

NOTES AND STUDIES

A NEW MS OF THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

FOR more than two years, ever since Dr Rendel Harris first published the 'Odes of Solomon' in October 1909, scholars have been expressing their regret that so interesting a document should have been preserved only in a single late copy. All the while a much older MS of the Odes was lying unnoticed at the British Museum, where it had been housed for some seventy years, and been duly catalogued for forty years!

B. M. Add. 14538 is described in Wright's *Catalogue* pp. 1003-1008, and is assigned by him to the 10th century. The greater part of the volume (*fol.* 1-148) consists of extracts from earlier writers arranged under headings: what follows (*fol.* 149-155) is in a different and to my eyes a rather earlier hand, as if an earlier MS had been bound up with what precedes. In this latter part there are about 50 lines on the page and the margins are very small, giving the impression that the leaves have been cut down to fit the rest. Wright's description of the leaves which concern us (*fol.* 149-152) runs as follows:—

4. A collection of Hymns, very imperfect. Fol. 149 *a*. Those that remain are numbered from **ב** to **כ**, and from **י** to **א**. The eighteenth begins thus: **הַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְבָבִי אֶמְצָא**
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה; and the nineteenth thus: **אֶתְּחַיֵּה**
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה
אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה אֶתְּחַיֵּה.

Nothing more was needed to tell us that we have here a MS of the Odes of Solomon, followed (as in Dr Harris's MS) by the Psalms of Solomon, and on examination this proves to be indeed the case.

Dr Wright's description needs some little correction and supplement. The four surviving leaves of Codex Nitriensis, which I shall call N, contain the 'Odes' from xvii 7 to the end, immediately followed by the 'Psalms', the extant portions in the numeration of Ryle and James

being i 1-iii 5 and x 4-xviii 5, but the last section (*fol.* 152) is both defaced and lacerated. There are no headlines, and as neither title nor colophon is preserved, the name of Solomon does not appear. The single Odes and Psalms are written quite continuously, but as in Dr Harris's MS (H) each 'Ode' ends with Halleluia (here written ܘܠܠܘܝܐ), while the Psalms have no such ending. Ode xlii ends at the end of the last line of *fol.* 151 a, 'Psalm' i beginning *fol.* 151 b without any break or superscription except ܘܠܠܘܝܐ, i.e. 'No. 43'.

It should be remembered that the division into 'Psalms' and 'Odes' so far as the Syriac Version is concerned, is modern and artificial. They are numbered in one series in N, the only headings being ܘܠܠܘܝܐ, ܘܠܠܘܝܐ, &c. (i.e. 'No. 27', 'No. 28'). In H the corresponding headings are ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ, ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ (i.e. 'Ode Twenty-seven', 'Ode Twenty-eight'). The collection was also known as 'The Psalms (ܘܠܠܘܝܐ) of Solomon, son of David',¹ but the *zmirta* of H exactly corresponds to the *ψδῆ* of Lactantius and the *Pistis Sophia*, as may be seen from Eph. v 19, so that there can be little doubt that the proper name of the whole Sixty Poems in Syriac was ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ.

The collations given below will shew how near the text of N is to that of H, in other words how generally satisfactory Dr Harris's text is, so far as the Syriac version of the Odes is concerned. It may further be added that if stiffness and absence of really characteristic native idiom be any test, the Syriac version may be accepted as a very faithful rendering of the original Greek of the Odes. From our point of view that is a merit, as it enables us more clearly to realize what this original Greek may have been like. At the same time it tends to prove that the literary history of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon in Syriac was neither long nor influential. Quite recently Mr W. R. Newbold has attempted to prove that Bardaisan was the author of the Odes,² but I do not suppose his theory will commend itself to any one who is familiar with original Syriac literature. The Odes in Syriac are a creditable piece of work, but their language is a very different thing from the graceful and flexible tongue in which the Acts of Judas Thomas and the Dialogue on Fate are written.³ No theory of the

¹ So *C. U. L. Add.* 2012, which quotes a few verses from 'Psalm 58' (i.e. Ryle and James xvi), as pointed out by Dr W. E. Barnes in *J. T. S.* for July 1910.

² *Journal of Biblical Literature* xxx 161-204.

³ As a simple instance, contrast the ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ of the Peshiṭta in Matt. xxviii 20 with the ܘܠܠܘܝܐ ܘܠܠܘܝܐ of Ode xlii 6.

origin of these Odes is satisfactory, which regards the Syriac translation that we possess otherwise than as an exotic.

