





The New Testament in Hebrew Dress

B. Felsenthal

The Hebrew Student, Vol. 1, No. 4. (Jul., 1882), p. 69.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0190-5953%28188207%291%3A4%3C69%3ATNTIHD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>

The Hebrew Student is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

inspiring the human heart with courage and hope. Even after the lapse of thirty-three centuries the child of God finds his faith and hope wrapped up in Moses' closing words of benediction upon the tribes:

"There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun who rideth upon the heaven in thy help and in his excellency on the sky, The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms;

And he shall thrust out the enemy before thee; and shall say Destroy them,

Israel thou shalt dwell in safety alone

The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine;

Also his heavens shall drop down dew,

Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord.

The shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency!

And thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee;

And thou shalt tread upon their high places."

These songs of Moses, beginning with that of victory and salvation of Israel at the Red Sea, blend harmoniously with that of the angels near Bethlehem's ancient site:

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

This blending harmony but prefigures the thrilling anthem of the redeemed who are represented by John as singing the song of Moses and the Lamb.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN HEBREW DRESS.*

BY

DR. B. FELSENTHAL.

Although we cannot recognize any scientific significance whatever in Delitzsch's translation of the New Testament, and although we are able to see in it nothing else than a missionary document, yet we will make prominent the fact that the translation taken as a whole is a very successful one. Not only each word-form but each daghesh and each vowel-sign has been well weighed, with care and grammatical scrupulousness. The translator, rightly, has not striven after an Old Testament purism, but he has endeavored to acquire the speech [*Sprachfarbe*] of the New Testament period, the mishna character of its phraseology. (Cf., e. g. צריך Matt. xxvi. 26; צלב ib. xxvii. 22; צריך Mar. xi. 3; ראי Luk vii. 4; כרי ib. vii. 6; חזקים לנהול ib. xx. 35; גבי הסנה ib. xx. 37; תכריכין ib. xx. 5; כפרט Jno. i. 5 sqq.) For this reason also, it cannot be thought strange if here and there words borrowed from the Greek should occur (e. g. פרחסיא Jno. x. 24; נליסקמא ib. xii. 6; דיתיקי Heb. ix. 17; etc.)

In some places, so it appears to us, the translator has not hit upon the right word. We take, for example, the word *logos*; which appears in the New Testament more than 300 times. So far as we can ascertain by a short comparison, Delitzsch has almost everywhere rendered it by the Hebrew דבר. (In Luke xx. 26, we found for it מאמר). Now let one read the first verse in the Gospel of St. John. How unhebraic does the verse read: את האלהים היה הדבר בראשית היה והדבר היה! Scarcely could any one who possesses anything of a Hebrew sensibility of the language understand this Hebrew verse in the sense of the original, if the Johannean doctrine of the Logos had not already been made known to him. What? Should the Hebrew דבר be used for the Greek *logos*? To

be sure *dabhar* occurs frequently enough in the Old Testament in the sense of *word*. But when the Hebrew Bible speaks of the unclean *dabhar* which is touched (Lev. v. 2), it means a *thing* and not a word. And when it discourses about the *dabhar* which is tried in the fire (Num. xxxi. 23), it discourses about a *thing* and not a word. And when it mentions a *dabhar* which bears marks (Deut. xxii. 20), it means also a *thing* and in no case a word. And so we find sufficient proof that in the course of time the signification of *dabhar* extended and transformed itself. At the time of the Apostles according to all probability it was used in the sense of *stuff* or *substance*. At all events we find it with this meaning in the Hebraic literature. And hence an interesting chapter in the history of the Hebrew language may be illustrated by the word דבר. How light would the Christian and Jewish scholastics of the middle ages have found their labor, as they sought to bring into harmony the biblical account of Creation and the Aristotelian philosophy, if they had had before them the verse הדבר הראשית היה. They could then, have very plainly transferred it. In the beginning was the substance. And what would not Göthe have made out of the *dabhar* if he had had it before him. His Faust does not know whether he shall translate: the word, or the sense, or the power, or the deed. With דבר in the text, the Spinozist Heide would certainly have called out: אלהים היה הדבר, God was the substance.

Without doubt, it was a mistake to set the word דבר in Jno. i. 1. Here, at all events, the right word would be מאמר, corresponding to the Targumistic מימרא. Cf. also the Mishna expression 'עשרה מאמרות וגו' (Aboth 5. 1). But many will say for the sake of consistency [*Gleichartigkeit*] *logos* was here also to be translated by דבר. Oh, no! It is an entirely false principle to determine to use always the same word in a translation for a certain word in the original. In different connections, with different authors and in different ages, words take on different shades of meaning; and the translator must always make account of this. In the English New Testament, consequently, the word *logos* is not always translated by the same word. We find it rendered by *thing*, *saying*, *word*, *speech*, etc.

Similarly also *hodos* should not always be translated by דרך. It seems to us that in many places the Mishna הלכה should have the preference; e. g. Jno. xiv. 5, 6 in the words: I am the way, the truth and the life.

Likewise Delitzsch has consistently למלאות ובו for the common "to fulfil what is written," and here לקיים is so readily suggested. The verb מלא is indeed really found in the Old Testament with the meaning here required (Cf. I Kgs. ii. 27); but on the other hand, in the Bible the verb קום appears much oftener with this meaning; thus in the Piel (Esther ix. 21, 29, 31; Ruth iv. 7; Ezra xiii. 6; Ps. cxix. 106, etc.) and in the Hiphil (Gen. vi. 18; ix. 9; 1 Sam. xv. 17; 2 Kgs. xxiii. 24). In the Mishna, however, *kayyem* is the commonest word and should be the one to be employed in a Hebrew New Testament.

In a revision of the translation still a few other changes might commend themselves to Prof. Delitzsch and his fellow-laborers.

* Translated by the authors' request, from the German, as it appeared in *Der Zeitgeist*, May 22d.



The Hebrew New Testament of Franz Delitzsch

Gustaf Dalman

The Old and New Testament Student, Vol. 15, No. 3/4. (Sep. - Oct., 1892), pp. 145-150.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0190-5937%28189209%2F10%2915%3A3%2F4%3C145%3ATHNTOF%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

The Old and New Testament Student is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT OF FRANZ
DELITZSCH.

By Rev. DR. GUSTAF DALMAN, of Leipzig.

Translated by Prof. A. S. Carrier, Chicago.

