

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*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:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

remains from that ruined temple, and they laid him in the grave. And so, with all his sins, his fall and shame, but with his great repentance, and his large, brave heart, and his love and loyalty to men and to God, they wrote over his grave that he was a true man of God, and a hero of God's kingdom on earth. The Epistle to the Hebrews needs no justification in endorsing that verdict and counting Samson among God's heroes.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

### THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

#### INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION.

IN our February paper we endeavoured to show that there are four kinds of textual discrepancies to which Semitic texts are liable in the process of transcription: (1) The diverse vocalization of the same consonants; (2) the interchange of similar letters; (3) the omission of one or more letters; (4) the transposition of two consecutive letters. We illustrated this by showing that the quotations in the New Testament from the Old give clear and abundant evidence that the Hebrew text from which they were translated differed in *each* of these ways from the current Massoretic text preserved in our Hebrew Bibles. The reason why our New Testament quotations differ from the Old is, in almost all cases, that they were based on MSS. which differed in the ways indicated from our present Hebrew text. It may be instructive to the thoughtful student to illustrate these modes of divergence in another way. It is admitted by modern scholars, almost without exception, that Psalm xviii. and 2 Samuel xxii. are two slightly variant copies of what was originally the same psalm. The differences between the two are very much

smaller than they appear in the English Bible ; indeed, for the most part they have arisen in the simple manner we have described, from slight errors on the part of the scribe. We will exhibit some of these various readings, making use of the figures which occur at the opening of this paper.

	(1)	
	PSALM xviii.	2 SAMUEL xxii.
51	מְגַדֵּל, magnifying.	מְגִדֵּל, a tower.
	(2)	
11	וִירָא, He soared.	וִירָא, He was seen.
12	חֹשֶׁכַת, darkness.	חֹשֶׁרֶת, gatherings.
33	וִיתִי, He maketh.	וִיתֵר, He guideth.
43	אֲרִיקָם, I cast them out.	אֲרִיקָם, I stamped them.
	(3)	
16	אֲפִיקֵי מַיִם, channels of waters.	אֲפִיקֵי יָם, channels of the sea.
35	נִחְתָּה, bend.	נִחְתָּה, is bent.
36	רֹתַנְעָה, Thy condescension.	עֲנַתְךָ, Thy answer.
42	יִשְׁעוּ, they cried.	יִשְׁעוּ, they looked.
44	תִּשְׁמַנֵּנִי, Thou madest me.	תִּשְׁמַרְנֵנִי, Thou preservedst me.
	(4)	
46	יִחְרְגוּ, they tremble.	יִחְרְרוּ, they gird themselves.

Equally instructive is a comparison of proper names, as found in the first book of Chronicles, with the way in which they are spelt in the earlier books of Scripture. I have noted *sixty-two* variations, which are clearly due to very simple errors of the scribe. Of these, thirteen are due to diverse vocalization of the same consonants ; twenty-eight to change of one letter ; eighteen to omission of a letter ; and three to transposition of consecutive consonants. An examination of the margin of the Revised Version will enable even the English reader, to a large extent, to verify this computation.

Granted the existence of an Aramaic Gospel, in accordance with patristic testimony, it is reasonable to suppose that the same kinds of copyists' errors would creep into the MSS. of this work as occur in different MSS. of the Hebrew

Scriptures; and, conversely, when passages in the synoptic Gospels exist in such substantial agreement as is compatible with the hypothesis that they are translations from the same source, and the divergences are such that, in very numerous instances, when the variant words are translated into Aramaic they yield words which closely resemble each other, differing only in one of the simple ways we have enumerated, then the hypothesis may claim to be a demonstrated fact—the synoptists made use of an Aramaic Gospel.

In the present paper we intend to adduce instances of the third and fourth modes of divergence above named; that is, where the divergent Greek words yield, when retranslated, Aramaic words which differ in the omission in one case of a single letter, or in the transposition of two consecutive letters.

