

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:



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



<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]

left. Of the variants recorded by Macler (pp. 267-270) for this chapter L agrees with only one, xvi 14 om. *հոբա*, 'they' before 'did not believe'.

The chief fact which emerges from this cursory study of the text of L is the need of a wider and surer knowledge of Armenian manuscripts of the gospels. A curious feature of this kind of investigation hitherto has been the concentration of interest in manuscripts in remote parts of the world and neglect of easily accessible and obviously promising material near at hand. The text of the Tübingen gospels, famous for its miniatures, has yet to be examined¹ as well as British Museum Add. 19727 which bears a date A.D. 633, probably derived from its archetype and more than two centuries earlier than any other known Armenian manuscript of the gospels.² Apart from the possibility of finding a manuscript of the early 'unrevised' text, now known only through the Georgian, a clearer notion might be gained of the vulgate in its original form.³ It is certain that all readings of a Byzantine or 'ecclesiastical' type found in Armenian manuscripts do not belong to it, and the separation of readings introduced by the 'revision' from others which have crept in through gradual processes of contamination is a delicate one which requires the control not only of the Old Georgian and other evidence of the Caesarean text but also of a better classification than we have at present of the Armenian manuscripts themselves.

R. P. CASEY.

AN UNRECORDED 'ARAMAISM' IN JOSEPHUS

('He began to say unto them').

THE purity and immunity from Semitism of the Greek style of the author of the *Jewish War*, a work ostensibly a 'translation' of an earlier draft composed in his 'vernacular' tongue,⁴ has often been noted

¹ Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Ma. xiii 1. Cf. F. N. Finck and L. Gjandzshezian, *Verzeichnis der armenischen Handschriften*, pp. 3-5; J. Strzygowski, *Kleinarmenische Miniaturenmalerei*. Tübingen, 1907. Fr. N. Akinian, *Handes Amsorya* xxxi-xxxii (1917-18), pp. 159-160.

² I have noted from a hasty examination of this manuscript that, of the doubtful readings, it agrees with Zohrab at Mt. ii 9, om. Mt. xvi 3, om. Lk. xxii 43-44 *և երևեցաւ . . . հեղեալ ի յերկիր*, om. Jo. v 4 *և հրեշտակ . . . հիւանդութիւն*, om. Jo. vii 53-viii 11, Mk. i 1 om. *որդւոյ նյ*, Mk. i 1 *յէսայի մարգարէ*.

³ In dealing with this problem, the Biblical quotations of early Armenian authors should not be overlooked. Cf. F. C. Conybeare, 'An Armenian Diatessaron', *J.T.S.* April 1924, pp. 232 ff.

⁴ *B.J.* i 3 *μεταβαλὼν ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῆ πατρίφ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον*.

with surprise and commendation. That immunity it doubtless largely owes to those able *συνεργοί*, to whom the author in later life paid a tardy acknowledgement¹; his own part in the 'translation' was probably slight. The style of the *Jewish Antiquities*, the *magnum opus* written in middle life under less favourable conditions and seemingly with less assistance, is more uneven; but here too a painstaking regard for the susceptibilities of his Greek readers has succeeded in excluding any obvious Semitism from his pages. The purpose of this note is twofold: (1) to explode a spurious and imaginary instance of 'Hebraism', of which Josephus has too long been unjustly accused, and (2) to call attention to a possible 'Aramaism' that has escaped remark.

To this freedom from Semitism there has hitherto been believed to be one exception. The idea that Josephus admitted a solitary 'Hebraism' into his writings originated with Wilhelm Schmidt in his generally excellent work *De Flavii Josephi elocutione observationes criticae*.² Schmidt's words have carried such weight that it will be well to quote them in full³:

A. vi 287 Legimus προσθέμενον μεταδιώκειν τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν, quae verba vulgo sic vertunt: 'dum pergis animam meam persequi' et A. xix 48 ἀνδρὸς οὐ μόνον στέγειν ἀ πύθοιτο προσησομένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ γνώμην φανεροῦντος τὴν αὐτοῦ 'viri, qui non solum reticere pergeret quae (ab aliis) comperisset, sed etiam quid sentiret ipse communicaret (cum aliis)'. vides προστίθεσθαι aliter verti non posse quam verbo 'pergendi'. Iosephus si hoc dicere voluit, Hebraismum admisit, eundem, quem admisertunt scriptores librorum sacrorum. nam ut προστίθεσθαι, ita Hebraeorum verbum הִבּ proprie est 'adicere, addere', tum persaepe cum infinitivo coniunctum 'pergere' significat.

