by which we obtain righteousness in Jesus Christ. Here is the summary of his complete argument. The more the extent and power of the reign of death prove the greatness of the condemnation which fell upon a single sin, the more certainly do the extent and power of the reign of life, established in the heart of believers by the twofold grace of God and Christ, prove the fact of justification granted to humanity in Christ, its Lord. Condemnation made manifest by death, justification shining forth in the gift of life—these are the opposite poles of St. Paul's idea in this passage, as in all the earlier portion of this epistle.

F. Godet.

THE LANGUAGE AND METRE OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

I.

In my inaugural lecture as Professor of Arabic (generously published by the Clarendon Press), I advanced the following theses:

I. That the proverbs of Ben-Sira are preserved in a number of independent sources, of which the most important are the Greek and Syriac versions, after them certain fragmentary revisions contained in the Latin version, certain MSS. of the Greek, and the secondary versions.

II. That there are reasons for believing that these proverbs were in a metre resembling the Arabic metre called Mutakārib.

III. That the language which from these various sources Ben-Sira appears to have used was a mixture of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac, resembling the language of the treatise Aboth de R. Nathan.
IV. That, the date of Ben-Sira being known, the dates of the latest books of the Bible must be far earlier than is ordinarily supposed, if any account is to be given of the difference between Ben-Sira’s language and that of, e.g., Koheleth.

This essay has been reviewed by Prof. Driver in the Oxford Magazine (Feb. 12th and 19th), Prof. Cheyne in the Academy (Feb. 15th), and Dr. Neubauer in the Guardian (Feb. 19th); and all reject propositions III. and IV., and all but Prof. Cheyne reject proposition II. It is however satisfactory that no one seems disposed to question proposition I.: some advance therefore has been made since Dr. Hatch’s Studies in Biblical Greek.

I have little liking for controversy, especially with friends and colleagues, and were nothing but my reputation as a scholar at stake, I should gladly yield the victory to my critics. But the real question at issue seems too momentous to allow of my being guided by courtesy and good taste; the idea that there is left in these verses a testimony to the truth of revelation is too overwhelming to be lightly taken up or lightly thrown down. I feel it my duty therefore to give such answer as I can to the objections; and this I will do by first stating the evidence for my propositions with greater detail than the lecture permitted, and then examining the criticisms. Yet I must add that this answer, so far as I am concerned, closes the controversy; and, being convinced of the truth of my method and deductions, I shall endeavour to continue the work which I have begun, whether it meet with approval or not.

There are two points worth noticing before I proceed.

1. Dr. Neubauer is very magisterial on the subject of Hebrew idiom, but the specimen which he has given of a correct translation of his own, עשר טוב ול אשר לא חמה, contains a decided solecism; for “to him who” in Hebrew is of course ול אשר; ויאיש אשר, or ולɹ.sorter, or being
impossible in any Semitic language.\(^1\) As therefore the greatest of us are fallible, perhaps Hebrew idiom had best be left out of the question.

2. Dr. Neubauer would have it that the theory that Ben-Sira wrote New Hebrew is not new, all that I have said having been said far better by the lamented Prof. Delitzsch. Undoubtedly Prof. Delitzsch would have been far more competent to restore Ben-Sira than I; but that great Talmudist and theologian, in his notice of Ben-Sira, mainly follows Zunz, and the conclusion of Zunz\(^2\) is, that, except the few New Hebrew words which he collects, and except a few Aramaic colourings, which doubtless belong to the later Berichterstätter, all these quotations from Ben-Sira are in pure biblical style. “Pure biblical style” is, I suppose, the language of the prophets.

The task of collecting the New Hebrew words in these quotations is no very considerable one; that of verifying them is perhaps more difficult, and has not hitherto been achieved. Prof. Delitzsch observes that יונם (Niph.) is used by Ben-Sira in the sense of to be married; but the verification of it in xlii. 9, קי פוער ענני מִזְפָּרָתָה, Hebrew יונם שֵׁם לְאָמַר, has been left to others (יונם, to hate, is confused with יונם, to lift, in i. 30, and with יונם, to forget, in xiii. 10). And it is by verifying all these words, and supplementing them with others, that I hope to do some service.

Moreover, if the nature of Ben-Sira’s language has been so well understood, how is it that his commentators make so little use of the information? The evil inclination, a purely rabbinic development, is mentioned several times

\(^1\) I quote this to show that this article is no fair specimen of Dr. Neubauer’s critical power, for he cannot be ignorant of a fact mentioned even in elementary grammars: Ball, p. 128; Gesenius, § 123; Ewald, § 333 a; Harper, § 46. Nor is the usage of the Mishna different; Baba Metsia, § 3, לְמַעַי שֶׁהָפְקֵדְוּן אֵי לָלָל.

\(^2\) Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 104.
in Ben-Sira; yet Fritzsche translates none of these passages rightly. xxxvii. 3 he makes it the "wicked idea of turning foe from friend"; xxi. 11, "a man's thoughts"; xv. 14, "his reasoning power," etc. And Fritzsche's commentary is still a standard work, and he was employed long after its publication to write the article on Ben-Sira in Schenkl's Bibel-lexicon. Nay, Fritzsche does not even know the foundation-stone of the criticism of Ben-Sira, the independence of the Syriac version; nor did the lamented Dr. Hatch know it, to whom Dr. Neubauer, with characteristic fairness, refers me for guidance, as though a guide who had missed the road at starting could be helpful later on. That the criticism of Ben-Sira consists in picking out his consonants from all the sources at our disposal by following clues and cross-clues, and then interpreting them by a metrical canon, I take to be an idea, of which, whether it be new or not, little use has been made.

Fritzsche gives us two specimen translations of chap. xxiv. Neither translator goes outside the Bible (save once) for his words; and some who have translated the whole book rarely venture further. Ben-Zev inserts in his text the long passage quoted from chap. xlii.; does he take the New Hebrew style and language of that passage as a model for the rest of his translation? On the contrary, he sedulously corrects the passage itself into biblical Hebrew, substituting בִּנְדוֹרָה for בְּנְדוֹרָה, שָׁא for שָׁא for מַעַ' for מַעַ', etc. Doubtless he thought, as Zunz seems to have thought, and as Fritzsche supposed long after them both, that the New Hebrew forms were due to those who quoted Ben-Sira, not to Ben-Sira himself. And this tacit assumption has been made by most of those who have worked at Ben-Sira, else we should have heard more of his place in biblical criticism. The true theory, that his language was the vulgar Hebrew of his time, was suggested long before the time of either Zunz or Delitzsch; and to the
early authorities who suggested it I have acknowledged my obligations.

