A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

TRANSLATION GREEK IN THE WISDOM
OF SOLOMON

CARL EVERETT PURINTON
ADELPHI COLLEGE

I

THE central question in the long-continued discussion of the
apocryphal Book of Wisdom, or Wisdom of Solomon, has
been that of unity. There have been three main periods or cycles
of criticism. In the opening period of what may be termed "mo-
dern" criticism, such writers as Houbigant[1], Eichhorn[2], Nachtigal[3],
Bretschneider[4], Bertholdt[5], and Engelbreth[6] were united in the
belief that the book was of composite authorship. Eichhorn, it
must be added, qualified his verdict by declaring that the sharp
difference in ideas between the earlier and later chapters could
be explained only on the basis of a different author for the second

[1] C. F. Houbigant, *Lectori ad libros Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici*, in preface
to Biblia Hebraica, Paris 1753; bound separately as *Prolegomena in Scrip-
turam Sacram*, 1753; reprinted in *Notae criticae in universos V. T. libros*, etc.,
Frankfurt 1777.

[2] J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die Apocryphischen Schriften des A. T.*,
pp. 88ff.; 144ff.; 200f., 1795.

[3] J. C. C. Nachtigal, *Die Versammlungen der Weisen*, II part, *Das Buch
der Weisheit*, Halle 1799.

[4] C. G. Bretschneider, *De Libri Sapientiae Parte Priore Cap. I-XI E
Duobus Libellis Diversis Conflata*, Vitebergae 1804.

[5] L. Bertholdt, *Histor. krit. Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und
apokryph. Schriften des A. und N. T.*, V. vol., first part, 2261ff., Erlangen
1815.

[6] W. F. Engelbreth, *Libri, qui vulgo inscribitur Sapientia Salomonis
latine conversi et explicati specimina* (2 vols.), Kopenhagen 1816.

part, or on the hypothesis that the later and inferior chapters were composed in the years of the writer's immaturity, long before the earlier.

The second cycle of criticism centers in the work of Grimm[7], who in 1860 gathered up the results of a lifetime of study and published what has since remained the standard, or as some would say, the "only" commentary worthy of the name dealing with the Book of Wisdom to the present day. Grimm concluded in favor of the unity of the book, fairly meeting and evaluating the arguments presented by Houbigant, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Bretschneider, and Nachtigal in turn. In his summary of arguments *pro* and *con*, Grimm built upon the work of critics immediately before him who had initiated the tendency toward the unity of the book, such as Heydenreich[8], Gfrörer[9], and especially Bauermeister[10], and by the thoroughness and fairness of his judgments lent conviction to the belief in the unity of the Book of Wisdom, a belief which still prevails in many quarters.

The turn of the century has witnessed a growing reluctance to accept the hitherto unquestioned findings of Grimm, and a renewed tendency to question the single authorship of the Wisdom of Solomon. Among those who still remain loyal are Siegfried[11], Goodrick[12], and Feldmann[13], yet an even longer array of names may be adduced for the opposite opinion. Among those who now suggest a division of the book may be listed Lincke[14], Weber[15],

[7] C. L. W. Grimm, *Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit*, Leipzig 1837; *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Kurzgefaßtes Handbuch), Leipzig 1860.

[8] M. Heydenreich, in Tzschirner's *Memorabilien*, Leipzig 1815.

[9] A. F. Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. II, pp. 200-272, 1831.

[10] *Commentarius in Sapientiam Salomonis*, Gottingae 1828.

[11] K. Siegfried, in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.*, Tübingen 1900.

[12] A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*, New York 1913.

[13] F. Feldmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Bonn 1926.

[14] K. F. A. Lincke, *Samaria und seine Propheten*, Tübingen and Leipzig 1903.

[15] W. Weber, "Die Komposition der Weisheit Salomo's", in *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theol.* 27 (1904), pp. 145-169.

Kohler[16], Gärtner[17], Holmes[18], Focke[19], Peters[20], and Speiser[21]. Especially worthy of note in this third cycle of discussion is the feeling of certain critics of the accepted point of view that the final court of appeal must be the question of the original language of the Book of Wisdom, and not as in the past, the question of the likeness or difference of the fundamental ideas in different sections of the book. This appeal to language considerations is in harmony with a larger movement represented by Klostermann, Burney, Montgomery and Torrey, the thesis of which is that many supposedly Greek documents in which a Semitic idiom is to be observed are in reality translations of Semitic sources. This point of view may be illustrated by a quotation from Professor Torrey[22] in an article entitled *Translations Made from Aramaic Gospels*:

> It has been customary to appeal to certain books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and to the Apocalypse of the New Testament, as examples of writings composed in Semitic-sounding Greek; but the fact is that all of the books thus cited as witnesses were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and our Greek versions are merely translations more or less literal.

As early as Houbigant we find the suggestion that chs. 1—9 of the Wisdom of Solomon were written in Hebrew, while chs. 10—19 were added later in Greek, perhaps by the same person who translated chs. 1—9. Bretschneider attempted to prove that Hebrew was the original language of 1 1—6 8. Recent interest in the original language of the book dates from an article written

[16] *Jewish Encyclopedia*, "Book of the Wisdom of Solomon", 1906.

[17] E. Gärtner, *Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit*, Berlin 1912.

[18] S. Holmes, (in Charles' *Apocrypha*), "The Wisdom of Solomon", 1913.

[19] F. Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, Göttingen 1913.

[20] N. Peters, "Ein hebräischer alphabetischer Psalm in der Weisheit Salomos, Kap. 9", *Bibl. Zeitschrift*, 14, pp. 1-14, 1916.

[21] E. A. Speiser, "The Heb. Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom", *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1924.

[22] *Studies in the History of Religion*, presented to C. H. Toy, New York, 1912, p. 288.

by D. S. Margoliouth, "Was the Book of Wisdom Written in Hebrew?"[23] in which the author cited 12 alleged cases of mistranslation. In the following year, Professor Freudenthal[24] replied with an article in which he accepted the importance of mistranslations, if they could be proved, but showed that the cases presented were not convincing, and marshalled the different reasons for believing the book to be an original Greek composition. At present interest centers in the suggestion of Focke[25] that chs. 1—5 have been translated from Hebrew by the same writer who composed chs. 6—19 in Greek, a view strikingly similar to the tentative proposal of Houbigant, at the very beginning of modern criticism of Wisdom. This hypothesis of a single translator-author has the great advantage of accounting both for the differences and the likenesses between the earlier and later chapters. It disposes, for example, of the striking misuse of *metalleuein* in both sections of the book, 4 12 and 16 25. As elaborated by Focke this theory becomes a very plausible solution of some of the main problems of the Book of Wisdom. The late Professor Gressmann[26] accepted this explanation, although he would not deny the possibility that there might be some originally Semitic material in chs. 6—19 and some originally Greek in chs. 1—5. By an interesting coincidence, Speiser arrived independently, although later, at much the same conclusion as Focke; namely, that the translator of the first part is at the same time the author of the second section. Speiser determined upon a different division of the book as follows: (1) 1 1—6 21; 8 1—9 18; (2) 6 22—7 30; 10 1—19 22. The especial value of Speiser's article lies in the 11 concrete cases where he claims to have found actual mistranslations from the Hebrew. These form a valuable supplement to the argument of Focke, who mentioned only three cases in which he considered a mistranslation to be apparent: 5 7; 1 3, and 2 6.

