MICHAEL G. COX

AUGUSTINE, JEROME, TYCONIUS AND THE *LINGUA PUNICA*

Introduction

Augustine of Hippo (354-430) is our only direct witness to the survival of the Punic language in North Africa in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. There has been surprisingly little unanimity among scholars as to how his references to Punic are to be interpreted. The ensuing controversy, characterized by Simon[1] as a "dialogue de sourds", has divided scholars into opposing camps.

Frend[2] interprets Augustine's reference to 'Punic' as really indicative of Libyan, i.e. Berber. In this he has been followed by Courtois.[3] Much emphasis has been placed upon the lack of Punic inscriptions after the early centuries of the Christian era. It has also been suggested that since a Frenchman in colonial days might not necessarily distinguish between Arabic and Berber, Augustine would have been equally ignorant with respect to Punic and Berber.

The entire argument based on inscriptional material largely ignores two important factors — widespread illiteracy, and large-scale conversion of the population to Christianity in the mid-3rd century.[4] Many cultures have preserved their languages for centuries, even millennia, despite illiteracy. We may think of Quechua in Peru, or, in North Africa itself, the Berber dialects. On the second count it is noteworthy that with the desertion of the sanctuaries of Baal pagan inscriptions in Punic cease. With Christianity came the codex of the Scriptures, drawing attention to calligraphy rather than epigraphy. Christian inscriptions are overwhelmingly but not exclusively in Latin.[5]

Green's study[6] of Augustine's references to Punic is comprehensive but not ex-

---

[1] M. Simon, 'Punique ou berbère'. *Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne*, Études Juives VI, Paris 1962, p. 89.

[2] W. H. C. Frend, 'A note on the Berber backround in the life of Augustine'. *Journal of Theological Studies* XLIII, 1942, pp. 111-191.

[3] C. Courtois, 'Saint Augustin et le problème de la survivance de punique'. *Revue Africaine* XXXIV 1950, pp. 259-282.

[4] P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* 1. Paris 1901, p. 11.

[5] See Segert pp. 265f (81.43) and KAI 180 pp. 32, 166f for Christian funeral inscriptions from Libya (4th century A.D.) in Punic written in Latin script. They testify, among other things, to the continued bearing of pagan names, both Latin and Punic, by Punic-speaking Christians. E.g. MERCURI AVO SANU VI 'Mercurius lived six years'; AMONIS AVO SANUTH XXV 'Amonis (Ḥammōn) lived twenty-five years'; AVO ANNIBONI SANU [   ] 'Annibonius (Hannibal) lived ... years'.

[6] W. M. Green, 'Augustine's use of Punic'. *Semitic and Oriental studies presented to William Popper.* University of California Publications in Semitic Philology XI. Berkeley & Los Angeles 1951, pp. 179-190. The reader is referred to this article for the Latin texts of Augustine *in extenso*; henceforward 'Green'.

haustive. He has demonstrated conclusively that Augustine refers to the Semitic language, Punic, brought to North Africa by the Phoenicians, and not to Berber, nor even a Punic-ized Berber.

Simon[7] claims that the Punic-speaking Donatist 'Circumcellions' could read the Bible in Hebrew, due to the similarity of the two Semitic languages. He overstates his case by an over-reliance on Hebrew and Arabic and a failure to consider actual Punic material as known from the inscriptions.

Brown[8] plays down the importance of Punic, emphasizing Latin as the sole language of culture in late Roman Africa. Millar[9] speculates that Punic was used alongside Latin, but that the use of non-durable writing materials has prevented the preservation of later Neo-Punic texts. The article of Vattioni[10] deserves to be better known for its use of Punic material.[11]

We shall now turn to an analysis of Augustine's Punic vocabulary. Our approach here is a lexical one, rather than the text-by-text method adopted by Green, in order to facilitate the linguistic and theological classification of the material. The Latin equivalents given are Augustine's own.

AUGUSTINE'S PUNIC VOCABULARY

A) Direct references

I. Proper Names
1. Pagan Divinities

Baal = dominus 'lord'[12]; Heb. **ba'al**; LXX βααλ; Latin Bible versions **Baal**; Phoen. **b'l** [*ba'l]; Latin transcriptions BAL (Segert p. 305), cf. Hanni**bal**. Is the Punic form quoted by Augustine influenced by the biblical title or is he referring to the traditional Phoenician form? Since ʿayin could not be written in Latin letters it is uncertain whether the transcription reflects the loss of the ʿayin in Neo-Punic (*ba'l > *bāl) (Segert 33.513.1 p. 62). Latin transcriptions of such names as Hannibal [*ḫanni-ba'l]

[7] M. Simon, 'Le judaïsme berbère dans l'Afrique ancienne'. op. cit. pp. 46f.

[8] P. Brown, 'Christianity and local culture in late Roman Africa'. *Journal of Roman Studies* (= *JRS*) LVIII, 1968, pp. 85-95. Brown declares, "Augustine will use the word 'Punic' to describe the native dialects which most countrymen would have spoken exclusively, and which many townsmen shared with Latin. This was not because such men spoke the language of the ancient Carthaginians" (P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography*. London 1967). Such unfounded statements fly in the face of the evidence. Confusion between Punic and Libyan persists in such recent works as J. Cuoq, *L'Église d'Afrique du Nord du IIe au XIIe siècle* (Paris 1984), p. 38: "Le berbère, ou mieux le libyque, n'a pas de littérature...Seul, saint Augustin en a conservé quelques mots, modeste vestige de la préhistoire d'une langue, qui s'est maintenue jusqu'à nos jours, à la différence du punique, qui a disparu, absorbé par la langue des conquérants arabes probablement."

[9] F. Millar, 'Local cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin'. *JRS* LVIII, 1968, pp. 126-134.

[10] F. Vattioni, 'Sant Agostino e la civiltà punica'. *Augustinianum* 8, Rome 1968, pp. 436-467.

[11] The classic work of Gautier (E. F. Gautier, *Les siècles obscurs du Maghreb*.Paris 1927) is still of value, despite the author's confessed ignorance of Punic. See esp. pp. 109-114.

[12] Nam Baal Punici videntur dicere dominum: unde Baalsamen quasi dominum caeli intelliguntur dicere: Samen quippe apud eos caeli appellantur. *Quaest. Hept.* CSEL 28:2, 458; Green p. 187.

reflect the Punic pronunciation. The same name appears in the Neo-Punic period as ANNIBONI (Annibon-ius); see footnote 5. With the loss of the gutturals a vowel change also took place. *ḫanni-ba'l > *anni-bāl > *anni-bōl > *anni-bōn. Was, then, the vulgar pronunciation of Ba'al [*bōn] in Augustine's day? Whether Punic-speaking Christians or Jews used this title with reference to the God of the Bible is a matter of speculation (see 'Adeodatus' below).

Baalsamen = dominum caeli 'lord of heaven'[13], **samen** = caeli 'heaven(s)'; Heb. **šāmayim** (dual); Phoen. and Pun. **b'l šmm [*ba'l šamem]** (KAI p. 57). In Greek transcription the title appears as (βεελ) σαμην (Segert p. 111). This would seem to reflect the Aramaic title **b^e'ēl s^emīn**, rather than the Phoenician form (cf. Jerome below). In a Punic inscription from Carthage (KAI A 78 p. 17, B p. 96) there appears the name **šln** (cf. **šlm**), attesting alternation between final **-m** and **-n** in Punic.

Abaddir(es) and **Eucaddir(es)**[14]. If the deities Abaddires are Semitic, the name may mean 'majestic Father' (Heb. **'āb 'addīr**; Phoen. and Pun. **'b 'dr [*'ab 'addīr]**) **'adr [*'addir]** is attested as an epithet of Ba'al Hammōn (KAI 138 pp. 26, 137; 162 pp. 30, 152). The name of the priests, Eucaddires, may be Berber with the second element loaned from Punic (cf. Vattioni p. 451).

2. Christian Martyrs

Namphamo = boni pedis homo 'the man of the good foot'[15]; Heb. **na'am pa'mō** 'the beauty of his foot', Phoen. and Pun. **n'm** 'good', **p'm** 'foot', cf. KAI 140 pp. 138-139 **n'mp'm[']** (***na'mpa'mō** or NP **nāmpāmō**). According to Benz[16] ***na'm** is a divine title, in addition to meaning 'good' or 'pleasant'. The name Namphamo is attested as both masculine and feminine (KAI, *loc. cit.*).

Miggin[17], Phoen. and Pun. √**mgn** pi. 'to dedicate'. The name Miggin means 'he has dedicated (a son?)'; alternative form **Magon** (Qal); Latin transcriptions Magonus and Miggin (KAI p. 67).

3. A Religious Sect

Abelonii, Abeliani[18]. According to Augustine this was a rural sect in the country-side around Hippo. They called themselves after Abel, the son of Adam and Eve. (Heb. **heḇel, hāḇel**). If derived from the Hebrew the name might be ***habelōn(im)**. The Punic may be ***'ab 'elon(im)**, but as Vattioni points out, 'Father of God' or 'Father of the gods' is hardly a fitting name. If *dalet* has dropped out the name might be **'abd'elon**

---

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] ...in sacerdotes Eucaddires et in numinibus Abaddires. *Epist.* 17:2, CSEL 34:1, 41f.; Green p. 180.

[15] ...archimartyrum Namphamonem. *Epist.* 16,2, CSEL 34:1, 37f.; Green p. 180. Nam si ea vocabula interpretemur, Namphamo quid aliud significat quam boni pedis hominem? *Epist.*17:2; Green p. 180.

[16] F. L. Benz, *Personal names in the Phoenician and Punic inscriptions*.Rome 1972, p. 362; see also p. 393.