He proceeds to quote from the LXX familiar and undoubted Hebraisms such as οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν αὐτούς ('ye shall see them *again* no more').

It is strange how this one erroneous observation of Schmidt has been perpetuated. Thus Thumb⁴ writes 'Was weiter den Josephus Flavius betrifft, so ist die Sprache dieses palästinischen Juden so rein, dass unter der Lupe des Forschers nur *ein* Hebraismus zu entdecken war, προστίθεσθαι mit dem Infinitiv "fortfahren" = הִבּ in gleicher Verwendung'. Deissmann⁵ and Moulton⁶ followed the same lead. I remember my

¹ *Cont. Ap.* i 50.

² Leipzig, 1893, a *Separatabdruck* from a philological journal, being paged 345-550.
³ p. 516.

⁴ *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, 1901, p. 125.

⁵ *Bible Studies* (1901) p. 67 n., 'It has been shown by Guil. Schmidt . . . that at most only one Hebraism is found in Josephus, and that a lexical one.'

⁶ *Grammar of N.T. Greek* i³ (1908) p. 233. Possibly also at one time Wellhausen: I cannot identify Moulton's reference 'Wellh. 28' in the *second* edition of the *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*.

friend Dr J. H. Moulton remarking in conversation how strange it was that the solitary Hebraism in Josephus should be one derived from the same Hebrew verb as his own name. I was at that time under the same delusion, and have only recently had occasion to investigate this pronouncement of Schmidt, which so many eminent scholars have been content to take on trust.

The first passage of Josephus, from which Schmidt quotes five words only, runs in Niese's text¹: . . . ἐμοὶ πιστεύσαι δεῖ, καὶ μὴ τοῖς κατηγοροῦσιν ἂ μῆτε εἰς νοῦν ἐβαλόμην μῆτε δύναται γενέσθαι προσθέμενον μεταδιώκειν τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν. The speaker is David, who has just spared Saul's life in the cave; and his words mean 'You ought to believe *me* and not to persecute my life, *putting faith in* those who accuse me of designs which I never conceived and could never have executed'. Προστίθεσθαι, frequent in Josephus for 'to side' or 'associate oneself with' a person or an opinion, comes in certain passages, as here, to be used as a mere synonym for πιστεύειν 'to believe'. Thus *A.* iv 21 τῶν ἀκροωμένων προστιθεμένων ('attaching credit to') ταῖς κατ' Ἀαρῶνος διαβολαῖς ἀναπίμπλαται τούτων ἅπας ὁ στρατός, xiv 157 προστιθεμένου ταῖς ἐκ τοῦ νεωτερίζειν ἐλπίσιν (|| προσανέχειν), 352 μᾶλλον οἷς ἤκουσεν περὶ τὰδελεφου καὶ τῆς Πάρθων ἐπιβουλῆς ἢ τοῖς ἐναντίοις προστιθέμενος, cf. xix 128 διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐθέλειν . . . ἀληθεία προστίθεσθαι (of those who refused to credit the news of the assassination of Caligula). Schmidt was himself misled by Hudson, who, regarding τοῖς κατηγοροῦσιν as dependent on πιστεύσαι and not on its synonym προσθέμενον, which he failed to understand, gave the latter the 'Hebraistic' meaning quoted by Schmidt '*pergis animam meam persequi*'. It should be added that the latest translator, Monsieur Weill, in the excellent version edited by the late Dr Théodore Reinach, interprets the word correctly: 'Sans plus *l'attacher* à ceux qui m'accusent . . . cesse de persécuter ma vie.'

