9-1-1941

The Opinions of Modern Scholars on the Origin of the Various Apocryphal Books

K. G. Manz
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

The Opinions of Modern Scholars on the Origin of the Various Apocryphal Books

The books which are ordinarily included in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament are the following: 1 Esdras, 9 chapters; Tobit, 14 chapters; Judith, 16 chapters; Wisdom of Solomon, 19 chapters; Wisdom of the Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), 51 chapters; Baruch, 5 chapters; Epistle of Jeremiah, 1 chapter; Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Children, 1 chapter; Susanna, 1 chapter; Bel and the Dragon, 1 chapter; 1 Maccabees, 16 chapters; 2 Maccabees, 15 chapters; 3 Maccabees, 7 chapters; 4 Maccabees, 18 chapters; Prayer of Manasseh, 1 chapter; Additions to Esther found in various chapters of the canonical book.

The order in which the books are given is in a general way the usual one. It is not that which is given in Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint, which starts out in this fashion: 1 Esdras, Judith, Tobit, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees. In fact, in this edition, the Apocrypha are mingled with the canonical books. The order above does not pretend to be chronological. An attempt at a chronological order is made by Oesterley (*The Books of the Apocrypha, Their Origin, Teaching, and Contents*, p. 320), with the following result: Ecclesiasticus, ca. 180 B. C.; Pharisaic recension, 100—50 B. C. Tobit, pre-Maccabean, early part of second century B. C. Judith, Maccabean, about the middle of the second century B. C. Additions to Daniel (Bel, the Dragon, Prayer of Azariah, Song of the Three Children), about the middle of the second century B. C. Additions to Esther, about the middle of the second century B. C. Susanna, about the middle of the second century B. C. Prayer of Manasses, post-Maccabean, ca. 110 B. C. 1 Maccabees, post-Maccabean, ca. 110 B. C. 1 (3) Esdras, post-Maccabean, ca. 110 B. C. Wisdom, earliest portion middle of first century B. C., latest portion beginning of first century A. D. 2 Maccabees, beginning of first century A. D. Baruch, end of first century A. D. Epistle of Jeremiah, end of first century A. D. The books not listed here are likewise late.

There is a reason why the various writers on this matter do not agree in the order in which they present the books and why they do not all follow the same chronological order. Says Oesterley (*Op. cit.*, p. 319): "There are different opinions regarding the dates of most of the books, and in some cases the *data* for coming to a conclusion are too scanty to allow of anything approaching confidence in the correctness of the date assigned."

Since it seems to be impossible to bring conclusive evidence for any one chronological order, we shall follow the order given in the

edition of the Septuagint and Apocrypha published by Samuel Bagster and Son Limited, 15 Paternoster Row, London.

After all, the order makes no difference, since each book must stand on its own merits. Naturally, however, the nationality and the religious view of the author, the language of the original composition, and the date and place of composition or translation, are important for our understanding of these writings. This article attempts to submit the introductory material for the various apocryphal writings which modern scholarship has made available.

1. ESDRAS OR GREEK EZRA

As the Apocrypha in general have not received the treatment by scholars which they merit, this book in particular has been treated with scant respect by scholars for many centuries. Says Oesterley (*Op. cit.*, p. 439): "Jerome, in his preface to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, condemned both the Esdras books in our Apocrypha with their 'dreams,' and the Church has followed him in relegating them to a very inferior position. It is only during the last decade or so that, owing, in the main, to the labors of Sir Henry Howorth, scholars have come to realize the importance of 1 (3) Esdras, with which we are at present concerned."

Perhaps the lack of interest in this book is due, after all, to the little value in it. "Luther hat das Buch nicht uebersetzt, weil sein Inhalt zu unbedeutend sei (E. A. 63, 103 f.)," says Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, p. 2. Moreover, Kautzsch (*op.cit.*, p. 2) makes this rather sweeping statement: "Irgendwelchen Anspruch auf geschichtlichen Wert kann das Buch nicht erheben. Es eignet ihm vielmehr mit vielen andern Erzeugnissen der spaeteren juedischen Literatur das Verfahren, aeltere Schriftstuecke zur Einkleidung und Stuetze eines in seiner Zeit herrschenden Gedankens zu verwerten, gleichviel ob sie dazu passen oder nicht."

Since this book has received various titles, *e. g.*, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, and 3 Esdras, and since the confusing titles have a tendency to cause people to confuse this book with the canonical book of Ezra, it will be necessary to agree on some name. On this babel of names Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 2), who calls it 3 Esdras, has this to say: "Die Bezeichnung 'drittes Buch des Ezra' stammt erst aus der lateinischen Bibeluebersetzung (Vulgata) [footnote: "Der Text der lateinischen (d. i., der einzigen antiken) Version des 3. Ezrabuches existiert in doppelter Gestalt: einer aelteren, die Sabatier in *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae* (Paris 1751) am Schluss des dritten Bandes aus einem Cod. Colbertinus mitteilt und die vielleicht mit der Vetus Latina identisch ist, und der 'durch Glaettung und Verbesserung' daraus entstandenen Rezension in der Vulgata;

vgl. Schuerer, Art. 'Apokryphen des Alten Testaments' in der *Pro-test. Realencykl.*, Bd. I (Leipzig 1896), S. 632."], die unsere Buecher Ezra und Nehemia als erstes und zweites Buch des Ezra zaehlte. Die griechische Bibeluebersetzung (Septuaginta) hatte es dagegen vor die Buecher Ezra und Nehemia gestellt und daher 'erstes Buch des Ezra' genannt."

To bring about some order in the confusion of the titles given to Books of Ezra, we follow Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p.440) in submitting a tabular form.

Hebrew Bible	Septuagint	Vulgate	English Bible	English Apocrypha (A. V.)
1. Ezra	2 Esdras or Esdras B	1 Esdras	Ezra	
2. Nehemiah	Neemias	Nehemias (called also 2 Esdras in the Vulgate)	Nehemiah	
3. ——	1 Esdras or Esdras A containing most of the canonical Ezra, 2 Chron. 35 and 36 and most of Neh. 8. It is called the Greek Ezra	3 Esdras		1 Esdras
4. ——	Not extant	4 Esdras		2 Esdras

"It will conduce to clearness if we speak of our present book as the 'Greek Ezra' and ignore those confusing titles. By the 'Hebrew Ezra' is meant, of course, the canonical book of Ezra." Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

Since, as Kautzsch indicates (*op. cit.*, p. 2), this book is not an independent piece of literary performance, but rather a compilation from various sources, it might be of interest to indicate the Scriptural sources from which parts of this book are drawn. These are not verbatim quotations, and yet there naturally are to be expected many literary similarities in words and phrases as well as contents.

Both Kautzsch and Oesterley give us tabulations which show that the author, or rather compiler, has drawn from the canonical books Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. According to these writers Greek Ezra 1:1-58 is drawn from 2 Chron. 35:1 to 36:21; Greek Ezra 2:1-15 from Hebrew Ezra 1:1-11 and 2 Chron. 36:22, 23; Greek Ezra 2:16-30, from Hebrew Ezra 4:7-24; Greek Ezra 3:1 to 5:6 shows no direct or indirect borrowing from Scripture; Greek Ezra 5:7-73, from Hebrew Ezra 2:1 to 4:5 and Nehemiah 7:6-73; Greek Ezra 6:1 to 7:15, from Hebrew Ezra 5:1 to 6:22; Greek Ezra 8:1 to 9:36, from Hebrew Ezra 7:1 to 9:44; Greek Ezra 9:37-55, from Nehemiah 7:73 to 8:12.

Modern Scholars on Origin of Various Apocryphal Books   661

Since the Hebrew Ezra, *i. e.*, the Book of Ezra in our Bibles, 2 Esdras or Esdras B, the translation of Hebrew Ezra in the Septuagint, and Greek Ezra, the book under consideration, cover in the main the same points of history, it might be of interest to say something about the relationship in which the three stand to one another. Naturally, the Hebrew Ezra was first. Esdras B, the translation from the Hebrew Ezra, found in the Septuagint, should be next in time, which, however, is not conceded by all. Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 444) contends that there are strong grounds for believing that the Greek Ezra is of earlier date than Esdras B. It is interesting to note that the only part of this book which is not drawn from canonical Scripture is that contained in chapters 3:1 to 5:3, the story of the competition between the three men of the body-guard of Darius on these three sentences: "Wine is the strongest"; "The king is strongest"; "Women are strongest, but above all things truth beareth away the victory" (3:1-12).

Although both Esdras B and the Greek Ezra draw their material (with the exception mentioned above) from the Hebrew Ezra, there is marked difference in the Greek of the two books. Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 443) contends that the "translation is free and paraphrastic" in the Greek Ezra, whereas in Esdras B, or 2 Esdras, the translation is a very literal one; it follows the Hebrew text minutely and with almost painful accuracy, sometimes giving renderings which are so close as to be rather lacking in sense in their translated form." Thackeray (Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, I, p. 759 f.) compares the Greek of these two books in the following words: "The two translations are of an essentially different character. While the writer of Esdras B [2 Esdras] shows a slavish adherence to the Hebrew, often transliterating his original and making no pretensions to style, Esdras A [the Greek Ezra] is marked by a free style of translation, an elegant and idiomatic Greek, a happy rendering of Hebraisms, and an omission of difficulties, which make it a far more readable book than the other. It was clearly intended for Greek readers unacquainted with Hebrew. The writer was a *litterateur* in possession of a wide Greek vocabulary.

