Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Interdirectionality of Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts

Sangil Lee

How to cite:

Lee, Sangil (2008) Interdirectionality of Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1971/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

Interdirectionality of Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

By

Sangil Lee

A copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of PhD

Durham University

Department of Theology and Religion

2008

1 8 DEC 2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The topic of bilingualism is not far away from me. My daughters who were born in UK are early bilinguals in Korean and English. Under Japanese Empire rule my parents were late bilinguals in Korean and Japanese. Both Durham Korean Church in Durham, UK and Korean Presbyterian Church of Purdue in West Lafayette, IN, USA where I have served are bilingual Christian communities like early Christian churches in Jerusalem and Roman Near East. The linguistic situations around me inspired me to try to write this work.

This dissertation is my doctoral thesis of Department of Theology and Religion, Durham University, under supervisions of Prof. James D. G. Dunn and Prof. Loren T. Stuckenbruck. First of all, I am extremely thankful to Prof. Dunn for his helpful insight, sharp criticism, and warmly encouragement for first two years. After his retirement, Prof. Stuckenbruck supervised my research for four years. I am immensely grateful for his supervision. He guided me with unceasingly encouragement and suggested invaluable comments and thoughtful criticisms. Whenever we discussed my arguments in his office room, I was excited and joyful. Their enthusiasms for research and their attitudes to life were deeply carved in my mind with my respect. I confess they are really my mentors in that they showed me how to live.

And due to Prof. Stuckenbruck's two sabbatical leaves, Prof. John Barclay and Dr. William Telford also kindly supervised my research for each term. I am extremely grateful for their invaluable comments and suggestions. Also Dr. Ted Kaizer (Dept. of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University) read part I and helped me greatly with insightful suggestions and encouragement. And I thank Prof. Fergus Millar (Dept. of Oriental Studies, Oxford University) thankfully gave me invaluable suggestions. Also I wish to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Benjamin Wold (Trinity College, Dublin) who read Part I and Dr. Anthony Le Donne who read Introduction and Part II. I appreciate their very insightful and

practical comments.

I should also thank my teachers of New Testament Studies and Linguistics in Korea. Professors Hoon-Taek Chung, Seyoon Kim (now, Fuller Theological Seminary), Sung-Soo Kwon, and Han-Soo Lee (Chongshin University) and Chang-Ki Hwang (Kosin University). They led me to New Testament Studies and opened my eyes to criticize the New Testament from the perspective of evangelicalism and especially, Prof. Kim was my hero. I am also obliged to Professors Yoon-Han Kim, Chung-Min Lee, Hyun-Bok Lee, Yang-Soo Moon, and Seung-Ho Nam who taught me Linguistics (Seoul National University). And I would like to express my gratitude with respect to Prof. Bong-Ho Son and Prof. Sang-Bok Kim for their encouragements and supports.

I recall many friends in Sheffield and Durham who have discussed our topics and played football and tennis: Drs. Hung-Sik Choi, Seung-Woo Chung, Hak-Jin Kim, Kyeng-Jin Min, Seung-Hoon Woo, Jae-Hoon Yang. I thank Dr. Hyun-Woo Shin for his comments, financial support, and encouragement. They have inspired, taught, challenged, and provoked me to deepen my arguments.

Thankfully, I had the privileges to present my papers; Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia in 2005 entitled, "Syntactic Changes of Legon, Hina and Hoti" in the section of Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics (chapter 6), Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) International Meeting in Edinburgh in 2006 entitled, "The Literary Functions of the Aramaic Words in the Markan Narrative" in the section of Synoptic Gospels (§8.3), and British New Testament Conference (BNTC) in Sheffield University in 2006 entitled, "Bilingualism of the Hebrews and the Hellenists in the Jerusalem Church" in the section of Short Papers (chapter 5). I appreciate the audience's responses and encouragement. I have also enjoyed the opportunities to attend Durham-Tübingen Symposium in Durham in 2004 and the Studiorum Novum Testamentum Societas (SNTS) Meeting in Durham in 2002.

I received scholarships by God's grace. Without their financial support and prayer I could not complete this work: Ustinov College Travel Fund, AHRC Award (three times), The Whitecourt Charitable Trust (twice), The Mylne Trust, Doorae Institute Abroad Scholarship (Korea), Westminster Theological Seminary Scholarship (Korea), ISF, Lightfoot Scholarship of Department of Theology (Durham University), Sangjoon Scholarship Foundation in Seoul. Also I am indebted to many individuals in UK, USA, and Korea.

Above all, my wife, Soo-Jung Chae deserves my sincere admiration. My better half has supported me in every possible way with patience. This dissertation is the product of her devotion. I thank my lovely daughters (Un and Sol) since their existence was always my joy and my strength. I am deeply grateful to my parents in-law like parents (Hee-Joong Chae and Jung-Ae Byun) for their love, support, and trust. Also I wish to express my gratitude to my grandmother (Sun Won) in memory and my grandmother in-law (Jeung-Chool Jung). And this dissertation may be dedicated to my parents (Seong-Hwa Lee and Kyung-Ae Noh) who sacrificed themselves for me. Finally, I give my thanks to the Lord who is the ground, purpose, and hope of my existence. Only he is my all.

Sangil Lee.

2008

ABSTRACT

Many scholars have assumed that Jesus and Gospel traditions have been transmitted in a unidirectional way from Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic, from oral into written, and from Semitic into Greek. This means that the former three traditions (e.g. Judaeo-Palestinian, oral, and Semitic traditions) are earlier and more original than the latter three traditions (e.g. Hellenistic, written, and Greek traditions). The unidirectionality hypotheses of transmission of Jesus and Gospel traditions have driven many scholars to single out Judaeo-Palestinian, oral, and Semitic traditions from Hellenistic, written, and Greek traditions. The Semitisms with Judaeo-Palestinian feature and orality have functioned as criteria to judge many significant issues of the New Testament studies such as provenances of the Gospels, the Synoptic Problem, the Historical Jesus, and development of the christological titles. However, when we apply Sociolinguistics, Cognitive Linguistics, and General Linguistics to the linguistic situations of first-century Palestine and Roman Near East, the linguistic milieus should be considered as bilingualism in Greek and vernacular languages rather than monolingualism. The study of bilingualism serves to blur the three lines between each temporal border. Rather, it supports that the transmission of Jesus and Gospel traditions is interdirectional between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic, between oral and written, and between Semitic and Greek traditions. This implies that the three former traditions do not always have temporal priority over the three latter traditions. This study suggests that Semitisms with Judaeo-Palestinian feature and orality cannot be used as criteria to decide temporal priority at the levels of Syntax, Phonology, and Semantics.

Declaration:

None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

Statement of Copyright:

A copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

Table of Contents

1 History of Research of Directionality of Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions..... 1

1.1 Herman Gunkel 1

1.2 *Sitz im Leben* Unidirectionality from Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic 2

1.2.1 Martin Dibelius 2

1.2.2 Rudolf Bultmann 3

1.3 Modal Unidirectionality from Oral into Written 3

1.3.1 The Scandinavian School 4

1.3.1.1 Harald Riesenfeld 4

1.3.1.2 Birger Gerhardsson 5

1.3.2 Orality Theory 5

1.4 Linguistic Unidirectionality from Aramaic into Greek 5

1.4.1 Aramaic Language as a Criterion 5

1.4.1.1 Charles C. Torrey 8

1.4.1.2 Matthew Black 11

1.4.1.3 Joachim Jeremias 12

1.4.1.4 Joseph Fitzmyer 12

1.4.2 Greek Language as a Criterion 15

1.4.2.1 Alexander Roberts 16

1.4.2.2 Aubrey Argyle 18

1.4.2.3 Robert Gundry 19

1.4.2.4 Stanley Porter 20

1.5 Interdirectionality Hypothesis 22

1.5.1 The *Sitz im Leben* Interdirectionality between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic Tradition: Martin Hengel 23

1.5.2 Modal Interdirectionality between Oral and Written Tradition 24

1.5.2.1 Form Criticism: Helmut Koester 24

1.5.2.2 The Scandinavian School: Samuel Byrskog 25

1.5.3 The Linguistic Interdirectionality between Semitic and Greek Tradition: E. P. Sanders 25

1.5.4 Interdirectionality Hypotheses and Gospel Studies 26

PART I. Bilingualism of First-Century Palestine and Roman Near East 29

2 Bilingualism and Diglossia 29

2.1 Definitions 31

2.1.1 Bilingualism 32

2.1.2 Bilingual Community 33

2.1.3 Bilingualism and Multilingualism 34

2.1.4 Early Bilingualism vs. Late Bilingualism 35

2.1.5 Primary Bilingualism vs. Acquired Bilingualism 36

2.1.6 Oral Bilingualism vs. Literate Bilingualism 37

2.1.7 Stages of Bilingualism 37

2.1.8 Balanced Bilingualism vs. Dominant Bilingualism 38

2.1.9 Matrix Language vs. Embedded Language 38

2.1.10 Substratum, Adstratum and Superstratum 39

2.1.11 Ancestor, Daughter, and Sister Language 39

2.2 Diglossia of First-Century Palestine? 40

2.2.1 Charles Ferguson 40

2.2.2 Joshua Fishman 42

2.2.3 Pinchas Lapide 43

2.2.4 Chaim Rabin 44

2.2.5 Bernard Spolsky 47

2.2.6 Jonathan Watt 49

2.3 Bilingualism and Diglossia Models 52

2.3.1 Characteristics of the Four Languages in First-Century Palestine 52

2.3.2 Language Preference Theory 53

2.3.3 Maximalism and Minimalism 55

2.3.4 Biliteracy of First-Century Palestine 59

3 Bilingualism of Jews in First-Century Palestine 61

3.1 Regional Bilingualism 61

3.1.1 Inscriptional Evidence 61

3.1.2 Papyrological Evidence 64

3.1.3 Population Geographical Evidence 66

3.2 Personal Bilingualism 68

3.2.1 Military Invasion and Following Colonization 70

3.2.2 Migration or Inflow 70

3.2.3 Ethnic Awareness 71

3.2.4 Bilingual Parents or Region 72

3.2.5 Formal Education 76

3.2.6 Occupation 86

3.3 Bilingualism of First-Century Palestine and Interdirectionality 90

4 Bilingualism of Jews in First-Century Diaspora 91

4.1 Grounds for Bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora 94

4.1.1 Bilingualism of the Roman Empire 94

4.1.2 Successive Immigration 98

4.1.3 Periodic Connection with Jerusalem 102

4.1.4 Learning Aramaic in Jerusalem 104

4.2 Alexandria 107

4.2.1 Bilingualism of the Ptolemaic and Early Roman Alexandria 109

4.2.2 Archaeological Evidence 113

4.2.3 Successive Immigration 118

4.2.4 Periodic Connection with Jerusalem 119

4.3 Antioch 120

4.3.1 Bilingualism of the Roman Antioch 121

4.3.2 Bilingualism of the Antiochene Jews 126

4.3.3 Bilingualism of the Antiochene Christians 129

4.4 Bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora and Interdirectionality 131

5 Bilingualism of the Earliest Christian Church in Jerusalem 133

5.1 The State of Affairs 133

5.2 Bilingualism of the Hebrews and Hellenists 139

5.2.1 Hebrews: Aramaic-Matrix Christians 142

5.2.2 Hellenists: Greek-Matrix Christians 147

5.3 The Bilingual Seven 155

5.3.1 Onomastica 156

5.3.2 Geographical Evidence 156

5.3.2.1 Caesarea Maritima 157

5.3.2.2 Samaria 159

5.3.2.3 Ethiopia 159

5.3.2.4 Antioch 162

5.3.3 Performance of Their Duty 163

5.4 Bilingualism of the Jerusalem Church and Interdirectionality of Jesus Tradition 166

PART II. Interdirectional Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts at the Levels of Syntax, Phonology, and Semantics 170

6 Syntax 177

7 Phonology 179

7.1 Linguistic Factors of Transliterated Variants in Bilingual Contexts 181

7.1.1 Different Phonetic System 181

7.1.2 Representation 186

7.1.3 Phonetic Change 191

7.1.4 Dialects 193

7.2 Three Views of Variant Spellings in Transliteration 194

7.2.1 Orthographic view 195

7.2.2 Variational View 197

7.2.2.1 Ephraim Speiser 198

7.2.2.2 James Barr 199

7.2.2.3 Alan Millard 200

7.2.2.4 Some Scholars of New Testament Greek 200

7.2.3 Bilingual View 202

7.3 Variant Spellings as Transliterated Allowords in Bilingual Context 203

7.3.1 Transliterated Allowords 203

7.3.2 Consonants 205

7.3.2.1 Plosives and Fricatives 205

7.3.2.2 Sibilants 206

7.3.2.3 Liquids 207

7.3.2.4 Gutturals 207

7.3.2.5 Additions of Consonants 209

7.3.3 Vowels 210

7.4 Some Variant Spellings as Transliterated Allowords in the Four Gospels and Acts 212

7.4.1 Local Proper Nouns 212

7.4.1.1 Ἰερουσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα 213

7.4.1.2 Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ 214

7.4.1.3 Γεννησάρ and Γεννησαρέτ 217

7.4.2 Personal Proper Nouns 219

7.4.2.1 Συμεών/Σίμων and Κηφᾶς/Πέτρος 220

7.4.2.2 Ἐλισάβη and Ἐλισάβετ 222

7.4.3 Other Transliterated Words 223

7.4.3.1 The Cry from the Cross 223

7.4.3.2 Μεσσίας/Χριστός 228

7.5 Variant Spellings as Allowords and Interdirectionality 231

8 Semantics 233

8.1 Aramaic Embedded Words as Codeswitching 235

8.1.1 Codeswitching, Interference, and Borrowing in a Bilingual Society 237

8.1.2 Codeswitching in New Testament Scholarship 244

8.1.3 Types of Codeswitching 249

8.1.4 Pragmatic Functions of Codeswitching 250

8.1.4.1 Vividness 251

8.1.4.2 Emphasis 251

8.1.4.3 Politeness 251

8.1.4.4 Solidarity 252

8.2 Ἀμήν Found in All Four Gospels 253

8.3 Codeswitchings in the Gospel of Mark 265

8.3.1 Αββα ὁ πατήρ 267

8.3.2 Ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα in the Miracle Stories 275

8.4 Codeswitchings in the Gospel of Luke and Acts 281

8.4.1 Language Change 282

8.4.2 Personal Name 284

8.4.2.1 Σίμων/Συμεών and Πέτρος/Κηφᾶς 285

8.4.2.2 Σαῦλος/Παῦλος and Σαούλ 288

8.4.3 Place Name 290

8.4.3.1 Ἰερουσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα 290

8.4.3.2 Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ 292

8.5 Aramaic Embedded Words as Codeswitchings and Interdirectionality 296

9 Summary of Results and Some Implications 300

9.1 Summary of Results 300

9.2 The Synoptic Problem 301

9.3 The Historical Jesus 302

9.4 Textual Criticism 302

9.5 Interdirectional Development of Christological Titles 303

Tables and Figures

Table 1 Differences and Agreements among Some Aramaic Dialects 146

Table 2 Phonological Correspondence between English and Korean 182

Table 3 Four Transliterated Korean spellings of 'Writing' 188

Table 4 Characteristics of Interference, Borrowing, and Codeswitching 244

Figure 1 The Relationship between Bilingualism and Diglossia 42

Figure 2 The Linguistic Distributions of ArmEmWords in the Greek Texts 236

ABBREVIATIONS I

AA Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere

AB The Anchor Bible

ABD *Anchor Bible Dictionary*

ABRL Anchor Bible Reference Library

ACL Applications of Cognitive Linguistics

ACW Ancient Christian Writers

AGJU Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums

AJP *American Journal of Philology*

AJT *American Journal of Theology*

Ann.Serv. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l' Égypte*

ANRW Temporini, H. & Wolfgang Hasse (eds.) 1972- *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)

AR *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*

ASMA Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity

ASNU Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis

ASOR The American Schools of Oriental Research

ATANT Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments

AThR *Anglican Theological Review*

AUS American University Studies

BAFCS The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting

BAG Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, & F. Wilbur Gingrich 1957 *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

BAR *Biblical Archaeology Review*

BAS *Berytus Archeological Studies*

BASOR *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research*

BBB Bonner biblische Beiträge

BBC *Bulletin of the Bezan Club*

BBJ Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher

BDB Brown, F., S. R. Driver, & C. A. Briggs 1907 *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

BDF Blass, F., A. Debrunner, Robert Funk 1961 *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Beg. Jackson, F. J. F. & K. Lake (eds.) 1920-33 *The Beginnings of Christianity* 5 Vols. (London: Macmillan).

BETL Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium

Bib *Biblica*

BibInt *Biblical Interpretation*

BILS Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics

BIS Biblical Interpretation Series

BJP Brill Josephus Project

BJRL *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*

BJS Brown Judaic Studies

BNTC Black's New Testament Commentaries

BS Biblical Seminar

BZ Biblische Zeitschrift

BZNW *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

CALC Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact

CAP *Cowley, A. E. 1923 Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon)*

CB The Clarendon Bible

CBC Cambridge Bible Commentary

CBET Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology

CE *Chronique d'Egypte*

CEJL Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature

CESG Kiraz, George Anton 20043 (1996) *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean Versions* 4 Vols. (NTTS 21/1-4; Leiden: Brill)

CGTC Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary

CHJ Davies, W.D. & L. Finkelstein 1989 *The Cambridge History of Judaism* 3 Vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

CHS Centre for Hellenic Studies King's College London

CIG *Corp Inscr Graec*

CIJ 1936-1952 *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum* 2 Vols (Roma: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana)

CILT Current Issues in Linguistic Theory

CJ *Classical Journal*

CL *Cognitive Linguistics*

CLR Cognitive Linguistics Research

CLS *Chicago Linguistic Society*

CPJ Tcherikover, Victor, Alexander Fuks & Menahem Stern (eds.) 1957-1964 *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 3 Vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

CQ *The Classical Quarterly*

CRINT Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum

CSL Cambridge Studies in Linguistics

CSoL Contributions to the Sociology of Language

CSPES Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time

CTL Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics

DBSup L. Pirot (ed) 1938 *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane)

DJD *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford: Clarendon)*

DJG Green, Joel, Scot McKnight, & Howard Marshall (eds.) 1992 *Dictionary of Jesus and Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP)

DLNTD Martin, R. P. & P. H. Davids (eds.) 1997 *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Development* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP)

EB Études Bibliques

EC Epworth Commentaries

ECC Early Christianity in Context

EFN Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria

Enchoria *Enchoria: Zeitschrift für Demotistik und Koptologie*

ESE Lidzbarski, Mark 1900-1915 *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik* 3 Vols. (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann)

ESEC Emory Studies in Early Christianity

ESW Ecumenical Studies in Worship

ExpTim *Expository Times*

Fraser Fraser, P. M. 1972 *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 3 Vols. (Oxford: Clarendon)

FRLANT Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

GLAJJ Stern, Menahem 1974-84 *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Publications of Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities)

GLICM Lehmann, Clayton Miles & Kenneth G. Holum 2000 *The Greek and Latin*

Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima (ASOR 5; Boston, MA:ASOR)

GRBS *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*

HKNT Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament

HNT Handbuch zum Neuen Testament

HOS Handbook of Oriental Studies

HRCS Hatch, Edwin & Henry A. Redpath 1998[2] (1897-1906) *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament: Including the Apocryphal Books* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker)

HSS Harvard Semitic Studies

HT Helps for Translators Prepared Under the Auspices of the United Bible Societies

HTKNT Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament

HTR *Harvard Theological Review*

HTS Harvard Theological Studies

HUCA *Hebrew Union College Annual*

IBS *Irish Biblical Studies*

ICC International Critical Commentary

ICT Issues in Contemporary Theology

IDB *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*

IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal*

IF *Indogermanische Forschungen*

IGCH Thompson, Margaret, Otto Mørkholm, & Colin Kraay (eds.) 1973 *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (New York: American Numismatic Society)

IJSL *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*

JBR *Journal of Bible and Religion*

JDS Judean Desert Studies

JEA *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*

JewSocSt *Jewish Social Studies*

JIGRE Horbury, W. & D. Noy 1992 *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

JJS *Journal of Jewish Studies*

JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JR *Journal of Religion*

JRASS Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series

JRS *Journal of Roman Studies*

JSI *Journal of Social Issues*

JSNT *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*

JSNTSS Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series

JSOTSupJournal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

JSPSup Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series

JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*

JSSSup Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement Series

KG Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth 1976 *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache* 2Vols. (Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung)

LCM Loeb Classical Monographs

LD Lectio Divina

Liddell-Scott Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott 1940 *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon)

LJNLA Ilan, Tal 2002 *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity Part I Palestine 330 BCE – 200 CE* (TSAJ 91; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)

LNTS Library of New Testament Studies (formerly JSNTSS)

MAMA *1928-93 Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua. Manchester & London*

MGWJ *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*

MHR *Mediterranean Historical Review*

MLS Modern Linguistics Series

MNTC Moffatt New Testament Commentary

NA^{26th} *Nestle Aland 26th edition*

NCBC New Century Bible Commentary

ND Horsley, Greg (et al.) 1976- *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre; Macquarie University / Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

NIBC New International Biblical Commentary

NIGTC The New International Greek Testament Commentary

NKZ *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*

NLCNT New London Commentary on the New Testament

NNM Numismatic Notes and Monographs

NovT *Novum Testamentum*

NovT Sup Novum Testamentum Supplement

NPNF Shaff, Philip (ed) 1889 *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* 13 Vols. (NY: Christian Literature Company)

NTL New Testament Library

NTT New Testament Theology

NTTS New Testament Tools and Studies

OBS Oxford Bible Series

OBT Overtures to Biblical Theology

OCM Oxford Classical Monographs

OeO Oriens et Occidens

OSLC Oxford Studies in Language Contact

OSTLT Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory

OTL Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics

OTS Old Testament Studies

PCHS Publications for the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London

PBA *Proceedings of the British Academy*

PCEAV Publications of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity

PCPS *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*

PEFQS *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*

PNTC Pelican New Testament Commentaries

PTMS Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series

PuP Päpste und Papsttum

RB *Revue Biblique*

RBS Resources for Biblical Study

REG *Revue des études grecques*

RevQ *Revue de Qumran*

RGRW Religions in the Greco-Roman World

SANT Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

SAOC Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization

SBLMS Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series

SBLSCSS Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series

SBLSymS Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series

SBT Studies in Biblical Theology

Schürer Schürer, Emil, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, & Matthew Black 1973-87 *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* Vol. I-III (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

SDSSRL Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature

SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SiBil	Studies in Bilingualism
SILPL	Summer Institute of Linguistics, Publications in Linguistics
SIS	Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics
SJGR	Studies in Judaism and its Greco-Roman Context
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SKN	Studien zu antiken Kulturkontakten und ihrem Nachleben
SLBA	Schweich Lectures of the British Academy
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SPIB	Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici
SPS	Sacra Pagina Series
SSCFL	Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
Stud. Hell.	Studia Hellenistica
StudOr	*Studia Orientalia*
SWJL	*Southwest Journal of Linguistics*
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
T&S	Texts and Studies
TCH	The Transformation of the Classical Heritage
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TLSM	Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TR	Theology and Religion
Tru	*Theologische Rundschau*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

TSL Typological Studies in Language

TZ *Theologische Zeitschrift*

Vaganay-Amphoux Vaganay, Leon & Christian-Bernard Amphoux 1991 *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

VF *Verkündigung und Forschung*

VGT Moulton, James Hope & George Milligan 1959 *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

VT *Vetus Testamentum*

Wadd. Waddington, W. H & Philippe Le Bas 1870 *Inscriptions grecques et latines receuillies en Grèce et en Asie Mineure* (Paris)

WC Westminster Commentaries

WJT *Westminster Theological Journal*

WLR *Washington Linguistics Review*

WLU *Working Papers on Language Universals Stanford University*

YCS *Yale Classical Studies*

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

ZKT *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*

ZTK *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

ABBREVIATIONS II

ArmEmWord	Aramaic embedded word
ArmGospel	Aramaic Gospel
ArmSpel	Aramaic spelling
ArmTrad	Aramaic tradition
CD	Cairo Damascus
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
FGs	Four Gospels
GkGospel	Greek Gospel
GkSpel	Greek spelling
GkTrad	Greek tradition
GofJn	Gospel of John
GofLk	Gospel of Luke
GofMk	Gospel of Mark
GofMt	Gospel of Matthew
GTrad	Gospel tradition
JTrad	Jesus tradition
J&GTrads	Jesus and Gospel traditions
MT	Masorah Text
NT	New Testament
OralTrad	Oral tradition
OralTransmission	Oral transmission
OT	Old Testament
P&RNE	Palestine and Roman Near East
RNE	Roman Near East

SemSpel	Semitic spelling
SemTrad	Semitic tradition
SynGs	Synoptic Gospels
SynTrad	Synoptic tradition
WrittenTrad	Written tradition

1. History of Research of Directionality of Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions

When biblical scholars investigate major issues of Gospel Studies, it seems that most have assumed three unidirectionalities of transmission of J&GTrads. J&GTrads were unidirectionally transmitted from Judaeo-Palestinian tradition into Hellenistic tradition (i.e. *Sitz im Leben* unidirectionality), from OralTrad into WrittenTrad (i.e. modal unidirectionality), and from SemTrad into GkTrad (i.e. linguistic unidirectionality), and not ever *vice versa*. This can be called the three unidirectionality hypotheses of transmission of J&GTrads.[1] It has been assumed that the former three traditions are earlier and more original than the latter three traditions. However, when we take bilingualism of first-century P&RNE into serious consideration, we must acknowledge that the J&GTrads were interdirectionally transmitted between Judaeo-Palestinian tradition and Hellenistic tradition, between OralTrad and WrittenTrad, and between SemTrad and GkTrad.

In this chapter,[2] the three unidirectionality hypotheses will be examined as they have been represented by prominent scholars. First of all, Gunkel as the progenitor of the unidirectionality hypothesis will be investigated (§1.1). Then, the three unidirectionality hypotheses will be discussed; *Sitz im Leben* unidirectionality hypothesis (§1.2), modal unidirectionality hypothesis (§1.3), and linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis (§1.4), respectively. Lastly, the interdirectionality hypothesis as an alternative will be proposed (§1.5).

1.1 Herman Gunkel

---

[1] Cadbury's remark demonstrates this point. He (1958:27-8) writes, "The gospel was transferred not only from Aramaic to Greek – but from Palestine to Europe, and from Jews to Gentiles."

[2] Originally, the total word of chapter 1 approximates to 26,000 words. However, I deleted or summarized them into around 9,200 words due to reasons of space. I tried to preserve parts related to linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis (§1.3.1.1; §1.3.1.4; §1.3.2.1; §1.3.2.2; §1.3.2.3; §1.3.2.4; §1.5.4), as far as I could.

Gunkel was the first to introduce form criticism and the concept of OralTrad, oral variants, and OralTransmission in a fully-dressed debate. He detected that there was something original behind a text itself. However, his serious problem lies in the fact that the directionality of the transmission of the biblical narratives is to be seen as "modal unidirectional." Consequently, the unidirectionality hypothesis, the teleological and unilinear view of the transmission diverted scholarly attention away from literary sources towards the oral forms behind the written form. In this sense, Gunkel is the progenitor of the unidirectionality hypothesis of the transmission of the biblical narratives. Therefore, these chronic obstacles that Gunkel could not iron out in his publications left his successors to be heirs to the same problems repeatedly in their publications.

1.2 *Sitz im Leben* Unidirectionality from Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic

Form and redaction critics have held the three unidirectionality hypotheses that J&GTrads were unidirectionally transmitted from Judaeo-Palestinian to Hellenistic, oral to written, and Aramaic to Greek. Nevertheless, concerning the issue of temporal priority or originality of J&GTrads they have assumed that *Sitz im Leben* unidirectionality should take precedence over modal unidirectionality or linguistic unidirectionality. Dibelius (§1.2.1) and Bultmann (§1.2.2) will be discussed respectively.[3]

1.2.1 Martin Dibelius

Using the overall concept of the OralTrad from Gunkel, Dibelius (1934; 1935;

---

[3] Theissen (1983; 1991; 1992; 2003; Theissen & Merz 1998) devotes considerable attention to the history of the transmission of GTrad in the earliest Christianity by use of a sociological method. However, his arguments are also based on the unidirectionality hypothesis.

1936; 1939; 1949) accepted Gunkel's insight into OralTrad and OralTransmission behind the fixed texts to a large extent so that he made a great contribution toward Gospel studies but he also repeated the same mistakes Gunkel had made. In terms of the transmission of the SynTrad, Dibelius approves the three unidirectionality hypotheses of JTrads from Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic, from oral into written, and Aramaic into Greek. As Gunkel did, even though he started with concern about the OralTrad and the OralTransmission, his teleological, unidirectional view compelled his focus on the final shape of the transmission, that is, the written GkTrad without regard to the OralTrad and the ArmTrad.

1.2.2 Rudolf Bultmann

Bultmann (1925; 1935; 1952; 1955; 1956; 1961; 1967; 1968; Bultmann & Kundsin 1934) posits the three unidirectionality hypotheses. However, he considers *Sitz im Leben* unidirectionality takes precedence over the other two factors (i.e. modal and linguistic factors). The originality of even ArmEmWords related to the linguistic directionality should be decided by the *Sitz im Leben* factor (§8.3.2). He also insists unidirectional development of Christological titles from Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christian church to Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian church (cf. n.392 μαράνα θά; §7.4.3.2 Μεσσίας and Χριστός).

1.3 Modal Unidirectionality from Oral into Written

Jesus spoke Aramaic whereas Gospels were written in Greek. This led to the assumption that JTrads were unidirectionally transmitted from oral into WrittenTrad. Furthermore, many scholars have assumed that ArmTrads were oral whereas GkTrads were

written since Aramaic materials were scarcely excavated before the discovery of the DSS.[4] Accordingly, it has been assumed that OralTrads are more original and earlier than WrittenTrads.

1.3.1 The Scandinavian School

The Scandinavian school which was thoroughly shaped by Gunkel's method retorts two weak points that the form critics neglected; they alternatively offer different views concerning transmitters and method of the traditions. Two scholars will be discussed; Harald Riesenfeld (§1.3.1.1) and Birger Gerhardsson (§1.3.1.2).

1.3.1.1 Harald Riesenfeld

Riesenfeld (1970) considers that JTrads were well preserved and were known to early Christian churches as well as to Paul. He is mostly concerned with the method of transmission of GTrads. Bearers of JTrad rigidly control the tradition by memorizing both content and form, as transmission of Rabbinic tradition was strictly preserved. He posits that OralTrads and WrittenTrads exist side by side. Later, the OralTrad was documented because early Christian communities felt that they should authorize their transmitters of the JTrad for recitation in Christian public worship. He presumes that the sayings by Jesus are preserved in an original Aramaic form in the memories of Jesus' disciples. This is adduced by the fact that Aramaic transliterated words are embedded in GkGospels such as *Talitha qūm*. Riesenfeld holds the modal unidirectionality hypothesis that WrittenTrads are the end-product of OralTrads like Gunkel.

---

[4] Frommel 1908:18; Dibelius 1934:32; Bultmann 1935:12-3; Olmstead 1942; even after the discovery of the DSS, Argyle 1974:89; John Brown 2000:240; Williams 2004b:7. For criticism against the view, see §2.3.4.

1.3.1.2 Birger Gerhardsson

Following and augmenting Riesenfeld, Gerhardsson gives attention to "transmitting persons." In his view, transmitting persons include Peter, Andrew, James, the Twelve, Paul, etc. who were connected with the chain of tradition. Contrarily, the form critics regarded them as unknown people. Gerhardsson suggests that OralTrads were preserved by Rabbinic techniques. He devotes attention to the Shema. He concludes that JTrads are reliable and reveal the historical Jesus. However, the Scandinavian school should have considered that written GTrads must have been circulated in oral forms again. In other words, WrittenTrads could have been changed to re-oralize them again, as Byrskog and others propose (§1.5.2). Both form critics and Scandinavian scholars like fraternal twin of Gunkel have considered Gospels written in Greek as the end-product on the basis of modal unidirectionality hypothesis.

1.3.2 Orality Theory

Of late, many scholars have applied orality theory to the transmission of J&GTrad. In this way, Kelber's earlier argument (1983) has gained recently momentum. However, most of them have assumed the modal unidirectionality hypothesis that OralTrad is unidirectionally transmitted into WrittenTrad and that Gospels written in Greek is the end-product.[5]

1.4 Linguistic Unidirectionality from Aramaic into Greek

---

[5] Bryan 1993; Dewey 1989:32-44; 1994:145-63; 1998; Fowler 1991; Henaut 1993; Horsley 1999; 2001; Kelber 1983, etc.

It has been assumed generally that Jesus and his disciples usually spoke Aramaic, whereas the SynGs we have were written in Greek. Although the linguistic gap between Aramaic and Greek has been explained in various ways, these arguments have been based upon the same presupposition that ArmTrad was transmitted into GkTrad in a unidirectional way, which can be called a linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis. This hypothesis has functioned as a foundation of the *Sitz im Leben* and modal unidirectionality hypotheses.

The linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis has been maintained by two major groups whether *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* are accepted or not. Some scholars who consider Aramaic language as a criterion have supposed that JTrad was spoken and/or written in Aramaic and later, translated into Greek *without exception*. They have concentrated on singling out of ArmTrads from Greek texts we have. This is so because ArmTrad is always more original and earlier than GkTrad. However, it seems that their presupposition is the unidirectional hypothesis on the basis of monolingualism of first-century Palestine. This is despite the fact that the linguistic milieu should be considered to be bilingual (chapters 3 & 4). On the other hand, others who take a serious view of a Greek language criterion have taken bilingualism of first-century Palestine into consideration. The proponents posit that Jesus who was a bilingual spoke Greek as well. This has led into an assumption that all JTrad was not transmitted from Aramaic into Greek. That is, some *exceptional* JTrads in Greek we have might have been spoken by Jesus. However, a problem lies in the fact that even the scholars who hold *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* did not take bilingualism of first-century Palestine into consideration seriously. If they accepted bilingualism, they would have done better to have assumed that JTrad in Greek was translated into Aramaic, as ArmTrads are translated into GkTrads.

Consequently, both approaches have been based on the unidirectional linguistic transmission of J&GTrads. If the bilingualism of first-century P&RNE was taken into

account seriously, the history of linguistic transmission of J&GTrads would have been totally different. The bilingualism implies that the sayings by Jesus and the stories about Jesus in Aramaic must have been translated into Greek during Jesus' historical ministry and continuing thereafter and that the sayings by Jesus and the stories about Jesus in Greek must have been translated into Aramaic during his historical ministry and continuing thereafter. Furthermore, the SynGs in Greek were most likely translated into Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix Christian communities, something which is reflected in the later Syriac versions (i.e. Sinaitic, Curetonian, Peshitta, and Harklean).

The linguistic unidirectionality of transmission of J&GTrads has been discussed in relation to major issues of Gospel Studies such as linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine, the Historical Jesus, NT Greek, Semitisms and Septuagintalisms, the Synoptic Problem, unidirectional development of Christological titles, etc, which will sporadically and frequently be discussed through this dissertation. Here, the two approaches to linguistic transmission of J&GTrads will be reviewed: Aramaic language as a criterion (§1.4.1) and Greek language as a criterion (§1.4.2).

1.4.1 Aramaic Language as a Criterion

Most scholars have assumed that J&GTrads were transmitted from Aramaic into Greek without exception. They have usually taken much account of Semitisms at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels on the basis of the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis.[6] The Aramaisms have been used as a criterion: the more Aramaized, the earlier,

---

[6] Concerning historical survey of the Semitisms of the NT, see Maloney 1981:7-34; Voelz 1984:894-930; *ND* 5.5-40; Black 1998:v-xxv; Jung 2004:5-61. For Semitisms on the basis of the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis, see Syntax (chapter 6), Phonology (chapter 7), and Semantics (chapter 8). Regarding the unidirectional influence from one language to another, Thackeray (1909:21) posits that "the Greek language was at all times the giver rather than the receiver." In this respect, Downes (1984:67) mentions that in bilingual contexts "one might expect the Low to be more open to borrowing terms from the High than vice versa, because of the prestige and standardization." That is, it is assumed that Greek was prestigious and standardized whereas Semitic languages were

which has widely been accepted as a criterion to decide temporal priority of J&GTrads.[7] In this chapter four major Semitic scholars will be discussed; Torrey (§1.4.1.1), Black (§1.4.1.2), Jeremias (§1.4.1.3), and Fitzmyer (§1.4.1.4).

1.4.1.1 Charles C. Torrey

Unlike form critics who make a sharp distinction between oral Aramaic and written Greek, Torrey takes written ArmGospel into account seriously.[8] Although many scholars have considered the Aramaic approach seriously, he investigates in fully-dressed discussion that the Four Gospels are a translation of Aramaic written Gospels.[9] In terms of the Greek of the FGs and the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine he suggests two points. (1) The FGs are in unpolished Greek and involve mistranslations (1933:267-73). His view of the Greek is simply shown by his remark (1936:lviii): "Any high school boy fairly well trained in Greek composition would be ashamed of such sentences as 10:38a or 22:54a [of the Gospel of Luke]". (2) Surprisingly, he supposed, even before the discovery of the DSS, that there were a large number of Aramaic written materials in Palestine in first centuries BC and AD. He (1933:252; cf. 1912:289; 1942:71-85) speculated, "The pre-Christian Aramaic literature, which must have been very extensive, rich in every field, shared the general fate of other ancient literatures."

---

not. Furthermore, Silva (1980:207) may propose that "the *native* language of a bilingual is not affected in the same way as his or her second language" (his emphasis). However, illustrating that Greek was a low-prestigious language at Rome, Horsley (*ND* 5.7) persuasively claims, "it is not true that the lower language is always the borrower and never the lender."

[7] Kilpatrick (1963:126-7) suggests that the more Semitizing text, the more original when he points out that ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν is more original because it is not a Greek expression. Quispel (1966:378) holds the same assumption to discuss the source of the Gospel of Thomas.

[8] Cadbury (1958:31) mentions: "If they [Torrey and Burney] should be ultimately accepted, this would add a whole new factor in our scheme of transmission of gospel history-a layer of Aramaic writings. It would mean that the transfer from Aramaic to Greek occurred not in the oral stage as we used to think, but in the literary stage."

[9] His argument is known as Translation Theory, which has continuously been suggested by Torrey's predecessors (e.g. Wellhausen and Dalman). Burney (1922, 1925), one of the scholars who made the most huge contribution in this direction, also seeks to achieve ArmGospel reconstruction. However, his drawback is similar to Torrey.

As for linguistic transmission of the FGs Torrey (1912:289-307; 1942:84) argued that Mark, Q, Matthew, and John were composed and circulated in Aramaic and were translated into Greek. Luke translated the original Aramaic recensions (i.e. Mark, Q, and Mt) into Greek in comparison with their Greek recensions since Luke posited that Aramaic sources are more authentic than Greek (1912:288-97). Torrey (1912:289-90, 308-9) considers that Aramaic documents are more authentic than Greek. He suggests three reasons. (1) The earliest tradition in Palestine was documented and circulated in Aramaic (1912:289). (2) Contemporary authors like Luke held the same view of the Aramaic original as the earliest tradition, mentioned before. He (1912:289) suggests that "to any collector of traditions, discourses, and other historic material these Semitic documents would appeal as especially 'authentic.'" (3) Translations including the Four Gospels involve many mistranslations whether it is intentional[10] or not.[11] Consequently, he (1912:305) proposes, "Semitic documents would be valued higher than Greek." This implies that the ArmTrad has temporal priority and authenticity rather than Greek does.

Taking a further step, his argument that J&GTrads were circulated in Semitic as well as Greek between the first century and the first decades of the second century merits attention. He (1912:296) suggests, "In the Oriental church, both Semitic and Greek recensions were in circulation."[12] And when the JTrads including the GofMk and Q were handed over to the great cities of the neighboring lands where Greek was used as their primary language, they were translated into Greek (1912:296-7). He intriguingly suggests, "It must be in both languages, Aram. and Grk., for both were used in all the Diaspora"

---

[10] Torrey (1912:279; 1933:ix-x; 1936:lviii) considers that the authors of the FGs intentionally prefer literary translation in order to deliver the Semitic original.

[11] He (1936) illustrates ten unintentional factors; ambiguity of the Aramaic text, questions misunderstood as declarations, the redundant "and," the reflexive pronoun and its substitute, Aramaic dialect, wrong vocalization of the Aramaic, confusion of some similar ArmSpels, slight corruption of the Aramaic text, aleph inserted or omitted, and waw or yodh inserted or omitted.

[12] Concerning Acts 1-15, he (1912:296) adds, "The document which he [Luke] translated appears to have belonged to that earliest stratum of Palestinian Christian literature which was written and circulated in the Aramaic tongue."

(1936:li). Consequently, he (1912:297) maintains that even though the Aramaic documents originally were translated into Greek, each original Aramaic recension was used until the first decades of the second century.

His arguments have left three major debating points. The first criticism is related to two languages (i.e. Aramaic and Greek). Concerning Aramaic language, he reconstructs his ArmGospels on his assumption that literary Aramaic is uniform for centuries.[13] However, it has been criticized that the Aramaic sources Torrey used are improper because he uses the Aramaic of the Targums of Onkelos and the Prophets.[14] In the case of Greek, Torrey argues that the syntax of the FGs and the first half of the Acts is translation Greek which is full of mistranslations.[15] Black (1967:5) criticizes against Torrey's new translation, saying, "Most of his examples of mistranslation, however, and several of Burney's are open to grave objection."

The second frequent criticism is that Aramaic written Gospels did not exist because there was no Aramaic literature around first century. From the perspective of the form criticism[16] some scholars (e.g. Goodspeed and Olmstead) affirmed with confidence that there were no Aramaic written materials in first-century Palestine so that Aramaic written Gospels could not exist.[17] However, not until ten years have Aramaic texts been unearthed from the

---

[13] Torrey (1933:249-50) mentions, "the mother-tongue of Jesus of Nazareth, of the Galilean villagers, of the people of Jerusalem and Judea, in short, of all Palestine, was a fairly homogeneous dialect of Western Aramaic. This had been the language of the land for centuries, and it continued to be the vernacular until long after the Apostolic age. The speech of the common people of Galilee differed in some noticeable respects from the Judean dialect; the literary language however was uniform, not only throughout Palestine, but also in the Jewish Dispersion."

[14] Black (1967:5) argues, "Both Burney and Torrey approach the study of the Aramaic of Jesus on the same linguistic assumptions as Dalman, that the Aramaic of the Targums of Onkelos and the Prophets is the best representative of Aramaic of Jesus." Fitzmyer (1998:82) also suggests, "This kind of Aramaic reveals part of the problematic character of Torrey's thesis, because he had to rely not only on earlier Biblical Aramaic, but mostly on that of the later targums and rabbinic writings." As a matter fact, a considerable number of Palestine Aramaic in the first-century BC and AD were unearthed after Torrey's publications (Fitzmyer 1979:39).

[15] Although he knows about new arguments of NT Greek provoked by the excavation of Egyptian Greek papyri, he disagrees with Deissmann and Moulton's views since he thinks Semitisms occurs throughout the FGs; see Torrey 1912:270-5.

[16] Most scholars of form criticism assume that there were no Aramaic written materials. For their arguments and my criticism, see §1.2.

[17] Olmstead (1942:41-75; here 47) declares, "there never *could* have been any Aramaic

Qumran caves (cf. Fitzmyer 1979a:39). As a matter of fact, the Qumran texts provided us with voluminous Aramaic documents in the first century B.C.E. and C.E., which supports Torrey's insightful proposal.

Third, it is worthy of putting an emphasis upon his intuitive argument concerning the bilingual circulation of the FGs in Palestine and all the Diaspora (1912:296-7; 1936:li). Nevertheless, it is regrettable that his bilingual circulation hypothesis is incomplete and inconsistent since he still held the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis. If he accepts the bilingual circulation hypothesis, he would have done better to have recognized a further possibility. GkTrads translated from Aramaic must have been translated into Aramaic again among Aramaic-matrix speakers in P&RNE (cf. Torrey 1936:li). This implies that ArmTrads are always more original and earlier than GkTrads because we cannot make a distinction between an ArmTrad retranslated from Greek and an ArmTrad original by Jesus. Torrey also holds the modal unidirectionality. He (1936:xlv) mentions, "the time [of oral circulation] was too short; there must also be teaching through the circulation of written material." However, the fact that the primary communicative vehicle was oral communication supports the modal interdirectionality between written and OralTrad, mentioned before (§1.3). Consequently, Torrey's biggest drawback is that he speculates that the linguistic and modal transmission of J&GTrads are unilinear from Aramaic into Greek and oral into written.

1.4.1.2 Matthew Black

Like form critics, Black (1965, 1967) ascribes Semitisms of the Gospels to the

---

literature" (his emphasis). Also Goodspeed (1942:315-40; here 331; cf. 1937:127-68) asserts that there was no "creative literary activity in written classical Aramaic by the year 50 after Christ." Furthermore, he (1942:315) confidently adds, "I know of no work written in Palestine between A.D. 1 and 50 – in Greek or in any other tongue." The critics seem to prefer taking position of form criticism to that of Aramaic school, as Olmstead (1942:46) mentions, "*New* Testament critics ... invoke Form Criticism to explain the long stretch of *oral* transmission demanded by their hypothesis that the Gospels were *first written* in Greek" (his emphasis).

linguistic gap between Aramaic Jesus spoke and Gospels written in Greek. He assumes that Aramaisms should be given temporal precedence so that Bezan texts including Semitic features should be considered as earlier than GkTrad or Western texts. However, when we take the bilingual approach to linguistic transmission of J&GTrads, ArmTrad is not always earlier than GkTrad. This implies that the frequency of Aramaisms does not decide the priority of the Bezan texts over the Western texts.

1.4.1.3 Joachim Jeremias

Jeremias (1966, 1971, 1972) tries to find an ArmTrad out of GkTrad through the *logia* of Jesus and Jesus' manner of speaking because ArmTrad and OralTrad are earlier than GkTrad and WrittenTrad on the basis of the linguistic and modal unidirectional hypotheses. However, Jeremias would have done better to have considered the interdirectionality hypotheses that the transmission of J&GTrads was interdirectional and hybrid.

1.4.1.4 Joseph Fitzmyer[18]

On the basis of maximal view of Greek in first-century Palestine,[19] it seems that Fitzmyer's moderate position[20] has widely been welcomed among biblical scholars.[21] He

---

[18] Although Fitzmyer admits bilingualism of first-century Palestine, he denies *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca*. On this account, I tentatively put him the group of "Aramaic language as a criterion."

[19] Concerning the use of Greek in first-century Palestine Fitzmyer (1992:59-60) posits, "A good number of these indicate that Greek was used for public announcements. Other found on ossuaries-inscribed in Greek and Hebrew (or Aramaic), or in Greek alone-from the vicinity of Jerusalem testify to the widespread use of Greek among first-century Palestinian Jews at all levels of society." For full-dressed discussion of maximal bilingualism of first-century Palestine, see §2.3 & chapter 3.

[20] Fitzmyer (1979a:29-56; here 46) describes the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine as quadrilingualism, which is well-balanced: "The most commonly used language of Palestine in the first century A.D. was Aramaic, but that many Palestinian Jews, not only those in Hellenistic towns, but farmers and craftsmen of less obviously Hellenized areas used Greek, at least as a second language. ... But pockets of Palestinian Jews also used Hebrew, even though its use was not widespread. ... Latin was really a negligible factor in the language-situation of first-century Palestine,

seems to be an adherent to the unidirectionality hypothesis as for linguistic transmission of J&GTrads. First of all, his view of *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* implies the unidirectionality hypothesis. While he admits that Jesus spoke Greek with Greek speakers,[22] he (1979a:10, 37) denies *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* (cf. §1.4.2).[23] He (1979a:10) proposes, "I am extremely skeptical about the sayings-tradition in the NT being rooted, even in part, in Greek sayings of Jesus himself."[24] Fitzmyer takes it for granted that this issue is one of the most significant factors. He (1979a:10) presents that in relation to *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* a caveat should be required since the argument "affects the whole question of the origin of the saying-tradition."[25] Consequently, he assumes that the linguistic transmission of J&GTrads should be unilinear and unidirectional from Aramaic into Greek.

Second, Fitzmyer (1992:63) suggests three stages of transmission of JTrad. This has widely been accepted but based on the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis. (1) The first stage is what Jesus said and did during his ministry (1-33 A.D.). (2) Second, his disciples and apostles taught and preached sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus (33-66 AD). (3) Lastly, the evangelists selected homilies and instructions and redacted them with their purpose and style (66-95 AD). He warns that some scholars confused "the Greek of stage III" with "Aramaic stage I." As a result, it seems that he makes a sharp distinction between ArmTrad stage and GkGospel stage, as form critics do.

---

since it was confined for the most part to the Roman occupiers."

[21] He makes a huge contribution to the study of Aramaic language of first-century Palestine. He opposes to the view of the Kahlean school including Black and suggests that Qumran Aramaic is Jesus's Aramaic; see Fitzmyer 1974; 1980; followed by Stuckenbruck 1991.

[22] He (1992:60-1) illustrates Pilate (Mk 15:2-5; Mt 27:11-14; Lk 23:3; Jn 18:33-8), a Roman centurion (Mt 8:5-13; Lk 7:2-10; Jn 4:46-53), a Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk 7:25-30), and Greeks (Jn 12:20-22, 7:35).

[23] He (1979a:10) may mention, "The possibility of it is always there, but when other factors are taken into consideration, it seems rather unlikely."

[24] He (1979a:37) also mentions, "if it be used to insist that we might even have in the Gospels some of the *ipsissima verba Iesu graeca*, actually uttered by him as he addressed his bilingual Galilean compatriots, then the evidence is being pressed beyond legitimate bounds." Instead, Fitzmyer (1979a:15) endorses Grant's arguments. Grant (1963:41) proposes that it is unconvincing that "part, at least, of some of the books were written not in Greek but in Aramaic" However, Grant as a unidirectionalist does not seem to take retranslation in a bilingual situation into account.

[25] Further, he (1979a:10) mentions, "The *caveat* is derived ultimately from other aspects of modern Gospel study, for no discussion of the Aramaic problem of the Gospels can prescind from the

Third, his argument of the linguistic gap is led into the issues of Semitisms and Septuagintalisms. Fitzmyer tries to reduce the alleged Semitisms so that he suggests three other possibilities. (1) In relation to Lukan improvement of Markan Greek, he (1981-5:107) suggests, "Part of the improvement is the result of the use of fewer Semitisms, and part of it the use of more resources of the Greek language." This implies that he also coniders that SemTrads are earlier than GkTrads. (2) Fitzmyer attributes Lukan Aramaisms to Luke's personal bilingualism in Syriac and Greek (cf. §1.4.1.4),[26] not to Semitic sources more original. He (1981-5:116) mentions, "the source of such interference [Aramaisms] could be Luke's origin in Syrian Antioch, where he lived as an *incola*, speaking the Aramaic dialect of the indigenous natives of that country," although he accepts that Luke "was also educated in the good Hellenistic culture of that town." (3) Fitzmyer considers some alleged Semitisms as Septuagintalisms.[27] He (1981:107-25) posits that Septuagintalisms meaning the wider and indirect interference of Semitism on the gospels through the LXX, would be a stronger term. He (1998:116) concludes with confidence, "Most of the instances cited as alleged Aramaisms are to be explained more correctly as Septuagintalisms."[28] Accordingly, although Fitzmyer accepts Semitic interference at the lexical and syntactic levels, he does not agree that the alleged Semitisms do not always guarantee more original sayings by Jesus and

---

issues raised by Synoptic source criticism, form criticism, and redaction criticism" (his emphasis).

[26] Given this is the case, he should call the Lukan Semitisms Syriacisms instead of Aramaisms. It is so because he points out the abuse of the term "Semitism," as he (1979:5) mentioned: "the way in which claims are sometimes made for the Aramaic substratum of the sayings of Jesus, when the evidence is merely 'Semitic' in general, or, worse still, derived from some other Semitic language, e.g., Hebrew, should no longer be countenanced. In other words, the discussion of the Aramaic background of the NT should be limited to Aramaic evidence, and to Aramaic evidence of the period contemporary with or slightly prior to the composition of the Greek New Testament writings themselves."

[27] Fitzmyer (1981-5:114) proposes, "the Semitisms of Lucan Greek which are found in the LXX should be frankly labeled as 'Septuagintisms,' only those that are not should be sorted out as true Aramaisms or Hebraisms." Moreover, he (1981:125) also posits, "Whatever one wants to say about the alleged Semitisms in Luke's Greek, one has in the long run to reckon with a great deal of influence from the LXX."

[28] He (1979:40) admits Semitic interference. In the case of verbs, he (1981:114-25) regards ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε, and ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων as Septuagintalisms and ἤρξατο λέγειν as a Aramaism because the former expressions occur in Septuagint whereas the latter style does not. Furthermore, to the list of Septuagintalisms of Luke he (1998:115) adds some instances of Acts such as ἀναστάς εἶπεν, ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον, and ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες. However, these verbs

stories about Jesus because they are Septuagintalisms. He (1998:91) mentions, "The fact that they are drawn from the LXX in most instances reveals that they cannot be ascribed to a source that would have been written in Aramaic." Consequently, he also assumes the linguistic interdirectionality hypothesis that SemTrads are earlier than GkTrads.

However, his two drawbacks can be leveled. (1) Although he takes bilingualism of first-century Palestine into account seriously, his view of linguistic transmission is still unilinear and unidirectional from Aramaic into Greek. If he admits the maximal view of bilingualism of first-century Palestine (i.e. both lower-status and rural bilingualism; §2.3 & chapter 3),[29] he would have been better to have considered the other three interdirectional possibilities of the linguistic transmission of J&GTrads. (2) His view of contact-induced syntactic change of NT Greek (i.e. Semitisms or Septuagintalisms) seems to exclude the possibility of internal-induced syntactic change (cf. chapter 6). Despite his maximal view of bilingualism, his argument is still based on the unidirectionality hypothesis. This implies that the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis is quite common among NT scholars.

Accordingly, the proponents for the Aramaic language as a criterion should have taken the bilingualism of first-century P&RNE into consideration seriously. The bilingualism hypothesis lends support to the notion that the linguistic transmission is not teleological, unilinear, and unidirectional but hybrid and interdirectional.

1.4.2 Greek Language as a Criterion

Bilingualism of first-century Palestine has promoted another possible view. It causes some scholars to pay their attention to a "different original language" in relation to the authenticity of sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus. The proponents have argued that

---

will be considered as grammatical polysemies due to internal-induced syntactic change (chapter 6).

[29] Fitzmyer (1979:39) mentions "an extensive Aramaic literary activity and an Aramaic literature" in first-century Palestine.

if Jesus was a bilingual and the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine was bilingualism, the original language of some JTrad was performed in Greek. In this regard, what is significant in their arguments is that one of the criteria of authenticity (i.e. Semitisms) should be reexamined. However, they hold still the teleological and unidirectional view that the GkTrad Jesus spoke is the last stage. If the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine was bilingual, they should have considered that JTrad in Greek must have been translated into Aramaic as well.

1.4.2.1 Alexander Roberts

Accepting bilingualism of first-century Palestine Roberts (1888) left a hefty book to deal with the language of Jesus and his disciples in detail. He (1888:105, 400) suggests that although Aramaic was the domestic language, Jesus and his apostles knew Greek as much as their contemporaries in Judaeo-Palestine did. He seems to assume that Jesus and his contemporaries were nearly balanced bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek (cf. §2.1.8). With regard to Jesus' audience, he (1888:144) mentions that it is Greek that a public teacher typically used and the audience habitually supposed to be addressed.

Roberts (1888:145-73) demonstrates six special proofs from the Gospels that Greek was the prevailing language of first-century Judaeo-Palestine, which has, to date, recurred to arguments in the same line. (1) In the case of the Sermon of the Mount, the crowd who came from Galilee and the Decapolis and Jerusalem and Judea and from beyond the Jordan (Mt4:25) spoke Greek. (2) As regards the conversation of Christ with the woman of Samaria, the residents of Samaria spoke Greek. (3) The Greeks who asked to see Jesus (Jn12:20-21) spoke Greek and Philip, Andrew, and Peter must have spoken Greek. (4) The situation of Pilate's intercourse with Christ (Mt27:11-14) implies that Pilate spoke Greek to Jesus without interpreters. Also the picture implies that Pilate understands what the people of

the Jewish crowd cry and has conversation with the Jewish multitude without interpreters (Mk15:8; Jn18:38-40, 19:4-7; cf. Lk23:13-14). (5) Incident connected with the Crucifixion that Jews around the cross confused the cry on the cross with the calling of Elias (Mt27:47-49; Mk15:35-36) implies that the Jews did not know Hebrew or Aramaic but were familiar with Greek. (6) In the conversation of Christ with Mary Magdalene (Jn20:16), Jesus probably called Mary *Mariam* (Hebrew name) because she called Jesus *Rabboni*. Special attention should be taken to the point that he applies the concept of codeswitching to the interpretation of these two Semitic names (for codeswitching, see §8.1.2). Roberts (1888:171) notes, "We see at once a beauty and significance in the employment and preservation of these Hebrew terms if the rest of the conversation was in Greek." He continues, "If it be supposed that the language used by Christ and Mary throughout was Hebrew, the meaning of these isolated expressions being retained in that tongue entirely disappears."[30] Based on the six episodes from the Gospels, Roberts assumes that Jesus spoke Greek because his conversational partners spoke Greek.

In relation to ArmTrad Roberts assumes that there were no Aramaic written materials since there were no Aramaic written versions in first-century Palestine. He (1888:143-4) asked, "Is it granted that neither could a written Aramaic version have constituted these Scriptures, since there is no reason to believe that any such version ever existed?"[31] This implies that the sayings by Jesus and the stories about Jesus have been preserved in Greek without translation from the start. Consequently, with regard to transmission of JTrad he (1888:480-1) suggests that the Gospels in Greek reflect *ipsissima*

---

[30] This concept of intentional language change (i.e. codeswitching) is found in Abbott, the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, and Birkeland (§8.1.2).

[31] He (1888:483-4) even mentions, "instead of having to study a comparatively poor and unattractive language like the Syriac, in order to have the satisfaction of becoming acquainted with something like the expressions employed by our Redeemer, we have only to open our Greek New Testament to find still preserved to us, in living reality, the very words which issued from His lips." He (1888:485-6), furthermore, alludes that if Jesus spoke Aramaic, he could not have made a distinction between φιλέω (Jn11:3, 5, 21:15-17) and ἀγαπάω and between πέτρος and πέτρα. However, admittedly, General Linguistics proposed by de Saussure suggests that this view of a language is unconvincing.

verba Jesu graeca as a whole except for some Semitic embedded words used as codeswitchings (cf. §8.1.1).

However, above all, it has widely been assumed that Jesus was a dominant bilingual (§2.1.8) and that Jesus and his contemporaries usually spoke Aramaic as their matrix language and Greek as their embedded language (chapter 3). The extreme view of Jesus' Greek as a matrix language has not been supported any longer among scholars. Second, ArmEmWords employed in the Gospels (i.e. codeswitching) imply that Jesus spoke Aramaic as his matrix language because they are everyday expressions (cf. §8.3.2). The biggest drawback, lastly, is related to transmission of JTrad. He should have taken transmission of JTrad in a bilingual context into consideration seriously. If the first-century Palestine was bilingualism, the GkTrad Jesus spoke must have been translated into Aramaic during Jesus' historical ministry and continuing thereafter. It is hard to single out of *ipsissima verba* on the lips of Jesus from GTrad, no matter which language Jesus spoke.[32] This disadvantage has repeated in arguments of the scholars who hold *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca*.

1.4.2.2 Aubrey Argyle

Unlike Roberts's extreme view of Greek as Jesus' matrix language, Argyle (1955b:92) suggests that Jesus who brought up in Galilee spoke Greek as his embedded language.[33] His Greek competence is adduced by his quotations from the Septuagint (Mt 4:1-11, Lk 4:1-13, and Mt 5:39-40 / Is50:6-8), his teaching (*iota* at Mt 5:18), and conversation with Greek speakers (Mt 4:25, Mk 3:7-8, 7:26, Lk 6:17, Jn 7:35, 12:21; cf. §3.2.6). Also at

---

[32] Fitzmyer (1992:63) also suggests, "there is no way to sort out what he might have taught in Greek from what we have inherited in the Greek tradition of the Gospels."

[33] For his view of the NT Greek as Hellenistic Greek with some Semitisms and Septuagintalisms, see chapter 6.

least five out of his twelve disciples (e.g. Peter, Andrew, James, John, and Levi) could speak Greek too.[34] Also he (1955b:93) mentions, "He and His disciples may often have conversed in Greek." Concerning linguistic transmission he (1955b:93) suggests two major points. As to GkTrad, "If in places we are reading the language He spoke, it is possible that we are reading His actual words." This leads to his assumption that "it is a mistake to assume that there must be Aramaic behind *all* His words" (his emphasis). Consequently, he (1955b:93) posits, "In some cases we may have direct access to the original utterances of our Lord." However, he should have considered that the GkTrad Jesus spoke could have been translated into ArmTrad because the linguistic milieu of Galilee was bilingual, as he consents.[35]

1.4.2.3 Robert Gundry

Robert Gundry (1964:404-8) tries to relate trilingualism of first-century Palestine to *ipsissima verba* of Jesus and transmission of JTrad in more detail. According to him (1964:405-7), archaeological data prove the trilingualism of first-century Palestine, that is, all three languages were commonly used by Palestinian Jews, especially Galileans. He (1964:407) notes, "Jesus the Galilean and the apostles, who were predominantly if not exclusively Galilean, commonly used Greek in addition to the Semitic tongues." As to sayings by Jesus he (1964:408) suggests, "Many may, in fact, be identical with dominical sayings originally spoken in Greek. This means that "many of the dominical sayings in the present Greek text of the gospels may be closer to the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus than has been

---

[34] He (1955b:93) suggests that many inhabitants of Galilee would speak Greek. In order that the four disciples sold their fish in Gentile market and that Levi was engaged in Government employ they could speak Greek (cf. §3.2.4; §3.2.6).

[35] Interestingly, Ross (1990:41-7) suggests that Jesus spoke Greek and Aramaic in his teachings. Some constructions in Greek Jesus spoke (ἐπιούσιον and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) were preserved because Jesus chose the words. However, he also maintains the linguistic unidirectionality of JTrad. If the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine was bilingual, as he suggests, the GkTrad Jesus spoke should have been translated into Aramaic and ArmTrad which had been translated from GkTrad must have been circulated in Aramaic-matrix Galileans as well.

supposed" (1964:408). Taking a further step, Gundry assumes that JTrad was transmitted in three languages in Palestine, although it is not detailed. He (1964:408) proposes, "The tradition about Jesus was expressed from the very first in Hebrew, Aramaic *and Greek*" (his emphasis). Consequently, he (1964:408; cf. 404) persuasively concludes by writing that "even the presence of Semitisms does not necessarily indicate an Aramaic (or Hebrew) substratum."

However, his view of multilingual transmission is incomplete like Torrey (§1.4.1.1). Gundry does not mention the possibility that JTrad in Greek was translated into Aramaic. He assumes that the SynGs in Greek is a terminus. In this respect, his view is still unidirectional because if the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine is bilingual, GkTrad and GkGospels would most likely have been translated into Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix speakers as well. And the ArmTrad and ArmGospels translated from Greek could have been retranslated to Greek. Accordingly, although he persuasively suggests multilingual transmission of JTrad based on trilingualism, it is regrettable that Gundry did not develop this view any more; nor has any other scholar paid attention to this multilingual transmission in detail.

1.4.2.4 Stanley Porter

Describing the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine as multilingualism (i.e. Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin), Porter (2000a:134) assumes that Jesus was a bilingual in Aramaic as his first language and Greek (or Hebrew) as his second language. Illustrating five criteria for authenticity of the historical Jesus[36] he follows Argyle's argument (§1.4.2.2). That is, he (2000a:89-100, 126-180) is skeptical about Aramaic language as a criterion that SemTrad lies behind all Gospels in Greek. Instead, he (2000a: 142-3) tries to add Greek

[36] The five criteria are double dissimilarity, least distinctiveness, coherence or consistency, multiple attestation, and Semitic language phenomena.

language to a criterion for authenticity. In relation to Greek linguistic criterion, he (2000a:143-63; summarized at 158) suggests that seven episodes[37] might have been *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* on the basis of three caveats; participants and their backgrounds, context and theme of discussion, and determination of the words of Jesus. The Greek linguistic criterion leads to the assumption that "all seven of these episodes are seen historically plausible as authentic to the Jesus tradition, at least in so far as the conversation taking place in Greek is concerned" (2000a:159).[38] In this respect, the relationship between the preserved GkTrads Jesus spoke and linguistic transmission of JTrad is of significance, to some extent, as he (2000a:164) proposes:

> The corrective value of this criterion for historical-Jesus research is that we should not reject any words or episode as inauthentic, or as the creation of a later Greek-speaking Church, simply because they appear to have been spoken in Greek or were spoken in a Greek-speaking environment, or were spoken to those who appear to have been themselves Greek-speaking.

That GkTrad can be used as a corrective method is of significance. However, his view is inconsistent like Roberts. He supposes that GkTrad is the last stage despite bilingual context. The assumed *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* must have been translated into Aramaic in

---

[37] Porter suggests seven passages: (i) Mt. 8:5-13 = Jn 4:46-54: Jesus' conversation with the centurion or commander (but the Johannine account diverges in terms of wording) (ii) Jn4:4-26: Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman (iii) Mk2:13-14 = Mt9:9 = Lk5:27-28 Jesus' calling of Levi/Matthew (iv) Mk 7:25-30 = Mt15:21-28 Jesus' conversion with the Syrophoenician or Cannaanite woman (v) Mk12:13-17 = Mt 22:16-22 = Lk 20:20-26 Jesus' conversation with the Pharisees and Herodians over the Roman coin of Caesar (vi) Mk8:27-30 = Mt16:13-20 = Lk9:18-21 Jesus' conversation with his disciples at Caesarea Philippi (vii) Mk15:2-5 = Mt27:11-14 = Lk23:2-4 = Jn18:29-38 Jesus' trial before Pilate. The number of GkTrad Jesus spoke is increasing; he has illustrated four passages; (i) Mk 7:25-30 (ii) Jn 12:20-28 (iii) Mt 8:5-13 = Lk 7:2-10 (iv) Mk 15:2-5 = Mt 27:11-14 = Lk 23:2-5 = Jn 18:29-38 (1994:149-53; cf. 1997:111-2).

[38] The argument that Jesus used Greek when he spoke to his Greek-speaking partners has already discussed in detail by Roberts (§1.4.2.1). Reviewing Porter's publication (2000a), Fitzmyer (2001:412) persuasively criticizes a limitation of the Greek linguistic criterion, saying, "the limited number of sayings, a mere seven, to which the criterion of the Greek language can be applied leaves a huge question: What about all the others preserved in Greek in the four Gospels?"

Aramaic-matrix speakers in P&RNE rather than they were *preserved without translation into Aramaic* until they would be delivered to the evangelists. In this respect, it is uncertain whether the assumed six GkTrads were directly delivered from the very GkTrad Jesus spoke or retranslated from ArmTrads which had already been translated from Greek. As a result, he would be faced with the same criticism that he intensely criticizes that ArmTrad cannot be reconstructed from GkTrad. This is so because "much of this examination has neglected a number of crucial linguistic factors regarding translation between Greek and Aramaic" (Porter 2000a:93-4). Hence, it is hard to say that the six GkTrads we have are *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* when bilingualism of first-century Palestine is taken into consideration seriously. Porter also takes teleological and unidirectional view. Accordingly, in terms of the transmission of JTrad, the proponents of "Greek language as a criterion" could not overcome the linguistic unidirectional hypothesis as well. In other words, their arguments are inconsistent because it is teleological view that ArmTrad was translated into Greek whereas GkTrad was preserved in bilingual contexts.

In summary, scholars have discussed the linguistic transmission of J&GTrads from the two perspectives of Aramaic language as a criterion and Greek language as a criterion. Unfortunately, the former is based on monolingualism of first-century P&RNE. The latter and Fitzmyer take the incomplete bilingualism of first-century P&RNE. As a result, both proponents presuppose that J&GTrads were transmitted from Aramaic into Greek in a teleological, unilinear, and unidirectional way. Both groups can be called linguistic unidirectionalists.

1.5 Interdirectionality Hypothesis

As we have seen from 1.1 to 1.4, many scholars have assumed the unidirectional transmission hypothesis. The J&GTrads were unidirectionally transmitted from Judaeo-

Palestinian into Hellenistic, oral into written, and Aramaic into Greek. However, all scholars have not followed the unidirectionality hypotheses. It is intriguing that some scholars have raised the possibility of the interdirectional transmission, although their concepts are not clear. In this chapter, I will review their arguments in relation to interdirectionality hypothesis. Concerning the possibility of the interdirectional transmission between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic tradition has consistently been raised by Martin Hengel (§1.5.1). Modal interdirectionality between Oral&WrittenTrad has been raised by two scholars (§1.5.2). Lastly, Sanders suggests the relationship between linguistic directionality and temporal priority (§1.5.3).

1.5.1 The *Sitz im Leben* Interdirectionality between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic Tradition: Martin Hengel

Hengel (1974, 1983, 1986, 1989a, 2001) convincingly proposes that Palestinian Judaism must be designated Hellenistic Judaism so that he successfully dilutes the borderline between Palestinian Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism.[39] This implies that it is difficult to make a clear distinction between Judaeo-Palestinian tradition and Hellenistic tradition. This is so because Judaeo-Palestinian tradition could have kept Hellenistic characteristics. Judaeo-Palestinian tradition does not always have temporal priority over Hellenistic tradition. Unfortunately, in terms of the linguistic directionality Hengel's view of bilingualism of first-century Palestine is incomplete. He admits that some bilinguals could have translated some important terminologies to Greek in the Jerusalem church. It is regrettable that he makes a strict linguistic distinction between Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christians and Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christians in the earliest church in Jerusalem (chapter 5). Consequently,

---

[39] Many scholars have endorsed Hengel's view, which will be often discussed in detail (cf. chapters 2-5).

although he dilutes the *Sitz im Leben* directionality between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic tradition, he still holds the linguistic unidirectionality of J&GTrads.[40]

1.5.2 Modal Interdirectionality between Oral and Written Tradition

Some scholars have assumed the possibility that modal transmission is not unidirectional but interdirectional. Orality was in a dominant position in ancient times (cf. Horsley, Draper, & Foley 2006). This means that the WrittenTrads must have been used as OralTrads again. Consequently, J&GTrads were transmitted in a hybrid, interdirectional way, not in a teleological, unilinear, and unidirectional way. Two scholars will be discussed in brief.[41]

1.5.2.1 Form Criticism: Helmut Koester

Koester has supposed that J&GTrads were interdirectionally transmitted between Oral&WrittenTrad, to some extent, in his major publications (1957:65; 1971:158-204, esp. 163-6; 1990; 1994: 293-297). However, his argument is still based on unidirectional transmission hypothesis. He (1994:297) suggests that after 2 Clement had been written, the

---

[40] He (1974:104) implies two points of directionality of transmission: "Hellenism also gained ground as an intellectual power in Jewish Palestine early and tenaciously. From this perspective the usual distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism needs to be corrected. ... from about the middle of the third century BC all Judaism must really be designated 'Hellenistic Judaism' in the strict sense, and a better differentiation could be made between the Greek-speaking Judaism of the Western Diaspora and the Aramaic/Hebrew-speaking Judaism of Palestine and Babylonia." This implies his inconsistent view of directionalities. Hengel accepts the possibility of *Sitz im Leben* interdirectionality but posits the linguistic unidirectionality from Aramaic to Greek.

[41] More recently, the number of scholars who hold the possibility of the modal interdirectionality is increasing. David Parker (1997) and Harry Gamble (2004) should be added to the list. The former suggests the interdirectional transmission between Oral&WrittenTrad from the perspective of textual criticism. The latter proposes the interplay between Oral&WrittenTrad by means of oral reproduction in the Christian worship and reading codices aloud. In relation to Rabbinic teachers, Jaffe posits that textual compositions would have changed to reoralization. He (2001:124) notes that there was "a continuous loop of manuscript and performance." This means that "original" texts are irrecoverable. Robbins (2006:146) also suggests, "When the early Christian prophetic register is present, an intermingling of multiple voices of authority that feature a dynamic interplay of

document was used orally once again in the churches. Given that this is the case, it is incoherent that he suggests that some literature (i.e. the canonical Gospels) remained in written forms whereas others (e.g. 2 Clement) were interdirectionally transmitted. If he assumes that the OralTrad continuously functions as a primary medium up to four Christian generations, he would have been better to have considered that the GofMk which had been already documented was still circulated in oral forms as well as in written forms up to four Christian centuries. Accordingly, despite his assumption of the modal interdirectionality of 2 Clement, Koester can not completely break himself from the traditional view of form criticism, that is, the modal unidirectionality of transmission of J&GTrads from the oral into the written.

1.5.2.2 The Scandinavian School: Samuel Byrskog

Byrskog (2000) lays emphasis on two points; one is a stress on eyewitnesses who play a leading part in shaping OralTrad as a result of comparison with Jewish and Hellenistic literatures. The other point is the relation between orality and literacy. He persuasively explains the relation of literacy to orality as re-oralization, unlike Kelber who looks upon the two media as tension. Byrskog (2000:143) convincingly proposes, "This constant interaction of written and oral material in a process of re-oralisation is thus an essential ingredient of the GTrad during all stages of its formation." However, he is still of the literacy-centred opinion that the directionality of transmission is unilinear from oral into written.

1.5.3 The Linguistic Interdirectionality between Semitic and Greek Tradition: E. P. Sanders

---

orality and literature is, as one might say, the order of the day."

As mentioned before, Torrey (§1.4.1.1) and Gundry (§1.4.2.3) may assume the linguistic interdirectional transmission, to some extent. Analyzing syntactic Semitisms in the SynTrads,[42] Sanders (1969) demonstrates that Matthew keeps the highest overall percentage of Semitisms, Luke next and Mark least, unlike the assumption that scholars have thought before. Also he (1969:199, 298) raises the possibility that Semitisms do not result from "remnants of the original" but from re-introduction into the Greek. He (1969:199) convincingly claims, "There is not necessarily a positive correlation between Semitisms and antiquity. An early tradition could have Hellenistic coloring while a late one could have Semitic coloring." In other words, Semitisms do not prove the temporal priority of any text or tradition. However, the Semitisms Sanders analyzed could have been used by contemporary non-biblical Greek writers in ancient times. This means that most of them might not have been Semitisms, although he examined the frequency of the Semitisms. It is regrettable that Sanders also dealt with tendencies of the SynTrad from the monolingual view of first-century Palestine.[43] If he took bilingualism into account seriously, his argument would have been more consistent.

1.5.4 Interdirectionality Hypotheses and Gospel Studies

The scholars mentioned have presupposed the three unidirectionality hypotheses in relation to Gospel Studies whether they have recognized or not (§1.1 – §1.4). J&GTrads were transmitted from Judaeo-Palestinian to Hellenistic, from oral to written, and from Aramaic to Greek. The directionalities are unidirectional and not ever *vice versa*. The three

---

[42] He examines καί parataxis, historic present, the use of εἰς for τις, and wording made more Semitic.

[43] He (1969:203-4; here 203) mentions bilingualism, saying "many of the Christians who handed down traditions in such churches as the one in Syrian Antioch were bilingual and may have introduced Aramaisms into the Greek traditions." He does not take bilingualism of first-century

unidirectionalities have functioned as criteria to decide temporal priority in Gospel Studies. The former three traditions have been regarded as earlier than the latter three. Furthermore, the unidirectionality hypotheses have deeply been related to major issues of Gospels Studies: the Synoptic Problem, the Historical Jesus, provenances of the Gospels and Acts, textual criticism of the Gospels and Acts, etc.

However, a few scholars have doubted the three presuppositions (§1.5.1 – §1.5.3). Hengel has cogently persuaded scholars to consider that we cannot make a sharp distinction between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic tradition since there was no sharp distinction between Palestinian Judaism and Diaspora Judaism. His view has been approved by many scholars (n.39). Many scholars who applied orality theory to Gospel Studies have posited that WrittenTrads were not end-product of OralTrads and that J&GTrads were interdirectionally transmitted between OralTrads and WrittenTrads (§1.5.2). Lastly, Sanders suggests that Semitisms do not prove temporal priority.

Nevertheless, even the scholars have not accepted all three interdirectionality hypotheses. They also have not tried to relate the interdirectionality hypotheses to transmission of J&GTrads in full-dressed discussion. These are because they do not take bilingualism of first-century P&RNE into consideration seriously. The bilingualism of first-century P&RNE should be studied in relation to transmission of J&GTrads (chapter 2). The study of bilingualism of first-century P&RNE (chapters 3-5) will dilute the borderlines between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic tradition, Oral&WrittenTrad, and Arm&GkTrad. The bilingualism will support the interdirectionality hypotheses rather than unidirectionality hypotheses.

In this respect, I will investigate the three interdirectionality hypotheses focusing on the linguistic interdirectionality hypothesis. There are two reasons. First, as we examined (§1.5.1 – §1.5.3), many scholars have raised the possibilities of the *Sitz im Leben* and the

---

Palestine into consideration.

modal interdirectionality hypotheses and many scholars have approved the two interdirectionality hypotheses. However, the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis from Aramaic to Greek remains unchallenged. Second, the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis has functioned as a foundation for both *Sitz im Leben* and modal unidirectionalities.[44]

Accordingly, the study of bilingualism related to linguistic directionality of transmission of J&GTrads is urgently required. In Part I, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE will be described (chapters 2-4). And bilingualism of the earliest church in Jerusalem will be discussed (chapter 5). In Part II, on the interdirectionality hypotheses I will discuss the arguments of J&GTrads at the levels of Syntax (chapter 6), Phonology (chapter 7), and Semantics (chapter 8).

---

[44] The criterion to distinguish Judaeo-Palestinian from Hellenistic tradition depends on the linguistic distinction between Arm&GkTrad (§1.2). Many scholars assume that OralTrads are Aramaic whereas WrittenTrads are Greek. In this respect, the modal distinction depends on the linguistic distinction (n.3).

Part I Bilingualism of First-Century Palestine and the Roman Near East

As surveyed before (chapter 1), most scholars presuppose the unidirectional hypothesis, that is, the JTrad is transmitted from Semitic into Greek, oral into written, and Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic. However, when the study of bilingualism is deeply investigated, the unidirectional hypothesis should be reconsidered. In this regard, bilingualism in relation to the directionality of the transmission of JTrad will be explored in Part I. First of all, comparing bilingualism with diglossia it will be suggested that the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine should be considered as bilingualism not as diglossia (chapter 2). Regional bilingualism of first-century Palestine and Diaspora will be examined (chapters 3 & 4, respectively). Communal bilingualism of the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem will be investigated (chapter 5).

2. Bilingualism and Diglossia

Although many NT scholars have frequently acknowledged the bilingual milieu of first-century Palestine, investigated in chapter 1, some have tried to relate the linguistic circumstances to the transmission of stories about Jesus and sayings by Jesus. However, a concerted investigation of the relationship between bilingualism and Gospel transmission, in terms of linguistics, has not yet been attempted. Indeed, it was not until the early 1960s that linguistic scholars moved beyond general linguistics[45] to focus on the sociolinguistic issue of bilingualism itself.[46] Furthermore, biblical scholars who consider these issues have often

---

[45] Chambers (1995:25-33) suggests two linguistic approaches to science of language; one is an empirical methodology focusing on "parole"; the other is rational methodology stressing on "langue" according to Saussure's term. Generally speaking, this is called "general linguistics," whereas that is called "sociolinguistics," "anthropological linguistics," "cognitive linguistics," or "neurolinguistics"; cf. Reed 2000:121-9.

[46] Coulmas 1997:1. Mackey (1968:554) mentions, "*bilingualism* is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use. It is not a feature of the code but of the message. It does not belong to the domain of 'langue' but of 'parole.'"

eschewed issues of bilingualism and thought of it as an issue subsidiary to the larger question of the authorship of certain NT writings or the language(s) of Jesus.[47]

The study of ancient bilingualism, especially bilingualism of first-century Palestine, is subject to three difficulties. First, although it is difficult to define precisely what a "language" is in modern times, it is even more challenging to do so in the ancient world. For instance, no matter how some modern biblical scholars have drawn such a distinction, how one differentiates between a "language" and a "dialect" in antiquity is ambiguous and cannot be located with any precision on a scale (Rabin 1976:1008). Taylor (2002:303) comments on this in regard to Aramaic dialects: "studies of language contact suggest that at the boundaries between different dialects there will have been intermediate forms containing some features of both." Some care should be taken, however, to form distinctions between language and dialect. Secondly, different designations used in ancient texts to refer to a language have caused serious confusion for modern scholars. In antiquity, it was possible for the same language to be referred to by different designations in different regions, a tendency noted by Rabin (1976:1008-9). Butcher too, for instance, enumerates that some ancient authors indicate different meanings when they use "Syriac" and "Arabic."[48] Noteworthy as well, one finds the same sort of discrepancy when ancient writers refer to ancient cities. The Ptolemaic city of Alexandria was occasionally called Babylonia (Neusner 1984:39). Thirdly, a paucity of extant language data from the period of concern is problematic. When this data is applied to spoken languages in ancient times, one can hardly detect any literary trace (Cotton 2005:151-2). The survival of extant materials sometimes may reflect speakers' ideology (Cotton 2005:152). It is necessary to compare the linguistic circumstances of analogous modern linguistic situations. Contemporary language settings clearly provide data

---

[47] For instance, see §2.2; §2.3. Acceptance to the term among biblical scholars also took time; see the change of Hengel's designations (n.313).

[48] Butcher 2003:270-2. Tcherikover (*CPJ* 1.5) also mentions that "Syrians" sometimes refer to "Jews." For various references to Phoenicia, see Muhly 1970:19-64.

that one may attempt to use in order to create theoretical models. These models may then assist in the evaluation of ancient linguistic contexts and allow a more confident approach to linguistics in the past (Paulston 2000:83).

Recently, unlike general linguists, specialists in the areas of sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, anthropological linguistics, and neurolinguistics have produced a significant number of studies related to bilingualism. Other areas of research such as archaeology, sociology, neuroscience and classical studies have helped NT scholars to gain easier access to information about bilingualism in first-century Palestine and the Roman Empire. Significant for the present conversation, several classicists have recently investigated the linguistic phenomenon of bilingualism [49] and the consequences of bilingualism.[50] Fewster (2002:220) discusses the significance of the subject for the field, stating that "bilingualism is a lively subject, both in linguistics and, particularly in recent times, in classics." Horsley (*ND* 5.19) also proposes that bilingual theory has a lot to offer to our understanding of language in antiquity. Just as in the field of classics, the study of bilingualism of the ancient texts would provide NT scholars with a significant tool to research biblical texts. To address the question of bilingualism in antiquity is, therefore, an interdisciplinary enterprise.

2.1 Definitions

Some sociolinguistic terms related to bilingualism may be used in a variety of ways and are often ill-defined. It is necessary to make clear how certain linguistic terms are used in this thesis. Furthermore, there are difficulties applying modern definitions to

---

[49] Especially, see bibliographies of the following two books: Adams 2003 and Adams *et al.* 2002.

[50] Language contact results in some linguistic phenomena; phonological level (transliteration), syntactic level (interference), and semantic level (interference, borrowing and codeswitching); see Adams 2003: *passim*. I will deal with these points in chapters 6, 7, and 8.

linguistic situations of late-antiquity. Large gaps that one must contend with relate especially to issues such as language education, literacy, and communication vehicles. With these points in mind, caution will be taken when describing how terms and definitions will be used and applied in the chapters to follow.

2.1.1 Bilingualism

Just as bilingualism existed in ancient times so too does it in the present. Bilingualism can be called a cross-linguistic phenomenon insofar as it is found in most areas of the world. As linguistic statistics proves,[51] bilingualism is a natural phenomenon in the world (Hoffmann 1991:1). As Mackey (1967:11) rightly points out, bilingualism is "far from being exceptional, [and] is a problem which affects the majority of the world's population." Although bilingualism appears self-evident, definitions of bilingualism vary depending on each scholar's criteria of what "proficiency" in a second language means and the degree to which one must know it.[52] Generally speaking, at one end of the definition spectrum one of the greatest American linguists, Bloomfield (1933:56), considers bilingualism as "native-like control of two languages." He thinks of bilingualism as a high level of proficiency in two languages (i.e. maximalist position). Hakuta (1986: 4) properly contends, "native-like control is difficult to define, and very few people who would generally be considered bilingual have anything resembling native-like control of both languages." Diebold (1961:99) offers a minimalist definition of bilingualism: a person can be called a bilingual even if they have no efficient control over two languages, but do have "a highly atomistic knowledge of the second language." This view he calls "incipient bilingualism," which is

---

[51] Hoffmann 1991:2-3. Explaining the reason of bilingualism, she mentions, "there are an estimated 5,000 tongues in the world, but only some 190 states, so it follows that many countries must contain many different languages, i.e. be multilingual. Approximately, 95 percent of the world's population are speakers of the 100 most frequently used languages... for many countries bilingualism is a normal requirement for daily communication and not a sign of any particular achievement."

also generally known as "semibilingualism."[53] However, one disadvantage of the minimal proficiency definition is that practically everyone in UK, USA, Canada, and many countries can be considered bilingual, because everyone can know a few words in another language (Romaine 1995:11). Mackey's definition is more attractive for the present discussion. He (1968:554-84) regards bilingualism simply as: the alternate use of two or more languages (cf. Weinreich 1963:1). Most specialists agree that this is a well-balanced view (Romaine 1995:12).

The definition of bilingualism faces similar problems among NT scholars. The extent of bilinguality[54] and who can be called a bilingual is an obstacle to biblical scholars and appears to cause hesitation in taking part in a more full-blown discussion of bilingualism of the NT (see *ND* 5.24). For most biblical scholars, it seems that bilingualism is generally accepted as native fluency to such a high degree that one can "equally" control two or more languages. The maximalist position is accepted virtually without challenge. If we follow this Bloomfield-like definition, very few bilinguals are found in the NT at all. If we take a Diebold-like definition, almost all Jews of first-century Palestine are to be considered bilinguals. If we take either extreme definition, the study of bilingualism in first-century Palestine would become meaningless. In the pages to follow I will follow the definition provided by Mackey.

2.1.2 Bilingual Community

---

[52] It is very difficult to define "bilingualism" in many aspects; see Hamers 1989:6-7.

[53] "Semibilingualism" is also called "passive bilingualism," or "receptive bilingualism." For the sake of easy understanding of NT scholars, I will use "semibilingualism" in this thesis. Furthermore, Horsley (*ND* 5.24-5) makes a distinction between "receptive" and "productive" bilingualism. However, he should have discussed the terms in relation to ancient literacy and orality. For the basic concepts of the terms in modern times are different from those of ancient times. In other words, it is well-known that the distinction between Greeks and non-Greeks depends on speaking Greek, not on writing Greek in ancient times. In this respect, bilingualism in ancient times does not mean biliteracy; refer to Spolsky 1983:100-7. Furthermore, for the same reason Jonathan Watt's argument is not persuasive (§2.2.6).

[54] The term "bilingualism" is also called "bilinguality" in the sense of proficiency. When proficiency is stressed, bilinguality will be used but it is same meaning with bilingualism.

It is necessary also to define what is meant when speaking of a "bilingual community." For instance, is it only when every member of a community is bilingual that one should label it a bilingual community? If we follow this definition, there may be very few communities that could be labeled as bilingual. If only a certain percent need to be bilingual, then what percentage point tips the balance moving the entire society to be called bilingual? On this point, the definition of Hamers & Blanc (1989:12) will help to bring greater precision to the discussion of bilingual communities:

> Every bilingual community is situated between the two poles of a continuum, ranging from a set made up of two unilingual groups each containing a small number of bilinguals, to a single group with a more or less large number of members using a second language for specific purposes. At one pole most speakers in each group use only one language for all functions, whereas at the other a varying number of speakers use both languages but for different purposes.

This definition will be applied to the discussion of linguistic communities of first-century Roman Empire.

2.1.3 Bilingualism and Multilingualism

Generally speaking, scholars do not distinguish between "bilingualism" and "multilingualism,"[55] because the definition of "bilingualism" itself is generally referred to as

---

[55] It seems that the term "multilingualism" is derived from Galen's use of δίγλωττος and πολύγλωττος rather than from Plutarch's use of δίγλωττος in the sense of "interpreter"; see Janse 2002:334.

the "linguistic competence of two or *more* languages."[56] In this sense, "bilingualism" will be used when referring to bilingualism or multilingualism, and specific instances of *multi*linguality will be emphasized (with italics).

2.1.4 Early Bilingualism vs. Late Bilingualism

The age at which one acquires the second language results in a striking difference in the level of proficiency. This is referred to as the "critical period hypothesis" (Hoffmann 1991:18, 36-7; Paradis 2004:59-60). A recent neuroscientific experiment in the prestigious journal *Nature* explores this idea:

> We applied functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to determine the spatial relationship between native and second languages in the human cortex, and show that within the frontal-lobe language-sensitive regions (Broca's area), second languages acquired in adulthood ('late' bilingual subjects) are spatially separated from native languages. However, when acquired during the early language acquisition stage of development ('early' bilingual subjects), native and second languages tend to be represented in common frontal cortical areas.[57]

These researchers (Kim *et al.* 1997:173) also propose that the "age of language acquisition may be a significant factor in determining the functional organization of this area in human brain." Generally known is that an "early" bilingual means that someone acquires

---

[56] Weinreich 1963:1 (his emphasis); also refer to Beardsmore 1982:4; Romaine 1995:12.

[57] Kim, Relkin, Lee, and Hirsch 1997:171. Cf. Their subjects participated with are explained as follows (p. 174): "The mean age of subjects was 29.3 (±4.2) years. Six subjects ('early' bilinguals) were exposed to two languages during infancy, and six subjects ('late' bilinguals) were exposed to a second language in early adulthood. The mean age of initial exposure to the second language was 11.2 (±1.5) years and the mean age that conversational fluency was achieved was 19.2 (±4.1) years. Each of the 'late' bilingual subjects had lived in the country of the second language, which assured a high standard for fluency."

the second language between the ages of 3-4, whereas a "late" bilingual after the ages of 11 or 12.[58] The result of the above experiment indicates that "early" bilinguals use their second and foreign languages like their first language, whereas "late" bilinguals cannot use their second language like first language at the levels of phonology and syntax (Hoffmann 1991:36-7), although the phonological and syntactic competence had developed *in close proximity*, as if their extent were limited by some factor like an inhibitory radius. Accordingly, a distinction between "early" and "late" bilinguals should be made.

2.1.5 Primary Bilingualism vs. Acquired Bilingualism

To be a bilingual in terms of "context," according to Hoffmann (1991:18), "the infant/child who acquires two languages from the speakers around him/her in an unstructured way" can be called a "primary" bilingual or a "natural" bilingual.[59] On the

---

[58] Kim, *et al.* 1997:171-4; Perani, *et al.* 1998:1841-1852; Evans, *et al.* 2002:292.

[59] Furthermore, although it is well-known, Horsley's definition of a "primary bilingualism" is not satisfactory. He defines a "primary bilingual" as "a speaker who has picked up a second language by force of circumstances (e.g., from the work environment), without any formal instruction," whereas a "secondary bilingual" refers to "a speaker who has learned a second language via systematic instruction" (*ND* 5.24). On the basis of his definition, he considers that upper-status or urban Jews in the first century could be secondary bilinguals whereas lower-status or rural ones could be primary bilinguals due to less access to formal education. However, the situation is more complicated than Horsley suggests; first of all, his definition omits "age" which is the most significant factor of primary bilinguality (see §2.1.4), despite that, as a matter of fact, even Beardsmore whom Horsley himself quotes (*ND* 5.24) mentions *a child* (Beardsmore 1982:8). As a matter of fact, a primary bilingual of first-century Palestine in Aramaic and Greek means three possibilities. (1) When he/she was an infant or a child, he/she learned two languages in linguistic situation where both Aramaic and Greek were used. (2) When he/she was an infant or a child he/she learned two languages at home from his/her parents. In this case, his/her parent(s) was/were bilingual(s) in Aramaic and Greek or one parent uses one language and other does another. (3) When he/she was an infant or a child he/she learned one language at home from his/her parents and other from people in public without formal education. In this respect, these three possibilities of primary bilingualism refute Horsley's suggestion that "there may be some appropriateness in seeing upper-status, urban Jews as those more likely to be secondary bilinguals, primary bilinguals being those with less access to formal education or who lived in rural areas." In other words, as Horsley mentions that secondary bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek in first-century Palestine belong to upper-status and urban group, primary bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek might be upper-status and urban Jews as well. However, we cannot say that secondary bilinguals always have better proficiency of language performance than primary bilinguals do, as Horsley assumes. For the point of the distinction between "primary" and "secondary" lies in that primary bilinguals use their two languages as mother tongue for they are early bilinguals, whereas secondary bilinguals could use the second language only as school language or cultural language, as Hoffmann points out that secondary bilingualism "involved with formal language teaching at school, during which the learner does not normally have much opportunity to practice the

other hand, an "acquired" bilingual or a "secondary" bilingual refers to "the person who becomes bilingual through systematic or structured instruction (that is, undergoing some kind of training)" (Hoffmann 1991:19).

2.1.6 Oral Bilingualism vs. Literate Bilingualism

It is generally assumed that modern bilinguals refer to those who read/write and speak two or more languages. However, not all bilinguals in ancient times could write or read their matrix language and/or their embedded language.[60] Only those who learn reading and writing could read and write the languages. This divides ancient bilinguals into oral bilinguals and literate bilinguals.

2.1.7 Stages of Bilingualism

Bilingualism itself is not stable.[61] In the progress of time one of two languages in a bilingual situation is always inclined to break the balance of the bilingualism. Younger speakers are inclined to learn and perfect the dominant language, whereas older speakers tend to maintain the balance of the bilingualism with full proficiency in the dominant and recessive languages. In this respect, Sommer (1997:67-8) suggests four phases of gradual development of bilingualism: (1) incipient; (2) integral; (3) progressive; and (4) regressive bilingualism. In this regard, it can be said that in the case of the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine, bilingualism was "progressive bilingualism" in Aramaic and Greek.[62]

---

language outside the classroom environment" (Hoffmann 1991:19).

[60] Modern sociolinguists are not interested in the distinction between oral and literate bilingualism. However, the distinction is of importance to biblical and classical scholars. For more discussion of the difference of bilingualism between in modern times and in ancient times, see Adams 2002:2, 3-7.

[61] Concerning unstableness of bilingualism in detail, see Winford 2003:99.

[62] Before "progressive bilingualism" in Aramaic and Greek, it can be called "regressive bilingualism" in Hebrew and Aramaic.

2.1.8 Balanced Bilingualism vs. Dominant Bilingualism

When considering equivalence, according to Hoffmann (1991:22), "balanced" bilingualism refers to using roughly equal proficiency in both languages. Whereas "dominant" bilingualism means that a bilingual has one stronger language and a weaker one. Hoffmann (1991:22) goes on to comment, "the language a bilingual feels more at home in, the 'preferred language,' may coincide with the dominant one, but this will not necessarily happen in every case."

2.1.9 Matrix Language vs. Embedded Language

In relation to dominant bilingualism, one should give attention to the one-sidedness of bilingualism. For a bilingual is often inclined to one language among the two or more languages. For bilinguals, the dominant language is called the "matrix language" and the less dominant language the "embedded language."[63] Additionally, it should not go without mention that the matrix language of an individual does not always correspond to the dominant language of their bilingual community. For instance, although the expressions, "Aramaic-speakers" and "Greek-speakers" reflect a monolingual context, "Aramaic-matrix speakers" and "Greek-matrix speakers" take bilinguality into account. Aramaic-matrix speakers refer to those who speak Aramaic as their matrix language and their linguistic competences open the possibility that they can speak other language(s) as their embedded language(s).

---

[63] Myers-Scotton 2002:16. Some sociolinguistic scholars may call matrix language "base language" or "L_1." In this respect, ArmEmWords in GkGospels will be considered (chapter 8).

