

of its unity, but is enriched with essentially human attributes. Apart from this scene of human evolution in struggle and sin, there is an original sinless humanity, complete, not in the making, but perfected. It exists in God, and when God breathed into His creature the breath of life He gave a portion of Himself, a potentiality to develop with that creature's evolution into a perfect man. If we accept this hypothesis, the fact of our identity in a sense with the Divine nature is established, and becomes more than a mere vague aspiration, and the ground is prepared for a reasonable solution of the problem of the formula of Chalcedon. It is no longer necessary for us to use that strange Modernist circumlocution 'made in Germany,' that, 'though Christ is in all senses human yet He has for us the value of God.' He is God, because He is Perfect Man. The Creeds are patient of this conception. In their formula the relation of the Divine and Human in Christ is a mystery for faith. The problem is just stated. But we have to take the abstract conceptions, spiritualize them,

and stress the conception that perfect Humanity, flawless in love and unerring in purpose, is an element in the Divine, and we are prepared to see the Son of Man, self-knowing and God-knowing, coming to His own in the Incarnation. The Person is Divine-Human, and therefore can energize in the human sphere as a limited human being.

With such a faith we are at one with St. Paul in his doctrine of the Heavenly Man, with St. John and his Logos, and indeed with all the orthodox writers up to Athanasius occupied as he was in preserving Christianity from drifting away from its purpose as a religion of salvation, and Augustine ever tracing analogies from human to divine: and indeed, so far as we may reverently discriminate, with the consciousness of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who accepted the rôle of Isaiah's suffering servant as well as that of David's triumphant Messiah, and while assuming a unique intimacy with the Father, yet could say: I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.

'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'

BY PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.THEOL., D.D., UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN.

AN unobtrusive word of Jesus, but one which is very illuminating to the sympathetic observer of the Passion story, has suffered the fate of being misinterpreted, even ill-treated under the influence of atticistic schematization, despite the fact that it was rendered correctly in the oldest versions. In the night of His betrayal, when Judas greeted the Master and kissed Him, Jesus said, 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'² [Mt 26⁵⁰]. Whoever reads these simple words with the eyes of the antique Hellenist will find in them just as little difficulty grammatically as in the similar gospel words from the fragment³ of a wedding parable (Mt 22¹²), 'Friend, how have you come here?'⁴

Ἐπί, with the accusative as well as with παρέιμι, admits of but one meaning. We find accurate

parallels for the uniting of both in literature; Plato, *Gorgias*, 447, ἐπ' αὐτό γε τοῦτο πάρομεν ('For just this are we here'), and still more apt because in the form of a question, Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 1101, ἐπὶ τί πάροστε δεῦρο; ('For what purpose are you present?'). Such *cur hic?* questions will have been thus formulated countless times in real life. The word to Judas is also a *cur hic?* question.

The use of the relative ὅς as an interrogative is by no means rare in late Greek, although distinguished grammarians have looked upon them as unbelievable before the systematic investigation of later texts. It has its analogies, however, in other languages, and its counterpart in the frequent use of the interrogative τίς as a relative.⁵

¹ Translated by Rev. Clarence Craig.

² ἔταίρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάροι;

³ The beginning of the parable is lost. Only the conclusion has been preserved, beginning with Mt 22¹¹. What precedes is another wedding parable, which ends with v.¹⁰.

⁴ ἔταίρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε;

⁵ J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of N.T. Greek*, i. (Prolegomena), 3rd ed., p. 93, gives good examples from the LXX, papyri and inscriptions. See also Blass-Debrunner, 5th ed., ¶ 298, 4. I add LXX, Lv 21¹⁷ (see Karl Huber, *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus*, Giessen, 1916, p. 69).

I gather together below some illustrations of the interrogatory δ s which have already been observed by other grammarians (Jannaris, Radermacher, A. T. Robertson, Blass-Debrunner).¹

The earliest translators of the New Testament have correctly understood the interrogatory meaning of the sentence. One should not look upon these men as philologists who spoke one language and learned others in school in order to translate it sentence by sentence with the assistance of a learned apparatus. Rather, as already the translators of the words of Jesus, they were Christians who had spoken two or three languages since childhood. (How often is this type ascertainable in the modern Orient!) They spoke the living languages with all their redundance, and were unaffected in their Greek by atticistic conventionalism. They simply translated from their naive feeling for the language, and we can be certain that they rarely struck amiss. Therefore we may look upon the oldest versions, the old Latin and the old Syriac, usually valued only for the text, not only as invaluable sources for the history of exegesis, but also as storehouses for modern exegetes. Both the old Latin and the old Syriac translation from Sinai have understood the word to Judas, however, as a *cur hic?* question, and many other translations of ancient and modern times have followed in this the right path.²

The misinterpretations of the phrase began early. They rest on the failure to recognize the interrogatory significance of δ . Already in the Codex Armachanus (812 A.D.), a representative of the Hibernian text,³ with its *amice, fac ad quod venisti* ('Friend, do that for which thou hast come'), the relative meaning is forcibly restored.

