

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

PART I

# THE ARAMAIC ORIGIN

OF THE

## FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

THE REV. C. F. BURNEY, M.A., D.LITT.

Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford

Fellow of Oriel and St. John's Colleges, Oxford

Canon of Rochester

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1922

# CONTENTS

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED . . . . .	PAGE vii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
CHAP.	
I. PRELIMINARY TESTING OF THE THEORY BY EXAMINATION OF THE PROLOGUE	28
ADDITIONAL NOTE . . . . .	43
II. THE SENTENCE . . . . .	49
III. CONJUNCTIONS . . . . .	66
IV. PRONOUNS . . . . .	79
V. THE VERB. . . . .	87
VI. NEGATIVES . . . . .	98
VII. MISTRANSLATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL ARAMAIC OF THE GOSPEL. . . . .	101
VIII. OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL . . . . .	114
IX. EPILOGUE . . . . .	126
APPENDIX . . . . .	153
INDEX . . . . .	173

## PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED

- Cur. = The Curetonian Syriac Version of the Gospels (cf. p. 26).  
Pal. Syr. = The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary (cf. p. 25).  
Pesh. = The Peshittā Syriac Version (cf. p. 25).  
Sin. = The Sinaitic Syriac Version of the Gospels (cf. p. 26).  
Targ. Jer. = The Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch (cf. p. 24).  
Targ. Jon. = The Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets (cf. p. 24).  
Targ. Onk. = The Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch (cf. p. 23).  
Targ. Ps.-Jon. = The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch (cf. p. 23).  
WH. = The Greek text of Westcott and Hort.
- Abbott, *JG.* = Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (1906).  
Dalman, *Gramm.* = G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* (1894).  
Dalman, *WJ.* = G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus considered in the light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (Eng. Trans., 1902).  
Deissmann, *LAE.* = A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (Eng. Trans., 1910).  
*HS?* = Sir John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (2nd edition, 1909).  
Moulton, *NTG?* = J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol. i, 3rd edition, reprinted 1919).  
Schlatter, *Sprache* = A. Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (1902).  
Wellhausen, *Einleitung?* = J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (zweite Ausgabe 1911).

## INTRODUCTION

IN a sermon preached in June 1920 before the University of Oxford\* the present writer made a plea for a closer synthesis of Old Testament learning with the study of the New Testament; and reviewing summarily and generally the kind of New Testament problems which might receive fuller elucidation through the more direct application to them of Semitic learning, he put forward the possibility that in the future a Semitic scholar might arise who, examining the language of the Fourth Gospel in detail, would prove beyond the range of reasonable doubt that it was based upon an Aramaic original.

In venturing upon this somewhat bold prophecy, the writer had not at the time any thought of undertaking the task himself. Absorbed in Old Testament studies, and realizing with ever-growing insistency the task which lies before Semitic scholars of widening and deepening the basis of their learning if they would make any really first-hand contribution to their subject, he had not enjoyed the opportunity of prosecuting his New Testament studies beyond the somewhat superficial stage which ordinarily represents a theological tutor's acquaintance with the wide range of learning in which, in addition to his own special branch of research, he has generally to direct his pupils' reading. The problem of the origin and authorship of the Fourth Gospel had, however, always attracted him. He had been impressed (as every Hebrew scholar must be impressed) with the Semitic character of its diction, and recognizing to the full the importance of Dr. Lightfoot's remarks on the question,† had realized that this was a subject of research fundamental to the problem of authorship which called for closer and more expert attention than it had hitherto received; and he had been amazed at the lightness with which it was dismissed or

\* Since published by the Oxford University Press under the title *The Old Testament Conception of Atonement fulfilled by Christ*.

† *Biblical Essays*, pp. 126 ff.

altogether ignored by New Testament scholars who confidently asserted the Hellenistic character of the Gospel. An article by Dr. C. J. Ball, entitled 'Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?', which appeared in the *Expository Times* for November 1909, explained certain peculiarities in the first chapter of the Gospel by the theory of an Aramaic original; and this, though (to the best of the present writer's knowledge) it stands alone in advocating this theory, yet appealed to him as evidently upon right lines.\* The evidence there adduced he had casually supplemented by notice of additional peculiarities pointing in the same direction; notably, the sharing by the Fourth Gospel of many of the peculiarities of diction which Canon Allen and Prof. Wellhausen cite as exhibiting the influence of Aramaic upon the style of St. Mark's Gospel.

This was about the position at which the writer's acquaintance with the subject stood when he wrote the sermon which he has mentioned. He had formed an opinion based on general observation, but he could not claim to have substantiated it by the kind of close study which deserves to be dignified as research. Further reflection, however, convinced him that the matter could not be allowed to rest here. He had suggested in the sermon that both

\* The view that the Fourth Gospel was originally written in Aramaic was put forward, though not worked out, by C. Salmasius (*De Hellenistica Commentarius*, 1645, pp. 257 f.), I. A. Bolten (*Der Bericht des Joannes von Jesu dem Messias, übersetzt*; 1797, *Vorbericht*, pp. xiv ff.), H. F. Pfannkuche (*Ueber die palästinische Landessprache in dem Zeitalter Christi*, in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibl. d. b. Litt.* viii, 1797, p. 367). L. Bertholdt (*Verosimilita de origine evangelii Joannis*, 1805; *Einleitung in . . . Schriften des A. u. N.T.*, iii, 1813, § 342) supposed that St. John wrote down the discourses of our Lord in Aramaic soon after they were spoken, and long subsequently translated them into Greek and incorporated them into his Greek gospel.

Many scholars, from Grotius (*Annotationes*, 1641) onwards, while holding the Gospel to have been written in Greek, have emphasized the Semitic character of its diction. The opinion of so great a Semitic scholar as H. Ewald (*Die johann. Schriften*, 1861, i, p. 44) is worthy of quotation: 'The Greek language of the author bears in itself the plainest and strongest marks of a genuine Hebrew. He is one born among Jews in the Holy Land, one who grew up to manhood in this society, without speaking Greek. Under the Greek mantle that he at a late date learned to throw about himself, he still bears in himself the whole mind and spirit of his mother tongue, and does not hesitate to let himself be led by it.' The discussion by C. E. Luthardt on the language of the Gospel (*St. John's Gospel*, E. T., 1876, i, pp. 15-64) is of considerable value.

Mention should here be made of the highly important work by Prof. A.

Old and New Testament scholars were as a rule content to dwell too much in water-tight compartments, and that more systematic first-hand application of Semitic linguistic knowledge to the New Testament might be expected to shed light upon a variety of problems. It followed that it was not only desirable that professed New Testament scholars should realize the importance to their researches of a first-hand equipment in Hebrew and Aramaic, but that Old Testament scholars equipped with a knowledge of these languages should turn to New Testament research, and endeavour by practical demonstration of the value of such knowledge to substantiate the truth of this thesis.

Thus it was that the writer turned seriously to tackle the question of the original language of the Fourth Gospel; and quickly convincing himself that the theory of an original Aramaic document was no chimera, but a fact which was capable of the fullest verification, set himself to collect and classify the evidence in a form which he trusts may justify the reasonableness of his opinion not merely to other Aramaic scholars, but to all New Testament scholars who will take the pains to follow out his arguments.

Inquiry into the Semitic characteristics of a New Testament book has nowadays to take account of the fact that the great modern discoveries of papyri and ostraka in Egypt have revolu-

Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (1902), with which the writer was unacquainted until he had practically completed the present study. Schlatter has demonstrated the Palestinian origin of the diction of the Fourth Gospel in the fullest possible manner by citing Rabbinic parallels to its phraseology verse by verse, the majority of verses throughout the whole Gospel being thus illustrated (thus e.g. in *ch. 1* parallels are cited for phrases in 34 out of the total 51 verses), and his work is a marvel of industry and intimate knowledge of the Midrashic sources which he employs. He has drawn, not from Aramaic, but from Rabbinic Hebrew—the *Mechilta* (commentary on Exodus) and *Siphre* (commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy) which date in substance from the 2nd century A. D., with supplements from the *Midrash Rabba* (on the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth). He chooses these Rabbinic Hebrew parallels rather than the Aramaic material which we possess e.g. in the Palestinian Talmud, because the former are nearer in date to the Fourth Gospel and better illustrate the religious thought of Palestinian Judaism in the first century; but, as he remarks (p. 12), any phrase employed in Rabbinic Hebrew (the language of the Schools) could without difficulty be similarly expressed in Aramaic (the popular medium of speech in Palestine). Schlatter's conclusion is that the writer of the Gospel was a Palestinian who thought and spoke in Aramaic, and only acquired his Greek in the course of his missionary work (p. 9).

tionized our conception of Biblical Greek, proving it to be, not a thing apart, but a more or less characteristic representative of the widespread *Koinḗ* dialect. The writer is not unacquainted with the researches of Professors Deissmann and Thumb, Milligan and Moulton, and recognizes the fact that they have proved that many constructions and usages both in the LXX and New Testament which were formerly supposed to reflect Semitic influence, are really nothing more than ordinary phenomena of the *Koinḗ* language. While readily making this acknowledgement to the excellent work of these scholars, he does not stand alone in holding that their reaction against the theory of Semitic influence upon Biblical Greek has been pushed too far. The fact is surely not without significance that practically the whole of the new material upon which we base our knowledge of the *Koinḗ* comes from Egypt, where there existed large colonies of Jews whose knowledge of Greek was undoubtedly influenced by the translation-Greek of the LXX, and who may not unreasonably be suspected of having influenced in some degree the character of Egyptian *Koinḗ*.\* A good example of such influence has been unwittingly

\* Cf. the judicious remarks of Dr. Swete, *Apocalypse*<sup>2</sup> (1907), p. cxxiv, n. 1: 'The present writer, while welcoming all the light that can be thrown on the vocabulary and syntax of the New Testament by a study of the Graeco-Egyptian papyri, and in particular the researches of Prof. Deissmann, Prof. Thumb, and Dr. J. H. Moulton, deprecates the induction which, as it seems to him, is being somewhat hastily based upon them, that the Greek of the New Testament has been but slightly influenced by the familiarity of the writers with Hebrew and Aramaic.... It is precarious to compare a literary document with a collection of personal and business letters, accounts, and other ephemeral writings; slips in word-formation or in syntax which are to be expected in the latter, are phenomenal in the former, and if they find a place there, can only be attributed to lifelong habits of thought. Moreover, it remains to be considered how far the quasi-Semitic colloquialisms of the papyri are themselves due to the influence of the large Greek-speaking Jewish population of the Delta.' Similarly, Mr. G. C. Richards, in reviewing the 2nd edition of Dr. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, x (1909), p. 289, remarks: 'The discovery of the Aramaic papyri from Assuan emphasizes this point [the evidence for large Jewish settlements in Egypt from an early date] most strongly, and even Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 83, n. 5) is prepared to admit that the adoption of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* as a legal phrase may be due to Semitic influence "in grauer Vorzeit". But this "Vorzeit" can scarcely be earlier than the end of the fourth century B.C. No doubt it is possible, as he says, that if originally a Semiticism, it may not have been felt to be so any longer. Such influence on the language of a population from an influx of settlers is quite common. Dr. Moulton makes

presented to us by Prof. Deissmann (*LAE*. pp. 129 ff.) in one of two passages which he quotes from the papyri for the express purpose of proving that the parataxis so characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, with its 'and . . . and', is not due to Semitic influence, but belongs to the popular *Koinḗ* style. This is a letter from two pig-merchants (c. A. D. 171) in which they complain to the Strategus that they have been attacked by brigands and robbed and beaten: ἀνερχομένων ἡμῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφείας Θεμίστου μερίδος ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον ἐπῆλθαν ἡμεῖν κακοῦργοί τινες . . . καὶ ἔδησαν ἡμᾶς σὺν καὶ τῷ μαγδωλοφύλακι καὶ πληγαῖς ἡμᾶς πλίσταις ἤκισαν κ[αὶ] τραυματῖαι ἐποίησαν τὸν [Πασίω]να καὶ εἰσανήρα[ν ἡμ]ῶν χοιρίδι[ον] α καὶ ἐβάσ[ταξαν τὸν τοῦ Πασίων]ος κιτῶνα . . . The term here used to describe 'the guard of the tower', μαγδωλοφύλαξ, embodies the ordinary Hebrew word for 'tower', *migdōl* (originally *magdōl*), and is thus clear evidence for Jewish influence upon Egyptian *Koinḗ* terminology. Yet Prof. Milligan (*New Testament Documents*, p. 154), referring to this section of Deissmann's work, states that he 'has been able to produce examples of similar [to the Fourth Gospel] paratactic sentences from sources *where no Semitic influence can be predicated*' (the italics are the present writer's); and similarly Prof. Moulton (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 486) remarks, 'Those who still find Semitism in these plain co-ordinated sentences [of the Fourth Gospel], with their large use of καί, may be recommended to study the most instructive parallels which Deissmann has set out,' &c.

We cite this passage merely as suggesting that the theory of Jewish influence upon the *Koinḗ* of Egypt, so far from being false or negligible, may in fact be supported by concrete evidence drawn from the papyri themselves. It does not follow, of course, that the

a point of the case of Wales. South Wales Welsh is regarded by North Wales people as an inferior *patois* because of the Anglicisms, which are to be seen not only in borrowed words but also in turns of expression. In fact we may say that, if the native language of a whole district may be strongly affected by the entry of aliens who learn it and learn it badly, *a fortiori* is a language, which is not the native one, but the medium of communication between natives and strangers, likely to be modified by all who use it.' So also Dr. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek Testament in the light of historical research*<sup>3</sup> (1919), p. 91: 'The LXX, though "translation Greek", was translated into the vernacular of Alexandria, and one can but wonder if the LXX did not have some slight and resultant influence upon the Alexandrian *Koinḗ* itself. The Jews were very numerous in Alexandria.'



paratactic style of the pig-merchants is due to Semitic influence; for, as Prof. Moulton justly observes (*NTG.*<sup>3</sup> i, p. 12), in speaking of co-ordination of sentences with simple *καί*, 'in itself the phenomenon proves nothing more than would a string of "ands" in an English rustic's story—elementary culture.' The vice of arguing from the epistolary style of an Egyptian pig-merchant or the speech of an English rustic to the style of the Fourth Gospel lies in the fact that the former are not *in pari materiā* with the latter. The theory of elementary culture which satisfactorily explains the style of the former is ill applied to a work which in thought, scheme, and execution takes rank as the greatest literary production of the New Testament, and the greatest religious monument of all time.

So with other stylistic peculiarities of the Gospel, such as the frequent use of *Casus pendens*. This, Prof. Moulton tells us, 'is one of the easiest of anacolutha, as much at home in English as in Greek' (*NTG.*<sup>3</sup> i, p. 69). We recognize the truth of this statement as regards colloquial English, especially among the semi-educated. We might be talking to a groom, and it would be natural for him to say, 'The gentleman who used to ride that horse—he lost his arm in the war.' Probably at times we use the same kind of anacoluthon ourselves in ordinary conversation; but we do *not* use it in writing a book or article which we hope may be worthy to rank as literature. Nor, if we take the whole New Testament as a fair specimen of literature written in the *Κοινή*, do we find as a rule more than very occasional instances of the usage. In the Fourth Gospel, however, it *is* remarkably frequent; and it is reasonable to seek some better reason than the supposition that the writer of the finest piece of literature in the New Testament was more than ordinarily infected with colloquialism. Now there *is* a literature in which both the usages which we have been noticing—parataxis and *Casus pendens*—are not the marks of lack of education but common phenomena of the best writing style, namely, the literature of Semitic-speaking peoples. If, then, these two characteristics of the style of the Fourth Gospel, only selected by way of example, fit in with numerous other characteristics which point to translation from a Semitic language, their evidence as part of our proof that the Gospel is such a

translation is not in the slightest degree invalidated by the fact that parallels can be adduced from the non-literary and ephemeral type of document which we find represented in the papyri.

As a matter of fact, we have little cause to quarrel with Prof. Moulton at any rate in the course which is followed in our discussion of the language of the Fourth Gospel, for he lays down a canon which covers a great part of the characteristics which are brought forward. 'If we are seeking', he says, 'for evidences of Semitic birth in a writer whose Greek betrays deficient knowledge of the resources of the language, we must not look only for uses which strain or actually contravene the Greek idiom. We shall find a subtler test in the *over-use* of locutions which can be defended as good *Koinē* Greek, but have their motive clearly in their coincidences with locutions of the writer's native tongue. This test of course applies only to Greek which is virtually or actually translated—to the Hebraism of the LXX and the Aramaism of New Testament books which are either translated from Aramaic sources or written by men who thought in Aramaic and moved with little freedom in Greek.'\* It is precisely this over-use of locutions coincident with locutions of Aramaic which will repeatedly be found to characterize the Greek of the Fourth Gospel.

From the remarks which are occasionally to be encountered in books and articles dealing with the Gospels it would appear that some amount of vagueness exists in the minds of many non-Semitic scholars as to the existence of a clear distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms. By some scholars, in fact, the question of distinction is ignored, and the two terms are used indifferently as though they were synonymous.† A glaring instance of this is to be seen in Prof. Schmiedel's remarks on the original language of St. Mark's Gospel in *Encyc. Bibl.* 1870. 'The language of Mk.', he says, 'Hebraizes still more strongly than does that of Mt. Nevertheless, the combinations of Allen (*Expositor*, 1900, i, pp. 436-43) do not prove that the evangelist wrote Aramaic, but only that he wrote a kind of Jewish Greek

\* *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 474.

† Cf. Dalman, *WJ.* pp. 18 f.

that he had derived from a reading of the LXX. Lk. also has Hebraisms, not only in chaps. 1 f. but elsewhere as well, and not only where he is dependent on Mk. or Mt. but also where he had no exemplar before him (as, for example, often "and it came to pass", καὶ ἐγένετο; see *HS.*<sup>2</sup> p. 37), and yet no one holds Lk.'s writing to be a translation of a Semitic original.'

It is something of a feat to have crowded so many misconceptions into the space of a few lines. Mk. does not Hebraize at all in the proper sense of the term; but the fact that his Greek exhibits a strong Aramaic colouring is admitted by all Semitic scholars who have studied the subject, though they differ as to whether this colouring implies actual translation from an original Aramaic document, or is merely due to the fact that the author was ill versed in Greek and accustomed to think and speak in Aramaic. Mk.'s 'Jewish Greek' cannot have been 'derived from a reading of the LXX', for it exhibits peculiarities (those which connect it with Aramaic) which are not found there, while at the same time the most striking Hebraisms of the LXX are absent from it. The fact that Lk. has Hebraisms is the first accurate statement which Prof. Schmiedel makes; but he goes on at once to confuse the issue again by equating the supposed 'Hebraisms' which are the result of dependence upon Mk. or Mt. with those which are found in passages in which the author 'had no exemplar before him'. The fact as regards the Marcan source in Lk. is that the third evangelist has made some attempt to smooth away the most palpable solecisms, but has by no means carried this out thoroughly or consistently; consequently a number of Marcan Aramaisms (not 'Hebraisms') remain in Lk.\* The parts of Lk.

\* As regards Mt., which Schmiedel also mentions as a source containing 'Hebraisms' employed by Lk., i.e. of course the Q document which is used in common by Mt. and Lk., the present writer cannot claim to have examined in detail into the question of its original language (Greek or Aramaic). No Semitic scholar can, however, study such a passage as Mt. 10<sup>26-33</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>2-9</sup> without arriving at the clear conviction that we either have in it the literal translation of an Aramaic original, or that the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord in Aramaic were branded on the hearts of His hearers and reproduced with a reverential exactitude amounting to virtual translation. Cf. especially the phrases μή φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ (Semitic 𐤓𐤕 of aversion after a verb of fearing), δμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί (cf. on this expression even Moulton, *NTG.*<sup>3</sup> i, p. 104), ἀκολουθεῖ ὑπίσω μου (Mt. 10<sup>38</sup>). Mistranslation of an

which may be taken to be due to the author himself (such as the setting of narratives, to which the phrase cited, *καὶ ἐγένετο*, belongs) *do* contain Hebraisms, and these so striking as to make this Gospel stand out as stylistically the most Hebraic Gospel of the four. Yet, as Schmiedel states, 'no one holds Lk.'s writing to be a translation of a Semitic original', for, paradoxical as it may seem, the very existence of this Hebraic colouring in his style

Aramaic original seems clearly to the indicated by comparison of the following passages:

Mt. 23 <sup>25,26</sup>	Lk. 11 <sup>39-41</sup>
<p><sup>25</sup> Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. <sup>26</sup> Φαρισαῖε τυφλέ,</p> <p>καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρόν.</p>	<p><sup>39</sup> Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. <sup>40</sup> ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὃ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν; <sup>41</sup> πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρά ὑμῖν ἐστίν.</p>

Here it can hardly be doubted that the remarkable variant between Mt. *καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς κτλ.* and Lk. *πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην* is to be explained by the fact that New Heb. and Aram. *כִּבֵּן* means both 'to purify' (occurring in Aram. as well as normal *כִּבֵּן*) and also 'to give alms' (cf. Wellhausen, *Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, p. 27). For the latter sense cf. the numerous occurrences in Midrash Rabba on Exodus, par. xxxiv; e.g. sect. 5 (New Heb.), 'If misfortune has befallen thy companion, consider how to give him alms (*לַבְּרִית*) and provide for him'; sect. 11 (Aram.), 'The Rabbis Yoḥanan and Resh Lakish were going down to bathe in the hot baths of Tiberias. A poor man met them. He said to them, "Give me alms" (*בִּי וְכִי*). They said to him, "When we come out we will give thee alms" (*כִּי וְכִי*). When they came out, they found him dead.' The inference is that our Lord used some such expression as *כִּבֵּן בְּכִי* 'That which is within purify'; this has been rightly rendered in Mt. and made more explicit by the addition of *τοῦ ποτηρίου κτλ.*, while in Lk. it has been wrongly rendered, 'That which is within give as alms'. *Ἐρμήνευσε δ' αὐτά, ὡς ἦν δυνατός, ἕκαστος.*

In the opening of the long indictment of the Scribes and Pharisees contained in Mt. 23, presumably from Q, we find a passage (vv. 2-7) which has clearly formed a source for Mk. in his short summary of teaching contained in 12<sup>38-40</sup>. It seems not unlikely that Mk.'s opening phrase, *Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν*, which recurs nearly *verbatim* in 4<sup>2</sup> (introducing the parable of the sower), may be his manner of referring to this written discourse-source to which he had access. Lk. 20<sup>46-47</sup> has followed Mk. and not Mt, though his opening statement that our Lord's words were spoken both to the multitude and to the disciples seems to indicate that he rightly identified Mk's abbreviated version with the long discourse of Mt. (Q), and selected the former. The parallel passages run as follows:

is a sure indication that he was steeped with LXX influence, and very possibly unacquainted with Hebrew.\*

Mt. 23<sup>1ff.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ λέγων· . . .  
<sup>5</sup> πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσιν πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· πλατύνουσιν γὰρ τὰ φυλακτήρια αὐτῶν καὶ μεγαλύνουσιν τὰ κράσπεδα, <sup>6</sup> φιλοῦσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς <sup>7</sup> καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, κτλ.

