Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

DR. RESCH'S PROOFS OF TRANSLATION.

IN the February number of THE EXPOSITOR, Dr. Sanday, in commenting with characteristic kindliness upon a paper which I contributed last July, and in comparing this with some works that have quite recently been published in Germany, remarked that I hardly appeared conscious of the many points of contact which my argument had with these —more particularly with the elaborate and learned work of Dr. Resch. This was purely an *argumentum e silentio* ; but for once this mode of reasoning was correctly applied. When it is known, however, that the paper to which Dr. Sanday refers was penned at least twelve months before these works appeared, the silence on that occasion will readily be explained and condoned. Perhaps I ought not to expect the same condonation, when I confess that I am indebted to Dr. Sanday for first directing my attention to the *Agrapha* of Dr. Resch, as having an important bearing on our investigations. After a diligent perusal of this most erudite treatise, which is written to collect and expound all the utterances of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels, I am strangely impressed by the many points of coincidence between two of the introductory chapters and the theories which, in absolute isolation, I had been led to form. Singularly enough, this is also the most suitable place at which reference can be made to Dr. Resch, and a comparison instituted between our methods, as well as our results. We both believe in a primitive Semitic document, written by the Apostle Matthew, that this document was used by the three synoptists, and that its contents can now be recovered only by internal criticism ; but Dr. Resch maintains that this primitive Gospel was written in Hebrew—not Aramaic.

In the interests of truth, it seems eminently desirable that the investigations of Dr. Resch should be placed before English scholars, so that they may be in a position to adjudicate between the rival claims of Hebrew and Aramaic to be the language in which the earliest Gospel was written. Especially is it important to ascertain the *method* by which the solution of this intricate problem has been attempted, and what kind of evidence has been deemed sufficient to satisfy one of Germany's ripest scholars as *proof* that our Greek evangelists have in some cases translated from a common Semitic document. On seeking an answer to these questions, we find that the test of translation-work, on which alone Dr. Resch relies, is the one which engaged our attention last month ; and it is on this account that an examination of his researches can at this point be most opportunely undertaken. The only implement of internal criticism by which Dr. Resch proposes to prove the existence of a Hebrew Gospel embedded in our present Greek Gospels is the one which we have designated (p. 118) indication No. V.; *viz.* that the divergent Greek words are diverse renderings of one and the same Hebrew word. Our author claims *fifty-nine* cases in point. About twenty of these however do not refer to divergences in the synoptists themselves, but to the variations with which one or other of the Gospels is quoted in the sub-apostolic age—which variations are thought to imply translation from a Hebrew original. These will furnish us a fruitful field of inquiry shortly ; but for the present we will omit them from the list. The remainder, with the exception of some few duplicates, we now transcribe.

		MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
		xxviii. 1.	xvi. 9.	
1	אֶחָד	μία	πρώτη	
		viii. 19; xxii. 35.		ix. 57; x. 25.
3	אֶחָד	εἷς		τις

		MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
		xxiii. 4.		xi. 46.
8	כָּבֵד	βαρύς		δυσβάστακτος
		xxv. 24.		xix. 21.
9	קָשֶׁה	σκληρός		αὐστηρός
		xxiv. 28.		xvii. 37.
14	פֶּגֶר	πτῶμα		σῶμα
		xxvi. 26.	xiv. 22.	xxii. 19.
16	בֵּרֵךְ	εὐλογεῖν	εὐλογεῖν	εὐχαριστεῖν
		v. 11.	(Hermas)	vi. 22.
20	חֵרֵף	εἰπεῖν πᾶν	βλασφημεῖν	ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα
		πονηρόν		ὡς πονηρόν
		v. 29.	ix. 43.	(Clem. Alex.)
21	טוֹב	συμφέρει	καλόν ἐστιν	αἱρετώτερον
		xv. 6.	vii. 13.	(Epiphanius)
23	מִצְוָה	ἐντολή	λόγος	νόμος
		viii. 2.	i. 40.	v. 12.
25	הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה	προσκυνεῖν	γονυπετεῖν	πίπτειν
				ἐπὶ πρόσωπον
		ix. 18.	v. 23.	viii. 42.
27	מוּת	τελευτᾶν	ἐσχάτως ἔχειν	ἀποθνήσκειν
		x. 38.	viii. 34.	xiv. 27.
28	נְשָׂא	λαμβάνειν	αἴρειν	βαστάζειν
		xvi. 25.	viii. 35.	xvii. 33.
29	חָיָה	σώζειν	σώζειν	ζωογονεῖν
				περιποιεῖσθαι
		xii. 39.	(Epiphanius)	xi. 29.
31	בִּקֵּשׁ	ἐπιζητεῖν	αἰτεῖν	ζητεῖν
		xxiii. 35.	(Epiphanius)	xi. 51.
33	הָרַג	φονεύειν	ἀποκτείνειν	. ἀπολλῦναι
		xxvii. 26.	xv. 15.	xxiii. 16.
36	יִסֵּר	φραγελλοῦν	φραγελλοῦν	παιδεύειν
		iv. 11.	(Hom. Clemt.)	iv. 13.
39	חָדַל	ἀφιέναι	παύεσθαι	ἀποστῆναι
		ix. 8.	ii. 12.	v. 26.
40	הִשְׁתּוֹמֵם	φοβεῖσθαι	ἐξίστασθαι	πλησθῆναι φόβου
		xvii. 2.	· ix. 2.	ix. 29.
43	הִשְׁתַּנָּה	μεταμορφοῦσθαι	μεταμορφοῦσθαι	ἕτερον γίνεσθαι
				D ἀλλοιοῦσθαι
		ix. 18.	v. 22.	viii. 41.
44	הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה	προσκυνεῖν	(προσ)πίπτειν	πίπτειν παρὰ
			πρὸς τοὺς πόδας	τοὺς πόδας

		MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
		xxiv. 27.		xvii. 24.
45	הֵאִיר	φαίνεσθαι		λάμπειν
		D φαίνειν		D ἀστράπτειν
		xxvi. 67.	xiv. 65.	xxii. 64.
48	הִכָּה	ῥαπίζειν	ῥαπίσμασιν	τύπτειν
	עַל־הַלְּחִי		βάλλειν	τὸ πρόσωπον
		xvii. 9.	ix. 9.	ix. 36.
50	אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ	ὅραμα	ἃ εἶδον	ὧν ἑώρακαν
				D ἐθεάσαντο
		xxvi. 71.	xiv. 68.	(Eusebius)
51	אוּלָם	πυλών	προαύλιον	πρόαυλις
			D. προσαυλή	
		v. 48.	(Clem. Alex.)	vi. 36.
55	הָיָה בַּאֲשֶׁר	ἔσεσθαι ὡς	μιμεῖσθαι	γίνεσθαι καθώς
		(Epiphanius)	iii. 16.	vi. 14.
56	קְרָא	ἐπικαλεῖν	ἐπιτιθέναι ὄνομα	ὀνομάζειν
		xviii. 6.	ix. 42.	xvii. 2.
58	טוֹב	συμφέρει	καλόν ἐστιν	λυσιτελεῖ
		(Ephr. Syr.)	(Clem. Alex.)	
		κρεῖσσον	αἱρετώτερον	

This is the list of variant translations, which, in the
judgment of this able representative of " severely critical "
German scholarship, is adequate to prove the existence of
a Semitic *Urevangelium*; and upon this list we would now
offer a few observations.

a. It will be observed that Dr. Resch presents to us but
one kind of proof. Simple as the thing may seem, it does
not appear to have occurred to any previous investigator in
this field, that the indications of translation must be of
diverse kinds—just as diverse as those which occur in the
several translations of the Hebrew Old Testament; and
that when we are searching for indications that two or
three Greek documents are translations from a hypothetical
Semitic text, we ought to be able to show that the same
phenomena are present as are found in works that are
known to be translations from a Semitic original. Let Dr.
Resch adduce instances in which the diverse vocalization

of the same Hebrew consonants, or the change of one letter, or the omission of a letter, or the transposition of two letters in the Hebrew text, will produce the divergent Greek readings which occur in the synoptists, and we will listen most attentively.