The discovery of a Nitrian MS of the Odes helps us to bring them back to their proper home, to the land of Egypt. As long as it seemed that the great Monophysite Library of St Mary Deipara contained no copy, it might be guessed that these Odes had had some peculiar ecclesiastical history in their Syriac dress. Now we can see that in all probability they are part of the literary activity of the Syriac Monophysite community in Egypt, the school that produced the translation of the Acts of SS. Peter and Paul and Luke.¹ All three authorities for the Odes in Syriac are of a definitely Jacobite character. The notice detected by Dr Barnes occurs in a late Jacobite MS, Dr Harris's MS is in a Jacobite hand, and the much older Nitrian MS is appended to a catena of extracts arranged and selected in the interests of Monophysite controversy. Moreover the small range of variation between N and H precludes the idea that they were much read.

One or two general remarks on the Odes may be added here. In discussing the style and meaning of these poems hardly sufficient attention seems to me to have been given to the fact that they come before us as Odes of *Solomon*. They are found bound up with the 'Psalms of Solomon', a pseudepigraphical work composed between 70 and 40 B.C. No doubt these Psalms were called Solomon's, because they are more or less modelled in style upon the Canonical Psalter, the Psalms of David. In fact, we may regard the ascription of these 'Psalms' to Solomon as an indication that the Davidic Psalter was already closed when they were written.

As for the Odes, there is nothing to shew that the name of Solomon was not associated with them from the first, whether they appeared separately, or (as I think more probable) they were first published as an enlarged and Christianized edition of the Solomonian collection. The mention of the *χριστός* by Solomon in the Psalms may have inspired the Odists to make Solomon speak of theology and grace in a more intimate and less political fashion. But pseudepigraphical composition amongst Jews and Christians had its own rules. Not, of course, that the authors tried to make the hero of old time prophesy or write in accordance with real historical verisimilitude: that would indeed be a literary anachronism. But, for all that, certain historical anachronisms were always avoided. It may almost be expressed in a formula—the Seers of old are supposed to foretell *events* and to understand *doctrines*, but they must be silent about *names*. Thus in Daniel xi we read all about the wars of the Syrian and Egyptian Diadochi, but the names

¹ See Guidi in the *Nachrichten v. d. k. Gesell. d. Wissenschaften*, 1889, p. 52.

of Antiochus and Ptolemy are never mentioned. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs no one doubts that John Hyrcanus is meant in *Levi* xviii, but his name is not uttered. The second of the Psalms of Solomon 'describes the death of Pompey in unmistakable terms', but the most definite detail 'Solomon' is allowed to set down is 'thrust through upon the mountains of Egypt'. Scholars have disputed whether the Odes of Solomon are Jewish or Christian, but in either case we must not expect more definiteness of statement than is appropriate for a pseudepigraphic work.

To the Early Christians the Psalms of David were a storehouse of specifically Christian doctrine. We ought not to expect that a work which calls itself 'Odes of Solomon' would be much more definitely Christian, on the surface and in the matter of names and catchwords, than the Psalms of David. The Odes of Solomon appear to me to be intended as adumbrations of Christian doctrine in exactly the same way that Psalm xvi (xv) 10 was supposed to indicate the Resurrection, or Psalm xxii (xxi) 17, 19 to indicate the details of the Passion. And this is what makes the interpretation of the Odes to us so exceedingly vague and unsatisfactory, so far as the date and position of the writer is concerned. The Psalms of Solomon 'prophesy' events: we can therefore date these Psalms by the history of events. The Odes of Solomon, on the other hand, 'prophesy' doctrines, and the history of doctrines and dogmas is not so sharply defined a chronological series as the history of events.

This may sound almost too obvious to lead to anything, but as a matter of fact the neglect of these elementary considerations has led several scholars to make definite and (to my mind) untenable statements about the Odes. Thus Dr Harris can still describe the Odist as a 'man who had no Eucharist so far as his language goes', and as a 'mystical writer whose affinities are not with priesthoods or sacraments'.¹ But is it not expecting too much, to expect that 'Solomon' will *name* the Christian Mysteries? Ode xlii is acknowledged to be Christian, because the writer speaking in the person of the 'Son of God' describes the Harrowing of Hell, and because at the beginning of the Ode is a mention of the 'Tree' and the 'outstretched hands' that are the Lord's Sign. What is not mentioned by name is Jesus and the Cross. But no one would say that the writer was really unaware that the name of the Son of God was Jesus or that He was crucified. Similarly, because the writer in other Odes speaks of cups of milk and never mentions Baptism or Eucharist, we are not at liberty to suggest that these institutions are not all the time in his mind. It is not a question of the *Disciplina arcani*, but of the style appropriate for pseudepigraphical composition.

