On various grounds it is probable that the introductory sentence to St Luke's second volume is not now in the form in which he intended to leave it.\footnote{See E. Meyer \textit{Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums} i pp. 34 ff and Norden \textit{Agnostos Theos} pp. 311 f.} Perhaps the easiest hypothesis is that in its present form it is a rough draft which St Luke intended to revise, but for some reason or other never did so.

It may be that a phrase from the LXX was in his mind, Gen. ii 3 :

\[ \text{ev aúi àkatépaunen ápò pánton tón érgon autóu òn ëpæatò ð theós poúsmai.} \]

So the words run in A, but E omits érgon and bw Chr. read ποιεῖν.\footnote{Which reading is also supported by Philo ed. \textfrak{3}.} It is a strange phrase\footnote{\textit{관리 선지자} is the Hebrew.} which may have lingered in the memory of one who was so familiar with the LXX as we know St Luke to have been.

\[ \text{ηπατο looks forward to ἀχρί ἂ πέρας . . . ἀνελήμφη and indicates comprehensiveness.} \]

We are reminded of St Luke's insistence, in the preface to his Gospel, upon the fact that his researches had gone back to the very first—Lk. i 2 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and again, i 3 ἀνωθεν. With the form of the sentence we may compare Lk. xxiv 27: καὶ ἀφεάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσείου καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσιν τοῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, i.e. he interpreted Moses and all the prophets and all the rest of the Scriptures beginning from the beginning. So here St Luke means to say that his former treatise gave an account of what Jesus did and taught, beginning from the beginning and omitting no essential particular right up to the Ascension.\footnote{So Loisy translates 'sur tout ce que Jesus a fait et enseigné depuis le commencement jusqu’au jour où . . . il fut ravi'. \textit{Commentary} pp. 135-140.}

J. W. Hunkin.

\textbf{ON HEATHEN DEITIES IN THE DOCTRINE OF ADDAI.}

It is stated in the \textit{Doctrime of Addai} (ed. Phillips, p. 24 l. 17) that the deity \textit{אשת נינגל} was worshipped at Harran.

That \textit{אשת נינגל} is the Syriac equivalent of NIN-GAL, the consort of Sin, whose temple at Harran was restored by Nabonidus, so as once more to become a residence for this god and his circle (Langdon \textit{Die neubabylonischen Königinschriften} pp. 219 ff), has already been recognized (Cooke \textit{North-Semitic Inscriptions} p. 188); but exactly which deity is denoted by \textit{אשת נינגל} ‘Daughter of NIN-GAL’ has not been suggested.

Now, Ishtar is frequently referred to as the daughter of Sin, from which her filial relationship to NIN-GAL may be inferred. But it is well to notice that, in the opening lines of a prayer addressed to Ishtar,
this goddess actually is called the child of NIN-GAL: *bu-uk-[rat] (ilu)
Sin i-lit-ti (ilu) NIN-[GAL] ‘the first-born of Sin, the child of NIN-
GAL’ (King Babylonian Magic and Sorcery no. 1 l. 31).

It would, therefore, seem not unreasonable to conclude that *din
is an appellation of Ishtar. Confirmation of this is perhaps
afforded by the passage that immediately follows (Phillips op. cit. p. 24
ll. 20–21): *dinpakāra, *kūlāni, *daḫu *dinpakāra ‘Be ye not led away captive by the rays of the luminaries
and the bright star’, which contains an obvious allusion to the worship
of Venus, with which planet Ishtar is identified. Her symbol, an eight-
rayed or sixteen-rayed star, is found always in conjunction with the
crescent of the moon-god Sin and the solar disc and rays of light that
symbolize the sun-god Shamash.

C. Winckworth.

APPENDIX TO MR C. WINCKWORTH’S NOTE.

I take the opportunity of Mr Winckworth’s note on Bath Nical or
Niggal to remark that the list of heathen deities in the Doctrine of Addai,
p. 24, seems to be connected with the names of the five Temples of
continuous heathen worship mentioned in the Talmud (b. Aboda
Zara 11b), viz. Bel, Nebo, Tar’atha, Serapis at Ascalon, and the Eagle
(_prior) in Arabia. The Eagle of the Arabians is also mentioned in
Addai, but nothing is said of this temple or worship in ancient times.

It is therefore reasonable to suppose that *dinpakāra and *kūlāni are in
both passages miswritings of *dinpakāra and *kūlāni, i.e. the great Arabian
God Dusares, whose shrine was at Petra (Epiph. li 22: Oehler ii 633). The
conjecture that ‘the Eagle’ was a miswriting of Dūsharā was first
made by Landauer in 1886, but was rejected by Nöldeke (ZDMG xl
186), on the ground that ‘Eagle’ also occurs in the passage from Aboda
Zara. Possibly both passages have a common origin in some list of
the most famous temples of the Orient, and the change from *kūlāni to
*kūlāni may have been made in this list.

However this may be, it is difficult to believe that any Temple in
‘Arabia’, i.e. Nabataea, can have been so famous as that of Dusares,
as long as his worship lasted. The obscure references to a Temple of
an Eagle in Arabia belong to S. Arabia, to the Himyaritic country,
which one would suppose was beyond the ken of Mesopotamian
Christians or Babylonian Jews. In any case, to read Dūsharā seems
to me a better emendation than to identify the Eagle with *
*, as
Dr G. A. Cooke does in the passage cited by Mr Winckworth, as *Nusku
is never associated with the ‘Arabians’ while Dūsharā (Dusares) is
associated with them.

F. C. Burkitt.