

ART. III.—THE LANGUAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.—THE LANGUAGES SPOKEN BY OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES.

WHAT was the language spoken by our Lord? It was supposed that this question was settled, but in the pages of the *Guardian*, February, 1889, it has been re-opened. At the foot of the page¹ I notice the leading special treatises on the subject, but proceed to handle it independently. I regard the question as one of linguistic science, evidence, and careful analogy, free from all bias of theology, and excluding anything that is supernatural, or out of the ordinary current of human affairs. I am a sincere believer in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, but not in the narrow sense of some writers.

In the Gospel of St. Luke we are told that the superscription on the Cross was in letters of Greek, and Latin; and Hebrew. In the Gospel of St. John it is stated that it was written in Hebrew, Greek, Latin. The expressions are :

γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς, καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς.
γεγραμμενον Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαῖστί, Ἑλληνιστί.

It is fair to state that the Revised Version of the New Testament rejects the words of St. Luke altogether, so the fact rests on the evidence of St. John alone; but he was an eye-witness. It would thus appear that the Hebrew style of writing came first, then the Roman, and lastly the Greek. This implies a threefold form of written characters, as well as of language. It may be taken as a fact, admitted beyond doubt, that the Hebrew language had long been superseded in the mouths of men by the Aramaic vernacular. The chief priests objected to the form of the superscription; it was Pilate's own order, to which he adhered. The languages ran as follows :

Line 1. Aramaic in the square Hebrew character lately introduced (*circa* 100 B.C.).

„ 2. Latin in the Roman capital letters, so well known.

„ 3. Greek in the uncial characters represented in the monumental inscriptions of the period, which are abundant.

Now, in one of these languages our Lord must have spoken : possibly, though not probably, in two, Aramaic and Greek; and words belonging to the third language, Latin, are reported as having fallen from His mouth—*e.g.*, “census,” tribute-money,

¹ 1. “The Language employed by our Lord and His Disciples,” by Dr. ROBERTS. Second Edition, 1869.

2. Mg. CLEMENT DAVID, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Damascus : “La langue parlée par Jesus Christ.” 1885.

3. “Dialects of Palestine in the Time of Christ,” by AD. NEUBAUER, of the Bodleian, Oxford. “*Studia Biblica.*” 1885.

etc.; but the real question is betwixt Aramaic, a Semitic language of Asia, and Greek, an Aryan language of European origin, but spoken extensively by Hellenists in Asia and Africa.

Now, a judgment can only be formed on a question of this kind, the data of which go back to nearly two thousand years, and the venue of which is in a far-distant land, by a careful consideration of certain analogies, aided by a certain experience in linguistic phenomena. In England practically there is one paramount language, spoken by our rulers, the leading educated classes, and the common people. But there are few countries where it is so; and as a fact, within the islands of Great Britain there are four other vernaculars, Welsh, Gaelic, Erse, and French (in the Channel Islands).

In the Baltic provinces in Europe, Russian is the dominant language of the rulers, German is the vernacular of the immigrant landowners and merchants, but the agriculturists and the ancient people speak "Liv" of the Ugro-Altai family. In Algeria in Africa, French is the dominant language of the rulers. Arabic, a Semitic language, is not only the language of the immigrant superior classes, but the religious language; but the indigenous inhabitants speak exclusively Kabail or Tuwarik, Hamitic languages. In Asia, in the central provinces of British India, English is the dominant language of the rulers; the superior immigrant classes speak Hindi, or Bengáli, of the Aryan family, or Telugu, of the Dravidian family, while the indigenous inhabitants speak, according to their particular tribes, Gond, or Khond, or Maler, of the Dravidian family, or Sontal and Kole, of the Kolarian group.

