A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

"*THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.*"

II.

AFTER thus disposing of θέλοντα, Prof. Marshall goes on to account for the divergence between αἴροντος and δανείσασθαι. The common Aramaic root, he suggests, is רשא. An examination of the usage of the word shows conclusively that it can represent neither δανείζομαι nor αἴρω. Prof. Marshall's account of the word is gravely inaccurate. The facts as stated by Levy are these. The primary idea involved in רשא is that of "possessing authority, might, power." When followed by ב, it signifies to "have power over some one," and is especially used of the power of a creditor over a debtor. Hence it means "to lend." Examples are—

Deut. xv. 2 (Onq.) : כָּל גְּבַר מָרֵי רְשׁוּ דְיִרְשֵׁי בְחַבְרֵיה.
    "Every creditor who shall lend to his neighbour."
Deut. xxiv. 11 (Onq.) : וְגַבְרָא דְאַתְּ רָשֵׁי בֵּיה.
    "The man to whom thou dost lend."

"A borrower" may be expressed paraphrastically by מן דרשן ביה, "he to whom men lend" : but this is no proof at all that רשי means "to borrow." The ordinary Aramaic words to express the latter notion are זוף or יזף and שאל. And accordingly the phrase in St. Matthew is rendered in the Peshitto by ܘܠܡܢ ܕܨܒܐ. It will follow from this that if we refuse to admit that רשא can mean "to borrow," the extension of this idea, which Prof. Marshall would read into the word, of "forceful seizure of goods" will be still less authorized.

In the last line of the passages under consideration we have the variant rendering μὴ ἀποστραφῇς and μὴ ἀπαίτει. This is accounted for by the difference between the Peal and Aphel of the verb הדר. "The Peal," says Prof. Marshall, means "to turn back, turn round, turn away."

We fail to find any instances of the use of the word in this last meaning. In point of fact it is opposed both to the " *usus loquendi* " and to the root idea of the verb, which is that of " returning," " turning back," either physically to a place from which one had originally set out, or metaphorically to a moral position from which one had fallen. " The Aphel," continues Prof. Marshall, means " to bring back, fetch back, ask back, answer." Here again we feel bound to protest against the use of the word as an equivalent of ἀπαίτει. It is difficult to find satisfactory examples of הדר in the sense " ask back," and in any case it is a meaning but rarely found. It seems never to have this signification in the Targums.

" The verb הדר," continues Prof. Marshall, " in the Aphel and Pael regularly means ' to answer ' in rabbinic literature." And so he goes on to equate ἀποκριθεὶς (St. Matt. xi. 25) with ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ (St. Luke x. 21). It is doubtful whether the use of הדר = to answer, is sufficiently authenticated to authorise its use here. But even if we admit this, surely the verb הַדַּר followed by the Aramaic equivalent of τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ could only suggest the rendering " gave glory to the Holy Spirit," a meaning which the Greek words certainly do not even hint at.

Two passages in the May number of THE EXPOSITOR further illustrate the untrustworthiness of Prof. Marshall's method of working. The first deals with the variants ὑψηλὸν (St. Matt. xvii. 1 ; St. Mark ix. 2) and προσεύξασθαι (St. Luke ix. 28). The latter word suggests the Aramaic equivalent צְלָאָה. But how can this be reconciled with ὑψηλόν ? Prof. Marshall thinks that if for צלאה, עלאה were read, the difficulty would be solved, although he acknowledges that רם not עלאה would be the word that we should expect. When we examine the use of עלאה in the Targums we find that it corresponds to the Hebrew עֶלְיוֹן. Now

the point to be noticed about both these words is that they
denote not simply "high," but "higher" or "highest."
The object or objects of contrast are either expressed or
implied by the context. Thus עלאה in the Targums is
applied to the "upper waters" Gen. i. 6 (J.I.), but more
frequently it is applied either to God Himself, or to the
dwelling place of God in the heavens, conceived of· as a
chamber (Job xxxvii. 9), or lastly to the angels of God
(Job xv. 15). Hence a consideration of the use of the word
in Aramaic justifies us in refusing to admit the possibility
of its being employed as the equivalent of ὑψηλὸς in St.
Matthew. If so applied, we could only think of the moun-
tains as being termed "higher" in contrast to some unmen-
tioned mountain, or else as being in some special sense
conceived of as the dwelling place of God.

