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PREFACE.

Some one will ask me, why have you written this in English. In truth, I myself do not know. I did so without premeditation, driven instinctively by the gratitude which I owe to the English publishers and patrons of my Hebrew New Testament.

And should one ask, what is the aim of these pages, I answer: firstly, they will afford a glimpse into the work, of which the Hebrew N. T. is the fruit. Secondly, they show what instructive results have proceeded therefrom for Hebrew grammar, especially syntax.

Leipzig, May 1883.

Fr. D.
In a forgotten book, entitled *Wissenschaft, Kunst, Judenthum*, I issued in the year 1838 St. Paul's hymn on love 1 Cor. XIII, translated into Hebrew, as a specimen of a new Hebrew version of the New Testament. After laborious and expensive preparations, which were aided chiefly by the Bavarian and Norwegian brethren, I published in 1870 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, who would take upon himself the expense of publishing and provide for its circulation. At last the British and Foreign Bible Society lent me its helpful hand, and 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. The text, followed there, is substantially that of the Sinaitic codex, with the principal variations of the Textus Receptus in brackets. But I soon felt, that a text formed by myself alone could not be exempt from individual arbitrariness, and that it was more natural to base the translation on the Receptus and to supplement it with critical remarks. After half a year a second edition became necessary, which I based on these principles; it bears the date of 1878. Only two years later, in 1880, a third edition appeared, in a larger form. Even the copies of this third were quickly exhausted, and already in October of the same year I prepared at Berlin with my never to be forgotten friend, the late Rev. Palmer Davies, a fourth electrotyped edition. The text had now to be definitively settled and the work demanded redoubled care. I revised it a third time and was successfully aided by the
Rev. S. R. Driver, now Pusey's successor as Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. Each of these editions represents, as I hope, a new degree of approximation to the ideal, which even in the fourth electrotyped edition of 1882 is still not attained. Therefore I was agreeably surprised, when Mr. James Watt, the successor of the late Davies, informed me, that the 5000 copies of the fourth edition were sold without any remaining. In truth, God has abundantly blessed our work. Far from priding myself, I acknowledge on the contrary the merits of my fellow-labourers, among whom are also not a small number of Jewish friends. We have cause to say, that our new translation has contributed somewhat to bring the New Testament nearer to the Jews as a prominent work of their literature. In a letter to Dr. Rahmer at Magdeburg I declared the New Testament to be the highest work that the Jewish genius has produced. He remarks in his *Literaturblatt* (1879 No 9), that this statement is relatively true, and Dr. Immanuel Deutsch in his review there owns, that form and matter, contents and dress, are productions of the Hebrew spirit and of Hebrew intuition.

In the revision of the text for the fifth edition I thought myself at first restricted to slight emendations in the plates, but when I was in Berlin and Messrs. Watt and Sharp heard that I should like to make some more material corrections, they proposed it to the Committee and Rev. Wm. Wright wrote me, March 6: „The Committee are much pleased to hear of the pains you are taking to make the fifth edition as perfect as possible, and they very cordially sanction any necessary outlay in the completion of the plates“. Consequently the fifth edition is revised more than superficially. I pass over in silence all the corrections regarding unavoidable typographical faults, as disfigurement of letters or defects as to vowels and signs, and I give only an account of the grammatical and stilistic emendations, by which, as I hope, this edition differs advantageously from the former.

Matth. IX. 21 נא אֲמָה בְּכִפָּרָה for she said within herself.

Changed to נא אֲמָה בָּכִּפָּרָה, because אֲמָה is without support in the biblical Hebrew. I may here remark once for all, that in
every verse of my Hebrew N. T. the accentuation has been carefully considered: the כְּפָרָה or הֵמָּה is everywhere the consequence of the regular accentuation, which requires here הָעַבֹּד, for it ought to be accentuated הָעַבֹּד. Other examples: Matth. VII. 8 for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, in our Hebrew text, the accents being added: הָעַבֹּד הָעַבֹּד הָעַבֹּד. Hence deliberately הָעַבֹּד, not הָעַבֹּד, is everywhere the consequence of the regular accentuation, which requires here הָעַבֹּד, for it ought to be accentuated הָעַבֹּד. Other examples: Matth. VII. 8 for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, in our Hebrew text, the accents being added: הָעַבֹּד הָעַבֹּד הָעַבֹּד. Hence deliberately הָעַבֹּד, not הָעַבֹּד, is written. Matth. XXVI. 26 יִאֶשֶׁר אַל תַּאֲדוּ this is my body, not יִאֶשֶׁר, for it ought to be accentuated יִאֶשֶׁר, comp. Koh. I. 17, 1 Chr. XXII. 1. Whoever is not acquainted with the laws of accentuology, is unable to insert or omit the Dagesh correctly. Such a one will hesitate at יִאֶשֶׁר 2 Cor. XI. 14, not knowing, that these two words as the first half of the verse must be accentuated יִאֶשֶׁר.

Matth. XI. 5. and the poor have the gospel preached to them. I have corrected יִאֶשֶׁר (as in the translation of Luk. VII. 22), because the biblical Hebrew employs not the Pual but the Hithpaël in this passive sense of זַעֲרַיֶּה-לִיקְּפָדָה, see 2 Sam. XVIII. 31. Matth. XI. 7 as they departed Jesus began to say. I thought for some time to prefer יִאֶשֶׁר but the syntactic scheme of temporal coincidence like 1 Sam. IX. 11, 1 Kings XIV. 17 al. is here in the right place, for as soon as the messengers of John went away Jesus began to vindicate before the people the honour of the Baptist. Together with the synchronistic construction I retained also the ethic dative יִאֶשֶׁר as in 1 Sam. XXVI. 12, although the biblical Hebrew likes better יִאֶשֶׁר (in French: il s'en est allé). Instances of the plural of the ethic dative of the 3. pers. are Ps. LXVI. 7, LXXX. 7, but not Job VI. 19 (Müller-Robertson's Hebrew Syntax § 51, 3); there יִאֶשֶׁר is in my opinion dative of the object, referring to יִאֶשֶׁר.

Matth. XI. 18 יִאֶשֶׁר he has a devil. I have preferred יִאֶשֶׁר a devil (demon) is in him, for יִאֶשֶׁר makes the impression of an emphasis, which is foreign to the original.
Matth. XVI. 24 שָׁם אִם שָׁמַיִם if any man will. The revised text has שָׁם אִם like Lev. XXVII. 2. It sounds more biblical.

Matth. XVII. 5 לֹא כָּל. The reader will refer that to God: and he said like Ezek. II. 1. But the meaning is that the heavenly voice said. Therefore now is written יְהֹוָה. At the same time I have remodelled the following verse.

Matth. XVII. 6 יְהֹוָה נַפֵּל הַמְּגִלֵּים יִדְּשֶׁה יִדְּשֶׁה And when the disciples heard it, they fell. This construction follows the pattern of the Chronicler 2 Chr. XV. 8. But the stress lies there upon נַפֵּל, here upon הַמְּגִלֵּים; I have therefore preferred the more classical construction לֹא כָּל הַמְּגִלֵּים. Consequently the expression of the object by נַפֵּל or הַמְּגִלֵּים could be dispensed with just as in the original text. 1

Matth. XVII. 11 הָא, rather הָא, which more clearly hints that it must be explained: Elias shall first come. Indeed הָא corresponds better to the Greek μέν, but it is of more importance that by הָא the following אָה is better characterised as participle according to the εὑρέθη of the original text.

