

# *Theology* on the *Web.org.uk*

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

JUNE, 1886.

---

ART. I.—DELITZSCH AND SALKINSON'S HEBREW  
TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE first portion of the New Testament known to have been translated into Hebrew was the Gospel of St. Matthew, which was executed for missionary purposes by Shem Tob ben Shaprat, a Spanish Jew, in 1385. The translation was made into Rabbinical, and not into classical Hebrew, but was not published until a century and a half later by Sebastian Münster (Basil. 1537). It has recently been reprinted from MSS. by Dr. A. Herbst (Göttingen, 1879), though it is now said that there are better MSS. in existence than those used by the learned editor. In 1557 a second edition of this portion appeared with the addition of a Hebrew version of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The New Testament as a whole was first edited in Hebrew by Elias Hutter (Noriberg. 1599-1600), in his Polyglott New Testament, in two large folio volumes, containing the New Testament in twelve languages (Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Bohemian, Italian, Spanish, French, English, Danish, and Polish). In the preparation of this great work Hutter was assisted by several eminent scholars of the day. Two years later Hutter published in quarto an edition of the New Testament in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German. The Hebrew translation was in the latter edition amended in several places.

In 1661 William Robertson, a Scotchman, published Hutter's translation separately in 8vo., with parallel references in Hebrew. Robertson emended some of the errors in Hutter's editions, but left a considerable number remaining. Hutter sought to translate the New Testament into the classical Hebrew, and, according to Delitzsch, exhibited a great command of the Hebrew language. His work was a marvel, as being the first effort at a complete translation, but many conspicuous

blunders, as Leusden has noted, still remained, such as the use of the article with nouns in the construct state (that is, governing others in the genitive), and with suffixes. In order not to offend the Jews, Hutter also everywhere gave the Old Testament passages quoted in the New in their Old Testament form, thereby not only introducing confusion occasionally into the argument of the New Testament writers, but seriously damaging the value of his translation as a true exponent of the text of the New Testament. We shall see by-and-by that he has been followed in this dangerous course by Mr. Salkinson, the latest translator of the New Testament into Hebrew.

Hutter's Hebrew New Testament proved of little immediate value in the work of Christian missions among the Jews. The Papal authorities also began, somewhere about 1660, the printing at Rome of an edition of the Hebrew New Testament; but whether the translation was taken from the work of Hutter, or executed by other scholars, we know not. This work was abandoned from some cause or other, and the bulk of Robertson's valuable re-issue of Hutter perished in 1666 in the Great Fire of London.

The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews was founded in 1809, and for its purposes it was necessary to have the New Testament in Hebrew. It is unnecessary here to attempt to sketch the history of the revised translation into Hebrew, which was mainly of the classical Old Testament type. The Society's revised version was first issued in 1817, and reprinted with a few corrections in several subsequent years. The Rev. Alexander McCaul, D.D., of Trinity College, Dublin, an eminent scholar and missionary, the well-known author of the controversial work entitled "The Old Paths," and afterwards Professor of King's College, London, with the Rev. J. C. Reichardt, a missionary to the Jews, Rev. S. Hoga, Translator into Hebrew of Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," and Rev. Michael S. Alexander, a Christian Jew, afterwards first Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, were the revisers of the Hebrew translations issued in 1837-8. A third revision was completed in 1866 by Rev. J. C. Reichardt, assisted by one of the most eminent Rabbinical scholars, Dr. J. H. R. Biesenthal, and Mr. Ezekiel Margoliouth, a Jewish missionary in London, father, we believe, of one of the most excellent Fellows and Tutors of New College, Oxford, Mr. David Samuel Margoliouth, distinguished for his attainments not only in classical literature but as a Sanskrit and Semitic scholar.