In the second passage, or rather pair of passages, adduced by Schmidt it is true that we find προστίθεσθαι used with an infinitive in a manner, if not foreign to classical Greek, at any rate unrecorded in the Lexicons, and bearing a superficial resemblance to the Hebraism of the Greek Bible. The parallel passages relate to two of the conspirators against the emperor Caligula, of whom one knew how to keep a secret and the other did not. They run as follows:—

A. xix 19 καὶ γὰρ εἶχέ τι θυμοειδὲς ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ ἐλευθέριον, ἢ φ' οὐ μὴδὲ στέγειν προστίθεσθαι τῶν βουλευμάτων' πολλοῖς γοῦν ἀνεκουνώσατο κτλ.

xix 48 ἐπεί τε ἀνδρὸς ἠτόρητο οὐ μόνον στέγειν ὧν πύθοιτο προσθησομένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ γνώμην φανεροῦντος τῆν αὐτοῦ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἤρτο.

¹ *A.* vi 287. I omit the opening words of the sentence, where the text is a little uncertain: they do not affect the point at issue.

But here it is to be noticed first that the writer is not Josephus himself, but a Greek assistant with peculiar mannerisms, whose favourite model was Thucydides, and who was the last person in the world to be guilty of a Hebraism; and secondly, that the supposed Hebraism should strictly mean, not 'continue (to keep a secret)' but 'repeat (to keep a secret)', 'keep a secret again'—a sense that is clearly inappropriate. It is not always easy to fix the precise shades of meaning intended by this assistant who shunned the commonplace and studied the *bizarre*; but we have here, I think, an extended use with infinitive of the classical meaning 'to agree': Regulus could not, while Chaereas could, 'consent' or 'bring himself' to keep his counsels to himself. The cumbrous phrase is comparable to the use of *μη ἀπηλλαγμένος* c. inf. ('not incapable of')¹ and *οὐκ ἀποστραμμένος* ('not averse from', 'ready to'), which are a distinctive feature of this writer.

But if the one supposed instance of 'Hebraism' in Josephus thus disappears, we find instead a hitherto unnoticed example of what in the N.T. has been pronounced by experts to be a pure 'Aramaism'. In Schmidt's fairly full 'Index verborum' the word *ἀρχεσθαι* is unrecorded. Yet the variable practice in the use of this word in different parts of the author's works is highly significant. In those portions which we know or can infer to have been written with skilled assistance, the verb is uncommon and, when used, retains its full classical force; in other portions where there is reason for thinking that such aid is lacking, it abounds and becomes simply otiose, being used with *verba loquendi* and the like in a manner foreign to Attic Greek, but familiar to all readers of the New Testament.

The phrase *ἤρξατο λέγειν* (*διδάσκειν*, &c.), which recurs repeatedly in the Synoptic Gospels, was declared by Dalman² to be a purely conventional Aramaism, corresponding to the Aramaic *ܐܪܚܝܢܐ* with participle, and having no counterpart in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. That verdict was accepted by the late Dr J. H. Moulton,³ and has been upheld by Professor Torrey. But Archdeacon Hunkin's article in this JOURNAL,⁴ adducing parallels from colloquial Greek, and from Xenophon in particular, has reopened the whole question.

Turning to Josephus, I said that his use of the word *ἀρχεσθαι* varies in different portions of his works. A close study of the style of those

¹ e. g. *A.* xix 217 (the discovery of Claudius in hiding), a good illustration of the writer's verbosity: *τοῦ μὲν ἀκριβοσωμένου τὴν ὕψιν ἀμαθῆς ὡν διὰ τὸν σκότον, τοῦ δὲ ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τὸν ὑπολοχῶντα κριτῆς εἶναι μὴ ἀπηλλαγμένος.* The model is Thuc. i 138 (*κρίναι ἱκανῶς οὐκ ἀπῆλλακτο*).

² *Die Worte Jesu* (1898) i 21, 29.

³ *Grammar of New Testament Greek*³ vol. i 14 f.