Matth. XVII. 20 הַמְּגִלֵּים עֲלֵיהֶם עֲלֵיהֶם because of your unbelief. The Elzevirian text has הוּא רַעֲשֵׁה because of your unbelief. The Hebrew of the 4th edition, taken from Num. XX. 12, will be understood historically: because you have not believed. Therefore I have substituted הַמְּגִלֵּים.

Matth. XX. 6 יְהֹוָה לִשֵּׁה יִשְׁמַעְתֶּה about the eleventh hour. The expression corresponds to that used in the computation of years Ezek. XXX. 20. XXVI. 1. Jer. XXXIX. 2, and months Deut. I. 3; המ or שָׁמַיִם in this case is accusative of determination, see Müller-Robertson’s Hebrew Syntax § 100 comp. 44. But in statements of the hours the construction יְהֹוָה לִשֵּׁה יִשְׁמַעְתֶּה Jer. LII. 29. Est. III. 7 seemed in v. 6 as well as in v. 9 preferable. After

1) Prof. Driver wrote me: ”I find very few instances (Josh. XXII. 24. Jer. IX. 11. Ps. XCII. 7) of המ in after שָׁמַיִם etc., indeed none at all in a large part of the historical books: where there is not some distinct emphasis on the רַעֲשֵׁה etc., might המ perhaps be omitted? or even sometimes המ altogether?“ The passage remodelled above is of this latter sort.
the style of the Mishna must be said מַעְשֵׁהַ הָעָדָר for there דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה or simply יְהוָה at two o’clock, Sanhedrin V. 3. Berachoth 4a; the whole fifth hour, שְׁבֵי הַנִּקְדֶשׁ the beginning of the sixth, Pesachim I. 4; a לָצְמֵשׁוּת half past eight, Pesachim V. 1.

Matth. XX. 10 רַבְנֵי they supposed. I have added גַּם as more conformable to the narrative. In the speech XXIV. 44 היה. to imagine’ needs no addition.

Matth. XX. 34 רַאֲשָׁנָה and immediately their eyes received sight. That רַאֲשָׁנָה does not express exactly the force of the Greek ἄνεκπλάσσεται; our revised text substitutes רָאָס כֹּל הָהֹלָמִים לְאָרוֹם בָּא. Matth. XXI. 1 מִלְך מְלַחְמֵה unto the mount of Olives. The Elzevirian text shows ποτά (not ποτὲ); I have now expressed it by ב, yet without changing Mark. XI. 1. Luk. XIX. 29. where ב stands still unaltered. The preposition ב does not exclude the site of the village on the slope of the mountain.

Matth. XXIV. 43 יִדְעָה יַדְעוּ but know this, that if . . . had known. The biblical usage exhibits יִדְעָה יַדְעוּ Job V. 27., but not ידוע (comp. above on Matth. XI. 7). For this reason I have chosen to write ידועו without the inf. intensivus, for the Greek text has simple אוי .

Matth. XXVII. 46 רַבְנֵי Changed into רַבְנֵי, because רַבְנֵי of the Receptus is here as well authenticated as וֹלְנֵי וֹלְנֵי of the same Mark. XV. 34.

Matth. XXVII. 51 הָעַלְכָּה from the top. The biblical idiom knows only above and הָעַלְכָּה from above. Thus I have corrected. Mark. VII. 3 תֹּלְכָּה with the fist. I have removed this translation of the Erasmian and Elzevirian reading תֹּלְכָּה, because it is

1) Erasmus in his editions has in the Greek text πορεύσαντες, in the Latin version crebro like the Vulgate (after the reading πορεύσαν), whence Tyndale often, Luther manchmal. Westcott and Hort acknowledge πορεύσαντε as the original reading, which, owing to its obscurity, has been variously altered and translated.
incompatible with the Jewish rite of washing the hands. I thought for a moment, that τούτον might correspond to the rabbinical מים (Chullin 107a), which excludes the use of aqueduct-water and requires the application of manly strength. But at last it seemed to me more probable, that the Greek writer of the gospel had in mind as far as the wrist, a phrase common in the statutes of hand-washing. If that expresses the true sense, τούτον indicates the whole hand from the fingers’ end to the lower end of the fore-arm. The text, thus translated, accords with the law, while the former translation נאמה was senseless and offensive.

Mark. VII. 4 and of couches. Statutes, concerning the washing of beds (κλινοντι), are unknown. I have now put this in round brackets, which indicate what the Revised English Version says in the margin: “Many ancient authorities add and couches”. The addition is wanting in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Mark. XII. 38 and salutations. Here after the Makkeph נאות (comp. חכמים Eccl. II. 6) or מנהל (comp. the forms Job VI. 8. Ps. CVI. 15) in the 4th edition had fallen out, it is now inserted in conformity with Matth. XXIII. 7. Luk. XI. 43.

Mark. XIII. 12 and children shall rise up נאמה. I have now preferred נאמה conformably to the fundamental passage Micah VII. 6 compare Sota IX. 15.

Luk. X, 28 מלב and thou shalt live. This form with Segol in pausa is received by Baer Prov. IV. 4. VII. 2., but most

1) The terminus ad quem which is defined by רה בקר of the Mischna Jadajim II. 3 is already controverted in the Gemara. Maimonides in Hilchoth Berachoth VI. § 4 repeats the formula without explanation. There are interpreters, who understand מלקוי תחנה东海 ימים that is, the place where the fingers are joined to the middle hand (metacarpus). But after the predominant interpretation of Alfási and others signifies מלקוי东海 ימים that is, the end of the hand (carpus), where it is joined with the arm. A third definition as a comment on Mark’s τούτον is given by Theophylact and Euthynius מלקוי2 רוד אברון as far the elbow. But in the law of the profane, not priestly hand-washing this terminus remains out of consideration.
readers would think it a misprint, therefore I have written מָאַז with Zere like Gen. XX. 7.

John VIII. 53 *whom makest thou thyself?* I have now preferred *יִתְנָה* as more intelligible. The former rendering followed the construction Is. XLII. 6. Comp. *Jalqut* Ezek. XXVIII. 2 where it is said to the king of Tyre: אַוִּית יִתְנָה נָא אַלּוֹ.

Act. II. 15 *it is the third hour of the day.* I have preferred *יִתְנָה* as more according to Ps. XC. 4b and to the usage of the Mishna e. gr. *הָיָהּ תְנָה* the second of the month, Sanhedrin V. 3. אַוִּית יִתְנָה the first day of the week, Taanith 27b.

Act. IV. 17 *that it spread no further among the people.* I have transposed מָאַז מָאַז so that no one should think of the phrase מָאַז מָאַז ,to break into' or 'to urge'.

Act. VII. 58 *laid down their clothes.* I have preferred the Kal מָאַז as more exactly the idiom of the Bible and Mishna 1 Sam. XIX. 24. Ezek. XLIV. 19. Joma III. 4. 6 and throughout; מָאַז signifies stripping off oneself, מָאַז (n. actionis of the Hiphil) stripping off another.

Act. VIII. 18 *was given,* in the Greek מָאַז מָאַז. I have changed the participle into the 3. preter. מָאַז.

Act. IX. 38 *to come to them.* After the negative מָאַז seemed more significant. But the alteration is of questionable merit, and there was no need to depart from the type Judg. XVIII. 9.

Act. XIV. 2 *against the brethren.* After מָאַז without doubt the preposition מָאַז is better and quite intelligible. In the postbiblical literature מָאַז מָאַז is frequent for 'to be angry at one', e. gr. *Aboda zara* 54b.

Act. XXI. 24 (23) *which have a vow on them.* This מָאַז is the worst dativus ethicus which I had admitted; for everywhere מָאַז after מָאַז denotes the person to whom
one makes the vow. The correct rendering, which indeed corresponds more closely to the Greek text, is אֶתְנַחַב (Num. XXX. 7. Ps. LVI. 13).

