MANUSCRIPTS OF THE APOCALYPSE—RECENT INVESTIGATIONS.

By H. C. HOSKIER.

IV.

APOC. 130.

So far from exhausting the subject in our last, we now approach another problem of deepest interest in the history of the transmission of the text, and have to consider another early cursive, this time at Mount Athos.

APOC. 130 (Ac. 359, P. 452) = Athos Iberorum 25 = Greg. 130 (Ac. 359, P. 452) [S. XI]

(Collated in 1921 from photographs made in 1913).

This very exceptional MS. has a magnificent foundation text, most unfortunately spoiled by some over-eager seventh-century rehandling.

Its original polyglot base is veneered with a much later strain of eclectic polyglot readings and re-renderings. In other words, what we had hoped, when we first ran through it, might prove to be a mine of wealth to check our existing material, proves, upon deeper examination, to be a source contaminated—not by the scribe—but by his forerunners.

In nearly every other verse we have a new reading, frequently, however, supported by the oldest MSS. of the Versions—Syriac, Sahidic, Bohairic, Latin, and we even run sometimes to the most ancient Greek underlying the Aethiopic.¹

¹ As at IX. 4 ἀλλὰ for εἴ μη absolutely alone with aeth, which is very striking; further, at: XIV. 14 — ομοίως 130 and aeth alone; XVI. 7 — τὸ θεός 43, 130 and aeth alone; XXII. 7 + καὶ αὐτὸ μακάριος 30, 130 and aeth alone, besides conjunction of aeth and syr S, as at VI. 6 the special order: καὶ τὸν ομοίως καὶ τὸ εἰλαὶν by (36) 130 aeth lat, syr S only; XIII. 2 — σῶμα sec. 38, 59, 69, 114, 130 syr S aeth arm; XIV. 14 — καὶ εἶδον § 129 syr S (aeth); and the substitution of ομοίως for ομοίως at II. 15 fin, by joining ομοίως to μετανόησον verse 16, corresponds exactly to aeth: “Et nunc resipisce sinminus . . .”
ΑΠΟΣ. 130  (Rduced)
These changes, are, some of them, probably basic; many others are the product of a later age, and represent later undesirable reflex action on the Greek.

All, however, with exceedingly few exceptions, make perfectly good sense. Thus, the omission at IX. 9 of των πτερυγων (quite alone, so far) makes sense enough: "And their sound was as the sound of many-horsed war-chariots rushing to battle."

We do not get a line on the original sources of corruption until we reach chapter VII., verse 1, where the scribe gives us ἴσραήλ πλην (he writes nearly everything in full, especially ουρανου, as against other scribes) instead of ἰνα. This at last gives it away. The scribe must have misread INA as IΗΑ, which shows that his copy was faint and old, the Η being taken for Ν, made like Η, the bar not visible in the Α, which was read as Α.

In X. 10 we find Ν* (and 200) dating the last revision of our MS., which reads: καὶ ἄτι ἐφαγον αὐτὸ ἐγεμώσθη ἡ κοιλία μου πικρίας (instead of ἐπικράνθη, without πικρίας). Now while Ν* reads ἐγεμώσθη with us, it was Ν* who added πικρίας. Ν* and Prim agree together (alone) to read "Repletus est venter meus," without ἀρτανύττε, whereas the reading of our MS. is that of the group Ν, f gig Beatus.

This MS. puts a quietus on many readings attested by Ν*B and a comparatively large group of cursive, to the exclusion of CAP and another large groups of cursive.

The intense sympathy of our MS. with the base of Ν* causes us to believe the testimony of 130 rather than that of Ν*B when such readings are not reproduced by 130.

The fact remains that numerous hitherto unique readings in syr S and boh and sah are being picked up by me in each important Greek document which I examine.

Of course many unique readings remain still in syr S unaccounted for, and unaccounted for by the exigencies of any translation from the Greek.

As we reduce these, it may become advisable to list some of them, with a view to their bearing upon the general problem of an original Syro-Greek recension, from which possibly sprang all the rest of the syriacising Greek MSS.
In this latest MS. under examination, No. 130, observe that it is the first one to leave out ἐβραίστη (as to the name Abaddon) in IX. 11. This is one opportunity out of two in the Apocalypse for it to act as Evan 28 or 157 did in leaving out “which being interpreted is” after local Aramaic expressions in the Gospels, and Apoc. 130 promptly avails of it, thus explaining some of its sympathy with syr S, if deriving from a Graeco-Syriac MS., as seems quite possible. Thus, at the other place, XVI. 16, please to notice that another strange thing happens. Our MS. suppresses τὸν καλομένον ἐβραίστη αρ μαγεδών altogether after τὸν τοπον, and substitutes τῶν ὁδών. Swete gives this reading without comment. It certainly is a very extraordinary reading, and a still more extraordinary substitution. The commentaries are silent about any such thing, and τῶν ὁδών would seem to be more to the point (cf. Matt. XXIV. 8, Mark XIII. 8, Acts II. 24); yet a slight clue offers, and the connection is not so far to seek, for some of the commentators comment immediately after regarding what they have to say on XVI. 14 seq. by a scholae beginning “Ἡ ἀγγελικὴ φωνὴ οὐρανόθεν φησί ‘γέγονε’ . . .” So this place of ἀρ Μαγεδών was “the place of songs, or of minstrels,” in a sense of “the song of the Heavenly Voice.” The voice saying γέγονε or γεγονα is followed by an awful tumult: “ἀστραπαί καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ μεγαὶ οἰος οὐκ εγενετο αἴφ οὐ εγενοντο οἱ ανθρώποι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τηλικοντο σεισμος ουτω μεγας” and τῶν ὁδών remains a most curious expression, yet not as wholly illogical as at first sight appears. (See accompanying photograph of XVI. 11/12-17).

Apoc. 130 does not generally run to such extremes. Only in two other places, once at IX. 20 he qualifies the idols as τα κωφα, and again at XVI. 20 he substitutes πας αηρ for πασα νησος. (See accompanying photograph of XVI. 17-XVII. 2).

He is, however, such a terrible eclectic that it is hard to pin the problem down within threshing distance. Thus, at VI. 15 we read ὅπασ for πέτρας, 130 being the first Greek MS. to make any change here. Swete quotes ὅπασ for bohairic, but erroneously ὅπης for

1 At XVI. 16, that other most valuable and important MS., Apoc. 56, is the only one to omit ἐβραίστη there, with Apoc. 106.
Λόγος 130 (Ῥωμᾶς)
Apoc. 130. Our MS. reads distinctly ἃπασ.¹ As to boh, it has: ἀιξολ ἑτε νιπετρα really "the holes of the rocks" (as most arm MSS.) not using the word for "mountains" employed above. The expression "πέτρας των ὁρῶν" has always seemed a rough expression, although no Greeks so far examined have turned it. Translators must have had difficulty, yet the Latins, including Prim, Anon, and Auct de Prom, who quote, render literally: "in petris montium," only Auct l. ad Novat. saying: "in cavernis montium." Aeth turns εἰς τὰ σπηλαία καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν ὁρῶν into: "in montibus et in recessibus."

The word ἀιξολ ² in coptic, corresponding to ὁπας, seen by our scribe's forerunner, may, indeed, have suggested the Greek synonym for ὁρῆς in the succeeding verse, where he writes: τῆς χολῆς for τῆς ὁργῆς, our English word "choler").

This is the first occurrence of the word in the Apoc., and the scribe does not use it again in XI. 18, XIV. 10, XVI. 19, XIX. 15, showing that some special cause operated in VI. 16 as to χολῆς there. [Swete misquotes: τῆς σχολῆς].

Now when you expect a strange reading in 130, you do not meet one, and the text flows smoothly on, to the very order sometimes of the textus receptus, opposed by the "middle Greeks," those without special traditions. The stranger readings of our MS. occur generally in most unexpected places.

It is a fact, and a very strange fact, that all these exceptional cursives—disagreeing in so large degree, as well as agreeing among themselves—have a perfectly easy and seemingly unartificial flow of text. This proves that the type of text which they represent was not elaborated in any tenth or eleventh-century scriptorium, but is the product of a much earlier age. This much we can establish with certainty.³

But how comes it that these MSS., while individually reproducing

¹ ὁπας is used in Heb. XI. 38 and James III. 11.
² ἀιξολ is also the word used in Hebr. XI. 38.
³ Thus we have in the same monastery at Meteora three very different types of text in the MSS. 200, 201, 202 all executed between A.D. 950 and 1075. The same of course applies to the great variety of texts on Mount Athos.
part of the traditions and idiosyncracies of particular early authorities, yet fail to agree among themselves to reproduce more, and seem to be so eclectic? It must be for the reason that a variety of recensions—all old—were current in different parts of the then limited Christian world, with no opportunity of comparing them.

One thing is beyond cavil. In a certain very ancient exemplar, perhaps underlying them all, there were certain faint or illegible places, for we notice that in all cursive with ancient collateral lines converging back to primal days, the same difficulties occur in the self-same places, many of which had already bothered the ancestor of N.

But, beyond this, we cannot yet understand when, how, and why the lines went apart. Fortunately, the medieval MSS. became, or remained, standardized along certain lines, and no great changes have been wrought in the text in more modern times; by that I mean between A.D. 850 and 1200.

The changes are all very ancient.

**THE POLYGLOT CHARACTER OF THEM ALL.**

Now comes a feature, most difficult to deal with. Of reflex polyglot action there is plenty. This also dates from very early days, but undoubtedly increased during the copying from A.D. 350 to 850. It also occurred immediately after the very first translations were made, and changes re-impressed themselves upon the Greek from the mere sight of a concurrent version and this in quite the earliest days. This is to be observed as to Syriac, Latin, and Coptic reaction all through our existing Greek MSS. of A.D. 850 to 1200, besides those copied in 375 to 500. But how to differentiate between the earliest and the later ones is the problem. The relative importance of certain cursive testimony, now rendered available, will, I am sure, contribute to an understanding and elucidation of this baffling problem.

Partial examination heretofore has led nowhere. What I have done for the Apocalypse can be done for the other books by anyone who is accurate, painstaking, and patient. The record, as we have it preserved, is now spread before us. Let us digest it intelligently.

The collection of this material to me has been most instructive. Where Soden failed—for failed he has—was in the attempt to collect material through others, and digest it for himself without the collator's
illuminating experiences. The actual collator must also be the one to present the full table of results. He alone can assess at their true value the testimonies of his various scribes. He alone, who has lived with them in the past in their old Scriptoria, can assess at their just value the relative positions to be established for individual members of large groups, and decide which shall govern the group.

Our MS. has the short heading:

\begin{quote}
\textit{iωάννον ἀποκάλυψις}
\end{quote}

but the subscription is:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἀποκάλυψις iωάννον}
\end{quote}

which agrees with the inscriptions of \textit{N} and \textit{C}.