I. Instances of the *omission* of one letter in one of the Aramaic words.

1. One instance of this was briefly referred to in our March paper, in the narrative of the paralytic who was lowered through the roof into the presence of Jesus. There were found, standing in exact parallelism, the two following phrases:

Mark ii. 4: They uncovered the roof.

Luke v. 19: They ascended upon the house.

We there showed that the constant, if not the only, word in Aramaic meaning to ascend is ܦܠܠܘܢ. This verb, in Pael ܦܠܠܘܢ, means to raise, to lift up and carry off, remove. Then we saw that the word likely to be used of the huts of the Galilæan peasants, with their mud roofs, is ܡܫܠܠܢܐ. This word, we may add, is used in the Syriac of the “booths” which Peter proposed to build upon the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 4), as also of the “houses” into which “the unjust steward” hoped that his debtors would

afterwards receive him (St. Luke xvi. 9). The word for roof is מַלְלָא. So Zephaniah ii. 14, "Her roofs have they torn down." So that in an unpointed text the difference between these two phrases is :

Mark = סלקו טללא

Luke = סלקו מטללא

2. In the injunction given by the Saviour that we should not set our affections unduly on things of the earth, but lay up treasure in heaven, we have an interesting verbal divergence, which seems to me explicable by the difference of one letter.

Matt. vi. 20: Where thieves do not *dig* (or *bore*) *through*.

Luke xii. 33: Where thief does not *draw near*.

In the first case, the underlying metaphor is to walls of mud, of which common houses were often built, and through which the thief bores a hole for himself to enter. The Aramaic word to express this process is נִקַּב. The word occurs for instance in the Targums :

2 Chron. xxxiii. 11: The Chaldæans made a copper mule, and *bored* many small holes, and inclosed Manasseh in it, and kindled a fire round about it.

2 Kings xii. 9: Jehoiada took a chest, and *bored* a hole in the lid thereof, and set it beside the altar.

Job xl. 24: Shall one *pierce through* his nose with a snare?

„ 26: Canst thou *pierce through* his jaw with a hook?

The verb "to draw near" is קָרַב; so that, using in both cases the imperfect tense, as indicating indefinite frequency, we obtain :

Matthew באתר דנגבין לא יקבו

Luke באתר דנגבין לא יקרבו

3. To return again to the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac. We are told that the demons were very pronounced in their preference as to where they wished to go,

if they were to be compelled to leave the man whom they had tormented for so long.

MARK v. 10.  
καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν,  
ἵνα μὴ αὐτοῦς  
ἀποστείλῃ  
εἰς τὴν χώρας.

LUKE viii. 31.  
καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν  
ἵνα μὴ αὐτοῖς  
ἐπιτάξῃ ἀπελθεῖν  
εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον.

On the third line we have clearly two synonyms, "to send away" and "to command to depart." Both may well come from  $\text{קָפַיַק}$  or  $\text{פָּעַיַי}$ , the causative of verbs meaning to "go out" or "go away," hence to "send forth." The fourth line is more difficult. Mark says that the demons "besought Him that He would not send them *out of the country*"; Luke, "they besought Him that He would not command them to depart *into the abyss*." Will it not be a decided gain, if we can show that these two expressions are, in Aramaic, so nearly alike as readily to be confounded by copyist or translator? The Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew  $\text{אָרֶץ}$  = earth, land, country, is  $\text{אַרְעָא}$ ,  $\text{אַרְעָא}$ . But the adjective which means lower, lowermost, infernal, is the very same in form,  $\text{אַרְעָא}$  or  $\text{אַרְעִיתָא}$ . These words are both used of Sheol or the underworld. There is also another word for "country," when used, as a townsman uses the word, of the region *outside* the busy haunts of men; this is  $\text{בְּרָא}$ ,  $\text{בְּרָא}$ . With prefixes, this word is used as a preposition, like the Hebrew  $\text{חוּץ}$ , and means "outside," "out of." Thus "out of the country," with verbs of rest, is  $\text{מְבָרָא לְאַרְעָא}$ ; with verbs of motion, as in the case before us,  $\text{לְמְבָרָא לְאַרְעָא}$ . But if a MS. omitted this  $\text{מ}$ , and still more if it omitted also the second  $\text{ל}$ , it would inevitably suggest the translation, "into the lower region," *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*. The difference therefore in Aramaic between these two strangely divergent phrases is really very slight.

