

A text-critical study of the *Nova Vulgata* of Sirach 41. Part 2: Text-critical evaluation*

John Francis ELWOLDE

Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya

Rebut: 03.02.2015 — Acceptat: 30.06.2016

Abstract. This part of the study (Part 2) examines and summarizes the detailed analyses of verses from Sirach 41–42 presented in Part 1 in order to show in practice (1) which version of the Vulgate the *Nova Vulgata* bases itself upon; (2) to what degree the *Nova Vulgata* adjusts the Vulgate to the LXX; (3) where the Hebrew sources differ significantly from the LXX, to what degree the *Nova Vulgata* adjusts the Vulgate to the Hebrew; and (4) to what extent the results of (2) and (3) coincide with the *Nova Vulgata's* remit for Sirach as specified by introductory remarks in the *Nova Vulgata* itself and in early articles on this issue. Finally, (5) some remarks are offered on the possible reasons for the *Nova Vulgata's* inconsistency in relation to the preceding matters and on ways in which such inconsistency might be rectified in a future revision.

Keywords: Sirach, Ecclesiasticus, Masada, Peshitta, Vulgate, Vetus Latina, *Nova Vulgata*

Correspondence: J. F. Elwolde, Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya. Carrer de la Diputació, 231. E-08007 Barcelona. EU. E-mail: jfelwolde@gmail.com.

* 'Part 1: Comparison with the source texts' was published in *Tamid* 12 (2016–2017), p. 7–63. Acknowledgement of help given by others is provided there.

Un estudi de crítica textual de la *Nova Vulgata* de Siràcida 41.

Part 2: Avaluació criticotextual

Resum. Aquesta part de l'estudi («part 2») examina i resumeix l'anàlisi detallada dels versets de Siràcida 41-42 presentada en la «part 1» per tal de mostrar a la pràctica: 1) en quina versió de la Vulgata es basa la *Nova Vulgata*; 2) fins a quin punt la *Nova Vulgata* ajusta la Vulgata a la versió dels LXX; 3) quan les fonts hebrees difereixen significativament dels LXX, fins a quin punt la *Nova Vulgata* ajusta la Vulgata a l'hebreu; 4) en quina mesura els resultats de 2 i 3 coincideixen amb la comesa respecte al Siràcida tal com s'especifica en les observacions introductòries de la mateixa *Nova Vulgata* i en els primers articles sobre aquesta matèria. Finalment, 5) s'ofereixen algunes observacions amb relació a les qüestions precedents i les maneres com aquesta inconsistència podria ser rectificada en una futura revisió.

Paraules clau: Siràcida, Eclesiàstic, Masada, Peixitta, Vulgata, Vetus Latina, *Nova Vulgata*

1. The stated objectives of the *Nova Vulgata*

The earliest reference to work on the *Nova Vulgata* (hereafter NV) is probably found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis – Commentarium Officiale* 58 (1966), p. 112: 'Il Santo Padre Paolo VI si è degnato di costituire una Commissione per la revisione della Volgata', a date for which is given on p. 10 of the 'Praefatio ad lectorem' of the NV itself: 'Die 29 mensis Novembris anno 1965 praedictus Summus Pontifex Paulus VI Pontificiam Commissionem pro Nova Vulgata Bibliorum editione instituit.' The same 'Praefatio' introduces the basic purpose of the NV in the words of Pope Paul VI on 23 December 1966:

Cogitatur de textu, in quo Vulgata editio Hieronymiana ad verbum exprimitur, ubi textum primigenium accurate exhibet, qualis in hodiernis editionibus, scientifica, ut aiunt, ratione confectis, continetur; prudenter vero emendabitur, ubi ab eo deflectit vel eum minus recte interpretatur, adhibita lingua Latinitatis biblicae christianae, ita ut respectus traditionis temperetur cum postulatis criticis aetatis nostrae. In Liturgiam ergo Latinam textus inducetur unicus, qui, ad scientiam quod attinet, impugnari non possit quique traditioni, disciplinae hermeneuticae ac sermoni christiano sit consen-

taneus. Qui textus erit etiam huiusmodi ut ad eum versiones vulgares referantur.¹

The ‘Praefatio’ also outlines nine ‘normae [...] generales, quas Commissio quoad versionem et linguam observabat’. The first two are of particular relevance to the relationship of the NV to forms of the text that preceded the Vulgate:

1. Religiose servanda est littera Vulgatae versionis s. Hieronymi quoties haec sensum textus primigenii fideliter reddit et facile intellegitur, nec ansam praebet ad eum minus recte intellegendum vel perperam interpretandum.

2. Si quando tamen vel in commentariis s. Hieronymi, ut non raro accidit, vel apud ss. Patres, vel in Vetere Latina versione textus primigenius verbis magis accommodatis et claris redditur quam in Vulgata editione, tunc hi modi eligendi esse videntur.²

The following statement by Tarsicio Stramare, assistant secretary to the Pontifical Commission for the Neo-Vulgate, is consistent with the first of these general norms:

Il testo fu emendato solo se richiesto da motivi di critica testuale e di filologia, ma sempre in modo da conservare nelle nuove locuzioni il colore e lo stile della

1. *Nova Vulgata*, ‘Praefatio ad lectorem’, p. 10. The original Italian is reported in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium Officiale*, 59 (1967):

Si pensa ad un testo, in cui quello della Volgata di S. Gerolamo sarà rispettato alla lettera, là dove esso riproduce fedelmente il testo originale, quale risulta dalle presenti edizioni scientifiche; sarà prudentemente corretto là dove se ne scosta, o non l’interpreta rettamente, adoperando allo scopo la lingua della “latinitas biblica” cristiana; in modo che siano temperati il rispetto per la tradizione e le sane esigenze critiche del nostro tempo.

La liturgia latina avrà così un testo unitario, scientificamente ineccepibile, coerente alla tradizione, all’ermeneutica e al linguaggio cristiano; esso servirà anche da punto di riferimento per le versioni nelle lingue volgari. (p. 53–54)

2. *Nova Vulgata*, ‘Praefatio ad lectorem’, p. 11:

1. The letter of St. Jerome’s Vulgate is to be strictly observed wherever it renders the sense of the original text faithfully and is easy to understand and does not give rise to less correct understanding or faulty interpretation.

2. Whenever, though, the original text is rendered by clearer and more fitting words in the commentaries of St. Jerome, as is not infrequently the case, or in the Church Fathers or in the Vetus Latina version, than it is in the Vulgate, then these forms of expression are to be considered among the choices available.

Volgata; no fu sostituita una traduzione verbale là dove le parole della Volgata davano fedelmente il senso.³

2. The textual character of Sirach

Although in the light of the preceding comments the NV can hardly be said to contribute to the textual criticism of the source texts (in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek) – but represents, rather, a revision of the Clementina *on the basis of* established modern textual criticism and interpretation of the source texts – for the deuterocanonical books in particular, special value is attached to its provision, in principle, of (a) faithful reproduction of the earliest extant forms of text and (b) scholarly reconstruction of yet earlier forms of text upon which those extant forms are based:

comme [saint Jérôme] n'avait pas mis la main à certains des livres deutéro-canoniques de l'A.T., la Néo-Vulgate a réalisé ici une oeuvre particulièrement importante, et cela en se basant sur les meilleures éditions critiques de ces livres.⁴

As Sirach falls into the category of books not revised by Jerome,⁵ the Vulgate version represents in principle an earlier stage of the Latin text, prior to Jerome:

Libros qui Sapientia Salomonis et Sapientia Hiesu filii Sirach inscribuntur, in Iudaeorum canone non receptos, emendare non curavit s. Hieronymus; quos in traditione Vulgatae versionis interposuit ille qui, saeculo quinto vel sexto, Hieronymi sacram bibliothecam supplevit.⁶

3. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 124–125. For the NV's retention of the Clementina's Latin wherever this does not significantly distort the sense of the original texts, see also DESCAMPS, 'Nouvelle Vulgate', p. 602a, and STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 133 = STRAMARE, 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448.

4. DESCAMPS, 'Nouvelle Vulgate', p. 602a.

5. Cf. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 129 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 445: 'Il testo latino presente nella Volgata non è di S. Girolamo, il quale, pur avendone visto un esemplare in ebraico, non considerava l'Ecclesiastico come canonico e conseguentemente né lo tradusse né ne curò la revisione.' Of the deuterocanonical books only Tobit and Judith were revised by Jerome; see GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 71–72.

6. *Biblia Sacra*, p. ix–x: 'The books that are entitled Wisdom of Solomon and Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, which were not received into the Jewish canon, St. Jerome did not care to revise; those that traditionally are of the Vulgate version were inserted by someone who in

In its turn, this pre-Hieronymian version of Sirach, represented by *Vetus Latina* mss., underwent significant changes over the centuries before its incorporation into the Vulgate:

Ita fit ut textus vulgatus ab antiquissima et pura latina translatione, saeculo forte iam secundo orta, non parum differat lectionesque recentiores saepius ad omnium codicum fidem exhibeat. Textus enim latinus primigenius (... *K*...), lingua archaica nec semper perspicua translatus,⁷ inter saeculum secundum et quintum diversimode immutatus est, vel librariorum negligentia, vel etiam illorum industria sive ad emendandam latinitatem sive ad codices graecos pressius adsequendos [...] Textus primigenius (*K*), deficientibus testibus, in integrum restitui nequit.⁸

Analysis of forms of text prior to the Vulgate, notably the Greek text – which in its shorter version in principle represents the grandson's translation of Ben Sira's original work in Hebrew⁹ – has to take account of a mixture of

the fifth or sixth century [see also THIELE, *Sirach*, p. 130] added to Jerome's collection of sacred books.' The primary manuscript for the edition of Sirach in *Biblia Sacra* and, to a more limited extent, in Weber's edition is *G* (Codex Sangermanensis, Paris, ninth century); see THIELE, *Sirach*, p. 125–130. The editor of Sirach in *Biblia Sacra* is not stated in the volume itself but is known to have been D. de Bruyne; see THIELE, *Sirach*, p. 103; GILBERT, 'Vetus Latina', p. 2.

7. Cf. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 129 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 445: 'un linguaggio talvolta oscuro e duro'.

8. *Biblia Sacra*, p. x: 'Accordingly, the text of the Vulgate differs not a little from the ancient pure Latin translation that perhaps emerged as early as the second century and more often faithfully displays the more recent readings of all the codices. For the original Latin text (... *K*...), representing an archaic and not always perspicuously translated form of language, suffered various changes between the second century and the fifth, through the negligence of copyists but also through their industry, whether in emendation of the Latin or in a closer adherence to the Greek codices. The original text (*K*), because of lack of witnesses, cannot be fully restored.'

Cf. SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Prolegomena', p. cxx–cxxi: 'Der Text des lateinischen Sirach ist in den Handschriften durch zahllose Schreibfehler und viele willkürliche Aenderungen entstellt, und die Zitate der Väter tragen zur Verbesserung des Textes nicht viel aus. [...] Zumeist [...] wird der Text durch Emendation geheilt werden müssen. [...] Die[se] Emendation ist namentlich dadurch erschwert, dass die ursprüngliche Uebersetzung durch fortgehende Korrektur nach dem Griechen und zwar nach verschiedenen griechischen Texten entstellt ist. Dies Korrektur ist nämlich, wenigstens der Hauptsache nach, älter als alle Textzeugen.'

9. The textual situation of the Greek is well summarized by Wright in the preface to his NETS translation of Sirach, p. 716: 'In the process of the textual transmission of the Greek, a number of proverbs were added to the book, and this recension is usually designated GKII.

ancient and mediaeval Hebrew witnesses, of the Syriac – which represents a rendering of the Hebrew that is independent of the Greek translation¹⁰ – and of Vetus Latina mss., through which different forms and interpretations of the Greek text are refracted:¹¹

For the most part, the NRSV puts readings from this Greek recension in footnotes leaving in the main text only GKI (= OG), that is, the translation of the author's grandson, who rendered the Hebrew text into Greek.'

Cf. ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 73: 'Die von der Zeugen der *O[rigeneischen] L[ukianischen]* Rezension überlieferten Varianten, namentlich die zahlreichen Zusätze, haben die Textkritiker schon lange beschäftigt; sie sehen hier die Reste einer zweiten griechischen Übersetzung des Sirach (GrII)'; *ibid.*, p. 113: 'GrI bedeutet die griech. Übersetzung des Enkels [...] GrII bedeutet die zweite (spätere) Übersetzung.'

Ziegler gives the Gr II additions in smaller type; *Biblia Sacra*, which provides the LXX verse reference in brackets when it differs from the Vulgate verse reference, includes any Gr II addition reflected in the Vulgate, with '(0)' as the LXX verse number each time. No instances are found, however, in the sequence of text examined in the main part of this study, and in fact Smend's presentation of Gr II, 'Kap. IV. Ueber eine zweite griechische Uebersetzung', in *Weisheit*, 'Prolegomena', p. xci–cxviii (cxiii), indicates no Gr II addition from any of the sources he cites (including the Vulgate) between 31:22 and 46:15. However, the list is not exhaustive (see, *ibid.*, p. xcvi: 'Ich füge dabei aber auch einige Zusätze des Lateiners'). 41:9*a* is the last italicized sequence in NETS before the section examined in this study and 42:15*d* the first italicized sequence after it. 41:9*a*, '[For if you multiply, it is for destruction]' (NETS), is, broadly, supported by Hebrew Ms. B and the Masada Ms. and the Peshitta, and is found, according to Ziegler, *Sapientia*, p. 318, in Londiniensis and Antonius Melissa (see also SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Kommentar', p. 383, 'Vorrede', p. x: 'Co. 248 (70)' ['70 = Cod. Monac. Gr. 551 (olim Augustanus), nach eigener Collation']); it is not included in Rahlfs's edition of the LXX or in the Clementina or in Weber's edition, *Biblia Sacra*, p. 326, or the NV; similar comments apply to 42:15*d*, '[and judgment happens by his good will.]' (NETS), found as an addition in Sinaiticus, in two minuscules, Sahidic, Armenian, the Peshitta, and Hebrew (Masada Ms. and Ms. B) (see ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 323; SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Kommentar', p. 395), but absent from Vulgate editions other than the NV, which does include the line: *et factum est in voluntate sua iudicium*. In other words, the NV has adjusted to Ziegler's edition of the LXX for the second Gr II addition (albeit without any indication that it is an addition), but not for the first one.

10. See, e.g., ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 31: 'Die altsyrische Übersetzung (Peschitta) [...] geht nicht auf *G*, sondern auf *H* zurück'; *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praenotanda', p. 18: 'Syriaca (*Syr*), quae translatio est e textu Hebraico ac, praeter Veterem Latinam, maiore auctoritate gaudet quam ceterae antiquae versiones.'

11. Cf. SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Prolegomena', p. cxv: 'Für die Emendationen des entarteten griechischen Textes sind die Afterübersetzungen von grossen Wert; in sehr vielen Fällen haben sie die ursprüngliche griechische Lesart bewahrt. Aber die Freiheit, mit der die Uebersetzer sich bewegten, lässt ihre griechische Vorlage nicht überall deutlich erkennen, und soweit

Sapientiae [...] Salomonis textus tum graeci tum latini sat plana proditu historia; etsi libri graecitatem obscuram interdum vix intellexit interpres, huius versionem (*K*) textus vulgatus fideliter retinuit, paucis mendis exceptis. Sapientia autem filii Sirach insolitas vicissitudines passa est. Periiit nempe forma primigenia textus hebraici, quem graece vertit sub Ptolomaeo Euergete nepos auctoris (*G*). Fragmenta hebraica nuper reperta (*H*) recensionem longiorem tradunt ad mentem Iudaismi posterioris retractatam; ab eiusdem generis recensione pendet et versio syriaca (*S*). Sed et ipsa versio graeca primigenia posterius instar textus hebraici longioris retractata est; a qua recensione retractata, quam citant Clemens Alexandrinus et pauci alli, quae etiam quodam modo traditur a codicibus graecis familiarum sive Luciani (*G^L*) sive Origenis (*G^O*), versio latina primigenia (*K*) originem trahit. Multo autem ante recensionem Vulgatae, codicibus uncialibus graecis ad puriorem textum alexandrinum (*G*) recognitis, ipsa traditio latina a *G* turbata est. Lectiones ergo latinae quae cum *H*, *S*, Clemente Alexandrino, *G^O*, *G^B* vel Cypriano conveniunt, interpreti antiquissimo (*K*) attribui possunt; illae autem quae his opponuntur, textum uncialium graecorum redolentes, suspicionem iniciunt se pertinere non ad *K*, sed tantum ad Vulgatam, vel etiam Vulgatae posteriores esse et in apparatu reiciendas.¹²

sie erkennbar ist, spiegeln die Afterübersetzungen zugleich eine noch stärkere Entartung des griechischen Textes wider, als sie in den griechischen Handschriften vorliegt. Beides gilt in besonderem Masse von der ältesten und wichtigsten Afterübersetzung, der Vetus Latina, die überdies selbst in völlig verwildertem Text auf uns gekommen ist.⁷

ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 23–24, emphasizes the importance of the *Biblia Sacra* edition, the ongoing work of the Vetus Latina Institute at Beuren, and his own edition of the LXX, all three works having a complementary relationship with the textual criticism of Sirach. The Vetus Latina Institute fascicle corresponding to Sir. 25:1–28:24, prepared by Anthony J. Forte, was published in 2014; nine fascicles covering the Prologue to chapter 24 (and introductions), prepared by Walter Thiele, were published between 1987 and 2005.

