of R^s or R^v,[1] though it penetrated into the Syrian Church and partially supplanted R^v. If, indeed, it was ever fixed by an official board of redaction or a synod, it may well have been thus fixed in speculative, if not Gnostic, circles, to which the docetic appearance of Raphael,[2] and the appendage to R^v which appears in viii 15 of R^c,[3] would especially appeal. At any rate the revision was made in a non-Jewish and probably in a Christian environment. This is shewn, for instance, by the use of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον in vi 15.[4] Again, the dog becomes distinctly prominent on the return journey—a striking illustration of the growing influence of Zoroastrian doctrines and practices.[5]

D. C. SIMPSON.

GREEK THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

IN reviewing Dr Abbott's book *Light on the Gospel from an ancient Poet* in this JOURNAL (xiv pp. 313–316), I drew attention to a couple of passages in the Odes of Solomon which appeared to me to offer strong reasons for believing that the Syriac text was translated from Greek. In the first of these cases I argued that in Ode xli 16 the Syriac gives us a translation of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. In the second case I gave it as my opinion that the words in Ode xxx 6 'and until it [the spring of living water] was *set* [*lit.* given] *in the midst*, they did not know it' could not be a translation from Hebrew, since they contain an unsemitic idiom, viz. εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι, *in medio ponere*.

In the last number of the JOURNAL, p. 442, Dr Abbott says of the first of these two arguments that it is 'strong', and, 'if it cannot be answered, and if two or three more such instances could be alleged, the conclusion might become irresistible'. It is in the hope of persuading Dr Abbott, and others also, that I adduce in the present Note some further passages in which there appear to me to be cogent reasons for

---

[1] Constantly, as is shewn in the critical synopsis, considerable divergences appear in codd. 104, 106, 107, and 𝔖.

[2] Note the omission of the names of Raphael, human and divine, in iii 14, ἀγγέλων in xii 15, and the change to the plural ὁράσεις in xii 19.

[3] 'May all the aeons praise Thee and let Thy angels bless Thee.'

[4] For the use of this term in those parts of the New Testament writings which were intended primarily for non-Jewish Christians see Plummer *S. Luke* (*Int. Crit. Com.*) pp. 132 sq.

[5] Thus there was a substratum of truth in Kohut's attempt to connect Tobit with the revival of interest in Zoroastrianism at this time.

concluding not merely that the Syriac is a translation from Greek, but also that the Odes were composed in Greek.

But first I should like to say a word as to the second of the two cases already alleged. Dr Abbott discounts the value of the argument here on the ground that the Syriac says not 'until it was *set* in the midst', but 'until it was *given* in the midst'; and he asks: 'May we not then justly say, "This is surely *in medio dare*"—and points to a Hebrew original?' But here, I think, he has overlooked the fact that Syriac as well as Hebrew can, and often does, put 'dare' for 'ponere'. This being so, a Syriac translator might quite well translate τιθέναι by 'give'. Thus we get back to the main question : Are there any grounds for supposing that a Hebrew writer would use the phrase 'set (*or* give) in the midst' in the idiomatic non-local sense which attaches to εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι, *in medio ponere*, and is required here in the Ode—namely, 'to publish', 'make known', 'bring forward openly'? Dr Abbott adduces from Num. xxx 5 the phrase 'in the middle': but there a real local 'middle', of a carefully specified area, is in question; and I can see no parity between that passage and the one in the Ode.

The following are the additional arguments referred to above.

I. In Ode vii 4 we read: 'He caused me to know Himself without envy in (*or* by) His simplicity; for His kindness made His greatness little.'

Dr Harris notes that the Syriac expression 'without envy' stands for ἀφθόνως; and to me it appears that it evidently does so. But in any case it must be intended to convey the meaning ungrudgingly, bountifully. But 'in His *simplicity*', which follows, does not in Syriac, any more than in English, explain or amplify this idea. Why then is the expression used? If we translate it literally into Greek we seem clearly to have the answer : (ἐν) τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτοῦ is 'in His bounty' (2 Cor. viii 2, ix 11, 13; and ἁπλῶς Jas. i 5), and this is precisely what the context requires.

The adjective 'simple' meets us in Ode xxxiv 1, which with the next verse runs as follows : 'No way is hard where there is a simple heart ; nor is there any wound (*lit.* stroke) in right thoughts.' Here, again, the sense is greatly improved if we put ἁπλοῦς for 'simple' (and also ἔκπληξις for 'wound'): 'No way is hard where there is a generous heart ; nor is there any dismay in right thoughts.'

