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In the numerous discussions of the Greek of New Testament documents with reference to the question of translation from Aramaic originals, the Fourth Gospel has generally been left out of account. The language of the Synoptists has been examined very diligently from this point of view, especially during the past two or three decades, and at least one competent Semitic scholar has published material of high importance. Wellhausen, in his “Evangelium Marci” (1903) and especially in his “Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien” (1905; 2d ed., 1911), argued, perhaps not quite conclusively, for an Aramaic original of our Gospel of Mark; and he and many others have discussed, in a somewhat desultory fashion, the question of possible written Semitic sources for portions of Matthew and Luke. To the majority of New Testament scholars it probably would seem superfluous, to many perhaps even ridiculous, to raise similar queries in regard to John, whether it be proposed to regard it as a formal translation, from beginning to end, or as “based on Semitic sources” — whatever this vague and unprofitable formula may mean. Since the time when the origin and authorship of the book first began to be discussed, its essentially Hellenistic character has rarely been questioned. It is generally taken for granted at the present day, even by those scholars who are most inclined to look for “translation Greek” in the New Testament. The reasons for this are obvious, and good as far as they go.

In the first place, the Gospel of John is connected by early tradition with Ephesus. If, as the great majority of Christian scholars since the third century have believed, it was first put forth in that city, the strong presumption is that it was originally composed in Greek. Again, the philosophy and theology of the book, so far removed from anything in the Synoptists,
have seemed, at least to Christian scholars, to be strange to Palestine and to breathe the atmosphere of the Hellenistic schools. The metaphysical prologue, the prevailingly allegorical method, the mystical quality of the writer's thought, the remarkable dogmatic development, these and other seeming indications of a foreign land and a comparatively late date have made their strong impression. Finally, the language itself has afforded a fair basis of argument. It is decidedly less awkward than the typical renderings of Semitic originals. The style, so remarkably simple and clear, disarms suspicion; and the diction is generally free from barbarisms, so that it is difficult to convict the writer of clear offences against current Greek usage. Quotations from the Old Testament are few in number as compared with those in the Synoptists, whence it happens that the reader is neither constantly reminded of the language of the LXX, nor made aware of a direct use of the Hebrew scriptures.

The case for a Greek original of the Fourth Gospel might thus appear to be sufficiently strong. Evidence to the contrary, however, has been accumulating in recent years, and some arguments which at first appeared convincing have been seen to lose their force.

The tradition regarding Ephesus is not only distressingly ambiguous, as every critical investigator knows, but also rests on a foundation which is, to say the least, insecure. The primary reason why the gospel was held to be Ephesian, and therefore was especially cherished and celebrated in Ephesus and the adjoining parts of Asia from a very early date, was undoubtedly the belief that the Apostle John, plainly indicated as its author, spent his last years in this region; a belief deeply rooted and widespread, first appearing to our view in the Book of Revelation. Added to this belief, moreover, and more or less complicated with it, is the seemingly authentic record of a John, "the presbyter," a "disciple of the Lord," who was living in Asia in the latter part of the first century, according to the testimony of Polycarp and Papias. It does not appear that this John of Asia was ever thought of in the early period as connected with the tradition of the Fourth Gospel, except in so
far as he was confounded with the apostle. In our own day, however, it has become increasingly common to conjecture for him some connection with it.

What, now, is the verdict of the foremost New Testament scholars of the present day as to the sojourn of the Apostle John in Asia? Few questions have been studied with such eagerness and critical acumen as this. A condensed but clear summary of the available material is given in Walter Bauer's "Johannesevangelium" (1912), pp. 3 f. (in Lietzmann's "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament"), and an unqualified negative is given as the answer. Professor Bacon, who probably has examined the evidence as thoroughly and carefully as any other scholar, reaches the following conclusion in his "Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate," 2d ed., 1918, pp. 153 f.: "As regards the person and work specifically there is nothing whatever to suggest his presence in Asia save the acceptance of Revelation by Papias and Justin. . . . The later Irenaean tradition of apostles and elders in Asia can only be a pseudo-tradition, whose origin must be studied in connection with the dissemination of the fourfold gospel." And again, p. 267: "We have ourselves seen reason for the decided conviction that Irenaeus' whole notion of an apostolic group about John in Asia rests on nothing more than the older assertions of his sojourn in Patmos, Polycarp's references to intercourse in boyhood with 'John' and others who had seen the Lord, and his own misinterpretation of Papias." With these conclusions there would doubtless now be widespread agreement among the ablest investigators of the problem.

But even if the belief in the sojourn of John the son of Zebedee in Asia is thus discredited, the student of the Ephesian tradition is only at the beginning of his inquiry, whether as to Asia as in some true sense the place of origin of the gospel or as to a "Johannine" authorship. It is necessary to take into account the three epistles of John, which evidently stand in some close literary relation to the gospel, and whose author styles himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος. Chapter 21 appears to be a later augmentation of the gospel; the addition may have been made in the locality where the work was first composed, or in some
other district or country. Does the ‘we’ of 21, 24 refer to the Christian community at Ephesus? If the question of a Semitic original is raised, new complications arise. Was the appended chapter also Semitic? Was the Greek translation of the whole made in the province of Asia? Is any “Semitic flavor” apparent in the Johannine epistles? May their “presbyter” author be identified with the aged disciple known to Polycarp? What relation, if any, does the Apocalypse bear to the epistles and the gospel? These are all matters of the utmost obscurity, complicated to a degree which only the experts in New Testament science and the history of the first Christian centuries can adequately understand. There is no present prospect of reducing the main questions to any simple formula. A very bold man might pronounce confidently on the who and where and when of these various literary activities, and a very sanguine young scholar might expect also to convince his colleagues. One fact, however, important for the present investigation, results from the very complexity of the problems of authorship and locality. Whatever verity there may be behind the hypothesis connecting a John of Asia with the promulgation of the Fourth Gospel, there is plenty of room left for an inquiry as to the original language of the book in its primitive form. As far as any claims of tradition are concerned, the question is open.

Aside from the fact that the tradition regarding Ephesus is precarious, and at best ambiguous, it has been observed by many scholars that the internal evidence of the gospel itself favors Palestine, rather than any country of the Dispersion, as the scene of its origin. There are, indeed, very striking indications that the author of this account of the public career and teachings of Jesus was intimately acquainted with the localities, both of major and minor importance, with which his narrative is concerned. The main facts were well stated by Sanday in his “Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel” (1872), pp. 288 f., and repeated by him in Lecture IV of his “Criticism of the Fourth Gospel” (1905). The significance of this evidence is generally admitted even by those who are least inclined to give the gospel an early date, or to regard
it as Palestinian in its origin; see for example Schmiedel in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, article ‘Gospels,’ col. 1796. Wellhausen, “Evangelium Johannis” (1908), p. 125, got from the many Johannine names and descriptions of localities not otherwise known the impression of a parading of “antiquarian rarities” — such, of course, they were for him. The author of the gospel seems to him to make one fatal slip, however: “Ein volliger Mangel an wirklicher topographischer Anschauung des heiligen Landes zeigt sich darin, dass die Leute von dem quellenreichen Sichem (Sychar) nach einer Zisterne gehen müssen, um Wasser zu holen.” Admitting that “Sychar” is Shechem, this criticism reads into the narrative what is neither contained nor implied in it. Wellhausen admits that the claim, so often made, that the evangelist shows himself imperfectly acquainted with Jewish customs and hierocratic regulations is unfounded, and gives examples proving the contrary. Bacon (pp. 385 ff.) discusses at some length “the fourth evangelist’s topography, which not only differs in a very striking way from the Synoptic, but admittedly indicates a first-hand knowledge of certain Palestinian localities”; also “his chronology, which is equally peculiar, and which also, in our judgment, indicates use of independent Palestinian tradition.” To account for the first-hand acquaintance with the topography Bacon adopts the interesting theory (reminding of Wellhausen’s estimate) that the author of the work was a second-century pilgrim to the Holy Land, visiting the numerous sacred sites. Of course the natural explanation of the writer’s intimate knowledge of the land, and his preference for the local chronology, if no other considerations prohibited, would be that he himself was a Palestinian. The question whether this hypothesis is tenable may be left aside for the present. At all events, the claim of Ephesus to be the primitive home of the gospel seems more and more doubtful as the evidence is examined.

