checked some of my readings from the manuscript itself. I tried to suggest its possible significance for the history of the Te Deum text in J.T.S. vol. xxxiv no. 135 pp. 250-257.

* * * * ate pueri dīi laudate nomen dīi te dīm laudamus
te dīm confitemur / tibi caeli & uniuerse potestates
te aeternum patrem omnis terra ueneratur tibi omnes an
hierufin serabin incessabili uoce proclant sēs sēs

dīs dī sabaoth
ni sunt caeli & uniuersa terra honore gloriae tuae
oriosus apostolorum chorus te profetarum lauda
numerus / rum sēa confitetur aeclesia
art rum candidatus laudat exercitus te per orbem ter
em inmense maiestatis uenerandum tuum/ gle xpe
um unigenitum filium sēm quoq paraclitum sēm tu rex

tris sempiternus es filius tu ad liberandum mundum suscip
orrusti urginis uterum tu deuicto mortis aculeo aperuisti
dentibus regna caelorum / uenturus
dexteram dī sedes in gloria patris (iudex cre)deris esse
ne redemisti / populum tuum dīe
nnam fac cum scis gloriam munerei. saluum fac
nedic hereditati tuae & rege eos & extolle illos usq in saeculu
gulos dies benedicimus te & laudamus nomen tuum in aeter
num & in saecula saeculorum amen

MAURICE FROST.

TWO TREES BECOME ONE: Ezek. xxxvii 16-17.

'And thou, son of man, take thee one tree (םי) and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another tree (םי), and write upon it, For Joseph, the tree (םי) of Ephraim and all the house of Israel his companions: and bring them near (זיבר, Piel Imper.) one to another for thee to be one tree (םי), and they shall become one 1 by thy means' (דיבר).

One of the common metaphors of the Hebrew Scriptures is that of a 'tree' to represent a people. In Ezek. xv 2 ff. the vine-tree (מגנה, מום) represents the inhabitants of Jerusalem: in Ezek. xvii 6 ff. and xix 10 the vine is the tribe of Judah or the royal house of Judah. Similarly in

1 Hebr. 'ones' (?), an impossible usage; s. Biblica XIX 181-183 [G. R. D.].
xxxii 3 the cedar represents Assyria, and the rival nations are described as ‘all the trees of Eden’ (יֶעַבְדֵּךְ, verse 9). On these analogies we may surely translate יֶעַבְדֵּךְ in its usual sense as ‘tree’. The two houses of Judah and Israel stand apart like two palms standing solitary and apart on the great Euphratean plain, but they are to be brought near to one another by Ezekiel’s ministry, and so they will become again as ‘one tree’.

This procedure might have been represented as a process of grafting: in that case no translator would have stumbled over the rendering of יֶעַבְדֵּךְ. But the prophet in verse 17 though he still uses his metaphor of ‘tree’ is losing grasp of his metaphor when he uses the verb ‘bring near’ (בָּשַׁל). The rendering ‘join them one to another’ (A.V.) cannot be justified: the verb describes admirably the approach of a person or a number of persons each to the other, as in Daniel vii 13, ‘And they brought him (one like unto a son of man) near before him (the ancient of days)’, where the Haphel of the Aramaic is used (רָשַׁל). Here in Ezek. xxxvii 17 the Prophet is charged to bring the two sections of Israel, symbolized by the two trees, into friendly approach. It is not too great a charge for a Prophet. He does not ‘join’ them together: they, the two peoples, come together when they are induced to approach one another.

The rendering ‘stick’ for יֶעַבְדֵּךְ (AV = RV) is due to the LXX, λαβὲ σεαυτὸν ὀξύος. The Greek translators were no doubt misled here by a reminiscence of the two symbolic staves (יִתְנָה כֶּפֶן, ὀξύος) of Zech. xi 7–14, ‘Beauty’ and ‘Bands’, with which JEHOWAH shepherded Israel and Judah before they were divided. The rendering ‘stick’ is equally wrong in 2 Kings vi 6.

