CLARIFYING MORE BAFFLING BIBLICAL PASSAGES

CHAPTER TWENTY EIGHT

"LUKE'S MISREADING IN 16:9 OF TWO HEBREW WORDS"

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

CHAPTER XXVIII

LUKE'S MISREADING IN 16:9
OF TWO HEBREW WORDS

INTRODUCTION

According to Matt 6:19 Jesus said, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," but in Luke 16:9 Jesus said, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness." The two imperatives are inconsistent, if not contradictory. A similar problem appears in Luke 14:26 where Jesus said, "If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple." But in Matt 22:39, Mark 12:31, and Luke 10:27 Jesus declared that Lev 19:18, "you shall love your *neighbor* (רֵעַ = kith-and-kin) as yourself," was the second greatest commandment, exceed only by the commandment to love God. A third problem appears in Matt 10:34–36, where the Prince of Peace —having stated in Matt 5:9, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God"—announced, "Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword." And yet there is no record that Jesus ever touched a sword.

I have already published my interpretation of the difficult sayings in Luke 14:26 and Matt 10:34, in which I conclude that a few statements of Jesus were mistranslated when they went from Hebrew into Greek.[1] The clarity of Hebrew speech can readily be lost when, as was the custom, Hebrew spelling did not use vowels. In Luke 14:26 the Hebrew word שׁנה /

שנא, meaning "to forsake" was misread as the word "to hate."
In Matt 10:34, שלם "end" was misread as "Shalom"; and the
word חלף "change" was misread as "sword." In this study,
using the same philological methodology, I focus on the para-
ble of the unjust steward in Luke 16:1–13, giving primary
attention to verses:8 and 9.

Gächter (1950: 121) rightly noted with reference to the par-
able of the unjust steward (ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας) in
Luke 16:1–13 that "this parable until now is still a *crux inter-
pretum*, and much more a *crux praedicantium*. Twenty-five
years later Topel (1975: 216) similarly noted,

> The literature dealing with the parable of the unjust steward
> is staggering, and after all the effort expended, its meaning
> still eludes us. Indeed, more than any other parable it can be
> expected to keep its mystery for future generations of exe-
> getes, for it bristles with difficulties.

But a few years earlier Fletcher (1969: 19, 24) rightly nar-
rowed the problems down to just one verse:

> V[erse] 9 is the real *crux interpretationis* of the parable. . .
> The saying is so difficult that there seems to be no disposi-
> tion on the part of interpreters to question its authenticity;
> presumably nothing so obscure would have been introduced
> into the tradition and erroneously attributed to Jesus. It must
> have been spoken by the Master himself. . . . *Does Jesus
> actually mean to counsel one to use money[2] to make friends
> in order in some way to assure one's admission to a
> heavenly dwelling*? [italics added]

The answer to Fletcher's question is an emphatic "No!"
and this study, focusing on Luke 16:8–9, presents the reasons
for my coming to this conclusion. First, a look at Luke 16:8.

Luke 16:8

καὶ ἐπήνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας
ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν·
ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ
τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς
εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν.

And the lord commended the unrighteous steward
that he did prudently,
because the sons of this age are more prudent
than the sons of the light,
in respect to their generation.

Vulgate

et laudavit dominus vilicum iniquitatis
quia prudenter fecisset
quia filii huius saeculi prudentiores filiis lucis
in generatione sua sunt

Peshiṭta Transliterated

ושבח מרן לרביתא דעולא דחכימאית
עבד בנוהי גיר דעלמא הנא חכימין אנון
מן בנוהי דנוהרא בשרבתהון הדא:

Peshiṭta

ܘܫܒܚ ܡܪܢ ܠܪܒܝܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ
ܥܒܕ ܒܢܘܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ
ܡܢ ܒܢܘܗܝ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܒܫܪܒܬܗܘܢ ܗܕܐ

Lamsa

And the lord praised the unjust steward
because he had done wisely;
for the children of this world are wiser
in their generation than the children of light.

