

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

he had been forbidden to traverse—he at length set foot in the latter city, and there founded the Church which in the closing years of the century succeeded Jerusalem and the Syrian Antioch as the metropolis of Apostolic Christianity.

F. H. CHASE.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

II.

3. DOES פַּחְרִין in Aramaic mean *tiles*? Prof. Marshall argues, without any misgivings, that it does. In the EXPOSITOR, March, 1891, p. 219, he says, “פַּחְרִין would be tiles.” When challenged by Mr. Allen for his proof, he now produces it: “פַּחְרָא = a potter, *κεραμεύς*, פַּחְרָא = earthenware, as in J, Exod. 12, 22, מִן דְּפַחְרָא = vessel of earthenware. The plural of nouns of material denotes pieces of that material. Hence פַּחְרִין must denote *κέραμοι*, tiles.” It is allowed, then, that פַּחְרִין is not known to occur with that meaning, but it is argued that it ought to have it. Obviously, however, the argument is fallacious. There is no doubt that פַּחְרָא means *earthenware*, but it does not follow from this that the plural פַּחְרִין has the definite sense of *tiles*: it may have been used to denote *fragments*, or *pieces*, of earthenware: can it be shown that Job (2, 8), when he took, in the Hebrew a חָרַשׁ, in the Aramaic a פַּחַר, to scrape himself with, took definitely a “tile?” What the native Aramaic word for a *tile* was I am very ready to own I do not know. And the translators of the *Lectio* and of the *Harkleian Version* appear to have been in the same predicament. For they know well enough what *κεράμων* in Luke 5, 19 means, but they express it, not by any genuine Aramaic word, but by *κεραμίδες*, or *κεραμίδιον* (ܟܪܡܝܕܝܘܢ), the diminutive of *κέραμος* itself, and the recognised

Syriac word for a *tile* (see Payne Smith, col. 3749).<sup>1</sup> In view of the two facts (1) that no instance has been produced in which פּוּרְרִין signifies *tiles*, (2) that *tile* is expressed in Syriac by a different word altogether, of foreign origin, I submit that Prof. Marshall has not succeeded in showing that פּוּרְרִין has the meaning "tiles."

4. When I first read Prof. Marshall's paper of March, 1891, this appeared to me to be the most plausible instance of his hypothesis which it contained. I then understood *ικμάδα* of the sap of the plant. I changed my opinion afterwards, because a more careful study of the text of the parable led me to believe that Mr. Allen was right in contending that *ικμάδα* (treated as an original and integral part of the parable) meant the moisture of the earth, which would not be denoted by the Aramaic שרף. If, however, Prof. Marshall will put his hypothesis in the definite form that the original gospel had שרש, *root*, but that in the copy which formed the basis of St. Luke's Gospel the last letter was so disfigured or imperfect that it suggested to the translator שרף, *sap*, I have no objection to it: *root* will then be the true text of the parable;<sup>2</sup> *ικμάδα* being now no longer an integral part of the parable, but originating in an error, it becomes a matter of indifference in what sense it is understood, and it may be taken in that which the Aramaic שרף will allow, viz. *sap*.

5. Surely the "real meaning" of שְׂרָא is not *a crowd*, but *a company of travellers*, i.e. *a caravan*. This is the meaning supported both by etymology and by usage. The root is preserved in the Arabic مَارَ *proficisci*, whence مِيَارَةَ "agmen una commeantium" (to quote Roediger's definition in the *Thesaurus*, p. 1384a); and this is the sense which the word has both in Syriac, the Aramaic of the Targums,

<sup>1</sup> The Pesh. renders loosely ܣܘܪܘܢܐ "from the roof."

<sup>2</sup> Observe that in his interpretation of this part of the parable, St. Luke like the other Evangelists, has *λίαν* (8, 13).

and also in the Aramaic of Palmyra (Roediger gives citations from each).<sup>1</sup> The word is thus used of a caravan, not, as Prof. Marshall says, "from the promiscuous nature of its crowd," but because it is derived from a root which signifies *to journey*. A more inappropriate word can hardly be imagined for describing the miscellaneous *ἄπαν πλῆθος*, gathered from the neighbourhood, of Lk. 8, 36. Levy, in his larger Lexicon, having cited six occurrences from the Talm. with the meaning *caravan*, cites a seventh, in which he renders it, not (as Prof. Marshall quotes him) "a crowd gathered in the street," but "a company of men going along the street." Even here, then, the true sense of the word is not lost; and the passage lends no support to the meaning contended for by Prof. Marshall. Kohut (who cites more examples than Levy) gives only the meaning *travelling company, caravan*.

