theocentric and hence stressing the *doctrinal fact* of *divine* forgiveness.[1] To put it another way, Matthew is the *challenging* Gospel of Christian *action*, and stresses the need for horizontal forgiveness (man-to-man). Luke, the *joyful* Gospel of Christian *being*, stresses the fact of vertical forgiveness (God-to-man, salvation). Both are authentic and central teachings of Christ, inter-related by him in his own Prayer, ' Forgive us . . . as we forgive '.

JAMES MEGIVERN C.M.

St John's University,
New York

THE ARAMAIC TRANSLATIONS:
a newly recognised aid for New Testament study [2]

The literatures of many countries have been laid under contribution by students of the NT in their efforts to find the cultural background from which the NT writings sprang. The writings and traditions of Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece and Palestine have all been seen at one time or another to have influenced the NT writings to a greater or lesser degree. The case for Egypt and Babylon never appeared too strong and the view defending their influence on the New Testament did not hold the field for any great length of time. Persia has a better case to offer, but her glory and fascination had faded by NT times. That Greek civilisation should have influenced the NT writers to a fair degree seems evident. After all, Paul was born in the Greek world

[1] Further substantiation of these contentions could be drawn from additional Synoptic material. E.g., Matthew's interest in the fraternal level comes through in his predilection for the quote from Osee 6:6 (quoted in Mt. 9:13 and 12:7), ' I desire mercy and not sacrifice.' And, of course, the parable of the Unforgiving Servant (18:23–35), which is present only in Matthew. As if the lesson were not painfully obvious, Matthew spells it out precisely in the closing verse, ' And that is how my heavenly Father will deal with you, unless you each forgive your brother from your hearts.' Once more, so to speak, God takes the cue from man's action.

As for Luke and his accent on divine forgiveness, this is further evidenced by the fact that only he has the parable of the Father of the Prodigal (as it is more properly called), 15:11–32, and he also is the only one to report the words of the dying Christ, ' Father, forgive them . . . ' (23:34).

[2] A brief survey of targumic studies from the sixteenth century to the present day can be seen in ' Targumic Studies ', *CBQ* 28 (1966), 1–19. The article of *CBQ* is the abbreviation of the first chapter of the dissertation, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. The Early Date of the Palestinian Targum. Arguments from the New Testament.* The thesis is to appear within a few months as vol. 27 of *Analecta Biblica* of the Biblical Institute. For an indication of the contents of the dissertation see ' Novum Testamentum et Targum Palaestinense ad Pentateuchum ', *Verbum Domini* 43 (1965), 288–300.

and became a Greek to the Greeks when preaching the Gospel. What wonder if we find evidence of Greek culture—as distinct from Jewish—in his epistles. Some have even thought the author of the Apocalypse was drawing in good part on Greek imagery and ideas when describing his visions. And it may not appear strange that Greek ideas can be seen in the Gospels, particularly in that of St. John.

The relative importance of Hellenism and Judaism in the NT writings is a well-known bone of contention among the learned. Recent researches in the Fourth Gospel,[1] at any rate, tend to show that Jewish culture predominates where some earlier students saw evidence of Hellenistic influence. The richest source of Jewish parallels to the NT is found, it would appear, in Rabbinic writings. To this we can add the apocalyptic writings and, in recent years, the Dead Sea Scrolls. All these, while they are of undoubted advantage, labour under certain difficulties. The Dead Sea literature and the apocalyptic writings really belong to marginal, rather than to normative, Judaism. While they parallel the NT in word and concept in certain places, there are other NT phrases to which they offer no parallel—the invocation of God as ' Father in heaven ', to mention only one. In other words, we must go beyond them for a full reconstruction of Jewish belief of the NT period.

Rabbinic writings, such as the Mishnah, Tosephta, Talmud and Homiletic Midrashim, offer a wealth of NT parallels; a glance at Billerbeck's *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* is proof of this. Yet even these writings have their shortcomings, the chief of which is that they represent Judaism as it was formulated after the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70: The bulk of the Homiletic Midrashim, in fact, comes from the Jewish schools of the third or fourth Christian centuries. Of course, we can trace a certain amount of this back to pre-Christian times, and even when proof of a pre-Christian date cannot be established it can in many cases be presumed. None the less, the difficulty remains. And, together with it, we must reckon with the fact that rabbinic material is linked with the Jewish schools, and was not necessarily known to the ordinary people.

