

CLARIFYING
BAFFLING
BIBLICAL PASSAGES

CHAPTER THIRTY

“I HAVE NOT COME
TO BRING THE END”
MATTHEW 10:34–36

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

©

2007

All Rights Reserved

XXX

“I HAVE NOT COME TO BRING THE END”

MATTHEW 10:34–36

INTRODUCTION

Matthew 5:9

μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί,
ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται
Blessed are the peacemakers
for they shall be called the sons of God.

Matthew 10:34

μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν·
οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν
Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth;
I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.¹

Matthew 26:52

τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Ἐπίστρεψον τὴν μάχαιράν σου εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς·
πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ
ἀπολοῦνται

Then Jesus said to him,
‘Put your sword back into its place;
for all who take the sword will perish by the sword.’

These statements of Jesus are impossible to harmonize, although there have been some attempts to minimize the tension, if not a contradiction, in these verses. Luz (2001: 109) summarized well the difficulties, stating

The sword saying is difficult. Its content is “dangerous and almost unbearable” and seems “more appropriate to the Qur’an than to the Gospels.” It does not fit well with the greeting of peace that the disciples are to bring into the houses (10:13) and the image of the disciples as peace makers (5:9, cf. Mark 9:50). It is more appropriate for the Christ of the Apocalypse who carries the sword in his mouth (Rev 1:16; 2:12, 16; 19:15, 21).²

Albright and Mann (1971: 129) paraphrased 10:34, “Do not think that I have come to impose peace on earth by force; I have come neither to impose peace, nor yet to make war.” They thought the saying was spoken in Aramaic, which they reconstructed as $\text{לֹא אָתָּת לְמַרְמֵי שְׁלָמָא אֱלֵא חֲרָבָא}$,³ with the אֱלֵא . . . לֹא “not . . . but” reflecting “some confusion in oral tradition into Greek” for the original לֹא . . . וְלֹא “neither . . . nor,”⁴ thereby making Jesus *neither* a pacifist *nor* a militarist.

Davies and Allison (1991: 218), without comment, called attention to the Aramaic retroversion of Albright and Mann, preferring instead just to recognize a “Semitism” in the expression $\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\eta\nu$ “to cast peace” and to recognize Luke’s “division” for Matthew’s “sword” as a secondary element in the tradition.⁵

Whereas Albright and Mann thought Matt10:34 suffered from several omissions, Davies and Allison, followed by Luz (2001: 108), considered 10:34–35 to be “an indissoluble unit that faithfully preserves words of Jesus.” They concluded that 10:34 means

the advent of the kingdom must not lead to a utopian view of the here and now: the enthusiastic extremes of ‘over-realized eschatology’ must be avoided. Tribulation is still the believer’s lot.

While Jesus's words in 10:34 in Greek sound like an announcement of a جهاد (*jihād*) "war," they become altered in their interpretation by Davies, Allison, and many others into a جاهد (*jāhid*),⁶ i.e., when Jesus stated that he was "casting a sword upon the earth," he was actually announcing the impending "difficulty, distress, and affliction" which his disciples would experience. Luz (2001: 110) phrased this idea in terms of the "active sword" versus "the passive sword," with Jesus saying the sword would not be drawn actively *by* him or *by* his disciples, but *against* him and his disciples. In other words Jesus was not calling for his disciples to do what Moses commanded the Levites to do for God: "put every man his sword (שִׁמּוֹ אִישׁ חֶרְבוֹ) on his side, and go to and fro from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor" (Exo 32:27). To the contrary, the "passive sword" Jesus spoke of referred to the anticipated suffering, woes, and tribulation which would be inflicted upon his followers.

On the other hand, Buchanan (1996: 467) argued for Matt 10:34 being Jesus' call for an active sword. He reasoned:

It seemed to many that the only way to obtain freedom and be ruled by their own king was to overpower Rome with military force. . . . There were extreme nationalists on the one side and those who had made peace with Rome and were profiting from this relationship on the other. . . . The peace required without revolution was the peace that collaborators had made with Rome. Neither Jesus nor his followers were prepared to endorse that kind of peace. To break this sabotage that was called peace, Jesus came to introduce a war. . . . The religious zeal of nationalist Jews prompted them to believe that they could succeed as others had done. Jesus was evidently involved in these aspirations.

