

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\_expositor-series-1.php

## THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

## INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (continued).

ALL who have had experience in conducting examinations in foreign languages are fully awaye 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 (נשא) our griefs, and carried our sorrows." Now the word con 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:	οῦτος 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 threeevangelists 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 οὖ λαμβάνει	ὄστις οὐ βαστάζει
τον σταυρον αύτοῦ	τον σταυρον έαυτοῦ,
καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου,	καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου,
ούκ έστι μου άξιος.	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 ( $\dot{a}p\dot{a}\tau\omega$ ) his cross daily, and follow Me." Does not the combination of words, *taking* the cross ( $\lambda a\mu\beta\dot{a}\nu\omega$ ), *taking up* the cross ( $a^{i}\rho\omega$ ), and *carrying* the cross ( $\beta a\sigma\tau\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ ), remind us of the variant renderings of the Hebrew word  $\chi^{i}\omega^{j}$ ? 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 ديم . It would be interesting, and not a little confirmatory, if we could show that in passages where occurs in the Targums, our three Greek words occur in the Septuagint. We can do this readily with reference to  $\lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu \omega$  and  $a \ddot{i} \rho \omega$ , but  $\beta a \sigma \tau \dot{a} \zeta \omega$  only occurs once in the Septuagint; yet if the word is thus rare, we hope to show clearly that its meaning belongs to  $\dot{c} \omega \dot{c}$ . The following are instances where  $\dot{c} \omega \dot{c}$  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  $(\check{\alpha} \rho a \tau \epsilon)$  the ark, and pass over.
- 2 Sam. ii. 32: They took up (aloovoi) Asahel, and buried him.
- 1 Sam. xiv. 7: Jonathan's armour bearer (δ αίρων τὰ σκεύη).
- Exod. xxv. 14: Thou shalt put the staves into the rings on the sides of the ark, to lift, or carry  $(ai\rho\epsilon\omega)$ , the ark with them.

As instances of  $\omega$  with the meaning of  $\beta a \sigma \tau \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ , 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 Jonathau: "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 covers the three Greek words; and if we assume that 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.	LUKE XVII. 33.
(Matt. xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35.) ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλη	δς έαν ζητήση
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	ος εαν ζητηση τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
σῶσαι,	περιποιήσασθαι,
<b>ἀπολέσει αὐτήν</b> ·	<b>ἀπολέσει αὐτήν</b> ·
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέση	καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέση
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	$[aec{v} au\dot{\eta} u]$ ,
ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ,	
οῦτος 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 שׁינֵיא and for "save" שׁינֵיא; so that in Aramaic the aphorism would run thus:

מַן דִּישֵׁיזֵיב נַפְּשֵׁה ישֵׁצְנָה or מַן דְּבָעֵי לְשֵׁיזָבָא . . וּמַן דִּישֵׁיזֵיא נַפְּשֵׁה יְשֵׁיזְבָנָה

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

Let us examine the words separately. שִׁיצִיא is said to be the Shaphel form of יָצָא, 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 " $\dot{w}$ ", 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,  $\sigma\hat{\omega}\sigma a\iota$ ,  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi o\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma a\sigma\theta a\iota$ , and  $\zeta\omega oyov\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ .

 $\sigma \omega \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu = (1)$  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.

 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\sigma\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta a\iota =$ to keep safe, preserve ; reserve for oneself, gain possession of. In the LXX. it is twice used as the antithesis of  $\dot{a}\pi\sigma\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\nu a\iota$ . 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" ( $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\sigma\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$  $a\dot{v}\tau \dot{\sigma}$ ).

 $\zeta \omega \sigma \gamma \sigma \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu =$ 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,  $\dot{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \sigma \gamma \dot{\sigma} \nu \sigma \nu \tau \dot{a} ~ \ddot{a} \rho \sigma \epsilon \nu a$ , "they preserved the males alive." So vers. 18, 22.

