

REVIEWS

THE ASSUAN PAPYRI.¹

THE publication of these texts is an event as important in its way as the discovery of the Moabite stone and the Zenjirli inscriptions. It brings into the light a remote corner of the ancient Semitic world, and reveals the internal life and the written language of a community the existence of which was entirely unsuspected until within the last three or four years. Hitherto we have depended upon a fairly considerable amount of papyri and ostraka, and a few inscriptions, for our knowledge of the Aramaic spoken in Egypt; of the life and history of those who spoke it the material told us practically nothing; only fragments of the papyri have survived, the ostraka are barely intelligible. All this is now changed. We have before us a series of documents, complete, easy to read and dated, which not only add immensely to our knowledge of the dialect, but possess a human interest and a historical value of no ordinary kind. Through the liberality of Mr Robert Mond these papyri, with two exceptions, have found a home in the Cairo Museum, and are now published in splendid facsimile, with introductions, translations and notes by Prof. Sayce and Mr Cowley. The way in which these scholars have done their work is beyond all praise; a difficult task has been accomplished with remarkable success.

The papyri reached the museum in a wonderful state of preservation, some of them tied up with string and sealed exactly as they were left by the fifth-century scribe; when they were unrolled the writing was found to be almost as brilliant as on the day when the ink dried. Not only have the leaves escaped damage, but fortunately ten of them are dated by the year of the reigning monarch and by the Babylonian and the Egyptian month. Only three documents of Egyptian Aramaic with dates upon them were known to us before: the Memphis tablet of the fourth year of Xerxes, B. C. 482,² the broken stele from Assuan of the

¹ *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan*. Edited by A. H. Sayce, with the assistance of A. E. Cowley; and with appendices by W. Spiegelberg and Seymour de Ricci. London: Moring, 1906. Folio; 79 pp., 27 facsimiles.

² *CIS*. ii 122 = *NSI*. 71; I venture for convenience to refer to the texts as given in *North-Semitic Inscriptions*. A small fragment of papyrus found at Sakkara in 1902 is conjecturally read 'Year 29 of Art[axerxe]s', i.e. 437-436 B.C. Clermont-Ganneau *Recueil* vi 257 f.

seventh year of Artaxerxes, B. C. 458, published by De Vogüé in 1903 (*Rép. d'épigr. sémi.* no. 438), and the Strassburg papyrus published by Euting in 1903 (*RÉS.* no. 361), dated the fourteenth year of Darius, 411-410 B. C., if 'Darius' be Darius Nothus. Hitherto we have been able only to guess the general date of the Aramaic papyri; it is satisfactory to find that our guesses are now shewn to be correct. The present documents all belong to the time when Egypt formed a province of the Persian Empire; the earliest is dated 471 B. C., the latest 411 B. C.; twelve years later Egypt recovered its independence.

But the peculiar interest of the new texts is this: though written in Aramaic, they are one and all of Jewish origin, and deal with the affairs of a Jewish community. The existence of such a community in the fifth century B. C., living on the island of Elephantinê at the First Cataract, was first made known when Mr Cowley published in 1903 a papyrus (*NSSI.* p. 404 ff) of the same provenance as those before us. We knew indeed that after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 a certain number of Jews made their way into Egypt, for Jeremiah addressed a prophecy to them; among the settlers whom he mentions are those 'in the country of Pathros', i. e. Upper Egypt (xliv 1, 15); it is the subsequent fortunes of these last which have unexpectedly come to light. The Jews for whom the present deeds were drawn, the witnesses who subscribe their signatures, may well have been the descendants of those who received and rejected the warnings of Jeremiah a century earlier. The settlers had established themselves at Yeb (יב; Egypt. *abu*, Ἰγῖβ) and Syênê (סן, i. e. Sêwên' or Sêwân, Ezek. xxix 10, xxx 6, Copt. *Sun*, Σνήνη). The latter is Assuan on the right bank of the Nile; the former is the island opposite, known to later history as Elephantinê—an identification due to the brilliant insight of M. Clermont-Ganneau.¹ Both places were of considerable importance to the country; they had been fortified to check the inroads of Sudanese tribes from the south.² It is rather curious that a member of the colony in Elephantinê is described as 'a Jew' (יהודי B 3. C 2. D 2. H 2), while a Jew resident in Syênê is called 'an Aramaean' (ארמאי A 2. E 2 f. F 3. G 2. K 2); the same person, Maḥseiah b. Yedoniah, appears three times as 'an Aramaean of Syênê' (A 2. E 1 f. G 2) and three times as 'a Jew of Yeb the fortress' (B 3. C 1 f. D 1 f.); on the other hand, Hoshaiiah b. Uriah is 'an Aramaean of Yeb' (J 2). The explanation may be, as Prof. Sayce suggests, that the colony at Yeb was specifically Jewish, while in Syênê the Jews were merged in the general body of Western Semites. As coming from S. Palestine the settlers are called 'Jews', as belonging to the western half of the Persian Empire they are called 'Aramaean';

¹ In his examination of the Strassb. papyrus, *Recueil* vi 222.