Buchanan reaffirmed notions of Jesus's being a political zealot, which were made popular by earlier critics like Reimarus and Brandon—whose interpretations had been subjected to a brief but careful critique by Black (1970: 116–117). Black espoused a variation along this line, stating

While not a political Zealot, Jesus could perhaps be claimed as an apocalyptic Zealot, proclaiming a final impending War against Belial and all his followers in heaven and on earth, even in the same family.

Keener (1999: 329), in disagreement with Black, noted that “sword” is standard metonymy for violence and war in Jewish literature and need not be so narrowly interpreted as Black proposed.⁷ Keener concurred with Davies and Allison that Jesus' sword referred to the suffering of Jesus' followers.

What commentators have failed to notice is that in Matt 10:34 Jesus was addressing two “messianic expectations” articulated by John the Baptist: (1) Matt 3:2, “repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” and (2) Matt 3:11–12,

but he who is coming after me . . . will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire.

Since the kingdom of God was at hand, John the Baptist expected the imminent end of the earth, coupled with the messiah's fiery retribution upon the unrepentant. The Greek text of Matt 10:34 could be read simply as Jesus's changing the weapon of retribution from *unquenchable fire* to an *insatiable sword*, in which case Luke 21:8–35 could serve as commentary:

they will fall by the edge of the sword . . . when you see these things taking place, you know that the kingdom of God is near . . . this generation will not pass away till all has taken place.

A HEBREW *VORLAGE*

The Aramaic *Vorlage* reconstructed by Albright and Mann, לָא אֶתְת לְמַרְמֵי שְׁלֵמָא אֶלָּא חֲרָבָא, is ambiguous when the vowels are removed. The consonantal reconstruction, לָא אֶתְת לְמַרְמֵי שְׁלֵמָא אֶלָּא חֲרָבָא, could be translated, “I did not come to *impose retribution* nor wage war.”⁸ The ambiguities are even greater when considering a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The Hebrew text of Shem Tob Ibn Shaprut⁹ provides several clues for reconstructing the Hebrew *Vorlage* which would account for differences between Matthew’s “sword” and Luke’s “divisions,” as well as demonstrate how ambiguous Jesus’s saying may have become when it was written in consonantal Hebrew. The best Shem Tob manuscripts¹⁰ read, אֶתְת לְמַרְמֵי שְׁלֵמָא אֶלָּא חֲרָבָא, whereas six other manuscripts read אֶתְת לְמַרְמֵי שְׁלֵמָא אֶלָּא חֲרָבָא, which equals the Greek text. At first glance the two best manuscripts seems simply to have omitted the word שְׁלֵמָא “peace.” However, the manuscripts may reflect an entirely different textual tradition because אֶתְת can mean more than “to set, to cast.” This possibility is suggested by texts where אֶתְת (= אֶתְת) means “to finish, to end,” as in *Arakhin* 10^b, פֶּתַח בְּחֵלֶל וּמְסִיִּים, “[the *Mishnah*] begins with *ḥalil* and ends with

abbub,” and in *Baba M^{tsi}a 76^b*, קמיה סיימוה קמיה “they cited it before him to the end.”¹¹

Following this line of evidence, the best Shem Tob manuscripts could have Jesus saying, “think not that I have come to bring the end (= לְשֵׁים) on earth.”¹² The six other Shem Tob manuscripts (with לשום שלום or לשים שלום) could have the same meaning were the שלום read as שלם—on the assumption that the original שלם was vocalized as שלום to bring it into conformity with the Greek εἰρήνην “peace.”

A *Vorlage* with אל תחשבו שבאתי לשם שלם בארץ could be read several ways, given the ambiguity of שלם, which could mean any of the following:

<i>šlm</i> “peace”	שלם	שָׁלוֹם	<i>shalôm</i> ¹³
<i>šlm</i> “recompense”	שלם	שָׁלֵם	<i>shillēm</i> ¹⁴
<i>šlm</i> “retribution”	שלם	שָׁלוֹם	<i>shillûm</i> ¹⁵
<i>šlm</i> “end, Finis”	שלם	שָׁלֵם	<i>shelem</i> . ¹⁶

What appears as repetition in the Greek text, βαλεῖν εἰρήνην . . . βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, could come from a *Vorlage* with paronomasia rather than repetition. If the original saying included the words לשם שלום . . . לשם שלום, the meaning could have been “Do not think that I have come to bring *retribution* (שָׁלוֹם) on the earth, nor have I come to bring the *end* (שָׁלֵם).” Were these Jesus’ words, he would have disagreed with John the Baptist that the end was near and the messiah would soon torch the earth in retribution upon the sinners. Such disagreement could have contributed to John’s doubts

about Jesus, which led him to inquire of Jesus, “Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?” (Luke 7:20).