Mark =  $\text{מְבָרָא לְאַרְעָא}$

Luke =  $\text{לְבָרָא אַרְעָא}$

4. In the narrative of the storm at sea we again have phrases used so similar as to suggest unity of source, and yet so diverse as to indicate translation from a slightly variant Aramaic text.

MATT. viii. 24.	MARK iv. 37.	LUKE viii. 23.
ὥστε καλύπτεσθαι } ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων }	ὥστε γεμίεσθαι	καὶ συνεπληροῦντο,
τὸ πλοῖον.	τὸ πλοῖον.	καὶ ἐκινδύνευον.

The verbs on the first line, "was covered with waves," "was filling," "they were being filled," are clearly synonymous phrases. We would suggest the verb ܦܘܫܘܬܐ as the probable original, which verb means to overflow, overwhelm, as in Psalm cxxiv. 4.

Then we have "the ship" in Matthew and Mark lying abreast of "were in danger" in Luke. Now we are able to fix confidently this latter phrase, for there is only one word in Aramaic, so far as I know, which possesses this meaning, and that is ܐܝܬܦܐܠ ܕܦܢܐ, Ithpael of ܦܢܐ. It occurs, for instance,

Deut. xxv. 3: Forty stripes shall be laid upon him; but with one less shall he be beaten, lest, if he be smitten beyond the thirty and nine, he *be in danger*. [The Palestinian Targum here illustrates 2 Corinthians xi. 24.]

"They were in danger" = ܐܝܬܦܐܠܢܐ. But the word for "ship" is ܦܢܐ, or, as it is spelt in the Samaritan Targum, ܦܢܐ. Is it not probable that this provincial form of the word "ship" stood in the Aramaic text, and was by copyist or translator read ܐܝܬܦܐܠܢܐ, "they were in danger"?

5. We will here give a case connected with the practice of representing numbers by letters of the alphabet, in which we venture to think that three numerals have been mistaken for a complete word. It occurs in the interpretation of the parable of the sower, and in describing the varying degrees of fruitfulness of the seed sown, we read that they yield fruit—

Matt. xiii. 23 : ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὁ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα.

Rev. Ver. : Some a hundred-fold, some sixty, some thirty.

Mark iv. 20 : ἐν τριάκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα, καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.

Thirty-fold, and sixty-fold, and a hundred-fold.

Luke viii. 15 : ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

With patience.

In accordance with the ancient mode of representing numerals by a letter of the alphabet, if we turn to any Greek codex we find :

Matthew : ο μεν ρ̄ ο δε ξ̄ ο δε λ̄.

Mark : εν λ̄ εν ξ̄ εν ρ̄.

There is a long-standing dispute whether εν should be read as the numeral ε̄ν or the preposition ἐν. The Latin codices for the most part read ε̄ν, the Greek and Syriac ἐν. The Revised Version gives ἐν, indicating "fold," as we say, "it yielded by the hundred"; but Lachmann, Anger, Alford, and others read ε̄ν in each case, "one thirty, one sixty, and one a hundred." There can be little doubt that our Revisers are correct; and if so, in an Aramaic codex we should certainly have in

Mark בל' ובס' ובק'

and with almost equal certainty

Matthew בק' בס' בל'

But just as there is vacillation as to the *order* of the numerals in our two Gospels, so the codices reveal uncertainty as to the occurrence of ἐν. The great codex B omits the second and third ἐν, and codex C omits the second ἐν. If we follow codex B, as probably carrying us back to the oldest text, we are led to the conclusion that the Aramaic text would be

בק' ס' ל' or בק' וס' ול'

