

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT

1. THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

With the exception of several chapters of Daniel and Ezra,¹ which are written in Aramaic, the language of the Old Testament is Hebrew. The Creation story (cf. Gen. 2: 19 ff.) and the story of the tower of Babel (Gen. 11) imply that Hebrew was the original language of mankind. When we turn from folk legend to linguistic origins, however, Hebrew does not appear to have been the original language of the Hebrews themselves, but the language of the inhabitants of Canaan who were conquered and partly displaced by Joshua; it is more accurately described once in the Old Testament (Isa. 19: 18) as 'the language of Canaan' (it is usually referred to by the Old Testament writers as 'Jewish', e.g. Isa. 36: 11; 2 Chron. 32: 18). The more primitive nomad desert tribes from across the Jordan appear to have been gradually assimilated to the culture and civilisation of the conquered Canaanites and to have adopted their speech as well as much in their culture, if not their manner of life; we do not know the precise nature of the original language of the Hebrew invaders, but it was probably a tribal dialect of the Old Aramaic, with possibly close affinities with the speech of Canaan² (cf. Deut. 26: 5 RSV). The name 'Hebrew' to describe the language of the Old Testament is derived from the ancient name of the Israelites *'Ibriyyim*, explained in the Old Testament as a patronymic (Gen. 10: 21). The name, in the form *Habiru*, is now known from Mari (second millennium B.C.) and many other second-millennium cuneiform sources. Various modern etymologies explain the word as 'the dwellers beyond the River', i.e. either the Jordan or (more probably) the Euphrates. (Abraham was born 'beyond the River' in this latter sense.) Other explanations are that it was a term applied to freebooters and mercenaries in Palestine and its neighbourhood (e.g. in the Tell-el-Amarna letters, 1400 B.C.); another

¹ Dan. 2: 4–7, 28; Ezra 4: 8–6: 18; 7: 12–26.

² See further, below, p. 5.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*From the Beginnings to Jerome*

proposal is that the word means ‘those who pass over boundaries’, i.e. nomads, and was a social classification.¹ The early nomadic tribes of the Patriarchs may have been so named for their customs and manner of life. (The name Israel came to be applied, after the conquests of Joshua, to the invading nomad tribes, not necessarily all *Habiru*, forged into a nation by the conquest and settlement in Canaan.) The application of the name to the Hebrew language appears first in the Greek adverb ἑβραϊστί, ‘in (the) Hebrew language’, in the prologue to ben Sira; it is also found in the New Testament, e.g. Rev. 9: 11, in Josephus and, less frequently, in the Talmud (the rabbis prefer the description ‘the holy tongue’).

Other Near Eastern languages are sporadically represented by a few isolated words and glosses in the Old Testament. There are, for instance, some Persian words in Daniel and Esther, and a few Greek words in Daniel. Gen. 41: 43, 45 gives the Egyptian form of Joseph’s name and an Egyptian exclamation *’abrēk*, EVV ‘Bow the knee!’ (perhaps simply ‘Attention’). At Gen. 31: 47 Laban uses the Aramaic expression *y’gar sah’dūtā*, Jacob its Hebrew equivalent *gal’ēd*, ‘heap of witness’. Jer. 10: 11 was possibly written in Aramaic as an injunction to be delivered to other nations.

Hebrew and Aramaic are two of the main representatives of the Semitic family of languages, named after Shem, the reputed ancestor of the Semitic peoples (Gen. 10: 21 ff.).² These languages were once spoken in an area extending roughly from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the mountains of Armenia to the horn of Africa. More precisely, the ancient habitat of the Semitic languages may be defined as Mesopotamia, Syria–Palestine, Arabia and Ethiopia. The living descendants of this ancient Semitic family are still to be found in this same extensive area; they are Hebrew in Israel (a modern revival of the classical language and its descendant, namely rabbinical, particularly Mishnaic, Hebrew), Syriac, Arabic—the most widely spoken modern Semitic language—and Ethiopic. The different branches of the ancient Semitic family are usually distin-

¹ This suggestion comes to me from Dr John C. L. Gibson of the University of Edinburgh. But cf. also F. F. Bruce in *Archaeology and Old Testament Study*, ed. D. W. Thomas (Oxford, 1967), p. 15.

