

# 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 Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*LAST GLEANINGS FROM THE SINAI  
PALIMPSEST.*

I HAVE lately had the opportunity of re-examining the Sinai Palimpsest of the Gospels. For the fourth time my sister, Mrs. Gibson, and I have spent a month beneath the shadow of those mighty cliffs which once resounded to the thunders heralding the giving of the Law.

The immediate object of our journey this year was to ensure that there shall be no mistakes in our forthcoming edition of the two Palestinian Syriac Lectionaries; but it was impossible for me to be in close proximity to the more important manuscript without an attempt to verify the few passages which have awakened doubt in the minds of the two surviving transcribers or of other scholars. I propose in the following paper to give the result of this investigation.

It will be remembered that the transcription which was made in 1893 by the late Prof. Bensly, Dr. Rendel Harris, and Mr. F. C. Burkitt, was published by the Cambridge University Press in 1894. Want of time obliged these gentlemen—especially Prof. Bensly—to leave many pages unfinished; and though Mr. Burkitt added portions of thirty-four pages more from my photographs after his return home, I felt that an effort ought to be made to complete the work.

On the eve of our departure from Sinai in 1893 I formed the project of persuading the monks to convey the manuscript to Cairo, and there to afford facilities to one or to all of the three transcribers to finish their copy without the toil and expense of another journey across the desert. I had then no apprehension about Prof. Bensly's health, and none of us could have foreseen that he would not be spared to edit his own portion. I, therefore, with the approval of

the whole party, wrote explaining my proposal to Archbishop Porphyrius. He and the monks were at first willing to meet my views; but unexpected difficulties arose, and they were never carried into effect. It was on account of these negotiations that the Palimpsest remained invisible to visitors during the spring of 1894. And here I must not forget to record that the conduct of the monks to my sister and myself, and in all that concerns the Palimpsest, has been characterized by unvarying loyalty and kindness.

I must also contradict the report which appeared in a Cairo newspaper, and in some French ones, that the Palimpsest was stolen from the Convent, and was offered for sale to Mrs. Gibson and me in 1895. The story is true of a MS. of II. III. and IV. Maccabees, but it is not true of the Palimpsest.

When we went to Sinai for the third time in 1895, I was very doubtful whether my eyesight would enable me to read much of the underlying Gospel text. I was agreeably disappointed; and the work that I did then was published last year in a reprint of ninety-eight pages, in which the text previously published is distinguished by being in black, whilst the fresh matter is in blue. My sister helped me in the task of verifying doubtful points.

Whilst many parts of this one are sufficiently free of superimposed matter to be read with comparative ease, in the very midst of the clearest line a word may present itself which either baffles all scrutiny, or affords abundant room for two opinions. To those of my readers who have read a palimpsest there is no need for any explanation of why these revisions and corrections were required.

Much of the dirt which covered the manuscript when I first saw it in 1892 was removed, probably with a sponge, before our second visit. Six only of the leaves were subjected to the steam of the kettle, the remainder having been separated from each other by the insertion of our

fingers. The reagent was used for the first time in 1893, and it is very curious how uncertain its effect has been. On the whole I was pleased to observe that this has been one of cleansing, and the monks are not altogether wrong when they call the application of it τὸ καθαρῖζεν. On some pages, such as that containing the final colophon, the words brought up by it remain of a dark colour, clear and distinct after the lapse of four years. On fol. 138r. which contains the Angelic Salutation in Luke ii. 14, the only visible words in 1893 were those copied by Prof. Bensly. In 1895 I washed the whole page over with the reagent, being encouraged to do so by the splendid manner in which the missing words came up. This year these had all disappeared. I washed it again with the same result as in 1895. In not a few places the after effect has been a clearing away of blotches, and this has revealed an awkward mistake of my own in John xi. 55.

Before we left home this year I sought and obtained from Dr. Nestle and from Mr. Burkitt a list of queries in regard to doubtful passages. Dr. Rendel Harris was so much engaged with his Armenian *protégés* that I did not ask him for this assistance.

The pages to which I refer in the following list are those of the 1894 edition. The insertions marked by an asterisk are those of the corresponding pages in my supplementary volume of 1896.