The Targums in Jewish Life

Students of the NT and of NT Judaism would welcome some

[1] Among the most recent studies to bring out the Jewish background of the Fourth Gospel we may instance, I. de la Potterie's *Alêtheia. La notion johannique de vérité et ses antécédents historiques*, being his doctoral dissertation at the Biblical Institute and to appear in the *Analecta Biblica*. Various arguments for Jewish, rather than for Hellenistic, influence on John can also be seen in the dissertation *The NT and the Palestinian Targum*, referred to in the preceding note. The Apocalypse, in particular, appears to be heavily dependent on Jewish liturgy as found in the Palestinian Targum.

source in which the religious ideas of the Jews of our Lord's day would be enshrined. The natural sources for such ideas would appear to be the Targums, or the translations of the OT into Aramaic, the vernacular of Palestine in the time of Christ. When the Hebrew Bible first came to be translated into the Aramaic vernacular we cannot say. Certain it is, though, that an Aramaic rendering of the portion of the Hebrew text read in the Synagogue on the Sabbath was an established custom in the days of Christ. In the regular Sabbath synagogue service a portion of the Pentateuch and of the Prophets was read, and immediately afterwards rendered into the Aramaic vernacular, somewhat as a vernacular rendering of the Epistle and Gospel used be given on Sundays in the days of the all-Latin Mass. The custom of this vernacular Aramaic translation was to make the common people understand the message of the Hebrew text (cf. Neh. 8:8).[1] From this it would follow that the translation would be paraphrastic rather than literal. Recent ideas and religious expectations would be introduced and contemporary place-names would replace older ones. At the beginning of the institution of the vernacular rendering it would appear that the paraphrase served both as translation and homily. It is not then surprising that the paraphrase would be done in a style to hold the attention of the audience, and in the everyday language of the people. The amusing incident would not even be alien to it. The targumic method is, then, midrashic, showing particularly all the characteristics of the *genre* as listed in R. Bloch's article 'Midrash' (*Supplément* to Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*).[2] This form of 'translation' or 'targumising' is very old. A number of the characteristics noted above can be found in the Septuagint rendering, notably in the Book of Isaiah which may be justly styled a Greek Targum.

The Date of the Targum of Palestine on the Pentateuch

At the present moment we have Targums for all the books of the OT, excepting Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, portions of which are already in Aramaic. We have more than one Targum for some books. Thus, for the Pentateuch we have the rather literal rendering of Onkelos and the very paraphrastic Targum of Palestine. The former is written in rather scholastic Aramaic while the latter is in the Aramaic dialect of

[1] The origin of the Targums and their place in Jewish liturgy are treated of in most introductions to the Targums. The reader may consult G. F. Moore, *Judaism I*, Cambridge (USA) 1927, pp. 174–6; 297–305. The bearing of this on the dating of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch can be seen in chapter II of the dissertation noted in n. 1 above.

[2] Vol. 5, cols. 1263–80.

Palestine.[1] The Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch is somewhat like the *Vetus Latina*. It never got a recension to reduce its varying texts to a unity and is now extant in its entirety in the recently discovered *Codex Neofiti 1*. It is also extant in fragments to certain verses, in the so-called *Fragmentary Targum*, and in a different form in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, whose text has a number of paraphrases proper to itself. The question that will immediately occur is why we do not turn to the paraphrastic Targums as evidence of the language and ideas of the ordinary people of NT Palestine. After all, Targums were then in common use and must have nurtured the spirituality of those who attended the synagogues.

The reason for a long neglect of the Targums in general, and of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch in particular, is easily explained. There can be no doubt that some Targums, notably those to the Five Scrolls (the Megilloth), are recent compositions, being dependent on the Talmud, and coming from the 7th or 8th century A.D. Pseudo-Jonathan makes mention of the wife and daughter of Mohammed. All this led to a distrust of the Palestinian Targum as a witness of NT Judaism. This is due mainly to the authority of G. Dalman, who considered Onkelos as much older than the Palestinian Targum, this latter, in his view, coming from the 4th or 5th century A.D.[2]

