Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

TWO HEBREW NEW TESTAMENTS.

THE first attempt in modern times to translate any part of the New Testament into Hebrew was made by Shem Tob ben Shaprut, a Jew of Tudela in Castile, who, for polemical purposes, prepared a Hebrew version of St. Matthew's Gospel, which he completed in 1385. This version remained in MS. till it was published (with textual alterations) by Sebastian Münster, under the title תּוֹרַת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, *Evangelium secundum Matthæum in Lingua He-braica, cum versione Latina atque succinctis annotationibus,* Basileæ, 1537.[1] This was reprinted in 1557 by the same scholar, together with a Hebrew version of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Other portions were translated by succeed-ing scholars, and the whole was finally completed by Elias Hutter, the entire version being included in the Polyglott New Testament, in twelve languages, issued by him in 1599. Elias Hutter, says Delitzsch, shows a command of Hebrew rarely found among Christians, and is often felicitous in his renderings. In 1809 was founded the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. Dissatisfied with the existing translations, this Society found itself before long with the task of revision upon its hands. The first revision, begun in 1813, was completed in 1817; and was reprinted subsequently in 1821, 1831, and 1835. A second revision followed in 1837–8, the joint work of the well-known Hebraist Alexander McCaul, J. C. Reichardt, an experienced mis-sionary, S. Hoga, the translator into Hebrew of *Pilgrim's Progress,* and M. S. Alexander, who became in 1841 the first Bishop of the newly established see of Jerusalem. A third revision, undertaken by J. C. Reichardt, with

[1] It has been re-edited recently, from MSS., by Dr. Adolf Herbst (Göttingen, 1879), who in his Introduction collects particulars illustrative of its history and character.

the assistance of Dr. J. H. R. Biesenthal, an accomplished
Rabbinical scholar,[1] and of Mr. Ezekiel Margoliouth, a
missionary resident in London, and intimately acquainted
with Jewish literature and learning, was completed in 1866.[2]

Meanwhile Professor Delitzsch, who amongst living
Christian scholars is perhaps the most profoundly read
in post-Biblical Jewish literature, and who throughout
his life has felt the liveliest interest in everything affect-
ing the welfare of the Jews,[3] had directed his attention
to the subject, and was induced ultimately, at the re-
quest of the Society of Friends of the Jews in Bavaria,
Saxony and Norway, to take in hand an independent
revision himself. The firstfruits of his labour was the
translation into Hebrew of the Epistle to the Romans,
with an Introduction and explanations from the Talmud
and Midrash, which appeared at Leipzig in 1870.
In the Introduction, after reviewing the history of past
translations, and exemplifying the faults of style and ex-
pression, under which even the last revision of the
London Society still laboured, Professor Delitzsch states
the principles and motives of his own work. His aim is
primarily a practical one—to bring home, namely, to the
διασπορὰ of Israel the words of the Gospel, by presenting
them in a form in which their force and meaning would be
directly apparent to a Jewish reader. But in the attain-
ment of this practical aim, other important ends are also
secured. Not only does it demand, as the condition of
success, an accurate exegesis of the New Testament itself,

---

[1] Author, amongst other works, of an edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews
in Hebrew, with philological and other explanatory notes. (*Das Trostschreiben
des Apostels Paulus an die Hebräer*, Leipzig, 1878.)

[2] Further details will be found in the Introduction to Delitzsch's *Brief an
die Römer*, mentioned subsequently,

[3] His emphatic and repeated protests against the charges falsely brought
against the Jews by agitators in Germany and Austria, may be quoted as a
recent illustration of this.

