

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

- Dec. Jesus starts for Galilee (Jn. iv 1, 3). John rebukes Herod and is imprisoned (Mk. vi 17-20 ||s; Josephus *Antiq.* XVIII v 2). Jesus near or at Samaria (Jn. iv 4-42). On hearing of John's imprisonment he goes on to Galilee (Mt. iv 12 ||s; Jn. iv 43-45); passes through Nazareth (Mt. iv 13 [καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά]); Lk. iv 16-30 belongs to a later occasion [see verse 23]); reaches Cana, where he cures the son of the courtier of Capernaum (Jn. iv 46-54); goes on to Capernaum himself (Mt. iv 13);
- ? A.D. 28. Jan. and there opens the Galilean ministry with the proclamation of the Kingdom of God (Mt. iv 17 [ἀπὸ τότε] ||s).

C. J. CADOUX.

PROFESSOR TORREY ON 'ACTS'¹

PROFESSOR C. C. TORREY, of Yale, published in 1916 a pamphlet of 72 pages in the *Harvard Theological Studies*, which on my return to ordinary University life I find to be not so well known in England as it deserves to be. I must confess at once that I am not in the least convinced of the correctness of Professor Torrey's main conclusions, but I am greatly impressed by the skill with which he has stated and defended them. It is rather an ungracious thing to introduce a friend and then to try to knock him down, and my excuse for doing this metaphorically to Professor Torrey's theory is my sense of the importance of his work and the danger of leaving it unanswered.

Professor Torrey's pamphlet consists of three chapters. In chap. i he elaborates his startling theory that the first half of Acts, viz. i 1-xv 35, is not only based to some extent on Semitic sources, but is actually a translation from an Aramaic document (pp. 3-41). In chap. ii he defends the integrity of the second half of Acts, viz. xv 36-end (pp. 42-54), and in chap. iii discusses the relation of the two parts, incidentally concluding that the date of Acts was early and that St Luke's Gospel was written before A.D. 61 (pp. 55-72). A good deal of chap. ii is concerned with Norden's *Agnostos Theos*, and since

¹ C. C. Torrey *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Harvard Theological Studies I), Cambridge (Mass.), 1916.

it goes over much the same ground as the present writer's review of Norden in this JOURNAL¹ and comes to much the same conclusions, I need not delay further with it here, except to recommend it to any one who still thinks that Apollonius of Tyana had anything to do with St Paul's speech at Athens as given in Acts xvii.

My concern now is with the opening chapter. Professor Torrey recognizes such uniformity of vocabulary and phraseology in the whole of Acts that 'it is obvious that the author of xvi-xxviii was the translator of i-xv' (p. 5). But 'there are no passages in which the *language* can be said to make it probable that Luke is composing his own Greek' (p. 6). A list of some 40 Semitic phrases from Acts i-xv is then given, to which follows § 3, which contains an elaborate examination of six 'especially striking Examples of Mistranslation', viz. ii 47, iii 16, iv 24 ff, viii 10, xi 27-30, xv 7 (pp. 10-22): I think it not unfair to say that by the evidence from these passages Professor Torrey's theory stands or falls. This is followed by about 50 other instances where Professor Torrey sees evidence of translation, but these, not being actual mistranslations, do not make his conclusions quite so inevitable (pp. 23-41).

Let us begin, as Professor Torrey does, with Acts ii 47. 'The most interesting of all the phrases which suggest translation is found in ii 47. The narrator is telling how the first large body of believers was formed in Jerusalem, as the result of those things which happened on the day of Pentecost. The new community was harmonious within, and was looked upon with favor by all the people of the city: "Day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favor with all the people." Verse 47 then continues: *ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*. Excepting the last three words, this is just what we should expect: a general statement regarding the increase of the newly formed church, similar to the statements made at frequent intervals (iv 4, v 14, vi 7, ix 31, &c.), throughout this narrative. But the words *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* have remained an unsolved riddle. The phrase ordinarily means "together", "in the same place"; in the Greek Old Testament it is the standing equivalent of *יחד* and *יחדיו*. It has just been used in this chapter, v. 44: "And all that believed were *together* and had all things common." Other passages in Luke-Acts are Lk. xvii 35, Ac. i 15, ii 1, also iv 26 (from Ps. ii 2). But in ii 47, the passage under discussion, the meaning "together" is obviously inadmissible. . . . In the *textus receptus* the attempt is made to join the troublesome words to the following

