MANUSCRIPTS OF THE APOCALYPSE—RECENT INVESTIGATIONS.

BY H. C. HOSKIER.

III.

APOC. 143 = Escurial X. 111. 6 (or 111. X. 6) = Greg. 143 [a. 1107]

This is to be found referred to in E. Miller’s catalogue of the Spanish MSS. (Paris, 1848), p. 397, where, in a volume of 292 pages, it is described as forming part (at fo. 235) of a volume of Miscellanies, being immediately preceded by a life of St. Elias, and succeeded by a life of St. Gregory the Armenian. The MS. is dated 1107, as per the subscription on folio 292 (at the end of the volume):

ετελλόθη ἡ βιβλίος αὐτῇ μηνὶ ἱολίῳ ἧς: ἔτους ἕκατεν ... Γραφὴν διὰ χειρὸς λεοντίου μοναχοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἀμαθός ἢ ἰδιώτου· εἰς τὴν μονὴν τοῦ ἀγίου φιλίππου τοῦ μελιτρών. Οἱ εὐνυχάναντες ἢ ἀναγινώσκοντες· εὐχασθαί ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διὰ τῶν ἐν··

The dear old scribe was weary at the close of his labours, for he subjoins this couplet:

Ὅσπερ ξένοι χαίρουσι πατρίδα βιβλεῖν.
Οὕτω καὶ ὁ γραφῶντας βιβλίου τέλος ··

Photographed for me by F. E. Manero, of Madrid, in 1913, and collated in 1921. In a rough but clear early hand, the forms of psi and chi being quite ancient. υ ἐφελκ is of constant occurrence; iota postscript entirely absent. It is written in double columns of 35 lines each. There is no catena, and there are no marginal remarks, nor divisions. There is no subscription, and the inscription is one of the “ἐν Πάτμῳ” ones, differing slightly from others. Occupies pp. 235 verso to 241 recto in the volume. Note the exact library mark, which is often given wrongly.
It has lain "perdu" for many years, but is none the less important for that.

This MS. was entirely unknown to the critics, and is, perhaps, one of the most important in the list.

It stands quite apart from any traditional family groups, and is worthy of our most attentive consideration. I commend it to you very specially.

The text runs to V. 14, and then, without the slightest sign of an omission, continues with chapter XX. 1 to the end. This "saltus" occurs on fo. 239 recto col. i., three lines from the bottom (see the accompanying photograph). At first sight it would appear to impair all confidence in the scribe, and nullify any value in the MS. But sufficient remains to interest us very greatly, and possibly to explain the circumstances which led to such unobservant copying, or extraction.

The reading καρχίδων in XXI. 19 gives away the provenance of the original as Coptic (καρχίδων is read by 35-68, 146 and coptic). Other readings prove that the original was a bilingual græco-coptic MS. In olden days, the African monks carried about with them single books of the N.T., and in this case a worn copy, from which the middle portion had possibly dropped out, may have formed the basis for transmission; perhaps one leaf happening to terminate at the end of the fifth chapter, and the next to have on it the beginning of the twentieth chapter.

I rise from collating these eight chapters with a profound sense of having been in the atmosphere and in the presence of the elements of a very ancient text, notwithstanding, the frailty of a scribe who is somewhat crude, but evidently quite honest. And I reach this conclusion without having (as it happens) been able to refer to a single collateral document during the collation.

Upon consulting my ledger of grouped readings, however, my conclusion is abundantly proven, and I find that we are face to face with a situation of deepest interest.

It had struck me, as I collated, that the startling additions, omissions, and substitutions were not mediaeval, and had a plausibility which pointed to a possible early edition, before all our stereotyped factors had become recognised as a kind of traditional text.

1 He describes himself as unlearned and unskilful: "άμαθον καὶ ἐδιώτων."
Further examination confirms me in this view. For instance, when the MS. suppresses ἰματίως in IV. 4, and writes that the four and twenty elders around the throne "were clothed about with white," we pause to wonder whether the original may not have been worded thus, and whether an officious redactor did not very early insert ἰματίως, thinking ἐν λευκοῖς an insufficient description; whereas the writer of the Apocalypse,1 describing heavenly things, would be at liberty to chronicle his impressions of the vision in terms not strictly mundane, and the "robes" would be unlike any earthly thing he had ever seen (see III. 4 ἐν λευκοῖς tantum). But the reader may say, "you are taking us into a region, foggy with the mists of antiquity, and you are again ‘subjective,’ whereas we of the modern school claim that we must be ‘objective,’ and surely some collateral evidence would remain that there is probability as well as plausibility in your conjecture that the omission is well-founded and approaches the long-lost basic text.” Very well, I accept your challenge, and remark that, in this first example, chosen at random, our MS. has the very respectable support of the great MS. N, of the extraordinary cursive 130, and of the Patmos codex 178, and now of our wonderful 200. Thus N 130, 143, 178 and 200 stand alone in suggesting this plausible reading!

