

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

JONAH.

II. 3. me] *om M* clamoris mei] clamorem meum *M* exaudisti vocem meam] vocem meam exaudisti *M* 4. altitudinem] altitudine *M* circumierunt] circumdederunt *M* turbulenta] excelsa *M* 5. forsitam apponam] forsitan non adiciam *M* in] ad *M* 6. aqua mihi] *tr M* circuiuit] circumdedit *M* me] + pelagus cooperuit caput meum *M* postremo] novissime *M* fissuras] fixuras *M* 7. et 1° *om M* terram] terra *M* vectes] serae *M* et ascendat *ad fin. com.*] et ascendat de corruptione vita mea ad te Dominum Deum meum *M* 8. in hoc quod] in eo dum *M* a me] *om M* dñi] + Dei *M* memoratus] commemoratus *M* veniat ad te] veniet *M* in 2° ad *M* 9. suam] tuam *M* 10. cum] in *M* supplico] sacrificabo *M* quaecumque *ad fin. com.*] reddam quod vovi sacrificium salvatori meo Domino *M*

HABAKKUK.

II. 4. autem] + meus *Bodl* mea] *om Bodl* vivit] vivet semper *Bodl* III. 2 extimui] timui *M* Consideravi] *pr* Domine *M* excidi mente] expavi *M* duorum] duum *M* 3. textit] operuit *Bodl M* laudis] laudationis *Bodl* laude *M* 4. splendor eius ut lux erit] fulgor illius quasi lumen erit *M* erunt] sunt *M* et illic constabilita est] illi confirmata est *M* constituet dilectionem validam] posuit claritatem firmam *M* 5. praecedet] exivit *M* secundum greges suos] pedes eius *M* 6. defluerunt] fluxerunt *M* quassati sunt montes] dissoluti sunt mentes *M* liquefacti sunt] defluerunt *M* 9. dirumpetur] scindetur *M* 10. videbunt *ad fin. com.*] videbunt gentes et dolebunt populi aspergens aquas contradictionis dedit abyssus vocem suam ab altitudine phantasiae suae *M* 11. constitit] steterunt *M* suo ordine] *tr M* in lucem *ad fin. com.*] in lumine splendoris iacula tua ibunt in luce coruscationis armatura tua *M* 12. In comminatione tua *ad fin. com.*] indignatione tua exterminabis terram et in furore tuo duces gentes *M* 13. populi tui] plebis tuae *M* ad] ut *M* faciendos] facias *M* Christos tuos] electos tuos *M* 15. Imposuisti] misisti *M* 17. ficus] *pr* quoniam *M* adferet] afferet *M* fructum] fructus *M* cibum] cibos *M* a pabulo] ab esca *M* in praecipibus] ad praesepia *M* 18. exultabo] gloriabor *M*

THE PESHITTA VERSION OF 2 KINGS.

IN two books, entitled respectively *An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version* (Cambridge, 1897) and *The Peshitta Psalter, edited with an Apparatus Criticus* (Cambridge, 1904), I began an investigation into the relation of the printed texts of the Old Testament Peshitta to the original authorities as far as they were accessible to me. The results obtained were somewhat different in the two cases. In the books of Chronicles, the Bible printed at Urmi by the American missionaries in 1852 (cited below as *U*) proved to be substantially no better than the Bible printed in London by Samuel Lee in 1823 (cited below as *L*). It was otherwise with the Psalter. The American text of the Psalms is superior to Lee's, whatever early authorities, Nestorian or Jacobite, be taken as a standard

of excellence. Even judged as a Jacobite text, Lee's is bad; the posthumous work of the great Dutchman van Erpe (Erpenius) given to the world in 1625 is a far better representative of the Western text.