¹ *J. T. S.* xv 455-464.

verse, making them the beginning of iii 1: "Now *together* Peter and John went up to the temple", &c. . . . Many old manuscripts and versions endeavour to improve the passage by inserting τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . The Revisers of 1881 render: "And the Lord added to *them* day by day those that were being saved", but remark in the margin that instead of "*to them*" the Greek reads "*together*" . . . Under these circumstances, the hypothesis of translation from a Semitic original certainly deserves to be considered. When the test of retroversion is applied, the result is unexpectedly interesting, for it not only provides an easy solution of the difficulty of the passage, but also seems to furnish direct evidence that author and translator lived in different parts of the Aramaic-speaking world.

'Of the possible Aramaic equivalents of the Greek ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, Hebrew לְהֵי, only one needs to be considered, namely the adverbial compound לְחֵדָא or לְחֵדָּא. Etymologically, this is equivalent to *in unum*, and it is occasionally used in this literal sense, "into one", meaning "together" (e.g. Joh. xi 52 εἰς ἓν). . . . *But in the Judean dialects of Aramaic the usual meaning of לְחֵדָּא is "greatly, exceedingly", and this is precisely what is needed in the place of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in Acts ii 47. . . .*

'We may then restore the original Aramaic of ii 47^b as follows: ומריא מוסף הוא לְחֵדָּא לְרִי חַיִּין כל יום לְחֵדָּא. Here the preposition ל in the fourth word might signify either the dative or the direct object. Doubtless it was originally intended to signify the former; but if the translator failed to recognize the peculiar use of לְחֵדָּא . . . it was inevitable that he should render with the Greek accusative. The correct rendering would be: ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοῖς σωζομένοις καθ' ἡμέραν σφόδρα, "*And the Lord added greatly day by day to the saved*" (Torrey, pp. 10-14).

I have given Professor Torrey's argument in his own words. It must be acknowledged that he makes out a very forcible case. It is quite evident that the Revised Version, which was set the task of making English for the true text,¹ has stumbled very badly. If we are to find an answer different from Professor Torrey's, we must find a better translation.

It appears to me that before this translation can be made we ought to determine more accurately what is involved in the term οἱ σωζόμενοι as well as in ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. The R. V. rendering ('those that were being saved') implies a view that I venture to think wrong.

Who, then, are the σωζόμενοι? The term occurs Lk. xiii 23,

¹ The text accepted by R.V. and Torrey is that of ΝΒΑC G 61 vg sah boh arm aeth—i. e. it is attested very well indeed.

Acts ii 47, 1 Cor. i 18, 2 Cor. ii 15. The two latter passages tell us clearly who they are to be contrasted with, viz. *οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι*, those who (in this time of grace) are being lost. The *ἀπολλύμενοι* are not necessarily getting worse and worse, but as a matter of fact when the interim is over and the great time of reckoning comes they will be found with the 'goats', while on the other hand the *σωζόμενοι* will be found with the 'sheep'. In other words, *οἱ σωζόμενοι* are 'the elect'. Will they be few or many?—the saying of our Lord in Lk. xiii 24 ff is careful to leave this question unanswered, but the whole wording assumes that a direct answer could be given if it were desirable, i.e. God knows the number of the saved, though man does not. Well, then, if God knows the number of the saved, of the *σωζόμενοι*, He will not add to them. Whatever else Acts ii 47 may mean, it will not tell us that the Lord was adding to the *σωζόμενοι*. But it may very well tell us that He was putting them together into one company.

For *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* I should like to refer my readers to an excellent Note in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* xxxvii pp. 105-110, by Mr. A. A. Vazakas, of the Union Theological Seminary. He points out that *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* is used by St Paul and the Apostolic Fathers almost as a technical phrase for the union of the Christian body. In addition to Acts i 15, ii 1, 44, and our passage, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* occurs 1 Cor. vii 5, xi 20, xiv 23; Barnabas iv 10; 1 Clement xxxiv 7; Ignatius *Eph.* xiii 1, *Magn.* vii 1, *Philad.* vi 2, x 1. In all of these places, if we leave 1 Cor. vii 5 out of consideration, it practically means 'in church'; when Christians often come together to church, says St Ignatius (*ὅταν γὰρ πικνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε*, *Eph.* xiii 1), the power of Satan is destroyed.