And N 143 are again quite alone with aeth at XXI. 14 in omitting εχον in the description of the wall and the twelve gates. Already, in verse 12, we have been informed that the great and high wall had twelve gates. In verse 14 εχον can be suppressed if we assume that the gates just described in verse 13 formed the principal part of the wall. The prominence given in verse 13 to each set of the three great gates on the N., S., E. and W. shows that they were of immense size. However, plausible or not, and N 143 conspire again together alone to omit εχον. I call attention to it here because a very subtle but a very important point is involved. I have noticed that when N writes comparative nonsense, other MSS. and versions had difficulties in those same places; this merely means that the common papyrus original, lying far back in the limbo of forgotten times, was faint and difficult to read in those same places. Thus, here at XXI. 14, our

1 The inscription, quite exceptionally, declares the work to have been that of the apostle John, as does the opening verse of chap. 1.
MS. 143 writes apparent nonsense of: τρειμέλιονος τρείοια for θεμέλιονος δώδεκα, after suppressing εξον. (It is to be noted that in a somewhat similar construction at IV. 7, we again omit εξον with gigas. And observe that, without Greek support, at IV. 2, we omit εκείνο with coptic.)

So again at XXI. 4 our MS. 143 has a unique reading of ὅτι ταῦτα for ὅτι τὰ πρωτα. It makes perfect sense, but has no backing. Observe, however, that Ν had difficulty here, reading ὅτι τὰ πρωβατα, Συρ Σ επὶ τὰ πρωβατα, and 59 (which is several times with us alone elsewhere) reads ὅτι τὰ αρχαία. And even Oecumenius (Apoc. 146) mixes it up, writing something I cannot read. It looks like τὸ επρωτα for ὅτι τὰ πρωτα.

Again, as to this faintness in the original parent copy lying back of all, note:—

xx. 4. — καὶ εξῆκαν 143, supported only by Aug, and immediately follows οὐς ᾂλευσαν for καὶ εβασιλευσαν, as if something there were illegible in the exemplar. Also at:

ii. 24. τοῖς ἐν τοῖς θυατηροῖς λοιποῖς. Changed order. Consult Ν, and ii. 26. τὰ ἔργα μοῦ ἀχρειτελους a unique order for ἀκρι τέλους τὰ ἔργα μοῦ, the words ἀκρι τέλους are dropped by Συρ Σ, also iv. 3. we write: ὁμοίων ὁρατεῖ μικρήνων. Cf. 120. Probably also a faint spot in the original.

Again this faintness may be responsible for our reading at:—

xxi. 27 ἐν. βιβλίων for ἀριθμοῦ where Ν reads οὐρανου,
Again xxii. 3. ἀναδεμα for καταθέμα or καταναθέμα where Ν reads καταγμα.

2. Omissions.

Continuing, however, with omissions but slightly supported, or new, we observe:—

i. 3/4. ο γαρ ιωανής ταῖς επτα εκκλ. (καὶρος εγγος) with (102)

i. 16. — ὅξεια with 46-88-101 (of the 1 family) only

ii. 5. — ὑπερεῖ ΝΑΣΙΠ 56, 130, 200 and versions Οεκ τετ et com 146), a notably strong conjunction for a very early tradition

ii. 13. — τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ with ΝΑΣΙΠ 38, 130 Οεκ (146 τετ), another notable Greek conjunction, plus gig harl vg Prim Syr Σ.
iv. 7. — καὶ ἰδίᾳ. Alone with 40 (quite a notable MS.) plus Syr. S. and Prim. [Even Irenaeus int. has enim]

v. 6. — καὶ οφθαλμοὺς επτα with 1 44 61 121 130 (always rather a redundant expression)

xx. 11. — ὁ ἀντὶ οὐρανὸς with 21 39 73 98 copt.

xxi. 1. — ἢ οὗτος θαλασσα “And there was not any more sea,” not “the sea,” with 51-90 and coptic

xxi. 4. — ὁ ἀντὶ θανάτου with N 18, 22, 23, 38, 47, all significant MSS.

xxi. 12. — καὶ εἰς τοὺς πυλῶνας αργυρόν δωδέκα with AE* 62-63, 65, 67, 100, 120, 136, 147 arm

xxi. 18. — αὐτὴς with 20, 32, 59, 136 copt.

xxi. 19. — κεκοσμημένος „ P 92, 111 arm gig Prim

xxii. 16. — τοῦτο „ Prim only

All this is anything but modern, so we cannot lightly put aside, although unsupported, such further omissions as the following:—

i. 8. — λέγει ὁ κυριός [Cf. Hipp: “οὖτος γὰρ καὶ ιωάννης εὑτεύ” (— λέγει ο κυριός)]

i. 10. — εὖ πνευματὶ

iii. 10. — τῆς ὤρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ (— τῆς ὦρας copt. Syr. S.)

iv. 8. — ο θεὸς

iv. 9. — καὶ εὐχαριστίαν

xx. 2. — καὶ σατανᾶς

xx. 4. — καὶ κρίμα εἴδοθη αὐτοῖς

xxi. 3. — εκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

xxi. 5. — ο καθήμενος επὶ τοῦ θρόνου.¹

A rather pretty distinction is drawn by an omission of the article as between XXI. 22 fin and XXI. 23 fin.

