LIVING DOCUMENT — This report is preliminary and will be updated frequently. New transcriptions, manuscript-image checks, corrections, textual variants, and comparisons with Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and Syriac witnesses will be added as the research continues. Assessments and labels reflect the evidence currently available and may change as more of the Cochin–Cambridge Hebrew New Testament is transcribed and evaluated.

Hidden in Hebrew: Reopening the Cochin–Cambridge New Testament

Why This Analysis Matters

This report asks a broad question: what kind of Hebrew is preserved in each book of the Cochin–Cambridge Hebrew New Testament, and what might that language reveal about the collection's history? The study does not assume that every book has the same origin. Instead, it compares the books one by one, looking for older Hebrew patterns, later Hebrew forms, Aramaic contact, translation-style wording, possible dependence on the Syriac Peshitta, textual variants, and passages that still require transcription or manuscript verification.

The larger goal is to determine whether the collection is simply one late Hebrew translation or whether it preserves several layers and transmission histories. A book with repeated Hebrew wordplay, biblical echoes, or coherent Hebrew-Aramaic patterns may deserve a different explanation from a book whose language closely follows a later Syriac translation. Textual differences also matter: a variant may preserve an older reading, a Hebrew interpretation, a translator’s explanation, or a later change. None of those possibilities can be decided from one word or one verse; they require full transcription, manuscript comparison, and careful comparison with Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac witnesses.

A Personal Note: Why This Text Deserves a New Hearing

What draws me to this collection is not one theory about one group of letters, but the possibility that the books preserve different linguistic and textual histories. Some passages contain striking Hebrew wording, biblical echoes, or Hebrew-Aramaic patterns. Others look more like later translations. Still others contain textual variations that may help us revisit difficult passages and long-debated connections with the Hebrew Bible. The collection's value lies partly in these differences.

The Pastoral Epistles—1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus—are one important comparison within that larger investigation. Many New Testament scholars date them to the late first or early second century and do not regard them as letters written directly by Paul, although the matter remains debated. If they come from a later setting, we should not expect their Hebrew versions to preserve the same signs of Late Second Temple Hebrew that may appear in earlier parts of the collection. In the material examined so far, they do not. Their wording instead appears to belong to a later, explanatory Hebrew translation tradition and may have been mediated through the Syriac Peshitta.

The importance of this collection also reaches beyond questions of language. The Cochin–Cambridge Hebrew New Testament contains textual variations that may preserve clues to how Hebrew readers understood difficult images, titles, numbers, and biblical echoes. Revelation is especially promising. Its Hebrew wording may help scholars reexamine the 144,000, the four horsemen, and other passages whose imagery is deeply connected to the Hebrew Bible. These readings may not provide instant answers, and every variant must be verified against the manuscripts, but they could clarify old questions, reveal overlooked wordplay, or expose connections that are harder to see in Greek, Syriac, or later translations alone.

This is why I believe the complete Cochin–Cambridge Hebrew New Testament deserves a fresh hearing. Scholars, translators, historians, and dedicated enthusiasts all have a role to play. Missing books and passages need to be transcribed; existing transcriptions need to be checked against manuscript images; significant variants need to be cataloged; and the entire collection needs sustained comparison with the Hebrew Bible, Greek New Testament, Syriac Peshitta, and other Hebrew witnesses. This remarkable textual tradition may still hold evidence that can reshape old discussions and open new ones. It is time to bring the whole collection back into the conversation.

Why the Pastoral Epistles Are a Useful Comparison

The SBL Study Bible and The New Oxford Annotated Bible reflect a substantial modern scholarly judgment that 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus were composed after Paul’s lifetime by a later writer or writers using Paul’s name and authority. Commonly cited reasons include major differences in vocabulary and style, a historical setting that is difficult to place within Paul’s known career, a more developed structure of church offices, and theological concerns that differ from the undisputed Pauline letters. Scholars who defend Pauline authorship remain part of the discussion, but later authorship is not fringe; it appears in major academic study Bibles and across a broad range of New Testament scholarship.

1 Corinthians 14:33–35 as a Test Case

The question is important because it shows how authorship, textual history, and language analysis can meet in a single passage. In its introduction to 1 Corinthians, the 2023 SBL Study Bible notes that some scholars propose that 14:33–35 is a later, non-Pauline addition. Its note on 14:34–35 further explains that some interpreters regard the command for women to be silent as a later addition that fits the viewpoint of the non-Pauline

Pastoral Letters, especially 1 Timothy 2:11–12 and Titus 2:5. The point is not merely that the passage is difficult. A major academic study Bible identifies the possibility that it entered the letter after Paul and reflects a later strand of church instruction.
The New Oxford Annotated Bible makes the same connection. Its note points to 1 Corinthians 11:5, where women are already assumed to pray and prophesy, and explains that many scholars therefore consider 14:34–35 a later insertion, comparing it with 1 Timothy 2:11–12. This internal tension matters: an earlier passage assumes women speak in worship, while the disputed passage commands silence. The comparison does not by itself prove interpolation, but it is one reason the passage has received sustained textual and historical scrutiny.
For this report, the example models responsible comparison. A later textual layer should not be expected to display the same linguistic profile as material rooted in an earlier Hebrew setting. If the Cochin Hebrew of the Pastoral Epistles is later, explanatory, and possibly Peshitta-mediated, while other books preserve stronger Hebrew wordplay or recurring Hebrew-Aramaic structures, the contrast may be historically meaningful. At the same time, linguistic difference alone cannot determine authorship or prove that a passage was added later; those conclusions require textual, historical, and manuscript evidence working together.

