of difference between *timere* and *vereri* but it is hardly likely that the translators were worrying about that. Probably they disliked the series of three words ending in -bunt, and the change is meant to provide a variation. The same motive will very likely explain many other changes, such as the transposition of *stulti* and *insipientes* in 93, 8, and the substitution of *gratia* for *misericordia* whenever the word is immediately followed by *fidelitas*. This sensitiveness to sounds of words is probably the cause of a multitude of small alterations, which, as they produce little or no difference in the sense, have perhaps caused greater irritation than the more radical changes.

In this last particular the laudable zeal of the translators (part and parcel undoubtedly of the ‘zeal of Thy house’) does seem to have carried them a little too far. But as regards the subject of the Latin in general, our only wish is that they had been even more zealous, more thoroughgoing in carrying out the sound principles which they themselves had adopted as their own.

W. REES.

St Mary’s, Cadogan St, London.

**A NOTE ON ‘LIPS-CHOROS’ IN ACTS 27, 12**

In the January issue of *Scripture* (pp. 144–6), Fr C. Lattey, S.J., following K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. V, pp. 33 8–44), considers the two Greek words *lips* and *choros* in Acts xxvii, 12, rendered in DV ‘southwest’ and ‘northwest’ respectively, to be two different names, a Greek and a Latin one, for the same wind.

In support of this explanation I wish to point out that the juxtaposition of two words of a different origin but having the same meaning is not an unusual phenomenon in languages which had to bear the impact of foreign languages. There are scores of examples in the Book of Common Prayer: thus ‘pray and beseech’, ‘acknowledge and confess’, ‘vanquish and overcome’, ‘trust and confidence’, etc. All these doublets are made up of a Saxon and a Latin element and testify to the Norman influence over the English language. I can quote further examples from Maltese. Thus we say: *emminni u ikkredini* ‘believe me’, the first being Arabo-Maltese, the other the Italian *credimi* : *skond il-fehma u l-intenzjoni* corresponding to Ital. *secondo l’intenzione, intenzione* being the Italian equivalent of the Semitico-Maltese *fehma* : in the act of contrition we say *réixtek u offendejtek* ‘I have offended thee’. Other parallels are: *mungbell* ‘volcano’, which is made up of Latin *mon(s)* or Italian *mon(te)* and Arabo-Maltese *gebel* (jebel) ‘mountain’; *marsaskala*, the name of a small bay in the eastern coast of the island made up of Arabo-Maltese *marsa* ‘harbour’ and Latin *scala* with the same meaning.
If both lips and choros means south-west, the geographical position of Phenice is the same as that of our matsa sirocco, a small bay looking towards the south-west.

P. P. SAYDON.

Royal University, Malta.

BOOK REVIEWS


This enrichment of English literature in a 'very special field of studies' is owing to the fact that the author is one of those to 'whose work and very existence' Germany was lately hostile, and it is a tribute to his linguistic ability that he has written this book in a language which is not his own. It deals with the problem of the aberrant texts which had engaged the attention of scholars even before the appearance of Mangey's edition in 1742. It had been conjectured that parts of Aquila's version had been taken from the Hexapla and inserted in Philo's text by a copyist. Before the appearance of Cohn and Wendland's edition, however, there was no complete presentment of the evidence on which alone an adequate study can be based. Both of these editors had intended to investigate the question on the basis of the evidence they had accumulated but both were prevented by death.

The lemmata, or passages of Scripture on which Philo's exposition is ostensibly based, often differ in some MSS from the readings of the Septuagint. This led Schröder to conclude that Philo took a text other than the Septuagint as the basis of his exposition; and this conclusion has itself been used by Paul Kahle in support of his thesis that originally there were several different Greek versions of the Old Testament of which the Septuagint is but one. Dr Katz has come to a different conclusion based on a minute examination of the whole field of available textual evidence. In its broad outline his view is that Philo's biblical text was that of the Septuagint. In some copies, however, the lemmata were omitted and in a later copy were replaced by a text other than that which Philo had had before him. The editor responsible went further and even at times interfered with the text as utilized in the course of the Alexandrine philosopher's exposition. This new text, is not, however, of a uniform character. In part Dr Katz finds it to be of the same type as a recension (R) identified by Rahlfs in the book of Ruth, but the interpolator may sometimes have inserted matter taken directly from Aquila's version. Dr Katz adduces evidence to show that the interpolator was a Christian, probably belonging to the Antiochian school and to be dated between the middle of the fourth and the middle of the sixth centuries. This bare summary indicates the importance of this