he had been forbidden to traverse—he at length set foot in the latter city, and there founded the Church which in the closing years of the century succeeded Jerusalem and the Syrian Antioch as the metropolis of Apostolic Christianity.

F. H. Chase.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

II.

3. Does פַּרְחָר in Aramaic mean tiles? Prof. Marshall argues, without any misgivings, that it does. In the Expositor, March, 1891, p. 219, he says, "Would be tiles." When challenged by Mr. Allen for his proof, he now produces it: "A potter, κεραμιν, Χωρίς = earthenware, as in J, Exod. 12, 22, אָשֶׁר = vessel of earthenware. The plural of nouns of material denotes pieces of that material. Hence פַּרְחָר must denote κέραμοι, tiles." It is allowed, then, that פַּרְחָר is not known to occur with that meaning, but it is argued that it ought to have it. Obviously, however, the argument is fallacious. There is no doubt that פַּרְחָר means earthenware, but it does not follow from this that the plural פַּרְחָר has the definite sense of tiles: it may have been used to denote fragments, or pieces, of earthenware: can it be shown that Job (2, 8), when he took, in the Hebrew אָשֶׁר, in the Aramaic אָשֶׁר, to scrape himself with, took definitely a "tile?" What the native Aramaic word for a tile was I am very ready to own I do not know. And the translators of the Lectionary and of the Harkleian Version appear to have been in the same predicament. For they know well enough what κεράμων in Luke 5, 19 means, but they express it, not by any genuine Aramaic word, but by κεραμίδες, or κεραμίδιον (κεράμος), the diminutive of κέραμος itself, and the recognised
Syriac word for a "tile" (see Payne Smith, col. 3749). In view of the two facts (1) that no instance has been produced in which יַרְדֵּנָה signifies tiles, (2) that tile is expressed in Syriac by a different word altogether, of foreign origin, I submit that Prof. Marshall has not succeeded in showing that יְרוּרְיָנָה has the meaning "tiles."

4. When I first read Prof. Marshall's paper of March, 1891, this appeared to me to be the most plausible instance of his hypothesis which it contained. I then understood קֵמַעַדָּה of the sap of the plant. I changed my opinion afterwards, because a more careful study of the text of the parable led me to believe that Mr. Allen was right in contending that קֵמַעַדָּה (treated as an original and integral part of the parable) meant the moisture of the earth, which would not be denoted by the Aramaic יֵרְשׁ. If, however, Prof. Marshall will put his hypothesis in the definite form that the original gospel had יֵרְשׁ, root, but that in the copy which formed the basis of St. Luke's Gospel the last letter was so disfigured or imperfect that it suggested to the translator יֵרְשׁ, sap, I have no objection to it: root will then be the true text of the parable; קֵמַעַדָּה being now no longer an integral part of the parable, but originating in an error, it becomes a matter of indifference in what sense it is understood, and it may be taken in that which the Aramaic יֵרְשׁ will allow, viz. sap.

5. Surely the "real meaning" of יֵרְשׁ is not a crowd, but a company of travellers, i.e. a caravan. This is the meaning supported both by etymology and by usage. The root is preserved in the Arabic ضِفِّيْصَصَ مَسْيَارَ "agmen una commeantium" (to quote Roediger's definition in the Thesaurus, p. 1384a); and this is the sense which the word has both in Syriac, the Aramaic of the Targums,

1 The Pesh. renders loosely מַחְטֵה , "from the roof."
2 Observe that in his interpretation of this part of the parable, St. Luke like the other Evangelists, has בֵּילָע (8, 13).
and also in the Aramaic of Palmyra (Roediger gives citations from each). The word is thus used of a caravan, not, as Prof. Marshall says, "from the promiscuous nature of its crowd," but because it is derived from a root which signifies *journey*. A more inappropriate word can hardly be imagined for describing the miscellaneous ἄπαν τπλήθος, gathered from the neighbourhood, of Lk. 8, 36. Levy, in his larger Lexicon, having cited six occurrences from the Talm. with the meaning *caravan*, cites a seventh, in which he renders it, not (as Prof. Marshall quotes him) "a crowd *gathered* in the street," but "a company of men *going* along the street." Even here, then, the true sense of the word is not lost; and the passage lends no support to the meaning contended for by Prof. Marshall. Kohut (who cites more examples than Levy) gives only the meaning *travelling company, caravan*.