12. *Biblia Sacra*, p. xi: ‘The history of the text of the Wisdom [...] of Solomon, first Greek then Latin, is quite straightforward to produce; although the translator could at times barely understand the book’s obscure Greek the text of the Vulgate has faithfully conserved a version of it (*K*), with the exception of a few mistakes. The Wisdom of the son of Sirach has, however, undergone some unusual vicissitudes. The original form of the Hebrew text, which the author’s grandson rendered into Greek (*G*) under Ptolemy Euergetes, has perished. Recently discovered Hebrew fragments (*H*) transmit a longer recension elaborated according to the thinking of a later form of Judaism; the Syriac version (*S*) also depends on a recension of the same kind. Moreover, the original Greek version itself was reworked in the manner of the longer Hebrew text. To this reworked recension, which Clement of Alexandria and some others quote and which is also to some extent transmitted by Greek codices of the Lucianic (*G^L*) and Origenistic (*G^O*) families, the earliest Latin version traces its origins. However, long before the Vulgate recension this Latin tradition was disrupted by *G* via recognized Greek

In short, the history of the Latin text underlying the Vulgate of Sirach is effectively intertwined with the history of the Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac versions:

Il testo dell'antica versione latina, a parte qualche revisione sporadica su testimoni greci, non fu radicalmente ritoccato, ma contiene tuttavia numerose aggiunte "che hanno i caratteri di una vera recensione, con la stessa ispirazione della recensione lunga di cui testimonia il Gr II. [...]"¹³ Il testo latino primitivo non solo è appoggiato dal greco 'luciano',¹⁴ ma anche dalle antiche citazioni patristiche greche, come pure spesso dall'ebraico e dal siriano [...] [e] rispecchia inoltre un testo greco [...] ora perduto [...] "Alle Tochterübersetzungen des griech. Sir. sind wichtig und nützlich, aber nur die lateinische Übersetzung (La) ist grundlegend"; "Von den Übersetzungen schließt sich oftmals die Vetus Latina (La) an, deren textkritischer Wert nicht hoch genug geschätzt werden kann". Il testo latino non va, dunque, visto semplicemente come cattiva traduzione del greco; le sue diversità rispetto al greco o all'ebraico possono essere considerate, invece che errori, come *variae lectiones* testimonianti qualcosa dell'originale.¹⁵

3. The *Nova Vulgata* of Sirach

Against this background it is hardly surprising that Ziegler could claim that "[u]nter allen Büchern der Septuaginta gibt Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) dem Textkritiker die meisten und schwierigsten Rätsel auf";¹⁶ or that in a survey of

uncial codices that follow a purer Alexandrian text. Accordingly, Latin readings that agree with *H*, *S*, Clement of Alexandria, *G^O*, *G^B* [Vaticanus], or Cyprian may be attributed to the earliest (Latin) translator; in contrast, those that disagree with these and are redolent of the text of the Greek uncials raise the suspicion of belonging not to *K* but rather to the Vulgata, or even of being later than the Vulgate, and are to be consigned to an apparatus.'

13. See the preceding note.

14. I.e. Gr II; see above, n. 12, and ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 73–75.

15. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 129–130 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 445. The first quotation is from H. DUESBERG and I. FRANSEN, *Ecclesiastico*, Turin, Marietti, 1966, *La Sacra Bibbia*, 293, p. 9–10; the second from ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 75; and the third from ZIEGLER, *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 10, p. 564.

16. This is the opening remark of ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 5 (quoting one of Ziegler's own earlier studies). The first edition of Ziegler's work was not available to the editors of *Biblia Sacra* Sirach (*ibid.*, p. xxii).

the process whereby the NV was produced Stramare devotes all of the section on ‘*Libri sapientiales*’ to Sirach,¹⁷ noting that ‘Per quanto riguarda i Libri Sapientiali, il libro dell’*Ecclesiastico* è stato quello che ha impegnato maggiormente la Commissione’;¹⁸ or that in the ‘Praenotanda’ to the NV more space is devoted to this book¹⁹ than to any other apart from the Psalter.

Stramare outlines the problems faced by the NV’s translation commission in accepting a Latin edition based solely on the earlier form of the Greek text (Gr I)²⁰ or, alternatively, on the extant Hebrew sources, and defends the eventual acceptance of the Vulgate – which in the case of Sirach represents the *Vetus Latina* in its different ms. traditions – as the base text for the NV:

La Commissione decise [...] [i]n assenza di titoli sufficienti da parte degli ‘originali’ per attirare nella loro orbita la correzione della Neo-Vulgata, la soluzione [...] di rispettare la conditio possidentis, applicando alla edizione ufficiale sisto-clementina i principi stabiliti per la Neo-Vulgata, ovviamente adattati alla speciale situazione critica del testo [...]²¹

17. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 128–133 = ‘Libro dell’*Ecclesiastico*’, p. 444–448.

18. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 128 = ‘Libro dell’*Ecclesiastico*’, p. 444.

19. *Nova Vulgata*, ‘Praenotanda’, p. 18–19.

20. See above, n. 12, where it is indicated that the earliest form of the Latin text was based on Gr II (the longer version), with revisions later made towards Gr I (the shorter version); see also THIELE, *Sirach*, p. 101, 114; GILBERT, ‘*Vetus Latina*’, p. 9: ‘the *Vetus Latina* of *Ecclesiasticus* was done on the basis of a Greek text already enlarged[, which] was [...] closer to the Hebrew text of Ben Sira than to the classical Greek version’. ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 14, summarizing other studies, indicates that the earliest form of the *Vetus Latina* of Sirach 1–43 and 51 is to be dated to the second half of the second or first half of the third century (in Africa; see also GILBERT, ‘*Vetus Latina*’, p. 1–2), with corrections towards the established text of the LXX, based on Gr I, perhaps made in the fifth century by one or both of the translators of the ‘Prologue’ and ch. 44–50.

21. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 131–132 = ‘Libro dell’*Ecclesiastico*’, p. 447. The same issue is summarized by GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 326–327.

A similar statement is found in the *Nova Vulgata*, ‘Praenotanda’, p. 18:

‘Quibus omnibus spectatis, consequitur ut minime effici possit – nec fieri umquam poterat – quaelibet textus primigenii critica instauratio. Hoc unum igitur faciendum putavimus: Latinam (*La*) scilicet versionem suscipere quasi normam, seu quasi textum sui iuris, eamque recognoscere iuxta quidem principia pro *Nova Vulgata* decreta, absque tamen necessitate eam plane accommodandi ad formam sive textus Graeci (I vel II) sive textus Hebraici, cum discrepantiae inter *La* et *Gr* vel *H*, quae identidem occurrunt, habendae sint variae lectiones alicuius saltem auctoritatis, non vero simpliciter mendosae lectiones, quae sint corrigendae.’

An immediate and basic question here concerns the identity of ‘la edizione ufficiale sisto-clementina’. According to Descamps, ‘Les traducteurs partent du texte *critique* de la Vulgate, tel qu’il résulte *surtout* des travaux de l’abbaye de Saint-Jérôme.’²² Descamps is cited and followed by Richard Clifford: ‘The textual basis of the *Nova Vulgata* was the critical edition [...] by the monks of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Jerome in Rome.’²³ During the 1960s, work on *Biblia Sacra* went hand in hand with the production of Robert Weber’s minor critical edition published in 1969 by the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft,²⁴ which is referred to by Stramare²⁵ and noted by Clifford as being ‘[e]specially useful to the Commission’,²⁶ presumably because it had been published well before the publication of the NV itself in 1979 and because its appearance in 1969 did not lag far behind the beginning of work on the NV at the end of 1965 and actually coincided with the appearance of Psalms, the first fruits of the NV commission (see the ‘Praenotanda’).

In the case of Sirach, the use of *Biblia Sacra* at first sight appears to be implied by Stramare, ‘Il testo della Volgata è stato pubblicato criticamente nel 1964’²⁷ (citing *Biblia Sacra*). However, Stramare clearly states:

All things considered, it follows that it is – and always has been – virtually impossible to bring about any critical restoration of the original text. We thought, then, that the following should be done, namely, to accept the Latin (*La*) version as the norm, or as a text in its own right, recognizing it in exact accordance with the principles established for the *Nova Vulgata*, and without the need to accommodate it wholly to the form of the Greek text (*I* or *II*) or the Hebrew text, with the discrepancies between *La* and *Gr* or *H* that frequently occur to be regarded in any case as variant readings of some authority, not simply as faulty readings to be corrected.

For the final sentence here, note also Stramare’s previously quoted comment on the *Vetus Latina*: ‘Il testo latino non va, dunque, visto semplicemente come cattiva traduzione del greco; le sue diversità rispetto al greco o all’ebraico possono essere considerate, invece che errori, come *variae lectiones* testimonianti qualcosa dell’originale.’ (STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 129–130 = ‘Libro dell’Ecclesiastico’, p. 445).

22. DESCAMPS, ‘Nouvelle Vulgate’, p. 602*a*; the second italicization has been added.

23. CLIFFORD, ‘Authority’, p. 198.

24. See DESCAMPS, ‘Nouvelle Vulgate’, p. 600*b*–601*a*; GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 298–299, indicates that later volumes of *Biblia Sacra* made use of the Stuttgart edition with regard to emendations, etc.

25. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 117–118.

26. CLIFFORD, ‘Authority’, p. 198, n. 5.

27. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 130 = ‘Libro dell’Ecclesiastico’, p. 445.

[La] edizione base fu tenuta, *come per gli altri libri*, la ‘editio emendatissima’ della *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis*, publicata cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Jeronymi in Urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti, Marietti 21965.²⁸

A similar statement, which also clarifies the role of Weber’s Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft edition, appears in Stramare’s other cited work:

Testo latino di base per l’A.T. è stato normalmente la “editio emendatissima” preparata dai Monaci benedettini della Pontificia Abbazia di S. Girolamo in Urbe (Marietti 21965), confrontata continuamente con la ed. di R. Weber [...] la quale per la parte finale dell’A.T. è la sola edizione critica.²⁹

Use of the Marietti edition is confirmed by this study, in which we find that where the reading of *Biblia Sacra* (or Weber) differs from that of Marietti (or Colunga & Turrado),³⁰ the NV never agrees with the reading of *Biblia Sacra* (or Weber) (note the empty Categories 5 and 6 in the *Analysis* section, below), even though in such cases the NV does not always agree with Marietti (or Colunga & Turrado) either (see Categories 3, 4, 10). In contrast, this study reveals very little evidence that the critical editions of the Vulgate, in particular *Biblia Sacra*, were consulted at all, at least for Sirach.

With regard to the edition of the LXX that formed the basis of the NV’s adjustments to the (Marietti) Clementina, Alfred Rahlfs’s Bible Societies manual edition is mentioned at the beginning of the ‘Praenotanda’ in connection with the Pentateuch and at the end in connection with Maccabees, whereas the Göttingen Septuagint is cited only once.³¹ However, in his ‘Il libro dell’Ecclesiastico’, Stramare frequently refers to Joseph Ziegler and his published works, including the 1965 Göttingen edition of Sirach, and so it is hardly unreasonable to assume that the NV editors of Sirach, who included Ziegler himself, would have examined this edition directly. This assumption appears to be confirmed by the NV’s adoption of a reading specific to Zie-

28. STRAMARE, ‘Libro dell’Ecclesiastico’, p. 447, n. 21 (italicization added).

29. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 124.

30. In the material reviewed in this study, the edition of Colunga & Turrado coincides almost exactly with that of Garofalo, and Weber’s edition coincides almost exactly with *Biblia Sacra*, although Weber provides a much more limited apparatus and does not include the numbers of the corresponding verses in the LXX.

31. In connection with Werner Kappler’s edition of 1 Maccabees and Robert Hanhart’s edition of 2 Maccabees.

gler's edition at 41:16*a* (Vulgate and NV: 19*a*). Moreover, Ziegler was a member of the NV's commission for most of its lifetime,³² although, unfortunately, he did not hold this role at the very beginning of the commission's activity, when, it appears, most of the work on Sirach was undertaken.³³

Returning to Stramare's presentation of the choice of the Vulgate as the base text for the NV, the 'adaptations' referred to by Stramare – '[...] adattati alla speciale situazione critica del testo [...]'] – are specified not only in that presentation but also in the NV's 'Praenotanda' to Sirach and are consistent with the 'normae generales' of the 'Praenotanda', noted in Section I ('The stated objectives of the *Nova Vulgata*'), above, concerning the relationship between the NV and the Vulgate:

a) when particular verses are found only in *La*, or, specifically, are seen to be derived from *Gr II*,³⁴ they are noted as, respectively, *La* or *Gr II*, followed by the chapter and verse number;

b) when particular duplications that are evident repetitions of other verses or pericopes have survived they are simply to be deleted;

c) when, however, the matter has to do with duplication of words, i.e. when a particular term of the Greek (*Gr*) or Hebrew (*H*) text is seen to be expressed by two or more synonyms, then, as it is not always certain that the simpler *Gr* or *H* form is to be regarded as earlier, we prefer to keep the *La* form, unless it happens, on the basis of evidence, that the meaning itself or something else might require or suggest emendation;³⁵

32. GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 275, n. 46, 47, cites the *Annuario Pontificio* for 1968 (p. 1061) and 1978 (p. 1076), in both of which Ziegler is listed as a 'consultore'; in fact, this is also true for 1969 (p. 1081), 1970 (p. 1065), 1971 (p. 1069), 1972 (p. 1018), 1973 (p. 1037–1038 [47 *consultori*]), 1974 (p. 1053–1054 [26 *consultori*]), 1975 (p. 1055), 1976 (p. 1065), 1977 (p. 1075), 1979 (p. 1078), and 1980 (p. 1081); from 1981 onwards there are no entries in the *Annuario Pontificio* for the *Pontificia Commissione per la Neo-Vulgata*.

33. STRAMARE, 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 446, observes: 'La Commissione aveva coscientemente proceduto fin dal 1965 per diversi tentativi [...]'. The last date here would seem to coincide with the creation of the NV commission on 29 November 1965 (see Section I, 'The stated objectives of the *Nova Vulgata*', above).

34. See above, n. 12.

35. 'Questi duplicati possono, infatti, essere dovuti alla stilistica latina, che ama scindere un concetto in due termini affini per mettere meglio in evidenza il contenuto semantico. Ma anche al di fuori delle stilistica, rimane sempre difficile stabilire quale dei due termini rappresenti il testo originale [...]'] (STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448).

d) next, when *La* is clearly seen to be corrupt, on account of misreading or distortion of meaning, and can be corrected with the help of *Gr* or *H* or even *La* itself, through opportune comparison of the codices, then emendation is to be made;

e) this is also the case, finally, when *La* obscurely produces sense and one much worse than that which *Gr*, *H*, or *Syr* might offer.³⁶

With regard to emendation of the Vulgate, Stramare comments:

In generale, quando il latino richiedeva una correzione, questa fu fatta sul greco [...];³⁷ in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito correggere sull'ebraico. [...] Il progetto attuale conserva, dunque, la Volgata, dove è sostenuta dall'ebraico o dal siriano, tenendo conto che le sue lezioni risalgono al più tardi al secolo II d.C. e precedono le recensioni greche. Si conserva ancora la Volgata quando è sostenuta dal greco, a meno che, caso assai raro, l'errore del greco sia evidente.³⁸

More generally:

Il testo fu emendato solo se richiesto da motivi di critica testuale e di filologia, ma sempre in modo da conservare nelle nuove locuzioni il colore e lo stile della Volgata; no fu sostituita una traduzione verbale là dove le parole della Volgata davano fedelmente il senso.³⁹

36. My translation; original, in the *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praenotanda', p. 18–19: 'a) cum versus quidam in *La* tantum invenirentur, vel praesertim ex *Gr II* viderentur derivati, iidem signarentur respective nota *La*, vel *Gr II*, sequente numero capitis et versus; b) cum duplicationes quaedam evidentes repetitiones aliorum versiculorum vel pericoparum evasisent, ipsae simpliciter delerentur; c) cum autem de duplicationibus verborum ageretur, i. e. cum terminus quidam textus Graeci (*Gr*) vel textus Hebraici (*H*) duobus aut pluribus synonymis expressus videretur, tunc, pro certo non semper habentes simpliciore formam *Gr* vel *H* primigeniam esse, servandam malleus formam *La*, nisi forte sensus ipse aut alia evidetiae causa emendationem exigeret vel suaderet; d) deinde cum *La* corrupta clare videretur ex falsa lectione vel ex detorto sensu eaque corrigi posset adiuvante *Gr* aut *H* vel etiam eiusdem *La* opportune codices comparando, tunc emendatio fieret; e) item denique, cum *La* obscuritate laboraret sensumque prorsum deteriore quam *Gr* vel *H* vel *Syr* offerret.'

37. '[...] sia a motivo dello stato attuale dell'ebraico e sia perché il modello del latino era stato un testo greco (meno lontano dall'ebraico dell'attuale greco) [...].'

38. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448. For the final sentence to cohere with the preceding one, 'il greco' would appear to refer to the pre-recensional form of the Greek translation.

39. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 124–125.