If in the Aramaic copy used by Luke the signs of abbreviation were omitted, what then? There is no Aramaic root קסל, but there is a Hebrew word כִּסָּל, which



means confidence, hope, patient waiting. And is not this precisely the meaning of *ὑπομονή*? In the Septuagint *ὑπομονή* is used ten times, always as the translation of a derivative of the root  $\text{תָּוַן}$  = to hope for, to wait for with confidence. On two occasions where Jehovah is called "the hope of Israel" (Jer. xiv. 8, xvii. 13) the Greek word is *ὑπομονή*. But *ὑπομονή* is not equivalent to *ἐλπίς*. It is rather the underlying confidence which gives persistence to hope. If *ἐλπίς* is hope, *ὑπομονή* is the "patience of hope," the pertinacious, well-founded confidence which furnishes the pabulum to an ever buoyant hope. This is the force of *ὑπομονή* in the LXX. and, for the most part, in the New Testament, though in the Pauline epistles it glides into the meaning of "endurance." But if *ὑπομονή* means patient waiting, confiding hope, this is precisely the meaning of  $\text{לְסָבַב}$ , as the following passages prove :

- Prov. iii. 26: The Lord shall be thy *confidence*: He shall prevent thy foot from being taken.  
 Ps. lxxviii. 7: That they might set their *hope* on God.  
 Job viii. 14: Whose *confidence* shall break in sunder, and whose trust is a spider's web.  
 „ xxxi. 24: If I have made gold my hope, or said to fine gold, Thou art my *confidence*.

Many explanations have been given as to why our Lord's words should be in this instance differently reported in Luke, as compared with the other two evangelists. All three cannot be rigorously correct. We would submit as a probable theory, that in Luke's copy of the Aramaic Gospel the notes of abbreviation were absent, and the evangelist translated  $\text{לְסָבַב}$  as one word. Two considerations render this increasingly probable. (1) The affinity between  $\text{ס}$  and  $\text{ב}$ , and their liability to be interchanged. (2) The frequency with which Luke seems to decipher his Aramaic MS. by an appeal to Hebrew.

6. In the discourse as to the legitimacy of divorce, when

the Pharisees came to Christ, asking if it were lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, the Saviour's reply is recorded with slight diversity :

MATT. xix. 4.  
 ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς  
 ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ  
 ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

MARK x. 6.  
 ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς κτίσεως  
 ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ  
 ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

“He who made (them) from the beginning” thus stands in parallelism with “from the beginning of creation”; and then follows in both cases, “He made them male and female.” The original passage is Genesis i. 27: “Male and female created (בְּרָא) He them.” We believe then that the verb in the Aramaic Gospel would be בְּרָא; and “He who created” = בְּרִיא; but the noun “creation” is בְּרִיאָה: so that the only difference in the two first lines in an Aramaic text is the letter ’.

Matthew = מן אולא דברא  
 Luke = מן אולא דבריא

7. We have a striking case in the narrative of the raising of Jairus' daughter. We are told that the Saviour, after excluding all but the favoured three and the parents of the child, went into the room where she was, and what occurred there is thus narrated :

MARK v. 41.  
 κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς  
 τοῦ παιδίου  
 λέγει αὐτῇ,  
 Ταλιθά, κούμι.

LUKE viii. 54.  
 κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς  
 ἐφώνησε  
 λέγων,  
 Ἢ παῖς, ἐγείρου.

The second line is remarkable, as giving in my judgment clear evidence of an Aramaic original. The regular word for “child” is רַבִּי, feminine רַבִּיָּה, or, in the Palestinian Targums, רַבִּיָּה; but the verb which means “to call by name” is רַבִּי, Pae' of רַבִּיָּה. This verb occurs for instance

Isa. xliii. 1: Fear not, I have called thee (קָרָאתִיךָ) by thy name, thou art mine.

Exod. xxxi. 2: Behold, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Hur.

Jer. xx. 3: The Lord hath not called thy name Pashur, but They-who-slay-with-the-sword-shall-surround-thee-on-every-side. [Hebrew: Magor-missabib=terror on every side.]

