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.
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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 Eccclus. 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): 'Από τοῦ Ταβία, περὶ οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐχοῦν ἔγγροκένα, ἵνα Ἑβραίοι ὁ τῷ Ταβία ὁ χρωνται σωστῇ τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ, εἰς γὰρ ἔχονταν ἄλλα ἐν ἀτακρύφως ἔβραυσθε. 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 Eccclus. must be dated.

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

In 4016 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, 4211 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 4215, where H conveys the sentiment, 'Through the word of God (Gn 18, etc.) arose only that which He pleased (Gn 181), and him that does His pleasure He accepted,' as, e.g.,
in the case of Enoch the very same verb *θυμος* is used in the words 'for God took him' (Gn 5:24, Ecclus. 44:16).

The statement, 'the sun, when he goeth forth, poureth out beams of light' (43:24), see above, 2m), is followed in H by the exclamation, 'How wonderful are the works of Jahweh!' From its original sense of 'dreadful,' ἀρνησɩς passed over to mean 'wonderful' (Ps 45:6 65:1 139:1, etc.; c.f. Oxford Heb. Lex. p. 431b). Margoliouth's rendering 'how terrible' (p. 16) is not the most probable, because ἀρνησɩς in the foregoing *stichos* designates the 'light ray' (see above). But Margoliouth prefers the idea which is expressed by G and S in 43:26, namely, 'a vessel (or instrument) of wonder.' He does so because then the syntactical connexion between v. 26 and v. 25 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 ܐܢܓܠܐܘܝܠܐ ܝܗܘܢ, 'vessel of wonder,' lay before the Hebrew retranslator, would the exclamation, 'How wonderful,' etc., be explicable? Would not the genitive which follows ܐܢܓܠܐܘܝܠܐ have restrained the retranslator from thinking of the word ܝܗܘܢ, 'what'? Has this word also the sense of the adverb 'how'? Brockelmann mentions this sense 'how' only in connexion with the form ܐܢܓܠܐܘܝܠܐ. 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. 16f.). But even if we do not suppose that the words ܐܢܓܐܠܐܘܝܠܐ were written with the so-called *scriptio continua,* yet we claim to read the words ܐܢܓܐܠܐ in immediate connexion. What do we hear? ܡܢܚܐ. Was it impossible for the Syriac ܡܢܚܐ and the Greek σχέδος, 'vessel,' to originate in this way? For in the time of Ben-Sira's grandson the use of ܡܢܚܐ, 'vessel,' was very frequent (Ezr 5:14, etc., Dt 5:26, 29), and who will guarantee that the translation of his grandson remained always intact, and was not afterwards modified through comparison with other versions?

43:25 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 ܡܢܚܐ, 'more than they,' for this is really taken by S from v. 4b into v. 4m, and reproduced by ܡܢܚܐ beyond it (the furnace). But, further, that is most probably an *intra-Hebraic* corruption of ܡܢܚܐ, 'makes warm,' or הָבָֹּשִׁים, 'brings to pass,' as is suggested by Schlatter (p. 43), who renders ܡܢܚܐ by 'Guss.' In any case the 'thrice,' although even by Schlatter it is held to be correct, cannot have been the source of ܗܘܢ which is read by H in 43:4 with the marginal note ܗܘܢ. Further, ܗܘܢ 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. 2b, 5ab. Ben-Sira, in my opinion, meant to say, 'Sending the sun, He sets the mountains in a blaze.'

In 43:5 G and S read 'shining in the firmament of heaven,' but H offers 'paving (less probably 'illuminating,' see above, 2f) the firmament with her light.' Does not ܒܢܐܒܐ contain an ܐ instead of a ܐ, just as ܒܢܐ is read for ܒܢܐ in 46:22b? On the mutual relation of ܫܢ and ܐ see my *Syntax,* § 330 m-p.

46:1 reads in G, ܕܐܓܢܒܐ ܟܐܬ ܡܬ ܒܝܘܡܐ ܐܒܘܛܘܝ, 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 ܪܘܢܐ, 'he was preserved,' which in v. 1b gives no proper sense, rests upon a combination of ܪܘܢܐ, 'was formed,' with ܪܘܢܐ, 'he preserved'?—In 46:3, 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' (ܢܝܠܐܘܝܠܐ) in v. 2b is derived neither from G (8ܢܐܘܒܘܛܘܝ) nor from S (9 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. 2d, which is wanting in G, S has ܠܒܢܐ, the usual word for 'priest,' but H gives not the precisely corresponding term, ܢܹܪܝܐ, 'priest,' but ܒܢܐ, '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.10b 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 ἐπὶ τὸ χάριτι τίτλον τοῦ βασιλείου του φίλου του). H has, 'and by his word also he was verified (or confirmed) as a shepherd.' This last word ἰλετο originated, in all probability, through an in-Hebraic corruption of the text, from ἱλετο, '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 ἱλετο), 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?

