those who can never die. Do we lack wisdom, or strength, for this high task and enterprise? Are we feeling at this moment how much we lack it? Let us ask it of God, then; and it shall be given us.

S. Cox.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION.

WE wish now to address ourselves definitely to the task of endeavouring to prove, as we have promised, that certain portions of the synoptic Gospels present indications of having been translated from a common Aramaic original. We have enumerated what seem to us the usual concomitants of translation work from a foreign source, when that source is known; and to guard ourselves from error we have illustrated each point from the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, as presented in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. But when we come to the converse case, of deciding whether the productions of some two or three men, which bear singular marks of resemblance, be really translation work, we find that the concomitants referred to are far from being equally useful. It would, for instance, be of very little value for our present undertaking were we to show that, in certain sections, the synoptists "agree in substance, but not in words"; for in describing an event in the life of our Lord, or reporting one of His discourses, that sort of agreement is precisely what we should expect if the Saviour spoke Greek, and the evangelists made no use of any common material. Similarly, if one were to endeavour to show that certain sections in the synoptists contain more Aramaisms than others, that might be serviceable in proving that the Gospels were

compilations, but it would go a very short way toward
proving that those sections had been *translated* from the
Aramaic; for the common source might, after all, have been
composed in Greek, and the idioms might be due to the
fact that the native tongue was more deeply ingrained in
the constitution of that Jewish author than of some others.
Before we reach *terra firma* we must pass on to indication
No. IV.; namely, that in a text written without vowels, as
all Semitic texts were in those days, the readers were liable
to read different vowels into the same consonants. This
liability to error may be illustrated from some of the
systems of short-hand, where the vowels are not written,
but have to be inserted by the reader. If we can succeed
in showing, in several instances, that the divergent words
in our Greek Gospels yield, when translated into Aramaic,
precisely the same consonants, and that *the diverse vocaliza-
tion of these same consonants yields the diverse meanings
that are found in our present Gospels*, we venture to think
that we shall be making out a strong case in support of
our theory that in these passages the evangelists were
translating from a common Aramaic original.

1. Our first illustration shall be of a simple character.
In connexion with the cure of the man with the withered
hand in the synagogue at Capernaum, his condition is
described in variant, but precisely equivalent terms, thus :

> Matt. xii. 10 : τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν.
> Mark iii. 1 : ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

In Aramaic the difference between the adjective ξηράν,
dry, and the participle ἐξηραμμένην, *dried*, *withered*, is simply
that of the diverse vocalization of the text-word יָבֵישׁ. If
in perusing the MS. the reader pronounced the word יָבֵשׁ,
he would obtain the adjective *dry*, "aridus, siccus"[1]; a

---

[1] Permit me at the outset to express my indebtedness, in general and in
particular, to the two invaluable lexicons, Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum*,

word which occurs in Ezekiel xxxvii. 2, "The bones were very *dry.*" Whereas if he were to insert vowels thus: יָבֵישׁ, he would obtain the participle of the intransitive verb יָבֵשׁ, which means to *become dry, be withered,* as in 1 Kings xiii. 4: וַיִּבְשַׁת יָדֵיהּ, "His (Jeroboam's) hand was dried up." We attach very little value however, for our present purpose, to instances of this kind, where the two divergent Greek words are from the same Greek root; the case will be incalculably stronger when we adduce words which in Greek have no apparent affinity, and show that these meanings belong to the same Aramaic text-word with different vowels attached.

2. A much more pertinent illustration is one which occurs in the parable of the sower, which as might have been anticipated, has proved to us quite a mine—the parable and its interpretation yielding no less than sixteen cases illustrative of our theory,[1] though most of them fall under indications V. and VI.

MATT. xiii. 4.	MARK iv. 4.	LUKE viii. 5.
ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν	ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν	ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν
παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν,
καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ κατεπατήθη,
τὰ πετεινά,	τὰ πετεινά,	καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ
		τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.	καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.	κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

The first two evangelists say, "There *came* the fowls and devoured it." Luke says, "It *was trodden down,* and the fowls devoured it." Why this diversity in so much similarity? It is evident that our Lord did not use *both* words;

Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum, edited and enlarged by Dr. B. Fischer (Leipzig, 1875); and Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (Leipzig, 1866). Both are indispensable, because arranged on different principles. In many respects I have also found useful a lexicon published at Padua in 1747, by A. Zanolini.

[1] It may here be stated that the sixty cases promised in January have already been more than doubled.

and even if we may shrink from pronouncing in most cases which evangelist gives our Lord's precise meaning, yet it will surely be an immense relief if we can see how the divergences arose. If now we turn to Buxtorf, we find a word דְּרַךְ, which means (1) *calcare, conculcare,* to tread upon, crush ; (2) *ingredi, incedere,* to come in, to enter. Precisely the meanings we require. In the former sense it occurs in Deuteronomy xi. 24 : " Every place whereon the sole of your foot shall *tread* shall be yours." In the second sense it occurs in Proverbs vi. 11 : " Thy poverty shall come and enter (or, rush) in upon thee." So that if it can be admitted that the Saviour's words were written down in the Aramaic as they were spoken, the only difference between these two divergent Greek words is, that of reading different vowels into the same Aramaic text-word.

Matthew and Mark would yield: וַהֲוָה דְּרֵיךְ עוֹפָא   וְאָכֵל יָתֵהּ

Luke requires :   וַהֲוָה דָּרִיךְ וְיוֹפָא אָכֵל יָתֵהּ

We may mention in passing (though the case belongs to VI.) how readily the difference between " root " and " moisture " is explained on our theory.

Matthew and Mark say : διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν   " . . . no root."
Luke :   διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα " . . . no moisture."

But the Aramaic word for " root " is (as in Hebrew) שֶׁרֶשׁ, while the word for " moisture," " succus, lachryma, humor arborum vel herbarum " is שְׁרַף—a difference in one letter only.

3. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, among the things which, after the manner of thorns, choke the good seed, we find

Mark iv. 19 : αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι.
Luke viii. 14 : ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου.

We wish now to show how closely these expressions, " desires for other things " and " pleasures of life," resemble

each other in Aramaic. But first we would direct attention
to a fact which has escaped the notice of most of our lexico-
graphers, that βίος in later Greek acquired the meaning of
luxurious life, "fast life"; as when *we* say that a young
man is anxious to go up to London to see "life." That
this is so is evident from Hesychius, who in his lexicon
defines βίος as (1) ζωή, (2) περιουσία; (1) life, (2) abundance
or luxury; and as an instance of this meaning we may
quote 1 John ii. 16, "The pride of life." I premise then
that Luke's phrase, ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου, means pleasures of
luxury, or, of the fast life. But if we turn to Buxtorf,
we find a noun, מוֹתָר, which has precisely the meanings
of περιουσία. Liddell and Scott define περιουσία as (1)
residue, surplus; (2) abundance, luxury: and Buxtorf
defines מוֹתָר as (1) "residuum, reliquum"; (2) "abun-
dantia, emolumentum." As an instance of this, compare
the Targum of Isaiah i. 9, "Unless the abundance of the
goodness (מותר טוביה) of Jehovah had left us a remnant."
There can be no doubt that we have there the Aramaic
equivalent of the Pauline phrase, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος,
"the riches of His goodness"; or, as Grimm suggests,
"The abundance or plenitude of His goodness." That the
leanings of the word are to the side of "superabundance"
is clear from the fact that its cognates denote "redun-
dance, prodigality." The word מוֹתָר means then (1)
"reliquum"; but that is precisely equivalent to τὰ λοιπά
in Mark's Gospel; (2) "abundantia," which is exactly βίος
in its secondary sense as περιουσία. So that if מוֹתָר
occurred in an Aramaic text, there would be a reasonable
doubt whether it should be rendered "other things," or
"abundance," "luxury." By the way, would not the
rendering of Psalm xvii. 14 be much improved if it were
conceded that the Hebrew word יֶתֶר would have the same
natural history as its cognate in Aramaic, and mean (1)
residue, (2) surplus, wealth, luxury, and we were to ren-

der : " They leave their superabundance, their extravagant wealth, to their babes "? Aquila in this passage renders יֶתֶר περιουσία.

Further, we have the homologue ἡδοναί and ἐπιθυμίαι. These are, in Latin, the *desiderabilia* and the *desideria*, the " desirable things" and the " desires" of life ; and from the verb רגג, to " seek, desire, long for," we obtain (1) רִגְגָא, that for which one longs, *pleasure*, delight—as when the Lord said to Ezekiel (xxiv. 16), " Behold, I take away the *delight* of thine eyes with a stroke"; and (2) רִגְגָא or רְגוֹגָא, *desire*, craving—as in Job xxxi. 35, " My *desire* is that God would answer me," and Deuteronomy xii. 20, " Thou mayest eat after all the desire of thy soul." So that the difference between these two phrases is very slight.

The pleasures of luxury ＝ רגגתא דכותר.
The desires for other things＝ רגוגיא דכותר.

4. Our next two illustrations shall be taken from the narrative of the healing of the lunatic boy, after our Lord descended from the mount of transfiguration. We have in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke two phrases which no harmonist has ventured to consider equivalent, and yet they yield most clearly to the solution we apply.

Luke ix. 39 : Καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ συντρῖβον αὐτόν.
　　　　　And it hardly departeth from him, sorely-bruising him.
Mark ix. 18 : Καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας, καὶ ξηραίνεται.
　　　　　And he grindeth his teeth, and pineth away.

The words which illustrate our present point are Συντρῖβον and ξηραίνεται, but the rest shall receive our attention. There is an Aramaic verb, פְּרַךְ, which means (1) to dry up, parch, fry ; (2) to crumble, crush, break in pieces. But these are just the two meanings desiderated. Συντρίβω, to shatter, smash, bruise, gives the second meaning of פרך ; and ξηραίνεται, withers, is dried, parched,

corresponds to the first meaning in the passive, as, *e.g.*, in Lamentation iv. 8, "Their skin cleaveth to their bone; it has become withered, פָּרִיךְ, like a stick."

Thus συντρῖβον is פְּרִיךְ, active participle Peal;

ξηραίνεται is פְּרִיךְ, passive participle Peal.

