

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

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, עֵשֶׂר טוֹב לוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא חָמָא, contains a decided solecism; for "to him who" in Hebrew is of course לְאִישׁ or לְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר, or לְמִי אֲשֶׁר; לוֹ אֲשֶׁר being

impossible in any Semitic language.<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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 נשא (Niph.) is used by Ben-Sira in the sense of *to be married*; but the *verification* of it in xlii. 9, και συζακηκυια μηποτε μισηθη, Hebrew בנרה שמוא לא תנשא, has been left to others (נשא, *to hate*, is confused with נשא, *to lift*, in i. 30, and with נשה, *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

<sup>1</sup> 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, למי שהפקדון אצלו.

<sup>2</sup> *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 Schenk'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 תַּפְתָּהּ for תַּתְּפְתָּהּ, פֶּן for שְׂמָא, גְּרִלָהּ for בְּגֵרָה, 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 עסק, of which the biblical Hebrew is דבר or הפץ; הרשה; זכות; בווא; נכנס; השליט; דור, of which the biblical Hebrew is שכן or ישב.

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 דור is Chaldee, but ישב Hebrew; with Ben-Sira the former is Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> With Daniel זכור is Chaldee and צדקה Hebrew; in Ben-Sira's language the two may be used indiscriminately. With Daniel עת is Hebrew, and ערן Chaldee; Ben-Sira uses the two in the same verse—

אל תמנע תושיה בעתה ואל תסתר חכמה בעדנה

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 לחדא, but with Daniel it is שניא. 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

<sup>1</sup> As it is with R. Akiba, *Aboth* de R. N., p. 71b. אל תדור בין הגוים.

Daniel will, if rightly cross-examined, be found to bear irrefragable 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. עסק or עשק, *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 commonest words, corresponding, as Buxtorf well says, with the Hebrew דבר, and particularly with the Middle Hebrew ענין or חפץ. Ben-Sira is recorded to have used this word in a verse quoted in Midrash Rabba and elsewhere,

וּאִין לך עסק בנסתרות

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

xxxvii. 11: οὐκέτι ἀργῶ περὶ πολλῆς ἐργασίας :

Syr. : עַם עַבְדָּא דְּבַעַל לְמַטְלָם לְמִרוּחֵי : *with a servant who desires to rob his master.*<sup>1</sup>

vii. 25: ἔση τετελεκῶς ἔργον μέγα :

Syr. : נְפֻק עֲשׂוּקִיא , *there shall go out oppression.*

xi. 9: ἐν κρίσει ἀμαρτωλῶν μὴ συνέδρευε :

Syr. : לֹא תִסְגַּא טְלוּמִיא , *do not multiply oppression.*

<sup>1</sup> רב of the Hebrew is here interpreted *master*. Its Greek gloss in this sense is δυνάστης; e.g. xvi. 11, δυνάστης ἐξίλασμων for רב סליחות.

iii. 23 : *μη περιεργάζου :*

Syr. : לא תתעסק, *do not wrangle.*

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

עם עבד עצל על רב עשק  
הוצא בת ותצא עשק רב  
בריב רשעים אל תתעשק  
ביתר מעשיו אל תתעשק

A further trace of this word is to be found in xxxviii. 24 :  
*ὁ ἐλασσόμενος τῇ πράξει αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται.*

הממעט בעסק יתחכם

Compare *Derech Erets* ed. Tawrogi, p. 13a; *Aboth*, p. 72b; and *Pirke Aboth*, § 4, הווי ממעט בעסק.

Yet another vestige seems to be in xxix. 27 :

*ἐπεξένωταί μοι ὁ ἀδελφὸς, χρεία τῆς οἰκίας :*

Syr. : ארחה ניר ערץ עלי, omitting the rest.

Heb. : הוקד האח עשק בבית

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 עשק. In the first half of the verse the Greek reading was הוקרה אחי, the Syriac הוקרה ארח. The Syriac ערץ corresponds in meaning with the Old Hebrew קרה; the Greek translator interprets from the Arabic קرى, "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. שיחה and סיחה.

This is also a rabbinic word, of very frequent occurrence

(see *Pirke Aboth*, § 1), signifying *conversation*. The form with **פ** does not occur in the Bible; that with **ש** occurs, but in the sense of *meditation*.

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

οὕτως σκύβαλα ἀνθρώπου ἐν λογισμῶ αὐτοῦ :

Syr. : שועיתא דאנשא על חושבנה, *So the talk of a man on his thought* ;

Heb. : כן סיחת אדם מרעיוני, *So the talk of a man from his mind*.

