

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

DR. RESCH'S PROOFS OF TRANSLATION.

IN the February number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, Dr. Sanday, in commenting with characteristic kindness upon a paper which I contributed last July, and in comparing this with some works that have quite recently been published in Germany, remarked that I hardly appeared conscious of the many points of contact which my argument had with these—more particularly with the elaborate and learned work of Dr. Resch. This was purely an *argumentum e silentio*; but for once this mode of reasoning was correctly applied. When it is known, however, that the paper to which Dr. Sanday refers was penned at least twelve months before these works appeared, the silence on that occasion will readily be explained and condoned. Perhaps I ought not to expect the same condonation, when I confess that I am indebted to Dr. Sanday for first directing my attention to the *Agrapha* of Dr. Resch, as having an important bearing on our investigations. After a diligent perusal of this most erudite treatise, which is written to collect and expound all the utterances of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels, I am strangely impressed by the many points of coincidence between two of the introductory chapters and the theories which, in absolute isolation, I had been led to form. Singularly enough, this is also the most suitable place at which reference can be made to Dr. Rasch, and a comparison instituted between our methods, as well as our results. We both believe in a primitive Semitic document, written by the Apostle Matthew, that this document was used by the three synoptists, and that its contents can now be recovered only by internal criticism; but Dr. Resch maintains that this primitive Gospel was written in Hebrew—not Aramaic.

In the interests of truth, it seems eminently desirable that the investigations of Dr. Resch should be placed before English scholars, so that they may be in a position to adjudicate between the rival claims of Hebrew and Aramaic to be the language in which the earliest Gospel was written. Especially is it important to ascertain the *method* by which the solution of this intricate problem has been attempted, and what kind of evidence has been deemed sufficient to satisfy one of Germany's ripest scholars as *proof* that our Greek evangelists have in some cases translated from a common Semitic document. On seeking an answer to these questions, we find that the test of translation-work, on which alone Dr. Resch relies, is the one which engaged our attention last month; and it is on this account that an examination of his researches can at this point be most opportunely undertaken. The only implement of internal criticism by which Dr. Resch proposes to prove the existence of a Hebrew Gospel embedded in our present Greek Gospels is the one which we have designated (p. 118) indication No. V.; *viz.* that the divergent Greek words are diverse renderings of one and the same Hebrew word. Our author claims *fifty-nine* cases in point. About twenty of these however do not refer to divergences in the synoptists themselves, but to the variations with which one or other of the Gospels is quoted in the sub-apostolic age—which variations are thought to imply translation from a Hebrew original. These will furnish us a fruitful field of inquiry shortly; but for the present we will omit them from the list. The remainder, with the exception of some few duplicates, we now transcribe.

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
	xxviii. 1.	xvi. 9.	
1	ܡܝܐ μῖα	πρώτη	
	viii. 19; xxii. 35.		ix. 57; x. 25.
3	ܠܝܢ εἰς		τις

		MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
8	קבר	xxiii. 4. βαρύς		xi. 46. δυσβάστακτος
9	קשף	xxv. 24. σκληρός		xix. 21. αύστηρός
14	קנר	xxiv. 28. πτῶμα		xvii. 37. σῶμα
16	קרר	xxvi. 26. εὐλογεῖν	xiv. 22. εὐλογεῖν (Hermas)	xxii. 19. εὐχαριστεῖν vi. 22.
20	קרר	v. 11. εἰπεῖν πᾶν πονηρόν	βλασφημεῖν	ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πονηρόν (Clem. Alex.)
21	קוב	v. 29. συμφέρει	ix. 43. καλόν ἐστιν	αἰρετώτερον (Eriphanius)
23	קצנה	xv. 6. ἐντολή	vii. 13. λόγος	νόμος
25	קשמתנה	viii. 2. προσκυνεῖν	i. 40. γονυπετεῖν	v. 12. πίπτειν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον
27	קנות	ix. 18. τελευτᾶν	v. 23. ἐσχάτως ἔχειν	viii. 42. ἀποθνήσκειν
28	קשף	x. 38. λαμβάνειν	viii. 34. αἶρειν	xix. 27. βαστάζειν
29	קה	xvi. 25. σώζειν	viii. 35. σώζειν	xvii. 33. ζωογονεῖν περιποιεῖσθαι
31	קשף	xii. 39. ἐπιζητεῖν	(Eriphanius) αἰτεῖν	xi. 29. ζητεῖν
33	קרר	xxiii. 35. φονεύειν	(Eriphanius) ἀποκτείνειν	xi. 51. ἀπολλύειν
36	קשר	xxvii. 26. φραγελλοῦν	xv. 15. φραγελλοῦν	xxiii. 16. παιδεύειν
39	קרר	iv. 11. ἀφιέναι	(Hom. Clemt.) παύεσθαι	iv. 13. ἀποστήγειν
40	קשמתנה	ix. 8. φοβεῖσθαι	ii. 12. ἐξίστασθαι	v. 26. πλησθῆναι φόβου
43	קשמתנה	xvii. 2. μεταμορφοῦσθαι	ix. 2. μεταμορφοῦσθαι	ix. 29. ἕτερον γίνεσθαι D ἀλλοιοῦσθαι
44	קשמתנה	ix. 18. προσκυνεῖν	v. 22. (προσ)πίπτειν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας	viii. 41. πίπτειν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας

	ΜΑΤΘΑΙΩΣ.	ΜΑΡΚ.	ΛΥΚΕ.
45	הַאִיר φαίνεσθαι D φαίνειν xxiv. 27. xxvi. 67.		Λύκειον xxvii. 24. λάμπειν D ἀστράπτειν xxii. 64.
48	הַבָּה עַל-הַלְהִי ράπιζειν xvii. 9.	xiv. 65. ράπισμασιν βάλλειν ix. 9.	τύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον ix. 36. ὄν ἐώρακαν D ἐθεάσαντο (Eusebius)
50	אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ δραμα	ἀ εἶδον	ὄν ἐώρακαν D ἐθεάσαντο (Eusebius)
51	אֲנִלְמ xxvi. 71. τυλών	xiv. 68. προαύλιον D. προσουλή (Clem. Alex.)	προαυλις vi. 36.
55	הִיָּה כְּאֲשֶׁר ἔσεσθαι ὡς (Eriphanus)	μιμῆσθαι iii. 16.	γίνεσθαι καθὼς vi. 14.
56	קָרָה ἐπικαλείν xviii. 6.	ἐπιτιθέναι ὄνομα ix. 42.	ὀνομάζειν xvii. 2.
58	טוֹב συμφέρει (Ephr. Syr.) κρείσσον	καλόν ἐστιν (Clem. Alex.) αἰρετώτερον	λυσιτελεῖ

This is the list of variant translations, which, in the judgment of this able representative of "severely critical" German scholarship, is adequate to prove the existence of a Semitic *Urevangelium*; and upon this list we would now offer a few observations.

a. It will be observed that Dr. Resch presents to us but *one kind* of proof. Simple as the thing may seem, it does not appear to have occurred to any previous investigator in this field, that the indications of translation must be of diverse kinds—just as diverse as those which occur in the several translations of the Hebrew Old Testament; and that when we are searching for indications that two or three Greek documents are translations from a hypothetical Semitic text, we ought to be able to show that the same phenomena are present as are found in works that are known to be translations from a Semitic original. Let Dr. Resch adduce instances in which the diverse vocalization

of the same Hebrew consonants, or the change of one letter, or the omission of a letter, or the transposition of two letters in the Hebrew text, will produce the divergent Greek readings which occur in the synoptists, and we will listen most attentively.