II.

Prof. Driver observes that the restorer of Ben-Sira should take for his basis the quotations in rabbinical literature. These are undoubtedly of use, but only so far as they correspond with the other evidence. Now in these quotations, scanty as they are, we find many words peculiar to the rabbinic dialect, such as עך, of which the biblical Hebrew is הרשה; עפי, of which the biblical Hebrew is נכס; והשך, of which the biblical Hebrew is דのように, an idea which belongs to the post-biblical theology; and ב, of which the biblical Hebrew is שישב or שנון.

Few as these words are, they are quite sufficient to distinguish the period of Ben-Sira from that of any biblical writer. For the first three are words of constant occurrence in the rabbinic writings, and have, as we have seen, equivalents of equally frequent occurrence in the biblical writings. These common and familiar words must, by their absence or presence, mark periods, if any words can; and the same is the case with the greater number of those collected in the following section.

In the case of Ecclesiastes (or Koheleth), that their absence is significant of period, can be proved by as cogent evidence as it is possible in such matters to adduce. For there is a Targum to Koheleth, written unquestionably many generations after the original, in which both the words and ideas of Koheleth are translated into those of the Targumist’s time. Now this Targumist employs in dealing with the matter of Koheleth the very technicalities of which Koheleth is ignorant, but with which Ben-Sira is familiar. Koheleth knows nothing of the evil inclination, of the third tongue, of obscenity of speech, of merits, of repentance; but his translator finds occasion to bring them all in.
And his translator employs in his Chaldee, as synonyms for Koheleth’s Hebrew, the very Chaldaisms which the next section will trace in Ben-Sira. If the “method of difference” is ever applicable to critical questions, this would seem to be a case for it. The Targumist of Koheleth is beyond question later than Koheleth,—later, probably, by ages; the technicalities and phrases which he introduces into his paraphrase in order to make Koheleth intelligible must be those of a later age, else why should Koheleth not have employed them himself? Many of these technicalities are found to recur in Ben-Sira as often as they recur in the Targum of Koheleth; and yet we are told that Koheleth and Ben-Sira are contemporaries!

But the date of Daniel is, after all, more important than that of Koheleth; and here the evidence is yet more forcible. The date of Daniel is fixed by modern scholars at 165 B.C., and Ewald, as is well known, finds an allusion in Daniel to Lucius Cornelius Scipio. Ben-Sira certainly wrote no later than 165, and probably a generation earlier; and he now rises from his grave to state that the languages which are distinct in Daniel are in his time mixed. With Daniel יִדָּרְךָ is Chaldee, but עִשְׂבָּה Hebrew; with Ben-Sira the former is Hebrew.¹ With Daniel וֹוהַ is Chaldee and עִשְׂבָּה Hebrew; in Ben-Sira’s language the two may be used indiscriminately. With Daniel הוא is Hebrew, and עִשְׂבָּה Chaldee; Ben-Sira uses the two in the same verse—

אֲלָל תָּכְנִין תַּרְשִׁי בֵּעָתָה אֲלָל תַּכְּנֵר תַּכְּנָה בֵּעֲרָה

Nay, more, the Chaldee of Ben-Sira is later than Daniel’s, for there are three (and perhaps yet more) indications that very with Ben-Sira is לָדוּדָא, but with Daniel it is שְׁנַיִּים. If therefore language can prove anything, it proves that Daniel was not written in 165; and Ben-Sira, who has hitherto been supposed to be the worst witness against

¹ As it is with R. Akiba, Aboth de R. N., p. 71b. אֲלָל תָּכְנִין תַּרְשִׁי בֵּעָתָה אֲלָל תַּכְּנֵר תַּכְּנָה בֵּעֲרָה.
Daniel will, if rightly cross-examined, be found to bear irre­
fragable witness in his favour. The person who conducts
this cross-examination aright will have performed a useful
service.

I will, in the following section, give a list of fifty phrases
occurring in Ben-Sira, but unknown, or almost unknown, to
the biblical dialect. This will not exhaust the stock, but if
it is not sufficient to prove our thesis, what number will be?

III.

1. פִּסֵק or פִּסְקָה, business.

This word occurs once (in Gen. xxvi. 20) in the sense of
strife; otherwise it is unknown to the Hebrew of the Bible.
In Chaldee and rabbinic Hebrew it is one of the com­
onest words, corresponding, as Buxtorf well says, with
the Hebrew "בר, and particularly with the Middle Hebrew
עִנֵי. Ben-Sira is recorded to have used this word
in a verse quoted in Midrash Rabba and elsewhere,

which the Greek represents by οὐκ ἐστὶ χρεία, the Syriac by
"confidence." There are however many more traces of
this word, which the Syriac translator regularly mistakes
for עִנֵי, "oppression," of which סְלֹהֵית is a common ren­
dering in the Peschitto; see, e.g., Psalm lxii. 4.

xxxvii. 11: οἰκετή ἄργῳ περὶ πολλῆς ἐργασίας:
Syr.: יָסָרְא דִּבְרָא לִמָּלֵס לְמַרְוָה, with a servant who
desires to rob his master.1

vii. 25: ἐσθη τετελεκὼς ἐργὸν μέγα;
Syr.: נָפְשׁ לְעָשָׁקָה, there shall go out oppression.

xi. 9: ἐν κρίσει ἀμαρτολῶν μὴ συνέδρενε;
Syr.: לָל הָעָסָה מַלְוָה, do not multiply oppression.

1 בָּר of the Hebrew is here interpreted master. Its Greek gloss in this
sense is δωδέσθης; e.g. xvi. 11, δωδέσθη τεσλαγμῶν for בְּר תֶלֶתָה.
iii. 23: μὴ περιεργάζει:
Syr.: λέ, do not wrangle.

In all these places the versions will be reconciled, and the meaning be made clear, by restoring the rabbinic עֲשֵׁךְ הָעִשְׁךְ.

A further trace of this word is to be found in xxxviii. 24:
ο ἐλασσούμενος τῇ πράξει αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται.

A both מַעֲשֵׁךְ בַּעֲשֵׁךְ.