Professor Lake, during a visit to Athos, was attracted to this MS., and with good reason; and he provided Dr. Swete with photographs of the MS. or readings of its text, which were used in the textual footnotes to the edition of 1911 of his book on the Apocalypse, under the same number by which we designate it, viz. Apoc. 130.

The date attributed by Gregory of XI. seems full high at first sight, but is probably correct. There is very little in the way of abbreviation, no numerals, no iota post, plenty of \(ν \varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\lambda\kappa\), and \(ι\delta\omicron\omicron\) is constant. Accents are wonderfully correct. The scribe writes a nice, easy, flowing hand, but not that of one of the schoolmen or professional penmen of the period.

Dates, however, mean but little in a matter of this kind, except as to the probable accuracy of the copying men in the Scriptoria. Thus, between 950 and 1175, the ratio of accuracy among scribes is far higher than before or later. It reached its highest point concurrently with what Dr. Cram would call the “Gothic” period, thus substantiating many of his contentions.

The text starts off with an innovation among Greek MSS. at I. 1 by omitting \(\tau\omicron\omicron\ δ\omicron\nu\lambda\omega\ α\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\) and this prepares us for the strange but highly interesting recension which follows.

Towards the close it has three readings (XXI. 5, 6, 8) close together, agreeing alone with 65, a manuscript which is wanting from chap. I.-XVI., and this shows what a loss this lacuna is in No. 65.

Apoc. 130 is the first one of our cursives to explain the reading of \textit{N}, who writes in XII. 13 \(\varepsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu\) for \(\varepsilon\delta\iota\omega\zeta\epsilon\). Apoc. 130 says
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de Duplicate, which I have already reported as the Oecumenian reading
(both text and commentary) in the Messina MS. of our No. 146, to
follow. This clearly explains the text which lay behind #, whose
reading can be meant for nothing else but the imperfect tense de
and have nothing to do with #.

Dr. Swete does not seem to see the point, as he quotes 130, but
does not mention #.

There is no getting away from the compelling interest of this MS.,
and Dr. Swete has overlooked a very large number of important key-
readings, even when quoting other MSS. or versions for them.

Thus, although he reports the new reading in II. 27 of ka
ποιμαίνειν for the usual ka ποιμαντιν or ka ποιμαίνει, he misses
the connection with Syr S, as he reports Gwynn’s translation for
ίνα ποιμαίνει. It is true that Gwynn placed this in his text, but his
footnote anticipated our reading in 130 by saying that he ought rather
to read ποιμαίνειν for the Syriac. So Swete fails to connect Apoc.
130 and Syr S here. (200 reads ποιμαντιν exceptionally.)

Now this particular connection would be slight enough, and perhaps
negligible, if there were not other sympathy with Syr S, but of this
there is plenty. Notice then, and very carefully—for Dr. Swete has
not reported it at all—that Apoc. 130 in the immediate vicinity of
the previous passage cited, viz. at II. 23 fin. in its text has—

+ ka παίδευσω ύμασ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ύμων.

This reading is found in the margin of Syr S, and is translated
into Greek by Dr. Gwynn, word for word with the Greek reading of
Apoc. 130.

Yet, curiously enough, we find no trace in Apoc. 130 of the
strange reading which occurs at IV. 8 in the text of Syr S of ἀπὸ
tῶν ὄνυχων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑπάνω for ἀνὰ before πτέρνγας ἔξ, this
“claws” clause being duly reported by Swete, and which is about the
equivalent of the coptic text. Of course, our MS. elsewhere is close
to coptic, and in this very place, while avoiding all about the “claws,”
has coptic order (in those coptic MSS. which have it) of ἓξ πτέρνγας
against all Greeks but 14-92.

Now all this and more occurs in the smoothest possible manner in
Apoc. 130, without tremor in the scribe’s pen, and in the midst of
considerable spells of conventional text. Explain it if you can.
Whatever we may think of the scribe, his text (the lines double-spaced, which is quite unusual and somewhat extravagant as regards the vellum) flows steadily along, and the stranger readings show no sign whatever of manipulation by him, but owe their origin exclusively to the uncommon exemplar used. And this again, we may fairly judge by inference, contained those rare lections in a straightforward fashion; otherwise, if there had been heavy corrections in that MS., the present copy would show some sign of hesitation in those places, which it does not do.

Therefore, the origin of the various readings goes back at least two generations of manuscripts and possibly more.

Swete has omitted to notice or to record a large number of variants, which must be placed before the student ere he can form any judgment as to the value of the text as a whole.

Indeed, this is most difficult to assess, because, while our MS. will be in accord alone with a limited but authoritative group like Ν CAP 56 copt Syr S alone, and that on many occasions, it goes apart and often apparently "wild" on so many other occasions, that to consider it a balancing factor in the former series gives it undue importance in the latter; and if we accord it no importance in the latter, it does away with its value as a supporter of the oldest MSS. and versions.

At any rate, we may rest assured, first, that there are effective reasons for the "wild" readings, which we cannot at present understand, as these occur in the midst of the strictest agreement with a conventional text, and, secondly, that all these variations trace to quite ancient sources, and have no relation to mediæval ecclesiastical bias.

Thus, in the very first chapter we read at:—

i. 9. [Neglected by Swete.] + ev ante ντόμονη with Dionys alone (59, quite a sympathetic MS. is the only other to read ev τη.)

ii. 15. δμως (for ὁμως or o μωσ) being an ancient form of ὁμως not given by Ν C or A, but strictly it should be δμως unless the fine distinction of δμως is intentional, meaning "notwithstanding" instead of "likewise," but in the earliest uncials there would be no accent to differentiate the word. But the scribe of Apoc. 130 means δμως, for he joins δμως to μετανοησον verse 16. "Nevertheless remember" exactly as αεθι.

[δμως occurs elsewhere in the N.T. at John XII. 42, Gal. III. 15 and 1 Cor. XIV. 7. Note that is a Johannine word, and manuscripts seem to concur at John xii. 42.
to read ὀμος (whether ὀμος or ὀμός) and not ὀμονος.
In Codex B it is accented ὀμος, in Codex N there is no accent. Dr. Swete does not give the accent for 130.]

But at:

iii. 16. χλιαρὸς for χλιαρὸς with N* alone (the Ionic form).

vi. 4. - αλκος alone with syr S copt and Anon.

vii. 4. - ἐσφαγμομενοι with 18, 146 and syr S.

viii. 10. - και επεσεν sec. with h and Prim [non sah boh arm aeth syr].

Neglected by Swete, who quotes Prim.

ix. 3. - ἐξονυσιαν ἀντε οἱ σκοφτωι with 40, 121 syr S. Cf. h eam pro potestatem. Cf. arm. Our MS. has many of these avoidances of redundancy. Either revision or a return to the original purer draft. Neglected by Swete.

xi. 2. ἐκεῖ βάλει (pro ἐκβάλε). This is new. Cf. N* και ἐκβάλε. Again due probably to a faint exemplar. (Obs. Prim - ἐκβάλε εξω.)

xiii. 8. οὐ οὐ γέγραπται pro ὄν οὐ γεγρ. This with C 19, 146 and Iren only. As A has οὐαί for οὐν οὐ, and N leaves out οὐ, the original was again not clear; the double οὐ coming together in uncial writing is confusing, and 130 maintains the right reading, keeping το ονομα following. Swete's text gives οὐ οὐ without giving C 130 credit for this in his notes.

xiv. 13. χῶ pro κυριω with CP 113 only.

xv. 4. - κυριε with 14-92, 18, 121 arm aeth Cypr Prim.


xvii. 15. ταυτα pro τα υδατα with 200 (contra Cypr). Again possibly due to the faint common original. (Compare the reverse in syr S at XI. 6 τα υδατα pro αυτα.)

17. την καρδιαν pro τας καρδιας with Hippolytus only. This surely takes our text into high antiquity, but Swete overlooks it.

xviii. 3. - τον θυμον alone with 113 syr S and Prim. (Cf. AC - τον οινον; cf. aeth veneno pro vino irae).

4. βλαβητε a prima manu ex emend. The scribe inserts the β. With E 67-120 and Anon (laedamini).

13. ἐπτοις pro ἐπτωι with 56, 95, 127, 200 (again that strong old cursive combination) and (syr).

xxi. 1. - πρωτη with 13, 29, 65 boh arm Iren Prim Aug [non Tert vid].

2. + και antε κεκοσμημενην with 100 only and arm Anon Auct prom (Iren int "ut").
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xxi. 6. ek touto u'datos tis ptnhs tis zwos dorea\nalone with 65, reversing the order of u'datos and ptnhs, and giving us the prettiest phrase: "I give to him who is athirst water from the spring of life," bringing this together. (Note that A omits tis ptnhs.)

xxii. 11. The form kai o rypa\nagrees alone with N 18 and 32. [Neglected as to 130 by Swete, who quotes the others.]

2.

The nature of other innovations is clear to me. They bear the imprint once more of "bilingual" tradition; or rather, not so much of tradition, as of positive error oculi and error mentis in copying from or referring to bilingual bicolumnar MSS. in early times.

Let us list some of them: —

i. 16 init. — kai. No Greeks but with sah and boh.

ii. 10. o dia\nagrees with arm 4. Observe change of preposition. [Swete records â for â but neglects eva and — balein].


23. kardh\nThis order [negl. Swete] is confirmed by 51-90, 113, 114, 127, 200 and arm boh [non sah] Vict Tyn.


v. 10. basileian pro basileis with (N) A 56, 143, 200 only of Greeks, but so copt latt and arm (one MS.). Syr S says "basileian kai ier\nand N "basileian\nkai ierateian," Tert and Cy\nalso use regnum.

vi. 6. Order: kai tou ouvov kai tou epa\nS aeth latt [non gig] and only Greek (36). [Negl. Swete omnino.]

12. — ws ante a\na. Alone with sah boh arm gig. [Swete neglects, quoting arm.]

13. epi pro eis with N 22, 23, 47, 55, 56, 81, 102, 200 copt syr S arm uno. [Negl. Swete, quoting N 47 syr S.]

15. opas pro petras. New with boh and arm plur. [Cf. Hebr. XI. 38.]

vii. 1 init. — kai. Thus CA 127, 146 latt sah.

12. Order: ë doxa kai ë evlogia. Alone with syr S.

viii. 8. Order: kai to trit\nh\nS, aima with copt only. [Negl. Swete.]

ix. 12 init. + idou with sah and arm absolutely alone. [Negl. Swete.]
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x. 4. + αὐτὰ post γραφεῖν with cop t arm aiiq. [Negl. Swete.]

