Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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."

Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο
Ἡρμήνευσε δ'αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.

PAPIAS APUD EUSEBIUM, *H.E.*, iii. 39.

[AT the request of the Editor of THE EXPOSITOR, I prefix
a few lines for the purpose of commending the following
pages to students interested in the subject with which they
deal. Mr. Allen writes so clearly and cogently that the
philological defects of Professor Marshall's results will be
evident, I am sure, even to those readers who have no
special knowledge of Aramaic to guide them. I wish indeed
that a different verdict upon Prof. Marshall's protracted
and self-denying labours had been possible. In principle,
the hypothesis that the differences frequently observable
between parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels may have
arisen from one of the variants being the translation of a
corrupt Hebrew or Aramaic text, is a thoroughly legitimate
one; it is only because, when brought to a practical test,
it is found to fail, that it has of necessity to be rejected.
A theory which, as Mr. Allen shows, postulates the re-
peated use of Aramaic words in forced or unidiomatic
applications, and with hypothetical meanings entirely un-
known to Aramaic literature, cannot be a sound one. It
may suffice to explain the phenomena presented by the
Gospels in a few isolated and comparatively simple cases:
more than this cannot be conceded. There is only one
point in Mr. Allen's argument at which, perhaps, exception
may be taken. It might be urged, namely, that whereas
one of the divergent renderings is based (*ex hyp.*) upon a
corruption of the original Aramaic text, the inaccurate
Aramaic usage which it implies cannot be pleaded against
the soundness of the hypothesis, the inaccuracy lying not
in the original text, but in the corruption. This is true;

but it may be noticed that not unfrequently both the assumed original reading and the corruption are equally questionable as Aramaic : it is, moreover, a serious defect in Prof. Marshall's method, that often, not to say usually, he leaves this point in ambiguity, and does not, on each occasion, tell his reader distinctly which of the alternatives proposed he conceives to be the genuine original reading, and which the corruption. Without the smallest prepossession against Prof. Marshall's hypothesis, and with every desire to judge it favourably, it is impossible, upon grounds of pure philology, to admit that it possesses plausibility in more than a very small proportion of the instances to which its author has applied it.—S. R. DRIVER.]

Among the unsolved problems which still exercise the ingenuity of New Testament critics, some of the most difficult and baffling are those connected with the so-called Logia of St. Matthew. In what language were they written ? What did they contain ? Did our three synoptists use them in compiling their Gospels ? If so, can we reconstruct them ? With regard to the second and third of these questions, critical inquiry has not, we are told, been altogether barren. " It used," writes Dr. Sanday,[1] " to be keenly debated, whether the Logia admitted any element of narrative ; now this is practically not denied." And the same authority assures us [2] that there is a very large consensus of scholars in favour of what is called the Two-Document Hypothesis ; " namely, that at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents—a narrative by St. Mark," and the Logia of St. Matthew. With regard, however, to the fourth point, controversy still rages. It is hotly debated, we are told, where we are to begin in our search. Shall we find the missing fragments of the Logia in

---

[1] EXPOSITOR, April, 1891, p. 305.
[2] EXPOSITOR, April, 1891, p. 302 ; Feb., 1891, p. 91.

greater proportion in St. Matthew or in St. Luke ? And no
two critics are agreed upon the method of rediscovery to be
pursued. Under such circumstances every fresh suggestion
that seems to point to final success, comes as a ray of light
to men groping in darkness. And quite recently a new
attempt has been made, an attempt so striking in concep-
tion, and so elaborately developed in detail, that it seems
to demand a close and minute examination.