6. *Δῶμα*, Lk. 5, 19 = *στέγη*, Mk. 2, 4. *Δῶμα* is used uniformly in the LXX., not of the *house* generally, but specially of the *house-top* (Heb. גג), which, in the East, as is well known, is flat, and used as a promenade and for many other purposes; and it has the same sense wherever it occurs in the Greek of the N.T. Even supposing, therefore, that מטללא (properly a *hut* or *booth*; used mostly for the Heb. סִכָּה) could be applied to the *οἶκος* of Mk. 2, 1 (which, in spite of all that Prof. Marshall has urged, may still be doubted), what reason is there to suppose it would be the original of *δῶμα*? The Aramaic word, which would naturally correspond to this (in its Hellenistic sense), is ܕܘܡܐ, used here both in the Peshitto and in the Lectionary, and regularly for *δῶμα* in the N.T., and גג in the O.T.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Palmyrene (see De Vogué, *Syrie Centrale*, pp. 12, 13), רב שירתא "chef de caravane" corresponds to *συνδιάρχης*, בני שירתא are members of a caravan, כנסה = *ἀνακομισά [μενον τῆς]* *συνδολαν προῖκα ἐξ ἰδλων*. *Συνδολα* means a travelling company or caravan (Luke 2, 44).

<sup>2</sup> Were it legitimate to presuppose distinctively Syriac usage, ܕܘܡܐ or

7. I am still as unconvinced as ever that שָׂרָא could stand for καθῆσθαι. (That it may be employed suitably for καταλῦσαι, Lk. 19, 7, has not been denied either by Mr. Allen or by myself; this is a sufficiently common usage.) It is true, in Ps. 80, 2; Isa. 6, 1. 37, 16 “שָׂרָא and καθῆσθαι represent the same Hebrew word”; but the form of the sentence is in the Targum so changed that the value of the fact for Prof. Marshall’s argument is reduced to *nil*. In the passages quoted, the Heb. speaks of Jehovah as “sitting” on the cherubim (or, in Isa. 6, 1, on a throne); in the Targum, however, the sentence is paraphrased, and the subject of שָׂרָא is no longer Jehovah Himself, but His Presence (שְׂכִינְתָא), or glory (יְקָרָא). The case is similar in 1 Sam. 4, 2, and elsewhere. That שָׂרָא could be used of a spiritual Presence—as it is used also of a spirit itself, Jud. 11, 29, or of the cloud, Ex. 40, 35—*settling down* or *resting* upon a place, is not disputed by Mr. Allen;<sup>1</sup> but this usage is no proof that it would be used in ordinary parlance of a person *sitting*. Nor can I think it probable that a translator, conversant with Aramaic, finding the words (Apr., 1891, p. 285) וְהוּוּ שְׂרִין סְפְרִיא וְחֻשְׁבִין, properly and naturally<sup>2</sup> signifying, “And the scribes *began* to think,” would have been likely to misunderstand שְׂרִין in the improbable and unsupported sense of καθῆμενοι.<sup>3</sup>

8. Prof. Marshall considers Mr. Allen’s objections to אָוִד,

Ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ might be suggested as the common original of both *στέγη* and *δῶμα* the latter word being understood in its Hellenistic sense, and being a slightly free rendering of the Aramaic). For *στέγη* = Ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ, see Mark 8, 8, Lk. 7, 6 in the Peshitto; = Ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ Mark 2, 4.

<sup>1</sup> Examples are abundant. See, for instance, Gen. 49, 27; Ex. 24, 16; Num. 5, 3; Isa. 8, 18; Ps. 82, 1; 84, 8; Cant. 1, 5; 8, 14; and in the Apheh, Ex. 25, 8; Deut. 12, 5; Ps. 9, 12; Joel 4, 17, 21, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Except that the *Pael* conjugation (ⲓⲥⲣⲓⲛ) might have been rather expected in the sense of *begin*.

