(a) The simile is that of a *seed*, i.e. it is something capable of growth, and something that forms one of a class, and is capable of being put into comparison with other individuals of the same class (μικρότερον πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, 32).

(b) The thing compared is "*the kingdom of heaven*," and therefore certainly not, primarily, Christ Himself, "the King"; but it must be used in one of the two senses in which He ordinarily uses the word. This will be either (1) the external visible body of disciples, the Church (if the name may be permitted so early); or (2) the reign of Christ in the heart (cf. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, part ii., c. i.).

(c) The context would seem to guide us to the prior of those two alternatives. The preceding parable—that of the Tares—is clearly a parable of the fortunes of the Church. The last parable of this group—the Draw-net—equally clearly has the same reference. These are the clearest, but all the rest of the group will bear the same interpretation.

It seems, then, that the primary reference is to the body of disciples. It is a parable of encouragement to the small body of followers; at the present moment, small, poor, insignificant, not to be compared for importance with Pharisees or Sadducees, with Essenes or Herodians, yet destined to grow into the Catholic Church.

Secondarily, it is quite legitimate to give it a subjective reference to the principle of Christianity in the individual heart. The disciples are not to be discouraged: the kingdom of heaven, and faith in Christ, which is its germ, may seem at first to get slight hold upon a heart, as compared with the other principles there; but it has the power of growth in a greater measure than they. It will ultimately gain its way, and all the other aims of life, the love of knowledge, of power, of fame, will only be secure when under its shadow. Bengel's note puts well this latter application: "Mundus habet varia sapientiæ, potentiæ, virtutis semina. Ea omnia vicit fides Christiana per omnem mundum propagata."

Keele College, Oxford.

WALTER LOCK.

The Aramaic Gospel.

A RÉSUMÉ OF THE THEORY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS GENESIS.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR J. T. MARSHALL, M.A., MANCHESTER.

WHEN, with unwonted impulsiveness, I promised last month to place before the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a summary of the arguments in favour of an Aramaic Gospel, I was not fully sensible of the difficulty of the task. To condense a process of argumentation which has occupied eleven papers in the *Expositor* into the limits of one paper is a task of no slight difficulty—especially as the argument is essentially cumulative. In fact I have, on two occasions, declined to accept the undertaking, when the request was made by a Society of Biblical Scholars in Oxford. But I have been led to see that, though there may be losses in some directions, there may in others be a decided gain in viewing the various parts of the argument as one compact whole; just as the juryman is often grateful for the summing up of the judge.

As furnishing an element of freshness to those

who have already perused my papers in the *Expositor*, and at the same time adding no little to the cogency of the proof, it has occurred to me that it may be well to slightly draw aside the veil of privacy, and permit you to see the theory in its genesis: to divulge to you how the idea first occurred to me, and how step by step it grew upon me, opening up remarkably in unexpected ways, until it became to me one of the most certain of all certitudes. If I can conduct you along the path I walked myself, I may in this way perhaps best lead you to the same goal. The method suggested will introduce more of the personal element than is in harmony with one's feelings, but I trust this will be forgiven in view of the higher interests sought after.

It was in the early spring of 1888, in connection with the study of 1 Thess. iv., v., that the germinal idea first occurred to me. Having satisfied myself

that the words *ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου* in chap. iv. 15 refer to Christ's discourses, I was comparing chap. v. 3-7 with an interesting fragment found only in Luke xxi. 34-36, and observed that the two passages correspond thought for thought; only that whereas Paul says the day will come "as *travail*," Luke says it will come "as a *snare*." Then the thought occurred that in Hebrew the words for "snare" and "travail" are almost identical, *חבל* being "a snare," and *חבל*, "travail."

