Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

En résumé la place du verbe est souvent insolite dans Marc. Ce fait découvert par C. H. Turner peut être appelé le *phénomène de Turner*.

A mon avis il prouve que Marc grec est une traduction d'un original latin. La tradition conservée par Saint Ephrem est vraie.

<div style="text-align: right">P.-L. COUCHOUD.</div>

THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

AMONG much else of interest in A. Delatte's recently published volume *Anecdota Atheniensia* I (*Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liége* xxxvi) is a Greek version of the Gospel of Thomas (pp. 264–271), in which for the first time we have the equivalent of the Latin *Thomas*, printed by Tischendorf, *Evv. Apocr.* (p. 164). That Latin version has three apparently extraneous or preliminary chapters (i–iii) which tell of the flight into Egypt and return. The fourth has the ascription to Thomas, and we make a fresh start with the Infancy miracles.

These chapters have always been somewhat of a puzzle, the second in particular, in which is a story that seems quite pointless. I will give it first in the Latin :

Et deambulante Iesu cum Maria matre eius per medium forum civitatis, respiciens vidit magistrum docentem discipulos suos. Et ecce xii passeres insidiantes inter se ceciderunt per murum in sinum illius magistri qui pueros docebat. Iesus autem cum vidisset hilaris factus est et stetit. Cum ille doctor vidit illum hilarem factum cum furore magno dixit discipulis suis : Ite adducite eum ad me. Cum autem sustulissent eum, magister apprehendit auriculam eius et dixit : quid vidisti quod hilaris factus es ? At ille dixit ei : Magister, ecce manus plena tritico. Ostendi illis et sparsi triticum quod in periculo e medio gerunt : (*another MS* plena tritici. Et hic ostendit spargens triticum quod cum periculo emit) propter hoc enim pugnaverunt (passeres) intra se ut dividerent triticum. Et non praeteriit inde Iesus donec (id quod dixerat) adimpletum est. Et hoc facto magister coepit eum proiicere de civitate una cum matre sua.

I defy anybody to make a coherent tale out of this : but let it now be read in the Greek :

Παρερχόμενοσ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦσ μετὰ τῆσ μητρὸσ αὐτοῦ διὰ τῆσ πλατείασ τῆσ πόλεωσ εἶδε διδάσκαλον καθηγητὴν διδάσκοντα παιδία. δώδεκα οὖν στρουθία κατελθόντα ἀπὸ τείχουσ ἐμάχοντο πρὸσ ἀλλήλουσ καὶ ἔπεσον ἐξαίφνησ εἰσ

τὸν κόλπον τοῦ καθηγητοῦ. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦσ ἐγέλασεν. ὡσ δὲ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ καθηγητὴσ γελῶντα, θυμοῦ πλησθεὶσ εἶπε· τί ἰδὼν ἐγέλασασ ; ὁ δὲ πρὸσ αὐτὸν ἔφη· καθηγητά, ἰδοὺ γυνὴ χήρα ἔρχεται πρόσ σε βαστάζουσα σῖτον ὃν μετὰ κόπου ἠγοράσατο, καὶ ὧδε ἔχει προσκόψαι καὶ διασκορπίσαι τὸν σῖτον. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μάχονται τὰ στρουθία ταῦτα πόσουσ κόκκουσ δεῖ ἕκαστον λαβεῖν. οὐκ ἀνεχώρησε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦσ ἕωσ οὗ τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπληρώθη. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ διδάσκαλοσ τοὺσ λόγουσ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰσ ἔργον γεγονότασ ἐκέλευσε διωχθῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆσ πόλεωσ μετὰ τῆσ μητρὸσ αὐτοῦ.

Now all is clear. Both the Child and the sparrows were able to foresee that the old woman would stumble and spill the corn she was carrying, and the sparrows were quarrelling in advance about their several shares. The Child waited to see the event ; all turned out as He had said, and the master, horrified at the supernormal knowledge, took means to expel Him from the town. The whole point has been obliterated in the Latin : perhaps in 'manus plena tritico' is a relic of anus : 'et hic ostendit spargens triticum quod cum periculo emit' represents 'et hic offendet', etc. The story seems to be an embroidery on the saying that 'a sparrow shall not fall to the ground without your Father'.

