

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

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.¹ Moreover, in the parallel passage, Mark xiv. 32, the

¹ 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

Vulgate has the word *prædium*, which more distinctly implies an agricultural tenure.

The Greek uses the term *khorion*, for which Grimm's *Clavis* gives precisely *prædium, villa*, in Acts xxviii. 7.¹

This translation seems to be necessary in the last mentioned passage. The received French versions render it: "Near to this place there were the lands of one named Publius, who was the chief person of the island," that is, the island of Malta. The expression "the lands" has been changed with advantage in the version of Rilliet into "the possessions." A provisional refuge was wanted for 276 wrecked persons; and their need was the more urgent as it was already the beginning of the bad season. Publius offered them, not lands, but farm buildings, which furnished them shelter during three months of winter.

It seems to us that the sense of *domain* would be near the mark in all the passages where Grimm renders *khorion* by *ager* and *fundus*, i.e. field, land. Jacob gave to his son Joseph a close, a rural property, not an open and undistinguished parcel of ground. Judas bought with the price of his crime a definite property, planted with trees, and situated near to Jerusalem.² Some of the Christians

definitions of Littré are a little different: 1. *Maison de plaisance* in the neighbourhood of the towns of Italy (Chateaubriand, Mme de Staël). 2. By extension it is used now all over Europe for an elegant country house newly built and of less pretension than a *château*.

¹ *Khorion* (χωριον) in the LXX designates sometimes a vineyard, sometimes a stronghold. Rural estates were often surrounded with high walls and provided with a tower (Isa. v. 2; Mark xii. 1; Luke xiv. 28). The Hebrew New Testament of the celebrated Delitzsch translates *khorion* (χωριον) by *chatzer*, חֲצֵר, a fortified inclosure. That of Salkinson, edited by Dr. Ginsburg, has *mekom gader*, מְקוֹם גָּדֵר, a fortified place. The Hebrew word for garden (*kepos*, κήπος, John xviii. 1, 26) is *gan*, גַּן, from the verb *ganan*, גָּנַן, to protect. A "garden" therefore implies private property, needing special permission for a stranger to enter.

² Thirty pieces of silver were the price of a slave (Exod. xxi. 32, Zech. xi. 12). This sum may have completed the amount of capital amassed by Judas, partly by his robbery of the common purse (John xii. 6), with a view to his purchase. It would seem that although Judas had *bought* the field (Acts. i. 18) he had not

of the primitive Church sold town houses, some country houses, to put their value into the hands of the Apostles. The property sold by Ananias and Sapphira is called also *ktēma*, a country property, a rural domain. In any case Grimm, Schleusner, and Wahl agree in avoiding the indefinite expression "place" which appears in the French received versions, a faulty expression, since *khōrion* in the New Testament has never the vague meaning of *topos*, place, spot. Luther, Lange, and Meyer have translated *khōrion* by *Vorwerk*, *Hof*, *Landgut*, *Meierei*, indicating the meaning for which we contend. De Wette translates it by *Gut*, another synonymous word. Maldonat and Grotius speak of a *house* at Gethsemane. For once at least the Vulgate is found to be right, in opposition to the French Protestant versions.¹

The translation "country house" once admitted, one of the greatest difficulties of the Gospel of Mark vanishes. With what object does this Gospel mention, on the occasion of the arrest of Jesus at Gethsemane, a young man who, "having a linen cloth cast about his naked body," abandons that strange garment to the companions of Judas when they endeavour to seize him? (Mark xiv. 50, 51.) It has been thought that the young man was no other than the Evangelist Mark, he being the only one who reports the episode, which thus appears to have an autobiographic

paid for it, as we are told (Matt. xxvii. 3-10) that he returned the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests, and that they afterwards completed the purchase of the Potter's Field.

¹ It is a curious fact that the French Roman Catholic versions have for centuries adopted the error on this point of the Protestant versions; but the Abbé Glairé (1863) translated the word "country house."

Another Roman Catholic author, the Abbé Michon, in his *Life of Jesus* (vol. ii., p. 45), states that "enormous olive trees, one of which is dying of old age, occupy the angle formed by the road to Bethany and the road leading to the top of the Mount of Olives. Here was the garden or inclosure. The dwelling house to which it belonged was probably somewhat higher on the slope of the hill." Any objection which might be raised in respect to the position as unsuitable for a villa, because low down in a narrow valley, is thus obviated.

character. So be it; but yet, why that peculiar costume? And what could be the use of a statement which, according to the celebrated commentator Meyer, seems to be purposeless? "That remains altogether unexplained," says the well known evangelical commentator, M. Louis Bonnet. Many persons have seen in the hero of this incident a mere looker on, or else an eccentric individual befooled by fright; but had it been curiosity or folly, the incident hardly merited the honour of narration.