² Herod. ii 30 καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ἐλεφαντίνῃ Πέρσαι φρουρούσι.

and since they hailed from the southern side of the Euphrates they receive, along with other nationalities, the name of 'Hebrews' (F 3).¹

The papyri are all legal documents concerned with house-property, ownership of land, marriage-settlements, quittance for payment, money-lending. Limited as the subject-matter is, it furnishes abundant illustrations of the manner in which the Jew adapted himself to circumstances and at the same time kept himself racially distinct; indeed we have here the earliest direct evidence of qualities which have characterized the Jews ever since the Dispersion began. In Upper Egypt we find them conforming to the use of the Aramaic tongue; they have learned to live a settled life under the laws of the Persian government, which were in fact the laws of ancient Babylonia, and therefore not strange or uncongenial to them;² hence they hold and bequeath property and apparently prosper in trade and business. A Jew was not excluded from office under the government (E 4). Mibṭahyah must have gone some distance in the way of adapting herself to circumstances when she took an oath by the Egyptian goddess Sati (F 5). Further, it was the custom for a foreign resident to place himself under the protection of a Persian official who seems to have presided over a certain quarter of the town, much as the *shékh* does in modern Cairo. In this sense the editors understand an expression which occurs on all the papyri except J; so-and-so (one of the principal parties) is described as belonging to the *regel* of Warizath, or Athropadan, or Ḥaumadāta. The word *regel* might be read *degel*, for there is practically no distinction between *r* and *d* in this script; *degel*, usually translated 'banner', 'standard', might be taken to mean 'a company'; but *regel*, 'foot', suggests a more promising interpretation, and we may render לרגל וריות lit. *at the foot of*, i.e. *following Warizath*, so *client of W.*, or more generally, *belonging to the quarter of W.* This sense is borne out by the distinction which is sometimes drawn between the *ba'al qiryah*,

¹ Prof. Bacher in *The Jewish Quarterly* for April 1907 suggests that the colonists were descendants partly of N. Israelites or Ephraimites and partly of Judaeans. The former may have come to Egypt from Assyria or Media with the Persian army under Cambyses, and would be called 'Aramaeans'; the latter would naturally be 'Jews', for N. Israelites were not called 'Jews' so early as the time of the first Persian kings. Living side by side at Syênê both Ephraimites and Judahites would be classed as 'Aramaeans'. Bacher argues that Hosea and Menahem, of frequent occurrence in the papyri, are both Ephraimite names. It may be doubted, however, whether much can be made of this argument; for Hosea = Hoshaiah (J 5. 17 cf. 2), and the latter is a Judaeon name, Jer. xlv 1, xliii 2, Neh. xii 32.

² The following features of Babylonian law appear in these documents: the careful dating, the oath before a deity, the money fines for an infringement of legal obligation, the signing of a deed by witnesses. The expressions *sust* or *process* ודין ודיבב, *institute proceedings* ברי, *my heart is content* מדיבב ריבבי are Babylonian formulae. Cf. Stevenson *Assyr. and Bab. Contracts* nos. 31-34, &c.

i. e. the full citizen, and the *ba'al regel*, i. e. the protected foreigner (A 9. E 10), and by the phrase 'of the self-same regel' (בזכם רגלָא C 2. H 4).