In the earlier verse our writer says (alone with 100 and 130): “And I saw no temple in her for the Lord God Omnipotent is her temple and a lamb.”

In the consequent verse he remarks: “and the city had no need of the sun, nor of the moon, that they should give light to her, for the glory of God shines for her, and her light (is) the lamb.”

A careful study of the foregoing will pave the way towards our further acquaintance with this recension. There is nothing particularly

¹ This is probably an omission due to the Coptic column, two clauses ending in θηροῦ there, and, therefore, an error of homoioteleuton, of which there are two or three others, due to the Greek.
careless or offensive about these omissions, nor do they in any way interfere with the flow of the narrative, and they include practically all of the rarer omissions, and may indeed be basic.

3.

Now let us take a couple of changes of case:—

At ii. 9 we read οὐδαμῶν instead of οὐδαμοῦς, which is supported so far by no other cursive before our 143, but is read by Ν and by C, and is so understood by aeth from its parent version. Now attested also by 200 [see article I]. Read then:

"And the blasphemy of those who say that they are of the Jews," instead of "those who call themselves Jews."

It is a fine distinction but a distinction all the same, and witnessed to by our oldest uncials. In a version this can be lost, but is, nevertheless, distinctly found impressed in the aethiopic.

At xxi. 15 we read: εἰχεν μετρον καλαμόν χρυσον instead of καλαμον. This also has the support of Να 31-106.

The fact that Να corrects is rather significant.

And then let us look at a change of number:—

At ii. 22 we read: μετανοεῖ for μετανοήσωσιν. This singular for plural is only to be found in 56 (a most noteworthy MS.) and Prim [obs. Zahn against Sabatier]. Cf. copt. It makes perfect sense: 'Unless she repent.'

And then, note this change of tense:—

At iv. 8. εἰχοντα for εἰχον with P 23, 38, 50, and 56, to which add:

At xxi. 3. έσκνυσεν for έσκνυσεν with Να 111; but compare Syr S. Again perfect sense, but someone may have thought that it did not accord with έσονται and έσται following. The Latins are all recorded for habitabit. An easy change to habitauit would be possible, but the reading is not so far given for the Latin. The reason, however, in 143 is obvious. The Coptic does not say "will tabernacle with," but "is being with," and the word is έκχι. The forerunner of our scribe, while copying his bi-columnar græco-coptic, saw έκχι in the coptic column, and voluntarily or involuntarily wrote the Greek aorist έσκνυσεν. This sight of the Coptic is visible also at xxi. 4 where 143 (alone) writes oude ter (pro oüte).
A few changes of order have curious and notable support:—

iii. 3. ηενωσας και ειληφας only Syr S, and now 143 and 156
xxi. 16. το πλατος αυτης και το υψος ισα εστιν where + αυτης post πλατος sec. has support from 18, 39 Syr S. and copt, and the omission of αυτης after υψος is supported by 46 gig etc. Together it forms an unique reading yet perfectly legitimate.

4. Additions.

All this will prepare us better to consider the additions, if we take note of the character of the foregoing perfectly natural and legitimate changes:—

Of additions then observe:—

i. 4. + ουσαις ante εναισισιατ with 36 and latt.

i. 14. + και ante ως χιων. 8-24, 36, 53 and thus exactly the sahidic (extant here) ΒΤΥΧ ΠΘΕ Π ΟΤΩΧΙΩΝ retaining και and ως, and boh with ΝΕΜ.

i. 20. + αι χρισαι post λυχνιαι with 36 (notable MS. of graeco-syriac parentage) and Syr S.

ii. 10. + γαρ post ιδου with 59

ii. 13. + μου post ημεραι , 95

Ibid. + μου post πιετος ,, CA 14-92, 146

ii. 27. + και συντρυφει αυτους ante ως τα σκευη with 36 again

iii. 3. + μετανοησης μηδε (ante γνησηρηγη). This is read by no Greeks but by Prim and the Coptic

iv. 8. + το ante αγιος So 12 and Coptic

v. 3. + ουτε post ηθυνατο with 36 and sah latt (exc. gig).

v. 5. + γαρ post ιδου ,, 36

xx. 4. + ιδουν inter και tert et τας φυχας with 56, 95, 127 (a notable combination) and sah.

xx. 6. + ο ante αγιος with 32

xx. 10. την καιομενην πυρι προ και θειου Cf. 32 copt. Note also:

xxi. 8. του πυρος προ τη καιομενη πυρι και θειου and cf. copt Tert Hipp.

xx. 10. + ευληθησαν post ο ψευδοπροφητης with 32

11. + του ante προσωπου with NAP 95, 127, copt Syr S.

xxi. 19. + ομοιοκ ενεις παντι ,, 32 (ομοιος)

xxii. 16. + και ο λογος post δαδ ,, 32 and 65

xxii. 18. + εγωσιανηστητω α ιρ ,, Prim

xxii. 19. + αυτου post πολεως ,, Syr S.
The above will not seem so extraordinary if weighed in the atmosphere of the early stages of transmission and not attributed too late.