Since there were numerous errors in the translation of the New Testament, published by the "London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," in 1817, and afterwards often revised, Franz Delitzsch as early as 1838 asked for a new translation, in "*Wissenschaft, Kunst, Judenthum*." But it was not until the year 1864 that the work was actually put in operation, as appears from an appeal of Delitzsch in his *Zeitschrift "Saat und Hoffnung"* for Christmas, 1864. By June, 1865, the translation of Matthew, James, Hebrews and Revelation was provisionally completed (S. u. H. III 7, 91). The first proof of Romans, with a Rabbinical commentary, appeared in the summer of 1870, together with an appendix containing a critique of that which had already been accomplished, and explanations of the principles which underlay the enterprise. At the same time (S. u. H. VIII. 75) Delitzsch announced that he wished thoroughly to revise Matthew. In May, 1874, he was able to announce (S. u. H. XI. 129) that the translation of the entire New Testament was ready for the press. Certain Jewish friends of Delitzsch, who were indemnified for their trouble by the munificence of the "*Gesellschaft für Juden Mission in Baiern und Norwegen*," had given important assistance to this work by forwarding proposed translations. After several useless efforts by various publishers the "*British and Foreign Bible Society*," in the summer of 1875, undertook the publication, so that the composition could begin in Sept., 1875. (S. u. H. XIV 80 ff).

In the spring of 1877 the work was completed (S. u. H. XIV 242ff); but now began the more difficult work of revision and criticism. Men like Prof. Levey in Breslau, Prof. Kaufmann in Budapest, Prof. Kautzsch in Basel, and Dr. Biesenthal in Leipzig, made suggestions for correction. Delitzsch himself

had come to the conclusion that the text of the Sinaitic Codex, which was originally adopted as the basis for translation, was not suitable for this purpose, and he decided, in accordance with the wish of the Bible Society, to make use of the Textus Receptus, and to add only the most important variants of the Sinaitic Codex in brackets. (S. u. H. XV 222ff). In the late autumn of 1878, the second edition, translated on this new principle, appeared. (S. u. H. XVI 55ff). In February, 1880, the third edition was issued (S. u. H. XVII 186f) and in the autumn of 1881, the fourth (S. u. H. XVIII 201f), to which Dr. Baer in Biebrich and Prof. Driver in Oxford had made most important contributions. The text of this fourth edition was electrotyped and is repeated in five other editions, with slight alterations.

In an article written in English, "The Hebrew New Testament" Leipzig, 1883, Delitzsch presented a number of important corrections, which, however, received but partial recognition in the stereotyped edition; though they were fully recognized in the new octavo edition of 1885, which, therefore, until the eleventh edition, which has just appeared, represented the most advanced form of the text.

Afterwards, and especially in consequence of proposed corrections by the Jewish scholars J. Kahan and J. Lichtenstein in Leipzig, and A. B. Ehrlich in New York, Delitzsch was convinced of the necessity of an extensive revision of his work. This he undertook in spite of increasing weakness and so comprehensive was his plan that he could entitle the present text a new translation. The thorough revision of the entire New Testament was provisionally completed when paralysis compelled the old man of seventy-six to lay down the pen and entrust the completion of the work to younger hands.

In the early part of February, 1890, he committed the work to the writer of this article, who had been closely connected with him for twenty years by a common interest in the evangelization of the Jews, hoping, however, to oversee the work until its completion. But God took the weary warrior home before more than the first half sheet could be placed in his dying hands. The review of this half sheet was the last work which was granted to my old friend, a

work in which he had been employed almost uninterruptedly for twenty-five years.*

The increased work given to me as editor, in which, by the request of Delitzsch, the Jewish scholar J. Kahan assisted me, consisted, (1) in the completion of the revision of the translation upon the basis of materials collected by Delitzsch, with the closest adaptation to the guiding principles. (2) In the furtherance of arrangements for the new printing; and (3) in the oversight of the press work. In the beginning of August, 1891, the work was completed; in February, 1892, the new eleventh edition was bound and on the market.

The text which underlies the new edition differs from that of earlier editions in that the *Textus Receptus* is discarded, and the more important and better readings of the older Codices find a place in it, while the less worthy readings of the *Receptus*, if they represented additions to the original text, remained in brackets, but if they were real variants they were placed at the foot of the page.

An effort was thus made to obviate the annoyances of the reader, on finding alternative readings standing in the text. Prof. Delitzsch declared that a thorough revision of the text in this particular was necessary, and he committed it to me, but this was delayed by the veto of the Bible Society. Unfortunately, on this account, the present text lacks in complete unity. In reality it is only the critical apparatus which has already appeared in the different editions which I revised, and gave a new form, according to the principles just stated.

At this point I wish to remark that I have replaced the superscription of the Apocalypse, from which Delitzsch had stricken the name of John, in the last edition supervised by him. Since he wished, by this alteration, only to remove the apparent contradiction between the superscription and the opening of the book (*Apocalypsis Iesou Xriston*), I do not doubt that he would have agreed with me on renewed consideration. An Appendix to contain practical notes, which

* An article which appeared after the death of Dr. Delitzsch entitled "Eine Übersetzungsarbeit Von 52 Jahren" containing some utterances of Delitzsch that had been printed before, gives an excessive reckoning, viz., from 1838, although nothing was done from 1838 to 1864.

should correct misapprehensions of Jewish readers, had been long planned by Delitzsch, but in his last remarks concerning the new edition (S. u. H. XXVII 74), which only appeared after his death, they were given up.

For the orthography of the Hebrew, the edition of Old Testament texts by Baer was adopted as a model. Orthographic peculiarities, like defective writing of vowels, are merely accidental. But the eye of the Old Testament reader ought not to be disturbed by a new writing.

By far the most difficult portion of my editorial work lay, as a matter of course, in the realm of the language. Delitzsch had laid it down as his principle that the text should be reproduced as if thought and written in Hebrew. But even if one should admit, which the writer can not do, that some of the New Testament writers really thought in Hebrew and not in Aramaic, it would still remain an impossibility to determine how the written Hebrew of the time of Jesus and the Apostles was constructed. What has been presented by Margoliouth, in *The Expositor* for 1880, regarding the language of the book of Sirach; by Kyle and James in *Psalmi Salmōniōn*, 1891, regarding the original of the Songs of Solomon, and by Resch in "*Agrapha Ausser Canonische Evangelien Fragmenti*" 1889, regarding an original Hebrew Gospel, is by no means entirely admissible, and even if it were, could not satisfactorily give a picture of the written Hebrew of that time. Therefore, there remain as the nearest accessible witnesses, the Book of David and the Mishna, which are sundered by three or four hundred years. But Delitzsch has endeavored to construct out of the Hebrew, of all periods of its history, down to the close of the Mishna, a dialect which would be fitted to become the instrument for the New Testament world of thought.

