

*THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.*

REPLY TO DR. DRIVER AND MR. ALLEN.

OXFORD has at length broken silence. More than two years ago Dr. Sanday, in a brief foot-note, ominously warned the readers of *THE EXPOSITOR* that there were some Semitic scholars in Oxford who were unable to endorse the warm encomium he has pronounced upon the author of the papers on the Aramaic Gospel. One of Oxford's youngest sons has given voice to the local dissatisfaction, and Dr. Driver, his instructor, has written a prefatory note "commending" Mr. Allen's "papers to students interested in the subjects on which they deal." To what extent Dr. Driver commits himself to all the statements of his disciple has been disputed. One periodical belonging to Canon Driver's own communion—*The Church of England Pulpit*—has gone so far as to charge the Canon with "evading the real question at issue" and indulging in "misleading verbiage" instead of stating plainly whether Mr. Allen or myself is the better Aramaic scholar. Dr. Driver's remarks are certainly condensed, and perhaps not marked by his customary lucidity; but, though the above review was prompted evidently by the kindest feelings towards myself, I must frankly admit that I consider it scarcely just to Dr. Driver. He intended, no doubt, to endorse Mr. Allen's papers—to "countersign them," as I am informed on good authority, and must be held responsible for *all* that they contain. For my own part I very much wish that Dr. Driver had replied *in propria personâ*. In the first place, I am unwilling to think that if Dr. Driver had really worked at the subject there would be so many blemishes as disfigure Mr. Allen's papers; and then I am quite certain that Dr. Driver would have written more modestly. The arrogance which Mr. Allen has

thought proper to assume is now happily seldom used by scholars in Biblical research, and is, in the present instance, woefully misplaced.

The remarks I have to offer on Mr. Allen's papers arrange themselves under five divisions :—

I. The papers ignore the cumulative nature of the argument.

II. They contain blunders due to sheer carelessness in consulting the materials before him.

III. They contain numerous errors due to a deficient acquaintance with Palestinian Aramaic literature.

IV. Many of the objections urged are hypercritical and unreasonable.

V. Mr. Allen ignores certain phenomena which are inseparable from the work of translation.

I. Mr. Allen manifests no appreciation of the cumulative nature of the argument.

This can best be understood by my giving a brief *résumé* of the history of the development of the hypothesis. When first the idea struck me that possibly the divergences in the Synoptics might be explained by an appeal to a written Semitic gospel, I began my investigations in total ignorance of the writings of those who had held the same theory, and under the pre-supposition that this document would be in Hebrew. The results however were very meagre and unsatisfactory. Then I took up the study of Aramaic, and under the belief that in the Targum of Onqelos we have the purest classical type of Aramaic, I carefully studied Onqelos, with such success that I was confident I was on the right tack, for the divergent Greek words yielded in several instances closely similar Aramaic words, or were explainable by the diverse meanings of the same word. Then I carefully studied the Samaritan Targum, and was much struck by its peculiarities, especially by the great carelessness in

spelling any word that contains a guttural. Almost any one guttural may be substituted for another, or any sibilant for another, and ׀ often takes the place of ׁ. To my immense pleasure I then noticed that in many instances the Aramaic equivalents of the divergent Greek words simply differ from one another in one of the above ways. Then I read the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel and the Hagiographa, noting the improved yield which I received from the Hagiographa as compared with the earlier books. Afterwards I procured a copy of the two Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch, studied them through and through, and was delighted to find that almost every word which I had appropriated from my earlier reading of the Targums was here; and not only so, but that several words which accorded best with the requirements of my hypothesis were to be found only in these Palestinian Targums. Then quite recently I have made a thorough study of the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, as edited by the late Paul de Lagarde. This version of the gospels was used by the Christians of Palestine from the fourth or fifth century to the time of the Arabian supremacy; and, though written in Syriac characters, it belongs essentially to the same type of dialect as the Palestinian Targums. This has in several ways confirmed the accuracy of my investigations; but as the purport of the present article is, alas! polemical rather than constructive, I may not here dilate on this. As specimens of Palestinian Aramaic we include then:—the Targum of the Hagiographa, the two Palestinian Targums, known as that of Pseudo-Jonathan and the fragmentary Jerusalem Targum; the Samaritan Targum, the so-called Jerusalem Lectionary, the book of Tobit, and the Aramaic portions of the Bible.<sup>1</sup> There are decided differences among all these specimens, but there is in the vocabulary a resemblance which is