5. Substitutions.

As to substitution or the equivalent, observe:—

i. 9. ev iū pro iū χy primo loco with NCP 38, 111 copt gig Dion.

Ibid. fin. iū (− χρωστον) " NCAP pauc. and Dion.

ii. 1 fin. χρυσιων pro χρυσών So CA only with χρυσεων

iii. 3. ποία ὁρα pro ποιαν ὁραν Cf. copt

iii. 9. γραμμονται pro γραμμων with 35 (49), 56, 67-120 vg Syr S.

iii. 19. an pro ean with N16, 36, 104, 146 (Occ.)

iv. 8. καθεαυτων pro en καθεαυτο Cf. 80 et gig.

Ibid. και en κυκλωθεν pro κυκλωθεν Cf. 18 et 56

xx. 3. αχριο αν pro αχρι Cf. 119

xx. 16. μεγα και λευκων Cf. 50 Prim

xxi. 2. Trs. ιδων in loc ante καυνα, non post καυνα (Cf. 100)

xxi. 8. εατιν pro en τη ante λιμη = Hipp (εσται en τη copi).

[Here with Hipp, we precede the composite Coptic. Latin and Prim = “pars erit,” Tert = “particula”?]

xxi. 10. eπι pro επ (ante oros) with Ν A 35, 56, 59, 87, 127

xxi. 11. την φωτιζουσαν αυτην pro εχουσαν την δοξαν του θεου. So 32. Cf. sah boh Prim. (Omit A 30, 35, 98, 104. Original indistinct?)

xxi. 12. ενγεγραμμενα with 18

Ibid. α εισιν (pro a εστι) " gig

xxi. 27. ενγεγραμμενοι " 31, 47 (84)

xxi. 2. εμμεσοι " A alone.

xxi. 3. εσται en autη " 18 copt

xxi. 5. επi pro ekei " ΝΑ 35, 56, 65, 68, 108**, 127, 146 Copt Prim

Ibid. επ αυτους pro αυτους " ΝΑ 18, 35, 68, 127, gig Prim Anon Ambr.

xxi. 12. εσται αυτω " 23

xxii. 14. οι πλουντες τας στολας αυτων with 7-45-104 (Ν A 38, 146, 127)

After weighing the above (especially when we are more closely acquainted with 18, 32, 36 and 56) we shall not be so startled to find at:—

xxi. 17. ουρανω (in full) for ανθρωπου with 114 alone
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This is no late change and may indeed be basic. The additional witness of such a MS. as 143 is most important. The ordinary text says that he measured the wall of the new Jerusalem, 144 πηχων, "the measure of a man, that is of an angel." This seems strange, and the more likely reading, "a heavenly measure, the measure of an angel," in contrast to the earthly number 666 at XIII. 18 fin. "for it is human numeration, and his number is 666."

In early script ouvou may have been misread ωνου, and perpetuated. At any rate this witness of ours is no xi, or xith century fakir, as the previous lists have shown, and this reading is co-aval with the regular reading ανθρωπου. That is all we are concerned to show.

6. Unique Readings.

We can now proceed to consider the few remaining unique readings with the greater confidence of not attributing them to vicious or late handling:—

i. 3. + ei post μακαριος
   i. 5. μαρτυς pro αρχων

\{ i. 9. επικαλουμενη pro καλουμενη (Lat. "appellatur")
   ii. 14. εμπαιειν pro βαλειν
   xxi. 10. περεγκεν pro απηδεγκε

i. 11. περκαμον pro περγαμον (Interchange of kappa and gamma is Coptic)

   i. 15. πληθυσεν καινο δυατων πολλων
   ii. 10. + μεγαλην post θλησιν
   ii. 15. o κρατων pro su κρατουντας [Cf. 36 - και αυ. Cf. 62-63 et Oec (146) κρατουντα]

ii. 16. μετα σου pro μεταυτων cum Prim solo
   ii. 22. αυτην pro μετ' αυτης. A rather notable reading:
   και τους μουχενουντας αυτην for μετ' αυτης

The latter (and the usual) reading would be a more probable change from an αυτην of the original draft than the inverse alteration.

iv. 8. αλλα παντοτε pro πηρας και νυκτος. There is no trace of this in others except in Tertullian orat. "non cesset" . . .

