STUDIES IN BEN SIRA.

THE discovery of so much of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus as is now in our hands necessitates and affords ample material for a revision of the modern translations of the book, which are based upon defective and discrepant Greek, Syriac, and other Versions. But the Hebrew as we have it is not free from clerical errors: in places it can be read only with difficulty, or not at all: and even where the text is good, and " he may run that readeth it," the meaning of the writer is for one reason or other not always immediately discoverable.

In the following short studies of a few more or less obscure passages in the Hebrew use is made of the five publications—(1) Dr. Schechter's edition in the *Expositor* (1896) of the Lewis-Gibson folio of Ecclesiasticus discovered by him on May 13, 1896; (2) The Oxford edition by Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer of this and nine following leaves subsequently found in the Bodleian Library (1897); (3) *Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (1897) from the *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* by Dr. Rudolf Smend; (4) *Das neu gefundene hebräische Stück des Sirach* (1897) by Dr. A. Schlatter, Professor in Berlin, from the *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*; (5) Dr. Schechter's article GENIZAH SPECIMENS, *Ecclesiasticus*, in this volume (pp. 197–206).

I. *Job* xiii. 28 *and Ecclesiasticus* xliii. 20.

To begin with a verse in which the reading is clear but has been thought to be corrupt. The rendering of Ecclus. xliii. 20 in the Oxford edition is as follows, except that the four clauses there make two lines in double columns, the clauses in the second column not commencing with capital letters :—

" The cold of the northwind he causeth to blow,
And congealeth his spring (marg. *the pond*) like rotten-
ness (?).
Over every standing water he spreadeth a crust,
And a pond putteth on as it were a breastplate."

The difficulty is in the second clause, which (with מקוה in the margin for מקורו) runs thus in the Hebrew :—

וכרקב יקפיא מקורו :

On this Dr. Smend has the foot-note, " וקרח für וכרקב (? Nöld. nach Gr.) und מְקֹרוֹ (Nöld.) oder vielleicht besser וכרקיע und מקוה Wellh.-Bacher."

Dr. Schlatter, substituting *cheth, lamed* for *resh, qof*, reads כחלב *as milk*, and gives the rendering, " Die Kälte des Nordwinds lässt er wehn, und lässt wie Milch die Quelle gerinnen," quoting in support of it Job x. 10, " Hast thou not poured me out *like milk*, and *curdled* me like cheese ? " and rendering the word for " curdle " (the anti-thesis of *pour*) by " lässt gerinnen."

A better solution is suggested by Job xiii. 28 (Sept.) ὁ παλαιοῦται ἴσα ἀσκῷ ἢ ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον, where ἀσκῷ is for רקב (A.V. & R.V. *a rotten thing*), in the sense *leather bottle*. This is a sense of the Targumic רוקבא (Syr. רקבא as in Job l. c.), on which see Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, s.v. רקב (1) ; and it gives a parallelism which is illustrated by the story of the Gibeonites, who went to Joshua with old bottles and old garments, saying, " These bottles of wine, which we filled, were new ; and, behold, they be rent : and

these our garments and our shoes are become old by reason of the very long journey " (Josh. ix. 13).

Whatever be the meaning of רקב in Job xiii. 28, enough has been said to show that Ben Sira may perhaps have used it in the sense ἀσκός in Ecclus. xliii. 20. In regarding the surface of a piece of water as stiffened into " a skin" by the frost, he would only have been giving a new application to an old simile, for the sea itself is thought of as gathered into an ἀσκός in Psalm xxxii. 7 (Sept.) συνάγει ὡσεὶ ἀσκὸν ὕδατα θαλάσσης. Again in Joshua iii. 16, " the waters which came down from above stood, and rose up in one heap," for נד heap Symmachus gives ἀσκωμα. The Septuagint renders it by πῆγμα, aptly corresponding to a word in the Greek of Ecclus. xliii. 20 καὶ παγήσεται κρύσταλλος ἀφ' ὕδατος. Compare also " ἀσκὸς βοός, the bag in which Aeolus bottled up the winds " (L. & S.).

In the New Testament the word ἀσκός occurs in the parable of the new and old wine and bottles (Matt. ix, Mark ii, Luke v), where for " bottles " the Revised Version substitutes " wine-skins " or " skins," as in St. Mark ii. 22 " And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins [marg. *skins used as bottles*]: else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins : but *they put* new wine into fresh wine-skins."

As the new wine-skins seem to some readers to spoil the old text, I will repeat here my suggestion lately made elsewhere that, there being such good literary authority for " leather bottle " as Shakespeare's line in Part 3 of Henry VI,

His cold thin drink out of his leather bottle,

it is an expression which might fairly be used in the Gospels. It would suffice to insert the word *leather* once in each of them. Thus St. Matthew ix. 17 would read, " Neither do men put new wine into old leather bottles : else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish : but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved."

