

# THE BIBLICAL-SEMITIC BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

## PART 2: GRAMMATICAL SEMITISMS

גַּלְעֵינִי וְאַבִּיטָה נִפְלְאוֹת מִתּוֹרַתְךָ:

**Open my eyes, that I may see wondrous things from your law.**  
(Psalm 119:18)

### 1. Introduction

The research of Semitic words and phrases in the New Testament has a long history which advanced most significantly after the Reformation, when theology eagerly returned to the Bible in its original languages. As a result studying Hebrew also became an integral part of Protestant Theology. I summarized the older history of research from Martin Luther onward, together with a table of lexical Semitisms, that is the Semitic words, in my first article on the Biblical-Semitic background of the New Testament in STT Vol. 6.<sup>1</sup> Today I want to continue with the altered situation in research since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. After that I want to demonstrate the grammatical Semitisms, or Semitic syntax, in the New Testament through the example of John 11:21-27.

In my first article I ended the history of research with *Gustaf Dalman* (1855-1941), who until today has remained a much cited researcher of the Semitic background of the words of Jesus. He was of the opinion that only the Aramaic writings of Rabbinic Judaism could serve as a solid foundation for researching NT Semitisms since they most likely contain

the popular, and therefore spoken, dialect of Palestine of the time of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> One result of his research is, that until today the majority of scholars holds the opinion that Jesus only spoke Aramaic. However, if one takes a close look at the table of lexical Semitisms in my previous article one gets the impression that Jesus must have spoken the *holy language Hebrew* besides the *profane language Aramaic*, as the Jews call them.<sup>3</sup> Now, if we want to bring something against the important research of Gustaf Dalman about the Aramaic background of the New Testament, then we also have to ask the basic question which Hebrew and Aramaic texts can serve as a sure foundation for comparison with the NT.

The oldest writings of Rabbinic Judaism, above all the Mishna are usually dated into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.<sup>4</sup> Likewise also the oldest Syriac Gospel-fragments as for example the Codex Curetonianus<sup>5</sup> can at its earliest only be dated around the year 200 AD.<sup>6</sup> In this time there still exist some slight traces of the older language era which was greatly influenced by Imperial Aramaic. But these texts from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries are too late for the formation of the gospels and the related question of its' Biblical-Semitic background. We therefore rather need texts from the first century, especially from the time around the year 70 AD, when the second temple in Jerusalem was destroyed. From this older language era we today have the

Hebrew and Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls as available sources. They are dated paleographically between the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC and the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD.<sup>7</sup> Since their discovery in 1947 they have been explored and today we have important results available which severely put Dalman's approach into question. While Dalman still held that Biblical Hebrew is completely „inapplicable“<sup>8</sup> as basis for Semitism research in the NT, the results of Qumran research have shown that especially the OT writings of the Second Temple period are the shaping example for the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus *Elisha Qimron*, one of the leading Israeli scholars in the field of Qumran Hebrew, writes:

*„The language of the DSS springs from the BH of the Second Temple period. In grammar, vocabulary, and even style it is very close to the language of the biblical books written in this period“<sup>9</sup>.*

And one page further he adds:

*„Of the words and features in DSS Hebrew unattested in the Bible many are known from MH [...] Yet 4QMMT whose language is most similar to MH and presumably best reflects the spoken Hebrew of Qumran, differs markedly from MH in its grammar“<sup>10</sup>.*

This means that the language of the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls on the one hand possess a great similarity with the Biblical books of the Second Temple period (esp. Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah und Chronicles), but on the other hand is markedly different from the language of the Mishna (at least in grammar). In a more restricted sense this similarity with the linguistic era of the biblical books of the Second Temple period is also true for Qumran Aramaic. Thus *E. Y. Kutscher* writes on the language of the Genesis-Apocryphon, which beside the Targum to Job, is the longest Aramaic text among the Dead Sea Scrolls:

*„The language is indicative of a transitional stage between biblical Aramaic and the later Aramaic dialects“<sup>11</sup>.*

Likewise also *Michael Sokoloff* characterizes the language of the Targum to Job:

*„Most of the linguistic traits of TgJ [...] are either common with BA or are intermediate between BA and GA.“<sup>12</sup>*

