

an affirmative answer can again be given; for there is an almost exactly parallel use of the Bab. *nukkuru* (II i theme, or Pi., of *nakāru* 'to be hostile'). The writer of an early Babylonian letter says that *Nabi-(i) Ilabrat šangū Anunitum ana $\frac{1}{3}$ manēm 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ šiglē kaspim bītam ana Idin-(i) Ilabrat dayānim unakkir* 'N. the priest of A. has alienated' or 'transferred the house to I. the judge for $\frac{1}{3}$ maneh 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ shekels of silver'.¹ This seems to be the sole known example of this usage in Babylonian literature; is it then justifiable to remove a similarly unique example of an analogous idiom from the Hebrew text? It rather suggests that the Pi. of נכר, like the II i theme of *nakāru*, can denote 'to alienate' in the sense of handing over or transferring property, especially by sale, from one person to another.

These suggestions are put forward, in some cases with considerable diffidence, in others with some degree of confidence, in the hope of clearing up a few of the difficulties caused by the confusion of homonymous roots or by the large number of rare words or meanings which must naturally be found in a dead language.

G. R. DRIVER.

THE PUNCTUATION OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS.

I TAKE this opportunity to refer to a matter which I feel to be of considerable importance. An admirable enterprise is on foot, of editing a reliable record of all New Testament readings up to date. I would plead that this ought to include a reliable record of the punctuation also, at the least of the more important manuscripts which are punctuated. The precise value of the punctuation is still rather uncertain, but in some cases it may well be very early. As an example of the importance of shewing reliable evidence, I may take the case of Rom. ix 5, evidently a most important passage in regard of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. In the almost classical edition of the epistle by Sanday and Headlam in the *International Critical Commentary* it is said (p. 234): 'The strongest evidence against the reference to Christ (i. e. of the last words of the verse) is that of the leading uncial MSS'. Now I believe that I have made it sufficiently plain in *The Expository Times* (April and October 1923) that this supposed argument from the punctuation of the chief uncials is founded on a misconception; certainly the Vatican Codex (B) supports no argument whatever, one way or the other. Hardly any description of the punctuation of the

¹ Ungnad *Babylonian Letters* (P. B. S., VII), pl. lxxxvi = Ungnad *Altbabylonische Briefe* pp. 83-84, no. 117, ll. 17-20.

manuscripts, however, is offered in the commentary, and even that little was apparently supplied expressly for the work by Sir F. G. Kenyon, Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. In particular, there seems to be need (so far as I know) of a reliable record of the punctuation of the *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus* (C) at Paris, which, to judge from an examination kindly made for me by a friend, is very unusual.

CUTHBERT LATTEY.

THE point raised by Fr Lattey is important, but it is one that raises great difficulties for an Editor of a critical apparatus. In a certain sense the punctuation of an ancient Greek work is no part of the original tradition; a properly written Greek paragraph goes in theory from the beginning to the end without punctuation, the beginnings and the due subordination of the several sentences being sufficiently indicated by the appropriate particles. The paragraph, on the other hand, is part of the text and should be indicated in an apparatus, if a full record is desired of any MS authority. Normally it is marked in MSS by the end of the last line of the paragraph being left blank, with or without a small horizontal stroke (the *paragraphus*) between that and the next line. But sometimes a break is made by only leaving a small blank space, perhaps of only one letter. This really is a sort of warning to the reader to pause. Somewhat similar is the syllable-divider, often inserted after 'barbarous' Proper Names, as in such sentences as $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\alpha\mu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\epsilon\eta$, where it stands to warn the reader against pronouncing it *a-braa-me-gen*, etc. A further advance towards punctuation is found in the habit of some scribes, e. g. of *e*, to set a point at the end of a paragraph (where really it is not needed), and also after numerals and contractions. Then besides all this there is in most MSS, beginning with *k* in the 4th century, a certain amount of real punctuation, i. e. points set in the text to indicate some sort of pause.

But how irregular and inconsistent it almost always is! In going through *k* I got the impression that some of the dots were probably made by the scribe while turning his eye to the exemplar for the next word, e. g. *gaudentes salutabant* Mk. ix 15, or *exclamaui pater* Mk. ix 24. At other places, no doubt, the dot is intentional and significant. What is an editor of a 'New Tischendorf' to do? He is not editing *k*, and has to think of balance and clarity as well as of completeness.

Fr Lattey refers to Rom. ix 5 and its disputed punctuation. In such a passage he is obviously right in saying that the facts of the transmitted punctuation should be recorded. But the value, or lack of value, in the punctuation of that verse in any MS depends very greatly

on the critical weight of the punctuation in that MS. This value can only be determined by a study of its punctuation elsewhere, in uncontroversial contexts, and the example of *k* warns us that a MS may have a supremely valuable text with a capricious punctuation. Fr Lattey quotes the discussion in the Commentary of Sanday and Headlam (p. 233-238): some readers of the JOURNAL may remember that I brought out a new interpretation of Rom. ix 5 in vol. v, pp. 451-455, to which I still adhere. The essence of this interpretation is that *εὐλογητὸς εἰστοῦσ ἀἰῶνας* implies that the Holy Name (the Tetragrammaton) has been explicitly or implicitly *pronounced*. Well, it is interesting to read Sir F. G. Kenyon's statement (*S. & H.*, p. 234) that A in Rom. ix 5 puts a point after *σάρκα* and also leaves a slight space: the punctuation is here by the original hand and so has some weight, though I am inclined to lay more stress on the 'slight space'. But what is still more important is that in Rom. i 25 before *ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺσ ἀἰῶνας* there is also a point and a slight space. This double occurrence of the slight space may be held to indicate that the scribe of A recognized that in both cases we are dealing with similar formulae.