² For a fuller account of these languages consult S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Porta Linguarum Orientalium* (Wiesbaden, 1964).

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Language and Script*

guished by the geographical areas where they mainly flourished, though this is in some respects less important than genealogical relationships or linguistic 'next of kin', which may or may not belong to the same area. The main branches are nowadays defined as North-East Semitic (Mesopotamia), North-West Semitic (Syria–Palestine) and South-West Semitic (Arabia and Ethiopia).¹ The North-East branch is represented by Akkadian, which replaced the non-Semitic Sumerian in the second millennium B.C., Babylonian, the dialect of the southern part of the region, and Assyrian, the dialect of the northern part. Some scholars have concluded that an even earlier Semitic language, to which they have given the name Old-Amorite, existed in this linguistic area in the second half of the third millennium B.C. North-West Semitic embraces Canaanite and Aramaic. Canaanite, which includes Hebrew, Phoenician and Punic, and Moabite, represents the non-Aramaic linguistic phenomena of the Syro-Palestinian area, from the second millennium B.C. onwards. Ugaritic, the language of the Ras Shamra texts (fourteenth, thirteenth centuries B.C.), is variously placed in the North-West or North-East branch. Aramaic represents a widespread linguistic group going back to the beginning of the first millennium B.C.² Arabic and Ge'ez or Ethiopic belong to the South-West Semitic group, the latter being a descendant of the old southern Arabic known from inscriptions. It used to be claimed that Arabic was one of the 'purest' of Semitic languages, i.e. the least contaminated by foreign influences and, therefore, the closest to the earliest form of Semitic speech. The latter rôle, however, nowadays would probably be accorded to Akkadian.³ Ancient Ethiopic first appears in epigraphic materials of the first Christian centuries and in the Aksum inscriptions of the fourth century A.D. It is the language of an extensive Ethiopian Christian literature. The modern Semitic languages of Ethiopia are represented by Tigrîña, Tigre, Amharic, Harari and Gurage.

On the whole, these broad geographical divisions correspond tolerably well (with some exceptions) with the distribution of gross linguistic features. East Semitic exhibits quite independent characteristics from West Semitic and these become more marked in the course

¹ See Moscati, *Introduction to the Comparative Grammar*, esp. p. 4.

² See further, below, p. 5.

³ 'Purity' of Arabic can also refer to the classical Qur'anic type of language; the language of the Qur'an is an artificial and scholastic one, based on one of the oldest dialects, presumably that of Mecca.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*From the Beginnings to Jerome*

of time; differentiation, however, is not so clearly evident in the archaic phases. Current opinion regards, for instance, the second-millennium languages, Amorite, Ugaritic and Tell-el-Amarna 'Canaanite' as largely an undifferentiated collection of dialects; some scholars even refuse to recognise a division between 'Canaanite' and Aramaic till the first millennium.¹ The relationship between the members of this widely diffused family, each with its own distinctive features, the result of factors such as isolation, foreign influences, culture 'drift', etc., is much the same as that within the Germanic group of languages, German, Norse, Danish, Swedish, etc., or the Slavonic group, Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, Serbian, etc.

