Review

Author(s): W. E. Crum

Review by: W. E. Crum

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 8, No. 3/4 (Oct., 1922), pp. 187-190

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853697>

Accessed: 29-12-2015 09:08 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Koptisches Handwörterbuch. By WILHELM SPIEGELBERG. (Continued from p. 119.)

P. 140 τω, το; is not this merely *qual.* of †? Cf. p. 139 το ε-. — εβαι here as elsewhere (εοται) “intel.” πετρα in the passage cited would be “monastery,” while κηπλαρι (*sic Cod.*) I take for *σκεπτάριον “awning.” — τεεβε is the A form in Ex. II 3. — P. 142. τωδε; non-existent; in Clem. p. 70, 18; read τωδρ = ἡγήσατο. — τωδε B “seal”; non-existent; read τωδ, the only form found. — It is hard to believe that τκα = “eternity” when it translates εἰς νῆκος, which here in B is ετρο (cf. S. Amos VIII 7). — P. 143. If the etymology for τωκ “bake” is right, then surely that on p. 162 for τωσε cannot justify this same meaning. — †κβο; why as one word and not †κβο, like †κ-κβο, †ρμμε? — τκας; only S; PEYRON’s mistake. — P. 144 τλω; non-existent; read (ZOEGA 443 n.) τλωσε, *i. e.* σλοοσε, cf. Gen. XXVIII 12 τλοοσε (*sic Cod.*). — τλοκλεκ = *rotare crinem* in Jerome’s *Vita Hilar.* — P. 145 том “hedge”; so PEYRON, but prob. mat. hung over door (cf. *Mus. Guim.* XVII 171, *CSCO.* 73 168). — P. 146 I have not found τωmt B “meet.” — P. 147 тне is, I think, always an earthen dyke. — P. 149 тапнт; *leg.*? тсаднт (cf. vv. 9, 15, where тсабо = this same Greek). — † пкес, though confirmed by ENGELBRETH, prob. *leg.* ткес (S. тκας in both places). — P. 150 топч = тодч (cf. p. 142) “seal-impress.” — трτω; cf. p. 103, where this was given as рτω. Both forms are found. — P. 151 I do not find тпанс S., nor т(е)реиот B. — тртер; non-existent; a variant (MS. P. Morgan) shows this = трир, as suggested. — P. 152 тер-тורי; whence the meaning “ladder”? — P. 153 тебо A is repeated p. 155, where it rightly belongs. — P. 156 таτ; Cod. Vatic. Deut. XVIII 11 has a noun мтаτ = LAG. ⲁⲩⲉⲃⲉⲛ. — P. 157 †тоти; non-existent; *leg.* †тотω (= WINSTEDT, *Theodore* 72; LEMM, *Misc.* CVII 1154, misreads this). — εωотел; Tattam at any rate has εοτελε. — τωоткоτ; PEYRON’s instances are all B. — P. 158 тогпак is not A, but A₂ (*Acta Pauli*). — εωотт “statue”; non-existent; is εотωт in Balestri-Hyvernat. — P. 159 τωγ “grind” (corn) seems to me an unnecessary novelty, where “arrange, dispose, place” would suffice. — εωγп; prob. = εωдγ (p. 142). — P. 160 ειδι “hire”; merely “be drunken” (Codd. A and S have μεμεθυμένω). — For τρο read †ρο — †ор; PEYRON (WILKINS) has тоρ, Cod. Vatic. and LAG. мωит. — P. 161 τωор; the better MS. has τωрр (cf. *Can. Ath.* p. 103).