In this statement Thackeray assumes that both Greek Ezra and Esdras B are translations of Hebrew Ezra. That assumption does not seem to be altogether correct. It is probably true that the writer of the Greek Ezra based the major portion of his book on Hebrew or Aramaic sources, as most of the writers assume. However, concerning the story of the three young men of the body-guard of Darius, Greek Ezra 3:1 to 5:6, it is generally agreed that this portion of the book, which by some is considered its core, was composed in Greek. Says Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 1): "Es zeichnet sich schon aeusserlich durch seine gefaelligere Form aus; denn es ist

nicht, wie das uebrige, Uebersetzung aus dem Hebraeischen, sondern urspruenglich griechisch geschrieben." Oesterley (op. cit., p. 454) says: "It was in all probability written in Greek by a Hellenistic Jew; yet the possibility of an Aramaic original is not excluded." Cf. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, p. 3; Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 1599.

About all that can be said with any degree of certainty about the author of this book is that he was in all probability a Hellenistic Jew.

The date of the composition or compilation of the Greek Ezra is also not at all certain. After weighing all considerations, Oesterley (op. cit., p. 454) gives as the most probable date ca. 100 B. C.

The place of the composition of this book is a matter of dispute. Some writers on the subject do not raise the question. Some contend that it was compiled in Jerusalem or at least in Palestine; others claim that it was written in Alexandria or at least in Egypt. Charles (op. cit., p. 5) contends that certain references in the book itself (e. g., 2:17; 4:15; 4:23; 4:27; 8:26) and phrases used which agree with those used in Egyptian papyri suggest that it was written in Egypt. This is the preferable view. Oesterley (op. cit., p. 454) claims even that the writing of the book at about 100 B. C. "is corroborated by considerations of vocabulary, as has been well shown by Dewick." (Cf. *The International Journal of Apocrypha*, April, 1913, pp. 33, 34.)

Bibliography of Greek Ezra

Charles, R. H., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, p. 1 ff.
Oesterley, W. O. E., *The Books of the Apocrypha*,* p. 439 ff.
Kautzsch, E., *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, p. 1 ff.
Fritsche, *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen.*
Howorth, Sir H. H., in *Academy* (1893).
Howorth, Sir H. H., in *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (1901—2).
Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (1910).
Thackeray, in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Volz, in *Encycl. Bibl.*

TOBIT

"The book of Tobit is one of the most perfect of Hebrew idylls. It was probably written within the second century B. C. It has been transmitted in various forms, all of which are considered to have sprung from a Hebrew or Aramic original," says the introduction of Samuel Bagster's edition of the Apocrypha, p. 1.

In Alfred Rahlfs's critical edition of the Setuagint, which no doubt is the best in existence, we find two renditions placed side by side. To the first rendition this significant note is affixed: "Tob. textus vulgaris: BA; in L hic liber deest (pars huius libri in 108 ab

---

* Their Origin, Teaching, and Contents.

alia manu addita est)." Added to the second rendition is this
note: "Tob. S: hic textus non nisi in cod. S inuenitur." (A denotes
Codex Alexandrinus, B Codex Vaticanus, and S Codex Sinaiticus,
usually referred to by the letter א).

On the various renditions of this book in Greek, Kautzsch
(*op. cit.*, p. 135) has this to say: "Das Buch Tobit liegt uns in einer
Reihe von mehr oder minder abweichenden Texten vor. Diese
verschiedenen Texte sind jedoch nicht etwa voneinander unab-
haengige Behandlungen des naemlichen Themas, sondern nur
Variationen der urspruenglichen Bearbeitung desselben.

"Als urspruenglichster oder gar der urspruengliche Text darf
wohl mit Noeldecke (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akad.*, 1879,
S. 45 ff.) der des Codex Alexandrinus (A) angesehen werden.
Verhaeltnismaessig wenige und geringe, aber immerhin als Glaet-
tungen anerkennbare Abweichungen davon zeigt der Codex Va-
ticanus (B). Den Charakter einer Textbearbeitung traegt der
Codex Sinaiticus (א). "Ein Stueck besonderer griechischer Text-
gestalt von 6, 9 bis 13, 8 bieten die Codices 44. 106. 107." Rahlfs, by
the way, prefers the text given in Codex A and Oesterley that of
Codex Sinaiticus.

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 136), who claims that this book was
written in Greek originally and does not pretend to be history,
does not say anything about sources from which this book is
drawn, as he did in regard to Greek Ezra. Oesterley (*op. cit.*,
p. 349), however, contends that the writer of Tobit used sources
and especially the story of Achikar the Wise. In fact, he feels
that it will be necessary to know this story if we would under-
stand the story of Tobit, although he also admits other sources.
Says Oesterley: "This story must at one time have been very
wide-spread and popular. It has come down to us in several forms,
which differ largely from each other but which are, nevertheless,
all variations of the same story in their essence. A much-
mutilated form of the story was found among the recently dis-
covered Aramaic *papyri* of Elephantine, which shows that it was
current among the Jews at least as early as the fifth century B. C."

The Story of Achikar the Wise

The story which is told in considerable detail by Oesterley
is this: Sennacherib, king of Assyria, had a vizier named Achikar,
a wise and erudite scribe. When the king died, and Esarhaddon,
his son, reigned in his stead, Achikar continued to hold the same
office. In the course of time Achikar became very rich, had many
wives, and built many castles; but he had no son. In reply to his
earnest prayer for a son, it was told him that he must instead
adopt Nadin, his nephew. Achikar ('Αχιάχαρος in Greek) did this

and educated Nadin carefully, teaching him all manner of wisdom. When Achikar became old, he asked the king to appoint Nadin in his place. This the king did. But Nadin, as vizier, did not follow the wise counsels which he had received from Achikar, but rather ill-treated his uncle's household. When Achikar tried to correct his adopted son, Nadin accused Achikar of high treason against the king and showed the latter forged letters in proof of Achikar's guilt. When Achikar was asked for an explanation by the king, he was so horrified by the slanderous accusation that he could not utter a word in defense. The king took this as a sign of guilt and commanded that Achikar be put to death. Since, however, the officer Nebusemakh, who was to execute the king's command, had, in years past, been saved by Achikar, when he had been the victim of a similar false accusation, he spared Achikar's life and hid him in a secret hiding-place underground.

When Pharaoh, king of Egypt, heard of the death of this wise vizier, he rejoiced and sent Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, a threatening letter to the effect that he would take away his kingdom from him if he did not send him a wise man who would be able to build a castle between heaven and earth. In his perplexity Esarhaddon took counsel with Nadin and all the wise men of the realm, but there was no one found to be able to do what the king of Egypt demanded. Now Nabusemakh told the king that he had spared the life of Achikar. This delighted the king, and he richly rewarded Nabusemakh. Achikar was brought before the king, agreed to answer all the requests of the king of Egypt, and thus delivered king Esarhaddon from his embarrassment. Achikar was again placed at the head of the royal household and greatly honored, while Nadin was rejected and soon died. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 350—353.

That this story of Achikar the Wise, which evidently enjoyed great popularity in ancient times, was widely known among the Jews and was passed down by word of mouth, has come down to us in various forms need not surprise us. Great differences are found in the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Aramaic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, Slavonic, and Greek forms of the story, which are still preserved.

"Now, the particular interest that the story of Achikar the Wise has for the study of the Book of Tobit lies in the fact that the writer of the latter utilized the former in the composition of his book; he assumes, moreover, as we shall see, a knowledge of the story of Achikar the Wise among his readers." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 353.)

Oesterley's first reason for claiming that the writer of Tobit used the story of Achikar the Wise as a basis of his book is this,

that the author of Tobit, "quite incidentally, as though he were well known" (*op. cit.*, 354), refers to the person of Achikar in Tobit 1:21, 22, where we are told that Achikar was vizier of Sennacherib, of Esarhaddon, and of Esarhaddon "appointed a second time." This is certainly a statement which agrees with the story of Achikar the Wise.

Next Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 354) refers to Tobit 11:18, in which we are told that Achikar and Nadab were present at the wedding of Tobias, as evidence of borrowing. The slight variation in the name Nadab and the fact that he is called the cousin instead of the nephew of Achikar need not affect the main point.

As the most striking evidence that the writer of Tobit used the story of Achikar, Oesterley (*op. cit.*, 354) refers to Tobit 14:10. Here we are told that Achikar brought up an adopted son who betrayed his benefactor by causing him to dwell in darkness underground; but that ultimately Achikar is saved and Nadab suffers the fate which he had designed for his benefactor.

As a further illustration of the indebtedness of the writer of Tobit to the story of Achikar, Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 355) quotes some parallel statements to Tobit from the story of Achikar (Syriac Version), thus:

Book of Tobit	Story of Achikar
Pour out thy bread and thy wine on the tomb of the righteous and give not to sinners (4:17).	My son, pour out thy wine on the graves of the righteous, rather than drink it with evil men (2:10).
Ask counsel of every man that is wise and despise not any counsel that is profitable (4:18).	My son, associate with the wise man, and thou wilt become wise like him (2:12).

