

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

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

THE GALILÆAN DIALECT.

ALL candid minds must readily admit that our argument is cumulative; and in such an argument the convergence of the lines of proof is a matter of vital importance. For instance, when it is ascertained by purely internal evidence that many of the divergences in the Synoptic Gospels are traceable to a variant rendering of the same or a closely similar Aramaic text, and when we turn to the Church Fathers, and find there abundant and unflinching testimony that the earliest Gospel was written by Matthew *Ἐβραῖστι*, which word in the New Testament always means "in Aramaic"—we have there *convergence of proof*. But further, Matthew was a Galilæan, and internal evidence shows that the Aramaic substratum did not extend much beyond the limits of the Galilæan ministry. The question then occurs, did Matthew's work possess any of the peculiarities of the Galilæan dialect? If we can show that this primitive record of the Galilæan ministry, written by a Galilæan, presents numerous dialectical peculiarities, we shall have a remarkable accumulation of evidence: the triple threads making an unbreakable cord.

We know from the record of Peter's denial that there was a clear difference between the Aramaic spoken in Galilee and that spoken in Jerusalem. Notwithstanding Peter's attempt to allay suspicion by engaging in conversation, he could not conceal his native dialect. The metropolitans came down on the luckless provincial then, as so often since, with the awkward charge, "Thy speech bewrayeth thee."

What were the provincialisms by which Peter was detected? We have three sources of information as to the

peculiarities of the language spoken in the more northerly districts of Palestine. (1) The anecdotes, perhaps caricatures, of Galilæan dialect, found in the Babylonian Talmud. (2) The discussions by rabbis who were natives of Galilee contained in the Palestinian Talmud. (3) The Samaritan Targum. This is confessedly a very ancient production, though its exact date is disputed. Walton holds that it cannot be placed long posterior to the erection of the temple on Mount Gerizim, because the need of a translation from the Hebrew would be imperative, as soon as regular worship was established. The Samaritans assign its composition to the priest Nathaniel, who died about 20 B.C.; while Gesenius fixes it in the first Christian century.

These three sources of information agree singularly in presenting the same features of dialectical peculiarity :

1. An indistinct pronunciation of the gutturals.
2. A confusion of cognate consonants.
3. An elision of the gutturals, and a disposition to run two or more words together.

The first two of these will now engage our attention. The third will be considered at some future time.

The Babylonian Talmud gives some amusing anecdotes of the provincialisms of Galilæans, which are collected in Buxtorf's Lexicon. We are told, *e.g.*, that a Galilæan who was a buyer of old clothes, etc., went about crying, אַמַר לְמֵאן אַמַר לְמֵאן, Who has any 'mar to sell? Whereupon the people said to him, What do you want? Do you want an ass, חֲמֹר, to ride upon; or wine, חֲמֵר, to drink; or wool, עֵמֶר, for clothing; or a sheep-skin, אֵמֶר, for covering? Dr. B. Fischer, in the supplementary matter which he has furnished to Winer's *Chaldäische Grammatik*, also gives a funny story from the same Talmud, of a Galilæan who was lowering a table by a rope into the street from an upper floor. He fastened the rope so that the feet of the table were a short distance from the ground, and while he was

coming downstairs, a man outside cut the rope, and ran off with the table. The Galilæan sent his wife to report the theft, and the man to whom she reported it understood her to call him a silly man whom a heretic stole and carried off, with his feet scarcely touching the ground. The changes due to dialect which caused the woman to be so grievously misunderstood are these: ך was sounded as ם, ף as ך, ן and ן as ך, and ם as ן. We have also the coalescence of one or two distinct words.