2.1.10 Substratum, Adstratum and Superstratum

Also of concern are terms that show the relationship between languages in bilingual society. Language contact causes language strata to occur in communities and is referred to with words such as substratum, adstratum, and superstratum.[64] In bilingual societies, if one language is dominant culturally, politically, economically, and/or socially, it is called "superstratum." "Substratum" refers to the non-dominant language of the two languages and is the counterpart to a superstratum. If neither of the languages is clearly dominant then the languages are called "adstrata." In a bilingual context, a language shift proceeds to adstratum or superstratum, but not to substratum.

2.1.11 Ancestor, Daughter and Sister Language

When considering the ancestry of language, terms are introduced by the family tree hypothesis in order to show the nature of relatedness of languages. On the basis of evolutionary theory, the hypothesis assumes, "after an ancestor language has split into two or more daughter languages, the speakers of the daughter languages go their separate ways, linguistically and often physically" (Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:27). For instance, Aramaic can be called an ancestor language and daughter languages would then be Palmyrene, Hatran, Syriac, Samaritan, and Christian Palestinian. The relationship between the daughter languages of Aramaic is referred to as sister languages (e.g. Palmyrene is a sister language to

---

[64] Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:141-3, 173-86. In its original use, the three terms are used by historical linguists to explain how language contact causes language change diachronically. They suggest three definitions of them as follows: "adstratum means that one of two (or more) languages spoken within an area by people who maintain their primary language while receiving influences from the other language involved in the contact situation; substratum means that former primary language of a group of speakers who have shifted to their formerly secondary language; and superstratum means that former primary language of a group of speakers who have entered a linguistic community and have been absorbed by that community, giving up their former primary language." However, in this thesis, sociolinguistically, the three terms will be used in the sense of synchronic milieu of first-century Palestine.

Hatran; cf. §4.3.1).

2.2 Diglossia of First-Century Palestine?

First of all, history of research needs to be considered. Many biblical scholars have applied the concept of "diglossia" to a description of the linguistic milieu without regard to bilingualism.[65] If this were not problematic enough, scholars like Spolsky (§2.2.5) and Horsley (n.71) make an obscure distinction between bilingualism and diglossia due to their vague definitions. In this respect, before making observations on bilingualism of first-century Roman Empire and Palestine, applications of the diglossia model to the linguistic milieu scholars have discussed will be considered.

2.2.1 Charles Ferguson

There are many biblical scholars who apply the term diglossia to the linguistic

---

[65] Scholars may apply bilingualism to the biblical languages, even though their approaches are not satisfactory fully; Hengel (see §1.5.1; chapter 5), Gundry and Porter (see §1.4.2), Greg Horsley (*passim*), Silva (*passim*), Schwartz (n.74, *passim*), Casey (*passim*); Vorster (*passim*); Richard Horsley 1996:158-62 (He applied both diglossia and bilingualism to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine. This means that his view is unclear. It should be regarded as bilingualism rather than diglossia); Groom 2003:28-41, and Hezser (*passim*). It is interesting that before discussion about bilingualism was full-fledged among sociolinguistic scholars, Gehman (1951:90) applies bilingualism to an analysis of the linguistic milieu of Alexandrian Jews. Especially, it is striking that Dalman had a recent concept of bilingualism; see §3.2.4. Also it is noteworthy to mention that Dibelius has a view of bilingualism of RNE at that time and he tries to relate bilingualism of RNE to Gospel transmission (§1.2.1; pp. 150-1). Most recently, Loveday Alexander (2005:231-52) applies Furgusonian definition of diglossia to Albert Wifstrand's view of Greek of the NT (Wifstrand 2005 chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) in order to explain the difference between Lucan and Marcan languages on the basis of dialectic difference; for discussion in detail of Wifstrand, see §6.1.5 (This part was omitted for reasons of space). When Alexander (2005:232-42) interprets Wifstrand's approach to relation between Lucan and Marcan language, she considers Lucan Greek as H-code whereas Marcan Greek as L-code. For Lucan Greek is more literary than Marcan Greek. Moreover, she (2005:242-52) regards Lucan Semitism as H-code whereas Marcan Semitisms as L-code. However, it is dubious that the distinction of the features of the H-code (Lucan) and L-code (Marcan) is clearly made, as will be discussed in detail (§2.2; §2.3). And if only one function (e.g. literacy) out of Ferguson's nine functions is necessary for the diglossic situation to exist, then it seems inappropriate for her to have applied the concept of diglossia to compare the two languages, as will be mentioned (§2.2.5). In addition, there are some scholars who may apply diglossia theory to the similar linguistic situation; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein 1978:169-80; Tapani Harviainen 1984:95-113.

milieu of first-century Palestine. Ferguson originally gave inspiration to both biblical and sociolinguistic scholars and will be considered first. He (1959:336) defines diglossia as follows:

> A relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation.

Following this definition of diglossia, Ferguson posits that there are two prerequisites for his application of diglossia: (1) genetic relationship between the two languages on some level (i.e. form) and (2) complementary functional distributions between H-language and L-language (i.e. function). In other words, in relation to "form," he suggests that the languages should be two dialects of the same language or at least genetically related languages. Ferguson (1959:325-340) provides four pairs of examples: spoken Arabic and classical Arabic; Swiss German and standard German; Haitian Creole and standard French; and spoken Greek and literary Greek. As to "function," in diglossic speech-communities he distinguishes H (high) variety from L (low) variety[66] for two languages that are used for different complementary functions. He (1959:328-36) argues that the H variety learned in the context of formal education has more prestige (religious), more literary heritage, a strict standardization, a higher developed syntax, and more complicated morphophonemic

---

[66] Sociolinguistic scholars mix "H-language and H-variety" and "L-language and L-variety."

phonology than the L variety, which is acquired at home.

It is problematic that there are few examples to support Ferguson's pure conditions of form and function. However, despite this, these distinctions of the two languages of diglossia triggered biblical scholars to begin applying the sociolinguistic tool of the study of diglossia to the linguistic milieu of Palestine in the first-century.

2.2.2 Joshua Fishman

In comparison with Ferguson, Fishman should be mentioned because there are two sociolinguistic models for the analysis of a diglossic situation. One is the Fergusonian model, while the other is the Fishmanian one. Fishman (1967:29-38) extends the definition of diglossia to bilingualism and suggests the relationship between them by means of a fourfold table as follows:[67]

[Figure 1] The Relationship between Bilingualism and Diglossia

BILINGUALISM \ DIGLOSSIA	+	-
+	Both diglossia and bilingualism	Bilingualism without diglossia
-	Diglossia without bilingualism	Neither diglossia nor bilingualism

As discussed, scholars such as Porter (§1.4.2.4) and Spolsky (§2.2.5) who apply diglossia theory to linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine should have taken the Fishmanian model rather than the Fergusonian model into account since their theories are closer to the former model. In light of Fishman, the linguistic milieu of first-century

Palestine should be regarded as "bilingualism without diglossia," that is, just "bilingualism," as will be demonstrated (§2.3).

2.2.3 Pinchas Lapide

Lapide (1975:483-501) first applied diglossia theory to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine; however, his argument has not attracted much scholarly attention.[68] Following the Fergusonian model, he suggests that the linguistic situation should be regarded as diglossia, that is, Hebrew is H language whereas Aramaic is L language. In his final conclusion, he (1975:498) adds Greek to the list so that he calls the linguistic milieu "triglossia." Furthermore, Jesus could speak the three languages (i.e. Hebrew [H language], Aramaic [L language] and Greek).

As to *function*, Lapide maintains that Aramaic (L-language) is secular and spoken language whereas Hebrew (H-language) is sacred, written, and religious language. Aramaic as L-language, he argues, is supported by the fact that, above all, there are not many literary works in Aramaic around first-century Palestine in comparison with Hebrew works.[69] He divides NT Semitisms into Hebraisms as H-language (i.e. H Logia) and Aramaisms as L-language (i.e. L Logia) depending on diglossic functions. Interestingly, he suggests one criterion for authenticity of JTrad that JTrad is composed of H Logia and L Logia.

However, his proposal is not convincing in some points. (1) In terms of *form*, there is no consistency. He (1975:485-6) mentions that both Aramaic and Hebrew are sister

---

[67] It is also published in an expanded version (Fishman 1971:73-89).

[68] The scholars mentioned (§2.2) paid no attention to Lapide's argument at all. (1) Rabin (1976) seems to overlook Lapide's article, despite of its similar methodology and consequence. (2) There are no scholars who discussed Lapide's argument in the mentioned book, *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics* (Porter ed.). (3) As a consequence, it is not proper that Spolsky and Watt consider that Rabin coined "triglossia" since Lapide has already used it; see n.77. Fortunately, Wise mentions the title of his article (1994:118) and Voelz (1984:924) simply introduced his view.

[69] For my criticism against this argument, see §2.3.4.

languages so that the two languages fit into the form in comparison with the four pairs of languages Ferguson suggested. However, Greek is not genetically related to the other two Semitic languages, as Ferguson suggests (§2.2.1). (2) When it comes to *function*, many Aramaic writings have been recovered.[70] This indicates that it is inappropriate that Aramaic was singly an oral vehicle of communication whereas Greek was a literary vehicle in first century Palestine. Accordingly, his diglossic distinction between Hebrew as H-language and Aramaic as L-language is unconvincing. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that it is Lapide who first applied diglossia theory to the linguistic situation. Although he mentions, "The gospel evidence confirms his (Jesus') bilingualism, which upon closer scrutiny, turns out to be *Diglossia*" (1975:485-6 [his emphasis]), closer scrutiny, conversely, shows that the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine requires bilingualism model rather than diglossia model, as will be suggested (§2.3). Lapide's drawbacks still appear when the views of scholars are discussed below.

2.2.4 Chaim Rabin

Rabin (1976:1007-39) describes the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine in terms of diglossia. He (1976:1007-1039) applies the term diglossia to consider late biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic. The significance of his proposal is that his sociolinguistic approach provides a general framework for later biblical scholars.[71] His

---

[70] Fitzmyer (1979a:39) suggests, "it is now evident that literature was indeed being composed in Aramaic in the last century B.C. and in the first century A.D." The existence of plentiful Aramaic literatures of first-century RNE, refer to §2.3.4; §3.1.

[71] See Wise 1992a:434-444. Especially, it is noteworthy that Horsley (*ND* 5.5-48) applies sociolinguistic theory to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine in more detail. He regards diglossia as societal phenomenon whereas bilingualism as individual one, as he explains that "bilingualism is often viewed as an individual, not a group, phenomenon" (*ND* 5.7). On this account, he argues that an issue like bilingual community of first-century Palestine "brings us to the subject of diglossia" (*ND* 5.7). In that sense, he also proposes that diglossic scheme fits the linguistic milieu well: "Do both [H-language and L-language] have a sufficiently clear, differentiated function that they can coexist peacefully within the society? All these points are of relevance to the question of language use in Palestine in I AD as, of course, elsewhere" (*ND* 5.8). As a consequence, in terms of the

argument will be discussed in more detail.

Analyzing the linguistic milieu with the diglossic scheme, Rabin (1976:1008-9) offers three functional distributions from the functions of H- and L-varieties which Ferguson categorised: (1) formal (religious)/ordinary; (2) prestigious/non-prestigious, and (3) written/spoken. Rabin proposes the three pairs of diglossic relationships between late biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic. When Rabin (1976:1008 n.1, 1015-6) proposes that late biblical Hebrew was H-language and Mishnaic Hebrew was L-language, it logically leads to the assumption that late biblical Hebrew would have been used as a formal (religious) and written language with prestige, whereas mishnaic Hebrew would have been used as an ordinary and spoken language without prestige. The problem, however, lies in the fact that his argument is not consistent with his theory of functional distributions. For instance, in terms of "religious" versus "ordinary" function, Rabin proposes that Mishnaic Hebrew was used as an everyday language,[72] one of the characteristics of L-language. Furthermore, in the case of Imperial Aramaic-mishnaic Hebrew diglossia, he (1976:1027) suggests, "Aramaic played the role of the upper, and Mishnaic Hebrew that of the lower language." However, he (1976:1008-9) suggests at the same time that the sect of the Pharisees as well as the Qumranites used mishnaic Hebrew as a language for religious teaching, which is one of the features of H-language.[73] As a consequence, Rabin's functional distributions between H-varieties and L-varieties are inconsistent.

In this regard, the suggestion of Schwartz is particularly relevant. He (1995:17) suggests that Hebrew from 300 BCE - 70 CE in Palestine was both "classical" and

---

relationship between Aramaic and Hebrew, Horsley agrees with Rabin's diglossic scheme, as he proposes that "the high/low relative status of Hebrew/Aramaic was clear-cut" (*ND* 5.22). What is more, although he also tries to apply diglossic scheme to the relationship between Aramaic and Greek, it seems fruitless (*ND* 5.22).

[72] Rabin 1976:1015-6; Mishnaic Hebrew "was the spoken language of the Judaean population. The mixed style was, therefore, a far-reaching concession to the language habits of the less educated reader, but enriched his limited everyday vocabulary from the rich reservoir of the Bible."

[73] Rabin (1976:1019) suggests, "the Qumran sect did not use mishnaic Hebrew, but conducted also their oral teaching in late biblical Hebrew."

"vernacular." In other words, Hebrew functioned both as a literary language of the elite (H-language) and as a vernacular language of the peasantry (L-language). In this sense, in relation to the discrepancy of Rabin's functional distribution theory, one should keep in mind a comment by Versteegh (2002:68):

> It has become abundantly clear that the view of diglossia as a linguistic situation, in which one language variety is used exclusively in formal writing and speaking, whereas the other is used for informal speaking, is too imprecise. In a diglossic speech community there are no discrete varieties, but linguistic variation is organized along a continuum between the standard language and the vernacular.

Indeed, it is proper that Schwartz (1995:17) should conclude, "The strict 'diglossia' model thus fails to explain the ancient Palestinian evidence."[74]

Not only is there a difficulty regarding *function*, but also Rabin's analysis is problematic when it comes to *form*. His discussion is connected with the genetic relation between the concerned languages. According to Ferguson's definition upon which Rabin's is based, "diglossia" refers to a linguistic phenomenon that envisages two varieties of the same language or at least two genetically related languages (Ferguson 1959:336). On this point, Rabin's diglossic scheme could not explain the other two important languages, such as Greek and Latin as a whole, despite the fact that he acknowledges Greek formed a significant part of the linguistic repertoire of first-century Palestine (1976:1011, 1032, 1036). In a sense, although the treatment of the Greek in his article seems to digress from the main point of his discussion (1976:1011, 1036),[75] his diglossic scheme does not permit him to deal with other

---

[74] Ten years later, he still holds the same opinion in his revised article. In the paper, he is concerned with the concept of bilingualism rather than the concept of diglossia, which has been followed by some scholars; especially, Hezser (2001: 246) agrees with his argument.

[75] Rabin, as a matter of fact, wrote chapter twenty-one 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century' and subsequently, Mussies wrote chapter twenty-two 'Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora'

languages due to genetically unrelated languages. As a consequence, this diglossic model does not provide a more whole picture of the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine.

In summary, although Rabin's discussion has had an enormous impact on subsequent biblical scholarship, his diglossic application to the linguistic situation of first-century Palestine has two problems. First, his functional allocations are inconsistent. Second, in terms of linguistic form, his diglossic scheme cannot reflect the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine as a whole. Silva (1980:217 n.55) rightly criticizes, "[Rabin's] use of the term 'diglossia' (Hebrew and Aramaic) to describe the status of Greek in Palestine seems to me unfortunate."[76] However, it is unfortunate that most subsequent scholars have simply concerned themselves with Rabin's notion of the *form* of diglossia rather than with his inconsistent understanding of diglossic *function*.

2.2.5 Bernard Spolsky

The works of two scholars, Spolsky and Jonathan Watt, take much account of *form* rather than *function*. First, Spolsky generally follows Rabin's theory.[77] In relation to *form*, he disagrees with Rabin because he omits Greek. Spolsky (1983:95-109; 1985:35-50; 1991:85-104) adds Greek to his list of language repertoire and describes the situation as "triglossia" (i.e. Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek). In relation to this, Porter (2000b:57) rightly

---

in the book.

[76] Silva's view of relationship between bilingualism and Semitisms will be considered (§8.1.2).

[77] Spolsky calls Rabin's theory "triglossia"; however, it does not seem that Rabin himself regarded the linguistic milieu as triglossia; what is worse, it is not appropriate that Spolsky says that Rabin coined the term "triglossia," when Spolsky (1991:85) mentions: "Rabin (1976) has suggested the term triglossia... Rabin's terminological innovation is a useful one." However, Rabin himself did not call his position "Triglossia" at all in the article of 1976 Spolsky suggests. The reason Spolsky projected the term into Rabin is that Spolsky himself intends to consider the linguistic milieu as triglossia in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek. Without a simple check of Rabin's article, Jonathan Watt (2000b:27) also mentions, "Rabin (1976) coined the neologism 'triglossia.'" However, no one will be able to find the term "triglossia" Rabin coined in the article. Rather, as mentioned before (n.68), Spolsky and Watt should have cited Lapide's article (1975:498) where "triglossia" had already been coined.

criticizes that he should have taken the Fishmanian model rather than the Fergusonian model as his theoretical ground for diglossia in order to portray the diglossic relation among the three languages. As mentioned before (§2.2.2), the problem is that in Fishman's term the linguistic phenomenon of 'bilingualism without diglossia' is the same as that of bilingualism. Accordingly, simply, Spolsky should have applied the bilingualism model to the linguistic situation of first-century Palestine without regard to the diglossic model, as will be discussed in more detail.

As to *function*, although criticizing Rabin's inappropriateness of functional distributions (Spolsky 1991:85), Spolsky (1991:95) also describes that only *certain* functional allocations correspond to the Fergusonian model. He (1983:99-100; 1985:40-1; 1991:94-5) suggests that the three languages *functioned* in a complementary way until the end of the Bar Kohkba revolt in 135CE: Hebrew was used as a language of written sacred texts; Aramaic for legal contracts and commerce; and Greek for governmental language. Furthermore, Spolsky does not distinguish between the concepts of diglossia and bilingualism, mixing triglossia and multilingualism in many cases.[78]

However, in terms of *function*, three points should be considered. (1) If only one or two functions out of Ferguson's nine functions is or are necessary for a diglossic situation to exist, then it seems inappropriate for him to have introduced the model of diglossia to the linguistic situation. Furthermore, it is hard to make a sharp distinction between spoken language and written language of ancient languages (Porter 2000b:55-6). (2) It is well-known that Aramaic and Greek were also used as languages of prayer and study; Greek was used as trade language as well. Moreover, the functions such as the *certain* functions (i.e.

---

[78] Describing the same linguistic situation, Spolsky uses multilingualism together with triglossia, as we can easily see the titles of his three articles; 'Triglossia and Literacy in Jewish Palestine of the First Century' (1983), 'Jewish Multilingualism in the First Century' (1985), and 'Diglossia in Hebrew in the Late Second Temple Period' (1991); and elsewhere in the three articles. In addition, explaining the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine as multilingualism (i.e. Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin), Spolsky & Cooper (1991:25-30) also apply Furgusonian diglossia theory to the analysis of the linguistic situation.

written sacred texts, legal contracts and commerce, and governmental language) do not fit into the diglossic dichotomy, H-language or L-language. In other words, the *certain* functions belong to H-varieties, not L-varieties. Rather, Spolsky's distribution fits into the model of bilingualism for the bilingualism model offers coexistence of languages and language choice, as will be discussed (§2.3.2).[79] (3) In this regard, it seems that he is confused to use the two concepts. However, the two models (i.e. bilingualism and diglossia) are totally different, as will be argued (§2.3.1). It is not proper that Spolsky mixes the two concepts.[80] Accordingly, he should have applied the model of bilingualism to the linguistic milieu.

2.2.6 Jonathan Watt

Watt pays significant attention to discussing *form* on the basis of the Fergusonian definition of diglossia. Disputing Spolsky's triglossia theory, Watt (2000b:24) supposes that according to Ferguson's definition one of two prerequisites for diglossia is the genetic relationship between the concerned languages and he stresses, "diglossia can apply only to the Semitic languages (or, theoretically, to the Greek alone), but not to Hebrew (or Aramaic) *and* Greek simultaneously" (2000b:32-33 [his emphasis]). On this account, he (2000b:32) considers Hebrew and Aramaic as essentially the same language; instead, he inserts Greek and Latin as T (tertiary) category into the linguistic repertoire of first-century Palestine. In addition, in contrast with the bipolar model (i.e. H-variants vs. L-variants), he borrows the concept of "continuum" from John Platt (1977:361-378) and posits Aramaic and Hebrew within a diglossic continuum as represented below (Watt 2000b:34):

---

[79] For relationship between language choice and bilingualism, see §2.3.2.

[80] Paulston 2000:87-8. Paulston suggests six different points between diglossia and bilingualism. For detail discussion, see §2.3.1.

High1 = biblical Hebrew (written)

High2 = Mishnaic Hebrew (spoken, written)

Low1 = Judaean Aramaic (spoken, written)

Low2 = Galilean Aramaic (distinguishable in speech only)

T1 = Koine Greek (spoken and written)

T2 = Latin (spoken? written?)

Three criticisms may be leveled at Watt's thesis. (1) With respect to *function*, Platt analyses six functions of the different languages used by the English-educated Chinese communities of Singapore and Malaysia. He considers the functions of language in contexts such as family, friendship, religion, education, employment, or transaction in order to distinguish H- from L-varieties (1977:364). However, Watt's theory is weak in that, as his diagram shows, he seems to make three distinctions: H- from L-varieties, High1 from High2, or Low1 from Low2. He does this on the basis of only a pair of functions like literacy versus orality. (2) Spolsky (1983:100-107) seeks to demonstrate that in the first century Palestine "oral" is superior to "written" and that "oral" is more prestigious than "written." If Spolsky is indeed correct, the "spoken" function of language in ancient times could stand in a different relationship to "written" language than in modern times. If "spoken" is more prestigious than "written," Watt's analysis of H- and L-languages would reverse the nature of the relationship. (3) Finally, in relation to *form*, Watt's dependence on Ferguson's definition of diglossia leads him to exclude Greek and Latin from his diglossic scheme and, consequently, to introduce his "T" category (Tertiary category refers to the addition of Latin and Greek to his linguistic inventory of first-century Palestine). However, in contrast to Watt's narrow definition of diglossia, some sociolinguistic scholars have applied the concept

of diglossia to the bilingual situation.[81] In this respect, Paulston (2000:87: cf. Porter 2000b:58) rightly points out, "it is quite clear that the notion of functional complementary distribution can include separate languages (and language families) as well as varieties of the same language." Furthermore, Ferguson (1991:215-6) himself later admitted the disadvantages of his narrow definition and would now consider a multilingual community such as Switzerland (where German, French, Italian, and Romansch are used) to be diglossic.

To sum up, in terms of *form*, the application of the diglossia model inhibits Rabin from explaining the use of other languages such as Greek and Latin. Spolsky is inconsistent when he refers to bilingualism with diglossia, and would likely benefit from adopting Fishman's model. Watt introduces the tertiary category into his diglossic scheme because he knows that the model of diglossia cannot make a place for Greek and Latin. Accordingly, various scholarly views indicate that the model of diglossia, in terms of *form*, is not in itself a proper tool to describe the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine.

Much more important are arguments related to *function*. Rabin's proposal of the function is inconsistent in his argument. Further, Spolsky and Watt uncritically accepted it. As noted above, the inadequacies of the diglossic scheme of "functional distribution" applied to first-century Palestine can be summarized into three points. (1) The conditional lists of functional distributions suggested by Rabin, Spolsky, and Watt do not result in much agreement. (2) Classifications of the functions of the H- and L-language of first-century Palestine are not complementary and vague. (3) Some functions in antiquity, such as orality versus literacy, could be different from modern times. As a consequence, it is inappropriate when scholars apply the diglossic scheme to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine because this model requires a clear distinction between H- and L-language. In terms of *function*, much discussion will be suggested in detail below (§2.3).

---

[81] Since Fishman's article they have extended the definition of "diglossia"; see Fishman 1967:29. For detail criticism of this extended definition, see Paulston 2000:85-87.

2.3 Bilingualism and Diglossia Models

One must recognize that the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine does not fit into the model of diglossia, but rather into that of bilingualism. An unfortunate consequence of this, the application of the diglossia model has obstructed the application of the bilingualism model and the maximalist view of bilingualism in first-century Palestine. Indeed, focusing on the model of diglossia has diverted scholarly attention from the model of bilingualism due to methodological overlap of the two sociolinguistic concepts. The bilingualism model is supported by four points: (1) the features of the four languages of the first-century Palestine (§2.3.1), (2) language preference theory (§2.3.2), (3) maximalism of the use of Greek in the first-century Palestine (§2.3.3) and (4) biliteracy of first-century Palestine (§2.3.4). The four comparisons between the bilingualism model and the diglossia model will be suggested.

2.3.1 Characteristics of the Four Languages in First-Century Palestine

The functional distribution of diglossia does not fit into the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine (§2.2). Among the nine diglossic functions Ferguson (1959:328-36) suggests,[82] Paulston (2000:87-8) adopts three different points between bilingualism and diglossia.[83] (1) Whereas L-language in diglossia is not standardized and often not written, L-language in bilingualism can be standardized. (2) L-language in diglossia is oral, while in bilingualism both H-language and L-language can be oral as well as written. (3) There are no

---

[82] In order to explain diglossic situation he enumerates nine points such as function, prestige, literary heritage, acquisition, standardization, stability, grammar, lexicon and phonology.

[83] Totally, Paulston suggests five points. However it seems that the two points such as direction of language shift and ethnicity require more discussion in the case of linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine.

native speakers of H-language in the diglossic scheme, whereas there are native speakers of both languages in the bilingual scheme. In addition, one more point between these models. which Ferguson mentioned but Paulston did not enumerate, is in regard to grammar. In diglossia the grammar of H-language is more developed than that of L-language. whereas in bilingualism the grammars of the two languages are both highly developed.

When the characteristics of the four languages (i.e. Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin) of first-century Palestine are taken into account individually, it is evident that the features of the four languages require the model of bilingualism rather than diglossia. Consider the following points: (1) Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek and Latin were standardized; (2) their grammars were highly developed; (3) they were used as spoken as well as written vehicles of communication;[84] and (4) there have been native speakers of all four languages in the Palestine. For these reasons, Paulston is justified in stating: "I find very little explanatory power in the concept of diglossia when applied to first-century Palestine" (2000:88-9). Accordingly, the features of the four languages of first-century Palestine do not require the model of diglossia, but rather bilingualism.

2.3.2 Language Preference Theory

According to recent studies of bilingualism in ancient societies, some linguistic situations also show that they cannot be adapted to the simple diglossic scheme of H- and L-varieties (Adams 2002:9). The theory of "language preference" should first of all be explained. Language preference theory corresponds to the concept of bilingualism rather than diglossia. Making a comparison between "bilingualism (on the part of psychologists) and diglossia (on the part of sociologists) (1967:29)," Fishman (1967:34) rightly points out, "bilingualism is essentially a characterization of individual 'linguistic behavior' whereas

diglossia is a characterization of 'linguistic organization' at the socio-cultural level" (emphasis added). In other words, it may be said, in Chomskyan terms, that bilingualism is concerned with "language performance," whereas diglossia is concerned with "language competence."[85] In bilingualism a bilingual and/or a bilingual community can choose a language among their repertoire. Romaine (1995:8) states, "Bilingualism exists within cognitive systems of individuals, as well in as families and communities." Contrary to this claim, in the diglossic scheme, there is a certain degree of determination to use a particular language (i.e. H-language or L-language) at the socio-cultural level.

David Taylor questions the diglossic dichotomy through his study of the linguistic situation of Palmyra. According to Taylor (2002:318-320), the use of Greek and Aramaic in the Hellenistic city of Palmyra cannot be categorized into a simple diglossic scheme because both languages were used as H-varieties, thereby showing that both had equal public status. Furthermore, it is intriguing that although Greek was used in the context of public activities, Aramaic almost always was the language of funerary inscriptions.[86] Taylor (2002:319) assumes, "this phenomenon is related to the psychology of identity ... at Palmyra Aramaic was considered the *appropriate language* for the linguistic domain of religion" (emphasis added). This shows that the distribution of language at Palmyra indicates social language preferences. One may observe in a bilingual situation something other than uniform diglossic opposition between H- and L-language.

In relation to Greek dialects it was said among ancient Greeks that Ionic is for

---

[84] Aramaic and Hebrew were used as written language as well (§2.3.4; §4.3.1).

[85] In the same vein, as Taylor (2002:300) mentions, in Saussurean terms, it can be said that "parole" is related to the concept of bilingualism, whereas "langue" is related to that of diglossia.

[86] Taylor 2002:319; he adds, "I know of only one funerary relief with Greek descriptions of the deceased (Colledge 1976: pl. 105), and its provenance is uncertain." However, there are several exceptions. Ingholt (1935:57-120) suggests that four dated Palmyrene tombs of 'Atenatan (98 CE), Malkû (115 CE), Nasrallat (141 CE), and Bar'â (186 CE) are engraved with bilingual inscriptions in Greek and Palmyrene. Ingholt (1938:114, 121) also suggests that the tomb of Lisams (186 CE) has two lines Greek inscriptions and the tomb of 'Abd'astôr (98 CE) is engraved with bilingual inscriptions in Palmyrene and Greek.

history, Doric for the choral lyric, and Attic for tragedy.[87] This does not mean that Ionic is H-variety whereas Doric is L-variety, but that each dialect is used in a different (literary) context. This linguistic distribution shows the contemporary Greek impressions of those dialects. In other words, this also indicates that the Greek dialects are related to the domain of language preference rather than to a uniformly diglossic dichotomy.

Language contact brings about some linguistic phenomena such as borrowing, interference, and codeswitching, as will be discussed (§8.1.1). The uniformly diglossic model can explain borrowing and interference but not codeswitching. Codeswitching in the NT literature can be easily explained on the basis of the bilingualism model. One of the reasons that the study of codeswitching has not been discussed among biblical scholars results from the application of the diglossia model. This will be argued comprehensively (chapter 8).

2.3.3 Maximalism and Minimalism

The degree to which Palestine was bilingual, in regard to lower-status and rural bilingualism, has been viewed on a scale ranging from maximalism to minimalism.[88] That minimalism is related to the model of diglossia should be considered. Maximalists have proposed that the first-century Palestine was *largely* bilingual.[89] They admit both lower-

---

[87] Haugen 1972:98. Also refer to Charles V's linguistic competence concerning his language preference and language choice between bilinguals in Jerusalem Talmud (§8.1.1).

[88] Kokkinos (1998:79-84) uses the two terms, maximalist and minimalist. Furthermore, van der Horst (2001:166) also calls Feldman, Rajak, Grabbe and the new Schürer minimalist interpreters, when he discusses influence of Greek over first-century Palestine.

[89] "Largely" is cited from Hengel 1989a:14-5; van der Horst 2001:166. The relationship between some terms should be mentioned to discuss bilingualism of Palestine. For biblical scholars had discussed the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine for quite a long time, before the term, bilingualism, was established by sociolinguists in 1960s. In this respect, some concepts such as "Hellenization of Palestine" and "the use of Greek in Palestine" scholars have employed, can be transposed into "bilingualism of Palestine" due to conceptual continuities. For it is generally said that as the verb *hellenizein* originally means "to speak Greek," the use of Greek is regarded as one of major characteristics of Hellenization. Goldstein (1981:67-9, 318-9) suggests six characteristics of Hellenization and puts forward that "our six traits are peculiarly Greek." In this sense, the use of Greek in Palestine where Aramaic was used as the primary language refers to being bilingual by and large; see Barclay 1996:88-91; Tcherikover 1959:344-57; Smith 1971:43-61.

status bilingualism and rural bilingualism. Regarding lower-status bilingualism, a maximalist takes Josephus' claim (*Ant.* 20.264) seriously that it is easy for even slaves to learn Greek.[90] Sevenster (1968:70) points out, "everyone in the Jewish country had the chance of speaking [Greek, and it] ...could evidently be heard in all circles of Jewish society." Lieberman (1965:39) too asserts, "The Greek language took hold of all classes among all the nations in the Mediterranean world. The Jews were no exception in this respect. We have already seen how deeply Greek penetrated into all the classes of Jewish society in Palestine." In terms of rural bilingualism, Morton Smith (1971:67), for example, proposes that "The contrast commonly drawn between the Greek cities and the Semitic countryside has been exaggerated. The countryside was permeated by Greek elements and influences." Van der Horst (2001:166; 1991:130) also asserts, "For most, or at least many, of the Jews in Palestine, Greek most probably remained a second language, certainly outside the urban areas." Along these same lines Hezser (2001:231) writes, "Greek was the language in which the Romans communicated with and issued decrees concerning the local Jewish population, not only in the Diaspora but in Palestine as well." Maximalists hold to both "urban and upper-status" and "rural and lower-status" bilingualism.

Minimalists propose a *partial* bilingualism view, thus confining the bilingualism of Palestine to urban and upper-status settings. The views of these scholars on lower-status bilingualism may be considered. Schürer (2.74), for example, contends, "It is probable that the lower levels of Palestinian society had either no more than a limited acquaintance with it (Greek language) or none at all." Tessa Rajak (2002: chapters1, 2, and 7) also proposes that Greek was used among some upper-status Jews. More recently, Lester Grabbe (1992:1.158) has concluded, "the use of Greek seems to have been confined to a particular segment of the

---

[90] I will deal with this in more detail in §3.2.6. Also refer to Sevenster 1968:69-70. Even Feldman (1986:91-2) who is one of the representative minimalists consents that many slaves were bilinguals because it was slaves rather than their masters who dealt with business transactions and would have even served as their interpreters. However, it is intriguing that he denies upper-status bilingualism; see n.91.

population, namely, the educated upper-class."

Minimalist views on rural bilingualism are expressed by other scholars. Eric Meyers raises the idea of "Galilean Regionalism."[91] Goodman (1983:67) accepts the Galilean Regionalism hypothesis and adds, "Greek is found in use in some parts of Galilee."[92] In the case of Phoenician cities like Tyre and Sidon, Grainger (1991:77-83, 108-11) also puts forward that the use of Greek does not necessarily apply to many small towns and villages. Returning to Grabbe, we note that he (1991:1.158, 1.170) suggests, "The number of Jews outside the Greek cities who were fluent in Greek seems small." Minimalism can be summarized by Fergus Millar's expression in his influential article: "'Hellenization' might, as is often supposed, have extended very little outside the towns or the upper classes."[93]

The diglossia model is related to the minimalist view of Greek influence over first-century Palestine. Applying diglossia to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine, the diglossia model presupposes that the linguistic milieu can be categorized into H- and L-language. In other words, minimalists assume that only upper-status and urban Jews used Greek (i.e. H-language), whereas lower-status and rural Jews used Aramaic (i.e. L-

---

[91] The proponents divide the linguistic situation in Galilee into Upper Galilee and Lower Galilee on the basis of Josephus's evidence (*Bell.* 3.38-40). While Upper Galilee was rural, less Hellenized and Aramaic and Hebrew were used, Lower Galilee was urbanized, much Hellenized and bilingual in Greek and Aramaic. See Meyers 1976:93-101; Meyers & Strange 1981:91; Meyers 1985:5.115-131. Recently, lots of scholars refute the hypothesis; Freyne 1980:138-145; Richard Horsley 1996:88-106; Crossan 1991:15-19. Ironically, Feldman (1986:93) does not follow the prototype of minimalism, when he mentions, "Greek was the language of the upper class, ... whereas Aramaic was spoken by the uneducated, particularly in the rural areas. But ... no such clear-cut distinction is defensible." In this respect, he asserts lower-status bilingualism (see n.90). However, he (1986:94-5) conforms to the Galilean Regionalism Hypothesis. From the perspective of factors of bilingualism (§3.2), it is persuasive that Feldman approves lower-status bilingualism, although it is problematic that he denies upper-status bilingualism. Furthermore, in relation to Hellenization of Palestine Feldman retorts in various aspects that Palestinian Jews were not as much influenced by Hellenization as Hengel argued; Feldman 1977:371-82; 1986:83-111; 1993:3-44. However, it seems proper that Grabbe (1991:1.151), another minimalist, rightly criticises that Feldman has two major flaws; "first, he seems to make a strong, underlying assumption that being Hellenized means ceasing to be a proper Jew. Second, his arguments against Hengel often depend on interpretations that would not be accepted by the majority of specialists."

[92] He (1983:68) also mentions, "in Upper Galilee and probably in the area around Lake Tiberias, Greek was only a thin strand in the linguistic cloth."

[93] Millar 1987b:132. Originally, although Millar was a minimalist, since his publication of 1993 he has changed his position from minimalism into maximalism: see n.109.

language).[94] Furthermore, the minimalist view seems to hold one criterion, that is, formal education, since lower-status or rural Palestinians could not receive Greek formal education so that they spoke Aramaic. However, formal education is only one out of six factors in bilingualism (§3.2). Although formal education is a significant factor, others like bilingual parents, bilingual region, and occupation can make Palestinians to be bilinguals, as will be suggested (§3.2). In this respect, recent evidence champions the maximalist view that both "upper and lower-status" Jews and "urban and rural" Jews used Greek. Regional bilingualism and personal bilingualism support maximalism, as will be discussed below (chapter 3). Accordingly, it will be contended that the diglossia model does not fit with the description of the linguistic milieu.

At this point it is necessary to mention the relationship between bilingualism and the discussion of maximalism and minimalism. More recently minimalists have considered that bilingualism actually defends minimalism. As will be mentioned (§4.1.1), most regions of the first-century Roman Empire were bilingual and used vernacular language(s) in addition to Greek. In relation to this, some scholars argue that the survival of vernacular languages indicates that the linguistic milieu of Palestine is partially bilingual. Millar (1983:55-71; 1987a: 143-64; 1987b:110-33) makes a coherent argument that the survival of vernacular languages is evidence for partial bilingualism. Grabbe (1991:1.150-8; here, 1.156) also proposes, "although it is often asserted that Greek became the official language of the conquered territories, this seems mistaken: the Seleucid Empire was multilingual, and local languages continued to be used in official documents." Feldman likewise argues:

> In language, as in culture generally, the degree to which Hellenism spread after Alexander has been much exaggerated. Thus, even in the most heavily Hellenized

---

[94] This is related to Fishmanian model and Ferguson's new definition; see Fishman 1967: Ferguson 1991: 215-6.

portions of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus, bilingual inscriptions and coins for this period are common. In Antioch, the capital of the Seleucid Empire, for example, Aramaic remained as the second language and continued thus even after the Roman conquest. Hence, if the Greek language emerged clearly triumphant in the Land of Israel, this would be the exception to the general pattern.[95]

Indeed, minimalists deem bilingualism as strong evidence to prove that the influence of Greek over first-century Palestine is not hugely significant. Ironic is that bilingualism, which resulted from the survival of vernacular language as suggested in Millar's well-known article (1987b), is used as the evidence for both maximalists and minimalists. Whereas Hengel (1989a:64 n.23) cites Millar's argument when he proposes his maximalist view, Grabbe (1991:1.156-8) employs the same argument to support his minimalist view!

As discussed in detail below (§4.1.1), bilingualism is not a zero-sum game. Schwartz's remark that the rise of vernacular languages does not generate a decline of Greek seems likely (see p.97). Bilingualism means that two or more languages *coexisted*. Therefore, the bilingualism of first-century Palestine is more compatible with the maximalist view than the minimalist view. Furthermore, maximalism will be also supported by regional (§3.1) and personal bilingualism (§3.2) in the first-century Jerusalem.

2.3.4 Biliteracy of First-Century Palestine

As mentioned (§1.2), many scholars including the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* consider that ArmTrad is oral whereas GkTrad is written so that there were no ArmGospels.[96]

---

[95] Feldman 1993:14. Here Feldman cites bilingualism presented by Avi-Yonah (1978:182) and by Green (1990: 313).

[96] Goodspeed 1937:127-68; 1942:315-40 (esp. 331-3); Albright 1960:201-2; Black 1967:16.

In other words, JTrad is transmitted from oral into written, that is, from Aramaic into Greek. Lapide applies the diglossia model to the linguistic milieu, as mentioned (§2.2.3). He (1975:486-92) assumes that there were not many Aramaic writings around first-century Palestine because Aramaic is an L-language (i.e. spoken language) whereas Hebrew is an H-language (written language). In this respect, the diglossia model is suitable for unidirectionality hypothesis from Aramaic into Greek and from oral into written.

However, as is well known, Aramaic literatures of first-century Palestine continue to be excavated, will be investigated in detail (§4.3.1).[97] The existence of the Aramaic literatures evidently supports the bilingualism model. This indicates that Christian literature could be circulated both in Aramaic and in Greek as well as both in oral and written form. In other words, a bilingualism model supports that the transmission of JTrad is not unidirectional but interdirectional.

[97] Butcher 2003:283-9; Fitzmyer 1979a:39; Millar 1993:5; Hitti 1951:257.

3. Bilingualism of Jews in First-Century Palestine

Examined in chapter 1, most NT scholars have adopted a unidirectional view with regard to the transmission of GTrad. The direction is from Aramaic to Greek, from oral to written, and from Judaeo-Palestine to the Hellenistic diaspora. Such unidirectionality, however, fails to consider the local impact of bilingualism. If we take bilingualism of first-century Palestine (chapter 3) and Roman Empire (chapter 4) more seriously into account, one is no longer in a position to draw sharp distinctions between Semitic languages and Greek, between Judaeo-Palestine and Hellenistic Diaspora, and between orality and literacy in the course of the GTrad's transmission. Bilingualism of Palestine (chapter 3), Alexandria (§4.2), and Antioch (§4.3) is mainly related to transmission of GTrad. Bilingualism of Palestine (chapter 3) and the Jerusalem church in the first century (chapter 5) are mainly related to transmission of JTrad. Although the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine has been considered complicated, there is no doubt that Jerusalem was a largely bilingual city. Regional bilingualism will be considered (§3.1) as well as personal bilingualism (§3.2).

3.1 Regional Bilingualism

Recent evidence concerning bilingualism of first-century Palestine supports the maximalist position. Three points will be considered such as inscriptions (§3.1.1), papyri (§3.1.2) and population geography (§3.1.3). Whereas inscriptional and papyrological testimonies usually show some literate bilingualism, population geographical evidence indicates the linguistic milieu of the whole community including non-literate bilinguals.

3.1.1 Inscriptional Evidence

The excavation of Greek inscriptions from first-century Palestine is strong evidence that there were many Greek-speakers.[98] The use of the language was not because of diglossic phenomenon but because of the choice of inscriptional language (Taylor 2002:319).[99] According to Frey (*CIJ* 2.113 – 339), in relation to Jewish inscriptions in Palestine, approximately 52 percent are in Greek, 40 percent in Hebrew/Aramaic, and 8 percent are bilingual written in both Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic. On the basis of Frey's *CIJ* (326) and later publications, *SEG* xi – xiii (114), Mussies (1976:1042 – 3) suggests that 440 Jewish inscriptions were found in Palestine proper: 69 in the cemeteries of Joppa (2^{nd} – 3^{rd} century), 196 in Beth-Shearim (1^{st} – 4^{th} century) and 90 on the ossuaries of Jerusalem (2^{nd} century B.C.E. – 2^{nd} century C.E.). On these data, van der Horst suggests, "The overall average of Greek inscriptions is slightly more than 53 percent." It is striking, he (2001:157, 168 n.16) adds, "even though in the past 65 years the material has more than tripled, the numerical ratio of Greek and non-Greek material has not changed at all!" Hengel suggests that of 23 ossuaries of Akeldama tombs excavated in 1989, 13 have Greek and 5 Hebrew and 5 are bilingual.[100] This indicates that around 80 percent of ossuaries were Greek or bilingual.

---

[98] In relation to major objections to validity of study of epitaphs, Clauss (1973:411) raises a question: how can less than 1 percent epitaphs of the population represent the linguistic milieu of the whole society? Van der Horst (2001:159-65) persuasively replies that the epitaphs from Palestine produces better statistical data because the epitaphs were excavated from different regions (urban and rural areas), from different social status (upper and lower) and from various places.

[99] The language choice of inscriptional language can be related to its religious language. Kaizer (2004:180-1) mentions that although Palmyra was a bilingual city, funerary context is dominated by Aramaic and that many particular aspects of the Palmyrene cults were originally expressed in Palmyrenean." Taylor (2002:319) also points out that the reason that Palmyrene was chosen as funerary language is "at Palmyra Aramaic was considered the appropriate language for the linguistic domain of religion." As will be mentioned (n.174), it is interesting that although parchments and papyri from Dura-Europos (ca 165 CE – 255) were written in Greek, Latin, Aramaic, Parthian, Middle Persian, and Syriac, liturgical text is in Hebrew. Furthermore, many papyri excavated from Jewish synagogue were written in Aramaic, although Greek was the predominant language in Dura as a whole. Kilpatrick (1964:218) concludes, "the simplest and most probable answer is that the Greek element in the congregation of the synagogue was so much the smaller and weaker."

[100] Hengel 2001:27. Cf. Avni & Greenhut 1996:57 – 72; esp. 66 n.19. Intriguingly, he adds, "the most interesting, number 19, mentions an Ariston from Apamea in Syria, a proselyte with the Hebrew name Juda, who is probably mentioned in the Mishna *Halla* 4:11 bringing first fruits from Apamea, which was accepted by the priests "for they said: He that owns [land] in Syria is as one that owns [land] in the outskirts of Jerusalem."

Moreover, according to Rahmani (1994:12), 233 inscribed ossuaries from the environs of Jerusalem, between the time of Herod the Great and 70 CE, have been excavated. Among these are 143 Jewish script only, 73 are only Greek, 14 or 15 bilingual, 2 Latin and 1 Palmyrene. Bilingual ossuaries are inscribed in Greek and Jewish scripts. Main texts are in Greek with repeated summary in Hebrew. This means that 87 or 88 out of 233 are Greek. From these inscriptions, Rahmani (1994:13) also proposes, "in and around Jerusalem and Jericho even the lower classes of the Jewish population knew some Greek." A more recent and fascinating piece of evidence is the Ordinance of Caesar, which is from first-century Nazareth and presently housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. This inscription contains an imperial edict inscribed in Greek (cf. Van der Horst 1991:159-162; 2001:162). Van der Horst (2001:162) suggests that the Ordinance clearly indicates, "A good many of the local Galileans were expected to be able to read it." What is striking is that numerous Greek funeral epitaphs in Jaffa and Beth Shearim prove that Greek was used by lower-status groups as well as by upper-status. It seems that the Greek excavated from Beth Shearim was not influenced by school education. Rather, Schwabe & Lifshitz (1974:220) present "It does seem as though the authors of the inscriptions learned their Greek from their pagan neighbors and knew how to speak it, but only seldom did they have a broader educational background." As Sevenster (1968:182; cf. Lieberman 1965:30) points out, "the simultaneous occurrence of tidy, correct and clumsy, primitive inscriptions in Greek proves that this language was used in widely divergent layers of the Jewish population in Palestine." Fitzmyer (1992:60; cf. 1992:77 n.21) presents that ossuaries "testify to the widespread use of Greek among first-century Palestine Jews at all levels of society." Van der Horst (2001:163) also mentions that this shows that Greek was not restricted to the upper-status in Palestine. Indeed, Hengel (1989a:10) is more than justified in asserting that Greek was used "by lower classes of the local Jewish population."[101] Accordingly, inscriptional evidence proves that the

---

[101] Hengel (1980:53) also asserts, "a more thorough 'Hellenization,' which also included the

bilingualism of first-century Palestine is rural bilingualism and lower-status bilingualism.[102]

3.1.2 Papyrological evidence

Greek papyri excavated from rural areas in Palestine strongly also support a maximalist view. One should consider firstly the Babatha archive to indicate village life in En-Gedi in Judea and Maoza, Zoara district in Arabia. These manuscripts, hidden at the time of the bar Kokhba Revolt (ca. 132), date between c. 94 and 132 CE. The thirty-five documents were written in Greek, Aramaic and Nabataean: "Six in Nabataean, three in Aramaic, seventeen in Greek, and nine in Greek with subscriptions and signatures in Aramaic or Nabataean" (Yadin 1971:229). This document can be considered to be a typical bilingualism in those times. The Babatha archive displays the interaction between villagers and Roman officials within a rural context. Sevenster (1968:185) rightly points out, "It should not be forgotten that the inhabitants everywhere came into contact more or less frequently with government officials. In order to understand legal regulations pertaining to contracts, taxes, census, a knowledge of Greek was necessary, or in any case expedient."

Secondly, caches of Greek documents found in Waddis Murabaat, Seiyal and Nahal Hever indicate rural bilingualism, especially the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (Tov 1990). Tov (2001:5) suggests, "all the Greek texts (and in Wadi Murabba'at and Masada, the great majority) are documentary, showing that Greek was actively used among the persons who deposited the texts."[103] Special attention should be paid

---

lower classes, only became a complete reality in Syria and Palestine under the protection of Rome ..."

[102] Furthermore, numismatics shows that the influence of Greek was huge in Palestine. Kokkinos (1998:81-2) proposes, "the numismatic evidence suggests that in the late Persian period Jewish society was exposed to Hellenic pressure." Cf. Mussies 1976:1044-5.

[103] Concerning Greek documentary texts from Nahal Hever, Cotton (*DJD* 27.154) notes, "these non-Hellenized or semi-Hellenized Jews chose to write their contracts in Greek either because of the absence of Jewish courts and archives using Aramaic as the official language in the places mentioned in the papyri, or out of the desire to leave open their option to go to the court of their choice." These texts support that Greek was used in rural areas.

to the relation between bilingualism and administration. Greek as the language of administration was known to residents in rural areas.[104] In relation to the Greek documents in rural areas, Freyne (1980:139) explains that the new administrative and business personnel "were not confined to the cities but were distributed throughout the villages and estates in charge of the affairs of the government." Elsewhere Freyne (1980:139) writes that, "the frequent journeys of these officials, some of higher, others of lesser rank, ensured a network of communication that tied village life to the various cities and touched everybody from the poorest peasant to the various village officials." Bickerman (1962:59) suggests, "The Jewish territory itself was crowded with Greek officers, civil agents and traders, as the papyri show." Hezser (2001:231) adds, "Greek was the language in which the Romans communicated with and issued decrees concerning the local Jewish population, not only in the Diaspora but in Palestine as well." Butcher (2003:277, 284-5) also proposes, "The Greek language and Greek cultural forms and practices penetrated beyond the high culture of the cities into rural environments as well." The documents found in rural areas support rural bilingualism.

Thirdly, it has been suggested that twenty-five Greek papyri were found among the DSS, which also demonstrates the maximalist view. Lim (2000:69) suggests that most of the Greek texts from caves 4 and 7 appear to be written in the Septuagintal Greek.[105] Tov (2001:1) presents that the cave 7 "thus witnesses activity in the Greek language, but only literary activity, since probably all the fragments found in this cave are non-documentary." Greek texts from Qumran and the Judaean wilderness evidently show that Greek works were

---

[104] Lewis (n.248) shows the demise of the Demotic due to the change of administration language. Polak (2006) also suggests that the main reason of language change from Hebrew to Aramaic in the Achaemenid Empire can be explained by the fact that Aramaic was used as administration language. This presents that change of administration language promotes substitution of living language.

[105] In relation to this, following Jose O'Callaghan, some scholars may assert that the papyri are the NT passages; see Thiede 1992. On the other hand, some scholars consider them as fragments from the books of 1 Enoch; see Nebe 1988; Puech 1996; Muro 1997-1998. However, Nickelsburg (2004:634) persuasively concludes, "The identification of these fragments as the remnants of the Epistle of Enoch is as unproven as previous attempts to assign them to the New Testament."

read in Judaea and elsewhere.[106] Above all, the fact that a sectarian community used the Septuagint for religious purposes[107] implies that Greek was broadly used in first-century Palestine. A colophon of Greek Esther (10:3*l*) that Book of Esther was translated into Greek in Jerusalem in first century BCE indicates that Greek literature was read among some Jews.[108] Also Lieberman (1965:30) suggests, "In the Hellenized town of Caesarea there were Jews who read the Shema in Greek." After surveying an extensive collection of papyri from the RNE, Cotton, Cockle, & Millar conclude, "a considerable proportion of the documents listed here do not emanate from cities, but from country districts characterized by villages or small towns."[109] Accordingly, papyrological evidence also suggests that the linguistic situation of first-century Palestine is largely bilingual.

3.1.3 Population Geographical Evidence

In terms of rural bilingualism, population geography of first-century Palestine can also offer a valuable tool to describe the bilingual situation from a different angle. Whereas inscriptional and papyrological evidences usually imply the bilingualism of the

---

[106] Hengel 1974:102; Fitzmyer 1990:11-3; Porter 1997b:293-316.

[107] Tov (2001:5) argues that "all of these [papyri of Cave 7] were brought directly to the cave from an archive outside Qumran or from a specific spot within the Qumran compound. ... There is no reason to believe that any of these texts was penned down in Qumran." However, topographically speaking, especially Cave 7 can be thought to have belonged to the Qumran site itself because geographical features of the district show its secludedness. Protective Wall runs south to the edge of the marl terrace from the southeast corner of the building complex at the base of high limestone cliffs.

[108] Bickerman 1944:339-62. Bickerman (1976:1.246-74; here, 258) mentions, "The book gives a quite favorable impression of the Greek used in Jerusalem in the time of Alexander Jannaeus." Also he notes that after Greek version of Torah other Jewish books were translated into Greek; for more information see Bickerman 1976:1.137-66, especially, 147-50. Hengel (1974:100-2) also states that some parts of I and II Maccabees were translated into Greek in Jerusalem.

[109] Cotton, Cockle, & Millar 1995:214-235; here 235. In his personal email communication of 20th Feb. 2006 Millar suggests, "the evidence both of inscriptions and of papyri and parchments (Cotton, Cockle, and Millar in *JRS* 1995) shows that everywhere in the Near East, where writing was in use at all. Greek was also used." I appreciate his thoughtful reply and his permission to use our email correspondence. He replied to me that "I could certainly count myself as a 'maximalist' and rather more so even than in 1993 (his stress)." Although Millar had been one of the representative minimalists by means of influential publications, he has changed his position since his publication in 1993.

literate of first-century Palestine, population geographical evidence indicates the bilingualism of all social statuses (i.e. both the literate and the illiterate) due to language contact by means of living in a border area, as will be discussed (§3.2.4). One may point to the suggestion of Millar that the Gospels do not draw a clear-cut distinction between Hellenistic cities and Jewish cities in first-century Palestine.[110] Furthermore, even Jews and Greek-speaking Gentiles mingled in the cities of Palestine.[111] Mussies (1976:1057-8) too makes a relevant comment that "the Jewish area is seen to be discontinuous. … a number of Hellenistic towns were scattered over the remaining territory." The discontinuity could cause Jews in rural areas near Hellenistic cities to learn Greek regardless of their formal education.

Mussies names the following Hellenistic cities: the entire coastal strip from Raphiah to Ptolemais, Decapolis, Gadara, Pella, Scythopolis/Beth Shean,[112] Gerasa, Philadelphia, Phasaelis in Judaea, Sepphoris and Tiberias in Galilee, Caesarea-Philippi and Betsaida-Julias[113] in Batanaea, Heshbon and a second Julias in Peraea and Sebaste in Samaria.[114] In this respect, Jews who live in a border area would have obtained bilingual competence (§3.2.4). Mussies (1976:1058) proposes, "If we may so call the remaining Jewish country, which is so strongly fragmentated and has so many enclaves, the knowledge of Greek must have been much more widespread than the mere presence of some Greek schools and synagogues in Jerusalem might suggest." The surrounding rural areas of the

---

[110] Millar 1993:343. For the interaction between Jews and Gentiles of Roman Galilee in the second century, see Goodman 1983:27-89.

[111] Millar 1993:343. Hengel (1991:55) calculates that "around 10-15 % of the then inhabitants of Jerusalem spoke Greek as their mother tongue." And he adds, "in a population of about 100,000 in Jerusalem and its surroundings that would give a population group of around 10,000 to 15,000." If this is the case, Greek-matrix speakers should have made contribution to bilingualism of Jerusalem. Furthermore, he (1991:55) mentions that tens, indeed hundreds of thousands of Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews streamed and some stayed in Jerusalem during the festivals. Pilgrimage also made Palestinian Jews bilinguals to some extent.

[112] cf. Millar 1993:378.

[113] cf. Dalman 1935:165.

[114] Mussies 1976:1058. Concerning bilingualism of Samaritans both inside and outside of the Samaritan homeland, van der Horst (1998:49-58; here 58) concludes, "This would make it exactly parallel to the Jewish situation in the later Roman Empire, where there was a Hebrew-speaking minority in the land of Israel, and a Greek speaking majority in the diasora, as well as a large number of Greek-speakers in the homeland itself." For Bickerman's list of the Hellenized cities of Palestine, see 1962:58; for Hengel's list, see 1989a:14-5; for Millar's list, see 1993:374-386.

cities mentioned may be geographically bilingual due to the influences of nearby Hellenistic cities without reference to upper-status or lower-status. Accordingly, population geographical evidence in first-century Palestine supports lower-status bilingualism. In summary, the epigraphical, papyrological and population geographical evidences show both "urban and upper-status" and "rural and lower-status" bilingualism.

3.2 Personal Bilingualism

The views of Fishman support the individualistic nature of bilingualism, which is "essentially a characterization of *individual* linguistic behavior" and stands in contrast to diglossia which is "a characterization of linguistic organization at the socio-cultural level" (Fishman 1967:34 [emphasis added]). In this respect, regional bilingualism does not always correspond to personal bilingualism (Beardsmore 1982:30). Although the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine should be viewed from a maximalist position, one should take the personal bilingualism of first-century Palestine into consideration on account of the individual characteristics of bilingualism proper.

Above all, in relation to personal bilingualism, several points should be kept in mind. First, personal bilingualism is certainly a matter of degree (Beardsmore 1982:10). Its spectrum is broad; some individuals more or less have full command of two languages, whereas others speak them to varying levels imperfectly. Second, those who acquired a bilingual ability within the Roman Empire may have used Greek for business but their mother tongue at home. Third, even primary bilinguals favor one language over another. Even though a primary bilingual obtains the mastery of two languages fully, only one language functions as a matrix language, while the other is an embedded language. Fourth, an acquired bilingual's linguistic competence of embedded language can nevertheless be developed in close proximity to the matrix language.

Let us turn our attention to factors of bilingualism in relation to personal bilingualism of first-century Palestine. A study of bilingualism should be investigated alongside the circumstance of bilingualism. Hakuta (1986:4) makes the point that "the study of bilingualism should include not only the study of the bilingual person but also the circumstances surrounding the creation of bilingualism and its maintenance or attrition." Myers-Scotton provides six factors that cause bilingualism, which merits attention here.[115] Adapting, and adding to, these six categories, we can enumerate the following causes of bilingualism in order to apply them to personal bilingualism at the turn of the eras.

Factors One and Two. (1) "Military invasion and following colonization" and (2) "migration and inflow." These two factors may be applied to every social status without regard to social status (cf. §3.1.3). Furthermore, when we see language contact through the history of Greeks, Romans, and Jews these two factors account for it. Various kinds of bilinguals such as "early," "late," "primary" and "acquired" are thus produced by the two factors.

Factor Three. (3) "Ethnic awareness." This factor is related to loyalty to one's nation. It depends on individual's devotion to Judaism.

Factor Four. (4) "Bilingual parents and bilingual region." These are the typical factors that cause "early" and "primary" bilinguals. Bilingual parents are mostly related to personal bilingualism, whereas bilingual region is mostly related to regional bilingualism. For instance, if anyone is born and/or grows up in a bilingual circumstance, whatever his/her parent is a bilingual or not, it is natural that they should be an early bilingual or a primary bilingual.

Factors Five and Six. (5) "Formal education" and (6) "occupation." These produce late bilingualism, secondary bilingualism, or semibilingualism. Formal education

---

[115] Myers-Scotton 2002:31-3; military invasion and subsequent colonisation, living in a border area or an ethnolinguistic enclave, education as a factor in bilingualism, spread of international languages, ethnic awareness, and migration for social and economic reasons.

and occupation are usually related to oral and written bilingualism.

3.2.1 Military Invasion and Colonization

The most far-reaching language contact was caused by military invasion and colonization that followed, as noted in detail (chapter 4). One may observe the report of return from exile in Nehemiah (13:24) where their children could not speak the Jews' language, but rather spoke half in speech of Ashdod. This indicates that their children were bilingual. Both Alexander the Great and the Roman Empire spread Greek and Latin throughout Palestine and the Middle East. As a result, Greek gradually took over from Aramaic in Palestine as the common language. Having been used from approximately the eighth century BCE to the time of Alexander the Great, Aramaic also supplanted Hebrew as the ordinary language of most of the Jews in Palestine and Babylonia by the beginning of the Common Era (Sawyer 1999:14).

3.2.2 Migration or Inflow

Migration or inflow for social and economic reasons would have been conducive to bilingualism. The military conquests of Alexander the Great gave rise to thousands of Greek immigrants to Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, Asia Minor and the region of Persia.[116] Most conquests consisted of thousands of soldiers and civilians of various occupations, statuses and nationalities (Bubenik 1989:54-5; Tcherikover 1959:115). This Hellenistic Diaspora spread Greek to areas where it had previously had little or no status Jewish immigrants from Palestine into the regions of the Roman Empire made Jews

[116] Bubenik 1989:54-6. He exemplifies their occupations as teachers, doctors, lawyers actors, architects, engineers, painters, sculptors, merchants, etc.

bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek in the environment of Greek speaking world (chapter 4). Furthermore, bilingualism in Jerusalem during the Second-Temple period was also accelerated by the Jewish Diaspora (§4.1.3, §4.2.4). Diaspora Jews first spread to most countries in the Near East and Mediterranean and then, in turn, returned to visit their ancestral land for reasons such as cult and religious pilgrimage (Rabin 1976:1007). Hence, one of the direct causes of widespread bilingualism in communities was migration or inflow.

3.2.3 Ethnic Awareness

Using a mother tongue is often regarded as an important sign of one's ethnic identity. Ethnic awareness purposefully attempts to preserve its language, thus creating a bilingual ethnic group.[117] In modern times Welsh, Gaelic and Breton are good examples of this (Myers-Scotton 2002:33). Schwartz (2005:53) mentions that immigrant groups like most Amish or Hasidim may preserve their ancestral languages far longer due to a rigorously separatist religious ideology. For instance, the inscriptional language of Palestinian coins may reflect Jewish attitude to Hellenism, as we can know that in the first Jewish war, the independent Jewish state minted coins in Palaeo-Hebrew language with non-Greek designs (Butcher 2003:275). In the early second century CE, the nationalistic use of Hebrew/Aramaic, written with Greek characters, and its significance for Bar Kokhba and his followers is well-known (cf. Yadin 1971:124, 181).[118] Cotton (1999:225) suggests, "Hebrew became the symbol of Jewish nationalism, of the independent Jewish State." The bilingualism due to national ideology may explain that Hebrew in the legal documents was

---

[117] For the relationship between ethnic awareness and language, see Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 1982:1-21; Appel & Muysken 1987:12-6.

[118] Incidentally, regarding four dated legal documents Yadin (1971:181) suggests, "It is interesting that the earlier documents [two of year one] are written in Aramaic while the later ones [two of year three] are in Hebrew. Possibly the change was made by a special decree of Bar-Kokhba who wanted to restore Hebrew as the official language of the state." In relation to this, Rosén (1980:223:6) convincingly argues that Hebrew was used as a legal language only during the second revolt, which is supported by Mussies (1983:362-4).

revived during the two Jewish revolts and became the language of the legal documents alongside with Aramaic.[119] Fitzmyer also presents that the reason that the majority of Qumran texts were written in Hebrew rather than in Aramaic can be explained by national ideology.[120] Hence, ethnic awareness may lead to bilingualism.

3.2.4 Bilingual Parents or Region

A bilingual parent(s) or bilingual region (i.e. birthplaces or growth-places) produce "early," "late," or "primary" bilinguals. In terms of bilingualism brought about by parent(s), intermarriage is usually the reason that produces this environment.[121] One may note that the practice of intermarriage was actually encouraged in the Vienna papyrus which preserves "some decrees of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, [and] seems to explicitly encourage intermarriage between natives and foreigners, by declaring that wives of such marriages were to be regarded as free women."[122] As a consequence, in first-century Roman Egypt native Greeks and Hellenized Egyptians often married Egyptians and would have produced children who were early or primary bilinguals.[123] Furthermore, some Greek and Macedonian soldiers and mercenaries in Syria married wives who were supplied from the native

---

[119] Cotton 1999:219-31; here, 220-5; 2005:153-6. She suggests, "the inner text of *DJD* XXVII no. 8. that is the part which is hidden, was written in Aramaic, whereas the outer text was written in Hebrew. In other words, the legally binding text, the inner one, is written in the normal language of legal documents at the time, whereas the Hebrew, displayed on the outside, advertises the ideology of the now independent Jewish state."

[120] Fitzmyer (1979a:30) mentions, "If the origins of the Qumran Essene community are rightly related to the aftermath of that revolt, this may explain why the majority of the Qumran texts discovered to date were written in Hebrew and composed at a time when most Palestinian Jews were thought to be speaking Aramaic."

[121] Mélèze-Modrzejewski (1983:241-68; esp. 248) argues that although some Hellenized native elite and some orientalized Greeks are of importance, they do not reflect Ptolemaic society as a whole but a marginal phenomenon of the society (see n.299). Nevertheless, bilingual parents or region is one of factors of bilingual circumstance because a bilingual community does not mean that all members of a community should be bilingual (see §2.1.2).

[122] Freyne 1980:152 n.94; Riggs 2005:19; Clarysse 1979:2.731-43; 1992:51-6; 1995:1-19.

[123] Fewster 2002:242; in terms of factors encouraging bilingualism in the second-century BCE Egypt, Horsley (*ND* 5.12) summarizes Antidoron Peremans's arguments (1983:253-80) in four points; 1) intermarriage 2) billeting civil servants in villagers' homes 3) intermingling of Egyptians and foreigners in the same corps 4) middle-echelon officials in the chora.

population (Hitti 1951:251). In the case of intermarriage, children could express themselves in both parental languages. This being the case, the reference in Acts 16:1 to Timothy, "whose mother was a Jewess...but whose father was a Greek," would likely mean that he would have been an early bilingual.

Anyone growing up in a bilingual region would also have become bilingual (Hengel 1974:105), even if their parents were monolingual. Living in a border area would have especially brought about bilingualism. As detailed previously (§3.1.3), the population geography of first-century Palestine shows an interesting result: "there was no clear boundary between Jewish and Gentile settlement either eastwards, in Peraea and Gaulanitis, or in the territory of Caesarea Panias, founded by the tetrarch Philip; or north-westwards into the territory of Tyre and Sidon" (Millar 1993:343). Furthermore, Scythopolis (Plain of Jezreel south of Galilee), Sebaste (site of ancient capital of Samaria), Tiberias (shore of the Sea of Galilee), and Sepphoris (near Nazareth) are all known to have had a mixed population of Gentiles and Jews (Millar 1993:343). As a matter of fact, there is no reason to suppose that Jews and Gentiles represented separate communities in any formal or constitutional sense. Consequently, mixed populations created regional bilingualism.

According to Hengel (1989a:16; cf. Bockmuehl 2005:81), first-century Bethsaida was "more *markedly* 'Hellenized' than the surrounding villages." Moreover, the residents at Bethsaida were a mixture of Jews, Syrians, and Greeks (1989a:16). Dalman (1935:165) proposes, "Anyone brought up in Bethsaida would not only have understood Greek, but would have been polished by intercourse with foreigners and have had some Greek culture." Jesus' disciples Peter, Andrew, Philip, James and John came from Bethsaida (Jn.1:44, 12:21)[124] and could have been primary bilinguals of spoken language.[125] Indeed, it appears

---

[124] Wilkinson 1977:63.

[125] Bockmuehl (2005:82) convincingly suggests, "there is therefore a very strong likelihood that Peter grew up fully bilingual in a Jewish minority setting. That his family and their friends were at ease with their Greek-speaking environment and its Herodian tetrarch seems reflected in the names they gave to their children." Although most of what he maintained is persuasive, it is regretful that he

from the NT account that Peter preached to congregations in territories where Greek was the dominant language.[126]

In relation to regional bilingualism, it seems that Jews of first-century Palestine might have accepted non-elite bilinguality in the narrative of John 7:14-36. Two major lines of interpretation of who the Ἕλληνες are (Jn.7:35) have been suggested. One interpretation is Greek-speaking Jews[127] who were not born in Palestine (i.e. native Greek speakers). The other view put forward by a large number of interpreters is that they are Greek-speaking Gentiles.[128] It is not easy to say whether Ἕλλην refers to Greek-speaking Jews or Greek-speaking Gentiles or whether Jesus intended for a Gentile mission or if this is rather John's message (Lindars 1972:296). Regardless of disagreements on how one should understand Ἕλλην, everyone agrees that the term refers to people whose first language was Greek. Despite the fact that Jesus is portrayed at one point as having never (formally) studied

---

tries to connect bilingualism and "in a Jewish minority setting" or their Greek names. Two points should be mentioned. (1) It seems that "in a Jewish minority setting" implies that Jews could speak Aramaic whereas Gentiles could speak Greek in Peter's home town. He seems to mean that Peter could speak Greek well because he grew up "in a Jewish minority setting." However, what Bethsaida was largely bilingual means that Greek was usually used as a matrix language whereas Aramaic as an embedded language without regard to ethnological classification (Jews or Gentiles). Bilingualism means coexistence of two or more languages (cf. §4.1.1). Regional bilingualism could provide bilinguality without regard to Peter's race. (2) It is well-known that name does not always indicate bilinguality (§5.3.1). Instead, it should be mentioned that regional bilingualism of first-century Bethsaida implies that what Peter grew up in childhood in Bethsaida means that he must have been an early or primary bilingual. Jesus' disciples, Peter, Andrew, Philip, James and John who came from Bethsaida might have been similar cases with Peter.

[126] Cf. 1Cor. 1:12, 9:5. Hengel (1974:105) mentions, "Simon Cephas-Peter ... later undertook extensive missionary journeys among the Jewish Diaspora of the West, which spoke only Greek." For Peter's bilinguality, see Hengel 1983:11, 37, 162 n.39, 170 n.26; 1986:92-8; Mussies 1976:1056; 1983:364. Peter's bilinguality is supported by four points: (a) Legendarily, according to mission narrative in Acts 10, Peter was known as the founder of the Gentile mission in predominantly Gentile Caesarea in relation to the conversion of Cornelius; see Cullmann 1962:37-9; Mussies 1983:364. (2) Personally, after deliverance from prison when Herod sought for Peter, he went down from Judea to the Hellenistic city, Caesarea where Herod the Great built, and remained there (Acts12:19). (3) Social-economically, what he owns a fish boat might indicate that he may be employed in trade with Phoenician cities because economically Galilee was largely dependant on Hellenized cities (Hengel 1989a:15). (4) Peter, Andrew and Philip, Jesus' disciples, came from Bethsaida where is Hellenized (Hengel 1989a:16). For information of regional bilingualism and occupational bilingualism, refer to §3.2.4 and §3.2.6. Given that these are the case, Peter might be a bilingual in Aramaic and Greek. Cullmann (1962:24) presents that Peter's bilinguality "does not prevent Acts 4:13 from characterizing him and his companion John as 'uneducated'. He had not 'studied' either by Jewish or by Greek standards." Recently, Bockmuehl (2005:64, *passim*) reasonably suggests, "Peter's origin in Bethsaida does indeed make him bilingual." This means that Peter was bilingual due to regional bilingualism.

[127] Robinson 1959-60:120, 124; Barrett 1975:11-19.

(Jn7:15), there is an indirect assumption about Jesus' ability to speak Greek in John 7:35-36. It seems evident that either the author/redactor of John's Gospel or the Jews portrayed here presupposed that Jesus could actually address Greek-speaking persons. This is adduced by John 12:20-23. When Greeks visit Jesus, Philip was sent to meet them. This implies that because Philip came from Bethsaida he could speak Greek (cf. Bockmuehl 2005:61). Philip asked Jesus to see some Greeks from Bethsaida of Galilee.[129] This combination in John's Gospel may hint that some non-elite Galileans including Jesus would have become bilinguals without formal education.[130]

It is noteworthy to mention that Dalman (1929:4) persuasively suggests that Jesus was a bilingual and gives three reasons. First, his mother belongs to a priestly family in Judaea (Lk1:36) implying she is an upper-status Jewess.[131] Mary as an elite bilingual could have spoken Greek and, if this is indeed the case, it raises a possibility that her bilingualism would have led to Jesus' early bilingualism. Second, Nazareth was a bilingual town and Jesus "having been brought up there, could not have lived in isolation from the influence of Greek" (Dalman 1929:4). Hengel (1989a:17; cf. Mussies 1983:359; Fitzmyer 1992:61) also points out, "the situation of his [Jesus'] native Nazareth on the border of Galilee and five kilometers from Sepphoris, the old capital of the region, offered a variety of possibilities of contacts with non-Jews." In light of these observations, it seems one may venture that regional bilingualism would have affected Jesus in this regard. Third, Jesus might have visited surrounding Hellenistic cities (Philadelphia, Hippo, Gadara, Pella, and Scythopolis) in his youth (Dalman 1929:4). On the basis of these three reasons, Dalman (1929:5) suggests "knowledge of Greek was common in Galilee," and it cannot exclude Jesus, "who was a

---

[128] Brown 1970:29, 314; Hengel 1989b:122; Fortna 1989:308 n.159; Lindars 1972:296.

[129] Argyle 1955b:93; Ross 1990:41-3; interestingly, Porter may illustrate more cases Jesus spoke with his conversational partners in Greek (§1.4.2.4).

[130] Following Pesch (1980:11-2), Bockmuehl (2005:60) may reasonable suggest that Peter had his own boat (Lk5:3), which means that "Peter would have received the customary elementary education..." However, his bilingualism is not related to his education but to regional bilingualism.

[131] For more information of Mary's social status, see Dalman 1935:52.

Galilean, from this common knowledge ..." He (1929:5) continues that Jesus "who knows the East is aware that familiarity with several languages is not necessarily proof of higher education, but is rather a state of things arising out of the conditions of intercourse between the different populations."[132] Finkel illustrates an interesting case. He (1981:146) suggests, "In a Galilee town, Greek and Aramaic words were common speech forms." In other words, he (1981:146) suggests that Jesus can speak Greek and his audience can understand the language,[133] as Jesus's saying implies: any father in a Galilee town might not be confused between Aramaic *patira* (flat bread) and Greek *petra* (rock) when his son asked his father for food and pronounced *PTR'*. Dalman's suggestion can be paraphrased in modern sociolinguistic terms. Jesus was an early bilingual due to parental bilingualism, a primary bilingual owing to geographical bilingualism, or at least a late bilingual because of the geographical bilingual factor.[134] Consequently, Jesus should be considered to be a regional bilingual, that is, a primary bilingual or at least a late bilingual.

3.2.5 Formal Education

Formal education produces "acquired" bilingualism. One of the characteristics of

---

[132] In the case of linguistic competence of Jesus, Fitzmyer (1979a:37) proposes, "the general evidence that we have been considering would suggest the likelihood that Jesus did speak Greek." Interestingly, Eshel & Edwards (2004:49-55) suggest that a potter's abededary from Khirbet Qana indicates the evidence that a craftsman tried to learn reading and writing Aramaic in a small village in Galilee in the Early Roman period. This may make it probable that an artisan like Jesus who belonged to similar social level to the craftsman had the possibility to learn reading and writing.

[133] Dibelius (1949:40) mentions, "Naturally a much greater Greek influence is to be assumed in Galilee, where the Jewish people bordered, so to speak, on the Hellenistic world, than in Judea. It is quite possible that Jesus and his disciples understood Greek, perhaps even spoke it." Hengel (1989a:17) suggests, "he was capable of carrying on a conversation in Greek." Van der Horst (1991:131) also notes that Jesus "understood and probably was even able to speak Greek."

[134] Taking a further step, it is interesting that Longenecker (1999:41-50) raises a possibility that Jesus spoke Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek because the biblical quotations he used are strongly Septuagintal whereas evangelists' quotations are Semitic. He (1999:50) raises a possibility that "in his use of the Old Testament, Jesus, who normally spoke Aramaic but could also speak Greek and Mishnaic Hebrew (at least to some extent), at times himself engaged in textual selection among the various Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek versions then current, and that some of the Septuagintal features in the text forms attributed to him actually are to be credited to him." This means that Septuagintalisms can be considered as the original sayings because Jesus cites the LXX. For more

acquired bilingualism is that one speaks a mother tongue at home and an acquired language for business. A language acquired through formal education never replaces a mother tongue. In this respect, we have lots of evidences that there were a considerable number of "elite bilinguals" or "sub-elite bilinguals" in the first-century Roman Empire (Adams 2003:9; Hoffmann 1991:46). Instances of this are readily available. Zoskales, a king of first-century Ethiopia, was Hellenized enough to read and write Greek at home (Casson 1989:45, 52-3; cf. Huntingford 1980), thus displaying a prototype of elite bilingualism which is prevalent at the time in the general region. Furthermore, the leading Roman figures are no exception,[135] examples are: Crassus (Cic. *De orat.* 2.2; *Quint.* 11.2.50), T. Albucius (Cic. *Brut.* 131), Augustus (Suet. *Tib.*21.4-6), Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 71.1), Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 42.1) and Titus.[136] Some kings of RNE were also bilinguals. Reporting the death of Crassus (BC 53), Plutarch (*Crass.* 32, 33) mentions that Orodes II (Hyrodes) of Parthia who Crassus defeated was well acquainted with Greek language and literature and that the contemporary king, Artavasdes of Armenia composed tragedies and wrote orations and histories. It is striking that "upper-class Romans who could not speak Greek (whether genuinely or allegedly) are sometimes disparaged" (Adams 2003:9; cf. Cic. *Verr.* 4.127). Most Jewish kings including Herod, Antipas, Philip, Agrippa I and Agrippa II were bilinguals. Herod seems to go to the Greek elementary school in Jerusalem (Hengel 1974:77). And Josephus (*Ant.* 16.6; cf. *Ant.* 18.143, 19.360, *Vita.* 359, *C. Ap.* 1.51) mentions that Herod sent his sons to study at Rome. This implies that his sons were bilinguals to master two or more languages such as Aramaic, Greek and Latin.

That both in the RNE and Rome powerful rulers were bilingual and sought Greek learning must have brought about a chain reaction. The Roman Empire employs bilingualism

---

information, see §6.1.5. But this part is omitted because of reasons of space.

[135] However, Goldstein (1981:69-70, 319-20) may mention that some conservative upper-status Romans rejected Hellenism.

[136] For argument of Titus' Greek competence, also see Sevenster 1968:62-65; he (1968:65) concludes, "it is very possible that Titus was anything but a fluent speaker of Greek."

as a means to rule over other countries. Fewster (2002:220) maintains that "The fact that Roman administrators could virtually act as though there were only two languages is a sign of their ability to integrate provincial elite." Within the upper echelons of Jewish society bilingualism must have been promoted. Those of a more moderate social status were also enthusiastic for Greek learning, as Lieberman (1965:21; cf. 27) contends: "we know how eagerly the middle class imitates the upper class, and how readily the lower strata follow the example of the middle groups."[137] Greek was the official language of the Roman government and aristocracy in first-century Palestine.[138] An administration language promotes learning the language. One of the political purposes to encourage Greek education in Palestine is "to gain greater influence over the Greek-speaking Diaspora" (Hengel 1974:77). Spolsky (1983:98) suggests, "A young Jew who wanted to rise in the world would have to learn Greek."[139] Additionally, Hengel (1989a:17; 1974:76) mentions, "the better the knowledge of language a Palestinian Jew acquired, the more easily he could rise in the social scale." Among the leading families of Jerusalem and the families of aristocrats, Greek was spoken (Hengel 1989a:14-17). The use of Greek in families implies that some upper-status Jews may be early bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek. The children of the leading families became early bilinguals who were taught by their bilingual father[140] or private tutors[141] and at least, late bilinguals in elementary school.[142] With these observations in mind, a minimalist Goodman's

---

[137] Sevenster (1968:60-1) also suggests, "the middle classes all too eagerly imitated the customs of the upper ones in this respect and that a knowledge of Greek and an ability to participate in conversation on matters concerning Greek culture became a sort of criterion of social status."

[138] Mussies 1976:1058. Mussies (1983:358) suggests, "The official use of Greek for this period [first centuries] is attested by coins and inscriptions." For instance, Eupolemus was probably a Greek-speaking priest of second-century BCE Jerusalem; see Collins 1983:40-2. Furthermore, Hengel (1974:103) presents that Zenon papyri indicate that "the Greek language was known in aristocratic and military circles of Judaism between 260 and 250 BC in Palestine."

[139] In the case of Egypt, it was the same situation; see Tcherikover 1963:15; Fewster 2002:242-3.

[140] Torah (*m. Qidd.* 4:14 and *t. Hag.* 1:2) admonishes fathers to educate their sons; Hezser (2003:192) mentions that in tannaitic times the duty to educate children rested almost exclusively on parents, with few opportunities provided outside the home." Also see Goodman 1983:72. Rajak (2002:26) assumes that Josephus was educated by his parents.

[141] Hezser (2001:91) mentions that it is usual that upper-status Jews learn their second language from private tutors.

[142] Hengel (1989a:17) suggests, "The larger cities, primarily Jerusalem, but also Sepphoris

proposal that "Aramaic would have been quite sufficient to make contact, both economic and cultural," and that there was "no *need* to learn another lingua franca" (1983:67 [his emphasis]) is unconvincing.

It is noteworthy that the definition of *Hellene* has changed from genealogy into education.[143] *Hellene* refers to a Greek "who had a Greek education," which means he "was one who had a command of the niceties of the Greek language."[144] Tcherikover (1963:14) points out, "a gymnasium education had served as an entrance-card into the privileged circles which, in the eyes of the Romans, were considered as 'Greeks' and sometimes even called 'gymnasium-graduates.'"[145] For these reasons, change in definition of *Hellene* could also have accelerated Jewish learning of Greek.

Most of the elite in first-century Palestine may have been acquired bilinguals, although this does not mean that all urban elites such as ordines, rulers, the rich, and retainers at that time were in fact bilinguals.[146] Personal bilingualism is individualistic and personal proficiency levels in Greek are varied. Nevertheless, elite bilingualism can be

---

and Tiberias, had Greek schools which presumably went as far as an elementary training in rhetoric." Hengel (1974:76) also summarizes, "All these points suggest that even from the Ptolemean period the sons of the Jewish aristocracy in other words, a long time before the establishment of the gymnasium and the ephebate there was something like a Greek elementary school." Also see Hezser 2001:91-2; Hezser (2001:91) mentions that Aramaic-speaking upper-status Jews learnt Greek as their second language from Greek-speaking non Jews or Diaspora Jews in Palestine.

[143] Grabbe 1991:1.166; Grabbe mentions, "the criterion soon became one not of genealogy but of education: a Greek was one who had a Greek education – a Greek was one who had a command of the niceties of the Greek language. This concept was extremely important in breaking down the barriers between the settlers and the natives, as the natives began to acquire a Greek education."

[144] Grabbe1991:1.166. In this respect, the verb ἑλληνίζω means "to speak Greek"; Liddell-Scott (p.536); Refer to Hengel 1974:74. The educated persons were called *Hellenes* which were defined in terms not of origin but of either their posts in the administration or their education. See Hengel 1974:73; Thompson 1992:324. She (1992:326) illustrates that "some (Hellenes), of course, were cleruchs, the Greek soldiers settled in the Egyptian countryside; others are specified as doctors, teachers, fullers, priests, and so on."

[145] He (1963:5) mentions that the two principles to distinguish Greeks from non-Greek are permanent residence in the *metropoleis* and a Greek education in the gymnasium.

[146] It seems very difficult to define "elite" of ancient times. For the definition of "elite," it is noteworthy to mention that Stegemann & Stegemann (1999:53-95; cf. 303-16) suggest three criteria such as power, privilege, and prestige to distinguish between elite (upper-stratum groups) and non-elite (lower-stratum groups). The former includes (1) ordines and ruling families in vassal states and provinces, (2) the rich, and (3) retainers whereas the latter (1) relatively poor, (2) minimum existence, and (3) absolutely poor. On the basis of Gerhard Lenski's model (1984) Neyrey (1996:255-67) suggests that social stratification of an advanced agrarian society is composed of ruler, governing class, retainer class, merchants, priests, peasants, artisans, and unclean, degraded and expendables.

assumed. Elite individuals among the high priests, Sadducees, Herodians, scribes, Pharisees and Rabbis must have been bilingual.[147]

The most common way to be bilingual would be the educational system of first-century Palestine;[148] it enabled upper-status Jews to become elite bilinguals (Hengel 1974:65-83; Sevenster 1968:183-4). Jews could receive Greek education in Jerusalem as well as in Greek Palestinian cities such as Sepporis, Tiberias, and Julias Bethsaida (Hengel 1991:55; Hezser 2001:90-4). In first-century Palestine "it was impossible to found a new 'Hellenistic' city without a Greek school" (Hengel 1991:55; cf. Hezser 2001:91-2). Hence, the educational system in first-century Palestine produced acquired bilinguals.

The main purpose of formal education is to offer children access to political and social power by means of learning Greek language and literary skills.[149] They seem to desire to learn refined style from model literary texts rather than a perceived vulgar style that uneducated people used (Butcher 2003:273). Bradford Welles *et al.* (*P. Dura*. V. I. 47) have put forward that the language of Greek parchments and papyri (the third century BCE – the third century CE) excavated from Dura does not deviate from the standard Attic dialect of the fourth century BCE except for a very few cases. They (*P. Dura*. V. I. 47) propose, "It is clear that the clerks of Dura and the vicinity were carefully trained in the classical language."

---

[147] Esler (2001:32-37) considers that the elite of first-century Palestine refers to members of the elite (high priests, Sadducees, and Herodians) and retainers of the elite (scribes and Pharisees). Richard Rohrbaugh (2000:204-5) provides useful source; he identifies urban elites in the GofMk: Caesar (12:14, 17), Pontius Pilate (15:2, 8, 15), Herod (6:14; 8:15), Herodias (6:17), Herodias' daughter (6:22), Philip (6:17), High priest (2:26, 14:47), Chief priests (8:31, 10:33), scribes (1:22, 2:6), elders (8:31), rich man (10:22), Sadducees (12:18), owner of upper room (14:14), Joseph of Arimathea (15:43), Jairus and his family (5:22), such retainers as Pharisees (2:16), people from Jairus' house (5:35), men arresting John the Baptist (6:17), soldier of the guard (6:27), Levi (2:14), those selling in the temple (11:15), servant-girl of high priest (14:66), crowd sent from chief priests, scribes and elders (14:43), physicians (2:17), Galilean priest (1:44), couriers, officers (6:21), Judas Iscariot (14:11), tax collectors (2:15), moneychangers (11:15), doorkeeper (13:34), soldiers (15:16), and the centurion (15:39). It seems that they might have been bilinguals.

[148] There were other ways to be bilinguals. Learning foreign languages is not special at that time. Josephus (*Ant*. 20.264) reports, "Jews look upon this sort of accomplishment as common for not only to all sorts of freemen, but to as many of the servants as please to learn them." Hengel (1974:60; see §4.2.4) mentions that Jews could have learned Greek from Diaspora Jews who visited from Egypt, Asia Minor and the Aegean to observe their holidays.

[149] Swain 2002:131. In the case of first-century Roman Egypt, Fewster (2002:242-3) supposes, "to be bilingual would have been a great advantage for these children (bilinguals)."

It is quite intriguing that when Egyptians learned Greek as a second language, they used a Ptolemaic Greek papyrus roll (ca. end of third or second century BCE).[150] The roll seems to be a Greek teacher's manual, which includes Greek education curriculum, reading, arithmetic and dating systems.[151] Furthermore, the most remarkable feature of the curriculum is to introduce Greek literature such as Homer -- taught at all levels of education[152] -- the tragedians, New Comedy, and other Greek writers.[153] Greek literature was also known in RNE in the first century BCE. Plutarch (*Crass*. 32, 33) mentions that the people of Seleucia knew the wisdom of Aesop and that a passage of Bacchae of Euripides was recited and many Greek compositions were introduced during celebration banquet for the death of Crassus in Parthia in 53BCE. According to Josephus[154] and Philo[155], even upper-status Jews in Antioch and Alexandria would be educated at gymnasium, [156] which means that they may have known Homer and Euripides.[157]

---

[150] Clarysse 1983:43-61; Thompson 1994:75-7; 1987:105-21.

[151] Clarysse 1983:44, 47-8; Thompson 1987:112-3; 1994:76.

[152] Hock 2001:56-77. The important role of Homer in Greek education was expressed by Heraclitus, Dio Chrysostom, and Quintilian; See Sandnes 2005:716-7. Morgan (1998:69) notices that "of the roughly 150 other texts by known authors, 97 are extracts from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The next most popular author is Euripides, with 20 texts." Concerning three stages of Greek school, see Hengel 1974:66-7.

[153] Clarysse 1983:44, 47-8; Thompson 1987:112-3; 1992:325; 1994:76.

[154] *Ant.* 12.119, 120, cf. *C. Ap*. 2.39 and *Bell.* 7.43, 44; cf. Tcherikover 1959:516 n.91; Bickerman 1962:53, 89 n.47; Hengel 1974:68.

[155] *Spec. leg*. 2. 230 (M 2, 298); *Somn*. 69 (M 2. 631), 129ff. (M 2, 640); Louis Feldman 1960:224-6.

[156] Hengel 1974:68; Tcherikover 1959:516 n.91; Bickerman 1962:53. In this regard, Nörden (1958:2.496-7) raises a possibility that Paul could have read some of Plato. On the other hand, Hengel (1991:37) supposes that Paul "probably had not read any classical Greek literature worth mentioning apart from the Greek (and Hebrew) Bible and Jewish pseudepigrapha like the Wisdom of Solomon." In more recent years, some scholars propose that some biblical writers knew Homer, Pindar and the tragedians; Andersen & Robbins (1993). In terms of Homer, see Glockmann 1968:57; MacDonald 1999:88-107; 2000; 2003a; 2003b:189-203. It seems that the Greek writers can be known to writers and readers of the FGs, if they got formal education. For even upper-status Jews who can be readers of the Gospels would be educated at gymnasium in Antioch or Alexandria where most scholars assert that the Gospels would be written. However, Mitchell (2003:254) points out that their arguments of Homeric influence still "are based on unconvincing and unexamined assumptions about ancient authorial practice and procedures."

[157] In the case of Lucian's time, Homer and Euripides in Antioch were well known in public. Weitzmann (1941:233-47; here 233) suggests, "No wonder, that in Lucian's time, when quotations from these two classics overcrowded literature, mosaicists depicted themes from Homer and Euripides and could be sure that these would be understood by a great public, even when the figures of the scenes were not accompanied by inscriptions."

In the case of Palestine, Hezser (2001:70) proposes, "this focus on Homer was not limited to Egypt but can be considered typical of the Graeco-Roman world from Hellenistic times onwards." The curriculum of Greek education at the gymnasium in Jerusalem and other Greek Palestinian cities seems to include texts of famous Greek writers such as Homer. Hengel (1974:103, 65-83) also suggests, "A Greek School must have existed in Jerusalem… There are signs of a continuation of Greek education in the Jewish capital, which even included the knowledge of Homer." Furthermore, it is striking that two epitaphs found in Beth Shearim were written in Homeric language both in form and content, although Beth Shearim was of high renown for rabbinic center and was known as epitaphs of great rabbis (Van der Horst 2001:164-5). The expression, 'my Beth Shearim' indicates that he is a native of Beth Shearim (Van der Horst 2001:163). The epitaph raises a possibility that a Palestinian native might learn Homeric Greek in Greek school. Accordingly, when upper-status and middle-status Jews learned Greek, they tried to imitate good style Greek, Atticism, not vulgar style of the street language. Using Atticism might be one of the characteristics of acquired bilinguals in first-century Palestine.

When acquired bilinguals learned Greek, how much Greek did they actually learn? Two cases in this regard may be considered. First is the bilingualism of Lucian of Samosata, a Syrian Greek orator in the early second century. It seems that the linguistic milieu of second-century Samosata is similar to some extent to that of first-century Palestine.[158] According to MacLeod, in the first half of the second century CE the inhabitants used Syrian Aramaic; some of them spoke Greek, and educated persons especially were bilinguals in Syriac and Greek. The headquarters of a Roman legion in Samosata may indicate that a few must have known Latin as well. This person Lucian spoke Syrian

---

[158] The political and sociological situation of Samosata is similar to that of Jerusalem: Samosata on the middle Euphrates "had once been the capital of the small kingdom of Commagene, founded in the third century B.C. and incorporated in the Roman Empire in 72 A.D" Jones 1986:6.

Aramaic as his native tongue during his boyhood and youth.[159] His parents were poor and he could not formally learn Greek. Instead, his parents apprenticed him to his uncle as a stone-cutter and statuary (Allinson 1905:ix-x). After he went to Ionia to get a school education in Greek, he at last became one of the "high-priced sophists" in Gaul (Allinson 1905:xi) which "was well known as a home of rhetoric, Greek as well as Latin" (Jones 1986:12). The late bilingualism of Lucian of Samosata indicates that he who is an acquired bilingual became the best Greek orator even though he acquired Greek as a second language.

Our second contributor to the question about the extent to which Greek was learned is Josephus. As to his acquisition of Greek as the second language Josephus (*Ant.* 20.263-4; Steve Mason's translation [2001:3]) states:

> For among my compatriots I am admitted to have an education in our country's customs that far surpasses theirs. And once I had consolidated my knowledge of Greek grammar, I worked very hard also to share in the learning of Greek letters and poetry, though my traditional habit has frustrated precision with respect to pronunciation. Among us: they do not favor those who have mastered the accent of many nations and made their speech frilly with elegance of diction, because they consider such a pursuit to be common-not only among those who happen to be free citizens, but even among domestics if they desire it.

The above statement indicates four points at the levels of phonology, syntax, and stylistics. (1) His pronunciation is not precise. As I have explained before (§2.1.4), it is natural that it is difficult for acquired and/or late bilinguals to pronounce their second

---

[159] MacLeod 1991:1. That Lucian was monolingual as a child indicates that his linguistic environments (e.g. parents and neighbours) were predominantly monolingual. For the relationship between the age of the second language acquisition and the levels of proficiency, see Critical Period Hypothesis (§2.1.4).

language precisely. Because a phonetic inventory of Aramaic is different from that of Greek, it is quite common that phonological rules of Aramaic could intervene in Greek pronunciation.[160] Although Josephus confesses his deficient competence in terms of Greek pronunciation, it is not that negative because others suffer the same problem. Rather, he ascribes his imprecise pronunciation to Jewish negative view of foreign language acquisition (Rajak 2002:50-1). Indeed, he intends to brag that he composes Attic Greek excellently at the levels of syntax and stylistics,[161] although it is hard to acquire literate bilingualism enough to compose a polished-style Greek. (2) Josephus is not an early or primary bilingual but a late or acquired bilingual. If he was an early or primary bilingual, his pronunciation would be precise and he would not have tried to consolidate his grammar. He was an Aramaic-matrix bilingual and Greek was his embedded language. This also indicates that his parents might be Aramaic-matrix speakers and might not use Greek at least at home (i.e. as most acquired bilinguals), although Josephus holds that his linage is a royal-priestly family (Rajak 2002:14-22). (3) Josephus is an oral and literate bilingual. He could speak Aramaic and Greek and write his publications in Aramaic and Greek. Despite the fact that Greek was foreign and unfamiliar to Josephus (*Ant.* 1.7),[162] when he tried to learn it in order to become a bilingual, he acquired excellent competence in written composition.[163] Bilingualism of first-century

---

[160] It is well-known among neurolinguistic scholars that when anyone learns the second language, there is a clear distinction of the outcome depending on his/her age (see §2.1.4). If he or she is over twelve years old, he or she will face with some difficulties in conversation at two levels; phonologically, he or she often violates complicated phonological rules for the inventory of consonants and vowels which is different from that of the second language. Syntactically, he frequently breaks intricate syntactic rules. For instance, 'He go to school'. However, in writing, he or she does not make such errors. Accordingly, Josephus's violation of pronunciation in Greek shows that he learned Greek as an acquired language over twelve years old. Nevertheless, he is known as one of the best writers in Greek. Similarly, although German speakers know sound values such as /θ/ or /ð/, when they speak English, they often utter them in an imprecise way. However, their imprecise pronunciation does not prove that they write English in an imprecise way. Josephus is not a primary bilingual or an early bilingual, but a late or acquired bilingual.

