
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

The New Biblical Papyri at Heidelberg.

By Professor Dr. theol. Adolf Deissmann, of the University of Heidelberg.

On the 27th of November 1900 the Imperial German Vice-Consul, Herr Dr. Reinhardt of Cairo, who was at the time on furlough in Germany, wrote to the Director of our University Library that he had seen a Greek papyrus manuscript at Herr Theodor Graf's in Paris, which contained portions of the Old Testament, belonging to the fifth century after Christ, and showing very important differences from the Septuagint text. He asked Herr Graf to let him take the manuscript to Germany to give the authorities there the opportunity of buying it.

Our University Library had already at that time been indebted to Dr. Reinhardt for his help in acquiring the highly valuable collection of Egyptian papyri in the Greek, Demotic, Coptic, Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, and Persian languages—a collection through which Heidelberg has been advanced to a place in the list of scientific institutions which possess papyri.

Papyri! Perhaps it will not be unwelcome if, before I say anything more, I give quite a short general account of the character and importance of these new finds as a whole.[1] Already in the eighteenth century, but especially in the ninth and tenth decades of the nineteenth century, there reached European museums ancient papyrus leaves, which were found in Egypt. It had long been known that the papyrus plant was used in antiquity to make leaves to bear writing; but that hundreds, or rather thousands, of inscribed papyrus leaves of the period from the fourth century before Christ down to the end of the tenth century after Christ would come into our hands in the original, was never dreamt of by the founders of modern archæology. We have to thank the undecaying durability of what is apparently so fragile a material and the dry climate of Egypt that in the ruins of old cities, especially among the old refuse, the places for deposits of rubbish, and also in graves countless masses of valuable leaves are preserved. In recent times rich papyrus finds have been obtained especially by systematic excavations, and no one can say what surprises the future still has in store for us. Quite a number of scientific subjects have through these finds received a new lease of life—the science of language, the study of antiquity in the widest sense, of law, of domestic economy, of the history of culture, and, not least, that of theology also. In the first place, highly important fragments of ancient, among them Christian, literary texts, which were lost, have been recovered; but also thousands of non-literary texts, for example, official documents of the most various character, wills, marriage contracts, leases, records of legal proceedings, day-books of officials, private letters, lists, speeches for the prosecution, etc., have been made accessible, which place the investigator not before a secondary or tertiary tradition of antiquity, but before antiquity itself. Every one of these leaves presents more or less living pictures, especially of the ordinary or more elementary writings of the Egyptian culture of an entire millennium. The needs and desires of these men, their action and work, their eating and drinking, their tillage and planting, their death and their burial,—of all these things these original leaves, which for the most part can be dated to a day, have a story to tell; and they tell also of the religious tempers of these men. This last fact is enough to make the study of the papyri interesting to the theologian; he learns here to know the men to whom Christianity, with its world-mission, turned. But the chief importance of the papyri for the theologian depends on another fact. I am not now thinking of the discovery of new early Christian literary texts, especially Biblical texts; of these we shall speak later. I am thinking now rather of the circumstance that in the *language* of the Greek papyrus documents there is offered to us an extraordinary source of valuable material for the investigation of the language of the Greek Bible. It has been proved that the translators of the Old Testament into Greek, and that the apostles and authors of the New Testament, got, not indeed, their central thoughts from the circles of the papyrus writers, but that they, on the whole, used the same Greek speech of ordinary life, which is found in the contemporary Greek texts of Egypt; and we have begun in Germany and England to

[1] Compare my article 'Papyri' in *The Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. iii. (London, 1902), and the article 'Papyri,' by Kenyon, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol.

work systematically through these papyrus texts for the explanation of the language of the Greek Bible.

While my above statement will be readily understood, that our library is *indebted* to Dr. Reinhardt for helping the purchase of our great collection of papyri, and that we owe him our sincere thanks, we must also consider it as a great service of our never-to-be-forgotten Karl Zangemeister, that he made the acquirement of this collection possible by his special knowledge and his energy.

In the Biblical papyrus manuscript, which Dr. Reinhardt offered us in his letter of 27th November 1900, Zangemeister at once took a lively interest. Although the price demanded by Herr Graf, the well-known possessor of the mummy portraits, was exceedingly high, still we believed that we ought to have one look at the codex. And so Dr. Reinhardt sent it in a box to Heidelberg, sealed with a high declaration of value, and here the contents of the torn brown leaves of ancient date were subjected to a rapid preliminary examination.

