

# THE BOOK OF BARUCH

## OR I BARUCH

### INTRODUCTION

#### § 1. SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK.

THE *Book of Baruch*, of which the Greek version is found in all our editions of the LXX, forms one of a series of writings to which the name of Jeremiah's secretary is attached. Brief characterizations of these will be found in Charles's *Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Introd.*, § 2 (p. xvi f.).

As will be shown in the sequel the tragic events of 597 (586) B.C., which heralded the exile, constitute a thin historic drapery which invests the yet greater tragedy of the Jewish race in A.D. 70. It is now generally accepted by recent critics that Nebuchadnezzar (Nabuchodonosor) and Belshazzar (Baltasar) represent the persons of Vespasian and Titus. Other corresponding traits between the Babylonian conquest here portrayed and the Roman conquest will reveal themselves to further scrutiny. Among alternative solutions which have been propounded from the days of Gruneberg (1797) to those of Ewald, Kneucker, and Schurer, none will be found to satisfy the conditions of the problem so well as that which we have just indicated (substantially that of Kneucker and Schurer).

#### § 2. CONTENTS.

The contents may be briefly summarized as follows:

I. Ch. i. 1-14. Baruch wrote the words of this book in the fifth year and read them over to Jechonias and his fellow exiles in Babylon. These wept, made a money collection, and sent it to the High Priest in Jerusalem with a message that it was intended for the purchase of offerings on the altar, and also with a request for prayer on behalf of Nebuchadnezzar and his son, whom they desire loyally to obey, as well as on their own behalf, who have sinned against God. This book of confession of sin shall be read on the feast-day in God's house.

II. i. 15-iii. 8. The confession immediately follows. God is just. Their punishment is the result of sin and disobedience (i. 15-ii. 12). To this there follows a prayer for Divine mercy (ii. 13-iii. 8). God's previous utterances through Jeremiah are recalled, especially His command to serve the king of Babylon. Disobedience to this command has brought calamities on Israel and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (ii. 21-26). Divine assurances follow that captivity will bring with it repentance and a final restoration to and rule over Palestine (ii. 27-35). This section closes with a cry to God not to remember Israel's past iniquities (iii. 1-8).

III. In the rest of the book we pass from the prose of the previous portion to poetry.

(a) iii. 9-iv. 4. Here, in the style of Hebrew Wisdom literature, we have the praise of God's laws of life. Neglect of them is the cause of Israel's calamities and exile. Learn, therefore, where wisdom is to be found (iv. 9-14). Not among the great and powerful rulers has it been found, nor even have those who are reputed wise discovered it (iii. 15-28). No one has found it in heaven or earth, but God, the all-wise Creator, alone is in possession of it, and has bestowed it on Jacob—the Law of God which is eternal and leads to life (iii. 29-iv. 1). This section concludes with a brief exhortation to Jacob to lay hold of Wisdom and walk in its light, and not to surrender the honour of this unique possession to any other.

(b) From this song of exhortation to Israel we pass to another of very different character: strains of lamentation and comfort in the style of the Deutero-Isaiah (iv. 5-v. 9): 'Be comforted' is the recurring refrain (iv. 5, 21, 27, 30) addressed (i) by Jerusalem to her children (iv. 5-29). 'Ye have been sold among the heathen, yet not to be destroyed. You have been surrendered to the enemy because you have angered God by past transgressions' (iv. 5-9). There follows a lamentation over the banishment of her children, and their harsh treatment at the hands of foreigners (iv. 10-17). 'But God, who has brought calamity, will also bring deliverance. I indeed trust in God for your salvation. Bear God's wrath in patience. You shall soon behold your enemy's destruction and set your foot on his neck. Joy shall come in place of sorrow' (iv. 18-29). (ii) God's word of comfort to Jerusalem (iv. 30-v. 9). Calamities are denounced against those cities that rejoiced at her fall. Fire shall come upon them. They shall be the habitation of demons. Jerusalem is exhorted to lift up her eyes and behold her children flocking to her from East and West, to divest herself of her

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

garment of sorrow and array herself with a robe of salvation and a tiara of glory. Her enemies shall bring her children back to her. Mountain and hill shall be made low and valleys filled that Israel may return. Woods and fragrant trees shall yield their shade to Israel, whom God shall bring back in joy.

### § 3. COMPOSITE CHARACTER.

The *composite character* of the treatise is evident from the preceding survey. The *prose section* comprised in I and II stands in *marked contrast with both the poetical sections in III (a) and (b)*. (I) in *contents*. The prose section is a confession of sin and a recognition that Israel's calamities and exile are the penalty for Israel's sins of disobedience. These will bring about repentance. It concludes with a cry for Divine mercy. On the other hand III (a), which is poetic in form, is based on a different conception. Here Israel's calamities are due to his neglect of Divine law regarded as Wisdom. This Wisdom, which belongs to God alone, He has bestowed on Israel as his precious privilege. Israel is exhorted to lay hold of it as the only means of safety. The contrast with III (b) is still more marked. We note the different attitude adopted towards Israel's conquerors. In i. 11, 12 Israel is exhorted to offer prayer on behalf of Nebuchadnezzar and his son, 'and the Lord will give us strength, and lighten our eyes, and we shall live under the shadow of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon, and under the shadow of Baltasar his son, and we shall serve them many days, and find favour in their sight.' Here the tradition of Jeremiah and Ezekiel is followed (Jer. xxvii. 6-8, xxix. 4-7; Ezek. xxvi. 7-12, xxix. 17-20). So again, ii. 20-22, 24 ascribes the calamities which Israel suffered to his refusal to obey the prophetic injunction, 'Bow your shoulders to serve the king of Babylon, and remain in the land that I gave unto your fathers.' But when we turn to III (b) the attitude towards Israel's conquerors is that of *embittered subjugation leading to revolt* reflected in the literature of the late-exilian or early post-exilian period (Jer. l, li; Isa. xlvi). 'Thine enemy hath persecuted thee; but shortly thou shalt see his destruction, and shalt tread upon their necks' (iv. 25). The peoples who afflicted Israel and rejoiced in his fall, the cities where Israelites served in slavery, shall feel craven dread and grieve in their own desolation (iv. 31-33). (II) We note also great diversity *with respect to the O. T. sources from which they respectively borrow*. In ch. i. 11-iii. 8 we have frequent citations from Jeremiah, Daniel, and Deuteronomy. Specially noteworthy is the repeated employment of whole clauses of Dan. ix. 7-19 in Baruch i. 15-ii. 17. On the other hand, the Wisdom section, iii. 9-iv. 4, contains numerous borrowings from Proverbs, Job, Deutero-Isaiah, and Sir. xxiv. The last section (iv. 5-v. 9) is very largely based on Deutero-Isaiah. The concluding portion is evidently inspired by Ps. of Sol. xi.

### § 4. CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS.

We have arrived, therefore, at the following general result, viz. that in the Book of Baruch we have to deal with three distinct literary elements which possess all the signs of emanating from different hands. (A) A prose document to be found in ch. i. 1-iii. 8. (B) A poetical document of the character of Wisdom literature in ch. iii. 9-iv. 4. (C) A further document of exhortation and comfort is added in iv. 5-v. 9. These we shall now consider separately.

(A) Difficulties beset us when we examine the opening verses of the book.

(i) In verse 2 the fifth year is the date assigned to the writing, and this is reckoned from the date when Jerusalem was captured and burnt (2 Kings xxv. 9; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 19). This, we know, took place in the year 587-586 B. C. Accordingly Fritzsche, followed by Gifford (*Apocrypha*, ed. Wace), would identify the assigned date of the writing with 582 (583) B. C. This view, however, encounters difficulties. (a) The destruction of the temple in 587-586 B. C. hardly seems compatible with the offerings (burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and incense) to be offered on the altar to which Baruch i. 10 makes reference. Accordingly Kneucker follows Eichhorn and other critics in dating the fifth year from the earlier capture of Jerusalem in 597 B. C. by Nebuchadnezzar, when Jehoiachin was made prisoner. Though the treasures of the temple and of the king's palace were carried off (2 Kings xxiv. 13), as well as the officers, household, artisans and soldiers (verses 12, 14-16), both city and temple were left intact. This, of course, rids us of one difficulty. Moreover, 597 is the date from which Ezekiel reckons (i. 2, viii. 1, &c.). On the other hand, it stands in complete variance with the explicit statement in Baruch i. 2 (last clause). Kneucker himself is aware of this contradiction (p. 16 NB). The difficulties which invest the alternative date 587-586 are far from insuperable. We learn in Jer. xli. 5 that offerings were made at the Jerusalem altar by men from Shechem and Shiloh after the temple had been destroyed. Therefore some form of cultus still persisted. (b) We have no evidence in Jeremiah or any other O. T. source that Baruch ever went to Babylonia. It is true that we have no personal details respecting Jeremiah's companion and scribe after he accompanied the prophet to Egypt (Jer. xliii. 5, 6); nevertheless such negative



## INTRODUCTION

evidence contains no presumption against such a journey of Baruch to Babylonia and his residence there after 586 B. C. But in the presence of other features in Baruch i affecting its historic credibility it will be seen that this is a subject of minor significance.

(ii) Among these other features we note that Baltasar (who is called in Daniel Belshazzar or Belteshazzar) is spoken of as son of Nebuchadnezzar (Bar. i. 11, 12). This is in exact accordance with Dan. v. 2, 13, 18, 21, and is known to be due to historical confusion. The only Belshazzar known to the cuneiform documents is Bel-sar-usur ('Bel, protect the king'), son of Nabonidus (Nabûnid), the last king of Babylon, overthrown by Cyrus.

(iii) The text of verse 2 is uncertain. The omission of the number or name of the month is strange. As is well known, months were designated by numbers (beginning from Nisan as the first month of the ecclesiastical or Babylonian calendar) in all exilic and post-exilic Hebrew documents.

(iv) The following verses hang very badly together. (a) After verse 1 we naturally expect that the words of the book will soon follow; instead of this, thirteen verses of narrative succeed. (b) Verse 4 has all the appearance of a redactional prolongation of the final clause of the preceding verse. (c) Verse 8 (as Kneucker has clearly shown) stands out of its natural place. The subject of the sentence cannot be Joakim of the preceding verse, but is evidently Baruch who is last mentioned in verse 3. Moreover, verse 9 follows naturally after verse 7 rather than verse 8.

(B) The character of the document iii. 9-iv. 4, as based on the Wisdom literature of the O. T. (Proverbs and Job) and containing a citation from Eccles. xxiv. 8, has been already indicated in §§ 2, 3. It is a message of comfort and exhortation addressed mainly to the exiles who have long lived 'in the enemies' land' (iii. 10), in other words, to the Jewish Diaspora. Their calamities are due to their abandonment of the fountain of Wisdom, the way of life revealed in the Torah. This amid all his losses Israel possesses as his priceless and eternal privilege conferred by God. Hold fast to it, and walk in its light, happy and secure.

This entire section has a unity of its own, and it is quite evident that this is the book to which Bar. i. 1, 3 a refers. These verses, therefore, form the adequate and natural preface. That verse 2 originally belonged to this preface is extremely improbable. It probably formed part of the introduction to the document A (ch. i. 2, 3 b-iii. 8). The reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by fire, i. 2 and ii. 26, points to this conclusion. A redactor united A and B. It is this combined work which we shall first consider. C will be considered later.

### § 5. A HEBREW ORIGINAL OF DOCUMENTS A AND B.

A considerable number of the older critics held that the original of the Book of Baruch was in Greek. This was the opinion of Grotius, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, Keil, and Noldeke (in his *Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 214). But this view has been abandoned by recent scholars. Even De Wette, who for a time held to the former view, saw reason to forsake it, and adopted the theory of a Hebrew original in the fourth edition of his *Introd. to the O. T.* (German), p. 443. Similarly Reusch, Ewald, Hitzig (*Die Psalmen*, vol. ii, p. 119), Fritzsche (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apocryphen des A. T.*—Special Introd. to Baruch, pp. 171 foll.), and more decisively Kneucker, who in his elaborate work, *Das Buch Baruch* (1879), unhesitatingly (in contrast with Fritzsche) assumes for the whole book a Hebrew original which he devotes the utmost pains to reconstruct. Schürer, on the other hand, sustains the doubts of Fritzsche (*ibid.*, p. 172) as to the latter portion (iii. 9-v. 9), with this difference that he *decisively asserts* that Greek and not Hebrew was its original form (*Gesch. des jud. Volkes im Zeitalter Christi*<sup>2</sup>, iii, p. 340; *PRE*<sup>2</sup>, i, p. 642). Similarly Reuss and Hilgenfeld (in *Zeitsch. für wiss. Theol.*). Bevan, in *Enc. Bibl.*, inclines towards this view. Marshall (art. 'Baruch' in *Hastings's DB*) propounds the ingenious theory that iii. 9-iv. 4 was originally composed in Aramaic. This view is based on a comparison of the Greek with the versions—the Peshitta [as Marshall assumes it to be], the Syr. reproduction of Origen's Hexaplar, as well as the Vulg. Nine examples are given by Dr. Marshall, but the first of these, iii. 16, 'peoples' . . . 'world', is quite as easily explicable on a Hebrew basis עַמִּים and עֲלָם; the *second* (iii. 18), which has more attractiveness, might also be explained from two possible meanings of קָיָים in Hebrew. The meaning 'fashion' is probably late, and due to Aramaic influence. Cf. Gen. xiv. 19, 22; Ps. cxxxix. 13; Prov. viii. 22. In the *third* case (iii. 19) we have the two renderings of S and S<sup>xxx</sup>—respectively of ἡφανίσθησαν, 'they are vanished' (R.V.), which Kneucker rightly holds to have reproduced the original Hebr. אָבְדוּ 'perished'. This Hebr. word is rendered by S אַחַרְבֵּלוּ (the Ethpa.) 'were corrupted', hence 'perished'. Comp. the use of the Greek verb in Matt. vi. 19 f. (cf. Syr. where Pa. חָבַל is used) as well as in Attic Greek. On the other hand, S<sup>xxx</sup>—אֶסְתַּרְתִּי, the Ethpeel, does not mean 'sinned' nor does it arise out of אֶסְתַּרְתִּי 'disappeared'. We constantly find אָבַד used for 'destroy' (as well as 'sin'), and as the equivalent

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

of ἀφανίζω (in Exod. xii. 15; 2 Kings x. 28; Ezek. xix. 7; Jer. l. 21, &c.), and its passive or Ethpe. as the rendering of ἀφανίζεσθαι, Ezek. xxv. 3; Job. xxii. 20 (cf. 2 Macc. xii. 22). Comp. other examples in Payne Smith's *Thesaur. Syr.* In this case the S<sup>hex.</sup> slavishly adheres to the Greek version. The *fourth* example (iii. 21) cited by Marshall, based on the diverse renderings, 'laid hold' and 'cared for', I am not able to follow. The S<sup>hex.</sup> reading is not צר but צר. The *fifth* (iii. 23), 'remembered' and 'trod', is due to a corruption of the Syriac translation (see notes) and therefore has no bearing on the question of the original. The *sixth* (iii. 31) accounts for the Vulgate *exquirat* by an Ethpeel form צרעב instead of צרע. But the Ethpe. form of this verb has no other than a *passive* meaning which can hardly be fitted into the structure of the clause and verse. The *seventh* example (iii. 34), 'their watches', and the colourless Syr., 'their places', may be accounted for by the loose rendering of S or by the corruption of the Hebr. original suggested in the notes. The *eighth* (iii. 37), 'appeared' . . . 'was revealed', might just as easily be explained as variant translations of a Hebr. original צרעב (or צרעב). In the general suspicion which regards the verse as a later Christian gloss, its evidential value counts for little. The *ninth* example (iv. 5), 'advantage' . . . 'dignity' (Vulg.), need not be dealt with, as it evidently possesses no cogency.

Nearly all living scholars, including Dr. Marshall, as well as Dr. Charles (in *Encycl. Brit.* (11th ed.)), are agreed that A (ch. i. 2, 3 b-iii. 8) was composed in Hebrew. For this there is strong evidence, and, in the opinion of the present writer, a fairly good case can be made for B (ch. i. 1, 3 a, iii. 9-iv. 4).

(a) The strongly-marked Hebraisms of the Greek version have been long recognized as affording unmistakable indications of a Hebrew original, viz. ch. i. 10 μάνα (cf. Jer. xvii. 26, xli. 5), or, as we should properly read with Codd. 22, 33, 36, 48, &c., *μανά*, is evidently the Greek mode of writing מנא. In the same verse the formula *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* simply covers the Hebr. חטאת 'sin-offering', as Lev. v. 10, 11, vii. 37, &c., clearly prove. Other significant traces of a Hebrew original may be cited, viz. ii. 23 ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων, Hebr. עוֹשֵׂי; εἰ μή, 'surely', arising out of εἰ μή, Hebr. אִם אִם idiomatically used for strong asseverations (ii. 29); ἀόμβρητες (*ibid.*) for מֵתִים; מֵתִים misread as 'dead' in iii. 4. Still more significant are the frequently recurring relative constructions so characteristic of Hebrew. Thus in ii. 4, 13, iii. 8 οὗ . . . ἐκεῖ = הַשָּׁמַיִם . . . הַיָּם (cf. Mark i. 7, vii. 25). Similarly ii. 26 . . . τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῶν וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב —. Comp. ii. 17, 29. These relative constructions are obviously characteristic of prose rather than poetry in Hebrew, and therefore belong to the document A rather than B (ch. i. 1, 3 a, iii. 9-iv. 4). In the latter, however, we have variants in the Greek and Syr. renderings such as 'peoples' and 'world' (iii. 16), as well as iii. 18 'workers' in silver (LXX) and 'those who gain' silver (Syr.), included in Marshall's list which can best be explained on the basis of a Hebraic original. Similarly iii. 11 'thou art counted with them that go down into Hades', iii. 14 'length of days', iii. 18 'there is no searching (ἐξεύρες) of his works' are all Hebrew phrases. In some cases, as will be shown in the notes, the Syr. version points the way more clearly to a Hebr. original. See also Kneucker, p. 25, but the list requires sifting.

