

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, *ρίζα σοφίας τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; καὶ τὰ πανουργέματα αὐτῆς τίς ἔγνω;* 7, *εἷς ἐστὶ σοφὸς φοβερὸς σφόδρα καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, Κύριος αὐτός.* 8, *ἔκτισεν αὐτήν, καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐξέχεεν αὐτήν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.*

שרש חכמה אל מי נגלה  
ותעלומותיה מי ידע  
אחד הוא חכם נורא לחדא  
ישב אל כסאו יהוה הוא  
בראה וראה וספרה  
ויסכנה על כל מעשיו

vii. 12, *μὴ ἀροτρία ψεύδος (evil, Syr.) ἐπ' ἀδελφῶ σου.*

אל תחרש רע על אחיך

vii. 13, μὴ θέλε ψεύδουσαι πᾶν ψεύδος· ὁ γὰρ ἐνδελεχισμὸς αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Syr. and Æth. "the end of it,"  
אחריתו for ארחתו,

אל תרצה לכזב כל כזב  
כי אין אחריתו לשובה

vii. 18, μνήσθητι ὅτι ὄργη οὐ χροιοεῖ, ὅτι ἐκδίκησις ἀσεβοῦς  
πῦρ καὶ σκώληξ.

זכור כי חמה לא תאחר  
כי נקמת ה'יא אש ורמה

xi. 19, ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν εὖρον ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ νῦν φάγωμαι  
ἐκ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μου.

כאמרו מצאתי מנוחה  
ועתה אכל משובתי

x. 9, τί ὑπερῆφανέυεται γῆ καὶ σποδός; ὅτι ἐν ζωῇ ἔρριψα  
τὰ ἐνδόστια αὐτοῦ. 10, μακρὸν ἀρρώστημα κόπτει ἰατρὸς, καὶ  
βασιλεὺς σήμερον, καὶ αὔριον τελευτήσσει (emended with the  
help of the Armenian and Syriac versions).

מה יתנאה עפר ואפר  
אשר בחייו רמות בקרבו  
ארך מרעות וקצר רפואה  
והיום מלך ומחר מת

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, καταφθορὰν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ ἔμμενε 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 *ای بسر*, *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 ζωὴν ἀνθρώπου,*

ראשית כל צרך חיי אדם

*ὔδωρ, πῦρ, καὶ σίδηρος καὶ ἄλα,*

מים אש וברזל ומלח

*καὶ σεμίδαλις πυροῦ καὶ μέλι καὶ γάλα,*

(Syr. and FAT and wheat)

חלב חטה ודבש וחלב

*αἶμα σταφυλῆς καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ ἱμάτιον,*

דם ענב ושמן ושמלה

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

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

אש וברד וכפן ומות

We have seen above that *כפן* 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 αἶμα καὶ ἔρις καὶ ῥομφαία,*

מות ודם וריב וחרב

*ἐπαγωγὰι, λιμὸς καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μαστιξ,*

מכות כפן ושבך ושושן

xxxvii. 18, ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν, ζῶν καὶ θάνατος,

טוב ורע חיים ומות

xxix. 21, ἀρχὴ ζωῆς ὕδωρ, καὶ ἄρτος,

ראשית חיים מים ולחם

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

xxxviii. 1. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισε ὁ Κύριος,

כי גם אתו ברא יהוה

Where גם 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 *ἀθάνατος* from xvii. 30, which I restore as עלמי, to show that Ben-Sira had a philosophical vocabulary, differing in formation from the Old Hebrew. My critic answers that עלמית 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 נצח." This too is a philosophical term of a new formation; so that my argument will be none the worse, only with עלמי the Syriac rendering is explicable, but not with נצח.

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 ראו; 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 רנישה be not the original of ἐνέργησα, some other word

must be represented by it; and that word will be as philosophical as the other, and the argument in consequence will be equally sound. For xii. 10, *ὡς γὰρ ὁ χαλκὸς ἰούται οὕτως ἡ πονηρία αὐτοῦ*, I restore רעותו תשחת כן כנהשת; my critic cavils at the pointing of תשחת, but in this he has elsewhere been shown to be wrong. Moreover he thinks כן is required. I fancy, on the contrary, that כן כנהשת would not be Hebrew, and that the omission of כן 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 unlikely that uncollated MSS. may contain yet more of these. Then the Æthiopic version should be printed; for this has some important readings (*e.g.* xxviii. 11, where *κατασπενδομένη* of Æth., for *κατασπενδομένη*, gives a certain clue for the restoration of the verse), and, besides, exists in two recensions. 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