
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

world." "The kingdom of this world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." Is it really so? We may at least reply, There is no hope for the man who does not act in the faith that it is.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

LINES OF DEFENCE OF THE BIBLICAL REVELATION.

II. THE WISDOM OF BEN-SIRA AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON (*continued*).

THE last parallel to be noticed is between Isaiah lvi. 4, 5 and Wisdom iii. 14. In Isaiah the eunuchs are mentioned together with the strangers; neither are to despair, since the former, if they keep the Sabbath, etc., shall be given a monument in God's house that is better than sons or daughters, while the strangers will form an integral part of God's people. In Wisdom the eunuchs are mentioned after the *virgins*, which is assuredly the more natural context for them. On the whole the mention of the eunuchs in Isaiah is most naturally explained as follows: In verse 2, "Keeping his hand from doing any evil," which comes in the context of the prophecy, reminds the prophet of Wisdom iii. 14, where this phrase is used of the eunuch. Hence the prophet, in verses 3–5, repeats and enlarges the promise made to them in Wisdom. Even here there seems to be the same relation between the two books that has several times been noticed: there is a steady flame in Wisdom, flashes in Isaiah. "The eunuch who does no wrong and thinks no wrong shall be well rewarded for his faith, and given a fair allotment in God's temple; for good deeds bear famous fruit, and the root of Wisdom is imperishable." Isaiah seems to take the temple literally; but how in that material temple can the eunuch have a monument that is better than sons or daughters? Wisdom clearly thinks of

the House of God not made with hands—the community of righteous souls.

If, then, it has been shown that Isaiah made use of the Wisdom of Solomon, what inference are we to draw? It makes no difference whether we regard the chapters quoted as the work of one writer or of a series, all earlier than the return from the Exile: in either case there will be a strong probability that the work which ascribes itself to Solomon is really Solomon's. There would be little likelihood of such a work being fabricated between the age of Solomon and that of Hezekiah.

For in the first place this book is either genuine or else a deliberate fabrication. It is not a work which from its philosophical character would be uncritically attributed to Solomon by those to whom the name and date of the real author were unknown. On the contrary, the writer claims to be Solomon. He tells us some facts about his own life, of his natural abilities, of his succeeding to his father's throne, of the command given him to build the Temple, of his scientific pursuits.

If we submit the work to some of the tests suggested above, it will not be found wanting. The author addresses the right audience—one of kings and judges of the earth. It is the audience to which the second Psalm is addressed. The language, owing to the paraphrastic nature of the translation which we have, cannot be restored in sufficient quantity to enable us to pass judgment on its character; but it is evidently in the style of the Prophets, *i.e.*, unmetrical, but with a fairly regular observance of the antithesis. Finally, the author makes a statement about the treatment of Israel as compared with that of other nations, which, while exceedingly suitable for the time of Solomon, would be surprising in the mouth of any serious thinker who had witnessed or lived after the first exile. Israel, he says, is subjected by God to paternal discipline, but other

nations are scourged ten thousand times as much![1] Now we know that the author of Psalm lxxxix. *quotes* this doctrine, but finds it impossible to reconcile the facts with it; he offers up the same prayer for the renewal of God's wonders as is offered up by Ben-Sira some decades before the appearance of Judas Maccabæus. This sentence, therefore, reveals a period of high prosperity, in which the Israelites could look back with satisfaction on the discipline which they had undergone and from which they thought they had issued triumphantly.

But supposing it to be a fabrication, what purpose had the fabricator? Certainly not to prove to the Greeks that their philosophy had been anticipated by the Hebrew sage: for, as we have seen, the arguments by which this book is shown to have been originally in Hebrew cannot be eluded. The *translator* may well have had that object; and for that he probably not only omitted the proper names, but introduced the very decided Platonism which arouses so much suspicion:[2] for that Solomon and Plato did not arrive independently at the fourfold division of virtue may be granted, and also that Plato did not borrow it from Solomon. The suspicion, however, that that passage has been tampered with by the translator is confirmed by the fact that some confusion appears in the Greek, and that the old Syriac version exhibits a threefold instead of a fourfold division. Moreover an *author* whose purpose was to impress the Greeks with the idea that Solomon anticipated Plato would not produce a Midrashic commentary on portions of the Pentateuch, with which a Greek audience would probably be quite unfamiliar. A Midrashic commentary must certainly have been intended for believing Israelites; and a fabricator who wrote for their benefit would probably have personated Solomon earlier than chapter vii., where he first begins to speak of himself. Further, the very high

