

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

quoting in a loose way from the Ode. I now feel some hesitation about this conclusion. Bār Kēphā's quotation formula, 'they say', rather suggests some philosophical dictum than an immediate quotation from such a book as the Odes; and in Ode xxxiv the Odist is himself definitely philosophizing; the passage cited above continues: 'for everything is above, and what is below is nothing, but is imagined by those in whom there is no knowledge.'

It has occurred to me that the Odist may here be quoting as well as Bār Kēphā. If any evidence could be produced in confirmation of this suspicion, it might throw a flood of light on many questions which have arisen out of our Syriac text of the Odes.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

ἘΠΙΦΩΣΚΕΙΝ.

IN the January number of this JOURNAL, p. 188 ff, Mr C. H. Turner has an elaborate Note on the meaning of ἐπιφώσκειν. The Note occurs at the end of an article on the Gospel of Peter, in the course of which, as also in the Note, Mr Turner explains his reasons for differing from the views set forth by Professor Lake in his book on the Historical Evidence for the Resurrection, published in 1907. I find myself differing from both my friends, or rather I agree first with one, then with the other, and I venture to think that a fresh statement of the questions at issue may not be out of place. The exact meaning of ἐπιφώσκειν may seem a small matter, but the fact is that its discussion raises a good many interesting and important questions as to the way in which the New Testament writers reckoned time: we begin with mere questions of lexicography, but at the end we may find ourselves discussing the nationality of St Luke and his credibility as a historian.

To put the matter shortly, I agree with Mr Turner that ἐπιφώσκειν is used of the next day 'drawing on', even of the Jewish Sabbath which began at dusk: this is indeed the traditional meaning. On the other hand I agree generally with Professor Lake in his exposition of Lk. xxiii 56.

1. *The Semitic usage.*—The word ἐπιφώσκειν is somewhat rare in Greek and most of the known passages, if not all, in which it occurs have been suggested either by Matt. xxviii 1 or Lk. xxiii 54. But the Semitic equivalents are used with some freedom in contexts that are not Biblical. The words in question are derived from the root *n-g-ḥ*,

which is usually said to imply 'brightness' or 'dawning', so that at first sight they are as inappropriate as *ἐπιφώσκειν* to denote the beginning of a Jewish day.

Nevertheless the root is so used in Jewish Aramaic, e.g. Pes. 4 a

אורתא דתליסר נגהי ארביסר

means 'the evening of the 13th (Nisan), at the beginning of the 14th', where the word translated 'at the beginning of' is *nāghē*, which would imply 'brightening up', if נגה really meant 'to dawn'. Yet the time indicated must be about sunset.

It seems to me that the word is primarily astrological, and that the light indicated is not the light of day at all. *Nughā* (כוכב נוגה) is the planet Venus. The 'dawn' implied by the verb may therefore have been originally that of the Morning or Evening Star, not that of the Sun.¹

However this may be, the Syriac use is quite clear, odd as it is. *ܘܡܬܘܢ ܒܘ* means 'very early in the morning', while the causative conjugation *ܘܡܬܘܢ* means 'to keep vigil all night', and the verbal noun used before a day of the week means 'the night preceding such-and-such a day'. Thus in the Chronicle of Joshua Stylites § 47 (Wright, p. 36) we are told of the fire in the sky 'on the 22nd of August, on the *night preceding* Friday', where the word translated by Wright 'night preceding' (*maghat-*) is by derivation 'dawning'.² Similarly in Joshua Stylites § 27 (Wright, p. 18) the night between Friday, 17 May, 496, and the following Saturday he calls 'the day of Friday, dawning of Saturday' (ܘܡܬܘܢ ܘܚܘܚܘܬܐ ܘܨܘܬܐ ܘܨܘܬܐ).

One other Syriac word must be noticed here. Mk. xiii 35 divides the watching-time into four parts, Evening, Midnight, Cock-crow, Morning.³ Probably these are not formal divisions of the night as opposed to the day, or to be regarded as equally long. But in any case 'cock-crow' comes between midnight and the morning. Now in the Sinai Palimpsest the word for cock-crow is *nughāytā*, a formation from *Nughā*. Whether therefore we connect the word with Venus or not, it is here used for a time before the dawn, rather than for the dawn itself.