And the rest of the words are almost equally alike when reduced to Aramaic. The Aramaic and Hebrew word for "grinding" the teeth is חרק, and the word to "depart from, flee from," is עָרק. I shall presently adduce evidence to show that the *Logia* was a Galilæan document, and it is well known that both Galilæans and Samaritans were very negligent in the pronunciation of gutturals; indeed in the Samaritan Targum the same words are spelt with ח or ע indifferently: so that the difference between חרק and ערק is of the slightest possible kind. Then μόγις, "with labour," "with difficulty," is בְּעָנְיָן; for עָנְיָן, according to Buxtorf, means (1) "negotium," business, and (2) "molestia," annoyance. And "with the teeth" (for חרק is followed by בְּ), is בְּשִׁנִּין. Therefore, neglecting the pronouns, which are always more or less at the option of the translator, the difference between these apparently incompatible phrases is simply this:

Luke ix. 39: וּבְעָנְיָן עָרק פְּרִיךְ.
Mark ix. 18: וּבְשִׁנִּין חרק פְּרִיךְ.

5. There is another couplet in the same narrative which admits of a similar explanation:

MARK ix. 20.	LUKE ix. 42.
καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν·	ἔτι δὲ προσερχόμενον αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν,	ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν
τὸ πνεῦμα	τὸ δαιμόνιον,
ἐσπάραξεν αὐτόν.	καὶ συνεσπάραξεν.

The two words which we wish to identify are ἰδὼν, "when he *saw*," and ἔρρηξεν, "he *broke*," or "*tore*." In an unvocalized Aramaic text these words would be undis-

tinguishable. ἔρρηξεν is אֲדִיק, 3 s. pret. Aphel of דְּקַק, to crush, break, bruise: and ἰδών, or rather εἶδεν, is אֲדִיק, 3 s. pret. Aphel of דִּיק, to gaze at, stare at. Could any one wish for a better explanation of the divergence than that the word אדיק in our hypothetical Aramaic document was by one reader pronounced אֲדִיק, "he tore," or "bruised him," and by the other אֲדִיק, "he gazed at him"? He who assents to this will raise no objection to me if I maintain that the difference between ἤνεγκαν αὐτόν, "they *brought* him," and προσερχόμενου αὐτοῦ, "he *came near*," has arisen from the confusion of the Peal קְרֵב, to *come near*, with the Pael קָרֵב, to *bring near*.

6. We will now turn to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the well-known variation in giving the words of our Lord:

> Matt. v. 48: Be ye perfect, τέλειοι, as, etc.
> Luke vi. 36: Be ye compassionate, οἰκτίρμονες, as, etc.

I would suggest that the one word which was used by our Lord was some form of חסל, which means (1) to bring to an end, "ad finem et complementum perducere," and (2) to nurse, foster, bring to maturity, wean. So that הֲסִיל, perfected, completed—the passive participle—is the equivalent of τέλειος; and חָסִיל, the active participle, may well be rendered by οἰκτίρμων, as denoting the compassionate mother-love manifested to the suckling-child. The noun הִכּוּלֵי occurs in the Targum of Psalm ciii. 2 in the rendering of "forget not all His *benefits*." Buxtorf would translate חִסּוּלֵי "beneficia," kindnesses; but Levy insists on a stronger meaning, "Nährungzustand, Nährungsweise, besonders vom Kinde an der Mutterbrust." So that, according to Levy, the Targum means, "Forget not thy motherly manner of nourishment by God,"—how God nourishes thee with a mother's love. The reader who can endorse this, and will read into the context of both New

Testament passages the word הֵיכָל, with its tender association of the maturing, fostering care of mother-love, will, we venture to think, begin to realize what a priceless treasure we shall possess if we can re-discover the Aramaic Gospel.

7. And now we will turn to the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac, which yields abundant evidence of having formed part of the primitive Gospel.

MARK v. 16.	LUKE viii. 36.
καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς	ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς
οἱ ἰδόντες,	οἱ ἰδόντες,
πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ,	πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς.
καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων.	καὶ τὸ τῆς περιχώρου
καὶ ἤρξαντο	ἅπαν πλῆθος
παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν	ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν
ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.	ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

It will be noted that I have slightly altered the *order* of the words in our Greek Gospels, so as to place the phrases which seem to me to be homologous on the same line ; but this I must in all cases claim the privilege to do. There is certainly abundance of diversity in these parallel columns, and it must surely be admitted as a strong argument, if we can show that *each line* can be reduced to the same or closely similar letters as written in an Aramaic document.

The words which more immediately concern us are χοίρων, " swine," and περιχώρου, " neighbourhood." The same Aramaic text-word differently vocalized would yield both these meanings. The first is חֲזִירָא; the second חֲוָּרָא. If, as is probable, the letters י and ו, which are called " matres lectionis," were inserted very sparingly in ancient Semitic writing, we then have חורא as the one word, meaning, according to the vowels inserted, " swine " or " neighbourhood."

As to the other homologues, we will take them in order. We have first διηγήσαντο and ἀπήγγειλαν, the very two

verbs which (as we showed last month) are used by the
LXX. and Hebrews ii. 12 respectively in their rendering
of Psalm xxii. 23 (22), "I will *declare*, אֲסַפְּרָה, Thy name
unto my brethren." This shows how feasible our theory
really is. We *know* that διηγήσομαι and ἀπαγγελῶ are
variant renderings of the one Hebrew word אֲסַפְּרָה. All
we maintain is, that διηγήσαντο and ἀπήγγειλαν in the
Gospels are also variant renderings of the Aramaic word
חַוִּי, which verb is the equivalent of סָפַּר, and is indeed
used for it in the Targum of the passage referred to.

The next pair of words is ἐγένετο and ἐσώθη. Mark:
"How *it happened* to the demoniac"; Luke: "How the
demoniac *was saved*." The identification which I have
here to offer does not quite satisfy me. We have the
word פְּלַט, which means (1) to turn out, eject, vomit; and
(2) intransitively, to be freed, rescued, escape, "liberari,
eripi, evadere." This of course suits well ἐσώθη, "was
saved"; but can פְּלַט mean also to *befall, happen*? I
cannot find that it does. It would be *natural* for it to do
so. The Latin verbs *evenire* and *evadere* mean (1) to go
out, (2) to befall. Our word "turn out" is also used in the
sense of "befall." Possibly in the vernacular therefore
the word פלט took the same course as the Latin *evadere*.

The next couplet is ἤρξαντο, "they began," and πλῆθος,
multitude. This divergence seems to me to have arisen
from the confusion of two similar words (1) שָׁרִיו or שְׁרִיאוּ,
Pt. Pael of שָׁרָא, to begin: and (2) שְׁיָרָא, a company,
caravan; which meaning would suit well the company of
swineherds referred to.

The identification of παρακαλεῖν and ἐρωτᾷν is very clear.
These are simply variant translations of the one word בְּעָא,
which means "quaerere, petere, rogare, orare, obsecrare";
that is, (1) to ask, (2) to beseech. Almost equally evident
is the cause of the variation in ἀπ' αὐτῶν, "from them,"
and ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν, "from their coasts." In Ara-

maic the difference is merely that of one letter. There is a word, בַּר, בְּרָא, which means the *open country*, the district *outside* the customary haunts of men. Then מִבְּרָא as an adverb and preposition means "*outside*," "*aloof from*." But there is also a word בְּרִיָא, a boundary, border, *coast*; so that the solution is to be sought in the confusion of these two similar words.

8. Our last illustration shall be drawn from the account of the lowering of the paralytic through the roof. This event is narrated with numerous divergences in each of the three synoptists, and it must surely be good news to the perplexed Bible student to be assured that these verbal divergences might arise in the simplest way in the process of translating from an Aramaic document, if he will only concede the existence of such a document, and that it was used by each of the three evangelists.

We would first speak of the divergent phrases :

> Matt. ix 2: ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον, lying on a bed.
> Mark ii. 3: αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων, carried by four.

No one feels these expressions incompatible, but would any one suppose that these two phrases might with equal correctness be the rendering of the same Aramaic letters when unvocalized? If this can be shown, will it not materially strengthen our position? Let us examine the point. The Aramaic word for "four" is אַרְבְּעָה; but one of the synonyms for "bed" is אַרְבְּעָה, strictly, that on which one stretches oneself, lies down at full length, a bed; or rather, may we not say a *stretcher*? So that apart from the context, the consonants ארבעה may with equal propriety be rendered "four" or "bed."

Then as to the words βεβλημένον (passive participle of βάλλω, to throw; passive, to be thrown down, to lie prostrate) and αἰρόμενον (passive participle of αἴρω, to carry), these meanings both belong to one word in Aramaic;

viz. מַלְטֵל, Palpel participle of טוּל. The meanings of מלטל given by Buxtorf are (1) "ejicere, projicere," to *throw out, throw down, cast forth*; and (2) "portare, transportare," to *carry, remove*. In the former of these two meanings it occurs both in the Hebrew and Targum of Isaiah xxii. 17: "Behold, Jehovah will throw thee down (as) with the throwing of a man." But what is more to our present purpose, the verb is (like βάλλω) used in the passive of *lying prostrate*, through sickness or in sleep; especially is the Hophal used in this sense in rabbinic literature. The Targums usually prefer the passive of רְמָא, which is the equivalent of טוּל. But, as we have said, מלטל also means to carry, to carry to and fro, to cause to wander, banish; *e.g.* 2 Samuel xv. 20, where David says to Ittai the Gittite, "Should I cause thee to wander to and fro (Revised Version, 'up and down') with us?" The passive of this, the Ithpalpel, would mean "to *be* carried to and fro, up and down," and thus the passive participle מִטַלְטֵל might mean either, "being thrown down, lying prostrate," βεβλημένον, or "being carried to and fro," αἱρόμενον. And as for the prepositions ἐπί and ὑπό, it is probable that they represent גַב, which means (1) upon; (2) with, near, beside. If, as is likely, the man was carried on the shoulders of the bearers, the word גַב, in the sense of "upon," would correctly represent both the ἐπί and the ὑπό. So that the Aramaic words, of which the renderings of Matthew and Mark are a possible translation, are

<div align="center">מִטַלְמֵל גַּב ארבעה</div>

9. If we turn to the Gospel of Luke, we find that the corresponding clause is: "They sought to bring him in, and to place him before Him." Can it be shown that this is a free translation of the above Aramaic words? We think so. If we vocalize the participle actively, as Palpel, thus, מְטַלְטֵל, we obtain the meaning, "Carrying him up

and down, hither and thither." The Palpel form is always indicative of rapid movement, excited effort; and if any one wished to represent freely and graphically the Palpel significance of the verb, and the way in which the weary but resolute bearers went hither and thither around the rim of the crowd to find access to the Saviour, he could not use more suitable words than those of Luke, " seeking to bring him in."