Yet another vestige seems to be in xxix. 27:
ἐπεξένωται μοι ὁ ἀδελφός, χρεία τῆς οἰκίας:
Syr.: ἄλοχον νικά ὕλην, omitting the rest.
Heb.: ἀνάρχης φίλα ὑπὲρ θύρας

The verse meant, Light the fire, bestir yourself in the house. The second half is omitted by the Syriac, and this has happened elsewhere in verses containing עֲשֵׁךְ. In the first half of the verse the Greek reading was ἠρώτα εἰς άτομον τὴς ἀφθονίας, the Syriac אָרְזָה אֲדֹם. The Syriac אָרְזָה עַל עַלְיָן corresponds in meaning with the Old Hebrew עִד__; the Greek translator interprets from the Arabic ṭayr, "to entertain" (an old word, it would seem; see Ferazdak, p. 12).—No word is more characteristic than this of the rabbinic style. The Targum of Koheleth has occasion to use it before the end of the third verse; Aboth de R. Nathan on the first page: strange that Koheleth, who deals so much with business and occupation, avoids this word and all its derivatives!

2. שָׁדָה וְשָׁדָה.

This is also a rabbinic word, of very frequent occurrence
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(see Pirke Aboth, § 1), signifying conversation. The form with  does not occur in the Bible; that with  occurs, but in the sense of meditation.

In Ben-Sira we have the rabbinic form in xxvii. 4:

{o}τως σκύβαλα ἀνθρώπου ἐν λογισμῷ αὐτοῦ:

Syr.:  שעריתא תוקננה על החפוך, So the talk of a man on his thought;

Heb.:  כ סילמה א vidéos מראונות, So the talk of a man from his mind.

The previous hemistich is corrupt, but can be emended. The Greek reading was  ἑρία, "refuse," "dung." Where the word is not corrupted, its ordinary gloss is  λαλία; xiii. 11,  ἐκ πολλῆς λαλίας πειράσει σε, the Hebrew of which is preserved in Aboth, p. 68a, בורוכי האמרים ברב שיווה, so that we may restore  ככ מרה שיווה יברקל (compare xxxii. 14,  ἐγχέγ λαλιάν, borrowed from Ps. cii. 1).

xx. 5:  ἐστὶ μυστήριον ἀπὸ πολλῆς λαλίας.

xxii. 13:  μὴ πληθύνῃς λόγον = ἃΛ τρεbuch of Pirke Aboth, § 1.

3. יֵשׁ, the evil inclination.

It is well known that this, in its personification, is a rabbinical development; in Koheleth there is no allusion to it, though the Targum of Koheleth finds occasion to mention it (vii. 9). In Ben-Sira however it plays an important part. The word is used in its biblical sense in the addition made by codd. 106 and 248 to xvii. 20:  εἴδος τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ, יֵשׁ יָד חם; elsewhere however it is employed in its technical sense.

xxxvii. 3:  ὁ πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα, πόθεν ἐνεκυλίσθης;

Syr.:  סע רבי שיש להנה אatsbyרי.

Emend  ἐκτίσθης from Syriac and Latin, and restore יֵשׁ, O evil inclination, wherefore wast thou created? That and  ἐχθρός stand for יֵשׁ which has been observed previously. Another proof passage is:
xvi. 28: ἐκαστὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔδειλυεν;
Syr.: ἄνεις λύχνως καὶ τραύρος; Heb.: εἶπεν λύχνως καὶ στήρι.

In xxi. 11 we have a similar rendering ἐννόημα:
ο φύλασσον νόμον κατακρατεῖ τού ἐννόηματος αὐτοῦ;
Syr.: άλοις ἠλατά;
Heb.: ἀλοις ἠλατά.

wherein ἀλοις ἠλατά is a double rabbinism (Aboth, p. 72b), recurring in the Syriac of xvii. 31.

Another rendering of this word is διαβουλίων, as we learn from xvii. 6:
διαβουλίων καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ φθαλμοὺς;
Syr.: ὑβραία λόγοι πολλοί μετὰ;
Heb.: ἃν ποιήσαντο τετείχοι, where ἃν should be rendered he created. The word however stands in its place in xv. 14: καὶ ἀφύκεταν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίων αὐτοῦ; Syr., ἔζησεν.

Another translation is probably βουλή, in vi. 2; but this verse is corrupt. Perhaps too in xxx. 21, μὴ θλίψῃς σαυτὸν ἐν βουλῇ σου, is for άλα ἡμερὰς ἄτεροι. The psychology no less than the word-play suggests this.

4. ῶμορίον, afflictions.

This word belongs to the genuine rabbinic language. It occurs in a verse of which the true reading is preserved in MS. 253 (ii. 5), ἐν νόσοις καὶ παιδείαις ἐπ’ αὐτῷ πεποιθῶς γίνον. There is however an allusion to it in xxx. 14, μεμαστηγαμένος εἰς τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ; with which compare Aboth, p. 82a, καὶ χαράμις ἐν εἰς τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ; yet the original of this phrase is almost certainly λῦκα βόνω, Aboth, p. 72b; λῦκα is an equally genuine rabbinism. It is likely that γίνον is the original of τὰ κρυπτὰ σου, Syr., thy bonds (σίδηρα and ἀσίδηρα), in i. 30. For a quiescent ξ omitted compare xlviii. 12, ἐν λαίλαπτι; Syr., in the store; Heb., בקופתא.

5. ἀπάτη, to persist.

This word is nowhere used in the Bible, but is a
favourite word in Chaldee. In i. 15, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰώνος ἐνσευερε, is unintelligible; for this the Syriac has Ῥητορᾶ. Clearly therefore the word ᾿ρητορᾶ was used, connected by the Greek translators with ἡ. The Coptic translator, who renders ᾿καμαντές (comp. xl. 25), must have followed a revised text, which rendered the word as if it had been Ῥητορᾶ. This usage of Ῥητορᾶ for “to be permanent,” is very common in the Targum; the antithesis, ᾿ἐμπιστευθήσεται, renders the restoration certain.

6. Ῥητορᾶ, grateful.

Buxtorf notices a rabbinic usage of Ῥητορᾶ in the sense of “grateful,” “pleasant.” This occurs in Ben-Sira vii. 33: χάρις δόματος ἐναντὶ παντὸς ᾿ξωντος; Syriac, Ῥητορᾶ, Buxtorf Ῥητορᾶ; Hebrew, ירמיהו. מִרְמָתָה.

7. שָׁמְא, perhaps.