β. In the above list there are several parallel phrases that are pure synonyms. We have more than once affirmed that we could not venture to build on cases of this nature, inasmuch as the occurrence of phrases *exactly* equivalent is just what one would expect in the narrative of three witnesses who were totally independent of each other, and had no access to a common source. For instance, if, when describing (see no. 40) the strange emotions which came over the crowd when they saw the paralytic rise from his bed and carry it forth, one evangelist says, "they were all afraid," ἐφοβήθησαν; another, "they were amazed," ἐξίστασθαι; and a third, "they were filled with fear," ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, there are two ways in which such synonymity might be explained. It might, of course, arise from the diverse rendering of a common Semitic word in a written Gospel; but if other facts were favourable, it *might* prove the very opposite, and might be used as indicating that the narrators had no intercourse with each other, directly or indirectly. On these grounds there are fourteen instances cited, which had been better omitted. They are nos. 8, 9, 23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 36, 40, 44, 48, 51, 55, and 56. Not one of these, I may say, had escaped my notice, but I did not deem it wise to mention any of them; for, though they might come in useful as confirming our theory, when it has been established by other evidence, yet when adduced as *proof*, they do but injure the cause they are intended to serve, because, in themselves considered, they can be accounted for without the hypothesis of a common source.

γ. Though the cases which Dr. Resch adduces were,

with one or two exceptions, all known to me, there were only three of them which I ventured in the April article to adduce, in the initial stage of the argument, as furnishing sufficient evidence of being variant translations of the same word in a Semitic document ; and these are all quite as favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaic as of a Hebrew original. These are nos. 28, 29, and 58. I admit that the Hebrew נָשָׂא explains the three variants λαμβάνειν, αἴρειν, and βαστάζειν, as well as the Aramaic נְטַל ; but I scarcely think that חָיָה covers the meanings of σώζειν, περιποιεῖσθαι, and ζωογονεῖν so well as שֵׁיְזִב, nor that טוֹב would suggest to three Greek translators the words λυσιτελεῖ, συμφέρει, and καλόν so readily as הֲנָא, which, as we have seen, possesses all these meanings in regular usage.

δ. Dr. Resch does not explain by this test any words that are really diverse in meaning. A Hebrew *Urevangelium* would, for instance, leave ὀφειλήματα and ἁμαρτίας in the Lord's prayer unexplained, for there is no one Hebrew word which possesses both these meanings. Our author, moreover, makes no use of the fact that many Hebrew verbs now spelt alike are really of distinct origin, and on this account possess meanings which cannot be subsumed under any one fundamental conception. In fact, Dr. Resch adduces no one case in which his Hebrew hypothesis explains genuinely diverse words that lie abreast of each other in the Greek harmony. That such instances exist in large numbers is evident, and any theory which supposes the parallel synoptic passages to be translated from a common source ought to attempt their elucidation.

ε. There are about ten cases left, all more or less impressive, and, as defending a counter-hypothesis, we are bound to examine whether they admit of as clear an explanation — or perhaps clearer — on the theory of an Aramaic, as of a Hebrew, *Urevangelium.* We attach the numbers on the foregoing list.

1 and 3. As to the homologues 1 and 3, no one would con-
tend that the Aramaic חַד = one, is not as suitable as the
Hebrew אֶחָד. Both can be used for the ordinal adjective
πρώτη, and both can be used for the indefinite pronoun τις.

14. Dr. Resch is, as I believe, quite correct in seeing in
σῶμα, a body, and πτῶμα, a carcase, an indication of trans-
lation. The passage is, "Wherever the carcase (Luke,
body) is, there will the eagles be gathered together"; and
our author suggests the Hebrew word פֶּגֶר as solving the
difficulty. But there is this objection : the Hebrew פֶּגֶר
nowhere *means* a body, but only a carcase or corpse ;
whereas the Aramaic cognate פְּגַר means both a living
body and a corpse, as in Proverbs x. 13, "The rod for the
body of him that is lacking in discretion." We submit
then that, so far as this word is concerned, the assumption
of the word פְּגַר in an Aramaic exemplar is more likely to
have led to the Greek variants σῶμα and πτῶμα than the
occurrence of פֶּגֶר in a Hebrew text.