But what about the word ארבעה ? We have shown that, variously vocalized, it may mean "four" or "a stretcher"; can it also yield Luke's rendering, θεῖναι αὐτόν, " to place him "? It can and does. The word θεῖναι is infinitive, and the Aphel inf. of רבע is אַרְבָּעָא. Add the 3rd sing. suffix, and we obtain אַרְבָּעִיתֵה or אַרְבָּעֵה. But רבע means to stretch, to lie at full length, and the Aphel means, to cause to lie, to lay, to place in a recumbent position. In the legend given in the Targum of Jonathan as to the burial of Moses, we are told that Michael and Gabriel spread forth the golden bier set with precious stones, and hung with purple silk, and that Metatron and other sages *laid him upon it,* אַרְבָּעוּן יָתֵיה עֲלוֹהִי. Similar as to posture, but widely different in other respects, is the force of the word in Deuteronomy xxv. 2 (Jonathan) : " The judge shall *cause him to lie down,* יַרְבְּעִנֵּיה, and they shall scourge him (the convicted criminal) in his presence." So that ארבעה, if vocalized as Aphel inf., means " to lay him down or place him "; θεῖναι αὐτόν. And as for Luke's words ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, we have that in גַּבֵּה, near him, beside him. So that we arrive at the remarkable conclusion that the three diverse phrases in the several Gospels might all be derived from the same three Aramaic words, with the solitary exception of one letter, גבה for גב. So that the words in Luke are a free translation of

כְּמֵילֵל וְגַבֵּה אַרְבָּעֵה

10. The details of lowering the man through the roof are given in Mark and Luke: not in Matthew. Let us examine them.

MARK ii. 4.	LUKE v. 19.
καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι	καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες διὰ ποίας
προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ	εἰσενέγκωσι αὐτὸν,
διὰ τὸν ὄχλον	διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,
ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην	ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα
ὅπου ἦν,	διὰ
καὶ ἐξορύξαντες	τῶν κεράμων
χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον	καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ.
ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.	

The words which illustrate our present point are in the fourth line ἀπεστέγασαν, "they *removed, uncovered*," and ἀναβάντες, they *went up*. The Aramaic equivalent for the Hebrew עָלָה, to go up, is סְלֵק, but the Pael סַלֵּק means to cause to go up, to raise, to lift and carry off. So that the difference between Mark and Luke is merely that of attaching different vowels to סלקו : סְלִקוּ = they went up; סַלִּקוּ = they removed.

But what of the corresponding words "house" and "roof"? Do these yield to our solution? Most readily, if all will now admit that those scholars were right who have maintained that the house in question was a peasant's house: for the word for *cottage* or *hut*, "tugurium," "Hütte," is מְטַלְּלָא; while the word for *roof* is טְלָלָא. According to Dr. Thomson, the houses in that part of the country now are very low, with flat roofs, reached by a stairway from the yard or court. The roof consists of beams about three feet apart, across which short sticks are arranged close together and covered with thickly matted thorn-bush, over which is spread a coat of stiff mortar, and on that the marl or earth that forms the roof. Such a lightly built dwelling might well be called מְטַלְּלָא, for in the Targums this word is used, *e.g.* Isaiah i. 8, "as a

cottage in a vineyard"; Leviticus xxiii. 42, of the *booths* in which the Israelites dwelt during the Feast of Tabernacles; and Genesis xxxiii. 17, of the booths which Jacob made for his cattle at Succoth. Thus the difference between "roof" and "cottage" is one letter only.

The reader will doubtless be glad to know what light the primitive Gospel has to throw on the two expressions which have puzzled New Testament scholars so long. Luke says, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, "through the tiles," which seems to imply that the roof was tiled; whereas Mark's word, ἐξορύξαντες, "digging out," seems to imply a roof made of mud and lime of the sort described by Dr. Thomson. Are the words for "tiles" and "digging out" at all alike in Aramaic, so as easily to be confused? They are. The word for "digging," plural participle, would be חָפְרִין; פַּחְרִין would be "tiles"; so that the transposition of two letters in an Aramaic text explains the entire mystery. If the reader will turn to our harmony, he will see ὅπου ἦν, "where he was," and διά, "through," standing on the same line. One Aramaic word for "through" is בְּגוּ, which also means "in the midst," and thus may very well have stood as the original of ὅπου ἦν, "where he was."

The description of the process as given by the two evangelists, diverse as it seems to us, may therefore be reduced to what is virtually the same Aramaic text with various readings.

Mark ii. 4.	Luke v. 19.
כלקו מללתא	סלקו לכמללתא
בגו וחפרין	ובגו פחרין
אהתו ארביעה	אחתונה וארביעה
דעלוי משרי רביע	

Thus much, then, as to the divergences which we think have arisen from inserting different vowels in the same Aramaic text-word. In our next article we hope to adduce

instances in which the divergence seems to have arisen
from the fact that the common Aramaic word has two mean-
ings, each of which is adopted by the several evangelists.

<div align="right">J. T. MARSHALL.</div>

THE HOUSE OF GETHSEMANE.

AFTER having passed through twenty-five editions, the
translation of the Holy Gospels which bears the name of
M. Henri Lasserre has been condemned by the Congrega-
tion of the Index. Our Lady of Lourdes, invoked by the
translator, has not succeeded in warding off the Roman
thunderbolt; but the noise made by it was enough to call
the attention of Protestants to a remarkable work which
deserves careful study. Thanks to their new interpreter,
the Evangelists speak the lively and forcible language of
the present day; the style is modernized. The innovations
are often characterized by elegant precision and scrupulous
exactitude.

Our present purpose is only to bring forward a single
detail: the expression *villa*, as applied to the garden of
Gethsemane. In Matthew xxvi. 36, the version of M.
Lasserre reads: "Jesus and His disciples entered into a
villa named Gethsemani."

Villa is a term which M. Lasserre has taken as he found
it in the text of the Vulgate. It appears in the dictionary
of the French Academy as a synonym for country seat;
but, in Latin, *villa* meant rather a country house, such
as in Switzerland would be called a "campagne," without
the notion of grandeur which attaches to the term country
seat.[1] Moreover, in the parallel passage, Mark xiv. 32, the

---

[1] The Latin word *villa* was Italian before it passed into modern languages.
According to the last edition of the dictionary of the French Academy, the
word may be used in a more general sense for a simple country house. The

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (*continued*).

ALL who have had experience in conducting examinations in foreign languages are fully aware that when a word has several meanings, more or less closely connected, the different translators are well nigh certain to exhaust all the possible meanings in their endeavours to reproduce the foreign word in their own language. In our February paper we selected several cases in which the same tendency was observable in the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures presented to us respectively in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. One other instance may be quoted here, as a fitting introduction to our present paper. It is the memorable passage in Isaiah liii. 4, "Surely He hath borne (נָשָׂא) our griefs, and carried our sorrows." Now the word נָשָׂא is one of the most equivocal of all Hebrew words; it possesses remarkable variety of shades of meaning, and the translators of our Authorized Version, who often seem bent on displaying the vast resources of the English language, and prompted by a desire to deal fairly with competing synonyms, translate this one Hebrew verb by no less than forty-one distinct English words, of which the favourites, according to Dr. Young's *Analytical Concordance*, are "to bear," which occurs 156 times; "lift up," 137 times; "take up," 116; "carry," 25. Knowing this tendency, we are quite prepared to find the passage in Isaiah variously translated in our Greek versions.

LXX. of Isa. liii. 4: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει.
He carries (or bears) our sins.

1 Pet. ii. 24: ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν.
Who His own self bare our sins.

Matt. viii. 17: αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν.
He Himself took our infirmities.

Now if, as most scholars are agreed, our Lord spoke Aramaic, and if the earliest memoir of our Lord's words and deeds was written in this language, and the first three evangelists had access to this document, and sometimes translated from it, we should expect the same phenomenon to show itself in the Gospels; *viz.* that Aramaic words which have a variety of allied meanings would be rendered by the translators by different Greek words. And if it can be shown in numerous instances, that, *in parallel passages of the synoptists, the divergent Greek words yield, when translated, the several recognised meanings of one Aramaic word,* we venture to regard this as evidence that the passages in question are translations from an Aramaic original.

1. Our first illustration shall be taken from those passages in which the Lord Jesus, with a distinct foreknowledge of the mode of His own death, uses the metaphor of crucifixion in enjoining the duty of self-denial, which was henceforth to be the chief characteristic of those who would be members of the Messianic kingdom.

Matt. x. 38.	Luke xiv. 27.
καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει	ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει
τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ	τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ,
καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου,	καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου,
οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος.	οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

On another occasion our Lord gave the same injunction in slightly variant language, and His words are reproduced with rare verbal agreement in each of the synoptic Gospels. Matthew xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34; Luke ix. 23: "If any one wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, and *take up* (ἀράτω) his cross daily, and follow Me." Does not the combination of words, *taking* the cross (λαμβάνω), *taking up* the cross (αἴρω), and *carrying* the cross (βαστάζω), remind us of the variant renderings of the Hebrew word נָשָׂא? And does not this suggest to us that there may be some one

Aramaic word which possesses all those meanings, so that the three Greek words are variant renderings of this one word in the original? Our conjecture is correct; and the desiderated word is נְטַל. It would be interesting, and not a little confirmatory, if we could show that in passages where נְטַל occurs in the Targums, our three Greek words occur in the Septuagint. We can do this readily with reference to $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ and $a\acute{\imath}\rho\omega$, but $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ only occurs once in the Septuagint; yet if the *word* is thus rare, we hope to show clearly that its *meaning* belongs to נְטַל. The following are instances where נְטַל occurs in the Targums arranged according to the meanings of our Greek words:

Gen. xxvii. 3 : Take ($\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon$) thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow.

Jud. xvi. 31 : Samson's brethren came down and took him ($\check{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta o\nu$), and buried him between Zorah and Eshtaol.

Josh. iii. 6 : Take up ($\check{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$) the ark, and pass over.

2 Sam. ii. 32 : They took up ($a\check{\imath}\rho o\nu\sigma\iota$) Asahel, and buried him.

1 Sam. xiv. 7 : Jonathan's armour-bearer ($\acute{o}\ a\check{\imath}\rho\omega\nu\ \tau\grave{\alpha}\ \sigma\kappa\epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta$).

