

the revealed Majesty of God in Christ, and to make confession before that white, awful, soul-searching splendour of holiness and love, before the final disclosure of our human guilt and the Divine righteousness made in the spilt blood of Jesus, is doing this. He gives the lie to his Maker and Judge. Impenitence in men who know the gospel, is the most tremendous and daring insolence we can conceive.

GEO. G. FINDLAY.

*PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S ARAMAIC GOSPEL.*

OWING to absence from home in the early part of September, I was unable to notice Prof. Marshall's "Reply" to Mr. Allen and myself in time for last month's EXPOSITOR. I must at the outset express my very sincere regret that the tone of Mr. Allen's criticism should have seemed to Prof. Marshall to be lacking in courtesy. As I shall hope to show in the course of the present paper, Mr. Allen's confidence in the substantial justice of his case was not misplaced; still, I am sure it was as far as possible from his intention to treat Prof. Marshall with disrespect, or to do him an injustice. In an investigation such as that which Prof. Marshall has undertaken it is always an advantage, where a difference of opinion exists, to hear at length the facts and considerations which may be urged on either side; though I must own that the facts adduced by Prof. Marshall in his Reply do not materially modify the judgment I had previously formed. But I must demur, in principle, to the attempt made by Prof. Marshall to fasten upon me the responsibility for "all" that Mr. Allen's papers contain. My prefatory note indicated indeed that I considered Mr. Allen's criticisms to be generally conclusive, and from this position (as will appear) I find no occasion to recede; but I do not think that the terms which I used can in fairness

be treated as holding me responsible for every single statement, and every single expression, which they contain. No doubt, had I been writing the papers myself, I should have stated some of Mr. Allen's points differently, in some cases, perhaps, expressing myself more explicitly and precisely, in others guarding myself by qualifications which he has omitted; but I could not expect Mr. Allen to accommodate everything that he wrote exactly to my own judgment, without destroying the independence involved naturally in the fact that he, and not I, was the author. I was, and am, perfectly prepared to "countersign" Mr. Allen's criticisms in their general import and tenor; but I must protest against the responsibility which I thus accept being held to extend to every particular statement and expression which his papers contain.

Without further preliminaries, I will take at once *seriatim* the definite objections urged by Prof. Marshall against Mr. Allen's criticisms. It is to be observed that in some instances the issue does not turn upon Aramaic usage, as such, but upon a literary judgment: which of two alternative *ideas* is the more likely to have been expressed by the writer of the original gospel?

II. 1. (p. 180). Prof. Marshall here complains that Mr. Allen (p. 463 of his second article) has imputed to him an inconsistency in the use made by him of two Aramaic idioms, of which he is guiltless. When I read in proof the passage referred to, I understood the usages cited to be meant as illustrations of the varying style of the Targums, without perceiving, or considering, how far the terms in which they were spoken of attributed definitely an inconsistency to Prof. Marshall himself. In so far as they do this they undoubtedly do him an injustice; and Mr. Allen desires to express his regret that he should, by inadvertence of language or any other cause, have imputed to Prof. Marshall the inconsistency complained of. At the same

time, it may be pointed out, Mr. Allen's conclusion that Prof. Marshall is too apt to select his vocabulary from the remoter corners of Aramaic literature does not depend for its "basis" upon the four examples there cited, but upon an induction extending over all parts of Prof. Marshall's papers. And it may be observed, further, *à propos* of כִּטְיָא, that Prof. Marshall makes no attempt to defend either his singular grammatical explanation of this expression, commented on by Mr. Allen (p. 458), or his theory (*ib.*, p. 459) that כִּטְיָא may have had the force of ἐδεήθη.

