

**ARAMAIC BIBLE COMPANION DATA
FROM GLADSTONE RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES
WIRRAL (INCLUDING 56 SIGNIFICANT QUOTES)**

AGNES SMITH LEWIS V F.CRAWFORD.BURKITT
THE OLD SYRIAC GOSPELS

*Shorthand C=Curetonian S=Sinaiticus Syr=Old Syrian M=mepharreshe
Palimpsest=4gospels found at Sinai Diatessaron =synthesis of gospel by Tatian-4thC.
Pesh=the Peshitta*

LEWIS

i Dr Burkitt has not adduced a scrap of reliable evidence in support of his theory that EDM originates with Bishop Palut about 200AD IN EDESSA after Tatian
ii Ephrem says the orthodox were called Palutians by the heretics so he was powerful and would not have abstained from imposing his own translation had he had one yet the Diatessaron was exclusively used till Rabbula in 400's.

iii Lewis argues that bishops don't do all the good work-and that **THE ANTIOCHENE CHRISTIANS DID NOT WAIT TILL AD160-3 GENERATIONS FOR A TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPELS IN THE VERNACULAR SYRIAC.**

iv Lewis argues that the Sinai Palimpsest was not extracted from Tatian's elaborate mosaic

v .If Tatian(Greek) is older

1. Why is angel of Bethesda absent from Sinai text but in Tatian?

2. Why is order of John 18 12-25 superior literary wise to that of the Greek MSS-how did the GREEK translator did get better from worse(except by consulting Syriac).

3. Why has the Palimpsest according to Burkitt himself an earlier text than Tatian in Matthew 1.25?

vi **RENDEL HARRIS- SINAI PALIMPSEST OMITTS ALL THE READINGS THE 19TH C CRITICS SAY ARE DOUBTFUL AND RV PUTS IN BRACKETS!**

vii Dr Fred Blass "phrases that occur twice"(In Tatian-not the Aramaic)i.e. not in the **PALIMPSEST**-which is a touchstone of what belongs to each of the 4 evangelists

viii "Father forgive them for they know not what they do" would never have been left aside had the 2nd C translators in Syria known of it.

ix In her preface she says Burkitt does not accept her MSS words preferring his own conjectures.

x The translator was better acquainted with Southern Palestine than Bishop Rabbula-cf Luke 1.39 "To a village in the hill country"(not a town) as in Peshitta

xi **In 127 REMARKABLE PASSAGES** AGNES shows the virtue and original excellence of the Palimpsest.

xii **LEWIS finds 600 quotes from the Syriac Fathers where acquaintance with the older text (not the later Peshitta)is secure.** Even Isho'dad (9thC) and Bar Salibi (12th)

xiii LEWIS has trawled whole of 4 gospels for similarities and dissimilarities to Cureton and Aliis Codd-34 codices in all