The previous hemistich is corrupt, but can be emended. The Greek reading was סוחת, "refuse," "dung." Where the word is not corrupted, its ordinary gloss is λαλιά; xiii. 11, ἐκ πολλῆς λαλιᾶς πειράσει σε, the Hebrew of which is preserved in *Aboth*, p. 68a, בודקין האדם ברב שיחה, so that we may restore כִּי מַרְבֵּי שִׁיחָה יְבַדֵּק (compare xxxii. 14, ἐκχέη λαλιάν, borrowed from Ps. cii. 1).

xx. 5 : ἔστι μισητὸς ἀπὸ πολλῆς λαλιᾶς.

xxii. 13 : μὴ πλεθύνῃς λόγον = אַל תִּרְבֵּי שִׁיחָה of *Pirke Aboth*, § 1.

### 3. יצר, 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 : εἰδὼς τὸ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ, ידע יצרו; elsewhere however it is employed in its technical sense.

xxxvii. 3 : ὃ πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα, πόθεν ἐνεκυλίσθη;

Syr. : סנא וביש למנא אתבריו.

Emend ἐκτίσθη from Syriac and Latin, and restore יצר הָרַע לְמַה נִבְרָאת, *O evil inclination, wherefore wast thou created?* That סנא and ἐχθρός stand for יצר has been observed previously. Another proof passage is :

xvi. 28 : ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔθλιψε ;

Syr. : אחד לא סנין ; Heb. : איש לרעהו לא צרו .

In xxi. 11 we have a similar rendering ἐννόημα :

ὁ φύλασσαν νόμον κατακρατεῖ τοῦ ἐννόηματος αὐτοῦ :

Syr. : אלץ יצרה :

Heb. : שמר תורה יכבש את יצרו :

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

Another rendering of this word is διαβούλιον, as we learn from xvii. 6 :

διαβούλιον καὶ γλώσσαν καὶ ὀφθαλμούς ;

Syr. : וברא להון פומא וש ;

Heb. : יצר פה לשון ועינים ,

where יצר should be rendered *he created*. The word however stands in its place in xv. 14 : καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ ; Syr., יצרהון .

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

#### 4. יסורים, 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 πεποιθὼς γίνου. There is however an allusion to it in xxx. 14, μεμαστιγωμένος εἰς τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ; with which compare *Aboth*, p. 82a, כל שיסורים משלים בנופו : yet the original of this phrase is almost certainly לוקה בנופו, *Aboth*, p. 72b ; לקה is an equally genuine rabbinism. It is likely that יסוריך is the original of τὰ κρυπτὰ σου, Syr., *thy bonds* (סודך and אסוריך), in i. 30. For a quiescent א omitted compare xlvi. 12, ἐν λαίλαπι ; Syr., *in the store* ; Heb., בסופה .

#### 5. התקן, to persist.

This word is nowhere used in the Bible, but is a

favourite word in Chaldee. In i. 15, *μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰῶνος ἐνόσσευσε*, is unintelligible; for this the Syriac has *אתתקנת*. Clearly therefore the word *הַתְּקִנָּה* was used, connected by the Greek translators with *קן*. The Coptic translator, who renders *αὐστηρικντε* (comp. xl. 25), must have followed a revised text, which rendered the word as if it had been *הַתְּקִנָּה*. This usage of *תתקן* for "to be permanent," is very common in the Targum; the antithesis, *ἐμπιστευθήσεται*, renders the restoration certain.

#### 6. *קן*, *grateful*.

Buxtorf notices a rabbinic usage of *קן* in the sense of "grateful," "pleasant." This occurs in Ben-Sira vii. 33: *χάρις δόματος ἔναντι παντὸς ζῶντος*; Syriac, *חסדא הי גיר*; Hebrew, *מיהבתא*; *קן מתן לפני כל חיים*.

#### 7. *שכא*, *perhaps*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira. The Greek gloss of this is *μήποτε*. xix. 13: *ἔλεγξον φίλον, μήποτε οὐκ ἐποίησεν*; *הוכח*; *רע שכא לא עשה*, etc.

#### 8. *לשון שרשית*, *the third tongue*.

See xxviii. 14, 15.

