

οτι ουκ ηρασα· και η γορασος
 ημαστω παρ εμπα αιματι
 σου εκ πασησ φυλησ και
 γλωσσησ· και λαουσ εθυσ·
 και ωπιησασ αυτοισ τω θω
 ημασ υιασ λεησ ερεθησ·
 και υιασ λαουσ σιγωπιησ
 ησ· και ιδου και ηκουσα
 ασφονησ εν εθουσ ποσσιν
 κυκλωσ του θρόνου και τω
 θωσιν και τωσ πρωστωσ
 ρων· και ην ο αριθμωσασ
 τωσ μωριαδωσ μωριαδων·
 εχιλιαδωσ χιλιασων λεγουσιν
 ταμθωσ μη μωριον· αριθμ
 ωπιησ το αριθμωσ τοσ φωνη
 μωριον λαμωσ τη δυναμει
 μω· και πλουσιον· και σο
 θισιν· και ισχυσ ετι μω
 και δοξασ· και ελογισαν·
 εστωσ κτισμασ· απηνευσ
 ουραωσ· και απησθησ· ε
 δπιησ φωσασησ· αι· απην
 και τα εν αυτοισ πασταν·
 ηκουσασ λεγουσιν τωσ και
 φη μωσ απησ θρωσ εστω
 αριθμωσ· η αλογισαν και ηπι
 αη και ηδοξαν και το κρατος
 εστωσ αιμασ τωσ αιμασων·
 εστωσ σαρωσ εστωσ ελεγεσων
 απησ· και οι πρωστωτεροι
 απασων επροσεκυνησων·
 και ιδου αλλωσ ενωσλον και
 τασαι μουσ εκ του ουωου·
 εχουσαι τησ κλησ τησ αιωσ

σου και αωσιν μεσλησασ
 τησ χησασ αυτου· και εκρωσ
 τησ εν τωσ δρακωσ τωσ μο
 φησ τωσ αρχων· οσπιησ
 δαμωσ· και εδησεν αυτο
 χιλιαστησ· εστωσ εν αυτοσ
 τησ αιωστων· και εκλεγεσιν
 και εφρησιν ενωσ αυτου
 ενωσ μη πωσ ησπιησ τησ·
 αριθμωσ τε λεγεσ τησ χιλιω
 στησ· εστωσ ταυτωσ· εστωσ
 φησιν αυτοσ χρωσ μωσ κρησ·
 και ιδου φρωσιν και εκωσθησ
 σασ απηστωσ· και κριμασ
 δωσθησ αυτοισ· και ιδου
 τασ φησασ τωσ παστωσ λεγισ
 μωσων δυνασ τησ μαρτυριασ
 ησ· και απηστωσ λογωσ τωσ
 και οι ηστωσ εστωσ κωστων
 τωσ φησιν ουδωσ τησ κωστων
 αυτων· εστωσ κελεωσ τωσ
 εστωσ απησ τωσ μωσ τωσ και
 εστωσ τησ χησασ αυτων· ουσ
 εστωσ μωσ τωσ χιλιωσ
 στησ· και οι λοιπωσ τωσ με
 κρωσ ουκ εστωσ εστωσ τε
 λεωσ τησ χιλιωσ τησ· απησ
 ησ απησ τωσ ηστωσ τησ· με
 και ρωσ εστωσ εστωσ μωσ
 ρωσ εν τησ αιωστων τησ
 τωσ· οσπιησ τωσ τωσ εστωσ
 τερωσ φωσ απησ ουκ εστωσ
 σασ· απησ τωσ ηστωσ
 τωσ και τωσ· εστωσ εστωσ
 σιν μωσ τωσ χιλιωσ τησ·

Cod. Escorialensis III^o 6. Fr. E. Manero, fol. Escorial

ΑΡΟC. 143 (REDUCED)

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE APOCALYPSE—RECENT INVESTIGATIONS.

BY H. C. HOSKIER.

III.