<sup>1</sup> This list should also include the Jerusalem Talmud, but my acquaintance with this is limited.

deeply interesting. I have taken the trouble to draw out lists of those words which they possess in common, but which are *not* found in Onqelos and "the Prophets," and find that a fair proportion of them has been claimed by me for the Aramaic Gospel.

It may perhaps be asked, Why, when the primitive Gospel was, *ex hypothesi*, a Palestinian document, I did not begin my investigations with the extant specimens of Palestinian literature. I may candidly confess that I did not at first know what the nature and importance of the difference was, between the different types of Aramaic. But was I not in this also "fortunate in my limitations?" Does not the groping, tentative way in which I proceeded confirm the reliableness of my conclusions? If I had not been working in the right vein, why was I unsuccessful in the application of Hebrew? Why, in the study of Onqelos, was I successful only with words which proved to be common to Onqelos and the Palestinian Targums?

When it is considered (1) that with a mind totally devoid of preconceptions, I was led to a vocabulary overwhelmingly Palestinian; (2) that the clerical errors, etc., which I found it necessary to assume, were the same *in kind* as those which manifest themselves in other Greek writings *known* to be a translation from a Semitic original—the Hebrew Scriptures; (3) that these kinds of divergence exist in almost the same ratio as in other works known to be translations; (4) that, according to tradition, the author was a Galilean, and there are numerous clear indications of Galilean dialect; and (5) that taking the linguistic clue into our hands, and following it solely and implicitly, we find that the contents of the Aramaic original were almost coterminous with the Galilean ministry—we have here a focussing of evidence which is really irresistible. The line of attack pursued by Mr. Allen is certainly trenchant, and of my first paper—the one designed to show that the

divergences in the Greek are due in some cases to the diverse vocalization of the same consonants—he makes sad havoc; but of the rest he only selects one here and one there for censure and deletion. So that if the whole memorable thirty and nine cases cited by Mr. Allen were dropped, the argument is so multiform that Mr. Allen's attack leaves the strength of the position almost intact. That this cannot however for one moment be conceded, it is now my purpose to show.

II. In some instances the objections raised by Mr. Allen are mere blunders due to a careless consultation of the materials before him.

1. In the June number (pp. 462, 463) Mr. Allen, with much gaiety, charges me with vacillation as to the type of Aramaic in which the primitive Gospel was written. Since my contention is for Truth, and not merely for Victory, I concede that a more decisive utterance on this point was called for. I now consent that no case shall reckon as evidence of the first rank, unless the word claimed to have occurred in the Aramaic original is found, with its Greek meaning, in extant *Palestinian* literature. If there are any words thus claimed by me which are found only in Onqelos, and consequently eschewed in the Pal. Targg., I gladly surrender them to the one who finds them. Words found only in the Targum of "the Prophets," and probably uncalled for by the subject-matter of extant Palestinian literature, shall be allowed to remain as evidence of the second rank. In view of the history just given of the development of my theory, it might have been supposed that Mr. Allen would have scored well in this respect. But it is not so. He adduces (VII. 463)<sup>1</sup> from my papers two words

<sup>1</sup> My papers appeared in Volumes III., IV. and V. of the Fourth Series of the EXPOSITOR; Mr. Allen's in Volume VII. For brevity, I indicate thus by the number of the volume.

