

those who can never die. Do we lack wisdom, or strength, for this high task and enterprise? Are we feeling at this moment how much we lack it? Let us ask it of God, then; and it shall be given us.

S. Cox.

### THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

#### INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION.

WE wish now to address ourselves definitely to the task of endeavouring to prove, as we have promised, that certain portions of the synoptic Gospels present indications of having been translated from a common Aramaic original. We have enumerated what seem to us the usual concomitants of translation work from a foreign source, when that source is known; and to guard ourselves from error we have illustrated each point from the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, as presented in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. But when we come to the converse case, of deciding whether the productions of some two or three men, which bear singular marks of resemblance, be really translation work, we find that the concomitants referred to are far from being equally useful. It would, for instance, be of very little value for our present undertaking were we to show that, in certain sections, the synoptists "agree in substance, but not in words"; for in describing an event in the life of our Lord, or reporting one of His discourses, that sort of agreement is precisely what we should expect if the Saviour spoke Greek, and the evangelists made no use of any common material. Similarly, if one were to endeavour to show that certain sections in the synoptists contain more Aramaisms than others, that might be serviceable in proving that the Gospels were

*compilations*, but it would go a very short way toward proving that those sections had been *translated* from the Aramaic; for the common source might, after all, have been composed in Greek, and the idioms might be due to the fact that the native tongue was more deeply ingrained in the constitution of that Jewish author than of some others. Before we reach *terra firma* we must pass on to indication No. IV.; namely, that in a text written without vowels, as all Semitic texts were in those days, the readers were liable to read different vowels into the same consonants. This liability to error may be illustrated from some of the systems of short-hand, where the vowels are not written, but have to be inserted by the reader. If we can succeed in showing, in several instances, that the divergent words in our Greek Gospels yield, when translated into Aramaic, precisely the same consonants, and that *the diverse vocalization of these same consonants yields the diverse meanings that are found in our present Gospels*, we venture to think that we shall be making out a strong case in support of our theory that in these passages the evangelists were translating from a common Aramaic original.

1. Our first illustration shall be of a simple character. In connexion with the cure of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue at Capernaum, his condition is described in variant, but precisely equivalent terms, thus :

Matt. xii. 10 : τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν.

Mark iii. 1 : ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

In Aramaic the difference between the adjective *ξηράν*, *dry*, and the participle *ἐξηραμμένην*, *dried, withered*, is simply that of the diverse vocalization of the text-word יָבִישׁ. If in perusing the MS. the reader pronounced the word יָבִישׁ, he would obtain the adjective *dry*, "aridus, siccus"<sup>1</sup>; a

<sup>1</sup> Permit me at the outset to express my indebtedness, in general and in particular, to the two invaluable lexicons, Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum*,

word which occurs in Ezekiel xxxvii. 2, "The bones were very *dry*." Whereas if he were to insert vowels thus: **יָבֵשׁ**, he would obtain the participle of the intransitive verb **יָבַשׁ**, which means to *become dry, be withered*, as in 1 Kings xiii. 4: **יָבֵשׁתָּ יָדוֹ**, "His (Jeroboam's) hand was dried up." We attach very little value however, for our present purpose, to instances of this kind, where the two divergent Greek words are from the same Greek root; the case will be incalculably stronger when we adduce words which in Greek have no apparent affinity, and show that these meanings belong to the same Aramaic text-word with different vowels attached.

2. A much more pertinent illustration is one which occurs in the parable of the sower, which as might have been anticipated, has proved to us quite a mine—the parable and its interpretation yielding no less than sixteen cases illustrative of our theory,<sup>1</sup> though most of them fall under indications V. and VI.

MATT. xiii. 4.	MARK iv. 4.	LUKE viii. 5.
ὃ μὲν ἔπασεν	ὃ μὲν ἔπασεν	ὃ μὲν ἔπασεν
παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν,
καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ καταπήθη,
τὰ πετεινά,	τὰ πετεινά,	καὶ τὰ πετεινά
		τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.	καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.	κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

The first two evangelists say, "There *came* the fowls and devoured it." Luke says, "It *was trodden down*, and the fowls devoured it." Why this diversity in so much similarity? It is evident that our Lord did not use *both* words;

*Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum*, edited and enlarged by Dr. B. Fischer (Leipzig, 1875); and Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (Leipzig, 1866). Both are indispensable, because arranged on different principles. In many respects I have also found useful a lexicon published at Padua in 1747, by A. Zanolini.