Stramare concludes as follows:

La Commissione è perfettamente consapevole di non aver fatto un'opera perfetta, ma onestamente può affermare di avere sperimentato in precedenza le diverse soluzioni, per attenersi, infine, a quella che le è sembrata la più prudente, ossia la conservazione della versione latina, la quale, con l'eliminazione degli errori e delle difettosità evidenti, e con le correzioni apportatele nel rispetto della latinitas propria del libro e dello stile, è ora più leggibile e attendibile.⁴⁰

While this last statement quite reasonably accepts the possibility of failings in the final form of the NV's revision of Sirach, it should not distract attention from uncertainty, contradiction, and inconsistency in the statements and intentions about the commission's *remit*, as expressed in the NV's 'Praenotanda' and in Stramare's articles.

An example of such uncertainty is to be seen in the following statement:

Latinam (*La*) [...] versionem suscipimus quasi normam [...], absque [...] necessitate eam plane accommodandi ad formam sive textus Graeci (*I vel II*) sive textus Hebraici, cum discrepantiae inter *La* et *Gr* vel *H*, quae identidem occurrunt, habendae sint variae lectiones alicuius saltem auctoritatis, non vero simpliciter mendosae lectiones, quae sint corrigendae.

[We] accept the Latin (*La*) [...] version as the norm, without the need to accommodate it wholly to the form of the Greek text (*I* or *II*) or the Hebrew text, with the discrepancies between *La* and *Gr* or *H* that frequently occur to be regarded in any case as variant readings of some authority, not simply as faulty readings to be corrected.⁴¹

Here, the door is opened both to adjusting variant Vulgate readings to the Greek or to the Hebrew, albeit only to some extent (and not *plane*), and to leaving such variants as they are. It might be assumed that for the first category the author of these words had in mind primarily differences in diction within lines present in the Latin and the Greek (and the Hebrew), whereas the second category primarily comprises lines that the Latin has in addition to those found in the Greek (and the Hebrew). However, this is not clearly stated and uncertainty remains concerning which divergent material is to be adjusted and which is not.

40. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 133 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448.

41. *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praenotanda', p. 18 (with my translation), quoted more fully above, n. 21.

Moreover, although the formulas ‘ad formam sive textus Graeci [...] sive textus Hebraici’ and ‘discrepantiae inter *La* et *Gr* vel *H*’ appear to treat the Hebrew and Greek traditions of Sirach as interchangeable equivalents, in reality it is clear that they are very different from one another in detail throughout and that not infrequently they also differ in significant ways with regard to the meaning conveyed. In cases where adjustment is deemed appropriate, the wording of the ‘Praenotanda’ does not clearly indicate to which of the earlier versions the Latin should be adjusted when the Greek and the Hebrew differ from one another and the Latin goes yet another way.

With regard to the first of these two issues – when adjustment to an earlier form of text should be made and when it should not – indications elsewhere in the ‘Praenotanda’ are rather conservative, recommending changes only in clear cases of corrupt text or opaque meaning:

c) cum [...] de duplicationibus verborum ageretur, [...], servandam malleus formam *La*, nisi forte sensus ipse aut alia evidētia causa emendationem exigere vel suaderet;

d) deinde cum *La* corrupta clare videretur ex falsa lectione vel ex detorto sensu eaque corrigi posset adiuvante *Gr* aut *H* [...], tunc emendatio fieret;

e) [...] cum *La* obscuritate laboraret sensumque prorsum deteriore quam *Gr* vel *H* vel *Syr* offerret.

‘c) when [...] the matter has to do with duplication of words [...] we prefer to keep the *La* form, unless it happens, on the basis of evidence, that the meaning itself or something else might require or suggest emendation;

d) next, when *La* is clearly seen to be corrupt, on account of misreading or distortion of meaning, and can be corrected with the help of *Gr* or *H* or even *La* itself [...], then emendation is to be made;

e) [...] when *La* obscurely produces sense and one much worse than that which *Gr*, *H*, or *Syr* might offer.⁴²

Such a conservative or minimalist position is broadly consistent with the goals of the NV as a whole:

Si pensa ad un testo, in cui quello della Volgata di S. Gerolamo sarà [...] prudentemente corretto là dove se ne scosta, o non l’interpreta rettamente [...] in

42. *Nova Vulgata*, ‘Praenotanda’, p. 18–19, with my translation.

modo che siano temperati il rispetto per la tradizione e le sane esigenze critiche del nostro tempo.⁴³

Il testo fu emendato solo se richiesto da motivi di critica testuale e di filologia [...]; no fu sostituita una traduzione verbale là dove le parole della Volgata davano fedelmente il senso.⁴⁴

However, even if the stated aim of the NV commission's revision of Sirach was, accordingly, to make only limited adjustments to an earlier text, this still leaves open the second area of uncertainty identified above, namely when the Hebrew witnesses (or the Peshitta) should take priority over the LXX as the text to which the NV commission should adjust the Clementina. The use of the 'Praenotanda' (in the sequences quoted above) of the expressions '*Gr aut H*' and '*Gr vel H vel Syr*', and of '*sive textus Graeci (I vel II) sive textus Hebraici*' and '*inter La et Gr vel H*', appears to imply equality and interchangeability among the three text traditions, and the following comments from Stramare at first sight only compound the confusion:

In generale, quando il latino richiedeva una correzione, questa fu fatta sul greco [...]; in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito correggere sull'ebraico. [...] Il progetto attuale conserva, dunque, la Volgata, dove è sostenuta dall'ebraico o dal siriano.

A degree of clarity emerges, however, from the immediately following statement of Stramare:

Si conserva ancora la Volgata quando è sostenuta dal greco, a meno che, caso assai raro, l'errore del greco sia evidente.

As an example of such a preference for the Hebrew, Stramare cites 42:12, where 'la confusione della Volgata e del greco circa la 2^a persona maschile con la 3^a persona femminile dell'imperativo è stata corretta sull'ebraico';⁴⁵ in other words, for the Vulgate's *noli intendere in specie [...] noli commorari* (Douai-Rheims: 'Behold not [...] beauty: and tarry not') the NV has *ne det speciem [...] non commoretur* (*Biblia de Navarra*: 'No muestre su belleza [...] ni se

43. Pope Paul VI, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium Officiale*, 59 (1967), p. 53–54 (also found in Latin in *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praefatio ad lectorem', p. 10, already quoted in Section I ('The stated objectives of the *Nova Vulgata*'), above.

44. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 124–125, also quoted above in this section.

45. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448 (for all three quotations).

siente’); here the NV indeed represents a more plausible interpretation of the extant Hebrew (as NAB: ‘Let her not parade her charms [...] or spend her time’) than that expressed by the LXX or the Vulgate.

With regard to the NV’s occasional preference for the Hebrew sources over the Greek, Stramare’s words and example are helpful but only to some extent. The example given is clearly one in which the grandson or another tradent has read basically the same Hebrew text that is conserved in the extant Hebrew witnesses but may be judged to have interpreted these words erroneously. However, this represents a rather rare category of potential misinterpretations and Stramare does not mention the many more texts in which the extant Hebrew witnesses and the Greek clearly differ in wording, that is to say, the Greek translator may be judged to have read a slightly or more extensively different Hebrew text or has misread or misheard the same Hebrew text. Such cases, where the form of the extant Hebrew witnesses differs from the one that appears to underlie the Greek translation, are not explicitly mentioned by Stramare (or the ‘Praenotanda’ to the NV), who offers no clear guidance as to how they might be resolved.

In any case, two basic principles appear to inform the norms found in the NV and in Stramare’s explanatory comments: (1) emendation is to be made only when there is a significant difference between the Vulgate and earlier traditions; (2) emendation is, in general, to be made towards the Greek rather than the Hebrew. This second principle is more clearly expressed by Stramare than by the ‘Praenotanda’, but both sources fail to address the manifold differences between the extant Hebrew witnesses and the LXX or to offer guidance in this matter.

The broad aim of the rest of this paper is, then, to see to what extent the results detailed in Part 1 of the present study match these principles, which may reasonably be regarded as the basis of the commission’s remit. The questions asked about those results focus specifically on the degree to which:

- (1) the NV simply follows the traditional text of the Vulgate (as reflected in Garofalo’s Marietti edition of the Clementina and in other editions of the Clementina);
- (2) the NV adapts the traditional text to the LXX;
- (3) the NV adapts the traditional text to the Hebrew⁴⁶ sources, when these are not clearly reflected in the LXX;

46. The Peshitta lacks most of the lines covered in this study.

(4) the NV could have drawn closer to the Greek and the Hebrew sources had it employed the critical editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra* (the readings of which are sometimes also recorded in the apparatus to the Marietti edition).

The conclusions arising from this analysis of the results of Part 1 should provide a first step towards understanding the nature of the NV revision of Sirach in practice – with regard to translation, interpretation, and textual preference⁴⁷ – and to what extent it corresponds to the remit noted above.

An issue that does not arise significantly in the present study is the NV's rejection of interpretations embodied in the Vulgate in favour of those accepted by recent scholarship.⁴⁸ Another area not in focus here is the quality of the NV's Latin, although in a number of cases (see under Category 4 in the next section) the NV appears to have opted for a wording different from that of the Vulgate on purely linguistic, translational, or stylistic grounds, without any obvious basis in textual or interpretative differences; similar comments apply to some instances of the NV's addition or omission of *et*.

4. Analysis of the results of Part 1

With regard to the first of the four issues – (1) the degree to which the NV simply follows the traditional text of the Vulgate – data from the 10 categories to be presented below indicate that a divergence from the Clementina

47. There is little analysis of this type in the few pages devoted to 'Cuestiones metodológicas' in GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 318–323; see especially p. 323. Note, however, the interesting list provided (*ibid.*, p. 333–334), for the Johannine literature, of differences between the NV edition of 1979 and the NV as it appears in the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft's *Novum Testamentum graece et latine* (ed. Eberhard & Erwin Nestle, Barbara & Kurt Aland, et. al.; Stuttgart, 1984) / *Novum Testamentum latine Novam Vulgatam Bibliorum Sacram Editionem secuti* (ed. Kurt & Barbara Aland; Stuttgart, 1984).

48. No such cases emerge from the portion of text discussed in this study. An example from elsewhere in the Bible is provided by **מִזְבְּחֵי**, which occurs eight times in the MT and is typically interpreted nowadays as 'incense altars', 'incense stands', 'incense burners' (thus REB, NJB, NJPS, NRSV). In the Vulgate, however, it is rendered at Lev 26:30; Ezek 6:4; 2 Chr 34:4 as *simulacra* (cf. KJV: 'images'), at Isa 17:8; 27:9; Ezek 6:6; 2 Chr 34:7 as *delubra* 'shrines', and at 2 Chr 14:4 as *fana* 'sanctuaries'. The NV has, in line with contemporary scholarship, *thymiamateria* 'censers' at Lev 26:30; Isa 17:8; 27:9; 2 Chr 14:4; 34:4, 7 (and, inconsistently, *delubra* at Ezek 6:4, 6).

(as represented by the Marietti edition) occurs in only 21 (12 + 7 + 2) cases in contrast to 53 (18 + 23 + 4 + 8) cases where the NV agrees with the traditional text. On this basis the NV appears to follow the traditional text two and a half times as often as it opts for an alternative reading, but if it is borne in mind that a case of equivalence can be as long as an entire line of text whereas a case of difference will often relate to just one word, the actual degree of formal identity between the NV and the Clementina is considerably greater.⁴⁹ The empty Categories 5 and 6, below, also strongly indicate that no more extensively critical edition of the Vulgate – specifically that of Weber or *Biblia Sacra* – lies behind the NV's Sirach.

Analysis of the NV's agreements and disagreements with the traditional text leads to an evaluation of the next three, inter-connected, issues, which are as much qualitative as quantitative: where the NV follows the traditional text (53 cases), is this decision correct, i.e. could the NV at times have come closer to the earlier – Greek and Hebrew – sources by following an alternative reading? Correspondingly, where the NV opts for a reading different from the one preferred by the traditional text (21 cases), does this always lead to a result in Latin that approximates more closely than the traditional text to either or both of the earlier sources?

A preliminary response to issues 2–4 focusing primarily on 2 – the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate, specifically as found in the Clementina, more closely to the LXX – is provided by the following summary of the evidence to be presented in detail below, a summary that distributes the readings of the NV across 10 categories, three of which are empty, based on agreement or disagreement with the LXX:

- (1) All five editions agree among themselves and also agree with the LXX (18 cases).
- (2) All five editions agree among themselves but do not agree with the LXX (23 cases).
- (3) The four earlier editions agree among themselves but the NV comes closer to the LXX (12 cases).

49. Often a line will appear more than once in one of the seven non-empty categories listed below and/or in more than one of them. For example, at 24*b* there is a difference in wording between the NV (*de impositione cubiti super mensam*) and the other Latin versions (*de discubitu in panibus*), but the Latin tradition as a whole (including the NV) also lacks an equivalent to the LXX's introductory καί.

(4) The four earlier editions agree among themselves and the NV comes no closer to the LXX (7 cases).

(5) The NV agrees with the critical editions (not the traditional text) and by doing so comes closer to the LXX (0 cases).

(6) The NV agrees with the critical editions (not the traditional text) and by doing so comes no closer to the LXX (0 cases).

(7) The NV agrees with the traditional text (not the critical editions) and by doing so comes closer to the LXX (4 cases).

(8) The NV agrees with the traditional text (not the critical editions) and by doing so comes no closer to the LXX (8 cases).

(9) The critical text and the traditional text disagree; the NV disagrees with both and comes closer to the LXX (0 cases).

(10) The critical text and the traditional text disagree; the NV disagrees with both and comes no closer to the LXX (2 cases).

With regard to the second issue – (2) the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate (Clementina) more closely to the LXX – Category 1 is neutral concerning the NV’s drawing nearer to or further away from the LXX (or the Hebrew sources), as is Category 7. However, Category 3 (12 cases) speaks positively for the NV’s closeness to the LXX, whereas Categories 2, 4, 8, and 10 (40 cases) indicate a lack of such approximation to the LXX. The broad initial picture is, then, that the NV has chosen to draw closer to the LXX in just under a quarter of the available opportunities (12/52). However, this conclusion undergoes considerable modification once less significant variations are disregarded, as indicated in the examination of the various categories presented below.

For the third issue – (3) the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate (Clementina) to the Hebrew sources, where these are not clearly reflected in the LXX – all categories need to be examined.

The fourth issue – (4) the degree to which the NV could have drawn closer to the LXX and/or the Hebrew sources had it employed the critical editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra* – is particularly relevant in the case of Categories 8 and 10 with regard to the LXX, and in all seven non-empty categories the same question may be asked with regard to the Hebrew sources. In respect of this fourth issue, both the biblical text of the critical editions and the first two apparatus to *Biblia Sacra* are relevant.

Bearing in mind that the 10 categories mentioned above are already primarily informed by the NV’s relationship to the LXX, the main focus in the following survey of these 10 categories is on the NV’s proximity to the

Hebrew sources and on the potential usefulness of *Biblia Sacra* for drawing closer to these sources as well as to the LXX.

(1) *All five editions agree among themselves and also agree with the LXX*

This category covers 18 cases where the critical editions have retained the traditional text and the NV has reproduced that text (apart from a different ordering of the text at 17*a–b* and 18) in the absence of any significant discrepancy in the Vulgate's representation of the Greek. In the majority of these cases, few if any comments were offered in the examination in Paper 1: 15*b* (12*b*), 16*a* (13*a*), 17*a–b* (15*a–b*), 18 (14*a*) (two cases), 17*d* (14*c*), 23*a* (18*c*/19*a*), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*), 25*c* (21*a*/22*b*), 27*c* (22*b*/24*b*), 28*a* (22*c*/25*a*), 28*b* (22*d*/25*b*), 42:1*c* (Rahlfs: 41:27*a*).

With regard to the NV's use or non-use of the Hebrew evidence, when this is not clearly reflected in the Greek, a striking case from Category 1 is 24*aB* (19*b*/20*a*), where the NV's *de veritate Dei et testamento* is identical with the other Latin editions and matches the Greek perfectly, but does not take into account a significant and probably superior Hebrew reading, which in its clearest form (in the Masada Ms.: **ab irritum faciendo iuramentum et pactum*) was unavailable to Ziegler when preparing the Göttingen edition⁵⁰ but available to the NV commission (which for most of its lifetime included Ziegler himself).⁵¹

A further example of the NV's failure to use the Hebrew sources unless already reflected in the LXX may be found at 18 (14*a*), where the NV maintains the traditional *disciplinam in pace conservate* instead of **disciplinam de confusione audite*, suggested by both Hebrew witnesses. The NV's failure to

50. ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, appeared too early to make use of Yadin's edition and study of the Masada material (1965) and makes no reference whatsoever to Yadin, despite an extensive annotated listing of literature on the Hebrew material (including studies by Alexander A. Di Lella from 1962 to 1964; see ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 81–84). Ziegler cited the Hebrew according to the edition of LÉVI, *Hebrew text* (see ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 84), and regularly employed the commentary by Smend, as signalled by the appearance of an abbreviated reference to it (and to Smend's index to the Greek, Syriac, and Hebrew vocabulary of Sirach) in Ziegler's apparatus.

51. See n. 32, above.

adapt to the Hebrew sources here is particularly striking because of its adoption of the Hebrew ordering of the text (see below, Category 4).

A similar case may be seen at 14*a* (11*a*), where the NV's *luctus* 'mourning' matches the Greek but not the Hebrew, which in both extant sources would suggest **vanitas*. Skehan's translation in the 1955 *Confraternity Bible* and the 1970 NAB reflects the Hebrew in all four cases cited thus far.