but the re-translation of the Greek text into the language from which much of its characteristic terminology was immediately borrowed, is often a means of materially aiding the work of interpretation. Thus, if properly executed, such a translation, besides subserving the practical aim which is its first object, is at the same time a valuable positive aid in the theological study of the New Testament. Very interesting examples of this are given by Professor Delitzsch in the work referred to; showing, for instance, how the Apostle's thought, even where it is most distinctively Hellenic or Christian, nevertheless finds expression in forms, and particularly in forms of reasoning, peculiar to the synagogue. Professor Delitzsch did not rest here, however; he continued his labours, taking naturally the London edition as the basis of his work, but subjecting it uniformly to correction and revision ; and in 1877 the first edition of his complete New Testament, consisting of 2,500 copies, was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The edition was soon exhausted; a second and third, each of the same number, followed in 1878 and 1880 ; a fourth and fifth, of 5,000 each, in 1881 and 1883, and a sixth and seventh, the latter in large 8vo size, both also of 5,000 copies, in 1885. None of these editions are mere reprints of the preceding one; not only has the learned author himself laboured continuously to improve his own work, but especially in the third and following editions he has made considerable use of contributions and suggestions offered to him by competent Hebrew scholars in different parts of the world. The 8vo edition of 1885 (which has been more thoroughly revised than the 32mo edition of the same year[1]) exhibits thus the maturest results of the author's studies ; and it will be apparent, even from the

---

[1] The latter was printed from the electrotype plates of the previous edition, —not, however, without the introduction into them of many improved renderings. The price of these two editions is, respectively, 1s. 6d. and 1s.

preceding rapid survey, what an amount of pains and thought is represented by it.[1]

The past year has, however, seen another Hebrew version of the New Testament offered to the public. Isaac Salkinson, a missionary whose sphere of labour was among the Jews of Austria, had long been acknowledged as a master of Hebrew style. In temperament he was a poet: and his translations into Hebrew of Tiedge's *Urania*, of Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet*, and of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, show him to have possessed a rare genius for Hebrew composition, and a rare power of casting the thought of a modern poet into felicitously chosen Hebrew form. He was known to have been for some time past engaged upon the New Testament, but he was prevented from bringing his work to a conclusion himself by his premature death in June, 1883. It is understood that a considerable part was left by him in a practically complete form, but that the MS. of the rest was imperfect, and had to be completed and prepared for publication by the editor. The task of editing the whole was undertaken by his friend, Dr. C. D. Ginsburg; and the result, published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, is now before us. The work invites, and indeed, challenges, comparison with the version of Prof. Delitzsch, which was, so to 'speak, in possession of the field, and had been most favourably received by those

---

[1] See further a *brochure*, written in English by Professor Delitzsch, *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society: a contribution to Hebrew Philology* (Leipzig, 1882), in which reasons are stated for some of the changes introduced into the fifth edition, and which contains at the end (pp. 35-7) a list of papers and articles connected with the subject, by the same author (in particular, twelve papers in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1876-8, entitled Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ, supplementary to Lightfoot and Schoettgen).

In many parts of the Continent, for instance in Germany and Italy, Hebrew is practically little known among the Jews; but elsewhere, especially in Austria and Russia, they are more familiar with it; and in those countries a considerable number of copies of the different editions of Delitzsch's version have been disposed of for missionary purposes.

best qualified to judge of its merits. Does it then sustain the comparison with the new version ? or must our verdict be that the latter is its superior, either in fidelity, or in chasteness of style, and deserves to supplant it in the confidence of the public ?

There can be no doubt as to the answer which these questions must receive. We desire to say nothing in disparagement of a work which, we may be sure, was undertaken as a labour of love, and the author of which can make no reply to the criticisms which may be passed upon it. But we cannot abstain from instituting the comparison which, by its publication, his work challenges. It is at once evident that its execution is uneven,—a circumstance due, it may be supposed, to the imperfect state in which the MS. was left at its author's death. In the best parts—for instance in the Gospels—his style is flowing and easy, his expressions are classical and well chosen; the pen of the "ready" and able writer has left its mark upon the pages. Ability, skill, delicacy of touch, must be frankly and gratefully acknowledged. The author shows that he can reach a high level of excellence; and probably, had he been spared to complete and revise his work continuously, the same qualities would have been visible throughout. But this, as we shall see, is not the case.

It should be premised that both translators have the same aim, to represent the N. T., namely, not in the more modern Hebrew found in the Mishnah (2nd cent. A.D.), and such as was probably spoken in the schools in the time of Christ; but, as far as possible, in the original language of the O. T., only admitting later terms, or forms of expression, where the use of them could not be avoided. The number of ideas occurring in the N. T. for which there is no equivalent in the O. T. is considerable. To say nothing of specific theological terms, such as *adoption, regeneration, baptism, faith, godhead;* ideas such

as *nature, freedom, promise, conscience, patience, danger,*[1]
doubt, worthy, ἔξεστι, μέλλει, δοκεῖ, δεῖ, and even such ap-
parently simple expressions as *not only . . . but also,* or
straightway, have no distinctive equivalent in the O. T.;
and in these cases recourse must of course be had to the
more abundant Hebrew vocabulary of a later age.[2] But
with exceptions such as these, particularly in the Gospels,
Acts, and Revelation, it is the aim of both translators
to employ as classical an idiom as possible.