APOC. 143 = Escorial X. 111. 6 (or 111. XC. 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) :

*ἐτελιώθη ἡ βιβλος αὐτῆ μὴνὶ ἰουλίῳ κς̄: ἔτους ξ̄χιε̄ ∴ Γραφήσα
δια χειρὸς λεοντίου μοναχοῦ πρεσβυτέρου· ἀμαθοῦς δ̄ ἰδιώτου· εἰς
τὴν μονὴν τοῦ ἀγίου φιλίππου τοῦ μελιτυροῦ. Οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες
δ̄ ἀναγνώσκοντες· εὐξασθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸν κν̄: ∽*

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

*Ὡσπερ ξένοι χαίρουσι πατρίδα βλέπειν.
Οὕτω καὶ οἱ γράφοντες 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. *ν* ἐφέλκ 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 *καρχιδων* in XXI. 19 gives away the provenance of the original as Coptic (*καρχηδων* 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.¹ 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 mediæval, 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: "ἀμαθούς καὶ ἰδιώτου."

Further examination confirms me in this view. For instance, when the MS. suppresses *ἱματίους* 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 *ἱματίους*, 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. \aleph , of the extraordinary cursive 130, and of the Patmos codex 178, and now of our wonderful 200. Thus \aleph 130, 143, 178 and 200 stand alone in suggesting this plausible reading!

And \aleph 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 \aleph 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 \aleph 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. I.

MS. 143 writes apparent nonsense of: *τριμελίουσ τρέϊσ* for *θεμελίους δώδεκα*, after suppressing *ἔχον*. (It is to be noted that in a somewhat similar construction at IV. 7, we again omit *εχον* with *gigas*. And observe that, without Greek support, at IV. 2, we omit *εκειτο* with *coptic*.)

So again at XXI. 4 our MS. 143 has a unique reading of *ὅτι ταῦτα* for *ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα*. It makes perfect sense, but has no backing. Observe, however, that **ℵ** had difficulty here, reading *στι τα προβατα*, *Syr S* *επι τα προσωπα*, and 59 (which is several times with us alone elsewhere) reads *στι τα αρχαια*. And even Oecumenius (Apoc. 146) mixes it up, writing something I cannot read. It looks like *το επρωτα* for *στι τα πρωτα*.

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

- xx. 4. — *και εξησαν* 143, supported only by *Aug*, and immediately follows *οὐς ἔλευσαν* for *και εβασιλευσαν*, as if something there were illegible in the exemplar. Also at :
 - ii. 24. *τοις εν τοις θυατηροις λοιποις*. Changed order. Consult **ℵ**, and ii. 26. *τα εργα μου αχρειτελους* a unique order for *αχρι τελους τα εργα μου*, the words *αχρι τελους* are dropped by *Syr S*, also iv. 3. we write : *ομοια ορασει μιαγδινω*. Cf. 120. Probably also a faint spot in the original.

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

- xxi. 27 *fin*. *βιβλιου* for *αρμιου* where **ℵ** reads *ουρανου*, Again xxii. 3. *αναθεμα* for *καταθεμα* or *καταναθεμα* where **ℵ** reads *καταγμα*.

2. Omissions.

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

- i. 3/4. *ο γαρ ιωαννης ταις επτα εκκλ*. (— *καιρος εγγυς*) with (102)
 - i. 16. — *οξεια* with 46-88-101 (of the 1 family) only
 - ii. 5. — *ταχει* ,, **ℵ**CAP 56, 130, 200 and versions *Oec txt et com* 146), a notably strong conjunction for a very early tradition
 - ii. 13. — *τα εργα σου και* with **ℵ**CAP 38, 130 *Oec* (146 *txt*), another notable Greek conjunction, plus *gig harl vg Prim Syr S*.