Mk. 12<sup>38-40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν·  
 βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς  
<sup>39</sup> καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις· <sup>40</sup> οἱ κατεσθίουσιν τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι, οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

Lk. 20<sup>45-47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς·  
<sup>46</sup> προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς καὶ φιλοῦντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις, <sup>47</sup> οἱ κατεσθίουσιν τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσεύχονται· οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

The statements of Mk. in vv. <sup>38, 39</sup> can be clearly recognized in Mt., except for τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν, which seems to be a paraphrase of καὶ μεγαλύνουσιν τὰ κράσπεδα, Mt. 23<sup>5</sup>. In v. <sup>40</sup> of Mk., however, we meet with two statements which do not seem, as they stand, to connect themselves directly with anything in Mt. Noticing, however, that the second of these speaks of *prayer*, we observe that the New Heb. and Aram. term for φυλακτήρια (Mt. 23<sup>5</sup>) is ܦܝܠܠܝܢ *phillin*, which properly means 'prayers'. Thus there is a suspicious resemblance between the two statements, 'make broad their phylacteries' and 'make long their prayers'. Now the verb πλατύνουσιν is rendered in Pesh. by ܠܥܒܕܐ, and Payne Smith in his *Thesaurus* quotes instances in which this Aph'el ܠܥܒܐ 'make broad', as well as the Pa'el ܠܥܒܐ, has the sense 'make verbose' (e. g. Severus Alexandrinus, *Rhetorica*, 79 v., ܠܥܒܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ 'If he wishes to be verbose'). It is likely, therefore, that an original ܠܥܒܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ 'who make broad their phylacteries', rightly rendered in Mt., appears in Mk. and Lk. in the mistranslation 'who make verbose their prayers'. It should be remarked that ܠܥܒܐ is not the ordinary Aramaic word for 'prayers' (ܢܚܝܐ); but it might be so interpreted by a translator who was aware of this meaning of the term in New Heb.

The writer believes that this suggestion as to a misunderstanding of ܠܥܒܐ is not his own, but has already been made; though he cannot recall to whom acknowledgement is due. He is himself responsible for pointing out the variant meanings of the verbal form.

\* That St. Luke was a Hellenistic Jew and not a Gentile would be—apart from other evidence to the contrary—the natural deduction from the fact that the LXX has coloured his Greek style in so marked a degree; since this surely implies that he was brought up upon the Greek Bible. Had he been a Gentile, and not converted to Christianity until he was a grown man, his Greek style would presumably have been already formed and would not have taken on a LXX

The following striking Hebraisms occurring in Lk. may serve to illustrate the true meaning of the term 'Hebraism', viz. a construction or word-usage found in *Biblical Hebrew* which has been copied in translation by the LXX, and has come through LXX influence into N. T. Greek:

1. ἐγένετο introducing a time-determination. The use of וַיָּהִי 'And it came to pass' is in such a case very idiomatic in Hebrew, and the LXX equivalent is καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δέ. After וַיָּהִי there follows *the note of time or occasion*, which may take various forms, such as—

An Infinitive with preposition ב; e.g. בְּבֹאֲם 'when they came' (lit. 'in their coming') = LXX ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτούς.

An Infinitive with preposition ב; e.g. בְּבֹאֲם 'at their coming' = LXX ὡς (or ἡνίκα) ἦλθον.

בְּבֹאֲם (or בִּ) 'when' with a Perfect; e.g. בְּבֹאֲם 'when they came' = LXX ὡς (or ἡνίκα) ἦλθον.

A Participle Absolute with pronominal or nominal subject; e.g. בָּאִים הָמָּה 'they (were) coming' = LXX αὐτῶν ἐρχομένων.

A specific note of time; e.g. בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי 'on the third day' = LXX (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ; מִמָּוֶת שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים 'after three days' = LXX μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς.

After this comes *the apodosis*, which is most frequently (though by no means invariably) introduced by 'and' (= 'then'); e.g. וַיֵּרְאוּ 'and they saw' = LXX (καὶ) εἶδον (LXX often omits καὶ), וַיֵּרְאוּ וַיִּהְיֶה 'and, behold, they saw' = LXX καὶ ἰδοὺ εἶδον, or simply וַיֵּרְאוּ 'they saw' = LXX εἶδον. The subject of the apodosis may of course vary from that of the time-determination (when this latter embodies a subject); e.g. וַיָּהִי בְּבֹאֲם וַיֵּצֵא אִישׁ לְקַרְאָתָם 'And it came to pass, as they came, that (lit. 'and') a man went out

colouring, at any rate to the extent that it has. We do, however, possess other and apparently contrary evidence in the fact that St. Paul in Col. 4<sup>14</sup> appears expressly to distinguish him from 'those of the circumcision' previously mentioned (v. 11); and this is taken by most scholars, such as Dr. Lightfoot (*Colossians*, p. 239) and Dr. Plummer (*St. Luke*, p. xix), as conclusive evidence that he was of Gentile origin, the latter scholar going so far as to maintain, 'That he was originally a heathen may be taken as certain'. Such a verdict, however, surely ignores the important criterion of style; and perhaps the conclusion which best satisfies the conflicting evidence is that he may have been a proselyte from his youth and have come over to Christianity from Judaism.

to meet them', or וַיְהִי הַפֶּה בָּאִים וְהִנֵּה אִישׁ יֵצֵא לִקְרֹאתָם 'And it came to pass, they (were) coming, and, behold, a man going out to meet them'.

Instances of this Hebrew construction, with time-determination ἐν τῷ (Infinitive) and apodosis introduced by καί, may be seen in Lk. 5<sup>1,12</sup>, 9<sup>51</sup>, 14<sup>1</sup>, 17<sup>11</sup>, 19<sup>15</sup>, 24<sup>4,(15)</sup>; without καί, Lk. 1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>6</sup>, 9<sup>18,33</sup>, 11<sup>1,27</sup>, 17<sup>14</sup>, 18<sup>35</sup>, 24<sup>30,51</sup>. With time-determination ὥς (Aorist), and without καί in apodosis, Lk. 1<sup>23,41</sup>, 2<sup>15</sup>, 19<sup>29</sup>. With specific note of time, and καί in apodosis, Lk. 5<sup>17</sup>, 8<sup>1,22</sup>, Acts 5<sup>7</sup>; without καί, Lk. 1<sup>59</sup>, 2<sup>1,46</sup>, 7<sup>11</sup>, 9<sup>28,37</sup>, 20<sup>1</sup>.

There are besides some cases in Lk., and many more in Acts, in which the verb of the apodosis is not an Aorist but an *Infinitive*. This modification of the construction, which is *not* found in Hebrew, and only occurs once in LXX (3 Kgs. 11<sup>43</sup> B), can be paralleled from the papyri. It seems therefore in Lk. and Acts to be a modification of the Hebraic construction under the influence of a known Koinḗ construction (cf. Thackeray, *Grammar of the O. T. in Greek*, p. 50). So Lk. 3<sup>21</sup>, 6<sup>1,6,12</sup>, Acts 4<sup>5</sup>, 9<sup>3\*,32,37</sup>, 14<sup>1</sup>, 16<sup>16</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup>, 22<sup>6,17</sup>, 28<sup>17</sup>. It may be noted that in some of these examples, viz. Acts 9<sup>32</sup>, 14<sup>1</sup>, 22<sup>6,17</sup>, the note of time or occasion has been variously modified so as to lose its clear-cut Hebraic form. In other cases, viz. Lk. 16<sup>22</sup>, Acts 9<sup>43</sup>, 11<sup>26</sup>, 28<sup>8</sup>, it is altogether absent. This is quite un-Hebraic. Hebrew might say וַיָּמָת הָאֲבִיּוֹן 'And the poor man died', without note of time except as inferred from the context ('and' = 'and then'), or, inserting note of time, וַיְהִי כִּשְׁנֵי יָמִים וַיָּמָת הָאֲבִיּוֹן 'And it came to pass, after some time (lit. "from the end of days"), that (lit. "and") the poor man died'; it would not say וַיְהִי וַיָּמָת הָאֲבִיּוֹן = ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πτωχόν (Lk. 16<sup>22</sup>). The reason why St. Luke modified his Gospel-style in this respect in Acts demands investigation. It would seem to imply a not inconsiderable interval between the two works, during which his wider intercourse with Gentile heathen in the course of his missionary labours exercised an influence on his style.

Outside Lk. and Acts ἐγένετο introducing a time-determination is only found in the five-times repeated phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν Ἰησοῦς in Mt. 7<sup>28</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>, 13<sup>53</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup>, 26<sup>1</sup>, and also in Mt. 9<sup>10</sup>, Mk. 1<sup>9</sup>, 2<sup>23</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup> (cf. 2<sup>15</sup>). In Semitic it is specifically a construction belonging to

\* With time-determination *before* ἐγένετο.

Biblical Hebrew, and not found in Aramaic except where this language copies the Hebrew construction in translation, as in the Targums.\*

These facts prove that in the construction under discussion we have a true Hebraism, which can only have entered into N. T. Greek through the influence of the LXX. Incidentally, its absence from Jn. tells against the use of the LXX by the writer of this Gospel.

2. Enforcement of verb by cognate substantive in Dative. When Hebrew desires to emphasize a verbal idea, it prefixes the Infinitive Absolute to the Finite verb. In LXX the place of the Infinitive is commonly taken by *the cognate substantive in the Dative*; e.g. Gen. 2<sup>17</sup> מוֹת תָּמוּת 'Thou shalt surely die' (lit. 'dying thou shalt die') = LXX θανάτῳ ἀποθανείσθαι, Judg. 15<sup>13</sup> לֹא כִּי־אָסַר וַיִּתְּנוּךְ בְּיָדָם 'Nay, but we will bind thee (lit. 'binding we will bind thee') and deliver thee into their hand; but we will not slay thee' (lit. 'slaying we will not slay thee') = LXX οὐχί, ὅτι ἀλλ' ἡ δεσμῶ δέησόμεν σε καὶ παραδώσομέν σε ἐν χειρὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ θανάτῳ οὐ θανατώσομέν σε. An alternative method employed by LXX is the rendering of the Infinitive by a *Participle*; e.g. Judg. 1<sup>28</sup> וְהוֹרִישׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ 'and did not expel them at all' (lit. 'and expelling did not expel them') = LXX καὶ ἐξάιρων οὐκ ἐξῆρεν αὐτόν.

No examples of the second form of the idiom are found in N. T. except in the LXX quotations Mt. 13<sup>14</sup>, Mk. 4<sup>12</sup>, Acts 7<sup>34</sup>, but the first occurs three times in the Lucan literature; viz. Lk. 22<sup>15</sup> ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, Acts 5<sup>28</sup> παραγγελία παρηγγείλαμεν, Acts 23<sup>14</sup> ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν (cf. also Acts 2<sup>30</sup> ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν).† Elsewhere in N. T. we find it only in Mt. 13<sup>14</sup>, 15<sup>4</sup> = Mk. 7<sup>10</sup> (both O. T. quotations), Jn. 3<sup>29</sup> χαρὰ χαίρει, Jas. 5<sup>17</sup> προσευχῇ προσηύξατο.

This enforcement of the verbal idea by the Infinitive, while found occasionally in other Semitic languages (cf. Babylonian *edīšu līdīš* 'let it be ever new'; Syriac ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ 'when they are completely victorious'), is peculiarly characteristic of Biblical Hebrew.‡

\* Cf. Dalman, *WJ.* p. 32.

† Acts 2<sup>17</sup> ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, which occurs in an O.T. quotation from Joel 2<sup>28</sup> (3<sup>1</sup> in Heb.) is different, the substantive representing the cognate Accusative in Heb. יְהַלְמוּם, LXX ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται.

‡ According to Dalman (*WJ.* p. 34) it is quite unknown in the Palestinian Aramaic of the Jews, apart from the Hebraizing rendering of the Targums.



3. Use of *προστίθμι* in place of *πάλιν* or a similar adverb in imitation of Hebrew *וַיִּבְרָא* 'he added' to do something, i.e. he did it *again*. There are two constructions in Hebrew: (1) the auxiliary verb *וַיִּבְרָא* may be followed by an Infinitive with preposition *ל*, e.g. *וַיִּבְרָא לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרָע* . . . *וַיִּבְרָא* 'and they added to do that which was evil' (i.e. 'they *again* did it') = LXX *καὶ προσέθεντο* . . . *ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν*, Judg. 3<sup>12</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>6</sup>; or (2) it may be followed by 'and' with a Finite verb, e.g. *וַיִּבְרָא וַיִּשָּׂא אַבְרָהָם* *וַיִּבְרָא* 'And Abraham added and took a wife' ('*again* took', or 'took a *second*') = LXX *προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα*, Gen. 25<sup>1</sup>; *וַיִּבְרָא וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלִיהוּ* *וַיִּבְרָא* 'And Elihu added and said' = LXX *Προσθεὶς δὲ Ἑλίουδς ἔτι λέγει*, Job 36<sup>1</sup>. Both of these constructions occur in the Lucan literature: (1) *καὶ προσέθετο ἕτερον πέμψαι δούλον* . . . *καὶ προσέθετο τρίτον πέμψαι*, Lk. 20<sup>11,12</sup>; *προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον*, Acts 12<sup>3</sup>; (2) *προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολήν*, Lk. 19<sup>11</sup>. The usage is not found elsewhere in N. T.\*

4. The phrase *πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην*, Lk. 7<sup>50</sup>, 8<sup>48</sup>, *ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην*, Mk. 5<sup>31</sup> (nowhere else in N. T.) is derived from the LXX rendering of the Hebrew *וַיִּשָּׂא וַיִּבְרָא*; cf. 1 Sam. 1<sup>17</sup>, 20<sup>13,42</sup>, 1 Kgs. 20 (LXX 21)<sup>18</sup>, 2 Kgs. 5<sup>19</sup>, 1 Chr. 12<sup>17</sup>, Tob. 10<sup>13</sup>, Judith 8<sup>25</sup>. The Hebrew preposition *ל* is here incorrectly given the sense *eis* which it commonly possesses. It is really an idiomatic usage known as *ל* of *norm*, *וַיִּשָּׂא* thus meaning lit. 'peace-wise' or 'health-wise', i.e. 'in peace or health'. The phrase belongs distinctively to Biblical Hebrew. The Targum Hebraizes in copying it in translation, but in the Peshittā the regular rendering is *וַיִּשָּׂא וַיִּבְרָא*, i.e. *πορεύου ἐν εἰρήνῃ*.

5. The expression *ἐνώπιον* is peculiarly characteristic of Lk. (23 times), Acts (13 times), and Apoc. which is marked by an Hebraic style (34 times). It is derived from LXX where it is extremely common (some hundreds of occurrences), and ordinarily represents Hebrew *לְפָנַי* 'before' (lit. 'to the face of'), or *לְעֵינַי* 'in the sight of' (lit. 'to the eyes of'). *ἐνώπιον* is only found once in Jn. (20<sup>30</sup>), and is unused in Mt. and Mk. In these Gospels we find *ἐμπροσθεν*, which also occurs in Lk.

*ἐναντι* (Lk. 1<sup>8</sup>, Acts 7<sup>10</sup>, 8<sup>21</sup>), *ἐναντίον* (Lk. 1<sup>6</sup>, 20<sup>26</sup>, 24<sup>19</sup>, Acts 7<sup>10</sup>, 8<sup>22</sup>), exclusively Lucan in N. T., are both very common in LXX, where they ordinarily render *לְעֵינַי* 'in the sight of' (lit. 'in the eyes of'),

\* Cf. however the text of D in Mk. 14<sup>26</sup>, *οὐ μὴ προσθῶ πικρῶν*.

i.e. 'in the *opinion* of'. Hebrew always observes a distinction between 'לְעֵינַי' 'in the (physical) sight of', and 'לְעֵינַי' 'in the (mental) sight of'. The same distinction may be noticed for the most part in the N. T. use of ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον.

In place of the distinctively Hebraic expressions לְפָנַי, לְעֵינַי, בְּעֵינַי, Aramaic uses בְּרִי, 'before', 'in front of'.

6. The phrase πρὸ προσώπου, which is a common LXX rendering of לְפָנַי, occurs in the O. T. quotation Mk. 1<sup>2</sup> = Mt. 11<sup>10</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>27</sup>, and only besides in Lk. 1<sup>76</sup>, 9<sup>52</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>, Acts 13<sup>24</sup>. ἀπὸ προσώπου = לְפָנַי in LXX is found in Acts 3<sup>19</sup>, 5<sup>41</sup>, 7<sup>45</sup>, 2 Thess. 1<sup>9</sup>, Apoc. 6<sup>16</sup>, 20<sup>11</sup> (ἀπὸ τοῦ π.). ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Lk. 21<sup>35</sup>, ἐπὶ προσώπου Acts 17<sup>26</sup>, are LXX renderings of לְפָנַי.

7. The phrase τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν, Lk. 9<sup>51</sup> (nowhere else in N. T.) is derived from LXX, where it renders Hebrew שֵׁם לִפְנֵי 'set the face' (Jer. 21<sup>10</sup>, Ezek. 6<sup>3</sup>, 13<sup>17</sup>, 14<sup>8</sup>, 15<sup>7</sup>, &c.).

8. λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, Lk. 20<sup>21</sup>, Gal. 2<sup>6</sup> occurs 9 times in LXX as the rendering of Hebrew שֵׁם לִפְנֵי 'take or lift up the face' of any one, i.e. show him partiality in judgement. More commonly this phrase is rendered in LXX by θανμάζειν πρόσωπον. The Semitic phrase occurs in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew. The N. T. substantives προσωπολήμπτῃς 'a respecter of persons' (Acts 10<sup>35</sup>), προσωποληψία (Rom. 2<sup>11</sup>, Eph. 6<sup>9</sup>, Col. 3<sup>35</sup>, Jas. 2<sup>1</sup>) 'partiality', are derived from the LXX Hebraism.

9. The use of the verb δίδωμι in a wider range of senses, which may be rendered 'put', 'set', 'appoint', 'allow', &c., appears in N. T. to be exclusively Lucan; cf. Lk. 7<sup>41</sup>, 12<sup>51.58</sup>, 15<sup>22</sup>, 19<sup>23</sup>, Acts 2<sup>19</sup> (quotation from Joel 3<sup>3</sup>), 2<sup>27</sup>, 13<sup>35</sup> (both quotations from Ps 16<sup>10</sup>), 10<sup>40</sup>, 19<sup>31</sup>. This usage comes from LXX where δίδωμι is the regular rendering of Hebrew יָדַן which, meaning primarily 'give', is regularly used also in such wider senses. Cf. the LXX rendering in Gen. 17<sup>20</sup> δώσω αὐτὸν εἰς ἔθνος μέγα, Gen. 31<sup>7</sup> οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς κακοποιῆσαί με, Deut. 1<sup>13</sup> δότε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνδρας σοφοὺς, Deut. 2<sup>25</sup> ἐνάρχον δοῦναι τὸν τρόπον σου. Such instances might be indefinitely multiplied.

These examples should serve clearly to illustrate the character of N. T. Hebraisms derived from the Greek of the LXX. We observe that they are characteristically Lucan, and in some cases exclusively so. Other N. T. Hebraisms may be found in the Greek of the Apocalypse (cf. Dr. Charles's Commentary, Index II),

and these owe their origin to a different cause, viz. first-hand imitation of Biblical Hebrew style—a cause which was perhaps also operative in the Birth-narrative of Lk. The Marcan Aramaisms collected by Canon Allen in the article mentioned by Prof. Schmiedel are wholly different in character; and the statement that they only prove that this evangelist ‘wrote a kind of Jewish Greek that he had derived from a reading of the LXX’ is most misleading. For example, one of Canon Allen’s most striking Aramaisms is the very frequent use of the Historic Present in Mk., which he rightly ascribes to the influence of the Aramaic usage of the Participle in narrative (cf. pp. 87 ff. of the present volume). How could this usage have been derived from reading the LXX, when, as Sir John Hawkins has shown (*HS.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 213), it is there comparatively rare? The total occurrences in the whole LXX are 337, and of these 232 occur in the four Books of Kingdoms, leaving only 105 for the whole of the rest of the LXX. ‘Out of the 232 instances in the four books of Kingdoms, the First Book (= 1 Samuel) contains very nearly two-thirds, viz. 151, which happens to be exactly the same number as Mark contains. But then 1 Kingdoms exceeds Mark in length by about one-third, as may be seen by comparing the two books in the pages of any English Bible—e.g. in the R.V. minion 8vo 1885, in which 1 Sam. occupies 26 pages, and Mark (without the Appendix) about 15 pages and a half. Consequently it appears that the historic presents are scattered considerably more thickly over the pages of the latter than of the former, the average to a page being in 1 Sam. about 6 and in Mark between 9 and 10’ (*HS.*<sup>2</sup> *loc. cit.*) Moreover, the same scholar has proved, in the most conclusive manner, in dealing with the Synoptists and the LXX, that Mark is considerably the least familiar with this version, Matthew occupies an intermediate place, while Luke shows most familiarity with it (*HS.*<sup>2</sup> pp. 198 ff.).

