

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

DUPLICATE TRANSLATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

IN the present paper we wish to call into requisition a deeply interesting phenomenon, which occurs in the second Gospel; *viz.* the existence of what we hope to show are duplicate translations of the Aramaic text. As we have casually hinted in our previous papers, some of the ancient scribes, when they were acquainted with two various readings of the passage they were copying, seem to have shrunk from the responsibility of deciding which was correct, and to have interwoven *both* into their MS. This peculiarity is by no means universally to be found in MSS. It seems to be limited both as to place and time, and thus due to a common influence. It occurs (1) in the Samaritan Targum; (2) in certain MSS. of the Septuagint, notably those which represent the recension of Lucian, who was priest at Antioch in Syria, and died A.D. 312; (3) in the copy of the Gospels known as the Curetonian Syriac; (4) in those New Testament codices which give what is known as the Syrian text; and also, as we hope to show, (5) in the Gospel of Mark, in the oldest text which extant MSS. supply to us. It would thus appear that the practice to which we refer was Aramæan as to its *locale*, and was in vogue in the earlier centuries of our era.

A few illustrations from each of these sources will elucidate and help to establish our position.

First we will give a few specimens from the Samaritan Targum. In each case the scribe seems to have known of two current translations of the one Hebrew word, and in his uncertainty as to which he should adopt, to have inserted both.

Gen. i. 27: And God *created, designed* (וּבְרָא וַיִּכְוֶן), man in His image, in the image of God designed He him, male and female designed He them.

- Gen. ii. 3: God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He *rested, ceased* (בטל פסק), as to all the work which God created to make.
- Gen. iii. 22: And now if he shall . . . take from the tree of life, and eat and *live, continue* (וחי ורף), for ever.
- Gen. xiv. 9: And Tidal *king, ruler* (מלך שלטון), of peoples.
- Gen. xxii. 16: And the word of Jehovah said, By Myself have I sworn, in *return, recompense* (חלק מרוק ד), for thy having done this, . . . I will bless thee. . . .

Our illustrations from the Septuagint we will gratefully borrow from Canon Driver's scholarly work, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. On page lvi, under the head of "Features of the Septuagint which are not Original Elements in the Version, or Due to the Translators," we have examples given of double renderings or "doublets." Our selection from Canon Driver's list shall be guided by the desire to adduce at least one example of each of the classes of clerical errors to which Semitic texts are liable.

1. Diverse vocalization of the same consonants.

In 1 Samuel vi. 7, in the description of the kine that were to convey the ark back to the land of Israel, there was evidently uncertainty among Greek translators whether the Hebrew word עול should be pointed עול=a yoke, or עיל=a suckling. The former would mean, "kine on whom there had come no *yoke*," the latter, "kine with whom was no *suckling*." The recension of Lucian testifies to the existence of both these renderings, for it places them side by side thus: ἀνευ τῶν τετεγγμένων ἐφ' ἃς οὐκ ἐπέερεθι ζύγος.

Change of consonants.

In 1 Samuel vi. 12 it is equally evident that the word in our present Hebrew text וָעֵי, "and lowing," was in some MSS. וָעֵי, "they were weary," for under a desire to preserve both readings Lucian's recension reads: "In a straight road they went, they were weary (ἐκοπίων), in one road they went lowing" (βοῶσαι).

In 1 Samuel xiv. 40, where our Hebrew Bible reads, "Then said he [Saul] unto all Israel, Ye shall be *on the one side* (לעבר אחד), and I and Jonathan will be *on the other side*" (לעבר אחר), the recension of Lucian has, "You shall be *for slavery* (εἰς δουλείαν)

and I and Jonathan will be for slavery," and then *follows* the correct translation as we have given it. The strange mistake arose from mistaking לעבר for לעֲבֵר, inf. of עָבַר, to serve.