II. In Ode xx 5 is this sentence ܪܚܡܐ ܩܢܝܢܐ ܢܘܟܪܝ ܠܐ ܬܩܢܐ. That this is odd Syriac Dr Harris is witness; he refuses to translate it. Literally it is : 'thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood of thy soul.' Dr Harris thought the words 'the blood of thy soul' must be corrupt, and accordingly substituted for them in his text

by the price of thy silver' (ܟܕܡܝ̈ܟ ܕܟܣܦܟ) : a brilliant, but hardly a convincing emendation. The Nitrian MS discovered by Professor Burkitt supports the reading of Dr Harris's own MS; and I believe that the text is in fact quite sound, and that the difficulty lies not in the expression 'the blood of thy soul' (which is merely the Syriac way of saying 'thine own blood'), but in a peculiar use of the verb ܩܢܐ 'to acquire', or, in one of its forms, 'to possess', 'be possessed of'.

In one of the 'Intercession' prayers of the Syriac 'Anaphora of St James' the following expression occurs : ܗܘ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܩܕܡܘܗܝ ܡܣܝܟ̈ܬܐ ܕܩܕܡܘܗܝ ܡܣܝܟ̈ܬܐ ܘܩܢܐ ; that is literally : '(Thou) that possessest things impossible (as) possible.' Now most of the Syriac Anaphora of St James was translated from a Greek text differing not very widely from the Greek 'St James' as we now have it. It is true that in the prayers of the 'Intercession' the Syriac does differ considerably from the present Greek ; but this only means that it was translated from a different form of Greek text. The proof that the Syriac 'Intercession' also was translated from Greek lies in the quotations it contains from the Old Testament, which follow the LXX. Moreover, the above words occur in Jacob of Edessa's revision of the Syriac Anaphora, for which he must have used Greek texts current in his time (saec. vii) : one of the MSS of this revision in the British Museum (Add. 14499 fol. 20) definitely describes it as a 'Greek correction'.

Now the passage from the Anaphora which I have cited shews the same peculiar use of the verb ܩܢܐ as the passage in the Ode, except that in the former the particular part of the verb used means 'possess' rather than 'acquire'. But there can be no reasonable doubt that the original Greek of '(Thou) that possessest things impossible (as) possible' was ὁ τὰ ἀδύνατα δυνατὰ ἔχων (an adaptation of Lk. xviii 27). As Syriac has no verb 'to have', the translator, in attempting to construe literally, has been driven to use 'possess' for ἔχειν, and this in a case where the Greek verb does not mean literally 'to have'.

This, it seems to me, supplies us with the clue to the meaning of 'thou shalt not *acquire* an alien the blood of thy soul'. The meaning is : 'thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own (flesh and) blood' ; and the Syriac is a translation of οὐχ ἔξεις (or the like) ἀλλότριον τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα.

As already observed, there is no sufficient reason to suspect the reading 'the blood of thy soul', which has the testimony of both MSS, and which is good Syriac for 'thine own blood'. But does not this phrase in itself involve a Grecism ? Is there any Hebrew authority for the use of 'blood', like 'flesh', in the sense of kith and kin ?

I think we may now take the case a step further, and find the origin of this sentence in the Ode, and at the same time account for a momentary outburst of realism, in *vv.* 5 and 6, which is quite unlike the Odist's usual manner. If we turn to Is. lviii we find some remarkable coincidences with our Ode xx. First, there is a general parallelism of structure :—

Isaiah	*Ode*
(*a*) the unacceptable fast.	(*a*) the acceptable sacrifice.
(*b*) conditions, in the form of precepts, for an acceptable fast.	(*b*) similar conditions for an acceptable sacrifice.
(*c*) happy results from fulfilment of conditions.	(*c*) similarly (*vv.* 7 foll.).[1]

But there is a good deal more than this general parallelism : among the conditions, or perhaps constituents, of the acceptable fast and sacrifice are these (translating *v.* 5 of the Ode according to the above restoration of its meaning) :—

Isaiah lviii 7	*Ode* xx 5, 6
'when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him ; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh' (R. V.). [For the second clause the LXX has καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψῃ.]	5 'thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own blood, neither shalt thou seek to devour thy neighbour, 6 neither shalt thou deprive him of the covering of his nakedness.'

Here we have a double coincidence : (*a*) in the command about clothing the naked, (*b*) in the precept, expressed in a negative form, about the duty of acknowledging one's own kith and kin. But the second, and more striking, part of the coincidence is lost unless *v.* 5 of the Ode is taken as above suggested.