The marking of the distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms may thus be seen to be a matter of fundamental importance to our inquiry. If Aramaic and Hebrew were so similar in structure and phraseology that close translations made from the two languages, or original Greek compositions influenced by their style, were practically indistinguishable, then it might not

matter whether the stylistic peculiarities of such documents were classed as Aramaisms or Hebraisms; though even so—since such phenomena would properly rank as the common property of two (if not more) languages of the Semitic group—it would scientifically be more correct to describe them as *Semitisms*. It is true that Aramaic and Hebrew, having sprung from a common ancestor, do in fact exhibit a considerable number of such common characteristics, the occurrence of which in isolated Greek passages of brief length might leave us in doubt whether the influencing factor was the one language or the other. In dealing, however, with Greek works such as the Gospels, we are concerned not with brief sentences but with lengthy documents; and if so be that in any of these we have actual or virtual translation from a Semitic original, the distinction between Aramaic style and Hebrew style is bound to assert itself.\*

If, then, we find a New Testament document such as St. Mark's Gospel, which lacks the clearly-marked Hebraisms of the Lucan literature—unmistakably derived from the LXX, and at the same time contains different marks of Semitic style which can only be referred to Aramaic, the conclusion should surely be obvious. Here we have the work, not of a Hellenist who studied the LXX, but of a Palestinian Jew who either actually wrote in Aramaic, or whose mind was so moulded by Aramaic idiom that his Greek perforce reflected it. Such a work is naturally found to contain, together with the specific Aramaisms, a number of Semitisms which may be paralleled both from Aramaic and Hebrew, and which may or may not be reflected in the Greek of the LXX. But it is the specific Aramaisms which must determine the character of the work (Palestinian and not Hellenistic). The other Semitisms serve but to add weight after the conclusion has been drawn.†

\* In speaking of 'Hebrew style' it may be well to reiterate the fact that we are referring to Biblical or Classical Hebrew. The 'New' Hebrew employed in the Mishna and Midrashim, which was the language of the Rabbinic Schools at or about the Christian era and subsequently, is structurally nearer akin to Aramaic than to Hebrew. This artificial product, however, fulfilled much the same function as did the dog-Latin employed by scholars in the Middle Ages, and there is no reason for supposing that it ever came into popular use.

† Cf. Allen, 'The Aramaic Element in St. Mark', *Expository Times*, xiii (1902), pp. 328 ff., an article which effectively disposes of the criticisms of Schmiedel.

Whether the Marcan Aramaisms prove actual translation from an original Aramaic document, as distinct from the virtual translation of a writer who, though using Greek as his medium of expression, is casting his words in the Aramaic mould which is more familiar to him, is a question which still remains open. The present writer, comparing the evidence for an Aramaic Marcan document with that which he himself adduces in this volume for an Aramaic Fourth Gospel, feels that the case for the former is not of equal cogency with that for the latter. To a large extent, as is natural, the evidence for the two works runs upon identical lines; and here the argument for Jn. is materially strengthened by the parallel usages of Mk. There is, however, a still larger mass of evidence which can be cited for Jn. to which no adequate analogue exists in Mk. Examination of the usages discussed in the present volume will be found to yield the following results:

*Usages common to Jn. and Mk.*

Parataxis (p. 56).  
 Frequency of Historic Present (p. 87).  
 Frequency of Imperfect ἔλεγεν, ἔλεγον (p. 92).  
 Sparse use of δέ, and preference for καί (p. 69).  
 ἵνα = conjunctive 'that' (p. 70).  
 πρὸς = 'with' (p. 28).

*Usages of Jn. found more rarely in Mk.*

Asyndeton\* (p. 49).  
*Casus pendens*† (p. 63).  
 καί linking contrasted statements = 'and yet'‡ (p. 66).  
 ἵνα mistranslation of ἵ relative. One case in Mk. (p. 76).  
 ὅτι mistranslation of ἵ relative. Two cases in Mk. (p. 77).  
 Relative completed by a Pronoun. Two cases in Mk. (p. 84).  
 οὐ μὴ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα = 'never'. Two parallels in Mk. (p. 99).  
 πιστεύειν εἰς. One case in Mk. (p. 34).

\* Allen quotes Asyndeton as characteristic of Mk. (*St. Mark*, pp. 18 f.), but his instances bear no comparison with the frequency of the usage in Jn.

† The present writer has noted only Mk. 6<sup>16</sup>, 7<sup>20</sup>, 12<sup>10</sup>, 13<sup>11</sup>.

‡ The only cases collected from Mk. are 4<sup>32</sup>, 5<sup>20, 31</sup>, 14<sup>49</sup>.

To these may be added an Aramaism of which one case occurs in each, viz. :

Anticipation of Genitive by Possessive Pronoun (p. 85).

*Usages characteristic of Jn. not found in Mk.*

Frequency of Personal Pronouns (p. 79).

Frequency of Emphatic Demonstratives οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος (p. 82).

ἵνα mistranslation of ܐܝܢܐ = 'when' (p. 77).

ὅτι mistranslation of ܐܝܢܐ = 'when' (p. 78).

ἔρχομαι Present as *Futurum instans* (p. 94).

οὐ . . . ἄνθρωπος = 'no one' (p. 99).

ἵνα μή employed to the exclusion of μήποτε (pp. 69, 100).

To these may be added an Aramaism of which one case only occurs in Jn., viz. :

Anticipation of direct Object of verb by Pronoun (p. 86).

Two cases of a construction which is Hebraic rather than Aramaic, viz. :

Change of construction after Participle (p. 96).

The Marcan usages noted above which find parallels in Jn. do not exhaust the Aramaisms of Mk. Others are cited by Allen (cf. *St. Mark*, pp. 48 ff.) and by Wellhausen (*Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 7 ff.), of which the most noteworthy are the frequent use of the adverbial πολλά = ܠܝܬܝܢܐ, and of the auxiliary ἤρξατο, -αυτο = ܐܝܢܐ; but they are not equally impressive because—though they fit in with the theory of translation from an Aramaic original—they are the kind of Aramaisms which might naturally be introduced by a writer of Greek whose native tongue was Aramaic. We may also note the fact that the Κοινή construction ἵνα = conjunctive 'that' which characterizes Mk. (though to a less extent than Jn.) is a usage which an Aramaic-speaking writer of Greek would naturally tend to exaggerate. On the other hand, the use of ἵνα in place of a relative, which can scarcely be understood except on the theory of mistranslation, while frequent in Jn. (cf. pp. 75 f.), occurs but once in Mk. What is needed to substantiate the theory of an Aramaic original for Mk. is some cogent evidence of mistranslation; and this has not as yet been advanced. In contrast, the writer believes that the evidence which he has collected in

Chap. VII in proof of mistranslation in Jn. must be recognized, on the whole, as exceedingly weighty.

Granted, however, the possibility of an Aramaic original for the Fourth Gospel, the question naturally arises—What evidence do we possess sufficient to enable us to prove this theory, and in a measure to reconstruct the original text?

The evidence is naturally drawn from our knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic at or about the period at which the Gospel is presumably to be dated.\* The following are the main sources of our knowledge:

1. The Aramaic sections of the O.T., viz. Jer. 10<sup>11</sup>, Ezr. 4<sup>a</sup>—6<sup>18</sup>, 7<sup>12-26</sup>, Dan. 2<sup>4b</sup>—7<sup>28</sup>. The Ezra-sections, if they are what they profess to be, date from the middle of the fifth century B.C.† The Book of Daniel is dated with approximate certainty under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, 168–167 B.C. The dialect of 2<sup>4b</sup>—7<sup>28</sup> is W. Aramaic, and is practically identical with that of the Ezra-sections, exhibiting affinities to the dialects of the Palmyrene and Nabataean inscriptions which date from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D.‡ This source is therefore of great value as closely approximating to what must have been the type of Aramaic spoken in Palestine in the first century of the Christian era.

2. The Targums or Aramaic paraphrases of the O.T. The synagogue-practice of expounding the Hebrew text of the O.T. by an Aramaic paraphrase is undoubtedly very ancient. Both the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds understand the term *תרגום* in Neh. 8<sup>8</sup>—R.V. 'And they read in the book, in the law of God *distinctly* (marg. *with an interpretation*); and they gave the sense, so that they understood the reading'—as referring to the use of

\* On this subject the standard work is Dr. G. Dalman's *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*. Cf. especially pp. 5–40. This may usefully be supplemented by the discussion in the same writer's *The Words of Jesus*, pp. 79–88.

† Ezr. 4<sup>a-28</sup>, though inserted into a section which relates the efforts of the Samaritans to thwart Zerubbabel's rebuilding of the Temple in the latter part of the sixth century B.C., really relates to the interruptions caused by the Samaritans and other enemies of the Jews to the project of the rebuilding of the city-walls, probably shortly before the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (444 B.C.) when Nehemiah intervened and secured the support of the Persian king. Cf. Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O.T.* p. 547.

‡ Cf. Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O.T.* pp. 503 ff.

an Aramaic paraphrase;\* and this view, though disputed, has something to be said in its favour.† If, however, the practice of

\* Cf. Bab. Megilla 3*a*; Nedarim 37*b*; Jerus. Megilla 74*d*. The same explanation is given in Midrash Bereshith Rabba, par. xxxvi. 12.

† Cf. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii, p. 74, who compares the use of מִפְּרָשׁ in the words of the Persian king's rescript in Ezr. 4<sup>18</sup>, עֲלֵינָא מִפְּרָשׁ, i.e. most naturally, 'The letter which ye sent unto us hath been read before me in translation', i.e. translated from Aramaic into Persian. The principal rival explanation (offered by Dr. Bertholet) is 'divided' (sc. into sections), i.e. 'section by section'; and on this explanation the following words יְשׁוּם שְׁכָל 'and giving the sense' may refer to an Aramaic paraphrase. The synagogue-custom as known to us was to read a verse of the Law in the Hebrew and follow it by the Aramaic paraphrase. In the Prophets three verses might be read together and followed by the Aramaic rendering.

Even in pre-exilic times (cf. 2 Kgs. 18<sup>26</sup>) Aramaic was the *lingua franca* of international communication. It must have been widely used, along with Babylonian, in the Neo-Babylonian kingdom. Cuneiform tablets of the late Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Achaemenian periods bear Aramaic dockets; and scribes or secretaries were employed for the purpose of writing Aramaic upon parchment along with those whose business it was to write Babylonian in cuneiform upon clay tablets (cf. the writer's *Judges*, pp. 255, 495). Probably Aramaic was the exclusive medium of intercourse between the exiled Jews and their captors, and was used by them in commercial dealings with foreigners. Thus the Jews who returned from exile must have come back with a knowledge of Aramaic at least as thorough as was their knowledge of Hebrew, and must have found that in Palestine Aramaic had established itself and gained ground owing to the mixture of races and the decay of national feeling among the Jews who had remained in Palestine.

The fact that Hebrew of a more or less classical character remained the literary language of the Jews to within at least a century before the Christian era does not of course imply that it was widely and generally *spoken* by the Jews up to that period. That it *was* understood and spoken in the earlier post-exilic period is implied by the fact that e.g. the prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, which were intended for a popular audience, are written in Hebrew; and by the allusion in Neh. 13<sup>24</sup>, which shows, however, at the same time, how easy the condition of affairs made it for the less precise Jews to drop Hebrew and adopt another language.

All that we can say, then, with any certainty, is that after the return from exile Hebrew and Aramaic must for a time have been used concurrently by the Jews. Religious, national, and literary feeling strove for the retention of Hebrew; but external influence making itself felt in the exigencies of daily life favoured the advance of Aramaic, and gradually led to its general adoption. Literary and cultivated Jews read Hebrew, and no doubt spoke it to some extent among themselves at least for some time after the return. The mass of the people who did not read books came more and more to speak Aramaic exclusively and to lose the knowledge of Hebrew.



using a Targum is not to be carried so far back as the days of Ezra, the fact that it became customary long before the Christian era is at any rate not in dispute.

The date at which written Targums first came into existence cannot certainly be determined.\* It is related that in the fourth century A.D. Samuel ben Isaac once entered a synagogue, and seeing a scribe reading the Targum from a book, admonished him thus: 'This is forbidden thee; for that which is received orally must only be delivered orally, and only that which is received in writing may be read from the book' (Jerus. Megilla iv. 1). There is, however, considerably older evidence for the existence of written Targums—for private reading and not for public worship. The Mishna† states that portions of the text of the Bible were 'written as a Targum' (Yadaim iv. 5); and there exists a Tannaitic‡ tradition that a Targum of the Book of Job existed in the days of Gamaliel the Elder (the grandson of Hillel and instructor of St. Paul; cf. Acts 5<sup>4ff.</sup>, 22<sup>3</sup>), and after being withdrawn from use by his orders, reappeared in the days of his grandson Gamaliel II.§ The Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, which became the official Targum of the Babylonian schools, must have been committed to writing and finally redacted at least as early as the third century A.D., since its Masora dates from the first half of that century. Two Palestinian Amoraim of the third century advised their congregation to read the Hebrew text of the Parasha (section of the Pentateuch read as lesson) twice in private and the Targum once, according to the practice of public worship. Joshua ben Levi commended this practice to his sons (Berakhoth 8 b), while Ammi, a pupil of Johanan, made it a rule

\* See on this subject Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii, pp. 88 ff., and the admirable article 'Targum' by Dr. W. Bacher in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

† The Mishna (i.e. 'Repetition' of the Law, or in a wider sense its *Exposition*) was compiled towards the end of the second century A.D.

‡ The Tannaim ('Teachers') were the Rabbinic authorities of the first two centuries of the Christian era whose work is embodied in the Mishna. They were succeeded by the Amoraim ('Speakers' or 'Interpreters'), third to fifth centuries A.D., who chiefly concerned themselves with the exposition of the Mishna. The outcome of this work was the Gemara, 'Supplement' or 'Complement' of the Mishna, which, together with the latter, forms the Talmud.

§ Cf. the passage from Tosefta Shabbath, ch. xiv, quoted by Berliner, *op. cit.* p. 89.

generally binding (*ib.* 8*a*). 'These two dicta were especially instrumental in authorizing the custom of reciting the Targum.'\* Thus we may gather how the practice of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures in Aramaic, at one time presumably dependent upon the extempore skill of the individual M<sup>e</sup>thurg<sup>e</sup>man, gradually assumed a fixed form; first, no doubt, orally, then in written shape.

The principal Targums which concern us are as follows:

The so-called Targum of Onkelos† on the Pentateuch. This is sometimes called the Babylonian Targum, as adopted and standardized in Babylonia not later, as we have seen, than the third century A.D. While exhibiting certain Babylonian peculiarities in diction, it 'is composed in a dialect fundamentally Palestinian'.‡ Its contents prove that it must have been drawn up in Palestine in the second century, since both its Halakhic and Haggadic elements§ exhibit the influence of the school of Akiba (who perished in the rebellion of Bar Cokhba, A.D. 135) and other prominent Tannaim.||

The Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch is, as it has come down to us, much later in date. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan is wrongly assigned to Jonathan (the reputed author of the Targum of the Prophets), possibly through mistaken interpretation of the abbreviation י"ח = *Targum Yerushalmi*, Jerusalem Targum, as *Targum Yehonathan*. As finally redacted it is not earlier than the seventh century A.D., but it is thought to contain many elements which are older than the Targum of Onkelos.¶ Comparison of these two Targums yields evidence that they were originally identical, their agreement being often *verbatim*.

\* Cf. Bacher, *op. cit.* p. 58.

† The name אונקלוס Onkelos appears to have arisen through confusion made in Bab. Megilla iii. 1 of a reference in Jerus. Megilla i. 11 to the Greek translation of Aquila אקילס Akylas. Cf. Berliner, *op. cit.* pp. 92 ff.

‡ Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. xxvii, quoted by Bacher, *op. cit.* p. 59*a*.

§ *Hālākhā* ('walking' or 'way'; so 'custom') is the exposition and application of the legal elements of Scripture; *Haggādā* ('narration') the elaboration of its historical and didactic portions.

|| Cf. Berliner, *op. cit.* p. 107.

¶ Dalman, *Gramm.* pp. 21 ff., and *WJ.* pp. 84 f., disputes this inference, holding the most primitive elements to be 'exactly the parts taken from the Onkelos Targum'.

In addition to the complete Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan there survive fragments of a Jerusalem Targum, apparently not all contemporaneous. In the view of Dr. Bacher, 'Both the Pseudo-Jonathan and the fragments contain much that has survived from a very early period; indeed the nucleus of the Palestinian Targum is older than the Babylonian which was redacted from it' (*op. cit.* p. 61 a).

The Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets\* is assigned by tradition to Jonathan ben Uzziel, who was Hillel's most famous pupil. The history of its transmission appears to follow the same lines as that of the Targum of Onkelos. Palestinian in origin (as is expressly stated in the Bab. Talmud), it gained official recognition in Babylonia in the third century A.D. It is frequently quoted by Joseph, the head of the Academy of Pumbeditha in Babylonia in the early part of the fourth century A.D., who, in referring to Isa. 8<sup>6</sup> and Zech. 12<sup>11</sup>, remarks that 'if there were no Targum to it, we should not know the meaning of these verses' (Sanhedrin 94 b; Moed Qaton 28 b; Megilla 3 a). Such reference implies the recognition of the Prophetic Targum as an ancient authority.

These Targums—and especially the Targums of Onkelos and of Jonathan on the Prophets—are of great value to us as illustrating the Palestinian Aramaic of the early centuries of the Christian era. Though, in the form in which we know them, they are later than the first century, they embody material which—whether in written or oral form—must have come down from that period; and from the linguistic point of view it is clear that they are faithful witnesses. Their dialect is closely allied to the dialect of the Book of Daniel, such slight differences as exist being mainly orthographical.† The only drawback to their use is that, being translations of Hebrew, they tend at times to Hebraize their Aramaic; but instances of this tendency are not difficult to detect, and are unlikely, therefore, to lead us astray.‡

\* The term 'Prophets' is of course used in the Jewish sense, including the four historical books known as 'the Former Prophets', viz. Josh., Judg., Sam., and Kgs.

† Cf. Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O.T.* p. 503; Nöldeke in *Encycl. Bibl.* 283.

‡ Cf. e.g. the passages cited on pp. 61 ff. On Hebraisms in the Targums cf. Dalman, *WJ.* p. 83.

3. The Palestinian (so-called Jerusalem) Talmud and the Midrashim contain short sections—stories and the like—in Aramaic interspersed amid the New Hebrew in which they are for the most part written. These Aramaic sections are the latest portions of these works, dating from the fourth to the sixth centuries A.D. They are clearly in the dialect of the people, and such linguistic peculiarities as this dialect exhibits connects it with Galilee rather than with Judaea.\*

4. The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, of unknown date, exhibits an Aramaic dialect akin to that of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim. As offering us the text of a great part of the Gospels translated into Palestinian Aramaic this Lectionary is of considerable interest. Like the Targums, however, in relation to the Hebrew text, it shows a certain tendency to adapt its language to its Greek original.

In addition to these Palestinian Aramaic sources, we may gain not inconsiderable aid through comparison of the ancient Syriac versions of the O. and N.T., making, of course, such allowances as are necessary for the dialectical differences between Eastern and Western Aramaic. The Peshittā translation of the O.T. is undoubtedly very ancient. Made directly from the Hebrew, it exhibits the traditions of Jewish exegesis, as appears from the points of connexion which it offers with Targumic renderings.† It may well have been the work of Jewish scholars, and can hardly be later than the early second century A.D., if so late. As compared with the Targums, it exhibits less of a tendency to accommodate its language to the Hebrew constructions of the original.

No Syriac version of the N.T. is as old as that of the O.T. We know that Tatian made his Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels (τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον), in Greek, and that this was translated into Syriac during his lifetime, c. A.D. 170.‡ It

\* Cf. Dalman, *Gramm.* pp. 12 ff., 31 ff.

† Cf. the illustrations of this tendency collected by Dr. Driver in his *Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, pp. lxxi f., and by the present writer in his *Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Kings*, pp. xxxiv f., and *Book of Judges*, p. cxxviii.

‡ For authorities cf. Dr. Nestle's article 'Syriac Versions' in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible*, iv, p. 646 a. The view that the Diatessaron was first composed in

continued in use at Edessa till the fifth century, when Rabbula, bishop of Edessa (A.D. 411-35), prepared a revision of the text of the separate Gospels (called *Evangelion da-M<sup>o</sup>pharr<sup>o</sup>shē*, 'Gospel of the Separate'), and ordered its substitution for the Diatessaron (*Evangelion da-M<sup>o</sup>hall<sup>o</sup>lē*, 'Gospel of the Mixed'), and the collection and confiscation of the copies of the latter. This was carried out with such thoroughness that no copy of the Syriac Diatessaron has survived, and we only know the work through an Armenian translation of St. Ephrem's Commentary upon it, and a late Arabic translation in which the text has been accommodated to that of the Peshittā.

Dr. Burkitt has shown that Syrian writers prior to Rabbula used the *Evangelion da-M<sup>o</sup>pharr<sup>o</sup>shē*,\* which has survived to us in the fragmentary remains of a recension of the Four Gospels discovered and edited by Dr. Cureton in 1858, and in the (nearly complete) palimpsest of the Gospels discovered by Mrs. Lewis at the convent on Mount Sinai in 1892; and further, that Rabbula, when he forbade the use of the Diatessaron, made a revision of this separate version of the Gospels in conformity with the Greek text current at Antioch at the beginning of the fifth century. This appears to have been the origin of the N.T. Peshittā. He has also shown that the *Evangelion da-M<sup>o</sup>pharr<sup>o</sup>shē* used the O.T. Peshittā, and must therefore be later than it.† His conclusion is that the Diatessaron was the earliest form of the N.T. possessed by the Syrian Church, the *Evangelion da-M<sup>o</sup>pharr<sup>o</sup>shē* being dated by him c. A.D. 200. According to this view the early Christian Church at Edessa had no N.T. prior to the Diatessaron in A.D. 170. 'For the first generation of Syriac-speaking Christians the Law and the Prophets sufficed.'‡ This is a conclusion which is open to question, and it may be that the old version represented by the Sinaitic and Curetonian should be placed at an earlier date.

The Old Syriac and Peshittā versions of the N.T., as well as

Greek and then translated into Syriac appears to be more probable than that it was originally composed in Syriac. Cf. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii, p. 206. For the latter view cf. J. F. Stenning in Hastings's *DB.*, v, p. 452.

\* Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii, pp. 101 ff.

† *op. cit.* pp. 201 ff.