6. Δώμα, Lk. 5, 19 = στέγη, Mk. 2, 4. Δώμα is used uniformly in the LXX., not of the house generally, but specially of the *house-top* (Heb. בֶּן), which, in the East, as is well known, is flat, and used as a promenade and for many other purposes; and it has the same sense wherever it occurs in the Greek of the N.T. Even supposing, therefore, that מְשִלֶל המְשִלֶל (properly a *hut* or *booth*; used mostly for the Heb. רֹבָק) could be applied to the οἶκος of Mk. 2, 1 (which, in spite of all that Prof. Marshall has urged, may still be doubted), what reason is there to suppose it would be the original of Δώμα? The Aramaic word, which would naturally correspond to this (in its Hellenistic sense), is נַּתִית, used here both in the Peshītto and in the Lexiconary, and regularly for Δώμα in the N.T., and ב ל in the O.T.\(^1\)

---

1 In Palmyrene (see De Vogüé, Syrie Centrale, pp. 12, 13), נַתִית "chef de caravane" corresponds to σωδάρχης, מְשִלֶל are members of a caravan. מְשִלֶל יִי אֲשֶׁר יִשְרָאֵל מַגְּלִים מֶל מְשִלֶל סְוֹדִים. Σωδία means a travelling company or caravan (Luke 2, 44).

2 Were it legitimate to presuppose distinctively Syriac usage, מַגְּלִים or
7. I am still as unconvinced as ever that אָשֶׁר could stand for קָאַהַטְוָאִי. (That it may be employed suitably for καταλύσαι, Lk. 19, 7, has not been denied either by Mr. Allen or by myself; this is a sufficiently common usage.) It is true, in Ps. 80, 2; Isa. 6, 1. 37, 16 "אָשֶׁר and קָאַהַטְוָאִי represent the same Hebrew word"; but the form of the sentence is in the Targum so changed that the value of the fact for Prof. Marshall's argument is reduced to nil. In the passages quoted, the Heb. speaks of Jehovah as "sitting" on the cherubim (or, in Isa. 6, 1, on a throne); in the Targum, however, the sentence is paraphrased, and the subject of אָשֶׁר is no longer Jehovah Himself, but His Presence (עָנָאשׁ), or glory (אָלֵף). The case is similar in 1 Sam. 4, 2, and elsewhere. That אָשֶׁר could be used of a spiritual Presence—as it is used also of a spirit itself, Jud. 11, 29, or of the cloud, Ex. 40, 35—settling down or resting upon a place, is not disputed by Mr. Allen; but this usage is no proof that it would be used in ordinary parlance of a person sitting. Nor can I think it probable that a translator, conversant with Aramaic, finding the words (Apr., 1891, p. 285) לאנוי שֵׁרָא תַּפְּרָא וַדְּבֵר, properly and naturally, signifying, "And the scribes began to think," would have been likely to misunderstand לאנו in the improbable and unsupported sense of קָאַהַמְעֶמְעֶמְו. 3

8. Prof. Marshall considers Mr. Allen's objections to אָשֶׁר might be suggested as the common original of both στέγη and δῶμα the latter word being understood in its Hellenistic sense, and being a slightly free rendering of the Aramaic). For στέγη the Peshitto; = מָלָאְמֵן Mark 2, 4.

1 Examples are abundant. See, for instance, Gen. 49, 27; Ex. 24, 16; Num. 5, 3; Isa. 8, 18; Ps. 82, 1; 84, 8; Cant. 1, 5; 8, 14; and in the Aphel, Ex. 25, 8; Dent. 12, 5; Ps. 9, 12; Joel 4, 17, 21, etc.