3. Omission of a consonant.

In 1 Samuel xviii. 28, where we read, "And Michal the daughter of Saul loved him," Lucian's MSS. read, *καὶ Μελεχὸλ ἡ θυγατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ ἠγάπα αὐτόν*. This is clearly a combination of two various readings which were current in Hebrew MSS. :

ומיכל בת שאול אהבתהו
וכל בית ישראל אהבהו

4. Transposition of adjacent consonants.

2 Samuel vi. 2. The approved text of the LXX. reads ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ Ἰουδα ἐν ἀναβάσει="From the rulers of Judah, in the ascent." The former half only occurs in the Hebrew מַבְעֵלֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן. Whence then comes ἐν ἀναβάσει? Clearly from a second reading obtained by the transposition of the first two letters, ' במעלה = in the ascent of Judah.

In the very important Syriac translation of considerable fragments of the Gospels, discovered by Dr. Cureton in a Nitrian monastery, and which has recently been with consummate skill retranslated into Greek by a German scholar, F. Baethgen, there are several instances of double translation. These are collected by the editor in his masterly introduction, and from this list we take the following :

Matt. viii. 9: The Greek words ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας="having under myself soldiers," are in the Curetonian Syriac translated literally; and *also* side by side with this are the words וואית לי שולטנא אף לי, "and I have authority, even I."

Luke xxii. 25: εὐεργέται is, as in the Peshito, rendered עבדי טבתא="doers of good"; and *also* דשפיר עבדין="those who act well."

Luke xxiii. 15: The Curetonian Syriac reads, "Nothing worthy of death has been done by Him, has he found against Him." This is a composite rendering of ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ.

There are also cases (like those in the Samaritan Targum) where *one* Greek word is translated by *two* Syriac synonyms, which are placed side by side.

Matt. v. 13: $\mu\omega\rho\alpha\nu\theta\eta$ ="have lost its savour," is rendered by the *two* words ܘܠܫܟܗ ܘܬܫܬܐ ="become foolish, become insipid."

Luke viii. 6: $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta$ ="was withered," is represented by the synonyms ܒܝܢ ܘܝܒܫ .

Luke xx. 16: $\mu\grave{\eta} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ becomes ܘܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܫܘܒܘܠܐ ="Gracious and let it not be." ܫܘܒܘܠܐ alone= $\mu\grave{\eta} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$. The rest is a literal translation appended.

Textual criticism of New Testament Greek MSS. reveals that the same process was at work there also, within the same geographical area. Thus far, we have found that it is Aramæan scribes with whom this mode of editing MSS. was fashionable; and it is very interesting to note that it is those Greek Testament MSS. which textual critics assign to the *Syrian text*, in which the scribes systematically combine the readings of earlier texts, and thus produce what are known as "conflate readings." The word "doublet" in the terminology of New Testament criticism is generally used to designate those passages in which the same incident or discourse is given *twice* in *the same* Gospel. It is perhaps not necessary to say that we have not thus far used the word in this sense, but as equivalent to double or conflate readings. Drs. Westcott and Hort, in their Introduction to *The New Testament in Greek*, have given several instances of this process. Two of these we will cite, in order to compare them with the instances we wish to introduce.

Mark ix. 49:

(α) $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho \pi\upsilon\tau\iota \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. (\aleph) B L Δ , etc.

(β) $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. D, etc.

(δ) $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho \pi\upsilon\tau\iota \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.

A C N E F G H K M S U V Γ II, etc.

Our learned editors contend, and very reasonably, that (a), "for every one shall be salted with fire," is the oldest reading; that a reminiscence of Leviticus ii. 13, "And every gift of your sacrifice shall be salted with salt," caused (β) to appear in some codices instead of (a), the change being helped by the words that follow in Mark, *καλὸν τὸ ἄλας, κ.τ.λ.* Then at the time of the first Syrian recension, the two incongruous alternatives were simply added together; and this is the reading of the Peshito Syriac, the Latin Vulgate, and the great mass of uncials quoted above, almost all of which give a Syrian text.

Mark vi. 33: "And they ran together there on foot from all the cities." After this **Ν** B read *προῆλθον αὐτούς*, "and outwent them"; D, *καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ*, "and assembled there"; whereas eleven uncials, which usually give a Syrian text, *combine* the two readings, *καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν*.