[161] Sevenster (1968:70) states, "he asserts with pride and satisfaction that he has achieved a very great deal regarding the writing of Greek."

[162] Rajak (2002:47-8) mentions that Roman Greek writers (i.e. A. Postumius Albinus and Aulus Gellius) who used Greek as their second language confess that it is difficult for them to use Greek. Josephus, in this sense, "had good reason, then, to overstress rather conceal his linguistic inadequacies."

[163] Many scholars accept "assistant theory," that is, Josephus was helped by Greek

Palestine persuaded Alexander Roberts (1888:444) who is a Scotch-English writer to delineate the language of Josephus as below:

> But his object was very different. It was his ambition to write in the style of the classical writers, and that he found a matter most difficult of attainment. He had then to deal with a ξένη καὶ ἀλλοδαπὴ διάλεκτος, just as we formerly saw was the case with Scotch authors of the last century in their attempts at writing correct and idiomatic English. To them English was substantially "a foreign tongue," as Josephus felt it to be with himself in regard to classical Greek. Yet his desire was to write in the style of the best authors, and his assiduous efforts to this effect were not in vain.

His good style of Greek composition "could be highly significant" for answering the question of "how much knowledge of Greek a Jew in the first century A. D. could acquire if he took serious pains about it" (Sevenster 1968:74; cf. Rajak 2002:50-1). In terms of Josephus' acquisition of Greek in Jerusalem, it is noteworthy that Rajak (2002:46-64) convincingly considers that bilingualism of Jerusalem enabled Josephus to learn Greek in Palestine. Josephus' remark indicates that a bilingual Jew, whose matrix language is Aramaic and embedded language is Greek, could write good style of Greek composition.[164] (4) The contemporary Jewish view of second language acquisition indicates that there are many early and/or primary bilinguals with precise pronunciation because of regional or occupational bilingualism. That is, there are many early bilinguals and primary bilinguals in first-century

---

assistants when he composed his books (Thackeray 1929:100-124). However, others like Rajak admit Josephus's competence of Greek; she (2002:236) argues that "second-rate authors imitated their models" and proposes, "it would be natural for Josephus to try out a number of different styles in his work." When we take bilingualism of first-century Palestine into account seriously, it is highly possible that Josephus could have written the styles of famous Greek writers.

[164] Josephus (*Vita* 9.40) mentions another acquired bilingual, Justus of Tiberias; refer to Rajak 1973:345-68; Freyne 1992:79.

Palestine without regard to their social status.

Paul seems to be a bilingual, also being very capable in Greek and Aramaic.[165] Regarding his matrix language there is some disagreement. Van Unnik (1973:304, 321-7), for example, suggests Paul's matrix language was Aramaic[166] whereas Hengel proposes it was Greek (Hengel 1991:34-7, 125 n.188; 1983:37). Becker (1993:34-6, 53) also suggests that Paul's matrix language was Greek and bases this on his splendid Greek composition. However, good Greek composition does not prove one's matrix language. Although Lucian and Josephus were acquired bilinguals who both used Aramaic as their matrix language, they became famous Greek writers. On the contrary, whether his matrix language was Aramaic or Greek, there is no doubt that he has a full mastery of both Aramaic and Greek. This means that Paul could be an early or primary bilingual. Even if he was a late or acquired bilingual, like Lucian and Josephus, acquired bilinguals, Paul's embedded language may be developed in close proximity to his matrix language. One of the reasons is that Paul considers his Aramaic competence as one of his credential lists, as Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (2 Cor.11:22; Phil. 3:5) shows (§5.2.1). Accordingly, from the perspective of bilingualism, the discussion concerning Paul's matrix language is not of importance because Paul could use his embedded language as much as his matrix language.

3.2.6 Occupation

Occupation can sometimes lead to individuals becoming acquired bilinguals.

---

[165] Concerning Paul's bilingualism, Millar (1993:364-5) draws a vivid picture of Paul about bilingual situation of Jerusalem.

[166] Bruce (1977:43) also suggests, "while Paul was born into a Jewish family which enjoyed citizen rights in a Greek-speaking city, Aramaic and not Greek was the language spoken in the home and perhaps also in the synagogue which they attended." It is interesting that Chrysostom regards Paul's matrix language as Aramaic. When Chrysostom (in 2 Tim 4, *NPNF*, 13.490) makes a comparison between the emperor Nero and Aramaic-speaking Paul, he mentions, "he (Paul) was a tent-maker, a poor man, unskilled in the wisdom of those without, knowing only the Hebrew tongue, a language despised by all, especially by the Italians."

Professional bilingualism was required in a bilingual region or a bilingual society. Some occupations would have given preference to bilinguals (Hezser 2001:240). Some professions like scribes demand biliteracy and others like traders do bi-orality. For instance, it is well-known that an Egyptian who intended to work anywhere under the Ptolemies (256-255 BCE) should speak and preferably write Greek as well (*P. Col.* 66): "I therefore request you, if you please, to order them to let me have what is owed to me / and in future to pay me regularly, so that I do not die of hunger because I do not know how to speak Greek" (cf. Austin 1981:418 no.245; Green 1990:313). This shows that getting a job in Egypt requires speaking Greek. Despite the fact that Phrygian is quite similar to Greek, it is interesting that Brixhe (2002:256) suggests who bilinguals in Phrygian and Greek would have been:

> Those who, in the course of their professional activities, dealt directly with civic officials (e.g. contractors), or who in one way or another came into contact with the Roman authorities (e.g. the army); medium or large landowners who produced more than they required to satisfy the needs of their family and sold some of the excess on the market; those who managed, or who were involved in the management of, large estates owned by Greek speakers, etc.

Similarly, Jews of first-century Palestine also tried to learn Greek for the purpose of their employment. Hezser suggests that for two types of professions Greek would have been a mandatory prerequisite. One is Jews who intend to work at public offices at the municipal level due to contact with non-Jewish Greek-speaking officials. The other is Jews those who are employed in trade relationships with Greek-speaking Gentiles or Jewish Diaspora (Hezser 2001:231; cf. Sevenster 1968:183). Economically, Galilee depended by and large on completely Hellenized cities in Phoenicia (Hengel 1989a:15). Galilean residents

who were employed in trade, like Peter, would have been required to speak Greek.[167] Those who worked as tax collectors, building craftsmen, and trade fishers were considered middle status and may have been bilingual (Hengel 1989a:17).[168] In this respect, Argyle assumes that Jesus as a carpenter who grew up in Galilee would speak Greek.[169] Similarly, he adds Simon, Andrew, James, John, and Levi to the list of contemporary bilinguals.[170] At the very least, they should be regarded as semibilinguals because to execute their jobs they would have been in contact with Greek-speaking people.

Sevenster (1968:38-61; here, 44; cf. Hengel 1989a:16) asserts that "many Rabbis were completely familiar with Greek." Palestinian rabbis generally spoke the Greek of the middle-class man of Palestine (Lieberman 1965:2).[171] This raises a possibility that the LXX was read elsewhere in Palestine as well as in Diaspora.[172] What is more, scribes in first-century Palestine may function as copyists like scribes in Ptolemaic Egypt.[173] A bilingual community requires bilingual copyists. For instance, that Babatha's legal documents are

---

[167] For Peter's bilinguality, see ns. 125, 126.

[168] For this reason, he assumes that Jesus who was a building craftsman might have been a bilingual.

[169] Argyle (1974:88) mentions, "Any Jewish tradesman who wished his business to prosper would be eager to make his range of customers as large as possible and so would welcome Greek-speaking Gentile customers as well as Jews. This would apply especially in Galilee of the Gentiles where the majority of the population was Gentile and Greek-speaking. ... If Joseph and Jesus wanted their carpentry business to prosper, they would be happy to welcome Gentile as well as Jewish customers. They would therefore need to speak Greek as well as Aramaic if they were to converse with all their customers." Fitzmyer (1992:61) also mentions that Jesus "was a skilled craftsman. ... He would naturally have conducted business in Greek with Gentiles in Nazareth and neighboring Sepphoris."

[170] Argyle (1974:88; cf. 1955b:92) mentions, "Simon and Andrew, James and John would need to know Greek if they were to sell their fish in Gentile markets. So would Levi, the inland revenue officer, the civil servant, engaged in government employ." Cf. Lee 1985:6; Fitzmyer 1992:62; Porter 1994:136.

[171] For Rabbi's Greek competence, see Lieberman 1965:27, 66; 1950:100-114. On the contrary, Philip Alexander (2001:74) considers that elites of Palestine were bilinguals: "there is surely a strong presumption that the Rabbis, who were among the more educated members of Jewish society, would have known the language (Greek)," although he holds a different view from Lieberman's argument.

[172] In relation to the LXX found in Qumran, it seems reasonable that Millar (1993:352) proposes, "if the texts found at Qumran included, as they did, at least some of the books of the Septuagint, we can be confident that the Bible could be read in Greek translation elsewhere in Judaea also." For instance, concerning the colophon of Greek Esther, see n.160.

[173] Saldarini 1988:241-276; Goodman 1994:102-8; Esler 2001:34-5. Moreover, Hengel delineates that "whereas Greek education was designed to produce gentlemen amateurs, Eastern education was designed to perpetuate a guild of professional scribes." For more information, see Hadas 1959:68.

written in Greek, Aramaic and Nabataean (Yadin 1971:230) indicates that the scribes in the bilingual society must have been bilinguals.[174]

Furthermore, some lower-status Jews were bilinguals. Slavery resulted from involuntary migration and sometimes made servants bilingual (Myers-Scotton 2002:32). We know that some slaves in Rome could be bilinguals who could speak Greek as well.[175] In addition, although slaves were from various countries, households preferred Greek-speaking slaves and, thus, forced them to learn Greek. Josephus (*Ant*, 20.264) mentions that even slaves could be bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek in first-century Palestine.[176] Feldman also allows the bilingualism of slaves when he (1993:19) mentions, "to be sure...slaves and freedmen knew and used Greek."[177] Gamble (2004:31) suggests, "Even the literate commonly preferred not to exert themselves in private reading, but to be read to by a literate household slave or freedman." One may say that bilingual competence in first-century Palestine does not show social status because slaves too could learn and speak Greek. Sevenster (1968:70) suggests, "This demonstrates that Greek was not only spoken in a few groups and classes, but that everyone in the Jewish country had the chance of speaking it. Greek could evidently be heard in all circles of Jewish society." As discussed, some professions prefer bilinguality while certain jobs require it.

In sum, the epigraphical, papyrological and population geographical evidences indicate that first-century Palestine was largely bilingualism. In other words, they show both

---

[174] For instance, *Dura Parchment* 28 and *P. Mesopotamia* found in Osrhoene show that professional scribes were bilinguals in Syriac and Greek; See Brock 1994:151-2; Butcher 2003:143. The parchments and papyri found in Osrhoene were written in Greek and Syriac and they were written by professional scribes. This also indicates that professional scribes in Edessa were bilinguals. See Brock 1994:151-2.

[175] Adams 2003:15, 761-2. Adams proves that some freedmen and slaves could speak Greek as well. Moreover, some of them might be literate, as epitaphs at Delos, Petronius, Plautus, and Rome show (p. 762).

[176] Sevenster 1968:69-70. For the information of literacy of slave in ancient times, see Gamble 2004:31; Starr 1991:337-43; esp. n.12.

[177] However, conversely, he denies that middle and upper status Jews of first-century Palestine could speak Greek. Nevertheless, if middle and upper status Jews could not speak Greek, "this would be the exception to the general pattern" of the phenomenon of bilingualism, as he expresses (1993:14).

"urban and upper-status" and "rural and lower-status" bilingualism. And political, social, economical, cultural, religious, and geographical factors enabled a considerable number of upper-status and lower-status Jews to be bilinguals.

3.3 Bilingualism of First-century Palestine and Interdirectionality

Bilingualism means coexistence. The maximalist view of bilingualism of first-century Palestine helps us to draw some pictures about both the historical Jesus and JTrad more completely: (1) When Jesus spoke to his audiences, there were many bilinguals who spoke and understood Greek both in upper-status and lower-status Jews. (2) During Jesus' ministry in Palestine, JTrad, sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus, must have been translated into Greek. As a result, JTrad must have been circulated in Aramaic as well as in Greek. Accordingly, transmission of JTrad was interdirectional and hybrid rather than unidirectional and unilinear.

4. Bilingualism of Jews in First-Century Diaspora

We have seen in chapter 1 that scholars have considered that Syrian Christian community made a significant contribution to transmission of JTrad and GTrad, although this first century community has attracted some scholars' attention without strong evidence. According to the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, one of the most important reasons to highlight the Syrian community is to bridge a linguistic gap between the Aramaic language used by Jesus and his disciples and the Greek the FGs were written in and to span between the Aramaic based Palestinian Christianity and Greek based Hellenistic Christianity.[178] Rudolf Bultmann (1925:145; 1967:102-3; cf. Bousset 1970:119) suggests that Syrian Christianity should be urgently investigated for coherence between Palestinian Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity. He (1925:145) considers that the problem of the Hellenization of the earliest Christianity is viewed as closely related to that of Syrification. On this account, it seems that for the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* the *linguistic* distinction is of significance in terms of the directionality of transmission of the early JTrad.

Fitzmyer (1979a:123) questions in this context whether by "Hellenistic Christianity" Greek-speaking communities in a pagan environment (such as Syria, Egypt, or Asia Minor) are meant. Additionally, he (1979a:123) considers if one can rule out that *Palestinian Christian Hellenists* had a great part in the formulation of the primitive kerygma. Hengel (1989a:1-6) has persuasively and exhaustively asserted that those who were "bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek" of the earliest Jerusalem church took significant part in the transmission of the JTrad.[179] In other words, in relation to the transmission of the JTrad,

---

[178] Bousset 1970:119-20; Bultmann 1935:12-3 (§1.2.2); Mack 1988:101-2. However, Dibelius (1949:25) has a different view of the contribution of the Syrian Christian community to the history of the earliest Christianity, when he suggests that Christian bilinguals of first-century Antioch could bridge between the two linguistic communities. See §1.2.1, §4.3.3.

[179] Furthermore, he (1989a:1-6) reveals that one of his reasons to write the publication is to criticise Syrian Christianity by Bultmann. Hengel properly criticizes against Syrification hypothesis in several points.

Bultmann focuses on the Hellenistic church such as the Syrian church, whereas Hengel on the Jerusalem church because of the *bilinguals*. More precisely, he concentrates on "bilingual *Palestinian* Greeks" (emphasis added).[180] However, it seems that most scholars. including Bultmann and Hengel, neglect the bilingualism of the Jewish Diaspora. One might consider that, for example, Roman Province Syria was a completely bilingual. Moreover. neither Bultmann nor Hengel takes into account the *Aramaic-matrix Diaspora Jews* and *Greek-matrix Palestinian Jews* seriously, as will be considered below. In relation to this concern, Millar (1993:21) questions:

> Were there Gentile Christian communities in this region which used Aramaic or a dialect of it? The Jewish community of Dura-Europos had certainly used Aramaic, as well as Greek. But had the Christian community nearby? Even if we do not treat the question as a purely linguistic one, was there, as so many modern books presume, a distinctive "Syrian" Christianity using Greek, which owed its character to its regional environment? If so, what would that mean? Of which of the many sub-regions of the Near East are we are talking, and what are the criteria of "Syrian" Christianity?

These questions raise the issue of whether or not there were a significant number of bilinguals in Syria alone. More generally questioned: were the linguistic situations of Palestine as well as other regions of the RNE bilingual or not?[181] Did Diaspora Jews of Syria and Egypt speak only Greek? Should all Gentile Christians be regarded as Greek-speakers? To highlight the importance of these questions, if the linguistic situations of Syria, Egypt,

---

[180] I will discuss with Hengel's argument in detail in chapter 5.

[181] Millar (1993:564-76) suggests that the RNE covers main sites such as Antioch, Cilicia. and Commagene (north), Phoenician Coast (west). Arabia, Sinai. the Red Sea. and the Hedjaz (south). and Mesopotamia, Dura, and Nisibis (east). I add Alexandria to the list of the region in this chapter.

and even Jerusalem were not monolingual but rather bilingual (i.e. Aramaic and Greek), it is inappropriate to view the unidirectionality of Gospel transmission as being from Semitic to Greek and from Judah-Palestinian Christianity to Hellenistic Christianity.

A study of bilingualism in first-century the RNE and Palestine may indicate that GTrad is not to be viewed straightforwardly as having developed unidirectionally from SemTrad to GkTrad. Indeed, both the Semitic and GkTrads probably circulated simultaneously in oral and written forms. The phenomenon of bilingualism will also make more fluid the borders between the Judah-Palestinian Christian church and Hellenistic church.[182] Furthermore, on the presupposition of many scholars that SemTrad was oral whereas GkTrad was written (chapter 1), the study of bilingualism will seek to display that just as OralTrad developed into a WrittenTrad, so too WrittenTrads may be changed into OralTrad. This may be a much more frequent practice than has been recognized. OralTransmission was a major communicative vehicle in ancient times and functioned much more complexly than a simple oral to written directional paradigm. Accordingly, it may be assumed that the directionality of the transmission of GTrad in first-century P&RNE was more likely hybrid than unilinear.[183] It is fitting that the transmission of the GTrad should be considered to be interdirectional rather than unidirectional.

In this chapter the bilingualism of the Jewish Diaspora of the first century Roman Empire will be observed. Following in chapters four and five will consider, respectively, bilingualism in Palestine and the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem. This chapter is concerned with four points: (1) the grounds for bilingualism of first-century Jewish Diaspora; (2) bilingualism of Alexandrian Jews; and (3) also of Antiochene Jews.

---

[182] Furthermore, Hengel (1974; 1980; 1983; 1986; 1991) also points out that there is no sharp distinction between Judaism and Hellenism in his major publications.

[183] As mentioned in §1.5.3. it is quite reasonable that Sanders criticizes unilinear transmission.

4.1 Grounds for Bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora

It is generally said that Jewish Diaspora of first-century Roman Empire has been known as Greek-speaking communities. However, recent evidence seems to support a bilingual view of the Jewish Diaspora for four reasons: (1) the bilingualism of the Roman Empire; (2) successive immigration; (3) periodic connection with Jerusalem; and (4) learning Aramaic in Jerusalem.

4.1.1 Bilingualism of the Roman Empire

It is said that one of the reasons of the success of Roman Empire is due to Roman policy of bilingualism (Fewster 2002:220). Scholars might have generally regarded the linguistic milieu of the first-century Roman Empire as Greek monolingualism, which is one of the characteristics of Hellenization. This assumption results in three linguistic presuppositions in relation to the spread of earliest Christianity: (1) the Gentiles spoke Greek whereas Jews spoke Aramaic; (2) Diaspora Jews spoke Greek whereas Palestinian Jews Aramaic; and (3) consequently Gentile Christianity refers to Greek-speaking community whereas Palestinian Christianity refers to Aramaic-speaking community.[184]

However, Classical historians have recently considered Hellenism as "coexistence" not as "fusion." In terms of the origin of the fusion hypothesis, when Hegelian philosophy was widely accepted, Johann Gustav Droysen (1836-43) studying under Hegel applied the Hegelian trinity (i.e. thesis – antithesis – synthesis) to Hellenistic world, that is, Greek + Oriental = fusion of the two. Criticizing Droysen's theory, Naphtali Lewis (1986:4) presents that an accumulation of archaeological evidence for last half-century not previously available, has demonstrated "the fallacy of the fusion hypothesis as a basis for understanding

the history of Hellenistic times."[185] Rather mutual influences were fringe (Lewis 1986:4). In terms of ethnic relationship between Greeks and Egyptians, Maehler (2004:3-4) suggests:

> But should this relationship be described as interaction, or as coexistence? Until relatively recently, most scholars thought that the two cultures began to merge early on, developing into a "mixed" Graeco-Egyptian civilization. Today, the opposite view, that Greeks and Egyptians lived their separate lives without taking much notice of each other, seems to be generally accepted.

As to languages, recently a consensus has been reached that although Greek was commonly employed in the first century CE, vernacular languages of most areas of the Roman Empire still persisted.[186] For instance, Acts 14:11 indicates that even *urban* inhabitants of Lystra of Galatia employ Lycaonian, their own native language, when they spoke to each other. However, these people changed their language codes from Lycaonian into Greek when they communicated with Barnabas and Paul. Jones (1940:289) suggests, "this piece of evidence is of particular value since it shows that the urban proletariat there still spoke Lycaonian: *a fortiori* the peasantry must have continued to speak it far later." The linguistic milieu of Lystra of Galatia seems to show a prototype of bilingualism in the Roman Empire because Lycaonian was used as the primary language and Greek as the

---

[184] For more arguments of the three presuppositions, see §5.2.

[185] In terms of onomastics, Mélèze-Modrzejewski (1983:248) suggests that Ptolemaic onomastics does not prove the linguistic milieu because the inscriptions show marginal group of the society so that "fusion" hypothesis is based on the fragile foundation of a special cases of limited scope.

[186] Selective publications are followed: Sartre 2005:274-96; Adams 2003; Butcher 2003; Adams 2002; Taylor 2002:298-331; Janse 2002:349; Fewster 2002:220-45; Brixhe 2002:246-66; Healey 2001:18-21; Porter 2000a:136-7; Cotton, Cockle & Millar 1995:214-235; Brock 1994:149-60; Millar 1993:xiv, 232-3, 503-4; 1992:97-123; Bubenik 1989:276-81; Sherwin-White 1987:1-31; Millar 1987a:143-64; 1987b:110-133; Drijvers 1984:1-27; Goodman 1983:64-5; Millar 1983:55-71; Mussies 1983:356-69; Rosén 1980:215-39; Mussies 1976:1040-64; Millar 1971:1-17; Brunt 1971:170-72; MacMullen 1966:1-17; Rostovtzeff 1957:193; Hitti 1951:256-7; Jones 1940:32-3, 288-93; Dibelius 1935:75; Roberts 1888:180-4; Bernhardy 1861:1.493. Furthermore, in terms of bilingualism in Greek-Roman period, Horsley offers some publications; see *ND* 5.11-2.

common language was second.

Above all, first-century Rome was known as a bilingual city.[187] Most areas where the Latin language family was used were also bilingual.[188] It is striking that in the case of the regions of the Greek language family, vernacular languages survived and did not disappeared. Strabo mentions that Cappadocia, as ἑτερόγλωττοις ἔθνεσι indicates, was a multilingual region (Janse 2002:347-9).[189] In terms of Punic,[190] even "Punic culture survived not only in Sardinia; in Africa Punic could be written until second or third centuries, in neo-Punic, Latin or Greek characters, and was spoken, at any rate as a peasant language, at least until the end of the fourth century [CE]" (Millar 1983:57). Phrygian was also bilingual in Phrygian and Greek. Phrygian inscriptions were found until the 2nd-4th CE (Janse 2002:350; Brixhe 2002:246-66; Bubenik 1989:277; Jones 1940:290). Patristic literature of Sokrates and Sozomenos evidences that Phrygian continued to be used up to the fifth century (Bubenik 1989:277; Janse 2002:350). The linguistic milieus of Ptolemaic and early Roman Egypt were bilingual in Egyptian and Greek, as will be mentioned in detail (§4.2.1). In the case of the RNE, even though Greek was used as the common language, Aramaic was also used as a primary language (Janse 2002:357; Millar 1993:503-4). The variety of the bilingual situation depends on the regions, as will be suggested (briefly below and in detail in §4.3.1).

The survival of vernacular languages reveals that Greek did not supplant vernacular languages completely, but rather *coexisted* with them. In other words, the persistence of the languages brings about bilingualism. Emphasis should be placed on the fact that bilingualism is not a "zero-sum game." As the definition indicates, bilingualism

---

[187] Adams 2003: *passim*; in the case of Roman Jews, refer to Noy 1997:300-11; Rutgers 1995:176-209; Angus 1914:123.

[188] Adams extensively deals with bilingualism of Latin family language, that is, its sister languages and its daughter languages in his monumental book (2003), mentioned above.

[189] Janse (2002:347-59) also mentions that although what Cappadocian is like is under dispute, it seems that it was distinct from Greek and was a daughter language of Anatolian; cf. Jones 1940:288-90.

[190] Acts 28:2 indicates, the residents of Malta, called βάρβαροι spoke Punic. Greek and Latin; see Barrett 1994-1998:1220-1.

refers to the alternative use of "two or more" languages. To illustrate the point, if a city where people use Aramaic is influenced by Greek, generally speaking, Aramaic will be the primary language whereas Greek will be a second language. This does not mean that residents speak only Greek, but rather that as bilinguals they speak Aramaic and Greek.[191] In this respect, although unsatisfactorily, Schwartz considers the relationship between Greek and *Hebrew*, his comments (2005:54) on the linguistic phenomenon of bilingualism merit attention:

> It would, for example, be simply false to say that the rise of Greek in the Hellenistic period generated a decline in Hebrew, or that the revival of Hebrew for some purposes in late antiquity implied a decline in Greek. Hebrew usage was only obliquely related to vicissitudes in the usage of Greek, if it was related to them at all.[192]

Almost all areas of the first-century RNE were bilingual in Greek and vernacular languages. Bilingualism occurred at different degrees and in different situations. The bilingualism of first-century RNE should be understood from the perspective of the coexistence of two or more languages. As Green (1990:313; cf. Millar 1971:1-17) asserts, "even in the heavily Hellenized areas of Syria, Phoenicia and Cyprus bilingual inscriptions are common." Along these same lines Jones (1940:290) points out, "more significant is the evidence for the survival of Aramaic in apparently Hellenized regions."[193] So too, Millar

---

[191] In similar to this, acculturation of Diaspora Jews does not mean assimilation. Although some Diaspora Jews were acculturated by Hellenism, this does not mean that they were assimilated to Hellenism. For more discussion, see Barclay 1996:92-8. Sterling (2001:274) also mentions, "no one seems to have thought that the use of the Greek language compromised Judaism. It is worth noting that Bar-Kochba carried on correspondence in Greek, even if the Greek letters were written by members of his staff. The use of Greek was therefore a matter of acculturation not assimilation."

[192] Unfortunately, he assumes that the primary language was Hebrew.

[193] Cf. Hitti 1951:256-7; Healey 2001:18-21. Yadin (1971:234) also suggests that while Nabataeans must have spoken an Arabic dialect, they used Aramaic as well.

(1987a:144) proposes, "various dialects of the Semitic language which we call 'Aramaic' were spoken all the way round the Fertile Crescent, from Babylonia to Arabia" (his emphasis). As a consequence, the survival of Aramaic means the coexistence of both Greek and Aramaic. There were many bilinguals in Greek and Aramaic in the regions of first-century RNE. Some upper-status inhabitants[194] in the regions of the RNE spoke only Greek, whereas some lower-status inhabitants spoke only Aramaic. In the same vein, many Diaspora Jews of the first-century RNE may have been bilinguals in Greek and Aramaic. Some upper-status Diaspora Jews of first-century RNE spoke only Greek, whereas some lower-status Jews only Aramaic. What is more, many Jewish and Gentile Christians of the RNE may have been bilinguals. Some upper-status Jewish and Gentile Christians spoke only Greek, whereas some lower-status Jewish and Gentile Christians only Aramaic.

4.1.2 Successive Immigration

It has been said that Palestinian Jews were scattered into regions of the Roman Empire for several reasons. Most obvious are: expulsion, political difficulties, religious persecution, internal conflicts, and tempting economic prospects in other countries.[195] After Palestinian Jews had immigrated into the regions where Greek was employed as a primary language, they should have been acculturated and, especially begun to speak Greek;[196] in the process of acculturation, it is no doubt that the first generation of the Jews in Diaspora must have tried to learn Greek. For first-generation Diaspora Jews, Aramaic was still their matrix

---

[194] In terms of measuring social stratification, I will use the term, "status," one of three different kinds of ranking in Roman times: class, *ordo*, and status, as Meeks (1983:51-73) suggests.

[195] Stern 1974:1.117; Kasher 1987:47. In this respect, Kasher (1987:47) mentions that migration of Jews is different from that of Greeks who were voluntary and encouraged by Hellenistic kings of those countries.

[196] In this respect, Hengel puts forward that "in terms of language, the 'Hellenization' of these Jewish garrison troops or cleruchs must have made fairly rapid progress. Only about twenty-five percent of the names of Jewish military settlers mentioned in third-century papyri are Semitic; all the rest are already Greek."

language, while Greek was their embedded language. From the second generation, Diaspora Jews in Hellenistic circumstance might have chosen Greek as their matrix language, if they could choose their language; as a result, they would be early or late bilinguals in Greek as their matrix language and Aramaic as their embedded language if upper-status younger Jews could acquire Greek education or live in regions where Greek was primary language (§3.2.4). Furthermore, in the course of time, the next generations of the Diaspora Jews must have preferred to use Greek rather than Aramaic more and more. As a consequence of this, it seems that scholars have proposed that the Diaspora Jews might have been Greek-speakers.

However, language maintenance theory in a bilingual setting should be considered. It has usually been reported that in the case of minority languages in multilingual settings, language shift to dominant language takes three generations or four generations.[197] Moreover, language shift in ancient times could be slower than in modern times.[198] When Diaspora Jews spread into the Greek-speaking regions, language shift from Aramaic into Greek also might have taken three or four generations. The second or third generation of Jewish Diaspora who were bilinguals[199] could still have spoken Aramaic in the Greek-speaking areas.

It is interesting that Henry Cadbury (*Beg.* 5.59-74, esp. 62 n.4.) considers Ἑβραῖοι as Aramaic-speaking Diaspora Jews.[200] He (*Beg.* 5:62 n.4.) mentions that inscriptions of "synagogue of Hebrews" were found at Corinth ([συνα]γωγὴ Ἑβρ[αίων]) dated between 100 BCE – 200 CE,[201] at Rome (συναγωγὴ Αἰβρέων),[202] and at Philadelphia in

---

[197] Paulston 1994; chapter 2.

[198] Paulston (1994:17) suggests six general factors of opportunity of access to the second language for language shift: participation in social institutions, mass-media, transportation, travel, occupations and demographic factors. These factors hint that modern people are easier to have opportunity to learn the second language than ancient people.

[199] It is noteworthy to mention that Paulston (1994:13) suggests, "The mechanism of language shift is bilingualism."

[200] For full discussion of the Hebrews and the Hellenists, see chapter 5.

[201] *CIJ* 718; for discussion of the inscription at Corinth, see Deissmann 1927:16-17 n.7; Deissmann 1957:86; cf. Müller 1919:24, 58, 72. 98, 106-7, 112, 173.

[202] *CIJ* 510; *CIG* 9909. For more inscriptions in Rome, see *CIJ* nos. 291 (Ἑβρ[αί]ων). 317 (Ἑβρ[αί]ων). and 535 (Ἑβρ[αί]ων).

Lydia (τ]ῇ ἁγιοτ[άτῃ σ]υναγωγῇ τῶν Ἑβραίων).[203] He assumes that the designation "Hebrews" refers to Aramaic-speaking Jews of the synagogue and distinguishes more recent Jewish emigrants from older emigrants.[204] The former is Aramaic-speaking Diaspora Jews and the latter is Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews. Cadbury admits that some Diaspora Jews spoke Aramaic because they were newer Jewish emigrants from Palestine. Although it is not clear that the inscriptions are related to the newer Diaspora Jews, there is no doubt that incessant emigration makes the Diaspora Jews into two linguistic groups, Aramaic-matrix Jews and Greek-matrix Jews within the dispersion.

Furthermore, attention should be drawn to the fact that Jews did not stop being war slaves, mercenary soldiers, traders, deportees, or refugees even after the 4th century BCE.[205] Tcherikover declares that emigration from Palestine still continued during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE by a considerable number of Syrians and included Jews who spoke *Aramaic* and "were engaged in various trades and belonged to all classes of society: Syrian merchants, officials, soldiers, field-hands, slaves, etc."[206]

One of the major factors of Jewish immigration was related to war.[207] There can be two ways to be war immigrants. The first is as a slave.[208] *The Letter of Aristeas* (chapters 12-27) details that Ptolemy I (305-282 BCE) took 100,000 captives to Egypt (cf. *Ant.* 12.11-33; Barclay 1996:21). Although this number is almost certainly exaggerated, it preserves

---

[203] *CIJ* 754. Keil & von Premerstein 1914: 32-4, no. 42. There were 2,000 Jewish families in Lydia and Phrygia who had been mass-transported from Mesopotamia and Babylonia (210-205 BCE); see n.332. If the Jews reside together, they might have spoken Aramaic to some extent.

[204] *Beg.* 5.62 n.4; van der Horst 1991:87. Schürer (2.2.248) mentioned, "we also hear of a συναγωγὴ Αἰβρέων, probably that of such of the Jews as spoke Hebrew, in contradistinction to those of them who had ceased to speak it." Cf. Schürer 1879:35; for various interpretations of this "Hebrew," see Leon 1995:147-9; Noy 1998: 111-3. It seems that they were Aramaic-matrix speakers rather than Aramaic speakers many scholars suggest; see §5.2.2.

[205] Barclay (1996:21-2) also suggests the types of Jewish immigration.

[206] *CPJ* 1.5. Tcherikover (*CPJ* p.5 n.13) mentions that the "Syrians" sometimes refer to Jews.

[207] Kasher (1987:48-53) fully deals with reasons of Jewish immigration. For the case of mass-transportation. Josephus (*Ant.* 12:147-53) preserves Antiochus III's letter to order Zeuxis to transport 2.000 Jewish families in Mesopotamia and Babylonia into Phrygia and Lydia around 210-205 BCE (Tcherikover 1959:287-8; Schalit 1960:289-318).

[208] For more detail discussion, see Noy 1998:108-9.

historical information that many Jews were caught by the Ptolemaic army (Tcherikover 1959:50-2, 425 n.45). During the Battle of Raphia (217 BCE) many Jews became captives and were sold as slaves (Kasher 1987:49).[209] Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 251; cf. *C. Ap.* 1.43) claims that Antiochus IV carried about 10,000 Jewish captives.[210] In the case of the Battle of Emmaus, the defeat of Judas Maccabaeus ended in trade of huge number of Jewish slaves (*Ant.* 12.296, 299).[211] Ptolemy IX Lathyrus (ca. 103-2 BCE) conquered Asochis, a city of Galilee, and 10,000 inhabitants sold into slavery (*Ant.* 13.337). Philo (*Leg.* 155) notes that after the fall of Jerusalem (63 BCE) Pompey sent many Jews to Rome. Cassius Longinus invade Taricheae and according to Josephus (*Bell.* 1.180; *Ant.* 14.120), 30,000 inhabitants were sent into slavery.[212] Herod makes it a policy to sell brigands into slavery (*Ant.* 16.1-4).[213] During Varus' War (4 BCE) Varus, the Roman governor of Syria suppressed insurgents at Sepphoris and made its inhabitants slaves (*Ant.* 17.289, 298). Titus sent 700 Jewish men who were tall and handsome to Rome (*Bell.* 7.118)[214] and also sent 97,000 captives in the East (*Bell.* 6.420). Vespasian in 66-70 CE sent 6,000 young men to Nero to dig the Corinthian Canal and 30,400 were sold as slaves (*Bell.* 3.540). As a consequence, many Jewish "immigrants" may have actually been slaves of war (cf. also Daniel). The second way is as mercenaries. Josephus (*C. Ap.* 1.192, 200) informs us that many Jews worked as mercenary soldiers in the 4th century BCE and went to different areas of the Roman Empire (cf. Kraeling 1932:131; Borgen 1996:75-6; Barclay 1996:20). In terms of war immigrants, it has been suggested that Paul's father or grandfather may have migrated from Judaea to

---

[209] Kasher assumes that Antiochus's order of the liberation of descendants of Jewish slaves indicates that many Jews were enslaved during the Fourth Syrian War.

[210] Cf. 1 *Macc*1:32; II *Macc*5:14; Dan11:33. The number of the Jewish war prisoners is not certain; for more discussion of the number, see Kasher 1987:70 n.12.

[211] See 1 Macc. 3:41; II Macc. 8:11-14, 16, 25; 34:36.

[212] Cf. *Ant.*14.304, 313, 319-23. The number may be exaggerated; see Smallwood 1976:36 n.58, 131.

[213] For more reference, see Kasher 1987:51, 71 n.28; Herod (37 BCE) might have sent Jewish captives to Rome.

[214] In the case of Roman Diaspora, Rutgers (1995:168) mentions, "it is true that part of the Jewish community in Rome originated among Jewish slaves who had been shipped there on various occasions during the first centuries BCE and CE." Philo (*Leg.* 155) mentions that Roman Jews bought

Tarsus in the 1st century BCE (Ramsay 1930:31-2; Hengel 1991:4-17).[215] Josephus becomes a first-generation Jew in Rome in the 1st CE (Shutt 1961:1-7).[216] For him, as an acquired bilingual, he tells us explicitly that his matrix language was Aramaic having written his works in Greek. Political reasons pushed a huge number of Palestinian Jews to escape from their land.[217] Furthermore, some upper-status Jews immigrated for economic profits (Kasher 1987:57-63).

For these reasons, the theory that the next generations of Jewish immigrants of Diaspora spoke Greek as their primary language is not clear in that it cannot be defined who first-generation Diaspora Jews really were. Accordingly, the incessant emigration from Palestine transfuses Aramaic-speaking natives among Jewish communities in the Diaspora so that the Jewish communities there could have maintained their linguistic competence in Aramaic to some degree.

4.1.3 Periodic Connection with Jerusalem

According to Paulston (1994:15-6), it is interesting that language shift of the Greek Americans into English took place in four generations whereas language shift of Italian Americans did in three generations in Pittsburgh. She (1994:16) investigates that some significant features supporting prolongation of language maintenance is "marriage patterns of endogamy, a prestigious language with literary tradition, and access to a social institution with formal instruction, i.e. literacy in the original mother-tongue." Jews were encouraged for endogamy and were educated by the Torah in their synagogues. This implies a possibility that Diaspora Jews could have used Aramaic as longer as scholars have thought.

---

some Jewish slaves and set them free.

[215] Deissmann (1957:90) mentions that Paul's father or grandfather immigrated from Gishala in Galilee to Tarsus. Cf. Mommsen 1901:83-4 n.4.

[216] See §3.2.5. It is interesting that Rajak (2002:11, chapter 7) stresses that Josephus was a Diaspora Jew.

Although immigrants usually forget their ancestral language within three generations at modern rates, some linguistic communities which are geographically isolated or religiously separated could preserve their ancestral language far longer (Schwartz 2005:53). Well-known is that Jews of the Diaspora observed Jewish laws and continually kept in touch with their homeland.[218] Tax collection from Diaspora Jews indicates interaction between Diaspora Jews and leaders in the Levant (Barclay 1996:418-21). Josephus (*Bell.* 7.218; 16.162-7) mentions that Diaspora Jews paid two drachmas every year to the Jerusalem temple.[219] According to Cicero (*Pro Flacc.* 28.67-9; cf. Josephus, *Bell.* 16.171), when Flaccus was a Roman governor of Asia (62-61 BCE), he confiscated the gold Jews sent from all the provinces to Jerusalem. Undoubtedly, the great majority of Diaspora Jews paid their temple tax.[220] It is interesting that Jewish peasants grew rice in the plain near Antioch in the late of the second century (*Tosefta Demai* 2.1).[221] Rabbis regularly visited even rural areas outside of Palestine in order to collect tax from them (Wilken 1983:37). As regards transportation of the temple tax, Philo (*Spec.* 1.77-8; *Leg.* 156, 316) remarks that groups of Jews delivered the sacred money to Jerusalem. Josephus (*Ant.* 18.310-3; here 313) also reports that "Many tens of thousands of men undertook the transportation of those donations." As a result, Philo (*Spec.*, 1.69, 76-78; cf. Acts 2:5-11) notes that tens of thousands of Diaspora Jews flocked to Jerusalem at the time of the three pilgrimage festivals (i.e. Passover, Shevuot and Sukkot). Jeremias (1969:83) suggests that 125,000 pilgrims visited Jerusalem on average at Passover. Sanders (1992:127-8) estimates the figure at 300,000 – 500,000. When even Greek-speaking Jews of Diaspora visited Jerusalem where

---

[217] Kasher (1987:54-7) illustrates political banishments and escapes in detail.

[218] Suggesting one of the reasons of Semitisms of the SynGs, Dalman (1909:16) assumes, "The spiritual intercourse also which Jewish Hellenists continuously had with Hebraists in Palestine implied a constant interchange between Greek and Aramaic (but not Hebrew) modes of expression."

[219] Cf. *Bell.* 16.27-28, 169-73; on the basis of Ex30:14-15.

[220] Mandell (1984:223-32) may confines the temple tax to Pharisees. However, most scholars consent that Diaspora Jews paid the temple tax; see Hegel 1991:55; Barclay 1996:418-24; Wilken 1983:38-42; Safrai 1974:1.186-93; Lietzmann 1953a:77; *CPJ* 1.80.

[221] For more discussion of the Jewish peasants near Antioch, see §4.3.2.

Aramaic was spoken as matrix language, they would have been exposed to Aramaic-speaking persons.

Furthermore, in relation to the strong connection between Babylonia and Jerusalem, Stern (1974:117) proposes that their political and religious interactions between Aramaic-speaking regions and Palestine in the first century were very strong. For instance, Herod, a king of Palestinian Jews, promotes respect and friendship of Babylonian Jews and further, appoints Hananel, a Babylonian Jew of sacerdotal family as high priest.[222] Furthermore, that even Hillel, one of the two leaders of Pharisees, came from Babylonia might indicate the religious relationship between Palestine and Babylonia.[223] The strong connections between Palestine and Alexandria and Syria will be discussed (§4.2.4, §4.3.2).

4.1.4 Learning Aramaic in Jerusalem

Some Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews who had extended stays in Jerusalem (e.g. Acts 2:5) may have acquired Aramaic in various ways (cf. §3.2) because even Greek immigrants to eastern countries in the Hellenistic-Roman era assimilated to eastern culture. Kasher (1987:46; cf. Clarysse 1992:51-2) suggests three reasons for the orientalization of the Greeks in the Mediterranean countries: intermarriage, coexistence far from the motherland, and pan-Greek solidarity among the Greek elite group. The strong interaction between Hellenism and Semitism in the RNE is well established.[224] For instance, Livy (*History* 38.17) was afraid of the orientalization of Roman soldiers and complained that the "Macedonians who occupy Alexandria, Seleucia, Babylonia and their other colonies throughout the world, have degenerated into Syrians and Parthians and Egyptians." Hitti (1951:256-7) proposes

---

[222] Neusner 1984:34-9; Schürer 1.400-67. For the information of the political-religious relationship between Herod and Hananel and Hyrcanus II from Parthia see Richardson 1999:162, 242-4

[223] For more information, see Neusner 1984:39-41.

[224] Fitzmyer (1979a:38-43) also mentions the interaction between Aramaic and Greek.

that in the case of Greek colonists "in Aramaic Syria and Jewish Palestine the native culture in general more than held its own; it gave more than it received."[225] In relationship to the Greeks of Ancient Egypt, D. O'Connor (1993:83) proposes that Greek residents there "became Egytianized to a significant degree while yet maintaining a distinctively 'Greek' culture."[226] Investigating the tombs of the Roman Alexandria, Venit (2002:7-21) suggests that ethnic boundaries between Greek and Egyptian became fluid.

Another issue to consider is that some of the late Seleucid kings were referred to with Aramaic nicknames. Alexander I was called Balas. Alexander II, who was not of Seleucid lineage, was called Zabinas, which means "gifted one" (Hitti 1951:256). Butcher (2003:284) considers this practice and says it is striking that "in some regions we find people with Greek names giving their children Semitic names." Greek inscriptions were unearthed from hill-top temples of the limestone massif, an area surrounded by long-established Greek cities in Northern Syria in 131 CE. The inscriptions show that the Greek-speaking builders may have had at least some knowledge of Aramaic because of the use of the term "Madbachos." The Madbachos certainly originated from the Hebrew זבך and Aramaic root דבך and means "altar" (Millar 1987a:162-3). As an explanation of such practices, Tcherikover (1963:12-3) proposes that "Under the influence of the East the Greeks themselves started to sink to the level of the natives among whom they lived. … even the eastern languages did not remain alien to them." Furthermore, some individuals of two families among Greek immigrants (near Pathyris the second century BCE) are identified as Greeks born in Egypt in Demotic (Riggs 2005:19).[227] It is interesting that a famous letter in the 2nd century BCE depicts a mother offering her son congratulations for learning Egyptian

---

[225] Hitti (1951:256) also presents, "the Greek colonists gradually became more affected by Semitic life than the natives by Greek life." Tcherikover 1963:13) properly puts forward that "the East exerted more powerful influence upon the Greeks than they themselves were able to exert upon it."

[226] It is interesting that even the cult of Isis of Egyptian religion became widespread in Italy and elsewhere in Roman times (O'Connor 1993:83). Green (1990:315) also points out, "it was the alien Greek, who, by intermarriage and religious syncretism, slowly became Egyptianized."

[227] For interconnections and ethnic designations, see Goudriaan 1988:58-69.

(Rostovtzeff 1957:2.883, 1545). In light of this letter, it is likely that some Greek-matrix Jewish and Gentile Christians who stayed in the Jerusalem may have tried to learn or relearn Aramaic.[228]

Four points can be provided by way of summary. First, the linguistic milieu of the Jewish Diaspora of the RNE can be regarded as bilingualism (Aramaic and Greek), rather than Greek monolingualism. Many of the Jewish Diaspora could have spoken Aramaic and Greek.[229] Some upper-status Jews could speak only Greek while some lower-status Jews only Aramaic. Second, successive immigrations transfuse Aramaic-speaking Jews (and Syrians) into Jewish Diaspora communities so that many Jews could have preserved their linguistic competence in Aramaic (perhaps to a limited extent). Third, periodic connections with Jerusalem could have helped Jews to maintain their ability to speak or perhaps even to learn Aramaic. Fourth, even Greek-matrix Jews who long stayed in Jerusalem might have tried to learn or relearn Aramaic as their embedded language. In light of these considerations, one should not conclude that Jewish communities in the first-century Diaspora were simply Greek-speaking communities.

Although bilingualism of Diaspora Jews is of significance in terms of the transmission of the JTrad, this issue will not be engaged with to any depth here.[230] Instead, three cases of regional bilingualisms will be illustrated: Alexandria (§4.2), Antioch (§4.3), and Jerusalem (chapters.3, 5). These communities have been selected for three reasons: (1) relatively speaking, from the three regions the cities represent a number of written sources

---

[228] Schnabel (2004:654) suggests that the Hellenists who resided in Jerusalem spoke Aramaic as well. He explains, "They hardly would have settled in the Jewish capital if they were unable or unwilling to communicate in Aramaic."

[229] It is interesting that Torrey (1933:250) suggests, "Not only in western Asia, however, but also in Egypt and the Mediterranean lands, Aramaic was the language commonly spoken and written by the Jewish colonists."

[230] In this regard, Taylor (2002:301) confesses that in terms of languages of only Syria and Mesopotamia "although it is probably beyond any one scholar (it is certainly beyond me) to control all of these languages, one should be alert to the possibility that they may also have had a significant impact on the other languages spoken."

are preserved and available to us.[231] (2) The Diaspora communities in Alexandria and Antioch were among the largest in ancient times (Stern 1974:1.138).[232] The regional congregations in the Jewish Diaspora in the empire played a significant role in the rapid transmission of JTrads. (3) Lastly, these three cities are often mentioned in scholarship that considers the provenance and the *Sitz im Leben* of the gospels. In terms of the provenances of the FGs, concerning the GofMt, there have been three provenances such as Antioch, Syria, Jerusalem, or Alexandria.[233] The written place of the GofMk has been argued as Rome, Galilee, Antioch, or small and rural Syria (Telford 1999:13-4). When it comes to the provenance of the GofLk, although Kümmel (1975:151) remarks, "There is no convincing argument for any of these conjectures, and we can say for certain only that Lk was written outside Palestine," Fitzmyer (1981-5:116) suggests that the Gospel was written in Syrian Antioch where was bilingual. Finally, the Fourth Gospel is assumed to be written in Syria (Antioch), Alexandria, or Asia Minor (Ephesus). Consequently, Antioch is the strongest candidate for the origins of the FGs. Bilingualism of the three cities will shed fresh insights into issues of the directionality of transmission of the GTrad in relation of the *Sitz im Leben* of the FGs.

4.2 Alexandria

It has been said that the Egyptian Jews were considered as Greek-speakers. In relation to the linguistic milieu of Ptolemaic and early Roman Egypt, Cowley (*CAP* xiv, 191, 200) assumes "it is unlikely that Aramaic continued in popular use in Egypt long after the

---

[231] As a matter of fact, when we deal with the bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora of first-century Roman Empire, we find some difficulties for there are not many first and secondary materials to deal with the topic. On this score, reviewing the history of research of Early Judaism, Kraft & Nickelsburg (1986:13) mention, "little work has been done on the question of the use of Semitic in non-Palestinian Hellenistic areas (e.g. Alexandria, Antioch)."

[232] It is said that there were one million Jews in Syria, Egypt, Babylonia and Asia Minor, which outnumbered the Palestinian Jews by three to one in the time of Philo of Alexanderia. See Baron 1952:170-1. However, Russell (1967:103-106) persuasively suggests that this figure was much exaggerated.

[233] Davies & Allison (2004:138-9) summarize the views of the origin that scholars have

time of Alexander the Great."[234] And he also states that in Egypt "Aramaic probably gave way to Greek by about 300 BCE."[235] Margolis & Marx (1927:129) likewise assume, "the younger generation spoke Greek, casting behind them the Hebrew speech, or the Aramaic which then had begun to displace Hebrew at home, at least in the rural districts." As for the linguistic milieu of Alexandrian Jews, Silva (1980:209-213) applies bilingualism theory to the linguistic milieu of the Alexandrian Jews and, surprisingly, concludes that Jewish immigrants from Palestine into Alexandria quickly and thoroughly changed their language from Aramaic to Greek without a transitory period of bilingualism in Aramaic and Greek.[236] Along similar lines, Sterling (2001:273-4; cf. Feldman 1993:51-6) effectively summarizes five reasons that the Jewish Diaspora in Alexandria should be referred to as a Greek-speaking community. Sterling's reasons and assumptions are: (1) the epigraphic excavations in Alexandria which indicate the interval between the 3rd century BCE and the 2nd century CE. (2) All literature found from Alexandria was written in Greek. (3) Greek was the norm for Jews in Alexandria. (4) The populace used the Septuagint. (5) Lastly, Philo did not know any Semitic language. Another consideration may be added to these five points: Jews did not know nor learn Egyptian.[237] For these reasons, used and explained by a variety of scholars, it is supposed that the Alexandrian Jewish community in the 1st century was straightforwardly a Greek-speaking community.

However, sociolinguistic approach, the study of bilingualism, can shed insight

---

suggested.

[234] His argument seems to be premised on the assumption, when he dates Aramaic papyri nos. 81, 82, and 83 (1923:190-1): "No date is given, but the many Greek names suggest the Ptolemaic period, and this is corroborated by the character of the writing, which shows a much later stage of development than that of the Elephantine documents. It is unlikely, however, that Aramaic survived, even in individual cases, long after the time of Alexander, and we shall perhaps not be far wrong in assuming a date about 300 B.C."

[235] *CAP*:xv. For the information of replacement of Aramaic by Greek in the period of Ptolemaic kings, see Thompson 1994:67-83.

[236] If we assume that Jewish immigration into Alexandria is once, restricted, and small, Silva's idea would be right. However, he should have considered successive and massive immigrations and periodic connection with Jerusalem.

[237] Hengel (1980:93) denies the possibility that Egyptian Jews spoke Demotic Egyptian; Griggs (1990:15) also mentions, "it is certain that the Jews did not use Egyptian as their spoken language." However, some Jews spoke the Demotic, as will be suggested later.

into the linguistic milieu of the Alexandrian Jewish community of the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods. Literary evidence now supports that Alexandria was a bilingual city in Greek and Egyptian and there were many bilinguals in Greek and Egyptian.[238] This indicates that the Jewish community in Alexandria seems to have been bilingual in Aramaic and Greek (or Egyptian) in the Ptolemaic as well as early Roman periods. Bilingualism among Alexandrian Jews may be proposed based upon four basic reasons. As noted previously (§4.1), these reasons may be explored in more detail.

4.2.1 Bilingualism of the Ptolemaic and Early Roman Alexandria

Recently, scholars have reached consensus that the linguistic milieu of the early Roman Egypt was bilingualism in both Greek and Egyptian since the Ptolemaic period.[239] This is based on a large collection of bilingual documents, many of which were relatively recently discovered (e.g. decrees, contracts, receipts, mummy labels, and ostraca) from both urban and rural areas.[240] Jews were inhabitants all over Ptolemaic-Roman Egypt, in cities as well as in the countryside since about the 4th century BCE.[241] Furthermore, it is intriguing

---

[238] The linguistic milieu of Roman Egypt should be called bilingualism rather than diglossia; see Adams 2003:754.

[239] Missiou 2007:336; Taylor 2000:335; Fewster 2002:228-236; Thompson 1992:324; 1994:73. Muhs 1992:249-51; Youtie 1975:201-221; Gignac 1976:46-8; MacMullen 1966:1, 7; Jones 1940:32-3. In terms of the linguistic situation, Fewster (2002:224-5) suggests that Greek was used as an administration language and majority language was Egyptian; in addition, other minor languages such as Aramaic, Carian, and Nubian were also employed in restricted areas. However, generally speaking, it can be said that it was bilingual in Greek and Egyptian.

[240] Fewster 2002:228-236; Riggs 2005:100, 119-22, 203-5, 250-1; Midgley 1992:237-41.

[241] Papyri demonstrate that Diaspora Jews in Egypt were dispersed in cities as well as villages; refer to Tcherikover 1963:10; Hegermann 1989:2.132; Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1993:72-6. Tcherikover (*CPJ* 1.8) reports a Jewish synagogue list in Egypt in which includes cities as well as villages. Papyri indicate that Egyptian Jews were in rural areas; see *CPJ* no 409 (Euhemereia in the Fayûm, 3 BC), no 411 (Philadelpheia in the Fayûm, 13th Nov. 3 CE), no. 413 (Tebtynis, 16 CE), no. 416 (Philadelpheia, 25 CE), no. 420 (420a; Euhemereia, 26 CE, 420b; Euhemereia, 28-9 CE), no. 421 (Arsinoe in the Fayûm, 16th May, 73 CE), no. 427 (Apollonias in the Fayûm, 10th Feb, 101 CE), no. 430 (Arsinoe in the Fayûm, 105 CE), no. 432 (Arsinoe, 113 CE), and no. 433 (Philadelpheia, 1st century CE). One of the reasons that Jews spread to rural areas in Egypt is due to slave trade. Tcherikover (1959:68-9) suggests that merchants bought slaves in Syria and sold in Egypt; for instance, Johanna, probably a Jewish slave-girl belonged to Apollonius in one of the villages of the Fayûm.

that four types of language are still to be found even in Roman Egypt such as hieroglyphic, hieratic, demotic, and Coptic.[242] Hieroglyphic or Demotic was still used in urban and rural areas of the early second century.[243] Egyptian scribes in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt also should learn to write Greek as well as Demotic (Riggs 2005:18-9; Tait 1994:208).[244] During the Ptolemaic and Roman periods there were both Greek and Demotic school-exercises including word-lists and grammatical exercises (Tassier 1992:311-5). A variety of literatures and para-literatures in Demotic in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods[245] were written or rewritten in Demotic and read among Egyptians (Riggs 2005:34-5).

Alexandria of the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods was a bilingual city as well, although it was the most Hellenized city of the Roman Egypt. There are four reasons. (1) Various Demotic writings mentioned above should be read among Alexandrian Egyptians. Egyptian fictions in Demotic, for instance, were supposed to be written by priest and widely circulated among them (Tait 1994:203-8). Tait (1994:207; cf. MacMullen 1966:8) states, "this is hardly surprising, as in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods the priesthood roughly constituted that portion of the population that was literate in Demotic." The upper-status

---

[242] Fewster 2002:225; Riggs 2005:35, 119-22, 203-5; Mertens 1992:233. Four Egyptian languages are as follows: (1) Hieroglyphic script is the oldest and archaic form. It was still used in the Roman Egypt as a religious monumental script. (2) Hieratic is simply hieroglyphs written quickly and cursively. It was a script for non-monumental writing. (3) Demotic refers to both a script and to a particular stage in the Egyptian language. It is a cursive script and is derived from hieroglyphs. Demotic was used as the standard documentary script in the Persian and Ptolemaic periods. Since the Roman Egypt, it is limitedly used and by the second century CE it was used only in tax receipts and temple. During much of the Roman Egypt, most Egyptians could not write in their own languages. Instead, when they wrote, they had to translate into Greek. (4) Coptic refers to Egyptian language written in Greek script with a few additional letters. Egyptians could get access to learning Coptic easier than Demotic. The earliest Coptic materials were used by Christians from the fourth century CE. For detail explanation for the four languages, see Fewster 2002:225-6; Ray 1994:51-66.

[243] Riggs 2005:62-4; Grajetzki 2003:128. For instance, Riggs 2000:136. Jasnow (1990:89-96) also suggests that four demotic texts were excavated from Thebe and Hawara (?) in Late Ptolemaic and early Roman period.

[244] On the other hand, Youtie (1975:205) suggests, "most Egyptians were so far removed from Greek as a language to be read or written that they had never even learned to speak it, at least sufficiently to maintain their side of an intelligible dialogue." In the judicial cases, Egyptians often enlisted the aid of official interpreters even in 4 century CE (*Ibid*).

[245] Mertens (1992:234) illustrates a variety of the genres of Demotic literatures. The numbers of the genre of the Demotic literatures are as follows: narrative (136), poetical (2), wisdom (39), historical/prophetical (12), religious (24), mythological (12), funerary/mortuary (36), magical (18), omen literature (27), juridical (8), medical (11), mathematical (7), astronomical/astrological (44), school exercises (38), onomastica and word-lists (28), scientific and others or not specified (80) and

Egyptians like priesthood and scribes were bilingual in Demotic and Greek. The circulation of the Demotic literature in the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods assumes that Demotic literatures in oral form were circulated among upper-status as well as at least lower-status Alexandrians. (2) One of the reasons that Demotic was used in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods is that priests and scribes performed their rituals in their vernacular languages (Riggs 2005:26). It is interesting that a Demotic version of *the Book of the Dead* was written as late as 64 CE (Riggs 2005:29).[246] (3) The royal library in Alexandria included Demotic bilingual literatures and some of them were translated into Greek (Fraser 1.681-7). (4) Although inscriptions in Demotic continued to 5 century CE and non-literary ostraca in Demotic to 3 century CE,[247] Demotic documents disappear in the second century CE.[248] This means that although documents (e.g. business documents) were written in Greek from the first century CE, at least to say, Demotic was still spoken all over the country (Maehler 2004:11).[249] That Egyptians used Egyptian as their spoken language is also proved by the appearance of Coptic later because Coptic is the Egyptian language written in Greek.[250] In summary, the linguistic milieu of Alexandria of the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods was bilingualism. Many Alexandrians must have been bilinguals in Greek and Egyptian. Upper-status inhabitants used Greek as their matrix language whereas lower-status inhabitants in the cities and most inhabitants in rural areas employed Egyptian as their matrix language. There must have been

---

possible literary texts (13).

[246] Cultural bilingualism of Ptolemaic Alexandria is proved by bilingualism of tombs of Ptolemaic Alexandria; see Venit 2007; I appreciate her sending this article with permission, although the book will be published in 2007.

[247] Youtie (1975:203) mentions that Egyptians spoke Egyptian up to 7 century CE.

[248] Youtie suggested that the demise of Demotic stems from the difficulty of learning Demotic script; see Youtie 1975:203. However, Lewis (1993:276) persuasively suggests that the decline of Demotic documents is due to Roman policy. The Roman government forced the Egyptian administration to deny Demotic documents.

[249] Thompson also (1994:73) mentions that although Greek had become the main language of administration, "at the same time surviving ostraca show the continued, but by no means exclusive, use of demotic for tax receipts in the towns and villages of Egypt – an indication of the spoken language of the majority of the population, including local officials."

[250] See n.241. Youtie (1975:203) also suggests, "The Egyptian language maintained itself as a medium of communication, both spoken and written, for almost a millennium under Greek, then Roman domination, with no break in the spoken tradition. There was, however, a late shift from the indigenous script known as Demotic to a Greek script."

monolinguals. Some upper-status inhabitants might have spoken only Greek whereas some lower-status inhabitants only Egyptian depending on their regional distribution or educational level.

Egyptian bilingualism hints at a linguistic distinction of the Jewish community in Alexandria between upper-status and lower-status. Although Alexandrian Jews were placed from the poorest to richest in a variety of professions (Barclay 1996:115-6),[251] known is that there were two Jewish groups of Roman Alexandria under the influence of two opposite trends of Jewish tradition and assimilation to Hellenism.[252] One group is upper-status Jews who tried to maintain their positions in the Greek society and to become acculturated in Greek society (Tcherikover 1963:20-5). Philo (*Pro Flacc*, 57) enumerates five upper-status professions of Alexandrian Jews around 38 CE: shipping traders, merchants, artisans, landowners and bankers (e.g. Philo's brother Alexander; *Ant*. 18.159).[253] Upper-status Jewish boys, like Egyptian boys, were usually educated to know a wide range of Greek authors and the grammar and meaning of classic texts (§3.2.5). Goodman (1983:73) considers this as well suggesting that "in the first century Jews in Egypt may well have undergone the same curriculum (as Egyptians)." Although the cost of education was very high (Goodman 1983:72-3; cf. see Doran 2001:94-115), upper-status Jews wanted their children to get Greek education in the gymnasium (Sterling 2001:277). Bilinguality would have offered a great advantage for any member of society.[254] Most upper-status Alexandrian Jews might have used Greek as their matrix language.

The other group of lower-status Jews constituted the majority of Alexandrian

---

[251] Barclay (1996:103-24) specifically suggests the levels of assimilation among Egyptian Jews such as high, medium, and low assimilation. Also see Paget 2004: 146.

[252] In that sense, facing with persecution in 38 CE, Tcherikover (1963:24) proposes "the Alexandrian Jewry was divided into two parts: on the one hand, the rich and the intellectuals defending their positions in Greek society and their civic rights by means of negotiation and explanation, and on the other the common people devoted to their ancestral tradition and ready to defend it by force of arms."

[253] For detail information of the five businesses, see *CPJ* 1.48-50, no. 152. Money-lenders are also mentioned by Philo (*Spec*. 2.75; *Virt*. 82-3).

[254] Fewster 2002:242-3; Tomson 2001:34: see §3.2.5.

Jews and was simple peasants, craftsmen, shepherds, and small merchants who rejected Hellenism and were closer to Jewish tradition and Jerusalem.[255] Lower-status Egyptians spoke Egyptian as their matrix language and it is reasonable to say, at the very least, some lower-status Alexandrian Jews who could not learn Greek because of economic or geographic reasons may have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language. It is highly possible that some of them might have spoken Egyptian as their embedded language instead of Greek.[256] Consider the following: (1) in a situation of language contact people typically learn their second language from those they have contact with (i.e. neighbors) unless they receive formal education. (2) In a bilingual circumstance a language shift may be to adstratum or superstratum. Lower-status Jews who lived among lower-status Egyptians, whether in cities or rural regions, may regard Egyptian as their adstratum or superstratum. Most lower-status Alexandrian Jews used Aramaic or Egyptian as their matrix language.

4.2.2 Archaeological Evidence

All this is also borne out by archaeological evidence: Inscriptions of the Ptolemaic and early Roman Egypt demonstrate Jews still used Aramaic and Demotic. Cowley (CAP:190-203) illustrates three Aramaic fragments from Elephantine in the third century and fourth century BCE.[257] (1) No. 81 (about 300 BCE) is 10 columns papyrus of a business document (= Torrey 1937:4). (2) No. 82 (early in the 3rd century BCE or much after 300 BCE) is 14 lines papyrus of a Jewish legal document (Torrey 1937:4). (3) No. 83 (between 400 and 300 BCE) is 30 lines of names and accounts. Concerning ostraca of Ptolemaic Egypt, Mark Lidzbarski presents that three ostraca of the Greek period were

---

[255] Tcherikover 1963:20-5; *CPJ* 1.50.

[256] Tcherikover (1963:10) mentions, "a Jew who lived in a village or a provincial town was far from the Hellenic spirit."

[257] These papyri do not refer to Elephantine documents of the fifth century BCE; see n.373.

written in Aramaic by Egyptian Jews. The first one (*ESE* II. 243-8) in Berlin museum is a memorandum, a list of names and accounts in the second or third century BCE.[258] The other two ostraca (*ESE*, III.22-6) in the third century BCE are in the Library at Strasbourg. One is a private letter concerning the sending of products. The other ostracon is also a memorandum of a list of names and accounts. Torrey (1937:5) points out, "it is natural to suppose that the language of the memorandum was that of the community where it was written." Also attention should be paid to Nash Papyrus. The papyrus written in Hebrew belongs to Maccabaean age (i.e. 165 and 37 BCE) and might come from Fayûm (Albright 1937:143-76).[259] It contains the Ten Commandments (Ex. 20:2-17 or Deut. 5:6-21) and the Shema (Deut. 6:4-5). What is interesting is that the Nash Papyrus might have been used as a lectionary or for teaching purposes among Egyptian Jews (Albright 1937:175). This oldest Hebrew biblical papyrus might indicate that Egyptian Jews knew a Semitic language (*JIGRE* 5).

Torrey also suggests three pieces of evidence: (1) Nine of ten Alexander tetradrachms (318 BCE) bear Aramaic graffiti from the Demanhur hoard (*IGCH* n.1664).[260] These seem to be marks of identification. The graffiti indicate that the ordinary written language of those who inscribed these graffiti was Aramaic. For these reasons, he (1937:7) concludes convincingly that the "Jews of Egypt continued, among themselves, to use their own language." (2) The prefixed letters to 2 Maccabees (i.e. one of the books of the "Apocrypha") was originally written in Aramaic in the second century BCE, and translated into Greek (Torrey1937:5-6; 1900:225-7). This shows that Aramaic was commonly used among Egyptian Jews. (3) A Roman tribune (Acts 21:37-8) considered Paul as an Aramaic-speaking Egyptian Jew because he was surprised that Paul spoke Greek to him. This means

---

[258] Lidzbarski (*ESE* 2.243-8) judges that the date of the ostracon was the second century BCE whereas Torrey (1937:5) decides that the date is the third century BCE.

[259] For a long discussion of the date, see Albright 1937:150-72.

[260] Its modern name is Damanhûr.

that the Roman tribune thought that the ordinary language of Egyptian Jews was not Greek but Aramaic (Torrey 1937:6).[261]

Furthermore, there are three epitaphs excavated from the Roman Egypt. (1) Taken from an area around Al-Minya on the Nile south of Oxyrhynchus, an epitaph (?) is written in Hebrew of the second century CE or later (*CIJ* II no. 1533; *CPJ* III no. 1533; *JIGRE* no. 118). (2) Excavated from Antinoopolis, an epitaph is written in Hebrew of the second century CE or later (*CIJ* II no. 1534; *CPJ* III no. 1534; *JIGRE* no. 119). (iii) Although its origin is not clear in Egypt, there is a mummy label in Hebrew of the second century CE or later (*JIGRE* no. 133; *CIJ* II no. 1536; *CPJ* III no. 1536). These epitaphs indicate that some Egyptian Jews knew Aramaic or Hebrew up to the second century.

There is literary and archaeological evidence to support that some Alexandrian Jews in the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods knew Aramaic. Blau (1913:11; Fuchs 1924:114-122) suggests that *baraitha* in Tosefta Kethuboth 4.9 (cf. b. Baba Mezi'a 104a, j. Yebamoth 15a) indicates that Aramaic was used in Jewish legal documents of Alexandria because the quoted text of the Alexandrian *kethuboth* is Aramaic. However, Tcherikover considers that the text does not prove the language of the community. He (*CPJ* 1.30 n.77) argues, "Since the Palestinian *kethuboth* were usually drawn up in Aramaic, it was natural to quote them in this language." Nevertheless, the existence of the text indicates that the Alexandrian Jewish community read the Aramaic text.

One should also note with interest that Horbury and Noy show five Jewish inscriptions from Ptolemaic and Greco-Roman Alexandria indicate that a Semitic language was used among Alexandrian Jews until the 2nd century CE and later (*JIGRE* nos. 3, 4, 5, 15, 17). (i) No. 3 excavated from El-Ibrahimiya, Alexandria is an epitaph in Aramaic with Hebrew proper names of the early Ptolemaic periods.[262] (ii) No. 4 excavated from El-

---

[261] For two kinds of possibilities of the reason of the tribune's surprise, see Barrett 1994-1998:1024-5.

[262] No.3 = *CIJ* II no.1424; *ESE* II.49; *CPJ* III no.1424; in relation to this epitaph, Hengel

Ibrahimiya, Alexandria is also an epitaph in Aramaic or Hebrew of the early Ptolemaic periods.[263] (iii) No. 5 excavated from El-Ibrahimiya, Alexandria is Aramaic letters and numerals of the early Ptolemaic periods.[264] (iv) No. 15 excavated from Roman Tower, Alexandria is a votive column base written in Greek (dedication) and Hebrew (*shalom*) of the late Roman period.[265] (v) No. 17 excavated from Alexandria is a part of a lintel written in Greek (dedication) and Hebrew (*shalom*) of the Roman period.[266] Horbury (1994:13; *JIGRE* 4-5) suggests that "Some Egyptian Jews knew Aramaic under the Ptolemies, and Hebrew in the later Roman empire." Horbury also adds two points to the evidence for the Jewish use of Aramaic in the Roman Alexandria. 1) Philo (*Flacc.* 39) records that the Aramaic word Μάριν was mimicked when Gentiles insulted that some Jews use Aramaic in Alexandria (38 CE). This implies that some Jews used Aramaic. 2) Paul's use of μαράναθά without any explanation in the letter sent to the Gentile church (I Cor. 16:22) presumes that Jews of Diaspora in Hellenistic city might know some Aramaic (Horbury 1994:14).[267] (3) An Aramaic poem preserved in the fragmentary Targum on Exodus in Alexandria (4th or 5th c.) as well as the Antinoe Marriage Contract written in both Aramaic and Greek (5th c.) confirm that Aramaic was used among some Jews in Egypt (Horbury 1994:16). Horbury (1994:17) states, "The surviving Greek literature of Egyptian Jews is not fully representative of Jewish speech, which in Ptolemaic and early Roman Egypt also embraced Aramaic." Taking a step further, he (1994:18) insists "we should probably allow for some circulation of Aramaic writings, as the Aramaic epitaphs suggested."

In terms of the Greek OT many scholars including Sterling, as mentioned before

---

(1980:91) mentions, "The fact that in the early Ptolemaic necropolis of Alexandria we find Aramaic and Greek inscriptions on Jewish tombs among Gentile graves accords with the cohabitation of Jews and Macedonians or Greeks in mixed military units and military settlements."

[263] No.4 = *ESE* III. p.50; *CIJ* II no.1425; *CPJ* III no.1425.

[264] No.5 = *ESE* III. p.50; *CIJ* II no.1426; *CPJ* III no.1426.

[265] No.15 = *CIJ* II no.1438; *CPJ* III no.1438.

[266] No.17 = *CIJ* II no.1437; *CPJ* III no.1437.

[267] Sociolinguistically, the Aramaic term seems to be codeswitching. This will be explained in detail (chapter 8).

(n.375), assume that the Alexandrian Jews' use of Septuagint strongly supports that the Alexandrian Jews spoke Greek.[268] However, Millar (1992:99) proposes that the publication of an Aramaic *ketubah* from Antinoopolis in Egypt (417 CE) reopens the question about Diaspora Jews and the use of Semitic languages. In admission that the language of the Jewish Diaspora was undoubtedly Greek and that the LXX was used, Millar (1992:99) persuasively argues that this "does not prove that the Hebrew Bible was unknown in the Diaspora; nor does it prove that Hebrew or Aramaic was nowhere spoken or used."

There is also an inscriptional evidence to support Demotic-speaking Jews. Intriguingly, one of the ten Aramaic graffiti, as Torrey (1937:7) mentioned, was incised in Demotic Egyptian. The inscription is *hp-hp p nf* (?), that is, "Hphp the sailor (?)" He (1937:7) proposes it is evident that the ten graffiti are Jewish origin of the fourth or the early third century BCE. Despite that it is one out of ten graffiti in amount, palaeographic proof is excellent in quality. Unfortunately, Torrey pays no attention to the Demotic graffito in terms of Jewish language in Egypt.[269] The existence of the Demotic graffito strongly suggests that some Egyptian Jews knew Demotic Egyptian in the fourth or the early third century BCE. As some Alexandrian Greeks tried to learn Egyptian (n.366), so some Alexandrian Jews did. Accordingly, the archaeological evidence proves that some Alexandrian Jews spoke Aramaic

---

[268] As to the origin of the Septuagint, various explanations have been suggested such as Palestinian, liturgical, educational, or interlinear origin; for the theories of the origin in detail, see Marcos 2000:53-65; McLay 2003:101-103. However, in relation to the origin, one should also pay attention to the relationship between the origin and the Alexandria Library, the first universal library in history. Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.21.2 in Eusebius *HE* 5.8.11-15) reports that Ptolemaic I ordered Demetrius of Phalerum to found a research centre (i.e. the Mouseion) and the Royal library (for Mouseion, see Maehler 2004:1-14; for the Alexandria Library in detail, see Fraser 1.305-35; El-Abbadi 1990:73-141). The royal library collected Greek literature and translated literature from other languages such as Egyptian and Persian (Fraser 1.330). The library also includes literature about Zoroastrianism and even Buddhism (El-Abbadi 2004:170). El-Abbadi (1990:170) mentions, "Intellectual curiosity and academic interest no doubt motivated scholars to study, translate and write about eastern religious and cultures." This background of the Alexandria library, to some extent, corresponds to a dramatic story according to the *Letter of Aristeas*. that is, King Ptolemaic II Philadelphus on advice of Demetrius of Phalerum ordered translation of the Pentateuch for his library. The Greek translation of the Pentateuch might be strongly influenced by the Alexandrian atmosphere that books of eastern religions was translated into Greek. As mentioned before (n.277), the Book of Esther was translated into Greek in even Jerusalem.

[269] Albright (1937:156 n.29a) also has no comment of the No 1 coin written in Demotic, when he reviews Torrey's the publication.

as well as Greek (some Demotic) in the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods.

4.2.3 Successive Immigration

Palestinian Jews constantly immigrated to Alexandria. This would make it feasible that Alexandrian Jews continued to speak Aramaic (Hengel 1980:93). Tcherikover demonstrates that Aramaic was spoken until the Greco-Roman period. He (*CPJ* 1.30) states, "there was a continuous stream of Syrian immigrants (including Jews) during the entire Hellenistic and Roman periods." Horbury (1994:15) proposes that both continuous immigration to and temporary sojourn in Egypt caused Jews there to become bilingual (Greek and Aramaic). Josephus (*C. Ap.* 194) mentions that a large number of Palestinian Jews were moved into Egypt after the death of Alexander. Josephus (*C. Ap.* 1.186-9; cf. *C. Ap.* 2.33; *Ant.* 12.9, *Aristeas* 12-4) also records that after the battle of Gaza (312 BCE) 100,000 Jews, including Hezekiah a Jewish high priest, accompanied Ptolemy I Soter to Egypt (Tcherikover 1959:56). Among them 30,000 were arranged in fortresses and the rest (i.e. old men and children) was given to Ptolemy' soldiers as slaves (Borgen 1996:75-6).[270] This means that some Jewish captives could learn Greek as a second language from upper-status solders whereas others might learn Demotic from lower-status Egyptians. In the second part of the 2nd century BCE, the immigration reaches its highest point. Papyri excavated from Egypt show that the proportion of Semitic names increased again.[271] The unexpected increase of Semitic names seems to be the result of massive immigration to

[270] Borgen mentions that later, Ptolemy II Philadelphus (284-246 BC) gave freedom to the slaves.

[271] *CPJ* 1.28, pp. 194-226. Kasher 1985:9. Hengel (1980:86) suggests two reasons of the increase of Semitic names; one is that "Jewish mercenaries were organized into independent units and gained considerable political significance under their own troop leaders." The other is that "this increase in Jewish names is also a sign that Jewish national self-awareness had also increased as a result of their stronger political position in Egypt and in the home country of Palestine." However, Honigman (1993:93-127) rebuts Hengel's position due to chronological and methodological problems. Despite all this, whether the Semitic names were Jews or Syrians, we cannot deny the fact that the Semitic names increased in the second century again, which proves that the first-generation

Egypt (ca. 165 BCE). Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 387; cf. *Bell.* 7.423) presents that Onias IV with his Jewish community fled to Alexandria (ca 162-160 BCE) and was warmly welcomed in the Ptolemaic court by Philometor (180-145 BCE).[272] The community was settled in Leontopolis as military force (*Ant.* 13.62-73; *Bell.* 7.421-36). In addition, Jewish immigration continued in the 1st century CE, as Claudius's letter (41 c. CE) hints, "Jews are forbidden to into the city other Jews from Egypt *or from Syria*" (Horbury 1994:15 [his emphasis]).[273] Furthermore, Horbury discusses that except for mercenary soldiers the reasons for Jewish immigration were various. He (1994:16) notes that visits for trade or other purposes made it possible for Alexandrian Jews to continue to speak Aramaic, like the cases of tax-farmer Joseph and his son Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 12.154-236) and stories of the political refuge of Onias, Sicarii's attempt to find its refuge in Alexandria, or Jesus who fled to Egypt.[274] The incessant immigration does not permit us to decide who the second-generation immigrants into Alexandria were, although admittedly the immigrants spoke Greek as their matrix language from the second-generation (§4.1.2). As a consequence of these factors, some Alexandrian Jews spoke Aramaic and particularly first-generation immigrants from Aramaic-speaking regions (Horbury 1994:16).

4.2.4 Periodic Connection with Jerusalem

Alexandrian Jews had continuous contact with Jerusalem (Tcherikover 1963:23-7).[275] In the words of Pearson (1986:210): "traffic between Jerusalem and Alexandria was

---

immigrants used Aramaic as their matrix language.

[272] For detail discussion of the date, see Barclay 1996:35-7.

[273] Cf. *CPJ* no.153 p.41 lines 95-6. However, Tcherikover (*CPJ* 1.5 n.13, 2.54) takes a note that the "Syria" refers to Palestine.

[274] However, in terms of the Jesus narrative, refer to Allison 1993:140-65; he suggests that the story of Jesus is often viewed as a purposeful and therefore non-historical account that casts Jesus as a Moses-like character.

[275] Egyptian Jews continuously had relationship with Jews in Jerusalem; see, Kasher 1985:1-28. For instance, when the Seleucids were defeated by the Hasmonaeans, Jews from Egypt and Cyrene made an active contribution to the Hasmonaean revolt. See Bickerman 1933:233-4; refer to

extensive." By all accounts, the interrelation between Jerusalem and Alexandria was strong (Tcherikover 1963:20-7). There are two major reasons to visit Jerusalem. (1) Philo (*Spec.* 1.68) mentions that Alexandrian Jews took part in Jewish pilgrimage holidays in Jerusalem. (2) Alexandrian Jews paid temple tax. Although concurring with the observation of Tcherikover that "a number of Alexandrian Jews lived in Jerusalem and enjoyed an independent organization, holding services in their own synagogues,"[276] this does not mean that they were not exposed to Aramaic-speaking contexts or that they did not know Aramaic. It is probable that constant visits to Jerusalem would have provided some Alexandrian Jews with opportunities to speak Aramaic, thereby enabling them to sustain it.

The Jewish community in Alexandria can be called a bilingual community. From the perspective of Hamers and Blanc's definition (§2.1.2) there were various kinds of bilinguals among the Jewish community in Alexandria based on their social status. These groups were: monolingual Greek speakers, early or late bilinguals of Aramaic and Greek, early or late bilinguals of Aramaic and Egyptian, and only Aramaic or Egyptian monolinguals.

4.3 Antioch

Many scholars have placed the Antiochene Christian community between Palestinian Jewish Christianity and Hellenistic Gentile Christianity. As previously touched upon, it has been suggested that Antioch could bridge the gap between Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christianity and Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christianity.[277] One assumption is that the Jewish Diaspora in Antioch used Greek because of Hellenizing influences. As Jerome Crowe (1997:xiii) mentions: "in Antioch...both Jews and pagans spoke Greek."

Ant. 13.74-79.

[276] Tcherikover 1963:24; cf. *Tosefta*, *Megillah* 3 (2), 6; Acts 6:9.

[277] See introduction to chapter3. Hengel & Schwemer 1997:279-286.

However, it seems that there were many bilinguals in Greek and a vernacular Aramaic dialect among Antiochene inhabitants and that most Antiochene residents spoke Aramaic as their matrix language, as will be discussed. This hints that most Antiochene Jews might have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language and that most Antiochene Christians might have spoken Aramaic as their matrix languages.

4.3.1 Bilingualism of the Roman Antioch

The linguistic situation of the Roman Province Syria[278] was *multi*lingual. While Greek was employed as the common language, vernacular languages in each region were still used for everyday purposes.[279] The bilingual circumstance of the Roman Province Syria cannot be summarized simplistically because the contact of Greek with Aramaic family language resulted in different consequences depending upon dialects, regions, and times (Brock 1994:149). Moreover, the bilingual distribution of regions of Syria varied. First of all, Palmyra was a publicly and officially bilingual society in Greek and a local Aramaic dialect (i.e. Palmyrenean) as a whole (Kaizer 2002:27-34). Kaizer (2002:27-34; here 27) mentions, "Out of ca 3000 inscriptions from Palmyra, mainly written in the local dialect of Aramaic, over 200 are bilingual, consisting of a Greek and a Palmyrene text."[280] He (2004:166; cf.

---

[278] Admittedly, the term "Syria" is too broad to define at that time; according to Strabo (*Geog.* 16.1.1-2) it refers to people those who in the Cilicians and the Phoenicians and the Judaeans and the sea that is opposite the Aegyptian Sea and the Gulf of Issus. Moreover, it may refer to peoples in Mesopotamia and Cappadocia in a broad sense; see Butcher 2003:271. In this respect, I will follow Millar's "Roman Province Syria" (1993:236). He suggests, "Roman Province Syria refers to three different regions, of which one was an enclave physically separate from the others. (1) Northern Syria, stretching across from the Mediterranean coast, and the two ports of Laodicea and Seleucia, through Antioch to the Euphrates. (2) The Phoenician coast, which in its northern part backed into the mountain-chain now called the Jebel Ansariyeh and in the south onto Mount Lebanon and then the hills of Galilee. Provincial territory seems indeed to have extended south not only to Ptolemais-Akko but beyond Mount Carmel to the small town of Dora."

[279] Sartre 2005:291-5; Brock 1994:149-160; Drijvers 1992:124-146; McCullough 1982:9; Millar 1971:7-8; 1987a:143-64; 1993:xiv, 232-3; Hitti 1951:256; Bernhardy 1861:1.493.

[280] As to sources of bilingualism of Palmyra, Dr. Ted Kaiser of Department of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University, one of the leading specialists in Palmyra provided me with many precious materials related to bilingualism of the RNE. I really appreciate his careful reading and invaluable suggestions about chapter 4.

Gzella 2005:445-58) states, "the local community expressed itself both in Greek and in a local Aramaic dialect (Palmyrenean)." In Palmyra Palmyrene, Greek, Aramaic, Latin, and Arabic were used and numerous bilingual documents are preserved written in Greek and Aramaic, Latin and Aramaic, or even in these three languages combined.[281] The language repertoire of Dura Europos may be listed, based upon parchments and papyri excavated, as: Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Parthian, Palmyrene Aramaic, Safaitic, and Middle Persian.[282] Aramaic was not the common language of the area any longer (ca 165 – 255 CE), but it was still used with Greek (Kilpatrick 1964:217). In the case of Samosata, the capital of Commagene, Aramaic and Greek were used as well (Jones 1940:291; Taylor 2002:305). As mentioned before (§3.2.5), although Lucian became the best orator in Greek and Latin, he could speak only Aramaic when he was young in Samosata. This indicates that "even in Samosata, the former royal capital and the metropolis of the district, the lower classes spoke Aramaic" (Jones 1940:291).[283] At Osrhoene, the capital of Edessa, Syriac and Greek were used and many in Syria of Late Antique were bilingual in Greek and Syriac (Sartre 2005:293; Brock 1994:149-160). Although Greek was used in Phoenicia, the majority used Aramaic as their spoken language (Sartre 2005:292-3; Baslez 2007; see §5.3.2.1). According to Millar (1987a:152-5; Grushevoi 1985:51-4), the Nabataean kingdom used Nabataean from the end of the 4th century BCE and continued to be used until the 4th century CE; inscriptions in Nabataean and Greek have also been discovered. Furthermore, it is hardly surprising that there might be education systems for Aramaic language in the Roman Province of Syria and written Aramaic dialects such as Nabataean, Palmyrene, Syriac and Hatrene "were presumably transmitted by some system of training or education"

---

[281] Adams 2003:248-64; Taylor 2002:317; Millar 1993:233, 319-336, 470; Hitti 1951:256; Ingholt 1935:57-120, 1938:93-140; Drijvers 1995:31-42; Davis & Stuckenbruck 1992:265-83. What is more, as Millar and Hitti mention, public use of Palmyrene Aramaic was employed as an official language until the late of the third century.

[282] Cf. *P. Dura* V.I; Kilpatrick 1964:217; Hitti 1951:256.

[283] Millar (1993:456) may take a cautious attitude in Lucian's language; "we still do not *know* whether Lucian, or anyone else in Samosata, or in Commagene generally, spoke a dialect of Aramaic" (his emphasis).

(Butcher 2003:285).

There is papyrological evidence for bilingualism in rural regions of Syria. Such rural bilingualism indicates that Greek was commonly used even in rural areas; vernacular languages were also employed by the inhabitants. One bilingual ostracon in Aramaic and Greek (25 July 277 BCE) was found in a small town in Idumaea called Khirbet el-Kôm which lies along Wadi es-Saffar between Hebron and Lachish (Geraty 1975:55-62). Grabbe (1991:1.185) writes, "the ostraca shows that Greek was already well established alongside the local language." A second, from the Euphrates archive, is known as the Mesopotamia papyri from the mid-3rd century and was written in Greek and Syriac. Although the exact location is not certain, the papyri appear to be related to a village called Beth Phouraia because one petition is related to a property dispute between two groups of villagers (Butcher 2003:143; Brock 1994:151-2). A third, as mentioned before, parchments and papyri found at Dura Europus provide information about village life in relation to military and civilian contexts (see n.460). The documents were written in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Palmyrene, Parthian, and Middle Persian and the location might be villages along the Khabur River, Ossa near the confluence of the Khabur and Euphrates, and Qatna on the Khabur (Butcher 2003:144). Lastly, Macadam (1983:106) also suggests a funerary dedication (unfortunately undated) to prove that Hellenization was limited among villagers of the southern Syria. The inscription from the village of Shaqqā (Wadd. 2143) notes that Alexander was a pious high priest as well as a dragoman for the procurators. When the Roman officials came down to the villages, he traveled among the villages with them to offer his translation wherever needed. It is intriguing that a bilingual inscription in Aramaic and Greek excavated from Armazi, the ancient capital of Iberia (Georgia), makes it possible to assume that Syrians who resided in Armazi in the mid of the second century were bilingual.[284] Accordingly, even though Greek

[284] Metzger (1956:25) suggests that the *terminus ad quem* of the inscription can be shown by the assumption that the Pharsman of the inscription might have referred to Pharsman III (145-185 AD), although Mussies (1983:357) supposes that the inscription dated as late as 75 AD.

was the official language of the RNE (Jones 1940:288), vernacular languages in Syria survived.

Antioch-on-the-Orontes, the capital of Syria and the third largest city of the Roman Empire,[285] was bilingual in Greek and Aramaic as well. Green (1990:313) suggests, "Aramaic remained the second language of Antioch, and was spoken as the vernacular throughout Syria long after the Roman conquest."[286] Even some upper-status Syrians used Aramaic as well. Taylor (2002:314-5) also argues, "in Northern Syria, even among the educated elites...there were many who also spoke the local dialects of Aramaic." He (2002:305; cf. Jones 1940:290) further demonstrates, "there are several references to higher-status primary bilinguals [in Antioch]." We know upper-status Jews who spoke only Aramaic even in the third century; Eusebius (*HE*, 4.30) indicates that Bardesanes was one of the most able Christians and wrote lots of literature in the Syriac Aramaic including poems even in the early third century and his pupils translated them from Aramaic into Greek (cf. Drijvers 1984: 109-22, 190-210). Macedonius who came from outside Antioch needed interpreters because he spoke only a local vernacular language (Theodoret, *HR* 13.7). Abraham of Cyrrhus, a bishop of Harran, spoke Aramaic (Theodoret, *HR* 17.9). Jerome (*Vita Malchi* 2; *Vita Hilar.* 22 cf. *Ep.*, 17.2) state that some monks spoke Aramaic and Theodoret (*HR* 5; cf. 14, 17) also mentions that monks knew only Syriac at Zeugma in the 4th century. On the other hand, Severian of Gabala could speak Greek with strong Syriac accent (Socrates, *HE* 6.1). Eusebius (*HE*, 1.13) also quotes extensive documents written in "the language of Suroi" from the archives of Edessa. In light of these findings, a significant number of upper-status inhabitants of northern Syria in the first five centuries might have spoken Aramaic as their

---

[285] Hengel & Schwemer (1997:186, 196) assume that the population of Antioch approximates to 300,000, and the Jewish population might be between 30,000 and 50,000. According to Meeks & Wilken 1978:8, the population of Antiochene Jews is about 22,000. For more discussion of the population, see Zetterholm 2003:37-8.

[286] Also refer to Sartre 2005:291-6; Feldman 1993:14; Bickerman 1979:97; Avi-Yonah 1978:182; Mørkholm 1966:18; Lietzmann 1953b:2.258; Rénan 1869:182.

matrix languages.[287]

In this respect, there is no question that lower-status or rural inhabitants[288] in Antioch spoke Aramaic as their matrix languages.[289] It is because lower-status Syrians could not acquire Greek due to geographical reason (spoken Greek) or economic reason (spoken and written Greek) (cf. §3.2). Even in the 4th century, Syriac was used in Antioch. For instance, when neighboring Syrians from the countryside came to the assembly, Chrysostom (*Cat. ill.* 8.2) records: "Let us not look to the fact that their speech is different from ours. Let us note carefully the true doctrine of their soul and not their barbarous tongue."[290] Chrysostom (*Cat. ill.* 8.4) repeatedly stresses such issues as: "let us not look simply at their appearance and the language they speak." This indicates that he is reminding his audience not to neglect rural Syrians and their barbarous language, but rather their religious stance. Elsewhere, and with the same concern, he (*Stat.* 19.2) makes remarks about "a people foreign to us in language, but in harmony with us concerning the faith" when rural Syrians come to Antioch on Sunday. On market days and festivals Syriac-speaking peasants flocked to Antioch, which indicates that there was lively interaction between Syriac-speaking and Greek-speaking Syrians, thus allowing Antiochene inhabitants to continue to hear Syriac. Furthermore, adding to the general picture, it is thought that the Syriac Peshitta might be used by Chrysostom (Krupp 1991:75).

Based on this, three points may be summarized. (1) The linguistic milieu of Antioch was bilingualism in Aramaic and Greek. (2) There may have been many bilinguals

---

[287] Taylor 2002:305, *passim*; Butcher 2003:285; Brock (1994:150) states that large numbers of residents in towns were Aramaic-matrix bilinguals.

[288] The term "inhabitant" is different from "citizen." Although a high proportion of population of a Greco-Roman city was free foreigners and slaves rather than citizens, the concept of inhabitants comprises all of them (Zetterholm 2003:24). In Antioch there were three kinds of inhabitants such as Athenian-Macedonian soldiers and colonists, indigenous Semitic-speaking people and Jews; see Downey 1962:12-3.

[289] Taylor 2002:305; Brock 1994:150. This does not deny that many of lower-status Syrians spoke Greek as their embedded languages. Taylor (2002:314) mentions, "Quite apart from soldiers, veterans, and government officials, it seems clear that significant numbers of individuals in northern Syria, even outside the cities, had productive control of Greek."

[290] *Ad pop Anti* 19.2 in *Cat ill* 8.2; *Bap. Inst.* 120 (*Cat ill* is well-documented in *Bap. Inst.*,

among both upper-status and lower-status Syrians. (3) The inhabitants' competence of speaking Greek depends on their social status and, by and large, it is appropriate to assume that upper-status inhabitants spoke Greek as their matrix languages while lower-status inhabitants Aramaic as their matrix languages.

4.3.2 Bilingualism of the Antiochene Jews

Although there are limited sources of information about Diaspora of Antiochene Jews in the time of Hellenistic and Roman era (Barclay 1996:243), it seems evident that large numbers of Jews resided in Antioch since the founding of the city (Kraeling 1932:131). Josephus (*Bell.* 7.43) suggests two reasons, its proximity and Antiochene kings' favor. Antioch's proximity to Palestine as well as to Persia might have allowed Jews to live together at Antioch (Wilken 1983:35; Stern 1974:137-8). Josephus (*C. Ap.* 2.39; *Ant.* 12.119) claims that Seleucus Nicanor settled a large number of Jewish mercenaries in Antioch and granted them privileges equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks who were the present inhabitants.[291] Furthermore, Syria could have been considered as an extension of Palestine (Wilken 1983:35).[292] Barclay (1996:242) suggests, "Jews from Judaea who settled ... in Damascus, Ascalon, Tyre or Antioch were not considered by most of their contemporaries to have 'entered' Syria, simply to have moved from one part of it to another" (his emphasis). It is interesting that Rabbis debated whether to tithe the produce in Syria.[293] This implies that

---

which I cite).

[291] Josephus suggests that Seleucus Nicator granted civil rights (πολιτεία) to the Antiochene Jews and they still holds this citizenship in Josephus' own day. The issue of the citizenship is still in dispute; Meeks & Wilken (1978:2) regard Josephus' reference as formal citizenship, whereas Barclay (1996:244-5) does not agree with it. For information of the debate, see Zetterholm 2003:32-7. Nevertheless, the dispute does not deny the fact that there were upper-status Jews in Antioch due to mercenaries. Kraeling 1932:137-8; Kasher 1985:9-10.

[292] As to "land of Damascus" in *CD*, although this issue is under dispute, Murphy-O'Connor argues that Damascus is a symbolic name for Babylon not for Qumran and that "land of Damascus" refers to Syria too (1974:221, 1996:69).

[293] According to *M. Halah* 4.11, "he that owns [land] in Syria is as one that owns [land] in the outskirts of Jerusalem." See n.349.

that Syria was considered as an extension of Palestine. Jewish leaders, Onias III, Jason and Menelaus frequently visited Antioch (Stern 1974:138). Especially, that Onias III took refuge at Daphne near Antioch from his opponents (2Macc. 4.33) indicates that there were considerable numbers of Jews in Antioch (Barclay 1996:245; Stern 1974:138). Herod the Great also visited to Antioch (*Ant.* 15.218, *Bell.* 1.512). For these reasons, Antioch became one of the biggest Jewish communities.[294]

Antiochene Jewish linguistic competence seems to be deeply related to social status as well. In Jewish communities of the RNE, including Antioch, there was a social distinction between upper-status and lower-status Jews. Well-known from a Jewish-Gentile conflict (66-67 CE), upper-status Jews had different positions from lower-status. As Josephus (*Bell* 2.267, 287; *Ant* 20.178) writes, upper-status Jews in Caesarea were keen to maintain peace between Jews and Gentiles, as upper-status Jews in Egypt did. One could speculate that this Jewish-Gentile conflict may have been an explosion of antagonism ignited by lower-status Jews and Gentiles (Barclay 1996:254).

In terms of upper-status Jews,[295] most upper-status Jews in Antioch would likely have been composed of retired soldiers and their descendants (Downey 1961:79-80). Josephus (*C. Ap.* 2.39; *Ant.* 12.119) notes that Jewish mercenaries fought in Seleucus's army and that some of them settled in Antioch. There were many Antiochene Jewish artisans who were sent to Jerusalem to design and wrought the temple (*Bell.* 7.45). We also know of some upper-status Jewish Christians like Manaen and Barnabas (Acts 13:1; cf. Acts 4:36-7). As many upper-status Syrians, many of upper-status Antiochene Jews might have been primary bilinguals or acquired bilinguals by means of intermarriage (i.e. veterans and soldiers), regional bilingualism, or formal education (§3.2). Usually, upper-status Jews might have

---

[294] Kraeling mentions, "it would appear to follow that as early as the first century A.D. there were no less than three Jewish communities in and about Antioch, one west of the city near Daphne, one in the city proper, and one east of the city in the 'plain of Antioch.'"

