II.

N our last we dealt with Apoc. 200. Now we have to deal with No. 201, a very different MS., with a commentary by an unknown author.

The scholia are attributed to Origen by Diobouniotis and Harnack, who published an edition in 1911.

This publication is not only faulty and inaccurate, but the pride of the scholar has caused Harnack to print his suppositious emendations in the text of the work and the real readings of the MS. are relegated to the footnotes, an inverted and pernicious manner of editing a document, so far unique, to which the present writer seriously objects.

Apart from itacisms and some spelling in the text of the Apoc. proper, which Harnack has changed, I would call attention to the following errors:

i. 1. το δουλω αυτου is omitted before ιωαννη but is present in the MS.

ii. 1. Read των αγγελων for τω αγγελω
4 init. and 14, 20. Read αλλα instead of αλλ.
8. MS. has εδμυρνη sic.
10. MS. has λαβειν not βαλειν
21. Read αυτην for αυτη
22. Read βαλω not βαλω
25. Read ἀχρι ου αν not αχρις ου αν

iii. 1/2. MS. has νεκρος ετηνου not νεκρος ει τηνου
2. Read ημελλον not ημελλον
7. MS. has (of course) δαδ and not Δαυιδ as printed. (So also in v. 5.)
9. Omit εγω before ηγαπησα
12. Add μου after θεου prim.
Ibid. Read επαυτου sic., not επι αυτων
14. Read εκκλησιας for εκκλησιας
Ibid. Read ὁ πιστος ὁ ιληθιως not ὁ πιστος καὶ ιληθιως
iv. 3/4. Harnack prints in his text "όμοιος ὤρασις σμαραγδίνων καὶ κυκλίθεν τοῦ θρόνου" but this clause appears only in the margin, and correctly thus: ομοίως ὡς ὤρασις σμαραγδίνων θρόνον κυκλίθεν τοῦ θρόνου

7. Dele το before προσωπον
8. Read ἔχοντα for ἔχον

Ibid. Read αγνος τε not semel
Ibid. Supply ὁ θεὸς after κυρίος
10. Read ἐκοσὶ τέσσαρες for ἐκοσὶν τέσσαρες. (ἐκοσὶ also v. 8.)

v. 1. Read ἐμμέσῳ for ἐν μέσῳ
2. Read καὶ ιδον αγγέλου, αγγέλου ἵσχυρον for αγγέλου semel.
8. For “προσευχαίν αὐτῶν [αὐτων]” read προσευχαίν των αγιων
11. For εἶδον read ἱδων
13. For αὐτοῖς πάντα, ἥκουσα read αὐτοῖς· παντας ἥκουσα

Ibid. For τοῦ θρόνου read τῷ θρόνῳ.

vi. 4. Dele καὶ before ὅνα
7. Dele φωιτήν
9. For “τῶν λόγων [τὴν λόγην]” read τῶν λόγων
11. Add καὶ before οἱ μελλόντες
12. For μέλας ἐγένετο read ἐγένετο μέλας·
16. For ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου read ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ

vii. 1 and 9. For εἶδον read ἱδων

Ibid. Add ὁ before ἀνέμος
4. For παρὰντα τέσσαρες read σαράντα = τέσσαρες
5/8. For δῶδεκα read ᾿ΙΒ passim.
6. For μανασῆ read μανασῆ
7. For Ἰσσάχαρ read ἰσσάχαρ
8. For ἐφραγμησμένοι read ἐσφ—sic, termination indeterminate
9. Add πολυς after ὄχλος

Ibid. For φωικας read φυικας
10 and 15. For ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου read ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ
17. For ὀδηγῆσαι read ὀδηγη.

Ibid. For “ἐξαλείψει [-ληψει]” read ἐξαλείψη

viii. 3. Instead of ἡλθεν codex has ἐξῆλθεν sic
6. ,, ,, ἐαυτοὺς ,, ,, αὐτοὺς
7. ,, ,, κατεικα [-καει] ,, ,, κατ’εκαει