Dr. Neubauer maintains that the Palestinian Talmud represents most closely the language in which the Saviour spoke, and that "if any attempt be made to translate New Testament texts into their original idiom, the type of Aramaic there represented should be chosen for the purpose." He speaks of its provincialisms thus: "The gutturals are constantly interchanged. ך is written for ן, ן for ן, which is thus often not pronounced at all. Very often the ן and ן are omitted. The labial letters are pronounced more softly than in the Babylonian Talmud. Instead of ך and ם they use *va*; for ך the Galilæan rabbis have often *b*. For ך we find ך; even ך and ך are interchanged, and two words are often united into one."¹ I have been asked repeatedly why I have not fully adopted Dr. Neubauer's theory. In reply I may briefly say that the difference between us is but slight. We both agree that Jesus spoke Aramaic, that if His words were committed to writing, Aramaic would be the language employed, and that the document recording His discourses would contain features peculiar to the more northerly dialects of Palestine.

I wish now briefly to indicate for what reasons, and to what extent, I have been led to believe that the *Logia* resembled the Samaritan Targum. (1) Our method of procedure has been inductive. At the outset we were uncertain whether the original language might prove to be

¹ *Studi Biblica*, vol. i., pp. 61, 62.

Hebrew, as Dr. Delitzsch believed, or Aramaic, as is maintained by Dr. Neubauer; but we were very soon obliged to discard the Hebrew, as our identifications could only be effected by Aramaic words. In most cases these words are common to all the Targums, but by-and-by we noticed a decided leaning to words found only in the Palestinian Targum. We have not as yet made use of any words found only in Samaritan, but have noted that the assumption of the peculiarities of dialect, and especially of spelling, which occur in the Samaritan Targum enable us, in numerous instances, to explain divergences in the Gospels. We have *not yet* noticed that the assumption of peculiarities special to the Palestinian Talmud helps us in our researches. (2) The inhabitants of Samaria and Galilee were one nation—Israel as distinct from Judah. The whole northern kingdom was known to the Assyrians as Samaria, or the land of the house of Omri, and the immigrants whom they sent would in all probability occupy the whole district more or less. Thus though the peoples of Samaria and Galilee were in Christ's time divided for purposes of administration, and to some extent by religion, and though the mongrel character of the immigration would cause the survival of foreign words in some localities which were not known in others, there was the closest affinity between the Galilæans and Samaritans in respect of language. (3) It is very probable that the Samaritan Targum existed in written form during the lifetime of Jesus, and thus it is a contemporary record of what an inhabitant of Jerusalem would regard as north country dialect; whereas the Palestinian Talmud would not be committed to writing until perhaps 300 years later. (4) If the *Logia* and the Samaritan Targum were written in the same half-century, they present us the Aramaic language at the *same stage of literary development*, and we may expect the same want of fixity as to orthography in

both. (5) Granted that the disputations given in the Palestinian Talmud are those of Galilæan rabbis, some of whom lived in the first century, and that we have thus a specimen of Galilæan dialect, would even the tenacious memories of rabbis transmit dialectical peculiarities accurately through several centuries? Would not the dialect in which this Talmud was written be nearer that of the fourth century than that of the first? We have no wish, however, to be obstinate on the point. The matter is one to be decided by internal evidence. Let both be tested, and let the dialect which best explains the divergences of the synoptic Gospels be voted to be the one in which the *Logia* was written.

The difference between Dr. Neubauer and myself is practically reduced to a minimum, so far as this present paper is concerned, because I intend to confine myself to dialectical modes of pronunciation and spelling rather than of vocabulary, and in these respects there is little difference between the Palestinian Talmud and the Samaritan Targum. In reading this latter work, I have carefully marked and afterwards classified all the deviations which are idiomatic. This is scarcely the place to exhibit the full results of our investigations, but a few of the more striking features may be noticed.

1. Indistinct pronunciation of the gutturals. Each of the gutturals א, ה, ח, and ע is used instead of the others; the most frequent anomaly being that of ע for ח. Dr. Petermann says that the modern Samaritans do not pronounce the gutturals at all, but it is doubtful whether this has always been the case. When שמע is sometimes spelt שמק and מחה, מחק; and when in the story from the Babylonian Talmud, a Galilæan's ה sounded like כ, we seem to have evidence that in ancient times they pronounced the gutturals carelessly or indistinctly, rather than that they did not pronounce them at all. We will now adduce

several instances from the Samaritan Targum illustrating the indistinctness of pronunciation, and also the want of fixity in the orthography; reminding us of the eight ways in which Tyndall's Bible spells the word "it": and, as being the more curious, we will confine ourselves to cases where the same word is differently spelt in the same immediate connexion.