[295] Hengel 1980:85-92; Barclay 1996:21-2. For instance, Roman society also has few upper-status inhabitants; see Meeks 2003:51-73; Gill 1994:105-118; Clarke 1993.

spoken Greek as their matrix languages. Moreover, in the case of acquired bilinguals Hitti (1951:257) properly proposes, "The educated Syrians, no doubt, studied Greek and wrote in it. But there is no reason to believe that they used it at home." From what is known of the function of bilingualism, it would be appropriate to surmise that even Jewish late or acquired bilinguals used Greek for business while speaking Aramaic in the home.

Another likely scenario is that most Antiochene Jews were lower-status inhabitants at Antioch. Many Jewish war prisoners taken in Palestine were brought to Antioch (j Sanhedrin 10.6) (see §4.1.2). They would have spoken Aramaic as their matrix languages like lower-status Syrians. Moreover, Jews also lived outside of Antioch. Malalas (*Chronographia*, 10.45; p. 261) reports that the Jewish community was in Daphne only seven kilometers south of Antioch and had been there since the time of Emperor Tiberius (14-31 CE). Secondly, Jews lived in rural areas near Antioch in the late 2nd century (*Tosefta Demai* 2.1).[296] Jewish peasants grew rice in the plain of Antioch,[297] and agricultural affairs clearly require permanent residence for a sustained period of time. Jewish farmers may have lived in the countryside of Antioch since at least the early 2nd century. Jewish peasants could have been numerous, it is said that Rabbis visited them to tithe the produce. Thirdly, Libanius (*Or.* 47.13) also reports that some Jews, his tenants, lived in the countryside of Antioch for four generations. Libanius of the 4th century knew that the Jews had lived there as his tenants for at least four generations and they may have been there even longer. These three cases indicate that Jewish peasants lived in the rural areas of Antioch around the 1st and 2nd century.[298] The Jews in the countryside of Antioch may have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language.

---

[296] Although the law of *Demai* is traditionally attributed to Hasmonean High Priest, Johanan Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE), this Tractate seems to indicate the situations of the latter half of the second century; See *Zeraim*, 2.52.

[297] Although there are several opinions of the location, most scholars think the place as the plain of Antioch; see Sarason 2005:2.889.

[298] As mentioned (§4.3.1). Chrysostom notes that lower-status Syrians from rural areas around Antioch flocked together into Antioch on feasts and Sundays.

Accordingly, in the case of upper-status Antiochene Jews, there were many bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek. Acquired or late bilinguals, unlike early or primary bilinguals, may have used Greek in business and Aramaic at home. And every community is composed by a majority of lower-status inhabitants and minority of upper-status. This indicates that most Diaspora Jews of first-century Antioch spoke Aramaic as their matrix language.

4.3.3 Bilingualism of the Antiochene Christians

Early Christian mission made great strides among lower-status Jews and Gentiles. Celsus (*C. Cels*. 3.44), writing against Christianity, despises Christianity because it attracted "only the foolish, dishonourable and stupid...slaves, women, and little children." He (*C. Cels*. 3.55) mentions that Christians are "wool-workers, cobblers, laundry-workers, and the most illiterate and bucolic yokels." Furthermore, he (*C. Cels*. 1.62) considers that Christianity is a movement of the lowest status. From the start "Jesus collected round him ten or eleven infamous men, the most wicked tax-collectors and sailors…collecting a means of livelihood in a disgraceful and importunate way." Although Celsus' intention is to insult and depreciate Christianity, his information may be correct and the majority of Christians could actually have been among lower-status of society, as 1 Corinthians 1:26-31 (cf. Mt 11:25-6) indicates. However, Stark (1996:33) presents that the early Christian communities have a number of upper-status Christians.[299] He (1996:33) concludes, "If the early church was like all the other cult movements for which good data exist, it was not a proletarian movement but was based on the more privileged classes." Nevertheless, it is reasonable to consider that about over 90% members of an ancient community belong to lower-status groups. It is noteworthy to

---

[299] He (1996:29-33) suggests the list of biblical scholars who hold the view. Refer to the definitions of upper-status and lower-status, see n.391. As a matter of fact, fishers and tax-collectors do not always belong to the lower-status.

mention Stegemann's suggestion (1999:77):

> Estimates of the percentage of the upper stratum in the overall population depend on which total population figure one uses for the Roman Empire. If we also include the families, we can set the share of the overall population between 1 and 5 percent. In any case, it is clear that in ancient societies there was only a thin upper stratum.

In this regard, most Antiochene Christians must have been composed of lower-status Jews and Gentiles. The proposal of Foakes-Jackson's (1931:100) is attractive: "it is by no means certain that the language of the majority of the Syrian Jews was Greek." Most Antiochene Christians spoke Aramaic as their matrix language whereas Greek as their embedded language. The linguistic milieu of the Syrians of Antioch reflects a clear cross-section of that of Antiochene Jews. As many upper-status Syrians and Jews were bilinguals (§4.3.1, §4.3.2), so many Gentile and Jewish Christians might have been bilinguals. Most upper-status Christians spoke Greek as their matrix language, whereas most lower-status Christians spoke Aramaic as their matrix language.

It is interesting that Dibelius (1935:75) suggests that preachers who were bilinguals in Greek and Aramaic delivered the Gospel in Greek because "there were at that time men of all classes in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Damascus, who could speak both languages."[300] He proposes that the bilingualism of Antioch creates a bridge between Palestinian Christianity and the Gentile Christianity (1949:25):

> Since, however, Jesus spoke Aramaic, though the tradition that has come down to

---

[300] Although his view of "bilingualism" of the RNE is vague and exaggerated, it is noteworthy that he suggests that there were many bilinguals in terms of Gospel transmission.

us in the Gospels is framed entirely in Greek, the words of Jesus must have been translated. But since the earliest Christian communities on the language frontier in northern Syria – in Antioch, for example – contained many bilingual members, the translation will have been very easily effected through the simple process of repeating in the one language what had been heard in the other.

Although Dibelius' view remains problematic,[301] it is quite right to consider that many Antiochene Christians were bilinguals. Accordingly, it is safe to suggest that the Antiochene Christian community was bilingual. Many upper-status Gentile and Jewish Christians would have been primary or acquired bilinguals who spoke Greek. Some of them could certainly speak only Greek. Moreover, the Antiochene Jewish community by and large was composed of lower-status Jews who used Aramaic as their matrix language and many of them would have been acquired bilinguals in Greek and Aramaic.

4.4 Bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora and Interdirectionality

As investigated above, it can be said that the linguistic milieus of RNE, especially Alexandria and Antioch were bilingualism. Bilingualism of Jewish Diaspora suggests two possibilities related to transmissions of JTrad and the FGs because Antioch was known as the most likely place where Matthew, Mark, and John were written. This implies that JTrads were circulated in Aramaic and in Greek and that after the Gospels were written in Greek, the Gospels might have been translated into Aramaic versions for Aramaic-matrix speakers again and the written Gospels must have been orally performed again in the circumstance of

---

[301] If the bilinguality of the Antiochene Christians made it possible to translate JTrad from Aramaic into Greek, he should have proposed that the bilinguality of the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem of Acts 6 had already afforded to translate the tradition. In other words, JTrads in Aramaic and Greek were circulated in the Jerusalem church as well as in the Antioch church.

the ancient oral societies. Accordingly, JTrad must have been transmitted from oral into written as well as written into oral and from Aramaic into Greek as well as Greek into Aramaic in and out of Palestine under Hellenistic Judaism.

Furthermore, in parallel with the circulations of JTrad, after the FGs had been written in Greek, the GkGospels must have been translated into Aramaic language family. This is adduced by the extant Syriac versions (e.g. Sinaitic, Curetonian, Peshitta, and Harklean). It is interesting that concerning the origin of the Western text of the NT many scholars including Chase (1893:137-49; cf. Epp 1966:3) propose that Syriac texts lie behind the Western texts. This means that the Greek Western texts were written under influence of Syriac texts which were translated from Greek texts. Consequently, the FGs in Greek must have been translated into other language family including Aramaic language family and the translated Aramaic versions must have been translated into Greek. Therefore, bilingualism of first-three-centuries RNE makes it possible to consider that the transmission of GTrad and the FGs is interdirectional, not unidirectional.

5. Bilingualism of the Earliest Christian Church in Jerusalem

Bilingualism in the first-century Palestine (chapter 3) and the Jewish Diaspora (chapter 4) leads to questions about bilingualism in the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem and especially issues of bilingualism in regard to "the Hebrews and the Hellenists" and of "the Seven." As has been investigated, many Jews of first-century Palestine were bilinguals (chapter 3) and most Jewish and Gentile of RNE spoke Aramaic their matrix language (chapter 4). If this is indeed the case, the Jerusalem church should be designated as a bilingual community[302] and will be the subject of this chapter. Bilingualism in the Jerusalem community will be discussed in four parts. (1) The current discussion of two particular designations in the book of Acts, with focus primarily on Hengel's contribution, will be reviewed (§5.1). (2) Bilingualism among the Hebrews and Hellenists, often considered to be monolinguals, will be suggested (§5.2). (3) The bilingual Seven who have been considered monolinguals will be reconsidered (§5.3). (4) Finally, the relationship between bilingualism of the Jerusalem church and interdirectionality of JTrad will be discussed (§5.4).

5.1 The State of Affairs

Since Baur (1873:1.38-60)[303] the issue of who the Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί were (Acts 6:1) has provoked endless controversies. Subsequently, scholars have suggested various views of the designations which include such views as: the linguistic distinction

---

[302] If we apply the definition to the linguistic situation (§2.1.2), it can be said: the linguistic milieu of the Jerusalem church can be situated between the two poles of a continuum. It ranges from a set made up of two unilingual groups of Aramaic and Greek each containing a small number of bilinguals in Aramaic and Greek, to a single group with a more or less large number of members using a second language for specific purposes. At one pole most speakers in each group use only one language for all functions, whereas at the other a varying number of speakers use both languages but for different purpose.

[303] According to Baur (1873:39) there were two groups in the Jerusalem church: one is the Hellenists whose leader was Stephen; the other is the Hebraists including the Apostles of Jesus. The former rejects Judaism and is in opposition to the existing Temple worship whereas the latter more

between Aramaic-speaker and Greek-speaker Jews, geographical distinction between Palestinian and Diaspora Jews, theological distinction between conservative and radical Jews, or ethnic distinction between Jews and Gentiles.[304] At present, it would appear that scholars have almost reached a consensus that the two terms stem from linguistic-geographical distinction on the basis of an assumption that both of them were Jews. That is, the Ἑβραῖοι refer to Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jews and the Ἑλληνισταί refer to Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews.

There have been two approaches to the Ἑλληνισταί. The first is a bilingual approach and the other a monolingual approach. More than 250 years ago Johann Bengel proposed that Ἑλληνισταί refers to bilinguals in Greek and Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic). He (1859:2.564) proposes Hellenists "were Jews born outside of Palestine, to whom it seems the Greek tongue, besides the Hebrew, was vernacular." In modern linguistic terms, this means that the Hellenists were *primary* bilinguals. Bengel (1859:2.525) also mentions "there is no doubt but that these Jews of all nations, who moreover were *dwelling* at Jerusalem, knew Hebrew" (his emphasis). This means that Hellenists *acquired* Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic) while living in Jerusalem. His suggestion that there were two kinds of bilingual Hellenists who used Greek and Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic), respectively, remains convincing for two reasons: (1) Hellenists from all nations were *primary* bilinguals in Greek and Aramaic because Jews who spoke Aramaic were born in Greek-speaking regions. (2) Some were acquired bilinguals acquiring Aramaic when they lived in Jerusalem or Aramaic-speaking regions. Furthermore, in terms of the Seven, Bengel (1859:2.566) suggested, "the Seven were in part Hebrews, in part Hellenists." It is regrettable that Bengel's suggestions in this regard have not continued to be debated in recent scholarship.

A number of scholars have given consideration to a monolingual-geographical

---

closely adheres to the Temple worship.

[304] For the history of the debate, see Hengel 1983:1-11; Hill 1992:5-17; Penner 2004:69-72. Roberts (1888:187-9 n.1) epitomized the history of research of Hellenists and Hebrews in detail.

view of the Ἑλληνισταί, as suggested by Moule (§5.3.3) and Hengel. The opinion of Hill is justified when he (1992:15) writes, "the most influential contemporary advocate of a view of the Hellenists consistent with that of F. C. Baur is Martin Hengel."[305] In light of the place of Hengel's argument in the current debate, he will serve as the primary counterpart below. Concerning the transmission of JTrad the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, including Bultmann, makes much of the Hellenistic Christians of the Syrian Church (see introduction to chapter 4). On the contrary, Hengel (2001:6-37) has diverted scholars' interest to the Hellenists of the Jerusalem Church.[306] He argues that the Hellenists and the Seven function as pivotal parts in the formation of the earliest Christianity in terms of the transmission of the JTrad from Aramaic into Greek and Gentile mission.

Acts 6 indicates that the early Christian church consisted mainly of Hebrews and Hellenists. Hengel suggests that Ἑβραῖοι refer to Palestinian Jewish Christians who spoke Aramaic and some Greek while the Ἑλληνισταί refer to Hellenistic Jewish Christians who spoke *only Greek* having returned from the Diaspora.[307] The Hellenists' monolingualism quickly led the Hellenists to separate their community from worshiping with the Aramaic-speaking Jerusalem church (Hengel 1983:14; 1991:56, 68).[308] The formation of the Hellenist Jewish Christian community is significant because the Hellenists made an essential contribution to the translation of JTrad from Aramaic to Greek. In other words, some parts of

---

[305] Penner (2004:23) also appraises, "the trajectory of scholarship on the Hellenists that begins with Baur culminates in Hengel's work on Acts 6:1-8:1. Hengel not only provides the most systematic interpretation of the Hellenists in the tradition of Baur; he also fuels the debate over the reconstruction of early Christian origins."

[306] As a result, Penner (2004:25-6) properly points out, "through the Hellenists, Hengel is able to move the most significant developments of early Christianity into Jerusalem in the formative period of Christian history."

[307] Hengel 1983:8-11; 1986:79; Hengel & Schwemer 1997:32-5. In fact, Hengel (1974:104) proposes, "a better differentiation could be made between the *Greek-speaking Judaism* of the Western Diaspora and the *Aramaic/Hebrew speaking Judaism* of Palestine and Babylonia" (emphasis added). He (1989a:7) also mentions, "this also gives us a first fairly clear criterion for distinction in this investigation: 'Hellenistic' Jews and Jewish Christians are ... those whose mother tongue was Greek, in contrast to the Jews in Palestine and in the Babylonian Diaspora who originally spoke Aramaic." Hengel's arguments are not persuasive in two points: (1) His definition of the "Western Diaspora" is not clear. Does, for instance, the Antiochene Christian community, one of the most important Christian communities, belong to the Western Diaspora? (2) Diaspora Jews do not always refer to Greek-speaking Jews, as mentioned before (chapter 3).

the JTrad, at least the Passion Narrative and the development of significant theological terms,[309] must have been translated by the Hellenists. They may have had vivid memoirs of the activities, death and resurrection of the JTrad on which the Hellenistic Christian community was based (Hengel 1983:27). The GkTrad of Jesus could have given impetus to the propagation of the message of Jesus to non-Jews by the earliest missionaries such as the Hellenists including the Seven (Hengel 1983:26-7). On this account, Hengel (1983:29) asserts, "we owe the real bridge between Jesus and Paul to those almost unknown Jewish-Christian 'Hellenists' of the group around Stephen and the first Greek-speaking community in Jerusalem which they founded; this was the first to translate the Jesus tradition into Greek."

But how is it possible for the Hellenists, who spoke only Greek, to translate the tradition of Jesus from Aramaic to Greek? Hengel's argument appears intent to quarantine the Hellenists, influenced by Hellenistic syncretism, from having any *active participation* in the process of translating the earliest JTrad from Aramaic to Greek (Hengel 1983:24). For Hengel, although the Hellenists were of significance in transmission (1983:29), their monolingual handicap implies that their roles must have been *limited* and *passive* in the formation of basic Christian terms and traditions (1983:27).[310] Their monolingualism makes it possible for Hengel to presuppose that the earliest JTrad was *unidirectionally* transmitted from the Ἑβραῖοι to the Ἑλληνισταί in the community in Jerusalem (1983:37; 1986:79).[311]

Hengel assigns translation duty to *bilinguals*. The translation-transmitters of the JTrad are between Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jewish Christians and Greek-speaking

---

[308] This view is further developed by Esler (1987:135-159; esp. 143, 159).

[309] Hengel (1989a:18; 1983:26-8) enumerates the terms such as αββα (transliterated), ἀγαπή, ἀπόστολος, ἐκκλησία, ἐλπίς, εὐαγγέλιον, κοινωνία, παρουσία, παρρησία, πιστεύειν, πίστις, χάρις, χάρισμα, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, etc.

[310] Hengel (1983:27) suggests that even Paul who can be called a Hellenist, only receives (παραλαμβάνω) and delivers (παραδίδωμι) "confessional formulae" in 1 Cor. 15:3-4 and Rom. 1:3-4. In relation to this, Hengel considers that Paul's mother tongue is Greek; see §3.2.5.

[311] It is regrettable that in terms of directionality of JTrad Hengel still holds to a linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis (§1.5.1), although he successfully dilutes the borderline between Judaism and Hellenism in his major publications.

Diaspora Jewish Christians in the Jerusalem church (1983:14).[312] At points he calls the bilinguals "jüdischen 'Graecopalästiner'" (1974:104-5) and at a later point develops the designation "zweisprachigen 'Gräkopalästinern'" (1974:11).[313] He provides instances of bilinguals[314] such as: Mary and her son John Mark (Acts12:12, 25; 13:5, 13; 15:37), Silas-Silvanus (Acts15:22, 27, 32, etc.; 1Thess.1:1; 2Cor.1:19, etc.), Judas Barsabbas (Acts15:22, 32), Menahem (i.e. the younger contemporary of Herod Antipas; Acts13:1), Matthew (Hengel 1974:105 n.359; cf. Jeremias 1959:270-4), and Peter (Hengel 1983:37, 162 n.39, 170 n.26). Hengel (1974:105) includes in this list "Jews who themselves came from the Diaspora but whose families were closely associated with Palestine and spent a great part of their life there." These were bilinguals such as Jason of Cyrene and later the Levite Joseph Barnabas from Cyprus, the "cousin" of John Mark (Acts4:36 etc; cf. Col4:10), and the Pharisee Saul-Paul from Tarsus (Hengel 1974:105).[315] In addition, he (1989a:17-8) adds more names to the list of the bilinguals later: Johanna (the wife of Chuza, ἐπίτροπος of Herod Antipas, i.e. his steward, Lk8:3), the tax farmers (e.g. the ἀρχιτελώνης Zacchaeus in Jericho, Lk 19:2), and then men like Nicodemus (Jn3:1) and Joseph of Arimathaea (Mt27:57). Hengel (1983:11, 29) also considers that "these bilingual 'Palestinian Greeks' are of decisive significance for the development of early Christianity." According to him they take an *active* and important part in the translation of JTrad, thereby bridging the linguistic groups of the Hebrews and Hellenists.

In his discussion of the "Seven," Hengel goes even further in relating the far-reaching program of the transmission of the earliest JTrad. His position (1983:12; 2001:28)

---

[312] He suggests, "The Hellenists may have been converted by the preaching of bilingual disciples and conversation with them."

[313] First, Hengel calls them "jüdischen 'Graecopalästiner'" in his *Judentum und Hellenismus* (in 1969 p. 193); later, he takes up "zweisprachigen 'Gräkopalästinern'" in his 'Zwischen Jesus und Paulus', (*ZTK* 72 [1975] p .171). He mixes the two terms. However, the problem lies in that he does not define the terms clearly, as will be discussed (§5.2).

[314] The lists of bilinguals of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem are as follows: 1974:104-5; 1983:10-11; 1989a:14-8.

[315] For Paul's bilinguality, see p.106.

is that "the 'Seven' are apparently all 'Hellenists.'" For him, this means that the Seven could speak only Greek.[316] Hengel provides three basic reasons for this conclusion: (1) They had Greek names (1991:68; 1983:12, 145 n.90); (2) the resolution of the Hellenists' complaint resulted in the appointment of the Seven (1983:13); and (3) after the martyrdom of Stephen the Hellenists were scattered and became active missionaries outside Judaea where the primary language was Greek (1983:13). These four points will be examined and challenged below (§5.2).

Many scholars have criticized Hengel's arguments. However, those who disagree with him have also based their comments upon a monolingual approach.[317] Furthermore, it is interesting that when Hengel criticizes other scholars' positions, he also proposes that they fail to consider the bilinguals who took a significant part in the transmission of the JTrad.[318] For nearly thirty years, Hengel has been discussing this issue from the perspective of bilingualism.[319] Recently, he (2001:7) has stressed, "we should not forget, especially in

[316] As a matter of fact, it does not seem that Hengel is confident whether the Hellenists spoke only Greek. For he (1974:105) mentions, "one might also point to the seven 'Hellenists' of Acts 6, though it is uncertain whether they knew Aramaic." After two decades he opens the possibility that the Hellenists might be bilinguals; Hengel (1989a:18) adds the Seven to the list of bilinguals in Jerusalem, when he poses, "not least, mention should of course be made here (the list of bilinguals) of the 'Seven' as the spokesmen of the Hellenist community (Acts 6:5)..."

[317] Their debates will not be dealt with in this paper. For information of the debates, see the references in n.304. However, it is noteworthy that Hill criticizes the traditional position raised by Baur and Hengel on the basis of theological distinction in his *Hellenists and Hebrews*. (1) Aramaic-speaking Jews were also persecuted. (2) Stephen's speech does not criticise the Law and the Temple; his argument is also summarized in Hill 1992:462-9; 1996:129-153. Hill's view is supported some scholars including Hurtado (2003:207-14) and (Witherington 1998:243-7) whereas others like Donald Hagner disagree with his view (1997:580-1). However, it is regrettable that Hill's view is also based on monolingual-geographical approach (Hill 1992:24). Concerning the existence of the Hellenists, Watson (1986:26) also proposes, "indeed, it seems very doubtful if there ever were two groups in the Jerusalem church, the Hellenists and the Hebrews." His view is followed by Räisänen (1992:149-58). Unfortunately, they are not interested in the bilingualism of the community as well. However, if the possibility of bilingualism of first-century Jerusalem church is not considered, lots of complicated linguistic problems in narratives of the Acts will occur. Richard (1978:341) assumes, "the author says very little concerning linguistic and theological factors. Stephen debated with diaspora Jews living in Jerusalem. From this it would be possible to consider him a Hellenist; however, Paul does the same and is not for that matter considered such. Furthermore, no thought is given in Acts 6:9-15 to language problems since the "Greek" opponents stir up the populace, the elders, and the scribes... and accuse Stephen before an Aramaic Sanhedrin." On this account, Richard is dubious concerning its historicity. However, he should have opened the possibility of bilingualism of the Jerusalem church.

[318] Criticizing Heitmüller (1912) and Kramer (1966)'s arguments of Greek-speaking Jewish-Christian community and Aramaic-speaking primitive community, Hengel (1983:32-7) criticizes that they fail to take account of bilingual Palestinian Greeks.

[319] See his *Judentum und Hellenismus* in 1969, pp. 104-5 and recently in his 'Judaism and

Jerusalem but also in Galilee or Syria and Babylonia, the bilingual Jews, who are so important for the beginnings of Christianity." Despite these remarks, a fundamental problem remains in that his own work does not clearly or comprehensively engage with the phenomenon of bilingualism. That Hengel does not take the *bilingual Jewish Diaspora* of the Roman Empire seriously is apparent although he accepts the following points. (1) The bilingualism of first-century Jerusalem (1983:10). (2) The bilingual Jewish Graeco-Palestinians including some of Jesus' disciples in the Jerusalem church (1974:104-5; 1983:11; see n.319). (3) The bilingual "Jews who themselves came from the Diaspora but whose families were closely associated with Palestine and spent a great part of their life there" (1974:105). His suggestion that the Hellenists spoke *only Greek* and the Hebrews spoke Aramaic and *some Greek* seems to be a starting point in misinterpreting the situation. The two terms are used only by Luke except for Paul (see §5.2.2). If Luke designates the Hebrews as those who speak Aramaic and some Greek, why do not we think that he uses the Hellenists as those who speak Greek and some Aramaic? The counterpart of the two language speakers (i.e. Hebrews) should be the two language speakers (i.e. Hellenists). Therefore, the bilingualism of the Hebrews and the Hellenists of the community in Jerusalem (§5.2) as well as the bilingual Seven (§5.3) needs to be considered from the perspective of bilingualism theory.

5.2 Bilingualism of the Hebrews and Hellenists

Hengel designates Ἑβραῖοι as Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jewish Christians and Ἑλληνισταί as Greek-speaking Diaspora Jewish Christians, that is, a monolingual, geographical, and ethnic distinction. It seems that his geographical and ethnic designations are based on his monolingual approach. Hengel's conception of bilinguals is not clear for

---

Hellenism Revisited' in 2001, pp. 6-37.

five reasons.[320] (1) He neither adequately defines "jüdischen 'Graecopalästiner'" and "zweisprachigen 'Gräkopalästinern'" nor explains the difference between them, although these two designations can be used differently to some degree. The relevance of this becomes clear when asking whether Matthew or Peter is to be designated as bilingual Palestinian *Greeks*. (2) It is not certain that bilinguals belong to either the Hebrews or the Hellenists. Also not clear is whether the bilingual group should be considered as a third group. (3) If the bilinguals belong to the Hellenists how can "bilinguals like Paul from Tarsus and Joseph Barnabas from Cyprus" be distinguished from the Hellenists who spoke only Greek? (4) If the bilinguals belong to the Hebrews, how can "Jews who themselves came from the Diaspora but whose families were closely associated with Palestine and spent a great part of their life there" (1974:105) be labeled as the Hebrews who spoke Aramaic as their matrix language? Some of them appear to be the Hellenists who spoke Greek as their matrix language. Discussed previously (§2.1.4), if anyone learns a second language after the ages of 11-12, they cannot use the second language with the same adeptness as their primary language. This means that unless we have their personal language acquisition details, it is difficult to classify them as the Hebrews. (5) Can bilinguals like Peter from Bethsaida (an Aramaic-matrix bilingual) and Joseph Barnabas from Cyprus (a Greek-matrix bilingual) be categorized into the same group of "zweisprachigen 'Gräkopalästinern'"?[321] Hengel seeks to

---

[320] As a matter of fact, many scholars do not articulate the concept of bilinguals of the Jerusalem church. It is interesting, for instance, that although Johannes Weiss recognized that most of the Hellenists in Jerusalem were bilinguals and many of them were Aramaic-matrix speakers, he did not overcome Baur's framework. He (1937:1.166) mentions, "The fact that these groups [the Hellenists] assembled in separate synagogues for worship indicates that the reading of Scripture and the prayers were conducted there in Greek. Many of them may also have still spoken their Aramaic mother-tongue, but we must assume that the permanent population of Jerusalem could also make itself understood by those who spoke only Greek. … Finally, unity with such Hellenists in the Christian church was possible only if the large majority of the members were to some extent at home in both languages." In other words, those who spoke "Aramaic mother-tongue" refer to Aramaic-matrix speakers. If most of the Hellenists were bilinguals and many of them were Aramaic-matrix Jews, why did they separate themselves from the Aramaic-matrix Christians in the Jerusalem church?

[321] It has been discussed among some scholars that the monolingual approach to the Hebrews and the Hellenists is faced with difficulty which category Paul and Barnabas as bilinguals belong to. For instance, in terms of Paul and Barnabas, Haenchen (1971:365-6) assumes that Paul and Barnabas belong to the Hellenists. However, Barrett (1994-1998:548) mentions, "though the witness of Acts is complicated by the fact that Luke seems to regard Paul and Barnabas as standing in

introduce bilinguals as a bridge between two linguistic communities in the Jerusalem church; however, there is no place for the bilinguals in his hypothesis because he (1991:56, 68; 1983:14) makes a strict dichotomy between the two groups on the basis of monolingual-geographical distinction. Marshall (1972:277-8) makes a helpful proposal that "members of each group might know the other's language and both linguistic groups were to be found in Palestine and in the Diaspora."[322] He (1972:280) convincingly states, "In Jerusalem and elsewhere the early Christian communities included bilingual members," and that this, "makes the thesis of a completely separate Aramaic-speaking church in Jerusalem all the less likely."[323]

If the bilingualism of Jerusalem and the Jewish Diaspora is taken seriously into account, then the "bilingual distinction" of the two designations should be investigated for two reasons. (1) Above all, the bilingual distinction can better explain the situation of the Jerusalem church. Whereas, in a sense, Aramaic-speakers and Greek-speakers are related to monolingual terms, Aramaic-matrix speakers and Greek-matrix speakers are related to bilingual terms. Aramaic-matrix speakers refer to those who speak Aramaic as their matrix language and their linguistic competences open the possibility that they can speak other language(s) as their embedded language(s) (§2.1.9). (2) The monolingual distinction does not cover all members of the Jerusalem church, especially bilinguals. However, the bilingual distinction offers a place for the bilinguals. Aramaic-matrix Christians in the Jerusalem

---

succession from Stephen, Barnabas seems on the whole to belong to 'the Hebrews' rather than to 'the Hellenists'." Rather, what the monolingualists have different views hints that bilingual approach to them should be required.

[322] He (1972:280) states, "it was once suggested by W. Bousset that the use of the term 'Lord' may have arisen in bilingual Christian circles; it was then possible to retain a Hellenistic origin for the phrase 'Maranatha' by ascribing it to the bilingual church in Antioch. The argument has generally been rejected, but the premise remains a sound one."

[323] However, as mentioned before (§4.1.2), it is noteworthy to consider Cadbury's argument again. Cadbury regards Ἑβραῖοι as Aramaic-speaking Diaspora Jews. Illustrating the inscriptions of "synagogue of Hebrews" found at Corinth, Rome, and Philadelphia in Lydia, he (*Beg*. 5.59-74; esp. 62 n.4) suggests, "Jews of the dispersion, whether at Rome, Corinth, Tarsus, or even at Jerusalem, might distinguish from members of the older dispersion the more recent Jewish emigrants from Palestine..." The former is Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews and the latter is Aramaic-speaking Diaspora Jews without regard to geographical distinction.

church mean those who spoke Aramaic as their matrix language and Greek as their embedded language. Greek-matrix Christians mean those who spoke Greek as their matrix language and Aramaic as their embedded language. (3) As will be discussed, Luke seems to find it difficult to group the members of the Jerusalem church into Aramaic-speakers and Greek-speakers (monolingual distinction), Palestinian and Diaspora persons (geographical distinction) or Jews and Gentiles (ethnic distinction) in a clear-cut way. For the members of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem were mixed linguistically, geographically. and ethnically. Accordingly, Luke seems to divide the church members into the two groups, Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί on the basis of the bilingual context of the Jerusalem church.

On the basis of this bilingual context, it will be proposed that the distinction between the Ἑβραῖοι and the Ἑλληνισταί does not refer to a monolingual, geographical, or ethnic distinction but a bilingual distinction in Aramaic-matrix Christians (§5.2.1) and in Greek-matrix Christians (§5.2.2).

5.2.1 Hebrews: Aramaic-Matrix Christians

Hengel considers the Ἑβραῖοι as Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jews. However, bilingualism in the Jewish Diaspora and the RNE in the 1st century hints that Ἑβραῖοι refer to Aramaic-matrix Christians in the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem without regard to geographical and ethnic distinction. As noted previously (chapter 4),[324] most Diaspora Jews

[324] Four points are as follows: (1) Bilingualism of the Roman Empire (2) Successive immigration (3) Periodic Connection with Jerusalem (4) Learning Aramaic in Jerusalem. Especially. in relation to "learning Aramaic in Jerusalem," Hengel's position is not consistent. Hengel (1983:11) suggests it is less likely that one could expect Diaspora Jews returning to Jerusalem to have learned Aramaic, although he (1983:143 n.75; 1980:76) does not deny the possibility completely. However, Hengel (1974:105) also assumes that Jews who came from the Diaspora are to be regarded as bilingual Palestinian Greeks because their families were closely associated with Palestine, having lived for much of their life there. In light of such reasoning. it seems difficult at best to deny the very real possibility that they learned Aramaic while in Palestine. Indeed, as he later admits some Jewish bilinguals who had been Diaspora Jews in Jerusalem may have *relearned* Aramaic. An awareness of this possibility arises almost unintentionally when he (1989a:18) writes: "[those] whose mother tongue was already Greek, even if they still understood Aramaic or had *relearned* it" (emphasis

and Gentiles in the Jerusalem church who were from Aramaic-speaking area could have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language.[325] If this is the correct model, the Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews hypothesis, that is, Diaspora Jews who spread in the RNE spoke only Greek, would have been the exception to the norm. And the Greek-speaking Gentile Christians hypothesis, that is, Gentile Christians spoke Greek, should be reexamined because all Gentiles do not always speak Greek as their matrix language. Accordingly, although some Christians are Gentiles or come from outside of Palestine, they should be called Ἑβραῖοι because they spoke Aramaic.

Hengel's monolingual-geographical distinction has also been doubted by some scholars; most often in connection to Paul's competence in Aramaic.[326] The occurrences of the term Ἑβραῖος in 2 Cor. 11:22 and Phil. 3:5 point to Paul's linguistic competence despite the fact that he is a Diaspora Jew. They argue that the Ἑβραῖοι refers to Aramaic-speaking Jews both in Palestine and *in the Diaspora* without respect to geographical distinction. Marshall (1972:278) concludes, "even, then, if there was a linguistic difference between 'Hebrews' and 'Hellenists', this was not necessarily the same thing as a difference between Palestinian and Diaspora Jews or between Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews." It deserves

---

added). On the one hand, Hengel denies the Hellenists ever relearned Aramaic while, on the other, he inadvertently allows for this possibility. In light of the strong interaction between Hellenism and Semitism in the RNE (§4.1.4), it is likely that some Greek-matrix Jewish Christians in the Jerusalem church may have tried to learn or relearn Aramaic because the Jerusalem church was a bilingual community.

[325] Millar (1987a:144) suggests, "various dialects of the Semitic language which we call 'Aramaic' were spoken all the way round the Fertile Crescent, from Babylonia to Arabia" (his emphasis). Also refer to Millar 1993:503-4; Taylor 2002:298-331.

[326] Michael (1928:142) mentions, "the latter (Hebrew) are Jews who, whether dwelling in Palestine or not, continue to use Hebrew (or Aramaic)." Beare (1959:107) notes, "a family which continued to speak Aramaic... even after long years of settlement in a Greek city; in some parts of Canada, Scottish families still ride themselves on preserving the Gaelic speech of their forebears who emigrated from the Western Highlands three or four generations ago." Bruce (1971:240) suggests, "'Hebrews', on the other hand, denotes Jews whose family ties were Palestinian, if they were not wholly resident in Palestine." Bruce (1952:151) also proposes, "the word (Ἑβραίους) here stands in opposition to Ἑλληνιστῶν, and apparently means Hebrew or Aramaic-speaking Jews, whether of Palestine or, like Paul (Phil.iii.5, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων), *of the Dispersion*" (emphasis added). Fitzmyer (1998:347) also writes that it "is not so simple, because this distinction does not explain the Pauline use of *Hebraios*...[and Paul]...never calls himself *Hellenistes*, but rather *Hebraios*." Richardson (1969:118 n.2) submits that "it is possible that Ἑβραῖοι could refer to Diaspora Jews speaking Hebrew as well as Greek."

serious consideration that that Paul who is a bilingual calls himself Ἑβραῖος strongly indicates that the Ἑβραῖοι refers to a bilingual term. Accordingly, if Paul's usage is the same as Luke's, the Ἑβραῖοι of the Jerusalem church refers to Aramaic-matrix Christians both in Palestine and from the Diaspora without geographical distinction.

The nation lists of Josephus and Acts 2:9-11 support that the designations of Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί refer to the bilingual distinction and not the monolingual-geographical-ethnic distinction. Josephus implies that Aramaic was the matrix language for some Diaspora Jews. In *Bellum Judaicum* he states in the introduction (1.3-6) that this was originally an Aramaic work translated into Greek at a later time. Josephus explains that it was intended for Diaspora Jews who lived among "the Parthians, and the Babylonians, and the remotest Arabians, and those of our nation beyond the Euphrates, with the Adiabeni." Josephus implies that his Palestinian Aramaic work could be understood well by Diaspora Jews spread throughout these regions.[327] Comparisons should be made with the Lukan ethnic list of Diaspora Jews who visited Jerusalem (Acts 2:9-11): "*Parthians and Medes and Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea*[328] and Cappadocia,[329] Pontus and Asia, Phrygia[330] and Pamphylia, Egypt (see §3.2) and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and *Arabians*" (italics added).[331]

---

[327] Sevenster (1968:61) also mentions, "the first impression given by the scattered comments made by Josephus on the language problems is that Aramaic was the language most familiar to the Jewish people in the first century CE"

[328] In terms of Lukan geographical horizon, there has not been consensus why the Lukan list includes "Judea" in the list of the nations. However, it seems that the problem results from a different view of the distinction between dialect and language. There was not a clearer distinction between dialect and language in ancient times than in modern times (cf. introduction to chapter 2). In other words, Luke seems to distinguish "Judaean Aramaic" from "Galilean Aramaic" (cf. Janse 2002:349). In fact, most Jews who came from Parthia, Media, Elam, Mesopotamia and Arabia also used Aramaic dialects which are sister languages of Galilean Aramaic. Luke seems to classify "Judean Aramaic" as a dialect of Aramaic language family such as Galilean, Syriac, Palmyrene or Nabatean. Accordingly, in comparison with Galilean Aramaic Luke seems to add Judea to the list.

[329] Cappadocia was multilingual; see §4.1.1.

[330] Phrygians used Phrygian and Greek; see §4.1.1.

[331] Quoting a letter from Agrippa I to Caligula Philo (*Leg. ad Cai.* 281-2) mentions that Jerusalem is the Mother city not only for Judaean Jews but also those of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coele-Syria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Asia, Bithynia, Pontus. Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aeolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, the Peloponnese, the isles of Euboea, Cyprus, Crete, the lands beyond the Euphrates, Babylonia and its neighboring satrapies.

Noteworthy is that most nations from Luke's ethnic list are those of known bilingual regions.[332] Janse (2002:349) observes, "what is interesting about the ἔθνη 'nations' (Acts 2:5)...is that most of them are known to be bilingual in the first century AD, speaking either Greek or Aramaic as a second language (as opposed to their 'own *native* language')." In comparison with these two ethnic lists, it seems that most Diaspora Jews in Jerusalem who came from the overlapped countries (see italicized names) spoke Aramaic as their matrix language (cf. Millar 1993:503-4; Bruce 1965:61-2).

Acts 2:8 explains that the reason they were bewildered and marveled lies in the fact that they heard the Galileans employ "our own native languages" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν). This means that the Diaspora Jews discerned their own native language where they were born and that they distinguished their languages from the Galilean Aramaic which Diaspora Jews had expected to hear from the Galileans. Even though the apostles spoke Galilean Aramaic, most Diaspora Jews who used the Aramaic language family[333] could have understood what the disciples were speaking about to a great extent.[334]

Taylor tabulates morphological and lexical differences and agreements among some Aramaic dialects. [Table 1] is helpful in the present discussion (2002:303):[335]

---

[332] Janse (2002:357) also suggests, "in the easternmost parts of Asia Minor a number of non-indigenous languages coexisted with Greek."

[333] As mentioned earlier (§2.1.11), Aramaic can be called an ancestor language. Galilean, Judean, Syriac, Nabatean and Palmyrene can be called daughter languages of Aramaic, and those languages can be called sister language to each other. Taylor (2002:302) also suggests that the Late Aramaic dialects include Middle Aramaic dialects of the Nabataeans (Petra, Bostra, and Hatra), Edessa, Syriac, Mandaic, Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Samaritan Aramaic. It is interesting that Chrysostom (in 2 Tim; *NPNF* 13.490) mentions that Syriac "has an affinity with the Hebrew."

[334] Taylor 2002:302-3; Cotton 2005:162. Tcherikover (*CPJ* 1.5) presents, "though differing from Jews in their religion, they (Syrians and Jews in Egypt, my insertion) had a common language with them (Aramaic). ... No wonder, then, that the Egyptian population confused all peoples coming from 'Syria' and called them all 'Syrians'; even the Hebrew language was sometimes mistaken for 'Syrian', i.e. Aramaic."

[335] In terms of similarity between the Cursive Jewish Script and the Nabataean Script, Yardeni (2000:11) investigates non-literary Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean documents from the Judaean desert (in the caves of Wadi Murabba'at and Nahal Hever and nearby dating from the late Second Temple period to the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 CE and concludes, "the examination of the letter-forms in the Jewish cursive script and their comparison with the Nabataean script showed a considerable number of similar types" (pp.216-7). In relation to this, it seems persuasive that Naveh (1982:112-4, 162-4, followed by Rahmani 1994:12 n.6) uses "Jewish script" as a local variant of Aramaic script developed in the Hellenistic age.

[Table 1] Differences and Agreements among Some Aramaic Dialects

Aramaic Dialects	S_3M imperfect: 'he will write'	P_1 pronoun: 'we'	SM demonst. Pronoun:'this'	(Vocabulary): 'he saw'
Palmyrene	*yktb* (=*yiktōb*?)	*'nhnw*	*dnh*	*hz'*
Hatran	*lktb* (=*liktōb*?)	----	*hdyn/'dyn*	*hz'*
Syriac	*nktwb* (*nekôb*)[a]	*'nhnn/hnn*	*hn'*	*hz*
Christian Palestinian	*yktwb* (=*yiktôb*)	*'nh/'nn*	*hdn/hdyn*	*hm'*
Samaritan	*yktb* (=*yiktab*)	*'nn*	*hdn/'hn*	*hm'*, *'m'*, *hz'*

[a] Early Syriac inscriptions have the form *yktb*.

As [Table 1] demonstrates, although the Aramaic family consists of diverse dialects both within and outside of Palestine, Aramaic family language speakers would have understood the Aramaic dialects of others.[336] Clearly, most Diaspora Jews in Jerusalem who came from Aramaic-speaking countries spoke Aramaic as their matrix language just like Palestinian Jews. That many Aramaic-matrix Diaspora Jews resided in 1st century Jerusalem (Acts 2:9-11) leads to the conclusion that there were many Aramaic-matrix Diaspora Christians in the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem. Furthermore, as will be discussed in detail (§5.2.2), most proselytes (ethnically, Gentiles; Acts 2:5, 11, 6:5) who came from Aramaic-speaking regions should have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language. In other words, most Gentiles who were from Aramaic-speaking regions should have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language, as mentioned before (chapter 4). That most Gentiles of the RNE spoke Aramaic as their matrix language means that many Gentile Christians in the Jerusalem church and churches in the RNE spoke Aramaic.

Accordingly, Aramaic-matrix Diaspora Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians

---

[336] Millar (1993:9) rightly suggests, "the use of the term 'Semitic' is harmless and unavoidable; the mutual resemblances in vocabulary and grammatical form, the identity of alphabet and the similarities of script of all the languages concerned are unmistakable."

should be classified as Ἑβραῖοι as well in spite of their name tags such as "Diaspora" or "Gentile." It is evident that the distinction between the Ἑβραῖοι and the Ἑλληνισταί is not made by monolingual, geographical or ethnic but by bilingual distinction. The Ἑβραῖοι at Acts 6:1 refers to Aramaic-matrix Christians, that is, Aramaic-matrix Jewish and Gentile Christians, and Aramaic-matrix Palestinian and Diaspora Christians.

5.2.2 Hellenists: Greek-Matrix Christians

As mentioned before, Hengel holds that the Ἑλληνισταί refers to Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews, that is, monolingual, geographical and ethnic distinction. However, when bilingualism of first-century RNE is taken into account seriously, the Ἑλληνισταί (Acts 6:1) means Greek-matrix Christians. Bilingual approach will be made by three points such as textual, ethnic, and geographical arguments.

When we deal with what Ἑλληνισταί (Acts 6:1) refers to, special attention should be given to Luke because Ἑλληνισταί occurs on only three occasions (Acts 6:1, 9:29, 11:20) in NT literature. In the case of Ἑλληνισταί (9:29), there is a general consensus that the Ἑλληνισταί (9:29) refers to Greek-speaking Jewish non-Christians (Foakes-Jackson 1931:99; Simon 1958:14-5; Fitzmyer 1998:440). Furthermore, there is no textual problem because Ἑλληνιστάς has no variants except for Codex A (see n.337).

The Ἑλληνιστάς at 11:20 is very complicated because some manuscripts like $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$, $\aleph^{c}$, A, and D* read Ἕλληνας.[337] Some scholars prefer to reading Ἕλληνας rather than Ἑλληνιστάς.[338] They suggest three main reasons. (i) Luke makes an ethnic contrast between Ἰουδαίοις in v. 19 and Ἕλληνας in v. 20. (ii) Lucan focus at 11:19-20 moves toward a

---

[337] Codex A shows the same tendency to alter Ἑλληνιστάς into Ἕλληνας at Acts 9:29.

[338] Bengel 1859:2.611; Hort 1896:94; Warfield 1883:120-5; Rackham 1951:166; Foakes-Jackson 1931:99-100; Moule 1958-59:100; Haenchen 1971:365; Neil 1973:144; Conzelmann 1987:87; Johnson 1992:203; Dunn 1996:154: Fitzmyer 1998:476.

Gentile mission. (iii) The strongest argument is the assumption that Luke uses Ἑλληνισταί to designate Greek-speaking *Jews*, as the other two occurrences (6:1, 9:29) show. For these reasons, they assume that Ἕλληνας (i.e. Gentiles) is a better reading. Other scholars consider that the Ἑλληνιστάς is the proper reading.[339] Two major reasons have been suggested. (i) Ἕλλην occurs in Acts ten times. Whenever an ethnic contrast is made, Ἕλλην is coupled with Ἰουδαῖος.[340] It is obvious that Luke makes an ethnic contrast between Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλλην in Acts.[341] Rather, in this sense, the reading Ἑλληνιστάς is better because it is *lectio difficilior*. (2) Although the Ἑλληνισταί (6:1, 9:29) refers to Greek-speaking *Jews*, Ἑλληνισταί (11:20) refers to Greek-speaking *persons*. For instance, Barrett (1994-1998:550) suggests, "It is thus by no means impossible that the word should have a third meaning here: at 6.1, Greek-speaking Jewish Christians; at 9.29, Greek-speaking Jews; at 11.20, Greek-speaking Gentiles."[342] Accordingly, there is a scholarly consensus that (1) Ἑλληνιστάς (11:20) is improperly used (2) and that Ἑλληνισταί at 6:1 and 9:29 refer to Greek-speaking *Jews*.

However, it seems that Luke intentionally uses Ἑλληνιστής three times in his narrative because Ἑλληνισταί at 6:1 and 9:29 are used as Greek-speaking *persons* as well as at 11:19. In other words, like Ἑβραῖοι does, Ἑλληνισταί refers to Greek-speaking persons who were Jews and Gentiles without regard to the ethnic distinction. As will be discussed, Luke recognizes that the earliest church in Jerusalem includes Greek-speaking Gentiles from the start. He intentionally intimates the existence of Gentiles in the Jerusalem church from the beginning. This argument leads us into the issue of ethnicity of the members of the

---

[339] Ropes *Beg.* 3.106; Cadbury *Beg.* 5.71; Williams 1964:142; Bruce 1952:151, 235; 1965:237; Martin *ABD* 136; Barrett 1994-1998:550-1; Witherington 1998:242; Metzger 1994:340-2.

[340] Acts 14:1, 18:4, 19:10, 17, and 20:21. All the occurrences in Acts are related to dissemination of the gospel. Luke states that the gospel was preached to Jews and Greeks, that is, to all people.

[341] In this regard, Johnson (1992:105) argues that when Luke intends to make an ethnic distinction between Jews and Greeks, he employs Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλλην. He prefers to read Ἕλληνας.

[342] Bruce (1952:151) also proposes, "here (vi. 1), Greek-speaking Jewish Christians; in ix. 29 probably Greek-speaking Jews in the synagogues; in xi. 20, probably Gentiles."

Jerusalem church at 2:5, 11 and 6:5.

The term Ἰουδαῖοι (Acts 2:5) has variants. That Ἰουδαῖοι was omitted in majority texts may indicate that it was added later.[343] Metzger (1994:251) points out, "Since Jews were already an ἔθνος, to say that these were from another ἔθνος is tantamount to a contradiction of terms."[344] If the Ἰουδαῖοι is inserted later, it can be said that the residers in Jerusalem are composed of both Jews and proselytes from every nation under heaven, not only Jews. This view is strongly supported by internal evidence, the phrase Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι (Acts 2:11).[345] Johnson (1992:44; cf. Fitzmyer 1998:243) suggests, "this (both Jews and proselytes) is a summary rather than a separate ethnic entry." This means that the residers in Jerusalem refer to Diaspora Jews and proselytes. On the other hand, Lake (*Beg.* 5.113-4) proposes, "In vs. 10 'Jews and proselytes' are treated as one of the component parts of the crowd. If so, obviously the rest of the crowd was not composed of Jews."[346] This means that most residers in Jerusalem are Gentiles and some Diaspora Jews and proselytes. Whether Johnson or Lake is right, Luke considers some residers in Jerusalem as Gentiles because proselytes mean ethnically Gentiles. Luke (2:41, 4:4) reports that Peter's sermon made about three thousand and five thousands persons Christians. The Christians should have included the Jews as well as the proselytes in Jerusalem. In this sense Luke seems to keep in his mind that the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem includes Jews and Gentiles from the start.

Furthermore, the possibility that Luke insinuates that there were some Gentiles in

---

[343] Ropes (*Beg.* 3.12) suggests that the original text including ℵ omits Ἰουδαῖοι, that the Western text holds Ἰουδαῖοι, and that the Old Uncials inserts it again; also see Lake, *Beg.* 5.113-4; Williams 1964:64.

[344] He raises two more textual problems; (i) why should Luke think it necessary to mention that Jews were dwelling in Jerusalem? (ii) Why should it be said that they were devout men; would not this be taken for granted from the fact that they were Jews?

[345] Most scholars including Hengel consider that the distinction between Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί is linguistic. Linguistically speaking, there is no linguistic difference between proselytes and Gentiles because the difference is religious.

[346] Lake (*Beg.* 5.113-4) assumes, "Probably Ἰουδαῖοι in vs. 5 was originally a mistaken gloss on εὐλαβεῖς." As a result, he (114) reaches a conclusion that "The desire of the writer was … to show that from the beginning the Gentiles heard and the Jews refused the testimony of the Spirit."

the Jerusalem church can be shown at Acts 6:5. It is interesting that the origin of Nicolaus, one of the Seven (Acts 6:5), was a Gentile who came from Antioch.[347] The introduction of the Seven resulted from practical purpose to solve alienation of Greek widows. The Seven served tables although they, of course, were leaders of the Jerusalem church. Why was an Antiochene Gentile chosen as one of the Seven representatives by the church members? Why, in an ethnic sense, does the Jerusalem church need a Gentile leader to serve table? What a Gentile leader was selected implies that there were some Gentile Christians in the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem.[348] In this sense, some scholars consider that the Ἑλληνισταί (6:1) refers to proselytes[349] or Gentiles.[350] Others including Hengel rebut the ethnic distinction and proposes that the Ἑλληνισταί (6:1) refer to only Jews, especially Diaspora Jews. The most significant reason is that Luke intends to unfold his story toward Gentile mission step by step. In this respect, they consider that the appearance of Gentiles at Acts 6:1 is gross anachronism let alone at 2:5 (Witherington 1998:241). Fitzmyer (1998:239) mentions, "the Lucan story disregards any others in Jerusalem who might not be Jews." Johnson (1992:105) also proposes, "Luke takes such pains to show the *gradual development of the Gentile mission* after the close of the Jerusalem narrative" (emphasis added).[351]

Interestingly, although many scholars mentioned above consider that the residers

---

[347] Only origin of Nicolaus is mentioned in the present verse. This implies that other six were born Jews. See Haenchen 1971:264; Barrett 1994-1998:315. Even Kraeling (1932:147) considers Nicolaus as a Greek. However, there is no information that he is a Greek.

[348] In the same vein, some scholars consider that the Seven were composed of the Ἑβραῖοι and the Ἑλληνισταί, lest they disregard the Hebrew widows; for detail discussion, see §5.3.3.

[349] Schwartz 1963:146-7; Bauer 1967:107-8; Blackman 1936-7:524-5; Grundmann 1939:45-73; Reicke 1957:116-7, 121; Schmithals 1965:34 n.71.

[350] Warfield 1883:113-127; Wetter 1922:411-2, 404-5; Cadbury *Beg.* 5.68; Windisch. *TDNT* 2.512. As a consequence, Cadbury (*Beg.* 5.65, 71-2) assumes that Ἑλληνιστάς of 11:20 refer to Greek-speaking Gentiles because he supposes that Ἑλληνιστής is synonym to Ἕλλην like the relationship between the two GkSpels of Jerusalem.

[351] Barrett (1994-1998:309) also proposes, "If from 6.1 (or from the day of Pentecost...) there had been Jewish and Gentile elements in the Jerusalem church, or if Luke had believed that it was so, could he have made so much of Peter's preaching to Cornelius, of the founding of the mixed church in Antioch, of Paul's break with the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch and of the Council of Ch. 15?" Haenchen (1971:260) mentions that proselytes "these (proselytes) are no pagans, for the Gentile mission did not (according to Luke) begin until Peter baptized Cornelius (Chapter 10)." Also see Simon 1958:15; Moule 1958-9:100-2; Bruce 1952:83; 1965:61; Güting 1975:149-69.

in Jerusalem (2:5) were ethnically composed of *Jews and Gentiles*, they suggest that Ἑλληνισταί (6:1) refers to only Diaspora *Jews*.[352] If that is the case, where are the Gentiles hidden up until Peter appears for Gentile mission? In reply to this, three points mentioned above can be suggested: (1) Luke recognizes that the Jerusalem church includes Gentiles from the start. (2) Luke intends to unfold his story toward Gentile mission. It is persuasive that Barrett (1994-1998:118) concludes that Luke regards the Jerusalem church as a universal church including Gentiles from the start: "from the beginning the Christian church was an inspired community and a universal community. It therefore included both Jews and 'pious men' of every kind." It seems that Luke depicts his narrative for Gentile mission not in a unilinear way but in a spiral way. The literary style is supported by the fact that he repeatedly introduces Gentile mission.[353] As a consequence, it seems that Luke intimates his readers that the Jerusalem church includes Gentile Christians from the start, as Acts 2:5, 11 and 6:5 hint. The use of the terms Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί (i.e. Aramaic-matrix speakers and Greek-matrix speakers including both Jews and Gentiles) seems to be placed in the medial stage between Ἰουδαῖος (i.e. Jews) and Ἕλλην (i.e. Gentiles). Concerning the expansion of the gospel Luke intends to dilute the ethnic border line between Jews and Gentiles by means of using the linguistic distinction as a bridge. Accordingly, it can be concluded: (1) Luke uses the Ἑλληνισταί as Greek-speaking persons at Acts 6:1, 9:29 and 11:20 without regard to ethnic distinction (Barrett 1994-1998:550; Metzger 1994:342; Witherington 1998:242). (2) The reading Ἕλληνας (11:20) does not seem appropriate because the ethnic distinction that the other two occurrences (6:5, 9:29) refer to only Jews is

---

[352] Marshall 1980:70, 125-6; Bruce 1965:60, 128; Haenchen 1971:171, 260; cf. Fitzmyer 1998:239, 347; Schnabel 2004:654-5. See Hengel's view (§5.1).

[353] Cadbury (*Beg.* 5.66-8) considers that Luke repeats beginnings of Gentile Christianity several times. He suggests the repetition such as the missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas (chapters 13- 14), the first conversion of Gentiles (11:19-20), the story of Cornelius (chapters 10 – 11), Philip and the Ethiopian (chapter 8), and the story of Pentecost (chapter 2). although the episode of Ethiopian he suggests is not persuasive. For my opinion of the Jewish Ethiopian, see §5.3.2.3. In relation to Lukan focus on Gentile mission, some scholars suggest that the Acts is a response concerning the identity issue of Gentile Christianity: see Maddox 1982:183-6; cf. Jervel 1972:68; Franklin 1975:116-44.

not persuasive.

Here, it is noteworthy to mention Craig Hill's argument. He insists that those who were persecuted were both the Hebrews and the Hellenists.[354] If those who were scattered were composed of Greek-matrix as well as Aramaic-matrix Christians, it can be understood better that those who were scattered traveled and preached the word to only Jews (μόνον Ἰουδαίοις) in Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch. It seems that the term Ἰουδαίοις at 11:19 means an ethnic distinction (Johnson 1992:105). On the other hand, Luke seems to draw a linguistic distinction by means of using Ἑλληνισταί at 11:20. "Some of them" who were from Cyprus and Cyrene preached even Ἑλληνιστάς, that is, Greek-matrix speakers. Did the 'some of them' *intentionally* preach to only Greek-matrix Gentiles? The 'some of them' must have preached the word to Greek-speaking Jews as well as Gentiles in Antioch. The object whom the "some of them" preached was ethnically two groups, Jews and Gentiles. There are two main reasons: (1) the population of the Antiochene Jews may be between 30,000 and 50,000 out of 300,000, the total population of Antioch (Hengel 1997:186, 196).[355] It is unlikely that the Christians intentionally avoided preaching the word to Antiochene Jews. (2) All Antiochene Gentiles did not speak Greek as their matrix language. Rather, most Antiochene Gentiles in the first century spoke Aramaic as their matrix language.[356] The "some of them" from Cyprus and Cyrene preached to ethnically mixed Greek-matrix inhabitants, both Greek-matrix Jews and Gentiles. Metzger (1994:342) convincingly suggests, "the word (Ἑλληνιστάς) is to be understood in the broad sense of 'Greek-speaking persons,' meaning thereby the mixed population of Antioch in contrast to the Ἰουδαῖοι of ver. 19." In this sense, it seems that Luke intentionally chooses to use the linguistic term, Ἑλληνιστάς, rather than the ethnic term, Ἕλληνας at 11:20. Luke finds it difficult to describe

---

[354] See n.317; also see Witherington 1998:243-7.

[355] For a detail discussion, see §4.3.1.

[356] It is interesting that Pierson Parker (1964:168) suggests, "Ἑλληνιστάς is correct. Luke probably meant to indicate that some Jews at Antioch spoke Greek, others Aramaic – which was the case – and that the wandering missionaries addressed themselves to both of the Jewish groups in that

that the inhabitants of Antioch to whom the Christians preached should be grouped into Gentiles on the basis of the ethnic distinction like the case of the Ἑβραῖοι. Accordingly, Luke seems to select the linguistic term (Ἑλληνιστάς) rather than the ethnic term (Ἕλληνας).

Now, Hengel's position of the geographical distinction in relation to the Ἑλληνιστής will be challenged. It seems that Hengel's position of the geographical distinction does not seem persuasive. Some scholars including C. S. Mann,[357] J. P. Meier,[358] L. T. Johnson,[359] and Barrett[360] throw doubt upon the strict geographical distinction between Aramaic-speaking *Palestinian* Jews and Greek-speaking *Diaspora* Jews. They have proposed the possibility that some Hellenists were Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews and others Greek-speaking Palestinian Jews.

There is little doubt that some Palestinian Jews would have used Greek as their matrix language and Aramaic as their embedded language. Recently, Schnabel (2004:654) criticizes against an early schism in the Jerusalem church raised by Baur and Hengel. He rightly suggests that the Hellenists who resided in Jerusalem spoke Aramaic as well because "They hardly would have settled in the Jewish capital if they were unable or unwilling to communicate in Aramaic." For this reason, he concludes, "we must remember that presumably the majority of Palestinian Jewish Christians were bilingual, speaking both Aramaic and Greek" (654).[361] As for regional bilingualism of first-century Palestine (§3.1), it can be summarized into three reasons. (1) In relation to language choice (§2.3.2) and

---

city."

[357] Mann (1967:301) mentions, "many Jews in Palestine, unless living far from cities, would be more or less at home in the vernacular Greek of the time (koine)."

[358] Meier (1991:267) presents, "Probably some of these Diaspora Jews were bilingual, but others (e.g. recent émigrés from the Diaspora) may have spoken nothing but Greek.

[359] Johnson (1992:105) also proposes, "hellenistes refers to a Jew who predominantly speaks Greek. *Some* of them were probably from the Diaspora (see Acts 2:7-12; 4:36; 6:9), although Greek was widely spoken in Palestine as well" (emphasis added).

[360] Barrett (1994-1998:315) suggests, "Luke's usage of the word Hellenist must not be taken to mean that they were necessarily Diaspora Jews."

[361] Frommel (1908:18) also considers the Jerusalem church as a bilingual community from the beginning "so that in public assemblies the Words of Jesus may have been communicated in Greek as well as in Aramaic." However, he assumes that an ArmGospel was oral gospel on the basis of unidirectionality (§1.3).

inscriptions (§3.1.1), the statistical data about the inscriptional languages from Palestine in late antiquity leads to the conclusion that some Palestinian Jews used Greek as their matrix language, at least to the extent that they chose Greek as the appropriate language for the linguistic domain of sublime inscriptional language. (2) Greek papyri excavated from Palestine such as Babatha archive, Waddis Murabaat and Seiyal, Nahal Hever, and DSS suggest that the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine is largely bilingual (§3.1.2). The papyrological evidence persuasively also support that some Palestinian Jews could speak Greek as their matrix language. (3) Population Geographical evidence indicates that Jews and Gentiles mixed in many cities throughout the Levant (§3.1.3). Living in a border area or among different language groups would have brought about bilingualism (§3.2.4). These regional bilingualism factors lead to causes of the personal bilingualism such as bilingual parents and region (§3.2.4), formal education (§3.2.5) and occupation (§3.2.6). Personal bilingualism factors of first-century Palestine strongly support that some Palestinian Jews in early Christianity used Greek as their matrix language. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Ἑλληνισταί may refer to Greek-matrix Jews who were born in Palestine and that Greek-matrix *Palestinian* Jewish Christians should be classified as Ἑλληνισταί.

In summary, Hengel suggests that the Ἑβραῖοι refer to Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jewish Christians and the Ἑλληνισταί Greek-speaking Diaspora Jewish Christians in the Jerusalem church on the basis of a monolingual, geographical, and ethnic distinction and becomes the launching point for a far-reaching theological program about how the JTrad was transmitted. Contra Hengel, an evaluation of bilingualism within the RNE and Jerusalem in the 1st century results in a much more complex picture than he conceives. The most significant aspects of this linguistic view may be summarized. (1) It is clear that Luke's designations Ἑβραῖοι and Ἑλληνισταί are based not upon monolingual-geographical-ethnic but bilingual distinctions. (2) The bilingualism of 1st century Jews in both Palestine and the Diaspora implies that the Jerusalem church was a bilingual community and that

many bilingual Christians were in the Jerusalem church. (3) The Ἑβραῖοι were Aramaic-matrix Christians (both Jews and Gentiles) who were in Palestine or came from the Diaspora. Aramaic-matrix Christians (i.e. dominant bilinguals in Aramaic) used Aramaic as their matrix language and Greek as their embedded language. One can easily support the notion that early or primary bilinguals spoke Greek as much as they would have spoken Aramaic. On the contrary, late or acquired bilinguals spoke Greek less than they spoke Aramaic and to varying degrees. Aramaic-matrix Christian semibilinguals used Greek for special purposes. (4) The Ἑλληνισταί were Greek-matrix Christians (both Jews and Gentiles) who were in Palestine or came from the Diaspora. Greek-matrix Christians (i.e. dominant bilinguals in Greek) used Greek as their matrix language and Aramaic as their embedded language. For instance, early or primary bilinguals spoke Aramaic just as much as Greek. On the contrary, late or acquired bilinguals spoke Aramaic less than they spoke Greek and to varying degrees. Greek-matrix Christian semibilinguals used Aramaic for special purposes. (5) Many monolinguals may have tried to acquire Aramaic or Greek as their secondary language in the bilingual Jerusalem church. (6) Bilingualism of first-century Jerusalem church indicates that JTrad "coexisted" in Aramaic as well as Greek in the Jerusalem church.

5.3 The Bilingual Seven

Hengel assumes that the Seven mentioned in Acts were Greek-speaking Hellenists based upon three points, as mentioned before (§5.1):[362] (1) the Seven have Greek names; (2) the resolution of neglected Hellenists is establishment of the Greek-speaking Seven; and (3) the Hellenists including Philip, one of the Seven, preached outside of Palestine where the primary languages are not Aramaic. However, Hengel's arguments are

[362] Some scholars raise a question that the Seven belongs to the Hellenistic group; see Penner 2004:69.

not persuasive from the perspective of the bilingualism of Jerusalem and the RNE. It should be considered that the Seven, as leaders of the bilingual church in Jerusalem, would themselves be bilinguals. They could have spoken Greek as their matrix language and Aramaic as their embedded language or *vice versa*.

5.3.1 Onomastica

A primary consideration of Hengel is the issue of the Greek names. He assumes that the Seven were the Hellenists. However, Fitzmyer (1998:350; cf. Barrett 1994-1998:314) has laid bare this reasoning observing that even though all seven have good Greek names, this does not indicate whether they should be located among the Hellenists or the Hebrews as many Jews of that period bore Greek names.[363] Moreover, there are a number of examples where residents with Greek names in the Near East gave Semitic names to their children (Butcher 2003:284).[364] A Greek name itself should not be considered indicative of someone's matrix language.

5.3.2 Geographical Evidence

Hengel makes another assumption that should not go without challenge. He (1991:56) is convinced that generally speaking Hellenists from the Greek-speaking Diaspora would not have understood Hebrew/Aramaic worship in the synagogues of Jerusalem. However, as discussed before (chapter 4; §5.2), the monolingual-geographical distinction of "Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews" is problematic because the existence of Aramaic-speaking

---

[363] Furthermore, it is appropriate that Richard Horsley (1996:159) mentions that without regard to their identity, people in bilingual situation "may adopt a name or a second name in the politically dominant or more prestigious language."

[364] He (2003:284) also mentions, "it is often unclear whether the use of a Greek personal name means that the individual was a Hellenized Greek speaker, or that a Semitic personal name

"Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews" is problematic because the existence of Aramaic-speaking Diaspora Jews simply cannot be denied. The linguistic milieus of the four regions where the episode of the Seven is said to have occurred need further consideration. Philip appears in three locations: (1) Caesarea Maritima, (2) Samaria, and (3) Ethiopia.[365] Furthermore, Nicolaus' origin is said to be (4) Antioch. The linguistic environment of these places is significant because they may well indicate the linguistic competence of the evangelists.

5.3.2.1 Caesarea Maritima

It has been suggested that after baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch Philip is depicted as going to Caesarea (Acts 8:40) where he remains until Paul visits (Acts 21:8). The linguistic milieu of Caesarea could understandably lead to the view that Philip spoke Greek because the city was well-known as a Greco-Roman city. This is expressed by Downey's remark (1975:23):

> If, as seems likely, Philip was a Greek-speaking Jew, it would be natural for him to settle in the provincial capital and cosmopolitan seaport; and this apparently is why we next find him in Caesarea about twenty years later...Philip...represents the first continuous leadership in the Christian community at Caesarea.

However, the linguistic milieu of Caesarea seems to be different from what has been considered. Caesarea's population in the mid-1st century, according to Josephus (*Bell.* 2.266-8), consisted mainly of Jews, Syrians, and Roman soldiers.[366] Caesarea was likely a

---

signifies someone who was less Hellenized."

[365] Philip preached in Azotus (Acts 8:40). However, it will not be dealt here for the linguistic situation of Azotus is similar to that of Caesarea. For more information, see Hengel 1983:110-5.

[366] Cf. Levine 1975:16, 22; Goodman 1987:64. Josephus mentions that although Jewish

many bilingual inscriptions excavated there.[367] Furthermore, later the Jerusalem Talmud (*Sota.* 7.1.21b) has a revealing comment attributed to Rabbi Levi that he heard some Jews pray in Greek, thus implying he was surprised not to hear Hebrew/Aramaic. The linguistic milieu of Caesarea in the mid-1st century seems to be similar to that of other Hellenistic cities of the RNE such as Antioch or Alexandria (cf. chapter 4). Josephus (*Ant.* 20.175-7; *Bell.* 2.268, 2.287) suggests that there were more rich Jewish residents than Syrians. Upper-status Jews were primary or acquired bilinguals[368] and acquired bilinguals spoke Greek for business but Aramaic at home. Most lower-status Jews may have spoken Aramaic. Most of them could have been bilinguals due to geographical or occupational bilingualism. All in all, most Caesarean Jews can be called Aramaic-matrix speakers. Taking the linguistic environment of Caesarean Jews into consideration, the episode in Acts about Philip does not hint that he spoke only Greek.

Moreover, there is no evidence that he had continuously stayed and worked as a Christian leader in Caesarea until Paul visited him in 58. (1) Cornelius was known as the first Gentile Christian in Caesarea. Before his conversion, there is no mention that Philip preached Gentiles or Jews and baptized them as he had worked at other places (Acts 8:12, 38). Despite that Cornelius was a famous God-fearer, he never heard about the Gospel of Jesus before Peter taught about the total life of Jesus including death and resurrection (Acts 10:34-43), as Levine (1975:24-5) points out. (2) Philip did not appear in relation to Cornelius's conversion. Because Philip might have not been in Caesarea, it seems that Cornelius called Peter in Joppa (Acts10:5). Krentz (1992:262) suggests that while Peter preached the gospel and baptized him, "Philip is not mentioned; he does not function as

---

population is at least 20,000 (*Bell* 2.457), it was for the greatest part inhabited by Greeks (*Bell* 3.409).

[367] Van der Horst 2001:161; Levine 1998:160-1; 1975:15-33; Hengel 1983:110-115; Millar 1993:377-8; Spolsky 1983:99; Lieberman 1965:29-67.

[368] Synagogue inscriptions from Caesarea (Roth-Gerson 1987:111-24) imply that all donors of the inscriptions could be Greek-speaking Jews as their Greek names show.

leader of the church at Caesarea."[369] As a result, it is uncertain that he continuously stayed between his arrival in Caesarea (8:40) and Paul's visiting in 58 (21:8). Accordingly, his residence in Caesarea should not be taken as proof that Philip was a monolingual Greek, but rather that he could easily have been like other Jews in Caesarea: bilingual.

5.3.2.2 Samaria

Philip preached the Christian message, baptized, and performed great miracles in the city of Samaria (Acts 8:5-13).[370] When Philip along with the two apostles Peter and John returned to Jerusalem they preached the gospel to many Samaritan villages (Acts 8:25).[371] Philip preached his message both in the city as well as villages. The linguistic situation of Samaria was likely similar to that of Judean bilingualism (i.e. Samaritan Aramaic and Greek) (Hengel 1989a:8). Most inhabitants of rural regions may have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language, although some of them spoke Greek as their embedded language. Many of the inhabitants of urban regions could have been bilinguals. As seen in the example of Caesarea Maritima, the linguistic situation of Samaria does not prove Philip spoke only Greek. Rather, one could just as easily conjecture that Philip preached the gospel bilingually in the city and in the countryside.

5.3.2.3 Ethiopia

In Acts 8:26-39 is an episode of Philip teaching an Ethiopian eunuch who is said

---

[369] Krentz (1992:262 n.13) also argues that "there is no evidence that Philip spent the intervening years there, or that any 'evangelist' ever served as resident leader of a local Christian community."

[370] Scholars assume that the city may be Sebaste or Shechem; see Haenchen 1971:301-2; for information of Sebaste, refer to *Bell.* 1.403: Strabo, *Geog.* 16.2.34.

[371] Marshall (1980:160) persuasively points out, "the subject of the verse is vaguely expressed, but no doubt includes Philip."

to be a minister of Candace[372] and is presently on his way back home after worshiping in Jerusalem. This eunuch's ethnicity and language merits attention. The language spoken by the eunuch could indicate Philip's linguistic competence. Many scholars have assumed that the eunuch was a Gentile from Meroe.[373] Rénan (1869:145, 145 n.4), however, suggests that the eunuch was a Falasha.[374] Fitzmyer (1998:410), in conversation with Haenchen,[375] argues that the eunuch "is to be understood as a Jew, or possibly a Jewish proselyte, who comes from a distant land." He (1998:412) comments in relation to this that one should not be surprised "an Ethiopian would be a Jew or a proselyte, because Ethiopic is a Semitic language related to Hebrew and Aramaic."

Although the reference to "Ethiopia" is vague,[376] for Luke, Αἰθίοψ is likely Meroe, the capital of the Nubian kingdom in what is today part of Sudan. Unfortunately, little is known of the people and language of 1st century Meroe, as O'Connor (1993:72) states, "all scholars agree that a much more representative range of sites needs to be excavated." He (1993:74) presents that although there is not a lot of clear information about ethnicity in the Napatan-Merotic kingdom the little we do have would allow cautious conjecture that the society was not homogeneous. In regard to language, there are a number of inscriptions; however, the longest and most significant are not yet translated due partly to

---

[372] As to Candace, Meinardus (1970:369) mentions, "Candace is not the name of a queen, but the royal title of several queens who ruled over Ethiopia just before and after the Christian era." For more information, see Budge 1928:62, 111-3.

[373] Eusebius, *HE* 2.1.13; Schneider 1982:1.498; Conzelmann 1987:67; Haenchen 1971:314-5; Spencer 1992:129, 146-8; Tannehill 1986:2.110; Bruce 1989:379; Barrett 1994-1998:425-6; Witherington 1998:297.

[374] The term "Falashas" refers to the Jews of Ethiopia in an Amharic word. It is interesting that the term, "Cush" or "Cushites" occurs approximately fifty times in the OT and most of them are translated into "Ethiopia." The Jews of Ethiopia were well known to people of the OT; for more information, see Spencer 1992:149-50. While Falasha has been called by other people, they call themselves Beta Israel. For this reason, Kaplan (1992:8-9) may prefer to call Beta Israel. It has been suggested that Falashas emigrated from the north (e.g. Jewish garrison at Elephantine) or via South Arabia (Ullendorff 1968:15-25).

[375] Haenchen (1971:314) mentions, "Luke cannot and did not say that the eunuch was a Gentile."

[376] The term Αἰθίοψ or Αἰθιοπία is ambiguous in race and geography. Even Herodotus (*Herodotus* 7.70) mentions that it refers to all peoples of dark skin, from the country south of Egypt, Nubia, to India.

our inability to decipher the language (O'Connor 1993:71).[377] As other regions of the 1st century Roman Empire, many Nubians may have been bilinguals in Egyptian and Meroitic (O'Connor 1993:83). The official language was Egyptian during Napatan times and Meroitic would likely have been the spoken language (Shinnie 1967:134).[378]

If the eunuch is a Jew in Meroe, as Rénan and Fitzmyer propose, other evidence may be considered. For instance, there are ethnographic and linguistic materials from 1st century Aksum, adjoining Meroe, which is one of two ancient kingdoms called Ethiopia. Kaplan's research (1992:17) on Falasha informs us that some Ethiopian traditions indicate that half the population of Aksum was Jewish before the growth of Christianity. Although these sources likely exaggerate the percentage of Jews, Kaplan (1992:17) notes that there is an overwhelming influence of Hebraic patterns on early Ethiopian culture. Despite the syncretism of beliefs and ceremonies, evidence supports that Falashas in the pre-Christian Aksumite Kingdom adhered to Jewish customs such as holidays, Sabbath, circumcision, *kashrut*, and prescriptions of ritual cleanness were observed with considerable strictness (Ullendorff 1990:93-107; esp. 106-7; 1956:247-50). The linguistic milieu of Aksum was bilingual, the two major languages being Greek and Geʿez, the latter belonging to the same Semitic family as Hebrew and Aramaic (Pankhurst 1998:24-5). Ullendorff (1990:106) considers that most Falashas could speak Geʿez, but were ignorant of Hebrew. However, there is a strong case to be made that first-generation immigrants using Aramaic (Kaplan 1992:19). Consistent Jewish influence on Ethiopia is apparent on a number of levels (Kaplan 1992:26-32). For instance, there were lively exchanges between Ethiopia and Elephantine Jews and/or Jews in South Arabia which indicates some Ethiopians would have known Aramaic or Hebrew (Kaplan 1992:26-32; cf. 17-9; Ullendorff 1990:95-6).

---

[377] He (1993:71) adds, "on the linguistic side we know that even in Napatan times the elite probably spoke Meroitic, a language not written down until the second century BCE Yet, by Christian times…Nubian, a language different from Meroitic, was spoken throughout Nubia."

[378] For more information of the relationship between Egyptian and Meroitic, see Shinnie 1967:132-40.

The eunuch in Acts might be a Falasha. The eunuch's visit to Jerusalem to worship may presuppose that he was a devoted Jew, observant in Jewish practices and visited Jerusalem with religious enthusiasm (Fitzmyer 1998:412). If indeed this is the case, there is also reason to consider the possibility that he would have been a speaker of Aramaic. If he is a proselyte of Meroe, conclusions about his ethnicity and language need to be reserved until such time when more excavations can be carried out. Finally, the eunuch episode does not deny that the eunuch spoke Aramaic and does not prove what language Philip spoke.

5.3.2.4 Antioch

There is only one geographical provenance known from the Seven and that is from Nicolas, who is known as a proselyte from Antioch. The Acts description of Nicolas most often interpreted him as a Gentile who was originally from Antioch (Barrett 1994-1998:315; Haenchen 1971:264; Blackman 1936-7:524-5; Simon 1958:12). It is generally hypothesized that Antiochene Gentiles must have spoken Greek. A gentile derivation of Nicolas seems to reinforce the assumption that at least one out of the Seven would have spoken Greek. However, the description of him as an "Antiochene Gentile" itself does not prove he was a monolingual Greek. Antioch was a fully bilingual city, in which Greek and Aramaic were used (cf. §4.3). Many upper-status Syrians (Gentiles) were bilingual and most Syrians spoke Aramaic. That Nicolas was of gentile origins does not suggest whether he spoke Aramaic or Greek.

The episodes of these Seven take place in four regions: Philip's three regions (Caesarea Maritima, Samaria and Meroe of Ethiopia) and Nicolaus (Antioch). Many have presupposed that these four regions were straightforwardly Greek-speaking regions. Nicolaus of Antioch was just a Greek-speaking Gentile. The Seven, therefore, were Greek-speakers. That the Seven were Greek-speakers supports the assumption that the Hellenists

spoke only Greek. However, Caesarea Maritima, Samaria, Meroe, and Antioch were bilingual regions. An analysis of regions gives no credence to the notion that the Seven and the Hellenists spoke only Greek. Indeed, the nature of these cities and region display there is every reason to consider the Hellenists could have been bilingual.

5.3.3 Performance of Their Duty

C. F. D. Moule's linguistic approach is that the Ἑβραῖοι were at least semibilinguals while the Ἑλληνισταί were Greek monolinguals (1958-9:100-2).[379] He (1958-9:101) proposes that despite the fact that all Seven were Hellenists who spoke only Greek, "the care of the 'Hebrew' needed no special attention and would go on smoothly as before." However, although Hengel (1983:11) follows Moule's argument of this linguistic distinction, he argues that the linguistic difference results in two different linguistic groups having their own services. The Palestinian Jewish Christians and Hellenistic Jewish Christians would have met separately (1983:14-5; 1991:56) because the Hellenists would not have understood Aramaic/Hebrew (1991:56, 68). And Hengel (1983:14-5; 1986:78) views the Seven as leaders of the Ἑλληνισταί in the early church who were in subordination to the Twelve Apostles.

There has been criticism of the traditional view, some believe too much has been made of the Ἑλληνισταί. If their appointment is related to duties including the distribution of alms, the Ἑβραῖοι should also have been taken into account seriously.[380] Harvey (1996:136) is right to doubt that "the dominant (at least in this situation) Hebrew or Aramaic speaking group did not understand (or want to understand) the needs of the Greek-speaking group (the

---

[379] It is well-known that John Chrysostom (*Homilies* 14 on Acts 6:1 and 21 on 9:29) first suggested the linguistic approach.

[380] In that sense, Johnson (1992:110) raises a question: "Or, if we are to conclude from the Greek names of the seven that they were to take over the care of the 'Hellenist' widows, who would look after the 'Hebrew' widows once the apostles left their station?"

'Seven')."[381] Robert Murray (1982:204) argues, "the committee of seven would have been chosen to represent both sides."[382] Furthermore, Munck (1967:57) suggests:

> Surely, to assume that the primitive church would choose a committee for social services in which only one of the feuding parties was represented would be to underestimate its efficiency in practical matters. Such procedure would probably have given rise to complaints from the Hebrews. There were presumably representatives of both groups among the seven, of which the best-known members, Stephen and Philip, may very well have been Hebrews.

From the perspective of performing duties, it is persuasive that Bengel (1859:2.566) suggests that the Seven are composed of both Hellenists and Hebrews for the whole community. However, the problem lies in that both sides in this discussion presuppose that Diaspora Jews were Greek-speaking Jews and monolinguals. Because the Seven are considered monolinguals, solutions to the problem have been attempted based solely on linguistic differences.

The linguistic milieus of most regions of the 1st century RNE were bilingual (chapter 4). Many Palestinian Jews were also bilinguals (chapter 3). The Jerusalem church was a bilingual community as well (§5.2). The Seven may already have been known as representatives of the Jerusalem church before the dispute between the Hebrews and the Hellenists broke out.[383] If the Seven were leaders of a bilingual Christian church mingled

---

[381] In this regard, he suggests that the "Hebrew" implies "good Jews" who were traditional and conservative. However, Penner (2004:70) criticizes two points: (1) The meaning of the term is different from text to text. (2) There is no evidence that "Hebrews" of Acts 6:1 is indicative of "good Jews' of 15:5 and 21:20. However, unfortunately, both Harvey's and Penner's arguments are also based on the monolingual approach.

[382] Similarly, Simon (1958:5-6) considers that although the Jerusalem church intended to choose the Seven from the two groups, the result turned out that the Seven were all Hellenists.

[383] Simon (1958:8) may mention, "the college of the Seven, far from being constituted by apostolic initiative, already existed before the conflict broke out."

with Aramaic-speakers and Greek-speakers (cf. Simon 1958:4-5), it makes a great deal of sense that church members would have chosen bilingual rather than monolingual leaders.

In Acts (6:3) the Seven as leaders must meet three basic qualifications: (1) a good reputation (μαρτυρούμενοι); (2) be filled with the spirit (πλήρεις πνεύματος); and (3) have wisdom (σοφία). In relation to σοφία, Jesus' promise in Luke 21:15 is noteworthy: 'I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict'.[384] The word σοφία in Luke-Acts plays a significant part in its theology.[385] Here in Luke 21:15 the word does not have a parallel in Matthew or Mark, which means that Luke intends to emphasize something significant in relation to the fulfillment of the promise of Jesus in his narrative. Moreover, despite that Jesus gives a promise to the Twelve disciples, Luke explains that the promise is fulfilled in the Seven (Fitzmyer 1998:358; Haenchen 1971:271; Conzelmann 1987:47). The adversaries could not withstand the wisdom and the spirit with which he spoke (Acts 6:10). Marshall (1980:125) points out, "although Luke depicts them formally as being in charge of the poor relief, he does not disguise the fact that they were spiritual leaders and evangelists." As Acts 21:8 indicates, some of the Seven play a role not only in distributing alms, but also ministering the message (Fitzmyer 1998:355; Barrett 1994-1998:306; Simon 1958:6-8). One clear consequence of these observations is that the Seven were evidently leaders of a bilingual community.[386]

---

[384] Plummer (1922:479) suggests that a mouth in Lk 21:15 "is meant the power of speech." And Johnson (1992:112) also regards σοφία as fulfillment of promise by Jesus.

[385] In Luke-Acts the term σοφία is used nine times. In Lukan usages, "those who are filled with wisdom" are Jesus (Lk 2:40, 52), Solomon (Lk 11:31), witnesses (Lk 21:15), the Seven (Acts 6:3), Stephen (Acts 6:10), Joseph (7:10), and Moses (7:22). Although the term was also used in Lk 7:35, it is uncertain whom it refers to. In this sense, the Lukan usages show that Luke uses σοφία significantly.

[386] Luke seems to consider the Seven to be important characters as leaders of the Earliest Christian Church. Two points can be mentioned; (1) Jesus commands his twelve disciples the mission for the world. Acts 1:8 indicates that you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in "Jerusalem" and in "all Judea" and "Samaria" and to "the end of the earth." According to Luke, the charge of Jesus to the twelve disciples is also fulfilled by the Seven. Luke delineates that the Seven are full with the Spirit; Stephen in Jerusalem (6:3, 10), Philip in Samaria (8:1-25), and Philip with the Ethiopian eunuch who comes from the end of the earth (8:26-39). Concerning the end of the earth, in the mythological geography of the ancient Greek historians Ethiopia was quite often identified with the end of the earth, and the last mission of Acts 1:8 was accomplished by Philip (Witherington 1998:290; Bruce 1989:380). For more information of the end of

Richard (1978:342, 346) proposes that if the Seven were chosen from Jewish and gentile converts like Nicolas, they may be distinguished and reputable members of the community unlike the Twelve Apostles who were mostly common fishermen.[387] It is highly possible that the Seven were upper-status Jews or Gentiles. In relation to the social power of bilingualism in the RNE at this time, bilinguality could have been one of the credentials. As Sterling (2001:274) appropriately points out: "the use of Aramaic seems to have been a point of pride for some first-century Jews; at least Saul of Tarsus thought that being a 'Hebrew of the Hebrew' was worthy of inclusion in a credentials list." If the church members who are composed of Aramaic-speakers and Greek-speakers picked the Seven as their leaders, it makes sense that they would have chosen bilinguals for harmonious performance of their duties.

5.4 Bilingualism of the Jerusalem Church and Interdirectionality of Jesus Tradition

Bilingualism of Christian churches of first-century Jerusalem[388] and RNE cast doubt on long-held prejudices that the language of the Diaspora Jews and Gentiles (ἔθνη) in

---

earth of ancient times, see Herodutus, *History* 3.25; Homer, *Odyssey* 1.22-4; Strabo, *Geog.* 1.1.6; 1.2.24; Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* 6.1). (2) It seems that Luke transposes apostles δώδεκα for the first time in Acts as he denominates the church leaders ἑπτά. This means the two usages result from his literary intention not from his source, as some scholars suggest that the occurrence of δώδεκα here is due to a new source (Barrett 1994-1998:311; Conzelmann 1987:44). Luke intentionally uses the two numbers δώδεκα and ἑπτά to show their similarity; when Jesus called together the apostles, Luke named them the *Twelve* in Lk 6:13. As the *Twelve* represented the twelve tribes of Israel in Lk 22:30, so the *Seven* are depicted as leaders of the Jerusalem church. There was a Jewish custom of appointing "seven" to discharge some task in ancient Jewish literature. Barrett (1994-1998:312) enumerates two cases; one is that Josephus mentioned that "appointed Seven judges in every city in Galilee." The other is to be found in *Megillah* 26a and *j. Megillah* 3.74a.16, the "seven best men in a city."

[387] Hengel (1983:26) also suggests, "earliest Christianity was changed from a basically rural and rustic sect whose founders were Galilean 'backwoodsmen' into an active and successful city religion."

[388] Some scholars assume that there are many bilinguals in the Jerusalem church, although they do not try to relate the bilingualism to directionality of transmission of J&GTrad. For instance, Hurtado (2005:86) mentions, "we should remind ourselves that from its earliest moments the young Christian movement (at least in Jerusalem and other urban settings) was a bilingual entity, comprising Greek-speaking and Aramaic-speaking believers, and a good many others who were effectively

the NT and other literature was Greek. Many scholars, including those in the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, assume that Diaspora Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians should be viewed as Greek-speakers when they make a distinction between "Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jewish Christians and Greek-speaking Diaspora Jewish Christians" or the "Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christianity and Greek-speaking gentile Christianity."[389] These clear distinctions between the Aramaic-speaking and the Greek-speaking Christian communities are deeply related to the unidirectional development of Christological titles because there is an assumption that Greek Christian communities could not understand Aramaic terms.[390] For instance, Μεσσίας[391] is circulated in Palestinian setting whereas Χριστός in the Hellenistic setting. The title, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is used in Palestinian setting whereas ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is used in the Hellenistic setting. Μαρε of the Palestinian setting was developed into κύριος of the Hellenistic setting.[392] It has been assumed that the Christological titles show the unidirectionality hypothesis that the JTrad was transmitted from the Aramaic-speaking setting into the Greek-speaking setting.

As mentioned before (§5.1), Hengel has diverted scholar's attention to translation

---

speakers of both languages."

[389] Cf. Heitmüller 1912; Bultmann 1952:1.48-53; 1956; Fuller 1965; Kramer 1966; Conzelmann 1969:72-86; Hahn 1969; Mack 1988. For criticism against the clear distinction of the two groups, see Cullmann 1959:323; Kümmel 1973:105-6, 118-9.

[390] Conzelmann (1969:72; cf. 1973:69) supposes, "The development of the significance of Χριστός in the direction of becoming a name took place naturally in the Greek-speaking world. The Greeks do not understand the title Messiah." However, it is usual that significant religious terminologies are not translated but transliterated. In modern Bible, it is natural that Χριστός is transliterated not translated in almost versions in the world like Christ. This means that it is highly possible that the translated form (Χριστός) was circulated with the transliterated form (Μεσσίας) in the first-century Jerusalem church (§7.4.3.2).

[391] It is interesting that only the GofJn which is considered as the latest Gospel has the transliterated title (Μεσσίας) rather than the translated title (Χριστός) in twice times. It hints that the title was used both in the Palestinian and Hellenistic settings, when the Gospel was written. Redating the GofJn, Robinson (1976:293) persuasively insists, "The gospel shows the marks of being both Palestinian and Greek." For the detailed discussion of Μεσσίας in the GofJn, see §7.4.3.2.

[392] In the case of μαράνα θά of 1Cor.16:22 the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* considers that the Maranatha formula was derived from Hellenistic church since מר could not used in Palestine; Heitmüller 1912:333-4; Bousset 1970:129; cf. 134; Bultmann 1952:51-2; Schulz 1962:126-7: Kramer 1966:99-107, 175. However, bilingualism implies that the Aramaic transliterated form (μαραναθα; cf. Didache10:6) and Greek translated equivalents (ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ Rev.22:20 and ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς Phil.4:5) could have been circulated together in the earliest church in Jerusalem (Marshall 1972-3:280; Hurtado 1998:100-111). For the use of "Lord" in Judaeo-Palestine, see Vermes 2000:201; Fitzmyer 1974:386; 2000:31.

of JTrad from the gentile Christian community in Antioch into Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in the earliest church in Jerusalem. It was a great turning point. Hengel considers that the JTrad in the Jerusalem church is transmitted from Ἑβραῖοι who were Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jews into Ἑλληνισταί who were Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews. It was bilinguals in the Jerusalem church that played an important role to bridge the gap between the two different linguistic communities. Although due to their monolingual handicap the Hellenists take limited and passive participation in transmission of JTrad, the translation-transmission was made by the Hellenists including the Seven in Jerusalem, not "decades later outside Palestine in Antioch or elsewhere" (Hengel 1989a:18). Hengel (1989a:18; 1983:26-8) suggests some parts of JTrad such as the Passion Narrative and significant theological terms such as αββα (transliterated), ἀγαπή, ἀπόστολος, ἐκκλησία, ἐλπίς, εὐαγγέλιον, κοινωνία, παρουσία, παρρησία, πιστεύειν, πίστις, χάρις, χάρισμα, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, etc. However, although Hengel quite often takes bilingualism into account, his methodology still stays within a monolingual framework. His notions of bilinguals are inconsistent and vague. As a consequence of this, he also assumes the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis that the translation-transmission of JTrad is unidirectional from Aramaic-speaking into Greek-speaking community in Jerusalem.

Contra such assumptions, Aramaic was the primary language of many regions of the first-century RNE. This implies that a great number of Gentiles in the RNE spoke Aramaic too and some Gentiles would only have spoken Aramaic. A large population of Aramaic-matrix Gentiles and Greek-matrix Jews suggests that many Aramaic-matrix gentile Christians and many Greek-matrix Jewish Christians were in the Jerusalem church and in Christian communities of the Roman Empire. The bilingualism of first-century Jerusalem and RNE indicates that many Gentile and Jewish Christians could be bilinguals and the Jerusalem church is a bilingual community. In this regard, most JTrad was translated into Greek in the Jerusalem church.

Furthermore, it seems that monolingual view of Palestinian Christians allows Baur and Bultmann to presuppose that the Palestinian Christians including the disciples of Jesus has a linguistic limit to control the course of transmission of translation from Aramaic into Greek in the Jerusalem church. However, the translation-transmission of JTrad in the Jerusalem church was strictly performed under supervision of bilingual disciples[393] and followers of Jesus[394] who were eyewitnesses to the sayings by Jesus and participants in the stories about Jesus.[395] Bilinguality of the disciples and followers of Jesus makes it possible to impose censorship of the translation-transmission of JTrad in the Jerusalem church. Accordingly, the JTrad was well-translated from Aramaic into Greek and Greek into Aramaic under control and circulated in Aramaic and Greek in the earliest Jerusalem church as well as in churches in the RNE including Antioch. Furthermore, we can not deny the possibility that the SynGs written in Greek were translated into Aramaic again and circulated in Aramaic-matrix Christian communities orally as well as in written form. Taking a further step, the SynGs in Greek could have been translated into Aramaic language family. Therefore, the directionality of transmission of JTrad is not unilinear but hybrid, not unidirectional but interdirectional from the start as well as after the written SynGs.

---

[393] Most disciples of Jesus could be bilinguals in the Jerusalem church (§3.2.4): Peter, Andrew, Philip, James, John, and Matthew. And Jesus and his mother were bilinguals (§3.2.4).

[394] Many followers of Jesus should be bilinguals in the Jerusalem church (cf. §3.2): at least, Nicodemus (Jn 3:1), a centurion near the Cross (Mk 15:39), a centurion and his servant in Capernaum (Mt 8:5; Lk 7:1), Joseph of Arimathea (Mk15:43), Jairus and his family (Mk5:22), Alexander and Rufus (Mk 15:21), and Zacchaeus (Lk19:2).

[395] Dibelius (1949:31-2) suggests, "The Greek narratives arose at a period when many eyewitnesses of Jesus' ministry were still living. They, especially the personal disciples of Jesus, would have been in a position to correct any egregious misrepresentation." Refer to eyewitnesses to Jesus and their functions in the transmission of GTrad, see Byrskog 2000:65-91, chapters 4 & 6 (§1.4.1.3).

PART II: Interdirectional Transmission of Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts at the Levels of Syntax, Phonology, and Semantics

Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE was previously investigated (Part I). As Part I showed, the topic of bilingualism of Palestine has been widely considered among biblical scholars even from the nineteenth century. However, their approaches had two drawbacks. First, it seems that their concepts and methodology of bilingualism have been obscure and unfledged. This is because the study of bilingualism as a branch of Sociolinguistics had not been taken seriously until the 1960s (cf. introduction to chapter 2).[396]

Second, scholars' applications of bilingualism to the FGs and Acts are either excessive or insufficient. In relation to the syntactic level of NT Greek, the scholars have applied the concepts of language contact to analysis of NT Greek. They commonly assumed that language contact between Semitic and Greek resulted in Semitisms or Septuagintalisms. This would imply that syntactic Semitisms provide us with temporal priority. That is, GTrads which include syntactic Semitisms could be older traditions. However, it seems that most syntactic shifts occur due to internal-induced syntactic change rather than contact-induced syntactic change (chapter 6). Biblical scholars, in this respect, have overemphasized the bilingual approach to the syntax of NT Greek.