Ibid. + εβδομοῦ ante οὐρανοῦ. New thus, but syr S = οὐρανοῦ τον εβδομοῦ.

x. 8. το βιβλίον το (— ηνεωμενον). βιβλίον by CA 14-92, 127, but ηνεωμενον omitted only by syr S and 130. [Neglected entirely by Swete, who merely quotes AC 6, 14 for βιβλίον, and 6 is wrong.] Curiously enough 130 is the only MS. to use βιβλίον consistently throughout this section, and yet indulges in the "seventh Heaven."

xi. 6. καὶ εἰκοσιῶν εἴκοσιαν. New Greek order with versions only. [Negl. Swete.]

19. — αὐτραπαί καὶ with one arm MS.

xii. 2. — καὶ sec. ante βασανίζομεν. New (but quite natural), alone with boh, which suppresses all copulas here.

9. — καὶ post διαβόλος with Ν boh only [contra sah]. Swete neglects, quoting Ν and boh.

11. τὰς ψυχὰς with 23 and the Egyptian fam 34 only as well as boh latt aiiq arm uno Prim. [Negl. Swete, quoting 35, 87 arm.]

14. — τὸν ante αἰετοῦ with Ν only and boh and arm? [Negl. Swete, quoting Ν arm.]

Ibid. — καὶ sec. ante καίρους with 41, 42, 53, 69, 75, 77, 81, 90, 122 syr S. [Negl. Swete.]

xiii. 2. — στομα sec with 38, 59, 69, 114 syr S aeth arm aiiq.

5. + καὶ ante δύο with A 16, 39, 69, 95, 127 gig syr Iren. [Negl. Swete, quoting others.]

6. — τοὺς. So 35 and gig only (τὸ aeth).

xiv. 13. + μεγαλην. Alone with cop t.

14. — καὶ εἴδου with Ν 129 syr S (aeth).

17. εκ τοῦ ουρανοῦ πρὸ εκ τοῦ ναοῦ τον εν τω ουρανω. Alone with cop t. [Negl. Swete.]

20. διαχλωρων εξακοσιων πρὸ χιλιων εξακοσιων. Alone, yet not alone, for this can only trace to a Latin column in a bilingual, which agreed with the reading of gigas (and therefore is most ancient), for while the other Latins, including even Anon, have "per stadia," and h "per istadio," gigas has "a stadiis mille quingentis," this STADIISMILLE being confused with Bis Mille and transferred to Greek as ΔΙΚΧΙΛΙΟΝ.

For further proof of such things compare XVIII. 18 ομοὶς (alone) for ομοί = similis the same for masculine or feminine gender. Or comp. χιλιως ετεσι at XX. 4 fin alone with milleannis. of the Latins, against the χιλιως ετη of all Greeks.
xv. 2. κιθαραν προ κιθαρας. Alone with aeth and arm πς.
3. — την οδην sec. So arm πς, and boh inverting the clause.
xvi. 6. εδωκεν προ εδωκας [πιειν]. Alone with two arm MSS.
xvii. 1. Δευρο και δειξε. So arm. No others.
xviii. 9. + παντες ante οι βασιλεις. New with boh only.
xix. 20. Order: και εβληθησαν οι δυο ξωντες [εις]. New with copt and aeth only. [Male Swete, negl. ord.]
   This is a good example of polyglot handling. The usual text is: ξωντες εβληθησαν οι δυο εις την λημνην. Syr S begins και (with us) and eliminates ξωντες. It appears confused. The redactor of our recension refers to copt and finds ξωντες later, so adopts that order. Later on he opposes copt.
xx. 12. — της ante ξωνης. With 74 and copt, and of course lat. Comp. other such omissions alone XI. 19 — της, XII. 10 — ἡ.

3.

Others more difficult to trace or to assess are:—
vi. 11. αναπαυσασθε προ να αναπαυσωνται. Alone with 146 com. and arm πς.
vii. 5. δαν προ Γαδ With 9, 13, 16, 23 (39, 69), 75 and arm.
viii. 2. θρονον προ θεον „ 39, 69, 102 arm πς.
   6. [ξωντες absque oi] „ few. [Swete neglects to notice for 130 although quoting Ν 36 arm.]
   10. — και επεσεν sec „ h and Prim only [non sah boh arm aeth]. [Negl. Swete, quoting Prim but not h.]
12. Order: το τεταρτον (sic) της σεληνης και το τριτον του ηλιου. This is a new order, and of course τεταρτον (referring to the “quarters” of the moon) is new. Observe h, which agreed just above, leaves out και το τριτον της σεληνης. Hence our new order, as the common parentage is the same. [Swete quotes τεταρτον all right, but not the new order, so that his quotation applies τεταρτον to the sun!]
ix. 13. — φωνην μιαν. This is new. But φωνην is omitted by gig Prim Cypr arm σισιq, μιαν by 38, and the clause by Ν π! 17. — εν τη ορασεi. New, but syr S omits more. [Negl. Swete.]
x. 4. + και ante εμελλουν. With 41, 102 and aeth. [Negl. Swete.]
xii. 6. οκτακοσιας (προ διακοσιας). So only 14-92 with αωξ.
xii. 17. πολεμον ποιησαι. With Ν and Anon only. [Negl. Swete.]

Ibid. - των λοιπων. Alone with arm and both. Notice another faint place in the original, for Ν says "επί λοιπων" and Hipp "ἀγιον."

xiii. 1. επι ταις κεφαλαις. Alone with gig [' in capitisbus," the rest have "super capita" but 114 επι των κεφαλων].

xiv. 3. - τεσσαρες. With C alone. [Negl. Swete.]

4.

Dr. Swete's actual errors in reporting (besides those touched on above) are at :

iii. 16. Where he quotes - ουτως. The MS. omits οτι not ουτως.
iv. 1. MS. has λεγοντα μετ εμου for λαλουσις μετ εμου λεγουσα.
v. 2. MS. has και ιδου αγγελου (- ισχυρον) κηρυσσοντα ισχυρα φων (- μεγαλη). Swete quotes with Ν for κηρυσσοντα ισχυρον.
v. 13. MS. has λεγοντος. He quotes λεγοντας.
vi. 11. Neglecting the construction, he misquotes αποκτεννεσθαι for the manuscript's αποκτεννεσθε. The MS. has a new reading here, omitting ως. He should have noticed ἀποκτεννεσθε, as he quotes in the same verse αναπαυσασθε for ων αναπαυσονται.

15. The MS. is clear for δτας. He quotes ους.

vii. 1. Male Swete. + ισραηλ ante ινα. The codex substitutes ισραηλ for ινα.

5. Male Swete ουβειυ. MS. has ουβημυ.
x. 5. Ιδεις προ ειδου. This is new. Swete brackets 130 as for ιδου !

7. MS. has [ος ευγεγελισε] τους εαυτου δουλους τους προφητας.

Swete quotes as if MS. read ο. 

xii. 10. και η σωτηρια. ("De novo in versu" pro και η βασιλεια). Swete is not clear.

xiii. 15. MS. has προσκυνησουσιν. Swete errs, quoting προσκυνησουσιν with Ν, etc.

xvi. 14. MS. has εκπορευεται ( - α) with Ν 88 alone. Swete notes - α, but apparently makes the MS. read εκπορευουται.

xix. 18. Male Swete των παντων. MS. has [παντων].

xxii. 6. Swete quotes 130 alone for the omission of δειξαι τους δουλοις αυτον, but a good many others omit also.

17. MS. has λεγουσαι. Male Swete λεγουσα.
His omissions are manifold, not so much, I think, from design as from carelessness, as he reports similar variations in other places. He neglects altogether some 215 readings, of which not less than half are of very considerable importance. For instance, besides some already mentioned, the following variations are not recorded at all:

i. 3. τον λόγον προ τοὺς λόγους, although he quotes ΝQ 100 aeth.
6. καὶ ποιησαντι ημιν (προ καὶ εποιήσαν ημας), although he quotes others.

ii. 1. εκκλησίων προ χρυσῶν. (New.)
3. καὶ υπομονήν + ἄν (ante εχεις). (New.)

24. οὐ προ ὅσοι. So Ν* and 130, 200 alone.
25. οὖ ἀν ἥξω (— αχρίς). (New.)
26. κρατῶν προ τηρῶν. With 13-55* only.

iii. 7. — τον ante δαδ; although supporting his text with CA 38 syr S.
9. τοὺς λεγοντας προ των λεγοντων.
10. ἡγαπησας προ ετηρησας. None of these recorded.

Ibid. ek pro epι prim. 
Ibid. — ολης et + κατωικουν sic ante πειράσαι.
Ibid. τους ληστας προ τους κατωικουντας.

11. ὅσα προ ὅ. (New.)
Ibid. fin. — σου. (New.)

12. αὐτῷ προ αυτῶν prim with Ν* 47, 61, 92 txt, 100*. Neglected although Ν is cited.
Ibid. — το οὖνομα τον θεου μου και. 130 with B only. Swete quotes B (his Q) but not 130.

17. οὐde προ οὐδενος. Neglected, while others are cited.

iv. 6. — καὶ κυκλῳ του θρωνου. Neglected, while others are cited.
7. + ws ante aetω. (New.)
9. τω θρωνω. Neglected, quoting ΝΑ.

v. 4. Om. vers. Neglected, quoting A 98.
6. — καὶ αφθαλμους επτα. With 1, 44, 61, 121.
9. στι ιγιασας (sic) τω θεω (— εσφαγης και). (New.)

vi. 5. ερχου λεγοντος sic (— και βλεπε). (New order.)
8 en λιμω και en ρομφαια και en θανατω. (New order.)
vi. 11. — καὶ οἱ συνδούλοι αὐτῶν. Alone with 36.

_Ibid._ οἱ ἑλεγον πρὸ οἱ μελλοντες. (New.)

[This whole verse is curiously reconstructed. Instead of: καὶ εὐδοθησαν εκαστοις στολαι λευκαι καὶ ερεθη αυτοις ἡν αναπαυσωνται ετι χρονου μικρον εως ου πληροσουνται καὶ οἱ συνδούλοι αυτων καὶ οἱ αδελφων αυτων οἱ μελλοντες αποκτένεσθαι ος καὶ αυτοι of the textus receptus, we are treated to the following (which is useless for anyone to report only partially): "καὶ εὐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολή λευκή· καὶ ἔρρηθη αὐτοῖς· ἀναπαύσασθε χρόνον μικρόν ἐως πληρώσων καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ ἑλεγον ἀποκτένεσθε καὶ αὐτοὶ·". Notice the punctuation before ἀναπαύσασθε, and the substitution of οἱ ἑλεγον for οἱ μελλοντες before ἀποκτένεσθε with the suppression of ὦς before καὶ αὐτοί·.]


13. — τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. New among Greeks with 113 only, but with Novat Anon Auct w om.

vii. 1. + καὶ ἄντε κρατοῦσαι with syr S and over a dozen cursives. Swete neglects, quoting others. [For his 97 doubtless read 79.]