β. In the above list there are several parallel phrases that are pure synonyms. We have more than once affirmed that we could not venture to build on cases of this nature, inasmuch as the occurrence of phrases *exactly* equivalent is just what one would expect in the narrative of three witnesses who were totally independent of each other, and had no access to a common source. For instance, if, when describing (see no. 40) the strange emotions which came over the crowd when they saw the paralytic rise from his bed and carry it forth, one evangelist says, "they were all afraid," ἐφοβήθησαν; another, "they were amazed," ἐξίστασθαι; and a third, "they were filled with fear," ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, there are two ways in which such synonymity might be explained. It might, of course, arise from the diverse rendering of a common Semitic word in a written Gospel; but if other facts were favourable, it *might* prove the very opposite, and might be used as indicating that the narrators had no intercourse with each other, directly or indirectly. On these grounds there are fourteen instances cited, which had been better omitted. They are nos. 8, 9, 23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 36, 40, 44, 48, 51, 55, and 56. Not one of these, I may say, had escaped my notice, but I did not deem it wise to mention any of them; for, though they might come in useful as confirming our theory, when it has been established by other evidence, yet when adduced as *proof*, they do but injure the cause they are intended to serve, because, in themselves considered, they can be accounted for without the hypothesis of a common source.

γ. Though the cases which Dr. Resch adduces were,

with one or two exceptions, all known to me, there were only three of them which I ventured in the April article to adduce, in the initial stage of the argument, as furnishing sufficient evidence of being variant translations of the same word in a Semitic document; and these are all quite as favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaic as of a Hebrew original. These are nos. 28, 29, and 58. I admit that the Hebrew אָרַב explains the three variants $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$, and $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, as well as the Aramaic ܐܪܒ ; but I scarcely think that אָרַב covers the meanings of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and $\zeta\omega\sigma\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ so well as אָרַב , nor that אָרַב would suggest to three Greek translators the words $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota$, and $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu$ so readily as אָרַב , which, as we have seen, possesses all these meanings in regular usage.

δ. Dr. Resch does not explain by this test any words that are really diverse in meaning. A Hebrew *Urevangelium* would, for instance, leave $\delta\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ in the Lord's prayer unexplained, for there is no one Hebrew word which possesses both these meanings. Our author, moreover, makes no use of the fact that many Hebrew verbs now spelt alike are really of distinct origin, and on this account possess meanings which cannot be subsumed under any one fundamental conception. In fact, Dr. Resch adduces no one case in which his Hebrew hypothesis explains genuinely diverse words that lie abreast of each other in the Greek harmony. That such instances exist in large numbers is evident, and any theory which supposes the parallel synoptic passages to be translated from a common source ought to attempt their elucidation.

ε. There are about ten cases left, all more or less impressive, and, as defending a counter-hypothesis, we are bound to examine whether they admit of as clear an explanation — or perhaps clearer — on the theory of an Aramaic, as of a Hebrew, *Urevangelium*. We attach the numbers on the foregoing list.

1 and 3. As to the homologues 1 and 3, no one would contend that the Aramaic ܐܝܢ = one, is not as suitable as the Hebrew אֶחָד. Both can be used for the ordinal adjective πρώτη, and both can be used for the indefinite pronoun τις.

14. Dr. Resch is, as I believe, quite correct in seeing in σῶμα, a body, and πτώμα, a carcase, an indication of translation. The passage is, "Wherever the carcase (Luke, body) is, there will the eagles be gathered together"; and our author suggests the Hebrew word פֶּגֶר as solving the difficulty. But there is this objection: the Hebrew פֶּגֶר nowhere means a body, but only a carcase or corpse; whereas the Aramaic cognate פֶּגֶר means both a living body and a corpse, as in Proverbs x. 13, "The rod for the body of him that is lacking in discretion." We submit then that, so far as this word is concerned, the assumption of the word פֶּגֶר in an Aramaic exemplar is more likely to have led to the Greek variants σῶμα and πτώμα than the occurrence of פֶּגֶר in a Hebrew text.

