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11F. present colition of the Serered Rooks of the Old Testoment in Hebrew exhibits the reconstructed text on the basis of which our new Version in the lolychrome Bible has been prepared by the learned contributors mentioned on the inside page of the back cover.

Departures from the Received Text are indicated by critical marks: - $\cdots$ (i.e. $V^{\top}=$ Virsions) designate a reading adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{a}^{3}$, \&c. indicate that the respective glosses relegated to the foot of the page are omitted in the Versions, esp. あ, ff. I'rov. 25,21); — " (i.e. c $=$ conjecture) are used for 1 Conjectural Emendations; and $"\left(i . e . j=7 \mathcal{F}^{\prime}\right)$, for changes involving merely a departure from the Masoretic points, or a different division of the consonantal text ( $i . g \cdot 30,1$ ). A pes 1 indicates transposition of the Masoretic pien gro - .. are used in cases where the $\quad\urcorner p$ has been adopted instead of the $=\because \Omega$, and " for changes introduced by reason of Parallel Passages. A small note of exclamation, ( $\epsilon .5 .24,31$ ) calls attention to readings deliberately preferred on the strength of some lleb. MSS or early printed editions of good authority: Doubtful Words or Passages are encloiced in notes of interrogation (1). Occasionally two critical marks are combined, e. g. $\cdots, i$. e. Dewiations from the Received Text suggested by the Versions as well as by Parallel Dassages; or es, $i$. c. Depalrtures from the Masoretic points, supported by the Versions, \&c. [] calls attention to transposed passages, the traditional position of the words in the Received Text being marked by [] while the transposed words are enclosed in []. In addition to these brackets, [], braces, if, and parentheses, (), are used if there are two or three transpositions on the same page (e.g. 23,2.8). In cases where two or three $=$ consecutive words are transposed the traditional sequence is indicated by $: 23$ \&ic. respectively prefixed to the individual words ( $\epsilon \cdot, 10,31.32$ ). Mransposition of consonants is indicated by figures above the respective letters (e.g. 14,32). Passages corrupted beyond emendation are indicated by ....., while * * point to Lac!rere in the original.

Headings $(1,1 ; 10,1 ; 24,23 ; 25,1 ; 30,1 ; 31,1)$ and Introductory Lines (1, 2-7; 22,17-21) have been printed in RED, also the Acrostic Letters in the Alphabetical 1'oems (24, 1.3.5; 31, 10-31).

The Ancient Versions are referred to in the Notes under the following abbreviations: $\boldsymbol{A l}=$ Masoretic Text; $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=$ LX゙X; $\mathbb{I}=$ Targun ; $\mathcal{I}=$ I'eslita; 3 $\boldsymbol{A}=$ Arabic Version; $\boldsymbol{J}$ (i.e. Jerome) $=$ V'ulgate $; \mathbb{E}=$ Ethiopic Version; $A=$ Aquila; $\theta=$ Theodotion $; \Sigma=$ Symmachos. ©A means Colex Alexandrinus ( A ), $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{P}}=$ Codex
 (13). The symbol c.a \&.c. in connection with $\sigma^{5}$ denotes corrections in the version of the poetical books, supposed to hawe been inserted in the $7^{\text {th }}$ cent. A.D. 40

The heavy-faced figures in the left margin of the . Votes ( $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 3$, S.c.) refer to the chapters, the numbers in () to the verses of the Hebrew text. The mark means amil(s) or omitted by; alt. $=$ as an alternatiale; $1^{\circ}, 2^{0}=$ first or second oicurrence, respectively. $A V=$ Authorized Version; $\mathrm{KV}=$ Revised Version.
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CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEBREW TEXT

## IVITII NOTES

Tiel late AUGUST MƯlLer, Ph. D.<br><br>Ani)<br>EMIL KAUTZSCH, D.D.<br><br>Engfon tranofation of the Cloteo<br>BY<br>\section*{DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, 1 . U.}<br>

Exipjig

```J C.HISRICHE'SrHE HUCHHSNDIUN゙ゥ
\[
1901
\]
```

> Eondon. (2). CC. DAVIDNUTE, 57-59 LUNG ACRE


שלי שלמה בן דוחד טלך ישראל： להבין אמרי בינה： צדק ומשבם וימשׁרים： לנער דעת ומוְמה： ונבוֹן תחהבּלות יקנה： דברי חכמים וחיזתם： ציצת יהוה ראטשת דעת חפמה ומוסר אוילים ביו：

 ועצנקם למרגרתּיך： $\therefore$ ハーウ


> ותמימי ביודי בור:

נחֵּלה בתּנו שלל： צים אחה יהּה לבּלמום מּ בעינ בל בעל בגף： יצפג לגפ： אה נהש

范 ，
 ৷

$$
22 \text { נבליגם בשׂאול חי״ב }
$$


414 נודלך תמּיל בתובנו

צ17 ב• חפם מוֹרה הרשת
18 והם לדתם יארבו 1919
＝חבבות בחוּן תרלּה
וב בראש המיוה תקרא בתחה שעריםס תאמר:
32 תשּׁו לתובחתי הנה אבּעה לבפ רוחיֵ:
בה והצרע בל עצנּ ותובחתי לא אביתם:


 Prov．

Eतל

[^0]3.4 צ כי את

וַַחרוּן תבואת


בשטמאוליה עשׁר וכבוד ובל נתילתיהֶ שלום:
 כונן שֶּצים בתבונה: וישחקים ירעפו של:

נצֹר תושׂיה ומושה: וחק לנרנרתּך ורגלך לא תבּ תוףף:



ושמר רנלך מלכר:


 אם לא נמלך רעה: ואל תית תיתר בכל דרכיו: וֹת ישרים סצדו:


ובםילים מַרים קלון:
והק"י゙ニ
תורתי אל ת תעובוּ
רך רך ויחיד לפּ
יתמך דברֵּ

ובכל קניּנךך קנֵּה בינה:
אהבקח ותצרך
תבַּ עטרת תפیָרת תבֵננךך:

וירבו לך שׁנות חיים: דורבתּך בע: ואם תרוין לא תכשל:

13 14 טו יקר ה ה" 6 17 דרכידֶ דרבי עּ
 19 ידוה בחבמה יסד אריץ ע ברעתו תהומות נבקעו
 22 23 24
 26

27 ת

29

 32
33 מצֵרת יהוה בیּ 34
 לה כבוד חכמים ינחלו

בی
2 ב 4

 6 אל תעובהּ ותשמרךך s מלטלה, ותרוממך 9
৷ 12

ואידכם כמופה יאתה־： ישׁחרגני ולה＇מצאֵני： וידאת יהוה לא בתרו： נאהצ בל תוכחתי：
וע： וישליות בטילים תیֵבדם：

ושאֵמן מפחר רעה：
ומצִּתי תצפן אתחך： פתטה לבך לחבונה： לתבונה תחקן קולך：
 ודעת אלהים תמצה： מםבי דעת ותבונה： מוגן להלכי רחם：
 וע＂： ורעת לנם

תבונה תנצרפה：
 ללצבת בדובי חּשך： יגילי בתהפבוּת ונלוזים בעעגלותם： מנבריה אמרידּ החליקה：
 וּ וּ ולא ישׂני ארחות חיים： וארחות צדיקים תהשמר：

ותמימים יֶּתרו בה： ובגדדים צים חו מפנה：
 ושלום＂יס＂ם לך：
 בעינ אלהיב ואדם：

1，27
28 צ

ל לא אבו לעצהת
וצ ויאבלו מתרי דרבם
32
33
2，4 בני אם תקח אמִּדי 2
3
4
יה אוֹ תבּ יראת יהוה －
7

 בי תבוּ חכמה בלּ

בוּ
12 להצילך מדרך רע
וצ



16 להצילך מאואה זרה
 או ב• בּ
 ב למצן תלך בדרך טובים

21 בי יש゙ׁ 22 ורי゙ル
 ב 2

3
4
ה הּטח אל יהוה בתל לבּ
6 בבל דרביך דעֵהו ； s
 －

[^1]ואל השט ת תורת אמך： עִנִבִם על גרגרחף：


בהתהלכך תחּנחוּ אתך והקץצותֶּ ה＂א ת＂שִּחף： טַּלקה לֹשוֹן נכריה： ：

 ורגליו לא תבּוינה：בגם

את כל הוּן ביתו יתן： משׁח וחרפתו לא ת תצחה：
ולא יהמול ביום נקם： ולה יאבה בי תַרבה שוֹתד：

ומצִּתי תנב ותורהי באישׁי עיציך：

 מנכריה אמריהֶ התליקד：

בニגים נער חסר לב：
ודרך ביהּד יציער：
בטישׁוֹ לילה ואפּלה：
בשית צונה ו ול ．．．．． בニニּ וצֵּנל פל בִּנה תארב：


דהיום שלמתי גדרי：
ל

מּר התהלים וקנְּמן： ונתעלסהי באֵהבים： הלך בדרך מַרחוק：
 בתֵלק שּׂתּהֶ תדּחגו：
 ולא ידע ב׳ בנםשׁו דוא：

6，

23 כ־ נר מצִוּה ותורה אור
＊．．．．．．．．22
בי゙ニ
24
テニニン

 ת

ו
32
33 נָּ
34 3


ニ




$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1**** * * } \\
& \text {; ואר } \\
& \text { 8 } \\
& \text { ロリングン ジメ } 9 \\
& \text { והגה אیטה לקראהתו } \\
& \text { י• המיה ה"א ולדות }
\end{aligned}
$$

ת

4
עי על בן יצּאתי לקראהתך
6ו מרבֵּים רבדתּ ערישׂ
－ココビロ 9ลコ 17
81 לבה נרוה לדים עד הבקר
19
＝צִּרור הכםף לקח בידו
21 המּמוּ ברב לקחה


．．．．．．．．．．．．．．${ }^{23^{\text {c．a }}}$

לשימר מוֹוֹת זתחי：
ויִּקּק רצון מ＂הוה：
בל משִׁנֹאּ אהבו מות：

חצבה עמודיקֶ שבעה：


חפר ל
וֹשתו
 ויצםיםו לך שיׁנות חיים：

：הム．לの－• על כפַּא מרע קרת：
המֵַשׁר

ולחם סתרח
：
 נלבדתֶּ באמרי פּך：

ותנומה לעםעַבּד：
וכצפור מיד יקוש：
ראֵּ דוביקּ וחכם：
תבין בקּ
מתٌ תקום מּשָּנחך：



## 8，34c．b <br>  <br> 36

ה
＝
3
די לבו לחמו בלחבּ
12
1313
ールッ
שו לקרא ל ל

> 17
> 8

הולך עִקִּשוּת פה：
מרה באצבעעתי：
בכל עת מדנים וּשֵלח：


2
3
＋אל תהן
ה הּנצ בצב
6
8.7 צאהין לה קצין 8

9

11 וּא
12

ו4 תהפבות בלּבו חרוש ירוּ
シュּ




| והיה） | ל 7，24 |
| :---: | :---: |
| \％ |  |
|  | 26 בי רי |
| צרדות צל תדרי מות | 27 דרב |

5

 וצדיק יםוֹ עולם

24
בה בעゴ

27



：תום
號

2
： 3
4


7

וברעת צהיקים ：חלצוּ
：

： －年

 －步
וּח.

9
－ ৷

ב 12 Tis

ם ע





```
－荈
```



``` ומשֵׁלח מדנים בּ
6，16 שׁׁu
17
18
```



## משּכי שלמה



13

 תחּ

ועּ
 ：
： ואוּ
 16

18 בבֵּ
洋ニ
＝

22

：

 ：
：

 ：ภלรูง ถาק 23 24
 ：ロעภภ ロッゾา フา7 ：




：





：



 ומרדףף רעה למותי： ורצונו המימי דרך： וזרע צוּיקים נמלט：

אֹא゙



 זדרש רעה תבואנּ：

ועבד איּל לחבם לב：
ולקח גב：בות חתם：


： ：

 וּיֶּ ישרים יצילם：
ובית צדּיקים יעמד：
וגעוּה לב יהּה לםוז：
מעתתב：וחבר לחת：

ומבדף ריקים הסר לב：







24

23
 בה נם： 26 27 טُّחר טוב יבּקשׁ רצון

28
29 עצבר ביתו ינחל רוח
ל פרי צדיק עי＂חי״

ת
2 ט ש沙水

4
 6 7 8

，
11
．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． 12


12

44 הורת חבש מקור ח״ם לםור ממּקשׁ מהת：
 16 16

 9 ＝

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 22 \text { טוב ינחיל בני בנים וּתבּן לצּיק חיל חוטא: }
\end{aligned}
$$







 6 בק＂ּ לֵין חבמה ואיּ ודעת לנבון בקל： 8

ובין ישׁׂרים רצון：9
－לב יודע מָּת נבּשו ובשוֹמחתו לא יתערב זר：

שטמועה טובה תרֵטן עצם:
בקרב חכמים תלין:
וּשׁמע תוכַחת קונה לב: ולםני בבוד ענִּה:
 ותמן רוחות יהוה: ועיצנו מהשׂׂתיך:
וגם רשׁע ליום רעה: יד ליד לה ינקה: וביראת יהוה סור מַרע:
גם אויביו ישלִלם אתוּ מרב תבואוח בלא עשתט: ויההּ יצן צעדו:

במשם ל לֹ
מעישַּn בל אבעי כים:
 ולבר ישרים יצהּ ואיצׁ חתם יכַּדּנה: ורצוגו בעב מלקיש:

וקגות בינה נבחר מבסף:


מחַלק שלל את נַּאים:
ובומח ביהוה הצשּׁיצ: ומתק שעתבֵּם "סףף לֶקח:

עעל עלוֹתיו ים"ף לקחח:
 ואחריתהּ דרבי מות:

בי אבק: עלי פיהו:

 והוליפו בדיך לה טוב: קרין שׂגתי בלה רעה:

ל, 15 שאור עינִּם ישֵׁמח לב
31 3233 בורע בוסר מואם נפם 33 יראת יההה מוסר חכמה

2 2

3 4
ה תועבת יהוה בל גבה לב
6 בחשד ואמח יבּ 7 ברצות יהוה זרכי איש

8 8 עוב מעט בצדֶקה 9 לב אדם יחֵ בּ דוכו

קסב על על:
11
12 12

4
שי בצור פגי מלך חי"ם
16



ב משׂביל על דבר יעצ"ה עוב
12 לחבם לב יקרוּ נבון
22
23
4

1)

27 איש בליעל צּרה רעה






Prov.

בדרך צדִקה תפצהא:
ומשל ברוחו מצ'בד עים:
ומיהוה, בל עּשבט:
מבֵּת טלֵּ ובח ריב: ובתוך החים יחלק גחלה:

ולחן לבות יהוה:
שיקר מיץ על לשיוֹ הּת:

ותפאָרח בנים אבותם:
אוף כי לנדיב שׂפח שיׁקר:


וּוֹנה בדבר מצריד אלוףף:
מַהבות בסיל מאה:

ואל כםיל =הולתו:
לא תמ"שׁ רעה טביתו: ולפגי התנלע דריב נטוֹש: תועבת יהוה גם הניהם:

> לקגות חכמה ולב ה"ן:

ואה לצרה יֶּלדי:

 ומהתך בלֹאומו יצול ברעה:

ולא יעשמח אב׳ נבל:
ורוח גבּהּ תیּבּ נרם:
להשות ארחות עשצם:


33
17,*
= 3 מַצְּרֶּ לבסק וצור לזהב 4

י- לעי לרש חַרף עוֹהּה
6 עִטרת וֹקַגים בני בנים
7 לא גמהּ לנםל, שלפת יתר s s
 תֵּת גּ

12
13 משׁיב רעה תחהת טובה


61 למה וה מחר ביד כםיל
717 בכל עה אהדב הברע

19
=
21

23


 3 + הון ימיף ברעים רצּם ודל מרעהּ יצרד:




ברדךי המרים ולה המה: שימר תבונה ולמבּת טוב:

8 קגה לב צ'הב נצ:


11
212 נַהם בבציר וٕעֶה מלך ובטל על גֵּשב רצוּנו:
13 ההת לאביו בן בםיל ודלף טרד מדִיני האשׂה:


טו עצלה תפּל תרךָּמה ונפּש רמִּיה תרעב: 16



 ו2 רבות מחשבות בלב אישׁ ועצת יההה היא תקים:

22

24


保



> עוֹビ ובבּ עוד והיים:
> שומר נבּשו ירחק מהם:
> 3
> +
 וֹשֵבם עברתו יהכלהי： כי נחן מלהמו לדל：

יֶישב ： 12 עִ י יהוה נצרו דעת וּסֵלף דברי בגד：

ועום יהוה יצול שם ：שם שֵּׁבט עוֹסר ירחיקבה משנו： נחן ליジּ אֹ

44
 i6 16
cery

ולקחת מוק＂לנטשך ：


 ：וּה ：חコเม ה ה
 ובל ציּ אֵּ למחסור：

 יוך ישׁר פעלוי
 לא

ובהשׂׂכיל לחבם יקח רעת：

גם הוה יקרא ולא א．עגה： וֹשחד בחת חמה עהּ：

ומחהּה לבעלי צִּני בקחל רפטאים ינוח：

אהּ＂ והחת ישוּ ב בוגד：
 וכםיל אדם יבֵלעעוּ


וּירד עו מבטְחה： שׁׁמר מִִּרוה גבּשוּ：

עושהּ בעביח הדון： בי מהאנו ידיו לעישׂה： וצדּיק יהן ולה יחשׂך：

：．．．．．．．．．．．．．．


 לםי חבלילות ע״ִּםּם：

 אחריתו בנח ：וּ

 ：אוּ
 ועעמל שׂׂתיהם תרֵברנה：

וּתבּ בל הוֹ יקר ונצים：
：ジ －ソンヅニาニ กัンヅภ
 ：וארק תixiv לyニ ib ：

 הלא


ונפת מתוק על חִכּך ：
חבשה לגロージ・•
א゙

： והשיב טֵעליץ

א גר רשטעים ידעך

23，26

28 אֹ
29


בוּ
1 32
33
 לה הצוּני בל חליתי


24，
ב 2
ルン ハ 3
4


שו אל תארם ת 16 בי שָׁ



ニソามニ
ב בי לא תהיה אחרית לרע

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { : אוּ }
\end{gathered}
$$

的放
 א． 23 בי תֵּ 2
：．．．．．
：
6



： 9
－ וֹאוּ

ואוּ



״ ברֵ

בי אם ביראת יהוּה כל היום： ותקוחך לה תברת：

וּ אל ת 4

テーラ 16 והעלזמה בלִינתי

17 ת

וּ וּ
 וקרעים תלֹジ
 חבמה ומוֹר ובינה： ורֶגֶּל יחלרתך ：וֹת
：
22
ב

כ כ


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ز" }
\end{aligned}
$$

：
 ודבֶּ

דבר דבר על צהּ


 ולשון רפה תשבר גם

פחן פן א゙ی゙ くア：


וּהוה ישֵּלם לך ： ופנים בועעמים לישון טתר： מצ゙ּ

 ！ א゙ッ כן לא נָּאוָה לכס לֹל כבוד：
 וֹשֵׁבט לגֵו כםילים：

שן תֹשִּוה לו גם אתה： בן יהיה חכם בעיניּ

וטילֹלח דברים ביר בטיל：

 ומשל בפי בסילים：בסים

פסיל שונה באוּלֵתו： תקוה לכםיל טמגו：

ארי בין הרחבות ： ועצֵל על מִשתו：
（3）



 ם בת בח ב
ファp aia ג 13


 17范
 mas לy jon ：
 22


 26
 2S
 － 3

4


הліч ой ．．．．．．．．． 6

 ต 9

 ッシッコ ロコก ジバ プバา 12
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24.21
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## ＂窂

## גם אלה לחפמים

2
23

10
24

26

 29



 ומחסר 34

ב בבד אלהים הַספחר דבר וכבד מלבים חקר דבר:
3 שֵֵים לרום וארין לעמק ולב מלבים אהּ חַקר:

25，＊גם אלה משלּי שלמה אצשר העתיקו אנשי חזקיה מלך צהודה：



וא＊•• ．．לדור דור： ונאספו עשׂבּת הרים： ומחיר לערה עתודים：

וחי：ם לגערותיך：

> 26
> 27 ורִ
> 28,

> 3 בבר רט゙ע
> 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \text { טוב ר" הולך בתּשו }
\end{aligned}
$$

> 8 מרבה הונו בּנ゙ 9 מֵּיר אוֹנו משמבע תורה
י•
שי ארי נהם ולר שוּקוק

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 19
\end{aligned}
$$

> 22 נבהל להּ
> 23
> ב
> בה רחב בּםש נִּרה מדון
> (26 ב

> 29,
> ב ברבות צדיקים ישׂמח העם
> 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { הי נבר מחליק על רגַהו }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 7 }
\end{aligned}
$$

180（3）
7グコローズร 27.27 （a）

הירה


ובאּץ נִרנן •שּמק מרון： וֹא゙ッ

והם ידרו חררי בשן：




ת：לה רעחתו בקהל： וגל וֹל ופה חלק על עלשה מִדֶחֶה：





 וגロ

בן אּ ： וּ טֵּאח רחוֹק：

> ואשיבה חרפי דבר: פתתהּ עברו נענשי ： －ובּ



ואמיש יציחת


בן לב




ジッ

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ジッ ーニコク ロッヂ ロอホูコ = }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 27,к }
\end{aligned}
$$

> ה
> ニール゙ ッัコ ロ"มロง゙ม 6

> 跡
> בל 9

> - $\ddagger$ M
> าภอม ถシา สハา ニルท 12

> טו
> ........... 16

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { בール } 21
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - } \rightarrow+83 \cdot a-6
\end{aligned}
$$

ビガッシュ27．2：（a）


הーה
ארב ロกプ •＊••• וֹビ心
 יִאכלוּה בבּ בשר

וארבע： דרך גחש עלי בּ בוּ


וחהת ארב ונב
וּビル



 וֹיא בחיכלי מלך：

ィ ולא
：．．．．．．．．．ךלal

30，12 דור טהּ
30 דורר מה רמו עינ
14 לאבל עני＂מאריץ

םו לעלוקה שֶּת בגות

16
אード

－קרוּ

19 דרך הנשׁר בשׁבֵּם

21 ב＝תחת עת עבד בי •מלוך


ィาะ
ジッ ジ
6
 2S

 3

 ： 33

## cata




|  |  <br> ： <br>  <br> ：הมחコセ̛ำ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | ：ニ゙ザソ |
|  | מַאֵ ：引コ |
|  |  |
| 10 |  |
|  | ：アッ゙ロ |
|  | ： |
|  |  |
| 15 | ：1גセカ |
|  |  |
|  | ：ゾะ コา กセセู วขコ |
|  | ：ブコニ アィゴ |
|  |  |
| 20 |  |
|  | ： |
|  | ：フาฯ |

ה＂ד 29,8
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## - Exitical @lotes on @roverbs stor

IIE PRINCIPAL commentaries and critical notes on the Book of Proverbs are referred to in the present notes under the follow. ing abbreviations: -

BAUMG. $=$ d. J. BAUMGARTNER, lifucte critigut sur l'ifelf dis le:lte du liver des l'rurerte's d'upris les princifules traductions "llicinntes, leeipzig, i890.
 Elresquiselies Handbuch zum ATV), Leipzig, 1847.

