are called on to \( \text{ἀποθέσαι} \) the old man the analogous achievement of Christ is cited and emphasised as an example and a type. When in Ephesians they are summoned \( \text{ἀποθέσαι} \) the old man, it seems natural to find the same thought underlying a slightly different form; and in the \( \text{καθώς} \) clause to recognise a reference to the laying aside by Jesus of the \( \text{σῶμα τῆς σαρκός} \), rendering the phrase as already suggested, "that as is actual fact in the case of Jesus, ye put off the old man."

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

**THE MISHNA ON IDOLATRY.**

Dr. HARKAVY (I think) once observed that whereas the Biblical inheritance of the Jews had been appropriated by strangers, their Rabbinical inheritance was still left to themselves. Encroachments on such estates by capable workers are more often welcomed than resented, and Mr. Elmslie is likely to meet with gratitude from the owners of the Talmud for pegging out a claim. The treatise which he has selected for translation and illustration is the most interesting of all—that which regulates the relations between Israelites and their pagan neighbours; it is packed full of matter that is of value to the anthropologist, the mythologist and the historian as well as to the Orientalist and theologian. Perhaps it feels strange in its new environment; accustomed to a commentary that is harder than the text, in Mr. Elmslie's edition it is surrounded by the luxuries of European scholarship, a critical apparatus, a translation which shirks no difficulty, and a commentary which elucidates its various obscurities; to these are added an Introduction, a series of excursuses and a glossary.

The publication of this treatise in an accessible form and by so competent a hand may prove to be of considerable importance politically. For the occupation of Palestine by Jewish communities has been going on for years and the introduction of constitutional government into the Ottoman Empire seems to favour the extension of that occupation. Will the resettled Jews adopt towards their neighbours the attitude of extreme intolerance which this treatise prescribes? When the writer was last in Palestine the statements made to him were rather in favour of an affirmative answer to this question: where the territory was occupied by Jews, there was no place for members of other communities. Mr. Elmslie’s work should be studied by all whom the Zionist movement interests; and it will be all the more valuable as a contribution to Eastern politics because it is evident that his mind is absolutely free from Antisemitism.

D. S. Margoliouth.

**ON A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.**

I have long been surprised to find how much stress is laid by most commentators upon a secondary application of this commandment, while they almost leave out of sight its plain and primary meaning. For they put *profane speaking*, not *lying*, as the thing chiefly forbidden. Here is an instance of what I mean. In Mant’s Bible (1817) stands (as from *Oxford Catechism...*): “In this third Commandment are forbidden: 1. Irreverent thoughts of God. 2. Blasphemy, or dishonourable mention of His name. 3. False swearing in avouching an untruth. 4. Perjury, or breaking a lawful oath. 5. Causing the name of God, and our holy profession, to be blasphemed by others.”

Now the commandment actually forbids, not 1, 2, 5, but