nor in Babylonia does a similar custom exist either on the New Year or on the Day of Atonement. Our fathers never observed it; but we know that it has spread in many countries.[1] It is, consequently, against all evidence to use it for illustrating the beliefs and the sacrifices of the time of the Temple.

A. BÜCHLER.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON: CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS.

III.

IN the two preceding articles the effort has been made so to characterize the poet of the Odes of Solomon by his salient and pervasive ideas that we may relate them on the one side to admittedly antecedent ideas in the literature of later Judaism, and on the other compare them with the elements which appear to be Christian. Of the latter we have two groups: (1) passages such as Ode 19 and the latter part of Ode 42, which are generally conceded to be interpolated; (2) passages whose authenticity is disputed, and which afford no other criterion of their origin than their agreement or disagreement (*a*) with their immediate context, and (*b*) with the conceptions and style of the Odist.

As an example of the class of admitted, and indeed almost self-evident, interpolations we cannot do better than to reproduce Ode 19, differentiating typographically the two poetic lines which seem to form the authentic basis from the prose addition.

ODE 19.

[1] A cup of milk was offered me
and I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord.
[2] The Son is the cup, and He who was milked is the Father:
[3] and the Holy Spirit milked Him: because His breasts were full,

[1] See *Revue des Études Juives*, xxxix. 1899, p. 77 ff.

and it was necessary for Him that His milk should be sufficiently released; [4] and the Holy Spirit opened his bosom and mingled the milk from the two breasts of the Father, and gave the mixture to the world without their knowing: [5] and they who receive in its fulness are the ones on the right hand.

[6] [The Spirit] opened the womb of the Virgin and she received conception and brought forth; and the Virgin became a Mother with many mercies; [7] and she travailed and brought forth a Son, without incurring pain; [8] and because she was not sufficiently prepared, and she had not sought a midwife (for He brought her to bear), she brought forth as if she were a man, of her own will; [9] and she brought Him forth openly, and acquired Him with great dignity, [10] and loved Him in his swaddling clothes, and guarded Him kindly, and showed Him in majesty. Hallelujah.

Ode 19 is in reality not an ode at all. Its first half (19*a*) consists merely of two lines wholly in the style and spirit of the Odist* followed by the allegorizing comment of some Christian editor. Its second half (19*b*) is, as Harris points out, an

account of the Virgin Birth which follows the parable of the cup of milk and can almost be detached as a separate composition.

But the phenomenon of the former half (19*a*) at least is not without its parallel. Ode 27 seems to consist of a single line of authentic text followed by two lines of allegorising exposition, the whole being identical (save for trifling corruption of text) with Ode 42. 1–3.

Ode 27.	Ode 42. 1–3
[1] I stretched out my hands and sanctified the Lord.	[1] I stretched out my hands and approached † my Lord.
[2] For the extension of my hands is the sign thereof ‡ [3] my expansion is the upright tree (the cross).	For the stretching of my hands is the sign thereof ‡: [2] my expansion is the outspread tree.

Ode 42 is one of those which the editor admits to be interpolated, and the character of verses 2–3 suggests

* See below, p. 245.

† See Gunkel, *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.*

‡ So Flemming. Harris: "His sign."

an alien and Christian origin. The poet in verse 1 is describing the attitude of prayer, as in the following:—

ODE 37.

i. [1] I stretched out my hands to my Lord,
and to the Most High I raised my voice;
[2] And I spake with the lips of my heart:
And He heard me when my voice reached Him.

ii. [3] His answer came unto me,
and gave me the fruits of my toils,
And it gave me rest by the grace of the Lord. Hallelujah.

In Ode 42 the writer of verse 23 takes the speaker of verse 1 to be Christ, and follows *Ep. Barn.* xii. 2–4 * in making this a reference to the stretching of Jesus' arms on the cross! How, then, has duplication occurred, which produced out of the line and gloss from Ode 42 an independent Ode? Until some better explanation be presented we must suppose that one of the series of transcribers and translators through whose hands the text has passed, found (perhaps on the margin) the authentic line repeated with the explanatory gloss attached, and transcribed them as an additional Ode; while Ode 42 was simultaneously transcribed with the gloss included.

If such was the origin of "Ode" 27, we can account for Ode 19*a*. Its first two lines reproduce the thought of Ode 8. 17:—

[17] I fashioned their members,
my own breasts I prepared for them
That they might drink my holy milk
And live thereby.

