

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE ODES OF SOLOMON AND THE *PISTIS SOPHIA*.

Of the forty-two Odes of Solomon published first by Dr Rendel Harris,<sup>1</sup> five (I, V, VI, XXII, XXV) are preserved more or less completely in the *Pistis Sophia*,<sup>2</sup> and Ode I is found only in that work. Dr Harris uses the Latin version of Schwartz-Petermann<sup>3</sup> and of Woide-Münter-Schmidt<sup>2</sup> for the text of the odes proper, and that of the former for the Gnostic hymns and commentaries which are associated with the odes in the *Pistis Sophia*. Schmidt's<sup>3</sup> able and modern translation has been used but sparingly.<sup>4</sup> Harnack-Flemming<sup>5</sup> give a new

<sup>1</sup> *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, Cambridge 1909.

<sup>2</sup> *Pistis Sophia, Opus gnosticum . . . descripsit et latine vertit M. G. Schwartz* edidit J. H. Petermann, Berolini 1851. (Codex Askew: British Museum Or. 5114.) The Odes therein contained: Fr. Münter *Odae gnosticae Salomoni tributa*, Havniae 1812. Noticed by Woide: *Appendix ad editionem N. T. graeci*, Oxford 1799. In Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* vol. vii, 1891, pp. 37 ff, is a revised Latin version from Woide-Münter by C. Schmidt. L. Ideler *Psalterium copticum*, Berlin 1837, in an appendix, gives the Odes (after Woide?) with curious differences in text from that of Schwartz-Petermann. Harnack *Über das gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen* vol. vii, 1891, has given the whole book an elaborate investigation.

The *Pistis Sophia* is a gnostic work which is extant in Coptic only. It is generally believed (Harnack-Flemming, p. 12) to represent a Greek text at least as old as the middle of the third century A. D. Jesus, after His ascension, is made to teach His disciples certain mysteries of a gnostic character. Among other things He relates the story of the sufferings of Pistis Sophia, a spirit whom He encountered between the worlds, unable to rise and assailed by 'emanations of the self-willed', who addressed Him with hymns of repentance. Jesus relates these hymns to His disciples and asks for an interpretation, which is furnished by quoting a Davidic Psalm or one of the Odes of Solomon, of which the Gnostic hymn is an equivalent. These hymns are called by Dr Harris 'Targums', and the explanations sometimes appended, in which the correspondence is carefully pointed out, he has called 'Detailed Commentaries'.

<sup>3</sup> C. Schmidt *Die koptisch-gnostischen Schriften* vol. i, in *Die griechisch-christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrh.*, Leipzig 1905.

<sup>4</sup> On p. 94 Dr Harris has given a version of Ode I which is unknown to me. Cf. *my branches were planted in me*.

<sup>5</sup> A. Harnack and J. Flemming *Ein jüdisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1910 (*Texte und Untersuchungen* vol. xxxv). As it is not always clear which of the writers is responsible for a given statement, we cite the work in the form HF (Harnack-Flemming). The 'Commentaries' on Odes XXII and XXV are omitted entirely. On p. 16 the 'Commentary' of Peter is mistaken for a 'Targum' of the woman (Pistis) Sophia. P. 17 the Targum to

German translation of the Syriac text by Flemming and a revised translation of the Coptic material by Schmidt, the whole being edited by Harnack with a valuable discussion (pp. 12-23) of the relationship between the Coptic and the Syriac versions.

In the present article I have brought together materials that have accumulated during a study of the Syriac Odes and of the corresponding portions of the *Pistis Sophia*.<sup>1</sup> For convenience the two versions are translated closely—even baldly—and placed side by side. The divergences are indicated by italics. Little textual emendation has been attempted; but I have tried by careful translation to bring the two versions into harmony as far as possible. Also I have compared with these two versions the other Coptic material, and noted the relationships existing between the texts as they stand. It is evident that much work remains to be done in amending the Syriac text; but the problem of the literary and textual relationship is fundamental, and must precede emendation.

Harnack (see p. 29 n. 5) takes the general position that differences between the Syriac and the Coptic texts of the Odes are to be traced to different recensions of the Greek original, since both the superversions are presumably accurate translations. Schulthess (see note 1) would explain them as errors of the Syriac and the Coptic translators of identical texts in Greek. Gunkel (see note 1) with much greater insight suggests: (a) errors in the transmission of the Syriac text; (b) errors of the Syriac and the Coptic translators in failing to understand the original Greek text; (c) our own errors in failing to understand the Syriac text as it is, through insufficient knowledge of the context (p. 294). A

Ode VI (uttered not by Sophia but by Jesus) is not inaptly called an *Einleitung*. P. 18 l. 19, 'Targum' is used wrongly for 'Commentary'.

<sup>1</sup> The stream of publication on the Odes is rising. For one writing from the western shore of the Ocean the delays incident on publication abroad are likely to lead to duplication of effort and ignorance of the latest word of others. There remains but one way: to submit as soon as one can, what one has, and to claim indulgence for the rest. I have seen (Jan. 1911):—

W. E. Barnes *An Ancient Christian Hymn Book* in the *Expositor*, 1910, pp. 52 ff.

J. H. Bernard *The Odes of Solomon* in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1910, pp. 1 ff.

H. Gunkel *Die Oden Salomos* in *Zeitschrift für die NT Wissenschaft*, 1910, pp. 291 ff.

F. Schulthess *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den Oden Salomos*, *ibid.*, pp. 241 ff.

F. Spitta *Zum Verständnis der Oden Salomos*, *ibid.*, pp. 193 ff and 259 ff.

W. Staerk *Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Oden Salomos* in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1910, pp. 289 ff.

R. H. Strachan *The Newly Discovered Odes of Solomon* in *Expository Times*, 1910, pp. 7 ff.

A. Ungnad and W. Staerk *Die Oden Salomos*, 1910.

J. Wellhausen in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1910, pp. 429 ff.

Th. Zahn *Die Oden Salomos* in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1910, pp. 667 ff.

number of emendations of the Syriac text have been suggested, especially by Schulthess and Gunkel (Gressmann). With scripts like the Syriac and Arabic it is easy to manipulate a text with almost any desired result, e.g. Schulthess finds **قلبي** in **قلبي** (Estrangelo of course), and Gressmann (Gunkel) finds it in **وحتبي** (Ode VI, v. 9, Gunkel, p. 297). With a few exceptions these have not been here reproduced; but the omission to reproduce them does not mean that I reject them in every case.

An example of what may be accomplished by any moderately ingenious person may be given for Ode XXII:—Verse 2 a: Arabic **جَنَّب** and **جَلَّب**; verse 2 b: **عَرَّب** and **عَرَّب**; verse 6: **طَيَّب** **لي** and **طَيَّب** **لي**; verse 12: **مِلك** and **مُلك**—or for that matter German *Reichtum* and *Reich*!

Ode I is preserved only in the *Pistis Sophia*. It is quoted inadvertently and mistakenly for the original of Ode V, verses 10–12 (see below in its place), and therefore is accompanied by no ‘Targum’ or ‘Commentary’. It may be dismissed with a translation.

With Odes V, VI, XXII, XXV, the problem begins.