(b) So far at least as document A is concerned the hypothesis of a Hebr. original is rendered fairly certain by the marginal note which the Syro-Hexaplar version attaches to Bar. i. 17, ii. 3 not recorded (*lit.* placed) in the Hebrew לַחַיִּים לְדַבַּר מִפִּי ה'. On the other hand, see Nestle in art. 'Septuagint' in *Hastings's DB.* iv. p. 450, footnote †.

### § 6. THE GREEK ORIGINAL OF C (Bar. iv. 5-v. 9).

It is, however, quite otherwise with document C. This document is a unity, not a series of lays, as Rothstein argues. Here evidences accumulate that the original was in Greek.

(a) The strongest support for this view is to be found in the close parallels between the *Greek* of Ps. of Sol. xi and Bar. iv. 36-v. 9.

| <i>Baruch.</i>  | <i>Ps. of Sol. xi.</i>  |
|---|---|
| iv. 37 ἰδοὺ ἐρχονται οἱ υἱοὶ σου . . . συνηγμένοι ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν ἕως δυσμῶν.  | 3 Ἴδε τὰ τέκνα σου ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν συνηγμένα.   |
| v. 1 Ἱερουσαλήμ . . . ἔνδυσαι τὴν εἰσπρέπειαν τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξης.  | 8 ἔνδυσαι, Ἱερουσαλήμ, τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου.   |
| v. 5 ἀναστήθι, Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ στήθι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕψους, καὶ ἴδε σου συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα ἀπὸ ἡλίου δυσμῶν ἕως ἀνατολῶν. | 3 στήθι, Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐφ' ὕψους, καὶ ἴδε τὰ τέκνα κτλ. as above.                               |
| v. 8 ἐκίασαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ὄρνυμοι καὶ πᾶν ξύλον εὐωδίας . . .  | 6-7 οἱ ὄρνυμοι ἐσκίασαν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ παροῶν αὐτῶν. πᾶν ξύλον εὐωδίας ἀπέτειλεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός. |



## INTRODUCTION

Comp. also Bar. v. 7 with Ps. of Sol. xi. 5. Here, as well as in the underlined phrases above, we have evident borrowings from the Greek of Deutero-Isaiah (see notes). But in the case of Baruch the borrowing comes through Ps. of Sol. This is made clear (a) by Bar. v. 8 compared with Ps. of Sol. xi. 6, 7; (β) by the repetitions. Note Bar. iv. 37 and v. 3 (the latter in closer approximation to Ps. of Sol. xi. 3). See also the careful investigation of this subject in Ryle and James's ed. of the Ps. of Sol., Introd. pp. lxxii foll. Other parallels between the document C and the Ps. of Sol., viz. iv. 26 ὁδοὶ τροχέαι, and Ps. of Sol. viii. 19; also Bar. iv. 20 and Ps. of Sol. ii. 21, 22 (Jerusalem clothed in sackcloth) are cited in Kneucker, p. 43 note, and also by Kyle and James (Introd., p. lxxvi), who extend the list so as to cover the whole of the Book of Baruch. Many of these, however, have very slight significance, while those which belong to the document C leave an irresistible impression of dependence by this document on the Ps. of Sol., and therefore become an important indication with respect to date.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Collateral evidence is supplied by the Syr. version. It will be seen hereafter that there are indications to warrant the belief that that version is based on the original Hebrew text as well as on the Greek version of the documents A and B; but when we come to the document C evidences abound that the only text on which the Syr. is based is the Greek. In iv. 20 and v. 1 the Greek word *στολή* is taken over into the Syriac. In iv. 34 Syr. even embodies a conflate reading. Thus in the LXX we have in B the original reading *ἀγαλλίαμα*, 'exultation', which was corrupted into *ἀγαλμα*, 'statue', 'idol', embodied in A. In Syr. we have the conflate reading 'I will take away from her the idols and the exultation'.

(c) Moreover, the phraseology is occasionally such as Hebrew could hardly employ. Thus in iv. 28 *δεκαπλασιάσατε ἐπιστραφήντες ζητήσαι αὐτόν*, 'return and seek him ten times more', could scarcely be represented by *שָׁבִי עֲשֵׂי עֲשֵׂי* (so Kneucker). The Piel (or Aram. Paal) of *שָׁב* means only 'to title'. Only some such circumlocution as perhaps *שָׁבִי עֲשֵׂי עֲשֵׂי עֲשֵׂי* would convey the idea expressed in the Greek. See also below on Greek style, § 9, I (Greek version).

(d) Lastly, the O.T. citations are based on LXX rather than the Hebrew text. This is especially clear in the Pentateuch.

### Baruch.

iv. 7 *παροξύνετε γὰρ τὸν ποιήσαντα ἡμᾶς θύσαντες δαιμονίους καὶ οὐ θεῶν.*  
 iv. 15 *ἐπήγγαγεν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔθνος μακρόθεν, ἔθνος ἀναίδες . . . καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπηθησαν προσβύτην οὐδὲ παιδίον ἠλέησαν.*  
 iv. 20 *ἐξεδυσάμην τὴν στολὴν . . . ἀνεδυσάμην δὲ σάκκον . . . cf. v. 1.*

### LXX.

Deut. xxxii. 16, 17 *παροξύναν με . . . ἔθυσαν δαιμονίους καὶ οὐ θεῶν.*  
 Deut. xxviii. 49, 50 *ἐπάξει κύριος ἐπὶ σὲ ἔθνος μακρόθεν . . . ἔθνος ἀναίδες . . . ὅστις οὐ θαυμάσει πρόσωπον πρὸςβύτων καὶ νέον οὐκ ἐλεήσει.*  
 Isa. lii. 1 *ἐδύσατε τὴν στολήν σου . . .*

[On re-studying the question of the original language of this chapter I have come to the conclusion that it was Hebrew on the following grounds:

1°. There can be practically no doubt that the true text of v. 6 is: *εἰσαγγεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πρὸς σὲ αἰρούμενοι μετὰ δόξης ὡς θρόνον βασιλείας.*

2°. A comparison of this verse with Isa. lxxvi. 20, xlix. 22 makes it clear that the text is to be rendered as in the R. V. 'God bringeth them in unto thee borne on high with glory, as on a royal throne', but decidedly not 'as a royal throne'.

3°. Now since the Greek is vigorous and idiomatic, the author of the Greek does not think in Hebrew, he is more or less a master of the Greek of his period. Accordingly he could not have written *ὡς θρόνον βασιλείας* if he had meant *ὡς ἐπὶ θρόνον βασιλείας*. But since the context and the associations of the passage require us to translate *ὡς θρόνον βασιλείας* 'as on a royal throne', it follows that we have here a definite Hebraism = *עַל כְּסֵל מַלְכוּת*. See my note on § 5 of the Ps. of Sol. where this subject is discussed by Dr. Buchanan Gray. This Hebraism could only be explained in one of two ways; either the writer thought in Hebrew or the Greek is a mistranslation of the Hebrew. The rest of the Greek is wholly against the former hypothesis. Hence we must have recourse to the latter. The Greek of ch. v is a translation from the Hebrew.

4°. The peculiar form of the expression has not been noticed. In Isa. lxxvi. 20 it is on actual wagons, horses, and litters that the returning Israelites are carried, since it is the Gentiles that convey them. But in our text, since it is God Himself that conveys them, the means by which He conveys them are not chariots, &c., nor anything that the writer can definitely describe. The Israelites are not borne 'on a royal throne' but on something resembling a royal throne. We have here the use of the Apocalyptic  $\pi$  so frequently used in this sense in Ezekiel and Daniel, and 1 Enoch, and of its Greek equivalent *ὡς* in Revelation. The supernatural element (at all events imaginatively) is introduced here and in the verses that follow.

<sup>1</sup> See note on the Introduction to the Ps. of Sol., § 5. We cannot accept Rothstein's suggestion that Ps. of Sol. xi is based on Bar. iv. 36-v. 9.

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

5°. No real difficulty is caused by the fact of the very close resemblance of Ps. of Sol. xi and 1 Bar. iv. 36—v. 9. They can be explained as versions of two different recensions of the same Hebrew psalm. In the LXX and Theodotion we have Greek translations of two recensions of the Semitic text of Daniel, the older of which is lost. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the two divergent Greek forms of the text presuppose two similarly divergent forms of the Hebrew original: while in the Zadokite Fragments, which are preserved only in Hebrew, we have two recensions of ch. ix. See *op. cit.* in vol. ii.

All, therefore, that we need to presuppose, is that the author of 1 Baruch adapted for his own purposes an existing Hebrew psalm, which is itself, or one form of it, preserved in Ps. of Sol. xi. Possibly also the translator of 1 Baruch had not only the Hebrew original of Baruch before him but also the Greek Version of Ps. of Sol. xi, just as Theodotion had the LXX, and the translator of the Hebrew original of  $\beta$  of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs had  $\alpha$  before him.—GEN. EDITOR.]

### § 7. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP.

We are now in a better position to consider the questions of *date* and *authorship*. The question of *date* has to be examined in relation to the three documents A, B, and C (*a*) separately and (*b*) in connexion with their redactional combination.

With reference to A (i. 2, 3 *b*—iii. 8) the determining factor in deciding the date is the close connexion between Dan. ix. 7–19 and Bar. i. 15–ii. 17 as well as the historical confusion common to Daniel and this document (i. 11, 12), to which attention has already been called (§ 4). Now close literary parallels are often capable of alternative solutions. So here it might be argued that Baruch precedes Daniel. And this was the view taken by Ewald (*Gesch. des V. Isr.*<sup>3</sup> iv, pp. 265 foll.; *Propheten des Alten Bundes*<sup>2</sup>, iii, pp. 252 foll.), who assigned the document to the close of the Persian Empire when the communities in and around Jerusalem were in a state of ferment (during the reign of Artaxerxes III (Ochus)) against Persian rule. This letter, under the name of Jeremiah's secretary Baruch, was intended to effect among Palestinian Jews what Jeremiah's own Epistle (Jer. xxix) effected among the Jews in exile, contentment with established foreign rule. Whatever view be taken as to the historical *prius*, whether it be Daniel or Baruch, it has been perfectly clear to nearly all except Roman Catholic critics that the document must have been composed long after the Babylonian exile. As in the case of Daniel, so also in that of this book, the historical confusion common to both can only have arisen long after the Babylonian Empire and its events had become a confused tradition. That the document A came after the Book of Daniel is indicated:

(1) By a comparison of Dan. ix. 7–19 with Bar. i. 15–ii. 17. The latter is longer and characterized by much repetition of phrase, e.g. 'have not hearkened unto the voice' . . . (= 'obeyed the voice', Dan. ix. 10, לֹא שָׁמַעְתָּ בְּקוֹל, Bar. i. 18, 19, 21, ii. 10; 'plagues', i. 20, ii. 2. From repetitions the former is not entirely free.

(2) By the contents of A. Here the whole situation that is disclosed cannot be reconciled even with the late Maccabaeon period. It is hardly conceivable that any Jew would have recommended at that time, with the retrospect of the great Maccabaeon struggle behind him, and in the existing state of national feeling, a policy of loyal submission to their conquerors. Nor was that period one of utter gloom and national humiliation. Fritzsche's conjecture (p. 173) we may safely put on one side.

It is quite otherwise with the events of 63 B.C., when Pompey invaded Judaea and captured Jerusalem. Some of the indications in the document A might be held to accord with the humiliations and sufferings inflicted on the Jews when the Roman general espoused the cause of Hyrcanus against his brother Aristobulus, and laid siege to the temple quarter of Jerusalem, and even entered the Holy of Holies. The cup of humiliation was full when he carried off Aristobulus as his prisoner, and Jewish captives and spoil graced his triumph two years later. It might indeed be argued that the friendly attitude enjoined towards Israel's conquerors in A (i. 11, 12; ii. 21 f.) would accord with the date 48 B.C., when Julius Caesar's policy of clemency was extended towards the Jews. Cp. Joseph. *Ant.* xiv. 10 (*passim*); according to Suetonius (*Caes.* 84) large numbers of Jews bewailed his death. See Schürer, ed. 3, iii, p. 30. When we turn, on the other hand, to the document C evidences might be held to accumulate in favour of identifying the situation created by Pompey's invasion with that which underlies the Book of Baruch, e.g. the reference in iv. 15 to the 'shameless nation, and of a strange language' brought 'from far' points clearly to the Roman invasion, and might be compared with the phraseology of Ps. of Sol. xvii. 9. Other references, such as the 'captivity' of Jerusalem's 'sons and daughters' (iv. 14) and the denunciation of Rome, 'she that rejoiced' at Jerusalem's 'fall, and was glad of thy ruin' (iv. 33), 'her exultation and her boasting', become significant in the light of the captives which Pompey carried to Rome to adorn his triumph, which included not only Aristobulus, but also his son, Antigonus, and his two daughters.

But they become even more significant in the light of the later Roman triumph under the Flavian dynasty which wrought the greatest tragedy from which Israel has ever suffered. Ever since Kneucker's careful investigations (published in 1870) critical opinion has decisively inclined towards the view that the actual historical events which underlie the Book of Baruch belonged to



## INTRODUCTION

the Jewish struggle against Rome of the years A.D. 66-70. The chief indications which point to this conclusion are:—

(i) The identification of Vespasian and his son Titus with 'Nabuchodonosor' and 'Baltasar his son' (i. 11, 12), whom Israel is commanded to serve loyally (ii. 21 f.). This expression of complaisance towards Rome finds its parallel in the attitude of the chief Pharisees in Judaea at a somewhat earlier period described in Josephus, *Wars*, ii. 17. 3, and in that of Josephus himself.

(ii) The fearful sufferings of the Jews to which reference is made (viz. 'great plagues', ii. 2; 'eating the flesh of children', ii. 3; 'bones of kings and ancestors cast forth', ii. 24) accord with the incidents in the siege of Jerusalem portrayed by Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, vi. 3, 4, story of the daughter of Eleazar devouring her own son; cp. also iv. 5. 1, 2). The reference in ii. 25 to those who 'were cast out to the heat by day, and to the frost by night, and died in great miseries by famine' finds ample confirmation in the full record of Josephus, according to whom (*Wars*, vi. 9. 2-3) 'there perished for want of food 11,000' at one time. On the other hand, the references to the captivity and bondage (ii. 13, 14, 23, 29; iii. 8) are fully attested by Josephus. His numbers are doubtless exaggerated in many cases, yet he is probably not very wide of the truth when he reckons the numbers of those who were carried into captivity during the entire war to be 97,000 (*Wars*, vi. 9. 3).

(iii) The clear and definite reference to the destruction of the temple by fire in i. 2 and ii. 26 cannot be said to apply to the events of 63 B.C., when Pompey entered the temple, and its precincts were desecrated by slaughter (Josephus, *Wars*, i. 7. 4 f.). Bar. ii. 26 evidently points to the destruction of the temple by fire in A.D. 70 (Jos., *ibid.*, vi. 4).

When we turn to the document B the contents can hardly be said to reveal a distinct historical situation. It is a discourse on Wisdom embodied in the Torah. Israel has been for some considerable time dwelling in a foreign land (Bar. iii. 10) which can only refer to the very extensive *diaspora* in Egypt, Asia Minor, and other lands. It is difficult to found any definite conclusion as to date upon this. It is obviously intended to console Israel during the Roman dominion in Palestine. While Israel's temporal heritage had passed under Roman subjugation and paid tribute to the conqueror, the great spiritual possession, wisdom enshrined in the Torah, remained Israel's eternal glory of which none should deprive him (Bar. iv. 1-3). There can be little doubt that the significance of such a message to Israel would be enhanced during the years that followed the great overthrow in Vespasian's reign when Israel was bereft of temple and temple rites in the sacred city. The contents of B might seem to indicate Alexandria or Palestine as the place of its origin, but about this it is impossible to pronounce definitely on the basis of these contents only.

With the document A it is otherwise. Ch. i. 2, when connected with ii. 26, in its reference to the total destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by fire, decisively points to the conclusion that it belonged to the original introduction of the document. Here the date of the writing is fixed as the fifth year after the destruction of the temple, i.e. A.D. 74. The spirit of submission to the Roman authority, which it reflects, would be natural in the years which immediately followed the overwhelming and crushing blow to Israel's national aspirations which the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple involved. A spirit and policy like that of Josephus underlies the document. Israel's main consolation at this hour was the spiritual consolation of the Torah. That at least remained. The document B was equally appropriate to the years which followed the catastrophe of A.D. 70. On the whole it appears probable that both A and B proceeded from the circle of Johanan ben Zaccai, the first president of the School at Jabneh after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. For (1) Johanan was a man of peace. He counselled peace in the struggle against Rome, and it is recorded of him that he prophesied imperial dignity for Vespasian in the days when he was a Roman general. (2) His pupils tore their garments and made lamentation as for the dead when they heard of the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem. (3) We read in *Suc. 28a* that he was a devoted student of the Torah, 'He did not go four yards without reflecting on the Torah and without the phylacteries.' These are significant traits which are reflected in both the documents A and B. See *Jewish Encycl.*, art. 'Johanan ben Zaccai'. This view has been suggested to the present writer, independently of one another, by both Prof. Burkitt and Mr. I. Abrahams.