2 Except that the Pael conjugation (סָלַמְשָר) might have been rather expected in the sense of begin.

3 Is it not a further objection to the supposition that προστεθεί in Lk. 5, 21 really corresponds to קָאַהַמְעֶמְו of Mk. 2, 6, that St. Luke has introduced the notice of the scribes and Pharisees "sitting" and listening while Jesus was teaching at an earlier point in his narrative (see v. 17)?
in the sense of *to go out*, very extravagant. נַשָּׁם in Dan. 2, 5. 8 is not even pointed as a verb;¹ and the view is a perfectly tenable one that the Talmudic נַשָּׁם *to go or to go away* is no genuine Aramaic verb, but a verb formed illegitimately upon the (false) assumption that נַשָּׁם in Dan. was a verb with that meaning. But even supposing that this view is incorrect, and that there was a real Aramaic verb נַשָּׁם, the use of the word is so restricted and peculiar²—for it is not the ordinary Aramaic word for *go* away—that it is extremely difficult to think that it would have been used of the lightning in Matt. 24, 27. Both the Peshitto and the Lectionary represent *ἐξερχόμενοι* here by the normal and ordinary נַשָּׁם.

9. Is it really the case that "בֵּן בְּלֵי is certainly the equivalent of μόριον or μόλις = cum molestia (as the numerous usages of בֵּן בְּלֵי in Ecclesiastes fully prove)?" The author of Eccl. might, possibly, have framed an aphorism, "And a merchant gaineth riches בֵּן בְּלֵי (with labour, or difficulty)" (though I think he would have written בֵּן בְּלֵי רב or בֵּן בְּלֵי 다),³ for the occupation, business, toil, which בֵּן בְּלֵי denotes would be the process by which a merchant would amass his wealth. But though the spirit left the afflicted youth μόριον, hardly or with difficulty, he surely did not leave him through a process of hard and vexatious occupation or business (בֵּן בְּלֵי),⁴ but "with difficulty" in the sense of

---

¹ Baer quotes no MS. authority for his punctuation נַשָּׁם.
² It is used chiefly in the phrase, of which Kohut cites some eighty occurrences in the Talmud, נַשָּׁם לְבָאֵד, "and they (or he) went after (i.e. followed, adhered to) their (or his) own opinion." The shade of meaning, expressed by the word, is not that of going or coming forth (cf. Keil on Dan. 2, 5), which is required in Matt. 24, 27, but that of going away.
³ In order that the reader may know exactly how בֵּן בְּלֵי is used in Ecclesiastes, I append a note of all the passages of that book in which it occurs: 1, 13, 2, 23, 26. 3, 10. 4, 8. 5, 2, 13. 8, 16. In none does it appear in an adverbial phrase.
⁴ This objection might indeed be met if it could be shown that בֵּן בְּלֵי was a phrase in such common use, that its original sense was no longer consciously perceived, and it was felt simply to have the force of an adverb, "scarcely." But the evidence of this forthcoming?
reluctantly, i.e., Framebuffer "with hardness," as the Lectionary has it,Framebuffer "scarcely," as the Peshitto.

V. a. 1. Prof. Marshall holds that ἀποχωρεῖ in Lk. 9, 39 represents the Aram. ḫreu, to flee. Mr. Allen asks, "Can ḫreu express the simple idea of departure implied in ἀποχωρεῖ?" and adds that here "the nuance of 'flight' is excluded by the context" (pp. 302, 303). To this Prof. Marshall replies, "Mr. Allen suggests that the idea of 'flight' is unsuitable to the Greek verb and also to the departure of the demon," and proceeds to reproach him with not knowing that ḫreu is so used three times in Neubauer's Tobit.

I do not understand Mr. Allen to have suggested that ḫreu is unsuitable in the abstract to the departure of a demon. What he meant, I suppose, was (1) that, joined with μόγμος, and denoting only a temporary departure of the evil spirit, ḫreu, to flee, was not exactly the word that would be expected (in the passages of Tobit referred to, 6, 4. 17. 8, 3, it is used of the final and total flight of the demon); and (2) that had St. Luke been translating the Aram. ḫreu, to flee, he would probably have represented it by some more adequate equivalent than the rather colourless ἀποχωρεῖ. Are these two considerations so very unreasonable?