Plummer (1922: 380–381) noted with reference to the early contradictory allegorical interpretations (which identified the steward variously with the Jewish hierarchy, publicans, penitents, Paul, Pilate, Judas, Satan, or Jesus) that "A catalogue of even the chief suggestions would serve no useful purpose ... The literature on the subject is voluminous and unrepaying." Landry and May (2000: 287–288) expressed a similar sentiment: "This parable has spawned a wide variety of interpretations, although none has produced anything resembling a scholarly consensus. . . it would not be wise to provide a comprehensive review of the literature. . . ."[3] Therefore they discussed only "the most popular and the most recent solutions to the puzzle of the Unjust Steward," as they presented the following interpretation of Luke 16:1–8a, with no mention of the real *crux interpretationis* in Luke 16:9.

> [The unjust steward] tries to get himself out of trouble by restoring his master's honor and salvaging his reputation as a good, loyal steward. He forgives a portion of the amount owed by his master's debtors. People would assume that the steward was acting on the master's orders, so these gestures would make the master look generous and charitable in the eyes of society. The prestige and honor gained by such benefaction would far outweigh the monetary loss to the master. The master hears what the steward has done and praises him for his actions since his honor has been restored. Moreover, the steward is now in a position either to keep his

position with this master or to secure one elsewhere, since his reputation for loyalty and good service has been re-covered.

Thus, like the steward of the parable, Landry and May can be praised (ἐπαινέω) for their astuteness (φρόνιμος) in suggesting indirectly that we take our text (γράμματα) of 16:8 and change the negative ἀδικίας to the affirmative δικαίας "faithful." Thus interpreted, Jesus presented this fictitious character as a model for his disciples to emulate, for through his cleverness he had come up with a win-win solution to his pending unemployment. The steward had been "unrighteous" in the squandering his lord's possessions; but he had redeemed himself and become praiseworthy through a manipulation of his lord's assets to his personal advantage and benefit to others.

Mann (1992:34–35), who thought the "lord" in the parable referred to Jesus, suggested that the ΑΛΙΚΙΑΣ "experience/expertise" in the original uncial text of Luke 16:8 was misread as ΑΔΙΚΙΑΣ "unjust." For Mann Jesus was commending the prudent and experienced manager because he acted wisely in the face of a situation that was beyond his control. (But Matthewson [1995: 34–37] faulted Mann's "guesswork" as a hypothetical textual error for which there is no evidence.)

THE REAL *CRUX INTERPRETATIONIS*

Luke 16:9

Καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους
ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ
δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς.

RSV

And I tell you, make friends for yourselves by means of
unrighteous mammon, so that when it fails
they may receive you into the eternal habitations.

Vulgate

Et ego vobis dico facite vobis amicos de
mamona iniquitatis ut cum defeceritis
recipiant vos in aeterna tabernacula.

DRA

And I say to you: Make unto you friends of
the mammon of iniquity: that when you shall fail,
they may receive you into everlasting dwellings.

Peshiṭta

ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܕܥܒܕܘ ܠܟܘܢ ܪܚܡܐ
ܡܢ ܡܡܘܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
ܕܡܐ ܕܢܓܡܪ ܢܩܒܠܘܢܟܘܢ ܒܡܛܠܝܗܘܢ ܕܠܥܠܡ

Peshiṭta Transliterated and Translated

ואף אנא אמר אנא לכון דעבדו לכון רחמא
מן ממונא הנא דעולא
דמא דנגמר נקבלונכון   במטליהון דלעלם:

And I also am saying unto you, make for yourselves friends
from this unrighteous mammon,
so that when it is gone they will receive you
into their everlasting tabernacles.

Although Landry and May translated the ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς
ἀδικίας "the mammon of unrighteousness" in Luke 16:9 as

"dishonest wealth" or "ill-gotten gains," they omitted the word ἀδικίας in their commentary, stating simply "It is indeed a shrewd use of wealth where everyone wins, and Luke has no problem showing Jesus enjoining his followers to be so clever." This omission of ἀδικίας followed the same omission by Gätcher (1950: 131) who stated "Jesus brings home to his disciples how they should detach themselves from riches, apply it to their brethren in need, and thus secure for themselves an eternal reward."