¹ Harris, ed. 2, p. xvi.

Those who have been reading Dr Schweitzer's new book will understand why it is the theology of the Fourth Gospel and not that of the Pauline Epistles and of the Synoptics that is again and again suggested by the 'Odes of Solomon'. It is because both the Fourth Gospel and the Odes are representatives of the early Greek-Christian theology,¹ which was dominated by the idea that the bodies of the faithful are delivered from 'corruption' by partaking of 'Spirit'. Like the Fourth Gospel, the religion of the Odes may be described as the Greek Mystery-religion, transfigured by the historical event of the Incarnation, an event which brought the life-giving πνεῦμα to men and thereby gave them salvation and a foretaste of apotheosis.

Collation of N with Harris's text (ed. 2).

ODE 17

7 **כחלם**] N *begins, fol. 149 a* **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 10 **כחלם**] + **י** N 11 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 15 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N (*so always*)

ODE 18: Title **כחלם** N (*in red, and so always*)

3 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N **כחלם**] **כחלם** N 4 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
כחלם N 6 **כחלם**] *so N (as txt.)* 8 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 N (=H) 11 **כחלם**] *om.* N 13 **כחלם**] *om.* N
כחלם] **כחלם** N (*so always*) 15 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 17 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N

ODE 19

3 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N **כחלם**] **כחלם** N (=H)
 6 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N (*sic*) 8 **כחלם**] *om.* N **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 N (*sic*) 10 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N (=H)

ODE 20

4 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 5 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N (*sic*) **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 7 **כחלם**] N (=H) **כחלם**] **כחלם** N
 8 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N 9 **כחלם**] **כחלם** N

¹ See *Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung* pp. 157-159.

ODE 21

3 **חל**] **חל** **ל** N (**חל** H) 5 **תירא**] **תירא** N
חיצו] **חיצו** N 6 **כא**] N *fol.* 149 *b* 7 **חצו**] **חצו** N

ODE 22

2 **ל** **חיו**] **ל** **חיו** N (*sic*) 3 **חל**] **חל** N
חל] **חל** N 5 **חיו**] **חיו** N 6 **חיו**] **חיו** N
7 **חיו**] **חיו** N 10 **חיו**] **חיו** N
חיו] **חיו** N (= *ἐνέργειαν*) 12 **חיו**] **חיו** N

ODE 23

1 **חיו**] **חיו** N 2 **חיו**] **חיו** N 4 **חיו**] **חיו** N
חיו] **חיו** N 5 **חיו**] **חיו** N (=H) 6 **חיו**] **חיו** N
7 **חיו**] **חיו** N 8 **חיו**] **חיו** N
9 **חיו**] **חיו** N (=H) 10 **חיו**] **חיו** N 11 **חיו**] **חיו** N
12 **חיו**] **חיו** N 13 **חיו**] **חיו** N 14 **חיו**] **חיו** N
15 **חיו**] **חיו** N 16 **חיו**] **חיו** N 17 **חיו**] **חיו** N
18 **חיו**] **חיו** N 19 **חיו**] **חיו** N
20 **חיו**] **חיו** N 21 **חיו**] **חיו** N

ODE 24

1 **חיו**] **חיו** N 3 **חיו**] **חיו** N
חיו] **חיו** N (=H) 4 **חיו**] **חיו** N
חיו] **חיו** N (= *txt.*) 7 **חיו**] **חיו** N (= *txt.*) 8 **חיו**] **חיו** N

ODE 25

2 **חיו**] **חיו** N (=H) 4 **חיו**] **חיו** N

5 ⲕⲁⲙⲓⲛⲉ] ⲕⲁⲙⲓⲛⲉ N 7 ⲕⲗⲟ]
ⲕⲗⲟ N 8 ⲕⲁⲙⲓ] N (*sic*) ⲕⲁⲙⲓ] ⲕⲁⲙⲓ N
 10 ⲕⲓⲛⲉ] ⲕⲓⲛⲉ N ⲕⲗⲟⲙⲟ] N *fol.* 150 *a*
 11 ⲕⲓⲛⲉ] ⲕⲓⲛⲉ N (=H)

ODE 26

I ⲕⲁⲛⲁ] N (=H) 9 ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ] ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ N
 11 ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ] ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ N 12 ⲁⲛ] ⲁⲛ N
ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ] N (*sic*) ⲕⲁⲙⲓ] ⲕⲁⲙⲓ N

ODE 27

I ,ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ ,ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲃⲏⲛ N (*sic*)

ODE 28

I ⲕⲗⲟ] N (=H) ⲕⲁⲙⲓ] ⲕⲁⲙⲓ N 2 ⲕⲗⲟ]
 H (*see facsimile*), ⲕⲗⲟ N ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 4 ⲁⲛ ⲁⲛ]
ⲁⲛ ⲁⲛ N (ⲁⲛ 2^o *now washed out*) 6 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N
ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 7 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N
ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 9 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ]
ⲕⲗⲟ] N 10 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 11 ⲕⲗⲟ]
ⲕⲗⲟ] N 14 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N
 16 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N (=H *mg.*) 17 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N

ODE 29

2 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 4 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N
 7 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 8 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N

ODE 30

No variation.