2. The Aramaic פִּרְךָ means *to rub, crumble, break in pieces* (Payne Smith, *fricuit*, in the passive *comminutus, contritus est*). It is not very common in the Targums, but it occurs in the Palestinian Targum of Num. 33, 52 of breaking in pieces an idol, and in that of Eccl. 3, 3 of breaking down a building. In the Talmud it is more frequent: Levy (*N.H.W.B.*) gives numerous examples, representing it by *zerbröckeln, zerreiben, zermalmen, zerstückeln*. In Syriac, also, it is not an uncommon word, being used, for instance, of breaking up clods of earth (for the Greek διαλύειν), in the passive to represent ψαθυρὸς (*friable, crumbling*, of soil); and in Luke 6, 1 both in the Peshitto, and in the Lectionary of the Palestinian Christians referred to by Prof. Marshall, of the disciples *rubbing* the ears of corn (Gk. ψάχειν). No instance is quoted in which פִּרְךָ has, even in appearance, the meaning "dry up, parch, fry" (Prof. Marshall, *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1891, p. 210), except the four passages from the Targums, cited by Mr. Allen, Isa. 24, 7; Ps. 80, 17. 90, 5; Lam. 4, 8. If in these passages it really means *to dry up*, it can mean it only in a secondary sense, in so far as the *crumbling or breaking to pieces*, which the word properly denotes, is the effect of heat: in other words, it would only denote a thing as parched or dried up in so far as heat had the effect upon it of causing it to crumble and fall to pieces; and thus used, it might be

applied to grass, or a tree, scorched by the sun or (Ps. 80, 17) by fire, or even to the skin (Lam. 4, 8) shrunk and shrivelled up in a protracted famine. But in view of the predominant, not to say exclusive, use of the word elsewhere (to *rub*, *crumble*, etc.), it cannot be regarded as certain that, in the four passages quoted, פֶּרֶךְ does mean *to dry up*: it is at least a tenable view that it simply means *to be crumbled* or *fall to pieces*, being used in this sense quite naturally in the first three passages, and hyperbolically in the fourth. That it was felt to express a different idea from *dry* (יָבֵשׁ) is apparent from the first two passages cited from the Talmud by Levy, Pes. 68b, יְבִישָׁה מִפֶּרֶךְ פְּרִיכָא, if (a scab) is dry, it *falls to pieces*; Chull. 46b, if the lung is so dry (יְבִישָׁה) that it can be *rubbed to pieces* with the nail, the animal may not be eaten. Clearly, in these passages, פֶּרֶךְ denotes a consequence following from dryness, not dryness itself. When, therefore, Prof. Marshall says (*l.c.*), "There is an Aramaic verb פֶּרֶךְ which means (1) to dry up, parch, fry," he does not quite correctly represent the facts: he gives the reader no opportunity of knowing that this sense of the word is exceedingly rare, and that it is even open to question whether it occurs at all. Prof. Marshall does not say distinctly (*l.c.*, p. 211) which of the two alternatives there given he supposes to represent the original text of the gospel; but from his words on p. 189 of his recent article, it may be inferred to be the second (καὶ ξηραίνεται). But I venture to think that any one who considers carefully the use of פֶּרֶךְ, פֶּרַךְ, will agree with me that it is exceedingly doubtful whether it is a suitable or probable word to have been used to express that effect of the action of the evil spirit upon the afflicted boy, which St. Mark represents by the verb ξηραίνεται.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It was a satisfaction to me, after I had written the above note, to find that Kohut, in his recent elaborate and enlarged edition of the *Aruch* of R. Nathan, recognises no meaning for פֶּרֶךְ, even in Lam. 4, 8, except that of to *rub* or *break in pieces* (zerreiben).