- iv. 7. - και *init.* Alone with 40 (quite a notable MS.) plus *Syr S.* and *Prim.* [Even *Irenaeus^{int.}* has enim]
- v. 6. - και οφθαλμους επτα with 1 44 61 121 130 (always rather a redundant expression)
- xx. 11. - ο *ante ουρανος* with 21 39 73 98 *copt.*
- xxi. 1. - η *ante θαλασσα* "And there was not any more sea," not "the sea," with 51-90 and *coptic*
- xxi. 4. - ο *ante θανατος* with **Σ** 18, 22, 23, 38, 47, all significant MSS.
- xxi. 12. - και επι τοις πυλωσιw αγγελουw δωδεκα with AE* 62-63, 65, 67, 100, 120, 136, 147 *arm*
- xxi. 18. - αυτης with 20, 32, 59, 136 *copt.*
- xxi. 19. - κεκοσμημενοι ,, P 92, 111 *arm g'ig Prim*
- xxii. 16. - ταυτα ,, *Prim* only

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

- i. 8. - λεγει ο κυριωw [Cf. *H'rr*: "ουτωw γαρ και ιωαννηw ειπεν" (- λεγει ο κυριωw)]
- i. 10. - εν πνευματι
- iii. 10. - της ωρωw του πειρασμου (- της ωρωw *copt.* *Syr S.*)
- iv. 8. - ο θεωw
- iv. 9. - και ευχαριστιαν
- xx. 2. - και σατανασ
- xx. 4. - και κριμα εδοθη αυτοιw
- xxi. 3. - εκ του ουρανου
- xxi. 5. - ο καθημενωw επι του θρονου.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

¹This is probably an omission due to the Coptic column, two clauses ending in **ΤΗΡΟΥ** 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 *ιουδαιων* instead of *ιουδαιους*, which is supported so far by no other cursive before our 143, but is read by **Σ** and by C, and is so understood by *aeth* from its parent version. Now attested also by 200 [see article 1]. 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: *ειχεν μετρον καλαμου χρυσουν* instead of *καλαμον*. This also has the support of **Σ**^a 31-106.

The fact that **Σ**^a corrects is rather significant.

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

At ii. 22 we read: *μετανοησει* for *μετανοησωσιν*. 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. *εχοντα* for *ειχον* with P 23, 38, 50, and 56, to which add:

xxi. 3. *εσκηνωσεν* for *σκηνωσει* with **Σ*** 111; but compare *Syr S*.

Again perfect sense, but someone may have thought that it did not accord with *εσονται* and *εσται* following. The Latins are all recorded for *habitabit*. An easy change to *habitavit* 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 **ΕCΧΗ**. The forerunner of our scribe, while copying his bi-columnar græco-coptic, saw **ΕCΧΗ** in the coptic column, and voluntarily or involuntarily wrote the Greek aorist *εσκηνωσεν*. This *sight* of the Coptic is visible also at

xxi. 4 where 143 (alone) writes *ουδε τε* (*pro ουτε*).