ODE 31

2 ⲕⲗⲟ] N (=H) ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N
 4 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N 6 ⲕⲗⲟ] N *illegible*
 7 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N (? ⲕⲗⲟ) 8 ⲕⲗⲟ] N *illegible*
 9 ⲕⲗⲟ] ⲕⲗⲟ] N (=H)

ODE 32

I אֶתְּנָהּ] N fol. 150 b 2 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ (om. אֶתְּנָהּ) N

ODE 33

6 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N IO אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (=H) II אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N

ODE 34

5 אֶתְּנָהּ] om. N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N

ODE 35

I אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 3 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 4 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (sic)
 5 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 6 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N

ODE 36

I אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 2, 3 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 3 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 4 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 6 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 7 אֶתְּנָהּ] om. N 8 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N

ODE 37

I אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N

ODE 38

2 אֶתְּנָהּ] N (=H) אֶתְּנָהּ] pr. אֶתְּנָהּ N
 3 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (sic) 4 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 5 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 6 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 8 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (sic)
 9 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (sic) אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N IO אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N
 13 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N 14 אֶתְּנָהּ] אֶתְּנָהּ N (sic)

PSALM 2: *Title* הנהגה (= 44) N

- 1 כבודך N (*sic*) 2 אמנתך N
 3 חב] *om.* N 4 אנא] *om.* N 5 היבטך] *היבטך* N
 7 אמנתך N נחם] *om.* N 8 אמנתך N
 11 חב] *om.* N* כבודך N 14 אמנתך N (= H)
 15 אמנתך] *om.* N נחם N 16 אמנתך N
 19 אמנתך] *om.* N 20 אמנתך] N (= H)
אמנתך] *om.* N (= H) 23 אמנתך N (= *txt.*)
 24 אמנתך] + אמנתך N אמנתך N 28 אמנתך (= *ἐκχέαι*)
אמנתך N (*letters badly formed*) 29 אמנתך] *om.* N
 N (= τοῦ εἰπεῖν) 30 אמנתך] N (= H)
 32 אמנתך N 35 אמנתך] N (= H) אמנתך] *om.* N
אמנתך] *om.* N אמנתך] *pr.* N אמנתך] N (= *txt.*)
 37 אמנתך] N (= H) 38 אמנתך ... אמנתך] *om.* N
 39 אמנתך] *om.* N 40 אמנתך] *om.* N

PSALM 3: *Title* הנהגה (= 45) N

- 1 אמנתך] *om.* N 2 אמנתך N (*rest as H*)
 4 אמנתך N 5 אמנתך] *om.* N אמנתך] N *fol.* 151 b ends

[N *fol.* 152 contained PSALMS x 4-xviii 5, but the leaf is torn and defaced and only a selection of readings is here given.]

PSALM 10

- 4 אמנתך] *first words legible*
 9 אמנתך] N (= H)

PSALM 11: *Title* הנהגה (= 53, *sic*) N

9] *om.* N

PSALM 12: *Title* הנהגה (= 54) N

- 4 אמנתך] *om.* N אמנתך] *pr.* N (*sic*)

PSALM 13: Title אנא (= 55) N

5 ,יבשחח] יבשחח N (,יבשחח H)

PSALM 14: Title אנא (= 56) N

PSALM 15: Title אנא (= 57) N

9 אנא אנא אנא N (*sic*)

PSALMS 16, 17: Titles illegible

37 אנא] אנא N

41 אנא אנא N (= λαοῦ

μεγάλου hil)

46 אנא N (= ἐν ἰσότητι ilmgΓ)

PSALM 18: Title אנא (= 60) N

4 אנא אנא אנא אנא N (σπέρμα ἀ. υἱοῦ 'I. Gr.)

