Invalides, gilded by us, reflects the rays of the sun. But reverses have come, the gold is effaced little by little. The rain of misfortunes and outrages with which we are deluged every day carries away the last particles. We are only lead, gentlemen, and soon we shall be but dust. Such is the destiny of great men; such is the near destiny of the great Napoleon.

"What an abyss between my profound misery and the eternal reign of Christ, proclaimed, worshipped, beloved, adored, living throughout the whole universe! Is that to die? Is it not rather to live? Behold the death of Christ, and behold that of God!"

"The Emperor was silent; and as General Bertrand equally kept silence, the Emperor resumed, 'If you do not understand that Jesus Christ is God, ah well! then I did wrong in making you a general!'"

ALEXANDER MAIR.

THE LANGUAGE AND METRE OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

3. I have, both in my essay and in this paper, shown that when the true glosses are discovered, the lines as a rule agree with the metrical canon; I will however quote a few more specimens before I proceed.

i. 6, ῥίζα σοφίας τίνι ἀπεκαλύψθη; καὶ τὰ πανουργεύματα αὐτῆς τῖς ἔγνω; 7, εἰς ἐστὶ σοφός φοβερὸς σφόδρα καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, Κύριος αὐτὸς. 8, ἐκτισεν αὐτὴν, καὶ εἴδε καὶ ἕξηρίθμησεν αὐτὴν, καὶ ἔξεχεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

vii. 12, μὴ ἀμορφία ψεῦδος (evil, Syr.) ἐπ’ ἀδελφό σου.

ἀλ θάνατος ῥεῖ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ.
vii. 13, μὴ θέλεις ἱεύσεσθαι πᾶν ἱεῦσος· ο γάρ ἐνδεχεσθαιν ἀυτὸν οὐκ εἰς ἅγαθὸν. Syr. and Aeth. “the end of it,”

αὐτὴ τὰς λέξεις λείψεις
ci ait' aheritir lomeb

vii. 18, μνήσθητι ὅτι ὅργῃ οὐ χρονεὶ, ὅτι ἐκδίκησις ἀσεβοῦς πῦρ καὶ σκόληξ.

θυραί αἰ διαθάρη
ci nukh' ef' at' ro'ne

xi. 19, ἐν τῷ εὐπαύν αὐτὸν εὐρὸν ᾄσταυσιν, καὶ νῦν φάγομαι ἐκ τῶν ἅγαθῶν μου.

camur'me mazat' me'nh'ah

μυθὴ ἀκλή μισοβοτι

χ. 9, τι ἵππηφανεῖται γῆ καὶ σποδὸς; ὅτι ἐν ζωῇ ἐρείφα τὰ ἐνδόσθια αὐτοῦ. 10, μακρὸν ἀρρώστημα κόπτει οἰατρός, καὶ βαϊλεύς σήμερον, καὶ αὐρίον τελευτήσει (emended with the help of the Armenian and Syriac versions).

מ'ה ירבעה עפר ראפר
אשרא בחיים רמה ת'ברב
ארד יראשת קציר דפואה
רודים כלת' וםורה הצ

When Prof. Driver asks why I do not give the induction on which my metrical theory is based, I should like to ask him how many lines constitute an induction. If every line in Ben-Sira must be naturally restored into this metre before he will believe in it, then indeed the case is lost; but previous discoverers of metrical laws have had no such hard conditions put to them, but, on the contrary, if they could show that any considerable number of lines of an author followed a law, this, it was thought, could not be accidental; for people can speak prose without knowing it, but can scarcely write verse without knowing it.

4. A decided trace of intentional versification consists in the padding of hemistichs, to give them the same number of words as the corresponding ones. So in a verse quoted
by Prof. Driver (xxviii. 6) μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παῦσαι ἔχθρας, καταφθοράν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ ἐμμενε ἐντολαῖς. Compare xviii. 25, xxv. 7, xxxvi. 5. Some verses have τέκνον prefixed, whereas most have not; if a number of syllables has to be observed, the reason of this insertion is very simple. Many a line of the Pand-nameh, a very similar book to Ecclesiasticus, is filled out with Ας σε, O son! In the Indian epics the insertion of a vocative is a very frequent method of filling a line.