A few *changes of order* have curious and notable support :—

- iii. 3. ηκουσας 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* ενασηηατ with 36 and *latt.*
- i. 14. + και *ante* ως χιων. 8-24, 36, 53 and thus exactly the *sahidic* (extant here) **ΒΥΩ ΝΘΕ Ν ΟΥΧΙΩΝ** retaining *και* and *ως*, and *boh* with **ΠΕΛΛ**
- i. 20. + αι χρυσαι *post* λυχνιαι with 36 (notable MS. of græco-syriac parentage) and *Syr S.*
- ii. 10. + γαρ *post* ιδου with 59
- ii. 13. + μου *post* ημεραις ,, 95
Ibid. + μου *post* πιστος ,, CA 14-92, 146
- ii. 27. + και συντριψει αυτους *ante* ως τα σκεψη with 36 again
- iii. 3. + μετανοησης μηδε (*ante* γσησρηρηγη). 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* ηδυνατο with 36 and *sah latt (exc. gig).*
- v. 5. + γαρ *post* ιδου ,, 36
- xx. 4. + ἴδων *inter* και *tert et* τας ψυχας with 56, 95, 127 (a notable combination) and *sah.*
- xx. 6. + ο *ante* αγιος with 32
- xx. 10. την καιομενην πυρι *pro* και θειου Cf. 32 *copt.* Note also :
- xxi. 8. του πυρος *pro* τη καιομενη πυρι και θειω and cf. *copt Tert Hipp.*
- xx. 10. + εβληθησαν *post* ο ψευδοπροφητης with 32
- 11. + του *ante* προσωπου with **ΝΑΡ** 95, 127, *copt Syr S.*
- xxi. 19. + ομοιω *ante* παντι ,, 32 (ομοιοι)
- xxii. 16. + και ο λογος *post* δαδ ,, 32 and 65
- xxii. 18. + εγωιωαννης τυρω α μρ ,, *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. *εν ω̄ pro ω̄ χ̄ῡ primo loco* with **NCP** 38, 111 *copt gig Dion.*
- Ibid. fin. ω̄ (- χριστου)* „ **NCAP** *pauc.* and *Dion.*
- ii. 1 *fin. χρυσίων pro χρυσῶν* So **CA** only with *χρυσεων*
- iii. 3. *ποῖα ὥρα pro ποῖαν ὡραν* *Cf. copt*
- iii. 9. *γνωσονται pro γνωσιν* with 35 (49), 56, 67-120 *vg Syr S.*
- iii. 19. *αν pro εαν* with **16**, 36, 104, 146 (*Oec.*)
- iv. 8. *καθεαυτων pro εν καθεαυτο* *Cf. 80 et gig.*
Ibid. και εν κυκλωθεν pro κυκλοθεν *Cf. 18 et 56*
- xx. 3. *αχρισ αν pro αχρι* *Cf. 119*
- xx. 11. *μεγα και λευκου* *Cf. 50 Prim*
- xxi. 2. *Trs. ιδου in loc ante καινην, non post καινην* (*Cf. 100*)
- xxi. 8. *εστιν pro εν τη ante λιμνη = Hiph̄ (εσται εν τη copt).*
 [Here with *Hiph̄*, we precede the composite Coptic.
Latin and *Prim* = “*pars erit,*” *Tert* = “*particula*” ?]
- xxi. 10. *επι pro επ (ante opos)* with **N 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 α εστι) „ *gig*
- xxi. 27. *εγγεγραμενοι* „ 31, 47 (84)
- xxii. 2. *εμμεσω* „ **A** alone.
- xxii. 3. *εσται εν αυτη* „ 18 *copt*
- xxii. 5. *ετι pro εκει* „ **NAP** 35, 56, 65, 68, 108**, 127, 146 *Copt Prim*
- Ibid. επ αυτους pro αυτους* „ **NA** 18, 35, 68, 127, *gig Prim Anon Ambr.*
- xxii. 12. *εσται αυτω* „ 23
- xxii. 14. *οι πλυναντες τας στολας αυτων* with 7-45-104 (**N 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. *ουρανου (in full) for ανθρωπου* with 114 alone

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 πηχῶν, "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 ουνου may have been misread ανου, and perpetuated. At any rate this witness of ours is no xi, or xiith century fakir, as the previous lists have shown, and this reading is *co-æval* 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. + ει *post* μακαριος
 - i. 5. μαρτυς *pro* αρχων
 - { i. 9. επικαλουμενη *pro* καλουμενη (Lat. "appellatur")
 - { ii. 14. ἐμβαλεῖν *pro* βαλεῖν
 - xxi. 10. ηνεγκεν *pro* απηνεγκε
 - i. 11. περκαμον *pro* περιγαμον (Interchange of kappa and gamma is *Coptic*)
 - i. 15. πληθουσ λαλου *pro* υδατων πολλων
 - ii. 10. + μεγαλην *post* θλιψιν
 - ii. 15. ο κρατων *pro* συ κρατουντας [Cf. 36 - και συ. 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 μοιχευοντας 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* ημερας και νυκτος. There is no trace of this in others except in *Tertullian orat.* "non cesset" . . .
 - v. 5. + απεκριθη *post* και *prim* [*sed* λεγει μοι, *non* λεγων μοι]. Cf. *Coptic et Hier.* These say "He came to me."

