

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Gospel narratives that he had read. St. Luke had much to record. He certainly did not wish to repeat the anti-Jewish polemic which occupies so large a place in the First Gospel, and he already had in other forms most of the Lord's sayings which are in the First Gospel and which were adapted to the purpose of his own work.

It may be noted that Harnack seems inclined to

reopen the question of the date of the Lucan writings and of St. Mark. See his *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 294 and 296. I think it probable that critical opinion will shortly move in the direction of, say, 60 A.D., as suggested by Harnack, for the Third Gospel, and 50 A.D., or shortly before, for the first publication of a Greek Second Gospel.

Harnack on the Recently Discovered Odes of Solomon.¹

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., D.D., PROFESSOR OF
EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

It is not many months since Dr. Rendel Harris published the *editio princeps* of the Odes of Solomon which he was fortunate enough to discover in a late Syriac MS. from the neighbourhood of the Tigris. A perusal of the book was bound to convince scholars that a remarkable addition had been made to ancient religious literature. And now Professor Harnack, speaking with unrivalled knowledge of the facts, declares that since the discovery of the *Didache*, thirty years ago, nothing so valuable as this has come to light (p. v). The *editio princeps*, it need scarcely be said, was an admirable piece of work, but it was inevitable that further study of the Syriac text would elucidate difficulties both of translation and of interpretation. Such is unquestionably the result of the new edition. Flemming's translation has brought clearness into many obscure places, and, in our judgment, Harnack has made as important a contribution towards the true estimate and explanation of the Odes, as that which he gave to the world many years ago in his classical edition of the *Didache*.

The absence of historical allusions in the Odes makes the question of the date a difficult one. But two or three facts are clear. A quotation from Ode 19 in Lactantius and the presence of five of the Odes in the *Pistis Sophia* make it evident that they were regarded as canonical considerably before the middle of the third century.

That would push back their origin, at latest, to the middle of the second century. But an allusion in Ode 4 to the Temple, in which reference is also made to a rival sanctuary (perhaps several?), justifies Harnack in assuming that the Temple was still standing when the Ode was written. This seems more probable than the suggestion of Rendel Harris that it was the destruction of the rival Temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt, in 73 A.D., which called forth the protest of the fourth Ode. Accordingly, the *terminus ad quem* must be placed somewhere before 70 A.D. On the other hand, according to the *Pistis Sophia*, the *Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae* of Pseudo-Athanasius (cent. 6), the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (cent. 9), and Harris's Syriac MS., the Odes formed one book with the famous Psalms of Solomon, which are placed before them by all but the last-named authority. We know that the *Psalms* of Solomon belong to the time of the Roman invasion of Judæa under Pompey. Hence, the *terminus a quo* for the Odes is probably about 50 B.C. It is universally agreed that the *Psalms* of Solomon are products of Palestinian Judaism. This, at least, raises the presumption that the Odes, which have been combined with them to form a single collection, are of Jewish and Palestinian origin also.

At this point there emerges an important difference of opinion between the two editors. Rendel Harris holds that 'the writer, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians, who were for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs, and the apologetic tone which is displayed in the

¹ *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert*. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von J. Flemming. Bearbeitet u. herausgegeben von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910. Pp. vi, 134.

Odes towards the Gentiles, as a part of the Christian Church, is only consistent with the very earliest ages, and with communities like the Palestinian Churches where Judaism was still in evidence and in control' (p. 87). It is plain to every reader that the Odes, as they stand, contain distinctly Christian elements. Reference is made to the Son, to the Incarnation, to the Virgin-Birth, to the Cross, to the *Descensus ad inferos*. But a careful examination shows that several of the Odes (notably 4 and 6) are certainly Jewish. A second large group reveals no essentially Christian features. How are the facts to be accounted for? Harnack, with real insight, as it appears to us, argues for the hypothesis that the original collection of Odes was purely Jewish, and that it was worked over by a Christian interpolator, who introduced Christian references and terms of thought, but in such a fashion that the insertions, as a rule, can be more or less plainly detected. His acute investigation of Ode 7 is an excellent illustration of how the interpolations may be removed from the text without seriously affecting the progress of the thought. Indeed, again and again, it is this operation alone which makes the context intelligible. But he frankly admits that Odes 19 and 27 are purely Christian, probably the work of the interpolator, although he is not certain that all the Christian elements spring from one source (p. 118).

Harnack's hypothesis is not a mere daring speculation, but one which is supported by a very remarkable parallel in the literature of later Judaism. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs present the same phenomena. Here also a fundamentally Jewish work has been revised and Christianized in parts by a Christian interpolator. In both cases the interpolations are sometimes obscure, because they are clothed essentially in the style of the original (p. 77). But not only does the *form* of the *Testaments* afford a striking parallel to the Odes, but also the character of their thought. The Odes reveal a more fully developed phase of a strain of religious thought in later Judaism, whose earlier stages may be traced in the Testaments. Harnack, from this standpoint, would place them between the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Johannine* literature. We must dwell for a little on this point. The Odes, and in a lesser degree the Testaments, do not belong to the main stream of Jewish religion. They embody a sort of