found *only* in Pal. Aram.—which is of course as it should be. Then, to prove my vacillation, he claims to cite two words *never* found in Pal. Aram. The first of these is אָרִי = “for.” Instead of this word, Pal. Aram. literature decidedly prefers אָרִים; but does not Mr. Allen know that in the fragmentary Palestinian Targum אָרִי is not uncommon, as *e.g.* Genesis xxi. 7, xxxi. 15? Next, Mr. Allen charges me with using בְּבַעֵי, the Babylonian word, instead of בְּמַטֵּי, the Palestinian. Here, strange to say, are two blunders. (1) I do *not* use בְּבַעֵי; בְּמַטֵּי is the word I make use of (III. 463). (2) Had I done so, there would have been no error; for בְּבַעֵי appears side by side with בְּמַטֵּי all through the Pal. Targg. Was not Mr. Allen aware of this? This is rather a startling basis for the loud assertion that I have “scoured the range of Aramaic literature in search of linguistic curiosities.” In all the four cases cited I adhere quite consistently to Palestinian Aramaic.

2. On page 393 (VII.) Mr. Allen avers that “the translation “wither,” for פָּרַךְ, is based on an unsound etymology, and must be abandoned,” and charges me with neglecting to read Dr. Fleischer’s Appendix to Levy’s Lexicon, where it is stated, he says, that “פָּרַךְ is not equivalent to φρύγειν—‘to parch,’ but to θρύπτειν—to ‘crush by rubbing.’” Now this is quite wrong. The point at issue between Levy and Fleischer is simply as to what is the *primary* signification. Levy says that פָּרַךְ means (1) φρύγειν, (2) θρύπτειν. Fleischer says the primary meaning is θρύπτειν, and that φρύγειν is secondary. I am amazed how Mr. Allen could assert that פָּרַךְ does not mean to *wither*, in view of such passages as Ps. xc. 5, Isa. xxiv. 7, and especially of Lam. iv. 8, “The skin is parched, withered, like wood.” Indeed, I can conceive of no stronger proof of the accuracy of our hypothesis than that, in the description of the condition of the demonized boy, ξηραίνεται = “is *withered*,” should stand parallel to συντρίβον = “*crushing* him” (Mark ix. 18 || Luke ix. 39).

3. Another case in which Mr. Allen has made imperfect use of his Lexicon, is, when he affirms (vii. 398) that טללא cannot mean the same as *στέγη* in Mark ii. 4. Now *στέγη* means a "covering" or "roof," and the kind of roof in the present case was one composed of brushwood, marl and mortar, which could be "dug out." But טללא means "Bedachung," "a covering affording protection," "tectum." If Mr. Allen will consult Levy again, he must see that its associations are precisely those of such a roof as is here described, and he will find the reference Zeph. ii. 14. "They destroy the door, they demolish the *roof*," and the passage from Berachoth, of the rod which fell from the *roof* טללא.

III. Mr. Allen makes numerous mistakes from which he might have been preserved by a first-hand acquaintance with the literature—especially the Palestinian Aramaic.

Dr. Chalmers warned atheists of the folly of affirming "there is no God," because, unless they were prepared to traverse every region of space, if they left any part unvisited, God might be there. Similarly it was somewhat rash on Mr. Allen's part to deny that words possess the meanings I assign, because, unless he was prepared to read every line of Palestinian Aramaic literature, that very meaning might be there in the line not read. I should be sorry to do Mr. Allen an injustice, but in his papers I fail to find any traces that he has studied the Palestinian Targums. Lexicons are very useful, but sometimes incomplete, as we shall see.

1. In the passage last cited, Mark ii. 4, "They removed the roof," I used פליק, Pael of קלק, to represent the verb. The Peal = "to go up." The Pael, to "lift up, carry away, remove" (like Greek ἀρῶ). But Mr. Allen doubts the suitability of the word, selecting examples to show that the word has only a figurative sense, and does not "de-

generate into the general idea of 'lifting up.'" A few illustrations from the Palestinian Targums dispel this idea.