I begin with Matt. iv. 18, p. 8, col. *a*, line 14. Here Mr. Burkitt rightly suggested that my own ܘܗܘ ܗܘܐ "as he was" should be ܘܗܘ ܗܘܐ "as he passed."

In Matt. viii. 22, p. 18=\*12 col. *a*, line 29, the *tau* of ܐܘܠܘܡܝܢ comes to the very edge of the page, and it is impossible that an *Alaf* can ever have been before it.

In Matt. viii. 33, p. 19=\*13, col. *a*, line 12 should read: ܘܗܘܘܢ ܗܘܘܢ ܗܘܘܢ "everything that he had done," and in verse 34, line 17, instead of ܘܗܘܘܢ ܗܘܘܢ "their coasts," it

should be  $\text{[from] beside them}$  . . . to the ship.”

And on the same p., col. *b*, line 24, Matt. ix. 11 should read :  $\text{[our Lord and with His disciples]}$  Both may be translated “our Lord and with His disciples.” It is evident that the last word of the previous line must be  $\text{[with]}$ , “with.”

On page 28=\*18 the space of a line is left blank between lines 15 and 16. The word  $\text{[Then]}$  (Matt. xii. 22). “Then” therefore begins a fresh paragraph. And in line 17, we have  $\text{[and blind]}$ , a certain (man) in whom . . . “and blind.”

On page 69, col. *b*, line 4, Matthew xxvi. 26, I was asked to ascertain if the word  $\text{[blessed]}$ , “blessed,” was not  $\text{[gave thanks]}$ , “gave thanks.” I thought I saw the first two letters of  $\text{[gave]}.$

In Mark iv. 9, p. 88=\*40 my only acquisition is the word  $\text{[let him hear]}$ , “let him hear.”

In Mark vi. 55 Mr. Burkitt has rightly conjectured that  $\text{[should be]}$ .

In Mark viii. 19, 20, p. 103=\*43, col. *b*, line 2, I read :

$\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$   
 $\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$   
 $\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$   
 $\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$   
 $\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$   
 $\text{[He said]} \text{ [unto]} \text{ [them]}$  . . . .

“ [They say] unto Him, Twelve. He said unto them, And when seven to four thousand, how many baskets of fragments took ye up? They say . . . Seven. He said unto them.”

In verse 25, line 22 of the same column I could distinguish an *Alaf* as the first letter of the line. The reading is therefore probably  $\text{[of the blind man]}$ .

In Mark viii. 38, page 104, col. *b*, line 26, Mr. Burkitt asked me to examine the word  $\text{حصب}$ . I found that it should be  $\text{حصب}$ , "amongst the sons of" (this adulterous and sinful generation).

In Mark x. 22, p. 110 = \*48 the first word of the last line of col. *a*  $\text{ح}$  has become quite distinct.

In Mark xii. 23, p. 117 = \*49, col. *a*, line 17  $\text{ح}$  should read  $\text{حط}$ , both meaning "whose." Lines 20, 21, 22 (*v.* 24) should read :

$\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$   
 $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$   
 $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$

"took her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do therefore err." The words of lines 20 and 21 were so invisible in 1895 that I thought  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$  came to the edge of the column.

In verse 27, col. *b*, line 11, I read :

. . . .  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$

And in verse 29, col. *b*, line 22 :

$\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$  . . . .

In Mark xvi. 8, p. 131, col. *b*, line 6,  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$  has distinctly a *yod* at the end. In the same column, three lines from the foot, Luke i. 3, Mr. Burkitt's suggestion of  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$  for  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$ , "who have investigated," is correct.

In Luke i. 80, p. 137 = \*57, col. *a*, line 24, I read  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$ , "and was in the desert."

In Luke ii. 14, p. 138 = \*58, col. *b*, line 8  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$  is exactly as Professor Bensly read it.

The initial  $\text{ܘ}$  is nearly covered by the upper writing, but its top is too round to allow of its being a *dalath*.

In Luke v. 17, p. 150 = \*66, col. *a*, line 8, I read  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$ , instead of  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$ .

And in verse 21, line 23 . . .  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܢܘܢ}$ .

On p. 155, col. *b*, line 20,  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$  should be  $\text{ܘܥܘܕܘܢܗܘܢ}$ .