This examination gave the following results :—

1. Twenty-seven more or less well-preserved papyrus leaves, inscribed on both sides, contained in uncial writing most of the Septuagint text of the prophets Zechariah and Malachi.

2. These leaves are not really fragments of an old *roll*, but of an old *codex*, *i.e.* of a book, which was technically prepared like our books, and so in leaves ; remains of the old cover of the book were still distinctly preserved.

3. A part of these leaves was briefly discussed in September of the year 1892, at the ninth International Congress of Orientalists in London, by the chaplain of the British Embassy in Vienna, Rev. W. H. Hechler, and two pages of the codex were at the time facsimiled in the *Times*, and appeared later also in the *Transactions* of the London Congress. Hechler set a very high value on the leaves, and was of opinion that they belonged to the third century A.D.

4. One of the facsimiled pages named appeared then in the year 1893 in the German family magazine *Daheim*, by a singular misunderstanding, under the title 'A Leaf of the Newly Found Apocryphal Gospel of Peter'—an error which was afterwards corrected by *Daheim*.

5. As to the age of the leaves, Mr. F. G. Kenyon, of the British Museum, judging by the script of the above-named facsimile of the *Times* and the *Transactions*, conjectured that they belonged to the seventh century, though he added a query ; and Herr Ulrich Wilcken in Halle a. S., our greatest German papyrologist, whose opinion we immediately asked by letter, thought (likewise with reserve) of the sixth or seventh century A.D.

6. The form of the text showed (in disagreement with the account in Dr. Reinhardt's letter) already in the cursory examination a whole number of peculiarities, which together made possible the opinion that the present fragments descended from a type of Septuagint text which is not a common one, but which shows the greatest relationship with the valuable palimpsest of the Prophets at Grotta Ferrata (Γ).

Through these discoveries of the preliminary testing only the following result was attained :—

The proposal could be put at once in our Papyrus Commission, which meets on such occasions, to recommend to the Grand Ducal Ministry the acquirement of these Biblical fragments, both as an addition to our papyrus collection in general, and also on account of the intrinsic value which the fragments have for Biblical science.

It was possible then to offer a distinctly lower price, as we were now concerned really with fragments, which for the expert were not absolutely new (Mr. Hechler had already seen and briefly described a part), as further the age of the leaves was not at all so great as Herr Graf had thought, and as finally the condition of the fragments was not at all so good, as we on the receipt of the first letter had thought,—all circumstances, which tended, not indeed to destroy the intrinsic value of the leaves, but of course to reduce their commercial value.

The Papyrus Commission unanimously agreed to the proposal above named, although in those days, as it happened, the opinion was held in no mean quarters, that such manuscripts should belong not to the smaller and medium-sized libraries, but to the very large libraries, to Berlin, Paris, London, and Rome, that centralization was in this matter the only right course. I myself cannot support this opinion. Why should not a library of moderate size, with the brilliant tradition of our Palatina, strive to become once more a great one, by a systematic enrichment of its manuscript resources? And why should we, with all our German Biblical science, allow so venerable a relic of the Bible to go past us? No ; he should buy such treasures

who has the opportunity *and* the means, for his gain as well as for his scientific development. From the ideal standpoint, the most correct course would certainly be to leave these treasures to Egypt; for they represent its spiritual past. But in the meantime we Europeans are still in a somewhat better position to value these things, to fix their scientific value and to preserve them, than the Fellahin, who see in the old leaves only objects of commerce. And so with a good conscience we recommended the acquirement of the Septuagint leaves, which were offered us not indeed by the finder, but at second-hand or third-hand, and thanks to the intelligent sympathy and the good offices of His Excellency, the then Minister of State, Dr. Nokk, and also to the good offices of Herr Theodor Graf, our library finally obtained the fragments on very favourable conditions.[1]

What happened afterwards? I purposely relate somewhat minutely the externals, which are connected with the acquirement and treatment of such a treasure, because to me the glance into any workshop is often more interesting than the glance at the completed work itself.