The best tests of metre are lines containing enumerations, where the order will necessarily be guided by the metre, if there be one. Such lines are:

xxxix. 26, ἀρχὴ πάσης χρείας εἰς ζωῆν ἄνθρωπον,

This enumeration suits the metre exactly, except (perhaps) the ά before ζωῆ; but this the symmetry shows to be an interpolation.

xxxix. 29, πῦρ καὶ χάλαζα καὶ λιμὸς καὶ θάνατος,

We have seen above that άρεθ was the form used.

It is to my mind unintelligible that the author should have inserted iron where he does in xxxix. 26, unless he had a number of syllables to complete.

xl. 9, θάνατος καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἔρις καὶ ῥομφαία,
xxxvii. 18, ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν, ζωὴ καὶ θάνατος,
Μοῦ, ὕψος ἡμῶν

xxix. 21, ἀρχὴ ζωῆς ὄδωρ, καὶ ἀρτος,
Ῥασὶτ, ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν

Under the head of padding must come the insertion of little words, which do not obviously affect the sense:

xxxviii. 1. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκτίσε ο ᾿Κύριος,

יכ בּּכ אֵת ברּי יְהוּדָהֶן
Where בּ is supported by the Syriac also.

It seems to me impossible that this can be accidental; but that the whole metrical theory has not been made out, I am willing to concede.

5. The variation that has been noticed above in common words between the Hebrew and Chaldee idiom has its easiest explanation in metrical necessity.

These then are the reasons which I allege for the belief that Ben-Sira wrote in metre; and what have the critics to say against it? "The quotations in the Talmud are not in metre," say Profs. Driver and Neubauer: but this is said without sufficient consideration; for, unless these scholars count otherwise than I do, they must know that the Talmudic quotations are a strong argument in my favour. It would have been fairer to depreciate this evidence than to deny its existence. "The Psalms are not in metre." This does not affect the question, and if they are not when Ben-Sira is, the distance between the two will be all the greater. Yet no scholar, however great his authority, has a right to beg this question. This is positively all in the way of argument that I can find in their reviews.

VI.

Having, as I think, shown that my theory of Ben-Sira's language and metre is confirmed by far too many indica-
tions to be easily overthrown, I am not much concerned about the criticisms of detail that have been offered. I have nowhere suggested that I am unlikely to err, and shall be grateful for corrections which I can accept. Prof. Cheyne has abstained from desultory and fruitless cavils, for which gratitude is due to him. Prof. Driver has but rarely indulged in them; and if I abstain from answering such as he has made, perhaps generous readers will attribute this to my strong disinclination to controversy with him, and to my still cherishing the hope that I may some day have his co-operation in my work, which would profit very greatly by his unrivalled acquaintance with the niceties of Hebrew, his skill, and his caution. Dr. Neubauer’s attack is in a different style; but there is an old saying that “he who digs a pit for his neighbour falls into it himself,” of which his attack strongly reminds me.

I quote the word αὐθάνατος from xvii. 30, which I restore as יִלִם, to show that Ben-Sira had a philosophical vocabulary, differing in formation from the Old Hebrew. My critic answers that יִלֶם is more common. Quite so, but as a feminine or as an adverb; and “the son of man” is not feminine, nor can an adverb be predicate of a sentence. “But Ben-Sira may have used הָנָה.” This too is a philosophical term of a new formation; so that my argument will be none the worse, only with יִלִם the Syriac rendering is explicable, but not with הָנָה.