¹ It is really the same in Hebrew. נגה is never quite certainly used of sunlight. David says the LORD is his Candle, lighting up his darkness like the star (2 Sam. xxii 29). In 2 Sam. xxiii 4 may not נֶגְהָה be a note of time—'a morning cloudless from the time of the rising of the Morning Star'?

² If the connexion with Venus be accepted, it would be literally 'in the starlight of Friday', and in the context it must be the Evening Star, since the time in question is also in a sense reckoned to the preceding Thursday.

³ The Greek words are *ὄψέ*, *μεσονύκτιον*, *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας*, *πρωί*.

2. *Greek use of ἐπιφώσκειν outside the Gospels.*—We do not learn much about ἐπιφώσκειν from Liddell and Scott. In addition to the N. T. a reference is given to C. I. 9119, in other words to the gravestone of a Christian lady from Nubia who departed this life about eleven hundred years ago just before the 8th of Athyr; but as the 'inscription' does not further tell us what time of day this was, it is useless for our purpose. Sophocles *Lexicon* quotes a more interesting passage from the Paschal Chronicle (Migne, xcii 532 end), which dates the Last Supper on March 22, Nisan 13, in the 5th hour of the night, near the beginning of March [23].¹ Here, therefore, the hour of ἐπιφώσκειν is in the 5th hour after sunset, from 10–11 p.m.

Why does the Chronicler put the Last Supper so late? Turn to Aphraates and you will see. In his Homily on the Pascha we are told that from the moment our Saviour gave His Body to be eaten He was numbered among the dead, and that the miraculous darkness at the Crucifixion and the subsequent light count as one night and day.² So he makes three whole days and nights between the true Death (at the Supper) and the Resurrection, for 'in the night when Sunday was drawing on,³ at the same time that He gave His Body to the Disciples, He rose from the dead' (Aphr. xii § 6, pp. 517–520).

Thus the passage in the Paschal Chronicle is not so much an independent use of ἐπιφώσκειν as an interpretation of Matt. xxviii 1. We learn, further, that Aphraates and his followers felt no objection to placing the actual moment of the Resurrection a full hour before midnight on what we should call Saturday. Such persons evidently reckon their day to begin about the same time as the Jewish ritual day.

Not all chronologers were satisfied with reckoning the darkness at the Crucifixion as an extra night. Tyconius (*Rules*, p. 58) is particularly emphatic against the theory. His solution is that any part of a twenty-four hours' day counts for the whole. But even he reckons the night as belonging to the following day:—*si Dominus ante solem, id est ante*

¹ The passage is confused and I suspect a lacuna. The actual text of the last words is ὥρα νυκτερινῇ ἐ τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς εἰκάδα τετάρτην. Something is wrong here, for later on Nisan 14 is said very distinctly to be the Crucifixion day, and that according to the Chronicler is March 23.

² Part of this reckoning is also in the *Didascalia* (see below), but Aphraates is, I believe, alone in thinking of our Lord as dead from the time of the Supper.

³ Syr. כַּלְלָא דְנִינְיָא מְנַחֵם כַּבְרָא. For the construction we may compare כַּלְלָא דְנִינְיָא מְנַחֵם כַּבְרָא 520²⁴ and כַּלְלָא דְנִינְיָא מְנַחֵם כַּבְרָא 521³, where 'Friday' and 'Saturday' are fem., and so the verb is in the fem. In Matt. xxviii 1, therefore, the Syriac versions state that Sunday was 'coming on', not that the night was 'dawning into' Sunday. In 521⁶ Aphraates says directly כַּלְלָא מְנַחֵם כַּבְרָא מְנַחֵם.

initium diei, resurrexit, nox illa pars est inlucescens diei: quod et competit operibus Dei, ut non dies obscuretur in noctem sed nox luceat in diem (p. 57). Here we have a real occurrence of *illucescere*, which is the standing equivalent in the Gospels of ἐπιφώσκειν, and it is used in the natural sense of the approach of daylight. It should be noted that Tyconius gives no opinion as to the hour of the Resurrection: any time after sunset on Saturday would suit his theory. But he is conscious that Mk. xvi 2 implies, even with the Western reading, some time nearer sunrise on Easter Sunday.¹

Two other ecclesiastical writers have a claim to be heard here, because they are concerned with actual ritual observance, concerning which they are so far authoritative, rather than with harmonistic exegesis.