The first thing to do was to construct them provisionally. Papyrus is indeed, as was said above, an excellent and durable material; but from the effects of our northern climate these brown children of the south must be protected as far as possible. So once more the codex, which had already become separated into its single leaves, was taken up leaf by leaf, and each leaf by itself was carefully dusted with a fine paint brush (of this dust a word more afterwards), then, again, each leaf was laid between two smooth plates of glass, which, at the edge, were lightly united with paste. Only four leaves hung together in pairs. These were naturally not cut apart, but were laid between two large plates of glass exactly as they hung together. Such folds as occurred in the leaves were smoothed where possible, and such fragments of leaves as had come off were restored to their original places. Even before its Heidelberg days the papyrus had been in the hands of a European artificer in paste, who had worked with much glue and little tact and put fragments in the wrong place, as was afterwards proved. Finally each 'glassed' leaf received its provisional number, and then at length it was possible to think of the definite scientific study of the new possession.

This scientific study is now completed.

As volume i. of the 'Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung' [Publications of the Heidelberg Papyrus Collection], the following work, prepared by me, is now published: *Die Septuaginta-Papyri und andere altchristliche Texte der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*, with sixty photographic plates, Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1905 (price, bound, 26 shillings). The volume contains, in addition to the edition of the Septuagint codex, the text of and commentary on the following pieces:—

A Graeco-Coptic parchment leaf with Exodus, chap. 15, of the seventh century A.D.

A fragment of parchment with Mark, chap. 6, of the sixth century A.D.

A fragment of parchment with Acts, chap. 28, and James, chap. 1, of the fifth century A.D.

A leaf of papyrus with the fragment of an Onomasticon sacrum, of the third or fourth century A.D.

An early Christian private letter on papyrus of the middle of the fourth century.

All the texts are represented in photographic facsimile in the original size.

The study of the Septuagint codex represents the chief content of the publication; on the discoveries contained in it let me make some communications.

First of all, something has been proved about the history of the codex, or, rather I should say, about its fate. Herr Theodor Graf acquired it with other Greek, Demotic, Arabic, and Coptic papyri, at Cairo in the year 1889; so far as could be learnt from the Arab traders, all these pieces came from the Faiyûm. There is no reason to doubt the correctness of this statement about their origin. For even if we had not been told by the dealers that the fragments belonged to the Faiyûm, their Egyptian origin, at least, would have been evident to us from other indications. In the first place, it is *a priori* probable that a papyrus codex offered for sale in Egypt also belongs to Egypt; but, in the second place, our Codex bears a distinct mark of its origin in the remains of its binding. The still existing binding-string is in the self-same place, where once it touched the folds

[1] It is with sorrowful regret, on the appearance of the edition, that reference must be made to the fact that all the gentlemen named by me, who did good service in the acquirement of the codex, have died in the interval—Zangemeister, Nokk, Reinhardt, and Graf.

of the innermost double-leaf, covered with small strips of parchment, clearly for the purpose of protecting the leaf from being cut through by the binding-strings. But these parchment strips are the remains of a torn Coptic (and therefore certainly Egyptian) manuscript, the careful script of which points to a great antiquity. For us these small strips, the dialect of which the well-known Berlin Coptologist Herr Carl Schmidt has recognized as Faiyûmic, are of inestimable value, as they prove the codex to be a genuine Egyptian one; for the assumption that the codex was written, say, in Asia Minor, bound up there or anywhere else with Coptic parchment strips, and after twelve hundred years recovered in the sands of Arabian Egypt, is so fantastic, that it must be immediately denied. We have, however, an even more interesting confirmation of the Egyptian origin of our Septuagint leaves: in the special form of the text which they represent. There exists in the Vatican library a manuscript known by the name Marchalianus (Q), which contains the Prophets in the Septuagint text, which was written in Egypt, and, according to the conjecture of the Italian scholar Ceriani, represents that form of text, which goes back to the Egyptian Biblical scholar Hesychius. We come back to this point later; meantime, it must be premised that the more minute testing of our Heidelberg Septuagint text has revealed its close relationship with, among others, the Marchalianus specially, and so with the probable Hesychius text, which is certainly Egyptian.