P. 169 †отωн; non-existent; *leg.* †отω with LAG. p. XII, Codd. Vatic. & Paris I. — аотωн in PS. 331 may be ета-, 3d fut., yet P. Bruce 123 has this form. — P. 170 онкре; non-existent; Job XIII 27 should read таотнкреⲁⲗⲉ ⲁⲗⲉ = δέ μου τὸν πόδα. — P. 171 отрас; its only meaning is “staff”; “crown” is due to PEYRON’s wrong reference. — отици “swell”; the Copt mistook, I think, πμπερημι for πρλω (cf. vars. in Cambridge LXX) and so used the word for “saw.” — P. 175 отпам; a bad form, in Paris 44 only: a var. of same text отпым. — отре in Paris 44 only; MASPERO *in loc.* ρотре. — P. 176 отег кап; that this, despite the *stat. constr.*, is but an ethic dat. is clear from use of каг, where the subject is sing. (Gen. XXXIII 18 etc.). — P. 177 отагмее; non-existent; other instances show the ε to belong to following енте. — P. 178 отосотес; it is the man, in n. 4, who gnaws his own tongue, not the disease. — ет; I do not find this as B.

P. 179. Surely the two ωн are one? — P. 180 етолм; I think this quite doubtful; cf. еттолм in Prov. XX 1. — ωме F, once only; read ωлн. — P. 184 ωпм in Sir. XXXIV 29 has the nominal form отпмеч. — P. 185 ωри; both PEYRON’s refs. are from KIRCHER, not ZOEGA! — ωхеб; the following мпотωп (*sic Cod.*) = мпототωп and begins a new phrase, “they were not willing to.”

P. 186 γα, εγω is, I suspect, “swine,” despite the Greek. — γа- “worth”; non-existent; таго || τιμή, γа- is the preposition = ὅση καί. — P. 187 γαιε; not “long” but “length,” contrasted with πωхн. — γот “hundred”; a suspect variant, found once in a late MS. — P. 188 εγиди; non-existent; ε- is the usual preposition after εро, as in Mat. XXIII 5. — γо “sand,” γои “height”; why these unusual