BICK. = G. IIICKELL, Krritische Bewheitung der Proatroine in 10 the Vienna Oriental Journal, vol. 5 (1891), 1pp. S6ff,
 Summhung C. a-a:rii, 16, Berlin, 1899.
 DedalzsCa, Bibl. Commentar \#̈ber das AT, Leipzig, 1873.
 Sprewken, in Thiol. 7ijdschrift, Leyden, 1853.

Ew. = H. Ewiln, Die Dichier des Alten Runder, part 2, second edition, Göttingen, 1867.

Frank. = W゙. Frankrenbrge, Die Spröche wibersetaf und erklarf in W: No. 20


GRäTZ $=11$. GRÏT\%, Feregefische studien zu den Salomenischen sifriokten, in Monatsschrift fur Gischichte und II'issenschuft dis Judimitums, 18St, pp. 289fi.; 337 fi.; 414 Ï.; 433 fi. Cf. GRÄrz's critical notes on l'roverbs in the second part of his Emendalione: 13reslan, 1893, pp. 30-33 (covers cc. 1-22.

 1p. 395 ff ; 3 Zïrich, 1867., 51 ff , und 327 ff . (covers cc. 1-9).

 Alerundrimm, Meldorpii et Lipsiae, 1788.
 (second cdition, Freiburg, 1896, pp. 7811 ., with brief critical notes on the text in the licilesrem, pp, 8 th .
 Tromerbien, l.ejuig, ISG3.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { : }
\end{aligned}
$$

：
： ：フロッ バ


：









：








ャンジ ローブルニ リาリ 23


ールコカニ ールルコ バン20

กุルาゼำ バフコニ リア 28



（2）

r Assyr. mistlini, Arabic ghai, and that the term refers to the form (contrast above, p. 32, 1. 49); it means originally neither parable nor proierb \& \& c. but simply a line of focty' or verse, each stich consisting of two hemistichs. - (According to Kövig, Stilistik (Bonn, 1900) p. Si, 1. 19 ל ל means rviup, sententia.)

For cuneiform proverbs see Haliny, Meltuges de critique af a histoire relutifs aur. peuples simitigues (l'aris, 1883 !. pp. 326 ff . and J.iger's paper in Beitr. z. Assyr. 2,274 fif, esp. p. 281; cf. note 20 to my lecture on The Book of Eiclesiastes (Boston, 1894. 1bid. n. 231 have quoted a specimen of an Assyrian
 "A city whose weapon is not strong -
The enemy will not be scattered in front of her gate."
The introcluctory verses at the beginning of the Book of Proverbs bear a certain resemblance to the npening lines of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic; sce Beif!: z. Assyr: 1, 102; MirdTER-Delizech, Geschichic Babylonichs unt Assyriens (Calw; 1891), p. t7; A. Jeremas, Izdubar-aimered Leipzig, 1891, 15 p. 14. It might be well to state in this conncction that it is by no means certain that the ideographic name of the hero of the Babylonian epic is to be read Gilgamis' (see Journal of the Amer. Orient. Soc., vol. 16, p. ix). Gilgames' may have been a surname like the appellation of the Babylonian Noah, Atra-zusis or Xasis-atra (see l. c., p. cxi). To read the ideographic name of the hero of 20 the Babylonian epic Gilgameš is about as reasonable as the idea that the name Richard 1 . should be pronounced Cour de Lion. Conttast RB 6,1, p. 116.
(8) 1 lave pointed out in the Critical Notes on Chronicles, p. So, 1.48 that $\pi$, is is a Babylonian loanword $=t \operatorname{cr} f \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ the indication of the divine will from which the sacred oracle is derived, while Aram. אn: א and Ethiopic Arit correspond to the byform of lerfu: zerlu. This zr-tu has no connection "ith Heb. Euns, as Zimamern suggests in his Beifr: zur bubyl. Religion, patt 2 Leipzig, 1899) p. 91, n. 2; ם'אור, the unfavorable, condemnatory answer of the oracle, is connected with soch to curse just as ullu, the cunciform technical term for the unfavorable answer is akin to chenser: ullulu means in Assyrian spell-bound from the to bind, just as arabu means not only to curre but also to bind (Deel, Heb. Iang., p. 53; $11 \mathrm{~W} 70^{\mathrm{b}} .138^{\mathrm{a}}$ ), or as 21,9 ) and enchantment. The technical name for the favorable answer, 11 eb. erpn blamelessness, acquithal is, in the cuneiform texts, annu, lit. response, of. Heb. 35 עגה (sce below, note on 15,28); a connection with ammí 'this' and Heb. त? (Zrmmekn, l. c., p. 88, n. 4) is not prolbable. The name of the Babylonian
 Is. 47,13, as Zimmikn suggests (1.c. p. 85, n. S) but we find it in 1s. 44,25;
 stract of my paper on The Origin of the Ifosaric Ceremomial in No. 145 of the Johns Hopkins ("nizersity Circulurs (Way, 1900) p. $37^{3}$ and my paper on Habp. Ionian Elements in the Leritic Ritual in vol. 19 of the Jourmal of Riblical Literafure (130ston, 1900, p. j8; of. Crit. Notes on Eara-Nehemiah, p. 60, 1. 15.
(10) $x \equiv \pi^{-5} \mathrm{~N}$, solemnly pronounced, is a full hemistich. Tor, Comm., p. 19, remarks ty that this clause may be purposely short. Similarly the brevity of the first
 practically equivalent to our modern dash ( - ) ; it is unnecessary to insert, with Bick, and Tor, "צִe (Gen, 9,24). For this intentional brevity of certain hemistichs see Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 172, I. 1: cf. also 1s. 40,9 , where the first hemistich 50

[^2]a [For the $\dot{0}$ in inta = Babyl. tertu see Crit. Notes on Ezra. \ehemiah. p. 3t, 1. 23; p. 58, I. 7 ; Crit. Notes on Isaial, p. 8 S, 1. $3^{8}$. - [?. H.]
l'rov.

Mし̈ntaU，H．F．，De prozerthorum quate dicuntur Aguri et Lemucilis urigine atyue indule，Lipsiac， 1869.
 Manulbuch ะum A7，Leiprig， 1883.

OORt $=\mathrm{H}$ ，OORT，Spreuken 1 －9，in Thiol．Tijilschrift，Leviden，188j．pp． 379 fi ．
 und in ihrens l＇erlulthisse an dime masoretischen Text，den L．I． $\mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ und demb Tiergrur untersucht；in ZAT 14 （1S94）．

Strack，Die Sprache Sulomus，second edition，Nürdlingen， 1899 （in Sirack＇s 10 and Zöckler＇s K̈urgefasster Kommmentar au dien Ileiligen Schriflen des A und 小’\％．

TOY＝C．11．＇Tor，A Critial and Exegefical Commentury on The Book of Procerbs，NVew lork and Edinburgh，1899，in The Intirnational Crifical Com－ mentary．

VOGEL＝A．SCHULIENSH l érsio integra J＇raecrbiornm Salomonis et in eddem Commenturius，quem in compindium reatesit it obsereationibus criluis anait Geo．Jo．Lunos：Vogei，Halis， 1768.

WHD．$=$ G．WHDEBOI：R，Die Spriwhe，in KaRL MARTI＇s Kurzer Hand－ Contmentar zum -1 F，l＇reiburg i．B．， 1897 （ef．also W＇uLDEBOER，De Tijdhifuling 20 wan het Boek der Sproution in Vershgen en ．Madedeelingen der Koninkl．Ahad． aun Wílinschapen（Afd．Letterkunde，\＆Neeks，deel iii）Jmsterdam，1899， pp．233－25j．
 it is better，however，to read h＝turn fotallowing 21，16 and Dan，1，17．


（6）The Hebrew term bero does not mean simile，farable，it refers to poetic lines consisting of two parallel halves or hemistichs：of．Assyr，mis＇u＂half＂Arab． （ in the middle．Like Arabic $-\underset{\sim}{i}$ cunciform poetry is generally arranged in wo parallcl columns，each line consisting of two lamistichs，as the Song of 35 Hoses in Deut． 32 appears in the current editions of $4 l$ ；of．SCHRADLR，Die Hollenfilut dir Istar（Giessen，1874）p．60；Havir，AkKad．Sprache（Berlin， 1883）p． 25 and pp．Nxv．xxwi below；ZrmaitRN，Babyl．Busspsa／men（Leipzig， 1885＇：Beilr．zur Kiontniss der Bubyl．Neligion，Part 1（Leipzig，1896．p．53； ZA 8，121；10，1；11，86；12，382；DELir2SC1，Das baby\％Il illschopfungsepos to （Leipzig，1896），pp． 6 and $60 \mathrm{ff} .$, especially pp． 100 ff ．and pp． 92 ff ；（ilNkl：L， Schopfung rud Chaus（Gütingen，1895）pp．ix and foı ff．；CherNe，Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．78，1． 24.
 parenthesis：＂of sentences constructed in purallelism，usually of Hebrew wisdom， but occasionally of other types；＂and Tol states in his Commentary on l＇ro－ verbs，1）．3：－＂lhe llebrew word לu゙ロ（provert）probably signifies similarity， parallifism（nearly $=$ comparison），and seems to bave been used at an early time of all poetry，hardly with reference to the form（parallelism of clatuses， clatuse－rhythm，being the distinctive formal characteristic of old－Semitic poetry），$j 0$ but，probably，with reference to the thought（shont distichs made by the juxta－ position of related ideas，originally comparisons with familiar objects．＂I be－ lieve，however，that here means originally equalitu in equal parts or hateres，
[One of the three hemistichs of this verse must be omitted; Tor cancels the first,

 -TM hemistichs, thus reading:-

(26) $\mathbf{T} \times$ calamity (cf. $1.27 ; 6,15 ; 13,15 ; 24,22 ; 27,10$; for 17,5 see p. $+9,1.16$ ) is identical with For pain =pris see Crit. Notes on Judges, p. 59, l. 6. - P. H.]

AIt hemistichs of the verse in AIf; apparently the words stood on the margin of the common archetype of Al and $(6$.

(30) [For iks of. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 81, 1. 3.
 i.ep, like كسلان lazy \&oc. (Barth $\$ 206^{2}$ ), so, too, Job 15.32 is adjective, not verbal; the two hemistichs of the verse must be

 hausixis translation of The Psalms, p. 169, l. 36; cf. below, 13,22.
The stem of (ff. below, p. 40, l. 32) not - P. P. H.]
 from the Qerê ron with which \& agrees? Both readings regard God as the
 the atry of His saints. Yet v. 9 presupposes that we are to regard the saints


 pointing תסידֶ. [For 7 .
 Assyrian, antedental $n$ is, as a rule, not assimilated in cases where the assimilation would produce ambiguity, e. g. enzu 'goat' in distinction from ezzu 'strong,' cnšu'weak' in distinction from eššu (= cilšu, hadšu) 'new' \&.c. See Mébraica 1, 227. V. $8^{\text {b }}$ should be inserted after $7^{2}$. - P. H.]
$\qquad$


Toy thinks the rhythm might be improved by reading inen thot shatt keep in. stead of Al ע.
(14) Al + in (so, too, ©St; Dvs., Grätz yl). This is a surprising pleonasm beside nוצann; it is evidently repeated from $14^{2}$ and is, with OORT, to be struck out.
 are crooked; but the parallel cmingen shows that the sinners are the subject. GIS and Tor try vainly to help the sense out by passing over the 2 in $z=$ ב.
(17) [For תיר see above, p. 33, 1. 38. - [. 11.]

It would perhaps be better to read, with Bick. and Tor, aria for all , אלהי.
 masculine, and if we accent the last syllable (as perfect of ane) the meaning
 read: -nיn בnen ; cf. 22, 14; 23, 27; also Is. 38, 17.
(19) For the first hemistich, 2 , of the line in the cunciform description of Hades (Haur'T, Nimr. Ep. 19,30): ahu biti săa cribušu ld aça to the house 50 whence no one issues who has once entered it; cf. JASTROW, Religrion of Rabylonia and Assyria (Boston, 1898), p. 560; Schradik's KB3 6,1, p. 80, 1. 5; p. 188, 1. 30. (P. S. - See now l'itsLR in his OLZ. 3, 45 I). - P. H.]
of the third line consists merely of＇ימיה（practically equivalent to Lift uf！！ s（y）while＂rin he represents the second hemistich．It is by no means neces．

 the translation of the opening chapter of Deutero－1saials in No． $1+5$ of the Jolins Hopkins C＇niacrsiby Circulurs，p． $39^{\text {b }}$ ．In the same way＂ñ Job 31，35 constitute two separate clauses（or lines），and we need not insert，with

 below）．The words on the Luther Monument in Whorms，with which the Reformer io is said to have concluded his answer at the Diet on April $18^{\text {th }} 1521$ ，Here stelee ich！Ich kunn miht anters．${ }^{x}$ Goth helfe mir！Amen，mighe form a tetrastich

 with＂phe．But v． $18^{2}$ supports 41 （so OORT）．［Enל instead of all ETh stems to be preferable．The error may be due to the intluence of v． $18^{3}(\mathcal{c} .12,6)$ ．


 certain occurrence of the fem．sing．กコロッ is Is． 43,16 ．
（16）V．IG is omitted by $\mathscr{G}^{-1 P}$ ，Hidz．，NOW．，DYS．，OURT，BICk．，WhLD．；it is an evident gloss from Is．59，7．©Sc．a§さ，liaumg．support 1 H ．
 emendation กセา．［aנח is certainly wrong；v． 17 is a proverbial yuotation．－P．H．］

 al sooi（ $¢ . \Psi$ I， 6 \＆c．）．


 and Crit．Notes on Ezekiel，p．70，J．50；contrast Ges．Nat $12 S C 1^{26}$ 1 124，c．
All ang in this connection（cf．8，3）cannot be 3 f plur．（ $=$ farus－the； cf ．Arab． jaqiont for juquirna，\＆c．）；nor can it be an emphatic form of the 3 f sing．（＝Arab． farunnan）；it mighe be explained as a form like Arab．tamudda for fomblud 35 （WRIGHL－Dl；GOEJE ${ }^{3}$ I, $\int 121$ ），but，unless we read，with HLld and OOR＇r，

（21）For Al המיוn（texewv）scems to have read nieh．Tos is inclined to adope this reading［so，too，OORr，Enf．－1．Jl．］or to substitute ary．a，as in 8，2．
Ill ナソニ overcrowds and disturbs the hemistich；it is evidently an explanatory 40 gloss to ©
In the same way the following $\overline{-r o n s}$ must be omitted as superfluous seribal ex－ pansion（so Toy）；cf．below，p． $55, \mathrm{~J} .23$.
 2x！，\＆c．for תnep， 9

 English translation of Joshua，p．S4，1．22．Cf．also below，p．36，1．i\＆
all ant inn jus Exלs must be omitted，with Tor，as scribal expansion．－J＇．H．j


z［ l is lardly necessary to state that these lirst two clauses are not authentic； ff．Kanke，Deutsche Gesch．im Zertalker der Kieform．，oth ed．，vol．i，p．336．－11．11．］
 would make the first hemistich too long unless we omit $\begin{aligned} & \text { ar } \\ & \text { as dittogram of }\end{aligned}$ mis (cf. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 52, l. j2).



 agreement with the imp. sing. which follows.
 does not occur.
(31) Instead of the flat $\mathfrak{A t}$ man choose not read, with Hitz. and Grätz, against

 of the b led to the change of ay to ck .
 cannot be opposed to the asb in the first hemistich of the verse; it should be those bending humbly before God. Cf. below, p. 49, 1.8 and RaHles, $\because y$ und 1y in den Psalmen, Göttingen, 1892.
(35). Wild. conjectures, following Hos. 4,7, ומבוּ but the glory of


4 (3) Tor reads ": w
 of Al , as it now exists, are fragments of v .7 which originally (see next note) followed v. 5. היI was added at the end of $v .4$ to complete the line after the 25 connection with אל השבח had been broken.
(6.7) Ill (and so, too, se) reads $v .6$ before $v .7$ although the suffixes in $v .6$ can only refer to בינה. V. 7 . 7 is lacking in $\mathscr{G}$, yet is not a gloss, as Oort thinks; it had dropped out of the archetype of Ill was entered later on the margin, and came in Al to stand in the wrong place.
(13) For fill (so Tors); cither can be right.




 (so rightly Pink.; Meid. re-tran lates: ו'm゙'; but the llif. can hardly be supported with Job 25,2 ). The true reading is obscure; OORT guesses שוהיהם.
(18.19) V. 19 inust be inserted before V. 18, following Hitz. and Del. and against mase. Otherwise we should have, at least, to strike out the I before rise as a 40 dittogram of the preceding 1 .

 but the usage of the language recognizes only the Niffal. © (önws $\mu \dot{\eta}$ Exdimu-
 ing of the verse, is a witness for the conjecture the.
(23) For $\mathfrak{A l}$ - 5 (so, too, 『) read, with $\mathfrak{G s},-\cos$ and (f. I)cut. 12,21.
(26) For For see below, ]. 38, 1. 50.

5 (2) The first hemistich has probably reached us incomplete; to read, with Bick., 50
 be an arbitrary addition. Dys. joins to mas, at the cnd of the first hemistich, ny: at the beginning of the secont; he then further arbitrarily supplements the
 lear them out. Siegrrien (TLZ '99, col. 329) suggests whe? will be zuiped azvay (cf. 6,33). Or should we read ing in the first hemistich, so that the 3 plur. impf. would be used in both hemistichs for the passive as in Aramaic (Ges.Kaurzscil ( $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{4}, \mathrm{g}$ )?
 will not be drawn to further occurrences of this.
(3) The third hemistich of the verse, all although found also in $\$$ s, is to be struck out, with $\mathbb{G}$, OORT, B1CK.; it is a gloss from 7,3.
(t) For all hew, which was probably influenced by 13,$15 ; \psi 111,10$, Tov suggests ver good repute.


 the first (Hitz., Oort); 4,22, for the second (Clericus, Grätz, Bick., Frank., Strack, Tov).

