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, of brightness; and in the other it is brightness, heightened by darkness, and not forgetting to look at the unenigmatical contemplation of these, with a kind of morbid satisfaction, prevailing tone is gloomy, relieved by an occasional touch of darkness, and not forgetting to look at the unenigmatical fixing attention on its sorrows, and hugging ourselves in the or bravely and thankfully and submissively and wisely resolving that we will rather seek to learn what God means 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.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

III.

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 a parallel participle of which corresponds to the parallel participle of. 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 which is read instead of of Q and X, which originated from a reminiscence of Gn 3:19, and the marginal note, which is read instead of unto him that is clothed, which corresponds to the parallel participle of. 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 1:18 2:17, 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, Masschet 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 *intrā*-Hebraic. To this category belong remarks on spelling, etc. (cf. Syr. for אב, 43:18a), on the replacement of הבּת by הבּת in (41:32b), which perhaps obtained the preference because a concrete good is named (cf. my Syntax, § 245b), on the change of א, 'God,' which seemed to be too general a name, into יהי in 40:10, or on the simplifying of 'days of number' into 'number of days' in 41:10a. This *intrā*-Hebrew origin of one part of the marginal notes is placed beyond doubt by the interchange of ל and ד in 36:10. For this *stichos* is found neither in G nor in §. The ד, 'too,' is due to the consideration that in v. 30ab 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 ל in v. 30a was meant to sum up all the particular groups which had been mentioned in vv. 28a-20b. He was drawing upon his own ideas, too, when in 36:10 the Jewish reader replaced 'His holy name,' for the Holy One, by 'his holy name.' For the last expression is not offered by either G or §, and is due to a superficial reminiscence of the Old Testament אדריכל of Lv 20:8, etc.

(b) Another portion of the marginal notes originated in a comparison with G and (or) §. An example is presented by 39:18, where הל מ, 'what is this?' is changed in the margin into המ, 'more than this,' answering to the מ, and the ו of G. Likewise, the נ, 'reproach, blame,' on the margin of 44:14b is due to an imitation of 'הנורא of G. Again, not the text of 43:8 (see above, 2f.), but the marginal נ, i.e. the Arabic מעמש, 'shining,' springs from a comparison of H with G or §, or with both of these. Further, מ realloc, 'his light sparkles' (43:9), is exchanged on the margin for רע, 'an ornament shining,' which is, beyond doubt, an imitation of κόρας φωτιζων, and first makes its appearance in late Syriac, being probably a loan-word from the Arabic, in which מ is used, '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 40:26 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 (ב, as was established by Smend, p. 4, stands instead of ב, Persian si) in the original writing, but was said by the מ ( = nā'īl). 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 מ 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 מ 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 מ by 'translator.'

The marginal note on 40:26 proves, then, nothing more than what could already be gathered from a second Persian marginal remark, 'this manuscript reached thus far' (45:8), namely, that some one who was acquainted with the Persian language had possession of the text of H and compared it with another manuscript.