

HE that doth love, and love amiss,
 This World's delights before true Christian joy,
 Hath made a Jewish choice :
 The World an ancient murderer is !
 Thousands of souls it hath and doth destroy
 With her enchanting voice,
 He that hath made a sorry wedding
 Between his soul and gold and hath preferred
 False gain before the true,
 Hath done what he condemns in reading ;
 For he hath sold for money his dear Lord.

HERBERT,

Sermons for Reference.

Bickersteth (E.), Condensed Notes on Scripture, 553.
 Davies (T.), Philippians, 289.
 Gordon (A. J.), Yet Speaking, 66.
 Maurice (F. W.), Lincoln's Inn Sermons, i. 246.
 Sallmon (W. H.), Culture of Christian Manhood, 200.
 Selby (T. G.), Unheeding God, 182.
American Pulpit of To-day, ii. 571.
Christian World Pulpit, xiv. 213.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

IV.

NONE of the points emphasized by Margoliouth appear to me to furnish any sure evidence that H is a retranslation 'out of a Syriac and a Persian translation' (p. 19), and that this last was made from G (p. 20). But perhaps there are circumstances which indicate positively that it is neither probable nor possible that H is a retranslation made from S and G. The following appear to me to be such circumstances.

(a) Is it very likely that soon after the time at which the last certain traces of the Hebrew *Ecclus.* are found (*i.e.* in the tenth century, cf. Cowley-Neubauer, p. xi) a retranslation of its sayings into Hebrew should have been undertaken? Was the Jewish scholar who interested himself in favour of a Hebrew form of Ben-Sira's words quite unaware that not a few traces of the Hebrew text of the book were still extant in Jewish literature? Could he fail to cherish the hope that a copy of the Hebrew *Ecclus.* would be discovered in some land of the Jewish Diaspora? Is it likely that he would have sought so early to restore the Hebrew form of the sayings by retranslation? This is not rendered probable by the circumstance that after the year 1516 Hebrew forms of the Book of Tobit began to be issued. For, to begin with, we have no guarantee that there was a Hebrew original of Tobit. On the contrary, Origen wrote to Sextus Julius Africanus

(cap. 13): 'Απὸ τοῦ Τωβία, περὶ οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐχρῆν ἐγνωκέναι, ὅτι Ἑβραῖοι τῷ Τωβία οὐ χρώνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν ἀποκρύφους Ἑβραϊστί. In the second place, we do not at all events meet with such late traces in the Jewish literature of a Hebrew original of the Book of Tobit as we do in the case of Ben-Sira. Consequently a Jew might more readily conceive the plan of reconstructing the Hebrew form of Tobit. Thirdly, it is not certain (see Neubauer, *Book of Tobit*, p. xiii) that the two Hebrew forms of the Book of Tobit which are now extant took their rise as early as the supposed retranslation of *Ecclus.* must be dated.

(b) Is it probable or possible that S and G were the sources of H?

In 40^{16b} both G (πρὸ παντὸς χόρτου) and S read, 'before every plant.' Is this the source of 'on account of' (see above, 2a) or 'before all rain'? Further, 42^{11f.} is not found in G, while in S it reads, 'and amongst houses shall she (a young maiden) not wander about.' How could this give rise to 'neither let it (the dwelling-place of a young maiden) be a house (or room) looking upon the entrances round about'? The same impossibility attaches to 42^{15cd}, where H conveys the sentiment, 'Through the word of God (Gn 1³, etc.) arose only that which He pleased (Gn 1³¹), and him that does His pleasure He accepted,' as, *e.g.*,

in the case of Enoch the very same verb לקח is used in the words 'for God took him' (Gn 5²⁴, Ecclus. 44¹⁰).