Classical Hebrew, by definition, is the language of the Old Testament scriptures. This is a comparatively narrow range of literature, dealing with a restricted area of topics, so that many other fields are totally neglected. The result is that Hebrew lexicography to a large extent reflects the interests of the redactors of the classical literature rather than the full range of the literary language, much less the spoken language of the classical period. The situation has to some extent been remedied by modern discoveries. Evidence for the proto-Hebrew of the Canaanites has been supplied by place-names and the Canaanite glosses on the Tell-el-Amarna letters (fifteenth to fourteenth centuries B.C.). (These glosses are composed in a form of Akkadian but contain many 'Canaanite' expressions.) The Ras Shamra epics (fourteenth to thirteenth centuries B.C.), written in Ugaritic, are particularly important no less for their literary style and poetic structure than for their language. The Lachish letters of the sixth century B.C., inscriptions, like the Gezer Calendar, the Siloam inscriptions, etc., have all added substantially to our knowledge of the ancient Hebrew language. This has also been extended forwards, so to speak, as well as backwards, by the extensive Hebrew discoveries known as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rabbinical and Mishnaic Hebrew build on the classical language and prepare the way for modern spoken Hebrew.

Structurally, Hebrew and Aramaic are relatively simple and uncomplicated languages—in word-stems, word-formation, syntax and grammar. Semitic word-stems are generally trilateral, i.e. they consist of three consonants only, though many of these were originally bi-consonantal stems, the third letter having been added later as a 'modi-

¹ See further, below, p. 5.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Language and Script*

fier': e.g. out of the biliteral root *h m*, two trilateral roots are formed, *n h m* and *r h m*, each representing different aspects of the basic idea of 'compassion'. There are very few words with four consonants, and compounds and polysyllabic words are virtually unknown in Semitic languages, except where borrowed from other languages. Differences of meaning are in the main conveyed by ringing certain changes in the consonantal stem, by gemination or the doubling of a letter, by the use of preformatives, etc.; or again, semantic differences are conveyed in pronunciation by the vocalisation of the consonantal stem. Originally in Hebrew the vowels were not represented in writing: later certain weak consonants, e.g. *h, y*, were used to represent vowels, and a complicated system of vowel points was introduced, placed in some cases above but usually below the consonants. Syntax and grammar are fundamentally of a simple character; parataxis predominates over hypotaxis in the structure of the sentence. The verb and its modifications, especially in its so-called 'tense' forms, plays a very important rôle. The 'tenses', Perfect, Imperfect, express kinds or modes of actions, especially as incomplete and continuous (Imperfect) or as finished and complete or as describing a state or condition (Perfect). In the noun, where semantic differences are also conveyed by gemination, preformatives, etc., there are two genders, masculine and feminine, the former without any special ending, the latter often ending in the morpheme *t* or *ah*.

With the help of Akkadian cuneiform inscriptions the existence of Aramaic-speaking tribes in the Mesopotamian basin can now be traced to the beginnings of the first millennium B.C.; records of their language in its earliest discoverable form—the 'Old Aramaic'—are extant in inscriptions from Damascus, Hamath, Arpad, Šam'al and Assyria, dating from the tenth to the eighth century B.C. The 'Old Aramaic', in its spoken types, probably consisted mainly of a number of tribal dialects, with close affinities, in an earlier period, with 'Canaanite' dialects.¹ Its successor was the classical or so-called Imperial Aramaic (*Reichsaramäisch*) of the Achaemenid chancellories, the official language

¹ Cf. above, p. 1. Two of the Šam'al inscriptions contain a specially important type of Aramaic known as Yaudic (from the name of the state of Šam'al, Ya'udi). Dr Gibson (in a letter) writes that, from his work on these and other Old Aramaic inscriptions, he finds that 'it is very difficult to differentiate scientifically' between 'Aramaic' and 'Canaanite': there are links between 'Aramaic' and Moabite, between Hebrew and Yaudic, and 'Yaudic' is not easily classified as either 'Aramaic' or 'Canaanite'.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*From the Beginnings to Jerome*