In a simplified manner this means: even in Qumran Aramaic we can find an undismissible formative influence of Biblical Aramaic as we encounter it in the Bible, especially in the Book of Daniel. The Hebrew and Aramaic of the time of Jesus thus draws heavily from the Biblical Books of the Second Temple period. In contrast to Dalman who wanted to build on the spoken dialect of the time of Jesus the final remaining question is if the Dead Sea Scrolls also contain the spoken dialect of the time of Jesus in any form. On this issue *Shelomo Morag*, who thoroughly researched the vocalization systems and pronunciation of Semitic languages, writes:

*„In describing GQH as essentially a continuation of LBH one would not do justice to this type of Hebrew [...] GQH as a whole possesses a number of prominent grammatical traits that are not related to the fabric of LBH. These traits probably represent a continuation of an old dialectal variation“<sup>13</sup>.*

In his article *Morag* focuses on the minor<sup>14</sup> differences between the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew of the Biblical Books from the Second Temple period. He explains the differences in DSS Hebrew as influences of spoken dialects.

These numerous new result from Qumran research show, that Dalman's approach, which only builds on the Aramaic writings of Rabbinic Judaism has to be questioned today. A new

investigation of the Semitisms in the NT starting from Biblical Books of the Second Temple period is therefore indispensable. This new investigation in NT Semitism research based on the Hebrew and Aramaic sources from the Second Temple period (515 BC – 70 AD) is what I call the *Biblical-Semitic background of the New Testament*. After this extensive introduction into the current research of Semitic languages in NT times we now want to make a first step of investigating the Biblical-Semitic background of the New Testament by looking at the example of John 11:21-27.

## 2. The Biblical-Semitic background of John 11:21-27

First of all we want to read through this passage from the resurrection story of Lazarus in the ESV translation:

**<sup>21</sup> Martha said to Jesus, “Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died. <sup>22</sup> But even now I know that whatever you ask from God, God will give you.” <sup>23</sup> Jesus said to her, “Your brother will rise again.” <sup>24</sup> Martha said to him, “I know that he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day.” <sup>25</sup> Jesus said to her, “I am the resurrection and the life. Whoever believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, <sup>26</sup> and everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die. Do you believe this?” <sup>27</sup> She said to him, “Yes, Lord; I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, who is coming into the world.”**

I have translated the original Greek text very literally into English and then compared it with a standard Bible translation in Hebrew<sup>15</sup>, Aramaic<sup>16</sup> and Arabic<sup>17</sup>. Through this comparison the following grammatical overlaps between the Greek text and the Semitic Bible-translations became obvious, which sound unusual in our languages:

**<sup>21</sup> Said Martha to Jesus, “Lord, if you had been here, not would have died my brother. <sup>22</sup> But even now I have known that whatever you ask from God, will give you God.” <sup>23</sup> Says to her Jesus, “he will rise again, your brother.” <sup>24</sup> Says to him Martha, “I have known that he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day.” <sup>25</sup> Said to her Jesus, “I am the resurrection and the life. The one believing in me, though he die, yet shall he live, <sup>26</sup> and everyone living and believing in me never shall he die. Do you believe in me?” <sup>27</sup> Says she to him, “Yes, Lord; I have believed that you are the Christ, the Son of God, the one coming into the world.”**

I have underlined the text, where it is a bit difficult for us to understand, but is easy to understand for someone who speaks a Semitic language (that is where the Greek text corresponds very much to the Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic Bible translation). Whatever is marked *italic* stands for a literal correspondence with the Hebrew translation which in this wording is not possible in Aramaic or Arabic. Thus far the first overview.

One feature of the text which is only possible in Hebrew is the usage of the participle with article (e.g. *the one believing / everyone living and believing / the one coming*), which we have to translate into English like into Aramaic and Arabic with a relative-clause. Likewise also the jump back and forth in the tenses of Past and Present (*said – says – said*) is only possible in Hebrew.

Features which are possible and common in all three West-Semitic languages are the word-order of *Verb – Subject* (*said Martha* instead of *Martha said*) as well as the unusual usage of the Perfect tense (*I have known / I have believed*). A look into the standard grammar of New Testament Greek does not help to explain

these distinctive overlaps with Semitic languages either. The NT grammar only shows that all distinctive grammatical features of the text are possible within the framework of the Greek language.<sup>18</sup>