[17] Migginem (acc.). *Epist.* 16:2; Green p. 180.

[18] Abelonii vocabantur, Punica declinatione nominis. *Haer.* 87 PL 42, 47; Green p. 188; Vattioni p. 450. See also article 'Abeloim' (O. Wermelinger) in *Augustinus-Lexicon* 1, ed. C. Mayer, Stuttgart 1986.

'servant of God' (Vattioni pp. 450f.). If so, the misinterpretation is not Augustine's; it was either current among the sectarians themselves, or else was due to outsiders' misconstruing the true name. The form Abeliani is Augustine's latinisation.

4. **Chanani** (variant: **Chenani**) = Punicus. See below.

5. **Sanam** and **Lucitas** (*Epist.* 16, 2). These names remain obscure (see Green pp. 180f), unless Sanam is connected with **šnm** 'two'.

II. Common Nouns

mammon = lucrum 'profit', 'wealth'[19], **mammona** = divitiae 'riches' ('Hebrew'), NT μαμωνᾶς (Matt. 6:24, Lk. 16:9), Aram. **māmōnā'**, Vulg. **mamona**. Augustine's Bible text is an Old Latin one. The double *m* does not represent a double consonant in either Aramaic or Punic. Augustine is our sole witness for the Punic word *mamon or *māmōn (J-H *in loc.*). His reference to the 'Hebraei' may indicate his ignorance of Hebrew and Aramaic, leading him to confuse them. Or, since he refers to the 'Hebrews' rather than the Hebrew language, might he be referring to contemporary Jews, possibly merchants at Carthage or Hippo, or to the Aramaic Targum in use in their synagogues (cf. *De Serm. Dom. in monte* 1, 9, 23 CC p. 24 1.518 ; PL 34 1240-1: 'quod audiui a quodam Hebraeo, cum id interrogassem.')? Might **mamon** even be a Phoenician (or Punic) loan-word in Hebrew, Targumic Aramaic and NT Greek?[20] The Phoenicians were wealthy merchants *par excellence*, as is frequently mentioned in the Bible (e.g. Is. 23, Ezek. 26-28). Lecerf[21] allows for the possibility that '**mammon**' was a loanword from Libyan. This would seem unlikely.

iar = lignum 'wood', 'timber'[22]. Heb. **ya'ar** 'forest', Pun. **yr** [*ya'r > *yār] 'wood'. In a Numidian-Punic bilingual inscription from Dougga (Thugga) (KAI 100 1.6) the word appears in the form **yr**, in the expression **hḥršm šyr** [*haḥoršim šeyār] 'the

---

[19] Quod Punici dicunt mammon Latine lucrum vocatur. Quod Hebraei dicunt mammona Latine divitiae vocantur. *Serm.* 113:2 PL38, 648; Mammona apud Hebraeos divitiae appellari dicuntur. Congruit et Punicum nomen: nam lucrum Punice mammon dicitur. *De Serm. Dom.* 2:14, 47 PL 34, 1290; Green p. 183; Mamona divitiae dicuntur nomine hebraeo, unde et punice mamon lucrum dicitur. *De Lect. Evang.* I-III, 248f., Vattioni p. 448.

[20] MH and Targ. Aram. **māmōn**. **Māmōn** is not attested in Biblical Hebrew, but the Hebrew word **beṣa'** 'unjust gain, profit' is translated in the Targums by **māmōn** (e.g. Gen. 37:26; Ju. 5:19; 1 Sam. 8:3; Is. 33:15; Ez. 22:13,27). It is noteworthy that the word is identical in Hebrew, Aramaic and Punic (Phoenician?) without any of the characteristic vowel shifts. Thus we do not find such forms as Aram. *me mōn or *me mān or Punic *māmūn.

Another Semitic word preserved in NT Greek, perhaps in Phoenician form, is ἀρραβών, Heb. **'ērābōn** (2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5; Eph. 1:14). It was probably brought to Greece by the Phoenicians (G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh 1937, *in loc.*). This too is a financial term, meaning 'earnest'. The Hebrew word **ma'ărāḇ** 'articles of exchange, merchandise', from the same verbal root √'rḇ (also attested in Phoenician), appears only in Ezek. 27 with reference to Tyre (9 times: vv. 13,17,19,25,27,33,34; verb also in vv. 9,27; BDB *in loc.*).

[21] Lecerf, 'Notule sur Saint Augustin et les survivances puniques'. *Augustinus Magister*, Paris 1954, pp. 32-3.

[22] Quod Punici dicunt "iar"... lignum. *In Psalm.* 123:8 PL 37, 1644f.; Green p. 184.

woodcutters', with the loss of the ᶜayin in vulgar Punic. It is uncertain whether **iar** is the vulgar form in Neo-Punic , or the more 'correct ' form ***ya'r**.

edom = sanguis 'blood'[23]. Augustine explains the biblical name Edom from Gen. 25:30, seeking support from Hebrew and Punic—the former at second-hand (qui illam linguam noverunt), possibly from the Jews, or else from Origen via Ambrose, or from Jerome. However, the Hebrew word for blood is **dām**, not **edom**. The form **d m** [*dōm] is attested in Phoenician and Punic (J-H, *in loc.*). Edom may be **ᵉdōm* with a prosthetic vowel, as in the Targums (cf.Vattioni p. 447), or the definite article: ***hadōm** > *adōm > *ᵉdōm (cf. J-H. *in loc.*).

III. Numeral

salus = tria 'three' [24]. Heb. **šālōš** is transcribed by Jerome as **salos** (Tres enim dicuntur "salos", *Comm. in Ionam* 3,4b 1.66). Augustine is an important witness to the Punic vowel shift $\bar{o} > \bar{u}$ in stressed syllables (**šālōš** > ***šalūš**) (Segert 36.48 p. 75). The association of the Punic numeral with the Latin word *salus* 'salvation' and with the Trinity by Valerius, Augustine's predecessor as Bishop of Hippo, may at first appear far-fetched (ut cum Latine nominatur "salis," a Punicis intellegantur "Tria"; et cum Punici lingua sua "Tria" nominant, Latine intellegatur "salus"). However, 'three' and the 'Trinity' are closely related in Semitic morphology (cf. Mod. Heb. **šillūš** = Trinity). Moreover, the word **šālōm** (Heb.) 'peace, welfare, salvation' would be ***šalūm** (i.e. **salum** in Latin script) in Punic, and might be misconstrued by a Latin-speaker as the accusative of **šalūš/salus**. Such plays-on-words would be common in a bilingual society.

IV. Verbs

messe = unge 'anoint' (imper.).[25] Green comments, "The Hebrew imperative is **mᵉshoḥ**; the Punic imperative might add the suffix aleph. But neither of these would properly be represented by Augustine's **messe**. If we have the word as Augustine wrote it, we must either mark it as an unparalleled form of Semitic imperative or conclude that Augustine was very inexpert in recording what he heard." We may retort that it is somewhat perilous to base conclusions as to the vocalisation of Punic on the Massoretic Hebrew, in particular with regard to the latter stages of Neo-Punic. Moreover, Green's information here is misleading.

Augustine is our sole witness for the verb **mšḥ** in Punic (J-H *in loc*). The presumed vocalisation in Phoen./Punic is ***mᵉšaḥ**, as in Hebrew (Friedrich, § 136, p. 59; Heb. **mᵉšaḥ**, lamed guttural, *contra* Green). However, in Neo-Punic the gutturals had generally disappeared, especially in popular speech (cf. Friedrich "vulgär-punisch"; Segert 54.232 p. 134). Even when the final *ḥ* is written in Punic inscriptions, Latin and

---

[23] ...nam et Punice Edom sanguis dicitur. *In Psalm.* 136:18 PL 37, 1772; Green pp. 184f.

[24] (Valerius) quaesivit ab eo qui et Latine nosset et Punice, quid esset "salus." Responsum est, "Tria." *In Rom. Imperf.* 13 PL 35, 2096f.; Green p. 186.

[25] Messias autem unctus est; ... Hebraice Messias est: unde et Punice *messe* dicitur unge. *In Evang. Ioh.*15:27 PL 35, 1520; Green p. 186.

Greek transcriptions are unable to provide equivalents, e.g. in a trilingual inscription from Sardinia (GA p. 91) the Punic text includes the place-name **m'rḥ,** whereas the Greek and Latin versions of the text give the forms Μηρρη and Merre. The 'aleph appears to be a *mater lectionis* for the vowel *e*, and the final vowel seems to have become *e* or *ᵉ* with the loss of the guttural *ḥ* (*meraḥ > *mere/ᵉ?); cf. **Messie** below. The double *ss* in **messe** probably reflects a single unvoiced *š* as distinct from double Semitic *s* or voiced *z*. Jerome transliterates Hebrew **'iššā** 'woman' as **Issa** and **'īšī** 'my man' as **Issi**, without distinguishing between the single and double consonants in Hebrew (in Osee I, ii, 16.17; CC LXXVI p. 29 lines 419, 424). Therefore we may posit as the Punic form underlying Augustine's transcription ***mᵉšaḥ** > ***mᵉša** > ***mᵉše**.

iar = putas? (colloquial) 'do you think ?'[26] Heb. √r'y, Punic √r'y 'to see'. Cf. Heb. **way-yar'** (waw-consecutive). We may understand **iar** as 'does it look like?' Possibly nipᶜal impf. 3m sing. 'it is / will be seen'; see J.-H. *in loc.*

***Messie** = **Messias** 'Messiah'[27] = unctus 'anointed';[28] Heb. **māšīaḥ** 'the anointed one' from √mšḥ 'to anoint', Aram. **mᵉšīḥā**'. Much depends upon our interpretation of the word 'consonum'. Does Augustine mean that the Punic word "sounds like" the Hebrew word, or that it is "in harmony, in general agreement with" it? Is the word in question the actual Hebrew form or the Latinised form? We can at least be certain of the consonants: **mšḥ**. With the loss of the 'aleph and final guttural, we may speculate that Messiah in Punic was ***mᵉšiᵉ**, which in Augustine's system of transliteration would be **messie**, cf. **messe** above.

