The Language Environment of First Century Judaea

Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels

VOLUME TWO

Edited by

Randall Buth and R. Steven Notley

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

Distinguishing Hebrew from Aramaic in Semitized Greek Texts, with an Application for the Gospels and Pseudepigrapha

Randall Buth

The Gospels can be tested to distinguish between Hebrew or Aramaic as the background language in Semitized Greek sources. When this is done correctly, the results point to a written Hebrew source behind the Greek sources to the Synoptic Gospels. This has a direct application for synoptic studies and the history of the earliest strata of the Jerusalem Jesus movement. The linguistic differentiation tests also have a direct application for Jewish literature from the Second Temple period that has survived in Greek. Distinguishing Hebrew from Aramaic can help to elucidate quite complex literary and textual histories.

The present study establishes three diagnostic tests for distinguishing Aramaic from Hebrew narrative sources in Greek translation during the Second Temple period. One test looks at both sides of the occurrence or non-occurrence of the Aramaic narrative conjunction אֱדַיִן *edayin*. The other test concerns the presence or absence of the narrative Hebraic structure, *impersonal ἐγένετο introducing a finite verb main clause*, as opposed to the Greek narrative structure, *impersonal ἐγένετο introducing an infinite main clause*. The validity and scope of each criterion is investigated. Pairing these tests allows us to add a third test, the test of internal consistency.

The linguistic data lead to conclusions that cut across common assumptions in New Testament studies. Consequently, the data will be presented in considerable detail so that their validity may be established. The article will be divided into five sections: 1. Previous Approaches to Distinguishing Hebrew from Aramaic Influence in Greek Texts; 2. Establishing the Criteria; 3. Application to Non-canonical Jewish Literature; 4. Application to New Testament Gospels and Acts; 5. Conclusions.

1   Previous Approaches to Distinguishing Hebrew from Aramaic Influence in Greek Texts

a   *A Syntactic Approach*

Previous approaches to the question of Hebrew vs. Aramaic sources behind a Greek document have not usually dealt with structural linguistic evidence.[1]

Raymond Martin recognized some of the vexing problems involved with distinguishing Aramaic from Hebrew in a Greek translation. Most of the distinguishing syntactical markers of Semitic translation were as true for an Aramaic translation source as for a Hebrew source. As an answer to this problem he suggested that a statistical analysis of clause-level word order frequencies might separate Hebrew-based and Aramaic-based sources behind Greek documents.[2] As the natural place to start he chose the Greek texts of the Aramaic parts of Daniel and Ezra in order to generate statistics that could be compared to the Greek texts of the Hebrew portions of those books and the Old Greek translation in general. Martin tested 1 Esdras and concluded that 1 Esd 3:1–5:6, the section without a known source, could be statistically distinguished as Aramaic.[3]

While Martin's conclusions were admittedly tentative, a basic problem with his approach was a lack of appreciation for the kinds of Aramaic being used

---

1   Two of the most widely used non-structural criteria are wordplay and mistranslation. They have a long and checkered history in Gospel criticism due to their nature of being conjectures and random. (See, for example, the discussion in Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to Gospels and Acts* [3d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967], 4–14.) Sometimes it is difficult to judge whether a proposal shows more of a proposer's ingenuity or reflects a necessary solution. For an anti-example, consider a name in Isa 8. Which is original: "<u>Qu</u>ickly to the <u>c</u>ache, <u>Speedi</u>ly to the <u>spoi</u>l" or מהר שלל חש בז? The alliteration is better in English, but we know that the original cannot be English, because English did not exist in the eighth century B.C.E. On the other hand, an author may signal a wordplay, as Josephus did in *War* 5.272. (The wordplay υἱὸς ἔρχεται in the "ancestral language" by guards on the city wall, warning the crowd below of an incoming stone missile, is unambiguously Hebrew: אבן באה can sound just like הבן בא when shouted quickly. Aramaic בְּרָא אָתֵה does not sound like כֵּפָא אָתֵה or אַבְנָא אָתֵה.) Proposals of mistranslation can be problematic if their necessity is questionable, if they are not a clear improvement, or if they are based on a different, unattested text. Yet any study of the Old Greek Bible confirms the necessity of the scholarly endeavor and it certainly helps to know which languages to be using in undertaking a quest for a wordplay or mistranslation. See the discussion on wordplay below under Susanna and in n. 66.

2   Raymond A. Martin, "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic sources in Acts I–XV," *NTS* 10 (1964): 38–59, and idem, *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts* (Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 18; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1989), 177–81.

3   Martin (ibid., 181) offers a "Tentative conclusion: 3:1–5:6 is free translation of Aramaic."

in Second Temple times. He was aware of the possibility of Greek masking his view of Aramaic,[4] but Aramaic itself was multi-dialectical. The older Aramaic literary style used during the Second Temple period was an Aramaic with a relatively "free" word order system.[5] However, in the West during the second half of the Second Temple period, Aramaic was being written in a clearer, Verb–Subject–Object order. The spoken dialects of Aramaic in the West apparently never adopted a "free" word order like that used in Persian-period Aramaic documents. Qumranic Aramaic and later Jewish Palestinian Aramaic do not follow the word order patterns of Persian-period Aramaic. In fact, the Persian period was a kind of linguistic abberation for a Semitic language. Akkadian had been influenced from Sumerian and had developed a Subject–Object–Verb order, and this in turn influenced Aramaic when it was adopted by the Assyrian and Babylonian administrations. Persian, too, reinforced this "non-Semitic" word order for Aramaic.[6]

Greek, on the other hand, was a language that had always known a "freer" word order. Linguists debate the status of any underlying word-order template for Greek, but it certainly generates a lot of sentences with Subjects, Objects, and other material in front of a Verb. Helma Dik has argued for an underlying Verb-initial template.[7] That is a helpful linguistic abstraction, and I think that it is correct not just for classical Ionic Greek but for the Koine as well. Yet, it does not change the fact that Greek texts exhibit a very varied word order. At times one might feel inclined to say, "anything can happen in Greek word order." The significance of this is that a well-edited Greek text will produce Subjects and Objects in front of a verb in ways that would cause Martin to declare a Semitized source "Aramaic." This is especially problematic in "tertiary

---

4 Martin (ibid., 180) states: "Aramaic word order and Greek word order are similar in this case."

5 One Aramaist of repute even suggested that the basic word order of Aramaic was Object–Verb–Subject. This would be such a rare word order among the world's languages, some would claim impossible, that linguists immediately doubt any such claim. There are good grounds for positing that the "free" Aramaic word order system was coming from a Verb–Subject–Object basic template. See Randall Buth, "Word Order in Aramaic from the Perspectives of Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis" (Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1987) (available via University Microfilms).

6 For a discussion of Persian word order, see Mark Hale, "Old Persian Word Order," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31 (1988): 27–40. Basic Subject-Object-Verb structures remain in modern Persian. See also, Scott L. Harvey, Winfred P. Lehmann and Jonathan Slocum, "Old Iranian Online Lesson 7: Old Persian": "The standard word order of Old Persian is Subject–Object–Verb." http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/eieol/aveol-7-R.html (accessed October 26, 2008).

7 Helma Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 5; Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995).

Greek" texts. By tertiary Greek I mean Greek translations of a Semitic source that have been further edited or redacted within a Greek context, that is, the resulting Greek is not just a translation, but that translation has been handled by a second author and further stylized. In such cases, the word order will tend toward Greek and could therefore artificially score as "Aramaic," even where the source had been Hebrew.

On the other hand, a Jewish Aramaic text with restrained Aramaic word order (i.e. relatively fixed and tending toward Verb–Subject–Object), might be literally translated into Greek and yet would score as "Hebrew." The *Genesis Apocryphon* in the travelogue section (cols. 19–22) would be such a document if literally translated. The Aramaic Antiochus Scroll is also such a document, even with its strong biblical Aramaic coloring. Unfortunately, we do not have Greek translations of either to serve as a statistical model.

Thus, word order is not a criterion that can reliably distinguish Hebrew from Aramaic, especially in a tertiary Greek text. If the Greek word order is relatively free, it could be either Hebrew or Aramaic that has been stylized in Greek. If the Greek word order is relatively tight and "Verb-initial," it could be either post-Persian period Aramaic or Hebrew. We must look elsewhere in order to distinguish Hebrew from Aramaic in a Semitized Greek document.

b   *Sociolinguistic Approaches*

The other major approach has been to argue probability based essentially on sociolinguistics. The probable language is decided on historical sociolinguistic considerations and then mistranslations and wordplays are brought forward as confirmation. The claim is that Jesus taught in Aramaic with the presumption that a Semitic written text about him would be in Aramaic. From an Aramaic assumption, Hebraisms are frequently treated as evidence of artificiality and "Septuagintalism." These issues are quite complex and could use monograph-length treatment. This is not the place to rehash the data on the language situation in the first century, though there are still points to be added[8] and mistakes to be corrected.[9] This has been the major approach of scholars like Gustaf Dalman, H. F. D. Sparks, and Matthew Black, and is explicitly discussed

---

8   The perspective of a tri-lingual environment and the function of the three Aramaic sentences in Mark are discussed in Randall Buth, "The Riddle of Jesus' Cry from the Cross," in the present volume.

9   For examples that bring needed correction and a new perspective, see Randall Buth and Chad Pierce, "Εβραϊστί" and Guido Baltes, "The Use of Hebrew and Aramaic in Epigraphic Sources of the New Testament Era," both in the present volume.

and accepted by E. P. Sanders.[10] Maurice Casey is a more recent illustration of this approach, especially in his work within the narrative framework Mark. The first-century language situation as argued by Casey and others is presented as justification for assuming a written Aramaic substratum at some point behind Semitized Greek sources to Mark and/or the Synoptics.

The problem, of course, is that the Jewish society in the first century is attested as trilingual. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek were all viable candidates for public, written documents. One might argue that the eschatological Yeshua movement[11] would naturally choose to write in Aramaic,[12] but that was revealed to be a questionable assumption after the discovery of another eschatological community like Qumran using Hebrew for their own documents and using rewritten Hebrew Bible like the Temple Scroll. The Jerusalem Yeshua community saw themselves as following the eschatological prophet of Deuteronomy (Deut 18:15 cited in Acts 3:22 and 7:37) and Hebrew would not be an unreasonable choice for recording a subsequent "eschatological *halaxa*," "new covenant," or a ספר דברי ישוע ("Book of the Words of Yeshua").[13] Assuming that Aramaic was the only choice because of an assumed popularity in the market is also a problematic argument when it is recognized that Jewish teaching in the first century was almost always orally published in Hebrew. In rabbinic literature there is a ruling that one should record a saying in the original language used by the teacher and this was generally Hebrew in the first century.[14]

---

10   E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 9; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969). See especially pages 199–206.

11   We have no problem with the name "Christian" here, but it is important to first evaluate the Jerusalem church as a Jewish movement (Acts 21:20) and within Jewish society. Χριστιανοί is a later and foreign term (Acts 11:26) and it is too easy to evaluate the first generation anachronistically.

12   For a sample methodological statement along these lines, see Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, 202–3, who states: "they are persuaded that the language of Jesus and his disciples was Aramaic . . . The question of how thoroughly trilingual Palestine was in the first-century still awaits solution . . . It still seems safe to conclude, however, that at least a significant proportion of the earliest Christian traditions was first formulated in Aramaic. This certainly justifies a search for the Aramaic background of the Gospel materials."

13   The name of the Tobit narrative is βίβλος λόγων Τωβιθ, "Book of the Words of Tobit." Cf. Papias' comment "Τὰ Λόγια [τοῦ Κυρίου]."

14   חייב אדם לומר בלשון רבו ("[In a discussion about Hillel's use of the word *hin*] a man must use the language of his teacher," *Eduyot* 1.3 [translation mine—R.B.]). This is a comment in the Mishnah on why the word *hin* was used in the previous statement. The Mishnah and Tannaitic literature are 99% Hebrew and quote many first-century teachers and situations. M. H. Segal (*Grammar of Mishnaic Grammar* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1927 (corrected

The Yeshua movement may have chosen Aramaic for some of their documents, but they may also have chosen Hebrew. We need to investigate some linguistic

---

sheets 1970)], 19–20) argued very succinctly for the general reliability of this tradition to preserve the language of sayings in their original language. One of the more telling arguments is that rabbinic sources preserve occasional early sayings in Aramaic. Segal (p. 20) concluded, "These Aramaic traditions were not translated into MH, but were left in their original language. It follows, therefore, that MH sayings were originally spoken in MH." Segal had argued that Mishnaic sayings were transmitted in their original language, which was Hebrew.

   More recently John Poirier ("The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity," *JGRChJ* 4 [2007]: 55–134) has repeated a suggestion that first-century rabbinic sayings were in Aramaic and were all translated into Hebrew for the Mishnah (p. 76): "as Hezser points out, 'the fact that the Mishnah was written and composed in Hebrew does not necessarily imply that the statements and traditions that it contains were originally formulated in that language,' that is, this language could well have been (and almost certainly was) Aramaic rather than Hebrew." Poirier's claim goes against the grain of the mass of Tannaitic and Amoraic literature and is "almost certainly" wrong, to use Poirier's own words. Poirier stands the evidence on its head. He cites an alleged example from Cathrine Hezser, who cited *y. Kil.* (1:1) 27a, but without giving the data. This is unfortunate because it is better evidence for the opposite of his claim. The Mishnah in question is a generic agricultural *halaxa* of ancient provenance.

החטים וההזונין אינן כלאים זה בזה.

השעורים ושבלת שועל, הכסמין והשיפון, הפול והספיר, הפרקדן והטפח, ופול הלבן
והשעועית—אינם כלאים זה בזה

Danby translates, "Wheat and tares are not accounted Diverse Kinds. Barley and goat-grass, spelt and oats, the common bean and the kidney bean, the everlasting-pea and the vetchling, the white bean and haricot bean are not accounted Diverse Kinds." It should be noted that these lists of grasses and beans are within properly structured sentences in Hebrew. A point of discussion occurs in *y. Kil.* (1:1) 27a:

ר' יונה בשם ר' חייא בר ווא.

אשכחון כת' על כותלא דר' הלל ביר' אלס.

פולה פישונה גילבונה מילותה סרפוונה פסילתה.

Rabbi Yona (fourth century C.E.) in the name of Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba (third to fourth century C.E.), "they found them written on the wall of Rabbi Hillel son of Rabbi Vales (third century C.E.). Egyptian bean, garden pea, chickpea-a [lathyrus sativus], chickpea-b [lathyrus cicera], white bean, φάσηλος kidneybean" (translation mine—R.B.). What we have in Talmud Yerushalmi is a glossary of the last six names of a Mishnaic *halaxa*. Far from showing that the *halaxa* was originally in Aramaic and then translated, it shows that it was originally in Hebrew and needed an Aramaic glossary at the beginning of the third century C.E. in order to apply it to some then current agricultural questions. Cf. Y. Sussman, "Torah in the Mouth," in *Mehqerei Talmud: Memorial Volume for Ephraim E. Urbach* (ed. Yaakov Sussman and David Rosenthal. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2005), 209–384 (215):

criteria before specifying the language of any source writings. We need a level playing field if we are going to evaluate the gospel evidence.

2 Establishing the Criteria

a Toward a Solution

Structural linguistic evidence is desirable in that it can show whether (a) Semitic source(s) was in Aramaic or Hebrew. Fortunately, there are some criteria that are diagnostic and that do not require "mistranslation" or "wordplays."

Languages have different ways of organizing and presenting a story. For example, in English a narrative can be told without an explicit conjunction at the beginning of almost every sentence. Greek, on the other hand, prefers to have a conjunction at the beginning of most sentences. These conjunctions provide a signal to the audience about how the discourse is progressing.[15]

b Criterion 1: Hebrew and Aramaic Use Different Connectives

Hebrew and Aramaic, as is well known, have quite a few examples of -ו ("and") to hold a story together and mark its progress. Greek, on the other hand, has three words that roughly correspond to this Semitic "and": δέ, καί, τέ. One could even add οὖν, μέν, ἀλλά, ὥστε and *asyndeton* (no marker), as words used in contexts where a Semitic author moves forward with a more insipid -ו ("and").

והרי ברור שאין זה (בכלאיים) אלא רישום אקראי של גלוסות (תרגומי מילים) לרשימת
הפירות המנויים שם במשנה, וזו הרי בוודאי אינה אלא 'בבחינת רשימות אישיות.
"So it is clear that this (in Kilayim) is none other than an incidental listing of glosses (translations of words) for the list of fruit specified in the Mishnah, and certainly in the category of personal notes" (translation mine—R.B.).

We note that both the Hebrew *halaxa* and the later Aramaic discussion are preserved in their original language according to standard rabbinic practice. The Mishnah are full sentences, while the Yerushalmi comment is only a list of glosses. The *halaxa* was given in Hebrew long before the Aramaic glosses were needed.

15   Those working in Bible translation from the 1960s and later would routinely study the way in which target languages linguistically organized their stories. The system of connectives and the presentation of the events of a story were studied in a growing field in linguistics called textlinguistics and discourse analysis. It was only natural to turn to biblical texts in Hebrew and Aramaic, and to Greek New Testament texts, in order to ask the same questions. While involved in Bible translation in the 1970s, I wrote up some observations and published them in a translation-oriented journal: "Perspectives in Gospel Discourse Studies," *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation* 6 (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1981). This present article is an expansion and reflection on those observations after thirty years of further study.

Since the Semitic word for "and" is used both for joining clauses as well as for joining nouns and noun phrases, Greek translators tended to prefer καί in their translations, since καί, too, could join items at both the level of clauses and of nouns and noun phrases. One of the features of Semitized Greek is a Greek style with an unnatural frequency and usage of καί to join sentences together. This has been widely acknowledged by scholars. But "Semitic καί" does not distinguish Aramaic from Hebrew.

Aramaic has a distinctive word that was used as a narrative connector in Second Temple Aramaic: אֱדַיִן and בֵּאדַיִן ("then, at that time").[16] Of course, both Hebrew and Greek have words for "then, at that time," אָז and τότε, respectively. But neither Hebrew nor Greek use this adverb frequently as part of the narrative conjunctive network. For example, in Daniel באדין/אדין combine for 46 occurrences,[17] which is 12.17 per thousand words of text. Ezra has 11 occurrences for 8.67 per thousand words of text. However, two of the examples in Ezra may not be purely "narrative conjunctions." Ezra 5:5 has ואדין ("and then"), where the word "and" can technically be called the conjunction, and 5:16 has ומן אדין ("and from then"). Without these two examples, the statistics for narrative אדין in Ezra are 7.09 per 1000.

In Greek translation from an Aramaic source we find that literal translation produces a high frequency of these τότε adverbial-conjunctions. For the purposes of comparison of statistics, it should be remembered that Greek total word counts are higher for any translation. Some particles and articles are counted as words in Greek but are not counted as individual words in Hebrew or Aramaic. This will produce lower "narrative τότε" ratios in literal Greek translations when compared to the Aramaic source ratios.

The Old Greek translation of Daniel has 39 occurrences of τότε, which is 6.96 per 1000.[18] The Theodotionic text of Daniel has 28 occurrences of τότε

---

16   There is no difference between באדין/אדין in how they are translated in Greek. For a discussion about their function and use in Aramaic, see Randall Buth, "אדין/τότε: An Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek," *Maarav, Journal for the Study of the Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures* 5–6 (1990): 33–48.

17   Only 45 of these are connectives. One is a simple adverb (Dan 7:11) that is not at the beginning of its clause.

18   In the Old Greek, several of the Aramaic source באדין/אדין are parallel to καί—Dan 3:3, 26a (LXX 3:93); 5:3, 6, 8; 6:6, 12, 14; δέ—4:16 (LXX 4:19); 6:5; οὕτως οὖν—Dan 3:26b (3:93), 30 (3:97); and τότε for כלקבל דנה—2:12; with missing verses 4:4; 5:24; and extra τότε—3:18; 5:7, 10; 6:21, 25.

for a statistic of 5.21 per 1000 words.[19] While some of the differences between the Greek and the Aramaic may be due to differences in text and inner-Greek contamination, the lower overall number of occurrences of τότε in comparison with the Aramaic source should probably be attributed to the unnaturalness of the use of τότε as a conjunction in Greek. This unnaturalness in Greek will be demonstrated below.

The Old Greek translation of Ezra has ten τότε, all of which occur parallel to אדין in the Aramaic.[20] There are 5.81 narrative τότε per 1000 words in the Old Greek to Aramaic Ezra.

For a Hebrew comparison we can look at a book like Genesis. Of the six occurrences of אז in Genesis, only one (4:26) is at the beginning of a narrative clause as a possible conjunction. Two (12:6; 13:7) are not the first word of the clause, one is compounded מאז ("from then, from that time," 39:5), and one is poetic (49:4). This produces a statistic of 0.19 per 1000 words, or 0.03 if limited to the one prototypical narrative example. In Late Biblical Hebrew we find the following in Hebrew-based Esther: the Hebrew text happens to be without אז, and we have four τότε in Greek translation: καὶ τότε (2:13); καὶ τότε (4:16); καὶ τότε (7:10); καὶ τότε (9:31). We note that all of these examples are prefixed with καί, so τότε may be called an adverb and would not necessarily be a "narrative conjunction." The underlying Hebrew text to these Greek τότε has וּבְזֶה (2:13), וּבְכֵן (4:16), -ו (7:10), וְכַאֲשֶׁר (9:31). But the slight increase in Greek in the direction of narrative τότε needs to be remembered, though its statistic is only 0.67 per 1000.