(11) Al ב בhould probably be omitted, with Tor, as (early) scribal insertion; cf. 1,15
(12) with OORT, following the context; Al which which only man and even 20 as a fathcr. DYS., following © with חיובי. But as only the Qal and Hiffil occur of the stem 2 באו , we should have at least to read, with Bick., Frank., Strack, Tor, יוִיְ,
For all $\overline{\mathrm{E}}$ Tor prefers to read
(13) For $\mathfrak{f l}$ ETM at the beginning of the second hemistich we should probably read, 25 with Kamph., Wild., Oort, Em., ש゙" (cf. 6,12; 1s. 2,9, \&c.) or, with Toy, wa.


(18) [םיץ is by no means cin ganz farbloses Bild (Frankenberg); we may safely
 13,$12 ; 15,4$ ) as well as of 0 חיו $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ( 10,$11 ; 13,14 ; 14,27 ; 16,22$ ) just as modern German pocts have not entirely forgotten the import of the term Jungbrunnen, although Tor, Comm., p. 206 remarks, "there seems to be no reason to suppose a reference to a primitive string of life corresponding to the tree of life of Gen. 2." For the tree of life and the spring of life (Assyr. namsit; of. Crit, Notes 35 on Ezekiel, p. $6 \neq 1.27$ ) in Oriental folklore see Menssnek, Alexander und Gitgames (Leipzig, 1894), p. 16; cf. Jastrow, Rel. of Bab. and Assyr., pp. 510.516. Sce also Schrader's K13 6,1, p. 248, 1. 25t: p. 252, 1. 298. The plant of life is mentioned, apart from the Nimrod Epic, in the cunciform historical texts, e. g. in an inscription of Esarhaddon (Beitr: z. Assyr: 3,254,11; $\epsilon$. ibid. p. 3(0): 40 surrûtu kima sammi halaţi clî sìr niše liţib 'may the kingdom be beneficial to

 might be explained as distributive: ciery one of them will be mode happy (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch $(145,1$ ) but in almost all analogous instances the text is doubt- $4 \overline{5}$

(21) Ant is unintelligible; it is impossible to get from v. 20 a subject for if:. Probably the words were taken from 4,21 to fill out a text which had become illegible (cf. English translation of Isaiah, p. 209, 1. 35). (f vié, $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$


(25) (2) (cf. note on 1, 1) with OORT, TOY, in accordance with the parallelism; A Exng: cf. below, p. 40, 1. 50.

 ס as a prefixed fimal clause subordinated to ${ }^{\text {b }}$. The appeal to Ambaric syntax (KÖNig, Syntax; $\{44, t$ ) docs not help matters.

In $\psi \psi 58,3 ; 78,50$ obe seems to stand for who (see above, p. 38,1 . 41 ): in $\psi 78$, 30


 justice, or in idiomatic German: iffnen der Lingerichtighicil Thuer und Thor
 migraatio. (P.S. - Cf. Plester in his (ILZ 3,45i, n. G.)

In the three passages in Prov., however, $=$ Eg undoubtedly corresponds to Assyr. be 10 egard, consider; and nowhere in OT does she mean to sucigh. The original meaning of obō steclyard may be indicator. - P. H.]
 it appeared necessary because v. 21 did not speak of the godless exclusively: (Gavopa; hence 1зוск.
 some similar verb, [probably riee, of. 13,23; Gen, 19,15; Num. 16,26; in all


6 (1-19) For the notes on 1.v. 1-19 sce below, p. 42, 11. 51 ff .
(22) V. 22 is, with Blck. and others, to be inserted after v. 23 (cf. on the transposition $7,3.4$ ); תנתה \& \&c. are evidently predicates of and antin. In the transposition of the verses the first hemistich has fallen out.
(23) Instead of all mion minin (reproofs of instrution) read, with ©S®, OORT, nimp $70181 ; 1$ and $\pi$ have changed places.
 For 41 Hithen, following $\Sigma \Theta$, seads from the smoothness of the tongrue of the strange noman (cf. A) ).



(27) [For הnי see below, p. 61, I. 38. - 1: 11.]
(29) בן (so, too, (5 and, essentially, Sid) is an explanatory gloss to iv. 27.35 28, and, as such, is struck out by Bicki.LL.
(30) For al אל Wild., Frask, read אלה; itropped out owing to the preceding io at the end of r .2 ) (haflesraphly); the traditional rendering M/en do met despise a thief is certainly very strange.
fil =yv $\because(s o$, too, (5iさ) is an dement too many and an evident gloss inter 40 preting ves on the basis of passages like Is. 58, 10. It disagrees with $1: 31$ and is struck out by BickitiL.
(35) [ $\because=$ is here concessive, as in Eccl. $4,14^{2}=\because=\mathrm{E}$ 1s. 1,15 or $\mathrm{a} \because=$ Eccl. $4,14^{\mathrm{b}}$; cf. the transtation of Eect. 4,13-16 in note 23 of my lecture on Ecclexiastes, Orienfal Studies, lioston, 1894, p. 272; sce aloo Gis. Kau risen § ico, b...1'. 11.] ts $\because=2 \cdot e_{1}^{1}$.
 Rechtes ansufingren.
A The Received Text wen in the freceding line ( $\%$. Job 36,23 ) seems
 Skizeen und loparteten, part 6. 1. ${ }_{5} 6$. All 2 z 2 is, of courac, implossible; but liftio Gis's cmendation azb ye all doce nol commend itself. Perhaps we should read:
 m. - P. H.]

 probably read 5 ：TT，and took 1 actively with an indefinite subject．According

（ 5 Merhaps $k$ is to be inserted，with OORT，before nib．


 p．187，l．27）；sce，however，Crit．Notes on Genesis，p．107，1． 51.

 ex日worv，－in all probabitity an arbitrary addition of a verb，after תיב＝had appeared in the text．The paraltelism requires something like athd thy hard－ won gain an alien shatih artay．OORT suggests ש゙コל：FRANK．Omits＝before ぶコ，taking＂クココ グコ as subject，corresponding to a＇tl in the first hemistich．
（16）Fraink．thinks that is or $6 x$ shoutd be inserted before 1 ll isw．
（17）According to Frank．we should read bs instead of Al $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{s}$ ．
（18）［ 1 erses 18－20 give the explanation of the allegorical language in 1 V ．15－17（just as $1 \mathrm{~s} .51,10^{3}$ explains the mythological allusions in the preceding line $5 \mathrm{~s}, 9^{\mathrm{c}}$ ）； ff ． my lecture on Eicclesiastes，1）． $20=$ Oriental Studie：（Boston，1894）p．261．－ 20 P．II．］
（19）Read，with Grace．Ven．al taútทs piגia1，Hitz．，Ookt，following 7，18，구․ The reading $\overline{T V}$ of all probably originated first in the Rabbinic interpretation of the whole section（so explicitly in ．Midrash Mishle from v． 15 on）as bearing on the study of the Torab（her breasts awill nourish thace；of．HFid．）
 third hemistich in the verse．It is evidently a kind of softening gloss to $10^{\mathrm{b}}$ ．
（20 The first hemistich is overloaded；we should probably，with Drs．，omit ill＇בע， following（5；if．1， 15 ．
 carcfully，．IV He pondered？all his goings，Crace．Ven．кai máas tas avaotpopás
 maketh leivel．but／he aicatches all his tracks，obseries all his doings 3 onmes
 who leaves obew untranslated，thinks（f）read nose instead of 41 abeo，but 0ho， 35 or rather the Nif．mplusu，is a common Assyr．word for regard，obscrere，notice， consider．Zal．GLIR（1791）translated correctly：allf alle ihic libensbalanch blickt


For the Assyr．stem obe see ZiMMERN，Fubyl．Busspsalmin，p．17：Dr：L．，IIW $528^{a}$ ；cf．also post－liblical and Iramaic ubz inspect，ciramine，search；Syr，alo to

 ＂ord，but ado perquisizit as well as Aram，びうこ）seems to be an Assyrian loan－


In is．26，7 obeg in
 follows a＇eva in dil，must be substituted for pris in the second bemistich；con－
 to the course of the righteous in $\psi 1,6$ ．

 plained in the same way；yon $x$ at the end of this verse is an explanatory gloss


(4) [1For the plur. Du'uc of. $\psi 141,4 ; 1$ s. 53,3 ; see, however, Cheine and Marti ad loc. - P. H.]
(5) Al 1 in in both hemistichs is strange; Grätz and Btck. read in the second

6) For all $\begin{gathered}\text { arde, which is doubeful, Grätz, Tor read ern: verify, as in } v .9 .\end{gathered}$

(10) Instead of 81 mopie my instruction read, with $\mathbb{G}$ se, OORT, and TOr, [The second hemistich, ודו, does not mean And knowledge.rather thun choice grold (so IV, Del. et scientiam prae auro lectissime); - $n=2$ inno is 10
 nust be explained in the same way, in which is placed before $\begin{gathered}\text { me: for the }\end{gathered}$ sake of emphasis. The following $\because=$, at the beginning of $\because, 11$, is confirmative (not $=$ for, but $=$ indecd). . $\quad$ niti is accusative dependent on 1 p. . Cf. p. 4t, l. 16.
(12) Alהan, which makes the frst hemistich too long, may be scribat expansion. - P. H.] is
 werstche mich anf klugheit, I am acquainted with prudence, I am an expert in frudence); Tor $\begin{gathered}\text { Pup } \\ I\end{gathered}$ posscss. [sll hawever, may be correct; it is a denominative verb, derived from $\mathfrak{i = w}$ neighbor (27,10; Ex. 12, 4; 3, 22; Ruth 4, 17: Jer. 6,$21 ; 431,12$ ); means I live close by, am witll acquainted acith, 20 הער, (not ego sapientia incolo sollertian, Del.). The phrase צירוע תל 1s. 53,3. - P'. H. $]$

 context; Bick., who also puts v. 13 after v. 17, strikes it out as a gloss.
(14) Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ Kורוּ I ant understunding: I have might, we have prob-
 or, at any rate, with OokT, Tor, אני ביגה אל would be on the analogy of numerous genuine Semitic nominal clauses expressing the identity or absolute 30 congruity of subject and predicate (cf. Ges.-K̈sutzsClı § 141, c.d., but here


(17) Ill Kchîl with GIE. Ew. points to $v .11$ where also Wisdom speaks of itself in the $3^{d} 35$ pers. According to Heid. the $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{Chib}$ is a dogmatic correction intended to prevent the use of the verse in defense of the Christian dóros doctrine; the Torah enters in the place of Wisdom. [Cf. below, p. 45, 1. 2.1; p. 66, 1. 14. For 2 Kֵ $=2$. cf . above, p. $33,1.25 \mathrm{ip} .34,1.44$.
(19) For see above, 1. II. - 1'. 11.]
(24) All (14 strange grammatically and in sense; strictly speaking, it can mean nothing lut the most honored among the teaters (cf. Is.
 twy passes over י.


 factory sense.
(27) [1: or All 1 pn ב p. 137, l. 13. The p may be due to the influence of $4.29^{\text {b }}$ where ipsa was cor- 50 rupted to 'pinz; sec below; p. 42, 1. 2. - 1'. 11.]
 of infinitives with sufixes in 14. 27-29.

I'rov.

7 （6）In place of ill יクコ




（9）For stl quently used in the livangel．Jlierosol．with the meaning time；but this usage may be derived from the passades in I＇roverls．
（10）All $=$ b
 PINKUSS）．［GORT，Em．suggests nาt．－l＇．H．］
（11）Instead of tll nano Tov reads na＝iv（cf．（ant．3，2．3）gredding about．
（16）Instead of At niman with sfrifelt（curpets）Grït\％conjectured nang I herée made

18）All nob：nd，usually explained as a by－form to $18 y(\nmid=y)$ ，is probably only a sub－ stitute for a coarser word；（Gerfuliogw

 $\kappa \in \pi q \omega \theta \in i \varsigma ;$ the article，however，would be peculiar，and the part．ņ̣ is found
 20 exa to be an adverb from the same stem（ $=$ lite a simfleton）；of．below，1．jo．

（22．23）After ekre，at the end of the first hemistich，the second hemistich has fallen out，as the parallelism shows； $22^{b}$（Kエソ תコe
 dropped out，formed the close of the period，as 9,18 shows， $22^{c}$（7aib לx
 the arrow clecte＇s his lizer）in at are hopelessly corrupt．Nor does（6 kai
 too，S®）help us out．l＇erhaps beis has come from a bar parallel to $\mathrm{N}=$ ，so GRÄ1Z；cf．Is．53．7．［KしBEふ，CPit．hemurk＇s on somi I＇assagis of（）T（London，

 atl bיs，at the end of $v .22$ ，to be a corrupt repctition of and $^{2}$ and，following LAG．，
 149,8 ）which is a gloss on $\mathbf{1 l}$ E＝y＝\％Ill hs may be a contraction of b：x，of．Syr．
 written alike（sec 1）r：L．，HW $32^{\mathrm{b}} .4 \mathrm{sbj}_{\mathrm{b}}$ a a／u．It is possible，however，that one

 stall，which is very improbable．l＇erhaps we should arrange the bemistichs in the following order：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { กล ห א }
\end{aligned}
$$

6 （3）An（so too，（6） original，we nust，with Itick．，presuppose that a corresponding second hemistich has been lost．
 Bpóxwv）ミ巳．P1Rll．S（Amalcktcn，1895，P．52）and Wild．read suit the parallelisin very well．
（7．8）［ 1 erses 7 and $S^{2}$ must be combined so as to form one line．To improve the rhythm

 V．$\delta^{\mathrm{b}}$ is a gloss on $\delta^{\mathrm{a}}$ ．－I＇．II．］


（14）By tran－posing，with l）ys．，the mank from 5 y to ye get two well－balaneed hemistichs．［yา，however，is superfluous and mars the rhythm；it would be better to omit it（so BIck．，Toy）；of．alsove，p．35，1．38．－P．H．］

（16）The sense requires the $Q^{c}$ rê $\quad$（so，too， $\mathbb{S E}$ ）；the $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{Chif}$ arose from a mis－ taken combination of seven abominations．

10（4）For Al wis we should perhaps read with Frask．，following 6．11；30，8，whり and then nity for Al nive（A slack hand produces pooerty）．
（6）The second hemistich is read by ©た in general as by $\mathfrak{A l}$ ．BICK．conjectures in－ geniously obj．and man as subj．（Pinkuss）．
 but The name of the just witl be used as a blessing（cf．Gen．12，2）；7上！is simply a synonym of zet just as Assyr．ziku（Del．，HW $255^{\text {b }}$ ）；see Hebraical $\mathbf{1}, 230$ ． In the scoond hemistich we must read，with Krochmal，Grätz，＝EN（Frank． 30

（9）Instead of 요 ： or it \％
 （and so S）$\delta \delta e ́$ ètérxwv $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ пappnoias eipnvorotî̀，which perhaps means，ac－ 35


 $W_{6}$ it can be urged that the parallelism in ce．to to 22,16 is almost everywhere


（17）［fi אוח should be pointed as participle，nik，corresponding to in the sec－ ond hemistich（so Frank．）．－1＇．II．］
 falsche Mauler dectich（luss）．This i ，undoubtedly eavier than Ill so far as the 45 syntax is concerned．＂y rep would have the same meaning：of．Is．14，11； 23 18．In the same way itep in Lex． 3.3 §c．seems to have been a subutan－

（20）Al घyュg can hardly be original；of Exdelutel，Slhio，e xan secm to have read difierently．［Following © aprupos $\pi \in \pi$ иринitvas we might be incluned to substitute $5^{0}$
 would hardly have been corrupted to ana．The orgigal text must have been fas（so， 100 ，Grätz in his Emend．）．The two verls，inz and $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITs，are combined }\end{aligned}$

8 （29）Instead of If ipina，which seems to have been introdured in error from $v .27$ ，
下゙心．
 as a variant to the second hemistich of 1.27.
（30）［For Ml jusk we must read jusw nursling（AV oni brought uf，pass．part．to the


 been taken over from 1.31 ，a firy stringely expressed piete of tautoluny．
（31）［V． 31 seems to be a gloss．
（32）The second hemistich of $1: 32$ must be transposed： $32^{b}$ and $3 t^{2}$ go together；i\％ Tov ud loc．and（HuRI，EEm．
（32．33）The first homistich of $x .32$ goes with $33^{2} ; 33^{6} \because \because 2 \pi$ 2x1）must be omitted as an interruptive glows．The orcler of the hemistichs in（r，V is $32^{a} \cdot 34^{a} \cdot 32^{b} \cdot 34^{b} \cdot 34^{c}, 15$ While 33 is amituen．－P．11．］
（33）V． $33 \wedge$ © © 6 ena and（f）are corrected from 11 ．

 EEODOt LWus and of ※．

9 （1）Instead of al nash loget，Frank．，Tor；Gort，Em，rad ney set up．
 too long；＇＇מר shoukd probably be canceled as a gloss or variant to m ，thoush


 tive form of the＂ord for riing was gulpu；this became，with assimitation of the a （cf．albove，p．35，1．34），gruppt；with partial assimilation of the initial $g_{g}$ to the final p（of．below，p．61，1． 4 i p． $05,1.36$ liapt：e ；and with resolution of the 30

 （ $1^{\text {st }}$ sing．color．）；accordin！to PiNk．this may be what is meant by Cf．＋． 16.
（7－50）Athough read by 11 and $6 \mathbb{Z}$ these verses are a later insctiun，as Grïr ra saw， 33 They do not adhress the simple as do v．v．4－6 and 11 fif：further，$\because$ in $v .11$ joins excellently with $\begin{array}{r} \\ .6 .\end{array}$
（9）It in is either corrupt，or a word has dropped out after cant；©（and so，too，s）

（13）Al nond liut instead of this ab tract noun，which is very strange here，read so


 Em．，following © dioxuviv，ret：yet lixk．duabts； $\mathbb{G}$ can only，he thinks， like ${ }^{2}$ ，hase set some expression which appealed to him in the place of the ts

（14）Instead of al xoe Tor reads nyicif．v． 3.






II（19＇Instead of the strange 1 ミjust（as？）of $\operatorname{A1}$（so，too，©）© $\$$ and Dis．，BIck．read，no

 ч 37．3．［Cf．also OORT，Em．


 Notice the plene written form as regularly in the case of his：
 Jïg．）and，correspondingly，for $\Omega 1$ in
 arbitrary addition qúєtaı．

 expunged as an attempt to correct שמח．Cf．Crit．Notes on 1saiah，p．90，1．7． 15

 Hebrew equivalent cannot be reached；GräTZ suggests buput but means almost．［in order to give


 is quoted in I l＇eter 4，IS．fil $\mathfrak{i}$ ํx＝represents of course an intentional alteration， for dogmatic purposes，of the original text；cf．below，1．43．－I＇H．］

12 （9）For $\mathfrak{m}$ it ${ }^{2}$（so，too，『）read，with $\mathfrak{G}$ § and Hitz，Bick．，Frank．，Strack，
 ［For צמב （Assyr．chîru，Del．， 11 W II ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ，below）；cf．Josh．5，11．12（1）．－P．H．］




 For 411 设，with which＂n is generally but arbitrarily understood，read or

 DORPI＇）Limas．
（13）For an wipt（cf． 20,$25 ; 29,6$ ）we should perhaps read weta chturgoles himself，with to

（14） $\mathrm{Al}+\mathrm{I}$（ So, too，$(55 \mathbb{E}$ ）is a mistaken limitation of a general statement；［ cf ．above， 1． 23 and p．44，1．35；also p．41，1． $3^{\prime}$ ，and p．62，1．6．－1＇．11．］
 below，p．52，1． 44 ：p．55，1． 35 and Crit．Notes on Numbers，p．43，1． 31.
（17．The stem of witucss， 7 ， TExterse may be translated：the man told us repeatedlly；a avitness is a person who repeats the facts of a case．Afterwards the stem 3 y to repeat，to reiterate came to mean to make a solemn dechuation（natg）；cf．A syr．as＇id（Dre．，HW $32^{\mathrm{b}}$ ）；the transiation testimony for nem is incorrect．－P．H．］
（25）Instead of $M$ I in which a masculine predicate is used after a feminine subject are either due to special reasons（anatoluthon \＆\＆．）or are textually suspicious；of．the list in

 （ 5 Édoxi $\mu a \sigma a s ~ h \mu a s ~ x a i ~ e ́ m u ́ p w \sigma u s) . ~ I t ~ i s ~ n o t ~ n e c e s s a r y ' ~ t o ~ s u p p o s e ~ t h a t ~ © ~ \pi \in \pi u p u-~$






For the corrupt ift ロine，at the end of the versc，を אnno dross would suggest to סינים（cf． 25,4 ；for 26,23 sce below，p．62，1．46）or לי゙2（1s．1，25）；but neither ©יo nor bac could have been corrupted to at tyms．The original reading must



7nad means throughout preforabe and is nowhere used attributively，but is always participial predicate；cf．abore，p．41，l．11．－P．11．］
 the beginning of the first hemistich；Tov prefers תコyิ．
（24）Only God could be subject of 11 jan，but He las not been mentioned previously．20 （6 סektri，following which Bick．emends： 13 ．Read ig：，with Hitz．，following \＆


（29）Al ant，but the abstract noun is strange．Kead，with $\mathbb{G}$ and in accordance with the parallelism，ent：$\$$ express the same but in the plural．perlap； 25 we should dioregard the accentuation and combinc，with Frasik．，following 13，6； Job 4．6， 79 ent（to be pointed cob？），so that nim would be the subject，not
（31）In this transposition，which is suggested by the sense，we follow Hirzig．
 perf．meant？）is simply at transcriptional blunder．
（6）For thl Ther prefers sain，following ose3；this is grammatically casicr，but mars the rhythm．［Perhaps we slould read nin；of．19，13；Lam， 4 20．－I＇．11．］
（7）The first hemistich is cridently too long；$\Omega \operatorname{lig}$（so，too，se）seems added in order to prevent the offense that might be taken at a statement that this took place at the deatio of erery man［Eccl．9，4］．G avoids the difficulty by adding p＇7s．



 （6）maric．Toy，however，gives newe as an alternative．


 from $\operatorname{somp}$ to and dropped out，in consequence，$v .10^{b}$ and $1 I^{2}$ ．The addi－ 45

 ascribes $10^{3} .11^{b}$ and 12.13 to the same source．
（12）［For the recurrence of the initial 2 in $19.9-12 \mathrm{cf}$ ．below，p．54．1．31．－1？．11．］
（16）The second and third hemistichs of this verse are added from $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \text { against } \\ & \| E \\ & 50\end{aligned}$ with Ew．，Hitz．，Bick．（Bick．however reads $16^{c}$ ：－
 with © avopeiol and HITz．，Ew．，Bickell．

14 (1) For $\mathfrak{m}$ E'w rimen the most pruditht amons ziomen (cf. Jud. 5, 29), read rinan, with Delitzecit, Des., Whin., Strack, Tor; Oorr, Fim, on the analogy of 1,$20 ; 9,1$; [ff. above, p. 3t, 1. 31. - 1P. 1].]. Al e'm is an explanatory gloss (so Toy).