Study Bibles Cited

The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version. 5th ed. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, Marc Z. Brettler, Carol A. Newsom, and Pheme Perkins. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
The SBL Study Bible. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, general editor. New York: HarperOne, 2023.
What this section covers. “Late Second Temple Hebrew” refers broadly to Hebrew used from the later Persian and Greek periods through the first century CE. The surviving texts do not all use the same kind of Hebrew. They include later biblical Hebrew, the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, early forms of Mishnaic Hebrew, and Hebrew influenced by Aramaic. Because these varieties overlap, one unusual word or spelling is not enough to date a text or identify its source language.

Language Background

During this period, Hebrew was used alongside Aramaic and Greek. Different writers used Hebrew for Scripture, stories, law, prayer, teaching, administration, and everyday communication. Some tried to sound like the Hebrew Bible. Others used a later, more conversational style. A text could also mix Hebrew and Aramaic. For that reason, this study looks for repeated patterns across a passage, not just a single word that happens to resemble Aramaic.

What We Look for in the Hebrew

- **Connecting words:** We compare forms such as אשרand the shorter ש־. Their use can show whether a passage sounds more biblical or more like later Hebrew.
- **Ways of showing possession:** We note the use of שלand longer phrases in place of the shorter forms common in biblical Hebrew.
- **Verb patterns:** We look at how the text tells a story, describes ongoing action, and uses forms of היה(“to be”). Repeated later patterns matter more than one unusual verb.
- **Pronouns and objects:** Forms meaning “he,” “them,” “to him,” or “to us” can help show whether a sentence is mainly Hebrew or contains Aramaic influence.

- **Vocabulary and style:** Later words, linking expressions, quotation formulas, and explanatory wording can point to a later Hebrew setting. Vocabulary by itself, however, is not decisive.
- **Spelling and copying:** Spelling choices, abbreviations, divine-name forms, and scribal mistakes may come from a copyist rather than the original author or translator. They must be considered separately from grammar.

How We Identify the Kind of Hebrew

The first question is not whether a passage contains Aramaic, but what kind of Hebrew forms its base. We compare its grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and storytelling style with known stages of Hebrew. **Biblical-style Hebrew** tends to favor biblical vocabulary, compact possession through joined nouns, and older narrative verb patterns. **Late Biblical Hebrew** keeps much of that framework but shows later vocabulary and changing syntax. **Mishnaic or Rabbinic Hebrew** more often uses ־ש, של, participles, expanded prepositional phrases, and expressions common in later Hebrew writing. **Translation-style Hebrew** may be grammatically Hebrew but sound unusually explanatory, repetitive, expanded, or shaped by the word order of another language. **Independently Hebraized Hebrew** uses Hebrew creatively—through wordplay, compressed clauses, biblical echoes, or newly formed expressions—rather than following another language mechanically.
To classify the Hebrew, we look for patterns that recur across a passage: how possession is expressed; whether a writer prefers אשר or ־ש; how past action and continuing action are described; whether pronouns are attached to words or expressed separately; whether sentences are compact or explanatory; and whether the vocabulary belongs mainly to the Bible, later Hebrew literature, or a mixed register. These positive Hebrew features establish the linguistic profile even when no Aramaic form is present.

Signs of Aramaic Influence

The best evidence for Aramaic is a group of features working together in the same phrase or sentence. These may include the prefix ־ד; clearly Aramaic verbs; pronouns such as לן ,להון ,ליה; noun endings such as א־and תא־; plurals ending in ־ין; the plural suffix ־כון; and sentence patterns that are natural in Aramaic. No single feature proves that a passage came from Aramaic. Some also occur in Rabbinic Hebrew or in more than one kind of Aramaic. The evidence becomes stronger when several features appear repeatedly together.

How the Evidence Is Weighed

1. **Whole phrases and sentences:** A complete Aramaic phrase or consistent Aramaic sentence pattern is the strongest evidence.
2. **Repeated word endings:** The same grammatical pattern appearing on several different words is stronger than one fixed expression.
3. **Several kinds of evidence together:** Agreement among verbs, pronouns, noun endings, connecting words, and sentence structure supports a real mixed Hebrew-Aramaic pattern.
4. **Single words:** One borrowed word or one form shared with Rabbinic Hebrew is worth noting, but it does not prove an Aramaic source.
5. **Missing evidence:** If a short excerpt contains no clear marker, that does not prove that the rest of the book has none. The amount of surviving text must always be considered.