In order, if possible, to solve this enigma, we have a preliminary remark to make. The "linen cloth" was simply a sheet.¹ Let us add that the Greek term *sindon*, in Sanskrit *sindhu*, in Hebrew סִדְוֹן *sadin*, refers to a tissue of great value. The vegetable product which was used in its manufacture was imported from India or Egypt. This furnishes an indication of considerable importance: the sheet of fine linen is, so to speak, marked with the name of the rich heir presumptive of the "villa."

The book of the Acts seems to confirm this supposition. We read there that John, surnamed Mark, had a mother called Mary, whose house, necessarily large and probably retired, served as a meeting-place for the persecuted members of the primitive Church.² There is a tradition that in this house took place the miracle of the first Christian Pentecost. When Peter is delivered from prison, he at once repairs to this dwelling, where "many were gathered together praying" (Acts xii. 12). Peter knocks, not ex-

¹ Eusebius the historian, in an enumeration, associates the *sindonai* (*σινδῶναι*) with beds and bed-coverings, *klinai kai strōmnai* (*κλιναι καὶ στρωματῶν*).

² Acts xii. 12-17. According to M. Reuss, the Mark of the Acts and Epistles is "without the least doubt" the person who passes for the author of our second Gospel.—*Histoire Apostolique*, p. 138. "The house of Mary, mother of John Mark, was the ordinary and hospitable retreat of the Apostles when they were at Jerusalem (*vide* Cornel and Fromond, *hic*). Thither they retired after the Saviour's ascension; there they elected St. Matthias, and there they received the Holy Ghost. Some believe that it was in this house that our Lord was accustomed to lodge when at Jerusalem (Alex. Menoch, *Apud Sur. xi. Jun.*)."—Dom Calmet, *Commentary*, ad locum.

actly at the door of a house, but at the door of a gateway, *ten thuran tou pulónos*, which in Switzerland is equivalent to the "portail d'une campagne." This door opening in an outer wall or in a palisade, and separated from the house by an open space called *aule*, is the usual characteristic of a villa as distinguished from a town house. Rhoda, the door-keeper, who comes to answer the knock, returns running, *eisdramousa*, which supposes the gateway to be at a short distance from the house.¹ According to M. Bonnet, Peter probably knocked "at the door of the courtyard, or at a small door opening in the carriage gate." There is reference to another *pulon* connected with the residence of Annas and his son-in-law the high priest Caiaphas. Precisely at this epoch, according to a statement of the Talmud, the Sanhedrin had removed the place of its sittings to the *hanuioth* or bazaars of the Mount of Olives, the private property of the family of Annas. There was therefore at least one other "villa" in the outskirts of Jerusalem, not far from Gethsemane, the residence of the very highest family among the Jews. This shows the aristocratic character of the neighbourhood. "It was there probably that Jesus was taken and judged," says M. Sabatier in the *Encyclopædia of Religious Sciences*. Peter, leaving the court and passing through the vestibule, proceeds towards the *pulon*, or gate, when a second servant denounces him.²

¹ "Around and outside of the square formed by the portico there was a sort of front court, inclosed by a wall" (Stapfer, *Palestine*, p. 172). This wall made necessary the outer gate of which we speak. Within a city, the *pulón* (πυλῶν) was a portico, the ornament of princely residences. Such a luxury would be very rare *inside* a fortified and compact city such as Jerusalem.

² Matt. xxvi. 57-75; comp. Mark xiv. 66-68; *aule* (αὐλή) and *proaulion* (προαύλιον). According to the historian Josephus, the suburbs of the city were covered with parks and gardens (*paradeisois*, παράδεισους).—*Wars*, vi. 1, 1; cf. v. 3, 2. Titus, says Josephus, caused all these trees to be cut down for strategic purposes. The houses of the estates were entirely destroyed, and the materials served either to fill up the moats round the city or to raise platforms for the besiegers. This accounts for the fact that no remains of the house of Gethsemane now exist.