[1] Wisdom xii. 22. [2] Wisdom viii. 7.

merit of most of the book makes us look for the author among men of renown. Solomon's reputation for Wisdom must have been based on something: for he is by no means a mythical personage, but one on whom history sheds a strong light. In the continuous thinking, the lofty conceptions, and the poetical images of this book, as well as the scientific interest which it displays, we have a full justification for the opinion of antiquity.

But how comes it that the very memory of the work has disappeared among the Jews? In the time of Melito [1] they clearly had lost it, for the Jewish informant of this writer identified Proverbs with Wisdom—a fact which seems to imply that the title had been preserved, though the book was lost, whence it was ignorantly transferred to a book with a different title; and of this phenomenon literary history offers a variety of illustrations. Yet of course the title "Wisdom" may have been learned from Greek-speaking Jews or Christians, and the utilization of the book in the New Testament by no means implies that its original still existed in Palestine.

Fragments of it were indeed retained in the traditional interpretation of the Pentateuch; one striking case was noticed in the first article; attention may here be called to some more. The statement in xvi. 21 that the Manna, to gratify the desire of the taster, turned to whatsoever he wanted, is repeated in the Midrash (*Rabbah*, ii. 36*a*).[2] "The Manna," it says, "contained every sort of taste, and each Israelite tasted whatsoever he wished." But the author of Wisdom apparently asserts this on his own authority, for he gives it as a justification of his description of the Manna as "adequate to every pleasure and suited to every taste." It must therefore have drifted from Wisdom into the Midrash, certainly before the Book of Wisdom was appropriated by Christians. The comparison of the dark-

[1] Ap. Cureton, *Spicilegium*, p. 35. [2] Also B. *Yoma*, 75*a*.

ness of Egypt to a prison is also found in the Midrash (*Tanchuma*, i. 79*b*). From the account of the darkness given in the Midrash some light can be thrown on Wisdom xviii. 1, 2. "But thy holy ones had very great light, whose voice they hearing, but seeing not their form, that the others too had suffered, accounted blessed, but that having been injured they did no harm, rejoiced." Truly an involved sentence, wherein the translator's determination to omit all proper names, especially that of Egypt, has led him to talk in enigmas. Who were the others who had suffered (or "not suffered," if that be the right reading)? It is probable (though not certain) that all this is to be explained from the Midrash. "There were," says the Midrash *Rabbah*, "certain sinners in Israel, who were unwilling to leave Egypt. God said, If I bring a plague on them openly and they die, the Egyptians will say, The same things happen to Israel as to us. Therefore He brought three days' darkness upon the Egyptians, that the Israelites might bury their dead without being seen by the Egyptians, and might praise God on that account." The Midrash *Tanchuma* tells the same story, adding (i. 84*b*), "Israel gave thanks and rejoiced, because their enemies did not see their punishment and rejoice thereat." From this we can interpret the passage in Wisdom. The Egyptians could hear the voices, though they could not see the forms of the Israelites; the suffering of the Israelites which the Egyptians accounted blessed was the loss of certain members of the Israelite community, who were buried while the Egyptians being in darkness could not see. The remaining clause, "rejoiced that having been injured they did no harm," appears from the Midrash to mean that the Egyptians were thankful that the Israelites who could have taken advantage of the darkness to rob them, did not do so; and in consequence of this proof of Israelitish honesty they were willing to lend them vessels of gold, etc. The

sentence which follows in Wisdom is so obscure as to be untranslatable. We can just see that the Hebrew word for "lent" has been mistranslated "besought"; but it is scarcely possible to restore the rest of it, though the sense must be that supplied by the Midrash.

