are not exact reproductionti, but in some cance are free, and in others reflect a text already corrnpt.

An interesting problem arises in in. g. where 11. (i. S. and Talmand diogree. St translates the verse twice, $x$. $\$$ and $r$. 10 , and agrees with Tralmul : $\because, 7$ (a) in S . is a variant of Talmud (a):





Il has romet imes aditions that hate corrupted the text, e.g. in xi. Io col, a verse that contradiets the preceding one. xi. 29
 ニ̈̈, N. II.. humble, oppress:

In eonchision, we maty ay that white II. comain- ome of the remainn of an original text, it has lecome oo cormpt that for furposes of eriticiom it hat little value in addition to that of the versions. In most instance where the versions have become cormpt or reflect a cormpt origimal. Il gives ne no help. The many lacmate in 11 . have been filked be translations from the versoms. I memdations have been made on the hasis of the versions. Tlie maryinal motes are often the readings of equally eorrupt texts: e.g. (p) the relations of B , and C . The text repreents ant attempted restoration of the original on the basis of some fathey remains and the versions

The text beeane cormpt becanse of the negleet which it sufferd during the carlier years of its existence. It was not meluded in the Conom, and (levi ii. p. sl.) it was prohibited by the doctors of the Tahmut. Subserpently it grew into general favor. The latin Volgate calls it licelesiasticus-the look par excellence for chureh reading. The fact that our fragments were found in the (ienifah of Cairo.- a saered depository of half-worn texts, shows the extecm in which the book was held in hater days. We are mot mrprised, the efore, that great efforts were mate wamend the negleet of the past and to restore the criginal by all meath posible.