Quoted from Ben-Sira. The Greek gloss of this is μήποτε. xix. 13: ἐλεγξάν φιλόν, μήποτε οὐκ ἐπολήσεν; Hebrew, שָׁמְא לֵאלָה, etc.

8. לֵאלָה שְׁכִישְׁת, the third tongue.

See xxviii. 14, 15.

9. רֶשֶׁה, to give leave.

This occurs in a verse cited in Midrash Rabba and elsewhere

בֹּחֵמ שָׁהַרִי פָּהַרְתֶּנָה

= iii. 22, καὶ προσετάγη σου; Syriac, שיאה. There are however other traces of this characteristically rabbinic word: xxiii. 2, ou μὴ παρῇ; Syriac, לא ירומ; Hebrew, לא νאראת. שָׁהַרְתֶּנָה.

10. סָפִים, drugs.

This word is quoted from Ben-Sira xxxviii. 4. In Old Hebrew it is only used of scents; but in rabbinic of the stock-in-trade of the physician (Aboth, p. 76a).
11. ἐνέλθω, to enter.

Quoted from Ben-Sira; its locus is xi. 8: ἐν μέσῳ λόγων μὴ παρεμβάλλων; Hebrew, אל תנין (comp. Aboth, p. 110a: אל תנין לתר חבי). It is very probable that throughout Ben-Sira σωματικόν is the gloss for בֵּנֵי, and συναγωγή for בְּנֵי. xlviii. 12, ἐν λάιλαπτ ἐσκε-πάσθη; Syriac, אַחֲרֶךָ; Hebrew, בֵּנֵי read בֵּנֵי.

12. ἐσκεπτόμεθα, accustom; ἑυρέθαι, custom.

Quoted from Ben-Sira xxiii. 15; see also Inaug., p. 15. A trace of it is in the gloss ψεύσματος before ἄπαιδευσίας in certain MSS. of iv. 25: "obscene speech" is not a lie (ἰδρολόγον), but is a habit.

13. ὁ στόχος, word, ידיהר, רו, dwelling.

Quoted from Ben-Sira in Baba Bathra. In our copies other traces of the word are to be found: xli. 5, παροικίας ἀσέβῶν; Syriac, Ὀλυμπεαὶ δοξαι, generation of sinners, i.e. ῥά, wrongly read ῥήρ. The word however really occurs in xlii. 6: εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν ταῖς παροικίας αὐτῶν; Syriac, ἐρυμενί, thinking of the Talmudic ῥήρ, "to order." Another trace of it is in xvi. 8: παρὰ τῆς παροικίας Λώτ; Syriac, on the dwellers of the city of Lot; Hebrew, רֹדֵי לְוֹת, the accursed generation: so that, if we lose one Chaldaism, we gain another equally violent.

14. ἐνέκει, to end.

Quoted from Ben-Sira in a Baraitha to Mass. Kallah, but in a corrupt form: ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστρόφων ἀνυψώσας τῷ ἄφεν. This is a reminiscence of xxviii. 6, μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ πᾶνσε ἐξῆρας (so read with Syriac, Hexaplar-Syriac, and Armenian). Hebrew, אֲשֵׁר, he gathered. A further trace of ἐνέκει is xliii. 17, οὐκ
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They shall not finish; for ἐμποιεῖν means to add: xxxix. 11, ἐὰν ἀναπώπηται ἐμποιεῖ αὐτῷ, with variant ἐὰν παύσηται, perhaps ergo ἀνέφηκε ἡ ἡμέρα. The same word probably occurred in xviii. 5, τίς προσθήσει ἐκδικηγήσασθαι τὰ ἔλεγα αὐτῷ;—where who shall finish? is required. The Syriac of xlvi. 4 renders it by the same word as is used in xxviii. 6. Compare Pirke Aboth, § 1, הלא מוסר ילים.

15. גובא, merits.

Quoted from Ben-Sira l.c. Its Greek gloss is ἔλεημοσύνη. xvii. 22: ἔλεημοσύνη ἄνδρος ὡς σφαγίς μετ’ αὐτοῦ:
Syr.: וּכְהֵא דְּכְכֵה בָּנְכֶה הַדְּכֶה
Heb.: גובא איש תוריה.

The word is used in the Targums as a rendering of דְּכֶה, and hence its Greek gloss here. Its occurrence in the rabbinic literature is also very constant.

16. דמעים, coals.

e. i. 0. מַחֲזִקשׁ בַּמַּחֲזִיק הַמַּחֲזִיק הַמַּחֲזִיק
Syr.: כיִתְדַהוּ ישאיפ אֹרָשֶׁא בָנְיָא בָנְיָא
Heb.: דמעים בלשׁם blazing, of the Psalms, is rendered with בָּנְיָא (from בָּנְיָא) in the Targum. This observation will explain.

Whether the verse ended בָּנְיָא or בָּנְיָא בָּנְיָא מַחֲזִיק בָּנְיָא בָּנְיָא, in either case it will contain a violent Chaldaism. The first half was read בָּנְיָא by the Syriac, בָּנְיָא by the Greek translator; בָּנְיָא is glossed בָּנְיָא in the Midrash Tanchuma; בָּנְיָא blazing, of the Psalms, is rendered מַחֲזִיק בָּנְיָא (from בָּנְיָא) in the Targum. This observation will explain.

xi. 7, πρὶν ἐξετάσῃς μὴ μέμψῃ:
Syr.: before thou examine become not associate:
Heb.: (before) תֵּדַהוּ (before) תֵּדַהו.

The Pael of בָּנְיָא (“to examine” in Syriac) is certified by the metre, but also by xi. 28, πρὸ τελευτῆς μὴ μακάριζε μακάριζα; Syriac, before examining praise no one; Hebrew, בָּנְיָא before תֵּדַהו.
17. נַּחֲשָׁה, to find.

This Chaldaism appears in a v.l. of MS. 106, in vi. 16, בִּנְפֶּרֶשָׁה יָרַעְתָּהוּ מִיָּדָיו, מיָדוֹת. MS. 106, αἰνεύσωσιν αὐτῶν. If Ben-Sira wrote נַחֲשָׁה, the difference may be easily explained, but never from מַיָּדוֹת. A further vestige of this word is xx. 9, ἐστὶν ἑβραία ἐστὶν ἐλάττωσιν. Syriac, Αἰτα χρήσεται ἐνθεορία. If Ben-Sira wrote נַחֲשָׁה, the Syriac reading is explicable by the omission of the ב, but not if he wrote מַיָּדוֹת (which, itself, is a New Hebrew word). In xiii. 26, for ἑβραία παραβολῶν the Syriac has מַיָּדוֹת שֶׁמֶה, שֶׁמֶה שֶׁמֶה שֶׁמֶה again. παραβολῶν is a gloss; the sense required is the darkening of the countenance: Hebrew הניחים; Greek νοοῦσα; Syriac, שום שום.