## 2.1. The Semitic character of John 11:21-27 in contrast to Josephus

Since even with the help of the standard NT grammar it remains unclear, whether the grammatical overlaps between Greek and the mentioned Semitic languages has to be regarded as a special feature, we now need to turn to a comparison with a Greek text from the surroundings of the New Testament. A well-known author from the time when the gospels were written is the Jewish historian *Flavius Josephus*. I have chosen one section from his speech to the resistant Jews in Jerusalem from his earliest work *The Jewish War*, which Josephus says to have written initially in Aramaic<sup>19</sup>. Josephus had been appointed by Titus to convince the Jews in Hebrew<sup>20</sup> to give up their resistance against the Roman siege. The occasion for this attempt of conviction was, that shortly before the continuous sacrifice in the temple had ceased. The speech is directed to the leader of the resistant Jews named John (De Bello Judaico 6:99-103):

<sup>99</sup> „At this Josephus cried aloud: “Pure indeed have you kept it [the city] for God! The Holy Place too remains undefiled! Your looked-for Ally has suffered no impiety from you and still receives His customary sacrifices! <sup>100</sup> Most impious wretch, should anyone deprive you of your daily food, you would consider him an enemy; and do you hope to have God, whom you have bereft of His everlasting worship, for your Ally in this war?

<sup>101</sup> And do you impute your sins to the Romans, who, to this day, are concerned for our laws and are trying to force you to restore to God those sacrifices which

*you have interrupted?* <sup>102</sup> Who would not bewail and lament for the city at this amazing inversion, when aliens and enemies rectify your impiety, while you, a Jew, nurtured in her laws, treat them more harshly even than your foes? <sup>103</sup> Yet, be sure, John, it is no disgrace to repent of misdeeds [...]”.<sup>21</sup>

If we search for Semitic features in this Greek text which are similar to the ones in John 11:21-27 we do not find any. On the contrary: the first sentence already begins with the word order of *Subject – Verb* which is usual in our Western languages. Here again this feature in contrast to John 11:

De Bello 6:99:

At this Josephus cried aloud:<sup>22</sup>

John 11:21:

Said Martha to Jesus:<sup>23</sup>

Over all the position of the Verb in the passage from Josephus is rather in the middle or at the end of the sentence. This is very uncommon for West-Semitic languages like Hebrew, Aramaic<sup>24</sup> or Arabic. In the passage from the Jewish War there also appear no unusual usages of tenses as in John 11. There are a few participles in the Jewish War 6, but not in the distinguished position at the beginning of the sentence as in John 11:

De Bello 6:101:

And do you impute your sins to the Romans, who, to this day, are concerned for our laws and are trying to force you to restore to God those sacrifices which you have interrupted?<sup>25</sup>

John 11:25b:

Who is believing in me, though he die, yet shall he live;<sup>26</sup>

It is evident that the selected passage from the Jewish War (which is even

slightly longer than the passage from the Gospel of John) does not contain a single sentence that has such distinctive parallels to Semitic languages as John 11:21-27. In contrast to the un-Semitic style of Josephus it becomes obvious that the author of the Gospel of John has a markedly Semitic style of writing.

## 2.2. The Hebrew usage of the participle

We now want to take a closer look at the distinguished usage of the participle in John 11:25ff. A well known Bible text in which we find exactly the same usage of the participle is Psalm 103:3-5. There we read in literal translation of the Hebrew text:

3 **the one forgiving** (*has-sōlēaḥ*<sup>27</sup>) **all your iniquity,**  
**the one healing** (*hā-rōpē*<sup>28</sup>) **all your diseases,**  
 4 **the one redeeming** (*hag-gō'ēl*<sup>29</sup>) **your life from destruction,**  
**the one crowning you** (*ha-me'atṭerēki*<sup>30</sup>) **with grace and mercy,**  
 5 **the one satisfying** (*ham-mašbīya*<sup>31</sup>) **with good your desire**  
 [...]

Of this Psalm there also exists a DSS fragment 4QPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q84), which testifies to the same usage of the participle in the Herodian Period (second half of the first century AD).<sup>32</sup> Often the reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls is innovative and simplified in comparison to the standard text of the Hebrew Bible (MT).<sup>33</sup> Thus if the usage of the participle in 4QPs<sup>b</sup> remained unchanged it means that also in the Herodian Period it was well understood. Hence if we parallel the usage of the participle in Psalm 103 with John 11:25ff it is not a too far-reaching comparison:

25 **Said to her Jesus, “I am the resurrection and the life. *The one believing***

(*ho pisteuōn*<sup>34</sup>) **in me, though he die, yet shall he live,**  
 26 **and everyone living and believing** (*pas ho zōn kai pisteuōn*<sup>35</sup>) **in me never shall he die. Do you believe this?”**  
 27 **Says she to him, “Yes, Lord; I have believed that you are the Christ, the Son of God, *the one coming into the world*** (*ho eis ton kosmon erchomenos*<sup>36</sup>).”