<sup>3</sup> Is it not a further objection to the supposition that *ἤρξαντο* in Lk. 5, 21 really corresponds to καθῆμενοι of Mk. 2, 6, that St. Luke has introduced the notice of the scribes and Pharisees “sitting” and listening while Jesus was teaching at an earlier point in his narrative (see *v.* 17) ?

in the sense of *to go out*, very extravagant. נִזְדַּן in Dan. 2, 5. 8 is not even pointed as a verb;<sup>1</sup> and the view is a perfectly tenable one that the Talmudic נִזְדַּן *to go* or *to go away* is no genuine Aramaic verb, but a verb formed illegitimately upon the (false) assumption that נִזְדַּן in Dan. was a verb with that meaning. But even supposing that this view is incorrect, and that there was a real Aramaic verb נִזְדַּן, the use of the word is so restricted and peculiar<sup>2</sup>—for it is not the ordinary Aramaic word for *go out*—that it is extremely difficult to think that it would have been used of the lightning in Matt. 24, 27. Both the Peshitto and the Lectionary represent ἐξέρχεται here by the normal and ordinary ܢܘܬܐ.

9. Is it really the case that “ בענין is certainly the equivalent of μόγισ or μόλις = cum molestia (as the numerous usages of ענין in Ecclesiastes fully prove)”? The author of Eccl. might, possibly, have framed an aphorism, “And a merchant gaineth riches בענין (*with labour, or difficulty*)” (though I think he would have written רב בענין רב or רע בענין רע),<sup>3</sup> for the *occupation, business, toil*, which ענין denotes would be the process by which a merchant would amass his wealth. But though the spirit left the afflicted youth μόγισ, *hardly* or *with difficulty*, he surely did not leave him through a process of hard and vexatious occupation or business (ענין),<sup>4</sup> but “with difficulty” in the sense of

<sup>1</sup> Baer quotes no MS. authority for his punctuation נִזְדַּן.

<sup>2</sup> It is used chiefly in the phrase, of which Kohut cites some eighty occurrences in the Talmud, וְאִזְדַּר לְטַעַמֵיהוֹ, “and they (*or* he) went after (*i.e.* followed, adhered to) their (*or* his) own opinion.” The shade of meaning, expressed by the word, is not that of going or coming *forth* (cf. Keil on Dan. 2, 5), which is required in Matt. 24, 27, but that of going *away*.

<sup>3</sup> In order that the reader may know exactly how ענין is used in Ecclesiastes, I append a note of all the passages of that book in which it occurs: 1, 13. 2, 23. 26. 3, 10. 4, 8. 5, 2. 13. 8, 16. In none does it appear in an adverbial phrase.

<sup>4</sup> This objection might indeed be met if it could be shown that בענין was a phrase in such common use, that its original sense was no longer consciously perceived, and it was felt simply to have the force of an adverb, “scarcely.” But the evidence of this forthcoming?



word commonly used, as of burning in a furnace generally,<sup>1</sup> so in particular of the burning in Gehenna (Eccl. 8, 10, 10, 11 Targum לאיתוקרא בניהנם; Cant. 8, 6 לאוקרא; 2 Sam. 23, 7). The cognate subst. יקירא occurs similarly, Isa. 33, 14; Gen. 27, 33 Ps.-Jon. ("And Isaac smelt a savour like the savour of the burning of Gehenna"); and, expressly, of the burning of souls (יקירת נפשתא Num. 11, 26 Ps.-Jon.; 2 Chr. 32, 21 אוקיר). Eccl. 9, 14 Targum might also justify אדלק.

