

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 *dileh* 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:  $\text{ܠܐ ܕܘܩܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ}$ ;

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  $\text{ܕܘܩܪܝܢܐ}$ , with the prepositional prefix  $\text{ܕ}$ . 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