I cannot agree with Professor Torrey that 'the incipient church in Jerusalem was not confined to any one meeting-place in such a way that the narrator could have said: "The Lord daily added new converts (and brought them) to the same place"' (p. 12, ll. 4-7). On the contrary, the narrator of Acts is very much occupied with laying emphasis upon the *congregation* of this earliest Christian Ecclesia. They were 'together', *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, when Matthias was elected, and again when the Spirit came at Pentecost. Now, notwithstanding the great increase in numbers, they are still 'together' (ii 44). A little later we hear that their regular place of assembly is Solomon's Porch (v 12). No doubt, as Professor Torrey says, they were not confined to any one meeting-place, they might go about from house to house. But they formed, as St Ignatius wished, only one congregation, and St Luke is most distinctly desirous to make this clear.

For these two reasons I cannot accept Professor Torrey's new explanation of Acts ii 47: I think that *οἱ σωζόμενοι* means the elect, not the visible Christian assembly; and I think the gathering together

of the congregation ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is too nearly in accordance with St Luke's favourite ideas to be a mere mistranslation of a colourless adverb meaning 'very much'. It should be noted that προστιθέναι¹ is here used instead of συνάγειν, because St Luke is speaking of fresh additions to the society, not of the gathering together of scattered members: the assembly of the professed converts was getting day by day more and more to be a muster of the elect—'the Lord was joining such as He had foreordained to be saved daily together.'

With regard to the word לְחַרְא (= 'very'), it may be remarked that it is found in all parts of the Targums, e.g. Ps. xlvii 2 and Exod. i 7, corresponding to Hebrew מֵאֵד. The word used to render Hebrew יָחַד and יַחְדָּו is כְּחַרְא (Syr. ܟܚܪܐ).² If St Luke had been translating from an Aramaic document which had לְחַרְא, should we not have found εἰς ἓν, as in Joh. xvii 23, rather than ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό?

The next passage brought forward by Professor Torrey as a mistranslation is Acts iii 16: καὶ [ἐπὶ] τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦτον δὲ θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε ἑστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν. 'Why, in particular, was it necessary to obscure the sense and spoil the sound by the ugly repetition of τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ?' (p. 15)? Professor Torrey goes on to quarrel with the text on the ground that the power of the Name is distinguished from the power of faith in or through the Name, but this belief in the power of the Name of Jesus is surely characteristic of the narrator of Acts xvi 18, xix 13, 17,³ i.e. of St Luke himself. The grammatical difficulty, however, is serious, so serious that Lachmann proposed to make a stop after ἑστερέωσεν.

Professor Torrey's solution is to retranslate into his imagined original Aramaic, thus:

ובְחַיִּמְנוּתָא דִּי שְׂמָהּ לְהַרְדֵּן דִּי חוּזַן אַנְתּוֹן וַיְדַעִין אַנְתּוֹן תַּקַּף שְׂמָהּ וְהִימְנוּתָא
דִּי בַּהּ יִהְיֶת לֵה חַלִּימוּתָא דָּא קְרַם כְּלַכְוֵן.

The words overlined should be pointed תַּקַּף שְׂמָהּ וְהִימְנוּתָא, but St Luke read it תַּקַּף שְׂמָהּ ἑστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. The true

¹ It is a favourite word with St Luke, in whose writings it is used 13 times out of 17 occurrences in the whole N.T.

² The one instance of לְחַרְא in an Aramaic text being used for Hebrew יָחַד given by Prof. Torrey, viz. Is. xliii 17 in the Palestinian Lectionary (Gibson, p. 35), is irregular, as there was no direct connexion between the Hebrew and this late Christian Lectionary. In the duplicate (Gibson, p. 76) לְחַרְא is omitted in agreement with the Greek.

³ I should like here to record my conviction that ἀρχιερέωσ in Acts xix 14 means a man who professed to know the true pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton from family tradition, and thereby to work magical cures.

translation then should have been: 'And by faith in His name He hath made strong this one whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is through Him hath given him this soundness before you all' (p. 16).