Rom. V. 1 *(הָנַחְּבָּה—being justified.* Instead of the Hophal, which is not biblical, I have put הָנַחְּבָּה after Dan. VIII. 14.

Rom. VII. 5 *(which were stirred up through the law.* The Nithpaēl is unnecessary, 

Rom. VIII. 20 *(לְעָשָׂה by reason of him who has subjected it.* I have prefixed the article to the participle, which does not need it; when a determination follows (Ps. LVII. 3, Am. IX. 12. Cant. VII. 5), but, followed by נְנַחֵא as well as by נְנַחֵא Ezek. XXI. 19 the article can scarcely be omitted and the construct state is in this case inadmissible; נְנַחְּבָּה Jer. XXXIII. 22 is a unique anomaly (Müller-Robertson, Hebrew Syntax § 73).

Rom. XI. 6 *(תַּנְחָבָּה work is no more work.* A similar case is Act. IX. 38. The change נְנַחֵא after 1 Kings XV. 21 was not necessary, but it agrees better with the later style (see the article לְעָשָׂה in Kimchi's Lexicon) and with the aramaic type (סַנְחָבָּה Trg. Gen. XVIII. 11 Targ.).

2 Cor. VII. 11 *(in this matter.* I have added נְנַחֵא. On the contrary I could not decide to change נְנַחֵא Matth. VIII, 16 into נְנַחֵא, because the meaning of נְטַנְחָבָּה is „only by virtue of a word“; comp. Is. XXIX. 21.

2 Cor. VII. 12 *(might appear.* Changed into נְנַחָבָּה in congruity with נְנַחָבָּה.

2 Cor. VII. 15 *(נְטַנְחָבָּה and his inward affection is more abundant toward you. I think: נְטַנְחָבָּה is much better.

2 Cor. VIII. 3 *(and beyond their power. נְטַנָּחָבָּה says the same more plainly.

2 Cor. VIII. 22 *(oftentimes.* The biblical Hebrew says always נְטַנָּחָבָּה, now presented by the revised text.
Gal. I. 14 of the traditions of my fathers. Having long disliked the form הָקָם, I have now acknowledged it as alone regular, just as הָקָם (dangers) 2 Cor. XI. 26.

Gal. V. 1 be entangled. I have now preferred חָמד, as reminding of חָמָם snare, although the one form is as free from objection as the other, comp. Deut. XII. 30 with VII. 25.

Eph. I. 20 when he raised him from the dead and set him... I regard now as better and nearer the Greek.

Eph. III. 10 the manifold (πολυπολυτελος) wisdom of God. The form πολυπολυτελος is analogous to Deut. XXX. 11, but less doubtful, as to the Hiphil, is the form πολυπολυτελος.

Eph. III. 17 rooted. The biblical Hebrew uses in the sense of taking root the Poel Is. XL. 24 and in the sense of being rooted the Poal Jer. XII. 2., I have therefore substituted עָרָבָא.

Eph. V. 33 let her see that she fear... The infinitive of אֵלֶּה is אֵלֶּה Josh. XXII. 25, mostly אֵלֶּה with ל once אֵל 1 Sam. XVIII. 29., elsewhere always אֵלֶּה, but exclusively in reference to God. Consequently אֵלֶּה was inapplicable, אֵלֶּה would be too affected, אֵלֶּה is without precedent, I escaped all difficulty by writing אֵלֶּה instead of אֵל (without article) was a misprint.

Phil. II. 15 in the midst of a crooked... nation. instead of/static (without article) was a misprint.

Phil. II. 21 they seek. I have given up the emphatic form Is. LVIII. 2 and reestablished the regular form of the pause וַיְשַׁרְרֵי (jidrośu), which needs no strengthening.

1 Thess. II. 2 we had suffered. The 1. pers. sing. is רָעָא Ps. CXIX. 71. Hence רָעָא seemed to be preferable, perhaps
without sufficient ground, because the Chirek is protected by
Is. LVIII. 3., see Böttcher, Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache II pag. 410.

1 Tim. VI. 20 oppositions of science falsely so called. I have now written ἄντωνον adj. relat. from
inversion. The old Syriac version has here מֵאֶשׁ, the
plural of מֶאֶשׁ.

2 Tim. I. 3 ἀπὸ προγόνων. Changed into εἰς ἡμῶν ἀντι
of my forefathers, for πρόγονον means ancestors in the
special sense of kindred.

Hebr. IV. 13 יְנִיעָּתָּא. The meaning of the words ποῦ δὲν ἐστὶ
ἀλογος, which I have rendered by שלא↩בחרת, is
questionable; my interpretation agrees with the English ver-
sion, which runs here thus: unto the eyes of him with whom
we have to do. Ex. XXIV. 13 is the name of him
who has a judicial matter to do with another. I suppose that
the author had this phrase in mind. But I have supplied it
with the suffix in an unjustifiable manner. The
םביחי, which are not ours, but of our counterpart. He is our
ב蓮ך בחרת, the suffix belongs to the whole notion, therefore
בוש כאריס יסיה מטול, just as in
the Talmud Mezia 14a: בֵּא לֵין בֶּי רֵי; Kethuboth 81b:
בֵּא לֵין בֶּי רֵי רִידְהוּ אָא, comp. Kamma 46b.

Hebr. IX. 28 מַעֲלֵהִים to bear. Rather מַעֲלֵהִים, because מַעֲלֵהִים is only
in מַעֲלֵהִים the usual form; without ב we read מַעֲלֵהִים, מַעֲלֵהִים, מַעֲלֵהִים.

1) The Hebrew N. T. of the London Society has מַעֲלֵהִים.
That is literal, but suggests a false idea, as appears by comparison of
1 Kings II. 14. 2 Kings IX. 5. Judg. III. 20. The best interpretation,
which is as much justified by the context as by the Greek use of
language (see Cremer’s Wörterbuch der neuest. Grécitut pag. 502), is
Calvin’s: qui nobiscum agit vel cum quo nobis est negotium; accepted by
Joseph B. M’Caul (in his Commentary 1871): „with whom we have to
do“. λόγος in this phrase signifies a judicial relation, having two sides;
the meaning is that God is our judge and that we are responsible to him.
Therefore I have rendered it by a forensic phrase of classical Hebrew.
1 Petr. I. 13 ἡ δὲ πρέπει καὶ ἐλπίς and hope perfectly (ὠφελοῦσα). I am now informed, that the infin. intensivus, when combined with an imperative, always follows it, therefore ἐλπίς ἢ πρέπει; differently from Ps. XL. 2, see Gesenius-Kautzsch § 131, 3c.

1 Petr. IV. 15 μὴ ἔλθῃ γὰρ ἔρρησθαι ἢ πράξεις ἢ πράξεως But let none of you suffer as a murderer. The particles ἢ ἢ ἢ are scarcely to be found together, I have written ἢ τί like Ex. VIII. 25.

Revel. IX. 17 ἰδρυμάτων θεοῦ having breastplates. The ἢ must be blotted out.

Revel. XI. 18 ἠκροβάτες thy wrath. I have preferred ἠμέτρητος according to Ps. XXXVIII. 2. The Chirek arises in the pause by dissimulation: ἠκροβάτες Ps. CII. 11.