We have already seen that the attitude of the document C (iv. 3-v. 9) to the Roman power is altogether different. Instead of compliance we have notes of burning resentment and hostility (see above, § 3). As in the document A the events of the Flavian War against Judaea in A.D. 66-70 clearly stand in the background. The captivity of Jerusalem's children (iv. 14), like the references in A (ii. 13, 14, 23, 29; iii. 8), are in conformity with the well-known facts of history (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3). 'Those that rejoiced' in Israel's fall and the 'exultation in her great multitude' (iv. 33, 34) receive a vivid illustration in the triumph of Vespasian and Titus. Such 'boasting' is to be 'turned into mourning' (iv. 34). We are unable to follow Kneucker in holding that the 'fire that

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

shall come upon her from the Everlasting' is a reference to the volcanic eruption which destroyed Pompeii and Herculaneum in A.D. 79.

It is hardly possible to determine the date of such a document by any definite *terminus ad quem*. As *terminus a quo* we naturally have the tragedy of A.D. 70, whose events were still vivid in the memory of the writer. The minds of those to whom he appealed were beginning to recover from the shock of a quite recent disaster. Therefore, while the document A might appeal to those who were cowed by a quite recent calamity, the document C might be reasonably placed a few years later. Perhaps A.D. 78 might be a not improbable date. But it might well have originated later still.

### § 8. REDACTION OF THE DOCUMENTS.

We have already seen that there is strong evidence to prove that the document A was originally composed in Hebrew, and that arguments less cogent, yet valid, lead us to the same conclusion respecting the document B, which is poetical in form. The combination of both these documents into a single Hebrew roll probably followed not many years after their separate origination. In the prevailing gloom and depression awakened by such a catastrophe as that of 70 A.D.—the *année terrible* of the Jewish race—consolatory works and apocalyptic treatises would meet a widespread want. Documents A and B would appeal to minds that were disposed to bow to the inevitable—the cosmopolitan Jew, the liberal Pharisee whose sympathies were with Ananus rather than John of Gischala. 'The immediate result of the terrible calamity was a profound shock to the spirit. How could God permit such a disaster to overtake His chosen people?' Schürer (*GJV*<sup>3</sup>, i, pp. 659 foll.) shows how these fundamental religious problems which meet us in the Psalms recurred with pressing intensity in the days that followed the destruction of Jerusalem. The solution of the problem of Israel's calamity was that it was a 'chastisement which God had inflicted on the people for their sin'. This conception meets us in both A and B (i. 17-19, 22, ii. 8-10, 24, iii. 8, 10-13), and also in C (iv. 7, 8). Cp. also Apoc. Bar. lxxvii. 3, 4.

It is difficult to decide how much in ch. i. 1-14 is the work of the editor who pieced together A and B. We have already seen that verses 3-9 hang badly together. We are confronted by an historical difficulty in i. 6-10, to which allusion has already been made. In § 4 we dealt with the apparent historic incompatibility of sacrificial offerings with the ruined temple. How can we reconcile these verses with the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70? Are we to regard i. 6-10 as unessential drapery? This seems hardly possible. We are driven, in fact, to raise the question discussed by Schürer (*ibid.*, pp. 653 foll.): Did sacrificial offerings actually cease immediately after the destruction of the temple? Putting aside Clem. Rom., ch. 41, and the Ep. to Diogn. 3, in which the allusion to sacrifices might be regarded as having reference to the past rather than the present, we come to the argument of Josephus, *contr. Ap.* ii. 6 *ad fin.* After stating that the law nowhere forbids Jews to pay honour to worthy men, provided it be inferior in kind to that which is paid to God, the writer proceeds to say 'we willingly testify our respect to our emperors and to the Roman people. We also offer perpetual sacrifices for them . . . although we offer no other such sacrifices at our common expense, not even for our own children, yet do we this as a special honour to the emperors.' Other confirmatory evidence is cited by Schürer; and though he is able to bring a considerable array of testimony on the other side, the statement of Josephus combined with Bar. i. 6-12 leaves behind a strong impression that such sacrifices were actually offered in Jerusalem after A.D. 70 by a party who were complaisant to the Roman power.<sup>1</sup> Probably these sacrifices ceased in the second century and subsequent Jewish writers ignored them as temporary and illegitimate.

The Greek translation of the Hebrew original of A and B was probably made at the close of the first century or soon after the beginning of the second. Whether it included from the first the document C (iv. 5-v. 9) or the latter came to be added subsequently it is impossible to determine. Kneucker, indeed, who regards the entire book as originally written in Hebrew, would make the *terminus a quo* of the Greek version about A.D. 118 or perhaps after the war of Bar Cocheba, A.D. 132-135. The *terminus ad quem* is A.D. 172, for Irenaeus (*Adv. Haereses*, v. 35) quotes the passage Bar. iv. 36-

<sup>1</sup> The view here adopted has the support of Mr. I. Abrahams. Schürer, *GJV*<sup>3</sup>, i, p. 654, cites the passage in Taanith iv. 6 in which, when enumerating Israel's days of calamity, it is stated 'on the 17th Tammuz the Tamid came to an end'. The language of Josephus, which has been cited, practically admits this: 'although we offer no other such sacrifices at the public expense.' Abrahams therefore argues that the statement cited by Schürer from Taanith iv. 6, so far from contradicting the statement of Josephus, gives us a clue to its real meaning, since the Tamid was habitually bought at the public expense (paid for by the Shekälím). Cf. *Pesikta Rabbati* (sect. Shekälím). Josephus asserts that though the Tamid had ceased, contributions for a sacrifice for the emperor continued. It is therefore impossible to set aside such an express statement as that of Josephus, especially when taken in conjunction with the important collateral testimony of Bar. i. 6-10. We have sacrifices for the emperor in the days of Caligula (*Wars*, ii. 10. 4; cp. 17. 2-4.)



## INTRODUCTION

v. 9 as the words of Jeremiah. Somewhat later (A.D. 176-178) Athenagoras, in his *Apologia*, addressed to the emperor, M. Aurelius, cites (§ 69) Bar. iii. 35 as the words of an inspired prophet in close connexion with passages from Isaiah.

### § 9. THE VERSIONS.

I. Among the versions, the *Greek* was the first to appear, and secured thereby a wider currency for the entire work among the scattered Jewish population, and subsequently among the Christian communities of the Roman Empire.

Opinions are divided on the question whether a single hand or two hands have worked at the Greek translation. Both Fritzsche and Schürer have argued for a single hand, as earlier scholars (e.g. De Wette and Hitzig) have done. Fritzsche (p. 172) acknowledges that differences in style are to be found between ch. i. 1-iii. 8 and the remainder of the work, but the language in both portions is in the main the same, while other scholars account for the difference by difference of subject-matter. Kneucker, on the other hand, contends strongly that two hands have worked at the Greek translation, and submits the entire book to a careful scrutiny (pp. 76-82). It should be noticed, however, that in his comparisons a very large number of the divergences in style are found in ch. iv. 5-v. 9, which we have already shown good reason for regarding as originally composed in Greek. This of itself would involve a considerable difference in style from the earlier portion translated from an original Hebrew text. Thus Kneucker observes the frequent employment of the Greek particle γάρ in iv. 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, v. 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 (in nearly every case reproduced in Syr. by ܘܢܘܢ), also a more independent and free arrangement of words, iv. 9, 24, 25, v. 1, 2. In ch. iv. 10, 11 *τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τῶν υἱῶν μου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων* without the repetition of *τὴν αἰχμ.* before *τῶν θυγ.* Also the genit. before the governing noun, iv. 25, 37, v. 5, 7, and the qualifying adj. or adjectival phrase preceding the noun: *τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν* (iv. 24), *τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπελθούσαν ἡμῖν ὄργην* (iv. 25); cf. iv. 29, 31, 33, 36, v. 3.

Another point to which the same writer calls attention is the close connexion between LXX on Jeremiah and our own text in those cases where borrowings from Jeremiah have taken place: e.g. Bar. i. 9, cf. Jer. xxiv. 1; Bar. ii. 3, cf. Jer. xix. 9; Bar. ii. 4, cf. Jer. xlii. 18; Bar. ii. 11, cf. Jer. xxxii. 21; Bar. ii. 13, cf. Jer. xlii. 2; Bar. ii. 21, 22, cf. Jer. xxxiv. 10, 9; Bar. ii. 23, cf. Jer. xxv. 10, 11, &c. These close resemblances are explained by some (Dillmann, Fritzsche, and Ewald) as due to the fact that the same Greek translator has produced the LXX of Jeremiah and the Greek rendering of Baruch. This theory, however, does not explain the differences as well as the coincidences of language. A more probable theory is that of Havernick, Schürer, and (in later years) of Hitzig that the Greek translator of Baruch was acquainted with and made use of the LXX Jeremiah. This view will be found to be in some respects parallel to that which we shall have to adopt in reference to the Syriac version. The Greek translator of the document A was evidently familiar with Theodotion's version of Daniel (G<sup>d</sup>) or its groundwork, as we have indicated frequently in the notes.<sup>1</sup>

The MSS. of the LXX from which our text is obtained are, in the order of importance:

1. The *Codex Vaticanus* (B), written in uncials of the fourth century.
2. *Cod. Alexandrinus* (A), written in uncials of the fifth century, now in the British Museum.
3. *Cod. Marchalianus*, written in uncials not later, according to Ceriani, than the sixth century, designated Q.
4. *Codex Venetus* (numbered 23), 'written in sloping uncials of the eighth and ninth centuries' (Swete).

In addition to these we have twenty-two cursive MSS. The famous *Sinaitic codex* (S) and the *Codex Ephræm Syri* (C) do not contain the Book of Baruch.

II. A *Syriac* version which ranks next in importance to the Greek must have been made before the time of Ephræm Syrus (about the middle of the fourth century), who specially cites the Book of Baruch. This version is identified by Ewald, Ceriani, and Schürer with the Peshitta, while Kneucker disputes this view, holding that the Pesh. did not contain the books of the Apocrypha. We have a Syriac version in two forms:

(1) That which is contained in Walton's *Polyglott*, vol. iv, based on the Pocock Codex as well as the Cod. Usserianus. Upon this version we have chiefly relied in the accompanying commentary. This version has been amended by Paul de Lagarde in his work *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace*, &c. (1861).

(2) We have also the Syro-Hexaplar translation of Bishop Paul of Tela, executed at the instigation of the Monophysite patriarch Athanasius of Antioch in the year A. D. 617 at Alexandria.

<sup>1</sup> Theodotion is mentioned in the Syro-Hexaplar as textual authority for the Greek (cited in margin of Ceriani's edition with initial  $\lambda$ ). Cp. *Enycl. Bibl.*, 'Text and Versions,' § 50.

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

It derives its name from the fact that it is based on Origen's Hexapla and closely follows the Greek text in the retention of Greek words and Hexaplaric signs. It thus becomes a valuable aid in the restoration of the Hexaplar text (De Wette, *Einführung*, 8th ed., § 60). This Syro-Hexaplar version is contained in a codex belonging to the eighth century, written in Estrangelo, called *Ambrosianus*, reproduced in 1874 by photolithography (not by any means clearly in some places) by Ceriani. There is also an earlier reproduction (1861) by the same scholar (clearly printed and easily read).

We are here chiefly concerned with Walton's and Lagarde's text. A very cursory examination of this version when compared with LXX (A and B) clearly shows that it is no mere slavish reproduction of the latter, but contains numerous variants as well as expansions. We have already shown that there is clear evidence to indicate that the Syriac version (i.e. Walton's, and also Lagarde's amended version) in iv. 5-v. 9 is based on the Greek original for the simple reason that in document C there was no other. But it is otherwise with i. 1-iv. 4 (A and B). Here we are unable to follow in its entirety Kneucker's elaborate proof that the Syriac version is wholly based on the LXX. Reasons will be forthcoming in the commentary which point to the conclusion that the Syr. was based on the Hebrew original as well as on the LXX version. (1) This inference might be suggested by the Syr. rendering of *ἐπὶ ποταμοῦ Σούδ*, Bar. i. 4 *ad fin.* Here Σούδ is reproduced in Syr. by ܫܘܪ. This may point to a Heb. variant, since the confusion of ט and ט is exceedingly common, and Greek reproduces ט by σ (as in ܫܘܪ). Too much stress, however, cannot be laid upon proper names, which Syriac notoriously modifies and alters. (2) A more instructive example is i. 1, where *ἐν Βαβυλώνι* corresponds to the Syr. ܒܒܠ 'to Babel' as though Baruch wrote the letter to Babylon. This variant is best explained by the Heb. original בבל in which the first of the three letters ב was dropped and בבל was naturally interpreted as accus. 'to Babel'. (3) A more striking example is found in the enigmatic word *ἐσχεδιάζομεν* (B; in A *ἐσχεδιάσαμεν*) in i. 19. The word is a *ἀπ. εἶρ.* in the LXX. In Suidas and Hesych. the Greek word is explained by *ἐγγίξειν, πλησιάζειν* which yields no satisfactory sense and yet is reproduced in the Syro-Hexaplar by ܫܘܫܘܒܝܢܝܢ. Fortunately we have in Diod. Sic. i. 23 and Polyb. xii. 4. 4, xxiii. 9. 12, a guide to a signification which yields a better sense, 'act precipitately or rashly' (R.V. 'dealt unadvisedly'): 'We have acted precipitately in not hearkening to his voice.' We have, however, in Dan. ix the source from which many passages and phrases are borrowed, and here Dan. ix. 5, 11 enables us to restore the original *וְהִתְרַשְׁטִי בְּקוֹלֵי*. Here Kneucker is obliged to confess that the Syr. version (that of Walton) 'is relatively the most correct', *ܘܠܐ ܢܥܡܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܢܥܡܕܝܢ* which evidently closely follows the Heb. original. But how did *ἐσχεδιάζομεν* arise? It might perhaps be suggested that it arose by corruption of *ἐστασιάζομεν*. But it is a far more probable view that *קִרְרַט* became corrupted into *קִתְרַט*. (4) For *ἐκολλήθη εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ κακὰ* in the following verse (i. 20) we have in Syr. ܠܠܘ ܠܠܘ ܠܠܘ. With the former cp. Deut. xxviii. 60 (Heb. and LXX). The corresponding Heb. of the original may therefore have been *וְהִתְרַשְׁטִי בְּקוֹלֵי*. But the Syr. rests on a variant *וְהִתְרַשְׁטִי בְּקוֹלֵי* which has greater inherent probability since we have in Dan. ix. 13 *כָּל רַעָה הוֹאֵת בָּאָה*, and we know that Dan. ix. 7-19 is the source from which phraseology is largely derived in Bar. i. 15-ii. 17. (5) In ii. 7 LXX *ἡ ἐλάλησεν κύριος ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, πάντα τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα ἃ ἦλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*. The original Heb. evidently was *וְעַלֵּי אֶת־כָּל־רַעָה הוֹאֵת הַבָּהּ עָלֵינוּ*. Here Syr. renders the opening Heb. *וְעַלֵּי* by 'inasmuch as' . . . *ܘܠܠܘ ܠܠܘ ܠܠܘ* 'inasmuch as the Lord [our God] has declared concerning us all these evils which have come upon us'. This rendering of the relat. in Heb. is not only more accurate but brings with it better construction and sense. It is obviously not based on the Greek but on the Heb. original. (6) Another striking example may be found in ch. i. 9, on which consult the commentary. (7) Examples of dependence on a Hebrew original, sometimes on a variant corruption, may also be found in the document B (Bar. iii. 9-iv. 4). e.g. iii. 16 *עַלֵּי* for *עַלֵּי*, 18 *קִקְרַט* for *קִקְרַט*. On these instances the notes should be consulted; also on iii. 21, 23, 34, 35. In not a few cases we have inferior renderings, and in a large number of passages indicated in the notes we have expansions<sup>1</sup> in the Syriac text itself, evidently in some cases added in later copies. But in some of the modifications introduced into the Syriac we may probably see primitive influences. And this concerns the document C (iv. 5-v. 9) as well as A and B.

<sup>1</sup> The most natural explanation of these variants and expansions is to be found in Prof. Sanday's article in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 17 foll., in which he describes the physical conditions under which a scribe or copyist worked with the roll, not spread out before him on a desk, but deposited in its *scrinium* or *capsa* for intermittent reference. A good example of a variant thus caused may be found in Bar. iv. 16 (on which see note). Still more would variations occur when we have to deal with translations and not copies. Here subtle motives would also co-operate, enhanced in the case of a rendering which was more or less paraphrastic.



## INTRODUCTION

We have therefore sufficient indications to show that the original author of the Syriac version as represented in Walton's *Polyglott* and Lagarde's edition made use of the Hebrew original of A and B, and not exclusively of the Greek translation as Kneucker insists (p. 163 f.). That it rested also on G Kneucker shows from many examples. Perhaps the most significant is to be found in iii. 32, in which *κρηίων τετραπόδων* corresponds to *רַבְרָבִים* in the Heb. original (cf. Exod. ix. 9, 10). This is the word which Delitzsch employs in his Heb. N. T. for *τετραπόδα* in Acts x. 12. But Syr. has no corresponding word, and so there renders *رَبَابٌ مُتَمَلِّكٌ* just as in Bar. iii. 32 *ܚܘܕܐ ܕܚܘܕܐ*. Cp. i. 14 note.

