

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

for this, when it was Paul who had been attacked, Paul whose relation with the older Apostles it was important to describe, Paul, whose "gospel" was in question. There is as little ground for deducing from the language of the Epistle that when it was written Barnabas was "of only secondary importance" as there is for deducing from Acts xi. 29, 30 that the relationship between Barnabas and Paul was at the time there referred to "in some way that of patron and client."

It has been acknowledged that Mr. Jones puts his objections with vividness and vigour, and just for that reason it seemed worth while to examine them. But after examination they do not appear either singly or collectively to militate against the early date of the Epistle. The really serious difficulty lies, as Professor Lake has pointed out, in the literary relationship with the Epistle to the Romans.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

NOTE ON THE ARTICLE "TRANSMISSION
OF THE GOSPEL."

THE explanation (p. 89) of the *right* cheek in Matthew v. 39 is most ingenious; but the Lewisan text omits the word *right*, having only "whosoever smiteth thee on thy cheek." The source of the word *right* was excellently detected by Merx. It comes from the *right hand* of v. 30, omitted (with the whole verse) in the Lewisan, doubtless accidentally; the *right hand* is more important than the left, but this is not the case with the cheek.

In Mark vi. 40 we read ἀπέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, "they reclined garden-beds, garden-beds," a difficult expression. But when we discover the Syriac for "garden-bed," the difficulty vanishes. That word is מְשַׁבְּתָא, as appears from *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 4147, in Arabic *maskabah* (Dozy, *Supplément*, i. 666). But in the text followed by Mark it was not used in its Syriac sense "garden-beds," but in its Hebrew sense *couches, lyings-down*, i.e. companies. It would appear that the Syriac word is derived from שָׁכַב in its Arabic sense, whence a *maskabah* means properly something watered. It is curious that this ancient word is condemned as a modernism by a recent Syrian writer on the vernacular.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.