This at once suggested the inquiry, Does not this seem to prove that these variations are due to translation from a common Hebrew original? St. Luke tells us very explicitly that before he wrote his Gospel "many had taken in hand to draw up a narrative of the things most surely believed among" the Christians. Does not the phenomenon before us seem to show that Luke and Paul had in their possession an account of the Lord's last great discourse written in Hebrew, and that the two readings, "as a snare" and "as travail," are variant translations of the same Hebrew form *חבל*? I lost no time in applying this suggestion to the other allusions to our Lord's words which are found in the Epistles, with the view of examining whether the variations which they present, as compared with our Greek Gospels, may be due to the circulation of Semitic fragments of our Lord's discourses, some of which Paul had in his possession, and from which his translations were made. (The results of these investigations eventually appeared in the *Expositor* of July 1890.) Then the larger question began to shape itself, Are the variations which the Gospels present of our Lord's sayings due to translation from a common Hebrew original? I had then for some time been a devoted student of Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, and was quite of the opinion that in his work we have the nearest approach we are ever likely to possess to the words of the Lord Jesus. But to test this hypothesis it was needful to make a thorough study of a *Harmony* of the Gospels. In this task I found it of great benefit that as a youth I constructed for my own use a Harmony of considerable parts of the Gospels, arranging in columns the parallel, though sometimes slightly divergent, expressions of the Synoptists on the same line. There was another of my earlier labours which seemed likely to serve a use altogether unforeseen and unpremeditated. Some ten or twelve years ago I devoted all my

leisure time to the study of Hebrew synonyms, and arranged lists of the Hebrew synonyms of more than three hundred English words, endeavouring from the Concordance and the study of words in their connection to ascertain their precise shade of meaning. And, claiming your indulgence, I may say there was another discipline which I found of great value. In studying the Hebrew, I have always kept an eye on the Septuagint; and in studying the Greek Testament I have devoted special attention to Old Testament quotations, and in cases where the Greek differs from the Hebrew I have habitually striven to reconstruct the Hebrew text which was presupposed by the Greek. Others may think me mistaken, but for my own part, in these preliminary studies, I reverently trace the guiding hand of One who leads us in a way that we know not. A minute study of the Harmony of the Gospels gradually revealed to me a threefold classification of their contents:—

A. There are numerous passages—sections, verses, or clauses—in which each of the Synoptists stands alone. Each gives matter not found in the others, or, if describing the same event, gives a more or less independent account.

B. There are many instances in which two, or sometimes three, evangelists agree *verbatim*; or, at all events, the differences are not greater than may have taken place in process of transcription from a Greek text, nor than are actually found in different MSS. of the same Greek author. As illustrations of this I would advise the study in a Greek Harmony of Luke vii. 32-35 || Matt. xi. 16-19; Luke xi. 31, 32 || Matt. xii. 41, 42; Luke v. 23, 24 || Matt. ix. 5, 6 || Mark ii. 9, 10; Luke vi. 2-4 || Matt. xii. 2-4 || Mark ii. 24-26; and, notably, all the passages in which Christ foretells His death.

C. There are other instances where the parallel passages agree in thought, but not in words. Verse after verse, thought agrees with thought, and yet there is far from verbal identity. There is precise parallelism in the clauses; almost every clause has its representative in one or other of the companion Gospels, and yet we come across words which are *not* equivalent. In the midst of substantial agreement we come across individual words which startle us by their discrepancy; and though the difference is not momentous, we cannot honestly say that the words mean quite the same. It was in *these* passages that we detected indications of translation from a common source; and it was to these