[23] *JRAS*, 1890, pp. 263 ff.

[24] J. Freudenthal, "What is the Original Language of the Wisdom of Solomon?" *JQR*, Vol. 3, 1891, pp. 722–753.

[25] *Op. cit.*, pp. 65, 66.

[26] *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1914, Nr. 29, 18 J, p. 1815.

A survey of the discussion of the book in the past leads one
to the opinion that if further progress toward a conclusion regarding
the main problem of unity is to be reached, it will be through
an appeal to the original language of the book. The long-continued
discussion of differences in thought, etc., seems to yield no promise
of final agreement. It is the purpose of the present writer to
give further consideration to the evidence of the text itself which
suggests that the first part of the book is a translation from
Hebrew.

II

In the Wisdom of Solomon, as elsewhere, the clue to Trans-
lation Greek is, in general, the awkwardness which arises in the
tendency to transfer words and not ideas from the original into
the translation. Before dealing in detail with more important
passages, there are a number of phrases in the book which may
obviously be called Hebraisms. Some of these are: 1 9, ἀκοὴ (שמועה);
1 10, οὓς ζηλώσεως; 1 12, ἔργοις χειρῶν ὑμῶν (בכם ידיכם);
2 24, οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες; 3 4, ἐν ὄψει ἀνθρώπων; 3 9, ὅτι
χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς
αὐτοῦ; cf. 4 14; 6 1, δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς; 6 2, ἀνωτίσασθε γεγαυ-
ρωμένοι ἐπὶ (הגאותה); 6 3, παρὰ 'Υψίστου, cf. 5 15 (παρὰ equal
to מאת); 9 4, ἐκ παίδων σου (instead of ἐκ τῶν παίδων σου); 9 6,
ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων; 9 17, ἀπὸ ὑψίστων; 10 16, ἐν τέρασι καὶ σημείοις;
10 17, καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς σκέπην ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς φλόγα ἄστρων
τὴν νύκτα (cf. 14 11, εἰς βδέλυγμα; 14 21, εἰς ἔνεδρον); 11 1, ἐν
χειρὶ προφήτου ἁγίου.

In addition to the Hebraisms listed above, a detailed explanation
is given in the following pages of the more striking instances of
translation-idiom. In certain cases we have merely to deal with
peculiarities in the Greek which strongly suggest a common
Hebrew idiom; in other examples it is possible to clarify the
meaning of passages hopelessly obscured for those who adhere
to an original Greek text; and on occasion it is possible to demon-
strate an actual mistranslation of the Hebrew original.

1 1 — ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας.

"In singleness of heart."

This particular phrase in the Greek is found in only one other passage of the Septuagint. That is 1 Chr. 29 17, where it renders the Hebrew בְּיֹשֶׁר לְבָבִי.

The words ἁπλότης, ἁπλοσύνη, ἁπλοῦν, ἁπλοῦς, ἁπλῶς almost invariably render some derivative of the root תם used in the ethical sense; thus in 21 places in the old Greek translations of the O. T.

The usual Heb. idiom is בְּתָם־לֵבָב; see Gen. 20 5, 6; 1 Ki. 9 4; Ps. 78 72; 101 2.

We happen to know that this idiom was rendered by ἁπλότης καρδίας in Gen. 20 5 by Symmachus, and in Ps. 78 72 by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. (It was doubtless rendered in this way by one or more of these translators in other passages, where we have no record.)

In 2 Sam. 15 11, LXX renders לְתֻמָּם by ἐν τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτῶν. Cf. Susanna 63; 1 Macc. 2 37, 60, and Aq., Sym., Th. in Prov. 28 6.

Hence, in Wisd. 1 1 we seem to have a close translation of a standing Hebrew phrase, viz. the idiom בתם לבב.

1 6c — καὶ ἐλεγχθήσεται ἐπελθούσης ἀδικίας.

No convincing translation of this verse has been made by those who claim that Greek is the original language of the book. In the translation of the convenient SPCK series, Oesterley made the conjecture, "And is *abashed* at the approach of unrighteousness," adding the obvious truth that "the meaning of the Greek is uncertain."

The difficulty comes, of course, not in translating the verb ἐλεγχθήσεται but in making a translation which will make sense in this context. The variety of translations which have been suggested shows that translators have not found a satisfactory reading. The AV evaded the problem by reading into 5 c the meaning of the preceding lines: "For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and *will not abide* when unrighteousness cometh in." This is something that might possibly be said about the holy

spirit of discipline, but it is not in any sense a translation of the word we have before us. The editors of the RV translated more literally, but with a corresponding loss in the sense of the passage: "And *will be put to confusion* when unrighteousness hath come in," with the marginal reading, "convicted."

Some such reading as "abashed," "ashamed," "be put to confusion" might seem possible, if considered apart from the biblical usage of ἐλέγχειν. In biblical Greek, however, the verb has the primary meaning "convict," "chasten," "rebuke," while the meaning to be "abashed." "ashamed," "put to confusion" is secondary and always carries with it the implication of the primary meaning. Thus a sense of shame or confusion is what results from the conviction of wrongdoing. That such a thing could be said of the holy spirit of discipline, or in other words, of *Sophia*, of the Spirit of God (for these words seem to be used almost interchangeably), is unthinkable.

That this meaning "convict" is to be connected with the Greek verb in question becomes almost inescapable when we compare with it the usage of this same writer in other parts of the book. Some form of the verb is used in five other places and in every case with the general meaning of "convict" or its equivalent.

Thus in 1 s the RV reads, "And the Supreme Power . . . putteth to confusion (marg. 'convicteth') the foolish." Line 1 s has, "Neither shall Justice, when it convicteth, pass him by." In 2 11 we find, "For that which is weak is found to be of no service (marg. 'convicted')." Line 4 20 reads, "And their lawless deeds shall convict them to their face." Finally in 12 2, we read, "Wherefore thou convictest by little and little them that . . . . ."

Furthermore, the noun of the same root occurs in the following passages: 1 9; 2 14; 11 8; 17 7 and 18 5, and the meaning in every case is that of "conviction," translated variously "reproof," "rebuke."