BURKITT

- **RABBULA BS EDESSA 411-435 ORDERED PRIESTS AND DEACONS SHOULD HAVE COPY OF SEPARATE GOSPELS-THE EDM-411-435 AND THEODORET 423-457 SWEEPED UP 200 COPIES OF DIATESSARON TO REPLACE IT WITH THE GOSPELS**-Edessa was an independent state
- *In 420 there was (1)the Syrian vulgate(Peshitta), (2)the Diatessaron and (3)the evangelion da mepharreshe*
- Curetonian(Some leaves in Berlin-John 7 Lk 15-17-82 and a half leaves-[1842- 80arrive in Brit Museum in 1847 2and a half more-Add.14451) from Convent of S.Mary Deipara Natron Valley west of Cairo-80 leaves reached England 1222ad-monk Habibai gave this Syrian doc to the Monastery in Sete Egypt.-Burkitt argues from “forsooth” in it-ancient word that it is old-it is in beautiful Estrangela-like Aphraates CodB it has red dots for punctuation. After the rebinding in 1222AD a misguided person corrected the Sermon on the Mount to agree with the Peshitta text!!NB
- Order Matt,Mark,John,Luke. Written in large beautiful estrangela-style of the early 5th cent-400-425AD. Leaves 11’3/4 by 9”-pages of 2 columns with 22 - 26 lines per page
- Palimpsest Sinaiticus differs in 250 places from anything else. Upper writing is 778AD –letters right to left with Georgian signatures left to right.
BURKITT LINKS IT WITH JOHN THE ANCHORITE OF BETH MARI QANON MONASTERY OF MAARRAH MESREN CITY NEAR ANTIOCH.-BURKITT SAYS THIS IS BET MERRI NEAR BEIRUT. HE ARGUES THE MONKS WENT TO SINAI TO ESCAPE RAIDS AND TOOK THEIR MSS WITH THEM. He says Gospel of John is 4th/5th cent. Act of Thomas 5thC, Transition of Mary 5th/6th cent-22 leaves in all were missing by 778AD. S itself is a vellum codex of 166 leaves of the 4 gospels in usual order-142 leaves comprise the Evangelion da Mepharreshe-Sy(i.e.4gospels)
- ‘I can think only of 8 passages where St EPHREM’S quotes from GOSPELS coincide linguistically with the Peshitta against the Palimpsest and only 5 where they coincide with the Curetonian against the Palimpsest.
Eg
1 Addai’s DOCT OF APOSTLES on Mt 24..27 “as the lightning lighteth” agrees with S(NOT SYR. VULGATE) argument falls.
2 Lk6.15 a one letter detail-no argument
Ephrem does not speak of the “shining of light on the waters” which is in the “mixed”DIAT of Tatian
3 A variant of Aphraates in Mt 28.20 “Teaching them to obey all I command & I am with you all the days” –not free from re-expression –weak In fact Burkitt shoots himself in the foot saying “There are very few coincidences in Aphraates with syr vg(later) against Sinaiticus and Curetonian united.

4 Matt 5.44 Peshitta +SC omit “that curseth..that compels” Aphraates has the simple text-cogent to Syriac-less wordy! Burkitt tries to squirm by saying on account of variants that Aphraates uses S & syr.vulg against C and C & syr. vulg against S willy nilly. BURKITT ALLEGES THIS DOES NOT SHOW Aphraates uses the Peshitta-in fact it proves nothing

5 Burkitt dismisses the rallying ground of Ephrem Syr as a base of proof of the high antiquity of the Peshitta. Ephrem’s commentary on the Diatessaron is not used in the following Works:-

Com Genesis-Exodus, Homily of our Lord, FragHom John1.1, Frag Treatise on false doctrine, Fear of God, Lett to monks in mountains, Letter to Publius, Exegetical sermons on Adam, on Jonah, of the nativity, Polemical sermons, on Faith, on free will, Paraenetica 1,2,3, Paradise Eden, Diverse sermons vol 1,2,3, Julian apostate, Paradise Eden supplemented, Carmina Nisibena, Hymn azymorum, of the crucifixion, sermon on reprehension, hymn on nativity, hymns on fasting & virginity, Rogation sermons, Hymns on confessors, Hymns on Abraham Kidunaya & Julian Saba, hymns on the Church. Epiphany hymns, Hymns on virginity, Rogation sermon Testament of Ephrem.(350 separate poems).[**most 6-7cent-some5thMSS**]

QUOTE 28 mk1.11 My son AND my beloved-that Ephrem added “and” to satisfy metre proves nothing!

QUOTE 69 MATT4.5 ‘Who saw you at the head of the corner where you stood?’ Pinnacle is “corner” in SC Peshitta has “wing” But Ephraim clearly can quote ancient Syriac parallel of S so argument is specious

QUOTE 67 Matt 5.18 “Heaven & earth pass not one jot letter will pass”. Here Aphraates uses S but C has “one jot letter & one horn”(The Peshitta has “one jot letter and one line” after the Greek. Again Burkitt is affirming not that the Peshitta which is later but the S and so ancient Syr is the source-self-defeating

QUOTE 28 Matt 5.39 ‘He that smites on right cheek present him the other also’ Agrees with S &C Peshitta has “right” –Burkitt acknowledges this is because of metrical reasons but the ancient Syriac is also retailed.

QUOTE 69 MATT4.5 “who saw you our Lord on the head of the corner” Peshitta=“wing” –the quote allies with S &C

‘Satan dared and said ‘fall from hence’ agrees also with S. Burkitt makes something of the fact that other Syria texts agree with Greek-but could they not be ‘mixed’? I very clearly believe in parallel linguistic factors-without prejudice to the Aramaic priority.

