

aim at the prize of blessedness, he aimed at the mark of perfectness. In becoming perfect he attained happiness, but his primary aim was not happiness. We may understand this by an illustration. In student life there are those who seek knowledge for its own sake, and there are those who seek it for the sake of the prize, and the honour, and the substantial success in life that knowledge brings. They who seek knowledge for the sake of a prize are not genuine lovers of knowledge—they love only the rewards of knowledge: had it no honour or substantial advantage connected with it they would be indolent. But while the prize was not St. Paul's aim, it was an incentive. If his step began to flag, the radiant diadem before him gave new vigour to his heart; and we know how, at the close of his career, the vision became more vivid and more entrancing: 'henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of glory.'

In the sphere of conduct the prize is the serviceable life; in the sphere of personal morality, it is the regenerated character.

Life in God's contempt apart,  
With ghastly smooth life dead at heart,  
Tame in earth's paddock as her prize.<sup>1</sup>

4. Why is the prize described as 'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'?

Dr. Vaughan is probably right in saying that the force of the phrase 'lies not in the idea of *upward* or *to heaven*, but in that of the Person who calls *being Himself above* or *in heaven*.' But as the Apostle regards the call as taking its character and object from this fact, *heavenly* is

<sup>1</sup> Browning, *Easter Day*, iii.

practically equivalent to *heavenward*. It is that summons or charge which comes to every Christian to make his home in the Jerusalem which is above.<sup>2</sup>

The determining feature in the high calling of the Christian is that it has Christ for its centre. His Word, His Will, is the law of the Christian's action. His sustaining and sanctifying influence pervades the whole of the Church's activity—pervades it in theory, and it is for us to see that it pervades it more and more completely in practice. 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.'<sup>3</sup>

The calling is not primarily a calling to receive a prize, but to run a race. The calling exists before the race begins. It is the invitation, the sanction, the authority by which the race is begun, the goal fixed, and the prize awarded. The high calling is, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the heavenly calling.<sup>4</sup>

It is a calling to be perfect; it is therefore not the Apostle's own, but God's. The work began with God. God will see to its accomplishment. It is this that gives his spiritual activity its greatest intensity. The calling is high, but not higher than by God's grace he may attain to. 'I like to think of that strong phrase of Calvin's—*irresistible grace*.'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> W. Sanday, *Two Present-Day Questions*, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> J. Thomas, *Myrtle Street Pulpit*, iii. 203.

<sup>5</sup> D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, p. 289.

## The New Hebrew Bible of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

BY PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D., MAULBRONN.

To say a word on this new undertaking I am perhaps the more entitled, or even called upon, since my name has been mentioned in connexion with it in a way which must give a wrong impression.

Under the heading 'A New Edition of the Hebrew Bible' there was, in the *Times* of 23rd January, a long correspondence, together with a leader on it.

With the leader the Society was, it seems, not quite satisfied; so the secretaries sent a letter to the *Times* (27th January); whose last paragraph was:

'In order to ensure accuracy the committee have *obtained* for Dr. Ginsburg the help of three accomplished scholars *as proof-readers*—

Professor Strack of Berlin, Herr Kahan of Leipzig, and Professor Eberhard Nestle of Maulbronn. The Society hopes therefore, within the limits it has been obliged to impose upon Dr. Ginsburg, to secure the best Hebrew Bible which has ever yet been issued in print.'

Finally, there was another letter in the *Times* (10th January) by Dr. E. W. Bullinger, secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society, stating that the 'New Edition' in question will be precisely the same, as far as the text is concerned, as that prepared by Dr. Ginsburg, and recently published by the Trinitarian Bible Society at an expense of over £2000.

The letter goes on to state that a second edition was lately printed from the plates of the first, which is on sale at greatly reduced prices, and on which royalties continue to be paid. A third edition is being prepared, in which there will be an appendix of several pages of typographical errors.

On the last paragraph of the letter, that it is an open question whether the new edition does not infringe the copyright of the Trinitarian Society, I cannot enter. I have to do here only with the new book and, in passing, with my connexion with it. And there can be no question that the new Hebrew Bible, of which only the first part, the Pentateuch, has appeared as yet, is the most *beautifully printed* Hebrew Bible or even Hebrew Book which I know of, so far as the text is concerned. The types of the apparatus, especially the vowelled types, are not clear enough, to come out well from the stereotype plates. But I am told that in the following parts a better type will be chosen, and, after the completion of the whole, the apparatus of the first part re-set in the new type.

With its broad margins—the book is of the size of 27 : 18, 5 cms.—the pages have a splendid appearance. The Trinitarian Bible, just mentioned, had a very clear print, and likewise the former editions of the B.F.B.S. (by Letteris): it is a pity that Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* in order to save space chose a type which for many eyes is very trying. All who lay stress on a clear print must now take the new edition.

But is it, as well as the most beautiful, also the most *correct*, and the most up-to-date edition?