Further, of the two, that of Salkinson affects more
entirely the classical style. Thus in Matt. ii., in place of
מְגוּשִׁים, which occurs in the Talmud, and is employed by
Delitzsch to represent the Greek *Μάγοι,* Salkinson uses
חֹזֵי כוֹכָבִים, an expression suggested by Isaiah xlvii. 13.
Doubtless the expression is more classical than that of
Delitzsch; but it must not be forgotten that by its use
the *distinctive* sense conveyed by the Greek is entirely lost.
In 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, the renderings *bread of heaven* and *rock
of salvation,* for *spiritual meat* and *spiritual rock,* are un-
doubtedly clever; but they seriously obscure the drift of
the Apostle's argument. It is a law of language that new
words must sometimes be found in order to give expression
to new ideas.

Let us then proceed with our comparison of the two
translations, which for brevity may be referred to by
the letters D. and S. respectively. In the first place, we

[1] The verb *endanger* occurs once, but not before Eccl. x. 9.
[2] Thus, to express ἀληθινὸς distinctly, אֲמִתִּי is often required (*e.g.* John i. 9;
iv. 23, 37; vi. 32 Del.; compare in mediæval Hebrew such expressions as
אַחֲדוּת אֲמִתִּית, *true unity;* דֵּעוֹת אֲמִתִּיּוֹת, *real opinions,* &c.). Similarly, for
the sake of definiteness, it is necessary to use special adjectives to express such
ideas as *spiritual, carnal, eternal.* See Rom. i. 20; xii. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 14; x. 4;
xv. 44; Col. iii. 16 in Delitzsch's translation. The development of Hebrew
which meets us in the Mishnah is analysed in Strack and Siegfried's *Lehrbuch
der Neuhebräischen Sprache* (1884). The intermediate link between the normal
classical Hebrew of the O. T. and the language of the Mishnah is afforded by the
Hebrew of Ecclesiastes: see the list of idioms in the Introduction to Delitzsch's
Koheleth, or in C. H. H. Wright's *Ecclesiastes* (1883), p. 488 ff.

notice a number of passages in which, though the render-
ings slightly vary, each is correct and appropriate, and a
preference on either side can hardly be expressed. Se-
condly, we notice passages in which sometimes one some-
times the other has found the happier or more idiomatic
expression. Instances in which S. appears to us to have
been successful in the choice of phrases are Matt. i. 18;
19 (לדבת עם); ii. 5*b* (כה); 7*b*; 9*b*; 17*a*; iii. 12; viii. 24
(from עד); ix. 33; x. 19 (the rendering of τί ἢ πῶς); xxvi.
42 (בלתי אם שתיתי); xxvii. 18; Luke i. 9; 20 (from עד);
ii. 26*b*; xv. 27; xviii. 3*b*; Acts ii. 24; vii. 44. On the
other hand, we prefer D. in Matt. ii. 13 (הם הלכו, an ex-
pressive idiom, used by the choicest writers of the O. T.);
iii. 15 (הניחה—more suitable here); iv. 3*b* (אָמֹר וְ); viii. 8
(מִבוֹאֲךָ, cf. Gen. xxix. 19—why the circumlocution in S.?);
29 *end*; ix. 32*a*; Luke iii. 11*b*; xviii. 4*b* (Deut. xxviii. 50);
xxiii. 23*b*; 28; John ii. 9; 10; xiii. 22 (where the expres-
sions in S. are inappropriate).

