

which existed or had existed in South Babylonia, he rejects Hoffmann's identification on the ground of geographical discrepancy¹. But from what has been said above it is evident that the position of Sarbôg is as vague as that of Armageddon. We need in fact to illustrate the Gnostic Hymn from the Babylonian Legend, not the Babylonian Legend from the Gnostic Hymn.

The mention of Shuruppak comes quite at the beginning of the Chaldean story of the Flood. Xisuthros begins his tale to Gilgamesh with the words

'Shuruppak, a city which thou knowest [on] the Euphrates doth lie,
The city it is old, and the Gods within it—

The great Gods who brought their mind to the crossing of the
Flood. . . .'

Xisuthros himself was of Shuruppak. Warned by the God Ea he embarks in the ship, and so is saved with his companions when the Flood overwhelms the rest of living things. It does not appear to be certain whether the 'great Gods' are distinct from the Gods within Shuruppak.

Thus the Babylonian city occupies a very prominent place in the great Epic: it may very well have entered into the general folk-lore of the Euphrates Valley. It was the abode of ancient heathen Gods who were somehow concerned in a terrible deluge, and a Christian poet would naturally express this by calling it the dwelling-place of savage demons. Above all it was famous as the point from whence the Babylonian Noah started on his wonderful voyage. It was therefore not inappropriate that the Prince in the Gnostic Hymn should pass by this city on his way to find the Pearl that was guarded by the Serpent in the midst of the Sea in Egypt.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE INTERPRETATION OF *BAR-JESUS*

WE read in Acts xiii 6-8 that when Paul and Barnabas came to Paphos they met with 'a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was *Bar-Jesus*'; and when they were speaking to Sergius Paulus, the proconsul, '*Elymas* the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them.' Here we at once meet with the difficulty that '*Elymas*' cannot be described as an interpretation of '*Bar-jesus*,' nor does it mean 'sorcerer'; in fact, there is no satisfactory explanation of what the meaning of the name can be.

¹ Jensen, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen*, p. 481.

The transmitted text, here as elsewhere, falls into two main channels. The ordinary text gives 'Ελύμας in ver. 8, while in ver. 6 MSS vary between ΒΑΡΙΗCOY (N &c.), ΒΑΡΙΗCOYC (B &c.), and ΒΑΡΙΗCOYH (A &c.). On the other hand the Western texts imply ἔτοιμος in ver. 8 in the place of 'Elymas.'

The evidence is as follows. Lucifer 253 has *etoemus* in ver. 8, D* has ΕΤΟΙΜΑC ; in ver. 6 the name Bar-jesus is spelt ΒΑΡΙΗCOYAN by D*, and *Bariesuban* by Lucifer who adds the gloss *quod interpretatur Paratus*. It is important to observe that this gloss is not an isolated peculiarity of Lucifer. The Fleury Palimpsest (*h*) is not extant at this point, and the Gigas (*g*) and the Vulgate MS called *demid* have the ordinary names, as was only to be expected in late codices, but both *g* and *demid* have the gloss. Moreover E, has ὁ μεθερμηνεύεται 'Ελύμας, which is no doubt ultimately derived from the same source. No Old Syriac evidence is extant, but the Peshitta has *Bar Shūmā* (? 'Son of a wound') instead of Bar-jesus, and in ver. 8 it reads 'This same sorcerer Bar Shuma, whose name is interpreted Ἀὐτὸς (ܐܘܬܘܫܡܐ)'.¹

Quite lately Dr. Rendel Harris (*Expositor* for March, 1902, pp. 189 ff.) has come forward as a champion of ἔτοιμος, identifying the 'Bar-Jesus' of Acts with a person called *Atom* (ἄτομος) by Josephus, and mentioned by him as playing a shady rôle in the story of Drusilla and Felix. 'Atom' must surely be a nickname. According to *Ant.* xx. 7, this *Atomos* was a Jew, a Cypriote and a magician, so that the resemblance between him and the *Etoemas* of Codex Bezae is very striking.