As the result of the foregoing investigations, we are led to see that the readings which are duplicated by the scribe are of two kinds: (1) Those which he knows to be variant renderings of the original work of which his text is a translation. (2) Those in which the various readings that the scribe combines are due to clerical errors in repeatedly transcribing the translated work. Most of the conflate readings of the Syrian text of Greek Testament MSS. are of this latter class. Most of the other instances we have adduced belong to the former; and it is to the former class also, to which the double readings in Mark's Gospel belong, to which we now wish to direct attention, and which we wish to prove to be due to a double translation of the same or a slightly variant Aramaic text.

Now as to our method. We will use as an illustration one of Canon Driver's list of doublets in the Septuagint. In 1 Samuel vi. 12, in reference to the kine that were dragging the cart and the ark to Bethshemesh, our Hebrew Bible has the word *וַיִּלְוּ*, "and lowing as they went." But side by side with this the LXX. has *ἐκοπίων* = they were weary. The student then sets himself (as in thousands of other cases) to inquire what Hebrew word resembling *וַיִּלְוּ* the Greek translator had before him, or thought he had,

when he wrote *ἐκοπίων*, and at once he fixes on *עג*, 3 pl. Pret. of *עג*.

But our problem is more intricate than this. Suppose that all Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament had perished in the dissolution of the Jewish state, and the Greek MSS. were all that had survived. Suppose, further, that the recollection of an original Hebrew had almost passed away, being only casually alluded to in some ancient authors, and that the general impression prevailed that the LXX. was the original work, how should we then proceed? Suppose one MS. of Samuel read *καὶ βοῶσαι*, and the word in exact parallelism with this in another MS. was *ἐκοπίων*, while a third MS. gave both *καὶ βοῶσαι* and *ἐκοπίων*, would not the fact that the first of these when translated into Hebrew yielded *עג*, and the second *עג*, furnish a filament of probability? and if the cases could be multiplied manifold, should we not then have a *cord* of probability strong enough to “draw the inference” that the Greek MSS. were translations from various readings of a common Hebrew text?

We will first adduce instances of a simple character in which words or phrases of synonymous import are duplicated in Mark's Gospel, just to show that we have here, to all appearance, the same phenomena as we have noted in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Curetonian Syriac, and the Septuagint, where we *know* that the doublets are in the translation, and not in the original, but are due to a peculiar habit of Aramæan scribes.

1. Matt. viii. 16: *ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης.*
- Luke iv. 40: *δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου.*
- Mark i. 32: *ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδν ὁ ἥλιος.*

The passages before us all refer to the incidents of the evening of the day on which Jesus healed Peter's mother-

in-law. The description is in each case substantially the same, and presents phenomena which imply unity of source. The first Gospel opens with the words, "And it was evening"; the third, "And when the sun was setting"; the second combines the other two, "And when it was evening, when the sun was setting." May we not reasonably assume, being aware of the ancient tradition that the first record of our Lord's ministry was written in Aramaic, that we have various translations of the same Aramaic phrase, $\text{וְכַךְ הָיָה עֶבְרִית}$ = "and when it was evening, or sunset"? for עֶבְרִית means, as Buxtorf says, "tempus vespertinum, ab solis occasu."

2. Another instance is to be found in the narrative of the transfiguration.

Matthew xvii. 1: And He leadeth them up into a high mountain *apart* (κατ' ἰδίαν).

Mark ix. 2 agrees with Matthew verbatim, but adds $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ = *alone*.

We would suggest that the common Aramaic was לְחֹד , or perhaps better, בְּלְחֹדְהוֹן . In most passages, when בְּלְחֹד occurs in the Targum, $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is found in the LXX., though κατ' ἰδίαν = individually, privately, precisely, hits off the literal meaning of בְּלְחֹד . The reading in Mark, κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους , is, we believe, a double translation of the one Aramaic word.