⁴ Vol. xxv (1924) p. 390.

works reveals the existence of various *strata*, as we may call them. Here I can but summarize the general results which I have reached ; a fuller statement will, I hope, appear elsewhere.¹ Briefly, the *Jewish War*, written, as we know, with the aid of *συνεργοί*, is a first-rate specimen of polished Atticistic Greek. The last book (vii) stands somewhat apart, and here features, otherwise only represented in the *Jewish Antiquities*, begin to appear ; the author, we may infer, is here more dependent on his own resources. The same intrusion of abnormal elements meets us in a few paragraphs at the end of Book ii, where the author is describing his own activities in Galilee. The *contra Apionem*, written in later life, reaches the same high level of excellence as the youthful work, the *Jewish War* ; and here too, though direct evidence is lacking, skilled assistance must have been obtained. The *magnum opus* of the author's middle life, the *Jewish Antiquities*, stands on another footing. A laboured production, often, it would seem, laid aside in weariness and despair, and only carried to completion through the instigation of his patron Epaphroditus and other interested friends,² it, or rather three-quarters of it, appears to have been in large measure the work of his own pen. Help, however, was requisitioned before the close, and for nearly five books the composition was entrusted to other hands. A break, alike in style and in treatment of authorities, occurs at or near the end of Book xiv, when the work was probably abandoned for a time. Two assistants then successively come to the author's aid. Books xv and xvi are the work of a first-class scholar, a lover of Greek poetry and of Sophocles in particular, and possibly one of those who had already taken a share in the *War* ; Books xvii-xix 275 are the production of a 'Thucydidean' whose pedantic mannerisms, in imitation of his model, have left an unmistakable impress. In the earlier books of the *Antiquities* these two assistants, the poet-lover not infrequently, the Thucydidean more rarely, have lent occasional aid ; from xv-xix they have between them practically taken over the entire task. Then, at the close, just as in the *War*, the historian appears once more to take up the pen, and in Book xx and its appendix, the *Life*, we probably come as near as anywhere to the *ipsissima verba* of the author. These general results, the outcome of prolonged study, the reader must be asked to take on trust. Details in the theory are doubtless open to question ; the main point, the distinction between the classical style of the *War* and the cruder style apparent throughout the bulk of *Antiquities* i-xiv, will be apparent to any careful reader. And it is to this portion, more precisely to *Ant.*

¹ In a forthcoming course of lectures on *Josephus the Man and the Historian*, and more fully in the Introduction to a Lexicon of Josephus, both to be published under the auspices of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation.

² Proem §§ 7-9.

i-xiii, that the colloquial use of ἀρχεσθαι, now to be considered, is confined.

The number of occurrences of ἀρχεσθαι with infinitive in the several works of Josephus is approximately: *Ant.* (with its appendix, the *Vita*) 82, *B. J.* 14, *c. Apionem* 3. The disproportionately large figure in *Ant.* is itself significant. *B. J.* has an average of two instances only per book, notwithstanding the abnormal length of the first two books; at the same rate *Ant.* should have under 40. Far more significant, however, is the distinction in usage. It will be well, by way of contrast, to begin by quoting the 14 examples in the *War*, of which all, with one exception, may be regarded as classical. They are as follows:—

Classical use of ἀρχεσθαι c. inf. in the 'Jewish War'.

(1) *B.* i 61 (|| *A.* xiii 249, i. e. taken over from the source) ξενοτροφείν πρώτος Ἰουδαίων ἤρξατο. John Hyrcanus was the first to introduce the practice.

(2) i 431 κακοδαιμονεῖν ἐκ γυναικὸς ἤρξατο. Herod's ill-starred career originated with his beloved Mariamne.

(3) i 448 Ἐρωδῆς . . . Ἀντίπατρον πάντα τρόπον προτιμᾶν ἀρχεται. A new departure: the first step towards the promotion of the parricide is taken by the father.

(4) i 471 διασύρειν ἀρξάμενος opposed to ἔπειτα. Antipater 'beginning by ridiculing the allegation would afterwards proceed to confirm it'.

(5) ii 218 opposed to τελεῖσθαι: τηλικούτον περιβαλεῖν ἤρξατο τέχως, ἡλικὸν ἂν τελεσθῆν ἀνήνυτον Ῥωμαίοις ἐποίησεν τὴν πολιορκίαν. It was never finished; its massive foundations are now being disclosed.

(6) ii 493 οὐ μὴν . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ὄπλων ἤρξατο σωφρονίζειν: before having recourse to arms he began by attempting to recall the insurgents to reason.