It is from the teaching of the book, however, that the chief argument for its origin in Greek surroundings has always been derived. The evidence here is striking and pervasive; to very many scholars it has seemed conclusive even without other confirmation, and only a very superficial inquirer could deal
with it as a matter of minor importance. Nevertheless, the ‘must be’ is rather apparent than real; the argument is, after all, based on extremely scanty and one-sided evidence, and it cannot be denied that the investigations of recent years have tended more and more to reduce its force. Are not the philosophy and theology of the book Hellenistic? Doubtless, if “Hellenistic” means influenced by Greek thought. This fact, however, can carry with it no conclusion as to the locality in which the author lived and wrote, or as to the language in which he composed his work. Had not Palestine itself been a “Hellenistic” land for many generations? One of the chief causes of the popular unrest, and the exasperation of the orthodox religious leaders, which culminated in the Maccabean uprising, more than two centuries before the earliest date to which the Gospel of John could possibly be assigned, was the encroachment of foreign modes of life and thought. It was not only by the common people and the uncultivated that the “new light” was seen. The reproach of ἀναξιόν touched the advanced thinkers as well as the neglecters of the sabbath and the frequenters of the gymnasium; it was the danger of foreign doctrines, even more than that of foreign customs, that was apprehended. And the new thought inevitably found its way in, and was welcomed and assimilated — unquestionably to the improvement, rather than the detriment, of Jewish theology. Since the third century B.C. there had been an increasing gain from this source, as we have evidence aside from mere probability. It is as easy to keep out the sunlight from a windowed house as to prevent the atmosphere of a new philosophy from reaching the scholars of a people whose doors are open. We find it convenient to fence off Palestine from the rest of the Hellenistic world, when we are speaking of its (conjectured) philosophy of the Greek period, as though it had lived its own untouched life. There was in fact no such isolation. Jerusalem was a cosmopolitan city, in some true sense. Streams of pilgrims and sojourners, from every quarter of the known world, flowed into and through it. Opinions as well as commodities were exchanged. Also throughout the land there was constant intercourse of Jew with gentile, and some intellectual barter, for it was a time of
unrest and inquiry. The Jews were leaders in theology in that
day as before, and they have always been a people of alert
mind, quick to comprehend and adapt. They had no monop-
oly of religious truth, and received something in return for
what they gave.

One of the most unfortunate and misleading features of the
prevailing modern interpretation of the Judaism of "the Land"
in the last centuries B.C. is the assumption (very natural, but
thoroughly mistaken) that the minute fragment of Hebrew-
Aramaic literature which happens to have been preserved for
us represents fairly the Palestinian Jewish thought of its day.
The fact is that we know extremely little about the intellectual
life of Israel in the Graeco-Roman period, in any part of the
world, and next to nothing about the thought and language of
the Palestinian Jewish philosophers, of whom there must have
been many. Good fortune has rescued for us the principal
works of a Jew of Egypt, Philo, doubtless a typical example
of the long-standing attempt to make use of Greek philosophy
in interpreting the history and faith of Israel as the chosen of
the peoples of the earth. The so-called Fourth Book of Mac-
cabees, which (though it originally circulated among Jews)
owes its preservation solely to Christian interest, is another
example, of a very different type. There is nothing fantastic
or improbable in the conjecture that if some miracle could have
saved for us the literature circulating in Palestine at the dawn
of the present era, we should find in it many able treatises, of
various degrees of originality, embodying aspects of Hellenistic
speculation which were commonplaces in all the learned cen-
tres. The mentally alert among the highly educated, in such
cities as Jerusalem, Damascus, Caesarea, Samaria, and the
chief cities of Galilee, could not be ignorant of the principal
movements of thought in the Mediterranean world. The con-
nection with Egypt was always especially close. There must
have been in some of these lesser centres Jewish scholars, ad-
vanced thinkers, who reached out eagerly for the new meta-
physical ideas and embodied them in their own speculative
treatises, composed occasionally, no doubt, in Greek, but far
oftener in Aramaic, which was not only the vernacular, but had
been for many centuries the chief literary language of Western Asia. Translation was almost as familiar a proceeding as writing itself, and had been so, from time immemorial, in all these regions. The current philosophical terminology was easily rendered, and Aramaic, in some ways the most elastic and adaptable of all the Semitic languages, was the same very respectable medium of interpretation then as in later years in the hands of the multitude of scholars who translated Greek treatises into "Syriac." A foreign work which seemed likely to be interesting to many — for the Jews of that time were a book-making and book-reading people (Eccles. 11, 12) — could be made available in this way. How long a time would elapse before a literary masterpiece, circulating in Egypt, could find its way to Azotus, or Sidon, or Capernaum? Perhaps a decade, perhaps a few months. Communication was easy, at all events, and the student who really wished to learn could be satisfied. "Judas (Maccabaeus) rescued from the war and collected for us certain books, and we have them here," wrote the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt, in the second century B.C. (the original language of the letter probably Aramaic); "if you have need of them, send and get them" (2 Macc. 2, 14 f.). Guessing at a lost literature is useful to only a very limited extent, to be sure, but it is likely that close students of this period of Jewish affairs will agree in holding it as virtually certain that there existed in Palestine at the close of the last century B.C. a written body of new doctrine with a Greek tinge; and I think that the probability will be admitted, by those best capable of judging, that the principal language in which it was embodied was Aramaic. Whatever such writings existed, perished along with the great bulk of the Palestinian Jewish literature. Why should they have been preserved? Just in proportion as they were definitely "Hellenistic" would they have been left to their fate. The zealous patriots, in their desperate extremity of persecution by Greeks and Romans, could not possibly rescue more than a handful of their writings. Their effort was not directed to keeping what was representative as literature, or intellectually eminent, but only to saving what was sacred, the ancient documents (actually such or so
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reputed) which had significance for their religious history, from the patriarchs to the restoration in the Persian period. Even such out-and-out Hebrew monuments of the old Jewish spirit as the Wisdom of Ben Sira and the deeply religious history known to us as First Maccabees were abandoned, to say nothing of the hundreds of writings, influential in their own day, of which no trace has survived.

Some decades ago it was customary to speak of the metaphysical prologue of the Fourth Gospel as "Alexandrine philosophy," with the implication that it could not have been composed in Palestine. In recent years there has been increasing recognition of the fact that the foreign-born terms and ideas, going beyond anything contained in the Hebrew scriptures on the one hand or in the Synoptic gospels on the other, were in general the typical product of their time rather than the property of any particular school or locality. The Jew of Graeco-Roman Palestine who had a mind for theological speculation would be certain to find guidance into these fruitful fields as soon as he talked with scholars. This, apparently, is the way in which the author of the Fourth Gospel obtained his bit of Greek philosophy. The distinctly "Hellenistic" element contained in his extraordinary work makes the impression of being the adopted means of answering certain profound questions rather than the outcropping of a characteristic mode of thought. It would not be dealing justly with it to speak of it as applied externally, for the evangelist has thought deeply and found firm standing-ground, as is shown by the essential harmony of his theology throughout the book; but the terms in which he ordinarily thinks — with all the depth of his thought — are characterized by Semitic simplicity, not by Greek subtlety. Certainly not all those who approach the study of the book from the point of view given by the early Christian writings, profane Greek literature, and the κοινή of the papyri, realize to what an extent this is true. First and last, in spite of the few plain traces of foreign speculation, the writing is Palestinian.

Interesting evidence in this direction is afforded by Schlatter's "Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten" (Gütersloh, 1902), a monograph which attempts to show that the lan-
guage of this gospel is essentially that of the contemporary native writers using their own Semitic idioms. It is true that "contemporary" writings, strictly speaking, are not to be had, for all the Jewish literature of the first century has perished, with the exception of those bits (chiefly documents of the New Testament) which have survived in Christian renderings into Greek. Even Jewish writings of the second century, composed in the language of the land and extensive enough to be used for purposes of comparison, are wanting. The first considerable monuments of Palestinian literature emerging after the great catastrophe and surviving to the present day are the Mishna (exposition of the Traditional Law), the Targums, and the older Midrashim. The Targums, though Aramaic, are translations (the oldest of them generally rendering the Hebrew quite closely), and therefore are of limited value to one looking for the vernacular speech. It is to the Midrashim that Schlatter turns, taking his illustrative material from Mechilta and Sifre — expositions of Exodus and Numbers-Deuteronomy respectively — with occasional recourse to other Rabbinic commentaries of approximately the same date. These all, like the Mishna, represent no actually living speech, but are composed in the "new Hebrew" which was the language of the Rabbinic schools. In both substance and form, however, they give us, for the most part, what is well attested as current in the second century of our era. As Schlatter remarks, and illustrates by numerous examples, the idioms of Hebrew and Aramaic are so nearly alike that whatever is said in the one language could also be said, in nearly or quite the same form, in the other. He presents parallels, chapter by chapter and verse by verse (or rather, phrase by phrase), throughout the Gospel and the First Epistle of John. The parallels which he brings are not always impressive in themselves; some of them seem to me nearly or quite worthless; and a superficial or hasty reading will be likely to miss their significance. The comparison touches the mere form of expression, the vocabulary, the phrase, oftener than the underlying thought. The reader who expects to find here a foreshadowing of the Johannine theology will go away disappointed; the originality of the evangelist is un-
touched. It is to be noted that every part of the gospel is
drawn upon. In the first chapter, phrases are taken from 34
of the 51 verses; in the prologue (1, 1–18), 14 verses are laid
under contribution. In the discourses of chaps. 13–17, where
in the nature of the case comparison is not easy, 49 verses
furnish illustrative material. His conclusion is (pp. 8 ff., 178 ff.)
that the native speech of the author was Aramaic, and that he
wrote his gospel in a sort of Greek which was essentially a mere
rendering of his own Semitic idioms into the imperfectly mas-
tered foreign tongue. As he says (p. 178), let the doubter at-
tempt to furnish some genuinely Greek text, a document which
is not Palestinian, nor Semitic, in its origin — one of the biog-
raphies of Plutarch, or a treatise of Philo, or one of the letters
in the κοινή of the papyri — with a similar running commentary
derived from these Midrashim, and he will be made to see the
impossibility of reaching a similar result. In spite of the ob-
vious defects in this display of parallels, and in spite of the
strong objection which may be made to certain of his inferences,
Schlatter’s demonstration is valid for its main contention. The
verbal embodiment of the evangelist’s thought, sentence by
sentence, from the first chapter to the last, is essentially
Semitic, only superficially and apparently Greek.