As to the last line, we claim that the Aramaic Gospel contained the words קַמִּי מַלְאִיתָא = Maiden, arise. This is translated by Luke ἡ παῖς, ἐγγέλρου. By Mark, the words are first transliterated, and then translated τὸ κοράσιον, ἔγειραι. It is worthy of note that the word מַלְאִיתָא is found only in the Palestinian Targums; that is, those otherwise known as the Targum of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum.

8. We will now, for the first time, turn to the narrative of the young man who came to Christ to know what he must do to inherit eternal life, and show what evidence it presents of having once existed in Aramaic.

MATT. xix. 16, 17.	MARK x. 17, 18.	LUKE xviii. 18, 19.
καὶ ἰδοῦ, προσελθὼν εἰς	καὶ προσδραμὼν εἰς	καὶ ἀρχὼν τις
εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω, ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν αἰώνιον;	καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα κληρονομήσω ζωὴν αἰώνιον;	ἐπηρωτήσεν αὐτόν· Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας κληρονομήσω ζωὴν αἰώνιον;
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ Θεός.	εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ Θεός.

The regularity and substantial agreement in these parallel columns clearly bespeaks unity of source: yet there are slight verbal divergences which require the assumption of an Aramaic source for their elucidation. On the second

line we have similarity in diversity, and when we recall that Aramaic, like Hebrew, has strictly no indefinite pronoun, but is obliged to use the numeral  $\text{קָדַם} = \epsilon\lambda\iota\varsigma =$  "one," for  $\tau\iota\varsigma =$  "a certain one," then the similarity is increased. Matthew says, "One came towards him"; Mark, supplementing this from the testimony of an eye-witness, says, "One ran towards Him, and knelt to Him." But the Aramaic verb "to come to meet," "to come in front of some person or thing," is  $\text{קָדַם}$ : as in Psalm lix. 11, "The God of my goodness comes-to-meet me"; 2 Kings xix. 32, "The king of Asshur shall not come-before this city with shields." But the adjective  $\text{קָדָמִי}$  means *first* in point of place, time, or rank: *e.g.* in the Syriac New Testament, in Colossians i. 18, we read, "That in all things He might be first" or "chief,"  $\text{בְּכָל בְּרִיּוֹתָא קָדָמִי}$ ; and in Matthew xx. 27, the word  $\text{קָדָמִי}$  is used as the antithesis of  $\text{עֲבָדָא}$ : "Who-soever would be *chief*, let him be your bondservant." So in the Samaritan Targum,  $\text{קָדַם}$  is used of the rulers, or taskmasters, who exacted the tale of bricks after the straw had been withheld (Exod. v. 6, 13). It is doubtless a mere accident that instances so apposite as these do not seem to occur in the Jewish Targums. Luke, we suggest, knew from personal investigation that the young man was an  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$ , *i.e.* one of the first rank, a chief or ruler, and was thus predisposed to see an allusion to this in the word  $\text{קָדַם}$ , which the other evangelists connect with the verb  $\text{קָדַם} =$  to come to meet.

The difference between  $\epsilon\chi\omega$ , "that I may *possess*," and  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\nu\omicron\mu\eta\sigma\omega$ , "that I may *inherit*, eternal life," is nothing more than the difference between the stative and active meanings of  $\text{יָרַת}$ , which signifies both "to possess by hereditary right" and to "obtain as an inheritance."

Of much more importance is our Lord's reply. In the oldest and usually most reliable MSS., the reply given by our Lord is, in Matthew's Gospel, reported to have been,

“Why askest thou Me concerning the good?” whereas in the other two synoptic Gospels we find, “Why callest thou Me good?” If we can show that in Aramaic there is only the difference of one letter between these two questions, it will surely be a gain to biblical scholarship; still more so, if it should ultimately lead us back to the one correct report of our Saviour’s words. “Why callest thou Me good?” we read in Mark and Luke. If we follow the mere force of alliteration, perhaps the Old Testament passage which these words suggest to us is Isaiah v. 20: “Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil!” (הוֹי הַאֲמִירִים לְרַע טוֹב.) The Targum paraphrases these words. A *literal* Aramaic translation would be נִי דְאֲמַרִין לְבִישׁ טַב. Following this analogy, we obtain for Mark and Luke