Thus we come to what amounts to an impasse if we are to accept the Greek as the original of this passage. It is hardly possible to accept the reading, "(the holy spirit of discipline) will be convicted" or even "will be put to confusion (with the implic-

ation of guilt)." On the other hand, that is clearly what the word ἐλέγχειν means as used in other parts of the book and this is in harmony with the Septuagint usage.

Is it possible to throw light on the question on the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the original Hebrew? Two conjectures have been made, both of which give sense to the context, which is an improvement over the hypothesis of a Greek original, at least. Focke, following Bretschneider, assumes that the translator had before him יוֹכִיחַ (ἐλέγξει) which he read as יוּכַח (ἐλεγχθήσεται). Of these two Hebrew forms, the active or Hifil occurs exceedingly frequently, while one citation of the passive or Hofal form is listed by Hatch and Redpath, in Job. 33 19, translated "is chastened." It would be difficult to conjecture this meaning "to be chastened" in connection with our passage, but the active meaning "to chastise" or "to convict" fits into the sense of the context admirably.

Speiser finds this hypothesis "hardly a felicitous one." He conjectures that the translator had before him the form יָמוּר, which he mistook for יָסוּר. "The line thus restored ought to be rendered: 'And will *remove*, when unrighteousness cometh in'." This suggestion has the virtue of giving us a verse in which all three members are parallel:

> "For a holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit,
> And will start away from thoughts that are without
> > understanding,
> And will remove, when unrighteousness cometh in."

On the other hand, is it the character of the "holy spirit of discipline" to depart from the scene when unrighteousness enters in? Is not the duty of discipline to punish those who are unrighteous in word or deed? In other words, is the nature of "*Paideia-Sophia*" entirely passive?

By omitting line 1 ᵃ, a line which hardly seems to belong to this part of Wisdom (see Focke, pp. 69, 70), Focke obtains in lines ᵃ b c and ᵇb, two couplets which present both attributes of "*Paideia-Sophia*" the active and the passive. Omitting ᵃᵃ we obtain:

"For a holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit,
And will start away from thoughts that are without
                                    und standing.
But will convict when unrighteousness hath come in,
And will not hold a blasphemer guiltless for his lips."

The word "But" in 50 is substituted for the usual "And" because it fits the context better and is equally possible as a translation of the Hebrew connective (Focke, p. 70).

Whatever be said of either of the above suggestions, they have the advantage of providing a translation which gives sense to the context in which the disputed passage is found. This is something at least which cannot be said for any readings from the accepted Greek text.

1 14 — ἔκτισεν γὰρ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα,
        καὶ σωτήριοι αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου.

The RV translates these lines:

"For he created all things *that they might have being*:
And the generative powers of the world are *healthsome*."

While the RV may make idiomatic English, it is nonsense in this connection. Of course, whatever is created has "being," but the question here is how long it is to last.

Εἰς τὸ εἶναι is not idiomatic Greek. The variant (55) reading εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is a mere worthless guess here.

Is it possible to obtain the obvious sense of the passage on the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the Hebrew? The phrase εἰς τὸ εἶναι would be, of course, the rendering of לִהְיֹת. But is that the meaning here? Is not the contrast here between *life* and *death*, and does not the writer mean to say that things were created *to live* rather than *to be*? In this case, the original Hebrew would be לִחְיֹת. This is good Hebrew idiom and makes good sense in the context.

In like manner, in the next line, isn't the meaning that the "origins of the universe" (תֹּולְדֹות תֵּבֵל) were "life-giving" (מְחַיֹּת)? Σωτήριοι would be a good rendering.

Thus restored from the original Hebrew, the translation of the verse reads:

"For he created all things that they might have life,
And the origins of the universe are life-giving,
Etc."

1 16 — ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ταῖς χερσὶν καὶ τοῖς λόγοις προσεκαλέσαντο
αὐτόν,
φίλον ἡγησάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐτάκησαν,
καὶ συνθήκην ἔθεντο πρὸς αὐτόν,
ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι.

"But ungodly men by their hands and their words called
death unto them.
Deeming *him* a friend they consumed away,
And they made a covenant with *him*,
Because they were worthy to be of his portion." (RV).

The RV clearly gives the meaning when it translates "death" in 1 16 a, but the word is not found in the Greek. The αὐτόν, repeated three times in this verse and the ἐκείνου refer to θάνατος, *which, however, has not been expressed.* Nor is it expressed in the Greek of the preceding line:

δικαιοσύνη γὰρ ἀθάνατός ἐστιν.

But if we consider the possibility here of translation Greek, it is evident that v. 15 could not be expressed in Heb. without the word "death" (מָוֶת), compounded with בְּלִי or some other negative. Although there is no suggestion here of a mistranslation, yet the origin of the Greek becomes clear when we consider it as a translation from the Hebrew.

Incidentally, the troublesome word ἐτάκησαν is probably a mere corruption of ἐκράτησαν: "Deeming him a friend *they laid hold upon him.*"

2 5 — κατεσφραγίσθη.
"Fast sealed."

The verse, in which this word occurs, reads in the AV. "And our end retreateth not; Because it is fast sealed, and none turneth it back."

The word is not common in the LXX, being listed only three times by Tromm. It is, however, a familiar Hebrew idiom, and in Job. 9 7; 37 7, and also in Deuteronomy 32 34 (ἐσφράγισται) is represented in the original by חתם.

2 6 — καὶ χρησώμεθα τῇ κτίσει ὡς νεότητι σπουδαίως.

"Come on therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present: and let us speedily use the creatures *like as in youth*." (AV).

> "Come therefore and let us enjoy the good things
> > that now are;
> And let us use the creation with all our soul
> > *as youth's possession*." (RV).

While the above translations make idiomatic English, they merely serve to hide the difficulty of the Greek. The most probable ms. reading is ὡς νεότητι, although Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus read νεότητος. The Old Latin reads "*tanquam in iuventute*" and the Peshitta "in our youth."

That this difficulty in the Greek is one of long standing may be judged from the varied attempts at translation. Grimm a first favored the meaning "eagerly as is fitting for youth," but later supported the reading ἐν νεότητι, "in youth." Siegfried accepts this with a reference to the Hebrew of Eccles. 11 9, בְּיַלְדוּתֶךָ, "in thy youth." Some such translation as this, "in youth" or "while we are young" is obviously the sense of the passage, but the difficulty of the Greek is not solved thereby. The literal translation, "And let us earnestly use creation like youth" is, as Speiser remarks, too vague.