A comparison of another kind, going deeper than Schlatter’s
and including the Old Testament as well as the Rabbinic writ-
ings, would show that the whole substructure of the Johannine
theology is Jewish. No spokesman of the nascent Christian
doctrine stands more squarely and firmly than “John” on the
basis of the Hebrew faith. There is no need to insist upon this,
for it is well known. The teaching of the fourth evangelist,
like that of the other Christian writers of the first century, has
for its chief source the Hebrew Messianic doctrine in its purest
form; the ancient doctrine, but re-stated from the new point
of view reached through the contemplation of the life and death
of Jesus. Our evangelist’s great contribution was his intimate
mystical interpretation of the person of the Messiah and of the
revelation given through him, an interpretation such as no
other gave or — we may say with confidence — could have
given.
Among the characteristic features of the Johannine teaching which have caused many scholars to turn their search-lights away from Palestine toward Ephesus, Antioch, or Alexandria, and to resist any suggestion of a Semitic original of this document, are the wide outlook of the writer, especially as regards the Christian church; the way in which he seems to stand apart from, if not at a distance from, "the Jews"; and the striking advance which his Christian doctrine shows over what is to be found in the Synoptists. No one of these considerations, however, need take us beyond Judea and Galilee, nor to a later date than the third quarter of the first century. The evangelist's outlook, at its widest, goes not a whit beyond that of the true Messianic hope, as set forth in detail by the Second Isaiah. What the Hebrew prophet foresaw and predicted was the redemption of God's elect, from every nation and people, led by a purified Israel in the coming age, after the incorrigible foes of the One God, Israelites and Gentiles alike, had been swept away by the Messiah and his hosts. This and nothing else was the essential program of the primitive Nazarenes, with the difference, that the Anointed One had already come, and that therefore there was such an immediate and pressing necessity of sending the message abroad as had never existed before. This necessity was evident as soon as Jesus was recognized as the Messiah. It is the mainspring of the Gospel of Mark, which is merely a compendium put together for immediate missionary use; it is no less apparent in the more elaborate gospels of Matthew and Luke. To whom was the message to be sent? Primarily, of course, to the Jews, who must first be gathered in, forming the vast nucleus from which the leaven would then go forth into every other people. So the Second Isaiah conceived the process; so every patriotic Israelite must have wished to see it; so, in all probability, the author of the Fourth Gospel hoped for its accomplishment. "Salvation is from the Jews" (4, 22), but is to extend to "the world" (vs. 42). Paul, on the contrary, after his first bitter experience, was ready to turn directly and primarily to the Gentiles. John, like his fellow evangelists, had constantly in mind "the ends of the earth" — the phrase so often used by the Second Isaiah. Hence, plainly,
many incidental features of the narrative, which would have been differently conceived, or omitted altogether, if the writer had had merely Palestinian readers, or even Jews only, in mind. The question of the original language is not affected by this consideration; Aramaic was understood, to some extent, wherever there were Jewish colonies (that is, all over the known world), and there would never be lack of an interpreter where one was necessary. Whoever had the message to give could write in his own language. The Prophets had written in Hebrew, and the translators were ready when they were needed.

Regarding the way in which the evangelist speaks of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Bauer (on 1, 19), expresses a view which is widely held, when he says: "Joh. spricht von den Juden fort und fort in einer Weise, die sich nur erklärt unter der Voraussetzung, dass die Juden als Nation zu bestehen aufgehört haben." This is indeed an easy — almost too easy — explanation of the evangelist's habit, but there are other modes of interpretation which lie quite as near and are much more probable. In itself, the term, as used by one Jew in speaking of his fellows, is in no way remarkable; the examples are abundant. Nor is the tone of reproach, or antagonism, in which it is sometimes employed, a thing to occasion surprise. From whom did the bitter and relentless antagonism come, from the time when the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah were first urged by his followers, through the struggles of the apostles in founding their church after his death, as recounted in the Book of Acts and the Epistles of Paul? Who barred the way to the realization of the splendid plan for the redemption of the wide world, Gentile and Jewish alike? In point of fact, the Christian church found in orthodox Judaism a consistent and permanent opponent, for very obvious reasons. A man of insight who was well acquainted with the official circles in Jerusalem especially might have foreseen this outcome long before the middle of the first century. The condemned and executed agitator, slighter of the Mosaic law, the son of a Galilean carpenter, was not the king and deliverer, the scion of the house of David, whom the prophets had seemed to describe and the teachers for generations past had pictured. Such a collection of proof-texts as
that in the Gospel of Matthew would arouse only ridicule; it could not be accepted as valid evidence by those who were inclined to question it. In any quarter of the world where the "Nazarenes" were brought into contact with the prevailing type of Judaism, so firmly constituted and sharply defined, the opposition would become apparent, but at no time and in no place was its irreconcilable nature so evident, the shell of this solid national and doctrinal system so certainly impenetrable by what the Christians sought to introduce, as in Palestine before 70 A.D. John merely expresses the same contrast which Paul felt when he wrote: "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one." Are we to believe that Paul thought of these persecutors of his as merely "eine historische Große"? The earliest documents of the New Testament frequently speak of the opponents of Jesus and his disciples as "the people," or "the multitude," meaning the Jewish people. John is more exact; it was not simply literary preference that determined his usage. Of his loyalty to his people I have already spoken; it is as unswerving as that of Paul; but it is the loyalty of the Old Testament prophets, who, though really holding the doctrine of "the chosen people" more firmly and consistently than their complacent contemporaries, yet in their moods of hot indignation seem to predict the destruction of the whole unworthy race. Thus the Second Isaiah, in a characteristic outburst, addresses the whole house of Jacob as the people who call themselves by the name of Israel, and claim the holy city and the support of the God of Israel, "not in truth nor by right!" (48, 1). So John represents Jesus as saying to his obdurate hearers that they are no true sons of Abraham (8, 39). So also in Matt. 3, 9 and Luke 3, 8 John the Baptist warns that God can raise up from the stones of the field better "children of Abraham" than the unfaithful Israelites.

Those who have looked for indications of time and place in the theology of the Fourth Gospel are a widely disagreeing multitude. The theory that the book represents Philonic philosophy (though lacking all the principal features of that school of thought) is no longer in the foreground, its adherents are a dwindling minority. The attempt to show the origin of
the Johannine ideas in Montanism convinced very few. Wellhausen is perhaps too sanguine when he says (p. 124) that the long-familiar theories of Gnostic influence and of a polemic against Gnosticism have been generally abandoned, but he is certainly right in maintaining that there is here nothing definitely characteristic of this school of thought. Not a few scholars discover "Paulinism" in the book, while others, equally well acquainted with Paul's writings, scout the idea. Some cry one thing and some another; while the one certainty that emerges, as to the teaching of the evangelist, is that he was a mystic with a peculiarly individual, highly original point of view. It is misleading to speak of the "dogmatic development" in John in such a way as to imply that it marks a necessarily later stage than that represented by the Synoptists. What we see is the profound experience of a man, not by any means that of a church; it is the advance made possible by a great soul, not by a series of years. In a writing whose keynote is practical religion rather than speculation or intellectual argument, and whose author takes his material from his own inner store rather than from the writings of others, it is not surprising that a definite location in place and time should be difficult. Wellhausen, after deciding in general that the various prevalent conjectures as to the home of the author are without any good foundation, concludes by saying (p. 126): "Auch der gewaltige inhaltliche Unterschied des vierten Evangeliums von den drei ersten macht es unwahrscheinlich, dass es auf demselben Boden wie jene entstanden sei; es würde dann kaum die alte jerusalemische Tradition mit solcher Freiheit behandeln." This dictum, however, puts a singularly artificial limit to the activity of the human mind. Was Palestine so unlike every other quarter of the educated world that it could produce no original ideas, even under the stimulus of great events? Did not Jesus himself, a Palestinian, treat the old Jerusalem tradition with considerable "freedom"?

We are brought, then, at last to the very important question of the original language of the book. *Is its Greek a translation?* As has already been said above, it has by no means the same degree of Semitic coloring that is apparent in the three Synoptic
gospels. This fact may, of course, mean simply that it is the work of a translator who conceived his task in a way somewhat approaching that in which any modern translator would conceive it, preferring to use Greek idioms and feeling himself under no obligation to retain the characteristically Semitic forms of expression where nothing was to be gained by it. There is certainly need of an investigation going deeper than that which was undertaken by Schlatter. How, and by whom, is the inquiry to be made that will do justice to whatever Semitic element there may be in the gospel, with a fair prospect of gaining whatever assured result the evidence can afford? The late J. H. Moulton, in his admirable "Grammar of New Testament Greek," Vol. II, p. 19, says, in speaking of Luke's gospel: "Neither Aramaic specialists nor Hellenistic have the right to decide whether he had any knowledge of a Semitic tongue: what we really need is prolonged collaboration of both, till a joint impression is formed which may have elements of authoritativeness." I agree heartily as to the "collaboration," but feel that it has hitherto been hopelessly one-sided, with the result that no firm standing-ground has been attained. The fact that the study has been "prolonged" in this way is the reason why the Synoptic problem is still unsolved, and why it is still possible for scholars to believe that the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were composed in Greek. Every linguistic feature in the Greek of the New Testament can be "explained" from the Hellenistic side; it is only necessary to read the commentaries in order to be assured of this. But only Semitic specialists, and in particular those who have made a long study of translation Greek from the Semitic side, can judge as to the extent and meaning of the Semitisms which are encountered. As Schlatter remarks (p. 9, note 2), the decisions, at this point, of those who are only specialists in Greek decide nothing.