‡ *op. cit.* p. 212.

the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, are of great value to our inquiry as illustrating Aramaic constructions in relation to the Greek of the Gospels. When, for example, we get a varying Greek construction, one form of which we suspect of being an Aramaism, and the Syriac versions render both alike in accordance with our suspected Aramaism, our primary inference receives strong confirmation. There are many instances of this in the Fourth Gospel (cf. e. g. pp. 72 ff.).

The *Acta Thomae*, an original Syriac work \* of fairly early date (early third century A.D.†) is sometimes used in the following pages for purposes of illustration.

The evidence which is brought forward in this volume in proof that the Greek text of the Fourth Gospel is a translation from Aramaic is concerned with the broad general characteristics of the Aramaic language, and does not depend upon dialectal details. Though dialects of the language may be distinguished, belonging to different places and different periods, their distinctive characteristics (if we except the earliest monuments of the language, of the 9th-8th centuries B.C.) are but slight in comparison with the common features which unite all branches of the language. Thus the exact dialectal form of the original which we presuppose is a matter of minor importance. We may have doubts as to the precise word or verbal termination or suffix which we should select; we can have no reasonable doubt as to constructions which properly characterize the language as a whole.

\* The fact that this work was originally written in Syriac has been conclusively proved by Dr. Burkitt in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, i, pp. 280 ff.; ii, p. 429; iii, p. 94.

† Cf. R. Duval, *La Littérature syriaque*, pp. 98 ff.

## CHAPTER I

### PRELIMINARY TESTING OF THE THEORY BY EXAMINATION OF THE PROLOGUE

As a preliminary to the classified discussion of particular usages, it is instructive to take the Prologue of the Gospel and examine it verse by verse. Thus we may gain at the outset a clearer conception of the texture of the writer's language as a whole; and, when we come to classify, may realize that we are not dealing merely with isolated phenomena, but with illustrations of a continuous characteristic which admits of but one explanation—the theory of an Aramaic original.

*vv.* <sup>1,2</sup>. The phrase *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* in the sense 'with God' is remarkable, as Westcott observes. He cites the parallel usage in Mt. 13<sup>56</sup>, Mk. 6<sup>3</sup>, 9<sup>19</sup>, 14<sup>49</sup>, Lk. 9<sup>11</sup>, 1 Jn. 1<sup>2</sup>. The last of these passages is an echo of the Gospel-prologue, presumably by the same author—*ἦτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. With regard to the Synoptic instances we notice (1) that they are all from the Marcan source, and (2) that Mt. 17<sup>17</sup>, Lk. 22<sup>53</sup> alter Mark's *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* to the more natural *μεθ' ὑμῶν*, while Mt. 26<sup>55</sup> omits the phrase altogether. The parallel passages are as follows :

- { Mk. 6<sup>3</sup> *καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς* ;
- { Mt. 13<sup>56</sup> *καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσὶν* ;
- { Mk. 9<sup>19</sup> *ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι* ;
- { Mt. 17<sup>17</sup> *ἕως πότε μεθ' ὑμῶν ἔσομαι* ;
- { Lk. 9<sup>11</sup> *ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς* ;
- { Mk. 14<sup>49</sup> *καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων*.
- { Mt. 26<sup>55</sup> *καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμενον διδάσκων*.
- { Lk. 22<sup>53</sup> *καθ' ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*.

Clearly, then, we are dealing with a phrase confined in the Gospels to the Marcan source and to Jn. which was so far strange

to the other Synoptists that they were moved on occasions to alter or expunge it. The view that it may represent an Aramaic phrase is at once suggested by the fact that it occurs three times in Mk., for which on other grounds an Aramaic original, or at any rate Aramaic influence, has been postulated. In Aramaic the common preposition ܠܐ (possibly akin to the verb ܠܐ 'join') denotes (1) connexion with, *apud*, *παρά*, (2) motion towards, *ad*, *πρός*. It may be suggested that feeling for the second meaning so commonly borne by ܠܐ has moved the translator of an Aramaic original to represent the preposition by *πρός* even when used in the former sense.\*

The usage of *πρός* = 'with' is frequent in St. Paul; cf. 1 Thess. 3<sup>1</sup>, 2 Thess. 2<sup>5</sup>, 3<sup>10</sup>, 1 Cor. 16<sup>6,7</sup>, 2 Cor. 5<sup>8</sup>, 11<sup>9</sup>, Gal. 1<sup>18</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, 4<sup>18,20</sup>, Phil. 1<sup>26</sup>, Philem.<sup>13</sup>. There are, however, many other indications that this Apostle's language is tinged with Aramaic influence.

v. 4. *ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν*. This reading has the consensus of early attestation, the punctuation which connects *ὁ γέγονεν* with the preceding sentence seeming 'to be little if at all earlier than Cent. IV' (WH.). Yet, as is well known, considerable difficulty has arisen in connexion with the interpretation, 'That which hath been made in Him was life'. The Aramaic equivalent would be (ܠܐ) ܕܗܝ ܚܝܐ ܒܝܗ ܕܝܗ. Here the opening ܕ, answering to 'that which', might equally well bear the meaning 'inasmuch as, since, because'; cf. the use of ܕ in Dan. 2<sup>41</sup> ܕܝܝܚܝܬܝܗ 'And *inasmuch as* thou sawest'; 2<sup>20</sup> ܕܝ ܗܚܝܬܝܗ ܕܝܚܝܬܝܗ 'because wisdom and might belongeth unto Him'. The Heb. relative אשר often bears the same sense. Adopting this interpretation, we obtain the meaning, 'Because in Him was life'; and this admirably suits the connexion—He was the source of all creation because He Himself was Life.

v. 5. *καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν*. The difficulty of *κατέλαβεν* is familiar. Dr. Ball, in his article

\* It was only after finishing this chapter that the writer noticed that the facts that *πρός* here = Aram. ܠܐ, and that the other Gospel-occurrences emanate from the Marcan source with its Aram. background, had been anticipated by Dr. Rendel Harris in the first of a series of articles on 'The origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel' in the *Expositor*, xii (1916), pp. 156 f. The coincidence in conclusion serves to prove that it is unmistakable for an Aramaic scholar.



mentioned in the Introduction, has made the brilliant suggestion that confusion may have arisen in Aramaic between the Aph'el form אֶקְבִּיל *'aḳbēl* 'darken' and the Pa'el form קִבֵּיל *kabbēl* from an outwardly identical root, meaning 'receive, take'. It may be further noted that in Syriac the latter root actually occurs in the Aph'el in the sense 'receive'—cf. Lk. 15<sup>27</sup> in Sin. and Pesh. ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'because he hath received him whole' (cf. other instances cited by Payne Smith, 3470). The difference between ܐܠܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'obscured it not' and ܐܠܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ *αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν* is slight; and if the construction was the common one of the participle with the substantive verb, ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'was not obscuring it', there would, in an unvocalized text, be no distinction between ܡܠܟܐ 'obscuring' and ܡܠܟܐ 'receiving'. The sense 'darken' is equally suitable to Jn. 12<sup>35</sup> *ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ*, ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'that darkness shroud you not'.

υ. <sup>6</sup>. ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος . . . ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης, i. e. . . . ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ. 'Whose name was' is only elsewhere so expressed in N.T. in *ch.* 3<sup>1</sup> ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, Apoc. 6<sup>3</sup> ἵππος χλωρός· καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος, Apoc. 9<sup>11</sup> τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου· ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν.

Elsewhere in N.T. the ordinary expression is ὀνόματι (classical); cf. Matt. 27<sup>32</sup>, Mk. 5<sup>22</sup>, Lk. 1<sup>5</sup>, 5<sup>27</sup>, 10<sup>38</sup>, 16<sup>10</sup>, 23<sup>50</sup>, 24<sup>18</sup>, Acts 5<sup>1,34</sup>, 8<sup>9</sup>, 9<sup>10,11,12,33,36</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>, 11<sup>28</sup>, 12<sup>13</sup>, 16<sup>1,14</sup>, 17<sup>34</sup>, 18<sup>2,7,24</sup>, 19<sup>24</sup>, 20<sup>9</sup>, 21<sup>10</sup>, 27<sup>1</sup>, 28<sup>7</sup> (30 occurrences). Other expressions are: ὀνόματι καλούμενος, Lk. 19<sup>2</sup>; καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, Lk. 1<sup>5</sup>; ὃ (ἧ) ὄνομα, Lk. 1<sup>26,27</sup>, 2<sup>25</sup>, 8<sup>41</sup>, 24<sup>13</sup>, Acts 13<sup>6</sup>; οὗ τὸ ὄνομα, Mk. 14<sup>32</sup>.

Pal. Syr. renders the Gospel-occurrences of ὀνόματι by ܡܠܟܐ 'his name', ܡܠܟܐ? 'who his name' (i.e. 'whose name'), ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ 'and his name'. Pesh. renders ὀνόματι by ܡܠܟܐ? (ܡܠܟܐ?) 'who his (her) name', ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ? 'who his name was', and once (Acts 16<sup>14</sup>) ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ 'her name was'. ὀνόματι καλούμενος, Lk. 19<sup>2</sup> = Pal. Syr. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ? 'who his name was called', Pesh. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ? 'who his name was'. καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, Lk. 1<sup>5</sup> = Pal. Syr. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ 'and her name', Pesh. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ 'her name was'. ὃ ὄνομα, Lk. 1<sup>27</sup> = Pal. Syr. caret, Pesh. ܡܠܟܐ? 'who his name'; Lk. 2<sup>25</sup> = Pal. Syr. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ? 'who was his name' (i.e. 'whose name was'), Pesh. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ 'his name was'; Lk. 8<sup>41</sup> =

Pal. Syr. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'who his name'; Acts 13<sup>6</sup> = Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'who his name was'. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, Lk. 1<sup>26</sup>, 24<sup>13</sup> = Pal. Syr. (1<sup>26</sup> caret) ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'which its name'. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, Mk. 14<sup>32</sup> = Pal. Syr. caret, Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'that which was called'. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, Jn. 1<sup>6</sup> = Pal. Syr. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'who his name', Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'his name'; Jn. 3<sup>1</sup> = Pal. Syr. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'his name', Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'his name was'; Rev. 6<sup>8</sup> = Pesh. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'name to it'; Rev. 9<sup>11</sup> = ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'which, name to it'.

In the Aramaic parts of the O.T. we find, Ezr. 5<sup>14</sup> ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'and they were given to Sheshbazzar his name' (i.e. 'to one whose name was S.');

Dan. 2<sup>26</sup>, 4<sup>5,16</sup> ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'who his name Belteshazzar'.

The Hebrew modes of expressing 'whose name was N.' are two, viz. (1) 'and his name N.', Gen. 24<sup>29</sup>, 38<sup>1,2</sup>, Judg. 13<sup>2</sup>, 17<sup>1</sup>, Ru. 2<sup>1</sup>, 1 Sam. 1<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>1,2</sup>, 17<sup>12</sup>, 21<sup>8</sup>, 22<sup>20</sup>, 2 Sam. 4<sup>4</sup>, 9<sup>2,12</sup>, 13<sup>3</sup>, 16<sup>5</sup>, 17<sup>25</sup>, 20<sup>1</sup>, 1 Chr. 2<sup>34</sup>, Est. 2<sup>5</sup>, Jer. 37<sup>13</sup> (22 occurrences), or (2) 'N. his name', 1 Sam. 17<sup>4,23</sup>, 2 Sam. 20<sup>21</sup>, 1 Kgs. 13<sup>2</sup>, 2 Chr. 28<sup>9</sup>, Job 1<sup>1</sup>, Zech. 6<sup>12</sup> (7 occurrences). Besides these two phrases, we once find (Dan. 10<sup>1</sup>) ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'Daniel, who his name was called Belteshazzar'. In all these cases the rendering of Targg. exactly corresponds with the Hebrew, except that in Targ. of Est. 2<sup>5</sup> we find ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'and his name *was called* Mordecai' for 'and his name Mordecai' of Heb. The rendering of Pesh. exactly corresponds with Heb. except in Ru. 2<sup>1</sup>, 1 Sam. 9<sup>2</sup>, 2 Sam. 9<sup>2</sup>, where we find 'who his name' for 'and his name'; in 1 Sam. 13<sup>3</sup>, where the phrase is omitted; and in Zech. 6<sup>12</sup>, where, in place of 'Branch his name', we have 'and his name Sunrise'. In LXX Heb. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'and his name' is rendered ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ, except in Gen. 24<sup>29</sup>, 38<sup>1,2</sup>, where we have ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ (ܡܢ) ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ. Heb. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'his name' is represented by ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ except in Job 1<sup>1</sup>, where we have ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ.

Outside O.T. we find that 'whose name was' is rendered in Syriac, 'his name', 'his name was', 'who his name', 'who his name was'. Cf. in Wright's *Apocryphal Acts*, ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'one of the chief men of Antioch, his name Alexander' (p. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ); ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'Now a certain man, Onesiphorus his name was' (p. ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ); ܡܢ ܕܢܡܢܐ 'a bath-keeper, who his name

Secundus' (p. ٤); ܡܢܠܐܘܫ ܕܒܢ ܡܢܠܐܘܫ ܕܒܢ ܡܢܠܐܘܫ 'a procurator's son, who his name was Menelaus' (p. ٦).

Thus it appears that *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* Ἰωάννης, Νικόδημος *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* exactly represent a Semitic construction common to Aramaic and Hebrew, and that the Greek represents the regular rendering of the Hebrew phrase. It is also noteworthy that the only other occurrences of *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* are found in Apoc., which is strongly Semitic in colouring.

υ. <sup>7</sup>. *ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ* probably = ܕܝܗܝܡܢܘܢ ܕܝܗܝ ܕܝܗܝܝܢܝܢ, which is most naturally taken to mean, 'that all might believe in *it*' (the light) rather than 'through him' (John). Cf., for the sense postulated, 12<sup>36</sup> ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε, and 12<sup>46</sup> ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ.

υ. <sup>8</sup>. οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς. The emphatic pronoun *ἐκεῖνος*—so characteristic of the Fourth Gospel—has its counterpart in the Aram. ܗܝܟܝܢ, Syriac ܐܝܝܢ 'that one', or in the Personal Pronoun ܗܝܢ. See below (p. 82).

ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. The difficulty of the supposed ellipse (usually supplied by the words, 'he came') is familiar. The whole verse would run in Aramaic, ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܗܘܪܐ ܐܝܠܗܐ, ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܪܐ ܥܠ ܢܗܘܪܐ (cf. Pal. Syr. ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܗܘܪܐ ܥܠ ܢܗܘܪܐ). It is probable that *ܕ* is here wrongly rendered *ἵνα*, and should have its relative force—'(*one*) *who*'. The sense then is, 'That one was not the light, but *one who* was to bear witness of the light'. Cf., for such a use of *ܕ* or *ܕܝ* without expressed antecedent ('one who', 'he who'), Ezr. 7<sup>25</sup>, ܕܥܠ ܕܥܠ ܕܥܠ ܕܥܠ 'and him *who* knoweth not ye shall teach'; Dan. 2<sup>23</sup> ܕܝܕܥܝܬܝ ܕܝܕܥܝܬܝ ܕܝܕܥܝܬܝ 'and now Thou hast made known to me *that which* we asked of Thee'. Cf. the similar use of *אשר* in Hebrew in Gen. 44<sup>9,10</sup> ܐܝܫܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ 'He with *whom* it is found of thy servants shall die . . . He with *whom* it is found shall be my slave', where the rendering of Targ. Onk. is ܕܝܫܥܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ ܕܝܫܥܐ. Other instances of *ܕ* relative mistranslated by *ἵνα* are given below (pp. 75 f.).\*

\* In favour of the ordinary view that the construction implies an ellipse stand two other passages cited by Westcott—9<sup>3</sup> Οὐτε οὗτος ἡμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, where before *ἵνα* we have to supply

v. 9. πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον is rightly recognized by J. Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraicae, ad loc.*) and by Schlatter (*Sprache*, pp. 18 f.) as the common Rabbinic phrase כָּל בָּאֵי עוֹלָם 'all comers into the world', i.e. all that are in it.\* The Aram. equivalent would be כָּל אֲנִי עָתִיד בְּעוֹלָמָא. Thus Westcott's proposal to regard τὸ φῶς as the subject of ἦν ἐρχόμενον ('The true light . . . was coming, &c.'): so R.V. *margin*) is excluded, and ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν can only mean, 'It was the true light', referring to the preceding verse. For this sense we seem to need a demonstrative pronoun; and this probably stood in Aramaic as הַזֶּה, which was misread הָיָה and rendered ἦν.

v. 10. καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. Notice the adversative force of καί = 'and yet', here and in v. 11 καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι κτλ. This is very frequent in Semitic (cf. p. 66).

v. 11. εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον, i.e. לְיָתָא לְיָתָא לְיָתָא (cf. Pal. Syr. and Pesh.). The use of τὰ ἴδια, οἱ ἴδιοι cannot, of course, be claimed as unusual; but the expressions are striking, and at once suggest to an Aramaic scholar the phrase דִּילֵיהּ 'which to him', i.e. 'that which pertains (or those who pertain) to him'—'his belongings'. ἴδιος is a favourite term in Jn.; occurring 15 times (1<sup>11bis-12</sup>, 4<sup>41</sup>, 5<sup>18,43</sup>, 7<sup>18</sup>, 8<sup>41</sup>, 10<sup>3,4,12</sup>, 13<sup>1</sup>, 15<sup>19</sup>, 16<sup>32</sup>, 19<sup>27</sup>), as against 5 in Mt., 1 in Mk., 4 in Lk.

v. 12. ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς κτλ. The construction

in thought some such words as 'he was born blind'; and 15<sup>26</sup> where before ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος κτλ. there is an implied ellipse of 'This cometh to pass'. Cf. also Mk. 14<sup>49</sup>. Similarly, Schlatter (*Sprache*, p. 18) cites parallels from Mechilta on Ex. 20<sup>19</sup> אֵלֹהִים אֶפְשָׁר לְהַעֲבִיר מִלֶּאךְ הַמּוֹת הַיְיִתִּי מֵעֲבִירוֹ אֵלֶּא עֲבָרָא נִיִּרָה 'If it were possible to remove the angel of death I should have removed him, but because the decree has already been decreed' (sc. 'I cannot do so'), and from Siphre on Num. 25<sup>1</sup> אִין אֲנִי נֹקְקִים לוֹ בְּכֶךְ אֵלֶּא שְׁתַּנְלָה עֲצֻמְךָ לוֹ 'We are not under such obligation to him, but (sc. it is necessary) that thou, &c.' In spite of these parallels for an ellipse, it is clear that הַ = ἵνα in the Aramaic rendering of our passage most naturally stands for the relative 'one who'; and this conclusion is supported by the other instances collected on pp. 75 f., where ἵνα is a mistranslation of a relative.

\* Schlatter quotes a remarkable para'lel to our passage from the Midrash Rabba on Leviticus, par. xxxi. 6—עוֹלָם בָּאֵי עוֹלָם וְלִכְלֵל וְלִתְחַתְּתֵיהֶם וְלִעֲלִיֹּנֵיהֶם אַתָּה מֵאִיר לְעוֹלָמֵיהֶם (Thou (God) givest light to those that are above and to those that are below, and to all comers into the world').



will of man, but of God'; i.e. He, being born not after the manner of flesh, but of God, was thus able to give to those who received Him power to become sons of God.

This interpretation is of a piece with that which is given above for *vv.* 3,4—just as the Logos was the Source of all physical life 'because in Him was life', so (*vv.* 12,13) He is the Source of spiritual life (the new birth) *because* He was born into the world, not by the ordinary process of human generation, but 'of God'. Cf. Lk. 1<sup>35</sup>

Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ,  
καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοί·  
διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον  
κληθήσεται υἱὸς Θεοῦ.

We note a connexion between υἱὸς Θεοῦ and τέκνα Θεοῦ of Jn. 1<sup>12</sup> which may not be accidental (cf. also ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω, Lk. 1<sup>34</sup>, with οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός, Jn. 1<sup>13</sup>). If this explanation of Jn. 1<sup>12,13</sup> be correct, the writer is drawing out the mystical import of the Virgin-Birth for believers on precisely the lines on which he elsewhere (5<sup>24-29</sup>, 11<sup>25,26</sup>, 14<sup>19</sup>) draws out the mystical import for them of the Resurrection.

On the other hand, the generally accepted reading οἱ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν surely involves a very strange sequence. The spiritual birth of believers is clearly the *result* of the grace described by ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, but *v.* 13 as phrased seems to imply that it was an antecedent condition. The author would surely have written 'and so they were born', or 'so that they should be born', had this result been the fact which he was intending to convey.

*v.* 14. καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. The verb ἐσκήνωσεν very clearly suggests the Jewish doctrine of the שְׁכִינָה *Sh'kīnā* (Heb.), שְׁכִינְתָּה *Sh'kīntā* (Aram.), or visible *dwelling* of Yahweh among His people, typified by the pillar of cloud standing above the Tent of Meeting, as subsequently in Solomon's Temple (Ex. 33<sup>7-11</sup> from the old document E; 1 Kgs. 8<sup>10,11</sup>). Cf. also, for the use of the verb שָׁכַן *śākan* of Yahweh's *dwelling* in the midst of Israel, Lev. 26<sup>11,12</sup> (H), Ex. 25<sup>8</sup>, 29<sup>15</sup>, Num. 5<sup>3</sup>, 35<sup>31</sup> (P), 1 Kgs. 6<sup>13</sup>, Ezek. 43<sup>9</sup>; of His *causing* His Name to  *dwell* there, Deut. 12<sup>11</sup>, 14<sup>23</sup>, 16<sup>2,6,11</sup>, 26<sup>2</sup>, & .). In Hebrew passages in which Yahweh is said to dwell, or to cause

His Name to dwell, in the midst of Israel, the Targumic phrase is, *He caused His Sh'kintā to dwell* there. Examples are—

<i>Heb.</i>	<i>Targ.</i>
Lev. 26 <sup>12</sup> 'And I will walk among you'.	'And I will cause My <i>Sh'kintā</i> to dwell among you'.
Ex. 25 <sup>8</sup> 'That I may dwell in your midst'.	'That I may cause My <i>Sh'kintā</i> to dwell among you'.
Ex. 29 <sup>15</sup> 'And I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel'.	'And I will cause My <i>Sh'kintā</i> to dwell in the midst of the children of Israel'.