of the Persian Empire and the international medium of cultural and commercial intercourse from the Euphrates to the Nile, even in countries possessing no indigenous Semitic culture. The Imperial Aramaic flourished from the seventh century till the close of the Persian period, into the third and possibly even the second century B.C. Most of our information about the official language comes from papyri discovered at Elephantine in the Upper Nile, documents consisting of letters and official correspondence with the central government in Persia.¹ This Imperial Aramaic served also as a literary language in this period: the story of the Persian sage Ahikar, one of the most popular tales of oriental antiquity, was composed in Aramaic in the fifth century B.C. The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra—biblical Aramaic—belong to the literary Aramaic of the classical period, though there are already indications in biblical Aramaic, in particular in orthography, of features which belong to, or more correctly anticipate, later forms of Jewish Aramaic. The so-called Aramaic *Apocryphon*, an early pre-Christian Jewish midrash, along with other fragments in Aramaic from Qumrân (e.g. substantial portions, in several recensions, of the Aramaic Enoch), also belong to this literary Aramaic of the classical period, though the Jews probably continued to write this form of Aramaic until early in the Christian period. Nabataean and Palmyrene are forms of West Aramaic found in inscriptions and papyri from Petra, Palmyra and elsewhere (Nabataean papyri have been found at Qumrân). Both these states (Petra and Palmyra) flourished between the first and the third centuries B.C.: the population was ethnically Arab. Palmyrene inscriptions are said to have been found in England.² Some scholars are inclined to class this 'later' West Aramaic with the Old Aramaic.

Towards the beginning of the Christian era, some think earlier, others later, Aramaic split into two main branches or dialects, West and East Aramaic, the latter an amalgam of older eastern dialects. The former was a more direct continuation of the Imperial Aramaic and the forerunner of the later Aramaic of the post-Christian Jewish rabbis, of the Talmud (Palestinian), some Midrashim and the Targums. Jewish Palestinian Aramaic was spoken and written in Palestine in the time of Christ and during the first centuries of the Christian era; Dalman

¹ Other sources, in addition to inscriptions, are Assyrian and Babylonian texts, Pahlavi (Persian), Egyptian ostraca, etc.

² Cf. Moscatti, *Introduction to the Comparative Grammar*, p. 11.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Language and Script*

detected within it two distinct dialects, a Galilaeen (cf. Matt. 26: 73) and a Judaeen. The Babylonian Talmud is composed in a Jewish form of the East Aramaic. East Aramaic was to provide the Christian Church with one of its main and distinctive media of literary expression, namely Syriac. Aramaic speech still survives in debased forms in the neighbourhood of Damascus, and in villages around Lake Urmiah and Mosul. A special form of Syriac was used mainly for liturgical purposes by Christian communities in Palestine; this 'Palestinian' Syriac was nearer the Jewish Aramaic of the synagogue and the Aramaic Targums or paraphrases of scripture than was classical Syriac. The liturgies and Targum to the Pentateuch of the Samaritans are composed in a similar form of Aramaic (not earlier than the fourth century A.D.).

The New Testament is written in a form of biblical Greek, the language of the Greek Old Testament and related writings, which is itself a deposit of the widely diffused hellenistic language, usually designated the Koine, i.e. the general (lit. common) form of the Greek language in the post-classical or hellenistic era. Strictly speaking the term Koine applied chiefly to spoken Greek, but it has come to be widely used to describe the literary Greek of this period, which is itself largely an amalgam of the spoken Koine and the old literary language.¹ The discovery in Egypt of masses of Greek papyri in the early decades of this century, written mainly in the unliturgical spoken Koine, led at the time to the claim that the main feature of New Testament Greek was that it was the ordinary vernacular Greek of the period. No one nowadays is disposed to deny the presence of such elements in the New Testament or that the Greek papyri have made an important contribution to New Testament linguistic studies. Even before the discovery of the papyri the view that the New Testament contained a colloquial or vernacular type of language was gaining ground; in Mark, it was claimed, spoken Greek, even Greek as spoken by the lower classes, had made its entry into literature.² On the other hand, it is equally impossible to ignore the markedly Semitic cast and colouring of the style and language of the Septuagint or of other types of Jewish Greek, vernacular or literary, or the fact of translation of Semitic, Hebrew or Aramaic sources. Mr E. K. Simpson's *Words Worth Weighing in the*

¹ Cf. A. Thumb, 'Hellenistic and Biblical Greek', *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, 1 (Edinburgh, 1915).