Even those who are not convinced must recognize the brilliance of this restoration, and were an Aramaic original for Acts i-xv an ascertained fact there would be little to say against it. But as the Aramaic original is, to my mind, a very doubtful hypothesis, let us see whether some other explanation of the difficulties of this passage is not possible. Professor Torrey sends us to Acts x 43 for a parallel, and I venture to think it does really give us a valuable hint, viz. that St Luke often uses an emphatic *τούτω* or *τούτων* (e. g. Lk. ix 26, Acts ii 23, 32, v 31, vii 35, x 40, xvi 3) to introduce a sentence. I suggest therefore that a colon be placed before *τούτων* and that the previous words be joined to the preceding verse.¹ The passage will then run: 'ye killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses, even to the faith in His Name: this man whom ye see and know His Name hath made strong, and the faith which is through Him hath given him this perfect soundness before you all.'

The *οὖν* in iii 15 is in itself vague, as in ii 32; it may be anything connected with Jesus and His resurrection. In Lk. xxiv 48 and Acts v 32 the Apostles' witness is to all the things connected therewith; here it is more closely referred to the only Name given to man for salvation (iv 12). By putting the stop before *τούτων*, 'ugly repetition' is turned into characteristically Lucan rhetoric.

As for the 'magical' power here ascribed to the Name of Jesus, is it not implied by the use of *φθέγγεσθαι* in Acts iv 18? Peter and John are there told not to *pronounce* the Name, which therefore is regarded as having virtue in itself.²

Professor Torrey's other examples of 'mistranslation' (iv 24 ff, viii 10, xi 27-30, xv 7) do not seem to me so plausible, and need not detain us so long. In iv 24 he gets rid of *στόματος* by regarding *διὰ στόματος* as a translation of *דַּבָּר* and (by the change of *נְהִי* into *נִהִי*) turns *ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπὼν* into 'that which our father, Thy servant David, said by the Holy Spirit', but he does not explain how *στόματος* came between *ἁγίου* and *Δαυεὶδ*. In viii 10 he transfers by retranslation the epithet 'great' from *δύναμις* to *θεοῦ*, making Simon a worshipper of 'the Great God', i. e. the Jews'

¹ *ἐπί*, bracketed above by me, should be omitted with Westcott and Hort on the sufficient authority of N* B 4 61 and the Armenian.

² What, we may ask, is the Aramaic equivalent for *φθέγγεσθαι*? Its use in Acts iv 18 does not suggest to me 'translation Greek'. I would say the same of *ἀπεφθέγγαστο* in Acts ii 14.

God. In xi 27-30 he reduces the famine over all the earth (*τὴν οἰκουμένην*) to a famine in the Land, i. e. the Holy Land only. The same thing occurs in Lk. ii 1, and there also Professor Torrey refers the exaggeration to a translator's slip.¹ In xv 7 he gets by retranslation: 'Ye know that from of old God chose you, that the Gentiles might hear, by my mouth, the word of the Gospel.' This is excellent, but is it not already present in the Greek? I do not think ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων refers to the events of chap. x, but to ἐξελέξατο, i. e. to Lk. xxiv 48 and the 'old days' of a former dispensation. The use of ἐν after (or rather, before) ἐξελέξατο is exactly paralleled in the Greek Bible by 1 Regn. xvi 9, 10 (*καὶ ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐξελέξατο ὁ κύριος*), and by using this construction St Luke is free to go on with an accusative and infinitive, which would have been impossible if he had put ὑμᾶς for ἐν ὑμῖν. It is a trailing construction, of course, giving (as I understand it) the effect of a condensed report of actual words used.

I venture to submit that Professor Torrey has not produced a compelling demonstration. It is on these six cases of alleged mistranslation that his case is founded, and I do not think his hypothesis of an Aramaic basis makes these passages any easier. The subsidiary evidence which he brings forward in § 4 is of various weight. The Note on i 18, *πρηνῆς γενόμενος*, seems to me inferior to Bp Chase's (*J. T. S.* xiii 271-285). In v 13 there is no contradiction with the following verse, as Professor Torrey assumes; Luke uses *κολλᾶσθαι* of attaching oneself to somebody without a regular introduction, which may sometimes be successful (Acts viii 29), but not always (ix 26). In any case Torrey's suggestion that *κολλᾶσθαι* is a mistranslation for 'contend' is highly improbable: I cannot find that קרב or לחם is used in any form in Aramaic for to 'contend'. On v 28 I cannot see how the construction of *παραγγελία παρηγγείλαμεν* differs from that of *ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματίσαμεν* in xxiii 14, for an oath is not much more concrete than a command. On xi 22 *εἰς τὰ ὄρα*—'no Greek writer would ever have perpetrated this', says Professor Torrey. But does not Matt. x 27 suggest that it means a whispered report? *εἰς τὰ ὄρα* is common enough in the LXX, while on the other hand the Targums and the Peshitta (as in Gen. 1 4) occasionally get rid of this picturesque Hebrew locution. Here again, therefore, Luke is biblical, but not particularly Aramaic in style. 'xii 20. *Θυμομαχῶν* is presumably נקמה.' But if so; St Luke must have been a singularly free translator! On xiii 1 *κατὰ τὴν οὐσαν ἐκκλησίαν* Professor Torrey has omitted to notice