In the second of the two instances alluded to, Prof.
Marshall is dealing with the variants ἐξέρχεται (St. Matt.
xxiv. 27) and ἀστράπτουσα (St. Luke xvii. 24). "The
Aramaic equivalent," we are told, "of ἐξέρχεσθαι is אזר,
which occurs twice in Biblical Aramaic (Dan. ii. 5, 8).
'The word has gone forth from me.' The verb used of the
flashing forth of light is אזהר." The first of these state-
ments is entirely misleading. It seems to imply that אזר
is the ordinary and common Aramaic word meaning "to
go out," and occurs amongst other examples in Daniel.
The exact contrary of this is the fact. אזדא in Daniel is
a difficult and uncertain word. It has been suggested that
it comes from a root אזר equivalent to אזל, but this ren-
dering is now almost universally rejected. Most modern
philologists have adopted the view of Prof. Nöldeke[1] that
the word is the Persian *azda*, "certain." [2] Whilst however

---

[1] In Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscrip.*, p. 617.

[2] So Kautzsch (*Gram. des Bibl. Aram.*, p. 63), Prof. Driver (*Introd. to Lit. of
O.T.*, p. 469), Mühlau and Volck (in Ges. *Handwörterbuch*, ed. 10 and 11), and
the two latest commentators on Daniel, Meinhold and Bevan.

Prof. Marshall's authorities for his use of the word are thus shown to be valueless, there is a word, אזד, which is used in Rabbinic literature in a sense approximating to that of ἐξέρχεσθαι. Jastrow gives the renderings "to be cut off, go apart, be gone." Levy translates by "*gehen, weggehen*," and cites the following instances :—

Schab 34ᵇ : אזדו לטעמייהו. "They differ, each following his own opinions."

Ned 41ᵃ: שיתא אזדו. "Six (halakhoth) escaped his memory."

Meil 17ᵇ ; נפק אזדא. "He went out and disappeared."

That the word, however, is a genuine Aramaic root, and not merely based upon a misunderstanding of the passage in Daniel, is very dubious. Even if it were, it would be quite unsuited to express the meaning involved in ἐξέρχεσθαι in the verse of St. Matthew in question.

An illustration in THE EXPOSITOR for June deals with the following passages :—

ST. MATT. XVIII. 15.	ST. MARK IX. 17.	ST. LUKE IX. 38.
Κύριε	Διδάσκαλε	Διδάσκαλε
ἐλεήσόν	ἤνεγκα	δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
μου τὸν υἱόν	τὸν υἱόν μου	ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.

Prof. Marshall attempts to reconcile the verbs in the second line by reference to a common original בְּמָטוּ. "This word," he continues, "found only in the Targum of Jonathan [1] is apparently precisely the equivalent of בְּעִית." We have noticed במטו also in the Aramaic text of Tobit, edited by Dr. Neubauer (chap. x.). "I have failed," says Prof. Marshall, "to find an instance, in which במטו is followed by an accusative, as בבע is ; but this is doubtless due to the scantiness of our literature. I suggest then that the common text, of which Matthew and Luke gave a free

---

[1] Should not "Jerus. Targums" be read here for "Targum of Jonathan"?

translation, was בְּמָטוּת בְּרִי, O my son! I pray for my son ! ''

We wish that Prof. Marshall had given some examples of בבעו " followed by an accusative." Such a construction would be impossible. If במטו is not found in this collocation, it is certainly not due to " the scantiness of our literature," but to the fact that such a construction would be anomalous and ungrammatical. The facts about בבעו are these. It is properly a noun meaning " prayer," or " entreaty," and occurs for instance in—

Jer. vii. 16 : בבעו וצלו, " With supplication and prayer."