B) Indirect references

Adeodatus = 'Given by God'. Such theophoric names are common in Phoen. and Punic, as in Hebrew, cf. Nathanael (God has given), Jonathan (Yahweh has given). According to Madec[29] **Adeodatus** is a translation of **Iatanbaal** (Baal has given); according to Vattioni [30], of **Iatonbaʿal** (Baal has given) or **Mutunbaʿal** (gift of Baal). There are a number of other possibilities, e.g. **Muthunilim** (gift of the gods) (Segert p. 306); **Baliato, Baliatho** [*baʿl-yaton] (Z. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. New Haven 1936, glossary, pp. 89-90).

Adeodatus could speak Punic better than his father, Augustine, as we know from a passage in *De Magistro* (13:44 PL 32, 1219; Green p. 185), which reports a dialogue between father and son. Adeodatus' mother, whose name Augustine does not reveal, if a Punic speaker, may have passed her mother tongue on to her son (*Conf.* VI. 15).

---

[26] Quod Punici dicunt "iar," non lignum, sed quando dubitant... hoc Latini possunt vel solent dicere "putas?" cum ita loquuntur: Putas, evasi hoc? *In Psalm.* 123,8 (Heb.Ps. 124:5 PL 37,1644f; Green p. 184.

[27] Hunc Hebraei dicunt Messiam, quod verbum Punicae linguae consonum est... *C.Petil.* 2,239 PL 43,341; Green p. 186.

[28] See note 24.

[29] G. Madec, 'Adeodatus'. *Augustinus-Lexicon* 1986; see also I. Kajanto, *Onomastic studies in the early Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage.* Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae II:1. Helsinki 1963, esp. pp. 102f.; M. Bénabou, *La résistance africaine à la romanisation.* Paris 1976, pp. 491-578.

[30] Vattioni, *op cit.* pp. 438ff.

salus 'salvation'; **vita** 'life' (Optime Punici Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam salutem, et sacramentum corporis Christi nihil aliud quam vitam vocant. *De Pecc. Mer*. 1:24, 34 PL 44, 128; Green p. 187.)

This important passage receives but perfunctory treatment from Green. Augustine comments that the 'Punic Christians' referred to the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist respectively as 'salvation' and 'life'. What does Augustine mean? There seem to be at least four possibilities: 1) Punic-speaking Christians used the Latin words quoted in their religious vocabulary ("Latinised Christian Neo-Punic"); 2) Augustine is translating into Latin the actual Punic words they used. If so, **vita** = **ḥayyim*. The translation of **salus** is problematic. But it may be that **šalūm* had received a theological dimension wider than 'peace' (pax), particularly since it resembled the Latin 'salus' (see above); 3) The Punic Christians wished to avoid Greek loanwords (cf. German *Taufe*, Finnish *kaste* 'baptism'). Before the Greek loanword *baptisma* became established in African Christian Latin such words as *lavacrum, intinctio, tinctio* were in general use. Augustine continued to use them on occasion in his sermons to the common people (Mohrmann, C. *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des heiligen Augustinus*, Nimegen 1932, pp. 83f.). Sainio (M. A. Sainio, *Semasiologische Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität*. Helsinki 1940, pp. 28f.) quotes Cyprian (*De hab. virg*. 23): *gratia lavacri salutaris* 'the salvific grace of washing (baptism)' (cf. Tit. 3:5) From this to 'salus' is but a short step; 4) Augustine associates the 'daily bread' of the Lord's Prayer with the eucharist (*Serm*. 57:7, 7; 58:4, 5; Mohrmann, *op. cit.* p. 112). This idea might well lead to the association of 'life' with the eucharist.

This passage has sometimes been translated in a misleading fashion. For instance, *NPNF* Vol. 1.5 p. 28: "The Christians of Carthage...". The reader receives the impression that Augustine is speaking of the Latin-speaking Christians of the city of Carthage, when in fact he is referring to the rural Punic-speaking Christians; I. Volpi (Sant' Agostino, *Natura e grazia*. Rome 1981, p. 61) translates: "i *nostri* cristiani punici...", thus restricting the reference to Catholic Christians, as distinct from sectarians or heretics. Courtois[31] comments correctly, "Ces chrétiens de langue »punique» sont généralement donatistes", but proceeds to a false conclusion: "Il devient alors évident que *punicus* a son sens large et que c'est aux chrétiens d'Afrique en général que s. Augustin entend donner un satisfecit." Rather, it would appear that Augustine is making a distinction between Punic and Latin-speaking Christians irrespective of their ecclesiastical allegiance. Such terminology might well have developed before the Donatist schism occurred in 312-313 A.D.

misericordia 'mercy, compassion'; **pietas** 'piety' etc. (...velut tu nuper verbo quodam Punico, cum ego misericordiam dixissem, pietatem significari te audisse ab eis quibus haec lingua magis nota esset... Si te bene audissem, nequaquam mihi videretur absurdum pietatem et misericordiam uno vocabulo Punico vocari. *De Mag*.13:44 PL 32, 1219; Green p. 185.)

fides 'faith'. Our text relates a dialogue between Augustine and his son Adeodatus. They discuss the meaning of a Punic word ('verbo quodam Punico'), which Augustine

---

[31] Courtois, *op. cit*. pp. 276ff.

understood as *misericordia* and Adeodatus as *pietas*, relying on those better-versed in the Punic language. The only known Punic word which seems to have both meanings is *ḥann* 'favour' (Heb. ḥēn), familiar from such names as Hannibal (also ANNIBAL). The verbal root is √ḥnn (Segert p. 83). However, Augustine at first misheard the word as *fides*. In Hebrew 'faith' is 'eʰmūnāh (√'mn; Amen is from the same root). This is not attested in Punic, except in the Latin transcription *emanethi* 'my credentials' in Plautus (*Poenulus*; Segert p. 266 line 937). We may speculate that the Punic word to which Augustine referred was **'eʰman*. If we compare the verbal roots √ḥnn and √'mn, auditory confusion becomes understandable when we realize that both the guttural ḥ and 'aleph had become weakened or lost in Neo-Punic:

[*ḥann > *anᵉn]   or   [*ḥanana > *anana]

[*'eʰman > *eʰman]   [*'amana > *amana]

Et extendit manum suam (Gen. 8:9) 'and he extended his hand'.[32] Heb. **wayyišlaḥ yādō**, Pun. **wa-šalaḥ* (perf.) / **šālōḥ** (abs. inf.) **yōdō** [*yād > *yōd], cf. ἰῶτα. Augustine notices a 'Hebraism' in his Latin Bible text, in fact a Semitism. The reflexive possessive adjective 'suam' is redundant in Latin, as it is in the Romance languages. This Semitism is "most familiar" (*familiarissima*) to Augustine from Punic. Heb. and Punic make use of the possessive, but as a suffix rather than as a separate word (as in Finnish). Augustine goes on to mention a similar example in Gen. 8:11 ...*in ore suo* 'in her mouth'.

The following text is a proverb: *Nummum quaerit pestilentia; duas illi da, et ducat se* 'When Pestilence asks for a coin, give her two, and let her go away'.[33] Augustine could have quoted this proverb in Punic, but does not do so, because not all his congregation would have understood it. Can we reconstruct the proverb?

nummus   = sestertius (a coin); a loan-word in Punic?

quaerit   = √š'l [*yiš'al] impf. 'asks'

pestilentia   = [ršpa](?) (Segert p. 301) **ršpm** [*reʰšpim] 'pestilence' (?)

duos   = **šnm** [*išnim] cf. ISNIM (Segert pp. 118, 120) 'two'

da   = [*ten] cf. Heb. **ten**; √ytn, Heb. √ntn 'give'

illi   = [lo] Neo-Punic **l'** (Segert pp. 99, 103)

et   = [wa-]

ducat se   = *yithpaʿel* of √hlk 'to go' (jussive) [*yithallek]

Afri and Punici

In Augustine's texts the speakers (and writers) of the 'lingua punica' are described as

---

[32] Quod scriptum est: Et extendit manum suam...locutio est, quam propterea Hebraeum puto, quia et Punicae linguae familiarissima est; in qua multa invenimus Hebraeis verbis consonantia... *Loc. Hept.* 1:24 CSEL 28:1, 511f.; Green p. 188.

[33] Proverbium notum est Punicum, quod quidem Latine vobis dicam, quia Punice non omnes nostis. Punicum enim proverbium est antiquum: Nummum quaerit pestilentia; duos illi da, et ducant se. *Serm.* 167:4 PL 38, 910; Green p. 183.

Afri and the language itself as *afra*. (*Epist.* 17:2: ut homo Afer scribens Afris, cum simus utrique in Africa constituti, Punica nomina exagitanda existimares...Quae lingua si inprobatur abs te, nega Punicis libris...; Green pp. 180f.; *In Epist Ioh.* 2:3: Sic honorant Christum (Donatisti) ut dicant illum remansisse ad duas linguas, Latinam et Punicam, id est, Afram; Green p. 188). *Afri* was the name given by the Romans to the "native subjects of Carthage...as opposed to the independent tribes of the Numidians and Mauri to the West ."[34]

We may wonder why it was necessary to explain that Punic was an African language. Since the Punic wars it would presumably have been general knowledge, at least among the literate, that Punic was the language of the Carthaginians. Saumagne[35] claims that Punic was, in Augustine's time, spoken in North Africa and nowhere else. This, as we shall attempt to demonstrate, does not sufficiently take into account the evidence of Jerome. But we may agree with the said author that the key passage for understanding this question is to be found in *Epist. ad Romanos inchoata expositio* 13.[36]

In this passage the 'Canaanite' or 'Syro-Phoenician' woman of Matt. 15:21-28 and Mk. 7:24-30 is described as 'Punica mulier' and 'Chananaea' (Chananaea enim, hoc est Punica mulier de finibus Tyri et Sidonis egressa...). The African peasants, upon being interrogated, described themselves as 'Chanani' in Punic (Punice respondentes). Augustine comments that this is one letter less than the Latin word *Chananaei* 'Canaanites'.