But while we learn how readily the Jewish colonists adapted themselves to live prosperously under alien skies, we also discover that they kept themselves separate from the native population. The genealogies and proper names imply this. Inter-marriage with Egyptians was avoided; though the lady Mibṭahyah, to whom most of the deeds refer, married an Egyptian named As-ḥor son of Teos, 'a builder to the king' (ארדיכל אַס חור בן תעוס G 2. H 3. 8), as her second husband. After the marriage, however, As-ḥor seems to have become a Jewish proselyte; at any rate this may be the reason why his name is changed to Nathan in J 3. K 2. His sons by Mibṭahyah are called Jews (H 3) or Aramaeans (K 2); their legal status was that of Jewish clients, not that of Egyptian citizens. A change of faith may be implied in the case of 'Hosea son of Peti-khnûm' B 17; was Peti-khnûm an Egyptian who became a Jew and so called his son 'Hosea', or was he a lax Jew who felt no scruple about being named 'whom the god Khnûm gives'?¹ The policy of the government towards the foreign settlers must have been remarkably liberal, for they were allowed to maintain their customs and, what is more, to practise their national religion. Thus the Jews could summon *the congregation* (עדה G 22. 26) to dispose of a petition for divorce. Whether *the court of the Hebrews* (דיןא וי עברין F 3) was a distinctively Jewish institution may be doubted, for its jurisdiction was certainly not confined to litigants of Jewish race. Thus the Egyptian builder Pi' son of Paḥî makes, in this court, an agreement with the Jewess Mib-ṭahyah; she swears by the goddess Sati; and not one of the witnesses bears a Jewish name. On the other hand, Jews bring an action in the Persian or Egyptian court of Naphâ (H 4), and not, as we might have expected, in the court of the Hebrews. Hence it is likely, as the editors suggest, that *Hebrews* is to be understood not in the biblical but in the Persian sense,² and to mean 'those beyond the River', 'the inhabitants of the countries south of Euphrates'; the term will then cover all western Semites. Though the Jews probably had not a court of their own, they were allowed a more valuable privilege; they had an altar of Yahweh in Elephantinê. It is mentioned twice incidentally; in E 14 the house which Maḥseiah gives to his daughter has its lower boundary by 'the altar of the god Yahu' (אגורא וי יהה אלה); in J 6

¹ An instance of a foreigner bearing an Egyptian name occurs in F 11, 'Petisis son of Nebo-nathan'; a Babylonian father gives his son an Egyptian name: the brother has the Babylonian name Nebo-re' (F 12). Cf. 'Uqban son of Shemesh-nuri, L 12; the son's name may be Jewish (cf. Jacob), the father's is not.

² The expression itself is much older and has this significance in Assyrian; e. g. the gods of Tyre are called 'the gods of *i-bir nân*' = עבר הנר in an inscr. temp. Esar-haddon, circ. 674 B.C. Winckler *Altor. Forsch.* ii 12. Cf. *NSI.* p. 346 f.

another house is bounded on the east by 'the altar of the god Yahu (אגורא זי יהו אלהא) with the king's road running between them'. The word 'agôra, lit. 'a stone heap', in the Targums means always a heathen altar; here it is used of the altar of Yahu; and as an unenclosed altar could hardly have stood by the road side, the word must include both the altar and the court or building in which it was placed, so we may render *chapel* or *shrine*. This was clearly not a synagogue, but a temple in which sacrifice was offered. Here is an unexpected commentary upon Isaiah xix 19, 'in that day there shall be an altar of Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt'! To bring our new and surprising information into proper relation with the prophecy we ought to know when the latter was written, but unfortunately that is just what we cannot determine. Dr Cheyne assigns the prophecy to the end of the reign of Ptolemy I (323-285 B. C.), i. e. to a date some 160 years later than these deeds. Supposing that Dr Cheyne's date is approximately correct—and his view may be taken as representative of current opinion—we can understand that the prophet had good reason to declare, from the experience of two centuries, that the worship of Israel's God was destined to be established in the land of Egypt. If there was an altar of Yahweh at Yeb, probably there were similar altars in other Jewish settlements. It is generally taken for granted that post-exilic Judaism knew of only one legitimate altar, that in the restored temple at Jerusalem; our papyri shew that when Onias IV founded the temple at Leontopolis in 160 B. C. (Jos. *Ant.* xiii 3) he was not introducing such an innovation as is commonly supposed. In connexion with the worship of Yahweh at Yeb and Syênê we notice that most of the Jewish names in the deeds are compounded with the suffixed *yah*; there is one instance of the divine name prefixed, Yeho'adar (K 16). The preference for compounds with *yah* rather than *el* (which does not occur) marks a relatively early period; the general type of the proper names is that of the exilic or early post-exilic age. Clearly the Jews of the fifth century B. C. had no objection to pronouncing the *nomen ineffabile* in ordinary speech (E 14. J 6), or in solemn oath (B 4. 6. 11, cf. Is. xix 18), or as an element in proper names. The God of Israel is called Yâhû (יהו B 4. 6. 11. J 6) or Yêhâh (יהה E 14) in the papyri, intermediate forms between the full Yahweh and the contracted Yah; used in this way as separate forms, neither has been known before.¹ We may conclude that in ordinary speech, and in secular as distinct from religious writings, the full form Yahweh was not employed.