Similar comments apply to the sequence of verses 24*c*–25*abc*–26–27*a* (NV; other editions: 24*c*–25*abc*–26*b*–27*a*; Ziegler: 19*d*–20*ab*–21*abc*; Rahlfs: 21*ab*–22*ab*–23*ab*), where the NV has maintained the LXX's order of elements concerning which shame should be felt rather than attempting any adaptation towards the Hebrew (specifically as represented by the Masada Ms.).

Less significantly, the NV does not reflect the conjunction *waw* at the beginning of 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*) in Hebrew, which is also reflected in the Greek and Latin traditions (although not in the editions of Ziegler and Rahlfs or in the four consulted editions of the Vulgate).

The NV's retention of the LXX's plural at 21*a* (17*a*), *erubescite*, rather than adjustment to the singular of both Hebrew witnesses, **erubescere*, could not have been corrected by reference to the *Confraternity Bible* or to the NAB, due to the nature of modern English grammar, although the German translations by Smend, Peters, and Sauer, as well as the *Einheitsübersetzung*, all employ the singular.

At the end of 22*a* (18*a*), the NV's retention of the Vulgate's *de delicto*, although reflecting the LXX's *περὶ πλῆμμελείας*, does not clearly represent either Ms. B's *על שקר* 'concerning a lie' (**de dolo*)⁵² or the Masada Ms.'s *על קשר* 'concerning a plot' (**de coniuratione*), the more likely original text.

In all eight cases – including the two at 18 (14*a*) – we see that well-attested Hebrew-based readings were not introduced into the NV, even though such readings are incorporated in other lines of text discussed in this study (see Category 3, below).

In response to the fourth issue outlined above – (4) the degree to which the NV might have drawn closer to the LXX and/or the Hebrew sources had it employed the critical editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra* – none of the eight Hebrew readings mentioned above are registered in the *Biblia Sacra* appa-

52. See Jer 6:13*b*: *כָּל־עֲשֵׂה שָׁקֶר / πάντες ἐποίησαν ψευδῆ / cuncti faciunt dolum*; the predicted form at 22*a* (18*a*) would be *de mendacio*, but this had already been used in the preceding line.

tus (and only two of them, at 21a [17a] and 22a [18a], are reflected in Ziegler's edition of the LXX). Nonetheless, all of them are represented in Yadin's edition and study of the Masada Ms. from 1965 and four of them (which do not rely on the Masada Ms.) are also reflected in Skehan's translation in the 1955 *Confraternity Bible* and the 1970 NAB, the latter published after the commission's work on Sirach began at the end of 1965 and well before the initial publication of the NV's wisdom books in 1977.⁵³

(2) *All five editions agree among themselves but do not agree with the LXX*

In these 23 cases, unanimity among the earlier editions has perhaps distracted the NV from noticing (and rectifying) mostly minor differences between the LXX and the Latin tradition.

In 20 cases the difference from the LXX is not obviously significant: non-insertion of line-initial *et*: 22b (18b), 24b (19c/20b), and 25a (20a/21b); non-omission of line-initial *et*: 24c (19d/21a); 27b (22a/24a); non-adjustment of *in corpore* to *in corporibus*: 14a (11a); of *de loco* to *a loco* (as Nobilius): 23b (19aA/19bA); of *de veritate* to *a veritate* (as Nobilius): 24aB (19b/20a); of *bonum autem* to *et bonum* (as Nobilius): 16b (13b); of *invenies* to *inveniens* (as Nobilius), or *omnium hominum* to *omnis viventis* (as Nobilius): 42:1d (Rahlfs: 41:27b) (three cases); or of *omnium (vivorum)* to *omnis (viventis)* (as Nobilius): 42:8d; non-pluralization of *sermonis (absconditi)*: 42:1b (Rahlfs: 41:26b); non-reversal of the expression *dati et accepti* at 24c (19d/21a) or of *a principe et (a) iudice* at 22a (18a); retention of *a respectu mulieris fornicariae* in place of **ab aspectu altera muliere* of the LXX (Ziegler and Rahlfs): 25b (Ziegler: 20b; Rahlfs: 22a) (two cases); of *mulier alieni viri* instead of *mulier conjugata* (as Nobilius) for the LXX's γυνή ὑπανδρος: 27a (21c/23b); and of *de bono nomine* as against **de nomine* of Ziegler and Rahlfs, the Hebrew, and the Syriac: 15a (12a).

Five of the six cases at the end (excluding *ab aspectu*, as Nobilius, for *a respectu*) are perhaps the most striking indication of the NV's failure to adjust to the LXX in this category, but they are ultimately of little semantic or exegetical significance. The policy that appears to have been followed by the NV commission here, in keeping with the NV's general principles, is that where

53. See above, n. 33, and *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praefatio ad lectorem', p. 10, n. 7.

the Latin tradition makes good sense in context and does not depart *significantly* from the *sense* of the Greek, no adjustment to the Greek is made.⁵⁴

The case of 22*a* (18*a*) is included in the relatively insignificant part of this category; the NV retains the traditional text, *a principe et a iudice*, and makes no adjustment towards the different order of the LXX: **a iudice et principe*. More significantly, there is no adjustment by the NV to the rather different text of the Hebrew: **a domino et domina* / **a principe et principissa*.

Three more significant differences from the LXX remain. In the first two, the NV has maintained *enim* ‘for’ at 17*c* (other editions: 17*d*; Ziegler and Rahlfs: 14*b*) for the LXX’s δέ, instead of adjusting to *autem* (Nobilius), and *verumtamen* ‘rather’ at 19 (16*a*) for the LXX’s τοιγαροῦν, instead of adjusting to *igitur* (Nobilius), *ergo*, or *quamobrem* (Badauel). In the third case, at 26 (NV; other editions: 26*b*; Ziegler: 21*b*; Rahlfs: 23*a*), the NV would have more closely followed the Greek ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως ‘before taking away a portion and a gift’ (NETS) had it altered the Vulgate’s *ab auferendo partem et non restituendo* to [...] *et dationem*; cf. Nobilius: *Ab ablatione partis et dationis*.

In principle, the NV’s non-adjustment to the LXX might mean in some cases that the NV stays closer to the meaning or the structure of the Hebrew. This appears to be true in six cases: 14*a* (11*a*), 22*b* (18*b*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) (retention of *dati et accepti*), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*) (two cases), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*). However, non-adjustment also means that the NV misses seven opportunities to come closer to the form of the Hebrew: at 15*a* (12*a*), where the ‘name’ is not explicitly designated as ‘good’; 24*b* (19*c*/20*b*), where addition of *et* would better have reflected at least the *earliest* Hebrew witness; 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) and 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), where omission of *et* would have led to the same result; 42:1*d* (Rahlfs: 41:27*b*) (two cases, not three, as לֵב ‘all’ is invariable); 42:8*d*.

In one case – 17*c* (NV) / 17*b* (other editions) / 14*b* (LXX) – the NV could have come nearer to the Hebrew by omitting the conjunction ‘but’ (δέ = *autem*, as Nobilius) of the LXX and ‘for’ (*enim*) of the Vulgate, although the NV’s retention of *enim* may hardly be said to misrepresent the Hebrew. This is also true of the nine remaining cases under this category, with the exception of 26 (NV) / 26*b* (other editions) / 21*b* (Ziegler) / 23*a* (Rahlfs), where

54. ‘[N]o fu sostituita una traduzione verbale là dove le parole della Volgata davano fedelmente il senso’ (STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Volgata’, p. 124–125).

the Hebrew would be better represented by *a silentio in divisione partis* than by *(et) ab auferendo partem et non restituendo*.

The apparatus of *Biblia Sacra* refer in some way to 12 of the 20 minor differences from the LXX from Category 2 – 14*a* (11*a*), 15*a* (12*a*), 22*b* (18*b*), 23*b* (19*aA*/19*bA*), 24*aB* (19*b*/20*a*), 24*b* (19*c*/20*b*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) (two cases), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*) (*a viso* for *a respectu*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*d* (Rahlfs: 41:27*b*) (*inveniens*, as Nobilius, for *invenies*), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*) – and to two of the three more significant differences – 17*c* (NV) / 17*d* (other editions) / 14*b* (Ziegler, Rahlfs); 26 (NV) / 26*b* (M, C, BS, W) / 21*b* (Ziegler) / 23*a* (Rahlfs) – as well as to two of the 13 differences from or similarities to the Hebrew sources: 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*); 42:1*d* (*inveniens* for *invenies*).

(3) *The four earlier editions agree among themselves but the NV comes closer to the LXX*

Under this category, the NV adjusts the Latin found in all four earlier editions (including Weber's edition and *Biblia Sacra*) and thereby comes closer to the LXX. However, although in each of the 12 cases noted below there is an evident difference between the LXX (in Ziegler's edition or that of Rahlfs) and the traditional Vulgate (in all four editions examined), it is in only the first five cases listed below that the textual variation also represents an obvious lexico-semantic difference; the sixth item, 42:8*d*, does not fit into this category.

At 14*b* (11*b*), the NV follows the LXX in including *non bonum* after *no-men*. The NV's addition to the Vulgate here is especially striking as it may be argued that the Vulgate had preserved a superior reading, which can, more easily than the Greek, be traced to the extant Hebrew sources.

At 19 (16*a*), on the other hand, the NV's *iudicium meum* reflects Ziegler's edition specifically (ἐπὶ τῷ κρίματί μου), in contrast to the reading of Rahlfs (ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί μου) and the Latin editions (*in his quae procedunt de ore meo*). Ziegler's reading clearly mirrors the Hebrew, via the well-known commentary of R. Smend.

At 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*), the NV's *a despectione* 'from disdain' constitutes a significantly improved translation of the LXX's ἀπὸ σκορακισμοῦ 'from scorning' (Ziegler and Rahlfs). However, the equivalent offered by the Vulgate (in the four consulted editions), *ab offuscatione* 'from concealing' – which perhaps represents a variant Greek reading – appears to reflect the underlying

Hebrew מְמַנֵּה ‘from withholding’ better than the Greek does. In effect, then, by adjusting to the LXX, the NV has drawn further away from the Hebrew sources, on which the LXX at this point is also clearly based.

The absence from the NV of the line *ne avertas faciem a proximo tuo* – found in traditional and critical editions of the Vulgate as 26*a* (between 21*a* and 21*b* in Ziegler and 22*b* and 23*a* in Rahlfs) – clearly and significantly reflects adjustment to the tradition represented by the LXX (Ziegler and Rahlfs), the Hebrew witnesses, and the Peshitta.

At 42:8*c*, the NV’s *in veritate* evidently comes far closer to ἀληθινῶς of the LXX and באמת of the Hebrew sources than *in omnibus* of the other Latin editions does.

At 42:8*d*, the NV’s *probatas* ‘tested’, also found in Nobilius, instead of the Vulgate’s *probabilis* ‘acceptable’ provides a more accurate equivalent of the LXX’s δεδοκιμασμένος, although the difference between the two Latin forms is hardly clear-cut. In any case, the NV, like the LXX, does not reflect the significantly different extant Hebrew here: ‘modest’ or ‘moderate’.

In the remaining six instances – two each at 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*) and 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*) – of the NV’s adaptation to the LXX (Ziegler and Rahlfs), the differences from the Vulgate (in all four editions examined) are, broadly speaking, more syntactic than lexico-semantic.

At 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*), the NV’s introductory *et* represents an additional element (apart from the change in syntax) that clearly reflects the LXX (Ziegler and Rahlfs), even though it is not supported by the Hebrew. In the same line, 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*), the NV’s *a respiciendo* for *ne respicias* reflects, via the LXX, the Hebrew structure with introductory *min*, also found in the Masada Ms. in the next line, 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), *a curiositate in ancillam* (NV) instead of *ne scruteris ancillam*, and in both the Masada Ms. and Ms. B at 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), *ab iteratione sermonis auditus* (NV) for *non duplices sermonem auditus*.⁵⁵

At 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*), both of the first two elements in the NV’s *et a revelatione* (= και ἀπὸ ἀποκαλύψεως), for *de revelatione* (= ἀποκαλύψεως), reflect not only Ziegler’s edition of the LXX but also the Hebrew.

As indicated in the comments above, the NV’s adjustment to the LXX – at 19 [16*a*] specifically as represented by Ziegler’s edition – also reflects the Hebrew sources in the majority of cases (8/12), three of which are clearly significant: *iudicium meum* at 19 (16*a*), the omission of 26*a*, and *in veritate* at

55. See below, under Category 4, for the lexical changes in these two passages.

42:8c. In two, relatively unimportant, cases – the addition of *et* at 27a (21c/23b) and, more strikingly, of *non bonum* at 14b (11b) – the NV’s reading has no clear support from the Hebrew witnesses and the NV would have reflected the Hebrew more closely – in the case of 27a (21c/23b) – or no worse – in the case of 14b (11b) – if it had retained the traditional text (in all four consulted editions). The NV is also neither better nor worse than the Vulgate with regard to the Hebrew in the case of 42:8d, although the difference from the Hebrew is more significant: ‘modest, moderate’ (Hebrew); ‘tested’ (NV, LXX); ‘acceptable’ (Vulgate). In the last case, 24c (19d/21a), the NV’s replacement of the Vulgate’s *ab offuscatione* by *a despectione*, apparently in order to represent the LXX more closely, actually takes the resulting Latin text significantly further from the Hebrew reading on which the LXX is probably based.

In only three of these 12 cases – 14b (11b), 42:8c, and the omission of 26a – do the apparatus of *Biblia Sacra* reflect in some way the (LXX) reading adopted by the NV. The Hebrew readings are not signalled except, indirectly, at 42:8c.

(4) *The four earlier editions agree among themselves and the NV comes no closer to the LXX*

In each of the seven instances under this category, the NV departs from a reading shared by all earlier forms of the Vulgate (including Weber and *Biblia Sacra*) that reflects the LXX with reasonable clarity.

Logically, a significant reason for such divergence might be in order to bring the Latin text into closer agreement with the Hebrew sources, and two of the new readings are indeed based, indirectly at least, on the Hebrew: at 20b (16c), instead of *et non omnia omnibus beneplacent in fide* the NV has *et non omnis pudor probatus*; the NV also has the line corresponding to 17a in other editions (14a in the LXX) as v. 18 or, in effect, as v. 19a. In both cases, Skehan’s translation in the *Confraternity Bible* (and later in the NAB) might lie behind the NV’s choice.

In contrast, there is no evidence from any source consulted that the next two lines (in the traditional versification: 17b–c; LXX: 14b–c; NV: 17c–d) should be exchanged with the following two (traditional: 18a–b; LXX: 15a–b; NV: 17a–b).

A different kind of divergence from earlier forms of the Latin text available to the NV is represented at 24b (19c/20b), where the NV’s *de impositione*

cubiti super mensam is a questionable attempt at an improvement, of a purely translational, clarificatory, kind, on *de discubitu in panibus*, but does not reflect any Greek or Latin textual variation or the extant Hebrew sources.

At 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), setting aside the NV's change in syntax in order to match the structure of the Greek, the use of a different lexical root (NV: *a curiositate in ancillam* for *ne scruteris ancillam* in other editions) might relate to the NV's use of *scrutari* in a positive context elsewhere and to its legal connotations, leading to its eschewal in the negative context here.

At 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 26*a*), *et ab iteratione sermonis* (NV) for *non duplices sermonem*, the change of lexeme would seem to have to do more with consistency of usage in Sirach, the verb *duplicare* being attested in Sirach only in this passage, and *iterare* four times. Although Ziegler's apparatus offers textual support for the NV's introductory *et*, there is no such support from editions of the traditional Latin text or from the Hebrew witnesses, and the NV's addition here is probably stylistic.

Of these seven divergences in the NV from the Vulgate (and in three cases also from the LXX), two seem to be derived, albeit indirectly, from the Hebrew, one is probably a mistake, and four appear to be the result of diverse linguistic, translational, and stylistic factors. Although these four readings differ from those found in the traditional text they do not express significantly different meanings.

The *Biblia Sacra* apparatus offer no clear support for any of the readings adopted by the NV in this category.

(7) *The NV agrees with the traditional text (not the critical editions) and by doing so comes closer to the LXX*

The first two cases of the four in this category are represented by 21*a* (17*a*): *erubescite a patre et a matre* (NV); *erubescite matrem et patrem* (critical); *αἰσχύνεσθε ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς*. Here, the traditional text and the NV are formally closer to the Greek (and the Hebrew) than are the two cited critical editions with regard to word order and also to case.⁵⁶

56. The NV's retention of the repeated preposition and its consequent failure to adapt the traditional text to the LXX (and the Hebrew sources) falls under Category 8, as neither the NV nor the text found in the two critical editions comes closer to the LXX in this respect.

At 23*b* (19*aA*/19*bA*) – NV: *et de loco*; critical: *de loco* – by retaining the traditional text with clause-initial *et* the NV not only stays closer to the LXX but also to the form of the Hebrew available to Ziegler.

Similarly, at 42:8*d* the NV's retention of *omnium vivorum* in the traditional text, as against *omnium virorum* in Weber's edition and *Biblia Sacra*, leaves the NV closer to the LXX and the Hebrew sources, which have the singular, **omnis viventis* (as Nobilius), throughout.

In all four cases, following the critical editions would have taken the NV a little further from the LXX, as signalled in each case by the apparatus to *Biblia Sacra*. By retaining the traditional text the NV has stayed close not only to the LXX but also to the Hebrew sources, which are alluded to by *Biblia Sacra* – indirectly – only at 42:8*d*.