divergent words that we directed special attention to test if they were translations from the same or from two very similar Hebrew words. Case after case was examined; the Hebrew synonyms of the two divergent Greek words were laid side by side to see if, in a MS., two of the Hebrew representatives were so near alike that one could easily be mistaken for the other. But all in vain, or almost in vain. The results were scanty in number and doubtful in quality. Evidently I was on the wrong tack. Then I thought of the counter hypothesis, that the primitive Gospel was written in Aramaic. So convinced was I that the phenomena indicated the use of a written document that, solely in order to verify the hypothesis, I commenced the study of Aramaic, procured Buxtorf's Targums and the best modern apparatus, immersed myself for a time in the subject, and eventually completed the study of the whole of Buxtorf's four portly volumes. During my reading, my thoughts were ever on the meanings required for the divergent Greek words, and in time I drew out some hundreds of lists of Aramaic synonyms, as I had done years before for the Hebrew. Before long my research was repaid. The first instance was in the Lord's Prayer—the first-fruits of my labour. In Matt. vi. 12 the prayer occurs: Forgive us our *debts*, *ὀφειλήματα*. Whereas in Luke xi. 4 we read: Forgive us our *sins*, *ἁμαρτίας*. Now it may safely be affirmed that if our Lord originally uttered the prayer in Greek, these divergences would never have occurred; for the remarkable memory of Orientals might surely be trusted to transmit this brief and specially sacred portion accurately. But when we remember that there is an Aramaic word *חוב*, which means (1) a *debt*, (2) a *sin* or trespass, does not this strongly suggest that the difference in the Greek words is due to a variant translation of the one Aramaic word *חובתא*? Again, in Matt. x. 28 we read: "Fear Him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in Gehenna;" but Luke xii. 5 says, "is able to *cast* into Gehenna." In Aramaic the word *שנא* has two distinct, unconnected meanings. The first is to "throw, cast"; usually of casting out a dead body, as Jer. xxii. 19. The second, to "burn, consume." May we not be permitted to infer that the divergence in the Greek is due to a variant rendering of the word *שנא*? And again, when Matt. x. 40 says, "He that *receiveth* you *receiveth* me," and in a similar connection, in Luke x. 16, we

have, "He that *heareth* you *heareth* me;" and we know that the verb *קבל* means both "to *receive*" and "to *hear*," is it not clear that since the Saviour spoke Aramaic we have before us two renderings of the one word? On what other supposition can we so satisfactorily explain the fact that Matt. x. 38 speaks of "*taking* the cross" (*λαμβάνειν*), Mark viii. 34 of "*taking up* the cross" (*αἶρειν*), and Luke xiv. 27 of "*carrying* the cross" (*βαστάζειν*), as by assuming that we have different translations of the Aramaic *קבל*, which is regularly used in all these significations. For an elaboration of these and other instances, I would refer the reader to *The Expositor* for April 1891.

I need not inform the readers of this Magazine that there are two hypotheses which attempt to explain the divergences in the Synoptic Gospels. The first is that of *oral tradition*, which seeks to explain them (1) by the necessarily variant account which two equally credible witnesses would give of the same incident; and (2) by the imperfection of human memory in orally transmitting the words of Jesus for many years before they were written. The other hypothesis is that which has assumed two or more *documents* as lying behind our present Synoptic Gospels. So long as it was maintained that these documents were *Greek*, I incline to think that the theory of oral tradition had in some respects the better of the argument; indeed there are some phenomena which I venture to think can best be explained by the theory of oral tradition, as I will presently try to show.

As regards the cases of explanation from Aramaic which we have thus far given, there is no reason why the out-and-out advocate of oral tradition, who *also* believes that Christ *spoke* Aramaic, should raise any objection. Even if Christ's discourses were committed to memory as spoken, and orally transmitted, the phenomena we have thus far considered would naturally occur. *קבל*, for instance, might naturally be translated into Greek "*receives*" and "*hears*," even if the Greek translators were simply listening to Jewish instructors, and had no access to a written document. But at this point our paths must diverge, for the great majority of the Greek variants can only be explained by the assumption of an Aramaic document, and not by oral tradition.

The question then arises: What are the *kinds* of frailties to which Semitic scribes are liable?

What kinds of variation regularly spring up in Semitic MSS. in the process of transcription? To answer this question, a study of the LXX., in conjunction with the Hebrew, is invaluable; but we can obtain a very satisfactory answer within the pages of the sacred volume itself (1) by comparing the Hebrew text of Ps. xviii. with that of 2 Sam. xxii., where we have the same Psalm twice recorded, almost all the differences being clerical; (2) by comparing the proper names in the Book of Chronicles with the same names as given in the earlier books of Scripture,—we find here more than sixty names differently spelt; (3) by comparing, with the Hebrew, many of the Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament, and examining what variant Hebrew reading is presupposed by the Greek text. A careful study of these sources of information discloses that the variations admit of a fourfold classification. (i.) The diverse vocalisation of the same Hebrew consonants. (ii.) The misreading of a Hebrew letter. (iii.) The omission of a letter. (iv.) The transposition of two adjacent consonants. These kinds of divergence are always present, and, what is more, there is a tolerably constant ratio in the frequency with which they respectively occur. This same ratio, we may add, is discernible in the *kinds* of variation we claim to have found in the Aramaic. (See *Expositor*, August 1892.)