The statement, 'the sun, when he goeth forth, poureth out beams of light' (43^{2a}, see above, 2*m*), is followed in H by the exclamation, 'How wonderful are the works of Jahweh!' From its original sense of 'dreadful,' נורא passed over to mean 'wonderful' (Ps 45⁵ 65⁶ 139¹⁴, etc.; cf. *Oxford Heb. Lex.* p. 431^b). Margoliouth's rendering 'how terrible' (p. 16) is not the most probable, because חמה in the foregoing *stichos* designates the 'light ray' (see above). But Margoliouth prefers the idea which is expressed by G and S in 43^{2b}, namely, 'a vessel (*or* instrument) of wonder.' He does so because then the syntactical connexion between v. 2^a and v. 2^b is quite simple. But is this a proper point of view from which to judge a description of the rise of the sun? To me the exclamation appears more natural, 'How wonderful are the works of the Lord!' But, granted that the Syriac *ܩܠܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܘܢܐ*, 'vessel of wonder,' lay before the Hebrew retranslator, would the exclamation, 'How wonderful,' etc., be explicable? Would not the genitive which follows *ܩܠܝܢܐ* have restrained the retranslator from thinking of the word *ܩܠܝܢܐ*, 'what'? Has this word also the sense of the adverb 'how'? Brockelmann mentions this sense 'how' only in connexion with the form *ܩܠܝܢܐ*. Would not at least the Persian translation, which is supposed to have taken the place of G, have prevented the retranslator from mistaking the expression 'vessel *or* instrument'? The other possibility, that H may here be the source of G and S, is not taken into account by Margoliouth (p. 16*f*). But even if we do not suppose that the words *מהנורה* were written with the so-called *scriptio continua*, yet we claim to read the words *מה נורה* in immediate consecution. What do we hear? *mān-nōra*. Was it impossible for the Syriac *mānā* and the Greek *σκεῖδος*, 'vessel,' to originate in this way? For in the time of Ben-Sira's grandson the use of *mān*, 'vessel,' was very frequent (Ezr 5¹⁴, etc., Dn 5^{2f}, 23), and who will guarantee that the translation of his grandson remained always intact, and was not afterwards modified through comparison with other versions?

43^{4b} begins in G and S with 'thrice,' and in substantial agreement they say that the sun three times more than a furnace sets the mountains in a blaze. I confess that the expression 'thrice'

does not appear to me to answer to the degree of heat of the sun. Perhaps it was occasioned by the *מהם*, 'more than they,' for this is really taken by S from v. 4^a into v. 4^b, and reproduced by *בְּמִסְתָּהּ* 'beyond it (the furnace).' But, further, that *מהם* is most probably an *intra*-Hebraic corruption of *מתם*, 'makes warm,' or *מתם*, 'brings to pass,' as is suggested by Schlatter (p. 43), who renders *מוצק* by 'Guss.' In any case the 'thrice,' although even by Schlatter it is held to be correct, cannot have been the source of *שולה* which is read by H in 43^{4b} with the marginal note *שולה*. Further, *שולה* appears to me to deserve the preference, representing a return to the subject 'God,' who as creator and ruler of the sun might readily be mentioned instead of the product of His hands, just as is the case in vv. 2^b, 5^{ab}. Ben-Sira, in my opinion, meant to say, 'Sending the sun, He sets the mountains in a blaze.'

In 43^{8d} G and S read 'shining in the firmament of heaven,' but H offers 'paving (less probably 'illuminating,' see above, 2*f*) the firmament with her light.' Does not *מורהרתו* contain an *m* instead of a *b*, just as *מוני* is read for *בני* in 40^{28a}? On the mutual relation of *m* and *b* see my *Syntax*, § 330 *m-p*.

46^{1a} reads in G, *ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, and in S, 'in order to bring by his hand,' but in H, 'who was formed that there might be in his days.' It is clear that H did not spring from either of these two sources, and can there be any doubt that the expression *יְצַרְתָּ*, 'he was preserved,' which in v. 1^b gives no proper sense, rests upon a combination of *נוצר*, 'was formed,' with *נצר*, 'he preserved'??—In 46^{1f} the three texts agree in reading, 'to give Israel his inheritance,' but S has in addition, 'the land of promise,' reading, 'to cause the children of Israel to take into possession the land of promise.' Which is the likelier, that H dropped this explanatory addition or that S inserted it?—The peculiar expression 'they as two' (*בשנים*) in v. 2^a is derived neither from G (*δύο ὄντες*) nor from S ('in their isolation,' *i.e.* 'they alone'). But it has parallels in the Old Test. (see my *Syntax*, § 332*m*: Nu 13^{28a}, etc.).—In v. 13^a, which is wanting in G, S has *בִּסְוֵן*, the usual word for 'priest,' but H gives not the precisely corresponding term, *כהן*, 'priest,' but *מכהן*, 'ministering as a priest.' He meant to say, not that Samuel was a priest in the ordinary sense, but only that he officiated occasionally as a priest. Did the 're-

