

and tossing of sleeplessness to the dripping of water or the tripping of feet; the underlying idea is that of restless or ceaseless motion of a petty kind.

In discussing  $\text{פְּלַג לְשׁוֹנִים}$  (Ps. lv 10)<sup>1</sup> I suggested reading  $\text{לְשׁוֹנִים}$  'the altercation of tongues'<sup>2</sup>; but the plural  $\text{לְשׁוֹנִים}$ , if it were accepted, would be a rather extreme Aramaism, and it is preferable to retain the M.T.'s  $\text{לְשׁוֹנֵי}$ <sup>3</sup> and suppose that the suffix refers to the enemy and the wicked mentioned above (in v. 4). G. R. DRIVER.

### CAPERNAUM, CAPHARNAUM

THE spelling of the place-name Capernaum or Capharnaum raises some important questions of interest both in the textual criticism of the Gospels and in Semitic nomenclature generally.

#### I

The attestation, so far as I can ascertain, for *Capharnaum* in Greek MSS is:

										<i>hiant</i>
Matt. iv 13	NB	D	Z	33	700		(Θ)			—
viii 5	NB			33	700					DZ
xi 23	NB	D		33	700					Z
xvii 24	NB	D		33	700				W	Z
Mk. i 21	NB	D	Δ	33	700	13.69.124	Θ .565	W		—
ii 1	NB	D	Δ	33	700		124 Θ .565	W		—
ix 33	NB	D	Δ				543* (Θ) .565	W		33
Lk. iv 23	NB	D		X	33			W		CΞ
31	NB	D		(X)	33			W		Ξ
vii 1	NB	C*D	Ξ	X	33	700		W		—
x 15	NB	C D	Ξ R		33	700				—
Jn. ii 12	NB			T <sup>b</sup>						CD
iv 46	NB	C D		T <sup>b</sup>	33			W		
vi 17	NB	D					y <sup>ser</sup>	W		C
24	NB	D						W		C
59	NB	C D		T	33			Θ	W	—

In Matt. iv 13 Θ has *καπαρ-*, in Mk. ix 33 Θ has *καπερφαρναυμ*, in Lk. iv 31 X has *καφερ-*. 'To Capernaum' is omitted in John ii 12 W.<sup>4</sup>

Latin texts all attest *Capharnaum* (often *Cafarnaum*), except *q* which has uniformly *Capernaum*, wherever extant. The Gothic has *Kafar-*

<sup>1</sup> In *J.T.S.* XXXIII 40-41.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Ps. xxxi 21 (ריב לשנות).

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Dan. iii 4, 7, 31 (לשניא).

<sup>4</sup> Sanders's collation of W at Mk. ii 1 gives *καρφαναουμ*, but as no *sic* is appended I suppose it is a printer's error. In Lk. x 15 Tischendorf has X instead of Ξ: an error, as appears from Tregelles.

*naum*, so that in this instance the text of *q* must have been directly revised from the Greek, not (like *f*) from the Gothic. The Egyptian versions and the Armenian attest 'Capharnaum'. The text of Mark in Old Georgian is well edited from the MSS known as Adysh, Opiza, and Tbet'. In all three places Adysh has *Καφ'arnaom*, Opiza has *Καφ'arnaum*, but Tbet' *Καπεrnaum*. This suggests that Tbet' (Blake's B) has been emended, and from a Greek source. The Syriac evidence is considered below.

From what has been already said two deductions are clear. First, there is one serious variant, not two, viz. *καφαρ-* or *καπερ-*: it is not a question of mere itacism, whether of consonant or vowel. In the second place, if we consider the case on its merits apart from general theories about the text, there is an impressive case in favour of Capharnaum in all Four Gospels. The Latin and Egyptian evidence is consistently on that side, so are the two oldest Greek MSS. Further, *Καφαρναούμ* is the form consistently used by Origen, both when quoting Scripture and when referring to the town in his own words. It is also the reading of Eusebius, in his work on the topographical names of Palestine, both in referring to the place itself (Lagarde, *OS* 273<sup>86</sup>) and in referring to Chorazin, which he says is at the twelfth milestone from Capharnaum (Lagarde, *OS* 303<sup>79</sup>). Another witness for *Καφαρναούμ* is Epiphanius 136 (*Haer.* 30), where he is writing about Count Joseph, and naming places in Galilee. On the side of 'Capernaum' there is no ancient version, except the revised Latin represented by *q*. In other words, *Καπερναούμ* belongs to the Byzantine text and to that alone: there is no sign of its existence before the 4th century.<sup>1</sup>