On the other hand, most scholars have not taken bilingualism into account seriously at the levels of Phonology and Semantics. In terms of transliterated variants, many scholars have tried to single out the original SemSpel from variant spellings of transliterated words on the basis of orthography. Three assumptions have been made: (1) the correct spelling is the original spelling. (2) A Semitic type spelling is more original than a Greek type spelling. (3) A Semitic transliterated word is closer to the sayings of Jesus and stories

---

[396] Many biblical scholars, for instance, used to think of "bilinguals" as "early bilinguals" or "primary bilinguals," regardless of "late bilinguals" or "acquired bilinguals," as mentioned before (§2.1).

about Jesus than a Greek translated word. However, it is normal that transliteration of proper nouns from a source language to a target language tends toward phonological variants due to various factors. This means that the correct transliterated spelling does not exist in most cases (chapter 7). We may find the original spelling/spellings the authors used. Furthermore, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE made it possible to consider that SemSpels were circulated with their Greek equivalents from the start. This means that SemSpels are not always earlier than GkSpels (chapter 7).

Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE should be taken into consideration seriously at the semantic level. Bilingualism brings about interference, borrowing, and codeswitching. In terms of ArmEmWords, language change from Greek into Aramaic, most scholars have regarded them as interferences or borrowings. However, speakers and writers could use ArmEmWords in their Greek texts *intentionally* in a bilingual context (chapter 8). In other words, ArmEmWords could be used as an intentional literary device called "codeswitching." This means that ArmEmWords themselves do not always indicate temporal priority. Accordingly, it seems that most biblical scholars have held a one-sided view of bilingualism at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels.

I would contend that their improper understanding of bilingualism is deeply related to their views of language change at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels. First of all, two approaches to language change need to be investigated. The study of *langue*, with a theoretical inclination, has been a mainstream of modern linguistics. It was propounded by Ferdinand de Saussure who opened the new chapter of modern linguistics, called "General Linguistics," which was developed by Noam Chomsky. Criticizing Historical Linguistics in the nineteenth century de Saussure did not take language variation or language change into consideration seriously. As is well-known, his train of thought can be summarized like this (1959:6-17): (i) *Langue* is a system whereas *parole* is its utterance. (ii) *Langue* is homogeneous, whereas *parole* is heterogeneous. (iii) Language shifts in *parole*, not in *langue*.

(iv) The shift of *parole* cannot change the *langue*. (v) The mission of linguists is to analyze *langue*, not *parole*. For de Saussure, language variation or language change is considered to be an abnormal linguistic phenomenon. Reemphasizing the Saussurian dichotomy, Chomsky substitutes language competence and language performance for *langue* and *parole*. He (1965:3) also excludes language change or language variation from the subject of linguistics and defines the scope of the study of linguistics as follows:

> Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.

However, his concept of a speaker or a linguistic community has been criticized because the ideal model of ideal speaker-listener in an ideal linguistic community could not be found in the world. Consequently, it has been criticized that the structuralism of Saussure-Chomsky failed to explain adequately language variation or language change because they do not take it as a part of Linguistics.

The pendulum swings between rationalism and empiricism in the history of research. The study of *parole*, with an empirical inclination, has lively been investigated in Sociolinguistics, Cognitive Linguistics, Cultural Linguistics, and Anthropological Linguistics. They have taken language variation caused by diachronic change (i.e. historical factors) and by synchronic change (i.e. social factors) into account seriously since 1960s. Unlike Saussure-Chomsky, Labov (1972:188-91; originally 1960s) suggests that there are four distinct difficulties that have had a significant effect on linguistic practice: (i) ungrammaticality of speech, (ii) variation in speech and in the speech community, (iii)

difficulties of hearing and recording, and (iv) rarity of syntactic forms. Labov (1966) considered linguistic variables as structural units, which has been supported by Chambers (1995:12-32) and Chambers & Trudgill (1998:127). This means, as Chambers (1995:25) mentions, that "hitherto, all linguistic units – phones, phonemes, morphemes, phrases, clauses – had been invariant, discrete, and qualitative. The variable is none of these." He continues, "Instead, it is variant, continuous, and quantitative." Going a further step, Chambers (1995:26-32) calls the study of *langue* categorical theory and the study of *parole* variation theory. He (1995:25) strongly insists, "The variable can only exist in a theory that abandons the axiom of categoricity." Accordingly, the categoricity theory (i.e. the study of *langue*) is not concerned with language variation, language change, or variants. In contrast, the variation theory (i.e. the study of *parole*) regards language as variation, change, or variants.

Many biblical scholars have considered Hellenistic Greek as *langue* on the basis of the categoricity theory (§6.1).[397] In other words, they have considered language variation, language change, or variants found in the NT Greek to be abnormal. However, the fact that Hellenistic Greek itself changed synchronically and diachronically means that Hellenistic Greek should be consider as *parole*, as will be fully discussed (§6.1).

As investigated in Part I, the linguistic milieus of first-century P&RNE were bilingualism in Greek and regional vernacular languages. Also, it was suggested that the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem was a bilingual community. If the JTrad was formed in bilingual contexts and the SynGs were circulated in bilingual contexts, which approach can explain their linguistic situations more appropriately? Milroy & Muysken (1995:3) criticize:

---

[397] Fortunately, it is welcomed that Reed (2000:121-9) encourages NT scholars to discuss NT language on the basis of the science of *parole* not that of *langue*. Also, Silva tries to investigate the NT Greek from the perspective of style (i.e. *parole*), although he considers Hellenistic Greek *langue* and NT Greek *parole* (§6.1.4).

Noam Chomsky's meta-theoretical focus on the ideal native speaker in the ideal speech community is perhaps the most famous modern embodiment of this monolingual and non-variationist focus. While generative grammar has flourished by focusing on simple cases and ignoring more complex situations such as bilingualism, generativists are not alone amongst modern linguists in reflecting such a traditional orientation.

Mackey (1970:554) also suggests, "bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use.... It does not belong to the domain of 'langue' but of 'parole'." Although some biblical scholars admit that the linguistic milieus of first-century P&RNE were bilingualism, it is regretful that their arguments are still based on Saussure-Chomskyan presupposition. Consequently, the approach to the language of NT should be investigated from the perspective of the variation theory.

Moreover, if Jesus usually spoke Aramaic and the Gospels were written in Greek, this example of language contact warrants an application of translation theory to this field. Koller (1979:183) calls translation theory "a science of *parole*." Fawcett (1997:4) also posits, "the view that translation theory must be studied as *parole* (a communicative event) rather than *langue* (an abstract system) is now widely accepted...." He explains, "translation is a fact of parole that there is no such thing as the one 'right' translation of a message." The J&GTrads were translated from Aramaic to Greek and later, *vice versa.* As such, our analysis of J&GTrads in bilingual contexts should be examined from the view of the study of *parole* rather than *langue*, language performance rather than language competence, and variation theory rather than categoricity theory.

The concepts of the categoricity theory, the science of *langue*, and language competence are deeply related to the unidirectionality hypothesis from Judaeo-Palestinian to

Hellenistic, from oral into written, and from Semitic into Greek. Many biblical scholars have tried to single out Semitisms or Septuagintalisms at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels from the FGs and Acts. In doing so, they assume that sayings and stories which betray Semitic influence/interference have a greater claim to "authenticity." This view considers such tradition to be closer to the historical Jesus according to the unilinear transmission hypothesis.

However, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE requires other perspective of transmission of J&GTrads. From the views of variation theory, the science of *parole*, and language performance Part II will be devoted to transmission of J&GTrads at the levels of Syntax, Phonology, and Semantics. With respect to syntax of NT Greek, many scholars have assumed that Hellenistic Greek is *langue*, whereas NT Greek is *parole* due to Semitisms or Septuagintalisms. However, both Hellenistic Greek and NT Greek should be thought of as *parole*. Furthermore, grammaticalization theory from the perspective of Cognitive Linguistics shows that syntactic changes are not Semitic interference due to contact-induced syntactic shifts but grammatical polysemies due to internal-induced syntactic shifts (chapter 6).

At the phonological level, when many scholars deal with phonological variants, they have sought to single out the only original SemSpel from transliterated variants on the basis of categoricity theory. In other words, they do not seriously consider that transliteration due to language contact tends toward phonological variants and that bilingual circumstance does not give temporal priority of SemSpel over GkSpel. In this respect, transliterated variants will be considered to be transliterated allowords from the view of variation theory (chapter 7).

Lastly, Semitic words embedded in the SynGs and Acts have been investigated from the perspective of language competence. Many NT scholars have considered Semitic embedded words as interference (or borrowing). In this view, Semitic words have temporal

priority because Jesus and his disciples used Aramaic as their matrix language. However, such semantic interference should be investigated from the view of language performance in the bilingualism in first-century P&RNE. The bilingual authors intentionally change language codes in bilingual contexts for their pragmatic functions; this is otherwise known as codeswitching (chapter 8).

6. Syntax[398]

Syntactic changes[399] are often found in the language of the SynGs and Acts. Most biblical scholars have assumed that these syntactic shifts have resulted from language contact between Aramaic and Greek. The changes have been viewed as Semitic interferences (Semitisms or Septuagintalisms) from the perspective of the categoricity theory. This position can be called the contact-induced syntactic change hypothesis. The hypothesis implies that syntactic changes of NT Greek are *abnormal* syntactic phenomena in comparison with Classical Greek or Hellenistic Greek. On the basis of the unidirectionality hypothesis, many scholars have used Semitic coloring as criteria for the temporal priority of J&GTrads. The more Semitized, the more original it is. That is, SemTrad of J&GTrads is more original than GkTrad. In this respect, the Semitic interference hypothesis has deeply been connected with major issues of the Gospel Studies such as the Historical Jesus, the Synoptic Problem, provenances of the Gospels and Acts, textual-criticism of the Gospels and Acts, and development of christological titles.

However, I would suggest that the Semitic interference hypothesis based on contact-induced syntactic change is too hasty a conclusion. It disregards the other possibility of syntactic shift of NT Greek which constitutes an internal-induced syntactic change hypothesis. Cognitive Linguists have examined that syntactic change occurs in a language itself in the grammaticalization process caused by human cognition regardless of language contact. In relation to this, they call syntactic changes syntactic polysemies. If syntactic shifts of the FGs and Acts that have been called Semitisms or Septuagintalisms correspond to the paradigm of grammaticalization process or the so-called solecisms are found in

---

[398] I have conducted chapter 6 Syntax in full-dressed discussion. The total word of chapter 6 Syntax approximated to 25,200 words. However, it could not be included in the thesis itself for the reasons of space. Consequently, I summarized chapter 6 here.

[399] Semitic interference, Semitic coloring, or syntactic solecism which is a well-known term has been usually used on the presupposition that the syntactic change is due to language contact.

Hellenistic Greek literature, the syntactic changes should be considered to be syntactic polysemies due to internal-induced syntactic changes, not Semitisms or Septuagintalisms due to contact-induced syntactic changes. Also, if, although the usages are not found in Hellenistic Greek literature except for NT literature, syntactic shifts observe the typical pattern of grammaticalization process, it is highly probable that the syntactic changes can be ascribed to internal-induced changes because the vocabulary of the NT is a tiny fraction of Hellenistic Greek. The cases of grammaticalization I suggested are saying verbs (ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν, ἐλάλησεν [εἶπεν]-λέγων), movement verbs (ἐλθών, ἐρχόμενος, καταλιπών), posture verbs (καθίσας, ἀναστάς, ἐγερθείς), conjunctions (ἵνα, ὅτι), and adverbs (Matthean τότε, Markan εὐθύς, and Johannine οὖν).

Furthermore, we cannot deny the possibility that some syntactic changes might be Semitisms or Setuagintalisms due to contact-induced change. Nevertheless, if we take bilingualism of first-century Palestine into serious consideration, J&GTrads must have been circulated in Greek as well as in Aramaic during Jesus ministry. This means that it is uncertain that the assumed Semitisms do not always refer to temporal priority. Accordingly, the Semitisms and the Septuagintalisms at the syntactic level do not support the unidirectionality hypothesis any more.

However, since syntactic change or shift is a more neutral term I will use this.

7. Phonology

It has usually been considered that while Aramaic was used by Jesus as his primary language in first-century Palestine, the FGs and Acts were written in Greek. This language contact between Aramaic and Greek leads copiously transliterated words in the FGs and Acts. Generally speaking, when a story is translated, proper nouns of the story are transliterated. Likewise, local proper nouns in settings of Jesus' ministry were transliterated. Second, personal proper nouns as characters in the FGs and Acts were transliterated as well. Third, it is interesting that some Aramaic transliterated words are preserved in the Greek narratives. The problem lies in the fact that the three kinds of the Aramaic transliterated words have their variant spellings.

There are two approaches to variant spellings of transliterated words at the phonological level. One is the orthographical view. Many biblical scholars have investigated variant spellings of transliterated words on the basis of the orthographical view. This view stems from a particular understanding of language change. This view assumes that phonological variation or language change found in the FGs and Acts are abnormal. The presupposition here is based on the categoricity theory, the study of *langue*, and language competence. In terms of transliterated words, this approach has tried to single out the "correct" spellings from the "corrupted" spellings and the "right" spellings from the "erroneous" spellings. This is because they have assumed that "correct" transliterated spellings are the "original" transliterated spellings which were used by the four evangelists. Furthermore, the scholars have assumed that Semitic type spellings (e.g. Ἰερουσαλήμ, Συμεών) are earlier than Greek type spellings (e.g. Ἱεροσόλυμα, Σίμων). Also transliterated words (e.g. Κηφᾶς, Μεσσίας) are earlier than translated words (e.g. Πέτρος, Χριστός). In other words, SemSpels and words have temporal priority over GkSpels and words. This assumption has been used as a criterion to decide which sayings by Jesus and stories about

Jesus are earlier tradition in relation to source criticism, textual criticism, the Synoptic Problem, and unidirectional Christology. This approach is based on the monolingual view of first-century P&RNE and on the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis that J&GTrads are linguistically transmitted from Semitic to Greek.

Contrarily, variant spellings of transliterated words at the phonological level should be observed from the perspective of variational view, the study of *parole*, or language performance. In other words, phonological variability of transliterated words and bilingualism of first-century P&RNE should be taken into consideration seriously. It is normal that transliteration leads to variant spellings due to four major factors (§7.1). Variability of transliterated spellings does not permit us to exclude variant spellings from orthography. Furthermore, the bilingual view implies that SemSpels, Semitic words, and Semitic type words were circulated with transliterated and translated spellings, Greek words, and Greek type words during Jesus' ministry and later. This militates against the idea that SemTrads ought to have temporal priority over GkTrads. Consequently, SemTrads in the FGs and Acts at the phonological level do not support the unidirectionality hypothesis but the interdirectionality hypothesis. In chapter 7, variant spellings of transliterated words in the FGs and Acts will be considered to be transliterated allowords from the perspective of variational view, the study of parole, and language performance.

Above all, five linguistic factors to cause variant spellings will be investigated (§7.1). Second, three approaches to the variant spellings (i.e. orthographical, variational, and bilingual views) will be illustrated (§7.2). Third, from the perspective of the variational view, variant spellings as transliterated allowords will be discussed (§7.3). Then, important variant spellings in the FGs and Acts will be discussed as transliterated allowords (§7.4). Lastly, the relationship between variant spellings as transliterated allowords and interdirectionality will be observed (§7.5).

7.1 Linguistic Factors of Transliterated Variants in Bilingual Contexts

Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE brought about variant spellings in the SynGs and Acts, when Semitic words or sentences were transliterated into their Greek equivalents. Phonologically speaking, there are four major factors to cause phonological variants. Different phonetic system (§7.1.1), representation (§7.1.2), phonetic change (§7.1.3), and dialects (§7.1.4) can cause transliterated spellings to be varied. Since this is not the place to enter the detailed discussions, the four factors will be briefly considered.

7.1.1 Different Phonetic System

Above all, concerning transliteration of foreign words in the SynGs and Acts many scholars have not seriously considered that transliteration from a source language into a target language produces phonological variants. When a foreign word of a source language is introduced to a target language for the first time, the transliterated words are adapted to the phonetic system of the target language. The problem lies in the fact that the phonological correspondence between the source language and the target language is not one-to-one function. On this score, different phonetic systems between the source language and the target language lead into phonological variants of transliterated words.

When Tübingen, a German city, is transliterated into English, it may be transcribed as Tubingen or Tuebingen. Köster, a German name, is the same case. Despite the fact that English is the closest language to German (i.e. Germanic family), English phonetic inventory does not have the two vowel values (i.e. ü and ö) so that two proper nouns in German are transcribed as the most similar sounds of English phonetic system. On the contrary, German phonetic inventory does not have a consonant equivalent to /ȝ/ of "Thatcher," English name. If a German who does not know English hears the name in English, he may transcribe

/Tatcher/ instead of /Thatcher/. Although English belongs to Germanic family, there are many differences in phonetic values between them when a word is translated from German to English or *vice versa*.

If both a source and a target language do not belong to one language family, the phonological correspondence between them will be much more complicated. When English words as a source language are transliterated into Korean as a target language, some phonological correspondence between English (i.e. the Indo-European family) and Korean (i.e. an Altaic family) is shown by [Table 2]:

[Table 2] Phonological Correspondence between English and Korean

PHONETIC VALUE	ENGLISH WORD	KOREAN WORD	
		KOREAN TRANSLITERATION	KOREAN PRONUNCIATION
[f]	FLASH	[플래쉬] [후래쉬]	[plæʃi] [huræʃi]
[θ]	THINK	[띵크] [씽크]	['tiŋk] ['siŋk]
[ɔ]	TOP	[톱] [탑]	[tob] [tab]
[^]	MONEY	[머니] [마니]	[məni] [mani]

As [Table 2] shows, [f] of FLASH, an English consonant, is transliterated into [p] or [h] of a Korean transliterated word because the Korean consonant inventory does not have the sound [f]. This means that [f] sounds [p] or [h] to Koreans.[400] Even though the [p] is

[400] When there is no exact phonological correspondence between a source language and a target language, a transcribed sound takes one or two out of phonological features of its source sound. The Korean phonological feature does not include the articulation place, [LABIODENTAL] whereas it includes the articulation manner, [FRICATIVE]. The English sound [f] is [LABIODENTAL] [FRICATIVE]. When the English sound [f] is transliterated into [p] or [h] of Korean sounds, [p] is [BILABIAL] [PLOSIVE] and [h] is [GLOTTAL] [FRICATIVE]. The [BILABIAL] of the sound [p] is

completely different from the [h] in Korean phonetic system, the sounds /p/ and /h/ are interchangeable. The two Korean transliterated words can be called "transliterated allowords" of English [f]. In the case of THINK, [θ] is transcribed as a double [d] or a double [s] because Korean phonetic system does not have the sound [θ] as well. This means that [θ] sounds a double [d] or a double [s] to Koreans.[401] Even though the phonetic value of a double [d], of course, is also totally different from a double [s] in Korean phonetic system, the sound [θ] is transliterated into the sound a double [d] or a double [s] in transliteration from English into Korean. This means that the two pairs of the two Korean sounds are "transliterated allowords" of the English sound [θ]. Similarly, in the case of vowel transliteration, Korean vowel system does not have the English vowel values, [ɔ] and [^], so the [ɔ] is transcribed as /o/ or /a/ and [^] is transcribed as /a/ or /ə/. What is surprising is that when English consonants and vowels are transliterated into Korean, most of their phonological correspondences do not function in a one-to-one relationship. Nevertheless, what is important is that the target language users, both writers and readers, understand the phonological variants of the transliterated words without any confusion. Furthermore, these variant spellings are officially written in the newspapers, journals, and academic books without any confusion. And these variant spellings are formally used in broadcast programs, governmental addresses, and academic discussions without any confusion. This may suggest that the variability of variant spellings in transliteration from one language to another in ancient times was predicted and accepted without any confusion. If so, transliteration in the first century was much more fluid than previously thought.

---

the closest one to articulation place of [f] in Korean consonant inventory. The [FRICATIVE] of the sound [h] is taken from [FRICATIVE] of [f].

[401] In the case of [θ], the phonological features of the sound [θ] are [INTERDENTAL] [FRICATIVE]. The Korean phonological feature does not include the articulation place. [INTERDENTAL] whereas it includes the articulation manner. [FRICATIVE]. When the English sound [θ] is transliterated into a double [t] or a double [s] of Korean consonants. a double [t] is [ALVEOLAR] [PLOSIVE] and a double [s] is [ALVEOLAR] [FRICATIVE]. The [ALVEOLAR] of the sound [t] is the closest one to articulation place of [θ] in Korean consonant inventory. The [FRICATIVE] of the sound [s] is taken from [FRICATIVE] of [θ].

The phonological variants in transliteration from Semitic into Greek can be produced by two major mechanisms.[402] (1) UNDERDIFFERENTIATION is the process that phonological variants are caused by confused Greek sounds when two or more Semitic sound values in Semitic sound inventory are distinguished but their Greek equivalents in Greek sound inventory are one Greek sound value. (2) OVERDIFFERENTIATION is the process that phonological variants are caused by confused Greek sounds when two or more Greek sound values in Greek sound inventory are distinguished but their Semitic equivalents in Semitic sound inventory are one Semitic sound value. The Hebrew sibilants ס, שׂ, שׁ, צ usually corresponds to only one Greek sibilant σ/ς. When Hebrew sibilants are transliterated into Greek one, σ/ς is underdifferentiated (cf. Sperber 1937-8:115). In the opposite direction, ס, שׂ, שׁ, and צ are overdifferentiated.

In this regard, Leclercq (1972-3:188) argued persuasively, "Transliteration cannot presume a uniform pronunciation of Greek in any part of the Greek world at a given period of time."[403] The different phonetic system between Greek and other languages implies that when Greek proper nouns are transliterated into other languages (or *vice versa*), phonological variants are produced. Because this topic is beyond the scope of this dissertation I will limit my illustration of these phenomena to four transliterations between Ancient Greek and other languages.[404]

As far as irregular phonological correspondence between Greek and Egyptian is

---

[402] Cf. Jeffers & Lehiste 1979: 139-40, 180-7.

[403] He suggests two reasons. (1) There is no consensus of pronunciation of ancient Greek among modern scholars. (2) Many modern languages pronounce the same Greek letters in different ways.

[404] In terms of phonological reconstruction, transliteration from a source language into a target language has been studied in many publications. Generally, Greek pronunciation (Allen 1987); Greek euphony (Stanford 1967); transliteration of Greek NT words into Latin characters (Leclercq 1972-3:187-90); transliteration of Hebrew terms in the Septuagint (Tov 1973); Latin personal proper nouns in NT Greek (Bauckham 2002); transliteration of NT proper names from Greek into Syriac (Burkitt 1912); Greek words transliterated into Hebrew (Rosén 1963) ; phonological correspondence between Egyptian and Semitic (Muchiki 1999); transliteration of NT proper names from Semitic or Latin into Greek (Williams 1995). Incidentally, according to Historical Linguistics, there are two methods of reconstruction on the basis of relatedness and regularity hypotheses; comparative reconstruction and internal reconstruction (Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:17-54). ArmEmWords in NT literature can be also reconstructed by both methods to a large extent.

concerned, when ancient Egyptians of Roman Egypt wrote / spoke Greek, they would have been confused between voiceless consonants and voiced consonants. Thackeray (1903:100-1 n.1) suggests, "It appears probable that Egyptians, in the early centuries of our era, could not pronounce Greek γ and δ."[405] Vergote (1984:1387) also points out the confusion of occlusives and fricatives between (β), γ, δ and (π), τ, χ and σ and /z/ among bilingual Egyptians (cf. Gignac 1976:85, 124). Following Vergote, Fewster (2002:235) mentions, "The τ/δ confusion is common in the Greek of Egypt as is that between γ/κ, π/β, and σ/ζ."[406]

In the case of Phrygian Greek, there is a different phonetic system between Phrygian and Greek as well. Brixhe (2002:262) mentions that Phrygians were confused between κ and χ, π and ϕ, and τ and θ. Also, they had difficulty to pronounce Greek cluster στ wherever the cluster is placed. This difficulty results in two variants (Brixhe 2002:263). One is that speakers of Phrygian used prothesis (e.g. ἰστήλην, ϵἰθήλ[η], Εἰστρατονικως, or Ἡστεφάνῳ). The other way is to reduce στ to τ.

Different phonetic system between Greek and Scythian which is an Iranian language is implied by Aristophanes. He (*Thesm* 1001-1230) described that a Scythian archer spoke broken Greek. Some scholars have suggested the phonological variants due to phonological interference.[407] Brixhe (1988; cf. Stanford 1967:140-4) presents two points: (1) Scythians substituted unaspirated π, τ, κ for aspirated ϕ, θ, χ. (2) Ει, η, and ι are confused. Austin & Olson (2004:308) add two points. They neglected (1) initial aspiration and (2) final –ν and –ς. This means that Scythian phonological system caused them to underdifferentiate Greek plosives (π/ϕ, τ/θ, or κ/χ).

A case of transliteration between Greek and Latin indicates the fact that some

---

[405] This is adduced by three bits of evidence. (1) The Greek κ is used as equivalents of both γ and κ of Demotic in demotic papyri of second century C.E. In other words, Greek γ and κ is underdifferentiated to Egyptians (2) In Sahidic the equivalent consonants are rarely employed except in Greek words. (3) Greek papyri show interchanges between κ and γ, and τ and δ.

[406] The phonological change of Egyptian Greek has been vividly discussed, which is summarized by Horrocks (1997:61-3).

[407] For the detailed discussion of the phonological reconstruction of Scythian. see Willi

Greeks cannot pronounce *f* of Latin due to different phonetic system. This is mentioned in Quintilian 1.4.14: "The Greeks aspirate the letter *f* like their phi; for example, Cicero in Pro Fundanio makes fun of a witness who is unable to pronounce the first letter of this name."[408] Also, the episode that the different consonant system between Greek (Amphionem) and Latin (Ampionem) might have caused contempt of court is written in Quintilian 12.10.57: "When the judge asked the uneducated witness whether he knew Amphionem, and the witness said that he did not, the judge repeated the name without an aspirate and with a shortened second syllable and then he knew him well."[409] Consequently, the different phonetic system must have caused phonological variants in transliteration of Latin to Greek.

In sum there can be little doubt that transliterations of Semitic words of the NT literature into Greek are no exception. First of all, sound values of both Semitic (i.e. Aramaic and Hebrew) and Greek are not established completely. These are still under debate.[410] Second, the degree of transliterated differentiation must have been bigger than others because Semitic and Greek are different language families. Most Semitic consonants did not exactly correspond to their Greek equivalents in transliteration, as will be discussed (§7.3). What is worse, when Semitic vowels are transliterated into their Greek equivalents, more various variants would be produced because the boundaries between the vowel sound values were more obscure than those between the consonant sound values, will be presented.

7.1.2 Representation

2003:202-11. Concerning phonology and phonetics of Aristophanes' Attic, see Willi 2003:233-41.

[408] This translation is Biville's (2002:83) "Graeci aspirare 'f' ut phi solent, ut pro Fundanio Cicero testem qui primam eius litteram dicere non posit irridet"

[409] This translation is Biville's (2002:83-4) "cum interrogasset rusticum testem an 'Amphionem' nosset, negante eo, detraxit aspirationem breuitauitque secundam eius nominis syllabam. et eum sic optime norat."

[410] See Stanford 1967; Leclercq 1972-3:188; Allen 1987; Caragounis 2004. Weinberg (1969-70:1-32) suggests that it is not easy to transcribe and transliterate sound values of Hebrew as a source language in a unified way. For the discussion of Hebrew sound values with their Greek equivalents, see Sperber 1937-8:103-274; esp. 127-132.

When a word is transliterated from a source language into a target language, the process of representation may cause variants at phonological, morphological, and semantic levels. Phones at the phonetic level are represented into phonemes by means of phonological rules[411] at the phonological levels.[412] As is well known in English, although [n] and [m] is totally different at the phonetic level, [n] sounds like /m/ by mediating an English phonological rule. In the case of "input" unlike "inset," [n] is realized as /m/ in the process of consonant assimilation on the influence of the bilabial sound [p].[413] Similarly, euphony has been said to be one of the factors of sound change (Stanford 1967:74-98, 149-50; Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:89-93). Buck (1965:55-85) also suggests dialectal variants (i.e. sound changes) due to ease of pronunciation such as rhotacism, assimilation, dissimilation, transposition, doubling, simplification, elision, aphaeresis, crasis, or apocope.

It should be considered that the primary method of communication in first-century P&RNE was not written but oral vehicle. OralTransmission of J&GTrads caused variant spellings in transliteration.[414] This is so because Greek phones may have been realized to phonemes differently from the written sounds on the basis of some phonological rules. In the case of Greek, as Hort (1896:156-7) mentions, when σύν- is pronounced, it is changed into σύμ- before bilabial consonants (e.g. β, π, φ, and μ) at the phonological representation.[415] This euphony results in two phonological variants (i.e. σύν- and σύμ-). *BDF* (§19) illustrates another assimilation; σὺν Μαριάμ and σὺμ Μαριάμ of Lk2:5 (complete assimilation); ἐν Κανά and ἐγ Κανα of Jn2:11 (partial assimilation). Caragounis (2004:379) suggests, "The κ

---

[411] Hyman 1975:12-5; one of the well-known English phonological rules is like this; /s, z, t/ becomes changed into [š, ž, č] before /y/ when it is pronounced.

[412] According to Hyman (1975:2), "A phonetic study tells how the sounds of a language are made and what their acoustic properties are. A phonological study tells how these sounds are used to convey meaning." The units of phonological representation are "phonemes" which are transcribed between diagonal bars // whereas the units of phonetic representation are "phones" (i.e. sound segments) between square brackets []; for detailed discussion, see Hyman 1975:8-9.

[413] Cf. Hyman 1975:1-15; Carr 1993:13-32.

[414] Metzger 1992:190-2; *Vaganay-Amphoux* 56; *BDF* §14.

[415] This phonological representation implies that β, π, φ, and μ were bilabials, although φ may have been regarded as a labiodental among some English scholars.

of the preposition ἐκ before B, Γ, and Δ as well as before Λ, M, and N is regularly changed to Γ for euphonic reasons." When these Greek phrases are transliterated to Semitic, they would have been transcribed to two Semitic words. Beth She‹arim is transliterated into Βησάρα, Βεσαρα, or Βισαρα (Mazar 1973:1-2). It seems that the consonant τ is absorbed into σ due to convenience for pronunciation because both of them are alveolars, as shown by Bêsân for Beth She‹an and Benafsha for Beth Nafsha (Mazar 1973:1-2).

A variation may occur due to the secondary articulation (Sloat, Taylor, & Hoard 1978:44-6).[416] When a sound [r] is produced in initial position in English, the lips are rounded. The /w/ is not realized in its written form, but when it is pronounced, it is unconditionally represented in pronunciation. And when an English native speedily pronounces WRITING, s/he may pronounce [r] instead of [t] of WRITING because [t] or [d] could be changed into [r] in the particular context. Consequently, when WRITING is transliterated to Korean, the two secondary articulations could have made the WRITING four transliterated Korean spellings like [Table 3].

[Table 3] Four Transliterated Korean spellings of 'Writing'

	+ ROUNDED	- ROUNDED
[t]	[r^{w}aitiŋ] 롸이팅	[raitiŋ] 라이팅
[t] > /r/	[r^{w}airiŋ] 롸이링	[rairiŋ] 라이링

The four transliterated Korean spellings are predictable and acceptable. Although [raitiŋ] is common, the other three spellings are acceptable to the learned who specially know the phonological realizations of English [r] and [t] in the process of phonological representation. The secondary articulation causes the transliterated word to be varied. This seems to be related to the variant spellings of Nazareth; Ναζαρά can be changed to

[416] The "secondary articulation" refers to "modifications which are imposed on the primary articulation of a sound" (Sloat, Taylor, & Hoard 1978:41).

Ναζωραῖος due to secondary articulation (§7.3.2.2). In the case of the difference of Jesus' dereliction cry, Williams (2004b:1-12) persuasively argues that the different spellings between Mt27:46 and Mk15:34 are caused by phonological representation of oral sounds (§7.4.3.1). Consequently, it should be brought into consideration that many phonological rule-governedness of Semitic and Greek caused spellings at the phonological representations to be varied in transliteration from Semitic into Greek.

Morphological representation[417] is related to variant spellings. When a word is transliterated, the spellings can be different whether morphemes are transliterated or not. Ilan (*LJNLA* 22-8) presents detailed instances of transliterated variations from Hebrew or Aramaic into Greek in the process of the morphological representation (e.g. declensions, feminine suffixes, or Semitic suffixes).[418] Rahmani (1994:13) illustrates that *Goliath* (nos 799, 800) from Jericho is not inflected as in the Septuagint, which is different from *Goliathos* or *Goliathes* in Josephus (*Ant.* 6:171, 177). The two variant spellings of Nazareth (i.e. Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ) may be explained due to morphological representation of Hebrew itself because both *–eth* and *–ah* are feminine endings (§7.4.2.2; §8.4.3.2). It seems that ι of Ταλιθα κουμι (muted case ending) might be added when scribe took its morpheme into consideration (§8.4.2).

In the case of representation at the semantic level, proper nouns of the SynGs and Acts are represented in two ways. Most proper nouns are usually transliterated from Semitic words into Greek words. Personal proper nouns, on the other hands, may be translated. Mussies (1994:249) assumes that two spellings, Μνάσων (Acts21:16; *CPJ*28 1.17) and Μν[ι]ασέας (*CIJ* 508) could be regarded as translating Zakaryah and as transliterating

---

[417] Morphology is usually defined as a "branch of linguistics that is concerned with the relation between meaning and form, within words and between words (Lardiere 2006:59)."

[418] She (*LJNLA* 18) suggests the tendencies of suffix transliteration of personal proper nouns found in the Septuagint, Josephus, and the NT. In the Septuagint when the personal proper nouns were transliterated into Greek, they do not decline them. In the case of works of Josephus the transliterations of the personal proper nouns are more Hellenized and their suffixes tend to decline. The authors of the NT tend to be closer to the Septuagintal style, but when it has a Hellenized form, it declines.

Manasseh, and that Justus (Acts1:23) may be derived from translating Zadok or from transliterating Joseph. Messiah and Christ (§7.4.3.2), and Cephas and Peter (§7.4.3.2) have two forms (i.e. a transliterated and a translated form). The two styles lead to two spellings for one proper noun.

It is interesting that when a word of a source language is transliterated into a target language, transliteration is sometimes influenced by etymology. Etymology (e.g. semantic interference or onomatopoeia) may cause variants. As is well known, the *hiero-* of the GkSpel of Jerusalem is relevant to "Holy" (Holy Solyma or Temple of Solyma) among Greek writers (cf. Smith 1907-8:1.261-2; cf. Sylva 1983:214). In fact, -ירו should have been transliterated into the light breathing (Ἰερου-) rather than the rough breathing (Ἱερο-). The popular etymology may cause two spellings of Jerusalem. In terms of transliteration of Βοανεργές (Mk3:17), the οα remained unsolved. The *shewa* can be transliterated into α or ο. This means that both Βανε- and Βονε- are possible transliterations whereas οα cannot be represented. However, Zimmermann (1979:10) suggests that οα in Βοανεργές was added by a Greek scribe because he considered the word (i.e. sons of thunder) as *boao*, *boa*, or *boe* which is related to great noises (e.g. war, wind, and waves). Taking a further step, Buth connects this transliterated term with popular etymology. He (1981:29) reasonably suggests, "Such a play on words could have influenced someone to break with conventional transliteration and to derive the 'unexplainable' form Βοαν- from -בני."[419] Taking a further step, in relation to the Greek transliteration (i.e. Ἱεροσόλυμα) of Jerusalem (§8.4.3.1), Sylva (1983:216) convincingly suggests that ancient etymology does not show the exact phonological correspondence between a source word and a target word. Popular etymology may cause phonological variants.

---

[419] Buth (1981:30) argues that the author of Βοαν- might be a Greek copyist rather than Mark because "Mark would be more conscious of the Semitic source than a Greek copyist." However, it seems that the inventor of the term could be Mark himself because he who might be a bilingual plays a pun by means of transliteration. More possible is that Jesus who might be a bilingual could have used Βοαν- as a codeswitching; cf. the bilinguality of Jesus (§3.2.4) and codeswitchings in the

7.1.3 Phonetic Change

Phonetic changes always occur in any language, which makes it difficult to reconstruct original sound values of an ancient language. The problem lies in the fact that, as Voelz (1984:939) points out, although Gospels were written in the first century, the authoritative manuscripts were written at least several centuries later. This gap makes it more difficult to trace the sound values of Hellenistic Greek. Concerning phonetic change, it is worthy to mention Gignac's suggestions (1976:58-9). (1) Although there is no exact way to reconstruct precise phonetic values of the original or transitional sounds, the study of comparative phonology of cognate sounds of related languages can provide us with reconstructed sound values. (ii) When a phonetic change is not reflected in writing, it is difficult to trace the changed sound. When it is transliterated, it may produce variant spellings. (iii) It is hard to decide the precise time limits of sound changes. (iv) Sound changes do not occur extensively and simultaneously but in localized areas and for a particular period. It should be cautious to do generalization. (v) Phonological variations may occur due to mistakes or slips of the pen.

Concerning phonetic change, some scholars have suggested that the pronunciation of Hellenistic Greek might be different from that of Classical Greek.[420] Concerning sound change in Rabbinic Greek, Rosén (1963:68) suggests that there were consonant changes from *nd* or *nt* into *d*; *mb* or *mp* to *b*; *ŋg* or *ŋk* into *g*. He illustrates that the Septuagint transliterates Hebrew ב into μβ in (e.g. חבקוק = Ἀμβακουμ) and that this is the same with Talmudic Greek (e.g. סבלת = συμ-βολή; סבלונות = σύμ-βολα; אבולא = ἔμ-βολος; אמבטי = ἐμ-βατή).

NT (chapter 8).

[420] Although this is a knotty problem, what is certain is that phonetic values are changing. For detailed discussion of changing pronunciation of Hellenistic Greek, see Caragounis 2004: Bubenik 1989; *BDF* §§17-35; Robertson 1934:236-41; Forster 1922:108-15.

Moreover, sound interchanges of Hellenistic Greek can cause phonological variants of NT Greek.[421] In relation to Egyptian Greek, Gignac (1976-81) suggests that many sounds were used interchangeably. He (summarized by van der Horst 1991:25-7) illustrates interchanges of αι and ε, ει and ι, η and ι/ει, η and ε/αι, οι and υ, υ and ει/ι/η, ει/ι and ε/αι, ω and ο, α and ε, α and ε, α and ο, α and αυ, and γ and ι, etc. According to *GLICM* (27-8), Greek inscriptions which are excavated from Caesarea Maritima in the Roman and Late Antique periods also show similar phonetic changes: (1) ι, η, υ, and ει sound alike and were confused in spelling. (2) Iotacisms were found.[422] (3) There were interchanges of ι and η, ι and ε, ι and ει, η and ει, ι and οι, and ει and οι. (4) Diphthongs had a tendency to change into monophthongs between ο and ου, υ and οι, υ and υι, υ and η, ε and αι, and ε and ευ. (5) The diphthong such as αυ was expanded into αυου. (6) Some vowel quantities were interchanged between ε and η and ο and ω. In the case of consonants, there were some phonetic changes: failure of assimilation of ν to γ, losses of liquid λ, nasal ν, and sibilant σ, simplification of doubled nasal ν, and gemination of σ. Caragounis (2004:365-382) also suggests interchanges between ει and ι, η and ε/ι, γ and ι, υ and ι, οι and ι, ηι and ι, ο/ου and ω, οι and ωι, αι and ε, αυ/ευ and ηυ, and etc. Also Greek inscriptions at Beth Shearim (about 10 miles from Nazareth) show phonetic changes. Schwabe & Lifshitz (1974:201-3) suggest: (1) iotacisms are found. Vowels ει, η, οι and υ are exchanged for ι and *vice versa*. (2) Conversely, ι disappears. (3) Some vowels replaced others: οιυ was used for ευ, ο for ου, ο for υ, ο for α, ου for ω, α for ε, ε for α, and ω for ε. In the case of consonants, (1) haplography is common. (2) There are interchanges between θ and τ and between χ and κ. (3) Π is confused with β. (4) K is weakened into γ and γ into ι. (5) X is replaced by κσ. (6) Dissimilation at a distance is shown.

---

[421] Hort (1896:157-62) shows interchanges between consonants and vowels of NT texts.

[422] From Jewish names excavated from Palestine from 330 BCE to 200CE. Ilan (*LJNLA* 21) mentions, "One of the most common features of Koine Greek is iotacism. This phenomenon is already evident in many of the name variations found."

Consequently, phonetic changes of a target language (i.e. Greek) occur in various ways. When proper nouns are transliterated, the phonetic changes may cause transliterated words to produce various spellings. Accordingly, Schwabe & Lifshitz (1974:203) reasonably suggests, "the transcription in the New Testament is by no means consistent."

7.1.4 Dialects

All languages have their dialects.[423] Both the source languages (i.e. Semitic) and the target language (i.e. Hellenistic Greek)[424] in the first centuries had their dialects as well.[425] It is well-known that *B.Erub*. 53b give evidence that Galileans were notorious for mispronunciation of gutturals and vowel sounds, which is adduced by Peter's mispronunciation (Mk14:70; cf. Mt 26:73):

> Now, as for that Galilean who said: 'Who has *ʿamar*? Who has *ʿamar*?' They said to him: 'Galilean fool! (Do you mean) an ass [*hamār*] to ride on? Or wine [*hamar*] to drink? Wool [*ʿamar*] for clothing? Or a sheepskin [*ʿîmar*] for a covering?' (Taylor 2002:303)[426]

This means that the pronunciations of ח, ע, ה, and א were not differentiated among Galileans so that they could understand them but not articulate them. Interestingly, Speiser (1933b:238) mentions "It is, doubtless, in self-defense that the Galilean scholars

---

[423] In reply to the question "Did dialectic differences persist?," Moulton (1919:39) suggests, "Speaking generally, we may reply in the negative. Dialectic differences there must have been in a language spoken over so large an area. But they need not theoretically be greater than those between British and American English."

[424] For the discussion of Greek dialects, see Buck 1965: Bartoněk 1972; Smyth 1974. For the discussion of Hebrew dialects, see Sperber 1937-8:149-53.

[425] Marcos (2000:14) may suggest, "there were greater degrees of dialectal differentiation than we know through the process of linguistic uniformity imposed by a great section of literary *koiné* and the way of speaking well and writing well spread by the Atticist movement."

[426] For more illustrations of Galilean mispronunciation, see Bockmuehl 2005:63-4 n.56.

chide the Babylonian Hiyya for his failure to differentiate between ח, ע, and ה." Dalman (1905:57-61) suggests that the inhabitants of Beth She‹arim could not articulate gutturals. Mazar (1973:1-2) also states that the original spelling of Beth She‹arim included ע, although the inhabitants could not speak the guttural. Egyptian dialect can cause Greek variant spellings. Taylor (2002:312) suggests, "while some of these forms are attested in other Aramaic dialects, they are best explained not as examples of interference but as defective spellings, since some are also to be found in the early Syriac inscriptions of Edessa"[427] It is well known that the transliterated difference between ταλιθα κουμ and ταλιθα κουμι of Mk5:41 is due to dialect (§8.4.2). Reed (2000:124) persuasively suggests, "Variant spelling practices probably due to pronunciation differences, as found in ancient Greek papyri, reveal such varieties of dialect in Egypt." Even Robertson (1934:178) proposes, "The dialects explain some variations in orthography," although his view is based on orthographical approach. Accordingly, dialects produce transliterated variations.

To sum up, it is normal that transliterated spellings have their variant spellings at the level of phonology. The variant spellings are caused by the four major factors: different phonetic system, representation, phonetic change, and dialects. In these cases, the variability in transliteration is predictable and acceptable.

7.2 Three Views of Variant Spellings in Transliteration

The fact that Aramaic was used as matrix language in first-century Palestine and that the SynGs were written in Greek caused copious Semitic transliterated words in the GkGospels. The Semitic transliterated words have their variant spellings which has attracted

---

[427] Taylor (2002:308) mentions, "This suggestion that the failure to write accurate Greek does not necessarily imply a lack of ability in spoken Greek is reinforced by a short inscription on a lintel in Bashakuh, Jebel Barisha, where the wordplay in part depends upon the local pronunciation/orthography."

NT scholars' attention. The scholars have considered the variable spellings of Semitic transliterated words in three views. Traditionally, variant spellings have been investigated from the perspective of the orthographical view on the basis of categoricity theory (§7.2.1). On the other hand, the variational view on the basis of variationism has been discussed by few scholars (§7.2.2). Lastly, the bilingual view will be suggested (§7.2.3).

7.2.1 Orthographical View

Many scholars have assumed that the single original spelling, the single original reading, and the single original text of the NT can be reconstructed by means of external and internal methods (see n.5).[428] As Barr (1989:187) points out, "this century the American school in the tradition of Albright" has held the orthographical view. This view is supported by Cross (1952, 1964, 1975) and Freedman (1962, 1969). They have posited that official spellings of epigraphic evidence can provide us with historical reconstruction and that the evidence of a chronology of orthographical developments can confirm the date of the original text.

Selecting the "original" from the "secondary" has also been applied to investigation of the Semitic transliterated words without exception. The scholars would usually have ascribed the phonological variants of Semitic transliterated words to "phonological errors." These errors have been caused either by evangelists in the transmission of JTrad or by copyists in the transmission of the GTrad. This orthographical

[428] Westcott & Hort (1896:303) submit, "We have therefore thought it best to aim at approximating as nearly as we could to the spelling of the autographs by means of documentary evidence." Souter (1954:3) presents, "Textual criticism seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgment, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished." Aland & Aland (1989:214) propose, "Only one reading can be original." Klijn (1966:103) suggests, "Textual criticism takes into account external evidence and internal evidence. At present the significance of internal evidence for restoring the original text is emphasized." Recently, Greenlee (1995:1) poses, "Textual criticism is the study of copies of any written work of which the autograph (the original) is unknown, with the purpose of ascertaining the original text."

approach to the variant spellings of Semitic transliterated words has been unceasingly supported by authoritative publications. Many scholars have dealt with phonological variants of Semitic transliterated words under the title of "orthography," "errors," or "corruption"; Hort (1896:148-79), Thackeray (1909:71-139; cf. 160-71), Robertson (1934:177-245), *BDF* (§§36-42), *Vaganay-Amphoux* (52-61), and Metzger (1992:186-206). From the perspective of the orthographical view Leon compares Roman Jewish epitaphs in Greek with in Latin. He (1960:87) poses, "we find far fewer examples of aberrations from *correct* Latin pronunciation and grammar" (emphasis added). Analyzing Jewish names in Late Antiquity Ilan (*LJNLA* 1.16) also holds the orthographical view, when he presents, "If Greek orthography corresponds to the *official orthography* of the name as recorded in the LXX translation, this is noted in the footnotes" (emphasis added). He (*LJNLA* 1.16) may complain that "scribes were very free in their transliteration of biblical names," but it is normal that transliteration itself from a source language into a target language is free to a great extent.

Consequently, the scholars who hold the orthographical view assume that the correct spelling should be singled out from corrupted spellings since they have the assumption that the correct spelling is the original spelling which was used by the four evangelists. The original spelling is the only single right spelling. Furthermore, the scholars have made efforts to single out a SemSpel from variant spellings of transliterated words in the FGs and Acts. This is so because they have presumed (1) that a SemSpel is an earlier spelling than its equivalent GkSpel and (2) that a SemTrad is closer to the original sayings by Jesus and the original stories about Jesus than GkTrad. These assumptions are based on the presupposition that the linguistic transmission of J&GTrads is unidirectional from Semitic to Greek.

Many scholars, on the one hand, have considered a SemSpel to be the original from the perspective of the monolingual view. It has been suggested that "final consonant mute forms" of three proper nouns (i.e. Ναζαρα, Γεννησαρ, and Ελισαβη; §7.4.1; §7.4.2)

reflect SemSpels. This means that SemSpels are more original and more correct spellings. Fitzmyer (1981-5:530) suggests that Ναζαρα "may reflect a more ancient Semitic form of the name." *BAG* (156) and *BDF* (§39(2)) suppose that Γεννησαρ should be regarded as the more correct form. *BDF* (§39(2)) also mentions that Ελισαβεε/Ελισαβη is the original. On the other hand, it has been presumed that the Semitic type spellings (e.g. Συμεών, Κηφᾶς, and Ἰερουσαλήμ) are earlier spellings than their equivalent Greek type spellings (e.g. Σίμων, Πέτρος, and Ἱεροσόλυμα) respectively (§7.4.1; §7.4.2).

The orthographical view is deeply related to the *Sitz im Leben* unidirectionality hypothesis of transmission of J&GTrads to some extent. The scholars have supposed that the authors and the readers of the Gospels were Greek speakers. That is, the SynGs were written in Greek monolingual contexts (e.g. Alexandria, Antioch, Galilee, Jerusalem, Rome, or Syria; see §4.1). The Matthean community, for instance, is said to be located in Syria. Kilpatrick (1946:104) mentions, "All this evidence taken together implies that the community was Greek-speaking rather than bilingual." The monolingual view of linguistic provenance leads into the assumption that SemSpels are older than GkSpels at the level of phonology. Accordingly, the orthographical view is based on the categoricity theory, the study of *langue*, and language competence. That is, spellings are transmitted from Semitic into Greek in a unidirectional way.

7.2.2 Variational View

On the other hand, some scholars have sporadically taken the phonological variants of Semitic transliterated words into consideration on the basis of variationism in their publications. Unfortunately, Hebrew scholars rather than NT scholars have made contribution to the variational approach because it is probable that they have frequently faced with more issues related to Semitic transliteration in the Septuagint. In terms of variational

approach, three scholars will be mentioned briefly.

7.2.2.1 Ephraim Speiser

From the variational angle, above all, Speiser (1926; 1933a; 1933b) showed his pivotal insight into the study of transliteration from Hebrew into Greek. Regarding transliteration of the Hexapla, he (1926:360) observed, "There is (sic!) a number of variations in the transliteration of the same word in different passages." He proposes that transliterations of the Hexapla are inconsistent. What is significant is his variational view of transliteration. He posits that the transliteration from one into another language naturally leads into variants. He suggests three reasons: phonological representation, disagreement of phonetic correspondence, sudden readjustment. First, he deliberates that the variant spellings result from phonological representation in the process of transliteration. Mentioning the statement of Jespersen who was one of the most renowned linguists of his contemporaries, he (1926:360) presents, "the pronunciation of a given word depends as much upon the position of the latter within the sentence as the exact sound of a given vowel or consonant varies with the character of the neighboring sounds." Modern linguistically speaking, phones at the phonetic level are realized into phonemes in a given word in the process of phonological rules so that the phonemes are varied (cf. §7.1.2). Second, phonetic correspondences from Hebrew into Greek do not function in a one-to-one relationship, which leads into phonological variants (cf. §7.1.1). He (1926:361) suggests, "it is self-evident that no two corresponding sounds of any two languages are, strictly speaking, identical." What is more, he (1926:361) proposes that even "similar sounds differ nevertheless in every language." This means that correct transliteration itself is impossible from the outset. Lastly, Speiser (1926:362) surprisingly submits, "This constantly increasing disparity results in sudden readjustments." This opens the possibility that scribes would have readjusted the

transliterated spellings according to their own habits or principles without hesitation. Accordingly, he convincingly concludes that it is normal that transliteration from Hebrew into Greek causes variant spellings because of phonological representation, phonetic correspondence, or readjustment. Unfortunately, despite the fact that his variational view of transliteration from Semitic to Greek was so vital that his view should have been developed further, scholarly attention has scarcely been given to him.

7.2.2.2 James Barr

Although Barr holds the categoricity theory at the Semantic level (1961), Barr (1989; cf. 1985) takes the variational view at the phonological level. He persists that there is no orthographical pattern or rigid laws of spellings in the Hebrew Bible. Instead of this, the spellings are random because of scribal style (1989:194). Consequently, Barr (1989:204) advocates that variable spellings should not be decided from the perspective of orthography (i.e. right or wrong spellings). He demonstrates lots of cases at the lexical level. In the case of *tol^{e}dot* (1989:2), it occurs irregularly in Genesis; תולדות (2:4), תולדת (in the next five occurrences, 5:1, 6:9, 10:1, 11:10, 27), תלדת (25:12), תולדת (25:19), and תלדות (next three occurrences, 36:1, 9, 37:2). In terms of proper nouns, he (1989:161-7) states that spellings of personal and local names are inconsistent and unpredictable.[429] As for Absalom with and without *waw*, it changes seven times within the eight verses 2 Sam 16:16-23 (Barr 1989:23). Many personal and local proper nouns preserve the variant spellings (Bar 1989:161-7). Even the spelling of David has variants (with and without *yod*; cf. 1989:166, 197). As a consequently, he (1989:24) strongly insists, "Surely no 'official' person or body of officials or official decision could have opted for the sort of alternation we have seen to exist, within

---

[429] I will suggest that variant spellings of transliterated words are predictable to some extent (§7.3.1).

one book or passage." Taking a further step, Barr (1989:187) suggests that variable spellings do not provide temporal priority of any text.

7.2.2.3 Alan Millard

Accepting Barr's proposal, Millard raises a question that the irregular occurrences of spellings are common phenomena in ancient times, as spellings of the Hebrew Bible did. He (1991) replies that the unconscious irregularities of spellings are also found in early Hebrew inscriptions, early Aramaic texts, and other ancient writing systems (e.g. West Semitic languages, Babylonian cuneiforms, or Egyptian hieroglyphs). He (1991:114-5) resolutely concludes that arbitrary spellings "can now be seen to be part of a common feature of ancient near eastern scribal practice." and that "there were no rigid rules, variable spelling was permissible."

7.2.2.4 Some Scholars of New Testament Greek

The variational view of Hebrew Bible scholars is also of significance to NT literature. In terms of the NT literature all scholars have not disregarded the variational approach to variant transliterated spellings of the NT literature. Raymond Brown (1993:209) convincingly posits variability of transliterated spellings in two points. First, although scholars have considered that the Aramaic embedded spellings are transliterated by "strict phonological rules," their derivations are "rarely accurate by scientific criteria." Second, scholars have insisted their arguments about transliterated words "with exclusivity" like a position that one variant is right but another is wrong. However, transliterated spellings should not be judged from the view of "either … or" because the spellings are "often a 'both…and,' rather than an 'either … or." In other words, as mentioned before (§7.1),

phonological correspondences are not one-to-one function so that the transliterated spellings are variable. Brown (1994:1052) maintains, "transliteration of Semitic vowels and consonants was not an exact procedure." And he applies the variational view to interpretation of "the cry of the cross" (§7.4.3.1).

Williams (2004b) also holds the variational view. He tries to apply it to analysis of variant spellings of the cry dereliction on the cross (§7.4.3.1). Concerning examination of Aramaic transliterated words in NT literature he (2004b:8) convincingly suggests:

> The phenomenon of alternative written realizations of the same sound is nothing like as common in English (which has largely standardized spellings) as it was in Koine Greek. Moreover, an even greater number of possible realizations would have existed for representing non-Greek words in Greek. … To insist that one must be the better or worse transcription may be rather beside the point.

Consequently, (1) a SemSpel of a source language (i.e. Semitic) may not be the single original SemSpel but the *original SemSpels* because the SemSpel itself can be variable. (2) Transliterated spellings of Semitic words in the FGs and Acts can be variable. (3) The original spelling may not be the correct spelling, and the secondary spelling may not be a corrupted spelling. This is so because transliterated spellings as such cannot be judged by exclusivity. These views deny the traditional orthographical view that we can single out the single original spelling, the single original reading, and the single original text of the NT. When it comes to investigation of transliterated words, it is persuasive that Leiwo (2002:182) proposes, "A descriptive analysis is far more important than a prescriptive one."[430] Variant spellings of transliterated terms of the FGs and Acts should not be

---

[430] Leiwo (2002:182) also posits "The main point … is not the 'correctness' of the Latin or the Greek, but the forms of deviation from the language generally used in these funerary inscriptions, which can tell us something about the varieties used within these communities."

investigated from the perspective of orthographical approach, the study of *langue*, and language competence but from variational approach, the study of *parole*, and language performance. However, if the scholars do not take the bilingual view below into consideration, despite their variational view, they cannot escape from the orthographical view completely.

7.2.3 Bilingual View

Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE should be taken into consideration seriously in dealing with transliterated words in relation to linguistic transmission of J&GTrads. Unfortunately, scholars have been largely unaware of the bilingual view and its logical implications. The bilingual view does not seem to support the orthographical view based on linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis that a SemSpel has the temporal priority over a GkSpel.

The variational-bilingual view implies two points. First, Semitic words may have been translated to Greek words. The SemSpels (e.g. Μεσσίας) must have been circulated with their equivalent GkSpels (e.g. Χριστός) in first-century P&RNE. This means that SemSpels were not always earlier than GkSpels. Second, bilingual authors and readers could have recognized both Semitic and GkSpels without any difficulties because any bilingual can transliterate a word of a source language to a target language. Also, authors and readers must have known variability of transliterated spellings without any confusion because it is known that phonological correspondence between Semitic and Greek is not one-to-one function (§7.1.1). Taking a further step, whenever authors and scribes met unfamiliar transliterated spellings, they might have preserved, adjusted, or readjusted the transliterated spellings in their own styles (cf. Speiser 1926:362), which causes a new variant. In this respect, it is necessary to consider the variant spellings in the NT literature to be transliterated allowords.

7.3 Variant Spellings as Transliterated Allowords in Bilingual Contexts

Here, I will take both variational and bilingual approaches to analysis of transliterated spellings in the SynGs and Acts. First of all, variant spellings will be considered as transliterated allowords (§7.3.1). Then, consonants of variant spellings as transliterated allowords will be discussed (§7.3.2). Lastly, vowels of variant spellings as transliterated allowords will be investigated (§7.3.3).

7.3.1 Transliterated Allowords

A "variant" can be defined as a word which includes one single or more different "distinctive features."[431] Ναζαρετ and Ναζαρεδ are two variants of the six GkSpels of Nazareth. The difference of the two spellings is the only one single distinctive feature, [±VOICED]. Their distinctive features can be analyzed: the τ is [-VOICED] [-ASPIRATED] [+PLOSIVE] [+ALVEOLAR] whereas the δ is [+VOICED] [-ASPIRATED] [+PLOSIVE] [+ALVEOLAR].[432] This means that the [±VOICED] makes their spellings different. The different spellings of Ναζαρετ and Ναζαρεδ can be called "minimal pairs."[433] In the case of the two Greek common nouns, τέρμα and δέρμα, this minimal pairs have different meanings: τέρμα means "end" whereas δέρμα means "skin."[434] However, the two variant spellings of "Nazareth" have the same meanings despite different consonants (i.e. τ

---

[431] A "distinctive feature" is usually defined as the most basic unit of phonological structure.

[432] It seems that Greek alveolar plosives (δ, τ, and θ) can be classified by two distinctive features, [ASPIRATED] and [VOICED]; δ is [−ASPIRATED] [+VOICED]. T is [−ASPIRATED] [-VOICED]. And θ is [+ASPIRATED] [-VOICED]. The sound values of Greek phonetic system have still been under debate. For recent other opinions, see Allen 1987:12-88; Caragounis 2004:352-83.

[433] "Minimal pairs" are defined as "Pairs of words that differ in only a single sound in the same position (Zsiga 2006:38). Two words, "try" and "dry" are minimal pairs.

[434] Allen makes a distinction of voiceless unaspirated (π, τ, κ) and voiceless aspirated (φ, θ, χ), he (1987:14) illustrated, "Their distinctiveness is demonstrated by minimally different pairs such

and δ) unlike the two common nouns. When נצרת is transliterated, the two consonants, τ of Ναζαρετ and δ of Ναζαρεδ are varied but predictable without any semantic change. This can be called "transliterated allophones."[435] Taking a further step, the two transliterated spellings of נצרת can be called "transliterated allowords."[436] The two spellings are varied but predictable in a transliterated context without any semantic change. The variant spellings of Nazareth (i.e. Ναζαρεδ, Ναζαρετ, and Ναζαρεθ) show variability and predictability without any semantic change. The three consonants (δ, τ, θ) share the two distinctive features, [+PLOSIVE] [+ALVEOLAR]. A consonant, ζ or ξ, never occurs as a transliterated allophone of ת of נצרת because the distinctive features of ζ or ξ are totally different from those of δ, τ, or θ. The selection of δ, τ, or θ rather than ζ or ξ is decided by phonological correspondence rules according to phonetic system of the source language (i.e. Hebrew) and the target language (i.e. Greek). Consequently, the variant spellings, δ of Ναζαρεδ, τ of Ναζαρετ, and θ of Ναζαρεθ, can be called transliterated allophones of ת of נצרת and the three variant spellings can be called transliterated allowords of נצרת, not corrupted spellings, or erroneous spellings. From the perspective of variational theory, the study of *parole*, and language performance, variant transliterated spellings would have most likely been considered as predictable and acceptable transliterated allowords among authors and readers.

Some instances of transliterated allowords of phonological correspondence between Semitic and Greek will be illustrated, which will show variability and predictability. Since this chapter is not the place to become involved in the phonological correspondence between Semitic and Greek for its own sake, some cases of consonants and vowels from *BDF*, *LJNLA* (330 BCE -200 CE), and *NA*[27th][437] will be briefly considered.

---

as πόρος/φόρος, πάτος/πάθος, and λέκος/λέχος.

[435] Allophones refer to "contextual variants," which means that allophones are varied but predictable without any semantic change (Hyman 1975:7-8).

[436] I coined "transliterated allowords" in analogy to allophones. Analogies of allophones are used in other sciences. Salzmann (1998:81-3) introduces the coinages in analogy to allophones: forms versus alloforms and facts versus allofacts in archaeology: motif versus allomotif in folklore.

[437] For more information of transliteration from Hebrew to Greek or Latin on the basis of

7.3.2 Consonants

Consonants are classified according to three factors such as articulatory manner, articulatory place, or voicing. When the consonants are transliterated from a source language to a target language, authors and scribes choose the closest sound of the phonetic system of the target language. However, they cannot but prefer one or two factors of them since all three factors of the consonant of the target language do not completely correspond to those of the consonant of the source language. As a result, the transliterated spellings depend on authors or scribes' preference for the factors to some degree. For instance, in the case of the transliteration of Ναζαρεδ, the scribe (D*) of Lk4:16 took δ whose distinctive features are [PLOSIVE] [ALVEOLAR] [+VOICED] instead of τ or θ [-VOICED]. Depending on consonantal classification by articulatory manners, transliterated variations of consonants will be considered.

7.3.2.1 Plosives and Fricatives

Semitic plosives and fricatives (e.g. ב, פ, ד, ת, ט, ג, כ, ק) are transliterated into Greek plosives and fricatives (e.g. φ, θ, χ, π, τ, κ, β, δ, γ).[438] Bilabial interchanges between φ and π occur. *BDF* (§39(2)) presents Καφαρναούμ-Καπερναούμ, πάσχα-φασκα-πασχώρ-φασσούρ, and Σαρεφθα-Σαρεπτα. Interestingly, when a word is transliterated from Greek into Hebrew, the plosive ב occasionally transliterates π or φ. In *LJNLA* (20) she exemplifies two cases; אפיקלוס for Ἀμφικλος and קלבוס for Κλεοπᾶς.

Tiberian vocalization, see Sperber 1937-8:103-274. He suggests the variant spellings caused by transliteration with the cases from the Septuagint, the Second Column of Origen's Hexapla, and St. Jerome.

[438] The reason to classify plosives and fricatives into one group is that when Hebrew plosives and fricatives are transliterated to Greek, plosives are mixed with fricatives. Sound values of

Following N. Cohen's suggestion that usually ת was transliterated into θ whereas ט into τ, Ilan (*LJNLA* 1.19) also illustrates alveolar interchanges with the following five variations: Μάρθα-Ματ, Ναθανάηλος-Ναταναήλου, Σαβαθεόν-Σαββαταῖος, Σεθί-Σητου, Ματταθίας-Ματθίας-Μαθθαῖος-Μαθεθ[ος]. *BDF* (§39(2)) also suggests the case that τ transliterates ת (e.g. σάββατα). Furthermore, *BDF* (§39(2)) presents consonant interchanges between θ and τ, Ελισαβεθ-Ελισαβετ, Σαρεφθα-Σαρεπτα, Ναζαρεθ-Ναζαρετ, and Γεννησαρεθ-Γεννησαρετ. On the other hand, in transliteration from a Greek word into Hebrew, it is known that τ is generally transliterated into ט whereas θ is translated into ת. However, their similar phonetic values of both the source language and the target language make them mixed. *LJNLA* (21) illustrates some cases; דשטין from Δοσίθεος, נוטוס- נותוס from Νόθος, פנטרה from Πανθήρας, תלמי from Πτολεμαῖος, and אפתלמיס-אפטלמיס from Εὔτολμος.

As for interchanges of velar sounds, the interchanges between κ, χ, and κχ occur. It is usual that χ transliterates כ (e.g. Καφαρναούμ). *LJNLA* (19) shows that ברוך is transliterated into Βαροῦχος, זכריה into Ζαχαρίας, כוסבא into Χωσιβᾶ, כוכבא into Χωχεβας, מכותא into Μαχουθας, and מלכיה into Μάλχος. However, it has still variants, as shown by Χαναναία / Κανανaία. Interestingly, according to (*LJNLA* 19), Josephus and the Septuagint usually use κχ for כ with a dagesh (Ζακχου for זַכַּי, Ζακχουρ for זכּור, and ζακχω for גנזך). Also *BDF* (§39(2)-(3)) presents that χ may translate ק (e.g. σαβαχθάνι for שבקתני), א (Ἀκελδαμάχ, Σιράχ), or ח (as will be mentioned).

7.3.2.2 Sibilants

Hebrew sibilants (ס, שׂ, שׁ, ז, and צ) are usually transliterated into Greek sibilants. It is usual that ζ transliterates ז. However, ζ may be used for intervocalic צ and σ may translate ז. *BDF* (§39(4)) may illustrate Ναζαρεθ as ζ used for צ. *LJNLA* (19) demonstrates following

---

consonants and vowels of Semitic and Greek are under debate, as mentioned before.

cases; Σακχαῖος (זכאי), Ἐσκίας (חזקיה), and Ἰώασδρος (יועזר). *BDF* (§39(4)) suggests Βόες from בעז. Ilan (*LJNLA* 20) puts forward that a Latin *s* is sometimes translated into ζ (i.e. Ζενέκας) and that the double σ sometimes was used in the transliteration of ש such as Ἀβεσσαλώμ (אבשלום), Ἐλισσαῖος (אלישע), Μανασσῆς (מנשה), and Ἰασσούου (ישוע).

In transliteration from a Greek word into Hebrew, the Hebrew sibilant צ was sometimes used to transliterate σ because the צ is similar to ס (*LJNLA* 20). *LJNLA* (20) illustrates three cases; אלקצדרין from Ἀλέξανδρος, ארצטון from Ἀρίστων, and אצטרובילי from Ἀριστόβουλος. Although the Greek letter σ/ς is usually transliterated into ס, ש also transliterates σ/ς. *LJNLA* (20) suggests some cases; אנגרש from Ἀθηναγόρας, אלכשא from Ἀλεξᾶς, דשטין from Δοσίθεος, אפקשיון from Εὐξα, אפרניש from Εὐφρόνιος, and נומש from Νόμος. Ilan (*LJNLA* 20) also mentions that some Semitic names mix a ש with a ס; סבא-שבא, כוסבא-כשבא, and מסבלה-משבלה deserve mention.

7.3.2.3 Liquids

Hebrew liquids (ל and ר) are transliterated into Greek liquids. In transliteration the Hebrew letters, מ and נ may be interchangeable at the phonological level as *LJNLA* (29) illustrates two cases; יכין-יכים and שלון-שלום (Σαλωμ -Σαλων). And μ and ν are interchangeable in Μαριαν/Μαριαμ/Μαρια.

7.3.2.4 Gutturals

The fact that gutturals (ח, ע, ה, א) do not have their equivalents in Greek phonetic system implies that when they are transliterated, they must have produced phonological

variants.[439] The Patriarchs' names, אַבְרָהָם, יִצְחָק, and יַעֲקֹב have gutturals. When they are transliterated into Greek, the gutturals are shorn, as shown by Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, and Ἰακώβ. In relation to this, Burkitt (1912:378) presents, "without private information, the retranslator from Greek into a Semitic language would not know where to put the gutturals in." Lightfoot (1872:154-5) notes, "For the Hebrew gutturals again the Greeks had no equivalent, and were obliged either to omit them or to substitute the nearest sound which their language afforded." He (1872:155) illustrates that the final ח is represented by an ϵ; often in the middle by χ. Although the gutturals were pronounced, they could never be written. In this respect, Lightfoot (1872:155) proposes, "any divergence from the Hebrew form which can be traced to this cause might be neglected." Westcott & Hort (1896:313) also show that when the gutturals such as א, ה, ע, ח are transliterated into Greek, the transliterations among manuscripts are inconsistent, although it is usual that א and ע are represented by smooth breathing while ה and ח by rough breathing.[440] Westcott-Hort, followed by Robertson (1934:225), illustrate: א may be transliterated into Ἀβραάμ, Ἐλμαδάμ, Ἠλείας, or ὡσαννά; ה into Ἄγαρ, Ἑρρώμ, Ἠλεί, or ὡσαννά; ע into Ἄγαβος, Ἔβερ, or Ἤρ; ח into Ἀκελδαμάχ, Ἐνώχ, or Εὔα.[441] Further, initial ע in some cases is rendered by γ (e.g. Γομόρρα and Γαζά; *BDF* §39 (3)). The guttural letter ח is usually translated into a vowel. Sometime χ translates it, as shown by Ῥαάβ-Ῥαχάβ from רָחָב. *BDF* (§39 (3)) suggests Ῥαχήλ, Ἀχάζ, Χαρράν, and πάσχα. Ilan (*LJNLA* 19) also mentions the following cases: Ἀχίαβος for אחיאב, Χαγείρας for חגירה, Χελκίας for חלקיה, Ἴσαχος for יצקח, and Χαλφεί for חלפי. Ironically, she

---

[439] Speiser (1933b:234) also mentions, "It is well-known that an extensive system of laryngals is one of the outstanding characteristics of the Semitic languages… It follows that speakers of other languages will find the laryngals difficult to pronounce." For Origenic transliterations of gutturals in detail, see Speiser 1933b:233-41.

[440] Following Westcott-Hort, *BDF* (§39(3)) may mention, "Yet it is to be hoped that future editions will follow Lagarde, Rahlfs, and the Göttingen editions of the LXX which omit both accents and breathing in proper names and other transliterations wherever absence of terminations and inflection indicate that no Grecizing was intended."

[441] Kahle (1959:164-71) also mentions that the Hebrew gutturals are transliterated into Greek α in the same way (e.g. Αερνων [ארנון] Jer. 31:20 A: Αερμων [[חרמון] Deut 3:8. Αηλαμ [עילב] 1Kings9:1A: Αενδωρ [עין דאר] 1Chron 8:24A).

(*LJNLA* 20) suggests that when a Greek word is transliterated into Hebrew, only כ (never ח) transliterates χ, as Ἰστόμαχος is transliterated into איסטמכוס, Νίκαρχος into ניקרכס, and Σύμμαχος into סומכוס. This implies that the transliteration correspondence between Hebrew and Greek does not function in a one-to-one relationship.

7.3.2.5 Additions of Consonants

Some consonants can be added for their pronunciation. *BDF* (§39(5)) suggests some cases; τ or δ of Ἰσραήλ-Ἰστραήλ (Mt19:28 W, Mk12:29 DW, Lk2:32 D, Acts B several times)-Ἰσδραήλ (occasionally τ, S always δ in Acts), τ of Μεστρεμ, β of Νεβρωδ, β of Ἰαμβρῆς (2Tim3:8), π of Σαμψῶν (Heb11:32), and π of Σαλαμψιων. The insertion of consonants is used to articulate the ρ or σ clearly, although the consonant may be mute. It is interesting that the insertion of consonants may betray the phonological values of Hellenistic Greek and, further, help to reconstruct ancient Greek phonetic system. When the consonants were chosen for articulate pronunciation, the decision is made according to distinctive features of the previous sound of the inserted consonants. In the case of τ or δ of Ἰστραήλ-Ἰσδραήλ and τ of Μεστρεμ (*BDF* §39; p.21), the fact that τ/δ is inserted after σ indicates that the articulatory place of τ/δ is the same with that of σ since the same articulatory places are required for articulatory convenience. It seems that the three consonants (i.e. τ, δ, and σ) must be alveolars.[442] As for β of Ἰαμβρῆς, π of Σαμψῶν, and π of Σαλαμψιων, the fact that β or π is inserted after μ means that the articulatory place of β or π is the same with that of μ because the same articulatory places are required for convenient articulation. It seems that the three consonants (β, π, and μ) must be bilabials.[443] The insertions of consonants cause variant spellings. Accordingly, when Semitic words of the NT literature are transliterated

---

[442] Caragounis (2004:352, 378) supposes that δ pronounced as *th* of "*th*en" in English.
[443] Caragounis (2004:352, 380) supposes that β pronounced as *v* of "van" in English.

into Greek in terms of consonantal variations, the variant spellings occur. The variant spellings should be considered as transliterated allowords.

7.3.3 Vowels

As for vowel transliteration, it is generally agreed that the variational gap of vowels is much wider than that of consonants. When the Semitic vowel letters are transliterated into Greek, they must have produced many transliterated variants. As mentioned before, vowels are varied due to vowel changes (§7.1.3) or dialects (§7.1.3). Above all, vocalizations of Semitic language make transliterated spellings more varied. Furthermore, concerning irregular correspondence between Semitic and Greek vowels, Rosén (1963:64) persuasively suggests:

> We are much worse off for the vowels, and the reason is obvious. There is the problem of deciding whether or not, in each particular case, the non-notation of a Greek vowel by a *mater lectionis* is just a case of defective spelling or an indication that the Greek word contained no *i* or no *u*, or no vowel at all.

The *shewa* makes lots of Greek vowel variants. Schmidt (1894:51-2) pointed out that vowel transliteration from Hebrew to Greek in the LXX and the NT literature is not one-to-one correspondence. He illustrated that initial *shewa*, medial *shewa*, *hateph segol*, *segol*, or *sere* is usually rendered into alpha in an irregular way. Rehm (1958:275 n.2) considers that *shewa* could be transcribed to ε or α (§7.4.3.1). Buth (1981:29) also mentions that *shewa* can be transliterated into α or o.

In transliteration from a Greek word into Hebrew, *LJNLA* (22) notes the interchanges between α and η; Ἰασσούου-Ἰησσούου, Ἰωνάθας-Ἰωνάθης, Ἰούδης-Ἰούδας,

Ἰησιας-Ἰαεσαιου, and Βασέας-Βησᾶς. The interchange between o and ω in transliteration from Hebrew into Greek occurs; *LJNLA* (22) shows the examples; Νεικάνορ-Νεικάνωρ, Φιλο-Φιλω, Δωσ[ιθεος]-Δοσίθεος, Θεοδωσιου-Θεοδόσιος, and Κλεοπᾶς-Κλωπᾶς; in the case of interchanges between η and ε, Ιεσοῦς-Ἰησοῦς, Ἰωσέ-Ἰωσή, Μνάσεου-Μνάσηου, Σελ[μ]ε-Σελαμε, Φάβεις-Φάβης, Ληουείς-Λευίς, and Σεθι-Σητοῦ.

The interchange between α and ε also occurs; Καφαρναουμ-Καπερναυμ, Ναζαρα(θ)-Ναζαρεθ, and Ζαρα-Ζαρε. *BDF* (§38) shows the interchange between ι and ει; Βενιαμιν-Βενιαμειν ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ Phil3:5, Rev11:1), Δαυιδ-Δαυϊδ ($\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ Mt20:31)-Δαυειδ ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ Mt20:31), Ἐλισαβετ-Ἐλισαβειτ (B always, S mostly, CD sporadically), Ἰεριχω-Ἰερειχω (Mt20:29 BCLZ), and Λευι(ς)-Λευει(ς) ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ Heb7:5), and Σάπφιρα (Acts5:1; MSS ει, ι, υ). The example of the interchange between α and ε are like these: Δαλματία and Δελματία (2Tim 4:10; cf. Deissmann 1903:182). Buck (1927:23) suggests, "the special Attic-Ionic η from α (long vowel), both been seen in Attic-Ionic μήτηρ = μάτηρ of other dialects." Furthermore, Gignac (1989:38) mentions that the vowel η in the first century CE was bivalent. Consequently, when a word is transliterated from Semitic to Greek, it is normal that vowels are frequently varied.

On the other hand, ArmEmWords in Syriac texts which were retransliterated from Greek imply that it is more difficult to reconstruct the phonetic values in bilingual situations. Burkitt (1912:378) ascribed intricateness of transliteration to the different phonetic system between a source language and a target language. His suggestion is worth quoting in full:

> Like Hebrew, many of the vowels [of Syriac] do not appear in writing, and those that are written are given in a notation that, according to our ideas, is singularly imperfect. On the other hand, many distinctions are made, especially in the sibilants, which disappear in the Greek, and (as in Hebrew) there are four true guttural sounds which are not represented in Greek at all. ... The real difficulty

> and the real interest arises (sic!) when, as so often in the New Testament, the Proper Name in the Greek is itself a transliteration or adaption of a Semitic word.

Consequently, when a Semitic word was transliterated into Greek, *vice versa* in terms of vowel variations, the variant spellings occur.

> Accordingly, it is normal that when Semitic words in the FGs and Acts were transliterated, the variant spellings occurred. The transliterated variants should be called transliterated allowords rather than erroneous spellings or corrupted spellings.

7.4 Some Variant Spellings as Transliterated Allowords in the Four Gospels and Acts

There are three kinds of the transliterated spellings in the FGs and Acts. Many scholars have investigated the spellings from the perspective of the orthographical view on the basis of linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis from Semitic to Greek. In this respect, when the spellings are discussed, the scholars have taken "source" into consideration seriously. However, the transliterated spellings will be considered as transliterated allowords from the perspective of variational theory on the basis of linguistic interdirectionality hypothesis between Semitic and Greek. I will illustrate some instances. First of all, three local proper nouns will be discussed (§7.4.1). Then, two personal proper nouns will be investigated (§7.4.2). Lastly, two other transliterated words will be studied (§7.4.3).

7.4.1 Local Proper Nouns

As for transliterations of local proper nouns, a distinction of the local proper nouns could be made between very well-known words and little known words. Jerusalem is very

well-known local proper noun in the first centuries. This means that it has fixed two GkSpels without any variant; a Semitic type and a Greek type. On the other hand, most local proper nouns have their variant spellings in transliteration. The two spellings of Jerusalem and the six spellings of Nazareth will be discussed respectively (§7.4.1.1; §7.4.1.2). Then, the spellings of Gennesaret will be observed (§7.4.1.3).

7.4.1.1 Ἰερουσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα

In NT literature, Jerusalem has two fixed spellings. One is Ἰερουσαλήμ, which is a transliterated form. The other is Ἱεροσόλυμα, a more morphologically adjusted form and the spelling declines. Hort (1881:313) assumes, "All names beginning with ῾ have received the smooth breathing" and that he reconstructs Ἰεροσόλυμα rather than Ἱεροσόλυμα. However, many scholars reconstruct Ἱεροσόλυμα. Bruce (1952:68-9) posits, "As Ἱεροσόλυμα is a conscious formation from ἱερός, it should have a rough breathing, *pace* WH [Westcott-Hort]." The spelling of Ἱεροσόλυμα was influenced by etymology, as mentioned before (§7.1.2).

Concerning the relation between the two spellings of Jerusalem and source, it has been assumed that the Semitic type spelling is related to a Palestinian source whereas the Greek type spelling is related to a Hellenistic source. Recently, Kilpatrick makes a distinction between them. He (1981:353) insists that Ἰερουσαλήμ of Mt 23:37 and Lk 13:34 is derived from a common source and that Ἱεροσόλυμα of Lk 2:22 originates from another source. However, Cadbury (1966:91) persuasively points out that although scholars have tried to connect the two spellings of Jerusalem with "source," "the attempts have failed, and probably the two forms owe their adoption to the changing fancy of the writer in each

several instance."[444] Winter (1956-57:141) also suggests, "The reading ἰερουσαλήμ is no proof of a Hebrew or Aramaic source for any section of the Lucan writing." The two variant spellings of Jerusalem are predictable and acceptable. The two spellings are transliterated allowords of Jerusalem.[445]

7.4.1.2 Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ

The spelling of Nazareth in the SynGs occurs nine times (Mt2:23, 4:13, 21:11, Mk1:9, Lk1:26, 2:4, 39, 51, 4:16) and is transliterated into six spellings (i.e. Ναζαρά, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαράθ, Ναζαρέδ, Ναζαρέτ, and Ναζαρέθ). The variant spellings of Nazareth have attracted scholars' attention with three philological questions. The first question is: which spelling is the original spelling out of the six transliterated spellings? Many scholars have assumed that Ναζαρά is the original SemSpel.[446] On this assumption the scholars have suggested two views of the Synoptic Problem (Q hypothesis and Markan priority without Q; to be discussed later §8.4.3.2). Second, Ναζωραῖος cannot be identical with Ναζαρηνός derived from Ναζαρά because there is a difference between ω and α. Third, ȝ is usually transliterated into σ, not ζ. One of the solutions some scholars have suggested is that Ναζωραῖος is related to a pre-Christian sect, "Nazarenes." However, whether scholars hold either position, it seems that the issues have been discussed on the basis of the orthographical view and further, the unidirectionality hypothesis.[447]

---

[444] Cadbury (1966:91) also mentions, "If this tendency to vary is a trait of Luke, these variations must not be used as some of them often have been, as marks of written sources slavishly followed and worked up into a patchwork like the Hexateuch in the Old Testament. For instance, the shifting use of and in Acts has been observed, and attempts made to use it as a criterion for the analysis into sources. In this particular case the attempts have failed, and probably the two forms owe their adoption to the changing fancy of the writer in each several instance."

[445] Luke intentionally uses the two allowords of Jerusalem as codeswitching at the semantic level (§8.4.3.1).

[446] Weiss 1900:30, 303; Burkitt 1912:392; Kilpatrick 1946:50; Fitzmyer 1981-5:530; Tuckett 1996:228 n.64; Goulder 2003:365.

[447] Burkitt (1912:392) implies the unidirectional transmission when he mentions that if the two spellings (Ναζαρέτ and Ναζαρά) are Semitic, "our Greek Gospels are some two generations

From the perspective of variation theory, it seems that the six spellings are predictable and normal, and that the two gentilics (Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός) are identical. (1) In terms of the interchange between α and ω, it seems that the secondary articulation of [r] in the process of phonological representation (§7.1.2) enables Ναζαρά́ to be Ναζωραῖος. Comparing 1QIsa[a] with the MT, Wise (1992b:573-4) suggests that when *schewa mobile* is followed by a plosive *b* or a trilled *r*, it is realized as *o/u* vowel.[448] When the ArmSpel of Nazareth is transliterated into Greek, the *ordinary* transliteration (i.e. written transliteration) is Ναζαρηνός whereas the *pronounced* transliteration (i.e. oral transliteration) which is adapted by the secondary articulation [+ROUNDED] is Ναζωραῖος.[449] Consequently, the two spellings, Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος, are decided by whether the secondary articulation [+ROUNDED] was adapted or not.

(2) The intervocalic sibilant צ could render ζ as well as σ (§7.3.2.2). This means that the transliteration of צ of נצרת/נצרה to ζ is predictable and normal.[450] Moore (*Beg*1.427) persuasively suggests that the fact ζ of Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός is uniformly transliterated into צ in the Old Syriac and Peshitta versions indicates that צ of the ArmSpel also transliterates ζ of Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος in NT times. Rüger (1981:262) also suggests that Hebrew נצר could have been pronounced as Νάζαρ in the NT times. Brown (1993:207-8) presents that one of the peculiarities of the Palestinian Aramaic dialect is that

---

earlier than any surviving monument of Semitic Christianity." In other words, he posits that the SemSpel is earlier than GkSpel. Schaeder (*TDNT* 4.875) also remarks, "nāṣrājā derives directly from the usage of the Aram. speaking disciples of Jesus and the primitive Jerusalem community." Many scholars have discussed the origin of Ναζαρά́ on the basis of the unidirectionality hypothesis: see §8.4.3.2.

[448] Wise (1992b:573) reasonably argues "He [the scribe of 1QIsa[a]] did not make this substitution in every case, but only when the *schwa mobile* was followed by the bilabial *b* or an *r* … and even then not always." It seems that "in every case" demonstrates that he seems to regard the phonological change as an allophone which always occurs in the particular condition. "Even then not always" means that the spellings can be varied depending on the application of the phonological representation (i.e. [+ROUNDED]) to the spelling.

[449] This is supported by two earlier scholars. Klein (1923:202-5; followed by Moore [*Beg*1.427-9]) admits metathesis between *a* and *o* and asserts that Aramaic Nazareth could be vocalized into Ναζαρέθ (αθ)-ετ(ατ), Ναζαρά, as יטבה and יטבת show. Another example is the transliteration of [r] of "WRITING" into Korean variant spellings (§7.1.2).

[450] For the detailed discussion of the etymological origins of the two spellings (i.e. Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος), see Brown 1993:209-213; 223-5; Davies & Allison 1988-1997:275-81.

an intervocalic צ could be transliterated into ζ due to partial assimilation.[451] The other five spellings (i.e. Ναζαράθ, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαρέδ, Ναζαρέτ, and Ναζαρέθ) can be explained as transliterated allowords more easily because interchanges of δ/τ/θ in transliteration are acceptable, as Zenner (1894:745) suggested (also see §7.3.2.1). The variant vowels (i.e. ε and α) are interchangeable (§7.1.3; §7.3.3).[452] The ζ as a transliterated allophone of צ of נצרת/נצרה shows that Ναζωραῖος is derived from Ναζαρά.[453]

(3) It is not certain that Ναζαρά is the earlier spelling than Ναζαρέθ because both *-ah* and *-eth* are feminine endings in Hebrew. Zenner (1894:744) suggests that Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ are variants which refer to the same place because of the two accepted Hebrew endings. Dalman (1935:59) illustrates many proper nouns which preserve ת ending; the place names are Daberath (דָּבְרַת/Δαβιρωθ Josh 19:12; 21:28; 1Chr6:57) and Tsarephath (צָרְפַת/Σάρεφθα Obad20; cf. 1Kings17:9). The personal names are Basemath (בָּשְׂמַת /Βασεμμαθ Gen36:3; 1Kings4:15) and Asenath (אָסְנַת/Ασεννεθ Gen41:45).[454] This implies that it is possible that the Aramaic original spelling is both נצרה and נצרת. In other words, it

---

[451] Regarding the transliteration of ʒ into ζ Brown (1993:207-8) illustrates ō z of Job1:1 (some LXX mss.) and Zogora in Greek copies of Jer48:34 (LXX31:34). Burkitt (1912:404-6) presents ten cases from the OT, although he denies that the two spellings are not identical. It is adduced by the fact that the partial assimilation, the change of an intervocalic sibilant [-VOICED] into [+VOICED], is also found in Greek as well as German.

[452] It is well-known that the interchange between ă and ĕ in transliteration occurs; Sperber 1937-8:180; Albright 1946:398.

[453] Brown (1993:209) criticizes the orthographical view that "the biblical attitude is often a 'both ... and,' rather than an 'either...or'" and suggests that both Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός are acceptable (cf. §7.2.2.4). Denying the similarity between Ναζωραῖος and a pre-Christian sect, the "Nazarenes," Davies & Allison (1988-1997:281) present, "So it seems more prudent to accept the simplest solution: Ναζωραῖος = ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ. This entails further that any connexion with *nāzîr* or *nēṣer* should be regarded not as primary but as secondary, the result of homeophony noticed once Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός had already come into existence." Fitzmyer suggests a well-balanced conclusion. He (1981-5:1215) suggests, "Probably the best explanation of Nazōraios at the moment is to regard it as a gentilic adj. meaning 'a person from Nazara/Nazareth,' but with the possible added nuance of either *nāzîr*, 'consecrated one,' or *nēṣer*, 'sprout, scion' of Davidic lineage."

[454] For more cases, see Zenner 1894:744 n.1; Dalman 1935:59. Zenner (1894:744) suggests that Ναζαρέθ is the original ending out of the two Hebrew spellings. Moore (*Beg*1.429) maintains, "there is no philological obstacle to deriving Ναζωραῖος, Ναζαρηνός, from the name of a town, Nazareth." Criticizing Kennard (1946:131-41; 1947:79-81), Albright (1946:398) suggests, "All three forms [Daberath, Anaharath, and Nazareth] are normal Aramaic." He (1946:398 n.2) continues, "Our three names were pronounced in the first century A.D. with final *et*" He concludes that Ναζωραῖος is a gentilic of Ναζαρέθ and the two spellings are Aramaic. Rüger (1981:262) also suggests that transliterated variants, Δαβωρ and Δεβηρωθ, of דבור are a similar case to Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρέθ.

is hard to insist that Ναζαρά is the earlier than Ναζαρέθ. Accordingly, all six GkSpels, Ναζαρά, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαράθ, Ναζαρέδ, Ναζαρέτ, and Ναζαρέθ, are transliterated allowords which are equivalent to the two ArmSpels, נצרה and נצרת. The two variants, Ναζωραῖος and Ναζαρηνός, were used identically as a man of Nazareth. Furthermore, bilingualism of first-century Palestine and RNE implies that both the ArmSpels and GkSpels were circulated among Judaeo-Palestinian residents. Writers/speakers and readers/listeners could understand the variant spellings without any confusion.

7.4.1.3 Γεννησάρ and Γεννησαρέτ

The transliterated spellings of Gennesaret will be investigated from the perspective of the same variation pattern of Nazareth (§7.4.1.2) and Elizabeth (§7.4.2.2). It seems that the spellings of Gennesaret have two kinds of Semitic feminine spellings. Above all, there is no doubt that Γεννησάρ was commonly used in the first centuries.[455] However, Γεννησαρέτ appears in the authoritative manuscripts of the SynGs (Mt14:34, Mk6:53, Lk5:1).[456] This implies that Gennesaret in Semitic could have had two feminine-ending spellings which are equivalent to Γεννησάρ and Γεννησαρέτ.[457]

From the perspective of the orthographical view, some scholars have assumed that Γεννησάρ is more correct than Γεννησαρέτ and that the former has temporal priority over the

---

[455] The spelling occurs in Talmud (גינוסר), Targums (גניסר Onk. Jer2:5 on Dt33:23; Onk. Jer1 on Num34:11), Syriac versions (ܓܢܣܪ) including vocalized Gēnēsar in the Peshitta, Josephus (Γεννησάρ; *Bell.*2.573, 3.463, 506, 515, 516. *Ant.*13.158; Γεννησαρίτιδι *Ant.*18.28, 36; Γενησαρίδος *Ant.*5.84). and 1 Macc11:67 (Γεννησάρ). Strabo (*Geogr.* 16.2.16 = *GLAJJ*1.288) called it Γεννησαρῖτις. Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* 5.15.71 = *GLAJJ*1.469) named Gennesaret *Genesaram.*

[456] Luke preserves Γεννησαρέτ without any variant. Along the similar line, the spelling Ναζαρέθ in Luke is used in four occasions without variants (Lk1:26, 2:4, 39, 51, 4:16), although Ναζαρά is used as a codeswitching at 4:16 (§8.4.3.2). Matthew and Mark show its variant spellings. Mt14:34 has four variant spellings: Γεννησαρέτ (ℵ B C (N) W Γ 0106 f^{1} 33. 579. 892. (1241. 1424). *l* 844. *l* 2211 *al* f (sy^{h}) mae), Γεννησάρ (D* 700 lat $sy^{s.c.p}$). Γεννησαράτ (D^{c}), and Γεννησαρέθ ((L) Θ f^{13} 𝔐 q (sa bo)). Mk6:53 has Γεννησαρέτ with two variant spellings: Γεννησάρ (D it vg^{mss} $sy^{s.p}$ bo^{ms}) and Γεν(ν)ησαρέθ (B* K N Θ $f^{1.13}$ 565 *pm* lat co).

[457] The variability of the two transliterated spellings can be explained. The interchange between τ and θ is predictable and acceptable (§7.3.2.1). For the vowel interchanges, see §7.1.3;

latter in the SynGs. Even Dalman (1935:121) put forward, "The lengthened form of Gennesar, *Gennesaret* ... is foreign to Aramaic-speaking people, and is most probably a wrong formation, one the model of Nazareth." Following Bauer (*BAG* 156), *BDF* (§39 (2)) suggests, "Γεννησαρεθ, -ρετ are incorrect, Γεννησαρ is correct in D, LXX, Jos. and elsewhere."

On the other hand, others have admitted that Γεννησάρ is the "correct" spelling, although it is not the "original" spelling in the SynGs. Burkitt (1912:391) is convinced that although the correct spelling of Gennesaret was Γεννησάρ, the original spelling in the GkGospels could be Γεννησαρέτ rather than Γεννησάρ because the former occurred in non-western texts. Matthew and Luke replaced Γεννησαρέτ by Γεννησάρ.[458] And, later, Γεννησαρέτ "was re-introduced into the Greek text of all three Gospels." McNeile (1915:221) also presents that Γεννησάρ is "probably more correct ... But it is not necessarily the true Gk. Reading in the gospels." Taylor (1952:332) suggests, "Γεννησάρ is probably more correct form ... it is less certain that it is the original Markan reading." However, this discord between "correct" and "original" is due to their orthographical view of variant spellings. From the perspective of the variational view, the two transliterated spellings are predictable and acceptable.

I would contend that the two spellings (Γεννησάρ and Γεννησαρέτ) are transliterated allowords. As mentioned before, Luke preserves -ρέτ ending spelling without any variation and the authoritative texts of Matthew and Mark have Γεννησαρέτ as well. This fact leads to the assumption that Gennesaret could have had two Semitic feminine spellings due to morphological leveling[459] by analogy to the spellings of Nazareth (§7.4.1.2) and

---

§7.3.3.

[458] Burkitt (1912:391) explains the reason that it was changed "by the more literary Evangelists Luke and Matthew. Harmonistic corruption would then cause the rarer form 'Gennesaret' to drop out of Mark."

[459] "Leveling" is generally defined as "a historical process that reduces or completely eliminates allomorphy within a paradigm, usually achieved by generalization of one allomorphic variant" (Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:179). For some Greek cases related to leveling, see Jeffers & Lehiste 1979:55-7.

Gennesaret of the SynGs and Chinnereth of the OT. This is adduced by the Targums. The Targums indicate the connection between Γεννησαρέτ and Chinnereth. Hebrew כִּנֶּרוֹת/כִּנֶּרֶת is always identified with Aramaic גִּנֵּיסַר (Num34:11, Deut3:17, Josh11:2, 12:3, 13:27, 19:35, and 1Kgs15:20).[460] The two Hebrew feminine spellings were incorporated into one spelling. For these reasons Γεννησάρ can be morphologically leveled into Γεννησαρέτ.[461]

Consequently, the two SemSpels could have been transliterated into two Greek equivalent spellings, Γεννησάρ and Γεννησαρέτ. As mentioned before, some scholars (Burkitt, McNeile, and Taylor) assume that the correct spelling (i.e. Γεννησάρ) is not always the original spelling (i.e. Γεννησαρέτ) on the basis of the orthographical view. It seems that this discrepancy perplexed the scholars. The assumption should be reexamined from the perspective of the variational view. To put it in another words, the original spelling is not always the correct spelling since transliterated allowords contradict the concept of "corrupted" or "erroneous" spelling. In terms of transliterated spellings we cannot find the "correct" spelling but the "original" spelling/spellings. The two SemSpels must have been used with their Greek equivalent transliterated spellings in the first centuries.

7.4.2 Personal Proper Nouns

Many Jews in first-century Palestine must have used their two names (i.e. Semitic and Greek) and called by the two names (cf. the introduction to §8.4.2). Two cases will be

---

[460] Kopp (1963:167) also identifies the lake of Gennesaret with Cenereth/Ceneroth (Num34:11, Josh12:3) and with Γεννησάρ/Γεννησαρέτ (1Macc16:67, Lk5:1). However, Smith (1898:443 n.1) denies the relationship between Chinnereth and Gennesaret since Gennesaret does not correspond to the Hebrew spellings or Greek equivalents of Chinnereth at the phonological level.

[461] Incidentally, the Septuagint has their Greek equivalents to כִּנֶּרוֹת/כִּנֶּרֶת. However, the GkSpels vary as much as phonological correspondences between the Hebrew spellings and their Greek equivalents can not be explained easily. There are five variant spellings: Χεναρα (Num34:11), Μαχαναρεθ (Deut3:17), Κενερωθ (Josh11:2), Χενερεθ (Josh12:3, 13:27) and Χεζραθ (1Kg15:20). The Γ/K/X are velar plosives. The interchanges of the consonants are predictable and acceptable (§7.3.2.1). The problem lies in the fact that the addition of σα of Γεννησαρέτ can not be explained easily. It may seem that the insertion (i.e. alveolar sibilant ζ of Χεζραθ) might have raised the possibility that σα of Γεννησαρέτ is added to Χεναρα.

discussed. The names of Simon Peter will be observed (§7.4.2.1). Then, the names of Elizabeth will be investigated (§7.4.2.2).