3. Here I must content myself with saying that Prof. Marshall does not seem to me to have made it at all probable that מותר should have even "suggested" βίος to a translator. βίος, in such passages as Lk. 8, 43, 15, 12, 30, 21, 4, means, of course, *that by which life is sustained*, i.e., *resources*, "living," "substance," or even affluence; but in the phrase ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου it surely denotes *life*, as a period of existence. Hence I do not understand what inducement a translator could have had to render מותר by βίος, "life": the etymology of מותר would rather, I should have thought, have suggested to him some word expressing more distinctly than βίος does the idea of *excess* or *abundance*.

c. Here there are two questions: (1) would דרך be naturally used of the birds which "came" (ἤλθε) to devour the seed in the parable (Matt. 13, 4; Mk. 4, 4)? (2) does דרין (the pass. part.) fairly express the idea of καταπατήθη, "was trampled down" (Lk. 8, 5)? "In every case *but one*," says Prof. Marshall emphatically, "where דרך occurs in the Hebrew, it is transferred to the Targums." This is an extraordinary misstatement, involving a far graver inaccuracy than any of which Mr. Allen has been guilty. In point of fact, of the forty-nine times which דרך occurs in the Hebrew Bible, it is rendered by the Aramaic דרין only

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Gen. 11, 28 Ps.-Jon.; and the Palestinian Fragments cited by Lagarde, *Prophetæ Chaldaice*, p. xxiv., l. 26; p. xxvi., l. 14.

ten times; <sup>1</sup> and the Hiphil הדררך, of which there are thirteen occurrences, is expressed by אררך only four times.<sup>2</sup> The inaccuracy is, however, immaterial to our present argument. ררך in Heb. means to *step* or *tread*—as on a threshold (1 Sam. 5, 5), a path, a way, a land; sometimes with the idea of *treading on* with impunity (Ps. 91, 13), or in triumph (Jud. 5, 21), or the proud consciousness of ownership (Deut. 33, 29; Am. 4, 13); it will then be nearly equivalent to the English *march*; it is also used in particular of *treading* the wine-press (Isa. 63, 2 al.), and *treading* (*i.e.* bending) a bow (Ps. 7, 13 al.). In Aramaic, as the passages quoted in the footnote show, its sense is not substantially different (except that there is no example of its use in connexion with the wine-press or the bow), viz., to *step* or *tread*; on the other hand, it is used (in the Aphel) more freely than in Heb. (in which it so occurs only once, Jer. 51, 33) of making the oxen *tread* the corn in threshing.<sup>3</sup> A land which is “trodden on” is also, of course, “entered”; but naturally this is no proof that ררך in itself means “to enter”; in Deut. 11, 25 it plainly means *to step*; in Mic. 5, 5, 6, Hab. 3, 15, to *tread*, in Prov. 6, 11 (Targum) to *advance steadily* or *march* (“as a warrior”). In Num. 24, 17 (Heb.), a highly poetical passage, where it is applied to a star (“hath *stepped forth*”), it is, of course, used figuratively (cf. the מסלות, or “highways” [A. V. courses], from which the stars fight, in Deborah’s song), denoting a proud and stately advance. Mr. Allen contends that such a word would not be naturally used of the birds approaching to devour the fallen seed. It may be confidently affirmed that it would not be used of birds “coming” by *flight*. If the birds were conceived as ad-

<sup>1</sup> Deut. 1, 36. 11, 24. 25. 33, 29. Jos. 1, 3. 14, 9. 1 Sam. 5, 5. Is. 59, 8. Mic. 5, 4. 5. (There is no Targum of Neh. 13, 15.)

<sup>2</sup> Isa. 42, 16. Jer. 51, 33. Ps. 25, 9. 119, 25.

<sup>3</sup> So also in Syriac (Payne Smith, col. 950): cf. the subst. דרכא, {ܕܪܟܐ}.

vancing on foot, in a stately and dignified procession, I am not prepared to deny that it might be used, though, I must confess, the employment of the word in such a connexion does not appear to me to be probable. The verb that would naturally be expected is, of course, **נתת** [ז].