II. *Ecclesiasticus* l. 1–3.

The January number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW contains an edition by Dr. Schechter of one of the more recently discovered Cairo leaves of Ecclesiasticus (pp. 197–206), which supplies a good typical instance of the way in which the Hebrew (while itself needing emendation) enables us to correct errors in our texts of the ancient Versions.

Ecclus. l. 1–3 runs thus in the Revised Version:—

1. It was Simon, the son of Onias, the great [marg. *high*]
   priest,
   Who in his life repaired the house,
   And in his days strengthened the temple:
2. And by him was built from the foundation the height
   of the double *wall*,
   The lofty underworks of the inclosure of the temple:
3. In his days the cistern of waters was diminished,
   The brasen vessel in compass as the sea.

Verse 1.—The MS. reads שמעון בן יוחנן הכהן כו', Great one of his brethren and glory of his people, *Simon son of Jochanan* the priest. On the Greek for יוחנ (Syr. נתניא) Professor Swete favours me with the following critical note:—

"In Sir. L. 1 the first hands of codd. Bא read IONIOϒ for ONIOϒ. Holmes and Parsons quote the same reading from cod. 253, Ιωναου from cod. 155, and 'Ιωνίου from the Aldine text. In 1 Macc. xii. 20, one cursive has Ιωναθαν [1] for 'Ονίᾳ. In 2 Macc. iii. 31, another cursive gives Αναυιαυ for 'Ονίαν. The text of Josephus shows similar variants. Niese's *apparatus criticus* gives Ιωνιαυ as a reading in *Ant.* xii. 44, Ιονιου, *ib.* 156, and Ιωνιας, Ιωνια, *ib.* 225."

Professor Swete adds in a postscript that "in Cod. Sin. ONIOϒ is a correction of א$^{c·*}$, for which a later hand has restored IONIOϒ."

---

[1] Note a similar confusion in the spelling of names in Acts iv. 6 (Codex Bezae), where in place of the current reading 'Ιωάννης the Greek has ΙΩΝΑΘΑΣ and the Latin IOATHAS (J. R. H.).

Verse 3.—The Revised Version has the marginal note on the word *diminished*, "The text here seems to be corrupt." The Syriac, Arabic, Greek and Latin are given as below in Walton's *Polyglot*.

The Syriac has וחפר מבועא, *and he digged the fountain*, for the whole verse. The Arabic likewise reads briefly وحفرت الينبوع, *Et fons effossus* [*est*].

The Greek and the Latin are respectively :—

ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἠλαττώθη ἀποδοχεῖον [al.—χεῖα] ὑδάτων,
χαλκὸς [al. λάκκος] ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης τὸ περίμετρον.
In diebus ipsius emanaverunt putei aquarum,
Et quasi mare adimpleti sunt supra modum.

The Hebrew, according to the MS., is :—

אשר בדורו נכרה מקוה   אשיח בם בהמונו:

אשיח בם] These words by themselves would naturally be read אָשִׂיחַ בָּם, but the context and the Versions require a different sense. Obviously בם is a corruption of כִּים, *quasi mare*, but it is less easy to explain or account for אשיח. The Greek χαλκὸς ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης κ.τ.λ., "The brasen vessel in compass as the sea," reminds us of ים הנחשת, "the *brasen sea* that was in the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xxv, Jer. lii). Accordingly it may be thought, either (1) that Ben Sira wrote נחשת in Ecclus. l. 3; or (2) that the Greek χαλκός is corrupt, and was possibly suggested by Solomon's *molten* (or *brasen*) *sea*. On the latter hypothesis, it was natural in the first instance to conjecture that Ben Sira wrote שיחה כו' (Schechter); the true reading of the Greek being supposed to be λάκκος ὡσεὶ θαλάσσης τὸ περί-μετρον, and λάκκον being an actual rendering of שיחה, *pit*, in a version of Psalm lvii. 7 (Field, *Hexapla*) כרו לפני שיחה, *they digged* [cf. נכרה in Ecclus. l. 3] *a pit before me*.

But a still better solution was suggested by Professor A. A. Bevan's reference to the Moabite Stone for a word אשוח (to be read אַשְׁוֵחַ or otherwise) meaning storage-pit or *reservoir* (p. 206), in place of which some copyist (if not

Ben Sira himself) may have written אשיח, as in the Cairo text. Dr. Schechter accordingly renders Ecclus. l. 3 :—

> " In whose generation a well was digged,
> A reservoir like the sea in its abundance."