Odes V, XXII, XXV are each accompanied by a Gnostic hymn (metanoia hymn) uttered—as the *Pistis Sophia* presents them—by the woman (Pistis) Sophia, and interpreted, in each case through one of the companions of Jesus, by the quotation of the Ode itself in its simple form. That it is the intention of the *Pistis Sophia* to quote a non-Gnostic or orthodox Ode and not a Gnostic version of the same is evident from the fact that the Davidic Psalms are treated in the same way,<sup>1</sup> and quoted without any attempt to gnosticize them.<sup>2</sup>

Ode VI has a similar Gnostic hymn, but uttered by Jesus, instead of Sophia.<sup>3</sup> It probably belongs to a different class from the others.

Odes VI, XXII, and XXV have, in addition to the Gnostic hymns just described, each a detailed Commentary, in which the text of the Gnostic hymns is shewn, piece by piece, to correspond with the quoted Ode. Both the Gnostic hymns and the text of the Odes are generally quoted exactly; but alterations may occur in either; the Odes may be quoted with better, worse, or indifferent readings; and the Gnostic hymns may be paraphrased so as to equate them better with the Odes.

<sup>1</sup> According to Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1891, vol. vii p. 34) nine Davidic Psalms are quoted complete, fourteen are abbreviated, and only one has omissions besides being abbreviated.

<sup>2</sup> The lack of a considerable portion of an Ode at the beginning or end does not argue that the part was unknown to the author of the *Pistis Sophia*, but merely that a part only of the same was necessary to his purpose of explaining a Gnostic hymn of definite limits.

<sup>3</sup> See Ode VI note 4 below.

It is safe to say that the Commentaries represent that part of the *Pistis Sophia* which is most essential ; not being taken in from outside, but written by its author. The same is doubtless true of the Gnostic hymn of Ode VI.<sup>1</sup>

Ode V, possibly in seven instances, certainly in five, displays the remarkable phenomenon of the agreement of the Syriac Ode with the Coptic Gnostic hymn, and the divergence of both from the Coptic Ode. Since we can hardly suppose that the Syriac text of the Odes, or its Greek ancestor, was influenced by the *Pistis Sophia*, we are compelled to believe that the Syriac through its ancestor was influenced by those very Gnostic hymns which are now in the *Pistis Sophia*, and that these were at an early date in circulation apart from that book and wholly independent of it, forming a collection of Gnostic hymns parallel to the orthodox Odes, from which they were derived. In Odes XXV and VI (?) this phenomenon is wanting ; it is most conspicuous in Ode V. There is nothing improbable in the notion that the Gnostic hymns as well as the orthodox Odes are older than the *Pistis Sophia*. Before Dr Harris's discovery of the Syriac text, the Odes were also supposed to have been composed to suit the purposes of the writer of the *Pistis Sophia*. We must suppose that these two sets of hymns were woven into a book, with the addition of stage setting and narrative, but especially with the composition of the harmonizing detailed Commentaries.

For several reasons it is likely that the *Pistis Sophia* was composed in Greek and translated into Coptic as a whole. For one thing Gnosticism was not popular among the native Egyptian population, as is seen from the rarity of Coptic manuscripts of such works. For another, the Copts were chiefly engaged up to the Council of Chalcedon (451) in translating Greek books, and the *Pistis Sophia* falls in this period. About 350 the Upper Egyptian Bible seems to have been finished, and doubtless also Greek Gnostic works were translated at this time. After 451 the Coptic Church separated from the Greek Church and ceased to be interested in translating Greek books, and it was only after that date that the Church became national linguistically and otherwise. But there are some three or four instances which seem to shew either that the Ode in Coptic has been adjusted to the Commentary in Coptic, after the *Pistis Sophia* has become a fixed Coptic book ; or else that the Commentator is using a Coptic Ode and writing a Coptic Commentary.

Again, it sometimes appears that the Commentator is using a different text from the one now joined to it in the *Pistis Sophia* ; a text agreeing more closely with that of the Syriac Odes ; or else that the Coptic Odes

<sup>1</sup> See Ode VI note 4 below.

were changed after the Commentary had been written. Of this there are three instances.

The four Odes possessing a Gnostic hymn—VI should perhaps not be counted—yield in all 17–19 instances in which the Syriac has diverged from the type, doubtless original, still presented by the Coptic Ode and the Gnostic hymn. But Ode XXII verse 12 shews corruption of the Ode by the hymn, after combination.

The three Odes possessing a Commentary yield 20 instances in which the Syriac has deviated from the form still preserved by the Coptic Odes and the Commentaries. But in some cases the agreement of the latter two against the former may be due to the harmonization alluded to above (p. 32 ll. 35 ff).

Combining the last two paragraphs, there are 37–39 instances in which the reading of the Coptic Odes is confirmed elsewhere in the *Pistis Sophia* as against the Syriac.

At times the Syriac Odes have a rather less simple reading than the Coptic Odes,<sup>1</sup> which is scarcely what one would expect; for the writer of a Gnostic Commentary on orthodox Odes would scarcely pare them down to extreme plainness before proceeding to fit them to extravagant Gnostic hymns. In 6–10 instances the Syriac is shewn to be under the influence of Gnostic hymns that have come down to us in the *Pistis Sophia*; and these are not outweighed by the 17–19 instances in which the opposite is true (Coptic Odes agreeing with Gnostic hymns against the Syriac), for such agreement is to be expected. As it is hard to conceive motives for the deliberate simplification of originally more ornate odes by the writer of the *Pistis Sophia*, it seems likely that where the Coptic Ode is simpler than the Syriac it is also the more original. And if the Syriac version is shewn, even in a few instances, to be secondary to the Coptic Odes, and at the same time to be influenced by extant Gnostic hymns, we cannot be sure that the whole Syriac collection has not been influenced, through its ancestors, by Gnostic hymns now lost. In that case the original Odes may have been much simpler; and there is no assurance that this or that mystical turn of expression has not been introduced later. Unfortunately the limitations of the material for comparison prevent a solution of the question.

<sup>1</sup> See especially Odes V and VI.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS.

- >< : differs from.  
*Br* : C. Brockelmann *Lexicon Syriacum*, Berlin 1895.  
*C* : the Coptic text of the Odes proper, as found in the *Pistis Sophia*.  
*Com* : the detailed Commentaries of the *Pistis Sophia*.  
*G* : the Greek archetype of both versions of the Odes.  
*Har* : A. Harnack *Über das gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia*.  
*HF* : A. Harnack and J. Flemming *Ein jüdisch-christliches Psalm-Buch*.  
*Hs* : J. R. Harris *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*.  
*Ideler* : L. Ideler *Psalterium Coptice*.  
*MP* : J. H. Moulton *Grammar of New Testament Greek* vol. i, 1908 (Prolegomena).  
*PS* : The Gnostic book *Pistis Sophia*.  
*RJ* : Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon*.  
*S* : the Syriac text of the Odes.  
*Sm* : C. Schmidt *Die koptisch-gnostischen Schriften*.  
*SwP* : M. G. Schwartz and J. H. Petermann *Pistis Sophia, Opus Gnosticum* : either Coptic text or Latin translation.  
*T* : the Gnostic hymns, as found in the *Pistis Sophia*.  
*WMS* : the Latin version of *Woide-Münter-Schmidt*.

