



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

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

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

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

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

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

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE APOCRYPHA.

THIS final instalment of the Revision of the Authorized Version of 1611 will be found to stand, in point of merit, as its contents mostly fall in point of time, somewhere between the Old and New Testaments. But while it does not, as a whole, attain the level of sober scholarship displayed by the Old Testament Revision, yet it is in parts a splendid performance, which will reflect credit on English learning and prove a priceless boon to the student. Indeed, the work as a whole is a distinct advance on the A. V., and it would have been a greater stride still but for the regrettable fact that some of the best of the new features are strangely defaced by what looks like a want of continuity in the editing. The most striking change is naturally the one that first catches the reader's eye: the arrangement of the whole version into paragraphs, and the display of the parallelism of line by the method of printing adopted in the more poetical and sententious parts. It is difficult to suggest any other cause than the one already hinted at in explanation of the spasmodic way in which the second of these great changes is neglected. The Prayer of Manasses is printed in one long paragraph, though the parallelism is quite as marked as in the Song of Judith, which the Revisers print in parallel lines. The same remark applies to the Song of the Three Children, where the parallelism is as plainly discernible as in any part of the Old Testament literature. Cf. the 136th Psalm with this Song, and it will be seen that while the O. T. Revisers rightly place the refrain, "For his mercy endureth for ever," in a separate line throughout, the Revisers of the Apocrypha neglect to do the same with the equally catching refrain, "Praise and exalt him above all for ever." (It is here noteworthy that the phrase "above all" is a developed form of the Psalmic "above all gods.") A similar surprise must be felt about the treatment of portions of Baruch iii-v; surely the parallelism in iii. 9 sq. is as easily displayed as say that in Ecclus. l. 1-3, where the

Revisers adopt the newer method? Baruch iii. 9-11 should run thus:—

Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life :
 Give ear to understand wisdom.
 How happeneth it, O Israel, that thou art in thine enemies' land,
 That thou art waxen old in a strange country,
 That thou art defiled with the dead,
 That thou art counted with them that go down into the grave ?

Another general and external point, on which however a difference of opinion is sure to be felt, concerns the retention of the italics. This is to me a very disturbing matter, though here the Revisers of the Apocrypha only maintain the questionable plan of the Old Testament Committee. But in the Apocrypha, as the Revisers' preface points out, a "greater freedom of rendering characterizes the (A. V.) translation when compared with the translation of the Old or of the New Testament," and this greater freedom, we are told, was here preserved. Why then was it necessary to print "a Greek place of exercise" in 2 Macc. iv. 12, where the text *γυμνάσιον* and the context render the word "Greek" a necessary part of the translation? The inconsistencies which such a method involve may be seen by comparing the R. V. of Proverbs xvi. 1 with the R. V. of Eccles. i. 1. In the latter, the Greek *Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ κυρίου* is rendered "All wisdom *cometh* from the Lord," but in Prov. xvi. 1, where *וְכֹמָה מֵעֵנָה* involves a similar addition of a verb "to come," the R. V. rightly gives us "The answer of the tongue is from the Lord," without any italicization of *is*. This question I am here raising is not a mere quibble, for at the basis of a true translation must lie a reproduction of Hebrew or Greek idiom by English idiom, and not by an italicized rendering which implies that a word or idea is unexpressed in the original, when it is really implicitly expressed by the syntax of the original. In Wisdom xvi. 9 the italics seem superfluous in rendering *ὑπὸ τοιούτων* "by such *as these*"; *ibid.* vii. 4 "*watchful* cares" seems to imply that the Greek *φροντίσιον* does not exactly mean "watchful, anxious concern." In Baruch vi. 39 "*these gods* of wood," for τὰ ξύλα introduces an unnecessary interpolation—"wooden things" is a more effective phrase. In Susanna v. 46 why is *woman* italicized? Does not *ταύτης* mean "this woman"? That the matter is important may be seen from this, that the use of italics leads sometimes to what is almost a mistranslation. A case occurs of what I mean, in the R. V. of the Wisdom of Solomon vi. 14, 'Ο ὀρθρίσας ἐπ' αὐτήν is translated "He that riseth up early to *seek* her;" *seek* being italicized, the reader is perhaps led to fancy that the Greek verb does not mean "seek." But this is just what ὀρθρίζω does mean