_Ibid._ μηποτε προ μητε bis. (New.)

2. — αὐτῶν. Neglected, although others quoted.

ix. 3 init. — καὶ. (New.)

4. ἀλλὰ προ εἰ μη. New with aeth.

11. — ἐβραιστὶ. New. Surely Swete should have noted this.

12 init. + ὄνομ. New with sah and arm alone.

14. τῶ προ ος εἰσχε. New thus. Swete brackets 130 with others for τῶ εχοντι, which is not accurate.

17. — εὐ τῶ ὀρασε. New thus, but syr S omits more.

20. — τὰ before ἀργυρα, χαλκα, λαθυμα, and ἕβλυμα. New thus as a whole among Greeks with 200.

_Ibid._ + α ἄντε ουτε secc. ἄντε βλέπειν. New. [Swete quotes the new "τὰ κωφα καὶ χρυσα," but omits the above in this verse.]

x. 4. + καὶ ἄντε εμελλοῦν. With two other of my cursives and aeth.

_Ibid._ + αὐτα post γραφεῖν. New with copt and arm alig. Swete neglects, although quoting εβδομου οὐρανοῦ in same verse.

xi. 6. — εἰς αἴμα. Completely overlooked by Swete. Now syr S leaves out επι τῶν ὑδατων, and 1, 12, etc., omit αὐτα, so probably a marginal notice to leave out αὐτα was misapplied by the others, and our omission must be noted.
xi. 11. *en autous pro etv autous.* Neglected, although others quoted.
19. *- tis ante diaothqes.* (New.)

xii. 4. *tiktevw.* Overlooked by Swete, although quoting others.
8. Order: *en to ouvraow etv.* (New, against sah boh order).
   - etv *Nc alig."

Ibid. *- mev evrtov,
17. *polemon poignai with Ntol and Apon.*

xiii. 1. *- kai eiodov ek tis thalass* motion, joining XII. 18 / XIII. 1 with stop after *thpion anabas* motion. *Prim* omits XII. 18, but has XIII. 1 as usual.
3. *eisphasmuov pro eisphammev.* Swete neglects this substitution not only for 130 but for other cursives. (So far I record eighteen MSS. for this.)

16. *diasin pro dios." Neglected, although others quoted.
17. *diosetai.* " " eleven others quoted.
18. *+ estin post autov." " " thirteen " " "

xiv. 3. *- tesfaraes.* With C alone. Swete quotes neither, although he notices *- kai quart.*
6. *- eti tis ghes.* (New.)
7. *- en phon megalya.* (New.)
11. *to xarisma pro to xaraimga.* New reading (a Pauline and Petrine expression). *Prim* is colourless with "notam." But surely Swete should have noticed this. No MS. or Version agrees, but at XIX. 20 arm 4 has what Coneybeare renders *tiv xares* for *tiv xaras* there, and which Swete sees fit to mention at that place.

13. *legounav pro legousvta.* Neglected, although *phon* for *phon* and *+ megalya* both in the accusative, are recorded.

Ibid. *gar pro de with NCAP, etc.* Swete records twelve others, but neglects 130.
14. MS. reads *kathmenov uos anvropon (- omoiovos). New thus with aeth.* Swete reports *- omoiovos* but neglects to notice *uos* for 130, although quoting 1 for it, and noting *kathmenos* for 130.
18. Order: *ek tou theiastrinov efxlthev with E.* Swete neglects this order of E and 130 (with 17, 67-120) although noting *- efxlthev* for A, and *- ek tou thos." for Prim, so the inverted order is important.

Ibid. *- legovn peymiov sou to thepavov to oxe kai.* Swete quotes *- legov* for 130 alone but not the rest of the omission, which is most misleading as syr S also omits *legov* (besides 14-92, 16, 72, 100), and *peymiov sou to thepavov to oxe* is omitted by arm and the cursive 12b, 16, 72, 100, and
finally καὶ τετρ by 100 gig and arm. Thus 100 and 130 agree.

xv. 2. The unique εξουσίαν (pro εχοντες) is neglected, although Swete records κεβαραν following (with aeth and arm uno). Αποκ. 130 would apparently apply εχονσαν to θελασσαν.

6/7. The MS. omits ek του ναον των τεσσαρων ἥξων. Swete says, as to λινοι or λιθον verse 6 “hiat 130,” but does not indicate what this hiatus amounts to. In reality I suppose the MS. should be quoted as – ek του ναον with many others, as well as for the longer omission, which may be an error, or deliberate, but it adds ἀσ post πληγας (ver. 6) and before εδωκε (ver. 7), completing the sense, which Swete quite overlooks.

xvi. 9. + των ante εκουσιων. Neglected, quoting others.

17. – του ναον. This is not properly indicated for 130 or others.

20. πας ανηρ εφυγεν pro πασα νησος εφυγε. Swete absolutely passes by this curious substitution, the most extraordinary in the whole MS. The MS. does not often indulge in such things, but when it does, the business of the critic is to report it, as there is no knowing when collateral agreement may be found in other documents, leading to identification of families, type, and common sources.

xvii. 5. – ἡ ante μητηρ. (New. Cf. copt.)

15. – ἀ. Alone with 98. Not noticed, although ταυτα for τα υδατα is cited with Ν alone.

18. εστι πολις pro εστιν η πολις. New, but neglected, as is – ἡ above before μητηρ, but these things all tend to show a polyglot mind, and must be recorded; else our labour is vain (cf. XII. 10 below).

xviii. 2. – και φυλακη ταυτος πνευματος ακαθαρτον. So six of my cursives. Swete is silent, although referring to μεμιαμμενον of 130 in the same verse.

4. – και sec. Omitted by 130 as well as by P 1, six other cursives, syr S and boh. Swete is silent as to all of them.

7 init. στω pro σας. (New.)

Ibid. αυτω pro ανυ. (New.) (– αυτη gig, – δοτε ανυ syr S.)

12. [πορφυρας with text rec.] Swete is silent as to 130, but quotes ἘΚΡ 7, 35, 95 Hipp., evidently overlooking it.

13. + και αμωμον not αμωμον. New thus. Swete has + και αμωμον in his text, but neglects the genitive of 130, although quoting κιναιμωμον for many others.

Ibid. θυμιαματος instead of θυμιαματα, following κιναιμωμον and
amomou, with another genitive. Swete neglects, although quoting Q 14, 92 for this, and 94 vg for θυμαματων.

xix. 20] καμινον for λιμνη. (New in both places.)

8. - ων αντε ο αριθμος. New. This, with + αυτων post αριθμος with ΝΑΒ mult. should be noticed, for the reading of 130 without δυν appears to be the best of all: "ο αριθμος αυτων ος η αρμος της θαλασσης," instead of ων ο αριθμος αυτων κ.τ.λ.

9. "[εκυκλευσαν] την πολιν και την παρεμβολην των αγιων [και την πολιν της γης]μενυσαν." This reduplication of την πολιν is to be noticed (cf. syr. S only; cf. B 97-122).
Swete passes it over, although referring to Q and 97.


11. ἐπ' αυτῷ (προ ἐπ' αυτώ). This is new. Others (81, 104, 114, 119-123 all notable cursive) read ἐπ' αυτῶ, but 130 is best, and should be quoted, because elsewhere most MSS. read ἐπ' αυτω and not the dative after καθημενος. Swete quotes 33 and 35 for ἐπ' αυτω (33 is wanting here), and is silent as to 130.

12. - εδυν προ ειδον. Notwithstanding above neglect, Swete has been careful to record 130 for εδυν, but overlooks it here and in four or five other places.

xxi. 10] και post μεγα. 130 reads: "ἐπ ορος μεγα υψηλον." Swete neglects this altogether, although a dozen cursive reads thus, and Cypr omits και υψηλον, which is also not mentioned.

13. The MS. reads και απο του νοτον which is a new reading.
Swete will not notice it.

16. Nor is δεκαδο mentioned for δωδεκα, although much smaller things are often recorded.

19. χαλκιδων is also neglected, although he cites Q 1, 29, 98 for it.

21. - ana. New (with one of my cursive 107*).

xxii. 7] + και ante μακαριος. So 30 and aeth besides 130. Swete is silent.

8. MS. reads ακοουν (- ὁ) και βλεπων ταυτα. So four other of my cursive.

Ibid. δεικνυντος. Swete quotes others, but not 130.
Some of the above omissions bear on our problems, as he has omitted to notice much basic agreement or collateral sympathy with the elder authorities.

Sporadic agreement with such MSS. as 36, 56, or 114, points to critical emendation (always at a remote date) with possible survival of some genuine “lost” readings, even among our unique series.

We can connect 130 with most of our important MSS., uncial and cursive, but with no one sufficiently to establish a firm “class” or “group” relationship in the way we can do it for others. It must, therefore, take its place singly alongside such MSS. as 18, 36, 40, 47, 95, 114 (143, 146, 200 to follow), which all reproduce separate lines of transmission, converging, it is true, as we remount the centuries, but being bounded by the “blinders” which envelop their separate and several transmission from remote ages.

The large omissions due to homoioteleuton are doubtless due in whole or in part to similar lacunæ in the parent copy, but which are due to the scribe’s own infirmity, and which are not it remains most difficult to establish, as we have no sister-MS. with which to compare it.

In a general way, there appears rather more sympathy with the two Coptic versions than with Syriac or Latin.

It is refreshing to find such a MS. still available among the unequal treasures of Mt. Athos, and as I have been unable, so far, to complete the examination of quite a score of recently catalogued MSS. in the different monasteries of the Promontory, more helpful material may possibly be brought to light after my day.

I flatter myself, however, that the picture which I have painted in my table of grouped readings will make the path of the future investigator more plain, and enable him more readily to assess at its true value any new evidence which may be forthcoming from the discovery of any other such interesting survivals as the present MS. under review.

6.

Remain the other unique readings not yet tabulated. We ought really to have given a sequent running list of all principal variations, instead of separating them. It would have been fairer to the MS.

However, we will close with the other readings not yet dealt with, which are so far unique, or nearly so.
1. - τω δουλω αυτου (So 170.)

9. - εγενομην τη νησο τη καλ. πατρω δια του λογου του θεου και δια την μαρτυριαν ησου χριστου.

11. + μοι post λεγονσης

Ibid. θ pro δ

12. και επεστρεψα επι την φωνη

(So 111, 146 h copt arm alia [non Gr.])

Minn alia sah bok syr S.

For επι cf. some + εκει, but none so far omit βλεπειν.

For the source of επι consider a coptic column, ε τεςΜΗ sah, ετςΜΗ bok.

13. ομαιος [υω ανου] ευδεδυμενος

Ibid. περιεξωμενος

17. - ως

Ibid. την χειρα αυτου pro την δεξιαν αυτου χειρα

Alone.