If the Hebrew saying of Jesus did not mention “peace,” did it speak of a “sword”? The answer must be, “Probably not!”¹⁷ In the first place, Greek μάκαιρα need not mean “sword.” The ξίφος was used for the straight sword and ῥμφαία indicated a large, broad sword.” The μάχαιρα was used for a knife, a carving-knife, a sacrificial knife, as well as a dirk, a dagger, an assassin’s weapon, and a short sword or cavalry saber. The μάκαιρα was the base word for a variety of knives, from the butcher’s cleaver, to the instruments of the surgeon and the barber.¹⁸

Moreover, neither μάχαιρα nor חַרֵב can account for Luke’s having διαμερισμόν “division” instead of the μάχαιραν in Matthew. If the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Matthew and Luke had חֲלֵף rather than חַרֵב, the differences in the Gospel tradition become transparent and the ambiguity of חֲלֵף could account for the misunderstandings reflected in the Greek texts. The ambiguity of consonantal חֲלֵף can be summarized as follows:

1. <i>hlp</i> “knife”	חֲלֵף	חֲוֹלֵף	<i>hōlef</i>
	חֲלֵף	חֲלִיף	<i>hallîf</i> ¹⁹
2. <i>hlp</i> “sharp spear”	חֲלֵף	חֲלִיף	<i>halîf</i> ²⁰
3. <i>hlp</i> “butcher knife”	חֲלֵף	מִחֲלֵף	<i>māhālaf</i> ²¹
4. <i>hlp</i> “change”	חֲלֵף	חֲלִיף	<i>hillûf</i> ²²
5. <i>hlp</i> “reversion”	חֲלֵף	חֲלֵף	<i>hēlef</i> ²³
6. <i>hlp</i> “substitution”	חֲלֵף	חֲלִיפָה	<i>hālîfāh</i> ²⁴

306 “I HAVE NOT COME TO BRING THE END”

7. <i>hlp</i> “differences”	חלף	חלף	<i>hilôf</i> ²⁵
8. <i>hlp</i> “dissension”	חלף	חלף	<i>hilôf</i> ²⁶
9. <i>hlp</i> “contention”	חלף	חלף	<i>hilf</i> ²⁷
10. <i>hlp</i> “covenant”	חלף	חלף	<i>hēlef</i> ²⁸
11. <i>hlp</i> “friendship”	חלף	חלף	<i>hēlef</i> ²⁹
12. <i>hlp</i> “brotherhood”	חלף	חלף	<i>hēlef</i> ³⁰
13. <i>hlp</i> “league”	חלף	חלף	<i>hēlef</i> ³¹
14. <i>hlp</i> “a sincere friend who swears to his companion that he will not act unfaithfully with him” =			
		חלף	<i>halif</i> ³²

In light of these lexical options, the original saying could have included a wordplay, as well a *double entendre*, to convey the following message:

Do not think that I have come to bring

- upon the earth retribution (שְׁלֹם),
- nor have I come to bring the end (שְׁלֵם).

But [I have come] to

- *make a change* (חלף),³³
- *establish a covenant community* (חלף).³⁴

THE CURETONIAN VARIANT

Although the Old Syriac (Syr^s) reads like the Greek text, “do not think that I came to bring peace on earth; I did not come to bring peace but a sword,”³⁵ the Curetonian (Syr^c)³⁶ has the doublet ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܘܨܘܪܐ ܘܫܦܥܐ (*pelgûtā ʿ dre^c yā nā ʿ wěsaypā*), meaning “*the division*³⁷ *of opinion*³⁸

and the sword.”³⁹ This doublet can readily be explained by a Hebrew *Vorlage* with the ambiguous חֶלֶק, meaning (1) חֶלֶק (*ḥilâf*) “difference of opinion” (the cognate of Arabic خلاف [*ḥilâf*]), and (2) חֶלֶק (*ḥallîf*) “knife.”⁴⁰

This “division of opinion” in the Curetonian text also appears in Luke 12:51 as διαμερισμόν “division, division of opinion,” discussed above, where it was noted that Luke’s διαμερισμόν “division” *cannot* be explained easily as a variant of Matthew’s μάχαιραν “sword,” although it can readily be explained as a different understanding of the ambiguous חֶלֶק in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

MATTHEW 10:35–36

ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι
 ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ
 καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς
 καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς

For I have come to divide
 a man against his father,
 and a daughter against her mother,
 and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law;
 and a man’s foes will be those of his own household.