In the above list all differences of reading and spelling are noted, including the plural points, but not differences of punctuation or other differences of pronunciation indicated by dots, except in a few cases where the sense is affected. The punctuation of N is normal; e.g. אנא for *hānōn*, אנא for *hennōn*, &c. The point in אנא ('from'), found in H, never occurs in N. אנא (*āthā*, 'sign') always has a point. אנא ('he brought') appears to have a point *below* the line (e.g. xxii 11), while אנא ('I am') has a point *above* the line (e.g. xlii 6).

I have been saved the necessity of attempting to demonstrate the essential unity of the Odes by the admirable paper of Dom Connolly in the January number of this JOURNAL, a paper that ought to be digested by all those whose general impressions of this curious work have been derived from Dr Harris or from Dr Harnack. Especially timely are his remarks upon Ode 19 (pp. 307-309): the chief point upon which I have any doubt is whether so comparatively rare a Syriac word as אנא (*sic* N) would have been used to translate so ordinary a Greek word as *ἐκράτησεν*. Even at the cost of mere repetition it is worth while saying once again that אנא means 'emptily' or 'to no purpose', and not 'sufficiently', at any rate in this context. In Ode 19, however, N brings in no various reading of importance: of the modern conjectures, the only fortunate one is Dom Connolly's suggestion that the copula should be omitted at the beginning of ver. 8, and as a matter of fact it is absent from N.

In what follows I have given the more important changes introduced by N, so far as they affect the translation. I have not included the

addition or omission of small particles, changes of number, &c., which do not appreciably affect the meaning. For the general convenience of the English reader I have taken as my standard the translation given in Dr Harris's 2nd ed., without however either criticizing or endorsing his translations generally, except so far as they are affected by the readings of N or call for some special note.

Ode 17

11 my bondmen] the bondmen N

Ode 18

3 it stood] they stood N (i.e. 'my members')

4 remove] cast away N

8 N agrees with H (Dr Harris's MS): (?) read ܘܢܘܢ for ܘܢܘܢ (same pronunciation) and render '8 And thou wilt preserve from me all that holds fast by evil things'

Ode 19

3 N has 'and she that milked Him is the Holy Spirit'

8 and because] *om.* and N (*see above for this Ode*)

Ode 20

4 your reins] thy reins H, my reins N (*sic*)

5 'by the blood of thy soul' N H: 'by', as so often in Semitic, is the ܕܢܘܢ of price, and means 'at the price of'

devour] deceive N (and H)

9 grace] goodness N

Ode 21

4 the thought of the Lord] cf. *Ode 20*¹: I believe personally that the Odist has the Christian Eucharist in mind

5 His light] *om.* His N served] passed N

Ode 22

2 cast me down] put them for me N

6 a rampart] Diettrich's conjecture is the text of N

10 energy] *sic* N; helps H

The first six verses of the Ode form one sentence; remembering that relative clauses which are logically in the 2nd pers. are often expressed in Syriac by the 3rd pers., we may translate thus:—

'He who brings me down from on high and brings me up from below, and who gathers the things that are betwixt and puts them for me, and who scatters my enemies and my adversaries, He that gave me authority over bonds to loose them, that overthrew through me the Dragon with seven heads and didst set me over his root to destroy his seed—it is Thou, Thou wast there and helped me, and in every place Thy Name was encircling me!'

8^b, 9 The best translation I can make of this difficult passage is : 'it made clear to me all the poisons . . . and the corrupter of corruption. I saw a corruptible bride being adorned and a bridegroom who corrupts and is corruptible.' No doubt Antichrist and Heresy is meant, using the words in a wide sense: what is really peculiar is that Heresy or Error is regarded as the bride of the Deceiver. Of course in *v.* 11, as Dom Connolly points out (p. 306), 'alike in the beloved and in his bride' should be translated 'resemble the beloved and his bride'. I cannot however feel quite certain that 'beloved' should have a capital letter. The figure of bridegroom and bride is not elsewhere used in the Odes for Christ and Church, and we cannot be sure that 'beloved' really had the definite article in the underlying Greek. The Syriac may mean no more than 'a beloved one and his bride'. The Deceiver and Error are like a bridegroom and a bride, and those who have dealings with such things are like folk who go to a wedding feast and get drunk.

Ode 40

5 and my tongue his psalms] and my tongue is sweet with his colloquies and [my members] are fat with his psalms N (*hole in vellum*)
8 inheritance] profit N (= H)

Ode 41

1] Let us praise the Lord, all ye His children, and let us receive the truth of His faith N

3 live] rejoice N

4 us] *om.* N

17 song] + to the Lord N

Ode 42

4 of no account . . . me] useless to those that know me, in order that I might be hidden to those that were not holding me N

25 and my name . . . heads] and I considered their faith, and I put upon their heads my name N

F. C. BURKITT.