Violent as the figure of a nursing-*father* appears to the modern ear, it is far from unknown either in Old Testament

* "The Spirit saith to the heart of Moses (Ex. xvii. 11 ff.) that he should make a type of the cross and of Him who was to suffer. . . . Moses therefore . . . stretched out his hands, and so Israel was again victorious. . . . And again in another prophet (Is. lxv. 2) He saith, The whole day long have I stretched out my hands unto a disobedient people." The interpolation in Ode 42 seems to cover ver. 2–4.

or New. Moses employs it in Numbers xi. 12, and Paul in 1 Thessalonians ii. 7.* In particular it is repeatedly applied by *Deutero-Isaiah* to the sustenance of restored Israel (Is. xlix. 23, lx. 16). Especially is our repugnance mitigated when we follow the poet's conception of the milk of the Lord in other Odes. Primarily it is the product of field and herd. The mountains of Judea "flowing with milk and honey" are like nourishing breasts for Yahweh's people. Ode 35 supplies such a picture of the land which drinks the dew of heaven :—

> [1] The dew of the Lord in quietness
> He distilled upon me.
> [2] And the cloud of peace
> He caused to rise over my head.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> [6] And I was carried like a child by his mother :
> And He gave me milk, the dew of the Lord.

But with the Odist we are ever trembling on the verge of the spiritual sense. More to him is the spiritual "milk" of the knowledge of Yahweh promised in Isaiah xxviii. 9 to a childlike and docile people, the free draught of "wine and milk" offered by His messenger in Isaiah lv. 1–3, than His gift of material subsistence which suggests the figure. Some allowance, then, must be made for differences of literary taste in different ages.

No such allowance, however, can possibly cover the crude and repulsive allegorizing of Ode 19. 2–5, for it is simply insupposable that the poet himself intended, e.g., a reference to Old and New Testament revelation in the mingled "milk from the *two* breasts of the Father." This forcing of the metaphor down upon all fours is on a par with the *gnosis* of the promise of "milk and honey" in *Ep. Barn.* vi. 8–10, 17,† if indeed it has not been actually

* Cf Gal. iv. 19.

† What saith the other prophet Moses unto them? "Behold, these things saith the Lord God; enter into the good land, which the Lord

suggested by it; for the distinction drawn between "those on the right hand" who receive the mixture of the milk "from the two breasts" and those who do not receive it "in its fulness" can only be understood with reference to Law and Gospel.

The second half of the "Ode" (19*b*) disconnected as it is with the earlier half, has perhaps somewhat better right to be considered authentic, because its author has not descended abruptly to the level of undisguised prose. Traces of the form of parallelism are seemingly present, whether as reminders not altogether obliterated by the reviser, or as more or less conscious imitation. But as similar assimilation to the poetic form of the original is present in other admitted interpolations * we need not be deterred by its form from accounting for this disconnected fragment as we accounted for 19*a*, if its contents prove of like nature.

Now 19*a*, as we have seen, *can* be accounted for as a Christian midrash, or exegetical comment, either upon Ode 8. 17 or upon an equivalent expression of some lost Ode. It is confirmatory of this result when we find that 19*b* would subserve a similar function toward Ode 11, inter-

sware unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and inherit it, a land flowing with milk and honey." But what saith knowledge (γνῶσις)? Understand ye. (It means) Set your hope on him who is about to be manifested to you in the flesh, even Jesus. For 'man' (Adam) is earth suffering; for from the face of the earth (*Adamah*) came the creation of Adam. What then meaneth he? Into the good land (earth, *Adamah*), a land (earth) flowing with milk and honey. Blessed is our Lord, brethren, who established among us wisdom and understanding of His secret things. For the prophet speaketh a parable concerning the Lord (as the Second Adam?) . . . What then is the milk and the honey? Because the child is first kept alive by honey, and then by milk. So in like manner we being kept alive by our faith in the promise (of the O.T.) and by the word (of the gospel) shall live and be lords of the earth."

* Cf. Ode 42, of which Harris writes: "The Psalm is too highly evolved in its imaginary treatment of the Descent into Hell to be reckoned as belonging to the same period as the main body of the collection."

preted as a canticle of the Virgin Mary. Mere juxtaposition will suffice to show the nature of this possible relation.

ODE 11. CIRCUMCISION OF THE HEART.

i. [1] My heart was cloven,*
and its flower appeared;
And grace sprang up in it:
and it brought forth fruit unto the Lord.

ii. [2] For the Most High clave † my heart
by His Holy Spirit;
And searched my affection toward Him,
and filled me with love for Him.

19. 6 [The Spirit] opened the womb of the Virgin, and she received conception and brought forth; and the Virgin became a mother with many mercies, and she travailed and brought forth a Son without incurring pain; and because she was not sufficiently prepared, etc., etc.