11. Codex lacks μερος which is printed in the text

ix. 2. Instead of ,, ἡμειξεν [ἡμεῖξεν] codex has ἡμεῖξεν
4. ,, ,, “ἐπὶ τῶν μετασων [-ότων]” codex has ἐπὶ τῶν μετατοπ
6. ,, ,, ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ βανατός codex has ὁ βανατός ἀπ’ αὐτῶν
8. ,, ,, τρίχας γυναικῶν codex has τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν
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11. Instead of βασιλεά ἐπ' αὐτῶν codex has ἐπ' αὐτῶν βασιλεά
17. For εἰδον read ἵδον
Ibid. For ἐπὶ αὐτῶν read ἐπὶ αὐτῶν
Ibid. For ὑκακιθινούς read ὑκακιθινοῦς
20. For χρυσία read χρυσία
Ibid. Supply τὰ before ἀργυρία
x. 1. For ἴδον init. read ἴδον
Ibid. For “ἡ ἱερεῖς [ἱερεῖς]” read ἱερεῖς sic
7. For τὸν δούλους ἑαυτῷ read τὸν εαυτῶν δοῦλους
8. For βιβλαρίδιον read βιβλαρίδιον sic
11. Supply ἐπὶ before εὗνει
xi. 17. For ἐλληφας read ἠλληφας
18. Between τῶν νεκρῶν and κριθήναι codex has τὰ
xii. 3. For πυρρός μέγας read μέγας πυρρός
5. For ῥάβδος read ῥάβδῳ
10. Dele ἧ before βασιλεία
xiii. 1. For βλασφημίας read βλασφημίας
2. For ὤς στόμα codex has ὡστόμα
3. For ὡς read ὡσεῖ
4. Between τίς δύοντος and τῷ θηρίῳ supply σοι vid.
5. Dele ἐξουσία
6. For βλασφημίαν read βλασφημίαν
Ibid. For “σκηνήν [-ενήν]” read σκηνήν
7. For πόλεμον ποίησαι read ποίησαι πόλεμον
10. For ἀποκτένει read ἀποκτένει
11. For ἐλάλει read ἐλάλη
15. For πνεῦμα δοῦναι read δοῦναι πνεῦμα
Ibid. For ποιήσῃ read ποιήσῃ
Ibid. For ἔλαν read ἓν
Ibid. For προσκυνησουσιν read προσκυνησοσιν

All this is in addition to the notes at foot which claim to reproduce the actual MS. readings where different from the text as printed.

We will now give some particulars of the readings of Apoc. 201, which, according to Harnack, is bound up with the previous MS. Both MSS. are of 1000 A.D. or earlier. This one is written partially by the Scribe of 200 and partially by another, but has a commentary. The inscription is ἀποκαλυπτεῖ τοῦ ἁγίου ἱωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου and we have no subscription, as the MS. is mutilated and the text ends at xiv. 5.
It has considerable affinity with the small group 14-92 and with the extraordinary MS. 130. Thus, at vi. 11, while substituting αναπαυσασθαι for ων αναπαυσονται with 130 (αναπαυσασθε), we have a new and very likely reading of μικρον (tantum) without ετι χρονον, thus: "και εδωθη αυτοις στολη λευκη και ερρεθη αυτοις αναπαυσασθαι μικρον, εως πληρωσωσιν και οι συνδουλοι αυτων και οι αδελφοι αυτων και οι μελλοντες αποκτενεσθαι ως και αυτοι."

There is always something new to be learned in every MS. examined, as only by the whole witness of our documents can we hope to recover long lost original phrases.

Thus—for better or for worse—this MS. at last pretends to solve the great difficulty at xii. 7. The impossible πολεμησαι μετα disappears, and μετα (ninus επολεμησαν or πολεμησαι) becomes intelligible, the whole hanging together thus: "Και εγενετο πολεμος εν τω ουρανω. Ο Μιχαηλ και οι αγγελοι αυτων μετα του δρακοντος, και ο δρακων επολεμησε και οι αγγελοι αυτων, και ουκ ισχυσεν (rather than ισχυσαν) . . .

Hitherto we have had to read επολεμησαν κατα (or μετα), or πολεμησαι (some "του πολεμησαι") μετα.

Notice also the strange εχει, for εστιν πριμ. in xiii. 18: "ωδε η σοφια εχει."

Amongst the new readings, besides the three above-mentioned, are to be noted these:—

i. 6. - ει ει 
ii. 10. λαβειν προ βαλειν 
iii. 1. - 6π. 
18. φανει προ φανερωθη 
v. 1. - και ειμεσω προ δεξιαν 
8. προσευκαιων (sine acc.) προ αι προσευχαι 
vi. 9. δια των λογων προ δια των λογων 
17. - στι 
ix. 7. ομοιαμα προ ομοια 
Ibid. - ομοιαμα αντε ως στεφανοι 
Ibid. - χρυσοι προ στεφανοι 
18. - και προ στεφανον 
20. τα άργυραμα σις sine acc. (Cf. Ν χρυσαμα) 
xi. 6. - και αντε κλεισαι
Intimacy with 14-92 is shown below:—

iv. 5. καὶ πρὸ αἰ ἐμι So 14-92 (130)

viii. 3. εὐα πρὸ ἡλθεν So 14-92 and 130

ix. 13. μιαν φωνὴν So 14-92

17. ἑττικοὺς πρὸ ἵππους So 14-92 and B.

