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 unaltering testimony that the earliest Gospel was written by Matthew Ἐβραῖος τι, 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, "Who has any 'mar to sell? Whereupon the people said to him, What do you want? Do you want an ass, עֵבֶר, to ride upon; or wine, וֵין, to drink; or wool, צֵר, for clothing; or a sheep-skin, כֶּפֶן, for covering? Dr. B. Fischer, in the supplementary matter which he has furnished to Winer's Chaldæische 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: ב was sounded as מ, פ as ג, נ and ב as ב, and ג as ג. 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. י is written for נ, נ for נ, which is thus often not pronounced at all. Very often the נ and נ are omitted. The labial letters are pronounced more softly than in the Babylonian Talmud. Instead of ב and ד they use נ; for הו the Galilæan rabbis have often ב. For ב we find ב; even ל and ג are interchanged, and two words are often united into one." 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
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Hebrew, as Dr. Delitzsch believed, or Aramaic, as is main-
tained 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 assump-
tion of the peculiarities of dialect, and especially of spell-
ing, 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 peculia-
rities 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 immi-
grants 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 pur-
poses 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 lan-
guage 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 נ, נ, נ, and י is used instead of the others; the most frequent anomaly being that of י for נ. 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 וַּמְעַ and בֵּית, וַּמְעַ; and when in the story from the Babylonian Talmud, a Galilæan's נ sounded like ב, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Verse(s)</th>
<th>Corresponding Word</th>
<th>Corresponding Verse(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִבְנָא, wine</td>
<td>Gen. ix. 21</td>
<td>יִבְנָא, ver. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִבְנָא, sheep</td>
<td>Num. xxviii. 7</td>
<td>יִבְנָא, vers. 3 and 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בִּנְיָמִין, he fled</td>
<td>Gen. xxxi. 21</td>
<td>בִּנְיָמִין, ver. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, not,</td>
<td>Gen. xviii. 15</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, same verse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, owner,</td>
<td>Exod. xxi. 28</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, he took away</td>
<td>Gen. xxxi. 18</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, he looked,</td>
<td>Gen. xii. 14</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, heaven,</td>
<td>Gen. i. 26</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, he sent,</td>
<td>Num. xx. 26</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, he smote,</td>
<td>Exod. vii. 20</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, ver. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעַלָּה, neighbour,</td>
<td>Deut. xv. 2</td>
<td>הָעַלָּה, same verse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 הָשָּׁבֵל, shibboleth, as הָשָּׁבֵל, sibboleth, that Jephthah determined who of the fugitives were Ephraimites (Jud. xii. 6). So we have in the Samaritan Targum, אֲחָס, a wife; אֲחָס, he sent; עֵבֶר, seven; עֵבֶר, he hoped; עֵבֶר, he dwelt, occurring along with the corresponding form in ש. This occurs even in the same connexion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Verse(s)</th>
<th>Corresponding Word</th>
<th>Corresponding Verse(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דָּוִים, to creep,</td>
<td>Gen. vii. 14</td>
<td>דָּוִים, same verse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּוִים, years,</td>
<td>Gen. xxiii. 1</td>
<td>דָּוִים, &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּאָרָה שָׁבְעָה, Beer-sheba,</td>
<td>Gen. xxi. 32</td>
<td>בּאָרָה שָׁבְעָה, ver. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּאָרָה שָׁבְעָה, owner,</td>
<td>Exod. xxi. 15</td>
<td>בּאָרָה שָׁבְעָה, ver. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We might show how ה interchanges with ש, י with י, מ with מ; but the most remarkable transmutation is that of ב and ד, which occurs some hundreds of times, and seems to imply that ב = ד had the soft sound of ד. When ד has a dagesh forte, it is almost always written ד, to distinguish
it from י, the sign of "o" or "u." It is remarkable to find in our Targum such forms as נביה for נבYA = vision; זרבא for זרבא = neck; and ב for ב = skin: but much more so to find בכר for בכר = appearance; so Genesis xii. 12, xxiv. 16, and ליב for ליב = a table. We will add other illustrations as before.

