

is not free from objection, however valuable his discovery is, that we have here an alphabetical poem. Undoubtedly our author's acuteness and boldness are adequate to such a re-translation; but he needs a far greater measure of sobriety as well. To be frank, we foresee from the continuance of his present project no further gain to science than perhaps here and there a clever remark on a particular passage.

TH. NÖLDEKE.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO "ECCLESIASTICUS."

By the kindness of the editor of THE EXPOSITOR I am allowed to say a word on Prof. Nöldeke's article on the Ecclesiasticus question in No. 29 of the *Literarisches Centralblatt*. I willingly allow that where I am at variance with Prof. Nöldeke the chances are very greatly in favour of Prof. Nöldeke being right and my being wrong; yet this violent review does not seem to me to really touch the vital points of my essays. For the question whether השכח and לחדה could have been used by Ben-Sira we have on his side merely an *à priori* assertion; whereas on mine we have in the first case *three* indicia, and I may now add the express assertion of the Syrian translator in xi. 27, where for κάκωσις ὄρας ἐπιλησμονήν ποιεῖ τρυφῆς he gives באשתא ובתא דיומא תשכח טבתא; and since תשכח does not mean *forget* in Syriac, the Hebrew must have been here תשכח, and the Syrian by rendering it *find* shows that he thought it could have that meaning. And if it be clear that MS. 106 represents a partly independent recension (and this has not yet been denied), then its reading αἰνέσει in vi. 16 should be accounted for; and ישכח with ישבח gives that account; for these two words are certainly confused in xxxvii. 6, מְה

ἐπιλάθῃ, Syriac לֹא תִשְׁכַּח ; Hebrew אֵל תִּשְׁכַּח or אֵל תִּשְׁבַּח . And with regard to לַחֲדָא , the coincidences which I have pointed out require some explanation ; and until a better one is provided I must adhere to my own. Now a few words like these are as good as a multitude.

With regard to the metre, I do not think it has been fairly treated. Some of Prof. Nöldeke's arguments rest on pointings which he would scarcely care to defend, such as הָרָאָה for הָרָאָהּ, יוֹעֲצָךְ for יוֹעֲצֶךָ , etc. ; most on an *à priori* theory of the Hebrew pronunciation of about 200 B.C., certainly deserving of respect, yet which must yield, if evidence can be produced. Some others rest on a slight misapprehension of the canon. This canon is the best colligation I can give of the fact of the form which many or most of the verses naturally assume, when what seem to be the true readings are recovered : but it is not an integral part of the argument ; and the vital part of that seems to me to have escaped the fire of Prof. Nöldeke's criticism, even should any or all of the minor objections prove unanswerable.¹

In a book called חֲמוּשׁ קִנְטְרִיסִים (ed. Coronel, Vienna, 1864) there is a long quotation from the *Book of Ben-Sira* ;² some of the verses resemble those of Ecclesiasticus, but the work whence they are taken is not the same. Many of these verses are in *rhyme* ; if therefore Ben-Sira knew of *rhyme*, why may he not have known of metre ?

הוּי רַחִים לְשִׁמָּא
דְּעִלְיָה קָם עֲלֵמָא
רַחִים כֹּל עֲמָא

¹ Which last is far from being the case. In iv. 30 (כִּרְב) my expedient is based on a comparison of all the versions ; Prof. Nöldeke's on a confusion of the two hemistichs (!) with a meaning assigned to the Syriac כֹּלֵב which, in spite of his authority, I regard as very improbable. Again حَامِد “means nothing like ἐπιβουλος” ; the Latin translator who renders that word *invidus* thought otherwise ; etc., etc.

² Page 7b. I owe my acquaintance with this book to a valued friend.

ואיזדהר מניאותא
 5 דלא יבא לכל גברא
 מבערא אפין מעקרא סיפין
 ומבניא אילון חלף תופין
 יליף ממלכין ואלופין
 וסעתהון למסגד תורפין
 10 וסיפא ביקוד טריפן
 רחים עינוותא
 דלא תיתי לעניותא
 דהיא מאיסא ובסירא
 קדם יקרא לא יאיא
 15 אלהין למאן דהוה כדין
 עבד נבורן דלא סבירן
 אלפא אלפי אלפיא מלאכן ושרפיא
 נקשן נפיא משמען כמתתפפיא
 והוא מרישא איתגאי ביומיה
 20 עטיפ גיורתא בגלימיה
 והוא לבושיה כל יומיה
 ברם למצפצפין בשמיה מכיך רומיה
 ומשמי שמיא
 מטפיל לענייא ויתמיא
 25 מה משבח ויאיא הוה נבייא
 דאישתבח מפום בריא
 לית כעבדי נבייא
 מאן בניין מיניכו
 אחסין בתר מלכו
 30 ריש חכמה וסברא
 מדחול מקמא מרא
 ולא יימרינד לבך
 דהא לא כן רובך
 ולא תצית לרובך
 35 דטמיר בגובך
 אסתכל ואהני נפשך
 יומא דכל אפא חשך
 כד יקוד גוף ונפש משך

I MAKE no reply to the foregoing "Note," for a refutation in detail would be tedious; and I am confident that every qualified judge will perceive that it does not in the smallest degree weaken the general force of my criticisms. Certainly I grant that, according to the rules of the punctuation, I ought to have written וְרָאָה and יַעֲצֵךְ; but even these forms do not produce the required metre. For i. 8 would still be a syllable too long, as וְסִפְרָה (for the doubled *p* cf. Job xxviii. 27) is ־־־; and the case is similar with vi. 6, in which יַעֲצֵךְ, as the "soft" (*raphe*) ך shows, has a Shwa mobile before that letter, and must consequently be scanned ־־־. For the rest, I content myself with adding the two following remarks by way of explanation upon points touched on in my review:

1. The Arabic كَرَب (the fundamental meaning of which is *to be tight* or *constrained*; see the *Zeitschr. für Assyriologie*, 1887, p. 447) is first used with reference to unpleasant emotions in *New-Syriac* (as in Turkish and Kurdish): the older Aramaic dialects know nothing of such a signification.

2. מַלְכָּא in 1 Sam. xxv. 3 Pesh. is an *adjective*, exactly as in Sir. iv. 30: comp. מַלְכָּא מַלְכָּא, "a mad old man," Qardagh, ed. Abbeloos, 38, 4; ed. Feige, 27, 12.

How the rhymed verses quoted by Prof. Margoliouth (which moreover do not conform to his metrical canon) can be treated as a product of the second century B.C., I am at a loss to understand. Those who are conversant with the later Jewish poetry will doubtless be able to determine approximately the age to which they actually belong.

TH. N.