v. 5. + απεκριθη post και prim [sed λεγε μοι, non λεγον μοι]. Cf. Coptic et Hier. These say "He came to me."
v. 9. γλώττης πρὸ γλώσσης [Thus throughout the Meteora MSS. 200 and 201 double τ is always written τγ]

xx. 4. επ αυτοὺς πρὸ επ αυτοὺς
xx. 10. + εκεῖ post βασανισθησονται
xxi. 12. + τα νοματα post ιασαλ (plen)
xxi. 18. εινδωσεις πρὸ ευδομησις
xxi. 19. ασμαραγδος (scpt ουκεμαρακλος). Cf. Syr

[In this connection observe Coptic interchange of Κ for ρ, which throws light on our scribe’s unique περκαμου for περγαμον above.]

xxii. 1. κρυσταλλος Not Greek but sah and many boh MSS.
xxii. 3. πανεθυμ πρὸ καταναθεμα
7 init. + λεγει κυριος post ταχυ
8. ακουων καὶ βλεπων ταυτα + μαρτυρω
9. τοῦτους πρὸ του βιβλιου τουτου
14. + υν μη ante ευελθωσιν
17. + της ante ξωνη

20. + ο θεος post λεγει
21. ημων πρὸ υμων

7. Conclusions.

We can now approach the crux of the problem, which we have reserved to the last, for the opening verse of chapter I. is quite unique and different from the common texts, including all our uncials and the versions.

After the inscription proper, which runs as follows:

Αποκαλυψε του άλοι τω άλη γλώσσης του άλοι ν ης
έναρευτων του ζεληλουν. ἢν ελεν ἐν πάτμω τη νίκων τη γλυθ'
the MS. has Αποκαλυψες ἰτ χυ της γενεαμενης εις εμε ιωανην του ἀποστο-
λου (eliminating completely εις εδοκεν αυτω ο θεος τους δουλους αυτου α δει
γενεθαι εν ταχει και εστιμανειν αποστειλας δια του αγγελου αυτου τω
dουλω αυτου ιωανην), and continues verse 2: του κηρυξα (substitute for ος εμαρτυρησε) τουν λογον του θεου και την μαρτυριαν ἰτ χυ ὁσα ιδων
· Μακαρες ει κ.τ.λ. . . . with the ordinary text.

[Note that Methodius' third century quotation omits ο θεος and α δει
geneithai.]

But for the previous studied exhibition of the very old text which
underlies 143, we might pass this over as some mediæval play of change for change' sake. But it cannot be. Are we in presence of a text underlying all? Of a first or early draft?

It has often been remarked, and Swete calls attention to it, that the closing chapter (XXII. 6, 14, 16) reproduces the wording of the opening verses of chapter I. But then I. 1, 2 might have been "accommodated" later to chapter XXII., which would explain the situation.

At any rate, we cannot dismiss this opening of 143 as beneath our notice, given the extremely ancient atmosphere which pervades the whole document. We have established:

1. That 143 reproduces two readings so far absolutely particular to ₱ (IV. 4, XXI. 14).
2. It reproduces a form only used by A (XXII. 2) and another by CA (II. 1).
3. It agrees in a peculiar case with ₱ C only.
4. It has unique agreement with Syr S.
5. It has constant and deep sympathy with the text of Prim. (e.g. alone at II. 16).
6. It is well acquainted with some of the base of gig.
7. It has large sympathy with some of our most important cursives as 56, 114, 36, 40, 18, 95, 127.
8. It agrees alone with the small group ₱NCAP 56 Oec, ₱NCAP 38 Syr gig Prim. Oec, a very formidable conjunction for early forms.
9. It agrees alone with Hippol. (XXI. 8) and with Prim. (II. 16).
10. It has some special agreement with sak where extant together.

I do not emphasize the special agreement with boh, because I am in entire disagreement with Guidi and Burkitt as to the date of the bohairic version. But the conjunction of third and fourth century readings in our MS., coupled with the certainty that it was copied from a bilingual græco-coptic MS., does not help their case at all for a late date of the bohairic version.

We are therefore compelled to ask the question as to whether in the dim past, a standardized version of the opening verse of the book was substituted for the original, and whether that original may be
represented in whole or in part by our version, which, immediately after this opening, runs with the ordinary fourth century traditions.

We are forced to ask this question most seriously, because throughout our eight chapters available for comparison (and how much more would there be if all were extant in the MS. 143) a steady stream of the most ancient readings is present, together with unfailing indications of the faint spots in an original, which stands at the source not only of N but of other important documents such as Syr S. In fact, it begins to appear as if we were on the footsteps of the precious papyrus document of the Apocalypse which was extant for the whole world at one time in but one exemplar, far back of N.

We have touched on these "faint spots" already, as being the source of trouble and perplexity to the forerunners of N.