But toward the last, he appeared to have felt that a greater unity of linguistic character was desirable for the translation, and that the new Hebrew of Mishna and of the older Midrash was the idiom which stood nearest the New Testament style. He moved, therefore, in this direction chiefly, in his revision of the translation, without, however, entirely obliterating the older Hebraic basis. This two-fold linguistic

form of the translation; in consequence of which, the oldest and newest elements often stand close together, embarrassed the editor not a little, as one can readily understand. But it must be admitted that the linguistic compromise adopted by Delitzsch, after much thought, was the only way out of a difficult dilemma. It is only too evident, from the Hebrew New Testament of Salkinson published as an example of classic Hebrew, that the New Testament revelation cannot be accurately reproduced in Old Testament Hebrew. On the other hand, a holy book completing the Old Testament revelation could not properly adopt the Rabbinic idiom of the Talmud and the Midrash. From such considerations as these arose that combination of idioms which may prove disturbing to scholars. There is yet another consideration, which led to the compromise.

The Hebrew New Testament was not intended to proclaim Christianity to the Jews of Talmudic times, but to those of the present day. The modern written Hebrew is, however, inter-penetrated with German colloquialisms, and even when there is an effort after the classic idiom, the result is often such an arbitrary hodge-podge of Old Testament phrases, used in utterly absurd senses, that the language seemed better fitted for a playground of wit and humors, than for a dignified medium of thought for scholars and sober, simple readers. No concessions whatever could be made to such poor linguistic taste, especially when it is remembered that ever since the time of Luzzato many profound thinkers among the Jews themselves had raised a bitter lament concerning this abuse of their language. Yet the Hebrew New Testament must contain nothing which the Jewish readers of the present time could fail to rightly understand. Hence it was necessary to employ a great number of expressions for which a Jew of the time of the Apostles would have used Greek terms. We discover from the Targums, less Midrash and Talmud that the Hebrew had no words of its own for certain post-biblical ideas, and that foreign words were adopted even when Hebrew equivalents existed. Since to the Jews of the present day, the exact meaning of the foreign words, is for the most part unknown, it was necessary to choose Hebrew expressions in some measure equivalent.

For the printing of the new edition, which consists of 469 pages in small 8.^o, new type was prepared after a Jewish pattern, by the famous printing house of W. Drugulin, of Leipzig, and these were made in Russia for this special purpose. The vowels were for the first time cast as a part of the letters, and thereby the injury to many of the types, during printing, otherwise unavoidable, was prevented. Unfortunately the type for the Superscription was not of this pattern, which explains the fact that the presses caused serious injury in some places. I have called attention to this in the Preface to the reader.

A translation of the Scriptures for practical purpose, if it is not a mere paraphrase, remains always somewhat imperfect. It was not an accident, but a divine Providence, that the completed revelation in Christ entered the world, not in Aramaic nor Hebrew dress, but in Greek, and it is also not an accident, but a consequence of the judgment denounced by Israel upon herself, that the word of the fulfilled new covenant returns to her, not as a Hebrew original, but as a translation out of the Greek. But would that this new offer of Salvation, in the Hebrew tongue by which Christ "who was born from the seed of David according to the flesh," for the second time appears among his people, might prove to be to them not a savor of death, but of life and salvation.

I append a tabular statement of all the past editions of Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, according to the eighty-seventh report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1891) p. 440.

EDITION.	COPIES.	WHERE PRINTED.	YEAR.	TYPE OR PLATES.
1st	2500	32mo Leipzig	1877	type
2nd	2500	" "	1878	"
3rd	2500	16mo "	1880	"
4th	5000	32mo Berlin	1881	plates
5th	5170	" "	1883	"
6th	4810	" "	1885	"
7th	5850	" "	1886	"
*8th	5000	8vo "	1885	type
9th	6000	32mo "	1888	plates
10th	4900	" "	1889	"
11th	5000	16mo Leipzig	1892	type
Total 49,230 copies.				

* This edition was originally not numbered at all, but was subsequently inserted after the edition of 1886, as the eighth edition.



Franz Delitzsch. Autobiography; With Introduction and Notes

Hermann V. Hilprecht; Franz Delitzsch

The Old Testament Student, Vol. 6, No. 7. (Mar., 1887), pp. 209-213.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0190-5945%28188703%296%3A7%3C209%3AFDAWIA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

The Old Testament Student is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.
AUTOBIOGRAPHY; WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY PROFESSOR HERMANN V. HILPRECHT, PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

February 23, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, *professor ordinarius* of theology in the University of Leipzig, entered on the seventy-fifth year of his age. There is scarcely another German or American theologian at the present time who has gained so great and widespread a reputation as has this venerable scholar, both in his own country and among other nations. For nearly half a century he has worked as an academical teacher, as a productive writer, and, chief of all, as the principal leader of the Jewish Mission. Students from all parts of the world have sat at his feet and come under his powerful influence. Even to-day, when he has reached and passed the usual boundaries of human life, his always over-crowded lectures, in the vast rooms of the flourishing Saxonian University, exercise the same attraction to his pupils as in that former period of his life when he, von Hofmann, Thomasius, Harnack, and other eminent men, raised the University of Erlangen to the seat of Lutheran theology and to the centre of scholarly life and faithful religious confession. This fact, which seems strange according to the general rule and experience of great academicians, finds its only reasonable explanation in his singular and unique personality. Indeed, that may well be added which cannot always be truly said of other scholars: Delitzsch has become old; but his teachings have remained fresh and young; and the notes of his lectures have not grown musty on the shelves of a fast-closed shrine. The man, with his natural disposition and talents of mind and heart,—the Christian, with his rich gifts of grace in faith and love,—and the scholar, with his thorough knowledge and his sharp faculty of judgment acquired by severe study and a restless activity of many years,—unite, in beautiful harmony, in Franz Delitzsch. For this very reason, the question sometimes raised, whether Delitzsch has proved greater as a man, or Christian, or scholar, can only be answered by the fact that, in the learned Hebraist and exegete, the faithful believer in Christ, with his unchangeable reverence for the Word of God, and the talented man, with his peculiar style, his expressive and vivid language, his speculative flight of thought and his poetical feeling, cannot be separated from each other.

