are collected together and illustrated. Appendix vi (*Ambrosii testimonia*) and Appendix vii (*Hieronymi testimonia*) are especially interesting. Amelli himself (Introd. pp. xxviii–xxxi) is inclined to claim Rufinus as the compiler, but so far as I have noticed Rufinus's own quotations from the Psalter have no points of contact with the Monte Cassino text. One difficulty, however, which Amelli brings forward (p. xxxii), does not, I confess, weigh much with me. Jerome said to Rufinus *Et me trilinguem bilinguis ipse ridebis?* There is surely no difficulty here! I cannot think that any Hebrew scholar would concede the honourable title of *trilinguis* to the unknown compiler of the Monte Cassino Psalter.

F. C. BURKITT.

ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ OR ΙΩΑΝΝΑ?—A NOTE ON PAPIAS *ap.* EUSEB. *H.E.* iii 39.

CONJECTURAL emendation is excusable only when exegesis fails to remove all reasonable difficulty and when any previous conjectures have failed to win assent. These conditions hold in our fragment. The problems still remain: Why, if Papias desires to distinguish the Johns, does he expressly describe them in the same terms? Why, if he desires to refer again to the John already mentioned, does he not say so? Or why do we leap from Andrew and Peter to two apostles of the second four, postponing John to Philip, Thomas, and James? And who is this James? Papias seems to speak of an aftermath period of reminiscence and retrospect, ill fitting the turbulent years during which James the son of Zebedee still survived. Then why couple John with the wrong James, without a word of comment? For whether this be James the son of Alphaeus or James of Jerusalem the pairing (and Papias certainly is grouping his list in pairs) is very harsh, when we realize how stereotyped 'James and John', meaning the brothers, had become. Some inkling of a corrupted text is given (as Zahn notices) by the isolation of the final τί. I suggest that we should read (omitting τί)

. . . ἢ ἡ Ἰακώβου ἢ Ἰωάννα ἢ . . .

a natural and proper pair (Lk xxiv 10) to whom enquirers after authentic records would always resort.

The inclusive masculines give no difficulty (cf. *Pistis Sophia* p. 231, Schwartze-Petermann, Latin version p. 146 'Maria Magdalene et Iohannes

παρθένος erunt praestantissimi inter meos μαθητὰς omnes'; and see Acts vi 1, 2, 7 al.). πρεσβύτεροι in its non-technical sense is as applicable to women as to men.[1] The insertion of women in the list is capable of explanation. Papias was collecting authentic λόγοι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων with his eye on current Gnostic prolixities (τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν). We may suppose that Gnosticism had already selected its *dramatis personae*. In later Gnostic writings the women are prominent. In the *Pistis Sophia* their persistent interruptions are reproved (see also *Apostolic Church Order* § 26) by the Apostles, among whom Philip, Thomas, and Matthew are an inner triad (Lat. vers. Schwartze-Petermann pp. 47, 48, 'Tres testes sunt P. et T. et M.').[2] Papias writes, 'I vouch for the truth of *my* λόγοι. They come from the very sources—Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Mary the (mother) of James, Joanna, Matthew—to which my opponents attribute *their* prolixities. I investigated all I could collect from these sources, as well as the more recent statements of Aristion and John'.

It need not be pointed out how swift and easy corruption of the text would be in unskilled hands; and lame explanations, such as that of Eusebius, would become imperative.

E. Iliff Robson.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ODES OF SOLOMON.

(i) Students of the Odes of Solomon should be grateful to Dom Connolly for calling attention in your last issue (p. 315) to an expression that appears to him to supply 'almost conclusive evidence that our present Syriac text is a translation from Greek'. In the other 'several cases' in which, he says, 'the Syriac seems obviously to be turning Greek expressions', the evidence appears to me futile (as I have endeavoured to shew)[3]; but there is no futility in his observations

[1] Perhaps even in the technical sense also, as βασιλεῖς (in later Greek, at least) includes king and queen.

[2] Joanna does not occur in *Pistis Sophia* itself, but I strongly suspect her presence, p. 202, Lat. vers. p. 129, in place of John. The apology and hesitation of the speaker, as if speaking for the first time, are alien to John, but especially natural in a woman and after the recent rebuke by St Peter. The context would be altered to fit the error once committed.

[3] See my *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet* pp. 189–190, 223–224.

on Ode xli 16, which he renders 'The Christ in truth is one: *and He was known from before the constitution of the world*'. I condense his argument as follows.

