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JAMES A. MONTGOMRERY UNIVITRITY OF PHANEIHYANIA

MT. 1 19: 'Joseph her husband being dirauos and not willing to make an example of her.' It is to be objected against the usual translation of $\delta$. as 'righteous' that the husband qua righteous should have made an example of his erring wife. But the term means, after its later peculiar development, 'kind, merciful, benevolent'; cf. 6 èneos - MPTs, and s. Skinner, DB 4, 281 b, Ropes, JBL 1903, 216 ff., both of whom give other references. Note also Arabic sadily 'true friend.' Translate therefore: 'Joseph being a kind man.'

Mt. 21 41: кaxoùs кахcós àто入éбet aùroús. I had diagnosed the first two words as - Syr. . ביש 'very ill,' and so I find all the Syr. VSS translating, through their divination of the true background of the Greek idiom. Possibly original carês caries as barbarous was early changed to the present form.

Mk. 1 24: Variant text between oida and oidapev. The latter


 aggerated translation of the original verb, which was probably MO with sense 'bid one shat up.' The same verb lies behind exicturay at 8 30, 32, 3s, where the Standard Version tranalates $1^{\circ}$ with 'charge,' $2^{\circ}$ and $3^{\circ}$ with 'rebuke.' (In the first case it is an injunction of silence about Jesus' Messiahship, not a rebuke of the claim.) The Syriac translators translate both verbs with

[^0]MKD. The difficulty of étrripă was felt by one tradition of text of Mt. 1620 , which replaced it with סıaनтé̀ $\lambda$ evv.
 éraтóv, with variants in marg. proposing cis or $\stackrel{\text { c̈ }}{ }$ throughout.
 Ev in all three cases. Of the VSS OLat. and $\boldsymbol{y}^{1}$ read $\mathfrak{E v}$, unum, consistently in both citations. In the first case there is required either eas or ey throughont, like the consistent ev in the second. These variations of tradition indicate that the idiom of the original text in the repeated passage was not immediately sensible, however plausibly we may explain any one of the several readings. I would propose that in the original A ramaic there was the multiplicative expression known in the BAram., Dan. 3 19, 'one seven' $=$ seven times. (For the continuance of this idiom in later Aram., I note its occurrence in the Syr. to Dan, 118 , 13.) This would equally explain both ets and ev as Aram. $7 \pi$, the former possibly having been original in V . s .

 of syncretism of construction the second clause is the easily recognized nominal participial clause of the Semitic. In the third is the resolution of the finite construction into the infinitive, common in late Heb. and Aram.; cf. Dan. 2 10, 5 15, and the interplay of these constructions in Dan. $15,217 \mathrm{f}$.
 met by AV, 'he would have passed by them,' or better 'he was for passing by them'; but Oenely hardly has this meaning. The original verb is to be found in Kyב, used in Targ. to Jonah 1 4, where the interesting Heb. idiom
 'the ship was seeking to break up.'
 toüras. The sense is perfectly clear: 'I see men walking like trees.' The original idiom is evident from the Syr. here, 'I see men as trees that [they are] ryalining,' or as it might also be put, 'I see men that as trees [they tre] walking.' The verb io $\mathrm{o}^{\mathrm{\omega}}$ appears to have been introduced to rive construction to the bald participle of the original.
 are naturally puzzled by a verb which means 'were scared.' And the same verb is used of the Lord's anguish in the Garden, 1433 , along with ídnuoveî. It is a case of translation of some Semitic psychological term with several shades of meaning. Thus the usually very strong root antw has in Dan. 422 (10) the mere sense of being 'embarrassed.' (Cf. the French development in 'désole'.) I suggest that the original Aram. was $\operatorname{Fin}$ or Finl, used here in the sense of being 'surprised,' and that irOamßeir was chosen for its assonance with the Sem. root, as frequently in the Gr. translations.
 translation, 'he bad yet one, a beloved son' is literal but clumsy, correcting the AV, which treats ëva as an indefinite article. The numeral doubtless represents the Heb. and Aram. TIT, with its Gr. translation monoyevis for the only son or daughter (e.g. Jud. 11 34), even as in the Syr. VSS of the Gospels the same word is used to translate the Johannine movoyenis, epithet of the Lord, the Sem. background of which is necessary to the exegesis of it. The original form may have been it MTM TTP TIT. The translator nicely separated the two appositives, or else the numeral would have been taken as merely the indefinite article.