The inferiority of the text of Chronicles in *U* admits of an easy explanation. The Nestorians did not receive Chronicles into their Canon, and MSS containing this book were wanting at Urmi. The Americans therefore took Chronicles (together with Ezra and Nehemiah, I believe) from some printed text, Lee's or the Polyglot, and reissued it with a few corrections of small importance. The Nestorian MS at Berlin, 'Sachau 90', which contains 1, 2, 3 Maccabees, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, &c., written in the seventeenth century, is doubtless derived ultimately from Jacobite ancestors.

The fact, however, that the quality of the text of *U* varies so greatly from the Psalter to the Books of Chronicles raises our curiosity as to the quality of the text in other books, and though *L* was found wanting in both cases, it is interesting to learn whether more or less trust is to be given to it in other parts of the Old Testament. No doubt the edition of the Peshitta which is promised by two German scholars, Drs Brockelmann and Jacob, will one day satisfy our enquiries, but in the meantime it may be worth while to record the results of a partial and tentative examination of the text of 2 Kings. The choice of this book was made independently of critical reasons connected with the Syriac Old Testament.

The three following MSS have been used for the present enquiry:—

(a) The Codex Ambrosianus, published in facsimile by Dr Ceriani, Milan, 1876–1883 (cited as 'A'). 6th or 7th century.

(b) The Buchanan Bible (Camb. Univ. Library, Oo. i. 1, 2, cited here as 'B'). Jacobite, 12th century.

(c) Camb. Univ. Library, Add. 1964. Nestorian, 13th century (cited as 'N').

It may be remarked that though both A and B are Jacobite, there is good reason for believing that they are independent authorities. Certainly B varies from A considerably both in the Psalter and in Chronicles. In 2 Kings the headings used in the two MSS differ from one another; so ii 1; 18; xiii 13.

I have also used the Scholia of Barhebraeus (ed. A. Morgenstern, Berlin, 1895, cited as 'bH'), and the Homilies of Aphrahat (ed. W. Wright, London, 1869). The Syro-Hexaplar (\mathfrak{S}) and the Massoretic Hebrew (\mathfrak{H}) are also compared. In the case of \mathfrak{S} some discrimination is needed, and I have sometimes stated its testimony within brackets as doubtful. Where the general wording of a verse differs considerably between \mathfrak{S} and the Peshitta, it is very difficult to decide whether

coincidence in a single word, or even in a short clause, is significant, unless the expression in question is an unusual one.

Perhaps the most important result of a comparison of the printed text or texts with the three MSS enumerated above lies in the relatively large number of places in which the text of *LU*, or at least of *L*, agrees with \mathfrak{H} , often with $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{S}$, where the MSS on the contrary shew disagreement. Plainly the later MSS on which *L* (and to a certain extent *U* also) depends have been corrupted from \mathfrak{S} , or in some cases from \mathfrak{H} through some other channel than \mathfrak{S} . The following passages should be consulted: (a) cases in which *L* agrees with \mathfrak{H} or with $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{S}$, though codices ABN disagree; ii 14; [iii 7 *ter*]; iii 21; iv 5; iv 39; vi 12 *bis*; 23; [cf. vii 6 سلا فحا]; viii 2; 14; 29 (order of the words); ix 25 *bis*; 26; 34; x 4; 9; [16]; 24; 31; 33. (b) cases in which *LU* agree with \mathfrak{H} or with $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{S}$, though codices ABN disagree: [i 3; ii 14]; iii 7; 17; iv 4; . . . x 14; &c.

The cases in which *L* differs from \mathfrak{H} and also from ABN are very few; vi 15 is perhaps a very late corruption.

The most curious reading (implying perhaps the influence of some Midrash) I have found occurs in iv 4 where, according to codd. ABN, Elisha says to the widow, *Pour into all these vessels water*. True, the collocation מאכלה מכלה arouses the suspicion that the words are an instance of dittography, but the turn is quite Midrashic. The new reading, *and there was not anything in the cauldron* (iv 41), puts quite a different complexion on the narrative. It is possible that the translators of the Peshitta regarded vv. 38-41 not as the account of a separate miracle but simply as the introduction to the account of the miracle given in vv. 42-44.