That the author of Tobit used other non-Jewish sources is very probable. There is, for example, a striking resemblance between the Book of Tobit, 2:2-9, and the "Story of the grateful dead man," an Armenian tale, according to which a wealthy man was once riding through a forest when he came upon some men misusing a corpse. When he asked the reason for this, he was told that the dead man had owed them money. He paid the man's debts and buried the body. He then continued his journey home. In his home city there dwelt a rich man, who had an only daughter. She had married five husbands, but in each case the husband had died on the night of the wedding. The hero of the tale resolved to seek this woman in marriage in spite of what had occurred. He succeeded in his desire. On the night of the wedding there issued forth from the mouth of the bride a serpent, which sought to bite and to kill him; but an unknown serving-man, who had been keeping guard, slew the serpent and thus saved the life of the bridegroom, to whom he then made himself known as the

dead man whose corpse the bridegroom had buried in the forest. That there should not be any connection between this story about the daughter, the serpent on the wedding-night, and Tobit 3:7 ff. is hard to believe. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 356—357.

As to the purpose of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 136) has this to say: "Das Buch bietet natuerlich nicht wirkliche Geschichte. Als *Historiker* aufzutreten, lag gar nicht in der Absicht seines Verfassers; der Zweck, den er verfolgte, war, seine Glaubens-genossen zu ermahnen und zu erbauen durch den Gedanken, dass der Fromme, der seine Froemmigkeit, d. i., hier das genaue Ein-halten der sittlichen und nicht zum wenigsten der rituallen Gebote Gottes, im Unglueck und unter den Heiden bewaehrt, von Gott wunderbar geleitet und mit reichem Lohne bedacht wird." The purpose is also expressed by Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 360 ff.) when he discusses the religious standpoint of the author. Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 174) claims that this book "probably emanated from orthodox circles in Egypt" and hence maintained the moral and ethical teachings of the Jews.

The original language of this book is a matter of controversy. After a thorough investigation of all evidence, Charles comes to the conclusion: "It must be admitted that the evidence of a Semitic origin is not strong enough to put the matter beyond con-troversy" (*op. cit.*, p. 182). "It is far more likely that a popular work such as Tobit would be written in Aramaic than Hebrew, especially if written in Egypt." (*Op. cit.*, p. 180.)

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 136) makes the bold statement: "Es laesst sich fast mit Sicherheit behaupten, dass unser Buch ur-spruenglich griechisch geschrieben gewesen ist. Der von A (und B) dargebotene Text ist durchweg kritisch unanfechtbar."

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 367—368) says: "Finally, if, as seems upon the whole probable, the book was originally written in Greek, a further reason for regarding Egypt as its original home is offered. Some scholars are strong advocates of a Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) original, but to give details of the reasons for either contention would involve technicalities which would be inappro-priate here. It must suffice to say that the Greek, as a whole, does not read like a translation, whatever may be the case in isolated instances. If one reads the Greek of Ecclesiasticus, which is admittedly a translation, and compares it with that of the Book of Tobit, the difference is enormous and forces one to believe that, if Tobit was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, its Greek form must not be a translation, but a paraphrase."

Where this book was written is also a question which is debated by the scholars. Says Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 136): "Der Ort der Abfassung ist mit Noeldeke wahrscheinlich ausserhalb

Palaestinas, vielleicht in Aegypten zu suchen; die Betonung der αἰχμαλωσία des Tobit scheint den Standpunkt des Verfassers selbst anzudeuten. Ebenso weist die schwaermerische Verehrung Jerusalems auf die juedische Diaspora. Manches spricht nun dafuer, an die aegyptische zu denken; denn (1) in Oberaegypten wird der Daemon gefesselt; (2) die Kenntnis der mesopotamischen Gegenden ist ungenau; (3) am aegyptischen (ptolemaeischen Hofe) finden wir wiederholt Mitglieder der juedischen Gemeinde in Amt und Wuerden."

Oesterley (op. cit., p. 366 f.) inclines to the same opinion as Kautzsch, saying: "The place of origin of the book cannot be decided with any certainty; it lies between Palestine and Egypt, though the balance of probability points to the latter. The book was written for the Jews of the Dispersion; this is clear from such words as the following: 'Give thanks unto Him before the Gentiles, ye children of Israel . . . living' (13:3, 4), and the writer himself says he is in captivity in 13:6: 'I, in the land of my captivity, give Him thanks.' As another evidence that the book was written in Egypt, Oesterley (op. cit., p. 367) points to Tobit 6:3, where we are told that "a great fish leaped out of the water and would have swallowed the foot of the young man. . . ." He holds that the author must have the crocodile in mind, which lives in Egypt. Again, the fact that the writer used as a source the "Tractate of Kohns" is claimed as evidence that Tobit was written in Egypt. This tractate was originally written for the purpose of propagating the cult of the Egyptian god Khons. In it occurred the story of a beautiful princess who was possessed by a demon, but by the help of Khons the demon was expelled and the princess cured. Only Egyptian Jews needed an antidote to the "Tractate of Khons."

The date of the composition of the Book of Tobit is likewise uncertain. "The book is certainly pre-Maccabean," says Charles (op. cit., p. 183). After discussing various arguments in favor of certain dates at some length, Charles comes to this conclusion: "Tobit was written at the very earliest ca. 350 B. C.; at the latest, ca. 170 B. C., probably much nearer the latter than the former date." (Op. cit., p. 185.)

On this matter Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 136) comes to this conclusion: "Ueber Zeit und Ort der Abfassung ist viel Sicheres und Genaues nicht festzustellen. Nach Cornill lassen uns die entwickelte Daemonologie und Angelologie sowie das pharisaeische Froemmigkeitsideal nicht ueber das zweite vorchristliche Jahrhundert zurueckgreifen. Vielleicht darf der Umstand, dass viele 'Brueder' des gesetzestreuen Tobit in ihren religioesen Pflichten laessig sind, uns nach Noeldeke an die Zeit kurz vor dem Auftreten

der Makkabaeer erinnern, so dass wir als *terminus a quo* etwa die Zeit plus-minus 175 anzusehen haetten. Ein *terminus ad quem* laesst sich besser feststellen: es ist die Zeit plus-minus 25 v. Chr. Der Verfasser unterscheidet naemlich 14:5 den gegenwaertigen unansehnlichen, d. h., dem Salomonischen ungleichen, Tempel Serubbabels von dem zukuenftigen herrlichen Bau der messianischen Zeit. Er kennt also noch nicht den herodianischen Prachtbau, schreibt somit vor dessen Zeit."

Oesterley, judging by the teaching of the book, comes to this conclusion: "The book is not necessarily later than Ecclesiasticus, for, although it does in some respects shows a development of doctrine, it is quite possible for contemporaries to be in substantial agreement and yet for one to hold slightly more advanced views on certain points than another. Our book may thus be assigned to a date not much later than B. C. 175 and not earlier than B. C. 190." (*Op. cit.*, p. 366.)

Luther wrote a preface to the Book of Tobit. He makes these remarks: "Und das griechische Exemplar siehet fast also, dass es ein Spiel gewest sei; denn es redet alles in Tobiae Person, wie die Personen im Spiel zu tun pflegen. Darnach ist ein Meister kommen und hat solch Spiel in eine ordentliche Rede gefasset." "Darum ist das Buch uns Christen auch nuetzlich und gut zu lesen, als eines feinen hebraeischen Poeten, der keine leichtfertigen, sondern die rechten Sachen handelt und aus der Massen christlich treibt und beschreibt." (St. L., XIV: 76, 77.)

Bibliography

Fritzsche, *Die Buecher Tobiae und Judith erklaert* (1853).
Hoffmann, *Auszuege aus syrischen Akten persischer Maertyrer*, pp. 182 ff. (1880).
Conybeare, Rendel Harris, and Agnes Smith Lewis, *The Story of Ahikar from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek, and Slavonic Versions* (1898).
Smend, *Alter und Herkunft des Achikarromans und sein Verhaeltnis zu Aesop* (1908).
Nau, *Histoire et Sagesse d'Ahikar* (1909).
Meyer, E., *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, pp. 102—128 (1912).
Ungnad, *Aramaeische Papyrus aus Elephantine*, pp. 62—82 (1911).
Charles, I, pp. 174—241.
Robertson Smith, "Tobit" in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.
Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Marshall).
Erbt, "Tobit" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.
Toy, "Tobit" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*.
Simrock, *Der gute Gerhard und die dankbaren Toten* (1856).
Schneider, *Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden*, pp. 638 ff. (1910).
Oesterley,* pp. 349—371.
Kautzsch,† pp. 135—147.

---

* *The Books of the Apocrypha*, etc.
† *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.*

JUDITH

"The title of the book in Greek is simply 'Ιουδείθ. . . . The name, of course, simply means 'Jewess.'" (Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 243.) "The story of Judith is a contribution to the literature of Jewish patriotism. It is a sacred historical novel. The story is laid in the period just after the return from the Captivity." (Samuel Bagster Edition, Introduction.)

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, pp. 372 ff.) outlines the contents of the book. He refers to Judith 1:1; 2:1 ff.; 4:2, 3; 4:6-8 as evidence that the writer is not to be looked upon as an historian and then concludes: "On the face of it, therefore, the book is not to be regarded as historical. Yet the writer is well acquainted with the Old Testament, and so far as the geography of Palestine is concerned, he is thoroughly *au fait.* We must conclude that he simply chose the historical names and times as the framework in which to place his story in order that he might thereby render it more dramatic; he purposely commits gross historical blunders in order to make it clear to his readers at the outset that the historical period chosen is merely for literary effect; 'they are to understand that this is fiction, not history; it did not take place in this or that definite period of Jewish history, but simply "once upon a time," the real vagueness of the date being transparently disguised in the manner which has become familiar in the folk-tales of other parts of the world' (Torrey in the *Jewish Encyclopedia,* VII, p. 388b)." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 378.)