2. It is doubtless true that ḫreuš (in its sense of kindling, setting on fire) might possibly, in such a context as that of Matt. 10, 28, have been paraphrased in the Greek by ἀπολέσαι. But the necessity of postulating such a paraphrase diminishes considerably the strength of the reasoning by which Prof. Marshall seeks to show that ḫreuš was really the common Aramaic original of the two versions (ἀπολέσαι and ἐμπᾶλεῖν). And is it clear that the rare ḫreuš,1 to kindle, light, is a word that would be suitably used of the burning of souls in Gehenna? ḫreuš (with its passive) is the

1 More common in Syriac than in the Targums.
word commonly used, as of burning in a furnace generally,¹ so in particular of the burning in Gehenna (Eccl. 8, 10, 11 Targum, Cant. 8, 6; 2 Sam. 23, 7). The cognate subst. נריע occurs similarly, Isa. 33, 14; Gen. 27, 33 Ps.-Jon. (“And Isaac smelt a savour of the fire and smoke of Gehenna”); and, expressly, of the burning of souls נריע Num. 11, 26 Ps.-Jon.; 2 Chr. 32, 21 (стафин). Eccl. 9, 14 Targum might also justify נריע.

3. Here I must content myself with saying that Prof. Marshall does not seem to me to have made it at all probable that נריע should have even “suggested” βίος to a translator. βίος, in such passages as Lk. 8, 43; 15, 12, 30, 21, 4, means, of course, that by which life is sustained, i.e., resources, “living,” “substance,” or even affluence; but in the phrase ζωή τοῦ βίου it surely denotes life, as a period of existence. Hence I do not understand what inducement a translator could have had to render נריע by βίος, “life”: the etymology of נריע would rather, I should have thought, have suggested to him some word expressing more distinctly than βίος does the idea of excess or abundance.

c. Here there are two questions: (1) would נריע be naturally used of the birds which “came” (ἔλαθε) to devour the seed in the parable (Matt. 13, 4; Mk. 4, 4)? (2) does נריע (the pass. part.) fairly express the idea of καταπατήθη, “was trampled down” (Lk. 8, 5)? “In every case but one,” says Prof. Marshall emphatically, “where נריע occurs in the Hebrew, it is transferred to the Targums.” This is an extraordinary misstatement, involving a far graver inaccuracy than any of which Mr. Allen has been guilty. In point of fact, of the forty-nine times which נריע occurs in the Hebrew Bible, it is rendered by the Aramaic נריע only

¹ E.g., Gen. 11, 23 Ps.-Jon.; and the Palestinian Fragments cited by Lagarde, Prophetae Chaldaice, p. xxiv., l. 26; p. xxvi., l. 14.
ten times;¹ and the Hiphil יד grub, of which there are thirteen occurrences, is expressed by יד only four times.² The inaccuracy is, however, immaterial to our present argument. יד in Heb. means to step or tread—as on a threshold (1 Sam. 5, 5), a path, a way, a land; sometimes with the idea of treading on with impunity (Ps. 91, 13), or in triumph (Jud. 5, 21), or the proud consciousness of ownership (Deut. 33, 29; Am. 4, 13); it will then be nearly equivalent to the English march; it is also used in particular of treading the wine-press (Isa. 63, 2 al.), and treading (i.e. bending) a bow (Ps. 7, 13 al.). In Aramaic, as the passages quoted in the footnote show, its sense is not substantially different (except that there is no example of its use in connexion with the wine-press or the bow), viz., to step or tread; on the other hand, it is used (in the Aphel) more freely than in Heb. (in which it so occurs only once, Jer. 51, 33) of making the oxen tread the corn in threshing.³ A land which is “trodden on” is also, of course, “entered”; but naturally this is no proof that יד in itself means “to enter”; in Deut. 11, 25 it plainly means to step; in Mic. 5, 5, 6, Hab. 3, 15, to tread, in Prov. 6, 11 (Targum) to advance steadily or march (“as a warrior”). In Num. 24, 17 (Heb.), a highly poetical passage, where it is applied to a star (“hath stepped forth”), it is, of course, used figuratively (cf. the מַלְאָך, or “highways” [A. V. courses], from which the stars fight, in Deborah’s song), denoting a proud and stately advance. Mr. Allen contends that such a word would not be naturally used of the birds approaching to devour the fallen seed. It may be confidently affirmed that it would not be used of birds “coming” by flight. If the birds were conceived as ad-

¹ Deut. 1, 36. 11, 24. 25. 33, 29. Jos. 1, 3. 14. 9. 1 Sam. 5, 5. Is. 59, 8. Mic. 5. 4. 5. (There is no Targum of Neh. 13, 15.)
³ So also in Syriac (Payne Smith, col. 950): cf. the subst. וַּלְכֶה, מַלְאָך.
vancing on foot, in a stately and dignified procession, I am not prepared to deny that it might be used, though, I must confess, the employment of the word in such a connexion does not appear to me to be probable. The verb that would naturally be expected is, of course, נָרָּה (רְאִי).