The following collations are not intended to be complete, even for 2 Kings i-xiii; they are meant to be merely illustrative.

- i 2. מכלה מכלה *L* = B
 מכלה מכלה (ut Jud. iii 23) *U* = AN \mathfrak{S}
3. מכלה [מכלה] *LU* \mathfrak{H}
 מכלה ABN
9. מכלה *L* = BN
 מכלה *U* = A \mathfrak{H}
- ii 1. מכלה *LU* = B
 pr. מכלה מכלה AN
 מכלה *L*
 מכלה *U* = ABN \mathfrak{S}
8. מכלה מכלה *LU* [מכלה מכלה] \mathfrak{S}
 מכלה מכלה ABN

- 5. $\text{سلا} L \text{ ٢٥}$
pr. $\text{حلا} U = \text{ABN}$
- 6. $\text{سلا} (sine\ add) L \text{ ٢٥} [\text{سلا} \text{ ٥}]$
add $\text{حلا} U = \text{ABN}$
- 8. $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABN} \text{ ٢}$
- 10. $\text{لام} (sine\ add) L \text{ ٢}$
add $\text{حلا} U = \text{ABN} [\text{سلا} \text{ ٥}]$
- 22. $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABN}$
- 24. $\text{لا} LU = \text{BN} \text{ ٥}$
 $\text{لا} A$
- 27. $\text{لا} (sine\ add) LU \text{ ٢٥}$
add $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢}$ ABN
 $\text{لا} LU = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢} \text{ Aph}^{128}$
- 29. $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABN} \text{ ٥}$
- 31. $\text{لا} L = \text{Brid} \text{ ٢}$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{AN}$
 $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} [U\ om.\ \text{٥}] = \text{ABN}$
- 32. $\text{لا} L [N \text{ ٢} \text{ sup ras}]$ [n. l. B]
add $\text{لا} U = A \text{ ٢}$
- 39. $\text{لا} L \text{ ٢}$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABridN} \text{ ٥}$
- 41. $\text{لا} [م] LU \text{ ٢} [\text{لا} \text{ ٥}]$
om. $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢} \text{ ABN}$
- 42. $\text{لا} LU = \text{BN} \text{ ٢}$
 $\text{لا} A \text{ ٥}$

- v 3. $\text{لا} LU \text{ ٥}$
 $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢} \text{ ABN}$
 $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABN}$
- 6. $\text{لا} L [U \text{ ٥}] [\text{لا} = U]$
 $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢} \text{ ABN}$
- 7. $\text{لا} L$
 $\text{لا} U = \text{ABN} \text{ bh}$
- 11. $\text{لا} LU$
 $\text{لا} \text{ ٥} \text{ ٢} \text{ ABN}$

13. $\text{L} [\text{\$ cum ast.}]$
 $U = \text{ABN}$
 L
 $U = \text{ABN}$
 (sine add) LU
 add ABN
14. LU $[\text{\$}]$
 om. ABN
17. L
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
 (sine add) LU
 add ABN
21. L
 $U = \text{ABN}$
23. L
 $U = \text{ABN}$
 LU
 ABN bh
24. LU
 ABN bh
 L
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
25. L (2^0)
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
26. (sine add) LU
 add ABN
 L
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
- vi i. (sine add) L $[\text{\$}]$
 add $U = \text{ABN}$
3. L
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
12. L $[\text{\$}]$
 $U = \text{ABN}$
 (sine add) L $[\text{\$}]$
 add $U = \text{ABN}$
 (sine add) L
 add $U = \text{ABN}$
 $L [U]$ $[\text{\$}]$
 $\text{AB}[N]$