forms?—P. 189 **ψαβιζο**; in B found once only, as **ψεβιζο**. PEYRON's form prob. confused with S **ψαβεζο**.—**πτυεβιω** **ζε** (e. g. Deut. xxvii 62) is "instead of being."—**ψωβε** and **ψωπε** (p. 203) have different etymologies, yet they can hardly be different words.—P. 191 **ψανε**; I suggest **ψαρνε** as appropriate here.—**ψαλ**; rather "bundle" (= **ψολ**), than "branch".—P. 193 **ψλεετ**; an error due to me; in all cases read **ψελεετ**, as in the texts.—P. 194 **ψωλ** should be **ψωλσ**.—**δαμνιγί**; MSS. have **δαμ** (v. STERN § 192).—**ρῥωε** **κνωμ**; instead of **τρίχαπτον** cf. Vulg. *subtilibus*.—**ψμκ**; non-existent; a bad reading for **ψωε**, cf. the same verse on pp. 173, 175 of WESSELY.—P. 195 **ψμοτη** only in Paris 44, elsewhere **ψμοτε**.—**ψωμε**; can hardly mean both "garment" and (p. 154) "fine, thin." The Arabic *rafī* shows that the latter is right.—P. 196 **ψμκνε**; STERN and MALLON have **ψμκνι**.—**ρμτε**; LACAU adds *sic* to **ρντε**.—**ψμτεροοτ**; doubtless misprint for **ποοτ**.—**ψεμφατ**; not a verb; prob. **†** has fallen out in the text quoted.—**ψωμ**; the meaning "pierce" was given by LORET (*Rec.* xiv 108), incorrectly by Bshai (*ĀZ.* '83, 128).—P. 198 **ψενθενί**; I cannot find this as "palm-tree". In ZORGA's citation (his two are but one) it = *σεβένιον*, as usual; in *Clem.* = Is. I 18, I suspect a confusion, since S and B leave *φουνικοῦν* untranslated.—P. 199 **ψνιγί**; non-existent; in both PEYRON's instances MS. has **ψνι**.—**ψενροι**; non-existent; MS. has **αιψενγ ρω** "I on my part asked him"; so too **ψενρω** = *Mus. Guim.* xxv 219 "me too they asked."—P. 200 **εοτρε** **νειεν** **ψοντε** "embroidering needle" (cf. *Triad.* 660).—P. 201 **ψενξε**; non-existent; MS. has **ψνι** **ξεεσκαολ** (*Mus. Guim.* xxv 56).—**ψνι**, a corn measure; non-existent; *leg.* **ετεψνι** **νε** (Paris 43, 111; cf. SETHE, *Dem. Urk.* 188).—P. 202 **ψενψων** = **ψεψων** (cf. Ps. li 2).—P. 203 **ψωπε** "begin to"; is this justified? If so, one must so translate in Lu. vii 38 and many other places.—P. 204 **ψααρμας** = *δέσματα τῶν βοῶν* (ZAHN, *Ac. Joan.* 145).—**ψαιρι**, n. 14; the meaning here is, I think, the ordinary one: "smite".—P. 205 **ψεερ** **νεριμε**; prob. misprint for **ψεερε**.—**ατψωργ**; non-existent; *leg.* **ατ-ψ-ωργ** (var. **οργγ**), *ἀπερίγραπτος, ἀχώρητος*.—P. 206 **ψαρθωτ**, var. **ψαροσωτ** "fresh, raw hide"; only **ορθωτ** = "palmstaff."—**αψωορνε**; non-existent; *leg.* **αψωονε**.—P. 207 **ψωρτ** "band"; *leg.* **ψορτ**.—**ψωρτ** "saw" (B, not S); this is merely the preceding word: the refs. nn. 5 and 6 are identical.—P. 209 **ψωτε** A; I cannot find this; is it S? The compounds cited by no means imply a verb.—P. 210 n. 14; it is to be observed that several MSS. have **ψαατε**.—P. 211 **ψντ**; but CIASCA *ad. loc.* has **ψατ**.—P. 212 **ψατποσῆ**; surely a mere error for **ρατ**, which constantly = *χρυσόχοδος*.—P. 214 **ψωψ** "pair": var. **ψωιψ** preferable.—**ψεψκε**; non-existent; this is **ψεψ** **κερμι** (= WINSTEDT, *Theodore* 27).—P. 216 **ψωστ**, a measure; prob. = **ψωστ**.—**ρερ**; occurs in SCHMIDT's Index to *Clem.*, but not in the text.—**ψοτρε** Paris 44 = Paris 43 **σοτρε**.—**ψσν**; of this it can only be said that CIASCA has **ψαξε** in Job xvii 6, xxx 9, xxxi 30.—P. 217 **ψοτσε**; is not **ψοτσε** probable?