In Luke vii. 14, p. 157=\*69, col. *b*, line 9, I think I have been mistaken in reading  $\aleph . . . \beth$ . The first two letters are right, but the *nun* has disappeared, and both Mrs. Gibson and I saw an *Alaf*. The word may possibly be  $\beth\aleph\aleph$ . Mr. Kennett suggests  $\beth\aleph\aleph$  i.e.  $\beth\aleph = \phi\omicron\rho\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$  with a prosthetic *Alaf*.

In Luke vii. 33, p. 159, col. *a*, line 16,  $\aleph\sigma\lambda\epsilon\delta$  should be  $\aleph\sigma\lambda\epsilon$ . This is probably a misprint.

In Luke ix. 10, p. 167=\*71, col. *a*, line 20,  $\beth\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ , "to the gates of the city" is very distinct.

In Luke x. 4, p. 172=\*74, col. *a*, lines 19, 20, I have got a few more words :

$$\begin{array}{c} \beth\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph \\ \beth\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph \end{array}$$

In Luke xi. 36, p. 179, col. *a*, line 19, Mr. Burkitt has rightly read  $\aleph$ .

In Luke xiii. 25, p. 189, col. *a*, line 14, we have *sic*  $\sigma\eta\sigma$ .

In Lukē xv. 12, p. 194, the last line of col. *b* is  $\sigma\eta\sigma . . . . \sigma$ , "unto (them) his . . . substance."

In Luke xvii. 9. p. 200, col. *b*, line 25, there is a *dalath* before  $\sigma\eta\sigma$  which was quite invisible till I touched it with the reagent, all the rest of the line being beautifully clear, so that Mr. Harris did not suspect it. The word after  $\sigma\eta\sigma$  is less clear than it was in 1895, and I willingly yield to the opinion of Mr. Kennett and Mr. Burkitt that it may be  $\sigma\eta\sigma$ .

In Luke xvii. 13, p. 201=\*87, col. *a*, line 15, Mr. Bonus detected that  $\beth\aleph\aleph\aleph$  should be  $\beth\aleph\aleph$ . I see both from my photograph and from the MS. that it is so ; and I think the mistake must have originated in a misprint, for my translation says, "and they lifted up."

Luke xxi. 34, p. 218=\*94, col. *a*, line 1, should read :  $\sigma\eta\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ .

In Luke xxiv. 33, p. 231, col. *b*, the last word  $\sigma\eta\sigma\sigma$

line 5, "And he hath appeared" is very distinct on the margin. It is, of course, a scribe's mistake.

In Luke xxiv. 41, p. 232, col. *a*, line 6, I got one word more,  $\text{והוא עמד לפניו}$ .

In John iii. 34, p. 243 = \*101, col. *a*, line 12, Mr. Burkitt suggested that  $\text{במידה}$  should be  $\text{במידת}$ , and this hint enabled me to see the upper stroke of the  $\angle$ , and so to read  $\text{במידת}$ , "by measure," instead of "by his measure." If the upper stroke of a *tau* is very faint, one is very apt to consider it a *he*. In the next line, the second word,  $\text{אב}$ , "father," is very distinct.

In col. *b* of the same page, line 20 (John iv. 6), I was pleased to get another word,  $\text{אשר יושב}$ , "so that he might rest."

In John v. 6, p. 249 = \*105, col. *a*, line 3, the dot above the *resh* in  $\text{אשר}$  has come out very distinctly.

In John vi. 15, p. 254 = \*108, col. *b*, line 6,  $\text{והסתר}$ , "and withdrew," should be  $\text{והסתר}$ , "and went up."

In John vii. 20, p. 260 = \*114, col. *b*, line 20,  $\text{אמרו}$ , "the multitudes [say] unto him," should be  $\text{אמרו}$ , "some [say] unto him."

In John x. 28, p. 275 = \*121, col. *a*, last line, after the word  $\text{אשר}$ , "my hand," there follows a word of two letters, of which the second one appears to be *dalath*. What it is I cannot imagine, but I am certain of its presence. Mr. Kennett suggests that it might be  $\text{אשר}$ .

In John xi. 55, p. 281 = \*8, col. *b*, line 16, I read  $\text{אשר}$ , "it was the evening." The after effect of the re-agent which I then applied has been to clear away a blotch above the letter *nun*, which made it look like a *shin*, and it needed no magnifying glass for me to read  $\text{אשר}$ , "it was the time." My own conjecture about the reason for this reading is, therefore, without a basis.

