which existed or had existed in South Babylonia, he rejects Hoffmann's identification on the ground of geographical discrepancy. But from what has been said above it is evident that the position of Sargob 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 Shuruuppak comes quite at the beginning of the Chaldean story of the Flood. Xisuthros begins his tale to Gilgamesh with the words

‘Shuruuppak, 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 Shuruuppak. 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 Shuruuppak.

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 'Elymas in ver. 8, while in ver. 6 MSS vary between BAP'HCOY (A &c.), BAP'HCOY (B &c.), and BAP'HCOY (A &c.). On the other hand the Western texts imply ἑτῶμος in ver. 8 in the place of 'Elymas.'

The evidence is as follows. Lucifer 253 has etoemus in ver. 8, D* has etoimac; in ver. 6 the name Bar-jesus is spelt BAP'HCOYN 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 (k) 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 δ μεθρημηταις ἐλήμας, 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 ἄλημός (אֶלֶיִמָה).

Quite lately Dr. Rendel Harris (Expositor for March, 1902, pp. 189 ff.) has come forward as a champion of ἑτῶμος, identifying the 'Bar-Jesus' of Acts with a person called Atom (Ἀτόμος) 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 Etoemus of Codex Bezae is very striking.

But I still hesitate to accept the identification, or to regard ἑτῶμος or ἑτωμᾶς 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, etoimac and etoimoc. 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 ὀλοίμος, i.e. δ λοιμός, 'the pestilent fellow.' This is so slight a change that the Peshitta reading ṣῆḥאא 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 δ λοιμός. It will not be necessary to seek a scientific derivation; Bar Yeshu (לְשֵׁיָ֣ו רָב) 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 distaste-
ful 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 ὤριμον, found in Ἡ and some other authorities.
Now S. Jerome (Lagarde's Onomastica 67 25) says Berieu maleficum
sin in malo, nonnulli Bariesu corrupte legunt, or as it is excellently para-
phrased by Beda Corrupte legitur Bariesu, cum Barieu (i.e. maleficus
sin in malo) legi debeat, credo guia nomen Iesu eisdem litteris sed nota
superposita scribatur. In other words Beda and S. Jerome wish us to
read ὤριμον instead of ὤριμον or ὣριμ. 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 άλεξσειμ (Ἐλεάζσοια). 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 πάπα ἄνθρωπα (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: ἄδειερατο ὅ
tοις ὅ λοιμος, ὅ μάγος, οὕτω γὰρ μεθαρμηνεύεται τὸ ὅμωμ αἴτοι, 'Now they
were withstanded by the pestilent fellow, the sorcerer I mean, for "pesti-
 lent 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 Ἡ, meaning page thirty-one.

Hermae Pastor has no express quotation from any book except
'Eldad and Modad' (Vis. ii 3. 4 ὅσο γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Άλεξσε καὶ Μωδάρ), 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
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