in Hellenistic Greek. Thus in Job viii. 5, where the Hebrew runs לָאֵל אֵל תִּשְׁחַר אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה תִּשְׁחַר אֵלֶיךָ, the LXX has σὺ δὲ ὀρθρίζε πρὸς κύριον, and the R.V. "If thou wouldst seek diligently unto the Lord." Cf. the use of ὀρθρίζω in (LXX) Ps. lxxiii. 1, and in some other passages cited by Prof. Freudenthal in this REVIEW, III, 746. The old sense of "rise early," had passed into the derived signification "to seek earnestly." Further, the italics are often ambiguous, for occasionally they imply more than the actual text contains. A striking instance is Eccles. xii. 3 "a foolish daughter is born" to her father's loss. The Greek, however, has only θυγάτηρ. In point of fact the author of Ecclesiasticus has a very low opinion of women in general (cf. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 187); and while he draws a distinction as regards the father's gain or loss between a bad and a good son, he may mean that a daughter, whether foolish or wise, is her father's loss; at best she is her husband's gain, always she is her father's detriment.

On the other hand, the Revisers have boldly broken from the old spellings of the names in the Apocrypha. They have not attempted a pedantic consistency, but they have been guided by sound common-sense and critical judgment. Some would have preferred them to have been a little bolder here and there, e.g. in 1 Macc. v. 66 where *Marisa* and *Samaría* might have changed places in margin and text. They have retained, too, the spelling *Modin* in 1 Macc. ii. 1-5, though there can be little critical ground for omitting an *e* and reading *Modein*, a syllable present both in the Greek Μωδεῖν, and in the Hebrew מוֹדֵיִם. It is not obvious, again, why *Arius* in 1 Macc. xii. 7 is read for 'Apeús—but what a scholarly change is made here from the *Darius* of the A.V.! Again, why do the Revisers, who rightly reject the A.V. *Maspha* (1 Macc. iii. 46), replace it by *Mizpeh*? Both the Hebrew of the MT. and all the varying texts of the LXX retain the second *a* sound, as do the Revisers of the Old Testament (see e.g. 1 Sam. vii. 5). But the name improvements are so numerous that it is impossible to do more than indicate a few. *Nebuchadnessar* (*Judith*, passim) for *Nabuchodonosor*; *Chittim* for *Chettiim* (1 Macc. i. 1); *Phineas* and *Joshua* (1 Macc. ii. 54-55) for *Phinees* and *Jesus*; *plain country* (1 Macc. xi. 38) for *Sephela*; *Hasideans* (= חַסִּידִים 1 Macc. ii. 42) for *Asideans*; *Chislew* (ibid. i. 54) for *Caslew*; *Michmash* (ibid. ix. 73) for *Machmas*; *Hazor* (= חָצוֹר ibid. xi. 67) for *Nazor*. The Revisers rightly resisted the temptation to substitute (with Codex Sinaiticus) *Nahum* for *Jonah* in Tobit xiv. 4, for though Tobit seems to imply ignorance of the Bible narrative in declaring that, "I believe all the things which Jonah the prophet spake of Nineveh, that it shall be overthrown," he is really following a Rabbinical tradition which would have it that the repentance of the Ninevites was insincere, and that their

respite from destruction was probably temporary. אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש תשובה של רמיות עשו אנשי נינוה (Taanith, *T. J.* II. 3. Cf. Rosenmann, *Studien zum Buche Tobit*, p. 11).

To many readers the point of greatest moment will be the treatment meted out to the text by the Revisers. The title-page anticipates the chief novelty of the revision, for we are informed that the present translation is made "out of the Greek and Latin tongues." This prepares us to find included the Latin fragment of 2 Esdras, but it also prepares us for the fact that the Revisers have not used any Hebrew texts to modify certain readings in the Greek. The point is a very debateable one. It must be freely admitted that the Hebrew or Aramaic texts of certain parts of the Apocrypha are neither ancient nor authentic. With the second book of the Maccabees (by the way the Revisers might profitably have given us the third and fourth books in an Appendix), and the Wisdom of Solomon, no Hebrew could be of any relevancy. The extant Hebrew Versions of Tobit and Judith are useless for this purpose¹, even if we do not accept the improbable theory of Nöldeke, Fritsche, and Schürer that Tobit was originally