There is, however, more to be said about these preliminary chapters of the Latin Thomas. Some connexion subsists between them and the conclusion of the Protevangelium. The last chapter of that runs thus :

Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰάκωβοσ ὁ γράψασ τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, θορύβου γενομένου ὅτε (al. ἔωσ οὗ) ἐτελεύτησεν Ἡρώδησ συνέστειλα ἐμαυτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἕωσ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θόρυβοσ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, δοξάζων τὸν δεσπότην θεὸν τὸν δόντα μοι τὴν δωρεὰν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην. (Doxology follows.)

At two points this touches the text of Thomas with which we are concerned.

First, in the opening words of the book :

DELATTE.	LAT.
Θορύβου γενομένου ἐζητεῖτο ὁ Ἰησοῦσ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέωσ. τότε οὖν ἄγγελοσ κυρίου λέγει τῷ Ἰωσήφ κτλ.	Cum facta fuisset conturbatio quoniam requisitio facta fuit ab Herode de d. n. I. C. ut eum interficeret tunc angelus etc.

Then more markedly at the end of cap. iii :

DELATTE.	LAT.
γνοὺσ δὲ * ὁ Ἰησοῦσ ἀπὸ τῆσ Αἰγύπτου συνέστειλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰσ τὴν ἔρημον μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν Ἡρώδου ἕωσ οὗ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θόρυβοσ ἐν Ἱερου-	Ut autem exiit Ioseph de Egypto (another MS : ut autem intellexit Ioseph quia venit Iesus de Egypto) post mortem Herodis, tulit eum in

σαλήμ. καὶ ἠρξάμην δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν κἀγὼ Ἰάκωβοσ τὸν δόντα μοι σοφίαν ὅτι ἐξεῦρον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν αὐτοῦ, ἀμήν.

deserto usque dum fieret tranquillitas in Ierusalem de his qui quaerebant animam pueri. Et egit gratias deo quod dedit intelligentiam (*al.* deo quia dedit ei talem intelligentiam) et quia invenit gratiam coram domino deo, amen.

The first words of the Greek are plainly defective : it was Joseph who received news—he had left the Virgin and Child and returned before them—but we cannot dwell on that now. The text continues :

ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην κἀγὼ γνωρίσαι πᾶσι τοῖσ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀδελφοῖσ ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριοσ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦσ Χριστόσ, γεννηθεὶσ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἡμῶν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν κώμῃ Ναζαρέτ· οὗ ἡ ἀρχή ἐστιν αὕτη.

Gloriosum est enarrare Thomam Israelitam et apostolum domini [et] de operibus Iesu postquam egressus est de Egypto in Nazareth. Intelligite omnes fratres carissimi quae fecit dominus Iesus quando fuit in civitate Nazareth. quod in primo capitulo.

This Greek agrees pretty well with one of Tischendorf's—the Paris fragment—save that it has eliminated the name Θωμᾶσ ὁ Ἰσραηλίτησ, leaving us to understand that the writer is James.

The Latin text, on the other hand, has preferred to eliminate the name of James which must once have stood in the sentence ' Et egit gratias deo ', etc.

At some period in the evolution of these Infancy Gospels it was the practice to make a single book out of the *Protevangelium* and the Gospel of Thomas. We have perhaps the finished article in the *Liber de infantia* (Ps-Matthew), where the junction is more or less neatly smoothed over. In ch. xvii we have the Massacre of the Innocents and the Flight into Egypt : xviii–xxiv tell of the journey : in xxv is the return, and xxvi sqq. give the contents of the Gospel of Thomas. The MS. Arundel 404 (see p. 120 of my *Latin Infancy Gospels*) makes the juncture rather less cleverly. But both avoid, of course, the mention of two writers.

In the new Greek and the Latin we seem to have the remains of another blend of *Protevangelium* and *Thomas*. The end of *Protev.* is farced with an incident or two connected with Egypt : then the return to Palestine, and thereafter the narratives of *Thomas*. The concluding words of *Protev.* are retained, and also the beginning of *Thomas*: but, in the Greek, a pretence is made that the two writings are by one author ; in the Latin, the first of the two writings is made anonymous.