A.                    לְמָא אֲמִיר אַתְּ לִי טַב

whereas the rendering in Matthew, “Why askest thou Me, or, speakest thou to Me, concerning the good?” is

B.                    לְמָא אֲמַר אַתְּ לִי לְטַב or לְרַטַב

I prefer to wait for the co-operation of others before applying the results of our investigations to the criticism of the Greek text; but is it not probable that the somewhat rare use of אֲמַר in the sense of “call” in *A* has led to *B*, and that *A* is the true reading?

The second part of the Saviour’s reply presents still greater difficulties, owing to the number of various readings; but we venture to think that the difficulties are wonderfully relieved by our hypothesis. Let us examine the various renderings:

Matthew, R.V.: εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός.

Mark and Luke: οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ Θεός.

Cur. Syriac: εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός ὁ Θεός. So Epiphanius.

Clem. *Strom.*: μόνος ἀγαθός ἔστιν [ὁ Θεός].

Justin :	<i>εἰς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.</i> So Marcosians in Irenæus.
Ptolemy :	<i>ἕνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πατέρα.</i>

We have here several very ancient readings, all derived, as we think, from the same original Aramaic text. It is a sound canon of literary criticism, that that reading is the most ancient from which all the others could be derived. What Aramaic text would, with very slight modifications, yield the variety of readings we have here presented? We would suggest

#### A. אִית אֱלֹהָ הַדְּדִיב

This means, "There is only one who is good." This is really the revised reading of Matthew: *εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός*, "One there is who is good," the prominent position of *εἰς* making it equivalent to *εἰς μόνος*. Ptolemy, whose writings are fragmentarily preserved in Epiphanius, retains the full text: *ἕνα μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθόν*.

A modification of this crept in, which we think was

#### B. אִית אֱלֹהָ הַדְּדִיב

"It is God alone who is good," הַדְּדִיב meaning both *unus* and *solus*. This change was the more likely to be made, as recalling a passage of which the Jews were very fond (Deut. xxxiii. 26): לֵית אֱלֹהָ אֱלֹהָ דִישְׂרָאֵל: "There is no God, only the God of Israel." *B* might also be rendered "There is one who is good, God," which is the reading of the Curetonian Syriac.

The next modification seems to have been

#### C. לֵית אֱלֹהָ הַדְּדִיב

This means, "There is none who is good save one." This variation would be liable to occur because אֱלֹהָ is usually employed with a negative. Then the combination of *B* and *C* yields our reading in Mark and Luke, "None is good

save one, (that is) God." In Justin and others the word God is changed into Father from reverential motives.

One other instance in the same narrative is well worthy of our consideration.

Matt. xix. 22: ἀκούσας δὲ τὸν λόγον ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος.

Mark x. 22: ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος.

Luke xviii. 23: ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περιλύπος ἐγένετο.

The verb *στυγνάζω* means to be amazed, astounded, stupefied. There are in Aramaic two cognate verbs, *ܨܡܫ* and *ܨܡܥܫ*, which have this meaning. The former is used of the stupefaction of Daniel, after he had listened to Nebuchadnezzar's dream (chap. iv. 19); and the latter is used of the consternation of Haman, when queen Esther said, "The adversary and enemy is this wicked Haman" (Est. vii. 6). Clearly either word could well describe the astonishment of the young man, who fancied himself sure of eternal life, but was told by one whose authority he revered, that for *him* at least nothing less than the surrender of all he possessed would save his soul from being corroded by worldliness. Assuming that the Gospel was first written in Aramaic, *one* of these verbs would certainly be used; and when we find abreast of this, in Matthew and Luke, *ἀκούσας*, *i.e.* *ܨܡܫ*, does not this go far to turn the assumption into an established fact?