The central feature of my theory is the assumption, which *seems* quite simple and reasonable, that the same kinds of variations which occurred in different MSS. of the Hebrew Bible would find their way into MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel. Strange to say, the probability of this simple assumption has been called in question by two of my critics, Dr. Resch and the Rev. Arthur Wright. Both are committed to theories which run counter to mine, and without assigning valid reasons they dismiss the matter as antecedently "incredible"; forgetting that what is "incredible" to one who is thus committed may be quite credible to one who will patiently examine the evidence. The fact is, that the method to which they object has been pronounced to be thoroughly legitimate by some of the first Semitic scholars of our country, and has been welcomed by numbers of Biblical scholars as yielding a reasonable solution of the problem. To my mind, it is antecedently even more probable that we should have clerical errors in the Aramaic MSS. than in copies of the Hebrew

Scriptures. In the first place, the Jews had wealth to command the services of the best scribes and the best parchment. The Palestinian Christians were exceedingly poor, and could command neither. Besides this, it is very probable that there was in the Aramaic of the period a great lack of fixity in the orthography. In the extant Biblical Aramaic, in some degree, but far more strikingly in the Samaritan Targum, this is very noticeable. There is a decided lack of uniformity in spelling the same words; reminding one, almost, of the eight ways in which Tyndale's Bible spells the word "it." In fact, this is the case in all languages until they acquire a literature and scholastic institutions. Both the above-named circumstances would contribute to variety in the transcription of Aramaic copies of the Gospel, and to difficulty in deciphering them.

Another argument in favour of our position, which is surely worthy of some credence, is the testimony of Papias, who is the one, nearest to the Apostolic age, who gives us any information as to the composition of the Gospels. His words are: "Matthew compiled the oracles (or 'the discourses') in the dialect of the Hebrews, and each one translated (or interpreted) them *as he was able*." Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος. The word Ἑβραῖς is confessedly ambiguous. It may mean Hebrew or Aramaic. It generally means "Hebrew," but in the New Testament, *e.g.*, the words Golgotha, Gabbatha, and Bethesda are all said to be Ἑβραϊστί, though they are all Aramaic forms. Many interpretations have been given of the words of Papias, but two things are evident: (1) that Matthew's work was somewhat widely used; and (2) that those who used it had some difficulty in translating it.

And now I come to that part of the evidence which cannot be condensed without diminution of forcefulness. I refer to the citation of instances, in which the attempt is made to explain the divergences in our canonical Gospels by showing that, *if we translate the diverse Greek words into Aramaic, we obtain Aramaic words bearing a very close resemblance to one another*—differing only in one or other of the four ways we have above referred to. We can only adduce a few cases of each kind, requesting those who wish to study the subject further to peruse the *Expositor* for 1891; or to wait patiently till I can find time—in co-operation, I trust, with

some other Aramaic scholars — to develop the theory more fully in a separate volume.

I. Instances in which the divergent Greek words yield the same Aramaic consonants differently vocalised.

Matt. xvii. 2, was transfigured, *μετεμορφώθη*.

Luke ix. 29, became different, *ἐτερος*.

In the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel we have repeatedly two meanings of the verb שָׁנָא or שִׁנִּי. It means, (1) to be different, diverse, Dan. viii. 3, 23; (2) to be changed, Dan. iii. 27, v. 9. If we suppose an Aramaic original text, יוֹהִי שִׁנִּי, then if we vocalise שִׁנִּי as שִׁנִּי, we obtain the meaning "was changed." If we point it שִׁנִּי, this means, "was different."

Matt. xiii. 4. The fowls *came* and devoured it; so Mark iv. 4.

Luke viii. 5. It *was trodden*, and the fowls devoured it.