What the Evidence Cannot Prove by Itself

Labels such as “Western Aramaic-compatible” or “Palestinian Aramaic-compatible” mean that a feature fits those varieties; they do not prove that the text was written in one of them. The same feature may occur in another kind of Aramaic, in Syriac, or in Rabbinic Hebrew. Copyists and translators may also change wording over time. A passage that resembles Greek or Syriac could reflect translation style rather than an original source in that language. A source claim therefore requires repeated, detailed matches across many passages.

How this applies to the Cochin–Cambridge texts. For each book, the table asks four basic questions: What kind of Hebrew is most common? Are there clear Aramaic features? Do those features appear repeatedly or only once? How much confidence is possible from the surviving sample? A “mixed Hebrew-Aramaic profile” means that Hebrew and Aramaic features recur together. It does not, by itself, reveal when the text was translated, what language an earlier source used, or where that source came from. Readings taken from another manuscript remain provisional until they are checked against the relevant Cochin manuscript image.

Book-Level Summary

Books by Their Main Hebrew Profile

- **Mainly Mishnaic or Rabbinic Hebrew, with varying amounts of Aramaic contact:** Matthew, Mark, John, Acts, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, and Jude. Their base language uses later Hebrew vocabulary, ־ש, analytical constructions, participles, and other post-biblical patterns.
- **Mainly later Hebrew in an explanatory or translation-like style:** Luke, Romans, 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and 2 Peter. Their grammar is Hebrew, but the wording is often expanded, explicit, repetitive, or shaped like a translation.
- **Mainly later Hebrew with ordinary Hebrew morphology and little secure Aramaic evidence in the passages studied:** Philippians and Colossians. Their possessive endings, participles, and sentence structure are Hebrew even though the register is later than biblical Hebrew.
- **Later Hebrew with a small, identifiable contact feature:** Ephesians and 1 Thessalonians. The surrounding language is Hebrew, while a limited number of pronoun endings point to Aramaic influence.
- **Later or Mishnaic-style Hebrew with forms shared by Hebrew and Aramaic:** Hebrews. The surrounding sentence structure is Hebrew, while plurals in ־ין cannot by themselves decide between Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic influence.
- **Distinctive biblical and post-biblical Hebrew:** Revelation. Its Hebrew wordplay, compressed clauses, biblical echoes, and omitted but recoverable subjects or objects give it a more independently Hebraized profile.
- **Not enough Hebrew text to classify:** Philemon, 2 John, and 3 John.

Books Showing Aramaic Features

- **Strong and repeated evidence:** Matthew, Mark, and John. These books contain several kinds of Aramaic evidence, including verbs, pronouns, word endings, ־ד, and complete phrase or sentence patterns.
- **Clear evidence in only part of the text:** 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 1 Thessalonians. These books contain genuine or strongly Aramaic-compatible forms, but the pattern is not continuous in the passages studied.

- **Limited or uncertain evidence:** Luke, Acts, Romans, Galatians, Titus, Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, Jude, and Revelation. These books contain a small number of possible Aramaic features. Some occur only once, and others are also found in Rabbinic Hebrew, so they do not prove a strong Aramaic layer.
- **No clear Aramaic marker in the passages studied:** 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and 2 Peter.
- **Not enough text to decide:** Philemon, 2 John, and 3 John.

Books That May Be Translations or Adaptations

- **Most likely to reflect translation or adaptation in the passages studied:** Luke, Romans, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, James, 1 Peter, 2 Thessalonians, and 2 Peter. Their wording is often explanatory, expanded, or typical of later Hebrew rather than continuous Aramaic.
- **Possible translation setting with some Aramaic influence:** Acts, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians, Hebrews, 1 John, and Jude. The main language is later Hebrew, with a small number of Aramaic-compatible features. A Syriac source for Jude has not been proven.
- **A group that should be compared closely with the Syriac Peshitta:** 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus. Their similar style may point to a shared translation history, but this must be tested verse by verse.
- **Too mixed for a simple label:** Matthew, Mark, and John. Their repeated Aramaic features could come from older source material, language contact, later editing, or translation. The language alone does not tell us which explanation is correct.
- **Hebraized in its own distinctive way:** Revelation. Its short clauses, Hebrew wordplay, and strongly Semitic style differ from the more explanatory language of several letters.
- **Not enough evidence to decide:** 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, 2 John, and 3 John.

At-a-Glance Public Assessment of the Cochin New Testament Books

This box gives a cautious, easy-to-read summary of the work completed so far. “Encouraging” means that the Hebrew or Hebrew-Aramaic evidence is worth pursuing; it does not mean that a book’s original language or translation history has been proven. A red “Negative: probably Peshitta-mediated” label means that the Hebrew is more likely a secondary translation made through the Syriac Peshitta and therefore provides weaker evidence for an independent Hebrew or Aramaic textual tradition. A peach “Caution” label marks possible Peshitta dependence that is not yet proven. All findings remain preliminary until larger portions are transcribed and checked against manuscript images.