I have already said that the correct use of ἑτερα and ὑπερα was not possible without thinking of the Hebrew text as throughout accented. Constant care has been bestowed also upon ἔπειτα and ἐπεξεργασία, that is, plena or defectiva scriptio. The orthography of the text has been settled in such a manner that it may present an appearance similar to the text of the O. T., which e. g. exhibits מֶשֶׁכֶם, מֶשֶךֶם, but always מֶשָךְ and with only one exception מֶשָךְ. Instead of מֶשֶךְ only three times is written מֶשֶךְ. The active participle is more often written without ἢ than with it e. g. always ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν and at least more frequently ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν; sometimes however the writing varies indifferently as ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν. The infinitive of Kal follows the same orthography: ἔρρησεν is never found, ἔρρησεν scarcely, almost always ἔρρησεν. Double ἢ in the same word as ἔρρησεν ἢ ἔρρησεν occurs sometimes, but preponderantly the writing seeks to avoid it, so that e. g. ἔρρησεν is found only twice. It is a rule to write ἔρρησεν, ἔρρησεν (comp. 2 Cor. VIII. 14 ἐργασίαν), and to write either ἔρρησεν or ἔρρησεν or even ἔρρησεν, not ἔρρησεν ἢ ἔρρησεν.

A serious error in the London translation was ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ (to God) and ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ (in God), which signify ,to the heathen gods' Ex. XXII. 19 and „among the gods“ Ps. LXXXVIII. 7, instead of ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ, ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ, which is the only form allowable. It is also worthy of note, that the O. T. Hebrew says ἐκείνου τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ, ἐκείνου τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ, but ἐκείνου τῷ ἀρχάγγελῳ.
As to the form רֶפֶן his gift Rom. V. 15. 1 Cor. VII. 7., I have queried till now, whether it has need of being altered into רֶפֶן or not. At last, I have resolved to retain רֶפֶן. Certainly the analogy of רֶפֶן requires רֶפֶן, but along with the form רֶפֶן a more aramaic form רֶפֶן can be supposed, whence רֶפֶן, like רֶפֶן thy gifts Dan. V. 17.

There were in the fourth edition but few misprints in punctuation, these are now corrected, viz. יְנָּתִי Matth. IV. 9 instead of יְנָּתִי ib. XXII. 21 instead of יְנָּתִי Luk. VI. 45 instead of יְנָּתִי Act. X. 46 instead of יְנָּתִי 1 Cor. XV. 12 instead of יְנָּתִי 1 John IV. 3 instead of יְנָּתִי. Two oversights in the consonants are noted above, Phil. II. 15 and Revel. IX. 17.

A great difficulty is occasioned to the translator by the notion of doubting and its Greek expressions. The language of the Mishna offers רֶפֶן and רֶפֶן (Targ. רֶפֶן) not of doubting persons¹, but of dubious things. This adjective was applicable in rendering μηδεν διαχρινόμενος James I. 6 by רֶפֶן יְנָּתִי, that is, indubitably, yet the following δ γάρ διαχρινόμενος requires a verb which signifies the action of doubting, because רֶפֶן would signify a man of dubious character, not a doubter. I have written רֶפֶן a man who entertains doubts. In Matth. XXI. 21 if ye have faith and doubt not the translation רֶפֶן אֲמֶנָהוּ לָשֶׁת רֶפֶן would mean: if nothing dubious is in it, that is, if your faith is genuine. Also אֹרֵב is useless, because the opinion that the biblical עָבָא גֶּשֶמִּמְיוֹנָה נִקְדֶּשֶׁנ Ps. LXXXVIII. 16 signifies I am doubtful starts from the false supposition, that רֶפֶן is derived from the particle רֶפֶן. Therefore I have ventured to use here the Reflexive רֶפֶן as an equivalent of διαχρινόμαι to doubt after the manner

¹ The only passage of the old literature, where רֶפֶן has the sense of personal action, is Job XXXIV. 37 Targ. יְנָּתִי רֶפֶן which seems to signify: he excites doubts, he shakes the faith by doubts.
of the later Hebrew 1, the same verb, which Phil. IV. 11 renders after the Talmudic use the Greek \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\rho\pi\varsigma \ \varepsilon\iota\nu\alpha \iota \) to be satisfied.

In two passages \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) was applicable, see Mark. XI. 23, Rom. XIV. 23; in four others, Rom. IV. 20, James II. 4, Matth. XIV. 31, XXVIII. 17 I have applied Hosea’s \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\pi\nu \) their heart is divided (X. 2) and in two others the translation was easy, because there ‘without doubt’ is the same as without tarrying Act. X. 20, XI. 12. By this it appears that it is impracticable to translate a Greek word everywhere by the same Hebrew word. The one \( \chi\alpha\pi\rho\varsigma \) for example comprehends the significations of \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) (John I. 17), \( \pi\pi\pi\pi\pi\pi \) (Luk. I. 30) and \( \varrho\iota\iota\iota\iota \) thanks (Rom. VI. 17).

The equivalent of \( \lambda\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\rho\gamma\iota\alpha \) in the sense of worship is \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) e. g. Luk. I. 23 (different from \( \pi\alpha\nu\beta\omicron\gamma\iota\eta \), the word for \( \delta\omicron\upsilon\alpha\iota\epsilon\alpha \)); yet there are passages e. g. Hebr. VIII. 6 where it could not be used. There only \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) was in place, the word that elsewhere e. g. 2 Cor. IX. 12 expresses the Greek \( \delta\iota\alpha\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\iota \alpha \). Also this \( \delta\iota\alpha\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\iota \alpha \) cannot be always translated by the same word. The Hebrew name of the deacon is \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) (Phil. I. 1 and 1 Tim.), of the deaconess \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) (Rom. XVI. 1), the \( n. \ actionis \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) is employed Act. XII. 25 and even VI. 4 where \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) seemed not so suitable. So although the word \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) is employed for \( \alpha\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\sigma\) in 1 John II. 15, in 1 John II. 16. 17 it seemed liable to misinterpretation. The principle, that, when the context and meaning is similar, uniformity ought to be carried through, has been from the first my standard. I fear however, that even in the fifth edition there still occurs some fluctuation in the rendering of certain words. Yet on the other

1) E. g. in § 2 of the first chapter of Jore Deah (Tur and Schulchan aruch): \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) „in this case being uncertain I will ask“, and in the code Mordechai where the recapitulation of Chullin begins: \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) „the learned men were in doubt about many things in the statutes of cattle slaughtering“, comp. Samuel Hanagid in his \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\pi\rho\lambda\nu\iota\kappa \) (the Talmudic non liquet): \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) „Maimonides is wont to say \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\sigma \) (Hitchoth Schemâ II. 13) he was doubtful. The Hebrew of the middle age says not only of things, but also of persons; \( \pi\nu\pi\pi\pi\nu \) he is doubting.
side the critic must beware of rashness and pedantry. Sometimes
where no reason for the varying expression can be discovered, the
translator may be guided by his exegetical or stylistic feeling, which
asserts a claim to the acknowledgement of its relative right.

In closing I may refer to several passages, the translation of
which has suggested weighty questions about Hebrew syntax. An
opportunity is thereby afforded to make public some interesting
portions of Professor Driver's correspondence, containing the results
of his critical examination of the earlier editions.

Matth. II. 1 brethren, there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem. The biblical Hebrew
says sometimes ליהוה or ליהוה, but mostly the bare accusative ליהוה, without the mark of direction. I notice —
S. R. Driver says — that in O. T. the names of places, especially
well known ones, occur usually after verbs of motion without מ
locale; this I have observed particularly in the historical books.
The observation is correct: accordingly the מ locale in the later
ditions is employed only occasionally where clearness and rhythm seemed to demand it.