This presupposes, we think, a different vocalisation of the text-word, דָּרַךְ. The verb דָּרַךְ has two meanings: (1) to tread upon; (2) to enter, come. The former meaning is the more common, but the latter clearly occurs in the Targum of Prov. vi. 11; Isa. lix. 8; and Deut. xi. 25. *κατεπατήθη* = דָּרַךְ הָיָה דָּרַךְ; *ἤλθε* = הָיָה דָּרַךְ.

Luke v. 19. They *went up* to the house-top.

Mark ii. 4. They *uncovered* the roof.

The Aramaic word סָלַק = to go up. But in Pael סָלַק = to cause to go up, to lift up and carry away, to remove. If the reader vocalised סָלַקוּ as סָלַקוּ, he obtained the meaning, "they went up"; if סָלַקוּ, "they removed."

Luke ix. 39. It hardly *departeth* from him, *sorely-bruising* him.

Mark ix. 18. He *grindeth* with his teeth and *pineth away*.

These words stand in close parallelism, but might be supposed to be independent descriptions, if it were not that, when translated into Aramaic, they yield words almost identical. The verb "to grind" with the teeth is פָּרַךְ; "to depart" is עָרַךְ; and, as we shall show, in the Samaritan Targum ע and פ are constantly interchanged. The verb, to dry up, parch, wither, is פָּרַךְ; as in Lam. iv. 8, "Their skin cleaveth to their bone, it has become *withered*, פָּרַךְ, like a stick." But in

Pael the same verb also means, to crumble, crush, shatter, precisely the meaning of *συντρίβω*.

Mark ix. 20. The spirit *saw* Him and it convulsed him.

Luke ix. 42. The demon *tore* him and convulsed him.

In an unvocalised Aramaic text, the italicised words would be alike. *ἐρρηξεν*, "he broke," or "tore" = אָרַץ, Aphel of דָּרַק, to break, crush; while *ιδών*, or rather *εἶδεν*, is אָרַץ, Aphel of דָּרַק, to see, look at, gaze.

These instances, selected mostly from the *Expositor* for March 1891, may suffice to show that some divergences in our Greek text may have arisen from the simple circumstance of reading different vowels into an unpointed Aramaic text.

I will now adduce some cases in which it is necessary to assume that some very slight alterations had crept into the Aramaic MSS., due to the misreading of one Aramaic letter, the omission of a letter, or the transposition of two adjacent letters.

Matt. xiii. 6. διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν *ρίζαν*. שֵׁשׁ.

Luke viii. 6. διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν *ἱκμάδα*. שָׁרָף.

Matt. xvii. 1. εἰς ὅρος ὑψηλόν. אֶלְאָה.

Luke ix. 28. εἰς τὸ ὄρος *προσεύξασθαι*. צִלְאָה.

Mark x. 49. εἶπεν αὐτὸν *φωνηθῆναι*. אֶתְקַרְאָה.

Luke xviii. 40. ἐκέλευσεν . . . *ἄχθῆναι*. אֶתְקַרְבָּה.

Mark v. 26. *δαπανήσασα* τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα. כָּל מִדְּתָהָּ.

Luke viii. 43. *προσαναλώσασα* ὅλον τὸν βίον. כָּל מִזְגָּתָהָּ.

Mark iv. 21. *μήτι* ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος. אֶתְאָה.

Matt. v. 15. οὐδὲ *καίουσι* λύχνον. אֶתְאָה.

Matt. viii. 19. εἶπον τοῖς *μαθηταῖς* σου. אֶתְמַרְתִּי.

Luke ix. 16. *προσῆνεγκα* τοῖς *μαθηταῖς* σου. אֶתְמַטִּית.

Matt. xii. 14. *συμβούλιον* ἔλαβον. } אֶתְמַלְכָּהּ.

Mark iii. 6. *συμβούλιον* ἐδίδουν. }

Luke vi. 11. *διεάλουν* πρὸς ἀλλήλους. אֶתְמַלְלִין.

Matt. xxiv. 23. *μὴ πιστεύσητε*. אֶתְתַּרְחֲצִין.