This state of affairs continued from the end of the last century until 1930. In that year P. Kahle published some fragments of the Palestinian Targum from the Cairo Geniza, the oldest of which he dated to the end of the 7th or to the beginning of the 8th century. If the Targum was then being consigned to writing the tradition it enshrines must be far older. From 1930 onwards the general approach to Jewish studies was also undergoing a change. The comparative and retrogressive method were now coming into vogue and one study after another indicated that much material, at least, in the Palestinian Targum was very old and pre-Christian. NT scholars were also turning to it to find there striking parallels to NT texts; parallels often not attested elsewhere. The researches of R. R. Bloch,[3] P. P. Kahle, M. Black, G. Vermes, S. Lyonnet, P. Grelot, R. Le Déaut, A. Diez Macho, J. R. Diaz, among others, made all this clear. The Palestinian Targum was by now seen to be, basically, an older rendering than Onkelos, and one to which students could turn in the reconstruction of Judaism of the first century A.D. and for the elucidation of

[1] The scholastic nature of the Aramaic of Onkelos may be due to its redaction in the Jewish Academies of Babylonia. It is also possible that the Aramaic represents the dialect of Judea. In any case, Onkelos appears to be a Palestinian product and may well have been originally identical with the more paraphrastic Palestinian Targum.

[2] Cf. further, art. cit. (*CBQ*), p. 9 and chapter I of dissertation.

[3] For these studies see art. cit., p. 18 and dissertation, loc. cit., for greater detail.

NT problems. The words of P. Kahle are borne out by results. In the *Cairo Geniza*[1] he writes of texts of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch:

> We can learn many more details from them than from the material collected by Billerbeck or Bonsirven. Their voluminous works only serve to indicate what the conditions were at the time of the reorganisation of Judaism after the destruction of the Temple; they show us how the rabbis rebuilt Judaism for the future.
>
> In the Palestinian Tergum of the Pentateuch we have in the main material coming down from pre-Christian times which must be studied by everyone who wishes to understand the state of Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity. And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it was similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians. It is material the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated.

Recent and Forthcoming Publications of Targums

The student of the Targums labours under many handicaps, due to the long neglect of this field of Jewish literature. To begin with, he will find no good recent introduction to the Targums in which he can find ready reference to the problems involved and the present state of targumic studies. Then, unless he is able to handle an Aramaic text, he will find it difficult to come by translations. The standard work is still Brian Walton's *London Polyglot* (1653–7; reprinted 1964, 6 vols., folio, £102), where the Aramaic text and a Latin translation of all Targums, except that of Chronicles,[2] can be found. If he is lucky he may come on an English translation of the Targum of Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (i.e. Pseudo-Jonathan), made by J. W. Etheridge and published in two volumes in 1862–5.[3] This English rendering is far from perfect, but no other translation of the Palestinian Targum or of Onkelos exists in the English language. Neither is there any in French, though German fares somewhat better, having a translation of portions of the Targum to the Pentateuch.[4]

Nor is the position regarding the Aramaic text much more satisfactory. The Aramaic text of Onkelos was first printed in 1492 and has been published a number of times since. A critical edition has been brought out by A. Sperber in volume I of *The Bible in Aramaic*.[5] In

[1] 2nd ed., Oxford 1959, p. 208.

[2] The Targum on Chronicles was first published in 1680–3 by M. F. Beck and (according to a different recension) by David Wilkins in 1715.

[3] *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments from the Jerusalem Targum*, London.

[4] The Targum to Genesis was published in the Aramaic text, with transcription and German rendering by M. Altschueler: *Die aramaeische Bibel-Versionen-Targumin. Targum Jonatan Ben'Uzij'el und Targum Jerusal^{e}mij, Text, Umschrift und Uebersetzung* (Orbis Antiquitatum, pt. I, tom. 2, vol. 1), Vienna & Leipzig 1909 (no more published).

[5] Leiden 1959.

1517 an *editio princeps* of the *Fragment Targum* was edited,[1] and revised in later editions. Then in 1593 the Aramaic edition of Pseudo-Jonathan was first printed.[2] All these were reproduced in Walton's Polyglot.

