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The remnants of subapostolic writings are too scanty to authorize us to dogmatize negatively on such a point. We did not know till the finding of the Διατήρη that the word apostle was the accepted designation of a certain class of evangelists in the early Church.

St. Paul's Handicraft: Acts xviii. 3.

PROF. EBERHARD NESTLE.

TUBINGEN.

Among the various explanations of the rare word σκηνοποιός, Acts xviii. 3, that of the Peshito has in recent times been almost entirely overlooked. This "queen of the versions," as it used to be called, renders lūtārā, or rather lūlārā. The Syriac word is extremely rare—almost unique—and has hitherto remained unexplained. Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, col. 1910, says that Karmesedināyā derives it from lāurā, i.e., the Latin lorum. In this Karmesedināyā is quite right; lūlārā is—what he did not see—nothing but the Latin lorarius.1 This is proved by a very curious passage in the legend of the Discovery of the Cross. The Syriac text runs thus:2 "Paulus, qui ante templum sedebat exercebat artem scenographiam" (scene-painting)—a new occupation for St. Paul; unless we should regard the word as equivalent to σκηνοπραγματών; but in the Greek,4 Ἰάκωβος ὁ πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν καθέζωμενος ὃ καὶ ἰμαντοτόμος. Wotke has recently published a new recension of the Greek, in which he thinks he discovers the original of the Latin form of the legend.5 In this we read, Ἰάκωβος ὁ πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν καθέζωμενος ὃς κοινότομος ἦν, for which we must, of course, restore, ὃς κοινοτόμος ἦν. Chrysostom, too, who probably

1 For the interchange of r and l the single example λείρων, lilium, will suffice.
2 In my Syriac Grammar, 117, 90 = de sancto cruce, 28, 90.
3 A. Holder, Inventio sanctae crucis, 1889, p. 6.
4 Ibid. p. 33.
5 Wotke, die griechische Vorlage der lateinischen Kreuzauffindungslegende, in Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für classische Philologie, XIII. (1891) 305.
understood Syriac, calls Paul σκυρστόμος, which some have wrongly interpreted "tent-maker." How did the Syriac translators come to render σκυρστόμος by lorarius? I can explain this only by supposing that they read, or misread, ημιστόμος, instead of σκυρστόμος.

Many interesting questions are raised by this word: How did the Latin word lorarius come into use among the Syrians? Has the Syriac version — supposing it to represent ημιστόμος — preserved the true reading? How are the Latin, Greek, and Syriac forms of the legend of the Holy Cross related to one another? It must suffice here to call attention to a word which must be taken into consideration by the critic of the New Testament text as well as by the student of St. Paul’s life.

The Use of רעים.

PROF. L. W. BATTEN.

PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL.

The translators of our English Bible have imposed pretty severe tasks on certain English words, but none perhaps has been subjected to a severer strain than “judgment,” which is the well-nigh universal rendering of the Hebrew רעים. A language with a small vocabulary, such as the Hebrew, may well represent different ideas by the same word; but why such a word should be uniformly rendered into another language with a more ample vocabulary, without any regard to sense or reason, it is hard to see.

That I do not exaggerate in my statement is apparent from a glance at, say Worcester’s Dictionary. There are given no less than ten different meanings of the word “judgment” as used in the Scriptures, and these do not cover all the cases if we take into account the various finer shades of meaning which appear in certain passages.

[In 2 cp. ad Tim., Hom. iv. (Opp. ed. Montfaucon, XI. 682); cf. de laud. S. Pauli, Hom. iv. (II. 494). Chrysostom and other Fathers occasionally accept and use this contemptuous designation of the apostle (as they do ἀλεξια in the case of others); this use is especially frequent in Theodoret, e.g. Opp. ed. Schulze, IV. 692, 837, 943, etc.; cf. 936; less frequently we find σκυρστόμος (I. 125; IV. 931) and σκυρστόμος (III. 297) employed in the same way. See Suicer, Thesaur. Ecles. ii. 981 f. Eds.]