In a series of articles which appeared in the EXPOSITOR
at various times between January, 1891, and August, 1892,
Prof. Marshall attempts to prove the possibility, not only
of detecting the Logia fragments that lie embedded in our
Gospels, but also of retranslating them into the original
Aramaic. Antecedently such a theory is an attractive one,
and we may say once for all that we do not approach it
with any prepossessions against it. As readers of the
EXPOSITOR will be aware, it is sometimes possible from the
divergent readings of the Syriac and Greek translations of
Ecclesiasticus, to restore with absolute certainty the original
text. A case in point may be found in Ecclus. iv. 15.[1]
Here the Greek translator renders " he who will give ear
to her [wisdom] shall judge nations (אֻמּוֹת)," whilst the
Syriac, no doubt rightly, gives " shall judge truth (אֱמֶת)."
A wrong punctuation on the part of the Greek translator
gave rise to a complete misunderstanding of the text.
Theoretically, then, Prof. Marshall's method would seem
plausible, but as it is elaborated by him, it distinctly and
emphatically fails to account for the phenomena to be ex-
plained. In order to embrace the variations in the Greek
text of the Gospels within the limits of a single Aramaic
word or phrase, he is obliged to coin for words meanings
which they never possessed, and to create new construc-
tions which defy grammatical analysis. He has no feeling

---

[1] *Speaker's Comm.*, Introd. to Ecclus., p. 27.

for Aramaic usage or Aramaic idiom. In almost every case where his retranslations have a seeming plausibility, it will be found upon examination that they are linguistically impossible. In the following pages we propose to justify what has just been said, by the few illustrations which our space permits us, and then to offer some further considerations of the theory from a more general point of view.

In the March number of the EXPOSITOR [1] Prof. Marshall proceeds to give instances of "portions of the Synoptic Gospels which present indications of having been translated from an Aramaic original." The second of these deals with a verse in the Parable of the Sower (St. Matt. xiii. 4, St. Luke viii. 5, St. Mark iv. 4). St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us that, in the case of the seed which fell by the wayside, the birds "came" (ἦλθε) and devoured it. St. Luke, on the other hand, says that it was "trodden down" (κατεπατήθη). Prof. Marshall supposes this latter verb to be a translation of the Aramaic root דרך. To account for the variant ἦλθε in the other two evangelists, he assumes that דרך also possessed the meaning of "coming in, entering," an assumption which he supports by the fact that Buxtorf gives as secondary meanings of the root "ingredi, incedere," and by the citation of two passages from the Targums (Deut. xi. 24, Prov. vi. 11). The imposition of this meaning upon דרך is the rock upon which the whole suggestion is shipwrecked. The root-idea of the verb is "to tread," as in the passage in Deuteronomy : "Every place upon which the sole of your foot shall tread." If Buxtorf adds as secondary meanings "ingredi," "incedere," we must not assume that the word can be used to denote "walking" absolutely, much less mere "coming." Prov. vi. 11 is rightly translated by Levy, "*und über dich*

---

[2] The following criticisms, in so far as they concern the March number, are in part based upon some notes written in April, 1891, with the help of Mr. C. F. Burney, B.A., St. John's College, Oxford.

hereinbrechen." In any case the usage here is metaphorical and poetical. We may with confidence affirm that דרך never denotes the abstract idea of motion implied in our English " coming," and every student of Aramaic must feel that the genius of the language would prohibit the application of the word to the movements of birds. Lastly, is it likely that the unusual word דרך would have been rendered by the common-place ἦλθε ?

Prof. Marshall proceeds to account for the difference between ἰκμάδα (St. Luke viii. 6) and ῥίζαν (St. Matt. xiii. 6, St. Mark iv. 6) by supposing a confusion between שרש and שרף, to which he assigns the meaning " moisture." The facts about the word are these. The only instances of its occurrence in the Targums given in the lexicons are Genesis xxxvii. 25, xliii. 10, J.I.,[1] where the Hebrew equivalent is צְרִי, " balsam." Thus we have no known occurrence of the word in the sense " moisture " in Biblical Aramaic. Buxtorf and Levy cite instances from the Talmud, where the word means " succus, lachryma, humor herbarum." Even these however afford no support to Prof. Marshall. The context in St. Luke (ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν) implies that the lack of moisture was a defect in the soil, upon which the seed had fallen (cf. ἰκμὰς in Hdt. IV. 185). We want some word implying moisture in general, and suggesting that the plants failed to find a damp soil, from which they could draw sufficient moisture for more than a premature and short growth. Now this is just what שרף does not express. It always (so far as appears) denotes the juices of the plant itself. To say that a tree withers because it has no sap is mere tautology. How, without the " succus herbarum " implied in שרף, could the plants have attained even sufficient growth to permit of its being said that they withered ?

