there was a North Arabian Asshur, Professor Hommel and I have independently shown. The adjuration becomes thus, 'by Ṣib'onith (*gloss*, Aralith of the Shurites).' That the cult of Ashtart was specially prevalent in North Arabia, I hope that I have shown sufficiently in *The Two Religions of Israel*.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

NOTE ON MARK 16 18

In my article *s.v.* "Aristion (Aristo)" in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 1906, I made the following reference to Conybeare's well-known conjecture based on the gloss *eritsu Ariston* inserted before the Marcan appendix (Mk. 16 9-20) in red ink in small cramped letters by the writer of an Armenian tenth century codex, ascribing the authorship of the appendix to the Aristion of Papias (Euseb. *H.E.* III, xxxix. 4):—

Undeniably the reference in Mk. 16 18 to drinking of poison with impunity must have literary connection with Papias' anecdote regarding Justus Barsabbas (*H.E.*, III. xxxix. 9), whatever the source. Conybeare's citation of a gloss 'against the name Aristion' in a Bodleian 12th cent. codex of Rufinus' translation of this passage, which referred to this story of the poison cup, was even (to the discoverer's eye) a designation by the unknown glossator of Aristion as author of this story. But besides the precariousness of this inference, it would scarcely be possible to write a gloss 'against the name Aristion' which would not be equally 'against the name of Elder John' immediately adjoining; and as mediæval legend reported the story of the poison cup of *John* (*i.e* the Apostle, identified in the glossator's period with the Elder) this would seem to be the more natural reference and meaning of the gloss.

Prof. J. Vernon Bartlett has recently done me the kindness to transcribe for me this gloss on the Rufinus codex with especial regard for its location on the page. His report is as follows:—

My notes on the Bodleian Ms. of Rufinus which I examined (Mss. 2 and Miscell. 294, once in the Monastery of Eberbach) are to this effect. The scholion is really simply one of a number of

marginal notes, indicating the contents, which occur throughout the Ms. Conybeare noticed that the 'scholion' 'Quod Justus qui et Barsabas venenum biberit nihilque ex hoc triste pertulerit' stood 'in the margin over against the name of Aristion,' and inferred that this showed consciousness that this story was 'due to or suggested by Aristion.'

But the position 'over against' Aristion is a mere accident, due to the fact that there is *no room* on the inner margin of the Ms. (which is written in 2 columns), where it should come, for the marginal note to be inserted. Hence it comes opposite the name of Aristion, which though a good deal earlier in the text, is in fact parallel (to the matter in question) in the other column. There are similar cases which I have observed elsewhere. Thus the inference was a mistake of Conybeare's and the observation is of no historical value.

For this purely negative result of the inquiry, which does not even connect the tradition of the poison cup with "John," I was prepared some years ago by an assurance from Professor Conybeare himself in conversation that there was "nothing in" the supposed evidence, and would scarcely have thought it worth while to bring this merely negative result before readers of the JOURNAL were it not that the ascription of the Marcan appendix to Aristion (groundless as I believe it to be) has been so generally accepted, and by scholars of such eminence.

In addition I have the following curious bit of evidence to submit on the question when and how the legend of the poison cup came to be detached from the name of Justus Barsabas and attached to that of the Apostle John. It may serve to justify my renewed invitation of the reader's attention to this subject.

As is well known, one of the new fragments of Papias taken by de Boor from cod. Baroscianus 142 in the Bodleian Library, and probably derived from Philippus Sidetes particularizes in regard to the story of the poison cup which Papias had (indirectly?—*ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ*) from the daughters of Philip, that it was drunk as an ordeal imposed by the unbelievers, and contained the poison *of a viper* (*ἰὸν ἐχίδνης*). Whether the venom of a viper taken by the

mouth is in reality a deadly poison (*φάρμακον δηλητήριον*), concerns not us but the physicians. It seems at least to have been so considered. But it does not appear by any testimony I am able to obtain that it was in such universal use as to warrant the inference in regard to poison cups in general that the poison was extracted from a serpent's fangs when no statement to that effect is made. We cannot, for example, infer that a painter of the period of the Renaissance or earlier, wishing to indicate to the eye the poisonous nature of the contents of a cup depicted on the canvas, would naturally resort to the expedient of painting a viper so disposed in the chalice that its head projects with threatening mien above the rim, while its tail hangs down over the side.

If, then, we look at the celebrated painting of John the Apostle and Evangelist by Domenichino, or, at other still older representations, in which this symbol occupies a position second only in prominence to that of the eagle derived from the pages of Irenæus,[1] we shall naturally say to ourselves: Mediæval legend gave the idea of the poison cup; for that is traceable back to the second century and rests ultimately, like the accompanying legend of John's immersion in boiling oil, on the prediction of Jesus to the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized" (Mk. 10 39); but whence the idea of this particular brand of poison, if not (directly or indirectly) from the pages of Papias himself?

We shall be grateful to the students of mediæval art if they will trace this apostolic viper to his literary lair. To all appearance he would seem to have escaped from the cup of Justus Barsabas.

Benj. W. Bacon.

Yale University.

[1] *Hær.* III. xi. 8. The symbols, however, are probably older than Irenæus (see my note on "Andreas of Cæsarea and the Virgin Birth" in *Am. Journ. of Theol.* xv. 1. Jan. 1911) and are variously applied. In Irenæus that of the *lion* is connected with John and the *eagle* with Mark.