In every way it appears to me that the Egyptian origin of our fragments has been raised above all doubt. To know the origin for certain means a great deal in the case of a Septuagint codex. For the Septuagint text was not uniform in the different territories of the Christian Church, but had assumed different forms, exactly as, for example, Luther's translation of the Bible has experienced in the course of time, through the innumerable editions, all possible changes, so that thus the text of our new Luther Bibles no longer coincides with Luther's text itself; or as the text of our Church hymns also often reads differently, for example, in Baden from what it does in Mecklenburg. In several great Church districts of ancient Christendom eminent Biblical investigators endeavoured to establish a uniform Septuagint text, just as in our time the English translation of the Bible has been revised, or as the Eisenach Church Conference has produced a uniform revision of Luther's Bible, or as we have exerted ourselves in Germany, to create gradually a uniform text of the most important hymns. Among the Biblical scholars of the early Christendom, who exerted themselves on the Septuagint text, three men stand out prominently—Origen in the third century after Christ, Lucian the Martyr in the fourth century, and Hesychius, perhaps also a martyr, probably also in the fourth century. Editions of the Septuagint text by these three scholars existed, each with specialities and characteristics. These three editions, however, no longer exist in connected completeness, and it is itself one of the most important tasks of Septuagint investigation to reconstruct these three 'recensions' of the Septuagint by Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius. For only then, when we have these recensions, can we arrange the real original Greek text of the Septuagint. Of the three recensions named, only two had official recognition in definite regions of the Church; that of Lucian in Asia Minor, that of Hesychius in Egypt. It is therefore not improbable that manuscripts which were written in Asia Minor contained the text of Lucian, and that Egyptian manuscripts contained the text of Hesychius. Does the establishment of both recensions, then, appear to be quite a simple matter? Certainly, if we only knew what manuscripts sprang from Egypt and what from Asia Minor. We know the *provenance* of extremely few Septuagint manuscripts with certainty, and we are quite glad when we can recognize in a manuscript even a slight supposed trace of its origin. For example, the famous Bible Codex Vaticanus, the original home of which is unknown, has a leaf patched with papyrus. Papyrus; at this word we think at once of Egypt, but this trace would be hardly sufficient to enable us to localize the codex with certainty. In our case we are rid of all trouble and care in this important question; our codex *is* localized, and this fact by itself would suffice to secure it a great importance among the Septuagint manuscripts.

The most important question for the investigation of the Septuagint, that of the *origin* of the manuscript, was thus answered. For the equally important question as to its *age*, I was able to quote the opinions of two experts in this matter. Mr. Kenyon,[1] after a new examination, put the

[1] In a letter of 12th June 1905, Mr. Kenyon very kindly informed me that he had 'referred' simply 'by an oversight'

codex in the seventh, Herr Wilcken[1] in the sixth or seventh century after Christ; both scholars gave this opinion with reserve. Time will here solve what we cannot as yet state with certainty. For Greek palæography is at the present time in a transition stage. The enormous new material which the papyrus finds have especially contributed is not yet worked up; and, as Herr Wilcken wrote to me, it is just in the case of the style of writing of our manuscript, the so-called uncial writing, that it is especially difficult for us to infer the date from the character of the script. Further, the form of the whole manuscript, the codex form, does not permit a certain conclusion as to the age. We do not even know when the book-roll was ousted by the book-codex, and, even if we did know, we should always have to postulate an intermediate stage in time, in which the antiquated roll was still in use side by side with the now fashionable codex.

Still, in no case can the manuscript have been produced later than the seventh century after Christ. So we say with all reserve—the codex belongs to about the seventh century after Christ. What does that mean? It means, the codex belongs to the period immediately before Muhammed, or to the early period of Islam; to a time from which the Diocletian persecution of the Christians was only as far removed as the Thirty Years' War is from us; to a time from which Origen was only as far removed as Luther is from us; to a time from which the appearance of Jesus Christ was only as far removed as the Golden Bull or Magna Charta is from us; to a time which is separated from the days of the destruction of the kingdom of Israel (722 B.C.) perhaps by the same number of centuries which separate *us* from this *manuscript*. So they are old, very old fragments. We are face to face with at least thirteen centuries, if we study their characters. This great age is the second reason which ensures the high importance of our leaves.

Who wrote the manuscript we do not know, and yet we can at least say something of the writer. He was in general very careful. To be sure, there is no lack of clerical errors, omissions, and other mistakes (once the man has skipped an entire page, because he was misled by the similar ending of the preceding page into the mistake that he had already written the following page); but if we compare *his* mistakes with the mistakes of the famous Codex Sinaiticus, then the first place must easily be awarded to our scribe, and in the criticism of his actual mistakes the fair judge will not forget two points: first, that the fire of Egypt's sun burned on the brain of this active man when he wrote; and second, that it is in any case an uncommonly difficult thing to copy an uncial manuscript, without division of words and without punctuation, absolutely without mistakes. Further, after our scribe, another took up the manuscript and corrected it here and there. His corrections are clearly independent of the first writing. This corrector, however, has not corrected all the mistakes, not even all the most manifest errors, which ought to prove that the *writer* of the codex had in the eyes of the *corrector* in any case turned out a good piece of work. From the defectiveness of the corrections one ought perhaps to draw another conclusion: the codex was perhaps not written for a large church, in which learned ecclesiastics were to be found who upheld literal accuracy in their Church Bibles, but was rather intended for a village church, where, perhaps, there was not so much question of literal accuracy. For the value of the form of the text which the scribe used, it is naturally of no consequence whether the Bible he wrote was a costly valuable town Bible, or a plain village Bible.