473b 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 ἰλετο, '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.58a, 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 4310b (see above).—47310d 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.—4810b 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, מְשֻׁלְשָׂה) their transgression'?

—In 48170, a stichos wanting in S, G says, 'he builded up water-holders (i.e. pools) for waters.' The text of H, ἁμαρτίαν ἐδοκιμάσαν οἱ λόφοι, cannot be derived from this. Smend (p. 26) suggests ἁμαρτίαν ἐδοκιμάσαν ἡμεῖς, 'the waters,' as the original of ἀρεῖον, 'mountains,' but he does not tell us what the words would then signify. For my part I would suggest that v.174 is intended as a contrast to v.170. After the latter stichos has stated that king Hezekiah hewed through rocks, v.174 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 4819a, would not have been rendered '[Then were] they melted in the pride of their heart.' Th's stichos is wanting in S.—The same remark holds good of 4984, where G has, 'And he was sanctified in the womb to be a prophet.' The nearest equivalent for ἀνθρωπομοσία would have been בָּלָה, not חָרָם. S has 'he became.' So, too, הָרָם בָּלָה is probably a simplification of the Hebrew idiom כִּלָּה, 'from the womb.'—According to G, 497b would end with בְּרָם עַל, 'to plant,' which answers to καταφυσεύω, the closing word of G in this stichos, which in the Vetus Latina also ends with 're­no­bare.' But H, instead of closing with בְּרָם עַל, has after this -יניא ('and to make strong'), as Cowley-Neubauer read, or בְּרָם עַל ('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
46th, where S has, ‘to bring through his hand deliverance to His beloved,’ and G ‘who, according to his name (i.e. יְשֵׁר), 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 belongs to this category, for the יהוה, ‘in her possession, i.e. along with her,’ might indeed have been missed by G (א י), but S could not have given יהוה (‘in company with her,’ etc.) for ה in the literal equivalent of א ד, or for this last. S must then have found יהוה in the Hebrew Ecclus., and consequently the יהוה 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 411a, ‘Fear for name.’ Much more probable is the expression, ‘Fear for thy name,’ and S actually offers מִשְׁמֵהוּ. But was not also intended in H? Haplography of כ might readily occur, just as we have ־ for ’ה in Ecclus. 422a, and the same phenomenon is present in 4225a 4316b 28 (cf. also מ, which is met with in 411a instead of מ, before מ). Further, in 467a the meaning intended not, ‘The fear of God is blessed like Eden.’ That is to say, was not מִשְׁמֵהוּ intended, and not מִשְׁמֵהוּ, 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 מִשְׁמֵהוּ of 437a. Through dittography of the מ of מיעד arose מ, and this word received the form מ when the final letters were introduced. So likewise arose the unintelligible מִשְׁמֵהוּ of 4724b at a time when מיעד was written. This factor contributed also to give birth to מיעד מִשְׁמֵהוּ, which sprang readily from מיעד מיעד.

(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. נֹדֶה (without ה), 4327a: מָחָד (intended for the plural מִשְׁם, 4426a; מְסֹלֵל = שַׁלַּמְשָׁל, 4711c; מָרְדִּיק, v.114; מָלָכָה (= לֶכֶה, v.146). 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 בָּנָה ( = ḳבָּד) Ezek 2311, Ps 4514, or בָּנוֹת ( = ḳבָּד) 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 such natural growth as נִשְׁמֵהוּ in 4616e?

The nominal type מִשְׁמֵהוּ already obtains the preference in the later books of the O.T. See all the instances in my Lehrgeb. ii. 151, 201; e.g. שֵׁקְחֵהוּ, ‘watering’ (Pr 3v). To the same category belongs מִשְׁמֵהוּ, ‘temptation,’ of Ecclus. 4420a. The same relation holds with the nominal type מִשְׁמֵהוּ which (cf. my Lehrgeb. ii. 153) appears in Pr 2030 (Ker2), Est 816, i Ch 258. Hence מִשְׁמֵהוּ of Ecclus 427a 4616b 488b is no mark of a later phase of Hebrew.