In the Panjab in Northern India, when we conquered it in 1846, I was one of the first British officers employed. An amnesty was proclaimed for all political offences, but if I had had occasion to try a native for murder or violent crime, and he was sentenced to death by hanging, had it been necessary or desirable to do so, I should have placed a superscription over the gallows in three languages in three different written characters, as follows:

- Line 1. English in the Roman character of the day, the language of the rulers.
- „ 2. Persian in the running Arabic character, the language at that time of the Judicial Courts, and of all correspondence.
- „ 3. Hindi in the Nágari character, the language of the people, and the only one understood by them.

And if the offender were a Sikh, or if there were numerous Sikhs in the neighbourhood, whom it was desirable to awe, a fourth language would possibly have been added:

- Line 4. Sikh or Panjábí in the Gúrmukhi character, the peculiar dialect of the Sikh religionists.

Now, all these languages and characters I myself could read and understand, and give orders in, though in the three latter languages the orders would be engrossed by native writers, *embodying my meaning in their own words*, and reading them out to me before I signed them with my name in the ordinary English manner; the official seal, in one, two, or three languages, was then stamped on the paper. This was the ordinary routine, and caused no great exertion or remarkable knowledge, and we thought nothing of it. But if in conversation in a good-sized village or small town like Nazareth (which I have lately visited), with the shopkeepers, or artisans, carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, I had addressed them in English or Persian, they would have understood nothing, yet Persian had been the dominant language of the Panjab, and, until the arrival of the British, the sole vehicle of literature and correspondence for more than seven hundred years. A long residence in the midst of a mixed population, such as the one described, generates a kind of sympathetic intelligence, for one has to talk down to the level of each particular person: an educated person, or a villager, who would like to be addressed in patois; a Hindu or a Mohammedan; a mountaineer or a religious devotee. The vocal chord has to be tuned to be acceptable and intelligible to each ear. To a chief, who came across the river Indus to visit me, I should speak Persian; to my own countrymen and English-speaking clerks, English; to the educated people, Hindustani; to the rough villagers or mountaineers, their patois; to the learned priests, pure Hindi. The population amounts to seventeen millions, and is far more enlightened than similar classes in Palestine; either in the present or past centuries. There are magnificent walled towns, great wealth of commerce and manufactures, highly developed agriculture, a constant stream of foreigners passing to and fro, and yet I repeat that the dominant language of culture, either of the Mohammedan or Christian rulers, was totally unknown to the portion of the population analogous to the class out of which our blessed Lord appeared in the flesh. It is an extraordinary mistake to suppose that the domination of foreigners or strangers alters the vernacular of the people; we can learn this from the domestic history of Russia and Austria, in each of which twenty languages at least are spoken; and of France and Great Britain, in each of which five languages are spoken, in spite of the over-weening influence of French and English literature. I have brought these considerations conspicuously forward in front of my argument, so as to prepare my reader for the appreciation of the arguments to be adduced by writers who clearly have never had experience of the phenomena presented.

In all humility I venture to express an opinion on this great

subject. I have carefully examined the works of late writers, such as Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott, and Farrar. They all seem to avoid the great difficulty: admitting that our Lord and His twelve Apostles spoke Aramaic *only* (for I cannot admit the hypothesis of their being capable of addressing a multitude in two languages at pleasure), how did it come about that the records of His life and teaching have exclusively come down to us in Greek? It does not follow that no contemporary records in Aramaic ever existed, and most probably, or perhaps most certainly, they did exist, but none have come down to us. Of all other religious teachers, the sages of the Veda, Buddha, Kabir, Baba Nanak, the Jain teachers, Confucius and Mohammed, we have their dicta in the language which they uttered. Dr. Wordsworth sadly records his convictions: "In strictness of speech, not one of the Evangelists gives us the exact words of Christ: *He conversed in Syro-Chaldaic; they wrote in Greek.*" My only qualification for intruding on this subject is that, having just completed a survey of the languages of the world, I have some familiarity with linguistic phenomena, and for a quarter of a century in Northern India I conducted important business daily in three or four languages at the same time.