It is obvious how the usage of the participle coincides in both texts, in Psalm 103:3-5 and in John 11:25ff. Furthermore, in comparison with Aramaic and Arabic it also becomes obvious that this usage of the participle in place of a relative-clause (e.g. „*the one forgiving*“ instead of „*who forgives*“ or „*the one believing*“ instead of „*who believes in me*“) is a wording which is only possible in Hebrew:

Greek: *The one believing in me*<sup>37</sup>

Hebrew: *The one believing in me*<sup>38</sup>

Aramaic: *Who (is) believing in me*<sup>39</sup>

Arabic: *Who has believed in me*<sup>40</sup>

We see, that the wording of the Greek text can be translated literally into Hebrew, but not into Aramaic or Arabic. Already in 1962 Klaus Beyer found out in his monograph *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* through comparison with Semitic languages, that the so-called *conditional participle* is a wording which is possible only in Hebrew.<sup>41</sup> Now this conditional use of the participle is a distinctively frequent feature in Johannine Literature.<sup>42</sup> Thus Klaus Beyer writes as a result of his investigation of the Semitic syntax in the NT, that „*Johev und 1-3Joh überwiegend (wie ausschließlich die Apc) unter hebräischem Einfluß stehen*“<sup>43</sup> [Translation: „*Johev and predominantly 1-3Joh (as well as exclusively Apc) are influenced by Hebrew*“]. So through this one conditional participle in John 11:25b we look at the tip of an iceberg of many other conditional participles in

Johannine Literature, which indicate a significant influence of Hebrew on the wording of the Greek text.

### 2.3. The Hebrew usage of tenses

But how can we be sure that Hebrew influence exists in John 11:21-27? We have already seen above that the usage of the perfect tense, as for example „*I have known/I have believed*“, is also similar in the Greek original and the Aramaic (as well as the Arabic) translation of the Gospel of John. However, there was a second feature of the text marked in *italic*, namely the leap back and forth in the tenses of present and past, which goes through the whole passage of John 11:21-27. However, in the Aramaic and Arabic translations this back and forth of tenses is lost. In the Hebrew translation we also always find the same tense, but this tense is the Waw-Imperfect or more precisely the *Imperfect consecutive*. This special Hebrew past tense is a present/future verbal form, which in the context of a narrative turns into a past tense. Let us compare the usage of tenses in John 11:21-27 with their Semitic translations:

21 Said Martha

*Gr.* Aorist (= past tense in narrative context)

*Hebr.* (Waw-)Imperfect (= past tense in narrative context)

*Aram.* Perfect

*Arab.* Perfect

23 Says to her Jesus

*Gr.* Present

*Hebr.* (Waw-)Imperfect (morp. = present/future)

*Aram.* Perfect

*Arab.* Perfect

24 Says to him Martha

*Gr.* Present

*Hebr.* (Waw-)Imperfect

*Aram.* Perfect

*Arab.* Perfect

25 Said to her Jesus

*Gr.* Aorist

*Hebr.* (Waw-)Imperfect

*Aram.* Perfect

*Arab.* Perfect

27 Says she to him

*Gr.* Present

*Hebr.* (Waw-)Imperfect

*Aram.* Perfect

*Arab.* Perfect

We see that only the Hebrew language possesses the possibility to use a morphological present/future form to express a past tense in narrative context. This archaic flexibility of the Hebrew Imperfect was already lost in Aramaic<sup>44</sup> and Arabic<sup>45</sup> to the greatest extent. Thus these languages employ the perfect tense in all cases. A look into the Greek grammar makes clear, that also in the Greek of NT times the tenses could be used more flexibly than in our languages today. But still it is not completely common in the NT (as can especially be observed in the Gospel of Luke) to jump back and forth in tenses within a narrative context.<sup>46</sup> Even the so-called Greek *Präsens historicum*, which is used to vividly bring a past tense narrative into the present tense, does not explain why the Gospel of John suddenly jumps back to the Aorist (past tense in narrative context) in verse 25 right before the most important saying of Jesus. Thus, verse 25 especially leads to the assumption that Hebrew influence must lie behind this unusual variation of Aorist and Present tense.