Exod. xxxiii. 12: Thou saidst to me *Carry up* this people.

xxxiii. 15: *Carry us* not up hence.

Lev. xxiv. 9: Ye shall eat the bread after it has been *removed* from the tables.

Num. xii. 9: The cloud of the glory was *lifted up* from upon the Shekinah.

Esther ii. 21: Is not the queen desiring to *remove* them and to raise up Mordecai?

Will my critics still maintain that a word which could be used for the *removal* of shewbread from upon a table could not be used of the *removal* of a thatch or roof from upon a house? In the Lectionary we have, for ἀπεστύγασαν, אַרְיִמוֹ, which is the precise equivalent of סִלְקִי.

2. I would now speak of the parallels "carried by four," Mark ii. 3; and "lying on a couch," Matt. ix. 2. As to the word "four," this is certainly אַרְבַּעַא. A couch is, of course, that on which one *reclines*, and I suggested that the verb "to recline" is רָבַעַ. But Dr. Driver, in a letter which I had the honour to receive from him some two years ago, says that רָבַעַ can only be used of *cattle*, and Mr. Allen seems to share the same opinion (vii. 395-6). This is true of the Targum of Onqelos, but in Pal. Aram., רָבַעַ is used of *men*. Levy gives a hint of this, and some uncertain examples; but in the Lectionary, in every instance where ἀνακλίνω or κατακλίνω occurs in the Greek, רָבַעַ is its equivalent. "Guests" are רַבְעִין (Matt. xxii. 11). "Couches" are מַרְבְּעִין (Luke xiv. 7, 8). Can it be a mere coincidence that in parallelism with the word "four" = אַרְבַּעַא, we have the word "couch," κλίνη = אַרְבַּעַא, a place on which one reclines, as I suggested; or, perhaps better, מַרְבְּעַא, the word found in the Lectionary for "couch"?

3. In the same connection, I used טַלְטַל in the sense of "carrying," and my critics deny that the word has this



meaning (vii. 396). Again they trust to Onqelos, and show lack of acquaintance with the Palestinian Targums. Are not the following cases conclusive :—J. Exod. xvi. 23, “Ye shall not *carry* anything from place to place on the Sabbath more than four cubits.” Sam. Deut. xix. 14, “Thou shalt not *carry away* thy neighbour’s landmark.” J. Lev. xxv. 14, “When ye buy anything which is *portable*, עסקא רמיטלטלא, from the hand of your neighbour, ye shall not defraud one another”? Will it now be said that מטלטל is unsuitable for the phrase “*carried by four*”?

4. We next deal with Mr. Allen’s assertion, “מטלטל does not mean being thrown down” (vii. 396). Again, in that dialect of Aramaic desiderated by my theory, we find what we need. J. Exod. xxiii. 8, “A bribe blinds the eyes of him that receiveth it, and *throws down* the mighty from their seats.” (Compare Luke i. 52. This is one of several coincidences with the New Testament, which I have noted in this Targum.) And also in Isa. xxii. 17, “Jehovah will *throw* thee down, like the throwing of a man, and shame shall cover thee.” Verbs of “throwing” have a tendency in the passive to mean, “to lie down.” Does not the rare passive form, βεβλημένον ἐπὶ κλίνης, almost of itself suggest an Aramaic passive, as would be כּמְלִיטְל, “thrown,” “lying”?