¹ Hebrew usage seems to suggest an emendation of Judith ix. 12, where the exclamation Ναὶ ναί is somewhat pointless. Is it not possible that these words belong to the previous verse and represent the Hebrew אמן ואמן? The LXX is not consistent in its rendering of אמן, sometimes it uses γένεοις, sometimes ἀμήν.—In Tobit iv. 17, I feel almost certain that the Greek is best explained by supposing a mistake between בקר and בקר. (By the way, the Revisers ought probably to have replaced "grace" (in Ecclus. vii. 33 b) by "kindness," for here χάρις = חסד.) Rosenmann, p. 22, defends the reading בקר by quoting על רוחנים ורוחנים קברי הצדיקים from the Karaites Sahal ben Mazliach, but the word should be read רוחנים. An important variant, suggested by Talmudical passages, is *three* for *seven* in Tobit vi. 13.—It is almost a pity that the Revisers did not add "and cheese" in Judith x. 5, for which there is strong authority in the versions and in Jewish tradition. On the whole, it must be said that the Revisers have failed altogether to do justice to Judith xvi. That in Judith some carelessness occurred is discernible from a comparison of xvi. 14 with ix. 12. In the former case *πάσα ἡ κτίσις σου* is rightly rendered "all thy creation," emending the A. V., which renders "all creatures." But in ix. 12, with strange inconsistency, *βασιλεὺ πάσης κτίσεώς σου* is rendered by the R. V. "King of every creature," the emendation being relegated to the margin!—It was, perhaps, too much to expect in Bel and the Dragon a transformation of the lions' den into the reality—viz. a subterranean pit, or chamber, where the lions were for the occasion confined. The Revisers of the O. T. also left the *den* in evidence, though it is hard to conceive how the lions could have contrived to live there.

composed in Greek and not in Hebrew. The Hebrew of the first book of the Maccabees is lost. But the matter stands somewhat differently with Ecclesiasticus. This work was, of course, written in Hebrew, and though the Hebrew or Aramaic original has long been lost, a large number of quotations from it are to be found in Rabbinical literature. These quotations were given in full in this REVIEW (Vol. III, p. 682) by Mr. Schechter (cf. Vol. IV, p. 162), and it is not unreasonable to maintain that they might be used, with caution and sparingly, for emending the Greek text. It would no doubt be easy to push this argument too far, but I think vii. 10, "Pray not when thou art fainthearted" (Heb. **אל יודה** reading **יודה** for **יורה**), is preferable to "Be not fainthearted in thy prayer." Again, in iii. 22, the R.V. has "Thou hast *no need of the things that are secret,*" but a better sense is given in the Hebrew "Thou hast *no business with the things that are secret.*" In xxvi. 3, should not the Hebrew **בחיק** (*in the bosom*) be read instead of **בחוק** ("*in the portion*") which seems to underlie the Greek *ἐν μερίδι*? So in xxxviii. 1, when the Revisers were emending the A.V. from "Honour a physician with the honour due to him," into "Honour a physician according to thy need of him," which has little sense, might they not have gone a little farther and have adopted the Hebrew reading "*before thou hast need of him*"? On the other hand, S^cadyah's text of Ecclus. v. 5-7, **עמו ואף עמו כי רחמים ואף עמו** (J. Q. R. IV, 163), better agrees with the Greek than do the citations in other Rabbinical forms (J. Q. R. III, 695), though the latter are more consonant with the context. The Revisers in xxi. 23 translate (the italics are not mine), "A foolish man peepeth in from the door of *another man's* house," but surely the Hebrew reading **אל בית** "*to another man's house*" gives a better sense. The Greek *ἀπὸ ἄλλης οἰκίας* . . . *eis oikían* is easily explained, since if, instead of the full form **אל בית**, the Hebrew had read **לבית**, the word would be ambiguous. But the passage in which the Hebrew gives the prettiest variant of all is in xiii. 15 seq. By reading **גוף** for **עוף** in verse 16, the Greek gives us *πᾶσα σὰρξ* instead of *bird*, while the Revisers (wrongly I think) change *beast* as given by the A. V. in verse 15 into "living creature." By this the parallelism is quite lost. If the reader will cast his eye down the third column and will compare the italicized lines with those in roman type (omitting for the present verse 20), he will see that the Hebrew beautifully preserves throughout the comparison of a fact in brute nature to a corresponding fact in human nature. For verse 20 the Hebrew gives us no help, but I cannot help thinking that perhaps **כבוש** (*restrained, humbled*) was read for **כבש** (*lamb*), and **וד** (*proud*) possibly for **זאב** (*wolf*) (with allusion to Isaiah xi. 6). It would be no insurmountable objection that verse 20 would, on this

view, resume the thought of verse 17. This is a not unknown device with the author of *Ecclus.* Comp. xxxiii. 19-23, where the final verse (23) repeats the thought of verse 19. This is how the present passage looks in the A.V., R.V., and in the translation suggested in part by the Hebrew:—