Now if we compare the line of tenses in John 11:21-27 with the Septuagint translation (LXX) of Exodus 10:8-10 the following becomes evident:

**8 So Moses and Aaron were brought back to Pharaoh. And he *said*<sup>47</sup> to**

them, “Go, serve the LORD your God. But which ones are to go?”

9 *Says*<sup>48</sup> Moses, “We will go with our young and our old. We will go with our sons and daughters and with our flocks and herds, for we must hold a feast to the LORD.”

10 But he *said*<sup>49</sup> to them, “The LORD be with you, if ever I let you and your little ones go! Look, you have some evil purpose in mind.”

Here, like in John 11:21-27, the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect „and he said/says“ is translated twice with the Greek Aorist and once with the present tense. Hence it seems to have been a Jewish custom to sometimes translate the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect with the Aorist and sometimes with the present tense.<sup>50</sup> From this background of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect the narrative style of John 11:21-27 looks quite orderly and coherent. But without the knowledge of the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect the line of tenses is somewhat confusing. But what looks like a confusion of tenses from our Western perspective is exactly the peculiarity of the Hebrew usage of tenses.

S. R. Driver tried to express this peculiarity of the Hebrew tenses with the following words:

*„The use of the Hebrew tenses will be better understood and more thoroughly appreciated if we keep in mind some of the peculiarities [...] One such peculiarity is the ease and rapidity with which a writer changes his standpoint, at one moment speaking of a scene as though still in the remote future, at another moment describing it as though present at his gaze”<sup>51</sup>.*

This means that jumping back and forth between tenses is exactly the distinctive feature of the Hebrew usage of tenses. Now we still have to bridge the gap be-

tween the time of the Old Testament and the time of the New Testament. For this purpose we need the Qumran scrolls. Up until now it was assumed in Qumran research that the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect was already in decline in the time when the New Testament was written. One reason for this assumption was that the Waw-Imperfect no longer appears in the later linguistic era of the Mishna.<sup>52</sup> However, the latest investigations show, that the usage of the Waw-Imperfect in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and therefore in New Testament times, was „stable“.<sup>53</sup> Thus we can firmly assume the influence of the Hebrew Waw-Imperfect in John 11:21-27.

### 3. The Relevance of the Biblical-Semitic background of John 11:21-27

At this point we want to suspend our grammatical investigation and ask which benefit we can gain by exploring the Biblical-Semitic background of John 11:21-27?

Firstly, it became clear through the Biblical-Semitic comparison that there exists a close linguistic gearing between the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. This is an important exegetical basis which in turn allows an alternative perspective in the theological discussion of our passage. It is a much debated issue in the Gospel of John that on the one hand Jesus says in John 5:28f: **Do not marvel at this, for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come out, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment.**

On the other hand he says in our passage today (John 11:25f):

**I am the resurrection and the life. Whoever believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die.**

Thus many theologians see a discrepancy between “present” and “future” resurrection in the Gospel of John.<sup>54</sup> However, this perspective of discrepancy of time is already based on our Western understanding of tenses which strictly distinguishes between present and future. In Semitic languages, however, it is impossible to distinguish present and future so clearly because both tenses are expressed with the “Imperfect” (which means *incomplete*) and belong together in their aspect of incompleteness. If one wants to say something that is absolute and always true as Jesus does here, in Semitic languages one has to say it either with the participle, as for example: “**the one believing in me**”, for the Semitic participle has no own tense and thus is regarded as stable constant in all contexts of time.<sup>55</sup> Or one has to say it in the perfect tense which is the final and completed form of expression as Martha does it and says: “**I have believed**”.

The investigation of the Biblical-Semitic background of the New Testament therefore has a twofold purpose: on the one hand it helps us to step out of our Western perception of reality so that we again become more sensitized to perceive and believe the Gospel as the first Christians did. On the other hand it helps us to become acquainted with the Semitic patterns of perception in the New Testament which can especially be applied to proclaiming the Gospel and to missions in the Middle Eastern context.