For a comparison of Greek from Jewish circles, consider 2 Maccabees, generally held to be an original Greek composition. There are three occurrences of τότε among 11,920 words and none of them unambiguously begins a clause as a conjunction:[21]

> 2 Macc 1:19
> οἱ τότε εὐσεβεῖς ἱερεῖς
> "the devout priests of that time,"

---

19   In Theodotionic Daniel we also find τότε for כלקבל דנה at 2:12; 3:8, and 6:10. Theodotion has δέ at Dan 2:15. It has καί at Dan 2:17, 19b, 48; 3:3, 13, 24 (3:91), 26b (3:93); 4:4 (4:7); 5:3, 8, 9, 29; 6:4, 5, 6, 13, 19, 22; 7:1, 19. διὰ τοῦτο occurs at 5:24.

20   Ezra 4:9 has אדין and the parallel in Greek has τάδε, "these things." This may be considered either a more stylized translation or evidence of a different text. It does not affect the status of τότε as a diagnostic criterion of Aramaic narrative behind a Greek translation.

21   *3 Maccabees*, Greek by consensus, has six τότε (1.17 per 1000 words), five of which look like narrative τότε (0.98/1000).

2 Macc 2:8
καὶ τότε ὁ κύριος ἀναδείξει
"and then the Lord will show,"

2 Macc 12: 18
ἄπρακτον τότε ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων ἐκλελυκότα
"having left the area at that time without doing anything."

Likewise, Josephus' *Antiquities*, Book 1, has 15,027 words and 11 occurrences of τότε, but none as a potential conjunctive. Even when τότε occurs near the beginning of a clause it is still a normal Greek adverb. For example,

Ant. 1.44
Λούδους δὲ τότε Λούδας ἔκτισε
Louda created the Loudites at that time

Ant. 1.170
ἣ τότε μὲν ἦν ἀγαθή
which (city) at that time on the one hand was good

Ant. 1.260
τότε μὲν ἀνεχώρησεν
and at that time he withdrew

Ant. 1.313
καὶ τότε μὲν ἑσπέρα γὰρ ἦν ἡσύχαζεν
and at that time on the one hand he was relaxing because it was evening.

Similar results are found for Books 18–20 of Josephus's *Antiquities*, with 38,710 words. There are 41 occurrences of τότε, but only two occur asyndetically at the beginning of a clause and could be considered a parallel to the Aramaic אדין: τότε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέγνω ὁ τιμώτατός μοι βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας, "(which things) at that time on the platform my most honored king Agrippas read..." (*Ant.* 19.310); τότε δὴ τῶν ὑποστρεψάντων αἰχμαλώτων Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ἰωσεδὲκ εἷς ὢν τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην λαμβάνει, "then indeed Yeshua son of Yosedek being one of the returning captives accepted the high priesthood" (*Ant.* 20.234).[22] Normal

---

22   The examples presented are intended to be representative of normal Greek style. An exhaustive listing of examples would not change the profile but would excessively clutter the present study.

Greek composition did not use τότε in any manner remotely suggesting a parallel to Aramaic אדין as a narrative conjunction.

The results of the above are sufficient to suggest that when we find τότε in a Semitized Greek text functioning as a potential conjunction with some frequency,[23] we are probably looking at Aramaic influence. However, the other side of this feature may be just as helpful as a diagnostic tool. The *lack of narrative τότε* in an otherwise Semitized Jewish Greek becomes evidence of Hebrew.

There are two questions that must be dealt with before we can accept narrative τότε as a potential criterion for distinguishing Aramaic from Hebrew in a Greek translation:

> Did all Aramaic narrative at the time use a narrative אדין?
> Were there no Greek authors who naturally used τότε as a quasi-narrative conjunction?

We must sift the evidence and carefully extrapolate over the times and places of potential writing in order to answer these questions with maximal reliability.

We have the biblical Aramaic texts of two writers, Ezra and Daniel, that both show the narrative אדין style. Extended Aramaic narratives from the Second Temple period are not many in number.

Some might think of looking at the various Targum traditions. The Qumran Aramaic Job translation[24] is the only extant Aramaic text of a canonical Hebrew book from the Second Temple period.[25] Even though it is a translation

---

23 A frequency of 3.00 narrative τότε per 1000 words is a reasonable threshold for assuming Aramaic influence. Anything over 1.50 narrative τότε per 1000 words in a Greek text begins to raise a question. 1.5 is an arbitrary number that is chosen because it is below known examples of Aramaic translation and above known examples of original Greek. The number serves as a convenient reference point for any discussion.

24 11Q10 Job ar is often called a "targum," but several studies have retreated from the appellation "targum." For a modified view of "targum," see Sally Gold, "Targum or Translation: New Light on the Character of Qumran Job (11Q10) from a Synoptic Approach," *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001): 101–20. For a "translation" perspective, see Daniel A. Machiela, "Hebrew, Aramaic, and the Differing Phenomena of Targum and Translation in the Second Temple Period and Post-Second Temple Period," in the present volume.

25 Qumran also attests a small, nine-verse fragment of Job in Aramaic (4Q157 Job ar, from Job 3:5; 4:16–5:3) and eight verses from Lev 16 (4Q156 Lev ar, from Hebrew Lev 16:12–15, 18–21). This latter may represent a complete book, or it may represent a holiday reading for the pilgrimage at Sukkot season. It has special scribal markings of dicola (double dots). It is remarkable that we have five ancient references to a *Job* in Aramaic: two copies from Qumran, two rabbinic stories connected with Gamaliel, and the colophon to the Old

from Hebrew, it inserts an אדין at a place where the MT has a *vav*. This would suggest that אדין was part of the style for the Aramaic translator of Job and is consistent with the picture of Aramaic narrative style that we have seen in Ezra and Daniel.[26]

11Q Job ar 20,6   אדין רגז   [space] **then** grew angry …

// MT Job 32.2   וַיִּחַר אַף אֱלִיהוּא   [*petucha* space] **and** Elihu got angry

None of the later Aramaic translation traditions from post-Second Temple times (Onkelos, Jonathan, Neofiti, Fragment Targum, Pseudo-Jonathan) reflects a style with a narrative אדין conjunction. However, because they are late, none of them can serve as evidence of Aramaic style during the Second Temple. Secondly, they are primarily translations from Hebrew, so that a lack of אדין can be explained as translationese and Hebrew influence.

There is one example of באדין in the late targum to the Song of Songs. The passage deals with a Greek attack on Jerusalem in the time of Alexander; therefore, this may be a fragment from an old narrative that was inserted or quoted:

באידין קמו יונאי וכנשו שתין מלכין מבני עשו עשו מלובשין שריונין רכיבי על סוסן ופרשים ותמנן רוכבין מבני ישמעאל רכיבין על פיליא בר־מן שאר עממיא ‹ולישנייא› דלית להון מנין ומניאו אלכסנדרוס רשיעא עליהון ואתא לאגחא קרבא על ירושלם:

then the Greeks arose and gathered sixty kings from the sons of Esau … and they appointed Alexander the wicked over them and he came and waged war against Jerusalem.

Greek translation of Job (42:17). Job seems to have been popular as a translation all over the ancient Near East. We will find a possible sixth Aramaic connection to Job traditions below in the *Testament of Job*.

26   The Qumran Job translation was probably not produced in the land of Israel, but further east. Cf. Takamitsu Muraoka, "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of *Job* from *Qumran* Cave XI," *JJS* 25 (1974): 425–43. See also Eibert Tigchelaar, "Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155–71 (160): "linguistic analysis suggests that the Targum of Job (4Q157; 11Q10) originated in the East." Tigchelaar adds a footnote "T. Muraoka, … (1974): 425–43; a position which is still held by Muraoka today."

In any case, the later targums,[27] being translations and dating from the post-Second Temple period, are irrelevant. They neither support nor contradict the thesis presented here and are not good evidence of natural Aramaic narrative style.

Syriac literature, too, is not able to help us in our investigation because of language developments and time considerations. Syriac is a Central/Eastern Aramaic dialect attested from the second century C.E. and following. Neither אדין nor באדין are used in Syriac. Syriac developed a new conjunction ܕܶܝܢ, *den*, דֵין ("and, but"). Syntactically, *den* is modelled after Greek δέ. It occurs postpositively after an initial element in a sentence, exactly like Greek δέ. However, the -n- sound at the end of the word suggests that *den* may have developed and merged as a reinterpretation of the older Aramaic אֱדַיִן, *edayin*. From Syriac ܕܶܝܢ, *den* ("and, but"), a new word for "then" was created by adding Syriac ܗܳܝ, *hoy* ("this, that [f.]") to *den* ("and, but"), resulting in ܗܳܝܕܶܝܢ, *hoyden* ("then, at that time").

In the Syriac recensions of the Ahiqar legend, a popular Aramaic story that goes back to the sixth century B.C.E., the frequencies of *hoyden* are something like the Second Temple Aramaic אדין. The five recensions listed at the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon project produce the following statistics for *hoyden* per 1000 words: recension 01 (414 words) = 9.66; recension 02 (5173 words) = 6.96; recension 03 (1237 words) = 3.23; recension 04 (5688 words) = 10.02; recension 05 (3522 words) = 5.39. These may be reflecting the continuation of the style of the older Aramaic story. However, in what may be the oldest native Syriac narrative that we have, a 400-word account of the great flood of Edessa in 201 C.E. from the Edessa Chronicles, we do not have any *hoyden*, but we do have examples of *den* (δέ) and *ger* (γάρ).

---

27   Restrictions of space do not allow us to discuss the complex origins of the targumic traditions. What is certain is that the Palestinian traditions are later than the Second Temple period and their lack of אדין is not acceptable evidence for Second-Temple Aramaic narrative. Likewise Onkelos and Jonathan are both later and geographically too questionable to serve as acceptable evidence. On geography, see Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "The Language of Targum Onkelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic," *JNES* 37 (1978): 169–79. See also Edward Cook, "A New Perspective on the Language of Onkelos and Jonathan," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 142–56; and Christa Müller-Kessler, "The Earliest Evidence for Targum Onqelos from Babylonia and the Question of its Dialect and Origin," *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001): 181–98.

In sum, Syriac reflects a later stage of the Aramaic language where אדין has metamorphasized into a Greek-styled conjunction *den.* Syriac cannot provide evidence of first-century Aramaic practice.

The non-biblical Aramaic texts from Qumran are the best evidence for Jewish Aramaic usage from the Second Temple period.[28] A survey of the extant texts is revealing.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* has 14 examples of narrative אדין.[29] Three examples are listed here:

1QGnAp 20,21	באדין אתה עלי חרקנוש
	[space] then Hirqanos came to me
1QGnAp 22,18	באדין קרב מלכא די סודם
	[space] then the king of Sodom approached
1QGnAp 22,20	באדין אמר אברם למלך סודם
	[space] then Avram said to the king of Sodom

Other Aramaic narratives from Qumran also show this Aramaic אדין style. Note the examples below from the Enoch traditions, from Aramaic Levi, from the Aramaic *Testament of Judah*, from the visions of Amram, and from the "ProtoEsther" story.

4Q204 Enoch^c ar 13.30	באדין ... [space] then ...
4Q530 Enoch Giants^b 2.3	באדין חלמו תריהון חלמין
	[space] then two of them dreamed dreams
4Q530 Enoch Giants^b 2.15	באדין ..ה הודה אחוהי אוהיה
	then [it was?] his brother Ohyah acknowledged
4Q213a AramaicLevi^b 2.11	[באדין נגדת then I set out
4Q213a AramaicLevi^b 2.13	[אדין then ...
4Q213aAramaicLevi^b 2.15	[אדין חזוין אחזית then I was shown visions
Bodlian AramaicLevi^a 10–11	אדין אמרת then I said
4Q538 TestJudah ar	[א]דין חשל ע[ל] then he formed against
4Q545 Visions of Amram^c ar 1.7–8	אדין כדי אשתציו יומי משתותא שלח

28　Two other possible languages from the first century can be ignored. Arabic was used to the South and East of Judea and later Arabic knows of a connector فَ, "so, then, and," that is reminiscent of the functions of Aramaic אדין. We do not, however, have any literature from the right period, and Nabatean is really the wrong culture to be pursuing background for the Gospels. Likewise, Latin does not produce anything that might produce Matthew's strong τότε style. For example, neither Caesar nor Tacitus use *tunc* or synonyms as a narrative conjunctive.

29　1QGnAp 2.1, 3, 8, 11, 13, 19; 5.16; 10:1, 11, 18; 11.12; 20.21; 22.18, 20.

then, when the days of the feast were completed, he sent

4Q550c JewsPersianCourt[c] ar 2.7   אדין על בגסרו

then Bagasro entered

Except for Tobit, all of our Qumran Aramaic narratives of considerable length
show a narrative אדין style.[30] Tobit (six pages in length)[31] is a special case and
will be discussed in the section on non-canonical Jewish literature.

A historical romance about the revolt and wars of the Maccabees adds to
our picture of Aramaic narrative. The Antiochus Scroll[32] is a document of 66
verses and 1300 words. It has ten examples of narrative אדין. בידין occurs in 14,
43, and 52. אדין occurs at 16, 17, 21, 26, 32, 38, 47. This is a rate of 7.69 per 1000
and comparable to the style of Daniel and Ezra.

An indirect testimony to the status of the אדין style in Second Temple
Jewish Aramaic is the New Testament book of Matthew. Matthew was cer-
tainly written in Greek and was certainly not written in Aramaic.[33] However,
out of 90 examples of τότε, Matthew has between 55 and 62 examples of a

---

30   4Q208–211 AstronEnoch ar have 33 instances of באדין in non-narrative text; 4Q242
      Nabonidus ar is fragmentary; 4Q243–246 Apocalyptic ar are all non-narrative and frag-
      mentary; 4Q318 Brontologion ar is a fragmentary, non-narrative list; 4Q339 FalseProphets
      ar is fragmentary; 4Q529 Words of Michael is fragmentary; 4Q534 Noah ar has a באדין in
      a fragmentary apocalyptic text; 4Q 537 TestJac? ar is fragmentary; 4Q539 ApocJoseph ar
      is fragmentary; 4Q540–541 ApocLevi ar is fragmentary but has a couple of אדין; 4Q542
      TestQahat ar is fragmentary; 4Q549 Hur and Mirian ar is fragmentary; 4Q551 ar is frag-
      mentary but has דין[א]; 4Q552 FourKingdoms ar and 4Q553 FourKingdoms ar are quite
      fragmentary, 4Q554–555 New Jerusalem ar are a non-narrative description; 4Q557–558
      Vision ar, 4Q559 BiblicalChron ar, 4Q560 Exorcism ar, 4Q561 Horoscope ar and 4Q562–575
      ar are all relatively short and fragmentary. 4Q565 ar apparently has a באדין.
31   Six pages of Semitic text in Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The
      Dead Sea Scrolls, Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–98).
32   For the text, see Menachem Tzvi Qaddari, "The Aramaic Antiochus Scroll (Part 1),[Hebrew]"
      The Yearbook for Jewish Studies and Humanities of Bar-Ilan University [Hebrew] (Ramat-
      Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1963), 81–105. Qaddari proposed a third-century C.E. date for the
      writing in *Leshonenu* 23 (1959): 129–45.
33   Martin's statistics (Raymond A. Martin, *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels* [Studies
      in the Bible and Early Christianity 10; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1987]) are useful for
      confirming that the work of Matthew as a whole is not a translation but a Greek writing.
      In addition, those who see Matthew as using Mark in Greek, the present author included,
      have added reasons for this conclusion that Greek Matthew is not a translation. Places in
      Matthew and Mark with identical Greek wording show a Greek compositional connec-
      tion, and if the textual influence is from Mark to Matthew then Matthew cannot be trans-
      lation. However, the argument from synoptic relationships is not necessary for showing
      that Matthew is not a translation. The statistical evidence gathered by Martin already
      shows that. The conclusion that canonical Matthew was written in Greek and was not a
      translation does not depend on synoptic theory.

narrative τότε.[34] This occurs where Matthew is otherwise word-for-word identical with Mark, in Matthean material, in Matthean–Mark material, in Matthean–Lukan material, and in triple tradition (Matthew//Mark//Luke). The feature is probably not coming from a source but is Matthew's own style in *Greek*.[35] It may or may not reflect Matthew's mother-tongue or his primary writing language.[36]

What is more important is that this Greek style testifies to a distinct Aramaic influence in another first-century document. This Aramaic influence reinforces our observation that Second Temple Aramaic was using an אדין style in narrative. Matthew's Greek style is inexplicable if contemporary Aramaic did not have an אדין style. As a secondary issue, the unnatural Greek style also raises the question of how many other "Matthews" might have existed. If Matthew could produce or create such a style, theoretically there could be others. Someone writing in a "Jewish" Greek could add τότε to a narrative in a way reminiscent of current Aramaic style. Textual traditions that show contamination with this style in Greek must be evaluated for the kind of influence, whether from an Aramaic source or a Jewish Greek writer. However, this question must be balanced with a recognition that a τότε-style was not a general style of a Jewish Greek dialect. If narrative τότε was a standard Jewish Greek style, then we would expect to see evidence of this in the other Synoptic Gospels where their style is not standard Greek. We will see below in Section 4, "Application to New Testament Gospels and Acts," that such is not the case. There is no evidence of a general "Jewish Greek" narrative τότε style.

Here, we must clarify the nature of the narrative connector so there is no misunderstanding on what is, and is not, diagnostic between Hebrew and Aramaic. In future contexts it is common for Hebrew to use אז ("then, at that time"), the etymological cognate of Aramaic אדין (First Temple Aramaic and poetic Hebrew was אזי). Here are three of Isaiah's seven occurrences:

---

34   For the Matthean data see the discussion below on Matthew, below in Section 4, "Application to New Testament Gospels and Acts."

35   On the conclusion that this is Matthew's Greek style, see the discussion on Matthew, below in Section 4, "Application to New Testament Gospels and Acts."

36   Multilingual situations can produce unpredictable styles. I am well acquainted with a particular man in Sub-Saharan Africa. He spoke a Nilotic language as a first-language, a second Nilotic language as a trade language, English as his primary language of education, Arabic as a spoken trade language, and Italian. For some reason he was fond of preaching in English with a conjunction "fa," which is Arabic, meaning "and, and then." English was his most developed and mature language, yet his English preaching style was distinctly idiosyncratic, exhibiting an Arabism.

Isa 58:8	אָז יִבָּקַע כַּשַּׁחַר אוֹרֶךָ	then your light will break out like dawn
Isa 58:14	אָז תִּתְעַנַּג עַל־יְהוָה	then you will have joy for the Lord
Isa 60:5	אָז תִּרְאִי וְנָהַרְתְּ	then you will see and be bright

As expected, a similar future use of אדין is attested in Aramaic and at Qumran. Here are four selected examples of "non-narrative" future use. They are good, generic Semitic. That is, they are equally good as Hebrew and Aramaic:

אדין יהוא   1QLevi ar 11.1 (cf. 27.1; 53.1, אדין in past contexts)
    then he will be
ב]אדין יערם וידע]   4Q534 Noah ar 1.6
    [space] then he will be wise and will know
[אדין יתפתחון ספרי חכמ]תא   4Q541(ApocryphonLevi b) ar 7.4
    then the books of wisdom will be opened
אדין יעדה חשוכא   4Q541(ApocryphonLevi b) ar 9.4
    then darkness will vanish

These examples of אז and אדין in future contexts are standard adverbial usages and should not be confused with the narrative use of אדין as a conjunction in Aramaic. It is also amply attested in Greek. There the 241 examples of (καὶ) τότε in the *Sibylline Oracles*, which is 8.23 futuristic τότε per 1000 words in this future-poetic Greek hexameter.

From all of the above, we can conclude that in Jewish Greek from the Second Temple period finding frequent examples of *narrative* τότε is an indication of Aramaic influence. *Narrative* τότε may indicate an Aramaic source, or *narrative* τότε may conceivably be an Aramaized writing style in Greek. Equally important, Semitic Greek without *narrative* τότε is a possible indication of Hebrew influence. If there is an indication of a Semitic source being used but there is no *narrative* τότε, then that source is probably Hebrew. We will examine this and further refine it by applying it to several texts after the other diagnostic criterion is introduced.

c   *Criterion 2: ויהי Impersonal ἐγένετο Setting to Introduce a Finite Verb*
Anyone who has read a semi-literal translation of the Hebrew Bible is acquainted with a peculiar style of old literary Hebrew narrative. The Hebrew verb for "be" is used impersonally with a "setting" and this setting structure introduces a finite verb. Several examples below illustrate this structure in Hebrew and in Greek and Aramaic translation. There are two basic subtypes of structures in Greek—those settings that introduce the following finite verb

without καί (subtype a),[37] and those settings that introduce the following finite verb by means of καί (subtype b):[38]

Gen 12:11 (Greek subtype a)[39]

וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִקְרִיב לָבוֹא מִצְרָיְמָה
וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־שָׂרַי אִשְׁתּוֹ
הִנֵּה־נָא יָדַעְתִּי כִּי אִשָּׁה יְפַת־מַרְאֶה אָתְּ:

And it happened as he neared to enter Egypt
and he said to Saray his wife
Look, I know that you are a beautiful woman.