(7) ii 522 δῆλοί τε ἦσαν οὐκ ἠρεμήσοντες ἀρξάμενων τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὁδεύειν, 'the Jews clearly did not mean to remain inactive, once the Romans began to march'.

(8) ii 652 (similar) δῆλός τε ἦν ἤδη πόρρωθεν ἀρχόμενος τυραννεῖν, 'plainly showed even at that early date that he was entering on a career of tyranny'.

(9) iii 407 ταῦτα . . . ὡς εὔρισκεν ἀληθῆ, οὕτω πιστεύειν . . . ἤρκετο. Having obtained witness to previous verified predictions of Josephus, Vespasian began to credit those concerning himself.

(10) and (11) vi 165 = 216 ἰδίαις χερσὶν ἀρξάμενοι καίειν τὰ ἅγια (τὸ ἱερόν). It was the Jews who set the example.

I have reserved till last the three instances with *verba loquendi*, viz.:

(12) iii 361 ἤρξατο πρὸς αὐτοὺς φιλοσοφεῖν (long speech of Josephus follows).

(13) vi 301 ἐξαπίνης ἀναβοᾶν ἤρξατο.

(14) vi 327 πρῶτος ἤρξατο λέγειν (speech of Titus follows).

But of these, the last two (though found in the sixth book, in which features of the style of the *Antiquities* already begin to appear) may be regarded as regular.

(13) Those ominous cries of the peasant Jesus, which ended only with his death during the siege, with a final cry upon his lips (τελευταῖον 309), actually began four years before the war, when the city was enjoying profound peace and prosperity.

(14) The beaten 'tyrants' ask for a parley, and victors and vanquished confront each other on either side of the bridge outside the temple. Titus, in token of his conquest, is the first to speak: ὅπερ ἦν τεκμήριον τοῦ κρατεῖν πρῶτος ἤρξατο λέγειν. The retort of the tyrants follows. The priority of the victor's speech is here emphasized.

Only (12) remains, and here, in this unique instance, I think we can trace the author's hand and possibly the influence of his native Aramaic. It is the well-known scene in the cave when the companions of Josephus threaten to kill him rather than allow him to surrender to the Romans. It was natural that in describing this critical incident the author should put pen to papyrus, however little of his own composition there may be in the rhetorical speech that follows. I am confirmed in this belief by finding the same phrase, with a change of tense, in the *Antiquities* (xii 99 φιλοσοφεῖν ἤρξατο). Even the imperfect tense here used, ἤρχετο, is abnormal in the *War* and may be attributed to the historian. There is here no contrast between beginning and end: no rejoinder is to follow: the verb is purely conventional and otiose.

Other orations in the *War*—to take a few examples—open simply with ἔλεξεν τοιαύδε (ii 344, Agrippa), ἔλεξεν ὧδε (iii 471, Titus), ἔφη c. oratio obliqua gliding into or. recta (iv 238, Jesus): cf. also λόγους παρεκάλει (vii 322).

The three examples of ἀρχεσθαι c. inf. in the *contra Apionem* (i 145, ii 2, 5) are all classical.

I turn now to the instances of the

Abnormal use of ἀρχεσθαι c. inf. in the 'Antiquities'.

These, as I said, are confined to the first thirteen books. Here, again, it is true, we meet with sporadic instances of the classical (or semi-classical) use, whether attributable to the author himself or to his assistant, e. g. iii 174 πρὸς τὸν καρπὸν μεταβαλεῖν ἠργμένης, v 330 πρὶν ἢ τοὺς οἰκέτας ἀρξασθαι κινεῖσθαι, viii 203 ἤδη Σολόμωνι τὰ πράγματα κακῶς ἔχειν ἤρχετο; but for the most part we find only the 'Aramaic' use with verbs of speaking or with kindred verbs, some of which reappear in the

same connexion in the Synoptic Gospels, or instances which can at best be regarded from the classical point of view as questionable.

With λέγειν, and precisely comparable to the N.T. instances, we have *A.* iv 133 ἤρξαντο πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγειν, vii 289 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὡς . . . , viii 3 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὅτι . . . ,¹ 276 γενομένης δὲ σιωπῆς ἤρξατο λέγειν, and similarly viii 295, ix 129, x 237 παραθαρσύνειν ἤρξατο καὶ λέγειν, xi 38 + 43 + 55 (|| LXX I Esdras, introducing the speeches of the three pages),² 300, xiii 289 λέγειν ἤρξατο πρὸς αὐτοὺς (the last instance in *Ani.* that I have noted).³

Beside these may be placed the following : *N. T. parallels.*
ἤρξα(ν)το ἀπολογεῖσθαι *A.* v 111.