[1] J.I. stands for the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch : J.II. for the Jerusalem Targum Fragments.

The third example is concerned with two phrases, which, rent from their context to give support to Prof. Marshall's theory, illustrate forcibly the defects of his method. The parallels in question are :—

> St. Mark iv. 19 : αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι.
> St. Luke viii. 14 : ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου.

After postulating for βίος the unnecessary and doubtful meaning " fast life," Prof. Marshall gives us the following reconstruction of what he conceives to have been the original Aramaic of these phrases :—

> The pleasures of luxury = רגנתא דמותר.
> The desires for other things = רגוניא דמותר.

It may be affirmed with confidence that neither phrase can have the meaning assigned to it. Prof. Marshall asserts that " if מותר occurred in an Aramaic text, there would be a reasonable doubt whether it should be rendered ' other things,' or ' luxury.' " The truth rather is that there would be no reasonable doubt that neither rendering would fairly represent the original. The word denotes strictly " that which remains over," in which sense it is used in Exod. xvi. 23 (Onq.) וית כל מותרא אצנעו. Here the addition of כל, and the surrounding context, seem to suggest that " τὸ λοιπὸν" would be a fair rendering. But it must be observed that the Hebrew original is not שארית, but the unusual word עדיף. The more usual Aramaic word for " the rest " is שאר as in Hebrew. But granting the possibility of the first rendering, surely it is impossible to see in מותר any such connotation as " luxury." The instances quoted by Buxtorf lend no support to any meaning except " abundance," or " advantage." Thus in Isaiah i. 9, מותר טוביה דיי means " the abundance of Jehovah's goodness," in Eccles. vi. 8, מה מותרא אית לחכימא suggests the rendering " what advantage has the wise man over the fool ? " and in

Eccles. ii. 13 the meaning is the same. But to identify these ideas with " luxury " or " βlos " is most arbitrary.

The fourth illustration presents us with the following phrases :—

> St. Luke ix. 39: $\kappa a i \ \mu \acute{o} \gamma \iota s \ \grave{a} \pi o \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} \ \grave{a} \pi' \ a \mathring{v} \tau o \hat{v}, \ \sigma v v \tau \rho \hat{\iota} \beta o v$ $a \mathring{v} \tau \acute{o} v.$
>
> St. Mark ix. 18 : $\kappa a i \ \tau \rho \acute{\iota} \zeta \epsilon \iota \ \tau o \grave{v} s \ \grave{o} \delta \acute{o} v \tau a s, \ \kappa a i \ \xi \eta \rho a \acute{\iota} v \epsilon \tau a \iota.$

Prof. Marshall's renderings are :—

> St. Luke : ובעגין ערק פריך.
> St. Mark : ובשגין חרק פריך.

Of these six words, three are used in a forced or doubtful meaning. Can בעגין have the sense implied in $\mu \acute{o} \gamma \iota s$? Does פריך ever mean " to wither ? " And lastly, can ערק express the simple idea of departure implied in $\grave{a} \pi o \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota}$?

עגין in Rabbinic Hebrew denotes, amongst other meanings, a man's business, his daily occupation. In the Targums, where however it is very rare, it signifies the material or substance of anything, or more generally "matter, affair, concern." Three instances of its use are :—

> טובי למאן דמשכיל לעגייני מסכנא : Ps. xli. 2.

" Happy is he who attends to the concerns of the poor."

> מתח עגינהון : Ps. xix. 5 (= Heb. קוּם).
> " The spreading out of their substance."

It is altogether illegitimate to argue that, because עגין occurs in Rabbinic literature in the sense " molestia, occupatio, negotium," בעגין would be used in ordinary Aramaic with the adverbial and secondary meaning expressed by $\mu \acute{o} \gamma \iota s$.