16. Dr. Resch adduces the two slightly divergent Greek words that are used, when, at the last supper, our Lord "gave thanks" before breaking the bread, εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας; and rightly gives the word בִּרְךְ as the equivalent—a word which has the same significance in Aramaic as in Hebrew. It was not our intention to adduce this case however, because the narrative of the last supper as given in Luke bears no evidence of having been translated from the same source as was used by the first two evangelists. In fact, we fail to find in any part of the Judæan ministry, except the great eschatological discourse, any satisfactory evidence that the narratives were translated from the same Aramaic document. After most laborious efforts, the divergences which occur in the Judæan narratives obstinately refuse to yield to our hypothesis, further than that, as in the case before us, we find two or more Greek words used to represent an

action, place, or thing, more familiarly known by an Aramaic word. We should not have ventured to suppose, for instance, that the four equivalents for "the porch" in no. 51, nor the words for "scourging" in no. 36, afford any evidence worth naming of translation from a common Semitic document.

20. In the last beatitude, in which our Lord congratulates those who shall suffer for their adherence to Himself, there occur the variant parallels :

Matt. v. 11: *καὶ εἰπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν.*

And shall speak against you every evil thing.

Luke vi. 22: *καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν.*

And shall cast out your name as evil.

Dr. Resch would give *חפרונכון* as the equivalent of the two entire phrases, being encouraged in this by the fact that in a quotation of this passage in *Hermas* the single verb *βλασφημεῖν* is used. We should have thought that *חפר* would be required for *ὀνειδίσωσιν*, "they shall reproach you"; but let that pass. It was our intention to give the Aramaic verb *ܘܢܝܠ* as the equivalent, not of the whole clauses, but of the parts *εἰπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν*, and *ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν*. That *εἰπεῖν κατά* was used in a stronger sense than lies on the surface, and meant to revile, execrate, curse, or blaspheme, is evident from Acts vi. 13, where, in the heat of their malignity, the accusers of Stephen said: "This fellow ceaseth not to speak words against (*ῥήματα λαλῶν κατά*) this holy place and the law." So Jude 15. And *ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα*, "to cast out the name," may mean to utter the name with contempt or with a malediction; or it may refer to the terrible curse which the synagogue pronounced on those who were adjudged finally apostate. These meanings are covered by the Aramaic word *ܘܢܝܠ*, which means to curse, execrate, blaspheme. It is, *e.g.*, used of Shimei, 2 Sam. xix. 21; of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 11; and of the unnatural son, Lev. xx. 9.

While the above explanation seems adequate to account for the divergence, there is another which has perhaps equal claim on our acceptance; namely, that the Aramaic copy used by the evangelist Luke contained some form of the the verb טיל = to throw or cast forth, instead of לוט; יטלו instead of ילטו: a case of the transposition of two letters, a clerical error inevitably found in all MSS. If יטלו occurred in the MSS. used by Luke, he would be obliged to explain it by an appeal to the word טיל, and would thus render, "they shall cast you, or, your name, out as evil." This solution is the more likely, as we hope by-and-by to adduce other cases where the transposition of two Aramaic letters explains the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

Further, we have seen that Dr. Resch would take each of the two phrases that we have quoted as one complex whole, and would regard each as a free rendering of some form of the one word חרף. But is this probable? Do not the parallel phrases *πᾶν πονηρόν* and *ὡς πονηρόν* point to some equivalent in the Semitic document? Dr. Resch has not recognised that, on his hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urschrift*, the same *kinds* of divergence are to be expected as confessedly occur in the several translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, or he would have conjectured that, in *πᾶν πονηρόν* and *ὡς πονηρόν*, we have respectively כל רע and כרע. In Aramaic, this would be כל ביש and כביש, the omission of the one letter ל explaining the difference between the two Greek readings.