From this point of view, viz. that of the assured originality of 'Capharnaum', the evidence of the inconsistent witnesses to that spelling is instructive. Fifty or sixty years ago the point of view of Scrivener and Burgon was still dominant, and the theories of Westcott and Hort were regarded as new and revolutionary: now Dr Hort and his theories hold the field, and the most debated questions circle round the variants we have learned to call 'Caesarean'. But this question of the value of Caesarean readings is not a rehabilitation of the current Greek text of the Middle Ages or of Burgon's strictures on Hort. Nevertheless, those who for any reason make serious excursions into the actual testimony of Byzantine Gospel texts soon find out how much variation of a sort the later texts actually present, as compared for instance with the uniformity of the Peshitta or even the Armenian. And so from time to time the doubt cannot but present itself whether 'the Byzantine text' (i.e. v. Soden's *K*) is only a mere recension, a single

<sup>1</sup> It may be noticed that two fragments from Oxyrhynchus (*OP* 847, 1566), both of the 4th century, attest Capharnaum and not Capernaum.

revised text with sub-varieties. It is by consideration of a variant like that of the spelling of Capharnaum that we may be reassured. We see the influence of a dominant but intrinsically inferior text asserting itself, but not completely, and leaving traces here and there of an older form of reading.

Thus C has *Caper-* in Matt. and Mk., *Cap̄har-* in John. It has *Caper-* in Lk. iv 31, but in Lk. vii 1 *Cap̄har-* corrected to *Caper-* by C<sup>s</sup>. Δ, as in other variations, is only non-Byzantine for Mk. The Graeco-Egyptian fragments called T, and also Z and Ξ, have *Caḥhar-* wherever extant. L, we may remark, has *Caper-* everywhere, but 33 only in Jn. ii 12, vi 17 and 24.

Of MSS with Caesarean tendencies, the ancient MS now at Washington has the Byzantine spelling in Matt. (*except* xvii 24), and also once in Luke. 565 has the non-Byzantine spelling in Mark only, Θ also in Matt. iv 13 and Jn. vi 59. The best half of the Ferrar-group has it in Mk. i 21, only 124 in Mk. ii 1, only 543\* in Mk. ix 33. Curiously enough, 700 has the non-Byzantine spelling 4/4 in Matt., 2/3 in Mk., 2/4 in Lk., not at all in Jn. γ<sup>scr</sup> is a Lectionary, now in the British Museum (*Burney* 22), but such sporadic instances of Καφαρναούμ (Jn. vi 17) seem to be very rare. Further, the presence in Mark of the non-Byzantine spelling in several documents, but not elsewhere, shews that we have to do with assimilation to a standard rather than with the caprices of scribes.

The Syriac evidence must now be examined. All Syriac texts but the Harclean have ܩܦܪܢܗܘܡ (KPRNḤUM). As the inserted Semitic guttural Ḥ shews, this is a translation rather than a transliteration, and means 'the village of Nahum', or rather *Nahumsthorpe*, for the word ܩܦܪܢܗܘܡ 'village', though (like the English 'thorp') quite common as part of a place-name, is not the usual word for 'village' or 'hamlet'. As for the pronunciation, both the Nestorian and the Jacobite tradition attest *kpar-*, not *kper-*. Nestorian *p* in such a position is always 'hard', but the Jacobite (e.g. Gwilliam's Mas. 2 on Matt. xi 23) regards the *p* as 'soft', i.e. *φ* not *π*. In other words, the Syriac tradition of the pronunciation, *quantum ualeat*, attests *καφαρ-*, not *καπερ-*.

By contrast to this some MSS of the Harclean have ܩܦܪܢܗܘܡ (e.g. *White*, Mk. i 21, ix 33), or ܩܦܪܢܗܘܡ (Jn. vi 17). These learned monstrosities are obviously meant to indicate *Καπερναούμ*. No doubt that was the spelling in Thomas of Harkel's Greek MS.

The late Dr Nestle made the suggestion that the Greek various readings *Καφαρναούμ*, *Καπερναούμ*, originated in attempts to put ܩܦܪܢܗܘܡ into Greek. In the form that he made this suggestion it is unsatisfactory, for the Greek is original and the Syriac translation or transliteration a mere equivalent. But he made a most useful contribution to knowledge

by pointing out that Theodoret in his *Historia Religiosa* XIX, a non-Biblical context about a place on the Euphrates in his own diocese, which he himself had visited, calls the village Καπερσανᾶ.<sup>1</sup> Nestle inferred that Καπερ- was the local Aramaic pronunciation of the word for 'thorp'.