Accordingly the conclusion to which we are guided is analogous to that to which Cornill was led in his memorable critical edition of Ezekiel (1886) when dealing with the Peshitta: 'It is apparent at every stage that S has rendered its Heb. original freely, and does not contemplate a literal translation' (p. 148). This will be found abundantly illustrated in the notes on Baruch, where additions and variations of phrase will be found, 'additions of the most varied character' (p. 150). 'S is no pure recension but a mixed one. In the first place LXX has exercised over it an important influence' (p. 153). A similar result is even recorded in far different conditions and a very different field, where divergences of rendering are naturally restricted, viz. in Genesis, by Hänel in his careful investigation of the Peshitta ('Die aussermasoretischen Übereinstimmungen zw. der Septuaginta und der Peshitta in der Genesis'). This writer shows from a large number of instances that S is there based not only on LXX but also on a Heb. text which stands considerably nearer to the LXX than the Massoretic version (pp. 68 foll.).<sup>1</sup>

From slight yet significant indications we may derive some inference as to the date of the Syriac version in its origin.

(a) In Bar. v. 2 Jerusalem is exhorted to put on the diadem (*μύρα*), but when we turn to the Syr. we find the diadem is exchanged for the military *helmet* (*ܠܘܨܘܬܐ* as in 1 Sam. xvii. 5, Eph. vi. 17). Again, in v. 5 'by tents' takes the place of 'on the height'.

(b) We note the expansion given in Syr. of iv. 31, 32: 'The cities shall be in dread that treated thee ill and rejoiced in thy downfall. The cities shall be in terror that enslaved thy sons. Thou shalt rejoice in their downfall. They shall be alarmed who treated thee ill. She shall be in dread who received thy sons.' An extra clause is added. The last clause refers to Rome specially, which we know possessed a large population of Jews (cf. Juven. *Sat.* iii. 12-16 and Schurer<sup>3</sup>, vol. iii, p. 35). The cities to which reference is here made are probably those to which the large number, to which Josephus refers, was deported. See above under § 7 (ii).

From these indications, of which (a) is the more significant, we infer that the Syriac version arose at a time when there was a considerable reawakening of the martial spirit of revolt against Rome. This points to a date about 135 B.C. and after, when the struggle, headed by Bar Cocheba, was impending—the last uprising of Judaism against the power of Rome. At that time a large population of Jews (considerably augmented by those who had escaped from Judaea under the Flavian dynasty) had settled down in the Euphrates lands. Among these Jews Syriac versions, not only of the O.T. but also of such works as the Book of Baruch, would find ready acceptance. The reader who has studied Prof. Burkitt's *Early Eastern Christianity* (see esp. pp. 73 foll.) will not find this date unreasonably early. Lastly, we know that the Jews were persecuted under Trajan, and that before the outbreak of Bar Cocheba's rebellion Rabbi Akiba made a final journey throughout Parthia and Asia Minor and preached against Hadrian and his legions (see art. Akiba in Hastings's *Enc. R. E.*) The Syriac version in its earliest form may have arisen 132 A.D.

III. We have two ancient Latin versions, (a) the *Vetus Latina a*, sometimes called the *Itala*, which also included Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Macc., Prayer of Manasseh, and fourth Esdras. That this version originated before the time of Jerome is evident from the fact that Cyprian (*Test. adversus Jud.* ii. 6) quotes Bar. iii. 35-7 and Tertullian (*Adv. Praxean* 16) makes a reference to verse 37. The version was, however, incorporated into the Vulgate. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon* characterizes the style of the *Itala* as a patois full of provincialisms and violations of grammatical and syntactical rules. Not a few Greek terms are retained in Latin form. The careful investigation of this version by Kneucker (pp. 143-9) shows how closely the Greek version is followed, but not the exact text of any existing codex. (b) *Vetus Latina b* was first published at Rome in 1688 by Jos. Caro from an old MS. Since then it has been republished by Sabatier in the *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. i (1873), on the basis of three additional MSS. Where *Vet. Lat. a* differs from the Greek text, *Vet. Lat. b* follows the latter. It is, however, also clear that *Vet. Lat. b* follows in a considerable number of details *Vet. Lat. a*, but has a better Latin style.

<sup>1</sup> Also Burkitt (*Enc. Bibl.*, 'Text and Versions,' Peshitta, § 60) remarks that the Syr. Ecclesiasticus is partly a rendering of the Hebrew.

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

IV. The *Arabic* version contained in Walton's *Polyglott* closely adheres to the Greek text. Kneucker has shown in his detailed examination (pp. 177 foll.) that in the vast majority of instances G<sup>A</sup> is followed and not G<sup>B</sup>.

V. The *Ethiopic* version similarly is based on G<sup>A</sup> in abbreviated form. It is contained in Dillmann's *Biblia Vet. Test. Aethiopica*, vol. v (1894).

VI. The *Coptic* version was first published in 1870 by Father Bsciai (see Kneucker *in loc.*) in an edition on the basis of the Cairo codex of the Prophets. Brugsch published subsequently (1872-4) a Sahidic (Thebaic) version of the Book of Baruch (including the Epistle of Jeremiah) in Lepsius' *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, series x, pp. 134-6; xi, pp. 18-21; xii, pp. 46-9, from a careful, though not faultless, copy made by the learned Copt Kabis. We have also an edition by Schulte, 1892 (pp. 37-9). This version, like the Arabic and Eth., adheres on the whole to G<sup>A</sup>, though there are *omissions* of individual words such as καί and of particles and pronouns, and even of phrases, and there are also *additions*.

VII. The *Armenian* version likewise follows, with few exceptions, G<sup>A</sup>.

### § 10. INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH LITERATURE.

The influence of the book on ecclesiastical *Christian literature* has been far greater than upon the Jewish. We have already referred to the use made by Athenagoras of Bar. iii. 35 (see § 8, *ad fin.*), as well as by Irenaeus, who quotes (*Adv. Haeres.* v. 35) the passage in Bar. iv. 36-v. 9 as the words of Jeremiah. It seems at this time to have been assumed that because Baruch was the secretary of the prophet, and wrote out many of his discourses, the Book of Baruch must have also contained the utterances of Jeremiah. Thus Clemens Alexandr. (*Paedag.* I. x. 91-2) cites several passages from the Book of Baruch as the words of Jeremiah. Hippolytus, in his treatise *Contra Noëtum*, takes note of the fact that Noëtus and his followers make use of the passage Bar. iii. 35-7 as a support to their patristian views of Christology. On the other hand, Origen, like Melito, follows the Jewish Canon, and so ignores what Roman Catholic theologians (including the latest commentator Schneedorfer) call the Deutero-Canonical books (Apocrypha), though Lamentations and Epistle of Jeremiah are included in the canonized writings. It is probable, however, that (as in the case of Clemens Al.) he included the Book of Baruch under Jeremiah, since he cites the oft-quoted Bar. iii. 38 in his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, and also Bar. iii. 9-13 in his *Jerem. Homil.* vii. 3. Similarly his pupil, Dionysius of Alexandria, quotes Bar. iii. 14, 15, while *Apost. Const.* cite Bar. iv. 4. So also references are to be found in Tertullian and Cyprian. Lactantius cites Bar. iii. 36 f. as the words of Jeremiah along with citations from Isaiah and the Psalms (*Inst.* iv. 38). Ephrêm Syr. regarded Bar., as well as the other Apocrypha, as Scripture.

Yet in fact many *Greek* Fathers of the fourth century separated the Apocryphal (or so-called Deutero-Canonical) writings from the Canonical. Baruch, however, formed an exception, since it was treated as an appendix to Jeremiah, and so formed part of what Athanasius calls *κατορθώμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα, πρὸς τὴν τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία*. Similarly, Cyril of Jerusalem and the Provincial Synod of Laodicea. Thus we find Chrysostom frequently quoting passages from Baruch as words 'of the prophet' or Jeremiah.

As we follow the *Latin* Fathers from Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrosius onwards we find a similar tradition. On the other hand Jerome, who studied and followed Hebrew tradition, forms a unique exception. He separates the Book of Baruch, together with the Epistle of Jeremiah, from the book of the prophet Jeremiah as non-Canonical: 'Librum autem Baruch notarii eius, qui apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur, praetermisimus.' This is the more remarkable since in subsequent times Pope Felix III, Cassiodorus, and others cite Baruch as authoritative scripture. In the Latin Bible (as revised by Jerome) Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah are omitted. Thus they are not to be found in the Cod. Amiatinus, the oldest known MS. of the Vulgate. On the other hand, at the Council of Trent it was recognized as part of the O.T. among other Deutero-Canonical books. Our English Bible follows the Protestant tradition in placing it among the Apocrypha as non-Canonical. For further detail we would refer to Reusch's work, pp. 2-21, and to Schürer, *GFV*<sup>3</sup>, iii, p. 342 f. Among Protestant German divines till Ewald there was a tendency to depreciate the value of the book.

With reference to the Book of Baruch as a part of *Jewish* literature, we have already shown that there are strong grounds for the belief that a Hebrew original of Bar. i. 1-iv. 4 existed for a time among the Jewish communities of the Diaspora during the last quarter of the first century, and that the rest of the book must have been published within that period in Greek. During the early part of the second century the whole must have circulated in Greek and somewhat later in Aramaic (among the Jewish settlements of Mesopotamia). But the history of the book both then and later among the Jewish communities is most obscure. Probably the note of complaisance towards the



## INTRODUCTION

Roman power in ch. i. 1-iii. 8 did not commend the book to Jews after the suppression of Bar Cocheba's insurrection in A.D. 135. The testimony of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (v. 20) that on the 10th of the month Gorpiaeus it was read along with the Lamentations of Jeremiah as a portion in Jewish worship is subject to some difficulty, as we are unable to identify the date assigned with that of the Jewish Calendar, though the statement is confirmed by a reference to synagogue-worship accompanied by a citation of Bar. iv. 9 in Ephrém Syrus. See Schürer, *GVV*<sup>2</sup>, iii, p. 342. The express statement of Jerome (Preface to Jerem.) that in his day the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah were 'not read among the Hebrews' would lead us to the conclusion that in the fourth century A.D. both had ceased to have any recognized place in current Jewish religious literature.

### § II. THE RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF THE BOOK OF BARUCH.

Since the book is composite in authorship and tendency, it cannot be said to present in its three documents any uniformity of ideas, except in certain positive general features common to all three parts and also in the general absence of others to which allusion will be made.

(a) *Doctrine of God.* In all the three documents God is recognized as the absolute ruler of Israel's destiny, the fountain of righteousness and power, i. 15, 19, ii. 6, iii. 1, 32 foll. The document B (iii. 9-iv. 4) naturally emphasizes God's wisdom and universal knowledge (iii. 32-73). On the other hand, God's mercy, which listens to the cry of His people, is assumed throughout the penitential supplication of i. 17, iii. 8, and is expressly affirmed in ii. 35, iii. 2. These features are, however, most prominent in document C (iv. 5-v. 4), which is greatly influenced by the Deutero-Isaiah, in which God's love and mercy to His people is the dominant theme. This divine compassion is the ground of the repeated exhortation 'Be of good cheer'. 'He that called thee by name will comfort thee.' This document C is specially characterized by the designation of God as 'Everlasting' (*αἰώνιος*), iv. 22, 35, v. 2, and as 'Holy One', iv. 22. On the other hand, when we turn to the document A (i. 2, 3*b*-iii. 8), Lord God (יהוה אלהים) is the usual combination, frequently with the 1st pers. plur. added, 'Lord our God.' In fact 'Lord' (= יהוה) belongs to this document and not to the other two. To this in two passages (iii. 1, 4) is added the epithet 'Almighty' (*παντοκράτωρ*, Heb. אֱלֹהֵי כָּל) or 'All-ruler' (iii. 1, 4). See Gifford's *Introd. ad fin.*

(b) *The doctrine of Sin and of Suffering* as the divinely inflicted chastisement for sin is strongly emphasized throughout the book, especially in i. 13, 18-ii. 10, 22 foll., iii. 10-13, iv. 6-8, 12, 13. Moreover, the sin of the fathers is visited in chastisement on the children, though the obverse doctrine of merit through the righteousness of ancestors which plays so large a part in Jewish Soteriology (cp. Matt. iii. 9, Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, § 63) is repudiated in ii. 19.

(c) *Silence on other points of doctrine.* One is impressed by a certain meagreness in the religious conceptions presented to us in this brief book. In this respect it stands sharply contrasted with the wealth of ideas contained in 2 Baruch, i. e. the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. Of the Angelology of the latter (2 Bar. vi. 4 f., vii, viii, temple destroyed by angels, with which the Epistle to the nine and a half tribes should be compared, lxxx. 1, 2 in Charles's ed. of 2 Bar.) we have not a trace, nor have we mention of Sirens, Liliths, and dragons (2 Bar. x. 8): only a stray reference to demons in 1 Bar. iv. 35, a borrowed feature. Even the Messianic element prominent in 2 Bar. (xxix. 3-8, xxxix. 7) is conspicuous by its absence, as in fact are apocalyptic and eschatological ideas generally. Of the resurrection of the righteous, to which 2 Bar. alludes (xxx) not a word is said in 1 Bar., though we cannot go so far as to assert (with Toy in *Jewish Encycl.*) that it is denied in ii. 17, where the language respecting the dead in Sheol is merely an echo of Ps. cxv. 17. Nor have we the pessimistic forecast of a coming age of decay such as we find in 2 Bar. xxxi. 5, xxxii. 5, 6 (cf. Epistle to the nine and a half tribes, lxxxiii. 9-23, lxxxv. 1c). The 2 Baruch and the Epistle to the nine and a half tribes evidently belong to a school and atmosphere of thought entirely different from that of 1 Baruch.

(d) *Great message of document B.* Ch. iii. 9-iv. 4, with its praise of Wisdom embodied in the Torah, strikes the highest note that meets the ear throughout the whole book. There is something profoundly impressive and pathetic in the closing verses of this document which direct Israel's thoughts away from his national humiliation, the temple-ruins and the vanished material pomp of religious ritual, to the eternal glory of that wisdom enshrined in the Torah which was to be Israel's inalienable possession for ever: 'Turn thee, O Jacob, and take hold of it: walk toward her shining in the presence of the light thereof.' We can afford to miss the grandiose and bizarre effects of apocalyptic as we stand in the clear sunlight of this sublime utterance. In place of the ruined temple the broad universe is the 'house of God' (iii. 24, 25).

## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

### § 12. SELECTED LITERATURE.

The articles on the Book of Baruch in the *Encycl. Bibl., Hastings's DB.*<sup>1</sup> *Encycl. Brit.* (11th ed.), *Jewish Encycl.*, and in *PRE*<sup>3</sup>, i, p. 640 f. under 'Apocryphen des A.T.'—Perhaps the most complete and useful is by SCHÜRER, *GJV*<sup>2</sup>, iii, pp. 338-44.

Among commentaries specially to be mentioned are FRITZSCHE, *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*, Leipz., 1851; REUSCH, *Erklärung des Buches Baruch* (1853), which is from the Roman Catholic standpoint, useful for its survey of the book's place in patristic literature, [also from same standpoint *Das Buch Jeremias, des Propheten Klagelieder u. das Buch Baruch* by SCHNEEDORFER (1903)]; EWALD in *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, iii (*Die jüngsten Propheten*). The most important, however, is that by KNEUCKER (1879), which contains not only an ample Introduction but also a very complete textual apparatus with a careful examination of the different versions, a full commentary, a translation, and a reproduction of the original Hebrew. In English should be specially mentioned the *Commentary on the Apocrypha*, edited by Dr. Wace, to which the Ven. E. H. Gifford, D.D., contributes the commentary on the Book of Baruch. Lastly, *Die Apocryphen des A.T.*, by KAUTZSCH, to which ROTHSTEIN contributes Baruch, will be found useful and suggestive.

Among other contributions we should mention HITZIG, *Zeitsch. für wissenschaftl. Theol.*, 1860, pp. 262-73; HILGENFELD, *ibid.*, 1862, pp. 199-203; 1879, pp. 437-54; 1880, pp. 412-22, and KNEUCKER, *ibid.*, 1880, pp. 309-23; GRÄTZ, 'Abfassungszeit und Bedeutung des Buches Baruch,' *Monatsch. für Gesch. u. Wissensch. des Judenthums*, iii, 1887, pp. 5-20.

<sup>1</sup> Attention should have been drawn above under § 2 to the two parts of the confession of Israel, noted in his article by Dr. Marshall. The *first* and shorter portion (i. 15-ii. 5) appears to have been intended more especially for use by the inhabitants of Judah. Hence the distinction in ii. 4 'round about us . . . hath scattered them'. The *second* part (ii. 6-iii. 8) is the confession more especially of the exiles. Hence in ii. 13, iii. 8 'scattered us'. This distinction is useful since it accounts for the repetition of phrase in the two parts, e. g. i. 15 and ii. 6; ii. 4 and ii. 13 (iii. 8). Both portions obviously proceeded from the same hand, rested on like presuppositions (such as the solidarity of Israel and Judah), and are based very largely on Danielic phraseology.