Luke xvii. 23. *μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε*. אֶתְתַּרְחֲקִין.

Matt. vi. 20. Where thieves do not bore through. יִקְבִּין.

Luke xii. 33. Where thieves do not draw near. יִקְרְבִּין.

Mark iv. 37. ὥστε γεμίεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον.
אִסְכְּנִי.¹

Luke viii. 23. καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ κινδυνεον.
אִסְכְּנִי.

Matt. xix. 4. ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. אֲרֵכָה.

Mark x. 6. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. אֲרֵכָה.

Matt. xix. 22. ἀκούσας δὲ τὸν λόγον. שָׁמַע.

Mark x. 22. στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ. שָׁמַע.

Matt. xiii. 21. σκανδαλίζεται. אֲרֵכָה.

Luke viii. 13. ἀφίστανται. אֲרֵכָה.

Those who wish to study the subject are advised to turn to the *Expositor* for May, June, and November 1891, where the above Aramaic words are explained, and their meaning illustrated from usage.

And now to revert to the history of the development of our theory. I had not been at work long before I detected that some words necessary to effect the explanation of the divergent Greek words were found only in the *Palestinian* Targums of the Pentateuch. It was necessary, therefore, to procure these and study them exhaustively. Before I had finished reading them, I found that they solved the problem even better than the dialect of Onkelos; for while I found it needful to use many words found only in the *Palestinian* Targums, I did not need any words that are found only in Onkelos. Is not that an important link in the chain of evidence?² But even more important was the discovery, that words which were the Aramaic translation of the Greek homologues, manifested the peculiarities characteristic of the *Galilean* dialect. In order to equip myself in this direction, I made a partial study of the *Palestinian* Talmud, and a very thorough study of the *Samaritan* Targum. Since the earliest editions of the *Samaritan* Targum were probably written in the first century, and there must always have been a close resemblance between *Samaritan* and *Galilean*, I found the study of *Samaritan* exceeding useful in my researches; disclosing, as it did, the fact that the Aramaic original must have contained many forms and peculiarities belonging to the northern dialect.

¹ So the word is spelt in Samaritan.

² It is interesting in this connection to note that the word מַלְיָתָא, talitha, in Mark, which is, as I consider, one of the surviving fragments of the Aramaic Gospel, is found only in the *Palestinian* Targums.

The peculiarities of the northern dialect were three—

I. Confusion of the gutturals. It was not that they used them indistinctly, but indiscriminately. Any of the gutturals, א, ה, ח, and ע, might be used for its fellows. E.g., in the *Samaritan* Targum חמרא, "wine," is written עמרא; and אמאר, "sheep," is also written חמאר; חבר, a neighbour, is in the same verse written עבר; דהק, "he took away," is written דעק; לא, "not," is often written לה, and so on, in hundreds of instances. It is doubtless due to this fact that חקל דמא, 'Ακελδαμά, is in some Greek MSS. spelt 'Ακελδαμάχ.

II. Transmutation of sibilants and dentals. This is the old provincialism of pronouncing שפלת as ספלת. In the *Samaritan* Targum ש is found for ס, and ס for ש, with the utmost carelessness. So ת interchanges with ש, ד with ז, and ט with צ.

III. Interchange of ב and ו. This is at first very misleading to the student of Samaritan. To find לוֹחָא לִבְחָא, טוֹר לִבְחָא, חוֹנָא לִבְחָא, is startling. Indeed, whenever ו has a daghesh forte, we generally find ב in its place.

Is it not a striking proof of the correctness of our hypothesis, that all these peculiarities present themselves somewhat frequently in pursuing our identifications of the Greek variants? We can here only cite a few instances—

Luke ix. 39. And hardly *departeth*. ערק.

Mark ix. 18. And *gnasheth* his teeth. חרק.

Mark iii. 5. How they might *destroy* Him.
יִאֲרִיבֵיהֶם.

Luke vi. 11. What they should *do* to Him.
יַעֲבִידֵיהֶם.

Matt. xxiv. 41. Grinding *in the mill*. באדרא.

