

in Christian instruction what they had themselves seen and heard : this motive may account for omissions otherwise perplexing in our extant fragments of the Gospel history. But beyond all this there is the overwhelming impulse from Paul's own experience which forces this many-sided genius to narrow himself to one message in his passionate striving for the souls of men. He who knew so many things will know nothing (1 Cor. ii. 2) but Jesus the Christ, and Him not firstly as the matchless Teacher, the pitying Healer, the flawless Example, but as Redeemer from sin. First things must stand first. Paul the Hebrew, the Greek, the Roman, gathered into his one person all the great forces of his age to accomplish his life-work of turning men's eyes to the Cross, over which were written in letters of Hebrew, Greek and Latin the words: THIS IS THE KING.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ODE OF SOLOMON.

IN bringing out the second edition of the text of the Odes of Solomon, and in reviewing the various hypotheses which have been current with regard to this perplexing book (and I do not ever remember a problem in criticism more obscure or more difficult to resolve), I have tried to indicate directions in which it was likely that further light would before long appear. It is only by the careful testing of these various hypotheses and by a renewed and microscopic study of the text that we can hope to resolve this hitherto recalcitrant problem or series of problems. It was not possible, of course, to stay the stream of articles and studies which were appearing all over Europe and America which already constitute a small literature : even while the second edition was passing through the press, the kaleidoscope of criticism was shifting into new combinations of form

and colour, which would have warned the most headstrong editor against the presumption that the problem was solved, and certainly would have deterred him from suggesting too loudly that he had himself solved it. As, however, I am still at work on the matter, and it will probably be some time before a third edition of the original text will be called for, I thought I might take my place amongst the critics, forsaking for a time the rôle of editor, and make some further modest contributions towards removing obscurities from the interpretation of the Odes.

Those persons who have already looked over the introductory pages of the second edition, with a view to estimate how the questions of date, authorship and meaning are likely to come to their answers, will have noted that I left the matter hanging in the air, in an attempt to explain one of the most puzzling of all the Odes, the thirty-eighth, in which the Odist begins by going up into the light of truth as into a chariot, and discloses various experiences and states of mind through which he has passed on the way to what appears to be a settled and satisfactory spiritual experience. I took up the study of this Ode, almost in despair, in the desire to find something upon which I could test Dr. Bernard's theory that the Odes were all Christian, that they were for the most part Baptismal hymns, and that they were much later than had been imagined by myself or Harnack or any other of the critics who had discussed the matter. For it seemed to me that we needed something stronger in the way of identification of Baptismal customs than white robes, or crowns on the head, or torches on the right hand and on the left. So I applied a renewed meditation to the thirty-eighth Ode; and the result of the inquiry has been that the translation of the Ode has been improved, and its consequent interpretation made more easy, as will appear from what follows.

We begin with the problems of text and translation. As it stood in my second edition the Ode opened thus :

ODE 38.

I went up into the light of truth as into a chariot ;
 And the Truth took me and led me ;
 And carried me across pits and gulleys ;
 And from the rocks and the waves it preserved me :
 And it became to me a haven of Salvation.

It will be noticed that the first edition had been improved by substituting *a haven* for *an instrument* and a close examination of the MS. shows that the pointing, which is faint but legible, requires this correction. It restores continuity with the previous sentence about escape from the rocks and the waves ; the final escape from such is, of course, a haven. While we restore continuity at this point, we become more sensible of discontinuity with the opening sentences. For what possible connexion is there between a ship that outrides the storm, and a chariot that indulges in a breakneck flight over pits and gulleys ? Obviously there was something wrong here : the chariot must be a ship, and the ravines and pits through which and over which it passes are the hollows of the storm-tossed sea : and since the Syriac word which we had rendered "chariot" might, on an emergency, be rendered "ship," the correction was made, and the restoration of continuity was complete. Moreover, the expression "I went up" is the usual Syriac word for "going on board" a ship ; and it follows that the allusion to the light of truth covers the name of the ship : the opening of the Ode now runs :

I boarded the good ship Light of Truth :
 The Truth took me and led me,
 And carried me across the yawning gulfs and hollows of the sea,
 etc., etc.,

in which I have introduced a minimum of paraphrastic effect.

