

In summing up, I tentatively suggest the following as a probable account of the origin of the version, and of the course of its early history. The Syriac version of the Pentateuch was made by a Jew (or Jews) for the use of Jews, its chief characteristic being faithfulness to the Hebrew original. The Christian Church took over this version, and acting in accordance with exegetical principles current at the time, as well as with the genius of the language, it gradually amplified and improved the style of the original translation. Somewhere about the fifth century a certain form of this ampler text was made standard in the Christian Church—there may have been simultaneously an irregular revision—and henceforth all codices more or less conformed to this type. The best example of this class is, on the whole, the ‘Codex Ambrosianus’. The older, more literal, type of text prolonged a waning existence for some centuries, but was finally ousted by the ‘standard’ text.

JOHN PINKERTON.

A NEW EDITION OF THE PENTATEUCH IN SYRIAC.

IN November 1910 the British and Foreign Bible Society entrusted me with the preparation of an edition of the Peshitta Pentateuch in Estrangela type, intended for the use of the Syrians of Mardin and its neighbourhood. In this new edition the misprints of Lee were to be corrected, and the text was to be revised with the help of ancient MSS. In accordance with the practice of the Society all critical notes were to be excluded.

I was fortunate in securing two valuable helpers in the work of collation: Mr C. W. Mitchell of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, who is editing Ephraim’s *Refutation of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, for the Text and Translation Society, and Mr J. Pinkerton (also of Emmanuel College). These two scholars shared with me the heavy labour of collation. For some acute suggestions as to particular readings I am under obligation to Mr Pinkerton, but for the revision of the text I am alone responsible. The printing took about two years. Every page was revised for the press by two of the three workers.

The list of MSS used may be presented as follows:—

A = Ceriani’s facsimile edition of the Ambrosian MS (for the Pentateuch). Century VI.

B = Camb. Univ. Lib. Oo. 1. 1 (Pentateuch). Century XII.

C = British Museum Add. 14,438 (Deuteronomy). Century VI.

D = B. M. Add. 14,425, dated A.D. 464 (Gen., Exod., Numb., Deut.).

E = B. M. Or. 4400 (Exod., Lev., Numb., Deut. i-xi). Century VI (?).

F = Florence, Laurent. Orient. 58 (Lev. xv 14—ad fin., Numb., Deut.). Century IX. Photographs of this MS procured by Mr Pinkerton were used.

G = B. M. Add. 14,427 (Lev., Numb., Deut.). Century VI.

H = B. M. Add. 14,671 (Pentateuch). Century XIII.

J = B. M. Add. 14,426 (Genesis). Century VI or VII.

N = B. M. Add. 12,172, foll. 136-164 (Genesis). Century IX or X.

R = B. M. Add. 14,428 (Numbers). Century VIII.

W = Bodleian C. 335 (Pentateuch). A.D. 1193-94 New College MS.

Y = B. M. Add. 14,669, ff. 23, 24 (Deut.). Century VI.

1 = Camb. Univ. Lib. Oo. 1. 27 (Pentateuch). Nestorian; century XVIII (probably).

X = B. M. Add. 12,138 (Nestorian Syrian Massora). A.D. 899.

Z = B. M. Add. 12,178 (Jacobite Syrian Massora). Century IX or X.

Of these MSS a few (B, W, X, Z) were consulted only occasionally Y is but a fragment (Deut. xxxii 51—xxxiv 7).

The American edition published at Urmi, 1852 ('U'), was freely referred to.

The problem presented by these MSS is a difficult one, specially in the first two books of the Pentateuch. 'D' occupies the place of dignity, for at the end of the book of Exodus it bears a date which is the earliest attached to any Biblical MS. But when its text is examined two facts become clear: (1) that it differs from that of all other MSS, (2) that in these differences it agrees with the Massoretic text. Thus in Exod. iv 13-31 there are eleven cases in which D differs from A B E H 1 and agrees with the Massoretic text. It is probable that there are two recensions of the Peshitta of the books of Genesis and Exodus represented respectively in D and in A B E H 1. The former of these has possibly been accommodated to the Massoretic text, while the text represented by the agreement of A and E is, at least, as ancient as that of 'D', and may be a more faithful copy of the original Peshitta. Accordingly, in forming the present text of Genesis and Exodus, the group A B E H 1 has been followed as far as possible, while D has been used with caution to promote a decision in cases in which the members of the group differ among themselves.

For the book of Leviticus 'D' does not exist, and the textual problem is comparatively simple.

For Numbers and Deuteronomy D is once more available, but the text has not the same striking character as for Genesis and Exodus. Probably it is very near to the original text of the Peshitta. Its reading has been adopted in most cases in which it is supported by one or more of the best of the remaining MSS ('A', 'F', or 'G').

Lee's text is over-full of marks of punctuation; these have been much reduced in number in the present edition. *Seyame* is more sparingly used, for in the ancient MSS it often seems a recent addition. On the other hand, *seyame* is restored to the singular word *maumāthā*, 'an oath', in deference to the weight of external evidence (including Barhebraeus on Gen. xxiv 8).

The number of new readings introduced on the authority of the oldest MSS is considerable, while their importance, it must be confessed, varies very much. In Gen. iii 12 the true reading of the Peshitta agrees exactly with MT, 'the woman whom thou gavest [to be] with me.' In iv 15 the text of the MSS (if it will stand) is to be rendered:—

'No! Thus [shall it be] with any slayer [of Cain]:
Cain shall be avenged sevenfold.'