In Ecclus. xlviii. 17 it is said, with a play upon the name Hezekiah (C. & N., p. 39) :—

> " Hezekiah strengthened his city,
> When he turned aside waters into the midst of it,
> And hewed the rocks with [Heb. *as*] brass,
> And stopped up the mountains for a pool."

The rendering " *with* brass " presupposes the alteration of *kaf* into *beth* in the Oxford fol. 9, recto, line 9 :—

ויחצב כנחשת צורים   ויחסום הרים מקוה :

The Greek and the Latin of this line are :—

> ὤρυξεν σιδήρῳ ἀκρότομον,
> καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν κρήνας εἰς ὕδατα.
> Et fodiit ferro rupem,
> Et aedificavit ad aquam puteum.

It is remarkable that a reading of the Greek in Ecclus. l. 3 is χαλκὸς ὡσεί, where there is no " brass " in the Hebrew ; whereas here, for כנחשת, *as brass*, the Greek has σιδήρῳ, *with iron*. In the former verse Fritzsche conjectured, perhaps rightly, that ἠλαττώθη is a corruption of ἐλατομήθη, *was hewn* ; but he supposed the word for *hew* in the Hebrew to be חצב. Here we have ויחצב, which might have been rendered καὶ ἐλατόμησε. For הרים מקוה Dr. Schlatter proposes to read למים מקוה, comparing the Greek κρήνας εἰς ὕδατα.

מקוה . . . כים] The comparison to the sea of an artificial pool for " the gathering together of waters " was evidently suggested to Ben Sira by Genesis i. 10 ולמקוה המים כו', " And God called the dry land Earth ; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas." This is a good illustration of his way of turning Scripture to his uses. It

would be a result of some critical importance if we could detect all his allusions to books of the Old Testament, and trace them to their several sources.

III. *The Lewis-Gibson folio.*

On the acquisition of the Lewis-Gibson folio of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, Mrs. Lewis writes in the *Guardian* for Feb. 23, 1898 (p. 313), " The single leaf which Mrs. Gibson and I brought to Cambridge in May, 1896, and which was discovered amongst a bundle of other fragments by Dr. Schechter, was bought by us in Southern Palestine, and not at Sinai."

The folio extends from chap. xxxix. 15 to chap. xl. 8 ; but in some places letters are torn away or mutilated, or so faded as to be hard to decipher. The *recto* begins thus, according to Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer's translation :—

" 1. [With s]ongs of the harp and of stringed instruments,
        And thus with a shout shalt thou say :

  2. All [the works of] God are good,
        And he supplieth every need in its season.

  3. . . . . . appraise . . . . .
        And the utterance of his mouth is his treasure.

  4. In [his] place he maketh his pleasure to prosper,
        And there is no restraint to his salvation."

The numerals 1–4 refer to the lines of the MS., each of which is made up of clauses *a* and *b* written in parallel columns. On the word " appraise " there is the foot-note, " So text, but the sense is obscure."

Line 3, recto.—The reading of this in the Oxford edition is

. . . . . ‏יׄעריך נ‎ .   ‏ומוצא פיו אוצרו‎ :

The Greek [𝔊] is given as follows :—

ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἔστη ὡς θιμωνιὰ ὕδωρ,
καὶ ἐν ῥήματι στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοχεῖα ὑδάτων.

The Syriac is also given, but with a numeration and spacing which indicate (p. xiv) that it is not understood to

be a rendering of the passage under consideration. It is
to the effect that God by his word makes the sun to rise
and set, thus :—

<div dir="rtl">

במאמרה מדנח שמשא   ובמאמרה הו מערב לה .

</div>

On the Hebrew of line 3 *a* there is the foot-note, " The נ is
fairly distinct: after it there is a blot which *may* conceal
a ד (cf. ⑤) or a ר; there is no sign of a third letter."

Dr. Smend gives as his text of the line, with several
letters marked as doubtful or indistinct :—

<div dir="rtl">

בדברו יעדיך על עכרים   וכמוצא פיו אוצרו:

</div>

Dr. Schlatter, assuming (1) that the Greek translator
was on the right track; and (2), on the authority of
Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer, that the *nun* is " deutlich
erkennbar," gives that letter only as certain in his text of
line 3 *a*, which is simply [ד]נ[כ] . . . . In a foot-note the
kaf is detached from יעריך: the remainder יערי of the verb
is turned into מים *water*: and for the whole clause is
given, with a reference to Psalm xxxiii. 7, דברו כונס מים כנד.
The note ends, " Las er נֵר, *die Leuchte?* ערך נר steht Ps.
cxxxii. 17." Dr. Schlatter's rendering of the line is, " Sein
Wort hält das Wasser wie Garben beisammen, und das,
was aus seinem Munde geht, seine Ansammlung."