Matth. II. 22 But when he heard . . . being afraid to go thither he was warned
in a dream. Many readers may expect rather כייא, but the
construction designedly does not follow the type of Gen.
XXVII. 34, but of 2 Chr. XV. 8. The main fact is כייא, the
perfect expresses the previous circumstance. In the first edition
after כייא, etc. the consecutive imperfect with strong Waw
without preceding כייא was used too frequently, whilst in the
earlier books of O. T. this construction is relatively rare, comp.
1 Sam. IV. 20 with Gen. XXXV. 17. I have left it sometimes,
but removed it in such passages as the above mentioned. See
Driver's Use of the Tenses in Hebrew § 127.1

1) In one of his letters, concerning my Hebrew version of the Acts
he says: "The instances of Waw consec. in answer to כייא,
下さい, etc. are very abundant in this book. Considering that this con-
struction occurs (if I mistake not) not more than 4 times in Genesis,
Mark. IV. 33 And with many parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it. My friend proposed דָּבָר and similarly דָּבַר in v. 34 as idiomatically corresponding to the Greek ἐλάλης, ἔφοντο, ἐλάλης. It is true, this synchronistic Imperfect is used by the old Hebrew especially to express that which one was wont to do (Job I. 5) or what was done continuously (Ex. XXXIII. 9, XXXIV. 34). I have preferred however the perfect: 1) because דָּבַר in the sense of ἐλάλης occurs only with יָה preceding Josh. X. 12 or יָה Hos. XII. 5; 2) because also the perfect can be used of an action begun in the past and continued Ex. XXXIII. 11. Ruth IV. 7. Ps. CXLIV. 8.

Mark. V. 39 רָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהוֹן And when he was come in, he saith. In the two first editions I have rendered this דָּבַר שְׁמִית, in the fourth דָּבַר שְׁמִית, for in the Hebrew of the O. T. שְׁמִית signifies to enter like שְׁמִית in the Hebrew of the Mishna. My friend proposed רָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהוֹן, which I adopted in the third edition, but afterwards set it aside: 1) because the Greek ἐποίησαν λέγει denotes both the actions as successive, not as simultaneous; 2) because it seemed advisable to be sparing with this antique scheme of temporal coincidence. I have accepted it e. g. Matth. XI. 7 (see above the remark on this passage).

once in Jud., 6 times in 1—2 Sam., would not once in three chapters be a sufficiently large allowance in the Acts? It seems to me that it is the tendency of the earlier Hebrew, in the case of temporal or causal clauses, which Greek often places early in a sentence, either a) to postpone them somewhat, or b) to prefix רָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהוֹן; it is the later Hebrew, that is apt to introduce them at the beginning. Compare ad a) Gen. XIX. 16. XXXIV. 7. L. 17. Ex. XXX. 18. Jud. VIII. 3 with 2 Chron. XII. 7. XV. 8. XX. 29. XXIV. 25. XXVI. 16. 19. XXXIII. 12. XXXIV. 14. Dan. X. 9. 11. 15. 19 and ad b) (ם)רָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהוֹן 2 Chr. VII. 1. XXIV. 14. XX. 23. XXIX. 29. XXX. 1 against some 14 times in earlier books with רָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהְלָבָּהוֹן prefixed. This observation is keen; hence the disapproval was well founded. In the later editions, as I hope, the two constructions are proportionally mixed and alternating not only for the sake of variation, but according to the importance of the several facts within the historical narrative.
Matth. XXIV. 27 so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. In the first edition I had left out this 'also' (xai) of the Greek text. It is questionable whether it is better to translate it or to leave it untranslated. There are many cases, especially in the Gospels, where this question arises. On this point also we have corresponded. I would like to know — my friend wrote me — whether, if Hebrew writers of O. T. could express fully what they wished to say without הב (after רָאָה or י), it was needful always to represent verbally the xai: it seemed to be at times superfluous and make the sentence unidiomatic. Hebrews either felt the sense was complete without it (with Luk. XVII. 37, where אב exhibits xai oi ἄστοι and Elzev. only oi ἄστοι, comp. Job XXXIX. 30) or sometimes seem to have adopted a different mode of expression (with Matth. X. 4 ὁ xai παραδοὺς αὐτῶν comp. Gen. XXXVII. 24. Ex. VI. 26 s.). Would not such a comparison for instance as Matth. XXIV. 27 have been felt to be complete by an O. T. author without the הב? The matter is worthy of attention. In general it must be said that the omission of the xai at times is allowable. The LXX add xai Deut. II. 21. VIII. 20. Is. LX. 13 al., where the Hebrew text runs without הב; hence vice versa it is permitted to the Hebrew translator to omit it sometimes where the Greek text has it." But the passage Matth. XXIV. 27 to which I have attached this remark, shows how difficult the decision is in some cases. It may seem inconsistent that I have left xai untranslated Luk. X. 39, but not likewise Matth. X. 4. Hebr. VII. 25. Even this little word renders the work of translation very difficult.

Luk. VI. 1 And it came to pass . . . that he went through the corn-fields and his disciples plucked. The construction is like Gen. XLI. 1. Jewish readers often declared, that לְהִי ought to be written. But Prof. S. R. Driver in our correspondence on the Hebrew N. T. has rightly observed: "The schemes לְהִי and לְהִי (e. g. Gen. XXII. 1) occur frequently in the Old Testa-
ment, no less than "האכזבנה" "ה ADDR", might they not be employed, especially the first, more often than is the case, for the sake of variety? I have made use of them in such passages, where the perfect after " ADDR", followed by consecutive imperfect, denotes a preparatory fact, on which the following rests. But not too often, because this classical construction makes a strange appearance to Jewish readers.

Luk. X. 33 הֶעֲרָבֵּדָהּ בְּֽאָדָם בָּרֹחַ But a certain Samaritan as he journeyed... The first edition had rendered this הֶעֲרָבֵּדָהּ as equivalent of the Greek δὲ was awkward; I had not yet freed myself from the unidiomatic manner of the London version, which is sadly marred by the abundant use of the הֶעֲרָבֵּדָהּ in place of δὲ. "I much doubt — S. R. Driver wrote me — if הֶעֲרָבֵּדָהּ is in place here? At least the earlier historical style would not have had recourse to it. Take all the passages in two or three books, given by Noldius, e.g. in the books of Genesis, Judges and Samuel: it is prefixed to single words as "עֲרָבֵּדָהּ" "עֲרָבֵּדָהּ", and it introduces a limitation upon some preceding clause. It also occurs more frequently in speeches than in the narrative, but hardly any — not even 1 Sam. XXIX. 9. 2 Sam. II. 10 — seem quite parallel to its use here. This is the fact. In the later editions these offensive הֶעֲרָבֵּדָהּ are, I hope, all dropped out.
Besides these passages of the synoptic Gospels the following passages also have occasioned grammatical queries and researches, the result of which seems to be not unimportant. Indeed, if I should give all the passages and words which have been matter of inquiry and discussion, it would be difficult to come to an end. Many questions are not even yet quite satisfactorily solved.

Matth. VII. 21. VIII. 2. 6 etc. xυπερε Lord! In the later Hebrew of liturgical prayer and poetry often κήρυ without article or suffix is employed as vocative e. g. εάν κήρυ τελούν αὐτῷ γένει, but in the biblical Hebrew neither κήρυ nor κήρει occurs in direct address, for κήρει Jer. XXII. 18 is exclamation, not address. Therefore I was constrained to substitute either κῆρει or κηρεί (not κήρει which is to be found only once 1 Sam. XVI. 16). The later postexilic language says also without article κηρεί Mylord high priest! Joma I. 3. κηρείς, κηρείς, κηρείς, o priests, o Levites, o Israelites! Megilla 3a. κηρείς, κηρείς, κηρείς, o Pharisees, o Sadducees! Jadajim IV. 7.