5. On page 456 Mr. Allen affirms that עֲלָאָה cannot be the equivalent of ὑψηλός, but means “higher” or “highest,” the objects of contrast being expressed or implied by the context. This is not correct. In Hebrew and Aramaic, there are no adjectives whose primary meaning is either comparative or superlative. The initial meaning is positive. It is true that the word “high” is a relative term, and necessarily connotes objects lower; but this does not prevent עֲלָאָה from being used in the positive degree. It usually denotes greater altitude than רָם (as our word “lofty” differs from “high”), and is used most frequently

of Him who is lofty *par excellence*. Here are some instances of עלאה in the positive degree:—

- 1 Kings ix. 8: And this house, which is *high*, shall be a hissing.  
 Deut. xxvi. 9: To make thee *high* above all nations.  
 Psa. lxxxix. 27: I will make thee *high* above all kings.  
 Job xxxvii. 9: From His *lofty* chambers cometh the storm.

In the first and third of these cases ὑψηλός actually occurs in the LXX. as the equivalent of עלאה. The others are paraphrastic additions. If the Mount of Transfiguration were Hermon, this explains why it should be called עלאה rather than רם.

6. Levy says that, with שָׁמָא, “name,” or בְּשָׁמָא, “by name,” the word רָבִי means “to call on some one by name”; and on the strength of this Mr. Allen felt secure in censuring me (vii. 465) for using רָבִי in this sense, *without* שמא or בשמא (iv. 381). If Mr. Allen had read the Targums as microscopically as I have, he would have come across Isaiah xlii. 6, I have *called* thee in righteousness, רַבִּיתָּךְ בְּקִשּׁוֹט.

7. In iv. 447, as the equivalent of τὸ ἐσπαρμένον, I suggest דִּרְרִיא; but Mr. Allen objects that דִּרְרִי does not mean “to sow,” but “to strew or scatter” (vii. 461). I reply, σπείρειν does not always mean “to sow”; indeed this very seed referred to as falling on the footpath was *strewn* or scattered there, rather than *sown*. So that דִּרְרִי and σπείρειν are equivalents. In fact in the very passage that Mr. Allen quotes, Exod. xxxii. 20, “Moses strewed it (the powdered gold) upon the water,” the LXX. has καὶ ἔσπειρεν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸ ὕδωρ.

8. In Luke x. 21, my explanation (iv. 288) of ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ would require this translation, “He *gave glory* to the Holy Spirit, saying, I thank Thee, O Father . . . that Thou hast revealed,” etc.; but Mr. Allen says that this is “a meaning which the Greek words

do not even hint at." A more perfect acquaintance with the Septuagint would have prevented this remark. The verb ἀγαλλιάω was coined by the LXX. for ἀγάλλω, to avoid the heathenish associations of the latter word. Ἀγάλλω means (1) to glorify, honour; (2) to exult, rejoice in; and ἀγαλλιάομαι has, in the LXX., precisely these meanings. Instances of the former are Isa. xli. 16, "The poor and needy shall give glory," Jer. xlix. (xxx.) 4; Psa. lxxx. (81) 1, xcvi. (96) 1, cxliv. (5) 7. These passages show that ܐܓܠܝܐ and ἀγαλλιάομαι are close synonyms. The insertion of the words τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ in Luke x. 21, as compared with Matt. xi. 25, is just in accordance with Luke iv. 1, iv. 14, xi. 13, xii. 12, when compared with their parallel passages.

IV. I wish now to speak of cases in which Mr. Allen's objections are hypercritical and unreasonable.

In the foregoing cases, some of Mr. Allen's remarks have been very trying and vexatious, but I have had the satisfaction that it allowed me an opportunity of giving additional evidence for my case. Now, I regret that my remarks will be chiefly, though not exclusively, polemical.

1. The first case of hypercriticism is (vii. 465), where Mr. Allen objects to my use of ܢܝܢ, of "kindling a lamp," as the equivalent of καίειν in Matt. v. 15, and of ἄπτειν in Luke viii. 16. I quote (iv. 459) Isa. xlv. 15, "He taketh thereof (of the fallen cedar) and warmeth himself; yea, he *kindleth* it (LXX. καύσαντες) and baketh bread," but this is judged insufficient. To object that a word cannot be used of kindling a *lamp*, because, in extant literature it is only used of kindling *wood*, is preposterous.