עמרה, wine,	Gen. ix. 21,	is written חמרה, ver. 24.
אמאר, sheep,	Num. xxviii. 7,	חמאר, vers. 3 and 8.
עקר, he fled,	Gen. xxxi. 21,	אקר, ver. 20.
לא, not,	Gen. xviii. 15,	לה, same verse.
מסחן, owner,	Exod. xxi. 28,	מסהן, ver. 22.
דהק, he took away,	Gen. xxxi. 18,	רעק, ver. 26.
ענל, he looked,	Gen. xii. 14,	חנל, ver. 12.
עללא, heaven,	Gen. i. 26,	חללה, ver. 28.
שלח, he sent,	Num. xx. 26,	שלע, ver. 28.
מחא, he smote,	Exod. vii. 20,	מעא, ver. 17.
חבר, neighbour,	Deut. xv. 2,	עבר, same verse.

2. Transmutation of cognate consonants. The most common case is that of the sibilants. This is indeed an old northern provincialism. It was by their pronunciation of שבֿלת, shibboleth, as סבֿלת, sibboleth, that Jephthah determined who of the fugitives were Ephraimites (Jud. xii. 6). So we have in the Samaritan Targum, אסה, a wife; סלח, he sent; סבע, seven; סבר, he hoped; סכן, he dwelt, occurring along with the corresponding form in ש. This occurs even in the same connexion.

רמש, to creep,	Gen. vii. 14,	is written רמס, same verse.
שני, years,	Gen. xxiii. 1,	סני, " "
באר שבע, Beer-sheba,	Gen. xxi. 32,	באר סבע, ver. 31.
מסחן, owner,	Exod. xxii. 15,	משחן, ver. 12.

We might show how ת interchanges with ש, ד with ז, ט with צ; but the most remarkable transmutation is that of ב and ו, which occurs some hundreds of times, and seems to imply that ב = b had the soft sound of ו. When ו has a daghesh forte, it is almost always written ב, to distinguish

it from ך, the sign of "o" or "u." It is remarkable to find in our Targum such forms as חזבא for חז״א = vision; צבאר for צ״אר = neck; and ז״ב for ז״י = skin: but much more so to find חזב for חז״י = appearance; so Genesis xii. 12, xxiv. 16, and לבח for ל״ח = a table. We will add other illustrations as before.

ט״רא, mountain,	Exod. xix. 25,	is written טברא, ver. 18.
ל״ט, curse,	Num. xxiii. 7,	לבט, ver. 8.
ב״ג, among,	Gen. xxiii. 10,	בנב, vers. 6 and 9.
ש״ה, to appoint,	Deut. xxii. 17,	שבה, ver. 14.

The word ח״י = he told, is usually spelt חבי, though in many cases we have a further deviation, and find הב״י = he told; as in Genesis xxix. 19, Exodus iii. 3, 9.

The converse reading of ך for ב is much more rare, but we have ה״י for חבי = give, Genesis xxx. 14; and ש״י for שבי = I play thee, Genesis xxxiii. 11.

And now we wish to show how the assumption of these dialectic forms in the Aramaic MSS. of the Gospel explains numerous instances of divergence in our synoptic Gospels.

I. The Gutturals.

1. We would briefly allude to two cases which have already come under our notice.

Luke ix. 39:	καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ	ערק בענין
Mark ix. 18:	καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας	חרק בשנין

The letters ח and ע are interchanged on every page of the Samaritan Targum; usually, though, ע stands for ח. In most cases no uncertainty arises; but if, in the *Logia*, ערק occurred for חרק, it would naturally suggest to a translator the idea of "departing," "fleeing away," rather than of "grinding the teeth."