Shem Tob Text of 10:35–36

באתי להפריד האדם
 הבן מאביו והבת מאמה
 והאויבים להיות אהובים

I have come to separate mankind:
 the son from his father,
 and the daughter from her mother;
 and the enemies are to become loved ones.

The Shem Tob text is obviously not a translation of the Greek text. The Greek preposition *κατα* "against," repeated three times, calls to mind the hostility found in Micah 7:6, "For the son dishonors his father, the daughter will rise up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: those in his house *shall be* all a man's enemies." But the tone in the Shem Tob text is gentle by comparison, requiring only the kind of separation often found when a man "forsakes father and mother and cleaves unto his wife." (Gen 2:24).

The Shem Tob text has the verb פָּרַד for the Greek διχάζω "to separate, to divide one against another, to turn someone against someone"⁴¹ The Arabic cognate of פָּרַד is فَرَدَ (*farada*) "to separate, to be single, to be alone, to be singular, to be unique" (Lane 1877: 2363–2365; Wehr 823–824). Lane noted that in stem II this verb means, "he applied himself to the study of practical religion, or the law, and withdrew from [the rest of] mankind, and attended only to the observance of the commands and prohibitions [of religion]," with the noun مَفْرَد (*mufarrid*) meaning "those who are devoted to the commemoration of the praises of God." Noteworthy also is the adjective فَرَدِي (*faradi*) "personal, individual, individualist, individualistic."

To the degree that nuances which survived in classical Arabic were common with their cognates in classical Hebrew, the division envisioned by Jesus would have been for individual freedom to participate in a religious community of his

avowed followers. Following the Hebrew text tradition, the new covenant community would not be against (κατά) anyone, not even against one's enemies, for enemies could now be embraced as family members, i.e., members of the covenant family for whom Jesus was Lord.

If **חָרֵב** and **פָּרַר** were in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek Matthew and the Greek Luke, they would provide the first hint from Jesus of a church, individualism, and a monastic lifestyle.

NOTES

1. Luke 12:51 reads δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῆ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν, “Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division” (RSV). Plummer (1922: 334–335) commented only on the ἀλλ', preferring to read it as ἄλλο and translating, “I came not to send *any other thing than* division” (Plummer's italics) and concluded simply, “Jesus does not wish his followers to live in a fool's paradise. . . . In this world they must expect tribulation.”
2. Luz's two quotations are from Brenz (1567: 438) and Black (1970: 115).
3. The **חָרֵב** in the reconstruction could have varied meanings in addition to “sword” or “war” (which are the cognates of Arabic حرب [ḥarb]), including **חָרֵב**, the cognate of Arabic خراب (ḥarīb) “desolation,” or **חָרַב** “drought,” which has no Arabic cognate. (See BDB 351–353; Lane 1865: 540, 715–717.)
4. In their notes Albright and Mann translated, “Do not think that I have come to impose peace on earth by force; I have come neither to impose peace, nor yet to make war. *But I have come to divide*

310 “I HAVE NOT COME TO BRING THE END”

the just from the unjust . . . a man against his father . . .” (italics mine), assuming that a simple homoioteleuton (from the first “I have come” to the second “I have come”) was responsible for the loss of the italicized words. The lacuna (indicated by the repeated three dots) are Albright’s and Mann’s way of indicating that “there has obviously been an omission here, but we do not know what it was at this stage—presumably the Micah passage [7:6] was quoted in full.”