Dr. J. H. R. Biesenthal, who assisted Mr. Reichardt in the revision of the Hebrew New Testament—though according to Dr. Delitzsch's statement his emendations were not generally adopted by Mr. Reichardt—was for many years a missionary

in connection with the London Jews' Society. Indeed, though now pensioned off, he was one of the greatest of that Society's missionaries. Though no longer on the list of effective missionaries, he by his works "still speaketh." He is the author of Commentaries in Rabbinical Hebrew on the Gospel of St. Luke in Hebrew (Berlin, 1855), on the Epistle to the Romans, in Hebrew (Berlin, 1855), and on the Epistle to the Hebrews in Hebrew, as well as of other important works. His latest work, unfortunately published in his old age, is *Das Trostschreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Hebräer*, Leipzig, 1878. Dr. Biesenthal in the latter work maintains the theory that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by the Apostle originally in Mishnaic Hebrew, and that the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews is only a translation made by one who was not fully competent for the task. He has accordingly attempted the difficult task of reconstructing the supposed Hebrew original, and, whatever may be thought of the correctness of his theory, there are few scholars so competent for the task of translating the Epistle (or "the Writing," or "Word of Consolation," as Biesenthal prefers to term that Epistle, from the expression found in Heb. xiii. 22), into the Hebrew of the Mishna, which was certainly nearer to the dialect spoken by our Lord and His Apostles than the classical Hebrew of the Prophets of the Old Testament. It is a pity that in the work referred to Dr. Biesenthal has not printed his translation—for such most scholars will certainly regard it—as a connected whole, instead of simply giving it at the head of each verse or section of a verse commented on. But even as it is, Biesenthal's version of this Epistle deserves to be favourably mentioned in any sketch of attempts to translate the New Testament into Hebrew.

We may pass over other isolated attempts to translate the New Testament into Hebrew, such as the translations made, we think, by Rev. S. Greenfield, and published by Messrs. Bagster and Sons in 1845, in small foolscap 8vo., so as to correspond with their editions of the Hebrew Bible.

Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch, of Leipzig, the well-known veteran commentator on many books of the Old Testament—deeply skilled also in New Testament exegesis, as his great Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews is of itself sufficient to prove—is well known as the greatest Christian authority on matters of Rabbinical literature. He was for many years thrown into the closest connection with Dr. J. H. R. Biesenthal; but independently of that fact, it is well known that one of his earliest productions was in the department of modern Hebrew literature, namely his *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, published in 1836. Thoroughly qualified for the work, if ever a man was, by reason of his special studies, and because of the

intense interest he has ever taken in missionary work among the Jews,<sup>1</sup> Professor Delitzsch published in 1870 a translation of the Epistle to the Romans in Hebrew, with introduction and critical notes, in which many passages of the Epistle are illustrated from the Talmud and Midrash. The British and Foreign Bible Society gladly availed itself of his services, which were freely rendered without reward, and in 1877 the first edition of his Hebrew New Testament appeared, for the basis of which the London edition of Reichardt was taken. The first edition of Delitzsch's version consisted of 2,500 copies. It was rapidly followed by a second in 1878, and a third in 1880, each of the same number of copies. In 1881 and 1883 the fourth and fifth editions were issued, each of 5,000 copies. In all 17,500 copies were disposed of within eight years, and two other editions, each of 5,000 copies, were issued in 1885. The last of these was printed in large 8vo., in order to meet the desire expressed by many that the Hebrew New Testament should correspond in form with the Old Testament, and should be able to be united with it in one volume.

None of these editions, as Professor Driver has stated in his article in *The Expositor* on the "Two Hebrew Testaments," were mere reprints of the preceding ones, but contain many fresh emendations. In the third and following editions Professor Delitzsch made considerable use of renderings and emendations suggested by Hebrew scholars in many parts of the world. The seventh 8vo. edition especially has been even more extensively revised than its predecessors.

Another translation has lately appeared under the auspices of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Mr. Isaac E. Salkinson was a missionary of the British Jews' Society, and was long well-known "as a master of Hebrew style." His translations into Hebrew of Milton's "Paradise Lost," of Tiedge's "Urania," of Shakespeare's "Othello" and "Romeo and Juliet," as well as of German classical works, have been warmly praised by those able to appreciate such productions. According to Dr. Ginsburg, who was one of his early fellow-students at college, Salkinson was engaged in the work of translating the New Testament "during the whole of his active life." He died, however, in June, 1883, leaving the work incomplete. How far his version was actually ready for press has not been distinctly

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Delitzsch has for many years published with this object a very interesting missionary publication *Saat auf Hoffnung: Zeitschrift für die Mission der Kirche an Israel*. It is very encouraging to note that another German professor of high mark as a Hebraist has lately begun to publish another journal with the same object; we refer to *Nathanael: Zeitschrift für die Arbeit der evangel. Kirche an Israel*, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Hermann L. Strack.

stated. Dr. Ginsburg says "he died when he began printing it, and before he had finished it, hoping that during the printing he might be enabled to finish the parts untranslated." The work, however, has been finished and carried through the press by Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, an eminent Hebrew Christian scholar. Dr. Ginsburg is the author of Historical and Critical Commentaries on the Song of Songs, the Book of Coheleth or Ecclesiastes, with valuable introductions. He is also the editor of Levita's Massoreth ha-Massoreth, and of smaller works, his *opus magnum* being the edition of the Massorah itself, of which two large folio volumes, with a supplemental volume, have already appeared, and which is to be completed by the fourth volume, which will contain an English translation and explanation of the whole work.