So, of the withdrawal of Yahweh's Presence,

Isa. 57 <sup>17</sup> 'I hid Myself'.	'I caused My <i>Sh'kintā</i> to depart (ascend) from them'.
Ps. 44 <sup>9</sup> 'And Thou goest not forth with our hosts'.	'And Thou dost not cause Thy <i>Sh'kintā</i> to dwell with our hosts'.
Ps. 88 <sup>5</sup> 'And they are cut off from Thy hand'.	'And they are separated from the face of Thy <i>Sh'kintā</i> '.

Thus we may assume with some confidence that καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν represents the Aramaic שְׁכִינְתִּי בְּיַנְיָהּ 'and caused His *Sh'kintā* to dwell among us'. The choice of the verb σκηνοῦν was doubtless largely dictated by its close resemblance to the Semitic root *š-k-n*. The same usage is to be seen in Apoc. 7<sup>15</sup> καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς, 21<sup>3</sup> Ἰδοὺ, ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν.

καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. Here we have a clear reference to a second term used in the Targums to describe God's Self-manifestation to mankind, כְּבוֹד 'the *Glory* of the Lord'. The conception of the כְּבוֹד *Y'kārā* goes back, like that of the *Sh'kintā*, to O. T. passages. In these the Heb. term is כְּבוֹד *Kābhōdh*. Thus, Ex. 16<sup>10</sup>, 'Behold, the *Glory* of the Lord appeared in the cloud'; 24<sup>16</sup>, 'And the *Glory* of the Lord abode upon mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days'; &c. The Targums employ *Y'kārā*, like *Sh'kintā*, in paraphrasing passages which might, as they stand in the Heb., be taken to describe the actual appearance of God in bodily form. Thus—

*Heb.**Targ.*

Ex. 3<sup>1</sup> 'And he came to the mountain of God, unto Horeb'.

'And he came to the mountain on which the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the Lord was revealed, even to Horeb'.

Ex. 3<sup>6</sup> 'For he was afraid to look upon God'.

'For he was afraid to look upon the manifestation of the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the Lord'.

Ex. 24<sup>10</sup> 'And they saw the God of Israel'.

'And they saw the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the God of Israel'.

We sometimes find *Sh'kīntā* and *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* coupled; שְׁכִינַת יְהוָה 'the Dwelling of the Glory'—

Isa. 40<sup>22</sup> 'He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth'.

'That causeth the *Sh'kīntā* of His *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* to dwell in lofty strength'.

Ps. 44<sup>24</sup> 'Wherefore hidest Thou Thy face?'

'Wherefore causest Thou the *Sh'kīntā* of Thy *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* to depart?'

Or, with inversion of order—

Isa. 6<sup>5</sup> 'For mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts'.

'For mine eye hath seen the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the *Sh'kīntā* of the King of the ages'.

This last passage, from Isaiah's vision, leads us to a point which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that when Jn. describes our Lord's Self-manifestation as *δόξα* he has in mind the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the Targums.\* In Jn. 12<sup>40,41</sup> the writer, after quoting Isa. 6<sup>10</sup>, adds the statement, ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. The opening of the vision (Isa. 6<sup>1</sup>) runs in Heb., 'I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne', and this is rendered in Targ., 'I saw the *Y<sup>e</sup>kārā* of the Lord resting on His throne'. Other instances in Jn. of *δόξα* in this sense are, 2<sup>11</sup> ἐφάνηρσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, 11<sup>40</sup> ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, 17<sup>24</sup> ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν.

We are now in a position to maintain that the *λόγος*-conception

\* Not of course necessarily the *written* Targums, but at any rate the conceptions which entered into the oral exposition of Scripture called Targum.



of the Prologue must undoubtedly be derived from the third and most frequent Targumic conception representing God in manifestation; that of the מִמְרָא דִּינָא 'the *Word* of the Lord'. We should no doubt trace the origin of the conception of the מִמְרָא *Mēmra* to O. T. passages in which Heb. דָּבָר *dābhār* 'Word' is employed in a connexion which almost suggests hypostatization, e.g. Ps. 107<sup>20</sup>, 'He sent forth His Word and healed them'; Is. 33<sup>6</sup>, 'By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made'. This latter passage, with its reference to the Word's action in Creation, recalls the repeated וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים 'And God *said*' in Gen. 1, where the Heb. verb אָמַר *'amar* is identical with the Aram. root from which *Mēmra* is derived. *Mēmra* occurs repeatedly in the Targg. in passages where the Heb. represents God as speaking, acting, or manifesting Himself in a manner which seemed too anthropomorphic to Jewish thought of later times. This may be illustrated from the occurrences of the term in the first few chapters of Genesis.

Heb.	Targ.
Gen. 3 <sup>8</sup> 'And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking, &c.'	'And they heard the voice of the <i>Mēmra</i> of the Lord God walking, &c.'
3 <sup>10</sup> 'I heard Thy voice'.	'I heard the voice of Thy <i>Mēmra</i> '.
6 <sup>6</sup> 'And it repented the Lord that He had made man'.	'And the Lord repented in His <i>Mēmra</i> because He had made man'.
6 <sup>7</sup> 'For it repenteth Me'.	'Because I have repented in My <i>Mēmra</i> '.
8 <sup>1</sup> 'And the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse, &c.'	'And the Lord said in (or by) His <i>Mēmra</i> , I will no more curse, &c.'
9 <sup>12</sup> 'This is the token of the covenant which I make between Me and you'.	'This is the token of the covenant which I am making between My <i>Mēmra</i> and you'.
So in vv. 13.15.16.17.	

We cannot fail to notice that in Jn. 1<sup>14</sup> the writer—no doubt with intention—brings together all three of these Targumic con-

ceptions.\* In καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο we have the *Mēmṛā*; in καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν the *Sh'kīntā*; in καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ the *Y'kārā*. This is evidence that, so far from his owing his λόγος-doctrine to an Alexandrine source, he is soaked through and through with the Palestinian Jewish thought which is represented by the Targums. Nor would the teaching of the Prologue need time for its development. Any disciple of our Lord who had heard the Targumic rendering of the O.T. in the synagogue, and who was capable of recognizing a superhuman power shining through the Master's Personality in His mighty acts, of detecting the Divine voice in His teaching, and at length of apprehending that in His Presence on earth God had come to dwell among men, could hardly fail to draw the inference that here was the grand fulfilment of O. T. conceptions so familiar to him through the Aramaic paraphrase.

πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. The reference of this statement back to the main subject of the sentence, ὁ λόγος—which makes καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα κτλ. a parenthesis—is certainly awkward. It would be possible to assume that πλήρης is a misreading for πλήρη,† referring to τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. If, however, v. 15, which speaks of the witness of John, and somewhat harshly breaks the connexion of thought, may be supposed to be misplaced, and properly to follow *after* the Prologue before v. 19 ('John bear witness . . . And this is the witness of John, &c.'), then another theory lies open. In v. 16 ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, i.e. כָּל־בְּרִיתֵנוּ מִלְּפָנָיו, 7 may mean, not 'because', but '*He who*' (the assumed mistranslation is a converse one to that noted in vv. 4-13). Thus we get the statement, 'Full of grace and truth was He of whose fullness we have all received'. Aramaic, literally rendered, would express this by, 'Full of grace and truth (was) *He who* of His fullness we have all received'.

v. 18. μονογενὴς Θεός. This reading has stronger attestation than the variant μονογενὴς υἱός, which looks like a correction. It must

\* This has been noted by Dalman, *WJ.* p. 231.

† This is the reading of Cod. D. Deissmann (*LAE.* pp. 125 ff.) defends πλήρης as an indeclinable adjective, on the score of popular usage; and is followed by Moulton (*NTG.* p. 50). The same view was earlier put forward by Blass, *Grammar* (Eng. tr. 1898), § 31, 6, and by C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theol. Studies* i (1900), pp. 120 ff.

be admitted, however, that the expression (though fully in accord with the teaching of the Prologue) is hardly to be expected after the preceding, 'No man hath seen God at any time'. It may be suggested that the Aramaic  $\text{יְחִיד אֱלֹהָא}$ , 'the only-begotten of God', has been misunderstood as  $\text{יְחִיד אֱלֹהָא}$  (Absolute for Construct State), and so rendered, 'the only-begotten God'.

It thus appears that nearly every verse of the Prologue yields evidence pointing to an Aramaic original. Besides, however, the special points which have been discussed, we notice generally (1) the simplicity of construction, with its fondness for co-ordination of sentences linked by *καί* (cf. especially *vs.* 1,3,5,10,11,14), and (2) the many cases of parallelism in thought and expression—a marked trait of Hebrew poetic composition. Close study of this latter characteristic brings to light a most interesting fact. The Prologue seems to take the form of a hymn, written in eleven parallel couplets, with comments introduced here and there by the writer. This may be clearly seen in the Aramaic translation which follows, together with an English rendering of it. In making the translation the Judaeen dialect has been used as far as possible. On the distinction between the Judaeen and Galilaean dialects of Aramaic, see Dalman, *Gramm.* pp. 33 ff.\*

בְּקִדְמָא הוּא מִימְרָא  
 וּמִימְרָא הוּא לְוֹת אֱלֹהָא.  
 וְאֵלֹהָא הוּא מִימְרָא  
 הוּא בְּקִדְמָא לְוֹת אֱלֹהָא.  
 בְּלֹא בִיה אִתְעֵבִיד  
 וּבִר מְנִיָּה לָא אִתְעֵבִיד בְּלוּם.  
 דְּהוּא בִיה חַיִּין  
 וְחַיִּין נְהוּרָא רִבְנִי אֲנִישָׁא.  
 וְנְהוּרָא בְּקִבְלָא מְנַהֵר  
 וּמְבִלָּא לָא אֲקִבְלִנִיה.

\* The differences are slight. We have chosen  $\text{הוּא}$  see 'rather than  $\text{חַמְמָא}$  'know' rather than  $\text{חַבְבָּם}$ ,  $\text{אִילָהֵן}$  'but' in preference to  $\text{אֱלֹא}$ ; and the nominal 1st plural suffix  $\text{נָא}$  rather than  $\text{יְ—}$ , verbal 1st plural suffix  $\text{נָא}$  rather than  $\text{נְ—}$ . Possibly the Relative should be  $\text{דִּי}$  as in Biblical Aramaic; but  $\text{דִּי}$  is the Targumic form. Choice of the Judaeen dialect is bound up with the view of authorship put forward on pp. 133 ff.

הוא נברא מִשְׁדֵּר מִן אֱלֹהִים שְׁמִיהּ יוֹחֵנָן. הָרִין אֲתָא לְסִתְרוֹ דִּי־סְהִיד עַל נְהוֹרָא  
דִּיהִימְנוֹן בֵּיהּ בְּלִי. לֹא הָוּא הוּא נְהוֹרָא אִילָּהּ דִּי־סְהִיד עַל נְהוֹרָא. הוּא נְהוֹרָא  
דְּקוֹשְׁטָא דְּמִנְהָר לְכָל אָנֶשׁ אֲתִי בְּעֵלְמָא. בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא

וְעֵלְמָא בֵּיהּ אִיתְעֲבִיד  
וְעֵלְמָא לֹא יִדְעִיהּ.

לְוֹת דִּילִיָּה אֲתָא  
וְדִילִיָּה לֹא קִבְּלוּגִיָּה.

בּוֹלְהוֹן דְּקִבְּלוּגִיָּה יְהִב לְהוֹן רְשׁוּתָא לְמַהְוִי (or דִּיהוֹן) בְּנִי אֱלֹהִים לְמַהִּימְנוֹן בְּשִׁמְיָהּ.  
דְּלֹא מִן דְּמָא (or דְּמִיוֹ?) וְלֹא מִן צְבוּת בְּסִרָא וְלֹא מִן צְבוּת גְּבִרָא אִילָּהּ מִן אֱלֹהִים  
אִיתְלִיד.

וּמִימְרָא בְּסִרָא אִיתְעֲבִיד  
וְאִשְׁרֵי שְׂבָנְתִּיהּ בִּינְנָא.

וְחֻוּקָא נִתְיַקְרִיָּה  
יִקְרָא כִּיתִידָא מִן אֲבָא.

מְלִי חָנָא וְקוֹשְׁטָא  
דְּמִן מְלִיָּה בּוֹלְנָא נִסְבְּנָא.

וְחָנָא חֲלַף חָנָא.

דְּאוֹרִיתָא מִן מִשְׁחָא אִיתְיַהִיב  
חָנָא וְקוֹשְׁטָא מִן מִשְׁחָא.

אֱלֹהִים לֹא הָוּא אָנֶשׁ מִן יוֹמָהּ. יְחִיד אֱלֹהִים דְּאִית בְּעוֹבָא דְּאַזָּא הוּא מְלִי.

1. 'In the beginning was the Word,  
And the Word was with God.
2. And God was the Word;  
He was in the beginning with God.
3. All things by Him were made;  
And without Him there was made naught;
4. Because in Him was life,  
And the life was the light of mankind.
5. And the light in darkness was shining,  
And the darkness obscured it not.

There was a man sent from God, his name, John. That one  
came for a witness, that he might bear witness of the light, that

all might believe in it. That one was not the light, but one who should bear witness of the light. It was the true light that lighteth every man coming into the world. He was in the world,

6. And the world by Him was made,  
And the world knew Him not.

7. Unto His own He came,  
And His own received Him not.

As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God—to those that believe in His name; because He was born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man, but of God.

8. And the Word was made flesh,  
And set His *Sh'kīntā* among us.

9. And we beheld His Glory,  
Glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.

10. He was full of grace and truth,  
Of Whose fullness we all have received,

And grace for grace.

11. For the law was given through Moses,  
Grace and truth through the Messiah.

No man hath ever seen God; the only-begotten of God, Who is in the bosom of the Father—He hath revealed.'

A striking feature of the hymn is that it contains several examples of the somewhat rare but well-marked form of parallelism which is known as *Climactic*. In this form stichos *b* of a couplet does not offer a more or less complete echo of stichos *a*, but adds something more which completes the sense of the distich, thus forming, as it were, its climax. Dr. Driver (*Literature of the O. T.* p. 363) remarks that 'this kind of rhythm is all but peculiar to the most elevated poetry'; and quotes as instances Ps. 29<sup>5</sup>, 92<sup>2</sup>, 93<sup>3</sup>, 94<sup>3</sup>, 96<sup>13</sup>, 113<sup>1</sup>. 'There is something analogous to it, though much less forcible and distinct, in some of the "Songs of Ascents" (Pss. 121-34), where a somewhat emphatic word is repeated from one verse (or line) in the next, as Ps. 121<sup>1b,2</sup> (help); v. 3<sup>b,4</sup>; v. 4<sup>b,5a</sup>; v. 7<sup>3a</sup>; 122<sup>2b,3a</sup>, &c.' Climactic parallelism is very characteristic

of the Song of Deborah; see note in the writer's Commentary on Judges, pp. 169 f. The following examples may be noted in the poem of the Prologue:—

4. Because in Him was life  
And the life | was the light of mankind.
5. And the light in darkness was shining,  
And the darkness | obscured it not.
7. Unto His own He came,  
And His own | received Him not.
9. And we beheld His glory,  
Glory | as of the only-begotten of the  
Father.
10. He was full of grace and truth,  
Of Whose fullness | we all have received.

Of the remaining couplets, 1, 2, and 8 may be reckoned as synonymous, while 3, 6, and 11 are antithetical.

It should be noted that the couplets, besides being parallel, appear also to be rhythmical, each line containing three stresses. In *v. 17*, in place of *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* the translation offers 'through the Messiah' simply, *metri gratiā*. *Ἰησοῦ* may very naturally have come in as a later addition.

*Additional Note on the interpretation of Jn. 1<sup>13</sup> as referring to the Virgin-Birth (cf. p. 34).*

There is an essential unity in the teaching of St. Luke, St. Paul, and St. John as to the mode and meaning of the Incarnation which ought not to be overlooked. All go back in thought to the appearance of Jesus Christ on earth as a new Creation, to be compared and contrasted with the first Creation of the world and of mankind; and all therefore draw upon Gen. 1, 2 in working out their theme. Just as God's first creative act was the formation of *light*, breaking in upon the physical darkness which had previously covered primeval chaos, so was the birth of Christ the dawn of Light in the midst of the spiritual darkness of the world. That this idea was in St. Paul's mind is definitely stated by him in 2 Cor. 4<sup>5,6</sup>, οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν

κύριον, . . . ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν Ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ. Cf. also 1 Cor. 4<sup>5</sup>, 2 Cor. 6<sup>14</sup>, Eph. 5<sup>8</sup>, Col. 1<sup>13</sup>. Allusion to Gen. 1, which is clearly seen in the opening words of Jn. 1, 'In the beginning', seems also to be behind vv. 4<sup>5</sup>, where it is stated that the Logos, as the Agent in Creation, represented the introduction of Light into the world, and, by an almost imperceptible transition, the writer's thought passes from the introduction of life and light at Creation to its spiritual introduction at the Incarnation. Moreover, just as the introduction of light into the world at Creation did not immediately abolish physical darkness, but led to the setting by God of a *division* (לְיָמִים, Gen. 1<sup>5</sup>) between light and darkness, so (Jn. 1<sup>9</sup>) in the Incarnation the Light was shining in darkness and the darkness did not obscure it; its introduction into the world producing a *κρίσις* whereby Light and darkness were sharply distinguished and men had to range themselves under the one or the other (Jn. 3<sup>19-21</sup>; cf. 9<sup>39</sup>, 12<sup>35, 36, 46</sup>).<sup>\*</sup> Turning to the Birth-narrative of St. Luke, it is surely not fanciful to find in the words of the angel in 1<sup>35</sup>, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελείσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι, an implied reference to Gen. 1<sup>2</sup>, where the Spirit of God is pictured as *brooding* or *hovering* (רָפָה) over the face of the waters in the initial process of Creation which issues in the production of light.† So for St. Luke the Divine Birth means the dawning of ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθήμενοις (1<sup>78, 79</sup>), and φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν (2<sup>32</sup>).

Again, the connexion in thought between the Old Creation and

<sup>\*</sup> A similar mystical interpretation of the Genesis passage is given in Midrash Bereshith Rabba, par. iii. 10; 'Rabbi Yannai said, When He began to create the world, the Holy One (blessed be He) observed the works of the righteous and the works of the wicked. "And the earth was a waste", i.e. the works of the wicked. "And God said, Let there be light", i.e. the works of the righteous. "And God divided between the light and between the darkness"—between the works of the righteous and the works of the wicked. "And God called the light, day", i.e. the works of the righteous. "And the darkness he called, night", i.e. the works of the wicked. "And there was morning", i.e. the works of the righteous. "And there was evening", i.e. the works of the wicked. "One day", inasmuch as the Holy One (blessed be He) gave them one day. And what is this? The Day of Atonement.'

† This Genesis passage is applied in Midrash Bereshith Rabba to the endowment of the Messiah with the Divine Spirit; 'This is the Spirit of the King-Messiah, as it is said, "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him".'

the New is explicit in St. Paul's teaching as to the first Adam and the second Adam in 1 Cor. 15<sup>45</sup>; οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν. This is worked out in the frequent antithesis between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα, and in the representation of baptism as a burial with Christ in which ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος is put off, and the baptized rises with Christ to newness of life (Rom. 6<sup>3ff.</sup>). We find the same antithesis between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα in Jn. 3<sup>a</sup>, 6<sup>63</sup>, the whole of the discussion with Nicodemus in *ch.* 3 turning on the new birth which is ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. In 6<sup>63</sup> it is stated, in contrast to σὰρξ, that τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζωοποιῶν, a thought of which the connexion with St. Paul's ἐγένετο . . . ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν can hardly be accidental. This connexion would, it may be presumed, be generally explained by the theory of the influence of Pauline Theology upon the writer of the Fourth Gospel; and this may be so. A fact, however, which is surely beyond question is that St. Paul's οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται refers not simply to the quotation from Gen. 2<sup>7</sup>, 'He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul', but to the whole passage relating to the first Adam and the second Adam, from ἐγένετο down to ζωοποιῶν. ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν depends upon ἐγένετο introducing the quotation equally with what goes before, from which it should be divided by a comma merely, and not by a colon (WH.) or full stop (R.V.). Had it been St. Paul's own addition, could he possibly have phrased the sentence thus, and not have written at least ὁ δὲ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ ἐγένετο εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν?

If, however, the whole passage is a quotation, whence was it derived? There can be no doubt that the form in which St. Paul's argument is cast is influenced by Rabbinic speculation, and that the Rabbinism of Palestine.\* Though born at Tarsus, he claims

\* The expression אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן 'the first Adam' is well known in early Midrashic literature. אָדָם הַאֲחֵרֶן 'the second Adam', i. e. the Messiah, is not known to us in Midrash before the *N'wē shālōm*, the work of a Spanish Jew in the 15th century A.D. (cf. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, pp. 40 ff.); but the Midrash Bereshith Rabba (ascribed by tradition to R. Hoshaiah, 3rd century A.D.) brings the Messiah into contrast with 'the first Adam' when, in commenting on Gen. 2<sup>4</sup>, 'These are the generations of the heaven and the earth', it quotes earlier Rabbinical speculation as to the reason why the word for 'generations' is written *plene* with י only in this passage and in Ruth 4<sup>18</sup>,



to be 'Εβραῖος ἐξ 'Εβραίων (Phil. 3<sup>5</sup>), i. e. not a 'Ελληνιστής (cf. Acts 6<sup>1</sup>), and he obtained his education at Jerusalem under Gamaliel, who was one of the most prominent Rabbinic teachers of the time (Acts 22<sup>3</sup>). But prior to St. Paul's conversion the earliest circle of Christian believers at Jerusalem was drawn not merely from the peasant-class, but embraced (according to Acts 6<sup>7</sup>) 'a great company of the priests', who would scarcely have been unversed in Rabbinic teaching, but may be supposed to have applied such learning as they had acquired to the service of the new Faith.