(LXX) ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν Αβραμ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον
εἶπεν Αβραμ Σαρα τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ
γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι γυνὴ εὐπρόσωπος εἶ

(Onkelos) וַהֲוָה כַד קְרִיב לְמֵיעַל לְמִצרַיִם
וַאֲמַר לְשָׂרַי אִיתְּתֵיה
הָא כְעַן יָדַענָא אֲרֵי אִיתְּתָא שַׁפִּירַת חֵיזּו אַת:

Gen 12:14 (Greek subtype a)[40]

וַיְהִי כְּבוֹא אַבְרָם מִצְרָיְמָה
וַיִּרְאוּ הַמִּצְרִים אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה כִּי־יָפָה הִוא מְאֹד:

---

[37]   These distinctive subtypes were first discussed by Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh T. & T. Clark, 1896).

[38]   Further discussion on this criterion was presented in Randall Buth and Brian Kvasnica, "The Parable of the Vineyard and the Tenants in its Historical and Linguistic Context," in *Jesus' Last Week* (ed. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker; Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 1; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 53–80 and 259–317, especially pages 268–73. See also Randall Buth, "A Hebraic Approach to Luke and the Resurrection Accounts: Still Needing to Re-do Dalman and Moulton," in *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae* (ed. R. Pierri; Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di Lino Cignelli OFM, Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006), 293–316.

[39]   The LXX εἶπεν Αβραμ did not translate the second Hebrew "and" because of considerations of Greek style, so it is subtype a.

[40]   This is Greek subtype a because the material following the setting (ἰδόντες…) is introduced without καί. Here the Hebrew has an infinitive as the setting (כְּבוֹא) and it is translated by a subordinate temporal clause in Greek (ἡνίκα+finite verb).

וַיִּרְאוּ אֹתָהּ שָׂרֵי פַרְעֹה
וַיְהַלְלוּ אֹתָהּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה

And it happened after Avram entered Egypt
and the Egyptians saw the woman that she was very beautiful
and Pharoah's administrators saw her
and praised her to Pharoah.

ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα εἰσῆλθεν Αβραμ εἰς Αἴγυπτον
ἰδόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὴν γυναῖκα ὅτι καλὴ ἦν σφόδρα,
καὶ εἶδον αὐτὴν οἱ ἄρχοντες Φαραω
καὶ ἐπήνεσαν αὐτὴν πρὸς Φαραω.

(Onkelos)

וַהֲוָה כַד עַל אַברם לְמִצרַיִם וַחֲזוֹ מִצרָאֵי יָת אִתְּתָא אֲרֵי שַׁפִּירָא הִיא לַחֲדָא:

Genesis 12:14 also illustrates subtype a. In addition, Gen. 12:14 shows a rare mistake where the translator has incorrectly tried to stylize the Hebrew source into smoother Greek. The first verb ויראו has been put into a nominative participle form ἰδόντες. But it is followed by an unnecessary "and" when linking the participle to the main verb καὶ εἶδον, and furthermore, the verb εἶδον has a different subject. This dangling participle and improper agreement was probably caused by the intervening description of what the first group saw: "that she was very beautiful." If the translator had wanted to subordinate one of the Hebrew verbs to a participle he should have chosen the second "seeing" and said καὶ ἐγένετο . . . εἶδον οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὅτι . . ., καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὴν οἱ ἄρχοντες Φαραω ἐπήνεσαν αὐτὴν πρὸς Φαραω. As the LXX stands, this καί would be a Hebraism of the "mistranslation" type and cannot serve as a pattern for imitation because it is too rare. It may not occur anywhere else in the Old Greek.[41]

---

41   The incorrect use of καί is obvious in Gen 12:14–15 because we have the Hebrew source text and because the subjects of the Greek participle and the main verb are different. There is a good potential example of this same phenomenon in Luke 5:18.

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον   and behold men carrying on a bed a man
ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος,   who was paralyzed
καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν   **and** they were seeking to bring him in

Normal Greek style would have φέροντες link to ἐζήτουν without a conjunctive καί. If this καί was the result of a Semitic source behind the Greek source, the unnecessary καί was probably caused by the intervening description of the man. However, it has then remained in the Greek manuscript tradition because it is still grammatically correct as Greek: the superfluous καί comes to be read as an adverb, "they were *even* trying to bring

Gen 19:34 (Greek subtype b)[42]

וַיְהִי מִמָּחֳרָת וַתֹּאמֶר הַבְּכִירָה

And it happened on the morrow,
and the older daughter said

ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἐπαύριον
καὶ εἶπεν ἡ πρεσβυτέρα

(Onkelos)
והוה ביומא דבתרוהי ואמרת רבתא

Gen 38:29 (Greek subtype b)[43]

---

him in." But such a focus on "*even* trying" appears to be misplaced, since there was noth-ing else for them to do if they were carrying the man. This text highlights the tensions in proposals of "mistranslation." One must appreciate the incongruity of the καί and then accept a narrative Semitic source behind an early stage of the Greek story. This would require a Semitized, non-Markan source to Luke. What is "reasonable and clear" to one reader, might be brushed aside as "amusing conjecture" by another. A major, non-Markan, Semitized source is the iceberg under the surface of the present study and this possibility underlines the importance of getting language details correct.

This "superfluous καί after a participle" appears to be very rare in Greek. Besides Luke 5:18 and Gen 12:14–15, we could only find two other examples: *Sedrach* 14.2, καὶ πεσόντες ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρακαλοῦντες τὸν θεὸν **καὶ** εἶπον, "and fallen on their face beseeching God **and** they said …," and *T. Job* 18:1, Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ λέγων αὐτοῖς, ἀπέλθων **καὶ** κατέβαλεν τὸν οἶκον ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα μου, "And saying even these things to them, having gone off and he threw down the house on my children." *Sedrach* is probably late (fourth century C.E.) and Greek, and likely to be an accidental mistake triggered by the interruptive present parti-ciple "beseeching God" hanging on the aorist participle. Perhaps παρακαλοῦντες had been παρεκάλουν in an earlier recension. The *Testament of Job* is probably a first-century prod-uct and may be reflecting Aramaic, as will be shown below. However, in the *Testament of Job* one could claim that the καί before κατέβαλεν is adverbial "even," since the first καί in the sentence is adverbial.

42   This is Plummer's subtype b because of καὶ after the setting and introducing the following finite verb clause.

43   The Hebrew text does not have a sequential past tense (*vav ha-hippux* structure) after the setting. It uses simple "and" + "behold." The LXX has retained this "and" in its translation so it is subtype b.

וַיְהִי כְּמֵשִׁיב יָדוֹ
וְהִנֵּה יָצָא אָחִיו
וַתֹּאמֶר מַה־פָּרַצְתָּ עָלֶיךָ פָּרֶץ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פָּרֶץ:

And it happened as he was returning his hand
and behold his brother came out.
and she said, "Look how you've broken out, and she called his name
Peretz."

ὡς δὲ ἐπισυνήγαγεν τὴν χεῖρα
καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ
ἡ δὲ εἶπεν τί διεκόπη διὰ σὲ φραγμός καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Φαρες

(Onkelos) וַהֲוָה כַד אֲתֵיב יְדֵיהּ
וְהָא נְפַק אֲחוּהִי
וַאֲמַרַת מָא תְקוֹף סַגִּי עֲלָךְ לְמִתְקַף וּקְרָא שְׁמֵיהּ פָּרֶץ:

Gen 39:15 (almost subtype a)[44]

וַיְהִי כְשָׁמְעוֹ כִּי־הֲרִימֹתִי קוֹלִי וָאֶקְרָא וַיַּעֲזֹב בִּגְדוֹ אֶצְלִי וַיָּנָס וַיֵּצֵא הַחוּצָה:

And it happened after his hearing that I raised my voice and cried out
    and he left his clothes with me
    and he fled and went outside.

ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτὸν ὅτι ὕψωσα τὴν φωνήν μου καὶ ἐβόησα
καταλιπὼν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ
ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω

(Onkelos)
וַהֲוָה כַד שְׁמַע אֲרֵי אֲרֵימִת קָלִי וּקְרֵית
וְשַׁבְקֵיהּ לִלְבָשֵׁיהּ לְוָתִי וַעֲרַק וּנְפַק לְשׁוּקָא:

Gen 22:1 (subtype a)[45]

---

44 The LXX does not use ἐγένετο in its translation, so it is technically not a Greek subtype.
    However, it drops καί after the setting so it is close to Greek subtype a.

45 The Hebrew does not follow with a sequential tense and the LXX does not use "and." This
    is subtype a. For contrast, compare Gen 22:20 in the LXX where it includes καί (subtype b):
    καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα καὶ ἀνηγγέλη τῷ Ἀβρααμ λέγοντες.

וַיְהִי אַחַר הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה
וְהָאֱלֹהִים נִסָּה אֶת־אַבְרָהָם
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּנִי:

καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα
ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Αβρααμ
καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Αβρααμ Αβρααμ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ ἐγώ

(Onkelos)
וַהֲוָה בָּתַר פִּתְגָמַיָּא הָאִלֵּין
וַיוי נַסִּי יָת אַבְרָהָם
וַאֲמַר לֵיהּ אברהם וַאֲמַר הָאֲנָא:

These examples show some flexibility on behalf of the Greek translators. For perspective, though, it should be added that by far the most common translation in the Old Greek Bible is to have ἐγένετο plus an infinitive setting that introduces a finite verb clause.

Ever since Alfred Plummer[46] it has been common to differentiate the Greek of these Hebraic structures into two subcategories. The first subcategory (a) serves as an introduction to the following main event, but it does not use "and" for that event. The main event is a finite verb (see above: Gen 12:11; 22:1, and 39:15 [though without ἐγένετο]). It may be considered slightly more refined as a Greek translation. The second subcategory (b) serves as an introduction to the following main event, but it includes "and" in its translation (see above: Gen 19:34; 22:20, and 38:29 [though without ἐγένετο]).

d A Similar "Greek" Structure, But Not Criterion #2: Plummer Category C

In addition to these Hebraic examples there is also a Greek structure that resembles this Hebraic ἐγένετο structure and the Greek impersonal-ἐγένετο structure must be distinguished from the Hebraic structure. It developed from a classical idiom that was built on συνέβη, "it happened," + an infinitive. This idiom occurs nine times in 2 Maccabees: 3:2 (συνέβαινεν); 4:30; 5:2, 18; 7:1; 9:2, 7; 10:5; 12:34; 13:7. Because the Hebraic structure often has an infinitive within a "setting phrase,"[47] the Greek structure with an infinitive as the main verb may

---

46   Plummer, *The Gospel According to Luke*.

47   See Mark 4:4; Luke 1:8; 2:6; 5:1, 12; 9:18, 33, 51; 11:1, 27; 14:1; 17:11, 14; 18:35; 19:15; 24:4, 15, 30, 51. For example, in Luke 24:30, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίδου αὐτοῖς, the infinitive κατακλιθῆναι is part of the setting and

sometimes be mistaken for the Hebraic Greek structure. Mark 2:23 (below) is an example of the Greek structure with an infinitive main verb:[48]

2 Macc 5:2:

συνέβη δὲ καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν σχεδὸν ἐφ᾿ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα **φαίνεσθαι** διὰ τῶν ἀέρων τρέχοντας ἱππεῖς διαχρύσους

and it happened throughout the whole country for almost forty days
there were appearing (inf.) in the air golden galloping horses

Acts 21:25:

ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναβαθμούς,
συνέβη **βαστάζεσθαι** αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν
διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ ὄχλου.

and when he was on the steps
it happened that he was being carried (inf.) by the soldiers
because of the force of the crowd.

Examples of γίνεσθαι (ἐγένετο), "become," introducing an infinitive event occur in the papyri in non-past contexts[49] and provide the link for the following "Greek" structure:

Mark 2:23   καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι **διαπορεύεσθαι**
             and it happened him, on the sabbath, to be going through
             the fields.

---

the main verbs are (λαβὼν . . .) εὐλόγησεν and (κλάσας) ἐπεδίδου. These are all the Hebraic structure.

48   Cf. Luke 3:21–22 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι. Here the setting phrases include an infinitive βαπτισθῆναι and a genitive absolutes βαπτισθέντος and προσευχομένου. The main events are recorded as infinitives ἀνεῳχθῆναι . . . καταβῆναι . . . γενέσθαι. Luke 3:21–22 is the Greek structure.

49   J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930) 126.

Thus, ἐγένετο, plus or minus a setting that introduces an infinitive main event should be called Greek, or Jewish Greek.[50] This is the third ἐγένετο setting structure, subcategory c in Plummer's classification. It is not a direct Hebraism. It is important to distinguish this Greek structure because many erroneous statements have been made by New Testament scholars about this structure found in Luke and Acts.[51]

e   Is "Impersonal ἐγένετο + Finite Main Verb" Hebrew or Aramaic?

Since the Targum sometimes mimics this Hebrew structure, scholars question whether this setting structure (indefinite ἐγένετο + finite main verb) should be considered unique to Hebrew? Although there is a near consensus that the structure is not natural to texts written in Aramaic, one scholar has suggested that the structure is unique to Aramaic in the Second Temple period and is not Hebrew at all.[52] Let us examine this claim.

Elliott Maloney appears to recognize that 4Q202 En-b ar ii 2 (= 1 En 6:1) may only be a reflection or translation of the biblical Hebrew structure.[53] His only natural Aramaic "example" comes from Elephantine Aramaic and needs to be cited in its larger context. It turns out to be an "anti-example" and does not reflect the common Biblical Hebrew structure.

Cowley 30 (fifth century B.C.E.), lines 8–12

אחר נפין דבר מצריא עם חילא אחרן

Then Nepin took the Egyptians with another force

---

50   See discussion in J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. 1: *Prolegomena*, (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908) 17. Plummer's "structure c" is not exactly found in Greek papyri, so it is best to call what we find in the Gospels "Jewish Greek" and a colloquial adaption of the Greek συνέβη construction.

51   For representative examples of erroneous and misleading statements, see nn. 112, 114, 115, 116.

52   Elliott Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1981). This was a dissertation under Joseph Fitzmyer at Fordham University, accepted 1979. The structure is discussed on pp. 81–86, 207–8, and 247.

53   Aramaic והוא כד]י can be compared with the Greek text καὶ ἐγένετο ὅταν (or ὅτε) ἐπληθύνθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτοῖς θυγατέρες, "And it happened when (whenever) the sons of men multiplied in those days (that) daughters were born to them" (translation Maloney's). This comes directly or indirectly from the Hebrew of Gen 6:1: וַיְהִי כִּי הֵחֵל הָאָדָם לָרֹב עַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה וּבָנוֹת יֻלְּדוּ לָהֶם.

אתו לבירת יב עם תליהם

they came to the fortress Yev with their weapons

עלו באגורא זך

they entered that temple

נדשוהי עד ארעא

they smashed it to the ground

ועמודיא זי אבנא זי הוו תמה תברו המו

and the pillars of stone that were there they broke them.

אף הוה

Even it happened

///// תרען זי אבן

five gates of stone,

בנין פסילה זי אבן זי הוו באגורא זך

a building of hewn stone that was in the that temple,

נדשו.

they smashed,

ודשיהם קימו

and their doors they set up

וציריהם זי דששיא אלך נחש

and the hinges of these doors were bronze

ומטלל עקהן זי ארז

and a ceiling of wood was cedar

כלא זי עם שירית אשרנא ואחרן זי תמה הוה

all that with the rest of the furniture and other things that were there

כלא באשה שרפו.

all of it they burned with fire.

The first thing that needs to be said about the above text is that the Aramaic structure is not like the Hebrew structure common in the Hebrew Bible.

In Hebrew, the ויהי clause is linked to subordinated material that provides a setting to the event or events that follow. The Hebrew setting material is typically a prepositional phrase, or an infinitive,[54] or כי plus a finite verb. In Hebrew narrative, this structure typically serves as a "setting phrase" to a new paragraph-type unit and foregrounded material that moves the narrative forward. The Aramaic of Cowley 30 is the opposite of the Hebrew structure. Cowley 30:8 opens with a narrative about the destruction that Nepin and the Egyptians accomplished. This is followed with a backgrounded listing of the specific events of destruction that are introduced by an adverb אף, "even," plus הוה, "was," and several backgrounded clauses. There is no subordinated "setting" clause joined to הוה, the narrative pauses in its temporal march, and the whole list expands and reiterates what had been mentioned in the narrative. The backgrounded nature of the material listed is further marked in Aramaic by verb final word order.

The only point of contact between Cowley 30:8–12 and Hebrew is the impersonal use of the verb "be, happen." However, structurally, they are as different as night and day. This difference is easily detected in Greek translation, for example, Mark 1:9 (cited by Maloney, 85) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ ("...and it happened in those days Jesus came from Nazareth ..."). This is clearly parallel to the Hebrew structure "impersonal 'be' + setting phrase + finite verb" where the finite verb moves the narrative forward. [55] The same is true of Maloney's other example, Mark 4:4. So, rather

---

54   Usually -כ or -ב + the infinitive.

55   See Exod 2:11 for an exact Hebrew example: ויהי בימים ההם ויגדל משה ויצא אל אחיו, "and it happened in those days and Moses grew up and went out to his brothers." LXX (subtype a): ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταῖς πολλαῖς ἐκείναις μέγας γενόμενος Μωυσῆς ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς

than establishing an Aramaic provenance for this structure, Maloney has unintentionally helped to establish its Hebrew pedigree. The structure "impersonal 'be' + setting phrase + (foregrounded) finite verb" is only natural to Hebrew and is only known to occur in Aramaic as translation from Hebrew.

f   *Criterion #2 Exists as Second Temple Hebrew*

After discussing the Aramaic side of this structure, we still need to look at the Hebrew side, since there are a couple of puzzles to be resolved. It is known that Mishnaic Hebrew no longer used the sequential tenses of Classical Hebrew. The very few examples like *b. Qid.* 66a[56] are to be treated as quotations from works that have otherwise disappeared. They do not prove that sequential tenses were still being actively used in the talmudic period.

During the Second Temple period we have examples of literary Hebrew books that use this Hebrew structure and we have examples of books without the Hebrew structure.

1 and 2 Chronicles, Nehemiah, Job (1:5, 6, 13; 2:1; 42:7), Zechariah (7:1), Jonah (4:8), Daniel (8:2, 15), Esther (1:1; 2:8; 3:4; 5:1, 2), and Ruth (1:1, 19; 3:8) use this structure.

On the other hand, there are Biblical Hebrew books that do not have an example of impersonal ויהי + setting + main clause: Ezra (narrative), Song of Songs (poetry), Lamentations (poetry), Qohelet (essay), Psalms (poetry), and Proverbs (poetry). Perhaps the most significant of these is Ezra since it is a

---

ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ. Other examples of ויהי בימים ההם include Exod 2:23 (where the LXX did not use ἐγένετο), Judg 19:1, and 1 Sam 28:1.

56   *b. Qid.* 66a is a famous story about Yannai and the Pharisees that starts in Mishnaic Hebrew, then quotes an apparent source in literary Hebrew with sequential tenses, even a מיד, "immediately," and then finishes in Mishnaic Hebrew. The text reads:

מעשה בינאי המלך שהלך לכוחלית שבמדבר וכיבש שם ששים כרכים, ובחזרתו היה
שמח שמחה גדולה, וקרא לכל חכמי ישראל. אמר להם: אבותינו היו אוכלים מלוחים בזמן
שהיו עסוקים בבנין בית המקדש, אף אנו נאכל מלוחים זכר לאבותינו, והעלו מלוחים על
שולחנות של זהב ואכלו. והיה שם אחד איש לץ לב רע ובליעל ואלעזר בן פועירה שמו,
ויאמר אלעזר בן פועירה לינאי המלך: ינאי המלך, לבם של פרושים עליך! ומה אעשה?
הקם להם בציץ שבין עיניך, הקים להם בציץ שבין עיניו. היה שם זקן אחד ויהודה בן
גדידיה שמו, **ויאמר** יהודה בן גדידיה לינאי המלך: ינאי המלך, רב לך כתר מלכות, הנח
כתר כהונה לזרעו של אהרן! שהיו אומרים: אמו נשבית במודיעים, **ויבוקש** הדבר ולא
נמצא; **ויבדלו** חכמי ישראל בזעם. **ויאמר** אלעזר בן פועירה לינאי המלך: ינאי המלך,
הדיוט שבישראל כך הוא דינו, ואתה מלך וכהן גדול כך הוא דינך? אם אתה
שומע לעצתי רומסם. ותורה מה תהא עליה? הרי כרוכה ומונחת בקרן זוית, כל הרוצה
ללמוד יבוא וילמוד. אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: **מיד** נזרקה בו אפיקורסות, דהוה ליה למימר:
תינח תורה שבכתב, תורה שבעל פה מאי? **מיד ותוצץ** הרעה על ידי אלעזר בן פועירה,
ויהרגו כל חכמי ישראל, והיה העולם משתומם עד שבא שמעון בן שטח והחזיר את
התורה ליושנה.

narrative, though it is relatively short. Note, for example Ezra 9:1: וככלות אלה נגשו אלי השרים, "and after these finished the officers came to me." The context fits the use of ויהי but the structure was not used.