## ODE I.

C<sup>1</sup>

1. The Lord is upon my head like a wreath, and I shall not depart from Him.
2. The Wreath of Truth<sup>2</sup> has been plaited<sup>3</sup> for me, and it has made thy shoots to grow in me.
3. For it is not like a dry wreath which does not sprout : nay, but *thou* livest upon my head,<sup>4</sup> and thou hast sprouted upon me.
4. Thy fruits are full and perfect ; full of thy healing.

<sup>1</sup> There is no *T* to this Ode. It was copied in by mistake for vv. 10-12 of Ode V, *q. v. infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Note the article (otherwise *Hs* pp. 89, 94).

<sup>3</sup> ⲁⲩⲩⲱⲛⲧ cannot be rendered by the 3rd plural active but only by the 3rd singular passive for which it is regularly used. Otherwise it has no subject. The logical subject is 'the Lord' ; but as He is made identical with the wreath, the verb is made passive to avoid expressing any subject.

In the translation of all the Odes the 1st perfect in Coptic has been rendered by the *have-tense* in English. The 1st perfect in Coptic is used to render both the perfect and the aorist of Greek, predominantly the latter. It appears that it stands in the Odes for an aorist. But the Greek aorist, where it designates no particular past time, should be rendered by the English *have-tense* as used in the non-narrative past, and not as a genuine present-perfect (cf. *MP* pp. 135-136). This question has been much confused by the fact that German books have been, and still are, the media of the study of oriental languages ; and in that language *narrative past*, *indefinite past*, and *present perfect* may all be expressed by the *have-tense-form*.

<sup>4</sup> Or : upon me : ⲉⲩⲗⲱⲓ.

## ODE V.

## C.

1. I will confess thee, O Lord,  
for thou art my God.<sup>1</sup>

2. Forsake me not, O Lord,<sup>2</sup>  
for<sup>3</sup> thou art my hope (ἐλπίς).

3. Thou hast given me<sup>4</sup> thy  
judgement<sup>5</sup> for nothing; and I  
have been delivered through thee.<sup>6</sup>

4. May<sup>7</sup> they fall down<sup>8</sup> who  
persecute me, and do thou not let  
them see me.

5. May a cloud of smoke cover  
their eyes, and a mist of air (ἀήρ)  
bring darkness upon them.

6. And do not let them see the  
daylight, that they may not seize  
me.

7. May their counsel be power-  
less<sup>9</sup>; and may what they have  
counselled come upon them.<sup>10</sup>

## S.

1. I will confess thee, O Lord,  
because I love thee.<sup>1</sup>

2. Forsake me not, O Most High,<sup>2</sup>  
for thou art my hope.

3. For nothing have I received  
thy goodness<sup>5</sup>; and I live thereby.<sup>6</sup>

4. May<sup>7</sup> my persecutors come<sup>8</sup>  
and may they not see me.

5. May a cloud of darkness fall  
upon their eyes, and an air (ἀήρ)  
of darkness bring darkness upon  
them.

6. And let there not be light  
for them to see, that they may not  
seize me.

7. May their counsel become a  
tumour<sup>9</sup>; and may what they have  
cunningly devised return upon their  
heads.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T: for I have wished to come to thee: for thou art my Saviour. C >< S >< T (?).

<sup>2</sup> T: Light of the Height. C >< S = T.

<sup>3</sup> SwP:  $\alpha\epsilon\alpha\epsilon$  for  $\alpha\epsilon$ .

<sup>4</sup> SwP:  $\pi\alpha\dot{\iota}$  for  $\pi\alpha\dot{\iota}$ .

<sup>5</sup> T: light; a Gnostic substitution for an indeterminable word, as in the following cases, indicated as 'silent'. C >< S >< T. C seems to be right.

<sup>6</sup> T: thou hast delivered me. C = T >< S. But S shows his characteristic way of rendering of the idea to be delivered by to live in Ode VI, v. 17, and the divergence may be attributed to that. T: thou. C = T >< S.

<sup>7</sup> The optative is demanded by C ( $\mu\alpha\rho\sigma\gamma\ \rho\epsilon$ ) and admitted by S ( $\rho\alpha\theta\iota\mu\alpha$ ), as in the following verses.

<sup>8</sup> T: may they fall down; but later: and do not let them come to the places which are beyond the heaven, to cause them to see me. T = C partly, and in part T = S. It is S and not C that is influenced by T; for it is the second half of T that is secondary, and incidental. C >< S = T.

<sup>9</sup> S:  $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\beta\alpha\lambda$  which = tumour (Br p. 242: ἀπόστημα ἀφλέγμαντον). Hs translates thick darkness. HF compares it with  $\kappa\theta\alpha\upsilon\lambda\upsilon$  thickness, and suggests Stumpfsinn. As a textual corruption in Syriac, Greek, or Coptic, the divergence is not apparent. C seems to give a good reading. T: let it not succeed, which may be the source of the reading of S, which would need to be rendered: a blind tumour—that swells but comes to nothing. C >< S = T (?).

<sup>10</sup> C may also be translated upon their heads ( $\epsilon\sigma\pi\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \epsilon\chi\omega\sigma\gamma$ ).

8. They meditated a plan, and it was not realized by them; *and they were overcome although they were powerful*<sup>11</sup>; and what they evilly (κακῶς) devised descended upon them.<sup>12</sup>

9. My hope (ἐλπίς) is in the Lord, and I shall not fear; *for thou art my God, my Saviour* (σωτήρ).<sup>13</sup>

10.<sup>14</sup>

8. For they meditated a plan, and it was not realized by them; . . . . .<sup>11</sup>; they deliberated evilly, *and were found to be empty*.<sup>12</sup>

9. For my hope is in the Lord, and I shall not fear; and *because the Lord is my salvation I shall not fear*.<sup>13</sup>

10. And He is as a wreath on my head; and I shall not tremble.

<sup>11</sup> Verse 8 b is chiasmically parallel to 8 a; and 8 c to 8 b; whilst 8 a and 8 c are directly parallel. Again: verses 8 a and 8 c are parallel to 7 a and 7 b. It might seem then that 8 b has been inserted by C. But the omission of such by S is much more easily explained: namely, on the ground that the disturbing member (correspondence to 7 a and 7 b; and double chiasm) was easily omitted in transmission. T omits the member 8 b; but this cannot surely be regarded as having influenced S. But see the following note.  $C > < S = T$ ? Verse 8 seems to be historical, rather than general or indefinite.

<sup>12</sup> S has merely made 8 c exactly parallel to 8 a, while C has made it parallel to 7 b. The reason for the change in S is that it had lost the second member 8 b. C appears to be the original form. T: *they were not able* is again on the side of S as against C.  $C > < S = T$ .

<sup>13</sup> There are three points of difference: (1) C: *thou art my God*; S: *the Lord*. (2) C: *my Saviour*; S: *my salvation*. (3) C has a causal clause going with what precedes; S has a parallel two-membered sentence. T: *Because I believed (πιστεύειν) in the Light, I shall not fear; and the Light is my Saviour, and I shall not fear*. T supports S in points (1) and (3).  $T = C$  in point (2).  $C > < S = T$  twice and  $C = T > < S$  once.