39. These parallel passages refer to the close of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when Matthew and Luke both say that "the devil *departed* from Him"; but Matthew uses the word ἀφίησιν, Luke, ἀπέστη. The narration of this event in the *Clementine Homilies* runs thus: "Albeit, the king of the ungodly, having attempted in many ways to seduce the King of the godly to do his will, and being unable, *desisted*" (ἐπαύσατο). Dr. Resch adduces this as

part evidence of the existence of a primitive Hebrew Gospel. He holds that these three slightly divergent Greek words bear marks of being a translation of the same Hebrew word in a primitive Gospel, and that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* made use of this *Urschrift*, as well as our two Greek evangelists. For my own part, I am hopeful that evidence can be adduced from the sub-apostolic age of the circulation of a Semitic Gospel; but the paraphrastic nature of the quotation in the *Homilies* in this case makes one doubtful whether any dependence can be placed upon it. At all events, if לָרַח = he ceased, desisted, suits the requirements of a Hebrew Gospel, it cannot be denied that קִסַּף לִי would in Aramaic even more completely cover the meanings of the three Greek words. This is rendered clear from the following occurrences of קִסַּף in the Targums.

- Exod. iv. 26: The Targum of Jonathan narrates that when Zipporah had circumcised Gershom, "the destroying angel *ceased from* Moses, so that Zipporah gave thanks."
- Prov. xvii. 13: Evil shall not depart from his house.
- Job vii. 16: Let me alone, or, depart from me (יִנִּי קִסַּף; LXX., ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ), for my life is vain.
- Job xiv. 6: Cease from him, let his wound cease, until he shall receive his reward as a hireling in his day.

43. This illustration is taken from the scene on the mount of transfiguration. We will present the context in parallelism, and show what support it affords to our own theory.

MATT. xvii. 1, 2.	MARK ix. 2, 3.	LUKE ix. 28, 29.
ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀνέβη
εἰς ὄρος	εἰς ὄρος	εἰς τὸ ὄρος
ὑψηλὸν	ὑψηλὸν	προσεύξασθαι.
κατ' ἰδίαν	κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους	
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ ἐγένετο
		ἐν τῷ προσεύχασθαι αὐτὸν
ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
μετεμορφώθη.	μετεμορφώθη.	ἕτερον.

In the third line we have *ύψηλόν* standing abreast with *προσεύξασθαι*. Do the words possessing these meanings resemble each other in Aramaic, so that one might easily be mistaken for the other? We think so. The usual Aramaic word meaning "to pray" is the Pael *ܘܢܝܥܘܢ*, which is precisely equivalent to *προσεύχομαι*, in that it implies a reverent posture in prayer, kneeling, with penitent, down-cast eyes. The infinitive of this verb is *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*. But the adjective meaning "very high," "summus, excelsus," *ύψηλός*, is *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*. It occurs frequently in the phrase "the most high God," as in Genesis xiv. 18, etc.; but it is also used of physical things. It is used, for instance, in Genesis i. 7, of "the waters that are above the firmament," which in the Jerusalem Targum are called *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*, "the waters that are above," in contrast to the *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*, "the waters that are beneath." So Psalm civ. 13: "He waters the mountains from the place of His lofty reservoirs." The Hebrew has "His chambers." Job xxxvii. 9, "From His *lofty* chamber cometh the tempest." If, as modern scholars are agreed, the mount of transfiguration was Hermon, which is three times as high as the loftiest summits of Judæa and Galilee, this explains the occurrence of *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ* = very high, instead of the common Targumic word *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ* = high. The only difference therefore in Aramaic between *προσεύξασθαι* and *ύψηλόν* in an unvocalized text is that between *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ* and *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*. The former is *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*, the latter *ܘܢܝܥܘܢܐ*. I admit most readily that, if this instance stood *alone*, it might be purely accidental; but if these cases are sufficiently multiplied to "eliminate chance," if about forty instances can be adduced, as we hope to do presently, in which the change of one letter accounts for the divergence in our Greek Gospels, then surely chance will be eliminated and the theory substantiated.