Still, I will not try myself to describe Delitzsch's person and character, his life and his work. Professor S. D. F. Salmond rejoiced us last year with a short but excellent sketch of his Leipzig friend in *The Expositor*.¹ Another survey of the life and work of this scholar, written in Hebrew, and accompanied by a very fair four-fold poem celebrating the venerable friend of Israel, was dedicated to

¹ See *The Expositor*, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.), No. XVIII., June, 1886, pp. 456-471. The etched portrait, however, which accompanied the article of Professor Salmond in the same number, was very imperfect. A really good likeness of Franz Delitzsch (32 x 43 centimeters) was issued in phototype 1885, by the *Centralbureau* of the *Instituta Judaica* (W. Faber) Leipzig, Thalstrasse, and may be obtained from there for M.1.50.

Delitzsch on his seventieth birthday (1883), and afterwards published, with his permission, by A. M. Stengel, under the title "Words of Truth and Love."¹ Shorter or longer articles and notes regarding Delitzsch's activity and success in the Jewish Mission will be found in several periodicals.²

Comparatively few persons, however, in Europe or in America, are aware that Professor Delitzsch himself some years ago wrote some personal remembrances of his life,—as far as I know, the only biographical notes from his pen ever given to the public. The author tells only the most important events in his life, briefly and simply. Nevertheless, this autobiography contains several things which do not occur in any of the above mentioned sketches. For this reason, and out of regard for the general interest taken on this side of the ocean in the person, the life and the writings of Delitzsch, I herewith submit my translation from the Norwegian into English of this autobiography, hitherto confined to a small circle of readers.

The cause of the writing of this autobiography is easily told. The editor of a small Norwegian religious paper, *Missions-Blad for Israel*, to the columns of which the Leipzig professor has contributed some other articles, asked Delitzsch for an outline of his life, intended to be an illustration of the likeness in the number for April, 1883. In acknowledgement of the faithful services of the Norwegian church in the field of Jewish Missions, and out of gratitude for their important support afforded in the bringing out of his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, Delitzsch fulfilled the wishes of his dear friends, and sent the following sketch:³

"I was born in Leipzig, February 23, 1813, and was baptized March 4, in the church of St. Nicolai at the same place. My father, who was a native of Leipzig, had at this time, and while I was a boy, a shop where he dealt in second-hand goods, a so-called frippery. This brought him in very little; and I passed an arduous childhood. My father died April 4, 1836, fifty-four years old.

"My benefactor from childhood was a Jew, called Hirsch Levy; he lived with us, and dealt in books. If it had not been for him, I could never have succeeded in studying. First, I went to a boys' school, and after that I attended the free

דברי אמת ואהבה אשר רחש לבי (p. 32) is the exact title of the little interesting pamphlet (p. 32) is בשרי העברה, שנת 1883, בחדש השני הוא פֶּעֶבְרוֹאֵר, בשלשה ועשרים יום בו, עת מלאות שבעים שנה ליום הולדת איש רב תבונות, הגול מרבבה לוחם כגבור מלחמת האמת והצדק וכאחד מגדולי ישראל יד ושם לו בחכמת ישרון וספרותו, דורש שלום עם ישראל וטובתו, הלא הוא החכם המפואר הישיש הנכבד פֶּרָאָפֶּעססאָר פֶּרָאָנֶץ דעליטש בעיר ליפסיא.

יצא לאור בשנת { טהר—לכ ו'רס }
 { יס"ף ימים—חיים : } לפ"ק.

ליום מלאות לו אחת ושבעים שנה מאת א. מ. שטעננעל.

Wien, 1884, at the author's personal expenses, II., Rembrandt-Str. 4.

² A brief essay, "Franz Delitzsch in his relation to Israel," written by me for *The Lutheran Church Review*, edited by Rev. Professor H. E. Jacobs, D. D. (Philadelphia, The Alumni Association of the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary) will appear in its second number, April, 1887.

³ Very appropriately the editor of the *Missions-Blad* remarks, in a note added to the lines of Delitzsch, pp. 51-54: "We have not been able, nor thought it proper, to send out missionaries among the Jews; but we have shared in the sending of the greatest missionary since the ascension of our Lord, the Holy Scriptures. What an honor for our 'low church' and for our people, to have had a part!"

school, of the town, where, at this time, Plato was director, and Dolz vice-director. Here I became a decided rationalist. I felt myself drawn to God; but the person of Jesus Christ was to me involved in utter darkness. I went to the university to study philosophy and philology; and while seeking for truth, I became absorbed in the systems of the great German philosophers; Fichte especially captivated me.

"But one of my university fellows, called Schütz, who had found the Saviour, and loved him, worked incessantly to bring me to believe. I resisted a long time; but this very day I could point out the place (in one of Leipzig's streets) where a light from above put me into the same state as Thomas when he exclaimed 'My Lord and my God!' Henceforth I became a theologian, and familiar with students who had been awakened by the mercy of God. There were also domestic circles of believers in Leipzig, where now I felt quite at home. The years from 1832 to 1834, my last three years at the university, were the happiest of my life; they were the spring of my spiritual life, the days of my first love.

"I also became associated with the missionaries of the Jews, Goldberg and Becker, who, in carrying on their work, visited the fairs of Leipzig. It was these two men who first taught me to love that people from which the Saviour descended, and taught me to pray for the conversion to Christ of those who had betrayed him. Now, when I am called 'the celebrated Hebraist,' it sounds strange when I say that the missionary Becker gave me the first rabbinical instruction; but so it was. I had brought some knowledge of Hebrew with me from the gymnasium; and this language became my favorite study. My studies of the Rabbinic began with the reading of the tract 'Or le'eth eres' (Light by eventide), with the missionary Becker.

"I found in my benefactor Hirsch an object for work. My interest in him brought not early but ripe fruit. May 10, 1843, my dearest benefactor was baptized; and two years after he passed away in peace.