Alone.

With 114, 146 only.

No other omits δεξιαν.

NCAP pauc.

NCAP al. [om. Swete].

CA 36.

38, 81, 178, 200.)

Alone.

NCAP 56, 143, 146, 200 gig copt syr S.

CAP 47, 111, 146, 200 gig harl copt syr S.

(100.) [Negl. Swete.]

AP 36, 81, 121.

Alone.

NCAP 38, 143, 146, 178, 200 syr S copt latt arm alia

C 111, 143, 146.

CA syr. [Negl. Swete.]

19 and 111. " "

14-92 only. ""

Alone (no versions).

Alone with 200.

NC 38-178.

Alone. [Negl. Swete.]

87 only.

Alone.

Alone. [Negl. Swete.]

Alone.

Contra copt, contra syr S.
iii. 18. κολούριον

iv. 3. σμαράγδω προ σαρδίνω
Ibid. fin. σμαράγδινων

4. καὶ επὶ τοὺς εἰκοσιτεσσαράς
θρόνους πρ. (— εἰδον)
Ibid. — περιβεβλημένους
Ibid. — εματίους

5. τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς πρὸ
τοῦ θρόνου αἳ εἰσὶ

6. ἐμμέσῳ

8. δὲ ἦν

9/10. — τῶν αἰωνῶν (9 fin.) μυκτὶ ad
καὶ βαλλοντι (ver. 10)

v. 3. — οὔδε υποκατω τῆς γῆς

13. — καὶ υποκατώ τῆς γῆς

6. ἐμμέσῳ prim. [non sec.]

Ibid. απεσταλμενα (— τα)

8. ειληθεν προ ελαβε

9/10. — ημας μυκτὶ ad το θεω

11 fin. — καὶ χυλιδες χυλιδων

14. — καὶ προσεκυνησαν ζωντὶ eis
τους αιωνας των αιωνων

vi. 1. ὥς φωνη βροντης λεγοντος

5. επ αυτου προ επ αυτω
Ibid. fin. — αυτου

6. κριθων

8. επ αυτου προ επανω αυτου

Ibid. — ο αντε θανατος
Ibid. επι τεταρτου (— το) τῆς γης

9. — δια sec.

Alone with the Complutensian edition! [We have still to find the MS. from which it was set up.]

Alone. (+ σμαράγδω B al.)
So 98 only. (Cf. 14 syr σμαράγδων.)

A alone.

63, 119 txt only.

N only and arm uno. (Also 143, 178, 200.)

Cf. 14-92 syr.

A 114, 200.

Saltus, sed om. των αιωνων bis, solus.

With N and nearly a dozen cursive.

With N 12 al. et copt.

A only, but A does it twice.

[Negl. Swete.]

So N 9, 26, 38, 67.

Alone.

(Error ex homoioitel.)

81 only.

Alone thus, many leaving out the ζωντι clause, but none so far the καὶ προσεκυνησαν.

New thus with arm. (Cf. A.)

Alone. (Cf. aeth.)

NCAP and some important cursive.

Alone. (επ προ επανω 56, αυτου new.)

NC and the Compl. group.

New without τα.

Alone with A of Greeks and gig tol Cypr Prim (copi).
vi. 10.  – o δεσποτης

Ibid. κρινεια pro κρινεις

Ibid. εκδικεια sic

17. αυτων pro αυτου

vii. 1. εις pro επι prim

Ibid. πυνευσι pro πυνει

3. μη δε bis pro μητε bis

5. δαν pro Γαδ

8 fin. εσφαραμενου

13. – εκ

viii. 2. βρονον pro θεου

3. εξηλθεν pro ηλθε

Ibid. [επι το θυσιστηριον] primo loco

11. απο pro εκ

12. φανη pro φαι, 3

13. αετοι [πετωμενου]

ix. 2. + καιομενης sic post καπνου secund.

4. μη δε sic pro ουδε bis

7. επιφυς ητοιμασμενων

Ibid. [ομοιου] χρυσων

10. [και] αι εξουσιαι αυτων· αδι-κησαι κ.τ.λ.

16. ως pro δυο

19. όμοιας (ex emend. Inprimoi)

Ibid. δημουσic

Alone. (Domine pro o δεσποτης gig.)

So 80, 81 and boh B. [Negl. Swete.]

New thus. [Negl. Swete.]

With NC 18, 38, 111, 146, 178, 200 of Greeks, syr S and Σ, and gig (ipsorum) Auct de prom (illorum).

Alone with gig (υπο by 29 is the only Greek variation).

With N and certain cursives.

With N 16, 39, 81, 102, 114, 121.

With 9, 13, 16, 23 (39, 69), 75 and arm.

With 104, 151 only.

With N 91, 111 only.

So only 39-69-102 and one arm MS.

14-92 only.

With fourteen cursives, against NBF plur.

Alone with 29 (ἐπι A). [Negl. Swete, quoting A.]

With NAF and seven cursives.

Agrees thus with 56.


178, 200, while 80 has μηδε prim.

Alone. (Cf. 67.)

Alone.

Alone. (Cf. perhaps ωp and ωπι sak for “numerare.”)

Alone.

Alone. Cf. arm alig in the singular. No others.
ix. 19. ταυτας pro autais
x. 8 init. και την φωνην ( - ἥν) ηκουσα
        παλιν του λαλουντος
        met emou ek tou ouranov leyouvan . . .

9. βιβλιν

xi. 6. αν pro ean

10. [περιψουσι cum t. r.]

11. αφινω pro αφηνουι

12. [καθημενοι cum t. r.]

xii. 6. - εκει post εινa ante [τρεφουσιν]
       sic]

10. [εγενετο] σωτηρια ( - ἥ) και
       δυναμις ( - ἥ)

12 init. - δια τουτο

14. - εις prim ante την ερημον

Ibid. εια pro oupo

18. εσταθη

xiii. 3. [Abest ek cum t.r. et B al pauc
       boh arm]

4. διι pro ὅς

5. + ἥ ante εξουσια

6. [eis] βλασφημιασ

Ibid. - τουs

8. το ονομα + αυτου

Ibid. - τη ante [βιβλιν]

10. ει τις εις αιχμαλωσιαν απαγει

13. μεγαλα σημεια (pro σημ. μεγ.)

Ibid. [wα και πυρ] εκ του ouranov
       πονηση εις την γην κατα-
       βηναι [ευωτιν των αν-
       θρωτων]

15. - wα και λαληση η εικων του
       θεριου

N 127, 146 only.
C 23, 38, 67-120, 56-108, 106
and these only. (Cf. N 16,
36, 104, iii. 19.)
[Negl. Swete.]
So 200. (αφινωσι NCAP
12.) [Negl. Swete.]
[Negl. Swete.]
So only 14-92, 59, h and syr S.
(New thus (while 67-120, 121
only omit ἡ prim)).
Alone.
Alone. (Cf. copt "towards.")
Alone [non copt].
So NCAP al pauc.
[Negl. Swete.]
with NCAP al.
Alone [non sah boh].
With NCAP 1, 18, 34, 67, 87,
95, 127. (Cf. latt qui vari-
ant inter se.)
With 35 and gig. (το aeth.)
(soli.)
With the 34 family only. (Obs.
- μεγαλα copt Prim.)
[Non accurate Swete.]
With certain cursive.
xiii. 16. ποιήσῃ (pro ποιεῖ). Alone (faciet Victorin, vg). ποιήσῃ N* 59, syr arm bok sah aeth Hipp 1/2 (sed fecit Prim.)

17. μηδεὶς pro μητίς With the 34 family only, 200 and sah bok.

18. ἐξακόσια ἐξήκοντα ἕξ' sic With P, etc. [Opposite, in the margin, λαΤείνος, but not in the scribe's hand. No other marginal remarks.]

xiv. 2. — κηθαραδών
5. αμομοὶ εἰσίν (— γαρ)

8. δευτερος PRO αγγελος
Ibid. η μεγάλη πόλις So 178. (Cf. aeth.)
Ibid. πεπτωκε So 12. (N* copt arm.)
10. εἰκ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐν τοῖς ποτηρίωι Alone. (Cf. arm.)
Ibid. — καὶ εὐνοιον τοῦ αρμιοῦ Alone.
11. εἰς τοὺς αἰωνας τῶν αἰωνῶν ἀναβαινει (+ τοὺς 69, non fam.)

13. ἀπὸ ἐμ (τῶν κοπῶν) So 102 only.
15. [τοῦ θερισαῖ]

18. εἴσουσιν εἰχὼν (pro εἰχὼν εξουσία) Alone. [Negl. Swete.]
20. δισχίλιων [εξακοσίων] Alone. (Cf. gig.)

xv. 3. μωτίς sic
Ibid. βασιλεὺς pro ὁ βασιλεὺς N* 18, 47, 56, 119-23 and ten others.

4. τις σε μη φοβηθῆ θ Α lone, but close to N* 95-127. (Cf. this combination supra at XIV. 8.)

Ibid. θαυμασθῇ pro δοξασθῇ Alone so far.

7. + ἂς

xvi. 1. ἔχετε pro εκχεατε Alone. One of the very rare places where the changes make nonsense.

3. — αὐτοῦ Alone.
4. εγγενοῦτο A 36, 56, 95, 100, 127, 200 copt syr latt aeth Prim.
7. κε ὁ παντὸ κράτωρ (— ὁ θεός) So aeth, and (43 — ὁ θεός ὁ).
xvi. 11. + καὶ post ουρανοῦ
14. συναγεῖν ἐπὶ συναγαγεῖν
xvii. 4. καὶ τα ακαθαρτα τῆς πονηρίας
tῆς γῆς
5. + αὐτῆς post οὐνόμα
Habiel
antea] Alone. (Cf. 12, 67.)
6. — εκ τοῦ αἰματος τῶν σιγῶν
καὶ εκ
So 156. (Cf. 146, 154, 155
bodB.)
Ibid. — ηπσου
With 1, 12, 36, 59, 67, 81, 114,
119-23, 120, 121 and arm uno.

8. [βλεποντες το θηριον] ὅτι ἦν
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ὅτι
πάρεστιν· δὲ δὲ . . .
New thus.
10. ὅπου ἐπὶ οὐπω
12. βασιλεῖας sic ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς
18 εἰς. αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
Alone. (Cf. Iren.)
xviii. 2. μεμαμμενον
3. πεπτωκε
4. — εκ τῶν πληγών αὐτῆς
With EP pauc.
6. — ὅμι
NCAP, etc.
Ibid. [καὶ διπλωσατε αὐτὴ διπλα (− το)]
6/7. Conjunctit
12. — παν prim
Alone. (Cf. sah.)
13. [καὶ οἰωνον.] [καὶ κτηνη καὶ προβατα.]
14. σου τῆς επιθυμιας τῆς φύχης
With NCAP 95-127. [Negl.
Swete.]
22. σαλπυγγων
With the 35 family, 90, 200.