On the first line, we have Matthew and Mark in unison with *ἀναφέρει αὐτούς*, "He led them up"; while Luke gives

ἀνέβη, "He went up." I would submit that these variants are due to the difference between the Peal ܪܘܿܬܐ, "He went up," and its causative, the Aphel, ܪܘܿܬܐܢ or ܪܘܿܬܐܢܐ, "He led up"; though of course, when Luke had deciphered the word which Matthew and Mark render ὑψηλόν, as meaning "to pray," consistency alone would perhaps suggest ἀνέβη, instead of ἀναφέρει.

The next parallels that we would endeavour to elucidate are those to which Dr. Resch alludes; namely, μετεμορφώθη, which occurs in Matthew and Mark, and ἕτερον, which is found in all the Greek MSS. of Luke except D. This remarkable MS. gives ἡλλοιώθη, and this reading is quoted by Origen. It is perhaps unnecessary to remind readers of THE EXPOSITOR of the way in which Bishop Wordsworth sought to account for this divergence. He held that Luke declined the use of μετεμορφώθη, lest he might awaken in the minds of his Greek readers any ideas or feelings connected with the fabulous metamorphoses of their heathen deities. This view was sanctioned by Dean Alford, and is also warmly defended by the Rev. Arthur Wright, who, in his recent work on the *Composition of the Four Gospels*, says: "The Gentile catechists knew that a metamorphosis would suggest wrong ideas to a Greek mind. It would recall the fables of Zeus changing into a bull or a swan, or would suggest to the Latins Ovid's fifteen books of *Metamorphoses*. In St. Luke accordingly we find the word removed and a new rendering substituted, 'the form of His countenance became different'" (pp. 50, 51). This is very plausible. It is one of the best attempts I remember to explain the divergences in the synoptists by subjective criticism; but the probability which it yields can never transcend subjectivity. We can never *know* that that was really Luke's motive. The hypothesis can lay no claim to be scientific. One of the conditions to which such hypotheses must conform is, that they "admit of verification

Shall I now have any difficulty in persuading my readers that *ἔτερον, ἡλλοιώθη*, and *μετεμορφώθη* are diverse renderings of the one word *שָׁנִי* or *שָׁנִי*? Or, if it be thought necessary that the word *μετεμορφώθη* requires the passive of the Pael, we shall obtain *שָׁנִי* = was caused to change, was altered.

But what of the rest of the clause? The equivalent of *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*, "in their presence," is *בְּאַנְפִּידוֹן*, and of *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ*, His countenance, *אַנְפִּידוֹן*. While for *εἶδος* = form, appearance, the most suitable word is *הוֹן*, which occurs

Esther ii. 2: Let virgins who are fair in appearance (*שְׂפִירָן הוֹן*;
LXX., *καλὰ τῶ εἶδει*), be sought for the king's approval.

Isa. liii. 2: In this passage the Targum sadly mars the original Hebrew as it renders: "His *appearance* (*הוֹן*); LXX., *εἶδος*) is not as the appearance of an ordinary man, nor the fear He inspires like that of an uneducated man (*הוֹן* = *ιδιώτης*); but the splendour of holiness is His, so that all who see Him shall gaze at Him."

We would suggest therefore that the difference between the third Gospel and the other two has arisen from a slightly variant text.

Luke requires *והוֹן דאנפודי שני*,

Matthew and Mark *והוֹן באנפידון שני*.

Of course in such cases the full amount of variation which our Greek text requires may not have existed in the Aramaic document. Let *one* word be miswritten or misread, and the rest must be pressed in order to give suitable sense.

45. In this instance Dr. Resch compares Matthew xxiv. 27, *φαίνεσθαι*, D *φαίνειν*, with Luke xvii. 24, *λάμπειν*, D *ἀστράπτειν*, and claims that the Hebrew *הֵאִיר* explains the variants. If the primitive Gospel was Hebrew, this is probable; but if it was Aramaic, *נְהַר* would explain them

equally well. But there is another couplet in the same passage which Dr. Resch does not mention.