QUOTE 67 ‘Heaven & earth pass away’-cf above

QUOTE 28 CF Above

QUOTE 70 “As the serpent’s bread is constant bread give us O Lord”. This is in all ancient Syr sources-logic tells me it is an Ephremic usage –with or without ref to Jesus “bread of our need” is Greek and perhaps a return to a superior source in both languages

QUOTE 28 They do not set new wine in bottles” Mt 9.17 Ephraim is “set” but Burkitt acknowledges it is a metre matter

Matt5.5 'You shall not go the way of the pagans' E agrees with Peshitta against Sinai-Peshitta had "peoples" like Greek-and Aphraates had "pagans" but as Burkitt adds Ephrem then agrees with Sinai on "nor in a TOWN of the Samaritans"

QUOTE 29 'By the dissipated he was thought an eater by the drunkards a drinker". Ephraim uses the word "one given to wine" while the later Peshitta has "one drinking" because later the translators as Burkitt imagines distaste the Greek terms PHAGOS and OINOPOTES. This is not foolproof for the early Syriac as represented by Ephraim could also carry accuracy in parallel with the Greek.

Matt14.28 Peter who walks on water is called Cephas in Peshitta whilst the S & C have Simon Cephas-it is bold of Burkitt to go there because as he acknowledges there are no "Petros" notices at all-a powerful sign of the independence and originality of the Syrian texts.

QUOTE 30 'The gate bars of Sheol shall not be able to conquer it"-Ephraim uses this graphic phrase-C and Pesh have "the doors of Sheol"-there is no argument to set alongside as S is not extant.-

"To you I give the keys of the doors"(Eph) Peshitta "Keys of the kingdom of heaven" The liberty of a poet appear not to have impressed itself on the mind of Burkitt.

"Who of you has beast in the hill-county and one stray who does not leave the 99 in the plain..."B argues that the mosaic must be Diatessaron style-he argues for the Arabic Diatessaron but the argument is convoluted QUOTE 31 "Forgive thy brother by sevens seventy times over". Whilst the Peshitta and Greek have "unto 70 times 7" and Aphraates ads "490" and "Batches" of seven is found in S & C.

QUOTE 32 MATT21.3 Say to them 'for their Lord they are required' Burkitt picks up on Woods who argues that "THE LORD HAS NEED OF THEM" (GREEK OF MATT21.3) IS BEHIND EPHREM. The Peshitta differs only in "our[Lord].The idea of "their master" is opposed to "their owner as normally understood" so Ephraim is seen to base himself on the earliest Greek. Burkitt adds that Pohlmann says you can never trust a Biblical quotation in the printed text of a commentary where it agrees with the Peshitta. This cynical statement unfavourably colours Syriac references and is dropped in to further devalue Syriac.

QUOTE 34 "He will let out the vineyard to other husbandmen which raise for him the produce in its season" Ephraim is represented as saying which is SC & Peshitta "give to him the fruits but this differs from the Syr Vulg and Evangelion da Mepharreshe

QUOTE35" They fettered that man whose body was defiled" Ephraim explains that the "body is the wedding garment which ought to be kept clean" S&C have"Take hold of him by hands and feet". Ephraim has "fasten" or "fetter" not 'bind"(hapaxlegomenon in NT Peshitta-at Acts 22.29. Burkitt argues for another version in antiquity but there is no allusion in the Diatessaron so either the version was Syriac or Ephrem is using a periphrastic style and his argument leads us into a cul de sac as is so often the case

QUOTE 36 Matt23.8'You shall not call anyone a great one on earth'
Agreement with SC but the Pesh has "you shall not be called Rabbi"
(agreement with Greek) does not link at all with the quote-extraneous fact-
argument ends in smoke

Matt27.46'eli eli why hast thou left me?' Cod Vat syr 111(pg 263a)from Dr G
Mercati of Vatican Library-Peshitta differs from C&S

QUOTE 37 Mark4.39"Be quiet quoth he you are muzzled" Ephrem has a
feminine particle. S&C missing-so quote not adequate for proof. Peshitta has
masculine pronoun

Mk7.28"Satisfy them from crumbs from the sons table"

"Dogs from the crumbs of their masters are satisfied" Mark7.28

"Son's table" is in S and arm. vg. I personally take it that the "Table of the Son"
may be a very ancient usage and bears on Christ himself.