But I still hesitate to accept the identification, or to regard ἔτοιμος or 'Ετοιμάς as the true reading in Acts xiii. 8. No variation in spelling can make *Bar-jesus* mean 'ready.' Still less can it be made to mean 'atom.' At the same time we must not on this account neglect the reading of what is perhaps the most ancient line of transmission. We have, in fact, for the name in ver. 8 two spellings, ΕΛΥΜΑC and ΕΤΟΙΜΟC. Is there no form which explains both, from which both may have been derived? The text of the Acts is certainly faulty in several passages, and a temperate use of conjecture is not out of place in this book of the New Testament. I venture, therefore, to read ΟΛΟΙΜΟC, i. e. ὁ λοιμός, 'the pestilent fellow.' This is so slight a change that the Peshitta reading ܐܘܬܘܫܡܐ might be pressed to support it (cf. Rom. xvi. 15), though no doubt it really stands for the ordinary 'Elymas.' The word occurs once again in Acts xxiv. 5 and was used by Demosthenes for a *φαρμακός*, so that it is quite in place here.

But now we have to consider how *Bar-jesus*, or whatever other spelling we adopt, can be 'interpreted' as ὁ λοιμός. It will not be necessary to seek a scientific derivation; *Bar Yeshu* (ܒܪ ܝܫܘܥ) is an exceedingly appropriate name for an Aramaic-speaking Jew in the first century A. D.,

and it is at the same time obvious that the name would sound distasteful to Christian ears when applied to a sorcerer and an opponent of the Apostles. The name was therefore variously disguised: perhaps the most probable spelling is ΒΑΡΙΗΟΥ, found in \aleph and some other authorities. Now S. Jerome (Lagarde's *Onomastica* 67 25) says *Berieu* maleficum *sive* in malo, *nonnulli Bariesu corrupte legunt*, or as it is excellently paraphrased by Beda *Corrupte legitur Bariesu, cum Barieu (i.e. maleficus sive in malo) legi debeat, credo quia nomen Iesu eisdem litteris sed nota superposita scribatur*. In other words Beda and S. Jerome wish us to read ΒΑΡΙΗΥ instead of ΒΑΡΙΗΟΥ or ΒΑΡΙΥ. This is not very probable: the real value of their conjecture is that it shows us how easily the greatest Hebrew scholar in the early Church could allow himself to believe that the sorcerer's name meant *maleficus* (בר ששענא). A similar piece of popular etymology may very well have commended itself to S. Luke, who is himself responsible for the questionable explanation of *Barnabas* as meaning *υἱὸς παραλήψεως* (Acts iv 36). Moreover S. Luke may have been anxious to inform his readers that the name of the sorcerer had really nothing to do with the name of our Lord.

The passage, therefore, as conjecturally restored, runs: ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ λοιμὸς, ὁ μάγος, οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, 'Now they were withstood by the pestilent fellow, the sorcerer I mean, for "pestilent fellow" is the interpretation of his name.'

F. C. BURKITT.

THE PERICOPE OF THE ADULTERESS.

OF the Pericope of the Adulteress (John vii 53-viii 11) we read in Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, that *In the whole range of Greek patristic literature before Cent. (x or) xii there is but one trace of any knowledge of its existence, the reference to it in the Apostolic Constitutions as an authority for the reception of penitents*. See *Apost. Const.* ii 24.

The editors had overlooked the parallel in the earlier *Didascalia*, to which Professor Nestle has lately called attention. The Greek of this is lost, but a Syriac Version of it survives, and the passage in question is preserved also in one of the Latin fragments of the *Didascalia* edited by Hauler (1900). Lagarde in his *Apost. Const.* in Greek refers in the margin of ii 24 to the parallel on the story in his Syriac *Didascalia*, namely by the Syriac letters 卍, meaning page *thirty-one*.

Hermae Pastor has no express quotation from any book except 'Eldad and Modad' (*Vis.* ii 3. 4 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάτ), but, as I understand the *Pastor*, it has many slight allusive references to Holy Scripture and other writings. *Mand.* iv 1. 4 puts the case of a married