I am not in a position to pursue to its end the examination of the new Greek text. Before this can be done with profit, we must have a decipherment of the very early Vienna palimpsest of the Latin version, of which Tischendorf read only a few short passages. This will help us to decide whether Peeters is right in his view that all the Greek and Latin texts we have go back to a Syriac base.

No Syriac equivalent of the first three chapters of the Latin *Thomas* has as yet been found. It is noteworthy that in the very old Syriac MS used by Wright, *Thomas* follows immediately after the *Protevangelium*; but there is no attempt to amalgamate the two books.

Quite enough of the (gnostic?) second-century Gospel survives in the various versions to make a thorough examination of all the authorities worth undertaking.

<div style="text-align: right">M. R. JAMES.</div>

THE ORIGIN OF פתגמא

THIS and other strange words in Ezra and Daniel are explained by commentators as Old Persian. The explanations are derived from an article by Gildemeister in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* iv pp. 208–215, and have been repeated by one after another without question or investigation. As the article appeared in 1842, it is not unreasonable to reconsider the etymologies there proposed in the light of the progress made in OP philology since that date. I only propose to deal here with one word which has been troubling me lately.

פתגמ(א) (Gildemeister, p. 214) occurs in a Hebrew context in Esther i 20 and Eccles. viii 11; in an Aramaic context in Dan. iii 16, iv 14, Ezra iv 17, v 7, 11, and vi 11. It is generally taken to mean a 'command', or in a weakened sense a 'word'. Lagarde in his 'Armenische Studien' in *Abh. d. k. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen* xxii no. 4 (p. 126), 1877, compares φθέγμα, but whether he means it etymologically or as a translation is not clear.

Since it is used in Ezra, Daniel, and Esther of the Persian king, Gildemeister (and the rest following him) makes it an OP word *patigâma* from *patigam* to 'arrive'. It is then made to mean a 'message', as modern Persian پَیام, said to be for پیغام (cf. the compound پیغمبر *nuntium afferens*). Perhaps some one who has more knowledge of Zend than I possess will say whether such a noun as *patigâma* is a correct formation and what its meaning should be. As far as I can find out, no such noun occurs. Yet if it was borrowed by Aramaic, it should be a

very common word which was heard frequently and for which there was no exact equivalent. Moreover, if it means 'message', it is a most unsuitable word in some passages. The Great King did not send messages. He gave orders. 'I Darius have made a decree; let it be done with all diligence' (Ezra vi 12). Further, if it came to mean only 'word' why should it have been used at all instead of the ordinary Aramaic? While thinking over these difficulties it occurred to me that it might be the Greek ἀπόφθεγμα, a troublesome word for a Semite to pronounce. I asked Mr Lobel whether this was ever used in the sense of a 'decision' or 'edict' (pronouncement). He told me that it was not so used, but (said he) why should not your word be ἐπίταγμα? In fact I believe that it *is* ἐπίταγμα, in the proper sense of a despotic command, and that this meaning suits the passages better than any other.

Ezra iv 17 'Then sent the king an *order*' (RV 'answer' is only a guess. LXX καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεύς). *V.* 19 shews this to be the meaning: מני שים טעם 'I hereby make a decree', and it was not to be altered (*v.* 21) עד מני טעמא יתשם 'until I make a (new) decree'. It was not a mere message or answer, and the style of it is shewn by *v.* 22 'Take heed that ye be not slack herein'.

Ezra v 7 'they sent the *decree*' bodily for verification (RV 'a letter', LXX ῥῆσιν). It was included in the letter (*v.* 6). It is true the text is not very skilfully managed just here (in *v.* 4 the first person is out of place), but it is inconceivable that different words should be used for the same letter in two consecutive verses (as RV). The meaning seems to be (*v.* 6) 'The copy (?) of the letter that Tattenai ... sent (enclosing the decree) and it was written therein thus'.

Ezra v 11 'And thus they replied to us (by quoting) *the decree*' (RV 'returned us *answer*', LXX ῥῆμα). They had the decree ready, and played it as their trump card.

Ezra vi 11 'whosoever shall alter this *decree*' (RV 'word', LXX ῥῆμα).

Dan. iii 16 'we have no care to answer thee as to this *decree*' (RV 'matter', LXX ἐπιταγῇ, Theod. ῥήματος). It is the decree mentioned in *v.* 10.