#### 9. *הרשה*, *to give leave*.

This occurs in a verse cited in Midrash Rabba and elsewhere

*במה שהרשית התבונן*

=iii. 22, *ἂ προσετάγη σοι*; Syriac, *דאשלוך*. There are however other traces of this characteristically rabbinic word: xxiii. 2, *οὐ μὴ παρηῆ*; Syriac, *לא נארתון*; Hebrew, *לא ירשו*.

#### 10. *סמים*, *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. נכנס, *to enter*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira; its *locus* is xi. 8: ἐν μέσῳ λόγων μὴ παρεμβάλλου; Hebrew, בתוך דברים אל תכנס (comp. *Aboth*, p. 110a: אינו נכנס לתוך דברי חברו). It is very probable that throughout Ben-Sira συναγειν is the gloss for כנס, and συναγωγή for כנסת. xlvi. 12, ἐν λαίλαπι ἐσκεπάσθη; Syriac, אתכנש; Hebrew, נכנס read נסך.

12. הרגל, *accustom*; רגילות, *custom*.

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

13. דור, *to dwell*; דיר, מדור, *dwelling*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira in Baba Bathra, חתן הדר בבית, חמיו. Although this passage does not occur in our copies, other traces of the word are to be found: xli. 5, παροικίας ἀσεβῶν; Syriac, תולדתא דחטיא, *generation of sinners*, i.e. דור wrongly read דיר. The word however really occurs in xlv. 6: εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν ταῖς παροικίαις αὐτῶν; Syriac, תוקנהין, thinking of the Talmudic דיר, "to order." Another trace of it is in xvi. 8: περὶ τῆς παροικίας Λώτ; Syriac, on the dwellers of the city of Lot; Hebrew, הדרור הליט, the accursed generation: so that, if we lose one Chaldaism, we gain another equally violent.

14. אסיף or הסיף, *to end*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira in a Baraitha to Mass. Kallah, but in a corrupt form: זכור את יום אסיפתך ואסוף חרפה. This is a reminiscence of xxviii. 6, μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παῦσαι ἔχθρας (so read with Syriac, Hexaplar-Syriac, and Armenian). Hebrew, זכור לאסיפה ואסיף איבה. אסיפה for *death* occurs in xvi. 30, where it is rendered ἡ ἀποστροφή αὐτῶν; Syriac, קפס, *he gathered*. A further trace of אסיף is xlii. 17, οὐκ

ἐνεποίησε τοῖς ἁγίοις Κύριος ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι πάντα τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ; Syriac, לֹא נִפְּוּ, *they shall not finish*; Hebrew, לֹא יִסְּפוּ; for ἐμποιεῖν means *to add*: xxxix. 11, ἐὰν ἀναπαύσῃται ἐμποιεῖ αὐτῶ, with variant ἐὰν παύσῃται, perhaps וְאִם יִסְּפוּ יוֹסִיף אֵלָיו. The same word probably occurred in xviii. 5, τίς προσθήσει ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ;—*where who shall finish?* is required. The Syriac of xlvi. 4 renders וְיִסְּפוּ by the same word as is used in xxviii. 6. Compare *Pirke Aboth*, § 1, דְּלֹא מוֹסִיף יוֹסִיף.

15. זכות, *merits*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira *l.c.* Its Greek gloss is ἐλεημοσύνη.

xvii. 22: ἐλεημοσύνη ἀνδρὸς ὡς σφραγὶς μετ' αὐτοῦ:

Syr.: זְכוּתָא דְכַלְהוֹן בְּנִינְשָׂא חֲתִימָא:

Heb.: זְכוּת אִישׁ חֲתוּמָה.

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

16. נמרים, *coals*.

viii. 10, μὴ ἔκκαιε ἀνθρακὰς ἀμαρτωλοῦ:

Syr.: לֹא תְהוּא שׁוּתְפָא לְרִשְׁעָא נְמִירָא, *be not the associate of the perfectly wicked*.

Whether the verse ended נְמִירֵי הַרְשָׁע or גְּמִירֵי הַרְשָׁע, in either case it will contain a violent Chaldaism. The first half was read אֵל תַּחַר by the Syriac, אֵל תַּחַר, by the Greek translator; תַּחַר is glossed תַּתִּיחַר in the Midrash Tanchuma; לְהַטִּים *blazing*, of the Psalms, is rendered חִירִין (from חָרַר) in the Targum. This observation will explain.

xi. 7, πρὶν ἐξετάσης μὴ μέμψη:

Syr.: *before thou examine become not associate*:

Heb.: טָרַם תִּשְׂאֵל אֵל תַּחַר (תַּחַר).