"For seven years (from 1835 to 1842) I led the devotional gatherings in a circle of believing friends. Some of the members are still alive; they stand, thank God! firm in faith; and when we meet, we confess that our anchor still holds in the old ground. Thus practically occupied on the one hand, I devoted myself, on the other, entirely to the study of Hebrew and of the Old Testament. This led me to Rosenmüller's¹ school, and then in particular connection with Fleischer² and with my dear Paul Caspari.³ Our aim was the same; and although

¹ Ernst Friedrich Karl Rosenmüller, son of the not less famous Johann Georg Rosenmüller, who died as professor of theology in Leipzig, 1815, studied and taught afterwards as *privat-docent* (1792), *professor extraordinarius* (1796) and *professor ordinarius* (1813-1835) of the oriental languages in the University of Leipzig. As academical teacher, he effected more through his great influence in personally advising and forwarding students in their work than through his attractiveness in the class-room. Rosenmüller's literary fertility is known. Of his numerous writings, "Das alte und neue Morgenland" (6 volumes, Leipzig, 1818-20) and "Scholia in Vetus Testamentum" (ed. ult. XI partes in 23 voll., 1820-35) are the most important. See article "Rosenmüller" in Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie, 2. ed., vol. 13, pp. 69 seq.

² H. O. Fleischer, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D., *professor ordinarius* of oriental languages in the University of Leipzig, and the greatest living authority in Arabic philology. As writer, he is well known by his edition of "Beidhawii Commentarius in Coranum," 2 volumina, Lipsiae, 1846-48, and by a great many essays of high value published in various scientific papers. Although more than eighty-five years old, Professor Fleischer still enjoys good health, devotes himself to literary work, and gathers round him a circle of advanced students and scholars, to whom he delivers his learned and attractive lectures.

³ C. Paul Caspari, Doctor and Professor of theology in Christiania, Norway, and President of

we were of different natures, we conceived an affection for each other, becoming intimate friends. And now, seeing this friend of mine among the representatives of the Norwegian church and of the Norwegian mission, I praise the merciful guidance of God.

"Up to this point I have not mentioned my mother. She was a daughter of a musician in a little town between Leipzig and Halle. When she became a widow, and was alone in the world, she started a little second-hand book-store; and even after I was elected professor, my mother still dealt in old books. This contrast grieved me much. But she wished to be independent, and for that she could not be blamed. She was an honest woman; she was respected and beloved by all who knew her. She took very little pleasure in this world; and when she died in my arms, December 7, 1857, she was happy to pass away. I am not the only one who visits her tomb from time to time. She was a faithful cross-bearer, to whom the words 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much' (Lk. vii. 47) may well be applied.

"I have often been asked for my biography; but I have never yet been so communicative as now in the case of my Norwegian brethren. My after life and work are easily told. In the year 1842 I 'habilitated' myself in Leipzig with a thesis on the prophet Habakkuk.¹ My communion-book² originated from the devotional gatherings which I conducted; and in my youthful enthusiasm for the Jewish literature, I wrote my book the 'History of the post-Biblical Jewish Poetry.'³ In the year 1846 I became professor in Rostock, 1850 in Erlangen, and 1867 in Leipzig, where I now hope to stay until my blessed end. In Erlangen I founded, in the year 1863, a journal devoted to the Jewish Mission, *Saat auf Hoffnung*. My Hebrew New Testament, which was issued in 1877, is now to be printed in the fifth edition.⁴ It is owing for the most part to the generosity of the Norwegian brethren, that this publication was made possible.

"I made the acquaintance of my wife by means of our devotional gatherings. Her mother and brother confessed Christ. We were married April 27, 1845. The fruit of this marriage was four sons. The oldest, Johannes, died while *professor extraordinarius* of theology, February 3, 1876, just as he had finished the editing

the Norwegian society for Jewish missions, is known both as a Semitic scholar by his useful "Arabische Grammatik" (4. edition issued by August Müller, Halle, 1876), and as a profound and reliable investigator in early Christian church history by his "Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel" (3 volumes; Christiania, 1866-75), by his "Bibelske Afhandlinger," and by his "Eine Augustin fälschlich beigelegte Homilia de sacrilegiis" (Christiania, 1886).

¹ Afterwards published in book-form under the title "Der Prophet Habakkuk," ausgelegt von Franz Delitzsch, Leipzig, 1843.

² "Das Sakrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi, Beicht- und Kommunionbuch." It was first published in 1844, and reached its seventh edition in 1886 (Leipzig: J. Neumann). Together with other works of Delitzsch, it has been translated into Norwegian.

³ "Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie" vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit. Leipzig, 1836.

⁴ The fifth edition having been sold speedily, a sixth followed at the end of 1884. In the following year (1885) an entirely revised octavo edition, with larger letters, was issued by Dr. Delitzsch, out of regard to the wishes expressed in Kischinew that the New Testament might be uniform with the Hebrew Old Testament by the British and Foreign Bible Society. As to the superiority of Delitzsch's last (octavo) edition in comparison with the version of Isaac Salkinson, published after his death at the expenses of the English Trinity Bible Society, 1885, see the articles "Delitzsch' und Salkinsons Hebräisches Neues Testament" in *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (edited by Prof. Dr. C. E. Luthardt, Leipzig), Nos. 45, 46, 47, pp. 431, 447, 455; and "Two Hebrew New Testaments" (by Rev. Prof. S. R. Driver, D. D.) in *The Expositor*, April, 1886, pp. 260 seq.

of Oehler's *Symbolik*.¹ He lies buried in the Evangelic church-yard in Genoa. His brother, Ernst, had already died January 17, 1872; he had served as assistant surgeon in the Franco-German war from its beginning to its end. Not until a long time after the conclusion of peace could he return. After a long illness, he succumbed from an acute pulmonary attack. His grave is in Leipzig. My two youngest sons are still alive. The older of them, Hermann, has an appointment with the general German Credit-bank; and the youngest, Friedrich (born September 3, 1850), *professor extraordinarius* of Assyriology,² is at present at the British Museum in London, where he continues his studies in the preparation of a Babylonian-Assyrian dictionary.

"I completed my seventieth year February 23. Although I dislike ovations of every kind, I was made more of than I could almost bear. But also many blessings have been showered upon me, especially from missionary societies abroad; and those blessings sound as sweet in my ears, as the lullaby sounds to the child, when it is lulled to sleep."

AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN PALESTINE.

BY PROFESSOR E. C. MITCHELL, D. D.,

Cambridge, Mass.

The historical method has come to be generally accepted as essential to a true science of interpretation. To know what writers mean, we must know who they were and what were the circumstances and conditions under which they wrote.

It is equally true that historical inquiry, to be thorough and trustworthy, must be based upon some geographical knowledge. To comprehend events we must have some idea of localities. To appreciate actions we must accurately conceive of the situation. To estimate character, motives, methods of thought, habits of expression, we must know the surroundings.