<sup>1</sup> It may here be stated that the sixty cases promised in January have already been more than doubled.

and even if we may shrink from pronouncing in most cases which evangelist gives our Lord's precise meaning, yet it will surely be an immense relief if we can see how the divergences arose. If now we turn to Buxtorf, we find a word ܦܦܦ, which means (1) *calcare, conculcare*, to tread upon, crush; (2) *ingredi, incedere*, to come in, to enter. Precisely the meanings we require. In the former sense it occurs in Deuteronomy xi. 24: "Every place whereon the sole of your foot shall *tread* shall be yours." In the second sense it occurs in Proverbs vi. 11: "Thy poverty shall come and enter (or, rush) in upon thee." So that if it can be admitted that the Saviour's words were written down in the Aramaic as they were spoken, the only difference between these two divergent Greek words is, that of reading different vowels into the same Aramaic text-word.

Matthew and Mark would yield: ܘܗܘܐ ܕܦܦܦ ܥܘܦܦܐ ܘܐܝܠ ܘܗܘܐ

Luke requires: ܘܗܘܐ ܕܦܦܦܐ ܘܥܘܦܦܐ ܐܝܠ ܘܗܘܐ

We may mention in passing (though the case belongs to VI.) how readily the difference between "root" and "moisture" is explained on our theory.

Matthew and Mark say: διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν " . . . no root."

Luke: διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα " . . . no moisture."

But the Aramaic word for "root" is (as in Hebrew) ܫܪܫ, while the word for "moisture," "succus, lachryma, humor arborum vel herbarum" is ܫܪܦ—a difference in one letter only.

3. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, among the things which, after the manner of thorns, choke the good seed, we find

Mark iv. 19: αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίας.

Luke viii. 14: ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου.

We wish now to show how closely these expressions, "desires for other things" and "pleasures of life," resemble

each other in Aramaic. But first we would direct attention to a fact which has escaped the notice of most of our lexicographers, that *βίος* in later Greek acquired the meaning of *luxurious life*, "fast life"; as when *we* say that a young man is anxious to go up to London to see "life." That this is so is evident from Hesychius, who in his lexicon defines *βίος* as (1) ζωή, (2) περιουσία; (1) life, (2) abundance or luxury; and as an instance of this meaning we may quote 1 John ii. 16, "The pride of life." I premise then that Luke's phrase, ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου, means pleasures of luxury, or, of the fast life. But if we turn to Buxtorf, we find a noun, מוֹתָר, which has precisely the meanings of περιουσία. Liddell and Scott define περιουσία as (1) residue, surplus; (2) abundance, luxury; and Buxtorf defines מוֹתָר as (1) "residuum, reliquum"; (2) "abundantia, emolumentum." As an instance of this, compare the Targum of Isaiah i. 9, "Unless the abundance of the goodness (מוֹתָר טוֹבִיָּה) of Jehovah had left us a remnant." There can be no doubt that we have there the Aramaic equivalent of the Pauline phrase, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος, "the riches of His goodness"; or, as Grimm suggests, "The abundance or plenitude of His goodness." That the leanings of the word are to the side of "superabundance" is clear from the fact that its cognates denote "redundance, prodigality." The word מוֹתָר means then (1) "reliquum"; but that is precisely equivalent to τὰ λοιπά in Mark's Gospel; (2) "abundantia," which is exactly βίος in its secondary sense as περιουσία. So that if מוֹתָר occurred in an Aramaic text, there would be a reasonable doubt whether it should be rendered "other things," or "abundance," "luxury." By the way, would not the rendering of Psalm xvii. 14 be much improved if it were conceded that the Hebrew word יִתָּר would have the same natural history as its cognate in Aramaic, and mean (1) residue, (2) surplus, wealth, luxury, and we were to ren-

der: "They leave their superabundance, their extravagant wealth, to their babes"? Aquila in this passage renders  $\text{תַּרְּ} \text{περιουσία}$ .