<sup>14</sup> Verses 10-12 are wanting in C. As Hs has shewn (p. 20), the writer of PS when he had finished copying the Gnostic Hymn (T) corresponding to vv. 10-12 of Ode V, turned to his copy of the Odes to copy out these verses; but his eye was caught by Ode I of our collection (the 17th in his book of Psalms and Odes) which has a similar beginning (cf. *supra* Ode I note 1). In this way Ode I was accidentally preserved to us, and Ode V, verses 10-12, lost. But the T of vv. 10-12 is of course preserved. It is to be noted that the T falls into two sections at v. 10, with an interlude, which will explain how the slip came about. It would seem from this, that the author of PS had before him both the T and the C; for though conceivable, it is unlikely that he first used C for making his T, and then forgot so far as to copy in another Ode than the one which he had just paraphrased. He is not composing Gnostic Hymns from Odes, but harmonizing the one set of existing hymns with the other. In fact it may be that at his time he was unable to tell what Ode corresponded to his Hymn, and his error is one of ignorance rather than of oversight. Although v. 9 furnishes a natural ending, and the thought turns at this point to the figure of the Wreath, vv. 10-12 were probably originally in the copy of the Odes used by the writer of PS, and are not an addition of S.

In view of the omission of vv. 10-12 in C no comparison with S can be made;

Even if everything should be shaken, I shall stand firm.

11. 11. And if the visible world should perish, I shall not die;  
12. 12. For the Lord is with me, and I with Him. Hallelujah!

## ODE VI.

C.

S.

1-6.<sup>1</sup>

7. A stream (ἀπόρροια)<sup>2</sup> issued forth; it became a great, broad river.<sup>3</sup>

8. *It carried away all things, and it turned toward the Temple.*<sup>4</sup>

1-6.<sup>1</sup>

7. *For a stream*<sup>2</sup> issued forth; and it became a great, broad river.<sup>3</sup>

8. *For it flooded everything, and broke up, and carried to the Temple.*<sup>4</sup>

but reconstruction of C from T can be attempted:—

10. The Lord has been a wreath unto my head, and I shall not depart from Him; and if all things are shaken, yet shall I not shake.

11. And if all things perish, yet shall I not perish.

12. For the Lord is with me, and I myself am with the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> These verses are wanting in C and are thus beyond the present discussion. Their motif is: *the Spirit of the Lord which takes possession of one; Grace, the knowledge of which is to be made known.* With v. 7 is introduced the motif of *the stream of God's Grace which pours out irresistibly over the world.* The two parts may have been separate odes or fragments, and the Coptic Odes may have lacked the first part. But the omission is explained if we suppose that PS did not care to quote more of the Ode than was represented in his Gnostic Hymn.

<sup>2</sup> ἀπόρροια need have no further mystical significance than the *נשא* of S (cf. HF p. 32). But *Sapientia Salomonis* 7<sup>2b</sup> (cited by HF) is on the borderland of 'emanations'.

<sup>3</sup> C: ἕρπο need not refer to the Nile. But if so taken, in connexion with the following expressions (dams, water-restrainers), one need not conclude that the hymn is Egyptian (Har p. 43). Cf. e. g. Amos 8<sup>8</sup>, 9<sup>5</sup>.

S: *κίμα* (misprint?), which Hs translates *river*, can only mean *light*. *κίμα* is right. It is so difficult to decide what part is narrative part and what general or indefinite that I have left it narrative throughout vv. 1-11. The case is clearer in vv. 12-end (cf. Hs and HF).

<sup>4</sup> C: *carried away all things* = S: *flooded everything and broke up*. This is probably the fullness of S in translation noticeable elsewhere. C: *and it turned toward the Temple* = S: *and carried to the Temple* (everything). T: ? *vid. infra*. Com, which appears for the first time in this ode, has and brought them to the Temple; i. e. it substitutes *ἀκντοϋ* for the *ἀκνοῦ* in its quotation from C. Here S is confirmed by Com. Gunkel (pp. 297-298) holds that the reading of C is correct, and explains S by translating it back into Greek *παθήνεγκε τὸν ναόν*, in which he seems to have support from the context. C >< S = Com. Both Com and S make the same mistranslation. Com does not quote a Coptic text of C. Since Com could not conceivably influence S, it must be assumed that Com has translated *παθήνεγκε* of C in

9. It could not be restrained by means of *firm*<sup>5</sup> (*dams*) and *built places*; nor (οὐδέ) could the arts (τέχναι) restrain it, of those who restrain the waters.<sup>5a</sup>

10. It was carried over the whole earth; and it *seized*<sup>6</sup> all things. *Dwellers upon the dry sands drank*.<sup>7</sup>

11. *Their thirst*<sup>8</sup> was *relieved*<sup>9</sup> and quenched, as the drink was given them from the Most High.

12. Blessed (μακάριοι)<sup>10</sup> are the ministers (διάκονοι) of that drink:

9. And the *impediments of the children of men*<sup>5</sup> were not able to restrain it; nor the arts of those who restrain waters.

10. *For* it went over the *face* of the whole earth; and it *filled*<sup>6</sup> everything. And *all the thirsty upon the earth were given to drink*.<sup>7</sup>

11. And *thirst*<sup>8</sup> was *relieved*<sup>9</sup> and quenched, for from the Most High the draught was given.

12. Blessed then are the ministers of that drink, who *are* in-

its quotation so as to interpret the more easily *T*:  $\alpha\gamma\omega \pi\acute{\sigma}\epsilon\mu \pi\acute{\iota}\pi\sigma\omicron\mu \pi\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\eta$  (if indeed that is the proper parallel) and that they might take the light-forces. *Com* cannot have influenced *S*, for that would be equivalent to saying that *PS* had influenced *S*. *T* of Ode VI is not uttered, like the others, by *Sophia*, but by *Jesus*. It is doubtful therefore whether it belongs at all to the same class of presumably independent Gnostic Hymns as the others represented by *T*. *Hs* calls it, like the others, a Gnostic Targum (p. 25). *HF* have noticed the difference and indicated it as the *introduction* to the Ode (p. 17), but have made the mistake of taking *Peter's Com* for *T* and calling it the 'Targum of the (woman) Pistis Sophia' (p. 16). Apparently no Gnostic Hymns existed for this Ode. The presence of this speech of *Jesus* is the one serious obstacle to the theory of the independence of the Gnostic Hymns. The Gnostic devotee can identify himself with *Sophia* in his hymns, but could hardly employ a hymn in the first person, uttered by *Jesus*. On the other hand this *T* is very different in character from the others, and does not appear to attempt even to paraphrase the Ode.

<sup>5</sup> *C*:  $\zeta\epsilon\pi\omega\rho\bar{\alpha}$  (*firmnesses*) seems to have the sense of  $\zeta\epsilon\mu\alpha \epsilon\gamma\omicron\rho\bar{\alpha}$  (*fortifications*, cf. the following parallel  $\zeta\epsilon\mu\alpha \epsilon\gamma\kappa\eta\tau$  *built places*). *Sm* amends  $\zeta\eta \zeta\epsilon\pi\omega\rho\bar{\alpha}$  to  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota \zeta\epsilon\pi\omega\rho\bar{\alpha}$  in accordance with *Com*, and thus obtains a closer parallel to *S* 'Nicht konnten ihn fassen Dämme und Bauten.' *S*:  $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\iota$  (*impediments*; not *restrainers*: *Hs*). The text of *C* is supported by *Com*. *C* = *Com* >< *S*.