The Gospel of John has indeed received some attention from Semitic scholars, but no one until Burney (see below) has given thorough treatment to any portion of the Semitic evidence. Dalman, who is perhaps more thoroughly equipped as regards knowledge of Aramaic than any other investigator, has simply
taken for granted the originally Hellenistic character of the gospel, and therefore has very little to offer for our present purpose. His remarks on the language of John in his “Worte Jesu” are generally designed to show how this gospel is less Semitic than the Synoptic gospels — themselves, in his opinion, originally Greek. Wellhausen, whose treatment even of the language of Mark is inadequate, plainly brings to his reading of the Fourth Gospel firmly fixed ideas as to its character and history which have affected both his observation and his interpretation of details. No one need object, indeed, to his general statement, p. 126, in regard to the undoubted Aramaic element in John, that the evangelist's Greek phraseology is “nicht entfernt so gefärbt wie die des Markus und des Verfassers der dem Matthäus und Lukas gemeinsamen Redestücke”; I said the same thing in my ‘Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels,’ in “Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy,” 1912, p. 272. His final conclusion is (p. 145) that the author's knowledge of Aramaic had no effect on his Greek; though his language resembles that of Mark inasmuch as it is the vulgar dialect, it differs from it in that is not a disguised Aramaic. I think it can be shown that in this judgment Wellhausen is mistaken. In his brief and too hasty characterization of the Johannine Greek (pp. 133–145) he notes numerous Semitisms, some of which are declared to be “merkwürdig,” but they are all dismissed lightly, as being much fewer in number than those in the Synoptists and therefore (!) of no significance; as though he had forgotten that the important evidence is to be sought in the stray solecism rather than in the ninety and nine classical idioms which need no justification. We know already that the evangelist is trying to write Greek, as well as his handicap — whatever it is — will let him. The only hope of learning the nature of his handicap lies in studying the occasional failures, lapses, or deliberate transgressions. Reckoning the proportion of correct usage tells nothing whatever as to the writer’s relative knowledge of Greek, if he and the others with whom he is compared happen to be translating; it shows merely the habit or immediate aim of the individual translator. Wellhausen points out numerous
Semitisms, see pp. 133 (two), 134 (two), 138 (three), 141, 142, 143, but does not account for their presence in the gospel. Still oftener he notes peculiar Johannine usages without any suggestion as to their origin, although they correspond to regular and characteristic Semitic idioms; see (ibid.) §§ 3 note 3, 6, 7 end, 8, 9 (Aramaism), 10 note, 11 end (Aramaism), 12 beginning and end (Aramaism), 13 (Aramaism), 14, 15, 17 middle, 20 (infin. absol., idiomatic in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew), 21 third paragraph, 23 second paragraph. Among the peculiarities of usage which he designates as especially characteristic of the Fourth Gospel are the following: (1) The use of a correlative, usually a pronoun, sometimes an adverbial expression, referring back to a relative, participle, or substantive (§ 6). This is a very common and characteristic Semitic usage. (2) A frequent use of περί, for which ὑπέρ is sometimes exchanged (§ 7 end, § 21 paragraph 3). This is simply the translation of the Aramaic יָּֽהָ, the idiomatic use of which corresponds in every case. (3) A peculiar way of using the separate pronouns of the first and second persons in the nominative case redundantly, as subject of a finite verb where no emphasis is intended (§ 18). This, Wellhausen fails to see, is due to the wide use of the Aramaic present participle (which use explains also the Johannine Greek discussed in § 12). With this participle the pronouns of the first and second persons are regularly employed. This is one of the most striking and certain Aramaisms in John.

By cutting out a considerable portion of the gospel as secondary, and emending the text of 2, 3 (§ 14), Wellhausen eliminates the genitive absolute from the “Grundschrift.” It occurs frequently, however (Burney enumerates 17 cases), and is employed in precisely the manner of the LXX. The claim (§ 19) that in John μέσος is an adjective, not a noun “as in Semitic,” is refuted by 20, 19; 26, εἰς τὸ μέσον. It is a strange assertion (p. 133 bottom), that “the genuine Semitic way (die echt semitische Art)” of reinforcing a casus pendens by a pronoun is not characteristic of John’s language (“findet sich bei J. höchstens annähernd in besonderen Fällen”). Burney cites 27 examples, and the construction is used in precisely the “genuine Semitic way.” Wellhausen does record the significant fact
(§ 1) that in the sentence the verb generally precedes, while the subject comes later. He proposes to explain this (p. 134) as "imitation of the Biblical style"; an explanation which, in view of the general character of John's Greek, has in my opinion not the least plausibility. A very characteristic Semitic construction is the clause in which a relative pronoun is followed by a pronominal or adverbial complement. Instead of saying, 'the place in which the children of Israel dwelt,' the Semitic would say, 'the place which the children of Israel dwelt in it.' This idiom, though possible in Greek (Moulton, I, pp. 94 f.), would hardly be chosen by cultivated authors, such as our New Testament writers; would never be imitated, unless by deliberate and uncommonly skilful forgers; but is quite easily taken over by a translator. Wellhausen, § 3, asserts that there is "no trace" of this construction to be found in John. There is however a perfect example in 1, 27, οὗ... αὐτῶν, and another, equally good, in 13, 26, ὅ... αὐτῶν. Wellhausen, indeed, notices 1, 33, ἐφ' ὅν... ἐπ' αὐτῶν, but tries (without success, it seems to me) to explain it otherwise. Another Semitic usage of which he finds "keine Spur" (§ 1, cf. § 17) is the construct state. This barbarism is indeed easily avoided, and John's use of the Greek article is ordinarily idiomatic; nevertheless there are distinct "traces" of the Semitism. In 1, 49, if John had not been rendering the construct, he would certainly have written ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (the phrase immediately preceding was not construct); nor in 5, 29 would he have written εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς and εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως. In 5, 27, the Curetonian and Peshitta versions are quite correct in rendering 'the Son of Man'; it was as the υἱὸς τοῦ Dan. 7, 13 that the judgment was given into his hands, not as a participant in human nature; cf. vs. 22. In 4, 5, what the author intended was certainly 'Jacob's well,' not 'a well of Jacob.' The πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ is precisely the same too literal rendering with which we are so familiar in the Greek translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. Thus, for example, Josh. 15, 9, ἐπὶ πηγὴν ὕδατος Ναφθώ, 'to the spring of the water of N.'; 1 Sam. 6, 14, εἰς ἄγραν Ἰσραήλ, 'to the field of Joshua'; Neh. 3, 16, ἐως κήπου τάφου Δανείδ, 'to the garden of the tomb of David'; and hundreds of
similar cases. Another instance in John is 6, 68, ἰηματα ζωῆς 
αἰωνίου, 'the words of eternal life.' Every earnest and faithful
Jewish teacher (and there certainly were many such) had
'words' of eternal life; one only had the words. Still another
example is 9, 5, φῶς εἶμι τοῦ κόσμου, 'I am the light of the world.'
Contrast 1, 4; 8, 12; Matt. 5, 13 f.; where the translation is
not so literal; and compare Ps. 26 (27), 1, Κύριος ὑπερασπιστὴς 
τῆς ζωῆς μου, 'the Lord is the protector of my life'; 27 (28), 8,
Κύριος κράταιωμα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, 'the Lord is the strength of his
people,' and the multitude of similar passages in which the
rendering is too literal to be correct as Greek.

Moulton, II, pp. 32 f. sets great store, very naturally, by
Wellhausen's verdict. He takes note, indeed, of the seemingly
strong argument for a Semitic original derived from the fact
that the verb generally precedes the subject, but thinks to off-
set this by quoting Wellhausen's (very misleading) dictum that
the order of words in John is generally unsemitic — as though
by emphasizing the number of sound links in a chain the pres-
ence of broken links could be rendered insignificant. He also
cites that scholar's (mistaken) assertion regarding the con-
struct state, and remarks with approval that he "stays his
hand" when he finds an "occasional" casus pendens (see above)
followed by a resumptive pronoun. (If Wellhausen had been
less inclined to stay his hand, and had made a really thorough
investigation, he would have given us a more valuable essay.)
Moulton concludes: "The linguistic evidence all goes to show
that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man who, while
cultured to the last degree, wrote Greek after the fashion of men
of quite elementary attainment." I confess that my credulity
is insufficient for this. Where and when can be found a literary
proceeding in any true sense parallel to the one here imagined
by Moulton? I am aware that Matthew, Mark, Luke, the
first half of Acts, and the Book of Revelation are all supposed
to afford illustration of it, but another explanation seems to me
incomparably more probable. These writers of Greek were
all highly educated men, with a wide knowledge of the Greek
tongue — and yet, somehow, with very little knowledge of it,
according to the current theory! Before they are convicted of
the willingness to write an uncouth, _learned_ patois, the possibility (which is also the antecedent probability) that they are merely translating ought to be investigated more thoroughly than hitherto. Why should a "cultured" man presume to do the thing which Moulton imagines John to have done? Writing for readers whose native tongue was Aramaic, he would of course have written in Aramaic. Writing for Greek readers, he surely would have known better than to repel them by employing the speech of a half-educated man. If among his cultured acquaintances there were any who knew how to write idiomatic Greek, they could easily have revised his manuscript, or written at his dictation. It was a literary age. For the supposition that he could have _chosen_ to write like a man "of quite elementary attainment" there could be no plausible ground — unless we suppose him to have wished to deceive his readers by giving his work the appearance of a translation; every educated man acquainted with the LXX knew the difference between translation Greek and the genuine article. The conjecture that _one_ writer actually performed this bizarre feat might perhaps have seemed less incredible; but when we are shown half a dozen authors, all men of very obvious learning and literary skill, said to be attempting this task for which they were not fitted, it is time to seek a new theory.