Book	Public assessment	What that means
Matthew	**Very encouraging**	Strong, repeated Hebrew-Aramaic patterns make this one of the most promising books for further study.
Mark	**Very encouraging**	A clear later-Hebrew base with a substantial Aramaic layer; full manuscript review is still needed.
Luke	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	The later-Hebrew translation profile is clear, while the scattered Aramaic features need broader testing.
John	**Very encouraging**	Repeated phrases, grammar, and vocabulary show a strong mixed profile. Only the manuscript-confirmed portions should be treated as firm evidence.

Acts	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	The Hebrew profile is clear and intermittent Aramaic contact is possible, but more continuous text must be studied.
Romans	**Possible**	The text looks like a later Hebrew translation, but the evidence for a deeper Semitic source is still limited.
1 Corinthians	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	Several clear Aramaic-compatible forms occur in part of the book, but the pattern is not yet continuous.
2 Corinthians	**Not enough analysis yet**	The available passage is later Hebrew, but more of the book must be transcribed and a misattributed passage corrected.
Galatians	**Possible**	The later Hebrew is clear, but the Aramaic-compatible evidence is limited and shared with Rabbinic Hebrew.
Ephesians	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	Repeated pronoun endings provide a small but clear Aramaic-compatible feature within later Hebrew.
Philippians	**Not enough analysis yet**	The supplied passage is clearly later Hebrew, but too little has been studied to judge the book's wider history.
Colossians	**Not enough analysis yet**	The available verse shows ordinary later-Hebrew grammar; more transcription is required.
1 Thessalonians	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	One meaningful Aramaic-compatible pronoun form appears, but it must be tested across more of the book.
2 Thessalonians	**Not enough analysis yet**	Only one verse has been studied; it looks like a later-Hebrew paraphrase.
1 Timothy	**Negative: probably Peshitta-mediated**	This appears more likely to be a Hebrew translation made through the Syriac Peshitta than evidence for an independent Hebrew or Aramaic textual tradition. Full verse-by-verse collation is still needed.
2 Timothy	**Negative: probably Peshitta-mediated**	This appears more likely to be a Hebrew translation made through the Syriac Peshitta and to belong to the same secondary translation group as 1 Timothy and Titus. Full collation is still needed.
Titus	**Negative: probably Peshitta-mediated**	Its paraphrastic Hebrew appears consistent with a translation made through the Syriac Peshitta rather than an independent Hebrew or Aramaic textual tradition. This remains probable rather than proven pending full collation.
Philemon	**Needs transcription and evaluation**	There is not yet enough source-controlled Hebrew text to classify the book.
Hebrews	**Possible**	The passage has a later-Hebrew base with forms shared by Hebrew and Aramaic, but they are not decisive.
James	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	The later Hebrew and loose translation style are noteworthy, but the mixed-language evidence remains limited.
1 Peter	**Encouraging, but needs more review**	There is substantial translation-style Hebrew and some contact evidence, but no sustained Aramaic system has been shown.

2 Peter	**Not enough analysis yet**	Only one verse has been supplied; more of the book must be transcribed before a conclusion is possible.
1 John	**Possible**	The Hebrew profile is clear, but the present Aramaic evidence consists mainly of one isolated form from the Gaster witness.
2 John	**Needs transcription and evaluation**	A source-controlled text and manuscript check are required before the book can be assessed.
3 John	**Needs transcription and evaluation**	A manuscript-based transcription is needed before comparison with 1 John and the rest of the collection.
Jude	**Caution: possible Peshitta-mediated translation**	Jude may have been translated into Hebrew through the Syriac Peshitta. Because the dependence is not yet proven, this is a cautionary finding rather than a firm negative classification.
Revelation	**Very encouraging**	Its distinctive Hebrew wordplay, biblical echoes, and internally Semitic style make it especially promising for further research.

Book	Secure Aramaic evidence	JPA / Western-compatible evidence	Limits / uncertainty	Dominant profile	Classification
Matthew — Analysis. The Cochin Hebrew Matthew is predominantly Mishnaic or Rabbinic Hebrew, but it contains frequent and sometimes extended Aramaic passages. Its Aramaic features include direct verbs, pronominal forms, the relative particle ־ד, emphatic-state endings, masculine plurals in ־ין, and phrase-level syntax that is often compatible with Palestinian or broader Western Aramaic. Matthew therefore appears to preserve a genuine mixed Hebrew-Aramaic linguistic profile rather than merely isolated Aramaic loanwords.					
Matthew	Direct verbs, pronouns, ־ד, emphatic forms, ־ין plurals, extended passages	Phrase-level syntax often Western/JPA-compatible	Many forms are not uniquely dialect-specific	Mishnaic/Rabbinic Hebrew with recurrent Aramaic	Strong mixed Hebrew-Aramaic profile
Mark — Analysis. The Cochin-Gaster text of Mark is chiefly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew, but it has a recurrent and productive Aramaic subsystem. Forms such as נפק, להון, מילתא, כד, לות, נפשיהון, גברין, דאלהים, דצילו, דילדה, and finite forms in ־ון occur alongside dense masculine plurals in ־ין. The Aramaic layer is substantial and internally varied, although most individual forms are compatible with several Aramaic dialects and do not by themselves prove a specifically Palestinian Aramaic source.					