As to the various forms in which the Greek text has come down to us Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 147) has this to say: "Der Text der griechischen Uebersetzung liegt in drei Rezensionen vor: (a) Der der LXX-Codices A und B, welch ersterem Sinaiticus haeufig folgt. Unserer Uebersetzung ist der Text von A zugrunde gelegt; (b) der der Codices 19, 108, Lucians Textrevision; (c) der des Codex 58, mit welchem Vet. Lat. und Syr. zusammengehen." Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 379 f.

Concerning the teaching of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 148) says: "Unser Buch dient aehnlich wie das Tobit-Buch der Glaubensstaerkung und Erbauung der Volksgenossen des Verfassers. Auch gegen die heidnische Uebermacht sollen sie bereit sein, fuer ihren Glauben und Kultus den Kampf aufzunehmen. Solange sie sich nicht an ihrem Gotte versuendigen durch Goetzendienst oder Uebertretung seiner rituellen Gebote, sind sie seines Schutzes gewiss, und vermag die gewaltigste Kriegsmacht nichts wider sie. Dieser Gedanke ist in eine Geschichte gekleidet, die wahrscheinlich vom Verfasser frei erfunden ist. Benutzt hat er fuer seine Darstellung mancherlei Namen historischer Personen und Ortschaften. Von jenen sei Nabuchodonozor, den er zum Koenige von Ninive

macht, Holofernes, der Satrap und Feldherr des Artaxerxes Ochus, und der Eunuch Bagoas, ein Zeitgenosse des vorigen, erwaehnt. Unter den Ortsnamen muessen wir vor allem Bethulia nennen, da 'der Verfasser seine Erzaehlung nicht geographisch in die Luft gebaut haben wird' (Schuerer)." Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 381 f.

"As to the anonymous author there is no tradition. From his writing in Hebrew and from his detailed references to the geography of the Holy Land, it may be inferred that he was a Palestinian Jew. From his theological views it seems that he belonged to the Pharisaic party. He was a man of some literary skill," says Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

In regard to the original language of this book Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 224) says: "It is generally agreed that the original was Semitic, and Hebrew rather than Aramaic. Indeed, there can be no possibility of doubt if we consider the style of the Greek and the nature of some of the mistakes in it. The language is not merely that popular Greek which we now know from papyri of the earlier centuries of A. D. to have been identified with the κοινὴ διάλεκτος of the New Testament, even when independent from any Semitic idiom. The translation is so literal that it can be put back into Hebrew with ease, and in some cases becomes fully intelligible only when so retranslated. Moreover, the usual lack of particles shows that the writer was under the influence of a foreign idiom, while the constant recurrence of phrases uncommon in late Greek but frequent in Hebrew shows incontestably the language of the original." Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1609.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 384) agrees with Charles when he says: "There can be not two opinions as to what the original language of the book was, namely, Hebrew; in numerous instances the Greek proves itself to have been translated from Hebrew, the idioms being those of classical Hebrew, so that this was the language of both the longer and the shorter forms. St. Jerome, in the preface to his translation, says that he had the book before him in Aramaic; this cannot, however, have been the original, for neither Origen nor the Jews with whom he was in communication knew either of a Hebrew or an Aramaic form of the book. The Hebrew original was lost altogether in the West, but must have been preserved in some form or other in the East."

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 147) is very positive that the original was Hebrew, for we read "Das Judith-Buch ist, wie mit Sicherheit behauptet werden darf, urspruenglich hebraeisch geschrieben gewesen. Das beweisen nicht nur die zahlreichen Hebraismen, wie ἡμέρας πολλάς und ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις oder σφόδρα und πλῆθος πολὺ σφόδρα u. v. a., sondern auch Missverstaendnisse des griechischen Uebersetzers, wie das 3:9."

As to the date of the book Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 245) says: "Allowing some time for the original book to become established before it was translated, . . . we should probably date the Greek not later than the beginning of the first century A. D."

Judging by the contents and the teaching of the book, Oesterley comes to this conclusion as to the date of the book: "So that we may safely assign the middle of the first century B. C. as the date of the *later* form of our book. As regards the earlier form of our book, it is to be noted that it contains no references to ceremonial observances, a fact which proves that it must have been written before Pharisaism had had time to develop; this is of itself sufficient to show that the book in its original form was written before 100 B. C., so that we shall not be far wrong in fixing its date about the middle of the second century B. C." (*Op. cit.*, p. 384. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1609.)

On the time of the composition of this book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 149) says: "Als Abfassungszeit unsers Buches wird allgemein die Zeit der Makkabaeer angesehen. Ein kriegerischer Geist durchweht das Ganze. Derselbe aeussert sich in fanatischem Hasse wider alles heidnische Wesen, so dass selbst die vom Alten Testament verurteilte Schandtat des Simeon und Levi Anerkennung findet, und nicht minder ist fuer ihn charakteristisch das starke Bewusstsein, dass der gegenwaertige Krieg ein heiliger, fuer Jahwe und seinen Kultus gefuehrter ist. Endlich erscheint als Feind der Juden der Koenig Nabuchodonozor, ein Typus fuer Antiochus Epiphanes; vgl. Cornill, Einl., S. 271. Das alles sind deutliche Merkzeichen der makkabaeischen Zeit."

Luther expresses high admiration for this book in his preface to it. (St. L. XIV: 68 ff.) He says: "Wo man die Geschichte Judith koennte aus bewaehrten, gewissen Historien beweisen, so waere es ein edel, fein Buch, das auch billig in der Bibel sein sollte, aber es will sich schwerlich reimen mit den Historien der Heiligen Schrift, sonderlich mit Jeremia und Esra," etc. He also expressed the idea, which is commonly accepted now, that it is not history but rather propaganda literature, for he says: "Etliche wollen, es sei kein Geschicht, sondern ein geistlich schoen Gedicht eines heiligen, geistreichen Mannes, der darinnen habe wollen malen und vorbilden des ganzen juedischen Volks Glueck und Sieg wider alle ihre Feinde," etc. "Solche Meinung gefaellt mir fast wohl, und denke, dass der Dichter wissentlich und mit Fleiss den Irrtum der Gezeit und Namen darein gesetzt hat, den Leser zu vermahnen, dass er's fuer ein solch geistlich, heilig Gedicht halten und verstehen sollte." "Darum ist es ein fein, gut, heilig, nuetzlich Buch, uns Christen wohl zu lesen."

From the fact that this book was written by a Palestinian Jew

and in the Hebrew language (although the original Hebrew is not at hand and the Hebrew versions known are late) both Charles and Oesterley suggest Palestine as the probable place of composition of this book. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 385; Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

Bibliography

Charles, I, pp. 242—267.
Oesterley, 372—384.
Kautzsch, I, pp. 147—164.
Fritzsche, *Die Buecher Tobiae und Judith erklaert* (1853).
Scholz, *Kommentar ueber das Buch Judith und ueber Bel und Drache* (1896).
Wuensche, *Aus Israel's Lehrhallen*, II, pp. 164—185 (1908).
Schuerer, in *Prot. Real-Encykl.*, I, 644 .
Weiszmann, *Das Buch Judith, historisch-kritisch beleuchtet*, Wien, 1891.

THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

Concerning the title of this book, which does not always bear the same name, Charles says (*op. cit.*, p. 519): "The earliest mention of the book is perhaps found in p. 11 a, line 8, of the Muratorian Canon (A. D. 200). There the title is 'Sapientia,' with the added words 'ab amicis Solomonis in honorem ipsius scripta.' Clement of Alexandria, head of the Catechetical school, A. D. 190 to 203, speaks of it under the title 'Wisdom of Solomon.' Tertullian (ca. 200) quotes it as the 'Wisdom of Solomon.'" Cf. Kautzsch, *op. cit*, p. 476.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 455) says about the title: "The title 'The Wisdom of Solomon' in the English versions comes from the Greek manuscripts, the three oldest of which have this exact title, while, in one form or another, they all have it. But the old Latin version has only 'The Book of Wisdom,' without any mention of Solomon; and the Syriac version, while ascribing it to Solomon, adds, 'of which there is a doubt; whether another wise man of the Hebrews wrote it in a prophetic spirit, putting it in the name of Solomon, and it was received.'"

On the matter of the title of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 476) has this illuminating note: "Das Buch der Weisheit Salomos verdankt diese seine Aufschrift, sowohl im griechischen Original als in den Uebersetzungen, dem Umstande, dass es sich selbst an mehreren Stellen, besonders in Kap. 7-9, am deutlichsten Kap. 9: 7, 8, als eine Rede des Koenigs Salomo einfuehrt."

If Solomon was not the author of this book, as is generally agreed, although some early Latin Fathers believed that he wrote it, we may well ask the question why it should have been ascribed to Solomon in the first place. The answer which is usually given in this, that to the Jews, Solomon was the wisdom-writer *par excellence* and that, therefore, any one desiring to com-

mend a book on wisdom would naturally choose this name as a pseudonym in preference to any other.

Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 476) says on this matter: "Es kann aber keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass wir darin eine Nachbildung einer literarischen Form haben, die schon in der spaeteren hebraeischen Literatur ueblich geworden war, nach der der wegen seiner Weisheit beruehmte Koenig von Israel gewissermassen als Patron der gesamten didaktischen Literatur angesehen wurde (vgl. Sir. 47: 14-17 (16-19)." "Sicher haben die Zeitgenossen des Verfassers nicht daran gedacht, dass ihnen hier eine authentische Rede Salomos vorgetragen werden sollte."