Again, among the results of observing the conditions under (*b*) is a coincidence of expression which in fact sent me in the first place to this chapter of Isaiah. The Ode *v.* 8 says: 'and glory [cod. N 'His glory] shall go before thee' ; Is. *v.* 8 says: 'and thy righteousness shall go before thee.'

Is this all pure coincidence? If it is not, and if the Odist is, as I think, actually working on Is. lviii, then there is another point that deserves attention. In *v.* 7 the Ode says: 'and come into His *Paradise*'; then, in *v.* 9 : 'and thou shalt *be fat* in (? the) truth in the praise of His name.' Isaiah says in *v.* 11, according to the LXX, καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ σου πιανθήσεται, καὶ ἔσται ὡς κῆπος μεθύων. That the Odist should put

---

[1] Dr Harris makes *v.* 7 begin with 'but'. Syr. 'and' can sometimes stand for 'but'; but here I think the force is 'and then'.

'Paradise' for 'garden' is not surprising, for he devotes a whole Ode (xi) to Paradise. Thus the parallel continues ; and we have yet another coincidence in πιανθήσεται and 'thou shalt be fat'. But here the correspondence depends on the LXX, for the Hebrew has a verb which is either explained as meaning 'he will invigorate' (יחליץ), or emended to 'he will renew' (יחליף), and which the Syriac renders 'he will make firm' (ܢܥܫܢ). If then the Odist is dependent on Isaiah here, he must have used the LXX: in other words, this Ode was composed in Greek.

III. The theme of Ode xii is 'the word'. But the Syriac noun employed is not that which regularly stands for λόγος ; it is *pethgāmā*, which answers better to ῥῆμα. This noun is used throughout the Ode except in *v.* 8, where we have *mellĕthā*, the usual equivalent of λόγος. The question arises, Is *mellĕthā* used here in the same sense in which *pethgāmā* is used in the rest of the Ode ? Dr Harris remarks : 'Apparently the Ode has two different renderings of λόγος.' I venture to take a different view.

In *v.* 5 it is said : 'the swiftness of the word (*pethgāmā*) is indescribable'.[1] *Pethgāmā* is still the subject of *vv.* 6 and 7, and of the first part of *v.* 8, which says : 'and by it the worlds spoke one to another.' The second half of *v.* 8 is thus translated by Dr Harris : 'and in the Word [*mellĕthā* here] were those that were silent.' But what does this mean, and how does it carry on the thought of the first half of the verse ? The Syriac is ܒܡܠܬܐ ܗܘܘ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܫܬܝܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ. It occurred to me some time ago—before I had thought of looking for the original Greek—that these words were intended to convey the following sense : 'and those that were silent became *with-speech*',[2] i.e. acquired the power of speech, became vocal. I am now confident that this is the true meaning, and I believe that the Syriac of *v.* 8ᵇ is merely an attempt at translating literally καὶ τὰ ἄφωνα ἔμφωνα ἐγένετο. Ἄφωνος is rendered by ܫܬܝܩ 'silent', in Is. liii 7, Acts viii 32 ; while ܒܡܠܬܐ, 'with- (*or* in-) speech', is exactly equivalent to ἔμφωνος, since *mellĕthā* (ܡܠܬܐ) means not only 'word' but also 'the power of speech '. For the construction cf. *Pesh.* at Lk. xxiv 5, where ἐμφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν is rendered 'and they became in-fear', in contrast with *syr. vet.* (*C S*) which has simply 'and they feared'.

Similar assonances to that in ἄφωνος and ἔμφωνος emerge elsewhere in the Odes when the Syriac is translated into Greek in the most

---

[1] Lit. 'without recounting', an extraordinary expression in Syriac, which I strongly suspect to be a translation of ἀνεκδιήγητος.

[2] The Syriac preposition 'in' may also be translated 'by' or 'with', as the context requires.

obvious way. Thus, in Ode xxxi 3 ܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܘܚܕܘܬܐ, 'grace and joy', is exactly χάριν καὶ χαράν. Again, Ode xxx 6 says: 'And it (the fountain of living water) came *undefined and unseen*; and until it was set in the midst they did not know it.' The italicized words are quite literally ἀόριστος καὶ ἀόρατος, though they might equally well stand for the two corresponding Greek adverbs.