Further, we have the homologue  $\eta\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}$  and  $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\iota\alpha\iota$ . These are, in Latin, the *desiderabilia* and the *desideria*, the "desirable things" and the "desires" of life; and from the verb  $\text{רָגַג}$ , to "seek, desire, long for," we obtain (1)  $\text{רָגַגְנָא}$ , that for which one longs, *pleasure*, *delight*—as when the Lord said to Ezekiel (xxiv. 16), "Behold, I take away the *delight* of thine eyes with a stroke"; and (2)  $\text{רָגַגְנָא}$  or  $\text{רָגַגְנָא}$ , *desire*, *craving*—as in Job xxxi. 35, "My *desire* is that God would answer me," and Deuteronomy xii. 20, "Thou mayest eat after all the desire of thy soul." So that the difference between these two phrases is very slight.

The pleasures of luxury =  $\text{רָגַגְנָא דְּמִוְחָר}$ .

The desires for other things =  $\text{רָגַגְנָא דְּמִוְחָר}$ .

4. Our next two illustrations shall be taken from the narrative of the healing of the lunatic boy, after our Lord descended from the mount of transfiguration. We have in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke two phrases which no harmonist has ventured to consider equivalent, and yet they yield most clearly to the solution we apply.

Luke ix. 39:  $\text{Καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντριβὸν αὐτόν}$ .

And it hardly departeth from him, sorely-bruising him.

Mark ix. 18:  $\text{Καὶ τρίξει τοὺς ὀδόντας, καὶ ξηραίνεται}$ .

And he grindeth his teeth, and pineth away.

The words which illustrate our present point are  $\text{Συντριβὸν}$  and  $\text{ξηραίνεται}$ , but the rest shall receive our attention. There is an Aramaic verb,  $\text{פָּרַךְ}$ , which means (1) to dry up, parch, fry; (2) to crumble, crush, break in pieces. But these are just the two meanings desiderated.  $\text{Συντριβὼ}$ , to shatter, smash, bruise, gives the second meaning of  $\text{פָּרַךְ}$ ; and  $\text{ξηραίνεται}$ , withers, is dried, parched,

corresponds to the first meaning in the passive, as, *e.g.*, in Lamentation iv. 8, "Their skin cleaveth to their bone; it has become withered, פְּרִיךְ, like a stick."

Thus συντριβον is פְּרִיךְ, active participle Peal;

ξηραίνεται is פְּרִיךְ, passive participle Peal.

And the rest of the words are almost equally alike when reduced to Aramaic. The Aramaic and Hebrew word for "grinding" the teeth is חֲרַק, and the word to "depart from, flee from," is עָרַק. I shall presently adduce evidence to show that the *Logia* was a Galilæan document, and it is well known that both Galilæans and Samaritans were very negligent in the pronunciation of gutturals; indeed in the Samaritan Targum the same words are spelt with ח or ע indifferently: so that the difference between חֲרַק and עָרַק is of the slightest possible kind. Then μόγισ, "with labour," "with difficulty," is בְּעֵינַי; for עֵינַי, according to Buxtorf, means (1) "negotium," business, and (2) "molestia," annoyance. And "with the teeth" (for חֲרַק is followed by בְּ), is בְּשֵׁנַי. Therefore, neglecting the pronouns, which are always more or less at the option of the translator, the difference between these apparently incompatible phrases is simply this:

Luke ix. 39: וּבְעֵינַי עָרַק פְּרִיךְ.

Mark ix. 18: וּבְשֵׁנַי חֲרַק פְּרִיךְ.

5. There is another couplet in the same narrative which admits of a similar explanation:

MARK ix. 20.

καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν  
καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν,  
τὸ πνεῦμα  
ἔσπαράξεν αὐτόν.

LUKE ix. 42.