The Paris MS. of the Fragment Targum (No. 110) was printed by M. Ginsburger in 1899 with the variants from the other MSS. of this Targum, i.e. Vatican 440, Nuremberg and Leipzig.[3] Four years later the same author published Pseudo-Jonathan according to a MS. in the British Museum.[4] Both Ginsburger's editions are useful. The former has a good list of earlier citations from the Palestinian Targum and the other is provided with a useful introduction. Both, unfortunately, fail to reproduce the MSS. faithfully—new critical editions were called for.

The most serious drawback for the student, however, is that until recent years no text of the entire Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch was known to exist. All we had, as already mentioned, were portions of it to the different books. It is surely to be reckoned as a singular stroke of good fortune when Fr. Alejandro Diez Macho, M.S.C., came on a MS. in the Vatican Museum in 1949 that he identified as the Palestinian Targum to the entire Pentateuch in 1956.[5] The MS. in question is Codex Neofiti 1. According to the colophon it was completed in Rome in 1504 for one 'Master Ayyidio', very probably Giles (Egedio) of Viterbo, OSA, the well-known Italian humanist, later to become a cardinal.[6] The language of this MS. has been recognised as a rather pure form of Galilaean Aramaic, but somewhat more recent than that of the Fragment of the Palestinian Targum of the Cairo Geniza. A. Diez Macho read a paper on the Targum at Oxford in 1959, and W. F. Albright informed him that the geographical data of the work pointed to the 2nd century A.D., as the date of the final recension of Neofiti. Diez Macho himself considers the Targum to be, on the whole, a pre-Christian version.[7] Rabbi Menahem Kasher, a specialist in rabbinic studies, goes further and considers Neofiti to be older than all the halakic midrashim, earlier than the Mishnah, and

[1] The first editor was the Augustinian, Felix Pratensis. The 2nd ed. was in 1524–5; the 3rd 1548; the 4th 1548; the 5th 1617; the 6th 1618–19; the 7th 1724–7. All these editions are in the British Museum, as are also those of Pseudo-Jonathan.

[2] From Bomberg's press at Venice.

[3] *Das Fragmententhargum* (*Thargum Jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch*), Berlin 1899.

[4] *Pseudo-Jonathan* (*Thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch*), *Nach der Londoner Handschrift* (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 27031), Berlin 1903.

[5] For literature on this discovery see art. cit. (*CBQ*), p. 16, n. 95; chapter I, note 144 of dissertation (cf. n. 1 above).

[6] cf. 'The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum, its Antiquity and Relation to the Other Targums', *VT*, *Supplements* 7 (Congress Volume, 1959), 229.

[7] There always remains the possibility that the 'Ayyidio' intended is not Giles of Viterbo.

to originate some centuries before the Christian era.[1] These are astounding claims that will surely be greatly modified in the course of time.

Whatever its date of origin, the present text of Neofiti shows clear evidence of later (3rd–4th cent. A.D. or later) rabbinic recension.[2] Be that as it may the basic text of Neofiti, and of the Palestinian Targum in general, appears to be very old and pre-Christian.

New Critical and De Luxe Edition of the Targum

A. Diez Macho has already prepared Neofiti and the Targums to the Pentateuch for publication. The text of Neofiti for the *editio princeps* of the Aramaic text will be accompanied in a separate volume by Spanish, English and French translations.[3] The centenary year of publication of Etheridge's second volume will then see the preparation of a new English translation of the entire Palestinian Targum, and this from the best manuscript available. The English translation should appear in 1966; but, of course, in such matters no definite date can be given.

A Critical Edition of the Targums to the Pentateuch

It was his editorial work on the New Madrid Polyglot Bible that led Diez Macho to identify Neofiti 1 as the complete Palestinian Targum. Work on the edition of the Targums for this Polyglot has been going steadily ahead for years past. At last the first part of the section on the Targums has appeared, in the form of a specimen copy containing the first chapter of Deuteronomy.[4] Here we are presented with a *de luxe* edition of the Targums to the Pentateuch. The lay-out permits the student to see the texts of all the Targums to any verse at a single glance.

[1] See his letter to Diez Macho in 'Magister-Minister. Prof. P. E. Kahle through twelve years of correspondence' [to A. Diez Macho], in *Recent Progress in Biblical Scholarship* (The Lincombe Lodge Research Library, Boars Hill, Oxford 1965), and separately, p. 43f.