However, recognizing the Biblical-Semitic background in our passage today also helps us in our Western context to see the firm and unchanging intention of the saying of Jesus, **I am the resurrection and the life**, not in the uncompleted and therefore speculative question of „present“ or „future“ resurrection but in the irrevocably firm fact of *faith* and of the *available presence of Jesus in all*

*contexts of time* just as Martha realizes and confesses it at the end:

**Yes, Lord; I have believed that you are the Christ, the Son of God, the one coming into the world.**

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Clemens Wassermann, “The Biblical-Semitic Background of the New Testament, Part 1: Lexical Semitisms”, *STT 6* (2011), pp. 105-168.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dalman’s introduction in *Die Worte Jesu*, which ends with the statement: „From all this one has to conclude that Jesus grew up in the Aramaic language and that he had to speak to his disciples and the people in Aramaic“, Gustaf Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> In Rabbinic literature Hebrew is called לשון הקודש = “*holy language*” whereas Aramaic is only לשון חול = “*profane language*”, cf. G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Holger M. Zellentin, „Mishna“, *RGG<sup>4</sup> 5* (2002), col. 1266.

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting that the Gospel of John follows right after the Gospel of Mark in the Codex Curetonianus. Linguistically this Codex still contains a few parallels to the older linguistic era of Biblical Aramaic/Qumran Aramaic (e.g. *bnai-’(a)naša* בני אדם = „sons of man“ in John 1:4 is still written with the same consonants as in בני אדם in Dan 2:38). In contrast the younger Peshitta-translation uses the spelling *bnai-naša* בני נאשא without the Alef at the beginning of אדם. Cf. Klaus Beyer, „Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur“, *ZDMG 116* (1966), pp. 242-254 as well as *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, pp. 50f note 1.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, p. 209. Similarly dates also S. P. Brock, „Versions, (Ancient Syriac)“, *Anchor Bible Dictionary 6* (1992), p. 794.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Armin Lange, „Qumran“, RGG<sup>4</sup> Bd. 6 (2003), col. 1884. For an overview also of the alternative Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls cf. Israel Carmi, “Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, In: L. H. Schiffmann / E. Tov / J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, pp. 886f.

<sup>8</sup> Gustaf Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 66.

<sup>9</sup> Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 116

<sup>10</sup> See above., p. 117.

<sup>11</sup> E.Y. Kutscher, “Aramaic”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*<sup>2</sup> 2 (2007), pp. 347-348.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Sokoloff, *The Targum To Job From Qumran Cave XI*, p. 25.

<sup>13</sup> Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations”, VT 38 (1988), p. 161.

<sup>14</sup> For example the frequent use of pausal forms in non-pausal position in DSS Hebrew (feature no. 5), see above, p. 155. Interestingly a similar feature of pausal forms in non-pausal position appears in several transliterated names in the NT as for example Ἄβελ instead of the expected Ἡβελ.

<sup>15</sup> *Hebrew New Testament* (reprint of Franz Delitzsch, *Sifre ha-berit ha-Hadaša*), London: Trinitarian Bible Society 1998.

<sup>16</sup> *The New Testament in Syriac*, London: British and Foreign Bible Society 1905-1920.

<sup>17</sup> *Al-kitabu l-muqaddas* (Arabic New Van Dyck Bible), Cairo: The Bible Society of Egypt<sup>2</sup> 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Blass / Debrunner / Rehkopf (= BDR), *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 411 and 413 (on participles), § 318, 321, 324 and 340 (on the usage of tenses) as well as § 472 (on the position of the verb).

<sup>19</sup> Josephus does not distinctly write “Aramaic”, but γλώσση [...] τῆ πατρίῳ (De

Bello Judaico 1:3), which means „mother tongue“, cf. Otto Michel / Otto Bauernfeind, *De bello Judaico Vol. I*, pp. 2f.

<sup>20</sup> ἐβραΐζων (The Jewish War 6:96), cf. Otto Michel / Otto Bauernfeind, *De bello Judaico Vol. II*, 2, pp.16f.

<sup>21</sup> H. St. Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books V-VII*, p. 207.

<sup>22</sup> καὶ ὁ Ἰώσηπος πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνέκραγεν

<sup>23</sup> εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν

<sup>24</sup> The verb in the Aramaic parts of the book of Daniel has the tendency to appear at the end of the sentence. But this feature has to be regarded as East-Semitic influence stemming from Akkadian. In NT times (that means in Qumran Aramaic) this word order has become uncommon. Cf. Gotthelf Bergsträsser, *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*, pp. 70f, Arthur Ungnad / Lubor Matouš, *Grammatik des Akkadischen*, p. 113 as well as Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, p. 243.