In the Hebrew Bible k^{e}na‘an refers to Canaan, the son of Ham, and to the land of Canaan. The Hebrew language is called 'the language of Canaan' (Is. 19:18 š^{e}pat k^{e}na‘an); Phoen. kn‘n (*kana‘n) refers to Phoenicia. The people are k^{e}na‘^{a}nīm (Heb.).

Here we have a case of discrepancy between a people's self-designation and their name in the eyes of foreigners. The word 'Hebrew' is another case in point (cf. Gen. 14:13 ; Jonah 1:9).[37]

Thus both Phoenicians and Punic-speaking Africans are *Chananim*. The distinction between Phoenician and Punic, valid as it is, was one introduced by the Greeks and Romans, and does not entirely reflect the self-consciousness of the speakers of the language.

In an Easter sermon (*Sermo* 121[38]) Augustine appears to identify himself with his hearers, not only in the sense of Christian fellowship but also of racial solidarity. 'De *gentibus* enim uenimus. In parentibus nostris lapides adorauimus, ideo *canes* dicti sumus. Recordamini quid audierit illa *mulier* quae clamabat post Dominum quia erat *chananaea*...' Augustine frequently associated the ideas 'dogs' (cf. Mt. 15:26-27) and 'Gentiles' with the Canaanite woman of the Gospels.[39] Here Augustine seems to

---

[34] R. C. C. Law, in *The Cambridge history of Africa* 2, ed. J. D. Fage, Cambridge 1978, p. 129.

[35] C. Saumagne, 'La survivance du punique en Afrique aux Ve—VIe siècles'. *Karthago* IV, 1953, pp. 169-178.

[36] *Ibid.* Saumagne quotes the passage in full with French translation pp. 172f.; Green p. 186.

[37] Cf. Suomi-suomalaiset = Finland-Finns; Cymro = Welsh; Welshman = 'foreigner'; Runa simi 'man language', 'language of man' = Quechua; etc.

[38] Augustin d'Hippone, 'Sermons pour la Pâque'. *Sources chrétiennes* 116. Paris 1966, pp. 228-229.

[39] On this association of ideas, see A.-M. la Bonnardière, 'La chananéenne, préfiguration de l'église'.

identify his ancestors as *chananim*, 'Libyphoenicians'.

Augustine's Pelagian adversary, Julian of Eclanum, addresses Augustine as 'Poenus' ('disputator hic Poenus' *Op. impf. c. Iul* I, 7 Pl 45,1053; 'Aristoteles Poenorum' *Ibid*. III, 199 PL 45, 1333). In the same work Julian refers to 'Punic falsehood' (falsitatem punicam, III, 78) and Augustine replies, 'Numquid quando Deus dicit: Reddam peccata patrum in filios, punice loquitur.' The reference appears to be historical and rhetorical rather than linguistic: "When God says, 'I will visit the sins of the fathers upon the sons,' is He speaking in the Punic fashion?" (i.e. falsely). Not only is Augustine *Poenus,* but he is also *Afer* (*c. Litt. Pet.* 3:29 'eo quod Afer sum'; 3,31 'quia et Afer sum') (S. Lancel, 'Afer, Afri', *Augustinus-Lexicon*)

Viewed in the light of the texts it would seem that Augustine was, or at least regarded himself as, descending from the Punic-speaking section of the population. We may therefore be justified in describing him as a 'Romanised Libyphoenician'.

At this point we may turn our eyes to the Eastern Mediterranean and Palestine and consider Jerome's references to the 'lingua punica'.

JEROME (c. 345— c. 419)

Jerome, living in Bethlehem from 386 till his death, refers several times to the 'lingua punica'. Most of these references occur in his Bible commentaries, all written in Bethlehem. It would seem *prima facie* unlikely that Jerome would consider Punic relevant to the work of biblical exposition, even if he was able to gather reliable material. We shall here attempt to demonstrate that Jerome's 'lingua punica' is in fact Phoenician, and that it was still spoken in 5th century Phoenicia.

386-387 A.D. *In Galatas* II (PL 26,37) 'cum et Afri Phoenicum linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint.' The 'Africans' had altered the 'language of the Phoenicians'. Origen also refers to the 'language of the Phoenicians' (*contra Celsum* III.6 PG XI col. 928) οὐχὶ... τῇ Σύρων... διαλέκτῳ ἢ τῇ Φοινίκων, ἀλλὰ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα Non Syrorum potius aut Phoenicum, quam Hebraica lingua. Procopius, the only definite witness to N. African Punic after the time of Augustine, calls Punic too the 'language of the Phoenicians' (Procopius, *De Bello Vandalico* 2,10 ...τῇ Φοινίκων φωνῇ)

389-391 A.D. *Hebraicae Quaestiones in Gen.* 35:27-36, 24 (CC LXXII p. 44) 'Ipse est Ana, qui inuenit *Iamim* in deserto' (Gen. 36:24 MT **hayyēmim** LXX Ιαμιν 'hot springs'). Jerome says that some interpreters considered

Saint Augustin et la Bible. Bible de Tous les Temps 3. Paris 1986, pp. 117-143, esp. p. 119. Quodvultdeus, a 5th-century bishop of Carthage with a Punic-type name, also describes himself as a dog: 'inter ceteros dominicos canes ipse catellus' (Quodvultdeus, *De Promissis et Praedictionibus Dei. Sources Chrétiennes* 101. Paris 1964, Prologus p. 132. On litholatry, the worship of stones, in North Africa, see Bénabou, *op. cit.* pp. 268-271.

iamim to mean 'seas' (maria), plural of Heb. **yām** 'sea'. Others interpreted the word as 'hot waters' (aquas calidas), as in the 'punica lingua' (iuxta punicae linguae uiciniam, quae hebraeae contermina est). This language is 'close' to Hebrew, even 'neighbouring upon it' geographically (uiciniam), a description more fitting of Phoenician than of N. African Punic. The noun **ym** [*y**ōm**] is not attested in Punic,[40] but occurs in Phoenician, e.g. in the phrase **ṣdn ym** 'Sidon of the sea' (KAI 14:6, 8; 15). It is not attested in the plural. However, **ḥm** 'heat' (Heb. **ḥom**) and the verb √**ḥmm** 'to be hot' are attested Semitic forms. The adjective 'hot' is **ḥām** in Hebrew, plural **ḥāmīm**. The corresponding Phoenician adjective, otherwise unattested, may thus be [*ḥamim**]** (plural), possibly pronounced at this period as **yamim** ($ḥ > y$).

396 A.D.   *In Jonam* 4,6 (CC LXXVI p. 414 lines 125-6)[41] 'Pro cucurbita sive hedera in hebraeo legimus ciceion quae etiam lingua syra et punica ciceia dicitur'. From the correspondence of Augustine and Jerome we know of a dispute in the former Phoenician colony of Oea (modern Tripoli in Libya) over Jerome's translation (Vulgate) of the Heb. word **qīqāyōn** in Jon. 4:6. The Old Latin version gave the translation *cucurbita* 'gourd', following the LXX κολοκύνθη. Jerome had translated the word as *hedera* 'ivy', a mistranslation.

Excursus

In 403 Augustine mentioned the incident at Oea to Jerome (*Epist.* 71:3,5) without mentioning the word in question. Jerome's *hedera* was objected to by the Greeks in particular (on the basis of the LXX?), and the local Jews, when consulted, had declared that the Latin *cucurbita* correctly rendered the Hebrew. In 404 Jerome replied, surmising that the passage in question was Jonah 4 (*Epist.* 112 (75):7,22), mentioning the Greek translations, Hebrew and Syriac, but omitting the reference to Punic. He recommends his commentary on Jonah to Augustine. Duval[42] considers the omission of the Punic word in Jerome's letter as due to his hesitancy with regard to passing on to an African information which he had received at second-hand. We may object to this on at least two counts: 1) If *ciceia* was genuinely N. African Punic it would have been most relevant to mention it, as it would have settled the dispute conclusively (although at the same time demonstrating the incorrectness of Jerome's translation). However, the present writer has as yet found no definite evidence that the

---

[40] The derivation of the Punic names Iambarich, Iambaria and Iambal from **ym** 'sea' is uncertain. See M. Fantar, *Le Dieu de la Mer chez les Phéniciens et les Puniques. Studi Semitici* 48, Rome 1977, pp. 112-115; see also pp. 103-105.

[41] Jérôme, 'Commentaire sur Jonas', ed. Y.-M. Duval. *Sources Chrétiennes* 323, Paris 1985, pp. 296-303, 419-425.

[42] Y.-M. Duval, 'Saint Augustin et le *Commentaire sur Jonas* de saint Jérôme'. *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 12, 1966, p. 12.

plant in question grew in N. Africa in the time of Augustine and Jerome.[43] If Duval is correct[44], the plant grew in the area stretching from Egypt to N. Syria i.e. in the E. Mediterranean and not in the Punic-speaking W. Mediterranean. Jerome himself says that it grew in Palestine: 'quae Palestinae creberrime nascitur'. 2) What could Jerome's sources have been? He never visited N. Africa and his correspondence with Augustine avoids the subject. Augustine's friend Alypius visited Jerome in Bethlehem in 394,[45] shortly before Jerome wrote his commentary, but would they have discussed such matters?