xi. 5. εκπορευμέναι So 14-92

13. εὖ φοβῶ πρὸ εἵμοι So 14-92 and Ν 44-52-82 syr S

xiii. 2. λεγόντων So 14-92 and Ν syr Σ Victorin

15. ἀποκτανθηναι (πρὸ 

ινα ἀποκτανθωσι) } So 14-92

Among other peculiarities we may notice:—

i. 7. ὄφνοναι πρὸ ὄφεται with Ν 1, 12, 81, 114, fam 119 syr copt

ii. 17. — ἀπὸ " 19, 130

iii. 12. οὐκ ουκ ἀναστικαὶ αὐτοὶ (πρὸ αὐτῶν) στυλοῦ So 47, 61, 92 [non 14], 100*, 130

iv. 3/4. — οὕτως ὁρασεὶ σμαραγδίνῳ καὶ κυκλοθεν τοῦ θρόνου τστ with Ν* solo

iv. 8. εὐχοτα πρὸ εἰχὸν .. P 23, 38, 50, 56

9. δώσωσιν .. Ν 67, 81, 92

9 10. + ἀμὴν πρὸς αἰώνων .. Ν 32, 95*, 121 syr S

v. 13. οἵα εὐσίν πρὸ α ἐστι .. fam 34

vii. 1 init. — καὶ .. CA 127, 130, latt, sah

Ibid. + ὁ ἀντί ανεμος .. C alig. et 200

3. καὶ πρὸ μὴς πρωτιν. .. A 38-178, 106

6. — ἐκ φύλως ἀσὴρ ἤ  χιλ. ἐσφραγ .. 35-87, 91

8. βεναιμεν .. AP al perpauce.

17. ὀδηγὴ πρὸ ὀδηγησει .. 39, 109

viii. 5. βρονται καὶ φοναι καὶ ἀστραπαι .. 46, 57, 62-3, 69, 72, 80

καὶ σείμαι —

9 fin. διεθάρει .. 7, 45, 81*

11. ὀσώσθων πρὸ εἰς ἄφωνον (F 200) h Prim.

Ibid. πολλαν sic πρὸ πολλοί .. (69)

x. 7. ἐνγγεγέλησατο .. alig. et 130

9. ἀπηλθα .. A alig. et 200

Ibid. καρδιαν πρὸ κοιλιαν .. A 63, 178
The scholia in this MS.—not those of Andreas, Arethas, or Oecumenius—have already been printed by Harnack. They are printed separately apart from the text, and the edition is full of errors. I would much prefer not to give a list of these, but feel bound to mention the more important ones, since it is a new document and cannot be referred to properly as long as the text is ambiguous.

Thus in the very first scholion beginning “οὐ μακηται τῷ λεχθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ σῆμα προσ τούς γυναῖκους. οὐδέτε καὶ ὁμᾶς δουλουσ ἄλλα φίλουσ . . . . . . . . .

a subsequent clause is printed as: “ἀντε ὑμολογοῦσιν ὡς τυγχάνουσι δούλοι, ἔξιον καὶ μέγιστον ἤγοιμενοι θέου δεσπότην ἔχειν,” but the codex has plainly “ἀξίωμα μέγιστον” and not “ἀξίον καὶ μέγιστον.”

It continues “ἐν γούν (sic) ταιο ἐπιστολαί αἰῶν γράφουσιν ὡς ἄλλοι τὰ ἥρητῶν ἀξίωματα προταττούσιν ¹ (sic) τοῦτο αὐτό.”

Again in Scholion 3 please read (fifth line) μακαριστοὺει and not μακαρίζεται. This is perfectly plain. (The footnote suggests μακαριστούει.)

In Scholion 5 Harnack has insisted on printing: ἀλλ’ ὡς πάντα ἐν ἐνθεν καὶ ἄλλως πάντα ἐν κύκλοι γάρ ὁ ἀυτός, but the codex reads: ἄλλως πάντα ἐν ἐνθεν καὶ παν κύκλοι γάρ ὁ ἀυτος· which Diobouniotis gave him.