16. Dr. Resch adduces the two slightly divergent Greek
words that are used, when, at the last supper, our Lord
"gave thanks" before breaking the bread, εὐλογήσας and
εὐχαριστήσας; and rightly gives the word בֵּרֵךְ as the
equivalent—a word which has the same significance in
Aramaic as in Hebrew. It was not our intention to
adduce this case however, because the narrative of the last
supper as given in Luke bears no evidence of having been
translated from the same source as was used by the first
two evangelists. In fact, we fail to find in any part of
the Judæan ministry, except the great eschatological dis-
course, any satisfactory evidence that the narratives were
translated from the same Aramaic document. After most
laborious efforts, the divergences which occur in the
Judæan narratives obstinately refuse to yield to our
hypothesis, further than that, as in the case before us,
we find two or more Greek words used to represent an

action, place, or thing, more familiarly known by an Aramaic word. We should not have ventured to suppose, for instance, that the four equivalents for "the porch" in no. 51, nor the words for "scourging" in no. 36, afford any evidence worth naming of translation from a common Semitic document.

20. In the last beatitude, in which our Lord congratulates those who shall suffer for their adherence to Himself, there occur the variant parallels:

> Matt. v. 11: καὶ εἴπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν.
> And shall speak against you every evil thing.
> Luke vi. 22: καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν.
> And shall cast out your name as evil.

Dr. Resch would give יחפרונכון as the equivalent of the two entire phrases, being encouraged in this by the fact that in a quotation of this passage in *Hermas* the single verb βλασφημεῖν is used. We should have thought that חרף would be required for ὀνειδίσωσιν, "they shall reproach you"; but let that pass. It was our intention to give the Aramaic verb לוט as the equivalent, not of the whole clauses, but of the parts εἴπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν, and ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν. That εἰπεῖν κατά was used in a stronger sense than lies on the surface, and meant to revile, execrate, curse, or blaspheme, is evident from Acts vi. 13, where, in the heat of their malignity, the accusers of Stephen said: "This fellow ceaseth not to speak words against (ῥήματα λαλῶν κατά) this holy place and the law." So Jude 15. And ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα, "to cast out the name," may mean to utter the name with contempt or with a malediction; or it may refer to the terrible curse which the synagogue pronounced on those who were adjudged finally apostate. These meanings are covered by the Aramaic word לוט, which means to curse, execrate, blaspheme. It is, *e.g.*, used of Shimei, 2 Sam. xix. 21; of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 11; and of the unnatural son, Lev. xx. 9.

While the above explanation seems adequate to account for the divergence, there is another which has perhaps equal claim on our acceptance ; namely, that the Aramaic copy used by the evangelist Luke contained some form of the the verb טוּל =to throw or cast forth, instead of לוּט ; יטלו instead of ילטו : a case of the transposition of two letters, a clerical error inevitably found in all MSS. If יטלו occurred in the MSS. used by Luke, he would be obliged to explain it by an appeal to the word טוּל, and would thus render, "they shall cast you, or, your name, out as evil." This solution is the more likely, as we hope by-and-by to adduce other cases where the transposition of two Aramaic letters explains the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

Further, we have seen that Dr. Resch would take each of the two phrases that we have quoted as one complex whole, and would regard each as a free rendering of some form of the one word חָרֵף. But is this probable? Do not the parallel phrases πᾶν πονηρόν and ὡς πονηρόν point to some equivalent in the Semitic document? Dr. Resch has not recognised that, on his hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urschrift*, the same *kinds* of divergence are to be expected as confessedly occur in the several translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, or he would have conjectured that, in πᾶν πονηρόν and ὡς πονηρόν, we have respectively כל רע and כרע. In Aramaic, this would be כל ביש and כביש, the omission of the one letter ל explaining the difference between the two Greek readings.

39. These parallel passages refer to the close of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when Matthew and Luke both say that "the devil *departed* from Him"; but Matthew uses the word ἀφίησιν, Luke, ἀπέστη. The narration of this event in the *Clementine Homilies* runs thus: "Albeit, the king of the ungodly, having attempted in many ways to seduce the King of the godly to do his will, and being unable, *desisted*" (ἐπαύσατο). Dr. Resch adduces this as

part evidence of the existence of a primitive Hebrew Gospel. He holds that these three slightly divergent Greek words bear marks of being a translation of the same Hebrew word in a primitive Gospel, and that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* made use of this *Urschrift*, as well as our two Greek evangelists. For my own part, I am hopeful that evidence can be adduced from the sub-apostolic age of the circulation of a Semitic Gospel; but the paraphrastic nature of the quotation in the *Homilies* in this case makes one doubtful whether any dependence can be placed upon it. At all events, if חָדַל = he ceased, desisted, suits the requirements of a Hebrew Gospel, it cannot be denied that פְּסַק מִן would in Aramaic even more completely cover the meanings of the three Greek words. This is rendered clear from the following occurrences of פְּסַק in the Targums.