18. דְּנֵהוּ = σφόδρα.

The Hebrew לָנֵהוּ is represented in the Targum by לְנֵהוּ. There are words corresponding with σφόδρα in the Syriac of Ben-Sira which make it likely that he used this Chaldean form.

i.,8: εἰς ἑστὶ σφόδρα φοβηρὸς σφόδρα:
Syr.: ὑπολογίζονται σφόδρα.
xii. 6: ὑγιεῖς ὑγιεῖς σφόδρα:
Syr.: ἀμπελόνα ἀμπελόνα.
xxxix. 16: τὰ ἐργα Κυρίου καλὰ σφόδρα:
Syr.: Ἀνάμνεσις καθαρῆς.

The Chaldean לָנֵהוּ, but not the Hebrew לָנֵהוּ, will explain these translations; and the metre will explain why the author prefers the Chaldean form. For that he used לָנֵהוּ in vii. 17 (where the Syriac renders it rightly by בּוּקָּב) is evinced by a quotation of this verse (under a false name) in Aboth, p. 74b. לָנֵהוּ seems transliterated from the original in the Syriac i. 29, where it would seem to be interpolated from xiii. 13, where it is strangely omitted.

19. סָנוֹנָה, danger.

This emerges in iii. 25; ὁ ἄγαπῶν κύνδυνον, Syr., he that
A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

loveth good things. In Old Heb. would mean "good things." xxxi. 10, ὁ πεπλανημένος, Syr. רָכִּישׁ, is perhaps to be explained similarly. With xxxi. 12, ἐὼς ἑαυτόν ἐκυν-δύνευσα, compare Targum of Psalm xviii. 5, מַסְכַּנְא לָעָּה.

20. נְדוֹךְ, a bachelor.

xxxvi. 26, τίς πιστεύσει εὐδοκεῖ λῃστῇ; Syr. נְדוֹךְ דְּדָךְ לְסִבְיוֹ. Now this word εὐδοκεῖ is used in Gen. xlix. 19 (Aq.) to represent נְדוֹך (which there means something quite different), and λῃστῇ is used to represent it, Jer. xviii. 22 and Hos. vii. 1. This word, of which the Syriac sense is very suitable in the present case, is therefore trebly certified.

21. חִירִים, sinners.

Greek gloss ἐπιτύμια.

viii. 5, μυθοθετησεν ὅτι πάντες ἐσμὲν ἐν ἐπιτύμλοις:
Syr. :
      כֵּלָה דָּתי. Æth. similarly.
Heb. : זָכָר יְכֵלָה חִירִים.
ix. 5: μὴ ποτε σκανδαλίσῃς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτυμλοῖς αὐτῆς:
Heb. : שְׁמָא חכֶשׁ בלטיֵת (so Æth.), lest thou fall in love with her. This is no less a Chaldaism than the former.

22. רוֹחֵן, occupation.

xxxviii. 34, ἡ δέησις αὐτῶν ἐν ἐργασίᾳ τέχνης; Syr., רוחה בּוּבַד אֲדָמְתוֹת, in Old Hebrew would mean their prayer (2 Chron. vi. 19); but in the Targum it means their meditation, occupation, and this is its sense here. The whole verse was probably

רוֹחֵן בּוּבַד אֲדָמְתוֹת

each word being a Chaldaism.

23. צדקה, alms.

The former word has this sense in the Jerusalem dialect; and regularly in Æthiopic, in which language a denominative תֹּלְתוֹת, "to give alms," is formed, corresponding with the Arabic צדקה. One of these words is used in its technical sense in vii. 10, כָּל ἐλεημοσύνην ποιήσαι μὴ
Whether the author wrote שָׁעַר or שָׁעַר, either is a technicality of the New Hebrew dialect. Compare xxix. 11: κατ’ εὐνοίας υψίστον; Syr. בֹּחוֹקָתָא וּבָצוֹתָא for υψίστον represents another New Hebrew word, a name for God.

24. רצָל, to pray, or turn.

The Book of Daniel very properly distinguishes between הָלָל the Chaldee, and הָלָל the Hebrew, for this idea; nor is the former used in any Hebrew document. Yet there is evidence that Ben-Sira employs הָלָל.
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Wherever in the Syriac מִיבָה corresponds with ἀγαθά, "goods," in the Greek, and "grace" makes better sense than "goods," it will be safe to assume that Ben-Sira wrote מִיבָה, and that his translator misread it מִיבָה.
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that the introduction of this word frequently restores the metre.

26. ἐπέστηκαν, to take up one's abode.

xxiv. 8, καὶ ἐν Ἰσραήλ κατακληρονομήθητι; Syr. אשתרה, and be confirmed.

xxiv. 10, καὶ οὕτως ἐν Σιών ἐστηρίχθην; Syr. הטם, I stood.

xxiv. 6, ἐν παντὶ λαῷ καὶ ἐθνεὶ ἐκτησάμην; Syr. אשתלה; Lat. primatum habui.

xxiv. 11, καὶ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἡ ἐξουσία μου. All these (and further ἐλειτούργησα of ver. 10) would seem to be attempts at rendering ἐσταιρίθην, I took up my abode, and I was deposited. ἐκτησάμην = ἔστησάς, primatum habui, ἡ ἐξουσία μου, ἐλειτούργησα, ἐστηρίχθην, from ἔστησάς, time.

27. ἡ ἡμέρα, time.

This is a pure Chaldaism, yet it seems plainly to occur in iv. 23 b, μὴ κρύψῃς τὴν σοφίαν σου εἰς καλλονήν. The first clause has ἐν καιρῷ; εἰς καλλονήν therefore is for ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, which should be rendered in its time. Cp. Inaug., p. 19.

28. νομιμά, to swear.

xliv. 21, διὰ τούτῳ ἐν ὅρκῳ ἐστησέν αὐτῷ; Syr. he swore to him, צי, = Chaldee צי, which in the Targum is quite regular in this sense. Ver. 22, καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσαὰκ ἐστησέν οὕτως. xlv. 24, ἐστάθη διαθήκη; Syr. God swore with oaths.