*S*: of the children of men. *C* and *Com* give no hint of it. *C* >< *S* >< *Com*.

Gunkel (Gressman) p. 297 amends  $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\iota\eta$  to  $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha$ .

<sup>5a</sup> Reading with *Sm* instead of  $\alpha\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma, \pi\alpha\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma$ .

<sup>6</sup> *S*: *filled* is paralleled by *Com*: *filled*, giving rise to the same dilemma as in note 4 *supra*. *C* is entirely different. *T* is silent; unless we regard as evidence:  $\alpha\gamma\omega \alpha\gamma\chi\iota \omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\eta \tau\eta\rho\bar{\eta} \pi\acute{\sigma}\iota \pi\omega\omega\mu \pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\gamma\lambda\eta$ , and the  $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$  of her  $\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta$  took all light, in which reference is made to the stream of light which *Gabriel* and *Michael* brought into the 'body of the matter' of the woman *Sophia*. The reading 'filled' is here implied, and *C* >< *S* = *Com*, *C* >< *S* = *T* (?).

<sup>7</sup> *C* = *Com* >< *S*.

<sup>8</sup> *C* = *Com* >< *S*.

<sup>9</sup> literally: loosened.

<sup>10</sup> *SwP*:  $\zeta\epsilon$  =  $\zeta\epsilon\eta$ .

those to whom *has been* intrusted the water of the Lord.<sup>11</sup> trusted with *His*<sup>11</sup> water.

13. They have restored lips that were parching; *those*<sup>12</sup> who were exhausted<sup>13</sup> *have received joy of heart*.

13. They have assuaged the dry lips, and the *will*<sup>12</sup> that had fainted<sup>13</sup> *they have raised up*.

14. They have seized<sup>13a</sup> expiring<sup>14</sup> souls (*ψυχαι*) that they might not die.

14. And souls that were near departing<sup>14</sup> they have caught back<sup>13a</sup> from death.

15. They have set up members<sup>15</sup> (*μέλη*) which were fallen.

15. And the members which were fallen they have *straightened*<sup>16</sup> and set up.

16. They have strengthened their *freedom* (*παρρησία*)<sup>17</sup> and have given light to their eyes.

16. They have given strength to their *coming*<sup>17</sup> and light to their eyes.

<sup>11</sup> *Com*: to whom *has been entrusted the stream of light* (or of the *Light*: meaning of the *Lord*). Taking the rendering *stream of light*, *Com* supports *S* (?). Taking the other rendering, *Com* = *C*. The latter has more in its favour; for the *stream of light* is regularly written *ταποροια ποροειν* in the *Com*, and not *ταποροια αποροειν* with the article as here. *C* = *Com* > < *S*.

<sup>12</sup> *C* = *Com* > < *S*.

<sup>13</sup> literally: *loosened*.

<sup>13a</sup> That *Sm*'s emendation of *αγαμαρτε* to *αγταρο* is wrong is now shewn by *S*: *αωκ*. It is an excellent example of 'better sense' emendation, overturned by an unexpected fact. Cf. above p. 35 n. 9.

<sup>14</sup> *C* and *S* are good equivalents. To be sure, *C*: *εγπογχε αππηγ* can refer to the subject (*ministers* understood) or the object (*souls*). Schmidt's corrected translation in *HF*: *indem sie den Hauch schickten* (= what ?) is noncommittal. *πογχε* = *βάλλειν επί* (Jo. 8<sup>59</sup>); *λιθάζω* (Io<sup>32</sup>); *ρίπτειν* (Mt. 27<sup>6</sup>); *ἀποστρέφειν* (26<sup>52</sup>); *ἐκβάλλειν* (Sir. 28<sup>9</sup>). *πεχματογ* is the only instance in Peyron's *Lex.* of (venenum) *inicere*. *S* also demands that we translate *πογχε* as *throw out*, *expire*, agreeing with the object. Verse 15 points in the same direction; and *T*: *ταϊ επεσπατακο πε*, *this one being about to perish*, leaves no room for doubt. *Com* quotes *C* exactly, but explains *πογχε* as *inicere*, for he paraphrases: *when they had injected (πτερογπογχε . . . ερογν ε . . .) the lights*. This is the source, doubtless, of *WMS*: *halitum innittentes* (otherwise *SwP* translation: *eicientes halitum*) and of *Sm*: *indem sie den Hauch hineinstiessen*. It seems unnecessary to amend postulated *ἀποπέμω* to *ἀπονέω* with *HF* (pp. 32-33). But *πογχε* was obscure to *Com*.

<sup>15</sup> *SwP*: *ρε = ρεν*.

<sup>16</sup> *C* = *Com* > < *S*.

<sup>17</sup> *HS* (p. 7) suggests that *S* goes back to *παροσία*, but *C* to *παρρησία*, and conjectures *παρείσει αυτων* or *παράλσει αυτων*. *HF* prefers the latter, but it can hardly be explained textually. As it stands, *παροσία* (= *S*) is without sense. *παρρησία* was almost certainly in the Greek underlying *C* and makes possible but difficult sense. *παρείσει* (*indifference*) recommends itself best perhaps. *Com* quotes *C* without substantial change and equates it with *T*: *and they became again as they had been at first*. *C* = *Com* > < *S*.

17. For all of them<sup>18</sup> have recognized *themselves*<sup>18</sup> in the Lord; and have *saved themselves*<sup>19</sup> by *water of eternal life*.

17. For every one<sup>18</sup> has recognized *them*<sup>18</sup> in the Lord; and [all] hath *lived*<sup>19</sup> by *living eternal water*. *Hallelujah*.<sup>20</sup>

## ODE XXII.

C.<sup>1</sup>

S.

1. He who brought me *down from*<sup>2</sup> the *exalted places above*<sup>3</sup> and<sup>4</sup>

1. He who brought me down from *the height*<sup>3</sup> and<sup>4</sup> *brought me*

<sup>18</sup> The subject refers to ministers or patients. In *S* the object is not reflexive; in *C* it may be so (αυτογνωσις). That it is to be taken reflexively is shewn by *T*: αἰχοῦν περηνη, *they have recognized each other*. *Com* quotes *C* and equates it with *T*. *C* = *T* > < *S* and *C* = *Com* > < *S*. αἰτούς (for ἀλλήλους) has been read αἰτούς by *S* and mistranslated (αὐκ). *C* leaves it doubtful, and *T* reads it correctly. The ministers and their patients have recognized each other in the Lord.

<sup>19</sup> *S*'s mannerism; cf. Ode V, verse 3, note 6.

<sup>20</sup> Characteristic of *S*.

<sup>1</sup> This Ode is preceded by a regular Gnostic Hymn of Sophia, and followed by a *Com* of Matthew.