□ This general principle is especially applicable to the science of biblical interpretation. So large a part of Sacred Scripture is in its nature historical, and so much of this history is dependent upon geographical conditions, that a prime requisite for obtaining any just idea of the sense is to know the place and the

¹ He published, in addition, "*De inspiratione Scripturæ Sacrae quid statuerint patres apostolici et apologetæ secundi sæculi*," by which writing he qualified, in 1872, as a university teacher. But he died before he could finish his work on the *Doctrinal System of the Roman Catholic church* ("*Das Lehrsystem der römischen Kirche*," vol. I., 1875).

² Friedrich Delitzsch, to whom, as far as I know, all the present professors of Assyrian in the universities of the United States are indebted as a teacher, was elected, in 1885, *professor ordinarius honorarius* of Assyriology and of the Semitic languages in the University of Leipzig. The next result of his investigations in London, which lasted from March to October, 1883, was a series of articles which appeared in the *Athenæum* under the title "The importance of Assyriology to Hebrew lexicography," afterwards published in pamphlet-form as "The Hebrew language viewed in the light of Assyrian research" (London: Williams & Norgate, 1883) and "*Die Sprache der Kossäer*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1884). According to the statement given on p. 24 in the latter work, the above mentioned dictionary has now been finished for more than two years. We are, therefore, entitled to hope that Friedrich Delitzsch, having issued in the mean time the third edition of his "*Assyrische Lesestücke*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1885), and his "*Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1886) will this year begin the publication of his often promised and long expected Assyrian dictionary.



Davidson on Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament

Hebraica, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Mar. - Apr. - May, 1884), pp. 16-17.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0160-2810%28188403%2F05%291%3A1%3C16%3ADODHNT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L>

Hebraica is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

almost our *earnestly*), Job vi., 19; with an intransitive participle, which is at the same time applied to an inanimate object, as, *the cart* הַמְלֵאָה לָהּ *which is full for itself* (i. e., which has quite filled itself) *with sheaves*, Amos ii., 13; and especially in sentences in which advice is tendered or a question asked, such a dative is apt to intrude itself, Isa. ii., 22, xxiii., 7. The strong liking on the part of certain later poets for the use of the particle, in the Aramaic fashion, is clearly evidenced by Ps. cxx., 6, cxxii., 3, cxxiii., 4. On the other hand, the extensive accumulation of pronouns having a reflex reference produces a degree of pleasantness, such as is found in the Lat. *ipsissimi*, Ger. *höchstselbst*: הֵמָּה . . . הֵמָּה לָהֶם, Eccles. iii., 18.—*Erwald's Hebrew Syntax*.

The word יָאֵר.—This word, meaning “river” or “channel,” commonly regarded as an Egyptian word and explained by the Egyptian *aur* “Nile,” is undoubtedly a genuine Hebrew word. This opinion is supported by the passage Job xxviii., 10, where יְאֵרִים means “fountains in the rocks” or, according to some commentators, “subterraneous passages hewn out in the rocks.” See also my remarks in *Paradies*, p. 312. The Assyrian form of the word, *ya'ûrê* “streams,” occurs in an inscription of Ramannirari I. (c. 1320 B. C.). Another derivative of the same root יָאֵר or יוֹאֵר, which I believe means “to send,” may be seen in the large inscription of Nebuchadnezzar (col. vi., 46), where the vast ocean *tî'âmtu gallatu*, is called *ya-ar-ri*, i. e., *yâri marti* “the bitter stream” on account of its salt-water. The Hebrew name of the Nile, יָאֵר (Assyr. *Yaru-u-u*) is probably an adaptation of the Egyptian word to the good Semitic name for “stream,” *ya'û-ru*, *yâru*, יָאֵר.—*Frederic Delitzsch, in Hebrew and Assyrian*.

Davidson on Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament.—In the fifth edition of the Hebrew New Testament, edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Prof. Delitzsch of Leipzig—a work carefully executed—there are several things still which need alteration and correction. We have dipped into the volume in several places and have found words incorrect or unsuitable. Thus for ἀγγελοι θεοῦ in Hebrews i., 6, *Elohim* is put; a plural which never signifies *angels*. In Galatians vi., 18, אחֵי “my brethren,” with a pause accent, is not the proper representative of ἀδελφοί alone. In Matthew xxii., 37, and Luke x., 27, מֵרֵעַ is given for δάσναια, which is not the best word. The Septuagint has for it συνειδήσεις in Ecclesiastes x., 20. In John viii., 44, הַכֹּזֵב is introduced after אֲבִי at the end of the verse, giving an interpretation more than doubtful. The uncertainty of the original Greek should have been retained.

In Acts iii., 16, הַאֲרוּכָה is not the best equivalent for ὁλοκληρία; the proper word is מְתֵם. In Romans ii., 4, for μακροθυμία there should be אֲרֶךְ אַפִּים not אֲרֶךְ רוּחַ. In Philippians ii., 6, the difficult word ἀρπαγμός is rendered יִשְׁלַל, which fails to give the true sense. In Jude 19, the rendering הַפְּרָשִׁים מִן-הַעֲבוּר *“who separate from the congregation,”* is too free, being an interpretation rather than a translation. And the interpretation is an incorrect one, for, according to the true reading, the meaning of the Greek is, “who create schisms.” In He-

brews xi., 10, the word "foundations" is rendered by a singular noun יְסוּדָתָהּ "its foundation," whereas the plural of יסוד should be used.

In Revelation xiii., 2, גְּדוּפִים stands for *blasphemia*, which is too mild a word, since it means "reproaches;" נִאָצָה is a better substitute. In Revelation xiii., 4 a better verb than שָׁמַם would be תָּמָה. The Hithpāl of שָׁמַם does not occur in the Bible with אַחֲרֵי after it. In Revelation xxi., 11 אֹר is the wrong word for the Greek φωστήρ; it should be מְאֹר. The text, taken as the basis, is the Elzevir of 1624; but several various and better readings are indicated in different parts. A critical text should have been adopted, such as Tischendorf's last, to which Delitzsch himself is favorable. But the Bible Society seems to stand in the way of such an innovation, however desirable at the present day.—*From Modern Review.*

