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

Just one point of detail. I observe that Dr. Dods rejects the revised rendering of St. John xiii. 2, "during supper," for "supper being served," or "supper-time having arrived." But has he not overlooked the change of reading, δείπνου γινομένου for γενομένου ?

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　W. SANDAY.

The Hebrew Accents, by Arthur Davis. London, D. Nutt, 1892.

Probably only those who have already solved all the other problems of the universe and find still a little time upon their hands think of studying the Hebrew Accents. To such persons a book of reasonable compass on the subject would be acceptable. No one who desires full knowledge can dispense with the two Treatises of Wickes (Clarendon Press), but these works are both long and expensive. Mr. Davis here offers a brief compend on the Prose Accents, which will be found of service as containing the main principles and facts of the accentuation. The book certainly might have been clearer. The author has a tendency to multiply rules (in a way that drives the reader to mutiny or despair), where the statement of a single general principle would have been sufficient. Examples of this are the rules on Sheva at the beginning, and those on Metheg at the end of the book ; and other examples occur throughout. For instance, three rules are given for the case of Munach taking the place of Metheg on the word of Zakeph, where the single rule that Metheg remains if on the first letter of the word would have been enough. It might have been well to mention that the apparent Pashta on the word of Zakeph is called *Methīgah*, because the name suggests the explanation of the peculiarity. Neither will the reader easily pick up the conditions under which *Zakeph Gadol* is to be used. This subject, indeed, is rather obscure in itself, and the best editions do not remove the perplexity. Comp. Genesis i. 19 with xx. 4, in Baer.

The rules for interpunction given by Mr. Davis (p. 31 *seq.*) will be found instructive. It may be held as now ascertained that the accentual principle is a dichotomy, and not, as Ewald maintained, a trichotomy. The verse is divided into two by Athnach, and then each of these two halves into two by Zakeph, and so on. From this principle it seems to follow that Segolta does not mark the *third* of a verse, as Mr. Davis still maintains, but is really a divider of the first half of the verse. This accent is subject to peculiar rhythmical laws, but seems to be in some way a modified Zakeph.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　A. B. DAVIDSON.