Speiser improves upon the original suggestion of Pfleiderer that νεότης is a slang word for "a girl," and that the meaning is "let us use God's creation as we would a harlot." Speiser refers to the suggestion of Zenner (Feldmann, p. 44) that we

should read in this passage ὡς νεοττίδι, "als Freudenmädchen," but remarks, "The sense would in such a case be excellent, but the procedure doubtful." Speiser himself makes the suggestion that the original Hebrew נְעָרוֹת "girls" was read by the translator נְעֻרֹת "youth," in support of which he refers to Eccles. 3 12.

But would "the sense ... in such a case be excellent?" There is nothing else in the Book of Wisdom to suggest this meaning. The simplest solution on the basis of an original Hebrew text is that of Bretschneider (see Focke, p. 71) that the translator, dealing with an unvocalized text, made the very easy mistake of reading the original בּ for the very similar preposition כּ. Accepting this hypothesis, we should have in the original Hebrew some such phrase as בַּיְלָדוֹת or perhaps בַּנְּעָרִים.

Thus here the theory of mistranslation from the Hebrew removes the difficulty of the Greek and gives a translation which is appropriate to the context:

> "Come therefore and let us enjoy the good things that
> now are;
> And let us use the creation with all our soul in youth."

2 16 — εἰς κίβδηλον ἐλογίσθημεν αὐτῷ.

"We were accounted of him as base metal . . . ." (RV).

With this verse should be compared 3 17, εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσονται, and 9 6, εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται. While the verb λογίζεσθαι occurs frequently in the Wisdom of Solomon, in connection with εἰς τὶ it is found in only these three verses. This is, of course, the familiar Hebrew idiom נֶחְשָׁב לְ, found in 1 Ki. 10 21, לִמְאוּמָה . . . .; Lam. 4 2, לֹא יֶחְשַׁב; Ps. 106 31, וַתֵּחָשֶׁב נֶחְשְׁבוּ לְנִבְלֵי־חָרֶשׂ; in Is. 40 17, מֵאֶפֶס וָתֹהוּ נֶחְשְׁבוּ־לוֹ, and in other places לוֹ לִצְדָקָה. The extreme literalness of the Greek in the three passages mentioned strongly suggests the possibility of translation from Hebrew.

4 13 — ἐπλήρωσεν χρόνους μακρούς.

This is thought to be a reference to Enoch, the "perfect" man, and is characteristically Hebrew in mode of expression. Goodrick

says "An idiomatic English translation is almost impossible RV 'long years' is not satisfactory), but the sense is plain enough. His moral training was completed early in life, and his few years were as good as very many."

The difficulty of translating this into English idiom is clear enough. But is this even idiomatic Greek? Goodrick considers πληροῦν χρόνον "a Hellenistic expression," following Grimm (p. 105) who says that the expression "gehört nur der hellenistischen Grācitāt" an. But the theory of a Jewish-Greek literary idiom has been abandoned by the very scholars who have maintained most consistently the Greek origin of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and certain books of the New Testament. If there never was any such thing as a literary "Jewish Greek," such an expression as πληροῦν χρόνον cannot have been composed in Greek at all. It can only be a literal translation from the familiar Hebrew idiom found variously in Gen. 25 24; 29 21; Lev. 8 33; 12 4; 25 30; Nu. 6 5; etc.

4 14 — μηδὲ θέντες ἐπὶ διανοίᾳ τὸ τοιοῦτο.

"Neither laying this to heart" (RV).

The Hebrew equivalent of the awkward phrase θέντες ἐπὶ διανοίᾳ is the common שׂוּם עַל־לֵב. Grimm remarks that the writer probably had in mind the passage in Isaiah 57 1. Inasmuch as the LXX gives an entirely different translation from the above, it is evident that the Hebrew must be the source, if this is the case. Isaiah 57 1 reads, "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart (הַצַּדִּיק אָבַד וְאֵין אִישׁ שָׂם עַל־לֵב); and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come." The context here and immediately following is so similar in thought to Wisdom 4 7 ff., that the dependence of Wisdom upon the Hebrew can hardly be doubted.

4 14 — διὰ τοῦτο ἔσπευσεν ἐκ μέσου πονηρίας.

This line has caused translators some difficulty. The AV renders (reading the whole verse), "For his soul pleased the Lord: therefore hasted he *to take him away* from among the wicked."

The editors of the RV preferred to consider not God, but "he," that is, Enoch, as the subject of the verb and accordingly translated, "Therefore hasted he out of the midst of wickedness," adding in the margin, however, the other reading, "*he hastened him away.*"

It is the verb ἔσπευσεν, of course, which causes the difficulty. The reading of the Greek is necessarily ambiguous. If we suppose a Hebrew original, we find that הבהיל, with the direct object understood, is quite the common thing in Hebrew poetry, and if substituted here, disposes of the ambiguity.

5 16 — διὰ τοῦτο λήμψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπείας
           καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους ἐκ χειρὸς Κυρίου.

The AV translated, "Therefore shall they receive a glorious kingdom, and a beautiful crown from the Lord's hand."

> The rendering of the RV is closer to the Greek,
> "Therefore shall they receive the *crown of royal dignity,*
> And the diadem of beauty from the Lord's hand."

The translation "crown" for βασίλειον is a frequent LXX usage. It is also confirmed by the recently published and as yet incomplete *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* by Preisigke, in which *"Königskrone"* is the meaning of the word.

Grimm's objection to this translation (p. 119) seems very weak. He argues, "*nicht Krone . . . denn in diesem Falle würde das Wort ganz dasselbe besagen wie διάδημα; . . . sondern Reich, Herrschaft, wie* 1 14." So far as the reference to 1 14 is concerned, the meaning there is ambiguous and may be rendered "palace" or "crown" with fully as much certainty as "kingdom."

The objection that if βασίλειον be read "crown," we should have the same meaning as in the following line suggests what was probably the case, almost certainly if the original were Hebrew. Such parallelism is exactly what we should expect. Goodrick remarks "that 'Kingdom of splendour', 'diadem of beauty', might well be considered Hebraisms, but whether from such influence

or not, 'genitives of quality' are frequent in New Testament Greek . . ." (p. 162). It is becoming more and more clear that the "frequent" peculiarities of the New Testament Greek mentioned by Goodrick are due to translation from Semitic sources. The evidence here leans in the same direction. Not only does the genitive construction suggest the Hebrew, but the best translation of βασίλειον with "crown" gives a balance between "crown of splendor" in the first line and "diadem of beauty" in the second, which is exactly what we should expect in Hebrew but not in Greek.

