

ἐκβαλὼν he contributed to perpetuate the mistake among later writers (we have, indeed, a further remove from the truth in the Armenian translation of the Chronicle, the translation of which published by the Mekhitarists of Venice in 1818 gives the rendering 'condignam suis factis similiter retributionem recipit'). Nor is this all, for he has deleted the other military phrases in Tertullian, omitting *sacramentis*, and mis-translating *disciplinam* by ἐπιστήμην.

Finally, this general misinterpretation has been confirmed by the tendency to regard the passage in Tertullian as calm historical prose, composed in much the same key as a state paper, like Pliny's letter. This is one of the many passages where divorce from the context (as in extracts) or a false assimilation of contexts (to which the device of parallel columns lends itself) precludes any exact appreciation of the method of expression used in them. These sentences of Tertullian are not simply historical. They are sandwiched between passages of fervent rhetoric, occurring as they do in the very exordium of the treatise, and being immediately followed by the famous rhetorical dilemma—'O sententiam necessitate confusam! Negat inquirendos ut innocentes, et mandat puniendos ut nocentes.' Need we wonder, then, that Tertullian's citation has itself tended to take some slight subjective and rhetorical colouring from its impassioned context?

I am under obligation to my friends and colleagues at Aberdeen—Professor A. Souter, Mr J. Fraser, and Mr W. M. Calder—for assistance and criticism in the preparation of this note. This is not to say, however, that I hold them committed to its main contention.

G. A. T. DAVIES.

ST MATTHEW XXV 31-46 AS A HEBREW POEM.

It is an interesting fact that if the parable of the Last Judgement is translated into Biblical Hebrew it falls immediately into a rhythmical form quite as regular and striking as the forms which are found in the Old Testament prophetic and poetical books.

I offer here such a translation, followed by a transliteration of the same, and an English rendering in which I have sought, while keeping as closely as possible to the familiar English wording, to reproduce as nearly as may be the rhythm of the Hebrew, with its system of so many beats to the line.

It will be noticed that the first three and last two lines of the first strophe rhyme upon the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. -ו, 'his', whilst in lines 4, 6, and 7 we have rhyme produced by the plur. masc.

termination *-īm*; and rhyme is also apparent in lines 5-9 of the second strophe which end with the suffix of the 1st sing. *-nī*, 'me', and in the corresponding strophe in the second section of the parable. In the third strophe the same effect is reached through use of the suffix of the 2nd sing. masc. *-kī*, 'thee'. We may notice also, in the last strophe of section 1 and its corresponding strophe in section 2, that we have lines rhyming upon the termination of the 3rd and 2nd masc. plur. *-hem*, *-kem*, *-tem*.

כבוא בן אדם בכבודו
 וכל המלאכים עמו
 וישב על כסא כבודו
 ונאספו לפניו כל העמים
 והפרידם איש מאחיו
 כהפריד הרעה הכבשים
 מהעתודים
 והציב הכבשים על ימינו
 והעתודים על שמאלו

ואמר המלך לאשר על ימינו
 לכו ברוכי אבי
 רשו הממלכה הנכונה לכם
 ממוסדות תבל
 כי רעב הייתי ותאכילוני
 צמא הייתי ותשקוני
 גר הייתי ותאספוני
 עירום ותלבישוני
 חלה הייתי ותפקדוני
 בית כלא הייתי ותבואו אלי

וענו אליו הצדיקים לאמר
 אדני
 מתי ראינוך רעב ונסעדך
 או צמא ונשקך
 מתי ראינוך גר ונאספך
 או עירום ונלכשן
 מתי ראינוך חלה ונפקדך
 או בית כלא ונבוא אליך

וענה המלך ואמר אליהם
 אמן אמרתי אליכם
 אשר עשיתם לאחד
 אחי אלה הצעירים
 גם לי עשיתם

אז יאמר גם לאשר על שמאולו
 לכו מעלי הארורים
 אל אש עולם
 הנכונה לשמן ולמלאכיו
 כי רעב הייתי ולא האכלתוני
 צמא הייתי ולא השקיתוני
 גר הייתי ולא אספתוני
 עירום ולא הלבשתוני
 חלה ובית כלא ולא פקרתוני