- v. 9. γλωττης *pro* γλωσσης [Thus throughout the *Meteora* MSS. 200 and 201 double τ is always written τγ]
- xx. 4. επ αυτοις *pro* επ αυτους
- xx. 10. + εκει *post* βασανισθησονται
- xxi. 12. + τα ονοματα *post* ισραηλ (*pleno*)
- xxi. 18. ενδωσις *pro* ενδομησις
- xxi. 19. ασμαραγδος (*copt* ογσμαρακδος). *Cf. Syr*
[In this connection observe Coptic interchange of κ for γ, which throws light on our scribe's unique *περκαμον* for *περγαμον* above.]
- xxii. 1. κρυσταλλοσ Not Greek but *sah* and many *boh* MSS.
- xxii. 3. ανάθεμα *pro* καταναθεμα
7 *init.* + λεγει κυριος *post* ταχυ
8. ακουων και βλεπων ταυτα + μαρτυρω
9. τούτους *pro* του βιβλιου τουτου
14. + ου μη *ante* εισελθωσιν
17. + της *ante* ζωης
19. τον λογον *pro* απο των λογων. New thus with 72 but not an unlikely reading. *Prim* omits altogether. Possibly another faint place.
20. + ο θεος *post* λεγει
21. ημων *pro* 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 :

ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἁγίου ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ

ἐγγεγραμμένου τοῦ θεολόγου· ἦν ἕλεν ἐν πάτμω τῇ νήσῳ κέ ἐγλό'

the MS. has Αποκαλυψις ἰω̅ χ̅ της γεναμενης εις εμε ιωαννην τον αποστολον (eliminating completely ην εδωκεν αυτω ο θεος τοις δουλοις αυτου α δει γενεσθαι εν ταχει και εσημανεν αποστειλας δια του αγγελου αυτου τω δουλω αυτου ιωαννη), and continues verse 2: του κηρυξαι (substitute for ος εμαρτυρησε) τον λογον του θεου και την μαρτυριαν ἰω̅ χ̅ οσα ιδων Μακαριος ει κ.τ.λ. . . . with the ordinary text.

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

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 **N** (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 **N** 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 **N**CAP 56 *Oec*, **N**CAP 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 *sah* 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 \aleph but of other important documents such as *Syr S*. In fact, it begins to appear as if we were on the footprints 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 \aleph .

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

The famous passage at xxii. 14 is another case in point. The ordinary text runs: *μακαριοι οι ποιουντες τας εντολας αυτου*, whereas these important documents: \aleph A 38, 127, 143, 7-45, 104, 146 *sah aeth Fulg Oec and Haymo*, read: *μακαριοι οι πλυνοντες (πλυναντες, 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 ἀδικῶν ἀδικήσατω ἐτι,*
2. *ὁ ρυπῶν ρυπώσατω ἐτι,*
3. *ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἐτι (οἱ δίκ. δικαιοσύνην ποιήσατω ἐτι),*
4. *ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἐτι,*

there are several variations as to the form of No. 2, \aleph reading (with 18 and 32) *ο ρυπαρος ρυπανθητω ἐτι*, while others have *ο ρυπαρος ρυπαρευθητω 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 : “ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ : ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι,” and nothing is said of a “filthy” or “sordid” one, ῥυπῶν or ῥυπαρός, 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 ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἐτι,
2. ὁ ἀνομος ἀνομησάτω ἐτι,
3. ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἐτι,
4. ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἐτι.

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 ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἐτι,
2. καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἐτι,

Erasmus having retranslated and being responsible for ὁ ρυπῶν ρυπωσάτω ἐτι.

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

ὁ ἀδικῶν δικησάτω ἔτι
καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι
καὶ ὁ ἅγιος 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 bicolunar 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 *θρόνον* 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 ܠܘܥܡܐ ܠܘܥܡܐ ܠܘܥܡܐ in XXI. 11 by “*tanquam lucem splendidam,*” a reference to Walton’s Polyglot gives us “*tanquam splendorem RADII.* This must represent in Greek :—

ὡς φωστῆρ αὐγῆς, instead of
(καὶ ὁ) φωστῆρ αὐτῆς read by all MSS.

Now turn to Gwynn, page 44 note :—

“11. καὶ ὁ φωστῆρ αὐτῆς. So some MSS. and *pr.* and most versions, but the MSS. and most MSS. (versions ?) omit *καὶ* as also *g* and *vg* [*am, arm, etc.* not *cl*] and Σ (which, however, reads these words differently from all else : αὐγῆς for αὐτῆς).