Matth. XV. 9 (= Is. XXIX. 13b) κηρείς ἰδίων la ἱπποτάσσεσθαι but in vain do they worship me. The LXX read κηρείς instead of κηρείς. And what follows κηρείς joins closely to the Targum which has κηρείς like ordinances of teaching men. LXX and Targum together bear here witness to a text different from the masoretic. I felt obliged to render the Hebrew text just as it lay before these ancient authorities. A similar case is Hebr. X. 5. In other places where the Greek
version does not necessarily presuppose a different text, e.g. Rom. IX. 28 = Is. X. 23 and Hebr. X. 30 = Deut. XXXII. 35 I have retained our received Hebrew text. Of course, the decision could sometimes but be precarious.

Luk. VI. 1 [יִנְטֶ֣שׁ הָרָ֣שָׁע֓ לְרָשָׁ֔עְתּוֹ] תַּמִּשֶּֽׁהַהֲנַמָּא. In the following editions I have removed these brackets, which indicated in the first, that the Sinaiticus (like the Vaticanus) has only ἐν σάββατῳ without δευτεροπρώτῳ. The remark of the late Tischendorf: ut ab additamentis ratione alienum est, ita cur omiscent in promptu est seems to me convincing. In the interpretation of this δευτεροπρώτῳ I agree with John Ligthfoot, understanding the first sabbath after the second Easter-day, or, as can also be said, the second sabbath after the day of offering the barley sheaf, which is the terminus a quo of the seven sabbaths (weeks) till Pentecost (Lev. XXIII. 15), consequently the second sabbath within פְּרֵהַת הָֽלֻּאָֹּת (the computation commencing from the Omer-offering). Instead תַּמִּשֶּֽׁהַהֲנַמָּא the later editions have תֻּמָּשֶּׁהַהֲנַמָּא, just as Luk. XXIII. 54 תַּמִּשֶּֽׁהַהֲנָּא afterwards is changed into תַּמִּשֶּֽׁהַהֲנַמָּא. The name of the Sabbath is originally feminine, wherefore liturgically it is represented as the royal bride of Israel (comp. however Is. LVIII. 13). We have used it in the passages above mentioned as masculine conformably to Is. LVI. 2. 6 and בֵּסְפִּינָה תַּמִּשֶּֽׁהַהֲנַמָּא, the name of the Sabbath before Easter. Concerning the Pentecost, the expression Act. II. 1 ἐν τῇ συμπληροούσθαι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς is very concise and not easily translatable. I believe, the translation רַחְמָא לְכַּפֶּרֶתָּא הָלֻּאָֹּת (ed. IV. V) shall be satisfactory. The revisers of the English version have blotted out the word fully of the received text. But fully points back to complete Lev. XXIII. 15.

John IV. 31 בְּאָשַׁנְדִי הָלֶֽפֶתַּבָּא the disciples prayed him. The verb בְּאָשַׁנְדִי occurs sometimes construed with the accusative of the thing begged for, but never with the accusative of the person, from whom one prays something. בְּאָשַׁנְדִי seq. accus. signifies 'to ask one'; but 'to beseech one' must be expressed
This rule is observed in the later editions.

John VI. 27 ἐγέρσεσθαι ἵνα ἰδή ἰδείτε γι' αυτόν τὸν ἐμπρός του γεννημένου Χριστού γι' αὐτόν for him the Father, God hath sealed. Thus the first edition, the following more accurately and clearly: not without influence from the conjecture, which the renowned grammarian Moses Reichersohn at Wilna proposed to me that the Lord, comparing himself with heavenly meat, alludes to לְסַח, which is the Palestinian name of the baker as one who impresses certain marks upon his loaves.

Act. VIII. 26. IX. 11 ἀπέσταλμεν ἵνα arise and go. The copulative after ἀπέσταλμεν is not false (comp. 1 Sam. XXIX. 7), but contrary to the usage; the second imperative after ἀπέσταλμεν follows without exception ἀνακάμπτεσθαι. Therefore from the second edition on the ὦ is omitted.

Act. X. 28 εἰσερχεσθαι ὅπως τοῖς ἄνω οὖν ἐφαρμόζονται ye yourselves know how that is an unlawful thing. From the second edition I have ἠλευθέρωσεν corrected to ἠλευθερωσθήσατε, because the biblical ἐλευθερώσατε is mostly construed with ἠλευθερώσατε, scarcely with ἠλευθερωσθήσατε Ex. XI. 7. Deut. XVIII. 21. Eccl. VIII. 12. Ezek. XX. 26., and except the last passage always the word after ἠλευθερωσθήσατε is a verb.

Rom. XVI. 20 shall bruise ἠπεκδέχοντο Satan under your feet. One might expect ἀπελευθέρωσεν, for St. Paul's hope recalls the promise, which is interwoven in the curse of the serpent, and ἐλευθερώσατε, at least the first ἠλευθερώσατε, 1 signifies there 'to bruise' like the targumic פְּלִנֶה and פְּלִנָה, by which the Hebrew פְּלִנֶה is wont to be translated. Nevertheless I did not dare to employ this verb, though I would have used it, if the apostle had said συντρίψει τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ὀφείλεσθαι or only τοῦ ὀφείλεσθαι. In other passages the expression,

1) The second means, as many think, attack by blowing. Indeed פְּלִנֶה in the Palestinian dialect of the Aramaic language signifies 'to blow' e.g. Bereschith rabba c. II: הוא ישיב קסם על שדק "even in sultry heat the wind blows (upon the water)".
which I have chosen brings out intentionally certain reminiscences, e.g. Matth. XV. 28 reminds of Cant. II. 10; John XIX. 30 (suggestion of Gen. II. 1 and of Ps. XXXI. 6; 2 Cor. VII. 5 of Deut. XXXII. 25 (suggestion of the Rev. G. H. Händler); 2 Thess. II. 8 of Is. XI. 4; Hebr. VIII. 2 of Ex. XV. 17 (suggestion of the Rev. D. Biesenthal).

Gal. III. 16 he saith not: (to thee) and (thy) seeds. The plural renders is employed by the Talmud in similar arguments e.g. Sanhedrin 37b, and the collective appears similarly concentrated on the one seed who shall arise from another place (Esth. IV. 14), that is, the king Messiah, in the Midrasch Ruth sect. VII extr. and often.

Gal. IV. 22 (by the free woman) 26 (Jerusalem that is above is free). I have rendered ἐλευθέρα in both verses by הַיְשֶׁנֶה. But it is true, as may friend at Wilna has objected, that denotes a woman which is set free (in Aramaic הַיְשֶׁנֶה, in Latin liberta), and that it is unsuitable so to name Sarah. For that reason (comp. Gal. III. 28. Hebr.) might be deemed preferable in Gal. IV. 22 sqq.

1 Thess. IV. 14 even so them also that are fallen asleep will God by Jesus bring with him. Prof. John J. Given (Londonderry) thinks this passage mistranslated and sadly marred through wrong connexion. The English version, the authorized as well as the revised, translates: which sleep in Jesus. But the Greek text says ἵνα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, which belongs to he will bring, because sleep through Jesus is an unexampled expression.