mystic individualism. And this character belongs not only to the Jewish original, but to the Christian revision. That is to say, there are marked affinities between the piety of the reviser and that of the circle or author (Harnack, like Harris, inclines, on the whole, to one main source) from whom the Odes have come. 'There speaks in them a mystic, who sees his Ego redeemed . . . and raised to the eternal through the revelation and knowledge of God and by means of the most intimate relationship of love towards Him, a man also who feels that it is his function, as a messenger of God, to communicate to others that which he has experienced' (p. 86). Harnack makes a most impressive collection of characteristic features from the Odes which sets in clear light the religious individuality of the Psalmist (p. 91 f.). He finds the keynote of his thought in such an utterance as that of Ode 26. 10: 'Who may so rest in the Highest, as to speak directly out of His mouth?' (p. 59). Harnack justly discovers foreshadowings of the singer's religious attitude in some of the Canonical Psalms (p. 92). In view of these, it is surely an exaggeration to say (in an important note denying the existence of Gnostic elements in the Odes, p. 103) that this real participation in the being of God through union with Him is not 'a deduction drawn from the ordinary Jewish religion, but springs from foreign influences.' Of course everything here turns on the precise meaning of 'the ordinary Jewish religion,' but the intimate fellowship with God which finds expression in many of the Psalms is surely at least a legitimate development in the light of experience of prominent elements in the religion of the Prophets. When we examine the remarkable expressions of the religious self-consciousness of this 'mystic prophet' in the Odes, we are not surprised that a Christian of later date (Harnack argues for 'about 100 A.D.') should have interpreted them in a Christian (Messianic) sense, and inserted additions to emphasize that interpretation.

Of quite peculiar interest are the leading conceptions of the Odes in their original form. Among them occur *χάρις, πιστεύειν, γνώσις, ἀλήθεια, φῶς, ὕδωρ ζῶν, ἀγάπη, ζωή*, of course in a Syriac dress (although Harnack gives reasons for holding that they go back, through a Greek translation, to a Hebrew or Aramaic original, p. 105). Here we are at once reminded of the Johannine writings.

Rendel Harris has discussed the connexion briefly (pp. 73, 74), and sums up with the statement: 'I think it will be conceded that we are in a Johannine atmosphere.' Harnack deliberately asserts that in the Odes we come upon 'the presuppositions of the piety and theology of John . . . apart from any Messianic doctrine' (p. 99). The importance of the phenomenon is that in these writings we are confronted by a type of Jewish religion which stands apart from Hellenic speculation, and yet flows into the same channel as that of Greek philosophy. In the one case, 'everything depends on the ordering of God, in the other on the nature of spirit.' 'Here,' as Harnack most suggestively observes, 'it is true, as in the case of many linguistic phenomena of the Hellenistic period, that there are Hellenisms which are also Semitisms' (p. 100). In these words there is opened up a vista of far-reaching discussion. Harnack declines to dogmatize on the circle to which this author belongs. But he ventures to say that 'John, before he became a Christian, may have been a Jewish mystic like the author of our Odes. To him he is most closely related. They possibly

spring from one circle' (p. 106). Now, in a sense, the Christian interpolator has attempted to do what John actually did, to bring this remarkable mystical individualism into direct connexion with Christ. But his attempt was mechanical. 'John has fused the Synoptic Christ with this religion of Light, Love, and Life, and placed its basis in Him' (pp. 99, 100). Harnack has carefully examined the Christology of the interpolator, and regards it as belonging to the main stream of Christological development in the Church, having nothing essentially Jewish-Christian or Gnostic about it, closely connected with Palestinian soil, and scarcely to be placed later than the end of the first century. Its type 'is closely akin to the Johannine; indeed, one must ask whether he did not know the Gospel of John. In the light of Ode 41, that is for me highly probable. I merely hesitate to affirm that it is certain' (p. 110).

Enough has been said to indicate the profound interest and importance of Harnack's discussion. We have not referred to the very valuable detailed commentary on the Odes, which no student of them can afford to neglect.

Literature.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG.

THE sixth and seventh volumes have now been issued of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net each). They contain respectively 505 and 502 pages in double column. And as each column contains an average of nearly 500 words, each volume contains about 500,000 words. It means much writing and much editing, and it is well worth the guinea charged for it.

Still it is not so good as the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, each volume of which contains about 1,250,000 words.

After a short account of the Inquisition, with a good bibliography, the first article of importance in the sixth volume is that on 'Inscriptions.' It is condensed from Dr. N. Müller's article in the German edition. Again the bibliography is good so far as it goes, but it has not been brought

up to date. The late Dr. H. Cremer's article on 'Inspiration,' after abridgment, has been supplemented by Professor David S. Schaff and Professor C. A. Beckwith. Then comes the first article of the kind for which the Encyclopedia is likely to be most frequently referred to—an article on the German sect called 'The Inspired.' It is curiously out of proportion to the greater topics round it, but we rejoice in its length and interest. The article on the 'Intermediate State' is only a column in length, with references to Eschatology, Probation, and Future. Then comes an article on 'Interpolations in the New Testament' which could have been saved, a cross-reference being made to the article on the text. After a little we come to the article on 'Isaiah,' which is signed by Professor James A. Kelso.

And this article reveals at once the strength and the weakness of the book. For the articles on Bible topics are generally well done and of con-