The internal life of the Jewish community is disclosed by the papyri

¹ A coin found near Gaza contains the name יהו; it is not certain, however, that we are to regard this as a form of the Tetragrammaton. Driver *Stud. Bibl.* i pp. 5, 19.

in several interesting ways. Thus we find that women occupy a position of considerable independence. A woman can hold and bequeath property, appear in court and take an oath, and make a contract in her own right.¹ From papyrus G we learn something about marriage customs. The bridegroom, for example, came to the bride's house and demanded her hand from her father; the words 'she is my wife and I am her husband (*ba'al*) from this day and for ever' may be the formula which sealed the marriage. The husband gave a present (*mohar*) to the bride's father, and a present both in money (*kesef tekūnah*, ? = 'outfit money') and in goods to the bride; the bride also gave a present to the bridegroom.² In the matter of divorce the rights of the woman are recognized as equal to those of the man; an advance upon the Deuteronomic law, which gives the right of divorce only to the husband. To be valid the act of divorce must be public; it takes place 'in the congregation' (G 22. 26); the Jewish law of later times was not nearly so humane or just. The word for divorce means literally *to hate* (שנא C 8. G 23. 27; cf. Deut. xxii 13, xxiv 3). Another reference to domestic life is given by papyrus K. After the death of the head of the family, the slaves, whose names are Egyptian, were divided among the heirs. Each slave was tattooed (שני, ? exact sense) afresh upon the right hand with a letter of the Aramaic alphabet (ארמית K 4. 6 *in Aramaic*) as a mark of ownership. The practice recalls at once Is. xlv 5 ἐπιγράψει χερὶ αὐτοῦ Τοῦ θεοῦ εἶμα LXX and Gal. vi 17. In the ostrakon M the writing is said to be on the right arm (דרע, prob. = זרוע). The letter used for this purpose was Yod; but why this letter more than another is not clear; in Ezek. ix 4, 6 the letter is Tav.

Outside the two Jewish communities various persons are mentioned whose titles or descriptions help us to picture the situation. Thus we hear of 'the ferryman of the cataract' (מלח זי מים קשיא), lit. 'sailor of the rough waters', A 13. B 11. D 8)³; one lived in Syênê, another in Yeb. The 'river-bailiff' (הנרז Persian, lit. *measurer*, i. e. of water, E 4, Strassb. pap. B 2) must have been an important government official. The garrison at Syênê was commanded by a *chef d'armée* (רב חילא), who had under him an officer deputed to hear cases in the local court (H 4 f. J 4). There is the 'architect to Syênê' or 'to the king' (ארכיטקט F 2. G 2); a workman, evidently a Persian, and a silversmith called the Berber (*Barbari*), who had something to do with the Fire-temple (אחרה, Pers. *athra*, B 2. E 19).

¹ The Code of Hammurabi, § 150, allows a woman to dispose of the property made over to her by her husband. See Johns *Bab. and Assy. Laws* ch. xxi.

² Cf. Gen. xxxiv 12, Josh. xv 18 ff.

³ Cf. אשפא (? = *ship*) in an ostrakon from Elephantinê, Lidzbarski *Ephemeris* ii p. 236.

rekûb) and Têma, *NSI.* 63 10. 13. 69 18. 20, cf. 62 3 *n.* The yod is written only when the suffix or the third radical or the gentilic ending is present, יהודין ארמין, שוין our sons, בנין.