In his later writings (*Epist.* 82, 404-5 A. D., and *De Civ. Dei* 18:43-44, 413-426 A.D.) Augustine makes use of information from Jerome's commentary without, it seems, receiving any further light from the reference to 'Punic' as to the nature of the plant. More than a century later the then Bishop of Oea, Verecundus, continued to use the Old Latin translation with *cucurbita* rather than Jerome's Vulgate.[46]

qīqāyōn = probably the ricinus communis or castor-oil tree, cf. Mod. Heb. qīqāyōn = ricinus communis (Encyclopaedia Hebraica *in loc.*), MH qīq (Jastrow *in loc.*)[47], Egyptian **kiki**, Akk. ḵûḵânîtu (J. A. Bewer, Jonah ICC p. 61). The plant *ricinus communis* was called in Greek κίκι and κίκιον and in Latin *cici*. It is mentioned by Greek medical writers. According to Herodotus, Strabo and Pliny the Elder (*Historia Naturalis* XV. 7. 25) it was cultivated in Egypt; the wild variety was to be found in Greece, according to Herodotus, and in Spain according to Pliny.[48]

If Jerome knew the Latin word *cici*, he did not use it in the Vulgate; presumably it would have been unnecessarily technical and obscure for the average Bible reader. Jerome's reference to the 'lingua syra' is not a reference either to the Aramaic Targum or to the Syriac Peshitta. Targum Jonathan: qīqāyōn[49], Peshitta: **qr''** (qar'a' or qarra'.[50] The 'Syriac' form appears to be the Aramaic status determinatus of *qīqī. The 'Punic' form may be late or vulgar Phoenician [Phoen. *qīqayat > Late Phoen.

[43] Cf. Gsell, 'Faune et flore de l'Afrique du nord'. *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du nord* 1. Paris 1921, pp. 137-158.

[44] Duval, *Sources Chr.* p. 421 n. 9.

[45] E. Feldmann, 'Alypius'. *Augustinus-Lexicon*; J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome*. London 1975, pp. 138, 217-220; see also p. 266.

[46] Y.-M. Duval, 'Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine' (2 vols.). *Études Augustiniennes*.Paris 1973, p. 556.

[47] M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, London and New York 1886-1903, *in loc.*

[48] For some of the information in this paragraph I am indebted to Dr. Alexander Uchitel of the Dept. of History of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in a private letter.

[49] *The Bible in Aramaic* III, ed. A. Sperber. Leiden 1962, p. 439. On Jerome and the Targums see, most recently, R. Hayward, 'Saint Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim'. *JSS* 32, 1987, pp. 105-123.

[50] *The Old Testament in Syriac* III:4. Leiden 1980, p. 44.

*qīqayā (> Punic *qīqayō)]. A clue is given by Jerome's wording in *Epist.* 112: quam vulgo Syri *ciceiam* vocant. Is Jerome referring to two spoken 'vulgar' dialects he had personally encountered in his travels in N. Palestine, Phoenicia and Syria?

406 A.D.   *In Osee* I, ii, 16.17 (CC LXVI p. 28 lines 405-411). With reference to the Babylonian god Bel Jerome declares, 'Hunc Sidonii et Phoenices appellant Baal; eadem enim inter beth et lamed litteras consonantes, ain uocalis littera ponitur, quae iuxta lingua illius nunc Beel, nunc Baal legitur, Vnde et Dido Sidonia regii generis, cum Aeneam suscepisset hospitio, hac patera Ioui uina delibat, qua *Belus et omnes a Belo soliti.*' (Verg., *Aen.* I, 729/730) T. Harviainen[51] comments, "Thus Jerome seems to refer to Aramaic and not to Hebrew." Is this not rather a reference to Aramaic and Phoenician? (Aram. bᵉʿēl, Phoen. bʿl). Are we to understand that the Phoenician pronunciation of Baal was, as in Hebrew, **ba'al**, rather than **ba'l**? Greek βααλ (Josephus etc.) and Akk. **ba-al-ma-lu-ku** (Heb. **ba'almālāk**; Phoen. ***ba'al-milk**) would seem to support this. If so, we may detect the dialectical change **ba'al** (Phoen.) > **ba'l** (Punic) [> **bāl** (Neo-Punic)?]. Jerome refers specifically to the presence of the ᶜayin in **Ba'al** in 5th-century Phoenicia (ain uocalis littera ponitur), whereas in Neo-Punic it had long since disappeared, at least in speech, e.g. **b'l-mlk**: ***ba'al-milk** (Phoen.) > ***bāl-milk** (Punic) > ***bōl-milik** (Neo-Punic) > ***bōn(o)-milik** (Late Neo-Punic). Bonomilex (Βονομίληξ) was a Christian martyr from Cyprus in the 4th century A.D. (See E. Lipinski, 'La Carthage de Chypre' in *Studia Phoenicia*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 15, Louvain 1983, pp. 209-234), esp. pp. 225ff.).
Jerome's information about N. Africa is here derived from Virgil. Once again the Phoenician language is called 'the language of the Phoenicians' (linguae illius i.e. Phoenicum). Here we may have evidence that in Sidon and Phoenicia in Jerome's day the old Phoenician title was still in use, but in competition with the Aramaic form of the same derivation.

406 A.D.   *In Amos* 3, Prologus line 15 (CC LXXVI p. 211): 'ne agrestes quidem casae et furorum similes quas Afri appellant mapalia'. Jerome refers to the 'mapalia', the dwellings of the 'Afri', comparing them to the peasant dwellings in Tekoa, the home town of the prophet Amos. Augustine mentions the 'Mappalienses', those who live in 'mapalia' (Epist. 66:2 CSEI 34:2, 336; Green p. 181). Virgil refers to 'pastores Libyae...et raris habitata mapalia tectis' (Verg. *Georg.* III, 340); cf. *Aeneis* I,421; IV,259 magalia. Sallust, who lived for a time in Africa, and used as his sources Latin translations of Punic works (Sallustius, *Bel. jugurt.* 17) records that

[51] T. Harviainen, On the vocalism of the closed unstressed syllables in Hebrew. A study based on the evidence provided by the transcriptions of St. Jerome and Palestinian punctuations. *Studia Orientalia* 48:1. Helsinki 1977, p. 52 n. 3.

the Numidian huts were called *mapalia* (*Ibid.* 18). It is thus a Numidian loan-word in both Punic and Latin. Augustine's information is first-hand, but in Jerome's case it appears to be a literary reference to Virgil and Sallust.

408-410 A.D. *In Esaiam* III, vii, 14 (CC LXXIII p. 103): 'lingua quoque Punica, quae de Hebraeorum fontibus manaredicitur, proprie uirgo *alma* appellatur'. alma = virgo 'virgin' = bethula (Heb. *ibid.* line 20). The Phoenician word *ʿalmat is attested. However, we would expect the following vowel shift: Proto-Can. *ʿalmatu > Phoen. *ʿalmat > Late Phoen.? and Heb. *ʿalmā > (Pun. *(ʿ)almō), cf. **Himilco**: *Ḥimilkat > *Ḥimilkā > *Ḥimilkō. It would seem that the vowel shift $\bar{a} > \bar{o}$ in stressed syllables had not taken place in Phoen. Do we then have here a Phoenician word still in colloquial use in 5th century Phoenicia (A.D.)? Tomback[52] gives the following meanings for ʿlmt: 1. young woman (Heb.), 2. maid (Phoen.), 3. singer (Phoen./Cyprus), 4. prostitute (Pun./Cyprus). Jerome is the sole witness for the meaning 'virgin'. However, the basic meaning of ʿlmt is best understood as 'unmarried young woman', with different connotations according to the context.

414-416 A.D. *In Hieremiam* V, 16-19 (CC LXXIV p. 243): 'Tyrus et Sidon in Phoenicis litore principes ciuitates, quarum Carthago colonia; unde et Poeni sermone corrupto quasi Phoeni appellantur, quorum lingua Hebraeae linguae magna ex parte confinis est'. Jerome recognizes Carthage as a colony of the Phoenician cities Tyre and Sidon. The Carthaginians (Poeni) are vulgarly called Phoeni. Hebrew is closely related to 'their' language (that of the Carthaginians and of the Phoenician cities also), i.e. Phoenico-Punic.

414 A.D. *Epist.*130 (PL 22 col.1109): 'Et tu (Demetrias) in Libyco littore... Stridor punicae linguae procacia tibi Fescennia cantabit'. Demetrias was at the time living in N. Africa, after fleeing from Rome, which the Goths sacked in 410. Jerome describes Africa as 'Libyan', as in Virgil (*Aeneis* I, 339: sed fines Libyci, genus intractabile bello; IV, 320: te propter Libycae gentes Nomadumque tyranni, etc.) and refers to the people as 'Punic' (cf. Vergilius, *Aeneis* I, 338: Punica regna vides, Tyrios et Agenoris urbem.). Augustine, the native African, always distinguishes between (Roman) Africa and Libya.[53] *Punicae linguae* 'Punic tongues' refers not to a multiplicity of languages but to the harshness (procacia) of the language spoken by the 'Punici' or of their accent in speaking Latin. Jerome makes a similar comment with regard to Hebrew. Hebrew words are "harsh and guttural" ('stridentia anhelantique uerba'. *Epist.* 125,12). Later in the same letter (6 col. 1110) there is another reference to the native *mapalia*.

---

52 R. S. Tomback, *A comparative Semitic lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic languages.* (Ph.D. diss.) New York Univ. 1974, microfilmed 1976, pp. 322-323.