With regard to Salkinson's Hebrew New Testament as it now lies before us, it is impossible to tell which part of the work is that of Salkinson, and what is the work of Ginsburg. It is unquestionably a work of great merit, but it is marred by great blemishes. The typographical mistakes in it are painfully numerous. The tenses are often confused, incorrect forms are employed, words are omitted, proper names assume strange and unknown shapes, and Hebrew grammar is sometimes altogether set at naught. Some of these things may possibly be excused, for it is well-nigh impossible to issue all at once an absolutely correct work of this kind; but very many of the blunders do not admit of being thus excused.

Three very important reviews of these two Hebrew Testaments have already appeared: (1) three articles in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, Nos. xlv.—xlvii., for 1885; (2) a review in the *Guardian* of February 17, 1886, signed by the well-known initials "A. N.;" and (3) the article of Canon Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, which has been already referred to. The opinion of the most competent scholars is to the effect that "errors of punctuation and grammar," such as are frequent in Salkinson's version, are not to be discovered in that of Delitzsch; that although Salkinson's work, which aims at a higher and a more classical style than that of Delitzsch, possesses in parts great merits, "its excellence is not sustained throughout." For if Delitzsch's translation is "occasionally stiff," it is an honest attempt to represent faithfully the New Testament, and is thoroughly grammatical. It may be well also to note that Professor Delitzsch is preparing another edition of his version, in which it is very likely he will adopt some of Salkinson's renderings, so far as may be consistent with the character of his own work. The object of the veteran German professor is not his own glorification, but the establishment of a really

excellent version of the New Testament, which may assist in showing forth more brightly the beauty of the Christian religion therein revealed.

Dr. Ginsburg has unfortunately attacked Delitzsch's translation in a most unbecoming manner; and the Trinitarian Bible Society, ever anxious to tilt a lance against the older British and Foreign Bible Society, against which the former Society is a standing protest, has in puffing its own translation seized upon every opportunity of running down the translation issued by the rival Society. It is not creditable that in such a sacred work as Bible translation, such an unfair spirit should be displayed; and, as we shall see, "those who dwell in glass houses should not throw stones." For, as shall be presently pointed out, the principles of the Trinitarian Bible Society are set at naught in their loudly praised Hebrew New Testament.

We have frequently noticed that many Jews, though sadly deficient themselves in grammatical knowledge of Hebrew, are often wont to speak contemptuously of the attainments of Gentile scholars, as if Gentiles could never obtain a thorough knowledge of Biblical Hebrew. For, as the Jews truly remark, "it is one thing to be able to understand a language, and another thing to write in that language." The application of this principle, however, to Biblical Hebrew is false. The Hebrew of the Old Testament has, many centuries ago, ceased to be a spoken language. Rabbinical Hebrew is that used for ordinary purposes, and an ordinary knowledge of the latter is sometimes prejudicial to a critical knowledge of the former. For what would be correct in Rabbinical Hebrew would be grossly wrong in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. Hence though books have been written in classical Hebrew, just as they have been written in classical Latin, that language has to be learned from study, and cannot be picked up vernacularly. The Jew and the Gentile stand, therefore, on the same platform in being obliged to learn the classical Hebrew from the books of the Old Testament, which are the only acknowledged authorities for its words, forms, and constructions.