Line four delete τὸ before ἂ and before ῥ. In Scholion 6 delete (line five) τῷ before θεο, the footnote is incorrect. Line 16 for “μαχαῖρα, γλώσσας δὲ σοφίαν ἱώνται” read μαχαῖρας γλώσσας δὲ σοφίαν ἱώνται.

¹ Double τ is practically always written τγ, not reproduced in the edition.
Scholion vii. Line 10. Read *vekroś* for *vekrōn*
Line 2. Delete *mēv*

Scholion viii. Line 1. Read ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆν and not ἐπὶ γῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆν

Scholion ix. Line 8. Delete καὶ before κἀκείθεν

Scholion x. Line 3. Read μαχάμενα for μαχάμενον text and not μαχάμενο as in the footnote
Line 4. Read ἀποβαλὼν for ἀποβαλέων
Line 5. Read ἀφήκασον for ἀφήκασον
Line 6. Read γεγόνει for ἐγεγόνει

Scholion xi. Line 3. Footnote should read ἀπολεσθείσα
Line 4. Read πειραθήσεται

Line 2. Add τῶν φθειροῦτα after θεοῦ
Line 5. Codex = γνοσάσας πάσας
Line 6. Add καὶ before ταρατγήμενος sic
Line 7. Add τήν before ταραχήν

Scholion xiii. Line 2. Read ἀπαταιῶνας

Scholion xiv. Line 7. For λευκῆ read λευκῆ
Line 11. Delete δὲ
Line 12. Read τούτου for τοῦτο
Line 13. Footnote should be ἐπὶ τοῦ κρουπτοῦ not κρούστου
Line 15. Read κατὰ ἄλληλας

But it would be wearisome to continue. I will only add from the remaining 25 scholia a few of the worst errors.

Scholion xx. Line 11. Supply ζωῆ after παρούσῃ
d Line 2. Delete τοῦ before προσώπου

Scholion xxii. Line 9. Delete ὅ before ἀληθῶς
Line 18. Add εἰναι before ἐν έαυτῷ

Scholion xxv. Line 7. Delete καὶ before τὰ κτισμάτα

Scholion xxvii. Line 23. Read οὐχὶ not οὐχ

Scholion xxviii. Line 2. Delete τῆς before φυλῆς
Line 1. For τὴν ἀνάστασιν read ἀναστάσιν γὰρ
Line 3. Read καίνον for καίνην

Scholion xxix. Line 21. Delete [οτί]

p. 34. Line 1 and note. Text is correct προσάγεται but the footnote is futile for the codex is plainly προσαγεται, written πρός (sin sin) αγεται and never προσαγεται. He was evidently not familiar with πρός for προσ.
Scholion xxx. Line 2. Codex has ὑπηρετητικαί
Line 3. καὶ αἱ ἔπελαστικαὶ sic is correct. No question of "vult D."
Line 4. Add τὴν before γην
Line 5. οὗ τὸ in footnote σύνω but codex συνωσ
Line 7. Add τοῦτον before δεομένου
Line 8. Never ποθήσωσιν. Codex plainly ποθησοῦσιν
Line 10. Last word ὄργη not ὄργην
Line 11. Footnote should be επεισε not επεισε
Line 12. Read παρατύνον for παρὰ αὐτῶν
Line 16. Read ἀμαρτιασ for ἀμαρτίαν
Line 19. Read κολασεί for κολάσιν

p. 36. Line 3. Footnote corrects text τῇ to την but leaves προσηγορία. Codex has τὴν γαρ επε- σειας, προσηγορεῖα
Line 5. Codex ἔπι τῆ (not τῆς) τοῦ διαβόλου
Line 9. Codex αὐτῶσ. Not "fortasse" as footnote
Line 12. Read ἀν ὑπὲρ for ὑπὲρ ἄν
Line 13. Read ἐκ τῆς πρώτης for ἐν τῇ πρώτη
Line 17. Read ἐκομεν for ἐκοµὲν
Line 26. Footnote "fortasse νοήσομεν." Codex νοήσω- μεν
Line 30. Read παραστήσας compendio not παραστήσει
or παραστῆς

p. 37. Line 2. Read εἰς τῶν for αὐτῶν and ἀποδεικνυτῶν
Line 3. Read αὐτῶσ aἰτίωσ for aἰτίον
Line 4. Read παραλειποῖτων for παραλειπότων
Line 5. Read κατὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ for κατὰ τὸν θεοῦ

Scholion xxxi. Line 4. Add φέρεται after ἐστέρας
Line 5. Read εφὸς for ἐφὸς
Line 6. Read κολαζομενοι not καλαζομενοι
Line 8. Read μετότου
Line 11/12. Read εδωκας for δεδωκας
Line 13. Read τὸξον for τὸξον
Line 13/19. Read διαρείσαται not διασεισθαί
Line 19. Codex has τοῦτον οὖν τοῦ ἰηλ. Text and footnote not clear
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Line 19. Text λέγοντες. Footnote says "λέγωμεν corr. D." but λέγομεν is the true reading of codex.

