'often as a term of respect and affection'. The main idiom, in its essential features, occurs eight times in the Old Testament and five times in the New; the Septuagint always reproduces the Hebrew idiom, so that no argument for the purpose of this article can be based upon it. It means *laissez-moi tranquille*, 'let me be', as the small French Crampon Bible puts it (in a note on John ii 4), but, *en bonne ou mauvaise part*, the tone may be friendly or unfriendly. More often it is unfriendly, but it is distinctly friendly in 2 Chron. xxxv 21, and the sequence sufficiently shews in what sense it was uttered here. The Hebrew idiom is concerned with *persons*; there are traces of a Greek idiom concerned with *things*. Demosthenes (*contra Aphobum*, ch. 12, ed. Reiske p. 855) says, Τί τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τῇ βασάνῳ; 'The law is clear on the point without any need to resort to torture'. Again, in Suetonius's Latin *Lives of the Caesars*, in a passage which I have not seen quoted before, we read that Otho said, Τί γάρ μοι καὶ μακροῖς αὐλοῖς; meaning, 'Why did I not leave the long pipes (business) alone', and apparently referring to a bad omen when he was acting as augur (Suet. *Otho*, 7). We also have a similar expression used by Synesius, a Christian bishop of the early fifth century (Epistle 105): Δήμῳ γὰρ δὴ καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ τί πρὸς ἄλληλα; This is 'an excuse for his *nolo episcopari*, and is an important contribution to the explanation of the phrase.

Reference has been made once and again in the foregoing to the Apocalypse of John, but without serious attempt to build up a case from it. If once it were allowed to have the same author as the Fourth Gospel, the thesis set forth in this article could be greatly strengthened; but it seems unlikely that those who find a difficulty in the thesis would admit such a premise. Nor, truth to tell, does the thesis really need such support; taken, as was said at the outset, as one great cumulative argument, the evidence already adduced appears of itself to amount to solid proof.

<div style="text-align: right">CUTHBERT LATTEY.</div>

ON 'LIFTING UP' AND 'EXALTING'.

DR E. A. ABBOTT in his exegetical studies on the Gospels has a great deal to say about 'lifting up'. According to him, 'lifting up' in the Fourth Gospel always implies Christ's Passion and Ascension (*Diatesserica* vii, 2998 (xxiii) *e*). There can of course be no doubt that the Evangelist connects the 'exaltation' of the Serpent in the Wilderness with the Crucifixion (John iii 14, xii 32–34), and at the same time regards

this 'exaltation' as some sort of glorification. The Greek word is ὑψοῦν, a word which lends itself well enough to the double meaning, but which as a matter of fact is not used in the Septuagint in connexion with Moses' brazen Serpent.

The object of this Note is not to criticize Dr Abbott's general position, but merely to enter a warning against so understanding his § 1003 c (*From Letter to Spirit* p. 360 note ³) as to suppose that the Aramaic root זקף has anything to do with this connexion of the idea of 'crucifixion' and 'exaltation'.

The passages in St John are so familiar that we naturally now associate the word 'lift up' with the Crucifixion of our Lord. When therefore we find that זְקַף (also זְקִיף) means both 'to lift up' and 'to crucify' or 'impale', it seems natural to assume that the Fourth Evangelist came to his theory of the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man by a Semitic path, that the theory must have been made by one who spoke or thought in Aramaic. The point of this Note is to shew that the 'lifting up' implied in זקף and its derivatives is of the nature of 'fixing', 'hanging', 'staking', or 'straightening', hardly ever of 'raising to a higher level'. There is an Aramaic word exactly corresponding to ὑψοῦν, *viz.* ארים (Heb. הרים), which like ὑψοῦν generally means to 'exalt' in a more or less metaphorical sense, but can also be used of 'raising to a higher level' (e.g. Joshua iv 5). This is the word used by the Syriac Versions for the passages in St John,[1] but it has no associations at all, apart from the context of these passages, with crucifixion or the stake.