Now any one who has to do with printing knows that to print a Hebrew Text with vowels and accents is one of the most difficult tasks that

can be fancied. No doubt great care has been bestowed on the correction, but when I saw the first part (Genesis), which had been distributed to the members of the International Congress of Orientalists at Kopenhagen last year, I at once found several misprints from the first page almost to the last (one of the worst in Gn 49<sup>7</sup> וְלִנִּי for וְלִנִּי). So I wrote to the Society that I should like to go through the pages with the help of my pupils (lads of fourteen to sixteen), to whom I would offer (as I had done on former occasions, for instance, when I corrected the Greek Testament for the Society) 20 Pfennig (twopence ha'penny) for every misprint they were to find. This offer was accepted, but not attended to. I never heard of the edition till I got two copies of the finished book on the 26th January.

In opening the new parts, the very second word in Ex 1<sup>1</sup> turned out to be without accent, and in the last verse but one in Deuteronomy (34<sup>11</sup>) a point was missing: probably both had disappeared from the plates; these were not faults of the proof-readers. But there were also faults overlooked by the correctors; the most interesting one, a wrong Dagesh in Dt 29<sup>14</sup>. For this little dot proves that the Bible of the Trinitarian Society mentioned above had served as printers' copy; but it proved, at the same time, that for the Trinitarian Bible itself, a copy of Letteris' edition had been used for the same purpose; for this misprint is also in Letteris. Not only books have their fates, according to the saying of Terentianus Maurus of old: *habent sua fata libelli*, but also misprints. I beg the reader's pardon for speaking so much about these minutiae, but as the statement of the secretaries, that my help also had been obtained by the Society as proof-reader, devolves some responsibility on myself, I am obliged to state the matters as they were. For the future parts I am promised an opportunity of seeing the proofs *before* the plates are made. Several points I should have arranged differently; how awkward, for instance, to have in the headings, chapters and verses at the inside, and the numbers of the pages at the outside, as if one were to look in a Bible to the pages!

But to come to more important points. The *text* is in the main the same as that of the Trinitarian Bible and that of Kittel's Bible, all reproducing the edition of Jacob B. Chayim's Bible of Venice, 1524–1525.

A new feature is the *apparatus*. Dr. Ginsburg

compared seventy-one MSS and nineteen printed editions from 1482 to 1525. Besides, he quotes for some passages the Samaritan Pentateuch (from which edition?), the Targums—again we miss a statement about the editions used,—the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the collations of Kennicott and De Rossi. To denote these sources by Hebrew letters does not recommend itself: much shorter and clearer are the abbreviations in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the O.T.* and in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*; but in an edition issued by the Bible Society which is destined to serve Jewish readers also, perhaps the other way seemed impracticable.

Few readers will be able fully to recognize the amount of labour bestowed on this apparatus, which rises from two lines on the page to fourteen and fifteen. To collate seventy MSS and twenty early editions: what scholar will have the patience necessary for this work? Truly, sincere thanks are due to Dr. Ginsburg and to the Society. But will the result be worth this labour and expense? I fear few scholars will say yes.

If the collations printed at the foot of the pages were complete, then they would be of great value; for then we would know that all Hebrew MSS and editions do not yield any more variants than are here gathered; and to know that would be a gain. But certainly the MSS and editions contain more variants. Leaving aside all accents and vowels, I give but one example of consonants: Ex 2<sup>17</sup> is יישיע printed with plene Yod in the new Ginsburg, while it is defective in Kittel, Letteris, and even in Ginsburg's first edition. The apparatus is silent; from the text we must conclude that all MSS and all editions agree in the *plene* spelling. I do not know why Ginsburg introduced it. I do not even care about these minutiae; I mention this case as an example, to show that the apparatus, rich and valuable as it is, is not complete enough

even for the Massoretic text; and yet the real difficulties begin behind it. For the student, the apparatus of Kittel and of Haupt is much more useful. The *text* in the type of the new Bible, with the apparatus of Haupt and Kittel in a corrected and supplemented form; this would give what the secretaries hope of the present edition: the best Hebrew Bible which has ever yet been issued in print. Meanwhile we are thankful to have here the most beautiful, with an apparatus which in one direction has nothing like it.

*P.S.*—I beg to mention one point more, in which sufficient circumspection has not been used for the convenience of the readers: that is the *chapter division*. The chapter division now common in the Hebrew Bibles has not the slightest historical value, and it was one of the gravest mistakes of the German Bible Revision to take a Hebrew Bible as standard for the chapters. The English Revisers were, in that direction, as in many others, much more equal to their task. They simply remarked on the margin for instance, at Gn 31<sup>55</sup> '[Ch. 32, 1 in Heb.],' at Ex 8<sup>1</sup> '[Ch. 7, 26 in Heb.],' at 8<sup>5</sup> '[Ch. 8, 1 in Heb.].' How can one incur the great costs of producing a new Hebrew Bible without settling these differences? In Ex 20 and Dt 5, Dr. Ginsburg has printed the text of the Ten Commandments three times: once in the text with both accentuations, and then twice separately in the apparatus, according to the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, giving their respective numberings; but the chapter division of the Christian Bible is withheld from us, and this in the country of Stephen Langton, who was its originator. But I must not take up more space. I trust this point and some others will be attended to in an appendix or at a future revision, but it would have saved much expense, if they had been properly considered beforehand.