A. V.	R. V.	READING SUGGESTED BY THE HEBREW.
15 Every beast loveth his like, and every man loveth his neighbour.	Every living creature loveth his like, And every man loveth his neighbour.	<i>Every beast loveth his like, And every man loveth his neighbour.</i>
16 All flesh consorteth according to kind, and a man will cleave to his like.	All flesh consorteth according to kind, And a man will cleave to his like.	<i>Every bird dwelleth with its kind, And a man will cleave to his like.</i>
17 What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb? so the sinner with the godly.	What fellowship shall the wolf have with the lamb? So is the sinner unto the godly.	<i>What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb? So is the sinner unto the godly.</i>
18 What agreement is there between the hyena and a dog? and what peace between the rich and the poor?	What peace is there between the hyena and the dog? And what peace between the rich man and the poor?	<i>What peace is there between the hyena and the dog? And what peace between the rich man and the poor?</i>
19 As the wild ass is the lion's prey in the wilderness, so the rich eat up the poor.	Wild asses are the prey of lions in the wilderness; So poor men are pasture for the rich.	<i>Wild asses are the prey of lions in the wilderness; So poor men are pasture for the rich.</i>
20 As the proud hate humility: so doth the rich abhor the poor.	Lowliness is an abomination to a proud man, So a poor man is an abomination to the rich.	<i>As the lamb is hated by the wolf, So a poor man is an abomination to the rich.</i>

The Revisers, indeed, make use of the Hebrew (or rather Syriac) in *Ecclus.* xxii. 6, but for some curious reason they reject even the three clear and well-established emendations (which Cheyne rightly accepts, *op. cit.*, p. 196) of כִּי־אֵר for כֹּאֵר, xxiv. 27, of *poison* for *head*, xxv. 15, and *enemies* for *Tyrians* in xlvi. 18.

It would be hard to congratulate the Revisers too cordially on the courage with which they have omitted the spurious additions to *Ecclesiasticus*. Perhaps the omitted passages should have been placed in the margin, or in an Appendix, but that was hardly consistent with the nature of their work. Nor would it be easy to cite the many places in which their renderings in this difficult book are decided improvements. I very much fancy the Revisers' phrase in xxii. 11, "Weep more sweetly for the dead"—it is a perfect foil to

the older classical expression "to weep bitterly," and is a distinct gain to Biblical phraseology. In x. 27, Proverbs xii. 9 has been rightly used to get the text. But I wish the Revisers had seen their way in the Introduction of Eccles. to translate "and are attached to these writings (i. e. this book)," instead of "addicted to these things," which is very ambiguous.

An excellent change in xv. 15, must, however, be specially commended:

A. V.

If thou wilt, to keep the commandments, and to perform acceptable faithfulness.

R. V.

If thou wilt, thou shalt keep the commandments;
And to perform faithfulness, is of *thine own* good pleasure.

The Wisdom of Solomon as it appears in the Revised Version is almost a new book. The translators have here produced a masterpiece. So frequent and so admirable are the changes, that I despair to select adequate specimens. Could anything be better than the word *nature* for *ἰσότης* in xvi. 21? The A.V. of xv. 19 runs thus: "Neither are they beautiful, so much as to be desired in respect of beasts: but they went without the praise of God and his blessing"—which is a real puzzle. The R.V. beautifully renders:—

Neither, as seen beside *other* creatures, are they beautiful, so that one should desire them,
But they have escaped both the praise of God and his blessing.

Another very difficult passage is xvii. 11 seq., and here the alterations are so felicitous and scholarly that I must find space for a longer quotation:—

A. V.

11 For wickedness, condemned by her own witness, is very timorous, and being pressed with conscience, always forecasteth grievous things.

12 For fear is nothing else but a betraying of the succours which reason offereth.

13 And the expectation from within, being less, counteth the ignorance more than the cause which bringeth the torment.

14 But they, sleeping the same sleep that night, which was indeed intolerable, and which came upon them out of the bottoms of the inevitable hell,

R. V.

For wickedness, condemned by a witness within, is a coward thing,
And being pressed hard by conscience, always forecasteth the worst lot:

For fear is nothing else but a surrender of the succours which reason offereth;

And from within *the heart* the expectation *of them* being less

Maketh of greater account the ignorance of the cause that bringeth the torment.

But they, all through the night which was powerless indeed,

And which came upon them out of the recesses of powerless Hades,
All sleeping the same sleep,

A. V.

15 Were partly vexed with monstrous apparitions, and partly fainted, their heart failing them : for a sudden fear, and not looked for, came upon them.