2. In Mark ii. 16 the Pharisees say, "Why doth your Master eat and *drink* (πίνει) with publicans and sinners." I postulate ܝܢܝܐ as the equivalent of πίνει, but to this Mr. Allen objects, because πίνειν = to drink, and ܝܢܝܐ = to drink

profusely. Does not, we would ask, even the context show that *πίνειν*, in the lips of those calumniators who are said to have called Jesus a "glutton and a winebibber," meant, in this case, to drink excessively? *πίνειν* is frequently so used in the LXX., and of such a meaning פָּרַן is the natural representative.

3. In the narrative of lowering the man through the tiles I (iii. 219) postulate for "tiles," the word פָּרַן; but Mr. Allen says that "further proof is desiderated" before this can be accepted. The proof which I would respectfully submit is this, פָּרַן = a potter, *κεραμειός*; פָּרַן = earthenware; as in J. Exod. xii. 22. מִן דְּפָרַן = vessel of earthenware. The plural of nouns of material denotes pieces of that material. Hence פָּרַן must mean *κέραμοι*, tiles.

4. In Matt. xiii. 6 || Luke viii. 6, we have the parallels *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν* and *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα*. The word for "root" is שֵׁשׁ, and for *ἰκμάδα* I suggested שֵׁשׁ, which denotes "the juices or fluid parts of animals and plants." Now *ἰκμάς* has precisely this meaning; but it can also denote "moisture in the soil," and therefore Mr. Allen claims that this last is the meaning of *ἰκμάς* here, and rejects שֵׁשׁ. Against this, I would urge (1) that the ancient versions understood *ἰκμάς* to denote the "humor" or sap of the plant. The Lectionary *e.g.* has לִירָא = the sap of life. (2) It is more in accordance with what we should expect from Luke the physician, for *ἰκμάς* was a decided medical term. (3) The parallelism suggests that both *ῥίζα* and *ἰκμάς* are parts of the plant.

5. The objection offered to שֵׁשׁ (vii. 395) is by no means convincing. I claim that שֵׁשׁ = *πληθος*; and Mr. Allen says that in the Targums it is only used of a "caravan." This may be so, but its real meaning is *a crowd*, "Menge," "turba," "caterva." Levy, in his larger Lexicon, cites from the Jerusalem Talmud a passage in which שֵׁשׁ denotes "a crowd gathered in the street." We infer then that שֵׁשׁ

was used of a caravan from the promiscuous nature of its crowd; and thus the word admirably suits the crowd of Gadarene swineherds and their sympathisers.

6. In iii. 218, I used מַטְלֵלָא of the δῶμα upon which the friends of the paralytic climbed, to lower him into the presence of Jesus; but the accuracy of this is challenged. Now, of a substantial house, מַטְלֵלָא could *not* be used; but as for such a building as is here described, with a roof of sticks and mud that needed to be "dug out," I insist there is no word in the language so suitable. I was formerly of opinion that the building thus referred to was a cottage; but the gathering of the Scribes, and the reconstruction of the passage into Aramaic, seem to render it more probable that a verandah or light structure of wood, with a roof of reeds and mortar, covered perhaps with slabs or tiles, and erected over a part of the courtyard, suits the circumstances best. Such a structure could certainly be called מַטְלֵלָא. See vii. 398.

7. I have twice used שָׂרָא (iii. 285, 6) as the equivalent of καθῆσθαι, and to this Mr. Allen raises objection. Certainly, if καθῆσθαι could *only* mean "to sit," in the rigorous sense of the word, my critic would be right. But when we read of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 1) as the centre of a great multitude, "καθημένος by the sea-side," this suggests the restful posture of שָׂרָא rather than יָתַב. And similarly the occupation of the house in Capernaum (Mark ii. 5, 6) by the Scribes and others, suggests a temporary retreat from the scorching heat of Gennesaret, which would be suitably expressed by שָׂרָא. When Christ went to *lodge* with Zacchæus the Lectionary uses שָׂרָא. Indeed, in three passages of the Old Testament, שָׂרָא and καθῆσθαι represent the same Hebrew word: Psa. lxxx. 2; Isa. vi. 1, xxxvii. 16.