2. Equally striking is the instance we gave in our last paper.

Mark iii. 5: They took counsel how they might *destroy* Him.

Luke vi. 11: They conversed what they should *do* to Him.

Mark=התמלכו דיאברון לה

Luke=התמללו דיעברון לה

3. In the narrative of our Lord's baptism we have two slightly variant expressions as to what occurred as Christ was being raised from the water after immersion.

Matt. iii. 16: And, lo, the heavens were opened (*ἀνεώχθησαν*).

Mark i. 10: And he saw the heavens rent asunder (*σχίζομένους*).

We would ask, if it can be a mere casual coincidence that the verb to open is פנא; and the verb to cleave, rend asunder, is פצע. The verb פצע occurs in the Palestinian Targum of Genesis xxii. 3, of Abraham cleaving the wood (LXX. *σχίσας*), and Judges v. 26, of the tent-peg with which Jael clove asunder the skull of Sisera; while פנא is used in Syriac and Targumic Aramaic of opening the mouth, or the formation of an orifice like the mouth.

Further, the word lo! *ecce!* is הוּ—the imperative used as an interjection, as in Genesis xxvii. 27, Lo! the smell of my son is as the smell of a field; and this imperative is identical in form with the Perfect Peal, “he saw,” and therefore the only difference in Aramaic, in the phrases before us, is this:

והוּי שמיא מתפצין

והוּי שמיא מתפצעין

4. We would now mention a case to which we alluded in our March paper without offering a satisfactory solution. A kind friend has suggested the following, which we gratefully adopt:

Mark v. 16: *πὼς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ.*

Luke viii. 36: *πὼς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.*

The equivalent of *ἐγένετο* is הוּא or הוּי, while the verb “to save,” to restore to life, or health, or sanity, whether

mental or spiritual, is ܩܝܝ. This meaning is not frequent in the Targums, but it is the constant word for *σώζω* in the Syriac New Testament, and hence may well have been current in this sense among the Galilæan apostles.

Mark=ܐܝܢ ܗܘܝ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܕܫܝܕܝܐ

How it happened to the demoniac (the man of demons).

Luke=ܐܝܢ ܗܝ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܕܫܝܕܝܐ

How He (Christ) saved the demoniac.

5. Our next illustration shall be drawn from our Lord's words, announcing the suddenness of His advent, when one shall be taken, and the other left.

Matt. xxiv. 41: *Δύο ἀλγήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ.*

Two women (shall be) grinding in the mill.

Luke xvii. 35: *Δύο ἔσονται ἀλγήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.*

Two women shall be grinding together.

Now the word for "mill," threshing-floor, or place where the corn is ground, is ܐܢܪܝܐ. It is used of the place where Boaz was winnowing barley, Ruth iii. 2; and of the place where Ornan was threshing wheat when he saw the angel, 1 Chron. xxi. 22. And the word for "together," "simul," ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, is ܒܥܝܕܝܐ, which of course is very easily confusable with ܒܐܪܝܐ. It is true that the form ܒܝܕܝܐ belongs rather to New-Hebrew than to the Targums; but, as we have said, this is what we are prepared for in Luke.

6. In the account of the Gadarene demoniac, when our Lord was landing on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, we read respecting the poor man:

Mark v. 6: *Ἴδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν.*

Having seen Jesus from afar.

Luke viii. 28: *Ἴδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας.*

Having seen Jesus, having cried aloud.

The Aramaic equivalent of ἀπὸ μακρόθεν is ܡܕܘܠܐ; of ἀνακράξας, ܡܟܠܐ, Aphel participle of ܟܠܐ, to roar or shout.

When used of men, it denotes the alarmed or distressed cry of an individual rather than a multitude.

Zeph. ii. 15: Whosoever passeth by shall cry out and wring his hands.

Micah vi. 9: The voice of the prophets of Jehovah crieth aloud unto the city.

Joel iii. 16: Jehovah shall shout (LXX. ἀνακράξεται) from Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem.