The Pael of שָׂאל ("to examine" in Syriac) is certified by the metre, but also by xi. 28, πρὸ τελευτῆς μὴ μακάριζε μηδένα; Syriac, *before examining praise no one*; Hebrew, לִפְנֵי שָׂאל אֵל תֹּאשֵׁר אִישׁ.

17. השכח, *to find*.

This Chaldaism appears in a *v.l.* of MS. 106, in vi. 16, οἱ φοβούμενοι Κύριον εὐρήσουσιν αὐτόν. MS. 106, αἰνέσουσιν αὐτόν. If Ben-Sira wrote ישכחהו, the difference may be easily explained, but never from ימצאהו. A further vestige of this word is xx. 9, ἔστιν εὔρεμα εἰς ἐλάττωσιν. Syriac, אית שויעתא דלחוסרנה. If Ben-Sira wrote שכחה, the Syriac reading is explicable by the omission of the כ, but not if he wrote מציאה (which, itself, is a New Hebrew word). In xiii. 26, for εὔρεσις παραβολῶν the Syriac has סונאא דשויעתא again. παραβολῶν is a gloss; the sense required is *the darkening of the countenance*: Hebrew חשיכתן; Greek reading, שיחתן; Syriac, שיחתן.

## 18. חרד = σφόδρα.

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

i. 8 : εἰς ἐστι σοφὸς φοβερὸς σφόδρα :

Syr. : ודחיל בלחודוהי.

xi. 6 : ἡτιμάσθησαν σφόδρα :

Syr. : אצטערו אכחדא.

xxxix. 16 : τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου καλὰ σφόδρα :

Syr. : יאין אכחדא.

The Chaldee לחרד, but not the Hebrew מאד, will explain these translations; and the *metre* will explain why the author prefers the Chaldee form. For that he used מאד in vii. 17 (where the Syriac renders it rightly by שב) is evinced by a quotation of this verse (under a false name) in *Aboth*, p. 74b. לחרד 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. סכנה, *danger*.

This emerges in iii. 25; ὁ ἀγαπῶν κίνδυνον, Syr., *he that*

*loveth good things.* סכנות in Old Heb. would mean "good things." xxxi. 10, ὁ πεπλανημένος, Syr. דכשר, is perhaps to be explained similarly. With xxxi. 12, ἕως θανάτου ἐκινδύνευσα, compare Targum of Psalm xviii. 5, מסכנא לממת.

20. גרוד, *a bachelor.*

xxxvi. 26, τίς πιστεύσει εὐζώνῳ ληστῇ; Syr. נרודא דרמא לטביא. Now this word εὐζωνος is used in Gen. xlix. 19 (Aq.) to represent גרוד (which there means something quite different), and ληστής 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. חיבים, *sinners.*

Greek gloss ἐπιτίμια.

viii. 5, μνήσθητι ὅτι πάντες ἐσμὲν ἐν ἐπιτιμίαις:

Syr.: כלן חטיין. Æth. similarly.

Heb.: זכור כי כלנו חיבים.

ix. 5: μήποτε σκανδαλισθῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτιμίαις αὐτῆς:

Heb.: שמא תכשל בהיבתה (so Æth.), *lest thou fall in love with her.* This is no less a Chaldaism than the former.

22. רנה, *occupation.*

xxxviii. 34, ἡ δέησις αὐτῶν ἐν ἐργασίᾳ τέχνης; Syr., ורניהון בעבדא דאומנותהון; ורנתם 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

ורנתם בעבד אומנות

each word being a Chaldaism.

23. מצוה or צדקה, *alms.*

The former word has this sense in the Jerusalem dialect; and regularly in Æthiopic, in which language a denominative תמצות, "to give alms," is formed, corresponding with the Arabic תצדק. One of these words is used in its technical sense in vii. 10, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην ποιῆσαι μὴ

*παρίδης*, Syr. (a) תשתוחר לא זדקתא ומן זדקתא (b) ולא תשתוחר למעבד פוקדנא. Whether the author wrote עשות מצוה or עבד צדקה, either is a technicality of the New Hebrew dialect. Compare xxix. 11: *κατ' ἐντολὰς ὑψίστου*; Syr. בודיקותא ובחובא. חובא for *ὑψίστου* represents another New Hebrew רחמן, a name for God.