'From [before] the *constitution* of the world' is the Peshitta rendering of ἀπὸ (*or* πρὸ) καταβολῆς κόσμου in seven out of ten cases in the New Testament. But *syr. vet.* avoids the italicized word, which is comparatively rare outside the Peshitta New Testament. Syriac has other words, corresponding to the Hebrew ones, to express 'foundation'. Moreover, Hebrew and Old Testament Syriac regularly speak of the foundation of the *earth*, or *habitable world* (which is not the word used here[1]). Hence in Hebrew, and in Syriac translations of Hebrew, 'we never find "constitution of the world"', the phrase used here. 'How then', asks Dom Connolly, 'does it come into the Odes? Obviously as a Syriac translation of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου by one who was familiar with the usual Peshitta version of this phrase'.

In reply to this, in the first place I am not sure whether the coincidence of a single phrase in some writer (date unknown) and in the Authorized Version of the Bible, should be accepted as proving 'obviously' that he was 'familiar with the usual English version'. Nevertheless the argument seems to me strong. If it cannot be answered, and if two or three more such instances could be alleged, the conclusion might become irresistible. But at present it seems to me that judgement should be suspended for the following reasons bearing on this particular passage.

(1) The word used by the Peshitta is a literal rendering of καταβολή, 'laying down' or 'casting down'. The Greek has very various meanings in various contexts, and has led Origen and Chrysostom into strange interpretations. Neither the Greek nor the Syriac means exactly '*constitution*'. Jerome (on Eph. i 4) says rightly 'Non id ipsum autem καταβολή quod *constitutio* sonat', where see context. Origen took καταβολή, in the phrase 'foundation of the world', as meaning 'casting down', and the Syriac has a kindred meaning in Heb. xi 11 VHh.[2]

(2) Of the two Scriptural passages that describe in poetic detail the Creation of the World, one, in Job, expressly mentions God as '*casting down*[3] the corner-stone' just before He 'shut up the sea with doors'. The other, in Proverbs, mentioning 'the sea' first (Prov. viii 29 'when he gave to the sea its bound . . . when he marked out the foundations

[1] The word used here is 'world' in the sense of time, as 'the *world* to come', 'the ancient *world*', &c.

[2] See Payne Smith *Thesaurus Syriacus* col. 3928.

[3] Job xxxviii 6 R.V. '*laid*', but Heb. '*shot*' or '*threw*', and so Targ. and Syr. Comp. *Joma* 54*b* 'The Holy One, blessed be He, *threw a stone into the sea, and on this was the world founded* (Job xxxviii 6)'.

of the earth') justifies us in supposing that the meaning in Job may be illustrated by the Horatian 'caementa *demittit* redemptor'. There is a great deal in Midrash in support of this view.

(3) Are there not other passages in the Odes which are akin, and perhaps allusive, to Job? And may not the poet be here thinking, not of 'the earth', or of 'the habitable world', but of the world of souls, the world to come, and of the 'foundation' of this, as being from the first 'sent down' from above, to be realized at the last in the New Jerusalem, the city that hath the foundations, 'coming down out of heaven from God' (Rev. xxi 2)?

I trust this passage of the Odes may be discussed by others whose knowledge of Syriac is more adequate than mine to the discussion.

(ii) Dom Connolly adds: 'In Ode xxx 6 there is another phrase which, I think, is hardly of Semitic origin, viz. "and until it was *set* [*lit.* given] *in the midst*, they did not know it". This is surely *εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι, in medio ponere*.'

But (1) is it fair to substitute a common Greek phrase, like *εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι*, for an uncommon or non-existent one, like *ἐν τῷ μέσῳ διδόναι*—of which I find no instance in Stephen's *Thesaurus* under *μέσος*—and then to say 'this is surely' from Greek? This Syriac phrase for '*in the middle*' is used by the Syriac translator (as also by Onkelos) in Numb. xxxv 5 corresponding to a Hebrew '*in the middle*'. (2) 'Give', for 'set' or 'appoint', is also a frequent Hebraism. May we not then justly say 'This is surely *in medio dare*—and points to a Hebrew original'?

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

'THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST.'

SOME readers of the JOURNAL, who have not time or opportunity to ransack the pages of foreign periodicals, may be glad to have their attention drawn to particular articles of interest or importance.

The December number of the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* pp. 293–305, contains an article by Dr G. A. van den Bergh on 'The Gnosis combated in the Apocalypse', in which he makes an unusually interesting suggestion for the solution of Apoc. xiii 18. *ὧδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν* may mean 'Here is wisdom necessary', expressing much the same thought as *ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου*. But it may have quite a different meaning. The *ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου* (cf. *μέτρον ἀνθρώπου* xxi 17) means 'ordinary human reckoning',