The difference in an unvocalized text is that of ה and כ, מכלל and מכלל. The occurrence of κράξας, a little farther on in Mark, we shall presently claim as a conflate reading.

By means of the adverb just quoted, or a closely allied form, we would now explain what has often been felt a difficulty in this threefold narrative of the Gadarene. Matthew viii. 30 says that there was *afar off* from them (μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν) a herd of swine feeding. Mark v. 11 and Luke viii. 32 say that it was *there* (ἐκεῖ). But we have a word תְּהִיב, which means "afar off," and also "there," "thither," "ibi," "illuc": only that the meaning "there" belongs rather to New-Hebrew than to Aramaic.

II. The Sibilants.

7. Our first instance of confusion among the sibilants shall be taken from the passage to which we referred in our last paper, as to the hiding of the lamp, where there is a slight divergence as to whether it is "under the bed" or "under the bushel."

Matt. v. 15: ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον, under the bushel.

Luke viii. 16: ὑποκάτω κλίνης, under a bed.

Luke xi. 33: ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον, under the bushel.

Mark iv. 21: ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, under the bushel or under the bed.

When we find that the word for μῶδιος is מֶדִי, which in the Palestinian dialect became מֶדִי, and when we know that one of the words for "a bed" is מֶדִי, and when we know further the readiness with which מ and ש change

places in a document contemporary with the *Logia*, we surmise that we have a duplicate rendering of one Aramaic word, probably סָרַן, and that in Mark we have a doublet. The word שְׁרִיָּא denotes not the pallet found in the houses of the poor, but a wooden structure, a couch or bedstead, as of course the context requires, if a lamp is to be placed under it. We have the word שְׁרִיָּא in the Targums, respecting the bed of Og king of Bashan (Deut. iii. 11): the couch on which, according to the Targum, Saul reclined at the feast from which David was absent (1 Sam. xx. 25); and the couches (Heb. garments) received in pledge from their debtors, upon which the wealthy reclined around the altars of heathen deities, carousing, as was their wont (Amos ii. 8). There can be no reasonable doubt that the divergence in our Gospels has arisen from the close resemblance of סָרַן or שׂוּא and שְׁרִיָּא.

8. On two occasions in the synoptists we have the verb "to find" standing in parallelism with the verb "to see," and we would explain this by a confusion of ש and ס.

Mark v. 15: They *beheld* the demonized one sitting, clothed, etc.

Luke viii. 35: They *found* the man from whom the demons had gone out, sitting, clothed, etc.

What difference exists in Aramaic between "they beheld, looked at," *θεωροῦσι*, and *εὑρουν*, "they found"? A very slight one when the style of spelling in the Samaritan Targum is considered. The verb to find is שָׁכַח or אִשְׁכַּח, Peal or Aphel. In the Jewish Targums the Aphel is more frequent, but in Samaritan the Peal of שכח, spelt שקח or שקע, is equally common. Further, the verb, to look at, gaze at, see, is סָכַח. It occurs, for instance,

Num. xxiv. 17: I have seen him, but not now; I have *beheld* him, but he is not near. When a king shall arise from Jacob, and the Messiah shall magnify Himself from Israel, He shall smite, etc.

Job xxiv. 18: He beholdeth not the path of the vineyard.

When we know the readiness with which **ש** and **ס** change places, even in the same verse, as we have seen, and how easily the gutturals interchange, it would be the easiest thing possible for **שכח** and **סכח** to be so written as to be undistinguishable from each other.

9. The second instance occurs in the narrative of the Transfiguration. After the disciples, overwhelmed with awe, had watched the heavenly visitants enter the cloud, we read in Matthew and Mark that "they saw Jesus only" (*εἶδον τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*): whereas Luke says, "Jesus was found alone." The passive of the verb "to find" is **אִשְׁתַּכַּח**; but this passive stands in parallelism with an active form, "they saw." Does that yield to our hypothesis? Exactly; for the Ithpeal of the verb **אִשְׁתַּכַּח** is more common in an active sense than the Peal itself.