53 *Augustinus- Lexicon, loc. cit.*

Of these eight passages, only four refer exclusively to Africa, and these appear to be literary references, principally to Virgil. One passage refers both to Phoenician and Punic, but as *one* language. The remaining four appear to be concerned with Phoenician alone. It is known that Jerome visited the biblical sites in Phoenicia and N. Palestine in 385 A.D.[54]; *Epist*.108.8 (PL 22 col. 882-3): Omitto Coeles, Syriae et Phoenices iter... *Beryto* (Beirut) Romana colonia et antiqua urbe *Sidone* derelicta, in *Sareptae* (Zarephath)...per arenas *Tyri*...pervenit *Acco*, quae nunc Ptolemais dicitur; et per campos *Mageddo*... Mirata ruinas *Dor*...

Is it not likely that Jerome's information, in particular the geographical and botanical details, was gathered primarily during this pilgrimage, a year or so before he began his great series of commentaries? (This does not rule out the possibility of later contact with merchants or fellow-Christians from Phoenicia.) If so, our knowledge of Phoenician is pushed forward by at least two centuries.[55]

We are now in a position to return to N. Africa, where Augustine was bishop of Hippo Regius, a former Phoenician colony, and a regular visitor to Carthage. Augustine lived in two worlds — the biblical and the contemporary N. African. He never visited Palestine, but made use of Jerome's scholarship in his exposition of Scripture. For Augustine the 'lingua punica' was a factor uniting these two worlds, for it derived from the Bible lands and was related to two of the biblical languages. At times Augustine sets it alongside other languages. It is important to consider which 'world' he is referring to in order to understand his meaning correctly. In *Evang. Ioh*.15:27 (Green p. 186): Cognatae quippe sunt linguae istae et vicinae, Hebraica, Punica, et Syra. Are we justified in translating as follows: "For these languages are related and neighbouring — Hebrew, Phoenician and Aramaic." Cf. Origen above. Augustine's description of the relation between the languages is reminiscent of Jerome's (see above ch. JEROME). *In Epist. Ioh*. 2:3 (Green p. 188): Sic honorant Christum (Donatisti) ut dicant illum remansisse ad duas linguas, Latinam et Punicam, id est, Afram. "They (the Donatists) thus honour Christ that they say that He is confined to two languages, the Latin and the Punic — that is, the African variety" (i.e. dialect, rather than the usual translation of 'the African (one)', i.e. language). It seems to the present writer that Augustine does not need to define Punic as African, but that he views Punic as the African variety of the mother language Phoenician, still, it seems, known in Phoenicia itself.

Thus, far from considering Punic a local *patois* of little importance, Augustine is able to include Phoenicio-Punic in a list of cultural languages of his day: '...Latino...Graeco... Punico...Hebraeo...Aegypto (Coptic?)...Indo (Sanskrit?)' (*Sermo* 288,3; PL 38,1304f.); Green p. 183.

---

[54] See Kelly, *Jerome*, pp. 312f.

[55] Segert, p. 24; *contra* D. Harden, *The Phoenicians*. London 1971: "Curiously enough, the Phoenician language died out sooner in the homeland, where it gave place to Aramaic and Greek during Hellenistic times, than in the western colonies." (p. 105).

Conclusions

From the texts of Augustine and Jerome we may conclude the following:

a) lingua punica = lingua Phoenicum = Phoenician or Punic according to the context.

b) Punicus, punica = Phoenician or Punic (adj.), normally referring to those who speak, or whose ancestors spoke, the 'lingua punica'.

c) Punicus = Chanani = Syro-Phoenician or Libyo-Phoenician according to the context. Chanani is the self-designation of both Phoenicians and N. African Punic-speakers. Punicus is the Roman name for them, derived from Greek Φοῖνιξ, -ικος.

d) 'Punica, id est afra' refers to the African dialect of Phoenician, the 'lingua punica', not to Berber (Frend and Courtois), nor to 'the African language' as distinct from Latin. The Berber dialects are not described as a single 'lingua afra' (*De Civ. Dei* 16:6 'Nam et in Africa barbaras gentes in una lingua plurimas novimus; Green pp. 189f.)

e) In the time of Augustine Punic was still a living language with all the characteristics implied by the term.

f) Augustine and Adeodatus had at least a passive knowledge of Punic, although it is difficult to assess the extent of their active knowledge of the language (*contra* Brown: "It is most unlikely that Augustine spoke anything but Latin"; *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography*, London 1967, p. 22). Augustine's knowledge and understanding of Punic is too exact and varied to be merely second-hand; although it is clear that it is not his mother tongue.

g) There existed a Christian vocabulary in Punic. We have evidence for the existence of a small part of the possible vocabulary e.g. ***šalūm, *Messie, *(ḥ)ayyim, *(ḥ)ann, *'eman, *Bāl**(?).

h) On the basis of Jerome's statements, Phoenician was obviously still a living language at the beginning of the 5th century A.D.

i) The Phoenicians had adopted Aramaic and Greek, as had the Jews, while still retaining their own language (cf. Mk. 7:26 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει).

j) Dialectical differences are to be discerned between Phoenician and Punic, e.g. in Phoenicia *ā* in stressed syllables had not become *ō* (cf. **alma**), while in N. Africa *ō* had changed to *ū* (cf. ***šalūm** etc.).

TYCONIUS (active c. 370—c. 390 A.D.)

Tyconius or Tichonius[56] was a lay Donatist theologian who turned to writing on biblical exegesis after being excommunicated by the Donatist church for his 'catholicizing' views. He is generally referred to as 'Tyconius Afer'.[57] Was his mother tongue Punic?

Tyconius' major work was his *Liber Regularum*, the first Latin treatise on biblical hermeneutics (edited by F. C. Burkitt[58]). It dates from before 383,[59] too early to be

---

[56] See P. Monceaux, *op. cit.* Vol. 5, ch. 5, pp. 165-219. On Tyconius' biblical exegesis see M. Simonetti, Profilo storico dell'esegesi patristica. *Sussidi patristici* I. Istituto patristico Augustinianum. Rome 1981; "Ticonio in realtà, fuori dell'Africa, doveva essere del tutto sconosciuto." (p. 188).

[57] "Tyconius natione Afer" (Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 18; Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 166).

[58] Tyconius, *Liber Regularum,* ed. F. C. Burkitt, *Texts and studies* III:1. Cambridge, 1894.

influenced by Jerome's commentaries or by the Vulgate.

At times the Old Latin Bible text of the Old Testament used by Tyconius reflects the Hebrew rather than the Greek of the LXX from which the Old Latin versions were translated. Burkitt proposes the hypothesis of the existence of a 'purer' version of the LXX, one closer to the MT.[60] However, there is no evidence for this, and the hypothesis would be generally rejected today. We may, as does Sparks[61], see the influence of Jewish Christians in the origin of the African Latin versions; nevertheless, Tyconius' biblical text remains somewhat problematic, in particular since he deliberately chose obscure passages of Scripture to demonstrate his exegetical methods, and thus is often the only witness to his Old Latin text of these passages.

If we consider that Hebrew and Punic are as closely related as Spanish and Italian, German and Dutch or Finnish and Estonian, it is conceivable that a good knowledge of one would enable partial, if not perfect, understanding of the other. Since Semitic writing generally operates on a consonantal basis, omitting the vowels, a literate Punic-speaker would be able to decipher a considerable amount of the as yet unvocalized Hebrew text of the OT, especially in the Old Hebrew script, which is almost identical with the Phoenician. A Punic-speaker would simply substitute the vowels of his own language for the, to him, unknown Hebrew ones. Differences in vocabulary between Hebrew and Punic would, of course, make this only a partial 'key' to the decipherment of Hebrew. As we have seen, Augustine makes frequent use of Punic in his exegesis of the Old Testament. Would this possibility have been lost on Tyconius, a generation or two earlier? We know, in fact, that he revised the Latin translation of the Apocalypse for his commentary[62], so it is not impossible that he would wish to revise OT texts also. Bearing this in mind, let us examine some of the passages in Tyconius which might lead us to some such conclusion.

1. Ezek. 28:7. MT **w-ḥllw**, LXX corruption στρώσουσιν 'they shall spread' which may be emended to τρώσουσιν 'they shall wound', Tyc. vulnerabunt 'they shall wound' (p. 80 line 9). The verb √ḥll is not attested in Phoen.-Pun., but may well have existed.

2. Ezek. 36:8. MT **ky qrby lbw'**, LXX corruption ἐλπίζουσιν 'they hope' for ἐγγίζουσιν 'they approach', Tyc. qui adpropinquat uenire 'who approaches to come' (p. 36 1.7). √qrb 'to approach' is attested in Phoen. (J-H. *in loc.*). Tyc. is almost the only witness to the true reading (Burkitt p. cxi).

3. Isa. 14:13. MT **lkwkb' 'l** 'to the stars of God', LXX τῶν ἄστ(ε)ρων τοῦ

[59] *Ibid*, p. xviii.

[60] *Ibid*, p. cxiii.

[61] H. F. D. Sparks, 'The Latin Bible' ch. IV, *The Bible in its English and Ancient versions*, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford 1954, pp. 102-103.

[62] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 197: "Selon toute vraisemblance, Tyconius revisa lui-même le vieux texte latin de Cyprien. Il dut publier, en même temps que son Commentaire, cette revision totale ou partielle de l'*Apocalypse* africaine"; cf. P. Capelle, 'Le Texte du Psautier Latin en Afrique', *Collectanea Biblica Latina* Vol. IV. Rome 1913, p. 177: "Le psautier donatiste se rapproche des "africains purs", bien qu'on perçoive à la fois des traces d'*évolution* et de *revision*."