וענו גם הם לאמר
 אדני

מתי ראינוך רעב וצמא
 וגר ועירום וחלה ובית כלא
 ולא שרתנו לך

וענה אליהם לאמר
 אמן אמרתי אליכם
 אשר לא עשיתם לאחד
 אחי אלה הצעירים
 גם לי לא עשיתם

והלכו אלה למוסר עולם
 והצדיקים לחיי עולם

keḇō ben 'ādām bikḇōdō
 wekōl hammal'ākīm 'immō
 weyāsāḇ 'al kissē keḇōdō
 wene'esḡū lepānāw kol hā'ammīm
 wehiprīdām 'īs me'ahīw
 kehaprīd hārō'ē hakeḇāsīm
 mēhā'attūdīm

wəhiššib hakkəbāsīm 'al yəminō
wəhā'attūdīm 'al səmōlō

wə'āmár hammélek la'ašér 'al yəminō
ləkú berúkə 'abí
rešú hammamláká hannekōná lakém
mimmosədōt iēbél
kí rā'ēb hāyīti watta'aklūni
šámé hāyīti wattaškūni
gér hāyīti watta'assepūni
'ēróm wattalbīšūni
hōlé hāyīti wattiṣkədūni
bēt kéle hāyīti wattaḅó'u 'eláy

wə'anú ēlāw haššaddikīm lēmór
'adōnáy
māṭáy re'inúkā rā'ēb wannis'adéka
'ō šámé wannaškéka
māṭáy re'inúkā gér wanne'assepékā
'ō 'ēróm wannalbīšéka
māṭáy re'inúkā hōlé wanniṣkədékā
'ō bēt kéle wannāḅó 'elékā
wə'aná hammélek wə'āmár 'alēhém
'amén 'amárti 'alékém
'ašér 'asitém lə'ahad
'ahḡay 'élle haššə'irīm
gam lí 'asitém

'az yōmár gam la'ašér 'al səmōlō
ləkú mē'aláy ha'rūrīm
'el éš 'olám
hannekōná lassātān ūlmal'akāw
kí rā'ēb hāyīti welō ha'akaltūni
šámé hāyīti welō hiškītūni
gér hāyīti welō 'issaptūni
'ēróm welō hilbaštūni
hōlé ūbēt kéle welō ṗəḡadtūni

wə'anú gam hém lēmór
'adōnáy
māṭáy re'inúkā rā'ēb ūšámé
wəgér wə'ēróm wəhōlé ūbēt kéle
welō šērātnū lāk

w'e'nāá 'alēhém lēmór
 'āmén 'āmárti 'alēkém
 'ašér lō 'asīém le'áħad
 'ahhay élle haṣṣe'irím
 gam lí lō 'asīém

wehálekū élle lemūsár 'olám
 wehaṣṣaddikím leħayyé 'olám

When the Son of man shall come in His glory,
 And all the angels with Him,
 He shall sit on the throne of His glory.
 And all nations shall be gathered before Him,
 And He shall separate them one from another,
 As the shepherd doth separate the sheep
 from among the goats;
 And He shall set the sheep on His right hand,
 But the goats on His left hand.

Then the king shall say to those on His right hand,
 Come, ye blessed of My Father,
 Inherit the kingdom prepared for you
 From the foundation of the world.
 For hungry was I, and ye fed me;
 Thirsty was I, and ye relieved me;
 A stranger was I, and ye housed me;
 Naked, and ye clothed me;
 Sick was I, and ye visited me;
 In prison was I, and ye came to me.

Then shall the righteous make answer to Him, saying,
 Lord,
 When saw we Thee hungry, and sustained Thee,
 Or thirsty, and relieved Thee?
 When saw we Thee a stranger, and housed Thee,
 Or naked, and clothed Thee?
 When saw we Thee sick, and visited Thee,
 Or in prison, and came to Thee?

Then the king shall answer and say unto them,
 That which ye did unto one
 of these least of My brethren,
 To Me too ye did it.