[2] cf. chapter II of dissertation where this is shown from a study of the relation of Neofiti to Mishnaic and talmudic texts. Neofiti is at pains to abide by rabbinic desires on major points of halakah on targumic rendering. A more detailed study of the point, together with arguments for a knowledge of the Palestinian Targum (particularly in the form found in Neofiti) among Palestinian Rabbis of the 2nd–4th centuries, can be seen in *La Rivista degli Studi Orientali* for 1966.

[3] The Spanish rendering is by A. Diez Macho, the French by R. Le Déaut, C.S.Sp. The English translation is being done at Moyne Park. The three versions will be available only with the Aramaic text, but the English one may be published separately shortly after the *editio princeps*. No date can be fixed for the *editio princeps*, but is likely to be late 1966 or early 1967.

[4] *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. Series IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. Adduntur Targum Pseudojonatan [sic!], Targum Onqelos et Targum Palaestinensis hispanica versio.* L. 5 *Deuteronomium. Caput I, editio critica curante Alexandro Diez Macho*, Madrid 1965; p. 23.

The text of Neofiti is printed in two columns, in large type, on the upper portion of the left hand page. Underneath this, in smaller type, we find first the numerous glosses to Neofiti, accompanied by any necessary observation; there then follow the extant texts of the Fragment Targum from Paris MS. 110 in a new and critical edition, that of Ginsburger, as we said, being untrustworthy. The Vatican (440) and Nuremberg MSS. of the same Targum are also printed in full, as is also, the British Museum MS. Or. 10.794 f. 8, imperfectly edited by M. Gaster in 1900. Also included in this page are the citations of the Palestinian Targum given by M. Ginsburger in his edition of the Paris MS. This left-hand page, then, gives us the entire text of the Palestinian Targum as found in Neofiti and other extant sources.

Facing this, on the right-hand page, we have three columns of text. In that on the left we find printed the corresponding text of Pseudo-Jonathan, direct from the London MS. which was so imperfectly edited by M. Ginsburger. In the central column stands the text of Onkelos according to MS. Vat. Ebr. 448 with transliteration in Tiberian vowel-signs of original Babylonian superlinear signs.

The very early vocalisation will add special significance to this edition of Onkelos. In the third column, to the extreme right, we have a Spanish translation of Neofiti. Footnotes to the Spanish rendering give the identification of the place-names, the reason underlying the Aramaic version of the H.T., the H.T., rendered, reference to other targumic texts and such like. The column bearing Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan also carry occasional footnotes. The former are mainly on the vocalisation; the latter give midrashic parallels (as Ginsburger's edition already did), or note when the MS. is corrected.

The lay-out necessarily requires that one or other page, very often both, have a fair amount of blank space. This, I suppose, is unavoidable, but will add considerably to the bulk of the work. It is to be regretted that the variant readings from the *editio princeps* (1593) of Pseudo-Jonathan are not given, those of major importance at any rate.[1] This

[1] Many of M. Ginsburger's errors consist in omission or addition of *matres lectionis*. He makes one major mistake in his edition of Lv. 22:28 which he reproduces as found in the *editio princeps* of 1591, without even indicating that he is not reproducing the London MS. The *editio princeps* of 1591 to this verse reads, 'My people, children of Israel, *as our Father* is merciful in heaven, so shall you be merciful on earth . . . ', the words being those of Moses. In the London MS (f. 130b) it is the Lord himself who speaks and says, ' My people, children of Israel, *as I am* merciful in heaven, so shall you be merciful on earth . . . '. The exact rendering of the London MS is censured by Rabbi Jose ben Bun (*c.* 350 A.D.) and is omitted from all texts of the Palestinian Targum apart from Pseudo-Jonathan. The omission is due to a rabbinic recension and there is clear evidence that the other texts of the Targum once carried the censured passage; see further chapter V, paragraph III, of dissertation, *The NT and the Palestinian Targum*. The bearing of this censured text on Mt. 5:48 and Lk. 6:36 is obvious.

would add considerably to the value of an already excellent production and would also help to fill in some blank space. Onkelos is not accompanied by any critical *apparatus*, but it appears that Onkelos is to be printed again, with *apparatus*, in volume V of the Polyglot [1] (the present specimen is from Vol. IV). But why print the text of Onkelos twice, especially when there is space for the apparatus in the present volume? Another point: the first verse of Deut. of Paris 110 was printed according to M. Ginsburger's edition before it was decided to reproduce the original MS. instead. Though, in this single verse alone, Ginsburger's edition has no fewer than seven errors (noted by Diez Macho on p. 2, n. 2) Ginsburger's text is left unchanged. It is hoped that in the definitive edition these errors will be rectified, preferably by substituting the correct MS. reading; if not, by a note at each word referring to the corrections at p. 2, n. 2. The writer has been able to check Neofiti against photostats of the original. The reproduction is extremely faithful: no misprint has been detected. We may presume the same holds good for the other texts.