1 Kings viii. 39 : תעביד בעותהון, " Thou wilt accomplish their prayer."

It is found also with a following genitive, but it should be noticed, that this seems to be always subjective, not objective. Thus בעות עבדך (2 Sam. vii. 20) means " the prayer which thy servant makes." בעותא דמשה (Exod. viii. 27, J.I.) is " the prayer uttered by Moses." More commonly, however, ב is prefixed. Two constructions are then found. The person supplicated follows in the vocative case or with מן prefixed. The use of מטו is very similar. It occurs, e.g., as a substantive in the accusative in Exodus xi. 8, J. יבעון מטו מיני; with ב prefixed, followed by a vocative in Genesis xliv. 18, במטו ריבוני, and followed by מן in Tobit x. במטו מינך, " I pray thee." It is more than doubtful whether במטות ברי could possibly have the meaning, " I pray for my son." The only probable and natural sense would be " with prayer of (to) my son," i.e., " O my son, I pray thee . . ."

In the verse following that just discussed we find the variants—

St. Matt. xvii. 16.	St. Mark ix. 18.	St. Luke ix. 40.
προσήνεγκα	εἶπα	ἐδεήθην

Following in the track of a suggestion made by Buxtorf as

to the *etymology* of מטו, Prof. Marshall proceeds to make
a quite groundless conjecture as to its *actual use.* " If
מטא," he says, " possessed the meaning of ' beseeching,' it
would be precisely after the analogy of the Greek word
ἐντυγχάνω. That it did possess this force is, we think,
rendered clear from a passage (viz. St. Luke ix. 40) in the
narrative under discussion." It is not difficult to see the
logical inaccuracy involved in these words. They present
us with an example of argument in a circle. That מטא
meant " to beseech " would be clear, if the assumption of
its possession of this meaning were the only one possible
method of accounting for the difference between the three
Greek words given above. But this is just the point which
has to be proved. " Will it need," Prof. Marshall gravely
asks, " any persuasion to convince my readers that we have
here respectively—

" מְטֵית ?   אֲמְרִית,   אֲמֵרִית,

Certainly we think that very much persuasion will be
needed to convince even the most credulous, unless some
sort of proof takes the place of mere assumption. So far
from denoting " beseeching," מטא can mean nothing but
" reach to," " arrive at," " happen," as *e.g.* in—

Job xx. 6 : וְרֵישֵׁיה לַעֲנָנֵי יִמְטֵי, " And his head reach to
the clouds."

Zech. xiv. 5 : אֲרֵי יִמְטֵי חֵילָא דְטוּרַיָּא לְאָצֵל, " For the
valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azel."

Gen. xliii. 20, J.I. : כַּד מְטֵינָא, " When we arrived."

Surely such arbitrary conjectures are a serious blemish in
a series of articles, which aim at being a scientific exposition
of an, as yet, unproved theory. To quote words used in
another connection by Prof. Marshall himself, " they do but
injure the cause they are intended to serve."

We think that sufficient proof of the linguistic improb-
ability of the majority of Prof. Marshall's reconstructions

has now been given, and that from his four remaining articles it will suffice if we take single illustrations.

In the article for September, Prof. Marshall compares the variants—

St. Matt. ix. 11.	St. Mark ii. 16.	St. Luke v. 30.
ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν	πίνει	πίνετε

διδάσκαλος might be a rendering of רבכון. For πίνετε he suggests רביתון, ב being written for ו, as in the Samaritan Targum. There is no intrinsic improbability in the use of the word itself. The objection to it is that it is quite unlikely that St. Mark or St. Luke would have failed to see the sarcasm involved in it (for it means of course "be drunken"), and have given such a feeble equivalent as the Greek πίνω.