Of the real meaning of Ode 11 the immediate context as well as the two preceding Odes leaves no room for doubt. The poet continues his comparison of the opening of his heart to that of the bosom of earth laid open by the ploughshare to the fructifying warmth and moisture of heaven, as follows:—

Ode 7. 14–17.
Bar. 3. 36

[3] And His opening ‡ of me
became my salvation;
And I ran in His way in His peace,
even in the way of truth.
[4] From the beginning even to the end
I acquired the knowledge of Him;
[5] And I was established on the rock of truth,
where He had set me up.

We have indeed nothing beyond a conjecture to offer that the description of the miraculous conception and virgin birth which enters so abruptly in 19. 6–10 was actually at any time attached to, or even suggested by Ode 11; but since its spurious character and its present disconnection

* Ode 10. 1 f. † Or: "circumcised."
‡ Or "circumcision."

are admitted, conjecture becomes unavoidable, and we have the analogy of Ode 27 to guide us.

Fortunately this particular interpolation admits of being dated within quite restricted limits. It is quoted not later than 311 A.D. by Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* iv. 12). This author even gives the name and number of the Ode, which must therefore have then formed a recognised part of the collection. Although Ode 19 is not one of the five preserved in *Pistis Sophia* we have no reason to doubt that it circulated with the rest as early as 200 A.D. But to place its origin more than a decade or so earlier than 200 A.D. is impossible. As Harris notes, this writer in describing the Nativity

> "dispenses with the usual aids to childbirth, and introduces details for which we find parallels in the Apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. And it is frankly impossible that the doctrine of the Miraculous Birth should have become so highly evolved in the first century."

In point of fact the legend of the painless child-bearing of Mary "without a midwife" appears in *Acta Petri c. Simone*, xxiv. and in an apocryphum Josephi of circ. 150–200 A.D. which forms the nucleus of *Protev. Jacobi* (chh. xix.–xx.).* Besides this we have the polemic allusion to those who do not "receive the milk in its fulness." Only those who receive the milk of revelation as mingled by the Spirit "from the *two* breasts of the Father" are "those on the right hand" (Matt. xxv. 23). Harnack will not indeed admit the view of Harris that we have a reference here either to the Marcionites who deny Old Testament revelation or Jews who deny the New. According to Harnack:

> "Our Ode is older than the New Testament, and if the two Testaments were meant the author would have expressed himself more plainly."

This statement, however, can hardly pass unchallenged.

* With *Protev. Jac.* xviii. 2 cf. Ode 24. 3 below.

The "Ode" is certainly much later than the *Epistle of Barnabas*, where in vi. 17 the "honey" and "milk" of the promise are similarly made to correspond to "promise" and "word." * Even Hebrews i. 1 f., ii. 2 f. contrasts the "word spoken through angels" with the new revelation. Ode 19 expresses itself more plainly than either. In conjunction with the Nativity legends the internal evidence of Ode 19 is therefore quite sufficient to bring down its date beyond 150 A.D.

The foregoing study of admittedly interpolated material should afford at least a foothold for grappling with more complicated problems. We have not only obtained an idea of the character of at least one redactional element, including even its approximate date, but we have been able to form a working hypothesis of the process by which some of this redactional material may have become incorporated into the text. We may reasonably apply the results already obtained to some of the obscurer Odes.

Next on this score to Ode 42, which the editor himself regards as spurious or interpolated,† stands the group Odes 22–24, of which Harris remarks that they "do not admit of grouping with the others." We have indeed already considered Ode 22 as an example of the theme "Redemption from Sheol,"‡ and need not return to it. But Ode 23 in its continuation of this theme gives every indication of almost hopeless textual corruption combined with unmistakably Christian explanations, as in the two concluding verses which give the following explanation regarding the letter of verses 5–9.

Now the letter was a great volume (πινακίδιον), which was wholly written by the finger of God: and the name of the Father was on it, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to rule for ever and ever. Hallelujah.

* See above, p. 246. † See note above, p. 247.
‡ See the article in the preceding number, p. 335.

There is of course just as little reason to doubt the second or third century Christian origin of this addition as there is to doubt its spuriousness. The comparison of the Lord's thought to a letter whose seal cannot be loosed by those who receive it in verses 5–9 has a certain relation to Isaiah xxix. 11.* The very confusion and unintelligibleness of verses 5–14 suggests in fact that the poetic effusion of verses 1–4 is rather covered over than wholly obliterated. But with verse 6 we have already descended to prose and prose to us at least unintelligible. In content, too, there is a lack of harmony; for whatever was in the mind of the Odist when he began, and even when he introduced the simile of the letter, we may be very sure it was not the "great tablet" with whose praise his Ode is made to wind up. The Editor writes:

> This is the most difficult of all the psalms in the collection, and I have almost despaired of being able to explain it.