 Al read cineth wih GSe and Hirz, Lagakde, Oort, Em.
(4) For all cieg Krochmal. (sce Grïty), Frink., Chajes, Tor read ox̧̣ (aithout oxen thice is no graint).
 literally it runs Go from the presemic of a foolish man, aml thow dost not know 10

 bear in mind, however, that iapu does not necessarily mean from the presence

 mant, and thon will not know lits of kinowledse, i. e., If you are in constamt
 you will not learn very much. - I'. II.]
(9) An : An means literally, but without the least connection with the second half of the verse, the guiltoffering mocks at fools. Quite dinierently (G) (and S) 20

(10) For all 7 IT Frank. reads
 same reading. Against this $\mathbb{G}$ otifoutal and $\$ 11$ (wen, probably following 12,7 7ֻ.
(13) For the grammatically impossible fill (with e) (chat minn en the case in Is. 17.6, which is quite analogous, and Ges-KAUTYSCH, $\int 131, \mathrm{n}$, note 1 ) it is certainly an easy correction, taking the $\pi$ over to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ Hirz., Dvs., Bick., Whid., Chailes. According to Jïg. this was the reading of $\mathbb{G}_{5}$, but that is uncertain, as is, also, the reading of $\mathcal{S}$. let since the article here 30 would be very strange, $\pi$ תיתחM must rather be due to a mistaken repetition from r. $12^{\mathrm{b}}$. Cf. below, note on 16,13 .
(14) Instead of the meaningless al read whent with C.irpillus, Del., Bick., Kamph, lr.sik, Strack, Tor, Oort, Em.; if. Jer. 17, 10; \%ech. s, f.6. © amó



 кセّ̛; but moddá, which is almost indispensable, is an arbitrary addition.

(22) Cinajis p. 16, note $i$ ) proposes in read in $22^{b}$ b shall be with them that deaise shed. I'erhaps we should insert, with Tor, t before the second 'ש゙h. [For nasi ion, i. c. Kimducss and faithjulniss, not merey' and truth, sec Crit. Nutes on I'salms, p. 80, 1. 27; of. Toy's Comm. on Irov., p. 295. - I'. H.]
(2f) All ceety loes not give a satisfactury sense; ©f ruvoupros, and following it Hitz.


[For II ntik at the beginning of the second hemistich read, with Gritit, Fraño, 'Tov, Oorr, Fim., in accoralance with the parallelim, net (ff.1,9; 4,9). For the 50
 of the first hemistich. - P. 11.]


12 GES.K゙AUTZSCH $\$ 1+5, \mathrm{u}$. Nor can $2 \mathrm{~S}^{2}$ be construed as feminine. According to

 be "xplained as a "rhythmical" jussive at the beginning of the clause; if. the numerous instances in CrEs. Katurascif 5 rog, $k$.
For ill 4 ?


 For $4 \times$ (so 11 l according to the best evidence, of. Bär, Liber Proverdiorum, 10 p. 40: meaning wodeatf) read bo with all the Ancient V'ersions and almost all commentators; only BI:RTMAU, DLLe, and probably BAUstg, are opposed.

13 (1) Since ant man cannot mean is the result of a futher's instirsction, as Di:L. renders, the verb governing it must have dropped out. © forces sense with 15

 with D)s. coming first, will if,7:99, 7 ; [contrast Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 136, 1. 35. - I'. H.]
(4) Instead of all whe whe is grammatically impossible (it could be eyplained 20
 with Dis., BICk., OOR1, Em.; in ©S® the verse runs quite differently.

(9) Grätz and Tor read mer, shines lrightly, following $2 \mathrm{~K} 3,22$; Is. 58 , 10, \&c., instead of 11 noter? which is certainly strange.
(10) Instead of 41 (so, too, $\mathbb{E}$ ) we would expect a participle, as a subject must be expressed; $0 \$$ kakós $=y$ (so, since loghi, most commentators; I'INK, thinks that it is rather $p$ ? ) is certainly not original.
 right since in all other passages ind means nothing but to take counsel, to con. 30 sult with others. [So, too, OORT, Em. - P. II.]
(1i) All (so, too, SU), according to the usual but linguistically impossible rendering, (gaincd) by fratd, is evidently a transcriptional error for לnEセ; © Emboroubaiouévn $=$ h
(13) For all bewi, we should perhaps read, with Fraski, following (forlecivel, af: 35

(15) Instcad of Al

(17) For tit wit we should perhaps read, with Gkĩte, Tox, yา.

Al be (so, too, (f\$) fulls into cuil) the contevt absolutely requires (hence even to Luther bringt ("holüch) לe?; so Arvoldi, Now., Dys., Bick., Kampla, Wild., Fr.ink., Strack, Dort, Em.
19) The first and second hemisticls of this verse are not parallel; wo hemistichs have probably dropped out between them.
(20) Instead of the Qrê̂
 serond imperative as capresion of the certain consequence of an action (thus thou wilt become wise.) cf. Ges. Kisurzich \& no, f.
(21) For st $\mathrm{c}^{2}=:$ (so, too, St; though, perhaps, with another pronunciation), to which God must be understood as subject, read : When Ew., Kantur. Tos, follow- 50 ing (6) кeradippetal; of. the same translation of Sen. 31,25; Ex. 15,9; Deut. 28,45 and often; the paralleli-m with $\begin{aligned} & \text { ghen } \\ & \text { is cact. }\end{aligned}$
(22) [Hor 1E3 fradestimat sec abore, note on 2,7.- P. H.]
 sing．even in $v .12$ ）st；also $ニ$ ss in $1.13^{b}$ agrees with the sing．［The plural， however，may be amplificative（aン＝the great king，cien the gratest king）； cf．above，p．34，I．31．－I＇．H．］
（10）An it probably a dittogram by mistake from the preceding in in in m（so Grärz）；it should be struck out，following（ $\mathcal{E S}$ ．［Contrast below；note on 30，13， p．67，1．41．－P．11．］

（22）Instead of ill יִּ Em．，following ©S（huplography）．


 to be marroui，DEL．，HW $88^{a}$ ；but transposition of $a$ is not exceptional．－I＇．11．］
 to $\begin{gathered}\text { ？} \\ \text { ？}\end{gathered}$ ）．
 goes without suying that pritentions specich is not proper for a fool．
 hence © avtidopias éreipel mâs kakós．On the other hand，£ renders ling
 as ビッ？

（18）All interpreted as for his ncighbor．But thas tüv éautoû pixuv，and $\$ 0: \omega \omega$

 means to gize security＇ 10 another（not for another person）．For in if． 18,17 ．A
 refers again to the creditor，not to the debtor．U whit means I pledge myself to thee（not for thec）．To srie sccurity for athing or for a man is

 （ffill diés he made him guarantice the thing）．In the same way $ニ シ y$ is con－ 35 strued with the accusative of the person for whom securty is given，ef． 11,15 ；

 Firuder；of．（iseek éfruâolai tiva mpos tiva or tive tivi）．In Syriac the verb 2ny to become sumty fur a person may be construed cither with the accusative or fo with the prepositions $=3$ ，or $4 \boldsymbol{y}$ ．The correct explanation of our passage is given in DelirzsCh＇s commentary，who quotes Flemscmin＇s translation apud alterum （sc．crediturem pro dibiture）．TOF renders，sitho becomes security＇ 10 unether，and adds，＂The another refers to the creditor．To another is lit．in the prisinec of his

（2I）For the participle ats casus fendens，which is．at the same time，equivalent to a conditional dause（as in Gen．9，6）of．Ges．Kat rzacis 5116 ，w．
 ever，the $b$ is only a dittogram of the $b$ preceding；lence（ 5 bsurn，© sy：en． ［The prefixed b，howewe might bee emphatic in this rase；see above，p．48，1．15． 50 －1．11．］
（22） M （so，too，apparently（G）according to the usual interpretation $=$ healing； read，with Drs．，הip，following \＆Laenos and © NE1，

14 but the conjecture pang phans their destration（HIr？．，Dys．，Toy）is not suc－ cessful．
（26）For At iy Chajles（p．9）prefers the adjective it．It is true that the suffix in ixa ＂ould then have a natural antecedent which is lacking in the Rectived Text．
（32）For All inise so，too，d，which could only mean（trusts）th his deuth，read ：ary 5
 Kampu．，Frank．，Toy，Guri，Em．
（33）The tenor of it in the second hemistich is not without difficulty；but to insert a negative before is too arbitrary（if．aboove，p．4．1．37）．For Sll yon Tol reads nific
（34）［ $11170 \pi=$ ？ 2 mi is doubeful in Lees 20,17 it may be a cuphemism）；perhaps we
 however，25， 10.
35）（hation is not predicate Frank．）as in $15, S ; 16,13$ ；in that case the $ל$ prefined to the following subject would have to be taken as the emplatic ל（cf．Crit．．Notes 15 on Ezra－Nehemialh，p．58，1． 20 and below，p．49，1． $50 ;$ p． $52,1.11$ ．The con－ struction is the same as in $15,10^{2} .24^{2}$ ，Sc．；§ ：حve－I＇．H．］

 ムqaıpeital atuiav．Chajes p．+3 ），followin！ $\mathbb{G}$ ，omits $\ddagger$ before 9 y but prefixes $=0$ it to ジン．

15 （2）The conjecture $\begin{aligned} \text {（2）（Dis．，Grär rz，Kamph，Frank．，Toy，OORT，Em．）descrves }\end{aligned}$

 Kautzsch § 118, g；contrast Crit．Notes on Ezra－゙̀chemiah，p．71，1．2j）；but ©


 loûvtal．

 p．90，1．32；p．115，l．31；contrast ibid．p．109，1．7．－1＇．H．］
（14）Instead of the Kethib（which comes from＝ex in v．13）read the Qere with Git．


（24）（5）（ 9 ）Fccl．3，21）may be subsequent additions．The omission of b before rem，after the preceding hisu，may be due to haplography．－I．11．］
 are dic．

 but the mind of the mightions meditatiss if，24，2，a mesponse，tries to site at fazoorable ansaver（if．below，p．66，1．33）；Im＇Hs justi meditatur didientiam． 45

 suggests $=: n$ ；but this makes poor sense．

16 4）Al ：anyuh，but the article is here syntactically impossible；if．Ges．${ }^{20}$ § $127, \mathrm{i}$ ．
 scales are judgment for JHJH，i．c．，the employment of false balances will be judged by Jнгни．
 p. 214. Assyr. išu' (DiLL, HW 310), idtu 'hand' (fem. itlu 'side', itti 'my side' = אr, ${ }^{\beta}$ originally "?ִ?; see Beitr. z. Assyr: $1,172^{\text {b }}$; see also Crit. Notes on Chron., p. 61, 1.31. The nota acusutivi ss (Lidz., p. 230) 1as no connection with the preposition תx (contrast Geo. Jofranin, Phen. Insche., 1889, p. 39), but is originally identical with $t=$, $n \times$ representing a form tht (Punic yth) or iith (like
 l'roleg', p. Ifg below), i.e. a form like chimm 'blood.' The $\pi$ in $\pi$, is just as irregular as the $m$ instead of $\dot{ \pm}$ in Arabic (Assyr. lus'šu, i. e. las'u=
 20,3: GG․․ 25 Ap. '83, 101) $=\boldsymbol{*}$, so that the $w$ in Arabic would be quite regular, and the $n$ in the Heb. nota accusatize and Aram. 'ת and r: (Nöld., Syr. $G r^{2} \int 287, n .1 j^{8}$ would then have to be explained in the same way as the $n$

 was bieing, cf. Assyr. asisí 'living leeing, animal' (DEL., HW $43^{\text {b }}$ ), and the nota accusutivi was originally used only before pronominal suffixes like $i i_{A}$ in Arabic


The form for the second person, Heb. Fink, should be atukiz in Assyr., but instead of dituka (written attukta of. Dri.., HW 160 and above, 1. 9) we find kithu, kíhš̆t (Dele, IIW $357^{\text {² }}$, the pronominal suffix being prefixed. This is due to the influence of the forms for the first person, $\hat{i t i}$, $\dot{s}{ }^{2} \dot{i}$, alongside of which we lave $i \hat{a} f i$ and $j \hat{a} s{ }_{s}$. The initial $j$ is here undoubtedly identical with the , in the Aramaic form of the notu accusativi n;, but it produced the impression of the suffix of the first person -ig being prefixed. Therefore the final i-vowel con- 25 taining the suffix of the first person was no longer preserved hut changed into $-u$ and $-a$, on the analogy of other nouns, and the sufix tia of the second
 being subsequently differentiated on the analogy of the personal pronoun,
 iäsìnt, \&ic. (Del. $\left.\int 55, \mathrm{~b}\right)$. Contrast Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,296.328.457.467. - P. H.]
 read 以ירㅜ, with Hrzz, Grätz, following se ( $\mathbb{C}$ is lacking in this clapter for v. $1-3$ ) and 28,6 .

Read yor fill with Hitz., Kamplu., Strack, Tor, following $£$.

a That is, is, not 'is; sec Fieitr. z. Assyr. 1, 260, n. 27; ef. ilhid. p. 328 .
$\beta$ The preposition $5 x$ avith is not a femininc form of the Assyr. prejosition inca


 2,83 , below, it is explained as a modification of $\underbrace{(u)}_{0}$, be an cmphatic form of the precative of tio (1)ra., $11 \mathrm{~W} 373^{b}$ below) just as the rare (Wribut-be Golish: 2, p. 96, below appears to be an emphatic form of the negative ע. Cf. GGN 25 . 1p. 'S3, p. 98, n. 2; Reckennory S 132 and p. 709.
of This remark has been misunderstood in Gis.oliunliz, S2b. Nönfery does not mean to say that \& betm is different from the nota acinsatray; be only wants to cmphasize the fact that the archaic use of $\mathbb{A}$ in cases like $-\mathbb{A}$. (where $-\mathbb{A}$. $=$ Assyr. ${ }^{\text {hifs }}$ ) is different from the common reflexive use of $A$.
e For $\Omega=2$ ef. above, p. 50, 1. 5.
FIn $j i j$ and Kith the final consonant has been dropped, while the initial $t$ in Ethiopic represents a prefixed pronominal element.
$\eta$ C\% Delitzscit, /'rol., p. 117 below; IIIV $154^{\text {a }}$
 gives a very feeble sense and stands, further, in no intelligible relationship with





 Chajes (p. 30) read rann; cf. Jud. 14,4.
(3) For II ? For al por reads, insolence.
(4) All

( 8 ) All an an an 26,22 ; but the rendering duinty ford is nothing but a ghess, 15 and the form (part. Hithpael!) would certainly be very strange. Lümk IILZ '99, col. 652 ) considers it to be miswriting for arpang (Cant. 5, 16; Neh. 8, to) brought about by the preceding
(10) $\mathfrak{A l}$ Mי: (so, too, (63®); HITz, perlaps rightly,
(14) For AI who soothes him; CHAJES (p. 13) suggests ahthe the courage of a man makes him endure suffering.
 For of. 25,8.9 and Crit. Notes on Ezat-Nch., p. 65, 1. 37. - I'. H.]
(19. Instead of Ill's strange '
 also read, is, according to PiNk., only a correction'. IItTz.'s ingenious conjecture M




 following $\mathfrak{6}$ édovtas.
 comrades, read w. with GRäTz, lraxk., Tor, following ミ. According to the
 [In Mic. 6, 10 we must read instead of atsen, with Wflliausen, Nowack, Ges. Humb ${ }^{13}$, RV, shall I be pruere, at the beginning of the following verse, for which we to must point, with 3 mumquid justificatho AV', shall I count them fure, wand shall I acquit hime (עw,

 (Rvssile p. 107): in Assyrian the l'iel wavkiti is used in the meaning to dechere ty free (Del., 11 W 254 ${ }^{3}$ ).
 the Masorah, but II. 1'. Smith and Gl:s.BL'the ${ }^{13}$ adopt Perla:S' suggestion,

 50
 to Thou hast 'cornervet' me or thoue hast hit the mail on the hecad.

As to ${ }^{2} \times \mathbf{x}$ in Irov. 18,24 , it cannot be denied that may have been pro-

 read by $6 S \mathbb{2}$; cf. 13,11 where
 and Bertheau, yb, as a substantive, 管. We must read, as in 12,13 (sec above,
 clause, ;h" (point re:; of. below. p. 67, 1. 20) is shortened impf. Qal (ff. above,
 " not refer to L.es: 27,33; in our passage the verb means simply to consider. The idea is, a man should not make a rash, inconsiderate wow but should consider the matter before he binds himself. Wis rendering of this line, maris àvopi taxú
 it does not presuppose a different text. The primary meaning of $\mu \in t a v o e i v$ is not repontance but reconsideration, afterthought. - 1'. H.]
An =uty is impf. consec. joined to a participle expressing a repeated action'ef. Ges.-Kaltzech § in, u. It is questionable, however, whether the text is not intended for $=\mathfrak{W}$ ?
For all in: $\operatorname{Grätz}$ and Chajes (p. 3) prefer (he shall bring upon them thei, oun iniquity); cf. $2 \mathrm{~S} 16,8 \mathrm{al}$. and exactly the same phrase in $\psi 94,23$. [loor the securrence of the initial D in w. $21-25$ of. p .541 .31. - I'. 11.]

(28) [For nem see above, p. 47, I. 43; for all 7 IEn in the second hemistich we should probably substitute pisa, following [5 Ev dikulooùn. - 1. 11.]
(30) Pיpron with the $K^{c}$ chitb, although a Hif. from pat is not found elsewhere; for the 25 Q'rê pang of. Est. 2, 3.9.12.
 intention distinguished from $\ddagger$ light; yet some MSS read 2 , (6SC express $\because$ ? Hitz. conjectures ze fruit, Chajes (p. 4z) ? Tixe, , \&ic.) which has passed also into Aram. and Arab. (cf. Fränkel, Aram. Fremdw., pp. 24.131), but in these languages is means yote,
 is properly subactio agri. The stem of Ass. niru 'yoke, collar' is - P P. 11.]