IV. In order to find out whether the Odes were composed in Greek or Hebrew, an obvious course is to examine their allusions to the Old Testament, with a view to discovering whether they betray any dependence on the LXX. But it is unfortunate that—whether of set purpose or not we cannot say—the author has only too successfully disguised his scriptural allusions. Sometimes the disguise is transparent enough: as when he says, 'as the eyes of a son to. his father' (Ode xiv 1); but though we can occasionally find the passage he is using, it is as a rule impossible to say whether he is working with any particular form of text. Nevertheless, in the following case there appears to be some tangible evidence to go upon.

Ps. cxv 1, LXX (= 2 Cor. iv 13)

ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα.

2 Cor. iv 13, *Pesh.*

'I believed, *therefore* (ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ) have I also spoken.'

Ode xxviii 4

'I believed, *therefore* (ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ) I was at rest.'

Ps. cxvi 10, Heb. (= cxv 1, LXX)

'I believed, *for* I will speak.'

Ps. cxvi 10, *Pesh.*

'I believed, *and* I spoke.'

Thus Ode xxviii 4 says, 'I believed, therefore', in the same Syriac words which translate ἐπίστευσα διό in 2 Cor. iv 13 (= Ps. cxv 1); while in the Psalm neither the Hebrew nor the Syriac version of it expresses 'therefore'. It may of course be denied that in saying 'I believed, therefore', quite abruptly and without obvious reference to anything in the preceding context, the Odist does so under the influence of the Psalm at all. But in view of the way in which he elsewhere turns Scripture phrases off, and just avoids making a definite quotation, I find it hard to believe that we have here a purely accidental coincidence with the LXX.

V. The Hebrew verbs ברח and נום 'to flee', and their Syriac equivalent ܥܪܩ, are not, so far as I know, used metaphorically of fleeing for refuge to, taking refuge in, God; they regularly denote a real local flight. Both languages use other verbs to express the idea of taking refuge in God. But in Ode xxv 1 it is said: 'unto Thee

have I *fled* (ܥܪܩܬ), my God.' Is not this a translation of πρὸς σὲ κατέφυγον (cf. Ps. cxlii 9)?

VI. In Odes vi 1, vii 20, xiv 8, and xxvi 3—the only passages in which a musical instrument is mentioned—we find the Greek noun κιθάρα transliterated. It is true that the word was in use in Syriac at an early date, for it occurs a number of times in the Syriac Old Testament. A statement as to its use in the Psalms will be sufficient for the present purpose. The rule there is that when either of the two stringed instruments, *nebhel* or *kinnōr*, is mentioned alone in the Hebrew, it is represented in the Syriac by *kennārā*, which is merely the Syriac form of *kinnōr*. But when *nebhel* and *kinnōr* occur together, κιθάρα is employed for *nebhel*. The equation *kennārā* in Syr. = *nebhel* (standing alone) in Heb., of which there happens to be only one example in Pss. (viz. cxliv 9), is supported by other passages, as Is. xiv 4, Am. v 22. Thus, in the Psalms at least, κιθάρα is only used in conjunction with *kennārā*, that is, when a second stringed instrument has to be named. If then the Odes were written in Hebrew and not in Greek, why is the Greek word for harp always used in the Syriac version, and the Semitic word avoided?

VII. Dr Abbott thinks little of certain alleged cases of translation from Greek words with privative *alpha*. But I think there are some instances of this in the Odes which, when carefully considered, are in themselves nearly decisive of the question whether or not the Syriac text is a translation from Greek. I have already (see p. 534 note 1) drawn attention to the odd Syriac expression in Ode xii 5 'the swiftness of the word is *indescribable*', lit. 'without recounting', which I have identified with ἀνεκδιήγητος. The following cases are even more telling.

The first is emphasized by Dr Harris on p. 47 of his Introduction (second ed.). He says: 'An interesting example [of Syr. ܕܠܐ ܚܣܡ for ἀφθόνως] will be found in Ode 11 *v.* 6, where we read "speaking waters touched my lips from the fountain of God without grudging" (i. e. abundantly).' Here the context requires the really positive idea which ἀφθόνως expresses, but which the Syriac does not express.

Exactly the same is the case with Ode vii 3: 'He caused me to know Himself *without grudging*', is again quite inadequate to express 'liberally', 'freely'; and it is only from the requirements of the context, and from the literal correspondence of the Syriac phrase to ἀφθόνως, that we can arrive at the meaning by guessing the original Greek. A third passage to which the same remark applies is xx 7: 'but put on the grace of the Lord *without grudging*.' The expression ܕܠܐ ܚܣܡ is found as a translation of ἄφθονος, ἀφθόνως, in 4 Macc. iii 10 (ἀφθόνους πηγάς), and Wisd. vii 13; and the crudeness of the Syriac in the former case is paralleled by the passages in the Odes.