βλασφημεῖν *Vita* 407.

δεῖσθαι καὶ παρακαλεῖν *A.* xi 265.

διαλέγεσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν vi 199.

διδάσκειν xi 49 (after LXX, the 'Aramaic' narrative in I Esd.).

Mk. iv 1, vi 2,
34, viii 31,
Acts i 1.

{ ἐπαινεῖν καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖν i 181.

{ ἐπαινεῖν ix 132.

{ εὐλογεῖν (τὸν θεόν) vii 380, viii 119.

Cf. Lk. xix 37
(αἰνεῖν τ. θεόν).

{ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ xi 64.

{ εὐχέσθαι τῷ θεῷ viii 342.

{ ἱκετεύειν καὶ παρακαλεῖν (sc. τὸν θεόν) vii 321.

κατηγορεῖν i 314.

κλαίειν καὶ ποτινᾶσθαι ix 179.

{ λόγους ποιεῖσθαι xii 110 (|| *Aristeas* εἶπε).⁴

{ λόγους προσφέρειν vi 209.

{ Lk. xxiii 2,
Acts xxiv 2.
Cf. Mk. xiv 19
(λυπεῖσθαι).

ἤρξα(ν)το { παρακαλεῖν (τὸν θεόν) vi 143, xiii 197.
{ προσκυνεῖν τῷ θεῷ vii 95 (+ κ. εὐχαριστεῖν), xi 131.
προφητεύειν vi 166, 222 (|| LXX καὶ προφητεύουσαν), viii 354 (interpolated into Biblical narrative).

Mk. v 17.

πυνθάνεσθαι vii 268, xi 160.

φιλοσοφεῖν xii 99 [cf. *B.* iii 361 above].

φυσιολογεῖν i 34.⁵

¹ πρώτη λέγειν ἤρξατο viii 27 (in the judgement of Solomon) is comparable to ex. (14) in the *War*.

² From this and other 'Aramaisms' Torrey infers an *Aramaic original* for this narrative in the Greek Bible.

³ *Vita* 244 ἐπεὶ δὲ καταστάς εἰς αὐτοὺς λέγειν ἤρξάμην, ἐβίβων ἅπαντες, is passable, but hardly classical.

⁴ The deliberate introduction of this 'began', absent from the Greek source which Josephus is paraphrasing, is noticeable; cf. *προφητεύειν* below.

⁵ *φυσιολογεῖν* Μωϋσῆς ἤρξατο περὶ τῆς τάνθρώπου κατασκευῆς (quoting Gen. ii 9 'God made man, taking dust from the ground'). The 'physiologizing' here imputed

More doubtfully may be included such instances as *A.* v 346 ἤρξατο κύνει,¹ xii 172 ἐγκαλεῖν, 173 ἀγαπᾶν, 317 θρηγεῖν, &c.

It is noticeable how many of the foregoing instances refer to divine worship. It is as if Josephus here unconsciously dropped into a form of speech familiar to him in the circles of synagogue or *Beth ha-Midrash*.

And here, at the end of Book xiii, this locution ceases. I find no instance of ἀρχεσθαι c. inf., whether classical or other, in Books xiv-xvi. The fastidious assistant who is responsible for the whole of xv-xvi and also, I think, for much of xiv, in particular for the editing or translation from the Latin of the *acta* which fill so large a space,² is even more chary of this use of the verb than the συνεργοί employed in the *War*. The second assistant, responsible for Books xvii-xix 275, makes a sparing and classical use of it, viz. :

xvii 59 Ἡρώδης . . . ἤκεν ὡς τὸν Φέρωραν, ἐπειδὴ ὕστερον ἀρχεται νοσεῖν ; and with the same verb in metaphorical sense.

xviii 25 ἤρξατο νοσεῖν τὸ ἔθνος.

xix 204 ἐξ οὗ . . . φύεσθαι . . . ἤρξατο σφοδρότερον τὸ μῖσος (after his favourite model, Thuc. i 103).

xix 254 ὡς ὁρᾷ παύοντας αὐτοὺς ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν οἷους τε ἀρχεσθαι (the converse of *B.* ii 493, where speech precedes blows).