5. Luz (2001: 110) noted, “While ‘to cast’ peace is a Semitic term, using ‘I cast’ with ‘sword’ is linguistically quite unusual.” On the “Semitism” of “casting peace” see (1) Jastrow’s references (1903: 965, 1535) to שׂוּם (= סוּם) “to place, to put” as in *B'rakhoth* 39^b, שָׂמַת שְׁלוֹם “thou hast made peace,” and in *Sanhedrin* 99^b, מוֹשִׂים שְׁלוֹם “causing peace,” and (2) סוּם (= שׂוּם) “to attach,” as in אֲוֹמָהּ שֶׁמִּסִּימִים לָהּ שְׁלוֹם “a nation to which peace is assigned” (*Cant. R* to VII, 1). In the Septuagint βάλλω “to cast” is used frequently to translate שׂוּם/שִׂים, as in Num 22:38, Jud 6:9, Jer 40:10 [LXX 47:10]; and Ezek 21:22 [LXX 23:24], where βαλεῖν χάρακα is used twice to translate לָשׂוּם קְרִים “to set up battering rams.” (Hatch and Redpath [1954: 189] list 20 different words in Hebrew translated by βάλλειν.)

6. See Lane 1865: 474, where this term is defined as “striving, labouring, or toiling,” used in the phrase جاهد جهد (*jahd jāhid*) “intense labor, severe difficulty or distress.”

7. In Hebrew it may not be a matter of metonymy since חֶרֶב “sword” and חֲרָב “desolation, violence” are from two distinctly different roots. The former is a cognate of Arabic حرب (*ḥarb*), while the latter is the cognate of خرب (*ḥarīb*). See above, note 3.

8. See Jastrow 1563, שְׁלוֹם “payment, punishment”; J. Payne Smith 156, רָצַח רָצוּחַ (ḥarbā^o armîw) “they waged war.”
9. See Howard 1987, 1995, and Hewitt 2000.
10. British Library Ms. Add. no. 26964 and its replica, ms C.
11. See Jastrow 965 for the verb סָוַם and 977 for the noun סְוִיָּם. On the interchange of ס and ש, see GKC 6^k.
12. On the elision of the ה of the *Hiph^cil* infinitive, see GKC § 53^g.
13. BDB 1022–1024; Jastrow 1586; J. Payne Smith 581–582.
14. BDB 1022; J. Payne Smith 581.
15. BDB 1024; Jastrow 1563, “requital, retribution, compensation, payment, punishment.”
16. BDB 1022; Jastrow 1585, “to be whole, complete; to end, cease,” used in the *Niph^cal* meaning “has ended (must die).” J. Payne Smith 581, “to come to the end of life”; יָבֹא מַלְכוּת אֱלֹהִים “the kingdom came to an end” and יָבֹא לְמַלְכוּת “the world has come to an end.” Note especially the use of תְּשִׁילֵי מִנִּי “you bring me to an end” in Isa 38:12 and 13.
17. The saying of Jesus in Luke 12:49, “I came to cast fire (πῦρ) on the earth . . .” could have come from a Hebrew *Vorlage* which had “I will cast אֹר on the earth,” meaning “I will cast *light* upon the earth.” The אֹר in Isa 44:16; 47:14; and Ezek 5:2, was translated as πῦρ “fire” rather than as “light.” Elsewhere אֹר appears in one hundred fifty places meaning “a light, to enlighten, to light.”
18. Liddell and Scott 1085, 1190, and 1574. In the Septuagint, μάχαρα translated חֲנִיָּה “spear,” מַאֲכָלֶת “knife,” בְּרִזָּל “iron,” as well as חֶרֶב “sword.”

312 “I HAVE NOT COME TO BRING THE END”

19. Jastrow 469. Note Jud 5:26 and Job 20:24 where חָלַף means “to pierce, to pass through.”

20. Lane 1865: 628 and 797c, where خليف (*ḥalīf*) is recognized as an error for حليف (*ḥalīf*).

21. BDB 322; Jastrow 762; Klein 219 “slaughtering knife” from the root “to pierce, be sharp.”

22. BDB 322; Jastrow 469, 472; J. Payne Smith 144; Wehr 297; Lane 1865: 792, 798, noting especially the English loanword “Caliph” meaning “vice-regent, lieutenant, substitute, one who has been made or appointed to take the place of him who was before him.” Note also Klein 219, “change, pass away, change religion.”

23. Jastrow 472.

24. BDB 322.

25. Lane 1865: 796; Wehr 298.

26. Wehr 297–299.

27. Lane 1865: 796, 798.

28. Lane 1865: 627. Arabic حلف (*ḥilf*) would be analogous to the Hebrew *segolate* סִפֵּר (**sipr*). The feminine خلفة (*ḥilfat*) is also attested. According to Simon (1793: 564, citing Schultens), حلف (*ḥalafa*) is the cognate of the חֲלִיפּוֹת in Psa 55:19–20,

אֵין חֲלִיפּוֹת לָמוֹ וְלֹא יִרְאוּ אֱלֹהִים
שָׁלַח יָדָיו בְּשַׁלְמֵיו חֲלַל בְּרִיתוֹ:

There were no *oaths of allegiance* from them,*
and they did not fear God.