3. It was, perhaps, an omission on Mr. Allen's part not to state the facts respecting טללל somewhat more fully: but Prof. Marshall, also, is too hasty in assuming that it has the definite sense of "roof." Commonly, as Mr. Allen correctly says, it denotes a covering in the figurative sense of *protection*; where it is used with a concrete force, its meaning is not at once apparent. Zeph. 2. 14 does not prove that it means a *roof*; it corresponds here to the Heb. ארזה, *i.e.* (as it seems) cedar-work (viz. of the ruined palaces of Nineveh), which makes it probable that it denotes rather the carved *ceiling* of a room: Levy renders it *Gebälk*. In the Talmudic passage (Berachoth 19a) to which Prof. Marshall appeals, it is rendered *ceiling* by both Levy and Jastrow (who cites two other examples of the same meaning). I could grant, reluctantly, that טללל *might* be used in Mk. 2, 4; but the word does not satisfy me: a term denoting the *lower* side of a roof appears to me to be unsuited to the context.<sup>1</sup>

III. 1. סליקו for ἀπεστέγασαν. This was a point on which I was doubtful myself whether Mr. Allen's criticism could be sustained; and, though I suspect פשׁ (Pesh., and the Lectionary) would have been the better word in Mark 2, 4, I will not dispute that סליק might also have been employed.

2. Matt. 9, 2 ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον = Mk. 2, 3 αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων. Prof. Marshall (*ib.*, p. 215) explains the variation between "four" and "bed" thus: "The Aramaic word for four is אַרְבַּעָה; but one of the synonyms for *bed* is אַרְבַּעָה, strictly, that on which one stretches oneself, lies down at full length, a bed; or rather, may we not say a *stretcher*?" Would not any reader of these words suppose

<sup>1</sup> The Lectionary uses for στέγη in Matt. 8, 8 ὤψ; *i.e.* (according to Nöldeke, in his very thorough study of the dialect of the Lectionary, in the *Z.D.M.G.* 1868, p. 517 note) ὄρφος, which is also (*ibid.*) to be restored for ὤψ; in Mark 2, 4.



But the passages from the Pal. Targums, which he quotes for the purpose of confuting Mr. Allen, have not, unfortunately, the cogency which he attributes to them. They prove indeed that מַלְטַל means (by a weakening of the primary sense of the root) to *move from place to place*, to *move on*, to *remove*, but not that it means to *bear* or *carry*.<sup>1</sup> Let it not be said that the difference is a slight one, or that I am hypercritical in drawing such a distinction; it is just such shades of meaning which, in translating into a foreign language, have to be most carefully noted and taken account of. In our own language, for instance, there are doubtless many sentences in which *move* or *carry* could be used indiscriminately; but how absurd it would sound to say, "He went out, *moving* his child with him"! And even here, of the two synonyms, *carrying* and *taking*, which might be substituted, how readily might a foreigner make a mistake in the idea which he intended to convey! The Pesh. represents ἀρόμενον by ܐܪܘܡܢܐ, the Lectionary by ܐܪܘܡܢܐ: these really express the idea of "being carried," or "borne," which, in spite of Prof. Marshall, I cannot consider that מַלְטַל does.

4. Prof. Marshall demurs to Mr. Allen's statement that מַלְטַל does not mean "thrown down." But is he sure that he has rightly translated the passage of Ps.-Jon. (Exod. 23, 8), which he has quoted to prove the contrary? Does not מַלְטַל חַכְמִיָּא מִמּוֹתֵבְנִיהוֹן mean "And *expels* the wise from their abodes"? *Abode* is the common meaning of מוֹתֵב in this Targum (see Gen. 36, 43; Exod. 10, 23; 12, 20; 35, 3; Lev. 3, 17; 7, 26, etc.); and in Walton's Polyglott the rendering is "errare facit." Compare, from another Pal. Targum, Ps. 68, 13 אִימְלַטְלוּ מִן פִּלְטְרִיהוֹן "are

<sup>1</sup> In Exod. 16, 29, Lev. 25, 14, "move" and "moveable" (Levy, *bewegliches*), not the narrower ideas of "carry" and "portable," are manifestly intended; and in Deut. xix. 14 the Sam. מַלְטַל represents the Heb. הָסִיג, which is not to "carry" but to "remove."

expelled from their palaces." It surely will not be denied that the proper meaning of טלטל, both in Heb. and in Aram., is to *hurl away, drive forth, banish*. Shebna, no doubt, when "hurled" from his dignity, was also "thrown down" from it; but the word used by Isaiah (22, 17) denotes the former idea, not the latter.