It is by no means improbable, therefore, that the passage as a whole may have been drawn from a collection of O. T. *Testimonia*, composed with the object of meeting Rabbinic Judaism upon its own ground.\* If it be objected to this suggestion that elsewhere throughout the N. T. γέγραπται introduces a definite citation from the O. T., and that this is also the case with allusions to ἡ γραφή

'These are the generations of Perez' (תולדות), but elsewhere always תולדת, and cites the inference that 6, which numerically = 6, implies that the six things which Adam lost through the Fall shall be restored at the coming of 'the son of Perez', i. e. the Davidic Messiah. The Messiah appears as a life-giver (cf. πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν) in the Midrash hag-gadol to Genesis (compiled by a Yemenite Jew of the 14th century) which, commenting on Gen. 16<sup>11</sup>, states that there are six persons whose names were given to them before their birth, viz. Ishmael, Isaac, Moses, Solomon, Josiah, and the King-Messiah. On the last it says, 'The King-Messiah, because it is written, "Before the sun his name shall be Yinnōn". And why is his name called Yinnōn? because he is destined to quicken those who sleep in the dust.' Here the Scriptural passage quoted is Ps. 72<sup>17</sup> לִפְנֵי שֶׁשֶׁשׁ יָבֹן שְׁמוֹ 'Before the sun shall his name propagate' (or 'produce life'), and the verbal form, only here in O. T., is treated as a Messianic title—'He who quickens'. This Midrash is quoted by Raymund Martin in his *Pugio Fidei*, chap. ii, 11, who refers it to Moses had-Darshan, born at Narbonne about the middle of the 11th century A. D. Late as this is, we have the evidence of the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 98 b) that Yinnōn was early regarded as a Messianic title, for in the passage in question the pupils of R. Yannai (an Amora of the first generation—2nd to 3rd century A. D.) maintain, as a compliment to their teacher, that the Messiah's name is to be Yinnōn. The Psalm-passage is quoted in Midrash Bereshith Rabba, par. i. 5, as evidence that the name of the Messiah existed prior to the creation of the world, though it is not there stated that Yinnōn is to be taken as his name.

Though no part of this Midrashic speculation can be traced back to the 1st century A. D., it serves to illustrate the kind of Rabbinic teaching which may well have formed part of St. Paul's early training.

\* Cf. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 272; 'We know that types and prophecies were eagerly sought out by the early Christians, and were soon collected in a kind of common stock from which every one drew at his pleasure.'

(with the possible exception of 1 Tim. 5<sup>18</sup>, where our Lord's words \*Ἀξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ seem to be included under the term), it may be replied that St. Paul's quotation *does* consist of such a citation from the O. T. *plus* a deduction therefrom, and would *ex hypothesi* be derived from a collection of proofs based on the O. T. and therefore drawn ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν. We may further draw attention to the use of this formula of citation in the Epistle of Barnabas 4<sup>14</sup>, where our Lord's words in Mt. 22<sup>14</sup> are quoted: προσέχωμεν μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρέθωμεν. Similarly, the formula λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή is used in Barnabas 16<sup>5</sup> to introduce a quotation from Enoch 89<sup>56,66</sup>.

If, then, this interpretation of 1 Cor. 15<sup>45</sup> as wholly a quotation be correct, the implication is that some time before St. Paul wrote his Epistle in A.D. 55-6, the antithesis between the first Adam and Christ as the second Adam had been worked out in Christian Rabbinic circles and was used in argument. This conclusion surely modifies the question of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel upon St. Paul in regard to the teaching here involved, suggesting as it does the alternative theory that both may have been dependent upon a common earlier method of theological expression of the truths of the Incarnation.

St. Luke supplies us with further food for thought in this connexion. His Birth-narrative is certainly from a Jewish-Christian source, and is generally acknowledged to be early. If any portions of it are earlier than the rest, these are the poems which it contains; and the angel's words at the Annunciation are no less a poem cast in rhythmical parallelism than are the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, and *Nunc dimittis*. We have had occasion to cite passages from all these, except the *Magnificat*, in arguing the unity of their thought with that of St. Paul and St. John. We may now note the fact that St. Luke carries back our Lord's genealogy to Adam, 'who was the son of God' (3<sup>38</sup>). What is the reason for this? Doubtless one reason is to be found in the fact that his Gospel is pre-eminently a universal Gospel—not for the Jews only but for the whole Gentile world also. May not, however, another (and perhaps the prime) reason be that the fact that the first Adam was born not by natural generation but by an act of God, in itself suggests the reasonableness that the second Adam should likewise

so be born? If this is so, it is of course likely that St. Luke may have owed his conception to St. Paul's doctrine of Christ as the second Adam; but, if our argument has been sound, St. Paul himself owed it to an earlier source, embodied in a collection of *Testimonia* for general use. If, then, St. Luke's τοῦ Ἀδάμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ links itself on to υἱὸς Θεοῦ in the words of the Annunciation, and if his thought shows connexion with St. Paul's doctrine of the two Adams, is it likely that St. Paul, in enunciating this doctrine, was ignorant of the tradition of the Virgin-Birth? \*

\* This point has already been brought out by Dr. Box, *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, pp. 38 f., 150.

## CHAPTER II

### THE SENTENCE

#### Asyndeton.

It is highly characteristic of Aramaic to open its sentences abruptly without the use of a connective particle. In this respect its contrast with Hebrew is very marked, the latter language regularly employing 'And' in prose to connect a sentence with what goes before, the force of this 'And' varying as determined by the context (And, So, Then, But, Yet, &c.). This difference in usage may well be illustrated from the Book of Daniel, in which *chs.* 1<sup>1</sup>—2<sup>4a</sup>, 8—12 are written in Hebrew, while *chs.* 2<sup>1b</sup>—7 are in Aramaic.

Dan. 1<sup>1</sup>—2<sup>4a</sup> (Hebrew) consists of 23 sentences. Of these, 22 (i.e. all but the opening verse of *ch.* 1) begin with 'And' (sometimes variously rendered in R.V. 'Then', 'But', 'So').

Dan. 2<sup>5-19</sup> (Aramaic) contains 44 sentences. Of these, 22 begin with a connective particle, and 22 without such particle. The openings are as follows:

#### *With connective particle.*

- v.<sup>6</sup> והן 'And if'.  
v.<sup>9</sup> די הן 'For if'.  
v.<sup>11</sup> ומלתא 'And the word'.  
v.<sup>13</sup> ורתא 'And the decree'.  
v.<sup>14</sup> דניאל באדין 'Then Daniel'.  
v.<sup>15b</sup> מלתא אדין 'Then the word'.  
v.<sup>16</sup> ודניאל על 'And Daniel went in'.  
v.<sup>17</sup> אדין דניאל 'Then Daniel'.  
v.<sup>19a</sup> אדין לדניאל 'Then to Daniel'.

#### *Without connective particle.*

- v.<sup>5</sup> ענה מלכא 'Answered the king'.  
v.<sup>7</sup> ענו 'They answered'.  
v.<sup>8</sup> ענה מלכא 'Answered the king'.  
v.<sup>10</sup> ענו כשדיא 'Answered the Chaldaeans'.  
v.<sup>12</sup> כל קבל דנה 'Because of this'.  
v.<sup>15a</sup> ענה ואמר 'He answered and said'.  
v.<sup>20</sup> ענה דניאל 'Answered Daniel'.

- v.<sup>19b</sup> ארין דניאל 'Then Daniel'.  
 v.<sup>25</sup> ארין אריוך 'Then Arioch'.  
 v.<sup>30</sup> ואנה 'And I'.  
 v.<sup>35</sup> בארין דקו 'Then were broken'.  
 v.<sup>39</sup> ובתרך 'And after thee'.  
 v.<sup>40</sup> ומלכו רביעיא 'And the fourth kingdom'.  
 v.<sup>41</sup> ורי חויתה 'And whereas thou sawest'.  
 v.<sup>42</sup> ואצבעת רגליא 'And the toes'.  
 v.<sup>43</sup> ורי חויתה 'And whereas thou sawest'.  
 v.<sup>44</sup> וביומיהן 'And in their days'.  
 v.<sup>46</sup> בארין מלכא 'Then the king'.  
 v.<sup>48</sup> ארין מלכא 'Then the king'.  
 v.<sup>49</sup> ודניאל 'And Daniel'.  
 v.<sup>22</sup> הוא גלא 'He revealeth'.  
 v.<sup>23</sup> לך אלה אבהתי 'To thee the God of my fathers'.  
 v.<sup>24</sup> כל קבל דנה 'Because of this'.  
 v.<sup>26</sup> ענה מלכא 'Answered the king'.  
 v.<sup>27</sup> ענה דניאל 'Answered Daniel'.  
 v.<sup>28b</sup> חלמך 'Thy dream'.  
 v.<sup>29</sup> אנתה מלכא 'Thou, O king'.  
 v.<sup>31a</sup> *id.*  
 v.<sup>31b</sup> צלמא דבן 'This image'.  
 v.<sup>32</sup> הוא צלמא 'That image'.  
 v.<sup>34</sup> חוה הוית 'Thou sawest'.  
 v.<sup>36</sup> דנה חלמא 'This is the dream'.  
 v.<sup>37</sup> אנתה מלכא 'Thou, O king'.  
 v.<sup>45</sup> כל קבל די חויתה 'Whereas thou sawest'.  
 v.<sup>47</sup> ענה מלכא 'Answered the king'.

This great frequency of unconnected sentences is equally characteristic of the rest of the Aramaic portion of the Book of Daniel. In *ch.* 8 the Hebrew begins again, and here we have 27 sentences (corresponding with the verse-division). Of these, 24 begin with 'And' (sometimes rendered, 'Then', 'Now', 'So', 'Yea'), and 3 only (*vv.* 1.4.20) without any connective particle. It will thus be seen how clear is the distinction in style between Aramaic and Hebrew even of so late a date (*c.* 167 B.C.). When we come down to the Hebrew of the Mishna, we *do* find a paucity of connective particles, entirely owing to the influence of Aramaic.

Now great frequency of sentences opening without a connective particle is a marked characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. If we take *ch.* 1—neglecting openings in *speeches* (*vv.* 20–23, &c.), where asyndeton is *natural* in Greek as in English—we find 34 asyndeton

openings, as against 28 with connective particle. In the 28 sentences which have connective particles, these are καί 19 times, δέ 4 times, ὅτι twice, οὖν 3 times. 'And', which is thus more than doubly as frequent as all the others taken together, is the ordinary Semitic connective particle, which bears various forces according to the context (cf. p. 49). The openings are as follows :

*With connective particle.*

v.<sup>5</sup> καὶ τὸ φῶς.

v.<sup>12</sup> ὅσοι δέ.

v.<sup>14a</sup> καὶ ὁ λόγος.

v.<sup>14b</sup> καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα.

v.<sup>16</sup> ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος.

v.<sup>17a</sup> ὅτι ὁ νόμος.

v.<sup>19</sup> καὶ αὕτη ἐστίν.

v.<sup>20</sup> καὶ ὁμολόγησεν.

v.<sup>21a</sup> καὶ ἠρώτησαν.

v.<sup>21b</sup> καὶ λέγει.

v.<sup>21c</sup> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη.

v.<sup>22</sup> εἶπαν οὖν.

v.<sup>24</sup> καὶ ἀπεσταλμένοι.

v.<sup>25a</sup> καὶ ἠρώτησαν.

v.<sup>25b</sup> Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις ;

v.<sup>31</sup> καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν.

v.<sup>32</sup> καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν.

*Without connective particle.*

v.<sup>1</sup> ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν.

v.<sup>2</sup> οὗτος ἦν.

v.<sup>3</sup> πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.

v.<sup>4</sup> ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.

v.<sup>6</sup> ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος.

v.<sup>7</sup> οὗτος ἦλθεν.

v.<sup>8</sup> οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς.

v.<sup>9</sup> ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν.

v.<sup>10</sup> ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν.

v.<sup>11</sup> εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε.

v.<sup>15</sup> Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ.

v.<sup>17b</sup> ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια.

v.<sup>18a</sup> Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε.

v.<sup>18b</sup> μονογενὴς Θεός.

v.<sup>23</sup> ἔφη.

v.<sup>26a</sup> ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς.

v.<sup>26b</sup> μέσος ὕμῶν στήκει.

v.<sup>27</sup> ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο.

v.<sup>29</sup> τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει.

- v.<sup>33</sup> καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν.  
 v.<sup>34</sup> καὶ γὰρ εἶώρακα.  
 v.<sup>36</sup> καὶ ἐμβλέψας.  
 v.<sup>37</sup> καὶ ἤκουσαν.  
 v.<sup>38a</sup> στραφεῖς δέ.  
 v.<sup>38b</sup> οἱ δὲ εἶπαν.  
 v.<sup>39b</sup> ἦλθαν οὖν.  
 v.<sup>43b</sup> καὶ εὐρίσκει Φίλιππον.  
 v.<sup>44</sup> ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος.  
 v.<sup>46a</sup> καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.  
 v.<sup>51</sup> καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ.  
 v.<sup>35</sup> τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν ἱσθῆκει.  
 v.<sup>39a</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς.  
 v.<sup>39c</sup> ὥρα ἦν ὡς δεκάτη.  
 v.<sup>40</sup> ἦν Ἀνδρέας.  
 v.<sup>41</sup> εὐρίσκει οὗτος.  
 v.<sup>42a</sup> ἤγαγεν αὐτόν.  
 v.<sup>42b</sup> ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ.  
 v.<sup>43a</sup> τῇ ἐπαύριον ἠθέλησεν.  
 v.<sup>45</sup> εὐρίσκει Φίλιππος.  
 v.<sup>46b</sup> λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος.  
 v.<sup>47</sup> εἶδεν Ἰησοῦς.  
 v.<sup>48a</sup> λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ.  
 v.<sup>48b</sup> ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς.  
 v.<sup>49</sup> ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ.  
 v.<sup>50</sup> ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς.

In order to prove that this characteristic is found throughout the Fourth Gospel, we may take two other chapters—from the middle and end—consisting mainly of narrative. *Ch.* 11 contains 59 sentences, of which 17 have no connective particle (*vv.* <sup>8.9</sup> *vs.* 11.23.24.25.26.27.34.35.39 *vs.* 40.44 *vs.* 48<sup>1</sup>); *ch.* 18 contains 52 sentences, and 20 of these are without connective particle (*vv.* <sup>1.5b</sup> *s.* 8.1<sup>1</sup>.20.21.23.25.26.30.31.34.35 *vs.* 36.37 *tr.* 38<sup>1</sup>). This is a smaller proportion than in *ch.* 1; yet, as compared with the Synoptists, it is a very high one. To take three chapters at random from the latter—Mt. 3 contains 13 sentences, *none* without connective particle; Mk. 1 contains 38 sentences, 2 only without connective particle (*vv.* <sup>1.8</sup>); Lk. 8 contains 60 sentences, 2 only without connective particle (*vv.* <sup>8b.10</sup>).

*Asyndeton* ἀπεκρίθη, ἀπεκρίθησαν = *asyndeton* ܡܕܝܝܐ, ܝܕܝܐ.

In the openings of unconnected sentences given above from the Aramaic of Dan. 2, it will be noticed that 9 out of the 22 take the form, 'Answered (so and-so)'. This is very characteristic,

28 examples occurring in the six Aramaic chapters, while there are only 2 cases of 'Then answered' (5<sup>17</sup>, 6<sup>14</sup>), and *none at all* of 'And answered'. In contrast, the whole Hebrew O.T. offers only 2 such unconnected openings, 'Answered' (Song 2<sup>10</sup>, rendered 'spake' in R.V.; Ps. 118<sup>5b</sup>), while there are 145 cases of 'And answered (so-and-so)', ויענו, ויענו, &c.

Theodotion's version of Dan. does not always represent this Aramaic 'Answered'; but where it does, it regularly renders ἀπεκρίθη, ἀπεκρίθησαν (11 times; *once* ἀποκριθείς), preserving the asyndeton in 4 cases (2<sup>5,7,10</sup>, 4<sup>27</sup>), but elsewhere prefixing καί. These 12 passages, in all of which the Aramaic phrase is regularly followed by 'and said', before statement of the words spoken, are as follows:

2 <sup>5</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	ἀπεκρίθη.
2 <sup>7</sup>	ואמרין . . . ענו	ἀπεκρίθησαν . . . καὶ εἶπαν.
2 <sup>8</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.
2 <sup>10</sup>	ואמרין . . . ענו	ἀπεκρίθησαν . . . καὶ λέγουσιν.
2 <sup>26</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.
2 <sup>27</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ λέγει.
2 <sup>47</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀποκριθείς . . . εἶπεν.
3 <sup>14</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.
3 <sup>16</sup>	ואמרין . . . ענו	καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν . . . λέγοντες.
3 <sup>20(95)</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.
4 <sup>16</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.
4 <sup>27</sup>	ואמר . . . ענה	ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν.

In the Fourth Gospel ἀπεκρίθη or ἀπεκρίθησαν occurs as asyndeton openings 65 times (see below), ἀποκρίνεται *once*, 13<sup>38</sup>. On the other hand, we have ἀπεκρίθη οὖν, 7<sup>16</sup>, 9<sup>25</sup>, 12<sup>34</sup>; ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν, 2<sup>18</sup>, 7<sup>17</sup>, 9<sup>20</sup>; ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη, 5<sup>11</sup>; ἀπεκρίνατο οὖν, 5<sup>19</sup>; ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο, 5<sup>17</sup>; ἀποκρίνεται οὖν, 13<sup>26</sup>; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκρίνεται, 12<sup>23</sup>; i.e. 11 cases of this verb as an opening with connective particle, as against 66 cases without. Elsewhere in the whole N.T. ἀπεκρίθη as an asyndeton opening occurs only in Mk. 12<sup>29</sup>. In the Synoptists the common phrase is ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθείς (ἀποκριθείς δὲ) εἶπεν, which rather resembles the common Hebrew phrase ויען ויאמר 'And he answered and said', of which it is frequently the rendering in LXX.

Of the 65 cases of asyndeton opening ἀπεκρίθη, ἀπεκρίθησαν in



Jn., 38 introduce the words spoken without further verb, viz. 1<sup>49</sup>, 3<sup>5</sup>, 5<sup>7.11</sup>, 6<sup>7.68.70</sup>, 7<sup>20.46</sup>, 8<sup>19.33.34.49.54</sup>, 9<sup>3.11.27</sup>, 10<sup>25.32.33.34</sup>, 11<sup>9</sup>, 13<sup>8.36</sup>, 16<sup>21</sup>, 18<sup>3.8.20.23.34.35.36.37</sup>, 19<sup>7.11.15.22</sup>, 21<sup>5</sup>; we *once* have ἀπεκρίθη . . . λέγων, 1<sup>26</sup>; while in the 26 other cases the opening is ἀπεκρίθη (ἀπεκρίθησαν) . . . καὶ εἶπεν (εἶπαν), viz. 1<sup>48.50</sup>, 2<sup>19</sup>, 3<sup>3.9.10.27</sup>, 4<sup>10.13.17</sup>, 6<sup>26.29.43</sup>, 7<sup>21.52</sup>, 8<sup>14.39.43</sup>, 9<sup>30.34.36</sup>, 12<sup>30</sup>, 13<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>23</sup>, 18<sup>30</sup>, 20<sup>58</sup>. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is a literal rendering of the Aram. ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܢܥ, and ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν of ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܢܥ, for which, as we have seen, they stand in Theodotion's Daniel.

*Asyndeton λέγει, λέγουσιν = asyndeton ܐܡܪܝܢ (participle), ܐܡܪܝܢ.*

Similarly, we constantly find that Jn. uses λέγει as an opening without connective particle. The cases are 1<sup>29.46.48</sup>, 2<sup>5.7</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>7.11.15.16.17.19.21.25.26.34.49.50</sup>, 5<sup>8</sup>, 6<sup>8</sup>, 7<sup>50</sup>, 8<sup>29</sup>, 9<sup>12</sup>, 11<sup>23.24.27.39 bis.40.44</sup>, 13<sup>6.8.9.10.36.37</sup>, 14<sup>5.6.8.9.22</sup>, 18<sup>3.17.26.38</sup>, 19<sup>6.15</sup>, 20<sup>13.5.16.17.29</sup>, 21<sup>3.10.12.15 bis.16 ter.17 bis.22</sup>; a total of 63. λέγουσιν without connective particle occurs in 11<sup>8.34</sup>, 16<sup>29</sup>, 21<sup>3</sup>; ἐκείνη . . . λέγει, 20<sup>15</sup>; ἄλλοι ἔλεγον in 10<sup>21</sup>, 12<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand, we have the opening καὶ λέγει in 2<sup>4.8</sup>, 19<sup>14</sup>; καὶ λέγουσιν in 20<sup>13</sup>; καὶ ἔλεγεν in 6<sup>65</sup>, 8<sup>23</sup>; καὶ ἔλεγον in 6<sup>42</sup>; λέγει οὖν in 4<sup>9</sup>, 7<sup>6</sup>, 13<sup>27</sup>, 18<sup>17</sup>, 19<sup>10</sup>, 21<sup>5.7</sup>; λέγουσιν οὖν in 9<sup>17</sup>; ἔλεγεν οὖν in 8<sup>31</sup>; ἔλεγον οὖν in 4<sup>33</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup>, 8<sup>19.25</sup>, 9<sup>10.16</sup>, 11<sup>36</sup>, 16<sup>18</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup>, 20<sup>25</sup>; λέγει δέ in 12<sup>4</sup>; ἔλεγεν δέ in 6<sup>71</sup>; ἔλεγον δέ in 10<sup>20</sup>; εἶτα λέγει in 19<sup>27</sup>, 20<sup>27</sup>; i.e. a total of 31 openings with connective particle, as against 70 without such particle.

In Mt. λέγει as an asyndeton opening occurs 16 times, viz. 16<sup>15</sup>, 17<sup>25</sup>, 18<sup>22</sup>, 19<sup>8.18.20</sup>, 20<sup>7.21.23</sup>, 21<sup>31.42</sup>, 22<sup>43</sup>, 26<sup>35.35.64</sup>, 27<sup>22</sup>; λέγουσιν 10 times, viz. 9<sup>28</sup>, 19<sup>7.10</sup>, 20<sup>7.22.33</sup>, 21<sup>3.41</sup>, 22<sup>42</sup>, 27<sup>22</sup>. In Mk. λέγει thus *never*; λέγουσιν in 8<sup>19</sup>.\* In Lk. λέγει in 16<sup>7</sup>, 19<sup>22</sup>; λέγουσιν *never*. In Acts there are *no occurrences* of λέγει, λέγουσιν as asyndeton openings.