ἔτι δὲ προσερχόμενον αὐτοῦ  
ἔρρηξεν αὐτόν  
τὸ δαιμόνιον,  
καὶ συνεσπάραξεν.

The two words which we wish to identify are ἰδὼν, "when he saw," and ἔρρηξεν, "he broke," or "tore." In an unvocalized Aramaic text these words would be undis-

tinguishable. ἔρρηξεν is קרַיִן, 3 s. pret. Aphel of קרַן, to crush, break, bruise: and ἰδών, or rather εἶδεν, is קרַיִן, 3 s. pret. Aphel of קרַן, to gaze at, stare at. Could any one wish for a better explanation of the divergence than that the word קרַיִן in our hypothetical Aramaic document was by one reader pronounced קרַיִן, "he tore," or "bruised him," and by the other קרַיִן, "he gazed at him"? He who assents to this will raise no objection to me if I maintain that the difference between ἤνεγκαν αὐτόν, "they brought him," and προσερχόμενον αὐτοῦ, "he came near," has arisen from the confusion of the Peal קרַב, to come near, with the Pael קרַב, to bring near.

6. We will now turn to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the well-known variation in giving the words of our Lord:

Matt. v. 48: Be ye perfect, τέλειοι, as, etc.

Luke vi. 36: Be ye compassionate, οἰκτίρμονες, as, etc.

I would suggest that the one word which was used by our Lord was some form of קסל, which means (1) to bring to an end, "ad finem et complementum perducere," and (2) to nurse, foster, bring to maturity, wean. So that קסיל, perfected, completed—the passive participle—is the equivalent of τέλειος; and קסיל, the active participle, may well be rendered by οἰκτίρμων, as denoting the compassionate mother-love manifested to the suckling-child. The noun קסיל occurs in the Targum of Psalm ciii. 2 in the rendering of "forget not all His *benefits*." Buxtorf would translate קסיל "beneficia," kindnesses; but Levy insists on a stronger meaning, "Nahrungszustand, Nahrungsweise, besonders vom Kinde an der Mutterbrust." So that, according to Levy, the Targum means, "Forget not thy motherly manner of nourishment by God,"—how God nourishes thee with a mother's love. The reader who can endorse this, and will read into the context of both New



Testament passages the word לִיָּקָה, with its tender association of the maturing, fostering care of mother-love, will, we venture to think, begin to realize what a priceless treasure we shall possess if we can re-discover the Aramaic Gospel.

7. And now we will turn to the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac, which yields abundant evidence of having formed part of the primitive Gospel.

MARK v. 16.	LUKE viii. 36.
καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς	ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς
οἱ ἰδόντες,	οἱ ἰδόντες,
πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ,	πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς.
καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων.	καὶ τὸ τῆς περιχώρου
καὶ ἤρξαντο	ἅπαν πλῆθος
παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν	ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν
ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὄριων αὐτῶν.	ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

It will be noted that I have slightly altered the *order* of the words in our Greek Gospels, so as to place the phrases which seem to me to be homologous on the same line; but this I must in all cases claim the privilege to do. There is certainly abundance of diversity in these parallel columns, and it must surely be admitted as a strong argument, if we can show that *each line* can be reduced to the same or closely similar letters as written in an Aramaic document.

The words which more immediately concern us are *χοίρων*, "swine," and *περιχώρου*, "neighbourhood." The same Aramaic text-word differently vocalized would yield both these meanings. The first is ܢܚܝܩܐ; the second ܢܚܝܩܐ. If, as is probable, the letters ܝ and ܘ, which are called "matres lectionis," were inserted very sparingly in ancient Semitic writing, we then have ܢܚܝܩܐ as the one word, meaning, according to the vowels inserted, "swine" or "neighbourhood."