I see no reason for regarding verses 1-2 as written especially to occupy a place in the *PS* (*RJ* p. 161); nor do I see why they need refer to pre-existence (*HF* p. 52), or to the Messiah or Jesus. This is a song, in Jewish strain, of one who has been oppressed, but who has at last found deliverance through God's help. 'Descending from the heights', and 'rising from the depths', are figures of speech merely. The 'removing of those who were in the midst' refers to the victory over the once present and dominant enemy. Yet it does look like Gnostic phrasing.

The Ode changes rapidly from the narrative part to the general, using the 1st perfect for both in *C*, and the perfect in *S*. Each reader will feel differently about the choice to be made in each case; but I have tried to distinguish between the two.

<sup>2</sup> The *MS* has εἰεσιτ ῥῆ, but *SwP* indicates a marginal *MS* correction inserting εἰολ, and this is confirmed by *T* and *Com*.

<sup>3</sup> If *above* is not original, and it seems not to be so, it has been introduced from *T* or *Com*. *T*: εἰπῆσαῖτη. *Com*: εἰρῆσαῖτη. *C*: τσα τη. (*Sm*) read: εἰσατη instead of *SwP*'s ἰσατη *beyond the heaven*. But both *C* and *S* may be translations of Greek: ἐκ τῶν ὑψίστων τῶν ἄνω: εἰολ ῥῆ ἡμα εἰσοσε εἰσατη;  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\mu\epsilon$ .

<sup>4</sup> Greek: καὶ αὐτός; the weak αὐτός was rendered in *S* and *C* by the verb with a latent subject, preceded by the copula. But it is evident that *and* introduces the principal clause: *He who . . . eum He*. *Com*: ἀγω οἱ: *and on the other hand*, which in a different way produces the needed contrast.

<sup>5</sup> *G* seems to have had: ἀνήγαγέ με ἐκ or ἐξήγαγέ με ἐκ. The former is represented in *S*. *C* writes ἀγῆτ εῖραῖ ῥῆ, which should mean: *he brought me out of*. εῖραῖ (= ὑβ, and = down) + ῥῆ ordinarily = *out of*. *T*: εῖραῖ ε . . . which means *down to* (not *up to*, as the context shews). *Com* quotes *C* exactly. The confusion could not have arisen in Greek (ἐκ, εἰς, ἀνά, κατά). It need not be thought that *T* is labouring to elucidate *C*'s Coptic εῖραῖ ῥῆ, or that therefore *T*

brought me out of <sup>5</sup> the places which are in the under firmament.<sup>6</sup> up from <sup>5</sup> the depth.<sup>6</sup>

2. He who removed <sup>6a</sup> those <sup>7</sup> who were in the midst, even He <sup>8</sup> has given me <sup>9</sup> knowledge concerning them.<sup>10</sup>

2. He who collected <sup>6a</sup> the things <sup>7</sup> that were in the midst, even He <sup>8</sup> has cast me down.<sup>10</sup>

3. He who scattered my enemies and my adversaries (ἀντιδίκους):

3. He who scattered my enemies and my adversaries:

4. He who gave me authority <sup>11</sup> over bonds to loose them:

4. He who gave me authority over bonds that I might loose them:

was made from a Coptic Ode, containing an unintelligible expression; *T* chooses to make both members of the verse parallel, and to introduce the contrast needed in an additional clause following: (*He who brought me down from . . . and brought me down to . . .*) and on the other hand thou hast saved me from the places below, through thy commandment.

<sup>6</sup> *G* may have been ἐκ τῶν βαθῶν τῶν κάτω, whence both *C*: εἰραῖ ἔν̄ ἄλλα εἰ̄π̄σ̄ον̄ ἄ̄πε̄σ̄η̄τ, and *S*: ܩܕܝܘܫܐ ܩܕܝܘܫܐ.

The sense of the two verses must have been: *He who brought me down from the heights above, even He has brought me up out of the depths below*: ὁ καταγαγὼν με ἐκ τῶν ὑψίστων τῶν ἄνω, καὶ αὐτὸς με ἀνήγαγεν ἐκ τῶν βαθῶν τῶν κάτω.

In conclusion: *C* and *S* as well as *T* and *Com* point to a common Greek text. And he is wrongly rendered by both. *Brought out* may be more original than *brought up*; or perhaps *C* is to be translated *brought up*.

<sup>6a</sup> *C* (πενταγῆι ἄλλα) *T* and *Com* (in quoting *C*) all have removed. *Com*, in its explanation, has (instead of *T*'s text): ἀκτρὲς ὡπ̄τ̄ ἔβολ: thou hast caused it to be cleansed. *S*: ܩܕܝܘܫܐ ܩܕܝܘܫܐ. *HF* (p. 53) rejects *C* as less intelligible than *S*. *C* = *T* > *S*.

<sup>7</sup> *C*: ἦ̄πε̄τ—may refer to persons; but *S*: ܩܕܝܘܫܐ does not, and is made directly parallel to ܩܕܝܘܫܐ of verse 1 b. *T* curiously agrees with *S*. *T*: thou didst remove the ὕλη which were in my light-forces, and I saw them. These ὕλη are impersonal and Gnostic, and consciously so; in *S* the touch of *T* is retained, but without understanding. *C* is ambiguous; but verse 3 shews that human enemies are thought of. I find nothing 'Gnostic' in *C*; no reference in verse 1 to pre-existence or the Messiah (*HF* p. 52), or in verse 2, to the Earth as between Heaven and the Underworld (*HF* p. 53). 'Former defeats (v. 1 a) have been turned to victory (v. 1 b). Those who were formerly an ever-present oppression in our midst He has removed (v. 2 a); and He has taught me how to vanquish them (v. 2 b).' So taken, v. 2 a is parallel to v. 3; and v. 2 b to v. 4. *C* > *S* = *T*!

<sup>8</sup> = *G*: καὶ αὐτός.

<sup>9</sup> *C*: ἀγτσαβοῦγ εροογ is corrected by *Com*: ἀγτσαβοῖ εροογ; it is merely a textual error in *C* (-βοογ from following εροογ).

<sup>10</sup> *T*: and I saw them confirms *C*, as does *Com*. *C* = *T* > *S*, cf. p. 31 l. 11. *HS* suggests ܩܕܝܘܫܐ for ܩܕܝܘܫܐ.

<sup>11</sup> *C* should have ἀγω (καὶ αὐτός) indicated by the context; verse 5 b is the principal clause. *S* read καὶ αὐτός. *S* has gone over to the second person under

5. He who smote (*παράσσειν*) with my hands the serpent having seven heads :

[Even] *He*<sup>11</sup> has established me over its root, that I may wipe out its seed (*σπέρμα*).

6. *And thou*<sup>12</sup> wast *with me*<sup>13</sup> helping me ; in every place thy name *surrounded me*.<sup>14</sup>

7. Thy right hand has brought to ruin *the poison of the slanderer*<sup>15</sup> ; thy hand has levelled the way of thy faithful ones (*πιστοί*).<sup>16</sup>

8. Thou hast *redeemed*<sup>17</sup> them from the graves (*τάφοι*), and removed them *from the midst of the corpses*.<sup>17</sup>

9. Thou hast taken dead bones ; thou hast covered them with a body (*σῶμα*) ;

10. And those who were motionless : thou didst give to them *energy* (*ἐνέργεια*) of *life*.<sup>18</sup>

11. Thy way has [ever] been without corruption ; and thy person<sup>19</sup> also. Thou didst bring

the influence of *T* (?) or perhaps of verse 6. *C* > < *S* = *T* (?). *S* is hardly correct, for v. 5 b goes with the preceding, and v. 6 makes a new beginning.