The next thing to notice is that the writer has a passage of Scripture in his mind, when he begins the composition of the Ode : in Psalm xliii. we have the prayer—

Oh ! send forth thy *light* and thy *truth* :
Let them *lead* me, let them *bring* me to thy Holy Hill !

The parallelism of this with

I went on board the Light of Truth :
The Truth took me and led me,
And carried me across gulfs and hollows,

will be sufficiently evident : and it may be suggested that the Psalm in some version or targum was actually current in the form,

Oh ! send forth the light of Thy truth.

However that may be, the Biblical dependence of the writer from the Psalm is clear.

Our next point is that there must be a further error in the lines :

From the rocks and the waves it preserved me :
And it became to me a haven of Salvation.

Clearly what we should expect the good ship to do is to *bring* the passenger to his haven. But how are we to deduce this from either the Syriac text or its underlying Greek ? From the Syriac it is clearly out of the question. The Greek behind it is—

Kaì ἐγένετό μοι λιμὴν σωτηρίας,

and this cannot easily be distorted from the sentence which we suggest for the original, and which was, in all probability, an imitation of the words in Psalm cvii. 30.

So he bringeth them to their desired haven.

We can see, however, that there is one direction in which the error would have been easy, and the correction obvious. In Aramaic we shall constantly find confusion between the words "there is" or "there was," אִתִּי and אִתִּי הוּא and the Aphel verb form אִתִּי ("he brought"). So that the

Greek word ἐγένετο is a misunderstanding of an Aramaic original, and by microscopic changes in the text of the first form of the Ode or by microscopic variations of the vocalisation, we come to what perplexed us in the Greek and the dependent Syriac.

I was led to this explanation by the consideration of the emendation made by Professor Torrey of Yale, in a recent article by Professor Bacon in this journal ¹ in which he proposed a similar explanation for the perplexing passage in Ode 6, where the words

And it brought to the Temple

can be restored to

And there was no one to hinder,

by a study of the possible underlying Aramaic. The error in this case was in the opposite direction. We are thus led from the study of two passages which are not in their original form to clear them both by the assumption that, after all, the Greek is not the original, however certainly it may be the parent of the Syriac and Coptic versions. We have now the first five lines in good order, as if in a ship, to use the Odist's language ; and we should naturally be tempted to stop and ask whether this tends in the direction of Dr. Bernard's theory or of Dr. Harnack's or of Dr. Diettrich's (the latter having in his last writing moved much nearer to Harnack and almost entirely removed the stress from the supposed baptismal analogies). If we can establish an Aramaic original we certainly move away from Bernard's position, for the fresh factor in the tradition requires time, and already Bernard is hard put to it for time in which the evolution of the Odes can be accomplished, and thinks they cannot have been composed much before A.D. 200. On the other hand that baptism is a

¹ EXPOSITOR for March, 1911, p. 199.

haven in the early figurative language of the Church is as certain as that the Church is a ship or the world the sea. For instance, in the *Nestorian Ritual for the Epiphany* (Conybeare and Maclean, p. 335) we find such sentences as the following :

Save me, O God, by thy name (Ps. liv.). "In the hidden valleys of the world thou walkest as in the sea. O thou who art unbaptized, hasten to come to the glorious haven of baptism. . . .

And he led them to the haven where they would be (Ps. cvii. 30). To the covenant of the haven of life we have come : to the glorious resurrection of Christ our Saviour.

These and other similar passages may, no doubt, be used in defence of Dr. Bernard's position. But perhaps we are too hasty in demanding a solution ; it will be better to continue the examination of our Ode a little further. The Odist goes on to say that the Truth

Set me on the arms of immortal life ;
It went with me and made me rest :
It suffered me not to wander, because it was the Truth.
And I ran no risk, because I walked with Him.
And I did not make an error in anything,
Because I obeyed the truth.