In vi 17 the difficult construction accepted in the MT is reproduced in the best Syriac MSS, 'the flood [even] waters' (so A D J N). In Exod. vi 2 the reading 'And God (*Allaha*) spake' is adopted on the evidence of A D against B^{vid} E H (*Marya*, 'the LORD'), but in agreement with MT (vulgo et ed. Ginsburg). In ix 16 Lee (with A H W and MT) reads, 'that I might shew thee my power', but E (with some support from D) gives 'that I might *shew in thee* my power', and this reading has been preferred in the present edition. In Lev. i 16, the reading 'And he shall remove' (so MT) has been restored on the authority of A E H (with *U*), and on the confession of Barhebraeus who testifies that this was the *Nestorian* reading. Numb. ix 20, according to the corrected text, runs, 'And when the cloud was *stretched* for days over the tabernacle' (so A D E G W and *U*). In xii 8 the true reading is, 'The glory of the LORD he *hath seen*' (so A B D E G R W and *U*). In xiv 1, 2 three omissions have to be made from Lee's text, viz. 'a great weeping'—'on that day'—'by the hand of the LORD'. In Deut. xvi 10 the true reading is, 'According as he hath blessed thee', not as Lee, 'In order that he may bless thee'.

Some difficult readings remain after all available MSS have been consulted, e.g. in Exod. iv 25 the MSS read, 'I have (*'ith li*) a bridegroom of blood', instead of '*Thou art* to me' (*'att li*). The former reading looks like a corruption of the latter (within the Syriac), but I judged it right to follow the consensus of the MSS.

Owing to the exclusion of critical notes an arbitrary decision had

sometimes to be made between two readings possessing an equal amount of support. Thus in Gen. xiii 10 authority is equally divided between *Allaha* ('God') and *Marya* ('the Lord'). Similarly in Deut. xx 8 *lebbeh* and *ālekh* are equally well attested, though the former only appears in this edition.

In Deut. xi 14, 15 the reading of Lee '*I* will give rain . . . and *I* will give grass' has been retained, but the attestation of the variant, '*He* will . . . and *He* will', is equally strong. The first person is read by A F G in agreement with MT, while the third person has the support of D E H in agreement with LXX.

Further, it is right to call attention to some of the readings of D which have been rejected for want of support from other early MSS. In Gen. vi 1, 4 for 'Sons of God', D seems to be alone in reading '*Bnai dayyane*', 'sons of the judges'. In vii 1 D (again alone?) reads *Marya*, 'the LORD' (so MT), for *Allaha*, 'God'. In viii 21 the words 'the sweet savour' are translated doubly in the Peshitta, but D omits the first rendering (*rêhâ daswatha*). In Exod. i 15 the names of the two midwives are given in A B E H I and Barhebraeus in the order 'Puah and Shiphrah', but D agrees with MT in giving the reverse order. In the last three instances it seems to me that D may preserve the original reading of the Peshitta.

The revision of Lee's edition of the Pentateuch has proved itself a task worth attempting, and it may be claimed for the new edition that it is a contribution to our knowledge of the Peshitta text. I cannot conclude these introductory words without expressing my deep sense of gratitude to the two scholars whose co-operation made the work possible, and to the British and Foreign Bible Society which through its Editorial Secretary, Dr Kilgour, has facilitated all my labours.

W. EMERY BARNES.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

By his article in the last number of the JOURNAL (vol. xiv pp. 530-538), entitled 'Greek the Original Language of the Odes of Solomon', Dom Connolly has once more earned the hearty thanks of all students of the Odes. But it contains at least one serious error, in regard to one of the passages dealt with, which, in the interests of readers of the

JOURNAL who have not ready access to the MSS of the Odes, ought not to pass uncorrected.

In Ode xx 5 Dom Connolly gives as the literal rendering 'Thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood of thy soul', omitting the preposition *beth* (i. e. 'with' or 'in') before 'the blood'. He adds, 'The Nitrian MS discovered by Professor Burkitt supports the reading of Dr Harris's own MS'. On this hypothesis, he argues that 'acquire' is to be taken as a mistranslation of the Greek $\epsilon\chi\omega$, meaning 'hold' or 'regard', and that the original, which was Greek, meant 'thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own (flesh and) blood'.

But this hypothesis is wrong. Dr Harris's printed text includes the preposition 'with', and, as I have ascertained, the facsimile of his MS in the British Museum also includes it. So too does the Nitrian MS. Accordingly, as regards this particular passage, Dom Connolly's argument, as stated by him, falls to the ground, unless the text be first emended by the omission of the preposition.

This and other portions of Dom Connolly's deeply interesting paper I hope to discuss fully in a forthcoming volume of 'Diatessarica'. I will therefore add nothing but a reiteration of thanks, to which I am especially bound by the fact that Dom Connolly wrote his paper 'in the hope of persuading Dr Abbott, and others also', that Greek was the original Language of the Odes of Solomon. I am not 'persuaded'. But I am none the less grateful.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

In a Note in the July number of the JOURNAL entitled 'Greek the original language of the Odes of Solomon', I quoted (pp. 531-532: item II of the Note) the first words of Ode xx v. 5 as follows: $\text{ܠܐ ܕܘܩܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ}$;

and I stated that this was the reading both of Dr Harris's MS and of cod. N, discovered by Professor Burkitt. It has been pointed out by Dr Abbott that this is incorrect, and that in both MSS the last word but one is ܕܥܘܠܡܐ , with the prepositional prefix ܕ . As I proceeded to argue from the Syriac text (in the form quoted above) to an underlying Greek text, and as the presence of the preposition would, had I been aware of it, have involved a somewhat different treatment of the case, I may be allowed to explain how it was that I came to make so strange a misquotation.

In writing the Note I used Dr Harris's second edition of the Odes, in which several textual errors of the first edition are corrected; and I had not the first edition by me at the time. Some time previously