

Holstein's codex, but as the collection of Bigot's printed books was dispersed, it would not be easy to find it to-day. In the 'Fonds français' of the Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 9467, among Ducange's papers, are preserved the 'Chronici Alexandrini Collationes' (see Omont, 'Inventaire des mss. grecs,' Paris, 1888, pt. 3, p. 389). In these, if anywhere, further information would be found to supplement what I have been able to put together in the above pages.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

DIFFICULTIES IN THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS EXPLAINED FROM THE ARAMAIC.

1. In St. Mark xii 3, 4, we are told that the wicked husbandmen 'beat and sent away empty' the first messenger of the absent owner of the vineyard, and 'wounded in the head,' and 'shamefully handled,' the second. The Greek word for 'wounded in the head,' κεφαλίουν (κ BL) presents us with a difficulty. In the first place it occurs only here. And secondly, if the meaning 'wound in the head' could be supported, so particular a word would still be surprising. Why the head? If the narrative were a relation of fact we should accept the statement with a sigh of pity for the ill-used envoy; but in a parable we expect some more general and less anatomical expression parallel to the comprehensive verbs of the context, 'beat,' 'shamefully handled,' 'killed.' Now to those who believe that the Lord was accustomed to speak in Aramaic, it will seem natural to suppose that the Greek word here used represents or misrepresents an Aramaic verb, which it may or may not be possible to rediscover.

I wish to suggest that we can go further than this, and find some ground for supposing that the writer is not merely putting into Greek, or recording in Greek, words spoken in Aramaic, but that he has before him in writing an Aramaic word which he has misunderstood. In other words he was translating an Aramaic document. There is a common Aramaic and Syriac root כַּשׁ, which in the Aphel means to 'misuse,' 'maltreat,' 'afflict.' The following examples from the Targums and Syriac VSS will illustrate its usage:—

Gen. xix 9, Onq. כַּעַן נִבְאַשׁ לָךְ. LXX. νῦν οὖν σέ κακώσομεν. Num. xi 11
לִמָּא אֲבִישׂתָא לַעֲבָרְךָ. LXX. ἵνα τί ἐκάκωσας τὸν θεράποντά σου; Num.
xvi 15 Onq. וְלֹא אֲבִישׂוּת לְחַד מִנְהוּן. LXX. οὐδὲ ἐκάκωσα οὐδένα αὐτῶν.
Acts vii 19 Pesh. כַּשׁ לְאָבִי = ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας. Acts xii 1
כַּשׁ לְאָבִי = κακῶσαι. Acts xiv 2 ἐκάκωσαν = כַּשׁ לְאָבִי.

Now it is, I think, plain that the meaning of this verb כַּשׁ = κακῶν

= 'malefacere,' is exactly what is wanted in our passage in St. Mark. The first servant was beaten and sent away empty. The second was maltreated and shamefully handled (*ἠτίμασαν*). The third was killed. Let us suppose that the translator had שׁוֹמֵר before him. Let us further suppose that the second letter was partly obliterated and looked like ר . The translator seems to have said to himself that he had before him what appeared to be the ordinary word שׂוֹר = 'head' verbalised¹. That puzzled him. He knew of no Greek equivalent, and therefore took the Greek word *κεφάλιον*, and verbalised that; thus giving an exact, if mechanical, equivalent of שׁוֹמֵר , and left it to his readers to conjecture the meaning. Some of them, however, preferred to drop out of the narrative so ambiguous a word. The writer of the first gospel seems to have substituted *επιδοκίμασαν*. St. Luke seems to have preferred to repeat *δείραντες* (*τραυματίσαντες* in Lc. xx 12 is an intentional softening of Mc.'s *ἀπέκτειναν*, to sharpen the climax. The messengers were maltreated in various ways; the son was put to death).

It may be urged that even if the translator found in his document a miswritten שׁוֹמֵר he would instinctively have emended; the verb being so common. But students of the LXX know that the translators of that VS not uncommonly misread, and so mistranslate, quite common Hebrew words, even though their mistranslation destroys the meaning of the passage. (Cf. Driver, *Heb. Text of Samuel*, p. lx.)