Although Fletcher (1963: 28) had recognized ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας "the mammon of unrighteousness" as a "scornful Semitism," other authors when commenting on Luke 16:9 interpreted the text as if the τῆς ἀδικίας "the unrighteous" were not there or was not to be taken literally. For example, Fitzmyer (1964: 41) commented on the phrase "make friends with the *wealth of dishonesty*" to mean:

> Use prudently the wealth that you have to insure your status when the eschaton arrives. It does not mean that Christians are to make use of ill-gotten gain; the expression is pejorative and expresses only the tendency of wealth as such."

Topel (1975: 220), in his following statement, appears to be comfortable in making the *mammon of iniquity* the equivalent of "riches" and "money" in general:

> Thus Luke means by the parable that the unjust man can show the Christian how to use riches to help the poor and so gain God's favor. Now this focus on the use of money is probably the reason for the adjoining verses on the mammon of iniquity, and so the proper use of money is an important part of the Lucan version of the parable.

Parrott (1991: 560), citing Jeremias (1963: 46, n. 86), stated:

> Unrighteousness mammon presumably does not mean here
> ill-gotten gains, since it is impossible to believe that thievery
> is being recommended. More likely the master's goods . . .
> are interpreted as representing any worldly goods . . . one's
> possessions.

So also DeSilva (1993: 255) paraphrased ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας as "material wealth" in his introductory statement:

> The hermeneutical move, as it were, centers on the expedient
> use of material wealth, and moves from the steward's
> context of remitting debts to the context of using wealth to
> benefit the disenfranchised members of the community and
> society.

Likewise, Matthewson (1995: 33–34), omitted or paraphrased the τῆς ἀδικίας when he concluded:

> Yet the parable as it stands in its present redactional context
> concerns the wise use of *possessions* . . . the "sons of light
> reflect prudence in the use of worldly possessions. . . . one's use
> of worldly possessions is an effective test of one's ability to
> handle eternal reward because it reveals where ultimate loyal-
> ties lie (v. 13). A disciple cannot render loyalty to mammon and
> at the same time give to God the exclusive loyalty that he
> deserves.

The omissions of the τῆς ἀδικίας or paraphrases of it as "material" or "worldly" (so translated in the NIV and NLT) are indirect responses to questions raised by many, including Gächter (1950:121, 123), who asked, " *How can Jesus make villainy an example for his followers*?" and "*Did Jesus, who otherwise knew so well how to speak to the hearts of men, really propose a parable which necessarily strikes one as touching on what according to all standards of morals is wrong*?" (italics mine)

This is the crux! A straightforward and simple translation of the Greek ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας has Jesus commanding the disciples to make friends for themselves *from*

- the mammon of unrighteousness (KJV, ASV, NAS, YLT)
- unrighteous mammon (RSV)
- mammon of iniquity (DRA)
- wealth of unrighteousness (NAU)
- dishonest wealth (NAB, NRS).

That is what comes from the Greek. But did Jesus teach this parable in Greek? Probably not! Torrey (1933: 157, 311) argued that Jesus spoke in Aramaic and that some of the Aramaic quotations were misunderstood when translated into Greek. Assuming that an initial interrogative particle was lost in translation from Aramaic to Greek, Torrey restored the particle, thereby removing the difficulties in Luke 16:8–9 by making Jesus' *statements* into these *questions*: "Did the lord of the estate praise his faithless manager? . . . and do I say to you . . . ?" The anticipated answer would have been in the negative. Parrott (1991: 513, n. 50) favorably cited Torrey's Aramaic reconstruction, and suggested that parable could have been a "parable of preparation," in which case the proposed question in 16:8a could have been answered in the affirmative. However, most scholars have ignored Torrey's proposals about an Aramaic original having an interrogative particle which was lost in transmission or translation.