The Greek and the Syriac differing totally, it is best first
to cross-question them as witnesses to the Hebrew text.

The Greek by ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ points to something like
בדברו, which would just fill the space before יעריך. For this
it may have read יעמד (Bacher) or עמד. In some hand-
writings, when the MS. is not in good condition, a confusion
between רי and מ may readily arise. Or יעריך may be
thought to be a corruption of an original יערים or יערם, cf.
Ex. xv. 8 :—

<div dir="rtl">

ברוח אפיך נערמו מים   נצבו כמו נד נוזלים:

</div>

An original כנד *as a heap* would account for θιμωνιά, and
ὕδωρ may have been added by the translator to show that
by θιμωνιά he meant a heap of *water*. Other Hebrew

words which are or might be translated by a form of
θιμωνιά, or by some other word for "heap," are גל, תל, נדיש,
ערימה, חמר.

The remainder of the Greek, with the omission of ὑδάτων
as merely epexegetic, may be almost literally retranslated
into Hebrew, ובמוצא פיו אוצרות.

The Latin has *exceptorium* (sing.) for ἀποδοχεῖα (pl.).

To explain the Syriac of line 3 *b*, instead of interpolating
beth omit *tsadé*, thus ומוצא פיו אורו. Then taking פה *mouth*,
"pro *jusso, praecepto*," and mistaking מוצא for a *hiphil*
participle, we may render the clause, "And his word
makes his light to rise." For an example of יצא in this
sense see Ecclus. xliii. 1 (p. 17, ed. C. & N.), "The sun,
when he goeth forth [marg.], poureth out warmth."

The Syriac of line 3 *a* is easily accounted for by supposing
that the translator read יעריב for יעריך, which may have been
written with a medial כ at the end[1]. Transposing the
statements, we then get for the whole line, "By his word
he maketh the sun rise; and by his word he maketh it set."
The discordant testimony of the Versions may be pro-
nounced on the whole not unfavourable to the Egyptian
Hebrew text, so far as it has been deciphered. This text
must now be examined more closely.

בדברו] Dr. Smend rightly supplies בדברו as a reading,
where others had left the space before יעריך vacant, or filled
it conjecturally. Looking at the MS., I should say (1) that
part of the second *beth*, including the junction of its two
strokes, is distinctly visible; (2) that there are other traces
of בדברו; (3) that these and the consentient testimony of
the Versions make Dr. Smend's reading practically certain.

יעריך] I do not regard the *yod* of this word as doubtful,
but Dr. Smend may possibly be right in reading *daleth*, as
written of course by mistake for *resh*. What is really difficult
is to make out what was written after יעריך. The Oxford
edition gives *nun* as "fairly distinct," presumably in the light

---

[1] In my unpublished *Catalogue* of Aboth MSS., no. 90 has "no distinctive
form for final כ."

of θιμωνιά. To me it seemed at first that what I supposed
the editors to have taken for *nun* might as well have been
taken for *kaf*. I can see also what has been taken for
ayin (Schechter, Smend). But possibly both appearances
are fallacious. The "blot" is darkest at its beginning,
which may not merely conceal but be the remains of some
letter, perhaps a *kaf*.

There is (I think) a *lamed* just after and in contact with
the blot. In fact this is the only letter which seems to me
at all distinct in the word following יעריך. As to this *lamed*
I may seem to be at one with Dr. Smend, who reads יעריך
על עכרים. But he gives the explanation (p. 28), " Von ל ist
der obere Schweif nicht sicher zu erkennen, die Spitze meine
ich aber unter der rechten Ecke von ט (in טובים) zu sehen."
But my *lamed* points to the right corner of the *beth* (not
the *teth*) in טובים (line 2 *a*).

As regards the sense of the verse, I take the second
hemistich to mean, *And his Word is his treasury*. In
Wisdom ix. 1 *b* the Revised Version has, " Who madest all
things by thy word," with the marginal note, " Gr. *in*,"
that is, IN THY WORD. Compare in the New Testament
Col. ii. 3 (ed. Ellicott) ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς
σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι, *in whom are all the
treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden*. As it is said
by St. Paul that all such treasures are in Christ [the Word] ;
so Ben Sira may have said that his Word is the treasury
out of which in creation God draws all things. In the
first hemistich I would suggest some such reading as
בדברו יעריך כל, *By his word he ordereth all things*.

Compare in 2 Sam. xxiii. 5, " ordered in all things and
sure;" and in Wisdom xv. 1, R.V.: " But thou, our God, art
gracious and true, Long-suffering, and in mercy ordering all
things."