(a) The lady, whom it is still convenient to call 'Silvia', describes the services which she saw in and near Jerusalem in the fifth or sixth century (*Itinera sancta* 71-101). The day began 'before cock-crow' and ended with the ceremony called *Lucernare*, i. e. τὸ Λυχνικόν, which was usually about 4 p.m. (*hora decima* p. 72₉). This is perhaps a controversial statement; but whatever may have been the origin of the Lamp-lighting, 'Silvia's' view is clear, for on p. 82₂₆ she ends her description of the Saturday before Palm Sunday with *et fit Lucernare iuxta consuetudinem*, continuing *Alia ergo die, id est Dominica*. And again at the end of Palm Sunday she says (p. 84₁₀) *quamlibet vero sit, tamen fit Lucernare . . . Item alia die, id est secunda feria*. In each case the first event noticed is at cock-crow.

'Silvia' once uses the word *illucescere*. After stating that vigils are kept from the Lamp-lighting on Friday till the morning of Saturday before Palm Sunday,² she goes on to say *At ubi autem coeperit se mane facere sabbato illucescente, offeret episcopus et facit oblationem mane sabbato* (81₂₆). The time indicated seems to be about 'cock-crow': *sabbato illucescente* seems to me to mean 'on the ensuing Saturday', not 'at the time of day when Saturday was approaching'.

With reference to Paschal chronology it should be noticed that on Maundy Thursday there is a special Mass (*oblatio*) about 4 p.m. (85₃₁); then the people go home to dinner (86₅) at sundown, immediately after which they assemble at Olivet, go up to the place of the Ascension (*Imbomon*) at midnight (86₁₃), visit Gethsemane at cock-crow (86_{18, 27}),

¹ The passage is curious enough to be worth quoting in full (*Rules*, p. 57): 'nam Marcus dicit oriente sole—non orto sed oriente, id est ad ortum eunte; Lucas autem diluculo. sed ne de hac locutione ambigeretur, alteri euangelistae aperte noctem fuisse testantur, nam Matheus nocte dicit uenisse mulieres ad monumentum et uidisse Dominum, Iohannes uero cum adhuc tenebrae essent.' So, as usual, Mark is to be explained away to fit the other Gospels! I suppose *ad ortum eunte* might be made to mean any time in the night.

² p. 81₁₄ *de hora lucernarii sexta feria . . . usque in mane sabbato*.

and arrive in Jerusalem at early dawn, when it begins to be light enough to recognize faces (87₇). From 'Silvia's' account the Last Supper itself does not seem to be directly commemorated, only the discourses which the Lord spoke to the Disciples sitting in a cave.¹ Possibly Joh. xiv-xvii is intended.

(b) The interests of the compilers of the *Didascalia* and of the *Apostolic Constitutions* are also primarily liturgical rather than exegetical. The *Didascalia* is marked by a very peculiar chronology of Passion Week, whereby our Lord eats an anticipated Passover with the Disciples on Tuesday evening, followed by His arrest that same night (272₈₋₁₀).² The object of this reckoning appears in V xviii (288₁₆₋₁₉): it is to legitimate the Fast of Holy Week, viz. abstinence from Monday to Thursday, strict fast on Friday and Saturday. This fast leads up to the Easter Feast: it therefore becomes important to know exactly when it should end. There is no uncertainty as to the answer: 'Be gathered together and watch all the night, reading the Scriptures until the third hour of the night after the Saturday, and then break your fast' (V xix 1 pp. 288₂₀-290₃). This method of stating the time (repeated 276₈, 292₅) does not, however, explain when Saturday ends. In 278₁₆ it is distinctly deduced from Gen. i 5 that the evening belongs to the following day. Yet in 272₈ and in 278₁₆ the Last Supper is spoken of as taking place in the evening of the preceding day. In any case the author of the *Didascalia* has a different outlook from the true Semitic view of Aphraates, for he speaks of the night *after* such and such a day (274₃, 290₂). I cannot help getting the impression that the *Didascalia* tries to reckon days by the Roman method of midnight to midnight.