I regret the length of this digression—all about a single point! But I add it to shew how difficult it is to discuss these points properly without verbiage. I am sure all those at all responsible for the projected 'New Tischendorf' are grateful to Fr Lattey for drawing attention to the importance of recording the punctuation of ancient MSS, and if after consideration it is decided not to record it, it will be with the time-honoured phrase that 'the editor regrets that considerations of space make it impossible to comply with Fr Lattey's interesting suggestion'.

F. C. BURKITT.

PSALM lxxxix 9.

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת מִי־כְמוֹד חֲסִין יְהוָה וַיִּאֲמֹנְתָךְ סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ

THE verse seems to translate awkwardly. Would it not be an improvement to divide after *כמוך* (as Kittel does) and change *יה חסין* to *ךך חסין* or *ךך חסין*? It occurs to me that possibly this was the original reading, for the change would get rid of the unusual *חסין* (described in BDB as an Aramaism); and would be in keeping with the language of the rest of the Psalm, in which *חסך* and *אמונה* occur in several places.

T. H. HUNT.

If this *v.* needs emendation, Mr. Hunt's is a good one. חסין for חסוך is an easy error of transcription: cf. Hab. i 5, 'Behold ye among the nations', where LXX reads בניים, καταφρονηταί, for בניים (M. T.). But is it well to 'get rid of' Aramaisms? Aramaic was the *lingua franca* for centuries of Western Asia. We ought rather to expect some Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew of almost any age. Moreover when the Hebrew thought of his God and looked down on the gods or the aspirations of his neighbours, he might easily drop into the use of an Aramaic word or phrase. So in Ps. ii 12 he uses the Aramaic phrase נשקו בר 'Kiss the Son'.¹ Very significant also is the Aramaic *v.* in Jer. x 11, 'Thus shall ye say unto them' (the Gentiles who would tempt you to forsake יהוה), 'The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens'. To omit this *v.* as editors do is to disregard Hebrew psychology. The root חסן, whether Aramaic or Hebrew appears nearly a dozen times in the Old Testament.

W. EMERY BARNES.

A STAGE IN THE HISTORY OF THE LAUDIAN MS OF ACTS.

MR E. A. LOWE contributes to the January number of *Speculum* a welcome note on the later history of the famous Laudian manuscript of the Acts (Bodl. Libr., MS Laud. Gr. 35). That this book was used by the Venerable Bede for his commentary is generally acknowledged; but what happened to the manuscript after it left Bede's hands and before it was acquired by Archbishop Laud is not clearly ascertained. About twelve years ago I noticed three lines written with a dry point on fol. 226 b. These lines are read by Mr Lowe as

MARIAE UIR[GINIS]
GAMUNDUM.

I tried without success to explain this last word, and abandoned the enquiry. But I mentioned to Dr Craster the fact that these scratches could be discerned, and he wrote a short paper on the history of the manuscript in the *Bodleian Quarterly Record* ii 288-290 (1919). He was of opinion that the word in the last line 'is apparently a variant of Gimmund or Gaemmund, a name of common occurrence in Germany in the eighth and ninth centuries, and found at Lauresheim, Fulda, and St Gall. Inasmuch as the connexion of the manuscript with Bede

¹ On this passage see *J. T. S.* xviii 24-29.

and even with the Anglo-Saxon world rests wholly on internal evidence it is important to find a Teutonic name inscribed on its pages'.

Mr Lowe, on the other hand, takes the word to indicate the name, not of a person, but of a place: 'Gamundum, Gamundium, Gamundiae, can be no other than Hornbach, situated in the diocese of Metz.' It may now be added that the *Monasterium Hornbah* is glossed *sive Gamundias* in the ninth-century confraternity book of St Gall.¹ This identification is beyond dispute. If any question arise about the termination of the word, it may be added that both forms Gamundium and Gamundum are found in the two earliest manuscripts of the Life of St Pirminius,² which was composed in the beginning of the ninth century,³ and in which it is said that Pirminius died there⁴ (about 753). Walahfrid Strabo, in verses written about 826, speaks of the saint as buried at Hornbach,⁵ a place which lies in what is now the Palatinate, about four miles south of Zweibrücken (Deux-Ponts).

The fact thus established that the Laudian manuscript was at some time in the eighth century preserved at Hornbach is of remarkable interest. St Pirminius is known as the founder of the famous monastery of Reichenau on the Lower Lake of Constance. He used to be taken for a Frank, but Hrabanus Maurus says expressly that he left his native land and settled in the Frankish territory.⁶ He was not an Irishman, and Hauck thought that he was perhaps an Anglo-Saxon.⁷ In 724 he founded the monastery at Reichenau, but after three years was obliged to depart. He made his way into Alsatia, and there took part in erecting a monastery at Murbach in the Vosges. Before many years Murbach became the home of the compilers of the earliest Annals drawn up on a definitely Anglo-Saxon model, reckoned by the years of the Incarnation, and in part written in an Insular hand. These Annals enjoyed a very wide diffusion. They passed in course of time down the Rhine to Cologne, across France into Normandy, and from Rouen into England, where they formed the basis of many sets of Annals; but these belong to a later stage. All that concerns us here is that the Laudian manuscript was at Hornbach at a time when that monastery was closely affected by Anglo-Saxon influences.

REGINALD L. POOLE.

¹ P. Piper *Libri Confraternitatum* (Berlin, 1884) p. 42.

² Ch. vi, ed. O. Holder-Egger, 1887, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* xv p. 27.

³ The editor, Holder-Egger, explains the word 'Gemünd, ahd. "Gamundi, gemundi," est confluentia'.

⁴ p. 30.

⁵ *Poetae Aevi Carolini* ii 304, ed. E. Dümmler, Berlin, 1884.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 224.

⁷ *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* i (3rd ed., 1904), 347.