But we pass on to consider the meaning of the verb פרך. Does it signify " to wither " ? In assigning to it this sense Prof. Marshall apparently follows Levy, who renders it by (1) *etwas dörren, rösten* (Gr. $\phi \rho \acute{v} \gamma \omega$, Lat.

frigo), (2) *zerbröckeln*. Had Prof. Marshall consulted
Fleischer's Appendix at the end of the volume, he would
have seen that the first of these two renderings can no
longer be maintained. Prof. Fleischer there states that פרך
is equivalent not to φρύγειν but to θρύπτειν, and that the
idea of "being broken" is the proper signification of the
word. This sense is supported by the renderings given in
Buxtorf, and suits all the passages where the word occurs.
Instances of its use are :—

Ps. lxxx. 17 : מתוקדא בנורא ומיפרכא.

"It is burned in the fire and broken down."

Eccles. iii. 3 : לפרכא בנינא = Heb. לִפְרוֹץ.

"To break down a building."

Isa. xxiv. 7 : אתפריכו גופניא.

"Fractæ, excisæ sunt vites."—*Buxt.*

The translation "to wither" is based on an unsound
etymology and must be abandoned.

But lastly, we have to consider whether ערק expresses
the meaning of ἀποχωρεῖ. It is generally used as the equi-
valent of the Hebrew ברח or נוס in the sense of flight,
impelled by fear or terror. In the Peshitto ܥܪܩ is used to
translate such words as φυγεῖν, ἐκφυγεῖν, ἀποδιδράσκειν. In
St. Matthew ii. 13, 14 it represents ἀναχωρεῖν, to which the
context gives the idea of flight. There is absolutely no
authority for the use of the word in the simple sense of
departure, and so far from any notion of "flight" being
involved in ἀποχωρεῖ, such a nuance is distinctly excluded
by the context.

The next illustration is concerned with the words in St.
Matthew v. 48, "Be ye perfect" (τέλειοι), for which St. Luke
(vi. 36) has "Be ye compassionate" (οἰκτίρμονες). To ac-
count for these variants it is suggested "that the one word
used by our Lord was some form of חסל;...חֲסִיל, perfected,
completed, is the equivalent of τέλειος, and חֲסִיל may well

be rendered by οἰκτίρμων." With regard to these very
extraordinary suggestions, we can only say that both the
meanings thus imposed upon חסל are purely hypothetical,
and unwarranted. חסל, it is true, starts from the meaning
" to be complete," but it never passes into the moral sphere.
It denotes (i.) " to come to an end " (of money), " to cease"
(from doing something); (ii.) "to complete" (2 Chr. vii. 11),
" to consume" [1] (of locusts). With the idea of bringing to
perfection it is used only of a tree ripening its fruit (Num.
xvii. 23, J.II.), or in the technical sense of a nurse weaning
a child (1 Sam. i. 24), an application entirely unconnected
with the moral sense of τέλειοι. The usage of the language
is a fatal objection to the proposal to impose upon חסיל the
meaning of "perfect," "upright." The connection between
οἰκτίρμων and חֲסָיל is, if possible, still less obvious. The
latter word can only mean either "ceasing" or "weaning."
It is quite incredible that it should have suggested to a
Greek translator the idea involved in οἰκτίρμων.

The seventh example presents us with the parallels :—

St. Mark. v. 16.	St. Luke viii. 36.
καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς	ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς
οἱ ἰδόντες	οἱ ἰδόντες
πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ	πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς
καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων	καὶ τὸ τῆς περιχώρου
καὶ ἤρξαντο	ἅπαν πλῆθος
παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν	ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν
ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν	ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν

The obvious Aramaic equivalent for χοίρων is חזירא.
This, if the "matres lectionis" were omitted, might be
mistaken for חזורא, and we are told that the latter word
means "neighbourhood," thus accounting for περιχώρου.
But as a matter of fact חזורא never has this meaning.

---

[1] Very rare, and perhaps only a Hebraism. Levy only quotes Deut. xxviii.
38 (where it corresponds to the Heb. חסל) ; Nah. iii. 16 (in some texts).