¹ Pseudo(?)-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Gentiles* (p. 253 A), $\delta\iota' \eta\nu \alpha\iota\tau\iota\alpha\nu \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ 'Ομήρω; Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, vi. 7 p. 257 d, Gaisford $\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$; Apophthegmata Patrum (Migne, P. G. lxx.), 105 C, 'Αρσένιε, $\delta\iota' \delta \acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma$; for other examples, cp. Usener, *der heil. Tychon*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 50.

² To mention only some: the Vulgate of Hieronymus, Luther, the Reformed John Piscator in his Latin work on the Bible (Herborn, 1613), as already in the German (Herborn, 1604), the English Authorized Version of 1611, the Dutch State Bible, the popular Greek translation of Maximos Kalliupolita (Geneva, 1638) [$\acute{\omega} \phi\iota\lambda\epsilon \delta\iota\alpha\tau\iota \eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega$]; and the edition of Queen Olga (Athens, 1900) [$\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon, \delta\iota\alpha\tau\iota \eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma$]; the French translations of David Martin and of J. F. Ostervald, the Italian (Rome, 1892), Weizsäcker.

³ *Novum Testamentum Latine*, edited by White (1911), p. vii.

Eight hundred years later the official Vulgate editions of the Papacy, the Sistine, and the Clementina printed *ad quid venisti?* instead of the Hieronymus text, *ad quod venisti?*⁴ The interrogatory meaning is fortunately not thereby removed, but the text is formally refined at least. It is comprehensible that a Byzantine exegete working under strong atticistic influences, Euthymios (twelfth century), should expressly reject the interrogatory meaning of δ .⁵ That comes from the same attitude as the *fac ad quod venisti* in the Irish codex.⁶ But one should not therefore cite Euthymios as an authority in such questions in which atticistic feeling for the language was in conflict with the living, oral language.

To this day the influence of this atticistic misunderstanding is marked. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of the more recent exegetes accept the judgment of partially obsolete grammars, and manifest scruples against an interrogatory δ . We need not wonder, then, that the English Revised Version of 1881 altered the correct translation of the Authorized Version of 1611, 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?' to 'Friend, do that for which thou art come.' That is exactly the text of the Book of Armagh.

Even more doubtful are two still more recent attempts, in spite of the high reputation of their originators. Julius Wellhausen,⁷ followed by E. Klostermann⁸ explains the sentence as abbreviated: ['Küsst du mich zu dem Zweck] zu dem du, wie man sieht, gekommen bist?' ['Do you kiss me in the object] for which it is evident you have come?' He considers that the 'Do you kiss me' does not need to be said because the kiss is performed on the scene just at that moment. Klostermann translates even more strangely ['Missbrauchst du den Kuss zu dem Zweck] zu dem du hier bist?'⁹ ['Do you misuse the kiss

⁴ This *ad quod* is a Latin vulgarism corresponding exactly to the Greek $\acute{\epsilon}\phi' \delta$. It has not likely arisen simply through imitation of the original.

⁵ See E. Klostermann (in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*), Mt 26⁵⁰. He follows the authority of Euthymios.

⁶ It has frequently been pointed out that the old Irish Biblical science was strongly dependent upon the Greek; see my article, 'Hisperica Famina in einem Evangelienkodex,' *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 34 (1913), col. 325 ff.

⁷ *Das Evangelium Matthæi erklärt*, Berlin, 1904, p. 140.

⁸ *Loc. cit.* p. 337.

⁹ These explanations are related to the older one by Curt Stage (*Das N.T. übersetzt in die Sprache der Gegenwart*), Leipzig [Reclam], 1896, p. 67 ['Heuchle nicht mit deinem

in the object] for which you are here?' I have the impression that just the reference to 'acting' rules out this explanation. The evangelist does not desire to report a mimical action which should work out with perfect correlation between the deed of the one and the word of the other, but a piece of tragic reality. When we enter into the spiritual atmosphere of the night of the betrayal, these words of Jesus cannot be so understood when viewed with undistorted perception.