The matter, I venture to think, is a little more complicated. There are really two words, with the same consonants but different vocalization, *kaphr* and *kaphar*. The first does not occur in Aramaic or Hebrew, unless in the form *kópher* (1 Sam. vi 18), but does occur in Arabic (كفر *kafr*, a village). The other form, just like 'thorp' in English, hardly ever occurs by itself in the singular. It is found in the Peshitta of 1 Sam. vi 18 to render כפר (which is perhaps a collective), but the Targum has the plural of כפר, another word for village, also used in Syriac.

The proper construct state of כפר (kāphār) is כפר (kēphar). Accordingly we find -φαρ in the second syllable of certain Palestinian villages mentioned by Josephus, never -περ. Καφαρναουμ itself occurs *Bellum* ii 520, Κεφαρνωκον in *Vit.* 403 (with variants), Καφαρεκχω *Bell.* ii 573, Καφαρτοβα (with variant Καταφαρτοβα) *Bell.* iv 447. In *Ant.* xii 105 Josephus writes Καφαρσαλαμα, while in 1 Macc. vii 32 A has Χαρφαρσαλαμα, N\* Φαρσ-, N<sup>v</sup> Χαφαρσ-. This agrees with the tradition of the vowels in the Syriac Bible, east and west: there is good evidence for -φαρ-, no evidence for -περ-.

All this goes to shew that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John wrote Καφαρναούμ, and that the MSS which retain that form have preserved the true text. But to be complete we need to explain the genesis of Καπερναούμ.

I feel inclined to think that Nestle's suggestion was on the right track, and that the origin of 'Capernaum', as distinct from 'Capharnaum', is to be sought for not in Palestine, but in Northern Syria, in the region of Theodoret and of Antioch. The positive evidence is very weak, but the variant merits special attention as perhaps the most characteristic new reading presented by the Byzantine text of the Gospels, the text called Antiochian by Hort.

## II

There is one curious feature of the spelling Καπερναούμ, which may be worth pointing out. S. Jerome long ago remarked that only in the foreign word *Appadno* (Dan. xi 45) was the π-sound heard in Hebrew,

<sup>1</sup> Κώμη τίς ἐστι τοῦ Εὐφράτου ποταμοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέραν, αὐτῇ ἐπικειμένη τῇ ὄχθῃ, Καπερσανᾶ καλουμένη. The place is called by Ammianus (according to the ordinary editions) *Capersana* in xviii 18, *Capessana* in xxi 14.

everywhere else it was like  $\phi$ . This is certainly true of the transliterations in the LXX. We find  $\Phi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$  and  $\Phi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma$  ( $\Phi\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma$ ), where the Hebrew has *Par'ōah* and *Pin' hās*. The river *Pishōn* in Gen. ii 11 is transliterated  $\Phi\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\omega}\nu$  in Greek. Nor is this just a peculiarity of Hebrew and Jewish pronunciation. In the very important article by T. Pinches on 'Greek transcriptions of Babylonian Tablets' (*PSBA*, 1902, pp. 108-119) we find the same distinctions made as in the MSS of the Greek Bible.<sup>1</sup> Thus *palgu* 'canal' (written *pal-gu*) is transliterated  $\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma$ , not  $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma$  or  $\pi\alpha\lambda\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ .

Scholars from the time of Alexander, therefore, were agreed that Semitic  $\Delta$ , with or without 'dagesh', corresponded to Greek  $\phi$ , and not to  $\pi$ . When, however, we turn from the work of Alexandrian literati, whether in Egypt or in Babylonia, to the evidence of Greek place-names we find a wholly different state of things. Palestine itself is the land of the Philistines ( $\Phi\upsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\iota\epsilon\iota\mu$ , Gen. x 14), the port of Jerusalem is *Joppa* ( $\text{Ἰόππη}$ ), Heb. *Yāphō*, modern *Yaffā*, *Yāfā*. Farther north we have  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha$ , Heb. *Šārephath*, modern *Šarafend*. If, then, Capersana really be a place called in Semitic  $\text{ܣܢܫܘܪܦܐ}$  or  $\text{ܣܢܫܘܪܦܐ}$  ('Sanasthorpe')—which, after all, remains to be proved—we may add it to the list of geographical names, in which Greek  $\pi$  corresponds to Semitic  $\Delta$ . In any case the contrast between the usage in 'geographical names, no doubt dating from a remote antiquity, and the usage of post-Alexandrian transliterators, deserves to be pointed out. At the same time this does not affect the witness of Origen, of Eusebius, and of Epiphanius to  $\text{Καφαρναούμ}$ , the spelling adopted by modern critical editors. F. C. BURKITT.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE ON $\text{Ματθαῖος}$ , $\text{Ματθαῖος}$

