Syriac Diatessaron attests 'James' for 'Levi' in Mk. ii 14 and probable that *syr.* *S* and *C*, had they been extant, would have had the same reading. In the Latin Diatessaron only one Publican is called; he is named Matthew (F 20, L 31): the Arabic (A vii 25 ff) gives also the call of Levi the Publican who made a feast (Lk. v 27 ff), but this Levi is not represented as an Apostle, or as the same as 'James son of Alphaeus' in A vii 9.

It should be noticed (1) that there is no sign of a various reading 'James' for 'Levi' in Lk. v 27, and (2) that the Western reading 'James' in Mk. ii 14 is obviously a blunder or blundering correction, suggested by the fact that James son of Alphaeus was the known name of an Apostle, whereas Levi son of Alphaeus is otherwise unknown. 'Levi' therefore is genuine in Mk. ii 4: the strongest external testimony is the fact that it is the name in Luke v, in a section of that Gospel directly based on Mark, while among our MSS its best supporters are ℵ B W and 1 &c.

But how large and how various is the 'Western' phalanx! Now that the correct text of the Syriac Diatessaron is assured we have the solid support of all Latin texts before the Vulgate, all extant Syriac texts before the Peshiṭta. In Greek we have D, the two Pontic texts Θ and 565, the 'Ferrar Group', and (if we may press the evidence of Origen) the text current at Caesarea. Granted that 'Levi' is right and 'James' is wrong, the problem that demands a solution is how 'Levi' managed to survive into the 4th century.

F. C. BURKITT.

MARK VIII 12 AND εἰ IN HELLENISTIC GREEK.

MR COLEMAN'S interesting and suggestive article in the last number of the JOURNAL seems to me to call for a reply by some one who like me feels that it is unsound, or at least contains some leading ideas which are unsound. And to begin at the end, I cannot think that his explanation of Mark viii 12 is convincing. It is true that the First and Third Gospels both report our Lord as saying that no sign would be given to that generation but the sign of Jonah. Granted: but the insertion of the sign of Jonah in Matt. xvi 4 [1] is surely due to the Evangelist. At another time and place our Lord doubtless 'reserved to Himself the sign of the true prophet', to use Mr Coleman's excellent phrase, but at 'Dalmanutha' (i. e. Tiberias) in the presence of carping adversaries the blunt refusal of Mark viii 12 seems to me alone appropriate, much more appropriate than the vague announcement

[1] On p. 166, l. 20, Matt. xvi 16 is a slip for xvi 4.

imagined by Mr Coleman and dignified by him with the title of a
Divine paradox. 'No sign' and 'the sign of Jonah' are not in-
consistent with one another, according to the certainly genuine inter-
pretation of the phrase given in Lk. xi 30 ff. The Ninevites heard
the message and repented, a similar opportunity had been granted to
the contemporaries of Jesus. And further, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν εἰ . . . is
not an 'oath', except to the Grammarian. It is no more of an oath
than μὴ γένοιτο is a naming of the Name of God. The understood
apodosis, for the Grammarian's requirements, might just as well be
'I am very much mistaken' as 'God do so to me and more also', or
any similar clause.

For these reasons I still prefer to interpret εἰ in Mk. viii 12 as
a negative, in company with the Sinai Palimpsest (followed by the
Peshiṭta), with the Coptic versions, with codd. W Δ 5 and the Ferrar
Group, and finally with Origen who says εἰ . . . τοῦτ' ἐστιν οὐ δοθή-
σεται.