3. In the narrative of the young ruler who came to Christ to ask what he must do to inherit eternal life, all three evangelists record that our Lord recited several precepts of the decalogue; but in Mark x. 19 we have both $\mu\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\psi\eta\varsigma$ = thou shalt not steal, and $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ = "thou shalt not rob." It is evident, since our Lord would not wish to add to the decalogue, that $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ is a variant translation of the original commandment, and as such was inserted by some very early scribe alongside the more common Greek rendering.

If any of my readers demur that these three cases, though interesting, fall short of *proof* of the existence of an Aramaic original, I am precisely of the same opinion. As the occurrence of synonyms in the several Gospels is doubtful evidence of translation from a common source, so is the repetition of synonymous words in the same Gospel. It is when the repeated words are *not* equivalent in meaning, like *καὶ βοῶσαι* and *ἐκοπιῶν*, that we are able to bring our method into play. If, when the duplicated words are translated into Aramaic, we obtain Aramaic words which are very nearly alike, but not identical, we are able then to infer that the divergent Greek words are due to a various reading in different MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel.

We will first, for the sake of completeness, mention one or two cases which have been casually alluded to in our previous papers.

4. Respecting the leper who came to our Lord when He had descended from the Mount of Beatitudes, it is said—

Matt. viii. 3: And his leprosy was cleansed (*ἐκαθαρίσθη*).

Luke v. 13: And his leprosy departed (*ἀπῆλθεν*).

Mark i. 42: And his leprosy departed and was cleansed.

Now if the words “was cleansed” and “departed” are very nearly alike in Aramaic, we shall have valuable evidence. We would suggest that the original reading was *סְגִירוּתָה אֶתְנַקַּת* = “his leprosy was cleansed.” The verb was by some scribe altered to *אֶתְנַרַּת* = fled, removed, departed. This appears in Luke. Then some worthy progenitor of Lucian, when transcribing the second Gospel, wishful that both renderings should be preserved, combined them, *ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη*.

5. In the triple narrative of the storm at sea, the severity of the storm is described as follows :

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

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

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

The words *σεισμός* and *λαίλαψ* are synonymous, and may well both come from **עפא**, the word which is used of the wind which blew down the house in which Job's sons and daughters were met together. In this passage (Job i. 19) we have the words **עפא רב־תא**, and we suggest that this was the original reading of the evangelic narrative. This became **עפא רב־תא**; and this, in accordance with the practice which occurs often on every page of the Samaritan Targum of writing **ב** for **ב**, was interpreted to mean **עפא רוח** = "a storm of wind." Then, in order to avoid losing the correct reading, both are combined by some early scribe of Mark's Gospel.

6. We will now consider the next verse, where we have the words in which the horror-stricken disciples addressed their Lord, who was asleep on the pillow. Their words are variously given, as we shall see.

MATT. viii. 25.	MARK iv. 38.	LUKE viii. 24.
Κύριε,	Διδάσκαλε,	Ἐπιστάτα,
σώσον ἡμᾶς,		ἐπιστάτα,
ἀπολλύμεθα.	{ οὐ μέλει σοι }	ἀπολλύμεθα.
	{ ἀπολλύμεθα. }	

On the first line we have three titles applied to the Saviour. What a stumbling-block such cases are in the way of those who maintain that the common "source" was in Greek! On the theory of an Aramaic "source," however, this is precisely what we should expect would occur. What Aramaic word do these three titles represent? *διδάσκαλε* might suggest **רַב־תּ**; *κύριε* and *ἐπιστάτα* suggest **מֶרֶךְ**. Have we any means of deciding? Let us see. Luke repeats *ἐπιστάτα*, and the parallel word in Matthew is *σώσον ἡμᾶς*. Are these alike in Aramaic, so as to be

easily confused? They are very nearly alike, if we assume מִרְּךָ, O Lord! or מִרְּנָךְ, our Lord! to have been the original title of address; for "save us" is מִרְּנָךְ, the imperative of נָטַר, to protect, preserve, save.