Then He shall say to those also on His left hand,
 Depart from Me, ye accursed,
 Into fire everlasting,
 Prepared for the Devil and his angels.
 For hungry was I, and ye fed Me not ;
 Thirsty was I, and ye relieved Me not ;
 A stranger was I, and ye housed Me not ;
 Naked, and ye clothed Me not ;
 Sick and in prison, and ye visited Me not.

Then they too shall make answer, saying,
 Lord,
 When saw we Thee either hungry or thirsty
 Or stranger or naked or sick or in prison,
 And did not minister to Thee?

And He shall make answer to them, saying,
 That which ye did not to one
 of these least of My brethren,
 To Me too ye did it not.

And these shall depart to chastisement everlasting,
 But the righteous to life everlasting.

It is important to remark (for the sake of those who are unacquainted with Hebrew) that I have not in the slightest degree exercised a *tour de force* in order to produce this rhythmical and rhyming effect in my translation. I have simply translated the Greek as it stands, as literally as possible and in the same order of words. Other scholars might conceivably have selected a different word in translation here and there ; but apart from this possibility the parable could scarcely have been translated otherwise. I append a few notes on the translation in cases in which it is possible that questions might be raised.

v. 32. ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων might be מרעוים instead of מהעוורים. In this case we most probably get one stress merely, *mēhā'izzim*, and the whole sentence forms a four-beat stichos :—

'As the shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats.'

vv. 35, 36. ἐπέινασα . . . ἐδίψησα . . . ἡσθένησα may possibly represent רעבתי, צמאתי, קליתי. This, however, would only make the difference of giving two-beat stichoi in place of three-beat, e. g.

kī ra'ābtī watta^a kīlūnī

as in the case of the line γυμνός, καὶ περιεβάλετέ με, 'erōm wattalbišūnī.

v. 35. In the case of the rendering *watt^o ass^e p̄ūnī*, 'and ye took me in', it may perhaps be doubted whether *habbāy^e iā*, 'into the house', can be dispensed with, since this occurs in Judges xix 15, 18, the only precise parallel. Cf., however, the use of the *Ḳal* form in Ps. xxvii 10, 'For my father and my mother have forsaken me, but Yahwe shall gather me', i. e. 'take me in', or, more generally, 'take care of me'. In the present passage Pesh. has ܘܕܠܩܡܘܢܝܘܢ simply, and the rendering of Pal. Syr. is similar.¹

v. 37-39. *wannis'ādēkā*, *wannaš^kēkā*, *wann^e ass^e p̄ēkā*, *wannalbīšēka*, *wanniš^kē dēkā* supply the object of the verbs, 'thee', which is understood in the Greek *καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν, κτλ.* This rendering is adopted because omission of the object appears somewhat unnatural in Hebrew. Such an omission, however, is within the range of possibility; and we might render *wannis'ād*, *wannaš^kē*, *wann^e ass^e p̄*, *wannalbīš*, *wanniš^kōd*. The rhythm would in no way be affected thereby, the only difference being the loss of the rhyming terminations to the lines produced by the suffix of the 2nd masc. sing. -*kā*.

v. 39. I have ventured to emend the text by the insertion of *wanniš^kē dēkā*, *καὶ ἐπεσκέψαμεν*; after *πότε δέ σε εἶδομεν ἀσθενῆ* (cf. v. 36). This improves the movement and rhythm of the poem, and may be claimed as legitimate, the case being different from that of v. 44, where all forms of service are summed up under *διηκονήσαμεν*. A similar change should perhaps be made in v. 43. It may, however, be intentional that, whereas we have *καὶ ἐπεσκέψασθέ με . . . καὶ ἔλθετε πρὸς με* in v. 36, the one phrase is chosen in v. 39, and the other in v. 43.

v. 40. I render *ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε κτλ.* by 'וּ דְּהַיְוָה וְשָׁן, and suppose that the original meaning of the Hebrew, 'That which, &c.', has been misunderstood in the Greek. It would be possible to understand וְשָׁן as meaning *ἐφ' ὅσον*.