THE spelling of the name of 'Matthew' with  $-\theta\theta-$  is rarer than the spelling  $\text{Καπερναούμ}$  for 'Capharnaum'. It occurs as follows:—

<i>Title</i>	NB D W	
Matt. ix 9	NB*D W	
x 3	NB D	W has $\mu\alpha\tau'\theta\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$
<i>Colophon</i>	B D W	N has no Colophon
Mk. iii 18	B*D W	N reads $\mu\alpha\tau\theta\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$
Lk. vi 15	NB D W	

To these should be added  $\text{Ματθαῖος}$  in Acts i 13 NB\*D, and  $\text{Ματθᾶν}$  in Matt. i 15 B D<sup>luc</sup> *Oxy.Pap.* 2.

The Syriac has  $\text{ܡܬܬܘܝܘܨ}$ . All Latins have *Matthaeus* or *Mattheus*, even the Latin of Codex Bezae (*d*). The Gothic attests  $-\theta\theta-$  except in Mk. iii 18, where it has  $-\tau\theta-$ . The Sahidic has  $-\theta\theta-$  everywhere.

<sup>1</sup> See on this the paper by the present writer in *PSBA*, 1902, pp. 143 ff.

All other Greek authorities than those quoted seem to attest *Ματθαῖος*, including the MS of Origen on St John.

It appears to me that the inference to be drawn is that *Ματθαῖος* is original, but that it was almost everywhere emended to *Ματθαῖος* under the influence of orthographical theory. The difference between the case of *Ματθαῖος* and that of *Καθαρναούμ* consists in this, that Κ. is only the name of an obscure village that happens to be mentioned in the Gospels, the spelling of which, therefore, more or less depends on the MS tradition, whereas M. is the name of an Evangelist, the spelling of whose name was determined by orthographical theories apart from that found in ancient MSS.

F. C. B.

## CRITICAL NOTES ON THE BLESSING OF MOSES

(Deut. xxxiii)

Deut. xxxiii 21

וַיְרֵא רֵאשִׁית לֹא בִישָׁם הִלְקַת מְחַקֵּק סָפִין  
וַיִּתֵּן רֵאשִׁי עִם צִדְקַת ה' עֲשֵׂה וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל

This verse has proved so difficult to interpret, that Driver<sup>1</sup> remarks 'it can hardly be made to yield tolerable sense'. Three main renderings have been suggested for stichoi b and c. They are as follows:—

1. For *there* was hidden the portion of the Lawgiver (Moses),  
And the heads of the people came.<sup>2</sup>

But סָפִין really means 'panelled' and not 'hidden', and therefore the Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon suggests an emendation to צָפִין. Moreover, Moses's grave on Mount Nebo was not in the portion of Gad but in that of Reuben,<sup>3</sup> and one fails to see how the existence of a burial plot upon it made the land desirable for settlement.

2. Most authorities therefore interpret מְחַקֵּק in a general sense, as 'commander, military chief' and compare its use in Gen. xlix 10, Judges ix 14.<sup>4</sup> They render:—

For *there* a portion (worthy) of a ruler was reserved,  
And the heads of the people came.

3. Some scholars who render stichos c—'he came with the heads of the people', emend וַיִּתֵּן into וַיָּאֵחַ<sup>5</sup> or וַיִּתֵּן אָחַ<sup>6</sup> because of the harshness of the accusative after  $\sqrt{\text{חָה}}$ . This emendation is based on LXX and Vulg.<sup>7</sup>, who were, however, quite in the dark themselves as to the meaning

<sup>1</sup> I.C.C. on Deuteronomy p. 411.

<sup>2</sup> So Vulgate, Peshittā, Rashi.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Num. xxxii 38; Josh. xiii 20.

<sup>4</sup> So Ibn Ezra, Ehrlich, Driver, Jewish Publication Society's Version.

<sup>5</sup> Oort, Emendationes, *ad loc.*

<sup>6</sup> Dillmann, Oettli, others.

<sup>7</sup> ἄμα, cum.