We note that all three synoptists have ἀπολλύμεθα, "we are perishing," whereas Mark has also οὐ μέλει σοι; "dost Thou not care?" We will now examine if οὐ μέλει σοι; is not a second rendering of the original text. In Syriac and Targumic Aramaic there is a word בְּטַל, which in the Peal of both languages means to cease from toil, desist, be disengaged. But, as is often the case, from this same root idea the meanings of the other conjugations diverge so as to be scarcely recognisable. In Syriac the Ethpeal means "to be careful," "take care." For instance:

- Luke x. 34: The Samaritan "placed him on his ass, and took him to the inn, and *took care* of him."
 Gal. ii. 10: Only that we should remember the poor; and I *was careful* to do this very thing.
 2 Tim. ii. 15: Be careful that thou mayest present thyself perfectly before God, a workman without cause for shame.

This evidently suits οὐ μέλει σοι; But is it not remarkable that in the Targums the Ithpael of the verb בְּטַל means "to be destroyed," to perish," "zerstört, vernichtet werden"?

- Psalm v. 11: Let them be *destroyed* by their own plans.
 Job xxii. 16: Wicked men . . . who *were destroyed* from the earth when it was not their time, whose body decomposed in the depth of the sea.
 Eccles. xii. 3: In the day when the molar-teeth of thy mouth *perish* until they cannot masticate food.

Can any one deny, in view of all the other evidence, that the diverse meanings of אַתְּבַטַּל in cognate dialects supply the explanation of the dual rendering in the second Gospel?

7. Our next illustration shall be drawn from a sum-

marized statement found in Mark and Luke as to the general effect produced by the early Galilæan ministry.

MARK i. 28.	LUKE iv. 37.
καὶ ἐξῆλθεν	καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο
ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ	ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ
εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρον	εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου.
τῆς Γαλιλαίας.	

There could be no clearer case of translation from a common source, especially if we can show that the addition of τῆς Γαλιλαίας in Mark is due to a composite reading. Of course the word for Galilee is ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ. Is the Aramaic equivalent for ἡ περίχωρος = the region round about, very like this? Just alike, with the exception of one vowel. It is ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ = "circuitus," "Umkreis"; as in Ezekiel xlvii. 8. Clearly then there were two current renderings of the word ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ, and the scribe, familiar with this fact, preserves both in his copy of Mark.

8. Once more we would direct attention to the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac. When our Lord landed on the eastern side of the lake, we read of the poor man as follows :

MARK v. 7.	LUKE viii. 28.
ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν	ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
ἀπὸ μακρόθεν } κράξας }	ἀνακράξας
προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ,	προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ,
καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε.	καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε.

Here are evident indications of unity of source. The two synonyms for obeisance are in keeping with the theory of translation, but are not able to prove it. But when we find that the Aramaic equivalent to the participle ἀνακράξας = "having shouted aloud," is ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ, while ἀπὸ μακρόθεν is ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ, we have, in the close resemblance in an unpointed text between ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ and ܢܗܠܝܠܝܢ, strong evidence

of translation from an Aramaic source. An early copyist of Mark's Gospel was, we assume, acquainted with these two Aramaic readings, and in his uncertainty as to which was correct took the cautious, if somewhat uncritical, plan of inserting both in his text, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν κρᾶξας.

9. And now we will turn to the parable of the sower, where we have two deeply interesting instances of doublets in Mark's Gospel. All three Gospels agree in the reading, "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God" (Matt., heaven); after which comes—

Matt. xiii. 11: ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται.

Luke viii. 10: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς.

Mark iv. 11: ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς.

The contrast here is between those who know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, the initiated, and those to whom it is not given to know them, the uninitiated. This latter class are called οἱ λοιποὶ and οἱ ἔξω. In a similar sense οἱ λοιποὶ occurs in Luke xviii. 9 of the Pharisees who "despised τοὺς λοιπούς," not "others," but the uneducated, the uninitiated, those outside their own guild or fraternity. So the Pharisee thanks God that he is not as οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (ver. 11). Similarly οἱ ἔξω, "those who are without," is used of those who are not Christians, who are outside the pale of the Christian fraternity (1 Cor. v. 12, Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. v. 6). Now the Aramaic word which best represents both these is חַלּוּנִי, which means an outsider, one who is not included in a favoured community or guild. One outside the favoured nation is נַבְרַ חַלּוּנִי (Deut. xvii. 15, J.); and one who does not belong to the guild of priests is called by the same name Isaiah xxiv. 2: "As with the people (חַלּוּנֵי אֶרֶץ), so with the priest." If one who is not-an-Israelite and one who is not-a-priest is called חַלּוּנִי, this would assuredly be the word to designate one who is not-a-Christian, not belonging