VIII. There is another point which must not be passed over, though its full force will be appreciated only by Syriac students. This is the use in the Odes of ܕܝܠܝ, ܕܝܠܗ after substantives to express possession. Strictly speaking ܕܝܠܝ should not be used (in cases where a possessive suffix is grammatically possible) except to give some sort of prominence to the possessor or to emphasize the fact of possession. Its indiscriminate employment after a noun, and equivalent to μου, αὐτοῦ, in the same position, is frequent in translations from Greek (though not in the earliest), but is hardly met with in native Syriac works. In original compositions by the best Syriac writers ܕܝܠܝ expresses 'my', 'mine', 'my own', not simply 'my'. Examples of an unidiomatic use of ܕܝܠܝ in the Odes are the following :—

viii 21 ܘܡܢ ܝܡܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ 'and at my right hand'. [There is no obvious reason for emphasis—'my own'—here.]

xi 18 ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܠܟ 'in Thy land'.

xii 4 ܕܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܝܠܟ 'of Thy beauty'.

xvii 12 ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ 'in my love'.

xvii 13 ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ 'my blessing'.

xxv 2 ܘܡܥܕܪܢܝ ܕܝܠܝ 'and my helper'.

xxvi 2 ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ 'His holy song'.

xxviii 9 ܘܥܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ 'but my (suffering of) wrong'.

I cannot think that a Syriac translation from Hebrew of, say, the third or fourth century, would have contained these anomalous constructions; for Hebrew has no detachable possessive particle, and relies entirely upon suffixes.

Before closing this paper there is a matter on which I wish to ask for information. In Ode xxxiv 5 we read :—

ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܠܬܚܬ܂ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ܂

'The likeness of that which is below is that which is above.'

Now Moses Bār Kēphā (saec. ix) in his Exposition of the Jacobite Liturgy (Brit. Mus. MS Add. 21210 fol. 51 b), after explaining that the deacons with their fans represent the cherubim and seraphim, adds :—

ܐܡܪܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܕܠܥܠ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܬܚܬ܂

'For they say : The likeness of what is above are those things that are below.'

It is obvious that there is some close connexion between these two sayings; and at first I took it for granted that Bār Kēphā was merely

quoting in a loose way from the Ode. I now feel some hesitation about this conclusion. Bār Kēphā's quotation formula, 'they say', rather suggests some philosophical dictum than an immediate quotation from such a book as the Odes; and in Ode xxxiv the Odist is himself definitely philosophizing; the passage cited above continues: 'for everything is above, and what is below is nothing, but is imagined by those in whom there is no knowledge.'

It has occurred to me that the Odist may here be quoting as well as Bār Kēphā. If any evidence could be produced in confirmation of this suspicion, it might throw a flood of light on many questions which have arisen out of our Syriac text of the Odes.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

ἘΠΙΦΩΣΚΕΙΝ.

IN the January number of this JOURNAL, p. 188 ff, Mr C. H. Turner has an elaborate Note on the meaning of ἐπιφώσκειν. The Note occurs at the end of an article on the Gospel of Peter, in the course of which, as also in the Note, Mr Turner explains his reasons for differing from the views set forth by Professor Lake in his book on the Historical Evidence for the Resurrection, published in 1907. I find myself differing from both my friends, or rather I agree first with one, then with the other, and I venture to think that a fresh statement of the questions at issue may not be out of place. The exact meaning of ἐπιφώσκειν may seem a small matter, but the fact is that its discussion raises a good many interesting and important questions as to the way in which the New Testament writers reckoned time: we begin with mere questions of lexicography, but at the end we may find ourselves discussing the nationality of St Luke and his credibility as a historian.

To put the matter shortly, I agree with Mr Turner that ἐπιφώσκειν is used of the next day 'drawing on', even of the Jewish Sabbath which began at dusk: this is indeed the traditional meaning. On the other hand I agree generally with Professor Lake in his exposition of Lk. xxiii 56.

1. *The Semitic usage.*—The word ἐπιφώσκειν is somewhat rare in Greek and most of the known passages, if not all, in which it occurs have been suggested either by Matt. xxviii 1 or Lk. xxiii 54. But the Semitic equivalents are used with some freedom in contexts that are not Biblical. The words in question are derived from the root *n-g-h*,