Thus we see that the words are almost synonymous.  $\Sigma \omega \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$  fixes the thoughts usually upon the danger avoided: ζωογονείν on the escape safe and sound, the preservation of life; περιποιείσθαι 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  $\square$ <sup>w</sup><sup>w</sup>, which means to rescue from danger or death. The following instances of the usage of  $\square$ <sup>w</sup><sup>w</sup><sup>w</sup> 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.,  $\delta\sigma\omega\theta\eta \mu\sigma\nu \ \dot{\eta} \psi\nu\chi\dot{\eta}$ .)
- 2 Kings xx. 6. Isaiah promises to Hezekiah from the Lord: "I will save (LXX.  $\sigma\omega\sigma\omega$ ) 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). (לא יְשׁיוֵב נִפְשָׁה); LXX., où μη σώση την ψυχην 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 selfdenial. 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 It is very significant that our Greek Gospels Praver. 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,"  $\dot{\phi}\epsilon\iota\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  and  $\dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau/\alpha\varsigma$ . As we have said, we consider these to be variant translations of the one word  $\neg \eta \dashv \neg$ , 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 (הוב קמון); 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
		(יְרֵי חוֹבֶך), 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?" (קוֹבָי)
	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 " (יְקַבְּל חוֹבָה).
	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? (לא יָשׁׁיָ 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 אכָרָא. The equivalent of "for" in this connexion is כָּרָאָ, "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  $\partial \phi \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$  and  $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau i a$  are translations of the one Aramaic word  $\Box \eta$ , 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 damnation" ( $a \partial \omega \nu i \omega \kappa \rho i \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ); whereas the Revisers, on the authority of B, L,  $\Delta$ ,  $\aleph$ , read  $a \partial \omega \nu i \omega v \dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \eta \mu a \tau o s$ , "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 :

יהי מתחיב חובא דעלמא.

When once the Church of Christ fully realizes the truth, which has hither to 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 In the case before us we have  $\kappa \rho i \sigma \iota_s$ —used, as often was. in the New Testament, in the sense of "condemnation, punishment "—and  $\dot{a}\mu\dot{a}\rho\tau\eta\mu a$ , "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 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 to lift up, bear, remove. When sin therefore is forgiven, 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, הוֹב, 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  $d\pi o\lambda \epsilon \sigma a\iota$ , to destroy, and έμβαλεῖν, to cast. This common form is "Ψ. The lexicons give two distinct words, "Ψ. 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	$\operatorname{corpse}$	shall	$\mathbf{be}$	thrown	$\mathbf{for}$	$\mathbf{food}$	$\mathbf{to}$	all	$_{\mathrm{the}}$	birds
	of	heaven	i.								

- 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 Jernsalem.

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, שָׁנָר or שָׁנָר, 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 הנורא שנירא. 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 שנר, and that this was variously rendered  $\dot{a}\pi o\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\sigma a\iota$  and  $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\beta a\lambda\epsilon \hat{\iota}\nu$ .

6. We have said that the word שנר 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 wrw, 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 unvoke 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.
ῆσαν δὲ καθήμενοι	καὶ ἦρξαντο
τινες τῶν γραμματέων	οί γραμματείς
	καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι.	διαλογίζεσθαι.

The homologous phrases clearly are  $\tilde{\eta}\sigma a\nu \kappa a\theta \dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu o\iota$  and  $\ddot{\eta}\rho\xi a\nu\tau o$ , or, as it might be expressed,  $\tilde{\eta}\sigma a\nu \dot{a}\rho\chi \dot{o}\mu\epsilon\nu o\iota$ . "The Scribes were sitting and reasoning," "The Scribes . . . were beginning to reason." Thus both are possible translations of

וַהַוּוֹ שָׁרַיָן סָפְרַיָּא וִחָשָׁבִין

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  $\forall \pi \forall \alpha$  and  $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha i$ .

7. In Luke iii. 23 we have a singular phrase,  $\kappa a i a \dot{v} \tau \delta i \eta v$ 'Invoûs  $\dot{a}\rho\chi \delta\mu \epsilon v os \dot{\omega}\sigma \epsilon i \dot{\epsilon}\tau \hat{\omega}v \tau \rho i \dot{\alpha}\kappa \sigma v \tau a$ : "Jesus was about thirty years of age, beginning," or, "when He began." To this our Revisers virtually add the word  $\delta i \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon i v$ , 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.

> ΜΑΤΤ. xiii. 1. ἐν τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ἐκάθητο

ΜΛRΚ iv. 1. καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν

παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

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

## ותנינות שרא על ימא

which may mean, "Again He sat by the sea," or, "Again He began by the sea," to which the second evangelist added  $\delta\iota\delta\dot{a\sigma\kappa}\epsilon\iota\nu$ , as the Revisers do in Luke iii. 23.

8. Another of these equivocal verbs of very frequent occurrence is קבל, 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 קבל 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 : so that the two sentences would respectively in Aramaic run thus:

> מו דּיקַבְּלְנְכוֹן יְקַבְּלְגִּי מו דִּיקַבֵּל מִגָּכוֹן יְקַבֵּל מִגִּי

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.