Luke xvii. 35. Grinding *together*. בהדרא.

Matt. v. 15. Under the bushel. (Paln.) סוּא.

Luke viii. 16. Under the bed. שוּיא, or סוּיא.

Matt. xvii. 8. They *saw* . . . Jesus alone.
אִסְכְּנִי.

Luke ix. 36. Jesus *was found* alone. אִשְׁתַּכַּח.

Matt. xiii. 32. The birds *come* and lodge. מְטִין.

Mark iv. 32. The birds *are able* to lodge.
מְטִין.

Mark v. 2. A man met Him from the *tombs*.
קבריא.

Luke viii. 27. A man met Him from the *city*.
קוריא.

(The second might, of course, also
be written קבריא.)

Matt. viii. 24. A *great* storm. זעפא רבמא.

Luke viii. 23. A storm of *wind*. זעף רבמא.

Matt. ix. 11. Why eateth your *Master*? רבא.

Mark ii. 16. Why eateth He and *drinketh*?
רביא, or רבא.

Another important link in the chain of evidence is to be obtained from the occurrence of *duplicate readings* in the Gospel of Mark. Many writers have directed attention to this peculiarity of the second Gospel, though some cases hitherto unsuspected have been unearthed by our method. For instance, it has often been noticed in connection with the healing of the leper, while Luke says, "His leprosy departed from him," and Matthew, "His leprosy was cleansed," Mark reads, "His leprosy departed and was cleansed." Now, our investigations show that in every case *where these duplicates occur, the two parts are, when translated into Aramaic, almost, if not quite, alike*. From this we infer that there were in vogue two renderings of the Aramaic, and that some very early redactor, addicted to the practice which shows itself in the Syrian conflate readings of the New Testament MSS., improved, as he thought, upon the text of Mark from which he was copying by adding the second reading with which he was familiar. In the case just cited, we would suggest that the original reading was אֲתִינְקָת = "was cleansed." This became אֲתִינְרָת = "fled," "removed," "departed." Then some worthy progenitor of Lucian, wishful to preserve both renderings, combined the two, ἀπηλθεν καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη. Similarly we have in Matt. viii. 24, a great storm; Luke viii. 23, a storm of wind; Mark iv. 37, a great storm of wind. We have just shown that this is explicable on our hypothesis. Again, we have seen that שׁוּא = שׁוּא means a bushel, and שׁוּיָא means a bed, and have explained the difference between ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον in Matt. v. 15 and ὑποκάτω κλίνης in Luke viii. 16 as variant renderings of the Aramaic. When we read in Mark iv. 21, "under the bushel *or* under the bed," does not the double reading confirm the existence of the Aramaic variant? Further—

Luke viii. 12. *Taketh away *the word*. דברא.

Matt. xiii. 19. Taketh away *that which was sown*.
דרריא

An early copyist transcribing Mark says, "Takes away the word which was sown," combining, as we believe, the two various Aramaic readings. [It will be noted that both these words are Palestinian.]

Several other valuable instances are given in the *Expositor* for December 1891, to which I would earnestly refer the reader. The fact that in each case the doublets yield Aramaic words which closely resemble each other, is strong evidence of derivation from a common Aramaic source.

And now, what were the contents of the Aramaic Gospel? or rather, what parts of the Gospels once existed in Aramaic? The excellence of our method, as we conceive of it, is that it allows no scope for preconceptions or subjectivity. We take the linguistic clue into our hands and follow it implicitly. Those parallel passages which present phenomena compatible with translation from a common Aramaic original, and in which the divergences can be explained by the assumption of very trifling and common variations in an Aramaic exemplar, must be assigned to the Aramaic Urevangelium, and the rest must be set aside. I confess that at first I had no idea that the theory would apply to other than the discourses, but after a time I found that the method applied even more richly to some of the narratives than to the discourses. May I request the reader to turn to the *Expositor* for August 1892, where there is a tabulated list of those parts of the Gospels which give evidence of translation from Aramaic. In the first place, I cannot thus far find any trace that it contained an account of our Lord's passion. It contained, speaking generally, the ministry of our Lord in Galilee. As to discourses, it contained the Sermon on the Mount, the admonitions of Matt. x., the parables of Matt. xiii., and the eschatological discourse of Matt. xxiv. As to narrative, it contained almost the whole of Mark's Gospel to the end of chap. xiii., and, as I believe, in the *order* in which the events occur in the Greek Gospel of Mark. The exceptions can be ascertained from the list. They are, speaking roughly, the latter half of chaps. ii. and iii. and most of chaps. vii. and xii. I need not say that I am far from attaching any the less historic