15. $\text{poo} L$
 $\text{poo} U = \text{ABN } \text{קס}$
17. $\text{חטאת} (1^{\text{mo}}) LU \text{ק}$
 add חטאת ; $\text{ABN } \text{bH } \text{ס}$
18. $\text{אשׁו} L = \text{A } \text{קס}$
 $\text{אשׁו} U = \text{BN}$
 $\text{אשׁו} L$
 $\text{אשׁו} U = \text{ABN } \text{bH } \text{ס}$
20. $\text{אל} L$ [n. l. B]
 $\text{אל} U = \text{AN } \text{ס}$
23. $\text{לחם} L$
 $\text{לחם} U = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{לחם} L \text{קס}$
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
29. $\text{חמה} L [\text{ס}]$
 $\text{חמה} U = \text{ABN}$
32. $\text{אפלה} LU = \text{ABN } [\text{קס}]$
 $\text{אפלה} \text{א} \text{Aph}^{\text{1st}}$
- vii 1. $\text{חמה} L$
 $\text{חמה} U = \text{ABN } \text{bH}$
2. $\text{חם} L$
 $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN } \text{bH}^{\text{od}}$
4. $\text{חם} L$
 om. $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN}$
5. $\text{חם} (2^{\text{do}}) L \text{ק} [\text{ס } \text{חם?}]$
 om. $U = \text{ABN}$
6. $\text{חם} . . \text{חם} L \text{ק}$
 tr. verba $U = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{חם} [\text{ס}] L \text{ס}$
 $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{חם} . . \text{חם} L [\text{קס}]$
 tr. verba $U = \text{ABN}$
8. $\text{חם} LU \text{ק} [\text{ס } \text{חם}]$
 $\text{חם} \text{א} \text{ABN}$
9. $\text{חם} L$
 $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN}$
10. $\text{חם} L$
 $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN } \text{ק}$
11. $\text{חם} L$
 $\text{חם} U = \text{ABN } [\text{ק } \text{q. v.}]$

12. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
13. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
14. $\text{حجج} L [U]$ $\text{حجج} [cf. \text{س}]$
 om. حجج ABN
15. $\text{حجج} L$
 tr. subst. $U = \text{ABN}$
16. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
17. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
18. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
19. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
20. $\text{حجج} LU$ $\text{حجج} [\text{س cum ast.}]$
 om. حجج ABN
- viii 2. $\text{حجج} L$ $\text{حجج} [\text{س}]$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
6. $\text{حجج} LU$ حجج
 $\text{حجج} (\text{sine } \text{حجج}) \text{ ABN}$
 $\text{حجج} LU$
 pr. حجج ABN
7. $\text{حجج} L$
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
8. $\text{حجج} L$
 tr. verba $U = \text{ABN}$
9. $\text{حجج} L$
 tr. verba $U = \text{ABN}$
14. $\text{حجج} (2^{\text{do}}) L$ حجج
 pr. $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN}$
15. $\text{حجج} (\text{sine add}) LU$ حجج
 add حجج ABN bH
 $\text{حجج} L$ حجج
 $\text{حجج} U = \text{ABN bH}$

- x 1. $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ (sine add) $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$
 add $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
 $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ [sine add]
 om. ABN
- 2. L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 4. $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ (sine add) $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$
 add $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$
 L (sine add) $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ [$\text{U} \text{L}$]
 add $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 5. $\text{L} = \text{A}$
 $\text{U} = \text{BN}$
 L [U]
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$ (sine o)
- 6. L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 9. $\text{L} \text{ABN}$
 om. $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 10. L
 ABN [$\text{U} \text{L}$]
- 11. L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 14. $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ [U] [L]
 om. ABN
- 16. L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
 L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 17. $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$ [L]
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
 L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
 L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 18. L
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
- 19. $\text{L} \text{U} \text{ABN}$
 tr. verba $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$
 L (per errorem)
 $\text{U} = \text{ABN}$