After coming to this conclusion, I saw (or supposed that
I saw) traces of two various readings of יעריך, both in
unusual places. (1) In the middle margin of line 3, below
and just touching the line ruled for the scribe's guidance,

and thus at a higher level than the text, I found a word
with an *ayin* followed by some less distinct letters. It
has been suggested to me (without reference to the Greek
ἔστη) that the letter next after the *ayin* is a *mem*. (2) Below
line 3 *a* and beginning a little before יעריך is something that
I could read as a word suiting neither line 3 (to which it
seems to be attached as a variant) nor line 4. If, however,
we may regard the last letter as a *mem*, like the *mem* of
Elohim at the end of the Oxford folio 1, recto, we may
make the word into יערים, comparing in Exodus, l. c.
נערמו מים.

Line 4, *recto.*—Dr. Schechter's reading of line 4 is:—

וְעֹשִׂי (?) [ר]צונו יצליח   ואין מעצור לתשועתו:

The Oxford edition reads [ין]תחתה רצונו כו׳, and Dr. Smend
תננחֹז רצונו כו׳. In the *Expositor* there is the note on וְעֹשִׂי,
" The word is very indistinct, and looks at the first glance
like תחש; but I am fairly certain of the reading given in
the text." On תחתיו, " was keinen Sinn ergiebt " (Schlatter),
Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer have the valuable note,
which (with some modification) prepares the way for
a more intelligible reading, " This word appears to have
been altered by a second hand: the ה is clear, but the rest
is not certain." These three readings seem to me to be all
as wide of the mark as they are different from one another.

The Greek of the line is:—

> ἐν προστάγματι αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ εὐδοκία,
> καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐλαττώσει τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ,

for which Clement of Alexandria (cf. Fritzsche) gives in
Paed. ii. 4 (Potter, p. 194) ὅτι ἐν προστάγματι αὐτοῦ πᾶσα
εὐδοκία γίνεται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλάττωσις εἰς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ.
It is to be noted that his construction καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν
ἐλάττωσις εἰς κ.τ.λ. is exactly that of the Hebrew. Ben Sira
obviously alludes to 1 Sam. xiv. 6, " for there is no restraint
to the Lord to save by many or by few."

The Syriac of line 4 *a* is בחדותא צביונה מתעבד, *with glad-*

ness his will is done, as Dr. Schlatter remarks, adding,
" Zu erwarten wäre ein zu רצונו im st. constr. stehendes
Nomen."

Unable to find a word that could with any probability
be read into and made to fill the space before רצונו, I at first
merely thought of חֵפֶץ רצונו יצליח as a conjectural original
fairly in harmony with the Versions; comparing for חפץ
יצליח Isaiah liii. 10 וַיהוה חָפֵץ כו׳ וחֵפֶץ יהוה בידו יצלח, and for
the combination חפץ רצונו St. Paul's κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ
θελήματος αὐτοῦ (Eph. i. 5). Further scrutiny of the text
led at length to a reading nearly on the lines of this
conjecture.

Preceding the slight remnant of the *resh* of רצונו is
a faded *vau*, which I would connect with what follows,
reading ורצונו. Before this are two accidental spots on the
paper, forming a sort of spurious *sof pasuq*. To the right
of this was seen a slight crease across the line, reaching from
line 3 to line 5. To the right of the crease is a faded stroke
of unusual form, with its top above the usual level of all
letters except *lamed*. It is like the second stroke of an *alef*
set nearly upright, and is not like anything else. Along
the crease there seemed to be traces of a stroke belonging
to a *lamed*, and joining the *alef*. I read therefore אל ורצונו.
For examples of *alef, lamed* joined together, see יחליפו כח ואל
in the long line near the end of the Oxford fol. 4, recto;
and יחזקאל at the beginning of line 13 in fol. 9, verso. This
is given as a specimen page in the Oxford edition, where it
faces the beginning of the Latin Version. See also שאלה in
the margin at the end of fol. 2, recto. The Greek πᾶσα
suggests כל for אל.

The first letter of the line is said to be certainly *tau*;
and its being a ת could scarcely have been doubted if it
had stood alone. But when letters are linked together we
get ambiguous forms. This letter is also more angular on
the right than some *taus*. Can it be a *cheth* finished off in
an unusual way, to connect it with the letter following?
The next letter would then be not much like anything in

the Hebrew alphabet, but not more unlike an incomplete ס, linked to the letters next before and after it, than anything else. What comes next after it is like part of an *ayin*, sloping down below the line; but the letter *ayin* is not so written in this manuscript. Can the third letter be the final letter ץ, with the part below the line turned aside for some reason?