² So J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin, 1905), p. 9.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*From the Beginnings to Jerome*

*Greek New Testament*¹ has shown how many important words there are on which the papyri shed no light at all, but which receive their true explanations in the literary hellenistic usage of the period; and the close attention now being paid to biblical semantics no less clearly underlines the fundamentally Semitic ways of thought, impressed on language and idiom, which have passed into the New Testament.

Among the more important contributions which have been made to the discussion of this problem in recent years are those of Nigel Turner,² H. S. Gehman³ and K. Beyer.⁴ Dr Turner, who carried on to its completion the *Syntax* volume of Moulton's famous *Grammar* (volume III), took a different view of the character of New Testament Greek from that of his distinguished predecessor in volume I: Dr Turner claims that biblical Greek, as a whole, 'is a unique language with a unity and character of its own' (p. 4), and that this unique quality was imparted to it by Semitic influences, first on the translators of the Septuagint, and then on the New Testament writers whose style was moulded by the Septuagint, though they themselves may have been unacquainted with Semitic speech or idiom. Dr Turner also subscribes to the theory of the existence of a literary and unliterary or spoken type of Jewish Greek influencing the New Testament; and he also fully allows for Semitic, more specifically Aramaic, influence, through the use by the New Testament writers, in particular in the gospels, of Aramaic sources. Dr Gehman sought to advance the hypothesis of Jewish Greek: he argued that there existed, in certain places and for certain periods, a vernacular 'Jews' Greek': in bilingual areas the masses did not keep both languages separate; Greek-speaking Jews spoke, and wrote, Greek with a pronounced 'Semitic cast'.

Dr Klaus Beyer's *Satzlehre* is a first part only of his projected Semitic syntax of the New Testament: in this volume the author is concerned exclusively with the structure of the New Testament

¹ Tyndale Lecture (London, 1946).

² J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, III, *Syntax*, by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh, 1963), especially Introduction, pp. xi ff. Dr Turner's views are set out more fully in his article on 'The Language of the New Testament' in the new *Peake's Commentary* (London, 1962), pp. 659 ff. Cf. also 'The Unique Character of Biblical Greek', *VT*, v (1955), 208 ff.

³ *VT*, I (1950), 90; IV (1954), 347. Cf. also Peter Katz, 'Zur Übersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta' in *Welt des Orients*, II (1956), 272 ff.

⁴ *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, I, *Satzlehre*, Teil I (Göttingen, 1961).

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Language and Script*

sentence which he shows has a predominantly Semitic character in the Synoptic Gospels, in the Johannine writings and in the Epistle of James.

Two illustrations which may be given from the vocabulary of the New Testament are the words ὑπόστας and παρουσία, both of which, it has been claimed, receive their correct explanation from the usage of the papyri, the first, especially in its use at Heb. 11: 1 in the meaning 'title-deeds', and the second in the sense of a royal 'coming' or 'presence'.¹ According to Moulton–Milligan (*Vocabulary*, p. 660), while the varied uses of ὑπόστας in the papyri are somewhat perplexing, in all cases there is the same central idea of something that underlies visible conditions and guarantees a future possession; they draw attention to one instance where ὑπόστας stands for the whole body of documents bearing on the ownership of a person's property, deposited in the archives, and forming the evidence of ownership. Consequently at Heb. 11: 1 they suggest the translation: 'Faith is the title-deed of things hoped for. . .'. Both words have been undeniably illumined by the usage in the papyri, but the usage in Jewish and biblical Greek is no less important. In biblical Greek ὑπόστας is used as the equivalent of the Hebrew *iḥelet* in the sense of 'hope' with the emphasis on an attitude of patient and confident waiting for something, a state of confident expectation; and this may well be the true sense of Heb. 11: 1. Josephus employs παρουσία in defining a diaphanous mist which surrounded the Tabernacle (probably the Shekhinah is in his mind) as the παρουσία of God, i.e. the *presence* of God in this theophany.² This is even closer to New Testament usage than the use in the papyri.