οὐρανοῦ 'of the stars of heaven'. Cyprian and Tyconius: stellas Dei 'the stars of God' (p. 70 1.7; 71,10; 72,12). Punic **kkb** 'star', **'l** 'god', cf. *IFP* p. 161 **hkkbm 'l** (*hak-kokabim 'ille) 'queste stelle', 'these stars'. In Neo-Punic *w* was a *mater lectionis* for *ō*, as in Heb. The Hebrew consonants would thus be entirely comprehensible to a reader of Neo-Punic.

4. Ps. 80:16 (79:18 LXX). MT **w'l bn 'mṣth lk** 'and upon son you strengthened yourself', LXX καὶ ἐπὶ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, ὃν εκραταίωσας σεαυτῷ 'and upon the son of man, whom you strengthened for yourself', Tyc. et in filium conroborasti tibi 'and upon the son you strengthened for yourself' (p. 6 1.17-18). The Latin text, to which Tyconius is the only witness, omits the Greek words underlined ('of man, whom'). Tyconius' version translates the Hebrew word for word. Burkitt comments, "Nothing but the influence of the original Hebrew, as expressed through two faithful unintelligent translations, explains the omission of the relative before 'conroborasti'" (p. cxiii). The Hebrew is a Semitic asyndetic relative clause (Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, transl. A. E. Cowley, Oxford 1910, pp. 386-7 g and h), which is perfectly acceptable in Hebrew and Punic (Segert 77.314, p. 258), while being bad Latin.

5. Isa. 13:3. MT **qr'ty** 'I call(ed)', LXX dittography καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς 'and I bring them', Tyc. et uoco eos (p. 50 1.16) 'and I call them'. Punic √**qr'** 'to call', cf. **corathi** 'I called' (*Poenulus* 1.930; Segert p. 266), [***qo/ara'ti**], Heb. **qārā'tī**.

Burkitt considers it an "inconceivable hypothesis that Tyconius has emended directly from the Hebrew" (p. cxv), yet what other possibility is there?

The aforementioned texts demonstrate that Tyconius' Old Latin is on occasion faithful to the Hebrew in passages where the LXX is corrupt or obscure. In general the Old Latin text agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew. To Tyconius the exegete it would be primarily obscure passages which would invite emendation. Have we any evidence that it was Tyconius himself who revised the text, rather than having inherited an already revised text? Certain readings indeed agree with Cyprian's text,[63] but in many instances he is the sole witness. Furthermore, even allowing for quotation from memory, we note some differences in the text of passages quoted more than once in the same work.

1. Ezek. 28:9. MT **h'mr t'mr**, LXX λέγων ἐρεῖς 'saying you shall say', Tyc. dicturus es (p. 77 1.29), narrans narrabis (p. 80 1.15). Burkitt comments, "Tyconius would scarcely substitute for »dicturus es» an imperfectly naturalised Hebrew idiom" (p. li). It is in fact a Semitism. The verb √**'mr** [***'amar**] is attested in both Phoen. and Pun.

2. Ezek. 28:13. MT **b'dn gn-'lhym** 'In Eden the garden of God', LXX ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου 'in the delights of Paradise', OL and Vulg. deliciis paradisi, Tyc. in deliciis paradisi Dei (p. 78 1.2-3, 81, 19), in paradiso Dei (p. 80 1.29). Burkitt describes the omission of the word 'deliciis' as a "careless blunder" (p.

---

63 Burkitt, pp. liii ff.

xlvi), but cf. Gen. 2:8 **gn-b'dn** 'a garden in Eden' = LXX παράδεισον ἐν Εδεμ 'paradise in Eden'.

3. Ezek. 28:4a, 5, 7, 17 (Burkitt p. xlvii). Sapientia (4a) or doctrina (vv. 5, 7, 17) in the first extensive quotation (pp. 77f.) are replaced (pp. 79f., 83) by scientia *in every case* where the Heb. is **ḥkmh** 'wisdom' (also attested in Phoen. J-H *in loc*.). If this were a revision from the Heb., why then did Tyconius not use the word sapientia 'wisdom'? In fact he had already used it where there are two other Heb. words (**stm** and **tbwnh**). Tyconius' quotations do not correspond entirely with the LXX, which translates **ḥkmh** by ἐπιστήμη (v. 4a), but also **stm** (v. 3) by the same Greek word. Thus, it seems, Tyconius preferred consistency to literalness in this instance.

If Tyconius did then refer to the Hebrew, he was the first Latin exegete to do so, antedating Jerome. However, Punic was no substitute for a knowledge of the 'hebraica veritas'. Tyconius' revisions are neither systematic nor always entirely correct. He does not steal Jerome's laurels in this respect!

It is interesting to note that of the nine passages quoted, five occur in Ezek. 28, which is addressed to the prince of Tyre, the mother-city of Carthage, and so of particular interest to the Christians and Jews of N. Africa, especially the 'Chanani'. Was this the main reason for desiring to establish a 'trustworthy' text of an often obscure passage? A Phoenician *Vorlage* has been posited for Ezek. 26-28 (See H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre*, Jerusalem 1973, pp. 323-325). If this "Tyrian poem" was also known in Carthage, it would further attract attention to Ezekiel's prophecy. A comparison of Tyconius' text with the LXX and MT shows it to be clearly translated from the LXX, but with reference to the Hebrew where the LXX is obscure. There is no question of a thoroughgoing revision from the Hebrew.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In Tyconius' *Liber Regularum* and in his Commentary on the Apocalypse[64] there is evidence of an African, even 'Punic' tradition of biblical interpretation. In Isa. 43:6 (MT **teymān**, LXX τῷ λιβί Vulg. austro) 'the south' is interpreted as a reference to Africa ('Africo' *Lib. Reg* p. 91.9; cf. p. 671.11). Interest is shown in the two Latin names for Tyre—Sor and Tyrus (Phoen **ṣor*) (pp. 40, 45-48, 53, 74, 77f., 80), and in Carthaginian trade (Ezek. 38:13 negotiationes Carthaginenses, p. 84 1.20f.).

In his commentary on the Apocalypse we find two biblical names in unusual forms; at first sight they appear to be copyists' errors: on Rev. 2:20 'mulierem Zezabel'. The Phoenician name **yizzbūl*, *'izzbūl*[65] 'Jezebel', Heb. *'īzebel*, unattested outside the Bible, is in NT Greek Ἰεζάβελ. However, the Neo-Punic name z'zbl is attested (KAI 159 line 6, cf. Benz, *op. cit.* pp. 108, 374f.: ZZBL, 'ZZB'L as a male proper name). Could such a name have been substituted in oral tradition for the outmoded form Jezebel? Other examples of Punic 'unisex' names are known (e.g. Namphamo).

---

[64]*Tyconii Afri fragmenta commentarii in apocalipsim ex Cod. Taurinensi*, ed. F.C. Burkitt. Spicilegium Casinense. Monte Cassino 1892, pp. 263-331.

[65] J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic inscriptions* 1. Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions. Oxford 1971, p. 62 n. 1.

On Rev. 2:23 Goliam (acc.) instead of Goliathem. This occurs several times. No *written* Bible version would omit the final *th* from the well-known biblical name, but the loss of final *-t* is common in Neo-Punic, at least in the spoken language. Is this an indication of oral biblical instruction among the Donatists [**Goliath > Goliā**]?

Certain of Tyconius' readings agree with Cyprian's text. Cyprian (c. 200-258) is referred to as *Poenus* by Augustine (*Op. Impf. c. Iul.* 1, 7 Poenus...Cyprianus), although this may merely indicate that he was bishop of Carthage. However, at least one writer (Leclercq[66]) finds possible Punic influence on his Latin syntax. No reference to the Punic language has been found in Tertullian's or Cyprian's writings.[67]

The name Tyconius appears to be unique.[68] If he was Punic-speaking his name may have been Punic or Berber. If it was Berber, might it be the same as **tnkw**, attested in a bilingual Punic-Numidian text (KAI 101, p. 20) [***Tinkō > *Tikkō**?]? In Punic **tichon** = she is (cf. *Poenulus* **chon** = to be). Punic names with preformative *taw* are attested, e.g. **thw'** 'she lives' and **thk'**, where the subject of the verb, possibly a goddess, is feminine (Benz, *op. cit.* p. 308). ***tikon (Tanit)** '(Tanit) exists' is a speculative reconstruction. The latter element would be dropped as unsuitable for a Christian name.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION

As we have seen, both Catholics and Donatists, but especially the latter, included Punic-speakers among their number. Most of these were peasants and presumably illiterate. Yet the Punic population was sufficiently vigorous to be able to produce acrostic psalms in their language (Aug. *In Psalm.* 118, 32 PL 37, 1595f. 'nostri vel Latine vel Punice, quos abecedarios vocant psalmos...'; Green p. 185). The Latin written by educated Africans may reveal little that is specifically African, but the colloquial Latin of Donatist peasants may reflect the influence of Semitic idiom.[69]

Interpreters were needed in bilingual areas (Aug., *Epist.* 66:2: a nobis (Catholics) subscripta eis (Donatists) Punice interpretentur[70]). An interpreter was, at least on occasion, required at church services.[71] If the *interpres* to which reference is made was a professional interpreter, or at least a competent one, was his function likely to be restricted to translating church notices?

A country bishop was required to know Punic in addition to Latin (*Epist.* 209:2f.: et Punica lingua esset instructus), although Brown disputes that this was absolutely essential,[72] since Latin was the language of Christianity: "The rapid Christianisation of Numidia involved, not a resurgence of any regional culture, but the creation of a Latin —

---

[66] H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire Archéologique Chrétienne et de Liturgie*. Paris 1907, p. 757.

[67] Millar, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

[68] Burkitt, *Lib. Reg.*, p. 103.