Exod. xxv. 14 : Thou shalt put the staves into the rings on the sides of the ark, to lift, or carry ($a\check{\imath}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$), the ark with them.

As instances of נְטַל with the *meaning* of $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, *i.e.* to carry a heavy burden, we may quote

Josh. iv. 8 : The children of Israel took twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan. And

Deut. iv. 7, Where we read in the Targum of Jonathan: "What people is so great, to whom the Lord is so nigh in the name of the word of the Lord? For the custom of the nations is to *carry* their gods upon their shoulders, that they may seem to be nigh unto them; but the word of the Lord sitteth upon His throne, . . . and heareth our prayers when we pray before Him."

These passages show conclusively that the Aramaic word נְטַל covers the three Greek words; and if we assume that נְטַל was the verb which our Lord employed, and that these are variant renderings of the one word, we can thus explain

more satisfactorily than in any other way the diversity in our Greek Gospels.

2. We will continue our researches, in the same group of utterances as to self-denial to which we have referred, each of which occurs, as we have seen, five times in the whole: once in each of the synoptists with verbal agreement, and once in Matthew and Luke respectively, with substantial, but not verbal agreement.

Luke ix. 24. (Matt. xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35.)	Luke xvii. 33.
ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ	ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
σῶσαι,	περιποιήσασθαι,
ἀπολέσει αὐτήν·	ἀπολέσει αὐτήν·
ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ	καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	[αὐτήν],
ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ,	
οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.	ζωογονήσει αὐτήν.

When we endeavour to translate into Aramaic the first of these passages, which occurs, with some very slight verbal differences which we cannot well exhibit, in each of the three Gospels, if we use the most common words, we find that they yield a striking alliteration, which is of itself an encouraging indication that we are correct. The most common word for "destroy" is שֵׁיצֵיא, and for "save" שֵׁיזֵיב; so that in Aramaic the aphorism would run thus:

מַן דִּישֵׁיזֵיב נַפְשֵׁהּ יִשְׁצְנַהּ or מַן דְּבָעֵי לְשֵׁיזָבָא . . . .
וּמַן דִּישֵׁיצֵיא נַפְשֵׁהּ יִשֵׁיזְבְנַהּ

And this we regard as the original of the entire group.

Let us examine the words separately. שֵׁיצֵיא is said to be the Shaphel form of יְצָא, to go out: and hence means, to bring out, to bring to an end, complete; but also, to make an end of, to ruin, destroy. We had occasion to remark in our first paper, that Aramaic was far from being

so prolific as Hebrew in words indicating destruction. There are *forty* Hebrew words which are in our English Bible translated "destroy." It would be difficult to find one-fourth that number in Aramaic. But while this may seem creditable to the Aramæans, it has a disadvantage to the modern philologist, in that it blunts the edge of the meaning of the Aramaic words. Our word שֵׁיצִיא, for instance, is used for the translation of so many Hebrew words, that we can only have a blurred conception attaching to it, whereas one would have desired a meaning clear and definite, especially when it comes from the lips of the Lord Jesus as to the hereafter. Such precision is, we fear, unattainable in the case before us.

To represent the great antithesis, we have in our Greek Gospels three words, σῶσαι, περιποιήσασθαι, and ζωογονήσει.

σώζειν = (1) to rescue or deliver from danger or destruction; (2) to heal. It is thus admirably fitted to express the salvation of the Gospel, which is both rescue from the penalty of sin and also restoration to health, a continual sanctification.

περιποιεῖσθαι = to keep safe, preserve; reserve for oneself, gain possession of. In the LXX. it is twice used as the antithesis of ἀποκτεῖναι. Genesis xii. 12, Abraham says to Sarah, "They will kill me, but save thee alive"; and in Exodus i. 16 Pharaoh gives the command, "If it be a son, kill it; if it be a daughter, preserve it alive" (περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό).

ζωογονεῖν = to endow with life, to give life, preserve alive. In actual usage there cannot have been much difference between this word and the foregoing, since in Exodus i. 17, where the disobedience of the midwives is narrated, we read, ἐζωογόνουν τὰ ἄρσενα, "they preserved the males alive." So vers. 18, 22.

Thus we see that the words are almost synonymous. Σώζειν fixes the thoughts usually upon the danger avoided:

ζωογονεῖν on the escape safe and sound, the preservation
of life; περιποιεῖσθαι on the advantage resulting from the
deliverance, the gain as compared with the loss of life; but
this distinction is not always conspicuous: and the ideas
implied in the whole three are all covered by the word
שֵׁיזִב, which means to rescue from danger or death. The
following instances of the usage of שֵׁיזִב in the Targums
will substantiate this:

Gen. xix. 20:	Lot, in begging to be allowed to go no farther than Zoar, says: "Let me save myself (or, be saved) there."
Gen. xxxii. 30:	I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. (LXX., ἐσώθη μου ἡ ψυχή.)
2 Kings xx. 6.	Isaiah promises to Hezekiah from the Lord: "I will save (LXX. σώσω) thee and this city from the hand of the king of Assyria."
Amos ii. 14:	And the place of refuge shall perish from the swift, and the mighty man shall not save his own soul (or, life). (לָא יְשֵׁיזִב נַפְשֵׁהּ; LXX., οὐ μὴ σώσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ.)
Dan. iii. 28:	Nebuchadnezzar says, "Blessed be God, who hath sent His angel, and *delivered* His servants." There the word is used of the three youths who were "preserved alive" in the midst of the burning fiery furnace.

The reason for the change of verb in the Greek Gospels
is evident from the context. In the triple occurrence it is
used in the broadest sense of the great doctrine of self-
denial. The antithesis of the here and the hereafter, earth
and heaven, self and God, is set before the disciple, and
the broad principle stated, he only worthily lives the higher
life who is ready at any moment to sacrifice the lower life.
In the second quotation from Luke (chap. xvii. 33) we are
planted in the midst of the dire calamities which shall
precede the second coming of the Son of Man; and in view
of the temptation to sacrifice principle in presence of the
fiery furnace of persecution, the evangelist was led to make

a particular application of the great fundamental principle, as he says: "He that seeks to preserve his life shall destroy it, and he who is ready to destroy it shall preserve it."

3. Our next illustration shall be from the Lord's Prayer. It is very significant that our Greek Gospels should present *any* verbal divergences in this passage, which must so early have become engrained in the Church's life. These divergences would never have existed if Christ originally uttered the prayer in Greek, for oral tradition might surely be trusted to transmit this brief portion *verbatim*; and more than that, if the Aramaic Gospel had not obtained a wide circulation before our Greek Gospels were penned, there would surely have been one common stereotyped translation to which the evangelists would have adhered. The point to which we wish to direct attention was briefly alluded to in our February paper, but it is desirable that the evidence in support of our explanation should be produced.

> Matt. vi. 12: Forgive us our *debts*, as we also have forgiven our
> debtors.
> Luke xi. 4: Forgive us our *sins*; for we also forgive every one who
> is indebted to us.

We would first speak of the contrasted words "debts" and "sins" or "trespasses," ὀφειλήματα and ἁμαρτίας. As we have said, we consider these to be variant translations of the one word חוֹב, which means, according to Levy, (1) Schuld, debitum; (2) Sünde; (3) Strafe. (1) a debt; (2) a debt to God, a sin; (3) punishment. As instances of these meanings we may quote:

> (1) Deut. xix. 15: (Jonathan) The testimony of one witness shall
> not be valid against a man for any assault, nor
> for any money-debt (חוֹב מָמוֹן); the sentence
> shall be confirmed upon the mouth of two
> witnesses, or three.

 2 Kings iv. 7 : Elisha says to the widow whose oil he has mul-
        tiplied : "Go, sell thy oil, and pay thy creditor
        (כָּרִי חוֹבֵךְ, the lord of thy debt), and thou and
        thy sons shall be supported on the rest."
(2) Gen. xxxi. 36 : Jacob says to Laban : "What is my trespass?"
        (חוֹבִי)
 Gen. l. 17 : Joseph's brethren say : "Oh ! forgive now the
        trespass of thy brethren."
 1 Sam. xxv. 28 : Forgive the trespass of thy handmaid.
(3) Gen. iv. 13 : My punishment is greater than I can bear.
 Lev. v. 1 : The phrase, " He shall bear his iniquity," becomes
        here and elsewhere in the Targum, " He shall
        receive his punishment " (יְקַבֵּל חוֹבֵהּ).
 Job xxiv. 12 : From the city the sons of men do groan, and the
        souls of them that are wounded with the sword
        do pray ; and shall not God inflict punishment?
        (לָא יְשַׁוֵּי חוֹבָא)

It will be noticed also that in the first Gospel we read,
"AS we forgive," while the third Gospel says, "FOR we
forgive." On our hypothesis of an Aramaic document, this
is accounted for very simply. The word for "as," "sicut,"
is בְּכְמָא. The equivalent of "for" in this connexion is
בְּמָא, "in eo," "quatenus," "seeing that." The difference
in Aramaic is therefore merely that of two letters very
much alike and easily confounded.

4. If it be conceded that ὀφείλημα and ἁμαρτία are
translations of the one Aramaic word חוֹב, is it not equally
apparent that the very ancient various reading of Mark iii.
29 is due to the same cause? The Authorized Version
says : " He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost
hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal dam-
nation " (αἰωνίου κρίσεως); whereas the Revisers, on the
authority of B, L, Δ, א, read αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος, " is guilty
of an eternal sin." We are strongly of opinion that the
two readings are variant translations of the words of the
primitive document :

<div align="center">יְהִי מִתְחַיָּב חוֹבָא דְעָלְמָא.</div>

When once the Church of Christ fully realizes the truth,
which has hitherto lain in a state of sub-consciousness, that
our Lord spoke Aramaic, there cannot fail to be a strong
desire to get back to the *ipsissima verba* which proceeded
from His lips, especially in His utterances as to the hereafter.
This will however always be precarious where we have only
one record of His words; but where we have two or three
divergent renderings, or ancient various readings, the very
divergences help us to perceive what the original Aramaic
was. In the case before us we have κρίσις—used, as often
in the New Testament, in the sense of "condemnation,
punishment"—and ἁμάρτημα, "sin," both very ancient
readings, going back, we believe, to the times when the
primitive document was first translated; and from this
we are enabled to discern that both are almost certainly
various renderings of the one word חוֹב. If this is so, we
are wonderfully helped in the interpretation of the passage.
He that persists in sin wrongs his own soul; and when
sin is unforgiven, the sinner bears his iniquity. The two
Hebrew words for "forgiveness" are סלח, to lift, and
נשא, to lift up, bear, remove. When sin therefore is for-
given, God lifts it, God bears it; but an eternal sin is one
which man must for ever bear. Moreover the fact that
"guilt" and "punishment" were in the Saviour's mind
not two thoughts, but one, expressed by one word, חוֹב,
teaches us the great truth that sin unlifted is its own
punishment, guilt its own hell.