8. Mr. Allen's objections to אִוֵּד are very extravagant (vii. 456, 7). Whatever may be the final decision as to אִוֵּד in Dan. ii. 5, where even the Revised Margin renders: "The

word is *gone forth* from me," it still remains true, as Kautzsch says, that "the existence of an Aramaic stem  $\text{רן}=\text{לן}$  cannot be doubted." If so, and Mr. Allen is at the pains to prove that this is so, there can be no reasonable objection to my assuming that  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota = \text{רן}$  in Matt. xxiv. 27.

9. As to  $\text{רענן}$  (vii. 392), which certainly is the equivalent of  $\mu\acute{o}\lambda\gamma\iota\varsigma$  or  $\mu\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma = \text{cum molestiâ}$  (as the numerous usages of  $\text{רענן}$  in Ecclesiastes fully prove), I did not postulate that this word occurred in the original document, but was mistaken for  $\text{בשנן}$  (iii. 210, 11) by a scribe or the translator.

V. Mr. Allen has no sympathetic appreciation of some phenomena which are inseparable from the problem.

a. He does not admit the possibility that a translator may give a *free* rendering. This has been evident on previous occasions. We will here cite one or two flagrant instances:—

1. In iii. 210 we spoke of the demon which had afflicted the boy whom Christ met at the foot of the mount of transfiguration. In Luke ix. 39 we read  $\mu\acute{o}\lambda\gamma\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\chi\omega\rho\epsilon\iota =$  "with difficulty he departs." For the verb "departs" I suggest  $\text{קע} =$  "fled," but Mr. Allen suggests that the idea of "flight" is unsuitable to the Greek verb and also to the departure of a demon. I am surprised at this, when Mr. Allen claims to have read Neubauer's Tobit, for on *three* occasions, when the departure of the demon from Sarah is referred to,  $\text{קע}$  is the very word employed.

2. In Matt. x. 28 || Luke xii. 5, we have "to destroy ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ ) in Gehenna," "to cast into Gehenna." I explained these (iii. 284) by  $\text{שגר} =$  "to cast out"; and a second verb, spelt the same,  $\text{שגר} =$  "to burn, consume with fire." Mr. Allen objects to this latter word, because  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$  means to "destroy," not to "burn." But when we know that, in accordance with the Christian *usus loquendi*, the

usual Greek word for the sufferings of Gehenna was ἀπολλύναι, this objection is quite swept away.

b. Mr. Allen takes no account of a fact familiar to all who have had experience of translation work, namely, that in rendering two or three connected words, if the translator gets on the wrong tack with the first word, he is likely to give a rendering not quite literal of the other words.

This principle may be applied to the parallels αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι (Mark iv. 19), and ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου (Luke viii. 14). "The desires for the remaining (or, other) things" is certainly רנניא דמותר, as Mr. Allen admits, after having, at the outset, denied it (vii. 391). But there is a very similar word רננתא, which means "pleasures"; and is so used in the Lectionary in this very passage. After translating the text-word by "pleasures," to render דמותר, "of the residue" or "remaining things" would not be suitable. But might דמותר suggest τοῦ βίου? Certainly. The lexicographer Hesychius says that βίος means (1) ζωή, (2) περιουσία. But περιουσία means, according to Liddell and Scott, surplus abundance, wealth, luxury: and מותר means residue, abundance, superfluity. Indeed in the Lectionary מותר and its cognates are regularly used of περισσεύμα and its cognates: "the having more than enough." *E.g.* Luke xv. 19, "bread enough and to spare." Luke xxi. 4, "They cast in of their *superfluity*, but she of her poverty." Therefore I can only repeat that מותר would naturally suggest βίος in the sense of "luxury," after the word "pleasures."