It is still left uncertain whether Prof. Marshall considers *αἰρόμενον* or *βεβλημένον* to represent the original Aramaic. The unsuitability of מטלטל, as expressing the former, has been pointed out. If מטלטל, as expressing the latter, be preferred, even though it were conceded that it meant *thrown down*, it clearly must mean *thrown down with violence*. Is it, therefore, at all a likely term to have been chosen to denote the manner in which the unfortunate paralytic was deposited on his couch? *βεβλημένον* may seem to be rather a strong term (yet cf. Matt. 10, 34, and note its use in Mark 7, 30 of a girl *after* her cure), but it is not so strong as מטלטל (with the assumed meaning) would be. The word to which it would naturally correspond is  $\text{ܠܫܝܢ}$ , which is actually used here, as well as in the similar passage, 9, 2, and in Mk. 7, 30, by both the Pesh. and the Lectionary. In the Pesh. the same verb is used in Gen. 21, 15 (for *השליך*) of Hagar's *casting* Ishmael *down* under the tree. I cannot think that Prof. Marshall has found the right word for either *αἰρόμενον* or *βεβλημένον*.

5. Prof. Marshall seeks (May, 1881, p. 384 f.) to explain the variants *εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν* (Mt. 17, 1; Mk. 9, 2) and *εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι* (Luke 9, 28) by a confusion between עלאה, *very high*, and צלאה, *to pray* (strictly, between לטור עלא and לטורא לצלאה, the resemblance between which is not quite so great). Mr. Allen denies that עלא is the equivalent of ὑψηλός; and again Prof. Marshall demurs. It is difficult not to think that Mr. Allen is right.  $\text{ܥܠܐ}$ , like the Heb. עליון, denotes what is *elevated* so as to be (expressly, or by implication) above other things; the word

which expresses the simple idea of *high, lofty*, is ܪܡ, ܝܢ. A *high mountain* (Heb. הר הר רם or הר גבוה) is regularly expressed in the Aramaic versions by ܝܢ; ܝܠܘܢ (e.g. Gen. 7, 19; Deut. 12, 2; Isa. 40, 9. 57, 7); a nation of tall men is ܝܢ ܕܒܢܝܢ (Deut. 1, 28 Pesh.); but Israel, when *exalted* above other nations, or a king *exalted* above other kings, is in Heb. עליון, in Aram. ܥܠܝܘܢ, ܥܠܝܘܢ (Deut. 26, 19. 28, 1; Ps. 89, 28). The *high* gates of Babylon are ܥܠܝܘܢ ܕܒܒܝܠܐ (Jer. 51, 58); but ܥܠܝܘܢ ܕܒܒܝܠܐ, ܬܪܥܘܢ ܥܠܝܘܢ, is the *elevated* (i.e. *upper*) gate, viz., of the Temple (2 Kings 15, 35 al.); and ܒܪܝܚܬܐ ܥܝܠܝܬܐ, ܥܠܝܘܢ ܕܥܠܝܘܢ, is the *upper* pool (Isa. 7, 3). Applied to the Temple (1 Kings 9, 8), ܥܠܝܘܢ, ܥܠܝܘܢ, ܥܠܝܘܢ, describes it, not properly as “high,” but as *standing on high*, above the rest of the city. The Aramaic words, as Mr. Allen rightly observes, are accordingly applied very frequently to God, as the One who, *κατ' ἑξοχὴν*, has His abode on high (e.g. Luke 1, 32. 35, in the Pesh., for ὑψιστος), and to heavenly things or places. Hermon, as a lofty mountain, would thus be correctly described in Aramaic as a ܝܢ; ܝܠܘܢ: a building on the top of it, however diminutive in itself, would be עליון in Heb., ܥܠܝܘܢ in Aramaic. So in the Lectionary ὄρος ὑψηλὸν is represented by ܝܢ; ܝܠܘܢ (Matt. 17, 1); even with *λίαν*, it is not ܥܠܝܘܢ (Matt. 4, 8). The sense, not of *high* (in the sense of *tall*, as reaching from the ground), but of *elevated, upper* (in tacit contrast to other things not so elevated), is apparent in the four passages quoted by Prof. Marshall; and it is singular that he should not have perceived it. The ܐܕܪܘܢ ܥܝܠܝܐ of Job 37, 9 is surely not the “lofty chamber,” but the “upper chamber” of the skies, whence elsewhere also rain and storm are conceived as emerging, the ܥܠܝܘܢ “upper chambers” (Targ. ܒܝܬ ܢܘܝ ܥܝܠܝܐ “upper treasures”) of Ps. 104, 13. I cannot think that ܥܠܝܘܢ would be at all the proper term to be used, merely for the sake of expressing the idea of a *high* or *lofty* mountain.