translator' introduce this fine distinction?—V.^{15b} is wanting in S, and reads in G, 'and he (Samuel) was known by his faithfulness as trustworthy in regard to the prophetic vision' (καὶ ἐγνωσθη ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ πιστὸς ὁράσεως). H has, 'and by his word also he was verified (or confirmed) as a shepherd.' This last word רועה originated, in all probability, through an *intra*-Hebraic corruption of the text, from רואה, 'seer.' But is there any likelihood that the 'retranslator' derived his text from G? On the other hand, the language of H could very readily be interpreted by G in the way represented by the reading of the latter.—In v.^{20c}, after the words, 'and lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy,' which are common to all three texts, S adds, 'to prepare an end for sins (or sinners, for יסוף, according to its pronunciation signifies either 'sin' or 'sinner'), while the addition reads in G, 'to blot out the wickedness of the people.' Can it be pronounced in any way probable that a retranslator, if he drew from S and G as his sources, should have entirely left out the addition just mentioned?

47^{3b} in S and G boasts of David that he played with bears as with lambs, whereas H says that David 'mocked at bears as at sons (*i.e.* offspring) of Bashan.' This expression, 'sons of Bashan,' occurs nowhere else except in Dt 32¹⁴, where it stands in apposition with אילים, 'rams.' These last are poetically referred to also in the passage before us under the title, 'sons of Bashan.' It appears to me easier to assume that 'sons of Bashan' was paraphrased, with the support of the parallel 'kid' of v.^{3a}, by S and G, than that the expression was introduced by a retranslator. Margoliouth makes a very bold assumption when he says (p. 17), 'Had it been in the *real* original, either the Greek or Syriac must have shown a trace of it.' For that S and G in their present shape did not arise in complete independence of one another is a very probable inference from the 'thrice' which both of them offer in 43^{4b} (see above).—47^{11od} reads in S, 'And He gave him a throne of the kingship over Israel as king,' and in G, 'and He gave him the covenant of kings and a throne of glory in Israel.' By the way, διαθήκη βασιλείων means 'the constitution or covenant which ensures to kings the heredity of their rule.' To take διαθήκη as = 'Gesetz' (Schlatter, p. 83) is unsuitable in this

context, which speaks of the *dying* David. The words of H are, '[And ga]ve him the constitution of kingship, and established his throne over Jerusalem.' In any case, this is no 'translation' from S and G.

In the last two chapters of Ecclus. I have noted the following passages as testifying against the view that H is derived from S and G.—48^{16b} reads in G, 'but many multiplied sins,' while S has 'and many of them added sins to sins.' Was it natural in this case for a 'translator' to select the expression, 'and many of them *made wondrous* (*i.e.* extraordinarily great, הפליא) their transgression'?—In 48^{17a}, a *stichos* wanting in S, G says, 'he builded up water-holders (*i.e.* pools) for waters.' The text of H, הרים ויהסום הרים מקח, cannot be derived from this. Smend (p. 26) suggests המים, 'the waters,' as the original of הרים, 'mountains,' but he does not tell us what the words would then signify. For my part I would suggest that v.^{17a} is intended as a contrast to v.^{17c}. After the latter *stichos* has stated that king Hezekiah hewed through rocks, v.^{17a} adds, 'and—on the other hand—he stopped up mountains as a place for collecting water.' This might be simplified by G into the statement quoted above.—The sentence, 'Then were their hearts and their hands shaken,' as it runs in G at 48^{19a}, would not have been rendered '[Then were] they melted in the pride of their heart.' This *stichos* is wanting in S.—The same remark holds good of 49^{6a}, where G has, 'And he was sanctified in the womb to be a prophet.' The nearest equivalent for ἡγιάσθη would have been נקדש, not נוצר. S has 'he became.' So, too, ἐν μήτρᾳ is probably a simplification of the Hebrew idiom מרחם, 'from the womb.'—According to G, 49^{7b} would end with לנטע, 'to plant,' which answers to καταφωτεύειν, the closing word of G in this *stichos*, which in the *Vetus Latina* also ends with 'renobare.' But H, instead of closing with לנטע, has after this ולהעז ('and to make strong'), as Cowley-Neubauer read, or ולהשיב ('and to restore'), as Smend (p. 27) proposes.

