

In the process of translating the book from Spanish, some unfortunate transliterations have been allowed to slip through. One such is the Arabic word *yebel*, which in English transliteration should have been *jebel* (p. 34).

This volume provides no attempt to distinguish between textual evidence and archaeological evidence, a procedure which seems to have limited the extent to which each of these disciplines could have been used. To write an archaeological commentary on the Bible is a very ambitious enterprise, especially by a person who is not primarily involved in archaeology. And though the work is of only limited value to the serious student, when we remember its original intent it is not an altogether unhappy result.

Andrews University

J. BJØRNAR STORFJELL

Carmignac, Jean. *La naissance des Évangiles Synoptiques*. 2d ed. Paris: O.E.I.L., 1984. 120 pp. Paperback, fr. 80.00.

In this monograph Carmignac presents the first results of twenty years of research on the Hebrew of NT times. After his prolonged immersion in the Hebrew of Qumran, he has come to the firm conviction that Mark, Matthew, and most of the sources for the Gospel of Luke were originally written in a Semitic language. Accordingly, our actual Synoptics are but Greek translations of these Semitic originals, little more than a *décalque littéraire* (p. 10) of the Hebrew or Aramaic documents.

Although the author states that the identity of the original language is secondary to his thesis (p. 76), he definitely favors the Hebrew hypothesis. He sees his view confirmed by numerous retroversions of the Gospels "back into Hebrew," listing these in chap. 2. In fact, Carmignac is an expert in this kind of translations, being also editor of an excellent series of reprints of Hebrew translations of the Gospels called *Traductions Hébraïques des Évangiles* (published thus far through vol. 4 [Brepols, 1982]). However, he acknowledges that in order to ascertain whether the Semitisms are Hebrew or whether they are Aramaic will require further study.

In chap. 3 the author expresses his theory on the origin of the Gospels, based mainly upon arguments from Semitisms. After recognizing the difficulty of establishing certain Semitisms, he classifies three groups that are considered the supporters of his thesis. There are, first of all, what he calls the "Semitisms of composition"—that is to say, those which are made evident by the fact that the Greek text would not have its present form if it had not been composed originally in a Semitic language. This might explain, e.g., the connection between "stones" and "children" in Matt 3:9

and Luke 3:8, if the original text had a Hebrew word-play between *ʿabānīm* and *bānīm* (pp. 38-39).

Second, there are some "Semitisms of transmission." These are made evident when two different wordings of our Greek Gospels are explained by an apparent confusion in the reading of a Hebrew or Aramaic text. Thus, the parallel texts of Matt 13:17 and Luke 10:24 are almost identical, except for one word: Matthew has δίκαιοι, whereas Luke has βασιλείς. There is no theological reason for this surprising change, which is, however, easily explained if the original document had the word *WYSRYM* (Matthew) read by Luke as *WSRYM* (pp. 42-43).

There are, finally, some "Semitisms of translation," detected in Greek expressions betraying a Semitic form. For instance, Mark 9:49 has the strange phrase "salted by fire," which is obviously a non-Greek idiom. It may be explained if the original had the Aramaic form *mālah*, a verb which has two roots, one meaning "to salt" and the other "to consume" (p. 44).

In spite of the numerous examples given, the author acknowledges that these may not be sufficiently convincing for the specialists. For them he promises to publish soon a more technical work in several volumes, with exhaustive lists and full discussions—an irrefutable proof for his thesis, the author assumes. (p. 50).

If in that fuller study Carmignac can demonstrate his thesis, the consequences for Gospel exegesis may be far-reaching. For if our Gospels were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic instead of in Greek, the accepted dates of composition must be seriously revised, the relationship between the writers and the witnesses of Jesus becomes much closer, and the influences of Greek thought on the Gospel tradition would be drastically reduced. The author is well aware of the import of his arguments, particularly on the dating of the Gospels. His position (cf. "La datation des Évangiles. État actuel de la recherche," in *Dieu parle. Études sur la Bible et son interprétation*, Mélanges en hommage à Pierre Courthial, ed. Paul Wells [Aix en Provence: Kerygma, 1984], pp. 12-22) reflects that of J. A. T. Robinson (*Redating the New Testament* [London: S.C.M., 1976]) and Claude Tresmontant (*Le Christ Hébreu. La langue et l'âge des Évangiles* [Paris: O.E.I.L., 1983]). Referring to Robinson and Tresmontant, Carmignac states: "We agree—he says—in rejecting the vicious circle by which the Gospels are dated on the basis of a supposed theological evolution, and then, the theological evolution is justified by the dating which it has put forward. We reach almost identical conclusions. Without any deliberate intention, our works complement each other and form a kind of trilogy" (pp. 94-95).

On the synoptic problem and the question of the formation of the Gospels, which Carmignac treats in chap. 4, his main conclusions are the following: (1) Mark, Matthew, and the sources of Luke were originally

written in a Semitic language. (2) This language is more probably Hebrew than Aramaic. (3) The third Gospel must have been written between A.D. 50 and 53, and therefore Matthew and Mark must be earlier—Mark around 42-45 and Matthew not later than 50 (p. 71). (4) The author of the Semitic Mark was probably Peter (a thesis that Carmignac fails to demonstrate). (5) The synoptic problem could be explained by an original Hebrew Gospel, namely this *Marc complete* (p. 55). (6) The common source of Mark and Luke are the *Logia* of Matthew. (7) The translator of Matthew used the text of Luke.