Nevertheless, many critics recognize "Semitic" elements in the parable in which the Aramaic ממונא (*mammôna'* = mammon) is the most conspicuous. Fletcher (1963: 28, 30) noted the "scornful Semitism" and a "Semitic aphorism"; Williams (1964: 296) recognized the "Semitic type parable";

Hiers (1972: 32) spoke of the "Semitic genitive construct"; Topel (1975: 218) also recognized a "Semitic construct state"; Ireland (1992: 97) identified the τῆς ἀδικίας "as an instance of the so-called Hebrew genitive"; and DeSilva (1993: 264–265) noted the "Semitic counterparts" and "simple Semitisms."

But, aside from Torrey's working with the Aramaic, no one that I am aware of has offered a *reconstruction* of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Luke 16:9—although the Hebrew translations by Salkinson-Ginsburg,[4] Delitzsch,[5] and others—as well as the Aramaic Peshiṭta cited above—are readily available. Certainly Jesus, as an itinerant teacher (διδάσκαλος), may have taught the multitudes in Aramaic or Greek. But as an honored Rabbi / Rabban ('Ραββί / Ραββουν = רַבָּן/רַבִּי) Jesus surely taught his disciples using Hebrew—just as the "Teacher of Righteousness" at Qumran taught the "sons of light" using Hebrew. It is inconceivable that Sadducees, and Pharisees would have taken Jesus seriously if he and his disciples handled *Torah* and *Halakah* only in Aramaic.

The solution to the crux of Luke 16:9 becomes obvious once an unverifiable but logical *reconstruction* of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the verse is made. Thus I offer this *reconstruction* of the Hebrew *Vorlage*—the unvocalized text with ambiguities and a vocalized text which removes of those ambiguities:

ואני אומר לכם התרעו מן הממון העול
וכאשר יעזב אז יקבלו אתכם אל משכנות עולם

וְאֲנִי אוֹמֵר לָכֶם הִתְרָעוּ מִן הַמָּמוֹן הָעַוָּל
וְכַאֲשֶׁר יֶעָזֵב אָז יְקַבְּלוּ אֶתְכֶם אל מִשְׁכְּנוֹת עוֹלָם:

The intensive reflexive *Hithpaʿel* הִתְרָעוּ matches the ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους "make friends for yourselves," the

same form found in Prov 22:24, where the negative imperative אַל־תִּתְרַע "do not make companionship" (BDB 945) was translated as μὴ ἴσθι ἑταῖρος "be not a friend." But the הִתְרָעוּ (spelled with a *qameṣ* under the ר over against הִתְרַעוּ spelled with a *pataḥ* under the ר) may have had another meaning.[6] Standard lexicons of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic list three stems spelled רָעָה:

- Stem I, רָעָה "to pasture, to tend, to graze." Its Arabic cognate is رعى (*raʿaya*).

- Stem II, רָעָה "to associate with, to cherish, to make a friend." Its Arabic cognates are راعى (*rāʿî*) "master, owner" and مرياع (*miryâʾ*) "companion," which equals the Hebrew רֵעַ "friend, companion."

- Stem III, the Aramaic רָעָה "to desire." Its Arabic cognate is رضى (*raṣaya*) and its Hebrew cognate is רָצָה (BDB 945–946; Jastrow 1903: 1486).[7]

A fourth רָעָה needs to be added to the lexicons of Aramaic and Hebrew. It is the רָעָה which is the cognate of the Arabic رعا / رعو [*raʿwa* / *raʿâ*] meaning "he refrained from things or affairs, he forebore, or he abstained from bad or foul conduct" (Lane 1867: 1108; Wehr 1979: 401).[8] This cognate was cited by Castell (1669: 3613) as meaning "*abstinuit ab aliqua re*"). This verb, רָעָה stem IV "to abstain from, to refrain from" (not רָעָה stem II "to make friends") would have been the verb which Jesus used and found its way into the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Luke 16:9. Consequently, the first half of the verse, ואני אומר לכם התרעו מן הממון העול, actually meant:

"But I say unto you 'Abstain yourselves from unrighteous mammon!'"