No mention is made of any plans for a translation of the texts of Onkelos or Pseudo-Jonathan,[2] nor of the other Targums, in the Madrid Polyglot. Such translations, however, are sure to appear in the not too remote future. Students will then have as easy access to this body of literature as to the other branches of Jewish literature. It has taken a long period of time to establish the importance of the Targums, of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch in particular, for NT Judaism and for an understanding of the NT. In these texts of the old Targum to the Pentateuch we have conserved those ideas that nurtured the spiritual life of the ordinary Jews of Christ's day. It is for research students and others to work on this and bring out even more its full significance for NT exegesis. The ground-work has been done; the case for a new approach to these old Aramaic versions established.

[1] See the plan of the entire series in the *Prooemium* to *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia*, Madrid 1957.

[2] The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, as already noted, has some very late references. It also has quite an amount of paraphrase not found in other texts of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. The question arises as to the value one must attribute to such paraphrase as a witness of Jewish ideas of New Testament times (cf. P. Grelot, *RB* 71 [1964], 266f.). R. Le Déaut has shown that portion of Paul's midrash on the veil of Moses (2 Cor. 3:16) can be illustrated from the paraphrase of this Targum (cf. *Biblica* 42 [1961], 28–48). In *The NT and the Palestinian Targum*, chapter VI, par. V, we have indicated how the greater part of the midrash on the veil of Moses seems to follow the paraphrase of Pseudo-Jonathan and how the enigmatic phrase 'the Lord is the Spirit' (2 Cor. 3:17) may well be explained through it. For the bearing of Ps.-Jon., Lv. 22:28 on Mt. 5:48 and Lk. 6:36 see n. 24. 2 Tm. 3:8 and a number of texts in the Apocalypse can also be explained by paraphrases found in Ps.-Jon. alone. In fact, this targumic paraphrase is closer in many ways to the NT than other texts of the Palestinian Targum. A new study of this work is clearly called for.

We may rest assured that we are entering a new age in targumic studies in which the Targums will stand beside the writings of the Apocalyptists, of the Monks of Qumran, and of the Rabbis, as traditions that influenced Christ, the Gospels and the other writers of the New Testament.

M. McNAMARA, M.S.C.

Moyne Park, Co. Galway.

THE PELICAN GOSPEL COMMENTARIES

The days when paper-backs merely served to provide one with the Agatha Christie somebody else had taken from the public library, are long past. While they are still cheap, they are nowadays not all whodunnits, and though still by professional writers some are by scholars. Nor are they even the poor man's version of a great classic, but may be the first and only edition of some brand-new work. This is the case with the Pelican Gospel Commentaries published by Penguin Books Ltd., 1963.[1] They are by scholars and written deliberately and only for this series. But like the old type of paper-back they will have a wide and varied reading public, and as the subject happens to be Sacred Scripture the effect they may have is worthy of some serious consideration.

From the publisher's point of view, although they are by scholars they are meant to be popular. The discrepancy is of course a general one but in this instance it is of moment. For while the New Testament is still a popular book with a large number of people, their assumptions about it are in almost complete opposition to the conclusions generally agreed to by scholars. And though scholarly men have entered a pulpit before now, there is no indication that religious congregations are any more aware of what scholars have considered proved and long taken for granted. The blurb on the back of each volume therefore hopefully introduces the writers as ' scholars who are in touch with contemporary Biblical theology and also with the needs of the average layman ' and the suggestion is that these books are going to bridge the gap.

The editorial foreword is more revealing. For it is asserted that ' the aim throughout has been to bring out the meaning the Evangelists intended to convey to their original readers ' and it is this which

[1] D. E. Nineham, *Saint Mark*, pp. 477; J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, pp. 487; G. B. Caird, *Saint Luke*, pp. 271.