5. Our next illustration shall be on a kindred theme.
We read in

> Matt. x. 28: Fear Him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in
> Gehenna.
> Luke xii. 5: Fear Him who after He hath killed is able to *cast* into
> Gehenna.

The two variants which we wish to identify with one
and the same Aramaic form are ἀπολέσαι, to destroy, and

ἐμβαλεῖν, to cast. This common form is שׁגר. The lexicons give two distinct words, שׁגר. The first means to throw, cast; "hinwerfen," "abjicere, projicere." As to the appropriateness of this verb to the context in our Gospels, we leave the reader to judge. It occurs

> Deut. xxviii. 26: Thy corpse shall be *thrown* for food to all the birds of heaven.
>
> Jer. xxxvi. 30: Thus saith the Lord concerning Jehoiakim, His corpse shall be *thrown* to the heat by day, and to the frost by night.
>
> Jer. xxii. 19: As men *cast* forth the corpse of an ass, so shall they *cast* forth his corpse. It shall be dragged and unbound outside the gate of Jerusalem.

The other usages of the verb are, so far as I have observed, all linked with the same unpleasant associations.

But there is a second verb, שְׁגַר or שַׁגֵּר, which means 'accendere, succendere, comburere, calefacere," to set on fire, burn, consume, heat. I have only found one instance of it in the Targums.

> Ezek. xxxix. 9: They shall *set on fire* . . . their weapons, their shields and their bucklers, their bows and their arrows; . . . and they shall kindle with them a fire lasting seven years.

The word is certainly Aramaic, but was appropriated by rabbinic writers, and is regularly employed of heating a furnace. Buxtorf gives a strange passage from the Talmud: "The Gentile heats the oven, and the Jew bakes the bread." So also "a heated furnace" is תנורא שׁגירא. When we have these facts before us, and especially when we bear in mind the words of our Saviour recorded in Luke xvi. 24, and doubtless intended by Him symbolically, "I am in anguish in this flame," we can see no reason to doubt that the word used by our Lord was שׁגר, and that this was variously rendered ἀπολέσαι and ἐμβαλεῖν.

6. We have said that the word שׁגר is thought by Levy and Buxtorf to represent two distinct roots, now spelt alike,

but once dissimilar. He who works with these two lexicons will soon discover that Levy evinces more of the spirit of the modern philologist in showing that the apparently divergent meanings are in many cases derivable from the same fundamental conception, and not separate roots. There is, for instance, the verb שְׁרָא, which means according to Buxtorf, (1) to begin ; (2) to dwell, rest, encamp ; (3) to loosen, dissolve, forgive, acquiesce—meanings tolerably wide apart certainly. But Levy ingeniously suggests that the root-thought is *to loosen.* From this, as branches from the trunk, he finds the meanings (1) to set free ; (2) absolve, forgive ; (3) to unyoke the beasts of burden, to loosen one's girdle, to rest, sit down, encamp ; (4) to loosen oneself from previous conditions, to start afresh, begin. But even if it can thus be shown that the meanings of "*beginning*" and "*sitting to rest*" are cognate, they are at all events distant relatives; and if we can show in two instances that those divergent meanings stand precisely parallel to each other in the harmony, this will, we think, make a strong case.

Mark ii. 6.	Luke v. 21.
ἦσαν δὲ καθήμενοι	καὶ ἤρξαντο
τινες τῶν γραμματέων	οἱ γραμματεῖς
	καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι.	διαλογίζεσθαι.

The homologous phrases clearly are ἦσαν καθήμενοι and ἤρξαντο, or, as it might be expressed, ἦσαν ἀρχόμενοι. "The Scribes were sitting and reasoning," "The Scribes . . . were beginning to reason." Thus both are possible trans- lations of

וַהֲווֹ שָׁרִין סָפְרַיָּא וְחָשְׁבִין

The context suggests the mid-day rest ; retreating to the shelter of the house from the scorching heat of the valley of Gennesareth—a temporary encampment ; and this thought is expressed equally well by both שְׁרָא and κάθημαι.

7. In Luke iii. 23 we have a singular phrase, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν
Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα : "Jesus was about
thirty years of age, beginning," or, "when He began."
To this our Revisers virtually add the word διδάσκειν, as
they render, "when He began to *teach*." I have no doubt
that these eminent scholars are correct in this, but it is
questionable whether any of them were aware that they
were thus following, if our hypothesis be substantiated, the
example of the evangelist Mark.

MATT. xiii. 1.	MARK. iv. 1.
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ	καὶ πάλιν
ἐκάθητο	ἤρξατο
	διδάσκειν
παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.	παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

I would suggest that the passage in the *Logia* ran thus :

וְתִנְיָנוּת יְשֵׁרָא עַל יַמָּא

which may mean, "Again He sat by the sea," or, "Again
He began by the sea," to which the second evangelist
added διδάσκειν, as the Revisers do in Luke iii. 23.

8. Another of these equivocal verbs of very frequent
occurrence is קַבֵּל, which means (1) to receive, receive with
approval, take pleasure in ; (2) to hear, understand, obey ;
(3) to shout, cry. It is by an appeal to these variant
meanings that we can explain two instances of divergence
in parallel passages in our synoptic Gospels.

Matt. x. 40 :   He that *receiveth* you receiveth Me.
Luke x. 16 :   He that *heareth* you heareth Me.

The word קַבֵּל is of very frequent occurrence in both these
meanings. The only difference is, that when it means
"to receive," it governs the accusative ; and when it means
"to hear," it is followed by the preposition מִן : so that the
two sentences would respectively in Aramaic run thus :

מַן דִּיקַבְּלִנְכוֹן יְקַבְּלִנִי
מָן דִּיקַבֵּל מִנְכוֹן יְקַבֵּל מִנִּי

9. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, in the description of those who represent the good soil, we have three expressions used to commend their treatment of the word sown.

Matt. xiii. 23.	Mark iv. 20.	Luke viii. 15.
συνιών,	παραδέχονται,	κατέχουσι,
understand.	receive, or accept.	retain.

We cannot but regard these three words as variant renderings of the Aramaic קַבֵּל. The root-thought of this verb is "to take in." Hence (1) to accept, (2) to take-in the meaning, to understand ; (3) to take-in permanently, to take home, retain. The following usages of קַבֵּל in the Targums will illustrate this :

(1) Ps. xxiv. 5 :   He shall receive the blessing from the Lord.
    Isa. xii. 3 :   Ye shall receive new teaching with joy from the elect of the righteous.
(2) Gen. xxiii. 15, 16 : And Ephron said, The land is worth four hundred shekels of silver : between me and thee what is that? And Abraham *understood* Ephron, and weighed him the silver.
(3) Lev. v. 1 :   "He shall receive his punishment." This phrase, which is the regular Targumic equivalent of our English phrase, "He shall bear his iniquity," certainly means more than a temporary punishment; it implies "retention," a permanent bearing of the guilt.

10. Our next illustrations shall be from the sermon on the mount.

Matt. v. 42.	Luke vi. 30.
τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε	παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε
δίδου,	δίδου·
καὶ τὸν θέλοντα	καὶ
ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ
μὴ ἀποστραφῇς.	μὴ ἀπαίτει.

The two somewhat divergent pairs of words to which we

would direct attention occur in the last two lines—the
addition of θέλοντα being quite an insignificant detail. Does
any one Aramaic word cover the two meanings of δανείζομαι,
to borrow, and αἴρω, to take away more or less forcibly?
This is certainly the case with רְשָׁא, which generally means
"to borrow," but has as its root-idea, not the "bated breath
and whispered humbleness" of the modern borrower, but
the forceful seizure of goods and money in the name of a
loan to a tyrannical ruler; "exactorem agere," as did the
ἄγγαροι of the Oriental monarchs, who had authority to
press into their service horses, vessels, and even the men
they met. This second meaning is of more frequent
occurrence in rabbinic literature than in the Targums, but
it is certainly the root-idea.

In the last line we have μὴ ἀποστραφῇς, "turn thou not
away," and μὴ ἀπαίτει, "ask (them) not again." This we
think is precisely the difference between the Peal and Aphel
of the verb הדר. The Peal = to turn back, turn round, turn
away. The Aphel, to bring back, fetch back, ask back, to
answer. In an unvocalized text it would be impossible to
distinguish these meanings. לא תהדר might with equal
propriety be rendered, "turn not away," or "ask not
back."

11. Besides the verb הדר, of which we have just been
speaking, there is a distinct Paelic verb הַדֵּר, to honour,
ascribe honour, glorify; and it is through these similar
forms that we would explain the following:

Matt. xi. 25.	Luke x. 21.
ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ	ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ
ἀποκριθεὶς	ἠγαλλιάσατο
	τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ,
ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.	καὶ εἶπεν.

The verb הדר in the Aphel and Pael regularly means "to
answer" in rabbinic literature, and thus = ἀποκριθείς in the

first Gospel. And as for ἠγαλλιάσατο, this verb means to
glory, rejoice, exult in a person or thing, to glorify; as Luke
i. 47, " My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath
glorified God my Saviour." But this is also the meaning
of the second root, הַדַּר, as is clear from Daniel iv. 31 (34),
" I have praised and *glorified* Him that liveth for ever,"
and ver. 34 (37), " And I praise, extol, and *glorify* the King
of heaven." We conclude then that both ἀπεκρίθη and
ἠγαλλιάσατο are possible renderings of the Pael הַדַּר.

12. Our last set of illustrations shall be taken from the
triple discourse as to the awfulness of offending one of
Christ's little ones.

MATT. xviii. 6.	MARK ix. 42.	LUKE xvii. 2.
συμφέρει αὐτῷ,	καλόν ἐστι αὐτῷ μᾶλλον	λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ
ἵνα κρεμασθῇ	εἰ περίκειται	εἰ περίκειται
μύλος ὀνικὸς	λίθος μυλικὸς	λίθος μυλικὸς
περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον
αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,
καὶ καταποντισθῇ	καὶ βέβληται	καὶ ἔρριπται
ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.
ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ	ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ	ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ
ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα.
τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.	τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.	