That at any rate is the interpretation followed in the *Constitutions*, for the passage in the *Didascalia* about ending the Fast at the third hour of the night is interpreted in the *Constitutions* to mean cock-crow: ἐπιφωσκούσης μᾶς σαββάτων, ἥτις ἐστὶ κυριακή, ἀπὸ ἑσπέρας ἕως ἀλεκτροφωνίας ἀγρυπνοῦντες . . . γρηγορεῖτε . . . μέχρις ἀλεκτρονίων κραυγῆς (291₆₋₁₃). I take this to mean 'when Sunday approaches, continue fasting after Saturday has past until about 3 a.m. on Easter morning'.³

The *Testamentum Domini*, on the other hand, which also has some

¹ *Spelunca in qua ipsa die Dominus cum apostolis fuit . . . loca de evangelio leguntur in quibus Dominus allocutus est discipulos eadem die sedens in eadem spelunca* (86₇, 11).

² *Didasc.* V xiv 5. I quote the *Didascalia* and the *Constitutions* by the pages of Funk's edition.

³ 'The third hour of the night' in Ac. xxiii 23 is taken by Blass to mean about 9-10 p.m.

connexion with the *Constitutions*, if not with the *Didascalía*, puts the end of the Fast at midnight (*Test. Dom.* ii 12).¹

Three passages from Epiphanius also deserve mention here. They are all in a sense derived from the *Didascalía*, but they are of interest as shewing more or less what ἐπιφώσκειν meant towards the end of the fourth century. Epiphanius (*Exp. fidei* 21) says ἐπιφωσκούση τετράδι συνελήφθη ὁ κύριος. Now whatever chronology we take of the Paschal Week, the arrest of our Lord took place in the middle of the night, before cock-crow: ἐπιφώσκειν here therefore indicates midnight, the beginning of the Roman day. In *Panar. Haer.* lxxi 11, on the other hand, writing against the Audiani, he says of the Jews ἐπιφωσκούσης τῆς κυριακῆς ἐσπέρας δύνανται θύειν τὸ πάσχα· μετὰ γὰρ ἐσπεραν παρελθόντος τοῦ σαββάτου οὐ δύνανται ἔργον ἐπιτελεῖν. We need not discuss the Paschal date here implied; in any case the Sunday indicated begins when the Sabbath is over, and that is in the 'evening'. ἐπιφώσκειν here, therefore, denotes the approach of evening on the Saturday before Easter. Yet the same Epiphanius *Haer.* li 26 writes ἐπιφώσκουσα κυριακῆ πεντεκαδικάτῃ νυκτερινῇ, ὅπερ ἦν φωτισμὸς ἄδου καὶ γῆς καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, i. e. he emphasizes the derivation from φῶς, shewing that the word to a Greek ear suggested the approach of illumination rather than the approach of evening.

Thus the Greek Ecclesiastical writers base their Easter reckoning and their use of ἐπιφώσκειν on Matt. xxviii 1, or upon something that depends on that verse. On the other hand, the mere word appears to indicate coming light and illumination rather than the gathering dusk of the beginning of a Jewish day. In any case it is impossible to study the descriptions of the ancient Ecclesiastical mode of observing Easter without being struck with the difference between it and what we are accustomed to in England to-day, or without realizing that both views are represented in the New Testament: most appropriately the Roman Church reads Matt. xxviii 1-7 for the Gospel on Holy Saturday, but Mk. xvi 1-7 on Easter Sunday itself. Our modern Easter Hymn speaks of the 'glorious morning ray, Breaking o'er the purple East'; the Church tradition prefers words like *O vere beata Nox, quae sola meruit scire tempus et horam in qua Christus ab inferis resurrexit.*

¹ It should be noted that all this part of the *Didascalía* is extant only in Syriac, so that we cannot use it as direct evidence for the meaning of ἐπιφώσκειν, since the words derived from the root *n-g-h* are used more freely in Syriac than ἐπιφώσκειν is in Greek. A clear instance is *Didasc.* V xiv 8 (274), where Funk has *Parasceve illucescente (eum vehementer coram Pilato accusaverunt)*. This modern Latin rendering appears to make Friday begin at dawn; but the corresponding words in the *Constitutions* (275₈) are παρασκευῆς ὄσης, and the Syriac really says 'Now when it was very early on the Friday' (ܟܕܘܢܝܘܢ ܡܘܬܝ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܘܫܝܢ).

