

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Did the Babylonians borrow their account of the Creation from the Israelites? From the historical point of view, as regards both civilization and religion, that is to Professor Zimmern simply inconceivable. Do they both go back to a common original? That is quite conceivable, but quite improbable. For there are features of the story that are evidently and exclusively Babylonian. The whole scenery, indeed, is specially Babylonian. It is the scenery of alluvial plains, like those of Babylonia, not the scenery of Palestine, nor yet of the Syrian or Arabian desert. Its theology also is Babylonian. It was not Jehovah but Marduk that was the god of spring or of the morning sun. To Professor Zimmern's mind the demonstration is now complete, that the account of the Creation in the Bible is borrowed from Babylonia.

When was it borrowed? Not at the Exile. No doubt the first chapter of Genesis, in its present literary form, may be placed as late as the Exile. But it is incredible, says Professor Zimmern, that the Jews of the Exile, with their sharply distinctive Jehovah cult, should have taken this myth, as he calls it, ready-made from their heathen oppressors, and placed it at the beginning of their sacred writings. Some of the later kings, as Ahaz,

were friendly to the Assyrians, and coquetted with foreign customs, but that also is too late a time for such an appropriation. To account for the form in which the narrative in Genesis appears, we are bound, Dr. Zimmern holds, to assume a long development on Israelite, and indeed on Palestinian, soil. One period only remains that suits the conditions.

It is the period of the Tell el-Amarna letters. These letters belong to the middle of the second millennium B.C. They reveal an active intercourse carried on between Babylonia and the West, and especially Egypt and Palestine. The medium of intercourse was the Babylonian language and writing. It was mythological texts that served as exercises for Egyptians and Syrians in the study of the language of intercourse, and Dr. Zimmern thinks it highly probable that the matter of these texts would have entered the consciousness of the students. It has come about indeed, by a strange disposition of Providence, that one of the mythological texts used for this purpose, and discovered at Tell el-Amarna, is no other than that story of Adapa which bears so close a resemblance to the biblical story of Paradise.

Ⓐ Remarkable Palimpsest.

BY AGNES SMITH LEWIS, PHIL. DR. (HALLE), LL.D. (ST. ANDREWS).

THOSE of your readers who take an interest in the palimpsest of the four Gospels in Syriac which I discovered in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai in 1892, will be pleased to learn that another manuscript has come into my hands, probably from the same quarter, which, though far its inferior in point of value, presents some features which are well worthy the consideration of the palæographer and the biblical scholar. It is a palimpsest, purchased at Suez in 1895, whose upper-script is a collection of extracts from the writings of the Christian Fathers in an Arabic

translation assigned to the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century. The under-script is chiefly Syriac, in two columns; a fifth or sixth century text of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* and *Transitus Mariæ* forming one book. Mingled with this are four leaves from two MSS of fifth century Peshitta Syriac Gospels, three leaves of an ancient Arabic document, and fourteen from the Syrian Father, Mar Jacob. Three leaves are a double palimpsest, Syriac texts from Exodus and Isaiah crossing each other beneath the later Arabic. But the book contains other

two features which place it among the curiosities of literature.

I have been aware for the last six years that many pages of the under-script were not Syriac, but a very peculiar Arabic. Until June of this year they baffled my attempts at identification, for two reasons: partly that I was seeking for a Christian text under a Christian one, and partly that they were Cufic. I need not waste words

earliest Cufic. But the most curious occurrence remains yet to be told.

I had copied a portion from each of these Cufic leaves, and was about to send it to the press, when I observed a little leaf, f. 11 in the book, which had apparently only the one Arabic writing on it. Thinking that the reagent might possibly reveal some more of an underlying Corân text, I passed my brush lightly over its margin, and to

f. 11^b

Gen. xl. 3, 4

ΚΗΠΑΡΑΤΩΑΡΧΙΜΑΓΕΙΡΩ
 ΕΙΣΤΟΔΕΣΜΩΤΗΡΙΟΝΕΙΣΤΟΝ
 ΤΟΠΟΝΟΥΙΩΣΗΦΑΠΗΚΤΟ
 ΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙΣΥΝΕΣΤΗΣΕΝ
 ΟΑΡΧΙΔΕΣΜΩΤΗΣΤΩΙΩ
 ΣΗΦΑΥΤΟΥΣΚΑΙΠΑΡΕΣΤΗ

Δ ΔΕΔΕΜΕΝΟΣ

Σ ΠΑΡΕΘΕΤΟ

Σ ΕΛΙΤΟΥΡΓΕΙ

f. 11^a

v. 7

Α ΕΜΒΡΑΣΣΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΤΕΤΑΡΑΓΜΕΝΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΗΡΩΤΑ
 ΝΟΙ
 Σ ΚΥΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΥΝΟΥΧΟΥΣ ΦΑΡΑΩ
 ΟΙ ΗΣΑΝ ΜΕΤΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΤΗ
 ΔΣ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΙ ΦΥΛΑΚΗ ΠΑΡΑΤΩ ΚΩ ΔΥ
 ΚΩ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΛΕΓΩΝ. ΤΙ ΟΤΙ ΤΑ ΠΡΟΣΩ
 Α ΚΑΚΑ ΠΑΥΜΩΝ Σ ΚΥΘΡΩ ΠΑΣΗΜ Ε
 Σ ΠΟΝΗΡΑ ΡΩ