## THE BOOK OF BARUCH

- 1 And these are the words of the book, which Baruch the son of Nerias, the son of Maaseas, the  
 2 son of Sedekias, the son of Asadias, the son of Helkias, wrote in Babylon, in the fifth year, and in  
 the seventh day of the month, what time as the Chaldeans took Jerusalem, and burnt it with fire.  
 3 And Baruch did read the words of this book in the hearing of Jechonias the son of Joakim king of  
 4 Judah, and in the hearing of all the people that came to hear the book, and in the hearing of the  
 mighty men, and of the kings' sons, and in the hearing of the elders, and in the hearing of all the  
 people, from the least unto the greatest, even of all them that dwelt at Babylon by the river Sud.  
 5, 6 And they wept, and fasted, and prayed before the Lord; they made also a collection of money  
 7 according to every man's power; and they sent it to Jerusalem unto Joakim the high priest, the  
 son of Helkias, the son of Salom, and to the priests, and to all the people which were found with  
 8 him at Jerusalem, at the same time when he took the vessels of the house of the Lord, that had been  
 carried out of the temple, to return them into the land of Judah, the tenth day of the month Sivan,

TITLE. G<sup>S</sup>Hex. Baruch; S 'In addition the Second Ep. of Baruch the Scribe'; S (Lag.) 'The Second Epistle'; Arm. 'Ep. of Baruch'; Vet. Lat. *ab* 'Prophecy of Baruch'; Copt. 'Baruch the prophet'. [The 'Second Ep.' in S title refers by implication to the earlier preceding Ep. in S addressed by Baruch to the nine and a half tribes beyond the Euphrates.]

INTRODUCTION 1-14 [1, 3a belong to document B; 2, 3b-14, excluding redactional insertions, to document A].

1. On the personal details respecting Baruch see *Ency. Bibl.*, *sub voce*, and cf. Joseph. *Ant.* x. 9. 1. Kneucker *Introd.*, pp. 2 foll. *Maaseas* here is obviously the Maššēah of Jer. xxxii. 12; *Asadias* is the Hebr. Hasadiah. We find the name in 1 Chron. iii. 20. In S, through omission of the opening character and the frequent confusion of 7 and 7, the name takes the form  $\text{כזא}$ . This form of the name may, however, have arisen through Jer. li. 39. Baruch's genealogy is here traced further back than Maššēah (Jer. xxxii. 12). S reads 'to Babylon', as though the letter were dispatched from Palestine. How this may have textually arisen has been already explained, *Introd.*, § 9 (ii. Syr. Version). In this way the so-called Second Ep. (in S) accords with the preceding epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes beyond the Euphrates (cf. Title above), which is given in Walton's *Polygl.* and as an addendum in Charles's *Apoc. of Baruch*, pp. 124 foll.

2. The omission of the numeral before  $\mu\pi\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$  is certainly unusual, and points either to a defective original or to an omission by the translator. S leads us to the conclusion that the omission belonged to the original. We have no warrant, therefore, for the insertion of the name of the month Sivan (with Ewald).

In Ezek. i. 2, viii. 1, &c., the years are reckoned from the date of the first capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar when Jehoiachin was made prisoner (597 B.C.). In this year, however, Jerusalem was not burnt, but in the subsequent and final capture when the temple was destroyed 587-586 B.C. (cf. Bar. ii. 26). It is from this date, therefore (with Fritzsche, as against Eichhorn and others), the fifth year should be reckoned. See *Introd.*, § 4.

3, 4. The language reminds us of 2 Kings xxiii. 2; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30.  $\pi\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ , i. e. to hear the book.  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$  instead of  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$  in 3a. Similarly  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$  in iv. 1. We know nothing of the locality of Sud. Grotius conjectures that it refers to the city Sota. Bochart would emend to *Sar*, i. e. the city Sora. S, in fact, renders 'river of Šūr', which may be founded on the original  $\text{שור}$ , but it is precarious to base a conclusion on the Syr. treatment of proper names. Cheyne's suggestion of Shihor (in *Ency. Bibl.*) is pure conjecture. L and Ar. follow G in reading *Sud*; so also characteristically S<sup>Hex</sup>.

5. With the phraseology comp. 2 Chron. xxiv. 5, 11; Lev. v. 7, &c.

7.  $\iota\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha$  (as contrasted with following  $\iota\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\epsilon$ ) is used in the pregnant sense of the head-priest of the Jerusalem sanctuary as in 1 Kings iv. 2; 2 Kings xi. 9, xii. 8; cf. Lev. xiii. 2; Num. iii. 6; Neh. xiii. 4; 1 Chron. xvi. 39, &c. (cf. 1 Macc. xv. 1). In assigning this position to Joakim the writer departs from earlier tradition. According to 1 Chron. v. 39 the succession of High Priests was Shallum, Hilkiah, Azariah, Seraiah. Esdras (A) viii. 1 interpolates Zichri between Hilkiah and Azariah. In only quite late times we find a tradition (in Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 5. 1) that on the death of Darius a certain Jehoiakim, son of Joshua, was High Priest contemporary with Ezra. But this was more than 120 years after the time to which this passage refers. The chief priest in Jerusalem at the time of its final overthrow (587-586 B.C.) was Seraiah, 2 Kings xxv. 18 (= Jer. lii. 24).

8. As already shown (*Introd.*, § 4) the reference of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\upsilon$  is vague. 'He' might be referred to Joakim (Jehoiakim) of the preceding verse (so Herzfeld, Hilgenfeld, &c.). But this is evidently not intended. Baruch, the subject of verse 3, is meant, since his presence in Babylon and not in Judaea fits the situation (so Fritzsche, Reusch, Ewald, Hävernick, Hitzig, and Kneucker).

The restoration of the vessels to Jerusalem is another departure from the older tradition. According to the latter, the vessels which had been carried off by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv. 13, i. e. 597 B.C., and xxv. 14 f., i. e. 586 B.C.) were restored by Cyrus (Ezra i. 7-11). The statement in this verse seems to ignore Jeremiah's polemic against Hananiah and the false prophets (Jer. xxvii. 16, xxviii. 3, xxix. 4). Zedekiah's preparation of silver vessels is another addition to the later story. The angelic vision in 2 Bar. vi. 4—to respecting the concealment of the furniture of the Holy of Holies is another example of the freedom with which later writers dealt with history. The month Sivan (May-June) belongs in origin to the Babylonian Calendar (Schrader, *ChZ.* ii, p. 69 f.), borrowed by exilic and post-exilic Judaism and made the third month of their ecclesiastical year. It is mentioned in the late post-exilic Esther viii. 9. S reads here Nisan and om. 'silver' (perhaps as derogatory to national dignity).

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 1. 9-20

9 *namely*, silver vessels, which Sedekias the son of Josias king of Judah had made, after that Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon had carried away Jechonias, and the princes, and the captives, and the mighty men, and the people of the land, from Jerusalem, and brought them unto Babylon. And they said, Behold, we have sent you money; buy you therefore with the money burnt offerings, and sin offerings, and incense, and prepare an oblation, and offer upon the altar of the Lord our God; and pray for the life of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon, and for the life of Baltasar his son, that their days may be as the days of heaven above the earth: and the Lord will give us strength, and lighten our eyes, and we shall live under the shadow of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon, and under the shadow of Baltasar his son, and we shall serve them many days, and find favour in their sight. Pray for us also unto the Lord our God, for we have sinned against the Lord our God; and unto this day the wrath of the Lord and his indignation is not turned from us. And ye shall read this book which we have sent unto you, to make confession in the house of the Lord, upon the day of the feast and on the days of the solemn assembly.

15 And ye shall say, To the Lord our God *belongeth* righteousness, but unto us confusion of face, as at this day, unto the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to our kings, and to our princes, and to our priests, and to our prophets, and to our fathers: for that we have sinned before the Lord, and disobeyed him, and have not hearkened unto the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in the commandments of the Lord that he hath set before us: since the day that the Lord brought our fathers out of the land of Egypt, unto this present day, we have been disobedient unto the Lord our God, and we have dealt unadvisedly in not hearkening unto his voice. Wherefore the plagues came unto us, and the curse, which the Lord commanded Moses his servant *to pronounce* in

9. Obviously an echo of Jer. xxiv. 1. There *δραμόνας* corresponds to the doubtful word סִפְסַר = 'prison' (Isa. xxiv. 22, xlii. 7; Ps. cxlii. 8), and there applied apparently to those who are imprisoned. The 'people of the land' corresponds to עַם הָאָרֶץ of Zech. vii. 5, but meaning here, as in 2 Kings xxiv. 14, Jer. i. 18, Dan. ix. 6, the common people as opposed to the aristocracy (in Zech. the laity as distinguished from the priesthood). S varies considerably after 'princes', viz. 'and the officers and the workmen and the armies from Jerusalem'. Here 'the workmen' (τεχνίταις = ἑργαῖται) takes the place of 'the people of the land' in G and Syr.-Hex., and stands in closer accord with both Jer. xxiv. 1 and the history of the year 597 B.C. (comp. 2 Kings xxiv. 14). We are in fact led to conclude that S here rather than G is based on the original Hebrew text.

10. *μνάσθαι* (more correctly *μνάσθαι* in many codd.), 'oblation', is obviously an attempt to reproduce the Hebr. מִנְחָה Jer. xvii. 26, xli. 5. *ποιήσατε*, 'prepare', is a literal rendering of the Hebr. תַּעֲשׂוּהֶם, as in Exod. xxxix. 36, &c., Lev. ix. 7, xv. 15. Similarly *καὶ ἀνοίστατε*, 'and offer', most probably corresponds to וְהַעֲלִיתֶם (Jer. xxxiii. 18 G<sup>a</sup>; Exod. xxiv. 5, xxx. 9; Lev. xiv. 20, &c.).

11. The exhortation to pray for the life of Nebuchadnezzar reflects the tone of prophecy in Jeremiah and Ezekiel towards Babylonia. In later exilic prophecy the tone becomes embittered (Isa. xlvii, Jer. l, li, contrasted with Jer. xxvii. 6-8, xxix. 4-7; Ezek. xxvi. 7-12, xxix. 17-20). *προσείσαθε περὶ . . .* seems an echo of Jer. xxix. 7 (xxxvi. 7 G<sup>b</sup>). On the historical questions involved see *Introduct.*, § 8.

Baltasar appears in Dan. v. 1 as Belshazzar (H, in G<sup>b</sup> and <sup>b</sup> Baltasar). Both here and in Daniel we have the same confusion of names. Belshazzar (in Babyl. *Bel-šar-ušur*, 'Bel, protect the king') was son of Nabonidus (*Nabû-naiû*, 'Nebo is gracious'), the last Babylonian king, not of Nebuchadnezzar (as in Dan. v. 2, 13, 18, 22, and in the present passage).

12. S introduces characteristic variations in the opening of the verse, 'and that the Lord grant unto us that we may serve him.'

13. *ἀπέστρεψεν* ('is . . . turned') is here intransit., whereas in verse 8 above *ἀποστρέψαι* is transit. On this tendency of transit. Greek verbs to become intransit., see Radermacher, *NTliche Gram.* (1911), pp. 18 foll.; comp. below, ii. 8. The Hebrew equivalent may be easily restored from Isa. ix. 11, 16, &c. (G *ἀποστρέψω*), lv. 10, viz. לֹא יָשָׁב בְּיָמֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה וְעָמָנוּ. S adds 'our God' to 'Lord' in all three cases where the Deity is mentioned. This combination is the usual formula in 1 Baruch.

14. **make confession** (*ἐξαγορεύσαι*), evidently the rendering of לְהִתְוַדֹּת, as in Lev. v. 7, xvi. 21; Num. v. 7. *καίρως* here stands for כְּתוּבָה in the sense of festival season or 'solemn assembly' (*πανήγυρις*), whereas *ἑσπέρως*, 'feast', is the translation of חֵן. Comp. Hos. ix. 5, xii. 10. But while S<sup>Hex.</sup> reproduces here G, S has 'days of the Lord'. This is evidently due to the influences of a corrupted Greek text (*καρίου* for *καροῦ*). G<sup>b</sup> S *ἡμέρας . . . ἡμέρας*, but G<sup>a</sup> and <sup>a</sup> harmonize by reading plur. in both cases, L by reading sing. S, moreover, introduces additions, 'make confession *on behalf of us* in the Lord's house *before the Lord*'.

CONFESSIO OF THE PALESTINIAN REMNANT, i. 15-ii. 5 (document A. See note on p. 582).

15-18 is closely modelled on Dan. ix. 7-10, yet abbreviated.

15. **as at this day** is the familiar Hebr. בְּכִיּוֹם הַיּוֹם in 1 Kings viii. 24 and Dan. ix. 7. On this pregnant use of פּ in Hebrew see Gesen.-Kautsch, *Hebr. Gr.*,<sup>26</sup> § 118. 6; comp. below, ii. 26 note.

17. **before the Lord**. *ἐναντι* G<sup>b</sup> belongs to the *κοινή*, Radermacher, *NTliche Gram.*, p. 117. G<sup>a</sup> *ἐναντίον*; 'for that we have sinned,' &c. = (לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְבַנֵּי אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְהִתְוַדֹּת, Dan. ix. 8, 11.

19. On *ἐσχεδίασμεν* (G<sup>a</sup> *ἐσχεδίασαμεν*), a *ἀπ. ἐρ.* in LXX ('dealt unadvisedly'), see *Introduct.*, § 9, ii (Syr. Vers.). S and Dan. ix. 5, 11 clearly show that we have in G a rendering based on a corrupt text. Translate: 'We have *rebelled* in not hearkening . . .'. *ἐσχεδίασμεν* arose out of the corruption of סָרְדָנוּ into סָרְדָנוּ.

20. **clave** (*ἐκολληθήν*). A strong phrase which occurs again in iii. 4. This and other expressions in this verse are



the day that he brought our fathers out of the land of Egypt, to give us a land that floweth with  
 21 milk and honey, as at this day. Nevertheless we hearkened not unto the voice of the Lord our  
 22 God, according unto all the words of the prophets, whom he sent unto us: but we walked every  
 2 man in the imagination of his own wicked heart, to serve strange gods, and to do that which is evil  
 2 in the sight of the Lord our God. Therefore the Lord hath made good his word, which he pro-  
 4 nounced against us, and against our judges that judged Israel, and against our kings, and against  
 2 our princes, and against the men of Israel and Judah, to bring upon us great plagues, such as never  
 3 happened under the whole heaven, as it came to pass in Jerusalem, according to the things that  
 3 are written in the law of Moses; that we should eat every man the flesh of his own son, and every  
 4 man the flesh of his own daughter. Moreover he hath given them to be in subjection to all the  
 4 kingdoms that are round about us, to be a reproach and a desolation among all the people round  
 5 about, where the Lord hath scattered them. Thus were they cast down, and not exalted, because  
 5 we sinned against the Lord our God, in not hearkening unto his voice. To the Lord our God  
 7 *belongeth* righteousness: but unto us and to our fathers confusion of face, as at this day. For all  
 8 these plagues are come upon us, which the Lord hath pronounced against us. Yet have we not  
 9 intreated the favour of the Lord, in turning every one from the thoughts of his wicked heart.  
 9 Therefore hath the Lord kept watch over the plagues, and the Lord hath brought *them* upon us;  
 10 for the Lord is righteous in all his works which he hath commanded us. Yet we have not hearkened  
 10 unto his voice, to walk in the commandments of the Lord that he hath set before us.  
 11 And now, O Lord, thou God of Israel, that hast brought thy people out of the land of Egypt  
 11 with a mighty hand, and with signs, and with wonders, and with great power, and with a high arm,  
 12 and hast gotten thyself a name, as at this day: O Lord our God, we have sinned, we have done  
 13 ungodly, we have dealt unrighteously in all thine ordinances. Let thy wrath turn from us: for we

obviously Deuteronomic, cf. Deut. xxviii. 60 (Hebr. and G). In the original there would stand והאלה והאלה (cf. also Dan. ix. 11). But S has a variant which is more probable. See *Introd.*, § 9, ii (Syr. Version).

21-22 continue in the Deuteronomic strain (esp. of Deut. xxviii) reflected in Dan. ix. 5-17. S contains an interpretative expansion 'to do all the words of his servants the prophets'.

22. G<sup>a</sup> (followed by Vet. Lat. a and Ar.) wrongly places *ἡμῶν* instead of *αὐτῶν* after *καρδίας*.

II. 1-2 follow Dan. ix. 12, 13 with many close resemblances in G to the corresponding version in Dan. of G<sup>a</sup>, but *δικαιοσύνη* for *σπέρμα* and *δικαιοσύνη* for *οὐ δέξομαι*. Note *ὑπὸ παντός τοῦ αἵματος* common to both. *καὶ ἐστῆσαν . . . δικαιοσύνη* is almost a literal reproduction of Dan. ix. 12. S<sup>Hex</sup> and Judah<sup>a</sup> in both cases to 'Israel'. Corresponding to *ἐστῆσαν*, 'made good', we should have the familiar *עָמְדוּ*. This Hif. is used in the sense of keeping a command or promise by fulfilling it. Cf. verse 24 and Gen. xxvi. 3; Lev. xxvi. 9; Deut. ix. 5; 1 Sam. i. 23, xv. 13; 1 Kings ii. 4, vi. 12, xii. 15; Jer. xi. 5, xxxiii. 14. S *سالم* appears to reproduce the Hebr. original, but this is not a necessary conclusion; cf. S<sup>Hex</sup> and Ar.

*ἀποχρίστων* 'Isr.'. Here Hebr. original would be *אִישׁ אִישׁ* where *אִישׁ* is used *collectively* as in Joshua ix. 6 and Judg. vii. 23 (where G more correctly has *ἀνὴρ*).

G<sup>a</sup> preserve the full original text, since they add *τοῦ ἀγαγεῖν* (Q<sup>a</sup> *ἀναγαγεῖν*) *ἐφ' ἡμᾶς κατὰ μέγαρα ἃ*, 'to bring upon us great plagues such as', just as in Dan. ix. 12, i.e. in Hebr. original . . . להביא עלינו רעה גדולה אשר . . . So S<sup>Hex</sup> (with asterisks) and Ar. S, however, has *سالم* *سالم* *سالم* perhaps based on *יבא עלינו ימה*, and after 'in heaven' adds 'upon all the earth' (evidently an expansion; cf. Dan. ix. 12).