Dan. iv 14 'The *decree* is by decision of the watchers' (RV 'sentence', LXX om., Theod. ὁ λόγος). It is stated in *vv.* 11-13.

Esther i 20 'And when the king's *decree* ... shall be published' (so RV, LXX νόμος and λόγος). It is the royal command proposed in *v.* 19, which will be a דת.

Eccles. viii 11 'Because *sentence* against an evil work is not executed speedily' (so RV, LXX ἀντίρρησις, with the reading מֵעֲשֵׂי). Here the meaning is extended—the decree of a judge. It is remarkable that the word should occur at all in this late book. It had evidently passed into common use and had lost its special meaning.

In all the passages it seems to me that the meaning of ἐπίταγμα is suitable. Then how came it to be adopted in Aramaic (and later in Hebrew) as a loan-word? Both Aramaic and Greek were international commercial languages under the Persian rule, and each borrowed from the other. I suggest that on the royal roads by which commerce travelled, there must have been regulations and tariffs established by royal decrees which were known in Greek as ἐπιτάγματα (פתגמתא, an excellent Aramaic plural, though the form does not occur). The term would then come to be used by traders, whether Aramaean or Greek, for all royal decrees. By the time of the LXX it had ceased to be understood. Yet the Masoretes, to their credit, followed a correct tradition in pointing the first syllable with an *i*, and were not led astray by the analogy of פַּתְשֶׁגֶן and פַּתְבַּג. In the Targums the word (adopted from Biblical Aramaic) has lost all definite meaning, and is said to be used simply as a synonym for דבר 'word', 'thing', but I have not examined the passages.

<div align="right">A. E. COWLEY.</div>

PROSE RHYTHM IN THE *PASSIO S. PERPETUAE*

THE third-century work known as the *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis* consists of three parts : an introduction and conclusion by an unnamed redactor ; a narrative written, we are told, by S. Perpetua herself, recounting her imprisonment and four visions ; and a much shorter narrative by another martyr, Saturus. In recent years the identity of the redactor has been made the subject of some discussion, Dr Armitage Robinson (*Cambridge Texts and Studies* i 2) arguing very ably in favour of Tertullian. It has also been questioned whether the narratives of the martyrs themselves are, as they claim to be, written in their own words, *sua manu et suo sensu* ; most scholars agree that they are genuine in the main, but some incline to the idea of a rehandling by the redactor.

In preparing for the press a translation of the *Passio* it seemed to me that an examination of the clausulae of the text was desirable and might be illuminating. Unfortunately, the total number of sentences which can be tested (quotation and conversation being excluded as is customary) is so small as to diminish somewhat the significance of the results obtained. Certain things, however, seem clear.

(1) The redactor's prose is the rhythmical prose of a practised writer and exhibits most of the conventional clausulae. His percentage for the form $- \cup - - \cup -$ is particularly high. Where the instances con-

sidered are so few in all, it would be unreasonable to argue from the prevalence or absence of Tertullian's most characteristic rhythms to the identity of the writer, though in fact the low percentage of $- \cup \cup \cup - \cup$ would seem to be in accordance with Tertullian's usage.

(2) Perpetua has a fairly high percentage of good clausulae, but her preferences are not the redactor's, e. g. she favours $- - - \cup -$, which he avoids. Further, since most of her metrically harsher endings, not only in clausulae but also in cola and commata, make good accentual forms (e. g. *méntis Diáboli, praésens non fúerat, último tradíderat*, a recurrent type), I think it probable that she consciously uses a *cursus mixtus*. In any case, her rhythms are sufficiently different from the redactor's to make it reasonably certain that her narrative was never revised by him.

(3) The short vision of Saturus reveals no conscious use of rhythm, quantitative or accentual. It also is evidently untouched by the redactor.

(4) The redactor's rhythmical prose seems to make necessary an emendation which indeed is already required by the sense. In cap. 18 all the MSS but one, and all the editions, read *comminabantur de hoc. Ut ... peruenerunt*, thus spoiling an excellent clausula and yielding no satisfactory meaning, since there is nothing to which *hoc* can plausibly refer. I propose to accept the reading of Codex Sarisburiensis, namely, *comminabantur. Dehinc ut ... peruenerunt*.

<div align="right">W. H. SHEWRING.</div>