P. 218 **γτο†**; Cod. Vatic. has the variant **τεγο†**, which should show **τεγ** to be the pronoun.

P. 222 **ρεβον[οτη]**; since the last syllable is an assumption, I should prefer **-βοτη**, or **-βοτοτη**.—P. 223 **ριω** = A; presumably a mistake for **ριω** = (so SCHMIDT in *Clem.* 38, 27).—P. 224 **ρο** "feast"; prob. **ρα**, as in 2 Macc. vi 6.—P. 225 **σιρο** in Num. ix 7, read with Cod. Vatic. **σροζ** *ὑστερεῖν*.—**ροτε**; read **ροι** **εψαξε** ("make) concentration in speech".—**ρ ροι**; prob. as in Mk. v 35 = *σπύλλειν*.—P. 226 **ρω** "cease;" in the phrase quoted by SETHE not this verb, but the pron. **ρω** occurs; "until God arranged for the brother on his part." No instance of **ρω** reflex. is known to me.—**ρῥε** n. 17; here the word must = A **εῖν** and must be distinct from "mourning."—P. 229 **ψενριν**; *leg.* **ψενριν**, in Penta-teuch and elsewhere.—**ρακ** "baldhead"; various texts, e. g. Jême 66, 33, make it probable that this is a trade.—**ρωκκ** = **ρωσκ**.—P. 230 **ρλι**; I cannot believe that in n. 1 this is anything but the usual *aliquid, nihil* and I would translate *e re nihili*, remembering that **ρηαατ** is as often "thing" as "vessel".—**ρηλε** (in Jême 68, 51) is, I think, *βλγ*.—P. 232 **ρλοσλωοτ**; usual meaning "high" (of things).—P. 233 **ερμκ**; this, in *Mil. Rain.* v 32, is for **κερ** **μμε** "genuine, superfine oil."—P. 234 **ρωμε**; here again I fear SPIEGELBERG has been misled by a careless note of mine (*Osireion* p. 42); **ραμε** is the sole form found so far.—**μοτδεμι** or **μοτδμη** appear the right forms.—P. 237 **ραπτοοτ**; on p. 6 π is not superlined. Which is correct?—P. 238 **σνι** B should be **ρνι**.—P. 239 **μα** **ηρων** can hardly be separated from **μα** **εγο** **ηρων**.—**ρρηε**; no evidence for its being masc.—P. 241 **ρρηι**; non-existent; MS. has **ρρηι**.—**ρρῆ**; the expression of numbers by letters is unknown in S (except in some old MSS., e. g. the Bruce Pap.).—P. 242 **ρρα** is always "face" in B, never "voice."—P. 244 **ρρω†**; all MSS. have **σρω†**.—P. 245 **ρρωψ** "freeze"; in Mat. xxiv 12, var. **ρρωψ**, prob. = **ορω**.—P. 246 **σρσρπ**; I take this as an adjective, "striped" (as AMÉLINEAU, *M. Guim.* xxv, 268).—**ρρε** **ερον**; should be **ρρε** **εραρον**.—P. 247 **σρρ**; B has **ρρρ** where "spin" is certain; elsewhere = "toil", e. g. Mat. vi 28.—**ρρεγ** should

surely join $\rho\omega\psi\psi$ "despise." — $\rho\epsilon\psi\rho\sigma\epsilon\theta$, n. 14; H. THOMPSON's collation reads $\rho\mu\eta$. — $\rho\sigma\eta$ "fatness"; read $\delta\sigma\eta$. — P. 248 $\rho\tau\eta$; the phrase (1 Kingd. xvii 7) is $\tau\epsilon\rho\tau\eta \mu\eta\epsilon\psi\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\rho$; therefore not "lance", though gender forbids = $\psi\tau\epsilon$. — P. 250 $\mu\alpha\rho\eta\tau$; imagined by ZOEGA, 537 n. — $\delta\iota\tau$ "flay" appears in B to be confused with $\rho\iota\tau\epsilon$. Are not $\rho\iota\tau\epsilon$ "flay" and "twist" a single word? — $\rho\alpha\tau$; cf. $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$ p. 248. — $\rho\omega\tau$ "presence"; not found in B. — P. 251 $\rho\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ "garment" fem. in CO. 100, 174, 368, 465 etc. — $\rho\alpha\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ A₂ is "garment". — $\rho\upsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ "darts"; an error? One var. has $\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$. — $\delta\omega\tau \epsilon\theta\sigma\lambda$; I think this should be $\delta\iota\tau$, the same in Jer. xviii (sic) 15 as in Job xxx 15. In Mich. v 13 A $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$ ought to = S $\psi\alpha\alpha\tau\epsilon$, which often translates $\epsilon\kappa\chi\omicron\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ (as indeed it once does in A, Zach. xii 11). — P. 252 $\rho\omega\tau\mu$; surely a scribe's error for $\psi\omega\tau\mu$ (cf. 2 ll. lower in the text cited). — P. 253 $\rho\omega\tau\eta$; merely for $\omega\tau\eta$, as SPIEGELBERG suggests. — P. 254 $\rho\omega\tau\psi$; for $\omega\psi\tau$, I think. — P. 257 $\rho\omega\sigma\tau\psi$; S should be $\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\psi$. — P. 259 $\rho\omega\chi\epsilon$; only once so, elsewhere $\rho\omega\chi$. — $\rho\omega\chi\chi$; THOMPSON's var. $\rho\upsilon\chi\rho\chi$ is preferable. — $\rho\omega\sigma\eta$; between this and $\rho\omega\chi\eta$ there seems to be a confusion, for nn. 2 and 12 refer to the same text.