¹ It would make this Review too long to include Prof. Torrey's earlier tract on Lk. i, ii. Perhaps it is not out of place to say that there also I am not convinced, not even that in Lk. i 39 *εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα* ought to have been 'to the Province of Judaea'.

that the participle is not otiose, because it indicates that not all the Antiochian prophets were visitors as in xi 27. I suppose I must not point out the Lucan parallels Lk. xxii 3, Acts v 17, because of course they also are due to translation! On xiii 22 εἰς βασιλεία: this Hebrew idiom is good enough for the LXX (e. g. 2 Regn. v 3, and also 2 Regn. vi 21 *in the Greek only*), and it is good enough Old English for the Saxon Chronicle¹; but it is not Aramaic and is variously avoided in the Targums and the Peshitta (Nöldeke's *Grammar* § 247 note).

On xiv 17 Professor Torrey remarks: 'There is apparently a mistranslation of some sort here. It is no more agreeable to usage in Aramaic or Greek to speak of "filling hearts with food" than it is in English.' He suggests a confusion between מכל 'from all' and מִכֶּל (*sic*) 'food'. We might first ask where Torrey has found מִכֶּל 'food' written defectively, but in any case I think most readers of the Book of Acts will prefer the old text to 'filling your hearts *with all* gladness'. There is, however, a further reason for accepting the Greek as it stands. Few critical conclusions appear to me so solidly founded as the dependence of certain sections of St Luke's Gospel upon Mark, and that in these sections St Luke uses no other source. One of these is Lk. xix 45-xxi 36, corresponding to Mk. xi 15-xiii 37; St Luke rewrites what is before him pretty freely, but he makes use of no other source. Whatever therefore differs in this section from the text of St Mark we may safely take as characteristic of St Luke's own style. When we turn to Lk. xxi 34 we read 'Take heed lest your *hearts* be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness'. The passage corresponds to Mk. xiii 33-36, but is entirely rewritten. I do not suggest that St Luke cherished any medical heresies on the functions of the heart; what is curious, is that it should be possible to confront Professor Torrey's piece of stylistic criticism with a rather close parallel. On p. 63 Torrey recurs to this passage (Acts xiv 15-17), referring back to the 'mistranslation' about food as if it were a thing proved. Surely there is something wrong in a literary theory which is obliged to lay stress upon the *contrast* between the speeches of St Paul at Lystra and at Athens! Professor Torrey actually claims ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα (without the article) as an Aramaism, forgetting 1 Thess. i 9.²

Finally, on xv 16-18 (p. 38), Professor Torrey does not bring out the great difficulty of regarding this citation of Amos ix 11, 12, as being based on anything but Greek. The original Hebrew of this passage,

¹ e. g. Leo IV is said to have hallowed Alfred 'to king'.

² It might conceivably be claimed as a Hebraism, though there is point in the absence of the Hebrew article in Josh. iii 10, Ps. xlii 3, &c. But in all these cases the Aramaic Targums actually insert an article (מִכֶּל מִכֶּל, *sic*)!

in complete accordance with the context, predicts that the 'tabernacle of David' will be raised up again *that it may get possession of the residue of Edom*, and this is attested by Targum and Peshitta. But the ancient Greek version, in its blundering ignorant way, translates אֲדָמָא by 'men' instead of 'Edom' and takes it to be the nominative, so that David's tabernacle is raised *that the residue of mankind may seek out*. This seems to me the very point of the quotation, as quoted in St James's speech. The value of the LXX to the modern textual critic is that of a witness to the Hebrew consonantal text which it attests; in Amos ix 12 we may infer that in that text אֲדָמָא was written 'defectively' (i. e. without י) and that the אָתא before שְׂאֲרֵיתָא (i. e. the mark of the acc.) was omitted.¹ But there is no evidence that אֲדָמָא in this verse, however spelled, was ever taken to denote anything else but Edom by any other interpreter except the ancient Greek version. It is therefore improbable that any Aramaic document had 'men' and not 'Edom' in quoting this verse, and unless the faulty interpretation which introduces 'men' be retained I do not see that the passage is sufficiently appropriate to the context to be quoted at all. Surely it is much more simple to regard the whole introduction of Amos ix into St James's speech as due to St Luke himself, freely composing something that went in the direction that he understood St James to have taken. St Luke follows the LXX, as usual with him.²