Instead of the meaningless $\$ 1$ (so, too, s®) read

(8) [ $\because i$ is supposed to be an intransitive adjective (derived from jo tazira, impf.
 7hl Gen. II, 30 (so Küxtg ii, 1, $5 \mathbf{j} 6$, n. 1); but it is impossible that the initial should have been preserved in this case: in is probably nothing but a corrupt dittogram of the following in (so STADE, TLZ 94, col. 234). As in a great many eases, the dittogram has displaced the original word qualifying e-x, of e. g. v. 26 and Crit. Notes on 1saiah, p. 169, 1.2t. In 7bi Gen. 11, 30 the 1 for, is simply due to an accidental error; so, 100 , in the Oriental こn: at the end of 2S 6,23; cf. Dratisk at loc. Sec also Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 49, I. 11.-1'. H.]

 correct; 7 ח $n=$, however, probably does not mean housc in common (R1'M) but conjugral chamber, although the Assyr. bit châri, quoted in my Alkikalische Sprache 50 (Berlin, $1883^{\prime}$ p. sixiv was based on the incorrect publication of the cunciform tevt in iv $R^{2} 27,1^{\text {b }}$. The new cdition in in $R^{2}$ shows that we must read, not hit cbirri, but bit emuiti as in iv R 1, $40^{2}$ (cf. Nimr. Ep. 81,46.48). Lit emûti means

19（7）The first two hemistichs of $v .7$ form one line independent and complete in itself； the third clatuse belongs to a second line，the first hemistich of which is lacking in fil［if．Drivik＇s Introd．${ }^{6}$ ，p． $39^{5}$ ，belon］．（5 has two addlitional hemisticlis before this sceond line，but without connection with the V .7 of tl ．
s＇ל with the Kethib；Qere is to him tlicy belong：of．26，2；Eura 4，2；y 100，3．
（S）According to Al＇s punctuation - wowld be cusus pertlens and equivalent to a conditional rlatise（if．above，note on 1721 ）and xצat would have to be under－ stood as dependent on some verbal idea like it huppers（cj．GES．KivutzsCh §114，h．i）．But for alst？we should perhaps read xip？with Dys．，Tus；follow－ ing（ 5 eupnoet and © if． 16,$20 ; 17,20$ ）．［It is not imposible that we have in this 10 ssibl a trace of the prefixed emphatic b（cf．abowe p． $48,1.15$ ）：xym $+J$ verily

 imperative（so MARTI，alt．）with prefixed emphatic $\%$ ．To add ns？，with CiHNNE， or win or gip（Mari！＇would mar the rhythm．－I＇．II．］
（i1）Instead of 11 Trent for which we should expect at leant the impf．as the molus
 following ふ and corresponding to the parallel $\mathfrak{\sim}$ ．
（16）As almost all the antithetic hemistichs standing second are joined on with ，


 gram from following ${ }^{\circ}$ ）deserses consideration，
nis：with the Qere（so and Btck．，perhaps also（G átoגtitat，of．Job 4，21）；

（19）Instead of לas（ $\mathfrak{K}^{\circ} \mathrm{cthib}$ ）which is an evident transcriptional error，read，with the Qere，hך．let it is certainly a question whether the original reading was not something absolutely different：of．Hitzig．
（zo．Ill TMn


（28）1ll yלニ’；better perlaps ジニ゙，with l゙RaNk．，following 15 こ8．
（29）For all arpy judiments，pumshments read，with Wili），FRask．，following（G）

 $\cdots-2 \times$ ，as the plural is used exclusively in l＇roverbs．
（3）［lt would perhaps be better to point，with CRALTZ，FRANK．，new instead of At

 sideration＂a fool quartels about ererything，or better with erery onci．，

（6）Instead of fil אొp．，with indefinite subject．read ※？Fi，following st and KamuH．； ［cf．，howwer，Crit．Notes on Eara－Nich．，p．33，1． 28 and above，p．45，l．15．－I＇．11．］

（S）［The jr－sez on which the Babylonian burif see above，p．33，1． $3 \$$ seated him－ self before rendering a decision is called，in the cunciform ritual tablets，kussit da＇timi（cf．1S 1，9；4，18）；see Z1Mnttrx，Beitr．zur Bithy．Religion，p．104，1． 122.
（9）For the recurrence of the initial $\leq$ in 1 T .79 if．p．jt．1．31．－1．H．］
（11）Instead of 1 ll trỵ（so，too，ぶ；according to litck．it comes from 21,8 ）read 50 1こ7．with（6）
 comes from 27,13 ．



 this a doublet the second form of which apparently omits こと：
Instead of the strange nlayt（so，too，©）read，with Drs．，Kamph．，ry？，follow－

 in sense and overburden the hemisticla rhythmically（but Tov，ธיセゼロージท）．


 to thee this day，eicn to thee，but there is no reason for cmplasizing the pronom－ inal suffix（Gis．－KaUTZSCH $\{135, \mathrm{e}$ ）in this case；contrast Delitzsch ad loc．
 the current interpretation of this as choice troops，then，taken metaphorically for choice specches，has absolutely no foundation；（5se express there－fold or for the third lime．
（21）Al \％ip（cf．note on 30，6）according to Tor gloss of an Aramaic－speaking scribe．



Al nex＂oxs，in the first hemistich，and sll biak，in the second，may be scribal


（23）For $\AA$ \＆ Frank．，בקוּ and and lic atill cheat those woho cheated them of their． life）．

（27）Al ars is unnecessary for the meaning and for the rlythm，and should be struck out，with 13 亿CK．，following ©SE；its origin was probably through dittography of $\Rightarrow$ in（13rek．）．［In Eecl． 5 ，j the case is different．－I＇．H．］
Instead of Al me？read，with Gid，Mri！；［see，however，Crit．Notes on Isaiah， p．121，1． 9 and above，p．52，1．44．
（29）For the etymology of and its connection with ant（cf．above，p．33，1．24） see note 48 of the paper quoted above，p．33，l． 43.
The second clause，fll P．H．］

23 （3）．BICK．is justified in striking out this werec，though $\sqrt[\sigma]{(1)}$ agree with $\mathfrak{N}$ in support－ ing it； $3^{3}$ is a doublet to $6^{b}, 3^{b}$ belongs to $S^{a}$ ，while $\delta^{b}$ is a gloss to $9^{\text {b }}$（sec bclow，p．56，l．25）．
 in his Texthritische Gtossen zu den Proverbien，cc． 23.24 （vol． 14 of the Vienna 45 Oriental Journal，p．150）inserts $4^{\text {b }}$ between $9^{a}$ and $9^{b}$ ，and adds $8^{b}$ as fourth hemistich．He reads：－

Sipeak not to a fool．desist from imparting to hime ther under－


 3，27：23，13：30，7．

21 neither sikuiegrerelterliches Haws 'Delitzsch, Assyr. Worterb., p. 151, 1. 15) nor Hitus dir l"'ravandtschaft , DEL., HWV $82^{2}$ ); cmitu means union and corresponds to תיay. It is not impossible that nימy, which we find exclusively in levit. and in Zcch. 13.7, is a Babylonian loan-word. Pcrhaps we should read in all passages mby instcad of nǐy: cf. below, $\mu .57,1.18$ and contrast Crit. Notes
 K"\%. Prophe ${ }^{3}$, P. 49: mein lírtratuter, ef. ibiul. p. 195 (intimus), I êtr cuherens
 Assyr. émri means not only to be united, but also to be liké; sec Zimmarki, buesspsalne"t, p. 69. (For NE 81, 46 if. now KB 6, 1, p. 155.) - P. H.]


(19) םינדומ, cf. note on v. 2.
 from $v .17$ and is to be struck out as rhythmically overloading the verse.
(21) fll ipty (so, too, st) is to be struck out, with ©, BICK., and Oorr, Emr, as a repetition by mistake from $21^{\text {a }}$.
(26) Instead of $\{1$ non (so, too, sむ) there must of necessity have been a subject
 $\varepsilon \pi 00 \mu i a s$ каксis, beside пisn which had already forced its way into the text 20 [perhaps dittograpliy of preceding mant. -.. P. H.], the original reading y? (or


(28) Al 7 İ unintelligible; similarly $\mathbb{G} \ddagger \mathbb{d}$, only $\mathbb{G}$ has putaooóuєvos, i. c., according to Cap. 25




(1) [The recurrence of the initial $;$ in w. 2-4 if. $11,9-12,20,7-9.24-26$ ) is acci-
dental (cf. P. 53, 1. 6); these verses form no grouts (DrtYer, Introd.
(1) [The recurrence of the initial $;$ in w. 2-4 if. $11,9-12,20,7-9.24-26$ ) is acci-
dental (if. P. 53, 1. 6); these verses form no groups (Drtver, Introd. ${ }^{6}$, p. 395 , n. $\because$ ); cf. bclow; p. 58, I. 18. - P. H.]
 ing to PINk.) is suspicious in that ane follows without a conjunction. Its meaning also is a question; elsewhere the word means thoms, and nims incans fisho hooks. Drs.'s conjecture of E'䎸s hidden (so, too, GRÄrz) deserves consideraLion. FRANK, and Tor prefer to read anss, following Job 18,9, where ares stands in parallclism with $n=$, but the text there is very doubtful.
(8) All

 by both rhythm and sensc. [OORT, Eme suggests -inי בnx. - I'. H] In Ill the parallel hemistich to $11^{\text {a }}$ has dropped out; © has oektoi bè uútụ muv-
 into one hemistich which, it is true, will bear explanation its antithesis to $\mathrm{V} \cdot 1 \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{a}}$
 The fact is, however, that only in has survised of the original third hemistich
 SU), we must read, with litck., ni!e, following (5 moluceivel.

23 (29) [The interjection "2x (ür. $\lambda \in \%$ ) secms to me doubiful; © Oópußos; 3 Cujus patri
 uĭ, tivi фeù; J. D. Michazlis (Gütt. 1778) translated (Vellecif; Zeegler (Lpz. 1791) Ekel, comparing (ubla') 'nausea;' KönıG, Lelirgel, ii, I, 339, derives
 miseria and considered to be an abstract form to pex. l'erhaps we should sub.

 Busspsatmen, p. 116, below; Assyr. Wörterbuch, p. 218; Hamłworterbuch, p. 32:
 of. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 87, I. 39. For the Assyr. $\hat{i}=$ Heb. $\hat{0}$ see ZA 2,261, n. 3; contrast DelatzsC13, Assjr. Wörterb., p. 215, n. 4. The Ancient lersions may have read ninp (cf. 15,16); although this is doubeful (e snx;,
 be used in the sense of $\langle\sigma \in \beta \in 1 a)$. - 1'. H.]
 p. 50, 1. 29.

(32) Al
(34) An ? but the meaning is uncertain, and the whole plarase is peculiar. Nor is 20
 לita in both hemistichs. Herhaps we should substitute ben, at the end of the verse,
 midst of the sea, like a person suffering from seasickness on the high seas. The 2
 not mean helmsman, nor is it necessary to restrict its use to professional saitors: any passenger on a ship may be called ban, just as we speak of a passenger who does not suffer from seasickness as being a gond stribr. Cf. also Sindbad

"Ihus the first bemistich refers to the natseating effect of intemperance, the squeamishness of the stomach: excessive drinking turns the stomach of the
 (and the gloss ibid. v. 16) The second hemistich probably describes the lant stage, the stupor caused by an overdose of intoxicating liguors; שix must be the $3 \mathbf{3}$
 the verse, which was displaced by 2 , was perhaps of. Matth. 27, 34
 therefore restore this line as follows: -

And thou witl be like a seaforing man in the midst of the sea
And lite one fullen asliep after a draught of peismous sall.
literally lite ome sliching through the poison of gitl. The rendering Or as he that licth ufon the top of a mast (so AV ) is impossible: a man cannot lic or stecp upon the hishest point of a mash. Nor is "Tor's rendering murh better: Thou will be like noe who is slecpingr at sea, litie one aslich in a rizolent storm. (cf. above, 1. 22; © $\mathfrak{E v}$ mod入̣̂̂ kdúdwvi). Sleçing at ser is a perfectly normal condition, and even in a violent storm to be alleep is certainly more comfortable than to lee atsake. liesides, we must remember Math. 8, 24 .
 we adopt this reading, beatr could be explained as a misplaced gloss on $2=4$ (of. below p. (0, 1.21), or stl han might be connected with . Irabic inh which is used
 J'rov.

23 （ 4.5 The first hemistich of $: . t$ is combined by D． 11 ．NULLER with the three hemi－ stichs of $v . j$ in the following manner：－

Toil not to maki thyself whih．for miches makes itself a ings，
Liki an cagle it glies hicurenaurt，if thou make＇st thine ye＇s fly afler it，it is go ne． The a before Fixa would have to be omitted．D．Il．Me＇leker＇s line can only mean Lassest du dionen blick darauf hinflicgen．－Liort ist es（sce D）matrecirs
 as a conditional chatse．IT cannot be used as a conditional partíle．－1＇．II．］





 if thon lookest at it with pleasure．For $\overline{-}=$ if sec above，1．10．－P．H．］
 subject is absolutely essential．

（7）fl w®コニ Mit（similarly（6さて）in the first hemistich is unintelligible． Of the second hemistich of this line only sinte has survived．
（8）On v． $3^{\text {b }}$ as continuation of $v . S^{\text {a }}$ sce above in the note on $v .3 ; \mathrm{v}^{\text {．}} \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{b}}$ ，alhough its present position in fll is supported by GSd，must be placed，with Bick．， after v .9 ．［ 1 l seems to be a gloss to $\mathbb{S}^{\text {b }}$ ．－P．H．
 Tor，and the parallelism．

（18）ミe presuppose the present $11 l$ and do not indicate any gap；but © has todv ráp тnpinons aircó；following this，read cither，with BICk．， Grätz，
 Crit．Notes on Judges，p．66，！．1）and is therefore always plural $=5.5$ ），never
 （ 103, ，note 3 ）must be corrected accordingly：In Is． 44,15 Cimbin：reads it 3




（22）In $22^{\text {b }}$ we have an antiprolipsis；if．Crit．Notes on Ezra，p．71，1．31．－I＇．11．］to

In the second hemistich read，with the Qerê，in？and rety＂：instead of afl
 equivalent to a conditional clause（if．above，on 17，21）with following＂itas

（25）V． 25 stands before 1.24 as apotosis to $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \text { ．} 23 \text { ．It } \text { is strange that the mother }\end{aligned}$ should be mentioned twice；Jor is probably tight in omitting Tex at the end of the first hemistich．［fesm may be a misplaced oloss ief．above，p．45．I． $35^{\circ}$ ，with Hize expliatizum（ef．Crit．Notes on Era－Nehemiah．p．68，1．53；Crit．Notes on Ezekiel，p．116．1．2），on Frits at the end of the second hemittich．－P．11． 50
（20）ה


 required also by iל：き．
（21）F゙or All ニックロ be net overbearing weth either of them．liut would not this admonition be rather superfluous？
 these zitho rise up agrainst them，scil．JHYH and the king），Bick．Erèw．It is， perhaps，simpler to read，with Dys．，Eutu as in the preceding line．

（26）［al שam makes the second hemistich too long and may be scribal expansion， cf．above，p．55．I．23．－P．H．］
（27）Since the first two clauses form a complete line we must recognize the existence of

Il חִּ must be explained as perf．consec．after a disconnected adverb of time： afteretards，then thow mayest \＆ic．Cf．the illustrations given in Ges．Kautzsen § $112,00$.
（28）［For All a $\psi \psi 27,12 ; 35,11,-$ P．It．$]$
 only as l＇íel of ane with the prefixed interogative तु，but for an interrogative particle after ？there would hardly be any analogy，except perhaps in אומה 2 S 35.35 ．I question，however，is out of place here，if only on account of the preceding prohilitive clause．

 iל השטה
 a．1010）as well at in accordance with the statement of Samson llansapnin 30 （about 1240 A．D．）and according to the celitio princeps（Naples，if 46 ，Compl．， BÄR，and Cinsibtrg．ש゙ep corresponds 10 ．Irabic aside as of no use， 10 cat zolhat one may chance to find，rien if it be
 must be rejected．（Cf．Crit．Notes on Isaial，p．167，1． 24 ．


 first homi，tich to all
 five terses（ $30-34$ ）in tho stanzas，each consisting of three lines or six hemistichs． 1．11．］
（34）Instead of Al Thann read，wits 1）ws，Toy，OokT，Fim．Fhate，following 6， 11 and（b． Instead of the inexplicable plural in？ with ©sid［cf．，howelcr，above，p． $31.131,-1$＇．H．］



Verse 5 ，whose structure is exactly the same，shows that we must read ks？for Al xy？．

23 elippa＝，is common in Assyrian（DeL，HIV 619）；ロ゚ב $=$＝Assyr．



（35）For the bresity of the hemistich ippo no sec above，note on I ，to．The entire verse is probably ：t gloss of an＇antitectotaler，＇who admite that intoxicating lifuers may be poison，but a very palatable and comparatiely harmless poinon from which he does not propose to abotain in the future．The wo verb，yan and represent conditional clauses：If they haze structio me or They may

 and in v．3：－

ショ
In the 2 stanza，however，there is no trace of it；nor is the alphabetical device carried through．Cf．in $31,2:-$
－㸚

and in 1.11 of the last chapter：－

ibid．，v． 21 ：－
ロ品
In all these cascs，however，this alliteration may be accidental；$f$ o above，p． 54 1．31．－P．11］
（5） 41 nema following 35．17．But evidently tre is to be read，with Hitz．，Dvs．，Grïtz，Btck．， Ksmpri．，Win．t．，Tor，following（ast，and also pesp in $5^{\text {b }}$（cf．Job 9，4）．Such comparisons ate very common in the stile of the l3ook of I＇roverbs（also in Eerclesiasticus）：not only persons are compared with each other（if．16，32；19，1； 27，10；28，（2）but alio conditions and actions（15，16f；16，8．19；17，1；21，9．19； 25 25，7．24）．Further，we hate perhaps to add，with lick．，Tor，ziv after zen．The
 breaks down on the alphabetical araingement；［if，however，above，I．14．］

（9）Instead of 41 ת
（10）The beginning of the first hemistich is lost；Brek．supplies［1］． 11 ． MüLti：R，l．c．，makes בי＂ before $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ant．Ile combines this line with the following two verses，and translates the passage as follows：If thoul hust been shack in the time of trouble of others．， thy sterength may fuit on the dey of＇thy men．trouble．Therefore deliter these 35 \＆．e．If we adopt this explanation，it would be better to read，at the beginning of the second hemistich，iל 7 ごは；but the proposed restoration is hardly sati－ fictory：－1＇．11．］
（1－4）ה Thould be read，with bick．，instead of al rat；something，also，has fallen
 mutation of Nameç to Seghol under the influence of the following ？of Ew－w．
 be supported only by the doubtulatagy of an？（ien．46．3）；of we wave，in addition to ren，only however，seems to be intended not as an intinitive but as an emplatio impera－ 45 tive like
The last two hemistichs of this verse，although all is supported by Gis ，are struck out by Bhek，as borrowings from 25，thand 23．iS．
（ 15 ）All ${ }^{2}$ ？mars the rhythm and is ficrlaps better omitted，following Bick，and Tos．

## $\because-5]-E_{i j}$


 are subsequent modifications of $9+2$. Lagarde's theory that ${ }^{3}$ is shortened from قدק (ff. Reckendorf, Arab. Symt. § 112 ) is not probable. The ${ }^{\circ}$ in in represents a partial assimilation to the) (see Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,26. below) and the $b$ in $b^{6}$ a subsequent assimilation of the $>$ to the initial ${ }^{\circ}$ (cf. above, p. t2,
 see Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 204, 1. 6.
 to smash,' Del., $111 \mathrm{I}^{\prime} 175^{\mathrm{a}}$. - P. 11.]
 ling tooth as it is commonly explained, deriving from y ר $=$ = p , read, with OORT (see below, 1. 18; cf. Em.), following © какой, and with similar meaning s. For 11 ll ת שirne read, with Hitz. ©ic., How M's curious text arose from Haggadistic interpretation see indicated in the Introduction to Ethat rabbathi 'p. 13 of WUNSchi's translation), and cf. M. T. Houtsma in ZAT '95, pp. 150 f. 15纤 op passed over by $\mathfrak{G}$, nor is it contained in $\mathrm{V} .20^{2}$ which is a doublet to $\mathrm{v} .19^{\mathrm{b}}$. We must strike it out, with Lagarne (he regarded it as $=0$ and originally a gloss on $\gamma$ pin in, $18^{\text {a }}$ ) and with OORT (Feestbiundel ... aant Dr. P. J. Veft, pp. 21 f. ). Yet this strangely shortens the scond hemistich.
 and $\begin{gathered}\text { p } \\ \text { por } \\ \text { fos, a doublet of } 19^{b} \\ \text { and therefore to be struck out, with Hitz., }\end{gathered}$ Lag., Bick., Oort, Wildeloer.

 pov from énkas sore, wleer; hence Grätz, Oort (see above, l. 18), pns Lev. 25
 thing has dropped out before rins y Luke 10,34.) The emendation peems to be correct (contrast Tar ad luc.). (6) has in Lev. 13,30-37; 14,5t өpaûoua, for which it would be better to read
 simate fonsurans and tinea sycosis. - 1'. H.]
 glosses. [Cf. below, note on 31,16.
(22) (2) can hardly denote hecop or shatch up and fut upon (TOS'), but it may mean
 'to kindle, to light," aył.ri' : mexitot 'lamp, candlestick, torch' (see Jolens Hop.
 is this meaning unsuitable in 6,27 and Is, 30,14. In 4 52,7 inn must be derived from תan (cf. Williausin, Shizzen und lorarbeiten, part 6, p. 175; so, too, Grätz, Comm.). Jerome in his Psalterium juxta /Jebratos renders tertebit to
 бє1 $\sigma \in$ (= $=$ anạ!). Nor does post 13iblical inn (Aram. אnn) mean scharren, sehturen (Dalman's Iforferbuch s. v.). Assyr, whth, which Brown-Driver-Briggs' Lexicon compares, has no comection with this stem, but corresponds to Arab.
 murri DeL, $11 \mathrm{~W} 295^{\text {b }}$ below, i.hti NEE 51,9 , tavtii 'overthrow.' - I'. H.]
(27) Instead of the meaningless $\boldsymbol{\square}$ IA Del., Dis., Btck., following Ex. 18, 18; yet both the masculine plur. and the paraltelism make this reading somewhat dubious. Frank., following © (see jo above 1.47) reads
 Keilsihriftforsthung, vol, 2, p. 260 DEL., $11 \mathrm{~W} 24 \mathrm{o}^{2}$. - I'. H.]
 Bickell, Frank. with v. $8^{\mathbf{a}}$, where we should have then to read, with Bick.,

(S) It p; Frank., Tor; " (for haze atilt thou farc in the end \&c.), but the follow-
 hemistich of the first line, except $\rho$, is lost.
 stucken [sic!], which is supposed to mean like golde'n grazings on carced figtores of silver; 'Yov: Likic grazed work of gold and cared work of silier (scil. just as indelible). But what are goldent Gravüren or golden graitings? And are those 10 engraved on stones more easily effiaced?
[1.UTHER's rendering Güldene Apfel in silbermen Sehalen (AV, apples of grohd in fictures of siteer) cannot be justified, but is certainly better than the translations suggested by modern commentators. I believe that fll nryme is a cor-
 Jucl. 9,48. There may lave been even a collective noun retty Gezreetir so that we might read gov natua. Also e§ xits appears to mean branch, rod; the l'ael 73 to whif may be denominative. (P. S. - I have since noticed that HIJz.








