit such wrongs as are, perhaps, not strictly forbidden and punishable by law, yet which are nevertheless wrongs. They are organizations of individuals who gain the control of the governmental machinery and make it subservient to their purposes; Or, they will by the lying and perjury of their tongues circumvent the law and destroy their neighbors. They are not heathens. (Cheyne p.158 thinks they are "highway robbers", in Proverbs).

3. Both books speak of a city population. The agricultural and rural classes are hardly thought of. a) Farming is not mentioned in Proverbs 1-9 and in only a few places in Ecclesiasticus. b) The people among whom and for whom the books are written were a commercial set. Evidently a city -- and business-like population (cf. Prov. 7:19f, 8:1f and also Eccles. 29:15f).

4. The principal theme of Prov.1-9 is a warning against a certain אשה זרה . This אשה זרה is the representation of כסלית which is the antithesis of חכמה . In the time of Ecclesiasticus there can be no doubt (from the frequent mention of it in the book itself) but that adultery was of common occurrence. Now, Frankenberg's contention, in this connection is that the views of the two books regarding that unfortunate are again similar, a) the אשה זרה is undoubtedly a married woman who carries on unlawful commerce in the absence of her husband, and b) the אשה זרה everywhere means the אשה גלית . She is no heathen but the wife of a fellow Jew.

Wildeboer, "Die Lit. des A.T." p.373 quotes Oort

as saying that the אשה זרה or נכרית is not a Jewish woman in Proverbs. But he likewise quotes Kuenen as opposed to Oort.

From these points, the conclusion is drawn that the works were composed under the same influence and hence, at the same period.

This conclusion it seems to me, is not sufficiently warranted. For, were it true, we would have a perfect right to expect to see no disagreement upon any fundamental thought.

This we do not observe. There is the consideration of one thought which Frankenberg persistently overlooked. I refer to the word *תורה*. In Proverbs the word is used for a synonym of "instruction" or "teaching" (cf. Prov. 7:2 marginal note R.V.); it has by no possible distortion, a reference to the Pentateuch. In 29:1,9,11 where a command is given to help the poor, there is added the words, that he, by showing mercy, "keepeth the commandments". Now this is a clear reference to Dt. 15:7,8. In 23:23 a wicked wife is said to be "disobedient to the law of the Most High" and her punishment is set forth in the next verse. Here the

author had in mind either Dt.22:22 or Lv.20:10. We are forcibly reminded of Dt.29:29 when we read 3:22 "What is commanded thee think thereon for thou hast no need for what is concealed".

These are but a few places where 'the law' is plainly the תורה and it or its ordinances are referred to: there are many others (cf. 1:23, 2:15-16, 6:37, 8:8, 9:15, 10:19, 15:1, 15, 19:17, 20 21:11, 22:27, 23:26, 32:15, 35:1 etc.). But, above all Ecclesiasticus has an open and clear reference to the "Law of Moses".

In 24:23 the author says "all these things are the book of the covenant of the Most High God, (even) the law which Moses commanded us for a heritage unto the assemblies of Jacob".

Nowhere in Proverbs can the connotation of the term תורה be shown to be similar to that of Ecclesiasticus. That the LXX translates the תורה of Proverbs by $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ does not have any sig-

nificance here. The LXX started out on its work with this translation $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ = תורה and used it for תורה no matter where or in what connection it occurred; then, again, $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is also the translation of מוסר and other words meaning "instruction" in the LXX. And, further, as my classmate Mr. Philip Wolf (who is making a special study of the LXX to Proverbs) informs me that the LXX rendering of Proverbs is very poor and uncertain. Nor is the likeness and identity of peculiar thoughts limited to part I of Proverbs. Many similarities occur as previously shown: but one in particular occurs in part II which betrays its late origin -- i.e. the conception of צדקה. In Prov. 10:2 and 11:4 it plainly means almsgiving, and as a proof of the fact that it is so understood we might mention that Synagogical almsboxes frequently have Prov. 10:2 upon them. This conception is also

thus clearly defined in Ecclesiasticus 29:12, 3:30, 40:24.

The Ecclesiastical conception of חכמה is much later than that of Proverbs. To J.b. Sirach, the Pentateuch had a definite standing and was always quoted as an authority. Proverbs doesn't as yet know of it as חכמה. As like, too, as it is to Proverbs in spirit and form, we may find many other points of dissimilarity between them.

In Proverbs we find isolated observations while here, we note a wider survey of the subject. Our author seems to take an epigram and dilate upon it, thus forming the maxim. Sometimes this serves his purpose as an elucidation while at other times, and this more generally, it gives a broad application of the epigram. Then too, the literature of this period went one step

beyond the poetry of Proverbs and added prose,-- Not prose as opposed to poetic measure and parallelism but such as is formed by a collection of many single thoughts on one subject-- "a grouping of gnomes", an essay. The authors of Proverbs threw their thoughts indiscriminately about; the author of Ecclesiasticus attempts some sort of a classification according to the subject treated.

Proverbs has many authors. This is, I believe generally accepted. Ecclesiasticus has only one.

Another difference is seen here: Proverbs, chs.1-9 especially, recognize only Jews(cf.Prov.5:14ff) while Ecclesiasticus speaks of "every people and nation" (cf.Eccl.24:6-8).

Cheyne says: "Night and day he must have studied his

revered models to have gained such an insight, into the secrets of style ". And I heartily concur with him. The book is undoubtedly written after Proverbs, and from the great likeness, which it bears to that great canonical book we must conclude it is an imitation of that work. Fortunately, we may say of it, what was urged in defense of the Earl of Beaconsfield when he was said to be a plagiarist, that, if its author did take thoughts from Proverbs he gave them back, enriched and with a further meaning added from having passed through his hands.