Our conclusion may now be perceived. Gethsemane was the name of a country house situated to the east of Jerusalem, on the other side of the Kedron, on the slope of the Mount of Olives, over against the Temple, and at a distance of less than a mile from the wall of the city. In the inclosure there was a plantation of olives, called *kepos*, orchard, in the Gospel of John, and an oil-press, in Aramæan, *Gethshemaneî*. The press had given its name to the whole estate.¹ This estate belonged to a rich dowager: Mary, mother of John whose surname was Mark.² The mention of the son to the exclusion of the husband, seems to indicate a widow. The mother and son together inhabited this residence. The prophet of Nazareth being a stranger in Jerusalem, Mary seems to have offered Him a shelter at Gethsemane. The door-keeper, perhaps that same Rhoda, or Rose, who later on came to answer Peter's knock, had received instructions to open the gate at any time, either to the Master or to His Apostles. Jesus often passed the night at this retreat. Luke tells us that He habitually retired in the evening to the Mount of Olives.³ But to what part of it? It was in the early days of April, or, according to other calculations, the beginning of March; it is scarcely to be supposed that at such a season of the year Jesus and His

¹ There still exists a clump of seven olive trees, at the place which bears the name of *Djesmaniggé*. Riehm concludes in favour of the authenticity of the tradition relating to this spot. The actual inclosure, however, can only be a portion of the ancient estate.

² In accordance with a custom still subsisting among the modern Israelites, Mark had two names. He was known at Jerusalem under that of John. Mark was a surname of Roman origin, which might be used in preference in relations with non-Jews. It is possible that the father of Mark was a Roman proselyte who had married a Jewess. Saul of Tarsus took the name Paul soon after the beginning of his missionary travels in heathen lands (Acts xiii. 9). Like Mark, he may have had this name given him by his parents long before he substituted it for that of the Benjamite king.

³ Luke xxi. 37, 38; xxii. 39, 40. Comp. John viii. 1; xviii. 2. The verb *aulizomai* (*αὐλιζομαι*) does not necessarily signify to bivouac, or pass the night in the open air; in Matt. xxi. 17, it is used in speaking of the hospitality received by Jesus at Bethany in the house of Lazarus and his two sisters.

disciples would sleep in the open air. On the occasion of His last visit to Gethsemane, Jesus said to eight of His Apostles, "Sit ye here." The weather was cold.¹ Peter is shortly afterwards seen elsewhere suffering so much from cold as to approach a fire at the risk of being seized and condemned to death like his Master. "Sit ye here," seems to imply a place where the hours of the night might be passed without inconvenience; it might be a building separate from the house itself.² Jesus, Peter, James, and John remained in the garden, to "watch and pray."

Judas, the treasurer of the apostolic company, may have founded his plan of treason upon this combination of circumstances. If Jesus had been in the habit of passing His nights in the open country, the intervention of Judas would scarcely have been needed. The Pharisees, who were miserly, could very well have dispensed with a somewhat large outlay. Any police agent could easily have followed the track of the Teacher of Nazareth and seized Him; but to violate a private domicile was a much more difficult affair, and the more so as Jesus had devoted partisans who would have helped to defend the gate.³ An attempt to force an entrance might have provoked a riot, or even a revolution. By paying a traitor, this uproar was avoided. Knowing the retreat of Jesus and the means of introducing himself, Judas conducted thither a band composed of a detachment from the Roman garrison under the command of a tribune, with guards of the Temple, armed with their official staves. According to our hypothesis, the

¹ John xviii. 18, "It was cold."

² Dr. Edersheim supposes that it was the building in which was the oil-press. *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., p. 538. Olshausen says: "The disciples perhaps entered the house of the proprietor, who was one of their friends."—*History of the Passion*, ad locum.

³ Many of the Galilæans who had cried Hosannah on the Day of Palms. The gardens near Jerusalem (κῆποι) were fortified by walls and moats; Titus nearly lost his life there.—Josephus, *Wars*, v. 2, 2.

Iscariot disposes this troop out of sight and then knocks at the "door of the gate," pronounces the password, and gets it opened. The soldiers and guards at once light their torches and lanterns, draw their swords, and press into the inclosure. Judas, going before them,¹ leads them to Jesus, who is already coming to meet him.

It was between eleven o'clock and midnight. The clatter of arms, the voices of the invaders, the shining of the torches awaken Mary and her son, who are surprised that it should have been possible thus to enter their premises in spite of the vigilance of the guardians. Without waiting to dress, Mark covers himself with a sheet from his bed and proceeds towards the troop. He sees that Jesus is being taken away. Strong in the sense of his proprietary rights, and therefore more courageous than the Apostles, who have abandoned their Master, he does not at first allow himself to be intimidated. Did he mean to intervene and to protest against this clandestine arrest? It is possible, and even probable. Be that as it may, he gives to Jesus a supreme mark of sympathy. He boldly keeps near to Him while John and Peter follow at a considerable distance. No one at the time sets a more noble example. As he goes along, however, he notices with alarm that the invaders are representatives of the established authorities. Suddenly he is seized, with the evident intention of making him a prisoner,² and he escapes by abandoning the sheet which he had used as a mantle. But he is not absolutely naked, *gumnos* in Greek and *nudus* in Latin may have a merely relative sense. When Jesus, after His resurrection, appeared to Simon Peter, who was fishing, Peter put on his mantle,

¹ Προήρχετο, Luke xxii. 47.