24. צלה, *to pray, or turn.*

The Book of Daniel very properly distinguishes between צלה the Chaldee, and התפלל the Hebrew, for this idea; nor is the former used in any Hebrew document. Yet there is evidence that Ben-Sira employs צלה.

li. 16, *ἐκλινα ὀλίγον τὸ οὖς μου*; Syriac, וצלית צלותה כד, *I prayed the prayer thereof when I was young* (perhaps read לותה); Heb., צליתי ועיר ואקבל; *my ear is a gloss.* Any one who will look up this word in Buxtorf's *Lex. Talm.* will see whence it comes.

xvii. 25, *δεήθητι κατὰ πρόσωπον* would seem to stand for צלה, *turn forward*; and xxvi. 5, *ἐπὶ τῷ τετάρτῳ προσώπῳ ἐδεήθη*, is perhaps פני צליתי, *I turned away my face.*

25. טיבות, *grace, goodness.*

Wherever in the Syriac טיבות corresponds with ἀγαθά, "goods," in the Greek, and "grace" makes better sense than "goods," it will be safe to assume that Ben-Sira wrote טיבות, and that his translator misread it טיבות.

xx. 16, *οὐκ ἔστι χάρις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς μου*; Syr. לטיבותי; *there are no thanks for my favours* is the sense required.

xxix. 17, *ἀγαθὰ ἐγγύου*; Syr. טיבות; the meaning is *the favour of a surety*, and it is the equivalent of *χάριτας ἐγγύου* of the preceding verse, with which the Syriac has confused it.

xviii. 15, *τέκνον ἐν ἀγαθοῖς*, for *when thou doest a favour.*

xii. 1, *ἔσται χάρις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς σου*; Syr. לטיבותך. The meaning is, *there will be thanks for thy favour.*

xii. 3. See *Inaug.*, p. 13.

xvii. 22, *χάρις* = *good works.* Cp. xlv. 26. It is noticeable

that the introduction of this word frequently restores the metre.

26. **השתרר, שרה**, to take up one's abode.

xxiv. 8, καὶ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κατακληρονομήθητι; Syr. ואשתררי, and be confirmed.

xxiv. 10, καὶ οὕτως ἐν Σιών ἐστήριχθην; Syr. קמת, I stood.

xxiv. 6, ἐν παντὶ λαῶ καὶ ἔθνει ἐκτησάμην; Syr. אשתלשת; Lat. *primatum habui*.

xxiv. 11, καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἐξουσία μου. All these (and further ἐλειτούργησα of ver. 10) would seem to be attempts at rendering שריתי and השתריתי, I took up my abode, and I was deposited. ἐκτησάμην = ירשתי, *primatum habui* שרותי, ἡ ἐξουσία μου רשותי, ἐλειτούργησα השתררתי, ἐστήριχθην השתררותי, from שרר.

27. **עדן**, 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 בעדנה, which should be rendered *in its time*. Cp. *Inaug.*, p. 19.

28. **קים**, to swear.

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

29. **טענה**, accusation.

xxxviii. 17, καὶ ποίησον τὸ πένθος κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν μίαν καὶ δύο χάριν διαβολῆς; Syr. on account of men. The full phrase is מפני טענת הבריות אבות, p. ה a. The Greek translator has given us one half, the Syrian the other.

30. **פקדן**, a commandment.

In xxxix. 18, ὃς ἐλαττώσει τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, the context requires *his commandment* rather than *his salvation*; the Syriac has פוקדנו; it is likely that this was what Ben-Sira

wrote, the Greek rendering representing פורקנו. Either of these words is a Chaldaism.

31. קור, *to go round.*

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

32. בסר, *to despise.*

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

33. עברה, *transgression.*

i. 20. φόβος Κυρίου ἀπωθεῖται ἀμαρτήματα, παραμένων δὲ ἀποστρέψει πᾶσαν ὀργήν. Ὀργή is the gloss of עברה very frequently, and the antithesis requires here a synonym of *sin*. עברה should therefore here be rendered *transgression*. This must also be the original of ὕβρεις τῶν ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ ἀμαρτωλῶν of xxiii. 2, probably a very technical rabbinism. ὕβρις is the gloss of עברה in xxi. 4, as is shown by the Syriac rendering *evening*, i.e. ערב.