Qumran adds to the list of literary Hebrew documents that do not use the narrative ויהי structure. However, most of these are non-narrative documents like the biblical books just listed that do not use this structure. For example, the non-narrative Community Rule (1QS 6.4) is suggestive of the structure but uses an impersonal "it will be" plus setting structure in the future:

והיה כי יערוכו השולחן לאכול או התירוש לשתות הכוהן ישלח ידו

> and it will be when they arrange the table to eat or the wine to drink, the priest will extend his hand.

A paraphrase of Genesis shows the impersonal setting structure. Even though the first four words of the Qumran example fit the biblical text itself, the continuation is independent of the biblical text and might be an example of semi-independent use. Compare the MT with the Qumran rewording:

Gen 8:5–6 (MT)

והמים היו הלוך וחסור עד החדש העשירי
בעשירי באחד לחדש נִרְאוּ רָאשֵׁי הֶהָרִים
וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וַיִּפְתַּח נח

This last line is expanded in the Qumran Genesis commentary 4Q252 1:12:

ויהי מקץ ארבעים יום להראות ראשי

> and it happened forty days after the appearing of the peaks of [the mountains]

However, just a few lines later, this same text drops a ויהי from the source while paraphrasing the account. 4Q 252 2.1 reads:

באחת ושש מאות שנה לחיי נוח

[MT has ויהי באחת ושש] In the 601st year of Noah's life . . .

There is a *Jubilees* fragment that appears to have this structure (11Q12, f9.2):

<div dir="rtl">

ויהי בשב[עה...

</div>

And it happened on the 7th . . .

The Temple Scroll has several examples of the impersonal setting structure in the future (11Q19 19.7; 56.20; 58.3, 11; 61.14; 62.6). It also has one interesting mistake for the MT of Deut 20:9:

<div dir="rtl">

והיה ככלות השטרים לדבר אל העם
ויהי ככלות השופטים...

</div>

And it would happen [*sic* (probably to be read וִיהִי or corrected to והיה)] after the judges finished . . .

So, while the Qumran literature gives evidence of knowing and using the impersonal "be" + setting structure in the future, there are no clear, unambiguous examples in the past. However, the future examples plus the ambiguous examples in the past are enough to suggest that the structure was part of the language. This is further confirmed by considering the non-canonical literature.

The books of 1–4 Maccabees have been preserved in Greek. One of them, 1 Maccabees, is written in a highly Semitized Greek and there is a scholarly consensus and ancient attestation that the book was originally written in Hebrew.[57] In support of this consensus we note that there are eight examples of the impersonal εγενετο setting structure introducing a finite verb.[58] This is helpful because 1 Maccabees (ca. 140–90 B.C.E.) joins the Late Biblical Hebrew canonical books in attesting this Hebrew usage.

From the data and discussion above, we must conclude that the structure "ויהי + setting + finite verb" was certainly a part of late Second Temple literary Hebrew. This is not remarkable and merely underlines what is close to a consensus. Maloney was mistaken in listing the "impersonal 'be' plus finite verb" structure as Aramaic and was rash in excluding the Hebrew structure from his survey of Semitic syntax in his study of Mark. Most scholars have followed

---

57   Thomas Fischer, "Maccabees, Books of," in *ABD*, 4:440.
58   1 Macc 1:1; 5:1, 30; 6:8; 7:2; 9:23; 10:64, 88.

Dalman[59] in recognizing the value of 1 Maccabees, and Late Biblical Hebrew in general, for establishing the characteristics of literary Hebrew during the Second Temple.

g   *The Consistency of the Two Criteria as a Third Test*
The two criteria for testing Semitic Greek narrative are:

> #1 the use of narrative τότε as a conjunction
> #2 impersonal ἐγένετο setting introducing a finite main verb

When these two criteria are used in tandem, they can also be evaluated for consistency and produce the following expectations.
    Greek documents translated from or influenced by Aramaic would be:

> Positive for #1: includes Aramaic "narrative τότε"
> Negative for #2: no Hebraic ἐγένετο

Greek documents translated from or influenced by Hebrew would be:

> Negative for #1: no Aramaic "narrative τότε"
> Positive for #2: includes Hebraic ἐγένετο

Greek documents composed in natural Greek would be:

> Negative for #1: no Aramaic "narrative τότε"
> Negative for #2: no Hebraic ἐγένετο

As a table:

Language	Narrative Criteria	
	#1 narrative τότε	**#2 Hebraic ἐγένετο Setting**
Aramaic	+	−
Hebrew	−	+
Greek	−	−

---

59   Gustaf Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (2d ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1930), 30.

These tests produce an observable profile that may clearly suggest Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic influence for the document under study.

Using the tests together adds a test for consistency since a positive criterion #1 would predict a negative #2, and a positive #2 would predict a negative #1. Any results different from these would flag the need for further investigation.

A third criterion for consistency would be positive if the results fit the table above. The consistency test would be negative if a document with an original Greek statistical profile (according to Martin) tested positive for either #1 or #2. Criterion #3 would also be negative if its profile was positive for both #1 and #2.

It goes without saying that additional confirmation would be sought and weighed for any analysis. One limitation could occur where an author imitated or adopted a foreign style and thus a false match could be obtained for one of the languages. A second limitation could occur where there is a partial match. For example, a Greek document might be highly Semitized from the standpoint of other criteria like word order patterns, genitives, non-Greek profiles of conjunctions, and prepositions, and yet it may still test negative for both #1 and #2 (like the Hebrew sections of Ezra). In addition, a Greek document might test positive for #1 and positive for #2, as we will see is the case with Matthew. Such anomalies demand a more careful analysis.

It should be remembered that we are dealing with much more than two random words or two structures. We are dealing with something that is woven into the fabric of the narrative structure of Second Temple period Aramaic and Hebrew. That is what gives these tests something of the quality of "litmus paper."

We can now proceed to an application of these criteria to fourteen Greek documents from the Second Temple period.

3 Application to Non-canonical Jewish Literature

a *1 Maccabees*

As discussed immediately above, 1 Maccabees tests positive for criterion #2. There are also five potential examples of "narrative τότε," yielding a frequency of 0.27 per 1000 words.[60] This is negligible in comparison with Daniel's 5.77 τότε per 1000 words (Theodotionic) and 6.78 (Old Greek), and Ezra's 5.81 (Old Greek). Consequently, we should assign a negative value to criterion #1. The resulting profile, negative #1, positive #2, and consistent in #3, marks 1 Maccabees as

---

60   1 Macc 2:29, 42; 4:41; 14:32; 16:9.

Hebrew. This conclusion fits the scholarly consensus today as well as the testimony of Origen and Jerome.

b   *2 Maccabees*

The profile of 2 Maccabees is equally clear. 2 Maccabees has three occurrences of τότε, but none of them are potential conjunctions. 2 Maccabees is negative for #1, and negative for #2. This profile would be Greek and this supports the scholarly consensus that 2 Maccabees was written in Greek.

c   *Susanna*

Susanna is a story from the Daniel traditions that is only known in Greek.[61] Since canonical Daniel is a bilingual document, one might expect a Semitic source, if such existed, to be in either Hebrew or Aramaic. The three criteria here can make a contribution since many commentaries and introductions present Hebrew and Aramaic as equally valid options.[62]

Susanna has two textual traditions. In the Theodotionic tradition there are zero examples of #1, while in the slightly shorter and different recension of the Old Greek there is only one τότε; this is preceded by καί and may not be the "narrative τότε" conjunction. Even if the καί were treated as a stylistic improvement by the Old Greek to an Aramaic-based τότε, the resulting statistic would be 1.26 narrative τότε per 1000, which would probably be too low for an Aramaic source.[63] Thus, both recensions test as negative for #1.

---

61   Speculation that 4Q551 was an Aramaic fragment of Susanna has been rightly rejected by George W. E. Nickelsburg, "4Q551: A Vorlage to Susanna or a Text Related to Judges 19?" *JJS* 48 (1997): 349–51.

62   Roger A. Bullard and Howard A. Hatton, *A Handbook on the Shorter Books of the Deuterocanon* (New York: United Bible Societies, 2006), 232: "Opinion today favors an original in either Aramaic or Hebrew." See also Dan W. Clanton, Jr., "(Re)Dating the Story of Susanna: A Proposal," *JSJ* 34 (2003): 121–40—"Aramaic or Hebrew"; Klaus Koenen, "Von der todesmutigen Susanna zum begabten Daniel: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Susann-Erzählung," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 54 (1998): 1–13—"Aramaic or Hebrew"; Helmut Engel, *Die Susanna Erzählung: Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 55–56—"Aramaic or Hebrew"; Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 80–84—"Aramaic or Hebrew." From the last century, see Henry Wace, *The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical commentary and a Revision of the Translation, Apocrypha* (London: John Murray, 1888), 2:308: "As to the original language of all the Three Additions to Daniel, it was probably in each case either Hebrew or Aramaic."

63   We have natural Greek examples that get over 1.00 per 1000, and we have no unambiguous Aramaic ratios below 3.0 per 1000.

On the other hand, Theodotionic Susanna has four examples (7, 15, 19, 28) of the Hebraic criterion #2, though the Old Greek recension has no examples of criterion #2.

In terms of language profile, Theodotionic Susanna is clearly Hebraic. The other tradition, the Old Greek, technically tests as potentially "Greek." It is negative for Aramaic τότε and negative for the Hebraic setting structure. However, if it is to be considered Semitized Greek on other grounds, then it would more likely be Hebraic than Aramaic. The lack of #1 is more significant than a lack of #2, because #1 is naturally more common in an Aramaic text than #2 is in a Hebrew text. Thus, the lack of the Hebraic setting in a story as short as Susanna means no more than the lack of the same thing in the Hebrew parts of Ezra. However, the relative lack of narrative τότε over the whole book of 36 verses in the Old Greek (795 words) is highly suggestive of its not being Aramaic. We would have expected between 2 and 7 examples were the book to be considered Aramaic in origin. We can conclude that Theodotionic Susanna was influenced by Hebrew, and that the Old Greek Susanna was probably influenced by Hebrew.

An interesting question is whether the two versions were working from the same source text, or from each other. While textual criticism tends to favor shorter versions and many see the Old Greek Bible as older than the Theodotionic text, the Old Greek is only 70% as long as the Theodotionic text and might reasonably be considered an epitome,[64] deriving either from Hebrew or from Greek. In favor of such a judgment is the general character of the Theodotionic version in this part of the Greek Bible. "Theodotion" is considered closer to its Semitic sources in canonical Daniel than the Old Greek. Its profile here matches that character, since the Theodotionic text tests as clearly Hebrew.[65] Since the Hebraic ויהי setting structure is verbose and repetitive, it would be in keeping with the Old Greek to delete these settings if the author/translator was trying to produce an epitome of Susanna.

Another question that remains is whether the two Greek word plays in the climax of the story (54–55, 58–59) require a Greek original. Scholars

---

64   The development of "Reader's Digest" versions of stories was a process that was begun in the Hellenistic age in Greek literature and the republican period in Latin literature. See Michael Silk, "Epitome," in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3d ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 549.

65   Incidentally, Theodotionic has the specifically Hebrew idiom ἐχθὲς τὴν τρίτην אתמל שלשם, "yesterday the third day" (Aramaic targums say כמאתמלי ומדקמוי, "as yesterday and previously" etc.] in v. 15, which supports a Hebrew undersource to Theodotion, while the Old Greek has skipped this detail, again in keeping with being an *epitome*.

differ on this. While one wordplay might be an accident of translation, two wordplays show obvious intention. The same two wordplays in both Greek recensions show Greek contact between the two. The easiest solution is that wordplays in Hebrew were replaced by the wordplays in Greek. Henry Wace, in the nineteenth century, listed several potential Hebrew wordplays.[66] Frank Zimmerman suggested a peach tree.[67] Our job here is not to list the history of speculation on this question. I could even add my own examples, like אַלוֹן/אֵלָה "oak, terebinth" אָלָה עַל ראשך "curse on your head." As Wace says, "these [proposed wordplays—R.B.] may suffice to shew how far those [wordplays—R.B.] of the Greek text are from constituting an insuperable objection to the theory of a Hebrew original."[68]

In any case, we can and should delete Aramaic from a list of probable original languages. Our Greek texts point to Hebrew for Susanna.

d   *Bel and the Dragon*

Criterion #1, "narrative τότε," is lacking in the Old Greek of Bel and the Dragon (895 words in length). The καὶ τότε in v. 14 is technically not the Aramaizing conjunction since καί serves as the conjunction. If we included this instance, the statistic would be 1.18, quite low for Aramaic though higher than Hebrew works like Esther, which yields 0.67 (the Old Greek parallels to canonical Esther have four καὶ τότε, 2:13; 4:16; 7:10; 9:31).

On the other hand, the Theodotionic text of Bel and the Dragon has two occurrences of τότε (21, 32), though neither is a prototypical "narrative τότε" (out of 871 words).

θ΄ 21 καὶ ὀγισθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς τότε συνέλαβεν τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας
θ΄ 32 τότε δὲ οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα καταφάγωσιν Δανιηλ.

---

66   Wace, *The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611)*, 2:324, points out that Lagard's Syriac translation of the story already has two wordplays at the places, despite being translated from Greek: *pasteqa*, "pistachio tree"; *pesaq*, "to cut off"; and *rummana*, "pomegranate tree," and *rumcha*, "sword." He also added "pomegranate"//"lift head" (רמון—הרים ראש), "nut"//"cut in two" (אגוז—יגזר), "fig"//"mourning" (תאנה—ירבה), "cypress"/"not forgive" (כפר—לא יכפר לך), "palm"/"be bitter" (תמר—), (בך תאניה ואניה, ימר לך). We cannot know what the original was, but we can expect that there were two wordplays.

67   Frank Zimmermann, "The Story of Susanna and its Original Language," *JQR* 48 (1957–58): 236–41 (237): "Probably the tree was a peach tree (פֶּרְסֵק)... 'Even now the angel of God hath received the sentence of God (פְּסָק), and shall cut thee in two (יְפַסְּקֶךְ).' "

68   Wace, *The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611)*, 2:324.

Verse 21 has τότε inside the Greek sentence, but it does begin the clause with the finite verb. In v. 32, the τότε is joined with the Greek conjunction δέ. If both of these represent Greek stylizations of *narrative* אדין the resulting statistic would be 2.30 per 1000. While this may not be strongly Aramaic, it is suggestive. It is not an expected statistic from a Hebrew source. However, it must be remembered that the structure is not exactly "narrative τότε." The second criterion will especially call into question the Aramaic interpretation of criterion #1 and serves as a consistency test.

Criterion #2 appears in vv. 15 and 33 in the Old Greek. In Theodotionic Bel and the Dragon, it appears in vv. 13, 18 and 28. The Old Greek appears to have reorganized vv. 14–17, which may explain the different placement of the Hebraic ἐγένετο structures.

In terms of language profile, Bel and the Dragon appears go back to a Hebrew original. The Old Greek is negative #1, positive #2, which is Hebraic. Theodotion is not clear on #1, and positive for #2, which also suggests Hebrew.

e   *1 Esdras*

This book shows an interesting mixed profile. Certain sections are incorporated from known sources, both Hebrew (1 Esd 1:1–55 is from 2 Chr 35:1–36:21; 1 Esd 2:1–2:15 is from the Hebrew section of Ezra 1:1–11; 1 Esd 5:7–73 is from Hebrew Ezra 2:1–4:5; 1 Esd 8:1–8 is from Hebrew Ezra 7:1–11; 1 Esd 8:25–9:55 is from Hebrew Ezra 7:27–10:44 plus Neh 7:73–8:12) and Aramaic (1 Esd 2:16–30 is from Aramaic Ezra 4:7–24; 1 Esd 6:1–7:15 is from Aramaic Ezra 4:24–6:22, and 1 Esd 8:9–8:25 is from Aramaic Ezra 7:12–26). These sources have influenced the final Greek document, 1 Esdras. The "Hebrew" Greek sections result in a profile of negative #1 and negative #2. This is the same profile that the Hebrew sources themselves have. The "Aramaic" Greek sections profile as positive #1 and negative #2, which is clearly Aramaic and is also the profile of the sources.

An interesting question is the unique material in 1 Esd 3:1–5:6. Its pattern is suggestive.

Narrative τότε occurs at (3:3 A-text) 3:4, (3:8? καὶ τότε, 4:33? καὶ τότε, 4:41? καὶ τότε); 4:42, 43, 47. The overall statistic for narrative τότε is at least 2.23 per 1000 words, and possibly could run as high as 4.47 per 1000 words. This is a little lower than that which is found in Daniel and Ezra, but it must be remembered that 1 Esdras contains long speeches. Speeches are not necessarily narrative stories and the speech of Dan 4:17–30 and requests and response of Ezra 4:10–22 and the decree of Ezra 7:12–26 do not contain narrative אדין. When the speech discourses are deleted from 1 Esd 3:18–24; 4:2–12, 14–32, and 34–40 the

statistics are 4.18 and 8.35 narrative τότε per 1000 words. We must conclude that the unique section in 1 Esd 3:1–5:6 tests positive for "narrative τότε."[69]

Criterion #2 does not occur in 1 Esdras, so it is negative for all sections, including 3:1–5:6. As mentioned above, criterion #2 does not occur in the Old Greek of the Hebrew sources themselves. While its lack may be compatible with Hebrew sources, it is predicted for both Aramaic-influenced and original Greek texts.

We can conclude that 1 Esd 3:1 to 5:6 has most likely been influenced by an Aramaic source.[70]

f   *Testament of Job*

The *Testament of Job* is often dated to the end of the Second Temple period, first century B.C.E.–first century C.E. Hebrew and Aramaic origins have been suggested for this work, although it is more commonly assumed to have been written in Greek. Our criteria can contribute data to add to the discussion.

The Greek text has 6784 words.

There are 14 "narrative τότε" (16:2; 17:1; 23:8, 10; 27:2, 6; 30:3; 35:1; 36:1; 38:3; 39:6, 13; 41:5; 43:1), and another 11 καὶ τότε as possible "narrative τότε" (8:3; 19:3; 20:3; 31:6; 40:2, 10; 44:5, 44:5[2]; 46:5; 49:1; 50:1). The close repetition of καὶ τότε at 44:5 suggests that this is not simply the Greek adverb, but is indeed a reflection of Aramaic influence in some form. Together these examples are 3.83 per 1000 words, quite a bit higher than anything we have seen in normal Greek. In addition, there is one τότε in a future context (4:11) and one as a non-conjunction (κἀγὼ τότε Νηρεός, 53:1). Therefore, criterion #1 must be considered positive.

---

69   Zipora Talshir and David Talshir, ("The Question of the Source Language to the Story of the Three Youths [1 Esd 3–4]" [Heb], in *Sha'arei Talmon, Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* [ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov with the assistance of Weston Fields; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992]), 63*–75:

משום מרכזיותה של τότε האמורה לשקף את מלת הקישור הארמית **אדין**, נוטה הכף ממילא לצד הטענה שאותו מקור שמי משוער ארמי היה ולא עברי.

"Because of the centrality of τότε, which is considered to reflect the Aramaic connector אדין, the balance of evidence swings on its own accord to the side of the argument that the assumed Semitic source was Aramaic and not Hebrew" (translation mine—R.B.) Cf. also: Zipora Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBSSCS 47, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

70   Raymond A. Martin (*Syntax Criticism*, 181) added some supporting evidence from word order and concluded that this evidence supports Aramaic. See n. 3. Word order can distinguish Imperial Aramaic from Hebrew but it cannot distinguish Western, Jewish Aramaic from Hebrew.

Criterion #2 is negative for this work, with one example of the "Greek" structure at 23:2: καὶ ἐγένετο κατὰ συγχυρίαν ἀπελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν γυναῖκα μου ("and it happened according to coincidence for my wife to go to him"). This is not an example of the Hebrew structure, but of the misleadingly similar Greek structure (subcategory c of Plummer's classification): instead of the Hebraic impersonal "become" + setting introducing a finite verb, here they introduce an infinitive clause.

We can make several observations about this Testament. First, it is not written to mimic the LXX. The frequent narrative τότε in the *Testament of Job* do not reflect either the LXX, or the Old Greek Bible in general; nor do they reflect the canonical book of Job in particular, with its ten τότε that only score 0.74 τότε per 1000 words. Only two of those τότε in canonical Job are candidates for "narrative τότε" (1:12; 2:2). The lack of Hebraic ἐγένετο structures further supports the claim that in the *Testament of Job* there is no intention of artificially imitating a biblical style.