3. *The Holy Women in the Gospel.*—The chief interest of the above rather extended survey of the use and apparent origin of *ἐπιφώσκειν* is connected with the accounts of our Lord's Burial and of the visit of the Women to the grave on Easter Day. I may therefore be permitted a few words on the Gospel narratives themselves, so far as they touch upon the movements of these Women.

St Mark, who does not use *ἐπιφώσκειν* at all, tells a clear and, as I venture to think, a consistent story. The Women see the hasty burial (Mk. xv 47) before sunset on Good Friday: it was already late (v. 42).¹ When the Jewish Sabbath was past and the shops were accessible they buy spices (xvi 1), i.e. on what we call Saturday evening. Then 'very early' on Sunday morning—but this is explained to be 'at sunrise'—they come to the tomb (xvi 2). All this is surely credible and the only account that is credible. Our Lord was not taken down from the Cross directly after He died, it was 'when the evening was come'; the Women could hardly have had time for their purchases before dusk, when the legal Sabbath began. What Mark tells us is that after the enforced twenty-four hours' pause for rest and reflexion they were ready to do what they could, and they buy at once what was necessary. They were not *expecting* the Resurrection. An all-night vigil by the tomb, outside the City, would have been almost certainly impracticable for them, and why should they have thought of it? Nevertheless they are up early, and by sunrise they are at the tomb.

I do not see any real incongruity between *λίαν πρωί* and *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου* in xvi 2: I doubt if *λίαν πρωί* here means more than 'as early as they possibly could'.

The accounts in Matthew and Luke differ in certain points from Mark, but where they differ they each contain internal improbabilities. In Matthew we have the story of the Guard at the Tomb, and all mention of the Women's spices is omitted. Possibly it may have been felt that the presence of a Guard was inconsistent with any attempt to get at the corpse. However this may be, Archdeacon Allen must be right in saying (p. 300): 'He [Matt.] seems to have wished to omit the "purchase", but not to have cared to pass over the note of time attached to it.' So we get the Women witnessing the Burial (Matt. xxvii 61), as in Mark, but after telling about the Guard Matthew goes on 'Now late on the Sabbath, as it was drawing on to the first day of the week, there came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to look at

¹ The Jewish reckoning makes *ὀψίας γενομένης* ambiguous, so St Mark twice adds an explanatory clause. Here *ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή* explains that though late it was not yet the Sabbath. On the other hand *ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος* in Mk. i 32 explains that the Galileans did not carry their sick folk out till the Sabbath was over. *παρασκευή* in St Mark is hardly our Friday, but rather the time from 3 p.m. to sunset (cf. Jos. *Ant.* xvi 6, 2).

the tomb ; and behold, there was a great earthquake . . . and the angel said . . . “ He is risen ” (xxviii 1, 2^a, 5, 6).

As we have seen in the earlier part of this article, this passage is the starting-point for the Ecclesiastical observance of Holy Week, but it is very difficult to follow in detail. No doubt ὄψε σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων means ‘ late on Saturday near the beginning of Sunday ’: but what did the Evangelist understand by *Saturday* and *Sunday*? For it is not the Jewish reckoning, as we might have expected. The visit of the Women to the tomb, with the Angel telling them that the Lord’s Resurrection had been already accomplished, must be after the Jewish Sabbath is over ; besides, we must account for νυκτός in Matt. xxviii 13. It seems to me that ‘ Matthew ’ hardly attempted to construct a time-table, or considered the intrinsic improbability of an all-night vigil for the Women. In any case the abiding peculiarity of his narrative is that he does not use the strict Jewish day, and consequently there is considerable likelihood that the community for which he wrote—was it Antioch?—did not use the Jewish day either.