(2) (A point not noticed by Mr. Allen.) It is far from clear that וֹרָּה is the Aramaic word which would here be rightly used to express כַּתַּפַּתְּפִּית. It is true כַּתַּפַּתְּפִּית and פַּתַּף in the LXX. both sometimes correspond to the Heb. וֹרָּה (as Deut. 11, 24; Jud. 5, 21); but in Lk. 8, 5 the idea is plainly not trodden on simply (Heb. וֹרָּה), but trodden on with insult or contempt, i.e., trampled down (Heb. סָלֵפּוּר, for which פַּתַּף or כַּתַּפַּתְּפִּית is also used, Isa. 1, 12, 26, 6. 28, 3 al.). The proper Aramaic word to express this idea is, I venture to think, not וֹרָּה, but שֵׁרְפְּשׁוֹר, in the passive שֵׁרְפְּשׁוֹר, שֵׁרְפָּכָה. This is used for סָלֵפּוּר in 2 Kings 14, 9; Isa. 1, 12, 26, 6. 28, 3, and elsewhere; it is used also for כַּתַּפַּתְּפִּית and פַּתַּף in the Peshitto, not only here (Lk. 8, 5), but also wherever else they occur in the N.T., and similarly in the Lectionary (Matt. 7, 6; Lk. 8, 5, 10, 19). Will the reader think me hypercritical if I therefore express a doubt whether Prof. Marshall has found the right original either for יָלִּ֖ה in Matt. 13, 4, or for כַּתַּפַּתְּפִּית in Lk. 8, 5?

I must express my regret that Prof. Marshall has felt himself debarred by want of space from examining Mr. Allen’s other criticisms; for I feel sure that, if called upon to do so, I could defend similarly their substantial justice.

On the whole, I venture to think that Mr. Allen’s papers are not “disfigured” by such serious “blemishes” as Prof. Marshall supposes. Though in one or two instances he has committed an oversight, and has sometimes also not, perhaps, stated his objections as fully and effectively as he might have done, his criticisms in other respects have either been substantiated entirely, or have been shown to express
a perfectly tenable view, which derives its strength, not from an imperfect acquaintance with Aramaic literature, but from an appreciative sense of idiomatic propriety which prompts him to doubt, once and again, whether the word proposed by Prof. Marshall is really admissible in the context for which it is claimed. In composition in a foreign language, it is better, surely, to be cautious than to be bold, to be even (it may be) too scrupulous in the choice of expressions than to be not scrupulous enough; and I cannot understand how Prof. Marshall could have postulated for his original Aramaic Gospel, words of which there could be the slightest doubt that they were properly and correctly used, and that they really and unquestionably bore the meanings which he attributes to them. But again and again we find him making use of words to which some doubt attaches: they are not the ordinary and natural words that would be expected; sometimes they are words that do not exist at all; at other times they are either very rare words, the precise meaning of which is not readily determinable, or they are words which do not really express the idea required.\(^1\) Prof. Marshall reproaches Mr. Allen with trusting too exclusively to the Lexicon, instead of basing his criticisms upon a first-hand acquaintance with Aramaic texts; but the Aramaic Lexica are comprehensive,

---

1 The following are some additional examples of words used by Prof. Marshall, which are, I venture to think, either extremely doubtful, or altogether inadmissible:—אנה (June, 1891, p. 457 f.) in the sense required Mk. 5, 29; Lk. 8, 44; הנך (ib. p. 464); הנך (is this the same as אדו, saw ?), Sept., p. 219; הנך, to open, ib. p. 220; ומ (of a man), ib. p. 220; ונ or ונ, Nov. p. 386 (the reflexive, ומ, which would be required, does not greatly resemble ומ or ונ, for הנך (as a general term), ib., p. 445; הנך, rock (!); is it possible to doubt, in the light of the general practice of the Targums—see e.g. Ps. 18, 3, 32, 47, 19, 15, 28, 1—and especially of the very explicit corresponding version of the parallel passage Job 14, 18, that the second Targum of Job 18, 4 simply understands “rock” figuratively of the Strong One, God?)? Aug., 1892, p. 90; ו for הרס (does הר mean anything except “daub over with lime”?), ib. p. 92.
and give numerous quotations; and though neither they, nor Mr. Allen's reading, may be exhaustive, yet if the meaning, or application, of words used by Prof. Marshall lies outside the limits of what the Lexica recognise, the burden of proof rests upon him who maintains the use to be legitimate; and scholars are justified in withholding their assent from it until the proof is produced. Were all Prof. Marshall's examples as unexceptionable as יִתְנַשֵּׁר and אַרְשָׁד (June, 1891, p. 455) they would carry conviction immediately; but how seldom can this be said to be the case! ¹