Friedrich Blass,¹ on the other hand, in whom one can more easily understand the old atticistic antipathy toward an interrogative δ , does not shrink from a far-reaching emendation of the clear text of the manuscripts: $\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon$ must be a corruption of $\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon$ or $\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon \alpha\iota\rho\epsilon$: 'Take what you have come for.' There one of the most genuine² and wonderful words of the Saviour has fallen sacrifice to atticism. It is an unintentional self-revelation of the one betrayed, which glitters as a last star before the traitor in the night of rejection: comrade, companion, friend has he yet called the one who has sunk to such depths! How can the gospel of the Passion forego this human, this superhuman word unless it is absolutely necessary?

But that necessity does not exist. Even he who distrusts the historical method of Biblical philology and demands a special example for each individual case can be satisfied. A Greek saying, which is to be found on Syrian goblets from the time of the Roman Empire, teaches us that just the question $\epsilon\phi' \delta \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota$; was a fixed phrase in popular speech. There is in the possession of my friend Dr. Theodor Wiegand (Berlin-Dahlem) a glass purchased by him in the Crim which bears the inscription encircling the whole as a band,³

$\epsilon\phi' \delta \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota$; Wherefore art thou here?
 $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu$. Rejoice!

Dr. Theodor Wiegand, to whom, together with the late Dr. Georg Moeller, I am indebted for a rubbing of the inscription on the cup and reference to other examples, assigns the inscription to the first century of the Christian era and describes it thus after an accurate investigation. The two Kuss, sondern tu], wozu du hier bist' ['Do not dissemble with your kiss but do that] for which you are here.'

¹ *Grammatik des Neutest. Griechisch* (1896), p. 172.

² Matthew gives here without doubt the primary tradition. The parallel in Lk 22⁴⁸ bears more the mark of cult-language.

³ I hope to be able to give a facsimile in the forthcoming newly revised fourth edition of my book, *Licht vom Osten*.

halves of the saying are arranged on the halves of the cup which consists of two parts pressed together. The spacing is such that one cannot tell which is the beginning of the saying.

I do not doubt but that $\epsilon\phi' \delta \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota$; is the beginning and $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ the answer.⁴ The inscription on the goblet and the gospel text help to explain each other. If we must hold the sentence in the Passion narrative for a question, as is sufficiently supported by popular Greek usage, then we hear a question from the Syrian goblet: the joyous *cur hic?* and the equally joyous answer.⁵

The Berlin Museum possesses other similar goblets. One bears the catalogue number 11866, the other belongs to the collection 'von Gans,' No. 212. Both have as orthographical variants $\epsilon\phi'$ ϕ instead of $\epsilon\phi' \delta$.⁶ The latter has after $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ a perpendicular line revealing where the two halves unite. This might mark the beginning and the end of the saying. Since further vessels of this kind with sayings are elsewhere preserved⁷ we are safe in assuming that this type of inscribed goblet was wide-spread and well known. It would be going too far to assume that the translator of the Aramaic word of Jesus was dependent upon the $\epsilon\phi' \delta \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota$; in this goblet saying. Rather both the translator of the words of Jesus and the author of the goblet inscription were dependent upon the popular Greek.

⁴ In itself $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu \epsilon\phi' \delta \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota$ would be conceivable. But what would that mean? 'Rejoice that you are here!' That would be very weak, however. Influenced by the presupposition that it must be a relative δ , the one who suggested the above translation offered as an alternative, 'Rejoice as long as you are still at hand (living).' This last explanation is grammatically hard as well as being very unilluminating.

⁵ See Ps 104 [103]¹⁵ $\delta\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\phi\rho\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\nu \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$, 'Wine delighteth the heart of man.'

⁶ The Syrian goblets therefore give a parallel to $\epsilon\phi' \phi$ witnessed by a minority of the manuscripts of Mt 26⁵⁰. The variant hardly rests on any real difference in meaning, but shows that \omicron and ω were no longer distinguished in pronunciation. The writers of the New Testament had the same possibilities of a varying orthography as the unknown who inscribed the saying on the Syrian goblet.

⁷ See (communication from Dr. Wiegand) G. Sangiorgi, *Collezione di vetri antichi*, Milano-Roma, 1914, Table 19, where there is published a Syrian goblet discovered in the province of Cremona bearing our inscription with the variant $\epsilon\phi' \phi$. Whoever has once observed this type of vessel will be sure that yet other examples will be discovered.