However that may be, so much seems to me certain that we have here a
 p. $36,1.30$ ), ziz. an allusion to the Semitic prototype of the golden fruit of the
 translation of Fizekicl, p. $155,1.9$ ) and the description of the garden of the gods 30 in the Babylonian Nimrod Epic (ed. Haupt, p. 63, ll. 48-51), where the trees of the gods (i¢̧e sa ilini) bear pearls (sandu; see my article $11 \%$ lag das Paradies? in L'ber Land whal IMeer, 1894/95, No. 15) as fruit (inbu), the branches (runhatu) hanging full of them, pleasant to the sight (ant dargati tabbat; Gen. 3,6 kin man


 of lapis lazuli ¡uknt; see Johns Hopkins L'nizersity' Circulars, July 'o4, p. 1u'; the fruit it bore was beantiful to behold amat amari fa' afs; of. DrL., HW" $566^{3}$.

 Like apples of grold on braniles of silacer is a worl spoken in due seieson.

It is a legendary reminiscence just as we speak of the Golden Age, the Philosopher's stone, the Iloly Grail, \&c. Contrast Z.1T 21, So. - 1'. 11.)


(13) Al בw: a superfluous element in the verse, and is probably only an addition to the comparison completely expressed in the preceding two clauses.

(16) [ ${ }^{\circ}$ is not a secondary formation derived from ${ }^{7}$ TE but ${ }^{\circ}$ ? - is a compound of 2 and 4 (cf. $e, g$ Lev, 25,26). Syr. ors means both enowsh and alreaty, just as


26 earthenware（olo，es），not 10 covering vessels of base metal with silver．－ 1＇．H．］
Al oph so， 100, SO）is usually，but artificially，explained as filecht lips，i．$c$ ． overflowing with assurances of frienelship；read，rather，with lisck．，ごph，follow－









27 （6）Al nา


 renders quite difierently：bul a friomd is saiectie to a man than frugrant aboods
 1．10）．For K゙мMr．＇s rendering it would be better to read with Dis．הin for 20

（10）
Al ally foreign to it；read，with lBCk．，nis and omit hs，which is better both in rlyythm and meaning．
（12）For sll－
（13）For Al ？
 but probably wrongly，as a translation of $\begin{aligned} \text { ang } \\ \text { ），and } \\ 20.16 \text { K゙thib．}\end{aligned}$
（14）［The first hemistich seems too long；and and ane may be scribal expan－ 30 sions．－P．II．］
（15 loo fal of $s$ and 1 if．（ira．hautzech． $75, x$ ），read－ated，with Olshausen．Stade， Bick．，Tos．（For ה！e if note 107 of the paper cited above，p．33．1．43．－I＇．II．


 predirate after a preceding feminine subject is impossible．
［Tos calls all the reading，that have been sugerested for his line，desperate ex． padients．©＇s rendering is imelligible but incorrect．It in possible that the author to of this לew meant to allude to the fact that the North（more accurately North west）＂ind is incleed onld and romgh in winter（if． 25,23 ，but ple：asant and refre hing during the summer months，while the South（or more accurately the
 the summer months，just as mbearable as the sirocen（if．linyoncor R＇s Heb． 45



In sicw of the mumerow elymolegies in J we cin safely believe that the authir of thi，line was conctious of the connection between fon and por need we doubt the fact that $\mathfrak{i}$ ：meant faremahk，propiticus in Hebrew（uf．pros lien． 50 35,18 ）just as in Arabic．Assyr．limnte will is probably a compound of ha immu （f．above，D．51，1．10）＇not righ，inalupicious＇see Beilr．Z．Assyr．1．467）；


26 (2) [In the cunciform incantations we find: J/ey the discase of the herd Assyr. marues ququedi, that is, perhaps, erpsipelers, S\%. Anthonn's firi; sec Z.1 8, 182)
 ZIMML:RN, Busspsulmen, p. IOI; I) La, 1111 ( $50^{2}$ s. ス̈, uñe - I'. 11., s Kethib with Gsd; Qere ib; if. above, p. j2, 1. j.
(5) [ $\mathrm{l}^{\circ}$; may loe a corrective interpolation; if. my note on the corrective interpolations in Eecl. (Johns Hopkins ('niversity Ciraturs, June $1891, \mathrm{p} .11$, n. S) and above, p. $45,1.42 ;$ also 1 . $58,1.6 ; 13.65,1.28$. Tossibly , 8.8 , which interrupts the connection between $v \mathrm{v}, 7$ and 2 , should be inserted after 8 . \& - 1'. I1.]


(7) It 1 , to the they hathe doten since wh? could hardly stand out of pause. Dre., Bick.,



(10) en?y, which is unintelligible at the end of the verse, is to be put, with Bick. and OORT, Em., after ל.
The second 9 ? of ill is probably due to the misplacing of aray; read, with

 ing tail instead of eats is perhaps preferable: if you take a nappish cur by the ears he will hardly be able to bite, but if you take hold of his tait the case is different. - P. 11.
 besides being rhythmically superlluous, or to be attached to the first hemistich, as is done by DrL., Now., Dis., lilck., Kisuli, Wh.1. [It wouk seem to be







 at the end of the first hemistich. ${ }^{x}$ We hase here an intentional paronomasia, cf. I. M. Casanowicz, Patomomasia (linston, 189f), p. 68, No. 291. The preposition $\%$ does not militate against the correctness of the reading $27 \%$ n. In the first place, we may read $\delta 心=520,12$; furthermure, $5 y$ may have the mean-

(18j Some qualification of mbabnez can hardly he disprencel with; bick. supplies mip̌ which, changed into mat, has found its way to the end of the verse. The remowal of nia compels us to adel before all arsin,
(21) Jor fll but the parallelinm is in favor of the Reecised Iext.
(23) [0יدo makes the first hemistich 100 long and shoukd be omited if. above, p. 44 .

 lions is the smooth supertirial copering. Is what is alwaysiockery in distinction from vessels of metal ff. 1.ev. 6,21, nes must refer to the process of alazing 50

## 

a [Ztegzer rematks in his Iranslation of I'roverbs (Ieeipzig, 1791) that ay belongs


28 For ill qe: Dvis., GRÄJz read oy; they regard the 1 as due 10 ditography of the ithat follows.

 Unless we are ready to adopt 1Bick.'s emendation we must omit $\dagger=0$ as an cer planatory gloss to in ( $^{\text {(cf. Neh. 10, 29) ; otherwise the hemistich would be too long. }}$
 points to the same reading. HrTz. takes ตั= ビธ์ ; [so, too OORT, Em.].


 :-T. [The ide: underlying the dual is the dowble life the efey leads. Cf. Sir. 2,12; Prov: 20,10.23; Deut. 25,13 $\mathfrak{i = x i} \mathfrak{i z x}$ (Al', diéers ivetights; sec Glis.-

 cyed, doublie-faced, dowble-handed, double-hearted, double-tongued (German doptretzingig) \&ic. The tan abays do not refer to the good way and the bad way between which the man has to choose (lOV) but to the two parts the efy acts, one secretly, and the other openly, the evil way which he pursues and the gond way which he pretends to follow (so lleeischer in Delitizeh's Comm. and 20 WILDedoer). - P. 11.]
 ever, may be a scribal expansion, suggested by Lev. 25,36; Ez. 18,8.13.17: 22,12. - P. H.]
(10) The unnecessary third hemistich of Al is found also in S $\mathbb{S}$; it exists, too, in $\mathbb{G}, 25$ but there, by the addition of another hemistich, it has been developed into an
 :13:3: The hemistich is doubtless to be struck out as an antifhetic scribal expansion. [Cf. p. 68, 1. 36 and Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 164, 1. 12.
(12) For Al wrni we must read efn! from win =eme 10 imprison, Syr. wan, Arab. 30
 دañ (Hiob, Kiel '91): Kerkere cin ihren Jirotz in der linteracelt. In the cunciform incantatory legend of the Descent of Istar ${ }^{\alpha}$ to Hades (Obv., I. $3^{8}$ ) the sance expression is used: upfissima ( $=$ luphiš + sï; of. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel,
 in our passage is due to partial assimilation of the original a to the following

 Notes on Isaiah, p. $8+1.45$ and Notes on Ezekicl, 11. 67.1 .13 ; cf. $2.14,268$. The form énen: may lave been preferred in orter to distinguish it from $=\frac{\pi}{2}$ fo to
 cis, udiokovtal ăvepurot is quite correct; adiokovtal, however, does not mean
 rapluted , $-\boldsymbol{\omega}$, , 11 is by no means necessary to suppose, with



 14,211 ). $\left.-11 . \mathrm{H}_{\text {. }}\right]$

[^3]27 I would therefore propose，with due reserve，the following restoration of the


 easily have dropped out before ${ }^{\prime} 0$ ，and it is curious that we have in 411 ，instead of two derivatives of $j^{\circ}$ ：th the beginning of the second hemistich，two derivatives of $j=צ$ at the beginning of the first hemistich．

 fil 29 is perhaps to be struck out，following Toy．
（18）［asmn should be pronounced njsn；sec above，p．3f，1．4t．－I＇．I1．］ After تᄏj：we should perhaps add iz，with Distirisick．
（19）Instead of Al a the parallelism would lead us to expect a noun governing


 everywhere else［cf，however，המל，$=0$ ，
 but according to others，ן－9．
 Grït
 reading which was probably due，in the first instance， 10 ש゙M
 （probably to be reat，with Cusixfe，nis＇s， $\operatorname{ta}$ to be tation as a radical on ac－ 25 count of $2 \mathrm{~S} 17,19$ ）is a mistake for some form derived from Fis with the mean－ ing crucible，and that the same word lies behind by＝（notice，before 5 ，as in up 12.7 （cf．WiellhaUsen ad loc．）．On the other hand，Cnmixi：（loc．cif．8，7， pp． 335 f．）reminds us that anan 7 Tha is supported by $\mathscr{G}$ ，except that of read
 artudituv．The word b；；which belongs to the language of the Mishnah， CHEY：f：further holds，is only a variant of enam，and this astain is only atn ex－ ample of the explatnatory addlitions which transcribers delight in．


 in stl as the first consonant of the following word．
Under $4 l l$ נַ
 tures לon before 71.

 of the shaving of the hatir，but of．©us $=$ ges
以 comprising all plants in thwir incipient stare．In Gen．1， 11 x： from the seeds both of こどジ and of $\ddagger$ ．－I＇．I1．］
（27）Al is a gloss on 耳arbtr，and overburdens the hemistich．
For 41 aי！（so， $100,6 \mathbb{U})$ Gr．ïr most suitably conjectures ph！on the analogy of $3 \mathrm{x}, 15$ ．
 Fim．？； 6 has the singular in both hemistichs while Se have the plural．


 mentators read, except that instead of (Ex. 43.8 ) the Qal dently be read, with DAHII:R [contrast Crit. Notes on lsaial, p. 196, 1. 11; note
 (reading לא

(3) For ill 9 ?
 second hemistich: and I have learned the knowled, of the Joty One.
 For $\operatorname{sl}$,
[For the brief hemistichs ise in and 12 ב
tll with 6 , as a gloss from $\mathrm{Jol} 38,5$.
(5) For mike in all probability stood originally; cf. $\Psi 1$ 18,31.
 ciation of apocopated imperfect forms. Even forms like $\operatorname{Fin}$ or $\begin{gathered}\text { tip } \\ \text { are, }\end{gathered}$
 as dissyllabic forms, jiflud \&ic. They are all monosyllables and should be sounded as though they were written 3 ºs is merely an auxiliary vowel as in bore when does not differ in pronunciation
 ing $s$, while the final $n$ is simply a sonant nasal as in linglish fisten, which is 25 not dissyllabic but practically $\underbrace{3}$.id. Cf. Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,294.328.
(8) I believe that $8^{c}$ is a subsecquent addition just as the final hemistich of the chapter, $33^{\text {c }}$, and 8.20 ; but it seems to me that not only $8^{c} .20$, and $33^{\mathrm{c}}$ but also $10.15^{\text {a }} \cdot 17.32$ are out of place and must be relegated to the margin. 1 do not mean to say that $14 \cdot 10.17 \cdot 32$ are glosses, they may be genuine $=\mathfrak{b}$ en, and may 30 have belonged to the collection, but they are not in their proper place in this section of numerical proverbs and should be inserted elsewhere. - I'. H.]

 taken as an exclamation in the Versions: 6 SWtit: p. f64) has Exrovov (koxov

 and the orisinal reading of s may liave been -aos eit li!; the bo we tind before : in the Rieceived Text may be a subseguent insertion; it is hardly probable that the conditionalemporal : (NomD. ${ }^{2}$ ) $25^{\circ}$ is a correction of the to
 which is so frepuent in Assyrian and in Arabic. In a great many cases in Arabic where to is said to be indefinite we bave this emplatic particle, c. s. in cases

 n. 3): see also REECKENuOR1, Die symhact. Virhaltuisse des frabischen, Leyden $1895-1) 8$, plp. $165 \mathbb{N} 425$. The emphatic -map appears in Hebrew in three forms: -




## คึ-

a $\left[\ln 15,23^{\text {b }}\right.$ the ease is different. - 1. 11.]

28 （16）Tov omits Al iיg ats a gloss．［This improves the rhythm．－1．11．］

G＇s reading תixian for \＆isian deserves consideration；it is accepted by Eiv．， Grïlz，Kimbll．，Wildebuer．


 l．AC．，GRäŤ，BiCK．，K゙AMPH，STRACK，WORT，だm，following s and perlatps

（23）For ft rns，whelt gives no meaning in this place and is rhythmically super 10 fluous，read rons．with bick．，th the end of the verse．This reading，it is trac，
 The meaning aftereserids，at lerst（STRACK in his Commentary：schliess／ich） is uncertain；the reading of 1 It scems to be intluenced by dogmatic considera－ tions，to make Corl the speaker（therefore the accentuation Ejse with rim 15


（24）fll $1: 2 \mathrm{z}$（so，too，（5）is rlythmically superfluous and should be struck out， with Dis．，lick．，is a scribal expansion．
 would better suit the paralleliom．

 with IIANDELKERN（oral Communication），yepo in stippirst．

 the parallelism），which could only mean they seck his life（Ex． $4.19 ; 1 \mathrm{~S} 20.3$ ，

 Crit．Notes on Ezekicl，p．9f，1．fo．




（2．1）For אלo of．Jud． $\mathrm{J} 7,2$ ；Lev． 5,1 which must be translated：If a ferson，ins spifi of his the＇ing heard the alduration of the jwitges，sin by nut giering testimuty sithen he is atoitness，so matlier abether he hate seith the thing or onlye heard of it，and thas incor sruild Sie．The apodosis to the four courdinated conditional clatuses begins in 8.6 ，nut in 5.5 ．Cf．the translation in felms／hoptins［＂niversity 40 Coirulurs，July＇ 44 ，p． $114^{\text {a }}$ and contrast B．ixiscll at ber：－I＇．II．］


30 For the section 30－31，9 see Müntab＂s disertation quoted above，p．32，1．1． 45
 Commentarius cel．Zacharias Aufrbach，Bonne，18GG．Sec also E．J．Dillon， The Sciptiis of the（）T I．ondon，18） 5 ）ple．133－156；269—272．
 $17^{b}$ ），or thinker，if．Assyr．csirrie（DeL．，$\ddot{S}$ iW $1 \$^{a}$ ）；the etymology is，of course， 50 very uncertain．－［P．1I．］
For stl א世̛ne w，which probably means the aracle or prophetic ulterance［cf．

 gin the verse with an imperative, Bereare.
 i. e. Terfus /lebrnici IEmendationes quibus in Vefere Testamento Necrlandice aertendo usi sunt A. KUENEK, I. HOOVKaAs, IV. H. Kosters, II. JURT, citidit H. OORT. Lugduni Batavorum, typis E. J. Brill, MCM]; but sec Kösig, Lehrsebathte, vol. 2, p. 245 , note 2.
(8) Ill gikn; but perhaps the 7 is due to ditography (the following verse begins with תng ) and we must read, with Dis., Tos (nll who suffer), "Tm.

(11) For the alliteration in the first hemistich see above, note on 24,1 .
(15) According to Toy ill $\pi$ तa second hemistich.
(16) (
 explanatory addition just as and anh in 25,21 or c.aミk in Eccl, 3,5.- P. 11.]

(21) For the alliteration in this verse sec note on 24,1 .
 droods which, however, (6) takes with v. 22.
(25) Ill phe̛n! perhaps better pnent for the same reasons as in $30,25 \mathrm{ff}$. Cf. above, p. 68, 1. 26.
(27) Kelhib nisjon is transcriptional error for nishn; so Qeeke.



 ma in Aral), Allihtumma see (rit. Notes on Numbers, p. f\$, 1. 45) (f. also . Iral). hatumma, Heb. Ehn; see also WRtGHT1): (ionsf: ${ }^{2} 2,3+3$, I. 10 .

In Fizek. 19,2, on the other hathd, the it atter onexi seems to correspond to the . Issyr. ma' 'thus, as follows,' intruducing nratio directa (cf. I)el., Ass. Gir.
 begins with Fax like the second allegory in $\therefore$. 10 .

The matter deserves further investigation.
 of. above, p. 52, 1. 11 and below, p. $86,1.28$; ; otherwise we should have no apodisis.
(15) Cf. Cheine, P'sis. 23,143 - I'. 11.]
 only
(17) For al nipe (cf. Glis.Kiautzsch \$ 24, e:) we should perhaps read, with likank., Tor, following (5, ת3! ! cf. 23, $22^{\mathrm{b}}$.