The use of the pronominal suffix י— with a feminine ‘they’ (4710b) has not a few analogies in the O.T. (see my Syntax, § 14).

Likewise the choice of plural expressions, such as כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ פִּקְרֵי, 3920b, כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ וִיְשֵׁרָיָה 4321b, כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ 4616b, כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ כְּתָנָה מִשְׁמֵהוּ v.20b (as in Gn 49), כַּמּוֹשֶׁה מִשְׁמֵהוּ 4620b, מִשְׁמֵהוּ v.14b, has strong roots in O.T. usage (Syntax, § 259a–262g); cf. נָשִּׁים מִשְׁמֵהוּ Ecclus 6 according to Saadya.

The genitive is indicated in quite normal fashion by the status constructus, or by 5 (4224b 4524b, 252). We do not find the pronoun of anticipation (Syntax, § 284a–e), as met with in Nu 12v, etc., although Ben-Sira, according to Talmudic tradition, wrote in 4010וַיְאַבֵּדְוּ, just as מִשְׁמֵהוּ; נָשִּׁים שָׁמַיִם is read in the Hebrew Book of Tobit (ed. Neubauer), p. 19, l. 21.—There are instances where the accusative exponent יִּתֵּן is wanting (cf. מִשְׁמֵהוּ 4740), which was a mark of the earlier linguistic
usage (Syntax, § 288a-c). On the other hand, 'יהי לה נק v. 5c has parallels in Ex 288a, etc. (§ 288h). But nowhere is the accusative indicated by מ 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 רעה in 401a (cf. § 292a), יריע in 4016a, 15ab, and רע, 'foe,' in 4618a, by which the whole category is designated (§ 292a, מ in 4613g, 4728b (§ 292g); etc. in 4727b (§ 294b); יריע in 474c owing to the frequency of this expression (§ 294f, g); also after יריע in 4027b, and in standing expressions like יריע מ in 3916a, 41a, 4416a, 28e, 4816b, and in יריע מ in 401d, 4214, 81, 4325b, 4516a, 4616e (cf. § 294f, Anmker.), whereas in 4823a instead of יריע certainly מ (ךּ הָוָּרָּה) was intended. The expression יריע מ, which, according to Gen. rabba viii. might be suggested for 38, 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 מיבחאר ha-פְּלֶנִים, and which is ascribed to Sal. ibn Gabirol, a poet of the eleventh century (ed. 1739), cf. 39א, etc., fol. 4ab.

The article in יריע מ (49b, cf. יריע מ 5111, according to Chagiga 16a, 30b) has its analogies in Lv 2416, etc. (Syntax, § 334n-q).

The position of the attribute in וי במ (4429a, cf. וי במ, 132b, according to Saadya) was already making its way into the O.T. (cf. Jer 161d, etc., in Syntax, § 334a). But Ecclus. does not exhibit the prefixed מ as we find it in וי הב, 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 4029b 4611d, are not rare in the O.T. (Syntax, § 340c, 341g). The following מ is found in Nu 163, etc. (§ 340c).

The imper. consecutivum occurs in יס, etc., 4328b 4416b, 28c, 4516b, 38d, 58bc 4616c 9a 4716b, etc., 22a, 4817c. On the other hand, the perf. copulativum (i.e. wakāṭal) with past sense is found in יס, etc., 3929 4216c 8a 11a (cf. כּ הָוָּרָּה, 58, according to Saadya). The avoiding of the perf. consecutivum, as exhibited by יריע מ of 3928, meets us also in the O.T. in parallel clauses, e.g. Job 152b, etc. All these phenomena, along with the passing over of an imperf. consecutivum, which is separated from its 'and,' into the perfect (4718b 4816b), are to be found also in the O.T. (Syntax, § 368q, r, 370d, e, l-s). But it is a question whether the tempora consecutivas, as exhibited in H, would have been employed by a retranslator of the eleventh century. For while, to be sure, the imperf. consecutivum especially occurs not infrequently in writings of this period, and above all such usual forms as יריע מ, yet even יריע מ is to be read in מיבחאר ha-פְּלֶנִים, fol. 2 b, etc., and in the Book of Tobit (ed. Neubauer) one notes the use with a past sense of יריע מ, p. 17, l. 15, יריע מ, etc., 186, 6, 8, 18, 191, 2011. 18-17, 211-6, 11-16, etc., e.g. 271f, 2915 3019 3312. The avoiding of the perf. consecutivum is specially striking in Tob 2514, 14f, 2614 2814 3019.

