

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<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.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (*continued*).

IN tracing the occasional divergences in the common matter of the Synoptic Gospels to diverse vocalization of the same Aramaic consonants, and to a variant rendering of the same Aramaic word, to which our attention has hitherto been chiefly confined, we have presupposed that each writer had before him precisely the same text. We pass on now to consider instances in which, as the basis of our elucidation of the divergences in our Greek Gospels, we assume that, in process of transcription, various readings had crept into the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel. The moment we posit a written document as the common source, we are bound to admit the possibility of errors of the scribe. Even in our Greek Testament MSS. which were written in the palmiest days of the Church's history, probably by command of the Roman emperor, on the finest parchment the world could produce, and presumably with the best talent the emperor could command, such errors are of frequent occurrence. And as to the MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures, the evidence is overwhelming that the all but stereotyped uniformity of extant MSS. furnishes no criterion that the text was equally uniform in the first century of our era. We have shown in our February paper that some of our New Testament quotations presuppose a slightly different Hebrew text from that which our Hebrew Bibles present; and in the perusal of the Septuagint, the student who accustoms himself to retranslate the Greek into the original, in cases where it differs from the Masoretic text, finds in multitudes of instances that the difference of one Hebrew letter explains the divergent readings of the LXX. While if the study of the Targums be included, or of the fragments of Origen's

Hexapla, as preserved to us in the magnificent edition of Dr. Field, the indications of the unsettled state of the Hebrew text up to about 150 A.D. are proportionately increased.

It may be well for the reader to turn to pp. 119-121, where we have shown that some of our New Testament quotations presuppose a slightly different text from that which the Masoretic tradition has preserved; and one other illustration may perhaps pertinently be here adduced.

- Romans xii. 19: Vengeance is Mine, I will recompense.
 Deut. xxxii. 35: Vengeance is Mine and recompense.
 „ LXX.: In the day of vengeance, I will recompense.
 „ Sam. Pent.: In the day of vengeance and recompense.

The Hebrew text which these readings respectively presuppose is as follows:

לי נקם אשלם
 לי נקם ושלם
 ליום נקם אשלם
 ליום נקם ושלם

The consideration of the foregoing facts prepares us to admit that, in a community of poor and comparatively unlearned men, as the first Palestinian Christians undoubtedly were, the manuscripts of the earliest Gospel cannot be assumed to have been free from errors of the scribe; and if written on perishable papyrus, they would be the more difficult to decipher, and thus various readings would the more rapidly be increased. We proceed now therefore to discuss the instances in which *the misreading or miswriting of one letter in an Aramaic document would lead to the divergences in the common matter of our Synoptic Gospels*. But before passing on to new cases, we will, for the sake of completeness, briefly cite those of this class which have been incidentally alluded to in our previous papers.

1. Matt. xiii. 6 :	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν	שרש
Luke viii. 6 :	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα	שרף
2. Mark ix. 18 :	τρίξει τοὺς δόντας	חרק בשנין
Luke ix. 39 :	μόγισ ἀποχωρεῖ	ערק בענין
3. Matt. vi. 12 :	ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν	בָּמָא
Luke xi. 4 :	καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν	בָּמָא
4. Matt. xvii. 1 :	εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν	עלאה
Luke ix. 28 :	εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι	צלאה

5. We proceed now to new cases. There are two very common Aramaic words, אָרַךְ and בָּרַךְ, which are manifestly alike. The former means to call, call for, name: the latter, to draw near; Pael, to cause to come near, to bring near. Now if in two passages which possess strong features of resemblance we find a verb "to call for" lying in the Harmony abreast of a verb "to bring near," we shall regard this as evidence of the kind of which we are in search, in support of our thesis that the variation in one letter in the Aramaic MSS. has in many cases occasioned the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

In connexion with the healing of Bartimæus, who sat begging near the gates of Jericho, and who cried for mercy when he heard that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by, the conduct of Jesus is described in slightly variant language.