6. No doubt, in view of Isa. 42, 6, Mr. Allen is guilty technically of an inaccuracy in saying (p. 460) that  $\text{רַבִּי}$ , in the sense of *to call*, is "always" followed by  $\text{שְׂמָא}$  or  $\text{בְּשְׂמָא}$ ; it is true, this is generally the case, but in Isa. 42, 6 it is found in that sense alone. But the objection is only thrown a stage further back: why is this somewhat peculiar and unusual expression resorted to by Prof. Marshall at all? Surely, where it occurs, it denotes not a mere calling ( $\epsilon\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon$ ), but (in accordance with the proper sense of  $\text{רַבִּי}$ , *to magnify*) to call or name honourably.<sup>1</sup> Is this idea suitable to the context in Lk. 8, 54, where Jesus simply *calls out* to the damsel, for the purpose of bidding her arise? The ordinary word for  $\epsilon\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon$  would, of course, be  $\text{קָרָא}$ ,  $\text{ܩܪܐ}$ , which is found, both here and elsewhere, in the Lectionary. It must remain in the highest degree doubtful not only whether  $\text{רַבִּי}$  would have been used in Luke 8, 54 by the original writer, but even whether (to adopt the other alternative) the consonants  $\text{רַבִּיתָא}$ , (for this, not  $\text{רַבִּי}$ , will of course have been "*the (female) child*"), even with the last two letters obscured or illegible, would have suggested the meaning *call* to a translator.

7. The difference between Mr. Allen and Prof. Marshall is here not very important. It is not denied, on the one hand, that  $\text{זָרַע}$ , not  $\text{רָרַי}$ , is the proper Aramaic word for *to sow*, or, on the other, that *to sow* might be used metaphorically in the sense of *to strew* or *scatter* (as in LXX. of Exod. 32, 20). The question between them resolves itself really into this, whether a word denoting *that which was sown*, or *that which was strewn* (sc. unintentionally) is most suitable in the original autograph of Matt. 13, 19 = Mk. 4, 15 = Luke 8, 12. In view of the prominence given in the parable as a whole to the action of the sower, the former

<sup>1</sup> In Jer. 20, 3 the clause from  $\text{יְתַכְנֶשֶׁן}$  does not seem to be Pashur's new name, but an independent sentence.

might seem to be the more probable; but the latter view is doubtless a tenable one, and Prof. Marshall prefers it. If it be adopted, Prof. Marshall's argument would seem to require for consistency the same word *strewn* to be presupposed in Matt. 13, 20, 22 for ὁ σπαρείς, but not in v. 23 (where the act on the part of the sower is intentional); it may be doubted whether this change of verb is a recommendation of his hypothesis.