What we have in this passage may be taken to be a direct allusion to a strikingly similar passage in Is. 62 3. Dependence upon this verse, however, would not be upon the LXX, which reads,

$$καὶ ἔσῃ στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου,$$
$$καὶ διάδημα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ σου.$$

It might easily be argued that the translator had before him something very close to the Hebrew of Is. 62 3, which is

וְהָיִ֛ית עֲטֶ֥רֶת תִּפְאֶ֖רֶת בְּיַד־יְהֹוָ֑ה
וּצְנִ֥יף מְלוּכָ֖ה בְּכַף־אֱלֹהָֽיִךְ.

6 1 — οὐ γὰρ ὑποστελεῖται πρόσωπον ὁ πάντων δεσπότης.

"For He which is Lord over all *shall fear no person.*" (AV)
"For the Sovereign Lord of all *will not refrain himself for any man's person.*" (RV)

The translation of the RV suggests better than the AV the awkwardness of ὑποστελεῖται πρόσωπον, a phrase clearly foreign to the Greek idiom. It is impossible to believe that the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon, at home in both Alexandrian Greek and Hebrew as we know him to be, composed such a barbarism. It is a clear example of an over-literal translation of a familiar Hebrew idiom. An example of this construction in the Hebrew Bible is found in Deut. 1 17: לֹא תָגוּרוּ מִפְּנֵי־אִישׁ.

8 4 — μύστις γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης
    καὶ αἱρετὶς τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

The difficulty here centers in the word αἱρετίς, which needs
to be considered, however, in its context.

The AV gives a dubious translation, "For she is privy to the
mysteries of the knowledge of God, and a lover of his works."

Grimm found the word puzzling: "αἱρετίς, schwerlich weiter
vorkommend, kann seiner Etymologie zufolge nichts anderes als
electrix (Vulg.) bedeuten." (p. 169.)

The editors of the RV chose this sense in their translation:

"For she is initiated into the knowledge of God,
And she chooseth out for him his works."

Two objections may be made to this translation, one from the
point of view of the sense. Isn't this too exalted a position for
Wisdom, to say that she "chooses" or "deviseth" what God shall
do? This passage is reminiscent of the verses in Prov. 8, where
Wisdom is with God from the beginning, but God is the active
agent.

Another suggestion might be taken from the principle of paral-
lelism so closely followed in much of this chapter. "To be initiated
into the knowledge of God" is a quite different thing from the
position of one who "chooses out" for God what he shall enact.
Thus the parallelism does not suggest the above readings.

The interesting suggestion has been made by C. C. Torrey and
E. A. Speiser, working independently of each other, that the ori-
ginal Hebrew חברת was mistaken by the translator for בחרת.
Thus we should read in place of "chooseth out for him his works"
some such translation as "And is an associate, sharer in."

On this hypothesis of a misreading of the Hebrew original,
we thus have the more natural:

"For she is initiated into the knowledge of God,
And is a sharer in his works."

9 1 — θεὲ πατέρων καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους σου.

The RV renders this line, "O God of the fathers, and Lord who
keepest thy mercy (marg. Lord of thy mercy)." But what sense

is there in the phrase, "Lord who keepest thy mercy"? Nor is
the marginal reading of any help. "Lord of *thy* mercy" is never
a LXX appellation for God.

The AV avoided part of the difficulty by leaving out the pos-
sessive pronoun σου, translating "O God of my fathers, and Lord
of mercy." Certain manuscript readings support such a trans-
lation by the omission of σου; namely 106, 248, 254, 261, Compl.,
but the more important documents preserve the more difficult
reading. Even without the troublesome σου, Grimm considered
the phrase κύριος ἐλέους "ein halber Hebraismus."

This is a case where the theory of translation out of the Hebrew
is especially convincing. According to the concordances, the usual
Hebrew equivalent for ἔλεος would be חֶסֶד. One form of this
word is the adjective חָסִיד, meaning "good" or "pious" and also
used substantively with the meaning "saint." We may conjecture
that in the present case the translator had before him the unvo-
calized word חסדיך. This word may be vocalized in two different
ways and two entirely different meanings may be obtained. The
translator here evidently read חֲסָדֶיךָ when the context demanded
חֲסִידֶיךָ. Had the correct translation been made, we should have
in the English: "O God of the fathers, and Lord of thy saints."
This is an improvement in at least two respects: first, it supplies
sense to the reading of the best mss.; and secondly, it gives us
a couplet suggestive of the usual Hebrew parallelism.

That the language is typical of this book may be judged from
its occurrence in two other passages of the Book of Wisdom:

> ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ   (3 9)
> ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ
> καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ.   (4 15)

If it be objected that the plural חסדים is rendered by the sin-
gular ἔλεος, it is precisely what we have in Is. 63 7, חַסְדֵי יְהוָֹה, and,
LXX, τὸν ἔλεον Κυρίου; in Ps. 106 7, אֶת־רֹב חֲסָדֶיךָ and LXX,
τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ ἐλέους σου.

In Gen. 32 11 the rendering is by another Greek word, but
still in the singular number: מִכֹּל הַחֲסָדִים translated ἀπὸ πάσης
δικαιοσύνης.

9 8 — καὶ ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς κρίσιν κρίνῃ.

    "and execute judgment with an upright heart." (AV)

    "and execute judgement in uprightness of soul." (RV)

While εὐθύς occurs frequently in the LXX and also in this particular Book of Wisdom, generally corresponding to the Hebrew ישר, yet this exact expression, ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς, occurs only here in Wisdom.

Wahl (*Clavis*) in connection with this passage refers to Ps. 119 7, the phrase, "I will give thanks unto thee with uprightness of heart," where the Hebrew equivalent of ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίας is בישר לבב.

It might be added, in this same connection, that the very common idiom רָב רִיב, accounts for the κρίσιν κρίνῃ; see, for example, these very same words in Prov. 22 23.

9 9 — τί ἀρεστὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου.

    "what is pleasing in thine eyes." (RV)

Even Grimm counts this a Hebraism, comparing with it the expression in Gen. 16 10 (evidently a typographical error for 16 6). In 16 6 we find the similar expression σοι ἀρεστὸν ᾖ, which is a translation of the original הטוב בעיניך.

Thackeray does not consider the possibility of finding translation Greek in the Book of Wisdom (see his *Introduction*), yet makes the following comment (p. 43), "As regards the use of ὀφθαλμός in phrases like 'to seem good,' or 'to find favor in the eyes (i. e. in the estimation) of someone (בעיני) we find the same sort of distinction between the groups of books as elsewhere. The classical παρά τινι or other paraphrase is rarely found. As a rule, the Pentateuch with some of the other books render בעיני by ἐναντίον (or the vernacular ἐνώπιον, ἔναντι), while the literal rendering ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς is reserved for the later historical books (and is unexampled in N. T.)."

Thus, to use Thackeray's own words, we have here a "literal" example of translation Greek, such as we should expect in the later historical books.