2. In St. Luke xxiv 32 the Old Latin texts offer some very divergent renderings of *καιομένη*. *l* has 'optusum' (and so Syroⁱⁿ Syro^{cu}, and Arm): *e* has 'exterminatum,' *c* 'excaecatium.'

Dr. Chase (*Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 68) has discussed this passage at length. He argues that 'optusum' is due to محم = *καιομένη* misread as محم which appears in the two early Syriac VSS. I wish to point out that if we change the first radical of this word we get حمم = 'exterminatum,' and that if we now change the second letter we have حمم = 'excaecatium.' Thus all three renderings 'optusum,' 'exterminatum,' and 'excaecatium,' might be explained as renderings of a single Syriac original in three stages of corruption. Is this accidental, or has it any bearing on the history of the Latin VSS? In support of the confusion of محم and حمم it is perhaps worth while quoting Sir. xlix 6, where for the Greek *ἐνεπύρισεν* the Syriac has حمم .

3. Another case where confusion between two Syriac words seems to explain a rendering in an Old Latin text is Mc. ix 50. Here for *ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλα ἡ* has 'habetis in vobis panem.' The last word seems to be due to confusion between ܠܫܠܫܐ = 'salt,' and ܠܫܠܫܐ = 'bread.'

¹ A similar confusion of the roots שׁוֹר and שׁוֹב may be found in Ps. cxli 5, where for the Heb. שׁוֹר רַח the LXX has *ἐλαϊον δὲ ἀμαρτωλοῦ*, reading שׁוֹב = שׁוֹר . For *ἀμαρτωλός* = שׁוֹר cf. Prov. xii 13, LXX and Targum.

The two Syriac words present greater similarity than do 'panem' and 'saalem' in Latin.

W. C. ALLEN.

ON JOB xxxiv 20.

THE verse stands thus in the Massoretic Text :—

רָבַע יָמָתוֹ וַחֲצוֹת לַיְלָה יִנְעָשׂוּם וַיִּעָבְרוּ וַיִּסִּירוּ אֲבִיר לֹא בָיָד :

In a moment they die and at midnight ; the people are violently shaken and pass away, and the mighty are removed without hand.

Here עַם, *the people*, does not suit the context, which requires some word parallel to אֲבִיר in the last clause. Budde supplies this by reading שׁוֹעִם, *the rich*. This certainly helps to balance the clause with that which follows, and receives probability from the fact that שׁוֹעַ occurs in the preceding verse. The method of obtaining it, however, viz. by repeating the last two letters of וַיִּנְעָשׂוּ, still leaves יִנְעָשׂוּ. This is not in itself a likely word, for (1) the *Pual* does not otherwise occur ; (2) the root is elsewhere used poetically of the phenomena of violent natural convulsions ; only once is it used metaphorically of the nations confounded by Jehovah (Jer. xxv 16) ; (3) the sense *violently shaken* is here opposed to the idea in the first and third strophes of the verse, namely that the rich, despite their present prosperity, shall be removed swiftly and silently by an unseen Power.

There is another way of emending the text, which, as a mere conjecture, is at once simpler and more convincing. If we read שׁוֹעִם from the consonants supplied by the MT, we have left the letters ינע. These directly suggest either ינעו, *are weary* or *toil*, or ינעו, *perish*.

Of these ינעו is superficially the more attractive ; but the fact that it would introduce an idea even more foreign to the context than ינעשו of the MT, is decisive against it.

On the other hand ינעו entirely suits the sense, and forms a natural parallel to ינעשו ; cf. xxxvi 12, where the parallel actually occurs, also xxxiv 15, where ינעו is parallel to עַל-עַפְרָיִם : both in the Elihu speeches. The loss of the two *vavs* is readily explained by the supposition that a scribe has taken a wrong view of the meaning of the verse, and thus connected the consonants with a different verb. For instance, the failure to see that עַם was part of שׁוֹעִם would leave ינעושו, which might easily have been read as a *Pual* : indeed, the present *Pual* form instead of *Qal* (cf. Ps. xviii (xvii) 8 = 2 Sam. xxii 8, Kthib) seems to point to an original *plene scriptum*¹. The first *vav* would thus be omitted as

¹ I have learned through the kindness of Mr. F. C. Burkitt that eight of Kennicott's MSS actually read ינעושו. He suggests also that this may be the true Massoretic reading.