c. Mr. Allen makes no allowance for the fact that our Aramaic Gospel is *ex hypothesi* composed in a dialect of which we have no contemporary representative. A study of the extant specimens of Palestinian literature discloses the fact that amid deeply pervasive agreements, each one has its peculiarities as to vocabulary. Each one has its list of peculiar words and peculiar meanings: and therefore some words may have had meanings of regular occurrence

in Galilee, which are somewhat rare in extant literature. I should not be disposed now to assign such cases to the first rank of evidence, but still they are not to be treated lightly. A very strong case of this nature is that of **וּרְךָ**, for which I claim the meaning "to come," in Matt. xiii. 4. It clearly has this meaning in a metaphorical sense. Prov. vi. 11, "Thy poverty shall *come* upon thee like an armed man"; and where **וּתְרִיךְ** is used as a doublet, with **וּתְיִתִּי**. It is a word common to Hebrew, Targumic Aramaic, and Syriac; and in each case the Lexicons give as the meaning (1) *calcare*, (2) *ingredi*. In every case *but one*, where **וּרְךָ** occurs in the Hebrew, it is transferred to the Targums. There is a string of these, where the rendering "to enter" seems to me demanded by the context, though the R.V. gives "tread." *E.g.* Micah v. 5, 6; Hab. iii. 15; Deut. xi. 25. The one exception above referred to, is Num. xxiv. 17, "A star shall *come* out of Jacob." Here surely the notion of "treading" is eliminated; but here, unfortunately for our present purpose, all the three Targums paraphrase the passage, by referring it to the Messiah. All this makes a very strong case for the identification of  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$  with  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\text{-}\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta$ .

And now, in conclusion, I have one or two words to add by way of *concession*. Pioneers must be prepared for the possibility of error. In the advocacy of a theory, "so novel in its conception," and elaborated in absolute seclusion, I should have been more than human, if I had not taken too roseate a view of some few of the suggested explanations of the divergent Greek words. I have for some considerable time had misgivings as to three of the Aramaic words suggested in my earlier papers. These are, **חַסְלָא** (iii. 212), **רְשָׁא** (iii. 288), and **הַרְדָּא** (iii. 288): three cases out of a round hundred! There are I find some few words in Mr. Allen's list, which I have not alluded to in this paper: the reason is simply lack of space. As to Mr. Allen's "considerations



of my theory from a general point of view," they are altogether too brief and superficial to be taken seriously. What the Synoptic problem has long desiderated is *facts*: theories swarm; every possible theory has found advocates; we need one or two facts as stepping stones; and unless Semitic scholars have vastly more to say against the hypothesis than has yet been said, the existence of one (or perhaps two) primitive Aramaic documents embedded in our present Synoptic Gospels is a *fact*. Many scholars who have long studied the Synoptic problem, and who have accepted the theory tentatively, have found it most elucidating; and while it does not perhaps explain everything, it goes a very long way to reduce the *chaos* which has hitherto prevailed, to an approximate *Kosmos*.

J. T. MARSHALL.

## ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

### IX. THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

OF the four lessons which Jesus taught His disciples concerning the significance of His death, the first was that in enduring a violent death at the hands of men He should be suffering for righteousness' sake. In this earliest lesson the Master presented His approaching end under a purely ethical aspect, and consistently therewith He spoke of it not as an isolated event, but as a fact falling under a general law according to which all who are faithful to the Divine interest in an evil world must endure suffering. From this point of view it is obvious that it is not for the death of Christ alone that a *rationale* is wanted. The question may legitimately be raised, What is the final cause of the sufferings of the righteous generally? a question on which the thoughts of Old Testament prophets, psalmists and sages had been much exercised. There is