29. ἡμετέρω, accusation.

xxxviii. 17, καὶ ποίησον τὸ πένθος κατὰ τὴν ἄξιαν αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν μιᾶν καὶ δύο χάριν διαβολής; Syr. on account of men. The full phrase is נפנ המThemeProvider ובריך, Aboth, p. 6 a. The Greek translator has given us one half, the Syrian the other.

30. ἐντολή, a commandment.

In xxxix. 18, δὲ ἐλαττώσει τὸ σωτηριον αὐτοῦ, the context requires his commandment rather than his salvation; the Syriac hasなどが; it is likely that this was what Ben-Sira
wrote, the Greek rendering representing πράξεις. Either of these words is a Chaldaism.

31. ῥό, to go round.

xxxvi. 5, στρεφόμενος is represented in the Syriac by a pig, ῥό. Bendtsen, who commenced these studies, observed the true account of this.

32. בָּרֵס, to despise.

xix. 1, ὁ ἐξουθενῶν τὰ ὀλίγα; Syr. whoso loves flesh. Of this one word בָּרֵס seems certain.

33. עֶברָה, transgression.

i. 20. φόβος Κυρίου ἀπωθεῖται ἁμαρτήματα, παραμένων δὲ ἀποστρέψει πᾶσαν ὁργήν. Ὄργη is the gloss of עֶברָה very frequently, and the antithesis requires here a synonym of sin. עֶברָה should therefore here be rendered transgression. This must also be the original of ὁβρεὰς τῶν ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ ἁμαρτωλῶν of xxiii. 2, probably a very technical rabbinism. ὁβρεὰς is the gloss of עֶברָה in xxi. 4, as is shown by the Syriac rendering evening, i.e. עֶברָה.

34. ἱλαρά, an enactment.

i. 4, πηγή σοφίας λόγος θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις καὶ αἱ πορεῖαι αὐτῆς ἐντολαὶ αἰῶνιοι; Heb. יִהלְכְיתֶיהוּ בְּמִשְׁחָתָהוּ, i.e. and her halachas are wise commandments.

35. ו, then.

A clue is given to this word in xvi. 10, καὶ οὕτως, Syr. in that time. Compare xxxv. 5, καὶ οὕτως ἀνάπεσε, Syr. and afterwards; xxxvi. 4, οὕτως with various reading τότε. οὕτως in xxiv. 11, ἐν τὸλει ἡγαπημένῃ οὕτως με κατέπαυσε, is perhaps for בָּעְר רָד בְּכָלָיוֹנִי.

36. בֶּנֶר, ἀκμαῖον.

Quoted from Ben-Sira. Its locus is xlii. 9, ἐν νεότητί αὐτῆς μὴ προτε παρακμάσῃ; Heb. בָּכַמְנָה שָׁמַא לְא לְחָבֵנ. In the next clause, συνφυκήκεια, it is corrupted to בֶּנֶר, which the translator makes equivalent to בֶּנֶר.
37. הביב, to repent; תושה, repentance.

xvii. 24, πλὴν μετανοοῦσιν ἔδωκεν ἑπάνωδον; Syr. repentance; Heb. בים אֶבֶּית נַהֲטָה בֵּיתוֹ. xxx. 19, μεταμεληθεὶς; Syr. תושה; Heb. תושה. It is not unlikely that the adverbial was sometimes used, of which we have a trace in xxxvi. 1, καὶ πάλιν ἐξελεῖται; Heb. ישוב נצל, read ישוב.

38. וְשָׁמַע, fool.

xvi. 23, ἀνήρ ἄφρων καὶ πλανῶμενος. The same confusion is to be found in xliii. 10, παραβῆ; Syr. תושה הכורע and תושה הכורע; Heb. תושה and תושה הכורע. This would seem to be the true explanation of the variety µωρὸς and µοιχὸς in xxv. 2.

39. מין, a number; ב, a vessel.

xxxviii. 29, ἐναρίθμος πᾶσα ἡ ἐργασία αὐτοῦ; Syr. בְּכָנָן בְּכָנָן or בְּכָנָן. It is not clear that Ben-Sira uses בְּכָנָן; in xii. 5, ἐμπόδισον τοὺς άρτος σου; Syr. thy weapons of war; Heb. כי לוחם; the Greek is right.

40. פֶּבַל and נְבוֹל فقال.

Inaug., p. 15. We learn from a quotation that in xxiii.15 דָּבָר עֲרֵיה, another rabbinism.

41. מימה, hunger.

xxxix. 29, πῦρ καὶ χάλαζα καὶ λιμὸς καὶ θάνατος;
Syr.: גיר אברים וכמץ דמות; Heb.: לא זכתを作る חומת.

42. מוכר and מرات, sickness.

xxxiv. 22, πᾶν ἀρρώστημα οὐ μὴ σοι ἄπαντησῃ; Syr. כל ביש אֶבֶּית לא חマーָב לֶר, no evil shall come near thee; Heb. כל ביש לא קירא (the same variation between ביש and קריב occurs in i. 30 and xiii. 9); x. 10, ἀρρώστημα, Syr. entrails, מיתָה and מיתָה; xxxiv. 2, ἀρρώστημα beta, מירא (the same variation between מירא and מערת; but the meaning is, from the pursuit of honour, מערת כבד).
in this passage, 

43. need and use.

Quoted from Ben-Sira: locus xxxviii. 1; but also vi. 10, ημέρα θλιψεώς σου is probably for ώς τώρα, the day of need.

44. to confer benefits.

A rabbinic expression, see Buxtorf and Jellinek, B.M. iii. 123; xxxii. 2, ἀνταποδίδοντα χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλις; Syr. he confers obligations who offers an offering; Heb. הנל חסדים מביא מחיה.

45. to overtake.

xv. 1, ὁ ἐγκρατὴς τοῦ νόμου καταλήψεται αὐτὴν; Syr. נחלו הב. Heb. הירבח מ b. נחלו הב ליתא. לא יירבח וنعPAL בעפיים; Heb. נחלו הב ליתא.

46. to counsel or to promise.

iii. 24 (in several MSS. and versions), γνώσεως δὲ ἀμοιρος ὀν μὴ ἐπαγγέλλον; Heb. לא תמליך, give not counsel, which the Syriac gloss expresses. In xxiii. 2, τὰς δὲ ὑβρεῖς τῶν ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ ἀμαρτσῶλων, ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ perhaps stands for ἐστίν, in work, i.e. sins of commission. מלחמה is found (instead of מלחמה) in ix. 17, ἔργον ἐπανεθήκεται; Syr. תיתר מלחמה; Heb. הרו הר בマルחמה; and also in xxx. 28, εἰς ἔργα κατάστησον; Syr. give him command.