7.4.2.1 Σίμων/Συμεών and Πέτρος/Κηφᾶς

According to *LJNLA* (56), Simon was the most popular male name. The name has Greek variants with their Hebrew equivalents; Συμεών-שמעין, Σίμων/Σίμον-סמון/שמון (Evans 2003:69-70). Jesus gave Simon the nickname Rock (i.e. כפא). Although כפא was a nickname, it must have been confused with a personal proper noun. Generally speaking, a proper noun is transliterated whereas a common noun is translated. However, Simon had two more nicknames in Greek. One is the transliterated nickname (i.e. Κηφᾶς); the other is the translated one (i.e. Πέτρος).[462]

Peter's name has attracted scholars' attention in two respects. First, Luke usually uses Σίμων. Interestingly, only Acts 15:14 preserves Συμεών. This has used to support the argument that when Luke wrote the first half of Acts, he used Semitic source. Second, it has been presupposed that the transliterated nickname (i.e. Κηφᾶς) is an earlier spelling than the translated nickname (i.e. Πέτρος). Hengel assumes that the SemSpel (i.e. Συμεών) is earlier than the GkSpel (Σιμών), when he (1989a:73 n.84) mentions that Luke "put a Συμεών on the lips of James the brother of the Lord. II Peter 1:1 has the pseudepigraphical archaizing Συμεὼν Πέτρος." Horsley (*ND* 1.94) also posits, "Symeon is the original form of his name; Simon is often substituted for it." He adds, "the passage [Acts 15:14] does at least suggest that this name [Συμεών] continued to be favoured in Jewish circles." And many scholars have assumed that because James was a Palestinian Jew Luke used a Palestinian name (i.e.

---

[462] Mussies (1994:249) illustrates the pairs of transliterated and translated personal names; Μνάσων (Acts21:16; *CPJ* 28 1.17) and Μν(ι)ασέας (*CIJ* 508)/Ζαχαρία, and Ἰοῦστος/Σαδώκ. He (1984:418) adds Tabitha and Dorkas (Acts 9:36) to the list.

Συμεών).[463] It seems that the scholars assume that Συμεών was circulated among Palestinian Jews whereas Σιμών among Gentiles on the basis of monolingualism.

However, there is no evidence that Συμεών was used in Jewish circles while Σίμων was used in Gentile circles. Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE implies that his two names were used even among Palestinian Jews. Furthermore, Bethsaida was largely Hellenized and most inhabitants were Greek-matrix speakers (§3.2.4). This implies that two names (i.e. Συμεών and Σίμων) might have been mixed from the birth or at least from childhood. The pronunciation of שמעין sounds like שמון in Galilee. It was hard to make a distinction between שמעין (Συμεών) and שמון (Σίμων) since Galileans could not articulate the guttural sound of ע of שמעין (cf. §7.1.4). As a matter of fact, following Deissmann (1903:315 n.2), Cullmann (1962:19) suggests that Σιμών is not derived from the Jewish name (i.e. Συμεών) but a native Greek name; this is adduced by Aristophanes. Later, Σιμών substituted for Συμεών. In this respect, he (1962:19; cf. Deissmann 1903:313 n.2) considers, "This [Σιμών] did not originate... by rendering into Greek the Hebrew name." Cullmann (1962:19) convincingly concludes, "Peter...had been given from the outset both the Hebrew name Symeon and the Greek name Simon of similar sound." Accordingly, the mixed use between Συμεών and Σίμων denies that the Semitic type name is earlier than Greek type name and that the two names are related to source.

In the case of Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος, the Aramaic nickname (i.e. כפא) is transliterated into Κηφᾶς which etymologically reminds κεφαλή[464] and it is also translated into Πέτρος.[465] Interestingly, Πέτρος is retransliterated into פטרוס which is etymologically related to כפא

---

[463] This argument will be discussed again at the Semantic level; for more scholars who hold this view, see §8.4.2.1.

[464] The κεφαλή (i.e. head) may be related to the lists of disciples (Mk3:16; Mt10:2, Lk6:14: Ac1:13) where Peter is first placed; cf. Fitzmyer 1979b:123.

[465] As for Πέτρος as a personal proper noun, Caragounis (1990:17-25: here, 23-4) presents, "*Petra* and various derivatives were in use already in pre-Christian times as proper names or cognomen among Greeks and Romans. In the forms Πετραῖος, *Petreius*, Πέτρων (Latin Petro) and Petronius (Greek Πετρώνιος) we have names that are quite close to Πέτρος in form and sound as well as in meaning." He continues, "Πέτρος was in existence, though no examples of it before the Christian era have turned up as yet."

(firstborn).[466] Regarding Luke's use of Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος, Horsley (*ND* 1.94) posits, "he must have come to be called by the Greek equivalent [Πέτρος] during his life, and this all but ousted Kephas from the NT writings." However, Simon was usually called Κηφᾶς by Paul except for two times as literary device (§8.4.2.1). This strongly suggests that both his nicknames, Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος, were used at the same time. In fact, the bilingualism of first-century Palestine might have enabled his nicknames to be used interchangeably regardless of temporal priority. Rather, Κηφᾶς was used privately whereas Πέτρος as officially (§8.4.2.1). Accordingly, the mixed use of his nicknames implies that SemSpels do not always guarantee earlier tradition than GkSpels.

7.4.2.2 Ἐλισάβη and Ἐλισάβετ

The spelling of Elizabeth occurs nine times (Lk1:5, 7, 13, 24, 36, 40, 41[2], 57). They have only one spelling, Ἐλισάβετ.[467] From the perspective of orthographical view *BDF* (§39(2)) assumes that Ἐλισάβεε is an original spelling and Lukan Ἐλισαβετ is a back-reading. *BDF* (§39(2)) also proposes, "In Ἐλισαβεθ -βετ, the dental is due to corruption in the LXX." However, אֱלִישָׁבַע of Exod6:23 was rendered into four Greek variant spellings, Ἐλισάβε, Ἐλισάβετ, Ἐλισάβεθ, and Ἐλεισάβεθ in the Septuagint (*HRCS* Appendix 1.56, 58). The variability of the plosives (τ and θ) and vowel (I and ει) of the four spellings is predictable and acceptable.[468] The two endings, –η and –ετ/εθ can be explained by morphological

---

[466] Incidentally, following Meyer's argument (1896:51), Merx (1902:160-2) insisted that the Greek *Petros* was transliterated from the Aramaic פטרוס so that *Petros* was made later, which is adduced by the fact that the *Petros* as a personal proper noun did not occur until Tertullian. However, suggesting the occurrences of Petros as a name Cullmann (1962:21) convincingly argues, "The theory … is quite impossible, in view of the fact that in Paul's letters Cephas is already the usual designation and Peter clearly was only a later derivation from it." It seems that the debate came to an end when Fitzmyer (1979b:127) suggested, "*kp'* does occur as a proper name in an Aramaic text from Elephantine (BMAP 8:10), dated … to 416 B.C."

[467] A few Old Latin versions (a, b, l*) of Lk1:46 read *Elisabet*. *Elisabel*. and *Elisabeth* respectively instead of Μαριάμ (cf. *BAG* 251); for the detailed discussion, see Fitzmyer 1981-85:365-6.

[468] For the variability of plosives, see §7.3.2.1; for the variability of vowel, see §7.1.3;

leveling which are derived from two Hebrew feminine ending suffix. And a bilingual ossuary (before 70 CE) preserves Ἐλισάβη and אלישבע (*CIJ* no.1338; *LJNLA* 239). For these reasons, the spelling of Ἐλισάβη is not earlier than that of Ἐλισάβετ, like the relationship between Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ (§7.4.1.2). The variant spellings, Ἐλισάβη and Ἐλισάβετ, are transliterated allowords.

7.4.3 Other Transliterated Words

Unlike proper nouns, when common words are transliterated, it is normal that the variation is bigger than a proper noun. Ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα in the Miracle Stories have lots of variant spellings, will be discussed in a full dress (§8.3.2). Here, two cases will be considered. The notorious case of variant spellings is the cry from the cross (§7.4.3.1). Then, one of the significant christological title, Χριστός/ Μεσσίας, will be observed (§7.4.3.2).

7.4.3.1 The Cry from the Cross

The variant spellings of the cry from the cross (Mt27:46 / Mk15:34) has been an age-old problem due to a variety of complicated variants.[469] From the perspective of the orthographical view scholars have sought to find the correct spelling which is earlier than other corrupted spellings on the basis of the presupposition that the transliterated sentence is earlier than the translated sentence.[470] They have focused on finding which languge Jesus

---

§7.3.3.

[469] Mt27:46 has ηλι ηλι (A D (L) W Θ $f^{1.13}$ 𝔐 lat) ελωι ελωι (ℵ B 33 vg^{mss} co): the Greek manuscripts of the phrase λεμα σαβαχθανι (ℵ L 33. 700 *pc* ff^{1}) has its variants: λαμα ζαφθανι (D* (^{c}: σαφθ-) b ff^{2} h) λαμα σαβαχθανι (Θ f^{1} *pc* vg^{cl} mae) λιμα σαβαχθανι (A (W) f^{13} 𝔐 (f q)) λεμα σαβακτανει (B (892) *pc* lat bo^{pt}). Mk15:34 has ελωι ελωι with its variant ηλι ηλι (D Θ 059. 565 *pc* it vg^{mss}; Eus). The phrase λεμα σαβαχθανι (ℵ(*: σαβακτ-) C L Δ Ψ (083: ζαβ-). 892 *pc* c l vg^{mss}; Eus) has its variants: λαμα σαβαχθανι (ζαβαφθ. B) B Θ 059. 1. 565. 2427. 2542^{s}. *l* 844 *pc* vg) λιμα σαβαχθανι ((A: σαβακτ-) f^{13} 33 𝔐 sy^{h}) λαμα ζαφθανι (D (i) vg^{mss}).

[470] Zimmermann (1947:465) mentions that *Ali* "would be the more correct and likely reading." Hooker (1981:376) assumes, "The quotation is given in Aramaic, though the confusion with

used when he called for God.[471] Some scholars have assumed that Jesus spoke Hebrew, as Matthean ηλι presents, since the pronunciation of ηλι is closer to that of Ἠλίας.[472] Taylor (1952:593) suggests, "the cry was uttered in Hebrew, for the comment of the bystanders, ἴδε Ἠλίαν φωνεῖ (15:35), is intelligible if Jesus cried ἠλεὶ ἠλεὶ or ἠλί ἠλί rather than ἐλωί ἐλωί." This implies that Mark conformed ηλι to Aramaic ελωι because he used ArmEmWords throughout his gospel.[473] Others, on the other hand, have assumed that Markan ελωι is original and then, Matthew hebraizes Markan ελωι to conform to Ps 22:1.[474] Consequently, the two opinions presuppose that Matthean cry is Hebrew whereas Markan cry is Aramaic.[475] In other words, one spelling is correct and the other is corrupted.

However, from the perspective of the variational view, ἠλί is an transliterated alloword of ἐλωί for four reasons. First of all, it seems that the variability of their phonological variants of the dereliction cry are predictable and acceptable. The vowel interchanges of ηλι between η and ε, and ει and ωι[476] are predictable and acceptable (§7.1.3; §7.3.3). The *shewa* interchanges of λαμα among α, ε, and ι are predictable and acceptable (§7.3.3). Rehm (1958:275; followed by Brown 1994:1052) states that *shewa* can be transliterated to either α or ε so that *lama* is not Hebrew but Aramaic. Williams (2004b:3)

---

the name Elijah is possible only in Hebrew. Matthew appears to have seen this difficulty (or to have made use of an *earlier* tradition)" (emphasis added).

[471] For the detailed discussion, see Gundry 1967:63-6; Moo 264-8; Brown 1994:1051-3.

[472] Menzies 1901:280; Allen 1922:294-5; Turner 1927:12; Dalman 1929:204-5; Kilpatrick 1946:104-5; Zimmermann 1947:465; Manson 1951-2:327; Birkeland 1954:25-6; Cranfield 1959:458; Nineham 1963:429; Lapide 1975:496.

[473] Dalman 1909:53. Taking a further step, he (1929:205) considers that Jesus used the cry as codeswitching-like concept (cf. chapter 8) since Jesus spoke Aramaic as his mother tongue. Dalman mentions, "His familiarity with Scripture, and reveals, above all, what was going on in His mind."

[474] On re-Judaization in Matthew, see Kilpatrick (1946:101-3). McNeile (1915:421) presents, "It is improbable that Jesus quoted the Heb., not only because He habitually spoke Aramaic, but because there could have been no reason for the alteration into Aram. for Greek-speaking Christians who understood neither language"; cf. Dalman 1909:53. Cadoux (1941:258) assumes that the cry "was probably Aramaic." In relation to the Textual Criticism, Sevenster (1968:36) insists, "The originality of the Aramaic form is, I believe, the most plausible. In a certain sense for that matter, it is the lectio difficilior in the context in which it stands. It is understandable that Matthew used "eli, eli" to make the bystanders' erroneous interpretation of the word as an invocation to Elijah more acceptable."

[475] Menzies 1901:280; Turner 1927:12; Kilpatrick 1946:104-5; Birkeland 1954:25-6; Cranfield 1959:458; Nineham 1963:429;

[476] Caragounis (2004:369-70) mentions, "Οι is confused with ι" and that "Οι interchanges also with ει" McNeile (1915:421) presents, "the ω may represent the duller sound of the Aram. ā."

also explains that since Aramaic initial vowel is unstressed the vowel would be varied by the scribes. The sound interchanges between σ and ζ (§7.3.2.2), βαχ and βακ (§7.3.2.1).[477] θα and τα (§7.3.2.1; cf. *Vaganay-Amphoux* 56; Williams 2004b:4), βαχ and φ,[478] and ι and ει of σαβαχθανι (§7.1.3; §7.3.3) are predictable and acceptable.

Second, both Matthew and Mark report that some of the bystanders misunderstood and thought that Jesus called Elijah. This has been the strongest evidence to support that Jesus spoke Hebrew since the pronunciation of Ἠλίας is closer to that of ηλι rather than ελωι. However, another possibility should be considered. The sharp distinction between ι and ωι cannot be made, as mentioned before (n.78). This is also shown by the fact that the Aramaic form should have been transcribed as *'Ēlî* or *'Ĕlāhî* rather than *elōî elōî*.[479] Furthermore, Elijah has variant spellings too (i.e. Ἠλίαν and Ἠλείαν).

Third, the bystanders who knew Elijah must have been Jews, not Roman soldiers. They would have known that the cry referred to God, if they heard it clearly. This implies that the Jewish bystanders could not hear exactly what Jesus cried because his cry was unclear at the moment of death and "in the hubbub surrounding three simultaneous crucifixions" (Gundry 1993:967). Consequently, Matthew and Mark intended to describe what they misunderstood not why they misunderstood.

Lastly, a group of scholars have raised the possibility that both ηλι and ελωι are Aramaic variant spellings. They pay attention to the Targum (Ps22:2) in which אלי was also

---

[477] Following Rehm (1958:275), Brown (1994:1052 n.61) presumes, "in the transliteration one must allow the influence of *th* on the consonant before it, so that a *k* rendering of Semitic *q* has been shifted to a *ch*."

[478] Concerning the relationship between βαχ and φ, many scholars have raised several possibilities. Allen (1912:295) explains, "D in Mk. has ζαφθανει, which may be a further assimilation to the Hebrew, and represent עזבתני, since D seems to assimilate the whole verse to the Hebrew reading. ηλι ηλι λαμα ζαφθανι." Dalman (1909:54 n.2) posits, "עֲזַבְתָּנִי, transliterated into Greek required ἀζαφθανεί, for θ changes a preceding β into φ." Turner (1928:12) also accepts D text in Mark. Gundry (1967:65) suggests, "ζαφθάνει (D), of which ζαβαφθάνει (B) is a corrupted form, rests on an original ἀζαφθάνει. the initial α having fallen out after λαμά." Williams (2004b:5) suggests another possibility that "The first consonant (') naturally cannot be represented in Greek, and with it falls away the following vowel. Hebrew ν (ב) becomes Greek φ by devoicing to assimilate to the following consonant θ."

[479] Brown (1994:1051 n.55: cf. Evans 2001:497) suggests, "1st century Aramaic would

employed. For this reason, even Dalman speculated that Jesus might have spoken אֵלִי, if Aramaic was spoken by Jesus.[480] Rehm (1958:275) notes that Matthean ηλι is a spoken Aramaic whereas Markan ελωι is a traditional Aramaic. Pointing out that the Targumic translation is אֵלִי,[481] Emerton (1961:199) suggests, "even if Jesus actually said *Eli*, he may have been speaking Aramaic," as many other scholars have suggested.[482] It is noteworthy to mention Williams. He (2004b:6) criticizes the orthographical view, "The choice with which one is regularly presented that either Matthew's or Mark's form must be the earlier may be a false dichotomy." He (2004b:8) suggests, "Matthew's ηλι and Mark's ελωι are simply independent transcriptions of the same utterance."[483] For these reasons, both ηλι and ελωι are Aramaic. The purpose of the two evangelists[484] is to present that Jesus was not Elijah despite that the readers of Mark or the bystanders expected Jesus to be Elijah.[485]

From the perspective of monolingual view of first-century P&RNE, it is taken for

---

permit *'Ēlî* or *'Ĕlāhî*."

[480] Dalman (1909:53) mentions, "If Jesus uttered the words of the Psalm in the Aramaic language, then it was precisely אֵלִי that was most naturally to be expected." However, he (n.68) insists that Jesus spoke the cry from the cross in Hebrew. Gundry (1967:64) also presents, "*eli* must have been familiar to Aramaic-speaking Jews … and Hebrew was understood and used by the Jews of that time."

[481] Following Stendahl (1954:84) Lapide (1975:496) mentions, "ελωι ελωι constitute an Over-Aramaisation, since Targum Onkelos uses here the Hebrew: אלי."

[482] Jeremias (1971:5 n.2) presents, "the cry from the cross in Mt27:46 has been transmitted *in toto* in Aramaic." Moo (1983:268) posits, "the transliterated texts of both Mt.27:46 and Mk15:34 represent an Aramaic cry." He (1983:267) mentions two reasons. (1) External evidence from manuscripts supports an Aramaic cry in both Matthew and Mark. (2) The אלי was not Hebrew but Aramaic and it was familiar to contemporary Aramaic speakers. Brown (1994:1052; cf. §7.2.2.4) asserts, "the Marcan transliteration represents Aramaic or an Aramaic dialect … Matt's transliteration could also represent Aramaic."

[483] He (2004b:8) suggests the reason that "the ω in Mark's ελωι was supplied in the process of converting the spoken form into a written convention, as Mark used the nearest Greek equivalent to the written Aramaic form *'lhy*."

[484] Hurtado (1983:268) suggests that Mark intentionally uses the misunderstanding of some bystanders. Mark intends to show that some bystanders still misunderstood who Jesus was because Mark has already exposed his readers that Jesus was not Elijah and that Elijah had already come before Jesus. Taking a further step, Whitters (2002:123) suggests that this episode should be relied on "a literary or rhetorical approach and not on linguistic or philological explanations." He insists that Mark intends to show the ironic misunderstanding that the bystanders regarded Jesus as Elijah. He (2002:124) presents, "The confusion of the bystanders is an intentional rhetorical device that prepares the reader for the resolution provided by the centurion."

[485] Elijah was believed to assist the Sufferer; for detailed explanation of the role of Elijah, see Dalman 1929:205-6; Whitters 2002:119-24. According to Rabbinic traditions, Elijah appears suddenly to help persons who need assistance; B.Ber. 58a; B. Ab. Zara 17b, 18b; Midrash Esther 10.9 (cf. Hooker 1981:376).

granted that the cry of the cross was unidirectionally transmitted from Aramaic to Greek. The two Aramaic forms had been circulated and then the two evangelists preserved them with their Greek equivalents for his monolingual readers. Taylor (1952:593) suggests, "Mark translates the Aramaic for the benefit of his readers."[486] However, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE leads the assumption that the cry of the cross was circulated in Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix speakers in Palestine as well as in RNE. As the same time, the Aramaic expression must have been translated to Greek equivalents among Greek-matrix speakers in Jerusalem, Palestine, and the RNE.[487]

Matthew and Mark have the Greek translated forms as well as Greek transliterated forms. Matthew has Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἱνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες without any variant. Mark has ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με (ℵ B Ψ 059 *pc* vg [-λειπ- L 083. 565. 892. 2427 pc]) with some variants.[488] On the other hand, the Septuagint (Ps22:2) has ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με. The two translated versions are different from the Septuagint version or the MT.[489] In fact, the comparison between Aramaic transliterated sentences and Greek translated sentences should be made. This is so because the two translated versions were most likely translated from their Aramaic versions in Jerusalem

---

[486] Also Anderson 1976:345; Brown 1994:1054.

[487] Interestingly, Manson insists that the Hebrew cry was circulated with Aramaic translation. Although Mark selected the Aramaic form, Hebrew form was still circulated as well. It is reasonable that he (1951-2:327) suggests, "if the cry was in fact uttered by our Lord in Hebrew, the earliest form of the *oral* Passion-narrative, as told in Palestine in Aramaic, may well have given both the Hebrew words and the Aramaic translation. And when Mark wrote his Gospel it is conceivable that the tradition offered both Hebrew and Aramaic. Whichever he accepted, the other would remain in oral circulation; and this may explain why both forms appear in the textual tradition of Mark." However, he should have considered bilingualism in Aramaic and Greek. This means that Aramaic and its Greek translation could have been circulated.

[488] The personal pronoun, μου is omitted in some texts (A K P Γ Δ Θ 059 $f^{1.\ 13}$ *l* 844 *pm* i vg^{mss} sa^{mss} Eus). And ὁ θεός μου is omitted in some texts (B 565 bo^{ms}). The sentence, ἐγκατέλιπές με is replaced by ωνειδισας με in some texts (D c [i] k). In relation to ὀνειδισμός-motif, Allen (1922:295) suggests, "D in Mk. has ὠνείδισας, probably to soften the harshness of the idea of Christ's entire abandonment by God." For the detailed discussion of ὀνειδισμός-motif, see Gundry 1967:64-6; Moo 1983:269-70.

[489] For the explanation of the varieties, see Moo 1983:270. Gundry (1967:66) notes, "both the Matthaean and the Marcan renderings of the Aramaic disagree with the LXX." Moo (1983:271) mentions, "We conclude that Mt. 27:46 and Mk. 15:34 show dependence on a Semitic original [Targum, Peshitta, or MT], while diverging from the LXX, as would, of course, be expected." Brown (1994:1954) suggests, "Even though Mark/Matt used the wording of the LXX, they stayed closer to

regardless of the versions of the Septuagint or the MT. When the two evangelists selected and preserved Aramaic transliterated forms, they must have known the translated versions as well. However, the evangelists used the Aramaic embedded sentence as codeswitchings with Greek translated forms like αββα ὁ πατήρ (§8.3.1). And the translated forms might have varied due to interference of the LXX and the MT during the circulation of the Gospels. Accordingly, the two Aramaic transliterated sentences were circulated with the two Greek translated sentences from the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem. The transliterated forms are not always earlier tradition than translated forms.

7.4.3.2 Μεσσίας/Χριστός

A Hebrew word (משיח) and an Aramaic word (משיחא)[490] had two Greek equivalent spellings. The transliterated spelling is Μεσσίας[491] (Jn1:41, 4:25) and the translated one is Χριστός.[492] In relation to the spellings of the "Christ," lots of scholars have held

---

the Hebrew in avoiding the LXX peculiarities."

[490] Some scholars have assumed that the two GkSpels are derived from משיח. On the other hand, Marshall (1976:94 n.2) suggests that Μεσσίας is derived from the ArmSpel. which seems to be more probable.

[491] Concerning correspondence of sibilants between Semitic and Greek, Allen (1987:12-4) suggests that in pure Attic dialect a geminate sigma does not occur but there are some exceptions in other dialects. It is not unusual that the geminate σσ transliterates ש of משיחא/משיח. Deissmann (1903:183) mentions some examples of geminate consonants: ἀρραβών, (Ephe 1:14) and ἀραβών. Ilan (*LJNLA* 22) also illustrates inconsistent transliterations of the same Greek proper nouns (i.e. single consonants and double consonants); Ἀδδᾶν-Ἀδᾶς from אדי, Ἀμία-Ἀμμία from אמא, Ἄνις-Ἄννις from חנן, [Ἄ]ννανος-Ἄνανος from חנן, Βάννους-Βάνους, Θεννας-Θενας from תחינה, Ἰεδδοῦν-Ἰούδαν from יהודה, Ιωανας-Ιωαννας from יוחנן/יוחנה, Ἰωάνης-Ἰωάννης from יוחנן, Ἰακκώβ[ου]-Ἰακώβου from יעקב, Μαθθαῖος-Μαθαῖος from מתתיה, Μαριάμμη-Μαριάμη from מרים, Μεσάλαμος-Μοσόλλαμος from משלם, Σάδδωκος-Σάδωκος from צדוק, Σαβαθέον-Σαββαταῖος from שבתי, Ῥεβέκκα-Ῥεβέκα from רבקה, and Σόρρα-Σόρα from שרה. She (*LJNLA* 22) mentions some confusions between a single consonant and a double consonant in Greek; Κοραίνου-Κοραίννος, Θαδαίου-Θαδδαίος, Κυρίλη-Κύριλλα, Πάπος-Πάππος, Σαβίων-Σαββίων, Ἀμφικάλλει-Ἄμφικλος, Ἀρριστυβόλα-Ἀριστοβόυλη, and Κεφαλλίων-Κεφαλίων. In the case geminate σσ, Schlätter (1975:55-6) illustrates Ἰεσσαῖος = ישי, Ἐλισσαῖος = אלישע, Μεσσάλμος = משלם, Ἀσσαμωναῖος = חשמי.

[492] Transliteration of Χριστός into *Chrestus* instead of *Christus* in Suetonius *Claud.*25.4 has been argued. Some scholars have not identified *Chrestus* with *Christus*. Benko (1969:406-18) insists that *Chrestus* was not *Christus* but a Jewish radical who belonged to a Zealot group; for more publications to support this view, see Van Voorst 2000:32 n.36). However, comparative phonologically speaking, Allen (1987:65) suggests, "There are indeed a number of words in which Greek ī is represented by Latin ē." *Vaganay-Amphoux* (1991:56) mentions, "Other interchanges also happen

unidirectional transmission from משיחא/משיח to Χριστός. The משיחא/משיח is used in the Palestine whereas Χριστός is used in Hellenistic churches. Furthermore, the transliterated spelling (Μεσσίας) has been said to be earlier than the translated spelling (Χριστός).

First, the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* has persisted the unidirectional Christology hypothesis that the Semitic term משיחא/משיח used in the Aramaic-speaking Palestinian setting was unidirectionally developed into Χριστός in the Greek-speaking Hellenistic setting. Conzelmann (1969:72-74; here 72) posits, "The development of the significance of χριστός in the direction of becoming a name took place naturally in the Greek-speaking world." From the perspective unidirectionality of christological development Bultmann (1934:17) considers that Jesus was משיחא and the Son of Man in Palestinian-Jewish Christian tradition whereas Χριστός is related to the Son of God in Hellenistic Jewish Christian tradition.[493] In addition, Μεσσίας is earlier spelling than Χριστός.

However, I would contend that the Semitic term (משיחא/משיח) and the Greek transliterated term (Μεσσίας) do not always show their temporal priority over the translated term (Χριστός). The bilingualism of first-century P&RNE implies that the Hebrew and the ArmSpels were employed as technical terms with its Greek equivalents (Μεσσίας and Χριστός) before and during Jesus's ministry. First of all, what is to consider is how and when the SemSpels of Messiah as technical terms were used. Criticizing the argument that the conceptions of the term are "disparate and inconsistent" Horbury (1998:12) convincingly proves that *Messiah* as a technical term[494] was consistently used "from the second century

---

between such letters as ϵ and αι, ϵ and η, o and ω. … for example, in 1 Pet 2:3, some manuscripts (K.018, L.020, etc.) replace χρηστός 'gentle' by χριστός 'Christ'." In transliteration Greek into Latin, comparative phonology between Latin and Greek presents that Greek [i] can be rendered by Latin [e], because Latin [e] is sometimes confused with [i] in the second century. In republican inscriptions, for instance, the Latin *Domitius* is rendered as Δομετιος and *Tiberius* as Τϵβϵριος. Lee (*ND* 5.16) suggests that the sound of Latin *ē* is represented as Greek H = [i]. It can be said, therefore, that *Chrestus* refers to *Christos*. For more extensive criticisms of Benko's arguments, see Van Voorst (2000:29-39) and Cappelletti (2006:73-81).

[493] For scholars who hold the same unidirectional Christology, see Fuller 1965:158-62; cf. 23-31, 63-4; Kramer 1966:38-44; Hahn 1969:168-72.

[494] De Jonge (1966:147) suggests that in the time of Jesus "great expectations are centred in the Lord's Anointed of the future." Fitzmyer (1981-5:198) also suggests, "In the time of Jesus the title

BC onwards, through the era of Christian origins and the Jewish revolts against Rome, and into the rabbinic period."[495] Second, the bilingualism of first-century P&RNE warrants the argument that the Semitic terms (i.e. מׁשׁיחא/מׁשׁיח) were translated to Χριστός and transliterated to Μεσσίας among Greek-matrix speakers during Jesus' historical ministry and continuing thereafter in Palestine as well as in the RNE. This is supported by some documents; some Greek translations of Dan9:26 from the early second century BCE rendered מׁשׁיחא/מׁשׁיח χριστός. The Psalms of Solomon also preserves χριστὸς κυρίου (17:32; 18:7) and χριστὸς αὐτοῦ (18:5). Furthermore, it is interesting that the transliterated spelling (i.e. Μεσσίας) occurs twice in Jn1:41 and 4:25 despite the virtual consensus that John was written later than the SynGs.[496] As a result, מׁשׁיחא/מׁשׁיח must have been used with Μεσσίας as well as Χριστός before and during Jesus's ministry.

Accordingly, Semitic type spellings are not always earlier than Greek type spellings in a bilingual context. A Semitic type spelling is just one of transliterated allowords. The SemSpel itself does not always prove its temporal priority over its equivalent GkSpel. Taking a further step, the sayings by Jesus including a Semitic type spelling do not always indicate more original tradition than those including a Greek type spelling. Also stories about Jesus including a Semitic type spelling are not always earlier tradition than those including a

---

'messiah' would have denoted an expected anointed agent sent by God either in the Davidic, kingly or political, tradition for the restoration of Israel and the triumph of God's power and dominion or in the priestly tradition... Jesus would not have been unaware of this messianic expectation or of a possible relationship of himself to it."

[495] Horbury (1998:9-11) illustrates three cases. (1) The מׁשׁיח appears in 1QS 9:11, 1QSa 2:20-1, CD 12:23-13:1, 4Q266 (fragment 10 i, line 12), Babylonian Talmud (Sukkah 52a), Talgum (Cant. 4. 5), Qumran (1QSa 2:11-12), Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 3, II Esdra 12.32, and Ps. Sol. 17:32 (36). (2) In the case of NT, Μεσσίας (Jn1:41, 4:25) and occur. (3) Messiah in Hebrew or Aramaic in rabbinic literature and Targums; (i) Mishnah, Ber. 1:5, Sotah 9:15 (Aramaic); (ii) Jerusalem Talmud, Kil. 32b and Ket. 35a (Aramaic); (iii) Targum Gen.49:10 (Onkelos), Isa.52:13, and Zech.6:12. He adds qualified occurrences of messiah: "his messiah" in the Parables of Enoch (48:10, 52:4), in 4Q52, or "messiah of righteousness" in 4Q Patriarchal Blessings (Gen49:10). According to Longenecker (1970:64), the Messiah (משיח) occurs in the Qumran materials (1QS 9:11, 1QS[a] 2:14, 20, 4QPatr. 3, CDC 19:10-11 [9:10], 20:1 [9:29], 12:23-4 [15:4], 14:19 [18:8], II QMelch. 18), Benediction 14 of the Shemoneh Esreh, Targum (Targ. Palest. Gen3:15, 49:1, 10, 11, Ex40:9, 11, Num23:21; Targ. Jon. Isa.16:1, 42:1), IV Ezra 12:32, II Bar. 29:3, 30:1, and I Enoch48:10, 52:4. For an earlier discussion, see de Jonge 1966. However, it is regretable that Horbury does not go further, although he (1994:14) recognized even the fact that the Diaspora Jews in Hellenistic cities like Alexandria were bilinguals (§4.2.2).

Greek type spelling.

7.5 Variant Spellings as Allowords and Interdirectionality

Many NT scholars have investigated variant spellings from the perspective of the orthographical and monolingual view. They have assumed that the original spelling is only one correct spelling. And SemTrads have temporal priority over GkTrads. The slogan, "the more Aramaized, the earlier" is based on the linguistic unidirectioanlity hypothesis. However, we have examined that when it comes to variant spellings of transliterated words at the phonological level, they should be explored from the perspective of variation theory, the study of *parole*, and language performance. In other words, it should be taken phonological variability of transliterated words and bilingualism of first-century P&RNE into consideration seriously.

Phonological variability causes variant spellings. This is because the Semitic equivalent itself could have variant spellings or because transliterated GkSpels could have variant spellings due to four major linguistic factors (§7.1). It was also possible for the evangelists or scribes to change the transliterated spellings according to their own preference for phonological correspondence between Semitic and Greek to some degree. The original spelling is not always the correct spelling. There could have been *original spellings* in Semitic as a source language as well as in Greek as a target language, or *vice versa*. Consequently, variant spellings of transliterated words in the FGs and Acts are predictable and acceptable in most cases. They are transliterated allowords regardless of temporal priority.

Furthermore, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE does not support the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis from Semitic to Greek but the interdirectionality hypothesis

---

[496] For the different view, see Robinson 1976.

between Semitic and Greek at the phonological level. J&GTrads were interdirectionally circulated between Semitic and Greek during Jesus' ministry. This was explained in four points. (1) The SemSpels were circulated with their Greek equivalents. (2) The transliterated words were circulated with translated words. (3) Semitic type spellings were circulated with Greek type spellings. (4) The Aramaic christological title (i.e. משיחא/משיח) was circulated with the Greek christological title (i.e. Χριστός).

Accordingly, variant spellings of transliterated words in the FGs and Acts should be considered as allowords regardless of temporal priority. The SemTrads do not always have temporal priority over the GkTrads. Semitisms at the phonological level do not support the linguistic unidirectionality hypothesis.

8. Semantics

The NT literature in Greek has copious Foreign embedded words. Especially, Aramaic transliterated words among them have attracted scholars' attention. The Aramaic embedded spellings, words, phrases, and sentences have been called Semitisms (i.e. Aramaisms) at the level of Semantics.[497] Related to semantic Semitisms, two views of ArmEmWords have been suggested. Some scholars have assumed that ArmEmWords are derived from Aramaic-speaking Christian church in Jerusalem. On the other hand, regarding some transliterated terms (e.g. ἀμήν, αββα, ταλιθα κουμ, εφφαθα, and μαραναθά), others including the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* have argued that the ArmEmWords originated from *Sitz im Leben* of the Greek-speaking Christian communities beyond Palestine.[498]

Unfortunately, both contrary views are based on the same presupposition of a monolingual approach to the linguistic milieu of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem. Both approaches make a clear distinction between the Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christian community and Greek-speaking Gentile Christian communities. The two monolingual approaches to the Semitisms at the semantic level may result in two assumptions. (1) Aramaic transliterated words are more original sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus than Greek translated words. (2) ArmTrads are earlier tradition than GkTrads. The two presuppositions are based on the unidirectionality hypothesis of transmission of J&GTrads. The J&GTrads in the earliest Aramaic-speaking Christian community were translated in Greek-speaking Gentile Christian communities in a linguistically unilinear way.

---

[497] I am not willing to make any decisive dichotomy between Semitisms and Aramaisms in this dissertation except in some cases of which I will mention. There are two reasons. (1) Although the distinction between Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the FGs has been discussed in relation to the question whether Jesus spoke Hebrew or Aramaic, there are little doubts, to date, that Jesus spoke Aramaic not Hebrew as his matrix language (§3.2.4; §8.6). (2) Variations of Foreign embedded words in the FGs due to linguistic factors in a bilingual context make it little possible to make a clear distinction between Hebrew and Aramaic (§7.1.2).

[498] Scholars consider Antioch or Damascus as a bilingual city (Heitmüller 1912:333-4: Bousset 1970:129; Bultmann 1952:51). However, the problem lies in the fact that they do not think of Palestine as a bilingual region.

This semantic Semitism functions as a criterion. It has wielded great influence upon many significant issues of the NT studies such as provenances of the Gospels, the Synoptic Problem, the Historical Jesus, and development of the christological titles.[499]

However, when bilingualism of first-century P&RNE is taken into account seriously, it seems that Semitisms at the semantic level do not support the unidirectionality hypothesis that J&GTrads are unidirectionally transmitted from Aramaic to Greek and from Judaeo-Palestinian to Hellenistic. Above all, when it comes to language changes from Greek to Aramaic in a bilingual context (i.e. Aramaisms), important are linguistic views of the language change in the NT literature. The unidirectional scholars have analyzed the ArmEmWords which are transliterated from Aramaic to Greek on the basis of language competence, a science of *langue*, and categoricity theory. As a result, they have regarded the ArmEmWords as interferences or borrowings (§8.1.2). However, the Aramaic transliterated words should be investigated from the perspective of language performance, a science of *parole*, and variation theory, as mentioned in detail (introduction to Part B). This enables us to consider the ArmEmWords as codeswitchings, that is, intentional literary device (§8.1.2).

At the level of phonology, as already noted (chapter 7), codeswitched sounds do not always function in a one-to-one relationship between two languages concerned. This means that an Aramaic transliterated term in Greek does not always provide us with decisive evidence enough to decide the Aramaic original spelling. At the morphosyntactic level, a codeswitched term from Aramaic into Greek is not adaptable into morphosyntactic system of the target language (i.e. Greek), which means [-ADAPTABLE] (cf. §8.1.1). For this reason, the codeswitched word may not be the correct spelling due to morphosyntax of a target language, as כירי of כירי מרי shows (§8.3.1). Hence, when codeswitchings (i.e. language changes) at the semantic level are discussed in the NT literature, one principle Ramat

---

[499] Taylor (1952:297) considers. "The retention of the Aramaic words, absent in Mt and Lk, shows the greater originality of Mk." Millard (2000:143) assumes, "Their rarity and distribution, therefore, speak in favour of their origin in very early traditions."

(1995:46) suggests should be remembered:

> One should keep in mind that the sociolinguistic approach has a kind of priority over the grammatical or structural approach in code switching studies, since the choice and the alternation between different languages or varieties is triggered by social or psychological factors rather than by internal linguistic factors of the languages involved.

Consequently, Aramaic transliterated words as codeswitching in the NT literature will be considered on the basis of the sociolinguistic approach rather than the general linguistic approach (introduction to Part B). In other words, Semitisms at the Semantic level will be dealt with at the *pragmatic* level[500] rather than at the phonological, morphological, or syntactic levels.[501]

In this chapter, Semitisms at the level of Semantics as codeswitchings will be observed at the level of Pragmatics. First of all, ArmEmWords in NT literature as codeswitchings will be considered (§8.1). Second, Ἀμήν which is found in all FGs will be discussed (§8.2). (3) In terms of transmission of JTrad, codeswitchings in Mark (§8.3), and Luke and Acts (§8.4), will be discussed respectively. Lastly, the relationship between ArmEmWords as codeswitchings and linguistic interdirectionality will be discussed (§8.6).

8.1 Aramaic Embedded Words as Codeswitching

Bilingualism always causes Foreign embedded words. The SynGs and Acts

---

[500] Mey (1994:42) defines: "pragmatics is the study of the conditions of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society." It is generally said that "pragmatics" is a subfield of "Semantics" (Fromkin & Rodman 1998:190).

[501] When Whitters deals with ArmEmWords in Mk 15:34-36 (§7.4.3.1), he (2002:123) persuasively argues, "The least complicated way to resolve this crux is to rely on a literary or

provide the sources for bilingual situation through sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus in first-century Palestine. Bilingualism of Palestine, in a sense, can be easily shown by the fact that whereas the SynGs and Acts are written in Greek, they include the foreign transliterated terms in Latin (δηνάρια, κῆνσος, κοδράντης, κουστωδία, λεγιών, λίτρα, μίλιον, ξέστης, πραιτώριον, σουδάριον, σπεκουλάτωρ, τίτλος, φραγελλόω) and Hebrew (γεεννα, μαμωνας, πάσχα, ῥαββί, σάββατον, σατανᾶς, ὡσαννα). And the linguistic distributions of ArmEmWords in the Greek texts can be usually enumerated as below in [Figure 2]:

[Figure 2] The Linguistic Distributions of ArmEmWords in the Greek Texts

Matthew: ρακα (5:22), Ιερουσαλημ (23:37), ελι ελι λεμα σαβαχθανι (27:46)
Mark: βοανηργές (3:17), ταλιθα κουμ (5:41), κορβᾶν (7:11), εφφαθα (7:34), Βαρτιμαῖος (10:46), ῥαββουνί (10:51), αββα (14:36), ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι (15:34)
Luke: Σιμών/Συμεών and Πέτρος/Κηφᾶς, Σαῦλος/Παῦλος and Σαούλ, Ναζαρά, Ἰερουσαλήμ

One can generally classify features of the foreign embedded words in the three languages. Latin transliterated terms are usually referred to as military and administrative language. As one of the three languages written in the inscription above Jesus' cross was Latin (Jn 19:19-20), the official terms might be systematically introduced by the Roman Empire, but they are confined to few administrative words (Millard 1995:451-8). Second, the Hebrew transliterated words are usually used as liturgical languages. This demonstrates that Hebrew was used in relation to religious activities. Hebrew was still one of the important languages of first-century Palestine (cf. Rabin 1976:1007-1039; Fitzmyer 1979a:44-6:

---

rhetorical approach and not on linguistic or philological explanations."

Spolsky 1983:95-109; 1985:35-50; 1991:85-104). Third, the Aramaic transliterated words are usually used as ordinary language, which shows that Jesus and his disciples used Aramaic as their matrix language.

A bilingual society always brings about codeswitching, interference, and borrowing at the semantic level. Comparing the three linguistic phenomena, I will suggest that some ArmEmWords should be regarded as codeswitchings rather than borrowings or interferences (§8.1.1). As investigated before (chapter 1), although scholars' attitudes to ArmEmWords vary, a brief history of research of codeswitching in NT scholarship will be observed (§8.1.2). The types of codeswitchings used in the NT literature will be discussed (§8.1.3). Finally, the pragmatic functions of codeswitchings will be suggested (§8.1.4).

8.1.1 Codeswitching, Interference, and Borrowing in a Bilingual Society

Bilingualism brings about borrowing, interference, and codeswitching.[502] To begin with, codeswitching will be defined with some instances because biblical scholars are not conversant with the concept unlike interference or borrowing and then, the other two linguistic phenomena due to language contact will be explained. Codeswitching is widely defined as language practice to use two or more languages, dialects, styles in the course of a single conversation to accomplish conversational purposes. Simply speaking, codeswitching is to change language codes[503] on purpose at the lexical, phrasal, or sentential levels.

The following instances of oral and written codeswitching will help to clarify what codeswitching is. Mel Gibson, a famous actor and film producer, depicts the crucifixion of

---

[502] Some scholars may distinguish "codeswitching" from "code mixing." However, I will treat these mechanism as equivalent. Furthermore, because, in a sense, semantic interference of code mixing is referred to as mixed language, it seems that codeswitching is more proper term than code mixing. See two publications for detail discussion: Myers-Scotton 2002, chapter 6; Thomason 2001:132.

[503] As to the term "code," I will follow Romaine's definition (1995:121) that code refers not only to different languages "but also to varieties of the same language as well as styles within a language." For detail discussion, see Coulmas 2005:109-10.

Jesus in his recent explosive movie, *The Passion of Christ*. When Jesus meets Pilate in the film, Jesus changes his language code from Aramaic into Latin. Apart from the question which language was really used, changing language in the bilingual setting is called codeswitching. According to Jerome's *Life of Hilarion* (Deferrari 1952:239-80), Hilary was born in Tabatha, a village in southern Palestine, about five miles from Gaza in early 290s. He was sent to Alexandria to be educated in the school of a grammarian and was skilled in the art of oratory. There was an officer who was in the bodyguard of Emperor Constantine and was possessed by a demon. When the officer visited Hilary, Hilary interrogated what had happened to him in Syriac instead of in Greek. And the officer who had known only Latin and Greek replied to Hilarion in Syriac as well. Furthermore, when he was confronted with an enormous camel which was also possessed by a demon, Hilarion spoke Syriac to it. When he exorcized a demon, he employed Syriac as a religious language. What this narrative indicates is that Hilary as a bilingual chooses his language codes depending on the situations he was confronted with.

In terms of written codeswitching, it is well-known that Leo Tolstoy uses codeswitching in his famous novel, *War and Peace* where the main characters often switch from Russian to French. In his book French was used as a language of *haute société* and of *haute culture* to all members of the aristocracy in Czarist Russia so that French seems to have been used everyday, to some extent, in most upper-status families. Timm, in her article (1978:303), points out that switching language code from Russian to French by bilingual characters of the novel is indicative of an additional meaning between the lines. One of the minor characters, Marya Dmitrievna Akhrosimova's codeswitching to French, as Tolstoy mentions (V.II.714), implies "contemptuous and affectionate attitude" toward the addressee, Sonya. Timm (1978:303) adds that, overall, codeswitching from Russian to French in the *War and Peace* is usually used in relation to courtship, flirtation, or other affairs of the heart; or for the description of womanly physical and/or "spiritual" attributes, because the early

19th century Russian aristocracy regarded French as *la langue d'amour*. Accordingly, we can know that by means of employing codeswitching Tolstoy conveys the implied meaning in their conversations between the characters on the sociolinguistic setting of the contemporary Russian society.

It is noteworthy that Charles V is reputed to have claimed that he spoke German to the horses, Italian with the ladies, French with the men, but Spanish to God. This implies that language choice depends on his addressee. Similarly, in relation to Greek dialects, it has been said that Ionic is for history, Doric for the choral lyric, and Attic for tragedy, as mentioned before (§2.3.2). This shows Greek speakers' preference. In ancient Palestine in Jerusalem Talmud Rabbi Jonathan of Beit Gubrin mentions language choice between bilinguals: "Four languages are of value: Greek for song, Latin for war, Aramaic for dirges, and Hebrew for speaking" (*Tractate Sotah* 7:2, 30a; cf. Spolsky & Cooper 1991:24). What is more, it is not rare that Palestinian Targum in Aramaic preserves the Hebrew (e.g. חנני of צגי אברהם בלשן בית קודשא ואמר חנני] at Gen22:11, 31:11, 35:18, Tar. Ps.-Jon. at 32:3). Codeswitching as language choice is used in a bilingual situation not in a diglossic situation, as mentioned (§2.3.2).

Bilingualism produces another language practice, interference. As a definition of interference, Grosjean (1995:262) presents, "an 'interference' is a speaker-specific deviation from the language being spoken due to the influence of the other 'deactivated' language … at all levels of language (phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic) and in all modalities (spoken and written)." Language contact also results in another linguistic phenomenon, borrowing. Borrowing can be defined as the adaptation of a word to the phonological, morphological, and syntactic patterns of the recipient language in the speech of those with only monolingual competence. It is known that explaining the origins of such words as πῦρ, ὕδωρ, and κύων Socrates (Plato, *Crat.* 409e) mentioned that the Greeks who especially inhabited among the barbarians, have taken many words from foreign words.

Interference is usually related to a morphological, syntactic, or semantic level, whereas borrowing to a lexical or semantic level. What should concern with borrowing is the process of borrowing from a foreign language into a recipient language. When a transliterated word adjusts itself to the environment of the target language, the process of adjustment observes the phonological, morphological, and syntactic rules of the target language. If a word is a borrowing, it declines depending on the rules of the recipient language. That is, a borrowing is not a foreign word any longer. In this regard, borrowings do not indicate authors' linguistic competence, or any clue for provenance of Gospels (cf. *ND* 5.21; Millard 1995:457-8; 2000:148-53; esp. 153). Semitic transliterated words in the FGs, for instance, σάββατον declines by its case. This means that it is a borrowing. Some scholars (Klijn 1967:27; Hengel 1985:28-9) suggest that Markan Latinisms indicate Roman provenance of the GofMk because the terms was used in a Latin speaking environment. Argyle (1963-4:113-4; 1974:89) also argues that Jesus spoke Greek because he mentioned ὑποκριτής. However, the loanwords do not approve its origin or his linguistic competence (*ND* 5.21; Fitzmyer 1992:62-3) because they usually occur as result of language contact in monolingual situation, as will be mentioned. It is because the author can employ the borrowings in any place, if he knows the word; furthermore, the term was known in other places as well.[504] As a consequence, borrowings do not help to decide any provenance or linguistic competence.

Although contact situation is so complicated that it resists generalized classification, the major differences among codeswitching, interference, and borrowing can be made by four characteristic features: multilingualism, adaptation, predictability, and intentionality.[505] (1) Romaine (1995:124) suggests, "borrowing can occur in the speech of

---

[504] Millard (1995:458) persuasively argues, "The Latinate explanations Mark supplies, κοδράντης and πραιτώριον, may indicate an origin in Rome, as Hengel has argued, … yet the use of the same words by Matthew may imply they were more widely known and that Mark was simply helping the general reader outside Palestine by adding greater precision."

[505] Adams (2003:18-29) makes a distinction between codeswitching, interference, and

those with only monolingual competence." On the other hand, interference is commonly employed in bilingual settings. However, codeswitching occurs either in a monolingual (one dialect into another or one style into another) or in a bilingual setting (one language into another). Furthermore, the use of codeswitching from one language into another, of course, does not always indicate the high degree of bilinguality of speakers and audience.

(2) Concerning adaptability Myers-Scotton (2002:42) observes, "most borrowed forms are entirely–or almost entirely–morphosyntactically integrated into the recipient language." However, codeswitching or interference is not be integrated into the target language system.[506] In the case of a Greek word in a Latin text, Adams (2003:26) properly illustrates:

> If on the other hand someone writing Latin were to refer to his brother as ἀδελφός (using either Greek script or a transliteration), one might reasonably say that a switch of codes had taken place: in no sense had ἀδελφός been accepted into the Latin language. Morphological criteria are revealing in distinguishing a switch code from borrowing. If a Greek word is given a Greek inflection in a Latin text, it is usually in my opinion justifiable to refer to the phenomenon as code-switching: the writer has switched momentarily into a different linguistic system.

In other words, a borrowing is adapted to the target language system at the phonological, morphological, and syntactical levels, whereas codeswitching is sometimes adapted only phonologically. Moreover, most borrowings are new entry words of lexical inventory in a dictionary of the recipient language. In this regard, in the case of αββα ὁ πατήρ

---

borrowing in classical literature.

[506] Grosjean (1995:263) makes a sharp distinction between codeswitching and borrowing: "'codeswitching' is shifting (switching) completely to the other language for a word, a phrase, a sentence, etc. 'Borrowing' is taking a word or short expression from the other language and (usually phonologically or morphologically) adapting it to the base-language."

(Mk14:36), despite the fact that the two words have the same meaning semantically, πατήρ declines with an definite article; however, αββα does not. Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ of Acts9:17 is also the same case; Σαοὺλ does not decline while ἀδελφέ declines. Nonetheless, some codeswitched words of the NT literature seem to be adapted morphosyntactically into Greek system because after the authors used foreign transliterated words as codeswitching in their texts, the words might have been adjusted when they circulated among Christians.

(3) Predictability is also a significant factor in a distinction between borrowing and the other two concepts. Eastman (1990:174) suggests, "borrowed items occur across large numbers of speakers in a speech community and with great frequency." Borrowing is used with high frequency; on the other hand, codeswitching or interference is not used frequently (Muysken 1995:190-1). In other words, frequency explains that while borrowing is predictable, codeswitching or interference is not predictable. As Myers-Scotton (2002:41) demonstrates, "most researchers agree that borrowed forms and codeswitching forms differ in regard to predictability." Borrowings must occur again in the same texts, since the borrowed word is an entry word in a dictionary of the target language. On the contrary, codeswitching or interference can not be expected to reappear in a certain place. In relation to this, Mackey (1970:569) distinguishes borrowing from interference; borrowing is collective and systematic whereas interference or codeswitching is individual and contingent. In a similar vein, Romaine (1995:51) puts forward that borrowing is related to language community; and yet, interference or codeswitching is performed individually.

With regard to the frequency, the relation between codeswitching and borrowing should be considered. Myers-Scotton (2002:41) presents that if the frequency of the codeswitching increases, it can find its status as a borrowing in the recipient language. When a codeswitching is used in a recipient language system in a certain context as well as with high frequency, the transliterated word begins to function as a borrowing in a dictionary entry of the target language. Codeswitchings from Aramaic to Greek used by the authors in

the FGs and Acts must have been used as nonce borrowings in the worship of the Christian communities. And then, the frequency of the ArmEmWords increased so that they would be ossified into borrowings enrolled in a dictionary entry of Greek lexical inventory of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem.

Dealing with ArmEmWords, some scholars have argued that the foreign terms are rare and the occurrence of the transliterated terms seems uneven and complained about unpredictability of ArmEmWords in the Gospels.[507] However, rare and unpredictable distributions of the ArmEmWords in the NT literature in Greek show that they are codeswitchings.

(4) Intentionality helps us to distinguish codeswitching from interference and borrowing. Interference occurs due to accidental errors by bilinguals, as Grosjean (1995:262) considers interference as "a speaker-specific deviation." On the other hand, codeswitching is employed by speaker's intention. Explaining codeswitching as indexical of social negotiations, Myers-Scotton (1988:156) states, "For the speaker, switching is a tool, a means of doing something ... For the listener, switching is an index, a symbol of the speaker's intentions." Heller (1995:161) suggests, "code switching is a form of language practice in which individuals draw on their linguistic resources to accomplish conversational purposes." Adams (2003:43) also explains codeswitching as "the use of Greek script for Latin as a matter of choice." Hence, the characteristics of codeswitching, interference, and borrowing can be represented by "markedness."[508] Their characteristics can be summarized into [Table

[507] Millard (2000:143) mentions that ArmEmWords "are not the phrases that might be expected. The cry 'Save me!' could have been presented in Aramaic to give immediacy in Mt. 14.30, or the command to dead Lazarus, 'Come out' in Jn 11.43, as 'Hosanna' is at the Triumphal Entry in Matthew, Mark and John and ephphatha, 'Be opened!' in Mk7.34, yet they are not." Aichele (1996:62) raises the similar illustration. It is interesting that unpredictability leads to two different assumptions; Aichele (1996:61-2) argues that unpredictability shows that ArmEmWords are not related to Semitisms nor to the historical Jesus. On the contrary, Millard (2000:143) mentions, "Their rarity and [unpredictable] distribution, therefore, speak in favor of their origin in very early traditions." Both scholars should have opened the possibility of literary device (i.e. codeswitching).

[508] "Markedness device," which is first introduced by the Prague School of Linguistics (e.g. Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy), has been widely used among linguistic scholars in many ways. Originally, "markedness" that is, [+] and [-], is a method to represent componential analysis of

into [Table 4]:

[Table 4] Characteristics of Interference, Borrowing, and Codeswitching

	MULTILINGUAL	ADAPTABLE	PREDICTABLE	INTENTIONAL
INTERFERENCE	+	-	-	-
BORROWING	-	+	+	-
CODESWITCHING	+/-*	-	-	+

(* In the case of codeswitching, a speaker can change his language code in a bilingual context [+ MULTILINGUAL] as well as in a monolingual context [- MULTILINGUAL].)

Accordingly, the features of codeswitching can be summarized as [+/- MULTILINGUAL], [- ADAPTABLE], [- PREDICTABLE] and [+ INTENTIONAL].

8.1.2 Codeswitching in New Testament Scholarship

It is unfortunate that some NT scholars fail to make a distinction between codeswitching, interference, and borrowing. For instance, αββα (Mk14:36) is considered as interference (Casey 1998:99) or borrowing (McCasland 1953:82, 90; Black 1995:137), as will be discussed in detail (§8.3.1). Notwithstanding introducing linguistic methodology, Silva does not distinguish interference from borrowing in his noted publications (1975:104; 1983:86). It is also regrettable that David Taylor does not make a distinction between interference and loanword without regard to codeswitching in his recent article in 2002.[509]

---

phonological representation; for detail explanation, see Hyman 1975:138-53. For "markedness" related to codeswitching, see Myers-Scotton 1993:75-111; her term, "markedness" refers to "intentionality" in a sense.

[509] Taylor (2002:310-314) suggests that the linguistic phenomenon that local dialect in North Syria influenced Syriac and Aramaic is considered as Aramaic interference. However, it seems that the phenomenon might be called borrowing because the occurrence of the local dialect is systematic and predictable, as he suggested.

The fact that even scholars who apply linguistic methodology to NT Studies fail to distinguish the three terms approves that the problem is more serious among NT scholars. Meanwhile, Spolsky (1985:44-49) may apply "preference rules" (from concepts of Jackendoff 1983) to analysis of the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine instead of codeswitching theory in order to explain how people choose a language in a bilingual situation (cf. Spolsky & Cooper 1991:95-113). However, it is more common that scholars use codeswitching theory rather than preference rules when they explain language choice in a bilingual society (Paulston 2000:81-3).

Nevertheless, it is interesting that although codeswitching is quite a young science, some biblical scholars have recognized the similar concept through the history of NT studies. Assuming that Jesus and his disciples spoke Greek as well, Roberts (1888:171) considers *Rabboni* as an intentional language change (i.e. codeswitching) because the author of the Gospel wanted to preserve Jesus's original sayings (§1.3.2.1). T. K. Abbott (1891:129-82) proposed that Jesus spoke Greek as his matrix language and sometimes Aramaic. Mark transliterates the Aramaic words into Greek and preserves the Aramaic words in his GkGospel by means of codeswitching in order that he stresses that Jesus spoke the transliterated words in Aramaic. However, his opinion runs counter the consensus of modern NT scholars that Jesus spoke Aramaic as his matrix language.[510] On the other hand, Birkeland (1954) insists that though Jesus regularly spoke Hebrew, he sometimes spoke Aramaic. The Aramaic words Jesus sometimes spoke were transliterated into Greek in the Gospels. In other words, although Jesus spoke Hebrew, he used some Aramaic terms which are transliterated into Greek in the Gospels and the authors of the Gospels also use the terms

---

[510] Illustrating Abbott's argument Turner (1965:181; cf. 1976:9-10) mentions that with some of the ArmEmWords in Mark, Jesus "may have been addressing individuals whose sole language was Aramaic." In other words, Jesus usually spoke Greek. It is interesting that he suggests, "The Aramaisms are not all primitive survivals of the original teaching of Jesus, but they may rather be a part of the evangelists' Greek style." However, pragmatic functions of codeswitching imply that Jesus spoke Aramaic as his matrix language because ArmEmWords are everyday language (§8.1.4; §8.3.2).

as codeswitchings. However, pragmatic functions of codeswitching indicate that Jesus spoke Aramaic, as will be discussed. Furthermore, interestingly, some scholars suggest that Jesus intentionally spoke eucharistic words in Hebrew for solemnity. Though retranslating eucharistic words of Jesus into Palestinian Aramaic, Dalman (1929:163) assumes that Jesus spoke the words of Institution in Hebrew.[511] Black (1957:305) argues that Jesus might have employed Hebrew in solemn situations (e.g. at the Institution of the Last Supper). Jeremias (1966:198; cf. 1971:8) presents, "we must reckon quite seriously with the possibility that Jesus spoke the solemn avowal of abstinence, the table prayers, and the words of interpretation in the Hebrew *lingua sacra*." Rabinowitz considers Jesus to be bilingual, fluent both in Aramaic and Hebrew. He (1962:238) assumes that the Aramaic Ταλιθα κουμ Jesus spoke was retained in a Hebrew text and that when the text was translated into Greek, the Aramaic sentence was preserved for adding local color. On the other hand, it is intriguing that the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* considers ArmEmWords (e.g. ἀμήν, αββα, ταλιθα κουμ, εφφαθα, and μαραναθά) as *intentional* insertions. They have argued that ArmEmWords originated from Greek-speaking communities with various intentions (§8.2; §8.4; §8.6.2). The fact that many scholars tried to use the concept of codeswitching in their publications with various views implies that it is urgent to apply codeswitchings theory to analyzing ArmEmWords in the SynGs and Acts.

Watt first introduced codeswitching theory to NT discussion in detail.[512] According to him, Semitic features in the Lk and Acts are not interference but language selection, that is, codeswitching by the author who was bilingual (1997:10, 51). He (1997:10) persuasively insists, "the presence of the Semitic features in Lk and Ac is neither unusual nor aberrant."

---

[511] Dalman (1929:163) suggests, "One might conclude from this that the words of Institution ... were spoken by our Lord in Hebrew; and it would be somewhat daring to consider it impossible that He, under the circumstances, should have sued the holy language."

[512] Wise (1992a:434) sheds sociolinguistic tools on the study of the languages of Palestine to explain the linguistic milieu of Palestine as diglossia. And he just mentioned and defined codeswitching as "the use of different levels or forms of the same language." Although Porter (2000a:132-3; cf. 154, 158 n.89) mentions that codeswitching is one of the significant topic of sociolinguistics, he does not suggest the possibility that Jesus or Gospel authors use it.

However, he applies the theory to only the study of Lk and Acts at the level of syntax.[513] Nor does he consider that Jesus as a bilingual might have used codeswitching. Watt (2000a:116) may mention codeswitching in his later publication but he did not develop the issue further. Nevertheless, it is welcomed that Adams opened a chapter of the study of codeswitching in ancient society in full dress, although he does not deal with biblical literature. He analyzes the characteristic features and functions of codeswitching in the famous ancient works written by ancient authors (e.g. Cicero) on the basis of a clear and erudite linguistic knowledge of interference, borrowing, and codeswitching.

There are three major reasons that NT scholars have disregarded codeswitching theory. (1) Above all, sociolinguists were late concerned about codeswitching theory. Milroy & Muysken (1995:8) point out, "In contrast with the research on bilingualism in general, and on borrowing and interference, the study of code-switching was slow in starting." It was not until 1960 that codeswitching attracted scholars' attention, although codeswitching was daily used in bilingual communities as well such as English and French in Canada, English and Welsh in Wales, or French and Flemish in Belgium. Myers-Scotton (1993:47-8) criticizes the prevailing views of codeswitching before 1960s:

> The dominant view of CS was simply that it did not exist, least of all as a research topic. If they treated CS at all, earlier studies of language in contact largely considered CS as an interference phenomenon, with "interference" interpreted in its most literal sense. That is, CS was considered part of the performance of the imperfect bilingual, motivated by inability to carry on a conversation in the language on the floor at the moment.[514]

---

[513] Furthermore, although he still admits the presupposition that the biblical Greek is influenced by Semitic interference, the solecism of Gospel Greek, to some degree, might be due to certain peculiarity in the process of evolution of later Greek in general (cf. chapter 6), as Dibelius suggested earlier (Dibelius 1934:35; 1935:74-5; see §6.1).

[514] Weinreich's remark (1953:73) is typical of the opinions: "The ideal bilingual switches

For this reason, although there have been similar concept of codeswitching, the ArmEmWords as codeswitching has been little discussed. Rather, ArmEmWords have been regarded as borrowing or interference because biblical scholars followed the dominant view of sociolinguistic scholars. However, with development of a study of sociolinguistics, especially bilingualism, the study of codeswitching has attracted lively discussion since the 1970s. Further, this discussion helped to understand the linguistic phenomenon of a multilingual community better than before. The present situation of the research is well expressed by Myers-Scotton's remark (1993:45; cf. Jacobson 1990): "in the last ten years, almost all major conferences within linguistics have included at least one paper on [codeswitching], and articles on CS appear regularly in many journals within the field."

(2) It seems that the historical-critical approach to the SynGs, in a sense, hindered the introduction of codeswitching for a long time. Many critics assumed that the SynTrads were composed of "small units" or that the authors of the SynGs were just collectors or redactors of the SynTrads, not creative authors. On this point, the transliterated words may be ascribed to the inadvertent mistake or indifference of the writers, which corresponds to definitions of interference or borrowing (§8.1.1). That is, the less responsible the authors, the less literally intentional the texts. It seems that the foreign embedded words are considered as interference rather than as codeswitching. However, literary-critical approach shows another possibility that the authors of the FGs played a much more important part in formation of SynGs than historical critics originally thought. Codeswitching theory is to observe the authors' intention between lines. On this point, codeswitching should be applied to analysis of ArmEmWords in the NT literature in that literary criticism is complementary to historical criticism.

---

from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence." For history of research of the development of the study of codeswitching, see Myers-Scotton 1993:45-74.

(3) One of the reasons that biblical scholars have paid little attention to codeswitching has been due to their view of the linguistic milieus of first-century P&RNE. When the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine is regarded as monolingualism or diglossia, it can be led into assumption that the ArmEmWords can be explained as interference or borrowing. Notably, from the perspective of monolingualism on the basis of a sharp distinction between Aramaic-speaking Judaeo-Palestinian Christian church and Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian church, form critics have considered ArmEmWords as foreign words *unknown* to readers/listeners so that they concluded that they are "wonder-working words."[515] Wardhaugh (1986:103) suggests, "In a diglossic communities also, the situation controls the choice of variety but the choice is much more rigidly defined by the particular activity that is involved and by the relationship between the participants." The uniformly diglossic model tends to consider ArmEmWords as borrowing and interference rather than as codeswitching. However, as discussed (chapters 2-4), the linguistic milieus of first-century P&RNE should be considered as bilingualism. The bilingualism model admits language preference theory (§2.3.2), which suggests that the authors of the NT literature could change their linguistic codes when they intend. For these reasons, the study of codeswitching in the NT literature which was written in bilingual settings is urgent request.

8.1.3 Types of Codeswitching

There are three kinds of codeswitchings: intersentential switching, tag switching, and intrasentential switching (Poplack 1980:615). Intersentential switching means switching whole clauses or sentences.[516] Tag switching denotes switching tag or interjection

---

[515] For the detailed argument and my criticism, see §1.2: §8.3.2.

[516] The term "sentence" in English is usually defined as a word or a group of words beginning with a capital letter and ending with a punctuation mark. For instance, "Father!" is a full sentence because it begins with a capital letter 'F' and ends with exclamation. Two terms, αββα and ρακα are full sentences.

syntactically independent. And intrasentential codeswitching occurs within sentences.

For instance, three instances can be mentioned in connection with the intersentential codeswitching. Even though he was an Aramaic speaker, Assyrian general commander named Rabshakeh intentionally spoke Hebrew to frighten Jews (II Kings18:26-28). Paul switches his language code from Greek into Aramaic when he speaks to the Jews in order to draw his audience's attention (Acts22:2). In addition, we can assume Peter's codeswitching in the SynGs; when it was said of Peter "certainly you are also one of them, for your accent betrays you" (Mt26:73), in response to their question he might have tried to change his Galilean dialect into Jerusalem standard language. On the other hand, there are lots of instances of intrasentential codeswitching in the NT literature, which will be observed below. The intrasentential codeswitching can be divided into alternation, insertion and repetition. The instances of repetition can be Βαρτιμαῖος, (Mk10:46) and αββα ὁ πατήρ (Mk14:36; Gal4:6; Rom8:15).

8.1.4 Pragmatic Functions of Codeswitching

Codeswitching implies authors' intention in texts. When the SynGs and Acts were read in Greek, ArmEmWords in Greek narratives sounded salient. When the Aramaic words were indeclinable, their pronunciations were so conspicuous that they must have attracted listeners' attention.[517] Scholars have discussed several practical functions of codeswitching between the lines. Citing works by Gumperz and others, Myers-Scotton (2002:11) considers, "codeswitching was worth studying because it so clearly shows how one variety conveys a

---

[517] By analogy with the change of the spelling of Jerusalem, Sylva (1983:219) properly mentions, "It would be as if the reader of an American novel had read the Germanic term 'München' throughout most of the novel to refer to the West German city. If every now and then the Anglicized term 'Munich' was used, it would give the reader pause and cause him to wonder why this term was used instead of 'München,' which the writer had been using extensively. In such a way, the two terms would be linked together in the reader's mind whenever the Anglicized term 'Munich' occurred. This is the sort of thing that occurs in Lk 2 38-Act 7 60." For his position of relationship between the change of the spelling of Jerusalem and pragmatic function, see §8.4.3.1

different social message from another-after all, switches had to 'mean something.'" Grosjean (1982:152) also suggests, "codeswitching is an important means of conveying linguistic and social information and an indicator of the speaker's momentary attitudes, communicative intents, and emotions." Although using codeswitchings implies many literary functions, four functions will be suggested here.

8.1.4.1 Vividness

First of all, let's return to the film, *the Passion of the Christ*. Why did Gibson, the producer of the film, want to change the language code of Jesus from Aramaic into Latin in several times in his film? Certainly, it is vividness that Gibson intends to convey by using codeswitching. Codeswitching makes readers to feel picturesque information. Furthermore, codeswitching implies that the writer is more conversant with facts related to person or situation (e.g. personal relationship to the historical Jesus).

8.1.4.2 Emphasis

Second, codeswitching plays a role to emphasize on a message. Codeswitching in some cases may repeat what has been said in two languages to emphasize or clarify a repeated message, that is, "repetition codeswitching" (Finlayson & Slabbert 1997:394). Romaine (1995:162) also notes, "here the switch itself is important, not the referential value of the utterance since the same thing is said in both languages." For instance, although αββα ὁ πατήρ (Mk14:36) is represented in two languages, the αββα is the same meaning with the ὁ πατήρ.

8.1.4.3 Politeness

Third, politeness should be considered one of the functions of codeswitching. Studying bilingualism between Latin and Greek on the island of Delos in the second century BCE, Adams suggests that "it (linguistic accommodation) may involve the use by the speaker of the addressee's primary language as a form of deference."[518] According to him, codeswitching into the addressee's primary language is known as a sporadic strategy in bilingual society. For instance, depending on his audience, Paul changes his language code into Aramaic by choice when he addresses his experience on the road of Damascus to Jews (Acts 22:2; 21:40).[519] Codeswitching is used for emotional utterances. When Paul changed his code, he must have expected to touch their emotion of his audience who used Aramaic as their matrix language.

8.1.4.4 Solidarity

Lastly, codeswitching functions as strengthening group solidarity, as the codeswitching into French in *War and Peace* shows that codeswitching is employed inside the aristocracy. Through studying the relations of power between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada, Heller (1995:167-169) concludes that codeswitching might be part of a process of assimilation in multilingual society; further, in that sense, codeswitching can become salient strategies for achieving solidarity and power. This is shown, conversely, that a speaker can use codeswitching to express different identity from others. Myers-Scotton (2006) suggests, "they [bilingual elite] present themselves as different from local people who do not speak the elite language with the same facility." Accordingly, Hoffmann (1991:116)

---

[518] Adams 2002: 2003:103-127; esp.121. Adams refers to linguistic accommodation as codeswitching.

[519] Using codeswitching depends on recipient/audience. Cicero used codeswitching from Latin to Greek at the highest frequency when he wrote *Ad Atticum* because Pomponius Atticus spoke Greek so well due to many years of residence in Athens (Swain 2002:148).

suggests that codeswitching is sometimes "used to express group identity, i.e. belonging to a bilingual community." It is interesting that Greek inscriptions excavated from Beth Shearim keep a Hebrew embedded word, ΣΑΛΟΜ.[520] This means that the dearest wish of the bereaved was codeswitched from Greek into Hebrew which is their religious language and that the Hebrew codeswitching consolidates their religious solidarity between the dead and the bereaved. The ArmEmWords in the NT literature function as tightening the solidarity of the earliest Christian communities. In the case of αββα and μαράνα θά, Paul uses them in Greek-matrix churches in order to share Christian identity in their worship. In the case of Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος (§8.4.2.1), Paul's codeswitching from Greek into Aramaic to refer to Simon in Galatians implies that Paul tries to display his personal relationship with Peter.

Now, codeswitchings in the SynGs and Acts and their implications will be discussed. First of all, ἀμήν will be investigated because it occurs in the FGs (§8.2). Codeswitchings in the GofMk (§8.3), and Lk and Acts (§8.4) will be observed, respectively. Then, the relationship between ArmEmWords as codeswitchings and interdirectionality hypothesis will be taken into account.

8.2 Ἀμήν Found in All Four Gospels

Above all, ἀμήν[521] will be considered in full dress. The introductory ἀμήν–formula is traditionally known as a Semitism. It occurs frequently but only on the lips of Jesus. What is significant is that there are translated Greek equivalents in parallel passages in the FGs. For these reasons the ἀμήν–formula will be regarded as a test case of Foreign embedded words in terms of translation transmission of JTrad. The ἀμήν-formula has raised two major

---

[520] Schwabe & Lifshitz 1973: nos. 21, 25, 28, 91 (= *CIJ* II.1034, 1036 + 1037, 1038, 1113).

[521] In terms of ArmEmWords, ὡσαννά occurs in three Gospels (Mt 21:9, 15; Mk11:9, 10; Jn12:13) and the cry from the cross occurs twofold (i.e. ελι ελι λεμα σαβαχθανι [Mt27:46] and ελοι, ελοι λαμα σαβαχθανι [Mk15:34]).

questions: (1) Is the prepositive ἀμήν unique to Jesus? (2) Why did all authors of the Four GkGospels preserve in most cases the Aramaic transliterated form instead of Greek translated equivalents? The first question seems to function as the basis for the second question. If the ἀμήν-formula was unique to Jesus, the authors would have tried to preserve it. In this respect, the issue of the uniqueness has attracted scholars' attention.

Jeremias insists, "prefatory ἀμήν–formula"[522] should be considered as "a new and completely unique manner of speaking" and "an incontestable linguistic characteristic of the *ipsissima vox Jesu*" (1967:115; cf. 1971:35-6). This is because he assumes that Aramaic transliterated words were closer to the sayings by the historical Jesus and more original tradition than non-SemTrad (§1.4.1.3). However, Jeremias (1967:113) also admits that the SynTrads have "an increasing tendency to delete the phrase with *amen* or to translate it."[523] In relation to this, he (1971:37) considers that *ipsissima vox Jesu*, like amen-sayings, are not always *ipsissima verba Jesu*.

In fact, regarding the occurrences of ἀμήν in the SynGs, the problem lies in the fact that the ἀμήν–formula differs in extent of use among the parallel passages of the SynGs. The disagreement is easily shown that while ἀμήν–formula occurs 31 times in Matthew and 13 times in Mark, Luke has only 6 times.[524] In addition, the Greek translation equivalents occur in the parallel passages where the Aramaic transliterated form (i.e. ἀμήν) might have been expected: ἀληθῶς, ἀλλά, γάρ, δέ, διά τοῦτο, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, κἀγώ, και, ναί, οὐχί, and πλήν.[525]

---

[522] Some scholars suggest that the prefaced ἀμήν as a sentence adverbial is found in OT (Hogg 1896:1-7; Dalman 1909:226-7; Talmon 1969:124-9) or Rabbinic literature (Daube 1956:388-93 [*B.T. Shab.* 119b, *San.* 111a]). However, the prepositive ἀμήν-formulas cannot really be forced into comparison with ἀμήν "saying verbs" in the sayings of Jesus (Hempel 1962:1.105; Fitzmyer 1981:536; Witherington 1990:188; see n.86).

[523] 1967:113; Matthew translated the amen-formula several times; even Mark kept the translated form; and Luke translated it in most cases; cf. ns. 524, 525.

[524] Luke sometimes omits the ἀμήν: Lk 7:9 / Mt 8:10, Lk 7:28 / Mt 11:11, Lk 10:12 / Mt 10:15, Lk 10:24 / Mt 13:17, Lk 12:59 / Mt 5:26, Lk 13:25 / Mt 25:12, Lk 15:7, 10 / Mt 18:13, Lk 17:6 / Mt 17:20, and Lk 22:34 / Mk 14:30. For detail analysis of the occurrences of ἀμήν in the FGs, see Hogg 1896:7-10; Jeremias 1967:112-5; Hasler 1969:13-24.

[525] In comparison with parallel passages in the SynGs Matthew more often keeps the translated equivalents where the Markan parallels preserve ArmEmWords: δέ (Mt 26:29) / ἀμήν (Mk 14:25), διὰ τοῦτο (Mt 12:31) / ἀμήν (Mk 3:28), and κάι (Mt 16:4) / ἀμήν (Mk 8:12). And Matthew

The occurrence of the transliterated form is [-PREDICTABLE]. The disagreement of parallel passages in the FGs indicates that both the Aramaic transliterated form and the Greek translated equivalents circulated together. The coexistence of translated and transliterated amens warrants a question: What are Semitisms at the semantic level? Scholars have considered Semitisms as Semitic words in Greek texts and as earlier traditions. However, the coexistence of amen formula both in Greek and in Aramaic within the same texts (i.e. all the FGs) speaks eloquently that all transliterated Semitisms are not always earlier tradition than Greek translated tradition. This is because the bilingualism of first-century Palestine makes it possible to translate the SemTrad into GkTrad as well as GkTrad into SemTrad during and after Jesus's ministry. This means that Semitic words do not always have temporal priority. Moreover, it is possible that the Greek translated equivalents to אמן–formula can be translated into the Aramaic transliterated formula again among Aramaic-matrix Christian communities of first-century P&RNE (e.g. Syria) during Jesus's ministry. Accordingly, Jeremias would have done better to have considered that the ἀμήν-formula could have been translated into אמן–formula when JTrads were circulated among Aramaic-matrix speakers in Palestine as well as in RNE before the formation of the SynTrads.

On the other hand, Berger and Chilton explore a different approach to the issue. They assume that the ἀμήν-formula in the sayings of Jesus (called Semitism) originated from Hellenistic communities where Greek was used. On the basis of redaction criticism,[526]

---

holds the Greek equivalents to which the amens in Aramaic might have been translated: δέ (5:32, 44, 6:29, 8:11), διὰ τοῦτο (6:25), γάρ (3:9, 23:39), ναί (11:9), πλήν (11:22, 24, 26:64). Mark does not keep the translated form in comparison with parallel passages with Matthew and Luke. Mark may omit the ἀμήν (Mk 6:4), although Lukan parallel has the ἀμήν (Lk 4:24). Luke has the translated equivalents where the Matthean or Markan parallels preserve ArmEmWords: ἀληθῶς (Lk 9:27) / ἀμήν (Mt 16:28, Mk 9:1), ἀληθῶς (Lk 12:44, however, intriguingly D ἀμήν) / ἀμήν (Mt 24:47). ἀληθῶς (Lk 21:3) / ἀμήν (Mk 12:43), γάρ (Lk 22:18) / ἀμήν (Mk 14:25), δὲ (Lk 16:17) / ἀμήν (Mt 5:18), δὲ (Lk 22:28) / ἀμήν (Mt 19:28), κἀι (Lk 11:29) / ἀμήν (Mk 8:12), κἀι (Lk 12:10) / ἀμήν (Mk 3:28), ναί (Lk 11:51) / ἀμήν (Mt 23:36), πλήν (Lk 10:14) / ἀμήν (Mt 10:15), and πλήν ἰδού (Lk 22:21) / ἀμήν (Mk 14:18). And Luke keeps the Greek equivalents to which the amens in Aramaic might have been translated: ἀλλά (6:27), γάρ (3:8, 10:24), δέ (12:4, 8, 12:27, 13:35), διὰ τοῦτο (12:22), ἐπ' ἀληθείας (4:25), κἀγώ (11:9), ναί (7:26, 12:5), and οὐχί (12:51). Furthermore, they omit the ἀμήν in some cases as well.

[526] Along similar lines, Hasler considers ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν as redactional addition. Claiming

Berger insists that the ἀμήν-formula was derived from the Hellenistic Jewish Christian communities because it is not found in Aramaic Jewish literature but in Greek Jewish literature. He (1970:3-28, 147-52) notes that the ἦ / εἶ μήν is interchangeable with ναί in the LXX. Interestingly, the ἀμήν-formula is found in the Testament of Abraham VIII and XX, which should be derived from ἦ μήν at Gen. 22:17 of the LXX rather than from כִּי of the MT. Berger supposes that ἦ / εἶ μήν is replaced with ἀμήν among the Hellenistic Jews. This is adduced by linguistic similarities. He claims that ἦ / εἶ μήν of the LXX is similar to ἀμήν of the sayings by Jesus at the levels of phonetics, syntax, and semantics.[527] This similarities enabled apocalyptically oriented Hellenistic Jewish Christians to replace ἦ / εἶ μήν with ἀμήν. This is also proved that ἀμήν is mixed with ναί in parallel passages in the SynGs. Accordingly, he (1970:18, 28) insists that ἀμήν–formula is firstly formulated in the Hellenistic Jewish Christian regions and is not a mark of *ipsissima vox Jesu*.

However, citing Turner's argument (1955a:221-2), Jeremias (1973:122) points out Berger's critical drawback. He argues that the two usages of Testament of Abraham which are found only in the Recension A (chapters 8 and 10) were composed in the Medieval Age unlike much shorter Recension B[528] and that the ἀμήν–formula was also influenced by

---

that ἀμήν even in Judaism was used as asseveration not as response (e.g. four Rabbinic texts such as Dt R·7 [203 d], Midr Ps 89, 4 [101 a]; 106, 9 [229 a]; Nu R 9 [155 c] and Rev. 7:12, 22:20; Hasler 1969:173), he (1969:171-2) argues that the ἀμήν–formula in the sayings of Jesus originated with charismatic prophets of the Hellenistic Christian communities in order to give authority to the words of the exalted Lord to his people. This means that the ἀμήν-sayings were secondarily placed on the lips of Jesus. However, (1) simply speaking, the responsory ἀμήν was still used in the NT literatures. Hempel (1962:1.105) enumerates the usages (Rom 15:33, I Cor. 14:16, II Cor. 1:20 reading H, Rev. 1:6, 7, 5:14, 7:12, 19:4, 22:20, etc.) Also Jeremias (1971:36 n.2) persuasively suggests that Rev. 7:12 and 22:20 should be considered as responsory ἀμήν. (2) As Jeremias proposes (1971:36 n.2; 1973:122), rather the four Rabbinic texts approves that they are used as responsory. (3) It is dubious that all amen sayings in the Gospels derive from the Hellenistic communities (Witherington 1990:186 n.33). (4) The biggest problem lies in his assumption that his argument is based on a clear distinction between Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking Jewish Christians. This point will be criticized with Berger's weak point. In relation to this, I pointed out Bultmann's drawback that some ArmEmWords arose in the Gentile Christian churches (§1.2.2)

[527] Berger 1970:4-28; esp. 17-8; it is regretful that he does not explain vowel interchangeability between η, ει, and α phonologically in detail, although his assumption seems right. Syntactically, both of them function as prepositive usages. Semantically, both are used as emphatic statements or oaths.

[528] For the discussion of the relation of the two recensions, see Allison 2003:12-27. Allison (2003:15) considers, "James's judgment, which holds RecShrt.'s much shorter story line to be

Christian usage. Recently, following Jeremias's refutation, Allison (2003:100; also 16) also suggests that the Testament of Abraham "itself cannot establish [Berger's] case, for too much of its language is later and Christian." The problem lies in the fact that the date of the Testament of Abraham is under debate (Charlesworth 1981:70). Nevertheless, whether or not the amen-formula of the Testament of Abraham was influenced by the Christian usage or not, Berger's contribution still remains: the ἀμήν–formula is related to ἦ / εἰ μήν of the LXX (Allison 2003:192; Chilton 1978:204-5).

Accepting Berger's view, Chilton (1978:210-1) puts forward his assumption that when Jesus spoke, he used introductory בקושטא in Aramaic, which was rendered into ἀμήν in Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian communities and then into *š^{e}rir 'it* in Syriac Gospels. He (1978:208-10) adduces evidence to back up his argument from two linguistic analyses of the Old Syriac Gospels (i.e. S [Sinaitic] and C [Curetonian]) and P (Peshitta). (1) He points out that there are a few irregularities[529] and omissions.[530] This shows that "'Amen' was not quite seen as indispensable, even though the attempt was made to transliterate it as part of the normative Greek text (208)." Furthermore, he observes that in some cases *we* is added to *amēn*.[531] Specifically, *we* is added to *amēn* at Mt10:23 (S–C), despite the fact that *ger* is also present. These additions suggest that "there was a certain reluctance to use 'Amen' by itself, as it appears in the Greek New Testament (209)." (2) Instead, Chilton (1978:209) assumes, "the predilection of S-C and P for *š^{e}rir 'it* corresponds to a use of בקושטא in the Aramaic Gospel Tradition" because there is a tendency that even substantives like ἀλήθεια and ἐπ' ἀληθείας are rendered into an adverb *š^{e}rir 'it* [532] or *šapirtā'*.[533] It is interesting that truth-stem asseverations in Mt22:16 and Lk20:21 are rendered into *bequsta* which is phonologically,

---

secondary, is sound."

[529] In terms of repetition of transliterated *amēn*, it is interesting that S is distinct from C, P, or H (Harklean). According to *CESG* (cf. Chilton 1978:208), Mk3:28, 14:18, 30 preserve double *amēn* and Jn3:11, 5:19, 6:26, 13:20, 21, 38, 21:18 have single *amēn*.

[530] C (Mt6:5, Mk16:20) and P (Mt18:19, Mk16:20).

[531] S-C (Mt5:26, 10:15, 23) and P (Mt5:26, 6:2, 5, 16, 10:15).

[532] S-C (Lk22:59, Jn8:4) and P (Lk22:59; cf. Jn8:40).

[533] S (Jn3:21).

morphologically, and substantively the equivalent of Aramaic בקושטא. The reason, he suggests, is that the two cases are non-dominical. Further, he assumes, "the fact that this logion is not ascribed to Jesus made the translator feel free to indulge his knowledge of an Aramaic locution" (209). This means that the Syriac translators have the predilection for *šᵉrir'it* or *šapirtā'* rather than for *bequsta*, even though they know that *bequsta* is the equivalent of בקושטא. Accordingly, בקושטא was rendered into the ἀμήν–formula in the Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian communities and the ἀμήν–formula was translated into *šᵉrir'it* or *šapirtā'*. This means that Jesus used בקושטא which is also found in the OT (Isa. Tar. 37:18, 45:14, 15)[534] and the ἀμήν–formula is not the transliterated Aramaic idiom but a translated Greek word which arose in the Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian community.[535]

However, it seems that Chilton's two arguments are not persuasive due to four points. (1) Chilton exaggerates that the irregularities and the omissions show the translators' disregard and reluctance to use the transliterated form. Rather, the translators seem to have a tendency to preserve the transliterated form. All ἀμήν–formulae are transliterated into *amēn* except only two omissions (Mt 6:5 C and Mt18:19 P) out of around 75 ἀμήν–formulae in the FGs.[536] It is surprising that the Syriac translators make a clear distinction between ἀμήν and the Greek equivalents (i.e. ἀληθῶς, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, and ἐπ' ἀληθείας). That is, the Greek equivalents are never rendered into *amēn*, although the Greek equivalents in the SynGs are interchangeable with ἀμήν in some parallel passages (n.74). These two points indicate that

---

[534] It is interesting that בקושטא in 1 Enoch 106:18 and 107:1 was translated ἐπ' ἀληθείας.

[535] Chilton (1984:202) concludes, "It also shows that, in using such a locution, Jesus would not have been entirely original; he was more probably echoing a convention, as was his habit, which his hearers were familiar with from regular worship in their synagogues."

[536] In the case of Mt6:5 C omits *amēn* whereas P and H keep it (S does not have the whole verse.) In the case of Mt18:19 P, although S and C keep *amēn* whereas P and H omits it, textual variants of the ἀμήν also occur in other manuscripts in Greek. He also suggests Mk16:20 C and P. However, this verse is not the ἀμήν–formula (i.e. ἀμήν–saying). Furthermore, the irregularities and omissions of the ἀμήν–formula in the FGs occur much more frequently than those of *amēn* in the Syriac Gospels. Nevertheless, it is taken for granted that the ἀμήν–formula in the FGs is generally considered as indispensable.

the translators were very sensitive to preservation of the ἀμήν–formula. And although the ἀμήν–formulae are frequently replaced by Greek particles in the parallel passages of the FGs as well (n.68), one considers that the authors of the FGs seem to preserve the ἀμήν–formula intentionally without reluctance. Rather, Chilton should reply to this question: why did both the Greek writers and the Syriac translators hold fast to preserve the transliterated form (ἀμήν / *amēn*) in almost all cases? (2) Chilton suggests that when Syriac translators meet non-dominical truth-stem asseverations, they render them into *bequsta* instead of *šᵉrir'it*. However, most adverbial truth-stem asseverations which are non-dominical (i.e. ἀληθῶς, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, and ἐπ' ἀληθείας) are rendered into *šᵉrir'it*, *šᵉrir'i*, or *bešᵉrir'i* except for the only two cases Chilton illustrates.[537] (3) Chilton assumes, "Aramaic בקושטא was remembered by the translators as the idiom which Greek 'truth'-stem locutions were designed to convey" (210). If the translators knew that the Aramaic term is בקושטא of the ArmGospels, they might have considered the equivalent of בקושטא as *bequsta* rather than *šᵉrir'it*. (4) The most serious problem lies in the fact that there are no Syriac translated equivalents in the Syriac Gospels (i.e. S, C, P, and H) where the transliterated ἀμήν–formulae occur in GkGospels. This shows that the Syriac translators took the transliterated ἀμήν–formula into account seriously. They deliberately transliterated the transliterated ἀμήν–formulae into Syriac transliterated *amēn* and translated the Greek translated equivalents into the Syriac equivalents respectively. For these reasons, Chilton's assumptions are not persuasive. Rather, Jeremias is more convincing when he suggests that the ἀμήν–formula was unique to Jesus. The unique usage impressed the authors of the FGs to preserve and to stress the formula. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy to mention that the Greek equivalents (i.e. ἀληθῶς, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ,

---

[537] Ἀληθῶς Mt14:33 (disciples; *šᵉrir'it* S, C, P, H), Mt26:73 (bystanders; *šᵉrir'it* S, P, H), Mt27:53 (a centurion; *šᵉrir'it* S, P, H), Mk14:70 (bystanders; *šᵉrir'it* S, P, H), Mk15:39 (a centurion; *šᵉrir'it* S, P, H), Jn6:14 (people; *šᵉrir'it* S, C, P, H), Jn7:26 (people; *šᵉrir'it* S, C, H), Jn7:40 (people: *šᵉrir'it* S, C, P, H); ἐν ἀληθείᾳ Mt22:16 (*bequesta* S, C, P / *bešᵉrir'i* H); ἐπ' ἀληθείας Mk12:14 (peoples sent by Pharisees; *bešᵉrir'i* S, P, H; it is noteworthy to attract our attention because its parallel passage is Lk20:21 (*bequsta*) Chilton illustrates above), Mk12:32 (a scribe; *bešᵉrir'i* S, P, H), Lk20:21 (*bequesta* S, C, P / *bešᵉrir'i* H), Lk22:59 (another person; *šᵉrir'it* C, P / *bešᵉrir'i* H).

and ἐπ' ἀληθείας) which are translated from ἀμήν–formulae in the sayings of Jesus are translated into *šᵉrir'it*, *šᵉrir'i*, or *bešᵉrir'i* again. This implies that the Greek translated equivalents could have been repeatedly translated into Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix Christian community.

Berger and Chilton have common shortcomings. (1) Both their approaches are based on the monolingual approach to earliest Christian communities. They take it for granted that there is a clear distinction between Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking Christian communities (Berger 1970:1-28; Chilton 1978:211). Consequently, they assume that the ἀμήν–formula could not but arise in the Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian community because the formula is related to the usage of the LXX.[538] However, the linguistic milieu of first-century RNE is bilingualism, as presented (chapters 3 and 4). The LXX was used among the relatively isolationist Qumran community (§3.1.2). It was also circulated in Jerusalem, a bilingual city where, what is more, Esther and others were translated into Greek in the first century BCE (§3.1.2). Even the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem was bilingualism (chapter 5). Hence, it is not convincing that since the ἀμήν–formula is related to the LXX, it arose in Greek-speaking Christian communities.

(2) In terms of transmission via translation, the bilingualism of the RNE including Palestine raises a possibility that the ἀμήν–formula must have been translated into the equivalents in various languages (e.g. Aramaic, Syriac, etc.) like Greek before the FGs were composed. This is proved by the fact that the FGs and the Syriac versions keep the translated equivalents of ἀμήν, as mentioned above. This runs contrary to Jeremias' argument that the transliterated words, so-called Semitisms, are always earlier traditions than the translated

---

[538] Concerning the occurrence of the prepositive *amen* in the Semitic materials. some scholars argue that prepositive *amen* was discovered in a Hebrew letter 7 century BCE; see Naveh 1960:135; Hasler 1969:173; Talmon 1969:124-9; Strugnell 1974:177-82. Others (Berger 1970:2-3; Jeremias 1973:122) interpret the *amen* differently, that is, "with 'mn taken with what precedes, but regarded as a shorthand or direct-address quotation of the "brothers." For more detail discussion, see Fitzmyer 1981:536. Fitzmyer (1981:536) convincingly concludes, "it is not certainly prepositive. Moreover, it scarcely sheds any light on the NT use before a verb of saying."

words.[539]

(3) Nevertheless, we must take seriously the idea that all of the evangelists preserved *the transliterated form in a bilingual circumstances in most cases* because ἀμήν is a manifestation of codeswitching. As partly discussed above, the features of the transliterated ἀμήν–formula in the sayings of Jesus in the FGs can be summarized as [+MULTILINGUAL]. [-ADAPTABLE], [-PREDICTABLE], and [+INTENTIONAL]. The audience was bilingual enough to understand the Aramaic transliterated embedded term [+MULTILINGUAL]. The usage of the introductory ἀμήν is distinct from the Greek language system, which means that the ἀμήν is not integrated into the recipient language system at the levels of syntax and semantics [-ADAPTABLE]. The occurrences can not be expected to appear regularly [-PREDICTABLE]. The fact that all the evangelists and the Syriac translators preserved the ἀμήν–formula shows that the occurrences of the formula are deliberate [+INTENTIONAL].[540] The ἀμήν–formula as codeswitching has some implications. That is, there are some intentions behind the authors' preservation of the formula. The ἀμήν–formula employed by Jesus made such an impact that it was kept as codeswitching in all FGs. This codeswitching conveys Jesus's sayings in a picturesque way [VIVIDNESS]. The ἀμήν–formula is also used as stress on Jesus's sayings [EMPHASIS].

There is a consensus that the ἀμήν–formula of the sayings by Jesus in the FGs refers to emphasis and solemnity.[541] How is it used as emphasis? A clue is found in the usage of ἦ / εἶ μήν of the LXX. There are similarities between ἀμήν of the FGs and ἦ / εἶ μήν of the LXX at the levels of phonology, syntax, and semantics,[542] as Berger (1970) argued. In

---

[539] It is interesting that Chilton (1978:211) concludes, "the contributions of Berger and Strugnell have definitively upset the facile generalization that 'Aramaic' is synonymous with 'dominical' and 'Greek' with 'secondary'." Although much of what he says is not persuasive because of monolingual approach and unidirectional hypothesis, his conclusion remains a sound one.

[540] Concerning the intentions of the authors of the FGs, see O'Neill 1959:1-9; Lindas 1972:150; Ellis 1999:181; Culpepper 2001:253-62.

[541] Dalman 1909:226-9; Manson 1935:207; Taylor 1952:242; Hasler 1969:168-87; Berger 1970:1-28; Jeremias 1971:35; Chilton 1978:203-11; Lee 1985:21 n.79; Brown 2000:243.