20. $\text{ממל מלה } L$
 $\text{חמלה ממל } U = ABN$
22. $\text{מחמל... חמל } LU$
 om. ABN
24. $\text{ממ } L$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{מח (sine add) } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN$
25. $\text{חמל } LU \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } ABN$
 $\text{מח (sine add) } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§ cum obel.]}$
27. $\text{חמל } L$
 $\text{חמ } U = ABN$
29. $\text{מח } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } U = ABN$
31. $\text{מח } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§]}$
33. $\text{חמ } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{מח } U = A[B]N \text{ } \text{[§ cum B]}$
 $\text{חמ } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{מח } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§ cum obel.]}$
- xi 2. $\text{חמ } LU \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } ABN$
4. $\text{מח } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{מח (sine add) } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 add $\text{חמ } U = ABN$
8. $\text{חמ } LU = N \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } A$ [n. l. B]
12. $\text{חמ } LU$
 $\text{חמ } ABN$
 $\text{חמ } L \text{ } \text{[§]}$
 $\text{חמ } U = [A \text{ } \text{[§]}]BN$
14. $\text{מח } LU$
 om. $\text{מח } ABN$
 $\text{מח } L$
 $\text{מח } U = ABN$

16. $L = N$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = AB$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
17. LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁 (sine add)
 add ABN 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
 LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁 [𐤅]
 om. ABN
 L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁 [𐤅]
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
18. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
19. $L = N$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = AB$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
- xii 4 L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
10. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁 (sine add)
 add $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
11. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
12. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $[U] = AB$ [N om. .]
13. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
14. LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 ABN (tantum) 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
18. LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 om. ABN 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $LU = AN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 B 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
21. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ bH 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 ABN 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 LU 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 ABN 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
- xiii 2. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁
 $U = ABN$ 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁
5. L 𐤅𐤀𐤁𐤁 [𐤅 q. v.]
 tr. verba $U = ABN$
6. $L = A$
 $U = BN$

7. $\text{حَمْد} \circ LU \text{ ܡܘܨ}$ $\text{حَمْد} \circ ABN$ 21. (fin.) $\text{حَمْد} \text{ ܡܘܨ} L = B$ [deest $U = N$ $\text{ܡܘܨ} \text{ ܡܘܨ} A$

In conclusion I may perhaps call attention to the fact that an interesting Lucianic (perhaps Midrashic) reading of ii 14 is found in the Syro-Hexaplar:—‘And he took the cloak of Elijah which fell upon him and smote the waters *and they were not divided*, and he said, Where is the LORD the God of Elijah, $\delta\phi\phi\acute{o}$? And he smote the waters, *and they were divided hither and thither*, and Elisha went over.’ The words in italics are found also in some texts of the Latin Vulgate.

W. EMERY BARNES.

RHYTHM IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

In the first edition of his *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (§ 82, 3) Professor Blass remarked on the occurrence of fragments of verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. So frequent are they that he was disposed to think that they were not the result of pure accident. Since that edition appeared he has discovered a rhythmical principle which runs through the whole Epistle. This principle is described in the second edition of his *Grammatik* as follows. ‘If the fragments of verse’, he says, ‘are not purely fortuitous, at any rate they are not the essential point. This consists rather in a mutual assimilation of beginnings and endings of sentences and clauses running through this Epistle. Ending may correspond to ending and beginning to beginning, also ending to beginning, especially if contiguous. Rhythm of this kind must have been taught in the rhetorical schools of Greece and Rome of the time, and the author of this Epistle must have passed through such a school.’ To take a single instance, in the opening sentence we have a clause ending with $(\text{πατρά})\sigma\iota\nu \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ followed by a clause ending with $(\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta)\sigma\epsilon\nu \ \eta\ \mu\acute{\iota}\nu \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \nu\acute{\iota}\omega$, i. e. twice $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, the omission of the definite article before $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega$ being due to metrical considerations. The subject has been worked out in detail by Professor Blass elsewhere¹.

In view of the many points of resemblance, especially in matters

¹ In *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, 1902, pp. 420–61, ‘Die rhythmische Komposition des Hebräerbriefes’, where a striking illustration from Cicero is quoted. Cf. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1898, Bd. II, Anhang II, über die Geschichte des rhythmischen Satzschlusses.