Thus passages of considerable length may be found, the
style of which, speaking generally, is equally excellent,
and in which there is no decided superiority on either
side. But we have not to read far to find that this is
not uniformly the case. It cannot be doubted that the
Sermon on the Mount is better rendered in D. than in
S. Not to lay stress here upon the imperfect syntax and
incorrect forms prominent in Matt. v. 19; vi. 3*b*; 21*b*;
28; vii. 11, the style in D. is more flowing, and the ex-
pressions are better chosen. And elsewhere, for instance in
parts of the Acts, the style of S. deteriorates still more;
Paul's speech at Athens, and the account of the tumult
at Ephesus (not to instance more) are simply barbarous
Hebrew. In the Prologue of St. John, the sense is
several times very imperfectly rendered, even if it be not
distorted.[1] In such parts of the Epistles as we have ex-

[1] In John i. 1 חֹוֶה (both times) should be הָיָה; and והוא before הדבר is more

amined we seldom find anything which is superior to D., and often that which is decidedly the reverse. Thus comparing the two translations in their broader and more general features, our verdict must be that S., though in parts it is excellent and shows the hand of a master, must be pronounced, as a whole, to be unquestionably inferior to D.

This opinion is strengthened when we come to examine details. Here (1), the *method of translation* followed by S. is open to criticism. In fact, he is not sufficiently faithful. Thus, in particular, instead of rendering a passage literally, he is apt to substitute for it a phrase borrowed, and often borrowed unsuitably, from the O. T. This practice is to be altogether deprecated. To be sure, in the translation of a modern poem into Hebrew, the adaptation of a phrase from the O. T. is permissible, and indeed is counted an elegance; but in such a work a strictly literal rendering is of small moment, a telling poetical equivalent is all that is required, and the original connexion or meaning of the borrowed phrase is unimportant. But in a translation of the N. T., both these matters are of serious importance. Moreover, the N. T. writers were not less familiar with the O. T. Scriptures than the modern translator; where they borrowed a phrase, or based their language upon a particular passage, this is always reflected distinctly in the Greek; in translating therefore the N. T. into Hebrew, it becomes a questionable liberty to adopt phrases, often rare or peculiar ones, from parts of the O. T. which there is no indication that the original writer had in his mind. Examples of such phrases, borrowed without sufficient reason, are Matt. ii. 3*b* (Isa. vii. 2); iii. 7 (נפשכם על

than superfluous. In *v*. 6 בְּאֶרֶץ is an intrusion, the intended meaning of which is far from clear. In *v*. 14 the words which correspond to καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο are scarcely intelligible, and in any case do not represent the sense of the Greek; in particular, the participle expresses not an *event* (ἐγένετο), but a *state*. In *v*. 11 the distinction of τὰ ἴδια and οἱ ἴδιοι is obliterated; and the rendering of οὐ κατέλαβον suggests an inappropriate idea.

gratuitously inserted from Gen. xix. 17); v. 24;[1] 28 (where
the rendering of D. preserves rightly the term used in
the tenth commandment); 41 (כברת ארץ); vi. 6 (cf. Ps.
xviii. 12); x. 13 (יחול); 32 (a recondite adaptation of Deut.
xxvi. 17, 18, but a very considerable deviation from the
Greek); xiii. 54 (Ps. xlviii. 6); xxv. 34 (הוסדה transcribed
mechanically from Exod. ix. 18, the pronoun here having
no antecedent! repeated strangely, John xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i.
20, and elsewhere); xxvii. 13 (Job xxxv. 16); 50 *end* (cf.
Ps. xxxi. 6; but here no translation of the Greek, though
suitable in Luke xxiii. 46. In support of D.'s rendering, see
Gen. xxxv. 18 LXX.); 51*b* (the introduction of fragments
of poetry ἀσυνδέτως is quite alien to the prose style of the
O. T.); 52*b*; Mark ix. 6*b* (אימתה—a form unheard of in
prose, but recurring elsewhere, *e.g.* 1 Cor. xiii. 6, עולתה);
24 (an incongruous phrase from Ps. lxxx. 6); Luke i. 21
(עד בוש—an arbitrary addition); ii. 40*b* (Ps. xlv. 3);
iv. 40 (Isa. liii. 3); xviii. 1; 8 *end*[2]; xxiii. 10 and 14 (Job
xxxvi. 19 and xxvi. 14 [so 1 Cor. xiii. 5]; both un-
suitable); John viii. 43 (Isa. lvii. 19); xiii. 27 *end*; 31
(נאדרי, from Exod. xv. 6, *at the end of a verse!*); Acts
xvi. 26 and xvii. 10 (again unsuitable poetical remini-
scences); Gal. v. 1 (Josh. iii. 17, in a very different con-
nexion); Jas. i. 5 (Jud. xviii. 7); Rev. iii. 17 (Job xxxi.
25); xviii. 7*b* (in spite of Isa. xlvii. 8, שכול is not = πένθος);
17 and 21 (Ps. lxxiii. 19 and Isa. liv. 8). In fact, such
examples occur on nearly every page, and often several
times in the same page.