The question which immediately suggests itself is whether it is antecedently probable that our Lord should have used Hebrew in speaking the parable. Since we know that He commonly employed Aramaic, and since this was the language in which we naturally assume that the populace would most readily understand Him, we are bound to ask whether the facts which I have noticed with regard to the Hebrew rendering of the parable are not sufficiently explained by the supposition that it was originally spoken in Aramaic; since Aramaic and Hebrew are in many respects closely akin. In order to test this

¹ Cf. the extract at the end of the note.

possibility so far as I am able I have rendered *vv.* 31-36 into Aramaic of the style of the Targums. This rendering is added at the close of the note, and I have followed it by the Palestinian Syriac version of the same verses.¹ My Aramaic translation was made before I had seen the Palestinian Syriac version. As a result, it appears that the rhythmical structure is largely obliterated; and, moreover, so far as I am aware, there is no evidence for the existence of any form of rhythmical composition in the Aramaic of about this period, the strictly quantitative systems of Syriac metre, the invention of which is ascribed to Bardesanes, being much later in date.

But is it really unlikely that our Lord should have composed and uttered the parable in Hebrew of the Old Testament model? Judging from His close study of the Old Testament scriptures, and from the recorded fact of His reading the portion of scripture in the synagogue at Nazareth, we cannot doubt that, as Man, He possessed an intimate knowledge of Hebrew. Our increasing acquaintance with the Jewish literature of this period has revealed the fact that works were produced in the Hebrew language up to a date considerably subsequent to the commencement of the Christian era. Evidence for this fact is found in writings of an Apocalyptic character. Dr Charles has made out a strong case for an original Hebrew text of the Assumption of Moses, which he dates *circa* A. D. 7 to 30, and of the Apocalypse of Baruch, *circa* A. D. 80 to 120. Similarly, Dr Wellhausen has argued for the Hebrew origin of 4 Ezra (*Skizzen* vi pp. 234-239, 1899), and the case for this work has most recently been ably worked out by Mr Box (*The Ezra Apocalypse*, 1912), who dates the work A. D. 80-130. The same view has been maintained by Dr Gunkel, Dr Charles, and other scholars. Dr Charles informs me that his study of the New Testament Apocalypse convinces him that it presents problems which can only be solved by the supposition of an underlying Hebrew original in certain parts.

These instances are surely sufficient to establish the fact that during the first century A. D. there existed writers of Apocalyptic literature who were accustomed to employ the Hebrew language as their medium of thought and expression. And the existence of such writers implies, of course, a wide circle of readers for whom such a medium formed a natural and appropriate currency, and who may have expected, even if they did not demand, that such teaching with regard to the Last Things should be thus presented.

It has frequently been remarked that our Lord's parable of the Last Judgement contains evidence of His acquaintance with the Apocalyptic

¹ As edited by Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae*.

phraseology of earlier times¹; and it is surely fitting that a parable which must be classed among the most solemn and impressive of all His utterances should be cast in the sacred language.

There is a further point upon which it is perhaps worth while to add a few words. To some minds the idea that the parable is a *poetical composition* may come with something of a shock, as opposed to the ordinary conception of our Lord's method of teaching. Certainly the view which is here advocated, if correct, brings to light a new medium by which He chose to convey the truths which He had to teach; since it is obvious that, if He employed this method once, He probably employed it upon other occasions also. But such a method of teaching by poetry, while it implies art, does not imply artificiality, or lessen the spontaneity of the teacher. We know now that the same method was constantly employed by the Hebrew prophets, whose most burning words are cast in this mould. The very teaching by parable of necessity involves art and premeditation; and upon any view of the parable with which we are dealing, the regular recurrence of its carefully balanced phrases exhibits a feeling for art in composition which may legitimately form subject for reverent study.

An Aramaic rendering of vs. 31-36.

31 בַּר יְיָתִי בְרִיָּה דְאֲנָשָׂא² בְּשׁוּבְחָיָה
 וְכָל מְלֻאכְיָה עִימָיָה
 וַיִּתֵּב עַל כּוּרְסֵי שׁוּבְחָיָה

¹ We may, for example, compare *v.* 31 with Enoch xlv 3, 'Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory'; lv 4, lxii 3, 'He sits on the throne of His glory'; lxii 5, 'When they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of His glory'; and similarly lxi 8, lxii 2, 3. With *v.* 41 compare Enoch liv 1-4, where 'iron chains of immeasurable weight' are said to be '*prepared for the hosts of Azazel* so that they may take them and cast them into the abyss of complete condemnation', which is described as '*a deep valley with burning fire*'. The phraseology of *vs.* 35 ff recalls Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, Joseph i 5, 6:—

'I was sold into slavery, and the Lord of all made me free:
 I was taken into captivity, and His strong hand succoured me.
 I was beset with hunger, and the Lord Himself nourished me.
 I was alone, and God comforted me:
 I was sick, and the Lord visited me:
 I was in prison, and my God shewed favour unto me;
 In bonds, and He released me.'