Δ in the margin stands for Aquila ; σ for Symmachus.

by telling how I at last got on to the right track, and with the help of a chemical reagent found that I possess seven leaves of a Cufic Corân belonging to the first half of the eighth century, or possibly to the end of the seventh; also sixteen and a half leaves from another Corân MS., which needed no reagent, and are also of the eighth century, though a little later, as their script shows a very few diacritical points. The script in both these MSS has all the characteristics of the

my intense astonishment, instead of the Arabic letters for which I was seeking, a row of beautiful Greek uncials appeared, like a vision from the forgotten past; and these were followed by eleven other lines, being six on each side of the leaf. Their resemblance to the script of the Codex Sinaiticus made me hope that they belonged to the fourth century; and I lost no time in identifying them with Gn 40^{3, 4} on one side, and Gn 40⁷ on the other. V.³ contains an interesting variant,

παρὰ τῷ ἀρχιμαγείρῳ, instead of παρὰ τῷ ἀρχιδεσμοφύλακι, which seems to be a closer rendering of the Hebrew text, מִן שַׁר הַמַּגִּידִים.

On the margin, close to the edge of the leaf, I noticed the letters *σομε* in small uncials. It was then the Long Vacation in Cambridge; but a few scholars remained, and I asked some of them what the mystic letters might mean, showing them at the same time the MS. I suppose that their eyes were, like mine, too closely riveted on the central text to observe that there was a column of small words on the margin of each page, entangled amongst the loops of the closely written upper Arabic script; and it was only after I had sent photographs of the two pages to my friend, Dr. Nestle of Maulbronn, that I was informed of the full value of the fragment. Dr. Nestle says—

‘The manuscript, from which the photographs of two pages have been placed in my hands, is important for three reasons—

‘1. Because uncial MSS of Genesis are few; Sinaiticus and Vaticanus being defective for the greater part of this book.

‘2. Because its texts appear particularly good, confirming Gn 40³, the reading of Philo, ἀρχιμαγείρῳ, which had been changed by the latest editors of his works (Cohn-Wendland, ii. 211) into the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus, ἀρχιδεσμοφύλακι. The true reading was known till now only from the Coptic and Syro-Hexaplaric Version and from six cursives of Holmes.

‘3. Because it contains marginal readings from the Hexapla of Origen, adding to those collected by Field some which were hitherto unknown, as 40⁷, *κακα* and *πονηρα* for *σκυθρωπα*.’

Within the last few years other parts of the Hexapla have been discovered by Messrs. Grenfell

and Hunt, and by Dr. Taylor, Master of St. John’s College, Cambridge. Dr. Taylor’s fragment was in the collection brought by Dr. Schechter from the Genizah in the synagogue of Old Cairo. But mine is from a different source. There are indications that before the year 1868 it was lying in the Library on Mount Sinai. How it was taken from that place, and what vicissitudes it has undergone, are beyond my power to investigate; but I may refer your readers to Professor E. T. Palmer’s narrative in the *Desert of the Exodus*, vol. i. p. 70. I hope to give all the texts which form its under-script in No. xi. of *Studia Sinaitica*.

It is indeed surprising that a small book of 162 leaves, each measuring 19 centimetres by 12, should contain such a variety of subjects: selections from Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodosius, Theodorus, Mar Ephraim, Mar Isaac, Mar Jacob, the apocryphal story of the Virgin Mary, two specimens of Peshiṭta Gospels, two specimens of very early Corāns, a private document, Syriac texts from Exodus and Isaiah, a beautiful Syriac hymn, and a leaf of the Septuagint, with variants from the Hexapla. The occurrence of Christian writing on the top of Mohammedan is of itself sufficiently singular. But the chief lesson which it conveys to me, as to all other owners of MSS dating between the seventh century and the eleventh, is, that we might try a harmless chemical, hydro-sulphuret of ammonia, by way of experiment, over a few of the margins which appear to us to be perfectly blank.

Since the above was written I have shown the fragment to my friend, Dr. Rendel Harris, who assigns it to the sixth century, or possibly to the beginning of the seventh. If the script is like that of Codex Sinaiticus it is also like that of Codex Bezae.

The New French School of Theology.

BY THE REV. J. DICK FLEMING, B.D., TRANENT.

IN the death of M. Auguste Sabatier the new Paris school of theology has lost its chief exponent. If this were the place for personal reminiscences, the writer might speak with a sense of personal gratitude of the sterling qualities of M. Sabatier as a professor in the Protestant College

of the Boulevard Arago, and of many a theological causerie, in which the professor became a student among his students and with the utmost freedom from professorial reserve discussed Neo-criticism or Ritschlianism, or any other ‘ism’ that flourished at home or abroad. But the main interest of