The whole question as to the original language of the book has been given a new prominence and brought near to a final solution by Professor Burney's "Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel." We have here, at last, a thoroughgoing, methodically sound argument by a competent scholar, designed to show that the idioms of the Fourth Gospel are not merely Semitic, but distinctly Aramaic, from the beginning of the book to its end. The author of the investigation, who is Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and Canon of Rochester, has long been known to students of Biblical Hebrew through his writings in this field. He tells us in his introductory chapter how in recent years the conviction had grown upon him that the diction of the Fourth Gospel

---

needed closer and more expert attention than it had hitherto received; how he had been impressed by Lightfoot’s remarks (Biblical Essays, pp. 126 ff.) on the language of the book, and by Dr. C. J. Ball’s article ‘Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?’ in the Expository Times for November, 1909; and how he finally was led to attack the question himself.

In order to prepare the way for his main argument, he presents first, in brief summary, a statistical comparison of the Marcan Aramaisms (which he assumes to be capable of demonstration) with those which he recognizes in John. He then proceeds to a detailed study of the prologue (1, 1–18), verse by verse, as a test of the theory of an Aramaic original. After a full discussion of the successive idioms, he turns the whole into an Aramaic corresponding to the Greek. Some suggestions in this direction had already been made, especially by Rendel Harris in the Expositor, vol. XII, 1916, pp. 156 f. In general, every Aramaic scholar will approve Burney’s result here. What he attempted to prove, that the Greek fits closely at all points on genuine Aramaic idioms, he has proved. When he tries to show in addition that the prologue is “a hymn, written in eleven parallel couplets, with comments introduced here and there by the writer” (p. 40), he fails to convince the present reviewer.

Then follows his main argument, pp. 49–125. Beginning with the Sentence, Chap. II, he discusses successively asyndeton, parataxis, and the casus pendens, comparing the Johannine usage with Biblical and Rabbinic Aramaic, and classical and “Palestinian” Syriac. Chaps. III–VI then give similar treatment to the conjunctions, pronouns, verb, and negatives. This is all work of the utmost importance, thoroughly done; it will not have to be done over again. To me, it has an especially keen interest because I have long been convinced that we have before us merely the translation of an original Aramaic gospel, and for years past have been making collections like these of Professor Burney with the intention of publishing them as a part of my work, now far advanced, on the Aramaic origin of all four gospels, and a solution, from this point of view, of the Synoptic problem. I am now able to leave behind this funda-
mental demonstration in the Fourth Gospel, simply pointing to the work of Professor Burney, who has performed the task with such thoroughness and skill as I myself should not have equalled. He has shown, conclusively, that the idioms of the book are characteristically Aramaic throughout.

There follow two chapters, VII and VIII, on Mistranslations of the Original Aramaic, and Quotations from the Old Testament. Here it is not quite so easy to accept Burney's conclusions. As to the quotations, his final decision, expressed with some hesitation, is that they were originally given in Aramaic (p. 125). I think it can be shown, on the contrary, that the Old Testament quotations in John, as in the three Synoptic gospels and "I Acts" (Acts 1, 1-15, 35), were made in the original Hebrew. In deciding for Aramaic, as against Hebrew, Burney relies chiefly on his restoration of the original text of 7, 38 (see below). He also regards the ινα μη in 12, 40 as the rendering of ἐκτιμάτωμα (p. 100). In what other way, however, should the Greek render Hebrew יְהוּדָּאִית, seeing that 'lest' is always expressed by ινα μη in this gospel, while μη ἐκτιμάτωμα is never used?

The subject of mistranslations is of the very foremost importance, especially when the fact of the continuously underlying idiom has been fully demonstrated, as in the present case. It is not indispensable to find such errors, and there is always great danger that the searcher after them may create his own harvest, so many are the opportunities of misunderstanding; their evidential value, however, when they can be demonstrated, is great, and in a document of this length it certainly should be possible to find at least a few. Close translation, in any age of the world, is a highly difficult task; and the interpreter would be more than human who could render twenty-one chapters of unpointed Aramaic text into Greek without making any slips.

Burney first presents the rather numerous cases in which he finds ground for believing that the ambiguity of the relative particle τι has led to a mistaken rendering. In 1, 8; 5, 7; 6, 30; 50; 9, 36, and 14, 16, where the Greek has ινα, he would render by 'who' or 'which'. In 8, 45; 9, 17, and possibly also 1, 16,
'who' instead of Greek ὁ. In 12, 23; 13, 1; 16, 2; 32, 'when' instead of ἐνα. In 9, 8 and 12, 41, 'when' instead of ὁ. Conversely, in 1, 4; 13 the relative pronoun should have been the conjunction, 'because, inasmuch as.' Burney also recognizes in 10, 29 (read 'who'), and 17, 11 f.; 24 ('those whom'), cases in which this ambiguous particle, used as a relative pronoun, was translated in an incorrect number or gender. Similarly, in 6, 37; 39 and 17, 2, where the meaning is 'every one who' or 'all those whom,' the Greek neuter, while perfectly defensible as a translation, would hardly have been written by one who was composing freely.

The rendering of this troublesome γ (or perhaps rather ὑ, the older form) is indeed a weak point in the Johannine Greek. Most of the examples cited by Burney would be seized upon at once by any expert investigator looking for evidence of translation. In 1, 13; 10, 29, and 17, 11 f. his interpretation, which is not to be obtained from the best attested Greek text, seems to me quite certain; and I should agree in some other instances where the Greek could nevertheless be defended, his emendation involving merely a stylistic improvement, not a substantially new interpretation. It does not seem to me, however, that defenders of the theory of an originally Greek gospel are likely to be convinced by any of these examples. The Greek conjunctions in question, especially ἐνα, are used so loosely in the later language that every variety of use in John — including such cases as 16, 2; 32 — could be defended by any one who felt defense to be necessary. There is occasionally room for argument over possible corruption in the Greek text, as in 10, 29. Beyond all this, the same exegetical considerations which led the translator to choose his neuter gender, or singular number, or causal conjunction, will govern the decision of many modern exegetes to hold by the present text.

Other suggested mistranslations are the following. 1, 5 and 12, 35, read 'darken' (ἀκβελ) instead of 'apprehend' or 'overtake' (ἀκβελ). — 1, 9, 'he was the true light,' ἀληθινὸς instead of ἀληθινός (ἀληθινός). — 1, 15, instead of 'for he was before me' read 'because he was the first (of all'). — 1, 29, read 'behold the child of God.' — 2, 22, 'his disciples remembered that he had said
this.’ (It is hardly necessary to suppose misunderstanding of the original text; the wide use of the Aramaic participle, so often rendered by the imperfect in John, would cover this case.) — 6, 63, ‘the things about which I have been speaking to you.’ — 7, 37 f., ‘he that thirsteth, let him come unto me; and let him drink that believeth in me. As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.’ The emendation turns on the supposed confusion of יִֽנֵּפּוּ ‘fountain’ with יִֽנֵּפּוּ ‘bowels.’ But Burney’s restored Aramaic is too far removed from the Greek, too improbable in itself, and not sufficiently like anything in the Old Testament. What is more important, I do not see how any translator could possibly make the blunder which Burney supposes. — 8, 56, ‘your father Abraham longed to see my day.’ The verb which Burney supposes here is not known to have occurred in Western Aramaic, and (if its use was like that in Syriac) would not easily have been misunderstood. — 9, 25, ‘this I know,’ instead of ‘one thing I know.’ — 20, 2, ‘I know not where they have laid him.’ — 20, 18, ‘announcing to the disciples that she had seen the Lord.’