II. We will now direct our attention to instances in which the Aramaic words which are obtained by the retransposition of two divergent Greek words differ in the *transposition of two letters*. These are few in number, as indeed the results obtained by the comparison of 2 Samuel xxii. with Psalm xviii. and of the proper names in 1 Chronicles with the same names as given in the earlier books of Scripture, would have led us to suppose. We have there only one instance of this character. We have

not more than four cases to adduce, as the result of our Aramaic researches, two of which have been already given.

1. In the narrative of lowering the paralytic through the roof, we find the word *ἐξορύξαντες* = "having dug out" (Mark ii. 4), standing in exact parallelism with *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*, "through the tiles" (Luke v. 19); and we showed, in our March paper, that the former is *חִפְרִין*, plural participle of *חִפַּר* = to dig; while the word for "tiles" is *פְּחִרִין*.

2. In the two accounts of the Sermon on the Mount given respectively by Matthew and Luke, when Matthew says, "They shall say against you every evil," Luke says, "They shall cast out your name as evil." We suggested in our May paper, that the verb to "speak-against" would almost certainly be *לִשׁוּא* or *לִשׁוּן*. But if, instead of *לִשׁוּן*, the scribe inadvertently wrote *יִשְׁלֹן*, this would suggest the verb *שָׁלַח* = to throw or cast, and explains the reading of Luke, "They shall *cast out* you, or your name, as evil."

3. In the parable of the sower, in recording what our Lord said about those who "have no root in themselves," while Matthew and Mark give *σκανδαλίζονται* = they stumble, Luke has *ἀφίστανται* = they fall away, apostatize. Now the verb which would certainly represent *σκανδαλίω* is *תִּקַּל* (= Hebrew *כָּשַׁל*), which, both in Peal and Ithpeal, means to stagger, to stumble. So Isaiah lix. 10, "We stumbled (*אתקלנא*) at noonday." But the verb to *fall away*, turn traitor, apostatize, is *אֶסְתַּלַּק*; e.g. in specifying who are not to partake of the passover, the so-called Targum of Jonathan mentions *בַּר יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּאֶסְתַּלַּק* = a son of Israel who has apostatized, fallen away from Judaism. When re-translated into Aramaic, the reading of Matthew and Mark requires *יתתקלון* or *יתקלון*, that of Luke, *יסתלקון*.

4. In the narrative of the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, there is a variant reading, which admits of solution in this way:



ΜΑΤΤ. xiv. 15.	MARK vi. 35.	LUKE ix. 12.
ὄψις δὲ	καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς	ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα
γενομένης	γενομένης	ἤρξατο κλίνειν·
προσῆλθον αὐτῷ	προσελθόντες αὐτῷ	προσελθόντες δὲ
οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	οἱ δώδεκα.
λέγοντες	λέγουσι ὅτι	
*Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος,	*Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος,	
καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν.	καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή.	

Here are surely abundant indications of free translation from a common source. On the first line, *ὄψις* = evening, stands abreast of *ὥρα πολλή* = a late hour; *πολλή* referring to the greatness of the number, drawing near to the twelfth hour. I would suggest that in the first line the original was *והיה שעת ערבית* = And it was the hour of evening, or, the hour of evening prayer. This Luke freely renders, "when the day began to wear away." In the last line we read in Matthew, "the hour (of prayer) has already gone by," *וכדו שעתא עברת*, the verb *עברת* being 3 s. f. pret. of *עבר*, which in Aramaic as in Hebrew means to go by, to go past; whereas the reading in Mark requires *וכדו שעת ערבת* = already it is the evening hour, a late hour.

J. T. MARSHALL.

### UZZIAH AND THE PHILISTINES.

THERE is perhaps no graver case of literary and historic injustice in the records of biblical study than the treatment accorded to the book of Chronicles, as respects its statements about Uzziah and his time, by one of the dominant schools of Old Testament criticism. As is well known, the critics to be named presently, parting company with their great pioneer Reuss, whose strength lay chiefly in literary judgment, feel themselves obliged to reject every historical statement in Chronicles not otherwise attested. Thus, in the matter now under inquiry, Wellhausen (*Encycl. Brit.*,