There are thus not a few elements in H which discountenance the attempt to derive this form of Ecclus. from S and G.

(c) Another consideration which tells against the proposed degradation of H is to be found in the circumstance that its language as a rule yields a good sense. This has been shown above by several examples. But I would point, further, to

46^{1cd}, where S has, 'to bring through his hand deliverance to His beloved,' and G 'who, according to his name (*i.e.* יהושע), was great for the saving of His elect,' but H says, 'who was formed that there might be in His days a great salvation to His chosen ones.' Even Margoliouth admits (p. 20 middle) that H 'restores the original once or twice.' He gives no examples, but at all events 40^{20d} belongs to this category, for the עמה, 'in her possession, *i.e.* along with her,' might indeed have been missed by G (ἐν αὐτῆ), but S could not have given צמח ('in company with her,' etc.) for בה the literal equivalent of ἐν αὐτῆ, or for this last. S must then have found עמה in the Hebrew Ecclus., and consequently the עמה of H represents the original.

(d) With tolerable certainty it may be assumed that the style of writing adopted in the archetype of H was one in which the *final* letters were not employed. For instance, it would be far from natural to say in 41^{12a} 'Fear for name.' Much more probable is the expression, 'Fear for thy name,' and S actually offers פסח. But was not also כ שמכ intended in H? Haplography of כ might readily occur, just as we have ו חוק for ו חוקו in Ecclus. 42^{2a}, and the same phenomenon is present in 42^{25b} 43^{10. 26} (cf. also חי, which is met with in 41^{13a} instead of היים, before יט). Further, in 40^{27a} was the meaning intended not, 'The fear of God is blessed like Eden.' That is to say, was not ערן נברכה intended, and not ערן ברכה, as Cowley-Neubauer, Schlatter, and Smend read? Even S has the participle 'blessed,' as I subsequently observed. But Eden is, in and by itself, blessed.—In the same way we may explain the reading בם מועד of 43^{7a}. Through dittography of the מ of מועד arose במ, and this word received the form בם when the final letters were introduced. So likewise arose the unintelligible להדיחם אדמתם of 47^{24b} at a time when להדיחם מאדמתם was written. This factor contributed also to give birth to נכברים ממותם of 48^{6b}, which sprang readily from נכברים ממותם. But the final letters came into use long before the eleventh century, the date to which Margoliouth assigns the origin of H, the commencement of their employment reaching back till c. 100 B.C. (cf. Weir, *A Short History of the Heb. Text of O.T.*, 1899, p. 46). Consequently H, seeing that its text was in all probability written at first without final letters, did not make its first appearance in the eleventh century A.D.

(e) What, finally, has the history of the Hebrew language to say on the point in controversy?

To commence with a purely external phenomenon, H is not quite without traces of an older orthography: cf. *e.g.* נוסף (without י), 43^{27a}; מצוח (intended for the plural *mizwōth*), 44^{20a}; מלכה (= *mal'khūth*), 47^{11c}; ירושלם, v. 11^d; נעריך (= *nē-ārēkha*), v. 14^a. Alongside of these H has, to be sure, many instances of the *scriptio plena*. But, in the first place, the later portions even of the Old Test. show a relatively frequent use of the vowel letters. One may recall כבודה (= *kebudda*) Ezk 23⁴¹, Ps 45¹⁴, or הוכה (= *hukka*) Ps 102⁵, etc. Other examples are given in my *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 347, and by Driver in Cowley-Neubauer, p. xxxvi. And will it be denied that the orthography of books which did not belong to the Canon underwent serious modification in the course of the reproduction of their text?

Would a later writer have selected a form of such natural growth as בעלתו which replaces בהעלתו in 46^{16c}?

