

SUPPOSE a wall papered with paper of two colours—one black, say, and the other gold. You can work your eye and adjust the focus of vision so that you may see either a black background or a gold one. In the one case the prevailing tone is gloomy, relieved by an occasional touch of brightness; and in the other it is brightness, heightened by a background of darkness. And so we can do with life, fixing attention on its sorrows, and hugging ourselves in the contemplation of these, with a kind of morbid satisfaction, or bravely and thankfully and submissively and wisely resolving that we will rather seek to learn what God means by darkness, and not forgetting to look at the unenigmatical blessings and plain obvious mercies that make up so much of our lives. We have to govern memory, as well as other faculties, by Christian principle.—A. MACLAREN.

MR. HUGHES tells a characteristic anecdote of starting one winter's night with his friend, Charles Kingsley, to walk down to Chelsea, and of their being caught in a dense fog before they had reached Hyde Park Corner. 'Both of us,' Mr. Hughes adds, 'knew the way well, but we lost it half a dozen times, and Kingsley's spirits seemed to rise as the fog thickened.' 'Is not this like life?' he said after one of our blunders; 'a deep yellow fog all round, with a dim light here and there shining through. You grope your way on from one lamp to another, and you go up wrong streets and back again. But you get home at last—there's always light enough for that.'—*Clerical Library*.

Good Life, Long Life.

He liveth long who liveth well;
All else is life but flung away;
He liveth longest who can tell
Of true things truly done each day.

Then fill each hour with what will last;
Buy up the moments as they go;
The life above, when this is past,
Is the ripe fruit of life below.

Sow love, and taste its fruitage pure;
Sow peace, and reap its harvest bright;
Sow sunbeams on the rock and moor,
And find a harvest-home of light.—H. BONAR.

Sermons for Reference.

Brown (J. B.), Sunday Afternoon, 336.
Brown (H. S.), Manliness, 160.
Fairbairn (A. M.), Christ in the Centuries, 107.
Maclaren (A.), Worn Christ, 223.
Moorhouse (J.), Jacob, 69.
Newman (J. H.), Parochial and Plain Sermons, iv. 214.
Nicholson (M.), Redeeming the Time, 108.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii.
Raleigh (A.), Thoughts for the Weary, 241.
Simcox (W. H.), Cessation of Prophecy, 30.
Winterbotham (R.), Sermons and Expositions, 36.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

III.

THE next task is to determine the character and origin of the *marginal notes* appended to H.¹

(a) On the margin of H we find notes regarding the orthography (e.g. חעלה for חועלה, 41^{14c}), the system of terminations (e.g. שרי for שרה, 40^{22b}, or פיהו for פיו, 39^{31b}), the linguistic usage, and regarding real or supposed corruptions in the text. Examples falling under the last-named categories will be adduced in the course of the following investigation.

(b) With reference to the origin of these marginal notes, Margoliouth (p. 4) puts forward the hypothesis that the retranslator noted on the margin forms and phrases which he might have chosen, but which he finally rejected. Elsewhere (p. 6) he adds: 'He may for some reason or other have abandoned the task of translating before he got his work into proper shape.' But

¹ H stands for the Hebrew Text of Cowley and Neubauer, G and S stand for the Greek and Syriac versions respectively.

does he actually mean that all the notes on the margin of H may be explained in this way? He cannot mean it, surely, for instance, in the case of ער לשוב, 'until the return,' of 40^{3b}, which originated from a reminiscence of ער שובך of Gn 3¹⁹, and the marginal note, ער לובש, 'unto him that is clothed,' which corresponds to the parallel participle of v.^{3a}. But his view of the origin of the marginal notes of H appears to me to be a natural one in only a very few instances. It may be natural in the case of נבראו (Smend, נעשים), which is read instead of נוצרו on the margin of 39^{28a}. But even in such cases Margoliouth's assumption is not *necessary*. He says, indeed (p. 4), 'On the margin of a late copy of a work professing to be original, and handed down as books were handed down before the invention of printing, such a quantity of variants would be astounding.' But, in the first place, even manuscripts of parts of the Old Testa-

ment canon exhibit notes on the strange spelling or the formation of words (see e.g. Pr 1¹⁸ 2³. 17. 21, etc.). Secondly, it is possible and probable that a book which did not belong to the canon of the Old Testament, and resembled a private composition, underwent more corrections (cf. Joel Müller, *Masechet Soferim*, § 25).

(c) But are the particular motives and sources of these marginal notes discoverable?