It is true that Jerome writes: "Sermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur." My only reply is that Jerome must have made a mistake. If such had been the case, what possible occasion could there have been for a Pentecostal miracle, whatever interpretation is accepted of that great event? We know as a positive fact that all prophets, and teachers, and reformers, and inaugurators of new religions, have made sole use of the vernacular of the people whom they addressed, and made this an article of their faith, and a necessity of their practice. Our missionary experience of modern times convinces us that the only way to get at people's hearts is through the vulgar tongue, spoken by the women, children, and least-educated persons of the community.

Now, if, for argument's sake, we admitted that our Lord and His Apostles had acquired a power of speaking Greek, and the educated men could understand His words, no one, who knows anything of Oriental women, would dare to say that such a phenomenon existed as "bilingual" women, and yet the women were as deeply converted by our Lord as the men. Then it is clear that our Lord possessed the power of writing, as it is recorded that He stooped down and wrote with His finger on the ground. The written characters of the Aramaic and Greek languages are essentially different, though they have both descended from the old Phœnician; but our Lord clearly indicated the written character which He used by the remark that not one jot or one tittle of the Law would pass away, which

applies accurately to the square Hebrew alphabet, which was in use at that time, but not to the uncial letters of the Greek alphabet, used in the current copies of the Septuagint. These letters exhibit none of the varieties of shape so common to the Hebrew ; there are neither vowel-accent nor diacritical points.

The strange assertion has been made, that the Greek language would be adopted willingly by conquered people, because it is so beautiful and powerful. This idea exposes a strange misconception of the *raison d'être* of the two thousand forms of speech, mutually unintelligible, spoken at this moment in the world. It may be questioned, whether Greek is more beautiful than other languages ; it is certainly much more complicated by grammatical rules than English, and the great army of non-Aryan languages which, like English, are free from the bondage of inflections ; yet who would venture to say that in any village or market-town of the great province of Banáras, which has been under British rule for more than a century, he would find anyone, except by a mere chance, who spoke a word of English, in spite of a free press, State schools, missionaries, courts of law, and men of commerce ? The distribution of the Bible and of missionary tracts is exclusively in the vernacular of each province. English printed matter would be useless.

I must decline to admit in this argument any miracle not recorded in Scripture. Modern criticism of the ordinary operations of man can no longer be silenced by the unwarranted assertion of verbal inspiration. The writers and speakers in the Bible were not impersonal machines ; but, as St. Paul said at Lystra, "men of like passions as their hearers." One clergyman consulted by me suggested that the power of the two Galilean fishermen, Peter and John, to write Greek epistles was part of the Pentecostal miracle. My reply was that that miracle related to the power of uttering sound with the tongue (*γλῶσσαι*), not to the power of recording thoughts on writing materials with the fingers (*δακτύλοι*). It appears to me that all the phenomena incidental to the purely human contingencies of the human art of writing must be expected, as each step is purely human, the outcome of the effort of man, under the influence, indeed, of spiritual aspirations in the same way as men and women are influenced now. The Holy Spirit speaks to our hearts, not to our tongues and hands.

I write to clear away some misconceptions which seem to make a difficult subject more difficult. It is a mistake to suppose that the Roman soldiers in such provinces as Syria were "Romans" in the strict sense, any more than the Sepoys of the army in British India are Britons. There is, however, no question that Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, was an Italian, as it is so stated ; and we have to ponder by what means

Peter communicated with him, and in what language. A captain of the Queen's army knows as little of Persian and Hindustani as Cornelius presumably did of Greek and Aramaic. Our Lord is reported to have uttered a certain number of Aramaic words, and, in fact, no less than twenty-nine words, or brief sentences, of Aramaic origin are found in the New Testament, and even in the Revelation the words "Hallelu Jah" are retained. The retention of these words may be quoted both for and against the Greek language theory. Some maintain that they were the words of the ordinary language of our Lord; and others, with great show of justice, urge that they were quoted because they were exceptional. Again, on one side St. Paul says distinctly that our Lord spoke to him on the road to Damascus in the Hebrew language; on the other hand, St. John heard Him in the Vision of the Revelation calling Himself Alpha and Omega, which apply solely to the Greek language, although the phrase "Aleph to Thau" appears in Hebrew books as a proverbial expression for the "First and the Last."