Of the further fortunes of our codex in early times we can say, moreover, that it became through use and other occurrences worn out and in part destroyed. Just as in our church books through long usage (among other things also through the shaking hold of the beginner) single pages are often damaged or become loosened from the binding, so our codex also gradually became worn out. Originally it contained, perhaps, all the Prophets, or at least the Dodekapropheton of the O.T.; now there exist only the prophets Zechariah and Malachi (the greater part of each); but even within this remnant two leaves have become lost, whether only recently, before the purchase by Herr Graf, or already in early times, I do not know. There is also a further point. In addition to the scribe and the corrector and the persons who used the book, some one *else* has occupied himself with the codex, not to its advantage, namely, a book-worm (the word is to be understood in the zoological

to a facsimile in Grenfell and Hunt (I had mentioned the facsimile on page 6, note 5, of my edition).

[1] As mentioned already above.

sense), who is historically no longer to be discovered. With indefatigable zeal this anonymous being has completed his work of quiet voracity; the places of the papyrus which were free from ink appear withal to have agreed more with him than those written upon. But this apparently only destructive mischief done by worms has again also a great positive merit: the remarkable windings of the labyrinth made by the worm-eating on the single leaves are for the investigator very welcome indications of the original position of the leaves. And the way in which the leaves originally lay is for the ascertainment of the original number of lines in a preceding or succeeding leaf, now destroyed, of the greatest importance: the next leaf, if it is somewhat less destroyed, and if we know, through the worm, how it was situated with respect to the other leaf, gives us perhaps the desired information; for the number of lines in two consecutive pages is, as a rule, the same.

Besides readers' usage and the damage done by the worm, still a third factor has done injurious work on the writing. Our codex must once have lain in the earth. It bore, even when we received it, a distinct layer of that venerable dust upon it which is so well known to the connoisseur of papyri: the papyri are for the most part covered with this dust, because they for the most part have been dug out of the Egyptian soil, especially out of the rubbish hills beside the ancient towns. This dust can be almost entirely removed, but in our case that did not become necessary. Only the thickest dust had to be brushed away dry, and the lost characters then came to light in most cases, even if faint. There is great probability that our codex was not, for example, found at the uncovering of a grave, say in a closed sarcophagus, but that it was dug out of the dry rubbish-earth. It reached this rubbish-heap because it had been long ago thrown away as useless.

Can we bring all these experiences of our codex in ancient times into anything like a definite series? I believe we can, with a certain probability; the codex was written, was corrected, was used until it was worn out. Then it was next kept in a corner, perhaps, of the native church; here the hungry guardians of this corner lay in wait for the booty they had descried, and one day at a church cleaning the old worthless fragment was cast on the rubbish-heap by a modern sensible, cultured man. Then came one more sympathetic than men, the south wind, and brought its clouds of dust upon it, year by year, century by century, till a deep layer of sand and earth had formed itself about the cast-off fragments. Then an unknown man in our age burrowed in the rubbish, found the old leaves, perhaps made a good stroke of business with them, and, in any case, helped them on the way to Herr Graf, from whom they came by Vienna and Paris, and other cities, to Heidelberg.

In my narrative up to this point I have referred to two points, which constitute the high value of our fragments for science—

First, its Egyptian origin;
Second, its age.

In the third place comes their *extent*. Fragments of papyrus Bibles have been up to the present uncommonly rare. Already, in the fifth and sixth century after Christ, papyrus Bibles were not so commonly to be found in Egypt as people perhaps suppose. There exists at Oxford the inventory of an Egyptian village church of that period, from which we learn that this church possessed twenty-one parchment books, but only three papyrus books. It corresponds to this state of affairs that we to-day in our libraries possess only very small relics of papyrus Bibles; as far as I know, our *Heidelberg* codex is now, of all the Bible fragments on papyrus hitherto known, the largest in extent.