34. הלכה, *an enactment.*

i. 4, πηγὴ σοφίας λόγος θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις καὶ αἱ πορεῖαι αὐτῆς ἐντολαὶ αἰώνιοι; Heb. והלכותיה מצות עלם, i.e. *and her halachas are wise commandments.*

35. כן, *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. ὁμοίως in xxiv. 11, ἐν πόλει ἡγαπημένη ὁμοίως με κατέπαυσε, is perhaps for בעיר דוד כן הניחני.

36. בנר, *ἀκμάζειν.*

Quoted from Ben-Sira. Its *locus* is xlii. 9, ἐν νεότητι αὐτῆς μήποτε παρακμάση; Heb. בקטנותה שמא לא תבגר. In the next clause, σσυμφηκκῦια, it is corrupted to גברה, which the translator makes equivalent to בעלה.

37. **שוב**, to repent ; **תשובה**, repentance.

xvii. 24, πλὴν μετανοοῦσιν ἔδωκεν ἐπάνοδον; Syr. *repentance*; Heb. ברם לשבים נתן תשובה. xxx. 19, μεταμεληθείς; Syr. תהפוך; Heb. תשוב. It is not unlikely that the adverbial שוב was sometimes used, of which we have a trace in xxxvi. 1, καὶ πάλιν ἐξελείται; Heb. ישוב ינצל, read ושוב.

38. **שטה**, fool.

xvi. 23, ἀνὴρ ἄφρων καὶ πλανώμενος. The same confusion is to be found in xlii. 10, παραβῆ; Syr. תשטא במדעה and נברא אחרנא ותאזול בתר נברא אחרנא; Heb. תשטה and תשטה. This would seem to be the true explanation of the variety μωρός and μοιχός in xxv. 2.

39. **מנין**, a number ; **כון**, a vessel.

xxxviii. 29, ἐναρίθμιος πάσα ἡ ἐργασία αὐτοῦ; Syr. במאני כל עבדה; Heb. בַּמְנִין or בְּמִנִּין. It is not clear that Ben-Sira uses כלי; in xii. 5, ἐμπόδισον τοὺς ἄρτους σου; Syr. thy weapons of war; Heb. כלי לחמך; the Greek is right.

40. **נבול פה** and **נבל**.

*Inaug.*, p. 15. We learn from a quotation that in xxiii. 15 λόγοις ὄνειδισμού stands for דברי ערוה, another rabbinism.

41. **כפן**, hunger.

xxxix. 29, πῦρ καὶ χάλαια καὶ λιμὸς καὶ θάνατος; Syr. : נורא וברדא וכאפא דמותא, and stones of death for כפין; Heb. : אש וברד וכפן ומות.

42. **מרע** and **מרעות**, sickness.

xxxiv. 22, πᾶν ἀρρώστημα οὐ μὴ σοι ἀπαντήσῃ; Syr. כל וכל לא תתקרב לך בישא לא תתקרב לך (the same variation between קרא and קרב occurs in i. 30 and xiii. 9); x. 10, ἀρρώστημα, Syr. entrails, מרעא תקיפא, Heb. מרעות and מעות; xxxiv. 2, ἀρρώστημα βαρύ, מרעא תקיפא, but the meaning is, from the pursuit of honour, כבוד (מרעות כבוד);

in this passage, ערות, *sleeplessness*, is confused with רעות more than once.

43. צרך, *need and use*.

Quoted from Ben-Sira : *locus* xxxviii. 1 ; but also vi. 10, ἡμέρα θλίψεώς σου is probably for צרך יום, *the day of need*.

44. גמל הסדים, *to confer benefits*.

A rabbinic expression, see Buxtorf and Jellinek, B.M. iii. 123 ; xxxii. 2, ἀνταποδιδούς χάριν προσφέρων σεμίδαλιν ; Syr. *he confers obligations who offers an offering* ; Heb. גמל הסדים מביא מנחה.

45. הדריך, *to overtake*.

xv. 1, ὁ ἐγκρατῆς τοῦ νόμου καταλήψεται αὐτήν ; Syr. נהלך בה ; Heb. ידרכנה. xv. 7, οὐ μὴ καταλήψονται αὐτήν ἄνδρες ἀσύνητοι, לא נהלכון בה השיא ; Heb. לא ידרכוה.