² According to the received text, he was seized by "young men." In that case, the attempt against Mark was only an escapade of young fellows; the soldiers and guards had nothing to do with it. Jesus, in giving Himself up, had stipulated that He alone should be taken by the regular agents of the public authorities.

“for he was naked,” as the text adds, as we should say, in working dress, in his shirt-sleeves. Peter wished to present himself to his Master in the complete costume required by social usage.¹

Mark was of a good family. His pious mother had provided him with an excellent education. Capable as well as zealous, he became ultimately the secretary and interpreter of the Apostle Peter, who calls him his son.²

Mark gathered from Peter some of those personal recollections which enrich his book. This precious document is, according to M. Reuss, the oldest of our Gospels; it appears to have been the fruit of a sort of joint authorship of Peter and Mark. The style recalls the impetuous temperament of Simon son of Jonas, and many a picturesque detail shows the work of an eye-witness. The Evangelist had a cousin in Barnabas, nephew of his mother, and himself a rich landowner. Barnabas took his cousin with him on the first preaching journey of the Apostle Paul. Mark had thus the special honour of being one of the first three missionaries of the Church. It is not known why he left his travelling companions on their arrival at Perga in Pamphylia. The narrative of Luke intimates that the motives of this separation were to a certain extent blame-worthy. It is possible that Mark, whose life had always been easy, drew back when faced by the fatigue and increasing dangers of the mission in a heathen country; he seems to be still the man whose intrepidity gave way at Gethsemane. Excuse has been made for him by supposing that ill news of his mother may have unexpectedly recalled him to Jerusalem at that moment. However that may be, Paul, on starting upon a second journey, refused to take Mark again. This was the subject of a sharp contention, *paroxysmos*. Barnabas, being a relative, showed more in-

¹ John xxi. 7. Comp. 1 Sam. xix. 24; Isa. xx. 2, 3.

² 1 Pet. v. 13.

dulgence; he took with him to Cyprus his cousin, who perhaps had, like himself, family connexions in that island. A few years later, we find Mark again in favour with Paul; the Apostle assigns to him a most distinguished position, and recommends him to the Colossians.¹

It is thought that after the death of Paul, Mark, who had remained with him, rejoined Peter in Asia; but if it be admitted that, in the First Epistle of Peter, Babylon means Rome, Mark did not leave that city. At last, according to Epiphanius, Eusebius, Nicephorus, and Jerome, he went to Egypt, where he probably founded the Church of Alexandria. His martyrdom is said to have taken place in the eighth year of the reign of Nero, some rioters having dragged him over sharp stones. But all this remains uncertain.

Let us return to the house of Gethsemane. Olshausen, Lange, and M. L. Bonnet have had a glimpse of a solution of the problem something like our own. M. Reuss has expressed himself thus: "It appears that Gethsemane was a special inclosure, with the proprietor of which Jesus and His disciples might be in relation. John calls it a garden, and the expression used by Matthew and Mark might be translated 'a country estate.' The end of the narrative of Mark makes it appear that the eleven apostles who accompanied Jesus were not the only persons present in that inclosure."²

We have not found anywhere the identification of the Villa of the Oil Press with the residence of Mark and Mary, but we have not met with anything opposed to it.³

¹ Col. iv. 10, *seq.*; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

² *Histoire Evangélique*, p. 650.

³ These lines were written before we had read, in a recent number of the *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie*, an article by M. Combe on M. Lasserre's translation of the Gospels (p. 186). M. Combe recognises that Gethsemane may be thought of as the country house of Mary, mother of Mark. In accord with Theophylact, Klostermann supposes that Mark was the son of the

In the light of the foregoing, the episode of the young man in the linen cloth becomes as it were the signature of the Evangelist, a discreet signature, which attests the early affection with which Jesus had inspired His biographer, and which brings into special prominence the piety and hospitality of "Mary, mother of Mark."

In his *Biblical Studies*,¹ Prof. F. Godet has already mentioned this signature. He says: "We are strongly tempted to ask if the young man spoken of in the scene at Gethsemane, who plays such a strange and mysterious part, was not Mark himself; in accordance with the custom of painters, he puts in this way his signature to his picture, as Matthew has signed his in the narrative of the call of a publican sitting at the receipt of custom."

