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 לָשׁוּ ח and לָשׁ וח 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 כַּאֲבַרְס הָאֶרֶם evidence τρυφή he gives אֲשַׁרוּוּל רָשַׁא חַשְׁוָה מְכוּנָה; and since לָשׁ וח does not mean forget in Syriac, the Hebrew must have been here כַּאֲבַרְס הָאֶרֶם, 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 alvérei in vi. 16 should be accounted for; and since שָׁבַע with שָׁבַע יִשָּׂכִ ס gives that account; for these two words are certainly confused in xxxvii. 6, μὴ
And 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 יִנְשִׁי for יַנֵּשָׁי, רָאָה for רָאָה יִנְשִׁי, 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 הנשה כְּפַרְסִיס (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?

¹ Which last is far from being the case. In iv. 30 (יבר) 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 יְלָבָה which, in spite of his authority, I regard as very improbable. Again חַאָמָד “means nothing like _éphēblos_”; 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.
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D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.
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 נָרָא וְנָעָבָן; but even these forms do not produce the required metre. For i. 8 would still be a syllable too long, as נָרָא הָאָרָא (for the doubled p cf. Job xxviii. 27) is ꝏ; and the case is similar with vi. 6, in which וַֽעֲבָן, as the "soft" (raphe) ꝏ shows, has a Shwa mobile before that letter, and must consequently be scanned ꝏ. 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 כַּרְבּ (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. כַּרְבּ in 1 Sam. xxv. 3 Pesh. is an adjective, exactly as in Sir. iv. 30: comp. חַרְבּ חַרְבּ, "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.