It would be difficult to find a passage which presents
clearer indications of translation than the above. We have
certainly here agreement in substance, but not in words. Let
us look at the first line. We have there συμφέρει, it is ad-
vantageous, profitable; καλόν ἐστι, it is good, well, pleasant,
agreeable; and λυσιτελεῖ, strictly, it pays the taxes, returns
expenses, hence, is remunerative, advantageous. Can we
find one Aramaic word which possesses all these meanings?
Yes, it is the word הֲנָא. Buxtorf says it means (1) pro-
desse; (2) voluptatem percipere; (3) lucrari, quæstum
facere. Precisely the meanings we want; and, by the
way, in the very order of our three evangelists. The

following illustrations from the Targums will make this clear :

(1) Prov. xi. 4 :   Riches do not profit in the day of wrath.
    Job xxxv. 3 :   What advantage is there to me more than my sin ?
(2) Jer. xxxi. 26 :   My sleep was pleasant to me.
    Ezek. xvi. 31 :   As a harlot who derives pleasure from her hire.
(3) Gen. xxxvii. 26 :   What money shall we gain if we slay our brother ?
    Esther iv. 1 :   And Mordecai knew by means of Elijah the high priest all that was done in heaven above, . . . and how it was written and sealed to destroy Israel from upon the earth, and how it was written and sealed in heaven that they should *derive gain* from the banquet of the wicked Ahasuerus, for the seal was sealed with clay.

13. The next line presents us Mark and Luke in unison with περίκειται, while Matthew gives κρεμασθῇ. Our Revisers refuse to admit any difference between the two words and in each case render, " were hanged about his neck." Perhaps they are right in this; though strictly περίκειμαι refers more to the process of laying or fastening the rope around the neck, while κρεμάννυμι means to hang or suspend, directing our thoughts to the object to which the rope is attached. The common Aramaic word was probably תְּלָא, which means to hang, hang up, suspend. The cognate תָּלָה occurs in the Hebrew Bible, and when it denotes crucifixion or impalement, it is rendered in the Targums by צְלַב ; but when the simple idea of suspension is implied the Targums use תְּלָא, as in 2 Samuel xviii. 10, of Absalom suspended in the oak ; and in Psalm cxxxvii. 2, of the captive Jews who hanged their harps on the willows. In both these instances the verb κρεμάννυμι is used in the Septuagint; and as an indication that the Aramaic תְּלָא also included the meaning of περίκειμαι we may cite Jonah ii. 6, where תְּלָא is used as the translation of the Hebrew word חָבַשׁ, to bind or fasten.

14. In the sixth line we have three words to represent the

process of throwing into the sea. Matthew has καταπον-
τισθῇ, which the Authorized Version renders " were *drowned*
in the depth of the sea," but the Revisers properly change
to " were *sunk*." Mark has βέβληται, " cast into the sea,"
and Luke, ἔρριπται, " thrown into the sea."

The one word which admirably represents all these Greek
verbs is the Passive of שְׁדָא. The force of καταποντίζω, to
precipitate, cause to sink down, is clearly involved in this
verb; as we see, for instance, in Exodus xv. 1, " The horse
and his rider hath He sunk into the sea"; and in Job
xxxviii. 6, where, in reference to the first establishment of
solidity in the chaotic abyss, we read : " Upon what are the
foundations embedded? and who lowered (or sunk down) the
corner stones ? " The usual meaning of the verb however
is to *throw*; and this of course suits βάλλω, the generic
word for throwing, and ρίπτω, to throw down or throw
forth. The verb שְׁדָא is constantly used of the throwing of
arrows ; as in the memorable incident narrated of Elisha in
2 Kings xiii., and in 2 Samuel xi. 24 when Joab sends word
to David, " The bowmen shot (*i.e.* threw down arrows)
at thy servants from upon the wall." It cannot be denied
therefore that the one word אִשְׁתְּדִי covers the meaning of
the three Greek words κατεποντισθῇ, βέβληται, and ἔρριπται.

Numerous other instances might be adduced. These are
perhaps the more important ones, and I trust will be
deemed sufficient to have established our thesis, that the
divergences in our synoptic Gospels are in some cases due
to a variant translation of one and the same Aramaic word.

<div align="right">J. T. MARSHALL.</div>

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (continued).

IN tracing the occasional divergences in the common matter
of the Synoptic Gospels to diverse vocalization of the same
Aramaic consonants, and to a variant rendering of the
same Aramaic word, to which our attention has hitherto
been chiefly confined, we have presupposed that each
writer had before him precisely the same text. We pass
on now to consider instances in which, as the basis of our
elucidation of the divergences in our Greek Gospels, we
assume that, in process of transcription, various readings
had crept into the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel. The
moment we posit a written document as the common
source, we are bound to admit the possibility of errors of
the scribe. Even in our Greek Testament MSS. which
were written in the palmiest days of the Church's history,
probably by command of the Roman emperor, on the
finest parchment the world could produce, and presumably
with the best talent the emperor could command, such
errors are of frequent occurrence. And as to the MSS. of
the Hebrew Scriptures, the evidence is overwhelming that
the all but stereotyped uniformity of extant MSS. furnishes
no criterion that the text was equally uniform in the first
century of our era. We have shown in our February
paper that some of our New Testament quotations pre-
suppose a slightly different Hebrew text from that which
our Hebrew Bibles present; and in the perusal of the
Septuagint, the student who accustoms himself to retrans-
late the Greek into the original, in cases where it differs
from the Masoretic text, finds in multitudes of instances
that the difference of one Hebrew letter explains the
divergent readings of the LXX. While if the study of
the Targums be included, or of the fragments of Origen's

Hexapla, as preserved to us in the magnificent edition of
Dr. Field, the indications of the unsettled state of the
Hebrew text up to about 150 A.D. are proportionately
increased.

It may be well for the reader to turn to pp. 119–121,
where we have shown that some of our New Testament
quotations presuppose a slightly different text from that
which the Masoretic tradition has preserved ; and one other
illustration may perhaps pertinently be here adduced.

Romans xii. 19:   Vengeance is Mine, I will recompense.
Deut. xxxii. 35:   Vengeance is Mine and recompense.
     „ LXX.:   In the day of vengeance, I will recompense.
     „ Sam. Pent.:   In the day of vengeance and recompense.

The Hebrew text which these readings respectively pre-
suppose is as follows :

$$\text{לי נקם אשלם}$$
$$\text{לי נקם ושלם}$$
$$\text{ליום נקם אשלם}$$
$$\text{ליום נקם ושלם}$$

The consideration of the foregoing facts prepares us to
admit that, in a community of poor and comparatively
unlearned men, as the first Palestinian Christians un-
doubtedly were, the manuscripts of the earliest Gospel
cannot be assumed to have been free from errors of the
scribe ; and if written on perishable papyrus, they would
be the more difficult to decipher, and thus various readings
would the more rapidly be increased. We proceed now
therefore to discuss the instances in which *the misreading
or miswriting of one letter in an Aramaic document would
lead to the divergences in the common matter of our Synoptic
Gospels.* But before passing on to new cases, we will, for
the sake of completeness, briefly cite those of this class
which have been incidentally alluded to in our previous
papers.

1. Matt. xiii. 6:	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν		שריש
Luke viii. 6:	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα		ישׁרף
2. Mark ix. 18:	τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας		חרק בשׁנין
Luke ix. 39:	μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ		ערק בעינין
3. Matt. vi. 12:	ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν		כְּמָא
Luke xi. 4:	καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν		בְּמָא
4. Matt. xvii. 1:	εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν		עלאה
Luke ix. 28:	εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι		צלאה

5. We proceed now to new cases. There are two very common Aramaic words, קְרָא and קְרֵב, which are manifestly alike. The former means to call, call for, name: the latter, to draw near; Pael, to cause to come near, to bring near. Now if in two passages which possess strong features of resemblance we find a verb " to call for" lying in the Harmony abreast of a verb " to bring near," we shall regard this as evidence of the kind of which we are in search, in support of our thesis that the variation in one letter in the Aramaic MSS. has in many cases occasioned the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

In connexion with the healing of Bartimæus, who sat begging near the gates of Jericho, and who cried for mercy when he heard that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by, the conduct of Jesus is described in slightly variant language.

MARK x. 49.	LUKE xviii. 40.
καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	σταθεὶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν	ἐκέλευσεν
αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι.	αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι.

Thus we notice that while Mark says, " He commanded him to be *called*," Luke says, " He commanded him to be *brought*." On the second line we have two words almost synonymous in this connexion, εἶπεν and ἐκέλευσεν, and we would suggest the word אמר as the original—a word which, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, means to speak, but which also denotes a gentle command. In our English Bible

אָמַר is rendered by the word "command" twenty-nine times, and "bid" thirteen times. We believe then, that in the two exemplars from which our passage was derived, there was simply this difference :

Mark   אֲמַר דְּיִתְקְרָא

Luke   אֲמַר דְּיִתְקְרֵב

The suitability of the verbs קְרָא (1) and קְרֵב (2) scarcely calls for illustration, but we cite one or two cases of each as specially apposite.

(1) 1 Sam. iii. 8 : Here am I ; for thou didst *call* me.

     Esther ii. 14 : She came in no more unto the king, unless . . . she were *called* by name pronounced and written.

     Esther iv. 11 : I have not been *called* (לָא אִתְקְרֵיתִי) to come in unto the king these thirty days.

(2) Gen. xlviii. 8, 9 : And Israel saw Joseph's sons, and he said, . . . *Bring them near* unto me, that I may bless them.

     Exod. xxii. 8 : The master of the house (to whom property had been entrusted which was afterwards stolen) *shall be brought* unto the Elohim.