Line 22. Text τολλήν, footnote τολλήν, but codex has fin lin τολλήν.

Scholion xxxii. Line 3. Read παρθενείας for παρθενίας [παρθένον is already corrected in footnote]

Scholion xxxiv. Line 2. διώναται text is correct. Footnote διώνατη is incorrect. Harnack has again misread the ligature fin lin "διώνατη"

Scholion xxxv. Line 1. ὀ θεὸς of the text is correct. Codex = ὁ θεό. Footnote "θου" is a gross error thinking the σ is ς

Line 3. Text ὁσοί, footnote ὁσού, but codex ὁσῷ or ὁσῷ

Line 7. Add μὲν after δαιμόνια

Line 8. Codex reads πνα (πνεύμα erroneous) for πνευματά

Line 10. Read λαλήσονοι for λαλήσονυι

Line 11. Delete τοὺς before ψαλμοὺς

Scholion xxxvi. p. 40 Line 1. First word σου is correct. Footnote τοῦ is wrong

Line 14. Read βουλήτη for βουλή

Line 16. Supply ἐπτὰ before βροντῶν (Codex as indicated in footnote has ἐρόντων but Harnack forgot the preceding ἐπτὰ)

Line 16. Supply οὐμαί before τῶν κόσμων

Line 18. Delete τῶν before λαλοῦσών

Scholion xxxvii. Line 3. Read ἐκαστοῦ not ἐκαστῶν

Line 7. Supply τῶν between οὐν and μισθῶν

p. 41. Line 2. Supply δηλοῦνται after φοβοῦμενοι

Line 5. Footnote should have τοῦ before προφήτου as the true reading of codex

Line 7. Supply γὰρ before ἅγιοι

Scholion xxxviii. Line 4. Footnote queries an omission of ὁς. Codex has it

Line 9/10. Read ἵνα γνῶ· μὴ τὴν not καὶ γνῶμη τὴν

p. 42. Line 1. Read ψευδὴ

Line 14 and note. τοῦτο δ’ εστὶ should be τοῦτο δὲ εστὶ

Line 16. Text "ἐν δὲ [add ἐκ]." See footnote. Codex is without it

p. 43. Line 5. Add τὴν before πρὸς θεῶν
Line 7 and note. Codex (difficult to read in photo), appears to be

Line 11. Read εἶ for εἶμι

Line 15. Read ἀνθρωπον not ἀνθρώπον

Line 16 fin. Add τοῦ θεοῦ after ὑποταγήν

Line 18. Between ἐκκλησίας and λαμβανομένης a word is missing. να is found in the MS. beginning a line before λαμβανομένης but the commencement after ἐκκλησίας, end of previous line, is illegible

Line 19. Read οὐδ' ουμη for οὐδὲ μη

p. 44. Nothing which is not indicated

Scholion xxxix.

" " "

Be it understood that the above are all in addition to the manuscript readings given in the footnotes. Not a very creditable showing for the editors.

As it would be quite outside my province to go into the matter of authorship of the Commentary, I must refer readers to Harnack’s publication, in which he takes up many important points, such as the references to the Epistle to the Hebrews in seven separate scholia, where the author of the epistle is referred to as “the apostle” (= Paul) in the same breath as the author of the Apocalypse is called “ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης.”

His general conclusions are for authorship preceding the fourth century, and almost a certainty that Origen is responsible; and valuable references are made not only to Origen’s general style and trend of thought, but to unusual words in his vocabulary which find a counterpart here. The last two scholia 38 and 39 are from Irenaeus.

I will give an example of a scholion, and copy No. xx occurring after Apoc. iii. 11, where reference is made to Cleopas (not naming the “other” disciple) and the journey to Emmaus. The great unsolved question, however, of what scriptures the Lord referred to in the Old Testament concerning Himself, remains open.

