# 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:

it was the foundation of the teaching whereby, under God, he changed a nation of slaves, deeply sunk in degradation and idolatry, into a free, independent, and God-fearing people?

J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

## *"HE CALLED" OR "SHE CALLED"?*

MATT. I. 25.

THE EXPOSITOR published lately a learned discussion " On the Proper Rendering of ἐκάθισεν of John xix. 13." While almost all commentators had taken it in the intransitive sense, " *he sat himself*," and did not even think of the possibility of taking it transitive, " and sat Him," or, when it was brought to their consideration by the new evidence brought forward for it, they declined it, and will, no doubt, for the most part do so, even after Prof. A. Roberts' defence of it ; so it is, perhaps, the case with the similar question : whether καὶ ἐκάλεσεν, Matt. i. 25, must be rendered " and *he* called," or " and *she* called." I may be permitted to lay it before the readers of the EXPOSITOR, the more so as it is a contribution to the most important question of the Aramaic Gospel lately ventilated in these pages.

While reading, the other day, in the *Syriac* New Testament, I was struck, for the first time for myself, by the observation, that this version reads : ܘܩܪܬ ܫܡܗ ܝܫܘܥ—וַקְרָת שְׁמֵה יֵשׁוּעַ—*i.e.*, " and *she* called His name Jesus." I have no sufficient private or public library at my disposal to ascertain, when and where this was noticed for the first time, and how many or how few have taken notice of it in recent times. In Tischendorf's *editio octava*, it is passed over, as also in James Murdock's *literal translation* from the Syriac Peshitto Version (sixth edition, Boston [1893]), where the verse is given : " And he knew her not, until she had borne her first-born son, and called His name Jesus."

That Gutbier already, 1663, and the Broxbourne edition of the Syriac Gospels and Acts of 1815 had noted it, I found afterwards; it may, however, do no harm to call fresh attention to it.

Going a little closer into the matter, I found, firstly, that not only the Vulgate Syriac Version, the Peshitto, reads so, but even the older one, the *Curetonian*, as also does the third, the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*. The fourth, the *Philoxeniana*, is not at my disposal, and I should be thankful to hear how this Revised Version of the Syrians gives the verse. Secondly, I found an apparently unimportant variation in the Greek text between Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort. Tischendorf prints—

καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν,
καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ 'Ιησοῦν.

Westcott-Hort, besides that they put οὗ into brackets, have a *colon* after υἱόν, instead of the simple comma of Tischendorf. It is clear, at first sight, that the *colon is much better*. It gives to the detached sentence and its important fact, which is in no immediate connection with the preceding οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν, its due weight. I think it is a fair specimen of the great care bestowed on the Revised Version, that there also the , of the Authorized Version was changed into : "till she had brought forth a son : and he called His name Jesus."

But it is clear, when we put a comma only, we have but the possibility of translating "and he knew her not . . . and he called"; if, on the other hand, we put a colon, already in the Greek text the possibility opens of rendering :

    " And *he* called," or " and *she* called."

It is, further, clear, why so few thought of this second possibility, and those who did so declined it. For do we not expressly read immediately before our verse (20, 21),

'Ιωσὴφ υἱὸς Δαυείδ μὴ φοβηθῇς, etc., τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν? (Notice again, by the by, the difference here in the interpunction. Tischendorf has a comma after *υἱόν*, Westcott-Hort no interpunction at all; the Authorized Version punctuates like Tischendorf, the Revised has a semi-colon;). There can be, it seems, not the least doubt. But there are already some Greek and Latin manuscripts which, in *v.* 21, instead of the second person, καλέσεις, vocab*is*, give the third, καλέσει, vocab*it*. It is true, these MSS. are few and late, and according to all critical principles, καλέσεις must be considered as the true reading of the Greek text. But *when we retranslate this Greek text into the Semitic original*, which we may presuppose for the Gospel—whether it be Aramaic or Hebrew, makes scarcely any difference in our case—how does it run? Take the Syriac Bible :

ܬܐܠܶܕ ܒܪܐ ܘܬܩܪܝܘܗܝ ܫܡܗ ܝܫܘܥ

or put it in Hebrew :

תֵּלֵד בֵּן וְתִקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ יֵשׁוּעַ

How is this to be translated? It may be just as well, "she will bring forth a son and *she will* call him," or "*thou shalt* call him." Nay, I am sure, every native Syrian, who is reading his Syriac Bible, *not knowing the Greek text*, will understand it in the former way, "*she will* call him," and it is a token of deficient care, that no edition, of which I know—neither that of Gutbier nor the Broxbourne nor Murdock—calls attention to this twofold possibility.

I think it is now clear why the Syriac versions in *v.* 25 so unanimously put "and *she* called "; they took already in *v.* 21 the verb, which in Semitic affords the double meaning, in the same sense, "*and she will call* Him." [1]

[1] Barhebraeus, the great commentator among the Syrians, remarks to this ܠܝܘܣܦ ܂ ܐܢܬ ܗܘ i.e. *thou Joseph*, and adds that Luke reads, *thou Mariam*.

Now rises the question : Did the original gospel contain this wording ? and is our present Greek a mistranslation ? I do not dare to speak definitely; at all events, it is very interesting to see that, according to Luke i. 31, the name is to be given *by Mary*, and that in Luke ii. 21 the *passive* is chosen, ἐκλήθη. By this supposition a little difference between the first and the third Gospels would disappear : and thus, not only in the third, but also in the first, the name would be given by the mother, to whom in most places of the O.T. the giving of the name is attributed. On the other hand, does it fit the position of Joseph, as the husband of Mary, if he is addressed : Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife . . . she shall bring forth a son and (she) shall call His name Jesus ?

There may be reasons adduced for both alternatives, and it would be interesting to hear them.

.It must still be added, that the ambiguity which lies in the Semitic Imperfect וְתִקְרָא, ‏ܰ‏ܘܬܩܪܐ, disappears, when καὶ καλέσεις is given, as is done in the modern Hebrew versions of Delitzsch and Salkinson by the perfect with ו consecutivum. In this case, there can be no doubt in *vowelled* Hebrew, וְקָרָאתְ. But, by a very strange coincidence indeed, in *unvowelled* Hebrew quite the same ambiguity arises; cf. Isaiah vii. 14 (Targum, Septuagint and the Commentaries). It is, however, very questionable whether in New Testament times the perfect with vav consecutive was still used in the same way as in older Hebrew. But this leads into questions which are beyond the range of this paper and demand a master in Hebrew tenses like Driver. It will be sufficient for me to have directed fresh attention to a question which, minute as it is, is not void of interest.

EBERHARD NESTLE.