We have now to find a motive for these statements, either in the language of the canonical scriptures or in the experience of the writer.

Starting from the assumed ship which is on her way to the haven, we make the further suggestion that the ship is the ark. The author who has gone on board is then either Noah, or a mystical fellow-passenger of his. The first thing that strikes our eyes is the statement that "he made me to rest," in which the Semitic scholar at once recognises the form of the name *Noah* : (*anih* involving *noh*) ; while the Greek Patristic or Hellenistic scholar is at once reminded that, from Philo onward, it has been the custom to explain the name of Noah in terms of *rest*. For example :

Philo : *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 24: ἐρμηνεύεται γὰρ Νῶε ἀνάπαυσις ἢ δίκαιος.

Philo : *De Abrahamo*, 5: ὃς ἐβραίων μὲν τῇ γλώττῃ καλεῖται Νῶε, τῇ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἀνάπαυσις ἢ δίκαιος . . . ἢ δὲ ἀνάπαυσις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἐναντίον τὴν παρὰ φύσιν κίνησιν ταραχῶν καὶ θορύβων, στάσεών τε καὶ πολέμων αἰτίαν εἶναι συμβέβηκεν, ἣν μετῴσιν οἱ φαῦλοι, ἡρέμιοι δὲ καὶ ἡσυχάζοντα καὶ σταθερὸν ἔτι δὲ καὶ εἰρηρικὸν βίον καὶ καλοκαγαθίαν τετιμηκότες,

from which it may be seen how Philo interpreted and made mysticism out of the name of Noah. And in this he had, we must remember, the suggestion of the Scriptures before him ; for do we not read in Genesis v. 29, the account of the birth of Noah, the same play upon the meaning of his name ? “ He called his name, Noah, saying, ‘ The Name shall comfort us for the labours of our hands ’ ” (*lit. shall comfort us*, the LXX rendering *διαναπαύσει*).

What Philo does, in thus following the Scripture hint, with the name of Noah, Justin does in following Philo. At the risk of a loss of proportion in the discussion, I add one or two parallels to show the connexion between Justin and Philo at this point :

1. Justin, ii. *Ap.* 7: Our Noah is called by you Deucalion.” Τὸν μόνον σὺν τοῖς ἰδίους παρ’ ἡμῖν καλούμενον Νῶε, παρ’ ὑμῖν δὲ Δευκαλίωνα.

With which compare—

Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 4.

τοῦτον Ἑλλήνες μὲν Δευκαλίωνα, Χαλδαῖοι δὲ Νῶε ἐπονομάζουσιν.

2. This Noah is the author of a new race :

Justin. *Dial.* 138 (after describing the flood under Noah), ὁ γὰρ Χριστός . . . ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν.

With which take

Philo *ut sup.*

Ἡξίωσε γὰρ ὁ ποιήτης τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τέλος γενέσθαι τῆς κατακρίτου γενεᾶς καὶ ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀνυπαίτιου.

3. That the name Noah means *rest*.

Justin, *Dial.* 138, shows that it was not to the drowned

earth that rest was promised, ἀλλὰ τῷ λαῷ τῷ πειθομένῳ αὐτῷ, ᾧ καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν προητοίμασεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὡς προδέδεικται διὰ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ συμβόλων.

With which we may compare Philo as above.

4. The man of rest is connected with the seventh day. Philo continues his identification of Noah and Rest by a reference to the rest of the seventh day, and Justin (*Dial.* 138) does the same by means of the eight persons and the eighth day. The occurrence of common matter and common method in Philo and Justin shows the hold which the Biblical equation of Noah and Rest had taken.