MARK x. 49.
καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν
αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι.

LUKE xviii. 40.
σταθεὶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς
ἐκέλευσεν
αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι.

Thus we notice that while Mark says, "He commanded him to be *called*," Luke says, "He commanded him to be *brought*." On the second line we have two words almost synonymous in this connexion, εἶπεν and ἐκέλευσεν, and we would suggest the word אָמַר as the original—a word which, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, means to speak, but which also denotes a gentle command. In our English Bible

אִמַּר is rendered by the word "command" twenty-nine times, and "bid" thirteen times. We believe then, that in the two exemplars from which our passage was derived, there was simply this difference :

Mark	אִמַּר דִּיתְקַרְא
Luke	אִמַּר דִּיתְקַרְב

The suitability of the verbs קַרְא (1) and קַרְב (2) scarcely calls for illustration, but we cite one or two cases of each as specially apposite.

- (1) 1 Sam. iii. 8: Here am I; for thou didst *call* me.
 Esther ii. 14: She came in no more unto the king, unless . . . she were *called* by name pronounced and written.
 Esther iv. 11: I have not been *called* (לָא אִתְקַרִיתִי) to come in unto the king these thirty days.
- (2) Gen. xviii. 8, 9: And Israel saw Joseph's sons, and he said, . . . *Bring them near* unto me, that I may bless them.
 Exod. xxii. 8: The master of the house (to whom property had been entrusted which was afterwards stolen) *shall be brought* unto the Elohim.

There is one remark I would like to make on this passage before leaving it. It will be noticed that in Mark I have quoted a reading not approved by our Revised Version. This is almost the only instance in which I shall do this. I have all but invariably found that the revised readings yield best to our hypothesis; indeed, many a precious hour has been wasted by neglecting to rectify the text of Stroud or Greswell, and applying our method to second-rate readings. All truth is mutually confirmatory; and it cannot but interest those who have been devoting so much valuable time to textual criticism of the New Testament to be informed that the theory of a primitive Aramaic Gospel in almost every case supports the readings of the Revised Version, and shows them to be the oldest. In the case before us however the Revisers,

with B, C, L, Δ, Ν, read *εἶπεν φωνήσατε αὐτόν*, "He said, Call ye him," instead of *εἶπεν αὐτόν φωνηθῆναι*, which is supported by A, D, and the remaining MSS., and also by the Syriac. Subjective criticism suggests that the rare use of *εἶπεν* in the sense of command caused at an early date the change to the *oratio recta*; and this suggestion is confirmed by our hypothesis, as well as by the Syriac versions, which do not always receive the full weight they deserve.

6. We would next turn to the narrative of the woman with the issue of blood, where we shall find two cases in which our present point is illustrated. In describing the previous efforts which the woman had made to find a remedy for her disease before she came to Christ, we have two parallel expressions:

- Mark v. 26: *δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα.*
Having spent all that she had.
- Luke viii. 43: *προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον.*
Having squandered all her living.

The two participles are almost synonymous, and we would suggest that the original Aramaic word was **ܒܘܒܐ**, to spend up, to spend to the very last. It occurs Ecclesiastes iii. 22, where the Targum amplifies the Hebrew text thus: "Why should I squander my money to destroy my righteousness? It is well for me to leave it to my son after me, or to support myself from it in the time of my old age."

As for the rest, *τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα* = "all that belonged to her," or, "all that she had," this would be **ܟܠܡܐ ܕܠܗܐ ܟܠܗܐ** or **ܟܠܡܐ ܕܠܗܐ**; whereas *ὅλον τὸν βίον*, "all her living," is **ܟܠܡܐ ܕܠܗܐ**. The noun **ܡܘܢܐ** has a peculiar interest, as disclosing the astrological pursuits of which the Jews were so fond, and which made "wandering Jews" the gypsies of the first Christian century. It denotes (1) a planet,

especially Jupiter; (2) fortune, fate; and (3) wealth, substance, means of living. In this last sense it occurs in the Targum as the equivalent of the Hebrew וְנֶחֱמָה.