47. to make ugly; obscene.

xii. 18, ἀλλοιώσει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ; Syr. וכתנה אפיח (contrast xiii. 25); the sense required is, to make an ugly gesture; Heb. שינה פניה (compare Eccles. viii. 1). The confusion between שינה, to hate, and שלית, to repeat, is not unknown in Ben-Sira; xix. 5, ὁ μισῶν λαλίαν; Syr. מלאך מלחמה; Heb. שינה פניה; xix. 9; cp. vii. 14, μη δευτεροφωσης λόγον; Syr. אל שלא שלית; Heb. שלית. Hence it
is not unlikely that βδελύγματα in x. 13, Syr. יְהוֹת, represent שְׁנָיוֹת and that in xxvii. 30, μὴν καὶ ὀργὴ, καὶ παῦτα ἐστὶ βδελύγματα, Syr. impurities, the true reading is יְהוֹת, are errors.

48. הָרָא, the creation.

xxxvi. 15, τὸις ἐν ἀρχῇ κτίσμασί σου perhaps stands for בְּרִיתֵךְ in the sense of thy covenants, for which we should expect בְּרִיתֵךְ; it will also be found that in xliii. 2 ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ probably stands for בָּרָא.

In xvi. 26 τὰ ἐργά αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς seems to represent מָעֵש בְּרָאשִׁית.

49. לָטָם, to curse.

See supra, No. 13.

50. שָׁנִיעָה, to narrate; שָׁנִיעָה, narration.

To διηγεῖσθαι, διήγημα, and διηγησία, which are very frequent in Ben-Sira, there correspond as a rule in the Syriac שָׁנִיעָה and שָׁנִיעָה. Some of these passages, as well as some of those where the Syriac uses other words, make it probable that the original had the words given above.

xxxviii. 25, ἀν διηγησίας αὐτοῦ ἐν νυσίς ταῦρων; cp. Prov. iii. 32. xix. 8, ἐν φίλῳ καὶ ἐν ἀθρόῳ μὴ διηγοῖ; Syr. בל לא ידבר, do not lie; Heb. בְּרָךְ וּרְעָךְ אל תשים תְּעָה, concerning friend and enemy tell no stories.

xxii. 8, διηγούμενος νυστάζοντι ὁ διηγούμενος μωρὸς, καὶ ἐπὶ συντελεῖα ἐρεῖ, τί ἐστί; Syr. as one who eats bread when he is not hungry; Heb. לא שומע ויתם; the Syrian read נִמְשָׁע הָלֶם, and interpreted the verb from its first conjugation in Syriac in the sense “whoso plays with bread.” vi. 35, πᾶσαν διηγησίαν θείαν θέλει ἀκούων; Syr. כָּל שומעת Jihad [רְצָה לְשֵׁם ה' יְהוֹהלְשֵׁם ה'] הַדּוֹר לְשֵׁם; Heb. כָּל שומעת Jihad [רְצָה לְשֵׁם ה' יְהוֹהלְשֵׁם ה'] הַדּוֹר לְשֵׁם.

IV.

These then are some of the observations on which my theory of the language of Ecclesiasticus is grounded, from
which it will appear that that theory corresponds very well with what is known of its nature from the quotations; and if I admit here and there pure Syriasms, it will be seen that such words as לְגָוזֶר open the door to them. Dr. Neubauer would have me point חָשֵׁה as nif'al in xii. 10; but he is mistaken, for this word is probably unconnected with the Hebrew חָשֵׁה (of which the Syriac form is שַׁחַשָּׁה), being rather a denominative from חָשֵׁה (like aeruginare from æs), in which the hif'il form is regular. 1 The demarcation line between the Syriac and Chaldee languages is not clear; and where the evidence is very strongly in favour of a Syriac word, it may be restored with very considerable confidence. The same is true (with considerable modifications) of Arabic words, provided there is reason to suppose them old and familiar.

In virtue of the observations collected above, and others like them, I hold that the development of the rabbinic dialect, as it appears in Ben-Sira, is wholly different from its development in Ecclesiastes; nor can I find in my learned critics' replies anything that can shake that conclusion. Prof. Cheyne merely states that Koheleth is somewhat the older of the two; Prof. Driver, that, so far as he can make out, the language of the two is about the same. Dr. Neubauer's standpoint would appear to shift for the purpose of contradicting me, so that he need not be answered. His argument that Jerome would not have called Ben-Sira's language Hebrew, had it been New Hebrew, I regard as a somewhat trifling cavil; yet had Ben-Sira used such expressions as עַשֶּׁר וַחֲרוֹב לָא אֶתְשָׁר לְאָל חַמָּא or as כְּנַחַשָּׁה חָשֵׁה כְּרַעֵהוּ, Jerome would have had little justification for calling it Hebrew or even Semitic. If Profs. Driver and Cheyne really think that the language of Ecclesiastes is one in which נָתַּן may be used indifferently for נַטָּא, נַטַּא for נַטַּא, of course my

1 So So, Mishna of Baba Kama, § 9.
arguments are not likely to convince them; but I venture to think that their opinion will some day be regarded as improbable.

V. THE METRE.

There are five reasons for believing that Ben-Sira wrote in metre:

1. The stichometry of the most ancient authorities, the Alexandrian MS., the Taurinensis of the Coptic version, the Amiatinus of the Latin. This is a most decided indication of metre, and hence the old authorities, whom Messrs. Doyly and Mant, the editors of the Family Bible, follow, rightly drew the conclusion which I quoted.

2. The rabbinical quotations from Ben-Sira, so far as they agree with the Greek and Syriac versions, agree with the metrical canon proposed in my essay. That these quotations are careless and inaccurate, used to be generally agreed; however, it is very remarkable that the Greek version should regularly so control them as to make them fit a certain scheme.