Dr. Ginsburg, on the assumption referred to, argues that Delitzsch and the scholars who assisted him with their suggestions, were "good Hebrew scholars, but they were foreigners to the language; and being foreigners to the language, they have committed blunders similar to those I have pointed out," alluding to some amusing instances, given in his speech, of mistakes made by foreigners with an imperfect knowledge of English. He then gives an instance, which though not distinctly stated, is taken from Delitzsch's translation, as follows:

Let me instance a passage in a translation of greater pretensions than this [query, Salkinson's?]. We are told "at last he sent his son," and then

we are told that when they saw that the son came, "they ill-treated him, they beheaded him, and sent him away blushing." That is the passage in the Hebrew New Testament. I can assure you that many a Jew has read the New Testament in the same way that you read *Punch*—to have a laugh at it, because such errors are exceedingly amusing; and I need hardly tell you that that is not the object of the New Testament. When they take it up like that, they had better not take it up at all.<sup>1</sup>

Such remarks as these are unjustifiable, and it is a pity that a scholar of Dr. Ginsburg's reputation should have stooped so low. The very criticism is an illustration of Dr. Ginsburg's weakness as a textual critic, however strong he may be as a collator of MSS. It will be no wonder, with such criticisms before them, if scholars who know the superiority of Professor Franz Delitzsch as a Biblical scholar or Hebraist, should retaliate by commenting strongly upon the blunders of Dr. Ginsburg's translation, as the present edition of Salkinson must more or less be regarded.

The true state of the case cited, to pass over minor inaccuracies of Dr. Ginsburg's statement,<sup>2</sup> is as follows: The Hebrew word by which Delitzsch has sought to render the very peculiar Greek word (ἐκεφαλαιώσαν, *wounded him in the head*), found in the passage in question (Mark xii. 4) is מַחֲקֵנוּ, which only occurs elsewhere in Deborah's Song in Judges v. 26, "She put her hand to the nail, And her right hand to the workmen's hammer; And with the hammer she smote Sisera [literally, "And she hammered Sisera"], she smote through his head (מַחֲקֵנוּ רִאשׁוֹ)." Delitzsch was fully justified in using the word in the last clause to translate the expression in the Greek original. For the meaning of the verb is abundantly clear from the context, as well as from cognate words in Hebrew or Arabic, and means only "she struck him violently on his head," which would have been a better rendering than the "struck through his head" of the Revised Version. The Authorised Version has erroneously followed the rendering of Kimchi, "she smote off his head." The translators did not perceive that the adoption of such a rendering actually introduces a discrepancy into the book of Judges. For according to the prose narrative in chapter iv., Jael could not have beheaded Sisera; and if she had, she would undoubtedly have gone forth to meet Barak with the head of Sisera in her hand. And (2) the sense in which the Greek expression is used by St.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ginsburg's speech is quoted above from the Report of the Annual Meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society given in the *Quarterly Record* of that Society for July, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> Such as that in the verse in question it is not "the son" who is represented as so treated.



Mark is almost unique, and hence even that peculiarity of the word has been preserved in Delitzsch's Hebrew translation.

The only slight excuse to be made for Dr. Ginsburg—for the usage of the word in Rabbinical Hebrew does not support his criticism—is, as has been pointed out by Professor Driver in a note to his article, "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 [a tent-peg] would be unsuitable for the purpose."

Moreover we may add that the rendering of Delitzsch's version given by Ginsburg, "sent him away blushing," is also incorrect. The Greek *ἠτλούσαν*, translated in the Revised Version *handled shamefully*, is rendered by Delitzsch by the same word as is used in 2 Sam. x. 5, 1 Chron. xix. 5, of the shameful treatment of David's ambassadors by Hanun, the King of Ammon, in both which passages the LXX. have rendered the Hebrew verb by the same word used by St. Mark; and the English word "blushing," both in grammatical form and sense, expresses a different idea from that conveyed by the Hebrew word made use of in Delitzsch's version. There is no such idea conveyed as that of getting red in the face from shame, which is the natural sense conveyed by *blushing* in English.

We have, however, no intention of entering upon the subject of the mistakes made in Salkinson's version, or of attempting to prove the superiority of that of Delitzsch. The reviewers already referred to have performed that work sufficiently. There is no doubt, however, that the publication, even such as it is—of Salkinson's version will prove of considerable importance; although the Trinitarian Bible Society would act wisely if it printed no more such puffs from anonymous writers as those contained in the *Quarterly Record* of that Society for January, 1886, in which we are told that "the work of Delitzsch, compared with the work of Salkinson, is like a miserable tent compared with the palaces of kings"!

We turn to consider a much more important matter, namely, whether the translation of Salkinson, supposing it to be the most faultless Hebrew, honestly represents the New Testament; and whether a Society which prides itself on "the circulation of uncorrupted versions of the Word of God," and protests against the British and Foreign Bible Society, mainly because it circulates Roman Catholic translations of the Holy Scriptures, in cases where Protestant versions will not be

received, is justified in regarding Salkinson's version, edited by Ginsburg, as an "uncorrupted version" in the common sense of the word.