QUOTE 38 MARK 7.33 'He spat on his fingers and put it in the ears of the deaf
mute' There are 4 readings in Greek-3 similar in Syriac. This serves to show
that there was wide cohesion and parallel vernaculars in early times. "He
spat & touched his tongue". Burkitt finds Ephraim's quote in Greek uncial
fragment Wd. What Burkitt then argues is that the Arabic Diatessaron
preserves it from the ancient Syriac. This is not even foolproof for the S
reading & minuscule 28 Ferrer Group agree except for "spat"

QUOTE 39 Mt12.42 "The pound and the mite of the widow he increased"

S "Two mites which are a quarter" Pesh. "Two pounds which are mites"

The adding of "pounds" from the Parable of Pounds is as Burkitt says unfair-
but here Ephrem is following that which constantly was the Syrian
expression.

Luke 2.30 Lo my eyes have seen your mercy" Agrees with S & Pesh. Burkitt
argues that "Your mercy" is instead of ""your life"-and that the alteration
came before Ephrem's time.

Luke2.34 "This one is set for falling & rising" Woods again observes that this
is a variant -cf commentary on Diatessaron

Luke2.36 'How like is the modest one to that most modest of the odest who
for seven days had been with a husband" Peshitta-7 years S HAS 7 DAYS-so
Ephraim follows the ancient S

QUOTE 41 LK4.29 "When they threw him from the hill he flew in the air"

Ephrem adopts Diatessaron not S or Peshitta. S has "so they might hang him"
Peshitta as RT

QUOTE 42 LUKE7.14 Now Jesus called to the dead man youth youth!"

Attested by Aphraates. Who says that he said to synagogue leader's daughter
"Maid maid"-it is conjectured to belong to DIAT-why not Syriac ancient
source? D talitha talitha

Lk7 41-43 Two debtors -C & Peshitta have "a certain creditor Ephraim
agrees with SC not Peshitta.

QUOTE 43 LK9.62 "No one puts his hand to the plough and looking back and
becomes fit for the kingdom of heaven". Ephrem is maverick as B
acknowledges -he does not produce any of the bible texts!!!!

Lk 12 16-20 "Lo this night thy dear soul from thee they require it" Aphraates +C+Pesh+S have "he said to his soul" & prefix of "Soul". Burkitt puts the agreement down to Diatessaron. Why not ancient syriac or the linguistic vernacular being unified early in lost docs?

QUOTE 45 LK 14.31 Who among kings goes to do battle with another king his fellow?" A paraphrase-which shows how versatile Ephrem is and the difficulty of this method of proof

QUOTE 47 "LK23 38 "HAPPY ART THOU O TABLET" Syriac for ~PITTAKION Lk23.43 "From thee(Golgotha) he opened and entered Eden". The DIATHas Eden not Paradise-so have Peshitta and S

QUOTE 48 "IN THE BEGINNING HE WAS THE WORD" JN1.1 "WORD" is feminine in C not masculine as in Pesh-S deficient-so not apt John1.3 The evangelist saith of him: "Everything was in him and without him was not one thing made" Agrees with Ev D ME as represented by C but the Peshitta has "all was through him". Here is a precise quote-the only one absolutely confirmed by Ephraim and it agrees absolutely with Sinai and has clearly Dr Mercati's Vatican Syrian MSS support on which Burkitt demurs although he says he sought it -whilst not admitting the absolute strength of this SERIOUS QUOTE OR QUOTES!

Also

John began ""Through him had been created everything...John therefore left that which through him had been created"

Ephrem takes these from Philoxenus on Trinity-cf Vatican Lib and BM Ad12164(6th century)differs from Pesh and C

QUOTE 51 John6.52 "How can this man his body give us?" Order is that of the Ferrer group

QUOTE 52 Our Lord purified the bodily frame of the brethren in a dish which is the symbol of concord"PESHITTA wahing basin" Ephrem 'dish for washing" also Aphraates

Quote 53 John15.1'The vineyard of truth" Diat-"I am the true vineyard" Also "In the 17th year let the vine give thanks to our Lord the vineyard of verity"-also in Arminian tract 2 288.