(20) Wioth the sulbect-matter and the prosaic form of this werse prove it to be a later addition [ff. above, p. 67, 1. 28]; so Dathe, 111 /\%, Dbl., Franki.nifekg. 20
(24) [Omission of oren in the second hemistich would improve the thythm; it is probably a gloss on Exara. Ookr, Fim. reads arane. - J'. H.]
 plained as indicating facts known by experience; according to könıg, syht. $\$ 369, f$ the emphatic copulative connection may be used instead of other colirdi- 25 mating conjunctions. But we should probably point iav! \&cc. as simple motus rei repetitie, just as we have the simple impf. in a negative clause in $\mathfrak{r} .30$.
 unv, שarn (so, too, OORT, lim.
(29) The first hemistich would gain by omitting rañ. - I'. H.]




(33) The third clause of $1: 33$ may be the complement to a lost hemistich; but it is 35 probably nothing but scribat expansion added by some one who felt called upon to append a moral. [Cf. p. 65. 1. 29; p. 62, 1. 8. - 1'. 11.]

 is is probably due to homorotilenton of [The second 9 , however, is better

(3) Instead of the curious Frop of the whould perhaps read, with Des., Kamphe,

For at nint Gesenius conjectured nmb? (so also Del., Wild., Strack, Tor,
 き1 (1)
 mically superfluous and evidently only a dittogram of the words which follow, 50 with the addition of 4 למול.
The evident gap after axims should probably be filled with hist or some such


After 24,22 111 and $\mathbb{G}$ differ also in the arrangement of the text: after the Collection of Aphurisms in 22,17-24,22 (6) has the first half of the Sayings of Agur benlakels (30,1-14), preceded lyy five proverbs not found in al (see below; p. S2, 1. 32); then follows the conclusion of c. 24, z'iz. vv. $23 \cdot 34$, contatining the
 after comes the second half of the Sidings of Agur ben-fokele (30,15-33), containing the I'semerical Proserbs (see above, p. 67, 1. 32) and followed by the Sirliugs of lemuel in $31, \mathrm{~J}-9$.

In the final chapters 2531 the arrangement is practically the same in both recensions except that, as stated above (11. 2.6), the . bilingrs of Agme atht l.cmuel 10 (30-31,9) precede in (6) cc. $25-29$, the first section (30,1-14) being inserted between $v .22$ and 23 of c. 24 , and the final section $(30,15-31,9)$ after the last verse of c. 24: thus ce. 25-29 are inserted, in (5, between w. 9 and to of c. 31; and the section 24,23-34 (0.52nל-6אe 2 ) is interposed between wr. if and 15 of c. 30. This arrangement of (6) $\mathbf{2 2}, 17-24,22 ; 30,1-14 ; 24,23-34 ; 30,15-33 ; 31,1-9 ; 15$ 25-29; 31, 10-31) is manifestly inferior to that of $\mathbf{1 1}$. - $\mathrm{J}^{\prime} .11$.

I (7) Fetween $7^{a}$ and $7^{b}$ of 4 two additional hemistichs are inserted in ( $6:-$

The first of these is derived from $\psi 110$ (Ill 111), 10 , where, alsn, it is preceded by äpx $\quad$ oopias qóßos Kupiou; the other is evidently a second translation of $7^{2}$ (so, too, "Or).
$\qquad$ of


Instead of $12^{b} \mathfrak{G}$ reads кui üpumev aủtoù tinv uvinup Ex Yク̂s, which is probably
 It may be a substitute for some illegible passage in the Hebrew original (so Lac.) ; of. Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. So, 1.6; p. S6, 1.15; p. 138, 1. 28; p. 152, 1. 3, \&c.
(14) In $\mathbb{C}$ it ${ }^{6}$ hat a double translation:-


The first and freer rendering is to be regarled, with J $\mathrm{J} G$., LAG., and liaumg., as the original; the second is lacking in Cod. 23 of HOLMES and l'arsocis.


 nothing but an explanatory glass to the precerling Onouupizouau Eautoís kaxi.
 the door of the mishty, which is evidently derived from 8,3 where $\pi$ rapi rap to


 sequently added and connected by means of $\bar{\eta}$. Aecording to L.iG., this fourth clause $27^{d}$ was rather a second translation of $27^{a}$ кai wes riv àpikntat upîv üpvew 45 oópußos, which was moved down here because a parallel was retuired for $27^{\circ}$.

 is, without doubt, a correction of the second and more original one, which pre 50 supposes as Hebrew original: המבּ reading ox ' 2 in $3^{\text {a }}$ which is attested by $\mathbb{}$.


## Appendix

## (cis) ces

Ftdoitional Eince and Itemisticfos
found in the
SEpruagintal Verston of the Book

and

## Eines wanting in that @ersion.

1HE SEPTUAGINTAL VERSION of the Book of Proverbs conains a number of arem and hemistichs not found in the received IIcbrew text (cf. 1,7.14.18.21.27;2,2.19.21;3,15.16.22.2S;4,10. 27; $5,3.23 ; 6,8.11 .25 ; 7,1 ; 8,21 ; 9,6.10 .12 .18 ; 10,4 ; 11,16 ;$ 12, 11.13.26; 13.9.11.13.15; 14, 22; 15, 1.18; 16,1-3.5.17.26.30; $17,5.6 .21 ; 18,22 ; 19,7 ; 22,8.9 .14 ; 24,22 ; 25,10.20 ; 26,11 ; 27,20.21$; $28,10.17 ; 29,25$. On the other liand, a number of hemistichs of 11 , are not represented in ( $6\left(c f .7,25 ; 8,29 ; 11,3^{b} \cdot 4 \cdot 10^{a} \cdot 11^{b} ; 13,6\right.$; $15,31 ; 16,1-3 ; 18,23-19,2 ; 20,14-19 ; 21,5.1 S ; 23,23 ; 25,9)$, and it is impossible to attribute all the clauses wanting in ( 5 to subsequent seribal 10 expansions of the IIcbrew text. Some of the additional proverbs in $\mathbb{G}$, however, may be mere idriants or iersional doublets cf. 1, 14.27; 2,2.19.21; 3,15; 4, 10; 5,$23 ; 6,25 ; 9.6 ; 14,22 ; 15,1,18 ; 22,8.9 ; 28,17 ; 27,7.25$ ) or illustratiou quetutions (if. 1,7;3,16.28;9,12;12,11;13,13;26,11) and explanatory slussis (if. 1,$18 ; 4,27 ; 13,15 ; 22,14$ ) or corroctiace interpolations (cf. 4,$27 ; 7,1$ and $\mathfrak{6}$; 15 omission of $11,3^{\text {b }} .4$; sec also above, p. 62, I. 6) which afterwards erept foom the margin into the text; others may have been found by the Greek translators, as subsequent expansions of Hebrew scribes, in their Egypuian recension of the llebrew text ( $i f .7,1 ; 8,21 ; 9,12.18 ; 10,4 ; 12,11.13 ; 13,13$; $16,1-3.17 ; 17,5.21 ; 19,7 ; 22,11.14 ; 24,22 ; 25,10.20 ; 27,20.21$ ); but we can 20 hardly suppose that all of the additional lines in (5 are based on a Ifebrew original (cf. 4,$27 ; 5,3 ; 6, S .11 ; 14,23 ; 17,6$ ). The cases in which $(5$ seems to have preserved some Ehew which formed part of the orjginal Hebrew text of $_{\text {whe }}$ the Book of Iroverbs (cf. 11,$16 ; 27,20.21$ ) are exceptional. Some of the additional proverbs of 6 are not given in 3. A Hebrew version of the additinnal 25 lines found in 6 is appended to FR, Ňz Detir rzsCh's commentary on Das salomoniscke Sfruilhbuch (Leipzig, 1873) pp. j43-547.
and on P. 543 he renders more literally:-

According to Ewald (Spriache Salomo's ${ }^{2}$, p. 94) the Hebrew text read as


We doubt, however, whether these two verses are derived from a II cbrew original: the first contains a gloss on $21127^{2}$ in which right ant left is interpreted cthically and made to apply to the right and to the crooked ways: the second, on the other hand, is a dogmatic correction ( $c f$. above, p. 70, 1. 16) of 1 II 26 where man is commanded to remore his fool from cril, and consequently looked upon as capable of molding ariglat his own ways. Laci.s suggestion deserves consideration that it was a Greck speaking Christian who, having in mind the much discussed doctrine of the täo sityls, lirst adeled these words.

 freely expanded in order 10 bridge the chasm between v.v. 2 and 3 of 11.
 which is probably the original rendering, takes $=$ in the sense among and $\mathbf{~} 20$ rete as paraplirase of a personal adjective, dissolute ( $c f$. GES. KAltTZSCH, §152, u). The second, kai evidently substituted for the original oüras in order to obtain a better connection) $\dot{a} \pi \dot{u} \lambda \in T 0$ di ¿ippooúvıv, is a later correction which was subsequently inserted after $23^{\circ}$.
$\qquad$

6 (8) After $\because .8$ (if has a long addition which may perhaps be rivided, with SwETE,





Or. so to the hec, I and liom heai diligent she is, I amd herie mobly she does ber auork. I Kimgs amd prophe use her labers for thior hedth, I amd acith all she is 35
 cutuse she honors zeisdemm. "There can be no question of a llebrew original for this addition ( $111 \% \%$ LAM., 'FOV). It originated with some Cireck who thought that the bee was at least as well suited as the ant to be an example of diligence and prudence; but to the Ilebrew oly such at vew of the bee, as batMo. righty to points out, is quite firreign.
(11) After a somewlat arbitrary translation of this verse 6 adds:-


Allil atoml atill disert the like at bat rummer.

These words are evidently in antithesis $10 \%$, 11 of fl , but in all probability were balanced against ( 5 in its present form. It is therefore useless, with L.Ac. and others, to labor orer a supposed llebrew original and its possible orjein. The reference to harvest is derived from v .8 , and the comparion of it in a riblily 50 streaming fountain may lave been suggested by such passages as . Imos 5, 24.

 Prov.
 Hebrew original. Tos's judgment (p. j1 of his Commentary) is correct: .- "This is not a scribal heterogram of the particular words of 41 , but an independent, allegorizing reading of the sclools. The next section also is taken as a description of moral folly and is introluced by the words víz, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ к. т. $\lambda_{\text {." }}$


 translation must again be considered, with Lati, against BAUMG.), to be a correction of the second and someshat strange rendering. The variant úto Eviau- 10 TūV $こ$. hats probably arisen under the intluence of 3,2 (so TOs), although (f) there

(21) In (5) we find two translation; of this verse. One, rentering it xplotoi Eoovtat
 and (along with the other form), in Compl., Ald. This is regarded by l.AG. and BACMG. as the more original. The second rendering, ötl eubeis kataokrviooova
 appears to show the hand of an Alcxandrian reviser.
 aủtท̂ oủdév movnpưv (read, with JïG., GR.itE, BIUMG., roontóv) and €ưYvwotós Eotiv Tâoıv toîs érrizovoiv aủty̆. The latter would probably run in Hebrew היהּ these two hemistichs, but in reversed order, represent the original translation, while $15^{\text {a.d }}$ is the work of a reviser.



IItho frops himself on lies hurnts the awind．I he fursues fluttering bisits； 11 for

 whl he srathers awith his hands wnfiwitfulwess．According to Ew．p．12j）the

：

DeL．，on the other hand，rendered it：－





Here，ton，the possibility of a Hebrew originat cannot be denied．In form and content these verses have real life and weisht．But they are certainly not the original scepuel of 111 v .12 ．They appear to have been adeled（perhaps as an illustrative quotation by a later sage in order to warn the disciples of that true 20 wisdom，which springs from the fear of Juhn（if．vi 10），to kecp aloof from false and lying wisclon（above all，probably；from heathen philosophy），which promises satisfaction but brings only sad disappointment．
（18）（5）adds four double hemistichs：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ïva modèv Zท̇ouls xpóvov. }
\end{aligned}
$$



 abide thens far I athat from a stramge fountain drink net，Ithat much time tho＇s materst liä＇e and that jears of life maty be added to thee．The llebrew original sun accordings to EW．p．126）：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { :ロาวม ローロ }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$






1）1．1．renders（p．543：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ・ビッだロフゴッに゙に } \\
& \text { : }
\end{aligned}
$$

＇The last line agrees exactly＇with lill．＇s translation．
That these lines are based on a llehrew original must be admittal．Hut they so are certainly the addition of some one who missed an express statement of hem dangerous the counsel of Folly in $x .17$ must be，Advice is therefore first gisen in four hemistichs how the danger of being led astrity by the adulteress mity be

 which subsequently pushed its way into the text, is later and more exact.

7 (1) lietweon vy. 1 and 2 ( 5 adds:-víe, tipu tòv Kúplov kui ioxúvels,


This verse has undenialdy a Itebrew flavor, and EW: held that ito original

He was inclined to insert this after i: 3 on account of its breaking the conncection to so badly between w. I and 2. More probably this verse is a protest on the part of some reater, Hebrew or Cireck, against the overemphasis upon a human command ats opposed to the fear of God which shoutd alone be considered.
(25). The second hemistich in this werse, which is lacking in © $\mathbb{V}$, is supplied by ofs.as
 Cond. Syr He:whl., p. 576.


If I decture to woun awhtht tukes placic from dey to day,
This may he based on at lebrew original. According to EWatn (p. 122) it
 while Drat. (p. 543) renders it:-
liut it is certainly only an addition for the purpose of facilitating the transition from the section "hich described ta kat) ipuépur fivéneva ( $1 \times, 1-21$ ) th that on tà é uī̃vos (IV. 22ff.); so baumiatiner.

 tos uútoú is derised from $\theta$.

9 (6) Grenders vo © $\mathrm{G}^{4}$ imodeinete depooivny reading ns with all other Versions, and

 Bualdeiuv). The further addition kai intijoutt ppóvnouv athd seck after insigight maty be explained on the supposition that to the above free rendering, as so often, a correction кui zinđete was added. From this arose by error intioute, and dien the necessary object was added in the form of eppoivnow. This hypothesis "ould secm to be simpler than Tag.'s that pporvotv, originally a ghoss to to ouveouv in the thirth hemistich, had come to stand after zijotet and that bijoete had then, for the sake of sense, been clianged by a reviser to Znfioute.

 zie) cannot be regarded as a second, and still lens, with Lab.., Bat'agg, as the fis anthentic translation of all wh $^{\text {b }}$. It is rather the gloss of some transcriber for whom all wisclom and knowledge of Goll was comprised in the stuly and knowledge of the Law.
(12) Between wr: 12 and 13 fridds: -


12 (26) Afterv. $26^{a}$ (6N Sc. (but not $\left(\sigma^{v}\right)$ add: -
 Lag. sees in this, no doubt rightly, the original translation of $v .10^{b}$. Then
 onfétar кakd. That this hemistich comes from $13,21^{2}$ is certified by the fact 5 that in $\mathbb{T}^{5}$ and some minuscules $13,21^{\circ}$ is further added.

I3 (6) The omission of this verse in (6v can only be accidental, fid \&e. read dokatoouvn
 hemistich bere takes gana erroncously ats subject; nevertheless it may be the 10 work of the firse translator (so l.A(j.).
(9) After this rerse (5AV (? after $\because$ 13) add:-

For the scond homistich cf., with l, AG., $\psi 37(\mathbb{\sigma} 36), 21^{b}:-\delta$ dé ठiкatos oik- 15 Tєipet кai hìoî. Ew. j). 14S) translates this addition:-


1) LL. rcudcrs:- : :

A connection with $1 \times .9$ or 10 cannot be estiblished, Tor remarks, "The couplet is not improbably a combination of glosses.
 evidently only a misplaced variant to $9^{\text {a }}$ (sec albove), fullowing $\psi 112$ ( $(6111$ ), 5 :-

(13) After $\because .13$ (5) add three hemistichs:vị̂ bodiụ oủsév ěozal araoóv.


 and DEL.:- :
The content suggests 17,2 (Ew), and a llebrew original is very probable. Tor 30 says, "This is apparently a scribal addition, titken, perhaps, from some current collcction of proverbs.
 word the addlition in 9,10 . The addition here is intended to explain what is meant by oúveass dra日ij in $15^{3}$.

14 (22) Ali MSS offer a double translation. F̈̈rst, it younger:mגavínevol tektaivovoı каксi,



which cat be recognized again as the older by its deviating further from sll. In this second case the translator probably read:-

## לא:

Can we regard this as the original text, or is it merely due to dittograply of 45 תew ten? The latter vicw is the more probable one, unkes gex yen were arbitrarily supplicel from the second hemistich in order to provide an object for 197. On the other hamd, "mant may possibly be original (ef. above, p. 47, 1. 42).

 to : Christian who had in mimel Luke 16,19-31: 10, 42. For Ev Evieiç Ladr. conjectured Ev doúvy; it may hate come from the lost second hemistich mansb).


9 best escaped, and thercafter (perhap)s by amother hand, atmsitive admonition is added on the model of $5,15 \%$, sterengthened with the promise of 9,11 .

Io (4) Nfter 10,4 (hut in Cod. 23 of $11.1^{\prime}$ and in some minuscules before the addition


A weill trancil son will be avise, athel the fool aill he use as a serviant. According to EW, the llcbrew original ran perhaps as follows:-

The connection of this hem with v .4 is loose, but it probably hat at llebrew iu original which was adeled by some transcriber on the margin.

II (3) V'V. $3^{b}$ and $p$ are lacking in ( $\sigma_{\text {; }}$ in their place $v, 10^{b}$ is inserted (Järi, LAAB.):
 fure $v .5$ ) from O. Since Ill npes, according to the parallelism, secms to mean 15 alms (so l.ar:.) the omission of $v .4$ may be regardect, with IteIDExif. and B.aUmi, as a protest against the doctrine of merit from good wotks; if. above, p. 41, 1. 36.
(1.) For the omission of $w, 10^{3}$ and $11^{b}$ in $\left(60^{b}\right.$ was inserted in the place of F . 4 : see above I. (3) and the filling of the gat from $O$, if. abose p. It, ilt. fiff.
( 16 ) The plus in of between $1016^{a}$ and ${ }^{\text {b }}$ has been atecepted in our text; see $p .9,20$ II. 39 and $4 t$ and if. p. $4 t$ II. 50 If. B.AUsti., however, explatins it as an aldition by the translator who, not recognizing the parallelism between $16^{a}$ and ${ }^{b}$ in $5 l l$, tried to help it out. 'Tov alsn doubts the originality of (f)s text on the ground that throne is used nowhere clse of a person. In this, however, he has not taken account of $15.22,23(722 \times 02)$ which was probably in the mind of the author of $16^{\text {b.c. }} 25$


3 renders this liturally, gui sumeis cst in aंini demusafionibus, in sus manitioni. lus relinguit conftomelium. . lecording to Ew. (p. 1\&1) the Hebrew orisinal was 30 perhaps:- $\quad$ -
DEt. ( 1 . 54 ) renders:- : :
The strangeness of the lireck expressions point to a llebren original, $i$. $c^{2}$. to an illustrative puotation on the margin of the $\$ 15$ from which the Greck wis translated. This was not, however, an exemplifying gloss on vi. $11^{\text {b }}$ but stood in some 35 relation or other to $\because .12$. listasg. rightly tinds it notels orthy that èv wxpetureoiv occurs again in $\vee: 12^{b}$, and DeL. is cortainly on the right track in presuppos-
 an attempt to restore 1.12 in 17 after it had become illegible ams unintelligible (c. above, p. 71, I. 28), or is simply a gloss caused by 7ise, we cannot vomure fo to decide.
(13) Nfterv. 13 (6 athls:- " ß

According to Eill. (p. 143 the llebrew original was:-

 tivill deliater souls. liut the rendering of Ex日diчet by bys is vesy arbitrory, and we should rather expect an antithesis. Det., 's rendering is certainly befter, whels runs:-

 gards tes (crushes himsel ) as possible in place of exs. "The proverb is most probably based on a llebrew original, but how it came into its present context is inexplicable.