There is one remark I would like to make on this passage before leaving it. It will be noticed that in Mark I have quoted a reading not approved by our Revised Version. This is almost the only instance in which I shall do this. I have all but invariably found that the revised readings yield best to our hypothesis ; indeed, many a precious hour has been wasted by neglecting to rectify the text of Stroud or Greswell, and applying our method to second-rate readings. All truth is mutually confirmatory ; and it cannot but interest those who have been devoting so much valuable time to textual criticism of the New Testament to be informed that the theory of a primitive Aramaic Gospel in almost every case supports the readings of the Revised Version, and shows them to be the oldest. In the case before us however the Revisers,

with B. C, L, Δ, ℵ, read εἶπεν φωνήσατε αὐτόν, " He said, Call
ye him," instead of εἶπεν αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι, which is sup-
ported by A, D, and the remaining MSS., and also by the
Syriac. Subjective criticism suggests that the rare use
of εἶπεν in the sense of command caused at an early date
the change to the *oratio recta*; and this suggestion is
confirmed by our hypothesis, as well as by the Syriac
versions, which do not always receive the full weight they
deserve.

6. We would next turn to the narrative of the woman
with the issue of blood, where we shall find two cases in
which our present point is illustrated. In describing the
previous efforts which the woman had made to find a
remedy for her disease before she came to Christ, we
have two parallel expressions :

Mark v. 26 :   δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα.
                 Having spent all that she had.
Luke viii. 43 : προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον.
                 Having squandered all her living.

The two participles are almost synonymous, and we
would suggest that the original Aramaic word was בַּזְבֵּז,
to spend up, to spend to the very last. It occurs Eccle-
siastes iii. 22, where the Targum amplifies the Hebrew text
thus : " Why should I squander my money to destroy my
righteousness ? It is well for me to leave it to my son
after me, or to support myself from it in the time of my
old age."

As for the rest, τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα = " all that belonged
to her," or, " all that she had," this would be כָּל מָא דִלָהּ
or כָּל מִדִּלָהּ; whereas ὅλον τὸν βίον, " all her living," is
כָּל מַזָּלָהּ. The noun מַזָּל has a peculiar interest, as dis-
closing the astrological pursuits of which the Jews were
so fond, and which made " wandering Jews " the gypsies
of the first Christian century. It denotes (1) a planet,

especially Jupiter; (2) fortune, fate; and (3) wealth, sub-
stance, means of living. In this last sense it occurs in the
Targum as the equivalent of the Hebrew הוֹן.

> Prov. xxix. 3: He that keepeth company with harlots squanders his
> living (מִזְבֵּה).
> Prov. xix. 4: *Wealth* addeth many friends; but poverty separateth
> one's friend from him.
> Ps. cxix. 14: In the way of Thy testimonies I have rejoiced, as
> much as in all *riches.*

7. In the same narrative, when the evangelists describe
the suddenness of the cure effected by touching the fringe
of the Saviour's shawl, we have an interesting divergence:

MARK v. 29.	LUKE viii. 44.
καὶ εὐθέως	καὶ παραχρῆμα
ἐξηράνθη	ἔστη
ἡ πηγὴ	ἡ ῥύσις
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.	τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

This furnishes us a fair specimen of the Synoptic pro-
blem. The resemblance in the order and number of the
words is too close to allow us to suppose absolute inde-
pendence. The diversity is too great to admit the theory
of mutual use. If either evangelist had access to the work
of the other, we cannot suppose that either would be so
capricious as to exchange εὐθέως for παραχρῆμα. There
remains then our theory of translation from a common
source. On this theory it is perfectly natural that we
should have the same number and order of words, synony-
mous words and phrases, and also, from various causes,
some little diversity. On this theory it is the most natural
thing possible that an Aramaic word הֱבִיל or בִּפְרִיעַ =
immediately, should be translated in one case εὐθέως and
in the other παραχρῆμα; and that the word אֲרִיתָא, which
denotes (1) a pool or fountain, "stagnum, fons," as in
Ps. cvii. 35, "He made the wilderness to be like a *pool* of

water"; and (2) a stream, "rivus," as in Psalm lxxviii. 44,
"He turned their *streams* into blood," should be rendered
by the two translators πηγή, a fountain ; ῥύσις, a stream—
especially when we find that this same word, with the pros-
thetic א dropped, was used in rabbinic literature in the
technical sense required by the context. Then we have
the parallels ἐξηράνθη = "was dried up," and ἔστη = "stood
still." These are not quite synonymous, but can be ex-
plained by the change in one single letter. The Aramaic
equivalent of ἐξηράνθη is אִתְנְגִיב, and the aptness of the
word to the context will be clear from the following
passages :

Gen. viii. 13 : The waters were *dried up* from off the earth.
Job xiv. 11 : The waters departed from the Red Sea ; . . . and
Jordan was *dried up* and parched before the ark of
Jehovah, and returned to the place of its sources.
Ps. cvi. 9 : He rebuked the Red Sea, and it was *dried up* (אתנגיב).
In rabbinic literature the verb is regularly used of
drying the hands after washing, and the body after
bathing.

We believe then that the word which stood in the
Aramaic MS. used by Mark was אתנגיב ; but if we suppose
that, instead of this word, the MS. used by the evangelist
Luke contained, or seemed to contain, אתנציב, there would
be no resource for him but to translate this word after the
analogy of the Hebrew נִצָּב or הִתְיַצֵּב, "stood still," ἔστη.
This is the more probable, as we have noticed with a
frequency almost approaching to a "law," that Luke is
prone to decipher his exemplar as yielding a Hebrew word,
where the others translate an Aramaic word ; or to give
a Hebrew meaning to a word which exists with slightly
diverse meanings in the two languages—thus implying that
he was more familiar with Hebrew than with Aramaic.

8. We would now draw an illustration from the sermon
on the mount :

Matt. v. 15.	Mark. iv. 21.	Luke viii. 16.	Luke xi. 33.
οὐδὲ	μήτι	οὐδεὶς	οὐδεὶς
καίουσι	ἔρχεται	ἅψας	ἅψας
λύχνον	ὁ λύχνος,	λύχνον	λύχνον
καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν	ἵνα τεθῇ	αὐτὸν τίθησιν	τίθησιν
ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον.	ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον;	ὑποκάτω κλίνης.	ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον.

We have here clearly two variants: (1) "A lamp *does not come* that one may place it under the bushel" (Mark); and, (2) "One *does not kindle* a lamp and place it under the bushel." Can it be a mere accidental circumstance that the verb "to come" is אֲתָא, and the verb "to kindle" is אֲיָא? It is needless to adduce illustrations of אתא, which is in the Targums the constant equivalent of the Hebrew בוא; and is, by the way, preserved in the New Testament, in the watchword of the early Christians, מרן אתא, Maran atha, Our Lord cometh. The suitability of אוא to the context is clear from the following Targumic passages:

Isa. xliv. 15: The prophet, in exposing the folly of idolatry, says of some of the wood from which the god is made, "he *kindleth* it (LXX. καύσαντες), and baketh bread."

Hosea vii. 4: Like an oven which the baker *kindles* for himself.

The presence of καίω and ἅπτομαι is quite in harmony with our theory, but not sufficient of itself to substantiate it. It would be venturesome to assert from this evidence alone that אוא stood in the *Urschrift*; but when we have the decided variant ἔρχεται = אתא, then we have veritable evidence as to the original text.

9. Another instance in which אֲתָא, or, as it is often written, אֲתֵי, seems to have been mistaken for another word is in the following passages:

Luke ix. 46: εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς.
A reasoning entered among them.
Mark ix. 34: πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν.
For they reasoned among themselves.

These two passages are strictly parallel. Each is in-

troductory to the placing of the child in the midst as the
example of humility, and yet we have this interesting diver-
sity. It must be felt that εἰσῆλθεν is used in an uncommon
sense; and we would suggest as the solution that in the
MS. used by Luke אתי was miswritten for ארי, the regular
word meaning "for."

<div align="center">

Luke's text requires: אתי ביניהון תוכחא

Mark's   ארי ביניהון אתוכחו

</div>

The last words in the couplets are respectively תּוּכְחָא
= "controversy," and אְתוּכָּחוּ, 3 pl. Ithpael of יכח. This
is the usual verb for argument or debate, in which each of
the disputants tries to vindicate himself, or to establish his
claim to the ownership of the thing under dispute. It
occurs in Genesis xxi. 25, when Abraham asserted his
claim to the well of water which the servants of Abimelech
had violently taken away; and in 2 Samuel xix. 9, of the
fierce controversy between the men of Israel, after the
death of Absalom, as to whether they should return to their
allegiance to David. Thus the verb and its cognate noun
may well be used of the controversy among the disciples as
to "which of them should be the greatest."

10. Let us now turn to a general statement as to Christ's
activity in Galilee, which is given with substantial agree-
ment in the second and third Gospels.

<div align="center">

MARK i. 34.   LUKE iv. 41.

καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια   καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν
οὐκ ἤφιε   οὐκ εἴα
λαλεῖν   αὐτὰ λαλεῖν,
ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν.   ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτὸν
                       τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι.

</div>

Can any theory explain the phenomena in these two
passages so satisfactorily as that of translation from a com-
mon document? It is not a description of any one event,
but a summarized account of Christ's general activity.

The description is evidently cast in the same mould: phrase corresponds with phrase. The synonyms ἤφιε and εἴα preclude the theory of mutual use. All we need therefore to establish our theory is to show that in Aramaic the words "demon" and "rebuke" might easily be mistaken. Let us see if this is so. The most common word for "rebuke" is נוף; and usually where it occurs in the Targums, the verb ἐπιτιμάω occurs in the LXX. It occurs for instance:

Zech. iii. 2: Jehovah *rebuke* thee, O seducer!
Nahum i. 4: Who *rebuked* the sea.
Mal. iii. 11: Jehovah shall for you *rebuke* the devourer.
Num. xii. 14: If her father have merely *rebuked* her, shall she not be shut up seven days?

The equivalent of ἐπιτιμῶν is thus נָזִיף. But suppose that, instead of נָזִיף, the MS. of Mark contained, or seemed to contain, נָזִיק. This would mean "the injurious one," or "the malevolent one"—the Peal participle of the verb נְזִק, which in Peal and Aphel alike means to injure; indeed the Aphel participle is regularly used as a noun, מַזִּיק, a malevolent evil spirit, a demon; as for instance:

Ps. cvi. 37: They sacrificed to *demons* (LXX. δαιμονίοις).
Ps. xci. 5: Thou shalt not be afraid through fear of evil spirits (מַזִּיקֵי), which walk in darkness; nor of the arrow of the angel of death which he shooteth by day.
Cant. viii. 3: The paraphrast here describes the bride, *i.e.* Israel, as rejoicing that she is surrounded on the right hand and on the left by the incense of prayer, that it is not possible for an evil demon (מַזִּיק) to hurt her.