² Possibly we should render אַדָּם בַּר, as in the Targum of Ezekiel.

- 32 וְיִתְבַּנְּשׁוּן קְדָמוֹהֵי בֵּל עַמְמֵיָא
 וְיִפְרִישׁ אֵינוֹן גְּבַר מֵאַחֵהוּי
 כְּמֵא דְמִפְרִישׁ רַעֵי אֲמַרְיָא מִן גְּדִיָא
 33 וְיִקְסִים אֲמַרְיָא מִן יַמִּינֵיהּ
 וְיִגְדִיָא מִן סְמָלֵיהּ
 34 הִידִין וְיִמַר מַלְכָא לְאֵינוֹן דְּמִן יַמִּינֵיהּ
 אַתּוּ בְרִיכִין דְּאַבְא
 אַחְסִינֵי מַלְכוּתָא דְעַתִּידָא לְכוֹן
 מִן דְּאַתְּיַסְדַּר עַלְמָא
 35 אַרִי כְפֹן הָוִית וְאוּכְלִתּוֹן לִי
 צַחֵי הָוִית וְאַשְׁקִיתּוֹן יְתִי
 דִּיר הָוִית וּכְנִשְׁתּוֹן יְתִי
 36 עַרְטִילֵי וְאַלְבִּשְׁתּוֹן יְתִי
 מִרַע הָוִית וְאַסְעֶרְתּוֹן יְתִי
 בְּבֵית אֲסִירֵי הָוִית וְאַתִּיתּוֹן לְוָתִי

The same in the Palestinian Syriac Version.

- 31 כֵּן יֵשׁ מֵאֵל כִּיֹּס וְיַחַד חֲלַחְסֵיָא
 סַמְעֵל מַלְאָקֵס חַסְסֵס
 חַסְסֵס יֵשׁ חֲלַחְסֵיָא חֲלַחְסֵיָא? אַחְסֵיָא
 32 סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵס? חַסְסֵס סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵיָא
 סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 33 סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 סַמְטַעְסֵי חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 34 חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא
 חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא חַסְסֵיָא

* 35
 * 36
 * 36
 * 36
 * 36

C. F. BURNEY.

SOME INDIAN PARALLELS TO HEBREW CULT.

DURING a residence of five years in India the writer, like other observers, could not but be often reminded of the Old Testament. Some of the things that seemed to illustrate the story of the external cult of the religion of Israel are set down in the following pages. They are intended rather to ask than to answer questions, but, as it is much easier to describe apparent parallels from a definite point of view, the view of the evolution of Hebrew cult here tentatively taken may be briefly indicated.

It supposes that the development of image-worship in Israel proceeded for a long time by the same stages as in most other races, but that at a certain point, under the leadership of the Prophets, the Southern as distinct from the Northern Kingdom refused the normal evolution. Man's earliest known worship took place at spots where some natural object—tree, spring, stone—marked the haunt and guaranteed the presence of a living and moving god; the sacred stone and tree gradually took artificial form (though not at first that of images); as 'civilization' advanced there proceeded side by side an evolution of the ritual *instrumenta* and of the architectural environment of a shrine; frequently 'idols'—i. e. carved copies of plants, animals, or men—were first used not as objects of worship but to ornament the *entourage* of a sacred place; ultimately the tree and the stone became images proper, and so 'idolatry', in the strict sense of the worship of images, was not the first but a late stage in the development of early cults. Israel practised the cult of natural objects, admitted the evolution of the stone both into the pillar (*mazzebah*) and the altar, and allowed the use even of carved figures in the environment of a shrine, but in the South it ultimately refused to