1）EL．＇s rentering of the three last abeng is：－

| ！ワコニ • <br>  <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

［For tras preferable sec above，p．44，I．16．－P．II．］
（17）After $17^{\text {a }}$（5 addls three hemistichs：－


 alhd way＇s of rightcousness bring lung life． Ihe aho accopls chastisement aill be happy． and he ritho heeds ribukes reill bicume wise．
Ew．regarded this as the original text，out of which the present text was shorten－ 15 ed by $17^{\text {bec d being dropped becatse the combination of the first and the last hemi－}}$ stichs（ $17^{2}$ and ${ }^{c}$ ）formed a suitable．That the intersening lines in（ 5 are based on a llebrew original can hardly be doubted．Del．raised the objection against their genuineness in the present context that all the ideas in the additional hemistichs hat already occurred，but this argument would apply to many passages $=$ in Ill．A more salid objection might be found in the fact that we have in of a double translation of $\$ 117^{\text {b }}$ ．Consequently $\mathbb{W}^{\prime}$ s arrangement of $\mathfrak{i}: 17$ in three double hemistichs coukd only be made when the double tramslation of $17^{6}$ was already in existence；otherwise one hemistich would have been lacking．Ac－ cording to Ew．（p．167）the Hebrew original of（117 b．c．d was：－

## 



The original translation of $17^{6}$ was，as LAli，recognized，the hemistich standing

 preceding，more exact translation certainly read originally oé before 甲utcoofe， but this had to be struck out when the theree preceding hemisticls had been in－ sericd after $17^{3}$ so that 0 equdioqet came to stand at the beginning of the first hemistich of a bem（Bauske）．

 be regarded as the translation of $\boldsymbol{n}$ ．According to Lati，the following hemistich
 the first translator，＂who，in the fishion of a midrash，developed statement and contradiction out of the hemistich．＂But there is no contradiction in the exact sense in this case；besides，the same translator，after having read ion for ther in $26^{\text {b }}$ ，could not read in＇s in $26^{c}$ ．This third lacmistich can，therefore，only be the gloss of some one who intended to give a more exact translation of $26^{\mathrm{b}}$ ， based on the reading ise．
 belonged，it may be supposed，th v． $27^{3}$ ，where it was superseded by．opuoget

 In this case the adlition of an antithesis after the fashion of a midrashl is con－ ceciable（see above， 1. fo），and it may even，perhap，have stood already in the Hebrew text of the tramblator（atcording to DEL．$=$ En！

15 （1）＇The beginning of this verse in（ 5 ，úprì émódnuatv кui qpovipous，is，in reality，a
 （Jä́j．）．Deforzscif，on the other hand，presupposes as the 11 ebrew original：－



 to have been the original reading．The younger and more exact version，which


[^4]（18）Df the two translations in（5）of this verse the first，by its greater exactness，slaows itself to be the younger whel was subsequently addel by at reviser．The second


transposes the two hemistichs．B．aval：hold．that this was done lirst lyy a 15 clumsy compiler：but if this conjecture were correct this verse would have a


（31）This verse was originally lacking in（ 5 ，but a reason for its omission camot be discovercel．In Cod． 23 of $11-1$＇and in a number of minuscules it is inserted ac－ 20 cording to the rendering of the other Gireck translators：－oüs áкойov EXÉrxous


16 （1）In place of the first three verses of this chapter（f）reads in some MSS after


Then in all MSS：－
 oi 万é ủбє
Finally after $v . j$（which lomever，accorling to LAC．，is a subsequent addition 30 in（ 5, put together from $11,20^{2}$ and $21^{a}$ ）：




The srater thou art．the more to thon humble thyself；
then sidl thou find srace before Jht 1 ．
All the works of the humbile are ofen liefore bed． hut the sodless aivill ferish on ant e＇eil duly．
The hesinning of the srave ixtel is the doinse of that whith is risht；to this is befler pleasins to God then shatesherings of sacrifices．
He ahe sectes JII＇H，will jind knomeledge and justice， athd they aho seek Him＂prishtly，aivill find pictie．
The substitution for $\mathbf{I l} 16,1-3.5$ of four entirely different orew was evidently due to the confusion which must have existed in the II brew text from which of was translated．In 6 these verses are arranged ats follows（but with several variations in different MSS：$-15,27 ; 16,6 ; 15,28 ; 16,7 ; 15,29 ; 16,8.9: 15,30$ ： 32，33；then the two first of the above arte；then 16,5 ant thereafter the two other ゴל゙と．Nevertheless we cannot doubt that these four abevo are basel on a Hebrew original，though it may have been somewhat younger than \＄1 16，1－3． 50 According to EW：this Hebrew text may have run as follows：－



The first hes forms an independent whole which no doubt goes back to a Ilcbrew original. Ew.'s restoration of that original (p. 183) runs:-

DEL.'s rendering probably comes nearer the original text:-
: ザ
5
The second hee is very difficult, and the above translation is only an attempt. The text is evidently very corrupt. Only one thing seems certain, namely that the last hemistich is intended to correspond to the superfluous third hemistich
 ed. Sut the principal difficulty lies in the fact that this last hemistich contains io neither a sequel nor an antithesis to the preceding, probably owing to the corruption of the latter. EW. (p. 184) conjectured that the original ratn:-

Jhe abho has too many fitinds has much riti;
and he riblo purswes atoords will not be sazed.
i. c., the atho pursues the emptry ziords of hyporritiond firints. I3ut this interpretation is artificial and forced in the highest degrec. Nor is Del.'s restoration, proposed on p. 14 of the introduction to his Commentary, any better:-

STe ribho is the friend of many will he reathrdid with erit;
le whe pursues atords abill not he saied.
On p. 307 of Dri..'s Commentary this last hemistich is explained to mean that courting the friendship of as many as possible is a pursuit of words which mean nothing and lead to nothing. On p. 545 DreL. gives as a literal translation of the


20 (14) $11^{\prime \prime} .14-19$ are lateking in ( 6 ; in Cod. 23 of II-P and some minuscules (ef. above, p. $80,1.41$ ) they are added from $\Theta$. The omission of these verses is probably due to the insertion of $\mathrm{vt}, 20-22$ in ( 6 after 1.9 (so Tov).

21 (5) V. 5 is lacking in (t) for no apparent reason; the addition in Cod. 23 of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P}$ and 6 minuscules is taken again from $\Theta$ (cf. above, I. 28).
 doúvetros (alii doúvetos or $\pi$ (ugavopos), which corresponds exactly to At , is according to Lag. due to a later hand.

22 (6) $V \cdot G, \wedge^{(5,}$ is added again from $\theta$ in Cod .23 of $\mathrm{H}-1$ ' and some minuscules.
(8) After v. $8(6$ adds two hemistichs:-


40
The first hemistich is a more exact (and therefore probably later) though not entircly literal translation of $v, 9^{a}, i, e_{0}$, a doublet of the freer translation which follows. The second hemistich, on the other hand, is a doublet of the translation of $v . S^{b}$, the only difierence being that the translator read, and rendered by
 which, however, is unknown to the OT; B.aUstc. Hought that it was לã, which is graphically dificult; EW, was probably right in supposing trat it was אeme fof Y 25 (il 26), \& Sc.
(9) After v. 9 (5) again has two idditional hemistichs:-


The first hemistich, according to Ew. (p. 201), ran in the original: : pho jnd /Ic atho gizes gifls, gatins honor and gloy: DEL. (p. 354) presupposed Prov.

17 （6）After v． 6 （fv \＆ec．（in（6n \＆c．after v．4）：adds this double hemistich：－
 toû dè ámíatou oủdè ¿ßo久ós．
To the fuithfut betongs the whhole werld of treasures： lut to the mifaithfut not an obolos．
Lag．considers this distich to be a transformation of $v .7$ ；it was read：－

and in translating it the order of the hemistichs was inverted．But this hypo－ thesis is so artilicial that it has rightly met with no acceptance．It is another question whether this verse ever had a Hebrew original．Vin．（p．171）thought it to

לאיש אמונים בל חקכניח הון ולוחַב נפּש איץ נֵרה:

DEL．，on the other hand，rendered：－

But both translations cover up the strangeness of the expression $\delta$ kúvroç tûv 15
 kiel，p．85，I．39．－1＇．11．］，while DeL．arbitrarily inverts nomen megens and nomen rictum．Tos may，be right in maintaining that the form is Greck．A reason for the addition cannot be discorered，unless it be that motd re－nccurs in 5.7 ．
 ingr this antithesis to $21^{1}$ ，our opinion is the same as in the case of the addition to 17,5 （sec above p．79，1．52．In Hebrew this hemistich would run：－

וй（cf．10，1）．
18 （8）Instead of v． 8 （6）has，as Jäg．recognized，a variant to the translation of $\mathbf{3 9}, 15.25$ The thought is akin to that of $\mathrm{Al} 18,9$ but not to 18,9 in（5）．The anticipation of 19,15 in this passalge is，therefore，just as inexplicable as the omission of 18,8 ： this latter verse joins well to 18,7 and can hardly be a later addition．
（22）After V .22 （6）adds the following double hemistich：－

He whe casts off a good wife casts off good． and he who refains an whultivess is foolish and godless．
Lag．rightly considers this $\operatorname{ta}$ be a transformation of $\mathrm{r}, 22$ ，which was added to the Hebrew text．מצא אצ＇ה． word－play שוציא；and，as Tof temarks，b is the natural anti－ thesis．Quite uncalled for is Ew．＇s hypothesis that this verse was added by a later hand in order to reduce the apparently too great praise of wives．Dis．． recngnized that the glossator was led by $A l$ ，nevertheless he trans－ lated：－
（23ff．）VV．18，23－19，2 are lacking in（5；in Cod． 23 of 11 －1）and some minuscules they have been added from $\Theta$ ．

19 （7）After vi．7a．b（6）adds twn ロיל：ー
àvíp Dé q̧óvíuos єúpígei aùtinv．
Gead consideation is near to those arho understand it，（or，who care for it；cf．
Gen．39，6）； 1 and an intelligent man will find it． 1 He who atorks much cizl， 50
finally consummates crit，I and he who irritates to s＇olent roonds（or rather，irri－
tutes arith atords，following，with DEI．．．，BaUatg．，the reading of（5）Compl，Aórors） suitl mot escape．
 tenth, point to a licbrew original, which is restored by Del., beginning from the third hemistich, as follows:-

> תרב לשון מלך ולא בשׁ
> א

But the last line here says the opposite of the Greck text; we should probably


In his Jahothïcher fïr Bibl. Wiss., 11 (1863) pp. 18 ff., Ew. regarded these verses as an original element in l'roverbs, adding a retranslation into Hebrew; but in the second edition of his Salomonische .ichriffen (Göttingen, 1867) there is not a word about them, so he seems to have himself given up all belief in their originality. Certainly, both the structure, with its lack of exact parallelism or clean cut antithesis, and the thought, with its wild and in part absurd exaggerations in the sixth hemistich, are at variance with the spirit of the Hebrew Book of Proverbs. Baumg. finds additional arguments atgainst the originality of this section in the prolix development of the same thought and in the fact that these verses are omitted in the other V'ersions.

25 (9) The omission of $9^{2}$ in $(6$ is to be explained by homarotelcuten: the translator passed over from at the end of 1.8 to at end of $\because .9$.
(10) (5) adds after $10^{\mathrm{b}}$, The hostitity amd chmity to thee zivill het fass matar, four


Xipıs xal pıגía e $\lambda \in \cup \theta \in \rho о i ̄$, ų̧ tingnoov ofautụ̂, ïve $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ध́roveiodatos révn,
 but will be to thec like unto death.
Fatior and friendship make free;
preserve them for thyself, that thou mayest not incur mproathes.
Guard thy' athy's rather, cusy of interiourse.
Ew. thinks from the bad Greek of these verses that they have been translated from Ilebrew; but attempts no retranslation. According to DeL. the original ran as follows:- : :
 אך
(20) After v. 20 (6) atds this hen:-



It can hardly be doubted that this $\begin{gathered}\text { en based on a } 11 \text { ebrew original, though }\end{gathered}$ it mas have been added later on account of its affinity in thought with $r$. 20.


 Sir. 4,21 (in Sir., however, these lines are joined to $v .20$ with Eotiv Ydp): -

Ëotiv ulaxúvn emúrovoa úpaptiav,
There is a shame which brings sin, and there is a shame ewhich leads to honor and fiater.
 transtation of $\mathrm{E} .1 \mathrm{I}^{\text {b }}$ ；liaumic，on the uther hand，thinks it is a gloss to 18,16 ． Following Horz，the second hemistich has been generally regarded at a variant transtation of $\mathrm{I}, 19$（חק）י quers the sout of hime rotho recitioes the gift Ew．）；it can only mean but（ $\mu$ evtot） it smatches atery the life of its possessor（0 wrongly takes wha ats a real plural； see，however，above，P．3ł，I．31）．In 1，19 this is at once plain，for there the secking of illegal gain is the gramuatical subject；アウン refers to him who is guily of this striving after unjust lucre．In this passacie，on the other hand，it must refer to him who seeks to give bribes and thes endangers his life，ziz．，if he is caught by a just judge．It cannot refer to him who receives bribes；cf．above， 1：w．＇s translation p． $81,1.52$ ）and 3 animam aution aufort accipicntirm．It canno be denied that this interpretation is somewhat artificial；nevertheless it is far more probable than to supply；with Del．，as subject to dqaıpeitce，civectousness in op－ position to munificence．
（11）For the hemistich missing in $\mathfrak{A l}$ after $\mathbb{R} .11^{\text {a }}$ of．above， $\mathrm{p} .54,11.44 \mathrm{ff}$ ．
（14）After v．it all texts of © read the following addtition：－
tiđiv ódoi xakui èvímıov ùvopós，
 ätoatpéqeiv dé deĩ ùmó iboû okoגıâ̧ kai xaxîs．
There are eail tutys before a mun｜and he hatis to turn from them；I but from a crooked and eat a＇dy one ought 10 turn．Form and thought show that we have here no verse but a prosaic gloss（to v．14？）．Nevertheless it is probable， especially on account of eviumov ávopós，that the gloss lay before to in a llebrew garb．According to Del．the IIcbrew original ran：－

23 （23）V． 23 is lacking in（ 5 ．Its originality，at least in the present context，is certainly dubious，since it breaks the connection between wr． 22 and 23 ff．In（f）Compl．\＆e． this verse is added as usually from $\theta$ ．
24 （22）After $\because .22$（ 5 adds several hemistichs，ten to eleven in number according as the
 Dexóuevos dè èdéato aùtóv．




 oủv veúposs ùvepúrtaus ávaRíake，


каі бurkaíєı $\ddot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \in \rho$ phós，

A son whth tieips the word of God arill be hept from destrution． $\ldots . . . . . . .$. ．（beyond translation）．
fil no tongrue shall a lie be suid to the king．
and no manner of lie shall puss his tongrue．
The king＇s tonsue is a swourd and not of jlesh，
atd whower is giaten oicr to it will be shatferad．
For when his armath is violently e．citict，
it consumes men and their sincues．
And graates in pieces thic bones of men． and burns them up as weith fire， so that they are uncatuble for young cagles．

29 (7) © translates $\Omega 17^{\mathbf{L}}$ wice Jag.): the second translation kui $\pi$ тwxû oùx úmépxel voûs érirvejuwv and a legerar has no juditious understanding presupposes eng in the beginning for 11 y . 'This change, however, must not be considered, with J $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{s}$, as a transcriptional error, but, with LaG., as an intentional alteration (cf. above, 1 . 70, I. 16). It is an example of the frequent playing with texts on the formula, licad net this but that, and does not involve any real textual variant. W'e may therefore pass over Baunti.'s remark that min may be a misunderstanding of the abbreviation (רש ance with the translator's usual method rather than the first.
(25) The third and fourth hemistichs in (5:
aóßera ảvopi סiswoıv o甲ci入ur,

are evidently a parallel to $\mathrm{v}, 5^{\text {an.b }}$ :



According to Lagarde both translations are by the first translator who, after having joined $25^{\text {a }}$ to $25^{\text {b }}$, translated the whole $v .25$ a second time. But it is difficult to see what led him to do anything of the kind. It is much more natural to suppose that the object of the second translation, i, $c$. (6) $2 j$ c.d, was a more exact rendering of Ill. Lag. himself admits that défela is intended to render 20



26 In the recently found 11 ebrew fragments of Sir. these words run as follows:-

Scmechter and Thyiok, The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Cambrilge, 18og), print on
 crossed out and not simply marked ats itilendum by a superimposed dot (if. Crit. Notes on the I'salms, p. 80, !. 33). This x is, of course, nothing but a transcrip. tional error due to the $x$ in the following ת. I would therefore read simply ב. The two dots above the שind $^{2}$ a in the original are placed a little more toward the Ifft; they represent, of course, the Ebin of the initial $y$ and the diacritical point of the $\because$ (contrast Ges. K゙autzsch, $\$ 8, g$ ). Both dots as well as the to hiso under the were added by a later hand to avoid all possible misunderstanding. Schecuther and Tavlor tramslate this on p. xiiii:-

> For there is a stame (.) that ludeth arith iniquity; and there is a shame that is honor and grace.

 fem. part. Hif. of News to pronounce (cf. Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 57, I. 8) for
 on the Text ( p .41 ) Schechter and Taylor remark on תxeme: "The dot indicates that the Ietuer is to be canceled. For jat ias, of. $\psi 84,12$." Cf. also R ressfle in 20 Theod. Studich und Krritiken, 1900, p. 375. We cannot explain why this quotation was introduced in this passage; Tov suggests that it may be due to a Christian scribe.

27 (20) After Y .20 , and in very loose connection with it, © 6 alds:-
ßóduypa Kupíu atnpizwv ópөaגıóv, каi ol àmaiठєutot áкратєís rגüбøŋ̆.
The who starcs arith his eye is an abomination to /mont: and fools are of imprudent tongue.
FN. (p. 235) and Del.. agrce in retranslating (cf. 16, 30): -

Here and in r. 21, if anywhere, we may have some original lines of l'roverbs Which have been lost in 111 .


The heart of the suicked seeks crit:
but ant honest heart secks after Rnoouledtre.
Ew, (p, 236 ) retranslates these lines as follows:-

while Delitzsen renders:-

On the probable genuineness of this cf. above on $\sqrt{6} .20$ (1.32).
 p. 65, I1. 25 ff. So much is certain that this hemistich is not "a third corruption + of ill $10^{\circ "}$ but an expansion of $x, 10^{c}$ into a bew, which may be ceen original.
(17) After v. 17 (5) adds a variant of 29,17 and $18^{3}$. But the difference between the third hemistich in the addition here $\left(28,17^{\circ}\right)$ and $29,18^{2}$ is so great that it is doubtful whether they are renderings of the same original. In (6) $28,17^{c}$ runs


 not away" as a liader for godliss prople.
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## дdocenda.

PP. IL. CC. VV:
[Add:-].D. Michatels, Sescartin der Consomantin sontohl als der
 Text sorvizogen hat oder gheich schutzet in Newe orientalische und elegetische libhothek, 1'art 7. pp. 168 ff. - I'. H.]
32,26 ( 1,1 ) On the strophic division of the l'rologue to l'roverbs of. the wiews of D. H. Mieleer in his. Strophenbeld in dion Protertion (Vienna, 1971) Pp, if ff. Ile divides $\mathbf{~}, 8-19$ into a two line introduction and two five line stanzas, substituting for from $10^{c}$. It is true that $x=i$ not stated to what end the sinners try to mislead us. This warning is not introduced before the beginning of the second stanza (iv. $1 \bar{y} \mathrm{ffi}$ ).

Shid., pp. 4 ff. c. 5 is divided into three seven line stanzas and 15 one final three line stanza, the introduction ( $\mathbf{v}$, 1.2) being considered a part of the first stanza.

Ibid., pp. vii fi. c. 8 is divided into three double stanzas and one final single stanza, each of five lines. To wbtain this he omits v. 11 (as the gloss of a reader from 3,14 f.), $13^{2}$ (so, ton, Breklelf.), 20
 $32^{\mathrm{b}}$, then $34^{\mathrm{b} . \mathrm{c}}$ \&c.
33.13 ( 6) [Contrast my paper The fiegrinning of the Lathlonian . Wimerot Epric in vol. 22 of the Jourmal of the Amerrian (1)rintal .Socief (New Hawen, 1901).
to ( S) Cf. Dubsis conmentary on Jeremiah (Tübingen, 1901) p. 365
35,22 ( 2,7 ) Sce 1)r. K. J. Grams's paper on aiph in 38,21 ( 5,18 ) Cf. p. 75, I. 36. J. 10 S 22.
 Dr. K. J. Grman's dissertation Jiuphemistic Liturgital Appendives 30

62, 16 ( 26,8 ) Geo. Brek in his revicw of Tov's Commentary on Proverbs (Theow.
 Maprapitns poall for All ata the who honors a fool is like a man who mixes up pearls with stones). 11e raises the question whether 35 нaprapitns is not a Semitic loanword.
48 (23) The Syriac term lor litharge is Le:iew. - I. II.j
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[^5]
[^0]:    Eנח 1088 （2）
    

[^1]:    

[^2]:    

[^3]:    4-
    a [Cf. the reference in Sugfrifn-Stade's 1.exicon, p. 1Sqb, above.
    B. In Scurader's kils 6,1, p. Sz uffiss is translated freat her, but this rendering is marked as doubtful. - P. II.]

    Prov.

[^4]:    кирпоi dé ùneßûv ủmolouvtal．

[^5]:    
    ¿ l'rofessor A. Kuenen who had agreed to do the Book died xii, 10 ' 91 .