Mk. 15 22: Гo入үo日à tótov. The appositive $\tau$. has given trouble; s. a long discussion on it by Vincent, in his Jérusalem, 2,92 f. It is simply the Aramaic NาN 'place' used after placenames. See a discussion of the term in my monograph, Origin of the Gospel According to St. John, 1923, 15.
 $\dot{\text { a }} \boldsymbol{i} \dot{\text { o }}$ oov́. The indefinite pl. act. ( $n$. b. also the present tense) is the construction common in BAram. in place of the pasaive; e. g. notably Dan. 4 22, 'with the dew of heaven they (will) wet thee,' postulate here avenging angels or demons as subject.

Jn. 4 6; 13 25: 'Jesus was sitting so (ourres) by the well;' 1325 'He reclining so (ov'тces) upon Jesus' breast.' The adverb has always given trouble. Cf. a mere suggestion of mine in the monograph on St. John, p. 21, where I proposed that it -

Aram. MD (kadû) in the sense, 'as he was.' But in reading the 14 th century text of the Life of Mar Yaballaha III (ed. Bedjan, 1895), I have come upon another sense of kadû which might be applicable here. There, always with the conj., lâ wěkadu frequently appears in adversative clauses as 'not only,' opposed to 'ella 'but also;' and this idiom is noticed by Payne Smith, Thes., s. v. But I find an instance in Mar Yaballaha where keada is used absolutely, as 'only,' p. 105, l. 5 ab inf.: 'Two questions he asked him, Whence art thou, and, What is thy name, only (wēkad $\hat{u}$ )." Now this sense of 'only, alone' would capitally suit the Gospel cases: Jesus sitting alone by the well, the disciple reclining alone upon Jesus' breast. The particle will then have developed from the sense of 'just as it is' to 'only so.' The chief objection to this explanation would be that the Syriac example is taken from a late document. I may notice the similar Arabic vocable fakat, used also at the end of the phrase in the sense 'only' and 'alone.'
 $\dot{v} \pi \eta=\chi^{c v} ;$ I am inclined to think that in this perplexing passage Mévov represents an abs. inf. in the original, i. e. לק (ANIT often - $\mu^{\prime}$ vecy), the abs. inf. appearing abundantly in early Syriac literature. The meaning appears to be: 'Did it not remain yours and even when sold continue in your power?'. By some hind of casuistry, comparable with the process with the kurban, the guilty pair tried to evade the communistic appropriation of their real estate by turning it into cash.
 positional phrase probably represents $7 \boldsymbol{T}=$ 'through,' per, and does not involve physical contact.
 idiom is that in Dan. 62 (1) and $\theta$ translates as here.
 he 'remained with them.' The nuance is different from Lu. 9 13, 'there came to be with the angel.' yiveotau here translates $\mathrm{NTO}^{\mathrm{N}}$; s. note on 54.
 Time, per se, was not taken in those watchless days. Now the
ninth hour was significant in the case of both Cornelius' and Peter's prayers because it was the great prayer-time of the day ('the time of the evening oblation' Dan. 9 21); and in 1030 we have the exact ritual expression, tiv ívíт"p тробcuरómevor, 'praying the nine o'clock prayers.' And so in our verse we expect time at which. The original evidently had this, expressing it after common Heb, and Aram. use with D, the very prep. which is found in the passage cited from Dan., which most translators erroneously render 'about.' And so $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ translates
 here with iorei тepi.
 тâs ... juraloùta. The clumsy relative clause is cleared up if we take $\dot{\omega}$ as representing the indefinite relative conjunction ${ }^{\top}$ (and so 7 in Heb.), anglice, 'and from all things, as you could not be justified in the law of M., every one is justified.'

Acts 15 27: ávarye $\lambda \lambda$ ortas. Ppl. with futore sense, as common in Aram., and so e. g., 247 toùs owơouévovs. Cf. my monograph on St. John, p. 18, and add to instances cited there

 тetayuévor eis Y̌uìv àcóvolv. Translators and commentators have
 so with a theological touch, praeordinati, followed with a fortunate amelioration by the EVV 'ordained.' Bat tároeo appears as the translation of D ר 'inscribe, sign' in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to Dan. 613 (12), and that it is not an error is evident from its repetition in a Heisplaric plus in the same verse, e. g. in Cod. A. We have here some Hellenistic use of $\tau \dot{a} \sigma \sigma a v$, doubtless with ivtácrean 'register' (e. g. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ Dan. 5 24) in mind. Tranglate here, as we might expect, 'those who were registered for eternal life;' cf. Dan. 12 1; Phil 4 ; Rev. 13 8, etc.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In presenting these few notes the writer taker pleasore in acknowledging his great indebtedness to Professor Torrey'e meveral distinguished contribations to the general aubject.