Exod. iv. 26:   The Targum of Jonathan narrates that when Zipporah had circumcised Gershom, "the destroying angel *ceased from* Moses, so that Zipporah gave thanks."
Prov. xvii. 13:   Evil shall not depart from his house.
Job vii. 16:   Let me alone, or, depart from me (פְּסַק מִנִּי; LXX., ἀπόστα ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ), for my life is vain.
Job xiv. 6:   Cease from him, let his wound cease, until he shall receive his reward as a hireling in his day.

43. This illustration is taken from the scene on the mount of transfiguration. We will present the context in parallelism, and show what support it affords to our own theory.

MATT. xvii. 1, 2.	MARK ix. 2, 3.	LUKE ix. 28, 29.
ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀνέβη
εἰς ὄρος	εἰς ὄρος	εἰς τὸ ὄρος
ὑψηλὸν	ὑψηλὸν	προσεύξασθαι.
κατ᾽ ἰδίαν·	κατ᾽ ἰδίαν μόνους·	
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ ἐγένετο
		ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν
ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
μετεμορφώθη.	μετεμορφώθη.	ἕτερον.

In the third line we have ὑψηλόν standing abreast with
προσεύξασθαι. Do the words possessing these meanings
resemble each other in Aramaic, so that one might easily
be mistaken for the other? We think so. The usual
Aramaic word meaning " to pray " is the Pael צַלִּי, which is
precisely equivalent to προσεύχομαι, in that it implies a
reverent posture in prayer, kneeling, with penitent, down-
cast eyes. The infinitive of this verb is צַלָּאָה. But the
adjective meaning . " very high," " summus, excelsus,"
ὑψηλός, is עַלָּאָה. It occurs frequently in the phrase " the
most high God," as in Genesis xiv. 18, etc. ; but it is also
used of physical things. It is used, for instance, in Genesis
i. 7, of " the waters that are above the firmament," which
in the Jerusalem Targum are called מַיָּא עַלָּאֵי, " the waters
that are above," in contrast to the מַיָּא אַרְעָאֵי, " the waters
that are beneath." So Psalm civ. 13 : " He waters the
mountains from the place of His lofty reservoirs." The
Hebrew has " His chambers." Job xxxvii. 9, " From His
lofty chamber cometh the tempest." If, as modern scholars
are agreed, the mount of transfiguration was Hermon,
which is three times as high as the loftiest summits of
Judæa and Galilee, this explains the occurrence of עַלָּאָה =
very high, instead of the common Targumic word רָם = high.
The only difference therefore in Aramaic between προσεύ-
ξασθαι and ὑψηλόν in an unvocalized text is that between
צ and ע. The former is צלאה, the latter עלאה. I admit
most readily that, if this instance stood *alone*, it might be
purely accidental ; but if these cases are sufficiently multi-
plied to "eliminate chance," if about forty instances can
be adduced, as we hope to do presently, in which the
change of one letter accounts for the divergence in our
Greek Gospels, then surely chance will be eliminated and
the theory substantiated.

On the first line, we have Matthew and Mark in unison
with ἀναφέρει αὐτούς, " He led them up"; while Luke gives

ἀνέβη, "He went up." I would submit that these variants are due to the difference between the Peal נְסַק, "He went up," and its causative, the Aphel, אַסֵּק or אַנְסֵק, "He led up"; though of course, when Luke had deciphered the word which Matthew and Mark render ὑψηλόν, as meaning "to pray," consistency alone would perhaps suggest ἀνέβη, instead of ἀναφέρει.