<sup>12</sup> *S* is better than *C*. No copula is needed at the beginning of a division.

<sup>13</sup> *C* = *T* > < *S*.

<sup>14</sup> *C*: ἀγκυτε εροϊ ; so also *T* and *Com* (quotation and interpretation). *S*:  
 ἰ κακο ἡβ. *C* is unquestionably the original, for it makes v. 6 b parallel to v. 6 a and *S* gives inferior sense. Schulthess, p. 252, emends:  
 ἡβ. *C* = *T* > < *S*.

<sup>15</sup> *T* gives no light. *Com* quotes *C* and equates it with *T*. *C* = *Com* > < *S*.

<sup>16</sup> Why should a figure derived from the Return of the Exiles be anything more than a mere literary allusion ?

<sup>17</sup> *T* gives no clue. *Com* quotes *C* and gives an interpretation not derived from *T*. But even this does not explain *S*. *C* = *Com* > < *S*. Freedom of translation will explain sufficiently.

<sup>18</sup> See above note.

<sup>19</sup> *C*: ἀγῶ ἡβ περσο (joining on to preceding : ἀτεκνὴν ἕωπε πούῃῃῃῃῃῃῃ) ; *S*: ἡβῶῃῃῃῃῃῃῃ (joining to preceding : ἡβῶ ἡβῶ)

5. He who overthrew with my hands the serpent having seven heads :

*And thou*<sup>11</sup> hast established me over its roots to destroy its seed.

6. *Thou*<sup>12</sup> wast *there*<sup>13</sup> and didst help me ; *and* in every place thy name *was blessed by me*.<sup>14</sup>

7. Thy right hand has brought to ruin *his evil poison*<sup>15</sup> ; *and* thy hand has levelled the way for those who believe in thee.<sup>16</sup>

8. *And* thou hast *chosen*<sup>17</sup> them from the graves, and separated them *from the dead*.<sup>17</sup>

9. Thou hast taken dead bones and covered them with bodies.

10. And they were motionless ; and thou didst give *aid for life*.<sup>18</sup>

11. Thy way is without corruption, and thy person (*πρόσωπον*).<sup>19</sup> Thou didst bring thy world to

thy world (αἰών) to destruction that all of them<sup>20</sup> might be dissolved and be renewed,

12. and that *thy light*<sup>21</sup> might be a foundation for them all.<sup>22</sup> Thou hast built thy *wealth*<sup>23</sup> upon them,<sup>24</sup> and they<sup>25</sup> have become a *holy*<sup>26</sup> dwelling place.

destruction, that everything might be dissolved and renewed,

12. and that the foundation for everything might be *thy rock*.<sup>21</sup> And upon *it*<sup>24</sup> thou hast built thy kingdom,<sup>23</sup> and thou<sup>25</sup> hast been the dwelling place of the saints.<sup>26</sup> *Hallelujah*.<sup>27</sup>

ODE XXV.

C.

S.

1. I have been delivered from *the*<sup>1</sup> bonds; I have fled to thee, *O Lord*.<sup>2</sup>

1. I have been delivered from *my*<sup>1</sup> bonds; and unto thee, *my God*<sup>2</sup> have I fled.

ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲕ ⲑⲁⲙ). To take ⲁⲓⲱ ⲙⲓⲓ as καὶ δέ (SwP) is impossible. ⲙⲓⲓ

continues the negation of ⲙⲓⲓⲧⲁⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ, and joins ΠΕΡΞΟ to the foregoing ΨΩΠΕ as a second subject. In perfect harmony with this is S. Indeed the supposedly feminine verb ⲑⲁⲑⲁⲕ cannot possibly be construed with ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲕ

which is masculine (as noted by HF p. 53, on Hs p. 118). Both ρⲟ and ⲁ stand for ἠρόσωρον, which means *person* as well as *face*; but HF (p. 53): “und dein Antlitz” ist unverständlich. ⲑⲁⲑⲁⲕ is 2nd person singular and begins a new sentence.

<sup>20</sup> i. e.: all things and all persons.

<sup>21</sup> T has corrupted C (after combination in the PS!) and S is right. C = T > < S.

<sup>22</sup> See note 20.

<sup>23</sup> C: ⲙⲓⲓⲧⲁⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ may possibly, though not probably, have arisen by textual corruption in Coptic from ⲙⲓⲓⲧⲁⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ: *kingdom*, which is the reading of S. T is silent. This would compel the assumption that the PS was composed in Coptic, or later strangely harmonized, for Com in quoting C gives the same word. It is by no means certain that *kingdom* is the original word in this place (so HF p. 54, cf. Ode 41<sup>10</sup>, 9<sup>4</sup>, 11<sup>9</sup>, 14 who admit that S is smoother, but C perhaps correct). C = Com > < S.

<sup>24</sup> C > < S = Com. T is silent. C has plainly been corrupted in transmission under the influence of *them all* (notes 20 and 22); but the building is to be done not on the things of the αἰών but upon the rock (*light*). S is right.

<sup>25</sup> T is silent. Com has: *it*. C: *they* (for the reason given in the preceding note). S stands alone: *thou*. Com seems to be right. C > < Com > < S.

<sup>26</sup> T is silent. C = Com > < S. G: κατόικησάν ἁγίων and . . . ἁγίων respectively.

<sup>27</sup> Regular in S and absent in C, T, and Com.

<sup>1</sup> C = T > < S and C = Com > < S. Perhaps ⲓⲁⲑⲁⲕ for ⲕⲓⲁⲑⲁⲕ; or merely the latitude of the translator. Probably C-T-Com are correct.

<sup>2</sup> = G: κύριε.

2. For thou hast become *for me* [as] a right hand, delivering me and helping me.<sup>3</sup>

3. Thou hast restrained (κωλύειν) those who contend against me ;

4. *And they have not shewn themselves*,<sup>4</sup> because thy person<sup>5</sup> was<sup>6</sup> with me, delivering me through<sup>7</sup> thy grace (χάρις).

5. I have been despised in the eyes<sup>8</sup> of many ; *and they have cast me out* ; I have been like lead in their eyes.<sup>9</sup>

6. Strength has come<sup>10</sup> to me through thee, helping me.<sup>11</sup>

7. For though hast set lamps at my right and at my left, in order that<sup>12</sup> no side of me should be without light.

8. *Thou hast covered*<sup>13</sup> (σκεπάζειν)

2. For thou hast become *my right hand of salvation and my helper*.<sup>3</sup>

3. Thou hast restrained those who rise up against me ;

4. *And I shall not see him any more*<sup>4</sup> ; because thy person (πρόσωπον)<sup>5</sup> was<sup>6</sup> with me, which delivered me through thy grace.

5. *But I have been despised and repudiated* in the eyes of many ; *and I have been in their eyes like lead*.