1 Sam. xvii. 42: The Philistine *looked* (**אִשְׁתַּכַּח**) and saw David.

Exod. iii. 6, J.: He (Moses) was afraid to look at the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord.

Genesis xv. 5: Look (**אִשְׁתַּכַּח**) now unto heaven.

It is evident that "they saw," or "beheld" = **אִשְׁתַּכַּח**, while "was found" is **אִשְׁתַּכַּח**, which might be written **אִשְׁתַּכַּח**.

10. As elucidated by an interchange of sibilants, we would now quote two similar passages in which the Saviour reminds those around Him that the disciple is not above his teacher :

Matthew x. 25: It is sufficient for the disciple that he become as his teacher.

Luke vi. 40: When perfected, every (disciple) shall be as his teacher.

The contrast is between *ἀρκετόν* = it is sufficient, and *κατηρτισμένος* = perfected, brought to maturity, having "completed his education." It is striking how nearly alike these words are in the original language as spoken by Christ. The verb to *complete* is **שִׁיַּיֵּא**. It occurs in Genesis ii. 2

of the completion of the work of creation; Exodus xl. 32, of the completion of the construction of the tabernacle; and 2 Chronicles viii. 16, of the completion of Solomon's temple; while the verb *καταρτίζω* occurs seven times in the Greek scriptures of the book of Ezra, respecting the completion of the various parts of the second temple. These two verbs are then clearly equivalent. As for *ἀρκετόν* = sufficient, the Aramaic word is **מִסְתִּיָּא**. Its construction is peculiar; it takes suffixes of the person for whom a thing is sufficient. It is sufficient for thee = **מִסְתִּיָּךְ**, for him = **מִסְתִּיָּהּ**.

Job vi. 7: My soul refuses to touch them; they make me sickly they are enough for my meal.

Num. xii. 14: But it shall be sufficient for her (**מִסְתִּיָּהּ**) that she (Miriam) be shut out of the camp seven days.

Remembering that the passive participle *κατηρτισμένος* requires the passive participle of **שִׁיֵּץ**, we obtain for the divergent Greek phrases:

Matthew: **מִסְתִּיָּהּ דִּיהוּ תִלְמִידָא כְּמִלִּיפָה**.

Luke: **מִשְׁתִּיָּצִי יְהוּ תִלְמִידָא כְּמִלִּיפָה**.

11. One more case of this description. It is from the parable of the grain of mustard seed, which, though very small, grows into a tree:

Matt. xiii. 32: So that the birds *come* and lodge.

Mark iv. 32: So that the birds *are able* to lodge.

One verb, meaning "to come" is **בִּטָּא**, and **מִצָּא** means to find, to find means how to do a thing, to be able. The verb **מִצָּא** would be singularly appropriate here. The birds find (room) to lodge, are able to lodge.

The use of **מִצָּא** and **אִשְׁכַּח**, both of which mean "to find," in the sense "to be able," is illustrated in two other New Testament passages:

Luke v. 19: *Μὴ εὐρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν.*
Not *finding* how they might bring him in.

Mark ii. 4: *Μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσει αὐτῷ.*
Not *being able* to come near to him.

So Luke vi. 7: *ἵνα εὕρωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.*
That they might *find*, i.e. *be able*, to accuse him.

III. Interchange of כ and נ.

12. We pass on now to an exceptionally interesting group of instances in which the confusion lies in the free use of כ and נ. The word for "graves," "tombs," is קבריא. The word for "the city," in the Palestinian and Samaritan Targums, is קרייא. Now, if the scribe of the *Logia* wrote כ for נ, as is done often on every page of the Samaritan Targum, "the city" and "the tombs" would alike be קבריא. So we are quite prepared to find in the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac:

Mark v. 2: A man met him from the *tombs*.

Luke viii. 27: A man met him from the *city*.

13. In the description of the storm which occurred on the Sea of Galilee, we have the following variants:

Matt. viii. 24: *σεισμὸς μέγας*, a great storm.