(3) *Formations. Personal Pronouns:* אנה agrees with the form found in the Bar-rekûb inscr. (63 1), the dialects of Nêrab and Cilicia (65 5. 68 1. 6), BAr. and Nabataean, as against the more archaic אנך אנכי in Zenjirli 61 1. 62 19. The pronoun of the second person is אנה m., אנהי f. as in Palmyrene, Targum Jon. and Syr.; Nêrab and Targum Onk. אה, BAr. אנהה. The pronoun of the third person is הוּ הִי f., as in Nab., Palm., Syr.; in Old Ar. הִיא, in BAr. הוּיא and הִיא. The plur. הִמוּ is used for both nom. and accus., as in the Aram. of Ezra; contrast הִמוּן (Daniel), Nab. אִנוּ, Targ. אִינוּן, Syr. ܐܢܘܢ. Noticeable are the forms of the suffixed pronouns כִּם and הֵם, agreeing with Old Aram., Nab. (61 29. 63 18. 85 2. 89 2), Ezra, Jer. x 11, Targ. Ps.-J (also אִן), but not with the usual Aram. forms כֹּן, בֹּן, הֹן, אֹס, BAr., Palm. The forms of the *demonstrative pronoun*, הִיּ, זֵה, fem. (*RÉS.* no. 247, 6), plur. אֵלֵהּ, correspond with the Old Aram. of Zenjirli, Nêrab, Têma, as against the Palestinian and Bibl. Aram., Nab., Palm. רִנָּה, דָּא, אֵלֵן, אֵלֵךְ, though in Jer. x 11, Ezr. v 15 אֵלֵהּ occurs. The other demonstrative זֶךְ, זֶנְךְ (not known elsewhere) contrasts with the BAr. דִּךְ, דִּךְ; the plur. אֵלֵךְ is the same in both dialects. The stronger form זֶכֶם C 2, H 4 *ille*, written before its noun, has its equivalent in דִּכְן Dan. ii 31, vii 20. In one papyrus, F, the forms דִּכָּא (a variety of זֶךְ), with the fem. דִּכִּי for addressing a woman, begin to appear; and in the same papyrus occurs the interesting form אֵלֵכִי, plur. fem., used in addressing a woman. These forms receive an exact illustration from the Arabic ذَاكَ, in speaking to a woman ذَاكَ, plur. ذَاكُم, fem. ذَاكَتُ; the suffixed ڪ, which is really a demonstrative particle, was regarded as the pronoun of the 2nd pers. and hence declined.¹ The feminine ending is هِ, not ه' or ه' as in BAr., or ه' as in Targ.; the emphatic form is not common, except in בִּירְחָא *fortress*, cf. עִבְרִתָּא, מְלִכּוּתָּא. The perfect 2nd pers. fem. sing. ends in ַי, which probably was pronounced as well as written, רחמתי D 10, עִבְרִתִּי F 6, יִמָּחִי F 5; in Syr. the ַי is written but not pronounced; in BAr. the form does not occur; in Hebr. it is fairly common, though the Massorites have usually altered קָטְלִיתִי to קָטְלִיתִי; in Pal. Aram. the ַי is found only with suffixes, קָטְלִיתִינִי. The imperfect 3rd pers. plur. always ends in ִן, the usual Aramaic termination; contrast the Old Ar. ַי 61 4. 7. 12. 64 9 and 65 9 (both jussive), 73 B 3, Dan. v 10 (jussive); in Ezra iv 12, Jer. x 11 the forms are exceptional and perhaps incorrect—they end in ַי but are not jussive. The imperf. of הוּהּ is יהוּהּ, יהוּן, never לְהוּהּ or לְהוּהּ.

(4) *Syntax.* The genitive relation is expressed as a rule by the

¹ Wright *Comp. Gram.* p. 110.

relative ןי, with the first noun in the emphatic, sometimes in the absolute, state, e. g. יהו אגורא זי יהו *the shrine of Yahu*, מלה זי מיא קשיא *the sailor of the rough waters*. Less frequently we meet with the periphrasis which became common in the later language, e. g. ביתה זי אסחור G 18 f. With common words the construct state is usual, e. g. קריה, בית זכריה, בעל קריה. The accusative is sometimes indicated by ל with the direct object, e. g. יהבת לכי לביחא E 2. 5, למבנה . . . למחסיה A 9; cf. Dan. iv 3, v 2, 7, 1 Chr. xvi 37, xviii 6 &c.

This brief examination of the dialect leads to the conclusion that it occupies a middle position in linguistic development between the Old Aramaic of N. Syria, Babylonia, and Cilicia, so far as we know it from inscriptions, and the later Aramaic of the O.T. and the Nabataean, Palmyrene, and Targum dialects. The older features of the language are still in existence, but they are gradually giving way to the forms which become familiar at a later period; probably the process had gone further in the spoken than in the written language. An exotic from the first, the Aramaic of Egypt did not long survive the foreign influences to which it owed its existence in the country. After the fall of the Persian Empire, it soon gave way before the rising tide of Hellenism, and Greek took the place of what had been the official language of the previous government. During the Greek period Aramaic texts are very rare, and in Egypt none are known during the 800 years between 400 B. C. and 400 A. D.¹