Prov. xxix. 3: He that keepeth company with harlots squanders his *living* (חַיָּתוֹ).

Prov. xix. 4: *Wealth* addeth many friends; but poverty separateth one's friend from him.

Ps. cxix. 14: In the way of Thy testimonies I have rejoiced, as much as in all *riches*.

7. In the same narrative, when the evangelists describe the suddenness of the cure effected by touching the fringe of the Saviour's shawl, we have an interesting divergence:

MARK v. 29.
καὶ ἐνθέως
ἐξήρανθη
ἡ πηγὴ
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

LUKE viii. 44.
καὶ παραχρῆμα
ἔστρη
ἡ ῥύσις
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

This furnishes us a fair specimen of the Synoptic problem. The resemblance in the order and number of the words is too close to allow us to suppose absolute independence. The diversity is too great to admit the theory of mutual use. If either evangelist had access to the work of the other, we cannot suppose that either would be so capricious as to exchange ἐνθέως for παραχρῆμα. There remains then our theory of translation from a common source. On this theory it is perfectly natural that we should have the same number and order of words, synonymous words and phrases, and also, from various causes, some little diversity. On this theory it is the most natural thing possible that an Aramaic word חַבִּיל or בְּפִרְיָע = immediately, should be translated in one case ἐνθέως and in the other παραχρῆμα; and that the word אַרְיָתָא, which denotes (1) a pool or fountain, "stagnum, fons," as in Ps. cvii. 35, "He made the wilderness to be like a *pool* of

water"; and (2) a stream, "rivus," as in Psalm lxxviii. 44, "He turned their *streams* into blood," should be rendered by the two translators *πηγή*, a fountain; *ρύσις*, a stream—especially when we find that this same word, with the prosthetic *Ṣ* dropped, was used in rabbinic literature in the technical sense required by the context. Then we have the parallels *ἐξηράνθη* = "was dried up," and *ἔστη* = "stood still." These are not quite synonymous, but can be explained by the change in one single letter. The Aramaic equivalent of *ἐξηράνθη* is *אֲתַנְנִיב*, and the aptness of the word to the context will be clear from the following passages:

Gen. viii. 13: The waters were *dried up* from off the earth.

Job xiv. 11: The waters departed from the Red Sea; . . . and Jordan was *dried up* and parched before the ark of Jehovah, and returned to the place of its sources.

Ps. cvi. 9: He rebuked the Red Sea, and it was *dried up* (*אֲתַנְנִיב*). In rabbinic literature the verb is regularly used of drying the hands after washing, and the body after bathing.

We believe then that the word which stood in the Aramaic MS. used by Mark was *אֲתַנְנִיב*; but if we suppose that, instead of this word, the MS. used by the evangelist Luke contained, or seemed to contain, *אֲתַנְנִיב*, there would be no resource for him but to translate this word after the analogy of the Hebrew *נָצַב* or *הִתְנַצַּב*, "stood still," *ἔστη*. This is the more probable, as we have noticed with a frequency almost approaching to a "law," that Luke is prone to decipher his exemplar as yielding a Hebrew word, where the others translate an Aramaic word; or to give a Hebrew meaning to a word which exists with slightly diverse meanings in the two languages—thus implying that he was more familiar with Hebrew than with Aramaic.

8. We would now draw an illustration from the sermon on the mount:

MATT. v. 15.	MARK iv. 21.	LUKE viii. 16.	LUKE xi. 33.
οὐδὲ	μήτι	οὐδεὶς	οὐδεὶς
καίουσιν	ἔρχεται	ἄψας	ἄψας
λύχνον	ὁ λύχνος,	λύχνον	λύχνον
καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν	ἵνα τεθῆ	αὐτὸν τήθησιν	τήθησιν
ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον.	ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ;	ὑποκάτω κλίνης.	ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον.