46. מלך, *to counsel or to promise*.

iii. 24 (in several MSS. and versions), γνώσεως δὲ ἄμοιρος μὴ ἐπαγγέλλου ; מא דגהר אנת מן ידעתא לא תהוא מלך ; Heb. אל תמלך, *give not counsel*, which the Syriac gloss למפסו expresses. In xxiii. 2, τὰς δὲ ὑβρεις τῶν ἐν ἐπαγγελία ἁμαρτωλῶν, ἐν ἐπαγγελία perhaps stands for במלכה, *in work, i.e. sins of commission*. מלכה is found (instead of מלאכה) in ix. 17, ἔργον ἐπαινεθήσεται ; Syr. תתקן מדינתא ; Heb. תישר מלכה ; and also in xxx. 28, εἰς ἔργα κατὰστησον ; Syr. *give him command*.

47. השנה, *to make ugly* ; שניא, *obscene*.

xii. 18, ἀλλοιώσει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ; Syr. ומסנא אפויהו (contrast xiii. 25) ; the sense required is, *to make an ugly gesture* ; Heb. ישנה פניו (compare Eccles. viii. 1). The confusion between שניא, *to hate*, and שנה, *to repeat*, is not unknown in Ben-Sira ; xix. 5, ὁ μισῶν λαλιάν ; Syr. דתנא מלתא ; Heb. שנה שיחה ; xix. 9 ; cp. vii. 14, μὴ δευτερώσης λόγον ; Syr. לא תשחף ; Heb. אל תשנה. Hence it

is not unlikely that βδελύγματα in x. 13, Syr. תרתיהון, represent שניאם and שניהם, and that in xxvii. 30, μῆνις καὶ ὀργή, καὶ ταῦτά ἐστι βδελύγματα, Syr. impurities, the true reading is שגיאות, are errors.

48. בריאה, *the creation.*

xxxvi. 15, τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ κτίσμασί σου perhaps stands for בריותיך in the sense of *thy covenants*, for which we should expect בריתותיך; it will also be found that in xliii. 2 ἐν ὀπτασία probably stands for בראות.

In xvi. 26 τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς seems to represent מעשי בראשית.

49. לוט, *to curse.*

See *supra*, No. 13.

50. השתעה, *to narrate*; שועית, *narration.*

To διηγείσθαι, διήγημα, and διήγησις, which are very frequent in Ben-Sira, there correspond as a rule in the Syriac אשתעי and שועית. 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, ἡ διήγησις αὐτοῦ ἐν υἱοῖς ταύρων; שועיתו את בני שורים; cp. Prov. iii. 32. xix. 8, ἐν φίλῳ καὶ ἐν ἐχθρῷ μὴ διηγοῦ; Syr. אל תדגל, *do not lie*; Heb. ברע וצר אל תשתעה, *concerning friend and enemy tell no stories.* xxii. 8, διηγούμενος νυστάζοντι ὁ διηγούμενος μωρῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ ἐρεῖ, τί ἐστι; Syr. *as one who eats bread when he is not hungry*; Heb. משתעה לנם; the Syrian read להם, and interpreted the verb from its first conjugation in Syriac in the sense "whoso plays with bread." vi. 35, πᾶσαν διήγησιω θεῖαν θέλε ἀκούειν; Syr. כל שועיתא היית. כל שועית היה [יהוה] רצה לשמוע; Heb. צבא למשמע.

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 Syriasm, it will be seen that such words as נָרוֹר open the door to them. Dr. Neubauer would have me point תְּשֻׁחִית as nif'al in xii. 10 ; but he is mistaken, for this word is probably unconnected with the Hebrew שָׁחַת (of which the Syriac form is שְׁחַט), being rather a denominative from נָחַשׁת (like *æruginare* from *æs*), in which the hif'il form is regular.<sup>1</sup> 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 עֵשֶׂר טוֹב לוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא חָטָא, or as כִּי כְנָחַשׁת תְּשֻׁחַת כֵּן רַעְתּוֹ, 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 הִשְׁכַּח may be used indifferently for מִצָּא, לְחַדָּא, כְּאֵר, שְׁכֵן, of course my

<sup>1</sup> So הַרְקִיב, הַחֲמִיּי, הַזְקִינ, 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) במה שהרשית התבונן, iii. 22.
- (2) ואין לך עשק בנסתרות ,,
- (3) אשה טובה מתנה טובה, xvi. 3.
- (4) אשה טובה אשרי בעלה, xvi. 1.
- (5) העלם עיניך מאשת הן, ix. 8.
- (6) ובין נדיבים תושיבך, xi. 1.
- (7) דל נאה ועשיר מכחש, xxv. 2.
- (8) בת לאביה מטמון שוא, xvii. 9.
- (9) מפחדה לא ישן בלילה ,,
- (10) בקטנתה שמא תתפתה ,,
- (11) בנערותה שמא תזנה ,,
- (12) בנרה שמא לא תנשא ,,
- (13) בחזק ממך אל תחקור, iii. 21.
- (14) ובמכסה ממך אל תשאק ,,