R. V.

Now were haunted by monstrous apparitions,

And now were paralysed by their soul's surrendering :

For fear sudden and unlooked for came upon them.

It is a pity to stop the quotation here, for the whole of this most difficult chapter scintillates with amazingly luminous emendations, which stamp the Revisers as masters of Greek and English. Other smaller changes are always improvements; in i. 12, "Court not death," exactly catches the force of *ζηλοῦν*, and is a delightful improvement on the A. V. "Seek not death." Death is personified in i. 16, and the Revisers correctly substitute *him* for *it*. In iii. 14 (it will be observed that the passages I am here citing are mostly the same difficult texts which induced Prof. Margoliouth to propound the strange hypothesis that the original language of the Wisdom was something other than Greek), the Revisers rightly replace the A. V. "For unto him shall be given the special gift of faith" by "For there shall be given him for his faithfulness a peculiar favour," for *πίστις* means *fidelity* in many passages of Hellenistic Greek (cf. Freudenthal, J. Q. R. III, 741-2). In iv. 10, the Revisers' emendation is admirable. The A. V. reads: "He pleased God and was beloved of him," the R. V. has "Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him," which well brings out the idea that *ἡγαπήθη* is the *consequence* of the righteous man being *εὐάρεστος*. The "much people" of the R. V. in vi. 2 represents the Greek *πλήθους* rather better than does the A. V. "people."

I have only left myself space to say a word or two of the new rendering of the Books of the Maccabees. Scholarly care is discernible in every line of the revision. In 2 Macc. iv. 9, the Greek has *τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχείς ἀναγράψαι*, which the A. V. makes nonsense of. The R. V. gives the right meaning: "And to register the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch." On the other hand, the technical title *στρατηγός*, in 1 Macc. xi. 59, means more than *captain*; *commander* would perhaps be a better term (cf. 1 Macc. xiv. 47). At all events 1 Macc. xiv. 27-28 is not satisfactorily dealt with, for whatever the right reading is it cannot be "in Asaramel," nor is the latter obscure word the name of a place. Schürer's suggestion (*Jewish People in the time of Christ*, E. T. I, i. p. 265, note 17), that the original was *סגן שר עם נא*, has much to recommend it. But the Revisers seem throughout their work on the Apocrypha to have resisted practically every temptation to construct the text by the aid of Hebrew. In no other way can one so readily explain their omission, e. g. in Ecclus. vi. 2,

to read "by a bull" instead of "as a bull" (cf. Ball's Introduction to the *Variorum Apocrypha*). Might not a better reading have been obtained, too, in 1 Macc. ii. 57, by remembering that "חכר" (especially in the books of the Maccabees), would mean pious acts rather than mercy? It is hard to understand how "David for being merciful inherited the throne." The writer, however, might well have cited David's piety as the cause of his preferment. Mercy was hardly a characteristic of the Biblical David, however much his virtues were idealized.

In the preceding comments, undue prominence has perhaps been given to passages in which I venture to differ from the conclusions arrived at by the compilers of the version under review. But these comments must not be taken to imply that I do not fully appreciate the magnitude of the service the Revisers have rendered. The Revisers might well address captious critics in the words prefaced by the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach to the Greek translation of his father's wisdom:—"Ye are intreated therefore to read with favour and attention, and to pardon us, if in any parts of what we have laboured to interpret, we may seem to fail in some of the phrases." But the authors of this translation have no need to plead for mercy. The most rigid and candid justice must assign to parts of their work a very high place, and to all of their work an honourable and respectable place, among the great translations of the present century.

I. ABRAHAMS.

THE SIFRE ZUTA.

ספרי זוטא. *Sifré Suta, d. i. eig. Sifré Numeri (in 2. Recension) zum ersten Male nach dem handschriftlichen Midrasch ha-gadol, Jalkut Simeoni u. a., gesammelt und mit Anmerkungen versehen, nebst einer ausführlichen Einleitung herausgegeben von Dr. B. KÖNIGSBERGER. (1. Lieferung, Frankfurt a. M. Kauffmann, 1894. 24 Blätter, 8vo.)*

In addition to the Sifre on the Book of Numbers, there was another Tannaite Midrash, several fragments of which are preserved in the *Jalkut Shimeoni*. With these and other fragments as a basis to work on, the late Nehemiah Brüll contributed to the Jubilee Volume, published on the occasion of Graetz's seventieth birthday, a descriptive sketch of the lost Midrash termed the "Minor Sifre" (ספרי זוטא). He endeavoured to demonstrate that that Midrash did not belong to a late period, as even Weiss's *History of Tradition* assumes, but that