We have here clearly two variants : (1) "A lamp *does not* come that one may place it under the bushel" (Mark) ; and, (2) "One *does not kindle* a lamp and place it under the bushel." Can it be a mere accidental circumstance that the verb "to come" is **ܟܘܡܐ**, and the verb "to kindle" is **ܟܘܢܐ**? It is needless to adduce illustrations of **ܟܘܢܐ**, which is in the Targums the constant equivalent of the Hebrew **בָּרַךְ** ; and is, by the way, preserved in the New Testament, in the watchword of the early Christians, **ܟܘܢܐ ܟܘܢܐ**, Maran atha, Our Lord cometh. The suitability of **ܟܘܢܐ** to the context is clear from the following Targumic passages :

Isa. xlv. 15 : The prophet, in exposing the folly of idolatry, says of some of the wood from which the god is made, "he *kindleth* it (LXX. *καύσαντες*), and baketh bread."

Hosea vii. 4 : Like an oven which the baker *kindles* for himself.

The presence of *καίω* and *ἄπτομαι* is quite in harmony with our theory, but not sufficient of itself to substantiate it. It would be venturesome to assert from this evidence alone that **ܟܘܢܐ** stood in the *Urschrift* ; but when we have the decided variant *ἔρχεται* = **ܟܘܡܐ**, then we have veritable evidence as to the original text.

9. Another instance in which **ܟܘܡܐ**, or, as it is often written, **ܟܘܡܐ**, seems to have been mistaken for another word is in the following passages :

Luke ix. 46 : *εἰσηλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς.*

A reasoning entered among them.

Mark ix. 34 : *πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν.*

For they reasoned among themselves.

These two passages are strictly parallel. Each is in-

troductory to the placing of the child in the midst as the example of humility, and yet we have this interesting diversity. It must be felt that *εἰσῆλθεν* is used in an uncommon sense; and we would suggest as the solution that in the MS. used by Luke **אתי** was miswritten for **ארי**, the regular word meaning "for."

Luke's text requires: **אתי ביניהון תוכחא**
 Mark's **ארי ביניהון אתוכחא**

The last words in the couplets are respectively **תוכחא** = "controversy," and **אתוכחוי**, 3 pl. Ithpael of **כח**. This is the usual verb for argument or debate, in which each of the disputants tries to vindicate himself, or to establish his claim to the ownership of the thing under dispute. It occurs in Genesis xxi. 25, when Abraham asserted his claim to the well of water which the servants of Abimelech had violently taken away; and in 2 Samuel xix. 9, of the fierce controversy between the men of Israel, after the death of Absalom, as to whether they should return to their allegiance to David. Thus the verb and its cognate noun may well be used of the controversy among the disciples as to "which of them should be the greatest."

10. Let us now turn to a general statement as to Christ's activity in Galilee, which is given with substantial agreement in the second and third Gospels.

MARK i. 34.	LUKE iv. 41.
καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια	καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν
οὐκ ἤφιε	οὐκ εἶα
λαλεῖν	αὐτὰ λαλεῖν,
ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν.	ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν
	τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι.

Can any theory explain the phenomena in these two passages so satisfactorily as that of translation from a common document? It is not a description of any one event, but a summarized account of Christ's general activity.

The description is evidently cast in the same mould : phrase corresponds with phrase. The synonyms *ἡφιε* and *εἶα* preclude the theory of mutual use. All we need therefore to establish our theory is to show that in Aramaic the words "demon" and "rebuke" might easily be mistaken. Let us see if this is so. The most common word for "rebuke" is ܩܢܝܢ; and usually where it occurs in the Targums, the verb *ἐπιτιμῶ* occurs in the LXX. It occurs for instance :

Zech. iii. 2: Jehovah *rebuke* thee, O seducer!

Nahum i. 4: Who *rebuked* the sea.

Mal. iii. 11: Jehovah shall for you *rebuke* the devourer.

Num. xii. 14: If her father have merely *rebuked* her, shall she not be shut up seven days?