(2) (A point not noticed by Mr. Allen.) It is far from clear that **דדד** is the Aramaic word which would here be rightly used to express *κατεπατήθη*. It is true *καταπατεῖν* and *πατεῖν* in the LXX. both sometimes correspond to the Heb. **דדד** (as Deut. 11, 24; Jud. 5, 21); but in Lk. 8, 5 the idea is plainly not *trodden on* simply (Heb. **דדד**), but trodden on with insult or contempt, *i.e.*, *trampled down* (Heb. **דדד**, for which *πατεῖν* or *καταπατεῖν* is also used, Isa. 1, 12. 26, 6. 28, 3 al.). The proper Aramaic word to express this idea is, I venture to think, not **דדד**, but **דדד**, **דדד**, in the passive **דדד**, **דדד**. This is used for **דדד** in 2 Kings 14, 9; Isa. 1, 12. 26, 6. 28, 3, and elsewhere; it is used also for *καταπατεῖν* and *πατεῖν* in the Peshitto, not only here (Lk. 8, 5), but also wherever else they occur in the N.T., and similarly in the Lectionary (Matt. 7, 6; Lk. 8, 5. 10, 19). Will the reader think me hypercritical if I therefore express a doubt whether Prof. Marshall has found the right original either for *ἤλθε* in Matt. 13, 4, or for *κατεπατήθη* in Lk. 8, 5?

I must express my regret that Prof. Marshall has felt himself debarred by want of space from examining Mr. Allen's other criticisms; for I feel sure that, if called upon to do so, I could defend similarly their substantial justice.

On the whole, I venture to think that Mr. Allen's papers are not "disfigured" by such serious "blemishes" as Prof. Marshall supposes. Though in one or two instances he has committed an oversight, and has sometimes also not, perhaps, stated his objections as fully and effectively as he might have done, his criticisms in other respects have either been substantiated entirely, or have been shown to express

a perfectly tenable view, which derives its strength, not from an imperfect acquaintance with Aramaic literature, but from an appreciative sense of idiomatic propriety which prompts him to doubt, once and again, whether the word proposed by Prof. Marshall is really admissible in the context for which it is claimed. In composition in a foreign language, it is better, surely, to be cautious than to be bold, to be even (it may be) too scrupulous in the choice of expressions than to be not scrupulous enough; and I cannot understand how Prof. Marshall could have postulated for his original Aramaic Gospel, words of which there could be the slightest doubt that they were properly and correctly used, and that they really and unquestionably bore the meanings which he attributes to them. But again and again we find him making use of words to which some *doubt* attaches: they are not the ordinary and natural words that would be expected; sometimes they are words that do not exist at all; at other times they are either very rare words, the precise meaning of which is not readily determinable, or they are words which do not really express the idea required.<sup>1</sup> Prof. Marshall reproaches Mr. Allen with trusting too exclusively to the Lexicon, instead of basing his criticisms upon a first-hand acquaintance with Aramaic texts; but the Aramaic Lexica are comprehensive,

<sup>1</sup> The following are some additional examples of words used by Prof. Marshall, which are, I venture to think, either extremely doubtful, or altogether inadmissible:—**אַחִירָא** (June, 1891, p. 457 f.) in the sense required Mk. 5, 29; I.k. 8, 44; **אַחֲנַקַת** (*ib.* p. 464); **אַסְחִיכִי**, *to look*, often for the Heb. הַשְׁקִיף (is this the same as *εἶδον*, *saw*?), Sept., p. 219; **פָּצַח**, *to open*, *ib.* p. 220; **כִּשְׁתִּיצִי** = *κατηρητισμένος* (of a man), *ib.* p. 220; **שִׁמְם** or **שְׁעִמְם**, Nov. p. 386 (the reflexive, **אַשְׁתִּמְם** or **אַשְׁתַּעֲמִם**, which would be required, does not greatly resemble **שִׁמְע**); **אַתְבַּמַּל** (Dec., p. 444); **נְלִילָא**, for *ἡ περὶχωρος* (as a general term), *ib.*, p. 445; **תְּקִיפָא**, *rock* (!; is it possible to doubt, in the light of the general practice of the Targums—see *e.g.* Ps. 18, 3. 32. 47. 19, 15. 28, 1— and especially of the very explicit corresponding version of the parallel passage Job 14, 18, that the second Targum of Job 18, 4 simply understands “rock” figuratively of the Strong One, God?), Aug., 1892, p. 90; **צָרוּ** and **כָּרוּ** for *ἀφαιῶσαι* (does **כִּיד** mean anything except “daub over with lime”?), *ib.* p. 92.