The Targumist also was misled, probably by the command to ‘write’ on the יֶעַבְדֵּךְ. Men write on a ‘tablet’: hence the Targum in verse 16 has מחָרֶּךְ לַּפְּתַּח חֵבֵּב, ‘take thee one tablet’. But two venerable versions remain faithful to the Hebrew. The Peshitta has מָסָּמֶךְ לִיפֶּה מִסָּמֶךְ, ‘take thee one tree’, and the Vulgate, ‘sume tibi lignum unum’. It is true that in the plural in Mark xiv 48 the word may be rendered ‘staves’ (ξύλων), but lignum is usually ‘tree’, as in Gen. ii 9, iii 1–3; Ezek. xxxii 5, 9, 14, 15; et passim.

If it be objected that בְּנָדִי, literally ‘in thy hand’, suits the rendering ‘stick’, let it be remembered that בְּנָדִי need not be understood literally. In 1 Sam. xvi 2 the LORD says to Samuel, ‘Take an heifer בְּנָדִי’ and in Mal. i 1 we read, ‘The word of JEHOWAH . . . by the hand of my messenger (בְּנָדִי),—not ‘by the mouth’.

Ezekiel is an obscure writer, and not least in his use of metaphors. Surely his lapse from a consistent use of the metaphor throughout
verses 16, 17 need not drive us from the obvious rendering of ובו. If Ezekiel’s meaning was ‘stick’ or ‘staff’, he could have used קַל (Ezek. xxxix 9), or מָמָא (iv. 16; v. 16), or even מַעֲשָׂה (xxix. 6).

W. EMERY BARNES.

LINGUISTIC AND TEXTUAL PROBLEMS: MINOR PROPHETS. III.

ZEPHANIAH.

I 17: אֲנָאָי בַּעֲדֶּקָתָהַלְלֵה הַטָּמָאִים. First, Nowack’s objection to the figure in the first clause that der Vergleich des ausgeschütteten Blutes mit dem Staub passt nicht is hypercritical; the picture is that of casting aside something of little value like earth. In fact, pouring out earth in digging trenches, filling holes or building ramps, was common in the ancient East, and there is extant a letter dated in the sanat epir Sipparim (KI) ēšapku ‘the year in which the soil of Sippar was poured out’ (from some famous operation carried out in it); and Palestinian writers must have been almost equally familiar with the process. Second, the Massoretes have vocalized עָכַי as a pass. participle meaning ‘their eaten stuff’ to fit the sense to that of עָכַי. The LXX, Pesh., and Arab. V., however, all translate it ‘their flesh’, which well suits the parallel עָכַי; and the Arab. אְלִקָה ‘flesh’ supports this rendering (as many renderings of the LXX are justified by Arabic roots, which are thus seen to be far older than the classical language in which alone they are otherwise known to us). Ought not then עָכַי to be restored, on the assumption that עָכַי was originally a general term for ‘food’, whether ‘flesh’ or ‘bread’, though afterwards restricted to ‘bread’, while עָכַי was always restricted to ‘flesh’? If, then, it is a word denoting flesh as what is eaten, i.e. animal flesh, its application here to human beings must be intended contemptuously (just as ‘hide’ and ‘carcass’ are sometimes so used in English parlance). Nor is the figure of pouring out flesh any too strange, being exactly illustrated by kal širḥu šapik ‘all his flesh is poured out’ in an Assyrian medical text. Thus the R.V.’s ‘and their blood shall be poured out as dust and their flesh as dung’ may be accepted as a justifiable translation of the M.T.

I 18: אֲנָאָי דַּעַל פּוֹלָנָא ‘an end, yea one hastily brought about’. This

1 In Kleine Propheten 296.
2 Sum. IŠ = Acc. epiruš (Heb. לאע) ; s. Muss-Arnolt C.D.A.S. 1081-1082 for numerous examples.
4 The חָמ ‘to eat’ is old, as the Acc. ḫebru ‘to eat, be satisfied’ shows.
5 Sum. UZU = Acc. śiruš (Hebr. מַעֲשָׂה).
6 Thompson A.M.T. 41 i 34.