(a) The following are quite regular:

(1) בְּהֵמֶה שֶׁהָרִישָׁת הָהֵבָנוֹת, iii. 22.
(2) וַאֲזֵי לְךָ בָּכָתִרְתָּ, "
(3) אַשָּׁה מְפֹרָה מַהְתָּ, xvi. 3.
(4) אַשָּׁה מְפֹרָה אֵשֶר בֵּעֵלָה, xvi. 1.
(5) הַעֲלֵה עִנְיִד מַאֲשָׁתָה, ix. 8.
(6) בְּנָוִים נֵרִים וּרְשַׁבְּרָה, xi. 1.
(7) רַל נַאֲה וּנְשָׁר מְכָה, xxv. 2.
(8) בָּתָּ לְאַבְרָהָם מְפֹמָן שֵׁאָה, xvii. 9.
(9) מְפֹדָה הַלָּא יִשֵּׁה בּוּלֵיתָ, "
(10) בּוֹקְפֵתָו שֵׁכָא הַתַּפָּתָה, "
(11) גִנְרֵתָה שֵׁכָא הָזָה, "
(12) בְּנָרָה שֵׁכָא לַעֲנַשָּה, "
(13) בְּצָהֵי בֵּמָךְ אֵלָה תְּרֵדוּ, iii. 21.
(14) בּוֹקְפֵתָו מְפֹדָה הַלָּא תְּרֵדוּ, "
The last seven do not correspond quite accurately with the Greek.

(b) The following disagree with the metre, but, when corrected according to the Greek and Syriac, correspond with it.

(1) הַבָּרֵךְ יְהֹוָה אַלְדָּמוֹד תִּנְהֹתָן
xxvi. 3. ἐν μερίδι φοβουμένων Κύριον δοθήσεται., read:
בָּרֵךְ יְהֹוָה הַתִּנְהֹתָן
Compare Targum of Koheleth xi. 6. As in the copies of Ben-Sira י is occasionally mistaken for the 3rd fem. plural suffix, there can be no objection to the introduction of the form.

(2), (3)
If this come from xiii. 16, πᾶσα σάρξ κατὰ γένος συνάγεται, καὶ τῷ ὀμοίῳ αὐτῷ προσκολληθήσεται ἀνήρ, it is to be emended—
בָּל בָּשָׁר לְמוֹנִו יָשֵׁב
וּרוּפַּה לְלְדוֹמָה לָלַעְבָּנ
but if it come from xxvii. 9, πετεινὰ πρὸς τὰ ὀμοία αὐτοῖς καταλύσει, it must be emended—
עַתָּה לְדוֹמָה לְדָמָה יְשֵׁלֵב
and in either case the scansion is accurate.

(4)
בּוֹכָר אַשְׁרֵד רָפֵא יִשְׁלוּאָא תַּצְנָרֵךְ לָל
xxxviii. 1, τίμα ἱατρὸν πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ [τιμαῖς omitted by Syriac and MSS. 106 and 296]; but the better reading is preserved by Clem. Alex.: τίμα ἱατρὸν πρὸς τὴν χρείαν αὐτοῦ—
בּוֹכָר רָפֵא לְפֵּן יִלְוָר, Honour a physician according to his use.

(5) אֲלָוָה הַעַלֵּה סְמִיטָן מִן הָאָרוֹן
xxxviii. 4, Κύριος ἐκτιναχ ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα. Syr. similarly; Heb. יז הָבָא מִן הָאָרוֹן סְמִיט.
A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

(6) בָּהַם רָפָהּ מְרַפְּאֵה הָאָתָה הָמִינָה

xxxviii. 7, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐθεράπευσεν, καὶ ἴψε τὸν πόνον αὐτοῦ:
Syr.: ἐκεῖ ἀπειλεῖται καὶ ἀπαλεῖται,
Heb.: בִּזִּמֶנְתָּם רָפָהָהּ מְרַפְּאֵה.

The Syriac stands for יִרְפָּהּ מְרַפְּאֵה: he cannot therefore have read יִרְפָּהּ; the Greek stands for רָפָהּ מְרַפְּאֵה: he cannot therefore have read the article. This illustrates the justice of Prof. Driver’s complaints about the omission of articles and particles.

(7) בָּהַם וּרְפָּאֵה הָאָתָה הָמִינָה

xxxviii. 8, μορφέως ἐν τούτοις προῆκε μίγμα:

רק בָּהַם וּרְפָּאֵה הָאָתָה

אֲשֶׁר רְפָּא הָאָתָה יִרְפָּאֵה is used in Exodus. What would scarcely be tolerable.

 ربֹּמָה יִרְפָּאֵה שָלמָךְ (8), (9)

גָּלַה מְתֶרְ וּלְאָתָה

(Also quoted in another form; see Fritzsche’s Comm., p. 37.) vi. 6, οἱ εἰρήνευοντες σοι, ἔστωσαν πολλοί, οἱ δὲ σύμβουλοι εἰς ἀπὸ χῦλων.

שלֶלָךְ יִרְפָּאֵה רְבֹּמָה

רֶצֶף יָחָד מָאָלָתָה.

Both lines scan perfectly.

(10) xxv. 2 is quoted in the form אָלָל וּרְפָּאֵה שָלָם שָוָה וּרְפָּאֵה שָלָם שָוָה מָעָרָה. We learn from the Greek and Syriac versions that בָּהַם רָפָּאֵה is spurious, and that something is lost at the end, the Greek being καὶ γέροντα μοιχον ἔλαττούμενον συνέσει. The Syriac and MS. 248 have, instead of μοιχον, fool, and this is required by the context; we should therefore restore—

וּכְתָה שִׁפְּחָה הֵם מִסָּרָה

would probably scan, though the verse would be less neat; but I regard it as a wrong interpretation of שִׁפְּחָה; of course for an adulteress שִׁפְּחָה is regular. But why, except to fill a measure, should the last words have been added?
This line scans accurately; however xi. 29, μὴ πάντα ἀνθρώπων εἰσαγεῖ εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου, should rather be restored—λαὶ καλὰ ἑαυτὰ ἄλλα βιβλία.

We should read, γάρ ἂν καλλεῖ γυναικὸς πολλοὶ ἐπλανηθήσαν.

It should be observed that the quotation agrees with the Syriac here, and that γάρ is added by MS. 248.

Of the rabbinical quotations then twenty-seven may be quoted in support of the metrical canon. As the whole number, according to Prof. Driver, is about twenty, this is a very large proportion. But when Dr. Neubauer thinks the metrical discoverer ought to base his law on the inaccurate tradition, and then try to fit it to the accurate tradition, he would seem to suggest a very perverse method of procedure.

The agreement of the Syriac tradition with several of these quotations is a phenomenon worth noticing, but the account to be given of it may be left for another occasion.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

(To be concluded)