The famous passage at xxii. 14 is another case in point. The ordinary text runs: μακαριοι οἱ πολυντες τας εντολας αυτων, whereas these important documents: N A 38, 127, 143, 7-45, 104, 146 sah aeth Fulg Oec and Haymo, read: μακαριοι οἱ πλυντες (πλυντες, 7, 45, 104, 143) τας στολας αυτων, and that valuable check-MS. for ancient traditions, 56, conflates the two readings.

The source of this variation is doubtless due to the difficulty of reading the original.

We will close by touching on another point, not yet referred to, which enables us to go to very high antiquity for light on the subject.

Probably on the same page of the old archetype occurred XXII. 11. In this verse, with its present fourfold clause:

1. ὁ ἀδίκος ἀδικησατω ἐτι,
2. ὁ ρυπων ρυπωσατω ἐτι,
3. ὁ δικαιος δικαιωθητω ἐτι (οὐ δικ. δικαιοσυνη ποιησατω ἐτι),
4. ὁ αγιος αγιασθητω ἐτι,

there are several variations as to the form of No. 2, N reading (with 18 and 32) ὁ ρυπαρος ρυπαρωθητω ἐτι, while others have ὁ ρυπαρος ρυπαρωθητω ἐτι, but the fourfold clause is made into a threefold one by A 34, 35, 65, 67, 68, 97, 121, 122, who omit No. 2 entirely. THEY ARE NOW JOINED BY 143.

In order to check this, we go as far back as we can into the records of antiquity, and we find the passage extant and quoted in the letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, concerning the martyr-
dom of Pothinus and others, in the beginning of the last quarter of the second century.

There it takes the form of: "Ἰνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ: ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι," and nothing is said of a "filthy" or "sordid" one, ρυπών or ρυπαρός, but of a "lawless" one.

I take it that in this passage also the basic document was faint, and ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι may be the true reading, and the full clauses be:—

1. ὁ ἀδικών ἀδικησάτω ἔτι,
2. ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι,
3. ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι,
4. ὁ ἁγιός ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.

At any rate, 143, with A and others, had difficulty, and cut out the second clause altogether.

As a matter of fact, our textus receptus ought to read only two clauses (as Vienna and Lyons), because Apoc. 1, upon which it was founded, reads only:—

1. ὁ ἀδικών ἀδικησάτω ἔτι,
2. καὶ ὁ ἁγιός ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι,

Erasmus having retranslated and being responsible for ὁ ρυπών ρυπωσάτω ἔτι.

A few other cursives (59, 104, 120, 153) make this a threefold clause, by omitting καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι in the third place, and two of them (104 and 153) adjust the matter by previously changing ἀδικησάτω to δικησάτω, thus:—

ὁ ἀδικών δικησάτω ἔτι
καὶ ὁ ρυπαρός ρυπαρευθήτω ἔτι
καὶ ὁ ἁγιός ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.

So much for this passage at the present time.

Whence, I wonder, did the old monk Leontius draw this long excerpt, including the special inscription? It would be interesting to find another copy. Meanwhile, we must pass on to consider other MSS. in our next article.

This MS. 143 has been used by Charles (Crit. and Exeg. Com.
on the Rev. of St. John, 1920), who is the first one to give some of its readings, but my readers will see from the foregoing that nobody has so far realised its full importance in these studies.

Postscript.

Since writing the above article, photographs of a document have reached me from Greece, which are of the highest importance in these studies. They are photographs of a bicolumnar codex of the eleventh century, which was written by a very careful scribe. For instance, every single breathing is perfectly square from beginning to end of the Apocalypse. Never a lapse anywhere to a rounded form. And the breathings are wonderfully accurate. But one rough breathing for a smooth one throughout. Let the reader try and accomplish this feat for only three or four consecutive verses! I mention this merely in passing.

At once the scribe of 200 is justified as to his reading of στόματος for θρόνου in XXII. 1, which so far was only found in 92 and 200, for our new MS. adopts this reading without question, although not of the 200 type elsewhere.

The MS. falls into none of our known classes, yet has many elements of them all, or rather of the rarer family types. As showing basic age, it connects alone with the Sinaitic (S) and the Alexandrine (A) many times. But it does the same with Gwynn’s Crawford Syriac, and with the Aethiopic version, and also with some of the MSS. of the Armenian. Again, we will find it alone with Gigas and often with Primasius, although sometimes with slight differences pointing to a common earlier Greek foundation base.

We are often alone with the very eclectic MS. 36, and others of that sort, and there is a polyglot element, partly near-basic no doubt, but also of a later date, as I will now try and illustrate.