A distinctive Semitic type of syntax is the *Zustandsatz* or circumstantial clause,³ a clause introduced by a noun or pronoun, describing circumstances attendant on but subordinate to the action of the main verb: the idiomatic equivalent in Greek is the genitive absolute construction or a temporal or other subordinate clause. A typical example from the Greek Bible will be found at 2 Sam. 20: 8, rendered by the RSV as 'When they were at the great stone which is in Gibeon, Amasa came to meet them'. The Hebrew (and its literal Greek translation) has simply 'and they (καὶ αὐτοί) were at the great stone which is in

¹ See especially A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (London, 1910), pp. 372 ff.

² *Ant.* III, 203.

³ A. Deissmann, *Semitische Syntax*, pp. 115 ff.

Cambridge University Press

0521099730 - The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to Jerome,
Volume 1

Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans

Excerpt

[More information](#)*From the Beginnings to Jerome*

Gibeon...'. Dr Beyer has drawn attention to the frequency of this construction in Luke,¹ as I had also done,² though ascribing it to Aramaic influence: it may be due, however, in Luke, to the influence of the Septuagint.³

It is only very rarely possible to determine in relation to a Greek Semitism whether it is the result of Hebrew or Aramaic influence; whether we are dealing with Septuagint influence or source or translation phenomena. For the sayings and teaching of Jesus, however, there is little doubt that the bulk of Semitisms are translation phenomena, and have arisen in the process of translating and paraphrasing the *verba ipsissima* of Jesus. We can be sure of this, not only on the *a priori* ground that Jesus spoke Aramaic, but from those few distinctive Aramaisms which are to be detected in the translation Greek of the gospels. It can be taken as certain that an Aramaic tradition (oral or written) lies behind the sayings of Jesus (in the Fourth Gospel as well as in the Synoptics), and possibly in the tradition of the words of the Baptist, and the speeches in Acts.⁴

There is one New Testament book, Revelation, whose crude Greek is particularly stained by 'Semitisms'. Like Mark's Gospel, Revelation has been explained as 'spoken Koine' Greek, the colloquial speech of the market-place: if it is, then those who spoke and wrote it were manifestly Jews. No New Testament book has a better claim to be written in 'Jews' Greek' than Revelation. In spite of its crudities, however, it probably belongs to the 'literary' rather than to the spoken Jewish Greek of its period. Apart altogether from the problem of sources—and the writer or final editor is plainly drawing on prior tradition, Jewish or Jewish-Christian, written or oral—the book is composed in the same kind of Greek as the Jewish-Greek apocalypses, such as the Greek Enoch or the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.⁵

¹ *Ibid.*

² *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1967), p. 83.

³ For a possible example of this clause as an explanation of the notorious *crux interpretum* at Heb. 11: 11, see my article on 'The Semitic Element in the New Testament', *ET*, LXXVII, no. 1 (Oct. 1965), 20 ff. and in *Apophoreta, Festschrift Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin, 1964), pp. 39 ff., and *An Aramaic Approach*, 3rd ed., pp. 83 ff.

⁴ See my *An Aramaic Approach*, 3rd ed. The investigation of Semitic sources in Acts has been carried an important step further by Dr Max Wilcox in his book *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford, 1965).

⁵ Cf. N. Turner, 'The Testament of Abraham: Problems in Biblical Greek', *NTS*, 1 (1955), 222 ff.