3. *ἀποχρίστων*, Hebr. *אִישׁ* in sense of 'every one'. We have here language based on Jer. xix. 9, Deut. xxviii. 53 (cf. Lev. xxvi. 29); G<sup>a</sup> 'sons' [plur.]; so Ar. S has *sing.* as G<sup>a</sup>.

4. *ἐποχρίστων*, 'in subjection', *ביר אהם ביר* [cf. Gen. xiv. 20 (H and G)], closely followed in S. The latter part of the verse is an echo of Jer. xlii. 8 (G closely corresponds), 'reproach and a desolation', *לְרֵעָה וְלְשִׁמְהָ* (cf. verse 13 and Mark i. 7, vii. 25), Hebr. *אִישׁ . . . אִישׁ*.

5. Borrowed from Deut. xxviii. 13.

CONFESSION OF THE EXILED COMMUNITY IN BABYLON, ii. 6-iii. 8 (document A).

6. Repetition of i. 15 with slight variation.

7. S renders 'seeing that the Lord our God hath uttered against us all these evils', &c. *سالم* *سالم* *سالم*

. . . *سالم* [ *سالم* ], which is a better rendering of the original Hebr. *אִישׁ אִישׁ יְהוָה עָלֵינוּ אֶת־כָּל־רָעָה הַבָּאָה עָלֵינוּ*. See *Introd.*, § 9, ii (Syr. Vers.). Here, however, S<sup>Hex</sup> follows G as usual. On *ὡς ἂν ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ* cf. Bar. i. 6 note.

8. G is here nearly identical with G<sup>a</sup> in the corresponding portion of Dan. ix. 13. *ἐπιθυμῶν*, 'thoughts': S *سالم*, 'inclinations', 'desires', as in i. 22 (*θεαίαι*), corresponds to Hebr. *מחשבות*.

9. An almost exact replica of Dan. ix. 14, which in its turn echoes Jer. xlii. 27. Note that for 'works which he hath done' in the Dan. passage, we have here 'which he hath commanded us' (in S *وصى* just as in G and S<sup>Hex</sup>, Hebr. *צוּ*). Yahweh is watching over the calamities in order to bring them to pass as retribution for transgression.

10. Repeats with variations i. 18, which closely follows Dan. ix. 16, G partly following the Dan. passage in G<sup>a</sup>.

11. Reproduces Dan. ix. 15 in its earlier part with Deuteronomic phrases added. Here again G follows the Dan. version of G<sup>a</sup>.

12. Continues the Danielic phraseology at the close of ix. 15 (cf. 5). G, however, prefers *ἀνομιάρων* to the *σπείρα* of G<sup>a</sup> and in Dan. as rendering of *מִשְׁפָּטִים*. Cf. verse 1.

13. The language is borrowed from Jer. xlii. 2, *כִּי קָטְרוּנוּ מְעַט מִרְבָּבָה* 'for we are left but a few out of many' (cf.

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 2. 14-26

14 are but a few left among the heathen, where thou hast scattered us. Hear our prayer, O Lord, and our petition, and deliver us for thine own sake, and give us favour in the sight of them which have led us away captive: that all the earth may know that thou art the Lord our God, because Israel and his posterity is called by thy name. O Lord, look down from thine holy house, and consider us: incline thine ear, O Lord, and hear: open thine eyes, and behold: for the dead that are in the grave, whose breath is taken from their bodies, will give unto the Lord neither glory nor righteousness: but the soul that is greatly vexed, which goeth stooping and feeble, and the eyes that fail, and the hungry soul, will give thee glory and righteousness, O Lord. For we do not present our supplication before thee, O Lord our God, for the righteousness of our fathers, and of our kings. For thou hast sent thy wrath and thine indignation upon us, as thou hast spoken by thy servants the prophets, saying, Thus saith the Lord, Bow your shoulders to serve the king of Babylon, and remain in the land that I gave unto your fathers. But if ye will not hear the voice of the Lord, to serve the king of Babylon, I will cause to cease out of the cities of Judah, and from without Jerusalem, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride: and the whole land shall be desolate without inhabitant. But we would not hearken unto thy voice, to serve the king of Babylon: therefore hast thou made good thy words that thou spakest by thy servants the prophets, *namely*, that the bones of our kings, and the bones of our fathers, should be taken out of their places. And, lo, they are cast out to the heat by day, and to the frost by night, and they died in great miseries by famine, by sword, and by pestilence. And the house which is called by thy name hast thou laid waste, as at this day, for the wickedness of the house of Israel and the house

Deut. iv. 27). ἀπό πολλῶν has been accidentally dropped out of G<sup>a</sup> and is inserted in S. ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ. We are justified in restoring ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ to the Heb. 1 Baruch, since some G codd. (22, 36, 48, 51, and others) retain ἀπό πολλ. and its omission is indicated in the marg. of S<sup>Hex</sup>. S supplies us here with a parallelism: 'because we have been left a few out of many and are scanty among these peoples among whom thou hast scattered us.'

14. ἀποιέλω corresponds to שָׁבַח (cf. Jer. xliii. 12, H and G). So here S ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ.  
 15. S adds 'holy' to 'name'.  
 16-17. ἐννόησον εἰς ἡμᾶς = ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ (or ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ Dan. ix. 23, G<sup>θ</sup> ἐννοήθητι ἐν). S repeats ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ, ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ, ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ (or ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ, Deut. xxvi. 15).

incline . . . thine eyes repeat Dan. ix. 18. On ὧν . . . αἰσῶν Hebr. relat. cf. verses 4, 13 above. We have here the ordinary O. T. teaching of life in Sheol taught in Ps. vi. 6, lxxxviii. 11, cxv. 17. πνεῦμα corresponds in meaning to הַיָּהוּה of Gen. vi. 17 (cf. הַיָּהוּה הַיָּהוּה, ii. 7). σπλάγγινι usually corresponds to Hebr. רַחֲמִים (cf. S), but here it is more likely that the original had שָׁמַיִם (as Kneucker suggests). δικαίωμα here = δικαιοσύνη (verse 18 *ad fin.*). Comp. Isa. xlv. 23 foll. The corresponding Hebr. הַיָּהוּה describes 'that aspect of Yahweh's activity which has for its object the salvation of His people' (Kautzsch in *DB*, v, p. 683).

18. ἐπὶ τὸ μέγεθος has caused difficulty to interpreters. S affords no help. Fritzsche rightly suspects that there lurks behind it a corrupted Hebr. original. The passage seems to reflect the spirit of Deut. xxviii. 65 f.

19. καταβάλλομεν τὸν ἔλεον, 'present our supplication', is fairly clear. S paraphrases: 'We seek from Thy presence compassion and cast our supplication in Thy presence.' It is nearly certain that we have here the rendering of the original Hebr. אָנַחְנוּ מִפְּלִים חַרְחָוֵנוּ, Jer. xxxviii. 26, xlii. 9; Dan. ix. 20. In all these passages G renders חַרְחָוֵנוּ (which means 'pity' and thence is used in the pregnant sense 'prayer for pity') by the corresponding ἔλεον, properly 'compassion', 'pity', like the Hebr. equivalent, and similarly used in a pregnant sense.

This verse exhibits a reaction against the prevalent Jewish doctrine of merit. It is not on account of the righteousness of ancestors and kings that we found our claim to divine compassion. See Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, §§ 63 foll. δικαίωματα, 'acts of righteousness' (הַיָּהוּה); comp. Rom. v. 18.

20. Phraseology borrowed from Jer. xxxvi. 7, הָאֵף וְהַחֲמָה הָאֵף 'wrath and indignation'. So also as in Dan. ix. 6, הַיָּהוּה הַיָּהוּה (G<sup>o</sup> παῖδων, G<sup>θ</sup> εὐδλων). Here Dan. LXX for 'servants' is followed.

21. Based on Jer. xxvii. 11, 12 and xxix. 5 f., 'bow your shoulders,' in Hebr. הִשְׁתַּחֲוִי אֶת־עַוְרֹתֶיךָ (or perhaps הִשְׁתַּחֲוִי אֶת־עַוְרֹתֶיךָ, Gen. xlix. 15), reflecting the attitude of Jeremiah and Ezekiel towards Babylonia; cf. i. 11-12 above.

23 reproduces Jeremiah's words repeated in Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9, xxxiii. 11. εἰς ἄβυσσον, 'desolate', probably = εἰς ἐρήμωσαν in Jer. vii. 34, הַיָּהוּה; comp. S ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ. ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων is an obvious Hebraism, viz. מֵאֵין יֹשֵׁב (= יֹשֵׁב, Jer. xxxiii. 10).

24. εἰστησας, 'thou hast made good', cf. ii. 1, 12, note.  
 should be taken out, τοῦ ἐξενεχθῆναι = ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ, Jer. viii. 1. S has also the act, viz. ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ (Aph).

25. Based on Jer. xxxvi. 30; latter part of the verse follows Jer. xiv. 12, xxxviii. 2. sword, famine, pestilence, but in the order 'famine, sword, pestilence'. That ἀποστολή represents 'pestilence' (ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ) is clear from Jer. xxxii. 36, where ἀποστολή is given in G. This use of the Greek word appears to arise from the use of ἀποστῆλαι as the equivalent of שָׁחַת when employed as in Jer. xxiv. 10 (H and G) of Yahweh sending plagues as chastisement. S and Ar. 'exile' appears to have arisen from a misunderstanding of the true meaning of ἀποστολή as S<sup>Hex</sup> marg. indicates.

26. οὐ . . . ἐπὶ αὐτῶν. Hebr. relat. constr. as in ii. 4, 13. There are no sufficient grounds, as Kneucker alleges, for regarding the first part of this verse as not genuine. Of the genuineness of the entire verse we have clear evidence in its thoroughly Hebraic diction. Not only the relat. construction already noted, but also ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῆς reflects the pregnant use of ⲁⲓⲃⲃⲉ (Ges.-Kautzsch, *Hebr. Gr.*<sup>20</sup>, § 118. 6, cf. Hos. ii. 5, 17, ix. 9, xii. 10). Moreover, the verse stands in full harmony with i. 2. The mere fact of repetitions of phrase (Kneucker cites i. 15, ii. 15) constitutes no argument against genuineness in a document crowded with repetition.



27 of Judah. Yet, O Lord our God, thou hast dealt with us after all thy kindness, and according to all  
 28 that great mercy of thine, as thou spakest by thy servant Moses in the day when thou didst command  
 29 him to write thy law before the children of Israel, saying, If ye will not hear my voice, surely this  
 very great multitude shall be turned into a small number among the nations, where I will scatter  
 30 them. For I know that they will not hear me, because it is a stiffnecked people: but in the land  
 31 of their captivity they shall lay it to heart, and shall know that I am the Lord their God: and I  
 32 will give them a heart, and ears to hear: and they shall praise me in the land of their captivity, and  
 33 think upon my name, and shall return from their stiff neck, and from their wicked deeds: for they  
 34 shall remember the way of their fathers, which sinned before the Lord. And I will bring them  
 again into the land which I swore unto their fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and they  
 35 shall be lords of it: and I will increase them, and they shall not be diminished. And I will make  
 an everlasting covenant with them to be their God, and they shall be my people: and I will no  
 more remove my people of Israel out of the land that I have given them.

3 1 O Lord Almighty, thou God of Israel, the soul in anguish, the troubled spirit, crieth unto thee.  
 2 Hear, O Lord, and have mercy: for thou art a merciful God: yea, have mercy upon us, because we  
 3 4 have sinned before thee. For thou sittest as king for ever, and we perish evermore. O Lord  
 Almighty, thou God of Israel, hear now the prayer of the dead Israelites, and of the children of  
 them which were sinners before thee, that hearkened not unto the voice of thee their God: for the  
 5 which cause these plagues came unto us. Remember not the iniquities of our fathers: but remember  
 6 thy power and thy name now at this time. For thou art the Lord our God, and thee, O Lord, will  
 7 we praise. For for this cause thou hast put thy fear in our hearts, to the intent that we should  
 call upon thy name: and we will praise thee in our captivity, for we have called to mind all the

27. S adds after 'kindness' the clause 'and according to all thy purpose' (رجو). Comp. Ps. li. 3.

29. Comp. Deut. xxviii. 62. The reading *σίμην* (G<sup>a</sup>-b) [in *ὁ ἴ μνη*], 'surely', arose out of *σιμή*, a literal rendering of the original Hebr. שׁוֹן־עֵן idiom used to express a strong asseveration which would be unintelligible in its literal Greek form. S, on the other hand, reproduces the Hebr. original. See Winer, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, 8th ed., p. 553, footnote 7 (on Heb. vi. 14), and especially p. 627, footnote 3, where useful parallels are given. *βόμβησις*, 'multitude', corresponds to *הַמְּנוּחָה* in the original (so Fritzsche, who compares Jer. xxxi. 34 *ἐθνοβόμβησις*, *מְנוּחָה*), rendered 'people' in S, which expands into a parallelism, 'shall be turned into a small number and shall be diminished among the peoples.' Hebr. relat. constr. *וְעַל* . . . *עִמָּם* as in verses 4, 13, 26, above.

30. lay it to heart is hardly satisfactory. The phrase is an echo of 1 Kings viii. 47, where R. V. rightly renders 'bethink themselves' (cf. Luke xv. 17 and Delitzsch's Hebr.), *וַיִּשְׁבוּ אֶת־לִבָּם*, almost literally reproduced in G<sup>a</sup> S and L (*converteretur ad cor suum*). *ἀποκαίσις* = *שׁוֹב*, Jer. xliii. 11.

31. Hebr. *אָזְנוֹ* 'ear' (sing. and du.) is used to express 'mind', 'intelligence' (cf. Assyr. *uznu*). Comp. 1 Sam. ix. 15, xx. 2, &c.; Isa. vi. 10; Matt. xiii. 9, 15.

32. A parallelism.

33. stiff neck, *קִשְׁתָּהּ קָשָׁה*, as in verse 30 *קִשְׁתָּהּ קָשָׁה*, Exod. xxxii. 9, &c.; Deut. ix. 6, &c.), though we have *τράχηλος* in 30 and *νῶτος* here (S has same word) for 'neck'.

34. Deuteronomic (Deut. vi. 10, &c.); last clause echoes Jer. xix. 6 b.

35 recalls Jer. xxxi. 31, xxxii. 40; remove, probably *שׁוֹמֵט* as in Isa. xlvi. 7 (cf. Num. xiv. 44), though S suggests a stronger word. Kneucker prefers *שׁוֹמֵט*, cf. Jer. xii. 14 foll., xlii. 10.

III. 1-8. Bitter cry of appeal to God from the exiles, and confession of past sin.

1. *Παντοκράτωρ*, 'Almighty', Hebr. *עֲבָרָא*, as in 2 Sam. v. 10, vii. 8, 26, &c., appended to *יהוה*. So S (as in 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26). *ἐν στείσις* (*בְּצִרְוֹת* or *בְּצִרָה*, cf. Ps. xxv. 17, xxxi. 8). *ἀκαθάρτων* must be the partic. and would correspond to *רְשָׁעִים*. Comp. Isa. lxi. 3 (H and G).

crieth, *צִעֲקָה* (as in Ps. lxxvii. 2). S + 'afflicted body' (perhaps *צִעֲקָה*).

2. S characteristically adds 'God' to 'Lord'. G<sup>a</sup> 'Hear, O Lord, and have mercy'. G<sup>a</sup> *וְעַל* + 'for thou art a merciful God, yea have mercy'. S + 'for thou art merciful and kind'. L and Ar. + 'because thou art a merciful God'. In the original we might therefore assume, with Kneucker, *הִנֵּנִי כִי הִנֵּנִי וְחַסִּיד אֱתָהּ*.

3. *καθήμενος* corresponds to *שָׁב*, used of sitting on a throne, Exod. xi. 5 (H and G). We should probably follow Ps. xxxix. 10 (rather than Isa. lvii. 15, with Kneucker), i. e. *יִשְׁבֵּב לְעוֹלָם*. S 'abidest for ever'.

4. For 'dead' of G<sup>a</sup> S and other versions, read with R. V. marg. 'men', *מֵתִים* of the original Hebrew being misread *מֵתִים* instead of *מֵתִים*. A more literal rendering of G would be: 'and [so] the evils came unto us.' S prefaces 'curses' to 'evils'. The original would then be *וְהָרְעוּת בְּנֵי הַמְּאָרָזִים וְהָרְעוּת בְּנֵי הַמְּאָרָזִים* (cf. Deut. xxviii. 20), or in sing. *וְהָרְעוּת בְּנֵי הַמְּאָרָזִים*.

5. S 'iniquity and folly', apparently based on an alliterative combination, *וְהַמְּאָרָזִים וְהַמְּאָרָזִים*, but here probably, as in many other cases, S expands the original text.

7. With the opening cf. Jer. xxvii. 40 b. The original has become corrupted. Hence we have several variants. S 'that we may invoke (call upon) thy holy name', where 'holy' is evidently added as in ii. 15. In other respects this accords with G<sup>a</sup> S, which substitute *νοῦ* for *καὶ* before *ἐπιστάθην*. In the latter part of the verse G<sup>a</sup> reads 'because we have put away from our mind all the iniquity', &c. Similarly Ar. and Vet. L. a *conventio* of iniquitate. But G<sup>a</sup> *καὶ* + *αὐτῶν* 'because we have recalled to our mind' (*ἐπιμνήσκω*), &c. S 'because thou hast recalled to our mind

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 3. 8-18

8 iniquity of our fathers, that sinned before thee. Behold, we are yet this day in our captivity, where thou hast scattered us, for a reproach and a curse, and to be subject to penalty, according to all the iniquities of our fathers, which departed from the Lord our God.