and give numerous quotations; and though neither they, nor Mr. Allen's reading, may be exhaustive, yet if the meaning, or application, of words used by Prof. Marshall lies outside the limits of what the Lexica recognise, the burden of proof rests upon him who maintains the use to be legitimate; and scholars are justified in withholding their assent from it until the proof is produced. Were all Prof. Marshall's examples as unexceptionable as יתקרב and יתקרנ (June, 1891, p. 455) they would carry conviction immediately; but how seldom can this be said to be the case! <sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, while hoping that Prof. Marshall may continue his studies in Aramaic literature (in which his notes on the usages of particular dialects, and the applications of particular words, can hardly fail, when completed, to form a welcome supplement to the materials at present available for students), I would venture to propose to him two modifications of his method, which, if he would consent to adopt them, would, I am sure, free his results from the philological blemishes which at present too often attach to them. The first is, that he should abstain entirely, in his reconstruction of the original Aramaic Gospel, from the use of words with theoretical meanings, and confine himself to those the meaning and applicability of which is established beyond the reach of reasonable doubt. Prof. Marshall, even where he has not adopted a meaning hypothetically, has frequently not exercised sufficient care in ascertaining the *precise* force of the word which he has employed; in the case of a rare or doubtful word, he is too ready to accept a meaning which will suit

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Marshall is severe on Mr. Allen when he deems him guilty of an inaccuracy; but he is guilty of them sometimes himself. יתקרב (Sept., 1891, p. 216) does *not once* occur in the Syriac N.T.,—or indeed, unless Payne Smith is strangely defective, in Syriac at all: the form used is always יתקרנ; and even this is only one, not "the constant" representative of σὺντεν.

the position that he desires it to occupy. And secondly, he would both lighten his own labour, and materially improve his case, if, instead of attempting (as he seems often to have done) to find *two* passable Aramaic phrases, representing respectively the *two* corresponding passages in the Gospels, he were to content himself with finding a good and unexceptionable Aramaic equivalent for *one* of the parallels, and with pointing out how the other could, by the assumption of textual error or other confusion, be reasonably deduced from this. If, for instance, instead of labouring fruitlessly to show that פחרין in Aramaic actually meant *tiles*, he had been content to argue that the original text had חפרין, *digging*, but that in the copy which formed the basis of Lk. 5, 19 the first two letters had become accidentally transposed, and that the translator, not knowing what פחרין meant, *conjectured*, from its resemblance to פחרא, a potter, and פחרא, earthenware, that it had the meaning of κέραμοι, *tiles*, no objection, upon grounds of philology, could be raised to his hypothesis, and numerous examples of mistakes, arising in a similar manner, could be quoted from the pages of the LXX.<sup>1</sup> I am not prepared now, any more than I was when writing my prefatory note (p. 387), to deny that *some* of Prof. Marshall's examples possess plausibility; others, as the one just noticed, and שרש and שרף (above, p. 420), admit of being re-stated in a form which (so far as I am able to judge) seems free from objection. Whether his solution of the variations between the Gospels is the true one, can hardly be determined until it has been applied, and found to suit, upon a more comprehensive and systematic scale than has hitherto been attempted. Especially, in order to judge of it properly, we ought to have not

<sup>1</sup> But in saying this, I must not be considered as endorsing in their entirety either of the two Aramaic sentences on p. 219 (March, 1891); for neither (apart from the questionable words employed) appears to me to be correct grammatically.

single, isolated phrases, but entire verses, or at least entire *sentences*, re-translated into Aramaic, and the origin of the variants in the parallel texts, examined and accounted for, one by one.<sup>1</sup> It would be not less premature, at present, to condemn Prof. Marshall's hypothesis *in toto* than to accept it *in toto*; and if what I have written may be the means of enabling him to free it from weak points, and to place it upon a securer basis, no one will rejoice more heartily than myself.

S. R. DRIVER.

<sup>1</sup> The two sentences (Mar., 1891, p. 211) are, for instance, both incomplete if they were properly filled out, (accepting, for the sake of argument, the words used) the resemblance between them would be considerably diminished.