Fourthly, and lastly: the contents of our codex, its *type of text*, are of high scientific interest. As the result of the critical examination of the text the following is established:—

The Heidelberg codex is closely related to the group whose characteristic representatives are the manuscripts A, Q, 106, 49, 26, Γ, 233 (?), 198;[1] that is to say, to the group which, especially since the study of A. Ceriani,[2] has been commonly considered as the representative of the Hesychius text of the Prophets, with the exception of Ezekiel. For Isaiah, the Dublin palimpsest, which comes from Egypt, appeared to Ceriani[3] as confirmation of his hypothesis; for the Minor Prophets there has hitherto existed no certain Egyptian witness,

[1] The list can be extended further.

[2] *De Codice Marchaliano seu Vaticano Græco 2125 prophetarum phototypica arte repræsentato commentatio, Romæ, 1890*, p. 105 f., 115.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 105.

but this has now appeared in the Heidelbergensis, which will henceforth, in every discussion about the Hesychius text, bear its weighty evidence.

In this connexion it is worthy of note that for the Minor Prophets the strong Hesychian tendency of $\aleph^{c.\,b}$ clearly reveals itself, less that of $\aleph^{c.\,a}$, still less that of $\aleph$ itself. Somewhat different observations can be made with reference to the hands that can be recognized in Q.

A new light falls also on the Coptic translations of the Minor Prophets. As far as I see, they all stand in very sharp contrast to the Hesychius text, represented by the Heidelbergensis, and this is especially true of the Bohairic version. Since Ceriani[1] it has become usual to speak of the Bohairic version as Hesychian; but for the Minor Prophets the opinion appears to me to be unavoidable that they, as well as the Sahidic and both the Achmimic versions, spring from pre-Hesychian originals, and that Hesychius did not trouble himself very much about the Copts. The instances of agreement—and they are not rare—between Hesychius and the Copts are easily explained by the circumstance that the translators as well as the reviser were essentially dependent on Egyptian Greek manuscripts.

Finally, it appears to me a peculiarity of the Heidelbergensis that it assimilates such passages as are cited in the New Testament, or are capable of a Christian meaning, as far as possible to their form in the New Testament text, or to the sphere of Christian thought. Of quite special interest is this phenomenon in the passage Zec 12^{10}, which I have tested thoroughly. As Heidelbergensis in the cases reviewed is accompanied by a more or less stately retinue of Hesychian witnesses, the tendency to Christian harmonization is probably a peculiarity of the Hesychian text in general. Psychologically such a harmonizing comes very naturally to a reviser who is preparing the text for practical use,—so naturally that we shall not be surprised if even witnesses to the Lucianic text have in some cases the Christian reading.

Christianizing tendencies in the Septuagint text do not, of course, emerge first in the revisers. It is the great importance of the Leipsic fragments of the Psalms[2] that they give us a glimpse of a yet older stage of Christian work on the Septuagint text and Christian influence on the Septuagint text. All further investigation of this section of the history of the Bible and of Christian piety which has been recognized by Heinrici in its importance must start from the Leipsic fragments of the Psalms; a further tract is lit up by the remains of an Egyptian village Bible, preserved to us in the Heidelberg fragments of the Prophets.

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 105.

[2] "Die Leipziger Papyrusfragmente der Psalmen," herausgegeben und untersucht von C. F. Georg Heinrici (*Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testamentes*, iv.), Leipzig, 1903.

The Masai and their Primitive Traditions.

By Professor the Rev. George G. Cameron, D.D., Aberdeen.

II.

In order that the question raised by Captain Merker may be easily understood, it may be desirable to transcribe, in brief form, the principal early traditions of the Masai as given by the German officer. Their resemblance to the early narratives of Genesis is, in some cases, sufficiently striking.

I. The Creation.

Originally, the earth was a dry desert in which a dragon had its abode. God descended from heaven, and fought and overcame the dragon. Through the blood of the slain dragon the earth-desert was fertilized, and on the spot where the dragon was slain arose Paradise. The earth was now free from danger; and God, by His creative word, called into existence sun, moon, stars, plants, animals, and last, the first human pair. The male —Maitumbe—was sent down from heaven; the female—Naiterogob—at God's command came forth from the heart of the earth. These two met in Paradise, whither God had brought Maitumbe. On the trees of Paradise hung the most precious