(8) *The NV agrees with the traditional text (not the critical editions) and by doing so comes no closer to the LXX*

In the following six cases – two of which are represented by 15*c* (12*c*) – the NV has retained the traditional text, which the critical editions have, however, adjusted to the form of the Greek. In other words, the NV would have come closer to the LXX had it followed the critical editions.

At 21*b* (17*b*) – NV: *et a praesidente et a potente*; critical: *et a praesidente et potente* – and 22*a* (18*a*) – NV: *a principe et a iudice*; critical: *a principe et iudice* – non-repetition of the preposition in the critical editions matches the Greek and the Hebrew; however, the repetition found in the NV and the traditional text lends greater consistency of structure across the literary unit. The same is true of the NV's retention of clause-initial *et* at 26 (21*b*/23*a*) – NV: *et ab auferendo partem*; critical: *ab auferendo partem* – where, again, the critical editions correspond more closely to the Greek and the Hebrew.

At 15*c* (12*c*), variation in the use of *et* is combined with a difference in word order: the NV maintains the traditional text – *quam mille thesauri pretiosi et magni* – in contrast to the two critical editions – *quam mille thesauri magni pretiosi* – which approximate more closely to the LXX. The Hebrew – **quam milia thesauri pretiosi* – cannot be clearly aligned with either variant.

At 20*a* (16*b*), the NV has maintained the Clementina's reading, *reverentia*, which is, in context, a justifiable rendering of *αἰσχύνη*, even though the form preferred by Weber and *Biblia Sacra*, *inreverentia*, is closer to the Greek (and Hebrew).

Two other cases are placed in this category (8) rather than the preceding one (7), because although the NV has retained the Clementina's reading and not adopted that of the critical editions, the LXX text does not appear to be significantly better expressed by either set of editions (traditional and NV as against *Biblia Sacra* and Weber).

At 16*b* (13*b*), although the accusative construction of the NV and the traditional text, *permanebit in aevum*, can hardly be argued to constitute a closer equivalent to the corresponding sequence in the LXX than the ablative structure introduced by the critical editions, *permanebit in aevo*, the latter, while justifiable, seems unnecessary and is not consistently employed in other books of the Bible.

As already indicated under Category 7, at 21*a* (17*a*) – *erubescite a patre et a matre* (NV); *erubescite matrem et patrem* (critical); αἰσχύνεσθε ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς – the NV fails to omit a repeated preposition; on the other hand, the two critical editions may not be said to have come any closer to the LXX in this matter, as their choice of reading precludes the use of a preposition in both places.

In four cases listed under this category – 20*a* (16*b*), 21*b* (17*b*), 22*a* (18*a*), 26 (21*b*/23*a*) – the NV would have come closer not only to the LXX but also to the Hebrew sources had it adopted the readings of the critical editions. In the other four cases – 15*c* (12*c*) (two cases), 16*b* (13*b*), 21*a* (17*a*) – structural differences between Latin and Greek and/or differences in phrasing between the Greek and Latin versions on the one hand and the extant Hebrew witnesses on the other do not permit such a judgement to be affirmed or rejected. In none of the eight cases in this category, however, can the traditional text retained by the NV be said to express a *significantly* different meaning from that expressed by the critical editions.

At 15*c* (12*c*), an element from the Hebrew text – **quam milia thesauri pretiosi* – is signalled by the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus

(10) *The critical text and the traditional text disagree; the NV disagrees with both and comes no closer to the LXX*

The NV's choice of *invisibilis* instead of the traditional *invisus* at 17*c* (14*b*) is inconsistent with its use of *invisus* (along with all other editions) in the same expression at 20:32 (30), as well as at 11:4, and does not represent a significantly better (or worse) interpretation of the LXX's ἀφανής. On the other

hand, had the NV employed the choice of the critical editions, *occultus* (also noted in the apparatus to the Marietti edition), it would have drawn closer to the Hebrew witnesses, including a rabbinic quotation of Sirach cited in the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus, even though the difference between *occultus* and *invisus/invisibilis* can hardly be regarded as significant from a semantic or exegetical perspective.

Also included in this category is the NV's failure to follow the Marietti edition (and *Biblia Sacra*) in clearly positioning the clause *de furto* – 24aA (19aB/19bB) – with what precedes it at the end of v. 23 rather than with what follows it at the beginning of v. 24; other editions of the traditional text (e.g. Colunga & Turrado) place the clause clearly at the beginning of v. 24, rather than at the end of v. 23 (Marietti and *Biblia Sacra*) or on a separate line (NV and Weber). However, as the NV's punctuation indicates that *de furto* goes with the words that precede it (as in the Hebrew sources and the LXX), this layout issue does not reflect a significant difference in reading or interpretation from that represented by Marietti and *Biblia Sacra* or by the LXX.

Returning now to the second issue outlined prior to our presentation of the 10 categories – (2) the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate (Clementina) more closely to the LXX – a superficial indication, as previously noted, is that the NV has chosen to draw closer to the LXX in just under a quarter of the 52 available opportunities, 12, as against the 40 cases in which such opportunities have not been seized. However, once readings that do not yield a significant difference in meaning (with respect to the LXX) are set aside from the relevant negative categories (2, 4, 8, 10) and the single positive category (3), then the negative readings are reduced by 35 (20 + 5 + 8 + 2), from 40 to five (three from Category 2 and two from Category 4), and the positive ones by seven, from 12 to five.

The five positive cases, all under Category 3, where the opportunity to move the NV closer to the LXX has been seized, are as follows:

14b (11b)

NV (= LXX): *nomen [...] non bonum debebitur*

M C BS W: *nomen [...] debebitur*

19 (16a)

NV (= LXX, Hbr.): *reveremini iudicium meum*

M C BS W: *reveremini in his quae procedunt de ore meo*

24c (19d/21a)

NV (= LXX): *et a despectione dati et accepti*

M C BS W: *et ab offuscatione dati et accepti*

26a

NV (= LXX, Hbr.): omits line

M C BS W: *ne avertas faciem a proximo tuo*

42:8c

NV (= LXX, Hbr.): *in veritate*

M C BS W: *in omnibus*.

In the two negative cases from Category 4, the NV has actually moved away from the LXX:

18 (14a)

M C BS W (= LXX): 17a (14a)

NV = Hbr.: 18

(different positioning of line)

20b (16c)

M C BS W (= LXX): *non omnia omnibus bene placent in fide*

NV (= Hbr.): *non omnis pudor probatus*.

In the three remaining negative cases, from Category 2, the NV has maintained Vulgate renderings that are significantly different from the Greek original:

17c (NV) / 17d (other editions) / 14b (Ziegler, Rahlfs)

NV M C BS W: *Sapientia enim abscondita [...]*

LXX: **Sapientia autem abscondita [...]* (σοφία δὲ κεκρυμμένη [...])

19 (16a)

NV M C BS W: *Verumtamen [...]*

LXX: **Igitur [...]* (Τοιγαροῦν [...])

26 (NV) / 26b (M, C, BS, W) / 21b (Ziegler) / 23a (Rahlfs)

NV M C BS W: *ab auferendo partem et non restituendo*

LXX: **ab auferendo partem et dationem* (ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως)

The last three negative cases appear to reflect oversights on the part of the NV's translation commission and over-reliance on the Vulgate; in contrast, the other two negative cases appear to result from the NV's adoption of readings in the Hebrew sources that are not reflected in the text of the LXX.

Correspondingly, three of the positive cases – 19 (16a), 42:8c, and the omission of 26a – clearly bring the NV into closer correspondence with the Hebrew sources as well as with the LXX. Although the other two positive cases represent a closer harmonization with the LXX than that found in the Vulgate, one of them, 24c (19d/21a), also constitutes a significant distancing

from the Hebrew text, compared with the reading found in the traditional (and critical) text. In the fifth case, 14*b* [11*b*], the NV's approximation to the LXX through the addition of *non bonum* takes it neither further from nor nearer to the *extant* Hebrew, which is equally poorly represented by the Vulgate.

An alternative way of expressing the same facts is to say that the NV comes closer to the extant Hebrew sources via *adjustment* to the LXX in three cases under Category 3 – 19 (16*a*), 42:8*c*, and the omission of 26*a* – and via its *drawing away from* the LXX in two cases under Category 4: 20*b* (16*c*) and 18. On the other hand, in another case from Category 3, 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*), the NV departs from the Hebrew by drawing closer to the LXX.

Although these findings undoubtedly reflect a degree of inconsistency in the NV commission's execution of its remit (which, as indicated in Section III, above, focused primarily on approximation to the LXX but also allowed the Hebrew sources to be reflected), they are based only on the 10 more significant cases. However, once less significant cases are taken into account as well, a more consistent picture emerges. Accordingly, although under Category 3 at 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*) the NV has moved closer to the LXX by adding an introductory *et* but by the same modification has moved further away from the Hebrew sources, in five of the remaining six less important cases from Category 3 – 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*) (NV: *a respiciendo*; other editions: *ne respicias*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), 42:1*b* (two cases) – adjustment to a reading based on the LXX has, in contrast, brought the NV into closer correspondence with the Hebrew as well.⁵⁷

Taking both the more and the less significant cases into account, then, it is clear that when the NV has introduced a change in the text of the Vulgate that change will *generally* bring the text closer to the LXX *and* to the extant Hebrew sources:

the NV comes closer to the Hebrew by *adjusting to* the LXX: Category 3: 19 (16*a*), omission of 26*a*, 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), 42:1*b* (two cases), 42:8*c*; eight cases;

the NV comes closer to the Hebrew by *drawing away from* the LXX: Category 4: 20*b* (16*c*), 18; two cases;

57. In the remaining case under Category 3, 42:8*d*, the NV's approximation to the LXX takes it neither further from nor nearer to the Hebrew, which is equally poorly represented by the Vulgate.

the NV departs from the Hebrew by *adjusting* to the LXX: Category 3: 24c (19d/21a), 27a (21c/23b); two cases.

This preponderance in favour of the NV's adjustment to the LXX and the Hebrew is in keeping with the evidence of four cases from Category 8 – 20a (16b), 21b (17b), 22a (18a), 26 (21b/23a) – where the NV would have come closer to the LXX and also to the Hebrew sources by adopting the readings of the critical editions; one case from Category 4 – 42:1a (Rahlfs: 41:26a) – where the NV would have represented both the LXX and the Hebrew better by maintaining the text found in all four of the other cited editions and not adding an introductory *et*;⁵⁸ and all four cases from Category 7, where by retaining the text of the Clementina (as distinct from that of the two critical editions) the NV has stayed closer not only to the LXX but also to the Hebrew sources.

These observations lead us naturally into the third of the four specified issues: (3) the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate (Clementina) to the Hebrew sources, where these are not clearly reflected in the LXX. The stated principles behind the NV's use of Greek and/or Hebrew sources was presented in Section III, above; in examining this issue it should be kept in mind that there is an apparent discrepancy between (a) the briefly stated principles of the 'Praenotanda', which seem to imply that the Hebrew sources are of no less importance than the Greek in emending the Vulgate – 'Gr *aut* H' – and (b) Stramare's statement about the actual practice of the commission, which indicates that the Hebrew sources were not usually preferred over the LXX: 'In generale, quando il latino richiedeva una correzione, questa fu fatta sul greco [...]; in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito coreggere sull'ebraico.'⁵⁹

Under Category 1, by following the readings shared by all four editions the NV has missed seven opportunities – 14a (11a); 18 (14a) (two cases); 21a (17a); 22a (18a); 24aB (19b/20a); 25abc–26–27ab (NV; other editions: 25abc–26b–27ab; Ziegler: 19d–20ab–21abc; Rahlfs: 21ab–22ab–23ab) (line ordering) – to reflect significantly different Hebrew readings. The other 11 cases

58. In three of the remaining four cases from Category 4 – the lexical differences from the Vulgate at 24b (19c/20b), 27b (22a/24a), and 42:1a (Rahlfs: 26a) – the NV does not significantly improve on the Vulgate's representation of the Greek (and the Hebrew) text; in the fourth case, the switching of 17c–d (NV) and 17a–b (NV) is probably an error.

59. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Volgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448.

in this category⁶⁰ may all be argued to offer an adequate representation of the Hebrew via the LXX.

Under Category 2, the NV has, by not adjusting to the LXX, again missed seven opportunities – 15*a* (12*a*), 22*a* (18*a*), 24*b* (19*c*/20*b*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) (retention of *et*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*d* (Rahlfs: 41:27*b*) (*inveniens*, as Nobilius, for *invenies*, and *omnis viventis*, as Nobilius, for *omnium hominum*), and 42:8*d* (*omnis viventis*, as Nobilius, for *omnium vivorum*) – to come closer to the Hebrew, although only one of these, at 22*a* (18*a*), is significant: NV (and the traditional text): *a principe et a iudice*; LXX: **a iudice et principe*; Hebrew: **a domino et domina*.

On the other hand, the NV has stayed closer to the Hebrew by *not* adjusting the text of the earlier editions (traditional and critical) to the LXX in five relatively unimportant cases: 14*a* (11*a*), 22*b* (18*b*), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*) (two cases), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*).

Although the NV's retention of the Vulgate's [...] *dati et accepti* at 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) maintains a text that is closer than the LXX is to the extant Hebrew, the Hebrew would have been significantly better represented as * [...] *dationem petitionis*.

At 26 (NV) / 26*b* (other editions) / 21*b* (Ziegler) / 23*a* (Rahlfs), the extant Hebrew text would have been better represented by a rendering that differs significantly from both the LXX and the Vulgate.

In one relatively insignificant case, 17*c* (NV) / 17*b* (other editions) / 14*b* (LXX), the NV could have come formally closer to the Hebrew by not adjusting the Vulgate's conjunction to that of the LXX but omitting it altogether.

In the remaining eight cases from Category 2, the Hebrew, where extant, is adequately reflected in the Vulgate (and the NV).

Under Category 3, by not following the shared reading of all four of the other cited editions the NV draws closer to the Hebrew sources on eight of the 12 occasions that it also draws closer to the LXX: 19 (16*a*), 26*a* (omission of line), 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*: *a respiciendo* for *ne respicias*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*) (two cases, the second of *et a* for *de*), 42:8*c*. Of these, the variants at 19 (16*a*), 26*a*, and 42:8*c* are particularly significant.

60. Including the absence of *et* in the NV (reflecting Hebrew *waw*) at the beginning of 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*). The conjunction is attested in witnesses to the Greek and Latin traditions (but not in the editions of Ziegler and Rahlfs) as well as in the Hebrew sources.

In two, relatively unimportant, cases – 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*: introductory *et*) and, more strikingly, 14*b* (11*b*) (NV and LXX: *nomen [...] non bonum delebitur*; M C W BS: *nomen [...] delebitur*) – the NV’s reading has no clear support from the Hebrew witnesses and the NV would have reflected the Hebrew no less closely had it retained the Vulgate’s traditional text. At 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*), however, the NV’s replacement of the Vulgate’s *ab offuscatione* by *a despectione*, in order to represent the LXX, takes the resulting Latin text significantly further from the Hebrew reading on which the LXX is ultimately based. At 42:8*d*, the NV’s *probatus* (also in Nobilius) provides a closer match for the LXX’s *δεδοκιμασμένος* than the Vulgate’s *probabilis* does, but does not reflect the significantly different Hebrew text with *ענוו* ‘humble’.

In Category 4 two significantly different NV readings are derived from the Hebrew rather than from the LXX – 20*b* (16*c*) and 18 (14) (line placement) – whereas one reading, of a less significant nature, 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), takes the NV further away from both the LXX and the Hebrew. In three of the remaining four cases in this category, the other editions indirectly reflect the Hebrew in one way and the NV indirectly reflects it in another. In the final case, the NV erroneously changes the order of lines attested in the other editions, the LXX, and the Hebrew sources.

In each of the four cases covered by Category 7 the NV slightly better reflects both the LXX and the Hebrew sources by following the traditional reading rather than that of the critical editions.

In four cases under Category 8, in contrast, the Greek *and* Hebrew sources are reflected marginally better by the critical editions than by editions of the traditional text and the NV: 20*a* (16*b*), 21*b* (17*b*), 22*a* (18*a*), 26 (21*b*/23*a*); in the remaining four cases – 15*c* (12*c*) (two cases), 16*b* (13*b*), 21*a* (17*a*) – the Hebrew is adequately reflected both in the traditional editions, followed by the NV, and in the alternative readings offered by the critical editions. In none of the eight cases, however, is the difference between the two sets of editions significant.

In the two cases under Category 10, although the reading – or the layout – of the critical text better reflects the Hebrew, the critical text does not differ significantly from the more traditional editions or from the NV.

To summarize, the NV adequately represents the extant Hebrew sources in 43 of the 53 cases in which it follows either a reading shared by all four cited editions of the Vulgate – 11 cases from 18 in Category 1: 15*b* (12*b*), 16*a* (13*a*), 17*a–b* (15*a–b*), 17*d* (14*c*), 23*a* (18*c*/19*a*), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*), 25*c* (21*a*/22*b*), 27*c* (22*b*/24*b*), 28*a* (22*c*/25*a*), 28*b* (22*d*/25*b*), 42:1*c* (Rahlfs: 41:27*a*); 20 cases

out of 23 in Category 2, the three exceptions being 22*a* (18*a*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) (*dati et accepti*), and 26 (NV) / 26*b* (other editions) / 21*b* (Ziegler) / 23*a* (Rahlfs) – or the reading found in the traditional editions but not in the critical ones, corresponding to all 12 cases represented by Categories 7 and 8.

