

Ecclesiastes, and could not have been used by him had he desired to express the ideas which they convey. I rather rest my inference on certain of the more characteristic words, occurring partly in the rabbinical quotations, partly in the verses restored by the Laudian Professor (while reserving my judgment, at least for the present, in the case of some amongst the latter). I hope also that I do not differ from the Professor on another point so widely as he seems from his concluding sentence to suppose; for I certainly think that, when his work is completed (which I trust may ere long be the case), he will have made both interesting and valuable additions to our knowledge of the Hebrew dialect spoken *circa* 200 B.C. The time however does not appear to me to be ripe for pronouncing an opinion on the degree in which his results will contribute to the more definite or secure solution of problems of the "higher criticism"; for the linguistic character of Ben-Sira's work can only be properly estimated when the restoration of a large part of it is complete, and when both the nature and the proportion of New Hebrew words recovered for it with certainty are exactly known.

S. R. DRIVER.

ONLY a few lines shall be added to Professor Driver's note. A statement on p. 297 seems to require re-examination. Most readers will certainly understand that Professor Delitzsch maintained the same view of the Hebrew quotations from Ben-Sira as Zunz. But as I read pp. 21 and 204 (cf. 181) of his work on Jewish poetry, this great Christian Talmudist held, not that Ben-Sira wrote "pure biblical Hebrew," but that his Hebrew presented many of those peculiarities which later on helped to form the idiom of rabbinism; in a word, that it was transitional, which is what we also thought to be the case. With regard to Professor Driver's explanations, I am delighted to have the opportunity of endorsing them, so far as they apply to anything that I have said or implied in my review. I thought that it was a complete restoration that was aimed at. I am happy to be assured of the contrary. I even hope that the restoration may be more complete than I had thought possible, and am certain that biblical critics will be at no loss to harmonize, as they have ever done, new data with old. Some at least of the New Hebrew words in the author's list fully satisfy my own judgment. I could wish

that so skilful a hand might some day give us as a *πάρεργον* the Psalms of Solomon in Hebrew, or indeed any other late Palestinian Jewish book only known to us in a translation. And if he only could prove his whole metrical theory (I fully appreciate his concession), I should be unfeignedly glad to argue backwards from it.

T. K. CHEYNE.

[AUTHOR'S NOTE TO P. 320, L. 19.—Prof. Driver's words were about *twenty aphorisms*. As several of these aphorisms are of more than one hemistich, my sentence might be so interpreted as to attribute to him an inaccuracy of which he was not really guilty.]

ABORTIVE ATTEMPT TO ARREST JESUS.

(JOHN VII. 30-36, 40-52.)

I TAKE these two passages together, although the one precedes and the other follows our Lord's great discourse on the water of life, delivered on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, because I wish to bring into one view a very remarkable incident of that week—I mean the abortive attempt of the authorities to arrest our Lord.

In order to a clear understanding of this occurrence, which marks the opening of a fresh stage in the story, it is needful to notice carefully the relations of Jesus to the court of justice which was called the Sanhedrim.

That body was more, to be sure, than a court of justice. It was likewise the highest council of legislation and of administration in ecclesiastical matters. It was the most venerable relic which the Roman conquerors had left standing of the ancient national constitution of Israel. But in the gospels, the character in which we have to do with the Great Council is that of a judicial body, competent to try the highest causes, though not to execute its own