Charles states (op. cit., 524): "The author of the book is generally assumed to be an Alexandrian Jew."

Although Oesterley discusses the question of a composite authorship from page 464 to 469, he comes to no definite conclusion, but says: "As to the personality of the author but very few data are to be gathered from the book; he must in all probability have been a Jew (cp. 12: 22), but a Hellenistic Jew, yet loyal to the Law (18: 4), who lived and wrote in Egypt (see 12: 23 ff.; 15: 18, 19, 16: 1, 9, where reference is made to Egyptian animal worship); his Jewish feeling is evidenced throughout the book; that he was domiciled in Alexandria is highly probable, for this was the center of Jewish-Hellenistic culture." (Op. cit., 457-458.)

Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 479) is much more positive on the authorship of this book than Oesterley, for he says: "Das Werk ist offenbar das wohldisponierte Erzeugnis eines einzigen Verfassers. Ueber jetzt verschollene Hypothesen, die es in Arbeiten verschiedener Haende zerlegten, s. Grimm, S. 9—15; Wace, S. 415. . . . Die Vermutungen ueber bestimmte Persoenlichkeiten als vermeintliche Verfasser des Buches glauben wir als wertlos uebergehen zu sollen; vgl. darueber Grimm, S. 16—26; Wace, S. 411—415. Die Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht fuer einen griechisch gebildeten, aber gesetzestreuen aegyptischen Juden. Dass er in Aegypten lebte, verraet die Anspielung auf den aegyptischen Tierdienst, 15: 18, 19; 16: 1, 9. Fuer Alexandria spricht, dass hier die Heimstaette der griechisch-juedischen Bildung war."

Even Luther has something to say on the question of authorship, for we read (St. L., XIV: 72-77): "Dies Buch ist lange Zeit in Zank gestanden, ob's unter die Buecher der Heiligen Schrift des Alten Testaments zu rechnen sein sollte oder nicht, sonderlich weil der Dichter sich hoeren laesst im neunten Kapitel, V. 7, als redete in diesem ganzen Buch der Koenig Salomo, welcher auch von der Weisheit im Buch der Koenige hoch geruehmt wird. Aber die alten Vaeter haben's stracks aus der Heiligen Schrift gesondert und gehalten, es sei unter der Person des Koenigs Salomo gemacht,

43

auf dass es um solches hochberuehmten Koenigs Namen und Person willen desto mehr geachtet und groesser Ansehen haette bei den Gewaltigen auf Erden, an welche es vornehmlich geschrieben ist, und vielleicht laengst untergegangen waere, wo es der Meister, so er geringes Ansehens gewest, unter seinem Namen haette lassen ausgehen."

As to the original language of the book Oesterley (*op. cit.,* p. 455) makes the terse and telling footnote: "That the book was originally written in Greek admits of no doubt." Charles (*op. cit.,* p. 524 f.) fully agrees with Oesterley. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, 2. Serie, Bd. 2, S. 1612.

About the original language of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.,* p. 476) says: "Das Buch selbst zeigt uns einen in griechischer Sprache und Literatur nicht unbewanderten Juden. Sein Griechisch ist zwar nicht immer korrekt, indem er bisweilen Worte in einer Bedeutung braucht, die in der klassischen Sprache nicht ueblich ist. Aber andererseits zeigt er doch eine ausgebreitete Kenntnis des griechischen Wortschatzes und ist in die Sprache so eingelebt, dass er aehnlich wie Philo (vgl. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria* [1875], S. 46 f., 135) auch eigne neue Wortkompositionen und Phrasen zu bilden wagt. Seine Darstellung zeigt Belesenheit in den griechischen Dichtern in manchen Partien seines Buches, die sich durch poetischen Schwung und geschickte Handhabung mancher dichterischen Formen auszeichnen."

As to the date of the book Charles (*op. cit.,* p. 521) says: "The present writer inclines to a date between 50 and 30 B. C. for the first part of the book and 30 B. C. to A. D. 10 for the second part."

"Fuer die Abfassungszeit bildet die Entstehung der griechischen Bibeluebersetzung (ca. 250) die Grenze nach oben, die nicht zu bezweifelnde [? Ed.] Bekanntschaft des Apostels Paulus mit dem Buche die Grenze nach unten. Die neuesten Datierungen schwanken zwischen 150 v. Chr. bis 40 n. Chr. Die Stellung, die der Verfasser in der Entwicklung des Alexandrinismus vor Philo einnimmt (vgl. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria,* S. 22—24), spricht dafuer, ihn zwischen 100—50 v. Chr. anzusetzen." After discussing the matter on pp. 459—464 in a rather detailed form on the basis of three separate considerations, Oesterley (p. 464) comes to this conclusion: "All things considered, the most probable date would seem to be the latter half of the last century B. C., the earlier part of the book belonging to the beginning, the latter half to the end, of this period."

A short, but able appreciation of the book is given in these words of the introduction to Samuel Bagster's edition of the Apocrypha: "This book is one of the most beautiful and important in

the Apocrypha. Its first portion (1:1 to 11:4) is distinguished for the singular beauty of its style, its noble teaching of immortality, and its panegyric on wisdom. The second portion of the book is very inferior to the first from a literary point of view. It contains a pictorial commentary on the story of the Exodus. — The book was, without doubt, written in Greek by an Alexandrian Jew, probably a short while before the Christian era."

Bibliography

Oesterley, pp. 455—478.
Grimm, *Das Buch der Weisheit erklaert* (1860).
Montefiore, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (1887).
Wace, I, pp. 403—534.
Deane, *The Book of Wisdom* (1881).
Menzel, *Der griechische Einfluss auf Prediger und Weisheit Salomos*, pp. 39—70 (1889).
Bois, *Essai sur les origines de la philosophie judeo-alexandrine* (1890).
Schuerer, II, iii, pp. 230—237.
Kautzsch, I, pp. 476—507.
Linke, *Samarien und seine Propheten*, pp. 119—144 (1903).
Stevenson, *Wisdom and Jewish Apocryphal Writings* (1903).
Friedlaender, M., *Griechische Philosophie im Alten Testamente*, pp. 182 to 208 (1904).
Zeller, *Outlines of Greek Philosophy* (1909).
Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (1909).
Charles, I, pp. 518—568.
Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom* (1913).
Freudenthal, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, III, 722—753 (1891).
Siegfried, in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*.
Toy, in *Encycl. Bibl.*
Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, ii, p. 606 f.
Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 231 (1900).
Grafe, *Das Verhaeltnis der Paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis* (1892).
Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*.
Hausrath, *Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 23 (1872).

SIRACH

This book is known by various names. "Ecclesiasticus," "Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach," "The Book of Ben Sira," "Das Buch Jesus Sirach," and "Sirach" are some of these names. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 270; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 321; Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 230 ff.

A brief but nevertheless illuminating characterization of the book is given in the introduction of Samuel Bagster's edition of the Apocrypha. It reads: "This book was originally written in Hebrew by Joshua Ben Sira of Jerusalem a few years before the outbreak of the Maccabean persecution. It was translated by his grandson into Greek, and until recently the book was known only in its Greek form, but by a surprising series of discoveries nearly the whole of the work is now extant in a Hebrew text.

"The book falls into two distinct and unequal divisions. The first forty-three chapters comprise, in the main, a text-book of

morals, which is of great value as reflecting the manners and customs of the age. The last eight chapters are occupied chiefly with the beautiful prose-hymn known as 'The Praise of Famous Men.' "

Luther, in his preface to this book (St. L., XIV: 78 ff.), pens the following notes of appreciation of this book: "Dies Buch ist bisher genannt im Latein Ecclesiasticus, welches sie haben verdeutscht: die geistliche Zucht. Und ist fast wohl getrieben und gebraucht in der Kirche, mit Lesen, Singen, und Predigen, aber mit wenigem Verstand und Nutzen, ohne dass es hat muessen der Geistlichen Stand und Kirchengepraenge ruehmen. Sonst heisst sein rechter Name 'Jesus Sirach,' nach seinem Meister, wie seine eigene Vorrede und das Griechische gibt. . . . Es ist ein nuetzlich Buch fuer den gemeinen Mann; denn auch alle sein Fleiss ist, dass er einen Buerger oder Hausvater gottesfuerchtig, fromm und klug mache," etc.

Concerning the title of the book Charles (op. cit., p. 291) says: "In the MSS. of the Greek Bible the author of our book is called Ἰησοῦς Σειράχ, or more briefly Σειράχ. . . . The full name of the author is given in the body of the book, in 50: 27." There we read: Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σίραχ Ἐλεάζαρ ὁ Ἰεροησολυμίτης, Jesus, the son of Sirach Eleazar of Jerusalem."

Rahlfs, in his edition of the LXX, gives us this note: "Sir. (= Siracides uel Ecclesiasticus [liber]): BSA."

This is the longest, and perhaps also the most important, of all the books of the Apocrypha. It covers almost one hundred pages in Rahlfs's edition of the LXX. Kautzsch uses 244 pages for his *Einleitung, Uebersetzung,* and *Anmerkungen* in his edition of the Apocrypha.