Our example from THE EXPOSITOR for November, is the following :—

St. Mark v. 41.	St. Luke viii. 54.
κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς	κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς
τοῦ παιδίου	ἐφώνησε

The second line seems to Prof. Marshall to give "clear evidence of an Aramaic original." "The regular word for ' child ' is רְבִי; but the verb which means ' to call by name ' is רַבִּי." The point here is that רבי in this sense is always followed in the Targums by שמא or בשמא. This is the key-note of the phrase. The verb means literally "to make great." It is used in—

> Jer. xi. 16 : כן רבי יי שמיך בעממיא. "The Lord hath made great thy name among the nations."
>
> Exod. xxxi. 2 (Onq.) : רבית׳ בשום. "I have made great by name, *i.e.*, I have specially marked out, Bezaleel."
>
> Jer. xx. 3 : לא פשחור רבי יי שמך. "Id est, (non) Paschuris magno nomine vocavit."—*Buxt.*

These examples will show with how little probability the

word can be assumed to be the equivalent of ἐφώνησε. To express the idea of " calling by name," Aramaic, like Hebrew, uses קרא.

The December number of THE EXPOSITOR furnishes us with the following example :—

ST. MATT. XIII. 19.	ST. MARK IV. 15.	ST. LUKE VIII. 12.
τὸ ἐσπαρμένον	τὸν λόγον	τὸν λόγον
	τὸν ἐσπαρμένον	

λόγον might be a rendering of דבורא. A slight change would give us דדריא, which Prof. Marshall renders " that which is sown." It is important here to notice that the " word " represents the " seed " of the Parable (ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, St. Luke viii. 11), and the idea involved in the words is that of the sowing of seed. Now this is not the meaning of the verb דרא, which corresponds to the Heb. זרא, not זרע, and means (1) to strew, scatter (Exod. xxxii. 20, Onq., Isa. xli. 16), (2) to winnow (Jer. iv. 11). It seems never to be used of seed in the Targums, and it is unlikely therefore that it would have been employed in this sense in the Logia. The common Aramaic word for " to sow " is זרע, " sown " therefore would be זריע.

It will be well now to sum up, as briefly as is consistent with clearness, those defects and blemishes which as it seems to us make the majority of Prof. Marshall's indications of translation untenable. We shall consider them first from the standpoint of language. Here we shall be concerned mainly with the linguistic probability of Prof. Marshall's reconstructions of the original Aramaic Document. And secondly, we shall deal more particularly with the phenomena presented by the Synoptic Gospels. In this case we shall have to consider the probability or improbability of such an original Aramaic document being embedded in the strata of our gospels.

We are not here concerned to discuss the difficult question

of the original language of the Logia mentioned by Papias. Prof. Marshall, with most modern critics, assumes that they were written in Aramaic. But even when this has been postulated much remains to be defined. The extant Aramaic literature, as distinct from the Syriac dialects, comprises, roughly speaking, the following branches : [1]—

I. The Aramaic portions of Ezra, dating probably from the fifth century B.C.

II. The Aramaic of Daniel, which is now generally dated about 166 B.C.

III. The dialects [2] of the Targums, the earliest of which in their present form cannot be earlier than the end of the second century A.D., and which are probably (the Palestinian certainly) later.[3]

IV. The Aramaic of the Talmuds.

V. The Aramaic of the inscriptions, comprising (principally) :

1. The Nabathean dialect.

2. The Palmyrene.

3. The Egyptian Aramaic.

Since these remains cover a period extending from the fifth century B.C. to the third or fourth century A.D., we naturally ask ourselves whether we cannot define more closely the term " Aramaic," as applied to a document which must fall within the limits of the first century of our era. Prof. Marshall very rightly attempts to do this. He started, he tells us, with " the surmise, which gradually deepened into a fixed conviction that the Urevangelium was written in the language of the Jewish Targums—not, however, without sundry dialectical peculiarities found in the Samaritan Targum." [4]   This statement calls for careful

---

[1] Dr. Wright's *Comp. Gram. of the Sem. Languages*, p. 16.

[2] Slightly differing, especially in vocabulary.

[3] Nöldeke, *Encycl. Brit.*, " Semitic Languages," 648[b].

