

Peshitta MS in the Library of S. Catharine's had a stop after 𐌒𐌐, in accordance with grammatical rule, and he further told me that really ancient Peshitta MSS generally, when their punctuation had not been tampered with, usually had a stop there and not after 𐌒𐌐𐌑 𐌒𐌐𐌑. It may be therefore of some interest to give the punctuation of the ancient British Museum MSS, so strangely passed over by Mr. Gwilliam and his coadjutor the late Mr. P. E. Pusey.

I have examined the passage in ten of these MSS, those numbered by Mr. Gwilliam 1 4 7 8 10 14 17 20 21 23. Of these, Mr. Gwilliam does not quote 10 20 or 21 for this passage, though I incline to think 20 one of the better MSS and one that has been assigned rather too late a date. Dr. Wright said 'vith or viith cent.': I should venture to put it in the early part of the sixth century. The evidence of the MSS may be arranged as follows:—

(α) Gwilliam's 21 (= B. M. Add. 14449, vi^o or vii^o)—no punctuation by the first hand.

(β) Gwilliam's 8 (= B. M. Add. 17114, vi^o or vii^o).

„ 10 (= B. M. Add. 17115, vi^o).

„ 20 (= B. M. Add. 12137, vi^o or vii^o).

These three have a point by the first hand after 𐌒𐌐, but no other point until the final one, found in all the MSS except 21* after 𐌒𐌐𐌑 𐌒𐌐𐌑.

(γ) Gwilliam's 17 (= B. M. Add. 14470, v^o or vi^o)—a point after 𐌒𐌐, and an inferior point (*sāmkā*) after 𐌒𐌐, both by the first hand.

(δ) Gwilliam's 14 (= B. M. Add. 14453, v^o or vi^o)—a point after 𐌒𐌐, now scratched out; there is now also a point after 𐌒𐌐𐌑, as well as the *sāmkā* after 𐌒𐌐, both of which look like the work of the first hand.

On the other hand we have

(ε) Gwilliam's 1 (= B. M. Add. 14455, vi^o).

„ 7 (= B. M. Add. 14460, A.D. 600).

„ 23 (= B. M. Add. 17113, vi^o, vii^o).

These have no point after 𐌒𐌐, but have the point after 𐌒𐌐𐌑 𐌒𐌐𐌑, and the *sāmkā* after 𐌒𐌐—in other words, they agree with Mr. Gwilliam's text, and the Massoretic MSS. Furthermore, codd. 8 14 and 21 have been altered by a later hand to agree with Mr. Gwilliam, the point after 𐌒𐌐 in 8 and 14 being deleted, and one inserted after 𐌒𐌐𐌑. The point after 𐌒𐌐 in 17 has also been deleted, but no stop has been inserted after 𐌒𐌐𐌑. The Nestorian Massora (B. M. Add. 12138, A.D. 899) also agrees with Mr. Gwilliam.

With regard to Gwilliam's 4 (B. M. Add. 14459, A.D. 530-40), I could not feel quite certain. It now agrees with Mr. Gwilliam, but I do not think the punctuation is original, and I rather incline to believe that cod. 4, like cod. 21, was originally unprovided with any punctuation in this passage.

To sum up:—for the point after $\text{L}\omega\omega$, i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *text*, and the punctuation demanded by the rules of Syriac syntax, we have codd. 8* 10 17* 20, and perhaps also 14*; for the point after $\text{J}\omega\omega\text{? } \varphi\omega\omega$, i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *margin* and the text printed by Mr. Gwilliam, we have codd. 1 7 23, and the later punctuators of 4 8 14 and 21.

There can be no doubt that the later tendency was to put the stop where Mr. Gwilliam has put it. It is implied in the Arabic *Diatessaron*, a translation made in the eleventh century; indeed, it would probably be difficult to get Syriac evidence for the stop after $\text{L}\omega\omega$ later than the seventh century. But the earliest witnesses tell another tale. Both the MSS assigned by Wright to the fifth century (codd. 14 and 17) had the stop by the first hand, and they are doubtless right in having it. I cannot but consider it a matter of regret that the Oxford *Tetraevangelium* should have retained in this important verse a conventional punctuation that mangles the grammar and obscures the thought.

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON ACTS xii 25.

IN a paper entitled 'A point in Pauline Chronology' Mr. G. A. Simcox has directed the attention of readers of this JOURNAL (vol. ii 586–590) to the difficult reading *ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*. But his remedy, namely to omit the whole verse as an interpolation, is surely more desperate than the disease. Three alternatives at least seem preferable. (1) We may assume that the verse originally contained no reference to Jerusalem at all; or (2) we may connect *εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ* with *πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*, giving it a more emphatic meaning than is usually suggested by those who favour this construction; or finally (3) we may be able to justify 'from Jerusalem' as after all the original reading.

(1) Most will admit that the textual phenomena are *prima facie* against the reading 'from Jerusalem,' either in its 'Western' form (*ἀπὸ*) or in its Alexandrine and Syrian form (*ἐξ*). It is discredited not only as a *lectio facilior* divided against itself, but also by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place *whence* return is made, wherever it is indicated by the context¹. On the other hand, even the place *whither* is twice omitted after *ὑποστρέφω*, in Acts viii 28, xx 3. In the former of these we have *ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ*, where the destination is only to be inferred from a statement that the man was a eunuch of the queen of the Ethiopians. In

¹ Τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος is the one case in which the place whence is named at all.