In this context, the Aramaic coloring of "narrative τότε" appears to reveal real Aramaic influence. The *Testament of Job* might have been written by someone with a writing style like the Gospel of Matthew, but, more simply and more likely, the *Testament of Job* looks like a reworking of an Aramaic core document. Hebrew can be ruled out as a reasonable possibility. If there is an Aramaic document lying behind our Greek *Testament of Job*, then the *Testament of Job* constitutes a second major Aramaic document circulating in antiquity that deals with the person of Job. As mentioned earlier, canonical Job has a five-fold testimony about an Aramaic translation: two rabbinic stories relating to the Gamaliel family, one about the grandfather, the other about his grandson; two copies of Aramaic Job at Qumran; and the reference in Job 42:17 of the Old Greek to the use of an Aramaic history of Job. The Testament of Job would be a sixth Aramaic document connected with the figure of Job.

g   *Joseph and Aseneth*
Joseph and Aseneth is a Greek story whose text is problematic and whose date of writing is widely disputed.

The Greek of the book is quite Semitized and is similar to the Life of Adam and Eve, Tobit, and Judith. However, scholarly opinion leans towards Greek as the original language of Joseph and Aseneth.[71] In particular, several thematic words like "immortal," "incorruptible," "unutterable," and "non-appearing," fit

---

71   For example, see C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:181: "Most scholars have agreed that Joseph and Aseneth was composed in Greek."

an assumption of an original Greek composition since they do not correspond to simple lexemes in Hebrew or Aramaic. We will examine data that calls into question the assumption of the book's Greek origin. We have a recent critical text of Joseph and Aseneth from 2003, and we may thank Christoff Burchard for his work, which has spanned thirty-five years.

The four textual families of the book, A–D, can be grouped into two camps according to the language profiles that we are applying in the present article. Burchard's critical text is labelled the B-family below and will be seen to profile as "Hebraic." The "short" version of the text published by Philonenko, the D-family, also profiles as "Hebraic."

The B-family text is:

> negative for criterion #1, especially in comparison to Batiffol's version, and positive for criterion #2 (1:1, 3:1, 11:1, 22:1, 23:1 in Philonenko's text.)

The A-family corresponds to Batiffol's version, which was published in 1892. The A-family is clearly influenced by Aramaic, at least from ch. 8 and following, where there are no fewer than 45 examples of "narrative τότε." That the A-family is positive for criterion #1 can be easily seen in the table below.

Criterion #1 according to textual families:

The Textual Families of Joseph and Aseneth

The manuscript families of Joseph and Aseneth: Family A = Batiffol (1892); Family D = Philonenko (1968); Family B = Burchard (2003). Verse numbers follow Burchard.

8:1	A: τότε ἀνέβη ἡ μητὴρ αὐτῆς	D: καὶ ἀνέβη ἡ μητὴρ αὐτῆς B: καὶ ἀνέβη ἡ μητὴρ τῆς Ἀσενέθ
8:9	A: τότε ἐπήρεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ	BD: καὶ ἐπήρε(ν) τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
10:1	καὶ ὡς ἐξῆλθεν Ἰωσήφ ...	D: τότε Πενταφρῆς ... ἀπῆλθον B: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν Ἰωσήφ
10:10	A: τότε οὖν ἐξεδύσατο	D: καὶ ἐξεδύσατο B: καὶ ἔσπευσεν
10:11	A: τότε λαμβάνει	BD: καὶ ἔλαβε

11:19	A: τότε ἀνέστη	D: καὶ ἀνέστη
14:12	A: τότε ἔσπευσεν	BD: καὶ ἀνέστη
14:14	A: τότε ἔσπευσεν καὶ εἰσῆλθεν	D: καὶ εἰσῆλθεν
		B: καὶ ἔσπευσεν καὶ εἰσῆλθεν
15:1	A: καὶ εἶθ' οὕτως ἦλθε	BD: καὶ ἦλθε
16:9	A: τότε θαμάσασα ἡ Ἀσενέθ εἶπεν	D: ------
		B: καὶ ἐθάμασεν ἡ Ἀσενέθ καὶ εἶπεν
16:13	A: τότε καλεῖ	D: ------
		B: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν
16:15	A: τότε ἐξέτεινεν ὁ θεῖος ἄγγελος	D: καὶ ἐξέτεινεν . . . ὁ ἄνθρωπος
		B: καὶ ἐξέτεινεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος
16:19	A: τότε περιεπλάκησαν	D: καὶ συνεπλάκησαν
		B: καὶ περιεπλάκησαν
16:21	A: τότε ἀνέστησαν πᾶσαι αἱ μέλισσαι	D: καὶ ἀπῆλθαν
		B: καὶ ἀνέστησαν πᾶσαι αἱ μέλισσαι
16:22	A: καὶ εἶθ' οὕτως ἐξέτεινεν	D: --------
		B: καὶ ἐξέτεινεν
16:23	A: τότε ἀνέστησαν πᾶσαι αἱ τεθνηκυ'	D: καὶ ἀνέστησαν . . . ἅπασαι
		B: καὶ ἀνέστησαν αἱ τεθνηκυῖαι
17:3	A: τότε ἐξέτεινε τρίτον	D: --------καὶ ἥψατο τοῦ κηρίου
		B: καὶ ἐξέτεινε τρίτον
17:6	A: τότε ἐκάλεσεν τὰς 7 παρθένους ἡ Ἀσενέθ	D: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὰς Ἀσενέθ
		B: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀσενέθ τὰς 7 παρθένους
17:9	A: τότε εἶπεν Ἀσενέθ	D: --------
		B: καὶ εἶπεν Ἀσενέθ
18:9	A: τότε ἀπελθὼν ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας	D: --------
		B: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ τροφεύς
19:2	A: τότε σπεύσασα Ἀσενέθ	D: καὶ κατέβη Ἀσενέθ
		B: καὶ ἔσπευσεν Ἀσενέθ καὶ κατέβη
19:8	A: τότε λέγει ὁ Ἰωσὴφ πρὸς Ἀσενέθ	D: --------
		B: καὶ λέγει ὁ Ἰωσὴφ πρὸς Ἀσενέθ
19:10	A: τότε ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ	D: καὶ ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
		B: καὶ ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ

19:11	A: εἶτα τὸ δεύτερον δέδωκεν	D: καὶ ἠσπάντο ἀλλήλους
		B: καὶ κατέφιλησεν αὐτὴν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἔδωκεν
20:5	A: εἶτα ἐκράτησεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῆς	D: καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῆς
		B: μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκράτησεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῆς
20:5	A: καὶ εἶθ᾽ οὕτως ἐκάθισεν αὐτὴν ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ	D: --------
		B: καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ
21:4	A: τότε ἀπέστειλε Φαραώ	D: καὶ ἀπέστειλε Φαραώ
		B: καὶ ἀπέστειλε Φαραώ
21:7	A: τότε περιέστρψεν αὐτοὺς Φαραώ	D: καὶ ἀπέστρψεν αὐτοὺς Φαραώ
		B: καὶ περιέστρψεν Φαραώ
22:6	A: τότε οὖν προσῆλθον . . . πρὸς Ἰακώβ	D: [καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς Ἰακώβ][see next]
		B: καὶ προσῆλθον πρὸς Ἰακώβ
22:8	A: τότε ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν	D: ------
		B: καὶ <εἶδεν> αὐτόν . . .
22:9	A: τότε ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν	D: ------
		B: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν
23:2	A: τότε ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους	D: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν . . . ἀγγέλους
		B: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους
23:9	A: τότε εἶπε Λευὶ . . .	D: καὶ εἶπε Λευὶς
		B: καὶ εἶπε Λευὶς
23:14	A: τότε εἵλκυσαν τὰς ῥομφαίας	D: καὶ εἵλκυσαν τὰς ῥομφαίας
		B: καὶ εἵλκυσαν τὰς ῥομφαίας
23:16	A: τότε ἐξέτεινε Λευὶ . . .	D: καὶ ἐξέτεινε Λευὶς . . .
		B: καὶ ἐξέτεινε Λευὶς . . .
24:2	A: τότε λέγουσιν αὐτῷ	D: καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν . . .
		B: καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ
24:5	A: τότε ἐχάρη ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω χαρὰν με᾽	D: καὶ ἐχάρη ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω χαρὰν με᾽
		B: καὶ ἐχάρη ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω χαρὰν με᾽
24:7	A: τότε ὁ υἱὸς Φαραώ. ἐψεύσατο	D: καὶ ἐψεύσατο ὁ υἱὸς Φαραώ . . .

			B: καὶ ἐψεύσατο αὐτοῖς ὁ υἱὸς Φαραώ ...
24:18	A: τότε δέδωκεν ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω		D: καὶ ... ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω ... ἔδωκεν
			B: καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω
25:1	A: τότε ἀνέστη ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ ...		D: καὶ-------
			B: καὶ ἀνέστη ὁ υἱὸς Φαραω ...
25:7	A: τότε ὀργίσθησαν		D: καὶ ὀργίσθησαν
			B: καὶ ὀργίσθησαν
26:4	A: τότε ἀπῆλθεν Ἀσενέθ		D: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν Ἀσενέθ
			B: καὶ ἀπῆλθεν Ἀσενέθ
26:6	A: τότε ἔγνω λευὶ ...		D: καὶ ἔγνω λευὶς ...
			B: καὶ ἔγνω λευὶς ...
27:2	A: τότε κατεπήδησε Βενιαμὶν ...		D: καὶ κατεπήδησε Βενιαμὴν ...
			B: καὶ κατεπήδησε Βενιαμὶν ...
27:6	A: τότε οἱ υἱοὶ Λίας ... κατεδίωξαν		D: τότε οἱ υἱοὶ Λίας ... κατεδίωξαν
			B: καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Λίας ... κατεδίωξαν
28:2	A: τότε πεσόντες ἐπὶ πρόσωπον		D: καὶ ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον
			B: καὶ ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον
28:8	A: τότε ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ὕλην ... Δ. κ Γ.		D: καὶ ἔφυγον Δὰν καὶ Γὰδ εἰς τὴν ὕλην
			B: καὶ ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ὕλην Δὰν καὶ Γάδ
28:14	A: τότε ἐξέτεινεν Ἀσενὲθ ...		D: καὶ ... εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀσενέθ
			B: καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Ἀσενὲθ ...
28:15	A: τότε προσελθὼν αὐτῇ Λευὶς		D: καὶ ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὴν Λευὶς ...
			B: καὶ ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὴν Λευὶς ...
29:3	A: τότε ἔδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν Λευί		D: καὶ ... ἔδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν Λευίς
			B: καὶ ἔδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν Λευίς
29:5	A: τότε ἀνέστησε Λευὶ τὸν υἱὸν ...		D: καὶ ἀνέστησε Λευὶ τὸν υἱὸν ...
			B: καὶ ἀνέστησε Λευὶ τὸν υἱὸν ...

The strong Aramaizing direction of the A-family needs to be checked for consistency. If it were a new translation from an Aramaic source we might predict that there would be no examples of criterion #2. The first place to check would be the five examples of criterion #2 of the B-family cited above. Three of those places delete the ἐγένετο in the A-family: 1:1, 11:1, and 22:1. This lack of the ἐγένετο structure is consistent with Aramaic influence. But the examples in 3:1 and 23:1 still need explanation in the A-family. What can we say about these two instances? First of all, if Hebrew was the original language of Joseph and Aseneth, then those two spots could be remnants just like sometimes happens in the Targumim to the Hebrew Bible. Or these two instances could be textual contamination from the "Hebraic" textual tradition in Greek. Finally, it is possible that the Aramaizing influence in the A-family was a development within the Greek tradition similar to what we find in Matthew. However, the predicted decrease in criterion #2 and the fact that we know that at least some of the pseudepigrapha circulated in three languages during the Second Temple (e.g. Tobit), could lead to the hypothesis that there were two Semitic language texts of Joseph and Aseneth, too.

If we assume that there was both a Hebrew source and an Aramaic source, how can we decide which was original? Consistency of the criteria is one help. The two examples of criterion #2 remaining in the A-family are not consistent with an Aramaic original. Likewise, if Aramaic were the original Semitic document, it is difficult to imagine how the B-family would purge its "narrative τότε" and test so consistently "Hebraic" unless there was, in fact, a Greek translation from an intervening Hebrew. However, we still cannot be certain which came first, Hebrew or Aramaic. If Burchard is correct that the B-family is an earlier recension and the A-family is later, then the textual history would also support the conclusion that Hebrew came first.[72]

We must still ask whether there was or was not a Semitic text. There are some indications of tight translationese in some sections of the work. These

---

72   The story gives "city of Refuge" as Aseneth's new name. "She will find refuge, she will flee" in Hebrew can be תנוס, Tanus, or perhaps תניס, "she will make flee" Tanis, a city in Egypt. This reverses the last three consonants of the name Aseneth. We see exegesis like this at Qumran where the Habakkuk pesher takes היכל, "palace, temple," and prophesies that Rome "will destroy," יְכַלֶּה. If Hebrew תניס is the correct derivation of the name and meaning in the story, then we have evidence of Hebrew, because Aramaic does not use the root נוס, for example, using ערק in the targum tradition. However, all of this is speculative without a source text. *Aseneth* 15:6 only mentions that Aseneth will no longer be "your name" and that "city of refuge" will be "your new name". It does not say that there is a connection between the old name Aseneth and the new name "city of refuge."

would indicate a Semitic source. They would also be evidence of Greek editing in a few limited sections.

(a)   Example of Probable Tight Translation
8:9:

> Καὶ εἶδεν αὐτὴν Ἰωσήφ.   and Joseph saw her

This is very Hebraic word order where αὐτὴν, "her," comes between the verb and subject in the Hebrew "quiet spot," a non-focal place between the verb and subject. This is one of many examples of possible tight translationese.

(b)   Intrusive Greek Editing
27:3:

> καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ υἱὸς Φαραὼ   and Pharoah's son fell
> ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν   from his horse onto the ground
> ἡμιθανὴς τυγχάνων.   half-dead becoming

The word ἡμιθανής has a compound, non-Semitic etymology and the word order is inverted from Semitic patterns. Ἡμιθανής looks like intrusive Greek editing. This Greek word does not smoothly mesh with the style of the surrounding text.

(c)   "A"-Family with a Possible Christian Interpolation
15:5:

> καὶ φαγεῖ ἄρτον ζωῆς εὐλογημένον,
>   and he will eat blessed bread of life
> καὶ πιεῖ ποτήριον ἐμπεπλησμένον ἀθανασίας,
>   and will drink a cup of immortality
> καὶ χρίσματι χρισθήσῃ εὐλογημένῳ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας
>   and with an ointment you will be
>   anointed, blessed of incorruptibility.

The subject matter has been discussed often in the literature. It might be suggestive of a Christian interpolation and at the same time we find two Greek lexical forms with α-privative. Greek "α-privative" words do not have direct Semitic counterparts and suggest some complication, at least. In addition, the word order of χρίσματι . . . εὐλογημένῳ is split in Greek fashion rather than being

found in tight Semitic word order. Thus, here, where distinctive Greek words are found, we also find distinctive Greek syntax. However, an interpolation is unnecessary. Greek vocabulary can be attributed to a translator. One does not need to explain every Greek-sounding vocabulary choice that does not have a clear relationship to a Semitic source.[73]

(d)   "A"-Family with a Possible Christian Interpolation
16:16:

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος	and the angel says to her
Ἰδοὺ δὴ ἔφαγες ἄρτον ζωῆς,	look, you ate the bread of life
καὶ ποτήριον ἔπιες ἀθανασίας	and cup of immortality you drank
καὶ χρίσματι κέχρισαι ἀφθαρσίας,	and with an ointment have been anointed of incorruptibility

Here, too, the non-Semitic, Greek vocabulary occurs in the midst of non-Semitic, Greek word order transposition, suggesting that the distinctive, non-Semitic Grecisms are part of a secondary recension and have been inserted into the text. (The texts behind Burchard's B-family are mixed here, and Burchard has followed a more Semitic order.)

Tentative conclusions for *Joseph and Aseneth* are as follows:

1. An Aramaic copy of *Joseph and Aseneth* was circulating and influenced the Greek textual tradition of the A-family *secondarily*.
2. This Aramaic text probably had roots in the Second Temple period when the narrative אדין-style was in use.[74] Of course, the text might be a late Aramaic stylization (old-styled Aramaic like *megillat Antiochus*), or possibly a Matthew-styled Greek recension. If the latter, it would probably put the book back into the Second Temple period.
3. It is possible that both Hebrew and Aramaic copies were in circulation, in a way similar to what we see with Tobit.
4. If the Greek is based on a Semitic source, then Hebrew is the most likely first language. A Hebrew profile suggests that the A-family (Battifol's

---

73   For example, cf. n. 75, where Talshir and Talshir argue such phenomena.
74   This is contra a fourth-century proposal. Cf. Ross Shepard Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and his Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Greek text) is secondary to either Philonenko's short version (D-family), or Burchard's long B-family.

It must be remembered that the criteria that are being developed in the present study cannot determine on their own whether or not a Semitic source existed. They can only distinguish whether Semitic influence lines up with Aramaic or with Hebrew and if the criteria are consistent.[75]

i   *Tobit*

The book of Tobit exists in two Greek recensions, fragments of which were found at Qumran in both Aramaic and Hebrew. We can apply our two criteria to see what they can tell us about the history of these versions.

4Q196papTobit[a] ar f2,6   ובעה אחיקר עלי   **and** ["Hebraic"] Ahiqar made a request for me

Old Greek א 1:22   τότε ἠξίωσεν Ἀχίχαρος περὶ ἐμοῦ   **then** Achichar petitioned concerning me

Old Greek A, B 1:22   καὶ ἠξίωσεν Ἀχίχαρος περὶ ἐμοῦ   **and** Achichar petitioned concerning me

The Greek recensions have the same words at this point, but differ in the conjunction. The Sinaiticus text has a "narrative τότε," which might lead us to expect אדין in an Aramaic fragment. But our Qumran fragment has -ו, which corresponds to the Greek recension of manuscripts A and B, even though the Qumran texts more often side with Sinaiticus.

4Q200 Tobit[e] Hebrew also has a word אז, "then," but this is not the Aramaic narrative conjunction, but a perfectly normal futuristic use in Hebrew, something that occurs in both Hebrew and Aramaic:

---

75   A general consensus that the book was written in a Jewish Greek modeled on the Greek Bible should probably be re-examined. In another context Talshir and Talshir ("The Question of the Source Language," 64*) point out:

"There is not a great deal of incentive in looking for components that are impossible to be written in a Semitic language. For in such a case there is a ready answer for any problem in the person of the [Greek] translator. For example, if a Greek conception par excellence like φιλανθρωπία, to which one would have difficulty supplying a source in Aramaic or Hebrew, is able to be considered a claim among the claims that the E-addition to Greek Esther was written originally in Greek, along comes the same Greek word in the translated parts of 1 Esdras, not in the story of the youths, and it does not matter that there is no clear equivalent [in Aramaic and Hebrew], which undermines the basis of the [Greek] claim" (translation mine—R.B.).

4Q200 Tobit[e] Hebrew   אז שמחי ודוצי   **so** be happy and dance[76]
Old Greek א 13:15   τότε πορεύθητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι   **then** go and rejoice
Old Greek A, B 13:15   χάρηθι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι   be happy and rejoice

This is standard Hebrew in song and future contexts and negative to criterion #1. Here, where "then" fits Hebrew, it shows up in both the Qumran text and Old Greek Sinaiticus.

There is something strange about Aramaic Tobit. With 1,200 words of extant Aramaic text from Qumran we could have expected four to ten examples of narrative τότε. But we have zero.

The Greek textual tradition for the whole book does not change this perspective. In the textual tradition of Old Greek A+B there are only two potential examples of narrative τότε.

Old Greek A, B 6:14   τότε εἶπεν τὸ παιδάριον τῷ ἀγγέλῳ
                       then the boy said to the angel
Old Greek A, B 8:21   καὶ τότε λαβόντα . . . πορεύεσθαι
                       and then he should take . . . and go
Old Greek A, B 12:6   τότε καλέσας τοὺς δύο κρυπτῶς εἶπεν
                       then taking the two secretly he said
Old Greek A, B 13:6   ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψητε . . . τότε ἐπιστρέψει
                       if you turn to him . . . then he will turn to you

The examples in 8:21 and 13:6 are in future contexts and irrelevant to criterion #1. They are only provided here in order to fill out the picture. In addition, 8:21 has a conjunction καί and could be interpreted as normal Greek. With only one example left, the statistic for narrative τότε is 0.18 per 1000 words and would only be 0.36 if 8:21 were included. Either of these numbers mean that this manuscript tradition tests unambiguously negative for narrative τότε, criterion #1.

In the textual tradition of Old Greek א there are six examples of narrative τότε and another two potential examples (6:7; 12:13):

Old Greek א 1:22   τότε ἠξίωσεν Ἀχιχαρος περὶ ἐμοῦ
                      then Achichar petitioned concerning me
Old Greek א 5:1   τότε ἀποκριθεὶς Τοβιας εἶπεν
                      then Tobias answered and said

---

76   This אז שמחי ודוצי is good Hebrew. The Greek of Sinaiticus τότε πορεύθητι, "then go . . . ," might suggest that some texts were copied/read as אז שמחי ורוצי, "be happy and run."