To both the Apostles was manifested a vision of the Risen Saviour. A Divine Voice was heard by them alone, and the human rendering of that voice was impressed on their perception in the language with which they were at the time familiar. To take the analogy of dreams, how often we hear friends speaking other languages than our own, and ourselves replying in them, if we are in the habit of using those languages in our waking hours. As time went on, the legends at Rome pretended that our Lord appeared to St. Peter and addressed him in Latin. The humble Christian may indeed believe that the Holy Spirit speaks to each believer in words *that are comprehended*, but only clothed in human vocables when their purport is recounted as an experience to others. The Spirit speaks to the heart of each one of us, but we should hardly presume to say that the words of the Spirit were English.

We know as a fact, that no Palestinian Jew during the existence of the second Temple produced a book in the Greek language. The original of such of the Apocryphal books as were written in Palestine was not in Greek. Aramaic translations of the Old Testament, or Targums, were used in Palestine. St. Paul no doubt could speak Greek, but the captain of the guard of the Temple was surprised that he was able to do so, because he took him for an Egyptian. Now, an Egyptian was just as open to Hellenic influence as a Syrian or a Cilician, upon the theory that the conquest of Alexander and the rule of his successors had altered the vernacular of the provinces of Western Asia; but St. Paul is described as addressing the Sanhedrin in Aramaic, and these were not the Jews of the villages, but of the capital city, the very classes who, if any parties of the

community understood Greek, should have understood it. If the introduction of military garrisons into a country leads to an alteration of the vernacular, Latin influence ought to have been felt, which is not pretended. In fact, the Jews of Palestine had in them a religious element, which made the retention of their language a necessity, a pride, and a Palladium. Syria may possibly have been Hellenized and Arianized, and Egypt no doubt felt the influence also; but Judea resisted the process to the last, and Jerusalem perished as the centre of a Hebrew polity, and speaking a Semitic language. If under the rule of the Antiochi there had been any taint of Hellenism, the revolt of the Maccabees would have effaced it. The legends on coins do not go far as evidence to prove a vernacular, as the rupee of British India has an English superscription totally unintelligible to the people who use the coin. The names of places, if of great antiquity, give valuable traces of extinct languages, but modern names of places are of doubtful value. In Palestine, Cæsarea, Dekapolis, or Tiberias, tell the tale of foreign conquest, just as Alexandria in Egypt, and Victoria all over the world, but they have not the faintest evidential value of the language spoken by the residents of these towns or districts.

There was, indeed, a large section of the Jewish people who were Hellenized and knew the Greek language, and adopted some of the Greek customs, and there may have been a Judeo-Greek colony in Jerusalem. But the majority of the Hellenists lived in foreign lands, coming to Judea from time to time for the feasts. The translation known as the Septuagint had done a great work in extending a knowledge of the great tenets of Judaism to the heathen world. But it had done something more. It had appropriated the Greek language for the expression of Hebrew thought, adapting the most exact machinery of word-formation to the most spiritual mode of conception. Something of the same kind has been done for the stored-up intellectual wealth of the Hindu by the touch of the English language. The position of Palestine geographically was most remarkable. It was just at the point where the Semitic world of Asia, the Hamitic world of Africa, and the Aryan world of Europe came into contact. The coasts of Asia Minor and North Africa were fringed with Greek colonies, and the Archipelago was studded with them. Some of the Gods of the Greek Idea had sprung from these islands. Greece had to thank Phœnicia for its alphabet, the same that was used by the Hebrews from its earliest days. But admitting all this *rapprochement* between the two races, there is no more reason to suppose that the villagers of Samaria and Galilee spoke Greek than that the inhabitants of the Greek islands, in which clusters of Jews had settled, spoke Aramaic. Our Lord's parables, illustrations, and eschatological conceptions,

were thoroughly Hebrew and Oriental. His *human* knowledge did not extend beyond His native province. As regards the Septuagint, there is reason to believe that it was unknown in Palestine except to scholars and Hellenist settlers, and it does not follow, because the Evangelists in their record of the events of our Lord's life more or less accurately quote the Septuagint, that our Lord Himself quoted it. Moreover, all the quotations in the Gospel may probably have been quoted from traditional (possibly written, possibly unwritten) Targums, current at the time, the translation of which into Greek by the Evangelists has caused the literal divergence of expression.