P. 260 $\chi\alpha\iota$; non-existent; read $\alpha\kappa\chi\alpha\iota\epsilon \phi\eta$. — P. 261 $\chi\alpha\tau\mu\omega\iota\tau$ B; read $\sigma\alpha\tau$. — P. 262 $\chi\eta$; I suggest $\chi\omicron\mu$ misread. — P. 264 $\chi\alpha\delta\alpha\chi\iota\theta$; non-existent; MS. $\chi\alpha\delta\chi\iota\theta$ = $\mu\iota\kappa\rho\sigma\phi\alpha\eta\varsigma$. — $\chi\alpha\kappa$; I do not find this with $\epsilon\theta\sigma\lambda$. — P. 265 $\chi\omega\kappa$ "possessions, property"; the meaning is (Jême 74, 37) "the whole" of my property. — $\chi\omega\kappa\iota$; non-existent; LAGARDE $\chi\omega\chi\iota$. And $\chi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon$ is S, not B. — P. 266 $\chi\omicron\lambda$ "hole"; non-existent; MS. $\chi\omicron\lambda$. — P. 267 $\chi\omega\lambda\kappa$; the evidence, when disentangled, shows: S $\chi\omega\lambda\kappa$ (1) "stretch, prolong," (2) "dive"; B $\sigma\omega\lambda\kappa$ (1) "stretch," (2) $\chi\omega\lambda\kappa$ "dive", *M. Guim.* xvii 190 alone having $\sigma\omega\lambda\kappa$ in the latter sense. $\chi\omega\lambda\kappa \epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon$ "be long in giving birth." — $\chi\epsilon\lambda\mu\iota$; non-existent; MS. $\chi\epsilon\lambda\mu\iota$ (cf. KIR. 77 *halamah* = $\kappa\iota\psi\iota$). — P. 268 $\sigma\omega\lambda\epsilon$; as often in MS. of *M. Guim.* xvii, the scribe has written σ for normal χ . For this word a different meaning is given on p. 288. — P. 269 $\chi\omicron\lambda\chi\epsilon\lambda$ B not found. — $\chi\mu\eta$; PEYRON is right: MS. has $\chi\mu\epsilon$. — $\chi\mu\epsilon$; an error due to my misreading; MS. (collated) has $\chi\eta\sigma$. — $\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon$ A; always $\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon$ except in text cited. — $\sigma\mu \pi\sigma\omega$ means "inform oneself (about)". — P. 270 $\chi\omicron\mu$ "basin"; rather suspect; the Arab has *kuwah* "strength." But the same words in Ps. cvii 9 leave $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\varsigma$ untranslated, as does S in both places. — $\kappa\epsilon\chi\epsilon\mu$; seeing the divergencies in Greek ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$), S $\mu\epsilon\psi\alpha\kappa$ and F $\mu\alpha\pi\tau\omega\varsigma$ (though the last 2 are equivalents), the meaning remains obscure. — $\chi\omega\mu$ "generations" is as often sing. — P. 272 $\chi\epsilon\pi\alpha\tau$; Cod. Vatic. and LAG. have $\chi\alpha\pi\epsilon\tau$; cf. $\chi\alpha\pi\epsilon$. — P. 273 $\chi\eta\epsilon\tau$; I think this = B $\sigma\eta\omega\sigma$, as in Ex. viii 10 (14). — $\chi\eta\sigma\tau\psi$; cf. $\chi\sigma\tau\psi$. Ryl. 94 p. 7 has $\chi\eta\sigma\tau\psi$ $\mu\eta\epsilon\psi\rho\eta\tau$, for the usual $\chi\sigma\tau\psi$. — $\chi\eta\chi\eta\tau$; BM. 192 $\chi\eta\tau$ (cited by THOMPSON *ad loc.*) seems the probable reading; cf. AMÉLINEAU *Schenoudi* I 353 $\alpha\tau\epsilon\psi\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\eta\eta \chi\iota \mu\mu\omicron\iota$. — P. 275 $\chi\eta\eta\tau$; Paris 44, which PEYRON quotes, has $\chi\eta\eta\tau\tau$; WOIDE's version is different. — P. 277 $\sigma\epsilon\rho\sigma$; P. 44, cited by PEYRON, has $\sigma\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon$. — $\chi\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\rho$; meaning unknown. In Deut. xxi 23 Cod. Vatic. and LAG. read $\chi\epsilon\psi\chi\omega\psi$. — P. 278 $\sigma\sigma$ is a $\frac{1}{2}$ $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omega\tau$, a $\frac{1}{2}$ $\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$, a $\frac{1}{2}$ $\epsilon\tau\iota\omega\psi\epsilon$, a $\frac{1}{2}$ ell, a $\frac{1}{2}$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta\eta$; I see no reason for confining the word to a $\frac{1}{2}$ *Solidus*. — P. 279 $\chi\omega\tau$; in *George* 54 the arabic translates "pillar," which seems preferable. — P. 280 n. 14, $\chi\omega\psi$ is here, I suspect, for $\omega\psi\chi$. — P. 281 $\chi\omicron\sigma\psi\epsilon$; the scribe's original reading $\chi\omicron\sigma\psi$ (as from $\chi\omicron$) befits the Greek. — $\chi\omega\psi\epsilon$; the *qual.* $\chi\eta\psi$ prob. = $\epsilon\tau\psi\eta\psi$, as ZOEGA 626 n. suggests. — $\chi\omega\psi$ "touch"; the citation in n. 8 has merely the meaning "draw nigh to," $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. — P. 282 $\chi\alpha\chi\epsilon \mu\eta$; I am doubtful as to the meaning I proposed here; perhaps "be hard towards" is better. — P. 284 $\sigma\alpha\sigma\epsilon\tau\omicron\lambda$ (sic Cod.); arab. *samâriyah* (sic), a kind of ship (Dozy); the Greek equivalent is doubtless $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\iota\nu$. — $\sigma\sigma\chi$ is *stat. pronom.* only.