Mark	נפק, להון, מילתא, כד, לות, נפשיהון, גברין; ד־; ־ון and ־ין	Substantial Aramaic-compatible subsystem	Individual forms do not prove JPA	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	Strong localized Aramaic layer
Luke — Analysis. The available Luke material is predominantly later Hebrew, characterized by productive ־ש, analytical constructions, post-biblical vocabulary, and Hebrew verbal morphology. It also contains scattered Aramaic-compatible words, suffixes, and plurals, but the evidence currently available does not establish continuous Aramaic grammar. Luke is best described provisionally as a later Hebrew translation or adaptation with localized Aramaic influence.					
Luke	Scattered Aramaic-compatible words, suffixes, and plurals	Localized contact features	No continuous Aramaic grammar established	Later Hebrew; productive ־ש and analytical syntax	Later Hebrew adaptation with localized influence
John — Analysis. Cochin Hebrew John is principally Mishnaic and Rabbinic Hebrew with a strong, recurrent Aramaic layer. Its most important evidence consists of complete phrases such as בית ענייא, קרייא, דמתקרי תאמה, מה לן, לא הוה להם עון, בההוא יום, רב כהנא, and רציפתא דכפא, together with direct verbs such as ענא, הוה, אזל, and אתא; pronouns such as ליה, להון, and לן; productive ־ד; emphatic endings in ־א and ־תא; and numerous plurals in ־ין. John therefore differs from books containing only isolated Aramaisms: its Aramaic vocabulary, morphology, and syntax recur within a dominant later-Hebrew framework and are often compatible with Western or Palestinian Aramaic, although not every form is dialect-specific.					
John	Complete phrases; ענא, הוה, אזל, אתא; ליה, להון, לן; ד־; ־א/־תא; ־ין	Repeated Western/JPA-compatible vocabulary, morphology, and syntax	Not every form is dialect-specific	Mishnaic/Rabbinic Hebrew framework	Strong recurrent Aramaic layer
Acts — Analysis. The available Acts material is predominantly later or Rabbinic Hebrew and displays the analytical syntax, productive ־ש, and post-biblical vocabulary typical of the wider Cochin collection. Aramaic influence is visible in selected lexical forms, plurals, and constructions, but the present evidence does not demonstrate a continuous Aramaic narrative layer comparable to that found in John, Matthew, or parts of Mark. Acts should therefore be classified provisionally as later Hebrew with intermittent Aramaic contact.					

Acts	Selected lexical forms, plurals, and constructions	Intermittent contact evidence	No continuous narrative layer	Later/Rabbinic Hebrew	Later Hebrew with intermittent Aramaic contact
Romans — Analysis. The available Romans passages are written mainly in later Hebrew, with Mishnaic and Rabbinic constructions, analytical prepositional phrases, and Hebrew verbal morphology. Aramaic-compatible vocabulary and morphology occur sporadically, but there is not yet enough evidence to reconstruct a sustained Aramaic subsystem or assign the language to a particular Aramaic dialect. The text presently appears to be a later Hebrew translation with limited Semitic contact features.					
Romans	Sporadic Aramaic-compatible vocabulary and morphology	General contact compatibility only	Insufficient for subsystem or dialect assignment	Later Hebrew	Limited Semitic contact features
1 Corinthians — Analysis. The supplied portions are predominantly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew. Chapter 12 contains the clearest Aramaic evidence, including קודשא, direct הוה, possible ד־ morphology, and the lexical pair מפליג / הפלגה; Chapter 11:6, by contrast, is later Hebrew and adds no secure direct Aramaic form. The present evidence supports only a localized Aramaic layer within a later-Hebrew text, not continuous Aramaic grammar.					
1 Corinthians	קודשא, הוה, possible ד־, מפליג / הפלגה	Localized compatibility in Chapter 12	Chapter 11:6 adds no secure form	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	Localized Aramaic layer
2 Corinthians — Analysis. The confirmed Cochin text of 2 Corinthians 3:17 is predominantly later Hebrew, with unusual word order but Hebrew morphology: אדוני הוא היה רוח ובמקום של אדון חפשים יהיה. It contains analytical של and later-Hebrew syntax but no secure direct Aramaic form. The passage supplied as "2 Corinthians 14:34–35" corresponds instead to 1 Corinthians 14:34–35 and should not be used as evidence for 2 Corinthians unless its manuscript attribution is corrected.					
2 Corinthians	No secure direct Aramaic form	None established	Misattributed 14:34–35 must be corrected	Later Hebrew	No demonstrated Aramaic subsystem
Galatians — Analysis. The supplied passages are predominantly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew, using constructions such as חילופינו, and חסרי הדעת, מיהו, שהרי, לפני עינכם, של תורה. The citation formula כתיב in 3:13 is Aramaic-compatible and common in Rabbinic discourse, but it is not uniquely Aramaic or					

