

Destruction' we get *City of Mercy*, or more accurately, *City of Kindliness*.

The first hand of **N** wrote

ΠΟΛΙΣΑΕΔΗΛΙΟΥΚΑΙΚΑΗΘΗCΕΤΑΙΗΜΙΑΠΟΛΙC

Here *ἡλίον* has been imported from Symmachus, and instead of ΕΚ we have ΚΑΙ, evidently an expansion of Κ. Now of all the corruptions in the LXX none is commoner than the misreading of transliterations, and I venture to suggest that the κ at the end of *ασεδ[ε]κ* is intrusive, derived from the initial κ of *κληθήσεται* written twice over. Thus for instance in 4 Reg. xxiii 36 *πῶρ π* is rendered ΕΚΚΡΟΥΜΑ in B instead of *ἐκ Πυρά*. Similarly in Micah vii 20 *δώσει εἰς ἀλήθειαν* (A B Q) is a mere mistake for *δώσει ἀλήθειαν* (lat. vt. and Lucian).

The process of corruption thus suggested is that an original ΠΟΛΙCΑΕCΕΔΚΑΗΘΗCΕΤΑΙ became ΠΟΛΙCΑΕCΕΔΚΚΑΗΘΗCΕΤΑΙ, which was then read either *πόλις ασεδεκ κληθήσεται* (as in the ordinary texts), or *πόλις ασεδ και κληθήσεται* (as in the ancestor of **N**). No Old Latin text of any value is here extant.

As to the meaning, *Civitas Pietatis* is exactly the name which is wanted. In Hebrew *hesed* is 'kindliness,' the virtue that knits society together, as Robertson Smith has said. In Hosea vi 6 it is co-ordinated with the true knowledge of the God of Israel, as opposed to sacrifice and burnt-offerings. According to Isaiah xvi 5 the Davidic kingdom is established in this 'kindliness': here, where it is prophesied that Egypt also shall be Jahwe's people, it is eminently appropriate that one of the Egyptian cities should acquire a name which so pointedly describes the new covenant of 'mercy' upon which they were about to enter.

2. ON S. EPHRAIM'S QUOTATION OF MATT. xxi 3.

IN preparing the Prolegomena to my forthcoming edition of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* I have had occasion to go over the Gospel quotations of S. Ephraim. In doing so I have come across a point so illuminating that it seems to me worth separate publication.

The most useful collection of S. Ephraim's quotations is still that drawn up by Dr. Woods for his article on the subject in *Studia Biblica* iii, pp. 120-138. It is true that this table does not include the works given in Dr. Lamy's volumes or those published at Oxford in 1865 by Overbeck. Still it has that greatest merit of scholarly work—it can be used and supplemented with ease even by those who do not adopt the conclusions of the author.

The point to which I wish to draw attention concerns the allusion to our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. It occurs in the unabridged Com-

MS at all ; it was simply added *de suo* by the editor (Pohlmann, p. 52), while for the last two words the MS actually has (Pohlmann, p. 54)

ܡܬܢܝܢ ܕܡܬܢܝܢ

in exact accordance with the Curetonian of Matt. xxi 3! The translation therefore of S. Ephraim's reference should run

'For He said that if they say to you "Why are ye loosing that colt?" say to them that for their Lord they are required.'

So disappears one of the most notable agreements of S. Ephraim with the Syriac Vulgate against the 'Old Syriac.' I confess that I am unconvinced that what we call the N. T. Peshitta was in existence in S. Ephraim's day, and I believe that we owe both its production and its victorious reception to the organizing energy of the great Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 411-435 A.D.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE WISDOM OF BEN SIRA.

OF the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus more than half is now extant in fragments of four manuscripts, which we shall call A, B, C, D.

A.

Two pairs of leaves of the MS A were edited in the volume entitled *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Camb. 1899), which was reviewed in the first number of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Two fresh leaves of A, belonging to and edited by Mr. Elkan Nathan Adler, have now been published in No. 47 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (April, 1900), with a preface beginning thus :

'Among the numerous fragments from the Cairo Genizah which I brought away with me in January, 1896, and which I have since acquired, I have discovered a portion of the famous Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus, and hasten to publish the text and translation with facsimiles. The requisite critical appendix and notes must follow, but the case containing the fragment was only opened on March 7 last, and the precious fragment itself identified two days later. This consists of a pair of leaves from the same MS as Messrs. Taylor and Schechter's MS A, and supplies the hiatus in their edition. One other leaf of this same MS has been quite recently discovered by M. Israël Lévi in Paris, containing chapter xxxvi 24 to xxxviii 1, and affording a valuable means of comparison of the two MSS A and B.'

The said Paris fragment being certainly, as Mr. Adler now sees, part of a different MS D, the leaves which we have of A contain only chapters