The variant (248) reading only tends to confirm the hypothesis of translation from the Hebrew, for it is equally awkward, ἐνώπιόν σου.

9 11c — καὶ φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς.

"And she shall guard me *in her glory.*" (RV)

Grimm (p. 187) translated ἐν τῇ δόξῃ, "*in ihrem Glanze;*" i. e., with the "brilliance" or "splendor" which characterizes her (cf. Wisdom 7 26, ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστιν φωτὸς ἀιδίου), Wisdom will illuminate the path for the one whom she loves, so that he may not go astray.

The AV rendered, "in her power," following the Vulg. "*in sua potentia.*" Goodrick characterizes this translation as the least likely of several possibilities (p. 220), because in the sense of "power" the word δόξα is applied only to God (cf. Rom. 6 4, Christ was raised from the dead, διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός). Here glory and power are identical, of course. Goodrick finds more likely: (1) "in her brightness," which suggests the reading of Grimm mentioned above; (2) "through her counsel," taking δόξα to mean δόγμα; (3) "with her good repute," emphasizing the *guarding* by Wisdom's good name rather than the thought of *guiding.* This is the rendering Goodrick includes in his own English translation.

The meaning of δόξα in this verse is necessarily ambiguous. If we consider this as a translation from a Hebrew original, there is a possible analogy in Is. 40 6 where δόξα is the translation of חֶסֶד. This is not the common use of δόξα, but that it is possible is shown here, and the analogy makes the meaning of v. 11c clearer: it is not in this case, *how* wisdom protects, but *why;* that is, because of her loving-kindness. Thus the meaning is "she will protect me in her loving-kindness."

10 1c — καὶ ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου.

The word ἰδίου is very peculiar here and clearly is not idiomatic Greek. In the AV it was not translated and we have merely the statement that Wisdom "brought him out of his fall." The

reference is to Adam, of course, and since there is no comparison
with any one else who has sinned, the literal translation of the RV
is clearly no improvement on the sense: "Wisdom guarded to
the end the first-formed father of the world that was created
alone, And delivered him out of his *own* transgression."

Adam's sin was a serious one and Wisdom alone saved him
from the death penalty. Similar references to "mortal sin" are
to be found in Num. 17 3; Deut. 21 22; 22 26; Hab. 2 10; Prov. 20 2,
etc. In the last two citations, the expression in Hebrew is אֹטֵא
נֶפֶשׁ (Hab. 2 10, וְנַפְשׁוֹ חוֹטֵא; Prov. 20 2, נַפְשׁוֹ חוֹטֵא).

The significance is to be found in the use of the Hebrew word נֶפֶשׁ.
With the suffix, נַפְשִׁי, נַפְשֶׁךָ, the word is very commonly used in
the sense of "self," "I myself," "thou thyself" etc. But the word
means "life" and is of course frequently used where life is said
or implied to be in danger: Ps. 3 3; 11 1; Is. 3 9; Ps. 7 3; 35 3, 7;
120 6. This is a Hebrew idiom which is ordinarily translated in
the LXX by ψυχή. For example, Hab. 2 10 reads in the Greek,
καὶ ἐξήμαρτεν ἡ ψυχή σου; while Prov. 20 2 is translated,
. . . ἁμαρτάνει εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν. We should translate liter-
ally in English with "sinning against" one's own soul (i. e., *life*),
which is another way of saying "mortal sin." This Hebrew idiom
is hard to translate into either the Greek or the English because
these two languages do not have the exact equivalent of נֶפֶשׁ.
"Soul" and "life" are not expressed by a single word in the latter
languages, while in classical Hebrew, at least, there is no way
to express the difference. Assuming that our writer was trans-
lating from the Hebrew, the original probably contained the
phrase נַפְשׁוֹ חוֹטֵא, and the troublesome ἰδίου is merely an attempt
to express literally in Greek what is a characteristically Hebrew
idiom. Thus the meaning of the line is that Wisdom "delivered
him from mortal sin."

10 3c — ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀφροσύνης ἀπέλιπον τῷ βίῳ μνημόσυνον.

"But they also left behind them *for (human) life (marg. 'by their
lives')* a monument of their folly." (RV)

The difficulty comes in the phrase τῷ βίῳ. Goodrick (p. 231) suggests that although βίος may mean "human life," yet in this verse and 14 21, τοῦτο ἐγένετο τῷ βίῳ εἰς ἔνεδρον, it may have the meaning of the world at large. In support of this he quotes 4 Macc. 17 14 where we have ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος ἐθεώρει, which is not very convincing.

Grimm (p. 199) refers to 4 Macc. 17 19 to show that βίος may bear the meaning „lebende," "the living." This is the sense of the context. The wicked "dying" are contrasted with the righteous "living." In v. 1 Wisdom preserves Adam, and even when he falls does not entirely forsake him. In v. 3 we have a reference to the lot of Cain. The tradition about the punishment of Cain is confused because of God's promise in Gen. 4 15 that he should not be *slain*. Yet, it is the fate of Cain and his posterity to perish utterly. Wisdom preserved the life of Noah (v. 4). V. 5 seems to refer vaguely to Wisdom's care for Abraham. In v. 6 Wisdom saves alive the righteous man Lot, while a pillar of salt testifies to the death of an unbelieving soul, the type of the wicked inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, etc. Thus we clearly have here the contrasted fate of the wicked and the righteous, the dying and the living. This is the sense, but not the ordinary translation of τῷ βίῳ.

Supposing, however, that we have here a translation from Hebrew, the origin of the difficulty is easy to determine. The Hebrew equivalent of βίος is חיּים which could mean either "life" or "the living." So the translation of this verse should be:

"But they also left behind them *for the living* a monument of their folly."

10 10 — εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις,
καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ.

"She prospered him in his toils,
And *multiplied the fruits of his labor*." (RV)

The difficulty in this line does not appear in the English translation. It centers in the word πόνους. Literally, the final clause

of the verse can only be translated, "She multiplied his labors," but it is clear that this cannot be the meaning.

Translators in general have accepted the suggestion of Grimm, who translated *"machte gross seinen Erwerb,"* taking τόνους in the sense of the "reward of labor," or "gain." But it is doubtful if it is possible to take this meaning from τόνοι. Liddell and Scott list three main varieties of the word's usage in Greek: (1) work, toil; (2) consequences of toil, in sense of distress, trouble; (3) anything produced by work, in the sense of a work of art. There is nothing here to substantiate the translation of Grimm. He referred to Prov. 3 ₉ (LXX), for support of his view, which reads,

> τίμα τὸν κύριον ἀπὸ σῶν δικαίων πόνων,
> καὶ ἀπάρχου αὐτῷ ἀπὸ σῶν καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης.