That the historical present in Jn., of which λέγει is the most frequent example, represents the similar usage of the participle in Aramaic, is argued later on (p. 88). There are no instances of the asyndeton opening ܐܡܪܝܢ (participle) in Dan., because the

\* The absence of this asyndeton usage in Mk. is a point against the view that this Gospel is a *literal translation* of an Aramaic document. There are very many cases where Mk. uses καὶ λέγει, ὁ δὲ λέγει as openings, where Jn. would certainly have used asyndeton λέγει. Cf. e.g., for the difference in style, the dialogue of Mk. 12<sup>14-17</sup>.

writer of this book prefers the formula 'Answered and said' which we have already noticed. This latter phrase, however, so much favoured in Dan., seems to have been practically confined to *Western* Aramaic, being unused in Syriac, except in *translation*, as in the Peshîṭā of the O.T.\* Ordinarily in Aramaic, especially in its Eastern branch, the asyndeton opening ܡܕܝܢܐ, ܕܝܢܐ (participle) is one of the most characteristic features of the language in description of a dialogue; and this naturally lends itself in Greek to a rendering by the asyndeton historical present λέγει. For example, the Syriac *Acta Thomae* in the first four pages (ed. Wright) offers twelve examples of the usage. The following is a literal rendering of a dialogue-passage from this work (p. ܡܕܝܢܐ):

'And when they had embarked and sat down, Habban the merchant says to Judas, "What is the craft that thou art able to practise?" Judas says to him, 'Carpentry and architecture—the work of a carpenter'. Habban the merchant says to him, "What art thou skilled to make in wood, and what in hewn stone?" Judas says to him, "In wood I have learned to make ploughs and yokes and ox-goads, and oars for ferry-boats and masts for ships; and in stone, tombstones and shrines and temples and palaces for kings". Habban the merchant says to him, "I was seeking just such a workman".'

With this we may compare the structure of the dialogue in Jn. 21<sup>15-17</sup>:

'So when they had broken their fast, Jesus says to Simon Peter, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these?" He says to Him, "Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee". He says to him, "Feed My lambs". He says to him again a second time, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me?" He says to Him, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee". He says to him, "Tend My sheep". He says to him the third time, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me?" Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, "Lovest thou Me?" And he said to Him, "Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee". Jesus says to him, "Feed My sheep".'

\* According to Dalman (*WJ.* p. 25) the formula is unknown in later Jewish Aramaic.

This very striking resemblance in structure between the two passages—both as regards pictorial  $\text{ⲉⲗⲉⲓ}$  = λέγει and asyndeton usage—is no mere chance and isolated phenomenon. Dialogues so framed are frequent in the Fourth Gospel (cf. especially the references to λέγει in chs. 4, 11, 13, 14, 18, 20), and innumerable parallels from Aramaic might be collected.\*

#### Parataxis.

Peculiarly Semitic is the simplicity of construction employed throughout the Fourth Gospel. Sentences are regularly co-ordinated, and linked by καί. Subordinate sentences are few and far between. In 6<sup>22-24</sup>, where the writer embarks exceptionally upon a somewhat complex sentence, he speedily becomes involved in difficulty. 13<sup>1-4</sup> is more successful as Greek; but this passage, in point of style, practically stands alone.† Such simplicity of construction can of course to some extent be paralleled from the Synoptic sources, particularly from Mk. But not even in Mk. does it attain anything like the vogue which it has in Jn.

#### *Comparative rarity of Aorist Participle describing action anterior to finite verb.*

In speaking above of Jn.'s phrase ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν, we noticed that the Synoptic equivalent subordinates the prior action by use of the Aorist Participle, e.g. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, i.e. the natural Greek construction. Though we occasionally find this latter construction in Jn.—e.g. 1<sup>36</sup> καὶ ἐμβλέψας . . . λέγει—it is far less common than in the Synoptists. An approximate count yields the following figures, the proportions of which are worked out according to the pages of WH.

\* The asyndeton construction is also frequent in Rabbinic Hebrew (under the influence of Aramaic), though here in description of past events the Perfect is normally used. Several examples are cited by Schlatter (*Sprache*, pp. 25 f.). Cf. e.g. Midrash Rabba on Exodus, par. v. 18 (Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh), 'He said to them, Who are ye? They said to him, We are the messengers of the Holy One, blessed be He. What are ye seeking? They said to him, Thus saith the Lord, &c.'

† We may note that v.<sup>2</sup> contains two out of the only seventeen occurrences of the Genitive absolute which are found in Jn.

	<i>pp. in WH.</i>	<i>Occurrences.</i>	<i>Proportion per page.</i>
Mt.	68	338	5
Mk.	41	224	5½
Lk.	72	324	4½
Jn.	53	58	1

Prof. Moulton (*NTG.*<sup>3</sup> i, p. 12), in speaking of 'co-ordination of clauses with the simple *καί*, in place of the use of participles or subordinate clauses', remarks that 'in itself the phenomenon proves nothing more than would a string of "ands" in an English rustic's story—elementary culture, and not the hampering presence of a foreign idiom that is being perpetually translated into its most literal equivalent'. This may be so 'in itself'; here, however, we have to ask why, if avoidance of the participial construction in favour of co-ordination is natural to *Κοινή* Greek, we find this striking disproportion between Jn. and the Synoptists which the figures reveal. The answer has been supplied elsewhere by Dr. Moulton himself. 'The over-use of locutions which can be defended as good *Κοινή* Greek' is a test of 'Greek which is virtually or actually translated'.\*

*Comparative rarity of Genitive absolute.*

As compared with the Synoptists, the use of the Genitive absolute in Jn. is infrequent. The approximate figures are, Mt. 48, Mk. 36, Lk. 59, Jn. 17; i.e. the Synoptists exhibit but slight variation in their use of the construction, and use it about 2½ times as often as Jn. While the Synoptists use the construction, almost without exception, in temporal clauses, Jn. 'employs it with more elasticity of meaning than is found in the Triple Tradition. A causal meaning ("as" or "because") is implied, probably or certainly, in 2<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>13</sup>, 6<sup>18</sup>. "Though" is certainly implied in 12<sup>37</sup>, 21<sup>11</sup>, and perhaps in 20<sup>19</sup>' (Abbott, *JG.* 2028-31).

The rarity of the Genitive absolute in Jn. is due partly to the use of parataxis: e.g. 1<sup>21</sup> *καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν τί οὖν; σὺ Ἡλείας εἶ; καὶ λέγει Οὐκ εἰμί.* 1<sup>46</sup> *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, . . λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος.*

\* *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 474. The quotation has already been given in full on p. 7.

1<sup>48</sup> λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ . . . ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ (contrast Mt. 17<sup>26</sup> εἰπόντος δέ Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Lk. 21<sup>5</sup> καὶ τινων λεγόντων . . . εἶπεν). 4<sup>46</sup> ἦλθεν οὖν . . . καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικός. 7<sup>45</sup> ἦλθον οὖν οἱ ὑπηρέται πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους, καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι (contrast Mt. 8<sup>28</sup> καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ . . . ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ. Mt. 17<sup>14,24</sup>, 21<sup>23</sup>). 6<sup>17</sup> καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει, καὶ οὕτω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς (contrast Mt. 8<sup>16</sup> ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ). 10<sup>27,24</sup> καὶ περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ . . . ἐκύκλωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (contrast Lk. 11<sup>29</sup> Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροισμένων ἤρξατο λέγειν).

The place of the Genitive absolute is also taken in Jn. by a temporal clause introduced by ὅτε, a construction for which, as compared with the Synoptists, this writer shows a relative fondness. Neglecting cases in which ὅτε has an antecedent (e.g. Jn. 4<sup>21</sup> ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε. So 4<sup>23</sup>, 5<sup>25</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup>, 16<sup>25</sup>), there are 16 cases of ὅτε introducing a temporal clause in Jn., as against 13 in Mt., 10 in Mk., 10 in Lk. If Jn. were as long as Mt., there would be proportionately 21 cases; if as long as Lk., 22 cases; if as short as Mk. 13 cases. The occurrences of ὡς = 'when' introducing a temporal clause in Jn. are 16; Lk. 16; Mt. and Mk. *none*.

In cases where the subject of the ὅτε or ὡς clause is the same as that of the principal clause, the temporal clause so introduced of course takes the place of an Aorist Participle in the nominative. These in Jn. are—ὅτε, 6<sup>24</sup>, 13<sup>12</sup>, 17<sup>12</sup>, 19<sup>6,8,23,30</sup>, 21<sup>18</sup>; ὡς, 2<sup>9</sup>, 4<sup>1,40</sup>, 11<sup>6,20,29,7,2,31</sup>, 19<sup>33</sup>, 21<sup>9</sup>. There remain 8 cases in which, the subject of the ὅτε clause being different from that of the principal clause, the Genitive absolute might have been used; and 5 similar cases of the ὡς clause. These are—ὅτε, 1<sup>19</sup>, 2<sup>22</sup>, 4<sup>45</sup>, 12<sup>16,17</sup>, 13<sup>31</sup>, 20<sup>24</sup>, 21<sup>15</sup>; ὡς, 2<sup>23</sup>, 6<sup>12,16</sup>, 7<sup>10</sup>, 18<sup>6</sup>. Similar cases in Lk. are—ὅτε 6, ὡς 8; Mt. ὅτε 7; Mk. ὅτε 9. Thus cases in which a ὅτε or ὡς clause takes the place of a Genitive absolute are in Jn. 13, as against Lk. 14, Mt. 7, Mk. 9. Though the figures in Jn. and Lk. are thus similar, it should be borne in mind that Lk. is considerably longer (72 pp. WH. as against 53 pp.), and also contains much more *narrative*, to which, in distinction from speeches, by far the greater number of such temporal clauses belong. Thus we are justified in finding in Jn., as compared with the Synoptists, a preponderance of temporal clauses introduced by ὅτε or ὡς, which serve to explain

(along with parataxis) the comparative rarity of the Genitive absolute in this Gospel.

Now the use of ܐܢܝܢ, ܐܢܝܢ, Syr. ܐܢܝܢ = 'when' to introduce a temporal clause is very common in Aramaic. This is the ordinary construction employed in the Syriac versions to render a temporal clause which Greek expresses by the Genitive absolute. The first few cases of the Genitive absolute in Lk. will serve to illustrate this (the rendering 'when' followed by the finite verb gives the literal representation of the Syriac construction).

Lk. 2<sup>2</sup> ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

Pal. Syr. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܝܪܝܢܝܘܫ ܐܢܝܢ 'when Quirinius was in Syria'.

Pesh. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ 'in the hegemony of Q. in S.'

Sin. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ 'in the years of Q., governor of S.'

Lk. 2<sup>12,13</sup> καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβαίνοντων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς, καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, κτλ.

Pal. Syr. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ 'And when He was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem according to the custom of the feast; and when they had fulfilled the days, &c.' Construction of Sin. and Pesh. identical.

Lk. 3<sup>1</sup> ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, κτλ.

Pal. Syr. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ 'when Pontius Pilate was governor in Judaea'.

Sin. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ 'in the hegemony of Pontius Pilate in Judah'. So Pesh.

Lk. 3<sup>15</sup> προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.

Pal. Syr. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ 'Now when the multitude was expectant, and all of them were debating in their hearts'.

Sin., Cur. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ 'And the men that were hearing him were reflecting in their minds'.

Pesh. ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ 'And when the multitude was expectant, and all of them were debating in their hearts'.



It is interesting to note that this construction of 'when' with a finite verb *and* the absence of an alternative construction resembling the Genitive absolute in Greek, is not common to Semitic, but is *specifically Aramaic*. Hebrew uses פֶּאֱשֶׁר 'when' with a finite verb somewhat rarely, but far more frequently employs the Infinitive construct with pronominal suffix, and prefixed ב 'in' or כ 'as'; e.g. בְּרֹאֵתוֹ 'when he saw', lit. 'in his seeing'. Further, it has a usage of the *Participle absolute* (cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 165) closely resembling the Greek Genitive absolute, and regularly rendered by it in LXX. In the passages where this construction occurs in O.T. it will be found that Targ. Hebraizes its Aramaic to a large extent, while exhibiting a tendency to use the true Aramaic construction. Pesh., on the other hand, regularly breaks away from the Hebrew construction, and renders by כֵּן 'when' with a finite verb. The English renderings aim at exactly reproducing the Semitic constructions.

Gen. 42<sup>35</sup> וַיְהִי הֵם מְרִיקִים שְׂקֵיהֶם וְהִנֵּה אִישׁ צָרוֹר כֶּסֶף בְּשָׁקוֹ 'And it came to pass, they emptying their sacks, and behold, each man's bundle of money in his sack'.

LXX ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ κατακενοῦν αὐτοὺς τοὺς σάκκους αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦν ἐκάστου ὁ δεσμός τοῦ ἀργυρίου ἐν τῷ σάκκῳ αὐτῶν.

Targ. וְהוּא אֵינָן מְרִיקִין שְׂקֵיהֶן וְהָא נָבַר צָרָר כֶּסֶף בְּשָׁקֵיהֶן, exactly follows Hebrew.

Pesh. כֵּן הָיָה כְּשֶׁמָּלְאוּ אֶת שְׂאֵמֵיהֶם וְהִנֵּה כֶּסֶף בְּפִי מִן הַבָּלָה 'And it came to pass that when they were emptying their sacks, behold, each man's bundle of money in the mouth of his bale'.

1 Kgs. 13<sup>20</sup> וַיְהִי הֵם יוֹשְׁבִים עַל הַשֻּׁלְחָן וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה 'And it came to pass, they sitting at the table, and there came the word of Yahweh'.

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν καθημένων [ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης], καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου.

Targ. וְהוּא עַד דִּאיִנָן מְסַתְחֲרִין עַל פְּתוּרָא וְהוּא פִתְגָם נְבוּאָה מִן קֳדָם יְהוָה 'And it came to pass, whilst they were sitting round the table, and (= then) there came a word of prophecy from before Y.'

Pesh. כֵּן הָיָה כְּשֶׁיָּשְׁבוּ אֶת הַשֻּׁלְחָן וְהִנֵּה הָיָה דְבַר יְהוָה 'And when they were sitting at the table, there came the word of the Lord'.



2 Kgs. 2<sup>11</sup> 'And it came to pass, they going on—going and talking (= and talking as they went), and, behold, a chariot of fire, &c.'

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν πορευομένων, ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἐλάλουν· καὶ ἰδὸν ἄρμα πυρὸς κτλ.

Targ. 'And it came to pass, whilst they were going on—going and talking, and (= then) behold, chariots of fire'.

Pesh. 'And it came to pass that when they were talking and going on, and (= then) behold, a chariot of fire'.

2 Kgs. 8<sup>5</sup> 'And it came to pass, he telling the king how he (Elisha) had raised the dead, and, behold, the woman whose son he had raised crying unto the king'.

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἐξηγουμένου τῷ βασιλεῖ ὡς ἐζωπύρησεν υἱὸν τεθνηκότα, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ γυνὴ ἣς ἐζωπύρησεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς βοῶσα πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα.

Targ. 'And it came to pass, he telling the king how he (Elisha) had raised the dead, and, behold, the woman whose son he had raised crying unto the king'.

Pesh. 'And when he was relating to the king that he had raised the dead, he saw the woman whose son he had raised making supplication before the king'.

2 Kgs. 8<sup>21</sup> 'And it came to pass, he arising (or arose) by night and smote Edom who surrounded him . . . and the people fled to their home'.

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀναστάντος, καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸν Ἐδὼμ τὸν κυκλώσαντα ἐπ' αὐτὸν . . . καὶ ἔφυγεν ὁ λαὸς κτλ.

Targ. 'And it came to pass, he arising (or arose) by night and smote Edom who surrounded him . . . and the people fled to their home'.

Pesh. 'And when he arose by night that he might destroy the Edomites who were surrounding him . . . and (= then) the people fled to their homes'.



Similarly in Aramaic—Dan. 2<sup>37,38</sup>, 'Thou, O king, the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven gave, &c., thou art that head of gold' (אַנְתָּה הוּא רִאשָׁה דִּי דְהָבָא); Dan. 3<sup>22</sup>, 'Those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, the flame of the fire slew them' (שְׂרִיפָא דִּי נִרְאָא); Dan. 4<sup>17-19</sup>, 'The tree that thou sawest, &c., it is thou, O king' (אַנְתָּה הוּא מִלְכָּא); Ezr. 5<sup>14</sup>, 'And moreover, the vessels of the house of God, &c., them did Cyrus the king take out (שׁוֹרֵץ הַבַּיִת) of the temple of Babylon'; Ezr. 7<sup>24</sup>, 'All priests and Levites, &c., it shall not be lawful to impose tribute, &c., upon them' (לִמְרִמָּא עַל־יהֵם); Ezr. 7<sup>26</sup>, 'Every one that will not perform the law of thy God and the law of the king, let judgement diligently be executed upon him' (לְהוֹיָא כְּתַעְבָּר מִנֵּה).

This reinforcement of a *Casus pendens* by the Pronoun is a marked characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. We may note the following illustrations:

1<sup>12</sup> ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι.

1<sup>18</sup> μονογενὴς Θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνος ἐξηγήσατο.

1<sup>33</sup> ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκείνός μοι εἶπεν.

3<sup>26</sup> ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ . . . ἴδε οὗτος βαπτίζει.\*

3<sup>32</sup> ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

5<sup>11</sup> Ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῇ ἐκείνός μοι εἶπεν.

5<sup>19</sup> ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκείνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ.

5<sup>36</sup> τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ πατήρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν (we should surely omit the comma after ποιῶ, and make αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα the subject of μαρτυρεῖ, reinforcing τὰ γὰρ ἔργα after ἃ δέδωκέ μοι κτλ.)

5<sup>37</sup> καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ ἐκείνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ.

5<sup>38</sup> ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκείνος τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε.

6<sup>39</sup> ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

6<sup>46</sup> ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα.

7<sup>18</sup> ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν.

8<sup>26</sup> καὶ γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

10<sup>1</sup> ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας . . . ἐκείνος κλέπτῃς ἐστὶν καὶ ληστῆς.

\* Schlatter (*Sprache*, pp. 49 f.) quotes a number of instances from Rabbinic Hebrew in which הִנֵּה 'behold, this one, &c.' reinforces a *Nominativus pendens*. Thus e. g. Mechilta on Ex. 16<sup>4</sup>, כָּל מִי שִׁישׁ לוֹ מָה יֵאָכֵל הַיּוֹם וּמָחָר מִי שִׁישׁ לוֹ מָה יֵאָכֵל הַיּוֹם וּמָחָר הָרִי זֶה מְחֹסֵר אִמְנָה 'Whosoever hath what he may eat to-day, and saith, What shall I eat to-morrow? behold, this one lacketh faith.'

10<sup>25</sup> τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.

12<sup>48</sup> ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

12<sup>49</sup> ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν δέδωκεν.

14<sup>12</sup> ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ποιήσει.

14<sup>13</sup> καὶ ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω.

14<sup>21</sup> ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με.

14<sup>26</sup> ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα.

15<sup>2</sup> πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπὸν αἶρει αὐτό, καὶ πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον καθαίρει αὐτό.

15<sup>5</sup> ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολύν.

17<sup>2</sup> ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

17<sup>24</sup> ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ᾤσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ.

18<sup>11</sup> τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;

Against these 27 \* instances in Jn. we can only set 11 in Mt. (4<sup>16</sup>, 13<sup>20,22,23,34</sup>, 15<sup>11</sup>, 19<sup>28</sup>, 21<sup>42</sup>, 24<sup>13</sup>, 25<sup>29</sup>, 26<sup>23</sup>), 4 in Mk. (6<sup>16</sup>, 7<sup>20</sup>, 12<sup>10</sup>, 13<sup>11</sup>), and 6 in Lk. (8<sup>14,15</sup>, 12<sup>48</sup>, 20<sup>17</sup>, 21<sup>6</sup>, 23<sup>50-52</sup>); and of these Mt. 4<sup>16</sup> and Mt. 21<sup>42</sup> = Mk. 12<sup>10</sup> = Lk. 20<sup>17</sup> are O.T. quotations.

Of course it cannot be claimed that the use of *Casus pendens* is specifically a Semitism, since—to go no farther—it is a familiar colloquialism in English. Prof. Moulton remarks that 'it is one of the easiest of anacolutha, as much at home in English as in Greek' (*NTG.*<sup>3</sup> i, p. 69). The fact which concerns us is the remarkable frequency of its occurrence in Jn. as compared with the Synoptists. If Lk., for example, is a fair specimen of Κοινή Greek, why should we find that a construction which occurs there but 6 times is employed in Jn. with six times the frequency? An adequate answer is forthcoming in the assumption that a common Aramaic construction has been exactly reproduced in translation.

\* Abbott (*JG.* 1921) adds 10<sup>35,36</sup>, ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς; "Whom the Father sanctified . . . do ye say [to him] Thou blasphemest?" best explained as [ἐκεῖνος] ὃν.<sup>7</sup> 7<sup>38</sup>, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ . . . ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ (also cited by Abbott) is not included as involving—on our theory—a mistranslation. Cf. p. 109.

## CHAPTER III

### CONJUNCTIONS

καί, οὐν.