All we need add is that the occurrence of the pronouncedly Christian elements and the hopeless confusion together is itself significant.

In Ode 24 the case is almost reversed. Here the view so ably presented by Bernard † that our Odes are really baptismal hymns reaches its maximum of plausibility. So far as their currency in Christian communities is concerned, there is much to commend it. Ode 24 in particular looks like an adaptation to such a purpose. But in their dominating ideas and fundamental structure these Odes have no closer relation to baptism than the "Song of Moses and the Children of Israel" in Exodus xv., or the Songs of Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah. The trouble with Ode 24 is that in its present form it reminds us of much of the statuary of the Oriental "antika" dealer, whose second-

* See also Prov. xx. 26

† *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, Oct. 1910.

century torsos are so apt to be supplied with seventh century, or even nineteenth century heads. The Ode has one subject, its opening verse another; and the ingenuity of the interpreter struggles in vain to effect a connexion between them. From verse 2 on the poet is describing an eschatological manifestation similar to that of *Apoc. Bar.* xxi. 21–23.* The last Enemy is being abolished. With him perish all that were found "imperfect." Those who were "lifted up in their hearts, but deficient in wisdom" were rejected, leaving none but such as had received "the word." But what had this to do with verse 1? We transcribe the Ode that the reader may judge of the difficulty:—

ODE 24. DESTRUCTION OF SHEOL.

[1] The dove fluttered over the Messiah (Christ) because He was her head; and she sang over Him and her voice was heard.

[2] And the inhabitants were afraid
and the sojourners were moved
Protev. Jac. xviii. 2. [3] The birds dropped their wings
and all creeping things died in their holes.

And the abysses were opened which had been covered †
And they cried to the Lord like women in travail
[4] And no food was given to them
because it belonged not to them.
[5] And they sealed up the abysses
with the seal of the Lord.

And they perished in the same thought
in which they had been ‡ from of old,
[6] For they were corrupt from the beginning;
and the end of their corruption was life.

* "Show to those who know not, and let them see that it has befallen us and our city until now according to the longsuffering of thy power, because on account of thy name thou hast called us a Beloved People. Every nature therefore from this onward is mortal. Reprove therefore the angel of death, and let thy glory appear, and let the might of thy beauty be known, and let Sheol be sealed, so that from this time forward it may not receive the dead, and let the treasuries of souls restore those which are enclosed in them."

† On this reading and Ode 24 in general see Duensing: *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* xii. 1 (1911) p. 86 f.

‡ Rendering suggested by C. C. Torrey.

7 And every one of them that was imperfect perished,
for there was no giving them a word that they might wait;
8 And the Lord destroyed the imaginations of all them
that had not the truth with them.
9 For they who in their hearts were lifted up
were deficient in wisdom,
And so they were rejected,
because the truth was not in them.
10 For the Lord disclosed His Way
and spread abroad His grace:
And those who understood it know His holiness. Hallelujah.

It is true that early Christian references to the story of Jesus' baptism with its "voice from heaven" connect with it the "prophecy" of Psalm xxix. 3, "The voice of the Lord is upon the waters," and that primitive art and legend depicted the terror of the river (god) after the example of Psalm cxiv. 3–5. Even Psalm lxxiv. 13† f. was employed, the "smiting of the heads of the Dragon in the sea" being applied to the baptism of Jesus in Jordan.* Such employments of the canonical Psalms in application to the baptism of Jesus might explain an *employment* of Ode 24 in some such sense as Bernard suggests, including the prefixing to it of its ill-fitting opening verse. But we are inquiring as to its *composition*; and the undoubtedly genuine Odes afford no example of such a transition as here between verse 1 and verse 2.† On the other hand we have found several instances already of what seem to be misplaced explanatory glosses. Verse 1 of Ode 24 has the characteristics of an explanatory gloss; in Ode 28. 1 f. we have expressions which may have given rise to it:—

* Jacoby, *Apokrypher Bericht über die Taufe Jesu*, etc. Strassburg, 1902, pp. 39, 47 ff., 73 f.

† The instances adduced by Harris (p. 123) from the *Descensus ad Inferos* to prove an association between the baptism and the Harrowing of Hell are less adapted to prove his point than those we have cited from Jacoby. The prediction to Seth, e.g., that when the Beloved Son comes into the world and is baptized by John "*then* thy father Adam will receive," etc., will not bear this inference.

[1] As the wings of doves over their nestlings;
and the mouth of their nestlings towards their mouths,
[2] So also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart.