In the parable the unjust steward was praised by his master for the clever use he made in the acquisition, dispersion, and distribution of unrighteous mammon, even though it was at the master's own expense. The *first* point Jesus made in the application of the parable was his own recognition that "the people of this world are more shrewd in dealing with their own kind than are the people of the light" (NIB 16:8). The *second* point Jesus made in his application of the parable was his injunction: "*Abstain yourselves from* (*such*) *unrighteous mammon*!'" Shrewd, clever or crafty acquisition, dispersion, and distribution of *unrighteous mammon* was not to be a practice among the children of light. It was just that simple. For "whoever is dishonest with very little will also be dishonest with much" and "if then with the unrighteous mammon you have not been faithful, who will trust you with that which is true?" (Luke 16:10–11). Once the imperative התרעו in the *Vorlage* of 16:9a is recognized as רָעָה stem IV everything in the parable fits together perfectly, even down to the ἐκ in the phrase ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, "[abstain] *from* unrighteous mammon."

Luke's misunderstanding of the proper derivation of the imperative התרעו in the Hebrew source he was using is understandable in light of the fact that רָעָה stem IV "to abstain from" was as rare as רָעָה stem II "to make friends" was common. Even if Luke had had access to our current Hebrew lexicons they would have been of no help with this *hapax legomenon*. The notorious ambiguity of Hebrew homographs can be blamed for Luke's first misreading of what he saw in his unpointed Hebrew source.

This appeal to an Arabic cognate to establish the existence of רָעָה stem IV "to abstain" in Jesus' vocabulary receives indirect support from the way in which the Arabic صلقة (ṣadaqat) "alms, charity" (Lane 1872 1668) matches the use of צדקה "alms, charity" in Hebrew (Jastrow 1903: 1264). In the Shem Tob *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* צדקה translates the ἐλεημοσύνη "alms" in Matt 6:1–4, which matches the Arabic صلقة (ṣadaqat) "alms."[9] The opposite of ממון עול "unrighteous wealth" would be ממון צדק "honest wealth." Changing the masculine צדק into the feminine changes the phrase into ממון צדקה "mammon of charity," with the צדקה meaning "liberality," especially with reference to alms and almsgiving.[10]

Luke's second misreading involved Jesus' use of עזב stem I "to forsake, to abandon" which was a homograph עזב stem II "to restore, to renew."[11] The translators of the Septuagint and Vulgate were unaware of עזב stem II—just as Luke was unaware of רָעָה stem IV, "to abstain." In the MT of Neh 3:8 is the phrase וַיַּעַזְבוּ יְרוּשָׁלַם meaning "they restored Jerusalem," which is the translation found in the NIV, NIB, NAS, NAU, NAB, and RSV, with the KJV, NKJ, and ASV having "they fortified Jerusalem." However, the Septuagint (contrary to historical fact) reads καὶ κατέλιπον Ιερουσαλημ "and they abandoned Jerusalem." Similarly, the Vulgate reads *et dimiserunt Hierusalem*, which became "and they left Jerusalem" in the Douay Rheims. Jastrow (1903: 1060–1061) does not cite this *hapax legomenon* עזב stem II in Neh 3:8, although it was cited by Castell (1669: 2714) and defined by him as *erexerunt*, *instaurarunt*, *roborarunt* (erect, restore, reinforce).

But Luke's second misreading had nothing to do with עזב stem I and עזב stem II. Rather it was his misreading in the *Vorlage* the *Niphᶜal* passive יעזב (= יֵעָזֵב) "it will be forsaken" as the *Qal* active יַעֲזֹב "it will fail" (= ἐκλίπη). Either way, the subject of the verb was the *unrighteous mammon* from which the children of light must abstain.[12]

With Luke's two misreadings now identified, the *Vorlage*,

$$\text{וכאשר יעזב אז יקבלו אתכם}$$
$$\text{אל משכנות עולם}^{13}$$

in 16:9b can be translated as "and when [the unrighteous mammon] is forsaken they will welcome you into the eternal tents."