Sometimes, in addition, the phrase thus borrowed is one
of which the original meaning is uncertain, a precarious
sense being arbitrarily affixed to it; at other times it is one
which suggests a misleading or doubtful association. Thus
(*a*) Matt. viii. 9 and Luke ii. 51 (in Luke especially the

---

[1] Reading of course, ורהב (Prov. vi. 3).

[2] עֲלֵי (here and elsewhere) is only poetical.

application of the phrase 1 Sam. xxii. 14 is inappropriate);
x. 28, xxvi. 61 and elsewhere (a most questionable adaptation
of the phrase in Deut. xxxiii. 7 in the sense of *be able* or
sufficient); Acts ix. 22 and xv. 24 (סכסך); xii. 21 and xx.
7 (Deut. xxxiii. 3*b*) ; and (β), Matt. ii. 4 (the phrase ...שאל פי‎
is used of asking for direction as to a course of action, not
of asking for mere information); v. 21 (בפלילים : D. uses
the later technical expression) ; xii. 13 (Exod. xiv. 27);
xiv. 31 and xxviii. 17 (D. is certainly right in using the post-
Biblical term for διστάζειν) ; xxi. 32*b* (the sense expressed
is merely that of *take to heart*, not *repent*, שוב‎); xxv. 46
(דראון [wrongly pointed] is no rendering of κόλασιν) ;
Mark v. 2*b* (borrowed from 1 Sam. xvi. 15, but at the cost
of obliterating the distinctive ἀκάθαρτον); ix. 12*b* (the
quotation from Isa. liii. 4, 5, 8, is unwarranted, and no
translation of ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ) ; 23 (יש לאל‎
ידך) ; 41 (Exod. xii. 4) ; Luke i. 22 (Ps. xxii. 8, etc.) ; i. 66*b*
(the phrase used denotes regularly to be seized by the
prophetic impulse ; Ezek. i. 3 ; iii. 22 ; 2 Kings iii. 15) ; iii. 8
(תשיג יד) ; John xi. 18 (1 Sam. xiv. 14) ; xii. 31 [1] (Ps. cxl. 12) ;
Acts xiii. 45*b* (2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 and Ps. lvi. 6 : but no
rendering of the Greek) ; xx. 9 (Ps. lxxvi. 6 : but the entire
verse is in fact a torso of phrases from the O. T., suggesting
the most incongruous associations). Sometimes indeed the
text is glossed so as seriously to alter the sense : thus Rev.
xiv. 13, the words " That they may rest from their labours ;
for their works *follow with them*," are transformed, without
the smallest necessity or excuse, into " There the weary are
at rest; and the work of their righteousness *goeth before
them*," from Job iii. 17 and Isa. lviii. 8, with a reminiscence
of Isa. xxxii. 17 (מעשה הצדקה).

It cannot, indeed, be denied that freedom such as this,
where it is consistent with idiom, enables a translator to

---

[1] נדחף moreover means *to hasten*, both in late Biblical Hebrew, and in the
Midrash (Levy, *s. v.*).

secure sometimes a grace of style which is beyond the reach
of one who makes fidelity his guiding principle. Thus in
Matt. ii. 13*b*, S. has undoubtedly the advantage over D.;
but it is gained at the cost of identifying the phrase with
that in *v.* 20, where the Greek is different. Similarly,
Matt. xxvi. 12, יצקה is better than שפכה; but the Greek
here is βαλοῦσα, a stronger word; and יצק is the equivalent
in *v.* 7 for κατέχεεν. So again Luke xv. 25*a*, but at the
expense of introducing something not expressed in the
Greek. In Matt. xxviii. 7 on the contrary a word, *going*,
is omitted. This may often be noticed. The question
which the translator is called upon to meet is this : Within
what limits is a deviation from the Greek permissible, for
the sake of securing an idiomatic Hebrew sentence, free
from stiffness? Possibly D. might have allowed himself
rather greater liberty in this respect than he has done,[1]
and have given thereby additional finish to his version; but
there can be no doubt that S. has taken it much too freely,
and without always gaining what was aimed at. More per-
missible adaptations are Matt. iii. 11 (קטנתי, cf. Gen. xxxii.
11) ; xii. 2 (לא תעשה,[2] cf. Lev. iv. 2); xxvi. 58*b* (Ruth iii. 18).