The next parallels that we would endeavour to elucidate are those to which Dr. Resch alludes; namely, μετεμορφώθη, which occurs in Matthew and Mark, and ἕτερον, which is found in all the Greek MSS. of Luke except D. This remarkable MS. gives ἠλλοιώθη, and this reading is quoted by Origen. It is perhaps unnecessary to remind readers of THE EXPOSITOR of the way in which Bishop Wordsworth sought to account for this divergence. He held that Luke declined the use of μετεμορφώθη, lest he might awaken in the minds of his Greek readers any ideas or feelings connected with the fabulous metamorphoses of their heathen deities. This view was sanctioned by Dean Alford, and is also warmly defended by the Rev. Arthur Wright, who, in his recent work on the *Composition of the Four Gospels*, says: "The Gentile catechists knew that a metamorphosis would suggest wrong ideas to a Greek mind. It would recall the fables of Zeus changing into a bull or a swan, or would suggest to the Latins Ovid's fifteen books of *Metamorphoses*. In St. Luke accordingly we find the word removed and a new rendering substituted, 'the form of His countenance became different'" (pp. 50, 51). This is very plausible. It is one of the best attempts I remember to explain the divergences in the synoptists by subjective criticism; but the probability which it yields can never transcend subjectivity. We can never *know* that that was really Luke's motive. The hypothesis can lay no claim to be scientific. One of the conditions to which such hypotheses must conform is, that they "admit of verification

or disproof, or at least of being rendered more or less probable by subsequent investigation."

In the theory of Resch, as well as in the one advocated in these papers, an attempt is made to substitute for this subjective plausibility a hypothesis which certainly admits of proof or disproof; namely, that the divergences are due to a variant translation of a Semitic document.

In the case before us, Dr. Resch suggests that the common Hebrew word was הִשְׁתַּנָּה; but this does not explain the whole difficulty. The divergence in the parallel passages extends beyond the verb, thus:

He was transfigured before them.
The form of His countenance became different.

The remainder of each sentence ought not to be ignored, and I would now offer the elucidation at which I arrived some months ago. The Aramaic verb that I would employ is cognate to the above Hebrew verb: it is שְׁנָא—or as it is otherwise written, שְׁנָי. This verb in Peal means to be or become different, "anders sein, werden"; in Pael, to make different, to alter, change. The occurrences of the Peal of שְׁנָא are instructive.

Deut. xxxiv. 7:   The glorious splendour of his (Moses') face was not *altered.*

Dan. iii. 27:   The hosen of the three Hebrew youths, after they came out of the furnace, "were not *changed.*" (LXX., ἠλλοιώθη).

Dan. v. 9:   Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance *was changed* in him.   (וְזִיוֹהִי שְׁנַיִן עֲלֹהִי; LXX., ἡ μορφὴ αὐτοῦ ἠλλοιώθη ἐν αὐτῷ.)

Dan. vi. 17:   The stone was sealed at the mouth of the den of lions, that the purpose concerning Daniel might not be *changed* (μὴ ἀλλοιωθῇ).

Dan. vii. 3:   Four great beasts came up from the sea, *different* (שָׁנְיָן) one from another.

Esther iii. 8:   There is a people scattered abroad, . . . and their laws are *different* from those of every people.

Shall I now have any difficulty in persuading my readers that ἕτερον, ἠλλοιώθη, and μετεμορφώθη are diverse renderings of the one word שְׁנִי or הֲוֵי שְׁנִי? Or, if it be thought necessary that the word μετεμορφώθη requires the passive of the Pael, we shall obtain הֲוֵי מִשַׁנַּי = was caused to change, was altered.

But what of the rest of the clause? The equivalent of ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, "in their presence," is בְּאַנְפֵּיהוֹן, and of τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, His countenance, אַנְפּוֹהִי. While for εἶδος = form, appearance, the most suitable word is חֵזוּ, which occurs

Esther ii. 2: Let virgins who are fair in appearance (שַׁפִּירָן דְּחֵזוּ; LXX., καλὰ τῷ εἴδει), be sought for the king's approval.

Isa. liii. 2: In this passage the Targum sadly mars the original Hebrew as it renders : "His *appearance* (חֵזְנֵיהּ; LXX., εἶδος) is not as the appearance of an ordinary man, nor the fear He inspires like that of an uneducated man (הֶדְיוֹט = ἰδιώτης); but the splendour of holiness is His, so that all who see Him shall gaze at Him."

We would suggest therefore that the difference between the third Gospel and the other two has arisen from a slightly variant text.

Luke requires   וחזו דאנפודי שני,

Matthew and Mark שני באנפיהון שני.