Gwynn has probably established to the satisfaction of scholars that Syr S is an older type than the three or four MSS. extant of Syr Σ. Now, while we are often with Syr S alone, or in small and weighty combinations, we have found a peculiar case where we are able to exhibit a long lost Greek reading, which appears only in Syriac dress in Σ, unless it is an integral part of Syr Σ as an independent, but then this would offer proof of Greek retranslation from Syriac at a certain indeterminate date, which my critics usually combine to disallow completely for any date!
I will now place them on the horns of a dilemma, and invite their attention to the following:—

Whereas Schaaf, in his edition of the Syriac N.T., translates the Syriac words ا Gems in XXI. 11 by "tanquam lucem splendidam," a reference to Walton's Polyglot gives us "tanquam splendorem RADII. This must represent in Greek:—

\[ \omega \phi ε \nu \gamma \eta \varsigma, \text{ instead of} \]

\[ (και \delta) \phi ε \nu \gamma \eta \varsigma \text{ read by all MSS.} \]

Now turn to Gwynn, page 44 note:—

"11. και \( \delta \) \phi ε \nu \gamma \eta \varsigma. So some MSS. and pr. and most versions, but the MSS. and most MSS. (versions ?) omit και as also g and vg [am, arm, etc. not cl] and Σ (which, however, reads these words differently from all else: \( \alpha \nu \gamma \eta \varsigma \text{ for } \alpha \nu \tau \varsigma \)).

Remains to find this reading in a Greek document of any importance. And, behold, we produce it in the present MS. under discussion, the photographs of which we now have in our hands.

The reading is there quite certainly. And there is no chance about it, for other things link it up indubitably to the text underlying Syr Σ, or force on us accommodation to the Syriac text of Syr Σ.

Observe, then, at XVIII. 7, that we substitute καταστροφιάσαι for καί ἔστροφιάσαι quite alone among Greek documents, but this is duly presented in the Latin translation of Syr Σ as lascivire against the 'et in deliciis fuit,' or 'et deliciarum habuit' or 'et delicias exercuit.'

In the same verse, the word βασανισμὸν is missing, owing to a lower corner of the page of the MS. being cut away, but the first three letters remain, and they are not βας but \( \dot{\alpha}φα. \ldots \). The problem is to find the right word. We could not do it alone without the help of Syr Σ, for it might be:—

\[ \dot{\alpha}φάνισμον, \text{ 'disappearance by destruction,'} \]

or \[ \dot{\alpha}φασίαν, \text{ 'dumbness,'} \]

or \[ \dot{\alpha}φανροτηρ, \text{ 'weakness,'} \]

or \[ \dot{\alpha}φάνειαν, \text{ 'ruin by obscurity,'} \]

or \[ \dot{\alpha}φάρωσιν, \text{ 'nakedness' (absence of cloak),} \]

or even \[ \dot{\alpha}φαίμεξιν, \text{ 'blood-letting.'} \]

How shall we decide? Turn to Schaaf's Syriac N.T. and you
find ἱγας, but the Latin text is the usual one, "cruciatum." Walton's translator, however, comes to the rescue and correctly informs us that the meaning is "vastationem;"
in other words, nothing else but ἀφάνισμον in Greek. So we restore the text with confidence, and add this to our collection of unique Greek readings supported by Syr.

It is impossible, in recording such matters, to give full force to the striking character of the evidence, because a complete collation and comparison with other documents can alone impress upon the student the intensely interesting character of the problems involved, and of their solution.

Gwynn forecast the reading of αὐγής and is on record to this effect, but no one has happened to forecast ἀφάνισμον as far as I am aware. Ἀφάνισμον, in the setting of Apoc. XVIII. 7, is far stronger than βασανισμῶν, although our scribe perpetuates βασανισμῶν in verse 10, and βασανισμῶν in verse 15, just as the Syriac there uses the other word ἱοιος:

And what a flood of light αὐγής throws on the grand passage in XXI. 11:—

φωστήρ αὐγής ὁμοίως λίθω τιμωτατῷ,
ὡς λίθω ἱάστι τι κρυσταλλίζοντι.
The gleaming of her rays!

I have no space to deal with this MS. fully here, which must be written up at greater length when we go to press with the body of our collations.

The word αὐγή occurs but once in the N.T., at Act XX. 11: until 'break of day,' meaning until the first rays of the sun cast their light or beams, and αὐγάζω once at 2 Cor. IV. 4: 'shine,' and διαυγάζω once 2 Pet. I. 19: 'dawn.'

It is related in origin to our word eighe, eye (pl. eyen), through Gothic anga¹ and German ange, Icelandic anna, Swedish öga, Sanskrit aksha (Latin originally oculus, now oculus. Hence Russian oko).

¹ "Window" in Gothic is auga-dauro: 'eye-door'!
Avyrj is very freely used by all the Greek poets in many interesting connections, thus:

Aeschylus: βίου δύντος αὐγαί, “life’s setting sun.”

or πυρὸς αὐγῆ, and βροντᾶς αὐγαί.

It is a “sheen,” as translated in the Apocalyptic passage by Conybeare for his Armenian MSS., and as applied to gold—Pindar: χρυσὸς αὐγάς ἐδείξεν.