Returning then to our Ode, we say that the writer, when he said that after his sea-voyage the Truth made him to rest, has Noah in his mind and has identified himself with Noachic conditions. Nor is this all; the identification is with Noah himself, for he continues to explain that "I ran no risk, because *I walked with Him*. But this is Genesis vi. 9: "Noah was a perfect man: *Noah walked with God*." And in this connexion note that the agreement in language between our Ode and Genesis is not made through the Septuagint (which says *εὐαρέστησεν, Noah pleased God*), nor with the Peshito, which here follows the LXX, but with the original Hebrew, which is another suggestion of an ultimate Semitic origin for the Odes.

If, then, we are right that in the opening verses this is an Ode of Noah, we cannot stop here; the rest of the language becomes significant. Noah did not wander, ran into no danger, obeyed the truth. On the one hand this is merely mystical exegesis on Genesis vi. 22: "according to all that the Lord commanded Noah, so did he." On the other hand, it is an oracular statement to shield the character of the Patriarch from reproaches which have been cast upon it, in the matter of his unhappy intoxication. The problem is this, "Can the perfect man be overcome

by wine ? ” And it is a serious problem for the mystical exegete. Philo devotes two treatises to the subject, *De Plantatione Noe* and *De Ebrietate*, in which he evades the main point very successfully by discussing the natural history of drunkenness and the like, in all of which discussions there is a minimum and an almost complete absence of Noah. But in his *Questions on Genesis* (ii. 68) he explains definitely that Noah did not get drunk : “ The just man did not drink wine but only a portion of wine . . . and the words *Noah was inebriated* are to be read in the sense that he used wine but did not abuse it;¹ . . . the wise man does the same.”

The value of these statements does not lie in their exegesis of the original vine-legend, but in their disclosure of the straits the Jewish and Christian teachers were reduced to, when they whitewashed their saints for exhibition to a Greek world. We can, at all events, in the light of these references and the underlying Scriptures, see an explanation for the language of the Ode about the perfect man who always obeys and walks with the Truth. The same difficulty will be found in the *Clementine Homilies* (ii. 51), where Peter stoutly maintains the errancy of the Old Testament, and declares that Adam, the son of God, was not a transgressor, nor was Noah, the typical righteous man in the world, a drunkard. Philo wavers in his opinions, and is evidently trying to evade the dilemma involved in the case. Sometimes he says that (*De Plant. Noe*, 36) “ it is plain that unmixed wine is a poison, which is the cause, not of death, but of madness : and why may we not pronounce madness to be death, since by it the most important thing in us dies, the mind ? ” A little lower down he maintains that to drink too much wine on proper occasions is not unsuitable for a wise man. From which it appears that Philo was in two minds on the subject. Sometimes he says Noah was not

drunk, sometimes he justifies him in being drunk ; his wisdom is maintained in each event. He also has an evasive explanation of Noah's planting, on the line that God is the real planter, who plants the Cosmos. The coincidence between the Odist and Philo in the description of drunkenness as madness which takes away the mind, should be noted.

May we then say that it is in this direction that we must look for the explanation of the passages which follow in which the Odist explains his escape from the witchcraft of the deceivers who invite men to the banquet and *give them to drink of the wine of their intoxication*, and affirms that "he was made wise so as not to fall into the hands of the deceiver" ? Perhaps, however, we are now moving too fast and too far. So at this point I rein in my steeds. The points which appear to come out of our discussion of the opening verses of the 38th Ode are these :

- (i) That the Odist is sailing in a ship (the Light of Truth) to a haven of salvation.
- (ii) That the original Ode was in Aramaic and not in Greek :
- (iii) That the ship is imagined to be the ark, and the voyager to be either Noah himself or some one who shares Noah's experiences.

J RENDEL HARRIS.

THE HELLENISTIC ATMOSPHERE OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

THE more difficult problems of New Testament Introduction are often complicated by the varied character of the evidence brought to bear upon them. A large number of separate arguments are adduced, none of them, perhaps, particularly cogent, and the general impression left is one of sheer be-