I confess that I am unable to follow Burney in any one of these instances. In 1, 5 and 12, 35 (even without the added difficulty of supposing that the same rather unlikely blunder was made twice), 1, 15; 1, 29 (!); 6, 63, and 9, 25, I very decidedly prefer the present readings to those which Burney proposes. As for the remainder, his suggestion in 1, 9 seems to me most improbable because of the preceding verse. His conjectured םָּיָּֽנָּה would naturally refer to John the Baptist, even in the text which he restores (p. 41). In 20, 2 ὀὐκ ὁδὲμνεν is quite correct, I think, but means ‘I do not know.’ I believe it to be an illustration of the characteristic delicacy in the use of the personal pronouns of which we have so many examples in the Semitic languages. Under certain circumstances it is common to avoid using the first person singular, under other circumstances the second person singular is replaced by the third, or by the second person plural. One of the most familiar illustrations is that mentioned by Dalman, (Grammatik, 2d ed., p. 108), the custom in the Galilean popular speech of substitut-
ing ‘that person,’ and the like, for ‘I’ and ‘me.’ Hebrew and Arabic furnish similar habits of speech; so also do Phoenician and old Western Aramaic, as I have shown elsewhere (ZAW, vol. 26, pp. 81ff.). In the present instance Mary Magdalene speaks modestly, as though her own personal knowledge were of minor importance — as indeed it was. I think that in 3, 2 (mentioned by Burney) Nicodemus, in the words in which he introduces himself to Jesus, also makes use of this modest form, oǐδομοιέν, meaning — and understood as meaning — ‘I know.’ Jesus is thereupon represented as echoing his visitor’s polite mode of speech when, in vs. 11, he begins to speak of himself and his own knowledge, using the plural number instead of saying ‘I speak that which I know, and I testify what I have seen, and thou dost not receive my testimony.’ The same substitution of ‘we’ for ‘I’ is well known in Greek (see, for example, Blass, § 48, 4), and is natural wherever the same feeling exists, as to a modest use of the first person singular, which we know to have been manifested in “the Galilean popular speech.” — I think (or perhaps I should say, ‘we think’) that the text which Burney would emend in 20, 18 is quite correct, seeing that such sudden alternations of direct and indirect discourse are a common phenomenon in Semitic writings (cf. also Mark 6, 8 f., Acts 1, 4, Tobit 8, 21). The author conceived the passage in this way: ‘Thereupon Mary Magdalene came and reported to the disciples, “I have seen the Lord!” and that he had said these things to her.’

It is tolerably certain that the skepticism which I have expressed as to these alleged mistranslations will be voiced even more decidedly by the hardened unbelievers whom Professor Burney and I are trying to convert. If the skepticism is justified, the capstone of his demonstration is wanting. Is the Fourth Gospel a translation? Granting the underlying Aramaic idiom, have we as yet convincing proof that the book, as it stands, is the Greek rendering of an Aramaic original? From the personal point of view gained from my own study of the Aramaic language, translation Greek, and the early New Testament writings, I should be entirely convinced by Burney’s main argument, chaps. I–VI, if I had not already examined the
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evidence in this gospel and reached the same conclusion. Those who are already inclined, or not disinclined, to believe will certainly be greatly impressed by the array of undeniable and most significant facts, reinforced by at least some of the suggested misrenderings of the Aramaic relative particle. On the other hand, the multitude of scholars who find it possible to believe that several New Testament writers, “John” among them, could by “thinking in Semitic while they wrote in Greek” achieve masterpieces of this calibre, and evidencing the profound knowledge of the Greek language which they certainly display, will hardly be disturbed in their position. Burney himself, I am surprised and disappointed to see, holds this view as possible, and thus saws deeply into the butt end of the limb on which he is sitting. He writes on p. 18: “Whether the Marcan Aramaisms prove actual translation from an original Aramaic document, as distinct from the virtual translation of a writer who, though using Greek as his medium of expression, is casting his words in the Aramaic mould which is more familiar to him, is a question which still remains open. The present writer, comparing the evidence for an Aramaic Marcan document with that which he himself adduces in this volume for an Aramaic Fourth Gospel, feels that the case for the former is not of equal cogency with that for the latter” (see also p. 8). And on p. 17: “Here [in Mark] we have the work . . . of a Palestinian Jew who either actually wrote in Aramaic, or whose mind was so moulded by Aramaic idiom that his Greek perforce reflected it.” Whatever else may be said of this conception of literary possibilities, it puts the burden of proof squarely on demonstrated mistranslations. Nothing else can carry conviction. Can his suggestions (if they are regarded as important) as to the original meaning of 1, 13; 10, 29, and 17, 11 f. bear the strain which is thus put upon them? Every emendation based on the hypothesis of mistranslation has against it a strong general probability, and the claim to have produced convincing evidence will not be acknowledged in cases where the “troublesome” reading, which can be cleared away by this expedient, can easily be explained in other ways. Walter Bauer’s “Johannesevangelium,” which I have selected as con-
cise, fair, and representative of the prevailing view, shows no sign of misgiving in commenting on the passages just mentioned and evidently finds no difficulty in them. It is not surprising that Professor Burney, who always expresses himself with reserve, should speak as though not quite certain of the validity of his demonstration; cf. p. 20, top, with the sentence on p. 126 f. Once more in regard to Mark he writes on p. 19: "What is needed to substantiate the theory of an Aramaic original is some cogent evidence of mistranslation; and this has not as yet been advanced." It is true that Wellhausen failed to demonstrate the fact that the Second Gospel was translated from an Aramaic original; and in particular, that he did not succeed in finding important examples of mistranslation. Such examples are to be had, however, and the evidence of all kinds is decidedly stronger in the case of Mark than in that of John. Burney's argument, for all its learning and acumen, weakens at the crucial point; to use a sporting phrase, it "lacks the punch." Among those who are inclined to demand in John what Burney demands in Mark, I think that the verdict is likely to be, "Not proven."

In Chap. IX, entitled Epilogue, the final conclusions of the author as to the date, place of writing, and authorship of the gospel are stated and defended; and to these conclusions are added conjectures as to the origin of the other Johannine writings. He decides upon A.D. 75–80 as the probable date; since (p. 128) the gospel is the work of a man of mature Christian experience, and since (p. 129) "there seem to be no indications pointing to a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70." (Are there any indications pointing to a date subsequent to that event?) For the place of writing he conjectures Antioch, on the ground that (p. 129) "the author was not writing, at least primarily, for Jews, but for a larger circle of Christians"; and because Antioch, being in an Aramaic-speaking country, would be suited to his theory of the original language. Further evidence in support of this view he finds in (1) the Johannine theology in the Epistles of Ignatius, and (2) traces of the same theology in the Odes of Solomon, recently conjectured by Rendel Harris to have been written at Antioch in the first century after Christ.
The author of the gospel Burney holds to have been "the other disciple," "the disciple whom Jesus loved," who is mentioned in it several times in such a significant manner. He does not, however, identify him with the son of Zebedee, but, following a line which others have taken, supposes him to have been a disciple unnamed in the gospels. A youth, he conjectures, an eyewitness and yet too young to be included among the Apostles, was the "beloved disciple." Emigrating to Antioch, he wrote his record in that city, and afterward journeyed on to Ephesus, where he appears as John the Presbyter. While in this region, in his last years, he may have produced the Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. (Burney expresses himself cautiously here, but sees good ground for the conjecture.) Attempting so late in life to adopt Greek "because of the exigencies of his new surroundings," he failed to master the language, and thus (!) achieved the extraordinary result which we see in the Apocalypse. The Epistles, which are in a very much smoother Greek, were presumably dictated to an amanuensis, who may also have been the translator of the gospel (pp. 137, 149 f.).

In thus transporting the author of the gospel to Ephesus, Burney places much reliance on the testimony of Irenaeus, which, as remarked above, is now so generally discredited by scholars. In deciding that Irenaeus, when he made mention of the John "who had seen the Lord," the John who was the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, and who lived at Ephesus until the times of Trajan, meant the Presbyter of Asia, never the son of Zebedee, Burney lays especial emphasis on the point that he is never defined by name as "Apostle," like Matthew, Peter, and Paul, in the forty or fifty passages where he is mentioned. Irenaeus does indeed in several passages (cited on p. 140) include this John by inference among the Apostles, and yet never styles him directly "John the Apostle," but always "John the disciple of the Lord," a designation for which Burney (p. 141) can find only the explanation that it was intended to distinguish him from the Apostles.

I think that there is a more probable explanation of Irenaeus's designation of the evangelist. How could any one read the four gospels thoughtfully without seeing that the author of
John was a "disciple of the Lord" in a sense in which the phrase could not possibly be applied to any one of the other three evangelists? On every page there is exhibited an intimacy with the thought of the Master which is not even approached elsewhere. Taking the record as true (and did not Irenaeus and his fellows thus regard it?), we have in this wonderful document a personal interpretation that testifies not merely to close and constant companionship, but also to the sympathy of the pupil whose mind is so richly endowed, and whose heart is so close to that of his teacher, that he is able to grasp and to expand in his own thought the teaching which another might not hear, or hearing could not comprehend. This wide difference between the Gospel of John on the one hand and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke on the other is so clear and so striking that it fully accounts for Irenaeus's preference for the affectionate designation, "the disciple of the Lord." There are many who sit in the privileged circle, but the mantle falls on one.

