

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 הַמַּשִּׁיחַ, *Evangelium secundum Matthæum in Lingua Hebraica, 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 succeeding 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 missionary, 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 affecting the welfare of the Jews,³ had directed his attention to the subject, and was induced ultimately, at the request 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 expression, 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 *διασπορά* 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 attainment 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 Trosts Schreiben 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 year¹) 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 electrotpe 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, ἔξῃστι, μέλλει, δοκεῖ, δεῖ,* and even such apparently 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 מְגִישִׁים, which occurs in the Talmud, and is employed by Delitzsch to represent the Greek *Μάγοι*, Salkinson uses הִזְי כִּכְבִּים, 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 undoubtedly 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 ἀληθινός distinctly, אֱמִתִּי is often required (e.g. John i. 9; iv. 23, 37; vi. 32 Del.; compare in mediæval Hebrew such expressions as אֱמִתּוּת אֱמִתִּית, true unity; רְעוּת אֱמִתִּית, 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 renderings slightly vary, each is correct and appropriate, and a preference on either side can hardly be expressed. Secondly, we notice passages in which sometimes one sometimes 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 (לרבת עם); ii. 5*b* (כה); 7*b*; 9*b*; 17*a*; iii. 12; viii. 24 (from עד); ix. 33; x. 19 (the rendering of $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \eta\ \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$); 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 expressive idiom, used by the choicest writers of the O. T.); iii. 15 (הניחה—more suitable here); iv. 3*b* (אמרו); viii. 8 (מבואד, 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 expressions 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 expressions 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 חָזַק (both times) should be הָלִיךְ; and זָהוּא before הַרְבַּר 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. 3b (Isa. vii. 2); iii. 7 (עַל נַפְשֶׁכֶּם)

than superfluous. In v. 6 בְּאַרְץ is an intrusion, the intended meaning of which is far from clear. In v. 14 the words which correspond to *καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ 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 (כְּבֵרֶת אֵרֶץ); vi. 6 (cf. Ps. xviii. 12); x. 13 (יָחֹל); 32 (a recondite adaptation of Deut. xxvi. 17, 18, but a very considerable deviation from the Greek); xiii. 54 (Ps. xlvi. 6); xxv. 34 (הִוְסֵדָה 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 ἀστυθέτως is quite alien to the prose style of the O. T.); 52 *b*; Mark ix. 6 *b* (אִימְתָה—a form unheard of in prose, but recurring elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 6, עֲלִמְתָה); 24 (an incongruous phrase from Ps. lxxx. 6); Luke i. 21 (עַד בּוֹשׁ—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 unsuitable); John viii. 43 (Isa. lvii. 19); xiii. 27 *end*; 31 (נֶאֱדָרִי, from Exod. xv. 6, *at the end of a verse*!); Acts xvi. 26 and xvii. 10 (again unsuitable poetical reminiscences); Gal. v. 1 (Josh. iii. 17, in a very different connexion); Jas. i. 5 (Jud. xviii. 7); Rev. iii. 17 (Job xxxi. 25); xviii. 7 *b* (in spite of Isa. xlvi. 8, שְׂכֹרֶל 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, וְרָהַב (Prov. vi. 3).

² עֲלִי (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 διατάζειν); xxi. 32*b* (the sense expressed is merely that of *take to heart*, not *repent*, שוב); xxv. 46 (רראון [wrongly pointed] is no rendering of κόλασις); 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 πολλά πάθη καὶ ἐξουδενωθῆ); 23 (ש לאל יד); 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. 31¹ (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 (בעשה הצדקה).

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

¹ נדחה 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, *צקה* is better than *שפכה*; but the Greek here is *βαλοῦσα*, a stronger word; and *צק* is the equivalent in *v.* 7 for *κατέχευεν*. 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 permissible 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 reproduce 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 *ויפח נפשו ויברך לרבו ויהי ככלותו לרבו* and *ויהי כאשר דבר את הרברים האלה* . . . Elsewhere, *כאשר כלה לרבו*, construed as in Gen. xviii. 33, might be appropriate. So Matt. xii. 24 *וישמעו הפרושים* (or *וישמעו אנשים מן העומדים שם* (or *אצלו*)) and *ויאמרו*; Mark xv. 35 *ויאמרו* (or *אצלו*) 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. . . עֵד הוּא. עֵד הוּא occurs in the O. T. and עֵד אֲנִי once or twice in late books; but עֵד הוּא never. The form used is always עוֹדְנוּ.

iii. 7, 11 and often, אֵךְ. אֵךְ is restrictive, not adverbative; 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 sufficiently indicated by their juxtaposition with the interposed ׀. So D. here rightly.

iii. 8; x. 32; xviii. 23 and constantly, אִפּוּא. 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 כִּי); in S. it becomes a general particle of inference, usurping the place of לְכֵן, וְעַתָּה, or simply of ׀.

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

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

iv. 17, מִעַתָּה הִדְוִיא (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 הִדְוִיא. In Acts ii. 40; xix. 26 occur instances of the opposite error, הוּוּה 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, אִפּס 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, מרוע זה. Contrary to idiom. זה למה זה is common in the O. T.; מרוע זה occurs never. ומרוע 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 כִּי עָתָה.

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

xii. 5, בְּמוֹ [*sic*]; Acts i. 2 בְּמוֹ. Frequent as לְמוֹ, עֲלִימוֹ are—at least in *poetry*—בְּמוֹ for בְּהֶם never occurs.

xii. 10; xiii. 55; xviii. 12, 21 and constantly, הֵאֵם. 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 אֵן 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 בְּעֵד 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 יָמִיד is preferable to the doubtful זֶה וּבְרִנֵּעַ.

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

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

ii. 49; Acts v. 15, אַחֲרַיִם מָהֵם. A questionable extension of the O. T. use of the plural of אַחַד.

ii. 62, after לאָמַר 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: 'וְהָיָה אַחֲרָי (אֲשֶׁר) חֲדַלְתִּי סוֹכֵן וּג' or לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר יֵאֲסֹפוּנִי אֶל בְּתֵיהֶם אַחֲרָי (אֲשֶׁר) חֲדַלְתִּי וּג'.

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

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

John i. 22, אֵת שְׁלַחֲנוּ דָבָר should follow.

i. 33, אֵת before מִי is as questionable as it is unnecessary.

Acts xx. 1, וּבְבִרְכָתוֹ אֹתָם. 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 (מִפִּיר); 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 הַמִּיתוּם); 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 (אָתִי, *me*, an error for אָתּוֹ, *him*¹); Acts ii. 31 *b*; ix. 12; xvi. 31 (וּתְרוּשַׁע); 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 (בִּיּוֹם); 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 *redeeming* 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 declaring 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 untranslatable. 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 כָּרַק 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. ἐκεφαλαιῶσαν 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