But sufficient examples will have been adduced to show
that an aptitude which is a merit and distinction in a trans-

---

[1] Phrases such as *And when he had said this, he* . . ., at the *close*
of a speech, are not in the style of the O. T. narrative, and are difficult to re-
produce in classical idiom. Luke xxiii. 46 ; xxiv. 40 (in both S. and D.) are
indeed exact, but not elegant. Recourse must be had to a circumlocution,
the nature of which will vary with the character of the passage. In these
two cases we would venture to suggest ויהי ככלותו לדבר ויפח נפשו and
ויהי כלה לדבר. Elsewhere, ויהי כאשר דבר את הדברים האלה . . ., construed
as in Gen. xviii. 33, might be appropriate. So Matt. xii. 24 וישמעו הפרושים
וישמעו אנשים מן העומדים שם (אצלו) ויאמרו (or ויאמרו; Mark xv. 35
כזאת too, in the best style, is only used in exceptional cases. In writing
Hebrew, the particles require to be handled with great delicacy. Matt.
xxvii. 23, כי מה עשה רעה would be both closer to the Greek and more idiomatic
(1 Sam. xxix. 8; 1 Kings xi. 22; 1 Sam. xx. 10 ; xxvi. 18) than the rendering of
either D. or S.

[2] D. here and in *v.* 4 has the technical expressions continually occurring
in similar discussions in the Mishnah, and in this connexion more suitable.

lator of *Romeo,* may become a snare to a translator of the
the New Testament.

Secondly, S. in spite of the classical style affected in it,
displays serious faults of grammar. Constructions occur
frequently which are unknown to the O. T.; particles are
used incorrectly, and false forms are of constant occurrence.

(*a.*) Matt. i. 20; ix. 18. . . . עוֹד הוּא. עוֹד הֵם occurs in
the O. T. and עוֹד אֲנִי once or twice in late books; but
עוֹד הוּא never. The form used is always עוֹדֶנּוּ.

iii. 7, 11 and often, אַךְ. אַךְ is restrictive, not adver-
sative; in S. it is continually used in the latter sense.
In classical Hebrew, the contrast between two clauses in
all ordinary cases, where it is not *very* marked, is suffi-
ciently indicated by their juxtaposition with the inter-
posed וְ. So D. here rightly.

iii. 8; x. 32; xviii. 23 and constantly, אֵפוֹא. The use of
this particle, again, is in S. quite unclassical. In the O. T.
it is rare, and restricted to special cases (especially with an
imperative, or מִי); in S. it becomes a general particle of
inference, usurping the place of לָכֵן, וְעַתָּה, or simply of וְ.

iv. 1, לַאֲשֶׁר [*sic*]. It is difficult to conjecture what this
is intended to represent.

iv. 4, וַיִּיעַ הוּא. הוּא here gives a false emphasis to the
Greek ὁ δέ . . .

iv. 17, מֵעֵת הַהִיא (cf. xvi. 21; xxvii. 15; Luke xvi. 10).
The solitary Mic. vii. 11 does not justify the omission of
the article before a substantive followed by הַהִיא. In Acts
ii. 40; xix. 26 occur instances of the opposite error, הַזֶּה
after a proper name (see Exod. xxxii. 1).

vi. 3 *b*; 21; xviii. 13; Luke xviii. 4. The jussive mood
in these verses is ungrammatical and expresses an incorrect
sense.

vi. 20; ix. 34; xi. 22 and elsewhere, אֶפֶס is another
particle of very limited use in the O. T., and not here in
place.

vii. 11.   The syntax of this verse defies analysis.[1]