8. I am sorry to be quite unable to allow that ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ may mean "gave glory to the Holy Spirit." Not only is this sense entirely unrecognised in the Greek Lexicon, but in the LXX. ἀγαλλιάομαι is used habitually to express various Hebrew words meaning *to exult* or *rejoice*, just as the substantives ἀγαλλίασις and ἀγαλλίαμα are used for various words significant of *exultation* or *joy*. In the passages of the LXX. which Prof. Marshall quotes, it corresponds to כָּבַד, הִתְהַלֵּל, הִתְהַלֵּל, words signifying *to glory* (not "to give glory") or *boast*, and to רִנָּה *ring out joyously*. The Aramaic כְּרַר, which does mean *to deck with honour* or *glorify*, would surely have been represented in the Greek by some other verb than ἀγαλλιάομαι.

IV. 1. Prof. Marshall thinks Mr. Allen hypercritical in objecting to the use of נִזְנ in the sense of kindling a lamp (June, 1891, p. 459), when it is, he urges, used in the Targum in the sense of kindling a fire. The question, however, is, whether it is so used. It is not the ordinary Aramaic word for *kindling* either a lamp or a fire: it is a very rare word, occurring thrice in Daniel (3, 19, 22): two passages are cited by Levy from the Targum, six other passages (in his *N.H.W.B.*) from the Jerusalem Talmud and the Midrashim. The question is, whether it means *to kindle*, or only *to heat*. In Dan. 3, 19 it seems plainly to have the latter sense, "And commanded that they should

*heat* the furnace seven times more than it was wont to be heated"—surely *kindle* would not suit in this passage: *v.* 22, "And the furnace was heated exceedingly." Isa. 44, 15 and Hos. 7, 4 are ambiguous; either meaning would suit, but *heat* is sufficient. In the six other passages quoted by Levy it is used in connexion with bath-houses.<sup>1</sup> The rendering *heat* suits all passages, the rendering *kindle* does not. I submit, therefore, that the word can only, on the evidence available, be shown to mean *to heat*, and that it is not applicable to the lighting of a lamp. I do not deny that the word may occur elsewhere in Aramaic, or even that it *may* there have the sense of *kindle*; but I submit that, before Prof. Marshall is entitled to employ it in this sense, he must produce the passage or passages where it is so used, and used unambiguously.<sup>2</sup> The common Aramaic words for *lighting* a lamp are אַדְלֵק (Exod. 40, 4. 25; Lev. 24, 2 Onq. and Ps.-Jon.; Matt. 5, 15; Lk. 8, 16. 11, 33 in the Lectionary), or אַנְהַר (the same passages in the Peshitto). Why presuppose such a questionable word as אִזַּן in the *Ur-evangelium* here, when there were suitable and ordinary words close at hand?

2. Another unimportant difference, the issue not relating to Aramaic usage, but being a question of literary feeling: is it more likely that in such a sentence as "He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners," the ordinary word for *drinketh* would have been used, or one meaning *to drink to excess* (יָרַי, like the Greek μεθύσκεισθαι)? 'Εσθίει is the ordinary word for *eating*, and hence it might be argued that the parallel *drinketh* would be the ordinary word as well. The Greek πίνει (Matt., Luke) would seem also to point

<sup>1</sup> e.g. הוּהּ הָהִיא בֵּי בְנֵי אֲזַיְיָהּ שְׁבַעַה יוֹמִין "There was a bath-house there, which he heated for seven days," etc.

<sup>2</sup> In Samaritan it occurs intransitively in the sense of *to burn* or *be hot*, Deut. 32, 22 (Heb. יָקַר).

in the same direction. Prof. Marshall argues for the suitability of ר״י. The reader must be left to judge of the force of the opposing arguments for himself.

But the consideration of Prof. Marshall's remaining objections must be reserved for a future occasion.

S. R. DRIVER.

*(To be concluded.)*