Old Greek א 5:3   τότε ἀποκριθεὶς Τωβιθ εἶπεν
            then Tobit answered and said

Old Greek א 6:7   καὶ τότε ἠρώτησεν τὸ παιδάριον
            and then the boy asked

Old Greek א 8:18   τότε εἶπεν   **then** he said

Old Greek א 9:1   τότε ἐκάλεσεν Τωβιας Ραφαηλ καὶ εἶπεν
            then Tobias called Rafael and said

Old Greek א 12:6   τότε ἐκάλεσε τοὺς δύο κρυπτῶς καὶ εἶπεν
            then he called the two secretly and said

Old Greek א 12:13   καὶ ὅτε … τότε ἀπέσταλμαι
            and when … then I am sent

Old Greek א 13:6   ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψητε … τότε ἐπιστρέψει
            if you turn to him … then he will turn to you

Old Greek א 13:15   τότε πορεύθητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι
            then go and rejoice [future context]

These produce at least 0.83 and maximally 1.11 narrative τότε per 1000. These would not be enough for us to consider that criterion #1 was positive. However, in comparison with the Aramaic texts from Qumran and with the other Greek traditions of Tobit, this is a significant increase. It would appear that the Sinaiticus tradition has received some Aramaic influence. It is impossible to tell whether this was from contact with an Aramaic exemplar or was the internal development of a Jewish Greek style. More importantly, if the Sinaiticus tradition shows influence from an Aramaic exemplar, then that would be a different Aramaic tradition than the one attested at Qumran. We must conclude that Greek Tobit is negative for criterion #1.

Testing for criterion #2 adds to our picture of Tobit. The Hebrew text at Qumran, 4Q200, does not have an example, nor does Old Greek Sinaiticus have an example.[77] Old Greek A and B also do not have an example. So Tobit is negative for criterion #2. As mentioned above in the discussion of Hebrew Ezra, the lack of criterion #2 does not prove that a document is not Hebrew since criterion #2 may be relatively infrequent in a Hebrew narrative. It is not as common as the simple Aramaic conjunction אדין.

---

77   Tobit 11:18 א ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐγένετο χαρὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Νινευη, and A/B, καὶ ἐγένετο χαρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν Νινευη ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, together suggest that a Semitic original might have looked something like ויהי ביום ותהי ביום הזה שמחה לכל היהודים or ויהי ביום הזה שמחה לכל היהודים. The correct concord in the first conjecture (ותהי) would show that this is not the impersonal structure ויהי plus a setting introducing a finite verb.

These data (Greek Tobit is negative for #1, and negative for #2, yet Semitically based) suggest that Tobit was originally written in Hebrew and was translated into Aramaic at an early date. The Aramaic translation probably did not have many narrative אדין, if any, because of its being a translation from Hebrew. The Greek tradition behind manuscripts A and B may have been translated from either a Hebrew or Aramaic exemplar; the Aramaic would have looked and tested like Hebrew. However, the Greek tradition behind Sinaiticus shows Aramaic influence, which was apparently secondarily added to the textual tradition. If this "influence" came from a written text, then the Aramaic tradition itself showed signs of either development or of a second translation. We do not need to propose such a second translation or development, though, because the influence is slight enough to have been a development within Jewish Greek.

Before leaving the question of Tobit's language of origin, we should put forward additional evidence that supports the conclusion that Hebrew was the original language of this book. Having sections of both Aramaic and Hebrew at Qumran allows us to see another structural feature, something that would not be visible in Greek translation.

Hebrew Tobit has examples of the narrative use of the adverbial infinitive. This suggests that it is *not* a translation (it is uncommon Hebrew and *non-Aramaic*):

4Q200 Tobit e f2.2 　　ה]וסבול אותכה במעי[

　　　　　　　　and (she) "to carry" you in her abdomen

　　　　　　　　(= Tob 4:4 ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ)

(=? Tob 4:4 ? κινδύνους πολλούς "many sufferings" =/= וסבול אותכה במעיה, while סבל can mean "suffer")

4Q200 Tobit e f4.3 　　ואמור לו　and (he) "to say" to him (= Tob 10:8)

4Q200 Tobit e f5.2 　　ונפוץ　　　and (he) "to scatter" (= Tob 11:11)

4Q200 Tobit e f6.4 　　בכן דבר טובי וכתוב תהלה

　　　　　　　　thus Tobi spoke and (he) "to write" a psalm (= Tobit 13:1)

It is easy to explain how these narrative infinitives would end up as finite verbs in Aramaic, since a translator would have no choice. However, it is more difficult to imagine that a translator would look at Aramaic finite verbs and unnecessarily translate them with infinitives. A Hebrew original is therefore the more difficult, yet reasonable, reading. In a review article on DJD 19, Matthew Morgenstern made a general evaluation to the effect that the Aramaic of Tobit

seems smoother than the Hebrew.[78] Possibly. It is difficult to judge with fragmented texts. However, if that were true, then it is more likely that the Aramaic is secondary. Translators have an obligation to make sense of a rough text. This can be demonstrated easily in any Bible translation, ancient or modern. Modern translations with footnotes that say "Hebrew obscure" confirm this point: these translations are clearer than their source.

We may reasonably conclude that the application of our criteria is sound. The criteria point to Hebrew being the original language of the book and that fits the other evidence.[79]

j   *Judith*

Criterion #1 is negative for Judith: Jdt 6:6 appears in a future context, while 15:3 and 16:11 exhibit the adverbial καὶ τότε. That gives us maximally two examples out of 9175 words for a statistic of 0.22 narrative τότε per 1000 words.

Criterion #2 is positive. Note Jdt 2:4; 5:22; 10:1; 12:10; (13:1); 13:12.

Taken together these criteria are consistent and they suggest a Hebrew background for Judith, if there existed a Semitic source. Even though the application of these three tests cannot give a definitive answer to the question of whether or not the work was translated from a Semitic source, nevertheless, in the case of Judith, they can rule out Aramaic.

k   *The Life of Adam and Eve (also called The Apocalypse of Moses)*

Adam and Eve has a complicated textual history that has recently been published by Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek, Critical Edition* (2005). Tromp distinguishes three macro families of manuscripts. His α family is positive for criterion #1. There are approximately 17 examples of "narrative τότε" (11:1; 12:2; 15:1; 16:2; 17:1; 18:1; 19:3; 21:5 [καὶ τότε]; 23:2, 4; 27:4, 5; 28:3; 31:3; 32:1; 35:1; 40:1 [καὶ τότε]), which is 3.80 per 1000 words. This textual family has evidence of Aramaic influence and the other families are only slightly less consistent on this criterion.

---

78   Matthew Morgenstern, "Language and Literature in the Second Temple Period," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997): 130–45 (140): "It would seem to me that the uncomfortable style of the Hebrew would suggest that it is secondary to the more fluent and stylistic Aramaic."

79   For an argument based on different criteria in support of an Aramaic original, see Daniel A. Machiela, "Hebrew, Aramaic, and the Differing Phenomena of Targum and Translation in the Second Temple Period and Post-Second Temple Period," in the present volume.

However, criterion #2 also appears to be positive. At 15:2 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ φυλάσσειν ἡμᾶς τὸν παράδεισον ἐφυλάττομεν ἕκαστος τὸ λαχὸν αὐτοῦ μέρος... ἐφύλαττον, "and it happened in our guarding the park we were guarding each one his received portion ... and I was guarding." This would be an uncommon example of the Hebraic setting structure because the same verb is used in the setting and in the finite verbs and the finite verbs are background descriptions in imperfect. Perhaps this is a biblicizing extension of the Aramaic usage found at Cowley 30, discussed above pp. 271–273.

If this example is not a false positive, then *The Life of Adam and Eve* has a complex history and fails the consistency criterion. We may tentatively suggest that criterion #2 is an accidental false positive created by a Greek translator or a biblicizing Aramaic source, since it is only one example. If a Semitic source is behind Adam and Eve, criterion #1 would suggest that it was an Aramaic source. There may or may not have been a Hebrew edition of this book in circulation, but one irregular example would seem to be insufficient evidence.[80]

4   Application to New Testament Gospels and Acts

a   *Gospel of Matthew*

Criterion #1 is found approximately 55 to 63 times in Matthew: 2:7, 16, 17; 3:5, 13, 15; 4:1, 5, 10, 11; (4:17, ἀπὸ τότε); 8:26; 9:6, 14, 29, 37; 11:20; 12:13, 22, 38; 13:36; 15:1, 12, 28; 16:12, 20, (16:21, ἀπὸ τότε), 24; 17:13, 19; 18:21, 32; 19:13, 27; 20:20, (21:1, καὶ ὅτε ... τότε), (22:8 in a parable),[81] (22:13 in parable); 22:15, 21; 23:1; (25:7 in parable); 26:3, 14, (26:16, καὶ ἀπὸ τότε), 31, 36, 38, 45, 50, 52, 56, 65, 67, 74; 27:3, (27:9),

---

80   M. D. Johnson ("Life of Adam and Eve," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:251) thinks that the source language was Hebrew, on the basis of what might be two cognate infinitives (at 17:5 and 41:3).

81   Matt 22:8 and 22:13 occur in the parable of the wedding of the king's son, and 25:7 occurs in the parable of the ten virgins. These are curious cases for two reasons. First, Jewish story parables were all recorded in Hebrew in rabbinic literature, even in Aramaic contexts, and an Aramaic source for these would be unique for ancient Jewish literature. (See the section on Lukan sources for further discussion of τότε and parables.) Second, these particular parables are distinctly Matthean with developed motifs that are like a pastiche from parallel synoptic material. Matthew 22:1–14 has a distinctive "son" motif that is missing from Luke 14:16–24, an abusing of messengers motif like the parable of the vineyard (Matt 21:35 and functional parallels in the vineyard parallels in Mark 12 and Luke 20), and a motif of a wedding garment (22:11–14) that has a teaching parallel in Luke 12:35–37. Likewise, Matt 25:1–13 has a door-knocking motif like Luke 12:35–38, and a door-closure motif like Luke 13:25–28. If τότε is distinctly Matthean, as we are arguing, then these two

13, 26, 27, 38, 58; 28:10. These occurrences generate a statistic of between 3.00 to 3.43 narrative τότε per 1000 words of text, which tests positive for criterion #1 and is far above our arbitrary reference point of 1.5 narrative τότε per 1000 words.

Examples of non-narrative τότε are found at 5:24; 7:5, 23; 9:15; 12:29, 44, 45; 13:26, 43; 16:27; 24:9, 10, 14, 16, 21, 23, 30, 40; 25:1, 31, 34, 37, 41, 44, 45; 27:16. These instances of non-narrative τότε are listed here for completeness. They are normal for Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, and are not diagnostic.

Criterion #2 should test negative if criterion #1 is reflecting an Aramaic source. However, Matthew has six examples of criterion # 2 (7:28; 9:10; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1). Five of these are found at the end of significant collections of Matthew arrangements. Matthew 7:28 concludes the Matthean Sermon on the Mount, 11:1 concludes the instruction for an apostolic mission, 13:53 concludes the long Matthean section of parables, 19:1 concludes the Galilean ministry, and 26:1 concludes the temple/Jerusalem teaching. Of these, 7:28; 13:53; 19:1, and 26:1 do not have parallels in Luke, even though Luke has parallel pericopae and is very accepting of ἐγένετο structures.

Together these two criteria are useful in evaluating Matthew. Testing positive for criterion #1 and also positive for criterion #2 is a signal that something complex is happening that is beyond a reflection of a Semitic source. Aramaic would produce #1 without #2, and Hebrew would produce #2 without #1.

Criterion #1 occurs in various kinds of material, including triple tradition, double tradition Matthew–Mark, double tradition Matthew–Luke, Matthean material, in parables, and parallel to material that is word-for-word identical to Mark, except for τότε.

Here are fifteen examples where the wording with Mark is close, sometimes close with Luke, too, but in no case do they have Matthew's narrative τότε:

Matt 3:5	τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία
Mark 1:5	καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῖται
Luke 3:3–7	(parallel pericope, but without this sentence)
Matt 4:11	τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος
Mark 1:12–13	(parallel pericope, but without this sentence)[82]

---

parables should be attributed to Matthean editing in Greek and not to a hypothetical Aramaic story parable.

82   This example does not help with the Matthew–Mark relationship, but is part of the evidence that confirms that Luke was not using Matthew. In the temptation pericope Matthew has four cases of narrative τότε, none of which are picked up by Luke.

Luke 4:13   καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμόν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέση ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ

Matt 9:6   ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας—**τότε** λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, ἐγερθεὶς ἆρον . . .

Mark 2:10–11   ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς—λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἆρον . . .

Luke 5:24   ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας—εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας . . .

Matt 8:26   **τότε** ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις

Mark 4:39   καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ

Luke 8:24   ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ

Matt 12:13   **τότε**   λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ,   ἔκτεινόν

Mark 3:5   καὶ περιβλεψάμενος . . .   λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ,   ἔκτεινόν

Luke 6:10   καὶ περιβλεψάμενος . . .   εἶπεν αὐτῷ,   ἔκτεινόν

Matt 17:19   **τότε** προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν εἶπον Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;

Mark 9:28   καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;[83]

Luke 9:37–43   (parallel pericopae, but without this sentence)

Matt 19:13   **τότε** προσηνέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία

Mark 10:13   καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία

Luke 18:15   προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ παιδία

Matt 21:1*[84]   καὶ   ὅτε   ἤγγισαν   εἰς   Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Βηθφαγή εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν **τότε** Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

---

83   The wording is quite tight over an extended sentence. One notices that Mark records a statement in spite of using ἐπηρώτων "they were questioning him." Matthew has rephrased the wording as a question and διὰ τί appears to be secondary according to the manuscripts of Mark that read ὅτι: B, ℵ, C, W, Θ, Byz. In any case, Matthew has narrative τότε, Mark does not have narrative τότε, while Luke does not have an exact parallel here.

84   This is an ambiguous τότε because it follows a "when" clause. By itself it would not be considered narrative τότε or a diagnostic example of Aramaic influence. However, in this

Mark 11:1   καὶ ὅτε ἠγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ

Luke 19:29   καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανία[ν] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

Matt 22:21   λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Καίσαρος. **τότε** λέγει αὐτοῖς
Mark 12:16–17   οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Καίσαρος. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
Luke 20:24–25   οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Καίσαρος. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῖς

Matt 26:14   **τότε** πορευθεὶς εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχειρεῖς

Mark 14:10   καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριὼθ ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχειρεῖς

Luke 22:3   εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα,

Matt 26:16*[85]   καὶ ἀπὸ **τότε** ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ
Mark 14:11   καὶ ἐζήτει πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ
Luke 22:6   καὶ ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν

Matt 26:31   **τότε** λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε
Mark 14:27   καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε
Luke 22:31–39   (parallel pericope, but without this sentence)

Matt 26:38   **τότε** λέγει αὐτοῖς περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ

Mark 14:34   καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε

Luke 22:39–41   (parallel pericope, but without this sentence)

---

case, the Aramaic influence is already clear, and it is equally clear that the τότε was not transferred along with the tight wording. It enters the synoptic tradition with Matthew, and ends right there.

85   This is technically not narrative τότε because of the conjunction and preposition. However, it fits Matthew's profile and, more importantly, it does not occur in either Mark or Luke. This is more significant for Luke, since Luke shares the phrase ἀπὸ τότε at Luke 16:16.

Matt 26:74	τότε ἤρξατο καταθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον[86]
Mark 14:71	ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον
Luke 22:60	εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις

Matt 27:26	τότε ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν
Mark 15:15	… ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν
Luke 23:25	ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν διὰ στάσιν

There are several generic, futuristic, non-narrative uses of τότε that are found almost word-for-word in Synoptic triple tradition, or in Matthew–Mark, or Matthew–Luke double tradition. These show that all of the Synoptic writers are able to accept and use the word τότε itself. And these wordings are natural to Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek—all three. They are generic τότε.

The following seven sets of readings are *not* narrative τότε:

Matt 7:5	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
Mark	(no parallel)
Luke 6:42	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.[87]

Matt 9:15	καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν
Mark 2:20	καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν
Luke 5:35	τότε νηστεύσουσιν

Matt 12:29	καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει
Mark 3:27	καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει
Luke 11:22	καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν

---

86 One should note the "pleonastic ἤρξατο" in Matthew. This is a fairly strong Markanism (1.91 per 1000 words, compared to Matthew's 0.59 per 1000) and it is most easily explained as being borrowed by Matthew. If so, then again, the τότε appears to be coming from Matthew's own style, since it is certainly not coming from Mark. See Buth and Kvasnica, "Parable of the Vineyard," 261–268, for a discussion of the Semitic background of "pleonastic ἤρξατο" and comparison between Luke and Mark.

87 Incidentally, this is a classic case of Luke retaining the vocabulary of a source that was, presumably, in good Semitic order, and then rearranging the words into a more typical Greek pattern. It would appear that Matthew has preserved the better source wording here. However, the same basic Greek words are in both and testify to a Greek literary connection between Matthew and Luke. They are not separate translations.

Matt 12:43–45   τότε λέγει εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου ἐπιστρέψω…[88]
τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα
Mark   (no parallel)
Luke 11:24–26   τότε λέγει εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου ἐπιστρέψω…
τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἕτερα πνεύματα

Matt 24:16   τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὸ ὄρη
Mark 13:14   τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὸ ὄρη
Luke 21:21   τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὸ ὄρη

Matt 24:23   τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ ἰδοὺ ὧδε
Mark 13:21   καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ ἰδοὺ ὧδε
Luke 17:23   καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, [ἢ] ἰδοὺ ὧδε

Because criterion #1 occurs throughout various kinds of Matthean material, sometimes including shared material word-for-word with Mark (except for τότε), it is probable that we are looking at a Matthean stylistic feature in Greek. It is also certain that he did not get the style from Mark. More importantly, a hypothesis of a Matthean narrative τότε style does not create the problems that would arise if we attributed the narrative τότε to a source.

If Matthew had taken his style from a non-Markan source, then we would need to explain the tight Greek verbal correspondence with Mark as Markan borrowing from Matthew. However, Mark would only have borrowed *generic* τότε from Matthew, curiously, he would never have borrowed *narrative* τότε. But how did Mark know the difference between narrative τότε and generic τότε? And why would that have made any difference? Mark of all people was not a Greek stylist who would have objected to something whose statistics are not Greek norms. And even a few narrative τότε are not out of line in Greek or Hebrew. Nevertheless, even if Mark would have borrowed the broken syntax in Mark 2:10, Mark did not borrow narrative τότε. Yet if Mark had shortened the saying in Matt 24:30 (to καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχομένῳ…; Mark 13:26), then he would have added the τότε from earlier in Matthew's verse, so that it would now join ὄψονται, creating a non-Matthean τότε:

---

[88]   These are timeless, proverbial examples, and so they are not narrative τότε. Matthew and Luke are about 90% similar in these three verses, which is remarkably high.

Matt 24:30–31   καὶ **τότε** φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν
                     οὐρανῷ
                     καὶ **τότε** κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς
                     καὶ ὄψονται τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν . . .
                     (24:31) καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους

Mark 13:26–27   (no parallel to Matt 24:30)
                     καὶ **τότε** ὄψονται τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις . . .
                     καὶ **τότε** ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους

Luke 21:27   (no parallel to Matt 24:30a)
                     καὶ **τότε** ὄψονται τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ . . .
                     (no parallel to Matt 24:31//Mark 13:27)

Mark would have dropped two τότε from earlier in Matt 24:30, and would then balance this by adding them to the following sentences, Mark 13:26–27. Mark would actually appear reticent to drop τότε from Matthew! This same text in Matthew only makes sense as a Matthean edit of Mark. Matthew added two sentences at the beginning of the saying parallel to Mark 13:26. He introduced both with τότε, his style, so that when he continued with Mark's sentences he needed to drop Mark's τότε (or else have four τότε in a row!). The result of these considerations is that assuming a literary flow from Matthew to Mark creates an unreasonable outcome. Unpredictably, Mark would accept some generic τότε, but would accept zero out of 60 narrative τότε.

Since the hypothesis that Matthew got his narrative τότε style from a source creates a serious, unexpected problem, we return to the non-problematic hypothesis: Matthew himself introduced narrative τότε. The most reasonable, least problematic hypothesis is that narrative τότε is Matthew's own writing style of Greek. This is a conclusion based on linguistic data and a literary analysis, not on a synoptic theory. The Matthean style hypothesis is not being chosen "because Matthew used Mark" but because the other hypothesis created problems. This point is extremely significant: it allows us to use linguistic data, Matthew's narrative τότε style, in synoptic criticism. Using Matthew's narrative τότε style in synoptic criticism is not circular reasoning. We will see below that many current Lukan studies are based on an assumed Synoptic theory. This has prevented scholars from asking the pertinent linguistic questions and appears to have led some scholars to even misrepresent the data.

The conclusion that narrative τότε is a feature in Matthew's own Greek style and not coming from a source is further reinforced when the incongruity of the existence of criterion #2 is considered.