Rules of Life.*

כִּי זֶה הָאִישׁ שֶׁחָרָה שְׁלוֹם עַרְוֹקָבָר
 לִשְׁכֵת בָּטַח כָּל-יָמָיו מִסֵּעַר.
 פַּה בִּרְכֵי תֵלֶךְ אֶל תַּט אֶל עֵבֶר.
 כִּי זֶה הֵיכַל כָּל-טוֹב, אֵף זֶה הַשֹּׁעַר:
 עַל הוֹן תִּשְׁיֵשׁ, רַק לֹא תַחַת עַל שֹׁכֵר.
 אֶתָּה תַחֲכֶם, רַק לֹא תִבּוֹ אִישׁ בְּעַר.
 בְּנִעַם תִּתְרָאֶה לְקִרְאָת כָּל-גֹּבֵר.
 אֶת-הַיִּשִּׁישׁ תַּהְדֵּר, תַּחֲוֹן תִּנְעֹר:
 אֶל נָא תִהְיֶה אִם לֹא תִשְׁפֹּט כָּל-אִמֶּר.
 אֶל נָא תִשְׁפֹּט אִם לֹא תַחְקֹר כָּל-טַעַם.
 אֶל נָא תַחְקֹר אֶת-הַנִּשְׁגָּב מִחֶמֶר:
 אִם יֵשׁ עוֹלָתָה בָּךְ, אַחֵר אֶל תִּכַּח.
 אִם זֶר שִׁמְךָ נֶאֱזַן אֶל תַּט בִּזְעֵם.
 שִׁתָּה תִמִּיד יִרְאֵת שְׂדֵי אֶל נִכַּח:

* From אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי הַנְּעוּרִים, by Ephraim Luzzatto. This work is very scarce, and is deservedly esteemed for its elegant diction and poetic beauties.

THE *6th* *revised*
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.
W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume III.

*WITH ETCHING OF PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH,
BY H. MANESSE.*

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVI.
2

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 *תורת המשיח*, *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 electrotypes 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 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 כְּנוּשִׁים, which occurs in the Talmud, and is employed by Delitzsch to represent the Greek *Μάγοι*, Salkinson uses חֲזִי כִּכְבָּיִם, 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, אֱמֶתֶת is often required (e.g. John i. 9; iv. 23, 37; vi. 32 Del.; compare in mediæval Hebrew such expressions as אֱמֶתֶת אֱמֶתֶת, *true unity*; אֱמֶתֶת אֱמֶתֶת, *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 (לדבת עם); ii. 5b (כה); 7b; 9b; 17a; 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. 26b; xv. 27; xviii. 3b; 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. 3b (אמר); viii. 8 (בבואך, cf. Gen. xxix. 19—why the circumlocution in S. ?); 29 end; ix. 32a; Luke iii. 11b; xviii. 4b (Deut. xxviii. 50); xxiii. 23b; 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. 3b; 21b; 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 הָיָה (both times) should be הָיָה; and וְהוּא before הָרַבֵּר 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 (על נפשכם)

than superfluous. In v. 6 פֶּן־יִשָּׁאֵר 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 αἱ ἴδιαι 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 אֶרֶץ); vi. 6 (cf. Ps. xviii. 12); x. 13 (יִדּוּל); 32 (a recondite adaptation of Deut. xxvi. 17, 18, but a very considerable deviation from the Greek); xiii. 54 (Ps. xlviii. 6); xxv. 34 (הוֹסֵדָה 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 ἀστυδέρως is quite alien to the prose style of the O. T.); 52 *b*; Mark ix. 6*b* (אֵיכְתָה—a form unheard of in prose, but recurring elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 6, עֲלָתָה); 24 (an incongruous phrase from Ps. lxxx. 6); Luke i. 21 (עַד בֹּרֵשׁ—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 (נֶאֱדָרָי, 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. xlvii. 8, שְׂכֹל 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, וְרָדָה (Prov. vi. 3).

² עָלִי (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. 3b); 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. 32b (the sense expressed is merely that of *take to heart*, not *repent*, שוב); xxv. 46 (דרגון [wrongly pointed] is no rendering of κόλασιν); Mark v. 2b (borrowed from 1 Sam. xvi. 15, but at the cost of obliterating the distinctive ἀκάθαρτον); ix. 12b (the quotation from Isa. liii. 4, 5, 8, is unwarranted, and no translation of ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ); 23 (ש' לאל); 41 (Exod. xii. 4); Luke i. 22 (Ps. xxii. 8, etc.); i. 66b (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. 45b (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. 13b, 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, שפכה יצק is better than βαλοῦσα; but the Greek here is βαλοῦσα, a stronger word; and יצק is the equivalent in v. 7 for κατέχευεν. So again Luke xv. 25a, 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. 58b (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 ויהי ככלותו לדבר ויסת נפשו and ויהי כאשר כלה לדבר. Elsewhere, כלאש כלה לדבר, construed as in Gen. xviii. 38, might be appropriate. So Matt. xii. 24 וישמעו הפרושים וישמעו אנשים מן העומדים שם (אצלו or ויאמרו) and ויאמרו; Mark xv. 85 ויאמרו (or ויאמרו) 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. . . . עַד הוּא. עַד הוּא occurs in the O. T. and עַד אֲנִי once or twice in late books; but עַד הוּא never. The form used is always עֲדָנוּ.

iii. 7, 11 and often, אֵין. אֵין is restrictive, not adversative; 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 וְ. So D. here rightly.

iii. 8; x. 32; xviii. 23 and constantly, אִפּוּי. 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 וְ.

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

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

iv. 17, מַעַת הָהִיא (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 הָהִיא. In Acts ii. 40; xix. 26 occur instances of the opposite error, הָהִיא 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, אִפּוּי 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 ב.

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 לכו, עליכו 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 א 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 בעיר 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 *l.*; also Deut. xvi. 17).

xxvi. 74, the later Heb. expression וּמִיָּד is preferable to the doubtful וְבִרְנָנֶע זֶה.

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

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

ii. 49; Acts v. 15, אַחֲדִים מֵהֶם. A questionable extension of the O. T. use of the plural of אֶחָד.

ii. 62, after לֵאמֹר 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 אַחֲרַי (אֲשֶׁר) חֲדַלְתִּי מֵהָיִית סוֹכֵן וְג' or לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר יִאֲסְפוּנִי אֵל בְּתִיהֶם אַחֲרַי (אֲשֶׁר) חֲדַלְתִּי וְג'.

xvii. 22; xxiii. 28, הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים in the O. T. (except of course where ׀ 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 שְׁלַחֲנֹנוּ should follow דִּבֶּר.