The words נברא, mountain, is written נברא, ver. 18.
נברא, curse, Num. xxiii. 7, ליב, ver. 8.
ליב, among, Gen. xxiii. 10, בבר, vers. 6 and 9.
ליב, to appoint, Deut. xxii. 17, ישיב, ver. 14.

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

The converse reading of ר for ר is much more rare, but we have רבר for רבר = give, Genesis xxx. 14; and רבר for רבר = I pray 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 μόνος ἀποχωρεῖ
Mark ix. 18: καὶ τρίζει τοὺς δόντας

The letters פ and פ are interchanged on every page of the Samaritan Targum; usually, though, פ stands for פ. In most cases no uncertainty arises; but if, in the Logia, פפפ occurred for פפפ, 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.

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 (ἀνεῴχθησαν).

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

We would ask, if it can be a mere casual coincidence that the verb to open is נפתח; and the verb to cleave, rend asunder, is פרל. The verb פרל 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 נפתח 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 וש— 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:

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: πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ.


The equivalent of ἐγένετο is נתר or נב, while the verb "to save," to restore to life, or health, or sanity, whether
mental or spiritual, is יִּדְעָה. 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 Galilean apostles.

Mark—How it happened to the demoniac (the man of demons).
Luke—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 ἀλήθονται ἐν τῷ μύλῳν.
Two women (shall be) grinding in the mill.
Two women shall be grinding together.

Now the word for “mill,” threshing-floor, or place where the corn is ground, is נֶחֶרֶס. 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 נָחַרְרָב, which of course is very easily confusible with נָחַרְרָב. It is true that the form נָחַרְרָב 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: ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρῶθεν.
Having seen Jesus from afar.
Having seen Jesus, having cried aloud.

The Aramaic equivalent of ἀπὸ μακρῶθεν is לֶפֶל; of ἀνακράζας, לֹא לְבָנֵי, Aphel participle of לָבָנֵי, 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. ἄνακράξεται) from Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem.

The difference in an unvocalized text is that of י and י, מֵלֶה and הֵלֶּה. The occurrence of κράξας, a little farther on in Mark, we shall presently claim as a conflated 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 יָלֵל, 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 τῶν μόδιων, under the bushel.

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

Luke xi. 33: ὑπὸ τῶν μόδιων, under the bushel.

Mark iv. 21: ὑπὸ τῶν μόδιων ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, under the bushel or under the bed.

When we find that the word for μόδιος is יָשָׁר, which in the Palestinian dialect became יָשָׁר, and when we know that one of the words for “a bed” is יָשָׁר, and when we know further the readiness with which ד and ש change
places in a document contemporary with the Logia, we surmise that we have a duplicate rendering of one Aramaic word, probably נֵיפָר, and that in Mark we have a doublet. The word נֵיפָר 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 נֵיפָר 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 נֵיפָר or נְיפָר and נֵיפָר.

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 נֵיפָר and נֵיפָר.

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," אָבָרֵא, and אָבָר, "they found"? A very slight one when the style of spelling in the Samaritan Targum is considered. The verb to find is אָבָר or אָבָר, Peal or Aphel. In the Jewish Targums the Aphel is more frequent, but in Samaritan the Peal of אָבָר, spelt אָבָר or אָבָר, is equally common. Further, the verb, to look at, gaze at, see, is אָבָר. 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 š and 6 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 הָנָשׁ and אֱלֹהֵי 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 הָנָשְׁב; 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 אֲנָה is more common in an active sense than the Peal itself.

1 Sam. xvii. 42: The Philistine looked (םֵאמֶר) 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 (אֲנָה) now unto heaven.

It is evident that “they saw,” or “beheld” = אֲנָה, while “was found” is הָנָשְׁב, which might be written מֵהָנָשְׁב.