6. And strength came<sup>10</sup> to me from thee, and help.<sup>11</sup>

7. A lamp hast thou set at my right and at my left, and<sup>12</sup> there shall be nothing in me without light.

8. *And I have been covered*<sup>13</sup>

<sup>3</sup> C:  $\chi\epsilon$  ἀκωυπε παϊ̄ πογπαμ = not 'bist . . . gewesen' &c., but 'bist geworden' (Schmidt in *HF*; also *SwP* and *WMS*). C: εκπογρη̄ πμοϊ̄ αγω εκπογρη̄ πμοϊ̄ αγω εκφ̄πτοοτ in both *SwP* and *Ideler*: dittography in MS. *HF* finds S:  $\kappa\omega\iota\gamma\alpha\gamma$   $\mu\mu\mu$  corrupt and suggests  $\mu\mu\mu$  ( $\mu$ )

$\kappa\omega\iota\gamma$   $\mu\mu$ . The emendation is unnecessary and  $\kappa\omega\iota\gamma$   $\mu\mu$  does not mean 'als mein Retter' (*HF* p. 58). C and S are in practical agreement.

<sup>4</sup> In the tense C = T >> S and C = Com >> S. If the enemies are potential and the passage is categorical rather than narrative, which seems to be the case, then C is correct; but see note 6. S is certainly narrative, for besides the future tense *any more*, he used *him* instead of the indefinite *them* (C). He believes the allusion to be to some particular enemy.

<sup>5</sup> C:  $\rho\sigma$  =  $\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ .

<sup>6</sup> C:  $\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon$  . . .  $\psi\omega\sigma\mu$ , imperfect tense. S has  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha$   $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha$ .

<sup>7</sup> C:  $\bar{\rho}\eta$  = *through*.

<sup>8</sup> C:  $\bar{\mu}\mu\epsilon\mu\tau\omicron$   $\epsilon\acute{\eta}\omicron\lambda$   $\bar{\mu}$  . . .

<sup>9</sup>  $\bar{\mu}\mu\epsilon\mu\tau\omicron$   $\epsilon\acute{\eta}\omicron\lambda$ .

<sup>10</sup> C:  $\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\pi\epsilon$  ; S:  $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha$ .

<sup>11</sup> C = T >> S and C = Com >> S.

<sup>12</sup> S:  $\kappa\lambda\alpha$ . C = T >> S and C = Com >> S.

<sup>13</sup> S:  $\delta\mu\mu\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\alpha$  ; C and Com:  $\alpha\kappa\sigma\epsilon\pi\alpha\zeta\epsilon$   $\bar{\mu}\mu\omicron\iota$  ; but T:  $\alpha\kappa\omega\acute{\eta}\kappa$   $\epsilon\acute{\eta}\omicron\lambda$   $\epsilon\chi\omega\iota$ , its Coptic equivalent. G had:  $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ . In using the passive construction S is unique. C = T >> S and C = Com >> S.

me under the garment<sup>14</sup> of thy grace<sup>15</sup>; and I have risen above the garments of skin.

9. It is thy right hand that has raised me up; and thou hast removed sickness from me.

10. I have become strengthened through thy truth, and holy through thy justice (δικαιοσύνη); those that contend against me have turned back.<sup>18</sup>

11. And I have become justified through thy<sup>21</sup> goodness (χρηστός); for thy<sup>21</sup> rest endures for ever and ever.

with the garment<sup>14</sup> of thy spirit<sup>15</sup>; and thou hast removed from me<sup>16</sup> the garments of skin.<sup>17</sup>

9. For thy right hand has raised me up, and thou hast caused sickness to pass away from me.

10. And I have become strong through the truth, and holy through thy justice; and all those that [contend] against me fear me.<sup>18</sup>

11. And I have become admirable<sup>19</sup> through the name of the Lord<sup>20</sup>; and I have become justified through His<sup>21</sup> goodness, and His<sup>21</sup> rest is for ever and ever. *Halleluja.*<sup>22</sup>

<sup>14</sup> S: 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠𐩪𐩣; C: 𐩨𐩠 𐩪𐩠𐩢𐩨𐩠; Com: 𐩪𐩠 𐩪𐩠𐩢𐩨𐩠. G had: σκέπασμα. That the reference is to covering with clothing is evident from verse 8 b. and this idea is conveyed in σκεπάσειν—σκέπασμα,—these are the current equivalents underlying the Syriac and Coptic words quoted; rather than *textisti me sub umbra* (WMS), *Du hast mich beschattet mit dem Schirm . . .* (Sm).

<sup>15</sup> Schmidt in HF (p. 58) suggests that περπῖνα (thy πνεῦμα) was miswritten as περπῖνα (thy grace). But Com also has περπῖνα (T is silent) which would argue that Com was actually composed from C in Coptic, or afterwards corrected to errors that had arisen in C during the transmission of the whole book PS.

<sup>16</sup> S: 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠𐩪𐩣 HF: 'und er hat weggenommen.'

<sup>17</sup> S: 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠𐩪𐩣 HS (p. 124): 'my raiment of skin.'

<sup>18</sup> C = Com >< S.

<sup>19</sup> HS amends S: 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠𐩪𐩣 to 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠. The corruption arose under the influence of the following 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩠. HF retains the reading of the MS.

<sup>20</sup> This extra half-verse 11 a in S, an expansion of 11 b, is unique. C = T >< S and C = Com >< S.

<sup>21</sup> C = Com >< S and C = T >< S.

<sup>22</sup> Characteristic of S.

## TABULATION.

	V	VI	XXII	XXV	
—	1 & 1?	0	0	0	$C > < S > < T.$
—	No Com	1	2	0	$C > < S > < Com.$
—	5 & 2?	1?	1 & 1?	0	$C > < S = T.$
—	No Com	2	1	0	$C > < S = Com.$
—	3	2	7	7	$C = T > < S.$
—	No Com	8	4	8	$C = Com > < S.$
—	No Com	2	1?	1	Com shows error of C.

W. H. WORRELL.

## THE POETRY OF THE GREEK BOOK OF PROVERBS.

THE late Dr Blass stigmatized as a waste of time the search for verses and fragments of verse in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> He admitted, however, that in this respect one book stood apart from the rest—the Epistle to the Hebrews. There not only did he note (in xii 13 ff) a faultless hexameter, followed almost immediately by two faultless trimeters, but (a far more essential matter) he discovered running through the Epistle ‘a carefully executed mutual assimilation of the beginnings and endings of sentences and clauses’. The general tendency is for the *στίχοι* to run in couplets, the concluding (and sometimes the opening) syllables of the second line having the same scansion as the corresponding syllables in the previous line. In the attention paid to the balance of final syllables the system is a sort of approach to rhyme.

In the Greek Old Testament two books must be exempted from the general stricture above mentioned. I have previously pointed out in this JOURNAL<sup>2</sup> that the couplet system is illustrated, perhaps even more strikingly than in Hebrews, in the Book of Wisdom. In the Greek version of the book of Proverbs that rhythmical device is not, so far as my observations have gone, represented to any appreciable extent. On the other hand, the number of complete or fragmentary hexameters and iambic lines in that book is far too numerous to be the result of accident. My attention was first

<sup>1</sup> *Gramm. of N. T. Greek* p. 297.<sup>2</sup> vi 232.