As to the importance of this book Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 230) says: "Die umfangreiche Spruchsammlung, die in der Lutherschen Bibeluebersetzung den Titel 'Das Buch Jesus Sirach' traegt, beansprucht unter den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments schon dadurch ein besonderes Interesse, weil sie die aelteste dieser Schriften ist und an Alter sogar das Buch Daniel [?] ueberragt, das noch in den Kanon Aufnahme gefunden hat, jedenfalls deshalb, weil es den altehrwuerdigen Namen des beruehmten Daniel, eines Zeitgenossen des Cyrus, trug, waehrend der Siracide sein Werk unter seinem Namen veroeffentlichte. Aber dies Werk ist zugleich unter den in rhythmischer Form abgefassten Apokryphen das bedeutendste, ebenso wie das erste Buch der Makkabaeer unter den apokryphischen "Geschichtsbuechern." The hypothesis of a second-century date for Daniel is unfounded.

Explaining the title of this book, Oesterley (op. cit., p. 321 f.) says: "Ecclesiasticus," the name with which we are most familiar,

gives no indication as to the contents of the book; it has, however, been the title whereby the book was known in the Western Church ever since the third century. St. Jerome retained the familiar title in his Latin version of the Bible, and it has continued in the Church ever since. On account of its manifold instruction in conduct of life it was much used in the early Church, especially in the case of catechumens; the title, therefore, of Ecclesiasticus was probably given to it because it was the ecclesiastical book *par excellence*. What the original title was we do not know; but in most manuscripts of the Greek version the title given is: 'Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach'; in the Syriac version it is: 'Wisdom of Ben Sira.' Both these were translations from the Hebrew, so that we shall not be far wrong in believing that the original title ran: 'The Wisdom of Ben Sira' or 'The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira.' [Note: In the recently found Hebrew text the author speaks of himself as "Simeon, the son of Jeshua (Jesus), the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira."] The Greek translator, in the prolog of the book, speaks of his grandfather 'Jesus' as the author. In the Talmud the book is referred to as 'The Book of Ben Sira'; the name 'Jesus' would have been omitted by the Rabbis for obvious reasons."

The contents, the doctrinal standpoint of the author, the integrity of the text, the Sadducean or Pharisaic tendency of the author, which Charles, Kautzsch, and Oesterley treat at considerable length, cannot be discussed here, for that would lead us too far afield. All these questions are, of course, of interest. Some are particularly important when the bearing of the Apocrypha on the New Testament is studied.

There should be no need of much discussion as to the author of this book since the author of the Greek translation in the prolog calls the author of the original Hebrew his "grandfather Jesus." It is the grandson of "Jesus, the son of Sirach of Jerusalem," who wrote the Greek text. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 280—291; Pauly-Wissowa, *loc. cit.*, p. 1611.

Yet we should like to know what manner of man this Jesus Ben Sira was. Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, 233, 234) explains in detail the presence of 'Ελεάζαρ after Σειράχ in 50:27 in Codex Alexandrinus. While Fritzsche held that this name was added by a later hand, Kautzsch contends that it goes back to an old tradition.

From Oesterley's lengthy discussion of the author of the book we draw the following. "In the prolog of the Greek version the writer says that he is about to translate his grandfather's work; in the Hebrew text the author gives his name, as we have seen; this is also given in the subscription; moreover, in the Talmud the author is given as Ben Sira. There is, therefore, every reason to believe that the author was Ben Sira; and this is universally

acknowledged. That he wrote the whole book does not admit of doubt; unity of authorship is stamped upon the work throughout. Further, that the Greek translation represents substantially the author's book, which his grandson had before him, is also practically certain. On the other hand, it may be doubted whether the book represents the final form which the author intended it to have; whether he was interrupted in his work, or whether he died before he was able to sift and arrange his material, a careful study of the book leaves the impression that the author left it in an incomplete state." *Op. cit.*, p. 322.

The reasons for thinking that the book did not receive its final revision are these: In many parts of the book the material is not logically arranged; the same subject matter is treated in different parts of the book; and there is inconsistency of teaching on cardinal points of doctrine, *e. g.*, the doctrine of sin.

"Ben Sira was not only an orthodox Jew, but he was also a scribe and a teacher. His grandson tells us in the Prolog that his grandfather had devoted his life to the study of 'the Law, the Prophets, and the other books of our fathers,' and that his object, in doing so, was that he might by teaching help others to a knowledge of the Law as well as in carrying out its precepts. Ben Sira's own words bear out the truth of this, for he is evidently speaking from personal experience when he says: 'Leisure increaseth wisdom to the scribe' (38:24); moreover, his very intimate knowledge of the Old Testament is just what one would expect of a scribe; this knowledge is evident on every page of his book, which is saturated with the thoughts of the Old Testament wisdom literature, almost the very words of which occur again and again; in the concluding chapters of his book (44:1 to 50:24) he sings the praises of all the great ones of Israel and shows how he has his Old Testament at his fingers' ends." (*Op. cit.*, p. 324.) The following passages from his book are quoted as having some bearing upon the author as a scribe and a teacher: 38:24 to 39:3; 39:1-3; 51:23-28; 24:30-34; 33:16-18; 39:12 ff.; 39:4; 34:10-12; 51:1-13; etc.

That the original language was Hebrew is evident from these words of the Greek translator in his prolog: "The same things uttered in Hebrew and translated into another tongue have not the same force in them," v. 22 f. That is confirmed by the fact, already alluded to, that a large portion (about two thirds) of the book has in recent years been found in Hebrew. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, 329. "Although he does not actually say so, it is pretty obvious that Ben Sira's grandson implies here that he translated his grandfather's book from the Hebrew (from the words of the Prolog). In the second place, in St. Jerome's time it would appear

that Hebrew manuscripts of the book existed in Palestine, for in
his preface to the books of Solomon he says that he found the book
of Jesus, the son of Sirach, in Hebrew. Then, again, in later times
Saadiah (A. D. 920) speaks of the existence of copies of the Hebrew
text, and he says that the vowel-points were added, which was,
as a rule, only done in the case of canonical books. And, lastly,
in a number of cases the renderings of the Greek necessitate the
assumption that they were translated from Hebrew.

"But all doubt, where such existed, was set at rest by the dis-
covery (1896—1900) of a number of fragments of the Hebrew
text. . . . Altogether about thirty leaves were found; they are
fragments belonging to four different manuscripts, and they all
come from the Genizah of a synagog in Cairo. As all these
manuscripts are written on paper and not on vellum, they cannot
be earlier than the ninth century A. D., for paper was not intro-
duced until this century; they all belong probably to the end of
the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century." Oesterley,
op. cit., pp. 329, 330.

"But while it is thus evident that Hebrew was the original
language in which our book was written, it does not necessarily
follow that the recently found manuscripts contain the original
form of the Hebrew." Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 331. Cf. Kautzsch,
op. cit., p. 255.

Zahn, *The Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 6, says con-
cerning the language of this book: "Jesus, the son of Sirach, a
resident of Jerusalem, wrote his book of proverbs in Biblical
Hebrew about 180 B. C., and his grandson in Egypt translated it
into Greek after 132 B. C."

Concerning the time of the composition of this book Kautzsch
(*op. cit.*, p. 235) says: "Eine naehere Bestimmung der Abfassungs-
zeit ist auf Grund der im Vorstehendem mitgeteilten Einblicke
in sein Leben und Sterben nicht moeglich. Dagegen liegen zwei
Momente zur naeheren Bestimmung der Zeit Jesus Sirachs vor:
das eine in der Angabe seines Enkels, dass er, nachdem er im 38.
Jahre unter Euergetes nach Aegypten gekommen war, dort seine
griechische Uebersetzung der Schrift des Grossvaters abfasste, das
andere in der Schilderung, die Jesus Sirach selbst von dem Hohen-
priester Simon, dem Sohne des Onias (bezw. Jonias und nach
dem hebraeischen Texte Jochanan), entwirft (50:1 ff.). Aber
diese scheinbar recht bestimmt lautenden Angaben geben tatsaech-
lich zu den verschiedenartigsten Zeitbestimmungen Anlass und
Gelegenheit, und zwar schon deshalb, weil es zwei Euergetes und
zwei Hohepriester Simon gegeben hat. . . . Kam aber sonach der
Enkel im Jahre 132 nach Aegypten, so faellt die Anfertigung der
Uebersetzung hoechstwahrscheinlich in die naechsten Jahre, etwa

130. Und wenn der Grossvater bei der Abfassung seiner Spruch-
sammlung etwa 40—60 Jahre aelter war als der Enkel bei der
Uebersetzungsarbeit, so faellt die erstere in die Jahre 190—170
v. Chr., und der Hohepriester Simon, dessen Verdienste um sein
Volk und dessen hehre Erscheinung beim Gottesdienst Jesus
Sirach im frischen Andenken an den eben Dahingegangenen preist,
ist alsdann Simon II., der nach Schuerer (III, p. 159) Anfang des
zweiten Jahrhunderts (wogegen sich Ewald's Fixierung auf 219 bis
199 nicht aufrecht halten laesst) Hohepriester war."

Oesterley (op. cit., pp. 327, 328) discusses the same matter,
starting from the data given in the Prolog. He concludes: "Those
words enable us to fix the date, approximately, of the translation
of the book; for there was only one Egyptian king of the name
of Euergetes to whom the translator's words could apply, namely,
Euergetes II, surnamed Physcon, who reigned altogether forty-
four years; first he was joint ruler with his elder brother, Philo-
metor (B. C. 170—145), and then he reigned alone (B. C. 145—116).
The thirty-eighth year of his reign would be 132 B. C.; soon after
this date, therefore, the Greek translation was made. Having got
this date, it is not difficult to fix an approximate date for the
original work; it would be about fifty or sixty years earlier.
At the end of chapter 49 and beginning of 50, according to the
Hebrew of our book, it says: 'Great among his brethren, and the
glory of his people, was Simeon, the son of Jochanan, the priest.'