The equivalent of *ἐπιτιμῶν* is thus ܩܢܝܢܝܢ. But suppose that, instead of ܩܢܝܢܝܢ, the MS. of Mark contained, or seemed to contain, ܩܢܝܢܝܢܝܢ. This would mean "the injurious one," or "the malevolent one"—the Peal participle of the verb ܩܢܝܢ, which in Peal and Aphel alike means to injure; indeed the Aphel participle is regularly used as a noun, ܩܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢ, a malevolent evil spirit, a demon; as for instance :

Ps. cvi. 37: They sacrificed to *demons* (LXX. *δαίμονιους*).

Ps. xci. 5: Thou shalt not be afraid through fear of evil spirits (ܩܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢ), which walk in darkness; nor of the arrow of the angel of death which he shooteth by day.

Cant. viii. 3: The paraphrast here describes the bride, *i.e.* Israel, as rejoicing that she is surrounded on the right hand and on the left by the incense of prayer, that it is not possible for an evil demon (ܩܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢ) to hurt her.

The Peal participle ܩܢܝܢܝܢ is then, we believe, rendered by the meaning which it shares in common with the more frequent Aphel participle ܩܢܝܢܝܢܝܢܝܢ = the malevolent one: *δαίμόνιον*.

11. In the account of the healing of the demoniac boy after the transfiguration there are two interesting varia-

tions in the words which the distressed father addresses to the Saviour as he comes to meet Him.

MATT. xvii. 15.

Κύριε,
ἐλέησόν
μου τὸν υἱόν.

MARK ix. 17.

Διδάσκαλε,
ἤνεγκα
τὸν υἱόν μου.

LUKE ix. 38.

Διδάσκαλε,
δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.

There are found in the Targums two words which are used of earnest, impassioned entreaty for pity or help. These are **בְּבַעֵי** or **בְּבַעֵית**, and **בְּמַטִּי** or **בְּמַטִּית**. The former is a noun **בַּעֵי**, from the verb **בָּעַע**, to pray or appeal, with the prefix **בְּ**; and in this form is used as an interjection, like the Hebrew **בִּי**.

Gen. xix. 18:

Lot said, O now, my lords.

Gen. xxiii. 11 (Jonathan): I-beseech-thee (**בְּבַעֵי**), my lord, hear me.

Gen. xxii. (Jerusalem): Oh for mercy (*i.e.* I pray for mercy, **בְּבַעֵי רַחֲמִין**), that when the sons of Isaac come in the hour of their distress, Thou mayest remember for them the binding of Isaac their father, and remit and forgive their sins.

The phrase **בְּבַעֵי רַחֲמִין**, in which it will be observed that **רַחֲמִין** stands as an accusative to the interjection, occurs twice in this prayer of Abraham.

The word **בְּמַטִּי** is found only in the Targum of Jonathan, and is apparently precisely the equivalent of **בְּבַעֵית**, being used in Jonathan where Onkelos has **בְּבַעֵית**; *e.g.* twice in Judah's appeal, Genesis xliii. 20 and Genesis xlv. 18. I have failed however to find an instance in which **בְּמַטִּי** is followed by an accusative, as **בְּבַעֵי** is; but this is doubtless due to the scantiness of our literature. I suggest then that the common text, of which Matthew and Luke give a free translation, was **בְּרִי בְּמַטִּית**, O my son! I pray for my son!

Instead of this, Mark has "I brought my son"; but the verb "to bring" is אָמַי, Aphel of מָטָה.

Gen. xxvii. 25 (Jonathan):	Esau brought it (venison) to his father.
Exod. xxii. 12, J:	If a beast entrusted to a neighbour to keep be torn by wild beasts, he shall bring the owner to the torn body.
Lev. ii. 8, J:	He shall bring it to the altar.