I neglect Harnack’s punctuation and errors, and give the text of the MS.:

Ἀγίος ἄληθινὸς· ὃ μη μετουσία ἀλλὰ ὀνοσία ἐν
τοιοῦτοις· αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἐξὼν τῆν κλίδα τοῦ
dαδ· ὀπινικα σάρξ γὰρ γέγονεν ὁ λόγος· ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ
Neither the text of this MS. [unlike No. 200] nor the commentary know anything beyond the conventional "μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος μου" clause in iii. 16. The com. occurs in the middle of iii. 14 and runs as follows (I copy the MS., not Harnack's emendations): Notice the paucity of accents. It is undoubtedly a direct copy from an old uncial:—

ο πιστός καὶ Ἀληθινός δ σωτήρ (sic pleno) υπάρχει· ού δια το πιστεος καὶ ἀληθειας μετέχειν· ἀλλα δια το βεβαιος καὶ ουσία (sic) εϊναι· ἀληθινός γαρ τόν αυτον επαντο το αληθεια καὶ ἀληθινός (sic) εϊναι· οτι δε το πιστός· αυτι βεβαιον καὶ ατρέπτων κειται φησιν ο αποστολος· η απιστουμει αυτον πιστον μεγη· αρνησαθαι γαρ εαυτον ουδιναται καὶ μωσης θε πιστος καὶ ουκεστιν αδικια εἴστοτο λειψει καὶ το γραφόμενον τιμοθέω.

πιστός δ λόγος· αυτι το μένων αει· καὶ ου διαπίπτων εϊρηται δε διαρτυς ο πιστός καὶ ἀληθινός προσ παράστασιν βεβαιωτησος· ωσαντος εστω το αμην· αρχην· δε τις κτίσεως ειπεν αυτων· ουχως κτισμα πρωτον κτίσεως αρχη εστων αυτης· αλλως εται (sic) του υπαρχειν αυτην οι δημιουργος· αρχη γαρ ποιητην πνευματόν το ποιητην· τοις ουτως κτισθαι δ εστων· και αρχην· το [here two letters (illeg.) scratched out and cancelled] αυτο δειτων λεγεν μελλωσε εμεσε· καὶ το εγενθητε μοι ε'σ πλησμονη· οιονει Γαρ επιπλοξεται (sic) εν εμοι· οταν γαρ την περι των μυην αποκάλει ἄφεντον οκς· του τοιαυτον ημεσεν γενομενον αυτω εις πλησμονη· και δια την αποστησιακαλιασ (sic) παχύτητα μη χρουνται ειναι (sic, om. Harnack) εν εαυτω.
These two specimens must suffice as examples of the scholia. Readers are referred for the remainder to Harnack's publication, for they are all of considerable interest when contrasted with the corresponding remarks of Andreas, Oecumenius and Arethas.

**Apol. 202 = Meteora 237.**

This the third early cursive of the Apoc. at Meteora, can be dismissed in a few words, as it is a member of the well-known Complutensian group, consisting of

- Cambridge
- Paris
- Rome
- Moscow
- Florence
- Rome
- Partham, (from Caracalla
- Crypto-Ferrata
- Athos
- Jerusalem
- Jerusalem
- Meteora

Apol. 10—17—37—49—77—91—96—110—160—187—190—202

The inscription is: αποκαλυψις του αγιου ωαννου του αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου θεολογου.

There is no subscription.

A short chain commentary is found here and there throughout, apparently extracts from Andreas.

Collated in 1921 from photographs made in 1912.

Of the stereotyped Compl. family it retains such things of the textus rectus as μονονυς (ix. 4), and the clause at viii. 12 verbatim with the τα, even φαινη and not φαυη.

It is very correctly copied with but the most trifling slips, and virtually no unique readings.

Opposite κλίνην in ii. 22 is the marginal note κλίνην ἀσθένειας.

At ix. 4 we find χόντον for χορτον (against the family traditions), with 25 and 78.

At ix. 5 we have παί συ the superimposed πληξη by the Commentary hand. πληξη is the reading of most of the Compl. MSS.

But at xii. 4 we have τίκτευν for τεκείν (see the photograph in the previous issue of the Bulletin) which is also read by E 59, 120, 130, and Hipp as well as Compl.
In xv. 6 the reading οὐπανοῦ for ναοῦ is supported by 56 as well as by this Compl. group.

Note at xvii. 5 our MS. reads πόρνων (for πορνῶν) by a few, and 77-96 of the Compl. family.

At xviii. 22-23 there is confusion and it is not true to type.

Our next article will deal with the Spanish MS. 143 and we can promise that it will be of much greater interest than the foregoing.

H. C. HOSKIER.