[69] P. W. Hoogterp, 'Quelques aspects du latin parlé en Afrique au commencement du quatrième siècle', *Archiuum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, Brussels 1940, esp. pp. 86-87, 103-104, 111-112.

[70] Green p. 181.

[71] *Epist.*108:14 "per Punicum interpretem."

[72] Brown, *JRS*, pp. 89-92, 94 n. 94.

or sub-Latin — religious culture on an unprecedented scale." In *Epist.* 84:2[73] Augustine states, "sed cum Latina lingua, cuius inopia in nostris regionibus evangelica dispensatio multum laborat." Brown understands this as referring to the difficulties in evangelism caused by the low standard of Latin in the areas around Hippo. A commonly-suggested emendation to 'Punica lingua' would place emphasis on the lack of Punic-speaking evangelists. In fact, both interpretations are possible, referring to two sides of the same question — the problems of a bilingual church.

A bilingual church situation is apt to lead to an unbalance in favour of one or the other language, depending upon which is the majority language in a given area, and the relative prestige of each. Even in the apostolic age there were disputes between different language groups (Acts 6). In the Donatist church, it would seem from Augustine's reference to the position of the two languages, Latin and Punic enjoyed more or less equal status. Augustine's concern for Punic bishops and evangelists (or at least with a working knowledge of Punic) may be seen in the light of the disadvantages he perceived in allowing the Donatists to gain a monopoly among the Punic-speaking population.

We may safely assume that if Punic was used in preaching, then a body of biblical material would have assumed Punic dress, even if it was not written down. We have seen possible reflections of this in Augustine and Tyconius.

In the N. African church there existed the *officio lectoris*, at least among the Catholics.[74] The task of the *lector* was to read the Scripture lessons in church. In a bilingual situation we might expect the lector to develop in the direction of the Jewish *metargem* or *meturgeman*[75], who would not only read but also translate the Scripture lessons into the vernacular, where no written translation was available. A preacher might preach in both languages, or an interpreter might translate. This is both ancient and modern missionary practice.

In the Palestinian and Syrian churches a similar process appears to have taken place before the Syriac Bible versions were fixed in writing. The Scriptures were read in Greek and translated into Syriac by the διηγητικός or 'narrator'[76].

If a Punic 'oral Targum' grew up, it is in the church services that it had its origin, perhaps parallel to the practice among Punic-speaking Jews, who may have lived in N. Africa even before the Roman conquest.[77] It would seem certain that it was possible to

---

[73] See Green p. 182.

[74] E. Paoli-Lafaye, 'Les »lecteurs« des textes liturgiques', *Bible de Tous les Temps* Vol. 3, pp. 59-74.

[75] "In the synagogues there was a translator or meturgeman (**mtwrgmn**) who translated verse by verse, or paragraph by paragraph the words of the reader. Explanations were introduced as an extension of the translation" (halacha and haggada)..."The targum as interpretative translation was written down probably when no translator was available in certain synagogues, so that the reader of the Law had to assume the duties of the translator as well." G. J. Kuiper, *The pseudo-Jonathan targum.* Rome 1972, pp. 10-11.

[76] J. A. Lamb, 'The place of the Bible in the liturgy'. *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, Cambridge 1970, pp. 574-575.

[77] See H. Z. Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews in North Africa* Vol. 1. Leiden 1974, pp. 10f., 23ff., 39ff.; H. Solin, Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.29.2. Berlin 1983, esp. pp. 770ff.; M. Simon, 'Le judaïsme berbère dans l'Afrique ancienne, *op. cit.* pp. 30ff.; see also U. Cassuto, 'Jewish translation of the Bible into Latin and its importance for the study of the Greek and Aramaic versions'. *Biblical and Oriental studies.* Jerusalem

have translated the Bible or parts of it into Punic. As Fox says with regard to the composition of Punic psalms, "People who were capable of such artistry could certainly have written translations of the Gospels." Fox's conclusion, however, is disputable: "Yet no Christian is known to have exploited Punic's forgotten potential."[78] Augustine and very probably Tyconius did exploit Punic's potential in their biblical exegesis. "There was...no concern to preach in Phrygian or write Scripture in Punic," claims Fox.[79] This is an *argumentum ex silentio*. We have hints in Augustine's writings; for the rest we must rely on probabilities and analogies. Augustine's church certainly lived in a 'pre-translation situation'. Written biblical texts have not survived, but they may well have existed. Oral 'Targums' and interpretative traditions died with the Muslim conquest, or passed into Islam. At least we know that Augustine emphasized the importance of learning the Lord's Prayer and Creed by heart and *not writing them down*.[80]

In fact we do have evidence that the Gospel(s?) was translated or interpreted into the language of the *Mauri* (Punic?). John Chrysostom (c. 344-407), Bishop of Constantinople: "Also the Scythians...Mauretanians, Indians ...have this doctrine (i.e. the apostles'), each of these peoples has translated it into its own language...".[81] Is this

1973, pp. 285-298: "Both the translators in the synagogues and the teachers in the schools translated in accordance with the exegetical tradition customary in Judaism... The translation was transmitted, of course, orally. Possibly some of the translators or teachers wrote down a part of the rendering for their own use or the use of their pupils, but no manuscript of this sort has come down to us." (p. 292). These words, originally referring to translation from Hebrew into Latin, might equally apply to translation from Hebrew into Punic by N. African Jews. It is a question of probability rather than of definite proof. A Jewish cemetery was in existence in Punic Carthage; see e.g. S.-E. Tlatli, *La Carthage Punique. Étude Urbaine*. Paris & Tunis 1978, pp. 56 (map), 89-90; N. de Lange, *Atlas of the Jewish World*. Oxford 1984, p. 118.

The present-day Jewish communities of Tunisia (Tunis and Djerba) claim that Jews arrived in Carthage and Djerba in two waves, the first in 586 B.C. following the destruction of Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem by the Babylonians, and the second in 70 A.D. after the destruction of the Second Temple by Titus. This claim is impossible to prove, but equally it cannot be disproved for lack of evidence. The Bible hints at other, more voluntary forms of emigration to Carthage and other Phoenician ports on the trade route to Tarshish (in Spain?): trade and Hebrew-Phoenician co-operation (1 Kings 9:26-28; 10:22; 2 Chron. 8:17-18; Jer. 10:9); personal reasons (Jon. 1:3. The ship was presumably Phoenician). It was thus possible for Hebrews to have reached Phoenician colonies even before the founding of Carthage, traditionally dated to 814 B.C. Is. 66:19 refers to "survivors" of the destruction of Jerusalem being sent "to the nations, to Tarshish...to the coastlands afar off". Phoenician ships would be the most natural form of transport for Hebrews to have resorted to.

[78] R. L. Fox, *Pagans and Christians*. London and Oxford 1986, p. 283.

[79] *Ibid.* p. 292.

[80] Aug. *Sermo* 212 'Quod symbolum cum audieritis totum... Nec ut eadem uerba teneatis, *ullo modo scribere debetis*, sed audiendo perdiscere, *nec cum tenueritis scribere*, sed memoria semper tenere atque recolare'. *Sources chrétiennes* 116, p. 182. 'Oratio autem quam hodie accepistis tenendam et ad octo dies reddendam'. *Sermo* 59. *ibid.* 116, p. 186.

[81] See E. Hartung, 'Johannes Chrysostom und die Heidenmission'. *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift* 1894, esp. pp. 318f.; M. Schlunk, 'Die Weltmission der Kirche Christi'. 2nd ed. Stuttgart 1951 (Finnish version, transl. M. Peltola, Helsinki 1973), no reference given! A similar list of peoples occurs in Chrysostom's sermon ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΛΥΣΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΧΑΝΑΝΑΙΑΣ (*De Chananaea*, PG LII 453): Σκύθαι, Θρᾷκες, Ἰνδοι, Μαῦροι, Κίλικες, Καππάδοκες, Σύροι, Φοίνικες; Εἰσελθε εἰς Περσῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀκούσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος, Ὡ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις εἰς τὴν Γότθων, εἰς τὴν βαρβάρων, εἰς τὴν Ἰνδῶν, εἰς τὴν Μαύρων... (*Ibid.* pp. 459/460). By this period the New Testament had certainly been translated into Syriac, Gothic and perhaps also Persian (see B. M. Metzger, *The Early*

merely rhetoric or is there a substantial historical basis?

We still await, with Fergus Millar[82], the discovery of further Punic material to fill the gaps in our knowledge.

ABBREVIATIONS

CC	*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina.*
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.*
Friedrich	J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik.* Analecta Orientalia XXXII. Rome 1951.
ICC	International Critical Commentary.
IFP	M. G. Guzzo Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni fenicie e puniche delle colonie in occidente.* Studi semitici 28. Rome 1967.
J.-H.	C.-F. Jean & J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest.* Leiden 1965
KAI	H. Donner & W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften.* Wiesbaden 1962.
LXX	Septuagint.
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew.
MT	Massoretic text.
NP	Neo-Punic.
PG	Migne's *Patrologia Graeca.*
PL	Migne's *Patrologia Latina.*
Segert	S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic.* Munich 1976.
Vulg	Jerome's Vulgate.

* * *

Versions of the New Testament. Oxford 1977, pp. 4-10 (Syriac), 375-378 (Gothic), 274-277 (Persian)). Whether the Mauretanians, Indians and other peoples would have heard the words of Mt. 15:28 in their own languages as well as in Latin, Greek or Syriac is a question to which we may never know the answer.

[82] Millar, *op. cit.* p. 134: "Suppose that — by some chance comparable to the preservation of a Greek papyrus at Thessalonika — a family archive of the second or third, or even the fourth, century were to be discovered at Lepcis or Hadrumetum or Mactar: would it certainly be in Latin alone?"