In accordance with this conjecture then, we would reproduce the original passages thus:

I brought my son = ברִי אִמַּיִת
 I pray for my son = ברִי בַמַּטָּה

12. Under the word מָטָה, Buxtorf in his lexicon, suggests that as בָּעַי comes from the verb בָּעַה = to beseech, so there must have been a word מַטָּה which also meant to beseech, though this meaning does not seem to attach to the word in extant literature. The verb מַטָּה means to arrive, alight upon, happen; so that if it possessed also the meaning of "beseeching," it would be precisely after the analogy of the Greek word ἐντυγχάνω. That it did possess this force is, we think, rendered clear from a passage in the narrative we have just had under our consideration.

Matt. xvii. 16:	I brought him to Thy disciples.
Mark ix. 18:	I spake to Thy disciples.
Luke ix. 40:	I besought Thy disciples.

Will it need any persuasion to convince my readers that we have here respectively

אִמַּיִת אִמַּרִית מָמַיִת?

We would suggest that the last was the original reading; but being of rare occurrence, it was translated, or replaced in the hands of the copyists, by two better known words.

13. In describing the healing of the leper who came to Christ in the first days of His ministry, with such wondrous faith, saying, "If Thou art willing, Thou art able

to cleanse me," we find different phrases used to describe the fact of his recovery.

Matt. viii. 3: His leprosy was cleansed.

Luke v. 13: His leprosy departed from him.

Mark i. 42: His leprosy departed from him, and was cleansed.

We would suggest that this difference is due to a various reading: אֲתִנְקֵת for אֲתִנְדֵת. The verb נקה in Pael means "to cleanse"; as in Isaiah i. 25, "And I will bring back the blow of My strength upon thee; and I will purify thy sins, as one who *cleanseth* with soap; and I will remove thy transgressions." The verb נָדַד is found in the Targum of Esther vi. 1, where the paraphrast, not content with stating that in that night sleep *departed* from king Ahasuerus, describes most volubly that sleep departed also from the Holy One, from Esther, from Haman, and from Mordecai. In each case we have in Buxtorf's edition of the Targum נָדַד, which Levy however, in his lexicon, corrects to נִדַד. The Ithpeal has the same meaning as the Peal, so that אֲתִנְדֵת אֲתִנְדֵת would mean "his leprosy departed."

In the reading in Mark's Gospel, "His leprosy departed from him, *and was cleansed*," we have our first instance of a phenomenon which will before long engage our serious attention—doublets in Mark. We shall endeavour to show that the phenomenon to which Canon Driver has directed attention in his deeply instructive work on the books of Samuel, as a remarkable feature in the LXX., occurs also in our present text of Mark; that is to say, when a transcriber is acquainted with two translations of the original, in his uncertainty as to which is correct, he sometimes inserts *both*. We shall endeavour to show that the repetitions for which Mark's Gospel is famous have in most cases arisen from uncertainty as to the Aramaic reading, as in the case before us.

14. When our Lord had healed the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the Sabbath day, the Pharisees were much enraged, and their subsequent action is thus described :

MATT. xii. 14.	MARK iii. 6.	LUKE vi. 11.
ἐξελθόντες	ἐξελθόντες	ἐπλήσθησαν
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	αὐτοὶ
	μετὰ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν	ἀνοίας·
συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν	διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.	as Matt.	τί ἂν ποιήσῃαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

In this brief passage there are three, if not four, of the lines in which the divergence can be explained by our hypothesis. On the first line we have ἐξελθόντες = "they went out," standing alongside ἐπλήσθησαν = "they were filled." But to express the idea of going out or away to a definite spot, or with a definite object in view, as in the case before us, the correct verb is ܘܢܬܢܐ: as we see from Numbers xxiii. 15, where Balaam says to Balak, "Stand here, while I go yonder," and 1 Samuel ix. 9, "Come, let us go to the seer"; whereas the regular verb, meaning "to be filled" is ܘܢܬܢܐ.