"This Simeon, the second of the name, was high priest from
B. C. 219—199; Ben Sira was clearly a contemporary of his (see
I. 1 ff.), but the way in which he writes about him suggests that
Simeon must have been dead some time when Ben Sira wrote;
we shall therefore not be far wrong in assigning the year B. C. 180,
or thereabouts, as the date of the composition of the book in
its original form."

Charles (op. cit., p. 293) says: "The translator calls the author
of the original book his ὁ πάππος, a term which may be interpreted
in its usual sense of 'grandfather.' The composition of the original
book of Ben Sira may therefore be assigned to the first quarter
of the second century B. C. (200—175 B. C.)."

Basing his investigation on the last sentence of the Prolog,
namely: "For in the eighth and thirtieth . . . the Law," Charles
concludes: "It may be concluded, therefore, that the translator
reached Egypt in this year (132 B. C.) and completed his transla-
tion of the book some few years later (between 132 and 116)."
(Op. cit., p. 293.)

In the Prolog the translator clearly states that he came
"into Egypt" and that he found a book there which he translated.
He claims that he did this work of love for those "who in a strange

country are willing to learn (τοῖς ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ βουλομένοις φιλομαθεῖν)."

As it is generally agreed that the original Hebrew was written in Palestine, so it is generally assumed that the translation into Greek was made in Egypt. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 293; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 327 f.; Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 233 ff.

Bibliography

Charles, I, pp. 268—517.
Oesterley, pp. 321—348.
Kautzsch, I, pp. 230—475.
Fritzsche, *Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach erklaert und uebersetzt* (1859).
Wace, II, pp. 1-239.
Schechter, *Studies in Judaism* (Second Series), pp. 55—101 (1908).
Hart, *Ecclesiasticus* (1909).
Oesterley, *Ecclesiasticus*, in the Cambridge Bible (1912).
Cowley and Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus*, pp. x—xi.
Margoliouth, *The Origin of the "Original" Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.*

BARUCH

This book, consisting of five chapters and a little over eight pages in Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint, is found in the Septuagint between the prophecies of Jeremiah and Lamentations. This illuminating remark is added there: "Bar.:BA.-S post Ier. scripsit librum Thr. usque ad 2:20 conseruatum; librum Bar. utrum post Thr. scripserit an omiserit, non liquet, quia post Thr. 2:20 multa folia interierunt." It will be seen from this that the Vatican and the Alexandrian MSS. contain this book, while the Sinaitic codex is here defective.

Luther did not have a very exalted opinion of this book. In his "Vorrede auf das Buch Baruch, 1530" he says: "Sehr geringe ist dies Buch, wer auch der gute Baruch ist. Denn es ist nicht glaublich, dass St. Jeremiae Diener, der auch Baruch heisst (dem auch diese Epistel zugemessen wird), nicht sollte hoeher und reicher im Geiste sein, weder dieser Baruch ist." After stating that he hardly cared to translate it, as he did not translate the third and fourth books of Ezra, which did not contain matters as worthwhile as Aesop, he adds: "Baruch lassen wir mitlaufen unter diesem Haufen (the books of the Apocrypha translated by Luther), weil er wider die Abgoetterei so hart schreibt und Mosis Gesetz vorhaelt." (St. L., XIV: 80, 81.)

The book of Baruch is composed of three distinct parts. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, pp. 569 ff.; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 497 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 1603. These three parts are: 1:1 to 3:8; 3:9 to 4:4; 4:5 to 5:9.

In his description of the contents of this book, Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 496) says in reference to the introductory remarks of this book: "It purports to have been written by Baruch, the friend

of Jeremiah, in Babylon during the Captivity; and after it had been read there 'in the hearing of Jechonias the son of Joakim, king of Judah, and in the hearing of the people' (1:3, 4), it was sent to Jerusalem to be read there (1:14); with it was also sent a collection of money to the high priest Joakim for the purpose of defraying the expenses of sacrifices (1:6–10); the people in Jerusalem are also asked to pray for Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, and for his son, Baltasar, as well as for the exiles (1:11–13)."

He then gives the following titles to the three parts: 1. The Book of Confessions (1:1 to 3:8); 2. The Sage's Words of Encouragement (3:9 to 4:4). 3. A Message of Good Cheer (4:5 to 5:9). With his description of the component parts of the Book of Baruch compare also Kautzsch's "Einleitung," *op. cit.*, p. 213 ff.

In regard to the author of this book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 213) makes the following statements: "Indes, wie dem auch sein mag, jedenfalls ist dies sicher: weder handelt es sich hier um ein wirkliches Produkt des geschichtlichen Baruch noch auch um ein irgendwie einheitliches Werk.". . . "Es ist also nur eine Fiktion, wenn das, was in dieser Schrift enthalten ist, mit dem Namen Baruchs in Zusammenhang gebracht wird.". . . "Aber das Werk ist auch keine Einheit oder doch nur insofern, als das Bussgebet wie die uebrigen Teile des Buches den Fall Jerusalems und die Zersteuung des Volkes in die Heidenwelt voraussetzen." Neither Charles nor Oesterley make any definite statements as to the author of this book other than to say that it "purports" to be the book of Baruch, that it consists of three different parts which may not have the same author. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 569 and 496, respectively.

As to the original language of the Book of Baruch the view commonly accepted by scholars now is this: The first part (chap. 1:1 to 3:8) was composed in Hebrew; the second part (chap. 3:9 to 4:4), in Hebrew or Aramaic; the third part (chap. 4:5 to 5:9), in Greek. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 572; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 506; Harwell, *The Principal Versions of Baruch*, p. 66; Pauly-Wissowa, *loc. cit.*, p. 1609.

While this is the commonly accepted view, Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 215, does not share that view fully. He says: "Was nun die Frage anlangt, in welcher Sprache die in diesem Buche vereinigten Stuecke urspruenglich abgefasst worden sind, so haben, wie die Mehrzahl der aelteren Kritiker, zuletzt noch Kneucker (*Das Buch Baruch*) und Koenig (*Einleitung*, S. 485), an einem hebraeischen Original festgehalten, unsers Erachtens mit allem Rechte. Die meisten Neueren allerdings (vgl. z. B. Cornill, *Einleitung*, S. 273; Schuerer, *Geschichte des juedischen Volkes*, II, S. 722 f.) wollen nur fuer den ersten Teil eine hebraeische Vorlage zugeben, waehrend die letzten Teile von 3:9 an griechisches Original sein sollen.

Die Eleganz des Griechischen (Cornill) in diesen Teilen kann selbstvertaendlich nichts gegen die Annahme einer hebraeischen Grundlage beweisen. Sie bewiese nur die Geschicklichkeit des Uebersetzers; uebrigens ist dieselbe auch nicht so gar gross. Uns hat sich bei der kritischen Untersuchung des Textes und seiner rhythmischen Rekonstruktion in der Uebersetzung je laenger, je mehr die Ueberzeugung unabweisbar aufgedraengt, dass es sich auch in den Liedern um urspruenglich wirklich hebraeische Gesaenge handelt."

Oesterley (op. cit., p. 504) says concerning the first two parts: "Both the sections so far considered were probably written in Hebrew or, in the case of the second, in Aramaic; Marshall (in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, I, p. 253) has given good ground for the latter contention." Again, he says concerning the original language of the last part: "The original language of the whole of 4:4 to 5:9 is recognized by most scholars as having been Greek from the beginning." (Op. cit., p. 506.)

Assuming that the third part was originally written in Greek, the date of the original and the translation of the first and of the second part is a matter of much dispute. Some date it as early as 100 B. C. and some as late as 150 A. D.

On the question of the date of the Book of Baruch, Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 215) has this to say: "Die Frage nach der Entstehungszeit ist natuerlich nach den kritischen Ergebnissen, die oben mitgeteilt wurden, eine komplizierte. Wir haben die Zeit der Herstellung des ganzen Buches von der Zeit der Entstehung der einzelnen Stuecke zu trennen. Die letzteren koennen lange vorhanden gewesen sein, ehe sie zu der Einheit als Buch Baruch verbunden wurden. Fuer das Bussgebet 1:16 ff. wuerde nun Dan. 9:4 ff. eine Linie angeben, ueber die wir bei der zeitlichen Ansetzung desselben nicht hinaufgehen duerfen, und da es nicht unwahrscheinlich ist, dass auch das Gebet in Dan. 9 erst nachtraeglich eingefuegt ist [?], so laege es durchaus nicht fern, zu schliesen, dass dann die Entstehung des Bussgebets in Baruch 1—3 noch tiefer hinab anzusetzen sei. Jedenfalls wuerde aber die Makkabaeerzeit nach oben die Grenze sein. Die Mehrzahl der Forscher bleibt auch bei dieser Zeit stehen (vgl. z. B. Fritzsche). Aber da nun alle Teile unsers Buches die Zerstoerung Jerusalems und die Wegfuehrung des Volkes voraussetzen, so hat man neuerdings gesagt, das zwinge dazu, an eine Herstellung des Buches nach der Zerstoerung Jerusalems durch Titus im Jahre 70 n. Chr. zu denken, denn auf einen andern Zeitpunkt der juedischen Geschichte seit der Makkabaeerzeit passe die Voraussetzung durchaus nichtmehr; vgl. Hitzig (Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1860, S. 262 ff.), besonders Kneucker (a. a. O.), Schuerer u. a. Indes,

dies wuerde zunaechst doch nur auf die Vereinigung der verschie-
denen Stuecke zu dem Buch und hoechstens auch noch auf das
Bussgebet Anwendung finden. Die Lieder koennten ihrer hebraei-
schen Grundlage nach ganz gut sehr viel aelter sein. Allerdings
scheint in dem letzten 5:5 ff. von dem Ps. Sal. 11:3 ff. abhaengig zu
sein (vgl. z. B. Schuerer a. a. O., S. 274; Cornill, S. 274). Jeden-
falls finden sich hier auffaellige Beruehrungen im einzelnen. Aber
uns macht das letzte Lied des Baruchbuchs seinem ganzen Cha-
rakter nach eher noch den Eindruck, als sei es die originale Vor-
lage fuer den Salomopsalm. Indes, jedenfalls laesst sich darueber
nur subjektiv urteilen."