As to the other homologues, we will take them in order. We have first *διηγήσαντο* and *ἀπήγγειλαν*, the very two

verbs which (as we showed last month) are used by the LXX. and Hebrews ii. 12 respectively in their rendering of Psalm xxii. 23 (22), "I will *declare*, אֶסְפְּרָא, Thy name unto my brethren." This shows how feasible our theory really is. We *know* that διηγῆσομαι and ἀπαγγελάω are variant renderings of the one Hebrew word אֶסְפְּרָא. All we maintain is, that διηγῆσαντο and ἀπήγγειλαν in the Gospels are also variant renderings of the Aramaic word ܩܝܢܝܢܐ, which verb is the equivalent of אֶסְפְּרָא, and is indeed used for it in the Targum of the passage referred to.

The next pair of words is ἐγένετο and ἐσώθη. Mark: "How it *happened* to the demoniac"; Luke: "How the demoniac *was saved*." The identification which I have here to offer does not quite satisfy me. We have the word ܦܠܬܐ, which means (1) to turn out, eject, vomit; and (2) intransitively, to be freed, rescued, escape, "liberari, eripi, evadere." This of course suits well ἐσώθη, "was saved"; but can ܦܠܬܐ mean also to *be fall, happen*? I cannot find that it does. It would be *natural* for it to do so. The Latin verbs *evenire* and *evadere* mean (1) to go out, (2) to befall. Our word "turn out" is also used in the sense of "befall." Possibly in the vernacular therefore the word ܦܠܬܐ took the same course as the Latin *evadere*.

The next couplet is ἤρξαντο, "they began," and πλῆθος, multitude. This divergence seems to me to have arisen from the confusion of two similar words (1) ܫܪܝܘܢܐ or ܫܪܝܐܢܐ, Pt. Pael of ܫܪܝܢܐ, to begin: and (2) ܫܪܝܐܢܐ, a company, caravan; which meaning would suit well the company of swineherds referred to.

The identification of παρακαλεῖν and ἐρωτᾶν is very clear. These are simply variant translations of the one word ܩܘܪܝܢܐ, which means "quærere, petere, rogare, orare, obsecrare"; that is, (1) to ask, (2) to beseech. Almost equally evident is the cause of the variation in ἀπ' αὐτῶν, "from them," and ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν, "from their coasts." In Ara-

maic the difference is merely that of one letter. There is a word, **בַּר, בְּרָא**, which means the *open country*, the district *outside* the customary haunts of men. Then **מִבְּרָא** as an adverb and preposition means "*outside*," "*aloof from*." But there is also a word **בְּרִיא**, a boundary, border, coast; so that the solution is to be sought in the confusion of these two similar words.

8. Our last illustration shall be drawn from the account of the lowering of the paralytic through the roof. This event is narrated with numerous divergences in each of the three synoptists, and it must surely be good news to the perplexed Bible student to be assured that these verbal divergences might arise in the simplest way in the process of translating from an Aramaic document, if he will only concede the existence of such a document, and that it was used by each of the three evangelists.

We would first speak of the divergent phrases :

Matt. ix 2: ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον, lying on a bed.

Mark ii. 3: αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων, carried by four.

No one feels these expressions incompatible, but would any one suppose that these two phrases might with equal correctness be the rendering of the same Aramaic letters when unvocalized? If this can be shown, will it not materially strengthen our position? Let us examine the point. The Aramaic word for "four" is **אַרְבַּעָה**; but one of the synonyms for "bed" is **אַרְבַּעָה**, strictly, that on which one stretches oneself, lies down at full length, a bed; or rather, may we not say a *stretcher*? So that apart from the context, the consonants **אַרְבַּעָה** may with equal propriety be rendered "four" or "bed."

Then as to the words *βεβλημένον* (passive participle of *βάλλω*, to throw; passive, to be thrown down, to lie prostrate) and *αἰρόμενον* (passive participle of *αἶρω*, to carry), these meanings both belong to one word in Aramaic;