Because criterion #2 occurs at boundaries of literary sections that are unique to Matthew and apparently arranged by Matthew himself, and because criterion #2 is incompatible with criterion #1, we conclude that the co-occurrence

of both criterion #1 and criterion #2 in Matthew's Gospel does not come from a source and are a result of Matthew's own Greek creation. Matthew wrote Greek with a style that borrowed from both Aramaic and Hebrew.[89]

We do have stylistic confirmation that Matthew is the writer who introduced narrative τότε. If it is true that Matthew received tight Greek wording from Mark, is there any stylistic Markanism that came along and shows up in Matthew? Yes. Mark's (καὶ) εὐθύς, "(and) immediately," is distinctive in the Gospels.[90] It does not distinguish Hebrew from Aramaic so it cannot be added to the criteria developed in the present study, but it is diagnostic of Mark. Mark has 42 examples of εὐθύς. Matthew has seven examples of εὐθύς[91] and eleven examples of εὐθέως, "immediately."[92] Of Matthew's total of 18 "immediately's," 14 are parallel to an "immediately" in Mark.[93] Most of Matthew's "immediatelys" have been initiated by Mark (78%). Most importantly, *all* the examples of εὐθύς are parallel to Mark. Matthew does not appear to use εὐθύς on his own.[94]

---

89   Theoretically, one might hypothesize that one of the criteria could come from a source and the other criterion was added according to Matthew's own style, creating the incompatibility. The discussion on τότε above showed that a source hypothesis for Matthew's narrative τότε is unreasonable. It is the programatic collection of material into five discourses that makes a source hypothesis for the impersonal ἐγένετο structure unreasonable. Neither item appears to have come directly from a source.

  On the other hand, one need not assume that Matthew would always write Greek with both criteria. Conceivably, re-arranging sources that had one of these criteria may have encouraged its adoption. That is particularly fitting for the impersonal ἐγένετο structure. Rearranging source materials that had many occurrences of the impersonal ἐγένετο structure may have encouraged the Matthean summary structures. Yet, regardless of influence, those summary sentences were probably penned by Matthew in Greek and were almost certainly not copied from a source.

90   The importance of (καὶ) εὐθύς for tracing synoptic relationships was pointed out by Robert L. Lindsey, *A Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of Mark: A Greek–Hebrew Diglot with English Introduction* (2d ed.; Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, 1973), 58–61. Buth and Kvasnica ("Parable of the Vineyard," 314) have further outlined its importance for synoptic studies.

91   Matt 3:16, 20, 21; 14:27; 21:2*, 3; 26:74*. (Matt 21:2 has εὐθύς in א, L, and Westcott-Hort, while UBS-NA read εὐθέως; 26:74 has εὐθύς in B, L, Θ, and Westcott-Hort, while UBS-NA read εὐθέως.)

92   Matt 4:20, 22; 8:3; 13:5; 14:22, 31; 20:34; 24:29; 25:15; 26:49; 27:48.

93   Matt 3:16; 4:20, 22; 8:3; 13:5, 20, 21; 14:22, 27; 20:34; 21:2, 3; 26:49, 74.

94   These statistics are according to the UBS/Nestle-Aland and Westcott-Hort texts. The Byzantine text family erases the εὐθύς unidirectional proof because in the Byz text family 40 of these "immediately" examples in Mark are εὐθέως. The unidirectional flow is missing. We still see the restriction of Mark's "immediately" in Matthew, but we cannot prove that Matthew is restricting these and that Mark is not expanding them. This does not alter the conclusion that narrative τότε was added to a Markan base by Matthew.

This means that εὐθύς in Matthew is a Markanism, and it confirms the literary flow from Mark to Matthew.

In light of the above, it is difficult to believe in the various Matthean-priority hypotheses. Theoretically it is not impossible, but truly difficult. Not a single narrative τότε crosses over into either Mark or Luke. This observation calls the Farrar-Goulder hypothesis into question as well.[95] The usefulness of narrative τότε is enhanced because it is like a conjunction and can be written by an author at a subconscious level, without thinking about it. Mark accepts τότε and has several τότε in parallel to Matthew's τότε. But none of these are narrative τότε. They are all the "non-Aramaic," generic τότε, acceptable in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. The same thing is true for evaluating Matthew with Luke, though the evidence is even stronger than in the case of Matthew with Mark. Luke actually has two or three cases of narrative τότε in his Gospel, and also has many of the same examples of generic τότε that Mark and Matthew have. In addition, Luke has 20 to 21 examples of narrative τότε in Acts. That makes the complete absence of Matthew's narrative τότε in the Gospel of Luke all the more remarkable. If Luke used Matthew, he would have refused all sixty examples of Matthean narrative τότε. Zero for sixty is truly a lack. The simplest explanation is that Luke did not use Matthew. This will be discussed below, in the sections dealing with Luke and Acts.

b   *Gospel of Mark*

This is the easiest of the Synoptic Gospels to test. Mark is negative for criterion #1. There are zero examples of "narrative τότε." This is an astounding statistic given the many studies that speak about Mark's Aramaic source background as though it were close to fact. Mark cannot have a written Aramaic background. The word τότε occurs, but in all six examples it occurs outside the narrative framework of the Gospel, and in future or hypothetical contexts (2:20; 3:27, 14, 21, 26, 27). The occurrence of τότε, אדין, or אז in future or hypothetical contexts is characteristic of Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew.

---

95   The Ferrar-Goulder hypothesis has Mark first, influencing Matthew; then Luke using Mark and Matthew together. The Griesbach "two gospel" hypothesis holds that Matthew was first, Luke used Matthew and then Mark merged the two. The Augustinian hypothesis holds that Matthew was first, used by Mark, and that Luke used Mark and Matthew. All of these hypotheses would struggle to explain the breakdown of τότε. Generic τότε goes into both Mark and Luke, but, inexplicably, narrative τότε is absolutely blocked from both Mark and Luke.

There are two examples of criterion #2 in Mark: in Mark 1:9 (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ), and in Mark 4:4 (in a parable, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν). Mark also has one or two examples of the Greek setting structure (2:23, with the setting within a following infinitive phrase;[96] 2:15, γίνεται without a setting, followed by infinitive).[97] These Greek structural examples should not be confused with, or added to, the Markan examples of criterion #2.

The criteria are consistent for Mark and they suggest that Mark's Semitic Greek might have a Hebrew influence. However, this evidence is not strong, especially in light of what we find below in Luke. In Luke there is strong evidence of a Hebraic gospel source.

What would be necessary to salvage an Aramaic background for Mark?[98] One could suggest that Mark's narrative may represent a colloquial Aramaic style that is not otherwise attested in the literature of this period, which literature is relatively meager. But that would mean ignoring what we do have and holding a position for which there is no supporting evidence. Such is not a strong position, certainly not a probable position. The criteria in the present study make a contribution to New Testament scholarship by highlighting the strong improbability of an Aramaic style for Mark.

A second possible way to salvage an Aramaic background for Mark might be to propose that Mark's idiosyncratic style with καὶ εὐθύς, "and immediately," somehow reflects the Aramaic narrative אדין, "then, at that time." The main problem with this proposal is that in rabbinic literature both colloquial Hebrew and Aramaic storytelling have styles with a word מיד, "immediately."[99] The use of εὐθύς in Mark already has a good linguistic explanation: the word מיד is used in both of those languages as a special narrative connector and could represent Hebrew as well as Aramaic. The one example of literary

---

96 Mark 2:23 is parallel to a similar Greek setting structure in Luke 6:1. J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. 1, *Prolegomena* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), 17, thought that this might be "a primitive assimilation to Lk 6:1."

97 Instead of the present tense γίνεται and a Greek structure, the Byzantine text family has the Hebraic structure at Mark 2:15 (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακεῖσθαι αὐτον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ). Whether or not the Byzantine reading is accepted here, the conclusions about possible Aramaic or Hebrew influence behind Mark's Greek remain the same.

98 See Guido Baltes, "The Origins of the 'Exclusive Aramaic Model' in the Nineteenth Century: Methodological Fallacies and Subtle Motives," in the present volume.

99 See Abba Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* [Hebrew] (2 vols.; 2d ed.; Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1967), 581–83, 598.

Hebrew narrative in rabbinic literature mentioned above (*b. Qid.* 66a) even has an example of this word מיד, so we know that the word could even penetrate late, literary Hebrew. At one point, however, Mark's εὐθύς-style appears non-Hebraic. Mark has καὶ εὐθύς while Hebrew texts do not show ומיד, but rather, only מיד.[100] Aramaic has both forms, "immediately" without "and" (מיד: Neof. Targ. has three examples—Gen 22:14, 38:25[b]; Exod 15:12)], and "immediately" with "and" (ומן יד/ומיד: Neof. Targ. has two examples in the Torah— Gen 38:25[a]; Lev 22:27; there are also two examples in Targum Esther Sheni). The forms with a prefaced "and" appear to be a secondary development of the idiom without "and" in Mishnaic Hebrew.[101] However, Mark's consistent addition of καί to εὐθύς suggests that this is part of his own Greek style, and that his addition of καί is a secondary reaccommodation to Greek, which prefers to connect sentences with a conjunction of some kind.[102] So we should not see the use of εὐθύς as coming from a written Aramaic source. If Mark's εὐθύς were coming from a written, first-century Aramaic source, we would need to see some "narrative τότε" in Mark's Gospel. The only reasonable solution is to view Mark's "and immediately" style as his own Greek style, which was probably modelled on Hebrew colloquial storytelling.

---

100   It appears that Robert L. Lindsey was aware of this restriction, "καὶ εὐθύς . . . cannot even be translated to the Hebrew of the First Century" (from the Introduction to Elmar Camillo Dos Santos and Robert Lisle Lindsey, *A Comparative Greek Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels* [Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, 1985], xv). Of course, καὶ εὐθύς could be translated, but the expression had no exact equivalent. That is, ומיד was not good or attested Hebrew and מיד by itself would not have elicited the two Greek words, καὶ εὐθύς, that are found so often in Mark.

101   Bendavid (*Biblical and Mishnaic*, 141, line 16, and 581 note) suggests that the word מיד in Mishnaic Hebrew came from Greek ἐκ χειρός, "at hand, at once," and is a partial replacement for the sequential narrative tenses when telling a literary story in colloquial Hebrew. In these cases מיד becomes one of the substitutes for -ו, "and," which explains why מיד consistently occurs in colloquial Hebrew without "and." He also suggests that מיד served as a replacement for אדין when re-telling an Aramaic story in Hebrew. On the other hand, later Aramaic has apparently borrowed this idiom from Mishnaic Hebrew because it uses the word by itself and also with "and." Thus, later Aramaic shows a linguistic development beyond the situation that caused מיד *miyyad*'s creation without "and."

102   When Mark uses this phrase at the beginning of a sentence it always has a conjunction with it, 28 times καί, once δέ, and once ἀλλά: Mark 1:10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 29, 30, 42; 2:8, 12; 4:5; 5:29, 30, 42a; 6:27, 45, 50 [ὁ δὲ εὐθύς]; 7:25 [ἀλλ᾽ εὐθύς], 35; 8:10; 9:15; 10:52; 11:2, 3; 14:43, 72; 15:1. When εὐθύς is preceded by a participle clause or other material (14 times), then it does not have καί: 1:28, 43; 3:6; 4:15, 16, 17, 29; 5:2, 42b; 6:25, 54; 9:20, 24 [most mss add καί; א, C drop εὐθύς]; 14:45. In other words, the conjunction is a Greek phenomenon, and part of Mark's Greek style.

Finally, if there is a Semitic source layered somewhere behind Mark's less-than-natural Greek, that source tests as Hebrew rather than Aramaic.

This means that Casey's Aramaic reconstructions of Markan narrative are not natural Aramaic of the period,[103] but, ironically, look like a translation from Hebrew.[104] The lack of אדין becomes especially visible where a parallel in Matthew has a narrative τότε. (The asterisk * within the texts below means that the parallel is not exact.)

Matt 12:13	τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα.
Mark 3:5	καὶ περιβλεψάμενος . . . λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔκτεινόν τὴν χεῖρα.
Casey (*Mark*, 138)	ואמר לאנשא, פשט ידא. ופשט ותוב[105] לה ידא

---

103   Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources to the Gospel of Mark* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), and Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources to Q: Sources for Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (SNTSMS 122; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Casey's reconstructions have too many Aramaic mistakes to be used reliably. See the review by Peter M. Head and Peter J. Williams, "Q Review," *Tyndale Bulletin* 54, no. 1 (2003): especially 138–44, where many Aramaic mistakes and inconsistencies are listed. These are not just typos, which also occur, but there are also mistakes that suggest a questionable control of the language. Casey uses Hebrew אומרין in an Aramaic sentence (*Mark* 121, 138), adds an *alef* to תאעלנא "don't bring us" for תעלנא (*Mark* 60), "corrects" Mark 3:5 and argues that "hand" should have been the subject ופשט ותוב לה ידא [*sic*], but then makes both verbs masculine instead of feminine and gets the form of the second verb wrong (תוב). Head and Williams include this last instance when describing similar mistakes in Casey's 2002 volume where he reconstructs with קום instead of קם (p. 141). If Casey meant the *vav* to mark the *qamets*-quality vowel, it is not in accord with Second Temple-period Aramaic spelling. We do have occasional evidence from a later dialect of words like "in heaven" spelled בשומיא, but בשומיא reflects a different phonological process and it is not a masculine singular verb.

104   Studies such as Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Band 1, Satzlehre, Teil 1* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962); or Black's *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3d ed., 1967), or Maloney's Ph.D. dissertation, published as *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; California: Scholars Press, 1979), or Casey's *Aramaic Sources to Mark*, and Casey's *Aramaic Sources to Q*, have all ignored the role of narrative τότε in Aramaic and have completely missed the non-Aramaic, Hebraic character of any Semitic written background to Mark, as well as Luke.

105   ופשט ותוב לה ידא [*sic*]. This is a mistake for ופשטת ותבת ליה ידא, according to Casey's understanding of his Aramaic "and the hand stretched out and returned to him" (Casey, *Mark*, 139). Casey should not have altered the sense of the Greek: καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ, ידיה (ואתאסית) פשט ידיה ותקנת.

At Mark 3:5 Casey's Aramaic text "misses an opportunity" for Aramaic narrative אדין. (Of course, if Mark was written in Greek and/or had influence from Hebrew, then there is no Aramaic to miss.)

Matt 12:22–24*	τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός . . . οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον
Mark 3:20–22	καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος . . . καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον . . .
Casey (Q, 147)	ועללין בבי ואתכנשת תובא כנשא . . . [106] וספריא דנחתו מן ירושלם אמרין דיש[107] בעל זבול לה, . . . ,
Matt 17:12–13*	ἀλλὰ ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον . . . τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάνου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν
Mark 9:13	καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ᾿ αὐτόν
Casey (*Mark*, 121)	ועבדו לה דצבו כדי כתיב עלוהי
Matt 20:20	τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου
Mark 10:35	καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάνης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου
Casey (*Mark*, 121)	וקרבין לה יעקב ויוחנן בני זבדיה ואמרין

At three more places (Mark 3:20–22; 9:17; 10:35) Casey misses more "opportunities" for Aramaic narrative אדין.

---

106 ועללין בבי ואתכנשת תובא כנשא (Casey's proposal). Besides missing another opportunity for inserting an Aramaic narrative style into Mark, this is a string of less probable choices. Aramaic עללין prefers the preposition ל (cf. Dan 5:10; 6:11; 1Q20 xix.13, 14; xx.6; 2Q24 f4.3; 4Q197 Tob ar f4 i.15; iii.1, 4; 4Q209 f7 iii.6; 4Q550c f1 ii.6, et al.). And see Old Syriac and Peshitto at Mark 3:19 with the verb לביתא (הוא) אתה. The form תובא is only found in 4Q540. The common forms in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Christian Palestinian, and Syriac are both תוב and תובן. There are better choices for an unmodified "crowd" (cf. 4Q530 EnGiants[b] i8 modified as על לכנשת גבריא) than כנישה, "a gathering, assembly [synagogue]," such as המון, קהל, and אוכלוסין "crowd, people [loan word from Greek found in Mishnaic Hebrew, Christian Palestinian, Samaritan, and Jewish Aramaic]."

107 דיש בעל זבול לה [*sic*]. This is a mistake for דאית ליה בעל זבול. Hebrew would have been שיש לו בעל זבול.

Matt 26:30–31*	καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.
	τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
Mark 14:26–27	καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.
	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Casey stops at v. 26. Matthew 26:31 is cited to suggest that an Aramaic narrative style fits these selections.

Matt 12:29	καὶ **τότε** τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει
Mark 3:27	καὶ **τότε** τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει
Casey (Q 148)	ובאדין יבז ביתה

This last example is not "Aramaic" narrative τότε but a usage that is equally good in Hebrew and Greek, especially with the "and." Ironically, at Mark 3:27, Casey finally includes an אדין in his text. But here the word "then" is not a narrative conjunction and fits equally well with Hebrew.

   The Greek structure related to criterion #2 also interfaces with Casey's reconstructions:

Matt 12:1	ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ
	τῶν σπορίμων
Luke 6:1	ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν
	σπορίμων
Mark 2:23	καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ
	τῶν σπορίμων
Casey (*Mark*, 138)	והוה בשבתא עבר בזרעיא

Casey's Aramaic looks like translationese from Hebrew. The verb structure is not natural Aramaic though Casey (*Mark*, 138) cites Qumran Enoch (6:1) as a precedent.[108] That Qumran passage does show an impersonal "be" verb before a setting clause, but it is a literal translation from the Hebrew. The structure in Mark is the "Greek" structure, subtype c, and the structure in Luke 6 is subtype c, though Luke's is closer to a Hebrew word order. When the structure of subtype c is put back into a Semitic language then it looks like the Hebrew structure of criterion #2.

---

108   See n. 53 above for the text. In the earlier section "*Is 'Impersonal ἐγένετο + Finite Main Verb'* *Hebrew or Aramaic?*" it is shown that the Semitic structure is not Aramaic, but Hebrew.

Casey's Aramaic is unreliable, as is his evaluation of the language background to Mark. Casey is unaware that his Markan Aramaic fits a Hebraic profile and not an Aramaic one.

In sum, Mark does not show evidence of Aramaic in his Greek, but Mark does show a pattern that is within Hebrew parameters.

c   *Luke*

Luke may be the most interesting and controversial to test for Semitic backgrounds.

Criterion #1 is negative for Aramaic influence. There are only two narrative τότε in the narrative framework of Luke (21:10; 24:45). This is a statistic of 0.10 per 1000 and can in no way be considered to represent Aramaic influence. There are also nine examples of τότε in a future context (5:35; 6:42; 13:26; 14:9, 10; 21:20, 21, 27; 23:30), a feature common to Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. There is also an adverbial usage in 16:16, and two examples in a non-narrative 'potential, proverbial' context (11:[24], 26). One "narrative τότε" comes in a parable (14:21).[109]

Criterion #2 is positive. There are 33–34 examples of the Hebraic setting structure, those that introduce a finite verb without καί (1:8, 23, 41, 59; 2:1, 6, 15, 46; 7:11; 9:18; [9:28]; [9:29 without ἦν, "was"]; 9:33, 37; 11:1, 14, 27, 14; 18:35; 19:29; 20:1; 24:30, 51 [22/23 total]), and those that introduce καί/δέ plus a finite verb (5:1, 12, 17; 8:1, 22; [9:28]; 9:51; 14:1; 17:11; 19:15; 24:4, 15 [11/12 total]). There are an additional five examples of the Greek setting structure introducing an infinitive main event (3:21; 6:1, 6, 12, 22).

Most New Testament scholars who followed Dalman took this clear Hebraic characterization as a sign of artificiality and Lukan creation, based primarily on three assumptions. It was generally assumed that Hebrew would not have been used for Gospel traditions, which naturally led to viewing something

---

109   Story parables were told in Hebrew. Cf. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Grammar*, 4–5:
"But even the later Amoraim, and even in Babylon, used MH [Mishnaic Hebrew—R.B.]
exclusively for the following purposes: *halakah*; expositions of the Scriptures; parables
(משל), even in the middle of an aram. conversation (cf., e.g. BA 60b; Ta'a. 5b)"; and Shmuel
Safrai, "Literary Languages in the Time of Jesus," in Notley, Turnage and Becker, eds.,
Jesus' Last Week, 225–44 (238): "Thousands of parables have been preserved . . . All of the
parables are in Hebrew." That means that this single occurrence of τότε in speech should
be treated as Greek. When added to Luke's statistics the result is still clearly negative for
criterion #1, 0.15 per 1000.

"Hebraic" as artificial and coming from an imitation of the Old Greek.[110] It was also assumed that Luke's Hebraisms were artificial because they are not coming from Mark.[111] Markan priority did not have room for a gospel-length, non-Markan Semitized source for Luke to use. Finally, it was assumed, mistakenly, that Luke used the Hebraic ἐγένετο setting structure in Acts. Dalman made the mistake explicitly: "Wer Beweise für ein hebräisches Urevangelium sammeln wollte, hätte zuerst dies καὶ ἐγένετο nennen müssen. . . . Selbst der 'Wir-Bericht' is nicht davon frei, s. Apg. 21,1.5; 27,44; 28,8.17 . . . Solche Beobachtungen verbieten die Annahme eines hebräischen Originals."[112] Dalman ignored the structural distinctions that had been outlined by Alfred Plummer as early as 1896. The Hebraic ἐγένετο structure does not occur even once in Acts.[113] This lack is against common scholarly assumptions and is important enough to bear repeating: *the Hebraic structure does not occur in Acts.* Notice how three widely

---

110   See, for example, H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 44 (1943): 129–38: "Confirmation, or otherwise, of this hypothesis has to be sought in any distinctive Aramaisms the Gospel may exhibit; since not only was Aramaic the particular Semitic language that St. Luke would come across . . . it was also the foundation of the Gospel tradition." Note also Sparks, "The Semitisms of the Acts," *JTS* NS 1, no. 1 (1950): 16–28 (16): "The main conclusion of the previous paper was that the vast majority of the Semitisms in the third gospel are not in fact Semitisms at all, but what I called 'Septuagintalisms'; and that St. Luke is to be regarded not as a 'Semitizer', but as an habitual, conscious, and deliberate 'Septuagintalizer'. This conclusion I claimed to have proved."