To this figure of 43 (out of 53) cases of broad equivalence among the Hebrew sources, the traditional editions, and the NV may be added 18 more (from a total of 21): both cases from Category 10, in which the NV's reading differs from that of the critical editions on the one hand and the traditional editions on the other; 10 of the 12 cases from Category 3, the two exceptions being 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) and 42:8*d*; and six of the seven cases from Category 4, the exception being the change in line order at 17*c*–*d* (NV) / 17*b*–*c* (other editions) / 14*b*–*c* (LXX). In each of the 16 cases from Categories 3 and 4 the NV differs from the reading shared by the other four editions but by doing so does not depart significantly from the Hebrew and sometimes actually draws closer to it.

In all 61 (43 + 18) of the 74 (53 + 21) cases, the NV may be said to have represented more or less accurately the Hebrew sources by following the traditional editions' rendering of the LXX, by not departing *significantly* from those editions, or by indeed departing significantly from them and in so doing better representing the underlying Hebrew.

Eighteen of these 61 positive and 13 (74 - 61) negative cases⁶¹ are of particular interest.

A. *The Hebrew is represented significantly better by the NV than by the Vulgate*

In each of the following five cases, by departing from the readings of the critical and/or traditional editions of the Vulgate the NV provides a closer representation of a significant Hebrew variant:

Category 3

19 (16*a*)

NV = Hbr. (= LXX Ziegler): *reveremini iudicium meum*

M C BS W (= LXX Rahlfs): *reveremini in his quae procedunt de ore meo*

61. The NV's reordering of the four lines of v. 17 (NV: cdab), which appear in a different order in other editions of the Latin text – 17*bc*–18*ab* – and the LXX – 14*bc*–15*ab* – and in the Hebrew sources, is regarded as a mistake and is not discussed in the following section.

26a

NV = Hbr. (= LXX): line absent

M C BS W: line present

42:8c

NV = Hbr. (= LXX): *in veritate*

M C BS W: *in omnibus*.

Category 4

20b (16c)

NV = Hbr.: *et non omnis pudor probatus*

M C BS W (= LXX): *et non omnia omnibus beneplacent in fide*

18 (14a)

M C BS W (= LXX): 17a (14a)

NV = Hbr.: 18 (different line placement).

B. *The Hebrew is significantly better reflected by the Vulgate than by the NV*

In the first part of this text from Category 3, which also constitutes a case listed under C, below, by adjusting towards the LXX the NV has (inadvertently) increased the distance between the resulting Latin text and the underlying Hebrew:

24c (19d/21a) (beginning)

NV (= LXX): *a despectione [...]*

M C BS W (= Hbr.): *ab offuscatione [...]*

C. *The Hebrew is inadequately reflected in both the Vulgate and the NV*

In the next seven cases, all from Category 1, the NV follows all other Latin editions in clearly reflecting the LXX but failing thereby to represent a significant Hebrew variant:

14a (11a)

NV M C BS W (= LXX): *luctus*

Hbr.: **vanitas*

18 (14a) (two cases)

NV M C BS W (= LXX): *disciplinam in pace conservate*

Hbr.: **disciplinam de confusione audite*

21a (17a)

NV M C BS W (= LXX): *erubescite*

Hbr.: **erubesce*

22a (18a) (end)

NV M C BS W (= LXX): *de delicto*

Hbr.: **de dolo* (Ms. B); **de coniuratione* (Masada Ms.)

24aB (19b/20a)

NV M C BS W (= LXX): *de veritate Dei et testamento*

Hbr.: **ab irritum faciendo iuramentum et pactum*

24c–25abc–26–27a

NV: 24c–25abc–26–27a =

M C BS W: 24c–25abc–26⁶²–27a =

Ziegler: 19d–20ab–21abc / Rahlfs: 21ab–22ab–23ab

Hbr. Masada Ms. (assuming NV verse numbering): 24c–25c–26–25a–27a–25b.

In the following two cases, from Category 2, the NV agrees with the other Latin editions, which in turn disagree with the LXX, on the one hand, and with the Hebrew, on the other:

22a (18a) (beginning)

NV M C (BS W): *a principe et (a) iudice*

LXX: *a iudice et principe* (Nobilius)

Hbr.: **a domino et domina* or **a principe et principissa*

26 (NV; other editions: 26b; Ziegler: 21b; Rahlfs: 23a)

NV M C BS W: *ab auferendo partem et non restituendo*

LXX: **ab auferendo partem et dationem*

Hbr.: **a silentio in divisione partis*.

In the next two cases, from Category 3, the NV agrees with the LXX rather than with the other Latin editions, but neither the LXX nor the reading of the other Latin editions agrees with the Hebrew:

14b (11b)

NV (= LXX): *nomen [...] impiorum non bonum delebitur*

M C BS W: *nomen [...] impiorum delebitur*

Hbr. (Ms. B): *vnomen [...] gratiae non delebitur*

62. The Vulgate also includes 26a, absent from the LXX, the Hebrew, and the NV, and irrelevant to the present comparison.

42:8d

NV (= LXX): *probatus*M C BS W: *probabilis*Hbr.: **modestus*.

Similarly, in the second part of the text listed under subsection B, above, by not adjusting towards the LXX the NV has maintained the Vulgate's relative proximity to the Hebrew but has not made a minor adjustment that would have more accurately represented the Hebrew text underlying the LXX:

Category 2

24c (19d/21a) (end)

LXX: [...] *accepti et dati* (Nobilius)NV M C BS W: [...] *dati et accepti*Hbr.: *[...] *dationem petitionis*.

The size of the last subsection – C. *The Hebrew is inadequately reflected in both the Vulgate and the NV* (12 cases) – and the incomplete use of Hebrew data when employed – a case in point being 18 (14a), where despite adopting the Hebrew ordering of the text the NV maintains the traditional *disciplinam in pace conservate* instead of **disciplinam de confusione audite*, suggested by two Hebrew witnesses – combine to suggest that direct or indirect examination of the Hebrew sources did not form a significant part of the NV commission's work, even though such scrutiny appears to be implied by the comments in Stramare's description and in the NV's 'Praenotanda', cited in Section III, above. The evidence presented so far points, rather, to the conclusion that the NV will in general only coincide with the Hebrew if the Hebrew is already reflected in the LXX.

Thus, for example, in the first two cases cited above under A (*The Hebrew is represented significantly better by the NV than by the Vulgate*), 19 (16a) and 26a, the NV departs from the other editions to draw closer to the LXX, which in turn, at least in these passages, reflects the Hebrew. However, in the antepenultimate item under C, 14b (11b) – *nomen [...] impiorum non bonum delebitur* (NV = LXX) / *nomen [...] impiorum delebitur* (M, C, W, BS) / **nomen gratiae non delebitur* (Hbr. Ms. B: שם חסד לא יכרת) – the NV appears to have overlooked (with Ziegler) the Vulgate's preservation of a reading that is arguably easier to trace to both extant Hebrew sources. This suggests that when the NV editors adapted the Vulgate to the LXX, they did not confirm that such adaptation would be consistent with the Hebrew witnesses.

In the third item under B, *24aB* (*19b/20a*), the NV does not take into account a significant and probably superior reading in the Hebrew text signalled in the mediaeval Ms. B and the Peshitta and confirmed in the Masada Ms. Although the Masada material was unavailable to Ziegler when preparing the Göttingen edition, it was fully published in 1965 and could have been employed by members of the NV commission between 1971, when work began on the final forms of the Old Testament books,⁶³ and the initial publication of the NV's wisdom books in 1977.⁶⁴ It seems reasonably clear, however, that Ziegler's conclusions as represented by his Göttingen edition were not reassessed by the NV commission, even though it included Ziegler himself, and that evidence unavailable to Ziegler was not taken into account.

In view of the date of the NV commission's work on Sirach, a possible source of its Hebrew-based readings is Patrick Skehan's 1955 translation in the so-called *Confraternity Bible*, which was published as a complete Bible in 1961 and was effectively reproduced in the 1970 NAB, which contains a largely identical version of Sirach. However, although the NV's placement of the line corresponding to *17a* in the other editions (*14a* in the LXX) as v. 18 and the NV's reading 'et non omnis pudor probatus' at *20b* (*16c*) (for the Vulgate's 'et non omnia omnibus beneplacent in fide') both agree with Skehan's translation – which has at *20b* (*16c*) 'nor is it always the proper thing to blush' – other obvious adaptations to the Hebrew reflected in Skehan's published translations in the *Confraternity Bible* and the NAB (as well as in Rudolf Smend's well-known study of Sirach) are omitted by the NV: *14a* (*11a*): 'a fleeting thing'; *18* (*14a*): 'heed my instruction about shame'; *22a* (*18a*): 'before master and mistress' (NAB: v. *15b*); *24aB* (*19b/20a*) 'of breaking an oath or agreement' (NAB: v. *17b*); *42:8d*: 'and recognized by all men as discreet'. The source(s) of the NV's occasional use of Hebrew-based readings thus remain(s) unclear.

As indicated in Section III, above, the basic principle issued to the NV's translation commission, in so far as it can be ascertained, was that the Hebrew was to be used only when the Greek could plausibly be shown to be based on a faulty reading of – or in – the Hebrew *Vorlage*: 'In generale, quando il latino richiedeva una correzione, questa fu fatta sul greco [...]; in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito coreggere

63. See *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praefatio ad lectorem', p. 10.

64. *Nova Vulgata*, 'Praefatio ad lectorem', p. 10, n. 7.

sull'ebraico.⁶⁵ The question arises, then, as to whether the NV's five significant adjustments towards the Hebrew, specified above, fulfil this condition, and whether its 13 significant non-adjustments fail to do so.

In the case of 19 (16*a*), the reading of traditional editions of the LXX, including the edition of Rahlfs, ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι μου – accurately paraphrased in all four cited editions of the Vulgate as *in his quae procedunt de ore meo* – may plausibly be argued to incorporate a phonetic or orthographic misunderstanding of an original ἐπὶ τῷ κρίματι μου, as in Ziegler's edition, followed by the NV, *iudicium meum*. As Ziegler points out, this emendation of the Greek text on the basis of the Hebrew goes back to Smend's major study.⁶⁶ While there is no doubt that the Greek of (Smend and) Ziegler and the Latin of the NV represent a significantly more literal rendering of the Hebrew, it is also possible that the text in traditional editions of the LXX represents an interpretative, contextual, rendering of 'judgement' as 'word(s)',⁶⁷ later paraphrastically rendered by the Latin: 'the things that come from my mouth'.⁶⁸

The NV's omission of v. 26*a* is supported by Ziegler, traditional editions of the LXX, and by both Hebrew witnesses.

At 20*b* (16*c*), the NV's *et non omnis pudor probatus* clearly represents אֵל וְלִבְחַר כָּל הַכֹּלִים נִבְחַר found in both Hebrew witnesses, whereas the Vulgate's *et non omnia omnibus bene placent in fide* appears to represent a misreading of הַפְּלִים 'being ashamed' as בְּכֹלָם 'by all (of them)' as well as scribal harmonization with or influence from באמת at the end of 42:1*c* (Rahlfs: 41:27*a*) and 42:8*c*.

The NV's repositioning of the line corresponding to v. 14*a* in the LXX and v. 17*a* in the Vulgate (*Disciplinam in pace conservate filii*) to the beginning of v. 19 (Ziegler and Rahlfs: v. 16),⁶⁹ which is numbered by the NV, accordingly, as v. 18, is fully in accordance with both Hebrew witnesses and is

65. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448.

66. ZIEGLER, *Sapientia*, p. 319, citing SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Kommentar', p. 385-386, on Ms. B, והכלמו על משפטי, which Smend renders more literally in the commentary, '[...] nach meiner Lehrweise', and more contextually in the Deutsche Uebersetzung, p. 73: 'und schämt euch, wie ich es bestimme'.

67. Thus PETERS, *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 350: 'Freiheit oder Textfehler'.

68. NOBILIUS, *Vetus Testamentum*, is, as expected, much closer to the Greek: *in verbo meo*.

69. See SMEND, *Weisheit*, 'Kommentar', p. 385; SKEHAN & DI LELLA, *Wisdom*, p. 476, 478.

widely accepted as reflecting an earlier structure of text than that represented by the LXX and the Vulgate.

At 42:8c, the NV's *in veritate* clearly matches both the LXX's ἀληθινῶς and באמת of the Hebrew. The Vulgate's *in omnibus*, for which *Biblia Sacra* and Ziegler offer no counterpart in the Latin or Greek tradition, appears to result from scribal confusion with *omnium virorum / vivorum* in the next line.⁷⁰ All translations consulted, apart from those based on the Clementina, accept the Hebrew-based reading of the LXX.

In all five of the above instances – in which the NV has adopted the Hebrew reading, whether or not reflected in the LXX, in contrast to the Vulgate – the NV's decision cannot easily be faulted on text-critical grounds. Should the NV, however, also have adopted the Hebrew readings in the 13 listed places where it has not?

(1) At 14a (11a) הַבֶּל *vanitas of both Hebrew witnesses probably suits the context better than *luctus* of the Vulgate and the NV, which appears to reflect a misreading, mishearing, or misinterpretation of הַבֶּל as אֲבֵל 'mourning'; the Hebrew-based reading is accepted by Smend, Peters, and Skehan.

(2–3) Similar remarks apply to one of the two Hebrew readings in v. 18 (NV) – Vulgate: 17a; LXX: 14a – where the Hebrew שמעו 'hear' could easily have been misread, misheard, or misinterpreted (in dictation) as שמרו 'keep'. On the other hand, the transformation of בִּשְׁתַּ ' (of) shame' to *in pace* 'in peace' can only easily be explained as the result of a visual confusion of some kind. In any case, both Hebrew readings (attested in both Hebrew witnesses) better match the context – especially when the line in which they occur is also repositioned, as it is in the NV – and are accepted by Smend, Peters, Skehan, and others.

(4) At 21a (17a) both Hebrew witnesses employ the singular form of the imperative – בּוֹשׁ – as against the plural of the LXX – αἰσχύνεσθε – and the Vulgate (including the NV): *erubescite*. The use of a plural in the Greek may be explained as due to the influence of plurals in the immediately preceding lines, but the parallel text at 42:1e (Rahlfs: 42:1a), with the singular, μὴ [...] αἰσχυσθῆς (*ne [...] confundaris*), as well as the abundance of singular verbs and complete lack of plural ones in the intervening lines, strongly suggests that the Hebrew should be followed at 21a (17a), just as it is by, for example, Smend, Peters, Sauer, and the *Einheitsübersetzung*.

70. Cf. PETERS, *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 354.

(5) At 24aB (19b/20a) the Hebrew text of the Masada Ms. – מהפר אלה – or of the mediaeval Ms. B – which is broadly compatible here with the Masada Ms. – provides a better link with the preceding and following material and is widely followed in commentaries and translations. In contrast, the text of the Vulgate and the NV, *de veritate Dei et testamento*, appears to result from the Greek translator's misreading – or a Hebrew scribe's miswriting – of the first word as מִאֲמֶת 'of the truth (of)' rather than as מִהֶפֶר 'of breach (of)' and subsequent interpreting of the second word not as אֱלֹה 'oath' but as אֱלֹהִים 'God'.

(6) Similar comments apply to 24c–25abc–26–27a (NV; other editions: 24c–25abc–26b–27a; Ziegler: 19d–20ab–21abc; Rahlfs: 21ab–22ab–23ab), where the NV has maintained the LXX's order of elements concerning which shame should be felt rather than attempting any adaptation towards the more logical arrangement of the five elements attested by the Hebrew (most completely as represented by the Masada Ms.) and accepted by Smend, Peters, and more recent studies and translations.

(7) At 22a (18a) the gender-based contrast attested in both Hebrew witnesses – cf. NAB: 'before master and mistress, of falsehood' – coheres with the preceding reference to 'father and mother'⁷¹ and is probably to be preferred over the LXX's 'before judge and magistrate, of error' (NETS), which is, in contrast, more obviously parallel to 21b (17b): 'and before leader and dynast, of falsehood' (NETS). The Greek translator, or an earlier Hebrew copyist, either did not understand the somewhat opaque reference to a female authority figure here and interpreted (or altered) the text accordingly, or (mis)interpreted גְּבוּרַת as 'Würdebezeichnung durch das Femininum'.⁷²

(8) At the end of the same line, 22a (18a), comparison with the preceding two lines and following three lines indicates that the shameful object or deed was originally different both from 'offence' (*delictum*) of the Vulgate and the NV (and the LXX), which appears to have been influenced by 'sin' (*iniquitas*) in the following line, and from 'falsehood' (*dolus*) of Hebrew Ms. B, which appears to have been influenced by 'lie' (*mendacium*) in the preceding line.

71. See Part 1 of this study in *Tamid*, 12 (2016–2017), p. 29–30, n. 109.

72. Thus PETERS, *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 350, comparing the LXX's interpretation of קְהֵלֶת as ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής 'the Ecclesiast' (NETS).