(a) A first part of the marginal notes may be called *intra*-Hebraic. To this category belong remarks on spelling, etc. (cf. לְמַעַנֵנוּ for לְמַעַנֵנוּ, 43^{26a}), on the replacement of מוֹבַח by מוֹב (41^{13ab}), which perhaps obtained the preference because a *concrete* good is named (cf. my *Syntax*, § 245b), on the change of אֵל, 'God,' which seemed to be too general a name, into עֲלִיָּן in 40^{1a}, or on the simplifying of 'days of number' into 'number of days' in 41^{13a}. This *intra*-Hebrew origin of one part of the marginal notes is placed beyond doubt by the interchange of בָּל and נָם in 39^{30c}. For this *stichos* is found neither in G nor in S. The נָם, 'too,' is due to the consideration that in v. 30^{ab} neither all evil things nor in general all the creatures of God are enumerated, and that consequently this special group must be linked on by 'too.' But the בָּל of v. 30^c was meant to sum up all the particular groups which had been mentioned in vv. 25a-30^b. He was drawing upon his own ideas, too, when in 39^{35b} the Jewish reader replaced שֵׁם הַקְּדוֹשׁ, 'the name of the Holy One,' by שֵׁם קְדוֹשׁ, 'His holy name.' For the last expression is not offered by either G or S, and is due to a superficial reminiscence of the Old Testament שֵׁם קְדוֹשׁ of Lv 20⁸, etc.

(β) Another portion of the marginal notes originated in a comparison with G and (or) S. An example is presented by 39^{34a}, where מַה זֶה, 'what is this?' is changed in the margin into מִזַּה, 'more than this,' answering to the מִכֵּה וְסִנֵּי of S and the τούτου of G. Likewise, חֲרַפָּה, 'reproach, blame,' on the margin of 42^{14b} is due to an imitation of the δνειδισμός of G. Again, not the text of 43^{8a} (see above, 2f), but the marginal note, i.e. the Arabic مِعْرَضٌ, *mu'riḍ*, 'shining,' springs from a comparison of H with G or S, or with both of these. Further, וְאוֹרוֹ מוֹהֵיר, 'his light sparkles' (43^{9b}), is exchanged on the margin for עֵדֵי מִשְׁרִיק, 'an ornament shining,' which is, beyond doubt, an imitation of κόσμος φωρίζων, and מִשְׁרִיק first makes its appearance in late Syriac, being probably a loan-word from the Arabic, in which مشرق

mushriḳ(un), 'rising, shining,' is a frequent word.

The *material* elements of the marginal notes of H thus conduct us, to be sure, into the Arabic sphere of language, but do not prove that the 'retranslator' worked from a *Persian* exemplar. It is merely a *formal* element in the marginal notes which points to the *Persian* sphere of language. On the margin of 40²² we read, 'All the days of a poor man are evil. Ben-Sira says, At night also,' etc., and this marginal note concludes with the words, 'It is probable that this was not (נָם, as was established by Smend, p. 4, stands instead of נָה, Persian ن) in the original writing, but was said by the נַאֲקִיל' (= *nāḳil*). What is the meaning of this last word? Margoliouth (p. 4) himself brings forward the senses, 'translator, copyist, reporter, narrator.' Which of these meanings are we to select here? Now, that Persian marginal note refers to sentences which occur in the Talmud, as one can read in Cowley-Neubauer (p. xxviii). Hence that sense of נַאֲקִיל will deserve the preference which suits the circumstance that the sentences in question have come down to us in the Talmud, and in this way there can be no doubt that the meaning 'narrator' is the one to be adopted. Consequently, the author of this Persian marginal note might have written it even if he regarded the Hebrew text which lay before him as the original of Ecclesiasticus. For he might assume that this original, in the course of the transmission of its text, had lost certain sayings. Notwithstanding, this Hebrew text would still have remained the original, and is there any difficulty in holding that the expression, 'the original writing,' means the text of H which we possess? In any case, the sentences to which this Persian marginal note refers, are *not* found in our present text. The term, نَاقول, then, did *not* mean the author of this Hebrew text, but the author of the tradition through which these sentences found their way into the Talmud. This has not been observed by Margoliouth, who consequently renders نَاقول incorrectly by 'translator.'

The marginal note on 40²² proves, then, nothing more than what could already be gathered from a second Persian marginal remark, 'this manuscript reached thus far' (45⁹), namely, that some one who was acquainted with the Persian language had possession of the text of H and compared it with another manuscript.