Dr. Neubauer is not justified in stating that I introduce Sanskrit words into Ben-Sira. If no word that has a Sanskrit etymon may be admitted, it will go hard with my critic’s יִסְדּ; for the etymon of that is more surely Sanskrit (rahasya) than the etymon of the other. I mention that a familiar Syriac and Chaldee word has an etymon in Sanskrit, to show how it comes to have the three meanings, sense, motion, and activity, which are required. But if יִרְבֵּית be not the original of εὐρήκωνα, some other word
must be represented by it; and that word will be as philo-
osophical as the other, and the argument in consequence
will be equally sound. For xii. 10, ὤσ γὰρ ὁ χαλκὸς οὐταῖ
σῶς ἡ πονηρία αὐτοῦ, I restore γενήσται תָּשֶׁה רַעֶה; my
critic cavils at the pointing of תָּשֶׁה, but in this he has
elsewhere been shown to be wrong. Moreover he thinks
כ is required. I fancy, on the contrary, that תָּשֶׁה וכ רַעֶה
would not be Hebrew, and that the omis-
sion of כ is required both by the grammar and the Syriac
tradition. His remaining cavils are equally insignificant,
and may well be neglected.

VII.

Being unable to find, then, in the observations of my
critics any reason for altering any of the opinions expressed
in the lecture referred to, I will venture to state how I
intend to continue my work. It is most important to
obtain, if possible, a complete critical apparatus; for many
MSS. embody additions and corrections, and those which
have been published are invariably of value; it is not un-
likely that uncollated MSS. may contain yet more of these.
Then the Ἑθιopic version should be printed; for this has
some important readings (e.g. xxviii. 11, where καταστα-
σαμένη of Ἑθ., for καταστασμένη, gives a certain clue for
the restoration of the verse), and, besides, exists in two
revisions. There would also appear to be some fragments
of the Sahidic version in the Paris Library, which Lagarde
has not collated in his valuable edition. The Armenian
version has been shown elsewhere to supply some palmary
emendations; and fresh study and repeated handling of each
of these show their value to be greater than it at first
appears. The rabbinic references and quotations are also
very imperfectly collected, and these give a guidance with
which it is impossible to dispense. The quotations in the
Greek and Latin Fathers also deserve more study than has
hitherto been given them. Some of the other apocryphal books would also seem to have been composed in a similar dialect, and cross-references are likely to be helpful. A complete restoration of Ben-Sira is, of course, not to be hoped for, but enough may be made out to tell us what the language of Hebrew poetry in 200 B.C. was like; and (though here I have the misfortune to differ from so good an authority as Prof. Driver) I venture still to think that the accomplishment of this work may be of consequence for the Hebrew language and for biblical theology.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

NOTE.

By the courtesy of the editor of The Expositor, I am permitted to make a few remarks on the subject of the preceding pages. If the criticisms that have been passed on the Inaugural Lecture of the Laudian Professor of Arabic should have no other effect than that of having induced him to publish the additional illustrations of his method and results contained in the last and present numbers of The Expositor, they will not have been written in vain; for his future critics will assuredly be in a better position to judge of both than those who had only the Lecture to guide them. In particular, many, at any rate, of the very interesting collection of New Hebrew words (p. 301 ff.) recovered for Ben-Sira appear to be certainly correct; and the grounds on which the Professor bases his opinion of the metre of Ecclesiasticus are far more fully stated than was the case in his Inaugural Lecture.

On the subject of the metre, the real difficulty which I felt was the want of a sufficient reason for supposing that Ben-Sira would be likely to adopt it. It is admitted by most Hebrew scholars—and the Laudian Professor himself does not appear to judge differently (see Inaug., p. 7)—that no part of the Old Testament has been satisfactorily shown to be written in strict metre; but until this has been done, or, in other words, until it has been proved that metre was a form in which ancient Hebrew poetry naturally found expression, it is difficult to understand what motive or inducement Ben-Sira could have had for adopting it. I grant of course that this à priori objection would be overcome by facts