Instead, the original text is most plausibly represented by ‘plot’ (**coniuratio*) of the Masada Ms., reflected in Sauer’s translation (‘Verschwörung’).⁷³

(9) At 26 (NV; other editions: 26*b*; Ziegler: 21*b* / Rahlfs: 23*a*) there appears to have been a process of corruption and misunderstanding between, on the one hand, the Hebrew – ‘of silence at the division of a portion’ – and the Greek – ‘before taking away a portion and a gift’ (NETS) – and, on the other hand, between the Greek and the Latin: ‘of taking away a portion and not restoring’ (*Douai-Rheims*). Smend and Skehan, in his various translations, both follow the Hebrew, although the specific processes that gave rise to the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek are far from clear, due in part to differences in the three Hebrew readings.

(10) At 14*b* (11*b*) Smend observes that the Hebrew, ‘aber der fromme Name wird nicht ausgetilgt’, is reflected in ‘[der] ursprüngliche[n] Lesart des Gr. [bei] S^{ca} und de[n] Armenier: ὄνομα δὲ ἀγαθὸν οὐκ ἐξάλειφθήσεται’,⁷⁴ and this is also reflected in Peters⁷⁵ and in the NAB (and the *Confraternity Bible*): ‘but a virtuous name will never be annihilated’.

(11) At 42:8*d* Peters suggests that the LXX’s *δεδοκιμασμένος* might derive from a misreading of צנוע ‘modest’ as צרוף ‘refined’, although elsewhere he also leaves open the possibility that the three rather different LXX renderings of צנוע (and הצנוע) at Sir 16:25*b*, 30:31*a* (33:23*a*) (Rahlfs: 31:22*c*), and 42:8*d* indirectly derive from the LXX interpretation of לָכֵן וְהֵצַנְעוּ ‘And to walk modestly’ (NJPS) at Mic 6:8 as καὶ ἔτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ‘and to be ready to walk’ (NETS).⁷⁶ In any case, Smend, Peters, and Skehan all accept the Hebrew reading at 42:8*d*.

(12–13) The text presented above under both B and C – 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) – serves first of all as a clear example of the NV’s (unintentional) departure from the Hebrew, which is better represented (albeit indirectly) at the beginning by the Vulgate’s *obfuscatio* than by *despectio* of the NV (and the LXX). However, the NAB (like the *Confraternity Bible*) appears to reflect the Hebrew in an obvious way only at the end of the line: ‘when asked’; at the beginning of the line, the rendering of the NAB and the *NABRE*, ‘Of refusing to

73. Other modern translations reflect Ms. B, as do studies published before the discovery of the Masada Ms.

74. SMEND, *Weisheit*, ‘Kommentar’, p. 384; ‘Deutsche Uebersetzung’, p. 72.

75. *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 345: ‘doch der Name des Frommen verschwindet nicht’.

76. Cf. PETERS, *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 258, 354.

give', could be based on the Hebrew witnesses, 'from withholding (the giving of a request)', or on the LXX, 'from being scornful (of taking and of giving)'.⁷⁷

In all but one (9) of these 13 cases, then, it may justifiably be argued, in view of the specific references in the *Praenotanda* to text-critical use of the Hebrew sources, that the NV has failed to follow the Hebrew when the Hebrew represents significantly different, and superior, readings to those attested in the LXX.

The last of the main issues to be discussed – (4) the degree to which the NV could have drawn closer to the LXX and/or the Hebrew sources had it employed the critical editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra* – is logically divided into two parts, relating to (a) the LXX and (b) the Hebrew sources. In both cases, reference to the various apparatus of *Biblia Sacra* is also made to see if a relevant LXX or Hebrew reading is signalled in them.

The answer to the first part – (a) the degree to which the NV would have come closer to the LXX had it followed the editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra*, where their readings differ from those found in editions of the traditional text – is effectively represented by the four cases from Category 7, the eight cases from Category 8, and one of the two cases from Category 10; in each of these categories there is a difference between the two sets of editions (more extensively critical as against traditional).⁷⁸

Examination of these three categories yields a positive answer to the question with regard to six of the eight instances under Category 8 – 20a (16b), 15c (12c) (two cases), 21b (17b), 22a (18a), 26 (21b/23a) – where the NV has retained the traditional text but would have come closer to the LXX had it followed the two critical editions, and a negative one with regard to all four instances under Category 7:⁷⁹ 21a (17a) (two cases), 23b (19aA/19bA), 42:8d; here, retaining the traditional text has maintained the NV's closeness to the LXX; following the critical editions would have taken the NV further away from the LXX.

77. Contrast the REB, which clearly reflects the LXX throughout: 'of giving or receiving with ill grace'.

78. In the other case from Category 10 – 24aA (19aB/19b B) – the NV agrees in its layout of the text with the edition of Weber but not with *Biblia Sacra* (or with the Marietti edition, which agrees with *Biblia Sacra*, or with the edition of Colunga & Turrado, which does not).

79. Under Category 10, it is uncertain whether *invisus* of the traditional text or *occultus* of the two critical editions better reflects the LXX's ἀφανής.

The difference between the two sets of readings is not especially noteworthy in any of these 10 cases and this initial, very limited, finding gives no clear indication that where the critical editions differ from the traditional text they may be assumed to provide a more accurate reflection of the LXX.

This conclusion is supported by observations from Categories 2, 3, and 4, in which the critical editions simply reproduce the readings of the traditional text. Accordingly, we see that Category 4 provides only seven examples of the critical editions' relative accuracy in reflecting the details of the LXX, whereas Categories 2 (23 cases) and 3 (12 cases) provide 35 instances of their relative inaccuracy. It would appear, then, that the readings of the two critical editions should be explicitly checked against the LXX, whether those readings agree or disagree with their counterparts in the traditional text.

In contrast, the apparatus to *Biblia Sacra* for the three categories that represent places in which the critical editions do not reflect the LXX as accurately as they might have done – 2, 3, and 7 – do indeed, as expected, provide clear evidence of the LXX readings, and on this account at least the critical editions should be favoured over editions of the traditional text. The LXX text – or a Latin reading that approximates more closely to it – is signalled by the apparatus in 12 of the 20 relatively unimportant differences from the LXX under Category 2 – 14*a* (11*a*), 15*a* (12*a*), 22*b* (18*b*), 23*b* (19*aA*/19*bA*), 24*aB* (19*b*/20*a*) (introductory preposition), 24*b* (19*c*/20*b*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) (two cases), 25*b* (20*b*/22*a*) (*a viso* for *a respectu*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*) (**sermones absconditorum* for *sermonis absconditi*), 42:1*d* (Rahlfs: 41:27*b*) (*inveniens* for *invenies*) – and in two of the three more significant ones – 17*c* (other editions: 17*d*; Ziegler and Rahlfs: 14*b*) and 26 (NV) / 26*b* (M, C, BS, W) / 21*b* (Ziegler) / 23*a* (Rahlfs) – as well as in all four cases, of little significance, under Category 7 – 21*a* (17*a*) (two cases), 23*b* (19*aA*/19*bA*), and 42:8*d* – and in three of the 12 cases under Category 3 – 14*b* (11*b*), 42:8*c*, and the omission of 26*a* – in which the NV differs from both traditional and critical editions and by so doing comes in all three cases *significantly* closer to the LXX. This figure of 21 (12 + 2 + 4 + 3) positive cases in which the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus offer information about differences from the LXX⁸⁰ gives additional value to the use of *Biblia Sacra*⁸¹ in approximating to the LXX.

80. In the 18 remaining cases from Categories 2 and 3 no such information is provided.

81. Specifically *Biblia Sacra*, rather than Weber's edition, which has only a limited apparatus.

Examination of all seven categories is required to answer the second part of our fourth question: to what extent might the NV have come closer to the Hebrew sources had it followed the editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra*, where these editions differ in their readings from those found in editions of the traditional text, or by following any indications concerning the Hebrew sources in the apparatus to *Biblia Sacra*?

Under Category 1, in which all five editions of the Latin text coincide and also reflect the LXX, none of seven instances – 14*a* (11*a*), 18 (14*a*) (two cases), 21*a* (14*a*), 22*a* (18*a*), 24*aB* (19*b*/20*a*), 24*c*–25*abc*–26–27*a* (NV; other editions: 24*c*–25*abc*–26*b*–27*a*; Ziegler: 19*d*–20*ab*–21*abc*; Rahlfs: 21*ab*–22*ab*–23*ab*) (line ordering) – of well-attested and significant Hebrew-based readings are registered in the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus.

Under Category 2, in which 20 minor and three more significant adjustments towards the LXX have not been made, seven opportunities to come closer to the form of the Hebrew via approximation to the LXX – 15*a* (12*a*), 22*a* (18*a*), 24*b* (19*c*/20*b*), 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*d* (Rahlfs: 41:27*b*) (two cases) – have also been missed, although only one of these seven cases – 22*a* (18*a*) – relates to a significantly different reading. Two of the Hebrew variants are alluded to by the apparatus of *Biblia Sacra*: 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*); 42:1*d* (*inveniens* for *invenies*).

Under Category 3, in which the NV departs from the shared reading of all four of the other cited editions, the apparatus of *Biblia Sacra* make no reference to four relatively unimportant Hebrew readings – 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*: *a respiciendo* for *ne respicias*), 27*b* (22*a*/24*a*), 42:1*a* (Rahlfs: 41:26*a*), 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41: 26*b*) (*a* for *de*) – and a more significant one – 19 (16*a*) – which the NV reflects via its approximation to the LXX; to two relatively unimportant cases – 27*a* (21*c*/23*b*: introductory *et*) and 14*b* (11*b*) – and one significant case – 24*c* (19*d*/21*a*) – in which the NV would have reflected the Hebrew more closely by retaining the traditional text of the Clementina (and of the critical editions); or to the Hebrew text with וְיִנְיָ ‘humble’ at 42:8*d*, which differs significantly from the LXX’s δεδοκιμασμένος (NV and Nobileius: *probatus*) and the Vulgate’s *probabilis*. However, the first apparatus of *Biblia Sacra* does refer, indirectly, to the significant Hebrew (and Greek) reading reflected in the NV at 42:8*c* – *in veritate* for the Vulgate’s *in omnibus* – and to the significant omission of the line that comprises 26*a* in other editions, as well as to the presence of *waw* at 42:1*b* (Rahlfs: 41:26*b*).

Under Category 4, two of the NV’s significant departures from the shared reading of the other four editions – 18 (placement of line), 20*b* (16*c*) – are

based on the Hebrew, whereas one minor change – addition of *et* at 42:1a (Rahlfs: 26a) – takes the NV slightly further from the Hebrew. No clear support is offered by the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus for any of the NV's seven readings in Category 4.

In each of the four cases in Category 7 – 21a (17a) (two cases), 23b (19aA/19bA), 42:8d – none of which are significant, by retaining the traditional text the NV stays closer not only to the LXX but also to the form of the Hebrew, to which the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus refer, indirectly, at 42:8d.

In four of the eight cases in Category 8 – 20a (16b), 21b (17b), 22a (18a), 26 (21b/23a) – the NV would have come closer not only to the LXX but also to the Hebrew sources had it adopted the readings of the critical editions. However, in none of the eight cases is the difference between the traditional editions and the NV, on the one hand, and *Biblia Sacra* and Weber, on the other, significant. The *Biblia Sacra* apparatus refer indirectly to the Hebrew text of 15c (12c) (**quam milia thesauri pretiosi*).

In one of the two cases under Category 10 – 17c (14b) – where the NV departs from the reading of the traditional editions on the one hand and of *Biblia Sacra* and Weber on the other, the reading preferred by *Biblia Sacra* and Weber is supported in the apparatus to *Biblia Sacra* not only by some Latin sources but also by a rabbinic quotation of Sirach (although the text of Sirach as such, found in the Genizah mss., is not cited). However, the three readings do not differ significantly from each other. In the other case, 24aA (19aB/19bB), to which no reference is made in the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus, the layout of *Biblia Sacra* and the Marietti edition reflects the logical structure of both the LXX and the Hebrew sources whereas the layout of the NV does not.

In sum, the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus contain pointers to five Hebrew readings not reflected in the NV: two in Category 2 – 24c (19d/21a), 42:1d (*inveniens* for *invenies*) – and one each in Categories 3, 8, and 10 – 42:1b (Rahlfs: 41:26b), 15c (12c), 17c (14b). The apparatus also refer, indirectly, to three Hebrew readings adopted by the NV but not reflected in the other four editions – Category 3: omission of 26a, 42:8c – or in the text of *Biblia Sacra* itself: Category 7: 42:8d. In four of the eight cases under Category 8 – 20a (16b), 21b (17b), 22a (18a), 26 (21b/23a) – the NV would have come closer to the Hebrew sources, via the LXX, had it adopted the readings found in the main text (not the apparatus) of the critical editions. On the other hand, in all four cases under Category 7 following the two critical editions would have led the NV away, albeit marginally, from both the LXX and the Hebrew sources.

In the texts cited thus far only three *significant* variations between the Hebrew text and the Latin (and/or Greek) tradition are referred to by the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus: 24c (19d/21a), *ab offuscatione* (C, M, W, BS / Hbr.) as against *a despectione* (NV / LXX); the omission of 26a; and the different reading at 42:8c: *in veritate* for the Vulgate's *in omnibus*. However, the *Biblia Sacra* apparatus fail to register two significant Hebrew variants adopted by the NV under Category 7 – 20b (16c) and the NV's positioning of the line corresponding to 17a in other editions (14a in the LXX) as v. 18 – and eight significant Hebrew variants not adopted by the NV under Category 1 – 14a (11a), 18 (14a) (two cases), 21a (14a), 22a (18a), 24aB (19b/20a), 24c–25abc–26–27a (NV; other editions: 24c–25abc–26b–27a; Ziegler: 19d–20ab–21abc; Rahlfs: 21ab–22ab–23ab) (line ordering) – and Category 3: 42:8d. There is, accordingly, little evidence to support the idea that the NV would have much better reflected the Hebrew sources had the commission employed the text and apparatus of *Biblia Sacra*.

This finding is broadly supported by the evidence presented towards the close of the discussion of the second main issue – (2) the degree to which the NV adapts the traditional text of the Vulgate (Clementina) more closely to the LXX – where it was shown that in four cases from Category 8 the NV would have come closer to the LXX and the Hebrew sources by adopting the readings of the critical editions, whereas in the four cases under Category 7 retaining the traditional text of the Clementina (and not adopting that of the two critical editions) has kept the NV closer not only to the LXX but also to the Hebrew sources.

5. Conclusions

The dominant theme emerging from the foregoing analysis is of consistency and the lack of it. If under Category 1 it was right for the NV not to opt for five significant Hebrew readings but to maintain the Vulgate's adherence to the LXX, how can it also be right for the NV on the one hand to adapt away from the LXX towards the Hebrew at 20b (16c) and at 18 (other editions: 17a; LXX: 14a) (Category 4) but on the other hand to come even closer to the LXX instead of moving towards the Hebrew, as at 14b (11b) (Category 3)? Apart from this there is also the issue of *incomplete* use of the Hebrew evidence in passages where the Hebrew material has clearly been accessed, albeit indirectly, as at 18 (14a) (Category 1).

Such discrepancy in the use of Greek and Hebrew sources – and particularly in the NV’s failure to use the Hebrew sources where these offer readings that are superior to those of the LXX from a text-critical perspective – is all the more striking in view of the remit apparently issued to the NV commission for Sirach, which not only dwells at some length on the Hebrew sources but also indicates that these are to be preferred when comparison with them suggests that the Greek and/or Latin traditions reflect a confused or corrupt reading: ‘in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito coreggere sull’ebraico’.⁸² As indicated in Section IV, above, in 12⁸³ of the 18 more significant cases examined the NV fails to follow the Hebrew where the Hebrew represents significantly superior readings to those attested in the LXX. In contrast, however, in five cases the NV has indeed correctly followed the Hebrew.

Another area of inconsistency, which is even more remarkable because it does not entail a decision concerning the superiority of one source (the Hebrew witnesses) over another (the LXX), is that of the NV’s approximation to the LXX. Category 3 provides various instances of the NV’s drawing closer to the precise wording of the LXX (specifically in the edition of Ziegler) and yet Categories 2 and 8 provide many more examples of failure to make such adjustments, all of which, in the case of Category 8, are represented by *Biblia Sacra* and by Weber’s edition. Although in our summary of the NV’s work we have frequently pointed to the relatively ‘insignificant’ nature of such changes/differences from an interpretative and exegetical perspective, it is also true that interpreters, exegetes, and, of course, text-critics, would have been afforded greater assistance had the NV consistently come closer to the exact text of the LXX. The failure to make such adjustments seems all the more remarkable in view of the primarily stylistic alterations the NV makes in four of the seven cases under Category 4 and in one of the two cases from Category 10, none of which have any text-critical relevance. If the NV commission were prepared to make unnecessary minor changes of this type, why did they not also make the numerous minor but less insignificant changes that would have brought the NV into closer agreement with the LXX?

82. STRAMARE, ‘Neo-Vulgata’, p. 132 = ‘Libro dell’Ecclesiastico’, p. 448.

83. This figure excludes 41:26, item 9 in the list of 13 cases of the NV’s failure to follow superior Hebrew readings, as not every detail of the underlying Hebrew text is certain.

The foregoing study has indicated that wherever a reading in editions of the Clementina (those of Colunga & Turrado and Marietti) differs from the reading found in the critical editions of Weber and *Biblia Sacra*, the NV never shares the reading of the critical editions, which strongly suggests that they were simply not consulted by the NV commission, at least for Sirach. This in turn suggests that where the traditional (Clementina) reading (found also in the NV) actually turns out to be a more faithful reflection of the Greek and/or the Hebrew than that provided by *Biblia Sacra* and Weber, the NV's reading constitutes a felicitous coincidence rather than a judicious selection of readings on the part of the NV commission; such cases are, not unexpectedly, matched by correspondingly infelicitous coincidences with the traditional editions (of the Clementina) in places where the two critical editions provide better readings, which the commission had, it would appear, not even seen.