And I doubt very much whether Mr Coleman be right in regarding
the Biblical Aramaic הֵן 'if' as connected with the Hebrew particle
הֵן the shorter form of הִנֵּה 'behold'. The Biblical and Nabatean
Aramaic הֵן is surely a side-form of the more widely spread אֵן (ܐܶܢ

and אִין, found in Syriac and other Aramaic dialects, corresponding to
اِنْ ('in) in Arabic, and also to אִם ('im) in Hebrew. All these forms
mean 'if' and do not mean 'behold'. As to form, hēn is quite in
accordance with analogy : the initial h corresponds to initial ' in Syriac
just as Biblical Aramaic hafʿel corresponds to Syriac 'afʿel, and the
final n for Hebrew m corresponds to Aramaic plural -īn corresponding
to Hebrew plural -im. On the use of הֵן for 'if' in Biblical Hebrew we
read in Gesenius-Cowley § 159 w (ed. of 1898, p. 524): 'Probably
. . . הֵן if is a pure Aramaism, and since the Aramaic word never has the
meaning behold, it is at least improbable that it had originally any con-
nexion with הֵן or הִנֵּה'. Among other passages in illustration they
quote Jer. iii 1.

One further Semitic use of an 'if'-clause is not noticed by Mr Cole-
man, viz. the total suppression of the apodosis. This is so strange to
English idiom, that English translators of the Bible have usually added
'well and good', or some such phrase. The best known example is
Dan. iii 15 : very likely Dan iii 17 ought to be similarly translated,
with a 'well' at the end. But this idiom seems to have been tolerable
in Greek, even to St Luke's ears ('if it bear fruit, well': Lk. xiii 9),
and it seems to me possible that some of Mr Coleman's examples from
the Old Testament were meant to be taken that way. 'If I have made
Jacob's brothers his bondmen—*then it will be so*' (Gen. xxvii 37). Yet

the passage as it stands in the LXX must surely be regarded as translation Greek.

What Mr Coleman seems to me to have proved is that the translators of the Greek Bible took *hen*, which usually stands for 'behold', in the sense of 'if' more often than is now recognized in Hebrew grammatical tradition. But it is a long step from that to infer a questionable derivation for the common Biblical Aramaic word for 'if', and a still longer one to apply the result to reverse the hitherto accepted meaning of Mark viii 12.

F. C. BURKITT.

YĀHŌʰ.

IT seems almost impertinent to reopen in England [1] the question of the vocalization of the Tetragrammaton, when the term Yahweh has spread to the very text-books of our secondary schools. Yet there is something to be said.

Not that anything is to be said in favour of the name Jehovah. That word is not to . be found earlier than the beginning of the fourteenth century, when Porchet wrote his *Victoria* in 1303,[2] and it is (to my mind) doubly wrong. First, it represents merely the vowels of Adonai, the 'surrogate' of the Tetragrammaton[3]; and secondly, it gives a consonantal value to the third letter of the Four. The form Jehovah cannot be right.

I. Is then Yahweh? It may be granted at once that no vocalization is more natural to any reader of the letters YHWH in Exod. iii 15, vi 3, if the word be considered in itself. It looks like an 'imperfect' of a ל"ה verb, and the only doubt would be the quality of the first syllable and the 'voice' which the word was intended to represent.[4] Nor again can it be denied that the curious *'Ehyeh* in Exod. iii 14 ('I AM hath sent me unto you'[5]) suggests a verbal form like Yahweh as the actual Name. But one cannot say more. Scholars have hardly

---

[1] The subject has recently been discussed from points of view other than that of this paper by Luckenbill in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* xl 277–283 (July 1924), Albright *Journal of Biblical Literature* xliii (1924) pp. 370–378, and xliv (1925) pp. 153–162, and Burkitt, xliv pp. 353–356.

[2] Printed in 1530.

[3] All the available information on this subject is given by Dr Dalman *Der Gottesname Adonai* 1889, to whom I would say 'Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume,' &c.

[4] It must, however, not be forgotten that the system of punctuation which ultimately prevailed was only one out of several, though I do not know that there would have been any difference in the case before us.

[5] I assume that the text is not interpolated, in spite of W. R. Arnold's arguments in his essay 'The Divine Name in Exod. iii 14', in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* xxiv 1905, pp. 129, 134.