Of course in such cases the full amount of variation which our Greek text requires may not have existed in the Aramaic document. Let *one* word be miswritten or misread, and the rest must be pressed in order to give suitable sense.

45. In this instance Dr. Resch compares Matthew xxiv. 27, φαίνεσθαι, D φαίνειν, with Luke xvii. 24, λάμπειν, D ἀστράπτειν, and claims that the Hebrew הֵאִיר explains the variants. If the primitive Gospel was Hebrew, this is probable ; but if it was Aramaic, נְהַר would explain them

equally well. But thére is another couplet in the same passage which Dr. Resch does not mention.

MATT. xxiv. 27.	LUKE xvii. 24.
ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ	ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ
ἐξέρχεται	ἀστράπτουσα
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν	ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν
καὶ φαίνεται	λάμπει
ἕως δυσμῶν.	εἰς τὴν ὑπ᾽ οὐρανόν.

Does the hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urevangelium* shed any light on the variants ἐξέρχεται and ἀστράπτουσα? We are not told. The Aramaic equivalent of ἐξέρχεσθαι is אזד, which occurs twice in biblical Aramaic, Daniel ii. 5 and 8, " The word has gone out from me." The verb used of the shining or flashing forth of light is אזהר, Aphel of זהר.

Prov. iv. 18:   The path of the just is like the light which shineth forth (דמזהר), and its light goes on unto the perfection of the day.

Isa. ix. 2 :   They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shone.

2 Sam. xxiii. 4:   He shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun shines ; *i.e.* flashes or breaks forth.

There are thus two probabilities before us by which to account for the variant ἐξέρχεται. Either we have two readings, אזד and אזהר ; or, since אזהר denotes, as we have seen, the breaking forth of light on preceding darkness, ἐξέρχεται may be a free rendering of אזהר.

50. Dr. Resch here gives אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ, " what they had seen," as the Hebrew equivalent of the three expressions, τὸ ὅραμα (Matt. xvii. 9), ἃ εἶδον (Mark ix. 9), and ὧν ἑώρακαν (Luke ix. 36). This explanation of course answers well for the last two, but leaves τὸ ὅραμα = " the vision," to be considered as a free translation. Now if in Aramaic the *three* phrases closely resemble each other, we shall once more claim the advantage. The Aramaic equivalent of אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ is דְּחֲזוֹ or דְּחֲזִיאוּ ; whereas the word for τὸ ὅραμα is חֵזוּ or חֶזְוָא.

Ezek. i. 1:   I saw in prophet vision (בְּחֵזוּ נְבוּאָה).

Dan. ii. 19 : The mystery was revealed to Daniel in a vision of the
night (בְּחֶזְוָא דִי לֵילְיָא; LXX., ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός).
So vii. 13.

Dan. iv. 10: In visions of my head (בְּחֶזְוֵי רֵאשִׁי; LXX., ἐν ὁράματι
τῆς νυκτός).

According to our theory therefore, the difference of one
letter in an unvocalized text explains the divergence. Mat-
thew and Mark require דחזו = what they had seen ; Luke
חזו, or perhaps חזוא = the vision.

Granted then the existence of a Semitic document as the
source of much of the common matter of the Synoptists,
was it written in Hebrew or in Aramaic ? That question
remains now for others to answer. We have shown that
Dr. Resch's evidence is incomplete *in kind*, and therefore
until the attempt has been made to apply Hebrew in the
same variety of ways as we have applied the Aramaic, we
ought in fairness to wait for a final answer. There are
however some of our strongest points to which Hebrew
affords no solution, and we have shown that in those cases
which Dr. Resch explains by an appeal to Hebrew, the
Aramaic proves equally efficacious, in some cases much
more so, and therefore for the present we may rightly claim
the advantage. Dr. Resch, we may add, devotes some few
pages to "extra-canonical quotations from the *Urevange-
lium*," in which he endeavours to show that the diversity
in the Gospel quotations in the early Fathers presupposes
a Hebrew original. This opens up a wide and deeply
interesting subject for inquiry—a subject which Dr. Resch
has made pre-eminently his own, and in which, as through-
out the whole of his admirable treatise, we shall often
delight to sit at his feet, wishing however most sincerely
that he could see that Aramaic, and not Hebrew, is the
master-key.

                                          J. T. MARSHALL.