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

Acts xx. 1, וּבִבְרָכָתִי 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 (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 הִמְיִיתוֹם); 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 (וּתְרַשֵּׁעַ); 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 (בִּיט); 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*.³

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 קָטַח 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. ἐκεφαλῶσαν 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

5235 205-
THE CHURCH
AT HOME AND ABROAD

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

BY ORDER OF
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VOLUME V.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION AND SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK
No. 1334 CHESTNUT STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
1889

est evangelical church whose pastor might be a collaborer at the mission salle. Now as a matter of fact the Protestant churches of France are largely Presbyterian, and of the strictest type; and so it happens by the carrying into effect of this measure Presbyterians get very much the larger share of members. The following figures will show this: In Paris and vicinity twenty-six Presbyterian churches are thus augmented, two Baptist churches and one Wesleyan, while two stations aid the Baptists in other ways, and seven stations have no denominational bias.

In all France outside of Paris eighty-one stations supply members to Presbyterian churches in the way indicated. Two stations

supply members to the Baptists, two to the Wesleyans, and three are neutral.

I should like to spend a few minutes in describing the exercises in connection with the opening of the one hundred and twenty-second of these salles or gospel halls in the city of Paris, in an old street and strange court near the Latin Quarter; but space will only permit me to give this brief and uncolored statement of important facts relating to the "Mission Populaire Evangelique de France" (McAll mission). I will only add that this article has been read to one of the council of administration before sending it to the United States, and it meets with his approval.

A. B. KING.

NICK.

THE HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.

The Hebrew language lives, although it is dead. The language is dead because it is no more the vulgar tongue of the Jewish people in their every-day intercourse. On the other hand, it lives because the nation which spoke it since the time of Abraham lives and is immortal, according to divine promise. Everywhere where a Jewish congregation is formed, there the prayers are in Hebrew. Besides this, there also exists a Hebrew literature of immense volume. It covers all provinces of art and science, and grows from day to day. The manifold Hebrew periodicals that appear in all parts of the world may justly be counted to this literature. No dead language, not even the Latin, exhibits such a vital power as the holy language of Israel.

True, the knowledge of Hebrew has decreased wherever worldliness and indifference reign supremely among the Israelites; but, nevertheless, any person of the present time understanding the Hebrew language and able to speak it to some extent can have intercourse with the Jews of Asia and Africa, yea, of all parts of the world. Therefore it was most important that the New Testament should be translated into Hebrew, so that the Jews of the immense

Russian empire, as well as the Jews from Spain to China, the Jews of Arabia, Malabar and Burmah, might be able to read the same.

In the apostolic times the work of translating the New Testament began, for the so-called "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (juxta Hebræos) was nothing else than a Hebrew translation of Matthew, albeit it was a very imperfect one. In the age of the Reformation Sebastian Muenster gave to this work a new impulse. Very thoughtfully he selected the title "Law (Thora) of the Messiah" for his Hebrew Matthew.

A new era began after the founding of the "London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews" (1809). This society undertook in the year 1813 the publication of a new and complete translation of the whole New Testament. In 1817 this translation was completed, but the society still made every sacrifice possible in the endeavor to revise and perfect the translation, first in the years 1837-1838, and then again 1863-1865. The converts with whose aid the second revision was completed were S. Hogan and M. S. Alexander. The latter was made first evangelical bishop of Jerusalem in 1841. The third revision was

made with the assistance of H. R. Biesenthal and Ezekiel Margoliouth. The ever-memorable A. McCaul was the soul of the second and J. C. Reichardt the soul of the third revision.

We have always acknowledged the merits of this translation and the blessing that rested upon it; but we also clearly perceived that its linguistic construction was so little idiomatically Hebrew that a Jewish reader would be rather repelled than attracted by the translation.

More than fifty years ago I therefore conceived the plan of a new translation, and issued St. Paul's hymn on "charity" (1 Cor. 13) as a specimen, in a book, now forgotten, entitled "*Wissenschaft, Kunst, Judenthum*." In the year 1870 I published, as a larger specimen of the work, the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Many years I sought for a publisher of the whole work who would take upon himself the expense of publishing and also provide for its circulation. At last the British and Foreign Bible Society lent me its helpful hand. Having obtained such a powerful and generous protection, the new translation went through the press, and forthwith enjoyed God's wonderful blessing. It was completed in the spring of 1877. (See my pamphlet, "The New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society," 1883.) Of my translation, nine editions have now appeared—eight in 32mo, one in octavo. Each of these editions strives to come nearer to the perfect ideal, which my work is still far from realizing. I am now preparing the tenth edition, which will be an almost entirely new translation, and for which types are being prepared, that are more characteristically national than the previous types.

That the translation of the London society was a good but at the same time a defective beginning was also perceived by Rev. Isaac Salkinson, missionary of the British society, about twenty years after I had contemplated a new translation. In 1855 he published the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans in Hebrew. There he stopped short and consumed his strength in translating dramas of Shakespeare and Milton's

Paradise Lost. When my translation of the whole New Testament appeared in 1877, he set to work to place a different translation at its side. He declined to associate himself with me for future mutual work; and wrote to me that his translation was intended chiefly for our unconverted brethren, and would be written in a style which the Jew has not yet forgotten to appreciate, that is, the biblical Hebrew.

As against Salkinson's idea, it was my plan to reproduce the New Testament in that peculiar Hebrew, without affected elegance, in which it has been thought and would have been written by the New Testament writers themselves, that is, without intentionally avoiding post-biblical words and phrases.

The translation of Salkinson appeared in the year 1885, after the lamented death of its author. It was edited by Chr. D. Ginsburg, and the Trinitarian Bible Society undertook the publication. It does not become me to praise my translation at the cost of Salkinson's. Nevertheless I may say that mine has gone through eight revisions and the new translation only through one.

Thus three Hebrew translations of the New Testament appear as rivals in the missionary field. In reference to style the translation of Salkinson is, without doubt, a progress over the translation of the London society, but in exegesis it is often less exact than the latter.

Nevertheless the Jewish reader can obtain through all three translations a picture of Jesus, the Christ, the godly Teacher, the man in whom God was as in no other man. A copy of any of these translations, placed in the hands of a Jew, may be the source of everlasting blessing to the Jewish reader.

It is already evident that the three translations have captured many Jewish hearts and have been greatly instrumental in supplanting the Talmudic caricature of Christ by a reverential conception of his person.

Thus the time is drawing nearer when the Jewish hatred of Jesus shall be turned into adoring love.

PROF. FRANZ DELITZSCH.

LEIPZIG.