In Harris' opinion the writer of what he justly calls "this exquisite Psalm" may have been "speaking as if in the person of Christ." An editor or transcriber of the Odes who held the same opinion may easily have attached the note now so unsuitably prefixed to Ode 24:—"The dove was fluttering over Christ because He was her head; and she was singing over Him, and her voice was heard."

In attempting to account for the inclusion of manifestly extraneous matter, for the most part baldest prose, we have ventured beyond the limits of the strictly demonstrable into the field of conjecture. This is permissible where there is general admission of the spurious nature of the material. But the case is otherwise with certain clearly Christian elements in passages and Odes not otherwise open to question. Of this we have seen an example in Ode 3, on the Adoption of Sons.* Harnack and Staerk agree that "the Son" as the object of the Odist's love is a complete contradiction of the context, which makes Israel Yahweh's "fervent Lover," and Yahweh the "Beloved." Harnack, who is not content like Staerk to delete the single word "the Son," but brackets the whole verse, considers that the proof is here conclusive ("stringent") of the Jewish origin of the Ode. Others ask why, even if interpolation in the interest of a more tangibly and distinctively Christian interpretation be admitted, it need necessarily follow that the original was not also Christian, though to a less pronounced degree. To this there is no answer save by the method we have outlined, a method—to borrow the mathematicians' phrase—of "approximation by double position." Study of the dominant and pervasive ideas

* See art. "Songs of the Lord's Beloved" in the preceding number of this journal, p. 329.

of the Odist will gradually reveal more and more of their relation to one another and to the pervasive ideas of the age when a Hellenised type of Judaism was anticipating much that we have been accustomed to look upon as distinctively Christian. Study of the admittedly spurious and dubious elements will throw increasing light upon the factors of change. Until this process of study and critical analysis is further advanced than at present a positive verdict would be premature. Something will depend on the verdict of the linguists on the original language of the Odes, more on the students of comparative religion, most of all perhaps on the literary critic familiar with the history and literary transmission of religious ideas in the Hellenistic world. The relation of the Odist's ideas to those of Paul and the Fourth Evangelist is self-evident. The vital importance to the student of Christian origins of clearly determining just what that relation is, whether a relation of direct or indirect dependence, and on which side the dependence lies, needs no further emphasis. A summary of impressions may seem an unsatisfactory conclusion where so much is at stake; but it is all that the present situation really warrants. It will not be too venturesome to say that increasing familiarity with the pervasive, controlling ideas of the Odes tends continually in the present writer's mind to increase the sense of their kinship to the literature of later Hellenistic Judaism which takes up and develops the ideas of Deutero-Isaiah. In the direction of the individualization of religion, the denationalizing of the Messianic hope, the approximation of a hypostatised Wisdom-doctrine to the Logos idea of the Stoics, and the adoption of Platonised conceptions of immortality and the relation of body and spirit, the Wisdom of Solomon, an Egyptian-Jewish writing of circ. 30 B.C., is the nearest representative of this development. In

the direction of eschatology, the Inheritance doctrine, idealised hopes of the renovated Land of Promise, and the tabernacling of God there with a Chosen People, glorified to be His sons and heirs, the nearest representative is perhaps the *Apocalypse of Baruch*. Beyond Isaiah, the canonical Psalms, Wisdom, and the Apocalypse of Baruch we do not need to go to parallel all the substance and basis of the Odes. It does not necessarily follow that they are not of Christian origin, for there are early Christian writings of which much the same might be said.

On the other hand, where the Christian element is most pronounced we find the strongest independent evidence of textual corruption. The substance of the thought appears to be quite unaffected by any New Testament writing. The more closely we scrutinise those elements which seem at first to be Christian the more do they seem to yield either a pre-Christian sense, or one at variance with the context. Under these circumstances it will surely be wiser not to risk a repetition of the error committed when the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a Jewish writing of approximately this same period, was pronounced to be Christian because of its interpolations, and to remember the principle long since laid down by a great master in this field, one of the ablest and most lamented scholars of our generation:—

> Considering that in the earliest days of the Christian Church this (pseudepigraphy) was a species of literary activity that flourished chiefly among the heretical sects, and that it was not till a somewhat later period that it began to be cultivated in Catholic circles as well, it may be assumed with some degree of probability that *those Old Testament pseudepigraphic writings which are mentioned in terms of high respect by the earliest of the Fathers, down, say to Origen inclusive* (ob. 251 A.D.) *are to be regarded generally as being of Jewish and not of Christian origin.**

B. W. BACON.

* Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, § 32, 7. Engl. Transl. Div. II. vol. iii. p. 125. Italics Schürer's.