The point to which we now call attention is one which will be understood by the ordinary readers of the English Bible. Is a translator justified in correcting—without any authority from ancient MSS.—statements made in the New Testament of facts recorded in the Old; or of ignoring the truth that very many quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures are derived from the Greek version of the Old Testament, known to scholars as the LXX., or the Septuagint?

It is well known, for instance, that the sacred name vocalized in our English versions, "Jehovah" does not occur in the New Testament at all. But in all the quotations from the Old Testament which occur in the New, instead of expressing the Greek word rendered "Lord" by its Hebrew equivalent, or, as Delitzsch has done, substituting the well-known later symbol,  $\text{יהוה}$ , which calls attention to the fact in a way the Jews are well accustomed to—Salkinson reintroduces the name *Jehovah*, which is even inserted in cases where it is designedly omitted in the New Testament, and in some cases where the name *God* has been substituted in its place. We do not, for reasons it would take too long to enumerate, object to its occasional introduction, in cases where there is no possibility of discussion arising; but for obvious reasons a translator must be very careful in this matter.

Quotations are constantly given in Salkinson's version from the Old Testament, even where the New Testament quotes them with very marked differences of detail. Thus in Matt. ii. 6 we have the text cited directly from Micah v. 1, in spite of all such differences. In Matt. xii. 20, 21, in place of "till He send forth judgment unto victory, and in His name shall the Gentiles hope," we have the Old Testament words from Isa. xlii. 3, 4, "He shall send judgment unto truth . . . and the isles shall wait for His law."

In Matt. xv. 9 (and in Mark vii. 7), in place of "But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men," we have the Old Testament phrase (Isa. xxix. 13), "And their fear of Me is a commandment of men which hath been taught them," which is by no means an identical statement.

The reviewer in the *Guardian* has pointed out that the opening four verses of St. Mark's Gospel have been considerably "doctored" in Salkinson's version. Similarly in Luke iii. 4, in place of "Prepare ye the way of the Lord: make His paths straight," we find, from the Old Testament, "Prepare ye the way of Jehovah: make straight in the desert a highway

for our God;" and in verse 6, instead of "all flesh shall see the salvation of God," we find the phrase from Isa. lii. 10, "and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God."

In Luke iv. 10, where many a commentator has called attention to what has usually been regarded as a very significant omission in the quotation made by Satan, from Ps. xci., Salkinson inserts the omitted phrase, "in all thy ways." In the eighteenth verse of the same chapter, in place of "the Spirit of the Lord," we have the full Old Testament phrase reintroduced from Isaiah, "the Spirit of the Lord Jehovah" (here with a serious typographical blunder). The quotation from the Old Testament given by St. Luke has in this place been much tampered with. Salkinson inserts from Isaiah lxi. the phrase, "the opening of the prison to them that are bound," in place of "the recovering of sight to the blind." For though the Hebrew word rendered "the opening of the prison" might refer to "the recovering of sight," the word "bound" could not properly be rendered by "blind." He quietly omits in the same place, "to set at liberty them that are bruised," which words are inserted in the New Testament from Isa. lviii. 6, (LXX.).

In Luke xi. 51, in place of "who perished between the altar and the sanctuary" (Gr. "house"), there is read, partly from 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, "who was slain by the side of the altar in the court of the house of Jehovah."

We pass over here the extraordinary rendering of the prologue of St. John, but calling attention still to the Old Testament quotations, we notice that in John viii. 17, "The testimony of two men is true," is changed, after Deut. xix. 15, into "At the mouth of two witnesses shall a matter be established." In John xii. 40 the quotation of the evangelist from Isaiah closes, as in the LXX., with the words "and I will heal them." Salkinson restores the passage to its Old Testament form—"and he healed." In John xix. 37, a much-disputed passage which ought to have been most carefully preserved in its New Testament form, Salkinson corrects the New from the Old (Zech. xii. 10), "They shall look on Me whom they have pierced."

In Acts i. 20, "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein," we have the Old Testament phrases reintroduced (Ps. lxxix. 25), "Let their habitation be desolate, and let none dwell in their tents," which, apart from the tampering with the text, is manifestly less appropriate.