[542] Hort (1896:158) mentions, "The εἶ μήν of He 6:14 (from LXX) is proved by abundant evidence in the LXX to be no mere itacism, and is distinctly recognized in *E. M.* 416 50: its difference

terms of phonological similarity, it is interesting that the vowel η was bivalent in the first century CE (Gignac 1989:38). From an angle of dialectology, there is interchangeability between α and η, for instance, Attic-Ionic μήτηρ where μάτηρ (cf. *māter* Lat.) occurs in other dialects.[543] Following Damaris on Acts17:34, Hemer (1989:232) also illustrates the vowel interchange between α and η as Δαμάριος and Δημάριον show.[544] In the periods of Homer and Classical Greek ἦ μήν, ἦ μάν, or ἦ μέν referring to asseverations and oaths occurs interchangeably (Caragounis 2004:214 n.264). When a Hebrew word was transliterated into Greek, η might interchange α. *LJNLA* (22) shows that Greek personal proper nouns excavated from Palestine between 330 BCE and 200 CE which were transliterated from Hebrew preserved the interchanges between α and η; Ἰασσούου-Ἰησσούου, Ἰωνάθας-Ἰωνάθης, Ἰούδης-Ἰούδας, Ἰησιας-Ἰαεσαιου, and Βασέας-Βησᾶς. It is interesting that inscriptions from Beth Shearim where was around 10 miles from Jesus' hometown (i.e. Nazareth) indicate that α and ε is interchangeable. Schwabe & Lifshitz (1974:202) put forward, "The interchange of epsilon for alpha is very common."[545] Furthermore, in the case of a codeswitching, transliteration from one language into another language, as [-ADAPTABLE] implied, it is possible that the vowel sound η or ει can be transliterated into α (chapter 7), as two variants

---

from ἦ μήν however is not strictly orthographical." Deissmann (1903:205-8) suggests that the two types are interchangeable and that εἰ μήν is not biblical Greek because it is found in the papyri between first century B.C.E. and C.E. Thackeray (1909:83-4) points out that εἰ μήν is interchangeable with ἦ μήν "due to the approximation in the pronunciation of η and ει." Gignac (1989:37) demonstrates that η is interchangeable with ει in the first century CE. Also Caragounis (2004:208-6) strongly suggests that ἦ μήν is interchangeable with εἰ μήν. This is also proved by the fact that quoting Gen22:17, Heb6:14 has the two variants: ἦ μήν (Ψ 𝔐) and εἰ μήν ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A B C D* 𝔓 33. 104. 326. 2464 *pc*).

[543] Buck (1955:21, 25) illustrates, "Originally *ā* ... became η in Attic-Ionic. Thus, τιμή, φημί, ἵσταμι, but in other dialects τιμά (α-stem), φαμί (Lat. *fārī*), ἵσταμι (Lat. stāre)." Robertson (1934:178-9) mentions, "One copyist would be a better representative of the pure vernacular κοινή, while another might live where Attic, Ionic, Doric or Northwest Greek had still positive influence. Often what looks like a breaking-down of the language is but the survival or revival of old dialectical forms or pronunciation."

[544] Δαμάριος (*I. Cret.* 4.235, of Gortyn), Δαμαρίων (*POxy* 4.706, of c. 115 CE; *POxy* 14.1734.2, of late 2nd-3rd CE), Δημαρίων (*SB* 1.4206.78, of Hermoupolis Magna, 80-69 BCE), Δημάριον (*IG* 2^2 .8618, of Athens, 1st AD; *BGU* 702.5-6, from the Fayum, 151 CE), and Δημάριν (*PRyl* 2.243.1, provenance unknown, 2nd CE).

[545] Schwabe & Lifshitz (1974) suggest the interchanges between α and ε; no. 81 Βεκηνῶ and Βεκά, in the case of Josephus, Βακά; nos.79, 188 μυρεψοῦ and μυραψοῦ, and no. 197 Μεωνιτον and Μαωνιτον. Radermacher (1925:43-4) suggests that ε appears instead of α in many cases.

(i.e. Εφφαθα and Εφφεθα) at Mk7:34 show.[546] Interchange between α and η frequently occurs in the LXX (Thackeray 1909:76). The ἀμήν of the FGs can sound like ἦ / εἶ μήν of the LXX, if anyone intends to borrow the term from the LXX. At the level of syntax, the ἀμήν functions as a sentential adverb, as does the Greek particle ἦ μήν.[547] Semantically, the function of ἀμήν in the FGs is similar to that of ἦ / εἶ μήν of the Classical Greek as well as the LXX which functions as making "a solemn affirmation, to confirm a statement, or to introduce an oath, or an oathlike utterance (Caragounis 2004:214-5)." In the Classical Greek, ἦ μήν is clearly frequent in particular contexts in oaths and adjurations.[548] Comparing ἦ μήν with ἦ and μήν Wakker (1997:222) *pragmatically* suggests that ἦ μήν "thus makes the declarative have the value of a *strong assurance*, the truth of the declarative being affirmed both 'objectively', at the representational level, and 'subjectively', at the interactional level" (his emphasis). In the LXX, the translators use ἦ μην when God makes an oath. The Pentateuch has ἦ μην seven times; it is used when God makes an oath (Gen22:17, 42:16, Num14:23, 28, 35) or a person makes his oath in the presence of God to demonstrate his innocence (Exod22:7, 10). The expression ἦ μην in Gen42:16 is used when Joseph spoke to his brother with the authority of Pharaoh who was regarded as God in those times. In the Prophets of the LXX, ἦ μην occurs six times. All ἦ μην in the prophets are employed when God makes an assertion through his prophets without exception; Isa45:23, Ezk33:27, 34:8, 35:6, 36:5, 38:19. Accordingly, Jesus's ἀμήν–formula in the FGs is similar to ἦ / εἶ μήν of the LXX at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels.

It is not clear that Jesus himself directly read the LXX,[549] although some scholars

---

[546] One of the famous examples of variants (α, η, and ει) in transliteration of Aramaic into Greek is also the Cry from the Cross at Mt27:46 / Mk15:34. *BDF* §36 "The variants in the Aramaic words from the Cross in Mt27:46 are characteristic: ηλει αηλι (ἀῆλί) ελω(ε)ι(μ), λεμα λημα λ(ε)ιμα λαμα, σαβαχθαν(ε)ι σαβακτανει ζαφθανει (σαφθ-); in Mk15:34 ελω(ε)ι ελωη ηλ(ε)ι, λεμα λαμ(μ)α λ(ε)ιμα, σαβαχθ- σαβακτ- σιβακθανει ζα(βα)φθανει."

[547] Cf. Denniston 1954:329; he suggests that μήν plays three roles, an emphatic particle, an adversative connecting particle, and a progressive connecting particle.

[548] Xenophon *An.* VI. 1.31, Plato *Phaedo* 115 D 8, *Apol.* 22 A 2; for more discussion, see Sicking & Ophuijsen 1993:56; Caragounis 2004:208-16.

[549] Bacon (1930:470-2) suggests that the OT passages Jesus cites have been assimilated to

ardently support the view.[550] Nevertheless, when Jesus pronounced the introductory אמן he seems to expect that the phonological, syntactic, and semantic affinities with the ἢ / εἰ μήν of the Septuagint must have reminded the audience of the dominical usage which was used by God or prophets as spokesmen of word of God in the Septuagint. Jesus used the אמן–formula as syntactic-semantic borrowing from the usage of the LXX. This is because the LXX (i.e. Pentateuch) was widely read and circulated in first-century Palestine (§3.1.2). Furthermore, it is certain that the writers of the FGs were also aware of the usage. This is supported by the fact that most quotations of the OT in the FGs were derived from the LXX rather than the MT.[551] As noted before, the usage of the Testament of Abraham shows the relationship between the prepositive ἀμήν and ἢ / εἰ μήν in the LXX (Berger 1970:17-8). As a result, Manson (1935:207) suggests, "In the earliest stages of the ministry the authority with which Jesus spoke astonished his hearers… An indication of this is furnished by the use of the word 'amen' by Jesus… 'Verily I say unto you…' is similar to the use of the introductory formula, 'Thus saith the Lord…' in Old Testament prophecy."[552] Jeremias

---

the LXX in the course of transmission. On the contrary, Bultmann (1963:16, 49) considers that the citations were attributed to Jesus later because the LXX was familiar to the writers. For criticisms against these two views, see Thomas 1976:205-14.

[550] Roberts (1888:111-44; here, 142) suggests, "the Greek translation of the LXX was the Bible of our Lord and His apostles." Argyle (1955b:92-3) suggests two points. (a) Mt 5:39-40 echoes Is 50:6-8 in the Septuagint (σιαγόνας … ῥαπίσματα … ἀπέστρεψα … κρινόμενός … ἀντιστήτω). (b) The OT quotations of Jesus's temptations (Mt 4:1-11; Lk4:1-13) which must have been derived from Jesus are similar to the LXX. In relation to OT citations by Jesus (i.e. Mk12:29-30/Mt22:37 and Mk10:19/Mt19:18-19/Lk18:20), Thomas (1976:213-4) suggests, "the original tradition for these citations in Greek was Septuagintal, which corresponds to the general Septuagintal nature of the citations attributed to Jesus." Richard Longenecker (1999:41-50) argues that the biblical quotations Jesus used are strongly based on the LXX, not on a Hebrew or Aramaic version, although even evangelists' quotations are dominantly Semitic. Interestingly, he (1999:50) raises a possibility that "in his use of the Old Testament, Jesus, who normally spoke Aramaic but could also speak Greek and Mishnaic Hebrew (at least to some extent), at times himself engaged in textual selection among the various Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek versions then current, and that some of the Septuagintal features in the text forms attributed to him actually are to be credited to him." Fitzmyer (1998:91) suggests, "It is not surprising that the quotations of the OT have ben drawn from a Greek translation, akin to the LXX." Brown (2000:243) assumes, "Sometimes the sayings given Jesus presupposes the LXX just where it differs from the Hebrew." He proposes three possibilities: (a) Jesus knew Greek (b) Nazareth rabbi explained the Hebrew Bible in Greek (3) The rabbi explained the Hebrew Bible out of more Hellenistic Targum. Dalman also insists that Jesus spoke Greek; see §1.3.2 and §3.2.4.

[551] Torrey 1941:47; Stendahl 1967:39-87, 169-82; Steyn 1995:232.

[552] Manson (1935:106) also mentions, "When the prophet spoke with authority, it was as the messenger of God: and the message which he had to deliver was properly introduced by the formula. When the scribe spoke authoritatively it was to declare what Scripture or tradition had to say.

(1971:36) also points out, "The only substantial analogy to ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν that can be produced is the messenger-formula 'Thus says the Lord', which is used by the prophets to show that their words are not their own wisdom, but a divine message." As a consequence of this, the authoritative usage on only the lips of Jesus is not "followed by any apostle or prophet of the early Church" (Hempel 1962:1.105).

In sum, Jesus used the אמן–formula with authority of the Lord and it was unique because Jesus coined the syntactic-semantic borrowing from the usage of the Septuagint. The אמן–formula was circulated in Aramaic-matrix speakers. Among Greek-matrix speakers, at the same time, two Greek forms were circulated; one is the ἀμήν–formula which was transliterated from אמן–formula and the other is ἀληθῶς or ἐπ' ἀληθείας which was translated from אמן–formula. There is evidence for three *amen* forms which circulated in P&RNE during and after Jesus's ministry. When the authors wrote their FGs, they deliberately preserved ἀμήν–formula as codeswitchings for their literary device. Accordingly, the Aramaic transliterated ἀμήν–formula called a Semitism is not always earlier tradition than its Greek translated equivalents (i.e. ἀληθῶς and ἐπ' ἀληθείας). And the ἀμήν–formula supports that JTrad is not unidirectionally transmitted from Aramaic-speaking Christian communities into Greek-speaking Christian communities.

8.3 Codeswitchings in the Gospel of Mark

Mark includes many Foreign embedded words. It has been said that there are plenty of Semitisms in the Gospel:[553] βοανηργές (3:17), ταλιθα κουμ (5:41), κορβᾶν (7:11), εφφαθα (7:34), Βαρτιμαῖος (10:46), ῥαββουνί (10:51), αββα (14:36), ελωι ελωι λεμα

When Jesus speaks with authority the formula is 'I say unto you'. It is as difficult to overestimate the significance of this distinction as it is easy to misunderstand it."

[553] Hengel (1985:46) mentions, "I do not know any other work in Greek which has as many Aramaic or Hebrew words and formulae in so narrow a space as does the second Gospel."

σαβαχθανι (15:34), etc. Scholars have taken these Semitic transliterated words in Mk at the level of semantics into account seriously. They have related them to the *ipsissima verba* of the historical Jesus and to the Marcan priority hypothesis. As mentioned before, this is because the appeal to Semitisms tends to result from two major assumptions: These are (1) that the Aramaic transliterated words are more original sayings by Jesus than the Greek translated equivalents[554] and (2) that ArmTrad is earlier tradition than GkTrad.[555] On the basis of the two assumptions, it has been considered that rich Semitisms of Mk at the level of Semantics support the Marcan priority hypothesis. Explaining ArmEmWords in Mk, Vermes (2000:235) posits:

> Mark's Gospel brings us nearer the Jesus of history than any other NT writing, and that Mark is the only evangelist who enables us to hear today an occasional and faint echo of what may have been the *ipsissima verba*, Jesus' own words in his own language.

The *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* has insisted that some ArmEmWords in Mk (e.g. ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα) originate from Hellenistic Christian communities so that these are secondary. The scholars still have the same presuppositions that Semitisms are considered as a criterion of originality (cf. §1.2).

However, the problem lies in the fact that the bilingual linguistic milieus of first-century Palestine and RNE have been largely disregarded. Once taken seriously, this bilingualism leads to another possibility: (1) Mark could have chosen intentionally to use Aramaic transliterated words as codeswitching rather than passively take over

---

[554] Taylor (1952:297) remarks, "The retention of the Aramaic words, absent in Mt and Lk, shows the greater originality of Mk."

[555] As cited before, Millard (2000:143) posits, "Their rarity and distribution, therefore, speak in favour of their origin in very early traditions."

translated/transliterated words from his source. This is so because the majority of Mark's audience (e.g. in Syria or Palestine) could have understood the Aramaic transliterated words. This implies that all Semitisms at the semantic level do not refer to earlier tradition. It seems that βοανηργές, ταλιθα κουμ, κορβᾶν, εφφαθα, Βαρτιμαῖος,[556] ῥαββουνί, αββα, and ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι are employed as codeswitchings by Mark. This is not the place to deal with each in detail. In terms of transmission of JTrad, αββα (§8.3.1) and ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα in the miracle stories (§8.3.2) will be discussed respectively.

8.3.1 Αββα ὁ πατήρ

It has widely been accepted that the ArmEmWord αββα is a Semitism, what is more, an *ipsissima verba Jesu*. It is striking that the transliterated Aramaic word called a Semitism is also found in Greek-speaking Gentile Christian communities (e.g. Rom 8:15;

---

[556] In the case of Βαρτιμαῖος, although it is generally known as a name, it seems that it is not the beggar's personal name. There are three reasons. (1) It is rare that Mark provides personal names in his narratives (Bultmann 1968:213; Dibelius 1934:52; Taylor 1952:446; Nineham 1963:28, 285; Evans 2001:129). (2) Βαρτιμαῖος placed in the midst of the double appositive expressions (ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου and τυφλὸς προσαίτης) is unusual (Bratcher & Nida 1961:338). (3) Mark reversed the order. The Aramaic word is transposed by its translation (Swete 1898:228; Rawlinson 1925:149; Taylor 1952:448; Cranfield 1959:344; Nineham 1963:285). It seems that Βαρτιμαῖος is employed as codeswitching [+MULTILINGUAL], [-PREDICTABLE], and [+INTENTIONAL]. In other words, ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου is a translated phrase whereas Βαρτιμαῖος is an Aramaic transliterated word, that is, repetition codeswitching (§8.1.5.2). One of the features of Marcan codeswitching is a bilingual repetition (e.g. αββα ὁ πατήρ §8.3.1). Another bilingual repetition is found at Acts 13:8 (Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος). It seems that Ἐλύμας is a Semitic transliterated word related to an Arabic word (i.e. *'alim*, which means learned, wise) and ὁ μάγος is its translated word (cf. Bruce 1952:256; Haenchen 1971:398-9 n.2; Barrett 1994:615; Witherington 1998:401). When a codeswitching as a bilingual repetition is used, the order may be reversed. This is because the writer intends to stress the word rather than to give interpretation of the Aramaic word. Later, it is probable that the Aramaic transliterated word in transmission was confused with a patronymic by analogy with Βαρθολομαῖος or Βαριωνᾶ (Bengel 1859:550; Swete 1898:228; Witherington 2001:291) and took its ending due to morphological adjustment. This episode is described in very detail. The precise details cause scholars to assume that the story reflects eyewitness testimony (Branscomb 1937:192; Rawlinson 1925:148; Taylor 1952:446-7; France 2002:422). Mark seems to intend to emphasize this story by using of codeswitching [EMPHASIS] and [VIVIDNESS]. Rawlinson (1949:148; cf. Taylor 1952:446) suggests that the reason this story is vividly described is that "the blind beggar publicly addressed our Lord by the Messianic title *Son of David* (his italic)." Cranfield (1959:344-5) also mentions, "it is remarkable that Jesus apparently did nothing to silence him – contrast viii.30." Rather, it seems that Mark intends to stress the messianic title in this narrative by means of codeswitching. Consequently, if Mark intends to emphasize this episode due to his appellation as prelude to the Entry, it produces counterevidence for Bousset's "Messianic Secret" (cf. Menzies 1901:202-3; Witherington 2001:291).

Gal 4:6). This has attracted scholars' special attention along with Μεσσίας (Jn1:41, 4:25) and μαράνα θά (1Cor16:22) in relation to the development of the christological term such as the "Son of God" and the directionality of transmission of JTrad from the Aramaic-speaking Christian community into Greek-speaking Christian communities.[557]

As to αββα ὁ πατήρ[558] two arguments have mainly been discussed; uniqueness and juxtaposition. First, whether or not the concept of "Father" is unique to Jesus has been debated. Jeremias (1965:9-30, 1967, 1971:61-8) suggests that the address to God as the Father is unique to Jesus and that αββα is *ipsissima vox Jesu*.[559] His view has been acclaimed among many scholars. On the other hand, some scholars have argued that addressing father to God is not unique to Jesus because it is found in other Jewish literature as well. Recently,

---

[557] Many scholars recognize the similarity between αββα and μαράνα θα in that Paul used the two transliterated terms to Greek-speaking Christian communities (Galatia, Rome, and Corinth) which are mainly composed of Greek-speaking Gentile Christians in terms of the development of christological titles; see Casey :1991:133; Hurtado 2003:110-1, 174.

[558] Concerning αββα ὁ πατήρ there have been complicated debates at the levels of phonetics, phonology, and morphology. However, codeswitching should be dealt with at the level of pragmatics rather than other linguistic levels. (1) Phonetically, regarding the discussion of a babbling sound of αββα Jeremias suggested that αββα was also used among adults, although he had regarded that αββα originated from the babbling of children's speech (1967:58-62). Concerning some scholars' criticisms against Jeremias's argument, Chilton (1993:153-4 n.7) refutes that Vermes misunderstands Jeremias's argument of "chatter of a small child." In fact, it seems that the phonetic debate is not essential point when Jeremias's argument is dealt with. (2) Concerning the morphological grammaticality of ὁ πατήρ: although Jeremias (1965:18) argues that ὁ πατήρ is an incorrect Greek usage, Fitzmyer (1985:19-20) persuasively enumerates the similar usages found in Classical Greek. And Mussies (1997:178 n.7) also suggests, "The term 'vocative' will denote not only vocatives in the proper sense like κύριε, but also nominatives and indeclinables used 'as vocative'..." Also see Moule 1959:32; Wilcox 1982:473. Mark also uses a nominative instead of a vocative in another place. In relation to translation of the dereliction cry from the cross (§7.4.3.1), Mk15:34 preserves a nominative (ὁ θεός; like the Septuatint) whereas Mt27:46 preserves a vocative (θεέ). (3) Morphologically, as to how *abbā* is formed, various opinions have been suggested; Lightfoot 1892:170 (emphatic vocative); Dalman 1909:192 (definite form); Strack-Billerbeck 1924:2.49 (determinierte form); Klausner 1928:332 (diminutive ending); Moule 1967:48 (definite form); Hahn 1969:307 (diminutive ending); Fitzmyer 1985 (emphatic state); Longenecker 1990:174 (emphatic form); Brown 1994:172 (emphatic state); Evans 2001:412 (vocative); France 2002:584 (emphatic vocative). It is generally admitted that αββα is an emphatic state of אַב with vocative force. However, other morphological explanations cannot be excluded because a transliterated spelling is not always one-to-one correspondence between Greek and Semitic sound system at the level of phonology in relation to transliteration. The transliterated spelling does not give decisive evidence; see §6.1. Since αββα is considered as a codeswitching, the transliterated form as a codeswitching may be free from grammaticality at the morpho-syntactic level; see §8.1.1. Nevertheless, pragmatically, αββα is emphatic state with vocative force, as will be discussed.

[559] Jeremias (1971:66) emphasizes, "We do not have a single example of God being addressed as 'Abbā in Judaism, but Jesus always addressed God in this way in his prayers." He adds, "It would have seemed disrespectful, indeed unthinkable to the sensibilities of Jesus' contemporaries to address God with his familiar word" (67). And he (1967:112) mentions, "the address itself is without question an incontestable characteristics of the *ipsissima vox Jesu*."

it seems that a consensus has almost been reached.[560] The address to God as "father" is distinctive of Jesus rather than unique to Jesus.[561] The distinction can be supported by three reasons. (1) Although the usage is found in other Jewish literature, it seems to be very scarce. Rather, this may contradict the possibility that the historical Jesus never used αββα when "the historical Jesus within Judaism" is taken into account (Charlesworth 1988:131-6; 1994:5-10). In the OT God is designated as "father" only eleven places in the OT whereas Jesus' address to God as father occurs around 170 times. This means that Jesus's usage is distinctive. (2) The αββα in prayer occurs in all five independent layers of the GTrads (e.g. Mk [3], Q [4], Special Lk [4], Special Mt [31], and Jn [100]).[562] Brown (1994:173-4) persuasively suggests that this multiple attestation implies that the usage is not invented by the authors of the FGs and may show "Jesus' consciousness of what he had received from God." (3) Jesus manifests a clear distinction between "my Father" and "your Father." Theissen & Merz (1998:526) persuasively suggest, "the distinction between 'my Father' and 'your Father' could indicate a special relationship of Jesus to God."[563] Consequently, the distinctive features of Jesus's

---

[560] Dunn 1975:22; 1989:27; Finkel 1981:152-8; Barr 1988:28-47; D'Angelo 1992b:151-6: Vermes 1983b:40-3; 1993:152-83; Thompson 2000:35-55; Evans 2001:412-3.

[561] Especially, Thompson 2000:28-34; Evans 2001:412: Davies & Allison 1988:1.602. Although Fitzmyer (1985:25-30) and Witherington (1990:216-8; also Chilton 1993:151-69; France 2002:584 n.17) defend Jeremias's view that the address to God as αββα is unique to Jesus contra Dunn, Barr, and Vermes, recent evidence from the DSS provides us with two usages of the address to God as Father (אבי 4Q372.1.6 and 4Q460.5.6). Also Dunn (1989:27) correctly points out that the concept of πατήρ in Judaism is found in the Wisd.14:3; Sir.23:1,4; 51:10; III Macc.6:3,8, although they are not Aramaic but Greek. These imply that the usage is not unique to Jesus. On the other hand, D'Angelo (1992a, 1992b) presents that αββα does not go back to Jesus. However, it seems that her arguments are based on slight foundation but have found little support; for persuasive criticism against D'Angelo's view, see Thompson 2000:23-5, 58-71. One point can be added to Thompson's criticism; D'Angelo's biggest drawback is that she takes a monolingual approach to first-century Christian communities, as will be discussed. Incidentally, some scholars present that αββα ὁ πατήρ originated from Greek-speaking Christian communities not from Jesus because there was no witness to hear αββα in Gethsemane. Conzelmann (1969:103) considers αββα as a community construction because, "No one could have heard the prayer." Fowler (1991:218) also describes, "Sleep had closed their eyes and ears and made them blind, deaf, and unknowing." However, Brown's reply to the skepticism is to the point. He (1994:174) suggests, "If one wishes to answer this 'village atheist' objection on its own low level, one can argue that perhaps the disciples were still awake when Jesus prayed about the hour/cup"; cf. Witherington 1990:219.

[562] Mk (4), Lk (15), Mt (42), and Jn (109) in all (Fitzmyer 1985:32).

[563] Thompson (2001:48) summarizes, "although address to God as 'father' is not unique in early Judaism, the regular recurrence of both 'my father' and 'our father' in prayer, parables and sayings of the Jesus tradition does show that it is featured more centrally than in either the Old Testament or the literature of Second Temple Judaism."

usage seem to betray his self-understanding.[564] Hence, it can be said that αββα is distinctive of Jesus with implication of indirect Christology.

Second, the juxtaposition of the transliterated form (αββα) and the translated form (ὁ πατήρ) has raised questions. It is striking that αββα stands alone at Mk14:36 because of three reasons: (1) the אב–words modified by pronominal suffixes or articles were translated 170 times in the Gospels. The αββα is the only one transliterated exception. (2) Mark renders אב-words into πατήρ-words (Mk8:38, 11:25, 11:26 (variants), 13:32, 14:36). Matthew and Luke use the good Greek vocative (πάτερ) in the parallel passages of the SynGs (πάτερ μου [אבי Mt26:39] and πάτερ [אבא Lk22:42]) and the vocative occurs 24 times in the three Gospels.[565] (3) The same fashion in the prayer of the Lord is found at Mt11:26/Lk10:21 (ὁ πατήρ). However, αββα never recurs in the FGs. Rather, the occurrence of αββα at Mk14:36 in the Gospels is unexpected.[566] In relation to this, although some scholars regard αββα as borrowing or interference,[567] the transliterated term seems to be a codeswitching because of its features [+MULTILINGUAL] and [-PREDICTABLE]. Concerning the juxtaposition of the αββα ὁ πατήρ, Swete (1898:324) raises three possibilities; (1) an interpretative note due to the Evangelist or his source; (2) a part of the original prayer; and (3) a formula familiar to the bilingual Palestinian Church. Sociolinguistically speaking, the three views can be restated: (1) Mark or his community where he got his source was monolingual. (2) Jesus

---

[564] Jeremias 1971:61-8; Kümmel 1973:40; Fitzmyer 1985:28-38; Kim 1983:74-5; Dunn 1975:21-6; 1989:26-9, 33-8; Witherington 1990:215-211. Taking a further step, some scholars suggest that αββα is a significant key word to grasp Jesus's understanding of God; Schillebeeckx 1979:256-71; Hamerton-Kelly 1979, 1981; Thompson 2000.

[565] In all twenty-four instances in the FGs (Mt6:9, 11:25, 26:39. 42; Lk10:21, 11:2, 15:12, 18, 21, 16:24, 27, 30, 22:42, 23:34, 46; Jn11:41, 12:27, 28, 17:1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25).

[566] Ross (1990:43) argues that Jesus who was a bilingual taught two versions of the Lord's prayer in Greek and Aramaic because "If it had been only in Aramaic, the word Abba would have been preserved [in the Lord's prayer]." However, the authors of the FGs did not preserve *abba* but translated it all the times only except Mk 14:36. Ross takes the unexpected case as his criterion.

[567] McCasland (1953:90) regards αββα as a borrowing and presents, "Abba had only a short life as a name for God in Greek. After Paul and Mark it was not to reappear in the Greek New Testament." Black (1995:137) also notes that αββα is a borrowing. Even Silva (1975:104; also 1983:86) confuses interference with borrowing and considers αββα as borrowing. On the other hand. Casey (1998:99) thinks of the Aramaic transliterated words of the Second Gospel as interference. However, there is a clear distinction between borrowing, interference, and codeswitching depending on their features, as already noted (§8.1.1).

used ὁ πατήρ as a codeswitching. (3) The earliest Jerusalem community that used αββα ὁ πατήρ was bilingual.

(1) On the basis of monolingual approach to first-century Christian communities, many scholars assume that the translated form ὁ πατήρ is added in order for Greek-speaking Christians to understand the meaning of the foreign word αββα. This monolingual presupposition is clearly expressed by Stanton. He (1995:152-3; cf. 2002:9) stresses, "the Aramaic word Abba is used, and then for the benefit of Greek speakers translated immediately as 'Father'. ... Paul was still using Abba when writing to Greek-speaking Christians who did not know a word of Aramaic!"[568] A strictly monolingual approach leads to another assumption that the αββα of Aramaic-speaking Christian communities has been taken over by Greek-speaking Christian communities (e.g. Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6).[569] Their monolingual approaches are laid on the presupposition that JTrad is unidirectionally transmitted from Aramaic into Greek.

However, the linguistic milieus of first-century P&RNE were bilingual, as have already suggested (chapters 3 and 4). There were many Jewish Christians in Galatia and Rome, although the number of Gentile Christians is for certain the majority. Many Jewish Christians in Galatian and Roman Christian communities might have been bilingual in Greek and Aramaic.[570] Furthermore, apart from their bilinguality, it is not persuasive that the simple

---

[568] Also Bengel 1859:1.567; McCasland 1953:81; Anderson 1976:319; Fitzmyer 1985:19, 31; D'Angelo 1992a: 615; Moloney 2002:293. Bultmann considers ArmEmWords as foreign incomprehensive words (§1.2.2; cf. 8.3.2). Aune (*ANRW* II.23.2.1550) mentions, "*abba* is a palindrome of a foreign (Aramaic) word which would have been incomprehensible to Gentile Roman Christians (or Galatian Christians) were it not for the fact that the utterance is interpretation." In this respect, he thinks of *abba* as *voces magicae*.

[569] Burton 1921:224; Bornkamm 1960:128; Betz 1979:211; Dunn 1993:221; D'Angelo 1992a:615; Brown 1994:175. It is insightful that Schillebeeckx (1979:99) proposes, "various Aramaisms (Hebraisms) in the New Testament Greek are no proof at all of authenticity (closeness to Jesus), or even, *per se*, of the early origin of a JTrad. Of itself it does not even lead us to an early Aramaic-speaking congregation, but rather to bilingual, Hellenistic-Jewish Christians who ... used a lot of Aramaic constructions in their Greek." However, he would have done better he had taken bilingualism of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem into account seriously.

[570] There might have been many Diaspora Jews in Rome and Galatia who were bilinguals because of successive immigration, periodic connection with Jerusalem, and learning Aramaic in Jerusalem (cf. §4.1). For Aramaic-matrix Roman Jews, see §4.1.2. And linguistic competence of Gentile immigrants who came from RNE in Rome and Galatia is the similar case with that of Jewish

word which is one of the most elementary words of family language, αββα, was difficult for Christian listeners to understand so that Paul and Mark kindly added the translated form to the transliterated form. Most regions of first-century Roman Empire were bilingual. This means that the codeswitching itself is familiar to residents of bilingual regions of first-century Roman Empire. If some listeners did not know the meaning of αββα at all, they quickly could have grasped the meaning. Cranfield (2001:400) convincingly points out, "It is perhaps rather more likely that ὁ πατήρ was added for the sake of emphasis than that it was added as an explanation which might be necessary for some in the Roman church." Language change must have attracted listeners' attention. Αββα (Mk14:36, Gal4:6, and Rom8:15) as a codeswitching functions as [EMPHASIS]. Abba's relationship to liturgy also shows [SOLIDARITY].

(2) It is possible that when Jesus prayed to God or delivered his messages, he could have used ὁ πατήρ as a codeswitching to express his heart in earnest or to emphasize his message.[571] The basic family word, ὁ πατήρ, must have been known to the residents in first-century bilingual Palestine. The bilingual repetition could be recognized as emphasis. The πατήρ was not an unfamiliar term to first-century bilingual Palestinians (cf. Lieberman 1965:15-67). Jesus may have used ὁ πατήρ as a codeswitching. If Jesus employed αββα along with ὁ πατήρ, the bilingual repetition might have been preserved and used by the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem as well as Greek-matrix Christian communities (e.g. Galatia and Rome).

(3) The other possibility is that although Jesus addressed to God as only אבא, both

---

immigrants.

[571] Sanday & Headlam (1902:203) posit that Jesus was familiar to the two languages and concentrated into "this word of all words such a depth of meaning." So "[Jesus] found Himself impelled spontaneously to repeat the word ..." Plummer (1915:176) suggests, "it is not improbable that in the opening address He used both [Aramaic and Greek]. Blunt (1929:253) mentions, "Our Lord may, however, have used both words; He probably, like most Jews, was to some extent bilingual." Taylor (1952:553) presents that αββα ὁ πατήρ is a primitive liturgical formula in a bilingual Church or the usage of Jesus Himself. However, some scholars disagree with this view: Lagrange 1947:388; Holleran 1973:24-6; Brown 1994:175.

the transliterated form and the translated form circulated in the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem. The uniform of the bilingual repetition (αββα ὁ πατήρ) in the different audiences (the GofMk, Galatians, and Romans) implies that the bilingual earliest Christian community have already used the repetition (αββα ὁ πατήρ) in relation to their liturgical service[572] to stress Jesus's message of the concept of God of "father" [VIVIDNESS], [EMPHASIS], and [SOLIDARITY].

The bilingual repetition occurs four times in the Revelation of John; 1:7 (ναί, ἀμήν), 9:11 (Ἀβαδδών Ἀπολλύων), and 12:9, 20:2 (Διάβολος Σατανᾶς). And *'Erubin* 53b provides us with another instance of the bilingual repetition of αββα ὁ πατήρ.[573] It is intriguing that when a woman entreats a judge, she calls him מרי כירי. The second transliterated word κύριε is expressed as a Greek equivalent to "my Lord (מרי). This indicates two interesting points. (a) In the case of αββα ὁ πατήρ in the Greek-matrix context, ὁ πατήρ is correctly used at the morphosyntactic level, although the transliterated form (i.e. αββα) has been under dispute. The מרי כירי in the Semitic-matrix context indicates that מרי is correctly employed at the morphosyntactic level, whereas the pronominal ending of כירי is omitted. This implies that transliterated form is more or less free from morphosyntactic rules, as mentioned above (§8.1.4). In other words, the morphosyntax of the transliterated form (i.e. αββα) should be decided by that of the translated form (i.e. ὁ πατήρ). Consequently, it seems that αββα should be considered as emphatic state which is same with ὁ πατήρ. (b) מרי כירי shows bilingual repetition. It seems that decision of a codeswitched word depends on the

---

[572] Pryke (1978:60) suggests, "Its origin is liturgical, and it is obviously an explanatory comment reflecting a bilingual situation..." Betz (1979:211) mentions, "The doubling of the invocation 'Father' seems to reflect the bilingual character of the early church." Zeller (1981:123) proposes, "The liturgical addresses '*abba*', *ho patēr* prove only that 'Abba' was used in the bilingual communities of Palestine." Mann (1986:590) notes, "this is a liturgical phrase in a bilingual community." Longenecker (1990:174) delineates, "The use of both ἀββᾶ and πατήρ reflects the bilingual character of the early church."

[573] Illustrating מרי כירי, Schöttgen (1733:1.252) considers that Jesus used the bilingual repetition; Lightfoot (1892:169) agrees with his view whereas Lagrange (1947:388; followed by Moule 1967:49-50 n.15 and by Holleran 1973:24-6) disagrees with his position. However, what is certain is that the phrase indicates the possibility that the bilingual repetition was used.

primary language by which the court used. מרי כירי proves that the use of the bilingual repetition of αββα ὁ πατήρ could deliberately be employed in the bilingual communities. The repetition as a codeswitching functions as a literary device to emphasize earnest and respectful request.[574] Romaine (1995:162) notes, "code-switches sometimes reiterate what has just been said. Their function is to clarify or emphasise a message." Every instance of αββα ὁ πατήρ in the NT literature reflects an earnest and respectful address to God as a father.

When the frequency of the αββα ὁ πατήρ increases in Christian liturgy, it is likely that it might have been used as a liturgical nonce borrowing in first-century Christian community in Jerusalem.[575] The liturgical borrowing was circulated even among Greek-matrix Christian communities. When Mark writes his gospel, he chooses αββα ὁ πατήρ as repetition codeswitching at Mk14:36 in an unexpected way with his intention [VIVIDNESS], [EMPHASIS], and [SOLIDARITY], as Paul does in Rom8:15 and Gal4:6.[576] What Mark switches Greek into Aramaic at Mk14:36 is a matter of his language choice rather than his source. In other words, we cannot decide whether or not he intended to insert the transliterated word after Mark read Matthew and/or Luke. What is evident is that although he could employ the translated term (i.e. πατήρ–words) at Mk14:36, as Matthew and Luke did and as Mark himself did elsewhere, he has just switched his language code into the transliterated term (i.e. αββα) at the critical scene of Jesus's prayer at Gethsemane. In terms

---

[574] Lightfoot (1892:169) suggests that the coexistence of αββα ὁ πατήρ indicates "the natural mode of emphasizing by repetition of the same idea in different forms." Plummer (1915:176) mentions, "Repetition, whether in one language or two is the outcome of strong feeling." Burton (1921:224) presents, "The repetition of the idea in Aramaic and Greek form gives added solemnity to the expression." Illustrating the usages of Latin, Greek, NT and OT instances, Mussies (1997:175-89) suggests that monolingual double appellative conveys emotional attitude of speakers.

[575] Moule (1961:77) suggests, "If what has been said about Abba is true, it is a curious fact that this, the most intimate of all prayer-words, should by its very transplantation into the setting of an alien language, Greek, have been on the way to becoming a crystallized 'liturgical formula'." Martin (1964:35) suggests, "'Abba was current coin in the early Churches as a title for God of special significance and depth of meaning."

[576] "Frequency" (i.e. [PREDICTABLE]) makes a distinction between borrowing and codeswitching (§8.1.1). If αββα is a borrowing, Mark and Paul will use αββα in every case in their literature. However, that the transliterated term occurs once respectively shows that αββα is a codeswitching not a borrowing. Nevertheless, αββα ὁ πατήρ as a prayer language could have been used as a borrowing in Christian services of first-century Palestine and Roman empire.

of transmission of the ArmEmWord, when translators are faced with this transliterated term, it is hard for them to decide whether he translates or transliterates it. It is interesting that Syriac translators took up different positions. The Old Syriac dropped αββα ("My father"). The Curetonian does not have this verse. The Peshitta translates αββα into Father ("Father, my Father") at Mk14:36 but "Abba, our Father" at Rom8:15 and Gal 4:6. The Philoxenian-Harclean renders αββα into ("Abba, that is, Father").[577] In similar, Mark has the propensity to select bilingual repetition whereas Matthew and Luke employ the different translated vocatives (πάτερ μου and πάτερ). Hence, *abba*, the codeswitched and transliterated word which is selected by Mark, does not provide us with any information that the Aramaic transliterated word is earlier than the translated word in other SynGs (Mt and Lk).

Accordingly, αββα is not transmitted from Aramaic-speaking Christian community in Jerusalem into Greek-speaking Gentile Christian communities in a unidirectional way. This is because the Jerusalem church was a bilingual community. And it seems that Christian communities in Galatia and Rome were bilingual enough to know the simple and fundamental word (i.e. αββα), which means that the translated form was not required. Bilingualism of the first-century Christian church in Jerusalem implies that αββα–words as Semitisms are not earlier sayings by Jesus than πατήρ–words. Therefore, a transliterated word called a Semitism always does not refer to earlier tradition than a translated word.[578]

8.3.2 Ταλιθα κουμ and εφφαθα in the Miracle Stories

Mark preserves two Semitic transliterated words, Ταλιθα κουμ (5:41) and Εφφαθα (7:34) in miracle stories about Jesus. The two ArmEmWords have been discussed by two

---

[577] For more information of other versions, see McCasland 1953:80-1.

[578] Riley (1989:169-70) interestingly suggests, "Mk adds the original Abba to Father (αββα ὁ πατήρ), consistently with his fondness for introducing Aramaic words with their translation. a fondness which does not imply his priority."

points (i.e. their spellings and provenances). First, in terms of their spellings, although many scholars have taken morphosyntactic approach to the transliterated words, the morphosyntactic analysis may not provide evidence enough to decide the Aramaic original terms. Regarding the morpheme of ταλιθα κουμ, some manuscripts read masculine imperative (κουμ); others feminine imperative (κουμι). Morphosyntactically, it has been said that κουμι might be correct because ταλιθα is feminine. This means that what κουμ survives in the oldest manuscripts implies that the original reading (κουμ) was replaced by κουμι in some manuscripts (*lectio difficilior*).

Recently, the variants have been explained by dialectal difference rather than scribal error. Vermes (1983a:212 n.64) considers κουμ as Galilean dialect. Cranfield (1959:190; cf. Johnson 1972:109-10) suggests that κουμ may be the Mesopotamian morpheme and κουμι is Palestinian one. Taking a further step, Johnson (1972:109-10) presents that the Palestinian feminine ending ι is silent. Wilcox (1982:473) proposes, "Perhaps the variants should be explained in terms of the pronunciation of the text (or possibly the influence of the Syriac) rather than as transcriptional errors."[579] Williams (2004b:1-2) also proposes, "*Qumi* was the earlier form and the one preferred in most dialects, while the elision of the ι is only found in the eastern dialects of Aramaic, such as Babylonian Jewish Aramaic and Syriac." Linguistically speaking, Fromkin & Rodman (1998:304) explain, "The relationship between the phonemic representation of words and sentences and the phonetic representation (the pronunciation of these words and sentences) is determined by phonological rules."[580] It can be that the variants were represented in the process of a phonological rule that the final ending ι is elision (§7.1). Consequently, whether it is dialect or phonological representation (i.e. muted case ending), the two phonological variants of

---

[579] Wilcox (1983:473 n.25) adduces this phonological phenomenon by Rabbinic Hebrew that a masculine verb is used instead of its feminine.

[580] For basic concepts of phonology, see Hyman 1975:1-15; Carr 1993:13-32; see chapter 7. For phonological rules, see §7.1.2.

feminine imperative (κουμ and κουμι) among Palestinian Jews are acceptable and normal.

In the case of εφφαθα, there has been under dispute whether it was transliterated from Aramaic or Hebrew. It is because it should be transliterated into εθφεθα or εθφεθθα.[581] Scholars have considered εφφαθα as assimilation so that it is an Aramaic term (cf. §7.1).[582] However, based on his morphological analysis, Rabinowitz (1962:229-38; 1971:151-6) argues that εφφαθα is a Hebrew *niph'al* singular imperative, not an Aramaic imperative. It is (1) because the Hebrew spelling corresponds to Greek transliterated spelling and is closer to Hebrew imperative than Aramaic imperative. (2) There is no linguistic evidence for the assimilation of *–t* to *–p* in the reflexive/passive stems of initial *–p* verbs in western Aramaic languages. This led him to assume that Jesus spoke Hebrew. Rabinowitz suggests that he sometimes spoke Aramaic (e.g. ταλιθα κουμ), which had been preserved in Hebrew text and was transliterated into Greek. However, he disregards that phonological correspondence do not function in a one-to-one relationship. In this regard, Emerton (1967:427-31) refutes Rabinowitz' opinion. The sound ת is sometimes assimilated to פ in Palestinian Aramaic texts. He persuasively suggests, "The inconsistency of usage in Palestinian Aramaic texts is not, therefore, necessarily evidence that one of the variant forms is not genuinely Palestinian." As a matter fact, in the case of a transliterated word a morphosyntactic approach does not offer decisive evidence because transliteration frequently entails variants, as mentioned before (chapter 7). Rather, morphosyntactic analysis of εφφαθα should depend on pragmatic analysis of the ArmEmWords.

As to the provenance of the two Aramaic embedded sentences, the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* suggests that the ArmEmWords in the miracle stories are not Semitisms because they originated from Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian churches.

---

[581] Εφφαθα has its vowel variants; Εφφεθα (D, $\aleph^c$), followed by Latin versions. Syriac versions (Sinaitic and Peshitta) omit the explanatory phrase.

[582] Swete 1898:152: Torrey (1933:301) explains that assimilation is due to euphonic improvement (§7.1.3).

Citing ῥῆσις βαρβαρική (Lucian, *Philopseudes* 9), Bultmann suggests that the Markan Jesus employs "wonder-working words" in a foreign language unknown to readers such as ταλιθα κουμ (5:41) and Εφφαθα (7:34)[583] in relation to Greek magical papyri.[584] Bultmann (1961:50; cf. 1968:240) suggests, "these miracle stories do not belong to the oldest strata of tradition, but, at least in their present form, were elaborated in Hellenistic Christianity."[585] Smith (1978:95) also states that ArmEmWords in Mk are similar to Greek magical papyri and that "talitha koum also circulated without translation as a magical formula" (cf. Acts9:36-8). As to the purpose of preservation of the ArmEmWords, Aune (1980:1535) suggests, "these formulas were probably preserved for the purpose of guiding Christian thaumaturges in exorcistic and healing activities.[586] In early Christianity, therefore, these Aramaic phrases may have functioned as magic formulas.[587] Consequently, their assumptions can be summarized into three parts: (1) the Markan Jesus uttered gibberish as a magical healer. (2) The ArmEmWords are unintelligible words to the audience of Jesus and Mk. (3) Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian community employed the Aramaic terms (i.e. codeswitchings) as magic formulas.

However, (1) according to speech act theory, ORDER-verbs in a speech entail a listener's understanding what a speaker utters.[588] This means that when Jesus orders (i.e.

---

[583] Bultmann & Kundsin 1934:38; Bultmann 1961:49; 1968: 222-3, 240.

[584] For Greek magical papyri, see Betz 1986; 1991:244-59. Concerning bilingual magical papyri in Demotic and Greek Johnson (1986:lv) points out, "Most have passages in Greek as well as in Demotic, and most have words glossed into Old Coptic...; some contain passages written in the earlier Egyptian hieratic script or words written in a special 'cipher' script, which would have been an effective secret code to a Greek reader but would have been deciphered fairly simply by an Egyptian."

[585] Also Dibelius 1934:84; Lohmeyer 1951:107; Burkill 1963:56-7; Fuller 1963:55; Nineham 1963:162; Hull 1974:84-6; Anderson 1976:156; Smith 1978:95; Aune 1980:1535; Fowler 1991:108. These scholars have perceived the similar concept of codeswitching.

[586] It is interesting that Origen (*C. Cels.* 65) remarks that if spells and incantations are translated into another language, their power will be lost.

[587] Nineham (1963:162; also Burkill 1963:57; Mussies 1984:430) assumes that Greek-speaking Christians "may well have felt it important to preserve the wonder-working words in their original – and to them foreign – form (cf. 7:34)."

[588] "Speech act theory" is a branch of Pragmatics and can be defined as "analysis of the way meanings and acts are linguistically communicated" (Schiffrin 1994:57). Distinguishing performatives from constatives, Austin (1962) suggests that there are three performative utterances; locutionary act (the production of sounds and words with meanings), illocutionary act (the issuing of an utterance with conventional communicative force achieved "in saying"), and perlocutionary act (the actual

ταλιθα κουμ or εφφαθα) he presupposes that the listeners understand what he utters. If Jesus uttered "incomprehensive foreign words" as ORDER, his ORDER might have misfired. The pragmatic reason that Jesus spoke Aramaic to them is that the Aramaic was the language they could understand.[589]

(2) As mentioned above, some scholars including the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* assume that the ArmEmWords were unknown to Greek-speaking readers. Others presume that the translated forms are provided for Greek-speaking Gentiles.[590] Unfortunately, both approaches are based on monolingualism. When the Aramaic words were present in the Greek text, the Greek-matrix Christians could have perceived the meanings of ArmEmWords by the context of the passage, their bilingual competence in Aramaic and Greek, or Aramaic-matrix Christians in the same communities. Furthermore, although Greek-speaking Christians do not know Aramaic at all, they could have known the meanings because of repeated reading of the texts. The Latin term *pater noster* is employed among English-speaking Christians. Those who do not know Latin can recite *pater noster* because they have been repeatedly heard. In a sense, it seems that reading the Gospels is like watching the film, *The Passion of the Christ* in that audience knows the story of the film before watching it. It is noteworthy to mention Gamble's argument (2004:38) that when liturgical texts are read over and over, they hold in esteem. He (2004:38) suggests, "the role of liturgical reading lies in its

---

effect achieved "by saying"). The illocutionary act includes ORDER, ASSERTION, SUGGESTION, PROMISE, etc. Searle (1969:62-71) presents that four felicity conditions make communication successful; propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential conditions. Seale (1969:66) analyzes ORDER-verb as follows: (1) Propositional content: Future act A of H. (2) Preparatory condition: (a) H is able to do A. S believes H is able to do A. (b) It is not obvious to both S and H that H will do A in the normal course of events of his own accord. (c) S must be in a position of authority over H. (3) Sincerity condition: S wants H to do A. (4) Essential condition: Counts as an attempt to get H to do A. The felicity conditions of ORDER-verbs imply that if Jesus utters incomprehensive foreign words to listeners, he violates the conditions of ORDER. For publications to apply speech act theory to the NT Studies, see Botha 1991:63.

[589] In terms of ταλιθα κουμ, Painter 1997:94; Witherington 2001:190; France 2002:240. As to εφφαθα, Taylor 1952:355; Cranfield 1959:190; Hooker 1981:150); Hurtado 1983:87; cf. 120; Hengel 1985:46; Witherington 2001:234 Also see Aichele (1996:60-1) summarizes the views of some scholars well.

[590] Rawlinson 1925:71; Taylor 1952:296; Cole1989:165; Anderson 1976:156; cf. n.14; Witherington 2001:190

ability to remind rather than to instruct."[591] Gamble (2004:38) puts forward:

> The practical effect of the liturgical reading of scripture in the early church was therefore not, in the first place, to provide information, but to shape and re-enforce the self-understanding of Christian congregations.

Mk was repeatedly recited so that the audience could have known the ArmEmWords.

(3) The two miracle stories about Jesus could have been circulated both in Greek and in Aramaic during and after Jesus's ministry. Although Mark could employ the translated words as Matthew and Luke do,[592] he intentionally chose to use Aramaic transliterated words as codeswitchings in order to deliver more vivid description of the miracle stories. The two ArmEmWords in the miracle stories can be analyzed like [+MULTILINGUAL], [-ADAPTABLE], [-PREDICTABLE], and [+INTENTIONAL]. France (2002:240; cf. Montefiore 1968:1.114) persuasively suggests that Mark preserves the Aramaic transliterated words for vivid recreation of the scene. It is because Mark's use of the ArmEmWords is derived from Petrine remembrance (Witherington 2002:190). Cranfield (1959:190) suggests, "the original words were remembered and valued as being the actual words used by Jesus on a memorable occasion."[593]

Bilingualism of first-century Palestine and RNE denies the temporal priority of ArmTrad over GkTrad. Sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus were circulated in Aramaic

---

[591] As Gamble points out, the literal meaning of ἀνάγνωσις is "a knowing again," "reminding." Furthermore, "it may be (although the matter continues to be disputed) that the term *religio* derives form *relegere*, 'to reread'. This was Cicero's view, though it was opposed by Lucretius and later by Lactantius, both of who prefer to derive *religio* from religare, 'to rebind' or 'to reconnect'." Cf. Griffiths 1999:43-4.

[592] It seems that the two translated forms (i.e. τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε and διανοίχθητι) in Mk (5:41 and 7:34) were added by copyists later.

[593] Menzies (1901:159) also suggests, "Mark is rich both in details of Jesus' methods of cure and in words descriptive of his moods and gestures; and this sigh can be understood in either way." Cranfield (1959:190) mentions, "The explanation is rather that the original words were remembered and valued as being the actual words used by Jesus on a memorable occasion."

and in Greek during and after Jesus's ministry in Judaeo-Palestine. And they were transmitted into Hellenistic regions in Aramaic as well as in Greek. Most Jewish residents in Antioch, Jerusalem, and Rome where Mk could be written could have been bilinguals. Dealing with JTrads in Aramaic and in Greek Mark deliberately uses Aramaic transliterated words as codeswitchings in his GkGospel. This means that the ArmEmWords do not prove temporal priority over Greek translated words. The ArmTrads are not earlier than GkTrads. Mark as a creative author of the GofMk employs them as codeswitching to stress his story for pragmatic function. Furthermore, the abundant Semitisms at the level of Semantics do not imply that Mk is earlier than the other SynGs because the semantic Semitisms do not have temporal priority. Rather, the occurrences of the Aramaic transliterated terms depend on authors' literary device.[594] The authors of the Gospels are not fettered by the sources but use the sources according to their intention. Nevertheless, Mark intended to deliver the original sayings by Jesus in Aramaic by use of codeswitchings which had already been known to most readers. Accordingly, the Semitisms at the level of Semantics in Mark do not support the unidirectionality hypothesis of transmission of J&GTrads.

8.4 Codeswitchings in the Gospel of Luke and Acts

Luke does not try to preserve ArmEmWords in the parallel passages where Mark employs.[595] Instead, Luke is very sensitive to language change (Cadbury 1958:226; *passim*). Luke notes that Lycaonians change their language code; they shout in Lycaonian whereas they accosted to Paul and Barnabas in Greek at Acts 14:11 (§4.1.1). He kindly explains which language the speaker uses (Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14). When the language was different

---

[594] Mark could use the ArmEmWords as literary device because Mark knew that the two other Synoptists did not use ArmEmWords. Mark was not the twelve disciple of Jesus, which forced Mark to use ArmEmWords in order to show his knowledge of the historical Jesus through Peter.

[595] Millard (2000:149) mentions, "Luke's preference for Greek words may accord with his style."

from the language the audience expected, Luke gives notice of audience's response that they were amazed at language change (Acts 2:6, 7, 12; 21:37; 22:2). Moreover, Luke changes the spellings of personal and place names from Greek to SemSpels in order to stress his intentions in his narrative flow.[596] The pronouncing differences of the spellings must have been heard remarkably when the GofLk was performed orally. Our procedure will be in three steps. (1) Luke changes language from common language to stylish language or from one language to another (§8.4.1). He changes linguistic codes of proper nouns; (2) personal names from Greek to SemSpels (§8.4.2) and (3) place names from Greek to SemSpels (§8.4.3).

8.4.1 Language Change

In terms of language change Luke uses two types of codeswitchings. First, he uses stylistic change in one language. Luke sometimes changes his manner of writing when he directly wants to cite words of Paul or Jesus in Acts. When Paul converses with a person of high social status, Luke uses elegant Greek style as mark of educated persons. It is well-known that Luke uses optative with ἄν in conversations with an Ethiopian eunuch (8:31), Epicurean and Stoic philosophers (17:18), and Agrippa (26:29).[597] For another instance, Luke employs stylistic Greek (εἰ ἔξεστίν μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σέ) to catch the Roman tribune's attention (Acts21:37). It seems that the reason Luke uses direct discourse in Acts is

---

[596] Wifstrand (2005) considers that Luke *intentionally* uses Semitisms in Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, which means that he uses his Semitisms as his literary devise. Illustrating Lystra (Acts14:8-9) and Jerusalem (Acts22:2) as bilingual areas Munck (1967:xxvii) also mentions, "Luke is aware of such semitisms but is not overly anxious to use them…It does seem peculiar, however, that Luke should use semitisms-they must be considered, therefore, as deliberate additions to the style of his work." Concerning syntactic change, Aejmelaeus (1993:34) also suggests, "A skillful imitator [Luke] could even utilize a small feature like this to give solemn, Septuagintal colouring to his language."

[597] A number of scholars have paid attention to Luke's change of Greek style. Haenchen (1971:311) mentions, "Luke makes this high official (a finance minister!) speak in a very educated fashion." Witherington (1998:197) notes, "Luke is quite capable of altering the style of the Greek to suit the speaker and occasion." Also see Bengel 1859:2.590; *BDF* §385; Radermacher 1911:128;

that Theophilus, his first reader, is a literate man of high social status.

Second, as to language change from one language to another, Luke uses codeswitchings when Paul defends himself from Jews. Paul spoke Greek to the Roman captain whereas he addressed the crowd in Aramaic (Acts21:37-22:2). [598] These codeswitchings imply Paul's intention. Speaking Greek to the Roman tribune makes him focus his attention on Paul. When Paul spoke elegant Greek, the tribune was astonished. This is because his prisoner spoke stylish Greek that the Roman tribune might have learned. On the other hand, when the Jews heard Aramaic, they became quieter. Their surprise means that the audience expected him to speak Greek.[599] Paul was accused of the charge that he taught all the Jews who were among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or to observe the customs. Paul seems to intend that speaking Aramaic attracts his Jewish audience's attention and makes them reconsider Paul's identity[600] because speaking a language is indexical[601] of the speaker's identity (§3.2.3),[602] as

---

Knox 1944:16-8; Barrett 1994:1.428.

[598] It has generally been accepted that the Hebrew at Acts21:40 refers to Aramaic like Jn5:2, 19:13, 17, 20, Acts 22:2, 26:14. For more information of the interplay of Hebrew and Aramaic and confusion in contemporary references of the two languages, see Schürer 2.20-28, 60-80; Strack & Billerbeck 1924:2.444.

[599] Some scholars have observed that Paul's codeswitching was intentional. Sevenster (1968:25) states, "faced with a crowd that was inclined to believe in such an accusation, it was highly expedient that he emphasized the fact that he was a Jew." Fitzmyer (1998:704) notes, "Jews of Jerusalem are surprised that a diaspora Jew would address them, not in Greek, but in Aramaic." The mob of the people arrested Paul and his colleague because Diaspora Jews in the Temple saw Paul to have preached Diaspora Jews and found him bring Greeks into the temple (21:28). It seems that the audience (i.e. both Diaspora and Palestinian Jews) considered Paul as a Greek-speaking Jew.

[600] This episode implies three points. (1) The captain's surprise suggests that a Jew in Jerusalem usually speaks Aramaic. However, when he speaks Greek, it caught his attention. (2) It is thought that Diaspora Jews usually spoke Greek as their matrix language. (3) The fact that Jews surprised implies that Aramaic was closely related to their national identity.

[601] For the relationship between codeswitching and indexicality, see Myers-Scotton 1993:86-90. She illustrates the indexicality of speaking English in Africa as a language power.

[602] The term Ἑλληνισταί refers to Greek-matrix Christians whereas its counterpart is Aramaic-matrix Christians (§5.2). The Ἑβραῖοι is used only once in Acts 6:1 but it occurs again (Phil.3:5; 2Cor.11:22) when Paul explains his identity to Gentile churches (Hengel 1992:36). Paul presents his credentials list for his apostleship (Phil3:4-5). Of various categories to show his identity (e.g. circumcision, race, tribe, Hebrew, and law) the meaning of "a Hebrew born of Hebrews" has called into question. A number of scholars consider "a Hebrew born of Hebrews" as "one of those who are Aramaic-speakers." Sterling (2001:274) appropriately points out, "the use of Aramaic seems to have been a point of pride for some first-century Jews; at least Saul of Tarsus thought that being a 'Hebrew of the Hebrew' was worthy of inclusion in a credentials list." In other words, Paul boasts about his linguistic competence of Aramaic. 2Cor.11:22-3 also enumerates his four credentials: one of Hebrews, one of Israelites, one of descendants of Abraham, one of ministers of Christ. The "one of

Myers-Scotton (2006:74) mentions that "for including a local language in their speech, the [bilingual] elite can claim that they are simply 'ordinary citizens.'" Luke vividly delivers this episode to his audience that Paul changes his linguistic codes with his intention.

8.4.2 Personal Name

The use of two names in Aramaic and Greek in first-century Palestine was accelerated by Hellenization in first-century Palestine so that many inhabitants used two names and were called by two names (cf. Harrer 1940:20; Hengel 1974:61-5).[603] The second names may have been usually made by translation, transliteration, or similarly pronounced names of their original Semitic names.[604] Luke intentionally changes the languages of personal names. It has been pointed out that Luke intends to change personal names from one language to another in fitted situations as his literary device.[605] When Lk and Acts were read in Greek, Semitic embedded spellings in Greek narrative sounded salient. Furthermore, when indeclinable, the SemSpels must have been conspicuous enough to attract audience's attention. In this respect, Luke uses codeswitchings of personal proper nouns from Greek names to Semitic names (or Semitic to Greek) in his narratives as his literary device. Taking the second names (i.e. usually Semitic names) might have been employed for pragmatic functions such as prestige,[606] pride,[607] identity,[608] or official use.[609] The home names are used

---

Hebrews" refers to his Aramaic competence as well. In this respect, he seems to be a primary bilingual. This means that Paul could speak both Aramaic and Greek nearly equally (§3.2.5). Hengel (1991:25) tries to relate 'Hebraioi' to Paul's origin.

[603] It seems that what Paul codeswitches Παῦλος to Σαούλ before his audiences at Acts 22:7, 13, 26:14 implies that the audiences probably presupposed that Paul could have had two names (cf. §8.4.2.2), as many contemporary Jews and Egyptians had two names (Deissmann 1903:315).

[604] Deissmann (1903:315) suggests,"The choice of such Graeco-Roman second names was usually determined by the innocent freedom of popular taste. But we can sometimes see that such names as were more or less similar in sound to the native name must have been specially preferred." For seven kinds of how to form two names, see *ND* 1.93-4.

[605] Cadbury (1958:225) suggests, "a more tangible evidence of Luke's sensitiveness to style appears in some variation in his proper names."

[606] Rabin (1976:1009) posits, "in most cases the greater prestige of religion or culture leads also to the adoption of names." Rabin (1976:1009 n.3) adds, "People often had two names, one in their home language, the other in the language of prestige." Horsley (1996:159) also mentions, "native

in private and close relationship while the second names are used in an official and formal situation. Luke's sensitiveness to language change is represented by Luke's codeswitching personal names. Two cases will be taken into account here; Σιμών/Συμεών and Πέτρος/Κηφᾶς (§8.4.2.1) and Σαούλ/Παῦλος (§8.4.2.2).

8.4.2.1 Σιμών/Συμεών and Πέτρος/Κηφᾶς

As mentioned before (§7.4.1.1), Simon is called by five names in NT literature; Σιμών, Συμεών, Βαριωνᾶ, Πέτρος, and Κηφᾶς. Luke intentionally uses names of Peter as codeswitching depending on suitable contexts.[610] In relation to language change of Peter's names, Luke's codeswitching (Σιμών and Συμεών in Acts and 1Peter) with Paul's codeswitching (Κηφᾶς and Πέτρος) in Galatians will be considered.

It has been pointed out that the linguistic change from Σιμών to Συμεών at Acts15:14 is deliberate.[611] Many scholars have considered that the spelling of Συμεών is Lukan intentional device because James was an Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jew or was speaking Aramaic. Witherington (1998:458) mentions that he [Luke] portrays James as using this Semitic form when speaking of a fellow Palestinian (and Galilean) Jew." Haenchen (1971:447) also states that "Luke employs the form Συμεών to show that James, the Lord's

---

users of a home language may adopt a name or a second name in the politically dominant or more prestigious language."

[607] Ramsay (1930:81) suggests, "it was the fashion for every Syrian, or Cilician, or Cappadocian, who prided himself on his Greek education and his knowledge of the Greek language, to bear a Greek name."

[608] Butcher (2003:284) suggests, "It was not uncommon for an individual to have a Semitic and a Greek or Latin name....The use of alternative names by an individual might suggest an ability to shift between alternative identities."

[609] Jones (1940:36-7) mentions, "The Greek name was originally additional to the native name; the former was used in Greek documents and when speaking in Greek, the latter at home."

[610] Concerning Luke's intentional language change, Cadbury (1958:227) mentions, "Cornelius and his Roman officers regularly refer to him as 'Simon surnamed Peter,' apparently treating the names as a Latin *nomen* and *cognomen*." He adds, "'John surnamed Mark' or 'John' becomes the straight Roman 'Marcus' (Mark) only as he starts out with Barnabas for service outside of Palestine."

[611] In the case of 2Pet1:1 Bockmuehl (2004:60) also mentions that the spelling (i.e. Συμεών) of 2Pet1:1 is used as "a deliberate allusion to the patriarch in the testamentary genre."

brother, is speaking Aramaic." [612] Luke vividly delivers James's speech by using codeswitching into Συμεών in his narrative.

Secondly, Paul calls Simon Κηφᾶς nine times (e.g. 1Cor1:12, 3:22, 9:5, 15:5, Gal1:18, 2:9, 11, 14) and Πέτρος two times (Gal2:7, 8). Some scholars may assume that Paul inadvertently uses the two names[613] or that Πέτρος occurs *unpredictably*.[614] Others think that Paul intentionally changes linguistic code. Regarding Paul's use of Aramaic name (i.e. Κηφᾶς) and change from Κηφᾶς to Πέτρος, two questions have been raised.[615] Above all, it seems reasonable that Paul uses the well-known Grecized name (i.e. Πέτρος) to Greek-speaking Gentile Christians. How did Paul know and why did Paul choose the Semitic transliterated name (i.e. Κηφᾶς) despite he also knew the well-known Grecized name (i.e. Πέτρος)? Second, why did he re-change his linguistic code from the Semitic name into the Grecized name only at Gal2:7-8?

As a matter of fact, unpredictable naming Simon Κηφᾶς to Greek-speaking Gentile Christians is one of the features of codeswitching [-PREDICTABLE]. How did Paul know Κηφᾶς? Bockmuehl adequately answers the question. He (2004:76) suggests:

---

[612] Cadbury (1958:227) suggests, "The literal Semitic form of Simon Peter's name, 'Simeon,' [intentionally] occurs only once, and that in the speech of James at the council of Jerusalem." Consenting Cadbury, Jackson & Lake (*Beg.* 4.175) presents, "The choice of this particular form of Peter's name is probably due to the author's sensitiveness to the appropriateness of words to occasions, especially in the speeches." They (*Beg.* 4.175) persuasively suggests, "It was fitting that Peter should be addressed by a Palestinian Jew by his Jewish name and even in its most Jewish spelling" Cullmann (1962:19 n.3) maintains, "In Acts15:14 this form is purposely used, the speaker is James." More scholars can be added; see §7.4.1.1

[613] Lake (1927:116) considers that Paul "used 'Cephas' and 'Peter' indifferently, and on no fixed principle."

[614] Arguing that Peter is not Cephas, Riddle (1940:169-70) mentions, "The starting point is the fact that Paul refers to 'Peter' but twice, while he refers eight times to 'Cephas.' It is a striking fact that in the two cases where he mentions 'Peter' he speaks of 'Cephas' *in the same sentence*" (his emphasis). Following Lake (1921), Goguel (1933:272-5), and Riddle (1940), Ehrman (1990) recently insists that Peter was one of the Twelve whereas Cephas was one of the Seventy. Ehrman (1990:467) also raises a question that "it is very difficult to see why he would *suddenly* call Peter by a different name without giving any indication to his reader that he had in mind the same person" (emphasis added). However, they disregard that one of the characteristics of codeswitching is [-PREDICTABLE]. Allison (1992:489-95) persuasively criticizes Ehrman's argument in a full dress mentioning that Peter is identified with Cephas.

[615] Elliott (1992:131) summarizes, "It is one of the problems of New Testament studies why Paul preferred the name Kephas for the apostle, but in Galatians it is also a problem why he did not use that name throughout chapter 2."

Even in the Aramaic-speaking churches of first-century Judaea, it was this unique appellation [Κηφᾶς] that most clearly distinguished Peter. This realization may in turn explain why Paul retains this nomenclature as his own preferred usage, after visiting 'the churches of Judaea that are in Christ' deliberately in order to 'make the acquaintance of Cephas.'

The codeswitching of calling Κηφᾶς implies that Paul intimates to Christians in Corinth and Galatia that he is personally conversant with Peter who is one of the pillars of the Jerusalem church and shows solidarity with the Mother Church in Jerusalem. This, at the same time, may allude that Paul himself stands in defensive position enough to use codeswitching. Whenever Paul codeswitches into Κηφᾶς (1Cor1:12, 3:22, 9:5, 15:5, Gal1:18, 2:9, 11, 14), he tries to show his conversance with Peter [CONVERSANT] [SOLIDARITY].[616] Consequently, Paul intentionally calls Simon Κηφᾶς for pragmatic function rather than for his Semitic source.

In the case of Gal2:7-8, it seems that Paul also codeswitches from Κηφᾶς into Πέτρος again. As for Paul's change of his linguistic code from Κηφᾶς into Πέτρος at Gal2:7-8, two opinions have been raised. Betz (1979:96-8; here 97) suggests, "the non-Pauline notions of the 'gospel of circumcision' and 'of uncircumcision' as well as the name 'Peter' may very well come from an underlying official statement."[617] On the other hand, Dunn (1993:105; cf. Munck 1959:62 n.2) criticizes against Betz's argument, saying that "why the Grecized form of Cephas' name should be used in such an agreement produced in Jerusalem, when *Kēphas*

---

[616] Dunn (1993:74) suggests that Paul "preferred the Aramaic form as a gentle acknowledgement of Peter's status within the Jewish-Christian congregations..." Incidentally, Paul's using Κηφᾶς given by the historical Jesus made it possible to insinuate that he knew the historical Jesus to some extent.

[617] For more detailed discussions, see Dinkler 1958:182-3; 1959:198; Cullmann (1962:20) also mentions, "because he [Paul] here cites an official document, in the Greek translation of which the form *Petros* was used."

itself was quite acceptable Greek (i. 18; ii.9), is less clear." And he (1993:108) adds, "Why Paul reverts to 'Cephas' after using 'Peter' in ii.7-8 is unclear." However, it seems that both groups disregard Paul as a creative author who uses literary device. Although we can not prove whether the official statement reflected Πέτρος or not, what is certain is that Paul intentionally *could* use Πέτρος as codeswitching for his pragmatic function. Paul seems to codeswitch from Κηφᾶς (personal nickname) into Πέτρος (official nickname) at Gal2:7-8 as his literary device. It is because the agreement is for Greek-matrix speaking Galatians and because Paul intends to deliver the vivid and authoritative report[618] of the Jerusalem resolution.[619] It seems, in this sense, that the official statement could have reflected Πέτρος. Accordingly, Paul uses Κηφᾶς as his personal nickname to hint close relationship to Peter and the Jerusalem leaders. On the other hand, he codeswitches from Κηφᾶς to Πέτρος as his official nickname to stress the vivid and authoritative agreement.

8.4.2.2 Σαῦλος/Παῦλος and Σαούλ

In relation to names of Paul (i.e Σαῦλος/Σαούλ and Παῦλος), two points have been discussed. (1) Why does Luke use Paul's two names at Acts13:9 (i.e. Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος)?[620] (2) Why suddenly does Luke use Σαούλ five times (Acts 9:4, 17, 22:7, 13,

---

[618] Haenchen (1971:447-8) suggests, "Luke makes James speak with a certain solemn formality: ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν 'he attended to the business of acquiring' a people from among the Gentiles."

[619] Allison (1992:491) also suggests, "Is Paul switch from 'Peter' to 'Cephas' really that odd if the two were one? Ancient writers, who in this were no different from modern writers, frequently used synonyms to avoid certain types of repetition, including the repetition of proper names." It seems that he could explain it better if he uses the concept of codeswitching.

[620] Deissmann (1903:313-4) suggests that the formula, Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος was abundantly found from inscriptions and papyri as well as Josephus. Regarding how to get his Latin name Deissmann (1903:314) criticizes the view that Paul adopted his Latin name (Παῦλος) after the Proconsul for the first time. Following Deissmann, Cadbury (1958:225) mentions, "The transition from the Hebrew to the Roman name is scarcely to be attributed merely to the mention in this context of the proconsul Sergius Paulus. Still less is it likely that Paul, a Roman citizen by birth, first acquired the Latin *cognomen* on this occasion." Harrer (1940:33) concludes, "the apostle was named *Paul* from birth, with Saul as his *signum*." Horsley (*ND* 1.94) mentions that by-name formula, Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (Acts 13:9) and Paul's Roman citizenship (Acts 22:26-9) imply that his two names were given at birth. For ancient and modern scholars' detailed presentations of the name change from Saul to Paul,

26:14)? There has been a consensus that Luke intentionally changes the two names of Paul in the two cases for his literary device. First of all, concerning Paul's intention to change from Σαῦλος to Παῦλος scholars have assumed that his Latin name was properly introduced at Acts13:9 because Luke depicts Paul as a missionary for Gentiles hereafter.[621] For this reason Luke codeswitches Paul's names from Semitic type (i.e. Σαῦλος) to Latin type (i.e. Παῦλος) at Acts 13:9 in the flow of his narrative. Second, the indeclinable form (Σαούλ) suddenly occurs when he was addressed by Jesus and Ananias. Conversely, Παῦλε is used, when Agrippa calls Paul (Acts26:24). In relation to this change, scholars also consider that the indeclinable form functions as Luke's literary device. Deissmann (1903:316 n.1) explains that the address of Σαούλ could be due to "the historian's sense of liturgical rhythm" Hemer (1989:225) also mentions, "The former [Σαούλ] is used in solemn address and Hebraic contexts." When his conversion story was spoken by Paul or read by later Christians in Greek, indeclinable SemSpels (moreover, they are vocatives) must have been prominent enough to attract audiences' attention. The codeswitchings are used to heighten the dramatic effect [VIVID].

Concerning Jesus' calling Σαούλ, why did Luke use codeswitching? Luke seems to consider that Jesus spoke Aramaic to at least Paul. It seems that Luke intends to deliver the grand scene vividly and sublimely by use of codeswitching. Why does Paul codeswitch his

---

see *Beg*.4.145-6.

[621] Deissmann (1903:317) concludes, "The historian [Luke] uses the one or the other name according to the field of his hero's labours; from chap. 13:1 the Jewish disciple Σαῦλος is an apostle to the whole world: it is high time, then, that he should be presented to the Greeks under a name about which there was nothing barbaric, and which, even before this, was really his own." Ramsay (1930:81-2) mentions, "the situation and surroundings of the moment, the rôle which he was playing for the time being, determined which name he was called by. In a Greek house [Paul] played the Greek, and bore the Greek name: in a company of natives, he was the native, and bore the native name." Cadbury (1958:225) mentions that the transition from Saul to Paul "is rather due to the author's feeling for the nomenclature appropriate to the setting. Therefore, when Paul's career is fairly started among the Gentiles, the author shifts to the Roman name." Barrett (1994-8:609) mentions that Luke intentionally depicts Paul as a missionary theologian from Acts 13:8 onwards because Saul is related to Judaism. Witherington III (1998:410) suggests, "Luke has introduced the name at this juncture because not Paul will be dealing with Gentiles and will accordingly want to use this Roman name in doing so."

names in his narratives?[622] Paul employs Σαούλ five times in his narratives. Paul intentionally uses Σαούλ as a codeswitching to show vivid and majestic description of the historical Jesus. Accordingly, Luke intentionally uses codeswitchings from Σαῦλος to Παῦλος, and Σαούλ for his pragmatic function.

8.4.3 Place Name

Luke is said to be sensitive to the spelling of place name. Cadbury (1958:126) suggests that Luke seems to consider Jerusalem and Nazareth as important places in his narrative flow. Jerusalem was regarded as a center. Nazareth is used as a turning point of Gentile mission in his narrative of the two books (i.e. Lk and Acts). It seems that he uses the spellings of the places as codeswitchings. The two spellings of Jerusalem, first of all, will be considered (§8.4.3.1). Then, the six spellings of Nazareth as codeswitching will be investigated (§8.4.3.2).[623]

8.4.3.1 Ἰερουσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα

Two spellings of Jerusalem occur in NT literature; one is an indeclinable form (Ἰερουσαλήμ) and the other is a declinable form (Ἱεροσόλυμα), as mentioned before (§7.4.1.1). Regarding the two spellings of Jerusalem scholarly attention has usually been paid to the Lukan usage.[624] It has been suggested that Luke makes much account of Jerusalem in his

---

[622] Codeswitchings used between the participants in relation to the invariable SemSpel (i.e. Σαούλ) can be mentioned like this: it seems that Aramaic was used between Jesus and Paul (Acts9:4). Paul spoke Aramaic in front of Jews in Jerusalem (Acts22:7, 13) to attract audience's attention (Acts 22:2). This means that Paul does not use Σαούλ as a codeswitching but that Luke uses the codeswitching (the Semitic indeclinable name, Σαούλ) by writing the story in Greek. On the other hand, when Paul spoke Greek before the king Agrippa, Paul used Σαούλ as a codeswitching.

[623] There are more cases that Luke uses the language change of place names as codeswitchings. Cadbury (1958:227; 1966:95) points out that Ἰούδας of Lk1:39 occurs in the birth stories in comparison with Ἰουδαία (e.g. Lk1:5, 65, 2:4, ...).

[624] Matthew deliberately spells Jerusalem Ἰερουσαλήμ twice in one verse at 23:37 when

narrative.[625] In this respect, he uses the two spellings of Jerusalem as his pragmatic function rather than Semitic source, as mentioned before (§7.3.2.1).

There has been a scholarly consensus that the two spellings of Jerusalem should be considered as Luke's intentional language change, although the interpretations of their distributions have been varied. Among their various views, three major scholars need to be mentioned here.[626] (1) Elliott (1992:113-20) considers that Luke deliberately uses

---

Jesus deplores the destruction of Jerusalem. It seems that the Matthean usage seems to be codeswitchings to practically function as [+VIVID]. Regarding the pragmatic function of Ἰερουσαλήμ, furthermore, Paul's usage in Galatians has been discussed as well. Deissmann (1903:316 n.1) may suggest that when Paul uses the SemSpel (i.e. Ἰερουσαλήμ), he intends to indicate "a solemn emphasis upon the word," which is shown in especially, Gal4:25, 26. For a recent discussion, see Murphy-O'Connor 1999:280-1; Bachmann 2000:288-9.

[625] Scholars have considered that Jerusalem is described as more than geographical meaning. Deissmann (1903:316 n.1) presents that Paul "considers the Semitic spelling as "the dwelling-place of the *saints*, Jerusalem is more to him than a mere geographical term." Bartlet (1901-2:157) mentions, "there is an emotional reason for the persistence of the more Hebraic form, the city being addressed as the hearth of Hebrew religion; that is, it is regarded strictly from the Jewish or theocratic standpoint." Loveday Alexander (1995:30) mentions, "Luke's story really has two mental maps. One centred on Jerusalem and one on the Mediterranean, and the movement from the one to the other enables us to chart a profound cultural shift within early Christianity. The geographical importance of the list of nations in Acts2.9-11 has long been recognized. Whether or not the table has affinities with 'astrological geography', it is clear that it presupposes a vision of the world centred on Jerusalem, like the later mediaeval Christian maps and like the contemporary map presupposed by the book of Jubilees." Bauckham (1995:418) mentions, "Jews all over the Diaspora looked to Jerusalem as the symbolic centre of their universe." He (1995:418) also mentions, "More important was the realistic perception that the Diaspora stretched as far east of Jerusalem as it did west, and that Jews were to be found among nations situated in all directions from Jerusalem."

What is more, the verb used with Jerusalem seems to imply Lukan cognitive view of Jerusalem. It seems that Luke and Paul consider Jerusalem as the Capital of the capitals when we take the verb "going up" and "going down" into consideration. The verb "going up" is usually used with the capital in most countries, as Bruce (1982:94) mentions, "more or less as in England one 'goes up to town' (i.e. to London)." The usage is usually related to their mind map rather than geographical map. It is interesting that the verb ἀναβαίνω is expressed to refer to Jerusalem, when Jerusalem is compared with other bigger capitals (i.e. Caesarea and Antioch). The verb ἀναβαίνω is used to refer to the visit from Caesarea to Jerusalem whereas καταβαίνω is used to refer to the journey from Jerusalem to Antioch at Acts18:22. The Jerusalem of the verse is under debate because the city does not appear at 18:22. Barrett (1994-98:880; cf. Haenchen 1971:544 n.5) assumes, "We cannot be certain that a visit to Jerusalem took place at this point." However, the use of the verb implies that the place Paul goes up must have been Jerusalem because it is Jerusalem that is bigger than other bigger capitals in their mind map. Concerning Acts18:22 Schneider (*TDNT* 519; ἀναβαίνω) suggests that the reason Paul uses ἀναβαίνω is "rather more than a topographical significance. Jerusalem meant the mother community." Ramsay (1930:264) suggests, "The terms 'going up' and 'going down' are used so frequently of the journey to and from Jerusalem as to establish this usage." In relation to Acts15:1 Barrett (1994-98:698) may mention that κατελθόντες is used when a move from Judea to Antioch because "ἀνέρχεσθαι, κατέρχεσθαι, and similar compounds were used of pilgrimages to and departures from the capital" although he also considers that he uses it due to a topographical reason.

[626] A number of scholars have remarked similar views to the three scholars mentioned. Wifstrand (2005:39) presents that Luke "especially uses Ἰερουσαλήμ when the name is being emphasized and the reference to the holy city is to be noticed, the city where Jesus' destiny is fulfilled." Cadbury (1958:227; cf. *Beg* 5.418) considers that Luke uses the two spellings in their contexts; the indeclinable form is used in Palestinian setting whereas the declinable form in the

Ἰερουσαλήμ in obviously Jewish atmospheres related to Jewish audiences, Jewish speakers, or Jewish territories in his two books. (2) De la Potterie (1982:153-65) presents that Ἰερουσαλήμ is used in more "religious" or "sacred" contexts while Ἱεροσόλυμα in more "profane" contexts. (3) Sylva is interested in the relationship between their distributions and etymology of the Greek type spelling of Jerusalem. He (1983:218-9) contends, "Luke varies his use of these terms in such a way as to keep the reader aware that two different terms for Jerusalem are being used, so as to keep the 'holy Salem' etymology in his reader's mind." Unfortunately, although the scholars have consented Luke's use of the spellings as intentional literary function, no one has applied codeswitching theory to their distributions of Jerusalem.

It seems that Luke considers Ἱεροσόλυμα as his base spelling of Jerusalem as other Synoptists use it. He employs an indeclinable spelling (i.e. Ἰερουσαλήμ) as codeswitching for his literary device. When the indeclinable spelling was read, the spelling must have caught audience's attention. Sylva (1983:219) suggests that when a speaker changes Jerusalem from Semitic type to Greek type, it functions as pragmatic emphasis on the change. Accordingly, Luke deliberately uses the Semitic type spelling (i.e. Ἰερουσαλήμ as codeswitching when the narratives are related to Jewish settings, Jewish speakers, Jewish territories, or more religious atmospheres for the pragmatic function [VIVID].

8.4.3.2 Ναζαρά and Ναζαρέθ

Luke's story of the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth has drawn NT scholars' attention

---

Hellenistic setting. Bruce (1952:68) states that Ἰερουσαλήμ is used in a Jewish atmosphere whereas Ἱεροσόλυμα is used in a Gentile context. Mussies (1984:421) suggests that "Ἰερουσαλήμ occurs only in speech which one may suppose to have been Aramaic, Ἱεροσόλυμα in words spoken by non-Jews or to non-Jews, the striking exception being 28.17 where Paul addresses the elders of the Roman Jews." Klauck (2000:4) says that "Luke uses the indeclinable word 'Jerusalem', which is to be considered as biblical Greek and more strongly evokes the Old Testament Jewish horizon." For more scholarly positions of Lukan intention, see Sylva 1983:208-10.

in two ways. One is concerned with the derivation of Ναζαρά, one of the six transliterated spellings of Nazareth. The other is that the "Nazareth pericope" plays a significant role in his narrative flow. The two points are deeply related each other. The issue of the origin of Ναζαρά will be first considered since the term pragmatically functions in his narrative flow.

The derivation of the SemSpel (i.e. Ναζαρά) has been discussed for over one century in relation to the Synoptic Problem. Some scholars have insisted that the spelling of Ναζαρά (Mt4:13; Lk4:16) was derived from Q because the spelling occurs only twice[627] in the parallel passages as well as in the same order in the SynGs.[628] Weiss (1876:121) argued that the word, Ναζαρά, is derived from Q. Recently, Tuckett (1982:344) persists that the common reference to Ναζαρά is "the most powerful argument for the existence of Q material." Others have suggested that Matthew created Ναζαρά from which Lukan Ναζαρά originated. This supports the Markan priority without the Q hypothesis. Holtzmann (1892:70) maintained that the spelling was created by Matthean redaction. Goulder (2003:368) holds that Matthew coined Ναζαρά at 2:23 and used at 4:13 because although "Matthew wishes to find a text in prophecy to show that by God's foreordaining Jesus lived in Nazareth," he could not find the prophecy in Scripture.

Whether the scholars have postulated that Ναζαρά originates from Q or Matthew, both arguments have been presented from the perspective of the orthographic view on the basis of monolingualism of first-century P&RNE. The problem is that both tried to single out of the original transliterated spelling of Mt4:13 and Lk4:16 from the six spellings of Nazareth and that they assume that Ναζαρά is original because of SemSpel.[629] However, it has been pointed out that all six variant spellings (i.e. Ναζαρά, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαράθ, Ναζαρέδ,

---

[627] Tuckett (1982:344) maintains that Ναζαρά occurs only twice (Mt4:13 and Lk4:16) in the SynGs and that the Ναζαρά was derived from Q. He (1984:131) repeatedly emphasizes, "Elsewhere Matthew never uses this form of the name [citing 2.23 and 21.11]." However. Goulder (2003) rejects his view, saying that the original spelling of Lk2:23 could be Ναζαρά.

[628] For detailed discussions, see Carruth, Robinson, & Heil 1996:401-41: Neirynck 2000:159-69.

[629] See §7.3.2.2. Many scholars also assume that the reason that Ναζαρά is the original is

Ναζαρέτ, and Ναζαρέθ) are acceptable and ordinary spellings which are transliterated from the two ArmSpels, נצרה and נצרת (§7.3.2.2). This denies that Ναζαρά has temporal priority to other five spellings. Ναζαρά is just one of the six SemSpels, that is, one of the transliterated allowords of Nazareth.

Moreover, the problem lies in the fact that scholars have tended to connect "unusual" or "rare" transliterated spellings with "source." Tuckett (1982:344) mentions, "The unusual spelling suggests that Matthew is using a source, and the same from of the name in Lk 4, 16 (which is equally singular in Luke) suggests that Luke has used the same source." Goulder (2003:366) also assumes that Ναζαρά is "rare" in Lk so that Ναζαρά is not Lukan but derived from Matthew.[630] However, should "unusual" or "rare" transliterated spellings be always considered as derivation from "source"? Can we ascribe the transliterated variations of proper nouns to Matthew or Luke? Criticizing Tuckett's argument, in fact, Goulder may suggest that Matthew intentionally coined Ναζαρά because he could create his own transliterated spellings as shown by the fact he transliterated Semitic personal and local proper nouns into Greek as his own way. He (2003:369) puts forward that Matthew recognized two types of Jerusalem and variants of some proper nouns like Γαβά/Γαβάθ/Γαβαά/Γαβαάθ and Ῥαμά/Ῥαμάθ. Consequently, he (2003:369 n.13) insists, "it is more likely that he made the adjustment himself: his genealogy includes a number of 'improvements', Ἰωβηδ, Ἀσαφ, Ἀμως." For this reason, Goulder considers that Matthew intentionally uses Ναζαρά as his literary device; Matthew wishes to show that every city Jesus moves is fulfilled by Scriptural prophecy in Matthew's own programme. On this account, when Matthew described that Jesus came to Nazareth at 4:13 he used Ναζαρά that "the form suggested in holy prophecy, and which he has already used at 2:23."

However, Goulder's argument is inconsistent because he did not pay the same

---

that it is the SemSpel; see Carruth, Robinson, & Heil 1996:401-41.

[630] Goulder (2003:371) also mentions, "Luke prefers to write Ἰερουσαλήμ on his own, but he is prepared to copy in Ἱεροσόλυμα from his source if required (19:28, cf. Mk11:1)."

attention to Luke's creative ability. Luke is well-known as a creative and language-sensitive writer, as shown by the fact that he frequently uses transliterated proper nouns as codeswitchings for his literary device (§8.4). Regarding Lukan literary creativity, as mentioned before (§8.4.3.1), Cadbury (1966:91) points out that the attempts to connect the change of spellings with source failed. Instead, the spelling changes should be regarded as authors' literary device. Comparing Lukan usage with other evangelists' usage, Elliott (1992:118) also states that Luke is more sensitive to use transliterated proper nouns than other evangelists. He (1992:119) convincingly suggests, "Copying from sources did not necessarily mean a blind repetition of vocabulary…Luke is no mere slavish copier here…" Accordingly, it is hard to say that Matthew and Luke imitated Ναζαρά from Q or Matthew. Matthew as well as Luke, instead, intends to use the language change as codeswitchings for their literary device.

It is generally agreed that Luke employs the "Nazareth pericope" as a turning point to Gentile mission extended to Acts, as Tuckett (1996:227) expresses "this pericope in Luke is extremely important for Luke's overall literary plan, functioning as a programmatic summary of the story that is to follow in his two-volume work."[631] A place name, "Nazareth," in Lk occurs five times (Lk1:26, 2:4, 39, 51, 4:16). The spelling Ναζαρέθ is used in four occasions without variants. But the last "Nazareth" of Luke4:16 has four variant spellings; Ναζαρά (ℵ B* (Δ) Ξ (33) pc e sa^{mss}; Or), Ναζαρέτ (K 565. 1424 *pm*), Ναζαρέθ (Γ Ψ f^{13} *pm*), and Ναζαράτ (A Θ 0102 *pc*). The variant spellings of Nazareth in Lk4:16 imply that the spelling of Lk4:16 did not seem to be Ναζαρέθ. If the spelling was Ναζαρέθ which is the same spelling with the other occurrences (Lk1:26, 2:4, 39, 51), the spelling also would had

---

[631] This is widely accepted among scholars; Cadbury 1958:189; Conzelmann 1960:31-38; Hill 1971:161-180; Tannehill 1972:51-75; Weatherly 1994:122-8; for older publications, see Dömer 1978:50-1; for more publications, see Siker 1992:75 n.9. Applying literary analysis to Luke 4:16-30, Siker (1992:75) observes, "When we consider redactional issues, we find broad agreement on one major point, that Luke 4:16-30, because of its placement at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, functions in a programmatic way for the whole of Luke and anticipates the Gentile mission so central to Acts."

preserved no variants. The variant spellings of 4:16 imply that Luke used Ναζαρά at 4:16, which embarrassed scribes to cause phonological variants because of scribal harmonization of -*ah* ending Ναζαρά with the –*th* ending spellings.[632]

Consequently, Luke intentionally codeswitches from the more usual spelling (i.e. Ναζαρέθ) to the less usual spelling (i.e. Ναζαρά). Especially, this must have been remarkable when Lk was read aloud. He intends to emphasize the pericope as a turning point in his narrative flow [EMPHASIS]. The use of the term "Nazareth" in Lk indicates that the writer of Lk is not only a redactor who collects his materials from sources, but also a creative writer who is capable to use the SemSpel of "Nazareth" as literary device in his narrative flow deliberately. Therefore, personal and local proper nouns that are transliterated from Semitic to Greek in Lk are not Semitisms or Septuagintalisms. This means that the Semitic transliterated words do not indicate temporal priority to Greek translated equivalent words and do not prove linguistic unidirectionality of J&GTrads from Semitic into Greek.

8.5 Aramaic Embedded Words as Codeswitchings and Interdirectionality

The unidirectional scholars have investigated ArmEmWords from the perspective of language competence, a science of *langue*, and categoricity theory. They have assumed that the ArmEmWords at the semantic level were transmitted from Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christian community to Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian communities in a unilinear way. In this sense, the ArmEmWords have temporal priority over Greek translated words

---

[632] In the case of variant spellings of Nazareth in the GofMt, Mt2:23 has three variant spellings; Ναζαρέτ (ℵ B D L 33. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. *l* 2211 *pm*); Ναζαρέθ (C K N W Γ [Δ] 0233^{vl} 0250 $f^{(1).13}$ 565 *pm* lat co); Ναζαρά ($\mathfrak{P}^{70vid}$; Eus). Mt4:13 has four variant spellings; Ναζαρά (ℵ^{1} B* Z 33 k mae); Ναζαρέτ (B^{2} L Γ 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. *l* 844. *l* 2211 *pm* aur); Ναζαρέθ (ℵ* D K W Θ 0233 $f^{1.13}$ 579 *pm* lat sa bo); Ναζαράθ (C P Δ *pc*). Mt21:11 has only one spelling (Ναζαρέθ). Matthew seems to spell Nazareth of Mt21:11 Ναζαρέθ which is more usual because there is no variant spellings. On the other hand, Matthew intentionally uses Ναζαρά twice in 2:23 and 4:13 in relation to prophecy of the OT, as Goulder pointed out before. The reason why two spellings have lots of variants is due to scribal harmonization because the spelling is unusual. It seems that Matthew who was a bilingual and creative writer used Ναζαρά as a codeswitching as well.

because the J&GTrads are unidirectionally transmitted from Aramaic to Greek. Consequently, they have considered ArmEmWords as interferences or borrowings. However, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE should be taken into consideration seriously. The Aramaic transliterated words in a bilingual context should be considered as codeswitchings from the perspective of language performance, a science of *parole*, and variation theory. The authors deliberately employ the ArmEmWords as codeswitchings in his narrative in Greek regardless their sources.

In terms of the transmission of J&GTrads at the semantic level the bilingual approach raises five interdirectional possibilities. (1) Jesus might have spoken Greek when he met Greek-matrix speakers. The GkTrad is earlier than Aramaic translated tradition.[633] As mentioned before (§1.3.2), the GkTrad must have been translated into Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix residents in Judaeo-Palestine. (2) When the sayings by Jesus and stories about Jesus circulated in Judaeo-Palestine, the JTrad in Aramaic must have been translated in Greek among Greek-matrix residents in Judaeo-Palestine during Jesus's ministry (chapter 3) and later, among Greek-matrix Christians in the earliest Christian church in Jerusalem (chapter 5). This implies that some GkTrads must have been Judaeo-Palestinian traditions so that linguistic distinction between Aramaic and GkTrads does not always correspond to the regional distinction between Judaeo-Palestinian and Hellenistic tradition (cf. §5.2). (3) When the Greek Judaeo-Palestinian tradition circulated among Aramaic-matrix Christians in bilingual RNE, the Greek Judaeo-Palestinian tradition must have been translated into Aramaic Hellenistic tradition in Aramaic-matrix families among Aramaic-matrix Christians in Jewish and Gentile Christian communities during and after Jesus's ministry. This suggests that ArmEmWords are not always closer to original sayings by the Historical Jesus and that ArmTrad is not always earlier than GkTrad. (4) It has generally been suggested that Syria,

---

[633] In a similar way, if Jesus used *legion* as a codeswitching, the Latin transliterated word might have been earlier tradition than other translated word in Semitic or Greek.

Alexandria and Palestine were the most plausible places where the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John were written. Most Syrian, Alexandrian, or Palestinian residents who could have been first audiences might have been Aramaic-matrix speakers. And, most Syrian, Alexandrian, or Palestinian Christians who could first have heard the GkGospels might have spoken Aramaic as their matrix language and Greek as their embedded language (chapters 3, 4). This implies that when Aramaic transliterated words were read among the residents, authors/readers could have expected that their readers/audiences could understand the meanings of the Aramaic transliterated words. (5) Most residents who were literate in those regions could have spoken Greek as their matrix language. That is why the Gospels were written in Greek with ArmEmWords. The bilinguality of the Christian communities may enable authors or speakers to employ foreign words in JTrad as codeswitching because the audience/readers could have known language change as literary device (i.e. codeswitchings).[634]

As for transmission of J&GTrads, the bilingual view of Semitisms at the level of Semantics suggests four assumptions. (1) Aramaic transliterated words should be investigated from the perspective of Pragmatics. In this sense, they were used as codeswitchings, not interferences or borrowings (§8.1). (2) Aramaic transliterated words are not always earlier traditions than Greek translated words. This is so because ArmTrads were circulated with GkTrads during and after Jesus's ministry in Judaeo-Palestine. (3) Bilingual circulation of JTrads during and after Jesus's ministry devaluates the *ipsissima verba Jesu* whether they are Aramaic or Greek (cf. §1.3). (4) Aramaic transliterated words could be used as literary device called codeswitchings in a bilingual context. Jesus himself could have used codeswitchings from Aramaic into Greek to bilingual Judaeo-Palestinian audiences, as αββα ὁ πατήρ (§8.3) shows. The authors of the FGs and Acts could use codeswitchings from

---

[634] It seems that Luke used Semitisms as literary devices (i.e. codeswitchings) because his audience (perhaps Theophilus in particular) knew the literary devices when he read/listened to Lk (cf. §3.2.5; §8.4).

Greek into Aramaic because Jesus spoke Aramaic. When writers/speakers use codeswitching, they tend to preserve what the original speaker says without any change, as possible as they can. Although ArmEmWords do not always indicate earlier JTrad, they must have been original to the JTrad. Accordingly, Semitisms at the semantic level do not support temporal priority or the unidirectionality hypothesis. The transmission of J&GTrads is not unilinear but hybrid, and not unidirectional but interdirectional.