[4] EXPOSITOR, February, 1891, p. 110.

examination. The so-called "Jewish Targums" fall into
two classes, the Palestinian and the Babylonian. It would
seem that the Babylonian Jews, instead of producing an
independent translation, borrowed the Palestinian Targums
and revised them to suit their own needs. Hence we find
that the language of the Babylonian translations whilst
being in the main Palestino-Aramaic, has a distinct East-
Aramaic element. And further, when we confine our
attention to the Babylonian Targums, we find individual-
ities of style and diction. Onqelos uses phrases which are
never found in Jonathan, and the latter has peculiarities
which distinguish his translation from that of Onqelos. [1]
Such individualities, employed by Prof. Marshall in his
retranslations, are the following:—

> כלי, "to cry out," though used by Jonathan never
> occurs in Onqelos.
>
> מן אולא is a characteristic of Jonathan, never in
> Onqelos.
>
> ארי, "but," is peculiar to the Babylonian Targums; the
> Jerusalem Targums prefer ארום.
>
> בבע is also a characteristic of the Babylonian Tar-
> gums; the Jerusalem Targums used instead במטו.

It is surely a defect in Prof. Marshall's method that he
should have thus combined in his supposed Aramaic Logia
the peculiarities of idiom that distinguish different dialects
and individual writers. With regard to the Samaritan
Targum little can here be said. But the suggestion that
"If the Logia and the Samaritan Targum were written in
the same half-century, they present us the Aramaic lan-
guage at the same stage of literary development" is purely
hypothetical, and has no evidence to support it. But still
further: in spite of his conviction that the Logia were
written in the language of the Jewish Targums, coloured

[1] Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten*, p. 14.

with some of the peculiarities of the Samaritan Targum,
Prof. Marshall is led by the exigencies of his theory to
overstep the limits thus laid down. With a courageous
indifference to considerations of period and dialect he scours
almost the entire range of Aramaic literature in his search
for linguistic curiosities. The Aramaic of Daniel, the
Palestinian and Babylonian Targums, the Aramaic of the
Talmuds, and even Neo-Hebrew, all alike furnish material
for the reconstruction of the Logia. We collect here some
of the rare and doubtful words, or words used in a doubtful
and improbable meaning, which are thought worthy of a
place in Prof. Marshall's document.

March, 1891.	דרך ׳	implying simply " the coming " of birds.
	שרף	= ἰκμάδα.
	מותר	= βίος and τὰ λοιπά.
	פרך	= ξηραίνεται.
	בענין	= μόγις.
	דקק	= ῥήγνυμι.
	חסיל	= τέλειος and οἰκτίρμων.
	חזורא	= περιχώρου.
	שירא	= πλῆθος.
	ארבעה	= κλίνη.
	גב	= ὑπό and ἐπί.
	מטלטל	= βεβλημένον and αἰρόμενον.
	סלק	= ἀπεστέγασαν.
	מטללא	= δῶμα.
	טללא	= στέγην.
	פחרין	= κεράμων.
	ערק	in the simple sense of " departure."
	בגו	= ὅπου ἦν.
	בגו	= διά.
	בריא	= ὀρίων.

April, 1891.	שׁגר	= ἀπολέσαι.
	רשׁא	= δανείζομαι and αἴρω.
	הדר	= ἀποστραφῇς and ἀπαίτει.
	שׁרא	= καθήμενοι (prop. "to encamp").
May, 1891.	אזד	= ἐξέρχεσθαι.
	עלאה	= ὑψηλός, and applied to ὄρος.
June, 1891.	מטא	= ἐδεήθην.
	אתכמטי	= ἐξελθόντες, without object expressed.
	אזא	= ἄψας, applied to a lamp.
	במטות ברי	= δέομαί σου . . . ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.
Sept., 1891.	בהדדא	= ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.
	רוי	= πίνει.
	אתהוי	= γέγονεν (but first quoted from the philosophical Hebrew of the 13th cent.).
Nov., 1891.	רבי	= ἐφώνησε (without שׁמא or בשׁמא).
	(ארעא) ברא	= "(lower) *region*" (for ἄβυσσος), properly "open field" or "country."
	אלא	(without a negative preceding) = "only."
Dec., 1891.	דרא	= ἐσπαρμένον.
Aug., 1892.	רדידא	= fine raiment in general.
	תרעייא	in an active sense "inroads," "ravages,"

a list which, if space permitted, we might readily increase.