to the true Israel, the true priesthood, outside the favoured fraternity to whom it is given to understand the mysteries of the kingdom. These are the *οἱ λοιποὶ* or *οἱ ἔξω*.

Whence then comes *ἐκείνοις*? In Aramaic "those" is הלין. How nearly like this is to הלון or הלוני is apparent. Is it not clear then, that there were two various readings current in the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel, להלין = *ἐκείνοις*, and להלני = *τοῖς λοιποῖς* and *τοῖς ἔξω*? Both are in the second Gospel found side by side.

10. A further case occurs in the interpretation of the parable, as to that part of the seed which falls on the footpath.

MATT. xiii. 19.	MARK iv. 15.	LUKE viii. 12.
ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρός, καὶ ἀρπάζει	ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἶρει	ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει
τὸ ἐσπαρμένον	{ τὸν λόγον } { τὸν ἐσπαρμένον }	τὸν λόγον
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	ἐν τ. καρδίαις αὐτῶν.	ἀπὸ τ. καρδίαις αὐτῶν.

The point to which we would direct special attention is the doublet in Mark. Luke says, "The devil cometh and taketh away *the word*"; Matthew, "*that which was sown*"; Mark, "*the word which was sown.*" Are these due to a slightly variant reading in the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel? Let us examine. The equivalent of *ὁ λόγος* is ܠܘܓܘܢ—a word, we may note, which is much more common in the Palestinian Targums than in the Babylonian. But the verb to *strew, scatter* is ܠܦܘܬܘܢ; as we read of Moses that he strewed (ܠܦܘܬܘܢ) the powdered gold upon the stream of water, and made the people drink it (Exod. xxxii. 20, J.). In one respect ܠܦܘܬܘܢ is more striking than *σπείρω*. The seed which falls on the pathway through the cornfield is not deliberately and intentionally placed there, it is not strictly *sown*; it is rather blown there by the wind: and this is precisely the idea involved in ܠܦܘܬܘܢ, which means to *strew*

or scatter by the wind, and hence also to winnow. If we translate τὸ ἐσπαρμένον into Aramaic, we obtain ܐܦܪܡܝܢܐ, fem. Pahil participle, with ܦ prefixed. We thus obtain two similar readings, ܦܠܚܐ or ܦܠܚܐ = "the word," and ܦܠܚܐ = "that which is sown": and just as in the LXX., the Samaritan Targum, and the Curetonian Syriac, both various readings are so often preserved side by side in the translation, so here we have τὸν λόγον and τὸν ἐσπαρμένον preserved side by side by a scribe who had been trained in the same Aramæan school.

J. T. MARSHALL.

THE DIVINE LOOKING-GLASS.

"But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves. Because if any man be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like a man looking at his natural face in a glass: for he looked at himself, and has gone away, and straightway he forgot what manner of man he was. But he that gazed into the perfect law of liberty, and continued (gazing), not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his doing."—JAMES i. 22-25.

IF St. James is the most practical, he certainly is not the most prosaic, of the inspired writers. He is a born poet, though he writes no poetry. He can hardly pen a sentence without lighting up his thought with some homely yet charming figure. A kinsman of the Lord Jesus, he has more of the manner of the Lord than any other of the apostles; like Him, he speaks in parables, and without a parable he can hardly speak at all. In the verse which precedes these he has exhorted his readers to receive the word into an honest and good heart. *That*, at least, is the substance of his exhortation. But he gives it this lively and poetic form. The heart of man is like a foul plot of ground, over-run with weeds and thorns. The pure word of God