On page 129, in speaking of the probable date of the Fourth Gospel, Burney refers to the εστίν in 5, 2, which has been thought to imply that the city was still standing intact, and says that the evidence of the present tense is "of doubtful validity if the Greek is regarded as a translation from Aramaic." I confess myself unable to share this view. The fact that εστίν is inserted here between past tenses would seem to me to show that the translator was following the indication of his original. It would have been natural to employ the past tense here also, נָר in Aramaic, πῦ in Greek, as in 4, 5 ("Jacob's well was there"); 11, 18 ("Bethany was about 15 stadia distant from Jerusalem"); 3, 23 ("there were many springs there"); 11, 38 ("the tomb was a cave"); 19, 20 ("the place was near the city"); and similar instances. The εστίν in 5, 2 points to נָר, as Burney surmises. In the Jewish Aramaic this word—unchanged, as it unquestionably must have been—regularly means 'there is,' not 'there was.' I do not believe that a writer who was aware that Jerusalem had been destroyed could have used the word here. I would add, as to the general question of the date, that to me, at least, it seems that the difficulty of
supposing the Fourth Gospel to have been composed after the year 70 is much greater than that which is encountered when it is assigned to an earlier period. On the supposition of the late date, how is it conceivable — to mention only one point among many — that the awful catastrophe of the destruction of the holy city, whether thought of as a calamity to the world or as a divine judgment on the unbelieving Jews, should receive not even the obscurest allusion?

Burney follows Dalman in laying great weight on the distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms (see pp. 7–17, and compare Dalman, Worte Jesu, pp. 18–34); not, however, as a means of differentiating among specimens of translation, but rather of distinguishing genuine translation Greek from the (imagined) Jewish-Greek sacred jargon of the Hellenist. That is, the presence of Hebraisms, as distinct from Aramaisms, in a New Testament writing is believed by these scholars to show that its author was not translating, but merely imitating the barbarous idioms of the LXX. The more numerous the Hebraisms, the surer the conclusion. Burney adds (p. 16) that he considers the matter to be of fundamental importance to his inquiry.

I hope to publish elsewhere what I have already written on this general subject; there is not space for it here, nor could I regard it as strictly relevant, since in my own view the demonstration of Hebraisms has only very slight significance of the sort demanded for it by Dalman and Burney, and can never be used as evidence that a given document is not a translation. In the first place, this formula for interpreting the Greek Semitisms ignores the probability that the idioms of the 'holy tongue' would have been at least as dear to the Nazarenes who wrote in Aramaic as to those who wrote in Greek. It was extremely natural that familiar Old Testament modes of speech should be imitated in these Palestinian writings which were intended to be in some sense the continuation and interpretation of the divine revelation to Israel. It must be remembered that the first Christian writers had reason to make contact, in this way, with the Hebrew scriptures; while the Rabbinical writers, on the contrary, would emphasize in every possible way
the unique character of the canonical writings; they would not, and did not, depart from current modes of speech in order to imitate the sacred style. There are other significant reasons, overlooked by Dalman and Burney, why the Rabbinical Aramaic cannot possibly be made the touchstone for determining the usage of Christian writers in the first century. Again, could not a translator (such as Luke) who was familiar with the LXX occasionally imitate Old Testament idioms in the Greek of his translation? The imitation would be far more likely under these circumstances than it would be if he were composing in Greek. It is almost always the case that the Hebrew idiom — as in the cases set forth by Burney in pp. 11–15 — is closely approached by an idiom of classical Aramaic, so that the rendering of the latter by the standing Greek equivalent of the former would be not only natural but entirely correct. For instance, the construction ἐν τῷ with the infinitive (Dalman, p. 26; Burney, p. 12), which, though attested in Aramaic, was probably not often used, doubtless owes its frequent employment by Luke to the fact that he thus rendered the much-used נֵגְפָּה (נה) clause, often too awkward if literally transferred to Greek. Luke's accuracy is then beautifully vindicated by the Syriac version, which in turn renders the construction with ἐν τῷ and the infinitive by restoring the characteristic Aramaic יְז clause. This is only one instance out of a number. The locutions in question, moreover, are all genuine and widespread Semitic constructions (by no means limited to Hebrew), not at all out of keeping with the genius of the Aramaic tongue, as their Greek renderings are with the genius of Greek. Linguistic borrowings come and go, and form a notoriously difficult subject. Not one of the “pure Hebraisms” listed by Dalman (p. 29) is unknown in the Aramaic which we happen to possess; and we have no satisfactory ground for conjecturing how extensively they may have been used in the older literary Aramaic (not simply “the popular speech”) of Palestine in the century just preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. Our standard grammars of the Biblical Aramaic still contain a list of “Hebraisms” which recent gain of knowledge has shown to be as truly Aramaic as Hebrew. Some originally Hebrew property has, of course, been com-
pletely assimilated by the other language. A few borrowings, traditionally designated as belonging peculiarly to Old Testament Aramaic, turn up now in the gospels. Thus, the phrase יִשָּׁהֵן, 'he answered and said,' so often used in Daniel, also found in Tobit, occurs in the same characteristic way in the four gospels, especially often in John (at least 26 times; Burney, p. 54), not at all in the Rabbinic literature. Dalman accordingly concludes (p. 20): "Die Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht dafür, dass echtes Aramäisch jene Formel nicht kannte. Dann können die Evangelisten sie nur direkt oder durch Vermittlung der griechischen Bibel aus dem Hebräischen entlehnt haben." What does he mean by "echtes Aramäisch"? We are dealing with the Jewish dialect at the beginning of the Christian era, and we certainly have no better source of information as to what it contained than the book of Daniel. Dalman’s conclusion is a strange perversion of the evidence. In general, it is putting the investigation wrong-end-foremost to begin by making an arbitrary list of "unborrowed" Hebraisms, forbidding their use by writers of Aramaic in a period whose literature has perished, and whose literary motives are only imperfectly understood. We must first identify the few surviving translations, and then ascertain from them, as far as we can, what idioms their originals employed. I can find in Burney’s discussion of the Hebraisms found in Luke merely information, often equivocal, as to the habits of a translator.

There are some minor points on which my own opinion would differ from Burney’s; a small group compared with the large number of incidental observations which call out my assent and admiration. I strongly doubt the influence of the Targums which he would show on pp. 35 ff. I do not think that John’s "logos-doctrine" can possibly be regarded as obtained from the Rabbinic memra, 'word,' or that it is in any sense "the development of conceptions enshrined in the Targums" (pp. 37 ff., 127). It is merely an isolated bit of Greek philosophy. The memra in the passages cited is nothing more than a circumlocution; neither here nor elsewhere is there any suggestion of hypostatization. I should venture to demur also when (p. 132, below) a connection is proposed between John’s
mysticism and the Jewish Haggada (!), on the ground that "mysticism is one of the characteristics of the Rabbinic method of treating Scripture." I have no doubt that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a well educated man, but any mysticism that can be discovered in the Rabbinic exegesis is far removed from his mode of thought. In concluding with Burney's book I repeat what I have already said, that it is an exceedingly valuable and timely contribution to the solution of one of the most important problems of biblical science.

After dealing in what some will think a severe manner with Professor Burney's proposed specimens of mistranslation in the Fourth Gospel, it may seem presumptuous to attempt to add similar suggestions of my own. I have, however, for some years past been collecting seeming instances of the sort, and cannot well hesitate to produce at least a few of them here, in the hope of reinforcing Burney's argument and my own. I accordingly give a selection, reserving others, and perhaps a further defence of those presented here, for a future publication.

11, 33, 38, the scene in which Jesus comes to the tomb of Lazarus. The mental attitude of the Master, as he sees Mary and her friends weeping, and again, as he draws near to the tomb, is described by the phrases ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι and ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ. The well known Greek verb means 'to be very angry, very indignant'; so, for instance, Thayer's Lexicon in the present passages. Various translations and commentaries have tried to evade this, but with no justification in either actual or probable usage. Walter Bauer, Johannesevangelium, holds fast to the Greek, as in duty bound, rendering by "ergrimmen," and explains the state of mind as the result of lèse majesté: "Jesus regards the bitter lamentation in the presence of the Prince of Life (vss. 25 f.) as doubt of his power, as insult to his majesty." And again, on vs. 38: "In renewed irritation (Erregung) at the expression of jesting skepticism, Jesus comes to the tomb." The picture of Jesus fuming with indignation over human faintheartedness in a time of deep affliction is intolerable, since it is untrue. Bauer and Thayer-Grimm are right, however, in maintaining that the Greek admits of no other meaning. The verb ἐμβριμάσθαι
renders, here and elsewhere, the root ירה (both Heb. and Aram.)
which, as commonly used in Aramaic and Syriac, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred signifies 'anger, wrath.' The hundredth case, however, returns more nearly to the proper meaning of the root, 'quiver, shake, tremble, be agitated' (occasionally from joy, as well as from other emotions). The best parallel to the present passage is 2 Sam. 19, 1 (18, 33), describing the grief of King David when he heard the news of the death of his son Absalom: 'The king was shaken to the depth of his soul [נרה in both Hebrew and Targum], and went up to the chamber over the gate, weeping and lamenting as he went.' Cf. also, for the wider meaning of the word, Is. 14, 3; 9; 16; Jer. 33, 9; Deut. 28, 65, and other similar examples. In the original text of John, Jesus was described as 'deeply moved,' and the Greek should have employed some such verb as ἐτραχνή (as in 13, 21); but the translator clung to the standard meaning of the Aramaic word.

We have similar mistranslations in Matt. 9, 30, ἐνέβρωμῆθη, and Mark 1, 43, ἐμβρωμησάμενος, where the meaning of the original ירה, in the af'el stem, was 'to admonish sternly' (literally, 'startle, cause to tremble'). Another example is Mark 3, 5, where μετ' ὀργῆς (!) renders נרה, 'in distress of soul.'