P. 285 $\sigma\iota\eta$ "border"; for $\sigma\iota\eta\sigma$ Cod. Vatic. has $\sigma\iota\eta \sigma\tau\omicron\sigma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\eta$. — $\sigma\alpha\delta\epsilon$; I suspect $\sigma\lambda\delta\epsilon$, cf. $\sigma\lambda\mu$. — P. 287 $\sigma\omega\lambda$ "repudiate"; I do not find this as S. — $\sigma\omega\lambda$ "collect" n. 2; both PEYRON's (ZOEGA's) instances of "rob" should be "collect." — $\sigma\sigma\omicron\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$; obscure; B of this text uses $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\iota$, thus it is part of lower leg or foot. — P. 288 $\sigma\lambda\sigma$; nn. 7 and 8 are identical and has not the form with ϵ . — $\sigma\alpha\lambda\sigma$ should be $\sigma\alpha\lambda\sigma\chi$. — $\sigma\mu\eta$; read? $\sigma\alpha\eta\epsilon$, which occurs a few lines below and is the S. equivalent in both instances. — P. 289 $\sigma\iota\mu\eta$ "cloud"; TATTAM 772 = CSO. 43, 147, where $\sigma\eta\eta\iota$. $\sigma\iota\mu\eta$, -e I take as noun from the preceding verb. — $\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon$ "gardens"; prob. read $\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu \epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\tau$ (cf. Vulg.). — P. 291 $\sigma\sigma\omicron\theta$; non-existent in this sense. In the verse cited (n. 1) $\sigma\epsilon\rho\omicron\theta$ occurs; hence confusion? — $\sigma\omega\eta\tau$; read $\sigma\omega\tau\eta \eta\pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. — $\sigma\psi\epsilon$; from Paris 44, Arab. *gawânis*, Greek $\beta\acute{o}\epsilon\varsigma$ (or $\mu\acute{o}\sigma\chi\omicron\iota$); so prob. read $\epsilon\psi\epsilon$. — P. 293 $\sigma\omicron\psi$ "dirt"; should be $\sigma\omicron\psi\chi$. — $\sigma\omega\tau\eta \rho\eta\tau$, n. 4; Greek $\eta\pi\iota\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$ shows the true meaning. — P. 294 $\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma\omega\chi$; cf. $\sigma\sigma\chi\sigma\chi$. — P. 295 $\sigma\sigma\chi\psi$ ϵ clearly = $\sigma\sigma\chi\theta$ in all places cited, e. g. *Aeg.* 279 $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\eta\chi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