specifically Palestinian. Galatians therefore shows a later-Hebrew matrix with a limited shared Aramaic-Rabbinic citation layer.					
Galatians	כתיב citation formula	Shared Aramaic-Rabbinic discourse usage	Not uniquely Aramaic or JPA	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	Limited citation layer
Ephesians — Analysis. The supplied passages use a later-Hebrew matrix but preserve repeated Aramaic-compatible second-person plural morphology. The clearest examples are נפשיכון in 5:19 and ברגליכון in 6:15, both containing the suffix ־כון. These forms are strongly compatible with Aramaic, although they are not uniquely diagnostic of Palestinian Aramaic. Ephesians is therefore best described as later Hebrew with a small but clear Aramaic pronominal layer.					
Ephesians	נפשיכון; ברגליכון; suffix ־כון	Strong Aramaic compatibility	Not uniquely JPA	Later Hebrew	Small clear pronominal layer
Philippians — Analysis. Cochin Philippians 4:6–7 is predominantly later Hebrew, using analytical syntax, רק, כל עת, and ordinary Hebrew possessive suffixes in בקשתכם, תפילתכם, לבבכם, and מחשבותיכם. No secure direct Aramaic form appears in the supplied passage. The abbreviation ה׳ should be preserved as a manuscript feature, while its expansion as a particular divine name remains an editorial decision rather than a linguistic feature of the verse.					
Philippians	No secure direct form	None established	Preserve ה׳ without editorial expansion	Later Hebrew	No continuous Aramaic grammar
Colossians — Analysis. Cochin Colossians 3:16 is predominantly later Hebrew, with Hebrew possessive suffixes in בניכם, עצמיכם, and בלביכם, participles such as מוכיחים and מזמרים, and coordinated nouns such as שירות ותושבחות. No secure direct Aramaic form is present in the supplied verse. The form מזמרים means “singing” or “making music” and should not by itself be translated as “God-singing.”					
Colossians	No secure direct form	None established	Do not overinterpret מזמרים	Later Hebrew	No continuous Aramaic grammar
1 Thessalonians — Analysis. The supplied passages are written mainly in later Hebrew, but 1:2 contains the Aramaic-compatible pronominal form כולכן, with a second-person masculine plural suffix related to ־כון. This is meaningful contact evidence but is not uniquely Palestinian Aramaic. The remainder belongs to a later Hebrew matrix, with the precise sense of בלי תקומה still requiring manuscript and contextual review.					
1 Thessalonians	כולכן; suffix related to ־כון	Aramaic-compatible morphology	Not uniquely JPA; בלי	Later Hebrew	Limited pronominal

			תקומה uncertain		contact evidence
2 Thessalonians — Analysis. The supplied text of 2 Thessalonians 1:11 is predominantly later Hebrew, especially in repeated בשביל, כל עת, productive Hebrew ־ש, and Hebrew direct-object forms. No secure direct Aramaic word or construction is demonstrated. The passage is best classified as a later-Hebrew paraphrase with no presently identifiable continuous Aramaic layer.					
2 Thessalonians	No secure direct form	None established	Only one supplied verse	Later Hebrew paraphrase	No identifiable continuous layer
1 Timothy — Analysis. The supplied 1 Timothy 4:1 passage is strongly later Hebrew, using אבל, בפירוש, באחרית הימים, איזה אנשים, שיעברו על, and Hebrew plural forms such as המסיתים and השטנים. No secure direct Aramaic form appears in the excerpt. Its language is explicit, explanatory, and paraphrastic, consistent with a later translation register rather than an inherited Western Aramaic layer.					
1 Timothy	No secure direct form	None established	Single supplied passage	Strongly later Hebrew	Explanatory translation register
2 Timothy — Analysis. The supplied portions of 2 Timothy 1 use predominantly later Hebrew, including רק, בשביל זה, להיות, להעמים, אני יודע במה שאני מאמין, בטוח אני, and לעתיד. No secure direct Aramaic form is demonstrated. The divine-name abbreviation ה׳ should be retained as written and distinguished from editorial expansion. Linguistically, the passages resemble later explanatory Hebrew rather than the mixed Hebrew-Aramaic profile of John or Mark.					
2 Timothy	No secure direct form	None established	Retain ה׳ as manuscript abbreviation	Later explanatory Hebrew	No mixed subsystem demonstrated
Titus — Analysis. The supplied Titus 2 material is predominantly later or Mishnaic-style Hebrew and is often paraphrastic. The plural זקינין is Aramaic-compatible, but it is also available within Rabbinic Hebrew and is not sufficient to establish an Aramaic source. Expressions such as גם כן, כמו זה, לא ישתו, and כדי שלא, together with Hebrew pronominal morphology, define the dominant linguistic framework.					
Titus	זקינין	Aramaic-compatible shared morphology	Also available in Rabbinic Hebrew	Later/Mishnaic-style Hebrew	Paraphrastic; no source established
Philemon — Analysis. No sufficient Hebrew transcription from Philemon has yet been included in the comparative evidence. Its Hebrew and Aramaic profile therefore cannot presently be classified responsibly. Any conclusion should await a source-controlled transcription and comparison with the Cochin manuscript images.					