It is not the eye proper, but the quality of the eye—its rays; thus Sophocles: ὀμμάτων αὐγαί the “rays,” the “shining” of the eyes; or of the soul; Plato: ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐγή, and then gradually of the eyes alone—αὐγαί, like the Latin lumina.

Probably the basic reading included both ἀὐγής and ἀὐτῆς and was:

“ἔχουσαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀσ (so our MS.) φωστήρ αὐγής αὐτῆς . . . “

“Having the glory of God as the Light-source of her radiance,” that is: the origin and source of her rays.

Somebody may have cancelled αὐτῆς in one copy, and someone αὐγής in another. As regards ‘her’ radiance, the missing τῆς before αὐγής (if we read τῆς αὐγής αὐτῆς) can be found by reading φῶς τῆς for φωστήρ. In fact our MS. may have φωσ as it is rather indistinct at the end of a line.

We have here probably the antithesis of conflation, a veritable de-conflation.

If the Syriac did not get it from an original Greek, the only other explanation would be that our Greek MS. retranslated from a late Syriac, which had mistaken αὐτῆς for αὐγής, which is not likely.

There are other curious passages like XXII. 2, where we read ἐκ μέσου for ἐν μέσῳ, with 92. This, coupled with στόματος for βρόνου in the previous verse (also with 92), shows affiliation of source, and no error. Now the Syriac here lends itself better to ἐκ than to ἐν.

Again, at XX. 6, we add αὐτοῦ after χρυσοῦ quite alone among Greek MSS., after the Syriac manner, and with the Syriac alone (and Fulgentius).

At XIX. 16 we have the plural ὀνόματα γεγραμμένα (—το) with the later Syriac, and elsewhere σαλπιγγῶν for τῆς σαλπίγγος
with Syr S and $\Sigma$, but there against note at XVI. 7 the singular (against plural of all others)—

"δικαιᾶ καὶ δικαία ἡ κρίσις σου"

with Syr $\Sigma$ (trace remains in the Greek uncialis with κρίσις), which points in the other direction. While λεόντων in XIII. 2 is countenanced by $\aleph$ 14-92 Victorin, as well as Syr. We have a novelty among Greek MSS. twice over of τῶν ἵσφαλτων for τῶν ὑψίων ἱσράηλ, VII. 4 and XXI. 12. In the first case agreed to by Syr $\Sigma$.

As regards the age of these things, compare III. 5 ἐπιφροσύνη for ἐκλοχία (prim.) alone with $\aleph$, and III. 8 + καὶ before ἵσον alone with Syr $S$, $\Sigma$.

Finally, note the double base of Syr $S$ and $\Sigma$ coming in at XIV. 15, where we omit the clause ὅτι ἔξηράνθη ὁ θεοσώμος τῆς γῆς with both of them, and with them alone.

And as regards the "true" reading in XV. 3 fin.

"The King of the Ages,"

as against the two variations supported by most, viz. :—

τῶν ἀγίων or τῶν ἐθνῶν

note that we hold "ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων" with $\aleph$ C 18, 56, 95, 127, 159 Syr $S$ and $\Sigma$, some latt and vgl., the Greek cursives being among the most important of our documents, (arm with 112 Gr. [against its family] conflates αἰώνων and ἐθνῶν, amiatinus = caelorum).

H. C. HOSKIER.

[In Souter's notes to his edition of the Greek Testament, he gives 94 and 2040 as the cursives supporting τῶν αἰώνων. 94 is an error for 95. Scrivener quotes his g, not b, for this. And Gregory's number of 2040 is none other than 951 Thus does the use of complicated and changing numeration affect the correct setting forth of evidence. It would have been better to quote '94, 95,' and then the student could more readily have detected the error. Souter leaves out 18 (an important MS.) which Tischendorf had mentioned, and which certainly reads thus. On the other hand, in von Soden's notes, while quoting his 1682 (= our 112 and Gregory's old 182) for the conflation of arm (although this Greek MS. is very late and differs here from its elder brothers' reading of τῶν ἐθνῶν), he quotes his l 22 and 503 for τῶν αἰώνων. His 503 is our 159, and 22 is probably his Av22 or Athos]
Stawron 48, which I have not yet collated. Soden's system in the Apoc. is very annoying for he has two similar numbers in several cases; thus 31 occurs twice; it can be either Av$^3$1 or Oec$^3$1. The same applies to his numbers 10 and 11, to his 51, 52, 53, to his 400 and to his 501. He did not use our 56, one of the most important of the MSS., nor our 127.

(To be continued. Article 4 will deal with Apoc. 130 first used by Dr. Swete.)

Correction of Misprints in Article 2.

Page 258: read ῥεῦσιν instead of ἅτα.

On p. 266, line 4, last word, ταῦτα is an impossible word due to inversion by compositor. It should be ταῦτας.

Same page last line but 5 εἰς. Iota has dropped out, should be εἴς.

H. C. HOSKIER.