MATT. xxiv. 27.

ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή
ἐξέρχεται
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν
καὶ φαίνεται
εἰς δυσμῶν.

LUKE xvii. 24.

ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή
ἀστράπτουσα
ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν
λάμπει
εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν.

Does the hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urevangelium* shed any light on the variants ἐξέρχεται and ἀστράπτουσα? We are not told. The Aramaic equivalent of ἐξέρχεσθαι is ܐܘܪ, which occurs twice in biblical Aramaic, Daniel ii. 5 and 8, "The word has gone out from me." The verb used of the shining or flashing forth of light is ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ, Aphel of ܐܘܪ.

- Prov. iv. 18: The path of the just is like the light which shineth forth (ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ), and its light goes on unto the perfection of the day.
- Isa. ix. 2: They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shone.
- 2 Sam. xxiii. 4: He shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun shines; *i.e.* flashes or breaks forth.

There are thus two probabilities before us by which to account for the variant ἐξέρχεται. Either we have two readings, ܐܘܪ and ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ; or, since ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ denotes, as we have seen, the breaking forth of light on preceding darkness, ἐξέρχεται may be a free rendering of ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ.

50. Dr. Resch here gives ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ, "what they had seen," as the Hebrew equivalent of the three expressions, τὸ ὄραμα (Matt. xvii. 9), ἡ εἶδον (Mark ix. 9), and ὃν ἑώρακαν (Luke ix. 36). This explanation of course answers well for the last two, but leaves τὸ ὄραμα = "the vision," to be considered as a free translation. Now if in Aramaic the three phrases closely resemble each other, we shall once more claim the advantage. The Aramaic equivalent of ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ is ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ or ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ; whereas the word for τὸ ὄραμα is ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ or ܐܘܪܐܘܪܐ.

Ezek. i. 1: I saw in prophet vision (ܩܘܘܢܐ ܢܒܝܐܘܬܐ).

Dan. ii. 19: The mystery was revealed to Daniel in a vision of the night (ܩܘܘܢܐ ܕܝܢܐܢܐ ܕܝܠܐܢܐ ܕܝܢܐܢܐ ܕܝܠܐܢܐ ܕܝܢܐܢܐ; LXX., ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτός).
So vii. 13.

Dan. iv. 10: In visions of my head (ܩܘܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܘܢܐ; LXX., ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτός).

According to our theory therefore, the difference of one letter in an unvocalized text explains the divergence. Matthew and Mark require ܩܘܘܢܐ = what they had seen; Luke ܩܘܢܐ, or perhaps ܩܘܘܢܐ = the vision.

Granted then the existence of a Semitic document as the source of much of the common matter of the Synoptists, was it written in Hebrew or in Aramaic? That question remains now for others to answer. We have shown that Dr. Resch's evidence is incomplete *in kind*, and therefore until the attempt has been made to apply Hebrew in the same variety of ways as we have applied the Aramaic, we ought in fairness to wait for a final answer. There are however some of our strongest points to which Hebrew affords no solution, and we have shown that in those cases which Dr. Resch explains by an appeal to Hebrew, the Aramaic proves equally efficacious, in some cases much more so, and therefore for the present we may rightly claim the advantage. Dr. Resch, we may add, devotes some few pages to "extra-canonical quotations from the *Urevangelium*," in which he endeavours to show that the diversity in the Gospel quotations in the early Fathers presupposes a Hebrew original. This opens up a wide and deeply interesting subject for inquiry—a subject which Dr. Resch has made pre-eminently his own, and in which, as throughout the whole of his admirable treatise, we shall often delight to sit at his feet, wishing however most sincerely that he could see that Aramaic, and not Hebrew, is the master-key.

J. T. MARSHALL.