The primary task of the NV commission was not text-critical – the provision of a Latin text that best reflects the earliest and/or best manuscript witnesses of the Vulgate – but interpretative and translational: the provision of as accurate as possible a translation into Latin of the text of the Bible as represented in accepted scholarly editions of the source texts (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek), the translation to reflect standard contemporary scholarly interpretation of those texts, although based as much as possible in its wording on the Clementine Vulgate in a standard and authorized edition (Marietti).

If this task were considered to lie at the minimal end of the revision spectrum, adjusting only the clearest of discrepancies from the standard edition of the text in the LXX, which constitutes the only fully extant form of an earlier text, then for the portion of text covered in the present study perhaps only *three* changes would have been necessary: (a) two of the five more significant adjustments by the NV to the LXX under Category 3, namely, the omission of v. 26a in other versions of the Vulgate and the NV's use of *in veritate* for *in omnibus* at 42:8c; (b) one of the NV's three more significant failures to adjust the text in earlier forms of the Vulgate – *ab auferendo partem et non restituendo* – to that of the LXX: **ab auferendo partem et dationem* (26 [NV] / 26b [M, C, BS, W] / 21b [Ziegler] / 23a [Rahlf's]). If the LXX were to be given preference over the extant Hebrew witnesses, then two adjustments by the NV towards the Hebrew would need to be reversed to match the forms found in other versions of the Vulgate, which correspond with the LXX: the positioning of v. 17a in other versions (and v. 14a in the LXX) as v. 18 in the NV and the altering of *non omnia omnibus bene placent in fide* in the other versions (and the LXX) at v. 20b (LXX: v. 16c) to *non omnis pudor probatus* in the NV.

However, the examples of Category 3 in particular indicate that on various occasions the NV has attempted to come closer to the LXX in structural detail and not only in meaning. Although these attempts at detailed harmonization with the Greek are greatly outnumbered by cases in which no such attempt has been made (Category 2) – even where a precedent for adjustment is found in critical editions of the Vulgate (Category 8) – the nature and extent of the words devoted to Sirach in the NV’s ‘Praenotanda’ suggest that a minimalist approach was not intended and that a more detailed adaptation to the LXX, as reflected in Category 3, was in fact the desired goal for the commission’s work on Sirach; Categories 2 and 8 represent, consequently, a clear failure to fulfil this remit. Whether this failure to adapt fully to the LXX was due to poor communication, to changes in personnel, to fatigue, or to some other motive remains unknown. A similar set of unanswerable questions relates to the commission’s failure to evaluate and, where appropriate, to make use of the extant Hebrew sources in a consistent manner, as already observed.

Although a proper evaluation of the nature of the commission’s work on Sirach would require analysis of considerably more material, a brief review of the first paragraph of the Prologue to Sirach (corresponding to verses 1–14 in the editions of Ziegler and Rahlfs)⁸⁴ as well as of the first nine verses of Ch. 1, following the Prologue, provides additional evidence that the inconsistencies already noted in the NV’s adjustment to the LXX comprise a recurrent feature of the commission’s work: the NV will occasionally and unpredictably make minor adjustments to the Latin of the Clementina in order to bring the text into closer formal harmony either with the LXX (see Category 3) or with diction and structure attested elsewhere in the Clementina itself (see Category 4). The contrast between, on the one hand, the NV’s propensity to adjust the Clementina towards significantly different LXX readings in the Prologue and, on the other hand, its overall failure to make such adjustments in verses 1–9 of Ch. 1 broadly corresponds with the inconsistency noted in regard to Ch. 41, where the NV will sometimes but not always adjust to both more and less significant differences from the LXX (note especially Categories 2 and 3).

On the basis of this evidence as a whole it may probably be concluded that the NV often but not always adjusts the Clementina to the LXX where the

84. This sequence of text corresponds to the first ‘half’ of the Prologue, according to PETERS, *Buch Jesus Sirach*, p. 2.

LXX has a significantly different reading, and that it occasionally but far from systematically makes other, more minor, adjustments either towards the LXX or towards parallel usages in the Clementina itself. The NV can hardly, then, be used as an authoritative guide to the form of Sirach in the LXX, as the NV does not always adjust the Clementina even to *significant* differences from the LXX. Although there are places in the NV that represent close and accurate adjustment to the LXX, there are also many that do not, especially in regard to differences of a formal rather than a semantic or an interpretative nature.

The fact that the adaptations noted by Stramare and in the NV's 'Praenotanda' are not, in principle, only towards the LXX but also towards the Hebrew can hardly be used as an excuse for such incomplete harmonization with the LXX, as the Hebrew sources inform the NV in only a very small minority of cases. Moreover, the Hebrew sources have been utilized inconsistently and have perhaps been accessed only indirectly.

It is possible that the NV's revision of the Clementina of Sirach was undertaken according to different interpretations of the stated principles by different members of the commission (or by the same member or members at different stages over the course of the translation); in any case, the work on Sirach – much of which might have taken place at the very beginning of the commission's period of activity⁸⁵ – does not appear ever to have been carefully reviewed against the stated translation principles, which are, themselves, less than orotund. The resulting product sometimes represents better readings than those embodied in Ziegler's edition of the LXX, and most of the adjustments to Ziegler that could have been made are relatively minor and have little impact on the interpretative and translational quality of the NV version of Sirach. Nonetheless, these and other 'saving graces' cannot disguise the fact that the NV reflects significant inconsistencies in procedure, which have resulted in a revised Latin version that, whatever its merits, cannot be used as a sure guide to the Greek translation of Ben Sira's composition and is even less reliable as a guide to the Hebrew witnesses.

Although there are clear indications that a closer approximation to the LXX could have emerged had the NV commission for Sirach adopted *Biblia Sacra* as its base text for the Vulgate, rather than an edition of the traditional Clementine text (see Category 8), they are outweighed by the evidence from

85. See n. 33, above.

numerous places in which the critical editions simply reproduce the traditional text and do not draw closer to the LXX, especially, but not only, in matters of detail (see Categories 2 and 3). Nonetheless, there is little doubt that the commission could have made better use of the apparatus to *Biblia Sacra*, the first of which provides indications regarding divergences between the Latin and, on the one hand, the Greek (in its different ms. traditions) and, on the other hand and to a much lesser extent, the Hebrew (where extant, albeit without reference to the Masada material) and Syriac.

It is clear, in sum, that each of the two basic principles in the NV commission's remit for Sirach outlined in Section III, above – (1) emendation is to be made only when there is a significant difference between the Vulgate and earlier traditions; (2) emendation, if required, is to be based on the Greek unless the Hebrew may be seen to represent a superior reading – was sometimes ignored, giving rise to various instances in which (1) adjustment is not made when there is a significant difference or, alternatively, is made when a difference is merely one of detail; and (2) adjustment is not made at all when the Greek (like the Hebrew) differs significantly from the Vulgate or is made towards the Greek when the Hebrew appears to preserve a superior reading.

Moving from past failure to future rectification, the work of the commission could now be improved relatively simply by revising the NV to ensure that it at least accurately reflects all *significant* differences from the LXX. For clarity, the rest of the text of NV Sirach might be left as it stands in the *traditional* Clementine text, effectively undoing the NV's minor adjustments towards the LXX.

If, however, harmonization with the LXX not only in points of substance but also in less significant matters of a more structural nature – without otherwise departing from the text of the Clementina – were to be the intended goal, a revision of the NV could do far worse than base itself on the 1588 translation of the Sixtine edition of Vaticanus by Flaminio de Nobili (Nobilis), which is conveniently compared with the Clementina in the edition by Bossuet. The text of Vaticanus would occasionally need to be adjusted to that of Ziegler's edition.

An additional study, supplementary to either of these revision processes, could register in an appendix or footnotes significant alternatives to the Greek in the extant Hebrew sources (informed, where appropriate, by the Syriac). Such a process would, of course, require examination of the Masada Ms. (and the material from Qumran Caves 2 and 11) as well as of the mediaeval

Hebrew mss., rather than simple reliance on the apparatus to Ziegler's edition or *Biblia Sacra*.

A revision of NV Sirach that followed such procedures would be consistent with Stramare's statement concerning the policy of the NV for Sirach, quoted at various points in this study:

In generale, quando il latino richiedeva una correzione, questa fu fatta sul greco [...]; in alcuni casi [...] dove lo richiedeva la critica interna, si è preferito correggere sull'ebraico. [...] Il progetto attuale conserva, dunque, la Volgata, dove è sostenuta dall'ebraico o dal siriano, tenendo conto che le sue lezioni risalgono al più tardi al secolo II d.C. e precedono le recensioni greche. Si conserva ancora la Volgata quando è sostenuta dal greco, a meno che, caso assai raro, l'errore del greco sia evidente.⁸⁶

The resulting text would be clearly and consistently based on the Greek and, where appropriate, the Hebrew, while not departing from the overall diction of the Clementina, and as such would not be subject to the following criticism of the NV's use of the Vulgate as the base text for Sirach, made in the context of an attack on the role of the NV as an authoritative guide to the text and interpretation to be embodied in translations accepted for liturgical use in the Church:

A detail that especially concerns us is *Liturgiam Authenticam* 37, which requires translators to use the *Nova Vulgata* as the textual basis for the deuterocanonical books. There are insurmountable problems with this requirement. The text of Wisdom of Solomon is so bad in *Nova Vulgata* that one specialist has recommended that ecclesiastical authority recall it.⁸⁷ The textual basis for Sirach in *Nova Vulgata* is essentially the Old Latin; concerning this text Alexander A. Di Lella, OFM, of The Catholic University of America, a leading authority on the book, has asserted that it 'has more doublets, variants, glosses and interpolations than any book of the Latin Bible [...] double and even triple renderings, additions, transpositions, Christian reworkings and a few omissions as well'.⁸⁸

86. STRAMARE, 'Neo-Vulgata', p. 132 = 'Libro dell'Ecclesiastico', p. 448.

87. The authority cited is Giuseppe SCARPAT, 'Osservazioni sul testo della *Sapientia* nella *Nova Vulgata*', *Rivista Biblica Italiana*, 35 (1987), p. 187-194 (187-188).

88. <https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/view.cfm?recnum=3958>. The words are taken from a 'letter conveying concerns related to the document "Liturgiam Authenticam," [...] sent to all U.S. bishops Aug. 13 [2001] by the executive board of the Catholic Biblical Association of America [...]'. Di Lella's comments are quoted from SKEHAN & DI LELLA, *Wisdom*, p. 57, 60. The Church's officially-stated position on the significance of the NV in Bible

Bibliography

- BADUEL, Claude. *Biblia utriusque Testamenti: De quorum nova interpretatione et copiosissimis in eam annotationibus lege quam in limine operis habes epistolam*. [Geneva]: Oliva Rob, Stephani, 1557.
- Biblia de Navarra: Edición popular*. Barañáin [Navarra]: EUNSA, 2011.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem, iussu Pauli PP. VI, cura et studio monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in Urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti edita: Sapientia Salomonis; Liber Hiesu filii Sirach. Cum praefationibus et variis capitulorum seriebus*. Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1964.
- BOSSUET, Jacques-Bénigne. *Liber Ecclesiastici [et] Explication de la Prophétie d'Isaie sur l'enfantement de la Sainte-Vierge, et du Ps. XXI*. Paris: Beaucé-Rusand & Belin-Mandar, 1826, p. 15–262. (Oeuvres Complètes de [Jacques-Bénigne] Bossuet, Évêque de Meaux, nouvelle éd., vol. 22)
- CLIFFORD, Richard J. 'The authority of the *Nova Vulgata*: A note on a recent roman document'. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 63 (2001), p. 197–202.
- COLUNGA, Alberto; TURRADO, Laurentio (ed.). *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam nova editio*. 9th edition. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1994. (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos; 14)

translation – in a letter from Card. Jorge A. MEDINA ESTÉVEZ, representing the Congregation for Divine Worship, 'Translations', p. 524 – is that 'For the preparation of a Lectionary' (and only in that case) 'the Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam* provides a sure basis for navigating through a forest of options as provided by the textual data [...]. The text to be translated is to be one that corresponds to the manuscript tradition reflected in the *Nova Vulgata*. [...] At times, the determination of a given manuscript tradition by the *Nova Vulgata* provides the textual critic with a necessary datum for his work as regards a translation for liturgical use [and only for such a translation], but it does not limit the exercise of his responsible discretion in evaluating textual variants within that tradition.'

The limiting of the impact of *Liturgiam Authenticam* to a restricted set of texts is, however, debatable. For example, GARCÍA-MORENO, *Neovulgata*, p. 255, claims – on the basis of the requirement in *De interpretatione textus liturgicorum* (25 January 1969) that 'en la liturgia romana, las traducciones bíblicas deben seguir fielmente el texto litúrgico latino' (ibid.) – that: 'gracias a la *lectio continua*, prácticamente toda la Biblia está incorporada a la Liturgia'; accordingly, 'ese principio es válido en cualquier traducción que quiera ser lo más acorde posible con la versión de la Iglesia, o por decirlo más claramente, con la interpretación que ella da al texto inspirado' (ibid.). García-Moreno appears to be unaware of *Liturgiam Authenticam*, however.

- Confraternity Bible: *The Holy Bible. Translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America sponsored by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine*. Vol. 3: *The Sapiential Books: Job to Sirach*. Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1955.
- Confraternity Bible: *The Holy Bible: Genesis to Ruth, Job to Sirach and the Prophets. Translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. Remainder of the Old Testament Douay Version and the New Testament Confraternity Edition; a revision of the Challoner-Rheims version edited by Catholic scholars under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine*. 4th edition. N. p.: St. Paul's Editions, 1961.
- DESCAMPS, Albert L. 'La Nouvelle Vulgate'. *Esprit et Vie*, 89 (1979), p. 598–603.
- GARCÍA-MORENO, Antonio. *La Neovulgata, precedentes y actualidad*. 2nd edition. Barañáin [Navarra]: EUNSA, 2011. (Facultad de Teología, Universidad de Navarra, Colección Teológica; 47) [1st edition, 1986]
- GAROFALO, Salvatore (ed.). *Biblia sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. iussu recognita et Clementis VIII auctoritate edita*. Editio emendatissima apparatu critico instructa, cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in Urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti. [Turin]: Marietti, 1965.
- GILBERT, Maurice. 'The Vetus Latina of Ecclesiasticus'. In: XERAVITS, Géza G.; ZSENGELLÉR, József (eds.). *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books (Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May)*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2008, p. 1–9. (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism; 127)
- LÉVI, Israel. *The Hebrew text of the book of 'Ecclesiasticus'*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904. (Semitic Studies Series; 3) [Reprinted 1951]
- MEDINA ESTÉVEZ, Jorge A. 'Translations and the consultation of the *Nova Vulgata* of the Latin Church'. *Notitiae*, 37 (Nov–Dec. 2001), p. 521–526. [Published also on line in: Eternal World Television Network. Irondale, Ala., <<http://www.ewtn.com/library/curia/cdwwulg.htm>> [Accessed: 20.10.2015]]
- NOBILI, Flaminio de [Flaminius NOBILIUS]. *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine redditum et ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum. Additus est index dictionum et loquutionum Hebraicarum, Græcarum, Latinarum,*

- quarum observatio visa est non inutilis futura.* Romae: In Aedibus Populi Romani, Apud Georgium Ferrarium, 1588.
- Nova Vulgata: Bibliorum Sacrorum editio Sacrosancto Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II ratione habita. Iussu Pauli PP. VI recognita. Auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgata.* 2nd edition. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1986. [Reprinted 1998. 1st edition: 1979]
- PETERS, Norbert. *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus übersetzt und erklärt.* Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913. (Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament; 25)
- RAHLFS, Alfred (ed.). *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes.* Vol. 2: *Libri poetici et prophetici.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982.
- SAUER, Georg. *Jesus Sirach / Ben Sira.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000. (Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Apokryphen; 1)
- SKEHAN, Patrick W.; DI LELLA, Alexander A. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1987. (Anchor Bible; 39)
- SMEND, Rudolph. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch. Mit einem hebräischen Glossar.* Berlin: George Reimer, 1906.
- STRAMARE, Tarsicio. 'Il Libro dell'Ecclesiastico nella Neo-Vulgata'. In: *Kirche und Bibel. Festgabe für Bischof Eduard Schick.* Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979, p. 443–448.
- 'La Neo-Vulgata: impresa scientifica e pastorale insieme'. *Estudios Bíblicos*, 38 (1979–1980), p. 115–138.
- THIELE, Walter (ed.). *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus).* Fasc. 2: *Einleitung (Schluß).* Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1988. (Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel; 11/2)
- WEBER, Robert [et al.] (ed.). *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem.* 4th edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994. [1st edition: 1969]
- WRIGHT, Benjamin G. 'Sirach'. In PIETERSMA, Albert; WRIGHT, Benjamin G. (ed.). *A new English translation of the Septuagint and other Greek translations traditionally included under that title [NETS].* New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 715–762.
- YADIN, Yigael. *The Ben Sira scroll from Masada.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965.
- ZIEGLER, Joseph (ed.). *Sapientia Iesu filii Sirach.* 2nd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980. (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis Editum; 13.2) [1st edition: 1965]