In John xii. 17, p. 283 = \*123, col. *b*, line 16, there is a  $\text{ו}$  before  $\text{אשר}$ , which makes it read, "and the multitude."



In John xiii. 23, p. 289 = \*127, col. *b*, line 1,  $\text{ܘܥܘܒܘܨܘܢ}$ , "on his bosom," has become quite distinct; and, in the same column, line 22 begins with  $\text{ܘܘܨܘܢ}$ .

In John xvi. 24, p. 298 = \*134, col. *a*, line 17, the words  $\text{ܘܗܝܬܘܗܘܢ}$ , "hitherto," "not," have become quite distinct.

In John xix. 41, p. 311 = \*139, col. *a*, line 10 should read  $\text{ܘܗܘܐ ܥܘܒܘܨܘܢ ܕܘܗܘܐ ܘܗܘܐ ܘܗܘܐ}$ , "a new sepulchre [in which no] man."

In verse 42, line 14 of the same column, I read  $\text{ܘܗܘܐ ܥܘܒܘܨܘܢ}$ , "in the new sepulchre."

The first word of the last line of that column still appears to be  $\text{ܘܗܘܐ ܥܘܒܘܨܘܢ}$  or  $\text{ܘܗܘܐ ܥܘܒܘܨܘܢ}$ , as Prof. Bensly saw it. [See Mr. Burkitt's notes, p. xlv. of the 1894 volume.] I can offer no explanation.

The above seems a very meagre result for my week's work at the Palimpsest. It proves, however, that justice had already been fully done to the text; and if any one wishes to decipher more of it, I recommend him to try the *lacunæ* in Mark xii. 21, 22, and John vi. 21-24. I do not, however, recommend a journey to Sinai on purpose for this, as these passages have quite baffled me.

I have been very anxious to see the manuscript rebound, as without this protection it is sure to suffer from the handling of visitors. Archbishop Porphyrius has, however, decided, I now think wisely, to leave it untouched. The upper writing comes very close to the inner edge of the leaves, and this edge is much worn by the friction of the cord which formerly held it together. Only a skilful hand, accustomed to deal with very ancient MSS., could attempt to bind it without injury, and the monks will not consent to send it either to London or to Paris. The Archbishop said that he must trust to three things for its preservation: "its cedar-lined box, its silken cover, and the conscience of the visitors who study it." So, on the last day of our stay at Sinai, I placed it open in the box, with the cover spread beneath it for a soft bed, and, after shutting down the

inner glass lid and locking it, advised the two holy Fathers, Polycarp and Procopius, who now act as librarians, to open only the outer wooden lid to passing travellers, and the glass lid also if a scholar should appear, who really wishes to study it. I think they will follow this direction.

AGNES S. LEWIS,

THE TRADITION THAT THERE WAS  
A "GALILEE" IN THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

THERE can be little doubt that a tradition about a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives has existed ever since the publication of the *Acts of Pilate*. The passage relied on is as follows :—

"And, after a few days, three men came from Galilee to Jerusalem. One was a priest, named Phineas; another, a Levite, named Angæus; but the remaining one a soldier, named Adas. These came to the chief priests and stated to them and to the people: 'That Jesus, whom ye crucified, we saw in Galilee with His eleven disciples upon the Mount of Olives, teaching them and saying, "Go into the whole world and proclaim the gospel, and whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but whosoever will not believe shall be condemned." And as He said these things He ascended into heaven. And not only we, but many others of the five hundred there saw him.' <sup>1</sup>

I shall have something to say upon the character of these *Acts of Pilate* later on; but there can be no doubt about their existence in the time of Justin Martyr. He has at least one reference to them in his *Apology*, where, in treating of Christ's miracles, he adds, "And that He did these things you can learn from the Acts prepared under Pontius Pilate." (*Apol.*, i. 48.) Tertullian, also, in treating of the same subject, has the following reference to Christ's post-resurrection manifestations, and to

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the version designated by Thilo as Paris D. caput xiv. Cf. *Evangelia Apocrypha*. Edidit C. Tischendorf, Lipsiæ, 1853.