There is an adverb חֹור which is nearly always doubled, like the Hebrew סביב סביב, and which is used only in the Jerusalem Targums, the Babylonian dialect preferring סחור סחור. There is also a noun חזרנותא or חוזרנותא (also belonging to the Palestinian dialect) which has the meaning "neighbourhood," but if we adopt this the superficial resemblance to חזירא in great part vanishes.

Another divergence to be accounted for is afforded by the couplet πλῆθος, ἤρξαντο. The latter would be represented in Aramaic by שָׁרִיאוּ. The former, we are informed, would be שֵׁירָא, a caravan; "which meaning would suit well the company of swineherds referred to."

These words give a wrong impression. The word πλῆθος may include, but certainly has not a primary reference to, the swineherds. It is defined as ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν (v. 37), and includes, we presume, those people whom the swineherds had fetched from the city and from the fields (v. 34). And secondly שיירא is a rare word, and is used only of Bedouin wanderers, as in Genesis xxxvii. 25 (Onq.) שירת ערבאי, or in Isaiah xxi. 13, שיירת בני דדן. Even in Isaiah lx. 6, where it represents שפעת, it has the same meaning; for the Targum paraphrases "company of camels" by שיירת ערבאי "caravan of Arabians."

In his eighth example Prof. Marshall almost outdoes himself in laxity of statement. He is comparing the sentences—

St. Matthew ix. 2 : ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον,

St. Mark ii. 3 : αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων,

and in order that we may have a word closely resembling אַרְבְּעָה, four, he gravely informs us that "one of the synonyms for 'bed' is אַרְבָּעָה, strictly, that on which one stretches oneself." After such an assurance it is difficult to hold to our belief that ארבעה implies not "that upon which one stretches oneself," but "the act of lying down," in

which sense it is used only of *cattle !* And yet the latter
is the true meaning of the word, which apparently occurs
only twice in the Targums, Isaiah vii. 25, and lxv. 10,
בית ארבעת בקרן דתורין, "a place of lying down of herds of
oxen."

Having thus disposed of ἐπὶ κλίνης and τεσσάρων, there
remain αἰρόμενον, and βεβλημένον, to be reconciled. How
can we account for these? Prof. Marshall informs us
that both might be represented by "the passive participle
מְטַלְטַל," which "might mean either 'being thrown
down,' or 'being carried to and fro.'" This statement is
not true to fact. מטלטל does not mean "being thrown
down," nor must the Rabbinic use of the Hophal (which
is not intensive), be brought forward to support such a
rendering. The reduplicated form would seem to exclude
the idea of lifelessness involved in βεβλημένον. Prof.
Marshall acknowledges that the Targums prefer the passive
of רמא, but adds "which is the equivalent of טול." This
latter assertion is not justified. The two words express
radically different shades of meaning, as a glance at Levy's
or Buxtorf's examples will prove.

Once again, מטלטל is not the equivalent of αἰρομένον.
The word (in the active voice) is used of trees rustling their
leaves (Deut. xxviii. 15, J.I.), of men shaking their heads (Job
xvi. 4). It occurs frequently in the sense of "expelling," and
the passive participle is used of a "wanderer," or "home-
less vagrant." Even granting for the moment that Prof.
Marshall is right when he asserts, without further proof,
that "the Ithpalpel would mean 'to be carried to and fro,
up and down,'" surely the context demands a word in
which the idea of "to and fro, up and down" falls into the
background, and that of "carrying" is predominant. The
true meaning of the Ithpalpel may be seen in such a pas-
sage as Psalm lxviii. 13, איטלטלו מן פלמריהון, "They were
driven away from their palaces." Since there are several

common words in Aramaic which express the simple notion of " carrying," *e.g.* סבל, טען, יבל, נטל, there can be no good reason for forcing this meaning upon the derivative טלטל. Lastly, there remains the equation $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}=\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$. "It is probable," we are informed, "that they represent גב, which means (1) upon, (2) with, near, beside." This is untrue. גב means not "upon," but "towards," after a verb of motion. In this sense it is rare. Levy cites only Numbers xxi. 9 (J.II.),

<div dir="rtl">תלי אפוי בצלו גב אבוי דבשמיא</div>

" He lifted up his face in prayer towards his Father in heaven." Here the idea of "up" lies in תלי, not in גב. More generally the word means "beside" = the Hebrew עם, or את. It does not correspond to $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$, and therefore "carried by four men" could not be represented by מטלטל גב ארבעה. We doubt whether these three words have any intelligible meaning at all.