How came it, then, that from the very earliest days this Semitic religion, orally pronounced in Aramaic, has come down to us, without any exception, entirely in Greek documents? The reason is, simply, that it was the Divine will that it should spread westward to the people of Europe, and be thence handed on to the rest of the world. The early Church was essentially a Greek Church; all the early Fathers wrote in Greek. Imperial Rome was in some respects a Greek city, and Greek was the alternative language; the poorer classes, the "*illuvies gentium*," the "*Græculus esuriens*," were Greeks in descent, culture, and speech. It might have been different: Paul of Tarsus was the selected agent to guide the spread of the new Idea; had he been a Syrian of Edessa, or a Mesopotamian of Babylon, or an Elamite from Susa, or a Mede from Ekbatana, or a Parthian from the Caspian (and all these nations were represented on the day of Pentecost), the Light to lighten the Gentiles, that sprang up in Galilee, might have flashed eastward, and the good tidings have remained in an Asiatic mould and language. The Jews had had constant relations in past centuries with Assyria, and Babylonia, and Persia, all of which were mentioned in their sacred books, but nothing with Greece and Italy. But Saul of Tarsus, a Roman citizen, a Greek scholar, a Hellenized Jew, was the chosen vessel to bear the Lord's name before the Gentiles; and his great personality and gifts, and his environment, settled once for all that Jesus should be known as "*Christ*," not as "*Messiah*," and His followers not as "*Messih*," but "*Christians*." One of the leading features of the new tenets was, that they were to be understood by the people, that the poor would have the Gospel preached. This necessity led to the Greek language being the first vehicle of communication, to be followed speedily by the Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Gothic, Abyssinian, and eventually by every language of the world. Two linguistic considerations suggest themselves here: one is the singular mode in which two at least of the sacred terms of the Jewish religion are Grecized, instead of being reserved in their Semitic form, as so many words, or even phrases, have been—*e.g.*, Hallelujah and Pascha.

I allude to the word *κίβωτος*, used for the Ark of the Covenant in the Revelation, and the word *περιτόμη* and *ἀκροβύστια* for circumcision and the contrary. By Mohammedans this old-world custom, so offensive to modern notions, is veiled by the euphemism of "sunnat" and "bi-sunnat," which means no more than a religious ceremony. The second consideration is, that it seems to persons unaccustomed to such phenomena impossible that the Heads of a Church should persistently address the laity (women and men) in a language which they cannot possibly understand, till explained to them in the vernacular by the priests. And yet such is the practice to this day of the Church of Rome, and only last year a Latin letter, forbidding boycotting, was read in the Roman Catholic chapels, in Ireland. One of the chief arguments brought forward to prove that the humbler classes of Palestine spoke and understood Greek, is that the Gospels and Epistles are in Greek. We can only suppose that the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, who spoke a Keltic language, and not Greek, was translated to the humbler members of the Church, in the same way as the Keltic Irish were made to understand the Pope's Latin epistle of last year.