The nominal type *kittil* already obtains the preference in the later books of the O.T. See all the instances in my *Lehrgeb.* ii. 151, 201; *e.g.* *shikkāty*, 'watering' (Pr 3⁸). To the same category belongs *nissāty*, 'temptation,' of Ecclus. 44^{20d}. The same relation holds with the nominal type *taktil* which (cf. my *Lehrgeb.* ii. 153) appears in Pr 20⁸⁰ (*Ḳerē*), Est 8¹⁵, 1 Ch 25⁸. Hence החליף of Ecclus 44^{17a} 46^{12b} 48^{8b} is no mark of a later phase of Hebrew.

The use of the pronominal suffix ם— with a feminine 'they' (47^{19b}) has not a few analogies in the O.T. (see my *Syntax*, § 14).

Likewise the choice of plural expressions, such as נקמות 39^{30b}, צמחים 43^{21b}, פלאות v. 25^a, נקמי 46^{1c}, הודות 47^{8a}, יצועים v. 20^b (as in Gn 40⁴), אשות 48^{3b}, תמוי v. 14^b, has strong roots in O.T. usage (*Syntax*, § 259a–262g); cf. אנשי שלומיך Ecclus 6⁸ according to Saadya.

The genitive is indicated in quite normal fashion by the *status constructus*, or by ל (42^{21d} 45^{6a. 25b}). We do not find the pronoun of anticipation (*Syntax*, § 284a–e), as met with in Nu 1²¹, etc., although Ben-Sira, according to Talmudic tradition, wrote in 40¹⁹ דעתו של אדם, just as אביהם של ישראל is read in the Hebrew Book of Tobit (ed. Neubauer), p. 19, l. 21.—There are instances where the accusative exponent את is wanting (cf. 47^{4c} ידו), which was a mark of the earlier linguistic

usage (*Syntax*, § 288a-c). On the other hand, 'אח איש וג' of v.^{5c} has parallels in Ex 28^{9a}, etc. (§ 288h). But nowhere is the accusative indicated by ל as in Tobit, p. 24, l. 10.

The preference for anarthrous terms is as great as in the poetical books of the O.T. (§ 292a-1); e.g. we find מארץ in 40^{11a} (cf. § 292a), רשע in 40^{10a, 16ab}, and צר, 'foe,' in 46^{18a}, by which the whole category is designated (§ 292f), עם in 46^{13f}, 47^{23d} (עמם 48^{16a}, cf. § 292g); דבר in 43^{27b} (§ 294b); על in 47^{4c} owing to the frequency of this expression (§ 294f, g); also after כל in כל כבוד in 40^{27b}, and in standing expressions like כל בשר in 39^{19a, 41^{4a} 44^{18b, 23g} 48^{12f}}, and in כל חי in 40^{1d} 42^{1d, 8d} 43^{25b} 45^{16a} 46^{19e} (cf. § 294f, Anmerk.), whereas in 48^{24a} instead of אחרית certainly הא' (τὰ ἔσχατα) was intended. The expression מן הארץ, which, according to *Gen. rabba* viii. might be suggested for 38⁴, is uncertain. Would even a retranslator in the eleventh century have possessed in such a high degree the disposition to a poetical avoidance of the article? This question cannot be answered with certainty in the affirmative, in the light, for instance, of the poem which is entitled *Mibchar ha-peninim*, and which is ascribed to Sal. ibn Gabirol, a poet of the eleventh century (ed. 1739), cf. הארץ, etc., fol. 4ab.

The article in קטרת סמים הממלח (49^{1b}, cf. יצר הרע 5⁴ 21¹¹, according to *Chagiga* 16a, 30b) has its analogies in Lv 24¹⁰, etc. (*Syntax*, § 334n-q).

The position of the attribute in רב כבוד (44^{2a}, cf. רב שיה 13^{11b}, according to Saadya) was already making its way into the O.T. (cf. Jer 16¹⁶, etc., in *Syntax*, § 334k). But *Ecclus.* does not exhibit the prefixed ה, as we find it in זה הבחור, etc., in Tob 28¹⁴, Ibn Ezra's *Reime und Gedichte* (ed. Rosin, 1891) iv. 17.

Instances of the *casus pendens*, such as we find in 39²⁹ 40^{29ab} 46^{11d}, are not rare in the O.T. (*Syntax*, § 340c, 341g). The following כלם 39^{16a, 33^a} is found in Nu 16³, etc. (§ 340k).