credibility to those parts thus excluded. It is simply a question of literary authorship ; and these parts do not yield to the requirements of the method—do not give any indications of translation. Besides this, the list *may* be incomplete. Our method can only work by comparison. When two parallel but divergent Greek words yield the same or slightly different Aramaic words, then our method comes into play. Consequently it can pronounce no verdict on those discourses or narratives which are only found in *one* of the Synoptics. Some of these parts *may* have formed part of the first Gospel, though our method cannot *prove* that they did.

I may be asked if I think there were *two* original Aramaic documents. Strictly speaking, our method is, as I said last month, dumb on the point of authorship. It can say nothing as to who wrote the documents. But the superior richness of the yield, whenever Mark and Luke occur in parallelism, as compared with the yield from the Matthean discourses, strongly indicates that we have two kinds of phenomena before us. Dr. Sanday has recently said that the Hypothesis of Two Documents at present holds the field. If this should continue to be the case—*i.e.* if this hypothesis should, by other arguments, be demonstrated—there is nothing in my results antagonistic, but rather favourable to the Two-Document Hypothesis, only my work will have shown that *both existed primarily in Aramaic*.

Now, in conclusion, what are the phenomena which seem to require the explanation of oral tradition? The reader will bear in mind our three-fold classification of the contents of the Synoptists, A, B, and C. With reference to the origin of the parts A and B, we have at present no concern. The class C consists of passages in which we have a substantial rather than a verbal agreement. But even in these passages, while we have very many synonyms and equivalent phrases, we have also more *verbal* agreement than is consistent with the supposition of *independent* translation from a common Aramaic original. In class C we have emphatically the phenomena of “similarity amid diversity.” As to the *divergences*, some may be due to editorial preferences ; others, to the difference

of plan which underlies each Gospel—the sublime conception of the Christ which each of the evangelists was divinely inspired to portray : of the rest, we believe that most of the Greek variants will eventually be proved to be due to variant renderings of Aramaic MSS. As to the verbal *similarities* in these passages, we incline to think that they are due to the fact that the Synoptists were familiar with a current Greek translation of the Aramaic. Here it is we invoke the aid of oral tradition. Dr. Weiss would postulate the existence of Greek written translations of the original Semitic Logia, but one shrinks from excessive multiplication of documents, and it seems to me that the resemblances are amply explained, if we assume that the evangelists, in the process of translation from the Aramaic MS., had in their thoughts a Greek translation which was current in the classes where the catechumens were instructed in the Gospels. Thus the difference between the Rev. Arthur Wright and myself is this : He claims that the discourses and narratives were transmitted orally by means of catechetical schools ; and then, after the lapse of many years, committed to writing in Greek by the evangelists, who are presumed to be the heads of such schools. The view which, after a minute word-for-word examination of the passages, and as the result of implicit following of linguistic evidence, I would advocate posits—1. An Aramaic document ; or, with equal, if not greater, probability, *two* Aramaic documents : one closely corresponding to our Gospel of Mark ; the other containing the discourses of Christ. 2. Instruction in the Gospels in the Greek language by catechists who probably taught the catechumens to commit the discourse and incidents to memory. 3. A Greek translation of the Aramaic document, made by evangelists who were familiar with the oral Greek text, which, with more or less uniformity, was current in the catechetical classes. It will, of course, be noticed that our hypothesis pushes back a *written copy* of the Lord’s words and deeds to within perhaps twenty years of the Saviour’s death, and thus renders far less probable—if not impossible—the incrustation of legend and of myth.