The next illustration is taken from the same narrative. The parallels are—

St. Mark ii. 4.	St. Luke v. 19.
ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην	ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα
ὅπου ἦν	διὰ
καὶ ἐξορύξαντες	τῶν κεράμων
χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον	καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ

It is suggested that the variation between ἀπεστέγασαν and ἀναβάντες may be accounted for by a confusion between סְלֵיק and סַלֵּיק. But it is doubtful whether סַלֵּיק could have the required sense. It means strictly "to cause to ascend," and seems never to degenerate into the general idea of "lifting up." Moreover it is not generally used of concrete, physical objects, like a roof. A few examples will illustrate this.

<div dir="rtl"> וטעים סביא יסליק</div> Job. xii. 20:

Heb.: <div dir="rtl">וְטַעַם זְקֵנִים יִקָּח</div>

<div dir="rtl">סליק אפייך מן חובי</div> Ps. li. 11:

Heb.: <div dir="rtl">הַסְתֵּר פָּנֶיךָ מֵחֲטָאָי</div>

The word is used several times of the removal from Israel of the Shekinah, e.g. in

Deut. xxxi. 18 (Onq.) : ואנא סלקא איסליק שכנתי מנהון.

Surely this is hardly the word that would have been used to express the removal of a roof.

We have next to account for the variants στέγην and δῶμα. It is suggested that στέγην represents טְלָלָא, whilst δῶμα presupposes מְטַלְלָא. But we are not satisfied that מטללא could have been applied to a house in Capernaum ; and, even if so used, it would hardly have suggested to a Greek translator the word δῶμα as an equivalent. It is used in the Targums of the booth which Jonah erected outside Nineveh, of the sheds made by Jacob for his cattle (Gen. xxxiii. 17), of the lair of wild beasts (Ps. x. 9), and of the booths set up during the feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 42). Lastly, in Isaiah i. 8, it represents the Hebrew כְּסֻכָּה בְכָרֶם. Prof. Marshall renders this "as a cottage." The usage of the word elsewhere would suggest rather the meaning "as a booth" (so Canon Cheyne). That στέγην could correspond to טללא is hardly more probable. The point here is that whilst the context demands for στέγην the concrete meaning "roof," i.e. the covering of a house, the word טללא, in so far as it admits of this translation at all, rather corresponds to the secondary sense which "roof" may have in English, i.e. "a covering, shelter, abode." The primary idea of the word is "shade, shadow," as in Ecclesiastes vi. 12, viii. 13. But since shade connotes "protection," we find the word employed in such instances as

Gen. xix. 8 (Onq.): בטלל שריתי, "under the shadow of my dwelling" ;

Isa. xxx. 2 : בטלל מצרים, "in the protection of Egypt," in both of which passages the Heb. is צֵל "shadow." It will be seen from these examples that the ideas denoted by טללא and St. Mark's στέγην are radically different.

Lastly, there remain the variants ἐξορύξαντες, κεράμων. The former suggests חפרין. If we transpose two letters, we get פחרין. This, Prof. Marshall tells us, would mean "tiles." But we can find no example of its use in such a sense. There is an Aramaic word, פחרא, which means a "potsherd, sherd, clay vessel." It represents the Hebrew חֶרֶשׂ in Isaiah xxx. 14, xlv. 9 ; Job ii. 8, and כְּלִי in Psalm xxxi. 13. But further proof is desiderated before it can be assumed that it would be applied to the tiles of a roof. The διὰ before κεράμων is equated with ὅπου ἦν by Prof. Marshall, who suggests that the Aramaic בְּנוֹ may be the common original, since בגו "means ' in the midst,' and thus may very well have stood as the original of ὅπου ἦν." But בגו, " in the midst," could not have the meaning of διά. " Through," in such a context, would rather be represented by מִן, as in Genesis xxvi. 8 (Onq.) ואיסתכי אבימלך...מן חרכא for the Hebrew וישקף...בעד החלון. And so the Peshitto in St. Luke gives ܚ ܡܶܢ ܒܶܝܬ ܓ̈ܰܠܠܶܐ. And that בגו standing by itself would suggest ὅπου ἦν is equally unlikely.