Where the references lie so thick on every page as is the case with Prof. SPIEGELBERG's Dictionary, a certain proportion of errors is inevitable and as the book is one sure to be much used, a list of some

of these—only such as were casually observed during the compilation of the above notes—may be not unwelcome. The large figures here=pages, the small=notes.

3₁: *Vit. Sin.* 66₁—Ib.₅: *Nah.* 3₁₇—Ib.₆: *Is.* 1₆—5₄: *Zech.* 14₁₃—6₄: *Nota* 1₆₈—14₇: TURAJEFF etc. belongs to n. 5—15₁: 278 line₇—18₁₃: 107—21₅: 23 (1885)—Ib.₆: *Num* 7₃—22 *ult.*: *Jac.* 2₂—32₃: 12₁—33₄: III 34—35₁: *Jer.*—Ib.₄: 23 (1885)—48₇, for *Z.* read *Kir.*—54 *penult.*: IV₇₃₀—55₈: § 33—61₅: *Deut.* 25₁₄—63₇: XXV₄₀—64₁: Quatremère, not Tattam—66₄: XLV—68₈: *Apoc.* 3₁₆—69₁: S. 31—76₈: *Amos*—79₄: 634—88₄: *Schen.* IV—91₆: *Anm.* 34—95₄: 23₄₂—96₄: *Zech.* 14₁₂—109₉: (1912)—111 *εδηλ*: (*Elym.* 25)—122₅: 25—125₉: no. 302₇—131 line₂₀: 7₈—133₃ and₄ should be transposed—136₄: III 47₁₁—Ib. 10: 632—141₃: 276 *i*—Ib.₁₃: *Ps.* 143—153₄: 95—173₁₂: 13₄₈—177₁₄: should be 2 *Chron.* III 7 (*v.* PEYRON)—178₈: S. 109—Ib. 11: 34₂₁—180₄: 5₂, 11—181 line₁₀: 110 *ult.*—183₆: 11₂₈—189₉: § 582. What is 619?—192₈: this belongs to n. 10—194₆: 334—Ib.₉: transpose 101 and 119—195₅: *Deut.* 18₁₄—Ib. *penult.*: n. 16 (ZORGA 473) relates to the preceding word—196₂: 4₁₀—Ib.₇: 73—198₆: 161₂₅—203₁: 8₁₉—213₅: 366, 367—222₂ and₃ should be transposed—223₁: read *Theban Ostr.* (H. THOMPSON), no. 2, S. 180—224₉: 21 but this ref. does not apply here.—228₉: 104—229₆: for Rossi etc. read Rossi *Papiri* I 1 50—Ib.₁₄: what is *Katal. Leiden* etc.? PLEYRE and BOESER's *Manuscripts* contains no B texts, nor does their small *Antiquités Coptes* (1900)—237₁₆: 5₃₄—245₉: BUDGE, *Michael*—251₁₈: 18₁₅—258₈: 27₂—267₁₂: *George* 180₂₀ cannot be traced—274₁₈: 105₇—278₇, nos. 134, 363 show the word *naÿe*, not *σoc*—285₇: 3₁₈—288₇ and₈ refer to 2 editions of a single text—291₁₁: 10₁₁

W. E. CRUM.