In the first line of the page stands נֵבֶל (Smend) with two *segols*, of which the latter is the more distinct. This in the MS. stands almost under the *lamed*, and not directly under the *beth* as it is printed in accordance with our custom. Beneath the third letter of line 4 is at least one dot, which may belong to a vowel sign; and the down stroke of the supposed ץ may have been deflected to make way for it. Thus the line would begin with חפץ, or an abortive attempt at it. Reading now חָפֵץ אֶל ורצונו יצליח, *God purposeth and his good pleasure prospereth*, or חֵפֶץ כו׳, we can account for the Greek ἐν προστάγματι and the Syriac בחדותא, since חפץ *beneplacitum* may be rendered either *ordinance* or *pleasure*. Cf. Psalm cxxxv. 6 כל אשר חָפֵץ כו׳, "Whatsoever the Lord pleased that did he in heaven, and in earth."

The reading חפץ is confirmed by what seem to me to be traces of a correction of the text (perhaps by the original scribe), the clearest part of which is like the top of a large ץ, to the left of and beginning just above the white spot in the margin of line 4 *a*.

Lines 15–16, *verso* — These lines are rendered by Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer :—

" 15. A little .... for a moment he is quiet,
    And from the midst of terror[s he is perturbed ?] ;
  16. ...... from the vision of his soul,
    (He is) as a fugitive [hurrying on before] the pursuer."

In the text they read מעט לחוק כרגע ישקוט with marginal variant קח. Dr. Schechter reads לחיק with marg. רוח, Dr. Smend לרוק with marg. לתנומ[ה].

Professor Margoliouth writes in the *Expositor*: "The

Greek has here ὀλίγον ὡς οὐδὲν ἐν ἀναπαύσει. The Hebrew
Fragment shows that we have not a mistranslation but
a corruption of the Greek text. The preposition ἐν, which
is before ἀναπαύσει, has really lost its substantive; and
ἀναπαύσει (which should rather be ἀναπαύσεται) is a verb
corresponding to the Hebrew ישקוט. I do not see why
Dr. Schechter should question לחיק, which seems very
natural in this context. Only the Greek shows us that the
order of the second and third words should be inverted;
and indeed it is unnatural to separate כרגע from מעט. The
verse so restored is metrical:

$$\text{מְעַט כְּרֶגַע לְחֵיק יִשְׁקוֹט}$$

and I can imagine none but metrical reasons which induced
the author to add לחיק, and to substitute מעט רגע for the
idiomatic כמעט רגע."

For my own part, I do not find any difficulty in the text
of the first half of the line, which (although it might
perhaps be improved rhythmically by a transposition) the
MS. seems to require us to read

$$\text{מעט לריק כרגע ישקוט:}$$

The man rests for "a little moment," לריק, εἰς κενόν, in vain:
he tries to repose, but in a moment he is disturbed by
nightmare.

Comparing the three readings לריק, לחוק, לחיק, we see
(1) that they agree as to the first and fourth letters;
(2) that one has *resh* after the lamed; (3) that one has *yod*
for the third letter. These readings together give לריק, and
the MS. as I see it does not suggest anything else. The
last stroke of the supposed *cheth* is a mere irregular scratch
on the paper, and goes below the line. The third letter is
quite unlike the *vau* of ישקום.

לרוח] Next, as to the marginal variant. Dr. Smend's
lamed also is probably not a real letter, but this is of no
great practical importance, since the readings קף and רוח
presuppose the undisputed *lamed* of the text. I see no

reason to doubt about the *cheth*. Before it is what looks at first like a ח (Smend); but this appearance is due to a spot on the paper, which may be passed over as accidental (Schechter, C. & N.). What has to be taken into account before the *cheth* has the appearance of a single letter, or part of one. The Oxford editors make it the top of a ק, taking (I suppose) a faint streak visible on the paper for the completion of that letter. Probably Dr. Schechter was right in reading רוח with *resh, vau* run together as one letter[1]; but I doubt about the interpretation, "The marginal reading רוח is probably to be pointed רֵוַח, meaning to be comfortable, to feel refreshed (cf. Biblical and Talmudic Dictionaries, s. v. רוח or רווח)." Dr. Smend writes in a footnote לְרֵוַח, with a query, for לריק which he gives in his text. Read rather לָרוּחַ in the margin, as a synonym for לָרִיק, and see in Gesenius under רוח, "de re inani .... לָרוּחַ *in ventum*, i. e. frustra, Eccl. v. 15, Jer. v. 13, Job vi. 26."