Every one must have observed the signature of John in John i. 40, xviii. 15, xix. 26, etc., and that of Luke in the pronoun *we* in Acts xvi. 10; some commentators have thought they have seen it also in Luke xxiv. 18. Our four Evangelists are more modest than Phidias, who dared to engrave his own portrait on the shield of Pallas Athene.

A signature is a proof of authenticity: in business it carries great weight. But we have here something more and better than an ordinary signature, which very often cannot be identified. There is, for instance, a legend to the effect that the original manuscript of the second Gospel has been preserved in the basilica of St. Mark at

owner of the house in which Jesus took the last supper with His disciples. He might have followed Jesus from Jerusalem to Gethsemane. We would observe that the costume adopted by this young man was scarcely admissible in the streets or suburbs of a city, while it is explained and justified by our hypothesis. As for Ebrard, he seems disposed to see in the young man in the "linen cloth" a servant on the farm of Gethsemane; this servant would be Mark, the author of the second Gospel. Ebrard thus approaches what we believe to be the true solution of the problem; but why suppose Mark to be a slave? We have had occasion to observe that, on the contrary, he occupied a high position in the social scale.

¹ *New Testament*, p. 40.

Venice. It is a relic so precious that it is never taken out of the treasury in which it is said to be inclosed. Supposing that it could be seen and examined, by what means could the signature of the Evangelist be verified ?

A forger will imitate a written signature, while that which we have in view is inimitable ; it is like the mark on the body, known to herself alone, by which after a long separation a mother recognises her child, changed by the nurse. In order to furnish the proof of authenticity contained in the incident under review, it would have been necessary to be fully acquainted with the private history of the narrator. A forger who should have invented this extraordinary incident would have been laughed at for his freak of imagination. Such an addition would have added absolutely nothing to the credit of his book. In order to inspire confidence in the first readers, to accredit the volume at the time of its publication, the anecdote of the young man in the linen cloth must have been already known to some well-informed persons ; in other words, it must have been true.

If so, and if the interpretation that we have given of it is plausible, if we have succeeded in verifying the signature of Mark, it becomes evident that the author of our second Gospel was an eye-witness of the arrest of Jesus at Gethsemane. And more than that, this witness took an active part in the drama which he narrates ; his name was Mark, and the narrative of the Passion has not been introduced into his book by a subsequent editor, as M. Reuss maintains.¹ Mark alone could have any interest in telling the

¹ *Histoire Evangélique*, p. 82, *seq.*, p. 87. M. Reuss explains why our two verses (Mark xiv. 50, 51) are omitted in the text of Matthew, but not at all why they figure in the second Gospel. If the young man in the linen cloth is not the author of the narrative, with what object does the Evangelist mention "a fact foreign to the history of the principal person, and of no interest to the Church in the absence of a proper name ?" The insertion of an insignificant episode would be all the more incomprehensible, the narrative of Mark being distinguished throughout by a truly Roman brevity.

apparently futile story which relates to himself. The transparent veil of anonymity seems to establish the identity of the narrator with the hero of this incident. The author of the second Gospel was then a contemporary of Jesus. His signature attests the truth of the facts which are the common basis of our four Gospels. Our study of the subject has resulted in the confirmation of our faith.

E. PETAVEL.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY ON THE GEOGRAPHY
OF ASIA MINOR.¹

PROFESSOR RAMSAY'S explorations in Asia Minor are among the three or four best things done by Englishmen in the field of scientific scholarship in this generation. They will take rank by the side of Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* and Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, as work really of the first order, and of European reputation. More than one public body contributed to the undertaking. Prof. Ramsay himself places at the head of the list the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, to whom his book is dedicated. I can speak freely of this because, although I have myself the honour to belong to that body, Prof. Ramsay's election had taken place before I was admitted to it, and the arrangements by which he was to hold his fellowship as a direct subsidy to the work of exploration were already complete.

It was one of the most far-sighted acts of any college within my memory, and one which has best justified itself by the result. But I fear that I must correct Prof. Ramsay on one point. He seems to think that his own was the first of a series of "research fellowships," to be continuously maintained. I wish it were so; but unfortunately, though the wish may be there, the power is absent. Since the date of Prof. Ramsay's election the revenues of the college have fallen so seriously, that, in spite of the generosity of more than one of its members, it is now all that it can do to

¹ *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. (Supplementary Papers of the Royal Geographical Society, vol. xviii.). By Prof. W. M. Ramsay. (London, 1890.)