> Honour the Lord with thy substance,
> And with the first fruits of all thine increase. (RV)

This is not decisive, nor are the two verses listed by him in Ecclus. 14 ₁₅ and 28 ₁₅. The first of these rather suggests the literal meaning of πόνοι:

> οὐχὶ ἑτέρῳ καταλείψεις τοὺς πόνους σου,
> καὶ τοὺς κόπους σου εἰς διαίρεσιν κλήρου.

> "Shalt thou not leave thy labours unto another,
> And thy toils to be divided by lot?" (RV)

Ecclus. 28 ₁₅ may be taken either way and is clearly not decisive:

> γλῶσσα τρίτη γυναῖκας ἀνδρείας ἐξέβαλεν,
> καὶ ἐστέρεσεν αὐτὰς τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν.

> "A third person's tongue hath cast out brave women,
> And deprived them of their labours." (RV)

So far as the Wisdom of Solomon is concerned the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the literal meaning, "labor," "toil," "pain," or the like, with one exception. The word πόνοι occurs in the following passages: 3 ₁₅; 5 ₁; 8 ₇, ₁₈; 9 ₁₆; 10 ₉, ₁₀; 15 ₄; 19 ₁₆. Aside from the verse in question, the only case in which there is ambiguity about the meaning is in 8 ₇,

καὶ εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις,
οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί.

The famous list of virtues follows. The RV renders 8 7,

"And if a man loveth righteousness,
The fruits of Wisdom's labour are virtues."

But equal sense is obtained if we translate this passage literally. The tasks which Wisdom sets are σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη and ἀνδρεία. Such duties as these are glorious duties and might well be described as virtues. Goodrick translates:

"And if a man cherish righteousness,
Her labours are virtues;
For she teacheth temperance and prudence,
Justice and manliness,
Than which nought in life is more profitable to man."

Goodrick himself evidently takes "labours" in the sense of "the fruits of labor," but this is not necessary to the meaning. The tasks Wisdom requires of man are temperance, prudence, justice, and manliness. These in themselves may be considered "labours."

An added difficulty to translators in this passage has been the meaning of the verb used with πόνοι, which is ἐπλήθυνεν. Goodrick finds a dilemma here. Either πόνους means "the fruit of his labours" or the verb ἐπλήθυνεν must mean "made to succeed," or "prospered." But, as we have seen, the first is very uncertain. According to classical usage, ἐπλήθυνεν cannot possibly mean "prospered." Goodrick (p. 233) escapes the dilemma by assuming that "'Wisdom' is writing in a foreign tongue." But, are we to admit that our writer is not well-versed in the Greek? That is not the evidence throughout the book; quite to the contrary. As Goodrick himself says, "the only true meaning is 'multiplied his toils'." Goodrick himself adopts the translation, "bless with plenty his labours;" but one does not feel he himself is convinced.

Thus we are not able to obtain a satisfactory translation on the basis of the Greek text, without reading into the line the obvious meaning of the context.

Assuming, however, that the writer was translating from the Hebrew, we come to a simple solution of the difficulty. The Hebrew equivalent of πόνοι is יְגִיעַ which has two meanings, (1) labor, toil; (2) the product of labor, or better, *the reward, gain.* In this usage the word is found in Is. 45 14; 55 2; Jer. 3 24; 20 5; Ps. 109 11; Neh. 5 13; as derived from tillage, Ps. 78 46; Job 39 11; Haggai 1 11; Ps. 128 2.

Thus it appears that our writer, translating from the Hebrew, naturally enough fell upon πόνοι, which is the common equivalent of יְגִיעַ in its primary meaning, and which he was regularly using in other passages of his translation. In this particular passage, however, in conjunction with ἐπλήθυνεν, the context demands another translation, perhaps καρπούς. So the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the Hebrew furnishes the simplest solution of the difficulty in this passage.

III

It remains to discuss the bearing of this evidence upon the division of the book. Several questions naturally arise: How far does the translated part extend? Or, to put it in another way, just where does the originally Greek section begin? Was *all* of the first part originally written in Hebrew?

From the character of this essay it is natural that chief importance should be given to the occurrence of translation-idiom in the Greek text. It is generally admitted that the traces of Hebrew idiom are to be found within the first half of the book. The cases cited in the previous section are scattered throughout the first ten chapters, while what is commonly considered to be a Hebraism is found in the first verse of the eleventh chapter. At the end of this verse there is an abrupt transition in the verbal sequence. V. 1 reads, "She (Wisdom) prospered their works in the hand of the holy prophet," with the verb in the third person singular; while v. 2, with a verb in the third person plural, introduces a new subject, the Israelites, "They went through the wilderness, etc." Furthermore, from this point onward there is a marked

lessening of the parallelism characteristic of the first ten chapters
as a whole. For these reasons especially the present writer con-
cludes that the translated material ends with 11 1 and that the
Greek original began with 11 2. This division of the book coincides
with that of the early critic, Eichhorn, who did not, however,
admit the possibility of Hebrew origin for the first part. It is
also identical with the major division proposed by Holmes, who
concluded that "the difference in style, presentation, and tone
between the two parts is undeniable."[27] Holmes balanced the
reasons in support of the composition of the book against those
for its unity and concluded that the most effective of these had
to do with the numerous and striking linguistic differences between
the two sections. He demonstrated with a chart the astonishingly
different proportion in which certain particles are used in the
first and last parts of Wisdom, including the following: μέν, δέ,
ἵνα, ἀλλά (μόνον), γάρ, καὶ γάρ. The significance of these figures
was seized upon by Speiser[28] who maintained that "Holmes' con-
clusions for considering the first part separately are all in favor
of its *Hebrew origin*. The latter will easily explain the paucity
of particles, comparatively smaller number of compounds, peculiar
distribution of certain words, etc. In fact a non-Greek source
of the book is practically *postulated* thereby, and the theory is
particularly supported by the fact that—to use Holmes' own
argument in a different connection—the support comes *un-
wittingly*, the author not having considered the possibility of a
Hebrew origin."

The division at the end of 11 1 harmonizes well with the opinion
of most critics who have touched upon the Hebraisms in the
Book of Wisdom, whether or not they have admitted the possi-
bility of a Hebrew original. Grimm[29], for example, listed the
following verses as containing Hebraisms: 1 1; 2 9; 2 15; 2 16;
4 13; 4 15; 7 29; 8 4; 8 11; 8 21; 9 3; 9 6; 9 9; 11 1; 13 9; 19 17. It

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 523.
[28] *Op. cit.*, pp. 478, 479.
[29] *Op. cit.*, Einleitung, "Sprache und Darstellung" (Sect. 3).

will be observed that 14 out of 16 of these Hebraisms fall within the limit designated. Several so-called "half-Hebraisms" mentioned by Grimm all belong within these chapters: 6 s; 6 14 and 9 1. More recently Professor Freudenthal[30] has referred to the "intermingling of stylistic ostentation and poverty" in the Wisdom of Solomon, by "poverty" indicating such Hebraisms as those in 1 1; 2 9; 4 15; 9 1; 9 8; 9 9 and 11 1. It will be observed that these Hebraisms all fall within the first section of the book. The three alleged cases of mistranslation cited by Focke have already been mentioned. Speiser himself has listed mistranslations in the following lines: 1 5; 1 16; 2 5; 2 6; 3 12; 4 12; 4 19; 5 8; 5 12; 8 4; 8 5—6.