This is not in the Sinaiticus or the Peshitta-this is from the Syriac Diatessaron.

QUOTE 54 John16.11 "The ruler of this world is judged" S agrees with Ephrem. JN16.1 He will reprove the world in its sins and about his righteousness-Sinaiticus against Greek & Peshitta (CODEX PALIMPSESTUS SINAITICUS NO.30 among Syriac MSS in St Catherines Mt Sinai)

Quote 54 My father take and keep him" Jn17.11 Ephrem drops "Holy" to make 5 syllable verse.

Quote 55 "Lo everything is finished" Jn19.30

Neither S or C extant The Arabic DIAT & Armenian Vg-Peshitta has just `~It is finished

QUOTE 56 "Judas Thomas" Jn14.22 cf Syriac doct of Addai and Eusebius HE 1.13 in C & S

Burkitt after his extensive work on S & C says EDM as it left the translators hands was a fairly faithful rep of the Greek text but EDM as we know it is the text of S & C (which Burkitt alleges is simply EDM revised later) **All this is speculative-based on the primacy of the Greek text in 200AD at Antioch.** Burkitt puts all divergence down to the Syriac Diatessaron and thinks the Old Syriac agreed with the DIAT and that S & C were revised to agree with the Greek. Subjective conjecture!

The fact that S & C do not agree with Peshitta is because it is later Burkitt assumes that C is Palut in 200AD whereas S is assimilated by scribe familiar with Diatessaron 400AD. He says C represents later reviser who brought EDM closer to the Greek. Thus he is trying to say that the Syriac of EDM is not really very ancient but is worked over.

S seems not to be amended-it is EDM or Diatessaron. **S IS TOTALLY FREE FROM WESTERN INTERPOLATIONS.** Burkitt argues that C is influenced by Diatessaron.

Ephrem says "Father forgive them" was assigned by Tatian to the Last moments of Christ whereas in the MSS of the Gospels it is at the moment of first crucifixion. C contained longer Mark conclusion and that amended Syriac were found in the east from the 4th century.

John 4.24 gave trouble to scribes {God is a spirit and they who worship him must worship in spirit and truth}

HORT SAID 12 YEARS BEFORE THE PALIMPSEST 'THE CHARACTER OF THE FUNDAMENTAL TEXT CONFIRMS THE GREAT ANTIQUITY OF THE VERSION C (CURETON) IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM; while readings show it degenerated by irregular revision"

The Syriac Diatessaron differs more widely from Peshitta readings than the EDM though the Peshitta has adopted western readings in the Diatessaron but absent from the Greek text that underlies the Old Syriac.

Agreements between S C & frag of Diat are too numerous for there not to be a common origin

THE QUOTES OF APHRAATES AND EPHREM ARE EARLIEST FORM OF SYRIAC DIATESSARON AND THEY AGREE LARGELY WITH EDM.

SYRIAC DIATESSARON AND OLD SYRIAC WERE INDEPENDENT WORKS IT SEEMS. Burkitt ends by saying that the translator of the EDM must not have been unfamiliar with the Syriac Diatessaron

THE OLD SYRIAC GOSPELS MRS. LEWIS SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL

TO Prof.Hjelt AS REFEREE

Stit,—I have now received a report from Dr. Arthur Hjelt, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Helsingfors, concerning Appendix I. in my edition of the Old Syriac Gospels. The monks did not allow Dr. Hjelt to use a re-agent; he could therefore examine only those passages which are visible without it.

In 133 passages he finds that I am right as against Dr. Burkitt ; and in as others he thinks that my reading is possible. Those in which he finds **Dr. Burkitt right as against me are seven in number** ; and those where his reading is possible, rather than mine, are ii. **Seven of these, however, I dispute, because the extra syllable, consisting generally of only one letter, which I added to these words, was seen by me only with the re-agent.**

For the benefit of those who possess my book, I subjoin a list of the verses verified.