The Peal participle נָזִיק is then, we believe, rendered by the meaning which it shares in common with the more frequent Aphel participle מַזִּיק = the malevolent one : δαιμόνιον.

11. In the account of the healing of the demoniac boy after the transfiguration there are two interesting varia-

tions in the words which the distressed father addresses to
the Saviour as he comes to meet Him.

Matt. xvii. 15.	Mark ix. 17.	Luke ix. 38.
Κύριε,	Διδάσκαλε,	Διδάσκαλε,
ἐλέησόν	ἤνεγκα	δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
μου τὸν υἱόν.	τὸν υἱόν μου.	ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.

There are found in the Targums two words which are
used of earnest, impassioned entreaty for pity or help.
These are בְּעֵי or בְּבָעוּת, and בְּמָטוּ or בְּמָטוּת. The
former is a noun בָּעֵי, from the verb בָּעָא, to pray or
appeal, with the prefix בְּ; and in this form is used as
an interjection, like the Hebrew בִּי.

Gen. xix. 18 :	Lot said, O now, my lords.
Gen. xxiii. 11 (Jonathan):	I-beseech-thee (בבעו), my lord, hear me.
Gen. xxii. (Jerusalem) :	Oh for mercy (*i.e.* I pray for mercy, בבעו רחמין), that when the sons of Isaac come in the hour of their distress, Thou mayest remember for them the binding of Isaac their father, and remit and forgive their sins.
	The phrase בְּבָעוּ רַחֲמִין, in which it will be observed that רחמין stands as an accusative to the interjection, occurs twice in this prayer of Abraham.

The word בְּמָטוּ is found only in the Targum of Jonathan,
and is apparently precisely the equivalent of בְּבָעוּת, being
used in Jonathan where Onkelos has בְּבָעוּת; *e.g.* twice
in Judah's appeal, Genesis xliii. 20 and Genesis xliv. 18.
I have failed however to find an instance in which בְּמָטוּ
is followed by an accusative, as בְּבָעֵי is; but this is
doubtless due to the scantiness of our literature. I suggest
then that the common text, of which Matthew and Luke
give a free translation, was בְּמָטוּת בְּרִי, O my son! I pray
for my son!

Instead of this, Mark has "I *brought* my son"; but the verb "to bring" is אַכְמֵי, Aphel of מְטָא.

Gen. xxvii. 25 (Jonathan): Esau *brought* it (venison) to his father.
Exod. xxii. 12, J : If a beast entrusted to a neighbour to keep be torn by wild beasts, he shall *bring* the owner to the torn body.
Lev. ii. 8, J : He shall *bring* it to the altar.

In accordance with this conjecture then, we would re-produce the original passages thus :

I brought my son = אַמְטִית בְּרִי
I pray for my son = בַּמְטוּת בְּרִי

12. Under the word מְטוֹ, Buxtorf in his lexicon, suggests that as בְּעֵי comes from the verb בְּעָא = to be-seech, so there must have been a word מְטָא which also meant to beseech, though this meaning does not seem to attach to the word in extant literature. The verb מְטָא means to arrive, alight upon, happen; so that if it pos-sessed also the meaning of "beseeching," it would be precisely after the analogy of the Greek word ἐντυγχάνω. That it did possess this force is, we think, rendered clear from a passage in the narrative we have just had under our consideration.

Matt. xvii. 16 : I *brought* him to Thy disciples.
Mark ix. 18 : I *spake* to Thy disciples.
Luke ix. 40 : I *besought* Thy disciples.

Will it need any persuasion to convince my readers that we have here respectively

מְטִית ?   אַמְרִית   אַכְמֵית

We would suggest that the last was the original reading; but being of rare occurrence, it was translated, or replaced in the hands of the copyists, by two better known words.

13. In describing the healing of the leper who came to Christ in the first days of His ministry, with such won-drous faith, saying, "If Thou art willing, Thou art able

to cleanse me," we find different phrases used to describe
the fact of his recovery.

Matt. viii. 3 : His leprosy was cleansed.
Luke v. 13 : His leprosy departed from him.
Mark i. 42 : His leprosy departed from him, and was cleansed.

We would suggest that this difference is due to a various
reading : אִתְגְּדַת for אִתְנַקַּת. The verb נקה in Pael
means "to cleanse"; as in Isaiah i. 25, "And I will
bring back the blow of My strength upon thee ; and I will
purify thy sins, as one who *cleanseth* with soap ; and I will
remove thy transgressions." The verb נְדַד is found in the
Targum of Esther vi. 1, where the paraphrast, not content
with stating that in that night sleep *departed* from king
Ahasuerus, describes most volubly that sleep departed also
from the Holy One, from Esther, from Haman, and from
Mordecai. In each case we have in Buxtorf's edition of
the Targum נָדַת, which Levy however, in his lexicon,
corrects to נַדַּת. The Ithpeal has the same meaning as
the Peal, so that סְגִירוּתֵיהּ אִתְגְּדַת would mean "his leprosy
departed."

In the reading in Mark's Gospel, "His leprosy departed
from him, *and* was cleansed," we have our first instance of
a phenomenon which will before long engage our serious
attention—doublets in Mark. We shall endeavour to show
that the phenomenon to which Canon Driver has directed
attention in his deeply instructive work on the books of
Samuel, as a remarkable feature in the LXX., occurs also
in our present text of Mark; that is to say, when a tran-
scriber is acquainted with two translations of the original,
in his uncertainty as to which is correct, he sometimes
inserts *both*. We shall endeavour to show that the repe-
titions for which Mark's Gospel is famous have in most
cases arisen from uncertainty as to the Aramaic reading,
as in the case before us.

14. When our Lord had healed the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the Sabbath day, the Pharisees were much enraged, and their subsequent action is thus described :

Matt. xii. 14.	Mark iii. 6.	Luke vi. 11.
ἐξελθόντες	ἐξελθόντες	ἐπλήσθησαν
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	αὐτοὶ
	μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν	ἀνοίας·
συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν	διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.	as Matt.	τί ἂν ποιήσειαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

In this brief passage there are three, if not four, of the lines in which the divergence can be explained by our hypothesis. On the first line we have ἐξελθόντες = " they went out," standing alongside ἐπλήσθησαν = " they were filled." But to express the idea of going out or away to a definite spot, or with a definite object in view, as in the case before us, the correct verb is אִתְמְטִי : as we see from Numbers xxiii. 15, where Balaam says to Balak, " Stand here, while I *go* yonder," and 1 Samuel ix. 9, " Come, let us *go* to the seer"; whereas the regular verb, meaning " to be filled " is אִתְמְלִי.

It will be noted that we place ἀνοίας abreast of τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν in our harmony. We do this with some little hesitancy. If we had evidence that the popular name for the Herodians was " the men of the *stoa* "—the *stoa* being used in Talmudic writers for the hall or pavement at the gates of palaces, where the magnates sat to listen to cases of litigation—then we might feel at liberty to affirm that there had been a confusion between סְטִיו = a hall or pavement, and סְטַיָא = folly, insanity. The latter word occurs Jeremiah xxviii. 16 and xxix. 32: and the crime of Hananiah and Shemaiah was just the same as that of which the Pharisees were guilty—malignantly opposing God's truth. But until the desired evidence is forthcoming we would not speak with confidence.

15. Further, it will be noted that while Matthew and Mark say, "they took counsel," Luke says, "they conversed with each other." This is precisely the difference between אִתְמַלְכוּן and אִתְמַלְּלוּן, as the following passages show:

Ps. lxii. 4 :　　　　When they swear to show kindness, they *are consulting* (מִתְמַלְכִין) to cast him down: they bless with their mouth, but they curse secretly.

Ps. lxxi. 10 :　　　They that watch for my soul *take counsel* together.

Exod. xxxii. 11, J :　God conversed (מִתְמַלֵּל) with Moses.

Num. vii. 89, J :　　When Moses went in to speak with Him, he heard the voice which *conversed* with him from upon the mercy seat.

16. In the last line, it is abundantly clear that the difference between ἀπολέσωσιν and ποιήσειαν is due to a confusion between אָבַד, to destroy, and עֲבַד, to do. In Hebrew עבד regularly means to work, serve, but is almost invariably used in the Targums as the equivalent of עָשָׂה, *to do*, which latter word is in the Targums never once to be seen.

17. Our space will admit of but one more illustration. It shall be taken from the prediction of the Saviour as to His second advent.

MATT. xxiv. 23 and MARK xiii. 21.	LUKE xvii. 23.
τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ,	καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν,
Ἰδού, ὧδε ὁ Χριστός,	Ἰδού, ὧδε,
Ἰδού, ἐκεῖ,	Ἰδού, ἐκεῖ.
μὴ πιστεύσητε.	μὴ ἀπέλθητε,
	μηδὲ διώξητε.

Thus when, to those who are perplexed by numerous claims of different persons to the Messiahship, the Lord Jesus gives advice as to how His disciples were to act, we find that two of the evangelists record his words to have been : " Do not believe," or " do not trust in them ":

while Luke says, "Do not depart," "Go not away from them, nor pursue after them"; remain tranquil. This is just the difference between לָא תִתְרַהֲקוּן and לָא תִתְרַדְחְצוּן. The following quotations from the Targums make this abundantly clear.

Ps. cxlvi. 3: Do not *trust* in princes (לא תתרהצון).
Jer. vii. 4: *Trust* not in the words of the false prophet.
Jer. xvii. 5: Cursed is the man that *trusteth* in man.
Ps. xxv. 2: O my God, in Thee have I *trusted*.

Then as instances of אתרחק, to go far away, to go to a distance, depart, we may quote:

Isa. xxxiii. 8: Because they have changed My covenant, they have *gone away* from their cities: man does not think of the evil that is coming upon him.
Ezek. viii. 6: Son of man, seest thou what these do? the many abominations which the house of Israel are doing there, that I should *go far away* from them.
Ezek. xi. 15: Son of man, thy brethren have said, *Get you far away* from the Lord.

If the MS. used by Luke read תתרחקון, and conformity with this rendered necessary the translation μὴ ἀπέλθητε, we are not surprised at the addition μηδὲ διώξητε.

In our next paper we intend to adduce evidence that the *Logia* contained some of the peculiarities of dialect which are found in the Samaritan Targum; and that the uncertainty caused by the dialectical forms has led in many cases to the divergent renderings found in our Greek Gospels.

J. T. Marshall.