This peculiar word (sonium) attracted a good deal of attention from the time of Scholz onwards. It seems to be the parent of the French soin, and so has been used to suggest a Gallic origin for Codex Bezae. I cannot find that anything fresh has been written about it since Rendel Harris's Study of Codex Bezae (1891), where possible connexions are discussed on pp. 26–29. At the foot of p. 28 Dr Harris remarks 'we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the word may after all be Vulgar Latin and not necessarily Vulgar Latin of as late a period as the sixth century'. This was an acute conjecture; the trouble was that there seemed to be no evidence.

An accident sent me to the edition of the Sortes Sangallenses by H. Winnefeld (Bonn, 1887). These Sortes have nothing to do with those in Codex Bezae itself or the associated ones in the St Germain codex (g), on which see Rendel Harris in the American Journal of Philology, vol. ix, no. 1. But the word sonium occurs in lix 9

\[ \text{de sonio liberaris et deo adiuuante} \]
\[ \text{ad filios tuos reuerteris saluus,} \]

and the corresponding verb soniari occurs in xii II, xxxvii II, xlvi II, e.g.

\[ \text{non es fugiturus, noli soniari.} \]

The S. Gallen MS (n. 908) is a palimpsest; the under writing, which contains the sortes, is of the sixth century. Moreover, the text, though at least in its present form Christian, is concerned with 'praetors' and 'aediles', and 'decemprimi', which seems to throw the composition of the sortes into the third century, or thereabouts. Thus sonium does turn out to be a Vulgar Latin word of respectable age, and so it throws no direct light whatever upon the age or country of the Latin side of Codex Bezae.

F. C. Burkitt.

**ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ.**

Apropos of Prof. C. H. Turner's important article on the exact significance of ἀγαπητός as applied to our Lord (Journal, vol. xxvii [1925-1926], pp. 113–129), I have come across a very interesting passage in Plutarch, which illustrates his argument. It occurs in the Moralia, tract 7, Περὶ πολυφιλίας (De amicorum multitudine) c. 2, pp. 93 F, 94 A, and reads as follows:

\[ \text{τὸ σφοδρὰ φιλεῖν καὶ φιλήσκειν πρὸς πολλοὺς ὁκὺ ἵστων, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁι} \]

As this example belongs to New Testament times, it may serve to bridge the gap between Aristotle and Julius Pollux.¹

A. Souter.

**Naζωραιος κληθήσεται.**

A **point** of some interest arises from Dr Dix’s article on ‘The Messiah ben Joseph’. If the blessings of Joseph in Gen. xlix and Deut. xxxiii were ever taken Messianically, they may be the source of the much discussed ‘He shall be called a Nazarene *Naζωραιος*’, Matt. ii 23. Joseph is there termed το ἀνακάμπτων, separate, consecrated, or prince, among his brethren. The LXX has in Genesis διὸ ἅγγιστον ἀδελφῶν, but in Deuteronomy Δοξασθεὶς ἐπ’ ἐν ἀδελφῶν. But the writer of Matt. i and ii is not dependent on the LXX, as is shewn by comparison of ii 15 Ἐξ Ἀγίωπτος ἐκάλεσα τὸν νιὼν μου with Ἐξ Αἰγίπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν. In Lam. iv 7, the only other place where το ἀνακάμπτων occurs outside the technical sense of ‘Nazirite’, LXX has Ναζειραῖος, Vulg. Nazaraei (Vulg. has Nazaraeus in all places, except sometimes in Numb. vi). This verse is quoted in this connexion by Tertullian (adv. Marc. iv 8) ‘The Creator’s Christ, according to prophecy, was to be called Nazareus, whence also the Jews call us by this very name, Nazarenos (v.l. Nazaraeos), because of Him. For we are those of whom it is written, Nazareus were made whiter than snow.’


Harold Smith.

¹ Turner, pp. 116 f.