<sup>25</sup> καὶ Ῥωμαίοις τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἀνατίθης οἱ μέχρι νῦν κήδονται τῶν ἡμετέρων νόμων καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ σοῦ διακοπεύσας θυσίας ἀποδίδοσθαι τῷ θεῷ βιάζονται

<sup>26</sup> ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται

<sup>27</sup> MT: הַסֵּלֶה 4QPs<sup>b</sup>: הַסֵּלֶה

<sup>28</sup> MT: הַרְפֵּא 4QPs<sup>b</sup>: הַרְפֵּא

<sup>29</sup> MT: הַגִּזְלֵה 4QPs<sup>b</sup>: הַגִּזְלֵה

<sup>30</sup> MT: הַמְעַטְרֵה 4QPs<sup>b</sup>: הַמְעַטְרֵה

<sup>31</sup> MT: הַמְשַׁבֵּיעַ 4QPs<sup>b</sup>: הַמְשַׁבֵּיעַ

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, pp. 33f and 96.

<sup>33</sup> Thus in 4QPs<sup>b</sup> the uncommon poetic pronominal suffix of 2fs *-ki* כִּי in הַמְעַטְרֵה is simplified to the more common pronominal suffix *-k* ךַּ.

<sup>34</sup> ὁ πιστεύων

<sup>35</sup> πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων. In the NT the participle with preceding πᾶς (= כָּל) always takes the article. In contrast the

LXX sometimes also omits the article. Thus the usage in the NT is not completely similar to the LXX. Cf. Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, p. 201 note 1 and p. 212.

<sup>36</sup> ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος

<sup>37</sup> ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ

<sup>38</sup> הַמֵּאֲמִין בִּי

<sup>39</sup> *man* (=who [interrog. pron.]) *da* (= who [rel. pron.]) *mhaimen* (= believing) *bī* (= in me): מִן דְּמַאֲמִין בִּי

<sup>40</sup> *man* (=who) *āmana* (= has believed) *bī* (= in me): مَنَ أَمَنَ بِي.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, pp. 141-145.197-218.230-232. The first assumptions concerning the Hebrew origin of this usage of the participle can already be found in Georg Benedict Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, p. 320 as well as in S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, pp. 172f.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, p. 211.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *See above*, *Semitische Syntax*, p. 17.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* § 52, pp. 169f.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Carl Brockelmann, *Arabische Grammatik* § 92, pp. 121f.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. BDR § 321 (Präsens historicum), p. 265.

<sup>47</sup> LXX:καὶ εἶπεν MT:וַיֹּאמֶר

<sup>48</sup> LXX:καὶ λέγει MT:וַיֹּאמֶר

<sup>49</sup> LXX:καὶ εἶπεν MT:וַיֹּאמֶר

<sup>50</sup> However, a closer comparison with Ex 10:8-10 LXX shows that in John 11:21-27 καὶ is missing before εἶπεν and λέγει. Thus John 11 does not simply imitate the translation technique of the LXX.

<sup>51</sup> S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, p. 5.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, "Hebrew Language", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8 (2007), pp. 637 and 645, as well as Martin G. Abegg,

*The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, In: Peter W. Flint / James C. VanderKam (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, pp. 337f.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Martin G. Abegg, *The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Hebrew Syntax*, In: Peter W. Flint / Jean Duhaime / Kyung S. Baek (ed.), *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 167f.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Hans-Joachim Eckstein, *Die Gegenwart des Kommenden und die Zukunft des Gegenwärtigen: Zur Eschatologie im Johannesevangelium*, In: Hans-Joachim Eckstein / Christof Landmesser / Hermann Lichtenberger (ed.), *Eschatologie – Eschatology*, pp. 149-169.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, p. 165 as well as Carl Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, p. 45.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegg, Martin G. *The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Hebrew Syntax*. In: Peter W. Flint / Jean Duhaime / Kyung S. Baek (ed.). *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2011, 163-172.

—. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: Peter W. Flint / James C. VanderKam (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol. I. Leiden: Brill 1998, 325-357.

Al-kitabu l-muqaddas (Arabic New Van Dyck Bible). Cairo: The Bible Society of Egypt 2003.

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen: Sprachproben und grammatische Skizzen*. München: Max Hueber 1928.

Beyer, Klaus. „Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur“, ZDMG 116 (1966),

242-254.

- . Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Hauptband). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1984.
- . Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Band I: Satzlehre Teil 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1962.
- Blass, Friedrich / Debrunner, Albert / Rehkopf, Friedrich. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht <sup>18</sup>2001.
- Brock, Sebastian P. "Versions, (Ancient Syriac)". Anchor Bible Dictionary 6 (1992), 794-799.
- Brockelmann, Carl. Arabische Grammatik (Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1960). Leipzig: Langenscheidt <sup>24</sup>1992.
- . Hebräische Syntax (Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1956). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener <sup>2</sup>2004.
- Burkitt, F. C. Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence, Vol. II: Introduction and notes. Cambridge: University Press 1904.
- Carmi, Israel. "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls". In: Lawrence H. Schiffmann / Emanuel Tov / James C. VanderKam. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 2000, 881-888.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der Aramäischen Sprache erörtert. Leipzig: Hinrichs <sup>2</sup>1930.
- . Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch und aramäische Dialektproben (Sonderausgabe, unveränd. reprograf. Nachdr. der 2. Aufl. 1905 und 1927, Leipzig: Hinrichs). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1960.
- Delitzsch, Franz. Hebrew New Testament (Nachdruck von Sifre ha-berit ha-Hadaša). London: Trinitarian Bible Society 1998.
- Driver, S. R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions (Nachdruck der Ausgabe London: Oxford University Press <sup>3</sup>1892). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. „Die Gegenwart des Kommenden und die Zukunft des Gegenwärtigen: Zur Eschatologie im Johannesevangelium“. In: Hans-Joachim Eckstein / Christof Landmesser / Hermann Lichtenberger (Hrsg.), Eschatologie – Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in the Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011, 149-169.
- Flint, Peter W. The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms. Leiden: Brill 1997.
- Kilgour, R. / Pinkerton, J. The New Testament in Syriac. London: British and Foreign Bible Society 1905-1920.
- Kutscher, Eduard Y. "Aramaic", Encyclopaedia Judaica<sup>2</sup> 2 (2007), 342-359.
- . "Hebrew Language", Encyclopaedia Judaica<sup>2</sup> 8 (2007), 620-649.
- Lange, Armin. „Qumran“, RGG<sup>4</sup> 6 (2003), 1873-1896.
- Michel, Otto / Bauernfeind, Otto. De bello Judaico - Der jüdische Krieg, Band I. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1959.
- . De bello Judaico - Der jüdische Krieg, Band II, 2. Darmstadt: Wis-

senschaftliche Buchgesellschaft  
1969.

Morag, Shelomo. "Qumran Hebrew:  
Some Typological Observations".  
VT 38 (1988), 148-164.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. A Grammar of  
Qumran Aramaic. Leuven: Peeters  
2011.

Qimron, Elisha. The Hebrew of the Dead  
Sea Scrolls (Paperback-Nachdruck  
der Ausgabe Atlanta: Scholars  
Press 1986). Winona Lake: Eisen-  
brauns 2008.

Sokoloff, Michael. The Targum To Job  
From Qumran Cave XI. Jerusalem:  
Ahva 1974.

Thackeray, H. St. Josephus: The Jewish  
War Books V-VII (The Loeb Classi-  
cal Library). Ann Arbor: Edwards,  
Reprint 2006.

Ungnad, Arthur / Matouš, Lubor. Gram-  
matik des Akkadischen. München:  
C.H. Beck <sup>5</sup>1969.

Wassermann, Clemens. „Der biblisch-  
semitische Hintergrund des Neu-  
en Testaments Teil 1: die lexika-  
lischen Semitismen“, STT 6 (2011),  
93-168.

Winer, Georg Benedict. Grammatik des  
neutestamentlichen Sprachidi-  
oms (siebente verbesserte und  
vermehrte Ausgabe besorgt von  
Dr. Gottlieb Lünemann). Leipzig:  
F. C. W. Vogel <sup>7</sup>1867.

Zellentin, Holger M. „Mishna“, RGG<sup>4</sup> 5  
(2002), 1263-1266.

CLEMENS WASSERMANN, Ostfildern,  
protestant Theologian, is a re-  
search fellow at EUSEBIA School  
of Theology (EST) with main re-  
search in Semitic languages and  
New Testament.

DIE  
WORTE  
DES  
HERRN  
SIND  
LAUTER  
WIE  
SILBER,  
IM TIEGEL  
GESCHMOLZEN,  
GELÄUTERT  
SIEBENMAL.  
PS 12,7