- 9 Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life :  
Give ear to understand wisdom.
- 10 How happeneth it, O Israel, that thou art in thine enemies' land,  
That thou art waxen old in a strange country,
- 11 That thou art defiled with the dead,  
That thou art counted with them that *go down* into the grave?
- 12 Thou hast forsaken the fountain of wisdom.
- 13 *For* if thou hadst walked in the way of God,  
Thou shouldst have dwelled in peace for ever.
- 14 Learn where is wisdom, where is strength,  
Where is understanding ; that thou mayst know also  
Where is length of days, and life,  
Where is the light of the eyes, and peace.
- 15 Who hath found out her place?  
And who hath come into her treasures?
- 16 Where are the princes of the heathen,  
And such as ruled the beasts that are upon the earth ;
- 17 They that had their pastime with the fowls of the air,  
And they that hoarded up silver  
And gold, wherein men trust  
And of whose getting there is no end?
- 18 For they that wrought in silver, and were so careful,  
And whose works are past finding out,

all the evils and iniquity . . . , where we have an expanded version, but may perhaps infer that in the Hebrew original stood  $\text{וְהַשְׁבֵּת לְלִבְבֵנוּ וְנָא}$ .

8. *ol* . . . *ekel*, Hebr. rel. constr. as in ii. 4, 13, 26, and also recurrence of the phraseology of ii. 4 and 29, comp. Jer. xlii. 18. S lengthens the series: curse, reproach, derision, and condemnation (= *σφλγσις* R. V. to be subject to penalty), the last word in S being the same as that which renders *κρίμα* in I Cor. xi. 34 (cf. Delitzsch, *Heb. N. T., ad loc.*). The Jer. parallel has also four terms: curse, horror, malediction, reproach (in which 'malediction' in G is rendered *ἀπά*). Accordingly S restores to our text the 'curse' of the *Jer.* passage, whereas the condemnation (subjection to penalty) might be regarded as a weakened form of the 'horror'. The original of S we might accordingly conjecture to be  $\text{לְאֵלֶּה וְלַחֲרָפָה וְלַהֲלֵלָה וְלֹא־שָׁמָח}$ .

BARUCH'S PRAISE OF AND EXHORTATION TO WISDOM REVEALED IN THE LAW, iii. 9-iv. 4 (document B).

9. S 'understanding and wisdom'. Comp. Prov. iv. 1*b*. The fuller expression in S maintains a more equable and rhythmic parallelism,  $\text{הַשְׁבִּיבוּ לְרַעַת בֵּינָה וְלַחֲכֵמָה}$ . The influence of the Wisdom literature (esp. of Prov.) throughout this document is obvious and natural.

10-12. R. V. rightly follows G<sup>49</sup> in omitting in verse 10 the second *ri* of G<sup>8</sup>. It is quite possible that we ought here to follow S and read:

Wherefore, O Israel, art thou waxen old in thine enemies' land,  
Hast polluted thyself ( $\text{הִטְמֵאתָ}$ ) in a strange land (cf. Hos. ix. 4),  
Art counted ( $\text{נִשְׁבֵּתָ}$ ) with the dead who go down to the grave ( $\text{יְרֵדֵי אֲדוֹלַי}$ , Ps. Iv. 16; Prov. i. 12),  
Hast forsaken the fountain ( $\text{מְקוֹר}$ ) of Wisdom? (Prov. xviii. 4).

14. Echoes of Prov. iii. 16, viii. 14.

16-17. Wisdom is not to be found among the rich and mighty of this world. There seems to be a subtle reference to Nebuchadnezzar. Cf. Dan. ii. 37, iv. 20*f*; Jer. xxvii. 6.

16. It would be best to render here by 'peoples' ( $\text{עַמִּים}$ ) rather than 'heathen', since *ethnos* also stands as the equivalent of  $\text{עַם}$  (Gen. xvii. 16; Lev. xxi. 1; Prov. xxx. 26). So Kneucker. Moreover S reads here  $\text{עוֹלָם}$  ( $\text{עָלָם}$ ) 'age', which is evidently a corruption of  $\text{עַמִּים}$ .

17 portrays the luxury and amusements of the rich. Comp. Judith xi. 7.

18. **they that wrought in silver** might correspond to  $\text{בָּרָשִׁי כֶסֶף}$ , as Kneucker suggests. Prov. xi. 27 (R. V. margin)



THE BOOK OF BARUCH 3. 19-26

- 19 They are vanished and gone down to the grave,  
And others are come up in their steads.
- 20 Younger men have seen the light,  
And dwelt upon the earth:  
But the way of knowledge have they not known,  
21 Neither understood they the paths thereof:  
Neither have their children laid hold of it:  
They are far off from their way.
- 22 It hath not been heard of in Canaan,  
Neither hath it been seen in Teman.
- 23 The sons also of Agar that seek understanding, [which are in the land,]  
The merchants of Merran and Teman,  
And the authors of fables, and the searchers out of understanding;  
None of these have known the way of wisdom,  
Or remembered her paths.
- 24 O Israel, how great is the house of God!  
And how large is the place of his possession!
- 25 Great, and hath none end;  
High, and unmeasurable.
- 26 There were the giants born that were famous of old,  
Great of stature, and expert in war.

would lead us on a wrong scent. We should rather find the original through S, 'who gain silver',  $\text{יִשְׁבְּרֵי כֶסֶף}$ , which might also mean 'makers' or 'fashioners' in silver. This is really an Aramaic use of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$ , reflected in the later Hebrew diction of Gen. xiv. 19, 22; Prov. viii. 22; Ps. cxxxix. 13. Both this and the following verse begin with the interrog. 'Who?' in S, in continuation of the series of interrogations that follow after 'Learn where', &c., in verse 14. On the other hand, G begins verse 18 with  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  'for', as though it gave the reason for the preceding verses. As these are interrog., we can only obtain an intelligible sequence with verse 18 in G by assuming (with Fritzsche) that a negative answer ['They no longer exist'] is implied after verse 17. But this anticipates verse 19. It would be better, therefore, to read at the opening of this verse with S, 'who are they who gain (are makers in) silver...?'

**whose works are past finding out.** A relat. sentence, more literally 'There is no searching (*ἐξέριπτος*) of their works'. S 'There is no numbering of their works'. The Hebrew original of G would be  $\text{וְאֵין מִסְפָּר לְעֵמָלָם}$ , and of S  $\text{וְאֵין מִסְפָּר לְעֵמָלָם}$ . The latter is perhaps an inferior reading. But both are quite consonant with the Wisdom literature on which this document (B) in 1 Baruch is modelled. Prov. xxv. 3; Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxxvi. 26 (cf. Isa. xl. 28).

19. The answer to the preceding queries. All these devotees of worldly pomp have vanished.

20. 'The young' would be a better translation of  $\text{νεώτεροι} = \text{מְבַרְכִים}$ , as opposed to  $\text{מְבִטְרִים}$  (*μεβιτρίται*), Ps. xxxvii. 25, cxlviii. 12 (cf. Judges viii. 20). 'Have seen the light' = 'have been born', Job iii. 16, 20, xxxiii. 30. For 'knowledge' S has 'loving intelligence' (*sūkolō d'rehm'othō*) or 'intelligence and love' (Lag.), an evident later expansion.

21. **their children**, i.e. the third generation, viz. sons of the young men of verse 20, who are themselves the sons of those who are referred to in verse 19.

**are far off.** S 'have removed themselves far and revolted from *its* way', i.e. of knowledge. Fritzsche rightly restores the sing. with S in place of the plur. (*ἀνὴρ*) with G, so also Rothstein. Moreover, the fuller rendering in S points to a more rhythmic length of line in the original  $\text{וְעַיִן מִסְפָּר לְעֵמָלָם}$ .

22. Teman, situated in Edom, was celebrated for its wisdom, Jer. xlix. 7.

23 is at variance with the passive construction of the previous verse (contained in G). From this defect S is entirely free, which shows the impress of the Hebrew original. This verse is obviously a continuation of the preceding 'nor among the Hagarenes who seek after understanding',  $\text{וְעַיִן מִסְפָּר לְעֵמָלָם}$ . The error in G probably arose from the omission of the first  $\text{וְ}$  in  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  (cf. l. 1). The force of the preceding negatives continues in this clause. Hence there is no need to write  $\text{וְעַיִן מִסְפָּר לְעֵמָלָם}$ . The emendation of  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  into  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  'gains', by Kruecker (who reads  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  'die um Erwerb das Land durchziehen'), is utterly unwarranted, and tends to destroy the parallelism. Probably 'Merran' has arisen by corruption from 'Midian' through the constant confusion that arises between  $\text{מֵדָן}$  and  $\text{מֵרָן}$  (so Gifford, who cites 'Medan and Midian', Gen. xvi. 15, xv. 2, sons of Keturah). Comp. Gen. xxxvii. 36. The Hagarenes are mentioned in Gen. xxv. 12 f. They are the nomads referred to in 1 Chron. v. 20 f., xxvii. 31. They inhabited the district east of Gilead. Comp. Ps. lxxxiii. 7.

It is impossible to resist the suspicion that this verse has received undue extension. S has 'followed up' for 'remembered', through corruption of its own text, i.e.  $\text{וְעַיִן}$  instead of  $\text{וְעַיִן}$ .

24. S prefixes 'Lord' to 'God', thus securing the usual combination. For 'large' it reads 'long and spacious'.

25. S has here an abbreviated text which spoils parallelism and rhythm, viz. 'And it has no end and is lofty and has no measure.' The 'house of God' here is evidently the *Universe* (not heaven exclusively as in ii. 16).

26. Gen. vi. 4 plays a considerable part in later Jewish writings, as 1 En. vii; Sir. xvi. 7; Wisd. xiv. 6.

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 3. 27-35

- 27 These did not God choose,  
Neither gave he the way of knowledge unto them :
- 28 So they perished, because they had no wisdom,  
They perished through their own foolishness.
- 29 Who hath gone up into heaven, and taken her,  
And brought her down from the clouds ?
- 30 Who hath gone over the sea, and found her,  
And will bring her for choice gold ?
- 31 There is none that knoweth her way,  
Nor any that comprehendeth her path.
- 32 But he that knoweth all things knoweth her,  
He found her out with his understanding :  
He that prepared the earth for evermore  
Hath filled it with four-footed beasts :
- 33 He that sendeth forth the light, and it goeth ;  
He called it, and it obeyed him with fear :
- 34 And the stars shined in their watches, and were glad :  
When he called them, they said, Here we be ;  
They shined with gladness unto him that made them.
- 35 This is our God,  
And there shall none other be accounted of in comparison of him.

27-28. For 'knowledge' S has 'wisdom'. 28 *a* (= 27 *b*) in S 'wisdom and understanding'.  
29-30. The interrog., as frequently in Hebrew, anticipates a negat. answer. Comp. as parallels Deut. xxx. 12, 13 ;

Prov. xxx. 4 ; Sir. li. 28. Here again S expands beyond the original (which was probably *מי עבר אל-עבר הים*) into 'who hath passed over the sea's bounds and extremities'.

31. From the interrog. form we pass to the direct negat. For 'comprehendeth' (*ἐνθυμούμενος*), S 'meditateth', 'pondereth', perhaps Hebr. *מִבִּינֵן* (Prov. xxiii. 1), or *מִתְבִּינֵן* (Isa. xliii. 18, lii. 15, Job xxxvii. 14).

32. Only God can discover wisdom with His omniscience—a clear echo from the Book of Job xxxviii. 12-24, which evidently underlies the thought of this passage). For 'understanding' S has 'wisdom', cf. verse 27 above. For

'prepared' read with S 'established' (*מִבְּנֵן*). 'For evermore', perhaps, as S indicates, in Hebr. *לְעוֹלָם עוֹלָמִים*.

'Four-footed beasts' (*τετραπόδα*) corresponds to Hebr. *בְּהֵמוֹת*. G has evidently influenced here S, which renders 'beasts of four feet'; see *Introd.*, § 9, ii (Syr. versions).

33. *fear* is an inadequate rendering of *τρόμος*. S has a different conclusion to the verse which might appear to indicate a lost line: 'Who sendeth forth the light and it goes, and called it and it obeyed him, and the earth responded to him with trembling.' Here the introduction of the earth comes in abruptly after the reference to the light of heaven in the previous couplet:

קרא לו וישמע אליו  
\* \* \* \* \*  
ותענהו הארץ ברעדה

'trembling' (*τρόμος*) is more consonant with the earthquake, and is therefore more in place when connected with the earth than in reference to light. Cf. Ps. xviii. 8, xlv. 7, civ. 32. Rothstein interprets 'light' as lightning (Job xxxvii. 5, xxxviii. 35), but this does not harmonize with verse 34, though readily compatible with such an intervening couplet as S indicates.

34. **their watches.** S 'their places'. We have to choose between the original readings: *בְּמִשְׁמְרוֹתָם* and *בְּמִקְוֹמָתָם*. The latter is colourless, and might have arisen by corruption from the former, which yields a picturesque and appropriate metaphor, the stars being represented as keeping sentinel duty at their night-watches. Cf. Sir. xliii. 10. Hom. *Iliad* viii. 555, 556. 'Here we be' (*ἵπασμεν*), S 'behold us' reproduces the Hebr. original *הִנֵּנּוּ*.

35 exhibits evident echoes of Isa. xliii. 10, 11, xlv. 6, xlv. 18, which in S become more apparent than in G, since we have three clauses, the third being a parallel of the second. S omits 'our', and for 'in comparison of (*πρός*) him' in the third clause renders 'above him' (*ὑπὲρ*):

This is God, and there is none other beside Him,  
And none other shall be reckoned above Him.

הוא האלהים ואין אחר כובלעדיו  
לא יחשב אחר עליו (לכניו)  
or



THE BOOK OF BARUCH 3. 36—4. 7

- 36 He hath found out all the way of knowledge,  
 37 And hath given it unto Jacob his servant,  
 And to Israel that is beloved of him.
- 4 1 [Afterward did she appear upon earth,  
 And was conversant with men.]  
 This is the book of the commandments of God,  
 And the law that endureth for ever:
- 2 All they that hold it fast *are appointed* to life;  
 But such as leave it shall die.
- 3 Turn thee, O Jacob, and take hold of it:  
 Walk towards her shining in the presence of the light thereof.
- 4 Give not thy glory to another,  
 Nor the things that are profitable unto thee to a strange nation.  
 O Israel, happy are we:  
 For the things that are pleasing to God are made known unto us.
- 5 Be of good cheer, my people,  
 The memorial of Israel.
- 6 Ye were sold to the nations,  
*But* not for destruction:  
 Because ye moved God to wrath,  
 Ye were delivered unto your adversaries.
- 7 For ye provoked him that made you  
 By sacrificing unto demons, and not to God.

36. For 'knowledge' S has 'wisdom', probably in accordance with the original. Comp., however, verses 27 and 32 above. The passage reflects Jewish particularism, and is evidently based on Sir. xxiv, 8 foll. Cf. Prov. viii, 31.

37 has long been suspected as a Christian gloss (Grotius, Hitzig, Hilgenfeld, Kneucker, Kodlstein). Grotius and Latin Fathers cite it in the interests of the Logos doctrine. See *Intro.*, § 10. In S the subject is masc., i.e. God: 'revealed himself and was seen.' So L and Ar. In G the subject is probably God as in verse 36, but it might be wisdom (knowledge); cf. Prov. viii, 31.

IV. 1 is evidently connected with iv. 36 (rather than 37). The wisdom which God has bestowed on Jacob is identified with the Torah, which is eternal. S 'book and memorial of the commandments . . . to all who hold it fast it shall be (for) life'. The addition 'and memorial' is evidently an extension of the original.

2. The expression is varied in S:

Turn and incline, O Jacob;  
 Lay hold and go in its path (cf. Prov. iii, 18, iv, 13)  
 Toward the brightness of its light (cf. Isa. lx, 3).

3. For 'glory', S 'praise and honour', and for 'profitable' (*συνεφερον* G), S 'good and advantageous', which are evidently paraphrastic expansions. 'Glorious' exists in Hebr. original *הדר* (Dan. vi, 21).

4. S 'Happy are we, happy art thou . . . What is pleasing to God we know.' This last clause conforms to the Hebrew idiom, which would here be *הַשׁוֹב לְאֵלֹהִים יִרְעָנָה* (cf. Deut. xxiii, 17).

SONGS OF LAMENTATION AND COMFORT ADDRESSED (a) BY JERUSALEM TO HER EXILED CHILDREN, AND (b) OF CONSOLATION ADDRESSED BY GOD TO JERUSALEM, iv. 5-v. 9 (document C). (Verses 5 to 9*a* should be regarded as introductory.)

(a) *Lamentation and comfort addressed by Jerusalem to her banished sons* (iv. 9*b*-29). The situation is that of the Jews in exile (verses 8, 10), just as in chap. i, and the language is obviously moulded on that of the Deutero-Isaiah, but, unlike the Deutero-Isaiah, the language of lamentation is more prominent, and the situation is painted in darker colours. In verses 7 foll. confession is made of past transgression (as in i. 17-30, 12) for which the present calamities are the penalty (iv. 6). In iv. 17-29 the exiles are exhorted to cry to God and deliverance from their enemies will come. Though the present be painful it shall speedily end, and better days shall come (21-24); destruction shall befall their foes (25 foll.), and for the exiles joy in place of the evils of the past.