*viz.* טַלְטַל, Palpel participle of טוּל. The meanings of טַלְטַל given by Buxtorf are (1) “ejicere, projicere,” to *throw out, throw down, cast forth*; and (2) “portare, transportare,” to *carry, remove*. In the former of these two meanings it occurs both in the Hebrew and Targum of Isaiah xxii. 17: “Behold, Jehovah will throw thee down (as) with the throwing of a man.” But what is more to our present purpose, the verb is (like βάλλω) used in the passive of *lying prostrate*, through sickness or in sleep; especially is the Hophal used in this sense in rabbinic literature. The Targums usually prefer the passive of רָמַא, which is the equivalent of טוּל. But, as we have said, טַלְטַל also means to carry, to carry to and fro, to cause to wander, banish; *e.g.* 2 Samuel xv. 20, where David says to Ittai the Gittite, “Should I cause thee to wander to and fro (Revised Version, ‘up and down’) with us?” The passive of this, the Ithpalpel, would mean “to be carried to and fro, up and down,” and thus the passive participle מְטַלְטַל might mean either, “being thrown down, lying prostrate,” βεβλημένον, or “being carried to and fro,” αἰρόμενον. And as for the prepositions ἐπὶ and ὑπὸ, it is probable that they represent גַּב, which means (1) upon; (2) with, near, beside. If, as is likely, the man was carried on the shoulders of the bearers, the word גַּב, in the sense of “upon,” would correctly represent both the ἐπὶ and the ὑπὸ. So that the Aramaic words, of which the renderings of Matthew and Mark are a possible translation, are

מְטַלְטַל גַּב אַרְבַּעַה

9. If we turn to the Gospel of Luke, we find that the corresponding clause is: “They sought to bring him in, and to place him before Him.” Can it be shown that this is a free translation of the above Aramaic words? We think so. If we vocalize the participle actively, as Palpel, thus, מְטַלְטַל, we obtain the meaning, “Carrying him up

and down, hither and thither." The Palpel form is always indicative of rapid movement, excited effort; and if any one wished to represent freely and graphically the Palpel significance of the verb, and the way in which the weary but resolute bearers went hither and thither around the rim of the crowd to find access to the Saviour, he could not use more suitable words than those of Luke, "seeking to bring him in."

But what about the word ארבעה? We have shown that, variously vocalized, it may mean "four" or "a stretcher"; can it also yield Luke's rendering, *θεῖναι αὐτόν*, "to place him"? It can and does. The word *θεῖναι* is infinitive, and the Aphel inf. of רבע is אַרְבַּעָא. Add the 3rd sing. suffix, and we obtain אַרְבַּעִיתָהּ or אַרְבַּעִיָהּ. But רבע means to stretch, to lie at full length, and the Aphel means, to cause to lie, to lay, to place in a recumbent position. In the legend given in the Targum of Jonathan as to the burial of Moses, we are told that Michael and Gabriel spread forth the golden bier set with precious stones, and hung with purple silk, and that Metatron and other sages *laid him upon it*, אַרְבַּעוּן יָתִיבָהּ עָלֶיהָ. Similar as to posture, but widely different in other respects, is the force of the word in Deuteronomy xxv. 2 (Jonathan): "The judge shall *cause him to lie down*, יַרְבַּעֵנִיָהּ, and they shall scourge him (the convicted criminal) in his presence." So that ארבעה, if vocalized as Aphel inf., means "to lay him down or place him"; *θεῖναι αὐτόν*. And as for Luke's words *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, we have that in נִבְיָהּ, near him, beside him. So that we arrive at the remarkable conclusion that the three diverse phrases in the several Gospels might all be derived from the same three Aramaic words, with the solitary exception of one letter, נבה for נב. So that the words in Luke are a free translation of

כַּטְלִיטַל וְנִבְיָהּ אַרְבַּעִיָהּ

10. The details of lowering the man through the roof are given in Mark and Luke: not in Matthew. Let us examine them.

MARK ii. 4.

καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι  
προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ  
διὰ τὸν ὄχλον  
ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην  
οἴου ἦν,  
καὶ ἐξορύξαντες  
χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον  
ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

LUKE v. 19.

καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες διὰ ποίας  
εἰσενέγκωσι αὐτὸν,  
διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,  
ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα  
διὰ  
τῶν κεράμων  
καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλιιδίῳ.