Thus, in Luke 16:9 according to a Hebrew *Vorlage*, Jesus probably said:

> *"But I say unto you 'Abstain / restrain yourselves*
> *from unrighteous mammon!*
> *And when it is forsaken / abandoned*
> *they will welcome you into the eternal dwellings*."

These words echo the admonition in I Enoch 104:6, "Now fear not, righteous ones, when you see the sinners waxing strong and prospering; do not be partners with them, but keep far away from all their injustice." The Greek text of Luke 16:9 —under the influence רָעָה stem II "to make a friend"—has Jesus repudiating this admonition of I Enoch; whereas the *Vorlage* with its רָעָה stem IV "to abstain, refrain" has Jesus confirming the stated prohibitions.

Those who would *welcome* (δέξωνται = קבל) those abstaining from unrighteous mammon would be heavenly angels such as those present at the empty tomb upon Jesus resurrection. I Enoch 104:1–2 provides a good commentary for this

identification.

> I swear unto you that in heaven the angels will remember
> you for good before the glory of the Great One; and your
> names shall be written before the glory of the Great One.
> . . . But now you shall shine like the lights of heaven, and
> you shall be seen; and the windows of heaven shall be
> open to you.

CONCLUSION

When Luke misread in a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the parable of
the unjust steward the passive verb יעזב "it will be forsaken"
as the active verb יעזב "it will fail" he compounded the prob-
lem of his having also misread in the same verse the verb
התרעו as if it were from the well attested stem רעה "to be a
friend" rather than the *hapax legomenon* of the verb רעה "to
abstain." As a result Jesus is quoted as saying enigmatically
"*make friends for yourselves by means of the mammon of
unrighteousness, so that when it fails, they will receive you
into the eternal dwellings*." Reconstructing the Hebrew *Vor-
lage* with these two corrections in mind the text probably read

וְאֲנִי אוֹמֵר לָכֶם הִתְרָעוּ מִן הַמָּמוֹן הָעַוָּל
וְכַאֲשֶׁר יֵעָזֵב אָז יְקַבְּלוּ אֶתְכֶם אל מִשְׁכְּנוֹת עוֹלָם:

"But I say unto you 'Abstain yourselves
from unrighteous mammon!
And when it is forsaken
they will welcome you into the eternal dwellings."

With this reconstruction and interpretation, Jesus' applica-
tion of the parable fits perfectly with Luke 16:10–13. The
declaration "you cannot serve God and mammon" (οὐ δύνασθε
θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνα), read as an injunction, means

"Serve God! Master mammon!" The disciples as children of light are to *repudiate* the ממון עול "mammon of unrighteousness." They are to control their ממון צדק "legitimate wealth, their honest assets" so that their mammon becomes צדקה "charitable resources for alms." This interpretation resonates well with Matt 6:19–20, "Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, ... but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." I Tim 6:9–12 would be an excellent application of this parable if its Hebrew *Vorlage* approximated what has been proposed above,

 . . . those who desire to be rich fall into temptation, into a snare, into many senseless and hurtful desires that plunge men into ruin and destruction. For the love of money is the root of all evils; it is through this craving that some have wandered away from the faith and pierced their hearts with many pangs. But as for you, man of God, shun all this; aim at righteousness, godliness, faith, love, steadfastness, gentleness. Fight the good fight of the faith; take hold of the eternal life to which you were called.

NOTES

1. See Chapter 30 and Chapter 31 in *Clarifying Baffling Biblical Passages* at http://daniel.eastern.edu/tmcdaniel/.

2. Note how Fletcher reduced the τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας "unrighteous mammon" to the one word "money." See below pp. 6–8.

3. Kissinger in his *Parables of Jesus* (1979: 398–408) provided a bibliography of one hundred thirty-three titles dealing directly with just this parable. Ireland has provided the best

summary of the varied interpretation in his book entitled *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*: *An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16:1-13* (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* v. 70; Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.) He reviewed one hundred fifty studies in preparation for his publication.