Matt. i. 2; ii. 2; 16; iii. 3; V. /9; viii. 16; viii. 24 and 29 are partly in my favour, and partly in Dr. Burkitt's. Matt. XV. 2; xvi. 9; xviii. 15; 19; xix. II; XXI. 38; XXIV. 2; XXV. II; XXVI. 24 as in text; 29; XXVII. 20; 37; 43; Mark iv. I; v. ; vi. 55 2; 12; Xi. 22; Xiii. 25; 27; 28; XiV. 19; 22; 24; xvi. 4; ; Luke i. 70; 79; 80; ii.8; g; 12; 15; iv. 35; 35; 36; 40; V. 4; 19; 262; vi. 33;viii. 192; ix. 52; x. 4; xii. 54; xiii. 32; xiv. xv. 6; xvi. 23; xvii. 15; xix. 4; 22. 33; sod. 15; 3/• xxii. 45; • John i. ; 42; 14 • 21; 21; 21; iv. 21; 35; vi. r. 'five words; vi. 19, a much-doubted word; 37; vii. II; 19; 49; 51; viii. 53; 33; ix. 2; 2; X. 38; Xi. 2; 18; 21; 25 conjectured by Dr. Burkitt, but read by me; xii. 29; 37; xiii. 32; xviii. so; '5; xx.

Also in the Supplement to Appendix I., pp. 294-299: Matt. ii. 9; iii. /4; v. 42; viii. 4; XVii. 20; xxiii. 17; xxiV. 22; 41. Mark i. 29; vi. 49; viii. 2; Luke i. 15; ii. 9; vii. 38; 44; viii. 49; x. 3; xi. 8; 38; xii. 3; 16; 31; 50; • xiii.. ; 32; xviii. 14; xix. 12; xx. 33; XXI. 12; i8; 49; John vi. 52; vii. 25 • 45; ix. II. Of the words which Dr. Hjelt thinks possible, he has underlined 2/ in my favour: Mark viii. 25; Luke v. i; t8; 222; viii. 19; ; xix. ; 6; 7; xxiii. 49; John vi. 25; ix. 9; x. 29; xiii. 23; xv. 6; 24; xviii. 2. And in the Supplement, pp. 294-299; Matt. xxi. 24; Mark xiv. 4; xvi. 7. Here Dr. Hjelt, not having the re-agent, did not see the segyame points. Luke xxii. 6; xxiii. 35. In the following passages Dr. Hjelt underlines 7 of Dr. Burkitt's readings as correct: Matt. xxii. 19; Luke xix. 5 a dot; *John xiii. 22. In the Supplement, John iii. 21; vii. 32; x. 9; xiii. 38.

And II as possible: Matt. viii. 24 partly; 29 partly; cf. supra. Mark xi. 2o; xiv. 9; *xvi. 418/ '• Luke v. 221; *iX. 38; xix. *28. In the Supplement, *Mark xvi. 5; Luke xii. 42; *xvi. /6.

I do not, however, accept all these 18 corrections to my own work. Those which I have marked with an asterisk I at first read as Dr. Burkitt and Dr. Hjelt have done. **But a slight touch with the re-agent revealed to me an additional final letter, or syllable, which sometimes put the word in the plural, but has now faded away.** Seldom has a wish been so quickly fulfilled as that which was expressed by your Reviewer on April 29. Dr. Burkitt has displayed great learning and ingenuity in his emendations of those passages which did not please him. But he has worked under the great disadvantage of **never having perused one half of the manuscript**—that half, in fact, which contained the most difficult passages. And what we chiefly want to have is the text as it was written in the second century; not as it has been revised in the twentieth. **In forty-one cases he has attempted to correct words that had been rightly read by the original transcriber**: 24 by Dr. Rendel Harris, 8 by me, 8 by Dr. Burkitt himself, 2 by Dr. Bensly and 2 by Bensly and Burkitt together. This was imprudent, for there are now four people who witness that the correction was unnecessary, viz., the original transcriber, myself, my sister, Mrs. Gibson (to whom I showed all such divergencies when at Sinai in 1906), and Dr. Hjelt.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate intend to prepare a leaflet suitable for placing in the pocket which they have put in the binding at the end of my book. It will contain a more detailed explanation of Dr. Hjelt's report, and will be sent by post to those who apply for it.

Yours faithfully,

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge, May 22.

THE ABOVE SUB-JOINED RECORD OF AGNES' LEWIS' WORK ON THE TEXT SHOWS HER INCREDIBLE ACCURATE AND SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO TEXT AND IN FACE OF TOP CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARSHIP HER SUPERIOR CAPABILITY

Bob Coffey

Aramaic Bible Companion