Line 15 *b*, which is defective in the MS., is read conjecturally (1) וּמֵבִין בלהות לאור מִצְפֶּה (Schechter) ; (2) וּמבין ש ... [בהל]ות, with the note on "perturbed" in the translation, "Reading יְשֻׁשַׁע ; or ? יְרֻשַׁ is disquieted" (C. & N.); (3) וּמבין בחֹ[למות יש]נֵשׁ, with the note, "וּמביּן (וּמבכין) = καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου ?—Der Armenier drückt nach Edersheim (ἐν ?) ἐνυπνίοις und κοπιᾷ aus" (Smend).

The Greek of the whole line as given in the Oxford edition is :—

ὀλίγον ὡς οὐδὲν ἐν ἀναπαύσει,
καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου ἐν ὕπνοις ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπιᾶς.

Dr. Schlatter gives it conjecturally, ὀλίγον . . . ὡς οὐδὲν . . . ἐν ἀναπαύσει καὶ ἀπ᾽ (ἐνυπνίων) ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κοπιᾷ, with the suggestive note, "G giebt καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου ἐν ὕπνοις ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (248: ἡμέραις) σκοπιᾶς. Hier steht καὶ ἀπ᾽ neben וּמבִּין ; ἐκείνου ist sicher verdorben. ἡμέραις ist darum zu beachten,

---

[1] In Ecclus. xliii. 20 *b* the Hebrew text has מקורו *his spring*, and the margin מקרה *pond*, the letters *resh, vau* in the one reading corresponding to single letter *hé* in the other.

weil es an die Möglichkeit denken lässt, dass σ von σκοπιᾶς
zu ἡμέρᾳ gehört."

The Greek ὀλίγον ὡς οὐδέν points to מעט ברגע. But what
has become of לריק, i. e. εἰς κενόν, as for example in Job
xxxix. 16 εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασεν ? If לריק (or לרוח) was rendered
εἰς κενόν, this might easily have been corrupted into the
ἐκείνου which Dr. Schlatter rejects as *sicher verdorben*.
There is no great difficulty about the transposition of
a word from the middle of 15 *a* to 15 *b*, and εἰς κενόν would
go well enough with something like ὡς ἡμέρας κοπιᾷ, *he
labours as by day*. But the former hemistich would read
as well with לריק at the end, thus:—

בִּמְעַט רֶגַע יִשְׁקוֹט לָרִיק.

In 15 *b* there is one word clear, namely מבין. Allowing
this to stand, we cannot read בחלומות *in dreams* after it;
but we may read בֶּהָלָה *terror*, or בהלות (pl.). The former is
joined with לריק in Lev. xxvi. 16, "I will even appoint over
you *terror* .... and ye shall sow your seed *in vain*;" and
in Isaiah lxv. 23, "they shall not labour *in vain*, nor bring
forth *for trouble*." For a cognate parallelism see Psalm
lxxviii. 33, "Therefore their days did he consume *in vanity*,
and their years *in trouble*." For the plural בהלות *terrors*,
see Jer. xv. 8.

After what is left of בהל (the paper being torn here)
there are first some small remains of letters : then nothing
at all : lastly a small *shin* and *sof pasuq*, wrenched out of
their place. In its original position the *shin* was lower
down, and a little further to the left. To fill up the line
I would suggest, as what may perhaps have stood in the
MS., something like:—

ומבין	בהלות	כים	נגרש
And amid,	*terrors*	*as the sea*	*he is troubled*

comparing Isaiah lvii. 20:—

כַּיָּם נִגְרָשׁ כִּי הַשְׁקֵט לֹא יוּכָל וַיִּגְרְשׁוּ מֵימָיו כו׳.

This would both account for the rendering ἡμέρᾳ (or -as)

in the Greek, as by mistake of YAM for YOM, and give the same antithesis of גרש and שקט in Ben Sira as in Isaiah, l. c. The reading נגרש suits its place in the MS., the paper being torn away close to the beginning of the ש, that is the top of its first stroke, but so as to leave ample space below for the survival of part of almost any possible letter except ר or ד. If the line had ended with גש (C. & N., Smend, Schlatter), the lower part of the gimel ought now to be visible; but the resh of ריש would have been just torn away. From the smallness of the shin we may be sure that no space was wasted at the end of the line.

The comparison of troubled sleep to the unrest of the sea is illustrated by Prov. xxiii. 33–35 R.V., " Thine eyes shall behold strange things, And thine heart shall utter froward things, Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, Or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast. They have stricken me, *shalt thou say*, and I was not hurt; They have beaten me, and I felt it not: When shall I awake? I will seek it yet again." Compare also Job vii. 4, " I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of the day;" and the New Testament metaphors from the sea in Eph. iv. 14, St. James i. 6.