The asyndetic relative clause, which in Arabic grammars is called סֵפִּי (cf. my Syntax, § 380c), shows itself frequently, as in יריע מ, 'the time (when) they are required,' etc., 3953d 4011a 421a, 4316a 4816f, סֵפִּי (Syntax, § 380h), as exhibited in יריע מ (Cowley-Neubauer, p. xxvii, No. LIX.), is not found in H. As the relative in subject clauses the only form used is יריע מ: 4429a 4516c 24e 4716c 4916c. How could the supposed retranslator have known that Ben-Sira did not use also יריע מ? This יריע מ is quite common in מיבחאר ha-פְּלֶנִים, fol. 2ab, 3ab, etc., and is found in Tobit, p. 17, etc., 1821 2014 2110 2216 2311 2415 2515 21, etc.

In the eleventh century would [םְלֵא], ('God,' (4029c 4516c 4616d 10b 4711a), have been rendered not by the precisely corresponding אך, but by יבּוּך (מלך) seen in יריע מ.

'Isaiah' is rarely in the post-biblical period designated by the longer form יריע מ. I have found this form in דיּדְגַּה ha-פְּלֶנִים (§ 704), and, for the sake of the rhyme, it occurs also in Ibn Ezra's Reime, etc. xiii. 4.; Seder o. s. (ed. Meyer) 104. Usually the shorter form יריע מ is written, e.g. in Baba bathra 14b; Sophertm, 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: יריע מ 484f, וּירוּשָׁלַיִם וּרוּשָׁלַיִם v. 17f, וּרוּשָׁלַיִם v. 29d, יריע מ 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 בֵּית, 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 Eccles. 39:15-49:11 nowhere show complete agreement with G and S (cf. 39:25
40:10. 38. 29 42:10. 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 42:8. 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 Eccles., 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, 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), לֵךְ ought to be לָכָה.

1 The translation of the Book of Tobit, which it is natural to compare with H of Eccles., exhibits the following linguistic phenomena: בְּהֵם, 'we,' 34:18 (the prevailing term for 'we' in New Hebrew); מִי, 'ex quo,' 20:6 (cf. יהו, Jon 16, etc.); בָּדְדָה, 24:4; אָסְחָה, 32:16; אָזְעָה, 22:24; יָרָה, 29:12; יָשָׁב, 23:4; יִסְחָה, 22:19; יִשְׁעֵיהו, 34:18; יִמְצָא, l. 22; יִנָּה יָבָא and יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'on account of,' 21:23. 21:31; †לָה, 'but,' 29:5, Milchacher. fol. 2b, 5b; יִנָּה יָבָא and יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'before,' 22:23 28:29; יִנָּה, 'when,' 30:8; יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'stat. const. plur., 23:7; יִנָּה, 35:1; יִנָּה יִנָּה, 26:28, i.e. the emphasizing יִנָּה (Syntax, § 41, 340 p.); יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'of,' 22:23 28:29; יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'world,' 22:23 28:29; the Divine title, יִנָּה יִנָּה, 19:9 19:19 24:9 25:9 33:9, and one meets even with יִנָּה יִנָּה for 'God,' 29:15.---In Milchacher. fol. 4b, we read יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'that' (damit), and in a 'non-metrical' poem of Hai Gaon (Dukes, Ehrenszilben und Denksteine, p. 7, 96 ff.) we find יִנָּה יִנָּה, line 100 (cf. יהו, 'these,' in Ibn Ezra's Reine, etc., iv. 15); infix. יִנָּה יִנָּה, l. 72, and יִנָּה יִנָּה, l. 166, 170; יִנָּה יִנָּה for יִנָּה יִנָּה, l. 5, 11, 40, 64, 111, 124; יִנָּה יִנָּה for יִנָּה יִנָּה, l. 40, cf. 66, 116, 90; יִנָּה יִנָּה, l. 113, 123, 174; יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'as if,' l. 32, 62, simply = 'like' in l. 40, 83; יִנָּה יִנָּה, 'lest.' l. 104 f.