1 Tim. II. 5 one mediator between God and men. Here and Hebr. VIII. 6 the employment of the rabbinical מעלי could be dispensed with by imitating the circumlocution of Deut. V. 5. Ex. XVIII. 19. The modern Hebrew ventures to say מְשִׁיחַ and even מְשִׁיחַ, but these copies of the occidental
mediator are as repudiable as מְדִיאֵר said of Goliath, who proceeds between the Philistines and Israel to decide the war by single combat 1 Sam. XVII. 4. 23. As to רָפָא, it is a noble word. The Talmud itself (jer. Megilla IV, 1) says: דְּרָפְא (the law is given by the hand of a mediator).

I subjoin here a list of forms, which occur in the first edition, but have disappeared in the following as grammatically incorrect or objectionable.

John XIX. 35 נִהְרָפְא he has borne witness, changed into נֵרָפְא (III. IV: רָפָא), comp. יָרְפָא 1 Kings XIII. 20 and on the other hand יָרְפָא Gen. XXXVII. 22 which is the pronunciation of the infinitive. — Acts XV. 14 (רָפָא) אִסְרָפְלָשֵׁה (תּוֹנ בֹּשֵׁה), rather נָרָפְא. Prov. XXXI. 30 like נָרָפְא Ps. XXII. 29 — Acts XIX. 9 (רָפְא) נָרְפְּא he departed (from them), rather נָרָפְא. The imperf. consec. of Kal and of Hiphil have the same vowels, e. g. Ex. VIII. 27. Gen. VIII. 13 — Act. XXI. 5 נְרָפְא our knees after נִרְפְּא Dan. VI. 11 with aspirate Caph, but the corresponding Hebrew forms all have Dagesh: נָרְפְּא, נָרָפְא, נִרְפְּא, and only with grave suffix נֵרָפְא — Act. XXII. 9 נֵרָפְא (at the end of the verse) they heard. The pausal form is always נֵרָפְא — Rom. XIII. 1 נֵרָפְא (last word of the verse) they are ordained. I have changed the Kamets into Pathach; the form נֵרָפְא Ez. XXVII. 19 (Kal with Dagesh affectuosum) is unconformable — 1 Cor. VI. 13 נֵרָפְא belly. I have afterwards preferred נֵרָפְא (with Sin after Jer. II. 34) as warranted by the Syriac נֵרָפְא — 1 Cor. XI. 28 גְּרָפְא let a man prove, better נֵרָפְא Ps. XI. 5 like נֵרָפְא — 2 Cor. XI. 21 גְּרָפְא he is bold, I am bold, wrong instead of בְּרָפְא Hiphil of נֵרָפְא — Eph. VI. 15 נֵרָפְאָל לְפָרְאָל and having shod your feet, erroneously for נֵרָפְאָל; the names of such organs as are double belong to the feminine nouns — 1 Tim. II. 9 נֵרָפְאָל with braided hair, altered into נֵרָפְאָל after Judg. XVI. 13. 19; נֵרָפְאָל looks like a plural of נֵרָפְאָל knife Ezr. I. 9 — 1 Pet. III. 22 נֵרָפְאָל and authorities, better נֵרָפְאָל from
with stable Dagesh, see Brief an die Römer (1870) pag. 94 sq. — 2 Pet. I. 4 having escaped, misprint for — Apoc. XIV. 15 thy sickle from like from. In spite of that, though uncertain, I have afterwards written .

The name of Tiberias John VI. 1 23. XXI. 1 is written , because is the Babylonian form, the Palestinian; the final letter is sometimes s sometimes n, but more often n (see Levy's Dictionaries) — The name of the town 'Exrapim John XI. 54 could be transcribed like Menachoth 83b. 85a, but according to 2 Chron. XIII. 19 seemed better as less exposed to misunderstanding — In place of ἑπίτροποι Gal. IV. 2 I have written in the second and later editions, the one form is as unobjectionable as the other, both are used in the talmudic language — I have left unaltered 2 Cor. I. 22 and in other passages; the form is the same as Constr. Constr. — The plural 1 Cor. I. 10 did not need correction; signifies classes and (from the same singular) signifies litigations (schisms), see Tosefta (ed. Zuckermandel) pag. 321 lin. 1.
I was not surprised, when my sharp-sighted critic in Oxford after the perusal of the first edition imposed upon a translator higher obligations than he found there fulfilled. ...Hebrew as we have it in O. T. — thus he wrote me — being in certain points a more limited language than Greek, and only able sometimes to express with difficulty what Greek can do with ease and lightness, does it not seem to you, that to translate a phrase word for word results at times in a sentence, which sounds slightly heavy and unnatural? In a piece of historical narrative, or a speech, it seems to me that in such cases we should endeavour to translate the phrase as a whole, to frame a sentence idiomatically, which, though it may not in every detail correspond to the Greek, shall still, taken altogether, express accurately the whole idea which the writer intends to convey. To translate S. Luke into Hebrew does not appear to me to be quite the same thing as to translate him into English or German; it is more like making an idiomatic translation of a piece of Plato or Thucydides. I notice you have allowed yourself the practice sometimes: might it be a little extended? I should of course not suggest it in the case of any technical or dogmatic term, where verbal exactness is evidently of primary consequence. But would it not also often secure as a collateral advantage — not unimportant, even in the Acts — a style more resembling that of O. T., in being at once more compressed and more antique?“ Briefly, my friend demands more liberty from the letter, more compliance towards the genius of Hebrew. I acknowledge the right of this plus ultra, but appeal at once to the ultra posse nemo
Two instances may show what I mean. The sentence Matth. X. 10 *the workman is worthy of his food* is translated הָעָבְדֵּנוּ דֹּרְחֵנוּ. Thereto my reviser remarked: „I do not criticize the exactness of the rendering, but would only ask whether for such a „spruchartiger Satz” some equivalent more in the pointed style of the old השם might not be found without the use of such a word as המלך of the book of Esther? The stress appears to lie in the general principle of human conduct appealed to by our Lord, rather than in the special word דָשַׁא.“ Indeed that המלך as not classical displeases me, but I do not know how to avoid it, for מְמַלְכֵּנוּ would signify that each labourer receives his food, but not that he is worthy to receive it. Similarly the rendering of the synoptic therefore ye shall receive the greater condemnation (Matth. XXIII. 14. Mark. XII. 40. Luk. XX. 47) by המלך does not satisfy me, and revising the text of the fourth edition I have pondered, whether that rendering might be improved in any way, yet having exhausted all possibilities I saw myself thrown back upon the translation hitherto given. If I had the choice between a classical, but too free version, and a less classical, but more faithful one, I would give the preference to the latter, because it is much more important, to preserve the originality of the divine word than to level it in favour of a more genuine Hebrew shape. The spirit of the N. T. has created for itself its own peculiar form of thinking and speaking, and the N. T. writers, especially St. Paul and St. John, have their own style. I was anxious not to withhold from the Jewish readers the impression of these peculiarities, even where the form is stiff, monotonous and unpleasing, for in the Holy scripture as the earthly vessel of heavenly thoughts and directions all is as much human as divine. We are not permitted to make the human form of the N. T. more beautiful than it is. I know, in this point my friend agrees with me. And I willingly grant him that I may have sacrificed regularity or elegance to fidelity in several places where both could be united. I am far from presuming that I have realized the ideal. A true and satisfactory version of the N. T. is a thing of the
future, and only will be produced, when the new Thora of the Gospel has been received into its heart of hearts by the regenerated remnant of Israel.