It will be noted that we place ἀνοίας abreast of τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν in our harmony. We do this with some little hesitancy. If we had evidence that the popular name for the Herodians was "the men of the *stoa*"—the *stoa* being used in Talmudic writers for the hall or pavement at the gates of palaces, where the magnates sat to listen to cases of litigation—then we might feel at liberty to affirm that there had been a confusion between ܘܢܬܢܐ = a hall or pavement, and ܢܘܦܠܐ = folly, insanity. The latter word occurs Jeremiah xxviii. 16 and xxix. 32: and the crime of Haniah and Shemaiah was just the same as that of which the Pharisees were guilty—malignantly opposing God's truth. But until the desired evidence is forthcoming we would not speak with confidence.

15. Further, it will be noted that while Matthew and Mark say, "they took counsel," Luke says, "they conversed with each other." This is precisely the difference between אֲתַמְלִיכוּן and אֲתַמְלִילוּן, as the following passages show :

- Ps. lxii. 4: When they swear to show kindness, they *are consulting* (מִתְמַלְכִּין) to cast him down: they bless with their mouth, but they curse secretly.
- Ps. lxxi. 10: They that watch for my soul *take counsel together*.
- Exod. xxxii. 11, J: God conversed (מִתְמַלֵּל) with Moses.
- Num. vii. 89, J: When Moses went in to speak with Him, he heard the voice which *conversed* with him from upon the mercy seat.

16. In the last line, it is abundantly clear that the difference between ἀπολέσωσιν and ποιήσκειαν is due to a confusion between אֲבַר, to destroy, and אֲבַר, to do. In Hebrew אֲבַר regularly means to work, serve, but is almost invariably used in the Targums as the equivalent of אֲבַר, to do, which latter word is in the Targums never once to be seen.

17. Our space will admit of but one more illustration. It shall be taken from the prediction of the Saviour as to His second advent.

MATT. xxiv. 23 and MARK xiii. 21.

τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ,
'Ιδοῦ, ὦδε ὁ Χριστός,
'Ιδοῦ, ἐκεῖ,
μὴ πιστεύσητε.

LUKE xvii. 23.

καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν,
'Ιδοῦ, ὦδε,
'Ιδοῦ, ἐκεῖ.
μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε,
μηδὲ διώξῃτε.

Thus when, to those who are perplexed by numerous claims of different persons to the Messiahship, the Lord Jesus gives advice as to how His disciples were to act, we find that two of the evangelists record his words to have been: "Do not believe," or "do not trust in them":

while Luke says, "Do not depart," "Go not away from them, nor pursue after them"; remain tranquil. This is just the difference between לֹא תִתְרַחֵקוּן and לֹא תִתְרַחֲצוּן. The following quotations from the Targums make this abundantly clear.

- Ps. cxlvi. 3: Do not *trust* in princes (לֹא תִתְרַחֲצוּן).
 Jer. vii. 4: *Trust* not in the words of the false prophet.
 Jer. xvii. 5: Cursed is the man that *trusteth* in man.
 Ps. xxv. 2: O my God, in Thee have I *trusted*.

Then as instances of אֲתִרְחֵק, to go far away, to go to a distance, depart, we may quote :

- Isa. xxxiii. 8: Because they have changed My covenant, they have *gone away* from their cities : man does not think of the evil that is coming upon him.
 Ezek. viii. 6: Son of man, seest thou what these do? the many abominations which the house of Israel are doing there, that I should *go far away* from them.
 Ezek. xi. 15: Son of man, thy brethren have said, *Get you far away* from the Lord.

If the MS. used by Luke read תִּתְרַחֲקוּן, and conformity with this rendered necessary the translation $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$, we are not surprised at the addition $\mu\eta\delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \delta\iota\acute{\omega}\xi\eta\tau\epsilon$.

In our next paper we intend to adduce evidence that the *Logia* contained some of the peculiarities of dialect which are found in the Samaritan Targum ; and that the uncertainty caused by the dialectical forms has led in many cases to the divergent renderings found in our Greek Gospels.

J. T. MARSHALL.