Matt. viii. 20 ; Mark ix. 6 ; Luke xxii. 2 ; Acts xix. 36 ; xxv. 27 *end ;* also Matt. xxvi. 18 ; Luke xviii. 5 ; 1 Cor. x. 33.   Though analogies may be cited for the use of the infinitive and ל in these passages, it is a very questionable extension of what actually occurs in the O. T., even including the peculiar constructions used by the Chronicler.

ix. 4, 11 ; xiii. 10 ; xv. 3 and repeatedly, מדוע זה.   Contrary to idiom.   למה זה is common in the O. T. ; מדוע זה occurs never.   ומדוע is sometimes used in a question expressing surprise.

xi. 23, ועמדה.   Where לו stands in the protasis, it is contrary to usage to introduce the apodosis by the perf. with *waw* " conversive." [2]   D. rightly כי עתה.

xii. 4 and elsewhere, אלה אשר for *those who.*   An inelegancy which should be avoided wherever possible.   See D. and 2 Sam. xvii. 12.

xii. 5, במו [*sic*] ; Acts i. 2 במו.   Frequent as עלימו, למו are—at least in *poetry*—במו for בהם never occurs.

xii. 10 ; xiii. 55 ; xviii. 12, 21 and constantly, האם.   This occurs *twice* in the O. T. ; the sense attaching to it is doubtful (see the Commentators on Job vi. 13) ; probably it has the force of an emphatic *num ?*   It is a total misuse of it to make it the ordinary term for expressing a simple interrogation.

xiii. 26 ; xiv. 24 ; xix. 28 ; xxiv. 10 ; Luke i. 10.   The use of אי in these passages is unidiomatic, and in no way increases the distinctness of the Hebrew.

xiii. 29 ; xxi. 23 ; Luke iii. 15 ; xxiv. 41, 44 and elsewhere.   The use of בעוד followed by the finite verb can only be characterised as barbarous.

---

[1] Mic. ii. 11 is an example not to be imitated.

[2] Contrast the classical idioms of D. (1 Kings viii. 27 ; Job xxv. 5 f. ; also Deut. xvi. 17).

xxvi. 74, the later Heb. expression וּמִיָד is preferable to the doubtful וּבְרֶגַע זֶה.

xxvii. 13; Acts ix. 13, עַד כּמה. Unclassical.

Luke ii. 41; the frequentative וְעָלוּ (see 1 Sam. i. 3) is desiderated.

ii. 49; Acts v. 15, אחדים מהם. A questionable extension of the O. T. use of the plural of אחד.

ii. 62, after לאמר the *direct* narration is indispensable.

xvi. 4. A temporal *within* a final clause gives rise to an involved sentence contrary to the genius of classical Hebrew. We must vary the construction in some such way as the following: והיה אחרי (אשר) חדלתי מהיות סוכן וג' or למען אשר יאספוני אל בתיהם אחרי (אשר) חדלתי וג'.

xvii. 22; xxiii. 28, הנה ימים באים in the O. T. (except of course where וְ is *separated* from the verb) is always followed by the perfect with the so-called *waw* "conversive."

xxiii. 15; John ii. 9, מבלי followed by the infinitive is an inelegant construction which might be readily avoided.

John i. 22, דבר should follow את שלחינו.

i. 33, את before מי is as questionable as it is unnecessary.

Acts xx. 1, וּבְרֵכָתוֹ אוֹתָם. An impossible construction.

(*b*) Incorrect forms are of frequent occurrence. Some of these may indeed be mere misprints; but others recur too persistently to be explained as printer's errors. A few of those which we have noted will be found in the following verses: Matt. iii. 15; v. 19 (מפיר); vi. 28 *end*; viii. 21 (three); x. 5; 14; 21 *end* (so xiv. 11*b*; xvii. 16, 17; Luke xxiii. 14, 15; Acts ii. 32; xix. 31; xx. 28; Rom. ix. 23; x. 9; Eph. i. 20; 1 Pet. i. 21—all instances of the form הֵמִיתוּם); xviii. 13; xxv. 7 *b* (Qal for Hifil, giving no sense); 45 and 46 (absol. for constr.); xxvii. 29; Mark ix. 9 (inf. abs. for inf. cstr.; so Luke i. 10; xxi. 14; Acts xvii. 2); 27 *end*; Luke i. 21 *end*; 22; 24 *b*; 30 *b* (masc. for fem.); 45 *a* (see Eccl. x. 17); 45 *b*; 46 (*is great* for *doth magnify*); xi. 25; 53; xix. 27 *b*; 30 *b*; xxi. 14 *end*; John i. 5 *end*; 14 *end*;