There is, besides all this, one positive reason against regarding the early chapters of Acts as a translation from the Aramaic. In chapters iii and iv Jesus is called *παῖσ θεοῦ* (iii 13, 26; iv 27, 30), a title found elsewhere in early Christian prayers, notably in the Didache and in 1 Clement. It is likely enough that St Luke was familiar with *παῖσ* as a title for the Lord Jesus from the Christian worship of his day, and so put it into the mouth of St Peter and the earliest Christian community. But it is essentially a Greek title, essentially un-Semitic; it is only in Greek that the quite distinct idea of 'son' and 'slave' can be combined in one term. In Hebrew and Aramaic עֶבֶר (= 'slave') is used also for the worshipper of a God, who is thereby regarded as his Master and Lord (אֲדָרְיָא, κύριος); the 'servant of Jehovah' is, literally, the slave of Jahweh, עֶבֶר יְהוָה. Similarly the officials of the Jewish kings are spoken of as his slaves (4 Regn. xix 5); some of these were quite great folk in their way, but in polite speech with a still greater foreign official they talk of themselves as his slaves (4 Regn. xviii 26). This Oriental style was a little too servile for Greeks, so in such cases the Greek Bible uses not δούλοι but παιδεσ, and perhaps it

¹ It is not expressed, as a matter of fact, in the Peshitta.

² As in Lk. iv 18, 19, which is made up from the LXX text of Isa. lxi 1, lviii 6^b, lxi 2^a.

was for this reason that the Greek Bible uses *παῖς* for the 'Servant' of the LORD in Isaiah (xlii 1, lii 13).

It is one thing to quote passages from the Prophets and to apply them in a general way to the Lord Jesus, as is done in Matt. xii 18 ff,¹ and quite another to take a particular term out of such passages and use it as a title. Christians from the beginning thought of Jesus as 'Son of God', *υἰὸς θεοῦ* (Mk. xiv 61, xv 39, Acts xiii 33, 1 Thess. i 9), but I do not think they ever called Him *δοῦλος θεοῦ* or עבד יהוה. On the other hand *παῖς θεοῦ* was unobjectionable; it seemed to combine the claim that He was Son of God with that of being the Suffering but Elect One prophesied about in Isaiah. But this convenient term is essentially Greek and cannot be represented in Aramaic. If Acts iv 24-30 be a translation from the Aramaic, then David in *v.* 25 and Jesus in *vv.* 27 and 30 must have been called either 'son' or 'slave', not some word that means either. It is not likely that David was called by the Aramaic equivalent of *υἰὸς θεοῦ*; is it likely that St Luke would have used the same title for both, if in his original, to which according to Professor Torrey's hypothesis he is so faithful, their titles were different in nature and dignity?

In conclusion it should be made quite clear that nothing that has been said in this paper is inconsistent with an occasional use by St Luke of Aramaic sources, written or oral. What I have tried to controvert is Professor Torrey's theory that Acts i-xv is as much a direct rendering from an Aramaic document, as e. g. Lk. v 12-vi 19 is a direct rendering of Mk. i 40-iii 19 from the rough wording of the Second Gospel into Lucan Greek.

¹ The quotation of Isa. xlii 1-4 in Matt. xii 18-21, in which *ὁ παῖς μου* occurs, agrees with the Hebrew better than the LXX does. In this respect it is similar to Matt. ii 15 (= Hos. xi 1) and some other O.T. passages peculiar to the First Gospel. But just as it retains *Name* instead of *Law* in *v.* 21 (= Isa. xlii 4 LXX), so it retains the *παῖς* of Isa. xlii 1 LXX, where *δοῦλος* would have been unacceptable to Christian ears. If the O.T. anthology from which our First Evangelist drew was written in 'Hebrew', it is evident that he was capable of 'interpreting' it very drastically.

F. C. BURKITT.