The imperf. *consecutivum* occurs in ויט, etc., 43^{23b} 44^{9b, 23cd}, 45^{2b, 3bcd, 5abc} 46^{5c, 9a} 47^{4b}, etc., 22^e 48^{17c}. On the other hand, the perf. *copulativum* (i.e. *wekatal*) with past sense is found in והתבוננתי, etc., 39^{22b} 44^{2b, 16a, 20b} (in 48^{7a} והשמיע is a mistake for השומע) 48^{11a, 12d}.—The perf. *consecutivum* occurs in והיית, 42^{1c, 8c, 11d} (cf. ואמרתה, 5⁵, according to Saadya). The avoiding of perf. *consecut.*, as exhibited by יוריש ויהפך of 39²³, meets us also in the O.T. in parallel clauses, e.g. Job 15^{2b},

etc. All these phenomena, along with the passing over of an imperf. *consecut.*, which is separated from its 'and,' into the perfect (47^{18d} 48^{2b}), are to be found also in the O.T. (*Syntax*, § 368q, r, 370d, e, l-s). But it is a question whether the *tempora consecutiva*, as exhibited in H, would have been employed by a retranslator of the eleventh century. For while, to be sure, the imperf. *consecut.* especially occurs not infrequently in writings of this period, and above all such usual forms as ויאמר, etc., yet even ואמר is to be read in *Mibchar ha-peninim*, fol. 2 b, etc., and in the Book of Tobit (ed. Neubauer) one notes the use with a past sense of והלכתי, p. 17, l. 15, וקראתי, etc., 18^{3, 6, 8, 18, 19^{7, 16} 20^{11f, 15-17, 19} 21^{4-6, 11-15}}, etc., e.g. 27^{9f}, 29^{15, 30¹⁷ 33¹²}. The avoiding of the perf. *consecut.* is specially striking in Tob 25^{4f, 14f}, 26¹⁶ 28¹⁶ 30²¹.

The asyndetic relative clause, which in Arabic grammars is called *Sifa* (cf. my *Syntax*, § 380c), shows itself frequently, as in עת יפקרו, 'the time (when) they are required,' etc., 39^{30d} 40^{11a} 42^{1a} 43^{30a} 48^{5a}. *Sifa* (*Syntax*, § 380h), as exhibited in אשר היקום (Cowley-Neubauer, p. xxvii, No. LIX.), is not found in H. As the relative in subject clauses the only form used is אשר: 44^{20a} 45^{23e, 24c, 47^{13c} 49^{10c}}. How could the supposed retranslator have known that Ben-Sira did not use also ש? This ש is quite common in *Mibchar ha-peninim*, fol. 2ab, 3ab, etc., and is found in Tobit, p. 17^b, etc., 18²¹ 20⁴ 21¹⁰ 22^{6, 17, 21} 25^{4, 21}, etc.

In the eleventh century would אלהים, 'God' (40^{26c} 45^{19a} 46^{6d, 10b} 47^{11a}), have been rendered not by the precisely corresponding אל, but by *Jahweh* (ייה)?

'Isaiah' is rarely in the post-biblical period designated by the longer form ישעיהו. I have found this form in *Dikdûkê ha-š'amim* (§ 70⁴), and, for the sake of the rhyme, it occurs also in Ibn Ezra's *Reime*, etc. xiii. 4.; *Seder o. z.* (ed. Meyer) 104. Usually the shorter form ישעיה is written, e.g. in *Baba bathra* 14b; *Sopherim*, viii. § 2; *Seder o. z.*, 105f.; Ibn Ezra (*l.c.*) xiv. 1. But the longer forms of such names are employed without exception in H: אליהו 48^{4a}, יהוקיהו v.^{17ff}, ישעיהו v.^{20d}, יהאשהו 49^{1a}, ירמיהו v.^{6c}.

The linguistic character of H then by no means demands that we should date this form of *Ecclus.* in the post-biblical period. On the contrary, many of the characteristic features of H, such, for instance, as the way of expressing the genitive, the marked avoidance of the article, and the

exclusive use of אשׁר, etc., render it extremely probable that it does *not* date from this period.