In Acts ii. 17, the clauses are transposed to coincide with the Book of Joel, and in the next verse the "my" is omitted with the words "handmaids" and "servants," and

the article dropped in the New Testament is reinserted. The clause "they shall prophesy," at the end of the eighteenth verse, is omitted.

In Acts vii. 15, 16, the text of St. Stephen's speech is coolly altered into "And Jacob went down into Egypt, and *Joseph* died there, he and our fathers, and were carried over to Shechem, and were buried in the grave that *our father* bought for a piece of silver of the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem." Here, by the alterations introduced into the text, which we have italicized, we have an unwarranted attempt to conceal the differences between the Old and the New Testaments. Delitzsch makes an attempt in this passage to obviate the discrepancy, but he honestly throws his suggestion into brackets, and further directs the reader's attention to the insertion by leaving the Hebrew words unpointed.

In a similar way, in verse 43 of the same chapter, the passage quoted by St. Stephen from Amos v. 26, 27, is inserted down to the words "beyond Damascus" in its Old Testament form, notwithstanding the considerable differences between the Hebrew and the LXX., which latter is the text given by St. Luke.

In Acts viii. 33, the verses cited have been given from Isa. liii., without any regard being paid to the differences existing in the New Testament quotation. In Acts xv. 17, in place of "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called," we have the exact words of Amos ix. 12 cited, "That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the nations, which are called by My name, saith Jehovah that doeth this," the interesting facts here being lost sight of, that the LXX. in place of יִרְשׁוּ read יִדְרְשׁוּ, and in place of *Edom* (אֶדוֹם) read *man* (אָדָם, *Adam*). We forbear to speak of the rendering of verse 18, as it would require too lengthened criticism.

But we must bring our remarks to a conclusion, and hence must pass over many interesting matters. We must notice, however, that in 2 Cor. vi. 17, "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing," is represented as in Isa. lii. 11, by "Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean, ye that bear the vessels of Jehovah," which is neither honest, nor appropriate to the Apostle's argument.

It must not, however, be supposed that the practice exhibited above is entirely uniform. On the contrary, as instances in which New Testament peculiarities have been preserved, we may refer to Acts xiii. 41; Rom. iii. 15-17, x. 11, 18;

1 Cor. ii. 9, xv. 55; Heb. x. 37, 38, xi. 21, xii. 26. But it is noteworthy that, owing to Salkinson's desire to avail himself of Old Testament language, many references are introduced to passages never thought of by the New Testament writers; the language of poetry is sometimes strangely intermingled with prose; while on the other hand he sometimes passes by references to the Old Testament without notice, and occasionally refers to other passages which could not have been then in the writer's thoughts. Thus in Heb. xii. 21, instead of, in rendering "I exceedingly fear and quake," availing himself, as Delitzsch has done, of the word of Moses in Deut. ix. 19, יִגְרָתִי which is rendered by the LXX. by the very phrase given in the New Testament ἡκφοβός εἰμι, Salkinson goes out of his way to introduce a most unsuitable phrase from Job iv. 14.

It would be exceedingly interesting, if we had space, to have called attention in connection with the above subject, to the important chapter of Dr. Biesenthal (in his *Trost-schreiben*, alluded to in the early part of this article), upon the mode and manner in which the Old Testament is quoted by the New Testament writers. Dr. Biesenthal shows that the peculiarities which are exhibited in the quotations found in the New Testament, are closely akin to those citations from the Old Testament found in the Talmud and Midrash. Hence the preservation of all those peculiarities in the New Testament writings is important, although the differences may create difficulties in the mind of those who have incautiously adopted the theory of verbal inspiration. For the discrepancies in question, when rightly examined, are really undesigned evidences in favour of the New Testament writings.

We close here, not for want of matter, but for want of space, and because we do not wish to weary our readers. Independently of its other defects, the version of Mr. Salkinson, as edited by Dr. Ginsburg, cannot be regarded as a fair exponent of the Greek text of the New Testament; it displays a dangerous disposition to tamper with the sacred text, often with good motives, but the more to be deplored for that very reason; and in spite of the loud pretensions of the Trinitarian Bible Society, Salkinson's Hebrew New Testament cannot be viewed as an "uncorrupted version of the Word of God." The charge is a serious one; we make it with pain, but we submit that we have presented evidence enough in support of the statement.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.