As compared with the Synoptists, καί in Jn. is infrequent in narrative. The occurrences, as given by Abbott (*JG.* 2133; cf. Bruder's *Concordance*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 456 ff.) are, Mt. about 250 times, Mk. more than 400 times, Lk. about 380 times, Jn. less than 100 times. This comparative infrequency seems to be due partly to the writer's use of asyndeton (cf. p. 50), partly to his fondness for οὐν, which he uses some 200 times, as against Mt. 57 times, Mk. 6 times, Lk. 31 times. καί is frequent in Jn. in speeches, linking co-ordinate clauses, as in a Semitic language. A striking Semitic usage may be seen in its employment to link *contrasted* statements, where in English we should naturally employ 'and yet' or 'but'. This is most frequent in speeches, though occasionally we find it also in the reflections of the author upon his narrative. So 1<sup>10,11</sup>, 2<sup>20</sup>, 3<sup>10,11,19,32</sup>, 4<sup>20</sup>, 5<sup>39,40,43,44</sup>, 6<sup>70</sup>, 7<sup>4,19,30</sup>, 8<sup>20,52,57</sup>, 9<sup>30,34</sup>, 11<sup>8</sup>, 12<sup>34</sup>, 16<sup>5</sup>, 20<sup>20</sup>, 21<sup>11</sup>. Cf., in Hebrew, Gen. 2<sup>16,17</sup>, 'Of every tree of the garden thou *mayest* eat; and (=but) of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it'; 3<sup>2,3</sup>, 'Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; and (=but) of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Ye shall not eat, &c.'; 17<sup>20,21</sup>, 'And as regards Ishmael I have heard thee; behold I have blessed him, &c. And (=But) my covenant will I establish with Isaac'; 32<sup>30</sup> (Heb. 32<sup>31</sup>), 'I have seen God face to face, and (=and yet) my life is preserved' (other instances of this common usage in *Oxford Heb. Lex.* p. 252 b). The same usage in Aramaic—where it is equally common—may be illustrated from Dan. 2<sup>5,6</sup>, 'If ye make not known to me the dream and its interpretation, ye shall be cut in pieces, &c.; and (=but) if ye shew the dream and the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts, &c.'; 3<sup>5,6</sup>, 'At what time ye hear . . . ye shall fall down

and worship the golden image, &c.; and (=but) whoso falleth not down, &c.'; 3<sup>17,18</sup>, 'If our God, whom we serve, be able to deliver us, He will deliver, &c.; and (=but) if not, be it known, &c.'; 4<sup>7</sup> (Aram. 4<sup>4</sup>), 'And I told the dream before them, and (=yet) its interpretation they did not make known to me'.

In Hebrew and Aramaic 'and' may very idiomatically introduce a contrasted idea in such a way as to suggest a *question*, this being implied by the contrast without the use of an interrogative particle. So in Hebrew, Judg. 14<sup>16</sup>, 'Behold, to my father and my mother I have not told it, and shall I tell it unto thee?' (lit. 'and to thee I shall tell it!'); 2 Sam. 11<sup>11</sup>, 'The ark, and Israel, and Judah are abiding in tents; and my lord Joab, and the servants of my lord, are encamped in the open field; and shall I go into my house, to eat and to drink, &c.?' (lit. 'and I shall go, &c.!' see further instances in *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* p. 252). The same usage may be illustrated in Aramaic from passages in *Acta Thomae* (ed. Wright).

(p. 99). ܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ. 'All buildings are built in summer; and thou buildest in winter!'

(p. 105). ܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ. 'On thy account I excused myself from my lord, king Mazdai, and from the supper; and thou dost not choose to sup with me!'

(p. 106). ܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ. 'Thou thyself hast not departed from us, except for a moment; and thou knowest not how we were shut up!'

With inverted order, (p. 107). ܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܬܐ. 'Thou sittest and hearkenest to vain words; and king Mazdai in his wrath is seeking to destroy thee!'

In a precisely similar way *καί* introduces a paradox in several passages in Jn., and the paradox, being hypothetical, is treated as a question.

2<sup>20</sup> Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν;

3<sup>10</sup> Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;

8<sup>57</sup> Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὕτω ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐώρακας;

9<sup>34</sup> Ἐν ἀμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος, καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς;

11<sup>8</sup> Ῥαββεί, νῦν ἐξήτουν σε λιθάσαι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ;

The use of 'and' with the sense 'and so' is very frequent in Semitic. Some few cases of καὶ so used are to be found in Jn., e.g. 5<sup>10</sup> Σάββατόν ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἄραι τὸν κράββατον, 6<sup>57</sup> καθὼς ἀπέστειλén με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ καὶ γὰρ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με κἀκείνος ζήσκει δι' ἐμέ, 11<sup>48</sup> ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτως, πάντες πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος. Usually, however, this consecutive connexion is expressed in Jn. by οὖν, which, as we have seen, is extraordinarily frequent (200 occurrences). It is highly probable that οὖν represents an original 'and' ('and so') in Aramaic in many cases\*; in others it may have been inserted by the translator to introduce a sentence which stood asyndeton in the original. The cases cited by Abbott (*JG.* 2191 a), in which Mk. omits οὖν while Mt. or Lk. has it in parallel passages, suggests that the particle in Jn. is due to the translator. Οὖν is usually rendered in Pal. Syr. by ܐܘܢ 'and' simply; but sometimes by ܐܘܢܐ = δέ.

μέν, δέ, γάρ.

μέν, which is very rare in Jn., is infrequent also in the Synoptists. The occurrences are, Mt. 20, Mk. 6, Lk. 10, Jn. 8.

\* The writer's conclusion as to οὖν given above stands as he had worked it out before reading the words of Prof. Burkitt in *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii, p. 89: 'In the course of working at the Syriac equivalents for S. Mark's εὐθύς and S. John's οὖν it has occurred to me that fundamentally they mean the same thing. and that they really correspond to the Hebrew "wāw consecutive". Not, of course, that either of these Gospels is a translation from the Hebrew; but if the authors of these Gospels were familiar with the Old Testament otherwise than through the awkward medium of the LXX, they might well have felt themselves in need of something to correspond to the Hebrew idiom. The essence of the meaning of "wāw consecutive" is that the event related is regarded as happening in due sequence to what has gone before. To express this καὶ is too inadequate a link, while δέ implies a contrast which is wholly wanting in the Hebrew: the turn of thought is more or less our English "and so". But this is exactly what S. Mark means by his καὶ εὐθύς, and it is what is generally meant in the Fourth Gospel by οὖν. Simon's wife's mother was sick of a fever and so they tell Jesus of her (καὶ εὐθύς Mk. 1<sup>30</sup>): S. Mark does not mean to emphasize the haste they were in to tell the news. Similarly in S. John there are literally scores of verses beginning with εἶπεν οὖν or εἶπον οὖν where "he said therefore" brings out too prominently the idea of causation. All that is meant is ܐܘܢܐ "and so he said", or "and so they said", as the case may be.' That οὖν corresponds to the Hebrew wāw consecutive was noticed by Ewald, *Die jehann. Schriften* (1861), p. 45, n. 2.

δέ is uncommon in Jn. and Mk. as compared with Mt. and Lk.\*

The numbers are, Mt. 496, Mk. 156, Lk. 508, Jn. 176.†

Thus, while the average number of occurrences per page (WH.) are  $7\frac{1}{2}$  in Mt. and 7 in Lk., in Mk. they are only  $3\frac{2}{3}$  and in Jn.  $3\frac{1}{2}$ .

Now W. Aramaic, like Hebrew, has no equivalent of δέ, both languages employing 'and' in its place, or (Aramaic) an asyndeton opening. The comparative avoidance of δέ in Mk. and Jn. is therefore strongly suggestive of translation from Aramaic in which the Semitic use of 'and', or of no connective particle at all, was usually copied. In Syriac the need for such a particle as δέ was, under Greek influence, so much felt that the Greek particle was introduced in the form ܕܝܢ *dēn*, in Pal. Syr. ܕܝ *dī*.

γάρ is less frequent in Jn. than in the Synoptists. The occurrences are Mt. 125, Mk. 67, Lk. 101, Jn. 66. If Jn. were as long as Mt., there would be proportionately 86 occurrences; if as long as Lk., 92 occurrences; if as short as Mk., 53 occurrences. If Mk. were as long as Mt., there would be 96 occurrences; if as long as Lk., 109 occurrences; if as long as Jn., 82 occurrences.

In W. Aramaic such particles and phrases as correspond more or less to γάρ, ܐܝܢ, ܕܝܢ, Biblical Aram. ܕܝܢ-ܕܝܢ, &c., are really much more weighty, bearing rather the sense *because*, *since*. In many cases in which Greek would use γάρ, Aramaic would be content with 'and' simply; and this may account for the comparative infrequency of γάρ in Jn. Syriac, feeling the need for a light particle like γάρ, introduced it in the form ܕܝܢ *gēr*.

#### ἵνα.

The frequency of ἵνα in Jn. is one of the most remarkable phenomena in this Gospel. The approximate number of occurrences is 127; whereas in Mt. we find 33, in Mk. 60, in Lk. 40. If Jn. were as long as Mt., there would be proportionately 163 occurrences; if as long as Lk., 178 occurrences; if as short as Mk., 101 occurrences. ἵνα μή occurs in Jn. 18 times, in Mt. 8 times, in Mk. 5 times, in Lk. 8 times. On the other hand, μήποτε in the sense 'that . . . not', 'lest', never occurs in Jn.,‡ whereas it is found in Mt. 8 times, in Mk. *twice*, in Lk. 6 times.

\* In Apoc. δέ is excessively rare, occurring some 5 times only.

† The numbers for the Synoptists are those given by Sir John Hawkins, *HS*² p. 151.

‡ Similarly in Apoc. we find ἵνα μή 11 times, μήποτε *never*.



Now there exists in Aramaic a particle—in origin a demonstrative—which is used with peculiar frequency to denote various shades of connexion. This particle appears in W. Aramaic as ܐܕܝ *dī* or ܐܕܝܐ *dē*, in Syriac as ܐܕܝܐ *dē*. As a particle of relation it denotes *who, which, that* (properly a connecting link between the relative sentence and its antecedent—*that one*, usually completed by a pronoun or pronominal suffix in the relative clause; e.g. ܐܕܝܐ ܕܝܗܐ *dē yehā* 'who he said to him', i.e. 'to whom he said'), and also the relative *when*. It may be used as a mark of the genitive, e.g. ܐܕܝܐ ܕܡܠܝܚܐ *dē mālīḥā* 'the king's captain' (lit. 'the captain, *that* of the king'). Further, it is especially frequent as a conjunction, *that*, in the sense *in that, inasmuch as, because*, and in a final sense, *in order that*. Our purpose is to show that *īva* occurs in Jn. in all the senses of ܐܕܝܐ or ܐܕܝܐ except that which marks the genitive relation.

The frequent occurrence of *īva* in a telic sense calls for no comment, beyond note of the fact that the use of *īva* μή to the exclusion of μήποτε favours the theory of literal translation of the Aramaic phrase ܐܕܝܐ *dē* 'that . . . not'.\* Further, the use of *īva* = conjunctive *that*, followed by a finite verb, where in classical Greek we should expect an Infinitive, is a well-ascertained characteristic of Κοινή Greek, and has come through the Κοινή into modern Greek in the form *vá*. What *is* remarkable, however, in Jn.'s usage of this idiom, as compared with Mt. and Lk., is its extreme frequency. This is also—though to a less extent—true of Mk.; and it is instructive to notice how many different expedients Mt. or Lk., or both of them, frequently employ in order to get rid of Mk.'s *īva*, whether used in a final sense or otherwise.†

- |   |                     |  |
|---|---------------------|--|
| { | Mk. 4 <sup>21</sup> | Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον<br>τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; |
|   | Mt. 5 <sup>15</sup> | οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον.                                  |
|   | Lk. 8 <sup>16</sup> | Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης<br>τίθουσιν.                |

\* Contrast the translation of Hebrew ܐܕܝܐ 'lest', Isa. 6<sup>10</sup>, by μήποτε (as in LXX) in Mt. 13<sup>15</sup>, Mk. 4<sup>12</sup>, with Jn. 12<sup>40</sup> ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κτλ. (cf. p. 100).

† The following Synoptic comparisons were kindly supplied to the writer by Sir John Hawkins.

- { Mk. 4<sup>22</sup> οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτόν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ.  
 { Mt. 10<sup>26</sup> οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται.  
 { Lk. 8<sup>7</sup> οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται.
- { Mk. 5<sup>18</sup> καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαίμονι-  
 σθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾗ.  
 { Mt. 8<sup>34</sup> om.  
 { Lk. 8<sup>37-38</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν. ἐδεῖτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ  
 ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ.
- { Mk. 5<sup>23</sup> καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως  
 ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.  
 { Mt. 9<sup>18</sup> ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἰς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ  
 μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ'  
 αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.  
 { Lk. 8<sup>42</sup> καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς  
 τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ . . . καὶ αὐτὴ  
 ἀπέθνησκεν.
- { Mk. 5<sup>43</sup> καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο.  
 { Mt. 9<sup>26</sup> om.  
 { Lk. 8<sup>56</sup> ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.
- { Mk. 6<sup>25</sup> Θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῶς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ  
 βαπτιστοῦ.  
 { Mt. 14<sup>8</sup> Δός μοι, φησὶν, ὧδε ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ  
 βαπτιστοῦ.  
 { Lk. om.
- { Mk. 6<sup>41</sup> καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς.  
 { Mt. 14<sup>19</sup> ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.  
 { Lk. 9<sup>16</sup> καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.
- { Mk. 9<sup>9</sup> Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους, διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα  
 μηδενὶ ἂ εἶδον διηγῶνται.  
 { Mt. 17<sup>9</sup> Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς  
 λέγων Μηδενὶ εἴπητε κτλ.  
 { Lk. om.

Cases in which Mk.'s ἵνα is retained by one or both of the other Synoptists are Mk. 6<sup>56</sup> = Mt. 14<sup>36</sup>; Mk. 8<sup>30</sup> = Mt. 16<sup>20</sup> (contrast







Cur. ܐܢܬܝܢ ܠܐ ܬܠܠܝܬܝܢ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ, by Pesh. ܐܠܠܝܬܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܬܠܠܝܬܝܢ 'He commanded (Pesh. warned) them that they should tell no man', as in καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα κτλ. of Mk. 5<sup>13</sup>. Such illustrations could be almost indefinitely multiplied.

*ἵνα as a mistranslation of ܐ relative, 'who', 'which'.*

So far, the most that we have accomplished is to establish a good case for the hypothesis that the excessive use of ἵνα in Mk., and still more in Jn., may be due to the fact that the writers of these Gospels were accustomed to think in Aramaic. The frequent use of the ἵνα construction in place of an Infinitive is not in itself sufficient to prove *translation from Aramaic*; for an Aramaic-speaking Jew, in writing Greek, would naturally tend to exaggerate the use of a Κοινή construction which resembled his own native idiom. Now, however, we have to notice a usage of ἵνα in Jn. which can hardly be explained except by the hypothesis of actual *mistranslation* of an original Aramaic document. There are several passages in which ἵνα seems clearly to represent a mistranslation of ܐ employed in a relative sense. Translate them into Aramaic in the only possible way, representing ἵνα by ܐ, and an Aramaic scholar would, without question, give to that ܐ the sense 'who' or 'which'.

1<sup>8</sup> οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. This passage has already been discussed in our notes on the Prologue (p. 32). The accepted interpretation of ἵνα with a telic force involves the assumption of an ellipse—'but (he came) that he might bear witness, &c.' If ἵνα is a mistranslation of ܐ relative no such ellipse is required, the passage meaning, 'He was not the light, but *one who* was to bear witness of the light'.

5<sup>7</sup> ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα . . . βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν. Pal. Syr., quite literally, ܠܐ ܐܢܬܝܢ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ . . . ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ. The obvious meaning of this in Aramaic is, 'I have not a man *who* . . . shall put me into the pool'.

6<sup>30</sup> Τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν; Pal. Syr., quite literally, ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ. The sense intended may well be, 'What sign then doest thou *which* we may see?' though, since the final sense of ܐ would here be appropriate in Aramaic as in the Greek ἵνα, the evidence of this passage is not pressed.

6<sup>50</sup> οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγη καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. Pal. Syr., quite literally, ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ. This is naturally to be rendered, 'This is the bread which came down from heaven, *which*, if a man eat thereof, he shall not die' (expressed in Aramaic, '*which* a man shall eat thereof and shall not die').

9<sup>36</sup> Καὶ τίς ἐστιν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; Pal. Syr., quite literally, ܕܝܬܝܢ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ. This means, without a doubt, 'And who is he, Lord, on whom I should believe?' (the Aramaic construction is, '*who* I should believe on him'). This meaning is surely much more natural and appropriate than is the final sense given to ἵνα by A.V., R.V., 'that I may believe on him', which can hardly fail to make us discount the quality of the man's faith, suggesting, as it does, that his gratitude to our Lord made him willing to believe on any one whom He named.

14<sup>16</sup> ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν ἵνα ᾗ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Pal. Syr., quite literally, ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ. The natural meaning is, 'He shall give you another Comforter, *who* shall abide with you for ever'. So ܕ (vt. <sup>mq</sup>) 'qui'.

If the fact that ἵνα in these passages is a mistranslation of ܐܝܢ relative be thought to need further evidence to clinch it, this may be found in the variation between Mk. 4<sup>22</sup> and the parallel passages Mt. 10<sup>26</sup>, Lk. 8<sup>17</sup> already noted. Here Mk.'s ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ is reproduced in Mt. by ὁ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, and in Lk. by ὁ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται. Thus ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ seems clearly to represent an original ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ 'except that which shall be revealed', i.e. 'which shall not be revealed', and this is the rendering of Pesh. ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܝܢܐ (Pal. Syr., Sin. vacant).\*

ὅτι *similarly a mistranslation of ܐܝܢ relative.*

In Jn. 9<sup>17</sup> Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠνέωξεν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; the use of ὅτι is very awkward, and the 'in that' of R.V. unconvincing. The passage, however, at once becomes clear when we recognize that ὅτι is simply a mistranslation of ܐܝܢ relative—'What sayest thou of him *who* hath opened thine eyes?' This

\* That ἵνα is here a mistranslation of ܐܝܢ relative has been noted by Wellhausen, *Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, p. 15.

sense, which is naturally to be deduced from the Aramaic, is given by the Arabic Diatessaron الذي فتح; and the best-attested reading of 8 (vt. vg.) is 'qui aperuit'. Similarly, in 8<sup>45</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω is rendered by Pal. Syr. ܐܢܝ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, which would naturally bear the sense, 'I who speak the truth'. This meaning, which offers a superior antithesis to 'he is a liar' of the preceding verse, is offered by the Diatessaron الذي 'who', and by two MSS. of 8 (vg.) 'qui'. In our notes on the Prologue a similar case of mistranslation is suggested in 1<sup>16</sup> ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ κτλ. (cf. p. 39), and, conversely, 7 = 'because, inasmuch as' seems to have been wrongly treated as the relative in 1<sup>4.13</sup> (cf. pp. 29, 34). A case in Mk. where ὅτι seems to be a mistranslation of 7 relative (ϕ) is 4<sup>41</sup>, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ; 'Who then is this whom (ϕ . . . αὐτῷ) even the wind and the sea obey?'\* Another may very possibly be seen in 8<sup>24</sup>, Βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας, where the difficult ὅτι may represent a wrong rendering of 7 (οὗς).† In Mt. 13<sup>16</sup> ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα [ὑμῶν] ὅτι ἀκούουσιν, the words ὅτι βλέπουσιν . . . ὅτι ἀκούουσιν are rendered by Sin., Cur., Pesh. ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ . . . ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, which may mean 'because they see, &c', or 'which see, &c.' The latter sense is given by the Diatessaron التي تبصر . . . التي تسمع, and by several MSS. of 8 (vt. vg.) 'qui vident . . . quae audiunt'. Hegesippus quotes the passage in the form μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα.‡ Since Hegesippus (according to Eusebius, *HE.* iv. 22) was a Hebrew by birth and made quotations from Syriac and Hebrew, we may infer that in this case his quotation is based upon a Syriac translation of Mt. The rendering of 8 vt. here and in the passages previously noticed shows the influence of a Syriac version upon this translation, and illustrates the natural sense which a reader of Aramaic would attach to the particle 7 in the contexts in question. Conversely, the same influence upon the so-called Western text is seen in Jn. 8<sup>53</sup> D, μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ 'Αβραάμ' ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, where WH. rightly has ὅστις ἀπέθανεν.

\* Noted by Wellhausen, *Einleitung*<sup>2</sup>, p. 15.

† Cf. Allen, *St. Mark*, *ad loc.*

‡ Cf. Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum*; edit. alt. ii, p. 213—a reference which the present writer owes to Dr. Cureton's discussion of the passage in *Remains of a very ancient recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac*, p. xxv.



*ina* as a mistranslation of 𐤒 = 'when'.

We have noticed, when speaking of the usage of 𐤒, that it can bear the meaning 'when', 𐤔𐤕𐤁. Strictly speaking in such a usage it is relational 'which', with ellipse of 'in it'—𐤒𐤕𐤒 'which in it' = 'in which'; cf. Jn. 5<sup>23</sup>, where 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕 𐤒 appears in Pal. Syr. as 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕 𐤒. The following cases occur in Jn. of *ina* standing for 𐤔𐤕𐤁:

12<sup>23</sup> 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

Pal. Syr. 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

13<sup>1</sup> 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

Pal. Syr. 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

16<sup>2</sup> 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

Pal. Syr. 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

16<sup>32</sup> 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 . . . 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

Pal. Syr. 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 . . . 𐤒 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁.

That in all these cases *ina* simply stands by mistranslation for 𐤔𐤕𐤁, and that no mystic final sense is to be traced in the usage such as is postulated by Westcott, is proved by the use of the normal phrase 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤔𐤕𐤁 in 4<sup>21,23</sup>, 5<sup>25</sup>, 16<sup>25</sup>, and 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 in 5<sup>28</sup>.

*𐤔𐤕𐤁* similarly a mistranslation of 𐤒 = 'when'.

In 9<sup>8</sup> 𐤀𐤕 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤔𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤒 we have a very awkward 𐤔𐤕𐤁, and R.V.'s halting rendering, 'they that saw him aforetime, that he was a beggar', is the best that can be made of the sentence. Clearly the sense demanded is 'when (𐤔𐤕𐤁) he was a beggar', and the natural inference is that 𐤒 = 'when' has been wrongly interpreted as conjunctive 'that'. Another clear instance of the same mistranslation is seen in 12<sup>41</sup>, 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 'Hsaías 𐤔𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁' (R.V. 'because he saw his glory'), where the sense demanded is 'when (𐤔𐤕𐤁) he saw His glory'.†

\* Freely quoted in the letter from the church at Lyons (Eusebius, *HE.* v. 1) with the correction 𐤀𐤕 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁 . . . 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁 for 𐤒 . . . 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁—𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤀𐤕𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁 𐤕𐤀𐤕𐤁.

† It is just possible that 𐤔𐤕𐤁 may here be a mistranslation of 𐤒 relative—'These things said Isaiah who saw His glory and spake concerning Him', but the sense 'when' seems to be preferable.