By the way, the proverbs which are found in the later Jewish literature and run parallel with sentences from Ecclus 39¹⁵-49¹¹ nowhere show complete agreement with G and S (cf. 39²⁵ 40^{19, 25, 29} 42^{9, 10}). The difference is probably due to two causes. On the one hand, the Hebrew form of Ben-Sira's sayings might easily undergo change in the course of oral tradition, and on the other hand the translations might give a new form to the sayings through contraction of synonymous clauses (e.g. in 42^{9, 10}). Hence the difference between the form of Jewish citations and that present in the words of H can prove nothing against the originality of the latter.

5. But even if Margoliouth's theory were better supported than appears to me to be the case, there would be no occasion for using this theory as the basis of an attack upon Old Testament critics. For in so far as the judgments of these have been methodically arrived at, they rest upon the combination of formal and material arguments. Margoliouth ought not to have forgotten this in speaking as he does (p. 20) about the partition of the Book of Isaiah. Is he not aware that the distinction of a Deutero-Isaiah is based as much upon the character of the contents of chaps. 40-66 as upon the linguistic peculiarities of these chapters? The partition of the Book of Isaiah would thus stand good even if the linguistic argument against the unity of the book that has come down to us (as presented e.g. in Driver's *Introduction*, or in my own *Einleitung*) could be proved to be incorrect. For my part I can contemplate with perfect equanimity every attempt to offer such proof.

At all events, I can discover no such proof in Margoliouth's pamphlet. For I consider that I have shown that he has assigned no sufficient

ground for his view that H is a retranslation of Ecclesiasticus. But even if he had succeeded in doing so, a number of Hebraists would have fallen into a mistake only in a very exceptional case. For if H contained a retranslation of Ecclus., this version would date from a period when the Hebrew language had no longer a natural life. Now, authors who write at a period when a language has only an artificial existence, may, through imitating earlier models, succeed in a way in concealing the linguistic character of their own era. I do not mean that the attempted imitation perfectly succeeds,¹ but in a certain measure this may happen. Hence many Hebraists, if they *had* erred in dating H, would have erred under very exceptional circumstances, and this error would not prove the falsity of the judgments which have been passed regarding the linguistic stage represented by O.T. books which were written during the period of the natural life of the Hebrew language.

P.S.—On p. 516, line 21 (August number), **בבבב** ought to be **בבבב**.

¹ The translation of the Book of Tobit, which it is natural to compare with H of Ecclus., exhibits the following linguistic phenomena: אנו, 'we,' 34¹⁸ (the prevailing term for 'we' in New Hebrew); באיזה, 'ex quo,' 26⁵ (cf. אי מוח, Jon 1⁸, etc.); נתברכו, 24⁴; נתרפא, 32²⁰; לירש, 22²¹; לירע, 26⁷; אי על עסק, l. 22; רחין, 34¹⁸; חייבין, 22¹⁶; מויקין, 23⁴; לרפאח, 'on account of,' 21¹² 29^{12, 21}; אבל, 'but,' 29¹, *Mibchar ha-pen.* fol. 2b, 5b; ש וקום, 'before,' 22⁹ 28⁹ 29⁹; בש, 'when,' 30¹⁷;—stat. const. plur., 23¹⁷; נסים, 35¹; אוחו כסף, 26²², i.e. the emphasizing אוחו (*Syntax*, § 41, 340 פק); עולם, 'world,' 22²² 28⁹; the Divine title, הַק"ה, 18¹⁸ 19¹⁰ 24¹¹ 26¹⁵ 33²⁰, and one meets even with חקום for 'God,' 29¹⁸.—In *Mibchar ha-pen.* fol. 4b, we read כרי ש, 'that' (*damid*), and in a 'non-metrical' poem of Hai Gaon (*Dukes, Ehrensäulen und Denksteine*, p. 7, 96 ff.) we find שרום for שרום (cf. אלו, 'these,' in Ibn Ezra's *Reime*, etc., iv. 15); infin. לישב, l. 72, and לחתן, ll. 166, 170; חתי for חתי, ll. 5, 11, 40, 64, 111, 124; יהי for יהיה, l. 40, cf. 66, 116, 90; ש, ll. 113, 123, 174; באלו, 'as if,' ll. 32, 62, simply = 'like' in ll. 40, 83; לבל, 'lest,' l. 104 f.