9. Summary of Results and Some Implications

9.1 Summary of Results

As we examined (chapter 1), most scholars have postulated the three unidirectionality hypotheses that J&GTrads were unidirectionally transmitted: (1) from Judaeo-Palestinian into Hellenistic, (2) from oral to written, and (3) from Aramaic to Greek. In this model, the former three traditions (i.e. Judaeo-Palestinian, oral, and Aramaic) are thought to have temporal priority over the latter three traditions (i.e. Hellenistic, written. and Greek). However, the study of bilingualism of first-century P&RNE serves to blur the lines between each temporal border. That is, the directionality of transmission of P&RNE is interdirectional, hybrid rather than unidirectional, unilinear.

In Part I, I suggested that the linguistic milieu of first-century P&RNE should be considered to be bilingualism rather than monolingualism or diglossia (chapter 2). The regional and personal bilingualisms of first-century Palestine show that when Jesus addressed to his audience, many of them were bilinguals. This means that JTrads were circulated in Greek among Greek-matrix speakers as well as in Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix speakers during and after Jesus' ministry (chapter 3). Bilingualism of Jews in the Diaspora (e.g. Alexandria and Antioch) implies that J&GTrads were circulated in Aramaic among Aramaic-matrix speakers as well as in Greek among Greek-matrix speakers during and after Jesus' ministry (chapter 4). The bilingualism of the earliest church in Jerusalem indicates that JTrads were circulated in Aramaic and in Greek in the church. And the development of christological titles (e.g. *Messiah-Christos* and *mari-kurios*) is not unidirectional from Judaeo-Palestinian to Hellenistic. It seems that the titles were circulated in Aramaic as well as in Greek during and after Jesus' ministry and later, in the Jerusalem church (chapter 5). Accordingly, SemTrads are not always indexical to earlier than GkTrads.

In Part II, we investigated so-called SemTrads at the levels of Syntax, Phonology, and Semantics from the perspectives of variation theory, the study of *parole*, and language performance rather than categoricity theory, the study of *langue*, and language competence. The syntactic changes of NT Greek mentioned in chapter 6 should not be thought as Semitisms or Septuagintalisms due to contact-induced but as grammaticalization due to internal-induced syntactic changes. The syntactic changes we discussed could have been considered as grammatical polysemies found in the universal human cognitive process regardless of Semitic interference. At the phonological level, when the phonological variants of Semitic transliterated words are predictable and acceptable, variant spellings are considered as allowords, not as Semitisms. And it seems that SemSpels, even christological titles, could have been circulated with GkSpels in bilingual contexts at the same time (chapter 7). Lastly, Semitic embedded words at the semantic level were used as codeswitchings which are authors' literary device. It seems that Semitic transliterated words were circulated with Greek translated words together. Accordingly, monolingual or incomplete bilingual approach to Gospel Studies reach the conclusion that Semitisms at the syntactic, phonological, and semantic levels have had temporal priority of SemTrads over GkTrads. However, bilingualism undermines the notion of temporal priority of SemTrads.

The monolingual slogan, "the more Aramaized, the earlier" is based on the linguistic unidirectioanlity hypothesis. The slogan has played an important role as a criteria in relation to major issues of Gospel Studies such as the Synoptic Problem, the Historical Jesus, provenances of the Gospels and Acts, textual criticism of the Gospels and Acts, and the unidirectional development of christological titles.

9.2 The Synoptic Problem

Scholars have endeavored to solve the Synoptic problem for a long time. Markan

priority, Markan priority without Q, and Matthean priority has been suggested most prominently. Although the theories are different from each other, all are based on the same presupposition that Semitisms at the phonological, syntactic, and semantic levels have temporal priority. Furthermore, they have argued that Semitisms support their own theories. However, bilingualism dilutes the distinction between SemTrads and GkTrads. Accordingly, the degree of Semitisms does not guarantee earlier tradition or earlier Gospel.[635]

9.3 The Historical Jesus

In terms of the sayings by Jesus and the stories about Jesus, scholars have assumed that SemTrads are more original than GkTrads. Bilingualism of first-century P&RNE implies that SemTrads were circulated with GkTrads together during and after Jesus' ministry. This means that SemTrads are not always more original than GkTrads. On the other hand, even *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* might have been circulated with their Aramaic equivalents together. That is, *ipsissima verba Jesu graeca* make no difference, even if we could locate them with confidence. Nevertheless, if the evangelists intentionally employed Aramaic embedded words, it seems that they used them as codeswitchings. In this case, it is highly possible that the Aramaic embedded words could have been the original sayings by Jesus. Accordingly, ArmEmWords do not always refer to earlier tradition but original tradition.

9.4 Textual Criticism

---

[635] Concerning the Synoptic Problem, attention should be paid to Gundry and Robinson. Gundry (1964:404) concludes, "The absence of Aramaisms (or more broadly, Semitisms) does not militate against authenticity." Robinson criticizes the unidirectional directionality hypothesis and seems to take interdirectional directionality hypothesis. He (1976:94) suggests: "We have been accustomed for so long to what might be called linear solutions to the synoptic problem, where one gospel simply 'used' another and must therefore be set later, that it is difficult to urge a more fluid and complex interrelation between them and their traditions without being accused of introducing unnecessary hypotheses and modifications. (my emphasis)" However, they do not develop this topic.

The Bezan text is said to be more frequently colored with Semitic constructions. Some scholars have supposed that D is nearer to the original than Non-Western texts since D is more Aramaized than Non-Western texts. This is because they assume that the more Aramaized, the earlier.[636] However, heavy Semitisms do not always refer to more original texts.[637] From the perspective of the interdirectionality hypothesis, we cannot decide whether the Semitisms came from original tradition by Jesus or from retranslated Greek tradition. Bilingualism of the first-century P&RNE implies that ArmTrads could have been circulated with GkTrads during and after Jesus' ministry. This means that ArmTrads do not always have the temporal priority over the GkTrads.

9.5 Interdirectional Development of Christological Titles

Monolingual view leads into the unidirectional Christology hypothesis that the christological titles were unidirectionally developed from Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christian community to Greek-speaking Hellenistic Christian community. The *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* has insisted the unidirectional development. They have made sharp distinctions between *Messiah* and *Christos* and between *mari* and *kurios*. However, bilingualism of first-century P&RNE supports the interdirectional development of the christological titles between Aramaic transliterated words and Greek translated words during and after Jesus' ministry.

---

[636] Wensinck (1937:11-48, here, 47) posits, "D seems, from this point of view, to have a claim for precedence." Black (1967:31) also mentions, "D stands nearer the underlying Aramaic tradition is of the greatest importance; in Luke it is the more primitive type of text."

[637] Fitzmyer (1979:17) persuasively criticizes, "The source of the alleged Aramaic material in Codex Bezae has not been convincingly ferreted out." He convincingly suggests, "one should be reluctant to regard its readings as more primitive *simply because they seem to be more Aramaized*" (my emphasis).

[REFERENCE]

PRIMARY SOURCE

Aristophanes

Thesm *Thesmophoriazusae*

Chrysostom

Ad pop Anti *Ad populum Antiochenum homiliae* 1-21

Bap. Inst. Harkins, Paul W. (translated and annotated) 1963 *St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions, Ancient Christian Writers* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press)

Cat ill *Catecheses ad illuminandos*

Hom. *Homilies*

In *2 Tim* *epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum at homiliae* 1-10

In Gen Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim

In Mat In Matthaeum homiliae 1-89

State. *Concerning the Statues*

Cicero

Brut. *Brutus or De claris oratoribus*

De orat. *De oratore*

Quint. *Pro Quinctio*

Verr *Verrem*

Eusebius

HE *Historia Ecclesiastica*

W-H Westcott, Brooke Foss & Fenton John Anthony Hort 2007 (1885) *The Greek New Testament with Comparative Apparatus Showing Variations from the Nestle-Aland*

and Robinson-Pierpont Editions with Greek Dictionary Revised and Expanded from a Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament by Alexander Souter (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson)

Herodotus

History *Historiae*

Homer

Odyssey *Odyssea*

Irenaeus

Haer. *Adversus haereses*

Jerome

Ep. *Epistulae*

Vita Hilar. *Vita S. Hilarionis eremitae*

Vita Malchi *Vita Malchi monachi*

Josephus

Ant. *Antiquitates judaicae*

Bell. *Bellum Judaicum*

C. Ap. *Contra Apionem*

Vita *Life of Josephus*

Libanius

Or. *Oration, Selected Orations* I-II, The Loeb Classical Library, 1977.

Livy

History *The History of Rome* W. M. Roberts (trans) (London: J.M. Dent & Sons) 1912.

Malalas

Chronographia *Ioannis Malalae chronographia* Ludwig Dindorf (ed.) (Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae; Bonn: Weber) 1831

Origen

C. Cels. *Origen: Contra Celsum* Henry Chadwick (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1953.

P. Col. *Zenon Papri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. dealing with Palestine and Egypt* Vol. I W. L. Westermann and E. S. Hasenoehrl (ed.) (NY: Columbia University Press) 1934; Vol. II W. L. Westermann, C. W. Keyes, and H. Liebesny (ed.) (NY: Columbia University Press) 1940.

P. Dura *The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters. Final Report V, Part I. The Parchments and Papyri* C. Bradford Welles, Robert. O. Fink, & J. Frank Gilliam, (eds.) (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press) 1959.

Philo

Leg. *Legatio ad Gaium*

Pro Flacc. *Pro Flaccus*

Spec. *De specialibus legibus*

Somn. *De Somniis*

Virt. *De virtutibus*

Philostratus

Vita Apoll. *Vita Apollonii*

Plato

Crat. *Cratylus*

Plutarch

Crass. *Crassus*

Socrates

HE *Historia Ecclesiastica*

Strabo

Geog. *Geographica*

Suetonius

Aug. *Divus Augustus*

Claud. *Divus Claudius*

Tib. *Tiberius*

Theodoret

HR *Historia Religiosa*

Talmud

Sota *Sotah*

Zeraim *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Zeraim* I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press) 1948.

Xenophon

An *Anabasis*

Abbott, T. K. 1891 *Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments* (London: Longmans)

Adams, James 2002 'Bilingualism at Delos' in Adams, Janse, & Swain: 103-27

2003 *Bilingualism and Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Adams, James, Mark Janse, and Simon Swain (eds) 2002 *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Aejmelaeus, Anneli 1993 *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Pharos)

Aichele, George 1996 *Jesus Framed* (London: Routledge)

Aland, Kurt & Barbara Aland 1989[2] *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Albright, W. F. 1937 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: the Nash Papyrus' *JBL* 56:143-76

1946 'The Names "Nazareth" and "Nazoraean"' *JBL* 65:397-401

1960[5] *The Archaeology of Palestine* (London: Penguin)

Alexander, Loveday 1995 '"In Journeyings Often": Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance' in Tuckett: 17-49

2005 *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (ECC; LNTS 298; London: T&T Clark)

Alexander, Philip 2001 'Hellenism and Hellenization as Problematic Historiographical Categories' in Engberg-Pedersen: 63-80

Allen, William Sidney 1987[3] (1968) *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Allen, Willoughby Charles 1912[3] (1907) *The Gospel According to S. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Allison, Dale C. Jr. 1992 'Peter and Cephas: One and the Same' *JBL* 111:489-95

1993 *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

2003 *Testament of Abraham* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)

Allinson, F. G. 1905 *Lucian Selected Writings* (Boston: Ginn & Company)

Alt, A. 1953 'Die Stätten des Wirkens Jesu in Galiläa territorialgeschichtlich betrachtet' in idem *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München: C. H. Bech'sche): 2.436-55

Andersen, Øivind & Vernon Robbins 1993 'Paradigms in Homer, Pindar, the Tragedians, and the New Testament' in *Semeia* 64: 3-31

Anderson, Hugh 1976 *The Gospel of Mark* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott)

Andrews, D. K. 1947 'The Translation of Aramaic *DI* in the Greek Bibles' *JBL* 66: 15-51

Angus, S. 1914 *The Environment of Early Christianity* (London: Duckworth)

Appel, R. & P. Muysken 1987 *Language Contact and Bilingualism* (London: Edward Arnold)

Argyle, Aubrey W. 1955 'An Alleged Semitism' *ExpTim* 66:177

1956 'An Alleged Semitism' *ExpTim* 67:247

1963-4 '"Hypocrites" and the Aramaic Theory' *ExpTim* 75:113-4

1969 'An Alleged Semitism' *ExpTim* 80:285-6

1974 'Greek Among the Jews of Palestine in New Testament Times,' *NTS* 20:87-9

Asgeirsson, Jon Ma, Kristin de Troyer, Marvin W. Meyer 2000 *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson* (BETL 146; Leuven: Leuven University Press)

Aune, David Edward 1980 'Magic in Early Christianity' *ANRW*II 23.2

Austin, Colin & S. Douglas Olson 2004 *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Austin, John Langshaw 1962 *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Austin, M. 1981 *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Austin, Peter 1998 'Crow is sitting chasing them': Grammaticalization and the verb 'to sit' in the Mantharta languages, Western Australia' in Siewierska & Song: 19-36

Avi-Yonah, M. 1978 *Hellenism and the East: Contacts and Interrelations from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International)

Avni, G & Z. Greenhut (eds) 1996 *The Akeldama Tombs: Three Burial Caves in the Kidron Valley, Jerusalem* (IAA Report I; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority): 57-72

Axmaker, Shelley, Annie Jaisser, & Helen Singmaster (eds) 1988 *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society)

Bacon, Benjamin W. 1930 *Studies in Matthew* (London: Constable)

Bachmann, Michael 2000 'ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ und ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ im Galaterbrief' *ZNW* 91:288-9

Bakhos, Carol (ed) 2005 *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context* (SJSJ 95; Leiden: Brill)

Balsdon, John Percy Vyvian Dacre 1979 *Romans and Aliens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)

Barclay, John 1996 *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Baron, S. W. 1952 *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (Vol. 1, New York: Columbia University Press)

Barr, James 1961 *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

1985 'Hebrew Orthography and the Book of Job' *JSS* 30: 1-33

1988 '"Abbā isn't Daddy"' *JTS* 39/1:28-47

1989 *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Barrett, C. Kingsley 1975 *The Gospel of John and Judaism* (London: SPCK)

1994-1998 *The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Bartlet, J. Vernon 1901-2 'The Twofold Use of "Jerusalem" in the Lucan Writings' *ExpTim* 13:157-8

Bartoněk, Antonín 1972 *Classification of the West Greek Dialects at the Time about 350 B.C.* (Adolf M. Hakkert: Amsterdam)

Baslez, M.-F. 2007 'The Bilingualism of the Phoenicians in the Ancient Greek World' in Christidis: 911-23

Bauckham, Richard 1995 'James and the Jerusalem Church' in Bauckham: 415-80

2002 'Paul and Other Jews with Latin Names in the New Testament' in Christophersen, Claussen, Frey, & Longenecker: 202-20

Bauckham, Richard (ed) 1995 *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (BAFCS 4; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Bauer, Walter 1967 'Jesus der Galiläer' in Strecker: 91-108

Baur, F. C. 1873-75 *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity* 2 vols. (London: Williams & Norgate)

Beardsmore, B. 1982 *Bilingualism: Basic Principles* (Avon: Tieto)

Beare, Francis Wright 1969[2] (1959) *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (BNTC; London: Adam & Charles Black)

Beattie, D.R.G. & M.J. McNamara 1994 *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (JSOTSS 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Becker, J. 1993 *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK)

Bell, G. K. A. & Adolf Deissmann 1930 *Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians* (London: Longman, Greek, & Co)

Bengel, Johann 1859 *Gnomon of the New Testament* 5 Vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

German edition in 1759

Benko, Stephen 1969 'The Edict of Claudius of A.D. 49' *TZ* 25: 406-18

Berger, Klaus 1970 *Die Amen-Worte Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Legitimation in apokalyptischer Rede* (BZNW 39; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)

Bernhardy, G. 1861 *Grundriss der Griechischen Litteratur 2 Vols.* (Halle: Eduard Anton)

Best, Ernest & R. McL. Wilson 1979 *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Betz, Hans Dieter 1979 *Galatians* (Hermenia; Philadelphia: Fortress)

1991 'Magic and Mystery in the Greek Magical Papyri' in Faraone: 244-59

Betz, Hans Dieter (ed) 1986 *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Bickerman, Elias J. 1933 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief von Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc 1:1-9)' *ZNW* 32:233-54

1944 'The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther' *JBL* 63/4:339-62

1949 'The Name of Christians' *HTR* 42:109-24

1962 *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-biblical Judaism* (New York: Schocken)

1976 *Studies in Jewish and Christian History Part I - III* (AGJU 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill)

1979 *The God of the Maccabees: Studies in the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* H. R. Moehring (trans) (Leiden: Brill)

Birkeland, Harris 1954 *The Language of Jesus* (Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad)

Biville, Frédérique 2002 'The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism' in Adams: 77-102

Black, David Alan 1995[2] (1988) *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books)

Black, David Alan (ed) 2002 *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids,

MI: Baker Academic)

Black, Matthew 1998, 1967[3] (1946) *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon)

1957 'The Recovery of the Language of Jesus' *NTS* 3:305-13

1965 'Second Thoughts – IX. The Semitic Element in the NT' *ExpTim* 77: 20-3

1968 'Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus' Black & Fohrer: 17-28

1970 'ΕΦΦΑΘΑ (Mk 7:34), [ΤΑ] ΠΑΣΧΑ (Mt 16:18W), [ΤΑ] ΣΑΒΒΑΤΑ (passim), [ΤΑ] ΔΙΔΡΑΧΜΑ (Mt 17:24 bis)' in Descamps: 57-62

Black, Matthew & Georg Fohrer (eds) 1968 *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (Berlin: Töpelmann)

Blackman, E. C. 1936-7 'The Hellenists of Acts VI.1' *ExpTim* 48: 524-5

Blau, Ludwig 1913 *Papyri und Talmud in gegenseitiger Beleuchtung* (Leipzig: Gustaf Fock)

Blinzler, J. & O. Kuss, & F. Mussner (eds) 1963 *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift Josef Schmid* (Regensburg: F. Pustet)

Bloomfield, L. 1933 *Language* (NY: Holt)

Blunt, A.W.F. 1929 *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (CB; Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bockmuehl, Markus 2001 *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

2004 'Simon Peter's Names in Jewish Sources' *JJS* 55:58-80

2005 'Simon Peter and Bethsaida' in Chilton & Evan: 53-90

Borgen, Peder 1996 *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Bornkamm, Günther 1960 *Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Botha, J. Eugene 1991 *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42* (NovT Sup 65; Leiden: Brill)

Bousset, Wilhelm 1906[6] *Die Offenbarung Johannis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

1970 *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of*

Christianity to Irenaeus (Nashville, TN: Abingdon)

Bowman, Alan & Greg Woolf (eds) 1994 *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Branscomb, B.H. 1937 *The Gospel of Mark* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Bratcher, Robert, G. & Eugene A. Nida 1961 *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (HT 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill)

Britto, F. 1986 *Diglossia: A Study of the Theory with Application to Tamil* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University)

Brixhe, Claude 1988 'La langue de l'étranger non grec chez Aristophane' in Lonis: 113-38

2002 'Interactions between Greek and Phrygian under the Roman Empire' in Adams: 246-66

Brock, Sebastian 1994 'Greek and Syriac in Late Antique Syria,' in Bowman: 151-2

Brown, John Pairman 2000 'The Noun-Vocabulary of Jesus' Aramaic' in Evans:240-78

Brown, Keith & Jim Miller (eds) 1999 *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories* (Oxford: Elsevier)

Brown, Raymond E. 1970^2 (1966) *The Gospel According to John* (AB 19 AB Garden City: Doubleday)

1993^2 (1977) *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday)

1994 *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* 2 Vols. (ABRL; New York: Doubleday)

Browning, Robert 1983^2 (1969) *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Bruce, F. F. 1952^2 (1951) *The Acts of the Apostles* (TNTC; London: The Tyndale Press)

1965 *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (NLCNT; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott)

1971 *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCB; London: Oliphants)

1977 *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Exeter: Paternoster)

1989 'Philip and the Ethiopian' *JSS* 34:377-87

Brunt, P. 1971 *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic* (New York: Norton)

Bryan, Christopher 1993 *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bubenik, V. 1989 *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

Buck, Carl Darling 1965 rev. (1928) *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Budge, E. A. W. 1928 *A History of Ethiopia: Nubia and Abyssinia* Vol. 1. (London: Methuen)

Bultmann, Rudolf 1925 'Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums' in *ZNW* 24:100-46

1935 *Jesus and the Word* (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson)

1952 & 1955 *Theology of the New Testament I, II* (London: SCM)

1956 *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting* (London: Thames & Hudson)

1961 *Existence and Faith* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

1967 *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* E. Dinkler ed. (Tübingen: Mohr)

1968^2 (1963) *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Bultmann, Rudolf & Karl Kundsin 1934 *Form Criticism: A New Method of New Testament Research* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company)

Burkill, T.A. 1963 *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press)

Burkitt, F. C. 1904 *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence* Vols II. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1912 'The Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names' *PBA* :377-408

Burney, C. F. 1922 *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon)

1925 *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Burton, Ernest de Witt 1921 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Butcher, Kevin 2003 *Roman Syria and the Near East* (London: The British Museum Press)

Buth, Randall 1981 'Mark 3.17 ΒΟΝΕΡΕΓΕΜ and Popular Etymology' *JSNT* 10: 29-33

Byrskog, Samuel 2000 *Story as History - History as Story; The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT 123; Tübingen: Mohr)

Cadbury, Henry J. 1920a *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

1920b 'Luke: Translator or Author?' *AJT* 24: 436-455

1933 'The Hellenists' in *Beg.* 5.59-74

1958[2] (1927) *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK)

1966 'Four Features of Lucan Style' in Keck & Martyn 87-102

Cadoux, Cecil John 1941 *The Historic Mission of Jesus: A Constructive Re-Examination of the Eschatological Teaching in the Synoptic Gospels* (London: Lutterworth)

Cappelletti, Silvia 2006 *The Jewish Community of Rome: From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E.* (SJSJ 113; Leiden: Brill)

Caragounis, Chrys C. 1990 *Peter and the Rock* (BZNW 58; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)

2004 *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (WUNT 167; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)

2005 'The Development of Greek and New Testament: A Response to Dr. M. Silva'

WTJ 67:405-15

Carr, Philip 1993 *Phonology* (MLS; London: Macmillan)

Carruth, Shawn, James M. Robinson, & Christoph Heil (eds) 1996 *Documenta Q: Q 4:1-13, 16 The Temptation of Jesus Nazara* (Leuven: Peeters)

Casey, P. Maurice 1991 *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK)

1998 *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Casson, L. 1989 *The Periplus Maris Erythraei: Test with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Chambers, Jack, K. 1995 *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and its Social Significance* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Chambers, Jack, K. & Peter Trudgill 1998[2] (1980) *Dialectology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Chapman, Dean W. 1993 *The Orphan Gospel: Mark's perspective on Jesus* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Charlesworth, James H. 1981 *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCSS 7S; Chico, CA: Scholars Press)

1988 *Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday)

1994 'A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of Abba: A Study of the Lord's Prayer' in Charlesworth:1-14

Charlesworth, James H. (ed) 1994 *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity)

Charlesworth, James H. & C. A. Evans (eds) 1993 *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSS 14; SSEJC 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Chase, Frederic Henry 1893 *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London: Macmillan)

Chilton, Bruce 1978 '"Amen": an Approach through Syriac Gospels' *ZNW* 69:203-11 (= 1986 *Studies in Judaism: Targumic Approaches to the Gospels: Essays in the Mutual Definition of Judaism and Christianity* (University Press of America): 15-23

1984 *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah* (London: SPCK)

1993 'God as "Father" in the Targumim, in Non-Canonical Literatures of Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity, and in Matthew' in Charlesworth et al: 151-69

Chilton, Bruce & Craig A. Evans (eds) 1994 *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (NTTS 19; Leiden: Brill)

2005 *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* (NovT Sup 115; Leiden: Brill)

Chomsky, Noam 1965 *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, MA: MIT)

Christidis, A.–F. (ed) 2007 *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Christophersen, Alf, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey & Bruce Longenecker (eds) 2002 *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn* (JSNTSS 217; Sheffield Academic Press: Continuum)

Clarke, Andrew 1993 *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6* (AGJU 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill)

Clarysse, Willy 1979 'Egyptian Estate-Holders in the Ptolemaic Period' in Lipinski: 2.73-43

1983 'Literary Papyri in Documentary "Archives"' in Van't Dack: 43-61

1992 'Some Greek in Egypt' in Johnson: 51-6

1995 'Greeks in Ptolemaic Thebes' in Vleeming: 1-19

Clauss, M 1973 'Probleme der Lebensalterstatistiken aufgrund römischer Grabinschriften'

Chiron 3:395-417

Cohen, Shaye J. D. & Ernest S. Frerichs (eds) 1993 *Diaspora in Antiquity* (BJS 288; Atlanta. Georgia: Scholars)

Cohn-Sherbok, D. & J. M. Court (eds) 2001 *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World: A Survey of Recent Scholarship* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Cole, Alan 1989[2] (1961) *The Gospel According to Mark* (TNTC; Leicester: IVP)

Collins, John 1983 *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad)

Collins, John & R. A. Kugler (eds) 2000 *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Collins, John & Gregory Sterling (eds) 2001 *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press)

Conzelmann, Hans 1960 *The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber)

1969 *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (NTL; London: SCM)

1973 *History of Primitive Christianity* (London: DLT)

1987 *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress)

Cooper, Robert L. & Bernard Spolsky 1991 *The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman's Sixty-Fifty Birthday* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Coseriu, Eugenio (ed) 1975 *Esquisses Linguistiques* II. (ILGL 37; München: Fink)

Cotton, Hannah 1999 'The Languages of Documents from the Judaean Desert' *ZPE* 125: 219-31

2005 'Language Gaps in Roman Palestine and the Roman Near East' in Frevel: 151-69

Cotton, Hannah, W. E. H. Cockle & F. Millar 1995 'The Papyrology of the Roman Near

East: A Survey' *JRS* 85: 214-235

Coulmas, Florian 2005 *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speaker's Choices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Coulmas, Florian (ed) 1997 *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Cowley, Arthur 1923 *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BCE* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Cranfield, C.E.B. 1959 *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (CGTC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

2001 (1975) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans* 2 Vols. (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Cross, Frank Moore 1964 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert' *HTR* 57 281-99; also in Frank M. Cross & S. Talmon 1975 *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) 177-95.

Cross, Frank, Moore & David Noel Freedman 1952 *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of Epigraphic Evidence* (New Haven: American Oriental Society)

Crossan, J. D. 1991 *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperCollins)

Crowe, J. 1997 *From Jerusalem to Antioch: the Gospel across Cultures* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press)

Culley, Robert C. 1986 'Oral Tradition and Biblical Studies' Oral Tradition 1: 30-65 (web)

Cullmann, Oscar 1953 *Early Christian Worship* (SBT 10; London: SCM)

1956 *The Early Church* (London: SCM)

1959 *Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM)

1962[2] (1953) *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study* (London: SCM)

Culpepper, R. Alan. 2001 'The Origin of the 'Amen, Amen' Sayings in the Gospel of John' in Fortna: 253-62

Dalman, Gustaf 1905[2] (1894) *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des palästinischen Talmud, des Onkelostargum und Prophetentargum, und der jerusalemischen Targume* (Leipzig: Hinrichs)

1909 *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language I. Introduction and Fundamental Ideas* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

1929 *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (London: SPCK)

1935 *Sacred Sites and Ways: Studies in the Topography of the Gospels* (London: SPCK)

D'Angelo, Mary Rose 1992a '*Abba* and "Father": Imperial Theology and the Jesus Traditions' *JBL* 111/4:611-30

1992b 'Theology in Mark and Q: *Abba* and "Father" in Context' *HTR* 85/2:149-74

Daube, David 1956 *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 1952 SOAS, University of London; London: Athlone)

Davies, William David & Dale C. Allison Jr. 1988-1997 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* 3 Vols. (ICC; London: T&T Clark)

Davies, William David & Louis Finkelstein 1989 *The Cambridge History of Judaism* Vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Davis, Carl Judson 1996 *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology* (JSNTSS 129; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Davis, M. T. & Loren Stuckenbruck 1992 'Notes on Translation Phenomena in the Palmyrene Bilinguals' in Kapera: 265-83

Deferrari, R. J. (ed) 1952 *Early Christian Biographies* (The Fathers of the Church Vol. XV; Washington: Catholic University of America Press): 239-80

Deissmann, Adolf 1903[2] (1901) *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and*

Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

1908 *The Philology of the Greek Bible: Its Present and Future* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

1927[4] (1910) *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

1929 *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research: The Haskell Lectures, 1929* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

1930 'The Name "Jesus"' in Bell & Deissmann:

1957[2] (1925) *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

1991 'Hellenistic Greek with Special Consideration of the Greek Bible' in Porter: 39-59

De Jonge, M. 1966 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus' *NovT* 8:132-48

Delobel, Joël (ed) 1982 *Logia; Les Paroles de Jésus – the Sayings of Jesus Mémorial Joseph Coppens* (BETL 59; Leuven: Leuven University Press)

Denniston, John Dewar 1954[2] (1934) *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

De la Potterie, I. 1982 'Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans les Actes de Apôtres' *Bib* 63:153-87

De Saussure, Ferdinand 1959 *Course in General Linguistics* Charles Bally & Albert Sechehaye (eds) (New York: Philosophical Library)

Descamps, Albert & André de Halleux (eds) 1970 *Mélanges bibliques en Hommage au R P Béda Rigaux* (Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot)

Dewey, Joanna 1989 'Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark' *Interpretation* 43:32-44

1994 'The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event: Implications for Interpretation' In

Malbon: 145-163

1998 'From Oral Stories to Written Text' *Concilium* 1998/3

De Zwaan, J. 1922 'The Use of the Greek Language in Acts' in *Beg*.2.30-65

Dibelius, Martin 1934 *From Tradition to Gospel* (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson)

1935 *Gospel Criticism and Christology* (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson)

1936 *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson)

1939 *The Message of Jesus* (London: Nicholson & Watson)

1949 *Jesus* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press)

Diebold, A. R. 1961 'Incipient Bilingualism' *Language* 37/1:97-112

Dinkler, Erich 1958 'Der Brief an die Galater' *VF* 1-3:175-83

1959 'Die Petrus-Rom-Frage' *TRu* 25:189-230 and 289-335

Dömer, M. 1978 *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Theologie des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (BBB51; Köln-Bonn: P. Hanstein)

Doran, Robert 2001 'The High Cost of a Good Education' in Collins: 94-115

Downes, William. 1984 *Language and Society* (London: Fontana)

Downey, Granville 1961 *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

1962 *Antioch in the Age of Theodosius the Great* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press)

1975 'Caesarea and the Christian Church' in Fritsch: 23-42

Drijvers, Han 1984 *East of Antioch: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity* (London: Variorum)

1992 'Syrian Christianity and Judaism' in Lieu: 124-146

1995 'Greek and Aramaic in Palmyrene Inscriptions' in Geller: 31-42

Droysen, Johann 1836-43 *Geschichte des Hellenismus* 3 vols. (Hamburg: Gotha)

Dunn, James D. G. 1975 *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic*

Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament (London: SCM)

1989[2] (1980) *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM)

1993 *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; London: A&C Black)

1996 *The Acts of the Apostles* (EC; Epworth, Peterborough)

2003 *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

2005 *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* (London: SPCK)

Dupont, Jacques 1985 *A cause de l'Evangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et Actes: offertes au P. Jacques Dupont O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD123; Paris: Cerf)

Duranti, Alessandro 1997 *Linguistic Anthropology* (CTL; Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press)

Eastman, Carol 1990[2] (1975) *Aspects of Language and Culture* (Novato, Calif.: Chandler & Sharp)

Edwards, Douglas, R. (ed) 2004 *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions, New Approaches* (London: Routledge)

Ehrman, Bart D. 1990 'Cephas and Peter' *JBL* 109:463-74

El-Abbadi, Mostafa 1990 *The Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria* (Paris:UNESCO)

2004 'The Alexandrian Library in History' in Hirst: 167-83

Elliott, J. Keith 1992 *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (EFN3: Cordoba: Ediciones el Almendro)

1993 *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: An Edition of C. H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" Together with Other Comparable Studies* (NovT Sup LXXI; Leiden: E. J. Brill)

Elliott, J. Keith (ed) 1976 *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (NovT Sup XLIV; Leiden: E. J. Brill)

Ellis, E. E. 2001 *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (BIS 39; Leiden: Brill)

Eltester, W. (ed) 1972 *Jesus in Nazareth* (BZNW 40; Berlin: de Gruyter)

Emerton, J.A. 1967 'Maranatha and Ephphatha' *JTS* 18:427-31

Engberg-Pedersen, T. (ed) 2001 *Paul Beyond the Judaism / Hellenism Divide* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK)

Epp, Eldon Jay 1966 *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (SNTSMS 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1999 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism' *HTR* 92: 245-81

2002 'Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century' in Black: 17-76

Epp, Eldon Jay & Gordon D. Fee (eds) 1981 *New Testament Textual Criticism Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Epp, Eldon Jay & George W. MacRae (eds) 1989 *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars)

Eshel, Esther & Douglas R. Edwards 2004 'Language and Writing in Early Roman Galilee: Social Location of a Potter's Abecedary from Khirbet Qana' in Edwards: 49-55

Esler, Philip 1987 *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

2001 'Palestinian Judaism in the First Century' in Cohn-Sherbok: 21-46

Esler, Philip (ed) 2000 *The Early Christian World* (London: Routledge)

Evans, Craig A. 2001 *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson)

2003 *Jesus and the Ossuaries* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press)

Evans, Craig A. (ed) 2000 *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (JSPSS33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Evans, J., L. Workman & P. Mayer 2002 'Differential Bilingual Laterality: Mythical Monster Found in Wales' *Brain and Language* 83/2: 291-299

Faraone, Christopher A. & Dirk Obbink (eds) 1991 *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Fasold, Ralph & Jeff Connor-Linton (eds) 2006 *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Fawcett, Peter 1997 *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theory Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome)

Feldman, Louis 1960 'The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt' *JewSocSt* 22:224-6

1977 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect' *JBL* 96: 371-82

1986 'How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine?' *HUCA* 57:83-111

1993 *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

Ferguson, Charles 1959 'Diglossia' *Word* 15:325-40

1991 'Diglossia Revisited' *SWJL* 10/1:214-34

Fewster, Penelope 2002 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt' in Adams: 220-45

Finkel, Asher 1981 'The Prayer of Jesus in Matthew' in Finkel: 131-70

Finkel, Asher & Lawrence Frizzell (eds) 1981 *Standing Before God: Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays In Honor of John M. Oesterreicher* (New York: KTAV)

Finlayson, R. & S. Slabbert 1997 "I'll Meet You Halfway with Language': Code-Switching Within a South African Urban Context' in Pütz: 381-421.

Fisiak, Jacek (ed) 1985 *Historical Semantics, Historical Word Formation* (TLSM 29; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Fishman, Joshua 1967 'Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism' *JSI* 23/2:29-38

1971 *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction*, (Rowley, MA: Newbury House)

Fishman, Joshua (ed) 1968 *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (Hague/Paris: Mouton)

1985 *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages* (Leiden: Brill)

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1968 Review of 'An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts' *CBQ* 30: 417-28

1971 *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman)

1974 'The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament' *NTS* 20: 382-407

1979a *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula, MT: Scholars)

1979b 'Aramaic Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament' in Best & McL.Wilson: 121-32

1980 'The Aramaic Language and the Study of the New Testament' *JBL* 99:5-21

1981-5 *The Gospel According to Luke* 2 Vols. (AB 28; New York: Doubleday)

1985 '*Abba* and Jesus' Relation to God' in Dupont: 14-381990 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (RBS 20; Atlanta: Scholars)

1992 'Did Jesus Speak Greek?' *BAR* 18:58-63, 76-7

1998 *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday)

2000 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (SDSSRL; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, MI)

2001 Review 'The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous

Discussion and New Proposals' *BibInt* 9: 410-3

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. 1931 *The Acts of the Apostles* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Foley, William A. 1997 *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction* (Language in Society: Oxford: Blackwell)

Forster, A. Haire 1922 'The Pronunciation of Greek in New Testament Times' *AThR*: 108-15

Fortna, Robert 1989 *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Fortna, Robert & Tom Thatcher (eds) 2001 *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK)

Fowler, Robert M. 1991 *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress)

Fox, Barbara (ed) 1996 *Studies in Anaphors* (TSL 33; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins)

France, R.T. 1985 *The Gospel According to Matthew: an Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

2002 *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Franklin, Eric 1975 *Christ the Lord: The Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK)

Freedman, David Noel 1962 'The Massoretic Texts and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography' *Textus* 2:87-102

1969 'Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job' *Eretz-Israel* 9:35-44

Frevel, Christian (ed) 2005 *Medien im antiken Palästina* (FAT 2.10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)

Freyne, Seán 1980 *Galilee From Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press)

1992 'Urban-Rural Relations in First-Century Galilee: Some Suggestions from the

Literary Sources' in Levine: 75-91

Fritsch, Charles T. (ed) 1975 *Studies in the history of Caesarea Maritima* (BASORSup 19; Missoula: Scholars)

Fromkin, Victoria & Robert Rodman 1998[6] (1974) *An Introduction to Language* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers)

Frommel, Otto 1908 *The Poetry of the Gospel of Jesus* (London: David Nutt)

Fuchs, L. 1924 *Die Juden Ägyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit* (Wien: M. Rath)

Fuller, Reginald H. 1963 *Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia: Westminster)

1965 *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (London: Lutterworth)

Gamble, Harry 2004 'Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon' in Horton: 27-39

Gehman, Henry 1951 'The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek' *VT* 1:81-90

1953 'Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis' *VT* 3:141-8

Geller, M. J., J. C. Greenfield & M. P. Weitzman (eds) 1995 *Studia Aramaica: New Sources and New Approaches. Papers Delivered at the London Conference of The Institute of Jewish Studies, University College London, 26th – 28th June 1991* (JSSSup 4; Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Geraty, L. T. 1975 'The Khirbet el-Kôm Bilingual Ostracon' *BASOR* 220:55-62

Giacalone Ramat, Anna 1995 'Code-Switching in the Context of Dialect/Standard Language Relations' in Milroy : 45-67

Gignac, Francis Thomas 1970 'The Language of the Non-Literary Greek Papyri' *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* D. H. Samuel (ed) (Toronto: Hakkert)

1976–1981 *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods Vol. I. Phonology & II. Morphology* (Milano: Cisalpino-La Goliardica)

1985 'The Papyri and the Greek Language' *YCS* 28: 154-65

1989 'Phonological Phenomena in the Greek Papyri Significant for the Text and Language of the New Testament' In Horgan: 33 – 46

Gill, David 1994 'Acts and the Urban Élites' in Gill: 105-118

Gill, David & Conrad Gempf (eds) 1994 *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting* (BAFCS 2; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Glockmann, Günter 1968 *Homer in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Justinus* (TU 105: Berlin: Akademie Verlag)

Goguel, M. 1933 *La Foi à la résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme primitif* (Paris: Leroux)

Goldstein, Jonathan 1981 'Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism' in Sanders: 2.64-87

Goodman, Martin 1983 *State and Society in Roman Galilee, CE 132-212* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld)

1987 *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome CE 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1994 'Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea' in Bowman: 102-8.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. 1926 *The Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

1937 *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (New York: McMillan)

1942 'The Possible Aramaic Gospel' *JNES* 1:315-40

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. 1978 'The Language of Targum Onkelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic' *JNES* 37:169-80

Goudriaan, K. 1988 *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Amsterdam)

Goulder, Michael D. 1993 'Luke's Knowledge of Matthew' in Strecker: 143-60

2003 'Two Significant Minor Agreements (Mat. 4:13 Par.; Mat. 26:67-68 Par.)' *NovT* 45: 365-73

Grabbe, Lester. L. 1988 *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo* (BJS 115; Atlanta, GA: Scholars)

1991 *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* 2 vols. (Minneapolis: Fortress)

Grainger, J. 1991 *Hellenistic Phoenicia* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Grajetzki, Wolfram 2003 *Burial Customs in Ancient Egypt: Life in Death for Rich and Poor* (London: Duckworth)

Grant, Robert M. 1963 *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London: Collins)

Green, Peter 1990 *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Green, William (ed) 1978-1985 *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* 5 vols. (SJGR, BJS 1, 9, 11, 27, 32; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press)

Greenberg, Joseph H. Charles A. Ferguson, & Edith Moravcsik (eds) 1978 *Universals of Human Language* 4 vols. (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

Greenlee, J. Harold 1995[2] (1964) *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson)

Griffiths, P. J. 1999 *Religious Reading: The Place of Reading in the Practice of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Griggs, Wilfred 1990 *Early Egyptian Christianity from its Origins to 451 CE* (Leiden: Brill)

Groom, Susan Anne 2003 *Linguistic Analysis of Biblical Hebrew* (Carlisle: Paternoster)

Grosjean, F. 1982 *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

1995 'A Psycholinguistic Approach to Code-Switching: The Recognition of Guest Words by Bilinguals' in Milroy: 259-75

Grundmann, Walter 1939 'Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde' *ZNW* 38:45-73

Grushevoi, Alexander 1985 'The Tribe 'Ubaishat in Safaitic Nabataean and Greek

Inscriptions' *BAS* 33:51-4

Guenther, Heinz O. 1992 'The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins' *Semeia* 55:41-76

Gumperz, John J. & J. Cook-Gumperz 1982 'Introduction: Language and the Communication of Social Identity in Gumperz: 1-21

Gumperz, John (ed) 1982 *Language and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Gumperz, John & Stephen Levinson (eds) 1996 *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Gundry, Robert Horton 1964 'The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine: its Bearing on the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition' *JBL* 83:404-8

1967 *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovT Sup 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill)

1993 *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

1994[2] (1982) *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Gunkel, Herman 1921 *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoed & Ruprecht)

1997 (German 1912[3]) *Genesis* Translated and Interpreted (MLBS; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press)

Gustave, Lefebvre 1908 'Égypte Gréco-Romaine' *Ann. Serv.*: 231-42

Güting, E. 1975 'Der geographische Horizont der sogenannten Völkerliste des Lukas (Acta 2, 9-11) *ZNW* 66:149-69

Güttgemanns, Erhardt 1979 *Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism: A*

Methodological Sketch of the Fundamental Problematics of Form and Redaction Criticism (PTMS 26; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick)

Gzella, Holger 2005 'Die Palmyrener in der griechisch-romischen Welt: Kulturelle Begegnung im Spiegel des Sprachkontaktes' *Klio* 87/2:445-58

Hadas, Moses 1959 *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Haenchen, Ernst 1968[2] *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklarung des Markus-Evangelium und der kanonischen Parallelen* (Berlin: Gruyter)

1971 *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Hagner, Donald 1997 'Jewish Christianity' in *DLNTD*:579-87

Hahn, Ferdinand 1969 *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (London: Lutterworth)

Hakuta, K. 1986 *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism* (New York: Basic Books)

Hamers, J. F. & M. H. A. Blanc 1989 *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Hamerton-Kelly, Robert 1979 *God the Father: Theology and Patriarchy in the Teaching of Jesus* (OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress)

1981 'God the Father in the Bible and in the Experience of Jesus: The State of the Question' in Metz & Schillebeeckx: 95-102

Harrer, G. A. 1940 'Saul who also is Called Paul' *HTR* 33:19-33

Harvey, G. 1996 *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew, and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU 35; Leiden: Brill)

Harviainen, Tapani 1984 'Diglossia in Jewish Eastern Aramaic' *StudOr* 55:95-113

Hasler, Victor 1969 *Amen: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Einführungsformel der Herrenworte "Wahrlich ich sage euch"* (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag)

Haugen, E. 1972 'Dialect, Language, Nation' in Pride: 97-111

Healey, John 2001 *The Religion of the Nabataeans: A Conspectus* (Leiden: Brill)

Hegermann, Harald 1989 'The Diaspora in the Hellenistic Age' in Davies: 115-66

Heitmüller, Wilhelm 1912 'Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus' *ZNW* 13:320-37

Heller, Monica 1995 'Code-switching and the Politics of Language' in Milroy: 158-174

Heller, Monica (ed) 1988 *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Hemer, Colin J. 1989 *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* Conrad H. Gempf ed. (WUNT 49; Tübingen: Mohr)

Hempel, J. 1962 'Amen' in *IDB*: 1.105

Henaut, B. W. 1993 *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4* (JSNTSS 82; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Hengel, Martin 1974 *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (London: SCM), *Judentum und Hellenismus* (in German in 1969)

1975 'Zwischen Jesus und Paulus' *ZTK* 72:151-206 (translated into English in Hengel 1983:1-29)

1980 *Jews, Greek and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period* (London: SCM)

1983 *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* (London: SCM)

1985 *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM)

1986 *Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM)

1989a *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century After Christ* (London: SCM)

1989b *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM)

1991 *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM)

1992 'The Pre-Christian Paul' in Lieu: 29-52

2001 'Judaism and Hellenism Revisited' in Collins: 6-37

Hengel, Martin & Anna Schwemer 1997 *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (London: SCM)

Hezser, Catherine 2001 *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)

2003 'Jewish Literacy and the Use of Writing in Late Roman Palestine' in Kalmin: 149-95

Hill, Craig C. 1992 *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division Within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress)

1996 'Acts 6.1-8.4: Division or Diversity?' in Witherington: 129-153.

Hill, David 1971 'The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke IV 16-30)' *NovT*13:161-80

Hirst, Anthony & Michael Silk (eds) 2004 *Alexandria, Real and Imagined* (PCHS 5; Hampshire: Ashgate)

Hitti, Philip 1951 *History of Syria Including Lebanon and Palestine* (London: Macmillan)

Hock, Ronald 2001 'Homer in Greco-Roman Education' in MacDonald: 56-77

Hoffmann, Charlotte 1991 *An Introduction to Bilingualism* (London: Longman)

Hogg, H. W. 1896 '"Amen." Notes on its Significance and Use in Biblical and Post-Biblical Times' *JQR* 9/1:1-23

Holleran, Warren J. 1973 *The Synoptic Gethsemane: A Critical Study* (Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice)

Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius 1892[2] (1889) *Die Synoptiker – Die Apostelgeschichte* (HKNT 1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr)

Honigman, S. 1993 'The Birth of a Diaspora: The Emergence of a Jewish Self-Definition in Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of Onomastics' in Cohen: 93-127

Hooker, Morna D. 1981 *The Gospel According to St Mark* (BNTC; London: A&C Black)

Horbury, William 1994 'Jewish Inscriptions and Jewish Literature in Egypt, with Special

Reference to Ecclesiasticus' in Van Henten: 9-43

1998 *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM)

Horgan, Maurya P. & Paul J. Kobelski 1989 *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* (New York: Crossroad)

Horrocks, Geoffrey 1997 *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longman)

Horsley, Richard 1996 *Archaeology, History, and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press)

1999 *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press)

2001 *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press)

Horsley, Richard A., Jonathan A. Draper, & John Miles Foley (eds) 2006 *Performing the Gospel Orality, Memory, and Mark: Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber* (Minneapolis: Fortress)

Hort, Fenton 1896 "Notes on Select Readings" in Westcott & Hort: 1-180

Horton, Charles (ed) 2004 *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels: The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P^{45}* (JSNTSS 258; London: T&T Clark)

Hull, John M. 1974 *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (SBT 28; London: SCM)

Huntingford, G. W. B. (trans & ed) 1980 *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (London: The Hakluyt Society)

Hurst, L. D. 1986 'The Neglected Role of Semantics in the Search for the Aramaic Words of Jesus' *JSNT* 28:63-80

Hurtado, Larry. 1983 *Mark* (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson)

1998[2] (1988) *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish*

Monotheism (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

2003 *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

2005 *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Hyman, Larry 1975 *Phonology: Theory and Analysis* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston)

Ingholt, Harald 1935 'Five Dated Tombs from Palmyra' *BAS* 2:57-120

1938 'Inscriptions and Sculptures from Palmyra' *BAS* 5:93-140

Jackendoff, Ray 1983 *Semantics in Cognition* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Jacobson, Rodolfo (ed) 1990 *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon* (AUS 13, Linguistics 2; Peter Lang)

Jaffe, Martin S. 2001 *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

James, John Courtenay 1920 *The Language of Palestine and Adjacent Regions* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

James, Montague. R. 1892 *The Testament of Abraham* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Janse, Mark 2002 'Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek' in Adams: 332-90

Jasnow, Richard 1990 'Demotic Texts from the Carnegie Museum of Natural History' *Enchoria* 17:89-96

Jeffers, Robert & Ilse Lehiste 1979 *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Jeremias, Joachim 1959 'Die Muttersprache des Evangelisten Matthäus' *ZNW* 50:270-4.

1965 *The Central Message of the New Testament* (London: SCM)

1966 *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM)

1967 *The Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 6; London: SCM)

1969 *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* (London: SCM)

1971 *New Testament Theology: Proclamation of Jesus* (NTL; London: SCM)

1972[3] (1954) *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM)

1973 'Zum nicht-responsorischen Amen' *ZNW* 64:122-3

Jervel, Jacob 1972 *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg)

Johnson, Janet (ed) 1986 'Introduction to the Demotic Magical Papyri' in Betz: lv-lviii

1992 *Life in Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine beyond* (SAOC 51; Chicago: the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago)

Johnson, Luke 1992 *The Acts of the Apostles* (SPS 5; Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press)

Johnson, Sherman E. 1972[2] (1960) *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (BNTC; London: A&C Black)

Jones, A. H. M. 1940 *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Jones, C. P. 1986 *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Jones, S. & S. Pearce (eds) 1998 *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* (JSPSup 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Jung, Chang-Wook 2004 *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* (JSNTSS 267; London/NY: T&T Clark)

Kahle, Paul E. 1959[2] (1947) *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Kahr, Joan Kasper 1975 'Adpositions and Locationals; Typology and Diachronic Development' *WLU*19:21-54

Kaizer, Ted 2002 *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period* (OeO, SKN 4; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner)

2004 'Religious Mentality in Palmyrene Documents' *Klio* 86/1:165-84

Kalmin, Richard & Seth Schwartz (eds) *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian*

Roman Empire (ISACR 3; Leuven: Peeters)

Kapera, Z. J. (ed) 1992 *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (Kraków: Enigma Press)

Kaplan, Steven 1992 *The Beta Israel [Falasha] in Ethiopia: From Earliest Times to the Twentieth Century* (New York: New York University Press)

Kasher, Aryeh 1985 *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (Tübingen: Mohr)

1987 'The Nature of Jewish Migration in the Mediterranean Countries in the Hellenistic-Roman Era' *MHR* 2:46-75

Keck, Leander E. & J. Louis Martyn 1966 *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (Nashville: Abingdon)

Kee, Howard. Clark 1977 *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM)

1989 'Synoptic Studies' in Epp: 245-269.

Keil, Josef & Anton von Premerstein 1914 *Bericht über eine dritte Reise in Lydien und den angrenzenden Gebieten Ioniens, ausgeführt 1911* (Philosophisch-historische Klasse 57; Vienna: Alfred Hölder)

Kelber, Werner 1983 *The Oral Tradition and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)

Kennard, J. Spencer Jr. 1946 'Was Capernaum the Home of Jesus?' *JBL* 65:131-41

1947 'Nazorean and Nazareth' *JBL* 66:79-81

Kilpatrick, George D. 1946 *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

1963 'Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament' in Blinzler, Kuss, & Mussner :125-37

1964 'Dura-Europos: The Parchments and the papyri' *GRBS* 5:215-25

1981 'Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament' in Epp & Fee: 349-60

Kim, K. H. S., N. R. Relkin, K.-M. Lee & J. Hirsch 1997 'District Cortical Areas Associated with Native and Second Languages' *Nature* 388: 171-4

Kim, Seyoon 1983 *The Son of Man as the Son of God* (WUNT 30; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr)

Klauck, Hans-Josef 2000 *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Klausner, Joseph 1928 *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching* (London: George Allen & Unwin)

Klein, Samuel 1923 'Drei Ortsnamen in Galiläa' *MGWJ* 67:202-5, 270-3

Klijn, A. F. J. 1959 'A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts' *NovT* 3: 1-27, 161-73

1966 'In Search of the Original Text of Acts' in Keck & Martyn: 103-110

1967 *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill)

Knox, Wilfred Lawrence 1944 *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (London: H. Milford)

Koester, Helmut 1957 *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag)

1971 'One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels' in Robinson & Koester: 158-204

1990 *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM)

1994 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition' *JBL* 113:293-297

Kokkinos, Nikos 1998 *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse* (JSPSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Koller, Werner 1979 *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer)

Kopp, Clemens 1963 *The Holy Places of the Gospels* (Freiburg: Herder)

Kövecses, Zoltán 2002 *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Kraeling, C. H. 1932 'The Jewish Community at Antioch,' *JBL* 51:130-60

Kraft, Robert & George Nickelsburg 1986 *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars)

Kramer, Werner 1966 *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (SBT 50; London: SCM)

Krasilnikoff, Jens & George Hinge (eds) 2007 *Alexandria – A Religious and Cultural Meltingpot* (ASMA 9; Aarhus)

Krentz, Edgar 1992 'Caesarea and Early Christianity' Vann: 261-7

Kristiansen, Gitte, Michel Achard, René Driven, & Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez 2006 *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives* (ACL 1; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Krupp, R. A. 1991 *Shepherding the Flock of God: The Pastoral Theology of John Chrysostom* (AUS 7; TR101; New York: Peter Lang)

Kuhrt, Amélie & S. Sherwin-White (eds) 1987 *Hellenism in the East: The Interrelation of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Kümmel, Werner Georg 1972 *The New Testament: the History of the Investigation of Its Problems* (Nashville: Abingdon)

1973 *The Theology of the New Testament According to its Major Witnesses Jesus – Paul - John* (Nashville: Abingdon)

1975 *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM)

Labov, William 1966 'The Linguistic Variable as a Structural Unit' *WLR* 3:4-22

1972 *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

Lagrange, Marie-Joseph 1947[8] (1929) *Évanglie selon Saint Marc* (EB; Paris: J. Gabalda)

Lake, Kirsopp 1921 'Simon, Cephas, Peter' *HTR* 14:95-7

1927[2] (1911) *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (London: Livingtons)

Lardiere, Donna 2006 'Words and Their Parts' in Fasold & Connor-Linton: 55-96

Lapide, Pinchas 1975 'Insights from Qumran into the Languages of Jesus' *RevQ* 8:483-501

Leclercq, A. A. 1972-3 'A Note on the Transliteration of New Testament Greek' *NTS* 19: 187-90

Lee, J.A.L. 1985 'Some Features of the Speech of Jesus in Mark's Gospel' *NovT* 27:1-26

Lehmann, Christian 2002 'New Reflections on Grammaticalization and Lexicalization' in Wischer & Diewald:1-18

Leiwo, 2002 'Bilingualism at Delos' in Adams, Janse, & Swain: 103-27

Lenski, Gerhard 1984 *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification* (Chapel Hill:)

Leon, Harry (updated edition by Carolyn Osiek) 1995 (1960) *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson)

Levine, Lee 1975 *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill)

1998 *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle: University of Washington Press)

Levine, Lee (ed) 1992 *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Lewis, Naphtali 1986 *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon)

1989 *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters Greek Papyri* (JDS; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society)

1993 'The Demise of the Demotic Document: When and Why' *JEA* 79:276

Li, Charles N. (ed) 1975 *Word Order and Word Order Change* (Austin: University of Texas Press)

Lieberman, Saul 1950 *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the 1 Century B.C.E. – IV Century C.E.* (New

York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America)

1965[2] (1942) *Greek in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II-IV Centuries C.E.* (New York: Philipp Feldheim)

Lieu, Judith, John North & Tessa Rajak (eds) 1992 *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge)

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber 1872[2] (1871) *On A Fresh Revision of the English New Testament* (London: Macmillan & Co.)

1890 *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (London: Macmillan)

1892 *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Macmillan)

Lim, Timothy 2000 'The Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism, and Biblical Interpretation' in Collins: 57-73

Lindas, Barnabas 1972 *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Oliphants)

Lipinski, E. (ed) 1979 *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East* (Leuven, Peeters)

Lipschits, Oded & Manfred Oeming (ed) 2006 *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbraun)

Lietzmann, H. 1953a *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (London: Lutterworth)

1953b *The Founding of the Church Universal: A History of the Early Church* (London: Lutterworth)

Lohmeyer, Ernst 1951 *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

1961[12] *Der Brief an die Philipper* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

Long, Gary Alan 2002 *Grammatical Concepts 101 for Biblical Hebrew: Learning Biblical Hebrew Grammatical Concepts Through English Grammar* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson)

Longenecker, Richard, N. 1970 *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (SBT 17; London: SCM)

1990 *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas, TX: Words)

1999[2] (1975) *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Lonis, R (ed) 1988 *L'Étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy)

Lyon, David Gordon & George Foot Moore (eds) 1912 *Studies in the History of Religions, Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends* (New York: Macmillan)

Macadam, Henry 1983 'Epigraphy and Village Life in Southern Syria During the Roman and Early Byzantine Periods' *BAS* 31: 103-15

MacDonald, Dennis 1999 'The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul' *NTS* 45:88-107

2000 *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

2003a *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

2003b 'Paul's Farewell to the Ephesian Elders and Hector's Farewell to Andromache: A Strategic Imitation of Homer's Iliad' in Penner:189-203.

MacDonald, Dennis (ed) 2001 *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press)

Mack, Burton L. 1988 *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

Mackey, William 1967 *Bilingualism as a World Problem/Le bilinguisme: Phenomene Mondial* (Montreal: Harvest House)

1968 'The Description of Bilingualism' in Fishman: 554-84

MacLeod, M. D. 1991 *Lucian: A Selection* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips)

MacMullen, Ramsay 1966 'Provincial Languages in the Roman Empire' *AJP* 87/1:1-17

Maddox, Robert 1982 *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (FRLANT 126; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

Maehler, Herwig 2004 'Alexandria, the Mouseion, and cultural identity' in Hirst: 1-14

Malbon, E. S. & McKnight, E. V. (eds) 1994 *The New Literary Criticism and the New*

Testament (JSNTSS 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Maloney, Elliott, C. 1981 *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; Chico, CA: Scholars)

Mandell, Sara 1984 'Who Paid the Temple Tax when the Jews were under Roman Rule?' *HTR* 77/2:223-32

Mann, C. S. 1967 '"Hellenists" and "Hebrews" in Acts VI 1' in Munck: 301-4

1980 *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday)

Manson, Thomas Walter 1935[2] (1931) *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1951-2 'The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus' *BJRL* 34:312-32

Manson, William 1930 *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Marcos, Natalio Fernández 2000 *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill)

Marcus, Ralph 1934 'Notes on Torrey's Translation of the Gospels' *HTR* 27: 211-39

Margolis, Max & Alexander Marx, 1927 *A History of the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society)

Marshall, I. Howard 1972-3 'Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments' *NTS* 19:277-8

1976 *The Origins of New Testament Christology* (ICT; Leicester: IVP)

1980 *The Acts of the Apostles* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans)

Marshall, I. Howard (ed) 1985 (1977) *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Carlisle: Paternoster)

Martin, James D. 1993[27] *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Martin, Ralph Philip 1964 *Worship in the Early Church* (London: Marshall, Morgan and

Scott)

Martin, T. W. 'Hellenists' in *ABD*

Marxsen, Willi 1964 *Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Eine Einführung in Ihre Probleme* (Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus)

Mason, Steve 2001 *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary Vol. 9 Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (BJP 9; Leiden: Brill)

Mayser, Edwin 1934 *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der Gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)

Mazar, Benjamin 1973 *Beth She`arim: Report on the Excavations During 1936-1940 Vol. I: Catacombs 1-4* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press)

McCasland, S. Vernon 1953 '"ABBA, FATHER"' *JBL* 72: 79-91

McCullough, W. Stewart 1982 *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam* (Chico, CA: Scholars)

McLay, R. T. 2003 *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

McKnight, Edgar V. 1969 *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press)

McNeile, Alan Hugh 1910 'Τότε in St Matthew' *JTS*11:127-8

1915 *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan)

Meeks, Wayne 2003[2] (1983) *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Meeks, Wayne & R. L. Wilken 1978 *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (Atlanta: Scholars)

Meier, John P. 1991 *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus Vol. One: The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday)

Meinardus, O.F.A. 1970 *Christian Egypt Faith and Life* (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press)

Mélèze-Modrzejewski, Joseph 1983 'Le statut des Hellenes dans l'Egypte lagide *REG* 96:241-68

1993 'How to be a Jew in Hellenistic Egypt' in Cohen:72-6

Menzies, Allan 1901 *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel According to Mark* (London: Macmillan)

Mertens, Jan 1992 'Bibliography and Description of Demotic Literary Texts: A Progress Report' in Johnson: 233-5

Merx, A. 1902 *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Text, II, I, Das Evangelium Matthäus*

Metz, Johannes-Baptist & Edward Schillebeeckx eds. 1981 *God as Father?* (*Concilium* 143: Dogma; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Metzger, Bruce M. 1956 'A Greek and Aramaic Inscription Discovered at Armazi in Georgia' *JNES* 15:18-26

1992[3] (1964) *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

1994[2] (1971) *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: American Bible Society)

Mey, Jacob L. 1994 *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Meyer, Arnold 1896 *Jesu Muttersprache: Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt* (Freiburg and Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr Paul Siebeck)

Meyers, Eric 1976 'Galilean Regionalism as a Factor in Historical Reconstruction' *BASOR* 221:93-101

1985 'Galilean Regionalism: A Reappraisal' in Green:5.115-131

Meyers, Eric & J. F. Strange 1981 *Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity* (London: SCM)

Michael, Hugh 1928 *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Midgley, James 1992 'A Bilingual Account of Monies Received' in Johnson: 237-41

Millar, Fergus 1971 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian: The Church, Local Culture and Political Allegiance' *JRS* 61:1-17

1983 'The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation' *PCPS* 209:55-71

1987a 'Empire, Community and Culture in the Roman Near East: Greeks, Syrians, Jews and Arabs' *JJS* 38:143-64

1987b 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria' in Kuhrt: 110-33

1992 'The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, AD 312-438' in Lieu: 97-123

1993 *The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Millard, Alan 1991 'Variable Spelling in Hebrew and Other Ancient Texts' *JTS* 42:106-15

1995 'Latin in first century Palestine' in Zevit: 451-8

2000 *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus* (BS 69, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken (eds) 1995 *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Missiou, A. 2007 'The Hellenistic Period' in Christidis:325-41

Mitchell, Margaret 2003 'Homer in the New Testament?' *JR* 83:244-60

Moffatt, James 1938 *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Moloney, Francis J. 2002 *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson)

Mommsen, Theodore 1901 'Die Rechtsverhaltnisse des Apostels Paulus' *ZNW* 2:81-96

Monro, David B. 1891[2] (1882) *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Montefiore, C. G. 1968[2] (1927) *The Synoptic Gospels* [edited by Harry M. Orlinsky] 2 Vols. (New York: KTAV)

Moo, Douglas J. 1983 *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press)

Moore, George Foot 1920 'Nazarene and Nazareth' in *Beg*:1.426-32

Morag, S. 1972 ''Εφφαθά (Mark vii. 34): Certainly Hebrew, Not Aramaic?' *JSS* 17:198-202

Morgan, J. R. & Richard Stoneman (eds) 1994 *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novels in Context* (London: Routledge)

Morgan, Teresa 1998 *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Mørkholm, Otto 1966 *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen: København)

Moule, C. F. D. 1958-59 'Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?' *ExpTim* 60:100-2

1959[2] (1953) *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1959-60 'A Reconsideration of the Context of *MARANATHA*' *NTS* 6: 307-10

1961 *Worship in the New Testament* (ESW 9; London: Lutterworth)

1967 *The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament* (SBT; London: SCM)

Moulton, James Hope 1906[2], 1919a[3] *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh)

Moulton, James Hope & George Milligan 1914-29 *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Moulton, James Hope & Wilbert Francis Howard 1929 *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. II: Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Muchiki, Yoshiyuki 1999 *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (SBLDS 173; Atlanta, GA: SBL)

Muhly, James D. 1970 'Homer and the Phoenicians: The Relations between Greece and the Near East in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age' *BAS* 19:19-64

Muhs, Brian 1992 'Demotic and Greek Ostraca in the Third Century B.C.' in Johnson:249-51

Muilenburg, James 1961 'The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כי in the Old Testament' *HUCA* 32:135-60

Mulder, Martin Jan & Harry Sysling (eds) 1988 *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT II.1; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum)

Munck, Johannes 1959 *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM)

1967 *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday)

Müller, Nikolaus (N. A. Bees ed) 1919 *Die Inschriften der Jüdischen Katakombe am Monteverde zu Rom* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz)

Muro, E. A. 1997-1998 'The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn gr = Enoch 103:3-4, 7-8' *RevQ* 19:307-12

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome 1974 'The Essenes and Their History' *RB* 81: 215-44

1996 *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Clarendon)

1999 'ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ / ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ in Galatians' ZNW 90:280-1

Murray, R. 1982 'Jews, Hebrews, and Christians: Some Needed Distinctions' *NovT* 24:194-208

Mussies, Gerard 1976 'Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora' in Safrai: 1040-64

1983 'Greek as the Vehicle of Early Christianity' *NTS* 29:356-69

1984 'The Use of Hebrew and Aramaic in the Greek New Testament' *NTS* 30:416-32

1994 'Jewish Personal Names in Some Non-literary Sources' in van Henten & van der Horst: 242-76

1997 'Double Vocatives' in Petersen: 175-89

Muysken, Pieter 1995 'Code-switching and grammatical theory' in Milroy: 177-98

Myers-Scotton, Carol 1988 'Code-Switching as Indexical of Social Negotiations' Heller:151-86

1993 *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa* (OSLC; Oxford: Clarendon Press)

2002 *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

2006 'How Codeswitching as an Available Option Empowers Bilinguals' in Pütz, Fishman & Neff-van Aertselaer: 73-84

Nagy, Gregory 1970 Greek Dialects and the Transformation of an Indo-European Process (LCM; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Naveh, Joseph 1960 'A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century BC' *IEJ* 10

1982 *Early History of the Alphabet: An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Palaeography* (Jerusalem: Magnes / Leiden: E. J. Brill)

Nebe, G. W. 1988 '7Q4-Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation' *RevQ* 13:629-33

Neil, William 1973 *The Acts of the Apostles* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott)

Neirynck, F. 2000 '*NAZARA* in Q: Pro and Con' in Asgeirsson, De Troyer, & Meyer: 159-69

Neumann, Günter & Jürgen Untermann 1980 *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium vom 8. bis 10. April 1974* (BBJ 40; Köln: Rheinland)

Neusner, Jacob 1984 *A History of the Jews in Babylonia I: The Parthian Period* (BJS 62: Chico, California: Scholars Press)

Neusner, Jacob (ed) 2005 *The Law of Agriculture in the Mishnah and the Tosefta: Translation, Commentary, Theology* (HOS 79/1-3; Leiden: Brill)

Neyrey, Jerome 1996 'Luke's Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts' in Witherington: 255-67

Nickelsburg, George 2004 'The Greek Fragments of 1 Enoch from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification' *RevQ* 21/4:631-4

Nickelsburg, George & G. W. MacRae, S. J. (eds) 1986 *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

Nineham, D.E. 1963 The Gospel of St Mark (PNTC; Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Nörden, Eduard 1958[2] (1909) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner)

Noy, D. 1997 'Writing in Tongues: The Use of Greek, Latin and Hebrew in Jewish Inscriptions from Roman Italy' *JJS* 48:300-11

1998 'Letters out of Judaea: Echoes of Israel in Jewish Inscriptions from Europe' in Jones: 106-17

O'Connor, D. 1993 *Ancient Nubia: Egypt's Rival in Africa* (Philadelphia: The University of Museum University of Pennsylvania)

Olmstead, Albert. T. 1942 'Could an Aramaic Gospel be Written?' *JNES* 1:41-75

O'Neill, J. C. 1959 'The Six Amen Sayings in Luke' *JTS* 10:1-9

Paget, James 2004 'Jews and Christians in Ancient Alexandria from the Ptolemies to Caracalla' in Hirst: 143-66

Painter, J. 1997 *Mark's Gospel* (London: Routledge)

Pankhurst, R. 1998 *The Ethiopians* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Paradis, Michel 2004 *A Neurolinguistic Theory of Bilingualism* (SiBil 18; Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

Paradis, Michel (ed) 1978 *Aspects of Bilingualism* (Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press)

Parker, David 1997 *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Parker, Pierson 1964 'Three Variant Readings in Luke-Acts' *JBL* 83:165-70

Paulston, Christina 1994 *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings: Implications for Language Policies* (SiBil 4; Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

2000 'Language Repertoire and Diglossia in First-Century Palestine: Some Comments' in Porter: 79-89

Pearson, B. A. 1986 'Christians and Jews in First-Century Alexandria' in Nickelsburg: 206-16

Penner, Todd 2004 *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (ESEC 10; London: T&T Clark)

Penner, Todd & Caroline van der Stichele (eds) 2003 *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSymS 20; Atlanta: Scholars)

Perani, D., E. Paulesu, N. S. Galles, E. Dupoux, S. Dehaene, V. Bettinardi, S. F. Cappa, F. Fazio, & J. Mehler 1998 'The Bilingual Brain: Proficiency and Age of Acquisition of the Second Language' *Brain* 121: 1841-1852

Peremans, Antidoron 1983 'Le bilinguisme dans les relations Greco-egypiennes sous les Lagides' in Van'T Dack: 253-80

Pesch, Rudolf 1980 *Simon-Petrus: Geschichte und geschichtliche Bedeutung des ersten Jüngenrs Jesu Christi* (PuP 15; Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann)

Petersen, William L., John S. Vos, & Henk J. de Jonge 1997 *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda* (Leiden: Brill)

Pfaff, Carol 1997 'Contacts and Conflicts: Perspectives from Code-Switching Research' in Pütz :341-360

Platt, J. T. 1977 'A Model for Polyglossia and Multilingualism (with Special Reference to

Singapore and Malaysia)' *Language in Society* 6:361-378.

Plummer, Alfred 1915 *The Gospel According to St Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1922[5] (1896) *The Gospel according to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Polak, Frank H. 2006 'Sociolinguistics and the Judean Speech Community in the Achaemenid Empire' in Lipschits: 589-628

Poplack, S. 1980 'Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching' *Linguistics* 18:581-618

Porter, Stanley E. 1989 'The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion' *NTS* 35:582-603

1994 'Jesus and the Use of Greek in Galilee' in Chilton & Evans: 123-54

1997a 'The Greek Language of the New Testament' in Porter:99-130

1997b 'The Greek Papyri of the Judaean Desert and the World of the Roman East' in Porter: 293-316

2000a *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (JSNTSS 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

2000b 'The Functional Distribution of Koine Greek' in Porter: 53-78

Porter, Stanley E. (ed) 1991 *The Language of the New Testament: Classical Essays* (JSNTSS 60; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

1997 *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill)

2000 *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics* (JSNTSS 193; SNTG 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Porter, Stanley E. & C. A. Evans (eds) 1997 *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Pride, J. B. & Janet Holmes (eds) 1972 *Sociolinguistics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Pryke, E.J. 1978 *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel: A Study of Syntax and Vocabulary*

as Guides to Redaction to Mark (SNTSMS33; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Puech, É. 1996 'Notes sur les fragments grecs du manuscrit 7Q4 = 1 Hénoch 103 et 105' *RB* 103:592-600

Pütz, Martin (ed) 1997 *Language Choice: Conditions, Constraints, and Consequences. Impact: Studies in Language and Society* Vol. 1 (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company)

Pütz, Martin, Joshua A. Fishman & JoAnne Neff-van Aertselaer 2006 *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of Empowerment Though Language* (CSoL 92; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Quispel, G. 1966 '"The Gospel of Thomas" and the "Gospel of the Hebrews"' *NTS* 12:371-82

Rabin, Chaim 1976 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century' in Safrai: 1007-39

Rabinowitz, Issac 1962 '"Be Opened" = 'Εφφαθα (Mark 7 34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?' *ZNW*53:229-38

1971 'ΕΠΠΑΘΑ (Mark vii. 34): Certainly Hebrew, Not Aramaic' *JSS* 16:151-6

Rackham, Richard 1951[14] (1901) *The Acts of the Apostles* (WC; London: Methuen)

Radermacher, Ludwig 1925[2] (1911) *Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache* (HNT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr)

Rahmani, L. Y. 1994 *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities)

Räisänen, Heikki 1992 *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays* (JSNTSS 43; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Rajak, Tessa 1973 'Justus of Tiberias' *CQ* 23/2:345-68

2002[2] (1983) *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth)

Ramsay, William Mitchell 1930[17] (1895) *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Rawlinson, Alfred E. J. 1925 *The Gospel According to St. Mark with Introduction Commentary and Additional Notes* (WC; London: Methuen & Co.)

1926 *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* (London: Longmans)

Ray, John 1994 'Literacy and Language in Egypt in the Late and Persian Periods' in Bowman: 51-66

Reed, Jeffrey 2000 'Language of Change and the Changing of Language: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Pauline Discourse' in Porter: 121-53

Reed, Jonathan L. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity)

Rehm, M. 1958 'Eli Eli Lama Sabacthani' *BZ* 2: 275-8

Reicke, Bo 1957 *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde; Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7* (ATANT 32; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag)

Rénan, Ernest 1869 *The Apostles* (London: N. Trübner & Co.)

Richard, E. 1978 *Acts 6:1-8:4 The Author's Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41; Missoula, Mont: Scholars)

Richardson, P. 1969 *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1999 *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Riddle, Donald W. 1932 'The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek' *JBL* 51:13-30

1940 'The Cephas-Peter Problem, and a Possible Solution' *JBL* 59:169-80

Riesenfeld, Harald 1970 *The Gospel Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

Riggs, Christina 2000 'Roman Mummy Masks from Deir El-Bahri' *JEA* 86:121-44

2005 *The Beautiful Burial in Roman Egypt: Art, Identity, and Funerary Religion*

(Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Rijksbaron, Albert 1997 *New Approaches to Greek Particles: Proceedings of the Colloquium Held in Amsterdam, January 4-6, 1996. To Honour C.J. Ruijgh on the Occasion of His Retirement* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben)

Riley, Harold 1989 *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Georgia: Mercer University Press)

Robbins, Vernon K. 2006 'Interfaces of Orality and Literature in the Gospel of Mark' in Horsley, Draper, & Foley: 125-46

Roberts, Alexander 1888 *Greek the Language of Christ and his Apostles* (London: Longmans)

Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou 2003 *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization* (CSL; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Robertson, Archibald Thomas 1934 *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville, TN: Broadman)

Robinson, James McConkey & Helmut Koester 1971 *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

Robinson, John A. T. 1959-60 'The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel' *NTS* 6:117-31

1976 *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM)

Rohrbaugh, Richard 2000 'The Jesus Tradition: The Gospel Writers' Strategies of Persuasion' in Esler: 198-230

Romaine, Suzanne 1995^2 (1989) *Bilingualism* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Rook, John T. 1981 '"Boanerges, Sons of Thunder" (Mark 3:17)' *JBL* 100:94-5

Rosén, Haiim B. 1961 'On the Use of the Tenses in the Aramaic of Daniel' *JSS*6:183-203

1963 'Palestinian KOINH in Rabbinic Illustration' *JSS* 8:56-72

1980 'Die Sprachsituation im römischen Palästina' in Neumann & Untermann: 215-39

Ross, J. M. 1990 'Jesus's Knowledge of Greek' *IBS* 12:41-7

Rostovtzeff, M. 1957 *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (P. M. Fraser, rev.; Oxford: Clarendon)

Roth-Gerson, Lea 1987 *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz-Israel* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi)

Rüger, Hans Peter 1981 'NAZAPEΘ / NAZAPA NAZAPHNOΣ / NAZΩPAIOΣ' *ZNW* 72:257-63

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José, Olga I. Díez 2002 'Patterns of Conceptual Interaction' in Dirven & Pörings: 489-532

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José & M. Sandra Peña Cervel (eds) 2005 *Cognitive Linguistics: Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction* (CLR 32; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

Russell, D. S. 1967 *The Jews from Alexander to Herod* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Rutgers, Leonard 1995 *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora* (RGRW 126; Leiden: Brill)

Safrai, Shmuel & Menahem Stern (eds) 1974-6 *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* 2 Vols (CRINT; Assen: Van Gorcum)

Saldarini, A. J. 1988 *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans)

Salzmann, Zdenek 1998[2] *Language, Culture and Society: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview)

Sanday, William & Arthur C. Headlam 1902 *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Sanders, E. P. 1969 *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 9; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1972-3 'The Overlaps of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem' *NTS* 19:453-65

1992 *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.-66 C.E.* (London: SCM)

Sanders, E. P., A. I. Baumgarten & Alan Mendelson (eds) 1981 *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol. II: Aspects of Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period* (London: SCM)

Sandnes, K. O. 2005 'Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. MacDonald's "Mimesis Criticism"' *JBL* 124:715-32

Sapir, Edward 1921 *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company)

Sarason, Richard 2005 'Mishnah-Tosefta Demai' in Neusner: 803-1103

Sartre, Maurice 2005 *The Middle East Under Rome* [Translated by Catherine Porter, Elizabeth Rawlings, Jeannine Routier-Pucci] (Cambridge, MA: Belknap)

Sawyer, J. F. A. 1999 *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts* (London: Routledge)

Schalit, A. 1960 'The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis Regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia' *JQR* 50: 289-318

Schiffrin, Deborah 1987 *Discourse Markers* (SIS 5; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1994 *Approaches to Discourse* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Schillebeeckx, Edward 1979 *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology* (London: William Collins Sons & Co)

Schlätter, Adolf 1975[4] *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie Er Spricht, Denkt, und Glaubt: Ein Kommentar zum Vierten Evangelium* (Stuttgart: Calwer)

Schmidt, Daryl D. 1991 'Semitisms and Septuagintalisms in the Book of Revelation' *NTS* 37:592-603

Schmidt, Nathaniel 1894 'Μαραναθα, I Cor. xvi. 22' *JBL* 13: 50-60

Schmithals, Walter 1965 *Paul and James* (SBT 46; London: SCM)

Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2004 *Early Christian Mission* 2 vols (Downers Grove, IL: IVP)

Schneider, G. 1982[2] (1980) *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT 5; Freiburg: Herder)

Schöttgen, Christian 1733-42 *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* 2 vols. (Dresda et Lipsiae: Apud Christoph. Hekelii b. filium)

Schulz, Siegfried 1962 'Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus' *ZNW* 53:125-44

Schürer, Emil 1879 *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig:)

Schwabe, Moshe & Baruch Lifshitz 1974 *Beth She'arim Vol. II: The Greek Inscriptions* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press)

Schwartz, Eduard 1963 'Zur Chronologie des Paulus' in *Gesammelte Schriften Vol. V: Zum Neuen Testament und zum frühen Christentum* (edited by Walther Eltester & Hans-Dietrich Altendorf) (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter): 124-69 (Originally, in 1907)

Schwartz, Seth 1995 'Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine' *Past and Present* 148:3-47

2005 'Hebrew and Imperialism in Jewish Palestine' in Bakhos: 53-84

Searle, John R. 1969 *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Sevenster, J. N. 1968 *Do You Know Greek?: How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known* (NovT Sup 19; Leiden: Brill)

Sherwin-White, S. 1987 'Seleucid Babylonia: a Case-Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule' in Kuhrt: 1-31

Shin, Hyeon Woo 2004 *Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem in Historical Jesus Research: The Search for Valid Criteria* (CBET 36; Leuven: Peeters)

Shinnie, P. L. 1967 *Meroe: A Civilization of the Sudan* (London: Thames & Hudson)

Shopen, Timothy (ed) 1985 *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* 3vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Shutt, R. J. H. 1961 *Studies in Josephus* (London: SPCK)

Siker, Jeffrey S. 1992 '"First to the Gentiles": A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30' *JBL*

111:73-90

Sicking, C.M.J. & J.M. van Ophuijsen 1993 *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato* (Leiden: Brill)

Siewierska, Anna & Jae Jung Song (eds) 1998 *Case, Typology and Grammar: In Honor of Barry J. Blake* (TSL 38; Amsterdam: Benjamins)

Silva, Moisés 1975 'Semantic Borrowing in the New Testament' *NTS* 22:104-110

1978 'New Lexical Semitisms?' *ZNW* 69:253-7

1980 'Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek' *Bib* 61:198-219

1983 *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan)

2005 'Biblical Greek and Modern Greek: A Review Article' *WTJ* 67:391-404

Simon, Marcel 1958 *St Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church* (London: Longmans)

Sluiter, Ineke 1992 'Causal Hina – Sound Greek' *Glotta* 70:39-53

Smallwood, E. M. 1976 *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations* (Leiden: Brill)

Smith, D. F. 2002 *Can We Hear What They Heard: The Effect of Orality Upon a Markan Reading-Event* (Durham University Ph.D. Unpublished thesis)

Smith, George Adam 1898[6] (1894) *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land: Especially in Relation to the History of Israel and of the Early Church* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

1907-8 *Jerusalem: The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* 2 vols. (London: Hodder & Stoughton)

Smith, John Charles & Delia Bentley (eds) 2000 *Historical Linguistics 1995: Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995 Vol. I: General Issues and Non-Germanic Languages* (CIL 161:

Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

Smith, Morton 1971 *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press)

1978 *Jesus the Magician* (London: Victor Gollancz)

Smyth, Herbert Weir 1974 *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects Vol. I: Ionic* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag)

Sommer, G. 1997 'Towards an Ethnography of Language Shift: Goals and Methods,' in Pütz: 56-76

Souter, Alexander 1954[2] (1913) *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth)

Sparks, H.F.D. 1943 'The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel' *JTS* xliv:129-38

1950 'The Semitisms of the Acts' *JTS* 1:16-28

Speiser, Ephraim Avigdor 1926 'The Pronunciation of Hebrew According to the Transliterations in the Hexapla' *JQR* 16:343-82

1933a 'The Pronunciation of Hebrew Based Chiefly on the Transliterations in the Hexapla' *JQR* 23:9-46

1933b 'The Pronunciation of Hebrew Based Chiefly on the Transliterations in the Hexapla' *JQR* 23: 233-65

Spencer, Scott 1992 *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (JSNTSS 67; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Sperber, Alexander 1937-8 'Hebrew Based on Greek and Latin Transliterations' *HUCA* 12-3:103-274

Spolsky, Bernard 1983 'Triglossia and literacy in Jewish Palestine of the first century' *IJSL* 42:100-7

1985 'Jewish Multilingualism in the First Century: An Essay in Historical Sociolinguistics' in Fishman: 35-50

1991 'Diglossia in Hebrew in the Late Second Temple Period' *SWJL* 10:85-104

Spolsky, Bernard & Robert L. Cooper 1991 *The Languages of Jerusalem* (OSLC; Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stanford, W. B. 1967 *The Sound of Greek: Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press)

Stanton, Graham 1995 *Gospel Truth?: Today's Quest for Jesus of Nazareth* (London: HarperCollins)

2002^2 (1989) *The Gospels and Jesus* (OBS; Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stark, Rodney 1996 *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

Starr, R. J. 1991 'Reading Aloud: *Lectores* and Roman Reading' *CJ* 86:337-43

Steever, Sanford B., Carol A. Walker, & Salikoko S. Mufwene (eds) 1976 *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society)

Stegemann, Ekkehard & Wolfgang Stegemann 1999 *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Stendahl, Krister 1967^2 (1954) *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (ASNU 20; Lund: CWK Gleerup)

Sterling, Gregory 2001 'Judaism between Jerusalem and Alexandria' in Collins: 263-301

Stern, Menahem 1974 'The Jewish Diaspora' in Safrai: 117-83

Steyn, G. F. 1995 *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (CBET12; Kampen: Kok Pharos)

Stillwell, Richard 1941 *Antioch On-The-Orontes III The Excavations 1937-39* (PCEAV; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

Strack, Hermann L. & Paul Billerbeck 1924 *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte Erläutert aus Talmud und Midrash* 4 vols. (München: C.H.

Becksche)

Strecker, Georg (ed) 1967 *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften* (Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr)

(ed) 1993 *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

Streeter, Burnett, Hillman 1930 *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of Manuscript, Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* (London: Macmillan)

Strelan, Rick 2004 'Who was Bar Jesus (Acts 13,6-12)?' *Bib* 85:65-81

Strugnell, J. 1974 '"Amen, I say unto you" in the Sayings of Jesus and in Early Christian Literature' *HTR* 67:177-82

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 1991 'An Approach to the New Testament Through Aramaic Sources: The Recent Methodological Debate *JSP* 8:3-29

Swain, Simon 2002 'Bilingualism in Cicero?' in Adams: 128-67

Sweeney, Marvin A. & Ehud Ben Zvi (eds) 2003 *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Swete, Henry Barclay 1898 *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan & Co.)

Sylva, Dennis D. 1983 'Ierousalēm and Hierosoluma in Luke-Acts' *ZNW* 74: 207-21

Tait, John 1994 'Egyptian Fiction in Demotic and Greek' in Morgan: 203-222

Talmon, Shemaryahu 1969 'Amen as an Introductory Oath Formula' *Textus* 7:124-9

Tannehill, R. C. 1972 'The Mission of Jesus According to Luke iv 16-30' in Eltester: 51-75

1986 *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

Tassier, Emmanuel 1992 'Greek and Demotic School-Exercises' in Johnson:311-5

Taylor, David 2000 'Christian Regional Diversity' in Esler: 330-43

2002 'Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia' in Adams: 298-331

Taylor, John R. 2002 Cognitive Grammar (OTL; Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Taylor, Vincent 1935[2] (1933) *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan)

1956 *The Gospels: A Short Introduction* (London: Epworth Press)

1952 *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan)

Tcherikover, Victor 1959 *Hellenistic Civilization and Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America)

1963 'The Decline of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt in the Roman Period' *JJS* 14:1-32

Telford, William R. 1999 The Theology of the Gospel of Mark (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Thackeray, Henry 1909 *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek Vol. 1 Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

1929 *Josephus, the Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion)

Theissen, Gerd 1983 *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress)

1991 *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress)

1992 *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress)

2003 *The New Testament: History, Literature, Religion* (London: T&T Clark)

Theissen, Gerd & Annette Merz 1998 *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress)

Thiede, C. 1992 *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (London: Paternoster)

Thomas, Kenneth 1976 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics' *NTS* 22:205-14

Thomason, Sarah 2001 *Language Contact: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Thompson, Dorothy 1987 'Ptolemaios and the 'Lighthouse': Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum' *PCPS* 213:105-21

1992 'Literacy and the Administration in Early Ptolemaic Egypt' in Johnson: 323-6

1994 'Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt' in Bowman: 67-83

Thompson, Marianne Meye 2000 *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK)

2001 'Jesus and his God' in Bockmuehl: 41-55

Thumb, Albert 1901 *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beitrager zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der KOINH* (Strassburg: Trübner)

1914 'On the Value of the Modern Greek for the Study of Ancient Greek' *CQ* 8:181-205

Timm, L. A. 1978 'Code-Switching in *War and Peace*' in Paradis: 302-315

Tomson, P. J. 2001 *'If This Be From Heaven...': Jesus and the New Testament Authors in Their Relationship to Judaism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Torrey, Charles Cutler 1900 'Die Briefe 2 Makk. I, I-2, 18' *ZAW* 20:225-242

1912 'The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels' in Lyon: 269-317

1916 *The Composition and Date of Acts* (HTS1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

1933 *The Four Gospels: A New Translation* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

1936 *Our Translated Gospels* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

1937 *Aramaic Graffiti on Coins of Demanhur* (NNM 77; New York: The American Numismatic Society)

1941 *Documents of the Primitive Church* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

1942 'The Aramaic of the Gospels' *JBL* 61:71-85

Tov, Emmanuel 1973 'Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament' *Textus* 8:78-92

1988 'The Septuagint' in Mulder & Sysling: 161-88

2001 'The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert' *NovT* XLIII:1-11

Tov, Emmanuel (ed) 1990 *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon)

Tuckett, Christopher, M. 1982 'Luke 4, 16-30, Isaiah and Q' in Delobel: 343-54

1984 'On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke' *NTS* 30: 130-42

1995 *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (JSNTSS 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

1996 *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

Turner, C. H. 1927 'Western Readings in the Second Half of St. Mark's Gospel' *JTS* 29:1-16

Turner, Henry Ernest William 1963 Historicity and the Gospels: A Sketch of Historical Method and its Application to the Gospels (London: Mowbray)

Turner, Nigel 1955a 'The "Testament of Abraham': Problems in Biblical Greek' *NTS* 1:219-23

1955b 'The Unique Character of Biblical Greek' *VT* 5:208-13

1955c 'An Alleged Semitism' *ExpTim* 66:252-4

1963 *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. III Syntax* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

1965 *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

1976a *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. IV Style* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

1976b 'The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts' in Elliot: 387-400

Ullendorff, Edward 1956 'Hebraic-Jewish Elements in Abyssinian (Monophysite) Christianity' *JSS* 1:247-50

1968 *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

1990[3] (1960) *The Ethiopians: An Introduction to Country and People* (Stuttgart: Steiner)

Van der Horst, Pieter 1991 *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millennium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 BCE – 700 CE)* (Kampen: Kok Pharos)

1998[2] *Hellenism-Judaism-Christianity: Essays on Their Interaction* (CBET8: Leuven: Peeters)

2001 'Greek in Jewish Palestine in Light of Jewish Epigraphy' in Collins: 154-74

Van Henten, Jan & Pieter W. van der Horst (eds) 1994 *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGJU 21; Leiden: Brill)

Vann, Robert Lindley 1992 Caesarea Papers: Straton's Tower, Herod's Harbour, and Roman and Byzantine Caesarea (JRASS 5; Ann Arbor, MI:

Van't Dack, E., P. Van Dessel & Van Gucht (eds) 1983 *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 24-26 May 1982* (Stud. Hell. 17; Leuven: Peeters)

Van Unnik, W. C. 1973 *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. Van Unnik Part 1. Evangelia, Paulina, Acta* (NovT Sup 29, Leiden: Brill)

Van Voorst, Robert E. 2000 *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Venit, Marjorie 2002 *Monumental Tombs of Ancient Alexandria: The Theater of the Dead* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

2007 'Theatrical Fiction and Visual Bilingualism in the Monumental Tombs of Ptolemaic Alexandria' in Krasilnikoff

Vergote, Jozef 1938 'Grec Biblique' in *DBSup*: 3.1353-60

1984 'Bilinguisme et Calques (Translation Loan-Words) en Égypte' *Atti del XVII congresso internazionale di papirologia III* :1385-9

Vermes, Geza 1983a (1973) *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: SCM)

1983b *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM)

1993 *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM)

2000 *The Changing Faces of Jesus* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Versteegh, Kees 2002 'Dead or Alive?: The Status of the Standard Language' in Adams: 52-74

Vleeming, S. P. (ed) 1995 *Hundred-Gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Leiden: Brill)

Voelz, James W. 1984 "The Language of the New Testament" *ANRW* 25.2.893-977

Von Soden, Baron Hermann 1906 *The History of Early Christian Literature: The Writings of the New Testament* (New York: Putnam's sons)

Vorster, Willem S. 1999 *Speaking of Jesus: Essays on Biblical Language, Gospel Narrative, and the Historical Jesus* J.E. Botha ed. (NovT Sup 92; Leiden: Brill)

Wakker, Gerry 1997 'Emphasis and Affirmation: Some Aspects of μήν in Tragedy' in Rijksbaron: 209-31

Wardhaugh, Ronald 1986 *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Warfield, B. B. 1883 'The Readings Ἕλληνας and Ἑλληνιστάς, Acts xi. 20' *JBL* 3:113-27

Watson, Francis 1986 *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (SNTSMS 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Watt, Jonathan 1997 *Code-switching in Luke and Acts* (BILS 31; New York: Peter Lang)

2000a 'Of Gutturals and Galileans: The Two Slurs of Matthew 26:73' in Porter: 107-20

2000b 'The Current Landscape of Diglossia Studies: The Diglossic Continuum in First-Century Palestine' in Porter: 18-36

Weatherly, J. A. 1994 *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSS 106; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Weinberg, Werner 1969-70 'Transliteration and Transcription of Hebrew' *HUCA* 60-61:1-32

Weinreich, U. 1953 *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems* (The Hague: Mouton)

Weiss, Bernhard 1876 *Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lukas-Parallelen* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses)

1900 *Die vier Evangelien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs)

Weiss, Johannes 1937 *The History of Primitive Christianity* 2 Vols. [Completed by Rudolf Knopf; translated by four friends and edited by Frederick C. Grant] (London: Macmillan)

Weitzmann, Kurt 1941 'Illustrations of Euripides and Homer in the Mosaics of Antioch' in Stillwell: 233-47

Wellhausen, 1905 *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: G. Reimer)

1909[2] *Das Evangelium Marci* (Berlin: G. Reimer)

Wensinck, A. J. 1937 'The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of Saint Luke' *BBC* 12:11-48

Westcott, Brooke & Fenton Hort 1896[2] (1881) *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan)

Wetter, G. P. 1922 'Das älteste hellenistische Christentum nach der Apostelgeschichte' *AR* 21:397-429

Whitters, Mark F. 2002 'Why Did the Bystanders Think Jesus Called upon Elijah Before He Died (Mark 15:34-36)? The Markan Position' *HTR* 95/1: 119-24

Wifstrand, Albert 2005 *Epochs and Styles* L. Rydbeck & S. E. Porter eds (WUNT 179; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)

Wilcox, Max 1965 *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon)

1982 'ΤΑΛΙΘΑ ΚΟΥΜ(Ι) in Mk 5, 41' in Delobel: 469-76

1994 'The Aramaic Background of the New Testament' in Beattie & McNamara: 362-78

Wilken, R. L. 1983 *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Wilkinson, J. 1977 *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades* (Warminster. England: Aris & Phillips)

Williams, C. S. C. 1964[2] (1957) *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (BNTC: London: Adam & Charles Black)

Williams, Margaret H. 1995 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts' in Bauckham: 79-113

Williams, P. J. 2004a *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (T&S III.2; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias)

2004b 'The Linguistic Background to Jesus' Dereliction Cry (Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:34)' in Williams, Clarke, Head, & Instone-Brewer: 1-12

Williams, P. J., Andrew D. Clarke, Peter M. Head, & David Instone-Brewer (eds) 2004 *The New Testament in its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans)

Winford, Donald 2003 *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Winter, Paul 1956-57 '"Nazareth" and "Jerusalem" in Luke Chs. I and II' *NTS* 3:136-42

Wischer, Ilse & Gabriele Diewald (eds) 2002 *New Reflections on Grammaticalization – Proceedings from the International Symposium on Grammaticalization, 17 – 19 June 1999, Potsdam, Germany* (TSL 49; Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

Wise, Michael 1992a 'Languages of Palestine' in *DJG*: 434-444

1992b 'Nazarene' in *DJG*: 571-4

1994 *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSS 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press)

Witherington, Ben III 1990 *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress)

1998 *The Acts of Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans)

2001 *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI:

Eerdmans)

Witherington, Ben III (ed) 1996 *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Yadin, Yigael 1971 *Bar Kokhba: The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt Against Imperial Rome* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson)

Yardeni, Ada 2000 *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew, and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judaean Desert and Related Material B* (The Ben-Zion Dinur Center for Research in Jewish History, The Hebrew University)

Yoder, James D. 1959 'Semitisms in Codex Bezae' *JBL* 78: 317-21

Youtie, H. 1975 'UPOGRAFEUS: The Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt' *ZPE* 17:201-221

Yule, George 1996 *Pragmatics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Zenner, J. K. 1894 'Philologisches zum Namen "Nazareth"' *ZKT* 18:744-7

Zetterholm, M. 2003 *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity* (London: Routledge)

Zevit, Ziony, Seymour Gitin, and Michael Sokoloff (eds) 1995 *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Zimmermann, Frank 1947 'The Last Words of Jesus' *JBL* 66:465-6

1979 *The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels* (New York: KTAV)

Zsiga, Elizabeth 2006 "The Sound of Language" Fasold & Connor-Linton:13-53