Philemon	No sufficient evidence	Not assessable	Source-controlled transcription required	Undetermined	Classification deferred
Hebrews — Analysis. The supplied Hebrews 6:6 passage is later or Mishnaic-style Hebrew with limited shared Aramaic-Rabbinic morphology. Forms such as חוזרין and תולים use masculine plurals in ־ין, but this ending occurs in both Aramaic and parts of Rabbinic Hebrew and is not uniquely diagnostic. The surrounding syntax is later Hebrew, so the passage does not demonstrate a continuous Aramaic clause.					
Hebrews	חוזרין, תולים; ־ין plurals	Shared Aramaic-Rabbinic morphology	Not uniquely diagnostic	Later/Mishnaic-style Hebrew	No continuous Aramaic clause
James — Analysis. The Cochin-Gaster text appears predominantly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew and is frequently paraphrastic, explanatory, and grammatically uneven. It contains Aramaic-compatible vocabulary and morphology, including shared ־ין endings and post-biblical constructions, but its primary structure remains Hebrew. James resembles Jude in its loose translation technique and later Hebrew register more than the stronger mixed Aramaic system found in John or Matthew.					
James	Shared ־ין endings and compatible vocabulary	Broad contact features	Primary structure remains Hebrew	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	Loose translation; no strong mixed system
1 Peter — Analysis. Chapters 1–3 are predominantly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew and contain extensive translation-language features, including בשביל, כדי ש־, באם ש־, עכשיו, כל עת, עולם הבא, על ידי, של, אצל, and אפילו. Forms such as מישו and scattered ־ין morphology are Aramaic-compatible, but no sustained direct Aramaic clause, productive emphatic-state system, or secure pronominal series has yet been demonstrated. The text suggests a mixed translation environment rather than organic Aramaic composition.					
1 Peter	מישו and scattered ־ין morphology	Mixed contact environment	No sustained clause or productive system	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	Mixed translation environment
2 Peter — Analysis. The supplied 2 Peter 2:5 passage is predominantly later Hebrew, using לא מרחם, שהיה מקדם, רק, שדרש, אנשי ביתו, and בשביל. It contains productive Hebrew ש־ and analytical syntax but no secure direct Aramaic form. The verse should therefore be treated as later-Hebrew evidence only until more of the book is transcribed.					

2 Peter	No secure direct form	None established	Only one verse supplied	Later Hebrew	Later-Hebrew evidence only
1 John — Analysis. The supplied material is predominantly later or Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew. Later-Hebrew features include באם ש־, שהמה, מאילו, בשביל, עכשיו, אינו, לא יש עון, כדי ליקח, שאנחנו, and איזה דבר. The isolated form קודשא in Gaster 4:3 is directly Aramaic, but the confirmed Cochin passages do not add a productive Aramaic grammatical system. The book is best described provisionally as later Hebrew with one isolated Aramaic lexical form.					
1 John	Isolated קודשא in Gaster 4:3	Limited lexical compatibility	No productive system in confirmed Cochin passages	Later/Mishnaic-Rabbinic Hebrew	One isolated Aramaic lexical form
2 John — Analysis. No sufficient source-controlled Hebrew transcription has yet been included. Its Hebrew-Aramaic profile cannot therefore be evaluated. Classification should be deferred until the Cochin or Gaster text is transcribed and checked against the manuscript image.					
2 John	No sufficient evidence	Not assessable	Transcription and image check required	Undetermined	Classification deferred
3 John — Analysis. No sufficient source-controlled Hebrew transcription has yet been included. Its linguistic register and any relationship to the Hebrew of 1 John remain undetermined. A manuscript-based transcription is needed before comparison with the other Johannine writings.					
3 John	No sufficient evidence	Not assessable	Manuscript-based transcription required	Undetermined	Classification deferred
Jude — Analysis. The Cochin-Gaster Jude is predominantly later, Mishnaic, or Rabbinic-style Hebrew, with a small Aramaic-derived lexical and morphological layer. Its clearest forms include איגרת, the discourse use of שוב, and possibly the finite ending in יחליקון. The text is highly paraphrastic and grammatically uneven, but mechanical reverse-translation of the Syriac Peshitta remains a hypothesis requiring direct verse-by-verse comparison; the Hebrew alone does not prove that source relationship.					
Jude	איגרת, discourse	Small shared lexical/morphological layer	Peshitta reverse-translation	Later/Mishnaic/Rabbinic-style Hebrew	Small Aramaic-derived layer