Another argument brought forward to support the theory of our Lord and His hearers using the Greek language is based on the fact that so many conversations are given, as well as addresses, which appear to be fresh, and not translations. In the history of Thucydides nothing is so remarkable as the set speeches which he places in the mouths of his characters; no one could charge him as a dishonest fabricator. But these speeches are, in fact, as regards form, his own essays based on the rules of rhetoric of his age, and as regards *matter* they are so far dramatic, that the sentiments are such as he conceived to be suitable to the supposed speaker, and his readers have in all times accepted this as such. Be it far from me to assert that the writers of the Old and New Testament took such a license as this, but it is the custom of the East to write in the ordinary familiar style, as if they were speaking; the lower classes in Europe do the same to this day. Educated people use the *oblique* sentence to express what they see or hear, but Orientals repeat a conversation as if they were standing behind the curtain, or sitting at a shorthand reporter's table. We are told what Abraham said to Isaac, when they were quite alone, and the very words of Abraham's conversation with the Creator are recorded. We are told what Herod said in his private chamber, and the remarks of other persons about John the Baptist having come to life. The conversation of evil spirits is given *totidem verbis*. This is only the style of writing of the nation and the age. The truthfulness of the narrative is not impugned, but the ordinary inference as *regards the particular*

language used cannot be inferred. When King Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylonia, and King Darius, a Persian, spoke to Daniel, though the very words uttered by them are repeated in Hebrew, as if the reporter had heard them, it must not be presumed that these two kings spoke the Hebrew language. When our Lord conversed with the Syro-Phœnician woman or the nine lepers, or the maniac in the country of the Gadarenes, it is unreasonable to argue that He spoke Greek because *bond-fide* Greek sentences are placed in His mouth by the compiler of the Gospel.

The Aramaic language has been alluded to; the question naturally arises, What is that language? It is sometimes called Judeo-Aramean, in contradistinction to the Syrian or Christian Aramean. There were three dialects in the time of our Lord: 1, Judæan; 2, Samaritan; 3, Galilean; the peculiarities of the latter betrayed the country to which Peter belonged. It was different from, yet cognate with, Hebrew. It is sometimes called Syro-Chaldaic, indicating that it was the vernacular of the region on both sides of the Euphrates, from Lebanon to the river Tigris. East Aramaic would be Chaldaic, and west Aramaic would be Syriac. It is stated by one scholar, and a very competent one, that another vernacular was also concurrently used—a modernized Hebrew—specimens of what we find in the Mishnah, and the Hebrew parts of the Talmud and Midrashin. In one or other of these variations of speech the Hebrew nation spoke after their return from captivity. There were, moreover, written Targums of parts of the Old Testament in this vernacular, from which in all probability our Lord quoted, and this may account for the diversity in the renderings. His quotation from Psalm xxii. on the Cross has been preserved. The reading of the sacred text was necessarily accompanied by a vernacular paraphrase—oral, indeed, but cast in a conventional mould handed down from father to son. The introduction of such paraphrases dates as far back as the time of Ezra, and there is reason to believe that *written* translations existed as early as the first century before Christ. When our Lord, in the synagogue at Nazareth, read the verses from Isaiah, he must have used such a translation. The written character used may, upon independent palæographical grounds, be safely determined as the square Hebrew character, called "Hebrew," which had about one century before Christ superseded the old Phœnician character, specimens of which last survive in stone monuments, and the pages of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Those who are hardy enough to assert that because the text of the Synoptic Gospels is in Greek, therefore all the actors of the events recorded therein must have *spoken* Greek, either solely or bilingually, and that all the utterances of our Lord are recorded with the accuracy of *ipsissima verba*, had better reflect

to what conclusions that theory would lead them, if applied to the Old Testament narrative. We are so habituated to use the Bible in the English translation, that we sometimes forget, and still oftener have failed to realize, that both the Old and New Testament texts, in the form in which they have come down to us, comprise narratives of conversations which took place in totally different languages: *ex gratia*, the words uttered by Potiphar's wife, by the Chief Butler when he addressed Pharaoh, by Balaam and Balak, and by the Queen of Sheba. It is obvious that none of these Scripture personages could have spoken in Hebrew, and yet the uninstructed reader might suppose that it was so, as the very words which they are supposed to have uttered are recorded as if they had been written down by a bystander.