N.B. The text now becomes conventional until we near the end
of the XIXth Chapter.

xx. 3. μετα δε ταυτα (− καὶ)
So 29, 30, 129 (98).
4. πεπελεκημενων
So (20), 25, 58, 70, 78, 84, 94.
Ibid. αὐτου ἐπὶ τοῦ θεου
Alone. Only clue is in sah
with ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ, involving T.

12. καὶ βιβλια ηνοξαν· καὶ αλλο
With 29 and 40.
βιβλιον ηνοξήθη
xxi. 5. λεγει ἐπὶ ειπεν
With A al et arm. Cf. Cypr
(Text: illis).
7. αὐτου ἐπὶ αὐτω
With 65 and Anon (dicit).
8. + ev ante pui
Alone with 65.
To sum up. The only "monstra" in reality in all this ancient medley are but:

ii. 1. εκκλησιόνων for χρυσῷν
iii. 17. ἀληθώνως for εὐελεῖνος
vii. 1. ἵσαρν ἢ for ἵνα
ix. 20. τὰ εἰδώλα τὰ κωφὰ καὶ χρυσά for εἰδώλα τὰ χρυσά
x. 4. εἶδομον οὐρανοῦ
xvi. 1. ἐχετε for ἐκχειτε

and, compared to other MSS., especially to the uncials, and A (which has many more), these monstra are well-balanced by the other remarkable features of the text, which we have already noticed.

In closing I cannot forbear to emphasise once more the polyglot character of the variations to be observed by a study of the readings shared by other MSS.

P.S.

Before proceeding with our investigation, I would like to call your attention to a tiny non-commentary MS. in Greece, which throws much light on our polyglot or Version problem.

I have had to collate it out of order, having only recently received the photographs of it. Notwithstanding its diminutive size (4 inches by 3), and its execution with a quill or a stub pen, and its many itacisms, and its numerous omissions, it is of great importance. This document also occurs in a volume of Miscellanies. Owing to its reception so late, I have had to attribute to it the number 113, instead of its former number in the catalogues.

I am inclined to think that it is copied direct from a rather late uncial, which in turn had already been somewhat reworked to the B or Q base, but contained very many ancient readings. This late uncial had been guilty of many errors of omission, due to homoioteleuton, which our scribe never tries to remedy. This alone shows that he did not revise his copy or consult other documents. And, as a rule, these manifold omissions do not injure the sense, and, therefore, he would not notice that anything was missing.

Now, to plunge at once into the heart of the matter. I have long waited for a Greek MS. which would give me the θαλασσης of
syr S for the \( \alpha \beta \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma \) of the current text in XI. 8. Until now (and we are up to No. 200), I had found none. But this little MS. has it! And not only this, but many another rare lection, tucked away so deep in the small writing that it takes a good pair of eyes and much watchfulness to avoid missing important detail.

Besides this reading, here are a few more of the sympathetic readings with syr S.

i. 13. The very unusual +\( \alpha u t o u \) after\( \pi \rho \sigma s \tau o u s \mu a s t o u s \) with syr acts and copt, but not Latin nor any other Greek MS.

ii. 1. \( \chi eir \rho r \delta e \xi a \). So syr S alone.

13. –\( \sigma p o u \kappa a t o i k e i \sigma \sigma a t a n a s \). So syr S and only 38 [non 178].

iii. 12. –\( \varepsilon k \tau o u \sigma u r a n o u \). So syr S, quite alone with us.

v. 3. \( k a i \lambda u s a i \tau a s \sigma f r a g i d a s \alpha u t o u \) (\( \pi r o \) \( \sigma u d e \) \( \beta l e p e i n \) \( \alpha u t o \)). So syr S, alone with us and only 108 (sister of the important 56).

vi. 4. –\( \alpha l l o s \). Our MS, 130, syr S and copt.

ix. 20. –\( \delta \nu n a t a i \). So syr S alone with us.

Ibid. In this same verse we have the very unusual order of: \( k a i \tau a \) \( \xi u l i n a \) \( k a i \tau a \) \( \lambda \theta i n a \) with syr S, boh [non sah] Greek \( \n \) and \( f a m \) 119, the latter being the most ancient source of \( f a m \) 1.

x. 1. –\( \iota \chi u r o n \). With syr S only and 146 con.

8. –\( \tau o \) \( \eta n e w \gamma m e n o n \). So syr S and 130, 146 con. only, but these retain to or its equivalent.

xviii. 3. –\( t o u \beta u m o u \). So syr S, 130 and Primasius.

11. \( k a i \rho r o \) \( o t i \). So syr S alone.

14. \( \epsilon u d e d i m e n o i n o s \) (agreeing with \( \epsilon \pi \pi o i s \) \( \lambda e u k o i s \)). So syr S and \( \n \) 152, 178 only.

Now comes a curious composition of syr S and \( \Sigma \), at

xx. 6. We read \( \tau o w \) \( \theta e o w \) \( k a i \tau o \) \( \chi r i s t o w \) +\( \alpha u t o u \) for the usual “\( \tau o n \) \( \theta e o w \) \( k a i \tau o n \) \( \chi r i s t o w \).” Observe that: 38 and syr S give us the dative, while 111 and syr \( \Sigma \) give us +\( \alpha u t o u \); and at:

xxi. 18 syr S and syr \( \Sigma \) both agree with us, alone, to read: \( \chi r i s t o w \) \( k a t a r o u \) instead of \( \chi r i s i o n \) \( k a t a r o u \).

If you turn to the Armenian, you find a score of striking coincidences, among them:—

II. 24 –\( \lambda o u t o s \); VI. 11 \( \alpha p o t h e s e i s w \) \( \rho r o \) \( \alpha p o k t e i n e s \theta e i a \) without a single other Greek MS., or another version; IX. 7 \( \alpha v b r o p o w \) \( \rho r o \)
If you turn to the Coptic, you find at XI. 10 + λεγοντες with the Coptic quite alone; XI. 15 βασιλευσονσιν for βασιλευσει alone among Greeks, with three MSS. of boh; at XIX. 7 we have δοξαζωμεν την δοξαν αυτων with 81 only of the Greeks. Compare the Coptic. At XIX. 13, we omit το ονομα αυτων. So only the bohairic. At XXI. 14, omit δωδεκα before αποστολων, and thus only, among the whole range of our documents, do sah and arm likewise omit.

We must dwell a moment on the passage at XX. 10. This is a most peculiar place. Of all MSS. and Versions, only our MS. and boh add "burning in" (την καιομενην εν) before "fire and brimstone." But our MS. adds εβληθησαν (sic) after ο ψευδοπροφητης, and boh does not. The only other MS. to add anything is 130, which adds προφητης earlier after το θηριον, repeating the "casting in." Now sah apparently does this, and at first sight it looked as if it did after ο ψευδοπροφητης also, but while boh transliterates ψευδοπροφητης, sah uses προφητης and the coptic word for "mendax" πονξε, having previously used the same word before το θηριον. Now πέξ or ποξ or πονξε in sahidic means to cast down, so that some confusion has arisen here, as between sahidic and the Greek MSS. 113 and 130 as to this additional προφητης. The thing seems indubitable. The bohairic word used (earlier in the verse) for εβληθη is different: ΑΥΣΙΤΩ.

If we turn to the Aethiopic, we find similar points of contact, in at least a score of places. Observe:—

i. 4/5. ευωπιον του θρονου αυτου και του ιησου χριστου, this τον replacing αυτο, and completely changing the sense.

v. 2. + λεγον after τις. Our MS., aeth, and boh 1/2.

vii. 8. επεσουν + και προσεκυνουσαν. Here is composition, alone among Greek MSS., but aeth has "adoraverunt" simply. [See below on XXI. 27 for a similar thing.]

xi. 8. - πλατειας (legens: "επι της πολεως"). So our MS. and aeth alone.
xi. 9. - καὶ εὕνων. Our MS., two others (81, 121) and aeth.

xii. 4. - τῆς μελλοντικῆς τεκεν. A most probable omission, yet no Greek MSS. omit, and no Versions but aeth.

xv. 5. ἢ σκηνή πρὸ τοῦ ναος τῆς σκηνῆς. So aeth with us alone.

We ought, perhaps, to have started this exhibition by saying that at the outset we find agreement between our MS. and the Fleury palimpsest, our oldest Latin MS. h (unfortunately extant for only a small portion of the Apocalypse), and, indeed, immediately at :

i. 3 we find our MS. saying ἀκουον for ἀκουοντες, alone with 40 (a graeco-syriac MS.) and 146 (the Oecumenian MS.) and aeth, which corresponds to the "qui legit et audit" of h. If this be considered indeterminate, the matter is clinched at :

7 by οὕτων τοὺς τινές κοπταὶ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ by our MS. with 102, copt and h. [As to Ν here, the first hand lacks ἐπί, but retains κοπταὶ.] Further, at :

17 ἐθηκε επί'εμε τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ (− χειρα επί'εμε) is the equivalent order of h: "imposuit super me dexteram suam"

Prim.: "posuit ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~", as against the usual: "posuit dexteram suam super me," as Gigas writes here. [The difference between Prim and h being only as between ἐπεθηκε and ἐθηκε, while the strange order agrees with us alone.]

It must not be thought from this that Gigas does not also have its points of contact with us, for in another anti-Greek matter of order, close by, at

ii. 10 ἐπὶ οἷς τῆς αἰκουμενῆς we agree with Gigas alone. And at :

16 we read ἀλ' ὅτι πρὸ οὖν ὁτι alone with gig ;

Ibid. - καὶ οὕτως φυγάροι οὔτε ζεστος. So gig.

xii. 10. Gigas and syr S support our order of: ἐκ τοῦ οὖν οὐγ λεγ.

xvi. 13. - τριά. So Gigas.

xix. 10. + τοῦτος post ὁτα μή. So Gigas, supported by Prim, but among Greeks by 32, 95-127 and 159 only, besides our MS.

xxii. 9. + τοῦτος post ὁτα μή, again with the same group 32, 127 (hiat 95 hoc loco), plus 56, another important Greek document, and gig Prim.