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 *καταστηνιάσαι* for *καὶ ἐστρηνιάσει* 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 *βασανισμόν* 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 *ἀφα*. . . . The problem is to find the right word. We could not do it alone without the help of *Syr* Σ, for it might be :—

- ἀφάνισμον, ‘disappearance by destruction,’
- or ἀφασίαν, ‘dumbness,’
- or ἀφανρότην, ‘weakness,’
- or ἀφάνειαν, ‘ruin by obscurity,’
- or ἀφάρωτον, ‘nakedness’ (absence of cloak),
- or even ἀφαίμιξιν, ‘blood-letting.’

How shall we decide ? Turn to Schaaf’s Syriac N.T. and you

find ܡܘܘܢ, 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 ἀγῆς 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 βασανισμόν, although our scribe perpetuates

βασανισμόν in verse 10, and

βασανισμοῦ in verse 15, just as the Syriac there uses

the other word ܡܘܘܢ :

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

φωστηρ ἀγῆς ὅμοιος λίθῳ τιμιωτατῶ,
ὡς λίθῳ ἰάσπιδι 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 ἀγῆ 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 ἀγάζω once at 2 Cor. IV. 4 : 'shine,' and διαγάζω once 2 Pet. I. 19 : 'dawn.'

It is related in origin to our word *eygh*, eye (pl. *eyen*), through Gothic *augo*¹ and German *auge*, Icelandic *auga*, Swedish *öga*, Sanskrit *aksha* (Latin originally *ocus*, now *oculus*. Hence Russian *oko*).

¹ "Window" in Gothic is *augo-dauro* : 'eye-door' !

Αυγή is very freely used by all the Greek poets in many interesting connections, thus :—

Aeschylus : βίου δύντος ἀυγαί, “life’s setting sun.”
or πυρὸς ἀυγή, and βροντὰς ἀυγαί.

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

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

Probably the basic reading included both ἀυγῆς and ἀυτῆς and was :—

“ ἔχουσαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ
ὡς (so our MS.) φωστῆρ ἀυγῆς ἀυτῆς . . . ”

“ 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 ἀυτῆς in one copy, and someone ἀυγῆς in another. As regards ‘her’ radiance, the missing τῆς before ἀυγῆς (if we read τῆς ἀυγῆς ἀυτῆς) can be found by reading φῶς τῆς for φωστῆρ. In fact our MS. may have φῶς 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 ἀυτῆς for ἀυγῆς, which is not likely.

There are other curious passages like XXII. 2, where we read ἐκ μέσου for ἐν μεσῳ, with 92. This, coupled with στόματος for θρόνου 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 χριστοῦ 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 σαλπυγγῶν for τῆς σαλπύγγος

with Syr S. and Σ, but thereagainst note at XVI. 7 the *singular* (against plural of *all others*)—

“ἀληθίνη καὶ δικαία ἡ κρίσις σου”

with Syr Σ (trace remains in the Greek uncials with *κρισις*), which points in the other direction. While *λεόντων* in XIII. 2 is countenanced by Ν 14-92 Victorin, as well as Syr. We have a novelty among Greek MSS. twice over of τῶν ἰσραηλιτῶν for τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, VII. 4 and XXI. 12. In the first case agreed to by Syr Σ.

As regards the age of these things, compare III. 5 ἔμπροσθεν for ἐνώπιον (*prim.*) alone with Ν, and III. 8 + καὶ before ἰδου alone with Syr S, Σ.

Finally, note the double base of Syr S and Σ coming in at XIV. 15, where we omit the clause ὅτι ἐξηράνθη ὁ θερισμὸς 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 Ν* C 18, 56, 95, 127, 159 Syr S and Σ, *somelatt* and *vg.*, 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 95! 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 1^a 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 Av³¹ or Oec³¹. 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 ~~so~~ *sic* instead of *ita*.

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

Same page last line but 5 ε'σ. Iota has dropped out, should be ε'ισ.

H. C. HOSKIER.