Let us, before basing any inference on so paradoxical a result as the genuineness of the Wisdom of Solomon, recapitulate the arguments whereby it has been reached: we shall then be able to see whether it is likely to hold its own against opposition, or to collapse so soon as it is assailed. First, it was shown to be a translation from Hebrew (*a*) by the fact that the true form of one of its verses is preserved in the Hebrew of the Midrash; (*b*) by the fact that in several cases by retranslating passages of Wisdom into Hebrew we obtain a better sense than the Greek offers; (*c*) by the fact that other passages of the Midrash which preserve matter contained in the Wisdom of Solomon do not appear to be based on the Greek, but on an original which gave either the same or a better sense.

Next we notice that Ben-Sira mentions this work among the Solomonic writings, and utilizes it for his anthology just as he utilizes the canonical Scriptures. Hence the work must have been classical by 200 B.C.

Next we find that the Greek translation of Wisdom was utilized by the LXX. translator of Isaiah, who is shown to have done his work before 265 B.C. The Greek translation of Wisdom is therefore not later than 270 B.C., and the original probably some generations earlier.

Next we compare a number of texts of Wisdom with a number of similar passages in Isaiah. In each case the phrase which is common to the two books appears to belong to the context of Wisdom rather than to that of Isaiah, and to be more specially appropriate in Wisdom, whereas in Isaiah it can most easily be understood as an allusion to

the work of the earlier classic. In one case the prophetic terminology which is already familiar to Isaiah appears in Wisdom to be in course of formation.

Then we notice that the nature of the audience addressed, the style of composition, and the historical background, all agree with the theory of Solomonic authorship; and to these may be added the general excellence of the work, and still more the grasp which it displays of the most important of the prophetic messages—the mission of Israel, the passion of the Messiah, and the hope of immortality.

Whatever in this book appears to be distinctly Greek may without audacity be attributed to the Greek translator, whom, from the fragment in the Midrash, we know to have treated his original with great licence.

In the chapter on the Bible of the Jews an attempt will be made to explain the nature of decanonization and its consequences for the book decanonized; and the question will be asked whether, if Job had been decanonized and in consequence preserved only in the Greek translation, we should have known more about it than we know about the Wisdom of Solomon.

The importance of this result is that it overthrows the modern criticism of the Pentateuch completely. For that the Pentateuch known to the author of Wisdom was practically the same as our Pentateuch does not admit of question. The moderns assert that the Tabernacle was an imitation of Solomon's Temple; but if Solomon himself states that his Temple was an imitation of the Tabernacle, this theory must be dismissed. If, therefore, the criteria whereby documents are separated in the Pentateuch have any scientific value, it must be very different from that which is ordinarily assigned them; and indeed it may be doubted whether our critical instruments are sufficiently powerful to analyse documents of such remote antiquity in

a language with which recent events have proved us to be so imperfectly acquainted.

The theory of Winckler, according to which the history of the Pentateuch is a fiction invented by David, is of course not overthrown by the fact of Solomon having commented on it, but it would require some very powerful evidence to make us believe that David's fiction could in so short a time have obtained such circulation and recognition.

That our Book of Genesis was known to Solomon may be inferred from the Song of Songs vii. 11, where the bride says, "Unto him is my desire," with an obvious reference to the familiar words said to Eve after the fall. But Wisdom without question contains references not only to Genesis, but to Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, with whose work its history stops, whereas Isaiah is already familiar with the history of the Judges.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

CHRIST AND HUMAN EMOTIONS.

THAT our Lord shared with men every true and pure emotion is a fact which no instructed Christian could deny. To deny it would be to rob Christ of the perfection of His manhood.

Thus we know that He felt "joy," and that of a radiant character, upon the return of the seventy.[1] It filled His inmost being, and found its natural expression in praise to the Father. Nor does the triumphal entry into Jerusalem exhaust the instances in which the Man of Sorrows must have rejoiced in heart. It was a "joy" at once peculiarly His own, and yet capable of passing out from Himself to the enrichment of His disciples.[2] Again, He felt, as none of the sons of men could fully feel, "compassion." All

[1] St. Luke x. 21 (ἠγαλλιάσατο). [2] St. John xv. 11.