We have no space to take up the intense agreement, but only in very occasional places, with Greek MSS. like 18, 40, 56, 59, 81, 100, 102, 104, 111, 114 or 122 (note here specially 113-122 together at : III. 20 κρουον πρὸ κρουω, and V. 4 επιπολυ πρὸ πολλα suddenly occurring out of a clear sky), or with 32 specially towards
the close, in half a dozen places. It would be interesting to follow this out in our search for the bases, for the respective agreements are thoroughly scattered; and while we have a little sympathy with the Oecumenian MS. 146 in a few places, we are treated to complete agreement in III. 17 with ὁ ταπεινὸς (for ὁ ταλαπτωρὸς of all other MSS.). And at XI. 13, while Oec. omits ονοματα ανθρωπων alone, we omit ανθρωπων, and 130 and 200 substitute ανδρων, showing something was wrong at this place far back in the history of transmission; as shown by omission of ονοματα in sah, numero pro ονοματα Prim, πνευματα pro ονοματα ανθρωπων αεθ, ονοματων ανθρωπων δοκ, ονοματα ανθρωποι syr S.

Add xi. 9. + καὶ ante αφησοσυν both 113 and 146, omitting the previous clause.

xxii. 17. λεγουσα 113 and 146 but 146 omits καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, which justifies it completely in using λεγουσα instead of λεγουσιν.

How far back many of these things go is to be seen by our unique agreement elsewhere with Primaition, as at:—

xvi. 8. ἐν πυρὶ καυματησαι τους ανθρωπους.

xvii. 8. + του αρμου post ζωης.

xxi. 11. + την φωτιζουσαν αυτην.

Or, pushing the enquiry further back still to Hippolytus, we agree alone with him at:—

xvii. 8. θαυμασοντων for θαυμασονται.

xviii. 12. χρυσιον ἡ αργυριον. Our MS., while Hippol apparently gives χρυσιον και αργυριον, but agrees alone to abandon the χρυσου and αργυρου of other Greek documents.

xix. 13. ἔρραπτισμενον. Ourseleves and Hippol, only supported by 35-87-132, 95-127 and the graeco-armenian MS. 109.

There are, of course, clear survivals of the text of Ν, A, C, P, sometimes in combination, as at:—

xviii. 21. – ἅγχυρον ΝΑ, but no cursive but the present one under discussion.

xiv. 13. χριστο pro κυριῳ by CP 130 and ourselves only,

but what is the situation when we abandon the oldest Greek uncials as a body, and flock with the Versions combined?

Now, as to agreement with the Versions in combination, exclusive of other Greek evidence, notice this:—
xiii. 4. Post τῷ δρακοντὶ τῷ δεδωκοτι + autw. Thus we find + τουνῳ
by syr, copt, aeth in combination, together with Iren and
Prim, but no other Greek MSS.

xiv. 4. γυναικος. pro γυναικων. Generic, confirmed by 164 aeth, boh
and sah in combination.

8. ηκολουθησεν + autw, and so syr S and Σ, copt, aeth, arm plur
and Prim.

15. + λεγων ante τω καθημενω, and so copt, arm, aeth collectively.

xvi. 6. Order: προφητων και αγιων. So also syr S, sah combined,
and 32 and 109 gr and arm.

xxii. 2 init. + και. 143, 200 Gig, aeth, arm, syr S [non copt].
8 init. – και. Sah, boh, syr S, vg, alig.
12. – εσται. Gig, sah, boh, syr S, and a few Greeks.

The proof of retranslation from the Versions is now apparent and
is almost openly avowed at:—

v. 8. επεσον + και προσεκυνησαν. Our MS. alone, with aeth “adora-
verunt,” and

xxi. 27. κοινων + ἡ ἀκάθαρτον by our MS. alone, where we find
Primasius rendering κοινων by inmundum (against the
“commune” of gig vg and other Fathers), while sah boh
aeth syr Σ all translate κοινων with words signifying
pollutum or inmundum. Hence the secret methods of the
recension, spread so long indirectly before our eyes, seem
now to be clearly acknowledged.

Some well-disposed doubters, nevertheless, may say—however
improbable the connection—that the redactor had in mind the “κοινων
ἡ ἀκάθαρτον” of St. Peter’s vision in Acts X. 14, but then why does
no other Greek MS. have the addition? Beyond this, we need only
look at the other evidence collaterally submitted above, in order to
rest assured that the whole performance of our MS. is of a piece, and
I resume the evidence thus:—

Upon an exceedingly ancient base, some reviser adapted his text,
after consulting the various Versions, and probably other Greek docu-
ments. Another came along and revised very sparingly and moder-
ately to the B type, this type originating in the seventh or eighth
century.

We are thus left with remarkable vestigia of the process, from
before Hippolytus’ time onwards.
If we consult Prinzasius himself, we will see that he indulged in the self-same process. The Aethiopic bears the same testimony. The Armenian ditto.

They all, with our MS. 113, built upon an ancient base, but, with an "improving" tendency, consulted the various available authorities, and spoiled what for us would have been an invaluable fount, if they had left well alone.

Remember that this MS. of ours is in a small volume of Miscellaneous, and thus escaped revising hands of another kind.

But you will say, "What has all this to do with the basic Greek text, of which we are in search?" That is precisely the point at issue. First, we have to show this variety of Version influence on the Greek MSS. as we have done above, and which may be resumed thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm</td>
<td>vi. 11</td>
<td>ἀποθνησκειν προ ἀποκτεινεσθαι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aeth</td>
<td>xv. 5</td>
<td>ὧ σκηνη προ ὧ ναος της σκηνης</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syr S</td>
<td>xi. 7</td>
<td>θαλασης προ αβυσσου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coptic</td>
<td>xi. 10</td>
<td>ο λεγοντες ποστ αλληλοις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boh</td>
<td>xx. 10</td>
<td>την καιομενην εν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sah</td>
<td>xx. 10</td>
<td>εβλυθησαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gigas</td>
<td>xi. 8</td>
<td>κοιτασθησονται (see beyond)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, we have to decide what of all this goes back to the underlying Greek. Now we know that much of it does not, for there still exist many other interesting readings in the Syriac, the Coptics, the Latin, the Aethiopic, and the Armenian, with which the Greek MSS. have nothing to do.

These readings are so bound up with the others, which some of the Greek MSS. do adopt, that we know these Greek MSS. picked and chose from the Versions, turning phrases back into Greek, while some slight element may well be basic, but not by any means all.

It is perhaps difficult to explain this to the outsider.

Will you do me a favour? Come and look over my shoulder as I enter a MS. in my Ledger of Collected Readings, and follow the play of these matters.

We are in the middle of the xith chapter. We have just picked up θαλασης (sic) for αβυσσου in the 7th verse, remember, and you want to know whether this reading, opposed by all other Greek
MSS, but the one we are looking at, takes us back to the underlying Greek base, common to syr S. and our MS.

Look well then at the very next verse, verse 8, where the ordinary text runs as follows:—

καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς πλατείας πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἣνις καλεῖται πνευματικὸς Σόδομα καὶ Ἀιγυπτός, ὅπου καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἐσταυρώθη.

Recent editors have changed τὰ πτώματα to τὸ πτῶμα, and as no verb follows, we need not discuss the justice of the change. They have added τῆς before πόλεως which is doubtless right, and they have changed ἡμῶν to αὐτῶν, for which there is very good and very numerous authority, strange as the innovation may seem to you.

Oecumenius in his commentary explains it: “ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν, τούτοτε τῶν δύο μαρτύρων ἐσταυρώθη”[1].

But that is the beginning of the problem, and not the end of it, if we are honestly in search of the basic text.

Because, in the first place, all the Latins, old and young, conspire with the sahidic and the bohairic versions against the reading τὰ πτώματα to read τὸ σῶμα at the outset, which our MS. here adopts, against both Syriacs, and the Armenian, and the Aethiopic.

We proceed to enter from our collation of this new Greek MS., and suddenly we are astounded to find the addition of ᾧ ἐσταυρώσανται (not extant in our New Testament vocabulary)—occurring after καὶ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν and before the word ἐπὶ. What does this mean? Well, we find that the ancient witness Gigas also has the addition of jacebunt, alone among the Latins, and therefore agrees with us. This is no recent reading then, for you remember that the Gigas codex, so important in the Acts and Apocalypse, reproduces word for word and at great length Lucifer’s fourth-century testimony. We are back in the fourth century then. (The Armenian as well as the Vulgate confirm this.) Has Primasius anything to say on the subject? Yes, he has an addition also, but a different one. He adds “ponet” (the MSS. of his writings vary between ponit, ponat, and ponet, according to Dr. Vogels’ latest edition). In his commentary, as Sabatier and Zahn point out, he says: “Alia translatio, corpus, posuit” (agreeing with the Aethiopic): “duorum dixit corpus unum, aliquando in subsequentibus corpora . . . projicietur (al. proicitur) id est spernetur . . .”. So also Tichonius and Beatus.
This *ponit* or *posuit* we do not yet find among the Greek witnesses [but see Oec. below], but our No. 59 (a somewhat remarkable witness) adds *πέσοντα* after the mention of the city, which is a kind of half-way house between *ponere* and *projicere*. The Anonymous commentator on the Apoc. uses *projicetur*, the word mentioned by Primasius.

Have we finished with the Greek witnesses? Not by any means. We have a document, No. 18, which is evidently of Graeco-Syriac origin (like 40), and 18 adds *ρψέ* in the same place as 59 adds *πέσοντα*. Now *ρψέ* equates not *jacebat* but *jactabat*. We are here closer to Gias than to the *projicetur* of Prim. and Anon. The Armenian has an addition slightly differing, and translated by Coneybeare “shall remain lying.”

Well, what have the Syriacs to say to all this? They know nothing of it. The MSS. of both versions S and Σ have no addition.

What about bohairic and sahidic? In this case, while quite independent of the other versions, they have an addition, and a different one. They have expressions corresponding to το *σωμα αντων* or τα *σωματα αντων*, *εσται* or *εσονται*, “will be.” Is there any Greek support? Yes, my ledger tells me that a corrector of the fourth-century Greek MS. Ν, viz. the corrector Ν, adds *εσται* in the same place, and certain MSS. of Erasmus family 1, viz. 62, 63, 72, 136, etc., add *εσονται* after *πολεως*. So they are all involved. But we are looking for the basic text; and in addition to the Syriac, and the Greek Uncials, most of my important cursive documents with a very old text, like 40, 56, 38-178, 111, 130, 170, 200, are perfectly silent here.

We turn to Oecumenius in our MS. 146, and there we find in his text: το *πτωμα* and + *θησει* after *πλατειας*, thus in a sense Graecising for us the expression of Primasius, and giving us yet another Greek variant addition.

In his (hitherto unpublished) commentary, Oec. says this:—

“ἀνθρωπος γὰρ ἔσται, ὃς ἔστων ἡ παρουσία κατ’ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ καθὼς ἑαυτος ἔκρηψε· τοῦτο ὁδε, φησιν, τὸ θηρίον ἀποκτενεῖ τοὺς δύο μάρτυρας· καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀταφα ῥύσει ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τῆς ἐρήμου·”
thus preceding the remarks of Andreas. In one of our large families 21-28-73-79-79a-80-99-103-112-(130)-138-170, we have the addition of ἀναφα ἑστι μεγαλης, while ὑψης has been already supplied by 18 (and we find another variant, ὑψησεται, in the important MS. 159).