The words which illustrate our present point are in the fourth line ἀπεστέγασαν, "they removed, uncovered," and ἀναβάντες, they went up. The Aramaic equivalent for the Hebrew הָלַע, to go up, is קָלַע, but the Pael קָלַע means to cause to go up, to raise, to lift and carry off. So that the difference between Mark and Luke is merely that of attaching different vowels to סלקו: סלקו = they went up; קלקו = they removed.

But what of the corresponding words "house" and "roof"? Do these yield to our solution? Most readily, if all will now admit that those scholars were right who have maintained that the house in question was a peasant's house: for the word for cottage or hut, "tugurium," "Hütte," is כְּטִלְלָא; while the word for roof is כְּטִלְלָא. According to Dr. Thomson, the houses in that part of the country now are very low, with flat roofs, reached by a stairway from the yard or court. The roof consists of beams about three feet apart, across which short sticks are arranged close together and covered with thickly matted thorn-bush, over which is spread a coat of stiff mortar, and on that the marl or earth that forms the roof. Such a lightly built dwelling might well be called כְּטִלְלָא, for in the Targums this word is used, e.g. Isaiah i. 8, "as a

cottage in a vineyard"; Leviticus xxiii. 42, of the *booths* in which the Israelites dwelt during the Feast of Tabernacles; and Genesis xxxiii. 17, of the booths which Jacob made for his cattle at Succoth. Thus the difference between "roof" and "cottage" is one letter only.

The reader will doubtless be glad to know what light the primitive Gospel has to throw on the two expressions which have puzzled New Testament scholars so long. Luke says, *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*, "through the tiles," which seems to imply that the roof was tiled; whereas Mark's word, *ἐξορύξαντες*, "digging out," seems to imply a roof made of mud and lime of the sort described by Dr. Thomson. Are the words for "tiles" and "digging out" at all alike in Aramaic, so as easily to be confused? They are. The word for "digging," plural participle, would be *חפרין*; *פחרין* would be "tiles"; so that the transposition of two letters in an Aramaic text explains the entire mystery. If the reader will turn to our harmony, he will see *ἔπου ἦν*, "where he was," and *διὰ*, "through," standing on the same line. One Aramaic word for "through" is *בגו*, which also means "in the midst," and thus may very well have stood as the original of *ἔπου ἦν*, "where he was."

The description of the process as given by the two evangelists, diverse as it seems to us, may therefore be reduced to what is virtually the same Aramaic text with various readings.

MARK II. 4.

סלקו שללתא  
בגו וחפרין  
אחתו ארבעה  
דעלוי משרי רביע

LUKE V. 19.

סלקו למשללתא  
ובגו פחרין  
אחתונה וארבעה

Thus much, then, as to the divergences which we think have arisen from inserting different vowels in the same Aramaic text-word. In our next article we hope to adduce

instances in which the divergence seems to have arisen from the fact that the common Aramaic word has two meanings, each of which is adopted by the several evangelists.

J. T. MARSHALL.

### THE HOUSE OF GETHSEMANE.

AFTER having passed through twenty-five editions, the translation of the Holy Gospels which bears the name of M. Henri Lasserre has been condemned by the Congregation of the Index. Our Lady of Lourdes, invoked by the translator, has not succeeded in warding off the Roman thunderbolt; but the noise made by it was enough to call the attention of Protestants to a remarkable work which deserves careful study. Thanks to their new interpreter, the Evangelists speak the lively and forcible language of the present day; the style is modernized. The innovations are often characterized by elegant precision and scrupulous exactitude.

Our present purpose is only to bring forward a single detail: the expression *villa*, as applied to the garden of Gethsemane. In Matthew xxvi. 36, the version of M. Lasserre reads: "Jesus and His disciples entered into a villa named Gethsemani."

*Villa* is a term which M. Lasserre has taken as he found it in the text of the Vulgate. It appears in the dictionary of the French Academy as a synonym for country seat; but, in Latin, *villa* meant rather a country house, such as in Switzerland would be called a "campagne," without the notion of grandeur which attaches to the term country seat.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in the parallel passage, Mark xiv. 32, the

<sup>1</sup> The Latin word *villa* was Italian before it passed into modern languages. According to the last edition of the dictionary of the French Academy, the word may be used in a more general sense for a simple country house. The