In conclusion, while hoping that Prof. Marshall may continue his studies in Aramaic literature (in which his notes on the usages of particular dialects, and the applications of particular words, can hardly fail, when completed, to form a welcome supplement to the materials at present available for students), I would venture to propose to him two modifications of his method, which, if he would consent to adopt them, would, I am sure, free his results from the philological blemishes which at present too often attach to them. The first is, that he should abstain entirely, in his reconstruction of the original Aramaic Gospel, from the use of words with theoretical meanings, and confine himself to those the meaning and applicability of which is established beyond the reach of reasonable doubt. Prof. Marshall, even where he has not adopted a meaning hypothetically, has frequently not exercised sufficient care in ascertaining the precise force of the word which he has employed; in the case of a rare or doubtful word, he is too ready to accept a meaning which will suit

¹ Prof. Marshall is severe on Mr. Allen when he deems him guilty of an inaccuracy; but he is guilty of them sometimes himself. (Sept., 1891, p. 216) does not once occur in the Syriac N.T.,—or indeed, unless Payne Smith is strangely defective, in Syriac at all: the form used is always יִתְנַשֵּׁר; and even this is only one, not "the constant" representative of σώτευ.
the position that he desires it to occupy. And secondly, he would both lighten his own labour, and materially improve his case, if, instead of attempting (as he seems often to have done) to find two passable Aramaic phrases, representing respectively the two corresponding passages in the Gospels, he were to content himself with finding a good and unexceptionable Aramaic equivalent for one of the parallels, and with pointing out how the other could, by the assumption of textual error or other confusion, be reasonably deduced from this. If, for instance, instead of labouring fruitlessly to show that נְטֶרֶן in Aramaic actually meant tiles, he had been content to argue that the original text had נְטֶרֶן, digging, but that in the copy which formed the basis of Lk. 5, 19 the first two letters had become accidentally transposed, and that the translator, not knowing what נְטֶרֶן meant, conjectured, from its resemblance to נְטָרִים, a potter, and נְטָרִים, earthenware, that it had the meaning of κέραμος, tiles, no objection, upon grounds of philology, could be raised to his hypothesis, and numerous examples of mistakes, arising in a similar manner, could be quoted from the pages of the LXX. 1 I am not prepared now, any more than I was when writing my prefatory note (p. 387), to deny that some of Prof. Marshall’s examples possess plausibility; others, as the one just noticed, and סְטִיר and נְטָרִים (above, p. 420), admit of being re-stated in a form which (so far as I am able to judge) seems free from objection. Whether his solution of the variations between the Gospels is the true one, can hardly be determined until it has been applied, and found to suit, upon a more comprehensive and systematic scale than has hitherto been attempted. Especially, in order to judge of it properly, we ought to have not

1 But in saying this, I must not be considered as endorsing in their entirety either of the two Aramaic sentences on p. 219 (March, 1891); for neither (apart from the questionable words employed) appears to me to be correct grammatically.
single, isolated phrases, but entire verses, or at least entire sentences, re-translated into Aramaic, and the origin of the variants in the parallel texts, examined and accounted for, one by one. It would be not less premature, at present, to condemn Prof. Marshall's hypothesis in toto than to accept it in toto; and if what I have written may be the means of enabling him to free it from weak points, and to place it upon a securer basis, no one will rejoice more heartily than myself.

S. R. Driver.

1 The two sentences (Mar., 1891, p. 211) are, for instance, both incomplete if they were properly filled out, (accepting, for the sake of argument, the words used) the resemblance between them would be considerably diminished.