5. S renders here, as in verses 27, 30, 'be comforted', which is evidently a Deutero-Isaianic trait (cf. Isa. xl, 1, liv, 11). Also for 'my people', S 'people of God'. 'Memorial' ('remembrance' = Hebr. *זִכְרוֹן*) is the equivalent of 'name', to which it frequently stands in parallelism (Exod. iii, 15; Job xviii, 17; Prov. x, 7). Cf. Deut. xxv, 19 and LXX (Kneucker). The word 'memorial', therefore, means those who preserve Israel's name (Grotius, Fritzsche).

6. S 'your adversaries' (as R. V.), giving greater definiteness than G (*τῶν ἐναντιῶν*). For 'ye moved God to wrath' (G<sup>2</sup> S L Ar.) G<sup>1</sup> has 'we', by obvious textual error.

7 contains an evident reminiscence of Deut. xxxii, 16, 17. S appends to 'him that made you' the appositional

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 4. 8-17

- 8 Ye forgot the everlasting God, that brought you up;  
Ye grieved also Jerusalem, that nursed you.
- 9 For she saw the wrath that is come upon you from God,  
And said,  
Hearken, ye *women* that dwell about Sion:  
For God hath brought upon me great mourning;
- 10 For I have seen the captivity of my sons and daughters,  
Which the Everlasting hath brought upon them.
- 11 For with joy did I nourish them;  
But sent them away with weeping and mourning.
- 12 Let no man rejoice over me,  
A widow, and forsaken of many:  
For the sins of my children am I left desolate;  
Because they turned aside from the law of God,  
13 And had no regard to his statutes,  
Neither walked they in the ways of God's commandments,  
Nor trod in the paths of discipline in his righteousness.
- 14 Let them that dwell about Sion come,  
And remember ye the captivity of my sons and daughters,  
Which the Everlasting hath brought upon them.
- 15 For he hath brought a nation upon them from far,  
A shameless nation, and of a strange language,  
Who neither revered old man,  
Nor pitied child.
- 16 And they have carried away the dear beloved sons of the widow,  
And left her that was alone desolate of her daughters.
- 17 But I, what can I help you?

phrase 'the everlasting God', an evident expansion, since it recurs in the following verse. This appellation 'everlasting' attached to God (*aiōnios*) is a Deutero-Isaianic trait (Isa. xl. 28 G אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם) which is a special characteristic of the document C (iv. 10, 14, 20, 22, 24, 35, v. 2). Gifford indeed remarks that *aiōnios* seems to take the place of *κύριος* (יהוה).

8. An equally evident reminiscence of Deut. xxxii. 18 b. S applies the term 'nurse' in both clauses, i. e. to both God and Jerusalem. 'God, that *nursed* you . . . Jerusalem, that *reared* you' would be a closer rendering of the Greek. G<sup>3</sup>, again, in the first clause substitutes 'us' for 'you' (as in verse 6), i. e. *ἡμῶν* for *ὑμῶν*, against G<sup>2</sup> S L Ar.

9. S characteristically prefixes 'Lord' to 'God' in both places, and introduces the parallelism 'the wrath which has come upon you and the anger from the presence of the Lord God'; to 'great' it adds 'eternal' as epithet of 'mourning'. In 9 b ('Hearken ye . . .') begins Jerusalem's lamentation over the exile of her sons (9 b-16).

10. S 'everlasting Lord' and 'upon me' (not 'them'). The latter is probably due to a harmonizing tendency.

11-12. S + 'and groaning (sighs)'. Also 'rejoice in my widowhood who am abandoned and desolated of much people'. The language and ideas are cast in the Deutero-Isaianic mould (Isa. xlix. 21, liv. 1, 4). S also appends an extra parallel clause with variation in phraseology:

'Because of the sins of my sons,  
because they turned aside from the path of the Lord God.'

13. S 'statutes and judgements', the familiar combination in Deut. (Deut. iv. 1, &c.) The rest of the verse in S runs: 'Nor did they walk in the way of God's statutes, nor did they tread or betake themselves to the paths of true instruction (lit. instruction of truth) in righteousness.' Here 'instruction' (discipline) and 'betake themselves' are expansions. 'Truth', however, rests on a more secure textual foundation, being found in G<sup>2</sup> S<sup>1</sup> L (+ ἀληθείας) L (om. *disciplinae*). And it has O. T. warrant. Cf. 1 Kings iii. 6.

14. We have here a change from 3rd to 2nd person. This, however, should probably be consistently carried out through the entire verse, as in S (so Kneucker). S om. 'come', and has in its place the pers. pron. 'ye' ('ye inhabitants of Zion, remember'), but this is probably due to inner-Syriac corruption of *ἔσθε* 'come ye' to *ἔστε* 'ye'.

15. Evidently echoes Deut. xxviii. 49, 50.

16. S. 'And they took captive and carried away the beloved (sons) of the widow and her daughters.' The 'daughters' are inserted in this clause perhaps owing to the influence of verse 14 above. S omits 'daughters', however, in the latter part of the verse: 'And her alone and solitary left they desolate.'

17 foll. After the lamentation there now begins a message of comfort. Jerusalem can afford no help, but God can. The question here, as frequently in O. T., implies a negation; and this S directly expresses.



THE BOOK OF BARUCH 4. 18-28

- 18 For he that brought these plagues upon you  
Will deliver you from the hand of your enemies.
- 19 Go your way, O my children, go your way :  
For I am left desolate.
- 20 I have put off the garment of peace,  
And put upon me the sackcloth of my petition :  
I will cry unto the Everlasting as long as I live.
- 21 Be of good cheer, O my children, cry unto God,  
And he shall deliver you from the power and hand of the enemies.
- 22 For I have trusted in the Everlasting, that he will save you ;  
And joy is come unto me from the Holy One,  
Because of the mercy which shall soon come unto you  
From the Everlasting your Saviour.
- 23 For I sent you out with mourning and weeping :  
But God will give you to me again with joy and gladness for ever.
- 24 For like as now they that dwell about Sion have seen your captivity :  
So shall they see shortly your salvation from our God,  
Which shall come upon you with great glory, and brightness of the Everlasting.
- 25 My children, suffer patiently the wrath that is come upon you from God :  
For thine enemy hath persecuted thee ;  
  
But shortly thou shalt see his destruction,  
And shalt tread upon their necks.
- 26 My delicate ones have gone rough ways ;  
They were taken away as a flock carried off by the enemies.
- 27 Be of good cheer, O my children, and cry unto God :  
For ye shall be remembered of him that hath brought *these things* upon you.
- 28 For as it was your mind to go astray from God :  
So, return and seek him ten times more.

18. G<sup>a</sup> + *ip̄is* after *ēnagayōn*, G<sup>a</sup> after *tā kōkōi*.

19. 'My' before children om. G L, and inserted in S Ar.

20. Jerusalem clothed in sackcloth of sorrow and supplication, the reverse of the picture in Isa. lii, 1, lxi, 3 (cf. I Bar. v, 1 below). S takes over *σπαδίης* of G. S 'I will cry unto thee that livest for ever in my days', G 'unto the Everlasting in my days' (= 'in my life-time', i. e. 'as long as I live').

21. **Be of good cheer.** S reproduces the form of Isa. li, 17, cf. lii, 1, 'awake'. G<sup>a</sup> 'power and hand', also Ar. Vet. Lat. *a, b de manu principum inimicorum* appears to presume a reading *ἐκ χειρὸς δυναστῶν ἐχθρῶν* (Kneucker). G<sup>a</sup> om. 'power', prob. due to paraphrastic expansion. S carries expansion further: 'from the hands of the mighty and from the hands of rulers and from the hands of adversaries.'

22. S for 'Holy One' has 'Lord God Everlasting', after which it renders 'because he hath at once taken compassion on them on account of the compassion of God your everlasting Saviour'. G<sup>a</sup> om. 'because of the mercy' (compassion). There can be little doubt that extensions have crept into the text.

23. S 'God' + 'from whom I received you' (obvious expansion).

24. S prefixes 'Lord' to 'our God', and continues: 'and he shall bring you with great joy.' Also 'everlasting Lord'. It may be noted, however, that this appellation of deity, *κύριος* (קַיִי), while frequent and indeed characteristic of the document A, is in reality foreign to C (see Introd., § 11, and note on iv, 7). It is evidently introduced by S, which has a tendency to combine 'Lord' with other designations of deity. Comp. S, verses 27 *for*, 28, 36, 8, 1, 2.

25. S 'My sons, be patient and endure the wrath' (+ 'Lord'). 'Thine enemy' G<sup>a</sup> S L Ar. G<sup>a</sup> om. 'thine'.

26. S expands: 'have gone into captivity and have travelled on hard rough ways', apparently an attempt to represent Isa. xl, 4 (including קָשָׁי and קָשָׁיִם). S continues: 'They have been scattered on difficult ways, they have been scattered like a flock that is carried off by enemies.' 'Scattered as a flock' is a combination which meets us in Ezek. xxxiv, 4, 5, 12; Zech. xiii, 7 (cf. Mark xiv, 27), &c.

27. Cf. verse 5. S 'for there shall be for you *with the Lord* remembrance from him that brought *these* [evils] upon you'. G om. obj. to 'brought'.

28-29. The phraseology is singularly unpoetic and non-Hebraic. See Introd., § 6 (1).

(b) *Message of comfort addressed by a prophet in God's name* (iv, 34) to Jerusalem (iv, 30-v, 9). Obviously a pendant to the address to the exiles by Jerusalem (iv, 5-29) which precedes. The enemies of Jerusalem shall receive divine chastisement (iv, 31-35). In this we see the influence of Jer. li. Help shall come from the east (iv, 36, v, 5), i. e. her exiled sons in Babylonia and the Euphrates lands. The language and ideas of the Deutero-Isaiah resound in chap. v (esp. verses 5 and 7).

THE BOOK OF BARUCH 4. 29—5. 4

- 29 For he that brought these plagues upon you  
Shall bring you everlasting joy again with your salvation.
- 30 Be of good cheer, O Jerusalem:  
For he that called thee by name will comfort thee.
- 31 Miserable are they that afflicted thee,  
And rejoiced at thy fall.
- 32 Miserable are the cities which thy children served:  
Miserable is she that received thy sons.
- 33 For as she rejoiced at thy fall,  
And was glad of thy ruin:  
So shall she be grieved for her own desolation.
- 34 And I will take away her exultation in her great multitude,  
And her boasting shall be turned into mourning.
- 35 For fire shall come upon her from the Everlasting, long to endure;  
And she shall be inhabited of devils for a great time.
- 36 O Jerusalem, look about thee toward the east,  
And behold the joy that cometh unto thee from God.
- 37 Lo, thy sons come, whom thou sentest away,  
They come gathered together from the east to the west [at the word of the Holy One],  
Rejoicing in the glory of God.
- 5 1 Put off, O Jerusalem, the garment of thy mourning and affliction,  
And put on the comeliness of the glory that *cometh* from God for ever.
- 2 Cast about thee the robe of the righteousness which *cometh* from God;  
Set a diadem on thine head of the glory of the Everlasting.
- 3 For God will show thy brightness unto every *region* under heaven.
- 4 For thy name shall be called of God for ever  
The peace of righteousness, and the glory of godliness.

30. **Be of good cheer** recurs here, as previously, iv. 5, 21, 27. **called thee by name** is naturally expressed in S analogously to Dan. i. 7 (cf. Phil. ii. 9).

31-32. **Miserable** is not an adequate rendering of *δειλῶσι*. (Shall be) 'alarmed' or 'affrighted' (S) is nearer the true meaning. Versions render variously. S expands the clauses of the verse: 'The cities shall be in dread that treated thee ill and rejoiced in thy downfall. The cities shall be in terror that enslaved thy sons. Thou shalt rejoice in their downfall. They shall be in dread who treated thee ill. She shall be in dread who received thy sons.' S seems to luxuriate in repetition of the phrase.

33. S om. second clause of parallelism *in protasi*, but amplifies the *apodosis*: 'So shall she be grieved and vexed.' The city (sing.) which is vaguely referred to in verses 32-5 is evidently Babylon (= Rome).

34. A strange confusion has arisen in G<sup>a</sup>, which reads *ἄγαλμα*, 'statue', 'idol', for *ἀγαλλίαμα*, 'exultation' (G<sup>b</sup>). This is reflected in the conflate reading of S, 'I will take away from her the idols and the exultation of great assemblies, and the joy shall become mourning.'

35. The conception is evidently derived from Jer. li. 58. Kneucker thinks that we have here a reference to the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79, which would of course furnish a *term. a quo* as regards date of document C (Introd., pp. 51 foll.), but the expression in the text is far too general in character.

The demons who are to inhabit the desolated city are a feature borrowed from Isa. xiii. 21, 22; Jer. li. 37.

36. The opening clause reflects Isa. xlix. 18, lx. 4.

V. 1. Again, as in iv. 20, S reproduces *σποδῆς* of G. **affliction**, S+ 'and suffering', 'and array thyself in the splendour which is from the Lord God unto glory everlasting'. Both conceptions and language resemble Isa. lii. 1.

2. *δὲπλοις*, 'robe', should rather be rendered by 'tunic', viz. the Hebr. *לְבָשֶׁת* of Isa. lxi. 10, of which this passage is evidently an echo. G there renders by *χιτών*, but *δὲπλοῖς* is the rendering in other passages where the same Hebrew word occurs, 1 Sam. ii. 19, xv. 27, xxiv. 12 (11 Hebr.); Ps. cviii. 28 (cix. 29 Hebr.).

This Baruch passage is the reverse of Ps. of Sol. ii. 21, 22, where the *μίτρα* or 'diadem' (Heb. *קִנֶּטֶס*) is put off. We have already seen (Introd., § 6) how close is the parallel between 1 Bar. iv. 37-v. 8 and Ps. of Sol. xi. 3-7. Here it may be noted that in S the military 'helmet' (*Sānūrīd*) takes the place of the 'diadem' as the woman's head-dress. See Introd., § 9, ii (Syr. Versions) *ad fin.*

3. S 'unto every man upon all the earth'.

4. *θεοσιβίην*, 'godliness', is the equivalent of the Hebr. 'fear of the Lord' (so S) as in Job xxviii. 28; comp. Gen. xx. 11. L. *pietas*.



THE BOOK OF BARUCH 5. 5-9

- 5 Arise, O Jerusalem, and stand upon the height,  
And look about thee toward the east,  
And behold thy children gathered from the going down of the sun unto the rising thereof [at the  
word of the Holy One],  
Rejoicing that God hath remembered them.
- 6 For they went from thee on foot,  
Being led away of their enemies:  
But God bringeth them in unto thee  
Borne on high with glory, as *on* a royal throne.
- 7 For God hath appointed that every high mountain, and the everlasting hills, should be made low,  
And the valleys filled up, to make plain the ground,  
That Israel may go safely in the glory of God.
- 8 Moreover the woods and every sweet-smelling tree have overshadowed Israel [by the comman-  
ment of God].
- 9 For God shall lead Israel with joy in the light of his glory  
With the mercy and righteousness that cometh from him.

5. Evidently reflects the Isaianic passages, Isa. li. 17 and lx. 4, and these either affect the version in S (e. g. 'awake' repeated, a Deutero-Isaianic trait) or S reflects the existence of a variant G in closer adhesion to the Isaianic model. Similarly 'gathered'; S + 'and coming to thee'; cf. Isa. lx. 4. Note in S the military feature 'by the tents' in place of 'upon the height' (G), though possibly this might arise by corruption; see Kneucker, p. 133.

6. G<sup>a</sup> *ὡς θρόνον*, 'as (on) a royal throne', lit. 'throne of the kingdom', has occasioned some difficulty. This seems to have been early felt, for in G<sup>a</sup> L and Ar. we have 'children of the kingdom', i. e. royal sons. The passage is obviously based on the Isaianic passages, Isa. xlix. 22, lx. 4, 9, and lxvi. 20, descriptive of the restoration of Jewish exiles. Are we to interpret *ὡς θρόνον* as meaning that the children are to be carried in state as a royal throne (a palanquin or sedan chair (Isa. lxvi. 20)), or, as seems more natural and as S ('carried aloft in glory on a royal throne') warrants us in supposing, should we interpret *ὡς θρόνον* as equivalent to 'as on a throne'? This has the appearance of, and probably is, a Hebraism =  $\text{נֹסֵבִים}$ , the well-known pregnant use of  $\text{נֹסֵב}$ , GA, § 118. 6. It would be perilous to base upon such a slender sporadic example any argument for a Hebraic original of the document C in face of the evidence already set forth (Introd., §§ 6, 9, ii). Let us remember that this document came from a patriotic Hellenic Jew familiar with his O. T., both in Greek and Hebrew. Examples of the pregnant use of  $\text{נֹסֵב}$  he would find reflected in his Greek Scriptures, 1 Kings viii. 24; Hos. ii. 5, 17, ix. 9, xii. 10. Before deciding upon a Hebr. original we must give due play to the considerations that should weigh with us as to the effect produced upon the Greek diction of Jews familiar with the Hebr. Scriptures as well as with 'the LXX, the constant reading of which by Hellenist Jews has unconsciously affected their Greek'. See Moulton, *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, vol. 1, p. 13<sup>1</sup>. Cf. also above, i. 15, ii. 26.

7. Evidently based in idea and phraseology on Isa. xl. 4. S om. 'and the everlasting hills (mounts)' of G and after 'made low' + 'and rough places shall become smooth and level', in closer approximation to the Isaianic original: comp. iv. 26 above.

8. S 'all trees of the wood'.

9. S 'For the God of Israel shall go before you', in closer adherence to Isa. lii. 12, lviii. 8; Exod. xiii. 21. For 'Him' (of G<sup>a</sup> L) G<sup>a</sup> S Ar. read 'God'.

<sup>1</sup> See the note by General Editor in Introd., § 6, and that in the Ps. of Sol. (vol. ii), § 5.