

published Legend of Danel from Ras Shamra. There (Tablet I, col. i, ll. 29-37) the sight of eagles hovering over a house is a sign of disaster. The same meaning may well obtain here. We should then render:

‘Set unto thy mouth the trumpet of alarm!’

It is as if an eagle were over Yahweh’s House!’

Finally, for  $\text{רָשָׁף}$  ought not  $\text{רָשָׁף} (?)$  ‘for there is an eagle’ to be read?

THEODOR H. GASTER.

### PARALLELS TO A N.T. USE OF $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$

THE following additions may be made to Professor Manson’s article. Cicero (*Ad Att.* ii. 1. 3) in 60 B.C. sends Atticus the speeches he had delivered as consul and calls them ‘hoc totum  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ’. Orelli objected to the genuineness of this passage, one of his reasons being that  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  ought not to be applied to a collection without any internal bond of connexion. But Cicero would have thought them most closely connected as being different parts of his defence of Rome against anarchy. No one now athetizes this passage. Josephus (*Ant.* xiv 312) quotes a decree of M. Antonius shortly after Philippi (42 B.C.) containing the words  $\delta\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \epsilon\kappa \nu\acute{o}\sigma\omicron\upsilon \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \tau\eta\varsigma \text{’}\text{Α}\text{σ}\text{ί}\text{α}\text{s} \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu \delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\eta\eta\eta \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu \nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota$ . Here the word seems to mean the *organized* province of Asia. Josephus’s own use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  may be illustrated by two passages. In *B.J.* i 15  $\tau\acute{o} \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \tau\eta\varsigma \text{’}\text{Ι}\text{s}\text{t}\text{o}\rho\text{i}\alpha\varsigma$ , ‘the structure of his history’, is made original if new facts are stated. In *Ant.* vii 66 David makes Jerusalem  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ , by adding the  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\alpha$  to the lower city, ‘one organic whole’. It is regrettable that the ninth part of the new Liddell and Scott only gives the N.T. uses, but none of those parallels which exhibit the sense of an ‘organic whole’ whether of persons or things.

G. C. RICHARDS.

### BARNABAS AND THE DIDACHE

IN his article ‘The much-belaboured Didache’ (*J.T.S.* Oct. 1936) Canon Streeter has done me the honour of devoting several paragraphs to an article of mine in the *JOURNAL* for April 1932 (‘The Didache in relation to the Epistle of Barnabas’),<sup>1</sup> in which I argued that the ‘Two

<sup>1</sup> I desire to point out that the two articles in the *J.T.S.* for April and July 1934, which in his opening paragraph (p. 369) Canon Streeter inadvertently attributes to me, are not mine but the late Dean Armitage Robinson’s, being his revision and enlargement of chapters i and iii of his book *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. They were printed after his death, but exactly as he left them, save for a very few—mostly explanatory—footnotes with my initials. For full particulars see *J.T.S.* April 1934, pp. 113-118. Happily Canon Streeter’s slip of memory has had no untoward consequences, as he makes no further allusion to the two articles of 1934 but confines attention to the one which is really mine.

Ways' in chapters xviii-xx of the Epistle is the immediate source of the 'Two Ways' in the Didache i-v.

I regret that at the present moment I am not in a position to do justice to Canon Streeter's comments and objections by attempting to reply to them in detail. To do so would exceed the space which I could ask for in this number of the JOURNAL, and would take me far beyond the one question arising out of my article—the relation of the Didache to Barnabas. I will content myself therefore with calling attention to a single point, which Canon Streeter appears to have either overlooked or forgotten. It is a matter which goes to the root of his whole position in regard to Barnabas and the Didache. To make this clear two preliminary remarks are necessary.

1. Canon Streeter says (p. 372): 'Dom Connolly has made it impossible for any future scholar to reverse his hypothesis and argue that Barnabas used the Didache. He has left unweakened the hypothesis that they both used a common source, which neither has incorporated without considerable modification.'

I welcome the admission in the first of these two sentences, for there have been scholars of repute who have not hesitated to assume that the Didache was known to Barnabas.

2. Next, it is to be gathered from Canon Streeter's last paragraph on p. 370 that he accepts chapter xvi of the Didache (that is, the concluding apocalyptic chapter) as an integral part of the document. The same is necessarily inferred from his book *The Four Gospels* (to which he refers us) pp. 508 and 510-511. In the first of these places he does *not* include ch. xvi among 'certain passages the text of which is not sufficiently certain to bear the weight of an important conclusion'; and in the second he discusses the Gospel allusions in ch. xvi on the same terms as those to be found in other (by him) unchallenged parts of the document. Here again he has my suffrage: I agree that there is no just reason for questioning the genuineness of the last chapter.

With these two postulates in mind let us now set side by side a passage from this last chapter of the Didache and one from an early chapter of Barnabas—long before the introduction of the 'Two Ways'.

*Barnabas iv 9-10.*

διὸ προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχά-  
ταις ἡμέραις· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφε-  
λήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς  
πίστεως ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ

*Didache xvi 2-3.*

πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε ζη-  
τοῦντες τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς  
ὑμῶν.

οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς  
χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, ἐὰν  
μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειω-

ἀνόμω καιρῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς μέλλουσιν θῆτε. ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις  
 σκανδάλοις ὡς πρέπει υἱοῖς θεοῦ ἀντι- ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδο-  
 στῶμεν, ἵνα μὴ σχῆ παρείδουσιν ὁ προφήται κτλ.  
 μέλας. . .

μὴ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδύνοντες μονά-  
 ζετε ὡς ἦδη δεικταιωμένοι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ  
 τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι συνζη-  
 τεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος.

Unless, then, Canon Streeter is prepared to revise his judgement in regard to the last chapter of the *Didache* (which I cannot think he will do simply because it is found borrowing from *Barnabas*), I do not see what he can effectually urge against my conclusion, based on other evidence, that the *Didache* derived its 'Two Ways' from *Barnabas*. If the author knows the *Epistle*, how can it be said that he has taken this from it but not that?

I did not refer in my article to the above quotation from *Barnabas* because I was there comparing the two versions of the 'Two Ways' strictly on their merits, and because this other parallel had already been commented on by Dr Armitage Robinson in his book *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache* pp. 67-68.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

## THE SPELLING *IESSUS* IN CERTAIN LATIN MSS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

IN his essay on 'The Name *Jesus*' in the series of Christological studies *Mysterium Christi*, Prof. Deissmann calls attention to the tendency of Christian copyists to obliterate or to make unrecognizable the name *Jesus* whenever it occurs in the true text of the N.T. as the name of any person other than the Saviour. 'Clearly it was felt to be a scandal', he writes, 'and that in early times, that there should have been other men of the name *Jesus* . . . thus we find that in all other cases where the name *Jesus* occurs in the N.T. there have been interferences with the text, by means of which other persons were deprived of the sacred name with varying degrees of success' (p. 16). That the alterations were not therefore accidental but deliberate is Deissmann's contention; and he quotes a number of instances where the reading (or spelling) Ἰησοῦς or *Iesus* should undoubtedly be restored.

Among these instances, however, are three of spelling in Vulgate MSS, which I believe to be inadmissible as evidence. They are as