If then the few fragments retranslated by Prof. Marshall contain so much that is unique in the language, what startling phenomena must the entire document have presented! To understand the dialect in which it was written we should have to request its discoverer to furnish us with a careful glossary, and a revised Aramaic Grammar. It may of course be said that Aramaic dialects differ so much that we cannot feel sure that one containing such a mix-

ture could not have existed. This is perhaps true; but we can at least assert with great confidence, that this particular dialect has not a shred of evidence to support it, that it is a purely conjectural one, that it was certainly never spoken by any people known to history, and finally that quite as certainly it was never committed to writing until late in this 19th century.

We turn now to our second consideration. Are the features presented by the Synoptic Gospels consistent with the theory that in certain sections they are translations from a genuine Apostolic Document like the Logia of St. Matthew? In examining the examples given by Prof. Marshall we have been strongly impressed by the very wide divergencies between the accounts of our Canonical Gospels. An example will illustrate this. The narrative of the woman with the issue of blood is common to all three Gospels. In St. Mark it occupies 10 verses, in St. Luke 6, and in St. Matthew 3; or to state the case somewhat differently, St. Mark employs some 154 words, St. Luke 104, and St. Matthew only 47.[1] St. Matthew omits the statement that the woman had spent much money on physicians and had heard of the fame of Jesus. He omits also the entire section which narrates the perception of Jesus that power had gone forth from Him, His question to the crowd and the consequent confession of the woman. St. Luke, who in the main retains this section, omits the statement that the woman came impelled by the reputation of Jesus. According to the best authorities, he omits also the allusion to her experiences with the doctors. He leaves out the account of her deliberation previous to her act of faith, and the assertion that "she perceived in her body that she was healed." He omits also the statement that Jesus looked round to see who had touched Him. And finally

---

[1] We have used the text given in Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*.

St. Mark omits the statement of St. Luke that, in reply
to the question of Jesus, all denied having touched Him.
To what does such wide divergence and such difference
of treatment point. Surely not to the conclusion that our
Canonical Evangelists were translating from St. Matthew's
Logia. How could they, who could not even claim to be
eyewitnesses of the facts recorded, have so ventured to
mutilate the work of an Apostle? To this argument an
objection will perhaps be raised on the ground of acknow-
ledged fact. "Modern critics," it may be said, "are almost
unanimous in asserting, that at least two of our Evan-
gelists did as a matter of fact use the Logia in the com-
pilation of their Gospels. It matters little from this point
of view whether they used the Aramaic original or a Greek
translation. The argument from their divergence would
apply equally to both, and is therefore excluded." But let
us reconsider the matter. On Prof. Marshall's hypothesis,
our three Evangelists had before them the Aramaic Logia
of St. Matthew. How, we repeat, could they have treated
it with the freedom implied in their accounts? But now let
us suppose the Logia to have been previously translated into
Greek, and quite possibly somewhat recast. On the "Two-
Document Hypothesis" the compilers of our Canonical St.
Matthew and St. Luke employed in the composition of
their Gospels two documents, this Greek translation of the
Logia and our canonical St. Mark, or a document very
similar to it. Surely the fact of previous translation would
account largely for the freedom with which the "Logia"
was treated. It would tend to obscure the immediate
consciousness of the Apostolic origin of the work. And
this feeling would be helped by the fact that side by side
with it there was being used a second Greek document
confessedly not of Apostolic origin. And thus we are led
to the conclusion that whilst the divergencies in our Gospels
seem inexplicable on the hypothesis that our Evangelists

were translating from the original Aramaic Logia, this difficulty is, if not altogether accounted for, at least greatly lessened, by the theory that they used a Greek translation. *Previous translation explains divergence of account.*