In connection with the parallelism reflected in the Greek text, Focke takes issue with the generally accepted point of view. Grimm judged the parallelism to continue through the first ten chapters, in imitation, as he thought, of the Hebrew style of the Psalms, Job and Proverbs. Siegfried (1900) affirmed the same point of view, although in his own translation he used verse form through 12 18, which caused Focke to inquire if we were expected to discover a third form of literary structure in chs. 10 1—12 18. Under the sub-heading, "Poesie und Prosa," Focke[31] claims that the parallelism of the book is limited as follows: in chs. 1—5 it is consistently observed; in 6 1—12 18 the parallelism preponderates with occasional prose; while in 12 19—ch. 19, the prose preponderates with only scattered examples of parallelism. Focke concludes that the author of chs. 6—19 in combining his own work with the original chs. 1—5 which he translated from the Hebrew, was at first consistently but gradually less and less careful to observe his imitation of the Hebrew parallelism. This attempt to limit the genuinely Hebrew parallelism to chs. 1—5 Focke combines with various arguments under the two general headings "Inhalt" and "Form" but inconclusively. For example, Focke points to the comparative absence of the term *Sophia* and

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 733.
[31] *Op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff.

other Greek terminology in chs. 1–5, compared with its frequent usage in chs. 6–19. Even if 1 6 be ruled out of consideration as an interpolation, as Focke insists, it is difficult to agree that "*diese auffällige singulare Erscheinung in den ersten fünf Kapiteln der Sap. völlig fehlt.*"[32] Traces of Greek thought certainly are to be found in the translator's language in 1 7; 2 2 c d; 2 8; 2 23. Thus chs. 1–5 are not free from this terminology. Nor does the usage of *Sophia* at least continue in all of chs. 6–19, occurring only once in these chapters.

A similar inconclusiveness exists in Focke's argument that in Part I as defined by him we find only a stern, judicial deity (1 3; 1 7–10; 4 16; 5 16–20), while in Part II we discover a benevolent, merciful deity.[33] To support his view Focke quotes from the second section: 6 7; 7 26; 11 23 ff; 11 26; 12 1; 12 2; 12 10; 12 11; 12 13; 12 18; 12 20; 12 22; 14 3; 15 1; 16 6; 16 7; 16 8; 16 10; 16 11; 16 21; 16 26; 19 22. It might be said, of course, that the writer is dealing in Part I with a different set of circumstances and a different phase of the nature of God. Even if the difference claimed can be convincingly shown, however, does this show a division between chs. 1–5 and 6–19? As will be observed, only two of the citations mentioned, 6 7 and 7 26, occur before the eleventh chapter. The division might nearly as well be drawn at chapter 11. Focke continues with an attempt to portray contrasting schemes of eschatology in chs. 1–5 and 6–19; and finally to uncover in chs. 1–5 a description of the Pharisees and Sadducees, proving the Palestinian origin of these chapters. One is left, however, with a consciousness of the difficulty of analyzing the book on such grounds, especially in the light of the many different conclusions reached by equally scholarly critics who have followed very similar methods of inquiry. Under the heading, "Form," Focke tabulates among other things the usage of certain particles and on this basis argues for his analysis of the book. It is illuminating, however, to observe that Holmes arrives at

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 21.
[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 22 ff.

a very different solution of the problem on the basis of a study
o' nearly the identical words classified by Focke. While agreeing
with Focke's hypothesis that the translator of the first part of
the book is the author of the second, yet it seems difficult to accept
his limitation of the Hebrew original to chs. 1–5.

Speiser would credit the first nine chapters to the Hebrew
original with the exception of the considerable section 6 22–7 30.
He reasons that after 6 21, "O ye kings of the people, honour
Wisdom, that you may reign for evermore," the redactor, presum-
ably the translator-author himself, felt the need of certain
"explanatory remarks" on the nature of Wisdom.[34] Speiser
also mentions, in agreement with Focke, that the parallelism
in this part of the book is not sustained, which is a contributing
factor to his decision that this section should be omitted from
the translated material. While it is possible to maintain, as did
the late Professor Gressmann, that certain sentences or longer
sections of the first part of the book may originally have been
written in the Greek and likewise in the second part that one or
more small sections may come originally from the Hebrew, yet
any such theory is exceedingly precarious. It has been commonly
supposed, for example, that so Greek a passage as the Sorites
in 6 17–20 could not have been written in Hebrew, yet it may
be pointed out that such step figures do occur in the Rabbinical
writings and more than once. So far as the suggestion of Speiser
is concerned, it is possible to mention at least one important
obstacle in the way of an obvious mistranslation in 7 22, which
involves a considerable number of verses. The Greek reads,
ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνῖτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία, which is translated,
"For Wisdom, which is the worker of all things, taught me."
Here Wisdom is made the subject of the verb while in the rest
of the same context, God is the subject, stated or understood.
V. 17 reads, "For he (God) hath given me certain knowledge of
the things that are, etc." God is considered the subject through
all the subsequent verses until v. 22 and should clearly be so read

[34] *Op. cit.*, p. 480.

in that verse. The line would then read, "For he (God) taught me wisdom, etc." In this manner the true sense of the passage may be restored. It is the opinion of the writer that with no considerable exceptions the section 1 1—11 1 is translated from the Hebrew.

In conclusion it might be added that we are dealing with the *Wisdom* of Solomon. It would be natural to expect that *Sophia* should be mentioned frequently in such a case throughout the various chapters of the book. It is noteworthy that after 11 1 the word occurs only in one passage, 14 5. Furthermore, it is the Wisdom of *Solomon* with which we are concerned, and in chs. 1 1—11 1 Solomon is given a prominent place. He is described as a king, the son of a king, one who seeks to be worthy of his father's throne (9 12); he speaks repeatedly in the first person; addresses in a tone of authority the "judges of the earth" (1 1) and kings and rulers (ch. 6). But after 11 1 Solomon drops out of sight. Such considerations together with those already mentioned lead one to believe that the original Wisdom of Solomon written in Hebrew extended as far as 11 1 of the present Greek text.