He stretched forth his hands in retribution;
they (plural with LXX) had profaned his covenant.

(McDaniel)

οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἀντάλλαγμα
καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν θεόν
ἐξέτεινεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδόναι
ἐβεβήλωσαν τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ

For they suffer no *exchange*,
and they have not feared God.
he has reached forth his hand with retribution;
they have profaned his covenant.

*See GKC 103^f for reading לָמוּ as a plural, and UT 425, #1337, for לְ “from.”

29. Lane 1865: 627; Wehr 235. KBS (321) cited חֶלֶף stem II, the cognate of Arabic *حلف* (*ḥalaf*) “sharp, high coarse grass, a writing reed.” However, *حلف* (*ḥalafa*) “to swear an oath, to establish a brotherhood, to unite in a covenant” and *حلف* (*ḥilf*) “confederacy, league, covenant” go unmentioned in KBS, even though these cognates were cited in earlier lexicons, like those of Castell (1669: 1255–1260) and Simon (1793: 564). The name Alphaeus, (Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) in Matt 10: 3, which appears in Hebrew as חֶלְפִי, in Syriac as *ḥalpay*, and in the Arabic as *حلفي* (*ḥalfī*), is to be derived from this stem. See Jastrow 457.

30. Lane 1865: 627; Wehr 235. The בְּנֵי חֶלְוָה “sons of the covenant” in Prov 31:8 is another likely occurrence of this cognate in Hebrew. Especially noteworthy in the context of this proverb is that *חלף* (*ḥalif*) which means “the act of confederating, or making a compact or confederacy, to aid, or assist; and making an agreement . . . the object was to aid the wronged, and for making close the ties of the relationship, and the like . . .” The verse should be translated, “Open your mouth for the dumb, for the rights of all who are sons of the covenant.” The Arabic translation of ברית frequently used *حلف* (*ḥalif*), as in Jud 9:46 where the MT ברית

314 “I HAVE NOT COME TO BRING THE END”

בֵּית אֵיל appears in the London Polyglot of Brian Walton (1657) as بیت ایل ليتحالفوا (*bayti ʾil liyataḥālafū*) “ut ibi conjurarent conspirarentque.”

31. Lane 1865: 627; Wehr 235.

32. Lane 1865: 627.

33. The cognate of خلف (*ḥillūf*) cited in Lane 1865: 792, 798.

34. The cognate of حلف (*ḥēlef*), cited in Lane 1865: 627. If this reconstruction is on target, this could be the first hint of the church.

35. Reading شَينَا (*šaynā*) for “peace” and سَينَا (*saipē*) for “sword.” The Peshiṭta reads سَينَا (*ḥarbā*) rather than سَينَا (*saipē*). This variant was noted by Hill (1972: 194), but without his distinguishing between Codex Sinaiticus (Syr^{sin}) and Codex Curetonianus (Syr^{cur}).

36. William Petersen noted,

If one ignores the Diatessaron (which is the oldest gospel text in Syriac), then three recensions of the gospels in Syriac exist. (A) The oldest of these three is the *vetus syra* or “Old Syriac,” which exists in two manuscripts: Codex Sinaiticus (Syr^s or Syr^{sin}, dated to the mid- or late-fourth cent.) and Codex Curetonianus (Syr^c or Syr^{cur}, early fifth cent.). It must be pointed out that these two manuscripts do *not* appear to be related; rather, each seems to represent a more or less independent translation of a Greek archetype (the Greek archetype apparently differed, as well); that this is the case is demonstrated by the differences in (1) word order, (2) vocabulary choice, (3) handling of passages in the Greek which required circumlocution in the Syriac, etc.

37. J. Payne Smith 446–447.

38. J. Payne Smith 546.

39. J. Payne Smith 375–376.

40. Lane 1865: 796; Wehr 298. The Curetonian ܩܠܘܬܐ ܕܪܝܢܐ (*pelgūtā³ dre^eyānā³*) could also translate חילוף which would be the cognate of خلف (*hīlf/ hulf*) “contention, division, dissension.”

41. Liddell Scott 403; Arndt and Gingrich 186.