Line 16, *verso.*—The Hebrew and the Syriac of line 16 *a* are respectively :—

<div dir="rtl">

מעט טע מחזון נפשו

דמתמלך בחזוא דלליא.
</div>

The Greek as given in the Oxford edition is τεθορυβημένος ἐν ὁράσει καρδίας αὐτοῦ, and the Latin, " cor turbatus est in visu cordis sui." But *cor turbatus* must be a corruption of *conturbatus*.

Immediately above מעט in the MS. is the same word in the line מעט לריק כו' ; and a " corrupt following" by the scribe of that precedent may have given rise to the impossible מעט טע, as Nöldeke has remarked. The Syriac seems to lead us a step in the right direction; for, מלך in that dialect having the sense טעם *counsel*, מתמלך *taking*

counsel suggests מתטעם, or (as it would be written) מטעם with *teth* dageshed. This points to a real correction of the text as we have it. Reading מטע (for מעט) with the Syriac, we get מטעמע מחזון נפשו.

מטעמע] Going again some way with the Syriac, which like the Greek begins with a participle (Schlatter), we may suppose that Ben Sira wrote מטעמע as a participle of the form מתטעמע. Changing the root-letter ט into ת, we get מתתעתע, as in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 ומתעתעים בנביאיו, R.V. "but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, *and scoffed at his prophets.*" Lexicographers (Buxtorf, Kohut, Levy) compare the Aramaic טעא with the Hebrew תעה *errare, aberrare.* See also Gesenius on תעע in *hithpalpel* and תעתעים *illusiones.* Ben Sira's מטעמע (possibly from a root טעע) may signify that the man is τεθορυβημένος, *conturbatus,* troubled or scared by the vision of his soul; or it may connote *hallucination* (lit. suffering himself to be led astray). Both senses suit the context, whatever be the precise definition of the term used.

Professor A. A. Bevan adds (Feb. 25, 1898), "I have just noticed that in Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus,* col. 1495, a passage is quoted from the Acta Martyrum in which a verb ܠܚܚ seems to occur :—ܚܡܠܐ ܘܡܚܚܚ ܠܚܚ ܣܡܝܢ ܚܡܣ̈ܝܢ ܡܣܚ̈ܝܢ ܣܡܣܚܐ *until their nostrils are ...... with the odour of corruption.*" The *Thesaurus* gives Assemani's rendering, *donec ipsorum animae foetore conficiantur.*

Line 16 *b* begins with כשריד, after which come fragments of a letter or two, partly displaced through the tearing of the paper. In the middle there is a great gap; and at the end רודף, a little above and to the right of its original position. Conjectural readings of the whole or part of what stood between these two words are ינום לפני (Schechter), ... ה (C. & N.), בורח מפני (Smend).

The Greek ὡς ἐκπεφευγὼς ἀπὸ προσώπου πολέμου and the Syriac איך גברא דערק מן קדם רדופא suggest כשריד מפני רודף (Schlatter), since SARID may be taken in the sense *effugiens* (Field, *Hexapla,* Obad. 18); but there is apparently room

for something more. Inserting הנם we might read, כשריד
הנם מפני רודף as a *remanent that fleeth from the pursuer*.
The old form *remanent* is here used for one remaining, to
avoid *remnant*, which naturally suggests more than one,
although it may be applied to one only, as in Shakespeare's
line, *Thou bloodless remnant of that royal blood!*

These *Studies* were already in type when I first saw the
Lewis-Gibson folio, of which I had previously used photo-
graphs. In the MS. and the photographs there are accidental
marks, which can easily be mistaken for traces of letters.
It may be well therefore to state that the new readings
pointed out in the recto (lines 3 and 4) have been seen as
such by others after me, although not completely deciphered.
It has been further suggested to me that at the end of
line 3 *a* there is a full-sized *lamed*, a little before the
somewhat smaller *ayin* in the middle margin (p. 480).

The letters " altered " in line 4 *a* do not seem, as they
stand, to spell anything: perhaps the alteration was meant
to have the effect of erasure. The Greek of the clause is
verbless (p. 480). This may have come of a confusion
between ΕΥΟΔ and ΕΥΔΟ, if its last word was εὐοδωθή-
σεται. Compare Ecclus. xi. 15 (17) καὶ ἡ εὐδοκία αὐτοῦ εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα εὐοδωθήσεται.

Looking again at the photograph, I still do not find any
vestige of a letter before the *shin* at the end of line 15,
verso (p. 486), although Dr. Smend (p. 28) claims to see,
" Vor ש eine untere Horizontale, die einem] gehören kann."

C. TAYLOR.