To illustrate the extraordinary interest of the new texts the following details of vocabulary are appended. A good many Hebraisms occur, as we should expect, e. g. לאמר . . . אמר, the form איש = BAR., Palm. אנש, Nab. אנוש; the Nif. ptc. נשחט G 10; the verb לקח (also in the Zenjirli dialect, 61 10. 12. 62 17 and on the Carpentras stele 75 3), which in the Ethpe. = *be taken* D 17 and not *be married* as usually in Aramaic; the words בעל (also in 62 10. 11. 63 10 f.), מרבית, בהמחה = Aram. רביתא, ערה; especially in Papyrus G several expressions have a distinctly Hebrew ring, על אנפי ארעה *male and female*, רכר ונקבה *on the face of the earth*, מן חם עד חוט *from a? to a thread*, בכף חרה *at one time* (cf. שכם אחד, פי אחד). The mixed character of the civilization of Upper Egypt is shewn by the presence of Assyrian words, אפל *brick wall*, אפל חמחי, סגן, טיב לבבי *suit and process*, דין ורבב *architect*, ארדיכל *exchange*, and Persian words, אבינרנא *compensation*, אחרה *fire-temple*, lit. המורד, פרתוך, דמנרין, (RÉS. no. 361), תיפחיא, נשכיא, and six names of Egyptian months. The lexicon receives considerable enrichment; thus we have the legal terms:—גרה Pa. *raise a suit* (Syr. Ethpa.), חסן Ha. *hold property* (cf. Daniel vii 18), טען Pe., Pa. *take, impose an*

¹ Lidzbarski, l.c. p. 243 f.

oath, ערר Pe. *set a suit in motion*, כבל Pe. *lodge a complaint* (Syr.), רחק Pe. *depart from, withdraw a claim*, רשה Pe. or Pa. *bring an action* (Syr.). Commercial terms are:—עקף? *accumulate*, פרם *salary* (Mishn. פְּרָמָא *portion*), פקד *deposit*, ראש *principal* (Talm.), רבה Pa. *bear interest* (Syr. Pe.). The following words, new to us at this period, find an explanation from later usage:—אנורה *shrine* (Targ. *altar*), משחח *measurement* (Targ., Syr.), נבו *receipt* (Talm. נְבוּאָה, Syr.), עשתא *measuring-rod* (late Hebr. עֶשֶׂת *bar, lump*, cf. Cant. v 14), פרכס *paint-box* (Talm. פְּרָכְסָא *paint the face*), פרה *divide* (Targ., Syr.), פשך *span* (Targ., Syr.), שוי *couch* (Targ.). The frequent use of רחם *to love* in the weakened sense *to wish* is characteristic. Valuable light is thrown upon the obscure expression in Prov. xxiv 27 לך ועתרה בשרה לך *and make it [thy work] ready in the field for thyself* by the use of the same verb in C 5 ועתר בהמתה *and stock it [the land] with cattle*. In the same line בני ארקא זך *build this land* may be compared with 1 Kings xvi 24 ויבן את ההר *and with the Phoenician* אית ארץ *built the plain of this land*, NSI. 8 3 ff. The word כנותה B 6 *his colleagues*, already known from a Memphis papyrus (CIS. ii 151), is used frequently in Ezra iv. The following adverbs and prepositions are noteworthy:—אחר *consequently*, אחרוהי C 4 *concerning it*, אפם (ם + אף) *assuredly*, בנו *thereto*, בשמי *on my behalf*, לא עד K 13 *not yet* (cf. Jer. xl 5 עודנו לא ישוב 2 Chr. xx 33), זי *whithersoever*, מנכן *hence*, מנעל *above*, עלא *thereon*, מן שטר מן J 13. 16 *as against* (cf. מִן מִן *besides, except*), חוב *further*, בענת M, N, O *now*, a feminine form of בען C 5, 73 A 1. B 1, BAR., Targ. The form בענת is also found in Ezra iv 10, vii 12 *and now* in the opening sentence of a letter to introduce the main topic. In the ostraka M, N, O the introductory matter is dropped for the sake of brevity, and the letter begins without more ado with בענת.

G. A. COOKE.

CODEX H OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles; photographed and deciphered by KIRSOPP LAKE, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leiden. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.)

DURING a visit to Mt. Athos made by Prof. Lake in 1903, partly under the auspices of the Hibbert and Hort Trustees, he was able to take photographs of the eight leaves of the well-known Codex H^{paul}, which are preserved in the monastery of the Laura. At the same time, following the example of the present Dean of Westminster in dealing with the leaves of the same MS at Paris, he succeeded in recovering portions of the text of some of the lost pages from the 'offsets' left by