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 ἀρκετῶν = 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 ἀρκετήσει. 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 καταφέροντω 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 ἀρκετὸν = sufficient, the Aramaic word is לָשׁוּנָיָה. Its construction is peculiar; it takes suffixes of the person for whom a thing is sufficient. It is sufficient for thee=משתני, for him=משתנייה.

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 (Miriam) that she (Miriam) be shut out of the camp seven days.

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

Matthew: נָשְׁתִּינוּ הָרוֹא הַלָּמוֹדָה נְכָלִיָּה.

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 מָצֵא, and מָצֵא means to find, to find means how to do a thing, to be able. The verb מָצֵא would be singularly appropriate here. The birds find (room) to lodge, are able to lodge.

The use of לָשׁוּנָיָה and מָצֵא, both of which mean “to find,” in the sense “to be able,” is illustrated in two other New Testament passages:
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Not finding how they might bring him in.

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

So Luke vi. 7: ἵνα εὑρωσί καταγγείλην αὐτῷ.
That they might find, i.e. be able, to accuse him.

III. Interchange of ב and 1.

12. We pass on now to an exceptionally interesting group of instances in which the confusion lies in the free use of ב and 1. The word for "graves," "tombs," is נברך. The word for "the city," in the Palestinian and Samaritan Targums, is נריר. Now, if the scribe of the Logia wrote ב for 1, as is done often on every page of the Samaritan Targum, "the city" and "the tombs" would alike be נברך. 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.
Mark iv. 37: λαίλαψ ἀνέμου μεγάλη, a great storm of wind.

Clearly σεισμὸς and λαίλαψ are synonyms, and may well stand for the Aramaic עומר. Our theory demands that we should prove the close resemblance in Aramaic between "great" and "wind." Now the word for "wind" is רוח or נשון, which, like לכב for מבר = a mountain, and לכת for לוח = a table, might be written כרכום; and the feminine of כרכום is כרכנה. We have the very phrase in Job i. 19: "There came a great storm (ереֶמֶא כרכנה) from the wilderness"; so that

a great storm = כרכנה רבחת
a storm of wind = כרכנה רבחת
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Matthew ix. 11.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mark ii. 16.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Luke v. 30.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τί</td>
<td>διὰ τί</td>
<td>διὰ τί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν</td>
<td>μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν</td>
<td>μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν</td>
<td>καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν</td>
<td>καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔσθει</td>
<td>ἔσθει</td>
<td>ἔσθετε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;</td>
<td>καὶ πίνει;</td>
<td>καὶ πίνετε;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the last line the variants are "your Teacher," "He drinks," "ye drink." "The Master or Teacher" is נבנ; "your teacher" is נבנ. The verb "to drink," in the sense intended by the spiteful Pharisees, is נבנ. But נא, with a Daghesh forte, is almost invariably written נא in the Samaritan Targum; therefore "He drinks" would be נא, which is identical in form with "the Master." "Ye drink" = נא, or possibly נא, or possibly נא; 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mark v. 33:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Luke viii. 47:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἶδεν ὁ γέγονεν αὐτῇ.</td>
<td>ἤδεισα ὅτι οἶκ ἐλαθε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing what was done to her.</td>
<td>Seeing that she was not hid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb "to be," נבנ, is used in Ithpael, נבנ, i.e. נבנ, with the meaning fieri, effici, to be done, effected—precisely the force of γέγονεν in our text. But the verb "to hide" is נבנ, which, in the Targums, only occurs in
the Ithpael, וַתַּשְׁרִי; "e.g. Genesis vii. 19, The mountains were hidden (וָתַּשְׁרִי). The difference between אֲלַל and γέγονεν is thus very slight. We have seen that the negative אָל = not, is in the same verse written אָל and אַל, while αὐτή = to her, is אַל. The form יד is the conjunction "that"; and also = id quod, that which; so that the divergence in Greek almost vanishes in Aramaic.

Mark: ידֶעַ דֶּרֶךְ הַתָּהְדְּרִיבָּרְבָּי or דֶּרֶךְ הַתָּהְדְּרִיבָּרְבָּי.

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.