48 (קרא) ; viii. 37 *end* ; viii. 28 (אתּי, *me*, an error for אתּו,
him [1] ;) Acts ii. 31 *b* ; ix. 12 ; xvi. 31 (ותושע) ; xix. 25 ; 26 *b*
(passive for active) ; 27 (see Jer. ii. 24) ; 36 ; 38 ; xx. 31
(so xxviii. 21) ; xxvii. 1 (*was chastised* for *was delivered*) ; 3
(ביום) ; Rom. viii. 35.   In Col. iv. 5, by a similar but, if
possible, still more extraordinary error, the Apostle is made
to exhort the Colossians to *sell* the time, instead of redeem-
ing it ; and in Acts i. 5, we read, not less strangely, *ye shall
baptize* instead of *ye shall be baptized*.[2]

It may be affirmed confidently that, except through
an isolated misprint, errors of punctuation and grammar,
such as those which have been indicated, are not to be
found in the whole of Prof. Delitzsch's version.[3]   Certainly
both these and other faults may be rectified without any
great difficulty by a qualified scholar, already familiar with
the Greek ; but the question forces itself upon us : What
will be the impression produced upon a reader of the class
for whom the translation is chiefly designed, and who may
make his first acquaintance with the New Testament
through a version in which they occur ?

Enough will have been written for the purpose of de-
claring our judgment on the two works before us.   We

---

[1] Or was the translator imitating Gen. xxx. 20 ?

[2] 1 Cor. x. 15, a word, *as*, is out of place, making the verse untranslateable.
In Luke xxiii. 2, is another strange and perplexing error, which however a
reader who recalls Exod. v. 5, may be able to correct.

[3] The charge which has been brought against a version which, though not
named, is evidently that of Prof. Delitzsch, of containing the absurd rendering,
" they ill-treated him, they *beheaded him*, and sent him away ashamed " (Mark
xii. 4), is unjust, and cannot be sustained.   The phrase employed is borrowed
from Judges v. 26, the verb מחק occurring nowhere else in O.T.   It is true
that David Kimchi understands the phrase as meaning *took off his head;* but
great as is the value of Kimchi's exegetical writings, he is not infallible, and is
sometimes demonstrably in error.   Here, as Gesenius pointed out, the meaning
assigned is altogether inappropriate, and not only is there no indication in the
narrative that Jael beheaded Sisera, but either a " hammer," or a " nail,"
would be unsuitable for the purpose.   There is no reason for supposing that the
phrase expresses more than *smote his head severely* which is apparently just the
sense of the ἀπ. λεγ. ἐκεφαλαίωσαν in the Gospel.

find that Salkinson's work, *in parts*, possesses high merits ; but its excellence is not sustained. Passages may be pointed to in which it is not inferior to Prof. Delitzsch's work, or which contain even a happier turn or phrase ; but far more frequently its inferiority is evident; it is too often a torso of heterogeneous phrases, culled indiscriminately from the most dissimilar parts of the O. T., and strung together without regard to unity of style ; and it is throughout sadly disfigured by unidiomatic constructions and ungrammatical forms. In fairness to its author, it ought of course to be recollected that it did not receive his final revision. We are grateful to Mr. Salkinson for what he has done ; we are grateful to Dr. Ginsburg for the pains which he has bestowed upon the completion and publication of his friend's work. The labour spent upon it will not have been in vain. In spite of the defects which it has been our duty to point out, it contains much both to interest and instruct; but it does not represent with accuracy the text of the New Testament, and it has no claim to supersede the version of Prof. Delitzsch.

S. R. DRIVER.

CHRISTUS CONSUMMATOR.

LESSONS FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IV. THE UNIVERSAL SOCIETY.

" Ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than *that of* Abel."—HEB. xii. 22–24 (Rev. Ver.).

WE have seen that the solemn and consolatory lessons of the priestly service of the Old Testament, which were brought together in their highest form on the Day of