Матт. 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  $\neg q \not q \not q$ . 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  $\neg q \not q$  in the Targums will illustrate this :

(1) Ps. xxiv. 5: Isa. xii. 3:	He shall receive the blessing from the Lord. 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 under- stood Ephron, and weighed him the silver.
(3) Lev. v. 1:	"He shall receive his punishment." This phrase, which is the regular Targumic equi- valent 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.
τ $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ αἰτοῦντί σε	παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε
δίδου,	δίδου·
καὶ τὸν θέλοντα	καὶ
ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι	άπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ
μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.	μὴ ἀπαίτει.

The two somewhat divergent pairs of words to which we

would direct attention occur in the last two lines—the addition of  $\theta \not\in \lambda o \nu \tau a$  being quite an insignificant detail. Does any one Aramaic word cover the two meanings of  $\delta a \nu e \noti \not\leq o \mu a \iota$ , to borrow, and  $a \noti \rho \omega$ , to take away more or less forcibly? This is certainly the case with  $\varkappa \noti \neg$ , 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  $a \noti \gamma \gamma a \rho o \iota$  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  $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{a}\pi o\sigma\tau\rho a\phi \hat{\eta}s$ , "turn thou not away," and  $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{a}\pi a (\tau \epsilon \iota,$ "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 ההרר, of which we have just been speaking, there is a distinct Paelic verb הַדָּר, to honour, ascribe honour, glorify; and it is through these similar forms that we would explain the following :

Матт. хі. 25.	LUKE x. 21.
έν ἐκείνῷ τῷ καιρῷ	έν αὐτῆ τῆ ὥρα
<b>ἀποκριθε</b> ὶς	<b>ήγαλλιάσα</b> το
	τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ 'Αγίῳ,
δ Ἰησοῦς ϵἶπεν.	καί είπεν.

The verb  $\neg \neg \neg$  in the Aphel and Pael regularly means "to answer" in rabbinic literature, and thus= $d\pi \sigma \kappa \rho \iota \theta \epsilon l_s$  in the

first Gospel. And as for  $\eta\gamma a\lambda\lambda\iota a\sigma a\tau o$ , 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, הדר, 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  $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho(\theta\eta)$  and ήγαλλιάσατο are possible renderings of the Pael הדר

12. Our last set of illustration's 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	λυσιτελεî αὐτῷ
ίνα κρεμίασ $ heta \hat{\eta}$	εἰ περίκειται	εỉ περίκειται
μύλος ὄνικὸς	λίθος μυλικός	λίθος μυλικός
περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον
αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,
каì ката $\pi$ оv $ au$ і $ heta \hat{\eta}$	καὶ βέβληται	καὶ ἔρριπται
έν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάο	σης. εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.	eis τῆν θάλασσαν.
ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίση	ΰς δ' ầν σκανδαλίση	Ϋ ίνα σκανδαλίση
ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα.
τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.	τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμ	έ.

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  $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota$ , it is advantageous, profitable;  $\kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ , it is good, well, pleasant, agreeable; and  $\lambda \nu \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ , 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 הנא. Buxtorf says it means (1) prodesse; (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 19 VOL. III.

following illustrations from the Targums will make this clear:

- 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  $\pi\epsilon\rho$  ( $\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau a\iota$ , while Matthew gives  $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu a\sigma\theta\hat{\eta}$ . 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  $\pi \epsilon \rho i \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu a \iota$ 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 תלא which means to hang, hang up, suspend. The cognate occurs in the Hebrew Bible, and when it denotes תלה crucifixion or impalement, it is rendered in the Targums by but when the simple idea of suspension is implied; צלב the Targums use תלא, 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  $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \dot{a} \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$  is used in the Septuagint; and as an indication that the Aramaic תלא also included the meaning of  $\pi\epsilon\rho(\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu a\iota)$  we may cite Jonah ii. 6, where הלא is used as the translation of the Hebrew. word word, to bind or fasten.

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

process of throwing into the sea. Matthew has  $\kappa a \tau a \pi o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \theta \hat{y}$ , which the Authorized Version renders "were *drowned* in the depth of the sea," but the Revisers properly change to "were *sunk*." Mark has  $\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \tau a \iota$ , " cast into the sea," and Luke,  $\epsilon \rho \rho \iota \pi \tau a \iota$ , "thrown into the sea."

The one word which admirably represents all these Greek verbs is the Passive of  $\omega \tau \omega$ . The force of  $\kappa a \tau a \pi o \nu \tau i \zeta \omega$ , 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  $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$ , the generic word for throwing, and  $\dot{\rho}(\pi\tau\omega)$ , to throw down or throw The verb  $\psi$  is constantly used of the throwing of forth. 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 אשתרי covers the meaning of the three Greek words  $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \pi o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}, \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \tau a \iota, and \epsilon \rho \rho \iota \pi \tau a \iota.$ 

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. J. T. MARSHALL.