Harwell (*op. cit.*, p. 66) says: "The date of the original com-
position would propably be not later than 100 B. C., and it is
altogether reasonable to suppose that the poems were composed
before the Maccabean age."

After a thorough investigation both Oesterley and Charles fix
the date of the first part at 74—75 A. D. Says Oesterley (*op. cit.*,
p. 500): "The period to which reference is intended in the book,
namely, the war with Rome, being A. D. 66—70, the fifth year
after the destruction of Jerusalem, mentioned in 1:2, will give
us the precise date of this portion of our book, *viz.,* A. D. 74—75."
Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 574 f.

As to the date of the second part Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 504)
says: "This section (3:9 to 4:4), therefore, may quite possibly
have been written under these conditions at the commencement
of the second century A. D. or even later, though it must have
been written not later than about A. D. 150 or thereabouts, as the
book is quoted by Athenagoras and Irenaeus. (According to
Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 274)."

Charles has this remark concerning the second part of the
book: "The document B was equally appropriate to the years
which followed the catastrophe of A. D. 70." (*Op. cit.*, p. 575.)

In reference to the date of the third part (5:4 to 5:9) Oesterley
says (*Op. cit.*, p. 506): "The indications in the Baruch passage,
however, point to a much later date, and we see no reason to
regard the date of this piece as different from that of section
3:9 to 4:4, the background of each is a peaceful present and a calm
future; the beginning of the second century A. D. may be assigned
as approximately the date of this section, too."

Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 574), however, comes to this conclusion:
"Perhaps A. D. 78 might be a not improbable date. But it might
well have originated later still."

As to the time of the translation of the first two parts, which
as all agree, were originally written in a Semitic language, Charles
(*op. cit.*, p. 576) says: "The Greek translation of the Hebrew

original of A and B was probably made at the close of the first century or soon after the beginning of the second." For the purpose of this discussion the dates of Charles are accepted.

Although the authorities used in this study do not come to any definite conclusion as to the place of composition or translation of this book, the author or compiler himself says in the very first verse that he wrote this book in Babylon (ἐν Βαβυλῶνι). While Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 504) does not evaluate this statement, he does seem to think that this book originated in Babylon, for he says: "The writer is a student of the Law, and he writes on Wisdom and rejoices in the knowledge of things that are pleasing unto God and exhorts others to do the same. All these things lead one to suggest that the scene is one of those academies in Babylonia, such as that at Nehardea, which received a considerable influx of Jews from Palestine after the great calamity of 70 A. D.; in these they studied in peace and reared up students of the Law." Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 574 f.

Bibliography

Fritzsche, *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen* (1851).
Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (1879).
Wace, II, pp. 241—286.
Schuerer, II, pp. 188—195.
Kautzsch, I, pp. 213—225.
Charles, I, pp. 569—595.
Marshall, in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible, sub v.*
Bevan, in the *Encycl. Bibl., sub v.*
Toy, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia, sub v.*
Harwell, *The Principal Versions of Baruch,* 1915.
Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament,* p. 274 (1896).

THE EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint this letter of 72 verses, covering all of four pages, appears after Lamentations. According to this editor it appears in Codices A and B, for he appends the note: "Ep. Ier.: BA." At the end of the letter this note appears: "Subscr. επιστολη ιερεμιου B, ιερεμιας προφητης βαρουχ θρηνοι και επιστολη A."

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 506 f.) thus describes this book, or letter: "In the Vulgate this epistle appears as the sixth chapter of Baruch; but in the Septuagint it is treated as a separate book and comes after Lamentations, with the inscription "Letter of Jeremy" and a title which runs: "Copy of a letter which Jeremiah sent to those who were about to be led captives by the king of the Babylonians, to give them a message, as it had been commanded him by God."

It has been thought by some that this letter was suggested by the letter referred to in Jer. 29:1; but this seems unlikely, because the contents of the letter here spoken of are given in verses 4 ff. of the same chapter. The letter before us is a not very skilfully

composed polemic against idolatry based to a large extent upon Jer. 10:1-16; Ps. 115:4-8, and Is. 49:9-19; it is also reminiscent of such passages as Wis. of Sol. 13:10-19; 15:13-17."

Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 226) gives us this brief characterization of the book: "Diesen Brief soll Jeremia geschrieben haben, um die Judaeer, die im Begriffe waren, als Gefangene nach Babylonien zu ziehen, vor dem Abfall zu den Goetzen der Heiden zu warnen. Zu dem Ende wird in der manigfaltigsten Weise die Nichtigkeit der Goetzen, d. i., der hoelzernen, silbernen und goldenen Gottesbilder dargetan."

As to the original language of the letter, Charles, after a study of the internal evidence, concludes: "Altogether it would seem difficult to avoid the conclusion that our epistle is a free translation of a lost Hebrew original." (Op. cit., p. 598.)

Oesterley (op. cit., p. 508) is however persuaded very much the other way, as he states: "The Epistle was, according to the opinion of most scholars, written in Greek; Ball, with much ingenuity and learning, seeks to show that it was written in Hebrew; but very ingenious as many of the instances are which he brings forward to show that the Greek is a translation of either the genuine Hebrew or, in other cases, of a corruption in the Hebrew text, they are by no means always convincing; and while it may be said that he has shown the possibility of its having been translated from Hebrew, it can hardly be said that he has demonstrated the probability of this. The Hebraisms it contains may well be no more than what are characteristic of Hellenistic Greek."

On the original language of this letter Kautzsch (op. cit., p. 226) expresses his conviction very briefly: "Es ist wohl kein Zweifel daran moeglich, dass dieser Brief von Hause aus griechisch abgefasst ist." In a critical note he speaks of those who insist upon a Hebrew original thus: "Nestle (Marginalien S. 42 f.) verwundert sich darueber, dass sich die fuer ein hebraeisches Original eintretenden katholischen Theologen die Stuetze fuer ihre These haben entgehen lassen, die das Targum zu Jer. 10:11 bietet: 'Dies ist die Abschrift des Briefes, den der Prophet Jeremia an den Ueberrest der Aeltesten der Exulantenschaft sandte, die in Babel waren.' Aber die Uebereinstimmung des Targums mit Brief Jer. 1:1 erstreckt sich eigentlich nur auf den Anfang, so dass eine Bekanntschaft des Targumisten mit dem griechischen Brief Jeremias nicht zu erweisen ist. Weit eher duerfte die Vorlage des Targumisten in Jer. 29:1 zu finden sein."

Charles makes no definite statement as to the date of this epistle. Kautzsch (op. cit., p.226) simply says: "Man hat gemeint, es sei schon in 2 Makk. 2:1 ff. auf ihn Bezug genommen; aber

sicher mit Unrecht. Die Abfassungszeit zu bestimmen, ist un-
moeglich."

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 508) has this to say: "The implication,
therefore, is that this letter was written at a time when the Jews
were in the enjoyment both of religious liberty and peaceful sur-
roundings. Another implication is that this period of quiet had
lasted some time; the danger of which the letter bears witness
would have taken some time to develop. Then, further, there is
no reference to the great calamity of A. D. 70, which affected the
Dispersion Jews very deeply from a religious point of view and
which would therefore have been referred to, one may presume,
had the letter been written some time soon after this catastrophe.
The possibility of its having been written some time before this
must be allowed; Marshall holds, for example, that it was written
during the first century B. C. (in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*,
II, p. 579); and there is no strong argument against this; the
present writer prefers to date it along with the two preceding
sections of this book, though he fully realizes the force of
Cheyne's words that 'it is hardly possible to fix the date exactly
and unsafe even to say that the epistle was written before
2 Maccabees, the supposed reference to it in 2 Mac. 3:1 ff. being
disputed.'" (Note: Encycl. Bibl., II, 2395.)

As to the place of composition of this epistle no authority
makes any definite statements. Since the epistle purports to have
been written to Babylon to warn the Exiles, why not assume that
it was written somewhere in Palestine?

Bibliography

Wace, II, pp. 287—303.
Kautzsch, I, pp. 226—229.
Charles, I, pp. 596—611.
Oesterley, pp. 506—508.
Marshall, in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, II, 579.
Cheyne, in *Encycl. Bibl.*, II, 2395.
Schuerer, *Prot. Real-Enzykl.*, S. 642.

Austin, Tex.   K. G. MANZ

(To be concluded)

————————◂●▸————————

Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Gospel Selections
———

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity
Luke 6:20-31

The words of our text remind us very strongly of the Sermon
on the Mount as it is briefly recorded by Matthew in chapter five.
Christ may have spoken similar words on various occasions. Far
more important it is for us to give due consideration to the im-
portant truths which he utters.