111   Sparks, "The Semitisms of St Luke's Gospel," 130: "It is established that St. Luke knew St. Mark and Q in Greek . . . In order to account for a fair proportion of the Lukan Semitisms we need look no further than St. Mark and Q . . . A substantial residuum . . . can only be due to the Evangelist himself. His continual re-phrasing of St. Mark is decisive on this point."

112   Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 26: "Whoever would collect proofs for a Hebrew source gospel should first start with καὶ ἐγένετο . . . [T]he We-section is not free from καὶ ἐγένετο, see Acts 21 etc. . . . Such observations forbid any assumption of a Hebrew source."

113   Hawkins recognized this lack of the Hebraic ἐγένετο structure as a problem. See John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synoptica* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), 179–80. See also Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. 1, *Prolegomena*, 17: "What then of (c), . . . adopted by him in Ac as an exclusive substitute for the other two?" One might turn to Codex Bezae to ameliorate this stark dichotomy. Codex Bezae [D 05] has two examples of the Hebraic structures in Acts 2:1 and 4:5. Bezae represents a significantly different recension of Acts. It is conceivable that there was influence from a non-canonical Hebraic document in these early Jerusalem stories. A possible Hebrew text does not mean, though, that Bezae's recension goes back to Luke. It could be an independent, later recension.

quoted authors—Howard,[114] Fitzmyer,[115] and Turner[116]—seem to have let presumptions color their report of the data. Dalman and these three are all unreliable on this question.

The comparison with Acts is especially enlightening for the question of an artificial biblicizing style that is often alleged for Luke. Comparing the Gospel with Acts leads to the opposite conclusion. In Acts, especially the second half,

---

114   Wilbert Francis Howard (in James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. 2 [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929], 427) implies that Luke did use the Hebraic structure in Acts: "We observe that in the latter [Acts–R.B.] Luke not only uses (c) [the Greek structure–R.B.] almost entirely to the exclusion of (a) and (b), but also avoids the more Hebraic form of the time clause." The word "almost" is unjustified if used to imply that there is evidence that Luke himself ever used the structure on his own. Howard's tables did not list any unambiguous evidence. They listed the two examples from Bezae, 2:1 and 4:5 and a citation of Acts 5:7 with a question mark (correctly, because it has an explicit subject and is not the Hebraic structure). Howard then favorably quoted a letter from Dr. G. G. Findlay to J. H. Moulton (p. 428): "Acts 20:16 seems decisive evidence of the native (or thoroughly naturalized) stamp of the idiom." On the one hand, it is ambiguous whether Findlay is referring to the Hebraic or Greek setting structure or to something else. However, the structure referred to (Acts 20:16) is neither: ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, "so that there would not be to him to be staying long in Asia." This is an impersonal γένηται but it is not a setting introducing a main event.

115   Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation and Notes* (AB 28; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), listed Acts 5:7 and 9:19 as examples of the Hebraic setting structure in Acts (p. 119). They are not. Acts 5:7, Ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς ὡρῶν τριῶν διάστημα, "and there was an interval of about three hours," has an explicit subject διάστημα. Howard (*A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 426) listed this verse with a question mark, recognizing both its similarity and difference from the other Hebraic structures. In Hebrew, one would have expected ויהי אחרי שלש שעות, which would have produced the following in Greek and English: καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τρεῖς ὥρας, "and it happened after three hours." Acts 9:19 reads: Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐν Δαμασκῷ μαθητῶν ἡμέρας τινάς, "and he was with the disciples in Damascus some days." Here the subject of ἐγένετο is Paul, "he." Both of Fitzmyer's examples fail.

116   N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 4, *Style* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976), 47: "The construction with the infinitive occurs, very rarely in non-Biblical authors, but the preponderance of the strictly Hebraic construction in Luke-Acts [*sic*—R.B.] indicates that even when Luke sometimes uses the infinitive construction he is still writing Biblical Greek influenced by the LXX (II Acts 19:1; We 16:6, 21:1, 5; 27:44; 28: 8)." Turner missed the point. If Luke was writing under the influence of biblical Greek, why did he only use the third structure, never the first two? Notice how Turner's wording "the preponderance of the strictly Hebraic construction in Luke–Acts" neatly slides over the fact that the structure only occurs in the Gospel of Luke, but not in Acts.

we see the hand of Luke himself, and he never uses the Hebraic structure. This is even true in Acts 22 where he explicitly says that Paul was speaking Hebrew, yet uses the Greek structural subtype c twice. In the Gospel he uses both the Hebraic structure and the Greek structure. Apparently, Luke was not particularly bothered by the difference between the Hebraic and Greek setting structures, and may not have been aware of their difference—the distinction has only been discussed in New Testament scholarship since the end of the nineteenth century. Yet in Acts Luke stops using the Hebraic structure entirely, and continues with 16 examples of the Greek structure.[117] The only thing we know for certain is that Luke in his own writing used structure c. The reasonable, probable conclusion is that the Hebraic structure in Luke's Gospel is coming from a source. It is not Lukan. As we see from his Gospel, Luke could accept a Hebraic structure from a source and use it in his writing. But when not receiving them from a source, he does not use them in his writing. This is what we see in Acts.[118]

On another question, Luke 19:15 had the Hebraic setting structure in the middle of a parable. This might suggest that when parables were written down in a text using the literary register (i.e. a parallel register to Late Biblical Hebrew rather than the low register, Mishnaic Hebrew), the parables were also adapted to literary Hebrew. Rabbinic literature preserves over two thousand story parables, and they are all preserved in colloquial Hebrew. One might legitimately assume that the parables recorded in the Gospels were presented orally in colloquial Hebrew but were still recorded and published in literary Hebrew during the Second Temple period. One of Mark's two examples of the Hebraic setting structure also occurred in a parable (4:4).

The scope of the Hebraic source(s) behind Luke's Greek sources also deserve(s) comment. The Hebraic setting structure is not from Luke himself, yet it occurs throughout his Gospel, in the first two chapters, in triple tradition parallels (Luke 5:1, 12, 17; 8:1, 22; 9:18, 28, 29, 33, 37; 18:35; 20:1; 24:4), in Matthew–Luke parallels (Luke 11:1, 14; 19:15), in Lukan material (7:11; 9:51; 11:27; 14:1; 17:11, 14; 24:15, 30), and curiously never in material parallel only to Mark. This means that a "gospel-length" Hebrew source is in the background. If someone were

---

117   For a list, see the notes on Acts, below.

118   For more on Lukan style, see Buth and Kvasnica "Parable of the Vineyard," 285, 312–16, where the phenomenon of Luke's schizophrenic style is explained as the opposite of Septuagintalizing; and Randall Buth, "Evaluating Luke's Unnatural Greek: A Look at His Connectives," in Steven E. Runge, ed., *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation, a Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn* (Logos Bible Software, 2011): 335–370.

inclined to equate this Hebrew source with Q, then it would be a maximally large Q, larger than Mark, and with a narrative framework.

d   *John*

Criterion #1 is negative. The examples of τότε in John do not resemble "narrative τότε," and are all normal examples of Greek usage: 7:10 (ὡς δὲ … τότε); 8:28 (future); 10:22 (adverbial, ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἐγκαίνια); 11:6 (ὡς οὖν … τότε μέν), 14 (τότε οὖν); 12:16 (ὅτε … τότε); 13:27 (καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον τότε); 19:1 (τότε οὖν), 16 (τότε οὖν); 20:8 (τότε οὖν).

There no examples of criterion #2.

One can conclude that John does not show evidence of using either a written Aramaic or written Hebrew source.

e   *Acts*

Criterion #1 is found 21 times in Acts, 11 of these are in chs. 1–15 and 10 and in chs. 16–28. Ten of the 11 examples in chs. 1–15 qualify as "narrative τότε." They are in the narrative framework of the book and begin their respective verse or sentence (Acts 1:12; 4:8; 5:26; 6:11; 8:17; 10:46, 48; 13:3, 12; 15:22). Acts 7:4 begins a sentence and is within Stephen's speech. Narrative τότε is thus 1.09 per 1000 or 0.99 per 1000 in Acts 1–15.

Seven of the examples in chs. 16–28 are in the narrative framework and qualify (21:13, 26, 33; 23:3; 25:12; 26:1; 27:32). Three additional examples (17:14, 27:21, 28:1) are all in past contexts, the last two occurring between a participle and the main part of a sentence. The statistics are maximally 1.19 (and adjusted, 0.83) narrative τότε per 1000 words.

Overall, the average raw τότε statistic in Acts of 1.14 per 1000 is a little low for suggesting any direct Aramaic influence. The frequent occurrence of τότε in the second half of Acts (Acts 15:36–28:31) strongly suggests that this is Luke's own narrative style. However, it is significantly higher than the number of narrative τότε in Luke's Gospel. This may be explained by supposing Hebraic sources behind Luke's Gospel. Hebraic Greek sources do not have narrative τότε, and this lack could influence a writer who might otherwise have add a few examples if left completely on his own.

Criterion #2 is negative. There are no Hebraic ἐγένετο structures in Acts, contrary to implications sometimes found in the literature.[119] The only "impersonal ἐγένετο setting" structures found in Acts are those that are modelled after the standard Greek structure that introduces an infinitive as the main event (Acts 4:5; 9:3, 32, 37, 43, [10:25 ὡς ἐγένετο …]; 11:26; 14:1; 16:16; 19:1; [21:1 ὡς δὲ

---

119   See nn. 112, 114, 115, and 116.

ἐγένετο +infinitive without setting]; [21:5 ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο + infinitive without setting]; 22:6, 17; 27:44; 28:8, 17).

We may conclude that Acts tests positively for Greek by the criteria. It is negative for both criterion #1 and criterion #2. If the occasional narrative τότε in Acts are Luke's personal style, then we are not able to distinguish the language of any potential sources or influences by the criteria here.[120] Moreover, any sources behind Acts were different from those employed in the Gospel, possibly in length, language, and amount of editing.

There are questions that remain. The higher rate of "narrative τότε" in Acts might suggest some kind of contact or influence from Aramaic. But it is not much different from a statistic like 0.98 or 1.17 for the Greek of *3 Maccabees*. Because of their occurrence in 2 Acts, we can account for these τότε in Acts as Luke's personal style. This is not surprising for the book of Acts, but it adds another piece to the puzzle of Luke's Gospel. Criterion #1 is not just negative for Aramaic influence in the Gospel, it is also low for the author Luke, if Acts is

---

120 This is in general agreement with studies like John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synoptica* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1909). On the "we" sections of Acts, Hawkins concludes (p. 185), "Such evidence of unity of authorship, drawn from a comparison of the language of the three Synoptic Gospels, appears to me irresistible." Hawkins also concluded that Luke and Acts were composed at quite different times (p. 180), "If the differences of vocabulary and phraseology which have been collected under these five headings are considered together, they seem to me to suggest the inference that the two books, though the works of the same writer, could not have proceeded from him at the same, or very nearly the same, time. Would it be at all likely that an author…would so alter his style in two nearly contemporaneous books as, e.g., to drop εἶπεν δέ, ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, and καὶ αὐτός, to take μὲν οὖν, τέ, κελεύειν, and συνέρχομαι, and to substitute the infinitive for the finite verb after ἐγένετο, to the extent that has now appeared?" However, Hawkins did not deal with narrative τότε, and τότε does not enter any of his lists dealing with Luke–Acts. Such an oversight is unfortunate, because it helps to put the ἐγένετο constructions in a different light. Narrative τότε is not just a different frequency—its relative lack in the Gospel is consistent with Hebraic influence from a source. And influence from sources can directly answer Hawkins questions. The structures that Hawkins mentions like εἶπεν δέ (58 occurrences in the Gospel, 16 in Acts), and τε (9 in the Gospel, 151 in Acts), still occur in both the Gospel and Acts, and are not as absolute as Luke's using the "Greek" ἐγένετο structure in Acts (Hebraic/Greek ratio in the Gospel is 34/5, in Acts 0/16 or 0/17). Since Luke used both ἐγένετο structures in the Gospel, it is difficult to believe that he was aware of a significant difference between them, yet he only has the Greek structure from what we know is his own influence. Once a major, narrative, non-Markan source for the Gospel is recognized, the different choices in vocabulary take on a different perspective. Hawkins' work has been very useful but it needs to be redone, especially in the light of his formula for determining what a Lukanism is.

showing his normal style. (A) Hebrew-influenced Greek source(s) behind the Gospel appear(s) to have affected Luke's overall style in the Gospel.

f   *The Larger Hebraic Context Behind the Synoptic Gospels*

The conclusions that point to a literary Hebrew gospel source behind the Greek sources of the Synoptic Gospels fit well within the larger picture of what is known about the linguistic situation in the land of Israel in the first century. The major points are:

1. Qumranic Hebrew shows the language choice of a major Jewish sect at the end of the Second Temple period. They chose the literary Hebrew dialect that is an extension of "Late Biblical Hebrew," though they were apparently aware of other proto-Mishnaic dialects.
2. The style of 1 Maccabees points to the use of literary Hebrew for the writing of a Maccabean history.
3. The descriptions in Acts 21 point to a Jerusalem-based messianic movement concerned with the study of Torah and participation in Temple worship. Literary Hebrew would be a natural fit for writings about a second Moses.[121]
4. The most natural reading of the Papias statement points to a Hebrew gospel prepared by Matthew, presumably for the Jerusalem church. (The tradition would have developed from a Hebrew source gospel, not from the canonical Greek Gospel of Matthew.)
5. It now appears that the Jewish people living in the land of Israel in the first century accessed the Hebrew Bible directly. This is confirmed by the relative lack of Targumim at Qumran, even though the Dead Sea sect had many Aramaic documents, including two copies of an Aramaic translation of the notoriously difficult book of Job.[122]

---

121   The linguistic worldview in the book of *Jubilees* associated Hebrew with the Garden of Eden and sees it restored at the call of Abraham, *Jub.* 12:25–7. Such a linguistic worldview would naturally fit with various restoration worldviews, including a group that used the Temple Scroll at Qumran or a group that was following a second Moses like the Yeshua movement (Acts 3).

122   The facts on the ground are problematic for the older assumptions that common Jews no longer accessed the Hebrew Bible directly. Consider the opening sentence of an article by Willem Smelik, "Language, Locus, and Translation Between the Talmudim," *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001): 199–224 (206): "In a society that had largely lost the ability to speak Hebrew—in both the Diaspora and Palestine—translations of the Torah must have been used quite freely around the beginning of the Common Era." Actually, this would explain the targum of Job, because Hebrew Job was written in a unique dialect in the history of

6. The Mishnah and rabbinic literature claim to record the teachings of the Pharisees and Tannaim in the language in which they were given. This literature overwhelmingly (99%) testifies that first-century teachers and the popular Hasidim taught in Hebrew.[123]

7. Story parables are given in Hebrew throughout rabbinic literature, even when within Aramaic contexts.

Linguistic trace elements in the Gospels point to Hebrew somewhere behind the Greek Gospels and they now join the above sociolinguistic testimonies.

5 Conclusions

The three tests in this study involve two criteria, narrative τότε and impersonal Hebraic ἐγένετο. These two criteria are joined with a consistency evaluation of the two criteria. Together, these tests produce essential data for any discussion of Semitic backgrounds to a Greek document. The application of these tests to many Jewish Greek documents from the Second Temple period shows their usefulness in adding precision to discussions about sources behind documents and about the textual history of documents. The coupling of the two criteria brings added reliability by highlighting anomalous results, as was found in the case of the Gospel of Matthew.

---

the Hebrew language. In the land of Israel, we must assume that the Hebrew Bible was commonly accessed directly in the Hebrew language during the Second Temple period. It is only in the second century that Smelik's opening statement starts to find support, as he himself points out: "In Palestine, translations may have found their way into the synagogue much later than in the diaspora, possibly not before the second century C.E. While generalizations are quite misleading, this assumption is based on observations that show that the inclusion of translations was not standard to the extent that many scholars assume it was. All the first-century sources on Palestine, including Philo, Josephus and the New Testament, refer to all elements within the service, including midrashic expositions, but remain silent about a translation. Only literary sources dating from the second century C.E. onward relate translations to the synagogue." We can add the archeological evidence of Qumran to that picture of agreement for the first century. The relative lack of Targumim at Qumran suggests that Aramaic biblical texts were not commonly used by Jews in the land in the first century. Cf. Machiela's contribution to the present volume, "Hebrew, Aramaic, and the Differing Phenomena of Targum and Translation in the Second Temple Period and Post-Second Temple Period."

123 See the longer discussion in n. 15.

On the other hand, it must be recognized and emphasized that these tests are not absolute. They must be done in conjunction with other studies. There are several scenarios in which anomalous results need to be explained. For example, the lack of impersonal Hebraic ἐγένετο structures in a translation of Ezra reflects a certain style of Second-Temple literary Hebrew. Thus, the lack of both criteria in a Greek document might point either to an original Greek document or to a Hebraically influenced document. If in other features the document has a stylistic profile of an original Greek document, then its Greek pedigree is strengthened by the lack of both criteria. However, if a document tests negative for both criteria but in other features the document tests as some kind of Semitized Greek, then the influence would be attributed to Hebrew rather than Aramaic. Finally, it must be remembered that theoretically an author might imitate the style of a Semitized Greek document or might write with a Jewish Greek idiolect. Careful examination of the consistency of all relevant data must be done before a reliable conclusion can be reached.

With the above caveats, we suggest that the following documents have a consistent Hebrew background or Hebraic influence: 1 Maccabees, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, Joseph and Aseneth, Tobit, and Judith.

Likewise, with the above caveats, we suggest that the following documents have an Aramaic background: 1 Esd 3:1–5:6, the *Testament of Job*, and probably *The Life of Adam and Eve*. It also appears that an Aramaic exemplar may have secondarily influenced the Greek textual tradition of *Joseph and Aseneth*.

In addition, we can suggest that the following documents have a Greek background without a long, written Semitic source: 2 Maccabees, John, and Acts.

The application of these criteria to the Greek Gospels is particularly fruitful in bringing more precision to discussions about Semitic source backgrounds. While the Synoptic Gospels are tertiary Greek, or at least Greek documents that were not translated directly from (a) Semitic source(s), they still present data of Semitized Greek. A Semitic source behind the Synoptic Gospels has not left the distinguishing features of an Aramaic source, but it has left features that testify to a potential Hebrew background. This is a linguistic datum and is not affected by arguments about which language is the most popular in home or market, nor by which synoptic theory one follows. Furthermore, this linguistic evidence suggests that the synoptic problem cannot be solved without seriously coming to grips with Hebrew.[124] The Hebrew gospel source(s) behind the Greek sources to the Synoptic Gospels is/are necessarily long. It is not a

---

124   It is beyond the scope of the present study to discuss this/these source(s) and its/their relationship to each Synoptic writer or the synoptics between themselves. It should be obvious that Luke was influenced by a source that reflects Hebrew. I consider Mark

minimal sayings-document, nor only the passion story, but a full-length biography from birth accounts to resurrection accounts.

As a corollary to the evaluations of the synoptic data, it is highly improbable that a stylistic imitation theory can account for the Semitic evidence in Luke–Acts. The stark difference of "impersonal ἐγένετο" between the Gospel and Acts and the lack of the Hebraic structure in Acts cannot be explained by "imitation Septuagintal Greek," nor can the differences in statistics with *narrative* τότε be so explained. These new tests call for a re-evaluation of Luke's style and working methods. Luke's style in the Gospel appears to come from a Greek source that descends from a literary Hebrew narrative.[125]

Previous scholars have approached the Semitized Greek Gospels with assumptions of the plausibility of an Aramaic background. The data of this study conflict with those assumptions and reverse them. Scholars will need to deal with the lack of any extant, Aramaic model on which to explain the stylistic Semitic data in Mark. Any Aramaic approaches will need to deal with these linguistic data that point unambiguously in the opposite direction, away from Aramaic and towards Hebrew. The ability to differentiate Hebrew from Aramaic in Semitized Greek sources changes the starting point of discussions about the Synoptic Gospels.

---

and Luke to be independent. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, probably had access to (the) Hebraized Greek source(s). This will be addressed in Volume 4 of this series.

125 If the Papias title τὰ λόγια [τοῦ κυρίου], "the sayings," reflects the Hebrew title, then the natural precedent would be ספר דברי ישוע/האדון as the title of a narrative story, on the model of Tobit: βίβλος λόγων Τωβιθ.