I am a little surprised to find no further abnormalities in Book xx and its appendix, the *Life* ; the two instances *A.* xx 259³ and *Vita* 12⁴ are passable if not elegant. But in these books the lack of speeches gave no scope for ἤρξατο λέγειν ; and perhaps the author had learnt restraint from his assistants.

We find, then, that the works of Josephus fall into two nearly equal portions, sharply distinguished by the use or disuse of this 'pleonastic' ἀρχεσθαι. The distinction is that of colloquial *versus* Atticistic Greek, and (we may safely add) of author *versus* assistants. The author's practice is in line with that of St Mark ; but, whereas the less erudite editors of Mark merely moderate his excessive use of 'begin', the more fastidious editors and collaborators of Josephus will have none of it. That it was good colloquial Greek, not disdained even by such a writer

to Moses, in other words the attempt to explain the process of man's creation, is confined to this one verse of the 'J' narrative ; but Jos. does not mean that it is broken off. The 'philosophizing' in *B.* iii 361 ff extends to a whole paragraph ; it is not a question of length.

¹ Yet Mr Hunkin (*l. c.* p. 398, n 2) supplies a close parallel from a Targum, 'as a woman who begins to bear (לְיָמֵי לֵילֵי נִיִּרְמִיָּה) a first-born'.

² xiv 145-155, 190-264, 306-322.

³ παύσεται δ' ἐνταῦθά μοι τὰ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας μεθ' ἣν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἠρξάμην γράφειν : the meaning is far from plain.

⁴ ἠρξάμην τε πολιτεῦσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἰρέσει κατακολουθῶν : the τε is not wanted.

as Xenophon, has been established by Archdeacon Hunkin. In the circumstances is it legitimate any longer to speak of 'Aramaism'? I still hold that, where the usage appears in profusion in Jewish writers such as Mark and Josephus, the possibility of Aramaic influence cannot be altogether excluded. Examples of its frequency in translations from Aramaic are quoted by Archdeacon Hunkin. It is, I think, another instance of that practice, by which the late Dr Moulton used to account for many 'Semitisms' in the N. T., the *over-working* of a form of expression, correct but unusual in good Greek, because it happened to correspond to a phrase that was frequent in the Semitic language.

I venture, therefore, to think that we have in this otiose use of ἀρχεσθαι with infinitive of verbs of speech, scattered so profusely over the first thirteen books of the *Antiquities*, and with one significant exception absent elsewhere, an instance of unconscious and involuntary retention of the author's native Aramaic phraseology. It was a colloquialism not so foreign to Greek speech but that it could pass muster, in certain circumstances, with writers having pretensions to style. The literary paraphrast of Ezra employed it when translating an Aramaic document; Luke, the Grecian, perhaps took it over from an existing version of the Aramaic *Logia*¹; and it flowed naturally from the pen of the Aramaic-speaking Josephus, as distinct from his assistants.

The disappearance of the one imaginary instance of Hebraism in his works and the emergence in its place of this colloquialism with distinct Aramaic associations, taken in conjunction with the Aramaic words which appear in the earlier books of the *Antiquities*² and the defective knowledge of Hebrew which his strange etymology of proper names seems often to betray, suggest that Aramaic, not Hebrew, was the language in which his thoughts were cast. This new evidence perhaps lends some slight support to the belief that 'the vernacular'³ in which he composed the first draft of the *Jewish War* was Aramaic and not, as has sometimes been suggested, Hebrew.

PS.—Archdeacon Hunkin's important article unfortunately escaped my notice until these pages were in proof. I have modified my first draft, so far as was possible, but am conscious that the question of 'Aramaism' needs further consideration.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

¹ Moulton *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, i 15.

² e. g. Διγλάθ A. i 39 for Hiddekel (though he translates the latter), δσαρθά iii 252, etc.

³ τῆ πατριῶ B. J. i 3.