This large 21 family also adds εασετι before επι, being a last variation for the Coptic addition.

There you have a picture from Gigas onward at a period from which the oldest Greek witnesses which have come down to us may be said to date. This picture is exceptional, with its mass of detail, and for this reason we have chosen it to illustrate the matter.

We will not wait to discuss a number of variations in the matter of the phrase as to the πλατειας της πολεως. There are a number of interesting small variants in which 18, Gigas, and the Syriac are involved.

But the point we make of retranslation into Greek from the Versions very early, quite apart from any basic text being involved, is, I think, made abundantly clear from the above.

Now, as regards the basic text, if a common underlying text were involved or concerned, we would also agree elsewhere in this same chapter with other unusual readings of the versions, as at :

| xi. 1. | + χρυσονος ἐπὶ καλάμος | by copt and aeth, |
| 4. | + πανῆς ἀντὶ της γῆς | " syr S, |
| 5. | - ἀδικησαι πρ. λοχο | " copt, |
| Ibid. | nocere — ledere ἡ πατάξαι | " gigas, |
| Ibid. | θέλησαι ἐν τούτοις | " Hippolytus, |
| 6. | καταβαίνῃ ἑπὶ βρέχῃ | " syr S, |
| Ibid. | ταπευσωσαι ἑπὶ πατάξαι | " syr S, |
| Ibid. | + τον δρόμον ἀντὶν καὶ | " Hippolytus, |
| 13. | + καὶ ἀντὶ οὐμάτα | " syr S, |

but we do not.

I do not mean to say that all the sporadic agreement with the Versions,—first with one and then with another,—is all due to their reflex action on the Greek. But I do mean to say that most of it is. The residuum, after sorting this out, of course probably applies to the old foundation text, of which we can get glimpses occasionally, and succeed in dating the accretions, and in accounting for them.
Thus, we have an excellent example at xiii. 5. Here is the ordinary text:

"καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα λαλῶν μεγάλα καὶ βλασφημίας· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἔξοψις ποιησαι μηνας τεσσαράκοντα δύο."

An innocent enough looking verse! But there is something wrong about εὔνωσις ποιησαι. Power to do what? The consequence is that the Complutensian, following its MSS. (which we have identified) and followed by Beza and Elzevir, added πολέμον between εὔνωσις and ποιησαι, and Colinaeus adds after ποιησαι. They are supported by EB of the uncials and no less than a hundred cursives, but they are doubtless wrong. This group includes good cursives like 47, 56, simply because they had to make the best of a bad job. Even our MS. 113, while excluding εὔνωσις, incorporates πολέμον.

Now the secret is this. The texts of Irenæus and Dionysius (extant here) omit ποιησαι, leaving us with "καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ εὔνωσια"

. . . "and was given to him authority: for forty-two months." In fact Dion. adds καὶ before μῆνας to emphasize matters. But Ν 100 and 113 omit εὔνωσια INSTEAD OF ποιησαι, because they misread the indications in the foundation copy as to the right word to omit!

The matter is further illustrated by the fact that Ν scratched his head and wanted to complete the sense, so he supplies ὃ θέλει before μῆνας. The beast was given to do what he wished for forty-two months. No cursives support. Only one version. That one is aeth. Thus the source which influenced Ν was accessible to aeth, or aeth got it later than the time of Ν. (The Aethiopic version works hard to overcome many ancient difficulties.) There is nothing else to detain us in the verse.

But it offers additional proof that 113 reproduces as to base a text or texts of most respectable age.

In this connection, I can mention that 113 is the only cursive to support Ν at XVIII. 14, where that MS. reads ριπάρα for λιπάρα, and we have ροιπάρα.

This is, of course, a small matter, but it shows how the wind blows. Shortly afterwards, at XVIII. 18, another proof occurs. For ὁροῦντες, Ν* writes first λεγοῦντες, then changes this to λεποῦντες, and finally to βλεποῦντες. Our MS. now writes calmly and without hesitation (but
also without other support): λεγοντες βλεπον. Most have simply βλεποντες, instead of ὁροντες.

But we shall never distinguish the elements of the lost primal text, unless we assemble, more carefully than hitherto, the keys existing in the Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Aethiopic, and Armenian versions, which link these up in very early times with certain of our Greek documents, and assist in simplifying the problem by directing attention to the character of the Greek texts severally (and sometimes compositely) underlying the Version texts.

Substitutions and transpositions in our MS. appear to be purposeful. Additions are quite rare, a very good signal of no thirteenth-century editing contemporaneous with the last scribe.

Omissions, when not simple errors in the original, have a certain object. Thus the shortened form of the threat to Laodicea (III. 15/16) is a good example. Our MS. briefly sets forth the whole matter thus:—

"Ωδα σοι τὰ ἑργα· ὅτι ψυχρὸς ἦ καὶ οὐ ζεστὸς· ἀλ' ὅτι χλιαρὸς ἦ· μελ璎σε ἐκ τῶν στόματος μου."

Some accretion there must have been, since the original text of the Seer was set down, as can be seen by variations in other documents. All are far more prolix.

In the matter of substitutions, take as an example: XIV. 4, γυναικος in the singular, for γυναικῶν of all other Greeks except 157 and 164.

But this has good Version support—(aeth, boh, sah, and doubtless Syriac originally)—and sounds very likely to have been corrupted to the plural later.

"These are they who have had no contact with WOMAN—(not 'women')—for virgins are they."

Again, at X. 2, as to the substitution of γεγραμενον—(the scribe always writes this word with one μ)—for ἀνεγραμενον, quite alone among the Greek witnesses, while Greek A and the Coptic conspire to show us a blank here, seems to indicate that both words may be additions. The sense requires neither word:—

"... And having in his hand a little book."

But at X. 3 (immediately thereafter) κυμάται for μυκάται (of the lion roaring) may be merely the frothing (or due to the somnolence)
of the scribe himself. [Note, however, that it is not a mere slip or error, but a real word].

Among unique substitutions, not countenanced by other Greeks, or by the Versions, we might refer to φαραγγύ (a Septuagint word) pro φαρμακεία in XVIII. 23. I hardly know what to make of it, whether we accept φαραγγύ or φαλαγγύ. There is no trace of this in other Greek documents. However, our unwonted and unique ἐμαγευσαν (not a Septuagint word) in XVII. 2 for εμεθυσθησαν may show the trend of the recension.

This also applies to βασανισθήσετε (vult – ταύ) for κατα-καυθήσεται in XVIII. 8.

In the matter of omissions, we cannot be precise, owing to the apparent carelessness of our scribe’s predecessor at an indeterminate date.

As to additions, most are of the very slightest importance. The more important ones all have Version support, notably:

- xi. 8. + κοιτασθήσονται with gig, etc. (previously referred to).
- xix. 10. ( + ποιήσας post ὧν ημεῖς ) 32, 95-127, 159 gig Prim vg.
- xxii. 9. ( + ποιήσης ) 32, 56, 127 (hiat 95) gig Prim vg.

The reader will want to know something about other strange readings, so far having no support. The list is a long and curious one. I will give a few to satisfy a legitimate curiosity:

- i. 10. πνευματικως vid (compendio) for ev ποιε. [Observe that 143 (see article 3) omits].
   “And send them to Ephesus.”

- ii. 13. + νῦν ante απεκτάνθη (“Antipas, my faithful witness, who was not murdered among you”).

- iii. 10. ημερας τον πειρασμου pro ωρας τον πειρασμου [against plain omission of the word by syr S and copt. Always a danger signal!]

- 20. – καὶ ἀντων μετ’ εμον. A curious omission, and yet plausible enough if we consider such a balancing clause to be an early addition.

- iv. 5. επορευνοντο pro επορευονται, avoiding reduplication of ἐκ.
- ix. 1. πεσῶ (sic) pro πεπτωκοτα.
- x. 2. λεια pro χειρί. (See, for the counterpart, under Syriac at II. 1.)
x. 10. καρδία προ κοιλία, but this has the support of 59, while we do not
so write in verse 9. It might well be that καρδία in the
second place is correct, and κοιλία in verse 9, because
very early the places may have been assimilated and
accommodated.

xii. 4. — αὐτοὺς. (In the Coptic the word is involved in the verb.)

xii. 10. ἀρτί εγενετο ἡ σωτηρία (πρὸ βασιλεία) καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ
ἐξουσία (πρὸ βασιλεία) τοῦ θεοῦ ημῶν καὶ ἡ βασιλεία
(πρὸ εξουσία) τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. It is difficult to under-
stand this threefold change. It is done without a tremor.

xiii. 16. — καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς.

xvi. 5. δίκαια εκρινας πρὸ ταύτα εκρινας.

xvii. 9. — οποὺ ἡ γυνὴ καθηταὶ επ αὐτῶν.

xvii. 10. — καὶ οὕτω εἰδή. (Possible error from homoioteleuton in the
Coptic, which, however, does not itself omit.)

xvi. 14. κυρίος μυρίων γι' κυρίος κυρίων. Not repeated later upon
another occasion.

xix. 17. πορευομένοις πρὸ πεπωμένοις. (No Versions, but Prim and
arm² omit the word. Another danger signal!)

xxi. 16. μῆκος πρὸ υψος.

xxi. 17. "μετρον ἀγγελοῦ ο εστὶν αὐθρωποῦ" (a complete inversion).

Obs. οὐννο πρὸ αὖν 114, οὐρανον πλην 143.

xxii. 1. — υδατος ζωης. (No others. Some read ζωντος (104) and
others the equivalent vivae for vitae (gig Patr latt syr.).

2. εχων πρὸ ποιουν.

Ibid. τοις πιστοῖς πρὸ των εθνών (following + κατηγγελετε after
ξυλων in the same verse, with a few Greek cursives).

11. καὶ ο δικαιωσας πρὸ καὶ ο δικαιος.

I offer my excuses for this very partial presentation of a most com-
plicated subject.

But for the courtesy of the Editor, I could not have presumed to
add even this much. But time presses, the cycles continue on their
courses, life is short, eyes are weakening, and it seems desirable to put
on record this witness, arriving so late amongst our material, and yet
present in our catalogues for these many years past. Von Soden does
not use it.

I would close my rapid survey with this observation. Upon the
right hand pages of my Ledger of collected readings, I have pencilled
in the more important readings obtained from collations of the Versions
and Fathers. Many of these are gradually being removed—each time
I collate an important Greek document, many transfers take place—to the left-hand side, to join the collected readings of Greek MSS., with or without Version and patristic support.

There will still be left a fairly large residuum, with which to elucidate the problem of the basic texts, and mere accretions thereto and whether the basic text was Greek or Graeco-Syriac.