	שוב, possible יחליקון		remains unproven		
Revelation — Analysis. Cochin Hebrew Revelation displays a distinctive Hebrew profile characterized by biblical and post-biblical vocabulary, Hebrew wordplay, compressed clauses, and frequent omission of recoverable subjects or objects. Aramaic-compatible vocabulary and morphology occur, but Revelation does not consistently follow the same source behavior attributed to the Pastoral Epistles. Its language appears more independently Hebraized and internally Semitic than the strongly explanatory or paraphrastic Hebrew found in several shorter epistles.					
Revelation	Aramaic-compatible vocabulary and morphology	Internally Semitic contact profile	Does not consistently match Pastoral source behavior	Distinctive biblical and post-biblical Hebrew	Independently Hebraized profile
Pastoral Epistles — Comparative note. 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus differ from much of the collection. Their supplied passages show comparatively uniform later Hebrew—explanatory, institutional, morally instructional, and generally lacking the dense direct Aramaic verbs, pronouns, emphatic-state nouns, and phrase-level syntax found in John, Matthew, and parts of Mark. Their proposed sustained correspondence with the Eastern Syriac Peshitta requires full collation. They should be treated as a relatively coherent, potentially Peshitta-aligned later-Hebrew group, while the rest of the collection remains more heterogeneous.					
Preliminary source-controlled summary. John 1–2 are confirmed from the Cochin manuscript. Evidence from John 3 onward is retained only where it derives from the Gaster manuscript and is marked provisional pending validation against the Cochin manuscript.					

Evidence category	**Representative findings**	**Current assessment**
Phrase-level Aramaic	בית ענייא קרייא; דמתקרי תאמה; מה לן; לא הוה להם עון; בההוא יום; רב כהנא; רציפתא דכפא	Highest-value evidence because morphology and syntax extend beyond isolated words; strongly Aramaic and often compatible with Western Aramaic/JPA,

		though not uniformly exclusive to JPA.
Relative/genitive ד־	דמתקרי; דכפא possible דמרתה and דפרושים	Direct Aramaic phrase structure; probable readings remain subject to image verification where noted.
Direct Aramaic verbs	ענא, הוה, אזל, אתא, מתקרי	Secure or high-confidence lexical Aramaisms; recurrent … ענא ואמר forms a stable mixed narrative formula.
Aramaic pronouns and particles	ליה, להון, לן, לאו, הכי	Clear or strong Aramaic/Rabbinic forms; individually shared across dialects, cumulatively significant.
Emphatic-state morphology	Masculine א־: מילא, רוקא, קרייא, דינא, כהנא, צליבא; feminine תא־: רציפתא, גפיפתא, קרקפתא, גגלתא	Strong Aramaic morphology. Secure common nouns favor final aleph; John 19 adds a concentrated feminine תא־ group.
Masculine plural ין־	מקיימין, יודעין, יכולין, מכירין, מעידין, דינרין,	Extensive recurring morphology shared by

	משלכין, דינין, עתידין, מריבין	Aramaic and parts of Rabbinic Hebrew; not uniquely JPA.
Possible Aramaic-influenced syntax	Recurring verb + ל־ objects: מכיר לי, שומע לי, עבדו ליה, אוהבים לי, שונא לכם, שואל לי, תפשו לישו, היכה לישו	Systematic contact pattern that may reflect Aramaic verbal government, translation syntax, or a contact variety of later Hebrew.
Rabbinic Hebrew/Aramaic-compatible forms	יהא/תהא, פרקליט, שולטנות, אילו/אלו, pervasive ש־	Supports a post-biblical Hebrew linguistic setting but is not independently diagnostic of JPA.
Dominant Hebrew matrix	בשביל, לפי ש־, כדי ש־, כיון ש־, עתיד + infinitive, אצל, של, מאומה, אפילו, עדיין, אחד לאחד, בית הכנסת, בית הקברות	Shows that John is not continuous Aramaic; the base language is predominantly Mishnaic/Rabbinic Hebrew.
Pending validation	John 1–2: confirmed against the Cochin manuscript. John 3 onward: readings presently derived from	Only John 1–2 may currently be cited as manuscript-confirmed Cochin evidence. Findings from later chapters remain provisional

	the Gaster manuscript and requiring validation against the Cochin manuscript images. No Gaster-only reading should be presented as confirmed Cochin evidence.	Gaster-derived comparanda until the corresponding Cochin readings are checked and confirmed; unsupported or divergent Gaster readings are to be removed from the Cochin grid.