In a future number of THE EXPOSITOR we have to consider the following passages :—

St. Matt. x. 28.	St. Luke xii. 5.
φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον	φοβηθῆτε
τὸν δυνάμενον	τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι
καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα	ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν
ἀπολέσαι	ἐμβαλεῖν
ἐν γεέννῃ	εἰς τὴν γέενναν

It is suggested that the variants ἀπολέσαι and ἐμβαλεῖν may be accounted for by a common original, שגר. The instances of this word adduced by Prof. Marshall seem sufficient to prove that it could well represent ἐμβαλεῖν, but we find it hard to believe that שגר, " to set on fire," would have been used in such a context. Prof. Marshall acknowledges that it seems to occur only once in the Tar-

gums, in Ezekiel xxxix. 9, where it is used of the destruction by fire of weapons of war, and adds that in Rabbinic writers it is regularly used of heating a furnace. This being so, we should have thought that the right conclusion to draw would be that the word was unworthy of a place in the Aramaic Gospel. The argument against it is threefold : (1) It is a rare word in Aramaic. (2) It could hardly have been applied to $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$. (3) It would not have been represented by so general a word as $\dot{a}\pi o \lambda \acute{e}\sigma a\iota$. We may remark in passing that we could have wished that Prof. Marshall had given us some solution of the variants—

$$\kappa a\grave{\iota} \ \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} v \ \kappa a\grave{\iota} \ \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a, \text{ and}$$
$$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \ \tau \grave{o} \ \dot{a}\pi o \kappa \tau \epsilon \hat{\iota} v a\iota.$$

Surely these call for explanation more urgently than the not very dissimilar $\dot{a}\pi o \lambda \acute{e}\sigma a\iota \ \acute{e}v$ and $\acute{e}\mu \beta a\lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} v \ \epsilon \acute{\iota} s$.

A further illustration in this article is taken from the Sermon on the Mount.

St. Matt. v. 42.	St. Luke vi. 20.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \ a\grave{\iota}\tauο\hat{\upsilon} v\tauί \ \sigma \epsilon$	$\pi a v\tau\grave{\iota} \ a\grave{\iota}\tauο\hat{\upsilon} v\tauί \ \sigma \epsilon$
$\delta ί\delta ο υ$	$\delta ί\delta ο υ$
$\kappa a\grave{\iota} \ \tau\grave{ο} v \ \theta \acute{e}\lambda ο v\tau a$	$\kappa a\grave{\iota}$
$\dot{a}\pi\grave{ο} \ \sigma ο\hat{\upsilon} \ \delta a v\epsilonί\sigma a\sigma \theta a\iota$	$\dot{a}\pi\grave{ο} \ \tauο\hat{\upsilon} \ a\emptyset ρ ο v\tau ο ς \ \tau\grave{a} \ \sigma \grave{a}$
$\mu \grave{\eta} \ \dot{a}\pi ο \sigma \tau ρ a\phi \hat{\eta} s$	$\mu \grave{\eta} \ \dot{a}\pi aί\tau \epsilon\iota$

$\tau\grave{ο} v \ \theta \acute{e}\lambda ο v\tau a$ in the first passage is dismissed by Prof. Marshall as being an "insignificant detail." These are bold words to apply to a phrase contained in a canonical writing. And moreover a very serious difficulty is thereby concealed. It is just such additions to the supposed original document which, as we hope to show, afford a cumulative argument of great force against the entire theory.

<div style="text-align:right">WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.</div>

<div style="text-align:center">(To be concluded.)</div>