Let us now turn to St Luke. Here we read of the Burial, followed by the note of time καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν (Lk. xxiii 54). The Women follow and witness what was done, and return to *prepare*—Luke does not say to *buy*—their spices. On the Sabbath indeed they rest (xxiii 56), but very early on Sunday they arrive at the Tomb (xxiv 1). Here again it is difficult to suppose that the Holy Women are keeping Jewish days, for the preparations for embalming are clearly placed by Luke on Good Friday evening (xxiii 56). But as he does not make them buy in the shops he does not introduce a patent impossibility.

It should be noticed that there is one curious piece of evidence which tends to shew that St Luke really did regard the ‘night’ as belonging to the previous ‘day’ and not *vice versa*. It is not Ac. xx 7, because τῇ ἐπαύριον proves nothing. Both the Greek αὔριον and the Hebrew מחר are used of the next period of daylight, independently of conventional reckonings of time. To-morrow is to-morrow in Hebrew as in English, whether it be reckoned the same day of the week or not.¹ If the Christians of Troas assembled in the evening and St Paul was to start during the following period of daylight, that would be ‘to-morrow’ (ἐπαύριον), whether they considered themselves to have met on April 11 or April 12. Similarly in Ac. xxiii 31, 32 ἡγαγον διὰ νυκτός . . . τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον . . . ὑπέστρεψαν is intelligible both to Jews and to Greeks.

¹ See the conversation of Lot’s daughters in Gen. xix 34. Further, the Israelites gathered the manna all day and all night and all the morrow (כל יום המחרת) in Nu. xi 32 : see also Judith vi 21, vii 1.

But Lk. ix 37 is different. The phrase τῆ ἐξῆς occurs twice in the Third Gospel and three times in Acts, not at all in the rest of the N. T., so that it may be regarded as characteristically Lucan, and as reflecting St Luke's point of view. St Luke tells the story of the Transfiguration in such a way as to suggest something happening at night (see v. 32, with the references to prayer in vv. 28, 29), and goes on to say 'Now it came to pass τῆ ἐξῆς ἡμέρα, on the *next* day . . .' (v. 37). These apparently simple words caused a difficulty to some ancient translators. The Old Syriac has 'on that day', and so has the Sahidic, while D and the Old Latin have 'in the course of the day' (διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας). In other words, according to the strict Ecclesiastical reckoning, it was not on the next day, but on the same day.

I infer that St Luke habitually thought of day and night much as we do. The whole night did not belong to the following day, as in the legal Jewish Kalendar. Where he made the division can hardly be ascertained. If the Women rested on the Sabbath and yet were at the Tomb ὄρθρον βαθείως, the division must be earlier than this¹: perhaps St Luke thought of 'cock-crow' as beginning the day, just as 'Silvia' seems to do. But however he divided his time he uses his words correctly: ἐπέφωσκειν in Lk. xxiii 54 refers to the 'drawing on' of a conventional period of time, not to an increase of daylight. Probably St Luke knew the term as a conventional equivalent among Greek-speaking Semites for the Aramaic *n-g-h*.

It would take too long to follow Mr Turner and Prof. Lake in their discussion of the Gospel of Peter and its relations to the Canonical Four. I can only say that I have found no parallel anywhere to πρωίας δὲ ἐπιφώσκοντος τοῦ σαββάτου (*Ev. Petri* § 9 *init.*), in which the Sabbath appears to begin at, or just before, daylight. It seems to correspond with the general ignorance of 'Peter' about Jewish affairs and with nothing else. One chief aim I have had in view is to shew that ἐπιφώσκειν is not quite so rare as the Dictionaries suggest, though its use is almost wholly confined to technical questions concerning the beginning of a Jewish day. I imagine it is a real example of that 'Jewish Greek' which the discoveries of Egyptian papyri have reduced to such a restricted compass. Its Aramaic equivalent, on the other hand, is much more freely used, whatever physical explanation be adopted for its origin.

F. C. BURKITT.

¹ Lk. xxiv 1; the Old Syriac translates this 'in the early dawn'; the Peshitta, under the influence of Joh. xx 1, has 'in the dawn while yet dark'.