Carmignac endeavors to show, in chap. 5, that his conclusions are confirmed by the testimonies of Papias, Irenaeus, Panthene, Origen, and Eusebius (on the basis of *Hist. Eccl.*, 3.24.6 and 39.4, 15-16; 5.8.2-4, 9.1, and 10.1; and 6.25.3-5). In chap. 6 he lists forty-six important contemporary authors who also support the hypothesis of original Semitic Gospels (including E. Nestlé, F. Blass, E. A. Abbott, J. Wellhausen, C. C. Torrey, M. J. Lagrange, C. F. Burney, M. Black, L. Vaganay, R. L. Lindsey, G. Gander, F. Zimmermann, C. Tresmontant, etc.; pp. 77-92). He urges us to examine seriously the arguments of these authors, for it is all the more significant that many of them are Israelites (e.g., Z. H. P. Chajes, H. J. Schonfield, P. Winter, P. Lapide, D. Flusser, S. T. Lachs, etc.). These not only know the Hebrew language well, but are clearly excluded from having any particular interest in strengthening the historical value of the Gospels (p. 91). Carmignac concludes his study by stating that "this will be, I dare to hope, the basis for the exegesis of the Synoptic Gospels around the year 2000" (p. 96).

The author's challenging assertions have not left the scholarly world indifferent. Reactions soon appeared, and in May 1984 a second, revised edition of this book was published. The text revisions are of minor interest: suppression of a paragraph on p. 47; addition of a reference on p. 81 to Hubert Grimme, who advocated in 1911 a Hebrew origin for the songs of Luke; mention on p. 90 of F. Zimmermann, *The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels* (1979), and S. Muñoz Iglesias, *Les Cantiques de l'Évangile de l'Enfance selon Saint Luc* (1981), both of whom also favor a Hebrew origin for the songs of Luke; and on p. 95 the addition of fn. 3, where the author repeats the difficulty of proving a date after 70 for the writing of the Gospels, according to the results of the studies by Robinson and the Paderborn Congress (20-23 May 1982).

The most interesting feature of this second edition is the inclusion of an appendix (pp. 97-111) called *Réponse aux critiques*. Here the author defends his work against twenty-two sharp criticisms by Pierre Grelot in *Évangiles et tradition apostolique. Reflexions sur un certain "Christ Hébreu,"* Collection Apologique (Paris: Cerf, 1984), pp. 174-187. Grelot questions the value of all the Semitisms advocated by Carmignac, as well as Carmignac's interpretation of 2 Cor 3:14 and 8:18 (cf. J. Carmignac,

"2 Corinthiens 3, 6-14 et le début de la formation du Nouveau Testament," *NTS* 24 [1978]: 384-386). He also questions the value of the Papias' material on the *Logia* of Matthew, and disputes the value of Irenaeus *Hist. Eccl.* 3.1.1 as a witness to the Semitic origin of the Gospels. But his main criticism of Carmignac is that of "narrow fundamentalism," namely, of "working on the faith assurance of assuming *a priori* that the Gospel is true, and of applying himself to prove it historically" (pp. 178-179).

Carmignac replies to these charges with thought-provoking arguments, and with two relevant questions: first, if there are scientific arguments in favor of an early date for the writing of the Gospels, why not take them seriously? and second, if these arguments help an unbeliever to ponder about the historicity of Jesus, or if they strengthen the faith of a believer, will this result not be worthwhile?

Grelot concluded his series of ironical remarks by prophesying that in the year 2000 the theories of Carmignac "will lay in the graveyard of dead hypothesis" (p. 187). Carmignac, in turn, challenges Grelot to meet at that date (if both are still alive!) and verify then which of the two will have been the best prophet. We would hope that the stimulating discussion brought about by this little book will contribute to the clarification of some important areas of the Synoptic question long before that time.

Collonges-sous-Salève, France

R. BADENAS

Gaede, S. D. *Where Gods May Dwell: On Understanding the Human Condition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1985. 186 pp. Paperback, \$7.95.

This book presents a simple but important argument: namely, that since all science is based on assumptions, a Christian should approach science from explicitly Christian assumptions. This is not the first of such arguments, but it is good to see it applied specifically to sociology, a field that in America definitely has Christian roots. The book is a welcome contribution to the age-old dialogue between religion and science, faith and reason. It is very readable with short chapters, easy language, and lively style. The author demonstrates broad knowledge of philosophy and of the history of both Christian and scientific thought, although he draws from such sources mainly to support his Christian apologetics.

The book is divided into two parts. Part A, "Thinking Christianly about the Social Sciences: A Question of Assumptions," examines the assumptions of science, their sources and implications (chaps. 1-4), and assesses the state of objective science in general and social science in particular (chaps. 5 and 6). Part B, "Toward a Christian Understanding of Human Relationships," is a case study of this mainstream sociological topic, outlining a framework that a Christian might use in examining the