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) בחיק יראי אלהים תנתן

xxvi. 3. ἐν μερίδι φοβουμένων Κύριον δοθήσεται, read :

בחלק יראי יה תנתן

Compare Targum of Koheleth xi. 6. As in the copies of Ben-Sira יה is occasionally mistaken for the 3rd fem. plural suffix, there can be no objection to the introduction of the form.

(2), (3) כל עוף למינו ישכן  
ובן אדם לדומה לו

If this come from xiii. 16, πᾶσα σὰρξ κατὰ γένος συνάγεται, καὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ αὐτῷ προσκολληθήσεται ἀνὴρ, it is to be emended—

כל בשר למינו יכנס  
ולדמה לו ידבק איש

but if it come from xxvii. 9, πετεινὰ πρὸς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καταλύσει, it must be emended—

עוף לדומים להם ישלנו

and in either case the scansion is accurate.

(4) כבד את רפאך עד שלא תצטרך לו

xxxviii. 1, τίμα ἰατρὸν πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ [τιμαῖς omitted by Syriac and MSS. 106 and 296]; but the better reading is preserved by Clem. Alex. : τίμα ἰατρὸν πρὸς τὴν χρείαν αὐτοῦ—

כבד רפא לפני צרכו, Honour a physician according to his use.

(5) אלה העלה סמים מן הארץ

xxxviii. 4, Κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα. Syr. similarly; Heb. יה ברא מן הארץ סמים.

(6) בהם הרפה מרפא את המכה

xxxviii. 7, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐθεράπευσε, καὶ ἤρε τὸν πόνον αὐτοῦ :

Syr. : בהון אסיא מניח מן כאבא,

Heb. : בהם רפא ירפה המכאוב.

The Syriac stands for ירפה מכאוב : he cannot therefore have read את ; the Greek stands for רפא ורפה : he cannot therefore have read the article. This illustrates the justice of Prof. Driver's complaints about the omission of articles and particles.

(7) בהם הרקה מרקה את המרקחת

xxxviii. 8, μυρεψὸς ἐν τούτοις ποιήσει μίγμα :

רקח בהם יעשה רקח

עשה רקח is used in Exodus. באלה would scarcely be tolerable.

(8), (9) רבים יהיו דרשי שלמדך

גלה סודך לאחד

(Also quoted in another form ; see Fritzsche's *Comm.*, p. 37.) vi. 6, οἱ εἰρηνεύοντές σοι, ἔστωσαν πολλοὶ, οἱ δὲ σύμβουλοι εἰς ἀπὸ χιλίων.

שלמדך יהיו רבים

ויעצך אחד מאלף.

Both lines scan perfectly.

(10) xxv. 2 is quoted in the form אלו הן דך גאה ועשיר מנאף. We learn from the Greek and Syriac versions that אלו הן is spurious, and that something is lost at the end, the Greek being καὶ γέροντα μοιχὸν ἐλαττούμενον συνέσει. The Syriac and MS. 248 have, instead of μοιχόν, fool, and this is required by the context ; we should therefore restore—

ווקן שמה חסר מדע.

מנאף would probably scan, though the verse would be less neat ; but I regard it as a wrong interpretation of שמה ; of course for an adulteress שמה is regular. But why, except to fill a measure, should the last words have been added ?

(11) ולא הכל תביא ביהך.

This line scans accurately; however xi. 29, *μη πάντα ἄνθρωπον εἴσαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου*, should rather be restored—

לא כל איש תביא אל ביהך  
כי רבים מארבי הערים.

(12) למסך עמו יין ושכר

also scans accurately; however ix. 9, *μηδὲ συμβολοκοπήσης μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν οἴνῳ*; Syr. *ולא תגר עמה שועיתא*; Lat. *non alterceris cum ea in vino*, is probably to be restored—

ואל תמשך עמה בחמר.

(13) כי בתאר אשה רבים השחתו

ix. 8: *ἐν κάλλει γυναικὸς πολλοὶ ἐπλανήθησαν*.

We should read

בתאר אשה רבים תע.

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.)