But once again : side by side with divergence of subject matter, our Gospels present us with very frequent coincidence in phraseology. Impressed by this latter phenomenon, Dr. Weiss asserts that "The writing which lies at the basis of our three Gospels cannot have been the primitive Hebrew work of St. Matthew, but an old Greek translation of it." Prof. Marshall, who quotes these words, thinks this " multiplication of documents " unnecessary, and prefers to appeal to oral instruction. " A current Greek rendering of the Aramaic, . . . supplemented from time to time by personal information, amply explains all the phenomena." This statement is misleading. Either such a " current Greek rendering" must have been stereotyped and crystallized into set words and phrases, in which case it would approximate so nearly to Dr. Weiss' " Greek translation" as to be indistinguishable from it, or it would not explain the phenomenon in question—coincidence in the Greek wording of our Gospels. There is one particular case of this verbal coincidence which seems to tell with crushing force against the translation theory. It is the word ἐπιούσιος in the Lord's Prayer. We may ask in passing how, if our three Evangelists were translating from a common original, as Prof. Marshall apparently assumes, St. Mark could have omitted this, the pivot and keynote of all Christian worship. But what can we say of ἐπιούσιος ? What Aramaic equivalent can we suppose to have given rise to this strange and difficult word ? Certainly not מחר, which Jerome tells us that he found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. How could St. Matthew and St. Luke, translating independently, have simultaneously hit upon a word so rare that Origen supposes it to have been coined by the Evan-

gelists (Orig. de Orat. 27). And if, baffled in this direction, we fall back upon the theory of "a current (oral) Greek rendering of the Aramaic," we are met again by the objection that if after passing from mouth to mouth such a rendering had settled down into so stereotyped a form, it would differ in a hardly perceptible degree from a written document.

And lastly : some of the variations presented by the synoptists seem capable of explanation on the supposition of corruption in the Greek text itself. Conjectures in this direction may often reach what Dr. Sanday calls " the climax of ingenuity," and seem " almost too brilliant to be true." [1] But surely it seems easier to suppose that such variants as περὶ τῶν χοίρων and τὸ τῆς περιχώρου[2] arose from ambiguity in the Greek text than to recognise in חזרא their common Aramaic original.

And so we draw to a close. We find that the instances of translation adduced by Prof. Marshall are unsatisfactory. They are based too often upon etymological misconceptions or linguistic impossibilities. He frequently postulates for words senses entirely at variance with the known usage of the language. And here it must be remembered that our knowledge of Aramaic is not fragmentary. The literature is sufficiently extensive to enable us nearly always to affirm with confidence what the linguistic use of a word was in actual fact. Again Prof. Marshall's theory is contradicted in two important particulars by the phenomena presented in the Gospels. On the one hand it altogether fails to account for their coincidence in verbal phraseology. On the other, it intensifies, instead of decreasing, the difficulty already felt in their divergencies in the subject matter of common narratives. It may be that the writers of our canonical St. Matthew and St. Luke made use of the

[1] EXPOSITOR, May, 1891, p. 348.
[2] EXPOSITOR, March, 1891, p. 213.

Logia : modern critics assert it with increasing unanimity. But if so, they must have had it before them in the form of a Greek translation. At any rate, if they employed and disintegrated the original Aramaic document, we still wait for the scholar who shall re-discover its missing fragments and reset them in their original unity.

WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.

[Since the preceding article was written, some very pertinent criticisms upon Prof. Marshall's methods have appeared in Dr. Resch's instructive and interesting volume, entitled *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte* (1893), pp. 94–108. Dr. Resch does not however deal with the philological character of Prof. Marshall's results, and his objections are thus independent of those that have been taken above. But he mentions (p. 160) the significant fact that Dr. Dalman, the learned Talmudic scholar, has expressed to him grave doubts respecting the manner in which Prof. Marshall handles his Aramaic.]