* * *

A friend of mine does not cease to entreat me to translate the New Testament into the Aramaic idiom which was spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles, that is, into the language of the Palestinian Talmud and the Palestinian Targums. But his desire rests on an illusion. The Hebrew remained even after the exile the language of Jewish literature. The Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach was written in Hebrew, as its fragments in the Talmud show. The original of the first book of Maccabees and of the so-called Psalter of Solomon was Hebrew. The inscriptions on coins, the epitaphs, the liturgic prayers were Hebrew. The form of the laws was Hebrew, as appears from their codification in the Mishna. Also the book, in which, as Papias says, Matthew had collected the sermons of the Lord, was written ἐβραϊκὸς διάλέκτῳ. It is true, that in that time ἐβραϊκάτι and χαλδαϊκάτι were not accurately distinguished. Nevertheless it is quite unlikely that Matthew wrote in Aramaic; for the Aramaic dialect of Palestine—which in the Talmud is called דרדר, and there and in the Targums can be better learned than from the so-called Evangelarium Hierosolymitanum and the fragments of a Palestinian version of Psalms, published by J. P. N. Land (Lugduni Bat. 1875)—was the language of daily life, the vulgar language, in which the people and also the learned were wont to converse and to hold controversies, but Ἡ Ἑβραῖς διάλεκτος, in which St. Paul was accosted by the exalted Saviour Act. XXVI. 14 and in which he himself addressed the people of Jerusalem Act. XXI. 40. XXII. 2. was the holy language, the language of the temple worship, of synagogue and domestic prayer, of all formulas of benediction, of the traditional law; further the parables, the animal fables, the lamentations for the dead in the Talmuds and Midrashim are
mostly Hebrew; the holy language continued to be the language of the higher form of speech, even the popular proverbs were only partly Aramaic. Josephus, stating in the Preface of his work on the Jewish war, that his narrative was originally drawn up for his compatriots of inner Asia in the common mother-tongue, certainly means the Hebrew, not the Aramaic language. Knowledge of Hebrew was then as now universal among the educated of the nation. Aramaic, on the contrary, was understood only by a small part of the Diaspora. Even now knowledge of Hebrew is much the more general, whereas acquaintance with the idiom of the so called Talmud Jerushalmi is a prerogative of very few Jewish scholars. Therefore it would be a useless attempt to translate the New Testament into the Palestinian Sursi. The Semitic woof of the New Testament Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic. Our Lord and his apostles thought and spoke for the most part in Hebrew. And the New Testament, as the new Thora, the completable half of God's revelation, must be translated into Hebrew, if we intend to make it a reading book for the Jews of all countries and a constituent part of the worship of the future Israel, who shall be saved after the entering in of the fulness of the Gentiles. The translation into Aramaic would be an artificial work, not without relative advantage — for it would exhibit in the New Testament language some features of the vernacular dialect of Palestine — but without practical aim. A proof of its restricted utility is the little help, which the Peschito affords to the Hebrew translator.¹

The project of a version of the N. T. in the Targumic idiom is in some degree favoured by John I. 1. Prof. Driver remarks regarding my translation of this overture to the fourth Gospel: „The rendering of λόγος has doubtless been well weighed. I wish that it were possible to employ the יְדֵי הָאֱלֹהִים in some way or other. Would not that term have the advantage of suggesting to the

¹) I mean help in finding the intended or equivalent Semitic phrases; for as regards the Palestinian form of proper names, the Aramaic versions of the New Testament are entirely useless: they transcribe slavishly the Greek forms.
Jewish reader associations analogous to, if not identical with, those suggested by λόγος to the Greek? אָדָם, unlike בֵּית (if I mistake not), but like λόγος, would be a significant word, having a previous history to which to attach itself and which gives it its meaning." Nevertheless after careful deliberation I have rendered λόγος by בֵּית, because the Word not only as mediator of the world’s creation and conservation is called בֵּית Ps. XXXIII. 6. CXLVII. 18, but also as mediator of salvation Ps. CVII. 20. Is. LV. 10 sq. For some time I thought of אָדָם as an equivalent of אָדָם, but I rejected it, because the Hebrew of the Mishna and its age knows אָדָם only as denoting the word of command, by which the world arose e. g. Aboth V. 1. Even אָדָם I did not like, for it is a post-biblical word, and yet it was of great importance to obviate the opinion, that the Logos was an invention of Stoic and Alexandrian philosophy, and not, as it is really the case, rooting and already germinant in the O. T. Certainly the Logos, more and more acknowledged as a divine hypostasis, which partakes of God’s personality, is ordinarily called בֵּית e. g. in the Midrash to Cant. II. 13: וַתְּהַלְמוּ הַסְתָּרָה מִסְיְרָה הֶזָּה the Word spoke with Moses. And in the Palestinian Targum the word as revealer of God and as God himself in his revelation bears besides the name מַלְאָךְ also the name מַלְאָךְ or מַלְאָךְ (see Levy’s Targumic Dictionary). But even these synonymous terms lead to בֵּית as the word really corresponding, especially in regard to such passages as 1 John I. 1 where only מַלְאָךְ or מַלְאָךְ is suitable.

Finally I cannot forbear to mention a New Testament term by which Jewish readers are offended, as I have heard from many sides. It is known that our Lord is wont to confirm his sentences by opening them with ἀμήν, in the Gospel of St. Matthew thirty times with ἀμήν λέγω, in the Gospel of St. John twenty five times with ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὡμόν. I have translated it in the Synoptics by בֵּית מֵאָה and in St. John by בֵּית מֵאָה מֵאָה מֵאָה. How many times Jewish friends have exclaimed: 'That is not Hebrew, and insisted that instead of מֵאָה ought to be said מֵאָה or מֵאָה. This מֵאָה at the head of the sentence is indeed
entirely foreign as much to the biblical as to the postbiblical style and has not its like in the whole Jewish literature. However it would be inconsiderate and arbitrary to remove this anomaly in favour of stylistic regularity and elegance. For if every great man has his own style, how much more the greatest of all! His manner of speaking contains much hitherto unheard of, for instance that he calls himself the Son of Man, which is infinitely different from אֶלְָה יָהָה, by which in the vernacular language of that time the speaker designated himself. This יָהָה also was a new and peculiar expression in the mouth of our Lord. Speaking the dialect of the people he began his solemn speeches with וַיִּוָּה אֶלְָה יָהָה, in Hebrew וַיִּוָּה אֶלְָה יָהָה, not וַיֵּהָה אֶלְָה יָהָה, because this order of the words obliterates the significant alliteration, which St. John intends to imitate by doubling the יָהָה. I am persuaded, that the name φίλος Αμήν, which is given to Christ Revel. III. 14 alludes to the oft repeated ἀμήν of the incomparable master.

Charles Dickens wrote to his son, as he was about to undertake a journey: „I have put a New Testament among your books, because it is the best book, which the world has known and will ever know“. In truth, it is the best in every respect. What a fullness and depth of contents this small volume encloses, its like is not to be found among the literatures of mankind. And every dispassionate inquirer must allow, that Jesus Christ, who is the centre of this book, has created a new era of human history. The root of Jesse has become the root of a new world. Even those, who deny His Messiahship, are not without a share in some fruits of his redemption. But it shall come to pass in the last days, that

1) In Sursi the speaker says אֵלְָה יָהָה (אֵלְָה יָהָה) not only of himself, but also of the person addressed; consequently this phrase is of no use to explain the self-denomination of our Lord by φίλος Αμήν του ἀνθρώπου Matth. VIII. 20 etc.
3) Translated back from the German.
they shall acknowledge Him whom they have so long despised. Israel will then become confessor and interpreter and apostle of the New Testament, and the new Thora, which is gone forth out of Zion, will then be gloriously transfigured into the holy tongue. Jacob shall then take root, Israel shall blossom and bud and fill the face of the world with fruit. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead! — O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord and his Christ! Their light is one, light of the only One, the heavenly source of life, as Christ has said: This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.
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