7, 37 f. "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly (ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ) shall flow rivers of living water." Probably most readers of the passage, ancient and modern, have felt uneasy as to this "scripture," for it is not only unpleasing in itself, but also is not well suited to the present context. There is no known scriptural passage to which the citation, as it stands, can refer. It was long ago seen that a different arrangement of clauses is possible, but even so, the great difficulty remains. I would suggest that the original text was intended to read as follows: 'Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me; and let him drink who believeth on me. As the scripture hath said, Out of the midst of her [i.e. Jerusalem] shall flow rivers of living water.' The reference is plainly to Zech. 14, 8: "And it shall come to pass in that day [the Messianic time] that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern
sea, and half of them toward the western sea; in summer and in winter shall it be." This involves no change whatever in the consonant text, but simply the pointing נְצָר instead of the (naturally expected) נֶצָר. The citation was evidently made for substance only, and therefore was not in Hebrew. This is the regular Aramaic word for the 'midst' of a city, both in Old Testament (Ezr. 4, 15) and Targums (Ps. 46, 6, "God is in the midst of her," מִבְּנָבָי). It is also very often used of human beings, meaning always the 'belly' or 'bowels,' i.e. exactly κοιλία.

7, 3. μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ὑπάγε ἐις τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ὅταν καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σοῦ θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ἔργα σου ἀ ποιεῖς. This is obviously one of the countless cases of omission (accidental or mistaken) of the conjunction ἀ — a very small, but often very important, particle. The original text, at the point where the corruption occurred, read as follows: ἃς ἀνὴρ ἀνενέκρινεν ἢ ἐκβάλει ἢ πρόκειται. The brethren of Jesus said to him, ironically: 'Move hence, pass over into Judea; so that (men) may see thy disciples and the "works" which thou dost.' The subject of the verb is the indefinite third person plural, so often used in Aramaic. It could have been predicted with certainty that some readers — even very careful readers — of the Semitic text would make the mistake which lies before us in the Greek; not merely because the word 'disciples' stands in the place ordinarily occupied by the subject of the verb, but also because this would seem, at first sight, to be the logical subject. Any copyist would therefore have been likely to drop the ἀ.

8, 56. "Abraham rejoiced (ἡγαλλιάσατο) to see my day, and he saw it, and rejoiced" is a tautology that cannot have been in the original. What we should suppose the author to have written is "Abraham desired, or prayed, to see my day." One of the most familiar Aramaic verbs with the meaning 'exult, rejoice exceedingly.' is ה, the regular equivalent of the Hebrew יָנ (e.g. in the Targums) and the Greek ἀγαλλιάσθαι. The most common verb with the meaning 'ask, seek, pray' is מַשָּׁם. It seems plain that the latter verb was originally intended here, and that its final ש was omitted in copying, partly because of the immediately following ש (בַּשָּׁמַן אֲבֹרָהָם), partly because
'Abraham *exulted* to see my day’ seemed such a probable saying. But the author wrote ‘*prayed* that he might see.’

14, 2. A notoriously difficult verse. I would suggest as the original reading an Aramaic text of which the following is an exact translation: ‘In my Father’s house are many mansions. *It is necessary, I say to you, that I should go* to prepare a place for you.’ Nothing could be better suited to the whole context than this. The text corresponding to the italicized words would be: בֵּית הַעָבֵד אֵל, נְגָר וַיָּדַע אֵל. It is a remarkable fact, and hardly accidental, that the very same text yields our Greek if only נְגָר is vocalized instead of נָגָר: ‘If not, would I *tell you* (or, *have been telling you*) that I go?’; the εἰπὸν rendering (quite correctly) the Aramaic participle in the characteristic use to which allusion has been made more than once in the preceding pages. This נְגָר, ‘to be fitting, necessary,’ seems to have been less common in the Jewish dialects than in Syriac, where it is found frequently in the oldest monuments of the language, including the Lewisian (“Sinaitic”) version of the four gospels, which has a strong Palestinian tinge. In judging as to the merits of the emendation here proposed, the parallel passage in 16, 7, in a strikingly similar context, should be compared: “Nevertheless, I *tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away;*” where the Greek εὐθύς very likely renders this same נְגָר. As for the supposed misunderstanding, even in classical Syriac there are probably at least a hundred occurrences of wela to one of wale; and the εἰ δὲ μὴ of 14, 2 would certainly not have seemed impossible here to a translator of that time, as it does to us. Observe, finally, that the very same abridged conditional clause consisting of the single word נְגָר, ‘but if not,’ is found in 2 Sam. 13, 26 and 2 Kings 5, 17, in both cases rendered קָאָל εἰ μὴ (the conclusion immediately following). A better parallel, showing how the mistake was made, could not be desired.

14, 31. The closing words of this verse, “Arise, let us go hence,” furnish perhaps the most perplexing problem in the book. No one arises, no one goes out; no further notice is taken of the summons, either by the Master himself or by his
disciples. The discourse continues through three long chapters. Some scholars have suspected, very naturally, an accidental disarrangement of the material of the book; and have even experimented with transposition of chapters, always with disastrous results. The fact is, except for the three puzzling words, εγείροντα, ἀγωμέν ἐντεῦθεν, the connection here is perfect. The leading theme of chapter 14 is the announcement, I must leave you and go hence. Then follows chapter 15, with the theme, Nevertheless, abide in me. The one is the necessary continuation of the other. The three words just quoted cannot represent what the author of the book wrote at this point.

The immediate context makes the suggestion plausible that in vs. 31 Jesus was giving this first division of his discourse a suitable close by saying that the necessity laid upon him, of ‘departing hence’ (the main subject of the chapter), was in order that the world might know that he was the divine Son, fulfilling his Father’s mission. The tragedy of his death would be the means of convincing mankind. For other passages where emphasis is put on this idea, see especially 8, 28 and 16, 10. Nowhere is the expression of the idea more in place than here in 14, 31. I would conjecture the following as the original reading, beginning with vs. 30: ‘I will no longer speak much with you, . . . but in order that the world may know that I love the Father, and that as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do, I will arise and go hence.’ The Aramaic of vs. 31 would be: יי ידוע עלמא יד רם אמה אמה אמה יד ובר לא אמה תבישה ינuber אמה קאמא יאמא למאח. Is it not evident that a copyist, who failed to recognize the euphemism ‘go hence,’ with the redundant ‘arise’ (Dalman, Worte Jesu, p. 19), effected the very slight corruption of the text? His eye catching the characters יאמא יאמא יאמא יאמא יאמא יאמא, it was easy for him to write the Greek translates.

20, 17. “Jesus saith to her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father; but go unto my brethren,” etc. These words of Jesus to Mary Magdalene are mystifying, to say the least. We might indeed have found his meaning comprehensible if he had said: ‘Touch me; for I have not yet as-
cended;' or, 'Touch me not, for I am about to ascend' (and therefore may not be approached in the same way as before). The Aramaic text corresponding to the Greek is the following:不信 了 了 了。 It is in all respects the correct text; but the Greek translation misses the meaning, because of the redundant conjunction τ, so frequently used in Palestinian writings, both Hebrew and Aramaic (in the Lewis Gospels found especially often introducing the continuation of a Ἰς-clause, as here), and so often misleading to copyists and translators, ancient or modern. The true rendering is: 'Touch me not; (but) before I ascend (lit., while I have not yet ascended) to the Father, go unto my brethren,' etc.

Many other passages might be added, if space permitted, illustrating either mistranslation or accidental corruption of an Aramaic text. In 1, 51, I would suggest that ἐπὶ represents the same use of ἦν which we see in Job 33, 23: 'If he have an angel to help him' (יהו, lit. 'over him'). That is, 'Ye shall see... the angels of God ascending and descending in the service of the Son of Man.'—1, 21; 25, 以色列 should have been rendered 'a prophet'; the same form, with the same vocalization, is used for both the definite and the indefinite meaning of this noun. A similar correction must be made in the Greek of 7, 40. — 1, 28, Bethabara is correct, and the tradition of the locality was preserved, as we should expect that it would be. But the original Greek reading was unquestionably בְּתָבָארַי. Instead of the original Aramic המר the familiar המר had been written, not necessarily by a careless scribe. I could point to inscriptions in Aramaic alphabets of about this period, in which the ease of confounding ב with ג, and מ with נ, is very evident, and where decipherers have actually been in doubt as to the characters which were intended.—In 4, 6 and 13, 25, οὖς is simply the Jewish-Aramaic יש, 'therefore, accordingly.' — 12, 7, 'Let her alone; should she keep it for the day of my burial?'; imperative of יש followed by imperfect tense without a conjunction; allowing either translation, but in the (usual) absence of any particle of interrogation the rendering of our Greek would be more natural.
These examples may suffice for the present. Even when they are taken by themselves they make a formidable group, for in each instance a serious difficulty in the traditional reading finds its obvious and easy solution in the Aramaic hypothesis. In no one of the passages discussed is it necessary to suppose carelessness or obtuseness on the part of either copyist or translator, or to postulate singular usage. In every chapter of the book, including chap. 21, there are numerous readings which receive their satisfactory explanation for the first time when the hypothesis of translation is applied to them. These facts, taken in connection with all the evidence of other kinds, seem to the present writer to prove conclusively that the Gospel of John was written in Aramaic, presumably in Palestine, and that our Greek text is both a close and a skilful translation.