The linguistic history of the Old Testament is a study of extreme fascination. We have nothing to compare with it in the world. It deserves to be the subject of a separate essay, and though it has an important bearing on the question of the language of the New Testament, I pass it by for the present, with this remark, that the Aramaic spoken by our Lord was, if not the *same*, at least a *similar* form of speech to that which was spoken by the "Syrian (Arami) ready to perish," who, 1921 years earlier, had crossed the Euphrates, and "who rejoiced to see His day." It died away from the lips of men when Jerusalem fell, for the Nation, who spoke it, had completed the task which it was given to do two thousand years before.

This, then, is the language in which, in the opinion of the most judicious scholars and sound theologians, words were uttered by Him who spake as no man spake—words which turned the world upside down, closing the long catena of past expectations, opening out the vista of a heavenly future. With the exception of the few words scattered through the Gospels, or in the Epistles and the Revelation, above alluded to, no word has come down to us in that particular variety of Semitic speech. We can approach to it in reading the Samaritan Pentateuch, which has survived, and the Mishnah and Midrashin; but for some Divine purpose this language, in which the new Idea was given birth to, has, like the phoenix, utterly perished, while the lives of so many other languages have been prolonged: the Greek, Arabic, and Persian, to be the vehicles of modern thought, and the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic, to be the earthen vessels of dead rituals, though of great value in the infancy of the new Faith. The Hebrew language, indeed, died, leaving the one imperishable evidence of its existence in the Old Testament; at the best it was but an inferior vehicle of speech. A kind of survival of it exists in the Judeo-German and Judeo-Spanish jargons, in which the basis of the language is Aryan, with

Hebrew phrases inserted. It is fortunate for the world that Greek was chosen for the task allotted to it, for as a written language it can never die, and as a vernacular it seems to be receiving new strength, for I heard it spoken at Athens in a style approaching its ancient purity.

No language has had such a history. If anyone asks, What is the Aramaic language? let him be told that it is language in which the Lord of Life made known to man the way of Salvation; in which He gave us our daily prayer; in which He instituted the Lord's Supper, and with His Apostles sang a hymn (the Hallel from a Targum) before He went down to Gethsemane; it is the language in which the fickle inhabitants of Jerusalem shouted "Hosannah!" and "Crucify Him!" in which He spoke to His Mother and the women who met Him in the Via Dolorosa; in which He spoke His last word to His Mother and St. John, while hanging on the Cross; in which He spoke to the women who came early to His sepulchre on Easter morn; in which He expounded to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus all the Scriptures concerning Himself, beginning at Moses and all the prophets; in which He gave His last commands on Mount Olivet; in which He spoke to Paul after His Ascension; in which, as we read in the Revelation, on the sea of glass is sung the song of Moses and the Lamb.

LIST OF ARAMAIC WORDS WHICH OCCUR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT,
IN THEIR GREEK FORM.

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Φαρισαῖος. | 16. ἄββά. |
| 2. Σατανᾶς. | 17. σίκερα. |
| 3. ρακά. | 18. Κηφας. |
| 4. γέεννα. | 19. Μεσσίας. |
| 5. μαμμωνᾶ. | 20. βηθεσδά. |
| 6. Βεελ-ζεβουλ. | 21. Ἄκελ δάμα. |
| 7. Ὀσαννά. | 22. Ταβιθά. |
| 8. ραββί. | 23. Ἀβαδδών. |
| 9. πάσχα. | 24. Ἀρ-μαγεδων. |
| 10. γολγοθά. | 25. Ἢλί Ἢλί λαμὰ σαβαχθανί. |
| 11. Βοανεργές. | Or, Ἐλωί, etc. |
| 12. κορβάν. | 26. Ταλιθά κόσμι. |
| 13. κορβανᾶν. | 27. Ἀλληλού-ϊα. |
| 14. ἔφφαθά. | 28. Μαρὰν-ἀθά. |
| 15. ραββουσί. | 29. Ἀμήν. |

Add to these proper names, specially those compounded of the word "bar," or son.

ROBERT CUST.