The word זקף appears to mean 'to set up by fixing firm', e g. Aphraates 278 ܐܰܪܥܳܐ ܥܰܠ ܛܽܘܪ̈ܶܐ ܙܩܰܦ 'God *fixed* the mountains on the earth'; Ephraim *Against Hypatius* ii (E R 65₁₄) quotes Mani as saying that the Primal Man flayed the Sons of Darkness, and out of their bones He moulded and *fixed* (ܙܩܰܦ) and piled up the mountains. In Gen. xxxi 45 Jacob with Laban set up a Stele (וירימה מצבה): in the Targum this is rendered וזקפה לקמא 'and he *fixed it up* for a standing stone'.[2] But in Joshua iv 5, where the men take up the stones on their shoulders, and in 2 Kings ii 13, where Elisha takes up Elijah's mantle, זקף is not used for הרים, because the object lifted up is not fixed.

It is quite in accordance with this that *zkīfā* ('a thing fixed', hence 'a stake') should be used for the Greek σταῦροσ in the N. T. There is another Aramaic word for 'cross', *ṣlībā*, but for some reason it was almost always avoided in the earliest Syriac version: I do not think any difference of meaning can be detected.

---

[1] The Palestinian Syriac has רומם, another form of the same root.

[2] קמא is regularly used in the Targums for the unorthodox Maṣṣēba of the Hebrew.

One or two idiomatic uses of זְקַף here call for notice. There is an easy transition from 'being fixed up' to 'standing up', so that in the Targums זְקַף is occasionally used in this sense, as in the case of Joseph's Sheaf (Gen. xxxvii 7).[1] In Syriac it is used for the 'bristling' of hair standing on end (Job iv 15), and this idea I think underlies the use of ܙܩܦ for a squally sea; in English also we say the sea 'got up', and both this and the Syriac suggest the aspect of a wild beast with its coat bristling rather than mere altitude of waves.

That a man who holds his hand up in prayer or asseveration should be said to 'fix' his hand is another natural usage (Exod. xvii 11, Deut. xxxii 40 in the Jerus. Targums). More curious is the use of our word in such phrases as זְקוֹף עֵינָךְ (Deut. iii 27), i. e. '*lift up* thine eye!' Here again I venture to think that if we analyse the notion, it is rather that of 'fixing up' than of 'elevation', because in all branches of Aramaic there is a synonym תְּלָא עֵינָא, *lit.* 'to hang the eyes'. Thus in Psalm cxxiii 2 there is no verb in the Hebrew, which runs 'as the eyes of slaves unto the hand of their masters . . . so our eyes unto the LORD our God': the Targum supplies מוֹדִיקִין (='gaze'), but in the First Targum to Esther v 14 we read that the House of Jacob prayed to their Father in Heaven saying 'as the eyes of slaves *hang* (תְּלִין) to their masters . . . so our eyes *hang* upon Thee'. And the Sinai Palimpsest at John vi 11, following the arrangement of the Diatessaron xviii 38–40 (see Mark vi 41), inserts before καὶ εὐχαρίστησεν the words ܘܬܠܐ ܒܫܡܝܐ, i. e. ἀναβλέψασ εἰσ τὸν οὐρανόν, *lit.* 'and He hung (His eyes) in heaven'. This use of ܬܠܐ for 'lift up the eyes' is regularly employed in the Palestinian Christian documents.

This Note was written mainly to make the actual usage of זְקַף in the various Aramaic dialects more clear to my own mind, and it will for instance be obvious to any one who has considered the examples given above that זְקַף (or אִזְדְּקַף) would be quite impossible to be used for the Ascension. The chief conclusion is that near as the ideas of 'lifting up' and 'exaltation' are, they were kept distinct in Aramaic as in other languages, and that the peculiar conjunction of *crucifixion* and *exaltation*, found in the Fourth Gospel, is a deliberate association of ideas, not a linguistic confusion.

[1] The only occurrences of זְקַף in Biblical Hebrew (Ps. cxlv 14, cxlvi 8) refer to straightening what is bent.

F. C. BURKITT.