4. The Salkinson-Ginsburg translation reads:

וַיְשַׁבַּח הָאָדוֹן אֶת־בֶּן־הָעַוְלָה אֶת־הַסֹּכֵן
אֲשֶׁר שִׂכֵּל אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂהוּ
כִּי בְנֵי הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה מַשְׂכִּילִים הֵם
מֵעַל בְּנֵי הָאוֹר בְּדֹרֹתָם:

Full text is availabe online at http://www.dvar-adonai.org/.

5. The Delitzsch translation has:

וַיְשַׁבַּח הָאָדוֹן אֶת־סֹכֵן הָעַוְלָה
עַל־אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱרִים לַעֲשׂוֹת
כִּי בְנֵי הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה עֲרוּמִים הֵם בְּדוֹרָם
מִבְּנֵי הָאוֹר:

Full text online at http://www.kirjasilta.net/ha-berit/ Luq.16. html.

6. The imperative התרע can be vocalized in two different ways:

• as הִתְרַעוּ, with the short *pataḥ* under the ר because the following ע cannot take the *dagesh* which doubles the middle letter of the stem in the *Hithpaᶜel*. The ע of this

הִתְרַעוּ would have what the Hebrew grammarians call an "implicit *dagesh,*" with the *pataḥ* theoretically being in a closed syllable;

- as הִתְרָעוּ, with the long *qameṣ* under the ר for *compensatory lengthening* of the vowel because the following ע cannot take the *dagesh* and the vowel under the ר is in an open syllable.

The quantitative length of the vowel in speech (*ă, a,* or *ā*) would preclude any ambiguity about the meaning; but once the words were written without vowels unintentional ambiguity was inevitable.

7. Sometimes the verb רָעַע stem I "to be evil, bad," was confused with the verb רָעָה stem II, as in Prov 18:24, where the MT אִישׁ רֵעִים לְהִתְרֹעֵעַ became in the KJV "A man *that hath* friends must shew himself friendly" (as though the text were the *Hithpaᶜel* infinitive הִתְרָעוֹת of רָעָה stem II). But by identifying the לְהִתְרֹעֵעַ as the *Hithpaᶜel* infinitive of רָעַע stem II "to break" the ASV reads "He that maketh many friends *doeth it* to his own destruction." The NIV and NIB read similarly, "A man of many companions may come to ruin."

8. On the relationship of the ל״ו verbs to the ל״ה verbs, see GKC §75[a].

9. Howard 1995: 22–23.

10. Note that in Arabic صلاقة (ṣadâqat) means "love, affec-
tion" and صديق (ṣadîq) means "a sincere and true friend"
(Lane 1872:1668).

11. Compare the difference of the English word *refrain* when
it is a noun and when it is a verb.

12. In the Septuagint λείπειν translated just two Hebrew
words, but ἐκλείπειν translated forty-seven different Hebrew
words, and ἐγκαταλείπειν translated fifteen different words.
Given these options for constructing the *Vorlage*, the root
עָזַב became the verb of choice in light of the עֲזוּבָה "was
abandoned" (= ἐγκατελείφθη) in Jer 4:29 and the יַעֲזֹב "it
will cease"(= ἐκλείψουσιν) in Jer 18:14.

13. The Delitzsch translation of Luke 16:9b reads

וְגַם־אֲנִי אֹמֵר לָכֶם קְנוּ לָכֶם אֹהֲבִים
בְּמָמוֹנָה שֶׁל־עַוְלָה
לְמַעַן יַאַסְפוּ אֶתְכֶם בְּעֵת כְּלֹתוֹ אֶל־מִשְׁכְּנוֹת עוֹלָם:

The Salkinson-Ginsburg translation of the same text has

וְאַף־אֲנִי אֹמֵר לָכֶם קְנוּ לָכֶם אֹהֲבִים
בְּכֶסֶף מְקוֹר הָעַוְלָה
וְכַאֲשֶׁר יָבֹא עַד־קִצּוֹ אָז יַאַסְפוּ אֶתְכֶם
אֶל־מִשְׁכְּנוֹת עוֹלָם:

See notes 4 and 5 for the internet addresses for the full text of
these translations online.