Luke viii. 23: *λαίλαψ ἀνέμου*, a storm of wind.

Mark iv. 37: *λαίλαψ ἀνέμου μεγάλη*, a great storm of wind.

Clearly *σεισμὸς* and *λαίλαψ* are synonyms, and may well stand for the Aramaic זעפא. Our theory demands that we should prove the close resemblance in Aramaic between "great" and "wind." Now the word for "wind" is ריח or ריחא, which, like טבר for טור = a mountain, and לבח for לוח = a table, might be written רבחה; and the feminine of רב is רבתא. We have the very phrase in Job i. 19: "There came a *great storm* (זעפא רבתא) from the wilderness"; so that

a great storm = זעפא רבתא

a storm of wind = זעפא רבחה

We note again that the transcriber of Mark, cognisant of the various reading in the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel, adopts the naïve plan of inserting both readings, "a great storm of wind."

14. While the Saviour was present at the feast in the house of Matthew, the Pharisees came to the disciples and put to them the following question :

MATTHEW ix. 11.	MARK ii. 16.	LUKE v. 30.
διὰ τί	τί ὅτι	διὰ τί
μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν	μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν	μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν
καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν	καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν	καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν
ἔσθίει	ἔσθίει	ἔσθίετε
ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;	καὶ πίνει;	καὶ πίνετε;

On the last line the variants are "your Teacher," "He drinks," "ye drink." "The Master or Teacher" is רבא; "your teacher" is רבכון. The verb "to drink," in the sense intended by the spiteful Pharisees, is רתא. But *vav*, with a Dagghesh forte, is almost invariably written ב in the Samaritan Targum; therefore "He drinks" would be רבא, which is identical in form with "the Master." "Ye drink" = רביתון, or possibly רביתון; so that the members of the last line, unlike as they seem in Greek, are singularly alike in Aramaic.

15. In the narrative of the woman who was healed while the Saviour was on His way to the house of Jairus, we have the following divergent phrases :

Mark v. 33 :	εἰδὴν ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ.
	Knowing what was done to her.
Luke viii. 47 :	ἰδοῦσα ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθε.
	Seeing that she was not hid.

The verb "to be," הוא, is used in Ithpael, אהתה, i.e. אהתהבי, with the meaning *feri, effici*, to be done, effected—precisely the force of *γέγονεν* in our text. But the verb "to hide" is חבא, which, in the Targums, only occurs in

the Ithpael, אִתְּהַבִּי; e.g. Genesis vii. 19, The mountains were hidden (אֶחָדָבִיאִי). The difference between ἔλαθε and γέγονεν is thus very slight. We have seen that the negative אֵל = not, is in the same verse written לֹה and לֹא, while אֲתָהּ = to her, is לָהּ. The form וְ is the conjunction "that"; and also = *id quod*, that which; so that the divergence in Greek almost vanishes in Aramaic.

Mark: ידעא די לה תתהוי or תתהבי.

Luke: ידעא די לא תתחבי.

There are a few other cases which we had intended to introduce, but they must remain over for the present.

J. T. MARSHALL.

THE HUMAN SPLENDOURS,

OUR LORD'S THIRD TEMPTATION.

IN the polemic of the Bread Problem our Lord has related Himself to the ruling physical want of man; in the polemic of the Hebrew Problem to that elect race and its acquisitions. In the third discussion, He relates Himself to the world outside the Hebrew, and to the ruling moral want.

The splendours of human nature, in Greek, Roman, and Barbarian contents pass before Him, and originate the final inspections. Christ assumes in baptism also the direction of nations outside the Hebrew bounds. He is to awake a new spirituality, compose a new epoch, appropriate the essences of Greek and Roman and Teutonic antiquity, keep the human splendours from sinking into night. A deviation is suggested from the original plan entrusted to Him, into which, as into a last paradise, the spirit of divergence withdraws.

We shall arrive at some understanding of this last study by keeping close to the picture which the Literary Artist has drawn for us.